UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 102—PART 8

JUNE 12, 1956, TO JUNE 29, 1956
(PAGES 10093 TO 11514)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1956

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 12, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Vernon May, First Baptist Church, Tylertown, Miss., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, Thou who hast made us for Thyself, as we come to Thee this day, we feel a deep sense of our need. We need Thee to help us become what You would have us be. May we find our example in Him who said, "I am come not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give My life a ransom for all. Pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you. Be not afraid, little flock, for it is the Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."

Help us, our Father, to recognize our individual responsibility in hastening the day when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and His Christ and He shall reign forever and ever.

Bless, we pray, the labors of these Thy servants to the end that justice and righteousness will prevail throughout the earth. In the name of Jesus Christ our Saviour we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, joint resolutions and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 692. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for peace";

H. R. 1402. An act for the relief of Santiago Gonzalez Trigo;

H. R. 1484. An act for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen;

H. R. 2045. An act for the relief of Joe Bargas;

H. R. 3744. An act to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to substitute employees in the postal field service;

H. R. 4873. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Mortimer T. Clement, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired;

H. R. 5079. An act for the relief of Tom Wong (Foo Tai Nam);

H. R. 7702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Shenekji;

H. R. 7913. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to effect the exchange of properties between the United States and the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo.;

H. R. 8709. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended;

H. R. 9475. An act to amend the tobacco-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 9838. An act to authorize transfer of officers of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve to the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 565. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 581. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 590. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 607. Joint resolution to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 247. Concurrent resolution requesting the return of enrolled bill H. R. 1913.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 909. An act for the relief of Charles O. Ferry and other employees of the Alaska Railroad Commission;

H. R. 2452. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the State of Wisconsin;

H. R. 5590. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Gustaf E. Lambert;

H. R. 7641. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for such other purposes;

H. R. 9824. An act to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who die as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean conflict;

H. J. Res. 472. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 533. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 534. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 535. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 553. Joint resolution waiving certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 554. Joint resolutions for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 555. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 566. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 40. An act for the relief of Mrs. William A. Curran;

S. 911. An act for the relief of Eftalia G. Stathis and Ariadni Vassiliki G. Stathis;

S. 1104. An act for the relief of Zoltan Klar and his wife, Vilma Hartmann Klar, and their minor son, Tibor Klar;

S. 1324. An act for the relief of Salvatore di Morello;

S. 1627. An act for the relief of Alexander Orlov and his wife, Maria Orlov;

S. 1869. An act for the relief of George Papoulias and Irene Papoulias (nee Birbilis);

S. 1893. An act for the relief of Harold D. Robinson;

S. 1921. An act for the relief of Ilena Issarescu and her children, Maria Ileana Habsburg-Lothringen and Alexandra Habsburg-Lothringen;

S. 2069. An act for the relief of Hsu Jen-Yuan, also known as Joseph Jen-Yuan Hsu;

S. 2229. An act for the relief of Nina Greenberg;

S. 2294. An act for the relief of Oscar Beregi and Margareth Leiss von Laimburg;

S. 2342. An act for the relief of Yvonne Rohran (Tung) Feng;

S. 2530. An act to repeal the authority of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to issue bonds, and for other purposes;

S. 2585. An act to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center;

S. 2586. An act for the relief of Annie Feig Hildebrand;

S. 2793. An act for the relief of Waclaw Tadeusz Nowosielski;

S. 2800. An act for the relief of David Chih-Wei Kwok;

S. 2895. An act for the relief of Harriet E. Van Tassel;

S. 2827. An act for the relief of Hazel Elizabeth Scott;

S. 2842. An act for the relief of Toini Margareta Heino;

S. 2864. An act for the relief of Waltraud Grete Schramm;

S. 2943. An act for the relief of Moses Rakocinski (Rakoczynski);

S. 2954. An act for the relief of Christina Arutjuenjan;

S. 2959. An act for the relief of Edith Johanna Augusta Kienest;

S. 2999. An act for the relief of Modesto Padilla-Ceja and his wife, Maria Toscano-Padilla;

S. 3000. An act for the relief of Francesco Zammuto;

S. 3009. An act for the relief of Kiyoshi Kinoshita;

S. 3024. An act for the relief of Donald Shang-Peh Kao;

S. 3032. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Middle Atlantic Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact.

S. 3100. An act for the relief of Marianne Eder Dunbar;

S. 3120. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended;

S. 3145. An act to require the Bureau of the Census to develop farm income data by economic class of farm;

S. 3208. An act for the relief of Moses Rosenberg;

S. 3212. An act for the relief of Sita Koppaka Rao and Vijayaalakshmi Koppaka Rao.

S. 3235. An act for the relief of Cleopatra Vasiliades;

S. 3314. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation;

S. 3344. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Territory of Alaska certain lands in the city of Sitka, known as Baranof Castle site;

S. 3402. An act for the relief of Roberto C. Bargas and Rosenda C. Bargas;

S. 3430. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, and for other purposes;

S. 3527. An act authorizing the State highway commission of the State of Maine to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada.

S. 3559. An act to amend the act of August 31, 1954, as amended, so as to extend the availability of emergency credit to farmers and stockmen;

S. 3579. An act for the relief of Elizabeth M. A. de Cuevas Faure;

S. 3581. An act to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service;

S. 3620. An act to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies;

S. 3681. An act to modify certain restrictions with respect to holding more than one office under the United States;

S. 3698. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1920, as amended, providing for allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, and for other purposes;

S. 3723. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey certain land in the county of Alameda, Calif., and to accept other land in exchange therefor;

S. 3778. An act to amend the act for the protection of walruses;

S. 3907. An act to amend section 345 of the Public Health Service Act;

S. 3958. An act to improve the health of the people by assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses and professional public-health personnel, assisting in the development of improved methods of care and treatment in the field of mental health, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 178. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation to provide for certain costs of United States participation in the International Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10721) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 19 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer had appointed the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. MCCLELLAN, as a member of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy in lieu of the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. Kilgore, deceased.

INCOME-TAX DEDUCTION FOR EMPLOYEES' PENSIONS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, in his third semiannual report, the Small Business Administrator said among other things at page 27:

> Another possible revision which is worth study concerns section 401 (formerly sec. 165) of the Internal Revenue Code. This section grants tax benefits to approved pension plans for employees, including executives, of corporations. There is no similar provision available for owners of approximately 3½ million small-business concerns which are not incorporated. Employees, including corporation executives, who participate in these plans do not have to include their employers' contribution in their individual gross income until pensions are received.
>
> The serious problem of the owners of small businesses is not only their difficulty in providing adequately for their old age and their retirement, but also their difficulty in competing with large corporations. A young man may be more attracted by the greater security afforded by a large corporation through its pension plan than by the opportunity which he may have to become an owner or a partner in a small business.

PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, complete elimination of destructive screw-worm fly from a tropical island, promising new techniques for irradiating deep-seated brain tumors, development of better meat and milk producing cattle resistant to high climatic temperatures, techniques for planting and harvesting fish from presently nonproductive fresh water lakes, new understanding of anemia, and extended storage life of uncooked poultry, were revealed during a progress report last week by scientists using radioisotopes. These were the highlights developed at a week-long series of hearings of the Research and Development Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I have the honor to be chairman.

During last week's hearings outstanding scientists reported on their work in the fields of medicine, biology, agriculture, and food sterilization in which radioactive isotopes, the byproduct of our atomic energy program, are playing a key role.

It is a tremendously gratifying experience to listen to these men describe their work, the implication of their finding and to perceive their dedicated determination to put the atom to use in treating mankind's illnesses and to develop new means to protect his health. So accustomed have we in Congress and the public at large become to hearing about the enormity of the atom's destructive power, it is refreshing indeed to hear firsthand from these capable and devoted servants of mankind of the work going on in their little advertised laboratories.

All of this work is being carried on under contract with the Atomic Energy Commission and the benefits of the scientific discoveries being made are just beginning to come out of the laboratories at an increasing rate.

For example, it was reported that a road map has been drawn of the cycle by which plants convert sunlight and carbon dioxide into the various constituents of green plant life such as sugar. With this clearer understanding of the process scientists have actually been able by the use of certain chemicals to almost treble the amount of sugar produced by a certain form of plant. From this, for example, it is apparent that great strides have been made in unlocking the secret of how nature produces chlorophyl.

The infestation of parts of Florida by the screw-worm fly is causing an estimated loss of $10 million worth of livestock a year. The application of the techniques used in the eradication of this pest from a badly infested island if they can be successfully applied on the mainland will offset the cost of doing it, and prevent the spread of this highly destructive insect.

The full transcript of last week's hearing will be made available to the public in the very near future and it is my hope that through the wide dissemination of this committee print people everywhere will become more aware of the great and invaluable contribution to mankind being made by the peaceful applications of atomic energy.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 10003) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1957, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FLAG DAY EXERCISES

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the Flag Day ceremonies that will be held here in the well of the House on Thursday, June 14, in commemoration of Flag Day and the second anniversary of the inclusion of the words "Under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. We promise you an excellent program.

The House will recess for the presentation of an interservice choral group, an honor guard, and the colors. It is hoped that a full membership will be in attendance on Flag Day.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker. there is talk in the air that we shall adjourn in mid-July. I think it is only fair that I should inform the House that I shall not vote to adjourn until the civil rights bill, now bottled up in the Rules Committee, is brought to the floor of the House. Furthermore, I shall demand a record roll-call on adjournment so that every Member of the House is put on record. Whatever the platform planks of the two great political parties may say about civil rights, it will be all hogwash if from both sides of the aisle of this House enough signatures cannot be obtained to the discharge petition to bring the issue squarely out in the open while the 84th Congress is in session.

Who is holding back? Now is the time for square talking and above-the-board dealing. I am informed that all the Democratic Members from Illinois have signed the discharge petition. Let someone speak with authority for the Republican Members from Illinois. Let others speak with authority for the State delegations, both Democratic and Republican, of the other States. This is a moral, not a partisan, issue. It would be violative of every tradition of this body and indeed of the very spirit of legislative representation if we should fold up shop and return home before we have faced on this floor the greatest moral issue of our generation.

SECRETARY OF STATE DULLES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dulles again exemplified his talent for improvident statements. He shocked neutral nations like India, Ireland, Sweden, and Indonesia by calling neutrality obsolete and immoral.

Now all the good President Sukarno's visit did was thus dissipated.

Nehru is due July 7 to visit with the President. I suggest Nehru's visit be postponed. The President probably could not see him then, and Nehru should not be compelled to take a poor substitute and thus confront Mr. Dulles who labels Nehru's India as immoral. His visit would be abortive at its threshold.

As a friend of India, I say, "Come later, Mr. Nehru, if you cannot see the President. Postpone your visit."

The strange part of the situation is that Mr. Dulles had cleared his speech at the White House, despite its inconsistency with the President's views at his last press conference that he saw no real harm in neutrality.

Apparently the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing.

The President discards the unfair theory that if one is not with us he is against us.

Dulles still adheres to this unrealistic if not dangerous notion.

I include in the RECORD a statement by Walter Lippmann which appears in today's Post and Times Herald.

SAFE DRIVING

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include an article from the Lowell Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the award winners of Chrysler's four-star driver awards for safe taxicab driving were given a trip to Washington yesterday. The safety awards are made to the most outstanding taxicab drivers in the entire country.

The Chrysler four-star driver award was given to John L. Michael for safety, courtesy, citizenship, and service.

Mr. Speaker, I wish every school in the Nation could hear the story of a man named John L. Michael, from Lowell, Mass., in my own district, who has driven an automobile for 41 years and never has had a chargeable action against him in all that time. Mr. Michael is 57 years old, and 23 years he has spent driving a taxicab. Much of that time has been with the Diamond Yellow Cab Taxi Service at Lowell. He is known also for his extreme courtesy and efficiency. Lowell is very proud of him.

I wish that every child in every school in the country could be told this story, and that the story could be printed and placed in every school.

Only 2 days ago the son of one of our most valued employees was critically injured by a teen-age driver who was driving at 80 miles an hour. If the children could be told the story about John Michael—this outstanding taxicab driver—they might be careful and would want to live up to his record.

It is only thoughtlessness that makes them reckless drivers. They do not mean to hurt and kill.

DOING BUSINESS WITH COMMUNISTS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it must be obvious to the American people, and I think to the free world generally, that you cannot do business with Communists unless you do it on their terms. It comes with a good deal of surprise to find out that neutralism in Europe is on the march. It is on the march in Asia and also in our own country we find that there are those in official positions who today feel that they can do business with the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, we are on notice in that respect, however. It was in 1920 when the Secretary of State for President Wilson, Mr. Colby, put it in black and white with respect to the broken promises of Russia.

He stated:

> The existing regime in Russia is based upon the negation of every principle of honor and good faith. The responsible leaders of the regime have frequently and openly boasted that they are willing to sign agreements and undertakings with foreign powers while not having the slightest intention of observing such undertakings or carrying out such agreements.

See note for further quotation.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that policy has not changed even to this day.

WHY IS AMERICA DISLIKED?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by M. Raymond Cartier which is, literally translated, entitled "Why Americans Are Detested in the Entire World." I trust that the Members of this House will read the article with care, as it has many very useful suggestions. It also brings to mind the truth of that great and old adage, "Lord, leave me to my enemies but defend me from my friends." I understand on good authority that M. Cartier claims to be a great friend as well as an understanding one of the United States.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

the Subcommittee on Territories of the House Interior Committee may meet this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTING FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 66]

Andersen, H. Carl	Fulton	Mailliard
Anfuso	Gamble	Merrow
Ashmore	Garmatz	Miller, Calif.
Barden	George	Morrison
Bell	Gray	Nelson
Boland	Hale	O'Hara, Minn.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Halleck	Phillips
Byrne, Pa.	Hays, Ohio	Powell
Cannon	Healey	Prouty
Carnahan	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.
Christopher	Hoffman, Mich.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Chudoff	Holtzman	Richards
Cooley	Hope	Rivers
Coudert	Horan	Shelley
Curtis, Mass.	Hyde	Sisk
Dawson, Ill.	Jackson	Thompson, La.
Diggs	Jensen	Thornberry
Donovan	Kee	Tumulty
Dorn, S. C.	Kelley, Pa.	Velde
Dowdy	King, Calif.	Wickersham
Eberharter	Lane	Williams, N. J.
Fjare	McConnell	Willis
Flood	McDowell	Wilson, Calif.
Fogarty	McIntire	Zelenko
	McMillan	
	Machrowitz	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and sixty Members are present, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUPPLEMENTING FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2200)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the purpose of this Act is to encourage State and local participation in the development of projects under the Federal reclamation laws and to provide for Federal assistance in the development of similar projects in the seventeen western reclamation States by non-Federal organizations.

"SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'construction' shall include rehabilitation and betterment.

"(b) The term 'Federal reclamation laws' shall mean the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

"(c) The term 'organization' shall mean a State or a department, agency, or political subdivision thereof or a conservancy district, irrigation district, water users' association, an agency created by interstate compact, or similar organization which has capacity to contract with the United States under the Federal reclamation laws.

"(d) The term 'project' shall mean (i) any complete irrigation undertaking, including incidental features thereof, or distinct unit of such an undertaking or a rehabilitation and betterment program for an existing irrigation project, authorized to be constructed pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws and (ii) any similar undertaking proposed to be constructed by an organization. The term 'project' shall not include any such undertaking, unit, or program the cost of which exceeds $5,000,000: *Provided,* That any project, the estimated cost of which is more than $5,000,000 but less than $10,000,000, may qualify under this Act if the applicant organization is ready, able, and willing to finance otherwise than by loan or grant under this Act all costs in excess of the amount of the loan or grant which would be made under this Act if the estimated construction cost were $5,000,000: *Provided further,* That nothing contained in this definition shall preclude the making of a grant not in excess of $5,000,000 in accordance with the provisions of sections 4 and 5 of this Act, to organizations whose proposed projects qualify for the same but which are not applicants for a loan under this Act: *And provided further,* That nothing contained in this Act shall preclude the making of more than one loan or grant, or combined loan and grant, to an organization so long as no two such loans or grants, or combinations thereof, are for the same project, as herein defined.

"(e) The term 'Secretary' shall mean the Secretary of the Interior.

"SEC. 3. Any organization desiring to avail itself of the benefits provided in this Act shall submit a proposal therefor to the Secretary in such form and manner as he shall prescribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by a payment of $1,000 to defray, in part, the cost of examining the proposal.

"SEC. 4. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construction of a project which has not theretofore been authorized for construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall set forth, among other things, a plan and estimated cost in detail comparable to those included in preauthorization reports required for a Federal reclamation project; shall have been submitted for review by the States of the drainage basin in which the project is located in like manner as provided in subsection (c), section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), except that the review may be limited to the State or States in which the project is located if the proposal is one solely for rehabilitation and betterment of an existing project; and shall include a proposed allocation of capital costs to functions such that costs for facilities used for a single purpose shall be allocated to that purpose and costs for facilities used for more than one purpose shall be so allocated among the purposes served that each purpose will share equitably in the costs of such joint facilities.

"(b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that the organization already holds or can acquire all lands and interests in land (except public and other lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and subject to disposition by him) and rights, pursuant to applicable State law, to the use of water necessary for the successful construction, operation, and maintenance of the project and that it is ready, able, and willing to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this Act such portion of the cost of construction (which portion shall include all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have advised is proper in the circumstances: *Provided,* That the contribution of any applicant organization shall not be required to be in excess of 25 per centum of the costs of the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects.

"(c) If the project is found by the Secretary and the Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appropriate State agency designated by him) to be financially feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this Act, the Secretary is hereby authorized to negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as provided in section 5; but no such contract shall be executed by the Secretary prior to sixty calendar days (which sixty days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain) from the date on which the project proposal has been submitted to both branches of the Congress for consideration by the appropriate committees thereof, and then only if neither such committee, by committee resolution and notification in writing to the Secretary, disapproves the project proposal within such period: *Provided,* That if both such committees, in the same manner and prior to the expiration of such period, approve the project proposal, then the Secretary may proceed to execute the contract: *Provided further,* That in the event either committee disapproves the project proposal, the Secretary shall not proceed further unless the Congress has approved the same. The Secretary at the time of submitting the project proposal to Congress or at the time of his determination that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this Act, may reserve from use or disposition inimical to the project any lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within his administrative jurisdiction and subject to the disposition by him and which are required for use by the project. Any such reservation shall expire at the end of two years unless the repayment contract provided for in section 5 of this Act shall have been executed.

"(d) The Secretary shall give due consideration to financial feasibility, emergency, or urgent need for the project, whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irrigation water for an existing irrigation project, whether the proposal involves rehabilitation of existing irrigation project

works, and whether the proposed project is primarily for irrigation. All project works and facilities constructed under this Act shall remain under the jurisdiction and control of the local contracting organization subject to the terms of the repayment contract.

"SEC. 5. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under the provisions of subsection (c) of section 4 of this Act shall set out, among other things—

"(a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made to the organization and the time and method of making the same available to the organization. Said loan shall not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of constructing the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects;

"(b) the maximum amount of any grant to be accorded the organization and the time and method of paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of constructing the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to nonreimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects;

"(c) a plan of repayment by the organization of (1) the sums lent to it in not more than fifty years from the date when the principal benefits of the project first become available; (2) interest, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, by estimating the average annual yield to maturity, on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations or prices during the month of May preceding the fiscal year in which the loan is made, on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of such month of May, and by adjusting such estimated average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum at the beginning of the fiscal year preceding the date on which the contract is executed, on that pro rata share of the loan which is attributable to furnishing irrigation benefits in each particular year to land held in private ownership by any one owner in excess of one hundred and sixty irrigable acres; and (3) in the case of any project involving an allocation to domestic, industrial, or municipal water supply, or commercial power produced as an element of the project and incidental to its full development, interest on the unamortized balance of an appropriate portion of the loan at a rate as determined in (2) above;

"(d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant predicated upon its performance of nonreimbursable functions is made in accordance with regulations with respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal department or agency primarily concerned with those functions and, in the event of noncompliance with such regulations, for operation by the United States or for repayment to the United States of the amount of any such grant;

"(e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as aforesaid. The liability of the United States under any contract entered into pursuant to this Act shall be contingent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out the same, and every such contract shall so recite; and

"(f) provisions conforming to the preference requirements contained in the proviso to section 9 (c) of the Act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1193), if the project produces electric power for sale.

"SEC. 6. Any proposal with respect to the construction of a project which has theretofore been authorized for construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall be made in like manner as a proposal under section 4 of this Act, but the Secretary may waive such requirements of subsections (a) and (b) of that section as he finds to be duplicative of, or rendered unnecessary or impossible by, action already taken by the United States. Upon approval of any such proposal by the Secretary he may negotiate and execute a contract which conforms, as nearly as may be, to the provisions of section 5 of this Act.

"SEC. 7. Upon request of an organization which has made or intends to make a proposal under this Act, the head of any Federal department or agency may make available to the organization any existing engineering, economic, or hydrologic information and printed material that it may have and that will be useful in connection with the planning, design, construction, or operation and maintenance of the project concerned. The reasonable cost of any plans, specifications, and other unpublished material furnished by the Secretary pursuant to this section and the cost of making and administering any loan under this Act shall, to the extent that they would not be nonreimbursable in the case of a project constructed under the Federal reclamation laws, be treated as a loan and covered in the provisions of the contract entered into under section 5 of this Act unless they are otherwise paid for by the organization.

"SEC. 8. The planning and construction of projects undertaken pursuant to this Act shall be subject to all procedural requirements and other provisions of the Act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080).

"SEC. 9. The Secretary is authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed $100,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall advise the Congress promptly on the receipt of each proposal referred to in section 3, and no contract shall become effective until appropriated funds are available to initiate the specific proposal covered by each contract. All such appropriations shall remain available until expended and shall, insofar as they are used to finance loans made under this Act, be reimbursable in the manner hereinabove provided.

"SEC. 11. This Act shall be a supplement to the Federal reclamation laws and may be cited as the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956.

"SEC. 12. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person, organization, or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to persons, organizations, or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
A. L. MILLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
ALAN BIBLE,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
FRANK A. BARRETT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 5881, providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The major change to the House-passed bill which was agreed to and adopted by the conference committee was the restriction of the legislation to the 17 western reclamation States. The bill as it passed the House was applicable to all 48 States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii. There is a need for the type of program that this legislation authorizes in the East and South as well as the West and this accounts for the wide support for nationwide coverage at the time the legislation was considered and passed in the House in May 1955. However, since that time the Departments of Agriculture and Interior and the Bureau of the Budget have recommended that the type of program authorized by this legislation be made available to the nonreclamation States by amendment to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566, 83d Cong.). In response to requests from Senator Anderson, chairman of the conference committee, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Peterson advised the committee that—

"The Department of Agriculture believes that the purposes sought by title II of H. R. 5881 can most successfully be accomplished by amendment to Public Law 566, 83d Congress, which will, if enacted, permit the Secretary of Agriculture to perform as an integral part of the agricultural services the purposes provided for in title II of H. R. 5881."

Bureau of the Budget Director Hughes advised the committee that—

"The Bureau also recommends that the Congress defer action on title II of the bill at this time, and that legislative authority to extend Federal assistance for irrigation developments in the 31 Eastern States be enacted separately from H. R. 5881. The Secretary of Agriculture will recommend to the Congress the extent to which such Federal assistance is required, and the terms and conditions under which it should be extended."

And Assistant Secretary of the Interior Aandahl advised that—

"Consideration of the differences between the two versions and of the problems involved in integrating operations under either of them with operations under the Water Facilities Act and the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act leads us to join the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Agriculture in recommending that coverage of the Eastern States in H. R. 5881 be deleted."

The Department of Agriculture is apparently disturbed over the prospect of administering two similar programs under separate legislation.

In addition to these expressions from the administration, another action—even more important to the conference committee's consideration—has taken place. Recently, the House passed H. R. 8750, which would amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, and this legislation is presently pending in the Senate. Enactment of H. R. 8750 or similar legislation would give the nonreclamation areas of the Nation a program similar to that provided by H. R. 5881 but without the problems inherent in attempting to administer basic reclamation legislation in nonreclamation States.

Under these circumstances, the conference committee considered it appropriate that the "small projects" local participation program provided under H. R. 5881 should be limited to the reclamation States.

Another significant change to the House-passed bill adopted by the conference committee relates to the authorization procedure. The bill as it passed the House would have required the Secretary to submit project proposals which he approved to both branches of the Congress and to not execute a contract covering any proposal prior to

60 days following such submission. This procedure would permit the review of the proposals by the Congress but it would not provide for approval or disapproval of such proposals. The conference committee retained this provision but extended it to provide for approval or disapproval by the appropriate House and Senate committees within the 60-day period. If either committee should disapprove a project proposal, approval by the Congress would be required before the Secretary could execute the contract.

With respect to the requirement that the applicant organization finance a portion of the project cost, the conference committee adopted, with some modification, the provision in the Senate-passed bill that the organization not be required to contribute in excess of 25 percent of the reimbursable costs.

The conference committee also adopted one other provision in the Senate-passed bill which requires that, where a project produces electric power or energy for sale, the contract for such project include provisions conforming to the power preference provisions of reclamation law. Because of the limitation in the size of the projects, and the treatment of power in the legislation as an incidental purpose, it is not expected that this "small projects" program will result in any appreciable power production for disposal by the organizations. The organizations themselves are preference customers under the law.

In all other major respects, the conference committee agreed to and adopted language in the House-passed bill.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
A. L. MILLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRESTON). The gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report on the small-projects bill which passed the House on May 28, I believe, of last year.

The purpose of this bill is to provide Federal assistance to local irrigation districts, water districts, and other public agencies in the construction of small projects.

The effect of the bill would be to permit the local agencies to build the small projects themselves rather than the Bureau of Reclamation, using the same funds the Bureau could use for that purpose; but, in my opinion, less of those funds, because local agencies can build small projects more cheaply.

This legislation has twice passed the House of Representatives, having passed the House in the preceding Congress under the authorship of the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, the then chairman of the House Committee on Interior, Dr. MILLER, where it failed of passage in the Senate in the last few days.

It again passed the House by a substantial vote in the spring of last year. When the bill was reported from our committee it applied the provisions for the benefit of small projects to all of the 48 States and was amended in the House to provide that with reference to those States, outside of the 17 Western reclamation States—that is, the 31 Southern and Eastern States—the act should be administered by the Department of Agriculture rather than the Department of the Interior.

The bill went over to the other side and the Senate struck out all of the provisions of the House bill and substituted a bill of its own containing two titles. The first title applied only to the 17 Western States and was substantially the bill which passed the House. Title II of the bill provided for operation of the law with reference to the 31 Eastern and Southern States under the Department of Agriculture, although by its terms it was applicable to the entire 48 States. In other words, in the other body the bill was rewritten. Title I applied to the 17 Western States, being in effect the measure passed by this House. The other States were then segregated and put in title II under the administration of the Department of Agriculture with substantially different terms and conditions relating to the type of projects which qualified for Federal assistance and the type of aid that would be given.

The House disagreed to the Senate amendments and asked for a conference during the latter part of the last session, but in the crowded situation that existed at that time we found it impossible to work out the differences between the two houses; therefore, the conference was adjourned over until this session.

In the interim, however, a request was sent to the various executive agencies to determine what their views were of the bill as written in two titles by the Senate and more particularly that portion which was included in title II and which applied to the 31 Eastern and Southern States. The various departments responded. The Department of Agriculture filed its report on January 9, 1956, as did the Department of the Interior on January 11, 1956, and the Bureau of the Budget on January 9, 1956. Each one of those agencies recommended that title II, relating to the operation of this small-project program under the Department of Agriculture, be stricken from the bill and be handled in separate legislation.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. Let me finish my statement.

Mr. GAVIN. I just wanted an explanation of why they disagreed.

Mr. ENGLE. I will be glad to elaborate on that part.

The Bureau of the Budget stated:

> The Bureau also recommends that the Congress defer action on title II of the bill at this time and that the legislative authority to extend Federal assistance for irrigation development in the 31 Eastern States be enacted separately from H. R. 5881. The Secretary of Agriculture will recommend to the Congress the extent to which Federal assistance is required and the terms and conditions under which it should be extended.

The Department of Agriculture said:

> The Department of Agriculture believes that the purposes sought in title II of H. R. 5881—
>
> Which is the bill before you—
>
> can most successfully be accomplished by amendment to Public Law 566, 83d Congress—
>
> Which, by the way, is the Watershed Protection Act—
>
> which will, if enacted, permit the Secretary of Agriculture to perform as an integral part of the agricultural services the purposes provided for in title II of H. R. 5881.

The Department of the Interior was a little more explicit on the point, saying:

> Considering the differences between the two versions and the problems involved in integrating operations under either of them with operations under the Water Facilities Act and the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, leads us to join the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Agriculture in recommending that coverage of the Eastern States in H. R. 5881 be deleted. This recommendation is made without prejudice to later consideration when the various problems inherent in the proposal have been satisfactorily resolved.

Now, subsequent to that time, as I was about to say, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] introduced a separate bill, and it was brought before this House and passed the House of Representatives some weeks ago. That bill is presently pending in the Committee on Public Works in the Senate. During the debate on that bill, which was the direct result of these departmental recommendations that these two matters be segregated and the projects under the Department of Agriculture be handled separately from the consideration of those under the Department of the Interior, Mr. HOPE, the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Agriculture, said this on page 6883 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 24, 1956, when the Poage bill was under consideration. The Poage bill, for the purpose of the record, is H. R. 8750. He said:

> It has been a disturbing thing to the Department of Agriculture to find that they would be compelled to administer two programs, each authorized by a separate piece of legislation, which, in a sense, would be competing with each other.

He was referring to the Watershed Protection Act and the Water Facilities Act, both of which are administered under the Department of Agriculture.

Continuing, he said:

> This legislation will clarify that matter, and I assume in the conference between the two Houses on the small-projects bill the conflicting matter will be eliminated.

I have discussed the matter with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], who is the author of H. R. 8750, the bill relating to the Department of Agriculture pending in the other body now, for the purpose of implementing the reports filed by Agriculture, Interior, and the Budget, and he is in agreement, too, that it would be just as well to eliminate title II from this bill.

The Poage bill is somewhat different in its terms than Senate title II which was tacked onto the bill presently before you. The suggestion was made that it might be possible to put the Poage bill into this conference report. There were certain questions which arose in connection with that which made it impossible for us to do it; not only the parliamentary matters involved, that is, taking the House-passed bill which came out of a different committee and in ef-

fect legislating in a conference committee to put that bill into the conference report, but in addition to that, the separate bill by the gentleman from Texas is presently pending over in the Senate where it was first referred to the Committee on Agriculture and subsequently to the Committee on Public Works. The Members can understand that there is a grave question of propriety of a committee of Congress taking over somebody else's bill, putting it in a conference report, and thereby depriving the regularly established committees of the other body of the consideration of that measure.

So the conference report which we have brought back has the complete concurrence of the members of the conference of the two bodies, except for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], who does not join in this report, and Senator LONG, who on the Senate side did not join—4 Members of the House and 4 Members of the Senate joined in the conference report. This conference report strikes out the title II part of the Senate bill and substitutes what is in effect the bill passed by the House in May of last year applying only to the 17 Western States. The remainder will be taken care of in the separate legislation authored by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], voted through this House and now pending in the other body.

So the conference report before us today is for all practical purposes the same measure that the House passed in May of last year limited to the 17 Western States. There are no really significant changes except for 1 or 2 smaller items that were referred to in the statement read of the managers on the part of the House with reference to certain of the details in the handling of these projects when they come before the Congress of the United States.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. I am sorry I did not hear the complete statement made by the gentleman from California. As he probably knows, I am very much interested in the Poage bill. May I ask, did the managers on the part of the Senate, in the conference committee, give the gentleman from California any assurance that they would support the Poage bill as it was sent over to the Senate, if it were deleted from this conference report?

Mr. ENGLE. It is very difficult for me, as chairman, to refer to what happened in the conference itself; but I would say to the gentleman that it is my opinion that all members of the conference will support the Poage bill in the Senate and that every effort will be made to get the Poage bill out of the committee in the Senate, get it to the floor of the Senate and send it down to the White House simultaneously with this bill. I say, without referring to anything that went on in the conference itself, that it is my opinion that that will be done. For my own part, I will say to the gentleman that I do favor the Poage bill and any assistance that I can give in getting it enacted into law, I intend to do. That was everybody's understanding. There is no conflict between us here. I discussed this matter with Mr. POAGE and he is satisfied with this conference report and the action that we took.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to say to the gentleman that just because Mr. POAGE is satisfied is not any reason why a great many of us are satisfied because, even though the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Texas are satisfied, that is not any reason why we should vote $100 million to 17 States, eliminating the other 31 States in the East. It does not make sense to me. The gentleman says that the Senate may consider the bill. Surely, they may consider it. But with the heavy schedule ahead and in the rush that will develop, it may never even get anywhere in the Senate.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman must keep in mind that there are some things that one can do in a conference and other things that one cannot do. I have tried to explain to the gentleman the difficulty we had due to the fact that we had a separate House-passed bill dealing precisely with that very subject matter, introduced in and passed by this House pursuant to the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. Is it not true that the 31 States about which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is so much concerned are adequately protected under the Poage bill that passed the House?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct. They all want that bill. The problem which arose and on which there has been some discussion by my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], and I assume concurred in by his colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], is that we did not hook the two of them together; and I tried to say that it just was not possible to do it.

Mr. GAVIN. It would be very satisfactory if the Poage bill were up here today. I heartily concur in the suggestion that the legislation is important. I should like to see it passed, but I do not want the other 31 States bypassed. The gentleman can give us no assurance that the Senate is going to take favorable action. I am interested in the East, as other people are interested in the Northwest. We, too, should participate in these programs that make great contributions to the conservation of our water supply in our economic and industrial life.

Mr. ENGLE. Will the gentleman withhold for just a minute for me to make this comment? His colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, was a part of the conference. He knows what discussions occurred there. I am perfectly sure that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] will be glad to discuss that with his colleague, but I cannot stand here on the floor, as the gentleman well knows, and discuss matters that occurred in the conference.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I call to the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the big difference between the Poage bill and this bill is that the money involved in this bill will go to the local groups, who will repay it to the Treasury of the United States. Under the Poage bill, the hundreds of millions of dollars that go to the other States are not reimbursable to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I say that, knowing the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] and knowing of his past record and stand, certainly the gentleman does not want to make it appear as though he concurred in the recommendations of the conferees, even if he was in the conference.

Mr. ENGLE. I made no such implication.

Mr. GAVIN. I doubt very much, knowing him as I do, that he would be taking such a position. I presume he was in the minority and, therefore, there was nothing he could do except to protest. If the group was in agreement, well, he might take the position, but he did not get anywhere. No doubt he will tell us of his position on the matter.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman raised a question as to what the other body was going to do with this legislation and with reference to whether or not there was a good faith intention to press the Poage bill on the other side. That is the matter to which I was referring and on which the gentleman can certainly secure adequate information.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. YOUNG. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us the relationship between the small-projects bill and the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act. Does the small-projects bill purport to amend or supersede in any way the rehabilitation and betterment legislation now on the books?

Mr. ENGLE. As far as I know, it does not. It is separate legislation that deals with physically small projects, permitting local agencies to build projects of that character themselves rather than have the Bureau of Reclamation do them more expensively. There is no project which is authorized by this bill which cannot be built under present reclamation law, but we think more of them will be built, and be built more cheaply, if this bill goes into effect.

Mr. YOUNG. One more question regarding the size of the project. I notice that the upper limitation is $5 million except in certain cases where projects between $5 and $10 million could qualify, providing the applying organization financed all costs in excess of what the charge would be if the project cost $5 million. To take a specific case, assume there was a $9-million project, one-third flood control, one-third reclamation, and one-third power. Would this mean a participating organization would receive one-third of $5 million, for example, for

flood control, or would it be $3 million, the relationship to the overall cost of $9 million?

Mr. ENGLE. It is only contemplated that the total amount of money which can be advanced in non-interest-bearing loans total not in excess of $5 million for any one project. If there are nonreimbursables in the project, they are nonrepayable as they are presently under the law.

Mr. YOUNG. Is the overall project reduced to $5 million for the purpose of determining the participation by the Federal Government with the local agencies? I notice in the legislation it is stated that the upper limit is $5 million. There are certain projects between five and ten million that may qualify, providing the organization will finance all costs in excess of what would be required, the $5 million.

Mr. ASPINALL. In excess of $5 million. That was the provision in the first bill as it went through the House. That provision is in there. I think the chairman should explain the question of the procedure in reporting back to the Congress on projects over a certain amount. I think that would be of benefit.

Mr. ENGLE. We have been very careful in this bill to give control to the Congress itself of these small projects. That matter is referred to on page 7 of the conference report in the third paragraph, which I will read:

> Another significant change to the House-passed bill adopted by the conference committee relates to the authorization procedure. The bill, as it passed the House, would have required the Secretary to submit project proposals which he approved to both branches of the Congress and to not execute a contract covering any proposal prior to 60 days following such submission. This procedure would permit the review of the proposals by the Congress but it would not provide for approval or disapproval of such proposals. The conference committee retained this provision but extended it to provide for approval or disapproval by the appropriate House and Senate committees within the 60-day period. If either committee should disapprove a project proposal, approval by the Congress would be required before the Secretary could execute the contract.

This is important because it gives the Congress a chance to look these projects over. The Secretary of the Interior cannot sit down and parcel out these projects without any surveillance by the congressional committees. The Committee on Appropriations first passes on the amount of money and the authorizing committee has the right to review and reject the project. If the authorizing committee reviews and rejects the project by resolution thereupon the project cannot be built unless it is authorized by the Congress. That is an important provision it seems to me and it is the one to which the gentleman referred.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRESTON). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-two Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 67]

Andersen, H. Carl	George	Nelson
Anfuso	Gray	O'Hara, Minn.
Ashmore	Hale	O'Neill
Bell	Halleck	Patman
Betts	Hays, Ohio	Phillips
Bolton, Oliver P.	Healey	Powell
Byrne, Pa.	Hoffman, Ill.	Prouty
Cannon	Hoffman, Mich.	Reed, N. Y.
Carlyle	Holtzman	Rhodes, Ariz.
Carnahan	Hope	Richards
Christopher	Horan	Riehlman
Chudoff	Jackson	Rivers
Cooley	Jensen	Robsion, Ky.
Coudert	Kee	Rogers, Fla.
Curtis, Mass.	Kelley, Pa.	Sisk
Dawson, Ill.	King, Calif.	Thompson, La.
Denton	Krueger	Thornberry
Diggs	Lane	Tumulty
Dondero	Lipscomb	Vanik
Dorn, S. C.	McConnell	Velde
Dowdy	McIntire	Vorys
Eberharter	McMillan	Wainwright
Fjare	Machrowicz	Wickersham
Fulton	Mailliard	Williams, N. J.
Gamble	Mason	Wolverton
Garmatz	Miller, Calif.	Zelenko
	Mollohan	
	Morrison	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 350 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 10899, the Department of Commerce and related agencies appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1957.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I regret that some Members were taken from other matters in connection with this quorum call, but I would like to use the opportunity while they are here to restate the basic proposition that is before the House, and that is that this small-projects bill comes back here limited to the 17 Western States, because the House of Representatives a few weeks ago passed separate legislation under the authorship of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], which puts the administration of small projects in other areas of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture; that bill is currently pending over in the Senate. It was not possible to sit and legislate as a conference committee with legislation in separate bills pending before the Senate, which had already passed the House, and to include that legislation then in this conference report.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I think the gentleman from California has well stated the situation. Some of the friends of this program, some of those who have been deeply interested in establishing a program all over the United States that would enable people in all parts of the country to enjoy the advantages of local irrigation and other water uses, have felt that if we passed this conference report today before we passed the bill that the Committee on Agriculture brought you some time ago and is now pending in the Senate, that we would be jeopardizing the opportunity to extend this program nationwide.

I think that is a mistake because I believe, if we pass this conference report and make the Engle bill applicable to the 17 Western States, that we have then given them a needed tool with which to work out their problem; that if we can then pass the small watersheds bill, as brought out by the Committee on Agriculture, we will have provided an effective tool for all of the United States; and that between the two we will have a very effective program of water utilization throughout the country.

I know that there are those who say that if you pass this bill you will get no help in passing a watersheds bill. That has not been my experience with the gentleman who now stands before you and those who have worked with him on this bill. I think that we may certainly assume that we will have all the support and all the cooperation that it is possible for them to give us.

I know that in the other body there is a considerable feeling that possibly they might even hold up action on this conference report until such time as they have had an opportunity at least to pass upon the watersheds bill in their committee and determine whether or not they were going to consider it there on the floor. They have that opportunity and I think we may rely upon them to use it intelligently. I do not think we should put ourselves in the position of forcing them to do something that they do not want to do. But I believe that we may rely upon them to do the intelligent thing, and by doing it we will have a well-rounded program.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statement of the gentleman, and certainly he is correct. The problem develops from the fact that one portion of this program is administered under the Department of the Interior and the other under the Department of Agriculture. Each of those departments recommended separate legislation, concurred in by the Bureau of the Budget. When the separate legislation was passed by the House it preempted that field, so far as that legislation was concerned.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. If the conference report before us today is approved and if the Poage watersheds bill is approved and still it develops that the effort to get an adequate local irrigation program for the States that are not in

the present reclamation program is not successful, is it the idea of the gentleman from California that his committee would be receptive to correcting any defects that might develop in the coming year that could not be handled by legislation from the Committee on Agriculture; that is, if it develops that it is necessary for us to bring in the Department of the Interior in the Eastern States into this program, how would the gentleman react to that?

Mr. ENGLE. We tried to do that. Our original bill included the 48 States under the Department of Agriculture. If you have trouble with the Poage bill we will amend this law to put you in.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 68]

Andersen, H. Carl	Garmatz	Miller, N. Y.
Ashmore	George	Morrison
Bell	Gray	Nelson
Betts	Hale	O'Hara, Minn.
Boggs	Halleck	Phillips
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hays, Ohio	Powell
Byrne, Pa.	Healey	Prouty
Cannon	Hébert	Rains
Carnahan	Heselton	Reed, N. Y.
Chudoff	Hoffman, Ill.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cooley	Hoffman, Mich.	Richards
Coudert	Holtzman	Rivers
Curtis, Mass.	Horan	Robsion, Ky.
Dawson, Ill.	Jackson	Sieminski
Deane	Jensen	Sisk
Diggs	Kean	Spence
Dondero	Kee	Thompson, La.
Dorn, S. C.	Kelley, Pa.	Thornberry
Dowdy	Krueger	Tumulty
Eberharter	Lane	Velde
Fjare	McConnell	Vorys
Fogarty	McIntire	Wainwright
Fulton	Machrowicz	Wickersham
Gamble	Mailliard	Williams, N. J.
	Mason	Wolverton
	Miller, Calif.	Zelenko

The SPEAKER. Three hundred fifty-one Members are present, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUPPLEMENTING FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California will proceed.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, at the time of the quorum call I was answering a question by the gentleman from Mississippi preparatory to getting around to yielding some time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] which I will do immediately after answering this question.

The gentleman from Mississippi asked whether or not our committee would cooperate in getting irrigation benefits for the Eastern and Southern States if for some reason or other difficulty is encountered with the Poage bill.

My answer to him is that the bill now before us when it came out of our committee applied to the 48 States but provided for the administration of the entire program in the whole country by the Department of the Interior. On the floor of the House, however, the Department of Agriculture was put in charge of projects outside of the 17 Western States which, of course, is the genesis of the difficulty we have had and as a result of which separate legislation has been introduced to authorize these small projects by the Department of Agriculture in other parts of the country.

So the answer to the gentleman's question is, Yes; and the precedent of the committee's action in including the 48 States is the best evidence I can cite to him of our intention and the attitude of our committee with reference to aiding the other States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in May of 1955 when the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported the bill H. R. 5881 to the House, the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior extended to the 48 States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska. When that bill was called up for debate on the floor of the House on May 26, 1955, there was an amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Alabama to limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to the 17 Western Reclamation States and in the 31 Midwestern, Eastern, Southern States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska the Secretary of Agriculture would administer the provisions of the bill. That is the way the bill passed the House.

It went over to the Senate, and the Senate also passed a bill covering the 48 States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

We went to conference in June of 1955. The conferees appointed on the part of the House were our good chairman, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, and myself. The managers on the part of the Senate were Senators ANDERSON, BIBLE, WATKINS, BARRETT, and LONG of Louisiana.

It is interesting, and the Members of the House should know, that 7 of the 10 conferees came from the 17 Western States. All of the conferees who signed that report with the exception of the Honorable LEO O'BRIEN came from the 17 Western States. Senator LONG and myself did not sign this conference report. I could not in good conscience sign it. I am therefore going to ask the Members of the House to recommit this to the conferees because the House and the Senate both have spoken and have explicitly stated they expected this bill to apply to the 48 States, and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

What the conferees did, in my opinion, was to absolutely disregard the will of the House and to absolutely disregard the will of the Senate and write their own legislation. This bill now gives the same $100 million not to the 48 States and the two Territories. This gives the $100 million to the 17 Western States.

Mr. Speaker, it is true, as has been pointed out, that we have passed the Poage bill, and I voted for that bill and I will support it and I hope that it will become law; but the very reasons that has been given that we should accept this conference report indicates to me that the major premise of the proponents' argument is false, because if we should pass the Poage bill it will take care of not just the other 31 States but the entire 48 States. Why therefore should we pass this bill just to take care of the 17 Western States? If the Poage bill is as good as the chairman of our committee has said it is and as Mr. POAGE says it is, and as I hope that it is, we do not need this legislation, for all the States will be provided for. Why should we give to the 17 Western States the $100 million provided for in this conference report when the House of Representatives and the United States Senate said it should extend to all 48 States? To me, the proponents and conferees who signed this report fail to answer that important question.

May I say to the Members who come from the Midwest, Eastern, and Southern States that probably each and every one of you have had the same experience I have had. Municipalities and interested groups in your home communities have written to you to ask whether or not there is anything in the law that would enable them to get a little Federal help so that they might improve their water system or that they might enlarge their water system, or control their waste water, or irrigate their lands. They do not ask for a Federal grant but they would like just a little Federal help. They have been hearing about the fact that the 17 Western States have been able to use the Bureau of Reclamation and through it secure Federal funds to get help for the towns in those 17 Western States for the very type of project that yours and my communities are seeking. But we in the Midwest, East, and the South have had absolutely no help from the Federal Government for these identical projects. One of the things I had hoped would come out of the conference was that the Midwest, the East, and the South would be able to get for our communities just the same benefits enjoyed by the 17 Western States for so many years at the expense of the Midwest, the East, and the South. During the many sessions of the conference Senator LONG and I did not try to cut down the rights enjoyed by the 17 Western States. We only ask that our people be entitled to the same benefits. But, no, no; we did not get that. We were told that this bill should be changed to take care of the 17 Western States and if any help were to be given to the Midwest, the East, and the South it would come from the Poage bill. Under the guise of the Poage bill being passed some day we were told we could have no help in this conference report; that we in the 31 Midwest, Eastern, and Southern States could not have the same benefits for our communities to help them with their municipal water supply, to help them with their industrial water supply, to help them with their saline water control problems that we have in all of the Eastern States and on the

Gulf of Mexico. No; we are cut out; we will have to rely on the Poage bill.

Well, let us see what has happened to the Poage bill. The Poage bill, as it passed the House of Representatives, was referred to the Senate and was sent to the Senate Agriculture Committee. Since it came before the House Agriculture Committee, it went, I think, to the proper committee, but the great chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee asked that his committee be discharged from the consideration of that bill and had it referred to another committee. I have recently been informed that it has since been reported to a third committee and not reported out as of this time.

Now, when the House of Representatives passes a bill covering 48 States, which enables the people in every town and hamlet in the Midwest, the East, and the South to get some assistance from the Federal Government for their water-control problems—and I think it is conceded by all Members of the House and the Senate and the members of the executive department that water is one of the great problems of our country—why should we give this special consideration now to the 17 Western States? If the bill should be referred back to the conferees and told that the House passed a bill covering the 48 States and they wanted these benefits extended under this bill to the 48 States, then to me it seems it comes with poor grace from several of the bureaus downtown to report adversely on this bill.

Now, I can understand why the Department of the Interior reported adversely on the bill. To me it is very simple. Their jurisdiction was not extended. They were told that the House expected them to continue to control the water in the 17 Western States and to not come into the 31 Midwest, Eastern, and Southern States. In the 31 Midwest, Eastern, and Southern States we already have the Department of Agriculture functioning, and the Department of Agriculture should extend its groundwork and all they would have had to do was to enlarge their present program a very little bit, and they would have been able to handle it. The reason the Department of Agriculture reported adversely on this bill is this: This bill would have given them a job to do that would have required them to do a little work. The bureaus downtown do not like to work unless they are performing duties that they have asked Congress to pass.

One of the things before the House right now on this conference report, I think, is that they must determine whether or not they should pass the legislation and determine what should be done with regard to the laws of this country or whether we should leave it up to 1 or 2 of the bureaus downtown. I think this issue on this conference report points up very clearly the fact that the Members of the House must decide whether or not they are actually the legislative body of the United States or whether the legislative body lies within certain bureaus downtown.

As one who is interested in extending the provisions of this bill to all 48 States, Hawaii, and Alaska for equal treatment to all, I urge you to vote to recommit this conference report to the conferees.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I understand there is $100 million involved in this bill. Is that right?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. GAVIN. That would be then prorated among the 17 States that would participate in the program; is that right?

Mr. SAYLOR. It would be allocated among the 17 Western States by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. GAVIN. Now, if the House bill had been agreed to and no deletion made by the conferees, then the $100 million would have given 48 States an opportunity to participate in this overall program; is that correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. There was absolutely no effort on the part of the conferees to cut down the $100 million. The only thing they cut was the number of States from 48 to 17. But they kept the $100 million for the 17 Western States.

Mr. GAVIN. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the only answer to it is this. The other 31 States that would like to participate in the program will be paying the taxes which will be used to make up the fund of $100 million to give the benefits to those 17 States.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is right.

Mr. GAVIN. I think it is a great program. All I ask is that fair and equitable consideration be given to all sections of the country and no special benefits to one section against any other section of the country. If they had let the bill alone as it passed the House and the Senate I would be for it. I would support the Poage bill. I think we are entitled to just as much consideration as any other section of the country.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. That is the reason I oppose this conference report. I should like this extended to all the 48 States.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman does not want to leave the impression with the Members of the House that there is going to be a prorated division of the $100 million authorized by this bill?

Mr. SAYLOR. No; I should like to make that very clear, that the gentleman's group kept the $100 million. The only thing that was prorated was the States. The $100 million will be allocated to the States by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. ASPINALL. But the money is not to be prorated State by State, anything like that. This is a trial or a research authorization. The gentleman also will admit that the Poage bill, which is an amendment to the Small Watersheds Act and which is supposed to take care of the interests of the 31 other States, has an unended authorization; that is, there is no limit to it and moneys may be expended as the Congress of the United States sees fit.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. But the important thing is that the Poage bill includes the 17 Western States; it does not exclude the 17 Western States, and they will have the benefits of this bill and the Poage bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the contents of the conference report have been accurately stated by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE]. Part of the report has been discussed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. SAYLOR], who is opposed to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are here considering a conference report on a bill for small projects, a bill that we passed in the 83d Congress and then lost in the other body in the closing days of that Congress. It has the same principle exactly, which I shall explain a little later. The bill before us now passed this Congress in June of last year. It did have 2 sections, 1 the watershed section touching the 31 Eastern and Southern States and the other dealing with the 17 Western States.

In the conference, of the managers on the part of the House and Senate, 8 of the 10 conferees saw fit to delete the watershed section, dealing with the 31 States, with the understanding that they would be included in a watershed bill known as the Poage-Hope bill, which passed this House. There is some concern about why that was done. I hold in my hand letters from the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture, these agencies wanted a separation of the bill because of duplication and troubles of administration—your conference committee followed the suggestion of the agencies concerned.

This is a bill to permit managers of local projects to handle their own planning, do their own work without a great deal of interference by the Federal Government. It is necessary for the local group to put up a thousand dollars to have their plans reviewed by the Federal Government. They may deposit up to 25 percent of the money and they may borrow up to $5 million if they meet all qualifications. It keeps details of planning and operation at the loval level. It cuts out controls from Washington.

I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is worried about the $100 million, that is the ceiling on the amount of money in the bill. Every penny of that money is to be paid back to the Federal Treasury. That is not true in the watersheds bill, which I voted for and which I think is a good bill. The only money repaid there would be the money for the municipal water supply. As to the flood-control moneys, the great State of Pennsylvania has received a quarter of a billion dollars in flood-control money, and not one penny of that has been or will be paid back to the Treasury.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Not at this point.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The local groups do the planning. They must repay borrowed moneys.

The local groups do their own planning. The bill has a provision that lets Congress review the project plans. That is a good point.

The original bill as passed by the House would have been difficult to administer. This is not a dispute between the 17 Western States and the East or South. Not at all. The watershed bill will benefit all States. I think the watershed bill is an excellent approach to the subject, and I voted for that bill.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] referred to the fact that the bill that passed the House had 48 States in it and the bill as it passed the Senate had 48 States in it, with, of course, a separate title for the portion under the Department of Agriculture. But it is true, is it not, that since that happened the House passed the Poage bill, which takes care of those portions under the Department of Agriculture? That bill is presently pending in established committees of the Senate. That is the reason we had to take that provision out and that the Senate conferees would not agree to tacking the Poage bill on.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the gentleman is correct. We should remember that this conference report makes it possible for local groups to borrow the money from the Federal Treasury. They must put up some of their own money. They have certain obligations they must fulfill. After they do that they can borrow the money and it must be paid back over a period of years.

I think the conference report is a good report. We have worked hard on it, and I recommend that it be adopted.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, after listening to my very good and able friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], of his very able presentation, I want to say I heartily concur in what he has said. I agree with him that this proposed legislation should be recommitted for further consideration. I feel that an injustice is being done in making it a sectional bill. Had the 48 States been considered rather than 17 States in the northwestern section of the country I would say it would be all right. However, it is quite evident that the 17 States and the Northwest got together and worked out legislation that will delete the 31 States in the East and the South and set up a $100 million program for their particular section of the Nation. If this bill is passed there will no doubt be a conference with Department of Interior as to the allocation of the $100 million authorized among the 17 States. Very nice program, I would say, for the Northwest; not so good for the East or South. All we do is pay the bill but not share the benefits.

There is something unique about the Congress. We do not seem to be organized in the northeastern part of the United States, and by that I mean the New England States and Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island and Delaware. Some day, I hope in the not too distant future, we are going to get organized in the Northeast section as you are in the Northwest and then when these various programs come up we will say, "Certainly, we will go along with various legislative proposals provided you give fair and equitable treatment to all sections of the Nation and do not give preferred consideration to one section against another." So long as you look after your area you are not concerned about the rest of the States. After legislation was enacted to include the other 31 States in the bill the conferees got together. As was pointed out by my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, 8 of the 10 conferees came from the Northwest. So the only two in the minority, Senator LONG, of Louisiana, and Representative SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, objected and were overruled. Certainly, they objected. So, we feel that it is rather an injustice that 17 States would bring in legislation to the exclusion of the other 31 States. Had I been one of the conferees handling the conference report, I would have let the legislation alone just as it was agreed upon by the House and Senate and would have permitted the 48 States to participate in this program without giving preferred consideration to one section of the country over any other section.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the gentleman from Colorado to say that the $100 million which would go to the 17 States was for experimental and research purposes?

Mr. GAVIN. If it is, it is quite a costly experimental and research program. I would not mind the northeastern section of the country having some kind of experimental program. My good friend here, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] can tell you about the coal industry in our State. I wish we could secure a $100 million program to carry on a research program to develop some technique and methods by which we could produce and sell more Pennsylvania coal. There are hundreds of miners who have been unemployed in the great State of Pennsylvania for the past several years in our region. A research program for coal would be most helpful. But should we offer legislation for such a program for coal in Pennsylvania, I wonder how much consideration would be given to it? Again, I say it is about time the States in the Northeast get organized. I hope we can get these Northeast States together and get organized and then maybe we can get some equitable and fair consideration when these legislative proposals are presented. I trust when this conference reported is voted upon it will be recommitted and the conferees will come up with legislation that will give fair treatment to all the States of the Nation.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, we have this afternoon witnessed a considerable difference of honest opinion. I think it is clear that everybody here is agreed that we ought to have a water program. Everybody, regardless of where he lives recognizes the importance of providing water storage both for municipal purposes and for irrigation purposes. The people of the West realized the need of water storage first because it was a more pressing problem for them. But, now such storage is a pressing problem for all parts of the United States.

This conference report will not solve all our problems all over the United States, but it does make a start in the direction that all of us think is sound and desirable. When combined with the bill that the Committee on Agriculture brought before this House recently and which we passed, and which is now pending in regular order in the other body, it will, as I see it, give us a pretty good water storage program all over the United States.

Now there are those who honestly say, "Let us beat down this conference report this afternoon and possibly that will force the advocates of the Engle bill into passing the Poage bill before we agree to this report." It seems to me that it is just a mistaken idea that you can or should force or blackmail others into seeing things your way. I think we all pretty well see the thing alike. We are all pretty well agreed that we need a water-storage program in every State in the Union. The bill, which the House recently passed, makes a water-storage program available to every State in the Union. This conference report on the one hand gives a program which I think is needed for these Western States, which are even more dependent on irrigation than your section and mine, perhaps. I live east of the 98th meridian. There are those who are trying to divide this House on a sectional basis. I do not live in that region where the Bureau of Reclamation now operates, although I do live in the great State of Texas. I come from east of that 98th meridian. Nevertheless, I want the reclamation area to have the program which they need. I also want the other States to have not only a water-storage program, but I also want the people of every State to have a sound flood-prevention program. The Poage bill provides both. Of course, I think the Poage bill should pass. Everyone seems agreed on that. The only question is whether we are more likely to secure passage by cooperation or by a kind of blackmail. I urge you to use cooperation.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I think that the greatest difficulty here is the question of the jurisdiction of those who must supervise any of these programs. No one can charge me with being sectional in my approach to any of the beneficial conservation programs. I have always favored and supported programs

that would help the Nation generally, regardless of where the projects—reclamation, flood control, or multipurpose—are located.

The Reclamation Act, the law of 1902, gave to the Department of the Interior the authority to supervise the reclamation program and such authority does not extend east of the 17 Western States. Accordingly, when we included in the original bill the 31 Western States we got into a difficulty of administration. There is no way at the present time by which the administration, that is, the Department of the Interior, can supervise under the terms of the general reclamation law any of the benefits which the 17 Western States have.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. When I have finished my statement I will yield.

The conference committee is not composed of 8 western Members of Congress but is composed of 7 Members from the West—the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] is the third member of the majority of the House conferees. The members of the conference were chosen in accordance with the rules of seniority in this House. We were agreeable to going along with a separate bill—the Poage bill—for administration by the Department of Agriculture, because we wanted all of the States to have the benefits which flow from irrigation programs and projects.

I now yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Is it not a fact that part of this $100 million that is mentioned is derived from reclamation funds? Reclamation funds are separate from the revenues that come from the land holdings in these 17 Western States?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct. The reason for the $100 million authorization limit in this legislation is for the purpose of determining whether or not a program like this, under the jurisdiction of a Federal department, can be operated successfully and effectively. There was no question of dividing up the monetary benefits, that might be considered, between different areas of the Nation.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman realizes that the 31 States were to be operated under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture, so there would not be any difficulty in that respect, even if they were all in the same bill. The 17 States under the Bureau of Reclamation and 31 States under Department of Agriculture. What assurance have we that the other body is going to take any action on this bill in this session of the Congress? None whatsoever. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] said the position we have taken today may be an effort to try to compel the Senate to take action on the Poage bill. I might say to the gentleman from Texas it will be a day well spent, as far as I am concerned, if we could recommit this bill and the other body did take action and passed the Poage bill. I would feel reconciled to this situation that fair and equitable consideration will be given to all States and sections of the country. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], said the present bill before us was a step in the right direction. To me it is in the wrong direction. It is going in the direction of the Northwest and I am in the direction of the Northeast. It it was directed to the Northeast it would be all right with me.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee, [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to give my support to this conference report. It does not go as far as it should in taking in all the States in the East. However, I was happy to serve on the subcommittee which wrote the watershed protection amendment, known as the Poage bill, which includes agricultural irrigation service and also municipal water supplies to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture. I hope, and I feel sure the Senate will take up that bill in the near future and pass the necessary legislation to carry out the provisions that are being demanded by people who are opposing this conference report.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. What we are talking about is separate but equal treatment, because we have to handle matters in separate bills, inasmuch as one is in Agriculture and one is in Interior.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. Separate and equal treatment, and we propose that the Poage bill will do just that.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SAYLOR moves to recommit the conference report to the conferees.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SAYLOR) there were—ayes 48, noes 66.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would remind the gentleman that there was an understanding that no votes would be had today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the conference report be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of no quorum.

AMENDING COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 503 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4090) to amend part II of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to require the installation of an automatic radiotelegraph call selector on cargo ships of the United States carrying less than two radio operators, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, when I have concluded my statement, I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 4090 is to amend section 353 of the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that cargo vessels of the United States must carry more than one radio operator unless the ship is fitted with an automatic radiotelegraph call selector, in addition to the auto-alarm required by present law.

The bill would also amend section 353 to provide that a continuous watch by means of qualified radio operators must be kept unless the ship is fitted with both the automatic radiotelegraph call selector and the auto-alarm.

It is pointed out in the report accompanying H. R. 4090 that such installation would facilitate and improve communications and thus promote safety standards at sea for the protection of life and property.

The effective date of the mandatory installation requirement is 18 months, or shorter if the Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission has found that the call selector is available and may be installed at a reasonable cost to shipowners, and that the patents necessary for the manufacture of the device are and will continue to be freely available for license at a reasonable royalty.

Mr. Speaker, this is a step in the right direction as far as safety of the sea is concerned. I recall just about a year ago—to be exact on June 27, 1955—when in Boston Harbor an excursion ship that travels around the harbor and oftentimes to Nantucket and to Providence, with 272 of a school group aboard ran aground in a dense fog in the harbor. It was amazing to the public at large and to the people at large that there was no auto alarm, there was no radio alarm, there was no ship-to-shore communication available on this excursion steamer. If the 272 aboard had ever realized there was no means of communicating to another ship or back to shore, there surely would have been a panic aboard that boat. There was a headline in the paper of that day that caused great concern. At the present time we have a little over a thousand ships in our cargo fleet that must have auto alarms. Auto alarms are used only in cases of dire distress when they send out an SOS. The radio telegraph alarm which is forced to be put into these new ships or they would have to carry an added radio man does this:

No. 1. The automatic radio telegraph call selector with capability of receiving and responding to the following: A, the international distress signal, S O S, B, the international safety signal, T T T, the international urgent signal, X X X, the ship's call sign and any other predetermined code which is desired for use in national emergency.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated previously, this definitely is a step in the right direction. This is an opportunity for the Congress to enact legislation for further safety of life at sea.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 503 and at this time yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the membership of this House will appreciate that it is not exactly a happy situation to oppose a bill authored by the majority leader.

At least, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is only doing what he believes to be right in opposing legislation he believes to be wrong.

H. R. 4090 is not a major piece of legislation. It is not included in any political program. It should be judged free of party and personalities. So, first, I urge my colleagues to act on the merit of the bill and not on the merit of its author and his worthy motives.

In my opinion, just the opposite occured when the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported the bill out. In fact, it reminded me of the old game of follow the leader. It could not have been decided, it seemed to me, on the basis of the testimony and hearings, and I feel if you read the 130 pages of the hearings you will recognize this as a gadget bill wrapped up and labeled "Safety at Sea."

A substantial minority of the Commerce Committee, according to the minority views, voted against reporting H. R. 4090 favorably.

The witnesses favoring H. R. 4090 were the owner of the patents, his son-in-law, a representative of one group of radio operators, and of course the distinguished author of this bill. Outside the latter, the proponents had some reason to hope for the passage of the bill.

For that matter, admittedly the various shipowners' associations had similar incentives to oppose the measure.

But the departments of Government which were negative or downright opposed certainly are objective critics and in the case of the Federal Communications Commission, particularly Commissioner Webster, are experts in this field and the very sources to which we laymen should look in order to avoid pitfalls and mistakes.

When I was a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee during the 83d Congress hearings were held on a bill similar to H. R. 4090. I signed minority views. Time, service on the Merchant Marine Committee, and further testimony have only served to increase my knowledge of the facts and conviction that this is bad legislation.

Frankly, it seemed to me the argument in the Rules Committee the other day was not a matter of explanation and logic but more of emotion.

For example, there was an attack on the steamship owners and the statement was made that this industry had always opposed safety and means of protecting lives at sea.

On the other hand, in testifying before the committee on H. R. 4090 the industry stated without challenge that the shipping industry is safety conscious. It pointed out with pride that it incorporates millions of dollars in safety features into American vessels. It stated with pride that it spends millions of dollars in operational measures and devices to increase safety of life at sea. As a matter of fact, as the hearings state, new technical specifications for the auto-alarm presently used internationally were supported by the shipping industry at the Safety of Life at Sea Conference in London in 1948.

Improved auto-alarm devices to overcome atmospheric and interfering signals have been adopted by the Federal Communications Commission as the hearings show. But such features are not incorporated in the proposed call selector device which would become mandatory under H. R. 4090. The FCC reports this new gadget will not respond efficiently with atmospheric interference. Interference will blanket the alerting signals.

As to the criticism that the industry has always opposed safety, I think the voluntary installations of direction-finding equipment 20 to 25 years in advance of compulsion contradict such a statement. Radar, depth sounders, loran, gyrocompasses and gyropilots and similar devices installed but not required by law, indicate the irresponsible nature of such undocumented arguments. Steamship interests supported a program for merchant ships to have internationally improved lifeboat radio equipment. And besides, if there were a basis of truth for the charge, the argument is hardly germane to the merits or lack of them with respect to H. R. 4090.

A Commerce Committee member before the Rules Committee referred as a similar case to airline opposition to imposition of a new air-safety system. I submit that testimony regarding safety devices in the field of aeronautical control is completely irrelevant. The charge is often made that scientific testing such as is conducted by the Federal Communications Commission is slow. If I had patents and were hopefully awaiting approval I would feel that way. But if the safety of my family and friends, and myself, were at stake I would want thorough testing under all conditions. The patented device under H. R. 4090 has never had such an operational test. What is the hurry? This is being a bit overanxious to hand a signed order in blank to the patent owner, saying if you can make this device work here is an order forcing more than 1,000 American ships to install a $2,500 or $3,000 piece of equipment, and this without finding out if the present internationally accepted system can be adapted to the same purpose.

As a matter of fact, great care has been taken by someone in drawing this bill to insure that the present system cannot be adapted to perform the proposed function of this new radio call selector.

Now, my friends, we are discovering something. Why is there to be added to section 354 a paragraph (b) with these words:

> The automatic radio call selector shall be independent of any other radio equipment on the ship.

There you have it. That little provision insures a new device must be added to the ship's equipment. It prevents adjusting the present alarm system to respond to individual ship call signals. That provision, my friends, may well be worth a million dollars to the patent owner of this new gadget.

Figuring $1,000 profit per piece of equipment and 1,000 or more ships each one of which will be forced to install a separate device—there is your million dollars—less, of course, the cost of buying the patent from the inventor and any promotional expenses.

Reference was made in the Commerce Committee hearings to an example where this call selector was supposed to have contributed to the saving of lives. This was the case of the steamship *Mormacroy* which stood by the British tanker *Adellen* for 3 days. But listen—quoting the statement of Moore-McCormack lines: "The call alarm was not used in summoning aid." As the ships lay side by side this gadget was used three times as were light and flag signals, but this selector was no factor in saving any lives.

This measure has the voice of Jacob, but the hands are the hands of Esau; and the House may be misled into giving its blessing to the wrong object. This is special interest legislation. It is dangerous to allow the high and highly emotional motive of safety-at-sea to be considered hastily with only 1 hour of debate.

I urge that H. R. 4090 be defeated so the great Committee on Interstate and

Foreign Commerce can restudy the measure in the light of the evidence.

Now I know very few Members have the time to read the complete printed committee report. However, the objections of the Coast Guard and the Federal Communications Commission should be noted—and above all the provisions of the bill itself should be thought out.

For example, in the Rules Committee one member, and this could have been true of all members, obviously was unfamiliar with the bill. He expressed support because of a case where 200 or more passengers on an excursion boat were stranded off a point of land near Boston. This bill pertains to cargo vessels. Passenger vessels must carry more than one radio operator.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'NEILL. I realize that what the gentleman is saying is true, but I was talking about safety at sea and that is what this bill has reference to.

Mr. PELLY. I thought the gentleman had not understood it.

Mr. O'NEILL. I understood it thoroughly, and I understand this, also, that all the laboring people, and the working people who ride on these ships, and all people connected with the cargo-carrying industry except the owners of the ships, are for the proposed legislation.

Mr. PELLY. I will come to that in my presentation.

Let me emphasize and repeat here and now that H. R. 4090 is to require an automatic radio alarm device on United States cargo vessels of 1,600 gross tons or more carrying less than 2 radio operators.

In summary, the reasons for opposing the bill are as follows:

First. As stated by the Coast Guard, Federal Communications Commission, and Defense Department in testimony on a similar bill—H. R. 6004—in the 83d Congress in 1954, the present mandatory internationally accepted auto-alarm device is more than adequate from the safety standpoint to receive distress calls and cyclone warnings on off-watch hours.

Second. The expense of hiring two more radio operators on cargo vessels, which as a practical matter is what would result if this bill is enacted into law, on the average per ship will amount to $12,000 per year straight-time pay and $2,500 for welfare per year, plus $3,500 overtime pay. A radio room on a ship now costs about $8,500 per year. By the terms of this bill, the cost will be $26,500, approximately. It is his sort of featherbedding that drives shipowners to transfer their cargo ships to foreign registry, where they employ low-wage foreign crews. My interest in this subject is in preserving an American merchant marine.

Third. This automatic radio call selector device duplicates existing equipment; it bypasses international safety and communications conventions; it bypasses procedures previously followed under section 602 (e) of the Communications Act of 1934, which specifically provided a method of approval of equipment in the field of marine radio.

GREAT LAKES STUDY

In the presentation to the Rules Committee the impression was gained that these devices had come into use since hearings on the bill in March, May, and June 1955. This misapprehension was due to 2 apparently conflicting statements; the statement that only 1 prototype device had been built, and the statement to the effect that 8 units were in use by the Moore-McCormack Steamship Co. The explanation is that a similar two-signal model was installed by Moore-McCormack in 1947 for convenience and commercial functions, not safety, but was found mechanically defective and the report of the hearings shows this company's unfavorable testimony.

A more complicated five-signal device is called for by this legislation. But the prototype model of it has never been tried out under operational conditions.

One of the most compelling arguments against the bill appeared in the Seafarers' Log, the official organ of the Seafarers' International Union. The article reads:

> The Radio Officers' Union, an affiliate of the Maritime Trades Department, is on record against the device as offering no advantages over the present automatic alarm systems. Automatic alarms, which are required by Government regulations, are keyed to respond to the international distress signal whether from ship or shore station.
>
> An ROU spokesman explained that the automatic call selector would be of little advantage in an emergency because a shore station would have to know the specific call numbers of all vessels that happened to be in the area. Most shore stations would not be in a position to know which ships were in a given vicinity.

And speaking of unions, I imagine all Members received a telegram from George Meany supporting H. R. 4090.

Somebody, whoever asked Mr. Meany to do them a personal favor, certainly caused him to get his wires crossed, because the AFL–CIO maritime trades division, as I said, is on record as opposed. One radio union representative in the hearings did support the bill. However, when you realize that American ships are being driven off the sea you realize why other maritime union leaders oppose this legislation—why Mr. Meany's own maritime trades are opposed. We only have 69 United States tramp vessels in operation. As members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee know only too well, our American shipowners have been transferring their ships to foreign registry. This can reduce the cost of wages, by substituting a low-wage foreign crew, about $20,000 a month. This bill would add about another $20,000 a year to American vessels expense which their foreign-flag competitors would not have to pay. No wonder the secretary of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, Harry Lundeberg, wrote me saying he is in thorough accord with my statements and that he thinks my position is absolutely correct. About this gadget he commented that it is not a necessity and will only impose, as he says, a heavier burden on the industry. This burden would be about $12 million a year, of which Uncle Sam would pay $3.3 million through subsidy.

No wonder Capt. George Decker, first vice president of the National Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America, A. F. of L., urges that the matter be taken to the International Convention for Safety at Sea and thus make all signatories either accept or reject the alarm device. He says in his letter to me:

> Do everything in your power to defeat H. R. 4090.

Obviously George Meany is supporting a friend, not legislation as it has been studied and reported by the maritime trades division of the AFL–CIO. Whoever got him to send each of us a telegram did him a disservice. He has enough interunion squabbles without pulling someone's chestnuts out of the fire against the best interest of the maritime workers.

Mr. Speaker, on page 3 of the hearings, 84th Congress, 1st session, before a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on H. R. 4090, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] in his testimony, the second paragraph at the bottom of the page, says the automatic radio call selector "is commercially perfected." I think he has been misinformed. Compare this statement with the testimony of Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc., on page 122 of the same hearings. It reads:

> In addition to the call alarm's failure to operate from causes traced to interferences and mechanical weakness, it has on occasion also suffered from another annoying defect—that is false alarms.

Also I might point out that when the Federal Communications Commission tested the auto call selector specified by this bill it had 72 false responses in 646 hours of operation. This explains why the Bureau of the Budget, in replying to a request of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for its views, commented: "The reports of the Department of Commerce and Federal Communications Commission raise important and as yet unresolved questions concerning the technical reliability and operational utility of the particular device specified in H. R. 4090." The Bureau suggested, as I do, further study and experimentation before enacting legislation. Overtime pay in responding to off-hour calls and false alarms is estimated at $32.90 per day.

I should point out, too, that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] in his statement to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, indicated a belief that the device is essential if our safety standards are to be maintained at the highest level.

Whereas Commissioner Edward M. Webster, of the Federal Communications Commission, on this point of safety, said in his testimony: "There are a lot of things which contribute to safety. I was brought up in the Coast Guard to consider safety matters. Hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of devices were submitted to us for examination, and they all contributed to safety. If you legislated every one of those pieces because it contributed to safety, you would load down the ship and you would not

have any place for cargo or for passengers. It is a relative matter."

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Would not the gentleman say that is quite an exaggerated statement that if all of these safety devices were put on the ship that the ship would be so loaded up that there would be no room for cargo and passengers?

Mr. PELLY. I think the point is that there are hundreds and hundreds of safety devices that are asked for.

Mr. GAVIN. Yes; but the point I am making is that the statement is quite exaggerated, would not the gentleman agree?

Mr. PELLY. I am quoting this testimony.

Mr. GAVIN. Yes; but the gentleman will agree that it is a bit exaggerated.

Mr. PELLY. I think Mr. Webster is considered to be the outstanding authority on electronic communications at sea.

Mr. Webster's statement continues as follows:

I cannot deny that this would contribute something to safety. My point is that it is not necessary because you already have a system, and it is not necessary to superimpose this on a system which has been provided and which has been provided now by treaty and by law. I think the weight is on the convenience side more than it is on the safety side.

As to whether H. R. 4090 would be operationally effective until the automatic radio call selector is approved by the Federal Communications Commission is not clear. However, assuming the mechanical weaknesses of the device can be corrected, I would emphasize strongly that reliability of operation should be assured likewise by the international standardization of the speed of transmission and characteristics of the signal. Under any circumstances there should be no approval by the Federal Communications Commission until the device has been endorsed by the next International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea.

I hope H. R. 4090 will be sent back to committee for further study. It is unnecessary and premature, as Commissioner Webster has pointed out.

Before I close I trust Members will understand that under H. R. 4090 a patented gadget, the patents for which are owned by a Mr. Benjamin Green who bought them from one of his employees, would have to be installed on all radio operator American cargo vessels. The gadget would have to be capable of being set manually to simultaneously receive and respond to Morse code international signals as follows: First, the ship's own code call; second, the international distress signal—S O S; third, the international safety signal; fourth, the international urgency signal; and fifth, any other emergency code.

Thus when the radio operator on a cargo vessel was off duty, he could be called by an alarm. The present signal for an automatic alarm can only be used in an emergency but not for matters that might or might no lead to a disaster.

Of course, under the present internationally accepted system messages are arranged so as to be transmitted from shore during radio operator watch. A ship can send a message any time by paying the operator overtime. No disaster at sea, as far as I can figure, would have been averted, or lives been saved from the *Titanic* sinking until now, by this legislation.

Meanwhile, I submit, international ship signals—all five under this proposed new gadget if you will—should be approved by the regular International Safety At Sea Conventions.

To sum up quickly why this rule should be defeated: The provision requiring the owner of the patents to make them available at reasonable cost to other manufacturers is no protection. According to the committee report there are 266 Government subsidized vessels and 771 nonsubsidized ships affected. When the St. Lawrence seaway is opened up, 243 more bulk carriers could also become compulsory prospects for the gadget. On a production-line basis, say at $3,000 each, it would be like several auto manufacturers building 1,000 automobiles. It is only economical and practical for one company to manufacture such a limited number. Otherwise the cost would be almost double. Any other manufacturer would have to add the royalty costs too and could not compete. So the special interest factor of the one family which owns the patents is distasteful to me. As I have said, the bill could be worth a million dollars to the patent owner.

That the gadget duplicates to a large extent an existing device on all ships, domestic and foreign, argues against the bill.

Finally, let me suggest that without the recommendation of technical Government advisers we laymen have no business approving such a measure. And why approve it in advance of the Federal Communication Commission's finding out if it works statisfactorily? Why the rush? Let the patent owner wait for his million.

With all the negative Government department reports, and with the facts which I hope I am contributing toward bringing into focus, I feel confident an Executive veto would result if the bill is passed as it might out of respect and deference to its sponsor.

Surely it is in the best interest of all—including the owner of the patents—to return the measure for further committee investigation and study.

In conclusion, let me say I intend, as I said before, at the proper time during the reading of the bill, to offer an amendment deferring the effective date until approval by the International Convention for Safety at Sea. If the committee would agree to accept that amendment which would cure the measure's greatest weakness, I would withdraw opposition now and let the experts by international convention resolve the issue.

If, as the proponents of the bill believe, H. R. 4090 has merit, international acceptance would greatly increase the safety factor of the bill, because all cargo vessels, domestic and foreign, would have to install the equipment.

Finally, I wish to thank the Members for their kind attention.

I have given you the facts, as I see them, and have explained my opposition. I consider H. R. 4090 special-interest legislation, but in no way, shape, or manner wish to diminish, as I told the Rules Committee, from the objectives or motives of any disagreeing Member.

I follow my conscience—and I say I hope the bill will be defeated.

If not, I urge adoption of an amendment providing for international acceptance.

If that in turn fails, I shall hope to gain recognition in order to move recommittal.

My colleagues, this is not good legislation.

I hope the bill will be defeated.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this bill is before the House after long hearings and searching consideration in two Congresses by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] last year, the bill was reported out. I have a telegram which he sent me, which I received today. It is addressed to me:

I regret that an unexpected matter of official business requires my presence in New Jersey today. I had expected to be in the House and speak in favor of your bill H. R. 4090 to require installation of an automatic radiotelegraph call selector on cargo ships carrying less than two radio operators. This bill should have the support of the House. It would provide additional safety and security to ships and men in maritime service. It is not claimed to be the last word but the system is undoubtedly a step forward in providing care and helpfulness to those who follow the sea. These men are entitled to have the benefit of every possible means that will provide for their safety and welfare. The need for this legislation has been given extensive consideration by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce both this session and in the previous Congress. Last session the bill was reported favorably but did not reach consideration in the House before adjournment. It should not be further delayed. It is important to our shipping interests and exceedingly important to the welfare of all seafaring men. I hope it will receive the approval of the House.

CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Ranking Republican Member, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I also have a telegram from Mr. George Meany, president, American Federation of Labor-CIO, which I understand has been sent to all Members:

We will appreciate your giving favorable consideration to H. R. 4090, which is a bill to improve safety of life at sea through use of automatic radio call selector. Passage of this legislation means better protection for American seamen and ships on the high seas, and, as has been true in the past, we must look to Congress for leadership in achieving this objective. Your support of this legislation will be appreciated.

Respectfully yours.

GEORGE MEANY,
President, AFL-CIO.

Now the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] has referred to the testimony of Mr. Webster, of the Federal Communications Commission. I have profound respect for the views of Commissioner Webster, but his views have

been met in this bill. This bill has to meet the requirements of the Federal Communications Commission.

This matter of the cost being $12 million is a new figure to me; I never heard that before, and I think that was just picked out of the air. The committee has been very careful. There is no monopoly. The language in the bill is specific, and the same protection is given in this bill as has been given in previous legislation passed by the Congress in years gone by to assure safety to men and property on the high seas.

This instrument is not something that costs $20,000; the outside cost is $1,650 to $1,800 per installation, and anyone can manufacture it by getting a license through the payment of a proper and justifiable royalty. Every instrument on a modern ship has at some time been controlled or owned by some individual or company as a result of a patent, and there is nothing unusual in relation to this bill that differentiates it from any other legislation the Congress has acted upon. We must keep in mind that every piece of legislation on the statute books for safety at sea has been brought about as a result of congressional action and against the bitter opposition of the steamship association. I am not saying that every shipowner is opposed, but the association as such has always bitterly opposed safety-at-sea legislation enacted by the Congress in the past.

It is the old battle of progress being impeded or attempted to be impeded, particularly when progress means the welfare of human beings; the big shipping interests bitterly opposed the existing laws for the protection of people in bygone years.

The bill means a saving of lives and property. Not so long ago there was a maritime catastrophe in the Pacific where a ship was sunk and about 35 seamen cast into the sea. They had their lifesaving instruments, but they floundered around in the sea for hours and hours and finally every one of them drowned, yet only a few miles away, not so far away, was another ship going in the same direction, but this other ship knew nothing of the disaster to the first or the plight of the seamen. Had there been one of these instruments on board there would have been constant communication with the shore and they would have learned of the disaster and could have come to the rescue of this stricken ship and probably saved most if not all of the men.

Talk about opposition, let me read you a list of the companies that use this device now:

	Units
Moore-McCormack Lines	35
States Marine Corp	20
Robin Lines	10
Standard Oil Company of New Jersey	15
Grace Line	14
United Fruit Co	1
Waterman Steamship Corp	3
Standard Vacuum	2
Maritime Administration vessels	108
United States Coast Guard	66

That is evidence they cannot contradict.

I will not take any more time under the rule except to make this observation about the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Washington. I respect his views and his right to oppose this legislation, but I do not respect his effort to impugn the motives of others. I do not say the gentleman did, but in a letter that was sent out very generally was that the committee reported this bill for me. Nothing was done for my personal interest; I cannot proceed that way in regard to any legislation. I have never approached any colleague of mine or any committee on the basis of my being so interested in the bill that I asked them because of friendship with me and my position to vote for the bill. I certainly would not have undertaken to do that; it could not have happened. The bill was reported out last year supported by Republicans on the committee; and it was reported out again this year. So there is the history of this bill so far as this Congress and past Congresses are concerned. The amendment that the gentleman from Washington says he is going to offer would defeat the bill. We have never put through legislation where it had to be internationally agreed upon as a condition precedent. All past legislation applied to American ships with reference to equipment for safety at sea and lives and property, then it was extended to the vessels of other countries. The amendment is a nice way of defeating the bill and is inconsistent with the history of Congress in the passage of sea legislation in the past. When the amendment is offered I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, before I got into politics I was a seaman and I want to speak today more as a seaman than as a Member of Congress, merely utilizing my membership in this body to gain the opportunity to speak. I am going to relate some past history not for the purpose of impressing anybody but for the purpose of trying to convince you that I know what I am talking about.

I have been on ships that have sunk under emergency conditions, others that have been rammed; I have gone over the side in the midst of typhoons to lash down equipment that was endangering the ship, I have sailed through good weather and bad, on easy seas and on rough ones. I have tremendous respect for the men who sail the seas, and I also know how very important is any piece of equipment, any regulation, any code, any custom that will promote safety at sea. I also have a similar understanding of any devices, codes, customs, and practices that will endanger the lives of men at sea, because when a ship casts off her lines and leaves port and gets out into the open sea she is on her own. What she has with her, what her men know as sailors, are those things upon which the lives of the men depend. So, with that kind of an introduction I just want to say that I think I know perhaps a little more about what is needed and not needed than our good colleague [Mr. WOLVERTON] despite all the testimony he has heard, and perhaps more than George Meany, who is not a seaman.

I agree with the Radio Operators Union, the men who sail on the ships, the SUP, the Sailor's Union of the Pacific, the Seafarer's International Union, who say: "Do not make us put these devices on the ships."

They do not come down here and say they are not necessary, they are duplicating equipment or anything like that. They say they are dangerous. Why are they dangerous? Just look at the minority views in this report that quote the Federal Communications Commission and these other Government departments affected, all of which have given adverse reports on this proposed legislation. The Federal Communications tests decry this equipment as unsatisfactory. Whether you say it has to be satisfactory before it goes on a ship or not, you are trying to compel the use of a piece of equipment that today cannot pass the tests.

What does that mean? Where men's lives depend upon the functioning of such equipment that does not work, you are putting them in peril. What happens when you get a piece of equipment like this that according to the FCC tests, during 464 hours it brought in a total of 72 false responses, or 1 every 9 hours. What does that do to your radio operator? It is like the boy who cried wolf. They flip it off, they cut the wires, they get rid of it somehow or other. They would not depend on it, and if they did, they would be responding to false alarms constantly, as well as the rest of these things that the Commission found out about this piece of equipment that will not work. Someone has said it will bring in one signal but will not bring in another. You see what I mean? I would not want to go to sea and be compelled by the laws of the United States Government to sail with a piece of equipment that is going to endanger me and endanger the men under me.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in command of ships. I commanded a 10,000-ton ship, and I know what the responsibility is, and based on that personal experience I plead with you to defeat this rule and defeat the bill, because you simply cannot put our seamen in the position of having to sail with equipment that is not worth while, that causes them to be in peril when they leave port, and if we execute our responsibility to this great group of people as we should, we will not force upon them a condition which will be created by this equipment which is unsafe.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I make reference to the steamer going aground in Boston Harbor last year with 272 schoolchildren on it. Now, this steamer would normally carry about 1,000 people. The interesting thing about it is that naturally it had a radio room like any ship would have, but the truth of the matter is that there was no radio operator aboard the ship, the reason being that the company wanted to cut down on expenses at the cost of the passengers who were aboard that steamer. I understand the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has already reported out a bill saying that ships that carry passengers, excursion steamers, fishing boats, and ships of that trade, will have to have

a radio man aboard the ship. Every law that has ever been enacted as far as safety is concerned, whether it is about running lights, whether it is to put life preservers on the boat, whether it is to put lifesaving craft on the boat, has been accomplished because of the fact that you have had to have legislation for it. The owners of the ships at all times have tried to reduce their costs to whatever extent they can, and they have opposed every type of legislation along the line.

Now, the fact remains, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has said, that the Moore-McCormack Lines have 35 units, the State Marine Corp. 20 units, and many others. He gave you a long list, naming some 8 or 10 companies that have over 300 of these units on their ships. Surely companies of this type would not have them on their ships if they did not think they were worthy.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the rule is adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROONEY). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4090) to amend part II of title III of the Communications Act of 1934, so as to require the installation of an automatic radio-telegraph call selector on cargo ships of the United States carrying less than two radio operators, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4090, with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill would require the installation of an automatic radiotelegraph call selector on certain cargo ships of the United States carrying less than two radio operators.

Ships equipped with such a device could receive radio messages from shore stations and other ships while the ship's radio operator is off duty. This would be an important contribution to safety at sea.

The Communications Act of 1934 now provides that cargo ships required to have radio must carry more than one radio operator unless the ship is fitted with an autoalarm. Unless such ship has an autoalarm, continuous watch must be maintained by qualified radio operators while the ship is being navigated outside a harbor or port.

The autoalarm responds to what is known as the international alarm signal, which is a series of 12 dashes 4 seconds long, spaced 1 second apart. The device is designed so that four dashes will actuate the circuit and ring bells in the radio officer's quarters, on the navigating bridge of the vessel and in the radio room. This will alert the radio operator to an emergency whenever he is off duty or listening to another frequency, so that he can receive the distress message, which follows the alarm signal by two minutes.

The primary usefulness of the autoalarm is in the period immediately before or after a maritime disaster occurs.

The call selector would perform a similar alerting function, but it would supplement the autoalarm by alerting the ship radio operator during situations which, although not of a distress nature, do involve maritime safety.

The autoalarm system now in use does not permit calling of ships in situations of difficulty not of a full distress nature. A ship carrying only a single radio operator is to cut off from messages alerting the ship to potential danger when the ship's radio operator is not on duty, which is the greater part of the day. Additionally, the installation of call selectors aboard ships would supplement the autoalarm by substantially increasing the probability of alerting other ships during distress situations. This is because call selectors will be capable of responding to the international distress signal while presently approved autoalarms will respond only to the international alarm signal. Under international radio distress procedures, the distress signal is transmitted far more frequently than the alarm signal, so that the call selector would be useful in many situations where the autoalarm would not respond.

Specifically, for example, installation of an automatic call selector would facilitate and improve communications in the following manner:

First. Specific ships known to be in the vicinity of a distressed vessel may be called directly by use of that vessel's own call sign.

Second. During protracted distress traffic the single radio officer on a cargo vessel working traffic with the distressed vessel is assisted in responding to calls when in an exhausted state after continuously operating alone over a period of days.

Third. Medical assistance and transfer of sick or injured at sea may be facilitated.

Fourth. Promulgation of weather and other maritime safety information may be facilitated and ships cautioned to avoid exposure to needless danger by receipt of such information.

Fifth. Response of ships to lifeboat transmitter signals sent by survivors whose vessels may not stay afloat till rescuers reach them will increase the rescue possibilities of such survivors.

The automatic radiotelegraph call selector has been compared to the bell on a telephone. Without a bell the owner of the telephone, if away from the instrument, would not be able to receive messages since there would be no way of alerting him to the fact that another person wanted to communicate with him. Comparably, a ship which has a single radio officer on duty for 8 hours can receive messages during those 8 hours. However, for 16 hours during each day when such officer is not on duty no messages may be received.

The bill provides that the automatic radiotelegraph call selector must be capable of receiving and responding to the following:

First. The international distress signal, S O S.

Second. The international safety signal, T T T.

Third. The international urgent signal, X X X.

Fourth. The ship's call sign.

Fifth. Any other predetermined code which is desired for use in national emergencies.

The bill postpones the effective date of the mandatory installation requirement until 18 months—or such shorter period as the Commission may determine—after the Commission has found that, first, an automatic radiotelegraph call selector is and will continue to be available and may be installed at a reasonable cost to shipowners; and second, patents covering or necessary to the manufacture of an automatic radiotelegraph call selector are and will continue to be freely available for license at a reasonable royalty. The committee feels that to avoid monopolization in the manufacture of this device it is necessary, in the public interest, to require that the patent owner make binding commitments to the Commission that the necessary patents will be available freely and that the royalty charged for the use of such patents will be reasonable before installation of a patented device becomes mandatory.

While the installation of automatic call selectors would be mandatory only for cargo ships of the United States, it was pointed out to the committee that this equipment could serve as links in a radio network of ships which are not so equipped, thus making an important contribution to safety on the high seas.

The public interest requires that safety standards at sea be maintained at the highest possible level for the protection of life and property. The proposed legislation would help in carrying out the obligation of the Congress to enact legislation to protect the public interest.

Let me reemphasize, Mr. Chairman, that the committee after rather extended hearings in the 83d Congress reported a similar bill; that following hearings in the present Congress H. R. 4090 was reported after being amended in order to meet some of the objections that had been raised with reference to possible monopoly and also in connection with the question of approval by the Federal Communications Commission. We made it very certain in this legislation that no equipment would be installed unless it had the approval of the Commission. If tests fail on a pilot model and if they do not measure up to the standards required, then it will be up to the manufacturer to develop another model and another set that will meet the requirements of the Commission.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, in the interests of safety that the pending legislation will be approved by the House.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this legislation. I opposed it in the committee and I oppose it here. The only qualification I claim for any information about this is what I heard in the committee. I am not a seafaring man. I come from the interior of the United States, from the State of Iowa, which while it is bounded by two great rivers has no maritime interest within the State and, certainly, there is no maritime interest within my own district. I did attend, I think, all the hearings on this bill before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I must say despite the very persuasive testimony of the majority leader and others, it has completely failed to convince me that this is desirable legislation. On the contrary, I am well convinced that this legislation is not in the interest of the country. To begin with, it is not in the interest of safety at sea.

Before going further, I would like to clarify one point which was made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and others in the debate relating to the number of devices that have already been installed on ships. There was some testimony about that before the committee, but when the witnesses were pinned down, the device that is now under consideration turns out not to be the same device that was referred to as having been installed on this multitude of ships. Further, the other devices which may in some respects be related to the present device now under consideration were installed on the ships of the Moore-McCormack Line, but were withdrawn and the Moore-McCormack Line is opposed to this legislation. Of course, the question of safety at sea is one of great importance. The men who go down to the sea in ships certainly deserve the consideration and the help of the Congress of the United States. But, on the contrary, we should not pass legislation here which would be an impediment to safety. Mr. Chairman, it is my considered opinion, after listening to the testimony before the committee, that this would not contribute to the safety of the people who go to sea. But, on the other hand, as has been pointed out in debate, it would destroy safety at sea or at least have a tendency to make it worse for seafaring people.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Will the gentleman explain a bit more fully his own opinion why he believes this would contribute not to safety but to less safety?

Mr. DOLLIVER. My reason has already been summed up by what has been said in the debate. Here is a device that has not been proven.

The Federal Communications Commission representative, Mr. Webster, who spent a long time in the Coast Guard, testified that the thing had not proven satisfactory. As was pointed out by the gentleman from California, if you have a device on board ship which has not proven satisfactory, what is going to happen? The crew will not pay any attention to it. The radio operator will say, "That equipment is no good," and he will turn it off or cut the wires. In other words, it is not a piece of equipment that would help safety at sea. It would destroy it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that this bill does not become effective until the Federal Communications Commission has found that the automatic radio-telegraph call selector is and will continue to be available, and may be installed at reasonable cost to shipowners?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Yes. That is in the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. That is part of the bill itself.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is part of the bill itself, and I am glad that safeguard is in the bill, but this bill is putting the cart before the horse. Let them get the approval of the Federal Communications Commission and let them establish a market for their product before they come here and ask us to require that their device be put on board ship.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman unnecessarily, but I think if we can talk about this we will get a better understanding. Is it not a fact that Commissioner Webster is one of the most able men in this field that we have in our Government?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Unquestionably.

Mr. HARRIS. He takes the position that he is against this bill. He calls it a dignified statute, as I recall. His principal objection is that it would be contrary to the agreement reached by the International Radio Conference. Is that not true?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Of course that is one of the reasons he is against it, and that is one of the reasons I am against it, because these matters of safety at sea go beyond one nationality. That is one of the reasons this law should not be adopted, because it puts a handicap restriction and extra burden upon American shipping which is already under certain handicaps in relation to competition with other maritime nations.

A great deal has been said about the question of the operators being opposed to this; the operators of shipping have been attacked in a very unfavorable light. There have been times in the history of the country when that was justified. However, I do not believe in this instance it is based upon any such crass and diabolical attitude on their part. They came before the committee in a very fair and unbiased manner and told their opinions, and without exception the shipowners, ship operators, were in opposition to this bill. For example, on page 54 of the hearings, in a letter from the Association of American Shipowners, they say:

> The association opposes this bill for a number of reasons, and we would appreciate it if you would include this letter in the record of hearings.

Then they give four very cogent reasons for their opposition to it. On page 108 of the hearings, the telecommunications committee, American Merchant Marine Institute, makes this statement:

> We oppose H. R. 4090 for the following reasons:
>
> We believe it both inappropriate and premature to consider the mandatory installation of an unknown and untried piece of equipment, even if the purpose of such a device should be found to be desirable.

Again, on page 122, the Moore-McCormack Lines, which has been referred to, said this:

> We do not feel that any selective calling equipment should be mandatory inasmuch as existing autoalarm equipment fulfills the safety requirements involving distress at sea, and we feel that the telegraph call alarm is purely a device of some commercial value which cannot be relied on implicitly but which offers the chance for the saving of operational expense, when operative.

In addition, this testimony before the committee is replete with witnesses who say that the equipment is experimental; it has never been proven in actual operation. It actually is the one prototype that has ever been manufactured in this system.

Why in the world should this body go ahead and make a compulsory market for a product which has not been approved, for a product which will produce only illusory benefits to the seafaring men?

Here is another perhaps minor item: A good share of the merchant marine of the United States is provided with a subsidy by the United States Government, and many people think justifiably so. Add this additional expense which will range according to some witnesses from $12,000 to $25,000 per year per ship, add that additional expense on these American ships and who is going to pay for it? It is going to be the taxpayers through a subsidy.

I ask that the bill be defeated.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise this afternoon in the interest of safety at sea. I have never worked aboard a ship in any capacity, but I have traveled extensively by air over the Atlantic and Pacific: I appeal to this House to vote for safety at sea. There are vast expanses of ocean where there are no rescue facilities of any kind, and there are spots 1,200 nautical miles from the nearest land in any direction. That is the reason I believe it to be worthwhile for this committee to make navigation as safe as possible. That is the kind of bill we are considering today. It will be another step to help protect individuals, ship owners, passenger vessels, and cargo vessels traveling throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said that we should wait until we have perfected this device, and then enact this legislation. That was not the case when the original legislation was passed, and I have before me the testimony of Commissioner Webster, of the Federal Communications Commission, wherein he stated that they recommended the legislation before they had actually developed the autoalarm.

As a matter of fact, what we are trying to do here today is merely to require a mechanism which can contribute more to safety than the one presently required, which was invented nearly 30 years ago—this is progress.

Our mechanical engineers, our electrical engineers have made progress, and we are trying to raise the requirements so that we will be up to date. Commissioner Webster made it clear in the hearings that at the time the other legislation to which I referred was passed by Congress, the device had not been perfected. He said it was simply a question of mechanical perfection, that the idea was well-known; there was no argument about that. So we are in exactly the same position today, as we consider this legislation, as we were at the time we considered legislation requiring the autoalarm on cargo vessels.

I want to say also, Mr. Chairman that, when we speak of cargo vessels, we are speaking of 97 percent of all the ships at sea. It is very important, therefore, that we provide additional requirement of safety for cargo vessels and thereby improve the safety of the passenger vessels as well. In the past we have waited until after the occurrence of a major disaster. We have already had several minor disasters, but we are prone to wait, as I say, until we have a major disaster, and then seek appropriate legislative action. What we must do is pass this preventive legislation, so that we may avert any major disaster at sea. That is the reason the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has reported the legislation to the House at this time.

I do not think it is necessary to wait for other nations to develop this device. I believe it is appropriate that the United States, the world leader in most fields, take the initiative in this instance as well and require that automatic call selectors be installed on our cargo vessels.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that the amendment to the Federal Communications Act of 1934 requiring an autoalarm came as the result of a tragedy and terrible disaster following the 1934 FCC Act and as a result of that tragedy the Communications Act was amended in 1937 to require an autoalarm radio system on United States cargo ships; is that true?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. That is correct. That is contained in our testimony here as well.

Mr. HARRIS. Following the utilization of this device, is it not true that our Government then took the lead during these years to bring about international agreements — agreements with other countries—that this system be installed on their ships?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. That is certainly correct.

Mr. HARRIS. The international agreements were promoted by our own Government after the FCC Act had been amended in 1937 to require this radio system or alarm system aboard ships?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. That is correct. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that all this legislation does is require the cargo vessels to install the new device we have referred to as the automatic call selector. This device responds to various signals, the urgent signal, distress signal, safety signal, and it also responds to the ship's call signal. It will also respond to any prearranged or predetermined code that the international conference would want to agree upon. So it would be contributing to safety.

I believe in safety at sea. I am not in favor of subsidies, but I would favor subsidizing safety if it is necessary to subsidize at all. We cannot put a price on safety with any more grace than we could put a price on human life. Therefore, I do not believe we should consider the price argument at all. As has been stated, it is only a matter of $1,500 or $2,000. The opponents have argued that it will run to $10,000 or $20,000, but it does not make any difference to me what the price is. If it involves safety, I am willing to pay the price. I do not care whether the Government has to pay it or whether the shipowners have to pay it, if it is for safety and will increase the safety of passengers on vessels at sea, I am for it and I am willing to pay the price.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say in conclusion I believe that this legislation is long overdue. We have been discussing it for the last 2 years. We reported out a bill last year, and naturally there were organizations which opposed it. The shipowners will always be opposed to this type of legislation, because it does not help the individual shipowners as the result of installing the device in any particular vessel, but it helps the people who are underway at sea in the event of an emergency. So, it is obvious that the Government must require this type of equipment, and it is imperative that Congress enact this legislation.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor this bill. I think it is a great stride forward. The opposition of the shipowners is to be expected but, I trust, not long endured. I want to reemphasize the fact that I have flown many, many thousands of miles over the water, and believe that if this equipment were installed in cargo vessels, it would be an aid in air emergencies as well as emergencies on the surface.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say again and reiterate that I feel for my opponents in this particular debate the very highest degree of regard for the members of the committee in particular, for when I was a member of that committee I always enjoyed it, and I think it is a wholesome thing to bring out the facts.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to say for the members of our committee and the Members of the House as well that we have the highest regard for the gentleman from Washington. We on the committee particularly recall that he was a member of this committee during the last Congress, and we regretted to see him leave. We know that his feeling in this matter and his attitude and position toward this matter is sincere. I recall that he opposed it when it was before this committee in the last Congress, as he is opposing it now. I just want to say that I, for one, know that the gentleman is sincere in his opposition, and I am sorry that I have to differ with him on this problem as I see it.

If the gentleman will permit me to say this further, the reason I feel that this is a principle that should be followed and pursued is because we are living in what we refer to and what everybody today calls the electronic age. More electronic devices are being developed for the benefit of the people, the public, to provide safety for the people of this country and of the world and I, for one, am not going to say that by my action here I am going to take a position that would retard or otherwise prevent our scientists from developing these devices which can mean so much to the future development and for the welfare of this country. That is the reason I believe these electronic devices, when they are so designed and developed, ought to be made available for the use of the public throughout the whole world, not only the United States. For that reason I feel that we ought to promote this project as one of those electronic devices which I believe will prove to be highly beneficial.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his very kind remarks about my motives in opposing this legislation.

I would like also to say that I think the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] will realize that the present device is only limited from doing exactly what this new call selector would do by international agreement. International agreement says that it be limited only to distress. Therefore, as far as the electronic device goes, to me, it would only do something by a complicated process that might well be done simply.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. This is no different from the controversy that we are in today with our military. In this Congress

we appropriated $550 million to the Navy to develop a system of air navigation aids, called TACAN, which is an electronic device that we all know about. We developed the common system which was promoted by this country and adopted by the ICAO Conference, the international conference, and which today has been adopted. But yet, in this Congress, through our own action, we appropriated $500 million to the Navy to develop this new navigation aid, which is another type of electronic device for the benefit and the use of our military people. If we were to adopt this one we are discussing it would not be contrary to the policy that we have pursued in promoting a new and an additional safety device for the benefit of our people.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. The gentleman realizes that the development of TACAN is completely separate and different from the device which is to be used commercially and which is used all over the world. A great amount of confusion is caused merely by fiat of the Congress, which is acting without understanding the technical difficulties inherent in the problem, and creating a difficult situation commercially, not only in this country but all over the world. That is why the Congress ought to be careful, when it gets into such a field of technical devices, which we, as laymen, know little about, before it acts, or it might cause a great deal of trouble because of unthoughtful action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PELLY. In that regard I want to make it plain that I am a layman and my judgment in this matter is based largely on the recommendation of Commissioner Webster who suggested that this intercommunication at sea should be based on standardized international agreement.

I want to say also at this time that when we come into the House again I am going to ask permission to put in the RECORD a statement covering the additional operating cost attributable to the call-selector device which would be required under H. R. 4090. I realize that we used a figure such as $12 million a year as the cost. I think if you would look at the record you would find the basis on which the various statements have been made.

I have outlined my objections to this bill at some length in the debate of the rule. There is nothing to be gained, as I see it, to add to that public record.

As stated by me, then, I intend to offer an amendment at the appropriate time. Already the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee added a section providing an effective date of the legislation as 18 months, or a shorter period if the Federal Communications Commission determines, after it finds this new equipment is available at reasonable cost and freely available for license at a reasonable royalty. I would add one more proviso to these two, so that this law would be deferred also until after the FCC finds this equipment is in conformity with safety of life at sea convention like the automatic alarm is.

I have told the distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee I would withdraw my objection if that amendment is accepted.

One provision in section 3 I dislike. It is designed to prevent adjusting the present automatic alarm to perform the added duty of responding to four signals—so it would make installation of this new gadget unnecessary. In section 3 the bill reads:

> The automatic radio call selector shall be independent, except for source of power and antenna, of any other radio equipment on the ship.

There is the provision to protect the owner of the patents to this gadget. There is monopoly written right into the language of the bill. It could not be plainer. That sentence should be worth a million dollars to Mr. Benjamin Green, who bought up the patents from an employee who worked for him at one time.

I shall have an amendment to nullify the effect of that language. I would accomplish this in section 4 by a provision to defer the effective date of this bill until it is determined by the FCC that agreement cannot be effected internationally to permit use of the present automatic alarm for the purposes which would be served by this new gadget.

Let me emphasize what the testimony of Commissioner E. M. Webster called for—the desirability of a common standardized distress call system in the world. If there is going to be any aid called for, why limit it to assistance from an American vessel. Why ignore a foreign ship—it may be the only one in the vicinity. Finally, too, let me say if the FCC were asking for legislation of this nature, I would not be in the well of the House today. But no Government department recommends this measure.

As minority views state, legislation of this type is most unusual. If there is doubt to the facts, the normal procedure is to direct that a study be conducted and a factual report be compiled. There is ample precedent in the field of marine safety radio equipment—as was provided in section 602 (e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

The present auto alarm can be used to accomplish exactly what this new call selector would do as provided in this bill. All it would take is a broadening of the limitation on its use by International Convention on Safety of Life at Sea.

This bill would make use of the present alarm impossible by insisting on a separate piece of equipment.

Accordingly, as I said, I shall introduce an amendment, the simple effect of which will be to defer the effective date of this legislation until the Federal Communications Commission finds "agreement cannot be effected internationally to permit use of the present auto-alarm for the safety purposes which would be served by the automatic radio call selector specified in this bill and unless and until such an automatic call selector is required by the next International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea to be installed on all vessels subject to such convention."

If that amendment is adopted, I see no objection to passage of the bill. It would cure the greatest weakness which is lack of international standardization.

I strongly urge support of such an amendment.

And I should like to say further, if my amendment is not adopted, I expect to offer a motion to recommit.

Estimated additional operating cost attributable to the call selector device which would be required under H. R. 4090

1. If device used with one radio operator: [1]

Alarms responding to T T T and other calls (from Coast Guard radio station data hearing, pp. 112–114): Average 1 alarm every 2 hours.

False alarms (from FCC laboratory tests, hearing, p. 59): Average 1 alarm every 8 hours.

Alarm in operation 16 hours per day: Average 10 alarms per day.

Overtime payable to radio operator for answering alarm ($3.29 per alarm): $32.90 per day.

Annual cost (ship at sea 50 percent [2] of time or 182.5 days): $6,004.24 per year.

2. Cost of second radio operator:

Basic wage of $501.72 per month	$6,020.64
Required wage increase to first radio operator	433.92
Automatic weekend overtime (52 weeks times 2 days equals 104 days plus 9 holidays) estimated at sea 50 percent or 56½ days at 8 hours per day times $2.19	989.88
Welfare, 365 days at $1.60 per day	584.00
Taxes (estimated)	150.00
Vacation fund, 9½ percent of basic wages ($6,454.56)	613.18
Wage classification cost, per year	8,791.62
Subsistence (average $1.75 per day), per year	638.75
	9,430.37
Overtime payable to radio operators for answering alarm, if installed (alarm in use 8 hours per day) [3]	3,002.12
Total, per year	12,432.49

3. Per annum cost to Government and industry: [4] On subsidized cargo vessels the entire cost must be borne by the Government because the added cost is 100 percent in excess of foreign wage and/or operating costs.

---

[1] NOTE.—It is the shipowners contention that it would be impossible to use the proposed device with a single radio operator because the radio operator could not physically stand the strain of being brought on duty an average of 10 times per night during off watch hours.

[2] Based on dry-cargo vessel. Other vessels, such as tankers, will be at sea more than 50 percent of the time.

[3] NOTE.—The dilemma presented by this bill is apparent. The call selector need not be installed if a second radio operator is carried, yet the purpose of the bill is to require the call selector.

[4] NOTE.—These cost figures are exclusive of equipment purchase, installation, and maintenance costs for which no accurate figures are available since the device itself is not in production. Estimated manufacturing costs range from $3,000–$10,000 per unit. (House committee report, p. 12.)

	To Government (266 subsidized cargo vessels)	To industry (771 nonsubsidized cargo vessels)	Total (1,037 cargo vessels)
Estimated cost if device could be used with single radio operator	$1,597,127.84	$4,629,269.04	$6,226,396.88
Estimated minimum cost of 2d radio operator	2,508,478.42	7,270,815.27	9,779,293.69
Estimated added cost if device used with 2 radio operators	798,563.92	2,314,634.52	3,113,198.44
Estimated total probable cost	3,307,042.34	9,585,449.79	12,892,492.13

4. Other costs: The following costs are not applicable to all vessels, and the number of ships which would be affected is not ascertainable:

(a) On some vessels, such as certain tankers, the ratio of crew to stewards is in such critical balance that if a second radio operator must be hired the ship must carry an additional steward. This will add an additional $4,108 per annum to the wage classification of the vessel involved.

(b) The second radio operator must be furnished with a room. In cases where new space must be provided, or when one of the 12 passenger spaces is utilized for this purpose, the cost is estimated at $6,000 to $8,000. If passenger cabin space is taken the cost becomes an annual revenue loss.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I tried to make it clear a while ago that I had a more than usual interest in safety at sea. We might have a bill before us to require every ship in the United States merchant marine to have an empty black box placed on the wheelhouse 5 feet long, 2 feet wide, and 3 feet deep. We could all get up and argue that such a device would make the sea safe for people who are passengers and people who are seamen, but we certainly could not give any reasons why.

The same situation pertains as to the device to which the bill refers. Nobody understands what there is about the wires, tubes, condensers, circuits, and dials of the device before us that would make for safety at sea. So nobody can give any reason why. So the argument made, that we are legislating for safety at sea, and you cannot be against saving lives so you should vote for this bill, sounds kind of good, but is specious when analyzed. And let me tell you, you can get yourself in trouble that way, whether you buy a pig in a poke or buy a black box or some other kind of mysterious device to put on ships is the same thing, if they do not work properly for the purpose of safety your safety argument is no good. On that issue, what is the evidence?

This is what the Federal Communications Commission says about this thing before us, according to the minority report:

FCC took two kinds of tests. They took tests on it to see if it could be set manually to receive the five different kinds of signals it is supposed to receive. In other words, a series of dots and dashes that are supposed to actuate any one of five particular types of signals. The signal then is supposed to appear in the wheelhouse or radio shack or wherever this device is set up. The FCC found that the device could not be set manually for equally efficient and accurate reception of each of the various signals. FCC further found that accuracy varied with the speed of transmission of the same actuating signals. In other words, it receives dots and dashes that are sent out by radio operators. Radio operators vary in the speed at which they send. Some of the foreigners do it differently than we do, and vice versa. So you might have a ship of some particular nationality sending a signal back home for one purpose and it will be actuating an alarm on an American ship for an entirely different purpose, all because of the different speeds and characteristics with which radio operators may transmit.

FCC also found that even room temperature and voltage had a great effect on these devices. If ever any of you have sailed a ship or operated on it, you know that the voltage is quite a problem. We have automatic voltage regulators, and so forth, but 9 times out of 10 somebody will dope off in the engineroom and maybe instead of 110 volts you will be getting 90 or 120. All of these uncontrollable factors and variables lead to the device's malfunctioning. I have great respect for marine engineers and the remarks I have just made should not be interpreted as critical. But anyone who knows the sea also knows that neither the deck gang nor the black gang ever misses an opportunity to complain about the other, so let us accept my words about voltage variations in that spirit, and just concede that for causes unknown and beyond the control of competent watches in the engineroom, it goes up and down.

The second kind of test, the positive response of this device to actuating signals, is where the true test of its value lies. The percent of true response varied from 46 percent to 92.5 percent on the 500-kilocycle band, which is the international distress frequency. On the lifeboat frequency it varied from 53.7 percent up to 100 percent on one of the tests.

You must be able to rely on a piece of equipment 100 percent if it is to save lives. How many people have bought a car that turned out to be a lemon, and you could not rely on it and had to get rid of it? When safety at sea is at stake you do not want to legislate devices on ships unless they are going to bring safety instead of danger. That is plain commonsense, because their reliability will either protect or endanger the lives of your seamen and passengers.

The startling facts about this device, according to the Federal Communications Commission tests, is that there were a total of 72 false responses in 646 hours of operation, or 1 every 9 hours. What if they had a false alarm in each fire department station here in Washington every 9 hours? Visualize it. The confusion and demoralization would be endless. Visualize what it would mean at sea, where just one radio operator is aboard ship. You see what a terrible thing it is to have these false alarms. It not only destroys the confidence of the people in the equipment, in this case the whole ship's crew, but, more than that, think of your radio operators. These fellows have so many hours on and so many hours off. If they are jumping up all during off-duty hours to respond to these false alarms, you can see what kind of shape those operators are going to be in before the voyage is over. You can see how disruptive of morale and efficiency this type of equipment is going to be. We should not be legislating for it; we should be legislating against it, if safety at sea is our goal.

I have stood watches for a long time. All of you that sailed in the Navy or merchant marine during the war know that the general alarm was ringing all the time. After that lasted a few months, you had to get back to port to rest or go crazy. You cannot keep people keyed up with alarms, real or false. That is all this device promises.

Congress appropriates a lot of money for the Federal Communications Commission and its engineering and testing people every year. If you have enough confidence in this agency to appropriate this money, you should have an equal confidence in what it says when it comes up here on the Hill and tells you that a piece of equipment is no good and gives you the statistics on its tests and everything else to prove it. Is it not just plain commonsense to believe the FCC?

We have heard the argument here that the people who stood up in the well of the House in 1934 arguing against the enactment of the auto-alarm legislation were just obstructionists. They may have been. But that does not apply to those who argue against this admittedly deficient and defective device proposed by the bill before us. For the auto alarm is today serving the purpose of alerting unmanned receivers when a May Day S O S distress call is broadcast. Legislating the additional device called for by this bill on to American ships would not only have all the disadvantages mentioned by others, but would, in addition, serve not to alert radio operators to emergency calls, but, through the device's inherent defects, serve to deaden response to them. It would promote anger, not safety, at sea. Protection of American seamen and passengers on United States-flag vessels demands this bill be scuttled.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U. S. C., sec. 153), is amended by adding

at the end thereof the following paragraph:
"(hh) 'Automatic radiotelegraph call selector' on a ship of the United States subject to the provisions of part II of title III of this act means a device meeting the requirements prescribed for such devices in section 355 (b) of this act and approved by the Commission."

SEC. 2. Section 353 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U. S. C., sec. 353), is amended to read as follows:

"OPERATORS, WATCHES, AUTO-ALARM, AND AUTOMATIC RADIOTELEGRAPH CALL SELECTOR—RADIOTELEGRAPH-EQUIPPED SHIPS

"SEC. 353. (a) At least two qualified operators shall be carried for safety purposes on—

"(1) each cargo ship of the United States which is required by this part to be fitted with a radiotelegraph installation and which is not fitted with an auto-alarm and an automatic radiotelegraph call selector;

"(2) each cargo ship (other than a ship of the United States) which is required by this part to be fitted with a radiotelegraph installation and which is not fitted with an auto-alarm; and

"(3) each passenger ship which is required by this part to be fitted with a radiotelegraph installation.

"(b) At least one qualified operator, who shall have had at least 6 months' previous service in the aggregate as a qualified operator in a station on board a ship or ships of the United States, shall be carried for safety purposes on—

"(1) each cargo ship of the United States which is required by this part to be fitted with a radiotelegraph installation and which is fitted with an autoalarm and an automatic radiotelegraph call selector in accordance with this title; and

"(e) Each cargo ship (other than a ship of the United States) which is required by this part to be fitted with a radiotelegraph installation and which is fitted with an autoalarm in accordance with this title.

"(c) Each ship of the United States required by this part to be fitted with a radiotelegraph installation shall, while being navigated outside a harbor or port, keep a continuous watch by means of qualified operators: *Provided*, That in lieu thereof, on a cargo ship of the United States fitted with an autoalarm and an automatic radiotelegraph call selector in proper operating condition, a watch of at least 8 hours per day, in the aggregate, shall be maintained by means of a qualified operator.

"(d) The Commission shall, when it finds it necessary for safety purposes, have authority to prescribe the particular hours of watch on a ship of the United States which is required by this part to be fitted with a radiotelegraph installation.

"(e) On any ship of the United States fitted with an autoalarm or an automatic radiotelegraph call selector, or with both an autoalarm and an automatic radiotelegraph call selector, such apparatus shall be in operation at all times while the ship is being navigated outside of a harbor or port when the operator is not on watch, and at such other times as the Commission may prescribe."

SEC. 3. Section 355 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U. S. C., sec. 355), is amended by redesignating paragraphs (a) through (h) as paragraphs (1) through (8), by striking out the words "subsection (d) of this section" in each place where they appear in the paragraphs redesignated as (5) and (6) and inserting in lieu thereof the words "paragraph (4) of this subsection", by inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 355.", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The automatic radiotelegraph call selector installed on any ship in accordance with this part shall be capable of being set manually to simultaneously receive and identify and respond to the following international Morse code signals:

"(1) The ship station call sign;

"(2) The international distress signal;

"(3) The international safety signal;

"(4) The international urgency signal; and

"(5) Any other predetermined code which is desired for use in national emergencies.

It shall provide a means for receiving such signals on the frequencies 500 kilocycles and 8,364 kilocycles, or such other frequency as the Commission may prescribe in lieu of 8,364 kilocycles, selectively but with respect to frequency not simultaneously, and shall sound an alarm if, but only if, any of the above 5 signals are received. Such alarm shall be sounded in the radio room, on the bridge, and at such other places on the ship as may be directed by the Commission. The automatic radiotelegraph call selectors shall be independent, except for source of power and antenna, of any other radio equipment on the ship."

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on the expiration of 18 months (or such shorter period as the Commission shall determine) after the Federal Communications Commission has found that—

(1) an automatic radiotelegraph call selector (as defined in section 3 (hh) of the Federal Communications Act of 1934, as amended by this act) is and will continue to be available, and may be installed, at a reasonable cost to shipowners; and

(2) patents covering, or necessary to the manufacture of, such an automatic radiotelegraph call selector are and will continue to be freely available for license at a reasonable royalty.

Mr. PRIEST (interrupting the reading of the bills). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD at this point, and open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PELLY: On page 6, in section 4, after line 2, insert a third proviso as follows:

"(3) agreement cannot be effected internationally to permit use of the present autoalarm for the purposes which would be served by the call selector device, and unless and until an automatic radio call selector is required by International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea to be installed on all vessels subject to such convention."

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I have no wish to delay the committee at this late hour. I think everyone understands what the amendment would accomplish. In brief, it would carry out the recommendation of Commissioner Webster of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to inquire of the author of the amendment as to the language which he proposes. He would add a new section on page 6; is that correct?

Mr. PELLY. No, that is not correct. The gentleman will see that on page 5 there are two provisos. This would add a third proviso so that the legislation would take effect after this third proviso.

Mr. HARRIS. The bill reads as follows.

On page 2 of the bill, subsection (2) of section 4, with reference to the effectuation of the act reads:

(2) patents covering, or necessary to the manufacture of, such an automatic radiotelegraph call selector are and will continue to be freely available for license at a reasonable royalty.

And then the gentleman by his amendment would add the number (3) after line 2, page 6.

Mr. PELLY. So then it would read, "after the Federal Communications Commission has found that—" subparagraph (1), which is followed by subparagraph (2); and I would add a third proviso, namely, that agreement cannot be effectuated internationally to permit use of the present auto-alarm for the purposes which would be served by the call selector device.

Mr. HARRIS. I see. That is the third subparagraph of section 4?

Mr. PELLY. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. After the Federal Communications Commission has found that an agreement cannot be effected internationally that would permit the use of the autoalarm for a purpose which will be served by the call-selector device, and unless and until the automatic radio call selector is required by International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea to be installed on all vessels subject to such convention.

Mr. PELLY. I would explain that this provision would mean that the Federal Communications Commission would have to find that under international convention it was acceptable and standardized before the law would take effect.

Mr. HARRIS. I hope you will pardon me if I have to ask for more time, but I have not seen the gentleman's amendment before. The amendment says:

The act shall take effect on the expiration of 18 months (or such shorter time as the Commission shall determine) after the Federal Communications Commission has found that—

(3) Agreement cannot be effected internationally to permit use of the present autoalarm for the purposes which would be served by the call-selector device, and unless and until an automatic radio call selector is required by International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea to be installed on all vessels subject to such convention.

Mr. PELLY. That is, it would be affected by the use of five different messages.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman knows very well from the hearings which our committee held last year and this year that the autoalarm cannot provide other signals which this call selector is designed to receive. Is that not true?

Mr. PELLY. I might say that the present alarm, that is, 12 dashes, under the present system that alert a ship for a disaster call could be used for an urgent message or a safety message or any other kind of message, but under international convention it is limited to disaster messages.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman knows very well that the autoalarm system has this one signal which it will receive; is that not true?

Mr. PELLY. Twelve dashes. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. It does not receive an international distress signal?

Mr. PELLY. It does not.

Mr. HARRIS. Then it does not receive an international safety signal?

Mr. PELLY. It would alert to say that a safety message is coming through.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. HARRIS was granted 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. PELLY. The point of this amendment is to provide that the alert signal presently used on ships can be for messages other than disaster messages.

Mr. HARRIS. I think I understand what the gentleman means, and certainly it confirms my feeling about it, that the amendment itself—I do not say it is designed for that purpose—but the effect of it will be to kill the bill. It cannot have any other effect.

Mr. PELLY. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman admits it. Therefore, I am opposed to the amendment because I am for the bill. The gentleman's admission is precisely what I thought he intended, and that was to kill the bill by this method. The gentleman has clarified precisely what I thought was in his mind, for the record.

Now, the purpose of bringing up this legislation is not because the Moore-McCormack Lines is against it; not because the labor organizations or someone else is for it. The purpose of this legislation is for safety of life at sea and safety of property. The hearings have revealed that over the years we had development in the electronic field. We developed the autoalarm system in 1934, 1935, and 1936, and it was adopted by this Congress in 1937. From that the International Radio Conference adopted it as a part of the international program. Through these years we have had, then, the development of a new system which can add to safety of life at sea. This is just in keeping with the great advances that have been made in electronics in many other fields during the last 15 years. Here is a device that not only will increase safety of life at sea but the safety of the ships owned by the very companies who are opposing it. To save my life I cannot understand why they should oppose something like this which would cost them one extra operator or else about $1,600 to $1,800 for this installation.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The fact that it has been said that the adoption of the amendment would kill the bill to me makes the amendment very desirable, also because I am opposed to the bill. However, in all seriousness, let me say that this amendment would permit or require that this device be adopted internationally as the present signaling device is adopted internationally by the International Convention; and it seems to me in, all seriousness, that is a very desirable amendment to this legislation and that it ought to be adopted for that reason, because then all the ships at sea would be required to have this kind of device.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. My time is very limited.

Mr. McCORMACK. It was not adopted until—

Mr. HARRIS. That is the point I was going to make; the International Radio Conference did not adopt the autoalarm system until after this Congress had amended the Federal Communications Commission Act to provide for it. Here we have another device. How can you promote something if it is not by law or by policy or principle adopted by the Government that is going to promote it? Who is going to promote something that has not been recognized by the man that offers it? They are going to say, of course, that if your own country does not adopt it, how can you expect us to adopt it and follow your leadership in an international conference?

I think it is well to remember that we have a system here that can add to what we already have had in these last nearly 20 years. If we will undertake to carry out our safety policies by development of a device of this kind and adopt it in our own country and then promote it in the international field, I think we will find that we will promote safety at sea, and, therefore, be in a better position to save life and property and avoid some of the disasters at sea that have occurred in the recent past.

I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, I have not been able to be here all afternoon. I should like to address a question to the proponents of this bill. Is there anything in the majority report that gives any indication of the cost? Can the gentleman from Tennessee tell me?

Mr. PRIEST. I believe the best estimate the committee received on cost was approximately between $1,600 and $1,800 per unit, though there were some who felt that about $1,800 was the best estimate the committee received.

Mr. GROSS. What would be the total cost?

Mr. PRIEST. It would depend on the number of ships. I do not recall the total number of cargo ships, but 97 percent of the cargo ships flying the American flag have but one radio operator. What the number is I do not know at the moment.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Washington. I am searching for information.

Mr. PELLY. I think the gentleman, unfortunately, was not here when I made a statement on that subject. It was to the effect that there are approximately 1,000 such vessels.

Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. PELLY. As soon as we get back into the House I shall ask permission to insert in my remarks a statement showing those figures, of the lumber of ships and cost.

I may say that the 4-way signal device of 1947 cost $1,650, and costs have about doubled since that time; so I would think the 5-way device, which is considerably more complicated, would be around $3,000, as a conservative estimate.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman give me any idea of the total cost of equipping the ships with this new device?

Mr. PELLY. I have said there are approximately 1,000 ships at $3,000 each. You can see it is an order for somebody to the extent of about $3 million. I would like to call attention to the fact also that the overtime involved in responding to the calls, either false alarms or regular calls that come to a ship on the basis of tests results in a cost to each ship of $30.90 per day. Figuring the ship is at sea approximately half of the time, you get a cost per year to a ship of $6,000. But no radio operator can stand being awakened approximately 10 times during his recreation and sleeping period, therefore you will have to put on extra radio operators.

Mr. GROSS. What would be the Government contribution by way of subsidies?

Mr. PELLY. $3 million, according to the ship operators.

Mr. GROSS. That would be the cost to the taxpayers of this country?

Mr. PELLY. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. That would be the direct cost to the taxpayers of this country?

Mr. PELLY. That is correct.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. May I ask the gentleman from Washington about the total cost of the installation say of a thousand of these units at $3,000, which I believe is a rather high figure, but we will accept that estimate for discussion. It would cost the taxpayers, he says, $3 million.

Mr. PELLY. I did not say that.

Mr. PRIEST. I think the gentleman from Iowa so understood it and I wanted that clear.

Mr. GROSS. I simply understood that the cost to the taxpayers of the country for this device—at least that is the statement of a number of people here—is not necessarily reliable, but that the cost would be $3 million.

Mr. PELLY. That is the operational cost.

Mr. PRIEST. That is the cost to the shipowners, the total cost to a thousand cargo ships, but it is not the cost to the taxpayers of the country. This is not a Government subsidy and it is not a Government program.

Mr. GROSS. It would be financed in part up to the amount of our subsidies to the shipping lines by the taxpayers?

Mr. PRIEST. There will be some of these ships that will receive subsidies, I am not sure how many that would be, but I do want to emphasize this is not a Government program insofar as paying the cost of the installation is concerned.

Mr. PELLY. I would like to emphasize that the cost to the shipowners of this device is not the big expense to them. It is in operating through additional radio operators. It is anticipated that the 277 subsidized ships that would

have to put this device on will in operating cost each year have to draw on their subsidies to the extent of $3,300,000.

Mr. GROSS. And as these costs went up there would be a demand from Congress for more subsidy?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words simply to point out this fact. The gentleman from Washington in response to the gentleman from Iowa said that a great deal of the additional cost would be involved by putting extra radio operators on. If there are as many as two radio operators, they would not have to put the device on. They have the choice. They may either install this equipment and continue to operate with one radio operator or they may put on two operators and not install the equipment.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. They would not have to buy $3 million worth of equipment but instead they would have entailed an expense per year of approximately $12,000 a ship, or a total of $12 million which would in effect be what would have to be done because no radio operator could stand these overtime difficulties on a regular basis.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the gentleman, if they are going to put on the additional operator they would not have to buy the equipment. Let us make that clear. Let us not double up on the cost and say they have to pay both.

Mr. PELLY. That is correct.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington a question. We have had the question raised as to how many of these ships would be subject to subsidy. The gentleman from Washington, I am sure, will agree with me that as a matter of fact a very few of the ships concerned here would be subject to subsidy for the reason, after all, as I understand the Merchant Marine Act, only certain classes or certain cargo vessels can be licensed to receive subsidies. Bulk cargo carriers generally and coastwise ships do not receive subsidy; am I correct?

Mr. PRIEST. Yes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. The record shows that there are 277 cargo vessels of 1,600 tons or more which would be affected by this legislation, which are under subsidy. That is in the record.

Mr. DINGELL. 277?

Mr. PELLY. Yes. But the bulk carriers on the Great Lakes, when the shipway is completed, would have to comply with this when they get ore

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from California

Mr. HOSMER. I think probably the people who are most familiar with safety at sea are the maritime insurance people, and anything, of course, that would reduce hazards at sea would reduce maritime rates. I wonder if there was any testimony at all before the committee from any maritime insurance people with respect to what the adoption of this law might do to maritime insurance rates.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the gentleman that I was not a member of the subcommittee, but I understand from the chairman of the subcommittee that there was no testimony on that particular subject.

Mr. HOSMER. It would be compelling to me that anything like this should have the opinion of the marine underwriters before such a drastic step was taken as to enact this device into law.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOLLINGER. On that question, would it not reduce insurance rates if the safety of the ships has been increased?

Mr. PRIEST. That was the general theory, I believe, that any increase in safety would have the effect of reducing the insurance rates.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4090) to amend part II of title III of the Communications Act of 1934, so as to require the installation of an automatic radio-telegraph call selector on cargo ships of the United States carrying less than two radio operators, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 508, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PELLY. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PELLY moves to recommit H. R. 4090 to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

1. For the purpose of bringing about evaluation of reliability of device under actual operational conditions of sufficient variety and duration to determine value of the device for safety purposes;

2. To bring in line with international procedures and criteria for safety and distress; and

3. For purpose of determining alternative and more reliable methods of accomplishing the purposes of this bill.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, on that motion I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of this bill be postponed until tomorrow.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to have a record vote on this bill. I wonder, if it is deferred, whether I could ask for a division and then, if there is not a quorum, get a rollcall vote.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts cannot guarantee that. I can assure the gentleman from Washington that the gentleman from Massachusetts will resort to no parliamentary methods to try to stop a rollcall vote. Of course, there is going to be another vote before the vote on this bill and, if there is a quorum present, then the constitutional number must stand.

I want the gentleman to understand that, but I am making my request in accordance with our agreement and in accordance with an agreement that I made with the House.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman that I should like to ask for a division in order to be sure that there will be an automatic rollcall.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman does that, then the House can do only one thing, and that is to adjourn. It would not be able to transact any more business today.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING READJUSTMENT PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS INVOLUNTARILY RELEASED FROM ACTIVE DUTY

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 517 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9952) to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 517 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 9952. The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour general debate on the bill.

H. R. 9952 amends the Armed Services Reserve Act of 1952 to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components, officers, and enlisted men, who are involuntarily released from active duty after having completed, immediately prior to release, at least 5 years of continuous active duty.

The payment would be computed on the basis of one-half of 1 month's basic pay in the grade in which the member is serving at the time of release for each year of active service ending with the 18th year.

Another section of the bill provides that a member of the Reserve who is within 2 years of qualifying for retirement pay shall not be involuntarily separated until he qualifies for retired pay.

Reserve members involuntarily released may elect to receive severance pay based on military service under any other provision of law.

Those who would not be entitled to such payments are listed in the bill—those released from active duty at their own request; those released from active duty for training; those released for moral or professional dereliction; those who would be immediately eligible for retired pay based on military service and a few other categories.

Reserve members may elect to receive readjustment pay or Veterans' Administration disability compensation to which they may be entitled, but not both.

The committee report complies with the Ramseyer rule and I urge the adoption of House Resolution 517.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] has so well and ably described the content and purpose of the bill which House Resolution 517 makes in order that I do not believe any additional comment on my part is necessary, except to say that it was the understanding of the Committee on Rules, according to my best recollection, that this bill was reported from the Committee on Armed Services by a unanimous vote, and I believe the rule was granted by the Committee on Rules by a unanimous vote.

I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9952) to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9952, with Mr. BAILEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the bill before the Committee is to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 in order to provide a reasonable lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty, after its enactment, and who shall have completed at least 5 years of continuous active duty.

As a result of the Korean hostilities and related international tensions of the last few years, a large number of Reserve officers with wartime experience have been retained on active duty.

These officers have served faithfully and efficiently, in many cases have 10 or more years, and now many are approaching the age at which their usefulness to the military forces is less than that of younger officers who are needed for current and future military service.

These older reservists have been away from civilian life for an extended period and, in some cases, have been called away from their civilian occupations on two separate occasions, during World War II and the Korean incident.

It is because of this that the legislation is before us today. We believe that these deserving individuals should be given an equitable payment upon involuntary release from active military duty to help them readjust themselves to civilian life again. We must all recognize that the Armed Forces require today, and will in the foreseeable future continue to require, large numbers of Reserve officers on extended active duty to meet the commitments of national defense.

As of the close of the last calendar year, approximately 72 percent of the active duty officer strength for the entire Defense Establishment were Reserve officers. For instance, the percentage of Reserve officers serving on active duty in each of the military departments were as follows: Army, 76 percent; Navy, 49 percent; Air Force, 83 percent; and Marine Corps, 49 percent.

Furthermore it is anticipated that the requirement for Reserve officers to serve on extended active duty in the future will continue to be high. As a matter of fact, it is estimated that to maintain the active military forces at a level approximating 2.8 million currently and for the foreseeable future, it will be necessary to keep approximately 150,000 Reserve officers on active duty to supplement the Regular officer corps. Excessive turnover of these Reserve personnel is costly and detrimental to the effectiveness of the military forces and the national security. The economic security which would be given by this legislation provides an inducement for qualified reservists to remain on active duty for prolonged periods, thereby reducing costly personnel turnover and increasing the effectiveness of our fighting forces through retention of experienced officers needed to direct our military units.

The commissioned Reserve element of the military departments consists of both volunteers and nonvolunteers. The nonvolunteers, for the most part, are any commissioned Reserve lieutenants serving the 2-year military obligation which they assumed in order to complete their college education and ROTC training.

The services must retain a considerable number of these officers on extended active duty beyond their obligated periods of service in order to maintain a balanced officer structure. On the other hand, these officers must be subject to release when their services are no longer required.

Existing law provides authority for keeping Reserve officers on active duty for long periods of time and also for releasing them when their services are no longer required. However, there is no provision for readjustment pay, or any other monetary cushion to ease their transition back to civilian occupations when their services on active duty can no longer be justified.

Personnel turnover among reservists continues to be a serious problem with all of the armed services. Much has been done, both by the Congress and the military departments, in the way of career attractiveness legislation and improved personnel management to reduce personnel turnover. These steps have had some effect as established by the fact that the personnel turnover rate of some 31 percent of the officer corps during fiscal year 1954 has been gradually reduced to a point of turnover of about 17 percent.

It is obvious, however, that anything that can be done to reduce personnel turnover will result in considerable savings to the Government and in increased effectiveness of the services.

Fluctuating military strength since World War II and lack of security in terms of tenure for Reserve component officers serving on active duty have caused undue uneasiness and anxiety among such officers, and many fine officers whose services were needed by the military departments have voluntarily returned to civilian life. This trend is particularly true in the case of officers who hold a civilian specialty for which there is great demand—for example, engineers and doctors. The armed services are doing all within their power to provide a greater sense of security to the highly capable type of active duty Reserve officers. Nevertheless, because of a continuing need to provide the degree of vitalization that is so essential in the active officer corps, it has been necessary and will continue to be necessary to release certain reservists involuntarily prior to their qualification for retirement benefits.

Those reservists who are subject to involuntary release from active duty, are usually those who have the greatest need for some type of monetary compensation to help them readjust to civilian pursuits. Most are reservists who have rendered relatively long and faithful service, and now that they are being released from their chosen career in the military service, through no fault of their own, it is only right that they be

provided with a monetary cushion to ease their readjustment back into civilian pursuits.

At this time I would like to explain the provisions of the bill. The readjustment payment authorized by this bill would be computed on the basis of one-half of 1 month's basic pay in the grade the reservist is serving at the time of release from active duty, for each year of active service up to and including the 18th year. A part of a year, that is 6 months or more, will be counted as a whole year, and a part of a year that is less than 6 months would be disregarded.

Although the bill provides for readjustment payments only through the 18th year of service, a provision of the bill provides that a member of a Reserve component who is on active duty and is within 2 years of qualifying for retirement pay shall not be involuntarily separated from active duty before he qualifies for that pay. Consequently, this type of individual would be retained in active service until he was eligible for retirement benefits.

Under the provisions of the bill, a reservist must have served 5 years of continuous active duty before he could qualify. Inasmuch as the required terms of service, both for enlisted men and officers, do not exceed 3 years, we know that a person who has served for 5 years has either reenlisted or has remained on active duty voluntarily, presumably with the thought of making the military service his career.

Now, I want to call your attention to the provisions of the bill which set forth those persons who are not entitled to any readjustment payment. For instance:

First, a person who is released from active duty at his own request is not entitled to any of the benefits of this bill.

Second, neither is a person who is released from active duty for training, inasmuch as he has been in training on active duty, that, in itself, means that he did not intend to remain on active duty for an extended period and thus make a career of the service.

Third, furthermore, a person who is released from active duty because of personal or moral dereliction would not be entitled to benefits.

Fourth, and persons released from active duty, who would be immediately eligible for retirement pay or for disability compensation, would not receive readjustment pay.

I should also point out that a person could only receive readjustment pay once. If a person serves for an extended period of time on active duty and then is involuntarily released, he would be paid readjustment pay. If he should later return to active duty and be qualified for another readjustment payment under this bill, he could not receive it unless he refunded the earlier payment.

I want to make one point clear. This bill does not authorize the payment of a bonus. This bill is not intended to reward a person for having served in the armed services but rather to recognize that when an individual has rendered long and satisfactory service, and then is required to leave active duty before qualifying for retirement, some monetary payment is necessary to readjust him to a new way of life.

I would like to call to your attention the fact that this legislation does not set a precedent. The Mustering Out Payment Act of 1944 provided for mustering-out payments for members engaged in active duty during World War II, who were discharged or released from active service under honorable conditions on or after December 7, 1941.

The Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 provided for mustering-out payments to members engaged in active service or or after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955.

The Officer Personnel Act of 1947 provides that an officer eliminated from the active list shall, if not eligible for retirement, be honorably discharged with severance pay. The Permanent Warrant Officer Act of 1954 provides for severance pay for warrant officers.

Consequently there is ample precedent to grant a rehabilitation payment to members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty.

I should also mention something about the cost of the bill. In the first place, the committee report sets out tables which show the payments that will be made under the provisions of the bill to an enlisted man in pay grade E–1 through E–7, and for officers from a warrant officer, pay grade W–1, on up.

The total estimated cost of the legislation for fiscal year 1957 is $11,842,000. This cost figure is based on the estimate that it will be necessary to involuntarily release 4,335 reservists during this period. It is not feasible to estimate a cost beyond fiscal year 1957 because there is no way of knowing at this time how many members of the Reserve components will have to be involuntarily released from active duty.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to close my remarks by reminding the Members that the personnel requirements of the Armed Forces are not static. Many considerations dictate what the size of our Armed Forces shall be at any time, and our officer personnel requirements contract and expand accordingly. It is not possible to avoid fluctuations. With the stabilized end strengths and the new Reserve program the military departments are working toward, I am sure it will be the policy and effort of the entire Department to keep fluctuations to the irreducible minimum. However, we all know that fluctuations will occur and that certain reservists, when circumstances require, will be released from active duty through no fault of their own.

In this respect the problem is comparable to that of industry with its fluctuating periods of increased and decreased productivity with attendant changes in personnel requirements. It is a growing practice in industry to grant severance pay to workers who have completed a specified minimum number of years in the company's employ if the worker's employment is thereafter terminated without fault on his part. This practice promotes stability because it requires prior faithful service and it promises financial aid to the individual during the period in which he is seeking other and new employment.

We have spent many years trying to build a strong and efficient Reserve. This bill is another milestone in the progress made by the Reserve components. I urge all of my colleagues to support this very worthwhile legislation.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. As I understand the legislation, the readjustment payment would not be made if the man secured a position in civil life and started receiving income before the expiration of a certain time.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Suppose the man has entered the service planning to make a career of it and through no fault of his own is separated after 5 years, he is paid an amount which would help him readjust himself in civilian life.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The readjustment benefits are not contingent upon any criteria of need. In other words, the officer might be fortunate enough to get a high paying job as soon as he leaves the service but would still draw these benefits?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The officer who is involuntarily separated from the service because of fluctuating needs of the defense picture after he has served 5 years gets a readjustment payment, but once he gets out into civilian life there is no military control over what he does.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think the gentleman does not understand my question: Take the case of a reservist who is separated against his will but is fortunate enough to land a good-paying job immediately, would he still draw benefits?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. He would draw the benefit before he got out of the service at the time of his release.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true this will apply to the Reserve officer who has had more than 5 years' service but less than 18 years?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. This is to assist him in the reestablishment of himself as a civilian?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct. We started with 5 years because we estimate that the average individual who stays 5 years in the service has in view making a career of that service. After he has gone a long way toward making a career of the service and when we take that opportunity away from him and turn him back to civilian life, we feel that there should be some sort of readjustment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The minimum, then, is 5 years; is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct. The reason for the 5 years, of

course, is that a 3-year enlistment would require a reenlistment, or, if you put it this way, a man who is in for 4 years will have to reenlist for an extended period. After he completes the first enlistment I think he intends to stay in the service and this encourages him to stay in the service as long as the service needs him.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask another question. Referring to a graduate of West Point, for instance, is he credited with 4 years of service at the Academy?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. No.

Mr. GROSS. They are not so credited?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. No.

Mr. GROSS. This would involve $5 million plus in the fiscal year 1956?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Eleven-million-dollars-plus.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about 1956. The cost in 1956 according to the Secretary of the Army is $5 million.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. There would not be any cost for the fiscal year 1956 because that has expired. For next year there would be a cost of $11 million.

Mr. GROSS. The letter from the Secretary of the Army so states?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That refers to the bill before we changed and amended it. This bill has been changed a great deal. This is a committee written bill. However, the Department now approves it, the Budget approves it just as though it were an original bill. It is a better bill than the Department sent us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House today is an important item of personnel legislation for the members of our Reserve components.

For many years I have worked to bring about an equalization of rights and benefits for members of the Reserve and Regular components of our military services. Because of my work in this field, I favor the enactment of this bill.

At the present time, all of the military departments are faced with a sizable hump in their officer corps resulting from the high personnel procurement during World War II—individuals who have remained on active duty and now have some 10 to 16 years of active military service.

Most of the armed services have more officers in this hump and now serving on active duty than can be properly utilized on a long-term basis. Many of these officers, who entered active service during World War II at relatively high ages, are now becoming overage in grade. They cannot be retained on active duty in an officer corps that must, of necessity, be composed primarily of highly qualified young officers who would be able to withstand the rigors of sustained combat.

A vitalized officer corps thus demands that many of these officers, who have relatively long periods of service but not enough to be qualified for retirement at this time, must be separated. These individuals find themselves with a major readjustment problem.

Now, I should point out that, under the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, a Regular officer eliminated from the active list before being eligible for retirement, may be honorably discharged from the Regular Army with severance pay.

Under the Permanent Warrant Officer Act of 1954, a permanent warrant officer who is unfit, or whose performance of duty is unsatisfactory, and who is not eligible for retirement, and who is separated after having completed more than 3 years of active service, is entitled to severance pay. Furthermore, a permanent warrant officer with less than 18 years of active service, who has twice failed of promotion is entitled to severance pay.

Consequently, I feel that it is only equity that Reserve officers be authorized a readjustment allowance, when they are involuntarily released from active duty, just as are Regular officers.

I have already mentioned that reservists, who are involuntarily released from active duty after many years of service, have a major readjustment problem. This is true because many of our business organizations are, like the Military Establishment, most reluctant to hire individuals at advanced ages. So we find that individuals released from active duty who have been away from civilian pursuits for a long period, and are now at advanced ages, are finding it extremely difficult to reestablish themselves in civilian occupations that will enable them to meet their financial needs. This is particularly true of individuals whose military training has been in fields that bear little relationship to civilian pursuits. These individuals have rendered faithful service to their country at a time when their services were vitally needed. Many have served in two or more armed conflicts. As a matter of fact, some of these officers were recalled to active duty involuntarily for the Korean emergency with considerable personal sacrifice.

The readjustment pay proposed by this bill will help these deserving individuals cushion their readjustment to civilian life and is certainly a justifiable element of the cost of national defense. In addition to the very real benefits to be provided to deserving reservists by this legislation, there are equivalent benefits that may be expected to accrue to the Government.

This bill should do much to induce stability in the officer structure of the Defense Establishment. Capable Reserve officers, knowing that they will be eligible for readjustment pay in the event of involuntary release prior to the time for retirement, will have an increased feeling of security and will be more likely to remain on active duty voluntarily for extended periods.

Never forget that under present and foreseeable circumstances, our national security is dependent on sizable augmentation of our Regular forces by members of our Reserve components. We depend heavily on them to maintain our military effectiveness.

The Congress has authorized severance pay for Regular officers whose careers are terminated prior to qualifying for retirement. But, at the present time, no such provision is available to members of the Reserve components. This is wrong. It is inequitable. It is discriminatory. But, by passing this legislation, we will be setting up a program whereby Reserves and Regulars will be placed on a similar basis and thus, we will give substantial equality for all who serve on active duty and must be released prior to qualifying for retirement.

I sincerely hope that all Members of the House, who are interested in the welfare of our reservists that serve with the active military services, will give their unqualified support to this legislation.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I would like to address the same question to the gentleman as I did to his predecessor. I have in mind the very considerable criticism which was addressed to the so-called 52–20 club following World War II, where payments were periodic and conditioned on the ex-serviceman not obtaining employment. I am just wondering if there is a possibility of similar criticism of this measure or if this program is somewhat different in nature from that.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. While the answer is no, I wish to qualify it by saying this: Let us consider the situation faced by a Reserve officer who has been on active duty, away from his home for a period of anywhere from 5 to less than 18 years, and who within 90, 60, or 30 days may receive word from his superior that he will be separated from active duty as of the 1st of the month. In such an instance here is what happens? First he has to think about moving his family to a community, because he may be occupying quarters on the station. Next he has to think about establishing a home somewhere for himself and family, because he can no longer live on the military station. In addition he has to buy civilian clothes and have a period of time for the purpose of establishing himself in a position, and rehabilitating himself in civilian life. This bill will provide him with a sum of money that he will use for the purpose of reestablishing himself as a Reserve officer on inactive duty as he returns to civilian life.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I think the committee has inserted a number of very good provisions on page 2 of the bill. But, I should like to ask the gentleman what is meant by a person who is released from active duty for training. What kind of training?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. A Reserve officer who is called up for training purposes may find himself on active duty for a period of months, weeks, or days, so we differentiate between an officer who is on active duty for a longer period of time—anywhere from 5 years to less than 18 years—and the Reserve officer who is called up only for training purposes.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the 6-month trainee under the reserve program would be one of the men included, and the National Guard sometimes sends its officers to the Regular Establishment for training purposes only.

In those cases the trainee would not be included under the act.

Mr. GROSS. But this is confined to a military trainee?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. This is confined to active duty by a Reserve officer but does not include a Reserve officer called up only for training.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] have thoroughly explained this bill. We sat in hearings for a long time and discussed the various angles of it. I believe it is a bill that is needed and one that is just to take care of the situation of, as I call him, the career reservist who has spent many years on active duty.

If there are any questions about the bill, I should be glad to answer them. Otherwise, I simply urge the support and passage of this bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank the members of the subcommittee for long and patient work on this bill. We started out with one type of bill. The subcommittee analyzed the provisions of the bill submitted to us very carefully. We revised it and redrafted it and came out with a much-improved bill. I think everybody on the committee is entitled to a great deal of commendation for the patience they displayed in helping us work out a good bill. I am pleased, therefore, to be able to present such a fine bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think it would be well to say for the record that this bill has the endorsement of the Reserve Officers Association, the National Guard, and other groups supporting the reserve of the country.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman. I should like to add this—this does not pertain exactly to the bill, but I think it is a matter of great interest to the Members of Congress. Under the Reserve Act which we passed last year providing for 6 months' training and for the training of Reserves in active duty, I should like to say that last week the Army recruited 1,980 reservists under this program. Of these 1,980 recruited in a 1-week period, 856, I am told by the Pentagon, were recruited under the 6-month training provisions of the act. There has been a lot of interest in it. The 6-year provision of the act refers to those cases where a Reserve goes on active duty for 2 years. We recruited last week 680 persons and, surprising to all of us, we recruited last week 444 under the provisions of the act which permits a man getting out of the active service to take 1 year of active duty in the Reserves in lieu of his obligation. As I say, we recruited 444 of those. Up to date we have recruited a grand total of 40,310 in the Army Reserve program under the new law.

We have until August 7 to complete this recruitment. We have a need for 90,000 in the Army Reserve. That represents a little less than 50 percent of our needs for the current year. I think that all who have been studying this program are optimistic that for the next year we will get the full needs of 90,000 persons for the Reserves under the Reserve Act of 1955. That was the requirement of the Army for that 1-year period of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 481), as amended, is further amended by adding the following section after section 259:

"SEC. 260. (a) A member of a reserve component who is involuntarily released from active duty after having completed immediately prior to such release at least 5 years of continuous active duty, except for breaks in service of not more than 30 days, as either an officer, warrant officer, or enlisted person, is entitled to a lump-sum readjustment payment computed on the basis of one-half of 1 month's basic pay in the grade in which he is serving at the time of release from active duty for each year of active service ending at the close of the 18th year. For the purposes of this subsection, a part of a year that is 6 months or more is counted as a whole year, and a part of a year that is less than 6 months is disregarded.

"(b) The following persons are not entitled to any payments under this section:

"(1) A person who is released from active duty at his own request.

"(2) A person who is released from active duty for training.

"(3) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, a person who is released from active duty because of moral or professional dereliction.

"(4) A person who upon release from active duty would be immediately eligible for retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay based entirely on his military service under any provision of law.

"(5) A person who upon release from active duty would be immediately eligible for severance pay based on his military service under any other provision of law. However, such a person may elect to receive either readjustment pay under this section or severance pay, but not both.

"(6) A person who upon release from active duty would be eligible for disability compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. However, such a person may elect to receive either readjustment pay under this section or disability compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, but not both. Election of readjustment pay shall not deprive a person of any disability compensation to which he may subsequently become entitled under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

"(c) The acceptance of readjustment pay under this section shall not deprive a person of any retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or other retirement benefits from the United States to which he would otherwise become entitled.

"(d) Under regulations prescribed by the appropriate Secretary, which regulations shall be as uniform as practicable, a member of a reserve component who is on active duty and is within 2 years of qualifying for retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay under any purely military retirement system, shall not be involuntarily separated from that duty before he qualifies for that pay unless his separation is approved by the appropriate Secretary.

"(e) A member of a Reserve component who on the effective date of this section is serving on active duty under an agreement authorized by section 235 of this act, and who is involuntarily released from active duty before completing his agreed term of service, may elect, in lieu of separation payment under that section, to receive readjustment pay under this section.

"(f) Any payments accruing to a person under this section shall be reduced by the amount of any payment previously received by that person under this section, unless he has already refunded the prior payment to the United States. If he has refunded the earlier payment, the period covered by the earlier payment shall be considered as a period for which no payment has been made under this act.

"(g) A person who receives readjustment pay under this section is not entitled to mustering-out pay under the Mustering Out Payment Act of 1944 or under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952.

"(h) For the purpose of this section, the term 'involuntary release' shall include release under conditions wherein a member of a Reserve component, who has completed a tour of duty, volunteers for an additional tour of duty and the service concerned does not extend or accept the volunteer request of the member for the additional tour."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "section 259" and insert in lieu thereof "section 264"; and in line 6, strike out "SEC. 260." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 265."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. BAILEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9952) to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty, pursuant to House Resolution 517, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit while the House is

in session during general debate on Thursday and Friday of this week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of the Honorable Bernard J. Berry, mayor of Jersey City, N. J., I have today introduced a bill to amend titles I and XIV of the Social Security Act to provide that, where a State requires an individual to assign his life-insurance policies to the State agency as a condition of assistance thereunder, such requirement shall not apply to the first $1,000 of the proceeds of such policies.

I deem it a high privilege to list below the letter from Mayor Berry which develops the proposal that prompted the introduction of this bill.

In his letter, it appears to me, and I trust that it does to the membership of this House, the distinguished mayor of Jersey City clearly justifies the need for the remedy which passage of the bill would provide:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
CITY HALL,
Jersey City, N. J., May 17, 1956.

Hon. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
Congressman, 13th District, New Jersey,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SIEMINSKI: Our local public assistance and medical center officials have called my attention to a condition at the medical center which is the cause of much resentment among some old-age or disability assistance recipients receiving care at the medical center.

Under the present State approved program which includes a Federal matching formula the Hudson County Welfare Board is permitted to pay up to $168 per month to the chronically ill old-age recipient for his care in the approved areas at the medical center.

Because of a Federal regulation the Hudson County Welfare Board is not permitted to give this assistance unless the recipient assigns all insurance, if any, to the Hudson County Welfare Board.

This has caused much resentment among the recipient, his family, and his legally responsible relatives since no part of this insurance may be retained for the funeral and burial expenses of the recipient in case of his death.

While it is true that the Hudson County Welfare Board is permitted to pay $255 for burial expenses it is felt that this is not sufficient and would be unnecessary if the family or legally responsible relatives were permitted by the regulations to retain up to $1,000 of the insurance for funeral and burial expenses.

I believe that this proposal is humane and realistic and therefore urge that you sponsor such a change in the present public assistance regulations of the Bureau of Public Assistance, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

May I offer the following proposal:

"All old-age and disability assistance recipients, who are covered by life insurance, shall be permitted to retain up to $1,000 of personal life insurance to be used for funeral and burial expenses upon their death."

May I have your reactions to this proposal?

I also wish to urge your active support of title I, title II, and title IV of the public assistance amendments of H. R. 9120 introduced by Representative JERE COOPER, of Tennessee and now in the House Ways and Means Committee.

Title I of this bill amends the formula for determining the Federal share of assistance expenditures to become effective July 1, 1957, so as to provide separate dollar-for-dollar matching of State expenditures for medical care in behalf of assistance recipients, up to a specified maximum.

Federal share would be 50 percent of amounts spent by the States up to $6 per month times adult recipients, $3 per month times child recipients.

The Federal share for medical care would be in addition to present Federal matching of public assistance.

Cost—$65 million commencing July 1, 1957, and increasing to about $110 million annually after 10 years.

Title II extends from September 30, 1956, to June 30, 1959, the present formula for determining the Federal share of public assistance expenditures.

Failure to extend the formula would result in a reduction of about $200 million in Federal grants and may result in a reduction in payments to recipients.

Title IV amends the aid to dependent children program by extending the list of relatives with whom the child may live and receive aid, and by eliminating the school attendance requirement from children 16 to 18 years of age.

I feel that these suggestions are in the best interests of our citizens and urge their adoption.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,
BERNARD J. BERRY, *Mayor.*

THE 24TH NATIONAL 4–H CLUB CAMP

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to three items of interest and import.

Mr. Speaker, the 24th National 4–H Club Camp will be held here in Washington, D. C., from June 13 through June 20, 1956. The purpose of the National 4–H Club Camp is to assist these young people between the ages of 10 and 21 years of age to prepare for more responsible citizenship and service through:

First. Learning more about the organization, structure, and functioning of the Federal Government.

Second. Travel over this vast country and the exchanging of ideas and experiences with other delegates from different parts of the country.

More than 2,156,000 young people belong to nearly 90,000 4–H Clubs in the 48 States, and Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. The delegates to this the 24th National 4–H Club Camp, numbering some 200 boys and girls, however, are chosen by their respective State extension service directors for outstanding project achievement, citizenship activity, leadership ability and community service.

Mr. Speaker, some 357,650 unpaid volunteer local leaders direct the activities of these 4–H'ers. They in turn are given training, and assistance by the county agricultural and home demonstration agents and the subject matter specialists of the State land-grant college or university. Some 100 of these adult 4–H leaders will accompany these 200 4–H Club delegates to Washington. They will attend special instruction classes so as to better equip themselves for their volunteer leadership activities.

The 4–H Club program, Mr. Speaker, now includes an international farm youth exchange program involving 40 countries. Over 300 outstanding 4–H Club members spend a summer in a foreign country living with farm families, assisting in the fields and participating in local community activities under this program. On the other hand, a young outstanding rural youth comes to this country living under the same type arrangements. Many civic organizations have sponsored on a State basis the exchange of 4–H Club members, as have business firms and foundations.

In particular, however, the National 4–H Club Foundation, with offices in Silver Spring, Md., has played a major role in establishing and administering, as an arm of the Federal-State Cooperative Extension Service, the international farm youth exchange program. In 1951, the Chevy Chase Junior College property was purchased by the Foundation. This property valued at $500,000 has been completely paid for and is now owned by the Nation's 2 million 4–H Club members. The center is to be renovated and ready for occupancy in 1958.

The property will be used by 4–H Club groups visiting here. They will live at the center while attending national camps. Facilities for meetings will be included.

Mr. Speaker, the National 4–H Club Foundation Journal for March 15, 1956, includes a short article on plans to renovate the property.

It is as follows:

RENOVATION PLANS PROCEED FOR NATIONAL 4–H CENTER

Plans for renovation of the National 4–H Club center are moving full speed ahead, following the decision by the board of trustees of the National 4–H Club Foundation to occupy the center by early 1958.

After its January 24–25 meeting, the board announced that the foundation would take over the center when the lease now held by the Department of Defense expires in June 1957. The Department has occupied the center property since shortly after its purchase in February 1951.

The center property consists of a beautiful 12½-acre campus in Chevy Chase, Md., a suburb of the Nation's Capital. There are three main buildings: Smith Hall, named for C. B. Smith, extension pioneer; and Turner and Warren Halls, named for Ray Turner and Miss Gertrude Warren, retired extension 4–H officials. When renovation is completed the center will be able to house and feed groups of 250 to 300 people, as well as provide conference rooms and other working facilities.

The property will be renovated to accommodate National 4–H Club Camp, the offices of the National 4–H Club Foundation, incoming and outgoing IFYE participants, and many other activities.

Among the many activities expected to take place at the center after its restoration are: Workshops and training conferences in connection with citizenship and human relations training programs; adult and junior leader training conferences; State and county 4–H citizenship training groups; meetings of 4–H Club program development committees, and county extension agent associations; subject matter specialists workshops; homemakers council sessions; and meetings of farm organization youth groups, agricultural commodity groups, etc.

The decision by the board of trustees to move ahead with putting the center in operation brings to a final stage the work and dreams of 4–H members and leaders for more than a decade. As a working shrine the 4–H center will reflect the vision and dedication of the thousands of 4–H members and leaders who have given both of time and money to turn this idea into reality. Through the share and care program more than $100,000 has been contributed to the development of the center, now valued at half a million dollars. More than half of the States have already completed their quotas with 4–H'ers giving a dime each to establish their own National 4–H home. Business groups, too, will be given an opportunity to give special financial assistance to establishing the center.

RISE IN DAIRY INCOME

Mr. Speaker, the publication, Dairy Situation, for May 14, 1956, should be read by all Members of the Congress who have been concerned about the dairy price support program, since it indicates that:

With larger sales and higher prices, cash receipts from dairy products this year will be substantially above the 1955 level.

Although production of milk is continuing to show substantial increases over a year earlier, the consumption of fluid milk and cream has also been on the increase. In addition, consumption has been aided by a substantial increase in the amount of creamery butter being made from whole milk and the production of several whole milk products.

Mr. Speaker, this has resulted in a 5- to 10-cent per hundred pounds price increase for milk during the first 4 months of 1956 over the corresponding period in 1955. As of May 15, 1956, according to the publication, Agricultural Prices, the average price of milk—whole—was $3.86 per hundredweight. This represented 91 percent of the parity price of $4.69 per hundredweight.

Although milk prices are not as high as a few years ago, prices for feeds have declined even more. For example, the milk feed price ratio has been above the longtime average since July of 1955. In April 1956, it was 6 percent above the average for that month. The result, of course, has been higher prices for dairy farmers.

OPERATIONS OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION IN UTAH

Mr. Speaker, during the past few months I have heard several Members complain about the operations of the Small Business Administration. Of course, in this election year one expects to hear such charges made against a Republican administration. But an accurate picture of the job the Small Business Administration has been doing in Utah makes it evident that a great many small businesses of all types have received financial assistance without which they could not have continued in business.

For example, about 37 percent of the net applications received in Utah by the Small Business Administration totaling some $857,000 were approved. What type of business-firms received loans? Namely, these:

First. Canning and processing of fruits and vegetables.
Second. Grain mill products.
Third. Logging camps and sawmills.
Fourth. Household furniture.
Fifth. Stone, clay, and glass products.
Sixth. Poultry processing.
Seventh. Retailers.
Eighth. Motels.
Ninth. Contractors.

How have the borrowers fared? Mr. Wendell B. Barnes informed me by letter that two of the loans made were canceled, and that although no loans have been repaid in full or otherwise liquidated, no loss is "anticipated to result."

Mr. Speaker, the small-business firm predominates in Utah's economy. A great many of them have and are finding financial assistance forthcoming from the Small Business Administration, which otherwise would fail to keep pace with their larger competitors, if not fail altogether.

ONE-HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF WISE COUNTY, VA.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I take the opportunity here today to bring to the attention of the Members of the House a celebration that is taking place in the Ninth Congressional District of Virginia.

Wise County is observing its 100th anniversary. A countywide, year-long series of events have been planned by the directors of this centennial celebration in order to bring every person and every facet of community life into the observance.

Wise County was formed on February 16, 1856, from three neighboring counties. The General Assembly of Virginia, which approved the formation of Wise in 1856, commemorated the 100th year of the county's existence with an appropriate resolution this year. This joint resolution, which I include herewith in my remarks, was introduced in the Virginia House of Delegates by two of my very good friends, Delegates Orby L. Cantrell and James L. Camblos. The resolution follows:

Whereas the county of Wise was formed 100 years ago, on February 16, 1856, by the severance of territory from the counties of Lee, Scott, and Russell, and was named in honor of Henry Alexander Wise, Governor of Virginia from 1856 to 1860; and

Whereas Wise County ranks sixth largest among the counties of the State, according to population, with over 56,000 sons and daughters; and

Whereas the Trail of the Lonesome Pine winds serenely through Wise County, which is endowed with the scenic beauty of lofty High Knob, and the tranquillity of peaceful Powell's Valley; and

Whereas in Wise County is located the Southwest Virginia Museum and the home of the noted author John Fox, Jr., who recorded forever the romance of mountain life in his novels, The Trail of the Lonesome Pine, The Shepherd of Kingdom Come, and others; and

Whereas Wise County is in the heart of Virginia's rich coal fields decorated with quaint beehive coke ovens and towering, modern coal tipples and coal processing structures, and is gifted with a variety of industry and agriculture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates (the Senate concurring), That the General Assembly of Virginia joins the county of Wise in commemorating its centennial anniversary, and acknowledges its contribution to the glorious history of this Commonwealth and the Nation; and be it

Resolved, further, That the clerk of the house of delegates is directed to send a suitably prepared copy of this resolution to the clerk of the board of supervisors of the county of Wise.

The objectives of the Wise celebration are, indeed, noteworthy. I list them here and commend the directors of the centennial for their intense interest in seeing that this observance results in much that is good for the future of the county.

The objectives are:

To pay tribute to the hardy pioneers who settled in this part of Virginia and passed on to us a heritage of which we are proud.

To give every citizen of Wise County, their friends and acquaintances abroad, an opportunity to celebrate in unity, friendship and good spirit, the 100th birthday of the county's glorious history.

To call attention to our own people as well as people beyond the borders of our county the outstanding progress our county has made in the development of schools, churches and industry.

To call attention of the tourist to the opportunities which Wise County affords them in scenic beauty and places of interest and recreation.

To contribute something to the achievement of education in the realm of local history and at the same time furnish entertainment and opportunity for having good wholesome fun.

Many outstanding events have been planned in connection with this centennial celebration. Among them are historical programs, parades, picnics, a centennial pageant, Governor's Day, and a special Labor Day celebration. In addition schools, churches and the various communities are scheduling, or have completed, special programs.

I would like to extend today to the Members an invitation to join me in attending and taking part in these many events that are a part of the Wise celebration. I know from experience that you will enjoy any visit to Wise County, which not only offers the hospitality for which southwest Virginia has become famous, but can provide many other recreational and entertainment opportunities. I quote from a recent article written by Mr. Luther F. Addington, executive director of the centennial, as an example of what you can expect to find in Wise County:

Visitors will find their way to turbulent, singing streams leaping from the mountain

and cast a red ibis or a black gnat or maybe a worm into the deep, dark pools to lure a trout from his watery hiding place. Whether they go to Machine Creek or Clear Creek or the head of Old Stoney, they will know the surcease from toil and worry and find joy untold in the exhilarating air of the land in the sky.

So I urge you to come to Wise County—to the land of John Fox, Jr., who wrote such books as The Trail of the Lonesome Pine and The Little Shepherd of Kingdom Come.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have Wise County among the counties and cities of my district. I am proud to have the opportunity of representing this fine group of citizens in the House. It is desirable and appropriate that we recognize Wise County and her sons and daughters on the occasion of their 100th birthday.

I am not one to make predictions, but I feel confident in stating that Wise County has a bright, prosperous future. Basing my prediction on the accomplishments of the past, I feel certain that this progressive county will go forward with continued vigor after pausing to reflect on the 100 years.

The 56,000 citizens of Wise County have a "song of celebration in their hearts" in this 100th year of their existence as a county. I pay tribute, today, to Wise County, and send my best wishes for the future years of growth and development in every field that I know are forthcoming.

IMPORTATION OF POULTRY AND EGGS FROM CANADA AND THE ARGENTINE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to tell the House of the plight of the poultry farmers in Massachusetts. A number of farmers in my district have gone out of business as the result of the high cost of feed, and they are protesting most bitterly now against the importation of a good deal of poultry and a good many eggs from the Argentine and also from Canada. It is a very unfair position to put my poultry farmers in, and I am extremely anxious to have this situation remedied. I am working with the Department of Agriculture, and I hope to have the support of the Members of the House in seeing that this importation of poultry and eggs from Canada and the Argentine stops. The eggs and poultry from these countries sell at a lower price than our farmers can afford to sell their products. The low price is always the market price.

PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS NEW NONSTOP SERVICE TO EUROPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, significantly it has become the responsibility of Pan American World Airways to bring to an end an era of aviation history just as it was that airline's responsibility to open new transportation vistas by being the first carrier to order jet aircraft for international operations.

This week Pan American began DC–7C service across the Atlantic, nonstop to Europe. This handsome new aircraft, built by Douglas, is capable of flying 5,000 miles without refueling. Consequently, passengers who board Pan American's new DC–7C this summer for a holiday in Europe will know that they will be arriving in London in 10 hours and in Paris in 11 hours.

The super–7 clipper, adapted from the luxury DC–7 by Pan American and Douglas Aircraft for over-ocean, nonstop, tourist class service, will be put into the transatlantic schedules of the airline in time to add more than 30 percent in passenger capacity during the booming summer season.

Carrying a full load of 71 passengers and 6,300 pounds of baggage and cargo, the plane will speed along at 353 miles an hour, faster than any other passenger plane. It is 30 miles faster than any over-ocean plane.

Newly designed seats, with built-in tables, more leg room, and enlarged galleys are among the improvement that make the plane the most comfortable available for tourist service travelers.

The planes will go into daily New York-Paris service this month with four of these flights continuing to Rome. In July, daily service between New York and London will begin, continuing on to Frankfurt three times a week. Super–7's will be put into additional flight to Frankfurt via Shannon and Brussels, and also via Prestwick and Amsterdam, in August.

The plane is powered by 4 of the newest Wright turbo-compound engines that give it 13,000 horsepower at take-off. Extra gasoline tanks built into the wing enable the Super-7 to fly nonstop for 4,000 miles and still have reserve fuel to fly another 1,000 miles.

The new seats have molded backs and cushions 30 percent thicker than in present tourist-class seats, with a down-filled pillow molded into the back of the cushion. The table, built into the back of the seat, can be dropped down for the use of the passenger sitting behind. It has been built so that even if the seat is fully reclined, the table will remain level. A new, large coatroom has been added, and there is more room for storing passengers' hand baggage.

More efficient and faster food service for passengers is made possible by the Super-7's enlarged galleys. The galleys are designed to store two full meals and an in-between snack for all passengers and crew members. A newly-developed coffee machine provides fresh coffee at all times.

The plane, which enables large groups of tourists to speed across the Atlantic faster than ever before, is still another step forward in the program to make travel available to more and more people.

This program was outlined in 1949 by the President of Pan American. He said at that time: "The goal is not just to fly airplanes on schedule, across oceans, to all six continents, and around the world. The goal is to carry people, cargo, and letters in great numbers—mass air transportation, for the average man at fares he can afford to pay."

Mr. Speaker, I opened these remarks with the use of the word "significantly" and let me explain why: Pan American was the first air carrier to use the glamorous and romantic old flying boats for transoceanic passenger travel. It was Pan American which first put the DC–4's into service around South America, across the Atlantic, and across the Pacific. In 1949, the revolutionary Boeing Stratocruiser went into service on Pan American routes bringing to air passengers the most luxurious accommodations of all times.

It is virtually certain that the DC–7C's will be the last of our piston engine aircraft built.

The jet age is already upon us, and Pan American will begin operating jet flights across the Atlantic, across the Pacific, and around the world in late 1958 or early 1959. Until that time the DC–7C's will provide the ultimate in dependable, swift, and comfortable service to the four corners of the world.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that historic day in October 1927, when a comparatively tiny Pan American plane flew 80 miles from Key West to Havana carrying United States mail over water by air for the first time. Swiftly the enthusiasm for Pan American spread, and working with the complete cooperation of the United States Government the airline expanded down the east coast of South America and, in 1928, combined with the W. R. Grace Co. to form Panagra, which has been flying down the west coast of South America for 28 years.

This expansion took place at a time when bilateral air agreements were unknown. Without the help of Government agencies, Pan American negotiated for landing privileges with our Latin American neighbors. Let it be understood, Mr. Speaker, that Pan American did not carry the financial burden alone. An interested and farseeing administration, which caught the importance of having a United States-flag carrier dominant in the international field, subsidized Pan American's early operation to a considerable extent. I recently learned from the Civil Aeronautics Board that Pan American is now almost completely off subsidy, that only on the national interest routes to Scandinavia, South Africa, and Australia does that airline still receive subsidy.

Pan American does not have a domestic operation as yet. All its American competitors in the international field do. Should Pan American ever obtain a high-density domestic route the Civil Aeronautics Board advises me the subsidy requirements would disappear overnight. This is a situation that can and should be corrected by quick and positive action on the part of the CAB in order that Pan American can compete sensibly and equally with other United States carriers with domestic certificates who fly on parallel routes to Europe, to the Orient, and to South America.

Pan American's record is one of remarkable and unbelievable achievements. This airline was first across the Pacific in 1935, first across the Atlantic in 1939, and first around the world in 1949. Credit for these accomplishments belongs to a great team of progressive air pioneers headed by Juan Terry Trippe, the company's president since its inception. A young Yale graduate and Marine Corps flier of World War I, Mr. Trippe was barely 28 years old when he conceived the idea of a privately owned commercial airline flying over water to every section of the world. Juan Trippe and his company have rendered a great public service. Those of us who have had the good fortune to travel extensively throughout the world get tremendous pride and comfort in seeing Pan American equipment at almost every airport of importance. We have also been greatly impressed with the amount of foreign competition Pan American has from airlines wholly owned and heavily subsidized by the governments under whose flag they fly.

Mr. Speaker, as Pan American begins to pioneer again with its new DC–7C equipment it seems imperative to me that the Congress of the United States should take pride in its record and should do everything in its power to help Pan American grow, expand, and prosper. It is no longer the tiny little company which began operating from Key West in 1927; Pan American now has 18,000 employees all over the world and is owned and controlled by 33,000 stockholders.

Personally, I am proud to be a member of our Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which is largely responsible for the good health of our commercial air-transport industry. I am likewise proud to salute Pan American World Airways for its initiative in placing at the disposal of American tourists such excellent equipment as the DC–7C.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to ask the gentleman to yield so that I may say a few words in behalf of Pan American, about which the gentleman is talking; and also, as a fellow committeeman with the gentleman, it has been my pleasure to observe the operations of Pan American and the fine services they have been extending to the public. I want to specifically call attention to one point about which I have some intimate knowledge, and that is the question of labor relations, the fine labor relations maintained by Pan American with the Transport Workers Union of New York City. In fact the relations have been so pleasant that Mike Quill, president of the Transport Workers Union, has written a letter to Pan American suggesting that Pan American be given a route from New York to Miami Beach.

So I want to commend the Pan American Airlines and the gentleman from Indiana for calling to the attention of the House this fine and splendid work that is being done.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I also wish to join with the gentleman from Indiana in the remarks he has made. I think it is particularly refreshing to know at a time when other nations are taking superiority in the air away from us not only in the military but also in the civilian air travel, that this country is making such rapid strides. I am particularly interested to know that it will now be possible for people in my area to fly nonstop to the principal cities of Europe.

Mr. BEAMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like this time to concur in the remarks made previously on the flight of Pan American to Detroit from Europe.

I would like to point out other significant features of the flight. To the auto and other industries that have exports and imports, this will be of great assistance to them. This emphasizes Detroit as being an international port.

Pan Americans decision to fly to Wayne Major Airport is important for it emphasizes the superiority over Willow Run as an airport for Detroit. Nearness, adequate landing field, and the practical arrangements with the Wayne County Road Commission, is certainly more desirable.

Pan American's move to Wayne-Major is a gain to Detroit not only for the additional service but also the practical approach of utilizing Wayne-Major as a civilian airport and to give back to the military Willow Run which they now so drastically need.

Mr. BEAMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Florida has unmatched pride and feeling for Pan American World Airways, for this airline which carries the United States flag around the world with such great distinction is our own. The company was formed in my district in Florida in 1927 with Mr. Juan Terry Trippe as president. Many of the residents of south Florida can remember when Pan American made its first flight from Key West to Habana on October 28, 1927. It was an augury of the future that 90 miles of this 110-mile route were over water. Pan American was America's first overseas air service.

Today Pan American's 4-engined airliners equipped with all the most modern electronic aids to navigation span the oceans and seas in our Western Hemisphere, alone they link 34 countries and colonies. Last year this company transported 1,045,131 passengers between the Americas.

This great worldwide air transport operation had its beginning in Florida with only seven employees. Its Florida-based Latin American division today employs 7,785 persons. Its planes are among the newest and finest produced by America's aircraft industry. Pan American's vast experience and skill helped design them.

As long ago as 1930, this company flew 600 miles nonstop across the Caribbean from Kingston, Jamaica, to the Panama Canal Zone. This was the longest scheduled overwater hop in the world until PAA began its transpacific service. While expanding around the world PAA has never forgotten Florida, its birthplace. It maintains its greatest overhaul depot in international aviation at Miami. It employs 6,028 persons in Florida alone, with an annual payroll in the State of $28,606,554.

Its employees are permanent, substantial residents of my congressional district, 4,500 of them owning their own homes there. About 5,500 of them own automobiles. Real estate and automobile taxes paid by these employees to the State of Florida exceed $1 million a year. They are active in civic affairs, as indicated by the $51,000 they contributed to the most recent Community Chest drive. Entirely in addition to the great importance of its employees to the community, Pan American itself spends $5 million a year for supplies and materials in Florida alone. The company also pays important taxes and fees to the State and Dade County.

PAA Clippers flew 456,171 passengers in and out of Florida in 1955. Conservatively estimating that each spent $15 daily for at least 3 days in the State, we can see that PAA's passengers spread another $20,500,000 through the State's economy, reaching every level from bankers to bootblacks.

Pan American has made Florida a summer resort for thousands of our good neighbors from Latin America. Nearly as much Spanish as English is heard on Miami's streets in summer months. Thousands of North Americans also fly in PAA Clippers to Latin America, this interchange of visitors is a major and vital contribution to greater understanding among the peoples of the Western Hemisphere.

Our country's policies and international relationships are aided too. It is not difficult to remember when mistrust and even hatred was the unhappy state of affairs in our part of the world. Since 1927 there has been a noticeable and growing change until now there is a high degree of understanding, friendliness and mutual respect. The family of nations of the Western Hemisphere now assist each other in their social cultural and economic development. PAA has had an important part in this new era of cordiality by linking all these countries with swift, efficient air transportation making possible the peoples visiting and knowing one another. For not only does PAA fly in and out of the Latin American countries, it also has assisted a number of them to establish air transport systems of their own. It lent its vast knowledge and experience to help found associate companies in Mexico, Cuba, Colombia, Venezuela, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, Brazil and the Dominican Republic. Thus Latin American air transportation advanced on a par with our own and a great store of good will resulted, not only for PAA but for the United States as well.

Among its many contributions in the international field, PAA has spent mil-

lions of its own advertising and public relations dollars to foster understanding and travel throughout the Western Hemisphere. It has striven for lower fares. Today bargain-rate tourist fares which PAA inaugurated are in effect on many airlines around the world.

We of Florida note with satisfaction that when Pan American has another great aerial achievement to demonstrate, it returns to its birthplace to make the demonstration. Thus its newest plane departed May 25 from Miami for 4,806-mile nonstop flight to Paris, the first ever to link Florida and France directly and the longest nonstop flight ever scheduled by an airline. This historic trip was made in 14 hours and 2 minutes with 63 persons on board.

This magnificient flight, too, is an augury of things to come with the jet age. We of Florida would be happy to see Pan American World Airways make regular flights from Florida to Europe, and opening up a new phase of intercontinental tourism. The plane used for the Miami-Paris flight was a DC–7C, the newest, fastest, and last of piston-driven airliners. It was the first aircraft capable of demonstrating the great distances which can be covered nonstop by jet airliners.

The world will shrink one-third in size with jet-propelled air transports, and the new era will bring new glory to the United States to Florida, and to the great airline born in my State.

Mr. BEAMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman on the statement he has made. I have had considerable experience in air transportation and have flown as a pilot. I have followed the development of international air transportation with great interest.

I very well remember the situation at the beginning of World War II when we found that Pan American had developed a system of international airways and air transportation which greatly assisted us in the war effort in ferrying airplanes and transporting troops in the early stages of World War II.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that our international carriers have continued to expand, notwithstanding the fact that we now have competition in international air transportation from nearly every country in the world. To maintain our leadership it is necessary for us to have the very best equipment, and it is gratifying to me to know that Pan American is continuing to expand their facilities to provide additional service and extend the length of their flights, as I understand, to 5,000 miles.

Mr. BEAMER. I thank the gentleman.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who are interested in the advancement of domestic or international airlines may have the opportunity and privilege of extending their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana has already paid many fine compliments to Pan American Airways and I wish to join with him in this most fitting tribute. Many of Pan American's employees reside in my congressional district and while I would like to acknowledge them all I have particular reference to Juan T. Trippe, president of Pan American, and Samuel F. Pryor, vice president and assistant to the president of that airline.

Both of these men have given a lifetime to the development of a sound commercial aviation system. It would have been relatively simple for either or both of them to get into some field of endeavor which brought a great reward and less heartache. But aviation, to them, presented an exciting challenge which they could not deny.

No one is more aware than these two constituents of mine of the competitive aspects of international aviation. Pan American Airways is unique in that it has no domestic routes, while all its American competitors in the international field enjoy the privilege of flights within the continental United States. Several of Pan American's foreign competitors are similarly situated in regard to domestic operations but these carriers are all owned by their governments and are heavily subsidized. Pan American is an international example of private enterprise, and for that reason this body should do all in its power to further its expansion and encourage it to fly wherever it can.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished colleague from Indiana in his complimentary remarks about Pan American Airways and jealously suggest that Connecticut has had a great stake in this company's conception and has an even greater stake in its future.

DISRUPTIVE INCREASES IN IMPORTS OF FOREIGN OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a speech I had hoped would be unnecessary. It involves a matter of great urgency to the Congress, to one of our basic defense industries, and to our country. It concerns a problem that many of us thought, and certainly hoped, we had solved. I refer to the unwarranted and disruptive increases in imports of foreign oil, in defiance of established Government policy and in violation of minimum defense standards set forth in that policy.

The issue of excessive oil imports is not new to my colleagues. It had exhaustive, and we thought conclusive, consideration in the first session of this Congress. It was one of the primary issues which led to enactment of the defense amendment to the 1955 Trade Agreements Extension Act.

It was the intent and expectation of the Congress that the defense amendment would be implemented in a manner which would solve the import problem, by establishing a proper relationship between imports and domestic oil production. Definite assurances were given that the amendment would be so employed. In fact, many leaders in Congress agreed to support the amendment only after such assurances were given.

Because of recent actions of the Office of Defense Mobilization, in effect disregarding the clear intent of Congress, as expressed in the defense amendment, it is urgent that the Congress review the oil import matter in light of what it hoped would occur, as against what has actually happened. I believe my colleagues will be shocked and disturbed, as I have been, by facts which indicate a handful of international oil companies have been given a green light to write their own ticket in importing foreign oil to the detriment of our defense-vital domestic petroleum industry.

Policies which we had hoped would end this problem have suddenly evaporated. Standards which the Congress considered and accepted as proper and necessary have been abandoned. Studies by government and industry which indicated an urgent need for less foreign oil—not more—have been ignored. Assurances given by the administration that the defense amendment would be implemented to hold oil imports to their 1954 relationship to domestic production, as recommended in February 1955 by a special Cabinet Committee, have been forgotten.

The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, under the law, is responsible for administration of the defense amendment as to imports of oil and other critical materials. In a recent action, based on an arbitrary reevaluation, ignoring the clearly expressed intent of Congress, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has, in effect, invited the importation of more foreign oil—at a time when total petroleum imports are scheduled at a rate 42 percent higher than in 1954—and at a time when production in most of our major oil producing States is being curtailed by State conservation agencies for lack of market.

Because of these developments, I believe the Congress needs and deserves a report on the stewardship of its defense policy as to foreign oil. This involves a review of past considerations of the problem by the administration, by the Congress, and by the petroleum industry. I will try to make this review as brief as possible. When I have finished, I do not believe there will be room for any other conclusion than that the Office of Defense Mobilization has broken faith with domestic oil producers and with the Congress, and has diluted Government policy so as to make it ineffective and meaningless.

Mr. Speaker, I can recall no problem which has had the benefit of more study, analysis, and discussion. Not within my memory do I recall when more sincere men dedicated so much time and thought to a single problem and accomplished so little. After more than a year of encouraging signs which indicated an equitable solution could be achieved, we

find ourselves right back where we started. Rather than a reduction in oil imports, there have been huge increases. Where we had hoped for and expected an effective limitation on imports, we find in effect a policy of encouragement for more imports.

More than a year ago, we received the first signs of a hope that the oil import problem could be resolved. In October 1954, President Eisenhower appointed a special Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy to study, among other things, the oil import problem.

In February 1955, the Cabinet Committee reported. Essentially, its findings supported many previous studies which concluded that imports were taking an increasingly disproportionate share of the domestic market, and were threatening the national security. Unlike many other studies, the Cabinet report reached definite conclusions. It stated that:

If imports of crude and residual oil should exceed significantly the respective proportions that these imports bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954, the domestic fuels situation could be so impaired as to endanger the orderly industrial growth which assures the military and civilian supplies and reserves that are necessary to the national defense.

Based on this conclusion, the Cabinet Committee recommended that:

If in the future the imports of crude oil and residual fuel oil exceed significantly the respective proportions that such imported oils bore to domestic production of crude oil in 1954, appropriate action should be taken.

These findings were disappointing to many, including myself. They proposed to restrain future imports on the basis of 1954 imports which had already been proved to be excessive. However, the recommendation recognized the important principle that future imports should be limited in relationship to domestic production. That was a principle for which domestic producers, and many in the Congress, had sought recognition since shortly after World War II. The Committee's recommendations were therefore accepted, in good faith, by the industry and by the Congress.

Here, at long last, we had found a basis for agreement and a basis for settlement of a longstanding and grievous problem. It was especially encouraging since neither side in the oil import controversy voiced any serious objections. Here was a basis, we hoped, for an equitable solution, acceptable to all concerned.

As my colleagues know, the Congress was considering the oil import problem when the Cabinet report was released. Many in the Congress thought legislation should be immediately adopted which would give meaning and effect to the Cabinet's recommendations. Legislation to effectuate a reasonable relationship between imports and domestic production was introduced, and strongly supported in both Houses. During discussions and hearings on this legislation, which would have given imported oil a permanent 10 percent of the expanding domestic market, a more than liberal formula, some leaders of Congress conferred with the administration on the oil import problem.

The sponsors of the proposed 10-percent limitation were persuaded that the matter could be resolved without writing into the law a specific limitation. The Cabinet Committee's formula was offered as a yardstick. In effect, the Congress was told, "We have a good formula. All we need is general legislative authority to effectuate this formula, if and when the need exists."

The result, as we all know, was compromise legislation, known as the defense amendment. I should like to here quote the provisions of that amendment:

In order to further the policy and purpose of this section, whenever the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has reason to believe that any article is being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security, he shall so advise the President, and if the President agrees that there is reason for such relief, the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine the facts. If, on the basis of such investigation and the report to him of the findings and recommendations made in connection herewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall take such action as he deems necessary to adjust the imports of such article to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security.

In adopting this amendment what yardstick did the Congress expect would be employed in dealing with the oil import problem? It was made imminently clear, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress expected—and in fact had assurances—that the Cabinet Committee formula, holding imports to their 1954 relationship to domestic production, would be the criterion for effectuating this amendment.

The record is abundantly clear that this was the intent of the Congress. The defense amendment originated in the Senate Finance Committee. Members of that committee made searching inquiry of the administration to determine whether the amendment would accomplish the intent of restricting oil imports. They were satisfied that it would.

So the defense amendment was written into the Trade Agreements Extension Act and the bill went to a Senate-House conference. The President called the amendment very fine, and said he would sign it into law. Subsequently, on June 21, the President signed the bill embodying the amendment in which the Congress, for the first time in a quarter century, had provided a means to restrict excessive oil imports.

Now, let us examine the interpretation of the Congress as to how it felt this amendment would be effectuated.

On July 30, 27 Members of the Senate addressed a letter to the Director of Defense Mobilization, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, who had served as chairman of the Cabinet Fuels Committee, and who was responsible under the law for administering oil import policy. This letter unmistakably spelled out the intent of Congress in writing the defense amendment. It read in part:

As you know, the 1955 extension of the Trade Agreements Act contains a new provision commonly referred to as the "national defense amendment," authorizing the President to take such action as he deems necessary to adjust imports of any commodity when such imports threaten to impair the national security. Responsibility for initiating such action under that provision of the law rests with your office.

In adopting the national defense amendment one of the principal factors considered by the Congress was the problem created by the large and increasing importation of foreign oil into the United States. In this connection the Congress gave particular attention to the findings of the Cabinet Committee, that in the interest of national defense oil imports should not exceed significantly the ratio that these imports bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954.

The legislative record of the Trade Agreements Extension Act in the Senate Finance Committee and in the Senate itself shows that the new provision of the act was adopted in the light of assurances that the executive branch of the Government would take action under this new authority to assure that oil imports would not exceed the levels recommended by the special Cabinet Committee. In the case of oil imports, therefore, the executive and legislative branches of Government are in agreement, without the need for further study, as to specific standards to be applied in implementing the policy contained in the national defense amendment.

These 27 Senators advised Dr. Flemming that they "would greatly appreciate your informing us as to what actions are now being contemplated by you under the authority contained in the 1955 extension of the Trade Agreements Act."

Further, at the time of Senate discussion of the "defense amendment" several Members of the Senate made significant statements in that body which further clarified the intent of the Congress.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, chairman of the Finance Committee, stated in the Senate on May 2:

The committee believes that this amendment will provide a means for assistance to the various national defense industries which would have been affected by the individual amendments presented.

Congress can initiate and adopt such legislation as it might deem advisable, should the action needed to protect these essential industries not be taken.

On the same day, Senator MILLIKIN, in discussing this amendment said:

I am convinced that the proposal can and will work. It grants to the President authority to take whatever action he deems necessary to adjust imports if they should threaten to impair the national security. He may use tariffs, quotas, import taxes, or other methods of import restriction. He is not limited as far as commodities are concerned except that they must be involved in our national security.

On May 3, Senator PRICE DANIEL, of Texas, addressed the following question to Senator CARLSON, of Kansas, a member of the Finance Committee:

Was there any reason why the committee included the (defense) amendment at all, if the committee did not feel that the national security would suffer if oil imports were in excess of the 1954 ratio?

Senator CARLSON answered:

We have assurances that those administering the act will act in accordance with the proposals submitted by the President's Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy and the evidence submitted to our committee. I have no doubt about it.

One reason why I say that is very definitely the opinion of the committee, or at least the intent of the committee, is the

fact that the chairman of the Finance Committee included in the report of the committee a part of the Advisory Committee's report, which, after all, in my opinion, gives the intent of the Finance Committee.

Senator CARLSON further stated on May 4:

I supported the proposal adopted by the committee because I was assured by those in the administration, responsible for the administration of the Trade Agreements program, that if such amendment were adopted by the committee and by Congress, action would immediately follow, and that imports of petroleum and its products would be definitely restricted.

I was further assured that such restriction would be based upon the study previously made, to which reference was made by the committee; that the basis of the limitation would be in accordance with the recommendation of that study. This study indicated the necessity of limiting imports of petroleum and its products to an amount and in the relative position of the imports of petroleum in 1954 as related to domestic production of crude oil in 1954.

I was further assured that the Director of Defense Mobilization would take the action indicated as necessary to adjust imports of petroleum and its products to the level and relationship of 1954.

I can assure the Senate that I would not have agreed to the amendment in H. R. 1, dealing with imports of commodities which are of national defense interest, had I not been assured that it would be the policy of those who administer the act to follow the intent of those who participated in preparing the report of the Advisory Committee.

If it develops, and we find that the program is not to be so administered, then it will become the duty of the Senate Finance Committee, the House Ways and Means Committee, or individual Senators and Members of Congress to demand full compliance with this intent.

On the same date, Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, inquired of Senator CARLSON:

Does he (Senator CARLSON) feel that the oil producers of my State would be justified in taking the assurances given as guaranties that the oil industry is not going to be disrupted by unusual and devastating amounts of oil imports?

Senator CARLSON replied:

Had I not believed the amendment we approved in committee, which was recommended by a very substantial vote, would protect the industry from ever-increasing imports, I certainly would not have voted to report the bill to the Senate, and I certainly would not be on the floor today stating I favored it and would vote for it.

I have given here only a partial recapitulation of the intent of the Congress, reflected in the expressions of Senators who worked earnestly for a solution of the problem and who, in good faith, accepted assurances of administration action, based on the Cabinet Committee study, and supported the defense amendment, on the basis of these assurances.

What was the industry's position concerning the effect of excessive imports at this time? On May 3, while Senators were discussing these assurances on the floor of the Senate, the National Petroleum Council issued a report of a special council Committee on Petroleum Imports. This committee had been organized to study the import problem at the specific request of the Department of the Interior.

I would remind my colleagues that the membership of the National Petroleum Council is composed of representatives of both oil importing companies and domestic producers. The report of the council's special committee, at this juncture, was therefore timely and of great significance. So were the conclusions of that committee, which read as follows:

1. The continued increase in imports of crude oil, coupled with a decline in exports of crude oil and its products, has damaged, in varying degrees, segments of the domestic oil industry.

2. Further increase of imports without regard to the principle of only supplementing the domestic production of crude oil and its products will seriously damage the domestic oil industry and thus affect the domestic economy and the national security.

3. Fair and equitable relationship have not prevailed between total imports of crude oil and total demands for oil in the United States during periods of excess availability of domestic oil for United States consumption. Fair and equitable relationships should obtain at all times between total imports of crude oil and its products and total demand for oil in the United States.

This, again, Mr. Speaker, is only one of many instances wherein we found general industry agreement that imports were not only too high and had harmed the domestic industry, but that action to curtail imports was due, if not overdue.

This, then, is a partial picture of the support from both industry and government for a limitation on imports. All these statements supported the principles laid down by the Special Cabinet Fuels Committee. I have to this day to hear one statement, from any quarter, that the conclusions of that Committee were in any way impractical, unworkable, or unfair.

With this background of support from all concerned, and in an atmosphere of agreement, in which we all trusted a solution was forthcoming, we were encouraged on August 8, 1955, when Defense Mobilizer Flemming took his first step in action which we expected would result in implementation of accepted policy. In a letter to 18 oil-importing companies on that day, Director Flemming recited the provisions of the defense amendment. In a press release, the Office of Defense Mobilization said Dr. Flemming was requesting information from the importing companies with respect to their importing programs, "after he received figures which indicated that the crude oil and residual oil imports of some companies have exceeded, and apparently will continue to exceed, the formula recommended by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy."

This observation by Dr. Flemming's office, that imports "apparently will continue to exceed the formula," was indeed prophetic. A little later I will explore with you how seriously imports have since then exceeded the formula.

Dr. Flemming also quoted portions of the Cabinet Committee's report, concluding with its findings that "if, in the future, the imports of crude oil and residual fuel oils exceed significantly the respective proportions that such imported oils bore to domestic production of crude oil in 1954, appropriate action should be taken."

The domestic oil industry, and the Congress, confident that action would be forthcoming, continued to wait for the appropriate action.

On September 12, Dr. Flemming again addressed a letter to the importing companies. Based on his studies of their programs, he advised them that:

First. Imports of crude oil and residual oils had increased more rapidly than domestic production of crude oil.

Second. Half of the companies reporting imports of crude oil had exceeded the ratio recommended by the Cabinet Committee.

Third. Unless company policy changes were made, the imports would continue to be substantially in excess of the standard recommended by the Cabinet Committee.

Dr. Flemming further advised the companies in that letter, that in the absence of individual voluntary action over and above that already taken, "it would be necessary to seek other means of implementing the recommendations of the Advisory Committee."

Despite these repeated explicit requests for voluntary curtailment, no overall action occurred which resulted in any downward adjustment in imports. We continued to await the appropriate action or other means which Dr. Flemming implied would be used.

Yet no positive action was forthcoming. Dr. Flemming, who had repeatedly called for voluntary compliance by the importing companies, for some reason did not exercise the specific authority he has under the law to obtain mandatory compliance.

Instead, on October 29, 1955, the Office of Defense Mobilization again called for voluntary action by the importers. Despite the fact that he had had convincing experience, indicating no likelihood of voluntary action by the importers, Dr. Flemming pleaded with them again.

What effect did this action have? Did it result in substantial compliance with the Cabinet Committee's formula? The record tells the story. For the year 1955, total oil imports exceeded the standards set by the Cabinet Committee by 116,000 barrels a day. While the Cabinet Committee recommended that imports be held to the 1954 relationship to domestic production, which was 16.6 percent, total imports in 1955 increased to 18.3 percent of domestic production.

We are now concerned, Mr. Speaker, with 1956 and the future. How much higher can imports go without disastrous effects? Scheduled imports this year give a hint of what can be expected. In recent reports to the Texas Railroad Commission, importing oil companies filed schedules which indicate total imports of 1,463,000 barrels daily in 1956, and more than 1,500,000 barrels a day in the last 6 months of this year.

In other words, total imports will amount to almost 21 percent of expected domestic production, and in the last 6 months, will be even more. I, again, point out that the original Cabinet report recommended restriction of imports to 16.6 percent of domestic production. The domestic producer has thus lost more

than 5 percent of his market while awaiting positive action by the Office of Defense Mobilization.

So, the vicious spiral has never ceased. Voluntary action repeatedly has proved a farce. I would remind my colleagues that "industrial statesmanship," or "voluntary action," was first argued as the wisest solution to the import problem in 1948. Since that time, total imports have almost tripled, rising from an average of about 500,000 barrels daily to a scheduled amount of more than 1,500,000 barrels a day, in the latter part of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how the domestic petroleum industry, on which we must depend for our security, can stand much more of that type of "voluntary action."

I would now call to the attention of the House some of the things that are happening to the domestic petroleum industry, in the face of this record and rising imports. I have requested some information on what is happening in some of the oil producing States. Here are the facts which stand as an indictment of the actions of the importing companies, and the condonement, and in fact encouragement, of these actions by the Office of Defense Mobilization.

I will begin with Texas because it is our largest producing oil State. For the month of May, the Texas Railroad Commission ordered the third consecutive reduction in crude-oil production. The reduction, ordered this month, amounted to 80,000 barrels a day. Total reductions, since March, amount to almost 200,000 barrels a day. The Fort Worth Star-Telegram reported a fourth consecutive reduction in Texas oil producing allowables "is expected" to be ordered for the month of June.

In Oklahoma, the State corporation commission, in May, ordered an across-the-board reduction of 15 percent in oil producing allowables amounting to about 35,000 barrels a day below the previous month's average.

In Louisiana, John B. Hussey, conservation commissioner, set that State's daily oil production allowable for May at a rate of 38,900 barrels below the April level. Kansas and North Dakota both reduced production 5,000 barrels daily in May.

More reductions are on the way. It is a foregone conclusion that further reductions must be made if we are to prevent waste of a vital natural resource, denied access to a market glutted with foreign oil.

These conditions in the oil-producing States make it imperative that Congress evaluate the problem of oil imports. Is the defense amendment being implemented as intended by Congress and can we expect that it will be? The answer, I fear, is obvious. It has just recently, on May 11, been made obvious by Dr. Flemming in another letter to the importers of oil.

In this letter, Dr. Flemming completely abandons the defense amendment and the policy of maintaining a stable relationship between imports and domestic production.

In this letter, Dr. Flemming continues to recognize the necessity of maintaining the 1954 relationship—but now only after excepting certain areas of the domestic market, certain types of imports and certain countries of origin.

For example, imports no longer to be considered as affecting the defense are the following:

First. All crude oil imports to the United States west coast of California, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, and Arizona whether from the Middle East, Far East, or Western Hemisphere countries.

Second. All crude-oil imports from Venezuela and Canada.

Third. All residual fuel oil imported for fueling ships at United States ports.

Fourth. All fuel oil imported for military use.

As amazing as it may seem, these exceptions account for over 75 percent of all imports scheduled for the year 1956. In other words, any limitation to be applied to imports would affect only about 375,000 barrels daily—while total imports are approaching 1,500,000 barrels a day.

In this latest proposal, outlined in Dr. Flemming's letter of May 11, to the importing companies, the following conclusions are reached:

First. Crude oil imports to the United States west coast should not be considered from a defense standpoint. This entirely ignores the large and increasing shipments into this area from the Middle East and the question of dependency on such sources.

Second. Crude oil imports from Canada and Venezuela should not be considered although these countries account for about 70 percent of total imports.

Third. Imports for fueling ships at United States ports and for military use, have no relationship to our national defense.

After making these amazing exceptions, which strip all possible effectiveness from existing policy, it was concluded that a reexamination of the oil import problem should be undertaken and completed by September 1, 1956. If this reexamination shows that imports were threatening the Nation's security, public hearings should then be held by October 1, 1956.

Mr. Speaker, I find it impossible to reconcile this latest action with existing and long-accepted national defense considerations as to oil imports. Importing oil companies, by these exceptions, have been afforded an escape hatch through which they can bring in more and more, not less, foreign oil. These few big importers of oil seem, conclusively now, to lead a charmed existence outside of any control by Government or without responsibility to the Nation.

These companies are powerfully persuasive. Despite their outrageous record of ignoring all policy, they have apparently convinced the Office of Defense Mobilization that they really intend to employ "voluntary restraint." Even worse, they evidently have persuaded the Office of Defense Mobilization to ignore the law and leave this vital problem in the hands of the international oil companies. Following through with their favorite tactic of "delay and postpone," they have even convinced those in authority that another investigation is in order. This will give them the most part of a year to increase imports, without restraint, at the expense of the domestic industry and the Nation's security.

Mr. Speaker, I for one do not propose to stand tonguetied while these companies lullaby the Office of Defense Mobilization into actions which violate every intent of the Congress, every accepted statement of industrial policy, and, even worse, the assurances given by the administration that oil import reductions would be effectuated.

We can no longer afford to leave the solution of the oil import problem in the hands of the importers themselves. We have trusted to this course, without result, so long as to make the Congress and the administration appear ridiculous, and, worse than that—our Government is beginning to look subservient to the international oil companies.

As my colleagues know, the Office of Defense Mobilization is concerned with maintaining a sound mobilization base for the defense of our country in these troubled times. We know, all too well, from recent events, that the entire Middle East area is embroiled in powder keg tensions. To invite, at this critical time, further dependence on Middle East oil—for the west coast or any part of our country—is utter folly which deserves the opposition and intervention of every Member of this Congress.

In maintaining our mobilization base, the Office of Defense Mobilization is concerned with the stockpiling of certain critical materials. In fact, Director Flemming reported last October that 65 strategic materials, 55 of them metal and minerals, are being stockpiled against any future emergency, under authority of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act.

What would my colleagues think if we suddenly found that these strategic materials were being stockpiled, under canvas, on the sand dunes of the Middle East Arabian countries? That question, I will admit, sounds so unthinkable as to not even merit discussion. Yet, through inviting increased imports of Middle East oil, we are placing increasing dependence for our most vital munition of war—petroleum—on an area which is not only afflicted with political and economic strife, but stands under the very shadow of Russia.

We are fortunate, Mr. Speaker, that oil is one of the materials we need not worry about stockpiling. Indeed, oil cannot be stockpiled beyond a few weeks supply, so we are doubly blessed in having within this country an abundance of developed reserves—and a vast hunting ground for more reserves—adequate to assure the defense of our country.

I emphasize that today we are the only major free world country with adequate oil to fuel world war III, if and when it should come. We must be wary if we are to preserve this position tomorrow, and next year, and 5 years from now. If we are to do this, I submit that we must preserve wise policies conducive to the continuous exploration and development which must be ceaseless if we are to maintain adequate future oil supplies. Above all, we must not trade away our

oil security through a policy of subservience to the international oil companies.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I am not talking against all imports. A favorite line of the importing companies every time this subject is broached is that, "we cannot shut off foreign oil." No one has proposed, ever, that this be done. What we are insisting upon, and have insisted upon, for nearly 10 years now, is that imports should be in reasonable relationship to domestic production. In the past year, we thought and hoped we had developed a basis for achieving this, and now we find this faint vestige of hope is being discarded; is being simply tossed out of the window, arbitrarily.

I would remind the House that strife for the goal of sometime, someway, relating imports to domestic production, so that foreign oil would share in any increase in the domestic market, now has a 10-year history. Since shortly after World War II, we have discussed, studied, committeed, commissioned, and worried over the problem. What has happened in that time?

Here, briefly, is the record. From the years 1941 to 1945, this country imported a total of 220,000 barrels of oil a day. In that period, we exported 420,000 barrels a day. This year, in 1956, imports are scheduled at 1,463,000 barrels a day. Exports are expected to be about 333,000 barrels daily. In slightly more than a decade, then, we have gone from a net exporter of 200,000 barrels daily to a net importer of more than 1,100,000 barrels daily.

This means, Mr. Speaker, that while we have vacillated on implementing sound policy on this matter, oil imports have increased more than 600 percent.

Mr. Speaker, we obviously have dickered with this vital question until 2 minutes of midnight, and in the face of these facts, the Office of Defense Mobilization now proposes an attempt to turn the clock back to a fruitless and nonexistent daylight; to turn the problem back to the importers for solution, and to hide the head of authority and responsibility in the sand.

Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues in the House, and many Members of the Senate, are understandably distressed over this situation. Like myself, they are primarily concerned with maintaining our domestic oil producing industry in a sound condition, recognizing that an adequate supply of oil within our own backyard is our first line of defense.

However, there are other important considerations. One of these is the effect of increasing imports on our domestic economy. My own State of Oklahoma has more than a theoretical or academic interest in this problem. Oklahoma has a very real stake in achieving a solution now, and many Oklahomans are deeply disturbed that we are now faced with a further unnecessary postponement of that solution.

Oklahoma grew up as an oil State, and now ranks fourth in production. Our first oil production came just 2 years after the run of 1889. Out of 77 counties in Oklahoma, 66 now produce oil or gas, and petroleum accounts for more than 92 percent of the total value of our mineral production. More than 50,000 Oklahomans are employed in the production of oil alone, not to mention the additional thousands employed in petroleum exploration, research, transportation, refining, and other phases of industry operations. Every county in my district produces oil, and anything which affects oil production is of real concern to the people of my district.

Oklahoma, for the past few years, has been a victim of this unsolved import problem. Since 1949 we have experienced recurring curtailments in the market. In each of these instances, the Oklahoma Corporation Commission has necessarily been forced to restrict Oklahoma production in accordance with its conservation standards. Throughout this period we have watched imported oil take an ever-increasing share of the domestic market. In addition to recent production curtailments ordered by the corporation commission, 4 major crude oil purchasers have instituted "pipeline proration" affecting almost 30,000 barrels of crude oil daily. This at a time when imports of oil are at a historic high, and still climbing.

Mr. Speaker, unless this new policy of inviting increased imports is immediately corrected, the Congress will have a clear call to act. We must do something if the vast reserves of the Middle East are to be stopped from taking an increasing share of our market. Imported oil has doubled its share of the domestic market in the past 7 years. Without effective control, imports can and will continue to take over more and more of the domestic market.

Unless more meaningful action comes from the administration, and soon, this Congress will be compelled to effectuate, with specific standards, the policy it has already so clearly spelled out. Unless we do, we risk becoming prostrate, without oil, before whatever enemy might choose to attack.

A reasonable limitation on oil imports, in relation to domestic production, seems indeed a small price to pay for our security as to oil. As representatives of the American people in the Congress, we are challenged to see that this small price is paid.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. I wish to commend the gentleman for bringing these facts before the House of Representatives. We all realize, of course, how seriously these oil imports have affected the economy, not only of Oklahoma but of every oil-producing State in the Nation. I have always contended that there could be no final cure for this except legislation by the Congress of the United States. I had hoped, however, that under the legislation that did exist it would be possible to get some relief. I had also hoped that Dr. Flemming's request for a voluntary reduction by the major companies would bring some results. I understand that in some instances it has brought certain results, but certainly not the results that are going to have to be obtained if the oil industry of this country is not seriously injured. I want to commend the gentleman on his statement and join with him in his remarks.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I want to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma for his statement in regard to the seriousness of the threat which is confronting the oil industry of this country. This is not something that has just arisen today. As the gentleman knows, he and many other Members of the House and many people of the Nation have been concerned for years over this problem of oil imports. Insofar as I know, none of us has ever advocated that all imports be banned. I have gone along with the theory it would be best to avoid further legislation if adequate results can be achieved otherwise. I think the administration has all the power it needs to cope with the situation, and I am sure the gentleman agrees. The percentage of oil of foreign origin which we are using has sharply increased. It has reached the danger point for the United States. It is causing trouble in my congressional district and in many other areas, as we all know, and something ought to be done about it. If something is not done about it we have got to pass legislation bringing about a reduction in these imports of foreign oil. I believe our people are on the right track in their effort to try to get relief and I hope our action here today will be noted by officials in authority and I hope that some effective results will be accomplished.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HIESTAND. I would like to state that I have carefully studied the gentleman's statement. It should be called a study because it is very effective. It is commended to all of those interested in the oil industry, it is commended especially to the members of the Department and the Office of Defense Mobilization for careful study. It depicts a serious situation. In the event of a crisis, we have not only got to protect our production and our reserves but we must protect the industry of exploration. That exploratory industry can be jeopardized and is now being jeopardized by the unlimited importation of oil. May I suggest to the Office of Defense Mobilization that unless something is done, this Congress is in a mood to take action and make it necessary. Neither the oil industry nor the administration would regard that as desirable. But something is going to have to be done.

I thank the gentleman for his very able statement.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to avail myself of this opportunity to compliment my colleague on his fine statement. Oil production in this country is one of our really basic industries. It is an industry that is indispensable to the economy of the great State which

my colleague and I are privileged to serve in this House. I agree with my friend that this is a matter which should be dealt with by the Congress. Experience has shown that we can get nowhere by delegating our responsibilities on this problem to administrative agencies. Increasing imports are hurting the oil industry in this country, and the time has come when specific legislative restrictions on imports or quotas should be imposed by law. Again I want to commend my friend for his statement.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. I am sure the gentleman will cover certain areas on this question which seem to me to be of utmost importance, namely, the clear intent of the Congress expressed in the Trade Agreements Act. I am sure the gentleman agrees that in the Trade Agreements Act passed in 1955, it was the clear intent of the Congress that all imports should be held to the 1954 level. Now, I would like to inquire of the gentleman, if I understand the conclusion of the President's committee, recently reported, if it is not a fact that they have made certain exceptions of imports from the Western Hemisphere, from Canada, and from Venezuela, and that bunker fuel for ships and even crude oil to the west coast of the United States, as well as military fuels, are not excepted by the committee; in other words, that is not to be taken into consideration in determining the 1954 level. I hope the gentleman will cover these points in his discussion of this question. Further, may I inquire if that is the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. JARMAN. I will say to the gentleman that certainly is my understanding. As a matter of fact, the exceptions that Dr. Flemming has set out in his letter of May 11 amount to over 75 percent of all imports scheduled for the year 1956, and he removes from the import field under consideration all but 20 to 25 percent of what we have heretofore classified as imports.

Mr. BURLESON. And as our colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority whip [Mr. ALBERT], has just said about the administration of this clear intent of the Congress, allow me to say that unless something is done, the administration of the congressional requirement is about to administer the independent oil operator out of business.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman from Oklahoma has raised this question this afternoon. I had a chance to read a copy of his speech that he was kind enough to mail me, and I was impressed with the factual information and logic it contained. As you know, for many years I, along with the other gentlemen here and many other Members of this Congress, have been interested in trying to see that the small independent oil producers of the great oil industry have thrown around them the proper protection so that they could continue to explore and continue to widen the development and the production of oil, and that they could have reasonable protection against excessive imports, so that they could prosper and continue to find and develop new fields which is so necessary to industry and the economy of our Nation, and so necessary to our national defense.

The gentleman from Oklahoma and others here know that we have had this problem up on the floor of this House many times and we held a number of conferences with those in the executive branch of the Government seeking to slow down the constant increase of imports at a time when only 10 percent of our market was being taken by imports.

Notwithstanding our efforts, imports have continued to increase to the point where probably 18 or 20 percent of our market for oil consumption in this country is going to foreign countries, because certain big major oil companies have somehow or other refused or at least failed to comply with the wish expressed by this Congress, and by the committee that was set up to determine what the limitations on oil imports should be. That Cabinet-level committee, after making a thorough study, decided that oil imports into the United States in the future should be held to a level not to exceed imports of the year 1954, and that any significant amount of increase above that would be looked upon as excessive.

They asked these big oil companies to comply. They have not fully complied. Dr. Flemming wrote them a second letter urging them to voluntarily comply with the order.

They still have failed to comply, and imports by these companies have increased.

Some 3 weeks ago I was in touch with Dr. Flemming over the telephone, complaining of the present situation which we are discussing this afternoon. He told me that it was his intent and that of his committee finally to reach the objective laid down in the order. I feel sure he made that statement in good faith. I hope he reaches the objective of lower imports in the very near future.

I am hoping that our discussion of this problem today will again serve notice, not only on the major oil companies which are responsible for most of the excess imports, but on the executive branch of the Government, because, unless there is compliance on the part of the powerful importing interests in oil, there is no alternative, in my judgment, except to protect the independent oil industry that is so necessary to the economy of our country and the defense of our Nation, by legislation, which we reluctantly decided not to press at that time, in the belief they would ultimately comply with the order and we could gain the objective sought in the interest of our people.

I commend the gentleman for bringing this matter to the floor of the House and to our attention this afternoon.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. The gentleman from Illinois has long been active in the consideration of this great problem, and I appreciate his contribution to our discussion.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I am very happy to yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the remarks that have been made by my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN] for bringing this very important problem before us.

I was very happy to see the gentleman so clearly point out in his remarks what was, without question, the intent of this Congress last year when we passed H. R. 1, the Reciprocal Trade Act, the so-called national defense amendments, which were designed to take care of this situation and without any shadow of doubt, according to the record before the committees and on the floor of the Congress, the intention of Congress was clearly expressed. While it may be necessary to have additional legislation in the future, if the situation is not corrected, it should be pointed out—and I think the gentleman did it very well in his remarks—that there is now in existence legislation that could take care of this situation and that was intended to take care of the situation and by all means should take care of it; in other words, it is administrative failure, in my judgment, and complete surrender on the part of the Office of ODM and others in the administration of the Reciprocal Trade Act, failure to carry out what was clearly the intent of Congress, that has brought about this situation.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. As the gentleman knows, the State of Texas has proration. I should like the RECORD to show that starting in March—for March, April, May, and June—production cuts occurred during each of those months. Today we are on a 15-day-out-of-a-month production basis, and the prospects are just about certain that there will be another cut in July, which poses a very serious situation for the small independent oil producer in the State of Texas.

Mr. JARMAN. Analogous to the last comment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], I would add that in Oklahoma, the State corporation commission in May ordered an across-the-board production cut of 15 percent in oil-producing allowables amounting to about 35,000 barrels a day below the previous month's average. The figures the gentleman has given and that I have cited are indicative of exactly what is happening to the domestic oil industry.

Mr. IKARD. If the gentleman will yield further, we have all heard that imports for the first quarter of this year are moderate and in line with what the 1954 imports were. I should like to point out, and I am sure the gentleman has later information than I do, that it

is my understanding that while the imports for the first quarter are not too much out of line, beginning with the second quarter and projected on through the rest of this calendar year they will continue to zoom upward to where they get completely out of any relationship of the 1954 figure in the second quarter and become worse in the third and fourth quarters, as near as we can project them at this time.

Mr. JARMAN . I would say to the gentleman that it is my understanding that during the first quarter of 1956 imports have averaged 110,000 barrels per day above the relationship in 1954, and it is anticipated that for the entire year of 1956 it will be an average of about 300,000 barrels per day, which is a sizable increase, having a great impact upon the industry as a whole.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield again, may I say that there is no question but that it is having an impact, as has been stated by the last speaker, and I think it is due to increase. It has had sufficient impact upon the producers in my State and in my district that the Ohio Oil Co., I understand, in the last day or two has reduced the price of oil by 10 cents a barrel. To me it would seem that with our industry growing at the greatest pace ever in the history of this country in peacetime, there ought to be a reasonable market and a reasonable production of oil allowed in this country to the American taxpayers.

Mr. JARMAN. I certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on this subject be permitted to revise and extend their remarks, and that any Members who may be interested in doing so be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time given me here to discuss an issue of critical and growing concern to our domestic economy and the Nation's security—the long-standing and increasing problem of excessive petroleum imports.

The oil-imports issue, as my colleagues know, is one which has perplexed the petroleum industry and the Congress since shortly after World War II. In the absence of any sound policy as to oil imports, we have seen foreign oil take an ever-increasing and unjustified share of the domestic market. For years a solution of the problem seemed elusive and difficult of achievement.

Since 1949 we have had recurring studies. We have had repeated enunciations from the petroleum industry that oil imports should only supplement domestic production, always with agreement from the importing companies that this was a wise policy. We had study after study by Government indicating a need to restrict imports to a supplementary level. Despite these almost endless efforts, a solution, somehow, failed to materialize.

Finally, last year action by both the Congress and the administration gave encouragement that a solution at last was forthcoming. The administration again conducted a study which indicated a need to curtail oil imports and, following through on that, the Congress amended the Trade Agreements Act so as to provide the administration the authority to achieve the necessary limitation.

In the defense amendment in the 1955 extension of the Trade Agreements Act the Congress placed in the Office of Defense Mobilization the authority and the responsibility for reducing oil imports when they threaten to impair the national security.

Previous to this action by the Congress, a Special Cabinet Committee on Fuels Policy, headed by the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, conducted an exhaustive study of the oil-import problem and concluded:

First. The oil imports in excess of their 1954 relationship to domestic production "could endanger the orderly industrial growth which assures the military and civilian supplies and reserves that are necessary to the national defense"; and

Second. If future oil imports should exceed their 1954 relationship to domestic production, "appropriate action should be taken."

Mr. Speaker, here were developments which, to the Congress, made an effective solution to the oil-import problem seem inescapable. The administration set a standard, advised that oil imports exceeding that standard could impair the national security, and recommended appropriate action should the standard be violated. The Congress, in adopting the defense amendment, provided the authority and defined the responsibility for implementing this appropriate action.

The defense amendment said imports should be curtailed when they "threatened to impair the national security." The Cabinet Committee had already determined that imports above their 1954 relationship to domestic production could impair the national security.

Is it any wonder that the Congress was encouraged, and indeed was satisfied that it had solved the oil-import problem, when assurances were given by the administration that the defense amendment would be so administered as to accomplish the import limitations recommended by the Cabinet Committee.

In fact, never in my experience have I seen a clearer mandate to implement authority provided by law. The legislative history of the defense amendment established beyond doubt that Congress intended that administration of the amendment must result immediately in import limitations.

Here was a problem which threatened our Nation's security. To solve it, we provided a law. We had an accepted standard for enforcement of the law. We delegated authority to enforce the law in compliance with this accepted standard. Notice was served on the violators, and potential violators, that they must comply, or face more stringent consequences.

Immediately after adoption of the defense amendment, it became obvious that enforcement was immediately necessary. Oil imports were substantially above their 1954 relationship to domestic production, and rising. Many in the Congress, concerned that the law be given effect, transmitted inquiries to the Office of Defense Mobilization. In one instance, 27 Senators wrote the ODM Director urging that enforcement of the law be implemented, and reciting the assurances from the administration that such enforcement would follow under authority of the defense amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the actions which have followed since that time are almost unbelievable. In a series of communications to the oil importers, the Director of ODM has urged compliance with the Cabinet Committee standard. In his succeeding communications, however, the rules of compliance have been so relaxed as to defeat any chance of ever achieving a limitation of imports on a basis recommended by the Cabinet Committee or, in fact, on any realistic basis.

The first of these letters from ODM to the importing companies was last August 8. Since that time oil imports have continued upward. When the year 1955 was over, and the figures added up, we found that total oil imports exceeded the Cabinet Committee standard by 116,000 barrels a day. In the meantime, other letters were dispatched to the importers by ODM. Dr. Flemming threatened the importers. He said if import limitations were not achieved voluntarily, other means would have to be employed.

Finally, Dr. Flemming apparently despaired of ever achieving voluntary compliance, and for some unexplained reason did not choose to employ the authority given him by Congress to obtain compliance. So, on the 11th of May, he dispatched an extraordinary letter to the importers. In this letter, he again cited the Cabinet Committee standard, and then proceeded to completely abandon all rules which might remotely have given him a chance to attain that standard.

In this letter, Dr. Flemming advised the importers that they could just forget certain oil imports. He omitted from any control at all imports of oil to the west coast of the United States, imports from Canada and Venezuela, and imports for fueling ships at United States ports and for military use.

Mr. Speaker, by these exceptions, Dr. Flemming has actually excused from any control at all more than 75 percent of the total imports now coming into the United States. On what basis this action can be justified is difficult for me to comprehend. It amounts to nothing more than complete surrender to the importing companies.

The implications of this surrender are disturbing and dangerous. At a time when we are confident of a policy of strength, we find a policy of vacillation, weakness, and surrender. The potential disaster of such a policy is made clear when we recognize how much of the domestic oil market has already been surrendered to the international oil crowd in only recent years.

In 1936 to 1941, total oil imports averaged 171,000 barrels daily, or less than 5 percent of domestic production.

In 1946 to 1951, total imports averaged 611,000 barrels a day, or more than 11 percent of domestic production.

In 1954, imports totaled 1,052,000 barrels a day, or 16.6 percent of domestic production. This was the danger point enunciated by the Cabinet Committee. This was the point beyond which the committee said excess imports should be subjected to appropriate action by Government.

In 1955, total imports averaged 1,248,000 barrels a day, exceeding the Cabinet Committee formula by 116,000 barrels a day, and amounting to 18.3 percent of domestic production.

In 1956, total oil imports are scheduled at an unprecedented 1,463,000 barrels a day, according to schedules filed by the importing oil companies with the Railroad Commission of Texas. This schedule, Mr. Speaker, exceeds the Cabinet Committee formula by 301,000 barrels a day, and amounts to almost 21 percent of expected United States oil production as forecast this year by the Bureau of Mines.

In the face of this record and these facts, the director of Defense Mobilization now removes all semblance of any barriers to increased imports, and invites increased imports and increased dependency on oil-producing areas on which this country would be helpless to depend in time of emergency.

Like many of my colleagues, I find it impossible to reconcile the actions of ODM with either existing policy, or the obvious increasing need to curtail, rather than invite more, oil imports.

What result are these tremendously increased imports now having?

To begin with, imports are denying more and more of the domestic market to domestic producers. Our crude oil producing capacity in the United States is about 9,100,000 barrels a day. The Bureau of Mines says domestic production this year will average 7 million barrels a day. This means, Mr. Speaker, that in face of these record and rising oil imports, the domestic petroleum industry now has more than 2 million barrels of oil a day shut in the ground, lying idle for want of a market.

It does not take much of a mathematician to compute what this will mean in terms of oil unfound, and thus unavilable, in any future emergency.

As previously stated, imports will exceed the Cabinet Committee formula by 301,000 barrels a day in 1956. If imports were made to comply with the formula, this would mean added income to domestic producers of more than $850,000 a day, or $310,250,000 in the year 1956, based on current crude oil prices.

Since World War I, Mr. Speaker, there have been an average of seven wells completed by the domestic petroleum industry for every million dollars of total income from oil and gas. A loss of total income amounting to $310,250,000, simply on the basis of nonconformity with the Cabinet Committee's import formula, will deny the domestic drilling of 2,170 wells in 1956.

Deducting dry holes, this means more than 1,000 new producing oil wells and almost 175 producing gas wells will not be drilled because of a failure to effectuate existing policy as to oil imports.

Mr. Speaker, if we project this result into an uncertain future without any limitation on imporation of foreign oil, the implications to the defense of our country become fearsome.

It is clear that if imports are left unrestrained in the next 10 years, as they have been in the past 10 years, income to domestic producers, to plow back in the ground to prove and develop new oil reserves, can be severely curtailed as to mean the difference between victory and defeat in any future war.

President Eisenhower has called our oil-producing ability a deterrent to Communist aggression. No greater truth was ever spoken. Without a strong domestic petroleum industry, we would be helpless before any enemy. It is obvious, therefore, if ODM shares the President's views as to the defense importance of our home oil industry, it should be concerned with building our domestic defense as to oil, rather than reverting to policies which experience has proven will undermine and defeat that objective.

In my home State of Texas, we are today reliving an all-too-familiar experience. With imports at a historic high, the Texas Railroad Commission has for the past 4 months been forced to reduce the flow of Texas oil. Our producing allowable for June was reduced 74,000 barrels daily from the May average. Together with previous curtailments in March, April, and May allowables have been reduced more than 200,000 barrels a day. In addition to this enforced curtailment for conservation purposes, we have experienced for the past year in west Texas the institution of pipeline proration, affecting at times up to 40,000 barrels daily of crude oil. This means that oil-purchasing companies, with their lines and tanks full, simply could not take the oil and many wells in a vast area of west Texas simply stood idle.

Mr. Speaker, the west Texas sour crude oil affected by this situation is of the same quality and type as much of the Middle East oil which Mr. Flemming has told the importers they can bring into the United States west coast area in unlimited quantities.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot too strongly condemn this recently announced policy which, unless challenged by the Congress and corrected by the administration, can result in the trading away of our security as to oil.

In these troubled times, I can think of no greater folly. This is no time to change the rules to suit the whims of the importing oil companies. It is clearly a time for positive action. If the administration refuses to take such action, then I submit that the Congress must.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, at this very moment the importation of foreign crude oil into the United States is seriously threatening the economy of the Southwest. Particularly I can testify it affects the area which I represent in the Congress. It has already had a serious effect and the prospects are that the situation will become extremely acute in the future if there is not a curb put upon imports of foreign oil. I speak from the standpoint of the independent oil operator, whom I think can be properly referred to as the small-business man of the oil industry.

Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pride that I contend that I represent more independent oil operators than any man in the Congress. I believe this statement can be supported statistically, but I well know that several of my colleagues will contest my contention. Be this as it may, I mention it to emphasize that in my area the independent oil operator supplies one of the most important needs of the great Southwest area, and because of the number in the business and the number of people involved, it becomes tremendously important not only to the immediate area but the Nation that he be treated fairly by his Government.

The oil industry, and particularly the independent operator whose very identity of being an independent means independence, very much desires that he not be regulated by the Government and wishes to have as little Government interference in the industry as possible. He has not wanted to see quotas on oil imports established, but rather it has been his hope that the major companies discipline themselves and limit their imports to a reasonable amount so as to supplement, rather than to supplant, the supply of oil in the United States. He has become desperate in view of the continued increase of foreign oil imports. In the last trade agreements bill the provision was made that oil imports should be held at the level of 1954. Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, heads the agency that is to carry out the intent of the Congress.

We are aware of the situation since that time. Oil imports have continued to increase.

On May 11, 1956, the President's Cabinet Committee under Mr. Flemming announced its findings relative to imports for 1956, as related to the 1954 level.

The Cabinet Committee should reconsider its findings because of the following:

First. Under the Committee's recommendations oil imports for this year would exceed the 1954 domestic crude-oil production by an average 234,000 barrels per day.

Second. The findings of the Committee would permit increases in crude-oil importation in 1956 over 1954 of 1,300 percent from Canada; 36 percent from the Middle and Far East; and 26 percent from Venezuela; as compared with an increase of 10 percent in United States crude-oil production.

Third. The conclusions would permit the United States western coast to become increasingly dependent on Eastern Hemisphere crude oil.

Fourth. The conclusions of the Committee would permit total imports of crude-oil and refined products to take over 20 percent of the United States market in 1956 as compared with 18.3

percent in 1955 and 16.6 percent in 1954. This is the largest increase in ratio since 1950.

If this trend is to continue and the policy of our Government supports these increases, I say unequivocally it will lead to an inadequate domestic supply of oil and an increasing dependency on foreign oil.

Mr. Speaker, my State of Texas has a system of proration of production. Contrary to the contention of some who are not familiar with it, proration is conservation. It is a sensible practice to conserve our natural resources. While we are conserving these God-given natural resources, and while the independent oil operator is the one who discovers between 85 and 90 percent of all the oil reserves in this country, he is being sabotaged by his own Government, which permits unprorated and cheaply produced crude oil to come into both his front and back door.

On many occasions it has been pointed out to the committees of the Congress, and on the floor of both the House and the Senate, that this country cannot afford to depend on foreign oil supplies. Those supplies could be cut off any day. In the meantime, if the domestic supply and the domestic oil economy has been dropped by this policy, it cannot be revived overnight. It would take years for the domestic oil economy to become healthy again once it had been supplanted by oil from sources outside of the United States.

As far back as 1950 I introduced legislation to establish quotas on foreign oil imports. As I have previously stated, the independent oil operator does not favor quotas if it can be avoided. The purpose of my bill at that time, and legislation introduced since, was to point up the need for a sensible policy and in order to bring it to the attention of Congress.

The day is rapidly approaching when drastic action must be taken unless the major oil-importing companies can be prevailed upon to act more sensibly and to recognize that the goose which lays the golden egg is not feeling well at all.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the President's Cabinet Committee and Mr. Flemming will reconsider their earlier conclusions and act in the most forceful manner to place restraints upon the importing companies. In my opinion, they must now take positive action because every appeal has been made to the importing companies, but they have failed to respond. The time is rapidly drawing near, if it does not already exist, which will make the situation extremely critical. Definite and positive action is absolutely necessary in order to place some reasonable control on ever-increasing oil imports.

SURVEYS OF FOREIGN TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, within the past 2 or 3 years a number of surveys have been made by various groups, both private and public, purporting to show the true interest of congressional districts or even States in foreign trade. Usually the results are given out under some title such as "The Stake of the *n*th Congressional District of the State of Blank in Foreign Trade."

Such surveys have been made by the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service, by the League of Women Voters, by world trade groups, universities, and so forth.

One thing most characteristic of such surveys is that they always demonstrate that further tariff reductions would be helpful; that is to say, the exporting interests of the district or area are shown to employ more people than would be hurt by a greater volume of imports.

Recently a proposal has been made that several million dollars be appropriated by Congress to be used by the United States Department of Commerce to make surveys of this character throughout the United States.

The time is therefore here when we should take a critical look at these surveys. From what I know of them they appear to be launched by those who are interested in export markets and unfailingly prove what the propagators set out to prove in the first place.

Of course, there is nothing to stop the League of Women Voters from making all the surveys they want. The same goes for any other privately financed organization. When, however it is proposed to expend public funds, all of us have a right to insist that any proposed survey must include both sides of the equation.

If the number of people employed in the export industries is to be determined, the number of people that would be needed to produce the goods imported should also be ascertained. Only in this way could a proper balance be struck. If this were not done the result of any such surveys would only be one-sided distortions of the true state of affairs, and therefore misleading.

I shall certainly oppose most strenuously any proposal to appropriate public funds for foreign-trade surveys in this country that would draw false pictures.

As for private surveys, some of them may need public exposure for their biased approach and lack of objective purpose.

Recently a survey of the kind I have referred to came to my attention. It was made by University of Minnesota economists in combination with private industries of that State. In response to an article that appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune giving the results of the survey a letter was printed in the same newspaper. This letter points out some of the serious defects of a survey of this kind.

I ask that this letter be included at this point in the RECORD. I am sure that more criticisms of this kind will be evoked as more of these private surveys are made:

(The writer of this letter is director of public relations, Cooperative Wool Growers, of Minnesota, South Dakota, and Iowa.)

To the EDITOR: The Sunday Tribune of April 8, carried an article entitled "Research Shows Tariff Cut Would Aid State Industry." The article states that the report of a combined group of businessmen and University of Minnesota economists found that reduced tariffs would help more industries of the State than they would injure. It says also that in 1947 no less than 13,488 Minnesotans in 27 industries held their jobs because of export trade.

Among the industries that would be helped by further tariff cuts are listed farm machinery and equipment, plastic products, construction and mining machinery, electric motors and generators, internal combustion engines and general industrial machinery and equipment.

Among the industrial products that would be injured are listed leather products (except footwear), pottery and sugar refining. Notably missing is the dairy industry. Among the agricultural groups that the report lists as likely casualties of lower tariffs are wheat, sugar beets and wool. Smaller injury, it says, would be inflicted on oats, malting barley, rye, and flax producers. On the other hand, growers of corn, soybeans, peas, and canning corn would stand to be helped moderately.

This gives the report the appearance of a product of honest effort; and that much may be granted. Nevertheless it is something of a shock to find the dairy industry, in which Minnesota stands third or fourth from the top in the Nation, missing from the list of industries that would be severely crippled by removal or a great reduction of trade barriers. This is one of the State's key industries. It could not be injured substantially without grievous injury to the State as a whole. But for the restrictive import quotas on cheese and the virtual embargo on butter the dairy industry of Minnesota would have been on the skids long ago.

The same would be true of wheat and wheat flour, both important sources of income for Minnesotans. The import quotas on these products are very much more restrictive than the tariffs on other products.

Ruin the dairying, the wheatgrowing, and flour-milling industries of Minnesota, and your exporters of different classes of machinery and motors would also soon feel the plight. It happens that the principal products of Minnesota are the beneficiaries of the most highly protective devices employed by the United States. That includes sugar, not yet mentioned here. Sugar is also protected by a special import quota law. The fact is that if products of the rest of the county were as highly protected as those of Minnesota we would have a low volume of imports, except of products on the free list.

It should not be forgotten that dairying, wheatgrowing, flour milling, and sugar-beet growing and sugar refining are also important to other States. If the import quotas on these products were removed the exporters of farm implements would find their sales falling off not only in Minnesota, but in Wisconsin, New York, and Pennsylvania (dairy States), in Utah, Colorado, Michigan, and California (sugar beet States), Louisiana and Florida (sugarcane States), and in Kansas, Nebraska, Illinois, and other wheatgrowing States.

While cotton is not grown in Minnesota, it also is highly protected by an import quota. Remove it and many Southern States would also decline drastically as a domestic market. Could the exporters of Minnesota live on their export markets? No.

There are the freer traders who wink at import quotas on agricultural products and explain them by pointing to price supports.

They overlook the fact that price supports were instituted to bring about parity between farm products and industrial products. If support prices on agricultural products make them vulnerable to imports does it not follow that industrial products, to the price level of which it is sought to lift farm products, must be equally vulnerable?

The business groups and University of Minnesota economists are to be congratulated for initiating a serious study on foreign trade. A beginning has been made. It would be useful if this were followed by a more comprehensive inquiry, taking into account all the factors.—LEONARD J. NADASDY, *Minneapolis.*

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BAILEY, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri, on Wednesday next, for 30 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ), for 60 minutes, on Wednesday, June 13, 1956.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BARTLETT and include an address made by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] at the University of Alaska on May 14, when she was awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws, notwithstanding it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $200.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALGER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AVERY.

Mr. KILBURN and to include a speech by Mr. DONDERO.

Mr. PELLY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. JENNINGS) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2967. An act to amend the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 13, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1960. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State Committees on Education Beyond the High School"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1961. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists of schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 9974. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the cutting of timber, the manufacture and sale of lumber, and the preservation of the forests on the Menominee Indian Reservation in the State of Wisconsin," approved March 28, 1908, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2331). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KLEIN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1146. An act to further amend section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, relating to fees of agents, attorneys, and representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 2332). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 10412. A bill to amend the act for the protection of walruses; without amendment (Rept. No. 2333). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11499. A bill to amend the Texas City Disaster Claims Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2334). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRESTON: Committee of conference. H. R. 10899. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2344). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 417. An act for the relief of Pearl O. Sellaz; without amendment (Rept. No. 2310). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 530. An act for the relief of the Sacred Heart Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 2311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1034. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Donald D. Parrish; without amendment (Rept. No. 2312). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1414. An act for the relief of James Edward Robinson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1622. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2314). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2016. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Lawrence F. Kramer; without amendment (Rept. No. 2315). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2152. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer; without amendment (Rept. No. 2316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2582. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of William E. Stone for disability retirement as a Reserve officer or Army of the United States officer under the provisions of the act of April 3, 1939, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3472. An act for the relief of Patricia A. Pembroke; without amendment (Rept. No. 2318). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1403. A bill for the relief of Anthony J. Varca, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2319). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3062. A bill for the relief of Paul H. Sarvis, Sr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3987. A bill for the relief of Onie Hack; with amendment (Rept. No. 2321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4336. A bill for the relief of Z. A. Hardee; with amendment (Rept. No. 2322). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7738. A bill for the relief of Scott Berry; with amendment (Rept. No. 2323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9106. A bill for the relief of Saul Lehman; without amendment (Rept. No. 2324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10281. A bill for the relief of Walter C. Jordan and Elton W. Johnson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10818. A bill for the relief of George T. Moore and Carl D. Berry; without amendment (Rept. No. 2326). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10587. A bill for the relief of Charlie Gardener Ford; with amendment

(Rept. No. 2327). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11207. A bill for the relief of Cyrus B. Follmer; without amendment (Rept. No. 2328). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11530. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Harold LeRoy Allen; without amendment (Rept. No. 2329). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 520. Resolution to refer H. R. 4507 to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 2330). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 245. An act for the relief of Ahmet Haldun Koca Taskin; without amendment (Rept. No. 2335). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1375. An act for the relief of Pingfong Ngo Chung and Pearl Wah Chung; with amendment (Rept. No. 2336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1814. An act for the relief of Teresa Lucia Cilli and Guiseppe Corrado Cilli; with amendment (Rept. No. 2337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9020. A bill for the relief of Toini Margareta Heino; with amendments (Rept. No. 2338). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 636. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amendments (Rept. No. 2339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 637. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 638. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain fiancées of United States citizens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2341). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1986. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Deckard; with amendment (Rept. No. 2342). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6765. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of the United Foundation Corporation of Union, N. J.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2343). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5155. A bill for the relief of Peder Strand; with amendment (Rept. No. 2345). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 11708. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 11709. A bill to amend Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 11710. A bill to provide vocational rehabilitation for certain persons who serve in the active military or naval service of the United States after January 31, 1955; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 11711. A bill to extend for an additional year the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 11712. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that annuitants may elect to have their annuities taxed in the manner provided by the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 11713. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 11714. A bill to extend for 3 years the existing authority of the Secretary of the Treasury in respect of transfers of distilled spirits for purposes deemed necessary to meet the requirements of the national defense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 11715. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 11716. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 11717. A bill to provide for the inclusion within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, of United States commissioners and the crediting for retirement purposes of certain past service of their secretarial and clerical assistants; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. R. 11718. A bill to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 11719. A bill to amend titles I and XIV of the Social Security Act to provide that, where a State requires an individual to assign his life-insurance policies to the State agency as a condition of assistance thereunder, such requirement shall not apply to the first $1,000 of the proceeds of such policies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 11720. A bill creating the City of St. Francisville Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill., and Knox County, Ind., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 11721. A bill to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment, and dismissal, of civilian officers and employees of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. J. Res. 647. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Arthur H. Compton as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 11722. A bill for the relief of Maria Sebbio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 11723. A bill for the relief of Christos Petropoolos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 11724. A bill for the relief of Albert Charles Jolly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 11725. A bill for the relief of M. E. Boales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11726. A bill for the relief of Leon Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 11727. A bill for the relief of Rachel Abouganem vda de Violin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 11728. A bill for the relief of Mohamad Hassan Dardari, alias Hassan Choukat Dardari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 11729. A bill for the relief of Daniel Wilging; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 11730. A bill for the relief of Miss Helene Dimitrowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 11731. A bill for the relief of Lars T. Radberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 11732. A bill for the relief of Wolf Greenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11733. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Giangrande; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 11734. A bill for the relief of Marie Haladjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 11735. A bill for the relief of Andor Muller and Rosa Muller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11736. A bill for the relief of Ante Lisica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (by request):

H. R. 11737. A bill for the relief of Leonard Pignatello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 11738. A bill for the relief of Connie Jean Osinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 11739. A bill for the relief of Vasilios A. Xerikos, his wife, Eleni, and three minor children, Nicoleta, Constantinos, and Andreas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1134. By Mr. SILER: Petition of some 4,700 residents of the counties of Greene, Montgomery, Miami, Warren, Allen, Putnam, Summit, Ashland, Athens, Meigs, Butler, Carroll, Champaign, Clark, Clinton, Columbiana, Coshocton, Crawford, Cuyahoga, Fairfield, Franklin, Gallia, Guernsey, Hamilton, Hancock, Mercer, Harrison, Highland, Jefferson, Lorain, Lucas, Mahoning, Noble, Pickway, Portage, Richland, Seneca, Trumbull, Warren, Washington, and Wood in the State of Ohio, urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1135. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted at a meeting of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian Americans of the city of Racine, Wis., held under the auspices of the local branch of the Lithuanian American Council, on June 10, 1956, to commemorate the 16th anniversary of the forcible occupation of the Baltic States by Soviet Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Sixteen Democratic Congressmen Refused Appointment by Dulles—Members Take Vigorous Exception

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles has refused to see 16 members of the New York State Democratic congressional delegation: Hon. VICTOR L. ANFUSO, Hon. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, Hon. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON, Hon. JAMES J. DELANEY, Hon. ISIDORE DOLLINGER, Hon. JAMES C. HEALEY, Hon. LESTER HOLTZMAN, Hon. EDNA F. KELLY, Hon EUGENE J. KEOGH, Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN, Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Hon. LEO O'BRIEN, Hon. ADAM C. POWELL, JR., Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY, and Hon. HERBERT ZELENKO. They represent a sizable proportion of the population of the largest State of our Union.

Mr. Dulles is adamant in his refusal to see the delegation and insists that he will only see three of the group. The delegation, speaking as a unit, has requested this interview to discuss with the Secretary of State the grave problems of the Middle East. Mr. Dulles, however, continues in his refusal to grant this request. Obviously, he cannot face the challenge of meeting 16 Members face to face, most particularly when he is well aware that this delegation is thoroughly cognizant of the issues at stake and their relation to the maintenance of peace between Israel and the Arab States.

The 16 members of this congressional unit have together explored this problem and have unanimously arrived at the central conclusion that the most concrete step that can be taken for the maintenance of peace is an equilibrium of arms between the opposing factions. It is, of course, this unanimity of approach that has frightened Mr. Dulles in view of the inconclusive, wavering, timid public appraisal the Department of State has made relative to this crucial situation.

It may well be that Mr. Dulles prides himself upon his diplomatic suavity faced with 1, 2 or 3 Members of Congress but refuses to subject himself to the interrogations and opinions of 16 Representatives. He has given no reason for such refusal but has arbitrarily refused to grant the appointment. If Mr. Dulles is so secure in his position on the Middle East and so certain of what serves the United States interests best, it would appear to us that he would more than welcome this opportunity of addressing himself to this problem before the New York State Democratic congressional Representatives.

If the logic and the facts are on the side of the administration, would he not, therefore, welcome this opportunity to persuade the 16 of the rightness of his course? Would he not welcome this opportunity to explain why United States arms are shipped to Iraq and Saudi Arabia and arms are denied to Israel, and why our allies are given the green light to ship arms to Israel while the United States denies Israel's request? Or is Mr. Dulles so shaky in his own opinion that he dares not expose it to the scrutiny and question of the 16 Members of Congress? Can he face 16 challengers and reply to their request for an explanation why the United States yielded to the Arab States and the Soviet Union in emasculating the resolution in the United Nations offered by Great Britain?

Surely Mr. Dulles must know the answers to these questions, but are the answers of such dubious worth that he does not dare expose them to the critical attention of 16 of New York State's Representatives?

The 16 members of the New York State Democratic congressional delegation, having a unanimity of viewpoint, have agreed to act as a unit in this matter and we resent the discourtesy shown to 16 Members of Congress in Mr. Dulles' refusal to see us. We question his motives.

A Bill To Require the Automobile Industry To Live Up to Fair Business Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act so as to require the automobile industry to live up to fair business standards.

The necessity for this legislation arises out of abuses which have grown up over a period of many years in the distribution of motor vehicles in interstate commerce. For some time, I have received complaints from automobile dealers in my district and in my own State about unfair business methods in the automobile industry. I also know of the way in which some automobile manufacturers have intimidated and threatened dealers with a cancellation of the dealer's franchise. In some cases dealers' contracts have been canceled in a most heartless way. In some instances many who have been faithful and loyal and competent have lost their automobile dealerships and have been without recourse under the law.

Lately automobile manufacturers are overloading the automobile dealers with new cars and if the dealer refuses to take the cars, which they know they cannot sell, some of these manufacturers and their agents threaten to cancel the dealership contracts.

The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that the automobile industry is overproducing and overloading its dealers.

A committee of the Senate has been studying this problem for more than a year and automobile manufacturers have known about this study. If they intended to clear up this bad situation in their own industry, they have had ample time to do so. Although it is probably fair to say that in some instances some effort has been made but it has not been successful.

Unless these bad practices in the automobile industry are corrected, our whole economy will suffer. Small-business men in the automobile sales field will be destroyed and, ultimately, the American people will suffer as well.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment this is must legislation for this session of Congress, and I urgently ask my colleagues to join with me and with others who have introduced similar legislation to see that this problem is handled by this session of Congress well before adjournment.

The bill which I introduced today reads as follows:

A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, with respect to certain unfair methods of competition and certain unfair practices in the distribution of new motor vehicles in interstate commerce

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 17 and 18 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended (15 U. S. C., secs. 57 and 58), are renumbered as sections 18 and 19, respectively, and such Act is further amended by

inserting after section 16 thereof the following section:

"SEC. 17. (a) For the purposes of section 5 it shall be deemed an unfair method of competition and an unfair act or practice in commerce:

"(1) For any manufacturer of motor vehicles to induce by means of coercion, intimidation, or discrimination any of its dealers to order or accept for delivery any product of any kind.

"(2) For a dealer knowingly to sell, other than to another dealer of such manufacturer, a new motor vehicle for resale as a new motor vehicle in competition with other dealers of such manufacturer without first affording such manufacturer an opportunity to repurchase such motor vehicle at the price paid therefor, and for such manufacturer to refuse to repurchase such motor vehicle at such price under a plan adopted by such manufacturer which is equitable to all dealers and consistent with the financial resources of such manufacturer.

"(3) For any manufacturer of motor vehicles to hold out or require that warranties will be fulfilled and services rendered by all of its dealers, without effectuating a reasonable system of compensating all of its dealers, for maintaining the personnel and facilities required to fulfill such warranties and render such services.

"(4) For any manufacturer of motor vehicles to execute a dealer's franchise after the date of enactment of this act which shall include any provision for its cancellation or termination at the option of the manufacturer of motor vehicles without the consent of the dealer, for any cause not specifically described and provided for in the franchise unless such franchise provides for the payment by the manufacturer to the dealer, upon the cancellation or termination thereof by the manufacturer without the consent of the dealer for any cause not so specified in the franchise, of a sum equal to the reasonable value of such franchise to such dealer, as determined by 3 appraisers, of whom 1 shall be selected by the manufacturer, 1 shall be selected by the dealer, and the third shall be selected by the manufacturer and the dealer, respectively.

"(b) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'manufacturer of motor vehicles' includes any corporation which acts for such a manufacturer in connection with the distribution of new motor vehicles in commerce.

"(2) The term 'dealer' means a franchised retail seller of motor vehicles."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on November 1, 1956.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, concerning my views on Federal aid to education generally, and the Kelly bill specifically, I feel that Federal aid to education is entirely unnecessary. Do we need the schools? Yes; of course, we do, and we're building them locally at a rate that will solve this so-called national crisis we face in shortage of classroom facilities. Further, the money that goes into school construction comes out of the pockets of our citizens whether this is done under the jurisdiction of the local and State agencies or whether the Federal Government masterminds the operation.

Therefore, let us not be deluded into thinking that through Federal aid we are securing somebody else's money to do the job. Nobody else is paying for our schools, but rather the local citizens, and in sending our money to Washington before returning it to local school construction a sizable deduction must be made by the Federal bureaucracy which is a total unproductive loss of money and certainly does not go into school construction.

In sober reflection no one can deny that Federal money put into construction of schools means Federal control since the Government must be careful in the expenditure of taxpayers' money.

As to the Kelly bill in particular, briefly let us examine it. On page 1 we find this under section 2:

> The Congress finds that despite sustained and vigorous efforts by the States and local communities, which have increased current school construction to an unprecedented level, there is still a serious national shortage of classrooms requiring emergency action on the part of the Federal Government.

Is this an emergency? If it is, why can we not meet this in the time-honored American way by putting our shoulders to the wheel locally rather than appealing to the far distant Federal Government? How many times in the name of emergency we Americans have called on Uncle Sam for help and the emergency apparently never passed but rather more and more Government control was imposed and the original cause for Government help was forgotten. The end is always bureaucrat control. Quoting again from page 2:

> The limited financial resources available to a number of communities are not adequate to support construction programs of sufficient size to eliminate their classroom shortages. Other communities, in their efforts to apply their potential resources to their needs, are confronted with restrictive debt and tax limits, an inability to borrow the necessary funds at reasonable rates, and other obstacles.

Why are there limited financial resources at the community level? The reasons best known to local residents probably stem from some very sound financial considerations and should not be overrun roughshod by the Federal Government offering Federal aid without regard to the cost, which perhaps was the motivating factor in the community's hesitancy to incur additional debt.

Further on page 2, the first provisos are mentioned for payment to the State on a current basis. Thereafter, for 29 pages there are rules and regulations spelling out the Federal controls imposed on the States in return for Federal money. These bureaucratic tactics only point out that the end result will be another American bureaucracy contrary to the founding principles of our Government. Twenty-nine pages of rules and regulations culminate in labor standards to be imposed in construction known as the Davis-Bacon Act. This act prescribes working conditions and wages to be dictated by the Secretary of Labor rather than by State and local custom and usage, commensurate with local economy. And we should not forget that in case of error and dispute during construction the Secretary of Labor is prosecutor, judge, and jury. In fact, there is no recourse from his decision—no right for an American to have his day in court.

This bureaucratic labor dictation is but another of the provisions specified in the Kelly bill for Federal aid to education. In the Davis-Bacon Act or any one of the 29 other pages of regulations there is further ample proof to the fact that Federal aid to education means Federal control. We American citizens do not want Government dictating when it comes to the education of our children and this danger is certainly now upon us.

Expeditious Handling of Certain FTC Cases Important To Survival of Small and Independent Businesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, recently wrote a letter of utmost importance. He directly raised the issue of whether the protection of the law will be available to small business by sufficiently swift enforcement on the part of executive agencies. I hope the reply of the Federal Trade Commission will be made available to the Members.

The letter follows:

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., June 4, 1956.

Re Firestone-Shell, Docket No. 6487; Goodyear-Atlantic Refining, Docket No. 6486; Goodrich-Texas Co., Docket No. 6485

Hon. JOHN W. GWYNNE,
Chairman, Federal Trade Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There has come to the attention of the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, information to the effect that the Federal Trade Commission has been requested by George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, that the above-entitled cases be heard by the Commission in the first instance instead of by a hearing examiner. The Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, has been requested to lend its support to that request.

An examination of the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act leads me to the conclusion that the Commission may hear these cases in the first instance instead of having a hearing examiner to hear them. Therefore, it being within the power of the Commission to do so, the matter appears to resolve itself into a question of what it should do.

If the Commission should decide to grant the request which has been made of it in this respect, it appears that a change in its Rules of Practice would have to be made. Therefore it appears that two questions are presented. One relates to the feasibility of the Commission presiding over

hearings in the above entitled cases. The other relates to the need for a change in the Commission's Rules of Practice to permit it to act in the public interest by hearing a case in the first instance where the public interest would so require. I cannot believe that the Commission would desire to contend to the Congress that no instance has arisen and no instance will arise in the future where the public interest would be served by the Commisison undertaking to hear a case at the beginning on the matters with respect to which it must ultimately make a decision. If I am correct in that assumption, it would seem to be a matter of prime public importance for the Commission to consider making the changes in its Rules of Practice that would permit it to serve the public interest fully in any instance.

Referring again to the above-entitled cases, I want the record to show and the Commission to know that I concur wholeheartedly in the view expressed by George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, when he states that the above-entitled cases are important to the survival of small and independent business enterprises. Therefore, I concur in his view that those cases are of prime importance to the public interest. Hence, in my opinion, any procedure available to the Commission and under which it can feasibly expedite the handling of those cases to an early conclusion will serve the public interest.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

Address of the Honorable George A. Dondero, Member of Congress, 18th Michigan District—Dedication of the Eisenhower Lock, St. Lawrence Seaway, Massena, N. Y. June 3, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith a speech given by our highly respected colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. DONDERO, at the dedication of the Eisenhower lock at Massena, N. Y., on June 3, 1956.

Mr. DONDERO worked for many years to get the St. Lawrence Seaway through and he was one of the authors of the bill that passed. People of northern New York will ever remember him with respect and gratitude.

A little more than 2 years ago, May 6, 1954, one of the great legislative battles to take place in the Congress of the United States came to an end. On that date the St. Lawrence Seaway and power project was adopted by Congress, and the United States had determined it would join Canada, our friendly neighbor government to the north, in constructing and developing this master project of North America.

Today it is under construction, and the dream of two friendly nations who speak the same language and read the same Bible is about to become a reality.

After a number of visits to the St. Lawrence River with committees from Congress, this visit today on this occasion is of the greatest personal pleasure and satisfaction to me. To say that I am extremely happy is an understatement, for today it is my rare privilege to view the actual construction of the seaway. This comes after a struggle of nearly 20 years, after many discouragements, and after overcoming formidable opposition. I say it is a fitting climax to nearly a score of years of unrequiting effort to advance the cause of the seaway. To have made at least some contribution toward the adoption of the seaway by the United States will permit me, upon my retirement from Congress next January 1957, to take with me a feeling of accomplishment of a project that will be of great benefit to the people of our time and generations yet unborn.

In my final appeal to the House of Representatives 2 years ago urging passage of the Wiley-Dondero bill, authorizing participation by the United States with Canada in building the seaway and power project, I called attention to the only quotation on the walls of the House Chamber in Washington immediately above the Speaker's chair. Webster nearly a century before proclaimed it, and I give that quotation:

"Let us develop the resources of our land. Call forth its power, build its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

The spirit of Webster prevailed that day, and all who played a part in advocating and promulgating this gigantic undertaking enjoy a consciousness of performing "something worthy to be remembered."

The subject of the seaway is not a new one. It has been the dream of man for more than 200 years. The French explorer, Champlain, first visualized the possibility of a canal linking the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean in the 17th century. In the crude diary which he left we may read of his plan for a St. Lawrence Seaway. His idea remained a dream for nearly 150 years. Now man's dream is coming true.

My pleasure in being present today is almost unrestrained. We are designating a lock on this occasion as a part of the St. Lawrence Seaway and power project and naming it for our great President, President Eisenhower, who did so much to make this day possible. We also recall today his vigorous advocacy of uniting with Canada in the construction of this project, and we will remember that on the 7th of January 1954, in his state of the Union message to the Congress he said:

"Some of our vital heavy materials come increasingly from Canada. Indeed our relations with Canada, happily always close, involve more and more the unbreakable ties of strategic interdependence. Both nations now need the St. Lawrence Seaway for security as well as for economic reasons. I urge the Congress promptly to approve our participation in its construction."

There is no comparable area on this earth that includes so many of the requisite qualifications for a master project as the Great Lakes region of the United States and Canada. In it is found a temperate but invigorating climate; unlimited quantities of iron ore; coal in abundance or near at hand; oil and mineral salts; varied but fertile soil conditions; adequate rainfall; immense agricultural areas; numerous industrial and commercial cities; ample labor, skilled and unskilled; boundless tracts of virgin timber; unnumbered square miles of recreational expanse; and in the center of it all, an allwise and generous providence planted five deep blue, fresh-water seas—the Great Lakes—to provide low-cost transportation for raw materials and fabricated products.

The seaway when completed will be the greatest inland waterway in the world. The same water which flows through the locks at the Soo, in Michigan, will flow unvexed to the sea through the St. Lawrence Waterway. It will be under the joint management and control of the Governments of the United States and Canada. We are nearing our goal, and I am very sure that all of us are happy to observe today the actual construction progressing at a satisfactory pace.

Through the many years that I have served in Congress while working for the development of the navigation and power project of the St. Lawrence, it has been a pleasure to work with so many distinguished citizens of the United States and Canada who contributed so much to a common end, namely, the building of the seaway. Some of them are here today: Senator Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin; Mr. Lewis G. Castle, of Duluth, Minn., Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the agency constructing the United States part of the project; the Honorable Lionel Chevrier, President of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada; and Dr. N. R. Danielian, who heads up the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association. I could name many others if time permitted.

It is no exaggeration to say that the great midcontinent area of Canada and the United States may justly and properly be called the granary, the pantry, and the breadbasket of the world. Nearly half of the food products of the continent are produced in the heartland of the continent.

It is well known that on the breast of the fresh-water seas which contain one-half of the sweet water of the earth moves an enormous tonnage of commerce belonging to the United States and Canada. We all know that through the locks at the Soo even now and before the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway passes every year more tonnage than through nearly all the other great canals of the world combined.

Again I wish to voice my pleasure and happiness on this occasion and for the privilege of being present. We may all look with encouragement to the near future when the seaway and power project will be completed. It will be a day of great achievement for both nations, and it will present to the future the vision of two nations and their faith and confidence in this common undertaking.

I wish to close these brief remarks with a quotation from an address delivered by the Honorable Lionel Chevrier, president of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada, in Copenhagen, Denmark, last year. Said he:

"Finally, after many years of hesitation we have decided to act together on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway. Here is a magnificent example to the world of international understanding and goodwill. Because of this, I believe that in the days to come the Canadian and American peoples will, for their own safety and the good of all, walk together in majesty, in justice, and in peace."

Commemorative Stamp for Amelia Earhart Putnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, it has been called to my attention on a number of occasions that no official Government recognition has been bestowed upon the late Amelia Earhart Putnam for her many contributions to the development of aviation in this country.

Since Miss Earhart was a native of Atchison, in my home district of Kansas,

I have urged that a commemorative stamp be issued by the Post Office Department to honor her for her pioneering role in aviation. This honor would renew in our national memory the courage and daring of Amelia Earhart and would express a nation's gratitude for her contributions to our welfare and advancement.

I believe sincerely that few women of this century deserve so completely the honor of a commemorative stamp as does Miss Earhart. Her achievements in aviation were phenomenal. She made history as the first woman to fly the Atlantic Ocean. This she accomplished in 1932 and in so doing established a new transatlantic record time of 13 hours and 30 minutes.

At one time Miss Earhart held the altitude, speed, and distance records for women in aviation. She became the world's No. 1 woman flier, and has to her everlasting credit an impressive list of "firsts."

First woman to fly the Atlantic Ocean.

First woman to fly the Atlantic Ocean alone.

First person to fly the Atlantic Ocean alone twice.

First woman to pilot an autogiro.

First person to cross the United States in an autogiro.

First woman to receive the Distinguished Flying Cross.

First woman to fly nonstop across the United States.

First woman to fly from Hawaii to the United States.

In March 1937, accompanied by a navigator, Miss Earhart started on a flight around the world. She flew from California to Hawaii, where the flight was interrupted when her plane was damaged as she took off from Honolulu on the second leg of the journey. Undaunted, she returned to the United States and prepared for another attempt to fly around the world.

On June 1, 1937, again accompanied by a navigator, Miss Earhart took off from Miami, Fla. She flew south to San Juan, P. R.; to Surinam, Dutch Guiana; to Brazil; across the Atlantic Ocean to Africa; across Africa to the Red Sea; along the Arabian coast to India; across India to Calcutta; to Rangoon; to Singapore; to Java; to Port Darwin, Australia; to Lae, New Guinea. On July 2 she took off for Howland Island, a tiny speck in the vast Pacific Ocean. Between 2:45 a. m. and 8:44 a. m. the following day the Coast Guard cutter *Itasca*, on watch for the plane near Howland Island, picked up a number of garbled messages which indicated the flight was in trouble. The plane was never seen again.

Amelia Earhart had flown more than three-fourths of the distance around the world when she disappeared. She was not quite 39 years of age, having been born July 24, 1898, at Atchison, Kans. The whole world watched and listened while hope steadily diminished for the safe return of Amelia Earhart and her navigator. It was difficult for the American public to believe Amelia Earhart was forever gone.

Although her most ambitious venture ended tragically, Miss Earhart displayed, in addition to the necessary high technical aptitudes for flying, courage and resourcefulness of the first order.

Amelia Earhart's activities outside her career in aviation also were distinguished. Few are aware of her untiring devotion and hard work in a hospital during World War I. She spent a number of years working in Boston and New York settlement houses and conducted English extension courses for Boston University in industrial communities in Massachusetts. She abounded in enthusiasm for the progress of women toward economic and political independence and equality. She worked tirelessly or the abolishment of laws which discriminated against women and she was vitally interested in careers for girls.

Miss Earhart wrote of her experiences in settlement work in these words:

> The biggest job of the social worker is to give boys and girls the experience that will keep them young and that will inspire a zest for life.

That phrase would seem to reflect a shining quality in Miss Earhart's own personality. Although she received the homage of the world, she remained a modest, dignified, and charming woman to the end.

In reviewing Miss Earhart's many contributions to aviation, we should not overlook her interest in the scientific aspect of flying. She became a consulting member of the faculty at Purdue University, specializing in aeronautics and careers for women. In 1931, she married publisher George Palmer Putnam, who never dissuaded her from her interests in aviation.

Amelia Earhart can be counted among America's pioneers in science, medicine, industry and exploration. It cannot be questioned that she brought merited glory to her country, not only as the world's chief woman flier but as one of the world's chief fliers. She was a stirring example of devotion to a cause larger than individual ambition or personal safety.

The spirit, the personality and the courage of Amelia Earhart should be singled out as a model by which future generations of Americans can pattern themselves. A commemorative stamp would be a highly appropriate memorial to Miss Earhart and to the traditional pioneering spirit which has been instrumental in making our Nation great.

Miss Earhart's achievements certainly merit her the honor of a special stamp. Furthermore, such a stamp would serve to further bring aviation to the public mind. I think one would not be amiss to say that such could be considered in the national interest. The interest in the stamp is not local.

The Ninety-Nines, Inc., the International Organization of Women Pilots, has adopted the Amelia Earhart commemorative stamp program as a project of the national organization.

The National Flying Farmers has expressed their keen interest in the stamp. This is of special meaning to me because I took part in the first organizational meeting of the Kansas Flying Farmers at Hutchinson.

The Honorable EDWARD H. REES, of Kansas, ranking minority member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives, has stated that he favors the issuance of this stamp.

Mrs. E. E. Kaufman, president of the Women's National Aeronautical Association of the United States, Inc., Raton, N. Mex., has written me to the effect that her organization is supporting the project.

Mr. Al Bennett, editor of the Atchison (Kans.) Daily Globe, says:

> It was her courage that broke the barrier for women pilots everywhere. It was her contagious smile that won friends for aviation, and for America, on the airstrips of Europe and Asia.
>
> Amelia Earhart was the Nation's Lady Lindy. A commemorative stamp issued in her honor seems a fitting and proper way to indicate her country's appreciation and gratitude.

Last year Senator FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, and Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, introduced a joint resolution providing for the issuance of such a commemorative stamp. Both Senator CARLSON and Senator SALTONSTALL have urged the Post Office Department to give early consideration to this matter.

Arthur Godfrey manifested his interest in this vital project by informing his many viewers and listeners on his daytime TV and radio show of the proposal for a special stamp on behalf of Miss Earhart.

Mr. Leo Pusch, president of the Kansas State Junior Chamber of Commerce, has indicated the interest of the Jaycees in this worthwhile project. He states that the "young men of action" feel such a stamp is important to remind our Nation of one who added much to our heritage.

Mr. J. E. Schaefer, vice president, general manager, Wichita division, Boeing Airplane Co., states:

> Amelia Earhart's courage and her deeds in the dynamic field of aviation most certainly are deserving of this recognition.
>
> We of Boeing are keenly interested in the individual roles and historic events which have contributed to the tremendous progress of aviation in the United States. Our country would indeed be remiss if the contributions of such a person were to be overlooked.

Mr. Brook L. Haines, president of the Topeka, Kans., Stamp Club:

> Last year France put out a special stamp honoring their outstanding, early-day aviatrix. The United States of America has an even better reason for honoring Amelia Earhart.

Louis M. Dobbin, chairman, Kansas chapter, the Ninety-Nines, Inc., Wichita, Kans.:

> Her many accomplishments very adequately establishes the need for such a commemorative stamp. We believe wholeheartedly that Miss Earhart deserves the honor for her untiring and unselfish efforts to further aviation.

The Kansas City Star in an editorial on April 7, 1956, entitled "Tomboy on a Stamp?" said in part:

> In any list of attractive American heroines, Miss Earhart would surely have a place. So naturally her name comes up with a discussion of women on postage stamps.

The Topeka Daily Capital expressed its interest in this stamp by reprinting in its entirety the Kansas City Star editorial.

The Post Office and Civil Service Committees of the House of Representatives and Senate have jurisdiction on legislation introduced for commemorative stamps. The Postmaster General also is empowered to issue such stamps, exercising his authority through administrative order.

In the 81st Congress, however, Members of the House and Senate Post Office Committees by joint resolution agreed not to consider bills introduced for commemorative stamps. They felt too much time was being devoted to discussion of such bills, most of which were not deserving of legislation. They justified their position by pointing out that the Postmaster General already had the authority under law to issue commemorative stamps; that only approximately a dozen such stamps can be authorized in any given year; and that since this function was already being fulfilled by the Postmaster General there was no need to take up valuable time of the committees with it. I think the committees' position is sound and constructive.

Although no such concurrent resolution is valid at this time, the position of the respective committees is the same; that is, they will not consider legislation for the issuance of commemorative stamps. The only course of action remaining, then, is to request a commemorative stamp issue of the Postmaster General.

The Post Office Department has indicated that their 1956 program for issuance of special stamps is unusually full. Nevertheless, I believe the significance of this commemorative stamp merits the special consideration of the Postmaster General, not only for 1956 but also for 1957 issuance. I am certain that all Members of Congress recognize the good which can be gained from such a stamp. This has international meaning. I urge all Members to express their interest in a special stamp to honor Amelia Earhart Putnam to the Postmaster General.

Likewise all interested citizens should write to the Postmaster General and inform him of their desire to have such a stamp issued. As Senator FRANK CARLSON has stated:

It is a stamp that should be issued.

Mrs. Green Awarded Degree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, Alaska was honored last month when our colleague, Representative EDITH GREEN, traveled to the Territory to receive an honorary degree from the University of Alaska. On May 14 President Elmer Rasmuson, of the board of regents of America's farthest north institution of higher learning, conferred on Mrs. GREEN the degree of honorary doctor of laws. Thus Mrs. GREEN became the first woman in the history of the university to be singled out for such an honor. Before President Rasmuson and President Ernest Patty, of the university, and all the others who had gathered at college for this memorable occasion, Representative GREEN delivered an address, Alaska and the Future: The Case for Liberalism, which makes a significant contribution to our present-day thinking. I deem it a privilege to be able to include Mrs. GREEN's speech with my remarks:

When President Patty honored me with the invitation to receive a degree with you today and to speak at your commencement, I was greatly pleased. But I was also a little hesitant. For I am not at all sure how much my generation is entitled to give advice to yours. I came today, therefore, hoping you might extend to me the charity Mark Twain once showed toward his father. "When I was a boy of 14," Mark Twain observed, "my father was so ignorant I could hardly stand to have the old man around. But when I got to be 21, I was astonished at how much the old man had learned in 7 years." So I am trusting, you see, in the tolerance of your maturity.

But I had other misgivings, too. From my own student days and from later experience as a teacher I have submitted to a number of commencement speeches in my time. So when I accepted your kind invitation, I did so with a determination to avoid, if at all possible, the pitfalls of the commencement speaker—the rolling rhetoric, the purple platitudes, the temptation to place on your shoulders, already weighed down with a black gown, the responsibility for all the future problems of the world.

Nevertheless, I accepted, because I genuinely looked forward with real pleasure to joining you on this occasion. And being here, in this role, I will inevitably talk about the future—because to young people like you, and particularly you in Alaska, the future is so appropriately the focus of importance.

Yet what led me to the decision that I must after all speak of the future was a journey into the past. Thinking back over past commencements I had taken part in, I could not help contrasting the mood of the thirties, the temper of the times young people were launched into then—and the mood of the fifties, the climate of opinion and action in which you are beginning your adult careers.

The climate of the thirties was a liberal climate—liberalism was the banner of the decade and most young people went out into the world of the thirties marching behind that banner. But the intellectual and practical temper of 1956 is dominated by what I would call the cult of middleism.

Now I want to make it clear that I am not here labeling political parties. Both of our major parties today, I think, are affected by the temper of the "middle of the road approach." But they are reflecting, not creating the larger mood of our society. The cult of middleism, I would say, reaches into every corner of our life—not only our politics but our literature, our social life and social values, our entertainment, our tastes and our fashions. My concern, therefore, is only in part political and, I believe, in no sense narrowly partisan. I am concerned rather with the mood of a nation, in all the manifestations of its life.

This contrast of the climate of the thirties and the climate of the fifties leads me to some convictions that have been crystallizing in my mind over several years—convictions that give me a great deal of concern. I should like to share them with you and submit them for your consideration this morning. They take the simple form of two general propositions and a third more specific one that bears on the fact that we are here today at an Alaskan university, honoring a graduating class of Alaska's young people. My first proposition is this: Middleism in its present cult is, I think, a snare and a delusion, a social creed without a future, and if I am right, and the pursuit of the middle has brought us to an inert standstill, then we should explore alternatives. And so, as a second proposition, I want to make the case for liberalism—to argue that liberalism, presently in something of an eclipse, is not just the outdated mood of the thirties but the best guide to the sixties—to the years of your maturity—you who are graduating here today. And finally to you, as young people, I want to say that you in Alaska should weigh the case for liberalism with very special interest—for the problems and challenges of your future, it seems to me, call with particular urgency for the liberal approach.

Let me briefly examine these three propositions. I am not, let me emphasize, condemning moderation. We are all moderates; who, indeed, is willing to call himself an extremist? But just because moderation is such a beguiling word, it needs to be examined with some care. There is moderation and there is moderation that is middleism. Before we embrace a particular brand we ought to examine it with some care—approach it, shall I say, with moderation. To my mind there is a great difference between true moderation and the creeping complacency that, far too easily, characterizes the present vogue of middelism.

Middelism, as it spreads its smog over our present-day attitudes, stands immobilized at a mathematical point halfway between two gutters. Now, we would do well to remember, that most accidents happen in the middle of the road. But more important, this attitude is a debasing of the meaning of moderation. True moderation is, indeed, a mean between extremes. But it is not a mathematical middle. And before you can find the mean, you have to recognize what are the extremes.

Let me give an example: Many of you are undoubtedly aware that a hot debate is presently going on over the proposal to provide Alaska with mental facilities to care for its own mentally ill. In the last few months, an irrational, extremist opposition has grown up against this legislation. Now where should a sensible man stand on this issue? Where are the extremes? One is certainly the hate-obsessed groups that call this a plot to create a "Siberia, U. S. A."; who charge that this is a scheme to allow the Governors of Alaska and of the several States, conspiring together, to ship off their political opponents to a million-acre concentration camp in Alaska. Is the other extreme, then, the medical associations, the many Members of the Congress of the United States, the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, and the leading citizens, in Alaska and the States, who conceived this project, drew up the bill that embodies it, and support its passage? Are these the two extremes? The lunatic right on the one hand and the overwhelming mass of informed judgment on the other, and if so, does moderation require the citizen to stand halfway between the two to take the middle of the road? Is he to believe that the Government, the professional groups, and the citizens supporting this proposal are, say, half-treasonable? What is a compromise on a mental hospital for Alaska—a point half-

way between decent medical care and inadequate care? And there are those in Washington, subjected to this barrage of propaganda, who say let's not go to extremes—let's take the middle of the road—let's study this a bit longer.

Perhaps I labor the point. But I must confess, this seems to me the dilemma we are left in by the cult of middleism. For it is a cult that wants to avoid clear-cut decision, that wants always to stand halfway between the points of controversy and try to please everyone. As often as not, this leaves us halfway between sense and nonsense.

This is, I profoundly believe, an insidious and dangerous philosophy and it is much too prevalent today. Its symptoms are everywhere. In their anxiety to avoid the charge of extremism, men rush together to huddle in an indistinguishable mediocrity. We reduce opinion and belief to the lowest common denominator. We banish uncomfortable questions from the realm of public discussion by labeling those who raise them as radicals or traitors. The deadly blight of overzealous Government security programs spreads down into the informal pressures of every community to threaten men whose greatest crime is that, in the distant past, they deviated from mass conformity in opinion or association or action.

Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge was a wealthy patron of the arts and a grand lady, who endowed a chamber music foundation at the Library of Congress. Her son is an eminent violinist and Harvard professor. Yet, after her death, when he had been invited to become a trustee of his mother's foundation, the Library of Congress hastily withdrew its invitation because some said he is a Socialist.

Last year, the Symphony of the Air, under the auspices of the State Department, made a tour abroad that was a great success in building good will for the United States. This year, its tour was suddenly canceled because an unnamed person charged that some of its members were pro-Communist. The procommunism of at least one of them consisted in having publicly criticized our atom-bomb testing program in the Pacific.

Now these are extreme examples. Yet in less dramatic forms, they are repeated daily in our society. Public libraries come under attack for having unpopular books on their shelves—books at least unpopular with certain vigilantes. In Indiana, a woman proposes to banish Robin Hood from children's literature as Communist in meaning. In Illinois, the American Legion finds subversion in a Girl Scout publication. One Southern State passed a law requiring that publishers of textbooks certify not only that the authors were not subversive—but also that the authorities cited in footnotes were non-Communist. This would presumably bar even a mention of Karl Marx from the textbooks of the State.

The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit becomes a best selling novel as the symbol of a mass-produced stereotype of the cult of middleism. The cautious man—the middle-of-the-road man—would do well to read only mass circulation magazines, watch his television set, confine controversy to the merits of big league baseball teams.

Such a trend, carried to its logical conclusion, can end only in a mass of mechanical men, repeating the safe and sterile platitudes of middleism, avoiding like a plague the outer regions where individuality, spontaneity, and originality live.

This pressure toward the mediocrity of the middle seems to me the great evil of our decade. It not only debases art and opinion, public discussion, and practical action, it does something more dangerous—it leads to a dangerous illusion of unreality. Some of its causes seem clear, and at the same time they point the danger. After a generation of struggle and hardship, of war and conflict, many men are tired of the strenuous life. They are tired of difficult decisions, of responsibility, and of sacrifice; they are tired of the unpleasant and often costly necessities the real world has forced upon us. They want, instead, a vacation from responsibility—a life without problems. They would rather take the middle of the road to avoid conflict with extremists at either end. Unfortunately the facts of life have not gone on vacation. The only way, in the middle fifties, that the comfortable illusion of a placid world can be achieved is through an exercise in unreality.

And that, I believe, is the meaning of the cult of middleism. For the cult of the middle is precisely a sedative guaranteed to banish the hard problems of reality and create instead the comfortable and drowsy illusion of unreality. But, unfortunately, the sedative is guaranteed to produce a hangover. If we succumb to the cult of middleism, we are headed for a hangover of cosmic proportions when the facts catch up with us.

Walter Lippmann a few years ago wisely pointed out that this illusory moderation is, in fact, not a guide to wise and practical action, but instead only the wishful misconception of men who think "getting along" is the only important thing—more important than where we are "getting along to" or where it will bring us out. It is a product of the illusion that differences of belief and value are not important—that the real issues over which men disagree can be clouded over and dissolved into a kind of porridge of good feeling.

This is a fatal misconception. Differences do matter. What one side is maintaining may be a great deal better than its opponent's position. It does matter whether we build a mental hospital for Alaska or because of wild charges of treason by a small but very vocal minority, play it safe to avoid criticism, we refuse to build one. And building a hospital is more important than coming to some middle ground of compromise with hysteria-mongers who oppose it. It's understandable that, today, most of us are tired of conflict and danger and seek some middle ground of moderation and safety. But as a recent writer has pointed out, "when, as is now the case, the balance of power between the major conflicting groups at the extremes gain disproportionate power simply because they are in a position to upset the whole applecart."

One danger of middleism, then, is that in the "name of moderation," we compromise good sense with the absurdity of the extremes. In our anxiety to avoid discomfort and conflict and criticism we hop from midpoint to midpoint, as the issues confront us, in a path that is not consistent moderation but aimless muddling. The end of such a path is clear—a paralyzed inertia at the center of a swamp of conformity.

This, I submit, is not true moderation. Yet if I read the signs of the times rightly, it is a misconception of moderation that is only too rapidly gaining ground in our country. It leads us in our public life to substitute rhetoric for reality, to gloss over the great problems that confront us with catch slogans and to attempt, by a kind of self-salesmanship, to deal with our problems by illusion rather than solution.

For the fact is, reality does not surrender to rhetoric; problems are not solved by catch phrases. Facts remain facts, and conflict remains conflict. Differences of opinion do matter; and real moderation is not an attempt to dissolve difference into discriminate compromise. As Charles Frankel says, "Every solution of a conflict between different groups in a society means some rearrangement of the existing balance of power. And in this rearrangement, it is inevitable that some people are going to lose more than others." And I submit—those who want to follow the middle of the road have the most to lose. What we need today is a little more enthusiasm for differences—in opinion, in clothes, in television programs—a little more honest recognition that there are conflicts of interests and principle—and a little more willingness to face up to the necessity to make hard choices and to tackle tough problems. And that brings us back to the case for liberalism. For the true moderation, I believe is liberalism.

Now I know that liberalism has been replaced in the current vogue, by something that is called moderation and is offered as a contrast. I simply do not buy that piece of semantics, no matter how much of a hard sell it is given. I say that, in fact, today's moderation is coasting on the momentum of the liberal past. And I say that, if we are not to end in a static bankruptcy, it is time we generated a new liberal program for the future.

What can liberalism offer? First, it can offer leadership. A mob is not a community; and a scramble to stay in the middle of the mob is not leadership. Leadership recognizes differences and conflict. What it provides is a direction to move, a solution to difference—and that doesn't mean simply leading us back to the mathematical middle. It means charting a course on the basis of realistic recognition of differences and choice as to the best practical direction in which to go.

Secondly, liberalism can offer leadership because it has some further guide to action than the haven of dead center. It is committed to principles and to goals that give it direction. At the same time, liberalism is truly moderate. For instance, we are dedicated to the liberal goal of giving to all Americans their equal rights and opportunities, regardless of creed or color. But as moderates, we recognize that time and patience and good will are necessary in practice to achieve that goal.

Liberalism, in fact, is a firm dedication to democratic and humane goals, tempered by a clear understanding of practical limitations. Now those who follow the cult of the middle will argue that their uncritical dependence on the patterns of the past is preferable to the bolder willingness of liberalism to open new frontiers. But I am reminded of another observation of Mark Twain's, a little sermon on the value of experience.

"We should be careful," said Mark, "to get out of an experience only the wisdom that is in it and stop there! Lest we be like the cat that sits down on the hot stove lid. She will never sit down on a hot stove lid again, and that is well, but also, she will never sit down on a cold one any more either." Middleism assumes that each new stove lid is hot. The liberal approaches each stove lid with an open mind, only being a true moderate, he tests it out first.

Thirdly, liberalism offers a quality that cannot be found in the sterile wasteland of dead center, it offers imagination. The greatest weakness of middleism is that it has no purpose. It is going nowhere and it has no ideas to offer as to where to go. It is trapped in the sterility of its own formula, a prisoner of the midpoint, wherever that midpoint happens to fall. What liberalism can offer in contrast is a willingness to explore and meet the challenges of the future on their own terms. We are in a new time, with new problems, yet still coasting, I am afraid, on the ideas of the thirties. But the ideas of the thirties are not immortal. Having accepted the general principles of the liberal program of the thirties, we argue the details of social security, fair labor legislation, and so on. Yet our debate is only an echo of the thunder of the thirties.

Now these are important issues; I would not dismiss them. But the point is that

they are only the residue of the great issues of our past. They are not the great issues of the future. Our future confronts us with new problems, new challenges. How are we to identify and understand the problems of our future—how to meet them? These are questions that are today too little asked, too little answered. They are questions that call, I say, for a renascence of the liberal imagination—the kind of bold imagination that met the challenge of the thirties, brought up to date to meet the challenge of the decades ahead. I think it is a unique strength of liberalism that it has in the past supplied the imagination to deal with new problems. In the tides of time we have used up the imagination of the past. We need today a new liberalism.

The shape of this new liberalism is, I think, emerging. Let me point to some evidence. In the thirties our great problems were elemental—the basic wants of housing, food and clothing, of a decent living and a reasonable security against personal catastrophe. Those problems have by no means completely disappeared for all our people. But the broad lines of solution have long since been laid down and we have made great progress along them. Today, for most of us, our future needs and wants go beyond basic and personal material necessities. As our wealth increases, we move toward new and previously undreamed of levels of income and standards of living. The pattern of our wants shifts. It is becoming plainer all the time that our great needs in the years ahead are likely to be community needs, calling for cooperative effort. While we have constantly added our new cars, television sets, household appliances, and other conveniences, some important things have been comparatively neglected. There is a growing concern today with the condition of our schools, our highways, our hospitals. With the growth of leisure and the resources for more recreation, we become more interested in the possibilities of our great national parks and forests, our community recreational facilities, our theaters, our museums.

Yet as we have grown wealthier, a smaller and smaller share of our income has gone for these things. The fact is, in the midst of plenty, we have neglected some of our most important needs. Our schools are a vivid example. We are confronted today with the consequences of years of neglect—a school system overcrowded and partly obsolete, teachers underpaid and in short supply.

Now these are only suggestive of the issues of our immediate future. But they indicate something of the nature of the problems we face. And they contain puzzling questions that we have not yet answered, for which our past experience provides only limited guidance. Many of these problems lie in what Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., has called "the public sector" of our life. And they call, in his terms, for a "rehabilitation of a sense of the public interest" as contrasted to private interests. To a certain extent, it is clear, we need to shift some of our emphasis and some of our income from our purely private, purely personal wants to our more public, our community needs. Here are problems that are not answered simply by government, or by government spending. They reach down to every level of our society, and they call for a response by all of us—through government, through our personal activity, in our groups and associations. There, in brief, is the case for liberalism, as I see it: the challenge of new problems, the need for new vigor and new ideas to meet the future ahead of us. It calls for imagination, for a realism willing to face facts, pleasant or unpleasant, to choose and discriminate among differences of interests rather than glossing them over, and for a leadership informed by liberal goals and tempered by true moderation. These qualities, I believe, liberalism has.

I would expect this Alaskan audience to be more than ordinarily receptive to the case for liberalism—both because of your own tradition and because of the special circumstances of your own future. Alaska has a great liberal tradition. One of the first acts of its first legislature, back in 1913, was to establish woman suffrage. The same legislature initiated a pattern of labor legislation, carried on in later years, that put Alaska in the liberal vanguard in its social responsibility toward its working people. Alaska, in 1949, enacted a law requiring equal pay for women for equal work—a step forward that has not yet been accepted by the Federal Congress.

A special word is in order for Alaska's new constitution. It has been widely praised, and properly, I think, as a thoroughly enlightened achievement. The thinking that produced it is as good an example as I could ask of what I mean by the liberal imagination. And the constitution is a fitting climax to Alaska's liberal tradition. And may I say that I think Ernest Gruening's keynote speech at the constitutional convention is one of the finest speeches I have ever read.

Alaska, in very special degree, needs a liberal approach to its future. The generation that is present here today in the person of this graduating class will be the generation of Alaskan statehood. For statehood is coming—must come and I hope soon, and I for one will watch with interest and concern to see if the Tennessee plan hastens that day. In spite of the disappointments and the broken promises, the facts of Alaskan progress will be irresistible and must be recognized and accepted in statehood. But Alaska as a State has before it a future that is not only big with promise, its promise is encased in some very new and very special problems.

Alaska has been a sleeping giant, just now waking to its enormous potential. Its resources of coal and oil and other minerals are only beginning to be explored. Its resources of soil and subsoil have barely been tapped. Farming, livestock raising, mining have great promise for the future. The wealth of your forests is only now being unlocked, with the first pulp mill recently constructed near Ketchikan. Furthermore, thanks to a wise liberal policy of conservation and planned foresight, your resources will have an orderly development, instead of the wasteful exploitation that has blighted so much of resource management in earlier American experience.

These are only a few of the facts that suggest the enormous potential of Alaska's future. But I would be less than candid if I did not acknowledge the problems that complicate your future. Alaska is big—one-fifth the area of the 48 present States—and its climate and terrain complicate its problems of bigness. Alaska is not 1 region but 3, and its differences, the peculiar problems of its differences, present real difficulties. Thanks to climate and to the character of some of its industries, your economy is greatly affected by seasonal employment and seasonal fluctuation of activity. Your highway communication, however promising, cannot bear all the burden of your future. Modern communications have brought Fairbanks closer to New York, today, than was Chicago a generation ago. Yet the fact remains that Alaska is remote and, to a degree, isolated from the rest of the continental United States.

I do not cite these considerations in a spirit of pessimism. I acknowledge them only as challenges. Like all problems, they contain hidden opportunities. But they are problems and they must be faced if Alaska is to grow. They call for planning, for vision, and for cooperation. They call for a leadership and imagination that can go beyond past experience into new fields. You will not get that kind of leadership and imagination from the cult of static, unimaginative mediocrity. You will get it from a moderate but dynamic liberalism.

It seems to me, indeed, that to inventory Alaska's problems and its future, however sketchily, is to make the case for liberalism. For the kind of leadership Alaska needs is liberal leadership; the kind of imagination Alaska needs is liberal imagination. Your future needs a congenial climate for individualism and the kind of encouragement to diversity of ideas and efforts that individualism breeds. But it needs, too, a climate of cooperation. Much of the basic development of Alaska will call for community effort—to develop electric power, to build communications, to encourage and promote the large-scale investment that development needs. The record demonstrates, I think, that liberalism, not timid middleism, is the basis for such bold efforts, both individual and cooperative. Your native people, many of them making the drastic leap from the primitive to complex modern society in one generation, need sympathy and understanding and help in making that adjustment. They will get that help, the record shows, from liberalism.

If Alaska is to progress, it needs the kind of confidence and vision that is willing to invest now for the sake of the future, and that believes that when all of us as a nation invest in a region, like yours, that we all, in the long run, benefit. It needs a strong conservationist policy, dedicated to sustained-yield treatment of renewable resources. It needs government dedicated to wise and careful development of the vast treasures of your public domain, careful to guard against its capture by shortsighted exploiters. On the record, you will get these qualities from liberalism. You will not get them from the compromisers of middleism.

A generation ago, Alaska was an outpost of civilization. Today, in the swift movement of global development, it lies at a crossroads of the world.

So I think it particularly appropriate, today, to put the case for liberalism to the bar of your judgment. For all of us, escape from the atrophy of the cult of middleism is of great importance. But Alaska has a special stake in the revival of a true liberalism. I hope and trust that in your generation the challenge will be accepted and that, through you, there will grow the new liberalism in which Alaska may flourish.

National Federation of Independent Business Urges Vigorous Enforcement of Antitrust Laws as Best Way To Aid Small Business as the Administration Moves Stanley N. Barnes to Less Influential Post and Establishes Small Business Committee To Study Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, many people have been inter-

ested in the large number of study groups and commissions established by the Eisenhower administration, and concerned over the fact that many of these groups were composed, in large part, of persons well known for their long record of opposition to the very programs they were appointed to study. In many cases, also, those appointed to these study groups and commissions have been in a position to benefit personally from the recommendations made.

Mr. Speaker, I tried the other day to learn the status of and count the many groups and commissions, but I lost my way, there were so many. There are those that are still studying their particular problems, those that have completed their work, and those that have been disbanded, so I do not know whether the figure today is 30, 40, or 50—and I would be completely surprised if the President himself knew just how many there are.

Now the President has established a Cabinet-level committee to deal with the problems of small business which follows the pattern of the study groups and commissions set up earlier. It is composed of people who have demonstrated their indifference to the very problem about which they are supposed to study and make recommendations. For instance, one of the members of the new committee is Charles E. Wilson, the Secretary of Defense. In a speech I made on the floor of the House on May 9 of this year I pointed out that in the 7 months ending January 31, 1956, the Department of Defense awarded contracts amounting to almost $1 billion. Of this huge sum only 5 percent went to firms having 500 employees or less. Surely, this kind of situation does not need any prolonged study. What is needed is a reversal of the present policy which favors big business to the almost total exclusion of small firms. Let us hope that decisive action to reverse this policy will be undertaken immediately and that we will be spared a lot of double-talk designed to pull the wool over our eyes and hide the fact that there is no intention to give worthwhile contracts to small business. The backbone of our economy has always been small business and it deserves more than it is getting from the Eisenhower administration—for what it has been getting is only the crumbs from the rich man's table.

Another important member of the new Cabinet-level committee is Wendell B. Barnes, head of the Small Business Administration. One of the most cogent comments on the agency he heads was made by Sylvia F. Porter in the New York Post of April 16, 1956. This keen commentator on financial affairs wrote of the recently published fifth semiannual report of the Small Business Administration in part, as follows:

The report boasts new awards to small-business firms under military contracts rose from 15.7 percent in the last 6 months of 1954 to 17.6 percent in the last 6 months of 1955, and the net value of awards to small business rose from 19.8 to 20 percent. A large part of the report and of the press release is devoted to this subject. Comment: But when you dig into other figures on defense contracts, the complexities seem baffling, and the boast seems meaningless.

For instance, for the full 1955 fiscal year, the percentage of new contracts going to small business fell from 18.3 to 18 percent, and the percentage of net procurement slumped from 25.1 to 21.8 percent. The SBA itself points out the net figure is the one which reveals the share of defense dollars going to small business over a long period.

What's more, a just-released separate report by the Defense Department discloses that since 1953 the share of defense contracts going to the giants of America has been swelling.

The report admits small businesses do complain of various problems such as the squeeze on some raw materials, higher prices, such as for steel scrap, which they are unable to absorb, tightening bank credit, inability to compete with larger firms for skilled professional help. But, remarks Barnes, shortages, bottlenecks, and price increases are characteristic of the boom economy which we are experiencing.

Comment: This tendency to minimize the problems of small business is the most startling aspect of the report. Small business is finding it brutally tough to compete against the giants for steel, aluminum, copper, newsprint, etc., and the SBA knows it. Small business is finding its borrowing costs are soaring and its ability to get new money is shrinking, and the SBA knows it. Small business is finding the pressures from every direction are fierce and mounting, and the SBA knows it.

So much for the new committee and its members. I suppose we will know before long whether it is a study committee like the others or really intends to come to grips with the preblems. In a letter to Dr. Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, General Eisenhower showed some awareness of the important role of small business in our economy. The President said:

The important contributions made by small-business concerns to the progressive spirit and vitality of the American economy have repeatedly been stressed in my economic reports to the Congress and on various other occasions. Such enterprises, of which there are some 4 million currently in operation, serve continuously as a dynamic influence in our free-enterprise system. It is often through them that new products and new processes are first brought into use.

Equally important, it is in small concerns that many men and women find an opportunity to demonstrate their ability to serve constructively in the business world. For these and related reasons Government policies that make it easier for new businesses to be established and that foster the growth of small concerns enhance the welfare of the whole economy.

After listing the Government programs now in operation to help small business the President declared that, despite these programs, "the conditions of our modern economy are such that many small concerns confront substantial hindrances to their growth." He said that the programs for aiding small business should be carefully reviewed at this time with the object of strengthening them where necessary and of making recommendations for steps that will provide such enterprises with additional constructive assistance. The programs listed by the President included loans and defense contract assistance, antitrust enforcement, various managerial and technical aids available from the Department of Commerce, efforts by the Office of Defense Mobilization to strengthen the productive potential of small firms in our defense programs, and help for small construction companies in the housing field.

The President's recommendations seem fine, at least on paper, but it remains to be seen whether the ideas he has expressed in his letter to Mr. Burns are to be implemented or whether, like so many other programs which the President has championed with platitudes, they become lost and forgotten. Words, Mr. Speaker, are not enough. They are useful only if they result in action. George J. Burger, Washington director of the National Federation of Independent Business, pointed out that the overall actions in establishing the new committee would be largely wasted if it failed to concentrate on the basic cause of small-business problems. This, he said, was the strengthening and enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Mr. Burger has a good point. Antitrust enforcement is an action which the Federal Government can take, and take now. Such action would speak more loudly than words.

Along this same line, I should like to remind the administration of a bill I have introduced, H. R. 9514, which would establish a graduated corporation tax to help small business. The National Federation of Independent Business recently completed a nationwide poll on this legislation. The poll, reaching in excess of 100,000 small-business men throughout the country, showed that 84 percent favored my bill, while only 12 percent were opposed to it. The President has hinted of his concern for the problems of small business. Were he to support this bill, it would clearly indicate that he understood the problems faced by small business today. Establishment of additional study groups and commissions and resounding speeches are no substitute for positive action.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the New York Times reported on June 2, 1956, that the President's action in establishing the new committee was the result of a recent rise in business failures to the levels of the late 1930's.

I include here as part of my remarks a statement by George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, and a report from the Washington Evening Star on the testimonial dinner given to Judge Stanley N. Barnes, who believes, as does Mr. Burger, in vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws:

PRESIDENT'S SPECIAL CABINET COMMITTEE
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
June 1, 1956.

George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, hailed the action of President Eisenhower in creating the Special Cabinet Committee To Strengthen the Economic Position and

Foster the Sound Development of Small Businesses.

He adds that it's a forward step by the administration to recognize this basic problem facing the future of over 4 million small business institutions in our expanding economy. He says: "We trust that this is not a partisan move."

This new Special Cabinet Committee in the opinion of Burger, should have no great difficulty in discovering the real basic causes for the destruction of small business. He holds to the premise that the destruction has been brought about by the failure of the administrations for the past 35 years or more to vigorously enforce the antitrust laws. "However," Burger adds, "one ray of light in this picture was the recent action by the head of the Antitrust Division, the Honorable Stanley Barnes. If a similar policy is instituted by the administration and following administrations, carrying out the program instituted by the present antitrust head, small business of this Nation can look for a bright future."

The federation's position on this has been stated time and again before congressional committees and also before the platform committee of both the Republican and Democratic National Conventions.

He stated that the principal function of this Special Cabinet Committee should be on the No. 1 proposition, namely, antitrust law enforcement and strengthening. Burger concludes, if this is not the No. 1 subject matter to be considered by this Special Cabinet Committee, the federation would consider the overall actions wasted, to a large degree.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of June 14, 1956]

FOUR HUNDRED JOIN IN TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR JUDGE BARNES

Some 400 friends and associates of Assistant Attorney General Stanley N. Barnes gathered last night at a testimonial dinner to mark his recent appointment as judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Leading jurists here and across the Nation were among the celebrants. Heading the list was Mr. Barnes' boss of the past 3 years, Attorney General Brownell.

The dinner, sponsored by the Federal Bar Association, the District chapter of the Federal Bar Association, and the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department, was held at the Shoreham Hotel.

RETURNS TO CALIFORNIA

Judge Barnes, 55-year-old Republican, lives at 3850 Tunlaw Road NW. His new job will take him back to his native State, California. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals covers California, Arizona, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Alaska, and Hawaii. His appointment by President Eisenhower was confirmed last March.

Congressmen, too, were present to honor the man who will soon go West to fill the post formerly held by Judge William E. Orr, who retired January 1.

Several noted guests, including Mr. Brownell, took part in the presentation of skits which hailed the guest of honor for distinguished service here. Judge Barnes has headed the Antitrust Division since 1953.

The skits began with his career as a judge of the Los Angeles County Superior Court from 1947 to his coming to the District 6 years later. He was "seen" as the bar associations see him, and by Judge Thurmond Arnold of the United States Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia "as a predecessor sees him." Mr. Brownell "saw" his as "any boss would see a remarkably talented and wonderful man."

ALSO PRESENT

Among those present to honor Judge Barnes were Mrs. Brownell, Mrs. Arnold, Chief Judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and Mrs. Bolitha J. Laws, Federal Trade Commission Chairman and Mrs. John W. Gwynne, Chief Judge of the Municipal Court and Mrs. Leonard Walsh, Solicitor General Simon Sobeloff, and Republican Senator and Mrs. Thomas H. Kuchel, of California.

Also, Gerald D. Morgan, assistant to the President; Judge Victor R. Hansen, of the superior court of California and recently named a candidate to the post being vacated by Judge Barnes; Senator Malone, Republican, of Nevada; Representative Celler, Democrat, of New York; and Deputy Attorney General and Mrs. William P. Rogers. Mr. Rogers was toastmaster.

Judge Barnes, who was president of the Federal Bar Association in 1954–55, also was honored by Earl W. Kintner, first vice president of the association; Mrs. John Green, president of the District Women's Bar Association; Charles Rhyne, president of the District chapter of the Federal Bar Association; and Mrs Bart Smyth.

Mrs. Barnes, Mrs. Morgan, and Mrs. Rhyne also were present.

Island of Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, there is clear indication that the strife-ridden situation on the Island of Cyprus has become far more than the internal matter the British claim it to be. The persistent uprisings by the Greek population on this strategic Mediterranean Island, and the heavy handed manner that the uprisings have been put down by the British have become the focusing point of a most effective Communist propaganda attack on what the Kremlin terms "western colonialism."

We all know that the Communists are always on the lookout for some means of driving a wedge between the Western allies. Cyprus has become another Communist wedge that is rapidly weakening the solidarity between the United States and three of its most important allies: Greece, Britain, and Turkey.

The announcement that Soviet Foreign Minister Demitri Shepilov will confer with Greek Foreign Minister Evangelos Averoff should add to our concern. The United States has spent billions of dollars in Greece to insure that this valued ally would not fall prey to Communist domination.

However, the Greeks from ancient times have been a proud people, and our support for their cause in Cyprus means more to them than our money. Shepilov is an expert propagandist and knows full well the implications of the Cyprus situation. There is no doubt that he will attempt to capitalize on the vacillating policy with regard to Cyprus.

On March 20, I wrote to President Eisenhower suggesting that representatives of the divergent interests in Cyprus meet with him in Washington to attempt to settle this menacing rift between vital allies of the United States.

The letter follows:

MARCH 20, 1956.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Together with most other Americans, I have become increasingly concerned about the critical situation involving the island of Cyprus. The forcing into exile of Archbishop Makarios by the British with the attendant civil disturbances on Cyprus and in Greece have added to the gravity of what was already a very difficult problem in a part of the world that is vital to the security of the United States and the rest of the free world.

I have noted with great interest that our Department of State has urged Great Britain and Greece to press for a peaceful solution of the Cyprus crisis and to establish a truly representative government on this Mediterranean island.

This is all good; however, I feel that the importance of the Cyprus situation calls for a more dynamic approach if we are to find a solution.

Therefore, I respectfully suggest that you invite representatives of the divergent interests in the Cyprus problem to Washington to confer with you in an effort to reach a solution.

It is my conviction that if such a meeting were to be held in Washington with you acting as mediator and as friend to all parties, the likelihood of finding a solution for this great problem would be materially enhanced.

I suggest that the most appropriate representatives at such a meeting would be Archbishop Makarios for the Cypriots and the British Governor of Cyprus, who exiled the Archbishop, for Great Britain.

Mr. President, I feel that if you were to make such an offer to mediate this strife between two of our closest allies it would be in keeping with our best traditions and would receive the approval of good people all over the world.

As an example of what can be accomplished by mediation of this type, I refer you to the accomplishments of President Theodore Roosevelt who in 1906 was awarded the Nobel peace prize for his success in settling the Russo-Japanese War which ended with the signing of the Treaty of Portsmouth, N. H., in 1905.

I respectfully offer these suggestions to you because I feel that the hour is late and that conditions on Cyprus and in Greece call for strong action of this kind.

Mr. President, I feel that if this suggestion should be promptly implemented, it would demonstrate in a dramatic and practical way that the United States of America and its friends are really dedicated to and devoted to the cause of peace and of justice in the world.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. DODD,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this recommendation as we know has not been carried out, and it now appears that there is little likelihood that it will be put into effect in the future. I do not feel that it is important that my recommendation be implemented, but I do feel strongly that

the United States must promptly take positive action to amicably settle the dispute in Cyprus.

The British interest in Cyprus is to preserve its control over this small Crown Colony which has an overwhelming Greek population. I maintain that the United States as the leader in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has a far greater interest. In our position of leadership, and having assumed a major part of the responsibility of defending the West from Communist attack, it is our duty to take positive action.

The United States is neglecting the responsibility that goes with leadership if it sits idly by while strife in Cyprus destroys the unity of the NATO countries, and supplies the Soviet Union with potent propaganda ammunition.

Dulles Indifferent to Indignities Heaped Upon American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Syrian Consulate at New York, when asked to visa a passport of a United States citizen of Jewish faith, will brazenly state, "I am very sorry, but we have instructions not to grant visas to members of the Hebrew faith."

The Lebanese Consulate is more polite, but just as firm in its refusal.

The Iraq Consulate will say that the Arab League Constitution forbids a visa to any Jew, and Iraq is a member of the League.

Submissively, our passport division of the Dulles State Department warns that American Jews will be denied the right to visit Arabian countries. The American Export Lines warns that not only American citizens of Jewish faith, but anyone with a Jewish name—Jew or gentile—will be excluded from their cruises that touch Arab ports.

Airlines warn that American Jewish passengers will not be allowed to disembark at Beirut and other Arab ports of entry.

Even United States Government civilians and military personnel must suffer indignities and violations of their rights as citizens.

Mr. Dulles accepts with complacency the refusal of Saudi Arabia to allow religious services by Christians and non-Moslems at the Dhahran base. Chaplains cannot display crosses except during services at the base.

Dulles offers lame excuses when complaints are voiced against such assaults upon our citizen rights.

Dulles, with the undoubted approval of the President, on February 24, last, testified before a Senate Committee on Saudi Arabian aid. He was asked whether the terms of our Mutual Security Agreement with Saudi Arabia actually disqualified Jewish servicemen from being stationed at the Dhahran base, replied:

> It may be.

Thus he accepts without remonstrance the right of a foreign state—this time Saudi Arabia—to pass upon the religious qualifications of our American citizens abroad.

A New York company advertises for welders to work in foreign parts. Those applying were told that Jewish welders would be barred. This proscription violated New York State law. The company excused its conduct by pointing to prohibitions contained in its contract with the Arabian Government.

Army contractors engaged in defense projects—the cost of which is paid by all of us—Jews and gentiles alike—has encouraged this ostracism of American Jews. Maj. Gen. G. J. Nold, Deputy Chief of Engineers, stated that Army contractors were warned not to recruit workers for Arab military bases in New York City because many of the applicants were likely to be Jews. He suggests that the Midwest would be a better recruiting point.

Such bland approval of discrimination permeates the Departments of Government having jurisdiction, and Mr. Dulles does not protest.

American firms are boycotted by Arab Governments where they have had any relation with Israeli firms.

We ask Mr. Dulles: "What do you intend to do about these deprivations of the rights of our citizens?"

Is it not time for the great United States to assert itself?

Shall we spinelessly continue to permit our rights to be trampled upon?

Our weakness only begets more flagrant and defiant Arabian truculence.

Even a Secretary of State must at times act with courage—even at the expense of the black gold, called oil.

Russia cannot be offered as an excuse. Through past mistakes Russia is already in the Middle East—knee-deep. Cut off Saudi Arabian aid and diplomatic relations would neither help nor hurt Russia.

But at least our honor as a nation would be served. We would not obsequiously accept insults from an oil-soaked potentate.

More astonishing was the attitude of President Eisenhower. He was questioned at a recent press conference whether we were making any effort to persuade Saudi Arabia to abandon its policy of barring American Jews from military service with American Armed Forces in that country. He astounded his audience by saying he had not heard of the matter, but nevertheless he offered the excuse that a sovereign state has "the right to determine if an American is persona non grata and cannot enter." What a humiliating concession to King Saud. Our President apparently sanctions discrimination against our citizenry on a religious basis. Shades of past Presidents. Washington proclaimed that our Government would "give to bigotry no sanction." Presidents Wilson, Taft, Cleveland, Teddy Roosevelt, demonstrated that the principle of religious liberty was applicable in our foreign relations as well as in our domestic affairs.

Let us have a policy based not on weakness but on strength.

In a comparable situation President Wilson argued that the price—of yielding—was too great. He said that "America is not a mere body of traders; it is a body of freedom" and that the greatness of America "is moral not material" and that we must "square our politics with our principles."

Dulles should do no less.

John W. Foster, grandfather of the present Secretary of State, when American Minister to St. Petersburg, made this point unmistakably clear in writing to the acting Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs:

> The Secretary of State instructs me to state to Your Excellency that in the presence of the fact that an American citizen has been ordered to leave Russia on no other ground than that he is the professor of a particular creed or the holder of certain religious views, it becomes the duty of the Government of the United States, which impartially seeks to protect all of its citizens of whatever origin or faith * * * to protest * * * insofar as the regulations for the expulsion of foreign Jews from Russia affects American citizens, it is an unjust reflection upon American Jews as a class and a discrimination which cannot be acquiesced in by my Government.

I suggest Mr. Dulles take a leaf out of his grandpa's book.

It is not difficult to find precedent in American history which upheld the principle of opposition against discrimination based on race or creed. In 1879, when Czarist Russia would not honor passports of Americans of Jewish faith, the House of Representatives passed a resolution, declaring:

> Rights of citizens of the United States should not be impaired, at home or abroad, because of religious beliefs; and that if the existing treaties between the United States and Russia be found, as is alleged, to discriminate in this or in any other particular, as to any classes of our citizens, the President be requested to take immediate action to have the treaty so amended as to remove the grievance.

In 1885, Secretary of State Thomas F. Bayard declared that the United States was entitled to "ask and expect that no race or class distinction shall be made as regards American citizens abroad." And in 1911, when Russia continued its discrimination against American Jews, the then Secretary of State, Philander Knox, let it be known that the United States was abrogating the 1832 treaty between the two countries.

Abandonment of principles wins no friends. Self-respect is lost and the respect of other nations for the United States is diminished. No man and no nation can afford to be tagged as a "paper moralist." The refusal of the United States Department of State to assert itself in behalf of the rights of American citizens puts us in the position of beggars and we are only embracing the shabby concept that the end justifies the means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 13, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, June 11, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God, of all grace and glory, in these vernal days, thrilling and throbbing with the loveliness of June, we thank Thee for every sacrament of beauty of which our enraptured senses drink as we bend in wonder to the petaled cups held up by bushes aflame with Thee. May the glory of the earth be but a parable of the things that are excellent blooming in our risen lives. As in these days of destiny, as we mass our might against the insidious assault of ruthless forces from without—foes that have not Thee in awe—give us to see that to be saved from the plots of savage enemies without will be futile unless Thou dost save us from ourselves. We confess our indifference and hardness of heart, our vanity of soul and pettiness of mind which refuse to put first Thy Kingdom and Thy righteousness. May our personal devotion to the things that matter most be a contribution to the coming of Thy new day when in a better order of human society, pity and laughter shall return to the common ways of man and peace—even Thy peace—breathe its benediction upon our war-weary world. We pray in Thy holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 11, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 872. An act for the relief of Sam Bergesen;

S. 910. An act for the relief of Lino Perez Martinez;

S. 1067. An act for the relief of Tibor Horvath; and

S. 1221. An act for the relief of the estate of Joseph Kelsch.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1739) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix rates of compensation of members of certain examining and licensing boards and commissions, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2984) for the relief of Col. John A. O'Keefe, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1840. An act to reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discriminations; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields;

H. R. 4037. An act for the relief of Truck and Axle Manufacturing Co.;

H. R. 4993. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to business property situated in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5041. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Dows Thyberg;

H. R. 5868. An act for the relief of the estate of Gertrude I. Keep;

H. R. 7400. An act for the relief of Ernest C. St. Onge;

H. R. 7515. An act for the relief of James E. Driscoll;

H. R. 7868. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands located at Weliweli, island of Kauai, to certain claimants;

H. R. 7890. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands located at Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, to certain persons;

H. R. 8005. An act to provide for the conveyance to the Mathew American Horse American Legion Post, No. 259, Cannon Ball, N. Dak., of certain lands upon the Standing Rock Reservation, N. Dak., for use as a site for the erection of a memorial monument in honor of members of the Armed Forces killed in battle;

H. R. 8149. An act to amend the first sentence of paragraph (a) of section 756 of title 11 of the District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition (par. (a) of sec. 5 of the act of April 1, 1942, ch. 207, 56 Stat. 193), relating to the transfer of actions from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 8452. An act to authorize and direct the conveyance of certain tracts of land in the State of Mississippi to Richard C. French, Lewis M. French, and Ruth French Hersey;

H. R. 9952. An act to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty;

H. R. 10010. An act for the relief of Roy Click;

H. R. 10011. An act for the relief of Jess Gary;

H. R. 10199. An act for the relief of A. O. Nissen and Don Nissen;

H. R. 10670. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act so as to extend the coverage of such act to employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia employed in District of Columbia institutions located in Maryland and Virginia;

H. R. 11320. An act to effect the control of narcotics, barbiturates, and dangerous drugs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11487. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937, as amended;

H. R. 11488. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended;

H. R. 11489. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Institute of Architects in the District of Columbia;

H. J. Res. 615. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 616. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 617. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 618. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 620. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 621. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 626. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 627. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2967. An act to amend the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and for other purposes;

H. R. 692. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for peace";

H. R. 1402. An act for the relief of Santiago Gonzales Trigo;

H. R. 1484. An act for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ann Elizabeth Doherty;

H. R. 2045. An act for the relief of Joe Bargas;

H. R. 3744. An act to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to substitute employees in the postal field service;

H. R. 4873. An act for the relief o. Lt. Comdr. Mortimer T. Clement, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired;

H. R. 5079. An act for the relief of Tom Wong (Foo Tai Nam);

H. R. 7702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Shenekji;

H. R. 7913. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to effect the exchange of properties between the United States and the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo.;

H. R. 8709. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended;

H. R. 9475. An act to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 9838. An act to authorize transfer of officers of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve to the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10721. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 565. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 581. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 590. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 607. Joint resolution to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 1840. An act to reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discriminations; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Antiprice Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discrimination is to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields;

H. R. 4037. An act for the relief of Truck and Axle Manufacturing Co.;

H. R. 5041. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Dows Thyberg;

H. R. 5868. An act for the relief of the estate of Gertrude I. Keep;

H. R. 7400. An act for the relief of Ernest C. St. Onge;

H. R. 7515. An act for the relief of James E. Driscoll;

H. R. 10010. An act for the relief of Roy Click;

H. R. 10011. An act for the relief of Jess Gary;

H. R. 10199. An act for the relief of A. O. Nissen and Don Nissen;

H. J. Res. 615. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 616. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 617. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 618. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 620. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 621. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigraiton and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 626. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 627. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4993. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to business property situated in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 8149. An act to amend the first sentence of paragraph (a) of section 756 of title 11 of the District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition (par. (a) of sec. 5 of the act of April 1, 1942, ch. 207, 56 Stat. 193), relating to the transfer of actions from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 10670. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act so as to extend the coverage of such act to employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia employed in District of Columbia institutions located in Maryland and Virginia;

H. R. 11320. An act to effect the control of narcotics, barbiturates, and dangerous drugs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11487. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937, as amended;

H. R. 11488. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended; and

H. R. 11489. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Institute of Architects in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 7888. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands located at Weliweli, island of Kauai, to certain claimants;

H. R. 7890. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands located at Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, to certain persons;

H. R. 8005. An act to provide for the conveyance to the Mathew American Horse American Legion Post, No. 259, Cannon Ball, N. Dak., of certain lands upon the Standing Rock Reservation, N. Dak., for use as a site for the erection of a memorial monument in honor of members of the Armed Forces killed in battle; and

H. R. 8452. An act to authorize and direct the conveyance of certain tracts of land in the State of Mississippi to Richard C. French, Lewis M. French, and Ruth French Hersey; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 9952. An act to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] be granted leave of the Senate beginning today and through Monday next, for the purpose of enabling him to attend the wedding of his daughter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is so granted.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LEHMAN was excused from attendance on today's session of the Senater after 12:15 p. m.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees were authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today:

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary;

The Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary; and

The Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Committee on Armed Services.

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and take action on the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT, 1956—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate, Executive I, 84th Congress, 2d session, the International Wheat Agreement, 1956, in the English, French, and Spanish languages, which was formulated at the United Nations Wheat Conference which concluded on April 25, 1956, and open for signature in Washington until and including May 18, 1956. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the agreement, and the agreement, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, if the Senate approve thereof, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the International Wheat Agreement, 1956, in the English, French, and Spanish languages, which was formulated at the United Nations Wheat Conference which concluded on April 25, 1956, and open for signature in Washington until and including May 18, 1956. It was signed on behalf of the Government of the United States of America and the governments of 39 other countries.

The purposes and provisions of the agreement are set forth in greater detail in the enclosed report of the Secretary of State and in the summary enclosed therewith.

Attention is invited particularly to the final paragraph of the report of the Secretary of State. It is my hope that the Senate will find it possible to give early consideration to the agreement so that, if the agreement be approved, ratification by the United States can be effected and an instrument of acceptance deposited by July 16.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 12, 1956.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State, with enclosed summary of principal provisions. 2. International Wheat Agreement, 1956.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Edward Page, Jr., and sundry other persons for appointment and promotion in the foreign and diplomatic service.

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Robert W. Knox, to be Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with the rank of rear admiral;

Arthur Kline, of Wyoming, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission, vice Claude L. Draper; and

Donald L. Campbell, and sundry other persons, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frederick O. Mercer, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frederick Van Pelt Bryan, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to the usual 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FEDERAL PROPERTY TO GOVERNMENT OF AMERICAN SAMOA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize and direct the transfer of certain Federal property to the government of American Samoa (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MCMILLAN DELTA PROJECT, PECOS RIVER BASIN, N. MEX.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and findings on the McMillan Delta Project, Pecos River Basin, New Mexico (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON AWARD OF THE YOUNG AMERICAN MEDAL FOR BRAVERY

A letter from the Attorney General, reporting, pursuant to law, that for the calendar year 1954, the Young American Medal for Bravery was awarded to Miss Patricia Ann Strickland, of Atlanta, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESCISSIONS OF ADJUSTMENTS OF STATUS OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered in cases relative to the rescissions of adjustments of status granted certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Victor Wen-Hwa Chu from a report transmitted to the Senate on May 18, 1955, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

J. A. ZACHARIASSEN & CO. *v.* UNITED STATES

A letter from the Clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 34, 82d Congress, 1st session, the opinion of that Court in the case of *J. A. Zachariassen & Co.* v. *The United States* (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ESTABLISHMENT OF STATE COMMITTEES ON EDUCATION BEYOND THE HIGH SCHOOL

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to encourage and assist the States in the establistment of State Committees on Education Beyond the High School (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petitions of Mr. and Mrs. John Fischer, and Mr. and Mrs. Fletcher C. Rice, of Lexington, Ill., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 923) to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Central Region, North American Gasoline Tax Conference, at its annual meeting, Delavan, Wis., relating to the tax on nonhighway use of gasoline; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, New York, N. Y., relating to civil rights, and so forth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, relating to employment policies and practices of the field postal service.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PROTESTING EMPLOYMENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES OF THE FIELD POSTAL SERVICE ADOPTED BY THE SPECIAL CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 14, 1956

Whereas the present policies of the Post Office Department involve the elimination of seniority as a major factor in promotions; and

Whereas the installation of the works performance standards program has resulted in the establishment of a vicious speed-up system which places men in competition with each other in an effort to reach impossible goals; and

Whereas other working conditions with particular reference to hours and tours of duty, assignments, compensatory time and substitute employment to name only a few are steadily deteriorating; and

Whereas interpretations of Public Law 68, 84th Congress, by the Post Office Department are designed to circumvent and nullify the provisions of section 606 (b) of that act by authorizing or purporting to authorize the employment of substitutes for less than 2 hours on a voluntary basis is direct violation of law; and

Whereas the interpretation by the Post Office Department of section 403 (1) deprives employees of their legal rights to promotions on specified dates, contrary to the stated language of the act; and

Whereas regional and district officers are issuing orders and directives, and post office inspectors are frequently instrumental in the promulgation of such orders and directives with respect to seniority, annual leave, filling of vacancies and increases in complement which are directly contrary to what we have been assured is the policy of the Post Office Department; and

Whereas employees who have the misfortune to be taken ill are discouraged and coerced in an attempt to prevent them using the sick leave provided by law when their physical condition makes it necessary for them to remain away from work, and by means of investigations covering sick leave used in prior years, employees are further intimidated from the use of sick leave when and where necessary; and

Whereas as a result of these developments and others too numerous to mention there is a steady and noticeable decline in morale among employees; and

Whereas these conditions have all been brought about by unilateral actions on the part of the Post Office Department without previous consultation with employee representatives on either a local or national scale; and

Whereas employees are restrained, under part 743.222 of the Postal Manual, from advising with each other—by means of bulletin boards located in locker and swing rooms not accessible to the public—concerning matters which may be held to be controversial by a postmaster who is, in many cases, directly and solely responsible for whatever controversy exists; and

Whereas by means of recent changes in the Postal Manual, part 744.442, a studied and calculated attempt has been made to silence and "gag" employees of the field postal service to prevent them from expressing their dissatisfaction with existing conditions; and

Whereas this action is in direct violation of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, better known as the Lloyd-LaFollette anti-gag law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, in special conference assembled, at Washington, D. C., May 14, 1956, does hereby condemn these actions of the Post Office Department as oppressive, unwise, and illegal and destructive of a sound modern personnel-management relationship, and calls upon the 84th Congress and each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives thereof to support an immediate congressional investigation of the aforementioned conditions, and to enact legislation which will absolutely require the heads of each department and agency of our Federal Government to cease and desist from practices which in the case of an employer under the National Labor Relations Act would be branded as unfair labor practices, and be it further

Resolved, That we endorse the Rhodes-Johnston bills H. R. 10237 and S. 3593 for this purpose and urge each Member of Congress who believes in human dignity and fair play to support this legislation and work for its enactment at the current session of the 84th Congress.

LEO E. GEORGE,
President.
E. C. HALLBECK,
Legislative Director.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment:

S. 3132. A bill to provide for purchase of lands within the Cache National Forest, Utah, to promote prevention of floods and minimization of soil erosion, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2207).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 3180. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of two United States commissioners for Cumberland Gap National Historical Park (Rept. No. 2208).

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2691. A bill for the relief of Cale P. Haun and Julia Fay Haun (Rept. No. 2209);

S. 2804. A bill for the relief of Dr. Shan Yah Gin (Rept. No. 2218);

S. 2839. A bill for the relief of Rosetta Ittner (Rept. No. 2219);

S. 3232. A bill for the relief of Josef Kranz (Rept. No. 2220);

S. 3292. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria (Schandl) Cote (Rept. No. 2221);

S. 3380. A bill for the relief of Zygmunt Sobota (Rept. No. 2222);

S. 3522. A bill for the relief of Theresia Schneider (Rept. No. 2223);

S. 3945. A bill for the relief of Walter C. Jordan and Elton W. Johnson (Rept. No. 2210);

H. R. 1410. A bill for the relief of Giovanna Scano (Rept. No. 2224);

H. R. 2709. A bill for the relief of the estate of Rene Weil (Rept. No. 2211);

H. R. 7373. A bill for the relief of Eugene G. Aretz (Rept. No. 2213); and

H. R. 8041. A bill for the relief of Clyde R. Stevens (Rept. No. 2214).

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1798. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Charles C. Phillips (Rept. No. 2217).

H. R. 3373. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zella K. Thissell (Rept. No. 2212);

H. R. 6888. A bill to amend the act of September 3, 1954 (Rept. No. 2226); and

H. J. Res. 592. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2225).

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 3150. A bill for the relief of Sgt. and Mrs. Herbert G. Herman (Rept. No. 2215);

H. R. 906. A bill for the relief of William Martin, of Tok Junction, Alaska (Rept. No. 2216); and

H. J. Res. 605. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2227).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 4035. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Foreign Aid Programs; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KNOWLAND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 4036. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theodore (Nicole Xantho) Rousseau; and

S. 4037. A bill for the relief of Aron Schatten (Soten); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 4038. A bill to change the designation of the Petrified Forest National Monument, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. ERVIN):

S. 4039. A bill to encourage the discovery, development and production of manganese bearing-ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 4040. A bill for the relief of John Dracos (Ioannis Dracos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 4041. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Pea Ridge National Military Park, in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. JENNER):

S. 4042. A bill for the relief of Jackson School Township, Ind.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 4043. A bill for the relief of Agapito Jorolan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 4044. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, Inc., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 4045. A bill creating the city of St. Francisville Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill., and Knox County, Ind., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 4046. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, so as to provide for allowance of certain claims by successor organizations to heirless or unclaimed property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 4047. A bill to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 4048. A bill relating to intercorporate relations between the General Public Utilities Corp., a corporation organized and operating in the United States, and the Manila Electric Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 4049. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Boss Hogan of Curry County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 4050. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 26, 1950, to clarify the intention of the Congress with respect to its application to nonsensitive positions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 4051. A bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 26, 1950, to reaffirm the discretion conferred thereby upon the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARTHY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 4052. A bill to permit the United States to be named a party defendant in certain suits to quiet title if the United States is a necessary party thereto by reason of its right, title, or interest in or to real property acquired from the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 4053. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of,

disability pension awards; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHAVEZ when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 4054. A bill to authorize the further extension of certain noncompetitive oil or gas leases issued under the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Arthur H. Compton as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps to be known as the National Liberation Stamp; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PROPOSED JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 82), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the purpose of this concurrent resolution to insure the soundness and maximum effectiveness of any foreign-aid program in which the United States may hereafter be engaged by providing, on the basis of a detailed study and evaluation of the policies and operations of our foreign-aid programs in the past and present, a means for—

(1) Clarifying the objectives which should be attained by any foreign-aid program of the United States and the considerations which should govern the selection of methods and policies for attaining those objectives;

(2) Determining specific organizational standards, procedures, and practices to promote improved administration of any such program at the operational level; and

(3) Developing a policy on foreign aid which will most effectively secure the implementation of such objectives while maintaining maximum economy and efficiency in all parts of the program at all levels of operation.

SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purpose of this concurrent resolution there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Foreign Aid (referred to in this concurrent resolution as the "committee"), to be composed of 6 Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate (not more than 3 of whom shall be appointed from the same political party) and 6 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives (not more than 3 of whom shall be appointed from the same political party).

(b) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(c) The committee may appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the committee to conduct a thorough fact-finding study and investigation of the operation of the foreign-aid programs of the United States in the past and present, in order to provide a body of information on the basis of which an intelligent evaluation of such programs can be made, giving particular attention to the accomplishments and failures of such programs, the actual cost of such programs, the specific purposes for which such costs were incurred, and the relation of such costs to the benefits resulting to (and other effects upon) both the United States and the countries receiving aid under such programs. Such study and investigation shall cover all matters involved in the furnishing of foreign aid (including the furnishing of military assistance, defense support, direct forces support, economic aid, technical cooperation, and other forms of assistance to foreign countries), and shall specifically include—

(1) field checks upon planning and programing and the procurement, delivery, and end use of economic aid commodities, with the cases selected for study being sufficiently numerous and widely spread over different program sectors in various countries to provide information from which fair and useful conclusions can be drawn regarding both policy and operations;

(2) a detailed inquiry into the use of military assistance funds, including planning, programing, obligational procedures, procurement methods both in the United States and overseas, accounting systems, and the use of military funds to achieve economic purposes;

(a) a thorough investigation, both in the United States and overseas of the relationships between the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the International Cooperation Administration at policy and operational levels;

(4) a study of the International Cooperation Administration staffing pattern, including all factors involved in the recruitment and assignment of personnel;

(5) an investigation as to the theoretical and actual responsibilities and procedures for formulation of foreign aid policy and the implementation and enforcement thereof at operational levels, both in the agencies above named and in the other Federal agencies participating in foreign-aid programs; also an investigation with respect to overlapping and duplication of functions, the efficiency, effectiveness, and economy with which programs are participated in, and the appropriateness of the distribution of such activities among the respective agencies.

(6) an investigation respecting overlapping and duplication as between foreign aid administered by Federal agencies and foreign-aid programs in which the United States participates, conducted by international agencies (both affiliated with and independent of the United Nations) and respecting the theoretical and actual responsibility for procedures and policies followed by such international agencies, their practical operation, and the advantages and disadvantages inuring to the United States through participation therein;

(7) an investigation as to policies followed in determining whether foreign aid shall be made a country by way of loan or grant, steps taken for insuring the repayment of loans, and the policies and safeguards with respect to the custody, management, and disposition of counterpart funds;

(8) an investigation of the policies and procedures in granting or denying aid to countries with respect to large and small industrial projects, with respect to increasing food supplies, and with respect to the provision of technical assistance;

(9) an investigation of the extent, if any, to which foreign aid is extended for projects or undertakings where private investment capital is available, and the extent to which aid is made contingent upon bona fide effort of the recipient country being made to improve inducements for investment by its domestic capital and foreign capital;

(10) an analysis of the manner in which appropriation requests are originated, justified, and approved by the Bureau of the Budget and submitted to the Congress in the form of illustrative country programs; and

(11) an examination of the methods employed to convert appropriations into country allocations and ultimately into approved programs and projects.

(b) The committee shall, on the basis of the information developed by its staff under subsection (a), evaluate the foreign aid programs of the United States and determine what changes therein are necessary in its opinion to accomplish the purpose of this concurrent resolution.

(c) The committee shall report to the Senate (or to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session) and to the House of Representatives (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Upon submission of such report the committee shall cease to exist.

SEC. 4. In carrying out its duties under this concurrent resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee or member thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places within or outside the continental United States, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the committee or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, against any individual subject to the laws of the United States, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were submitted and referred, as indicated:

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. KERR):

S. Res. 281. Resolution relative to the conservation and development of land and water resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and Public Works, jointly.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. Res. 282. Resolution to amend Rule XXXVII with respect to procedure on treaties which operate to modify or supersede acts of Congress; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRICKER when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

COMMISSION ON FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the establishment of a Commission on Foreign Aid Programs. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4035) for the establishment of a Commission on Foreign Aid Programs, introduced by Mr. KNOWLAND, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Re-

lations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Foreign Aid Evaluation Act of 1956."

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this act to insure the soundness and maximum effectiveness of any foreign aid program in which the United States may hereafter be engaged by providing, on the basis of a detailed study and evaluation of the policies and operation of our present and past foreign aid programs, a means for—

(1) clarifying the objectives of any foreign aid program of the United States, and the considerations which should govern the selection of methods and policies to attain those objectives;

(2) determining specific organizational standards, procedures, and practices to promote improved administration of any such program at the operational level; and

(3) developing a policy on foreign aid which will most effectively secure the implementation of such objectives while maintaining maximum economy and efficiency in all parts of the program at all levels of operation.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

SEC. 3. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the purpose set forth in section 2 of this act, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Foreign Aid Programs (referred to hereinafter as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) Number and appointment: The Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, 2 from the executive branch of the Government and 2 from private life;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, 2 from the Senate and 2 from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 from the House of Representatives and 2 from private life.

(b) Vacancies: Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. The Chairman of the Commission shall be designated by the President. The Commission shall elect a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 6. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) Members of Congress: Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members from the executive branch: The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members from private life: The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) Investigation: The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the operation of the present and past foreign aid programs of the United States, in order to provide complete information on the basis of which such programs can be evaluated, giving particular attention to the accomplishments and failures of such programs, the actual cost of such programs, the specific purposes for which such costs were incurred, and the relation of such costs to the effects of such expenditures upon the United States and upon the countries receiving aid under such programs. Such study and investigation shall cover all matters involved in the furnishing of foreign aid (including the furnishing of military assistance, defense support, direct forces support, economic aid, technical cooperation, and other forms of assistance to foreign countries), and shall specifically include—

(1) field checks upon planning and programing, and the procurement, delivery, and end use of economic aid commodities, through the making of case studies, the cases selected for study being sufficiently numerous and widely spread over different program sectors in various countries to provide information from which fair and useful conclusions can be drawn regarding both policy and operations;

(2) a detailed inquiry into the use of military assistance funds, including planning, programing, obligational procedures, procurement methods both in the United States and overseas, accounting systems, and the use of military funds to achieve economic purposes;

(3) a thorough investigation, both in the United States and overseas, of the actual relationships existing between the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the International Cooperation Administration at policy and operational levels;

(4) a study of the International Cooperation Administration staffing pattern, including all factors involved in the recruitment and assignment of personnel;

(5) an analysis of the manner in which appropriation requests are originated, justified, and approved by the Bureau of the Budget and submitted to the Congress in the form of illustrative country programs; and

(6) an examination of the methods employed to convert appropriations into country allocations and ultimately into approved programs and projects.

(b) Evaluation: On the basis of the information so obtained, the Commission shall evaluate the foreign-aid programs of the United States and determine what changes therein are necessary in its opinion to improve their effectiveness and efficiency.

(c) Reports: The Commission shall submit to the President and to the Congress (1) interim reports at such time or times as the Commission deems necessary, (2) a comprehensive report of its activities and the results of its studies on or before ----------, and (3) its final report not later than ----------, at which date the Commission shall cease to exist. The final report of the Commission may propose such legislative enactments and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 11. (a) Hearings and sessions: The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (2 U. S. C. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) Obtaining official data: The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

SUMMARY SUSPENSION OF EMPLOYMENT OF CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 26, 1950, to reaffirm the discretion conferred thereby upon the President.

In connection with the bill, I ask unanimous consent that a release of the national public relations division, the American Legion, Indianapolis, Ind., relating to a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania against Steve Nelson may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately

referred; and, without objection, the release will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4052) to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 26, 1950, to reaffirm the discretion conferred thereby upon the President, introduced by Mr. MCCARTHY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The release, presented by Mr. MCCARTHY, is as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.—The American Legion has gone on record urging the United States Congress "to preserve the powers" of the States and Territories to make and enforce antisubversive laws in their respective areas.

The action, taken by the national executive committee here May 2–4, was a consequence of the recent Nelson decision of the United States Supreme Court which is believed to jeopardize the validity of countersubversion measures on the statute books of 42 States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

The resolution, submitted by the National Americanism Commission and unanimously approved by the NEC, points out:

"This great number of State laws relating to sedition and subversive activities is evidence of the grave concern of the States and of the need for such State legislation for the preservation of law and order within their respective borders."

On April 2, 1956, the Supreme Court handed down a decision in the case of the *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* v. *Steve Nelson*, holding that the Smith Act of 1940, as amended, superseded the Pennsylvania Sedition Act and preempted the field of legislation involving advocacy of the overthrow of the Government by force and violence.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, by majority opinion of 6 to 3, rendered a decision on April 2, 1956, in the case of *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* v. *Steve Nelson*, holding that the Smith Act of 1940, as amended in 1948, superseded the Pennsylvania Sedition Act and preempted the field of legislation prohibiting the knowing advocacy of the overthrow of the Government of the United States and any political subdivision thereof by force and violence; and

"Whereas, 42 States, together with the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, now have laws penalizing the advocacy of violent overthrow of the Federal, State, or Territorial Governments, and the validity of these laws is now questionable because of the broad rule laid down by the aforesaid Nelson decision; and

"Whereas this great number of State laws relating to sedition and subversive activities is evidence of the grave concern of the States of the need for such State legislation for the preservation of law and order within their respective borders: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the national executive committee of the American Legion, meeting in Indianapolis, Ind., May 2, 3, 4, 1956, That the National Legislative Commission be and it is hereby directed to prepare appropriate legislation and obtain the passage thereof by the United States Congress, to preserve the powers of the several States and Territories and the sovereignty of the States of the United States to enact and enforce legislation penalizing sedition and subversive activities within the boundaries of such Territories and sovereign States."

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS REGULATION NO. 1 (A), RELATING TO DISABILITY PENSION AWARDS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to liberalize and increase the disability awards for veterans of World War I. This bill is identical with H. R. 7886, as amended, which was reported favorably from the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Previously, I introduced Senate bill 3436, which pertains to the same subject, and which was referred to the Senate Committee on Finance. I hope this bill will supersede Senate bill 3436, and that the Committee on Finance will table Senate 3436 and consider this measure.

Because of the interest in this measure, which is endorsed by the American Legion, I am asking that the bill lie on the desk until Friday in order that Senators who may wish to join me in sponsoring the bill may have the opportunity to add their names.

I am sure the Senate is aware that the veterans of World War I are now over 60 years of age average, and that if the Congress ever intends to adopt any program in their hour of need, now is the time to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Mexico.

The bill (S. 4053) to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF LAND AND WATER RESOURCES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am about to submit a resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Montana may proceed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, a Senate resolution dealing with vital matters concerning the relationship of the executive departments with the Senate of the United States.

Joining me in the sponsorship of the resolution are three distinguished Members of the Senate: the chairman of the Committee on Public Works [Mr. CHAVEZ]; the chairman of the Subcommitte on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. ANDERSON]; and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works [Mr. KERR].

The subject matter of the resolution relates to fundamental subjects which are the responsibility of two committees. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be referred for consideration to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I have the honor to be chairman, and to the Committee on Public Works, the chairman of which is agreeable to this procedure.

I shall request the cooperation of the chairman of the Public Works Committee in holding joint hearings on the resolution at the earliest convenient date, possibly within the next 10 days. In the meantime, the comments of the executive agencies concerned and the Bureau of the Budget will be requested, and spokesmen for these agencies will be invited to testify. It is our hope to conclude the hearings speedily, so that appropriate consideration may be given the resolution promptly.

The resolution is comparatively brief. The preamble recites cogent reasons for its submission and consideration by the Senate.

Briefly, these reasons are based in part on the promulgation by the Bureau of the Budget, late in 1952, of Budget Circular No. A–47, prescribing standards, procedures, and policies for the evaluation of proposed Federal projects for land and water resources development. It also calls attention to revision of Circular No. A–47, which would impose further restrictions on Federal participation in land and water resources development.

The resolution would declare the sense of the Senate to be that water-resource development continues to be a responsibility of the Federal Government. It warns against nullification of this long-established policy by executive agencies, and asserts that such action constitutes a usurpation of the legislative function. Comprehensive planning of land and water resources is stated to be vital.

Of particular concern to all Members of the Congress is the "layering" process in the executive agencies. The number of agencies dealing with water resources should be reduced, rather than increased, as proposed by the President's Committee, so that the administrative procedure of review could be simplified and shortened.

Section 4 calls for the submission to the Congress of project reports that conform to criteria presented by congressional committees having jurisdiction over the subject matter. It seeks to assure to the Congress a full disclosure of all essential facts, estimates, and views without limiting reports to preconceived views of executive agencies.

Section 5 declares that any departures from established policies, procedures, and standards by executive agencies shall be effected only after "full examination and consideration of the Congress."

In brief, we propose that the Senate shall go on record against government by fiat of the executive agencies, rather than by orderly congressional procedures.

The preamble also deals with the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, and mentions that the President asks that the Congress give prompt attention to its proposals. Pointed reference is also made to the failure of the executive branch of the Government to implement recommendations of the Water Policy Advisory group. This omission has come about, notwithstanding the President's statement that legislative pro-

posals would "be submitted to implement the recommendations."

I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of my remarks, the text of the resolution be printed in full, together with a statement which I have prepared, explaining in detail the reasons and the objectives of the proposal.

Attached to the statement is a copy of my memorandum dated April 4 to the members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This memorandum outlines a problem which has confronted our committee—as I am sure it has others—in connection with the attitude of some of the executive departments, at least on occasions, with respect to reports on bills for which official requests have been made. The immediate occasion for the memorandum was the cogent comments of two distinguished members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. BARRETT, of Wyoming, and Mr. GOLDWATER, of Arizona]. Their remarks are attached to the letter for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the joint reference of the resolution? The Chair hears none.

The resolution (S. Res. 281), submitted by Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. KERR), was received, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works, jointly, as follows:

Whereas the Bureau of the Budget, on December 31, 1952, issued Circular No. A–47, prescribing standards, procedures, and policies for the evaluation of proposed Federal projects for land and water resources conservation and development; and

Whereas the Bureau of the Budget, on November 29, 1954, proposed a revision of Circular No. A–47, the application of which would impose further restriction by the executive agencies on Federal participation in the conservation and development of land and water resources, and on which hearings were held by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs March 15 and March 30, 1955; and

Whereas, on January 17, 1956, the President of the United States transmitted to the Congress the Report (H. Doc. No. 315, 84th Cong., 2d sess.) of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, consisting of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture, designated by the President May 26, 1954, with a recommendation that "the Congress give prompt attention to its proposals"; and

Whereas it is stated, at page 84 of the Economic Report of the President, transmitted to the Congress January 24, 1956, that "in due course, legislative proposals will be submitted to implement the recommendations" of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, but no such proposals have yet been submitted to the Congress and instead it is indicated that the recommendations may be implemented by direct action of the executive agencies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the stabilization of the national economy and the effectuation of the wisest, most orderly, and most economic utilization of the land and water resources of the Nation for the widest possible public benefit require that the Federal Government continue to exercise all of its constitutional powers not only to encourage but to participate in the conservation and development of such resources for all purposes, and that the continued nullification by the executive agencies of this fundamental and long-established national policy would constitute a usurpation of the legislative power.

SEC. 2. That land and water resources development should be planned on comprehensive bases and with a view to such an ultimately integrated operation of component segments as will insure the realization of an optimum degree of physical and economic efficiency.

SEC. 3. That the number of Federal agencies, offices, and organizations having to do with the planning and review of projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources should be reduced, rather than increased, and that technical and administrative routing and review procedures should be simplified and shortened in order to facilitate and to accelerate the submittal of reports to the Congress in support of requests for the authorization of projects.

SEC. 4. That reports to the Congress in support of requests for the authorization of projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources should include evaluations made in accordance with criteria prescribed by the congressional committees having jurisdiction of the subject matter, and that they should fully disclose the details and results of all studies and analyses of all potential utilizations, costs, allocations, payout, and benefits, both direct and indirect, made by all interested operating agencies.

SEC. 5. That the preservation of the constitutional principle of separation of powers requires that any departure by the executive agencies from the observance and employment of the traditional policies, standards, procedures, and techniques reflected in and growing out of the settled administration of the large body of organic law governing the conservation and development of the land and water resources of the Nation be effected only after full examination and consideration by the Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the printing in the RECORD of the matters referred to?

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF SENATE RESOLUTION 281

The purpose of this Senate resolution is to correct a situation in which the executive agencies of the Government are progressively arrogating to themselves land and water resources development policymaking functions which properly reside with the Congress.

It is elementary that the National Government has a set of constitutional powers which provide the legal foundation for broad activity in this field. These derive from the commerce clause, the property clause, the treatymaking provisions, the war powers clauses, and the power to provide for the general welfare.

For more than a half century the Congress has repeatedly exercised these constitutional powers through the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of works and directing the conduct of activities in myriad fields of land and water resources conservation and development. These fields include the following:

1. River regulation.
2. Rivers and harbor and inland waterways.
3. Improvement of navigation.
4. Control of floods.
5. Conservation, storage, and replenishment of surface and underground water supplies, and their release and delivery for domestic, agricultural, municipal, and industrial purposes.
6. Generation, transmission, and marketing of hydroelectric power and energy.
7. Watershed management.
8. Soil conservation.
9. Salinity repulsion.
10. Stream pollution abatement.
11. Beach erosion control.
12. Conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources.
13. Protection of life and health.
14. Enjoyment of recreational benefits.

The Congress has regularly appropriated moneys for loans, grants, and direct expenditures for the foregoing purposes.

These many years have built up a large body of organic law, with an attendant growth of traditional standards, procedures, and techniques, all reflecting a fundamental and well-established national policy of Federal participation in the full utilization of all of our land and water resources.

More recently, however, a dangerous trend of encroachment by the executive agencies on the constitutional powers of the legislative branch of the Government has become apparent.

On December 31, 1952, the Bureau of the Budget issued Circular No. A–47, on the subject of "Reports and budget estimates relating to Federal programs and projects for conservation, development, or use of water and related land resources." It is generally recognized that many land and water resources projects which already are in varying stages of authorization, construction, and operation could not have been justified as economically feasible by the rigid, executively imposed standards of Circular No. A–47.

It is empirically demonstrable, nevertheless, that the potential contributions of these projects to the national wealth exceeds the initial Federal investment by many times.

On November 29, 1954, the Bureau of the Budget proposed a revision of Circular No. A–47. This revision, if adopted, would establish even more inflexible standards for Federal participation in the conservation and development of land and water resources.

Circular No. A–47 and the proposed revision were the subjects of hearings conducted by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs March 15 and 30, 1955. It was then indicated by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that formal issuance of a revision of the circular would await the recommendations of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, consisting of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture. This Committee had been designated by the President May 26, 1954, with an instruction to submit its recommendations "* * * not later than December 1, 1954."

The Committee's Report was not submitted however, until December 22, 1955, and it was transmitted to the Congress by the President January 17, 1956, with his recommendation that "* * * the Congress give prompt attention to its proposals." Shortly thereafter, on January 24, 1956, the President transmitted to the Congress his Economic Report, in which it was stated that "in due course, legislative proposals will be submitted to implement the recommendations" of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy. No such proposals have yet been submitted to the Congress, nor, on the other hand, has the proposed revision of Budget Circular No. A–47 been formally adopted.

However, there are indications that the executive agencies may undertake to put the recommendations of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy into actual operation by administrative fiat. The practical application of a number of them would have a most serious and damaging impact on the continued conservation and development of the land and

water resources of the Nation, by reason of the resultant curtailment of Federal participation in such activity.

Exemplary of the expressed executive attitude is a statement of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy in the submittal of its Report to the President. It is there stated that the recommendations are believed to "* * * avoid the undue intrusion of the Federal Government into this field." The Committee further has recommended that individual units within regional or river basin plans be set up as component segments or projects, stating that "to so separate general plans into their component projects offers much wider opportunity for participation of non-Federal agencies, and thus not only reduces Federal responsibility but leaves the door open for local initiative."

The Committee has recommended an extraordinary and highly layered scheme of organization for the planning and review of land and water resources projects. This would include (1) a number of regional or river basin water resources committees, composed of Federal and State representatives, which would "* * * coordinate resources planning and development activities" and recommend annual work schedules "* * * to be reflected in the budget requests of each cooperating agency," (2) a permanent Interagency Committee on Water Resources, composed of high-level officials of six Federal agencies, to "* * * have authority by unanimous action to determine finally interagency relationships," (3) an office of Coordinator of Water Resources, in the Executive Office of the President, which would "* * * cooperate with the Bureau of the Budget and the Council of Economic Advisers in the evaluation of departmental requests for appropriations, and assist in the reconciliation of water resources policy with other Federal policies," and (4) a Board of Review for Water Resources Projects, also in the Executive Office of the President, composed of three persons "* * * who have had no part in the original planning of the projects they would be asked to review and who would not be involved in the subsequent construction of such projects."

The functions of all of the foregoing would be in addition to and separate from the functions of the several operating agencies and the budgetary, fiscal policy review, and legislative clearance functions of the Bureau of the Budget. It is manifest that the repetitive review which these processes would entail could succeed in bringing Federal participation in land and water resources conservation and development to a complete standstill.

The Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy has failed to accord adequate recognition to the development of hydroelectric power potential as a national water resources problem. This is particularly true with respect to the essential financial significance of such development in the economic justification of multiple-purpose projects for the irrigation and reclamation of arid and semiarid lands in the 17 Western States.

The Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy has recommended that "no loans or guaranties should be made to cover costs of developing projects or portions thereof for power or municipal and industrial water, since, if these are economically sound, they may be readily financed otherwise."

With respect to the evaluation of projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources, the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy has recommended (1) that the separable cost-remaining benefits method of costs allocation be employed to the exclusion of other methods, (2) that benefit-cost ratios be calculated on the basis of primary benefits only, (3) that the evaluation period for estimating benefits and costs in no circumstances be greater than 50 years, and (4) that all Federal agencies conform to uniform standards of evaluation.

It is imperative that the Congress reaffirm and implement its constitutional responsibility for establishing national policies and prescribing standards in the field of land and water resources conservation and development. Legislative acquiescence in a contrary course of executive action would constitute an abdication of that responsibility. This resolution will make clear the sense of the Senate.

APRIL 4, 1956.

You will be interested in the attached excerpts from a colloquy between Senators GOLDWATER and BARRETT at a committee hearing on Monday, March 19, on S. 863 (and Senator BARRETT'S amendments thereto), a bill to govern the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water.

In reviewing the transcript of the hearing, I was impressed with Senator GOLDWATER'S views on two points, which I regard as of moment to bring to the direct attention of the members of the committee individually. When you have reviewed the comments of our two colleagues, particularly with respect to the trend that has been accentuated in the present administration with respect to the reports on pending legislation, I shall be glad to have your views as to appropriate action looking to correction of the situation emphasized by the two Senators.

Senator GOLDWATER'S comments, while particularly pointed to the reports on S. 863, are directed generally toward the trend in the executive departments. I am sure we all feel that this trend is not particularly new but that it is now being accentuated, as the Senator emphasizes. I quote the following paragraphs from the statement of the junior Senator from Arizona, which I feel are especially pertinent:

"I do not know why we in the legislative branch have to wait patiently and bend over backward and salaam toward the upper end of Pennsylvania Avenue waiting for these reports.

"I have read the Constitution a thousand times and I cannot find anything which says that when we are writing our legislation we have to wait for somebody up there to say 'Yes' or 'No.'

"Personally, I do not like the idea of such report having such a bearing on legislation. I think it is a complete infringement on the intent of the Constitution to have the Executive, through its various agencies, influencing legislation down here."

Other phases of Senator GOLDWATER'S statement relate to the merits of S. 863 and the proposed amendments, as well as to the ever greater need for the Western States to take action against the accelerated trend toward complete Federal control, especially with respect to water laws. The legislation before us well may be a step toward solving the water rights phase of the problem.

My purpose in bringing the observations of Senators GOLDWATER and BARRETT to the attention of each individual member of the committee is with a view to determining whether the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs should consider the adoption of a rule which would seek to remedy the situation that is stated so succinctly. I have noted, over the years, the growing tendency in the executive departments to attempt to dictate to the Congress. They hold over our heads the threats of veto by the President, although I doubt if any President is often consulted directly prior to the making of such threats except with respect to major pieces of legislation which carry out his announced program.

When you have considered this memorandum, together with the attached copy of Senator GOLDWATER'S observations and those of Senator BARRETT on this subject, I will appreciate your comments by April 20, on the following suggestion:

That the committee consider the adoption of a rule that would, among other things, seek expressions from the executive agencies only along these lines:

(a) Objective or factual reports to be submitted promptly as a matter of information;

(b) Specific authority or precedents are to be cited by the agencies in support of whatever conclusions they wish to state;

(c) Recommendations shall be couched in language that recognizes the legislative responsibility as separate from that of the executive; and

(d) Unless reports are furnished promptly, the committee will assume there is no objection on the part of the executive agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget;

(e) That when expressions such as "in accord" or "not in accord" with the President's program are used, there shall be specific references to the President's views rather than generalizations.

On receipt of your comments, I will call a special meeting of the committee to consider the subject. The date will probably be a day convenient to the majority of the committee.

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

EXCERPTS FROM A COLLOQUY BETWEEN SENATORS GOLDWATER AND BARRETT AT A COMMITTEE HEARING ON MONDAY, MARCH 19, ON S. 863 (AND SENATOR BARRETT'S AMENDMENTS THERETO), A BILL TO GOVERN THE CONTROL, APPROPRIATION, USE, AND DISTRIBUTION OF WATER

Senator GOLDWATER. Senator BARRETT, as you know, you and I discussed this situation last year when these court decisions came down and I agreed with you at that time concerning the necessity of legislation, and I do now more than ever.

I, myself, as a Republican, am deeply concerned and disturbed by the attitude of this administration as reflected in the several reports that we have before us where this administration heretofore has diverted most of its domestic efforts to getting the Federal Government out of the business of the several States, in conformity with the 10th amendment, it now seems bent on getting into the area that is most sacred and most important to the arid and semiarid States of the West.

They are, in effect, tampering with the way of life in the West that has existed since the West has existed; in fact, as was brought out this morning, the present recognition of water rights stems from the very founding of California and has been borne out through over 100 years of practice as accepted by the people of the West.

This attitude of the several agencies of the Government I think will seriously affect western land values inasmuch as water rights and land values are one and the same thing when one is figuring property and property values in our part of the country.

I think the very fact that these several agencies of Government have expressed themselves as being of a mind that the Federal Government should get into an area where the States have historically operated will probably throw a cloud over these values even as of now.

Now, one of these reports, the report of the Bureau of the Budget, I believe, they state on page 2, and I quote in part as follows:

"The fact remains that serious problems of Federal policy regarding the exercise of water rights, particularly in the arid and semiarid areas of the West, have existed for a long time and there are basic conflicts which must be resolved."

Now, Mr. Chairman, you and I, coming from the West, know that that is not true. I cannot recall in my memory where the Federal Government and the State of Arizona have come into any argument that has not been resolved amicably, and quickly, and usually in the direction that the Federal Government wanted it to be resolved in.

Senator BARRETT. If my colleague will yield to me, the next witness is going to be the State engineer of Wyoming, and I am sure that he will confirm the statement that I am about to make, which is that there never has been a conflict between the Federal Government and the State of Wyoming with reference to water rights that interfered with the Federal Government in any shape or form.

Senator GOLDWATER. I knew that the experience of the chairman was the same as mine and I think witness after witness from all the 17 Western States will bear us out.

Many people, particularly people in non-Indian States, express concern over the Indians' rights. That is an area that might be called Federal policy.

I would just like to put this for the record: that in every major decree that Arizona has ever had concerning its rivers, the Indians' rights are the first to have been spelled out.

That is true of the Colorado compact and in the Kent system, which comprises the Salt and the Verde and the Gila decrees that applied to the Gila, the Indians' rights were fully and adequately protected. So it is just not true what the various Federal agencies of the Government are saying.

I concur in what Senator MALONE has said; they have either done it through ignorance, and I would like to think that that is the case, or they have done it through malicious intent to interfere with our way of life and, as a Republican, I would resent that.

I appreciate the opportunity to make this statement and I also want to compliment you, Senator BARRETT, on the excellent statement you made covering the whole problem this morning.

Senator BARRETT. Thank you very much, Senator GOLDWATER. I may say, in defense of the administration, that several departments of the executive arm of the Government are in favor of this legislation; so I have been advised for quite some time.

It is true, as you point out, Senator GOLDWATER, that the Justice Department has raised some legal questions, some constitutional questions, in hearings over on the House side.

I may say that water lawyers who have had extensive experience in that particular field for a long period of years in the West have examined the record and are wholly in opposition to the position taken by the Justice Department.

I am hoping as a result of these hearings we can at least convince every reasonable man on this committee that they are wrong in their contentions and their position and that the rule, as laid down by the Congress for the past 90 years, is a sound one and that there is no good reason why we should not reaffirm or restate that at this time.

I want to congratulate you at this time, Senator Goldwater, on the splendid statement you made here this morning.

Senator GOLDWATER. If I may be permitted to go one step further, because this brings up something that has been extremely distasteful to me before I came to the Senate and particularly since I have been here, and that is the idea that the executive branch of the administration enter into the legislative branch's work by the submission of these reports.

I do not know why we in the legislative branch have to wait patiently and bend over backward and salaam toward the upper end of Pennsylvania Avenue waiting for these reports.

I have read the Constitution a thousand times and I cannot find anything which says that when we are writing our legislation we have to wait for somebody up there to say "Yes" or "No."

Personally, I do not like the idea of such reports having such a bearing on legislation. I think it is a complete infringement on the intent of the Constitution to have the executive, through its various agencies, influencing legislation down here.

Here is legislation that affects 17 Western States, some 138 million acres of land, which is more land than lies east of the Mississippi, and the millions and millions of people that live on it, and yet if we are to follow the accepted practice of Congress during the last 25 or 30 years, I would say that this legislation has a pretty bad start because several people, and I imagine most of them are from the Eastern States, have written these reports and written them in a way that will not be of benefit to the people that we represent.

I think it is incumbent upon us in this legislation, and in all legislation, to disregard whether it is favorable or unfavorable to those reports insofar as they influence legislation.

Senator BARRETT. I may say to my colleague that Senator KNOWLAND spoke to me just a few minutes ago and he wants an opportunity to appear before this committee. He feels just as strongly as you do that while the committee may feel under some compulsion to consider the reports that are brought up here by these departments of the Government, that, nevertheless, we in the Congress have the final responsibility and that it is going to be incumbent upon us to write legislation that we think is fair and equitable for the Western States and legislation that will at the same time protect the legitimate interests of the United States.

So far as I know, I think that is precisely what this committee is going to do and what the Senate will do, and I hope what the House will do.

When we get this legislation down there to the White House, then is when their responsibility starts and if they want to take the position contrary to the position taken by the Congress since 1866, that again is their responsibility.

Senator GOLDWATER. Yes.

Senator BARRETT. Thank you very much, Senator GOLDWATER.

Senator GOLDWATER. Thank you very much.

AMENDMENT OF RULE, RELATING TO PROCEDURE ON CERTAIN TREATIES

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, a resolution to amend the Senate rules relative to committee reports on certain self-executing treaties.

As Members of the Senate know, article VI, paragraph 2 of the Constitution of the United States permits some treaties to become the supreme law of the land without implementing legislation by the Congress. The text of the treaty-control amendment (S. J. Res. 1), which was reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee, does not make all treaties non-self-executing.

Accordingly, there is a need for some procedure whereby lawyers and other interested parties can be notified that acts of Congress may have been superseded or modified by treaty provisions. At the present time, a lawyer can study the United States Code with the utmost care and diligence and still be unaware that an apparently existing law has been abrogated or modified by a treaty subsequent in time. This is an intolerable situation. No law, whether in treaty or statutory form, can be truly just unless the people affected thereby have adequate notice of its existence.

In the final analysis, of course, the courts must determine whether or not a particular treaty is self-executing or non-self-executing. The resolution I have introduced does not deprive the courts of this power. My resolution merely provides that the committee report on a treaty shall state to what extent, if any, ratification of the treaty will operate to supersede or modify an act of Congress. If, in the judgment of the reporting committee, ratification of the treaty would abrogate or modify any Federal law, the resolution would require a copy of the Senate committee report to be forwarded to the law revision counsel of the House Committee on the Judiciary for use in annotating pertinent sections of the United States Code.

I am indebted to Mr. Donald C. Beelar of the District of Columbia bar for making the suggestion which has led to the introduction of the resolution. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks the text of the resolution and the thoughtful article by Mr. Beelar which appeared in the September 1955 issue of the American Bar Association Journal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD; and without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 282), submitted by Mr. BRICKER, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"4. When a treaty is reported from a committee recommending the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, the report of the committee shall state to what extent, if any, ratification thereof will operate to supersede or modify an act of Congress.

"5. When the Senate advises and consents to ratification of a treaty which, in the judgment of the reporting committee, will operate to supersede or modify an act of Congress, a copy of the Senate committee report shall be forwarded by the Secretary of the Senate to the Clerk of the House of Representatives for use by the Law Revision Counsel of the House Committee on the Judiciary in annotating pertinent sections of the United States Code."

The article, presented by Mr. BRICKER, is as follows:

TREATY-MADE LAW: A CASE IN POINT ON PROCEDURAL DEFICIENCIES

(By Donald C. Beelar, of the District of Columbia bar)

(Most lawyers would probably feel themselves well equipped to answer a simple question like, "Can an alien be licensed to pilot an aircraft in the United States?" Particularly so if they had a week or 10 days in which to do the necessary research in the applicable Federal statutes and regulations. Mr. Beelar's article shows that it is not so simple—not if the question is in an area of the law in which the provisions of some treaty may be relevant. Mr. Beelar declares that his point is well taken regardless of the final disposition of the Bricker amendment.)

"Laws are intended for all our people to live by; and the people go to law offices

to learn what their rights under these laws are."—Justice Jackson, title 341 United States Code, section 384, at page 396.

If you are an attorney who comes in contact with Federal law you doubtlessly rely on the United States Code. It is gratifying to learn that the 1952 edition is one-fifth "positive law" and the remaining four-fifths, now prima-facie evidence of the law, are in the process of codification and reenactment into positive law. Nothing less than "positive law" can give an attorney that feeling of confidence which is so essential in dealing with a subject covered by a Federal statute. But is this confidence well founded?

There is one glaring deficiency in the lawyer's facility to ascertain what is the law. Most everyone by now is familiar with the fact that provisions of a Federal statute can be indirectly repealed or modified by a subsequent convention, treaty, or executive agreement. Also new law can be "enacted" without notice or knowledge. It is not our purpose here to fan the smoldering fires of the Bricker amendment. Our query is how does an attorney know whether a positive provision of law has been displaced or superseded by some convention or treaty?

Consider for example an actual case. (Only the names and places have been withheld to protect the inocent.) And it could happen to anyone, even you and me.

An airline company in, say, the central United States, desired to employ a certain pilot. The answer to the citizenship question was "Canadian." The personnel department, being either curious or efficient, asked for a legal opinion on the employment eligibility of an alien pilot.

Perhaps if this question were given to a dozen different lawyers they would start out in as many different directions. A bit of research in almost any direction would soon establish that the licensing of persons to fly airplanes has long since been preempted by the Federal Government. This would lead to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. sec. 401, et seq.), a careful reading of which, however, would reveal nothing about the licensing of alien pilots. In dealing with a field under regulation by a Federal agency, it is not the statute that is revealing or complicated but the bulk output of regulations thereunder. This search brings to light CFR Title 14: Civil Aviation, a neatly printed volume of 983 pages not including the pocket supplement of 367 pages. Somewhere in this tome, you say to yourself, there should be some fine print on the alien-pilot question. It occurs to you all along that there just must be aliens flying airplanes in the United States, e. g., like driving cars or boats. There are foreign-flag airplanes daily coming into or transiting the United States.

Maybe the difficulty has to do with the piloting of an aircraft of United States registry? Section 21.12 of the regulations turns up with a paragraph entitled "Citizenship." This provides (to paraphrase) that a pilot must be a United States citizen or a citizen of a foreign government which grants reciprocal pilot privileges to our citizens. This would seem to provide a clear-cut answer if we only knew whether Canada grants reciprocal rights.[1] There are a large number of other regulations dealing with "aeronautical knowledge," "physical condition," "aeronautical experience" and various proficiencies including, to wit, "radio skill" (sec. 21.18). No mention is made in these regulations that the exercise of radio skill in an aircraft cockpit is restricted by another law and a sister agency, the FCC, to one holding a license to operate a radio transmitter.

It just so happens that you know from experience one of the many duties of a pilot is to communicate by radio. This leads you on a detour out of the civil air regulations back into the main body of the law, the United States Code, title 47, i. e., Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

Section 301 of that act prohibits a person from using and operating a radio station without an FCC license. Nonobservance can add up to $10,000 or 2 years' imprisonment or both. The prohibition expressly applies to radio stations upon any vessel or aircraft of the United States. Moreover, section 318 provides that each radio station, even though licensed, must be actually operated by a person holding an operator's license. The payoff provision is found in section 303 (l), which restricts the licensing of radio station operators to citizens of the United States.

It begins to look bad for our Canadian pilot applicant.

An attorney never jumps to conclusions without a lot of cross checking. The FCC, like the CAB and CAA, also has its file of regulations, part 9 of which is entitled "Aviation Services" (47 C. F. R. 9.10–9.1005). This body of agency dealing with aviation radio services in general, and aircraft radio stations in particular, is negative of any provision either on Canadians, aliens, or licensed operators of aircraft stations. FCC part 13, however, entitled "Commercial Radio Operators," quite positively requires a radio operator's license by any person operating an aircraft radio station. Rule 13.5 on eligibility of a licensed radio operator specifies United States citizenship, which could hardly be otherwise in view of section 303 (l) of the act. The next step in this research is to run through all available annotations, looseleaf services, and in this case the trade service, Pike & Fischer, Radio Regulations. Everything checks out. The controlling regulations are still in force. There has been no change in the law. Section 303 (l) is decisive.

Conclusions:

1. A Canadian citizen otherwise qualified may obtain an airman's certificate which will authorize him to pilot a United States aircraft.

2. A Canadian citizen, however, is disqualified by statute from being granted a radio operator's license which is required for the operation of an aircraft radio station.

3. Since the duties of a transport pilot embrace both flying of the aircraft and operation of its radio transmitting equipment, the alien's disqualification to perform an inseparable part of the duties of a pilot operates to disqualify a Canadian citizen from pilot employment with the airline company.

These conclusions seem unassailable. To hire a pilot who can't operate a radio station would be like hiring a paperhanger who didn't have even one arm.

You have complete confidence in the answer given. You wish that all legal opinions were susceptible of such a definite answer. Your opinion is thereupon put into final form, signed, and delivered. The file is marked "Closed."

If that were all, there would be no story. The sequel happened about like this. The next time you heard of the case, the personnel department is on the telephone reminding you of your opinion on the Canadian pilot question and telling you that you are as wrong as rain, or words to that effect, and how come you had never heard of Treaty Series 2508. No attorney likes to be told he is wrong, especially by a layman.

For a flashback of the supervening events, it seems that the Canadian applicant had made inquiries back home about employer discrimination in the United States against Canadian citizens. This got into diplomatic channels to Washington where it found its way into the roulette of interdepartmental references which came to rest on No. 2508, being Telecommunications Convention Between the United States and Canada, effective May 15, 1952. Article I thereof provides in full as follows:

"With respect to radio equipment installed on civil aircraft of either country and properly licensed by the country of registry for the primary purpose of navigation and safe operation of the aircraft a United States citizen holding a pilot license and, in addition, a radio operator license issued by the United States of America, may operate such radio equipment on an aircraft registered in Canada and operated in either country, and a Canadian citizen holding a pilot license and, in addition, a radio operator certificate issued by Canada, may operate such radio equipment on an aircraft registered in the United States of America and operated in either country; provided, that the operation of such radio equipment shall be in accordance with local law and regulation and complementary to his functions or duties as a pilot; provided also, that either country may require, for security purposes or to assure familiarity with domestic radio operating regulations and procedures, the registration or examination of citizens of the other country and the issuance of a permit for the privileges set forth herein."

After some days' delay in obtaining a copy of this 5-cent document (which is about the amount you feel like after reading article I), you begin to wonder how the existence of this thing didn't show up anywhere in your research. You back-track, like a criminal returning to the scene of the crime, over all statutes, CAA, CAB, and FCC regulations and their annotations. After painstakingly tracing these sources you arrive at the following somewhat astounding findings and conclusions:

1. The available compilations of Federal law contain no reference to treaties which may change existing law or enact new law.

2. Although the principal purpose of TS–2508, the United States-Canadian Convention, was to overcome the disability of section 303 (l) of the Communications Act of 1934 as to Canadian nationals being granted radio operator licenses, the convention makes no mention of section 303 (l). The annotations to that section contain no reference to the convention.

3. The rules and regulations of the CAB and CAA contain no reference to the convention. On the contrary, these regulations imply no citizenship disability for persons performing pilot functions including radio.

4. The FCC rules and regulations, as pertains to section 303 (l) or part 9, Aviation Services or part 13, Commercial Radio Operators, nowhere indicate the existence of the Canadian convention. On the contrary, these rules show no breach in the absolute prohibition against aliens being radio operators of aircraft radio stations.[2]

5. There is no cross-reference between the CAA regulations and the FCC regulations relating to use of a pilot's license by one in possession of a valid radio operator's license, or relating the exercise of an aircraft radio operator's license to one in possession of a valid airman's certificate.

6. Due diligence in the use of facilities normally available to a law office would not reveal the existence of TS–2508 or its contents.

Of course, once such a treaty becomes known, it is not difficult to corroborate its existence. Like any puzzle, it is very simple if you already know the solution. With

[1] Subsequent to the event in question, the CAA itself found it administratively impractical to ascertain what foreign countries granted reciprocal pilot rights to United States citizens and in March 1954 sec. 21.12 was changed so that a pilot may be a citizen of any country or of no country.

[2] Pike and Fischer, I R. R. 52.501 does have 8 pages of the fine print listing treaties relating to radio, 1910 to date, giving the T. S. number and bare-subject-title but their provisions are not cited or collated in the specific provisions of law or rules.

the existence of TS-2508 having come to your attention, albeit in the unorthodox and unprofessional manner above recited, you delve more intensely into the problem; why no notice, no citation, no red flag. You bridge the gap in this post-mortem phase of the research with the following:

1. No notice of the proposed convention was carried in the Federal Register.

2. Senate ratification was devoid of any indication that section 303 (1) was being modified.

3. Annual report of the Federal Communications Commission for the year in question, although reporting on subject matters such as international treaty activities, aeronautical radio services, aviation organizations and conferences, and aircraft radio stations, contains no mention of the United States-Canadian Convention.

4. This treaty is not listed in United States Code Congressional Service.

5. Although the annual output of treaty law for 1951 is contained in a 2-volume compilation of 2,589 pages entitled "United States Treaties and Other International Agreements," there is no subject-matter digest of these documents. There is no current slip service or digest and the bound compilations are some 2 years behind, e. g., the 1952 edition is not available as of January 1955. (See 1 U. S. C., sec. 112a).

6. Little and Brown's edition of Laws and Treaties advertised in title 1, United States Code, section 113 may provide some assistance except that telephone inquiries of two leading book stores in the Nation's Capital produced the information that according to them no such edition currently exists.

Concluding caveat: When dealing with a provision of positive law of a sort which might be changed or superseded by some treaty, convention, or agreement the chances are you won't know about and can't find it.

The saying at law is where there is a wrong there is a remedy. In any event, the problem illustrated by the above case would seem to indicate, as a minimum, the following procedural improvements:

1. It would seem reasonable that the United States Senate when called upon to ratify a treaty should know whether or not it is changing or superseding existing statutory law.

2. When the subject matter of a treaty changes or enacts new law in a field regulated by a Federal agency, some public notice of the proposal should be given. (At this point of metamorphic juncture from a foreign affairs function to domestic law, public notice would seem to facilitate good administration.)

3. Where a treaty changes or supersedes a provision of law regulated by an agency, the rules of the interested or sponsoring agency should contain a citation to the treaty, and, if necessary, modifications should be made in the rules.

4. Publishers of legal services should annotate or cite applicable treaties which affect statutory law, or raise a flag in the preface that no consideration is given to treaty-made law.

The foregoing improvements should be placed in effect quite regardless of the Bricker amendment controversy or its outcome.

SOCIAL-SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 7225, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. THYE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 7225, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to House bill 7225, the Social Security Amendments of 1956, and ask that it be printed and lie on the desks of the individual Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS—MOTION TO RECONSIDER—REQUEST FOR HOUSE TO RETURN JOINT RESOLUTION (H. J. RES. 472)

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to give notice of a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 472) for the relief of certain aliens was passed by the Senate on June 11, 1956. Also, I move that the House be requested to return to the Senate the joint resolution, which has already been transmitted to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the House will be requested to return the joint resolution, and the motion to reconsider will be entered.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT REPORT ENTITLED "COMPULSORY INSPECTION OF POULTRY" (S. DOC. NO. 129)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I submit a report of that committee's Subcommittee on Legislation Affecting the Food and Drug Administration, entitled "Compulsory Inspection of Poultry." I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Address entitled "Appraisal of Air Force Public Relations," delivered by Senator GOLDWATER before Air War College, Montgomery, Ala., June 12, 1956.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON VARIOUS CIVIL-RIGHTS PROPOSALS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], I desire to give notice that the committee will resume hearings on the various civil-rights proposals beginning at 2:30 p. m. Tuesday, June 19, 1956, and at 2:30 p. m., Friday, June 22, 1956, in the committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM G. JUERGENS TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, June 19, 1956, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the nomination of William G. Juergens, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Illinois, vice Fred L. Wham, retired.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself, chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON PROPOSALS TO EXTEND THE VETERANS' LOAN-GUARANTY PROGRAM, BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I wish to announce that there will be public hearings before the subcommittee next week at 10 a. m., June 20 and 21, on pending bills to extend the veterans' loan-guaranty program. The hearings will be held in the Old Supreme Court Chamber, P-63, in the Capitol. Anyone wishing to testify should call the committee staff director, Stewart McClure, on extension 41.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 13, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2967) to amend the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and for other purposes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce, for the information of the Senate, that at the conclusion of the morning business I shall ask the Senate to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business, S. 3982, and proceed to the consideration of the

public-works appropriation bill. Following action on the public works appropriation bill, the Senate will revert to the mining bill, Calendar No. 2169, S. 3982.

I am hopeful that today and tomorrow we may be able to consider:

Calendar No. 2113, H. R. 8102, to provide for the disposition of moneys arising from deductions made from carriers on account of the loss of or damage to military material in transit;

Calendar No. 2114, H. R. 8693, to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 in relation to the refund of reenlistment bonuses;

Calendar No. 2115, H. R. 8922, to provide for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services;

Calendar No. 2120, Senate Resolution 274, a contempt citation against Joseph Bruno;

Calendar No. 2121, Senate Resolution 275, a contempt citation against William Frazier Evans;

Calendar No. 2122, Senate Resolution 276, a contempt citation against Robert I. Hasoi;

Calendar No. 2123, Senate Resolution 277, a contempt citation against Salvatore Santaro;

Calendar No. 2124, Senate Resolution 278, a contempt citation against Jesse Alexander;

Calendar No. 2125, Senate Resolution 279, a contempt citation against Joseph Bendinelli.

The contempt-citation resolutions will be in charge of the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], chairman of the subcommittee handling the narcotics legislation.

The Senate will then proceed to Calendar No. 2039, S. 3448, the airlines capital-gains bill, provided the Department has supplied the information desired by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Then the Senate will proceed to Calendar No. 2155, H. R. 7763, amending the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act.

During today I hope to confer with the distinguished minority leader and perhaps announce other bills which may be considered on tomorrow.

I am hopeful the conference committees on the appropriation bills and the road bill may be able to reach an agreement during the week, so we can clear up the calendar in regard to those measures.

SUPPORT OF ADLAI STEVENSON FOR DEMOCRATIC NOMINATION FOR PRESIDENT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Thomas L. Stokes which appeared in the Washington Star, pointing out the widespread nature of the support of Adali Stevenson for the Democratic nomination for President of the United States.

As Mr. Stokes points out, Adlai Stevenson has demonstrated in primaries from Florida to Alaska, climaxed by his great victory in California, that he is the people's choice and the people's candidate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW "PEOPLE'S CANDIDATE"—STEVENSON VIEWED AS ONLY DEMOCRAT ATTRACTING SUPPORT IN ALL REGIONS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The only seeming obstacle now to Adlai Stevenson's renomination by the Democrats in Chicago in August is a possible combination against him behind an outsider or "dark horse."

But the chances of a successful operation of that sort appear, as of now, very poor, and for two reasons: One is historical; that is, ill luck usually has attended such allied stop movements directed at a front runner. The other is a circumstance pertinent to the present situation, which is the lack of a candidate who in himself could rally enough support among party leaders and divergent delegate elements in the convention to defeat Adlai Stevenson. He has broad-based support, not only among party leaders but in the voting public itself. That he demonstrated again in the climactic California primary, as he has previously in other tests.

His only open and public challenger in test by popular vote, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, was finally and irrevocably eliminated by Adlai Stevenson's sweeping and conclusive California victory. The Tennessee Senator's adopted title of "the people's candidate" was whisked away like a leaf of autumn in the hurricane of votes against him in his five successive primary defeats by Adlai Stevenson—California, Florida, Oregon, District of Columbia, and Alaska, to backtrack the trail.

Senator KEFAUVER thus lost the only argument that had the slightest chance of moving party leaders who, in fact, are even more hostile toward him now because of his bitter attacks on Adlai Stevenson in the Florida-California windup.

One way to describe the situation that now seems to have developed in the Democratic Party is that the type of candidate needed to beat Adlai Stevenson in the convention would be another Adali Stevenson; that is, one who could attract support among all groups and in all regions of the very motley Democratic Party and yet remain the respected figure that he is.

None such appears among those listed as "dark horse" or "compromise" candidates. You can check them off one by one: Gov. Averell Harriman of New York, who has the handicap of deep-seated southern antagonism; Gov. Frank J. Lausche of Ohio, vetoed by powerful labor and New Deal-Fair Deal elements in the party and evoking no warmth among many regular party leaders because of his party irregularity; Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, regarded as too vague a political character to inspire enthusiasm; Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, Senate party leader, a regional candidate who stirs no rank-and-file interest beyond the South, if much there, and who has a health handicap in the heart attack he suffered a year ago.

In such a situation, you also encounter an obstacle that has been observed so often before in this reporter's long experience with national conventions. This is the inability of such a group to agree on which among them should be "it." They do have to agree and pool their vote resources, for it will take all the delegate strength they might pull together to block a front runner such as Adlai Stevenson is now. Such alliances usually fall apart on the rocks of personal egotism, which is especially highly developed in the political species.

Lest someone bring up the 1952 Democratic convention where Senator KEFAUVER, himself then the front runner, was blocked, it may be pointed out that he lacked support among convention leaders and, furthermore had antagonized powerful big city bosses by his crime investigation. He had limits beyond which he could not enlist recruits and therefore he never could have won. He had gone as far as he possibly could go and got into a stalemate with other candidates who likewise had gone as far as they possibly could go. None could get a majority, since delegates attached to one would go to none of the others. This created an impasse in which an outsider agreeable generally to all could be brought in to break the deadlock—and that was Adlai Stevenson.

For Ike-cowed Democrats, California is clearly the biggest shot in the arm of this primary, preconvention season. This is because of the size of the Democratic vote, indicating interest and high party morale, and because Democrats found they still have a champion and a leader capable of exciting the voters and a leader, as well, who has support all across the board. Special appeals by Senator KEFAUVER, approaching the demagogic, failed to shake loose from Adlai Stevenson support from such groups of the elderly folks and Negroes who voted for the 1952 Democratic candidate in large numbers. That indicates the latter offers the best hope of unifying the Democrats—if that were possible.

California, as the climax of his series of victories, was a real personal triumph for Adlai Stevenson. It was the glorious end of a comeback road from Minnesota in March where he suffered a heavy blow at the hands of the Tennessee Senator. What Adlai Stevenson has done since is a measure of his inner strength and of his determination. Anyone who knows him knows what an ordeal it was for him to get out and grub for votes, town by town, street by street, handshake by handshake. Yet, he set himself resolutely to it and not only came to enjoy it but also became most adept at it. His desire to win became infectious. He transported it finally to those he met.

He has, indeed, become sort of a people's candidate himself.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION AND THE PROBLEM OF SEGREGATION IN THE SCHOOLS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, one of the major issues with which this Congress has been faced, and still confronts, is the issue of Federal aid to education and its relationship to the problem of segregation in the schools in some parts of the country. I, myself, have long felt, ever since this proposal was made in the Congress 2 years ago, that essential as the basic measure is, it is likewise essential to insure that Federal funds raised by taxation of all the people shall not be used to further and accentuate segregation, and shall not be used to build schools, in States and school districts, in a manner and with the purpose of maintaining and deepening the pattern of segregation in education, in the face of a Supreme Court decision, under the Constitution.

This is a question on which men of good will can honestly differ. There are some liberals who sincerely believe that this issue should not be raised in connection with the Federal-aid-to-education bill.

There are other persons, of course, who are opposed to an antisegregation proviso on the aid-to-education bill because they are determined to defend the pattern of segregation in education.

Among the liberals who take different views on this question, a considerable debate has been in progress over the past

6 months. I was privileged to participate in such a debate in the pages of the Progressive magazine, a responsible periodical published in Madison, Wis. My opponent in this debate was my very good friend and most respected and admired colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

He and I see eye to eye on most issues. I know that we see eye to eye on the basic issue of Federal aid to education. Of course we see eye to eye on the vital questions of civil rights and civil liberties. Hence, our debate on this particular question was carried on, and will continue to be carried on, in the friendliest spirit. I honor the sincerity of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. I know that he honors mine.

I think it would be very useful to the Senate and enlightening to the country to have the views I have expressed in the pages of the Progressive magazine, and the contrary views expressed by the Senator from Oregon, spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article I wrote on the question of amending the Federal school-aid bill so as to prevent the Federal Government from promoting segregation in the schools be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, to be followed by the very able presentation on the same subject, but on the opposite side, by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE BY SENATOR LEHMAN IN MAY ISSUE OF THE PROGRESSIVE, ON SCHOOLS, SUBSIDIES, AND SEGREGATION

Why do men of good will differ on the question of an antisegregation amendment to the Federal school aid bill? Part of the answer may be found in the confusion over the nature of the question. The short title—"antisegregation amendment"—might be one of the factors in the confusion.

The amendment I propose to the school aid bill is not designed to end segregation in the public schools. It is not designed to implement or enforce the Supreme Court decisions on segregation. Whether Congress should act directly to implement the 14th amendment in reference to public school education is quite another question. I happen to think it would be a good idea, but that is not the question we are dealing with in the school aid bill, which is clearly not the vehicle for such a difficult, debatable, and comprehensive undertaking.

What I propose is simply a "law-and-order" amendment, designed only to restrain the Federal Government from aiding and abetting recalcitrant States and school districts in their defiance of the law and the Constitution. Early last year I served notice in the Senate that I would propose such an amendment. It is this proposed Lehman amendment that I want to discuss here. I hasten to explain that while my amendment is somewhat different in its scope and mode of operation from the Powell amendment in the House, the general intent and philosophy of both amendments are the same. In any event my amendment is going to be the one offered and I assume will be the one considered in the Senate.

My amendment would authorize and direct the President to put in escrow the funds which would otherwise be paid to those States and school districts which are known or found to be actively defying the Supreme Court mandate to give all schoolchildren within their States that equal protection of the law required by the Constitution. Thereafter the money would be paid to these States and school districts as soon as it is established that they are trying "in good faith" to comply with the Supreme Court decision.

There is no thought of requiring that the States should have completed the desegregation of their schools as a condition precedent to receiving Federal aid—only that, in accordance with the Court decree of May 31, 1955, they are proceeding to "make a prompt and reasonable start toward full compliance."

I do not expect by this amendment to force unwilling States and school districts immediately to desegregate their schools. That would be like trying to stop a rampaging elephant with a peashooter.

Actually, this amendment is not really aimed at the States at all, but at the Federal Government, and at the integrity of the laws of the Nation as a whole. The least Congress can do in this connection is to restrain the Executive from abetting defiant States and school districts in the very performance of their acts of defiance.

I cannot see how it can even be argued that States and school districts strenuously engaged in resisting the Court's prohibitions against the practice of racial discrimination in the schools should still receive Federal funds collected from all taxpayers, for the construction of the very instruments of legal defiance and racial discrimination.

Suppose we proceed to consider the chief arguments of the liberal opponents of this amendment. They can, I believe, be roughly summarized as follows:

The amendment will kill the school-aid bill because the southerners will filibuster it to death.

The amendment is irrevelant to the purposes of the school-aid bill.

The amendment is unnecessary because the President has the power to do everything the amendment proposes.

The amendment is unnecessary because the courts are going to take care of the problem.

Killing the bill by means of this amendment will penalize all the States and all schoolchildren in order to punish a few recalcitrant States.

Withholding the funds from the defiant States and school districts will retard rather than advance the cause of desegregation in those States, and will not help but rather harm the Negro children in those States and districts.

II

Notice that most of these arguments really flow from the first—that the amendment will kill the school-aid bill. Therefore, the liberal opponents of the amendment are, in effect, not only urging that the amendment should not be adopted, but that it shouldn't even be offered. The rest of their arguments, I am afraid, are largely rationalizations for their fear that the amendment, if offered, will be adopted and thus provoke a filibuster.

I for one am not at all willing to concede that the consideration of this amendment will mean the death of the school-aid bill. This is a defeatist assumption which accepts in advance, without the test of trial and opposition, the blackmail threat of the filibuster.

I believe the amendment is not only sound but absolutely essential for the sake of the integrity of this legislation. I want to test the opposition to it. Let the southern opponents of this amendment bear the burden of challenge to law and order, and to orderly procedures in the Senate. Let us see if they have the strength of conviction and purpose, on the issue of defying the Constitution, to conduct a filibuster.

Let us see how many will join in the grinding test of the filibuster on this issue of law and order—which is quite different from FEPC. My own guess is that on this issue there will be less than an all-out filibuster. This is not 1949. This is 1956.

Of course, I could be wrong. I could be misjudging the temper of my colleagues in the Senate. But is our moral purpose so much weaker than theirs that we should not even hazard the attempt? I cannot believe this.

I think a filibuster on this issue can be overcome if the liberals and others committed, politically or otherwise, to the cause of law and order unite in support of this amendment. We can invoke the rules of the Senate which permit 1 Senator no more than 2 speeches on the same proposition. We can circulate a cloture petition. As shamefully inadequate as the cloture rule is, I propose to find out whether we cannot, on this issue, get the 64 votes required for cloture. It will be a good occasion for men to stand up and be counted.

But how about the argument that the amendment is irrelevant to the legislation? I am convinced it is as much a part of the question of Federal aid for education as a limb is a part of the human body. It can be cut off, but its absence will be noticeable. Some might wish it weren't so, but the Supreme Court's decision of May 17, 1954, made the one question an inseparable part of the other. Indeed, it can scarcely be denied that the question of segregation in education more and more dominates the question of Federal assistance to education.

Shall Congress act as if the historic event of May 17, 1954, had not taken place? Shall we take no notice of the mighty pageant of events which has occurred since that day? It is pure wordmongering to pose the question of whether Congress should take cognizance of these events, in connection with this or any other legislation. Congress, like the rest of the country and the world, has taken cognizance. Today the school segregation issue, and all it implies, dominates all our thoughts and conditions almost all our actions.

For Congress to fail to consider an amendment to the school-aid bill dealing with the situation that has developed as a result of the Supreme Court decisions would constitute, in itself, a negative action of powerful eloquence and tremendous significance. It would mean that Congress was deliberately refraining from taking a stand not only on the question of segregation, but more directly on the question of how the Executive should dispose of public money for the support of local education in cases where that education was being conducted in overt defiance of the laws of the land, and in overt violation of the constitutional rights of those to be educated.

It might even be argued by the defiant States and school districts that such an action by Congress constituted a repudiation of the Supreme Court's rulings.

Now, for the argument that the amendment is unnecessary because the President has the inherent power to do what the amendment would direct him to do: True, the President has the power. He could proclaim, consistent with his oath of office—"to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution"—that he intended to withhold school-aid funds from those States and school districts which publicly undertake to evade and defy the rulings of the Supreme Court prohibiting unconstitutional and unlawful discrimination in education.

If the President were to do this, it might not be necessary to press the amendment—although I think it would still be preferable for Congress to establish the standards for withholding, as well as to provide specifically for the holding of these funds in escrow, pending the time of compliance. But if the President were to indicate quite clearly and rather specifically how the executive branch would take care of this problem, I think the

Congress would be justified in leaving it to his discretion.

The fact is, however, that the President has not proclaimed any such intention, despite repeated appeals that he do so. He and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Commissioner of Education have replied negatively to inquiries on this point, in a manner that strongly suggests the executive branch would not exercise such an authority unless specifically instructed by Congress. So Congress has no alternative but to act.

What about the argument that the amendment is unnecessary because the courts are going to take care of the problem, and that Congress should not interfere?

This argument is inapplicable to my amendment, which, I repeat, is not designed to bring segregation to an end, or force compliance with the Supreme Court's decision, or interfere in any way with the work of the courts. I do not propose, in this amendment, either to supplant or supplement the courts in wrestling with the grave, overall problem of resistance to the law and the court rulings. That is another and much larger problem which must be separately and prayerfully considered.

III

Yet this discussion would be incomplete without some reference to the overwhelming difficulties faced by the courts in pursuing their present course. The amount of time it may take the courts to confront and consider all the various devices that are being busily improvised to avoid and resist compliance literally staggers the imagination.

There are four States—Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina—which have proclaimed their determined defiance of the law, and have, each in a different manner, staked out a course designed to resist compliance. These States, moreover, have enacted legislation which will effectively prevent—and in some cases violently penalize—any attempt by any locality to comply with the court decrees.

Two States—Virginia and North Carolina—while they have moved in a complex manner to evade the constitutional requirements—have enacted legislation which may make it possible for localities to integrate their schools if they so desire. But the likelihood of large scale integration in these States is remote, until the State laws themselves have been legally attacked and disposed of in the courts.

In general, no two of the resisting States are following exactly the same course. They are dispersing their devices, as if by design, and running down different alleyways in their determination to escape from compliance. Some propose to turn over all authority over the schools to the local school board. Some have enacted legislation purporting to grant immunity to local school boards from all court orders and decrees. Some propose to lease school facilities to "private" organizations.

Altogether, the arsenal of proposed means of "legal" evasion of the Supreme Court's ruling is depressingly vast and is growing by the hour. It probably will take years to confront each one of these devices in the courts and place it under the ban of the Constitution.

To those who are interested in reading a comprehensive summary of the various legal means which are being invoked to thwart the Supreme Court decision, I commend the study by Prof. James Nabrit in the symposium on racial desegregation and integration published in the March 1956, Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Sciences. A briefer and more readable summary appears in the April 3 issue of Look magazine, where Prof. Fred Rodell has listed some of the possibilities of evasive action and consequent delay.

Now I should like to turn, in answer to the last two arguments against my amendment listed earlier in this article, to a consideration of the moral nature of the issue.

I want to emphasize again that my amendment is not a "penalty" or a "punishment" of anybody. It is a restraint only on the Federal Government which, in the school aid legislation, is launching not only a new program, but a one-shot program. This is not permanent legislation, but emergency legislation. When the money authorized under the school aid bill is expended, the program will be over.

The Federal Government bears the responsibility for the manner in which the money is spent and the uses to which it is put. The Federal Government is responsible to the taxpaying public, to the general public, to the schoolchildren, to the future of the Nation, and to the rest of the world.

Whatever disguise is given the legally enforced practice of segregation, it remains the defensive shield for the concept of white supremacy and the drawn sword for the enforcement of that concept. That is the doctrine which is being defended by the resisting and defiant States.

Some thoughtful Southern leaders have already undertaken to grapple directly with this central issue. Shall we be less outspoken than they?

Msgr. Charles J. Plauche, Southern-born Chancellor of the New Orleans Archidiocese, recently declared that "racial segregation is a shameful blot on our national escutcheon and can no longer be ignored and set aside for future consideration. As an American I submit there is no acceptable moral alternative to the condemnation of segregation of the Negro and the acceptance of integration of the races in public and semi-public institutions and agencies."

Monsignor Plauche has been far from alone in the South in his definition of the moral values involved in this issue.

Indeed, the reaction of the South to the Supreme Court decision has been far from monolithic. Of the 17 States and the District of Columbia in which school segregation was officially sanctioned and practiced prior to May 17, 1954, only a handful stand today in attitudes of open defiance. The others have either integrated completely or are moving, unsteadily, and unhappily in some cases, in the inevitable direction.

I fear that failure of Congress to take cognizance in the school aid legislation of the overt defiance being offered by a few will encourage, and even force, others into the ranks of the resistors.

What of the rest of the world? What will the great majority of mankind think if we, in Congress, insist on pretending that the issue is not before us, even when we are considering school legislation? What will happen to our pretense of leadership of free mankind, both colored and white?

IV

Now what about the school children? How does all of this affect all of them? It is their plight, after all, which moves us to consider this legislation. Will they have reason to be grateful to us for failing to consider that aspect of the segregation issue which necessarily intrudes upon the question of school aid? What of the Negro children?

It is mistakenly maintained by the opponents of my amendment that even segregated education works in the direction of desegregation. Nothing could be further from the fact. The segregated schools are one of the prime training grounds for the acceptance of the practice of segregation. The schools are one of the few places where all children come into direct contact with the authority of government. What does government teach them in the segregated schools? It teaches them to accept segregation and discrimination as a way of life. It teaches Negroes that they are, by nature, inferior. It teaches whites that they are, by nature, superior. It teaches them "separateness" and "differentness," so utterly repugnant not only to law but to life.

How can we in Congress say that we benefit anybody, whether white or black, by refraining from posing the law-and-order issue in connection with this legislation?

It is important, I know, to build more school buildings for our school children. But stone and mortar do not make a school. A school building is not the only factor in the training of our young. What do we tell our school children, in these fine new buildings, about the sanctity of law and order, and the dignity of American citizenship? How do we explain to them that Congress provided the money for these buildings, but didn't bother even to consider the question of the evil practices of racial discrimination in some States and some school districts? I am not referring to the children in the segregated schools, but to all our school children.

Isn't the integrity of our democratic processes just as vital a factor in the education of the young as the quality of the classroom walls and of the gymnasium facilities?

I do not believe that I can be any more eloquent in stating the moral issue involved than a Federal judge in New Orleans, Southern born and Southern bred Judge J. Skelly Wright, when, on February 15 of this year, he ordered segregation in the schools of Orleans Parish to be brought to an end, and when he overturned the segregation statutes of Louisiana which required this segregation. He said:

"The problem of changing a people's mores, particularly those with an emotional overlay, is not to be taken lightly. It is a problem which will require the utmost patience, understanding, generosity, and forbearance from all of us. But the magnitude of the problem may not nullify the principle. And that principle is that we are all of us, free-born Americans, with a right to make our way, unfettered by sanctions imposed by man because of the work of God."

We in Congress can do no less than to accept our responsibility to abide by this principle, and to fight for it when it comes to issue, and to acknowledge it as among the highest principles we know, not to be sacrificed out of timidity or on the alter of expediency.

ARTICLE BY SENATOR NEUBERGER IN MAY ISSUE OF THE PROGRESSIVE, ON SCHOOLS, SUBSIDIES, AND SEGREGATION

"The common school is the greatest discovery ever made by man."—Abraham Flexner.

A committee of the Senate has reported: "Millions of children still attend schools which are unsafe or which permit learning only part time or under conditions of serious overcrowding." More than a million children are going to school in buildings not designed originally for school use. Two children out of five have been attending school in structures which do not conform to minimum fire-safety requirements. Elementary teachers in cities of medium size are paid less than railroad switchtenders, automobile workers, coal miners, or glass blowers. Over 75,000 teachers quit the profession each year. Furthermore, during the next 5 years, the number of schoolchildren will rise from 30 million to 45 million, with no means in sight to provide properly for their education.

This is not happening in Russia or the Congo or Malaya.

It is happening in the United States of America, a Nation where corporate profits stand at an all-time high, where $40 billion is spent annually for armaments, and where the stock exchange creates new bonanzas and new millionaires almost each day.

Many local school districts are bonded to the hilt. Others are so strapped for funds

that their credit is gone. State governments have run out of sources of revenue to tap for school purposes. My own State, not a realm of great industry or wealth, has saddled itself with the highest State income tax in the land in order to carry its educational responsibilities. The one ultimate solution, unless we are to default on our duty to the children of America, is Federal aid to education. Only the Federal Government has the fiscal resources to end the school crisis.

I rank this as a primary obligation of the 1956 session of Congress. Nothing must be permitted to form a barricade between this country's boys and girls and an adequate education. That is why I oppose adding any amendment, whether Senator LEHMAN's or Representative POWELL's, to the bill which would authorize $400 million annually, for each of 4 years, in the form of Federal aid to school construction. Both the Lehman and Powell amendments, they are similar in purpose if somewhat different in emphasis and language, would imperil early authorization of school construction funds. I shall refer to the antisegregation rider in the remainder of my argument as the Powell amendment since the proposal is best known to the public by that title.

II

If we lived in the best possible of worlds, I would favor the Powell amendment denying assistance to any State or district practicing segregation in the schools. But we live in a world where the rules of the United States Senate permit practically unlimited debate. Those rules make it possible for a minority—namely the Dixiecrats from the South—to prevent passage of a school-aid bill carrying an antisegregation amendment. Therefore, we are confronted with the alterntive:

1. To pass the Federal-aid-to-education bill, without the Powell amendment.

2. To add the Powell amendment and watch the bill filibustered to death.

These are harsh choices for somebody who detests segregation and discrimination as much as I do. In the Oregon Legislature, my wife and I have been sponsors of legislation to assure equal treatment of all races and creeds in public places, to guarantee fair employment practices and to end a legal ban against mixed marriages, a ban which dated from frontier hostility against the American Indian. Even while in the Army during the building of the Alaska Highway, I did all that a second lieutenant could to bring about better housing and other facilities for colored troops helping valiantly to hack that great corridor out of the sub-Arctic solitudes. So my own record in this respect is clear, I trust.

But I also believe strongly in education. I think it is disgraceful the way we have allowed our school facilities to deteriorate, in a country as rich and mighty as the United States. Ending segregation is a noble cause; aiding education is likewise a noble cause. Shall we imperil the fate of both by tying them together legislatively?

A newspaper as consistently liberal as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch has recently had this to say editorially about the Powell amendment: "There is more than a suspicion that some of the backers of this step are moved by cold cynicism which is quite willing to defeat Federal aid to schools, court the northern Negro vote, and expose the Democratic Party split over segregation, all in one fell swoop."

I had occasion to remember that editorial when the congressional delegation from our State met at breakfast with a group of Oregon school principals. The Republican Member of Congress from the second Oregon district said on this occasion that he felt it necessary to support the Powell amendment, in order to be consistent with his oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. Yet, as a State Senator, this same man had cast 1 of only 5 votes against Negroes in Oregon trade schools. Furthermore, the Congressman also eventually admitted to the school group that he doubted if Federal aid to education were really necessary or desirable.

Now, I realize this is far from true of a man like Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, who has fought all his life for equal treatment of all peoples, and who is one of the kindest and most warmhearted human beings it has ever been my privilege to know. But it should give us pause to consider that there are men actively involved in the struggle for the Powell amendment who do not have HERBERT LEHMAN's long record in behalf of equality and fairness. Indeed, some of the backers of the Powell amendment have been more identified with antagonism toward Federal aid for schools than in support of integration for the races of mankind.

In addition, why make the children the pawn in this controversy? If it is wrong for Federal funds to go to places where there is segregation in the schools, then what of the Federal funds that help to build hospitals in which the races are segregated? If anything, it is more inherently evil to turn away a sick or injured man from a hospital erected with Federal aid than to deny a child schooling in a classroom built with Federal aid. Both are wrong, but why pick on one and not the other?

Would backers of the Powell amendment apply it to Federal-aid highway funds which assist in the construction of roads over which Jim Crow buses travel? And what of the federally financed Salk vaccine that has been going to children during this past year, through distribution in the schools? Do advocates of the Powell amendment care to withhold Salk vaccine from States encouraging segregation in the school systems? And what of Federal farm-price supports in rural counties where Negroes are intimidated away from the ballot box? Should Federal navigation locks accommodate boats which force separate quarters on Negro crews or passengers?

The extent of such application of the Powell-amendment theory is virtually endless. Why, then are its sponsors splicing it only to the bill for Federal aid to schools? This is being done for the very reason which should discourage such a course—because of the Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in public-school systems.

The defiance of the Court's decision by inflamatory and lawless groups in the South has dramatized the school situation. It is in this sphere that applying the Powell amendment can attain the maximum dramatic and political impact. Yet, through fiat of our highest judicial tribunal, the Federal district courts throughout the South have been empowered to work out obedience to the school-case decision. In other words, schools are the realm where the Powell amendment is needed the least. The ruling of the Supreme Court already has begun to operate, albeit slowly, in the field of education. Where the Powell amendment might be far more justified is in the case of segregated hospitals and segregated highway usages, where no Supreme Court decision has yet been rendered.

III

On top of all this, coupling the Powell amendment to the school bill is on the shakiest kind of moral and ethical ground. In educational budgets, haste often is of the essence. Jefferson said that our young people come this way but once. This was in the era when the old Northwest Ordinance of 1785 was first establishing the idea of public support of education. While the political argument goes on over the Powell amendment, a whole generation of young Americans can lose out educationally. The sufferers will not be the politicians on each side of the issue, those intransigent ones in the North and the South. No; the victims of the debate will be the schoolchildren of America. By starving education, we merely prepare the sod for more seeds of intolerance in the future.

Even forgetting the Powell amendment, the schedule for Federal aid to our schools is all too tardy, at best. The school-aid bills are only authorizations. Should they pass in this session of Congress, already more than half over, the necessary appropriations probably would not be enacted until the 1958 fiscal year, which begins July 1, 1957. It will take at least 2 full years, perhaps 3, for the new school buildings constructed with these Federal-aid funds to be transferred from the drawing boards of architects into steel and glass and bricks and concrete.

Under the most favorable circumstances, a child will practically have gone all of the way through high school and halfway through grammar school before the present Federal-aid bills now before Congress could contribute affirmatively to the improvement of his education.

To slow down this discouraging schedule by the inevitable complications of the Powell amendment is to venture a grim risk, indeed, with the destiny of America's most precious resource, its children. If the Powell amendment is tied to the school bill, a Senate filibuster by southern extremists and by decent southerners frightened politically by extremists, is as inexorable as tomorrow's sunrise. The result will be the defeat of the school-aid bill. It will be talked to death. If it dies, so will the hopes of millions of teachers, parents, and children for better and more adequate schools.

This is a time for political courage on both sides of the Mason and Dixon line. We of the North hope and pray that some of the politicians of the South will resist their extremists and fomenters of hate. We are disappointed when some southern liberals find themselves unable or unwilling to do so. But the bell likewise tolls for us. We, too, must be brave enough to stand against extremists of our own, who would imperil the school aid required by all children, white and black, in order to punish the segregated schools of the South. Adlai E. Stevenson resisted this demand, and it may have cost him dearly in terms of political popularity. Yet I believe that somewhere, if only in Abou Ben Adhem's book of life, there is a mark honoring Stevenson's singular act of political valor.

I am one Senator who is quite willing to see the civil rights issue fought out on the floor of the Senate. I should like to see before us bills to remove the poll tax, to assure fair-employment practices, and to end discrimination in such public places as hotels and restaurants. I believe legislation ought to be passed allocating seats in the House of Representatives not on a State's census population but according to the number of people who participate in elections. This would prevent Southern States from securing congressional representation as a result of Negro residents who are denied the right to vote. The present situation is as incongruous as a father who qualifies for income-tax exemptions because of children he fails to feed and clothe.

In addition, I should like to see the rules of the Senate modified so that a simple majority of Senators can shut off debate. An argument can be made for filibusters, but I believe they generally do more harm than good. In my opinion, Senator LEHMAN was right early in 1955 when he proposed a fight by liberal Senators to reform archaic Senate rules.

I make no defense of Dixiecrat Senators who would use the existing rules of the Senate to filibuster into oblivion a school-aid bill, if it includes the Powell amendment. Such men are dominated by bigotry rather than reason. Yet I know they probably never will change their basic thought patterns—at least not within the foreseeable

future. I also know the Senate rules cannot be changed immediately. And aid to schools must be provided long before these slow-moving political changes ever occur, unless our educational plant is to decay shamefully. I think most Americans are aware of this, as demonstrated by the March 21 Gallup Poll showing a 2-to-1 majority against any effort to tie conditions to school-aid legislation.

The Powell amendment, good though may be the intentions of its principal author, Representative POWELL, would make the school systems a mere baton to be passed back and forth in a political marathon. Let us keep the two issues separated. After all, one might validly add an amendment to the school bill denying Federal aid to any State or district which failed to pay its teachers properly or which throttled academic freedom. Why not similarly penalize districts which fail to take advantage of the school-lunch program? Public-power advocates may want to deny Federal aid to school buildings that burn kilowatts from private utilities in their light bulbs. And what if organized labor insisted that the new schools be constructed only by men belonging to trade unions? My wife, Maurine, who once taught physical education in the schools of Oregon, has reminded me that some health "nuts" like herself could conceivably suggest a restriction of Federal aid to those schools where physical education, modern dance, or gymnastics are required subjects.

Let us avoid these side shows, which endanger the safety of the main tent. The important challenge before us all is to secure some adequate measure of Federal aid for our schools, without jeopardizing local control of education. This cannot be put off into the distant and remote future, following a prolonged national controversy over the Powell amendment. It is urgently needed now, today, immediately.

DECLARATION BY MICHIGAN DEMOCRATS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to a document known as the Michigan Declaration.

This document expresses the philosophy of the Democratic Party of my State of Michigan, as adopted at the recent State convention. I shall not burden the RECORD with the full text of the Michigan Declaration, since it is my understanding that Democratic members of the Michigan delegation in the House of Representatives intend to place the text in the RECORD.

However, I should like to comment on the Michigan Declaration. As I said, it expresses the philosophy of the Democratic Party in my State. It is not a radical document. On the contrary, it is a moderate—but understanding—approach to many problems facing our country. It puts into words many things that need saying.

The preamble of the declaration states that the world is embroiled in total revolutions of great peril or promise in the affairs of men and of nations. The revolutions specifically noted concern atomic energy, automation, weapons of war, anticolonialism, Soviet imperialism, atheistic communism, integration, and time and space.

None of these are particularly startling. They exist—and we all know it. The question is: What are we going to do?

As the declaration states:

> The peril or promise of these revolutions cannot be met by part-time administration of halfway programs under indifferent leadership with lukewarm concern for the needs of the people.

The declaration continues:

> The National Republican administration feeds Americans an opiate of complacency in these times of vast scientific and ideological turmoil. It commits a psychological betrayal of the people by not informing them of the true nature of events.

The declaration goes on to list very briefly the moderate approach to the various problems that face us, suggesting the broad goals for which we should strive.

It urges the Democratic Party not to rest on the laurels of past accomplishments, stating in these words:

> The Democratic Party must renew the great concepts with which it is identified, protect them against betrayal and reversal, enlarge their scope to make government grow in service to the people.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to read the Michigan Declaration.

SCRAPPING OF THE BATTLESHIP "OREGON" FAMOUS VESSEL OF THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR IN JAPANESE SCRAPYARDS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, last summer, in 1955, when I first heard that the hull of the once great battleship *Oregon* was imminently to be sold for scrap, I immediately asked my staff to investigate the situation. As a citizen of Oregon, born in Portland, I had from my earliest memory heard the stirring narration of naval history which was recited from grade to grade, and from year to year. I shared the common pride in the illustrious achievements of the gallant ship, and I thrilled with my fellow Oregonians whenever I passed it on the Portland waterfront, where for some years it was berthed in a friendly Willamette River harbor. Schools all over Oregon organized pilgrimages, and thousands of school children vicariously relived the events written into its glorious record of accomplishment in the Spanish-American War and World War I as they filed along its decks.

The tranquil chapter of the *Oregon's* existence was rudely ended in 1942 when, stripped of her superstructure and nearly everything else, the battleship was reduced to duty as an ammunition barge serving the Pacific Fleet. The final chapters in the history of the *Oregon* were foreshadowed at that time.

A letter from A. C. Mumma, rear admiral, United States Navy, Chief of the Bureau of Ships, was the official confirmation answering my inquiry. Pleased that the Navy would be alert to any parts remaining which might have historic interest for the schools or historical museums of my State, I put aside my previous misgivings, to accept the verdict of the naval authorities. I had the impression that the worn hull was so unseaworthy that even the scrapping would have to be done in far-distant Guam, where it performed the humiliating utility of a breakwater. It seemed more fitting that it should there be scrapped, rather than left to disintegrate on the coral reefs. The recent news of its sale to a Japanese firm, which found it no insuperable problem to tow the hull to Japan for final cutting into scrap, indicates that the hull must have been in better repair than we had been led to believe.

In Oregon this final chapter has, not unexpectedly, met a wave of chagrin, disappointment, and indignation—chagrin that the final chapters of the *Oregon* were so completely humiliating, disappointment that the Navy showed no interest or feeling corresponding to that expressed by Oregonians, and indignation that the final salvage came in a distant port where the last identity would fade into the rusty anonymity of the scrap heap.

In the discussions carried on with the Bureau of Ships, the memorandum in my files indicates that the Curator of the Navy had reviewed the possibility of further salvage of possible items of historical interest. Suggestions as to the possibility of striking medallions from the steel of the bulkheads elicited the information that this had been done in connection with the famous battleship *Maine*, but with disappointing results; the public had failed to respond, and the Navy had on hand a supply of medallions for which there was no demand.

I am sure, Mr. President, that schools and museums in Oregon would have welcomed such medallions from the *Oregon*, which would memorialize the happier chapters in the career of the illustrious battleship. Realizing that the last opportunity for such a project was fast slipping away, and that only through the intercession of the Japanese Government could anything at all now be done, I have passed on the suggestion to the Japanese Embassy.

Before exploring the subject, which they will do, they have reminded me that the transactions which have resulted in the towing of the *Oregon* to a Japanese port are between private firms of the respective nations, and may be beyond the accomplishment of governmental action at this late date.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news story by Roger Stuart, which appeared February 1, 1956, in the Washington Daily News; a letter from the Department of the Navy, a letter on the subject to a constituent; a copy of the letter I addressed to the Japanese Embassy; and a news release relative to this matter.

There being no objection, the article, letters, and release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of February 1, 1956]

THE END HAS COME FOR U. S. S. "OREGON," "PRIDE OF PACIFIC"

(By Roger Stuart)

Want to buy a battleship? You won't get much by way of fighting power. But there's salvageable metal wrapped up in the offer—plus a good bit of honest sentiment.

Once she was the proud U. S. S. *Oregon*, "Pride of the Pacific," they used to call her "Bulldog of the Fleet."

Yes; the same *Oregon* whose unprecedented 71-day, 17,000-mile dash around Cape Horn in time to join the fleet action in the Spanish American War thrilled Americans of a half-century ago, and proved the need for a Panama Canal.

The same *Oregon* which, in the Battle of Santiago, slam-banged into action through the smoke off the *Brooklyn's* starboard quarter, adding her thunderous salvos of 13-inch guns to the *Brooklyn's* 8-inch, and both sending out continuous sprays of metal from their quick-fire guns.

UPS AND DOWNS

Her history since then has been one of ups and downs—mostly downs, but with a kind of glory in World War II.

It was back in the early 1920's—she was 21 years old then—that she was first designated "no longer useful" and marked for scrapping.

But she wasn't scrapped. The citizens of the State of Oregon requested the loan of the old battlewagon for use in an exposition. She remained in Portland Harbor quite a while.

As World War II was drawing near, Uncle Sam had need of a lot of ships. But not the *Oregon*. In February 1941, she was designated an "unclassified miscellaneous ship." And 18 months after that, she was stricken from the Navy's register.

Ironically, it was on December 7, 1942—1 year to the day after Pearl Harbor—that the *Oregon* was sold for $35,000 to two Portland businessmen. Her superstructure was scrapped, her engines, boilers, pipes, generators, and other equipment ripped out—to net the purchasers $193,620.

GIVEN NUMBER

They loaded her hull with dynamite and other explosives and floated her across the Pacific to Guam. There, during the rest of the war, she served as a floating ammunition depot.

She was useful, but perhaps not useful enough to suit the *Oregon's* intrepid spirit. In any event, she broke her moorings several times. Apparently she was determined to get out to sea. The last time she broke away she became mired on a coral reef.

Again it was decided her days of service were over. The Navy came to the conclusion that she should be sunk by gunfire. But historians and others, the record shows, protested such treatment for the once glorious *Oregon*. She was spared.

DECISION REACHED

Then, in the summer of 1955, the decision was reached to tow her out to sea and scuttle her. Meanwhile, however, Congress had passed a bill permitting the Navy to keep both the *Oregon* and another famous ship, the *Olympia*, for 6 months more.

But time finally ran out on the *Oregon*. Now she's up for sale as scrap. The Brooklyn Navy Yard has been assigned responsibility for her disposal. The *Oregon's* shattered hulk remains in Guam—and any potential purchaser who wishes to inspect her must get clearance from the Navy. Bids will be accepted until March 18.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF SHIPS,
Washington, D. C., September 1, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I am writing to apprise you of the Navy's plans for disposing of the U. S. S. *Oregon*.

As you probably know, the *Oregon* is presently moored at Guam. She is a hollow hulk with no existing compartmentation and has been stripped of her superstructure and all machinery and appurtenances. For your information, I am enclosing a photograph of this relic.

The act of July 23, 1954 (Public Law 523, 83d Cong.) authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of the *Oregon* after July 23, 1955, in the event that no application for transfer to a qualified donee is approved by this date. The act further provides that the vessel may be disposed of by sale or by scrapping, in the discretion of the Secretary.

As no application for the *Oregon* was received, the Navy is now authorized to dispose of this relic. After careful consideration of the various factors involved, it has been determined to be in the best interests of the Government to dispose of the *Oregon* by sale for scrap purposes only.

Prior to the sale of the *Oregon*, any parts of the ship that are of historic interest will be removed for retention by the Navy or for loan or gift to nonprofit historical or educational institutions.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,
A. G. MUMMA,
Rear Admiral, United States Navy,
Chief of Bureau.

JUNE 1, 1956.

Mrs. HOWARD VENN,
Lake Grove, Oreg.

DEAR MRS. VENN: I can understand, exactly, the sense of anger and sorrow that you felt when you read of the "final ignominious fate of the old battleship *Oregon*." Last year, shortly before time for adjournment, my attention was called to the imminent disposal for scrap purposes of the hulk of the old battleship. Feeling concerned at that time that the final chapter of the historic vessel would be a sorry one, I began a series of discussions over the probable fate of what was left of the former great battleship. Particularly I inquired if there was anything that could be salvaged and preserved in museums or used in any way to commemorate the glorious early chapters of the *Oregon*. Government officials, as a result of my recurring inquiries, made a further investigation, reporting back that there was nothing left that could be salvaged—that all that remained was the steel plate that composed the hulk. I stressed to the officials that even buckets of old rivets might be of interest as souvenirs for elementary schools of the State. We even investigated the possibility of stamping out of the steel plate small commemorative plaques of medalions which could be placed in public and school libraries. This request produced information that such a project had been attempted with the remains of the old battleship *Maine* and they suggested rather facetiously but to the point, that if I knew of any market where quantities of these old medalions might be sold the Government had a ready supply for such a market.

There would seem to be no recourse from the Navy's judgment that all that was left of the *Oregon* was a partially submerged hulk having value only as scrap. From the description of the unseaworthiness of the old hulk, I gained the impression that perhaps it would have to be cut up for salvage in Guam where it had been towed following the war.

The story, announced a few days ago relating its final sale to scrap merchants of Japan, as a last and final irony, reemphasizes the ridiculous fiasco that began with its return to the service in World War II. Economically, it is perhaps best that its end has come as described in the recent news story, on the other hand, however, in the sense of what it has meant to us historically, your suggestion that it be blown up and sunk, is certainly understandable. Again let me say that I understand completely your feeling of offense and indignation over the ignominious end of the old battleship.

Sincerely,
RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
June 11, 1956.

His Excellency the Honorable SADAO IGUCHI,
The Ambassador of Japan, Japanese Embassy, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: This letter will formalize the remarks of Mr. Jones, my administrative assistant, pursuant to the scrapping of the hull of the old battleship *Oregon*, in the recent telephone conversation to the Embassy.

I am sure you have some familiarity with the illustrious history of the battleship—its 17,000-mile race from the Atlantic around the Horn to joint the fleet action in the Philippines during the Spanish-American War and its illustrious career as flagship of the American fleet in World War I.

The *Oregon* for a number of years was berthed in the Willamette River in Portland, Oreg., where it very appropriately served as a naval memorial, visited daily by scores of school children and proud citizens.

In 1942 it was again returned to duty, over the most strenuous protests of hundreds of Oregonians. Used as a barge and later a floating warehouse, it more recently had the sad fate of serving as a breakwater in Guam.

Now that it is to be cut up for scrap after its purchase by a Japanese firm, a great deal of indignation and protest is coming from many of my Oregon constituents. They feel, quite understandably, that to be cut up for scrap metal is the most ignominious end that could be conceived for a battleship whose feats wrote a bright chapter in American naval history.

In view of this public feeling of profound disappointment, it seemed to me that if there should be anything at all salvageable, something which might in some way be made available to schools and public libraries as a memorial of our great ship, it could be the basis for an effective gesture of good will between the two nations.

What I am suggesting might follow the pattern of action incident to the battleship *Maine*. From the sheets of steel composing the bulkhead of the *Maine*, commemorative medalions were stamped out. Medalions, of course, could very appropriately be placed in schools and public libraries, or sold at a nominal sum to the public at large.

I realize the hull of the *Oregon* has passed into the hands of a private firm which will cut it into scrap. However, a few sheets of scrap steel or some other part could be made into commemorative articles.

I thought your government might wish to explore the possibilities, knowing that such a gesture would be productive of infinite good will between the people of Oregon and Japan, who face each other across the vast expanse of the Pacific.

Respectfully,
RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, has asked for the assistance of the Japanese Ambassador in obtaining as souvenirs for distribution to Oregon schools and libraries "even a bucket of rivets" from the remains of the old battleship U. S. S. *Oregon* which has been sold to Japanese interests for salvage of scrap steel.

The hull of the *Oregon*, which raced 17,000 miles around Cape Horn in 68 days to take part in naval maneuvers of the Spanish-American War, has been taken from Guam, where it was stripped down for use as an ammunition barge during World War II, and will be cut up for scrap metal. NEUBERGER requested the Japanese Embassy to determine what action could be taken to obtain metal objects from the ship which might be of interest as memorabilia of the ship's historic past.

The Oregon Senator recalled that last year it was brought to his attention that the half-submerged vessel would be disposed of as scrap.

"At the time, I inquired if there was anything that could be salvaged and preserved in museums or used in any way to commemorate the glorious early chapters of the *Oregon*," NEUBERGER said. "However, Government officials checked and discovered that there was nothing left that could be salvaged—all that remained was the steel plate that composed the hull.

"We even investigated the possibility of stamping out of the steel plate commemorative plaques or medallions which could be placed in public and school libraries. This request produced information that such a project had been attempted with the remains of the old battleship *Maine* and it was suggested rather facetiously but to the point, that if I knew of any market where quantities of these old *Maine* medallions might be sold, the Government had a ready supply for such a market.

"The story relating the *Oregon's* final sale to scrap merchants of Japan is a final irony which reemphasizes the fiasco that began when it was returned to service in World War II. Economically, it is perhaps best that its end has come as described in the recent news story, since much of our foreign aid program is directed toward rehabilitation of the Japanese economy so it may withstand the threats of Communist aggression. However, in the sense of what the ship has meant to our State historically, it is regrettable that its final disposal has been so ignominious.

"It is my hope that a portion of the remains can be obtained from the Japanese salvage company, so they can be disposed of appropriately through the Oregon Historical Society, and to the end that there be kept alive the memory of a day when the *Oregon*, Dewey and Manila Bay were names indelibly written in American history."

ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of a statement I have prepared on the subject of Armenian independence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARTHY

It is a great temptation these days, when we are searching our minds and hearts for ways of protecting the free world against Communist aggression, to forget about those countries that have already been engulfed by the Soviet tyranny. But we must remember that we all—the whole human race—are in this thing together. We must not forget that the very fate that we and the other nations of the free world seek to avoid has already befallen nations which were, unluckily, located closer to the source of Communist power. These nations have been living in slavery for 10, in some cases upwards of 30 years. The people of these nations know intimately the agony of oppression which we only know about indirectly; and they look to us for their deliverance. We should never cease to remind ourselves and the rest of the world of our moral duty to help these people—and of our vow, affirmed in countless national documents, not to rest until their deliverance has been accomplished.

I refer specifically today to the gallant people of Armenia who, some 2 weeks ago, celebrated the 38th anniversary of their national independence day. On May 28, 1918, the Armenian nation proclaimed itself a free and independent republic.

The independent Republic of Armenia was recognized by the United States, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and most of the leading powers of Europe and Asia. For nearly 2 years the Armenian people made a noble effort to consolidate their newly won independence and to establish themselves permanently as one of the free, democratic nations of the world. Unfortunately this struggle came to a tragic end toward the close of 1920 when Armenia was overrun by foreign invaders operating under a plot hatched in Russia by Lenin and Stalin.

After a year of ruthless Communist rule, on February 18, 1921, the Armenian people once again rose up and threw off their oppressors. This new bid for independence was, however, short-lived. Once again the Communist armies crossed Armenia's borders and overran the country. Armenia was incorporated into the Soviet Union, and the Armenian people have lived in bondage ever since.

Still, to this day, the Armenian people, in both the homeland and abroad, continue to strive for freedom and independence. I know that their heroic struggle will one day be rewarded because I know that the American people are firmly determined that communism shall one day be erased from the face of the earth.

A "REFRESHING PAUSE"

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, each time I think the Eisenhower administration has gone about as far as it can go in its cold-blooded attitude toward human problems, I get a new surprise.

The latest example of this callous approach to suffering is the news story that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey depicts our economy as enjoying a refreshing pause.

As he was quoted in press reports this morning, Mr. Humphrey told a congressional subcommittee that it is "just as well to hesitate a little."

I am doubtful, Mr. President, that the more than 220,000 unemployed workers in my State of Michigan are enjoying this refreshing pause or the long hesitation in receiving pay checks.

Would the associates of Mr. Humphrey and the Eisenhower administration enjoy a refreshing pause in the stock market?

Mr. Humphrey also offers this comment on the plight of the auto industry:

Conditions are now proceeding in a very satisfactory manner.

Mr. Humphrey has a strange idea of "satisfactory" when more and more auto workers are being laid off daily. And perhaps he thinks the manufacturers are enjoying this refreshing pause in sales.

Mr. President, this attitude of Mr. Humphrey's coincides exactly with the recent remark of President Eisenhower's assistant, Howard Pyle, who said the "right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy."

They take this attitude because they know the auto industry will come out of its recession eventually and profits will bounce back up into the stratosphere.

But they have no feeling at all for the hundreds of thousands of workers who will never catch up for the months of no pay checks.

This is not a recent attitude of the Eisenhower administration. It has been distressingly obvious ever since the great "crusade" took over the White House.

Back in 1954, when the auto workers were also enjoying their "right to suffer," Secretary of Defense Wilson made this prediction:

Oh, the new models get into production in November and December—maybe a few people will go back South when it gets a little cold—I think you'll about balance out by Christmas.

Mr. Humphrey himself said that year that 4 million unemployed was a "relatively low figure" and added that it was "remarkable that it is not worse than it is."

Secretary of Commerce Weeks, another member of the Eisenhower team, also said in 1954 that the unemployment situation was "coming along in a satisfactory manner," just as Mr. Humphrey says today that "conditions are now proceeding in a very satisfactory manner."

Mr. President, we can do little about this deep-rooted, big-business attitude short of election day.

After that I trust we shall have a long refreshing pause from the Eisenhower administration.

MEDICAL RESEARCH

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, in the June 11, 1956 issue of the Providence (R. I.) Journal there appeared a very fine editorial in support of realistic funds for medical research. I invite the attention of all Members to it, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE ACTS BOLDLY TO PROMOTE MEDICAL RESEARCH

The United States Senate took a heartening forward step a few days ago to reinforce the battle lines of an offensive that is perhaps less newsworthy than the building up of our arsenal of nuclear weapons but, in the long run, is probably a good deal more significant. This is the far-flung research offensive against the scourages of cancer, heart disease, mental illness, and other major cripplers and killers.

Upholding a recommendation of its appropriations subcommittee headed by Senator LISTER HILL of Alabama, the Senate voted a record-breaking appropriation of $184,400,000 for medical research under the auspices of the National Institutes of Health for the fiscal year beginning July 1. The sum is $57,900,000 more than the administration had asked for, $48,900,000 more than the House has authorized, and 82 percent larger than the appropriation for the current year.

If the Senate version prevails, next year's allotments for the National Cancer Institute and the National Institute of Mental Health will be virtually double their current appropriations. The National Heart Institute will get $14,500,000 more than it has for this year.

Rhode Island's Congressman FOGARTY, who is chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee in the health field, may be expected to play a key role in the matter when the medical research bill goes to conference between the two branches. It is to be hoped that Mr. FOGARTY will use his potent influence to try to prevail upon his colleagues in the House to go along with the Senate in assuring more adequate financing for the battle against disease and premature death.

The Hill subcommittee based its recommendation for a sharp increase in research funds upon the testimony of some of the country's most distinguished medical scien-

tists, including Dr. Paul Dudley White and Dr. Sidney Farber. After listening to a long procession of competent witnesses, the subcommittee called for a grand national strategy of medical research to pursue the exciting laboratory leads which have been hobbled by a lack of funds.

There are few investments promising richer dividends in health, happiness, and longer life than medical research. What can be accomplished when sufficient funds are made available to the researchers has been dramatically demonstrated by the development of the Salk polio vaccine. With the formidable problem of the chronic diseases still to be solved, a concerted research attack certainly appears worth an annual investment considerably below the cost of a single atomic aircraft carrier.

CONTRADICTORY STATEMENTS ON AIR BASE CONSTRUCTION

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, this morning I read in the press a news dispatch by the United Press reporting that the Air Force's construction chief in his appearance before the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee investigating American airpower, had stated that, first, the air base construction is lagging behind the buildup of the Air Force because of a shortage of money; second, that by mid-1957 the Air Force will have only minimum facilities to handle its planes; third, that these bases will be substandard, thereby limiting the combat effectiveness of the wings; and, fourth, that this condition comes from a "scanty purse" as a result of the economies ordered both by the Defense Department and Congress.

I am shocked and puzzled by this statement of the Air Force Assistant Chief of Staff for Installations, because his superiors, the Air Force Chief of Staff General Twining and the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Financial Management, Mr. Lyle S Garlock, in answer to pointed and direct questions I asked them recently when they appeared before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, both stated categorically that Congress had given the Air Force all the money it had requested for air bases, and very definitely and unequivocally that Congress was not responsible for any cut in funds for air bases, but rather that the responsibility for that was within the executive department. In other words, whatever cuts were made were those dictated within the Department of the Air Force, itself, the Department of Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget.

I first raised this question with General Twining because of his article, "The Air Force in the Jet Age," in the March issue of the magazine Air Force, in which he had made the statement:

> We cannot even get enough base money to properly prepare existing bases to accommodate our modern, high-performance aircraft.

Later in the presence of the Secretary of the Air Force at the public hearings of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, in answer to my questions General Twining categorically and unequivocally denied that Congress had failed to give the Air Force all the money it had requested for air bases. Secretary Quarles made no dissent to General Twining's strong denial to me that Congress had any part in bringing about a shortage of funds for air bases.

Mr. President, I am getting just a little weary of pinning Air Force representatives down on loose statements they make which either indirectly imply or directly accuse Congress of not giving the Air Force all the money it has requested for air bases.

Consciously or unconsciously, in these conflicting statements by its duly authorized representatives the Department of the Air Force is guilty of nothing less than duplicity. These false statements which, in substance, charge the Congress with undermining our national air security cast a serious cloud over the integrity and reliability of the Air Force when its representatives make statements either for public consumption and before congressional committees.

Surely our confidence is shaken and we do not know what we can believe from the Air Force when its representatives go out of their way to make false representations and accuse Congress of something of which apparently the Department of the Air Force, itself, is guilty, in conjunction with the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget, in making whatever cuts are made in the amount of money requested by the Air Force Assistant Chief of Staff for Installations and his associates for air bases.

Mr. President, when the bill for appropriations for air bases comes before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, I shall certainly demand that the Air Force Assistant Chief of Staff, together with the Air Force Chief of Staff, the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Financial Management, and the Secretary of the Air Force be requested to appear before that subcommittee at the same time and in round-table manner explain these conflicting statements and the reasons for Air Force representatives continuing to make false charges against Congress.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, the President's illness has called attention to the remarkable position which he occupies throughout the world and our own country.

This is clear by the interest displayed in the capital of every nation.

President Eisenhower has achieved a unique position of world leadership as no other man of our day.

He is the symbol of the free world's resistance to communism without sword rattling.

He is the symbol here at home of stability without complacency.

The world prays for his speedy recovery. The 20th century needs him.

LEO M. HARVEY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a few days ago Mr. J. Addington Wagner, national commander of the American Legion, presented a Legion citation to a great American and a great industrialist, Mr. Leo M. Harvey. The citation honored this man for his patriotism, his philanthropies, and his peacetime and wartime services as a citizen of the United States.

The citation reads:

> Presented by the American Legion to Leo M. Harvey, citizen-patriot, industrial leader, philanthropist.
>
> In recognition of his contributions to the general economic welfare, and to the military strength of the United States in three wars 1917–18, 1941–45, 1950–53, and in appreciation of his many personal acts of kindness and generosity on behalf of the children of America.

I am most happy to see Mr. Harvey's work recognized and lauded. I am sure all of his many, many friends share my feelings.

Founder and president of Harvey Machine Co. and Harvey Aluminum, Leo Harvey has devoted much of his apparently limitless energy to the industrial and commercial welfare of the United States since he came to this country over 40 years ago. He has been and is an outstanding success in American life. And many of his achievements have made contributions to the ability of our country to defeat its enemies and to maintain its high standards of peacetime living.

We in the Far West know Leo Harvey to be one of the finest examples of the free enterprise system in action in the United States. The tribute paid him by the American Legion was well merited.

I ask unanimous consent to have the remarks of National Commander Wagner on the occasion of the presentation of this citation to Mr. Leo Harvey printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follow:

REMARKS BY J. ADDINGTON WAGNER, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION AT LUNCHEON, HARVEY ALUMINUM, TORRANCE, CALIF., TUESDAY, MAY 29, 1956

Anyone who has the good fortune of being raised in the State of Michigan acquires an appreciation of the industrial strength of America.

In my case, it wasn't even necessary to go to Detroit or Flint to sharpen that appreciation. We had—and still have—in Battle Creek one of the truly great centers of American industry; and the chief product, as you may have heard, generates far more energy than its production consumes.

I must confess, however, that I have seen here today what is to me a new dimension in technology. Certainly those of us who are here for the first time are tremendously impressed by the size and the equipment and the production techniques of Harvey Aluminum. The claim has been made that only a dedicated engineer can fully appreciate engineering tools and their products. Perhaps so. But it seems to me that anyone coming here and touring your facilities as we have done, is bound to see something awesome and exciting in the work you are carrying on.

We, of the American Legion, of course, find a special appeal in your work. We are veterans of war. We have fought the enemies of our country, using arms and materiel supplied by you of Harvey Aluminum and your colleagues in industry. For us there is assurance here that vitally important defense production is being maintained and that those who man our defense forces today are being furnished the best that science and ingenuity and hard work can provide.

You will recall that the theme of Armed Forces Day, earlier this month, was "Power

for peace." I think that phrase expresses the prayerful hope of all of us. It is not our first choice to discourage attack by preparing to resist attack. Rather, the choice has been forced upon us by those in the world who do not cherish peace as we do and who would permit us to remain at peace only if we manifest our power.

The American Legion believes unqualifiedly in a strong preparedness program. To be effective, this strength must be real and measureable. It must exist—not as ideas or blueprints in the planning room—but as functioning weapons in the sky and on the ground and sea. That is the kind of peace-preserving strength that you in Harvey Aluminum are producing now; and in our judgment it is just as vital to the Nation's security as production in time of war.

It strikes me that there is something more important than the industrial strength of America on display today. The spirit of America and all that America means in terms of human liberty and individual opportunity also are very much in evidence.

Many of you know Mr. Leo Harvey far better than do I. After a relatively few hours' acquaintanceship with him, certainly it would be presumptuous of me to attempt to measure him as a man or as an American. But some things I do know about him, and they deserve to be said for the benefit of the rest of us and our appreciation of the land we love.

We believe, as a cardinal principle of Americanism, that a man can go as far as his talent and initiative can carry him. We hold that under our free enterprise system, the individual controls his pursuit of happiness and success, and that his starting place—no matter how modest or seemingly unfavored—does not bar his way. Abraham Lincoln is perhaps the most noted case in point, but there are many others of more recent times—among them, captains of industry like Henry Ford and William Knudsen and Andrew Carnegie. And yet, none of these provided a more emphatic or more inspiring success story than is told in the still current record of the gentleman who is our host here today.

He came to America 41 years ago, a young man virtually alone in a land whose people and customs were foreign to all he had known. Like the forefathers of most of us, he was poor in goods and rich in spirit. He brought with him a belief in Almighty God, a desire to be a good American, and a willingness to work hard. All that he has achieved since—all that he has today—gives proof that these are the keys that really count in the United States of America.

It might be said that America has been good to Mr. Harvey. It must be said that Mr. Harvey has been good for America. He has been good not only as a responsible leader of industry, but as a responsible and generous citizen.

Some of his most important works have nothing to do with aluminum products or the management of a great business enterprise. They have a great deal to do, however, with the future health and happiness of thousands of children throughout the country who are having a hard pull.

This, too, is part of the spirit of America and of private American enterprise. For a system which offers great prizes for the individual who can earn them also needs private enterprise in behalf of the public welfare.

Because they overlook this human factor, some of our friends abroad fail to understand America's standard of values. They say that we worship only the machine and the things it makes. If they could know the history and the philosophy of Americans like Leo Harvey, they would understand better where the true strength and greatness of America are to be found.

Now, Mr. Harvey, I am going to conclude these observations by performing a very pleasant task, for which authority was given me by the American Legion's national executive committee. To you, sir, I want to present a token of the esteem and admiration in which you are held by American Legionnaires. We wish for you continued success and many more happy years of service to your community, your State, and your Nation. We hope that this symbol of our gratitude will convey to you some measure of our sincere appreciation for all you have done to prove—once again—that in America good men can make good dreams come true.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Montana in congratulating Mr. Leo M. Harvey upon his receiving so impressive a citation from the national commander of the American Legion.

As one of the Senators from the State of Oregon, I am in a position to know of Mr. Harvey's pioneering in the field of industrial development. There soon will be erected on the banks of the Columbia River, at the city of The Dalles, in our State, a great aluminum plant of the Harvey Machine Co. This plant will employ our people, it will shape our raw materials and resources into vital metal for peacetime uses and for defense, and it will contribute to the general prosperity of our region.

Leo M. Harvey, who came to the United States over four decades ago, thus typifies the best in the American tradition. All of us, except for fullblooded American Indians, are either immigrants or the descendants of immigrants. It is part of the American genius that men and women from overseas have performed so capably and so illustriously in contributing to the progress and development of this great Nation.

By helping to encourage competition in the aluminum industry, Leo M. Harvey has done his part toward strengthening our free-enterprise system, which is so essential to our well-being as a nation.

I know that many people in our State of Oregon, where soon the new aluminum plant of the Harvey Machine Co. will stand on the banks of the West's greatest river, join the senior Senator from Montana in congratulating Leo M. Harvey as he receives this citation from the American Legion for his service to our Nation in war and in peace.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like to join my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana, in saluting Mr. Leo Harvey.

As we all know, Mr. President, tomorrow will be Flag Day. As the Senator from Montana spoke, I could not help but think of how very meaningful tomorrow's patriotic ceremonies will be for Mr. Harvey, a man whose life, career, and whose public spirit personify the essence of America.

As the Senator said, Leo Harvey arrived in this country 40 years ago. When he arrived his pockets were empty of funds, but his heart was full of hope. In this country of ours, now, and in the past, and, God willing, in the future, a man—any man—can hope. He can hope to make his fortune, can hope to make his life a full one, rich in human value. He can do these things when hope is coupled with energy.

Leo Harvey, in the years following his arrival, translated his hopes into realities. With his determination, his vitality, and his confidence in this Nation, he built one of our country's fine firms. He also possessed vision and out of this vision was erected a great aluminum company. Mr. Harvey's business firms made invaluable contributions in the two great wars fought by the United States to protect man's individual right to hope, and only a free man can hope.

Last May 29, Leo Harvey was awarded a citation by the American Legion. In my humble judgment, that award was well deserved. Leo Harvey, a captain of industry, came up through the ranks. This one-time immigrant became one of our most active citizens, and the young man who arrived with empty pockets now is an outstanding philanthropist.

I congratulate Mr. Harvey upon his citation by the American Legion, and commend him for confirming—through his business and personal life—the fine American traditions.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in the remarks with reference to Mr. Leo Harvey. I think the citation awarded to him by the American Legion speaks for itself. His career is a fine example of the kind of contribution which can be made to American life by an immigrant.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from Washington for his comment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in paying high respect to Leo Harvey, not only because of his enterprise, but because he has made a great contribution to civic affairs and to the welfare of his community.

Mr. SYMINGTON subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to join the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and other Senators in the fine compliments they have paid to Mr. Leo Harvey, one of the great manufacturers of the United States. I have known Mr. Harvey for many years, and I believe the award which has been made to him is fully justified.

PRODUCTION OF TUNGSTEN, ASBESTOS, FLUORSPAR, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there is no further morning business, the morning business is concluded, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3982) to provide for the maintenance of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes.

PUBLICATION OF SPEECH OF KHRUSHCHEV EXPOSING AND DENOUNCING JOSEPH STALIN

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Department of State has performed an important service in making public the remarks of Khrushchev exposing and denouncing the crimes and brutalities of Joseph Stalin. In many significant ways, this document is historic and unique. Certainly, no one in the free world has ever done as well as Khrushchev in revealing the faults and evils of the Soviet system.

Khrushchev catalogs in detail the wrongs committed by Stalin against the Russian people and his comrades in the Bolshevik movement. But the speech, as we have it, does not set the record straight on Stalin's crimes outside Russia's borders. Perhaps a portion of the speech is missing.

Khrushchev did say:

> The willfulness of Stalin showed itself not only in decisions concerning the internal life of the country but also in the international relations of the Soviet Union.

But Stalin's offenses in foreign policy are not enumerated. In particular, the document is silent on what may be Stalin's greatest crime against the human race—namely, his frustration of plans to eliminate from national arsenals atomic bombs and other weapons of mass destruction.

The record on this issue is clear and decisive. In 1946 the United States made bold and revolutionary proposals to the United Nations for the abolition of such weapons and a system of inspection and control.

Remember, Mr. President, that in 1946 we alone had the atomic bomb. There were no hydrogen bombs. There were no long-range missiles. In the interests of world peace, we were prepared to relinquish our monopoly on the wartime atom. The stage was set for a massive breakthrough in international cooperation.

With dictatorial bluntness, Stalin brushed aside this historic opportunity. He frustrated and blocked the effort to reach agreement. By the fall of 1948, all members of the U. N. were agreed on the basic elements of a plan for armaments reduction and control—except for Russia and her satellites. It was Stalin who slammed the door in the face of this bright hope for peace.

As a result, the shadow of devastating weapons today darkens the whole world. Stalin's legacy to his countrymen, as well as to us, is a competition in the fabrication of weapons whose destructiveness cannot be exaggerated. Bombs of almost limitless force, intercontinental missiles of incredible speed—these are not the products of phantasy but the hard prospects of sober reality. The armaments race is a tragic monument to Stalin's rigid rule.

Of course, Mr. President, Stalin told his people that the United States scuttled efforts toward disarmament. This was a colossal lie. The story that America plotted atomic war was a fabrication conceived by Stalin, propagated by Stalin and spread across the globe by Communist agents. It is time the Russian people knew the truth. Khrushchev should make known the full record.

America did not spawn the arms race. To avoid that contest, we were prepared to take unprecedented steps. Even after Stalin blocked arms reduction and control, our defense forces were maintained at a minimum level. Only the Communist invasion of South Korea forced a change in our policies. Since the end of the Korean war, we have continued our defense buildup for two reasons. First, because Russia's military power stands at the highest level in history and continues to expand. Second, because Khrushchev and his colleagues persist in their unyielding opposition to effective arms controls.

Very soon the Senate will be called upon again to vote great sums of money for defense—both at home and abroad. Many of us will vote for these programs as a vital safeguard for our security. But had the disarmament efforts in the early postwar years succeeded, had Stalin not stood in the way, we would not now need to spend such vast amounts for military purposes.

It is hard to conceive what could be accomplished if we could take this money and spend it for the economic and social betterment of man. What incredible progress we could make toward a fuller life for our people and less privileged peoples throughout the world.

In 1950 and 1951, the late Senator Brien McMahon sponsored a resolution in support of effective disarmament and the use of the resources thereby saved for economic development on a global scale. Together with other men of both parties, I introduced an identical resolution in the House of Representatives.

I believe those resolutions still summarize the fundamental desires of the American people. We want to find some means of barring mass destruction weapons from the earth's surface. We do not like to channel our human and material resources into arms programs. We would much prefer to join in efforts to attack poverty and want throughout the world.

Hardly a day goes by without some notice in the press of a hearty wish by Khrushchev to promote good will and understanding among nations. If Khrushchev is sincere, he can prove it to the world by a simple first step. He can tell the Russian people the truth—that it was their own mad leader, Stalin, who blocked disarmament. He can tell them that it was Stalin who established a pattern of hostility toward the free world which has made these postwar years, years of crisis. He can tell them that it was Stalin's dogmatic rule which led to the trials of the Berlin Blockade and the Korean war.

Perhaps, Mr. President, it is hoping for too much to expect Khrushchev to give the Russian people the facts about Stalin's foreign policy. Until he does so, however, we can derive little comfort from his denunciation of Stalin's domestic errors. For history will show that Stalin's crimes against the free world equal, if not surpass, the evils he wrought against his fellow Russians.

Doubtless the truth would come as a great shock to the Russian people. We might well find them pressing their leaders for moderate and honest policies. For certainly the mass of mankind is united in its desire to avoid incineration by hydrogen bombs.

If Khrushchev takes this first step and tells the Russian people the truth about Stalin's foreign policy, perhaps we could respond with more assurance to the Soviet smile.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to compliment the junior Senator from Washington upon the statement he has just made, because I think he has emphasized exactly what the situation is and has certainly brought home some points which need a little more elaboration before we can place any trust in what the leaders of the Soviet Union have to say, especially statements made by Messrs. Khrushchev and Bulganin.

I note that the Senator in his speech made the statement that Khrushchev should make known the complete record. I wonder if the Senator can tell the Senate why Mr. Khrushchev is so modest about disclosing the part which he and Messrs. Bulganin, Malenkov, and Molotov played in the affairs of the Soviet Union during the time Mr. Stalin was premier.

Mr. JACKSON. I think of Mr. Khrushchev and his crowd have resolved to use a historic "out" which all totalitarian leaders employ, namely, that of a scapegoat. They are using Stalin as a scapegoat for their troubles within the Soviet Union.

The difficulty with the position of Mr. Khrushchev and the others who are associated with him is that when they make statements they do not come before the world with clean hands. If they could come with clean hands, they would be in a better position, in my judgment, to expect the world to consider their words to have true and sincere meaning. But they have been very careful to confine their attack on Stalin to the domestic conduct of Stalin within the Soviet Union. They have not stated that Mr. Stalin was the cause of world tensions and of the terrible possibility of a hydrogen war which hangs over the heads of free men and women everywhere.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted that the Senator is emphasizing the foreign policy aspects of the reports being issued by Mr. Khrushchev. I say that, of course, with the thought in mind that foreign policy is not being given much consideration in the devastating confessions which are now being made.

I am wondering, however, if perhaps it is not significant that some of the old gang, of which Messrs. Khrushchev, Malenkov, and Molotov were a part, are not being liquidated, but are being retained in inferior positions. It seems to me that what we are witnessing is a continuation of the old style tactics dressed up in new clothes, with the objectives of the Soviet Union still being the same and being carried out in the persons of

Mr. Khrushchev, especially, and Mr. Bulganin, who seems to hold a title but really does not exercise much authority in the way of power.

Mr. JACKSON. The distinguished Senator from Montana has made an excellent point. It seems to me that it is the same old house which is sought to be remodeled by the making of a few changes. But I think the results will be devastating if the same old crowd continues to live in the house.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator in his speech said:

He—

meaning Krushchev—

can tell the Russian people the truth—that it was their own mad leader, Stalin, who blocked disarmament.

Is it not true that Mr. Khrushchev is himself at the present time doing a pretty good job of blocking disarmament?

Mr. JACKSON. That is absolutely correct. Not only is Mr. Khrushchev blocking disarmament, but the man who was his foreign policy spokesman until a few days ago—Mr. Molotov—is a past master of obstruction; and apparently the new foreign minister is a specialist in the same field. Particularly is he an expert on the Middle East, where Russia is now getting ready to expand its base of operations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad the Senator from Washington has mentioned that, because it is common knowledge that the new foreign minister, Dimitri T. Shepilov, is the one who negotiated the arms deal in the Middle East. It is anticipated that on his trips to Syria, Libya, and Greece he will stir up more trouble in that part of the world.

It is quite pertinent, I think, that we should examine Russian foreign policy, because I anticipate, and anticipate strongly, that the Soviet Union is in the Middle East and in Africa to stay.

It was especially pleasant for me to note that the distinguished Senator from Washington referred to the proposal made by the late Senator McMahon. I recall serving with the Senator from Washington in the House at the time he introduced a similar proposal there. I am delighted that he is keeping alive the memory of Senator McMahon, by reintroducing the resolution, because I think he is following in the footsteps of the man who, as a Member of this body, was the first Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on which the distinguished junior Senator from Washington so ably serves.

Mr. JACKSON. Our Nation and the other nations of the free world owe an everlasting debt of gratitude to the late Senator Brien McMahon. Brien McMahon appreciated the danger which confronted the free world. It was under his leadership as Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that this Nation's atomic energy efforts were expanded. It was Brien McMahon who worked day and night for the program of effective, rascal-proof disarmament. We can all be proud of our late distinguished colleague for the contribution he made to the national security and the furtherance of peace in this troubled world.

OIL AND GAS DRILLING IN NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGES IS INCONSISTENT WITH ORIGINAL PURPOSE OF THESE GAME SANCTUARIES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I call on Secretary of the Interior Seaton to cancel the oil and gas leases upon our National Wildlife Refuge lands, which were handed out so generously and recklessly by his predecessor in office.

Wildlife—in the air, under the water, and on the surface of the earth—is among our most precious heritages. These animals, birds, and fish are particularly important and symbolic to our young people. Already we have made perilous inroads on the continent's supply of wild creatures. Unless our wildlife refuges are protected, the depredations will multiply and increase.

When ex-Senator Seaton was confirmed by the Senate on June 6, I pointed out that the way in which he measures up to the challenge of this oil drilling on wildlife refuges may decide whether he ranks in history as another Douglas McKay or another Gifford Pinchot.

Gifford Pinchot was the great conservationist who took the lead in setting aside our vast forest reserves for future generations of Americans. Douglas McKay is the man who threw wide open the portals of the wildlife lands to the oil and gas companies.

OUR WILDLIFE SANCTUARIES DATE FROM 1903

The people of the United States are proud of our great system of wildlife refuges. These domains are especially essential to the ducks and geese which fly miraculously along the flyways between their summer homes in the Canadian Arctic and their winter nesting grounds beside southern waters. In the marshy sanctuaries, the birds can nest, feed, breed, and restore spent energies. There they are protected. There they are safe, at least temporarily. The first Federal wildlife refuge was established in 1903, when a true friend of conservation, Theodore Roosevelt, occupied the White House.

It so happens that petroleum deposits often are found near the swampy terrain that is ideal for a wildfowl sanctuary. Thus the oil and gas companies have eyed the refuges for years with greedy eyes. The Interior Department stewardship of Douglas McKay offered them their big chance; they leaped at it, avidly.

Listen to the words spoken not long ago at the 21st North American Wildlife Conference in New Orleans, by Dr. Ira Noel Gabrielson, first director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, now head of the Wildlife Management Institute:

It is not possible to explore for oil or gas, or to develop oil or gas fields, without doing damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat.

SHALL WATERFOWL SUFFER FATE OF PASSENGER PIGEON?

Dr. Gabrielson is a lifelong Republican, but, ahead of that, he is a lifelong conservationist. He realizes that any species can become extinct. We take our ducks and geese for granted. Yet the passenger pigeon, once the most numerous bird on the globe, became a relic because of terrible destruction and depredations. The last passenger pigeon died in the Cincinnati Zoo in 1914. Her name was Martha. There never will be another one of these lovely little birds on our planet if the earth endures for a billion years. The same could happen to mallards and teal and Canadian geese, if we let oil derricks become more predominant than nesting grounds on our wildlife refuges.

Declared Dr. Gabrielson, who, I am proud to say, is an illustrious graduate of Oregon State College:

During the time that Secretary McKay's famous "stop order" was in effect, from August 1953 to December 1955, several hundred leases were issued, while only 11 were issued from 1920 to August 1953.

Think of that, Mr. President. Secretary McKay promulgated a "stop order," presumably to halt oil and gas drilling on the refuges. While the so-called stop order was in effect more oil and gas leases were allowed than during any other period in the history of the refuge system, by many times over. Is not such trickery ample justification for the rescinding of these leases by the new Secretary, Mr. Fred Seaton?

ARE REFUGES FOR WILDLIFE OR OIL?

One of the outstanding wildlife experts in the country is Michael Hudoba, an editor of Sports Afield magazine. In his regular column for March 1956, this leader among the organization known as Outdoor Writers of America has highlighted some of the sinister aspects of the McKay policies regarding national wildlife refuges.

Writes Michael Hudoba:

The primary purpose of any wildlife refuge is to conserve and restore wildlife species. That purpose now is diverted. Wildlife now must share the refuges with the oil- and gas-drilling operations.

Secretary McKay's order raises the question whether wildlife preservation can continue even to remain the primary purpose of the refuges. It is the most serious reversal of policy toward wildlife conservation since the refuge system was established and built laboriously over the years.

I concur with Mr. Hudoba's cogent analysis. Apparently the adverse effect of ex-Secretary McKay's policies is widely recognized by many able editorial commentators in publications devoted to the interests of sportsmen and other outdoor enthusiasts. Mr. Harold Titus, the noted editor of Field and Stream, in the June issue of that magazine, also commented on the oil leases granted under ex-Secretary McKay. He said:

Well, the conservationist who doesn't feel uneasy about the future of resources under management like that is a rare bird, indeed.

Once the Interior Department officially recognizes that oil and gas prospecting occupies a parallel role with wildlife and waterfowl protection on the refuges, what then becomes of the original purpose of the refuge system? Is a particular sanctuary a nesting ground for wild birds or a potential source of petroleum riches? What if the General Services Administration decided to rent out Government offices for hotel rooms

each night? Would the original purpose of the Federal offices thus be furthered and served?

Some of the most questionable leases have been permitted inside the great Lacassine Waterfowl Refuge to the Frankfort Oil Co., a subsidiary of the Seagram Whisky Distilleries. Under the McKay regime, 6 leases were issued to the Frankfort Corp. 4 days after new regulations were announced governing oil and gas drilling. The leases were issued without competitive bidding and predated to 1 day prior to the official establishment of the new regulations.

"ANOTHER LONG BACKWARD STEP"

Dr. Gabrielson has properly referred to Mr. McKay's policy of issuing oil and gas leases on a wholesale basis as "another long backward step in wildlife conservation." This was also the general conclusion of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which spent considerable time studying this whole question of oil and gas leasing within the refuges.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed the six major conclusions and recommendations of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, concerning this vital matter.

There being no objection, the conclusion and recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pursuant to the authority contained in House Resolution 118, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries undertook an investigation of the wildlife refuge system within the Department of the Interior.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The record of the hearings is a picture of extreme administrative confusion. There has been absolutely no effective liaison and coordination between several of the bureaus in the Department of the Interior, between the Washington office and the field of the Fish and Wildlife Service or even between the various branches within the Fish and Wildlife Service.

2. Notwithstanding that only 11 leases had been issued on wildlife refuge lands over the years since the original Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, and notwithstanding the fact that a stop order was issued in August 1953, directing the suspension of action on all oil and gas leases then pending, 60 leases were granted between the issuance of the suspension order and the issuance of new regulations on December 2, 1955. In addition, during this same period some 214 leases were granted on other lands administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service, as against 281 leases on such lands issued prior to August 31, 1953. Such increased activity in the issuance of leases by the Secretary of the Interior, or by those under his immediate supervision, can only result in serious damage to the wildlife refuge system in this country. The fact that this activity took place while a suspension order was in effect for the ostensible purpose of revising the regulations to provide greater protection to wildlife lands only aggravates the situation.

3. It is incredible that the Fish and Wildlife Service had no knowledge of the stepped-up tempo of leasing by the Bureau of Land Management, when almost 500 leases were granted in 1 area. The necessary activities in connection with location and exploration certainly should have been sufficient to prompt a report by the field employees to the Director of the Service. And the failure on the part of the Washington office to keep informed as to activities in the field points up the necessity for changes either in personnel or organization.

4. The Fish and Wildlife Service is also to be criticized for its failure to establish a uniform procedure for handling those leases about which it was informed. In the case of the Railroad Valley leases, the regional office handled the details, while in the Lacassine leases similar transactions were handled almost exclusively through the Washington office, with no information about them in the regional office.

5. The new regulations fall far short of providing the degree of protection to the refuges which the activities of recent years prove to be necessary. Superficially these regulations appear to give a veto power to the Fish and Wildlife Service. However, under applicable laws, oil and gas leasing in wildlife lands is a matter solely within the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior. Consequently, the veto power exists only so long as, and to the extent that the Secretary permits the regulations to control.

6. The hearings clearly demonstrated the necessity for some legislative check on the authority to make disposals which might lessen the value of wildlife refuges for conservation purposes. The committee found itself somewhat uncertain as to the manner in which the requisite control should be exercised. The bills under consideration seemed to contemplate the enactment of special legislation for each disposal of any interest in a wildlife refuge. This procedure, it seemed, would be impractical for a number of reasons. Hence, it was decided to try, for an experimental period of time, an arrangement between the Secretary of the Interior and the committee under which each proposed alienation or relinquishment of any interest the Fish and Wildlife Service has in lands under its jurisdiction would be submitted to the committee, and the committee would have 60 days to indicate its approval or disapproval of the action contemplated. If this arrangement does not work satisfactorily, the committee intends to reconsider the problem, as well as alternative solutions thereto, including the enactment of appropriate legislation.

MEMBERS OF BOTH PARTIES AGREE ON REFUGES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, let me emphasize that these conclusions represent the unanimous views of 17 Democratic members of the House committee and 12 Republicans. I want to stress just 1 or 2 of their ideas further. Note that 60 leases were granted on major National Wildlife Refuge lands during the 2 years that the presumed McKay stop order was in effect, as contrasted with a mere 11 leases during the prior 33 years.

While his stop order existed, Secretary McKay countenanced an average of 30 oil and gas leases on wildlife refuges per year. However, since 1920 there had been approved by earlier Interior Secretaries, both Democrat and Republican, only an average of one such lease every 3 years. This is the McKay record in the realm of safeguarding wildlife refuges, so far as oil and gas prospecting is concerned.

Members of the Senate also should take notice of the significant fact that the House committee unanimously referred to extreme administrative confusion and also to the undeniable circumstance that such increased activity in the issuance of leases by the Secretary of the Interior, or by those under his immediate supervision, can only result in serious damage to the wildlife refuge system in this country.

And the House committee has added:

The fact that this activity took place while a suspension order was in effect, for the ostensible purpose of revising the regulations to provide greater protection to wildlife lands, only aggravates the situation.

STOP ORDER VIOLATED BY WHOLESALE OIL LEASING

That phrase from the unanimous report of this important committee in the other Chamber, Mr. President, merits the searching study of both the Senate and Secretary Seaton. With the supposed McKay stop order in effect, conservationists were off guard. They presumed all was well on the marshy nesting grounds where the free-winging waterfowl were at ease. Men like Dr. Gabrielson and his associates could justifiably have been turning their backs for a moment. It was during this hiatus, this truce, that the McKay regime issued oil and gas leases in such indiscriminate quantities on the refuges which had been reserved for our wildfowl, for our grazing animals like bison and antelope, and for other creatures of the air and the field.

Mr. President, the profligate issuance of oil and gas leases by Secretary McKay and his subordinates during the span of their own stop order was a sneak attack. It was an ambush, a blow in the dark. These leases on our wildlife refuges would have been bad enough at any time. During the existence of an alleged stop order, they were doubly or even triply reprehensible. These circumstances, alone, should more than justify the rescinding of the oil and gas leases by the new head of the Interior Department, Secretary Fred A. Seaton.

SENATOR CITES RECORD FOR WILDLIFE PROTECTION

I believe, Mr. President, that my sincere interest in the welfare of our wildlife has been many times demonstrated. I am the sponsor of a bill, passed by the Senate on June 11, to use surplus feed grains for our migratory waterfowl. I endured considerable criticism because I protested the elimination of the famous and historic White House squirrels—a species which had fascinated many of our great Presidents, but which was proscribed for removal because of claw marks upon a new golf putting green. I have introduced legislation to cancel licenses for dams that would impede the famous steelhead trout runs of the Deschutes River or choke off the magnificent waterfalls and lakes of the upper McKenzie River. I am opposing proposed Federal projects in the watersheds of the Clearwater and Salmon Rivers, which would have such disastrous effects on the great Chinook salmon runs of the Northwest and on the remaining elk herds of the Lochsa-Selway wilderness.

Our wildlife, Mr. President, cannot be sacrificed to wanton commercialism and still survive. In some places we have to make a choice. Ex-Secretary McKay made the wrong choice when he yielded to the importunings of those who would try to superimpose oil and gas prospecting upon our national wildlife refuges.

In a way, I believe that the President of the United States has repudiated the

damage done to our wildlife refuge system, because Mr. Eisenhower very properly disregarded ex-Secretary McKay's recommendation that the Cabinet position go to Under Secretary Davis, who had helped to approve the oil-drilling program. Several newspapers even have reported that Mr. McKay sent utility lobbyists to the White House to urge the Davis selection upon the President. Instead, the President bypassed the McKay satellites completely and went outside the Interior Department to choose former Senator Seaton, who had been a personally popular member of this body.

OUR WILD CREATURES BELONG TO THE NEXT GENERATION

Mr. President, political figures come and go—Presidents of the United States, Vice Presidents, Cabinet members, Senators, Representatives, judges. All are mortal, physically as well as politically. But the great riddle of earth's eternal process of birth, growth, and death is never ending. Part of that process occurs in the environment inhabited by the beasts and birds placed here by the Almighty. Man, despite his ingenuity, cannot create a living thing. No scientist on our planet ever can shape another passenger pigeon. But man can help to reserve a protected realm, where some of God's creatures will be safe from man's own depredations and attacks. That is what our National Wildlife Refuge system has meant. That is why the alarming threat to this system, posed by oil and gas prospecting, must be reversed and thrown back. That is why I make such an appeal from the floor of the Senate today.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article from the March 1956, issue of American Forests magazine, entitled "Our Vanishing Species," by Will Barker, which illustrates how lack of protection has contributed toward the sad and steady diminution of such living things as grizzly bears, American bison, whooping cranes, and landlocked salmon.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR VANISHING SPECIES

(By Will Barker)

As competition for the land continues unabated, several species of native wildlife are finding survival increasingly difficult. Currently there are about 15 of these endangered species as the National Wildlife Federation designates those members of the wildlife community whose existence is in jeopardy.

Among the birds and mammals on the Federation's 1956 list is the grizzly bear, first described scientifically by Lewis and Clark after their return from exploring the headwaters of the Missouri and Columbia Rivers in 1805–6. Only a few hundred of these great humpbacked bears with dished-in faces and grizzled coats are left in the United States.

In wilderness areas of Colorado, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming, and in Yellowstone and Glacier National Parks, individual grizzlies roam over territories that are about 20 miles in diameter and use well-defined routes that lead to above timberline. Outside the United States there are large areas that may still be designated grizzly bear territory. In Alaska, the Yukon, and British Columbia grizzlies in considerable numbers wander over individual territories in the rugged mountains and across vast expanses of tundra.

Alaska is reported to have more than 10,000 grizzly bears, and though figures are unavailable, western Canada is supposed to have a good-sized population of this bear, whose fur may have a dark-brown cast, the usual color, or a hue that is yellowish, grayish, or blackish. Light-tipped hairs on the upper parts of the body give the animal the grizzled appearance from which it gets its common name.

A grizzly does not reach full size until the animal is 8 to 10 years old, about one-half of its life span in the wild. A mature male weighs anywhere from 500 to 800 pounds—occasionally as much as 1,000 pounds—measures 6 to 7½ feet in length, and stands 3 to 3½ feet at the shoulders. A full-grown female weighs about 400 pounds, with the other physical proportions scaled to this smaller weight.

To preserve the grizzly bear in Alaska, the Territorial Game Commission has reduced the limit from 2 to 1 grizzly or brown bear except in southeastern Alaska. Such a measure should maintain a sufficient breeding stock of these bears in Alaska so that the species will be perpetuated—provided, of course, that wilderness habitat is always available, the great problem for saving stateside grizzlies from extinction even if all hunting is prohibited.

In November 1955, the world's only flock of whooping cranes, 1 of the birds on the Federation's list, returned to their wintering grounds with 8 young. These 8 juveniles constitute the largest increase in the flock since the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge on the Gulf of Texas. At Aransas the whooping crane is given special attention.

The first official count of the whooping crane, a great white bird with a red-crowned head and black-tipped wings, was made in 1938–39. There were only 18 birds then and in 1941–42 there were only 15 whoopers—representatives of an indigenous North American bird that was apparently never numerous. In the early 1800's the range of the whooping crane was from the Arctic coast to central Mexico and from Utah to South Carolina. Each whooping-crane family needed a considerable area for its wintering ground and for its nesting and breeding ground in summer. Settlement of the country, expansion of agriculture, and related activities including drainage of wetlands and coastal marshes, reduced the range of the whoopers, and many of the birds were either deliberately shot or mistakenly shot on their southern migration—a flight of nearly a thousand miles.

To survive, the greatest need of the whooping crane is protection from hunters during the fall migration and privacy on their wintering grounds. Establishment of the Aransas refuge has assured these birds the necessary privacy, but little can be done by officials charged with enforcing Federal and State regulations during the cranes' fall migration when they fly through provinces and States whose waterfowl hunting seasons open early. Therefore it is up to all of us—hunters, amateur and professional ornithologists, and conservationists—to cooperate in protecting the whooping crane so that this representative of our once truly abundant wildlife can survive.

An indigenous fish whose numbers are so few that its continued existence is open to question is the Montana grayling—a fish that is purplish blue on the back and a lighter purple on the sides and lower margins. The large dorsal fin is a dusky green flecked with rose and orange. The Eskimos call the grayling "hewluk-powak," meaning fish with a winglike fin and the last two words of its scientific name, Thymallus signifer tricolor, are apt. Signifer, meaning standardbearer, and tricolor, three colors, truly describe the enormous dorsal fin, which readily distinguishes the grayling from the trout.

Originally there were two species of grayling in the United States—the Michigan and the Montana. The Michigan grayling was considered extinct by 1931, but the Montana grayling has managed to survive in a small part of its former range—all of the Missouri River drainage above Great Falls. Although pollution and siltation played a large part in the decline of the Montana grayling, the introduction of exotic fishes is believed to be one of the major causes for the greatly reduced numbers of grayling.

To survive, the grayling needs clear, cold, and unpolluted streams with sand or gravel bottoms. In the fish's original range there are only a few such spots; these areas are in the upper tributaries of the Big Hole and Beaverhead Rivers. In the tributaries of the Big Hole River artificial propagation is the means by which the grayling is maintained, but the upper drainage of the Beaverhead in the Red Rock Lakes area is much as it was in the days when grayling were comparatively abundant. Here the grayling maintains itself naturally.

Since irrigation on Red Rock Lakes—a national wildlife refuge—has been curtailed or not permitted until after July 1, there has been a marked increase in young grayling and in 1955 adult spawners were seen in three creeks where none had been seen for many years. However, despite this increase—an increase of sufficient numbers to permit limited fishing—management must be continued and have the support of all those interested in the preservation of a native species, a species most numerous in an area which has been the means whereby a once-endangered species has been saved from extinction.

In 1935, the 40,000-acre Red Rocks Lakes Migratory Waterfowl Refuge was established in southwestern Montana to preserve and protect the trumpeter swan, largest of the North American waterfowl. In 1935 there were only 73 swans by actual count; today there are more than 600 of these great white birds, that stand about 3 feet and have a wingspread of more than 7 feet. These birds, closely related to the more numerous whistling swan, have been saved from extinction by the timely action of all those interested in saving a part of America's wildlife legacy. The increase of the trumpeter swan is conservation-in-action at its best, and is an example of what can be done to save an endangered species, whose habitat had been greatly reduced by civilization's encroachment—to be regretted but nonetheless inevitable due to our constantly growing population.

In a U-shaped region about 100 miles long in the mountains and foothills surrounding the southern San Joaquin Valley of California, about 60 of our largest soaring land birds survive. These survivors of another native American species are the California condors, birds with black plumage and a naked head that is bright orange. A condor weighs about 20 pounds and has a wingspread of 9 feet. To survive the condor needs above all else protection from disturbance by man and a Federal law specifically naming the bird as one which cannot be shot.

In the Southeast on the Florida Keys, from Big Pine Key to Key West, the little key deer, a pint-sized edition of the Virginia whitetail, has increased in the face of tremendous odds until there are about 130. All this little deer needs to maintain itself is a reasonable amount of habitat and protection. The establishment of a protective area for the key deer, now known as the Key Deer National Wildlife Refuge in 1935 should do much to give the little animal the necessary

protection. In fact it is thought that this area—home of American crocodiles, alligators, and raccoons—will support 300 key deer provided a year-round supply of fresh water can be better distributed throughout the refuge.

Another unique American species, the everglade kite, exists in numbers about twice those of the whooping crane. In all there are possibly 60 everglade kites, a mouse-gray bird in the case of the male, dark brown for the female. The kite, known only to Florida, has a long, slender, and strongly hooked bill, and eats only one species of freshwater snail.

As marshes were drained the food of the kite disappeared and with its going the kite went too, and numbers of kites were shot due to ignorance or thoughtlessness. At present the Florida Audubon Society, the Florida Game and Fish Commission, and Federal authorities have posted certain marsh areas where the kite still probes for snails and are publicizing the need to give this unusual bird a chance to survive.

Once our largest woodpecker, the ivory-billed woodpecker, was found in the large river swamps from southeastern North Carolina to eastern Texas, in the Mississippi bottomlands north to the mouth of the Ohio, and in the great cypress swamps of Florida. The only recent reports that this once-numerous bird still exists have come from northern Florida. If these reports can be verified, then the remaining ivory-billed woodpeckers, if any, must be given rigid protection on a forest area which has to be managed so that there is an abundant food supply.

Although not in danger of extinction except in the Great Lakes, the lake trout is on the list of species which needs some form of aid for their preservation in the Great Lakes. Since 1939 the commercial and sport fisheries in the Great Lakes have constantly decreased until 22 pounds of lake trout were caught in Lake Michigan in 1954.

The cause of this decline in the catch of lake trout is the sea lamprey—an eel-like predator, which subsists entirely on the blood and body juices of fishes.

The remaining species on the list are the Great Lakes sturgeon, now so few in numbers that in some lakes it may be impossible to save it; Attwater's prairie chicken, at present know to exist only in parts of 11 Texas counties; the once abundant Eskimo curlew; the desert bighorn sheep; and the rare black-footed ferret.

No one knows with any certainty which of these species can be saved or which will become members of the wildlife America that was. But if these species have not passed over the threshold, that is become too few, where it is impossible to restore them, there may be a conservation miracle similar to the one which saved the rare sea otter from extinction.

In 1911 there was only a remnant of the once-abundant sea otter herd left in the Aleutian Islands area. Today there is a herd of several thousand in the waters around these foggy, treeless, and windswept islands, and a small herd of about 300 off the California coast near Carmel. Rigid protection is responsible for the increase of the sea otter—a mammal with a rich dark brown or black coat and a white-whiskered face that makes the animal look like a quizzical old man—the reason for the nickname "old man of the sea."

It may not be possible to save all these endangered species or even build them back to such numbers as the trumpeter swan or the sea otter, but let us hope that the majority of them can be saved—living representatives like the once-endangered buffalo of the wildlife America that Audubon, Douglas, and Muir knew and loved.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I also ask consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Medford Mail-Tribune of June 7, 1956, by the able and distinguished editor, Mr. Robert W. Ruhl, winner of a Pulitzer prize for outstanding editorial work. Mr. Ruhl comments on the reaction of conservationists to the wildlife refuge oil-leasing policies of former Secretary McKay, and points up the consternation felt by those interested in preserving wildlife at what has been described as "one of the worst blows to conservation on record."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail-Tribune of June 7, 1956]

FIELD AND STREAM SCORES MCKAY

The race between Senator MORSE and former Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay will not be decided by the Republicans—much as they would like it to be.

Nor will it be decided by the Democrats.

It will be decided by the independent voters in between who hold the balance of power, who discount the slanted propaganda on both sides, and after determining the facts vote for the candidate they believe best qualified for the job.

In this search for the facts they won't go to the campaign "hand-outs" of either party, but to the records of the two men and especially to facts from informed and impartial sources.

It will be remembered by those who listened to Secretary McKay in his primary campaign, that he was in practically a perpetual state of extreme indignation. The chief cause was the charge of "giveaway." Most emphatically Mr. McKay denied such charges in toto, and declared, instead of following any giveaway course he served the best interests of the people of his State and Nation.

No single charge aroused Mr. McKay's ire more strongly than the charge that he permitted oil drilling in wildlife refuges under his control, to the detriment of wildlife extension and protection.

This charge, he claimed, was not only untrue but the exact reverse of the truth. Under his administration, he maintained, wildlife refuges had been increased, and he suspended certain regulations promulgated by his predecessors—Democratic—because they failed to properly safeguard wildlife and true conservation values.

Well what are the facts?

We suggest that those who have no partisan bias or ax to grind read an article in the June Field and Stream entitled "Conservation." It is written by Harold Titus, the editor, and it is hard to believe he is motivated by any sinister partisan considerations, or is dealing with anything but the McKay record in the realm of wildlife conservation, as it stands.

Here is Editor Titus' judgment of McKay:

"Of the thousand-odd working conservationists attending the North American Wild Life Conference in New Orleans, many returned to their office confused, bewildered, and apprehensive. Oil was the disturbing influence, oil beneath the surface of the wildlife refuges. And oil leases by the hundreds safe in the vaults of petroleum-producing companies which had been issued during a period when, as far as the public was aware, all leasing had been suspended. What appears to be the full story of incredibly loose and highly hazardous procedures in the Interior Department was told at the conference. * * * There was a general feeling that wildlife conservation had been dealt a blow that might come to be rated as one of the worst on record.

"A certain amount of reassurance, however, was just around the corner. * * * The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee issued a report that not only strongly rebuked Secretary McKay for the goings on in his Department but called on him to give Congress a 60-day notice before issuing more private oil leases. * * * The report described the management of refuges as a picture of extreme administrative confusion, declared the recent leasing could only result in serious damage to the wildlife refuge system, and expressed the opinion that McKay regulations governing leasing fall far short of adequate protection for public lands.

"To be sure, Secretary McKay had already announced his intention of retiring from the Cabinet to seek a Senate seat, and evidently over 500 oil leases had been granted. But that forceful and completely bipartisan stand by the committee promised to put mineral-development on the refuges under wraps for the closing weeks of the McKay administration. Furthermore, it should stand as a warning to any successor of Mr. McKay's who might feel that the welfare of wildlife is not the direct objective in the maintenance of the national refuge system." * * *

"Well, the conservationist who doesn't feel uneasy about the future of resources under management like that is a rare bird indeed."

There is the opinion of the editor of Field and Stream regarding former Secretary McKay's regime and certainly furnishes justification of the giveaway charge as far as wildlife conservation is concerned. It is unlikely that Mr. Titus fails to reflect the views of true conservationists throughout the country, a verdict based not on party, but on principle.

Moreover this view fits in perfectly with the entire McKay picture. Like the Al Serena case it does not involve any criminal action or intent, and Mr. McKay and his defenders will undoubtedly use the same alibi in both cases, namely, that oil leases in wildlife refuges were granted in previous administrations, just as forest reserves were mined for timber, this attitude based on the old fallacy that two wrongs make a right.

But as Editor Titus indicates in this article, while there are those who maintain drilling for oil does not necessarily impair wildlife protection, just as mining forest reserves for timber, does not necessarily doom forest conservation, both practices on the scale countenanced by the Interior Department under Secretary McKay should stop, and it is hoped will be under his successor, for the sake of the country and perpetuation of the conservation principle.

Editor Titus concludes:

"Finally everybody appeared to have the involved story straight and went home with the understanding that over 550 oil leases (in the wildlife refuges) were outstanding and that if these were exercised the staff of the refuge branch would probably be the busiest young men in public service just reviewing operating plans. For even to the complacent minority the recital of goings-on in the Interior Department was depressing. Just what the effect will be of the demand of House committee that Congress be consulted on lease applications in the future remains to be seen. It is certain, however, that the procedures will be watched from all directions."

So here we have as a result of the McKay giveaway policies to the oil companies one of the worst blows to conservation on record.

That is not the judgment of the political enemies of ex-Governor McKay or the Democratic press but the editor of Field and Stream who chooses that declaration as the title for his article.—R. W. R.

A WORLD FOOD BANK

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, there is in progress right now, in Washington and elsewhere, considerable debate on the matter of this Nation's responsibilities in the field of foreign aid. There is concern over the means and methods of providing assistance to friendly, but less fortunate, democracies whose friendship and security we in these United States need for mutual benefit, for friendly relations, and for protection against the menace of international communism.

Earlier this week the House of Representatives voted on President Eisenhower's request for almost $5 billion for foreign aid. By a rollcall vote of 273 to 122, the Members of the House cut the President's foreign-aid request by more than a billion dollars—from four billion nine hundred million to three billion eight hundred million.

Whatever the outcome of these discussions, these debates, and these votes on the foreign-aid program, it must be recognized that what takes place in Congress reflects the thinking of our people. It must be recognized that the American taxpayer is weary, and weary of paying such a stiff price to maintain friendships. Many people feel, and with some justification, that we are becoming the wealthy uncle who is welcome only so long as the money holds out.

At the same time, I think the American taxpayer knows the value and wisdom of reasonable and sound programs to help free nations remain free. There have been some bad spots in the past, but experience has shown that some foreign-aid programs pay off.

I want it clearly understood that I have always been in sympathy with the spirit of foreign aid to less fortunate friendly nations of the free world. But at the same time, I believe in being realistic. In our zest to help, there must be a businesslike approach, founded on a sound basis.

When it comes to saying how many dollars this or that country should get, that must be determined by the experts; and I am certainly no expert in this field.

But I do know this, and it does not take an expert to see it:

When it comes to sitting down and working out ways and means of approaching many of these overall programs, the administration has turned deaf ears on some proposals and ideas that I think are important.

Take, for example, a resolution I submitted, calling for the establishment of a world food bank. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] submitted a similar measure, and many Senators joined in cosponsoring these resolutions.

The resolution, when adopted, would express to the President of the United States, and to the world, the sense of the Senate that the President should initiate negotiations, through the framework of the United Nations and other international channels, for the creation of a world food bank, patterned after the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. From this bank, member nations could in times of distress, shortages, famine, and other disasters, borrow food, fibers, or both, and repay such loans, when able, in kind, other raw materials, or in cash.

In recent months literally millions of words have been spoken and written about our excess stocks of foods and fibers, and what to do about them. Little has been said, however, about the hungry men, women, and children who people the world, or about what can be done, in a practical way, to fill their empty stomachs.

International statistics show that more than 1 billion people, of the total world population of 2,400,000,000, go to bed at night with their hunger only partially satisfied. We know also that communism and other ideologies foreign to the concept of freedom of the individual man thrive best in lands where the specter of hunger stalks.

To my mind, no more effective weapon could be forged for use in the battle against international communism than the creation of a world food bank with facilities for lessening the pangs of hunger that gnaw in the stomachs of hundreds of millions of people. We have learned, and all the rest of the world has learned, that an international bank conceived and operated along democratic lines and principles can and will, operate successfully for the mutual benefit of all participating nations. As I pointed out earlier, I refer specifically and directly to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Today, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has 56 members; and its balance sheet, the measure of the peaceful services it has rendered in a world torn with strife, tells a graphic story of what nations can accomplish when they work together toward a common goal.

Mr. President, I wish to reemphasize that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is not a charitable organization engaged in a giveaway program—just as the world food bank proposed by Senate Resolution No. 85 is not designed to operate as a giveaway institution.

The record shows that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development pays dividends not only in good will among the participating nations and peoples, but also in dollars and cents. Its net cash income last year, over and above all operating expenses, exceeded $20 million.

The world food bank, as proposed by Senate Resolution No. 85, will serve as a medium of distribution, for the effective and businesslike disposal and utilization, of so-called surplus food, fiber, and other agricultural products which have accumulated or may accumulate or be needed in this or other participating nations. I submit that it is high time to put the presently accumulated stocks of foods and fibers for peace into humanitarian use, without loss to the American taxpayer, through the medium of a world food bank.

How better, I ask, could we improve our foreign relations? How better could we prove to a suspicious world that we mean what we say when we announce we are willing to share the fruits of our technologies and our learning with the peoples of other nations?

When it comes to foreign aid, a world food bank is a natural.

If we want to help friendly foreign nations, and at the same time help ourselves, then I think that we ought to give serious thought to the idea of a world food bank.

The blessing of abundant production has become a burden upon us in the form of heavy surplus farm products. Many friendly nations need the food and clothing these surpluses can furnish. I say it is up to us to work out a way to put them where they are needed. And I sincerely think it can be done without stuffing an unlimited number of dollars into the hip pockets of our foreign friends.

Only 2 weeks ago, a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held hearings on the two resolutions that would set up the framework for a world food bank.

Representatives of the State Department, the very people who are now crying for more money for foreign aid, said flatly that such a program was not needed.

In fact, they were strong in their opposition to such an idea.

Such reasoning just does not make sense to me. It is very apparent that some blind spots are throwing so-called vision out of focus.

I want it clearly understood, Mr. President, that I am not criticizing the theory or wisdom of foreign aid, but I do think the attitude of the administration is both shameful and pitiful when it comes to listening to suggestions.

Thought and reason have been put in a cage down in the executive branch when it comes to many of our problems in foreign relations.

I say this with all deliberation, because I am certain that the President is sincere about the funds he has requested.

I also feel that if the President knew the attitude of the State Department about the world food bank he would be disturbed. He would be disturbed because he knows the importance of businesslike approaches to foreign economic problems.

With these thoughts in mind, I ask every Member of the Senate to weigh carefully the foreign-aid legislation when it comes up for final deliberation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9824) to

establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean conflict.

SECURITY REGULATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, this week the country has received another disquieting decision from the Supreme Court which strikes down still another safeguard which Congress has created to protect our country against the Communist conspiracy and all other disloyal elements endeavoring to destroy our great constitutional citadel of freedom.

In its split-decision this week, the majority of the Court has utilized its judicial power to prevent the President of the United States from exercising the executive power he felt he needed to establish security regulations for Government employees which are sufficiently effective to protect our country in this uneasy era of the cold war and the continuing Communist acts of aggression and misrepresentation.

President Eisenhower, in strict conformity with his pledge to rid Government of its Reds and to clean out official Washington of any and all lurking spies and Communist agents very wisely, early in his administration exercised the executive authority which Congress gave him in the act of August 26, 1950, to extend security checks and codes of loyalty to all Federal employees. Perhaps in the eyes of the majority of the Court, our Commander in Chief was a little naive because he drew from his long military experience the sturdy conclusion that in any kind of war, victory requires an army—civilian or military—comprised completely of loyal, dedicated, and patriotic people. Believing this—and I am sure most Members of Congress will agree with the President—President Eisenhower issued an executive order based on authority conveyed to him by Congress and in the act of August 26, 1950, applying the Government's security checks and loyalty provisions to all Government employees. This week the majority of the Court deprived our Commander in Chief of this important power to protect our national interest.

Therefore, once again I am introducing remedial legislation in an effort to plug another hole in the defense bastions of America which has been created by another unrealistic and unhappy decision by six isolated members of our Supreme Court. A week ago I felt compelled to introduce legislation suggesting emergency action to shore up America's defenses against the destructive action of the Court in making another split decision which deprived our country of the power to take effective action in depriving naturalized citizens of their citizenship in cases where they had obtained that citizenship fraudulently. That decision was bad enough in the light of current world conditions, but bad as it was the decision this week is a thousand times worse in terms of safeguarding our national security and with relation to our fight for freedom in this era of aggressive, godless communism.

I salute Justices Clark, Reed, and Minton for their courageous and convincing dissent. I simply cannot follow the nebulous reasoning and the strained conclusions of the other 6 Justices; but the 3 great and good dissenters never spoke with greater veracity and acumen than when they said this week "The Court's order has stricken down the most effective weapon against subversive activity available to the Government." What a travesty on our judicial procedure when in the joint efforts of Congress and the Executive to safeguard our fellow citizens against the clear and present dangers of communism, six men in black robes can nullify our every effort and expose the internal workings of our Government to the stealthy espionage and sabotage of Communist agents whose services the Government cannot now terminate unless the agency in which they work be designated "sensitive" or unless their individual positions are classified as "sensitive."

But even then, the majority of the court does not believe that the President, the Commander in Chief, has the authority, the power, or the judgment to determine which such jobs or positions should be regarded as sensitive. They seem to feel that Congress has no such authority. They seem to feel that in some way or other the Supreme Court has been called upon to interpret the mind of Congress, to pass upon the judgment of the President and, from their safe and isolated quarters, arrive at a determination that certain jobs considered by the President to be sensitive are not in fact important to our national security.

Before we find time to appropriate billions of dollars trying to defend ourselves with foreign aid, Mr. President, I hope the Senate Committee on the Judiciary will promptly report favorably the remedial and protective legislation which I am today introducing.

Either communism is a menace or it is not. Either we are in a cold war or we are living in a peace eternal. Either we join ranks and protect our peace and our freedoms or we squander our national resources in appropriating billions for defense and mutual security while we expose our internal governmental structure to the spies of communism and depend on the shreds of protective legislative still left us by the present Supreme Court to maintain the constitutional government which the Court is presumed to help defend.

We shall not get very far in the business of national defense and mutual security if, at the same time we are called upon to appropriate billions to protect ourselves against dangers from without, we continue to riddle our defenses against communism at home, and succumb to and accept Supreme Court decisions which stultify the power of the Government of the United States to defend itself.

If we must stay here all summer, if we must stay here until after the Supreme Court has recessed, if we must stay here until the conventions have begun and until after they have concluded, I submit we have no more important business to attend to than to tighten the internal security defenses of our country, now that they have been completely destroyed in this area by the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I introduce and send to the desk, for appropriate reference a bill proposing remedial emergency legislation to correct the condition in which we find ourselves after the Supreme Court decision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4047) to amend the act of August 26, 1950 relating to the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of the Government, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. COTTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, my bill provides a direct and simple method of closing the great hole shot into our internal defense supports by the Court's decision. I would simply amend the act of August 26, 1950 by adding a single straight-forward paragraph to say:

> Nothing herein contained shall be construed to limit the application of this act to civilian officers or employees occupying positions deemed to be sensitive from a national security standpoint.

That, Mr. President, was clearly intended by section 3 of the act as written, which said:

> The provisions of this act shall apply to such other Departments and agencies of the Government as the President may, from time to time, deem necessary in the best interests of national security.

Mr. President, let me read that again, because, I confess it is very difficult for me to determine how six learned lexicographers who serve as judges can read that language and say that Congress did not mean in extending this power to the President to include such other agencies as he deems necessary in the best interests of our national security. Let me read it again because the Congress will have to study the English language very carefully in order to couch its legislative determination in monosyllabic words which the Court cannot ignore and which the Court cannot invalidate. When we wrote the act, I thought the language was pretty clear. We said:

> The provisions of this act shall apply to such other departments and agencies of the Government as the President may, from time to time, deem necessary to the best interests of national security.

President Eisenhower did deem it necessary to do exactly that. President Eisenhower did deem it necessary in the best interests of national security to apply the provisions of this act to all the other Government agencies and departments. President Eisenhower's great effort to help protect all Americans against all forms of subversion have been defeated by the action of the Court this week.

I do not know of anything more important than for us to rededicate ourselves to this legislative objective.

We will not win the war against communism merely by building bombs and bombers. We will not win it simply by appropriating money for foreign aid or mutual security; we will not win it by treaties and international conferences; we will not win it until such time as Congress writes a law so clear that even the present majority of the Supreme Court can understand that Congress is serious about giving the President the right and the power and the authority and, in my opinion, the obligation to insist that only Americans shall stand guard today in Federal positions of responsibility.

Six Justices of the Supreme Court have held Congress did not understand the English language. They have held that the President of the United States, our Commander in Chief, did not know what he needed in order to protect our national security.

Mr. President, for a long time I have been engaged in the effort to find out what we can do as legislators to protect ourselves against Godless communism. I have been engaged in it longer, I might say, than any other sitting Member of the Senate or of the House. I started away back yonder with Martin Dies. I am still working at it with the able chairman, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. I am the author of the first 17 sections of the Internal Security Act, an act on which we labored for 2 long years, an act which was finally passed by the Senate after the second-longest filibuster in history, over the veto of President Truman, an act which was also approved promptly over the veto of President Truman by the House of Representatives. Democratic majorities in both Houses of Congress set precedent by overriding a Democratic President's veto of legislation authored by a Republican. Congress was that concerned about security.

I can well understand that if the present attitude of the Supreme Court prevails, when it is called upon to adjudicate the various sections of that act, our Internal Security Act also is likely to be destroyed.

Mr. President, when we find that the Supreme Court destroys our defenses, not because they are unconstitutional, not because the Court finds some conflict in them with other legislation, not because the Court says we are arrogating unto ourselves authority we do not have, but because, as they say to us, "Gentlemen of the Senate and gentlemen of the House, you do not know how to write what you mean," and when they say to the President he has no right to act upon the mandate we have given him, it becomes serious indeed. It creates a security emergency.

The Supreme Court is endeavoring to become a legislative body and write legislation by interpreting what we have in mind and what we say in simple terms, as understandably expressed, as we set forth our intent in the act, when we said in section 3 of the act:

> The provisions of this act shall apply to such other departments and agencies of the Government as the President may, from time to time, deem necessary in the best interests of national security.

And if in the eyes of the Supreme Court that is not understandable language, and if in the eyes of the Supreme Court the President has done wrong in responding to his responsibilities as Commander in Chief in the middle of a cold war, by closing the doors of the Government to spies and saboteurs, then Congress has the responsibility to write it all over again. It has that responsibility now, in June and July of 1956, not after we reconvene. It has that responsibility before we consider other measures of national defense. Ours is the legislative body of this land. I say that, Mr. President, because if we decay from within, we will never be strong against dangers from without.

Therefore, I say that Congress once again must take up the melancholy business of rewriting what we have already written, of reenacting legislation which we have already enacted, of restating once again what we have already stated clearly, and of reiterating the determination we have made many times before, that America must have the right to defend itself, and that the Constitution was never intended to be a document creating a system of government incapable of survival or of self-defense.

Mr. President, some of the editorial writers who have consistently fought every effort by Congress to tighten our internal security against communism are applauding this decision by the six majority members of the Supreme Court. They are the same editorial writers incidentally or perhaps not incidentally who said the Alger Hiss case was merely a red herring, the same editorial writers who have always been antianti-Communist the same editorial writers who fought the Mundt-Nixon bill, the same editorial writers who encouraged President Truman to veto the bill and who condemned Congress when it passed the bill over the President's veto—these editorial writers are saying that this is a great victory for civil liberties.

It is not a great victory for civil rights unless catering to communism is a great victory for civil liberties. It is not a great victory for civil rights unless the editorial writers to whom I have referred actually believe that under the communistic system citizens have more rights than they have here. This country provides better civil rights than does any other country in the world. It certainly provides better civil liberties than these editorial writers could hope to secure for themselves or their readers in Russia or in any other area of the world.

Mr. President, their editorial comments entirely ignore the context of the act Congress wrote in 1950. They would uphold this surprising decision of the Supreme Court by saying it is a victory for civil rights because the act gave an agency or a department the right summarily to dismiss someone suspected of being a Communist or who was caught redhanded as a spy and working for the taxpayers of America.

Let me explore the act a little bit, Mr. President. It is Public Law 733 of the 81st Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire act be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks so that readers of the RECORD may follow it.

There being no objection, the act was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Public Law 733, 81st Cong., Ch. 803, 2d Sess.]
H. R. 7439

An act to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), as amended (5 U. S. C. 652), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State; Secretary of Commerce; Attorney General; the Secretary of Defense; the Secretary of the Army; the Secretary of the Navy; the Secretary of the Air Force; the Secretary of the Treasury; the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission; the Chairman, National Security Resources Board; or the Director, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, may, in his absolute discretion and when deemed necessary in the interests of national security, suspend, without pay, any civilian officer or employee of the Department of State (including the Foreign Service of the United States), Department of Commerce, Department of Justice, Department of Defense, Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, Department of the Air Force, Coast Guard, Atomic Energy Commission, National Security Resources Board, or National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, respectively, or of their several field services: *Provided*, That to the extent that such agency head determines that the interests of the national security permit, the employee concerned shall be notified of the reasons for his suspension and within 30 days after such notification any such person shall have an opportunity to submit any statements or affidavits to the official designated by the head of the agency concerned to show why he should be reinstated or restored to duty. The agency head concerned may, following such investigation and review as he deems necessary, terminate the employment of such suspended civilian officer or employee whenever he shall determine such termination necessary or advisable in the interest of the national security of the United States, and such determination by the agency head concerned shall be conclusive and final: *Provided further*, That any employee having a permanent or indefinite appointment, and having completed his probationary or trial period, who is a citizen of the United States whose employment is suspended under the authority of this act, shall be given after his suspension and before his employment is terminated under the authority of this act, (1) a written statement within 30 days after his suspension of the charges against him, which shall be subject to amendment within 30 days thereafter and which shall be stated as specifically as security considerations permit; (2) an opportunity within 30 days thereafter (plus an additional 30 days if the charges are amended) to answer such charges and to submit affidavits; (3) a hearing, at the employee's request, by a duly constituted agency authority for this purpose; (4) a review of his case by the agency head, or some official designated by him, before a decision adverse to the employee is made final; and (5) a written statement of the decision of the agency head: *Provided further*, That any person whose employment is so suspended or

terminated under the authority of this act may, in the discretion of the agency head concerned, be reinstated or restored to duty, and if so reinstated or restored shall be allowed compensation for all or any part of the period of such suspension or termination in an amount not to exceed the difference between the amount such person would normally have earned during the period of such suspension or termination, at the rate he was receiving on the date of suspension or termination, as appropriate, and the interim net earnings of such person: *Provided further*, That the termination of employment herein provided shall not affect the right of such officer or employee to seek or accept employment in any other department or agency of the Government: *Provided further*, That the head of any department or agency considering the appointment of any person whose employment has been terminated under the provisions of this act may make such appointment only after consultation with the Civil Service Commission, which agency shall have the authority at the written request of either the head of such agency or such employee to determine whether any such person is eligible for employment by any other agency or department of the Government.

SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall impair the powers vested in the Atomic Energy Commission by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 or the requirements of section 12 of that act that adequate provision be made for administrative review of any determination to dismiss any employee of said Commission.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall apply to such other departments and agencies of the Government as the President may, from time to time, deem necessary in the best interests of national security. If any departments or agencies are included by the President, he shall so report to the Committees on the Armed Services of the Congress.

SEC. 4. Section 3 of the act of December 17, 1942 (56 Stat. 1053), and section 104 of the act of July 20, 1949 (Public Law 179, 81st Cong.), and section 630 of the act of October 29, 1949 (Public Law 434, 81st Cong.), are hereby repealed.

Approved August 26, 1950.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in the middle of the first part of the act it is provided that the agency head concerned may, following an investigation, terminate the employment of a suspended civilian officer or employee whenever he shall determine such termination necessary or advisable in the interest of the national security of the United States.

Mr. President, what is all this about? What are these multibillions of dollars in expenditures meant for? For what reason are all the hearings on defense held by a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee? Why all the argument about whether the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force should get an extra billion dollars? Why all the talk about whether we should or should not appropriate more money for NATO and Greece and other nations, if it is not to protect the internal security of the United States from an invasion from without and from, I would dare to hope, sabotage from within? Certainly, Mr. President, the record is horrendous enough when we think about Alger Hiss, what happened at Fort Monmouth, the exposé of Communists working in defense plants, and of the persons it has been necessary to discharge from State Department employment. Harry Dexter White's infamy alone should sober all of us.

Certainly, Congress was acting wisely when it said that department heads should have the right, in the interest of the national security of the United States, summarily to expose and to force the resignation of a Red or a pink or a punk or a spy or a saboteur, or even a sex pervert, Mr. President.

I read further:

and such determination by the agency head concerned shall be conclusive and final.

At this point some editorial writers say, "Ah ha, they are destroying the civil rights of the people. They can kick this poor little Communist spy out of the Government service and make his termination of office final."

That is the opinion of editorial writers who got caught in the switches of having been wrong on this issue for the past 20 years and who are now trying to find some place to which they can retire to justify their earlier errors concerning "red herrings" and the like.

The editorial writers do not read any further in the law. They have satisfied their purposes. They do not bother to read the rest of the act, so I shall read it for them in order that anyone who actually wishes to defend America's internal security will know how far Congress went, and properly so, in defending the civil rights even of the Reds who would reduce us all to the position of slaves.

The act continues:

and such determination by the agency head concerned shall be conclusive and final: *Provided further*—

The editorial writers did not read that. Maybe the Supreme Court did not read it, either; I do not know. We seem to be getting "slaphappy" about the whole subject of internal security. I hear people say, "There is more danger from fascism than from communism." More danger, I suppose from nazism than from communism. That may have been true at one time in the history of the world, but we had better get in tune with the times. It is not true today.

Mr. President, I have just been requested to leave the bill which I introduced on the desk because some Senators desire to become cosponsors. I am happy to do so.

I ask unanimous consent that it be held at the desk so that any Senators who wish to add their names as cosponsors may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I was about to discuss a proviso in the act. Congress thought, the President thought, the FBI thought, the Attorney General thought, and those in charge of our internal security thought it might be a good thing, when we caught a suspected Communist, to discharge him at once, not serve notice that he could continue to spy for 30 days and then terminate his employment with the Government. We thought the best time to get rid of him was now, not to wait until he filled his portfolio with secrets and delivered them to Moscow.

I read further from the act:

Provided further, That any employee having a permanent or indefinite appointment, and having completed his probationary or trial period, who is a citizen of the United States whose employment is suspended under the authority of this act—

That includes them all. There are only two kinds of appointments, a definite appointment and a probationary appointment. If a man is a citizen, he has his civil rights.

I read further:

shall be given after his suspension and before his employment is terminated under the authority of this act, (1) a written statement within 30 days after his suspension of the charges against him.

It is not a question of merely kicking a man out. He shall receive within 30 days a written statement spelling out the charges—

which shall be subject to amendment within 30 days thereafter and which shall be stated as specifically as security considerations permit.

That certainly takes care of him. These are not nebulous charges; they are not charges written in the kind of rubber language which the Supreme Court claims it finds recently in our legislative enactments. They are written specifically. They are set forth verbatim.

Second, the discharged, alleged disloyal Government employee, or whoever he is, if he happens to be an innocent person, has—

an opportunity within 30 days thereafter (plus an additional 30 days if the charges are amended) to answer such charges and to submit affidavits.

He has an opportunity to find out specifically why he was dismissed. He can present his rejoinder specifically. He is allowed as much time as the Government is allowed, and all must act within 30 days.

Third, there is granted "a hearing, at the employee's request by a duly constituted agency authority for this purpose." He is the beneficiary of that wonderful device—"a hearing"—which the editorial writers are always wanting to make certain is available to all the reds, all the pinks, and all the punks. So the employee gets his hearing.

Fourth, he gets more than that. He gets:

A review of his case by the agency head, or some official designated by him, before a decision adverse to the employee is made final.

Fifth, he gets:

A written statement of the decision of the agency head: *Provided further*, That any person whose employment is so suspended or terminated under the authority of this act may, in the discretion of the agency head concerned, be reinstated or restored to duty, and if so reinstataed or restored shall be allowed compensation for all or any part of the period of such suspension or termination in an amount not to exceed the difference between the amount such person would normally have earned during the period of suspension or termination, at the rate he was receiving on the date of suspension or termination, as appropriate, and the interim net earnings of such person.

So he gets his pay even if he is not working if he is restored to his employment.

Provided further, that the termination of employment herein provided shall not affect the right of such officer or employee to seek or accept employment in any other department or agency of the Government: *Provided further,* That the head of any department or agency considering the appointment of any person whose employment has been terminated under the provisions of this act may make such appointment only after consultation with the Civil Service Commission, which agency shall have the authority at the written request of either the head of such agency or such employee to determine whether any such person is eligible for employment by any other agency or department of the Government.

Mr. President, this is a simple act, written in short words and direct statements, and passed in the hope that the Supreme Court would understand what we had in mind.

In all events, the Commander in Chief read it. The act was passed long before General Eisenhower became President or was a candidate for President. He found it in the laws of the land. He said, "This is good. Innocent Americans"—they are the ones we hear so much about—"are entitled," said President Eisenhower, "to have loyal persons in the Government. Innocent Americans are entitled to have spies, saboteurs, and espionage agents dismissed from the Government service. Innocent Americans are entitled to live in a country which believes its public officials have a responsibility for loyalty to their Government and should have faith in our system of government and should believe in democracy and should support the Constitution."

So the President said, "This is a good law. It is good for the Army, good for the Navy, good for the State Department, good for everybody working in the Federal Government."

I think Congress and the people generally applauded the President when he said that. If we apply this salutary law to all the departments and agencies of the Government and remove from office employees who are found to be unfaithful, while giving them the benefit of this long series of "Provided furthers," they can have all their civil rights protected and can be reestablished in their employment if it is found that they have been falsely or fraudulently accused. In the meantime, we protect over a hundred million really innocent Americans against having their freedoms and their civic rights dissipated or destroyed by Communist operatives from within the Government.

Mr. President, we are confronted with a very serious problem this afternoon, because we shall be called upon, and rightly so, by the Defense and State Departments to appropriate vast sums of money to protect America. I feel certain that we will exercise our best collective judgment on that issue. But is there a single Senator among us who believes we can save America in that way alone, by creating a great big sieve full of holes and calling it a screen, through which to accept disloyal Americans seeking employment?

The most naive Member of Congress or the most naive member of the Supreme Court must certainly realize that as a part of the discipline of Communist action which applies to Communist agents in America the first instruction is, "Get into the Government. Weasel your way in. Worm your way in. Sneak into the Government. Get on the inside. Work your way up. Shift into positions of greater responsibility, greater importance, and greater access to information."

Is there a Member of Congress, or a member of the Supreme Court, or an editorial writer who is so naive as to believe that in a sensitive agency there is anything less than a sensitive job? Does he believe that in the Government, in time of either cold or hot war, there is anything which is not a sensitive activity?

If I were directing the Communist espionage apparatus, the installation of a custodian having access to the private offices of Government officials in the darkness of the night would be, in my opinion, a No. 1 assignment. There I would place some of my best operatives. There I would put some of my best sleuths. There I would put some of my most devoted spies. It is so easy to pry open a desk; so easy to piece together information found in wastepaper receptacles; so easy to move through the recesses of a dark, unoccupied building to find information which would be helpful to those being served in Moscow.

What kind of business is it when the Supreme Court suggests that the Commander in Chief in his responsibility has only the right to select certain headline jobs and certain headline agencies and to say to their heads, "You must put Americans on guard. But as for all the other agencies and positions, come one, come all; it is open sesame for every spy. You, Mr. President, have no authority to screen subversives out of the entire Government."

Mr. President, I think we have more important business confronting us than to adjourn the Senate. I wish the majority leader were here today so I could exact from him a promise, if I could, to hold the Senate in session until we could correct the injury done to our defenses by this decision of the Supreme Court. Knowing the majority leader as I do, I think he will join with me in urging that Congress stay in session at least that long. Knowing the members of the Committee on the Judiciary as I know them, I am optimistic enough to predict that they will act on the proposed legislation so quickly that we will not have to delay our adjournment in order to pass it before we go home.

But let us as Senators start getting our eye on the ball. Let us begin to consider a way in which we can save America other than by spending the taxpayers' money in big bundles. Let us measure up to the responsibility which faces us. The Supreme Court has challenged us; let us accept the challenge. Let us do it as men and women of courage and conviction.

In conclusion, I suggest that in the battle for survival it is more important that we reestablish the defenses of our citadel of freedom from within than that we concentrate always on the job of how we are going to increase the defenses of freedom against the dangers from without. As Senators, we have the responsibility to see clearly to the point in this dangerous age. Otherwise, we should abdicate in favor of those who will not concentrate alone on saving America against distant, offshore enemies by spending the money of the taxpayers overseas in a myopic effort to keep out of the country those dangers which we permit to be nourished from within.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Does the Senator happen to remember the vote by which the bill was passed by the Senate and also by the House?

Mr. MUNDT. Not the exact vote. I remember it was overwhelmingly passed, after it had been carefully debated on the floor. It was passed overwhelmingly. There was not a Member of the Senate, I am sure, who would find himself in agreement with the tortured interpretation of the English language handed down by the Supreme Court this week.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Was not that measure very thoroughly and carefully discussed by many Members of the Senate?

Mr. MUNDT. It was, indeed, and it was one with respect to which Democrats and Republicans alike, good Americans all, said, "This is the way we can make sure of doing something, except to talk and gesticulate, about communism. This is the way to meet the issue. This is a must. Protect the home base first, before starting to chase flies in the outfield."

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Has it not always been the duty of the courts to interpret the laws as they were intended by the legislative branch of government?

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely so; and I might add that the Supreme Court was supposed to determine the constitutionality of the laws, and was supposed to see that they were administered in conformity with the legislative intent and their language. We labored long and hard to put into simple English language what we proposed in this act. We did not even make it mandatory. We said if the Commander in Chief of the country, in times of stress, strain, and danger, thinks it essential, to protect America, that he add additional departments to be included under loyalty and security rules, he shall have that right. And it is that right which the Supreme Court sought to strip from our Commander in Chief this week.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to compliment the able Senator from South Dakota. I have not heard all of his re-

marks. I am not immediately familiar with the provisions of the bill he has introduced, but I wish to associate myself with the views and sentiments expressed by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. I wish to assure him, as one Member of this body, and as a member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, I shall urge immediate consideration of the bill. I know I favor its general objectives, and I think the able Senator is rendering a service to the country in pointing up this issue and in fighting for remedial legislation that will correct some of the actions being taken by the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court, I think, should be more concerned in finding ways to sustain and uphold the acts of Congress which are intended to protect the security of our country. I am becoming distressed and alarmed by some of its decisions, and the flimsy pretext and lack of logic and the unsound reasoning on which they are based and I wish to join the Senator in the general sentiments, at least, which he has expressed.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Arkansas very much, indeed, for his helpful contribution. It is so typical of him. I know of his great work in the committee on which he serves. It is frustrating and disillusioning, after the long and hard process of enacting legislation designed to protect America, to have it so cavalierly thrown aside by six members of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DANIEL. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and to join and associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I think it is fine that the Senator has introduced a bill on this subject. I certainly intend to support such proposed legislation.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Texas. With his tremendous influence and power in the Judiciary Committee, I have every confidence that the Judiciary Committee will act promptly. This is an emergency. We are confronted constantly with the need for emergency legislation. We are asked to appropriate billions of dollars for emergencies. This is an emergency which requires a few straight-from-the-shoulder words to the Supreme Court, and I hope the Senate will give the bill prompt consideration.

A great and distinguished member of the opposition party said recently that, in his opinion, there was such a thing as wanting to be President too badly. In my opinion, there is such a thing, on the part of the Justices of the Supreme Court, as a desire to adjudicate too broadly.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCLELLAN obtained the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may make a very brief statement on the public works appropriation bill?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am very happy to yield to my distinguished colleague. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD at an appropriate place following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[Mr. FULBRIGHT addressed the Senate. His remarks appear in today's RECORD following the beginning of the consideration of the public works appropriation bill.]

PROGRESS REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE POLITICAL ACTIVITIES, LOBBYING, AND CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions, I made on the 14th day of March a brief report to the Senate with respect to the committee's organization. At that time I also expressed some of my views regarding the committee's duties and responsibilities as they relate to the task assigned to it.

I advised the Senate that a staff would have to be assembled; that a good staff was important to the success of the committee's labors; and that we would promptly undertake to assemble a staff of the quality prescribed by the rules of the committee—a staff capable and competent, and selected solely on the basis of fitness to perform its duties, without regard to political preference or affiliation.

Although the resolution creating this special committee does not require it, as chairman I feel that I should keep the Senate informed by making at proper intervals progress reports on the committee's activities.

Mr. President, I am pleased to advise that the committee has now completed the selection of an initial staff of 14 members, 9 of whom are professional and five of whom are clerical, and each of whom was unanimously approved by the committee. This size staff is adequate to enable the committee to begin its work, although it is probable that the workload of the committee will so increase as to require that additional staff members be added.

On March 19, having in mind the Neff-Senator CASE of South Dakota incident, and by direction of the committee, I, as chairman, wrote each Member of the United States Senate a personal letter requesting that he submit to the Special Committee any facts within his knowledge or any information in his possession, regarding any attempt illegally or improperly to influence him or any other Member of the Senate, or any officer or employee of the executive branch of the Government. It was felt that if any such attempt had been made illegally or improperly to influence any Senator, he would know about it, and, therefore, he could report, and it was his duty to report, such attempt or activity to the committee.

To date, only 43 Senators have replied. Only 3 or 4 have reported or suggested any facts or information of the nature requested. One of the incidents reported by a Senator to the committee has already been investigated and disposed of. The other suggested leads are now being processed by preliminary inquiry. All other information or material which has come to the committee from other sources in the form of complaints or allegations is presently being carefully gone over and screened by the staff, to determine whether it has merit and is of sufficient substance to warrant committee action. These matters will be processed as expeditiously as may be practical.

Since the Neff-Senator CASE of South Dakota incident was associated with the Senate's consideration of the Harris-Fulbright natural gas bill, the committee at its next meeting following organization unanimously ordered a full investigation of lobbying and political activities of both the proponents and opponents of that measure.

On May 1, a public hearing was held in connection with the activities of the General Gas Committee, a group of gas producers organized to support and promote the enactment of the gas bill. The chairman of the General Gas Committee, Mr. Matson Nixon, testified and made all of the records of that committee available to the special committee, and those records are now under study by the staff.

On May 24, a hearing in executive session was held by the committee to investigate charges in the February 9, 1956, issue of the Leader, a Bismarck, N. Dak., publication, in an article headlined "YOUNG Sells Out Again," having reference to Senator MILTON YOUNG, of North Dakota, with respect to his vote on the Harris-Fulbright gas bill. The representatives of the Leader responsible for this newspaper story were subpenaed and placed under oath and given an opportunity to substantiate the charges made in the article against Senator YOUNG. They denied under oath that it was their intention to either charge or imply that Senator YOUNG had yielded or had been subjected to any improper or any illegal influence in connection with his vote on the natural gas bill, or on any vote that he may have cast at any time as a Member of the United States Senate. Therefore, the committee concluded that the headline charge of the article, "YOUNG Sells Out Again," and all of the article's further implication of any wrongdoing on the part of Senator YOUNG were wholly unsupported, without any basis of fact whatsoever, and completely false. The committee immediately issued a public statement to that effect, and made public the proceedings of such hearing.

Mr. President, I wish to state on my own responsibility as a United States Senator that the article of the Leader making the charges against Senator YOUNG is simply that type of "sordid and irresponsible journalism that resorts to the poison pen to contaminate the news and pollute the stream of public information through the media of the free press"; and I so stated to the press at that time. The article was most reprehensible; and I am confident that such malicious and distorted reporting and

editorializing on the news is repudiated and condemned by all the responsible press and by everyone who cherishes the right of freedom of speech and freedom of the press, and who associates with that right and privilege an obligation of fairness and decency in reporting and publishing the news.

I should also like to inform the Senate that approximately 1,100 reports are filed quarterly with the Secretary of the Senate by groups or individuals believing themselves to come under the requirements of the Lobbying Act. The committee staff has been instructed to examine these reports for each of the last five quarters, and is now in process of doing so.

Obviously, it is impossible for this committee to examine, interrogate, and thoroughly investigate each of these individuals and groups with respect to their lobbying activities; but in carrying out its purpose to thoroughly investigate lobbying activities and improper influence in connection with the Harris-Fulbright natural gas bill, the committee has selected and approved for immediate attention of the staff and for investigation the following organizations some of whom are registered under the Lobbying Act, four of whom supported and four of whom opposed the enactment of the Harris-Fulbright measure. They are: Committee for Pipe Line Companies, Council of Local Gas Companies, Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, Natural Gas & Oil Resources Committee, Joint Committee of Consumers and Small Producers, The Mayors Committee on Natural Gas, National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, and United Auto Workers of America, AFL–CIO.

The committee's selection of these groups does not imply or indicate at this time that their activities were in any way illegal or improper. Nor from this selection is it to be inferred that the committee will not investigate other groups or persons that lobbied or undertook to use influence for the enactment or defeat of the measure. But these have been selected as among those most active and as among those making the largest expenditures.

The representatives of these organizations have already been interviewed by the staff and, in cases in which it is believed necessary, investigations have already been made or are now being made of their records, which they have made available.

As a result of the preliminary work done by the staff in connection with these groups, public hearings have been scheduled for June 14 and 15 and for June 21 and 22. Further public hearings will be ordered as soon as preliminary work of the staff will permit.

Mr. President, other work of the committee is proceeding expeditiously. It is the intention of the committee to examine into any specific charges, information, or leads within its jurisdiction that may come to its attention or be submitted to it that indicate any illegal or improper political activities, lobbying, or campaign contributions. I should like to point out, however, that the committee does not have a nationwide network of staffed offices or a field force of personnel to make investigation and inquiries. We have only a small staff in very limited space located here at the Capitol in the city of Washington. Therefore, it is perfectly apparent that the committee and its staff, on the basis of their own initiative and resources, cannot possibly ferret out and investigate each and every possible action or incident of wrongdoing that may have occurred and that may come within the purview of the committee's duties and responsibilities.

I point out again that this committee must necessarily deal in facts. Innuendoes, inferences, and rumors are of little or no value. It is of no assistance to this committee to have someone tell us that "everyone knows" that there Member of the Senate to supply the committed, but it is of interest and can be a great help to the committee if anyone can tell us the name of someone who may know of such an act or of some document or item of evidence which will demonstrate the fact.

Mr. President, having called upon each Member of the Senate to supply the committee with any facts or information within their knowledge that might be helpful, and in view of the rather meager results that request has produced, and in view of the great public interest in the subject matter of this investigation, I now wish to broaden that request and invitation to include members of the press, columnists, commentators, and all other sources of information, including all citizens and the public at large, to give to this committee any concrete facts within their knowledge or any information they may have, and the source of that information, regarding "attempts to influence improperly or illegally the Senate or any Member thereof or any candidate therefor, or any officer or employee of the executive branch of the Government, through campaign contributions, political activities, lobbying, or any and all other activities or practices."

All such information from any reliable source will be received, pursued, appropriately considered, and acted on by the committee.

Mr. President, just as I pointed out and emphasized in my earlier report to the Senate immediately following the organization of the committee, responsibility for the success of this special committee's labors rest equally upon each political party and upon each individual member of the committee, irrespective of party. I also pointed out and emphasized at that time, that the responsibility in this field of each individual member of the Senate had in nowise been lessened or diminished by reason of the appointment of this special committee. I now wish to point out and emphasize as well that it is the duty of every citizen possessing knowledge or information in these areas of activities that would be helpful to the committee to submit such facts and information to it. I most respectfully urge the press and other media of news and public information to give full cooperation and assistance to the committee in conveying this committee's request and invitation to the public.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I commend the Senator for the address which he has just completed, showing the progress of the work of the committee. The work of the committee which he has outlined has been done in a very fair and clear manner.

I also wish to take this opportunity to commend the Senator from Arkansas for the very effective and forceful manner in which he is serving as chairman of the special committee. It is a difficult task, and, with all his other duties, I know it constitutes a great burden. Members of the committee of both political parties are very hearty in their commendation of the job which the chairman of the committee is doing, and are aware of the sacrifices which he is making in rendering that service.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank my distinguished friend, the very able vice chairman of the committee, who is working with me. We are all trying to do a clean, efficient job, which will lead to a constructive result.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I also wish to commend the Senator from Arkansas for having submitted this report to the Senate. I wish to associate myself with the remarks which the distinguished chairman of the committee has made with respect to the committee action and activities up to date.

I assure not only my colleagues, but all others, that the committee is proceeding to make the investigation and to obtain all the facts possible relative to any misuse of lobbying or any attempt to exercise undue influence in connection with legislation.

I again commend the Senator from Arkansas for giving us this report.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

THE SHORTAGE OF RAILROAD BOXCARS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, many of us from the Midwest are very much interested in a bill now before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which would amend the Interstate Commerce Act in an effort to alleviate the recurring problem of shortages of railroad boxcars. I refer to S. 2770, which has been the subject of hearings by the committee, and which I understand received further committee consideration today.

I am sure that a great many Members of the Senate have had the same experience I have had in receiving, from time to time, urgent pleas for assistance in meeting an acute need for boxcars. I personally have interceded on a number of occasions with responsible individuals in the desire to do everything I could to assist, but oftentimes I have found unfortunately that there was little that could be achieved immediately to meet a critical need at that moment.

It is, therefore, my earnest desire to determine whether we can constructively legislate on the problem, and that is the reason why I today refer to the pending legislation, as I believe we are properly approaching the problem through legislation along the lines of S. 2770.

I sincerely hope that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will bring this legislation before the Senate at an early date. Prompt consideration and action by the Senate thereafter will, in my opinion, give us reason to hope for ultimate achievement in solving, at least partially, this recurring problem.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter I directed on May 16, 1956, to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 16, 1956.*

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: One of the problems of nationwide concern is the developing shortage of boxcars which, at times, reaches acute emergency proportions. On many occasions, I have had to intercede with those directly concerned with the problem in an effort to assist in alleviating boxcar shortages, particularly those in the Midwest when they occur around harvesttime and need is great.

It is, therefore, for these reason that I have been watching carefully the developments on legislation before your committee, specifically S. 2770. In my opinion, the basic objectives of this proposed legislation are sound, and I am pleased that your committee has it under consideration. In this connection, I should like to bring to the attention of the members of your committee two telegrams I have recently received, and I ask that they be incorporated in the record of your subcommittee's hearings.

I just wish to add that I hope your committee will be disposed to favorably consider legislation along these lines within the immediate future. In my opinion, legislation of this character is desirable, and I view it as a step in the direction of assuring an adequate supply of boxcars to those areas of the country where there is a real and positive need for them.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator.

FRIENDSHIP INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT—PAN AMERICAN AIRLINE

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, last Thursday I had the honor and pleasure of accompanying diplomatic representatives from 14 Latin American countries as they visited Friendship International Airport, inspected the port of Baltimore, and got a chance to see our fine Baltimore Orioles baseball team in action.

The day's festivities, which were sponsored by the Greater Baltimore Committee, began with the trip to Friendship. Before we left the airport, the diplomats were speaking enthusiastically about its great potential for helping cement the nations of the Americas.

It is unfortunate that so many persons of our own country have failed to comprehend what our Latin American friends saw so quickly.

One of the most glaring examples of the shortsighted treatment of the situation can be found in the East Coast-Florida case, which is now being studied by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

In a preliminary CAB report on the proceedings, an examiner reported that the issue should be considered as a domestic affair.

Perhaps that would be true if all the airlines which have submitted applications were strictly domestic lines.

There is one applicant, however, which has demonstrated its ability to provide service over transoceanic routes and which has now offered to integrate its far-reaching system with proposed runs along the east coast.

That applicant is the Pan American World Airways System, and I say that to deny it an east coast route on the grounds that the case is domestic—and that Pan American's plan does not fit into that category—would be as ridiculous as to forbid our vessels from engaging in coastal and transoceanic trade during the same trip.

Obviously the matter is much more than merely domestic, and the very fact that Pan American has provided international aspects to the case makes the application of that airline far stronger than it would be otherwise.

Here is what Pan American proposes to offer:

A service which would not only link the east coast's major population areas with one another, but which would also join them with Latin America, Europe, and Asia without time-consuming layovers, etc.

I have spoken first of the international aspects because, unfortunately, they seem to have been widely ignored or disregarded in some circles.

The domestic advantages offered by Pan American are equally impressive.

What we are attempting to obtain, we must remember, is safe, efficient, adequate service to handle the enormous amount of air traffic along the east coast.

Toward that end, Pan American can provide flying equipment of the highest quality for both passenger and cargo service.

It has trained personnel to conduct the operation.

It has jet planes on order which, when delivered, will be placed into the system at once.

It is the logical airline to be given permission to provide additional service between New England and Florida.

I will not repeat at this time the data offered in the East Coast-Florida case to show that Federal airline subsidies of more than $8 million will be saved if the Pan American application is approved.

Suffice it to say that the possible savings have been widely publicized and that the Congress—and thousands of taxpayers—will be watching attentively to see how the issue is handled.

I do, however, wish to dwell for a moment on the feeling in some quarters that the CAB should not be interested in the question of which airports are involved in these proceedings.

I have always felt—and I am sure that most of my colleagues have had similar beliefs—that the CAB was taking a broad view of the matters placed before it.

I was amazed, therefore, to learn that Pan American's offer to serve the Washington-Baltimore area through Friendship International Airport was not an issue in the case, as far as the CAB examiner was concerned.

Is it not an issue that the world-travellers who fly to and from this region demand additional schedules and services which can only be established through Friendship?

Is it not an issue that Washington's air facilities are heavily over-burdened and that utilization of Friendship would provide a measure of safety which is long overdue?

Of course those are issues. They are the issues.

And since they are so intimately connected with Friendship, I do not see how the East Coast-Florida proceedings can be given adequate consideration unless our modern airport in Maryland and its facilities become an important item in the final determination.

I am confident that the officials of the Civil Aeronautics Board will justify the trust which has been placed in them, and will approve Pan American's application as the one which will provide prompt, safe and adequate service to our East Coast cities within an international network.

At the beginning of my remarks, I spoke of the Latin American diplomats who visited Friendship last week. I should now like to mention them by name and also read into the RECORD the proclamation which Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., of Baltimore, issued in designating a day in honor of them and their countries.

The Latin American visitors to Baltimore were:

From Nicaragua: Ambassador Don Guillermo Sevilla-Sacasa, Dr. Jorge Alberto Montealegre, commercial and financial counselor; Liceciado Ricardo Parrales, deputy to Dr. Montealegre, and I. Irving Davidson, legal counsel.

From Peru: Don Gonzalo Pizarro, minister plenipotentiary; Jose Urdanizia, counsel general, and Enrique Larosa, first secretary.

From Bolivia: Ambassador Don Victor Andrade.

From Paraguay: Persio da Silva, first secretary, and Miguel Angel Reyes, second secretary.

From Guatamala: Ambassador Jose Luis Cruz-Salazar.

From Dominican Republic: Dr. Oscar G. Ginebra, minister plenipotentiary.

From Panama: Don Juan Manuel Mendez Merida, minister.

From Cuba: Dr. Mario Nunez de Villavicencio, first secretary.

From Honduras: Ambassador Carlos Izaguirre and Dr. Policarpo Callejas B., first secretary.

From Costa Rica: Don Jorge Hazera, counselor.

From Colombia: Dr. Ricardo Anaya, minister counselor.

From Argentina: Santos Goni, first secretary.

From Chile: Ambassador Maria Rodriquez A., and Carlos Valenzula, minister counsel.

From Uraguay: Washington P. Bermudez, charge d' affaires.

In his proclamation, Mayor D'Alesandro said:

Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice, and peace in the world, and it is essential to promote the development of friendly relations between nations; and

Whereas the friendly relationship existing between the various Latin American nations and the United States of America is based on a spirit of goodwill and a community of interests affecting the social and economic welfare of our respective countries; and

Whereas the purpose of Latin American Day in Baltimore is to bring to the attention of the people of this community the importance of Latin America to the city of Baltimore and the State of Maryland; and

Whereas it has been estimated that between 30 and 45 percent of all commerce through the port of Baltimore either originates from or is destined to Latin America, which is indicative of the important role Latin America plays in the economic health and welfare of our city and State:

Now, therefore, I, Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., mayor of the city of Baltimore, do hereby proclaim Thursday, June 7, 1956, as Latin American Day in Baltimore, and do urge all our citizens to give serious thought to the importance of Latin America in our economic and social welfare, and to resolve to do everything within our power to further strengthen the bonds of friendship now existing between our respective countries.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). The secretary will call the roll.

The legilsative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, Senate bill 3982, to provide for the maintenance of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes, be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 11319.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

(The following statement by Mr. FULBRIGHT, made during the speech of Mr. MCCLELLAN, is, by request, printed at this point:)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, before returning to the executive session of the Foreign Relations Committee, I should like to comment briefly on the public works appropriation bill. The river development and resources conservation program is of vital importance to the State of Arkansas. I wish to commend the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who served so ably as chairman of the subcommittee, as well as the chairman and the members of the full committee, for the excellent bill which has been reported this year.

The senior Senator from Louisiana and the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], have, of course, been long interested in this program, as have all the members of the Committee on Appropriations. In the years to come I am confident that these gentlemen, who have served so diligently in the preparation of this program, will be remembered long after many of the other actions taken by this body have been forgotten. It is a great pleasure when we can appropriate money for something constructive in these days in which practically all, or at least the vast majority, of bills are devoted to purposes which are destructive rather than constructive.

The action by the committee this year is of far-reaching significance, particularly to the vast Arkansas River Valley area. Although a comprehensive flood control and navigation plan was authorized for the Arkansas River in 1946, the project has gone forward at a snail's pace. About all the area was able to obtain was a small appropriation annually for emergency bank stabilization, which is at best only a holding operation and makes little contribution to the long-range development of the area.

Under the bill reported by the Senate committee, I am glad to note that for the first time it will be possible to move ahead with the construction of vital projects.

The committee has approved $750,000 for Dardanelle Dam. This appropriation is long overdue, for, as Senators will recall, the Congress in 1950 appropriated $1 million to begin construction of Dardanelle. Due to the Korean war, the project was delayed and the money was never used. At long last, however, it appears that construction of Dardanelle will be initiated and the people of the Arkansas River will be assured of the benefits of flood control, water conservation, navigation, and irrigation. I might point out also that this project is being constructed in an area which has been losing population due to limited economic opportunities.

Of importance also to the Arkansas River Valley are the three projects in Oklahoma—the Eufala, Keystone, and Oolagah Dams—for which a total of $7,500,000 has been provided for construction. Construction funds are also provided for the Calion project in southern Arkansas.

I should also like to commend the committee for its action in recognizing the importance of early construction of the Beaver Reservoir and the Greer's Ferry Reservoir. It happens that Beaver Reservoir will be located in the section of Arkansas in which I live, and I am particularly familiar with the economic conditions which make the early construction of the dam of vital importance. The Ozark area has suffered serious economic setbacks in recent years, due to drought, and it too has seen the population dwindle because of limited economic opportunities. The construction of the Beaver Reservoir and the Greer's Ferry Reservoir will provide needed employment during the construction period, and will open up unlimited opportunities in the future.

The committee also has recognized the importance of planning several other projects in Arkansas which are essential to the orderly economic development of our area. I shall not comment on these in detail, but I am glad to know that the way is being paved for the construction in the area of other projects which are urgently needed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc; that the bill, as thus amended, be regarded for purposes of amendment as the original text; and that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by agreement to this request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I merely rise as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee which is marking up the foreign aid bill, to pay my tribute of respect to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ELLENDER] dealing with the public works appropriation bill, and to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] who is chairman of the subcommittee dealing with the reclamation provisions of the bill, for the very fine work they have accomplished.

The committee functioned in a bipartisan manner. All members approached the task in a spirit of trying to solve the flood-control problem and other problems. I simply wish to say, because I shall be forced to be absent from the floor of the Senate for the reason I have stated, that the committee has done an outstanding job.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to thank my good friend from California for his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Louisiana is agreed to, and the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the heading "Title II—Department of the Interior—General Investigations," on

page 5, line 18, after the word "expended", to strike out "$5,270,000" and insert "$5,680,000", and in line 19, after the word "which", to strike out "$4,560,000" and insert "$4,970,000."

Under the subhead "Construction and Rehabilitation," on page 6, line 5, after the word "expended", to strike out "$125,900,000" and insert "$138,961,000."

On page 6, line 24, after the word "nonreturnable", to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That not to exceed $233,800 shall be available for the emergency protection of medicinal waters of Soap Lake, Wash., from irrigation operations of the Columbia Basin project, which amount beyond the ability of the water users to repay shall be repayable from surplus power revenues of Grand Coulee Dam."

On page 7, line 5, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That not to exceed $520,000 shall be available toward emergency rehabilitation of the works of the Hayden Lake unit, Rathdrum Prairie project, Idaho, to be repaid in full under conditions satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior."

Under the subhead "Operation and Maintenance," on page 8, line 8, after the word "law", to strike out "$26,500,000" and insert "$27,267,000."

Under the subhead "Upper Colorado River Basin Fund," on page 9, line 9, after the numerals "485", to strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$13,000,000."

On page 9, line 10, after the word "expended", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That funds appropriated under this head shall be immediately transferred to the appropriation entitled, 'Construction and Rehabilitation, Bureau of Reclamation.'"

Under the subhead "Administrative Provisions," on page 10, line 23, after the word "prints", to insert "construction of minimum recreational facilities at reclamation reservoirs to be nonreimbursable."

On page 13, after line 5, to insert:

"Sums which have heretofore been expended for construction purposes on the Boulder Canyon project from operation and maintenance appropriations and revenue receipts shall be considered as having been advanced to the Colorado River dam fund and repaid to the Secretary of the Treasury as of May 31 of the same operating year."

On page 13, after line 11, to insert:

"Funds made available herein and hereafter to the Trinity division, Central Valley project, shall be available for the design and construction of power and hydraulic facilities totalling not to exceed approximately 400,000 kilowatts."

On page 13, after line 16, to insert:

"All funds expended for construction, operation, and maintenance of the 2,000-second-foot Wahluke siphon, Columbia Basin project, shall be reimbursable, but repayment of those parts thereof and of other expenditures for said project which the Secretary finds properly allocable to irrigable lands located on the Wahluke slope shall be deferred until they are no longer needed in connection with operations of the Atomic Energy Commission and have been irrigated."

Under the heading "Title III—Civil Functions, Department of the Army—Cemeterial Expenses." on page 15, line 20, after the word "cemeteries", to strike out "$6,500,000" and insert "$6,765,000."

Under the subhead "General Investigations," on page 16, line 20, after the word "expended", to strike out "$8,122,000" and insert "$9,322,000."

Under the subhead "Construction, General," on page 17, line 7, after the word "expended", to strike out "$422,034,000" and insert "$463,373,000."

On page 17, line 23, after the word "litigation", to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That in view of the physical conditions that developed during construction which increased the cost of land acquisition beyond the legal authority of the city of Grand Forks to provide, the Chief of Engineers is authorized to expend, for land acquisition, not to exceed the sum of $100,000 of the amount herein appropriated for the Grand Forks unit of the Red River of the North project:".

On page 18, line 5, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That in lieu of protecting the Lewis and Clark Irrigation District, the sum of $1,935,000 of the funds herein or hereafter appropriated for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River shall be available for the purchase of lands and improvements in the Lewis and Clark Irrigation District, and the sum of $1,196,000 shall be available for the relocation of highways and utilities therein. The substitution of land acquisition for the protection shall be made and the Secretary of the Army shall acquire such land and improvements if all of the landowners, on or before June 30, 1957, have offered to sell their property on terms agreeable to said landowners, and within the amount provided herein for such land acquisition."

On page 18, line 18, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That in lieu of protecting the East Bottom of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, the sum of $1,341,891 of the funds herein or hereafter appropriated for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River shall be available for the purchase of lands and improvements in and contiguous to the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, and not to exceed $2,000,000 shall be available to the Corps of Engineers for protection of the intake structure of the pumping plant in Zero Bottom and for the construction of bank protection to prevent erosion in the Missouri River adjacent to the Buford-Trenton irrigation project. The substitution of land acquisition for protection shall be made and the Secretary of the Army shall acquire such land and improvements if all of the landowners, except the heirs of Louis Morin, Jr., on or before June 30, 1957, have offered to sell their property on the terms agreeable to said landowners, and within the amount provided for such land acquisition: *Provided,* That the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, is authorized to acquire by condemnation proceedings, in the appropriate United States district court, the public domain allotment of Louis Morin, Jr., now deceased, described as the west half southwest quarter, section 16, and the north half southeast quarter, section 17, township 153 north, range 102 west, fifth principal meridian, North Dakota, in connection with the construction and operation of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir: *Provided further,* That in the event land acquisition is undertaken in lieu of protection of the East Bottom, that in recognition of the increased per acre annual operation and maintenance cost of the remaining lands in the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, the construction charge obligation assignable to the remaining lands of said district pursuant to the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), as amended, and the proposed contract between the United States and Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, approved as to form February 23, 1955, shall be nonreimbursable, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to enter into a contract with the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District to transfer operation and maintenance responsibility for project works constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation for the benefit of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District to such district."

On page 20, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,500,000", and in line 15, after the word "appropriated", to strike out the colon and *"Provided further,* That no funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for the planning or construction of the Wilkesboro Reservoir, N. C."

Under the subhead "Operation and Maintenance, General," on page 21, line 7, after the word "expended", to strike out "$85,900,000" and insert "$95,900,000."

Under the subhead "General Expenses," on page 21, line 16, after the word "investigations", to strike out "$10,075,000" and insert "$10,400,000."

Under the subhead "Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries," on page 21, line 23, after the word "expended", to strike out "$56,030,000" and insert "$62,791,000."

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to endorse very strongly what the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] has said regarding the chairman of the subcommittee before whom I and other witnesses from my State appeared this year. I wish to acknowledge very gratefully the remarkably sympathetic and detailed attention which the Senator gave to the problems of stricken areas, particularly those in New England. That is not intended to be exclusive, by any means, but I am personally familiar with the evidence and the attention the distinguished Senator has given to our problem.

I wish very strongly to endorse the remarks of the Senator from California and to applaud the Senator from Louisiana for the remarkable job he has done.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared and which I ask to have appear following the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement submitted by Mr. BUSH appears in the RECORD following Mr. ELLENDER's speech.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Louisiana and to the committee for covering in the bill not only the budgeted items, but nonbudgeted items covering uncompleted river and harbor projects in the State of Washington, including Blaine, $116,000; Everett, $120,000; Grays Harbor (Westhaven), $61,000; Willapa River and Harbor, $130,000; Quillayute, $444,000; Columbia River at Baker Bay-Ilwaco (complete planning and start dredging), $70,000; Stillaguamish River (complete survey, report on benefits and costs), $5,000.

We appreciate the fact that as a result of our representations to the committee, funds have been included in the bill for the projects which I have just mentioned. We appreciate the very fine cooperation of the chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, Mr. President, I appreciate all that is being said about me and the committee, but

I am not unmindful of the fact that a great deal of the work was accomplished by the efforts of various Senators who appeared before the committee and made a good case for the projects which they presented.

I wish to commend my good friend from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] as well as his colleague [Mr. MAGNUSON]. Their section of the country was inundated by a recent flood, as was Connecticut. They did very good service in presenting to us in concrete form the various projects, and I am happy that the committee was able to include in the bill many of the projects suggested by the Senators who appeared before us. I express the hope that the Senate conferees will be able to convince the House conferees that these projects are as worthy as we think they are and that they should be retained in the bill.

Mr. President, while bouquets are being thrown at the committee, I wish to say that the members of the staff who worked with me are to be highly commended. We have with us today Mr. Kenneth Bousquet, clerk of the subcommittee, and Miss Grace E. Johnson, assistant clerk, both of whom worked very diligently and assisted in every respect in making it possible for us to report the bill in time.

The hearings started on March 20, and continued through the remainder of March, all of April, and all of May. The committee heard a total of 683 witnesses and representatives of various organizations. Each Senator has on his desk four volumes which contain the evidence taken during the hearings.

I wish to state for the RECORD that all the projects were completely justified by the United States Army engineers, and, of course, no projects were put into the bill or recommended for action except those which received the sanction of the engineers.

Mr. President, this year we proceeded in the same manner as we proceeded last year, with one exception. The funds necessary to operate the Atomic Energy Commission are not included in this bill; they will be provided for later in the supplemental bill.

The Subcommittee on Public Works divided itself into 3 subcommittees. The one, which dealt with the Tennessee Valley Authority, and would have dealt with the Atomic Energy Commission funds, was headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. The portion of the public works appropriation bill dealing with reclamation, the power marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior, was handled by my good friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is also the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Both Senators did noble work in obtaining all the evidence necessary to make certain that proper justifications were made for all the projects which are included in the bill.

Before marking up the bill, I myself studied not only the projects for which the Bureau of the Budget made estimates, but also other projects which were not budgeted. It often happens that many small projects are neglected for some time, and those who foster them sometimes cannot come to Washington and make their presentation to the Bureau of the Budget. So in order to balance the bill, and in order that it might take care of many worthy projects which were not considered by the Bureau of the Budget, I recommended to the subcommittee the inclusion of a number of projects which had been asked for by witnesses from all over the country, and some, also, which had been requested by Members of both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

I am glad that a substantial number of such projects were included. My hope is that it will be possible to retain all of them when the conferees meet.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I listened with interest to what the Senator said about meeting the requests of people throughout the country for these very important projects. I think the Senator is to be commended for the attention which he has given to them.

I have a question regarding a Department of the Interior project in the Missouri River Basin, namely, a powerline from Fort Randall, S. Dak., to Grand Island, Nebr., which was approved by the Bureau of the Budget, recommended by the Department of the Interior as feasible, and requested by the President. A rather sizable delegation appeared before the committee and spoke for the project. To the best of my knowledge, no witness appeared against it. Yet I find that it was not included in the bill. I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee could enlighten me as to the reason for the action of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator who handled that matter is the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. However, I shall be glad to give some of the reasons why that project was not included.

It seems there was fear on the part of some of the Senators and Representatives from the area concerned that if that line was built there might be an inequitable distribution of the electricity. It was stated that in Nebraska all the power would be distributed through a publicly-owned system, and fear was expressed that because of the unique situation in Nebraska, where every consumer would be a preference customer, there would be an inequitable distribution of the electricity between the Missouri River States.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator says that fear was expressed. Was that expression given by anyone who appeared before the committee?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; it was an expression by Members of Congress.

Mr. CURTIS. By Members of the House of Representatives?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; and also by Members of the Senate. As a matter of fact, one member of our committee expressed such fear.

The thought was that if some method could be worked out whereby the electricity would be properly distributed, whereby the States north of Nebraska, including Minnesota, which might be entitled to the electricity, would get their just share of the power, and if an equitable formula could be devised, we might in the near future consider the inclusion in a bill of sufficient funds to take care of the problem about which the Senator from Nebraska is now speaking.

It was further said that a year's delay would not be harmful, for the simple reason that it would be probably 3 years before electricity from the dams would be available. Since the transmission line could be built within the space of 18 to 24 months, it was thought that we might wait until next year. In the meantime an agreement could be reached as to the distribution of the electricity. Then it would be likely that the line to which the Senator referred would be completed when the power was available.

Mr. CURTIS. I am interested in what the distinguished chairman has said about the fears which were expressed. Was any evidence submitted to the committee indicating that the allocation of power in the Missouri River Basin States up to date has been unfair?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, there was none.

Mr. CURTIS. Was any evidence received by the committee indicating that the Bureau of Reclamation contemplated any unfair allocation of power among the States?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, there was no such evidence submitted. But before we finally decided upon the position we took, it was suggested that consultation be had with the Bureau of Reclamation, and that some language be included in the report, or that assurance be obtained from the Bureau, relative to the distribution of the electricity. I do not believe that such assurance was obtained. Perhaps the distinguished Senator from Arizona can enlighten us on that subject.

Mr. HAYDEN. The matter was considered at length by both the subcommittee and the full committee. The action taken in the committee was based upon two factors.

First, at the present time, under existing firm power contracts this facility is not economically feasible under present allotments to customers in Nebraska. That is to say, at the present time a 115-kilovolt line is feasible; a 230-kilovolt line is not feasible.

Mr. CURTIS. To which finding is the Senator referring?

Mr. HAYDEN. To the finding of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. CURTIS. But the Bureau recommended a 230-kilovolt line and said that it was feasible over the period of its life; did it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes; there is no question about that; but not now.

Second, a unique situation exists in Nebraska, in that every consumer is a preference customer. The committee considered for inclusion in the bill provisions to overcome this situation. However, the problem is so involved that the committee felt the matter should be handled by the proper legislative committee. The preference clause could not be

amended in an appropriation bill. Every customer in Nebraska is a preference customer.

Mr. CURTIS. I am very grateful to the Senator from Arizona, who granted us such a fine hearing.

Was any evidence submitted to the Senator's subcommittee or to the full committee indicating that the Department of the Interior had been unfair in the allocation of power up to date?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, no.

Mr. CURTIS. Was any evidence submitted to the committee indicating that the Department of the Interior anticipated the allocation of power unfairly among the States?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, there were no allegations of unfairness at all on the part of anyone.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana was speaking about the fears which had been expressed. That is why I asked my questions.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. The question that bothers me is not whether there has been any spirit of favoritism toward Nebraska, Wyoming, South Dakota, or any other State in that area, but whether, under existing law, the Bureau of Reclamation might be required to deliver power to Nebraska in preference to people in Wyoming or South Dakota.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the crux of the question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I think perhaps I can give an illustration which supports these fears. One afternoon about a year ago, two gentlemen came to my office in the Senate Office Building. One was an official of the Milwaukee Railroad and the other was an industrial representative. They said that one of the large companies producing aluminum was interested in utilizing the town of Pickstown. Pickstown was built by the Corps of Army Engineers, at a cost of between $6 million and $7 million. It was built for the purpose of housing construction workers on the Randall Dam on the Missouri River in South Dakota. The Government is through with Pickstown. The dam has been built. While a few of the houses will be needed for the operators of the dam, the larger part of the construction was declared surplusage.

The industrial firm, which is in the business of making aluminum, was interested in the possibility of building on that town site and taking it off the Government's hands and erecting an aluminum production plant. But when they approached the Department of the Interior they were told they could be given no assurance of getting electricity from the Government dam.

As I ran the matter down with them and the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Aandahl, we learned that since the State of Nebraska is served entirely by public power, consequently every distributor in the State of Nebraska has preference and can get power in preference to anyone in South Dakota, unless he is served by a public body. If the aluminum company had gone 70 or 80 miles south and located itself in the State of Nebraska, it could have bought power developed on the Missouri River through one of the suppliers in the State of Nebraska. But Pickstown could not be moved into Nebraska. Consequently, the Government had no opportunity to dispose of this construction town, because it could not be moved into Nebraska, where the aluminum company could qualify to get power through preference distributors. Therefore, the aluminum industry was not located there, and the Government still has Pickstown on its hands.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to give another illustration, which is even worse than the South Dakota illustration.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield without losing the floor.

Mr. BARRETT. The power site at Glendo will be coming into production in about a year. It is within 40 miles of the Nebraska State line. Under existing law, a good many citizens of Wyoming have been getting power indirectly from the Bureau of Reclamation, through a private power company, for many years. When Glendo comes into production preference customers in Wyoming, I assume, will be taken care of by the Bureau of Reclamation. After preference customers are taken care of the rest of the power from Glendo can be preempted from the people of Wyoming who are not preference customers.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana and the distinguished Senator from Arizona are rendering a great service in bringing this matter up. It seems to me we shall need legislation to guarantee to our people a fair share of the power produced in their own States.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to say that I am not unaware of the fact that a very good case was made for use of the peak load during the summer when water was released for irrigation purposes. If it were possible to do that, I do not think there would be objection on the part of the States of North and South Dakota.

Mr. CURTIS. I am glad to hear the chairman say that, because, as a matter of fact, this summer power available when water is released can be sold in South Dakota at "dump" rates, and the Nebraska farmers are anxious to pay regular rates. That would enhance the Treasury by from $175,000 to $300,000 in additional revenues a year.

I should like to ask a further question. Was there any evidence submitted to the committee in support of the fears about which we have just heard? I think the fears are based on an entirely erroneous idea of the power situation in Nebraska. In Nebraska many of the public bodies have outstanding bonds. Their business is to produce power. They want to produce all the power they can. The second largest public power body in the State is Omaha Public Power. It is located on the Missouri River. It is not getting 1 kilowatt of electricity from the Missouri River system, and none is currently planned. Right now additional steam systems are being built in my State. Two of the important hydro plants are serving irrigation districts. The minute they stop producing power, the cost of irrigation goes up tremendously. Nebraska has no desire to draw from other States power which they should rightly have, or which would be uneconomic. We have shown every desire to cooperate with them.

We would accept any limitation which would be reasonable. I think the figures will show that at the present time we are getting only about 15 percent of our power revenues from the Bureau of Reclamation, and that in 1958 we shall get only 12.8 percent.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona if it is not true that both North and South Dakota are served by 230-kilovolt lines from Bureau of Reclamation Missouri River plants.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true.

Mr. CURTIS. And the bill provides for the construction of a 230-kilovolt line into Minnesota.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true, but there was a load factor in each case which justified that line.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand. I thank the Senator for giving us this time. I do not mean to be critical. I want the answers in the RECORD. Is it not true that Nebraska is the only Missouri River State which does not have a 230-kilovolt line?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true. There is no question that once the question of how in the future the area will be developed is decided, and the need for a 230-kilovolt line is established, such a line will be constructed; but until that question is determined, there would be justification only for a 215-kilovolt line, because there does not exist the market for the larger one.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will recall that we received evidence, as I remember, that even though the building of the line were to be delayed for a year, no time would be lost, because it would be 3 years before electricity could be fed into the line. In the meantime, it was suggested that some agreement be entered into with the Reclamation Bureau whereby peak load electricity could be utilized and there would be no interference with the just share of the interested people who were entitled to have the electricity. If this could be worked out, I do not believe any trouble at all would be encountered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I am aware of the widespread opposition in certain States in the Missouri River Basin to the preference clause which applies to the distribution of electricity. I remind the Senate that the preference clause was not written by Nebraska. It is a general law which Congress enacted. Those who are opposed to it should make some attempt to change it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think Nebraska happens to be the only State in the Union in which almost all the electricity is distributed by publicly owned power systems.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to say that I think the decision announced by the two distinguished Senators, and made by the full committee, was wise when it was made, and that its wisdom is even more apparent now, in view of recent developments.

In the first place, as regards the older developments, the Senator from Louisiana has just referred to the fact, which I think is known to all of us, that Nebraska is the greatest beneficiary of national generosity in connection with public power, of any State in the Union. In the first place, Nebraska is the only State to which all the water resources within it have been granted or released, for its own development; and, second, as an additional ground for gratitude to the Nation, which I am sure the State of Nebraska feels, the construction of several of the large structures built there was made possible through grants or Federal loans. However, that is neither here nor there.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield, let me say that the structures referred to are not in Nebraska; instead, they are in South Dakota.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield on that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to complete my point, please.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. So, Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Nebraska is in the very fortunate position of being able to wait until due judgment can be exercised in connection with this matter, so that injustice will not be done to States only a small part of whose electric power is being used by distributors who fall within the preference clause, whereas in his own State—primarily because of the generosity of Congress, and under laws passed by Congress—all the electricity distributed which is produced from water power does fall within the preference clause.

The second point is that it seems to me that what has happened at this particular session indicates very clearly the wisdom of the decision made, because in the Niagara power case the Senate recently decided that the preference clause had such sacrosanct standing that the Senate would not even permit the sovereign State of New York to operate under its own water-power development policies, but in granting to that State a small part of what the Senate has already granted to Nebraska—that is to say, the right to develop a small part of its water power—the Senate held that the preference clause was sacrosanct and could not be touched and must prevail even over another method of distribution, as prescribed by a New York State law.

So it seems to me that the distinguished chairman of the committee and the chairman of the Reclamations Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works are on such strong ground that even the Senator from Nebraska—who, as I say, represents a State which, as compared with all the other States in this field, should have the most gratitude to the Federal Government—would have to realize, or should realize, that the course of wisdom is being followed and that a little time should be taken to reach a just solution.

I believe that it will be possible to devise a formula under which, on the basis of the percentage of power distributed, let us say, to other States in general in the Missouri River Valley—both power which comes under the preference clause and power which does not come under it—equal treatment may be given by subsequent legislation to the State of Nebraska. I would strongly favor that, in connection with this matter, the State of Nebraska be accorded treatment equal to that given her neighboring States. But, inasmuch as Nebraska has received preferred treatment up to this time, I feel that the Senator from Nebraska can scarcely complain if a Senate committee wishes to take due time to find out what would be the fair solution of this particular problem.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield at this point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has referred to the generous treatment of the State of Nebraska by the Federal Government.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Nebraska does not deny that, does he?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. None of the power developed in the State of Nebraska is Federal power. Most of it is developed by municipal bodies with private financing. In Nebraska we have practically no Federal power production at all. We have three hydroelectric projects which were built under the PWA; but other than those, all the others were financed privately. Therefore, I do not like to have any record to the contrary stand without being challenged as to accuracy.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that this is the case—and if I am in error about it, I hope my friend will correct me: The Federal Power Commission, acting under Federal law, had to give to the State of Nebraska licenses and permission for the development of the hydroelectric projects in Nebraska——

Mr. CURTIS. Is that generosity?

Mr. HOLLAND. Just as the Federal Government did in the case of the State of South Carolina, for the development of two great projects there; and just as the Federal Government did in the case of the State of Oklahoma, for one great project there. The Congress followed the course laid down by the Federal Power Commission, in the case of the State of Oklahoma, by passing another law in the same field, last year. We did so because in that instance, flood-control water, as well as power water, was involved. The Markham Ferry Dam is the one to which I am referring. I understand that the Federal Government had a great deal to do with giving the original permission and consent for the development of waters in the State of Nebraska in which the Federal Government certainly had an interest. If that is not true, and if the Federal Government had no right to intervene in the handling of those waters, then the Federal Government has been proceeding very unwisely in the case of many reclamation projects in the State of Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. In Nebraska there are practically no Federal reclamation projects that are producing power.

Mr. HOLLAND. But the question is as to the right of the Federal Government to exercise Federal powers in connection with the running waters which happen to traverse the State of Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not accept the view that the Federal Government owns that water.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ELLENDER] and the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. HAYDEN] have covered this question so ably, as has also the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], that there is little left to be said about it.

However, I wish to call attention to this fact: In view of the Federal preference clause or act, and in view of the public-power laws of Nebraska, as members of the Appropriations Committee, we could not authorize the transmission line to be built into Nebraska, because the moment the line was built in Nebraska, the transmission line would become the preferred customer, with a perfect right to draw on all current generated in that area.

So long as the laws of Nebraska remain as they are, and the Federal preference clause remains as it is, we are compelled to ask that the Reclamation Bureau make a finding and establish a policy before the construction of a transmission line can be authorized.

Other Senators have very ably covered the question. Any further debate on it will be only so many words spoken.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I wish to commend the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota a moment ago. However, I do not think he has stated the solution quite accurately. It seems to me that, instead of asking the Bureau of Reclamation to adopt some rule or regulation, we must take jurisdiction over that subject, probably in a legislative committee.

I am sure the people of the great State of Nebraska do not intend to be unfair. They have not been unkind in demanding this power. But, as I see it, at the present time, the Bureau of Reclamation is helpless. If some REA or other power agency in Nebraska asks for all the power developed in my State over and above the needs of preference customers, we have no choice except to deliver it to them. So it seems to me that we must have some legislation on

this subject, and develop the preference clause somewhat.

I appreciate the sentiments expressed by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and my colleague from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. I believe that, approaching this question in the spirit in which we are approaching it today, Nebraska, Wyoming, South Dakota, and the other States involved can arrive at a fair and just division of the power. But certainly the people of Wyoming, in which State the water which flows into the State of Nebraska arises, should not now find themselves in a position in which the people of Nebraska would have greater use of Wyoming water for irrigating their own lands, and be in a position to have the big end of the power, merely because Nebraska is a public-power State.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My distinguished friend from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] certainly knows the history of the Missouri River development, because at one time he was a member of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives. He was one of those who introduced proposed legislation looking toward the Missouri River power development. In 1944, when the Senator from Nebraska was a Member of the House and introduced his proposal, the justification for building the structures was flood control.

The Nation has been generous to Nebraska. The State of South Dakota has been generous to Nebraska. Under the authority of the Flood Control Act of 1944, the so-called Pick-Sloan plan was authorized, and the Government authorized the building of several structures in the State of South Dakota, and one in North Dakota. It authorized 4 or 5 structures in South Dakota and 1 in North Dakota, to create gigantic reservoirs in which to park the flood waters of the Missouri River and keep them off Nebraska.

When Nebraska was asking for this project and this program on the Missouri River back in 1944, the purpose at that time was to prevent the Missouri River from flooding Omaha and the farmlands between Sioux City and Omaha, and to the south. Nebraska did not ask then for power. Nebraska asked for places to park the floodwater. So South Dakota joined in the request, and gave up 450,000 acres of river bottom land, so that flood waters on the Missouri River could be parked in South Dakota and kept off Nebraska.

After the structures were built, the State of Nebraska, which is served to the extent of 100 percent by public power bodies, said, "Now build a 230-kilovolt line into Nebraska, to siphon the power from South Dakota into Nebraska, and we will use the power, and all the people of Nebraska can get some of the power, because of the preference laws, and because the State of Nebraska is a public-power State."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not at the moment. I should like to make a connected statement.

Today the city of Omaha advertises to industry, "Come to a city where you can build on the waterfront and have a guaranty that floods will not destroy your buildings. Come to Omaha. Great industrial opportunity awaits you here. No longer will the Missouri River flood you out."

The city of Omaha, whose sewage plants, water-intake lines, and other facilities were affected by floods, now gets the benefit, because South Dakota was generous and said, "Park the water in South Dakota." The Federal Government said, "Park the floodwaters in South Dakota, and keep them off Nebraska."

We have done all that. We would like to see the people of South Dakota afforded an opportunity to have access to this power. That is why we are not enthusiastic about building a 230-kilovolt line which would establish priority of use and siphon the power down into Nebraska, making it impossible for our REA's 10 years from now, to get the power they may need. Today our public bodies in South Dakota can contract only for the power for which they have immediate prospective use. They could not protect themselves for 10 years in the future if this 230-kilovolt line were built, because the pattern of use would be carried down to the preference customers in Nebraska.

We heartily applaud the decision of the committee that, until a formula is devised which will insure a fair and equitable distribution of the power, we should not permit lines to be built which would deny to South Dakota, which already provides the land upon which to park the water, the opportunity to obtain a fair distribution of the power.

I am in favor of the preference law. I have never voted to repeal the preference law. I believe that in the case cited by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Niagara case, we could well have allowed the State of New York to apply its preference law if the State of New York was to finance the building of the Niagara dam and the hydroelectric project in connection therewith.

However, I am reminded of the fact that in 1944, when Congress authorized the Hungry Horse Dam in Montana, it provided specifically that the people of Montana should have the primary use of the power developed by the Hungry Horse Dam, and that it should also be available to the other States, but that the people of Montana and the State of Montana should have consideration. The water was there, the dam was there, and the people of Montana were to have a fair share of the power.

In connection with the Denison Dam in Oklahoma, I understand that a policy decision was made which made it possible for the people of Oklahoma to have some of the power developed there. I hope that before we are through there will be provided a formula which will allow some of the power to remain in South Dakota. In South Dakota we have the Gavin's Point Dam, the Randall Dam, the Oahe Dam, and the Big Bend Dam. The four dams will have a generating capacity of more than 1 billion kilowatts. I hope there will be devised some formula which will allow some of that power to remain in South Dakota; and I hope there will be devised a formula by which the people of Wyoming can get some of the power in Wyoming from the Glendo Dam in Wyoming, close to the Nebraska line.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, may I ask one question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator from South Dakota is not intimating, is he, that we ought to settle this question on a dam-by-dam basis?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; although perhaps we shall have to do that. That has been done in the past. But possibly there should be general legislation.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for yielding to me.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I express the hope that my good friend from Nebraska will consult with the Interior Department to determine whether or not the Interior Department has the right, under the law, to make proper and equitable distribution of this power. If not, it strikes me that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] has suggested a method by which it could be done, namely, by legislation. My fear is that if the conditions which exist next year are the same as the conditions which now exist, we shall again be forced to leave dangling in the air the question as to whether or not Nebraska can get all this power. It may be that again we shall have to defer construction of this line.

If the Bureau of Reclamation cannot make a proper and equitable distribution of this power under the law as it now stands, it strikes me, as the Senator from Wyoming has stated, that some legislation ought to be enacted in order to give the Bureau the authority to do it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the Senator has been very generous in yielding to me. I wonder whether he would be kind enough to yield to me for 1 more minute.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator for yielding in response to my inquiry. When I examined the record I found that the contentions of Nebraska were not disputed; that there was nothing in the record in opposition to its request for this line, and that its position was supported by the Bureau of the Budget. The answer has been developed now as to why the committee took its action. I wish to point out that in 1955 South Dakota received 67 percent of all its load requirements from the Bureau of Reclamation and that Nebraska received 16½ percent.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I hope the Senator is not intimating that in South Dakota all of the 67 percent of the load was received. I am sure the Senator

is referring to the preference customers.

Mr. CURTIS. No; the preference customers were taken care of. I do not believe that there is any justification for the belief that in the future the power will be allocated to the disadvantage of any other State. It has not been in the past. Our own belief is that while we are getting 16½ percent of our power requirements in 1955, by 1958 it will be down to 12.8 percent, but that we will need the 230-kilovolt line to get even that much. I thank the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Arizona for the consideration they gave this matter in committee.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WATKINS. For the purpose of my question I read from page 7 of the committee report, as follows:

> Provo River project, Utah: The committee has approved the use of $300,000 of prior-year funds for the acquisition of additional rights-of-way easements for the diversions of water into the Provo River and Deer Creek Reservoir. Recent floods in the area have made it essential that these additional right-of-way be acquired.

I call attention to that language of the report in light of what we thought was intended in our emergency request filed with the committee, namely, that in order to get some relief for that situation it was not intended that the relief be limited to additional easements, but that the relief could include necessary river channel revision and other improvements. Many times relief can be obtained by river channel revision or by the construction of what we in the West call riprap, which would be more economical under certain conditions and just as effective as the acquisition of easements.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly that was the intention of the committee. We wanted to accomplish it in the most practical way possible. We want the most feasible method used. If it can be done by a levee or an easement, or in some other way, that is what we feel should be done.

Mr. WATKINS. Or perhaps by revising the river channel?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; whatever is the most economical way of doing it certainly should be the method used. It should be done in the most economical and in the best manner possible, and the method should not be confined to an easement. We do not want to stand on any technicality.

Mr. WATKINS. Whatever needs to be done to relieve the situation to which we have called attention. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. WATKINS. I thought that was the Senator's understanding, but some people in the field who must do the work were a little worried about the language, in that it might restrict them to the acquisition of easements and that they would be prohibited from making necessary river-channel rectification or repairs.

Mr. HAYDEN. Some legally minded person might look at it that way, but no practical minded person, I am sure, would go along with that thinking. We want to do what is necessary to take care of the situation.

Mr. WATKINS. Yes; and it could be done by making the improvements in the ways I have mentioned.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

GRANDFATHER WILLIAM KNOWLAND

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senate will indulge me, I should like the attention of Members on both sides of the aisle for a bipartisan announcement of considerable importance. It involves the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

For many years, I have been closely associated with the Senator from California. Like every Member of this Chamber—on either side of the aisle—I have found him to be able, patriotic, courteous, and thoughtful.

But I wonder how many of my colleagues know that he is also a five-time winner in the contest for the proudest granddaddy in the Senate?

His fifth victory was chalked up last Monday when Harold W. Jewett II discovered America. Anybody who has found buttons lying on the floor in front of the minority leader's desk in the past 2 days can know now that they popped right off BILL KNOWLAND's shirt.

The Senator from California is one of the youngest leaders in Senate history. He is also one of the youngest grandfathers I know.

I have been busy trying to get a little girl out of junior high school while BILL KNOWLAND has had five grandchildren.

As I said in the beginning, this is a bipartisan announcement and for my colleagues on this side of the aisle, I want to congratulate the minority leader, Mr. and Mrs. Harold W. Jewett, and the new addition to the family.

The very best thing I can hope for Harold W. Jewett II is that he will grow up to be as fine a man, as thoughtful a man and as able a man as his grandfather. [Applause.]

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his very kind and gracious remarks. I was in attendance at a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations when he asked me to come to the floor of the Senate. Needless to say both Mrs. Knowland and I are highly pleased at the arrival of our fifth grandchild and second grandson.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I would also like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader. While speaking of grandchildren, I should also like to say something about myself. [Laughter.] I have an only son. While he was in the service he asked consent to marry. I told him it was all right provided the first six children would be boys and the seventh a girl. He failed me, in that the first five are boys and the sixth is a girl and the seventh is a boy. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I should like to say, in a serious vein, what a marvelous country this is. We have been debating very serious matters relating to the whole Nation. The distinguished minority leader has been discussing matters relating to the whole world. The distinguished majority leader has been working out a program of legislation so that we may conclude our business in order to do other things in various parts of the country. Then we come on the floor of the Senate and there is a good feeling shown. America is indeed fortunate to have a man like LYNDON JOHNSON as the majority leader of the Senate and a man like BILL KNOWLAND as the minority leader.

So long as America has men of that kind, Mr. President, we can all carry on and know that we shall have a great and successful America.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I should like to join with the majority leader and my other distinguished colleagues in paying tribute to Grandfather KNOWLAND. [Laughter.]

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to announce that it is expected on tomorrow to call up the conference report on the very important Department of Commerce appropriation bill.

Also, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance [Mr. BYRD] intends to call up the conference report on H. R. 7247.

In addition to the bills previously scheduled, the following bills may be considered tomorrow or soon thereafter:

Calendar No. 2135, Senate bill 374, to provide for the extension and suspension in certain cases of statutes of limitation on false swearing by Government employees with respect to subversive activities and connections;

Calendar No. 2140, S. 3617, to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities;

Calendar No. 2141, S. 782, to prevent citizens of questionable loyalty to the United States from accepting any office or employment in or under the United Nations, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 2170, H. R. 9052, to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports;

Calendar No. 2194, S. 3866, to facilitate the making of lease-purchase agreements by the Administrator of General Services, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 2214, S. 3195, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of

Rhode Island to the town of North Kingstown, R. I.;

Calendar No. 2215, S. 3768, to amend section 158 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, so as to include the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare among the executive departments there listed, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 2216, H. R. 7896, to provide for the conveyance of certain land in the city of Hogansville, Ga., to the city of Hogansville;

Calendar No. 2217, H. R. 8404, to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former prisoner of war camp near Douglas, Converse County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 2218, H. R. 9377, to provide for the sale to the Eagle Rock Young Men's Christian Association of certain real property located in Los Angeles, Calif.;

Calendar No. 2219, H. R. 10417, to amend the Federal Register Act, as amended, so as to provide for the effectiveness and notice to the public of proclamations, orders, regulations, and other documents in a period following an attack or threatened attack upon the continental United States;

Calendar No. 2220, S. 2654, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.;

Calendar No. 2221, S. 3843, to adjust the application of section 322 of the so-called Economy Act of 1932 to premises leased for Government purposes;

Calendar No. 2222, H. R. 7855, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to extend until June 30, 1956, the period during which disposals of surplus property may be made by negotiation; and

Calendar No. 2223, S. 3316, authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.

Furthermore, it is intended to have the Senate consider the contempt citation resolution probably tomorrow, because, since it is now almost 4 o'clock, it is not planned to have the Senate continue in session late into the evening.

I give notice to all Senators that it is likely that the leadership will call up all of these measures tomorrow.

I am hopeful that action on the public works appropriation bill may be concluded today.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope so.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I rise to pay my tribute to the senior Senator from Louisiana for the very wonderful job that he has done this year as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works. It has been my privilege to serve with him on that subcommittee and I say that it has truly been an education on efficient and effective leadership on legislation.

This is not said in the superficiality of flattery. It is said in genuine sincerity, for I saw with my own eyes and heard with my own ears day after day in serving on the subcommittee. His was a superlative demonstration of a man dedicated to his duty—of a man who had an unusual balance between a sense of efficiency and economy on the one hand and of the vital public works needs of every section of our country on the other hand.

Performance such as that displayed by the senior Senator from Louisiana is not easily achieved. It takes not only his unusual ability and keen mind but his years of experience in handling these matters for the Senate. Not only the Senate but the entire country owes him a debt of gratitude for what he has done.

I want to also commend Mr. Kenneth Bousquet, of the subcommittee staff. We just could not have done the job without him, without his remarkable ability, without his patience, and without the many, many long hours he put in. We are certainly lucky to have him.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Maine for her kind remarks.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I wish to invite the distinguished Senator's attention to page 18 of the report, with reference to the Delaware River project, an interim 35-foot project. It was authorized for a 40-foot project. As I understand, it is something which does not interfere with the authorization in 1954 of a 40-foot channel.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. The money which we are now appropriating and which will be appropriated in the future will complete the project to a 35-foot depth.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. As I understand, if the next session of Congress appropriates for a 40-foot channel, that will be done?

Mr. ELLENDER. The appropriation for the interim 35-foot project does not change the existing authorization for the 40-foot project.

(The following statement by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, made during the morning hour, is, in accordance with his request, printed at this point in the RECORD:)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, inasmuch as I shall be engaged in the deliberations of the Committee on Foreign Relations this afternoon during the time that the public-works appropriation bill will be debated in the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the approximate place in the debate on the appropriation bill a statement which I have prepared on the deepening of the Delaware River from Philadelphia to Trenton, and on other public-works projects included in the Senate bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

We are today considering a public works appropriation bill of great interest to New Jersey.

The news contained in this bill is excellent news for many people in my State.

Many of us in New Jersey and in our neighboring State of Pennsylvania have for some time been urging the appropriation of much needed funds for the deepening of the Delaware River from Philadelphia to Trenton. My colleague from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and I urged approval of this appropriation in a joint letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, Mr. CANNON, on March 23 of this year. On May 9 we wrote a similar joint letter to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

The House and the Senate committee have approved the $6 million request for this project.

I am also gratified to note that the Senate committee has approved the provision in the House bill for a $500,000 special study of flood conditions and water resources of the Delaware River.

On May 9 my colleague and I wrote the distinguished Senator from Louisiana urging approval of this sum.

The bill before us contains other projects of special interest to my constituents.

The Senate committee has approved the appropriation of $4,500,000 for the deepening of the New York-New Jersey channels, the so-called Arthur Kill project. This is $1 million more than the House appropriated.

For my colleague, Senator CASE, and for the two Senators from New York, I testified before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee urging these funds for the Arthur Kill project and also urging approval of a $200,000 appropriation for a study of the serious, shocking condition in the Hudson River in the Weehawken-Edgewater section.

The House unfortunately did not approve this request, but I am most gratified to note that the Senate committee is asking for $100,000 for this important study.

The bill before us also contains $1,060,000 for construction in the Marcus Hook and Mantua Creek anchorages, and $1,800,000 for the Staten Island Rapid Transit Bridge project.

I wish to pay tribute to the Senate Appropriations Committee, and especially to its subcommittee chairman, the able Senator from Louisiana, for their sympathetic action on the portions of this bill affecting the State of New Jersey.

The future of those whose livelihood depends on these various waterways has been greatly enhanced by the work of this committee.

My State, and indirectly the Nation as a whole, will be better off as a result of the action we are taking today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, first, I wish to join with the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] in the commendation she has made of the chairman of the subcommittee. Also the full membership of the committee is entitled to the thanks of the committee for a job well done. I also wish to join the Senator from Maine in expressing the appreciation not only of myself but of my entire office for the complete cooperation we received from Mr. Bousquet and the other members of the staff of the committee which has served the Senator from Louisiana so ably in his chairmanship of the subcommittee. As the Senator knows, we have had some very difficult problems in my State last year as the result of the disastrous flood which we suffered. I am sure that at times we must have seemed to the Senator from Louisiana to be somewhat of a nuisance, and not only to him, but to Mr. Bousquet and to the members of his staff as well.

I know the people of my State would want me to say this afternoon that not on a single occasion have we ever received anything but the most sympathetic attention from the chairman, the other members of the committee, and the committee staff. I am sure, also, that the people of my State would think I had failed them if I did not express in their behalf their thanks, because I know they are going to be deeply thankful for what the Senator's committee under his understanding leadership has done for the Pacific Northwest through this bill.

I think it is the soundest conservation appropriation bill that has come out of the committee in my 12 years of service in the Senate. I do not think we can begin fully to understand the implications of the bill until we experienced the flood-control benefits that are bound to flow from it in the years ahead. The Senator from Louisiana, working in teamwork fashion with that great man from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is chairman of the full committee, has again demonstrated that we have an appropriations committee with a leadership that understands the importance of our conserving and developing to the maximum potentiality the natural resources of this country.

I wish Members of the Senate would take a look for a moment, as I use examples in my own State, at some of the conservation implications of the bill which is before us.

Here is a bill which nationally, according to my figures, shows some $410,000 increases for surveys in the field of navigation and some $690,000 increases for surveys in the field of flood control.

If we wish to look at it from the standpoint of an incentive to the economy of the country or from the standpoint of soundly conserving of our natural resources, I do not care from what angle we look at it, the committee has done a magnificent job.

Too frequently in the Senate, I think, as we fight over appropriation issues for our States, as we try to get all we can for our States, we are not sufficiently cognizant of the problems confronting the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee.

I know the benefits of sound flood control could not have come to pass if he had not had understanding members on the appropriation committee who have brought forth, I repeat, the greatest conservation appropriation bill that I have observed since I have been a Member of the Senate.

I wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], not from the standpoint of the selfish interest of my State, but because I think this bill is a sound natural resource conservation bill which is going to bring a great many benefits in the form of intangibles as well as tangibles to the people of the country. How can we evaluate saving people from the disaster of a flood? We cannot do it. We know that when we pass this bill today we are going to reduce materially flood disasters in the years immediately ahead. We are going to reduce the losses and costs of flood disasters.

I want the Senator from Louisiana to know, Mr. President, that I am grateful, and I want the committee to know that I am grateful. I think we should express in the Senate appreciation when we are as deeply moved as I am deeply moved in behalf of the people of my State with reference to this bill.

I have only a question or two, and I wish to ask them only for the purpose of legislative history.

As the Senator from Louisiana knows, I appeared before his committee and made a plea for the earmarking of some projects for surveys, and the Senator very rightly told me it was not the policy of the committee to earmark funds for surveys. He told me in the very beginning that the Pacific Northwest projects were not going to be earmarked, but that he would be very glad to have my testimony concerning particular projects. As he knows, I testified in behalf of studies for the Umpqua River, the Silvies River, Coos Bay, Coquille River and tributaries, Crooked River, Klamath River, lower Columbia River, Luckiamute River and Rickreall Creek, Rogue River and tributaries, Yamhill River, Grande Ronde River and tributaries, and Powder River and tributaries. The President's original budget made no provision for any of these except Umpqua River (Winchester Bay) and Silvies River.

The Senator from Louisiana made it very clear to me that he wanted my testimony to be in the record, but that he thought I should know that the specific projects would not be earmarked, because it is not the policy of the committee and it has not been the policy of the committee to earmark them. But in view of the fact that there is an increase of $690,000 in the Senate committee bill for flood control surveys, I am asking if, in connection with the flood survey projects, we might assume, in view of the record which was made in the committee, that the Army engineers would seek to carry out these proposed Oregon surveys if they are deemed to be feasible, unless some good cause could be shown why any of those surveys should not be carried out.

Mr. ELLENDER. My good friend from Oregon has correctly stated that the Senate Committee on Appropriations does not earmark funds for any particular project, so far as general investigations are concerned, but the increase in funds for flood control studies—$690,000 over and above what the House provided—is intended to take care of the projects he mentioned, as well as others that have been gone into by the subcommittee and which are a part of the record. I direct the Senator's attention to the language at the bottom of page 10 of the report:

> The committee prefers not to make specific allocations to individual investigations. It desires, however, to call to the attention of the Corps of Engineers the testimony presented to the committee with respect to the need for increased amounts for surveys contained in its tentative allocation of the budget recommendations and expects that increased amounts will be applied to those surveys wherever feasible. In the allocation of the balance of the increases recommended it is desired that careful consideration be given to the needs of those areas for which testimony was presented to the committee. The allocation of the funds recommended by the committee is shown on the following table:

Then follow the specific amounts.

The Senator from Oregon can readily see that the testimony he presented, as well as that presented by many other Senators, related to various projects, and it was from the amounts sought by the Senators and by other witnesses for flood control study purposes that the committee reached its conclusion as to the amount of the increase it should recommend for this work.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for his statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator will note, there is no question in my mind that the Corps of Engineers will consider the projects which were presented to the committee, and for which the money is really being provided. But, as I said, many projects are presented which the Corps of Engineers considers but finds to be not feasible, and so it does not look into them further. But the final decision is, of course, left to the Corps of Engineers.

If the Senator's projects are worthy, as I believe them to be, from the testimony, the bill contains ample funds to take care of them, provided, of course, we can convince the House that the increase voted by the Senate is desirable.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for the statement he has made. I understand the Senator's position, but he knows very well that sometimes these things are not understood back home. I wanted the record to show that although we presented testimony in behalf of the Oregon specific projects which I enumerated a few minutes ago, the long-standing policy of the committee is that the committee does not earmark the funds for specific surveys, but makes a record on each project, and the Army Engineers, on the basis of the record, have the discretionary right to

decide which ones they believe are most worthy.

We are dealing here with the particular streams which caused us so much flood damage in Oregon last year. I wanted the people of my State to understand why the projects are not earmarked, and why they must take their chances under a general appropriation for survey purposes, with the Army Engineers having at their discretion money for the specific purpose of surveying the projects which they think most meritorious.

I express once more a word of thanks, because we have in the appropriation special references to some drainage districts on the Lower Columbia River, namely, the Beaver, John, Midland, Multnomah No. 1, Peninsula No. 1, Peninsula No. 2, Rainier, and Sauvies Island.

I know that the people who have suffered great flood losses in the area of those districts would want me to say this to the chairman of the committee, and also to the other members of the committee: We deeply appreciate the favorable consideration which these items have received in the bill, because those people have "had it." They have gone through the disaster of floods. When we deal with this section of my State, we are dealing with a section where the water has been over the banks and where tremendous damage has been suffered.

Mr. ELLENDER. This matter was taken up by me with the Corps of Engineers. The proponents of the surveys unquestionably made a splendid case. The subcommittee allowed all the money which could possibly be used in that area.

There are 2, 3, or 4 other projects which will receive attention next year, but the Corps of Engineers have stated to the committee emphatically that the numbers of projects for which we have provided is all that the corps could economically take care of this year.

It is a great pity that projects of this kind, and projects in Connecticut—and, in fact, the entire Northeast— for which we had to provide funds had to await congressional action until a great disaster occurred in that region.

The Senator will remember that back in 1928 a flood occurred along the Mississippi River which resulted in damage of more than $2 billion. It was because of the tremendous losses which were suffered by the people in the Mississippi Valley that the Flood Control Act of 1928 was passed.

By the same token, a great many worthy projects in the Northeast, from Maine down through the New England States, have been lying dormant for many years. It required a tropical hurricane and the tremendous floods of last year to make the people of that area realize that the projects which had been authorized urgently need to be built. The record shows that if the projects which had been authorized had been built, the floods would not have occurred, and the losses from storm and flood damages were greater than the entire cost of the projects for which we are now planning.

Mr. MORSE. That is going to be true in my State. I think it will be found that the cost of the projects, many times over, will be saved.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what prompted the subcommittee, as well as the full committee, to study all the projects, and authorize amounts over and above the budget requests.

Mr. MORSE. The last thing I want to say is that not only do I want the chairman of the committee to know of my appreciation for what he has done, and to give him thanks on behalf of my State, but I also want to pay tribute to the committee for its nonpartisanship in this matter. I talked to Republican members of the committee. I want to say, to their everlasting credit, they did not hesitate a moment on the merits of any of my proposals in these flood-control projects, because they, too, recognize, as we all should, that when we are dealing with flood control we are dealing with a nonpartisan matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator well knows that floods do not distinguish between Republicans and Democrats.

Mr. MORSE. That is true.

Mr. ELLENDER. Our subcommittee and the full committee work for the country as a whole. It strikes me that if all the projects which have been authorized were built soon we could prevent the tremendous losses, not only in lives and physical improvements, but in precious topsoil that occur every time there is a flood. That is one reason I have taken so much interest in this bill, as well as in other legislation pertaining to conservation of our resources.

It strikes me that if the Senate will stand behind the appropriations contained in the pending bill and can get the House to agree to what the Senate may recommend, then within the next 5 or 6 years we shall be able to prevent a great proportion of the loss of life and property that occurs during floods and save billions of tons of topsoil which is washed down to the sea.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may make a request on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I read the following provision, beginning on line 12, page 13, of the bill:

> Funds made available herein and hereafter to the Trinity division, Central Valley project, shall be available for the design and construction of power and hydraulic facilities totaling not to exceed approximately 400,000 kilowatts.

The original authorization was for 233,000 kilowatts, but storage on Clear Creek was not contemplated at that time. Since that is now contemplated, the committee authorized 400,000 kilowatts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter I addressed to the Secretary of the Interior in regard to the matter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 11, 1956.

The Honorable FRED SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Committee on Appropriations recommended the inclusion of the following amendment in the Public Works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1957 (H. R. 11319):

"Funds made available herein and hereafter to the Trinity Division, Central Valley project, shall be available for the design and construction of power facilities totaling not to exceed approximately 400,000 kilowatts."

In explaining this action the committee stated in its report:

"The authorizing act for the Trinity Division provided for a power development of not to exceed 233,000 kilowatts, which was based on the plan of development that did not include storage on Clear Creek. In order to have a full development of the resource the power capacity will have to be increased. The committee recommends the inclusion of a provision in the bill to authorize the development of power facilities not to exceed approximately 400,000 kilowatts."

A question has arisen as to the intent of the committee in recommending this provision. The purpose of this letter is to answer these questions.

The provision recommended by the committee has only one purpose, which is to increase the authorized power development from that of 233,000 kilowatts contained in the authorizing act (Public Law 386, 83d Cong.) to not to exceed approximately 400,000 kilowatts.

It was not the intent of the committee to in any way effect the provisions of the authorizing act set out in the proviso in section 1, pertaining to the negotiations with a private utility in the area for the development of the power facilities of the project.

With respect to funds appropriated in the bill for the Central Valley Project, the schedule presented in the budget justifications shall not be considered as being amended by this provision.

Yours very sincerely,

CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to join the senior Senator from Oregon in expressing appreciation to the chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations for the very careful consideration which the worthwhile projects in our State, and in the Pacific Northwest generally, have received. In the comparatively short time I have been a Member of the Senate, I have been impressed extremely favorably by the way in which the senior Senator from Louisiana has put the welfare of our country ahead of any other considerations when the public works appropriation bills are reported to the Senate.

I shall not repeat what the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has said, other than to add that, as the Senator from Louisiana pointed out, to have ignored these fine projects would have been extremely penny-wise and pound-foolish.

The Pacific Northwest appears to be that part of the country which has perhaps the greatest rainfall on its seacoast, and unless the floods of its vast rivers are controlled, those waters are lost. If those floods are controlled, it is to the country's lasting benefit. The economy of our region is strengthened.

I wish to join the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in expressing gratitude for what the Senate committee has done. I am sure the people of my State and the people of the whole Pacific

Northwest will appreciate the faithful service of the senior Senator from Louisiana and his colleagues on the committee.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. I wish to take this opportunity to commend the Senator from Louisiana for his stalwart leadership as chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. He has been most courteous and gracious to the people of the Great Lakes area whose representatives have appeared before the committee. I wish him to know that the people of the Great Lakes region are appreciative of his sympathetic view of their problems. I also wish to extend my commendation to the very able clerk, Mr. Bousquet.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I, too, want to commend the senior Senator from Louisiana for his fine work on the bill. In it he has brought before the Senate very worthwhile recommendations.

I should like to call his attention to a couple of items affecting my own State. In the first place, I may say the $400,000 item for the Snake River in the Jackson Hole area will permit some permanent work on one of the bad streams of the West. This spring there were very bad flood conditions on the river. I am glad a permanent program is being started there. I am hopeful that the work can be carried to a conclusion, so the expenditure of so much money on a temporary basis can be avoided.

I am also interested in another item, the one with respect to Goose Creek in the Sheridan area. I appreciate the fact that the committee has authorized an item of $25,000 for plans for that project. There have been bad flood conditions in that area—even within the past 10 days. I hold in my hand an article which appeared in the Sheridan Press under date of May 29, 1956, which newspaper also contains pictures showing some of the great damage done to the city of Sheridan by the flood on Goose Creek.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in the Sheridan Press dealing with this subject matter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLOOD WATERS RECEDE AFTER CAUSING DAMAGE—CROPS, GARDENS, AND BASEMENTS ARE HIT AS GOOSE CREEK OVERFLOWS

Menacing flood waters in the Sheridan area resulting from the 2.22 inches of rain were dropping today but not without some damages left behind.

Crops and gardens near the rampaging creeks were flooded with shrubs and flowers being floated out in some instances, and there were many flooded basements in homes located near the areas where water broke over the banks.

The Big Goose, which did its darndest but not quite its bestest, crested last night at 11:15 o'clock at a gage high of 6.94 feet, according to the USGS here.

But the creek is falling steadily, as is Little Goose. According to USGS measurements of Big Goose at 7:30 a. m. today the gage height was 6.83 feet, and the discharge 3.170 second feet. At 10 a. m. today, the gage height was 6.75 feet.

It has been a busy and somewhat worrisome 24 hours, however.

Water at city park broke the banks flooding the nearby shorelands about the middle of the afternoon yesterday. The park was closed to traffic last night.

Yesterday morning city crews managed to loosen driftwood at the millrace dam with a dragline, and then the dragline hooked on the dam. It was later freed.

Water was reported in yards of residences near the creeks in the city. But probably the worst flooding took place in the Thorne-Rider ball park area where streets and yards were under water.

Out along the Big Goose west of town low-lying pastures were under water, and ranch buildings and ranch equipment looked rather strange isolated by creek-made lakes.

Help was called to the Maverick south of town yesterday afternoon and banks were built up to hold back the water. Mrs. L. W. McEwan reported this morning that they got along fine, and that there is just a little water in their basement.

George L. Haynes, engineer in charge of the Sheridan USGS office, reported that Piney Creek was running bankfull at Ucross about 3:30 yesterday afternoon and was still rising.

At Ranchester, the Tongue River was reported down 8 inches this morning after cresting about midnight.

Principal concern was the pump which serves the town's water system but the water receded after flowing into the pumphouse pit and rising within 6 inches of the pump. Had the pump been flooded the water system would have been out of operation.

The Ranchester park was under water, and at the crest the road near the river bridge was inundated.

Damage was believed slight to farms and ranches although lowlands were flooded.

Along the Little Tongue River at Dayton water was reported in several basements.

Swollen by mountain snow runoff and rains, both North Piney and South Piney were high at Story where a hard rain fell about 8 o'clock this morning.

Story reported that North Piney is down about 2½ feet this morning.

Water was reported in the George Vuylsteke basement, and in yards on Pinedale Avenue. The Teunis Clark place was damaged on North Piney Road. Flower beds were washed out and a section of patio damaged. Gravel placed on roads in Story has been somewhat washed away by the rain. The creek partly diverted into the old channel near the Anita Barton cabins.

Mervin Champion and Gaskill were unable to cross over to their places by car due to high water. A number of privately owned small bridges were washed away when driftwood piled up near the structures.

The United States Weather Bureau at Sheridan predicts considerable cloudiness this afternoon and tonight with scattered thundershowers this evening and a few afternoon showers Wednesday. Warmer temperatures are expected, however, with a high of 70 to 75 degrees.

The 2.2? inches recorded for the storm brings the May amount to 4.92 inches or 2.28 above average for the entire month. Total moisture since January 1 now measures 9.78 inches or 2.30 above normal.

Barring heavy rains in the mountains which would again bring the Goose Creek, Tongue River and others in the vicinity to flood stage, the waters are expected to continue dropping until the normal high for this period of spring when snows are melting is reached, officials believe.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I may say, the amount allowed is completely inadequate. I have taken the matter up with the Army engineers. I have in my hand a letter signed by E. C. Itschner, major general, United States Army, in which he says additional funds should be supplied if the necessary investigation is to be made this year and the river brought under control by flood-control construction next year.

I have discussed this matter with my friend, the Senator from Louisiana, and he has told me he would be glad to consider the item in the supplemental bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to say to my good friend from Wyoming that the estimated cost of the project is $2,470,000. Up to now no money has been provided for planning. The appropriation of $25,000 recommended is for planning. If a case can be made before the committee, in considering the supplemental bill, that the project should be constructed during the next fiscal year, I am sure the committee will be glad to consider the project in its study of the supplemental bill—provided the project is warranted. The Senator has submitted for the RECORD a letter from the Corps of Engineers. That has not before come to my attention, but I give assurance to my friend that I shall be glad to present it to the committee in its consideration of the next supplemental appropriation bill, before the present session ends.

Mr. BARRETT. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter which I received from General Itschner.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 12, 1956.

Hon. FRANK A. BARRETT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BARRETT: Reference is made to your recent request for information, concerning the possibility of expediting the planning with a view toward early initiation of construction of the Sheridan, Wyo., flood-control project.

As you know, no funds have been appropriated for this project. The amount of $25,000 was included in the President's budget estimate for fiscal year 1957 for the initiation of preconstruction planning work. However, no funds were included in the Public Works Appropriation Bill for fiscal year 1957 as recently passed by the House of Representatives. The report of the Senate Appropriations Committee (Report No. 2169) on this appropriation bill included a recommendation for an allocation of the budget estimate, $25,000, to this project.

In answer to your inquiry as to whether, in view of recent damaging floods along Goose Creek in the Sheridan area, it would be practicable to utilize funds in addition to this amount, the following information is furnished. The amount of $25,000 included for this project in the fiscal year 1957 budget represents the best allocation for this project after consideration of this project in relation to the total budgetary requirements of all projects in the civil works program now before the Congress, and the relationship of these requirements to those for all Federal programs. While it would be practicable to expend an additional $35,000 for planning work on this

project in fiscal year 1957, considering this project by itself without relation to the overall program, we cannot at this time recommend that any additional funds be made available in fiscal year 1957.

You also asked for advice as to what specific work could be accomplished with any additional amount which might be utilized in fiscal year 1957. The additional amount of $35,000 would permit completion of the general design of the overall project and initiation of detailed design including plans and specifications for one of the three units tentatively set up for the project. This would permit initiation of construction at an earlier date.

I trust that the information furnished will be adequate for your needs.

Sincerely yours,

E. C. ITSCHNER,
Major General, United States Army,
Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared relating to the Goose Creek in the Sheridan area.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BARRETT

The town of Sheridan in my State is located on Goose Creek at the foot of Big Horn Mountains. It is a town of 12,000 people. When the snow melts in the spring of the year the danger of floods is always imminent and a matter of great concern to the people of that community. Since 1883 there have been a total of 22 floods or an average of 1 every 3 years, some of which were worse than others and a couple that were disastrous in character and all of which were extremely destructive to many of the citizens along the stream. These floods cause extensive damage to residential, business, and industrial areas as well as public buildings, streets, bridges, highways, railroad facilities, and utilities systems.

The communities at the base of these great mountains near the Continental Divide in the mountainous West are subject to attack from these vicious floods caused by the heavy runoff from the terrific snow packs of the previous winter.

While the floods in the Sheridan area are not normally the worst in our State, nevertheless they have been very bad at times and flood loss over the years is estimated somewhat in excess of a half million dollars.

The Sheridan project was authorized by Congress in 1950 and it is estimated that the total cost of the project will be $2,470,000. Since the authorization of the project, however, no funds have been made available to complete the planning phase of the work.

This year the Army engineers submitted a budget request for $25,000 to initiate planning on the Sheridan project. I am advised that the engineers could wisely utilize an additional $35,000 for planning this year and with that amount the planning can be pretty well completed.

I am today in receipt of a letter from Gen. E. C. Itschner, the Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, and I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for the great care which he has given to this entire matter.

The hearings which I hold in my hand apparently weigh some four or five pounds, and comprise some 3,200 pages.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say that we heard 683 witnesses in 2½ months.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, imagination almost fails at the contemplation of that number.

When we reflect on the days and months the Senator from Louisiana spent on the farm bill, then to have this task in addition was a crushing burden. So the thanks of the Senate should go to the Senator from Louisiana. I only hope he has not endangered his health, despite his strong constitution. I sincerely hope he will not overdo and that he will take care of himself.

Mr. President, I wish to make a general statement on the whole matter of river and harbor appropriations and to some degree upon the reclamation items as well.

As the Senators know, when I first came to this body, I became somewhat alarmed at the tendency of localities and business interests to demand appropriations, at the public expense, for projects which, although partially justified, did not justify the full amount of expenditures by the general taxpayers. I worked hard on individual items, and carried my objections to the floor of the Senate. Although I was treated very courteously and in a friendly fashion by the other Members of the Senate, I think that on almost every occasion I was turned down. On 1 or 2 bills I had some success which up to date has saved large amounts of money. So on these river and harbor bills I felt as if I were butting my head against a rubber wall, and rebounding at every effort. I do not claim to have been correct on every objection I raised. Undoubtedly I made mistakes.

I think we all know some of the difficulties which are involved in these bills. They are not the fault of the Members of the Senate or the fault of the Members of the House of Representatives. Instead, they are primarily the fault of the pressures from the home communities. When the Federal Government pays 100 percent of the cost of a given improvement, which also will be of benefit to local individuals and local industrial groups, then there is an incentive for local groups and private business interests to feed out of the public trough.

One of the ironic and extraordinary features about this situation is that such claims for local improvements frequently are made by groups and citizens who also are vociferous in their demands for overall governmental economy. On the one hand, they demand governmental economy; and on the other hand, they demand large appropriations for their particular interests. Unless a Senator or Representative complies, and tries to get the Congress to make such appropriations for his home groups or his home State, he is quickly attacked by the local groups, local newspapers, and others, and speedily finds his way to the political graveyard. So a tremendous pressure—almost more than flesh and blood can stand or can permanently resist—is placed on Members of Congress.

I wish to refer to some of the projects to which I take exception. Some of them result from requests that the Government deepen a channel or a river, although the full or major share benefit of the project will go to a group of private business men, or in some cases to private speculators, or in other cases to big business, which will not contribute anything to the cost of the project, but will reap great rewards as a result of lower freight rates or reduced shipping costs.

Mr. President, I am not always a diplomatic fellow; so I hope the Senators from Pennsylvania will not take it amiss if I say that I feel that the project to deepen to 41 feet the Delaware River from Philadelphia to Trenton, which will serve only one mill—the Fairless mill, of the United States Steel Corp.—is a project of that type. In my opinion, the United States Steel Corp. is abundantly able to pay for the cost of the project, and certainly is able to pay for half of the cost.

Some years ago we had a similar appropriation for deepening the Detroit River—which would have benefited only the Detroit Edison Co. I think I have detected in the pending bill 2 or 3 appropriations of a somewhat similar nature.

Very frankly, Mr. President, I should like to state what has happened. I present myself as a case, not because I, myself, am important, but because my case illustrates the difficulties of the democratic process. I fought these appropriations for 6 years, but with little effect upon legislation. I am sure that almost all I have done has been to make, not enemies, but opponents on the floor of this body. It was not a way to make friends. So far as my own State is concerned, I am now overwhelmed by demands from localities and business interests to have further appropriations made. The very groups which demand governmental economy will also demand projects costing $100 million or lesser amounts, and all at the public expense; and those groups are unwilling to contribute much if anything to the cost of the projects themselves, although they will benefit very greatly from them.

Mr. President, I shall very frankly confess that I have been somewhat worn out by this struggle, both by my ultimate lack of success on the floor of the Senate and by lack of support in my own State. Therefore I am temporarily retiring from the wars on this subject. I do not promise that I am permanently retiring from the wars; but at the moment I am exhausted not only by opposition from in front but also by sorties from the rear. So I am going to pause, and recapture my breath, and hope that a little deeper sense of responsibility will develop in the Nation as a whole.

Let me make just a few general observations: I think it is almost hopeless for any Senator to try to do what I tried to do when I first came to this body, namely, to consider these projects one by one. This bill is built up out of a whole system of mutual accommodations, in which the favors are widely distributed, with the implicit promise that no one will kick over the applecart;

that if Senators do not object to the bill as a whole, they will "get theirs." It is a process, if I may use an inelegant expression, of mutual backscratching and mutual logrolling. Any Member who tries to buck the system is only confronted with an impossible amount of work in trying to ascertain the relative merits of a given project; and any Member who does ascertain them, and who feels convinced that he is correct, is unable to get an individual project turned down because the Senators from the State in which the project is located, and which thus is benefiting, naturally will oppose any objection to the project; and the other Members of the Senate will feel that they must support the Senators in question, because if they do not do so, similar appropriations for their own States at some time likely will be called into question.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to finish my apologia, and then I shall yield.

So, Mr. President, I think it will be hopeless to attack this problem item by item. Any Senator who does will get worn out and exhausted by it. The steamroller will go over any Senator who attempts to do so. I hasten to state that I certainly do not mean to say that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] or the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are steamroller engineers. But any Senator who attempts to attack this problem item by item will find that the sheer processes of life will go over him, and he will have to retire from the war.

So, Mr. President, as I have said, I announce that, for the time being, at least, I am taking a vacation from this struggle, until there is a deeper public appreciation of what is involved.

However, I should like to make some general suggestions. While I think it is hopeless to attack these projects individually, we could help clear up the situation if we were to require the communities and industries which benefit to pay an appreciable share of the costs. If the local communities or businesses have to foot a part of the bill they will not be as eager to get both feet and their snouts in the public trough. They will scrutinize the worthwhileness of the projects more carefully, and generally cut down their requests for appropriations, because they will have to pay a portion of the bill.

I hope, therefore, that we can arrive at a formula which, in connection with river and harbor appropriations, will assess a portion of the cost against the localities and the individuals benefited. The poorer communities should pay less than those that are well to do.

In the case of river improvements, I think we should bear in mind that in the narrowing of the channels a great deal of land is reclaimed. On occasion the Army engineers have boasted that they have reclaimed more land than has the Bureau of Reclamation. They reclaim it at almost 100-percent cost to the Federal Government. Speculators can buy up the swampland at a small cost, turn bulldozers onto it, and convert it into very rich land, worth many times the cost, because of the rich deposits of soil which have accumulated over the course of centuries.

I believe that the land thus reclaimed should be assessed for a portion of the cost. I certainly think that companies which benefit directly, as United States Steel will benefit from the deepening of the Delaware River between Philadelphia and Trenton, should pay a portion of the cost.

We must also rethink the question of tolls on the benefited waterways. Suppose we reduce shipping costs 50 cents a ton to an individual company, at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States. Is it not proper that the individual company should pay at least 10 or 20 cents a ton in increased toll charges, to pay for the cost of the improvement which has thus benefited it?

We have made a beginning in this direction in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway. I am very happy that we have done so. The cost of the St. Lawrence Seaway is to be met by tolls imposed on shipping which goes through the St. Lawrence Seaway.

I was very glad that the principle was introduced, because it will tend to make the St. Lawrence seaway self-supporting. I should be perfectly willing to apply the same principle to the connecting channels on the Great Lakes, including the Mackinac and Detroit Rivers. It could be applied in many other areas.

So I hope that we may consider this subject and try to devise automatic safeguards which will lessen the terrific pressure which now operates upon each Senator and Member of the House, resulting in a great waste of public funds. Under the present circumstances, it is virtually impossible for any one Senator or any group of Senators to correct the situation. So, as I say, I am sure I will gladden the hearts of many of my colleagues if I say that I am temporarily "retiring from the wars," but I hope to return some day, not with an attack on specific projects, but with some specific proposals which will lessen the general pressure.

Before I take my seat I wish to congratulate again the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for the extraordinarily faithful work he has done. When I first came here I heard him speak for 15 hours, and saw him as fresh at the end of the 15 hours as he was at the beginning. Until that record was beaten by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I thought it was the most amazing display of physical and mental vitality I had ever seen. I disagreed with what he said, but his manner of saying it was an extraordinary performance. But this year the Senator from Louisiana has outdistanced them all—with continuous hearings on the farm bill and continuous hearings on what I still persist in calling the rivers and harbors bill. I do not see how he stands it. We are very grateful to him for his work; and I know the conscientiousness with which he has approached his task.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. A few years ago I expressed the hope that the able and distinguished Senator from Illinois would obtain a seat on the Appropriations Committee, in order that he might work with us on the Appropriations Committee rather than work on us as members of that committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will say to my good friend from Minnesota that I have never tried to work on members of the committee. However, I feel that in addition to the functions and responsibilities of individual members of the committees, the Senate, as a deliberative body, has also a function to perform. I believe that a member of the Senate ought not to feel that he has fully discharged his duty unless he speaks his mind on points on which he feels strongly, and on which he feels somewhat informed. Perhaps if I improve my strength a little, I may be back in the future, and the Senator from Minnesota may not be quite as happy.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana a question. I refer to page 11 of the report. I think I understand the situation; but for the purpose of clarifying the RECORD—and I am quite sure that what I have in mind is taken care of—under the title of "General Investigations, Fiscal Year 1957," I note that the committee increased the amount allowed by the House from $8,122,000 to $9,322,000. Am I to understand that this increase is available for the making of surveys in cases in which the respective legislative committees may adopt resolutions ordering that such surveys be made?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. I refer him to the language at the bottom of page 10 of the report, which I read into the RECORD earlier, and which serves notice on the Corps of Engineers as to why these increases were made. As I pointed out a while ago, we have received many requests from Senators and Members of the House, as well as from others throughout the country, for such surveys.

As a result of such requests we have increased the sum involved. Although we are not directing the engineers to undertake surveys of specific projects, yet we ask them to bear in mind those projects which have been brought to their attention, either in the record or by way of resolutions.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee whether, in making this increase in allowance for surveys by the Corps of Engineers, it was the desire of the committee to provide for a number of surveys on which testimony had been presented?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the review of a project come within the definition of a survey of a project? Is the review of an

already authorized project included within that definition?

Mr. ELLENDER. There are several projects which have been deferred for restudy. In those circumstances we have earmarked money for such programs.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator to exactly what I have in mind.

A situation has developed concerning the authorized navigation project on the Ouachita River in Arkansas. It should be reviewed. To this end I have introduced the necessary review resolution. I am hopeful that the Public Works Committee will approve the resolution.

The cost of this review survey is estimated by the Corps of Army Engineers to be about $10,000. It is expected that the Corps of Engineers will initiate this survey to determine the feasibility of relocating the existing dam No. 8 near Calion, Ark., with the funds provided for the general investigation. Is that authority contained in this appropriation?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; generally. The Senator is referring to an authorized project, I assume.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is not only authorized, but physically in existence. The possibility is that it needs relocating.

Mr. ELLENDER. Any funds appropriated for a project can be used for that purpose.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I did not want to submit an amendment on that point if I understood that the kind of project I have referred to is included in the bill. It is a small project which needs to be resurveyed and reviewed with a view to relocating it.

Mr. ELLENDER. All these surveys are made of unauthorized projects to determine whether Congress should authorize them. However, in the case the Senator from Arkansas has mentioned, when Congress appropriates money for a project it has authorized, that money can be used for resurveying it, and that could be done in the case the Senator has in mind.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator very much. I wish to associate myself with the fine compliments which have been paid to the chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill before the Senate and to the distinguished chairman of the full Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

I work with both Senators and I know of their devotion to duty in connection with appropriation bills, particularly the bill now pending before the Senate. Therefore I wish to associate myself with the fine compliments which have been paid to the Senators this afternoon, because I know how richly the compliments are deserved.

I desire to say, although not necessarily by way of answering the distinguished Senator from Illinois, that in many places, as Senators know, the local people have paid and paid, have bonded their homes and have mortgaged their properties to initiate projects, and in practically all of them, particularly with reference to levees and so forth, they still pay by giving rights-of-way and by paying maintenance costs after the projects are built. Therefore it is not a case entirely of merely legislating benefits to some particular individuals or some particular business.

Beyond all that, as we build these projects and as we develop our country and provide opportunities for people to have homes and have farms and to have their businesses, we preserve and advance the economy of the Nation and that in turn makes it possible for the people affected to pay their income taxes. Those income taxes become quite an important item not only from the standpoint of our Government, but from the standpoint of the economy of the whole country and the economy of the people who earn the money.

Therefore our country and our Government lose nothing by these projects. There might be, now and then, a project here or there which is not economically justified, but in the overall and in the general program, and in the light of what is accomplished, the economy of an area is enhanced, and in time additional revenue is realized through taxation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not want to debate the matter with my good friend from Illinois, but I could cite a project in his own State, the so-called Calumet Sag Channel which I believe is a good answer to his objection. That project cost about $90 million, and it is estimated that the contribution that will be made by the local people will amount to more than $18 million. A project of that kind protects business in a locality and helps the whole country. Let us also consider, for example, a project of the kind that we are building along the Ohio River in order to provide better navigation and better transportation. As a rule the rivers are used to carry bulk material. However, on the banks of the rivers a great many factories are built; they bring more people to the area and, as a result, more taxes are collected. I would give assurance to my good friend from Illinois that, so far as I know, every project in the bill has been carefully scrutinized by the committee and has been justified by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I wish to join my colleagues in commending the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the other members of the full committee and of the subcommittee for the work they have done in preparing the pending bill and making it ready for action on the floor of the Senate.

They have demonstrated in a very remarkable way a grasp of the problems and situations involved and of the opportunities afforded to improve the general welfare of our country. I appreciate the remarks made a little while ago by the Senator who referred to the nonpartisan attitude or element of conservation. I regard it as bipartisan. It is one of the most important functions of government. If I am not mistaken, the first bill passed by the first Congress of the United States provided for the payment of salaries of Members of Congress. The second bill provided for governmental assistance in the building of a canal to bring about transportation between certain areas of the Original Thirteen States.

Transportation facilities have always been regarded as being connected with the public welfare and the responsibility of the General Government. We are in the process of approving a highway construction bill which will cost tens of billions of dollars. It will improve our transportation facilities, reinforce the national defense, and increase the vitality and productivity of our country. I know of nothing in that bill which requires adjacent property owners to pay for the roads which are to be built.

I am not sure but that the information the distinguished Senator from Illinois—for whom I have great respect and affection—gave us a little while ago was good news. For many years I was under the impression that either the Appropriations Committee ought to take him in as a member or abdicate in deference to him, or that he should remove from his own shoulders the heavy burden of responsibility which he seemed to try to assume in attempting to rewrite appropriation bills on the floor of the Senate.

I think he is a great man, a fine man, a sincere man, and a good man. However, I have always felt that he had undertaken a burden under which no Senator could stand up and survive, and I watched him undertake it with great concern for his physical health and endurance.

Therefore it is good news to the Senate and to the fine constituency of our friend from Illinois that he will now sidestep the assumption of that great burden and tremendous responsibility.

Again, Mr. President, I wish to thank the committee for the very fine job it has done. I remember the evidence of the Chief of Engineers before the Public Works Subcommittee a few months ago in which he advised that all the flood-control projects now in operation had, during the period since their construction, produced economic benefits at the rate of at least four times their cost, as estimated at the time of their authorization and construction. In other words, all the flood-control projects constructed and operated by the Federal Government, none of which had been authorized unless it was in excess of 1 to 1 of benefits to cost, had produced in the period of their operation more than 4 times the economic benefits which it had been estimated they would produce.

The distinguished Chief of Engineers made another statement, Mr. President, which I think is of profound significance to every Senator and to every citizen. He said that unless we develop a more aggressive program of soil and water conservation, within the next 50 years vast areas of our country will become so dry and arid that they will resemble the Gobi Desert.

It has been most amazing to note the enormous increase in the per capita consumption of water and the per capita requirements of water, the greatly increased degree of pollution in our rivers

and streams, and the increasing evidence that we have not developed and conserved our water resources at a rate proportionate to the increased use we have made of them and the demands we have exacted.

I think the bill now before the Senate, Mr. President, is the most forward-looking step which the committee has ever taken and the Senate has ever taken more nearly to meet the requirements for the future welfare of our country in the matter of flood control, conservation, and use of water. If we are to avoid the terrible catastrophe so dramatically described by the Chief of Engineers as the impending possibility of vast areas becoming a Gobi Desert, we must not only put into effect the provisions of this bill but we must, in the future, develop an even more aggressive program of conservation of water and conservation of our soil and natural resources.

The work of the great Senator from Louisiana and his subcommittee will be one of the finest monuments ever erected in any session of the Congress to their dedication to the public welfare and their ability efficiently and properly to serve the Nation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I should like to make inquiry about and to express my interest in the last item on page 17 of the report. But before I do that, Mr. President, I should like to make an observation or two with reference to the discussion which occurred earlier on the floor, not with the idea of revising it, but out of justice and fairness, and perhaps for the information of the Senate, to make clear the position of Omaha in connection with the works on the upper reaches of the Missouri River.

We are grateful for the generosity of the Federal Government in doing whatever it can for us, whether directly or indirectly. We are also grateful to the State of South Dakota. On the other hand, I do not think Senators or anyone else should be under the impression that any part of the State of Nebraska or the State as a whole has been overreaching in connection with power from the dams which are on the upstream reaches of the Missouri River. The Omaha Public Power District embraces not only the county in which Omaha is located, but likewise several adjoining counties. It does not get any power from the Bureau of Reclamation. It supplies its own needs and has enough for export beyond the confines of its municipal corporate limits.

It seemed to me that those facts should be in the RECORD for the purpose of negativing any idea that we are overreaching.

Mr. President, I should at this time like to associate myself with the commendation of the chairman of the Flood Control Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. Even on the sore point of the 230 kilovolts line, he has shown himself to be fair. I hope that as time progresses we shall be able to work in cooperation with our neighbor States and arrive at a solution which will be mutually satisfactory.

With reference to the final item on page 17 of the report, it has been my understanding that the Corps of Engineers is about ready to do construction work on that project. I am wondering if we could have a statement in the RECORD in explanation of why there should be a sum for planning rather than an allowance for construction.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will note on page 1595 of part 2 of the hearings that the entire cost of the project is $113,000, and that the benefit ratio is 2.85 to 1, which is a very good ratio. The Budget Bureau took the position when the survey report was submitted to Congress, that before proceeding with the construction of the project a further study should be made by way of planning to see whether a favorable benefit-to-cost ratio could be obtained and still give greater flood protection. If the cost of the project remains within $150,000 I can give assurance to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that, under the law as it stands, the Corps of Engineers will be able to construct the project without having to come back to Congress for the full amount, for the simple reason that it comes within the category of small projects costing under $150,000, and such projects are authorized.

Mr. HRUSKA. So that if the study for the purpose of increasing the degree of protection should result in estimates under $150,000, the project would still fall within the category to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. We have provided extra money for projects of this character.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish to express my appreciation of the work of the able and distinguished Senator from Louisiana in connection with this bill. The bill presents a well-rounded program treating all sections of the country equitably and fairly. It represents, I believe, the greatest forward step I have seen in the development of public works, and, particularly, the water resource program in all sections of the Nation.

I wish to thank, also, the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and other Senators for their consideration of the projects which are of vital importance to the State of Oklahoma. They have been patient with our testimony, and their decision, while perhaps not representing the amount we should like to have, is most satisfactory and certainly will produce a great forward stride in the comprehensive and effective development of the water resources of the great southwestern area. We feel that with the consideration accorded by the bill, it will be possible to continue the development of our natural resources. We do not consider this as an expenditure; rather, it is an investment in American water resources. Considering the life of these projects over 75 years, they will prove to be among the finest investments which we are capable of making.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. First, I wish to join in the many commendations of the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and also of the able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

I particularly direct my attention to the problems which have been taken care of in the bill, and express my appreciation of the fact that the committee saw fit to allow the construction of 2 dams to go forward at the same time. If the chairman of the subcommittee will recall the testimony before the subcommittee concerning Matthews Canyon and Pine Canyon, in my State, it was shown that they were only the short distance of 3 or 4 miles apart.

During the testimony, it was developed by a question asked by the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] that there would be a saving if both dams were constructed at the same time; if both dams could begin their advance together through the planning and survey stage in order to be ready for simultaneous construction.

The testimony of the Army engineers was to the effect that if both dams went forward at the same time, there would be a saving of approximately $100,000. Therefore, I am grateful to the committee and to the distinguished chairman for securing the advancement of primary construction funds for both dams, so that they may go forward together. They are properly joined together as a unit, and they work together in solving the flood-control problem in this particular eastern area of my State.

I sincerely thank the Senator for the kind consideration which was given to the witnesses from my State who spoke on behalf of these projects.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Nevada has correctly stated the facts. The committee thought that the saving of $100,000 was worth making. That is why both projects, since they are so close together, were included in the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. It seems to me that that is sound business practice, and I appreciate it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have already expressed privately, and many times to our distinguished chairman of the subcommittee my very great appreciation for the careful and, I think, highly patriotic way in which he has handled the whole subject. His efforts cannot be measured only in terms of the many witnesses who were examined and the 2,723 pages of testimony contained in the hearings.

I wish to call attention to certain things in connection with his very mag-

nificent performance which have made the greatest impression on me.

The first was the completely national approach which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana made to the subject. In the first meeting of our subcommittee, he brought out the fact that because of some oversight or because of the fact that Senators from particular areas had not been assigned to the committees handling this type of work, or for some other reason, perhaps, some areas of the country were scarcely represented in the agenda of work which was carried in the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget. The Senator from Louisiana, therefore, set out to look for meritorious projects in those areas, so that the program might be on a more national basis. I myself thought that that was extremely fair, and that the results accomplished gave to the bill a national aspect, which it had failed to have prior to the time the Senator from Louisiana gave it that attention. So, first I wish to compliment him on that achievement.

Second, I compliment him for having brought about what I think is sound economy in connection with so many specific projects. For instance, I have in mind the type of project in which, by hastening the work a little more than the Bureau of the Budget had scheduled it, and in which the benefit-cost ratio was very, very high, the benefits would start to pour in from the investment much more quickly and in a larger proportion in comparison to the size of the investment. On such projects the Senator would recommend and strongly insist upon hurrying the work to completion, so that the benefits might begin to accrue earlier, and the total investment might begin to pay the very real dividends which would be received from its completion at an earlier date.

I thought that was a fine way in which to approach a public work, and I certainly commend the Senator most heartily because he followed that method in numerous instances in this measure.

The third thing I thought was very good economy was that the Senator looked for projects, the development of which had been allowed to be discontinued, so that their completion was long deferred, or even lost sight of—projects which were very, very much worthwhile.

In several instances in this particular bill, as in the bill last year, that kind of project was brought back into action, so that it might speedily be made alive again, and benefits from it soon received.

In my own State, two projects such as the ones in the general classes I have just mentioned have had their own merits recognized by the committee. I think this would not have been possible without the sympathy of the chairman.

One of the projects is the harbor of Tampa, the largest harbor in the State of Florida, a State which has some 1,200 miles of coastline and many harbors. At Tampa the work had been going on slowly, but by the addition of $1,500,000 to this year's appropriation, as recommended by the committee, certain phases of the work are expected to be completed this year, instead of in 2 years. The harbor will be completed to the degree that the larger ships, ships which require deeper water, can begin to go to the port fully loaded a year earlier, simply by the use of $1,500,000 more money.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator at this point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to be interrupted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Not only will that channel be used sooner; but if the committee had not provided money to complete it, more advertising would have been necessary, and probably another contractor would have had to take over the work, all of which might have cost as much as will now be saved.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is exactly correct. As is the case in the great many projects of this kind, someone had lost sight of that fact. The Senator from Louisiana picked up that project and insisted that it be handled as private business would have handled it. The two great dredges which have been working there will be kept there instead of having work on the harbor cease in the middle of the fiscal year 1957. By continuing the work through fiscal year 1957 that part of the work will be completed, and the entire channel up to the main port of Tampa will be opened up.

I cite that as one example in expressing my great gratitude to the Senator from Louisiana, because I think it is an example of good government operating efficiently, as private business would operate in a similar case. It is simply one of the many cases of this kind in which the Senator has in connection with the bill acted more efficiently and in the public interest.

The second instance I wish to mention in my own State relates to a project which serves the people of the country throughout almost every mile of its length, but which cannot serve to the maximum degree until it has been completed. I refer to the intracoastal canal from Trenton, N. J., to Miami. This waterway serves to great advantage in its upper reaches, but it will serve to even greater advantage when it has been completed from Trenton to Miami. It had been partially completed before World War II, but there are great needs which will be served by the completion of the canal all the way to Miami, which I hardly need to state for the RECORD.

During the military operations in the Korean war, the Government insisted on extending the canal to its full authorized depth below Jacksonville to the guided-missile base at Cocoa for military reasons, but the lower half of the mileage in Florida was still left incomplete. Between Eau Gallie and Miami it operates at a depth of 9 feet, and in limited width, but the huge barges which come all the way down from Trenton, N. J., to Cocoa, Fla., have to transship there, so their cargoes can be carried in much smaller vessels on down to West Palm Beach, Fort Lauderdale, and Miami—a very active area, now containing about a million and a quarter people, and with tremendous construction projects, both private and public, under way. Both civilian and military needs require completion of that final mileage.

If somebody had not come along and picked it up, the Nation probably would have been satisfied with the good values—and they are good values—being received from the operation in the upper part of the mileage of that great waterway. But the Senator from Louisiana, and I thank him for it, is willing to begin now the construction of that additional mileage so the canal can operate in its entirety, and so everybody along the canal and all business in the Nation will be better served by the completion of the canal.

I am deeply grateful to the Senator from Louisiana. I wanted to express gratitude not only for myself and my distinguished colleague [Mr. SMATHERS], who asked me to express it for him, but also for the people of Florida.

There was one further subject which I wanted to mention and which has already been discussed several times. I refer to the fact that individual survey items do not appear in the bill. I approve of the policy which the distinguished Senator has followed, of leaving the matter, in the last analysis, to the discretion of the technical group, the engineers. In the event funds are insufficient to cover the whole program, they should pick out those places where the funds can best be used.

There are three Florida survey items which are very, very important, two of which will fall in the ordinary classification, the Bakers Haulover item, and the survey for the Chipola River cutoff on the Apalachicola, for which we shall have a particular need right now because the bill contains the funds by the use of which the channel in the river will be opened. The question is, of course, whether or not the channel will follow the old main river or the Chipola River cutoff which, traditionally for 100 years, has been the avenue of commerce in that area.

I have discussed the matter with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, and I understand from him that these two items, on which a good showing was made, are among those which are to be recommended to the engineers, and the engineers have stated that the funds allocated will permit them to carry those projects on. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. They both fall within the language appearing at the bottom of page 10 of the report, which I put into the RECORD several times, to the effect that consideration should be given to the surveys which have been mentioned and brought to the attention of the committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the reply of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

The third of the survey matters falls in a little different classification because it, in effect, calls for an adjustment of an authorization made long ago upon a survey then acceptable, so that a new and greater port may be built at the city of Miami. The distinguished Senator will remember the testimony of the city manager. I quote from his testimony.

The total project will cost in the neighborhood of $18 million. The cost by the Federal

Government will be in the neighborhood of $5 million.

That refers to the channel work. The city and county stand ready to meet the other expenses.

The problem is to adjust speedily the old authorization to the new conditions now to be met, which are that they do not want to leave the port on the principal waterfront of the city, which abuts Bay Front Park, one of the most beautiful parks in the State, but, instead, wish to move it to an island which can be made accessible through the joint efforts of the local bodies and of the Federal Government by the dredging of the channel.

As I understand, that project falls in a perhaps little different classification, because it calls for an adjustment rather than anything original, and also comes within a classification which, as I recall, the engineers regarded as of such importance that, in order to handle it this year, they probably would have to hire a firm of engineers to do the work, rather than handle it themselves.

Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. After the hearing and following the presentation made by the distinguished Senator from Florida, I asked the engineers how much money could economically be spent this year for the survey, and they said $45,000. I believe the Senator asked for $50,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; and I was glad they could do the work for $45,000. My understanding is that, if granted that sum—and that sum may certainly be granted in view of the amount provided by the bill—the engineers intend to procure the services of a well-qualified firm to proceed to the adjustment of the old authorization to the present conditions, so that they can move ahead to the actual construction work next year. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I said, the amount is not specifically earmarked for that purpose, but we are providing the money for it. It is because of that project and other projects that we have increased the amount for surveys. I believe if the engineers comply with the language I read a while ago, which appears at the bottom of page 10 of the report, that project will be surveyed this year, without question.

Mr. HOLLAND. And they will be enabled to give to that project the high priority which they stated to the committee they felt it should be given?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. One of the reasons why we do not earmark funds is that we leave it to the engineers to select the projects which are of high priority. This project was one of high priority. If the House agrees with the amounts of money we have provided, I have no doubt the project will be surveyed this year.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to join my colleagues in extending my thanks personally to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee who handled the bill, and also to the chairman of the full committee, because both Senators have proved to be of inestimable value insofar as the development of the State of Montana is concerned. I know I certainly speak in behalf of the senior Senator from my State [Mr. MURRAY], as well as for my colleague in the House, Representative METCALF. We are indebted to this committee for the restoration of funds for the Helena Valley Unit, which is important to the area surrounding the capital of our State.

Even though the President vetoed the Yellowtail Dam bill on last Friday, we certainly are indebted to the committee and to the chairman of the subcommittee for the great interest he has taken and for the restoration of funds to that project, and also for the continuation of funds last year for the Helena Valley project and the Yellowtail project.

We are also happy to note that the Senator from Louisiana has taken an interest in the Bitter Root irrigation district; and that under the provisions of the pending bill, $225,000 in excess of the Budget estimate and the appropriation made by the House of Representatives is allowed for rehabilitation of the facilities of this district in Montana.

We are also glad to note that the Senator from Louisiana has done us a service by recommending the appropriation of funds for construction of the second powerplant at the Fort Peck Dam project.

Despite the fact that no funds were allowed, I also wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana for the personal interest he has taken in the Libby project and for the inquiries directed to the Corps of Engineers.

I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana only one question: Can he tell the Senate what the report of the Corps of Engineers was on the low-dam proposal by Representative METCALF for the Libby project, in the northwestern part of Montana?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, if the low dam were built with provision for raising the benefit-to-cost ratio would be, I believe, 0.64 to 1, which would not justify construction of the project. Instead, it would be necessary to build the entire project. But in order to build the dam as a whole, it would be necessary for the United States to enter into a compact with Canada. Unless that were done, it would be necessary to build the project at the height which some desire.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In other words, the low dam?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, the so-called two-stage dam, which would not be a justified project.

So we are very hopeful that in the near future a compact with Canada can be signed, and that the high dam can be built.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana; and again I express the thanks of my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MURRAY] and the Representative in Congress from the Western District, and all the other people of Montana, for the personal consideration the Senator from Louisiana has shown us. If we have not fared as well as we would have liked, at least I assure the Senator from Louisiana that is not his fault. I am only sorry that the President saw fit to veto the measure providing for the settlement with the Indians for the right-of-way for the Yellowtail Dam project, which is one of the important projects in the West. As a result, I think we shall have to wait for many years for the fruits which would have been possible if the committee's recommendation had been followed.

Again I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to go hurriedly over the various items we have considered.

As I said at the beginning of my statement, we provided for funds for the Tennessee Valley Authority, and for reclamation projects—all of which have been discussed this afternoon—and also for rivers and harbors and flood-control projects.

Title I of the bill deals with the funds to be appropriated for the Tennessee Valley Authority. In that case, the committee followed the House of Representatives in suggesting an appropriation of $5,357,000 of new money.

I ask unanimous consent that the applicable portion of the committee's report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 2169) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE I

Tennessee Valley Authority

Appropriation, 1956	$27,053,000
Estimate, 1957 (and rescission of $6,500,000)	5,357,000
House allowance (and rescission of $6,500,000)	5,357,000
Senate recommendation (and rescission of $6,500,000)	5,357,000

The committee recommends the approval of the budget estimate of $5,357,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, without amendment to the bill as it passed the House.

The committee believes it is unwise for the Tennessee Valley Authority to continue a policy whereby units can be added at existing plants without coming to the Congress for authorization and funds. The committee urges the appropriate legislative committee to act on this matter in order to clarify this situation before the next appropriation request is submitted to the Congress. So long as the prevailing interpretation of the law permits TVA to continue placing new units in existing plants, it means that the Congress cannot authorize a new plant in this area without losing all control over its continuing expansion.

Mr. ELLENDER. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from the side slips, showing the justification for the entire amount of appropriated and financed obligations, as well as those paid out of proceeds from the TVA funds.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Summary of regular appropriation-financed budget (for fiscal years ending June 30, 1955, 1956, and 1957)

Page reference		1955 actual	1956 estimate	1957 estimate
	APPROPRIATION FINANCED OBLIGATIONS			
	ACQUISITION OF ASSETS			
	Fertilizer and munitions program:			
30	Chemical facilities	$937,382	$556,000	$1,249,000
	Distribution of administrative and general expenses	28,981	27,000	40,000
	Total fertilizer and munitions program	966,363	583,000	1,289,000
	General service activities:			
37	General facilities	548,871	325,921	54,000
	Distribution of administrative and general expenses	3,755	8,000	8,000
	Total general service activities	552,626	333,921	62,000
	Total acquisition of assets, appropriation financed	101,658,916	63,667,921	15,955,000
	EXPENSES			
	Navigation, flood control, and power program:			
42	Navigation operations	263,216	246,000	253,000
46	Flood control operations	175,543	175,000	211,000
58	Multipurpose reservoir operations	2,170,690	2,066,000	2,200,000
	Distribution of administrative and general expenses	184,437	197,000	225,000
	Total navigation, flood control, and power program	2,793,886	2,684,000	2,949,000
	Fertilizer and munitions program:			
68	Fertilizer and munitions development	2,269,484	2,201,000	2,446,000
	Distribution of administrative and general expenses	87,069	100,000	110,000
	Total fertilizer and munitions program	2,356,553	2,301,000	2,556,000
	APPROPRIATION FINANCED OBLIGATIONS—continued			
	EXPENSES—continued			
	Resource development program:			
87	Resource development	$336,370	$400,000	$400,000
	Distribution of administrative and general expenses	43,869	44,000	50,000
	Total resource development program	380,239	444,000	450,000
	General service activities: Maintenance of bridges financed by others on TVA dams	1,900	4,000	7,000
	Total expenses, appropriation financed	5,532,578	5,433,000	5,962,000
	CHANGES IN WORKING CAPITAL			
	Inventories and property transfers:			
125	General inventories	−30,086		
	Property transfers	−3,273		
	Total changes in working capital, appropriation financed	−33,359		
	Total regular appropriation financed budget	107,158,135	69,100,921	21,917,000
	SOURCES OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS			
	Appropriation	120,000,000	27,053,000	5,357,000
	Balance from prior year	52,266,056	65,107,921	16,560,000
	Balance carried forward to subsequent year	−65,107,921	−16,560,000	
	Unobligated balance (amount provided by Public Law 163 for transmission connections with Mississippi Valley Generating Co.):			
	Brought forward			6,500,000
	Carried forward		−6,500,000	
	Rescinded			−6,500,000
	Total appropriated funds	107,158,135	69,100,921	21,917,000

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the budget estimate for title II, which includes the Bureau of Reclamation, was $224,267,000. This appropriation would be used for the programs and activities of the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Bureau of Reclamation. For all these purposes, the House allowed $196,090,000; and the Senate committee has recommended $217,328,000, or an increase of $21,238,000. This amount is $6,939,000 below the budget estimate.

The first item is the appropriation for the Office of the Secretary, including the funds for operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration. The committee recommends that the Senate concur in the House of Representatives allowance of $1,378,000—the amount of the budget estimate—for expenses of operation and maintenance of the Southeastern Power Administration. Of the total amount recommended, $1,134,000 is for the purchase of energy and the payment of wheeling charges for the delivery of energy to preference customers in the area, through the facilities of the private utilities serving the area.

For operation and maintenance of the Southwestern Power Administration, the budget estimate was $1 million. The committee recommends the amount allowed by the House of Representatives, which is the same as the amount of the budget estimate.

For the continuing fund, the committee recommends $6,400,000, the amount of the budget estimate, and also the amount approved by the House of Representatives.

The committee also authorized the use of $290,000 of available construction funds for the construction of transmission facilities to serve the city of Bentonville, Ark.

The next item is the Bonneville Power Administration. The committee has approved the construction program presented in the justification submitted in support of the budget item. This program totals $23,122,000, of which $4,422,000 is based on utilization of prior year funds, and the balance—namely, $18,700,000—is for new appropriations. The committee recommends the amount of the budget estimate, namely, $18,700,000, which is the amount allowed by the House of Representatives.

For operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system, the committee recommends $7,400,000, the amount of the budget estimate, and also the amount allowed by the House of Representatives.

For general investigations, Bureau of Reclamation, the committee recommends the amount of the budget estimate, or $5,680,000, being an increase of $410,000 over the amount allowed by the House of Representatives. The House reduction was applied to investigations scheduled in the Columbia Basin of Washington and the Central Valley of California. The committee felt that the full amount of the budget estimate is required in order to maintain an adequate investigations program in these areas.

For construction and rehabilitation, the committee recommends $138,961,000, or an increase of $13,061,000 over the amount allowed by the House of Representatives, and $11,939,000 below the amount of the budget estimate.

In addition, the committee approved the application of $20,336,642 of prior-year funds to certain projects.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that the applicable portion of the report be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 2169) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

General investigations

Appropriation, 1956	$5,104,000
Budget estimate, 1957	5,680,000
House allowance	5,270,000
Committee recommendation	5,680,000

The committee recommends the allowance of the budget estimate of $5,680,000 for general investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation. This amount is an increase of $410,000 over the House allowance.

The House reduction was applied to investigations scheduled in the Columbia Basin of Washington and the Central Valley of California. It is the view of the committee

the full budget estimate is required to maintain an adequate investigations program in these areas.

The committee urges the Department to expedite its report on the Palisades reregulating reservoir, and forward its findings to the Congress in order that authorizing legislation might be considered early in the next session of the Congress.

Construction and rehabilitation

Appropriation, 1956	$146,041,000
Budget estimate, 1957	150,900,000
House allowance	125,900,000
Committee recommendation	138,961,000

The committee recommends a construction program totaling $163,956,442 for the Bureau of Reclamation. This program is to be financed as follows:

Appropriation (new funds)	$138,961,000
Prior-year funds	4,425,000
Application of prior-year funds to projects	20,570,442
Total program	163,956,442

The allocation of the appropriation recommended is set out in the following tabulation:

Project or unit	Allocation of appropriated funds		
	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate committee recommendation
Gila project, Arizona	$1,077,000	$1,077,000	$1,077,000
Palo Verde, auxiliary division, Arizona	3,702,000	3,702,000	3,702,000
Boulder Canyon project, Arizona-Nevada	130,000	130,000	130,000
Boulder City municipal office, Nevada	20,000	20,000	20,000
Parker Davis project, Arizona-California-Nevada	312,000	312,000	312,000
Central Valley project, California	19,393,000	19,393,000	19,393,000
Santa Maria project, California	6,171,000	6,171,000	6,171,000
Solano project, California	12,200,000	12,200,000	12,200,000
Ventura project, California	250,000	250,000	2,250,000
Collbran project, Colorado	1,000,000	----------	1,000,000
Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado	530,000	530,000	530,000
Michaud Flats project, Idaho	2,480,000	2,480,000	2,480,000
Minidoka project, North Side pumping division, Idaho	2,768,000	2,768,000	2,768,000
Palisades project, Idaho	5,787,000	5,787,000	5,787,000
Fort Peck project, Montana and North Dakota	118,000	118,000	118,000
Middle Rio Grande project, New Mexico	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Washita Basin project, Oklahoma	500,000	375,000	500,000
Deschutes project, North unit, Oregon	1,035,000	1,035,000	1,035,000
Rogue River project, Talent division, Oregon	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
Savage Rapids Dam, fish protective facilities, Oregon	----------	208,000	208,000
Provo River project, Utah	659,000	659,000	659,000
Weber Bains project, Utah	10,066,000	10,066,000	10,066,000
Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Columbia Basin project, Washington	13,850,000	13,850,000	13,850,000
Yakima project, Kennewick division, Washington	1,288,000	1,288,000	1,288,000
Yakima project, Roza division, Washington	1,720,000	1,720,000	1,720,000
Eden project, Wyoming	$869,000	$869,000	$869,000
Shoshone project, Wyoming	554,000	554,000	554,000
Drainage and minor construction	984,000	984,000	984,000
Rehabilitation and betterment	3,305,000	3,305,000	3,530,000
Missouri River Basin project:			
Bostwick division, Nebraska-Kansas	4,690,000	4,690,000	4,690,000
Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska	3,151,000	3,151,000	3,151,000
Glendo unit, Wyoming	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
Hanover-Bluff unit, Wyoming	600,000	600,000	600,000
Helena Valley unit, Montana	2,500,000	----------	1,750,000
Kirwin unit, Kansas	2,055,000	2,055,000	2,055,007
Lower Marias unit, Montana	155,000	115,000	115,000
Owl Creek unit, Wyoming	1,397,000	1,397,000	1,397,000
Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota	55,000	55,000	55,000
Sargent unit, Nebraska	728,000	728,000	728,000
St. Francis unit, Colorado-Kansas	317,000	----------	----------
Transmission division	8,255,000	2,755,000	2,755,000
Webster unit, Kansas	540,000	540,000	540,000
Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming	10,850,000	----------	7,510,000
Drainage and minor construction	634,000	634,000	634,000
Investigations	3,105,000	2,654,000	3,105,000
Other Interior agencies	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
Total Missouri River Basin project	52,732,000	33,074,000	42,785,000
Total construction and rehabilitation	150,900,000	130,325,000	143,386,000
Less available funds from prior years	----------	4,425,000	4,425,000
Total appropriation	150,900,000	125,900,000	138,961,000

In addition to the recommended appropriation of $138,961,000, the committee approves of the application of $20,336,642 of prior-year funds to the following projects:

Project or unit:	*Amount*
Gila project, Arizona	$250,000
Boulder Canyon project, Arizona-Nevada	966,999
Cachuma project, California	35,769
Central Valley project, California	2,000,000
Ventura project, California	4,150,000
Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado	100,000
Palisades project, Idaho	220,000
Rathdrum Prairie project, Hayden Lake unit, Idaho	520,000
Carlsbad project, Alamogordo Dam, N. Mex	20,000
Buford-Trenton project, North Dakota	123,074
Provo River project, Utah	300,000
Chief Joseph Dam project Washington	31,000
Columbia Basin project, Washington	733,800
Eden project, Wyoming	208,000
Drainage and minor construction	6,000
Rehabilitation and betterment	9,800
Missouri River Basin project:	
Dickinson unit, North Dakota	25,000
Helena Valley unit, Montana	2,250,000
Transmission division	5,031,000
Webster unit, Kansas	250,000
Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming	3,340,000
Total, Missouri River Basin project	10,896,000
Total, construction and rehabilitation	20,570,442

Boulder Canyon project, Arizona-Nevada: The committee has been informed that certain accounting adjustments are required on the Boulder Canyon project to properly reflect in its repayment certain construction expenditures made from operation and maintenance funds and revenue receipts. The committee recommends the inclusion of a provision in the bill to correct this situation and insure full repayment of the project.

Central Valley project, California: The authorizing act for the Trinity division provided for a power development of not to exceed 233,000 kilowatts, which was based on the plan of development that did not include storage on Clear Creek. However, the authorizing act did provide for the Clear Creek storage. In order to have a full development of the resource the power capacity will have to be increased. The committee recommends the inclusion of a provision in the bill to authorize the development of power facilities not to exceed approximately 400,000 kilowatts.

Ventura project, California: The committee recommends a construction program of $6,400,000 for the Ventura project, an increase of $2 million over the program proposed in the budget. This increase will expedite the construction of the project to allow for storage of water in the spring of 1959. The program recommended by the committee is to be financed as follows:

Allocation of appropriation	$2,250,000
Prior year funds	4,150,000

Collbran project, Colorado: The committee recommends the allowance of the budget estimate of $1 million for the initiation of construction of the Collbran project in Colorado.

The House committee takes the position that no funds should be allowed for this project until a repayment contract has been executed. The committee is not in agreement with the position of the House committee on this point. It is the view of the committee that construction should proceed immediately on the project. The committee expects strict compliance with the existing provisions of law that prohibit the delivery of water to lands prior to the execution of a repayment contract. The view of the committee on this matter is not to be confined to the Collbran project. This view is applicable to any project authorized under the reclamation laws.

Rathdrum Prairie project, Hayden Lake unit, Idaho: The committee recommends the inclusion of a provision in the bill to provide for the emergency rehabilitation of the Hayden Lake unit of the Rathdrum Prairie project in Idaho. The committee approves of the use of $520,000 of prior-year funds to carry out this work. The total amount is to be fully repaid by the water users under terms satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior.

Carlsbad project, Alamogordo Dam, N. Mex.: The committee approves the use of $20,000 of prior-year funds for the construction of recreational facilities at the Alamogordo Dam in New Mexico. To clear up any question of the Bureau of Reclamation's legal authority to carry out this work the committee has recommended the inclusion of a provision in the bill to authorize such expenditures.

Washita Basin project, Oklahoma: The committee recommends the allowance of the budget estimate of $500,000 for the initiation of construction of the Washita Basin project in Oklahoma. The amount recommended is an increase of $125,000 over the House allowance. It is the view of the committee that the full budget estimate of $500,000 will be required for this project.

Provo River project, Utah: The committee has approved the use of $300,000 of prior-year funds for the acquisition of additional rights-of-way easements for the diversions of

water into the Provo River and Deer Creek Reservoir. Recent floods in the area have made it essential that these additional rights-of-way be acquired.

Columbia Basin project, Washington: It has come to the attention of the committee that part of the lands to be served by the Wahluke siphon are held by the Atomic Energy Commission. Inasmuch as these lands will ultimately be brought under irrigation, the committee feels that the siphon should be constructed to provide adequate capacity to serve all the lands. However, the committee recommends the inclusion of a provision in the bill to defer repayment of the costs of construction and operation and maintenance on that portion of the siphon properly allocable to the lands presently held by the Atomic Energy Commission.

The committee recommends the inclusion of a provision in the bill to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to take the necessary steps for the emergency protection of Soap Lake. The costs involved are to be repaid from the water users of the Columbia Basin project and the power revenues of the Grand Coulee Dam.

The committee approves the use of $233,800 of prior-year funds for this work.

Rehabilitation and betterment: The committee recommends an appropriation of $3,530,000 for rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects. The increase of $225,000 over the budget estimate and House allowance is for the rehabilitation of the facilities of the Bitter Root Irrigation District in Montana.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Dickinson unit, North Dakota: The committee approves of the use of $25,000 of prior year funds for the construction of recreational facilities at the Dickinson Dam in North Dakota. The committee recommends the inclusion of a provision in the bill to authorize this type of expenditure.

Helena Valley unit, Montana: The committee recommends the allowance of $1,750,000 for the Helena Valley unit. This amount in addition to $2,250,000 of prior year funds approved for this unit will provide for the budget program of $4 million.

It is the view of the committee that construction should proceed immediately on this unit. However, the committee urges the Bureau of Reclamation to continue its negotiations with the supplemental water users and the city of Helena to provide for additional repayment on the unit.

Lower Marias unit, Montana: The committee recommends that the Senate concur in the House allowance of $115,000 for this unit. The reduction of $40,000 below the budget estimate was programed for preconstruction work on irrigation facilities. It is the view of the committee that no funds should be expended for irrigation facilities on this unit until the farmers in the area express a greater interest in irrigation.

St. Francis unit, Colorado: The committee recommends that the Senate concur in the action of the House in disallowing funds for the St. Francis unit in Colorado. The budget estimate of $317,000 was for preconstruction work on the irrigation feature of the unit. It is the view of the committee that no funds should be expended for irrigation facilities on this unit until the farmers in the area express an increased interest in irrigation.

Transmission division: The committee recommends that the Senate concur in the House allowance of $2,755,000 for the transmission division. In addition to this amount the committee approves of the use of $5,031,000 of prior year funds for this purpose.

The reduction of $5,500,000 has been applied to the proposed Fort Randall to Grand Island 230-kilovolt transmission line.

Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming: The committee recommends the allowance of $7,510,000 for the Yellowtail unit. In addition to this amount the committee has approved the use of $3,340,000 of prior year funds for this unit, to provide for a total program of $10,850,000—the budget estimate.

It is the hope of the committee that the problems pertaining to the acquisition of the site will be resolved at an early date.

Investigations: The committee recommends the allowance of the budget estimate of $3,105,000 for investigations in the Missouri River Basin. The House allowed $2,654,000, and applied the reduction of $451,000 to investigations of the Oahe unit. It is the view of the committee that the budget estimate is required to finance the investigations program.

Operation and maintenance

Appropriation, 1956	$24,750,000
Budget estimate, 1957	27,267,000
House allowance	26,500,000
Committee recommendation	27,267,000

The committee recommends the allowance of the budget estimate of $27,267,000 for operation and maintenance of facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation. The amount recommended is an increase of $767,000 over the House allowance of $26,500,000.

The committee is in complete agreement with House committee with regard to the transfer of projects to the water users. However, the committee does not agree with the House that a reduction in operation and maintenance funds will hasten the transfer of projects.

In recommending the allowance of the budget estimate for this purpose the committee has taken into consideration the fact that of the total appropriation over $24 million will be returned to the Treasury in the form of payments from water users and power revenues.

Within the amount recomemnded an additional $60,000 is to be applied to the Colorado River front work and levee system for studies with regard to the drainage problems that have developed in the Yuma area on the lower Colorado River. Such studies were authorized by the act of June 29, 1946 (60 Stat. 338). The committee expects additional funds for this purpose to be included in the budget for fiscal year 1958.

General administrative expenses

Appropriation, 1956	$3,760,000
Budget estimate, 1957	3,942,000
House allowance	3,942,000
Committee recommendation	3,942,000

The committee recommends that the Senate concur in the House allowance of $3,942,000, the budget estimate, for the general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Reclamation. These funds are required to assure the proper administration of the expanded construction program of the Bureau.

Colorado River storage project

Appropriation, 1956	None
Budget estimate, 1957	$8,000,000
House allowance	6,000,000
Committee recommendation	13,000,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $13 million for the initiation of construction of the Colorado River storage project. It is the view of the committee that construction should be initiated in fiscal year 1957 on the following units of the project: Glen Canyon unit, Arizona; Flaming Gorge unit, Utah and Wyoming; and the Navaho unit, New Mexico.

The funds recommended are allocated to the following units:

Flaming Gorge, Utah-Wyo	$1,300,000
Glen Canyon, Ariz	9,325,000
Navaho, N. Mex	800,000
Advanced planning on authorized participating projects	1,575,000
Total	13,000,000

In the construction of the Glen Canyon unit it will be necessary to construct a bridge across the river below the dam site. The estimated cost of such a bridge is $1,800,000. During the course of the hearings it was developed that the State of Arizona is going to extend its highway system into the area of the Glen Canyon Dam and desires to have this bridge constructed to meet the minimum standards for a primary highway bridge. It is estimated that the additional cost will be approximately $1,200,000. It is the view of the committee that the bridge should be constructed so as to meet the standards of a primary highway bridge, provided the Bureau of Reclamation can reach agreements with the Highway Commission of the State of Arizona and other Federal agencies covering the additional costs of approximately $1,200,000.

It is the view of the committee that the Bureau of Reclamation should employ, where practical, and urge its contractors to employ, Indians in the construction of this project.

The committee recommends the inclusion of a provision in the bill to transfer the funds appropriated for the Colorado River storage project from the separate appropriation to the appropriation entitled "Construction and Rehabilitation, Bureau of Reclamation." In the future funds for this project should be submitted under the "Construction and rehabilitation" appropriation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the next is title III.

The first appropriation under that title is for cemeterial expenses. While the House allowed the full budget estimate of $6,500,000 the report directed the allocation of an additional $265,000 for the purchase of headstones and the deletion of a like amount from personal services. The committee concurred in the increase for the purchase of headstones but not in the reduction of personal services which means a reduction in maintenance. The committee therefore recommends an increase of $265,000 or a total of $6,765,000.

For general investigations the committee accepted the House version and added $1,200,000 of which $410,000 was for navigation studies, $690,000 for flood-control studies, and $100,000 for special studies, namely the Hudson River siltation study. The committee did not allocate the increases for the navigation and flood-control studies. It is however calling to the attention of the Department the testimony received showing the need for additional funds for individual studies.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the applicable portion of the report be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 2169) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

General investigations, fiscal year 1957

Item	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1957	House allowance	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
1. Examinations and surveys:			
(a) Navigation studies	$450,000	$487,000	$897,000
(b) Flood control studies	2,050,000	2,140,000	2,830,000
(c) Beach erosion cooperative studies	100,000	100,000	100,000
(d) Special studies:			
(1) San Francisco Bay area survey	400,000	400,000	400,000
(2) Survey Great Lakes water levels			
(3) Ohio River Basin survey	100,000	100,000	100,000
(4) Great Lakes harbors survey	160,000	160,000	160,000
(5) Columbia River review	250,000	250,000	250,000
(6) Delaware River review	100,000	500,000	500,000
(7) Watershed Protection Act studies	50,000	50,000	50,000
(8) Hurricane studies	1,000,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
(9) Hudson River (siltation) study			100,000
Subtotal, examinations and surveys	4,660,000	5,587,000	6,787,000
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—continued			
2. Collection and study of basic data:			
(a) Stream gaging (U. S. Geological Survey)	$188,000	$188,000	$188,000
(b) Precipitation studies (U. S. Weather Bureau)	244,000	244,000	244,000
(c) Fish and wildlife studies (U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	43,000	43,000	43,000
Subtotal, collection and study of basic data	475,000	475,000	475,000
3. Research and development:			
(a) Beach erosion development studies	150,000	150,000	150,000
(b) Hydrologic studies	100,000	100,000	100,000
(c) Civil works investigations	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
(d) Mississippi basin model	400,000	400,000	400,000
Subtotal, research and development	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
4. Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway restudy		160,000	160,000
Total, general investigations	7,035,000	8,122,000	9,322,000

Construction, general

Appropriation, 1956	$441,160,014
Budget estimate, 1957	422,687,000
House allowance	422,034,000
Committee recommendation	463,373,000

The recommendations of the committee include the initiation of a number of well-justified projects and increases in other projects included in the bill as passed the House where it was indicated that additional funds could be efficiently and economically used. In view of the unobligated balance that the Corps of Engineers estimates it will carry forward into fiscal year 1957 the committee concurs in the action of the House in taking an overall reduction of $10 million in arriving at the appropriation required to carry out the approved program during fiscal year 1957.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, for construction, general, the committee recommends $463,373,000 an increase of $41,339,000 over the amount allowed by the House. Of this increase $6,187,000 is accounted for by the restoration of the budget estimate on 8 construction items and 4 planning items; $20,245,000 represents new starts on 33 construction projects and 31 new starts on planning; $15,657,000 represents increases in amounts allowed by the House on 26 construction projects and 6 planning projects. The committee also reduced the House allowance on one construction project and two planning projects for a total reduction of $750,000. The details of the committee recommendations are shown in the report.

I wish to place in the RECORD at this point a summary indicating the increases under title 3; also a summary which indicates the new starts for planning as well as for construction.

There being no objection, the summaries were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Increases, title III

Cemeterial expense (replace maintenance funds diverted by House for purchase of headstones)		$265,000
General investigations:		
Navigation studies	+$410,000	
Flood control studies	+690,000	
Special studies, Hudson River siltation	100,000	
	1,200,000	
Construction, general		41,339,000

	Construction	Planning
Restoration of budget estimate	$5,722,000	$465,000
Increases to items in House bill	19,645,000	600,000
New starts added by Senate	13,897,000	1,760,000
Reductions from House allowance	−400,000	−350,000
Net increase	+38,864,000	+2,475,000

Operation and maintenance (to start reduction of backlog of deferred maintenance)	$10,000,000
General expenses:	
Increase due to expanded program—	
Office, Chief of Engineers	93,000
Division offices	206,000
River and Harbor Board	25,000
Beach Erosion Board	1,000
Total	325,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries:	
Planning, increase	10,000
Construction, new starts	600,000
Construction, increases	5,276,000
Maintenance, increase	875,000
Total increase	6,761,000
Increases, title III	59,890,000

New starts added by Senate committee

	Construction	Planning	Purpose
Alaska:			
Craig Harbor	$365,000		Fishing harbor and shelter.
Elfin Cove	173,000		Do.
Kodiak Harbor	500,000		Do.
Pelican Harbor	362,000		Do.
Sitka Harbor		$31,000	Do.
Alabama: Jackson lock and dam.	750,000		Replace 3 obsolete dams on the Tombigbee River.
Arkansas:			
De Gray Reservoir		20,000	To develop water supply features of project.
Walnut Bayou		25,000	Flood control for agricultural land.
California: Santa Maria River		50,000	Levees for urban and rural area.
Connecticut: New Haven Harbor.	536,000		Deepening from 18 to 22 feet.
Idaho: Columbia River justification reports.		102,000	Local flood protection.
Illinois: Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri.	200,000		Regulating works for reduction of maintenance.
Kansas:			
Council Grove Reservation		150,000	Flood control, Grand (Neosho) River.
Elk City Reservoir		75,000	Flood control, Verdigris River.
Milford Reservoir		90,000	Flood control, Kansas River.
Kentucky: Dam 41	1,000,000		Replace existing obsolete lock.
Louisiana:			
Bayou Segnette		$435,000	Interim connection to intracoastal waterway.
Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the gulf.		260,000	40-foot channel in southwest pass.
Maine: Rockland Harbor	$810,000		18-foot channel.
Massachusetts:			
Boston Harbor	1,000,000		Anchorage area for safety.
Cape Cod Canal	157,000		Harbor of refuge.
Nantucket Harbor	162,000		Do.
Michigan:			
Au Sable Harbor		10,000	Do.
Cheboygan River and Harbor.	110,000		Anchorage and deepening for safety and U. S. Coast Guard.
Harrisville Harbor	260,000		Harbor of refuge.
Whitefish Point Harbor	100,000		Do.
Montana: Billings	200,000		Urban flood control.
Nevada: Pine Canyon Reservoir.	200,000		Flood control for urban and railroad property.
New York:			
Black Rock and Tonawanda Harbor.		6,000	Work out local cooperation.
Buffalo Harbor	250,000		Deepening north entrance.
Genegantslet Reservoir		100,000	Flood control for urban area.
South Plymouth Reservoir		100,000	Do.
Ohio: Dillon Reservoir	1,500,000		Flood control for Zanesville.

New starts added by Senate committee—Continued

	Construction	Planning	Purpose
Oklahoma:			
Enid		$38,000	Flood control for urban area.
Keystone Reservoir	$1,500,000		Flood control, water supply and silt control.
Oregon:			
Chetco River	225,000		Fishing and shelter.
Holley Reservoir		100,000	Flood control, irrigation and pollution control.
Lower Columbia River improvement to existing works.		226,000	Increased protection for organized drainage districts.
Skipanon Channel	185,000		Mooring basin for small craft.
Rhode Island:			
Sand Hill Cove Beach	40,000		Shore protection.
Sakonnet Harbor	600,000		Harbor of refuge.
South Dakota: Big Bend Reservoir.		150,000	Power site selection controls installation at Oahe.
Texas:			
Denison Dam:			
Recreational facilities	250,000		Opening additional areas for public use.
Willis site bridge	800,000		Wartime restrictions prevented crossing at time of construction.
Texas—Continued			
Gulf intracoastal waterway, Colorado River.		$20,000	Channel to Bay City.
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Channel to La Quinta.	$500,000		32 foot channel started by local interests.
Proctor Reservoir		75,000	Flood control and water supply.
Utah: Salt Lake City		53,000	Urban flood control.
Virginia: Chesapeake Bay to Chincoteague Bay.	300,000		Fishing and shelter.
Virgin Islands:			
Christiansted Harbor		2,000	Deep draft harbor economic study.
St. Thomas Harbor		2,000	Do.
Washington:			
Blaine Harbor	116,000		Fishing and shelter.
Columbia River at Baker Bay.		70,000	Do.
Everett Harbor	120,000		Moorage for commercial and pleasure craft.
Grays Harbor	61,000		Fishing and shelter, U. S. Coast Guard.
Stillaguamish River		5,000	Economic report.
Willapa River and Harbor	130,000		Fishing and shelter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, for operation and maintenance the committee has recommended an increase of $10 million to be used for deferred maintenance. The Corps of Engineers testified that there is a backlog of $65 million of deferred maintenance.

In the past it has been my feeling that the Bureau of the Budget and, in fact, the Congress itself have been very niggardly in providing funds for the operation and maintenance of projects which the Federal Government is spending huge sums of money to construct. I believe the Congress has not provided sufficient funds to operate and maintain these facilities properly.

I obtained the facts from the Corps of Engineers. There is a backlog of more than $65 million of operation and maintenance that should be taken care of. Many important projects were completed at great cost; and today many of those projects cannot be utilized to the full extent. I wish to cite two in particular, both located in the small State of Delaware. I refer to the Delaware City branch channel, and the Lewes-Rehoboth Canal. These two projects were completed quite a few years ago, but because sufficient funds were not provided to maintain them, the projects are now useless.

What the committee has done is to recommend a 5-year program, and to provide $10 million each year, so that this backlog of operation and maintenance can be attended to, in order that projects such as the ones I have just mentioned can be utilized to the full extent.

There is another such project in Michigan, namely, the Pentwater Harbor. That harbor was completed not very long ago, and because insufficient sums of money were provided for the maintenance of the harbor, it is now useless, although it cost millions of dollars when it was originally constructed.

Those are only a few of the projects to which I refer. There are many others in the same category.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I did not hear all the Senator said about the failure of the projects by reason of the fact that they did not have operation and maintenance money. I wonder if the committee has ever considered the question of seeing to it that the beneficiaries of the projects of various kinds and types under the head of public works at least take care of the cost of operation and maintenance.

Mr. ELLENDER. We are not now discussing reclamation.

Mr. WATKINS. I know. I am talking about ordinary flood control and river and harbor improvements.

Mr. ELLENDER. We are talking about river and harbor projects. Harbor projects are built for the benefit of the people as a whole. They are usually maintained and operated for the public, by the Federal Government. That was the policy in mind from the inception.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand all that; but the shipping companies receive a large benefit from such developments. They have their piers there where they are able to dock their ships.

Mr. ELLENDER. If we were to follow that theory, we would have to revise our policy. In the past our policy has been to build these great projects with public funds, and to maintain them with public funds, because they are for the benefit of all the people.

Mr. WATKINS. In a general way they are for the benefit of all the people; but some of the coastal canals, for example, costing $85 million or more, are used only by shipping companies. I find that they do not pay any tolls, or any operation and maintenance costs. My contention is that some day those who receive the benefits ought to pay for the operation and maintenance. That is the rule with respect to all reclamation projects. Those who receive the benefits pay the operation and maintenance. The appropriations for operation and maintenance in connection with river and harbor and flood control projects are almost as high as, if not higher than, the entire reclamation program appropriations, for construction and everything else combined.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not wish to get into an argument with my good friend on this subject, but he well remembers that several years ago the Congress enacted a law for rehabilitation and betterment of projects which had already been completed in the reclamation States of the Midwest.

The bill pending provides $3,530,000 for rehabilitation and betterment, which should have been taken care of by those who own and operate these projects.

Mr. WATKINS. That money will all be repaid by those people.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. It will be repaid over a period of 40 years, without interest.

I do not wish to enter into an argument with my good friend from Utah. I believe that the way the program works, it is for the benefit of the country as a whole. I refer in particular to the great projects which are built in cities such as New York, New Orleans, Buffalo, and other cities throughout the country. Freight from all over the world comes there.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand; but there are certain private groups which receive tremendous benefits, and they ought to pay something. At least they should pay for operation and maintenance. We pay the cost of construction, principal, and interest on practically all of our projects, and then we pay operation and maintenance. Why is there such discrimination?

Mr. ELLENDER. It may be that the entire program should be revised.

Mr. WATKINS. I agree very strongly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Not only with respect to flood control, but also with respect to reclamation.

Mr. WATKINS. I vote for flood control projects. I think they are in the interest of the entire country, and I have contended that reclamation is likewise in the interest of the entire country. However, we receive different treatment. We are discriminated against. Members stand on the floor of the Senate and criticize us at various times. I note that one of our critics has retired from the wars temporarily. We receive such criticism all the time.

Now we must make up a sum of $10 million, in two installments, I understand——

Mr. ELLENDER. No. It is something the Congress neglected to do. It is something for which the Budget Bureau failed to provide.

Mr. WATKINS. In other words, those who receive the benefits are not paying any part of the cost.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. It was incumbent upon the Federal Government to pay that cost. However, the Budget Bureau was niggardly in providing sufficient operation and maintenance funds in order to maintain the projects.

Mr. WATKINS. They should have followed our rule. We maintain the projects ourselves. Why should not those who benefit from other projects maintain them?

Mr. ELLENDER. What was the Senator's question?

Mr. WATKINS. Why should not those who receive benefits from other projects follow the reclamation rule, and pay for their maintenance and operation?

Mr. ELLENDER. The beneficiaries of reclamation projects do pay to a certain extent. However, as I stated a moment ago, in many instances the Federal Government has had to provide the money. Of course, it is repayable over a period of 40 years, without interest.

Mr. WATKINS. Why not lend the money to the other people, and let them repay it?

Mr. ELLENDER. Perhaps the entire program should be revised.

Mr. WATKINS. I agree with the Senator. It should be revised in order that there may be no discrimination against reclamation.

Mr. ELLENDER. In view of the increased program recommended, the committee approved an increase of $325,000 for general expenses. It is essential that there be adequate funds for supervision and administration of this important program.

For Mississippi River and tributaries the committee recommended $62,791,000, an increase of $6,761,000 over the amount allowed by the House.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the applicable portion of the report be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 2169) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries

Appropriation 1956	$51,962,500
Budget estimate 1957	56,030,000
House allowance	56,030,000
Committee recommendation	62,791,000

The details of the committee's recommendation are shown on the following table:

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, fiscal year 1957

Projects	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1957	House allowance	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1. General investigations:			
(a) Examinations and surveys	$560,000	$560,000	$560,000
(b) Collection and study of basic data	86,000	86,000	86,000
Subtotal, general investigations	646,000	646,000	646,000
2. Advance engineering and design:			
(a) New Madrid, Mo.	40,000	40,000	50,000
(b) Baton Rouge Harbor	50,000	50,000	50,000
Subtotal, advance engineering and design	90,000	90,000	100,000
3. Construction:			
Mississippi River levees	1,960,000	1,960,000	2,250,000
Channel improvement	18,750,000	18,750,000	21,500,000
Sec. 6 levees			
Mapping			
Memphis Harbor	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Vicksburg Harbor			400,000
Morganza structure			
Old River control	6,700,000	6,700,000	7,700,000
St. Francis Basin	2,954,000	2,954,000	3,250,000
Lower White River	350,000	350,000	350,000
Reelfoot Lake	325,000	325,000	325,000
Cache Basin			
L'Anguille Basin			
West Tennessee tributaries			
Grand Prairie-Bayou Meto			
Lower Arkansas	500,000	500,000	700,000
Tensas Basin	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc.	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
Red River backwater	100,000	100,000	100,000
3. Construction—Continued			
Yazoo Basin	($3,320,000)	($3,320,000)	($3,720,000)
Sardis Reservoir			
Enid Reservoir			
Arkabutla Reservoir			100,000
Grenada Reservoir			
Greenwood			
Belzoni	243,000	243,000	243,000
Yazoo City	102,000	102,000	102,000
Auxiliary channels	1,800,000	1,800,000	2,000,000
Main stem			100,000
Tributaries	300,000	300,000	300,000
Big Sunflower River, etc.	875,000	875,000	875,000
Yazoo backwater			
Lower Red River			
Bayou Cocodrie and tributaries			
Atchafalaya Basin	(3,460,000)	(3,460,000)	(4,000,000)
Atchafalaya Basin Floodway	3,460,000	3,460,000	4,000,000
Atchafalaya River navigation			
Amite River			
Lake Pontchartrain	350,000	350,000	350,000
Completed separable units			
Subtotal, construction	41,169,000	41,169,000	47,045,000
4. Maintenance	14,125,000	14,125,000	15,000,000
5. Flood-control-emergencies			
Grand total, Mississippi River and tributaries	56,030,000	56,030,000	62,791,000

Mr. ELLENDER. For Niagara remedial works the committee recommended the budget estimate, $500,000, the amount allowed by the House.

The committee approved the budget estimate of $150,000 for the United States section of the St. Lawrence River, Joint Board of Engineers.

(The following statement was ordered to be printed at this point in the RECORD:)

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH REGARDING FLOOD CONTROL APPROPRIATIONS FOR NEW ENGLAND FOR FISCAL YEAR 1957

Flood control in Connecticut and other New England States, sorely afflicted by the flood disasters of 1955 and earlier years, will be given great impetus by enactment of the public works appropriations bill for 1957.

I am particularly pleased by the increase to $1 million in funds for the Thomaston, Conn., dam and reservoir, essential for the protection of the lower Naugatuck Valley, and by the provision of adequate funds for upstream flood-control reservoirs in the Connecticut and Thames Rivers Basins.

Also gratifying is the increase to $1,400,000 in funds for continuation of the hurricane survey authorized by the Bush Act (Public Law 71, 84th Cong.), which aims at eventual protection against the coastal flooding associated with hurricanes which caused such great damage in 1954 and prior years.

An orderly continuation of harbor improvement in Connecticut will be made possible by the $536,000 in the Senate bill for the Quinnipiac River project in New Haven and by the $57,000 earmarked for the Eight-Mile River project in the Connecticut River. Also important are harbor maintenance funds of $560,000 for New Haven, $115,000 for Bridgeport, and $84,000 for Stamford.

Looking at the bill from a regional standpoint, its enactment will mean the provision this year of almost $20 million in flood-control funds for New England, the largest amount ever made available by the Congress in a single session.

The $2 million in planning and construction funds already provided by this Congress in the urgent deficiency bill for 1956 has made possible an early start on the accelerated flood control program for my State and region which was recommended by President Eisenhower. By adding more than $17,500,000 in such funds, the present bill contemplates that this essential work will continue during the 12 months beginning on July 1 at the fastest pace within the capabilities of the Corps of Engineers.

The total estimated cost to the Federal Government of the New England projects included in the bill is more than $150 million. And $150 million by no means represents the total amount which must be spent if Connecticut and New England are to have the flood protection they so urgently need.

The 1955 floods disclosed many gaps in the flood protective system which previously had been recommended for New England. Surveys now underway, authorized by a resolution of the Senate Committee on Public Works at my request on September 14, 1955, and for which funds are provided in the urgent deficiency bill and in the present bill, will, undoubtedly, result in recommendations for additional projects.

These surveys already have resulted in recommendations by the New England division engineer, Brig. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., for two flood-control dams above Torrington, Conn., and a third above Winsted, Conn. It is my hope that the Corps of Engineers will submit its final reports on these projects in time for their authorization later in the present session. Other project

recommendations will result from surveys of the Connecticut, Merrimack, Thames, Housatonic, and Blackstone River Basins and the coastal streams in Connecticut and other New England States, although it is probable that the pressure of time will prevent these from being authorized until the next Congress.

In addition, there is a crying need in Connecticut and New England generally, as well as in other areas of the Nation, for small, but vital local flood protective works. In this connection, it is disappointing that the House of Representatives has not yet taken action on S. 3272, to expedite such projects, or on a companion bill sponsored by the House majority leader, Congressman JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts. I had hoped this legislation would be finally enacted in time for an appropriation to be included in the present bill. Unfortunately, although the Senate approved S. 3272 many weeks ago, on April 18, 1956, the bill has yet to be reported to the House floor by the Committee on Public Works of that body. If the House should approve this needed legislation in the near future, it may yet be possible to make provision of funds in a later supplemental bill.

This was a matter which, of course, was beyond the control of the Appropriations Committee. And I would be remiss if I did not express my appreciation to the members of that committee, and particularly to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], for their generous response to New England's needs. I am sure that I express the sentiments of the people of Connecticut and of New England generally, in extending a heartfelt thanks.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues for all the kind things they have said about me.

I do not deserve them all. I am only doing my duty as a Senator. I am very much interested in this work, and I hope to be able to continue it.

I am one who believes that unless we protect our greatest resource, namely, water, and unless we keep it inland and do not let it flow to the sea, some day our great country may become as barren as the Gobi Desert, or as lands which I have seen in old Persia. It was my privilege to travel throughout Persia. 500 years before Christ, the entire area of Persia could sustain the livelihood of 115 million people. Now it can sustain only 14 million.

Consider the great Valley of Mesopotamia, between the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. At one time that area could take care of 15 million people. Today that great valley can hardly take care of 2 million people. Why? Because of the neglect of the great natural resource of water. If it had been possible to retain the waters upstream on those great rivers, and not permit them to carry down the rich topsoils, the chances are that that great valley would still be very productive.

The fact is that those rivers carried millions of tons of earth down the stream and clogged the small tributaries and rivers in Mesopotamia. Today that land is not suitable for any cultivation. It is sour. It cannot be used. Certainly we do not want that to happen to our great country. That is why I am so anxious to see to it that sufficient funds are appropriated.

As I pointed out earlier this afternoon, it is a great pity that it requires a calamity like the one that happened last year in Connecticut and in Massachusetts to awaken the people in those areas to the necessity of providing funds for projects which had been authorized for a long time. I have been a member of the committee for quite a number of years, and at no time before last year and the year before did the people of that area come to us and request funds. It required a calamity like hurricanes Hazel and Diane to make them realize the necessity of getting those projects built.

The record is replete with evidence that the great losses sustained in the last year in those areas are in an amount which would have more than paid for the completion of the program which was authorized 15 years ago.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that what the Senator from Louisiana has said about flood control and erosion control is music to my ears. The major premise of his remarks outlines the basic conservation philosophy of the senior Senator from Oregon. When the Senator speaks about what has happened to Persia and to other countries and to other fallen civilizations, I would simply apply those remarks to China.

Mr. ELLENDER. And India.

Mr. MORSE. And India. However, let us consider China for a moment. What is done to protect natural resources is directly related to what happens to political systems.

A study of the history of what happened to natural resources and what happened to the political systems of the nations in which there was a failure to protect natural resources will disclose that what I have said is true. Of course, there are many other factors, but the fact remains that when China was a great civilization, she was a China rich in natural resources. She was not the China of thousands of square miles of lost topsoil. She was not a deforested China. She was not a flood-ridden China. She was a China rich in topsoil, and she was also rich in governmental systems.

We had better keep in mind the fact that as we destroy natural resources, we also destroy good government, because political turmoil is created, as well as political upheavals. We cannot let people lose their surplus food supplies and have them politically contented. When we are making the fight that we are making for a sound conservation program in our country, we are also fighting to strengthen our democratic processes. I say that because if the time ever comes when the American people have lost their rich heritage in their topsoil and in their forests and in their natural resources generally, then we will also have political chaos in America.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I agree with what he says.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Louisiana to the communication which I addressed to him, and which is reproduced at page 2151 of the hearings. It refers to the subject I discussed with him informally a few minutes ago, namely, local protection projects not requiring specific authorization.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point my letter of April 20, 1956, addressed to the Senator from Louisiana.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1956.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Subcommittee for Public Works,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, the Senate has passed S. 3272 which would increase to $500,000 from $150,000 the amount which the Army engineers may expend on a flood-control project without specific congressional authorization, under section 212 of the Flood Control Act of 1950.

The bill as it passed the Senate authorizes an increase to $15 million from $3 million the amount that may be appropriated in any single year.

I was particularly interested in seeing this bill reported out from the Committee on Public Works and passed by the Senate because it is my observation that many relatively small projects have a maximum of benefit for smaller communities and suburban areas that are lost sight of in the drive for the big spectacular projects.

I respectfully and earnestly urge that your subcommittee take note of the provisions of S. 3272 and increase the appropriation for these projects under section 212 of the Flood Control Act of 1950.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CASE,
Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I again ask the Senator whether he would not feel warranted in allowing an additional amount for this item. I notice that the amount recommended by the committee is $1,200,000. This is for projects which come under so-called section 212 of the Flood Control Act of 1950, under which the Corps of Army Engineers can, on their own initiative, in the case of a project their investigation determines to be feasible, provide allocations up to $150,000 for the accomplishment of local protective works. It has the usual requirements of local cooperation on rights-of-way, and things of that sort.

I invite the chairman's attention to the fact that the Senate Committee on Public Works already this year has reported and the Senate has passed S. 2372, which increases the amount which Congress may appropriate in any one year. Present law, as the Senator knows, authorizes appropriations up to $3 million annually and allocations not in excess of $150,000.

The bill which the Senate passed, and which came from the Committee on Public Works, proposed to increase the $3 million total authorization to $15 million, and the size of the project allocations to $250,000.

I have in my hand the report of the Committee on Public Works on S. 3272. It is report No. 1732. At page 9 of the report there is a comment which I should like to read. I shall read merely the last sentence:

Accordingly, the Bureau of the Budget would not object to amending section 212 to

increase the limit on individual projects to $250,000 and the annual limit on appropriations for projects in this category to $5 million.

The Committee on Public Works held extensive hearings on this subject, reported the bill, and the Senate passed the bill, to increase the total limit of appropriations to $15 million. Yet here we are considering the report of the committee which refers to $1,400,000, which is considerably less even than the current authorization of $3 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish the Bureau of the Budget would do what it recommends. If the Senator will look at the record he will see that the Bureau of the Budget submitted an estimate of $1 million for this item. The House provided that amount. The committee of the Senate increased it by $200,000.

I wish to say to my good friend that I would not be inclined to increase it to as much as $3 million, for the reason that the evidence the subcommittee developed from the Corps of Army Engineers was to the effect that they could not spend economically this year more than $1,500,000. However, if the Senator desires to increase it from $1,200,000 to $1,500,000, which is the amount the Corps of Engineers said they could economically spend this year, I would have no objection to such an amendment, and I would gladly take it to conference.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then, Mr. President, I move to amend the bill on page 17, line 8, by striking out "$463,373,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$463,673,000". That would increase the amount by $300,000, and it would be used for the purposes which we have just discussed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "$463,373,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$463,673,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to say that this additional amount is to be used at the discretion of the Corps of Army Engineers, without in any manner earmarking it for any particular project.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I certainly agree. I do not believe in the practice of earmarking on the floor, a general appropriation. However, I wish to insert in the RECORD, following action on this matter, some correspondence I have had with the Corps of Engineers with respect to two projects of this type in my own State. I may say to the chairman that one of them is on Moccasin Creek, at Aberdeen, S. Dak., and the other is at Red Dale Gulch, Rapid City, S. Dak. The Corps of Engineers have indicated that they are feasible projects and can be completed for between $100,000 and $150,000. In one case the flood loss in 1 year was $82,000, and in the other $112,000, if I remember correctly. In both cases it is proposed that there be local cost sharing.

I am not suggesting that by asking permission to put it in the RECORD we are earmarking the money, but by requesting $1,500,000 for local projects instead of $1,200,000, we are providing as much as the engineers have indicated to the committee they could process with their available engineering staff at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. I would raise no objection to taking the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OMAHA, NEBR., *April 27, 1956.*

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: In response to the inquiry in your letter of April 20, 1956, I am pleased to furnish you the following information concerning the flood-control projects we are studying on Moccasin Creek near Aberdeen and in the Red Dale Gulch area of Rapid City, with particular reference to the probable qualification of these projects as small flood-control projects under the provisions of section 212 of the 1950 Flood Control Act.

MOCCASIN CREEK, ABERDEEN

The Omaha District's studies of Moccasin Creek are well advanced. The flood problem on Moccasin Creek, as you know, is due primarily to Elm River floodwaters which overtop the very low divide separating the Elm River from the headwaters of Moccasin Creek and flow southward down the Moccasin Creek valley. Consideration is being given to the construction of levees in the divide area to prevent such overflow.

The district is currently engaged in some further studies to determine whether any additional improvements are needed on Moccasin Creek or its tributary, Foote Creek, in the immediate vicinity of Aberdeen to achieve a desirable degree of flood control.

Although our studies are not completed, present indications are that an economically justified project can be developed with Federal costs below the curent $150,000 limitation for section 212 projects.

If these expectations prove correct, local interests will be required to furnish the normal local cooperation for projects of this nature including the furnishing of rights-of-way, accomplishment of any necessary alterations of roads, bridges, and utilities, and maintenance of the project after completion.

The district expects to complete its studies, discuss the project with local interests, and, barring unforeseen circumstances, submit a report to this office by June 30. I anticipate that 2 or 3 weeks will be required for review in this office, after which the report will be forwarded to the Chief of Engineers for consideration of project authorization.

RED DALE GULCH, RAPID CITY

The Omaha District's studies of a flood-control project for the Red Dale Gulch area of Rapid City are also well advanced, and a report thereon is expected in this office within the very near future. The principal source of floodwaters affecting the Red Dale Gulch area is in Cedar Canyon, and the district tentatively proposed construction of a dam and reservoir in Cedar Canyon which would control the major part of its drainage area. The estimated cost substantially exceeds the current $150,000 limitation for section 212 projects, but the project might nevertheless be considered for construction as a section 212 project, even under existing limitations, if local interests would be willing to assume costs in excess of $150,000. The estimated cost is well below the increased limitation of $500,000 in S. 3272 as passed by the Senate.

There are some complicating factors in our study of this project. First, in order to limit costs to a level commensurate with the benefits of this small project, the design of the dam incorporates some unusual features. Secondly, the dam and reservoir would not completely overcome the flood threat since storm drainage facilities in the Red Dale Gulch area itself are not adequate, and consideration must be given to the need for complementary improvements by local intests. Finally, the benefits of the project would be entirely of a very local nature; and, in accordance with current Federal policy, consideration must be given to requiring local interests to participate in the cost of the project even if the existing limitation on the Federal cost of section 212 projects is raised. Normally, projects of this nature would be discussed with local interests before a report is submitted to this office and to the Chief of Engineers. In this instance, because of the complicating factors present, I consider it desirable that preliminary review of the project be accomplished in this office and in the office of the Chief of Engineers before the district discusses the project with local interests. I assure you that preliminary review in this office will be expedited and that the report will be forwarded to the Chief of Engineers as soon as practicable.

Please write me further if you have any additional questions regarding these projects.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. POTTER,
Brigadier General, USA,
Division Engineer.

PRELIMINARY, MOCCASIN CREEK
CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
UNITED STATES ARMY,
Omaha, Nebr., August 23, 1955.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senator,
Custer, S. Dak.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: Reference is made to your letter of July 18, 1955, in regard to the flood problem on Moccasin Creek near Aberdeen, S. Dak., and to my interim reply of July 22, 1955. I now have Colonel Hayes' report on his preliminary investigation of the problem area, and I am pleased to furnish you the data which you requested.

Moccasin Creek is a small, right-bank tributary of the James River, draining an area of about 533 square miles of very flat terrain. The stream rises about 7 miles north of Aberdeen, flows generally southward traversing the southeast portion of the town, and joins the James River some 15 miles below Aberdeen. Only a very small portion of the total drainage area lies upstream from Aberdeen, and this area is not in itself large enough to generate damaging flood flows. However, the Moccasin Creek drainage area at its northern end is separated from the much larger Elm River drainage area by a very low divide which has occasionally been overtopped by flood flows on the Elm River and caused flooding on Moccasin Creek. Foote Creek, which joins Moccasin Creek about 2 miles below Aberdeen is reported to have aggravated and prolonged flooding on Moccasin Creek at Aberdeen on some occasions when Moccasin Creek flows were blocked by high discharges on Foote Creek.

The channel of Moccasin Creek through Aberdeen is at present obstructed in two places. At Eighth Street, a former bridge has been replaced by a low earth fill through which two 42-inch diameter pipes have been installed to pass normal flows. Just above the south city limits a low earth dam has been constructed. The city engineer advises, however, that it is planned to remove

these obstructions at such time as flooding on Moccasin Creek appears imminent.

Detailed information regarding floods on Moccasin Creek is available only for the floods of March-April 1943 and April 1952. Residents of the area report that floods occurred also in 1922 and in 1928. All of these floods occurred in the early spring, during the period of snow melt runoff, and in each case the bulk of the floodwaters came from the Elm River drainage area over the low divide previously described.

During the flood of April 1952, the greatest for which data are available, about 240 acres of land within the city of Aberdeen were flooded to depths ranging from 1 to 8 feet. In this area, 72 homes with an aggregate value of about $725,000 suffered damages estimated at $68,000. In addition, three business establishments, a public school ground, the city park, and numerous streets and alleys were flooded and damaged. U. S. Highway 12 was overtopped and closed to traffic for several days. A total of 204 persons were forced to leave their homes for periods of from 1 to 5 days. Total damages in Aberdeen during this flood were estimated to be about $80,000.

Since the 1952 flood, some 25 additional homes have been built in the area subject to flooding and other improvements have been made. Recurrence of the 1952 flood at this time would undoubtedly cause somewhat greater damage than that actually experienced in 1952.

On the basis of the limited data available, it appears that Moccasin Creek is subject to damaging floods about once in 10 years, on the average. Based on very preliminary studies, it appears that average annual damages in Aberdeen total about $6,000.

Following the flood of April 1952, the Brown County highway department constructed an earth levee along the divide between the Elm River and Moccasin Creek drainage areas with a view to preventing future flow of Elm River floodwaters across this divide. However, the levee is vulnerable to flanking since neither end is tied to high ground. It is understood that landowners in the area prevented extension of the levee to provide adequate ties to high ground.

Local interests have suggested several alternate methods for correction of the Moccasin Creek flood problem including extension and possible raising of the existing divide levee, diversion of Moccasin Creek flows eastward to the Elm River from a point near the Highway 12 crossing, and channel improvement and levees along Moccasin and Foote Creeks. It appears that the first of these methods would be the most practicable and most economical.

Based upon our preliminary damage estimates, elimination of most of these damages would justify expenditure of something over $100,000 for corrective measures. It appears, therefore, that a project for protection of Aberdeen against floods on Moccasin Creek would be eligible for construction under the provisions of section 212 of the 1950 Flood Control Act providing that a desirable project can be constructed for this amount. Field surveys and additional studies will be required before we can develop an estimate of the cost of improvement.

The flood problem on Moccasin Creek would be corrected, of course, by construction of the Westport Reservoir which we have proposed for construction on the Elm River. Continued local opposition to the Westport Reservoir, however, makes relief from this source a somewhat remote possibility. I feel, therefore, that a local flood protection project on Moccasin Creek would be warranted if it can be economically justified.

Accordingly, I propose to undertake, in connection with our James River investigation, additional studies of sufficient scope to determine the probable cost and economic justification of a project for flood control on Moccasin Creek. A decision can then be reached, if economic justification is present, whether project authorization should be sought for a section 212 project if the estimated Federal cost is less than $150,000, or through the medium of an interim report if the estimated Federal Cost is greater than $150,000.

I hope that the above information is sufficient for your current needs. I shall write you further when the studies described in the preceding paragraph are completed.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. POTTER,
Bridagier General, USA,
Division Engineer.

PRELIMINARY RED DALE GULCH
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington D. C., August 3, 1955.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: Please refer to your letter of July 16, 1955, concerning the flood problem at Rapid City, S. Dak. A report on this matter has now been received from the division engineer of our Missouri River division, and I am pleased to furnish you the following information.

The flood of July 9, 1955, which had its source in the Cedar Canyon, Red Dale Gulch, and Yucca Gulch areas, inundated about 40 acres in west Rapid City to depths ranging from 6 inches to 2 feet. Affected in varying degrees were 101 residences, 2 motels, a drive-in cafe, and numerous city streets and alleys. Total flood damages were estimated at $26,000, and resulted from rainfall of about 2.5 inches.

It had been previously estimated that a flood of major proportions could cause damages amounting to $131,000 in the concerned area, since the natural stream channels traversing the damage zone have been so encroached upon by recent improvements in the area, that they now have little value as floodways. It is apparent, therefore, that a severe flood threat exists at Rapid City.

The plan of protection for Rapid City developed several years ago by the Corps of Engineers, will require a complete reanalysis because of the further developments in the area. It is very probable, however, that both the benefits and costs of flood protection for the area may be increased.

Local interests have proposed a plan of protection that would involve construction of two small reservoirs located in Cedar Canyon and in Red Dale Gulch, supplemented by a storm water disposal system, in the flood plain area. However, they have indicated that they do not feel they are able or willing, to bear the entire cost of the necessary improvements. Full consideration will be given to the plans as well as the desires of the local people in any further Corps of Engineers studies of the problem area.

Emergency-repair authorities presently available to the Corps are not applicable to this case since there are no existing flood-control works in the area; and highways, bridges, or public works appear to be involved only in a very minor degree, if at all.

Although this area is included in the report on the Cheyenne River Basin, the restudy of which is shortly to be resumed, it is considered that the feasibility of providing a small local protection project under the authority of section 212 of the 1950 Flood Control Act should be investigated. Accordingly, I am pleased to inform you that the district engineer at Omaha is being authorized to make a reconnaissance study of the problem to determine whether an economically feasible solution can be found under the section 212 authority.

Should this study indicate the possibility of developing a feasible project pursuant to section 212 authority, you may be assured that prompt consideration will be given to authorization of the necessary detailed engineering and economic studies. However, a backlog of such projects for which detailed studies have already been completed prevents earmarking of any of the limited funds provided for that purpose, at this time.

I trust that the above information is sufficient for your present needs. I would be pleased to discuss the matter further with you, Senator MUNDT, and Representative BERRY, should you so desire.

Sincerely yours,

E. C. ITSCHNER,
Brigadier General, USA, Assistant Chief of Engineers, for Civil Works.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the public works appropriations bill for 1957 contains one item of great importance not only to my State of Michigan but to all the Great Lakes States and the entire economy.

I am referring to the allocation of $5 million to begin long-awaited construction to deepen the connecting channels between the Great Lakes.

Mr. President, this is a new chapter in the dramatic story of how our Great Lakes are being opened to the commerce of the world.

Work is already underway to make the St. Lawrence Seaway an accomplished fact. When this work is completed, as well as the necessary deepening of the channels, Great Lakes ports will rival those elsewhere throughout the world for their activity.

But even without the St. Lawrence Seaway, the deepening of the channels will have an extremely beneficial effect on Great Lakes transportation. The Corps of Engineers estimates that, exclusive of the seaway—commerce between Great Lakes ports will benefit by more than 88 million tons annually.

I do not think I need emphasize what this will mean eventually to the economy of the Great Lakes States when the channels are completed and the ports are improved.

More than 12 million people live and work in 5 of the port areas—Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee, Toledo, Cleveland, and Buffalo. They will reap great economic gains from the anticipated increase in Great Lakes activity.

But the economic gains will not stop there, Mr. President. They will spread over the entire Middle West and the Nation.

The Great Lakes area, long the heartland of America, will finally be utilized to the fullest extent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, as the senior minority member of the Subcommittee on Public Works, I wish to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee on the fine service they have performed for their country. As a member of the Public Works Committee, during the past 10 years I know we have tried to authorize projects all over the Nation which would strengthen

not only localities but the entire country by tying the country together to the extent it could be tied by water transportation and by the preservation of our natural resources.

For example, Mr. President, Pittsburgh receives oil by water from Houston, Tex. It is an economical way to transport that very important commodity.

So, Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana for the fine work he has done. He has been tireless in hearing various witnesses from all over the Nation, and has rendered a service which is most commendable and most helpful.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to be associated with the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania with reference to the great work of the chairman of the subcommittee. I may argue with him sometimes with reference to some discriminations which have occurred, but I wish to commend him for the great service he has rendered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. KERR conferees on the part of the Senate.

REVIVAL OF INTEREST IN CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it is gratifying to me that the spokesmen for organized conservation groups are now taking renewed interest in the principles of conservation as advanced by two great pioneers of the movement President Theodore Roosevelt and his Forestry Chief, Gifford Pinchot.

One reason for this new interest in the founders of the American conservation movement is the approaching 50th anniversary of the calling in Washington by President Theodore Roosevelt of the historic Conference of Governors in 1908. This conference dealt with the problems of conservation and wise utilization of our natural resources and marks a significant milestone in the history of conservation in this country.

One reason I am pleased with this revival of interest in the conservation philosophy of Roosevelt and Pinchot, is that these two great men realized and repetitively stressed that the Nation's water supply is the No. 1 priority in our natural resource conservation planning. The 1908 conference of governors, in fact, had its genesis in the efforts of the Roosevelt administration to preserve the forest watersheds and to develop the Nation's waterways.

At the recent Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee hearings on a Senate resolution to provide for the commemoration of the golden anniversary of that historic Conference of Governors, one of the outstanding witnesses was the widow of Gifford Pinchot. Her statement was so infused with the true conservation spirit of Gifford Pinchot, that I believe it is eminently worthy of the consideration of the Members of this body at this time. Hence I hereby request unanimous consent to have her statement printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it also happened that a statement I made at the Senate committee hearing also stressed the comprehensive scope of the conservation principles as practiced by Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot. In view of the similarities of the general subject matter in the two statements, I hereby request unanimous consent to have my statement printed in the RECORD following the statement of Mrs. Pinchot.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, these two statements will, I believe, direct the attention of conservationists to the origins of the movement to conserve and wisely utilize the Nation's natural resources. In any conservation program, as President Theodore Roosevelt pointed out, the conservation of water is essential, frequently basic to other accompanying conservation objectives.

I deeply appreciate the efforts made by the distinguished widow of an esteemed Governor of Pennsylvania and one of the most distinguished men in forestry and conservation, to come before a Senate committee and give her views on some of the problems faced by our pioneering conservationists a half century ago. Gifford Pinchot was a great American and an eminent conservationist, and after hearing Mrs. Pinchot testify, I am sure that her own interest and enthusiasm did much to inspire him to keep steadfastly to his difficult task of persuading America to give heed to the still-urgent necessity of conserving our water and our soil resources, and wisely utilizing all of our natural resources. In the semiarid West we especially appreciate the courage and foresight of Roosevelt and Pinchot.

EXHIBIT 1

STATEMENT OF MRS. GIFFORD PINCHOT, WIDOW OF FORMER GOV. GIFFORD PINCHOT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mrs. PINCHOT. Mr. Chairman, I feel highly honored by your invitation to address this meeting in support of your joint resolution for commemoration of the Governors Conservation Conference in 1908. This conference was, as you know, the highly original and imaginative vehicle devised by Theodore Roosevelt for officially launching and presenting the science of conservation to the American people.

You see, he was after nothing less than a full understanding and approval by the entire Nation for what was then not only a revolutionary science, but a basic and urgent necessity for the welfare of America.

But all this you know already, and, of course, Senator MURRAY, I am glad to comply with your three directives:

First. To tell something of the early history of conservation;

Second. To speak with special emphasis on the background of this governors' conference of 1908—the 50th anniversary of which you are planning to celebrate in 1958;

And your third directive indicated that you wanted me to make recommendations for some specific activities your Commission might later want to take up on behalf of conservation. That, too, I will be most happy to attempt.

But here I must warn you that there is a danger that you may not like some of the things I am going to say. For you see, conservation is not an easy mistress—on the contrary, it is a fighting creed—and a worker in the field must be astute enough to realize that some who are loudest and most vociferous in their support of a particular measure of conservation may actually be an enemy of the philosophy and an opponent of most of the other disciplines.

Now, to being with the history of conservation, that should not be difficult for me, since you probably know that this early history can and must be told largely in terms of the life history of one man—that man, Gifford Pinchot, my husband.

Or rather, I should say, told in the terms of the history of two men: one President Roosevelt—of course, I mean Theodore Roosevelt—and the other, Gifford Pinchot. As you probably know, T. R. put the entire power of his administration behind the conservation movement as spelled out, organized, and brought to birth by Pinchot.

Now, as to the start of this necessary Pinchot history, he was the son of well-to-do New York parents of a French ancestry, his education more or less typical of that of the privileged young man of his day, school and college, Exeter, Yale, and so on.

After graduation, Pinchot cast about, as young people must, for what to do with his life. The law had no attraction for him; neither did the opportunity of a real estate job offered by a very rich old uncle. At this point, James Pinchot, his father, asked "What would you think of becoming a forester?" Now that rang a bell.

Pinchot was an out-of-doors man; he had always been interested in the natural sciences. Even as a boy he had done considerable work collecting for and with a number of distinguished French scientists from the Sorbonne.

So off he started to find how and where to get the necessary education, only then to discover there were no forestry schools in America, and what was even worse, not so much as a single professionally trained American forester.

After much consultation both here and abroad, plus a personal survey of many of the established schools in France, England, Germany, and Switzerland, he decided upon the L'Ecole Nationale Forestiere at Nancy in eastern France.

On his return to America 3 years later, Pinchot realized he had the field entirely to himself. However, he found that there did exist a certain meager amount of concern about the appalling devastation of the forests throughout the country; unfortunately, such concern being expressed mainly by a few feeble old men who sat in comfortable leather chairs in their Fifth Avenue club-

houses grumbling to each other about the situation.

Never, however, did it occur to any one of them so much as to lift a finger to do anything practical about the problem, and young Pinchot understood that if he didn't tackle the job no one else was likely so to do, and that if something effective were ever to be done, the first job must be to get forestry out of urban Fifth Avenue and into the western woods.

Furthermore, that since forest devastation was on a nationwide scale, largely on forests owned by the Nation, any concerted action would have to be developed on a nationwide basis, and that consequently it was necessary to get a toehold in the National Government somewhere, if possible in Washington, preferably through the President.

However, a different kind of opportunity opened up just at that moment. George Vanderbilt, a sensationally rich and idle young man, was at this time building himself an enormous estate in North Carolina which included some 7,000 acres of forestland, and amazingly enough, this rather bumbling youth was somehow intelligent enough to sound Pinchot out about taking charge of his Biltmore Forest in terms of applied forestry.

Here was Pinchot's chance, a real chance, to prove what America did not then know—that trees could be scientifically lumbered, that forests could be sustained in terms of annual growth and yield, and that a satisfactory income could be produced all at one and the same time. In fact, as far as forest ownership was concerned, that it was almost possible to have your cake and eat it, too.

Pinchot's immediate acceptance of Vanderbilt's offer amazed the old fuddy-duddies in New York, the chief of whom wrote saying, "If you can make forestry profitable under the conditions at Biltmore within the next 10 years, I shall consider you the wisest forester and financier of the age."

Not too encouraging a sendoff for a young man on his first professional job. However, Biltmore Forest did prove a complete and brilliant success; it did demonstrate that forestry was not only necessary, but was a practical, scientific, and financial possibility.

The Biltmore Forest—now the Pisgah National Forest—is still in operation today, I believe in better shape, producing more and more valuable types of trees, giving more salable lumber and, I assume, also producing bigger income than in the last decade of the 19th century.

But significant as this was, it still did not furnish the Government toehold Pinchot needed. Since the forests were a national resource and forest devastation was actually operating on a nationwide scale, this new knowledge must be applied right across the country with no time lost. This must be sought in Washington and preferably through the influence of the Presidency.

Benjamin Harrison was President at that time and he was openly concerned about forest devastation and inclined to favor some kind of protection.

In 1891, Congress authorized the President to withdraw parts of the public domain for forest reserves; and so President Harrison promptly set aside 13 million acres, the nucleus of our present national forests. These reserves, however, were totally withdrawn from every kind of use, and they aroused strong opposition in the West, where they were located. The idea of using the reserves as productive timber resources did not come in until after Pinchot had introduced it the following year at Biltmore.

Cleveland's second term then had 2 years more to run. He was not an out-of-doors man, but he was a wise and intelligent President, one who knew men, was never afraid of ideas, nor reluctant to break new ground. With his help, a bill was introduced into the Congress in 1893 which authorized the Secretary of the Interior to "establish immediately such services as shall be required" on the forest reserves. This bill was unfortunately defeated but, Pinchot says, "the forest laws we have today were largely built upon it."

Then Pinchot was sent to talk to Hoke Smith, the then Secretary of the Interior who, as I understand, was told to do what he could to back up these Pinchot ideas for forest preservation. Pinchot quite understood that as a very far-down-the-line underling young bureaucrat, which he was then, nothing he said or did could be expected to get a hearing, still less produce much of an impression, to which end he decided it would be advantageous to enlist the aid of some well-known and well-established Government agency.

So he suggested to the Secretary that a consultation with the National Academy of Sciences might be helpful. But Hoke Smith, realizing how little he knew about forests, was puzzled even how to formulate the questions whose answers he needed for public backing, and asked Pinchot to draft the proper and pregnant questions.

The final result, amusingly enough, was that the National Academy of Sciences, which itself knew less than nothing about practical forestry, had to come to Pinchot for help in answering the questions he had himself formulated, and so was brain-trusting born.

After Cleveland, came almost 5 years of McKinley, an Ohio man who was perhaps more interested in Wall Street than in the development of the West. However, he was in favor of forest preservation, and some months after he came in, the Pettigrew amendment was passed authorizing management of the reserves for timber production, thus ending the conflict over the absolute locking up of the timber in the national forests.

In 1898 he appointed Gifford Pinchot to be head of the Forestry Division in the Department of Agriculture. This is important; you will hear a great deal more about this later.

Then on September 14, 1901, President McKinley was assassinated in Buffalo, and on the same day Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office as President of the United States.

Roosevelt and Pinchot already were well known to each other. As a matter of fact, the latter had been consulted by T. R. when governor on questions of forestry and stream flow in New York.

Naturally, Pinchot was anxious that the new President's inaugural message should stress the conservation movement. T. R. was more than willing and authorized Pinchot to make a draft for this on the subject of forestry and conservation. Roosevelt accepted substantially everything Pinchot had written.

The Presidential message made forestry and irrigation into national issues of continental consequence and slated them toward the high degree of public acceptance they achieved in the next 10 years. The message said:

"The practical usefulness of the national forest reserves to the mining, grazing, irrigation and other interests of the regions in which the reserves lie has led to a widespread demand by the people of the West for their protection and extension. The forest reserves will inevitably be of still greater use in the future than in the past. Additions should be increased by a thoroughly businesslike management.

"Water supply itself depends upon the forest. In the arid region it is water, not land, that measures production. The western half of the United States would sustain a population greater than that of our whole country today if the waters that now run to waste were saved and used for irrigation. The forest and water problems are perhaps the most vital internal questions of the United States."

He further said:

"The fundamental idea of forestry is the perpetuation of forests by use. Forest protection is not an end in itself; it is a means to increase and sustain the resources of the country and the industries which depend upon them. The preservation of America's forests is an imperative business necessity.

"The reclamation and settlement of the arid lands will enrich every portion of our country, just as the settlement of the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys brought prosperity to the entire Atlantic seaboard. Our people as a whole will profit, for successful homemaking is but another name for the upbuilding of the Nation.

"Nature has supplied America, and still supplies us, with more kinds of resources in a more lavish degree than has ever been the case at any time or with any other people. Our position in the world has been attained by the extent and thoroughness of the control we have achieved over nature; but we are more, not less, dependent upon what she furnishes than at any previous time of history since the days of primitive man.

"The conservation of natural resources is the fundamental problem. Unless we solve that problem, it will avail us little to solve all others."

And that was that. This first message made it clear where T. R. stood on all the facets of conservation. By 1907 Pinchot was not only chief forester, but he had become Roosevelt's topflight adviser on the management of practically all domestic and conservation measures—water resources, erosion, soil conservation, land, minerals, oil, gas, iron, coal, and other features of the public domain that were controlled by various agencies of the Government.

I am somewhat embarrassed to be speaking so much about my husband, but it is history and there is no way of telling about the coming of conservation without telling it in terms of the man who was responsible for that. Then, too, the story is unique.

Here was a very young man, starting without Government contacts, without experience in Government, who single-handed, in 10 years, actually changed the political picture of America and in so doing, the history of a continent.

There is one point I am concerned to bring you, a point which is too rarely stressed by conservationists. This deals with the philosophy of conservation, the philosophy that was so truly born of Gifford Pinchot's mind and spirit, and from which he derives much of his temporal and earthly immortality.

Beyond the preservation of the forests, beyond reclamation of the soil, beyond the various techniques of land and flood control, over and above and back of all of these stands the philosophy of conservation, the philosophy that informs, polarizes and directs action throughout.

Conservation to Gifford Pinchot was never a vague, fuzzy aspiration. It was concrete, exact, dynamic—the application of science and technology to our material economy for the purpose of enhancing and elevating the life of the individual.

The conservation he preached dealt with protection of the forests in terms of wise use and sustained yield. It dealt with the relation of these forests to the fertility of the soil, to erosion and flood prevention, to inland waterways. It dealt with the relation of forests to industrial development.

But first, last, and all the time, conservation dealt with human beings, with sheepherders and homesteaders, whose livelihood depended on the measure of protection from exploitation that the Forest Service was prepared to give. It dealt with the economic and social problems of country life, with rural education, with the country church, with equality of opportunity. The list is a long one.

A conservation policy, Pinchot said, has three great purposes:

"(1) Wisely to use, protect, and renew the natural resources of the earth.

"(2) Scientifically to control the use of these resources and their products in the common interest, to the end of securing their distribution to the people at fair and reasonable charges for goods and services.

"(3) To make certain that the rights of the people to govern themselves should not be controlled by great monopolies through their power over natural resources."

In other words, the greatest good for the greatest number for the longest time.

To Pinchot, you see, man himself is a natural resource. The basic and primary resource for whose material, moral, and spiritual welfare the conservation doctrine is invoked. Man, without whose energy, the energy of coal and oil, of electricity, yes, of atomic fission, itself is inert and meaningless.

Believing, as he did, that the planned and orderly development of the earth and all it contains is indispensable to the permanent prosperity of the human race, conservation in its widest sense became to him one of the guiding principles through which such prosperity might be achieved. A bold creative affirmation in ethical and spiritual terms of our faith in the dignity of man as a child of God.

Pinchot was trained as a forester; he thought as a forester; he felt like a forester. But before he had practiced forestry long, he realized that there were questions with which he as chief forester had been called upon to deal—questions that on the face of them might seem to have little to do with trees.

In his autobiography, he writes about going some 42 years ago "into the gathering gloom of an expiring day to ride in Rock Creek Park, and of taking with him on that ride the difficult problems upon which he was constantly at work."

He was thinking not only of the national forests, but of those in the hands of private lumbermen, of the overgrazing and forest fires, of blighted areas and dust bowls—in short, of all the misery and waste due to the wanton neglect of the most elementary measures of conservation.

But thinking also of the abuses and exploitation of mineral deposits on public lands, of the danger of monopoly control over our natural resources. He was thinking about rural electrification and the multiple benefits that would arise from a public water power policy developed in terms of social use and need, of effective regulation of public utilities, of giant power.

Looking a long way forward, he had already envisioned the possibility of great river developments and their relation not only to an improved agriculture, but to a sounder national economy.

Further, and most significantly, he was thinking of natural resources as an international problem, one that directly affects issues of war and peace. What had all these various issues to do with forestry, he asked himself, and what had forestry to do with them? What was the basic link, if any, between them all?

Suddenly the idea flashed through his mind, "Here are no longer a lot of different, independent, often antagonistic questions, each on its own separate little island," as he a forester had been in the habit of thinking.

"Instead, there is one central question—manysided, yes—but still a unit. All so closely connected as to make it imperative that they be coordinated and treated as part of a single coherent whole."

Seen in this new light, "these separate issues fitted each into the other to make up one central problem—the use of the earth for the good of man." To Pinchot, it was "like coming out of a dark tunnel." He "had been seeing one spot of light ahead, and all of a sudden the whole landscape rushed into visibility."

It was a new policy that was needed. One not merely domestic, but worldwide in its scope. One that involved not only the welfare of man, but his very existence on earth. Moreover, it was an international policy in which all nations must eventually cooperate for their fullest development, a policy to which, after much thought, he decided to give the name of conservation.

In these terms conservation became not solely, nor even primarily a matter of techniques, as some moderns seem to believe, but of Government policy on the highest level. There was never any doubt of that fact, nor of what it implied in the mind of Gifford Pinchot, and of T. R. and in the minds of the early foresters.

Now, to go back to that first governors' conference in 1908, called at the instigation of Pinchot by the then President Theodore Roosevelt, a meeting of the governors of the 47 States, held at the White House.

At the conference, for the first time in history, the idea of conservation was spelled out to the American people in terms so simple as to be understood by all. First, they were made to realize that our natural resources are not inexhaustible. That, on the contrary, these were being wasted and destroyed at a rate that was disastrous and might soon become fatal.

The point was then driven home that the natural resources of the country are a national heritage, to be made use of in establishing and promoting the welfare, the prosperity, and the happiness of the American people.

Hitherto, said Theodore Roosevelt, our national policy had been one of almost unrestricted destruction of these resources. It was a policy that had led and was leading to the exhaustion of many of them. Moreover, it was one that gave unequalled opportunity for exploitation by monopoly.

And "monopoly can no longer be tolerated," proclaimed the President. "In the past, we have admitted the right of the individual to injure the future of the Republic for his own present profit. The time has come to put an end to such exploitation."

Always, you see, the protection of the rights of the people marched side by side with the technology of forest management, the development of water power, extraction of minerals, et cetera.

Always the emphasis laid upon the social purpose of conservation—that purposes defined by Gifford Pinchot as "the greatest good for the greatest number for the longest time." Always the conception stressed that conservation is not a series of independent issues, but one central problem to be faced and solved as such.

You may be interested to know that almost immediately following the governors' conference, a second conference, the North American Conservation Conference, met in Washington, with representatives of Mexico, Canada, Newfoundland and the United States participating. The declaration of principles adopted there said:

"We recognize the mutual interest of the nations on the Continent of North America and the dependence of the welfare of each upon its natural resources.

We agree that the conservation of these resources is undeniable for the continued prosperity of each nation. Natural resources are not confined by the boundary lines that separate nations. We agree that no nation acting alone can adequately conserve them and we recommend the adoption of concurrent measures for conserving the material foundation and welfare of all the nations concerned and for ascertaining their location."

Perhaps the greatest recommendation of this conference was the following:

"We recommend that any conservation program should become worldwide in its scope and therefore suggest to the President of the United States of America that all nations should be invited to join together in conference on the subject of world resources and their conservation and wide utilization."

As a matter of fact, Roosevelt had already been thinking that, and an invitation was sent out by the President to all the major nations of the world for such a conference. I think that 30 of them had accepted, among them Germany, England, France, and Russia and some others, when President Taft, who succeeded Theodore Roosevelt, decided to kill this conference and he voided the invitations.

Now, as to the directive you gave me about suggestions I might make for action when your Commission is organized, there is one item which, with your permission, I should like to bring to your attention. This deals with an issue Gifford Pinchot always referred to as "unfinished business," something he had not been able to get to before his death, but which was on his mind always.

I should like to lay this baby in your lap, for I feel strongly about its future importance. But before going into that, may I lay before you some facts which may not have been brought to your attention in their proper significance.

Today the national forests contain something like 126 million acres of forests, most of it reasonably well protected in the interest of the present and the future.

On the other hand, there are something over 358 million acres of forests, some in farmers' woodlots, privately held land and State forests. On the great majority of this acreage it is probably fair to say that little scientific forestry is being done and still less conservation practiced. Forest fires are only too often allowed to blaze unchecked. Lumbering may be destructive to reproduction.

We cannot dodge the fact that protection of these lands means a minimum form of control and that brings up the old question of control by whom?

I know something of the murky field between Federal and State action and realize that this is one of the hottest spots in American politics, one in which emotions run high.

These 358 million acres may be of untold value to the American people and I think you will agree with me that something must be done to see that it is protected for the benefit of our descendants; that if an end is put to the present situation, it will have to be done on the ground that there is no private right to public destruction.

You may not agree, but I believe the only possible or adequate protection lies in the hands of the National Government.

I am not presuming to outline any tentative legislation, nor to tell you in my opinion what ought or could be done. I merely want to say that this has been a problem for the last 40 years and in the absence of Federal action no effective controls have been set up in a majority of the States.

I am deeply concerned that this last loophole be closed and I beg of you gentlemen to inquire into the facts and decide what action should be taken. You see, some day America may need the trees on these 358 million acres, need the lumber badly. We are a growing Nation and more wood is being consumed each year.

The second suggestion concerns a frequently made attempt to transfer the Forest Service out of the Department of Agriculture, where it was placed by Pinchot and Roosevelt, into the Interior. Practically every President except Hoover has tried and failed to get this done. Such a transfer, of course, ignores the basic fact that forestry is a crop just as surely as corn, tobacco or cotton,

and crops are the concern of Agriculture—not Interior.

I shall not presume to bore you with recommendations at this point—only to beg of you if this does come up again to consider it seriously and with due protection to the interest of the farmer whose woodlot will be affected, and possibly allow me to testify as I feel strongly about this and would like to put before you the position that Pinchot took, and I want to concur with the recommendation by your committee.

Thank you very much.

EXHIBIT 2

STATEMENT BY SENATOR A. V. WATKINS, RELATIVE TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 139, PROVIDING FOR OBSERVANCE OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONSERVATION MOVEMENT

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity provided for me to appear before this committee to endorse the proposal to establish a commission to plan and direct a nationwide observance of the 50th anniversary of the conservation movement.

However, my purpose in appearing before you is not only to endorse the suggestion, but also to point out the comprehensive scope of the conservation movement set in motion by the conference of governors convened in 1908 by that great President, Theodore Roosevelt.

Conservation, as Teddy Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot visualized it, was not confined merely to the preservation of scenery. It involved the conservation and wise use of all our natural resources. It was a bipartisan program, involving the active participation of the States, as evidenced by the convening of the 1908 conference of governors, a historic event which this legislation will memorialize.

I not only believe that we should commemorate this occasion, which marked the real origin of the conservation movement, but also that we, as conservationists, should utilize this golden anniversary for some soul-searching and stocktaking to assure ourselves that our efforts in this direction are holding to the objectives and principles as laid down by the movement's founding fathers half a century ago.

To that end, I request you to review with me the origins and recommendations of that historic conference of governors of 1908.

In a preface to the official proceedings of the conference of governors, Secretary W. J. McGee makes this summation of the movement's origins:

"The idea of conserving the Nation's resources arose partly from the recent forestry movement, partly from the still more recent waterway movement."

In short, the conservation movement originated in part from the national-forest program, established by Teddy Roosevelt and the Congress primarily to preserve the Nation's watersheds, and the waterway movement, another great water resource program to develop the country's rivers and navigable lakes.

This disclosure may come as a distinct surprise to some modern-day conservationists, who apparently have become obsessed with the idea that the conservation and development of water resources is inimical to the aims of conservation. Actually, as the record shows, the water development program was responsible for the very genesis of this great natural resource conservation movement.

President Roosevelt is very specific on this subject in a quotation presented by Mr. McGee in that same preface. The germ of the idea for the conference of governors, he said, "took form in an address by President Roosevelt before the Society of American Foresters (of which he was and is an associate member), March 26, 1903. In expressions indicating perhaps more clearly than any of earlier date, the interdependence of our resources, he said to the forest students:

" 'Your attention must be directed to the preservation of the forests, not as an end in itself, but as a means of preserving the prosperity of the Nation. * * * In the arid region of the West agriculture depends first of all upon the available water supply. In such a region forest protection alone can maintain the stream flow necessary for irrigation and can prevent the great and destructive floods so ruinous to communities farther down the same streams. * * * The relation between forests and the whole mineral industry is an extremely intimate one. The very existence of lumbering * * * depends upon the success of our work as a nation in putting practical forestry into effective operation. As it is with mining and lumbering, so it is in only a less degree with transportation, manufactures, and commerce in general. The relation of all these industries to forestry is of the most intimate and dependent kind.' "

Later, in appointing the Inland Waterways Commission, an event of historic importance in the development of our great national waterways system, President Teddy Roosevelt made this comment, further attesting to the interdependence of our natural resources:

"It is becoming clear that our streams should be considered and conserved as great natural resources. * * * The time has come for merging local projects and uses of the inland waters in a comprehensive plan designed for the benefit of the entire country. * * * It is not possible to properly frame so large a plan * * * without taking account of the orderly development of other natural resources. Therefore, I ask that the Inland Waterways Commission shall consider the relations of the streams to the use of all the great permanent natural resources and their conservation for the making and maintenance of prosperous homes."

In announcing his plans to convene the conference of governors, President Roosevelt made this comment in the course of an address before the Lakes-to-Gulf Deep Waterway Association meeting at Memphis on October 4, 1907:

"As I have said elsewhere, the conservation of natural resources is the fundamental problem. Unless we solve that problem it will avail us little to solve all others. To solve it, the whole nation must undertake the task through their organizations and associations, through the men whom they have made specially responsible for the welfare of the several States, and finally through Congress and the Executive. As a preliminary step, the Inland Waterways Commission has asked me to call a conference on the conservation of natural resources, including, of course, the streams, to meet in Washington during the coming winter. I shall accordingly call such a conference. It ought to be among the most important gatherings in our history, for none have had a more vital question to consider."

When the historic Governors' Conference convened in 1908, it included not only the governors of the respective States, but also representatives or organizations concerned with preservation and wise use of our forest watersheds and timber, our streams, and our minerals. It was truly a conservation conference, in every sense of the word.

The comprehensive nature of this first national conservation conference was reflected in the declaration of views and recommendations which was submitted and approved at the fifth session of the 3-day Washington conference. The proceedings of this session, in respect to these recommendations, are so significant, that I hereby request that an extract of the proceedings of this session be introduced into the record as a part of my remarks. But, in summary, I present herewith some extracts from the declaration which emphasize the interdependence of natural resources in this movement:

"The great prosperity of our country rests upon the abundant resources of the land."

"We look upon these resources as a heritage to be made use of in establishing and promoting the comfort, prosperity, and happiness of the American people.

"We declare our firm conviction that this conservation of our natural resources is a subject of transcendent importance which should engage unremittingly the attention of the Nation, the States, and the people in earnest cooperation. These natural resources include the land on which we live and which yields our food; the living waters which fertilize the soil, supply power, and form great avenues of commerce; the forests which yield the materials for our homes, prevent erosion of the soil, and conserve the navigation and other uses of our streams; and the minerals which form the basis of our industrial life and supply us with heat, light, and power.

"We agree that the land should be so used that erosion and soil-wash shall cease; that there should be reclamation of arid and semi-arid regions by means of irrigation, and of swamp and overflowed regions by means of drainage; that the waters should be so conserved and used as to promote navigation, to enable the arid regions to be reclaimed by irrigation, and to develop power in the interests of the people; that the forests which regulate our rivers, support our industries, and promote the fertility and productiveness of the soil should be preserved and perpetuated; that the minerals found so abundantly beneath the surface should be so used as to prolong their utility; that the beauty, healthfulness, and habitability of our country should be preserved and increased; that the sources of national wealth exist for the benefit of the people and that monopoly thereof should not be tolerated.

"We urge the continuation and extension of forest policies.

"We recognize in our waters a most valuable asset of the people of the United States.

"Let us conserve the foundations of our prosperity."

That "declaration" of 1908 stamped that Conference of Governors as a real meeting of conservationists, vitally interested in all the natural resources of this great country.

As a part of the program for commemorating this half century of conservation, I recommend the convening of a similar Conference of Governors and representatives of all natural-resource organizations for the purpose of taking stock of our progress and re-evaluating our problems in terms of successes and failures during the past 50 years. Perhaps the convocation of such an assembly will serve to remind all who express interest in such a movement that all our natural resources are worthy of the attention of conservationists of the stature of Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot.

Out of such a second Governors' Conference at the halfway point in the first century of organized conservation may come renewed cooperation and interest in the overall problems of conserving and utilizing our natural resources. Problems in this field are destined to get worse before they get better, and our success in conserving and wisely using our natural resources in the face of increasing pressures and increasing population will call for cooperative, far-sighted statesmanship of the type displayed by those eminent founders of the century's great bipartisan conservation movement.

MAINTENANCE OF TUNGSTEN, ASBESTOS, FLUORSPAR, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3982) to provide for the maintenance of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes.

THE NATION WATCHES HELLS CANYON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had planned to deliver my speech earlier in the day, but, as is always my practice, I cooperated with the leadership of the Senate in agreeing to postpone my speech until the passage of the public works appropriation bill. I explained to the leadership that I was going to speak for the RECORD and that I wished only to make the speech so that it would be available for reference in connection with what I am satisfied will be one of the most important debates that will be held in this session of the Congress between now and adjournment. It will be a debate on the great power flood-control and conservation issues involved in Hells Canyon Dam. I shall discuss it briefly this afternoon under the title "A Nation Watches Hells Canyon."

Mr. President, when I wrote this speech yesterday it was my understanding that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs contemplated a meeting tomorrow, at which time the Hells Canyon Dam bill would be taken up in the committee.

I have been advised by the chairman of the committee that several members cannot be present tomorrow, with the result that the meeting will be postponed for a few days.

I call that to the attention of the press, because my speech is in the Press Gallery, and I want the representatives of the press to know that when I wrote this speech I was of the understanding that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs would meet tomorrow. However, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the exceedingly able chairman of that committee, who has one of the finest records in the entire history of the Senate on the matter of conservation and power development, advises me, in fact, assures me, that there will be a meeting of the committee in the very near future, at which time the Hells Canyon bill, of which I am the author, with some 29 cosponsors, will be taken up by the committee.

The action of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on this issue, when the meeting is held, will be of vital concern not only to the Pacific Northwest but also to the whole Nation.

At issue is whether the Nation's best and most economical dam site will be developed fully for flood control, low-cost power, navigation, aid to irrigation, and recreation or be sacrificed to underdevelopment with less flood control, less power at higher cost, negligible contributions to navigation and recreation, and no assistance to irrigation.

RECENT FLOOD PROVES PERIL

Only last week the Columbia and its tributaries flooded, causing great damage. It was the third worst flood in the basin. But for the flood-control storage of great multipurpose dams like Grand Coulee and Hungry Horse, the devastation would have been greater than it was. Luckily, the weather turned cold. If the thaw had continued, the flood might have equaled or exceeded the tragic floods of 1894 and 1948. The potential was there. It lay in the heavy snows that run into the Snake River above the Hells Canyon Dam site. The potential damage exceeded the cost of Hells Canyon.

We may not be so lucky again. The law of averages indicates we will not be that fortunate again. High Hells Canyon Dam should be built while there is still time to avert a major catastrophe.

SUPPOSED ALTERNATIVES INADEQUATE

On June 9, the Corps of Engineers announced hearings on its review of the historic 308 report which gave us the main control plan for the Columbia River Basin. Hells Canyon is a key part of that plan for flood control, power, and the other benefits of multipurpose, integrated river development.

The corps announcement states:

> Because the present outlook visualizes the early attainment of only 50 percent of the storage development contemplated by the 1948 Main Control Plan, the review study will include an examination of other apparently feasible and economic storage developments in the basin. Table I attached to this bulletin lists the storage projects which have been considered. Those projects which appear to be worthy of more detailed investigation and appraisals are underlined in the tabulation. Two additional projects, the Bruces Eddy and Penny Cliffs projects on the Clearwater River, which would provide 3,730,000 acre-feet of usable storage, already have been studied in detail and have been recommended for construction in a report submitted to Congress on June 1, 1955.

The flood storage and downstream benefits of these projects are less than those of Hells Canyon. They are bitterly opposed by conservationists, whereas Hells Canyon is not. With Hells Canyon's flood and power storage lost, these inadequate substitutes will be more strongly urged. These Clearwater dams would be good enough only to make up some of the difference between high Hells Canyon and the Idaho Power Co. projects, when and if they are built. The Clearwater crests far less frequently than the Snake at Hells Canyon. With Hells Canyon developed fully for flood control, the Clearwater crests would be far less serious than they have been.

INDUSTRY AND FERTILIZER

Hells Canyon's low-cost power means new taxpaying private enterprise for the Pacific Northwest. The whole Nation would gain from the new profits, wages, and purchasing power which the high dam would bring into being.

A whole new phosphate fertilizer industry would be opened up by low-cost Hells Canyon power. This means that the whole farm economy of the Nation would be improved, for phosphate fertilizer reserves are running low. Farmers in the Midwest and West would be able to save from $10 to $20 a ton on this new fertilizer output.

WATER RIGHTS

Idaho Power Co. propaganda has attempted to inject a false water rights issue into the controversy over Hells Canyon. The company and its partisans claim the high dam imperils upstream irrigation.

Expert witnesses from the Bureau of Reclamation and the Snake River watermaster testified before the FPC and congressional committees that there will be ample water for all foreseeable upstream irrigation and operation of the dam. The FPC examiner and the FPC found and stated in their decisions that this is clear.

The bill S. 1333 provides:

> SEC. 2. The operation of the Hells Canyon Dam shall be only such as does not conflict with present and future rights to the use of water for irrigation or other beneficial consumptive uses, whether now or hereafter existing, valid under State law, of the upstream waters of the Snake River and its tributaries.

This is an ironclad guaranty. It compares favorably indeed with the language proposed in a letter of January 31, 1956, to the FPC from Assistant Secretary of Interior Aandahl in connection with the partnership application for Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley Dams. This is what the administration's spokesman said in regard to a private utility application:

> The proposed developments are located downstream from extensive existing and potential water utilization projects in the upper Snake River Basin. To be feasible, the irrigation developments must have an assured water supply free from downstream encumbrances. It is recommended that any license that may be issued contain a provision somewhat similar to that contained in the FPC opinion and order issuing license in the matter of the Idaho Power Co. on project Nos. 1971, 2132, and 2133 (Oxbow, Hells Canyon, and Brownlee) which would fully protect the water rights of potential upstream water conservation developments. The following stipulation would provide the desired protection:
>
> "The use of the waters of the Snake River and its tributaries in connection with works constructed pursuant to this license shall be subordinate to all future depletion of streamflow attributable to future upstream diversions for irrigation or other beneficial consumptive uses under State law."

There is no time limit on the language of S. 1333. In contrast, any license for a private project can be revoked or modified at the end of the 50-year license period.

These facts are directed to the senior Senators from Utah and Idaho, who, as members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, have claimed that the Hells Canyon bill (S. 1333) does not protect upstream irrigation rights. The similar, but less extensive, language of the Interior Department's suggestion for private projects—the language of the Idaho Power Co. licenses—is far less protective of the rights over which they express concern.

COMPANY PROCEEDS WITHOUT OREGON'S APPROVAL

Moreover, we have seen how the company flouts Federal and State laws. The company has begun preliminary construction work without obtaining a license and water rights from Oregon under Oregon water law. The company has

used its condemnation powers in Idaho ruthlessly. There is no consolation to upstream water users in the company's action.

HIGH AND COMPANY DAMS COMPARED

On the basis of the record of extensive hearings and findings, the comparison between high Hells Canyon and the company three-dam plan is as follows. Bear in mind that the company has received licenses for only two dams. The third will probably never be built. That factor makes the proven superiority of the high Hells Canyon Dam even more clear and the company program even less in the public interest.

POLITICS CANNOT CHANGE PHYSICAL FACTS

In the historic debate on Hells Canyon much will be said. Politics and private utility partisanship will result in false arguments and distortions of the engineering facts as they have been testified to before Congress and the Federal Power Commission.

I believe the superiority of Hells Canyon Dam for the Pacific Northwest and the Nation will carry the day. I warn solemnly that nothing less than the truth will do. Politics and partisanship can distort and confuse. But the floods of tomorrow, the power shortages ahead, the economic underdevelopment that threatens cannot be controlled or averted by false facts and arguments.

The Columbia River Basin and its greatest tributary, the Snake River, are living, physical facts. They are gifts to our people from providence. Let us use them wisely and honestly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table entitled "Comparison Between the High Hells Canyon Project and the Idaho Power Company Three-Dam Scheme."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison between the high Hells Canyon project and the Idaho Power Co. 3-dam scheme

Item	High Hells Canyon Dam	Idaho Power Co. 3 dams [1]
1. Power output (prime kilowatts)	924,000	505,000.
2. Power costs (per kilowatt-hour)	2.7 mills	6.69 mills.
3. Active storage (acre-feet)	3,880,000	1,000,000.
4. Flood control benefits (annual)	$2,300,000	$1,000,000.
5. Navigation benefits (annual)	$189,000	$108,000.
6. Recreation benefits (number of annual visitors)	500,000 to 650,000	250,000 to 325,000.
7. Power revenues for aid to future reclamation	Yes	No.
8. Availability of power to entire region	do	Do.
9. Development of phosphate fertilizer	"The high dam project by providing power at low rates might be expected to stimulate large-scale development of the prosphate resources and large-scale expansion of fertilizer production" (examiner's finding No. 159). This means fertilizer to farmers in Midwest and West at savings of $10 to $20 a ton.	"The 3-dam plan would stimulate less phosphate development and less fertilizer production than the high dam project" (examiner's finding No. 160).
10. Development of electroprocess industries	"The high dam project, because of its high volume and low cost power output, might be expected to stimulate the expansion of electroprocess industries to a greater extent than the 3-dam plan, including those which would utilize regional mineral resources" (examiner's finding No. 162).	(See examiner's finding No. 162, opposite column.)
11. Cost of project (less transmission lines)	$308,473,000 FPC examiner said: "The facts seem to point to the inescapable conclusion that with the marked and substantial advantage of the Government's credit the high dam would be, dollar for dollar, the better investment and the more nearly ideal development of the Middle Snake."	$175,766,000.
12. Benefit-to-cost ratio	1.83 to 1	0.91 to 1 (dividing the examiner's figures on annual value of power at market by the annual cost of power at market. This shows the 3-dam plan as being economically unfeasible.)

[1] In fact, the FPC and company have indicated that the third dam may never be built even if the FPC decision is not reversed.

THE LOSS TO THE PEOPLE IF THE FPC DECISION IS ALLOWED TO STAND

1. Active storage capacity of 2,880,000 acre-feet vitally needed to aid in controlling the river and meeting the goals of the Army engineers' main control plan.

2. Nearly the equivalent of the power production of Bonneville Dam—419,000 prime, year-around kilowatts. Several important downstream dams are dependent upon Hells Canyon storage for power output. Lacking Hells Canyon storage they may not be built. The total loss would amount to 2¼ million kilowatts of prime power capability.

3. Nine hundred and twenty-four thousand kilowatts of prime power generated at 2.7 mills per kilowatt-hour and available over the Bonneville transmission grid to serve loads throughout the region at Federal wholesale rates of slightly over 2 mills per kilowatt-hour. The Commission wishes to substitute in their stead 505,000 kilowatts of private power costing 6.69 mills per kilowatt-hour to generate and available only to the Idaho Power Co. service area.

4. Thirty-five thousand jobs in manufacturing—another 35,000 jobs in service industries—$700 million in manufactured products.

5. Forty-five million dollars in annual Federal income and corporation taxes—$3 million annually in local property taxes.

6. Full development of the Nation's greatest phosphates reserves—for high analysis, low-cost farm fertilizer which would save the farmers of 17 Midwestern and Western States more than $5 million annually, increase use of fertilizers on the land, reduce soil depletion, increase yield and nutritional content of crops.

7. Millions of dollars in flood control, navigation, and recreation benefits.

8. Rightful control by the people over development of their rivers to be used for their greatest benefit.

9. Realization of the goals of the comprehensive plan for development of the Columbia Basin—for this decision would mean its dismemberment for the benefit of the power companies and the attendant loss of millions of kilowatts of low-cost power and millions of acre-feet of vitally needed upstream storage. This would result in slow stagnation of the Pacific Northwest's economy, for it has but one abundant, cheap energy base—falling water—to attract new industry that cannot now be established in this country.

10. Power revenues to aid in repaying reimbursable costs of upstream irrigation projects which will be needed to provide more food in decades ahead for our rapidly growing population.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the point immediately following my speech earlier this afternoon on the subject of the Hells Canyon Dam certain newspaper articles which have just been handed to me.

The first article, which is entitled "Engineers Say Dams Answer to Control of Future Flood Crests," was written by Leverett G. Richards and published in the Portland Oregonian of Wednesday, June 6, 1956.

The article relates to the observation of Brig. Gen. L. H. Foote, of the North Pacific Division of the Corps of Engineers. Brigadier General Foote was asked whether the floods in the North Pacific are necessary. His reply was that they are not necessary; that they can be controlled within reason. He proceeds to discuss in the article the effect of flood-control installations already in existence upon the flood which has just been experienced on the Columbia River, and which was, according to the article, one of the worst floods in the recent history of the river.

It is very interesting to observe that in the course of his comments this great Army engineer points out that in order to achieve practical flood control, construction of the following dams would be required:

The high dam at Hells Canyon, 2,600,000 acre-feet; Payette River, increased by 300,000; John Day, 1,400,000; Priest Rapids, 2,100,000; Libby Dam, 3,900,000; Glacier View, 1,800,000; and increase of 3,900,000 acre-feet of storage at Grand Coulee by installation of new gates that would operate under high pressure, and by upriver storage from new dams.

The article quotes from the speech Brigadier General Foote is reported to have made in Spokane in April, as follows:

The development of the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River by the 5-dam plan of the private power companies would provide about 1,500,000 acre-feet of storage (Brownlee and Pleasant Valley Dams) as compared with 2,600,000 at Hells Canyon Dam.

I am very glad this article has reached my hands on the very day I have discussed the Hells Canyon Dam issue from the standpoint of its flood-control features as well as from the standpoint of its power features.

This has always been the position of the Army engineers, ever since the so-called master plan "308" report. Hells Canyon has been one of the major recommendations of the Army engineers, so far as flood control in the Pacific Northwest is concerned.

Yet there are shortsighted persons who forget about the welfare of the future population of our section of the country, a section whose population is increasing rapidly each year, and who are willing, under the whiplash, apparently, of private utility political pressure, to deny to future generations the maximum flood-control potentiality of the Snake Rixer, which can be obtained only if a high dam is built at Hells Canyon, as the Army engineers have, without exception, recommended for some years past.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article, which is one of the best supporting proofs I have seen in recent times of the position which I have taken in the Senate, for 11 years now, in support of Hells Canyon, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENGINEERS SAY DAMS ANSWER TO CONTROL OF FUTURE FLOOD CRESTS

(By Leverett G. Richards)

"Was this flood necessary?"

"Why couldn't the engineers hold down the crest and save my dike?"

These are the perennial questions asked by the people who live in the lowlands.

Brig. Gen. L. H. Foote, north Pacific division, Corps of Engineers, has the answers.

Floods aren't necessary. They can be controlled within reason. The flood of 1956 would have ranked next to the flood of 1948 if existing reservoirs along the United States portion of the Columbia and its tributaries had not been used to reduce the peak flow.

The crest was cut about 2 feet. Without Grand Coulee and other dams, the crest would have exceeded the 28.2-foot level at which Smith Lake broke suddenly through the S. P. & S. Railway fill on Memorial Day, 1948, smashing the city of Vanport. It would have been the third worst flood in the history of the river.

The Columbia crested at Vancouver, Wash., at high noon, June 13, 1948 at 30.2 feet (29.9 at Portland). Had all the present resources of the river, including existing reservoir capacity at Grand Coulee, been used in 1948, the crest could have been held down 1¾ to 2 feet.

ONE FLOOD WORSE

Peak flow of the Columbia at The Dalles in 1948 was 1,010,000 cubic feet per second on May 31. This peak outpouring of snow and rainwater has been exceeded only once in history, June 7, 1894, when 1,240,000 cubic feet per second flowed past The Dalles, raising the river at Portland to 33 feet. (No data were kept on Vancouver at that time.)

The 1894 flood, highest crest—although not the greatest runoff—in history, could have been cut down by 2 feet by full use of all the 4,900,000 acre-feet of storage now available on the river, General Foote points out.

The engineers could pull the teeth of Old Man River almost completely. They have a plan for dams to provide 20,900,000 acre-feet of storage which could cut the flow of the river in a flood of 1894 proportions down to 800,000 cubic feet per second at The Dalles. That would cut the crest at Vancouver by 7.7 feet.

The worst flood in history could be cut down to dike size—about 25 feet—if all the dams proposed were constructed to the heights proposed.

FLOOD LOSS WEIGHED

Would it be worth the cost? The cost of the program has not been estimated, but General Foote estimates a flood of 1894 proportions under present conditions would approximate $300 million damage on the lower Columbia River.

The lower river is protected by 52 improved drainage and diking districts with 307 miles of levees embracing 57 percent of the total lower river flood plain. Without these levees the average annual flood damage on the lower river would exceed $30 million, General Foote estimates.

He credits existing levees with reducing this annual loss by about $10 million, while the storage available in existing reservoirs reduces this annual loss by about another $5,000,000.

Improvements and extensions to existing levees might feasibly reduce this annual damage by another $2 million. "However, if the main control plan as originally conceived was accomplished, the combined protection of levees and flood storage would reduce the annual damage by over $27 million, including an annual credit of some $16 million of damage reduction to reservoirs."

To achieve practical flood control would require construction of the following dams:

The high dam at Hells Canyon, 2,600,000 acre-feet; Payette River, increased by 300,000; John Day, 1,400,000; Priest Rapids, 2,100,000; Libby dam, 3,900,000; Glacier View, 1,800,000; and increase of 3,900,000 acre-feet of storage at Grand Coulee by installation of new gates that would operate under high pressure, and by upriver storage from new dams.

FISH GROUP PROTESTS

These projects, together with 4,890,000 acre-feet of storage usable at existing dams, would provide 20,890,000 acre-feet of usable storage for flood control.

Opposition to the proposed full flood control program, however, will cut the available storage in half, according to the present outlook, General Foote estimates.

The Glacier View project, "although feasible from an engineering and economic standpoint, was not recommended * * * because of opposition by recreation and wildlife interests," General Foote explained in a speech to the Northwest Public Power Association in Spokane in April.

The Libby project is deferred indefinitely pending further negotiations with Canada. The plan proposed by Grant County PUD for Priest Rapids will provide only 500,000 acre-feet of storage in lieu of 2,100,000 acre-feet.

"Local interests affected by the John Day project object strenuously to the 2 million acre-feet of surcharge storage currently authorized. The modified proposal reflecting local views will provide about 500,000 acre-feet," General Foote reports.

"The development of the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River by the five-dam plan of the private power companies would provide about 1,500,000 acre-feet of storage (at Brownlee and Pleasant Valley Dams) as compared with 2,600,000."

As a consequence, only half the possible flood-control storage will be available. Instead of cutting the crest of a flood of 1894 proportions by 7.7 feet at Vancouver, the crest can be cut 5.3 feet—when and if the projects outlined above are completed.

To combat this year's flood, and next year's the engineers have storage capacity available of 2,100,000 acre-feet at Hungry Horse Dam; 1,200,000 at Grand Coulee (increased at 2,800,000 this year by emergency use of diversion tunnels).

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my speech on the Hells Canyon Dam issue, two articles from the St. Helens Sentinel-Mist of June 5, 1956, dealing with the recent flood. The headline of one article is "Veneer Road Flooded, Prescott Area Isolated, as River Tops 25 Feet." The headline of the other article reads, "Rainier Families Evacuate West Dike-Land District."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VENEER ROAD FLOODED, PRESCOTT AREA ISOLATED, AS RIVER TOPS 25 FEET

A river height of 25.5 feet was read Monday about noon at the Pope and Talbot Dock, three-tenths of a foot higher than official forecast. At that height, the river had already closed down the P. & T. creosote plant, hampered work activities at the Crown Zellerbach paper mill's wood mill, and flooded the roadway entering the CZ veneer plant. The latter condition saw workers being ferried to their jobs Monday morning from where the roadway is cut off beside the highway.

The St. Helens city dock lay under about 1 foot of water Monday morning after being flooded over the weekend. Tons of crushed rock were dumped on the roadway and over the dock to keep it from floating away.

At the lumber mill, about 1 foot of water stood between the dock and the water level. H. J. "Hawk" Olsen, plant manager at the Pope and Talbot mill, stated Monday that the mill would continue to operate as long as that foot of freeboard remained. He said that two planers were out of operation but the rest of the mill is still in production. The chip carrier that travels chips to the paper mill from the lumber mill was as a result also out of operation.

CZ officials at the papermill said that stored pulp can be used to supplement the pulp supply while chip delivery is reduced. Large stores of dried pulp have been built up against such an emergency.

In other parts of the lower Columbia area, water had edged itself up alongside the Old Portland Road in the McNulty area and toward Scappoose where the road leading from the Columbia River highway toward the airport was inundated. In the area north of St. Helens, Deer Island farms and pasture lands were standing in water and the Prescott Road toward Rainier was inundated, stranding about 150 persons. Although the homes stand on high ground, two amphibious vehicles were sent to the location to ferry people and goods.

Dikes at the paper mill were holding strong Monday as the river lapped within 2½ feet of the top at points. Saturation at certain spots was requiring sandbagging and installation of water pumps. Only small spots of water that had seeped through the dike was evident, where floodwaters had in previous years covered the whole area.

RAINIER FAMILIES EVACUATE WEST DIKE-LAND DISTRICT

Seventy-three families of the Rainier drainage district occupying 1,287 acres of lowland west of the Longview Bridge were evacuated from that area over Friday and Saturday. The exodus came as the level of the Columbia River edged nearer to the 1948 flood height that swept out the S. P. & S. Railway dike protecting the area.

The families were moved to makeshift housing in Rainier, Longview, and Kelso. The Red Cross had previously voiced an appeal to residents for such housing in case of emergency.

Animal shelter was provided in similar fashion by persons who generously answered the appeal. About 1,500 head of cattle are pastured in the district, as well as sheep and poultry.

Red Cross Disaster Chairman Adolph S. McAnear set up emergency headquarters in the Rainier Elementary School, where the chairman is also principal.

Evacuation of the Rainier district followed inspection of potential danger areas by officers of the Corps of Engineers and the State civil-defense organization, including Col. Arthur M. Sheets, State civil-defense director. They found conditions critical at five drainage districts on the Oregon side of the river.

Besides Rainier, the others are Magruder, 592 acres; Westport, 190 acres; Clatskanie, 300 acres; and Columbia No. 1, 1,600 acres of the downriver end of Sauvies Island.

Colonel Sheets, who, by agreement, is coordinator of Oregon flood emergency procedures, said that even at a river stage of 27 feet at Portland, the water would not flow over the dikes of any district, but continued pressure was expected to cause seepage and boils which, if not checked, could cause the dikes to wash out.

Colonel Sheets detailed A. R. Cardiello, emergency welfare director for State civil defense, to work with the Red Cross in handling the evacuation of Rainier district and finding housing for the refugees.

Twenty-four-hour patrols are being maintained on the dike. About $100,000 was spent by the Army engineers in reinforcing the railroad fill as flood emergency work this spring and work of sandbagging boils and seepage is continuing.

Phil Cole, area engineer in charge, said the dike itself is not critical at present, but is getting soft. Heavy seepage is reported at the lower end. The S. P. & S. has furnished section crews to assist and also provided a speeder to patrol the lower end of the district and transport sandbags.

Many of the men were moving out Friday so they would be free to work on the dike, they explained. This is the third evacuation for some of the residents.

The State civil defense organization has provided a large siren in the center of the district, which will be sounded if there is a break.

Most of the residents expected to be moved by Sunday. Others plan to stay.

Headquarters for civil defense have been set up in a small Farmers' Union clapboard hall in the district, which itself shows the ravages of several floodings. At a meeting there Thursday night the county judge promised police protection of all homes evacuated. Columbia County sheriff's office is permitting no one but residents and flood workers in the area. The guard will be augmented as more people move out.

Portable lighting equipment was delivered by the OCD for use in night work.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have put those two articles in the RECORD because they are supporting evidence of the warnings I have given the Senate in many speeches on the subject of flood dangers which constantly threaten the people of my State and the State of Washington as the result of the failure of the Congress to date to enact flood control legislation, such as the high dam for Hells Canyon, which would, as General Foote has pointed out, greatly reduce the danger to our people and the terrific loss which is suffered economically in my section of the country because flood control projects are not being built.

I have reason to believe that in the near future the Hells Canyon Dam bill, of which I am the author, will be reported to the Senate. I want to say that if anyone really believes in a liberal policy when it comes to human values, the flood control features of that bill alone recommend that the bill pass the Senate of the United States by a substantial majority.

As I said at the beginning of my speech on the Hells Canyon issue today, the eyes of the Nation will be on the Congress of the United States when the Hells Canyon Dam issue comes up for a vote before adjournment. It will raise the question whether the people control the Congress or the private-utility monopolistic combine controls the Congress. Let me say I am satisfied the people will give the Congress their answer if the Congress surrenders to monopolistic, selfish interests on the Hells Canyon Dam issue.

WASHINGTON LOWDOWN, BY LARSTON D. FARRAR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a passing comment on a very interesting book entitled "Washington Lowdown," written by Larston D. Farrar, which I read on the plane the other night. One does not have to agree with everything in the book to recognize that it is a book which should be read. It is a book full of very interesting information about the Washington scene. One has only to read the table of contents to have his reading appetite whetted.

Among the chapter headings are "My First Night in Babylon"; "The Changing of the Guard"; "Washington Wonderland"; "The Not Too Moral Crusade"; "Capitol Hill—a New View for You"; "The Not-So-Exclusive Senate"; "The Unrepresentative House"; "Behind the White House Balconies"; "The Number 1 American"; "America's First Billion-Dollar Cabinet"; "The Not-So-Supreme Court"; "Feudin' and Fightin' "; "Who Speaks for the Lord—in the Halls of the People?"; "Influence"; "The Irregular Regulators"; "High and Low Society"; "Confessions of a G-Girl"; "Uncle Sam—Jack-of-All-Trades"; "The Candidates—1956 Models"; "There's More To See, in Washington, D. C."

Mr. President, this book is not light reading, even though the headings of the chapters might indicate to the contrary. There are a great many serious implications in this book, Mr. President, in respect to the operation of our Government. Much of it has needed to be said for a long, long time. It speaks for itself.

My friend from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has just said he is going to get the book and read it. I think it ought to be read by a great many people in and out of this administration and in and out of Congress. There is one section of it, Mr. President, which deals with my opponent in the campaign ahead. I think it ought to be read, because he has been going up and down the State of Oregon saying that he has not given anything away. He has also been going up and down the State of Oregon saying some rather unkind things about the senior Senator from Oregon. I have not lost my sense of humor about him, and I do not intend to. However, I think it would be rather interesting to hear what a brilliant author and able newspaperman has to say in this book, Washington Lowdown, about my opponent.

That section reads:

But the biggest goat of all the members of the Cabinet has been Secretary McKay, who won quick confirmation because Senators generally felt that here was an innocuous Governor of Oregon who had been in politics a long time and understood the function of an administrator. The Senators were, of course, badly fooled, and not 2 years had passed before such men as Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon and similar guardians of the public interest were hinting that McKay ought to resign. On March 9, 1956, McKay announced his resignation to run against Morse.

The Denver Post, a Republican newspaper that vigorously supports the administration generally, had this to say about McKay, less than 3 years after he had become Secretary of the Interior:

"Why doesn't Douglas McKay follow Mrs. Hobby in retirement from President Eisenhower's Cabinet? * * *

"Mr. McKay hasn't helped the Eisenhower administration articulate a water and public works policy that makes sense. He has been of little help in passing legislation that would strengthen the Republican Party's record in that field. Nor has he dramatized the national investment values of reclamation and the use and reuse of water for the benefit of the West, whence he entered high office, or the Nation he is supposed to represent."

In one of his first speeches in Washington, to the United States Chamber of Commerce, Secretary McKay said: "We're here in the saddle as an administration representing business and industry." This was on a par with Mr. Wilson's famous General Motors remark. It also was a tip-off as to how he viewed his task as head of the Department of the Interior, which, more than any other agency in the Federal Government, guards the treasures that belong to the public—ranging from the grazing lands in the West to the national parks in every State in the Nation. Mr. McKay also became the first member of the President's Cabinet who had to withdraw an appointee's nomination. Although Tom Lyon had admitted publicly that he did not believe in the Federal safety inspection of mines, McKay named him Director of the Bureau of Mines. Mr. Lyon was also drawing a sizable pension from one of the largest mine companies in the country, and big mining companies traditionally have fought Federal inspection, the only true safeguard for the unprotected worker.

Almost at the same time, Mr. McKay abruptly dismissed Albert M. Day, Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, who had risen through the ranks in Government service from 1918. This brought protests from sportsmen's organizations and conservation groups throughout the Nation. He appointed in Mr. Day's place one John L. Farley, whose only qualification to lead the most important game and wildlife agency in the country was that he had worked with the Crown Zellerbach Corp., a paper and pulp manufacturing company, and with a private utility company.

Mr. McKay also dismissed Marion Clawson, director of the Bureau of Land Management, who had been in the Government since the Hoover administration, because, Mr. Clawson said publicly, he would not grant the requests of the "grazing interests." After Mr. Clawson was out, Mr. McKay gave his Department's undivided support to the Eisenhower-approved legislation to give a small group of stockmen special rights to

public grazing lands. The Democrats on Capitol Hill defeated the measure.

But far more significant than the men with whom he surrounded himself were the actions Mr. McKay took. With the cooperation of President Eisenhower, McKay reversed the former administration's policy with regard to Hells Canyon, a deep gorge on the Snake River at the Oregon-Idaho border. Interior officials before McKay had favored a single high Federal dam at the site, as opposed to the Idaho Power Co.'s plan to build three smaller dams producing a total of only about half as much power as the Federal dam and at much higher cost to consumers. The Interior Department—and most western Democrats—had maintained that to permit the smaller dams to be built would be wasting the use of a much-needed water power resource, but within months after taking office, McKay withdrew the Department of Interior's objections to the Idaho Power Co. plan, after "clearing" it with the President and the Cabinet. The Federal Power Commission then voted to approve the Idaho Power Co. application for a permit to build the first dam, although its own hearing examiner had found that "the high [Federal] dam is dollar for dollar the best investment and the more nearly ideal development of the middle Snake River."

The Democrats point to these samples of why they gave McKay the title of "The Giveaway King."

A $40 million Government plant in Louisiana, Mo., was on the verge of perfecting a process of producing oil from coal. It was closed abruptly by Secretary McKay and part of the plant sold to the Hercules Powder Co. for less than 25 cents on the taxpayer's dollar.

A similar Federal plant in western Colorado has been working on extracting oil from oil-bearing shale. Since the experiment has proved a success, the oil industry has told Secretary McKay that it can take over from here, and McKay has given his nod of approval. Even Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, Republican, of Colorado, who has never been known to favor Government ownership, has objected to this proposal.

Secretary McKay has told California officials that he would "listen to a proposal" for them to buy out Uncle Sam's Central Valley multipurpose project, in which the taxpayers have half a billion dollars invested.

Mr. President, I have read the section of the book about McKay because it supports the views of many people who oppose his record as Secretary of Interior. The section of the book which I have read is printed in a book written by a newspaperman, who has been in a good position to observe the operation of governmental departments. He is familiar with McKay's sorry record. What author Larston Farrar says about McKay is of interest, in view of the fact that my opponent is so profuse in his disclaimers about said record as Secretary of Interior. I am sure the voters of my State will be interested in learning that there are others besides his opponent in the campaign who are of the view that his policy in the field of natural resources has not been a policy that has promoted the best interests of the public.

The other chapters of Farrar's book are also revealing of unfortunate malfeasance in office of some other officials. It is a book which will challenge the wishful thinking of many Americans if they will but read it. It discloses many of the political expediencies of the Eisenhower administration.

BAN ON FORCED LABOR

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, one of the important matters to come before the current 39th conference of the International Labor Organization is a convention to ban forced labor. While there should not be any question about the attitude of the free world, and particularly of the United States Government on such a question, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], recognizing some indecision and difference of opinion within the present administration, wisely introduced Senate Joint Resolution 117, and later Senate Resolution 248, to express the conviction that our Government should exercise leadership in the ILO to develop and adopt an international convention which would effectively outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes.

In April of this year the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare received devastating testimony concerning the continuation of the institution of forced labor in Communist Russia and other Iron Curtain and some Arab countries. The importance and urgent need for such an international convention was clearly demonstrated.

Despite the reported support for such a convention by the Department of Labor of our Government, the State Department has been insisting upon a watered-down version of the convention which would make it apply only to prohibit international trade in the products of forced labor, and I understand that some Republican members of the Labor Committee have delayed adoption of the more sweeping resolution proposed by the Senator from Minnesota, because of this attitude on the part of our State Department. They have, indeed, made informal suggestions for amendment of the resolution so as to permit it to be interpreted as applying only to such prohibition of international trade.

The weak and altogether inadequate position of the State Department was set forth in a Statement of United States Policy sent to me by Robert C. Hill, Assistant Secretary of State, on May 24. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF UNITED STATES POLICY WITH RESPECT TO THE POSSIBILITY OF AN INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONVENTION ON FORCED LABOR

(Transmitted by Assistant Secretary of State Robert C. Hill, May 24, 1956)

There is an item, Forced Labor, on the agenda of the ILO Conference which is to meet at Geneva in June 1956. The conference will decide what action the ILO should take on the subject. The conference might simply adopt a resolution, or might decide that the ILO should draft a new ILO convention to be submitted to ILO member governments for ratification. The replies of ILO member governments to an ILO questionnaire indicate that a majority of ILO member governments will vote in favor of having the ILO proceed to prepare a new convention.

The immediate issue before the United States Government therefore is to determine whether this Government should vote in favor of the formulation of an ILO convention on forced labor. There has been some delay in determining the position because of the ramifications of the problem of ILO action for United States treaty policy. There is a clear distinction between subjects which are appropriate for the United States treaty power and those which are not. No subject is appropriate for the exercise of the United States treaty power except matters of international concern which are appropriate matters for contracts between nations.

An ILO convention whose provisions relate solely to domestic measures to ban forced labor would not be appropriate for United States treaty action. However, an ILO convention prohibiting international trade and commerce in materials, goods and articles mined, manufactured or produced, wholly or in part, by forced labor, as defined in that convention, would be appropriate for United States treaty action.

In view of the fact that the United States abhors forced labor, the delegation to the International Labor Conference is being instructed to propose that the ILO formulate and adopt a convention which would prohibit international trade and commerce in the products of forced labor. The United States delegation is being authorized to state that the United States Government would support such a convention and would undertake to secure its ratification.

The position of the United States Government therefore is completely clear. If an ILO convention is confined to prohibiting international trade and commerce in the products of forced labor, the United States will support such a convention and undertake to secure its ratification.

If in addition to providing for the prohibition of trade in products of forced labor the draft convention were to contain provisions for undertaking to institute domestic measures to ban forced labor, the United States would have to make reservation against the provisions purporting to outlaw forced labor as this is not an appropriate matter for a United States treaty. Under the Constitution, forced labor is already prohibited in this country.

A third possibility is that a convention might be formulated which did not relate to international trade and commerce in products of forced labor but confined its provisions to prohibitions on forced-labor practices within countries; the delegation will be instructed to abstain, pointing out that such practices are prohibited in the United States by the Constitution and that the proposed convention provisions are not appropriate for a United States treaty.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to say that explanation is, I think, unworthy of the Government of the United States.

I believe this policy of the State Department and the delay on the part of some of the members of the Labor Committee on the other side of the aisle in approving Senate Resolution 248 are grave mistakes. Surely, the United States must not hesitate both to approve and to urge other nations to approve a convention which outlaws involuntary servitude, which for many years has been outlawed under our own Constitution. This immediate opportunity through the ILO to strike a blow for freedom and to point out one of the continuing evils of the Communist system should not be lost.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times for June 13, 1956, urging the support by our Government of such a convention to abolish slave labor. I urge upon our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are members of the Senate Labor Committee the most care-

ful consideration of this editorial opinion, to the end that Senate action on Senate Resolution 248 may be forthcoming without further delay.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO END FORCED LABOR

Forced labor is the No. 1 issue before the 39th conference of the International Labor Organization, which has begun in Geneva this week. Both in the United Nations and in the ILO the United States has unsparingly condemned forced labor, and we actively promoted the ILO investigations which exposed its widespread practice in the countries of the Communist bloc.

The ILO now has to decide what to do about it. The conference could adopt a mere "recommendation" to each member nation to put an end to forced labor, or it might pass a "convention," which would commit each ratifying nation to take action. The State Department first favored a recommendation because Secretary Dulles told the Senate last year that a treaty should not deal with "what are essentially matters of domestic concern." The Department of Labor, however, has consistently favored a convention, as has George P. Delaney, the United States labor delegate. The employer delegate, Charles H. Smith, Jr., has not yet publicly taken sides.

Just before the conference opened 1 of the 2 United States Government delegates, John Ernest Wilkins, Assistant Secretary of Labor, disclosed in a public statement what apparently is now to be our Government's line: Promotion of a convention which would effectively abolish forced labor by removing its products from international trade.

A prohibition against such trade should certainly be passed and we hope all our delegates will help to see it through. But this alone would not put an end to forced labor, even if it were effectively carried out. After all, few of the products of forced labor are exported. The conference should also outlaw forced labor within the boundaries of each member country.

To hesitate because ILO conventions on this or any other subject are treaties is absurd. The State Department itself has not acted as if they were in the past—including those dealing with domestic affairs. Four such, which our ILO Government delegates had supported without the Department's protest, were forwarded last year by Mr. Dulles to the President for submission to Congress—not to the Senate, as would have been required had they been treaties. Also, unlike treaties, ILO conventions are, by the terms of its constitution, submissible by any member government to its constituent states for ratification. This is now being done in the case of the four just mentioned because they involve matters within the purview of the states, such as minimum wages and equal pay for equal work.

But an ILO convention outlawing forced labor would not require any such procedure. This country has already prohibited involuntary servitude everywhere within its borders, and this act has been ratified by the several States. We call to witness the 13th amendment of the United States Constitution.

All four United States delegates at Geneva should push for a forthright convention that will outlaw forced labor and all its works—both inside and outside the boundaries of each member nation. And, if it is passed—even without any reference to international trade—the State Department should take the lead in promoting its unanimous ratification by appropriate Government action. Anything short of this would bring contempt on our former protestations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator from Illinois knows, I am very much interested in the work of his committee in respect to the slave-labor problem. I wish to ask whether the committee has taken into consideration at all the problem, and the allegations in respect to it, of the prevalence of human slavery in Saudi Arabia.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, it was covered in the report of the International Labor Organization and in the proceedings. Undoubtedly it is true that the slave trade still exists, and that slaves are being transported from Africa into Saudi Arabia, across the narrow strait of the Red Sea which separates the Arabian peninsula from Africa. It has been a long-standing evil. There is evidence that it still continues. To my mind it is a great blot upon the record of that country.

Mr. MORSE. I think that to be carrying on relationships with, and supplying economic aid to, a country which still traffics in the slavery of human beings is also a great blot on the record of the United States.

I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois that in my judgment an airbase in Saudi Arabia is not worth the sacrifice of American ideals, and neither is oil worth the sacrifice of those ideals.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I find myself in agreement with the Senator from Oregon. I also feel that the attitude of our State Department in not only permitting but encouraging the sale of munitions to Saudi Arabia and in permitting the Saudi Arabian Government to exercise a veto power as to what members of the United States Armed Forces shall be permitted to go to Saudi Arabia is a disgraceful ceding of national self-respect. When Thomas Jefferson had to deal with the pirates of Tunis, he did not behave in a fashion similar to that in which our State Department, under Mr. Dulles, is now behaving.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to hear the comments on this matter by the Senator from Illinois. I am satisfied that in southeast Asia we are finding ourselves in great trouble, so far as our prestige is concerned, because the leaders of some of those countries—or, at least, some of the leaders to whom I have talked—throw right into my face the Saudi Arabia slave traffic, and charge us, in effect, with condoning it, because of the activities we carry on in Saudi Arabia. I think we should make very clear that we are not going to give support or economic aid to a country which engages in human slavery.

On the other point the Senator from Illinois makes—namely, the fact that an American soldier who is a Jew cannot serve in the Armed Forces of the United States at our airbase in Saudi Arabia—I wish to say I think that situation is simply inexcusable. I hold to the point of view that we should remove our forces from Saudi Arabia, if having them stay there means that we have to sacrifice what I consider to be a sovereign right. If the Government of Saudi Arabia does not wish to respect our right to have any American, regardless of his race, color, or creed, serve in a United States uniform at a United States base in Saudi Arabia, then let us remove our forces from Saudi Arabia.

Incidentally, I think the importance of that base is greatly overrated. In my opinion, it probably is considered of more importance to certain economic oil interests than it is important to the United States as a blockade against possible aggression by communism.

Neither am I greatly moved by the argument that if we do not participate in the kind of program we have inaugurated in Saudi Arabia, Saudi Arabia might go over to the Communists. I do not believe there is any danger that such a thing will happen; but if it should happen, let me say it would be quite a headache to the Communists. I am not sure that in the long run it would not be to our benefit, rather than to our injury.

In any event, I think we should stand behind our ideals as a Nation. In connection with the policy we are following in Saudi Arabia, we cannot justify sacrificing our ideals.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I agree. Let me say that I think the State Department not only has been extraordinarily timid, but also has been extraordinarily callous as regards human principles in this whole matter.

In testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Labor, of which I was then chairman, an Assistant Secretary of State had the nerve to argue that a convention opposing forced labor would have to be in the form of a treaty submitted to the Senate, and that it would, by implication, expose the administration to the opposition of those who do not wish to have the treaty power used for welfare and humane purposes. Even on the technical point which was raised, I know the Assistant Secretary of State was mistaken, because the charter of the International Labor Organization specifically provides that in Federal countries—this being a Federal country—the signatory nation has one of a number of alternative courses which are perfectly legitimate. Of course, one course is to submit it as a treaty; but that is not required. Another is to submit it to both Houses of Congress, so that both Houses can consider the matter. A third is that if under the Federal system the power in these matters is vested in the constituent states, the matter can be submitted to the states. In other words, the basic charter of the International Labor Organization does not require the submission of such a matter to the Congress in the form of a treaty.

I would not be opposed to having it so submitted to the Congress. I am not afraid to have the United States Congress take a stand against forced labor. I do not believe that the people of the United States are afraid to take a stand against forced labor. As a matter of fact, it is outlawed by the 13th amendment, which abolishes slavery and involuntary servitude in the United States. It is thoroughly in keeping with American policy to prevent slave labor.

The primary practitioners of forced labor are Communist Russia, which has from 15 million to 25 million people in slave-labor camps, and Communist

China, which has approximately 15 million. They are the nations which are practicing slave labor, and they are the nations which should be called to account.

Those countries now have the effrontery to support this international convention. It would be an extraordinary thing if our State Department should put us in a position before the world of opposing a convention on forced labor which will be primarily directed against the Soviet Union and Red China, and permit Red China and Soviet Russia to appear before the world as the defenders of human liberty.

I realize that the problems of the Department of State are many, and that we should be more charitable in judging the actions of the present Secretary of State than our Republican friends were in judging the actions of Mr. Acheson, who was very badly treated by the opposition party.

Nevertheless, I find it difficult either to understand or appreciate the attitude of the State Department and Mr. Dulles in this connection. I think it can only be said that they are afraid of that section of their party which is opposed to international cooperation and to any international agreement which either directly or indirectly could be used to effect humane purposes within this country or other countries. So I quite agree with the attitude taken by the New York Times and other newspapers.

I note the presence in the Chamber at this moment of the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who started this movement in the winter, and who has borne the main burden of the struggle.

Our delegation is now in Geneva. It will shortly be called upon to vote on this question. I very much hope that the State Department will reverse its position and permit the conscience of the country to be felt. I hope it will support this convention, instead of trying to limit the convention to commodities which enter into international trade.

Only an insignificant proportion of the articles upon which forced labor works in Red China and Red Russia enter into international trade. The major portion of forced labor is used on so-called public works in those countries, or upon articles in domestic trade. So the proposal of the State Department is not at all effective. It is a sham and a delusion. They should not be allowed to get away with it, and I hope very much that popular indignation will force them to reverse themselves.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota, to whom the country owes a great deal for arousing the public conscience on this subject.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, let me say to the Senator from Illinois that we are all very grateful to him for holding the hearings which he has held, and for permitting us to make our positions clear relative to the attitude of the State Department; also the position that many groups in this country hold, as to the necessity of an ILO convention which will put the United States squarely on the line in opposition to any type of forced labor.

As the Senator from Illinois has noted in his comment, we were led to believe a few weeks ago that the administration had changed its position from that of objecting to a convention to outlaw or ban slave labor, to that of supporting such a convention. I was led to believe this through statements which I read in the press, through the editorial in the New York Times, and through comments in the Washington Post and Times Herald.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Minnesota took the floor and praised the Secretary of Labor for the part he had played, and commended the administration for reversing its position, and so did the Senator from Illinois. We are always glad to praise the administration when it does well or seems to do so. But in this case in our desire to be fair we were badly deceived.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Again I say to the Senator that the administration's reversal is somewhat apropos of some of its other reversals. We are led to believe by the spoken word, by the inflection, by the adjectives which are used, that there has been a change of heart or a change of policy. This is particularly true whenever the administration speaks through the President or through one of the spokesmen of the administration not directly related to the problem.

In this instance, Secretary of Labor Mitchell spoke in what I thought were clear and unmistakable terms as to the attitude of his Department, the President, and the administration, in support of an ILO convention. But the State Department refused to go along.

I wish to make my position clear. First, the presentation of the State Department is open for anyone to examine. That presentation is flimsy. It is based upon assumptions which are not meritorious. It contains what I call hair-splitting legal arguments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Which are not well founded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Which would not be accepted in a law school as sound legal doctrine. Surely the distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. MORSE], the former dean of a law school, would be able to take the argument of the State Department to pieces, bit by bit, and show its lack of merit.

As the Senator may recall, we argued this question out. I asked for the privilege of returning to the committee at the time the State Department representative was there, following my own testimony. I did so return, and I believe the RECORD will indicate that we made it crystal clear that under the constitution of the ILO we could adopt such a convention without any violation whatsoever of American constitutional procedures. Furthermore, the President has sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations similar conventions which did not call for ratification.

There is no argument except the argument of the unwillingness of the administration to take a principal position. Why? This administration wants to carry water on both shoulders. It wants to be pro-Bricker amendment and anti-Bricker amendment at the same time. That is what it boils down to. The administration wants to be for Executive leadership in foreign policy in some parts of the country, but not really for it in some other parts of the country. It wants to be all things to all people.

The result will be that our country will become the laughing stock of all the other peoples of the world. If the United States cannot go on record against forced labor, what can we go on record for or against?

The next thing the administration will suggest is that we take a halfhearted attitude with respect to Mother's Day and the Fourth of July.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to defend the administration in that connection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Perhaps I should not have said both—one or the other.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the administration will verbally defend American mothers, American homes, and the Fourth of July.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One of the ways to defend both American mothers and the Fourth of July is to go on record for human dignity. Forced labor is the complete denial of human dignity. Here is an administration and a Government supposedly representing the finest traditions and principles of human dignity and freedom. The greatest free labor movement in the world is asking this Government to commit itself, by convention and by document, at least to an expression of an attitude and policy against forced labor. Why do we not do it?

We do not do it because of some clever legal arguments that such a course might not fit into the pattern of American constitutional government, despite the fact that the ILO convention contains a separate article designed expressly for the type of Federal system which the United States Constitution establishes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That article was placed in the ILO constitution by Samuel Gompers at the organization meeting of the ILO in Paris in 1919, to meet the specific case of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

This is but further evidence of what I call the failure of the administration to comprehend the problems which beset the world, the failure of the Government to meet head-on the great challenges in foreign policy, the failure to appreciate the psychological aspects of foreign policy, the failure to understand that this is not only a struggle with guns, but a struggle for men's minds and souls, and the spirits of the people. This is why our foreign-aid bill is in trouble.

The foreign-aid bill is in trouble, despite the pronouncements of the President and his agents, because it tries to be all things to all people. The spokesmen of the administration have talked about foreign aid in the past as if it were a great burden. They have reassured the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in the past that foreign aid would be cut. They have come before the Committee on Foreign Relations and told us that the world is one of peace and joy and plenty and happiness, and that the world

is better and that the whole picture is rosy.

Now they come before Congress and ask us to appropriate $4,900,000,000 for foreign aid. Is it any wonder that the foreign-aid bill is in trouble?

It is in trouble because this administration, from the President to the Secretary of State down, has not spoken frankly and honestly to the American people about the international situation. Many Members of the Senate are sick and tired of being played with, and sick and tired of being misinformed and having misrepresentations given them about these matters.

I have been a loyal supporter of foreign-aid bills, as the Presiding Officer knows and as the Senator from Illinois knows. I have been a supporter even when it meant parting with my political and social friends on the issue. I have voted for every request the administration has made in that field. However, Mr. President, I say that today I have grave doubts about the present bill. I happen to believe that this administration will have to do more than merely issue press releases and call hastily concocted conferences with two or three leaders in the Senate. There are no two or three leaders in the Senate who will deliver this Senator's vote. It is one vote apiece in this Chamber. If the foreign-aid bill is as important as it has been said it is, let the administration consult with all of us. I want to know more about it. I have studied it very carefully, and I have read every document concerning it which has been presented to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I am aware of everything that has taken place in connection with that subject in years gone by.

Mr. President, it is impossible to be all things to all people. This administration has got to make up its mind whether it wants to be popular in the press or responsible in leadership. When it substitutes popularity for leadership, it gets into trouble, and when it substitutes mediocrity for principle, it gets into more trouble. The administration would rather have popularity than leadership, and would rather have mediocrity than principle. That is what they are getting, Mr. President. They will get a mediocre bill when the roll is called, if that is what they are going to do. The House has already passed a mediocre bill, and the administration will probably get another mediocre bill from the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I had not intended to discuss the foreign-aid bill today. I had intended to confine my remarks to the position of our Government on the ILO Convention at Geneva.

However, I may say that the comments of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] force me to define my position more carefully. I, too, have supported the administration in years past. I am very dubious, however, whether I should do so on this occasion.

The reasons for my dubiousness are those cited by the Senator from Minnesota. First, cooperation is a two-way street and not a one-way street. Those of us who have supported the administration in the past not only never received any thanks from the administration for what we did—and of course we never expected that much—but the administration and its party has proceeded to try to defame us in our States. Our very support, in fact, has been used as the basis for a bitter and relentless attack on us by the administration party in our home States.

For the sake of the record I will ask my colleagues to seriously consider this possibility that I am about to suggest. In European parliaments, a member can abstain from voting. In the Senate, if a Member is challenged, he may be required to state his reasons for abstaining.

I shall suggest to my Democratic colleagues that they at least think over the possibility of abstaining from voting on the mutual-security bill, and then let the Senators on the other side see if they can pass it by themselves. It might be very well if we washed our hands of the measure. We know quite well what our fate will be if we do support it. Of course, we are not afraid in these matters, and we are ready to face the consequences, and we are ready to have the administration party defame us and allow their defamation to continue, provided the administration will itself fight for the principles in which it says it believes, and if it will observe the minimum of polite behavior in such matters.

However, when the Secretary of State appears before the Committee on Foreign Relations and makes the statement that everything is fine in the world, and when the President makes a speech saying that our prestige has never been as high as it is today, it naturally raises the question in the minds of Senators and of people generally as to why the appropriation for foreign aid should be increased.

If those statements are correct, the implication is that foreign aid should be reduced. If those statements are not correct, then the administration owes an explanation to the American people, and, in my judgment, an apology and retraction. It is not enough to issue contradictory statements.

Therefore, I hope very much that the administration will consider this matter very carefully and will realize that if it expects cooperation on this side of the aisle, it must extend some cooperation itself. We do not ask for political support, but is it too much to suggest that we should be treated as having pure motives?

I am getting a little sick and tired of being called upon to bail out the administration and then to find that very act of bailing out the administration is being used as a ground for relentless attacks by those who profess to be administration supporters.

Mr. President, I should say, in conclusion, that we do not question the patriotism of the President or of the Secretary of State. I believe the President is just as patriotic as was Harry Truman, and that the present Secretary of State is just as patriotic as was Dean Acheson. One difference is that, whereas the patriotism of President Truman and Dean Acheson was bitterly attacked by certain Members on the other side of the aisle, we on our side of the aisle have been very careful not to question the motives of the President and the Secretary of State. We should continue along that course. We think they are patriotic and well-meaning men, but that they do not understand the principles of bipartisan cooperation on foreign policy, and that they do not realize the importance of holding to moral positions and being consistent in truth telling in their attitude toward the public.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am sorry that I did not come into the Chamber in time to hear all the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Illinois and of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, and the full colloquy which took place.

I was a little amused, however, by the complaint of the Senator from Illinois that there had not been affirmative support on the part of the administration for Senators who voted in favor of certain proposals in the field of foreign policy, which the administration had advocated.

I have been a Member of the Senate for only 11 years. During that time I have supported the Greek-Turkish aid program, the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance, the Marshall plan, and other measures related to our foreign policy, which had been advocated by the then President of the United States, Mr. Truman. I supported those programs dealing with foreign policy not because a Democratic President was advocating them, but because he was my President of the United States and had the responsibility to the American people of making the recommendations. After that rather consistent and full support, in which many other Senators on this side of the aisle joined, I have no recollection of having had any endorsement from Mr. Truman in 1952, when I was running for reelection.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hardly think it is within the realm of party politics, as we know it, that the distinguished Senator from Illinois should put that price upon his support of foreign policy for the benefit of our entire Nation.

I may say that I was a little disappointed, if not shocked, by the Senator's suggestion that an alternative was to have a sitdown strike on the part of a substantial group of Democrats in regard to mutual aid. This is, to be sure, a controversial subject. There are Members on both sides of the aisle who will honestly differ as to the precise course mutual aid should take in dollar figures, or whether, indeed, there should be a mutual-aid bill at all. Such differences have occurred on both sides of the aisle in years past. I think, if the Senator will check the rollcalls, he will find they have occurred on both sides of the aisle. Senators have their rights, responsibilities, and obligations.

As I have stated, I have served in this Chamber for 11 years, and for 6 years previously I served in the California Legislature. I have never cast a vote in order to avoid a difficult rollcall. I think every Senator, obviously, is entitled to vote. Under the Constitution, he is expected to vote, and I do not believe there should occur in the Senate such a thing as a sitdown strike of Senators, who, accordingly, would not be assuming their full obligations and their full responsibilities in whatever action the Senate of the United States might

take on the mutual aid bill, which at least the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff believe is important to the future defense of our country and the preservation of a free world of free men.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it seems to me the remarks of the Senator from California call for clarification on my part.

I may say that, certainly, I do not think it is possible under present American party politics for a member of one party who is supporting the program of a President of another party to receive the active support of the President; but I have been disappointed at the failure of the President to support members of his own party who support his program.

I think however there are certain obligations which the development of the bipartisan foreign policy imposes upon the administration and upon the official party of the administration, if they seek the cooperation of the opposition party. At least, our motives should not be questioned. We should not be labeled as noncooperative or as being obstructionists. We should not be told that if the administration does not get a majority there will be a cold war. It should not be said that we are the war party, as was said in the last election campaign in many States. I have documentary evidence in the form of circulars which claim that the Democratic Party is the war party. There were speeches made saying we were causing the lifeblood of American boys to be shed. We were held up as vampires or veritable werewolves and even worse things were said.

Mr. President, these are untrue charges. They threaten the solidarity of the American Republic. We Democrats love this country as much as do the Senators on the other side of the aisle. We would sacrifice our lives and spill our blood for our country. I think that has been proved. We do not think that when we support the administration in measures which we believe to be correct, we should then be defamed. It has been done.

Let me make it clear that the President himself has not defamed us. I think the President himself is a man of good will. But he has not restrained members of his party who have defamed us.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that, certainly, no such statement has been made by the President of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is aware that no such statement has ever been made or even contemplated by the minority leader, who has consistently pointed out that there is no less devotion to the public service, no less patriotism to our country, among those who sit on the other side of the aisle than there is among those who sit on this side of the aisle. At the time I was majority leader I tried to make it clear that there is only one party of treason in this country, and that is the Communist Party, which constitutes an international conspiracy to destroy the country which we all love and seek to serve.

If we wanted to document the case, I think we would find, perhaps, that there have been irresponsible statements on the part of persons in both parties. I know the Senator regrets it as I regret it, wherever it may occur. I happen to be one of those who believe that we may be in greater danger when the men in the Kremlin smile than when they frown, and we certainly want to create no issues which will fundamentally divide and cause a great cleavage between our people. The Communist program is to divide and conquer, so far as they can successfully do so.

There will be honest debate and differences of opinion on various public issues. I think we can raise those issues and discuss them in the political forum without questioning the motives of any man as to his patriotism or his desire to serve his country and to leave to our children a better land than we ourselves found.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with the remarks which my good friend from California has made. I have never heard him become personal in debate. He has always conducted discussions on a high level. And that is true of a great many members of his party. I think, however, the Democratic Party has taken a great deal of unjustified punishment in regard to its motives within the past 10 years, and these utterances have seldom been restrained by the leaders of the Republican Party. I am not aware that members of our party have made similar charges against the Republican Party. If they have, I certainly regret it and believe they should not have been made.

What I was really trying to say was exactly the point to which the Senator from California finally came, namely, that the issues before the country are so serious that we should not permit a cleavage to develop. The way to build mutual trust is not to undertake to do it at the last minute when a measure is before Congress for action. It is in the day-to-day activities and the day-to-day conduct of our political affairs. I think it is appropriate to call attention to the fact that we Democrats have had our patience sorely tried in connection with these matters. When the administration gets into a difficult position and needs our votes, it asks for them, but, almost immediately afterwards, the drumfire of attack, frequently with poisoned bullets, continues. It is only natural that many of us should resent this.

With regard to the specific point of abstention from voting, I think the RECORD will show that I did not say I would abstain or that I necessarily advised Senators on our side of the aisle to abstain. I suggested it as a possibility to be considered. I do not know how I will vote on the measure. I want to read the testimony.

But I can say that the general behavior of the administration, and of its party toward the Members of our party does not encourage cooperation; it makes cooperation more difficult. In all charity, I think there is room for an improvement in their manners.

That is all I wish to say, Mr. President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely want to add one word to what has been said, since the Senator from California alluded to me. The Senator from California, the minority leader, was not present during my comments. I may say to the Senator that I think, in a sense, he would agree with what I said.

I pointed out that I felt the foreign-aid bill was in difficulty for the following reasons: First, there had been a number of statements made in recent years—during the past 3 years or more—to the effect that the funds provided for foreign aid could be substantially reduced. Furthermore, last year, as I think the RECORD will bear out, there was an indication that the foreign-aid bill for the coming fiscal year would not be more than it was last year, but it was hoped that the amount could be reduced.

I recall the hearings in 1953. I recall that the budget which came up at that time from the previous administration was cut approximately $2 billion. The reduction was heralded as a substantial saving.

I am mindful of the fact that in the present foreign-aid bill there is an increase of about $2 billion, which does not increase our foreign aid one bit, but which merely fills in the pipeline which was being drained dry or was being drained off faster than the replenishment or the refilling could take place. In other words, as we say in my section of the country, the chickens have come home to roost. We have spent a little more than we expected to spend in the past 3 years, and the backlog, the reserve, the inheritance, so to speak, from previous authorizations has begun to run out.

I said, and I repeat, that I feel the administration has had more difficulty with the foreign-aid bill, for one reason—not solely, but for one reason—namely, that Congress and the public have been led to believe that foreign aid would taper off, while responsible person after responsible person has said throughout the years that the struggle with Communist tyranny may last not for 5 years or 10 years or 25 years, but perhaps for 50 years. We do not know.

Furthermore, I think it is somewhat paradoxical that the very time the administration has asked for $4,900,000,000 as a foreign-aid authorization because the world situation demands it, the testimony before not only the Senate committees, but also the committees of the other Chamber and also public statements, indicate that the world situation is much better. I have even heard the Secretary of State say that the reason why the Soviet Union is doing what it is now doing is that we have been so successful in our foreign policy. I hope that is true. But I may suggest that we cannot have it both ways. We cannot say, on the one hand, that everything is much better and that we are winning, and then, on the other hand, indicate that it is necessary to have much more money in order to be able to hold our position.

I look forward to the testimony of men like General Gruenther and Admiral Radford being made public. Admiral Radford said that one of the main weaknesses in our foreign policy was a po-

litical weakness, not a military weakness. I believe the senior Senator from California was present when the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in response to a question, said that the main weakness today, particularly in NATO, as he saw it, was not military, but political. There is no amount of money which will firm up political weakness. That can come only from able political leadership.

I happen to be an active supporter of foreign aid. I have never made any apologies for it. I am perfectly willing to go back to my constituency and justify my votes for extensive foreign-aid commitments.

I must say, in all candor, that I am not particularly impressed with the request for substantial funds for Baghdad Pact countries. I am interested in their caloric intake. I am not certain, based upon my limited knowledge of the Middle East, that many of them can carry the weapons we are about to send them.

I am concerned about the amount of funds we are willing to put into certain parts of Europe, especially the parts of Europe which have shown within recent weeks tendencies toward great affection not only for the West, but also for the Soviet bloc. I must confess that I have not been one who thinks that some of the military shipments to southeast Asia are worth very much more than the shipment of the goods. I have been of the opinion that some of the military shipments to some areas have promoted friendship for rather than served as a deterrent against the Soviets. I have noticed that when we have supplied guns, instead of frightening the Russians, we have frightened the Indians and the Afghans. I have noticed that when we have put weapons into the Middle East, instead of frightening Russians we have frightened the Israelis, the Iraquis, the Saudi Arabians, or the Egyptians. When we have sent weapons into the South Asian countries—and we sent plenty into Indochina—it did not save them.

I favor economic aid for South Vietnam; make no mistake about it. My record bears me out. I am for military assistance for countries struggling for a free existence—countries like Korea, South Vietnam, and Taiwan. But I think the time is well at hand to evaluate the amount of military assistance we shall give and what good it will do. That is my position. I do not think the Senator from California and I basically disagree about it.

I read the statement of the Senator from California on the ticker today of his willingness to restore the substantial cut made by the House of Representatives. I am not for an across the board promiscuous cut, but I do favor a selective analysis of each and every item.

One of the reasons why the bill is in trouble is that we have had contradictory statements from the leadership in the administration.

I can bring to the floor mail from my constituency—and it is an able, intelligent constituency—asking me, "Senator HUMPHREY, are you going to support President Eisenhower in his request for more funds?"

I asked Mr. Hollister, the head of the ICA, "Do you support the use of more United States funds through the United Nations agencies?"

Mr. Hollister said, "No." But Mr. Lodge, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, made a public speech in which he advocated the spending of more money; and apparently he is the administrative spokesman. He is our chief Ambassador to the United Nations.

We were led to believe some months ago by spokesmen for the administration that more and more funds should be put into technical assistance, into what we call straight economic assistance—not defense support, but economic assistance. I submit that in the case of the present foreign-aid bill, which we will debate extensively, more than 80 percent, almost 90 percent, of its total funds are for either direct military assistance or defense support.

These are things which are confusing. That is why there are serious problems confronting Congress. If it is desired to have a foreign-aid bill around which support can be mustered, I think the support will cut across both sides of the aisle. I agree with that. I think if anyone will check the record, he will find that the basic support for the foreign-aid requests of this administration has come from this side of the aisle. It is one thing to vote for foreign aid, but how much is needed? It is like building a house, but putting no furnishings in it. We have basically supported the administration's request for an authorization.

I only wanted to clear my own record on this question, because I think it will be found that when it has finally been decided, the junior Senator from Minnesota will be found, in the main, giving substantial support to a foreign-aid bill which, I hope and trust, will be worthy of this Government; a foreign-aid bill which will not be displeasing to those in responsible leadership.

UNITED STATES DEVELOPMENT OF ATOMIC ELECTRIC POWER

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a full-page advertisement paid for by private electric utility companies appeared in a large number of daily newspapers throughout the United States today. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks the advertisement be printed, together with a list of the newspapers with which at least one advertising agency placed the advertisement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, this partial list of newspapers, in which this full-page advertisement appeared, indicates that the private power companies spent approximately $100,000 today to mislead and misinform the American people on the nuclear power program. I want to demonstrate how cleverly it has been done. A headline over the advertisement reads:

> This is the way nations rate in nuclear reactors built or planned.

Then beneath that headline, in smaller type, and within parentheses, there are these words:

> All types and for all purposes.

Now, for the United States, this advertisement lists 55 reactors completed as of 1956. It lists 35 reactors as "building or planned." It lists for the Soviet Union 6 as completed in 1956, and 11 as built or planned.

I wish to refer to the figures listed for the United States. This is not the first time the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has heard of these so-called power reactors. In testimony before the Joint Committee there appeared Mr. Elmer L. Lindseth, representing the Edison Electric Institute. He testified on May 24. He presented to the committee a list of 89 reactors, either completed, under development, planned or applied for. I notice the advertisement indicates 90 rather than 89. I suppose the sum of 90 is a little more appealing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the list of so-called power reactors which Mr. Lindseth included in his presentation to the committee.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Nuclear reactors in the United States—Completed, under development, planned or applied for

PRESSURIZED WATER REACTORS, WATER-COOLED AND MODERATED

Name	Owned by	Location	Function	Date of operation
Low intensity reactor MTR mockup	AEC	Oak Ridge, Tenn	Research	1950.
Materials testing reactor	do	Arco, Idaho	Testing	1952.
Submarine thermal reactor, mark I	Navy	do	Submarine	1953.
Submarine thermal reactor, mark II	do	*Nautilus*	do	1955.
Shippingport	AEC–Duquesne	Shippingport, Pa	Power	1957.
Westinghouse test reactor	Westinghouse	Blairsville, Pa	Testing	1957.
Engineering test reactor	AEC	Arco, Idaho	do	1957.
Army package power reactor	do	Fort Belvoir, Va	Power	1957.
University of Florida reactor	University of Florida	Gainesville vicinity	Research	1959.
Yankee Atomic Electric Co	Yankee Atomic Electric Co	Rowe, Mass	Power	1960.
Consolidated Edison Co	Consolidated Edison Co	Indian Point, N. Y	do	1960.
Submarine fleet reactor	Navy	Not stated	Submarine	Not stated.
Large ship reactor	AEC	Arco, Idaho	Large ship	Do.
Submarine advanced reactor	do	West Milton, N. Y	Submarine	Do.

Nuclear reactors in the United States—Completed, under development, planned or applied for—Continued

BOILING WATER REACTORS, WATER MODERATED AND COOLED

Name	Owned by	Location	Function	Date of operation
Boiling experimental reactor borax I (destroyed)	AEC-ANL	Arco, Idaho	Experimental	1953.
Boiling experimental reactor borax II (rebuilt as borax III).	do	do	do	1954.
Boiling experimental reactor borax III	do	do	Power prototype	1955.
Experimental boiling water reactor	do	Lamont, Ill	do	1956.
General Electric	General Electric	Livermore-Pleasanton, Calif.	Research-power	1957.
Nuclear power group (dual cycle)	Commonwealth Edison	Morton, Ill	Power	1960.
Elk River	Elk River Rural Electric Cooperative Association	Elk River, Minn	do	1960.

SWIMMING POOL REACTORS, WATER MODERATED AND COOLED

Bulk shielding reactor	AEC-ORNL	Oak Ridge, Tenn	Research	1950.
Convair research reactor	Not stated	Fort Worth, Tex	do	1953.
Tower shielding reactor	AEC-ORNL	Oak Ridge, Tenn	do	Not stated.
Pennsylvania State University	Penn State University	University Park, Pa	do	1955.
University of Michigan	University of Michigan	Ann Arbor, Mich	do	1956.
Naval Research Laboratories	Naval Research Laboratory	Washington, D. C	do	1956.
American Machine & Foundry	American Machine & Foundry	New York City area	do	1956.
Battelle Memorial Institute	Battelle Memorial Institute	Columbus, Ohio	do	1956.
Livermore Laboratory (low power test reactor)	AEC	Livermore, Calif	do	1957.
Oak Ridge research reactor	do	Oak Ridge, Tenn	do	1957.
Omega West	do	Los Alamos, N. Mex	do	Not stated.
Watertown Arsenal	Watertown Arsenal	Watertown, Mass	do	Do.
Washington State	Washington State	Pullman, Wash	do	Do.

HOMOGENEOUS REACTORS

Low power water boiler	AEC	Los Alamos, N. Mex	Research	1944.
High power water boiler	do	do	do	1944.
Super power water boiler	do	do	do	1951.
Homogeneous reactor experiment (dismantled)	do	Oak Ridge, Tenn	do	1952.
Homogeneous test reactor 1 (dismantled)	do	do	Power prototype	1952.
North Carolina State reactor	North Carolina State College	Raleigh, N. C	Research	1953.
Los Alamos power reactor 1	AEC	Los Alamos, N. Mex	Power prototype	1956.
Los Alamos power reactor 2	do	do	do	1956.
Homogeneous test reactor 2	AEC	Oak Ridge, Tenn	do	1956.
Armour Research Foundation	Armour Research Foundation	Chicago, Ill	Research	1956.
Gamma Corp	Gamma	Mansfield, Mass	do	1956.
UCLA Medical	UCLA	UCLA Medical Center	Research and treatment.	1956.
Wolverine	Wolverine Electric Cooperative	Vicinity, Hersey, Mich	Power	1959.
Pennsylvania advanced reactor	Pennsylvania Power & Light Co	Pennsylvania	do	1962.
North American Aviation	Not stated	Downey, Calif	Research	Not stated.

HEAVY WATER REACTORS

Chicago pile 3	AEC	Chicago, Ill	Research	1944.
(Modified to) Chicago pile 3′	do	do	do	1950.
Chicago pile 5	do	Lamont, Ill	do	1953.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	MIT	Cambridge, Mass	Research-medical therapy.	1957–59.
Chugach	Chugach Electric Association	Vicinity, Anchorage, Alaska	Power	1961.
Savannah River (5 reactors)	AEC	Aiken, S. C	Production	Not stated.
Brookhaven Medical	do	Upton, N. Y	Research	Do.

GRAPHITE REACTORS

Chicago pile 1	AEC	Chicago, Ill	First reactor	1942.
(rebuilt as) Chicago pile 2	do	do	Research	1943.
Oak Ridge X-10 area reactor	do	Oak Ridge, Tenn	Isotope production.	1943.
Hanford 305 test reactor	do	Hanford, Wash	Testing	1944.
Hanford (8 reactors)	do	do	Production	1944.
Brookhaven National Laboratory	do	Upton, N. Y	Research	1950.
Thermal test reactor	do	Schenectady, N. Y	do	1951.
Sodium reactor experiment	AEC, NAA	Santa Susanna, Calif	Power prototype	1956.
Nebraska group	Consumers Public Power District	Nebraska	Power	1959.
Holyoke	City of Holyoke, Mass	Vicinity, Holyoke, Mass	do	1960.

LIQUID METAL FUEL REACTORS

Liquid metal fueled reactor	AEC	Brookhaven, N. Y	Research-power	1959.
Orlando	City of Orlando, Fla	Vicinity, Orlando, Fla	Power	1960.

FAST BREEDER REACTORS

Experimental breeder reactor 1	AEC	Arco, Idaho	Research	1951.
Experimental breeder reactor 2	do	do	Power prototype	1959.
Power Reactor Development Co	Power Reactor Development Co	Monroe, Mich	Power	1960.

ORGANIC MODERATED REACTORS

Organic moderated reactor	AEC	Arco, Idaho	Research-power	1957.
Piqua	City of Piqua, Ohio	Vicinity, Piqua, Ohio	Power	1960.

Nuclear reactors in the United States—Completed, under development, planned or applied for—Continued

VARIOUS TYPE REACTORS

Name	Owned by	Location	Function	Date of operation
Los Alamos fast Clementine (dismantled)	AEC	Los Alamos, N. Mex.	Research	1946.
Sodium intermediate reactor mark A	do	West Milton, N. Y.	Land-based prototype submarine.	1955.
Sodium intermediate reactor mark B	do	Submarine *Sea Wolf*	Submarine	Not stated.
Aircraft reactor experiment	Not stated	Not stated	Experimental	Do.

TYPE NOT YET SELECTED

Florida group	Not stated	Tampa Bay area	Power	1962-63.

Nuclear powerplants, investor-owned utilities participation

Organization	Reactor type	Capacity (kilowatts)	Estimated investment by organization (millions)	In operation by	Status as of May 1956
Duquesne Light Co	Pressurized water	100,000	$15	1957	Construction half completed. Reactor due to go critical in summer of 1957.
Consolidated Edison	Pressurized water thorium-uranium converter.	236,000	55	1960	Construction permit issued May 4, 1956. Site procured. Studies, research and engineering underway. Construction scheduled to start in summer of 1956.
Nuclear power group (7 utility companies).	Boiling water	180,000	45	1960	Construction permit issued May 4, 1956. Site procured. Studies, research and engineering underway. Construction scheduled to start in summer of 1956.
Penn Power & Light Co	Homogeneous	150,000	(1)	1962	Announced in July 1955 intention to build homogeneous reactor by 1962. Carrying on various studies, research and development and engineering.
Power Reactor Development Co. (18 utility companies).	Fast breeder	100.000	55	1960	Proposal accepted by AEC as basis for negotiation of contract Aug. 8, 1955. Construction permit applied for Jan. 6, 1956. Studies, research, and engineering underway. Construction tentatively scheduled to start August 1956.
Yankee Atomic Electric Co	Pressurized water	134,000	33.4	(2)	Proposal accepted by AEC as basis for negotiation of contract, Feb. 8, 1956. Site procured. Studies, research and engineering underway. Construction tentatively scheduled to start in spring of 1957.
Florida group (3 utility companies)	Not stated	200,000	50	(3)	Announced in March 1956, intention to build reactor by 1962-63. Carrying on various studies to determine best reactor.
Pacific Gas & Electric	Boiling water	5,000	1.5	1957	Construction permit issued May 15, 1956. Site procured. Studies, research and engineering underway. Construction to start in 1956.
Southern California Edison Co	Sodium graphite	7,500	1	1956	Construction about completed. Due in operation in 1956.
Total		1,112,500	305.2		

[1] Not stated. [2] 1959 or 1960. [3] 1962 or 1963.

Mr. GORE. I should like to call attention to the fact that one of the reactors listed by Mr. Lindseth is the Boiling Experimental Reactor, Borax 1. It is listed as being in Arco, Idaho. As a matter of fact, as the distinguished chairman of the committee well knows, this was a small experimental reactor, which is not there anymore because, as an experiment, it was permitted to be blown up in order to secure additional information. It is listed as one of the 89. It is not in existence at all.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me for a moment?

Mr. GORE. Yes, I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Tennessee is aware, of course, that in this advertisement the question is asked, "Is America behind in the development of atomic-electric power?" And the advertisement says, "The full facts answer 'No.'"

Then the advertisement continues and purports to prove it by listing the number of reactors of all types, as it says. Those reactors may not be designed at all for power. The great majority were not so designed at all.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Tennessee knows, does he not, that one of the reactors listed is a reactor in a submarine, that it has probably the highest operating cost of any reactor one can imagine, and is not in any way designed to generate electric power?

Mr. GORE. Yes; I do.

Mr. ANDERSON. Could not the Senator from Tennessee go through the list and name the reactors one by one, and find that many of them are of exactly the same type?

Mr. GORE. As a matter of fact, I have Mr. Lindseth's testimony, and I read a part of it from page 274 of the hearings. I asked Mr. Lindseth this question:

> Mr. Lindseth, by way of demonstrating whether or not this list of 89 which you have cited is mostly of the test-tube variety, would you be so kind as to point out one single power reactor, except for Shippingport, the nuclear portion of which is financed largely by the Government, and a reactor to produce weapon materials or military propulsion, that has been constructed or on which construction has even started to generate power in as much as 5,000 kilowatts?

There was some colloquy. Mr. Lindseth did not understand the question. Finally, we got down to the answer, which appears on page 275 of the hearings:

> Mr. LINDSETH. To my knowledge, there is no reactor other than a military reactor producing power in the amounts which Senator GORE has limited the question to, 5,000 kilowatts.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Tennessee used the term 5,000 kilowatts. He probably had a reason for so doing. Is the Senator from Tennessee familiar with the fact that a 5,000 kilowatt station has been in operation in Russia since 1954?

Mr. GORE. I am, and I read in the newspapers a few days ago that Mr. Tito had been invited to see it.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Tennessee recalls, does he not, that during the Atoms-for-Peace Conference in Geneva, a general invitation was extended to scientists to see that station?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the Senator from Tennessee recall that some time ago some American scientists went to see that station, and stated that they were impressed by what they had seen?

Mr. GORE. The expression they used was quite complimentary.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

Does the Senator from Tennessee notice that in the list of the nuclear reactors Mr. Lindseth submitted, he included Chicago Pile No. 1, the first reactor in 1942, in which Fermi for the first time got an atomic reaction?

Mr. GORE. Yes. That is one of the 89.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is one of the evidences of how much of a contribution the private power industry is making to this program.

Mr. GORE. That is cited as evidence of how America is getting ahead with this program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Senator from Tennessee believe that Chicago pile No. 1 is in any way connected with the development of a modern powerplant, except that it was the first reactor of its kind?

Mr. GORE. Not at all.

Mr. ANDERSON. I read the advertisement and I noticed the Atomic Energy Commission, which may get some comfort out of the advertisement, gave an award the other day to Dr. John Von Neumann. I think it was a very well deserved award. After the advertisement, I think they should find out who prepared the advertisement and certify him a permanent award and membership in the Loyal Council of Ananias. I must say this is a marvelous piece of work, in which the electric companies can take no pride.

Mr. GORE. And for which the customers of the utilities will have to pay.

Mr. ANDERSON. This will go into the calculations of why their rates need to be sustained.

I should like also to say to the Senator from Tennessee that I asked the newspapers for the list. They said I could have it on request. They did not have it, but they are going to get it for me. I think it would be well to summon before the committee the presidents of the companies, and have them tell us where these 90 reactors are.

Apparently they know some things that some of the rest of us do not know, because certainly we cannot find out where 90 power reactors are being planned; and Chicago Pile No. 1 would scarcely be called a power reactor, it seems to me.

I talked to the president of one of the companies which supposedly was responsible for the advertisement. The president of the company said to me, "I want you to understand that my company had no connection whatever with this." So I am very anxious to learn what companies did have a connection with it, because this is the sort of thing which gets the private electric industry into trouble.

I believe the Senator from Tennessee will concede that by means of the hearing on indemnity insurance which is scheduled for tomorrow, the joint committee is trying hard to help with the development of reactors. We have been trying in every way we can to help the electric industry get off the ground. But this advertisement is the sort of thing that sinks the industry back to earth again.

Mr. GORE. I have joined with the distinguished chairman of the committee in trying to remove the roadblocks and in trying to facilitate the entrance of private industry—whether utilities or otherwise—into the field of nuclear power. As the Senator from New Mexico knows, in hearings held before our committee, there has been presented evidence which caused us deep concern about how the United States was lagging behind in the development of atomic power. But in this $100,000, full-page advertisement, the American people are assured that groups in the United States "have built, or are building or planning" more nuclear reactors than all other nations combined. Does the distinguished chairman of the committee think that the testimony presented at the hearings we held, which have just been completed, justifies this advertisement?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not only do I not believe they justify it, but I think it is a tragic thing that an attempt is made to picture this activity in a way in which it does not deserve to be portrayed.

For example, the "Los Alamos Fast Clementine" reactor is shown in the list. "Clementine" is a nice word; and after listing that project, the word "dismantled" is included. So I suppose the advertising agency which is responsible for the advertisement will rise and will sing "Thou art lost and gone forever, dreadful sorry, Clementine."

Mr. GORE. Of the 55 referred to in the advertisement as completed in 1956, not 1 plant is able to produce electric power in commercial or industrial quantity and of the 35 listed as being built or planned, only 1 is under construction. I ask the chairman of the committee whether my statement is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. As the Senator from Tennessee will remember, when we went into this matter, we found that words became changed around considerably. I think I would say that only one private plant was under construction. However, in order to prove that another was under construction, I could say there was testimony that a small plant was being built in California, to test the theory; and if the small plant worked, it could be said that it would be translated into a big plant somewhere else in the United States. Thus, it could be said that construction of the tiny plant in California was proof that the big plant was under construction. If words can thus be completely twisted around, one might also say that in view of the fact that 50 years ago Einstein presented his theory of relativity, which led to all these developments, therefore it could be said that that plant was under construction 50 years ago.

Mr. GORE. As a matter of fact, if we use the phrase "building or planned," the figure "35" could just as well be 10 times that number.

Mr. ANDERSON. Again I say it is tragic that they did not include with the statement about "building or planned" a statement that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has a bill calling for six reactors. Those responsible for the advertisement certainly should add those six reactors, as called for by the Gore bill, because they are planned.

Mr. GORE. Yes; by all means.

Mr. ANDERSON. Furthermore, Representative COLE, a fine and able man, a Republican from the State of New York, and a most serious and helpful member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, whom I would not criticize for all the world, and whom I do not criticize, asked me whether I would join him in sponsoring a bill for the purpose of seeing whether there was a desire to have a reactor built here in the Capitol, so that all the people, particularly the children of America, as they visit the Capitol, could see a reactor operating and turning a little bit of electric energy into the electric line supplying the Capitol. We introduced that bill. I think it is very discourteous of the advertising agency to ignore the former committee chairman, and the present committee member, who is participating in that venture, which is planned.

The Florida group is also listed. It is dependent on the Brookhaven device. Private industry did not have a thing to do with the Brookhaven experiment. But when that experiment got well along, the Atomic Energy Commission entered into a contract with Babcock and Wilcox to develop further the Brookhaven reactor. If that concept works out as well as the Government hopes it will, then private industry will take it over and use it. As a result, it would seem that private industry now takes credit for that activity by the Government, inasmuch as it is listed among the 90.

That is why I think the man who planned the advertisement is entitled to some sort of special certificate for his imagination.

Mr. GORE. I agree with the Senator from New Mexico. I point out that of the 35 listed as building or planned, one is now under construction to produce electricity in commercial quantities; but it is being constructed, not under the 1954 act, but under the 1946 act. The reactor part of it is being paid for almost exclusively by the Federal Government. This is the shipping port reactor. I also point out that all the other 34 referred to in the advertisement are in the discussion or "talking" stage. I am not sure how definitely they are being talked about or discussed. But the fact is that since the 1954 act became law, not one license has been issued for the construction and operation of an atomic-power reactor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield again to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I only wish to try to point out that some fine things have been done in this country. I hope America does have the lead in nuclear electric power.

Mr. GORE. I hope it will lead.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope it does; I do not say that I think it does or does not. For the purpose of what I wish to say, I only say I hope America always will have the lead.

One of the ways in which I think it may have the lead is the very way by which we have taken the giant steps which already have been taken. The great lead of American technology results from the step Albert Einstein took when he wrote to the President of the United States. I cannot quote his letter exactly, but he said he had been ac-

quainted with the work of Fermi and Szilard—S-z-i-l-a-r-d; and I spell the name because one of the able persons conducting the examination asked, one day, "What is this reference to lizards"? [Laughter.]

Albert Einstein said to President Roosevelt that he had become acquainted with the work of Fermi and Szilard, in manuscript; and that that led him to believe that certain things could be done. So the slender thread of that one letter from that great man to the President of the United States resulted in the beginning of the work. The Chicago pile was built. Many fine scientists participated in the work on that pile. I believe that most of them were connected with educational institutions. The story is told that Compton sent to the president of a great institution a telegram saying "The Italian navigator has reached his destination. The natives were friendly."

From that start, the lead of the United States has been brought about by the Government's sponsoring of the program—not by the private utility companies, as the advertisement would lead one to believe. It has been carried on in the great national laboratories, by Dr. Zinn and his staff at Argonne, and by Dr. Weinberg and his staff at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and by cooperation with such great industrial organizations as Westinghouse, General Electric under Government contracts; and in the case of the *Nautilus*, under the technical guidance of Admiral Rickover.

I think it is too bad if we try to pick up all the reactors which have been constructed by great public-spirited individuals or organizations and say, "This is the magnificent work of the private utility industry of America."

Only a short time ago, Dr. Hafstad left the Atomic Energy Commission, where he was making only a few thousand dollars a year, to move to a position of responsibility, first, with a great bank, and then with a great industrial organization. I am not trying to embarrass him; but the salary he is now receiving is several times the salary he received when he was connected with the Atomic Energy Commission.

The development of these laboratories has been made possible by the dedicated service of men like Zinn, Weinberg, and other individuals, and by the contributions made by a great group of professors scattered across the country in educational institutions. To try to make up a claptrap advertisement in a newspaper, with the idea of persuading the American people that private industry has carried the load all the way and is now prepared to carry it in unprecedented proportions, is ridiculous.

No one that I know anything about is trying to stop the program for reactor development upon which the Atomic Energy Commission has launched. I have commended the able Senator from Tennessee for the fact that he has suggested that we supplement that program by a continuation of the type of Government inspiration and Government operation which has characterized the work at Argonne and Oak Ridge. The private utilities do the progress of atomic energy development severe damage when they allow an advertisement such as this to be prepared, taking to themselves credit for things they have not done, would not do, and could not do.

Mr. GORE. And do not expect to do.

I thank the distinguished and eloquent chairman of the committee.

Let me refer once again to the figures contained in the advertisement. In view of the fact that the Soviet Union was the first to have a 5,000 kilowatt power reactor, as such, and in view of the fact that the Soviet Union was the first to drop from an airplane a hydrogen weapon or device, I wonder just how they made such an accomplishment with only 6 reactors, whereas the United States, according to this advertisement, had 55. Obviously they are using different criteria with respect to the number of reactors within the United States, and with respect to the type and kind of reactors in the Soviet Union.

Let me read another sentence from the advertisement:

> From this basic research—some of which is also being done by America's independent electric companies—the next step is big, full size commercial atomic electric plants.

That is exactly what I have been pleading for—that the next step be a vigorous program of actual construction and operation of full size demonstration atomic electric plants which are prototypes of regular commercial plants.

That is not what is being done. That is what needs to be done.

I read further:

> That step is being taken, too.

Where is that step being taken? I continue to read:

> The electric light and power companies already have seven of these large atomic electric plants on the way or under study.

I repeat—"on the way or under study." What does that term mean?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know why they stop with seven. They could just as well have said 70, because American industry has the Russian plants under study. It has the British plants under study. I talked with Dr. Philip Sporn, of American Gas & Electric, only a day or two ago, and asked him if he was familiar with the Calder-Hall plant. He said, "Yes, I have gone through it." He had it under study. That plant should have been added to the list.

Mr. GORE. By all means.

Mr. ANDERSON. I personally have been at Harwell and have taken a look at the installations there. I had that plant under study. I resent the fact that the utility companies do not pay any attention to my study, but are interested only in the study of the private utility companies.

I point out to the able Senator from Tennessee that I think we should ask American industry to write another advertisement, explaining the terrific advance of the Russians, in view of all the numbers against them. We have 90 on our list, and there are only 7 on theirs. As the Senator from Tennessee pointed out, they have the first commercial plant in operation generating power. It generates 5,000 kilowatts. I mention this only because not long ago I spoke before a group of high energy nuclear physicists, at their international meeting at Rochester. I was at the banquet table. At the session at which I spoke, two notches to my left was Dr. Veksler, the great Russian physicist, and just beyond him Professor McMillan, of the University of California. I believe Professor McMillan was mainly responsible, with Ernest Lawrence and others—I do not undertake to allocate individual credits—for building a six-bev bevatron. However, that night in the discussion they were talking about the great, magnificent one which had already been constructed in Russia, 10-bev accelerator. That 10-bev machine is much larger than anything we have. It is said that we are going to catch up with them by building another larger one at Brookhaven; but when we have it almost finished, the Russians will have brought in one several times bigger than ours will be when it is finished, and they will have it in operation.

The Russians are also building the first atomic-powered surface vessel. I do not believe anyone questions the fact that they have an icebreaker under way and hope to launch it within a year. As the able Senator from Tennessee pointed out a moment ago, they have been able to drop a thermonuclear bomb from an airplane ahead of the time when we dropped ours; and not only that, but they announced to the world when we were going to drop ours. That announcement came as a shock to me. I would like to have been let in on the secret, as I am sure the Senator from Tennessee would have been.

The amazing thing is that the Russians accomplished all this with a ratio of only 17 to 90. My point is that if they are gaining on us that rapidly, it might be well for us to look to our leadership, if we hope to keep it in the days ahead.

Mr. GORE. The Senator suggests that the Joint Committee and the American people would like to have more information. The closing sentence in the advertisement to which I have been referring is as follows:

> Because this is so, reports of progress in atomic electric power will be brought to you from time to time by America's independent electric light and power companies.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. In that particular connection, I hope we shall have a hearing on this subject before the Congress adjourns, because I want the private utility people to bring me up to date. The law provides that the committee shall be currently and fully informed by the Atomic Energy Commission. If the Atomic Energy Commission falls down on the job, I assume private industry can pick up the ball and give it to us.

I had inquired from the people who were receiving these advertisements if they had received the next series of advertisements. I was informed that they had not. I talked with a man in New

York and tried to obtain some advance copies of the advertisements, so that I could be brought up to date by the advertising agency. However, they were not available.

I suggest to the Senator from Tennessee that if we hold a hearing on this subject the private utilities may be a little more cautious in the next advertisement and stay a little closer to the facts. I do not doubt that by counting everything, including dismantled plants and plants which have been forgotten, they can count up to 90; but I will say to the able Senator from Tennessee that, as a member of the joint committee, I went over some of the restricted areas near Los Alamos.

While it is true that the first atomic explosion took place at Alamogordo, hundreds and hundreds of test shots took place on the New Mexico desert long before the big one was shot off. So, if this is going to be the technique to be followed, we will have to go back and find out about all the hundreds of tiny shots that may help develop some theory which may lead finally to the Alamogordo bomb. That is not what we do.

Therefore I think they had better pay some attention, and not talk about some tiny little reactors which have been dismantled and discarded and forgotten, and not try to foist those off on the American people as powerplants which are under way.

Mr. GORE. And as accomplishments of the private utilities.

Mr. ANDERSON. Surely.

Mr. GORE. The able Senator has suggested that we would profit by experience. I want to call to his attention another sentence in this advertisement, and I agree with this sentence:

> Until they provide operating experience, no one will know which types are most useful for further development.

With that I thoroughly agree.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I dislike very much to interrupt the Senator again, but I wish to point out that in the hearings which have just been held, and in which the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has been blessed by the services of Dr. Zinn as a consultant—and he is as able a man as we could have found, and he is a wonderful person—we have learned that possibly—just possibly—the types we are now exploring may not be the ultimate type at all. We have not been exploring the gas-cooled reactor, which may offer the possibility of economical power. We are not fully trying high temperatures. It should be remembered that it is only by high temperatures that high efficiency is obtained in the transfer of heat energy.

All these things have been brought out and pointed out to us in the last few weeks and will shortly be available in the printed report on the Gore bill. I say to the Senator that that statement is true; that we will not know until we try. That is what he and I and other Senators have been trying to say, that we had better have a great many bets, including some bets on the types that are said to be the types which will become commercially feasible and competitive with other types of fuel.

It is all very well to say that we will build the same thing in Shippingport, Pa., that is in the *Nautilus*. However, let us remember that the *Nautilus* type is not commercially feasible as yet. Let us remember also that the current which will be supplied at Shippingport in the first installation is said to be 52 mills. No one is interested in 52-mill power. No one will accuse private industry of trying to stack the deck by having its reactors so expensive that they can prove that atomic power is not commercially feasible. They are tending in the right direction, and they hope to get it down to perhaps 14 mills. However, what is needed is 6- or 8- or 10-mill power.

We have been proposing—the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and other Senators—that an effort be made to find out if there are not other types of reactors which will produce current, so that we can get it down into that area.

It is only by testing some of these second guesses and some of the other bets, as well as what looked promising in the first test, that that can be accomplished. I am sure that the Senator agrees with the statement that that is what we have been trying to accomplish.

Mr. GORE. I agree thoroughly. I wish to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the type of reactor which he indicates is not being undertaken in this country—the gas-cooled reactor—is being developed by both Great Britain and Russia, and that a reactor of that type was designed in this country as early as 1946.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure the Senator from Tennessee has stated the fact correctly. The British plants which are going to be used as dual purpose reactors are using gas cooling. What their final types will be, I do not know. The Russians are starting to build a gas-cooled reactor. It seems only proper that the country which is supposed to have the leadership in this field should try one.

I call attention to the fact that probably as early as 1944 it was expected that a gas-cooled reactor would be built in this country. We went so far as to let a contract to the Monsanto Chemical Co. for the construction of it, and $3 million was set aside for it. I am not going to try to find out how it got stopped. Certainly by now, 12 years later, it might be safe to go ahead with it a little bit.

Mr. GORE. The fact remains that there are experienced and competent technical personnel in the Atomic Energy Commission who want to develop this kind of reactor, and who want to see it developed.

However, the fact also remains, Mr. President, that under the 1954 act, the Atomic Energy Commission is powerless to bring about the development of a large-scale reactor using this approach unless some private concern comes forward and volunteers to build one. The Commission apparently can only react to proposals submitted to it. The Commission has had made to it, under the 1954 act, proposals involving some reactor designs.

There are other, perhaps more promising designs, on which no proposal has been made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say that I am greatly interested in what the Senator from Tennessee has said and what the Senator from New Mexico has said. It has been a very enlightening discussion. I have only a very limited knowledge of this great program. It is not my privilege to serve on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I wish to commend again the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from New Mexico. I read the Senator's statement before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and I wrote him a letter about it. I read every word of it. In fact, I briefed it. It was almost an article for an encyclopedia in its soundness and breadth and scope.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator may have noticed that I motioned to one of the staff members to come over so that I could talk with him for a moment. I heard the Senator say that the 1954 Atomic Energy Act does not permit the Atomic Energy Commission to initiate this type of reactor the Senator was discussing—the gas-cooled reactor, I believe he called it.

Mr. GORE. The law does not permit the Commission to initiate construction of any type of reactor of commercial size.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of a commercial size. I recall that the amendment offered by the former Senator from Colorado, now the able and distinguished Governor of Colorado, Mr. Johnson—and I was keenly interested in that amendment and voted for it—authorized the Commission to undertake these power developments. At least I thought that was the case.

I have been informed just now that the amendment was so modified in conference as to remove its very spirit. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee whether the prohibition to which the Senator refers is a matter of policy established by the present Commission.

Mr. GORE. The 1954 act does not authorize the making of an appropriation for the construction by the Government of a reactor to generate electricity in commercial or industrial quantities.

To that extent the Commission's hands are tied. To that extent private enterprise has a monopoly on the use of this natural resource, atomic energy, for the generation of electricity in commercial quantities. It so happens that utility companies are the only segment of private industry to submit such proposals. I do not say this in criticism of private industry. I do criticize the utilities which have attempted to mislead the American people on the stage of development of atomic power in the United States. I do not criticize them for being cautious and reluctant to enter this very risky field. Under the 1954 act, we are

relying solely upon the profit motive for the actual development and operation of large-scale atomic powerplants. The profit motive is not very effective, because the economic barrier to competitive electricity has not yet been broken.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand the Senator's point and I think it is a very valid one.

I wish to conclude my comment by saying that I think the whole country is deeply indebted to the Senator and his associates on the committee, particularly the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], whom I have heard speak on this subject from time to time. But the Senator from Tennessee has a record of great service. He has pointed out some inaccuracies in the advertisement to which he has directed his remarks. That, in itself, is a great service. But I think the important service is to try to keep the record straight in our relative position in research into the uses of atomic energy.

If I correctly understand the Senator's point, it is that today the Commission has its hands tied in terms of the broad experimentation which may be necessary to find the most economical and feasible source for electric energy. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. Insofar as the actual construction and operation of large-scale powerplants are concerned.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand. And the Senator is apparently of the opinion that unless we construct such a plant we cannot really ascertain whether it is economically feasible to have atomic-energy-developed electric energy.

Mr. GORE. I so say, and so does the advertisement. So does the Atomic Energy Commission. So do all the technicians who have spoken, so far as I am informed, upon this subject. It is in doing that we learn. It is in the actual construction and operation of the first reactor, the second generation, and the third generation of reactors, which use and benefit by the experience of the previous ones that we will acquire the necessary skill and will break the bottlenecks leading to economical atomic power. I want to see our country do it, and do it first.

One of the serious deficiencies of the present program and of the present law is that the Atomic Energy Commission itself, the United States Government, by the law is prevented from taking the initiative. It must respond to propositions which some private concern makes to it. I hope private concerns will offer more propositions, that they will move in more vigorously. I want to invite them in. I want to remove some obstacles, and I hope the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will report a bill tomorrow to have the Government assume a large share of the insurance risk on these reactors. I want to bring the American private-enterprise system into this program with widespread participation. What is the way to do it? It is to demonstrate the feasibility and the practicality of atomic power.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly feel that the Senator is correct. I recall the remarks to which I alluded earlier when he emphasized the very point he is now reiterating so succinctly and so positively. It seems to me a shame, after the people have contributed billions of dollars, that there should be such a lag at this particular moment. I cannot help being mindful of the kind of law we might have had in 1954 had the bill not been amended in the Senate. The bill which came from the committee at that time was very disappointing to me; and I think the Senator from Tennessee recalls his very vigorous participation in the debate.

Mr. GORE. Yes, I do. I had a few sleepless nights.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to ask the Senator one final question, to see if he can give us a little enlightenment on it. I understand that the OEEC has made a report relating to the European countries' plan of organization and development of reactors for electric power. Does the Senator have any information he can give the Senate on that point? I know the Senator showed me the report an hour or so ago, and I thought maybe he might want to refer to it.

Mr. GORE. I have that report in hand. It was released only last Tuesday, June 5. Before reading from it I wish to point out to the Senator a matter which may prove of some interest to him and perhaps to other persons. The United States representative to the OEEC, which is the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, is a gentleman by the name of Walker L. Cisler, who happens also to be president of the Power Reactor Development Corporation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is that a public or a private corporation?

Mr. GORE. That is a private corporation in which there are involved a number of concerns, but of which Mr. Cisler's corporation is the principal leader and of which he is president. He is also President of the Detroit-Edison Company.

Incidentally, I understand that some of the OEEC representatives are in Washington at this time.

The reactor development program in Western Europe, I point out to the Senator, from Minnesota who is a distinguished member of the Foreign Relations Committee, is at a critical stage.

Mr. President, it is now 7:47 p. m., and I do not expect to talk very much longer, but I think I shall have something more to say, perhaps tomorrow or the next day, on the importance of reactor development in Western Europe.

I wish to read only a few sentences now from the OEEC report to which I referred:

> Without including the immense amounts which are being and will be spent on research and experimental plant, we can estimate the OEEC area investment in nuclear powerplants for 1955–75 at $11,000 million, to which should be added $500 million for the erection of plant to mine, prepare, process, and regenerate nuclear fuels, giving a total estimate of $11,500 million.

I ask the Senator if that statement does not have significance in this country. Western Europe is an area of short energy supply. Western Europe has exploited much of its coal deposits. It is dependent upon the Middle East for oil. This study shows that within the next few years the gap between supply and demand, the gap between a reliable supply of coal, oil, and gas, all normal fuels, and the requirement for fuel, is very great.

One question is, to what country will Western Europe turn to supply this demand for $11 billion worth of reactors and reactor fuel? Will the United States furnish it, or will the Soviet Union furnish it?

I shall submit the report to the able Senator, and shall make some further remarks about it later. I suggest that this is a matter of the gravest importance, not only economically here at home, but economically abroad, and in international affairs.

I read in today's issue of the New York Times that a broadcast from the Soviet Union only yesterday pilloried the United States for having dropped the first atom bomb. The newspaper article was a United Press dispatch from Tokyo. The broadcast was heard there by the Japanese people and other Asiatic peoples. It was upon the Japanese people that that bomb was dropped.

I do not join in the criticism of the United States for having done so, but I say that we bear that responsibility in world opinion. I think it places upon us a moral obligation to maintain America's leadership in bringing the benefits of the peacetime uses of atomic energy not only to the people of the United States, but to the people of the world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope the Senator from Tennessee on another day will bring to the attention of this body more of the facts in the report on European cooperation for the development of atomic energy.

As I understand, with the great power needs in Western Europe, with an expanding European industry, and with Europe facing a shortage of coal, oil, gas, and other fuels, Western European countries are pushing hard for the development of nuclear reactors.

As the Senator has said—and I think he has put his finger upon a very important economic development, and, I may say, a very important, significant political development—if the Western European countries are to import reactors, so to speak, if they are to get them from other areas, it will be from either the United States or the Soviet Union.

At the present time, from what I have heard in the discussion and from what I have read in the newspapers, and particularly from what I have read in the statements of members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Soviet Union is making considerable advancement and progress in the development of nuclear reactors. Therefore, she may very well be in a position to deliver a

variety of reactors which are economically feasible, or feasible for the economic production of electrical energy. If Soviet Russia can deliver such reactors to, let us say, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, the Scandinavian countries, and other countries, she will then have moved into a very sensitive area of the Western European economy, because she will be able to follow that effort by a type of political control.

We have known, for example, that the fuel oil which comes from the Middle East, much of which has been under British and French control for years, has given Great Britain and France considerable influence in Western Europe. The Soviet Union today is in the stage where she can threaten the free flow of that oil and literally choke it off, unless we are willing to engage in hostilities to prevent it. If the Soviet Union can wield such a threat on the supply of oil and at the same time can develop her reactors, which will be available for sale in Western European countries to meet the power gap——

Mr. GORE. And also if she can make available the necessary fuel.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And also the necessary fuel, yes, which goes with those reactors, Russia will be in a very enviable position.

So we are not simply talking about a small peacetime enterprise, and whether or not we ought to have more reactors so that we can do business; we are also talking high policy, national security policy, international policy, political policy. We are talking about a policy which has primarily economic implications.

I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee agrees with that general analysis.

Mr. GORE. I think the point is most important. The evidence available to the joint committee indicates that the United States is falling woefully behind the Soviet Union in the actual development, construction, and operation of large-scale power reactors.

I say to the Senator that the bottlenecks may not be broken by a small laboratory reactor; they may not be broken by a pilot plant; but they may be broken by a large-scale prototype reactor.

Furthermore, the secret of the release of the vast amount of economic power which is surely soon to come will likely not be solved by relying upon development of reactors of any one particular design. All must be explored.

The junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is chairman of the joint committee, referred to one type of reactor which is not being developed in this country as a large-scale plant. There are many more. For instance, I can name two offhand. We are not building a power reactor to utilize the experience of the big reactors at Savannah River. We are not developing a reactor to utilize the experience of the reactors at Hanford, Wash.

We need to move vigorously on this program. It is through governmental leadership and through cooperation between the Government and industry that we can do so. It is only through that process that we can do so.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times of June 13, 1956]

HOW AMERICA WILL KEEP ITS LEAD IN ATOMIC ELECTRIC POWER

This is the way nations rate in nuclear reactors built or planned (all types and for all purposes):

Completed as of 1956:	
United States	55
Great Britain	7
Russia	6
All others	10
Building or planned:	
United States	35
Great Britain	23
Russia	11
All others	14

In the past few months, the question has been raised, "Is America behind in the development of atomic-electric power?" The full facts answer "No." And America's electric light and power industry, in full cooperation with other organizations in this country engaged in atomic research and development, will do its part to make sure the answer remains "No."

At the present time, for instance, the Atomic Energy Commission, the electric companies, and various other organizations have built, or are building or planning, more nuclear reactors than all other nations combined. More in number and scope—90, representing many reactor designs. And more promising for the future—for every reactor today is largely experimental, built to provide research in and knowledge of a whole new science and a new technology.

ELECTRICITY FROM THE ATOM

Much of this research and knowledge has a direct bearing on one of the atom's greatest promises, the production of electric power. Far more experimentation will be required to prove which of the many types of reactors are most efficient, most workable and most economical. But we are well on the way to finding out.

Foremost in this experimentation is the basic and comprehensive reactor research program led and carried on by the Atomic Energy Commission. This research puts theories to the test, discovers how to design and build various types of reactors, uncovers basic problems and possibilities, and provides the vital first tries that are necessary before larger and better reactors can be designed and built. Already, these tests are separating the most promising from the least.

THE NEXT STEP

From this basic research—some of which is also being done by America's independent electric companies—the next step is big, full-size commercial atomic-electric plants. That step is being taken, too. The electric light and power companies already have seven of these large atomic-electric plants on the way or under study. They, too, are experimental as far as their reactors go—for they include a number of different kinds of reactors and various designs. Until they provide operating experience, no one will know which types are most useful for further development.

The problem of producing electricity from the atom was solved long ago. But so long as we have adequate supplies of coal, oil, and gas that can produce low-price electricity, it would be wasteful for America to build large numbers of atomic-electric powerplants which could produce electricity only at high cost. Our objective should be economy and efficiency in reactor design and construction, without passing up any promising designs in our search. Progress toward this objective is being made.

ELECTRIC COMPANIES BUILD

More than $300 million from individual investors is involved in the planning and construction of atomic-electric plants and related research. A total of 44 electric companies is participating in building these reactor plants. In so doing, they are drawing on their industry's 75-year experience in producing electricity from other fuels.

To speed this program still further, America's independent, electric companies are forming a special task force on atomic-electric reactors. The function and nature of this new group is described in the box below.

STILL IN TESTING STAGE

Because the United States today has plenty of electric power and plenty of conventional fuels, the wise program is to test many reactors, types, and designs and select the best. It will help assure our continuing lead in atomic development over countries which are building atomic-electric plants with today's limited knowledge because they so desperately need electricity at any price.

Information like this about our Nation's atomic-electric power program is important to you and others interested in the welfare of their country. It is important to you as a citizen and as an electric customer. Because this is so, reports of progress in atomic-electric power will be brought to you from time to time by America's independent electric light and power companies.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Atomic-electric power is in its infancy. So varied are its possibilities that special measures must be taken to see that none of the atom's promises will be overlooked.

To make sure of this, America's electric light and power companies are forming a technical appraisal task force to evaluate and stimulate research, development, and construction that will advance the promise of economical and practical electric power. This task force will be composed of some of the Nation's leading nuclear engineers and scientists, as well as leaders in the electric industry.

The findings of this task force, as well as all other experience and knowledge of America's power companies in the field of nuclear reactors, will be shared wtih any group dedicated to the objective of maintaining American leadership in atomic-electric power.

EXHIBIT 2

New York Times.
New York Herald Tribune.
Washington Post and Times Herald.
The Evening Star.
Cleveland Plain Dealer.
Detroit News.
Detroit Free Press.
Chicago Tribune.
St. Louis Globe Democrat.
St. Louis Post Dispatch.
Minneapolis Star.
Minneapolis Tribune.
St. Paul Dispatch.
St. Paul Pioneer Press.
Denver Post.
Christian Science Monitor.
Wall Street Journal.
San Francisco Examiner.
Oakland Tribune.
Los Angeles Times.
Boston Herald.
Boston Traveler.
New Orleans Times Picayune.
New Orleans States.
Dallas News.
Atlanta Constitution.
Atlanta Journal.
Des Moines Register.
Des Moines Tribune
Seattle Times.
Kansas City Times.
Kansas City Star.
Philadelphia Bulletin.
Philadelphia Inquirer.
Portland Oregonian.
Pittsburgh Press.

APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR BRICKER AS MEMBER OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SENATE RECEPTION ROOM, VICE SENATOR MILLIKIN, RESIGNED

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Before recognizing the Senator from Tennessee, the Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce the appointment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] as a member of the Special Committee on the Senate Reception Room, created by Senate Resolution 145, 84th Congress, in the place of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], resigned.

RECESS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order heretofore entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, June 14, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 13 (legislative day of June 11), 1956.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Victor R. Hansen, of California, to be Assistant Attorney General, vice Stanley N. Barnes, resigned.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

Edward J. Worrel, Jr.
Charles W. Miller

The following-named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

Stanley L. Smith
John A. Weber
William H. Campbell

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W–2, in the United States Coast Guard:

Carl D. Stange	Finis L. McClanahan
Donat Cotnoir	Robert F. Konrad
Bampton L. Jones	Cornelius A. Johnson
Eugene Newsome	Palmer F. Guarente
Wayne W. Fish	Philip J. Crawley
Peter P. Zilkan	Frederick M. Rummel
Alvin R. Rutz	Joseph A. DelTorto
Elbert S. Hendrix	Raymond R. Thiele
Raymond C. Buday	Earl H. McDonald
Edward C. Zachowski	Robert L. Roberts
Boyd M. Smith	James B. Hunnings
Kenneth M. Lumsden	Wilbur T. Hutchinson
Elmer L. Alban	Charles J. Albanese
George D. Miller, Jr.	William R. Bentler
Frederick D. Mann	Charter D. Edwards
James W. Berry	Harry H. Stimpson, Jr.
James I. Pledger, Jr.	Edison Jones
William F. Brock	Beverly E. Locke
Doily Fulcher	Claude W. Jenkins
Merle S. Wilson	

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

I. FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be medical directors

Russell O. Settle	Curtis G. Southard
Waldron M. Sennott	Hugh B. Cottrell
Dorland J. Davis	Louis Jacobs
Albert L. Chapman	Carl L. Larson
James K. Shafer	Max M. Van Sandt

To be senior surgeon

Eli M. Lippman

To be surgeons

William J. Zukel	William H. Sage III
Carl F. Essig, Jr.	Charles A. Jarvis
Simon P. Abrahams	Charles H. Lithgow
Virgil B. Polley	John M. Bishop, Jr.
Jarvis E. Seegmiller	Robert H. Aronstam
John S. Shuttleworth	James W. Osberg, Jr.
DeArmond Moore	Robert L. Brutsche
Richmond T. Prehn	James R. Lewis
Harry S. Wise	Carl F. Mattern
Paul M. Duffy	Clifford H. Cole
John V. Osborne	Harvey A. Itano
John H. Waite	Daniel J. Tenenberg
Thos. J. Kennedy, Jr.	C. F. Sparger
Victor E. Archer	Ernest Cotlove
Charles J. Buhrow	Douglas H. Crockett
Ernest G. Hanowell	

To be senior assistant surgeons

Allen C. Pirkle	John R. Moran
John F. Lee, Jr.	James D. Tovey
Jack Durell	John W. Glotfelty
Don E. Leuzinger	William K. Carlile

To be dental director

Herbert A. Spencer

To be dental surgeons

Alfred Popper	Quentin M. Smith
John W. Heck	Reuben L. Turner

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

L. Charles Larsen	George J. Yocum
Charles H. Davis	Leonard R. Iverson
George E. Garrington	

To be sanitary engineer director

Glen J. Hopkins

To be senior sanitary engineers

Frederick K. Erickson	Joseph H. Coffey
Paul C. Henderson	Frederick Aldridge
Ernest P. Dubuque	E. Carl Warkentin
Harry Stierli	John H. Ludwig
John R. Thoman	Harvey F. Ludwig
Frank A. Butrico	Harry W. Poston
Bernard B. Berger	Donald J. Schliessmann
Louis F. Warrick	James H. Crawford
Ray Raneri	Samuel R. Weibel
O. John Schmidt	Curtis E. Richey
Kenneth C. Lauster	Gerald Dyksterhouse
Joseph A. Boyer	
Ross W. Buck	

To be sanitary engineers

William B. Page
Ernest C. Tsivoglou

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

Jerrold M. Michael

To be senior pharmacists

Ernest J. Simnacher
Carmen A. Carrato
Boyd W. Stephenson

To be pharmacists

Milton W. Skolaut
Frank E. Dondero
Allen J. Brands

To be senior assistant pharmacists

Albert B. Ripley	Joseph N. Salvino
Mario C. Baratta	Bertram J. Baughman

To be scientist director

John T. Tripp

To be senior scientists

Francis M. Middleton
Richard P. Dow
Simon Kinsman

To be senior assistant scientist

Virgil R. Carlson

To be senior sanitarian

Daniel E. O'Keefe

To be sanitarians

Charles E. Gerhardt
Samuel M. Rogers

To be senior veterinarian

Robert D. Courter

To be nurse director

Florence H. Callahan

To be senior nurse officers

Elizabeth H. Boeker	Gladys C. Guydes
Marjorie W. Spaulding	M. Lois Power
Catherine M. Sullivan	M. Dolores Jones
Margaret E. Willhoit	Anne H. MacNeill

To be nurse officers

Genevieve T. Piette	Faye G. Abdellah
Florence J. Ullman	Elizabeth J. Haglund
Elizabeth Kuhlman	

To be senior dietitian

Engla J. Anderson

To be dietitian

Susanne C. Van Leuzen

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of section 415 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate them to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general while so serving:

Maj. Gen. Ray A. Robinson, United States Marine Corps.

Maj. Gen. Merrill B. Twining, United States Marine Corps.

The following-named officers, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the grade of lieutenant general:

Lt. Gen. Alfred H. Noble, United States Marine Corps.

Lt. Gen. William O. Brice, United States Marine Corps.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of colonel:

Daniel C. Pollock	Maurice W. Fletcher
Monfurd K. Peyton	Albert F. Lucas III
Ralph A. Collins, Jr.	Donald M. Schmuck
Edward N. Rydalch	John P. Leonard, Jr.
Raymond G. Davis	Andrew G. Smith, Jr.
Ransom M. Wood	Raymond L. Dean
Walter S. Osipoff	Alfred H. Marks
Jess P. Ferrill, Jr.	Everette H. Vaughan
Guy H. Kissinger, Jr.	Randolph C. Berkeley, Jr.
Edward H. Hurst	Jackson B. Butterfield
Donn J. Robertson	Robert A. Harvey
William M. Frash	John F. Carey
Elmer A. Wrenn	John A. McAlister
Thomas L. Ridge	Hamilton Lawrence
Byron V. Leary	Rex R. Stillwell
Merrill M. Day	Norman H. Jungers
Lowell E. English	Richard E. Figley
Robert F. Steidtmann	Gordon D. Gayle
Alvin S. Sanders	James D. McBrayer, Jr.
James C. Magee, Jr.	Jack Hawkins
Albert J. Roose	William A. Stiles
Rodney M. Handley	Edwin C. Aiken
Harold C. Boehm	Russell Duncan
Robert C. Hiatt	Richard M. Huizenga
John H. McMillan	William A. Cloman, Jr.
Charles W. McCoy	
John W. Burkhardt	

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel:

Truman K. Lyford	Anthony A. Akstin
James B. Carpenter, Jr.	Kenneth L. Reusser
Joseph A. Bruder	Paul M. Smith
Irving B. Hayes	Whitman S. Bartley
Warren E. Whipple	Bruce E. Keith
Glenn E. Norris	Robert S. Anderson
John P. Lanigan	James C. Short
Bernard McShane	Maurice H. Clarke
Robert H. Hammond	Robert A. McCabe
John E. Shepherd, Jr.	Roscoe E. Cole
Charles H. Horn	Cecil D. Ferguson
Leslie A. Gilson, Jr.	William R. Ourand, Jr.
Frederic F. Draper	Richard J. Morrisey
	Harold Wallace

Jack R. Munday
Frank C. Thomas
John W. Zuber
Donald V. Anderson
Donald T. Rohrabacher
Howard M. Lee
Thomas H. Rogers, Jr.
George H. Hazel
Henry W. Hise
Jules M. Rouse
Fritz Stampfli
Herbert Gomes
George J. Brookes, Jr.
Richard L. Braun
Griffith B. Doyle
Robert E. Johnson
Gordon L. Allen
John S. Reamy
Alfred A. Tillmann
Dorian J. Wright
Jack R. Edwards
Edward C. Thoemmes
Bolish J. Kozak
Alton P. Trapnell
William E. Baird
John H. Biumenstein
Francis P. Dayton
James S. Williams
Lyle E. Buck
Robert S. Hudson
Howard W. Bollmann
Alexander M. Hearn
Dan H. Johnson
William H. Costello
Norman O'Bryan
Alton W. McCully
James R. Dyer
Wilbur F. Evans, Jr.
Leslie J. Parnell
Philip T. Kujovsky
Clarence T. Risher, Jr.
J. E. Estes
Joseph L. Abel
Kenneth B. Boyd
Edward H. Voorhees
Richard E. Sullivan
Virgil T. Wills
Frank W. Harrington
Dave E. Severance
Harold E. Nelson
Frederick Simpson
Don P. Wyckoff
Sanford B. Hunt, Jr.
Thomas S. Witherspoon
John R. Stone
Douglas E. Haberlie
Joseph L. Atkins
Robert Hall
Roy H. Elrod
William H. Rankin
John S. Chambers, Jr.
Charles J. Keen
John D. Lines, Jr.
Gilbert Percy
Thomas H. Hughes, Jr.
Eugene G. McIntyre
Albert L. Clark
Gerard M. Shuchter
Edwin E. Shifflett
Paul H. Kellogg
James H. Phillips
James A. Crotinger
Paul L. Pankhurst
Lynn E. Midkiff
Norman S. Chase
Judson C. Richardson, Jr.
Richard Hey, Jr.
George P. Blackburn, Jr.
Ben L. Hoover
Edwin H. Simmons
David W. Bridges
George W. Carrington, Jr.
Thomas M. Fields
Richard H. Jeschke, Jr.
John P. McNeil
Ralph J. Parker, Jr.
Arthur M. Hale
Robert A. Scherr
Grover C. Williams, Jr.
John A. Hood
William V. Schwebke
Steve J. Cibik
James L. Jones
Warren H. Keck
James P. Treadwell
Robert E. Lorigan
Donald V. Nahrgang
Roy H. Thompson
Robert S. Wilson
John Marston, Jr.
Eugene J. Robinson
Dennis P. Casey
Robert L. Rathbun
Thomas J. Cushman, Jr.
Louis V. Brooks
John J. Windsor
Earl N. Lewis
Thomas M. Forsyth, Jr.
Willis L. Fairbanks
Robert F. Stinkraus
John Skinner, Jr.
Clement J. Stadler
Elswin P. Dunn
Walter W. Turner
William D. Armstrong
George M. Warnke
Wesley R. Christie
Charles H. Le Claire
George W. Ellis
Fred E. Haynes, Jr.
William L. Bates, Jr.
Robert M. Calland
Albert Hartman
Robert B. Carney, Jr.
James F. McClanahan
Frank Johnson
Merwin H. Silverthorn, Jr.
William L. Dick
Joseph E. Fogg
Beldon Lidyard
Michael J. Sisul
Albert H. Keith
Irvin H. Elrod
Walter H. Eastham
Raymond F. Gotko
George Jones
William A. Searight
Richard P. Brezinski
Theodore R. Cathey
James W. Eldridge

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of major:

John A. Ritchie
Richard J. Collins
Edwin H. Lathrop
Daniel R. Kingsley
Albert H. Risner
Richard E. Moody
Thomas B. Sparkman
William M. Sigler, Jr.
Walter B. Patton
Bevan G. Cass
Thomas F. McGraw, Jr.
Albert C. Schoner
Dwight E. Mayo
Robert W. Hohl
Richard J. Schriver
Edward Shamis
Robert B. Clay
John W. Walker
John E. Shields
Cecil E. Robbins
Roscoe R. St. John
David G. Swinford
William J. Longfellow
Richard A. Bauer
Norman G. Ewers
Roger A. Morris
Harold O. Jones
Randolph J. Ewan
Raymond M. Smith
Edward S. Lambert
Clarence E. Leonard
Joseph W. Clune
Oliver R. Davis
John P. Kelley
John T. Moore
Donald E. Whitfield
Harry L. Foust
Julius R. Rose
William Shanks, Jr.
Dean W. Lindley
Henry F. Brandon
George J. King
Willmar M. Bledsoe
Laurence H. Woods
Richard H. Kern
Norris D. Allen
Harold R. Reed, Jr.
Hardy V. Huffstutter, Jr.
William C. McGraw, Jr.
Dee E. Ezell
Edward P. Stamford
James S. Ashman
Charles J. O'Malley
Lewis L. Miller
Eugene N. James
Merrill F. Suter
Robert M. Fraser, Jr.
Rex C. Denny, Jr.
Arthur E. Phillips
Clyde R. Jarrett
Collin H. Rushfeldt
John J. Hilburn, Jr.
Rockwell M. Rutledge
Bernadin J. Daigle
Eugene V. Goldston
John J. Filippo
Frederic T. Watts, Jr.
Norman W. Flinn, Jr.
Robert R. Klingman
Edward N. Le Faivre
William C. Parker, Jr.
Gordon R. Reier
John J. Danner
Austin C. Fitzgerald
William H. Drewitz
Harold L. Sharkey
William I. Armagost
Robert E. McCann
Amil K. Clark
Robert G. Williams
James A. Hoey, Jr.
Robert A. McMullen
John A. Hughes
Harold W. Adams
Franklin F. Ramseur, Jr.
Neil E. Barber
Mercer R. Smith
Donald J. Hallameyer
Marvin A. Skeath, Jr.
John S. Perrin
George E. Chamberlin, Jr.
Philip J. Keleher
Richard S. Togerson
George E. Petro
Samuel F. Martin
Gilbert A. Barrett
Darwin B. Pond, Jr.
John W. Ruhsam
Samuel E. Helm, Jr.
Joseph T. Murphy
Emidio Briganti
John McCabe
Walter J. Klimek
Charles R. Leutz, Jr.
Allen R. Semb
John F. Sutkus
Raymond H. Schanamann
Kenneth T. Dykes
Lloyd J. Parsons
Emery E. Nelson
W. C. Hall
Roy J. Leite, Jr.
Edgar P. Holt
Robert Dobbins, Jr.
Alfred F. McCaleb, Jr.
Thomas H. Horn
Walter C. Stewart, Jr.
Ernest W. Payne
Paul Schmuck, Jr.
John H. Thomas
Goodwin C. Groff
James W. Bateman
William R. Gould
Norman C. Wiley
Arthur O. Schmagel
Leroy A. Seipp
John W. Sullivan
Richard A. Winters, Jr.
Charles H. Coppedge
Byron Graham, Jr.
Robert F. Marr
Edward D. Smith
Harrel K. Jobe
Edwin Pendrey
George S. Mansfield
William J. Halligan
Russell Swanson
Richard A. Ward
Charles A. Salser
Albert Fowler
Ronald H. Gemmell
Stone W. Quillian
Charles F. Dizney
Harold W. Hawkins
Grady W. Ray
Nicholas J. Dennis
Donald E. Francke
Charles H. Gould
Lynn F. Williams
Harry B. Hanson
Kenneth E. Huntington
Roland S. Helstrom
George H. Albers
Norman R. Reichwald
William A. Danckaert
Elmer Amundson
Robert E. Gilmour
Donald Conroy
Edward L. Andre
Jerry B. Smith
Carl S. Detmering
Richard C. Andrews
Bill E. Horner
George A. Phillips
Arthur W. Ecklund
Lee R. Miller
Edward H. Walker
Dudley Cook
Paul W. Seabaugh
Neil F. Young
Owen G. Jackson, Jr.
Elmer J. Zorn
James D. Johnson, Jr.
John N. Snapper
Wilbur O. Nelson
Philip A. Davis
Daniel G. Murray
George W. Parker
Charles T. Caldwell
Frank J. O'Hara, Jr.
Dale L. Ward
Russell A. Andres
Arthur W. Newendorp
John M. Jagoda
Anthony D. Anton
Thomas A. Gribbin II
Albert A. Grasselli
George J. Collins
George E. Mouzakis
Olen H. Price
Charles W. Egan
Charles E. Boswell, Jr.
Ralph P. Ward, Jr.
Robert L. Smith
Leland C. Ritter
Merlin L. Dake
Charles R. Howe
Eugene W. Meyer
John J. Fischer
Jack A. Miller
Robert M. Schneider
Kenneth G. Fiegener
Robert R. Tabler
Robert L. Gibson
Roy J. Molick
Edward A. Bray
Jack G. Harrington
Donald A. Panska
Charles C. Angle
Merlin T. Matthews
Guy M. Washburn
Durwood P. McCall
Lenhrew E. Lovette
Richard J. Sullivan
Robert F. Warren
Roderick J. Munro
Henry G. Holmes, Jr.
Ruel H. Corley, Jr.
Harry F. Painter
John M. McLaurin, Jr.
Urban A. Lees
Bernard J. Stender
Charles D. Dawkins, Jr.
Lewis E. Bolts
Charles C. Whipple
Ira V. Babcock
Donald F. Mileson
Oliver J. Koester
Ward L. Hooper
Guy M. Gipple
Robert B. Robinson
Leslie T. McFadden
Gordon C. Hart
Alexander Wilson
Robert D. Green
Dwain L. Redalen
Jefferson A. Davis, Jr.
Robert J. Wright
Harold G. McRay
Kenneth L. Anstock
Grover C. Jackson
Robert W. Petersen
Craig C. Crabb
Gerald Q. Fagnan
Russell G. Patterson, Jr.
Richard B. Newport
James M. Babb
Harvey E. Wendt
Robert E. Wagner
Harry O. Taylor
Robert J. Graham
Varge G. Frisbie
John F. McMahon, Jr.
James W. Ferris
Robert King, Jr.
Roland B. Heilman
William L. Atwater, Jr.
Walter E. Daniel
Daniel P. Githens, Jr.
Richard L. Michael, Jr.
William H. Bortz, Jr.
Wilbur F. Simlik
Harry G. C. Henneberger
William Whitehill
Weldon C. Cooke
Earl A. Trager, Jr.
Williams P. Brown
Homer D. Hoyle
Robert J. Zitnik
Arnold W. Barden
William H. Roley
Don G. Derryberry
Crawford B. Malone
Alva Anderson
George Mottl
Dan C. Holland
Sylvester F. Leis
James E. Meehan
William R. Lucas
Walter N. Roark, Jr.
Richard H. Peacock
Thomas E. Mulvihill
Otis R. Waldrop
Robert J. Young
Clark Ashton
Thomas H. Hughes
William J. Peter, Jr.
Elmer F. Koehler
John L. Greene
Dail D. Fine
Burton D. Currier
William J. Donovan
Robert Rause
Hugh D. Washburn, Jr.
Raymond H. W. Pett
Charles F. Stansbury
Earl E. Jones, Jr.
Rose T. Pinkston
John S. Banks
George H. Elias
James Sharp II
Myron P. Weiczorek
Troy L. Galford
Arthur L. Jackson
Woodrow W. Brown
Virgil R. Martin
Eugene Anderson
Matthew J. Kruszewski
Ray M. Burrill
James B. Seaton
Walter P. Landis
John H. Tomlinson
Lornie Leslie
Saint Clair Tant
Conrad J. Morgan
David R. McGrew, Jr.
Joseph W. Utz
Donald L. Shenaut
Albert F. Rinehart
Anthony J. Roscoe
William D. Miears
Robert J. Greenway
William M. Rossiter
Oscar A. Bosma
John C. Hudock
Felix L. Ferranto
Alfred T. Coon
William L. Nolte
Adam A. Metz
Edgar S. Hamilton
Paul Adams
Bill L. Parham
Gerald L. Pines
Henry G. Goare
Warren L. Mobley
Kenneth M. Stayer

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of captain:

Carlisle G. Kohl, Jr.
Charles R. Puckett
Page H. Holmes
Doyle H. Cole
William G. Siegfried, Sr.
Thomas G. Mooney
Leonard F. Blake
David G. Geddes
Vernon C. Shortsleeves
George E. Fuller
Estas L. Williams
George W. Troxler
Leonard Schoenberger
Timothy S. Vogt
Warren J. Skvaril
Thomas I. Gunning
Leonard C. Taft
Charles S. Smith
Ernest B. Altekruse
Charles E. Woodul
Nick J. Kapetan
James H. Mac Lean
Maurice C. Ashley, Jr.
Robert W. Taylor
Thomas W. Turner
Richard S. McCutchen
Robert C. Needham
Mallett C. Jackson, Jr.
John H. Miller
Harry J. Nolan
Roger W. Peard, Jr.
Warren C. Sherman
John C. Gordy, Jr.
William Wentworth

John M. Johnson, Jr.
Raymond L. Barrie, Jr.
Robert F. Maiden
Richard H. Francis
William F. Saunders, Jr.
Ralph H. Brown
Pierre D. Reissner
Henry W. Tubbs, Jr.
Harold L. Dawe, Jr.
Charles R. Kennington, Jr.
Kenneth W. Schieweck
Wayne L. Hall
Robert L. McElroy
Kenneth R. Steele
Basile Lubka
Charles B. Sturgell
Charles M. C. Jones, Jr.
Robert G. Hunt, Jr.
James R. Gober
Harold A. Hatch
William F. Sparks
Thomas B. White, Jr.
Dwight E. Roberts
Derrell C. Briden
Tom D. Parsons
George E. Hayward
Hans W. Henzel
Richard W. Sheppe
Alan M. Lindell
John L. Eareckson
Thomas J. Deen, Jr.
John F. Conroy
Willard D. Merrill
Joseph Z. Taylor
Miles M. Hoover, Jr.
Thomas G. Borden
Kelly J. Davis, Jr.
Robert L. Scruggs
Kenneth E. Turner
Daniel J. Boyle, Jr.
Thomas E. Ringwood, Jr.
William J. Budge
Francis A. Gore, Jr.
James S. Wilson
Eugene O. Speckart
Lewis H. Devine
Richard H. West
Charles H. Opfar, Jr.
James W. Stanhouse
Calhoun J. Killeen
Robert L. Lockhart
John P. Schied
John R. Heppert
Theophil P. Riegert
James F. Wolfe, Jr.
Luther G. Troen
Walter A. Gagne, Jr.
Andrew B. Cook
John G. Belden
Berthal H. Henning, Jr.
William D. Bassett, Jr.
Henry A. Commiskey, Sr.
Raymond R. Rall, Jr.
Ivil L. Carver
Tilton A. Anderson
Thomas G. Snipes
Charles D. Fay
Harry D. Woods
George A. P. Haynes
Wendell O. Beard
Charles S. Whiting
Randlett T. Lawrence
Charles V. Jarman
Samuel E. Englehart
Theodore R. Wall
Littleton W. T. Waller II
Raymond C. Paulson
Max A. Merritt
Robert G. Staffney
Jack E. Townsend
David S. Karukin
Bruce C. Ogilvie
Edgar F. Musgrove
John W. Haggerty III
Richard R. Miller
Clyde L. Eyer
Allen S. Harris
Charles P. McCallum, Jr.
Byron L. Magness
Robert J. Barton
John F. McCarthy, Jr.
Fred Grabowsky
Albert C. Smith, Jr.
John R. Dickson
Willard S. Peterson
Robert H. Krider
George H. Grimes
C. P. Clark, Jr.
Frederick M. Haden
Gilbert W. Ferguson
Richard C. Andersen
Howard M. Markus
Richard D. Alexander
Richard B. Talbott
Orvis O. Gaughf, Jr.
George R. Phillips
Charles A. Webster
William T. Harrell, Jr.
Harris J. Levert, Jr.
George R. Lamb
George B. Addison, Jr.
Donald J. Burger
Victor O'Hanesian
Douglas E. Wade
William C. Keith, Jr.
William F. Alsop, Jr.
Ralph L. Cunningham, Jr.
William R. Grubaugh
Kenneth S. Foley
Emmett J. Hyde
Robert S. Silverthorn
Adolph G. Sadeski
Garland T. Beyerle
Marvin H. Stevens
Jerry F. Mathis
Claude E. Deering, Jr.
William E. Cross, Jr.
Elwin B. Hart
Harold E. Stine
David G. Mehargue
Edward J. Bronars
John J. Oltermann
James W. Marsh
Harry O. Cowing, Jr.
George F. Tubley
Lee R. Bendell
Charles A. Rosenfeld
Donald N. McKeon
Arthur R. Petersen
Vincent J. Pross, Jr.
John E. Greenwood
Wendell N. Vest
Martin B. Reilly
Taylor J. Tucker
Grover C. Koontz
Andrew E. Hare
David M. Twomey
James J. Dinardo, Jr.
Paul D. Walker, Jr.
Audrey P. McNair
Robert J. Irwin
Thomas A. Palmer
Robert B. Brennan
Warren M. Brown
Ira L. Morgan, Jr.
Alexander P. McMillan
Otto I. Svenson, Jr.
Fredric A. Green
Leo A. Shane
Laurence D. Krentzlin
Johan S. Gestson
George T. Sargent, Jr.
Harry L. Gary
Robert E. Gruenler
Walter V. Walsh
Stanley A. Herman
Harry B. Randall III
Raymond M. Ryan
Jack Erwin
Lawrence A. Hall
Gilbert H. Holmes
Bernard L. Turner
Wilson E. D. Shepherd
Bain McClintock
Robert N. Good
Donald C. Miller
Charles S. Homola, Jr.
Richard K. Buchanan
David M. Ridderhof
Aubrey W. Talbert, Jr.
Birchard B. De Witt
David J. Wightman
Winston D. Chapman
William B. Shields
Oral R. Swigart, Jr.
Holcombe H. Thomas
Frederick M. Woeller
Richard E. Jones
Cornelius F. Savage, Jr.
Rodolfo L. Trevino
Eugene F. Hertling, Jr.
Albert J. Ziogar
Joseph Nastasi
Kenneth M. Buss
Cyril Wadzita
Richard B. Sheridan
Jack L. Handey
Joshua W. Dorsey III
William Lesser
Paul G. McMahon
James H. Bryson
John N. Webb
Robert G. Brown
Henry E. Wold
Winans D. Holliday
Don L. Keller
David J. Hytrek
William R. Corson
Kenneth L. Robinson, Jr.
Robert W. Oliver
Peter G. Paraskos
Thomas J. Burckell
Eugene D. Foxworth, Jr.
Edward J. Rigby
Robert O. Ducker
James W. Wood
Donald C. Stanton
Erin D. Smith
James L. Bowman
James R. Aichele
Lawrence R. Dorsa
James E. Bald
William B. Fleming
Warren R. Johnson
Joseph V. McLernan
Robert H. Harter
John L. Lowe
Stewart G. Mayse
Gregory J. Cizek
William K. Horn
Charles W. Abbott
Joseph J. N. Gambardella
Thomas E. Bulger
Stanley H. Olson
William B. McCurdy
Edward R. Watson
Robert C. Jenkins
Richard J. Smith
Earl F. Roth, Jr.
Reagan L. Preis
Richard B. Wyatt
Newell D. Staley, Jr.
William M. Herrin, Jr.
Robert L. Gunter
Jesse L. Gibney, Jr.
Withold J. Bacauskas
Anthony A. Monti
Thomas I. Gerard
Robert E. Wehrle
Joseph C. Shea, Jr.
William K. Rockey
Heman J. Redfield III
Richard T. Guidera
Arthur W. Anthony, Jr.
Richard E. Campbell
Marshall J. Treado
Robert E. Presson
Steve Minko
Robert B. March
Charles G. Cooper
Grover J. Rees, Jr.
Robert A. Lindsley
Harold C. Colvin
James R. McEnaney
David J. Hunter
Norman B. McCrary
Henry V. Martin
Elliott R. Laine, Jr.
Thomas F. Manley
Frederick D. Leder
James E. Spangler
Alexander M. Stewart
David I. Carter
Robert D. Whitesell
John K. Davis
Clinton J. Thro, Jr.
Stanley P. Daggett, Jr.
William B. Muir
Lloyd E. Tatem
Harrison G. Frasier
Roddey B. Moss
Kenneth J. Ivanson
George V. Ruos, Jr.
William V. H. White
Howard L. Barrett, Jr.
Robert R. Montgomery
Robert E. Hunter, Jr.
Hugh T. Kennedy
Carlton D. Goodiel, Jr.
Hal W. Vincent
George E. Beattie
Jack F. Ingalls III
Clement C. Buckley, Jr.
James W. Abraham
James A. Todd
Richard H. Burnett
Paul X. Kelley
Ross L. Mulford
George W. Houck
Byron T. Chen
James W. Myers
Donald J. Beatty
Birney A. Adams
Peter F. C. Armstrong
John E. Buynak
Francis C. Cushing, Jr.
William J. Galyon
Charles K. Whitfield
William M. Tatum, Jr.
Richard D. Mickelson
Henry C. Hutson
James W. Laseter
Joseph L. Sadowski
Robert A. Walker
Edward L. Lieland, Jr.
William K. Parcell
Winston F. Fontaine
Jean M. Penney
Joseph M. Laney, Jr.
Raymond W. Craig
Clinton Roberson
Carey S. Hughes
Carl R. Lundquist
Goodell P. Warren
Charles F. Whitehead
Darrel E. Bjorklund
David Y. Westling
James N. Bardin
Edward J. Rutty
Robert W. Cooney
Douglas V. Stowell
Edward J. Driscoll, Jr.
Philip M. Crosswait
Ronald I. Severson
Wilford E. Overgard
George D. Cumming
Robert E. Howard, Jr.
James G. Martz III
Robert E. Miller
George H. Shutt, Jr.
Dean C. Macho
Luther S. Smith, Jr.
Clarke A. Rhykerd
Raymond A. Cameron
Charles O. Hiett
Herbert M. Baker
Frank R. Smoke
William G. McCool, Jr.
Richard E. Percival
Russell W. McNutt
Ural W. Shadrick
Frederick H. Seitz
William D. Stoddart III
Arnold E. Bench
Franklin G. Cowie, Jr.
Louis A. Bonin
Leslie L. Darbyshire
Francis E. Doud
Edgar K. Jacks
Charles A. Sewell
Conrad P. Buschmann
Lucius O. Davis
L. G. Linman
William S. Russ
James A. Trout
Edward M. Guell
Paul A. Manning
Francis H. Thurston
Eugene R. Brady
James F. Meyers, Jr.
Clement C. Chamberlain, Jr.
Richard A. Bonney
Robert P. Kuhn
Victor A. Ruvo
Palmer A. Roessle
Thomas P. Bartleson, Jr.
Freddie J. Baker
James M. Bannan
Dalvin Serrin
Joseph J. Marron
Donald R. Stiver
Donald L. Rice
Cecil G. Dunnagan
Francis L. Delaney
John W. Unkle
Preston E. Howell
Douglas E. Erway
Paul W. Niesen
Whitlock N. Sharpe
Ralph D. Wallace
Frank E. Weitz
Dwight E. Howard
Frank D. McCarthy
Leonard M. Gillespie
Jack W. Conard
Daniel M. Wilson
James R. O'Mara
Jimmie W. Duncan
John H. Strope
James G. Doss, Jr.
Edward F. Penico
Vance E. Brown
Baxter W. Seaton
David D. Finne, Jr.
Charles H. Walker
Joseph R. Donaldson
Keith H. Helms
Charles E. Kiser
Winon E. Corley
Thomas L. Curtis
Joseph A. Corvi
Andrew V. Mincey
John E. Forde, Jr.
Ralph W. Tufts
Louis J. Bacher
Kenneth K. Case
Mark P. Fennessy
Richard N. Buethe
Marion A. Andrews
Maurice H. Alexander
Philip W. Haley
Donald P. Plante
William E. Caslin
James H. McGee
Ernest G. Schauppner
John R. Hansford
Gerard M. Kieswetter
Marshall B. Armstrong
Laverne D. Highhouse
Arthur S. Ohlgren
Frank L. Leister
Charles H. Van Diver
Robert F. Koehler
Albert W. Wallach
Charles M. Reitz
Everette D. Bedwell
Robert M. Tremmel
Robert K. Damon
Tom W. Williams
George L. Newton
Richard V. Molesky
Themistocles T. Annas
Warren F. Wolff
William J. Spiesel
Walter E. Kiracofe
Gary Wilder
William J. Dinse
Herbert O. Smith
George L. Bartlett
Raymond J. O'Leary
William D. Kent
Albert O. Nelson
Gordon M. B. Livingston
John E. Watson
Edwin C. King
Elmer N. Snyder
Norman L. Padgett
Alan D. Albert, Jr.
Peter A. Soderbergh
Robert N. Burhans
William E. Clemens
Charles R. Kerr, Jr.
William R. Miller, Jr.
Robert J. Norton
Donald L. Mitchell
Arnold G. Ziegler
Paul E. Wilson
Leo N. Nagrodsky
Richard E. Kutz
Frank L. Bourne, Jr.
Henry Englisch
Harry L. Morris, Jr.
Elmer H. Holthus
Rodger E. Rourke
Ermil L. Whisman
Garry M. Pearce, Jr.
Conway L. Austin
Arthur M. Brown
Robert L. Simonis
Hubert I. Frey
Walter A. Weston
Howard R. Mead, Jr.
Billy M. Adrian
Theodore Lowdermilk, Jr.
Paul S. Dopp
Elmer M. Thompson
William C. Vielhauer
Marion M. Etheridge, Jr.
Joseph F. Schoen, Jr.
Leonard E. Fuchs
Herbert L. Fogarty
Wade E. Branen
Joseph K. Griffis, Jr.
Roland L. McDaniel
Jack W. Evans
William A. Thompson
James S. G. Turner
Charles R. Figard
Richard L. Robinson
Thomas A. Hodges
Bruce M. Phillips
Roger H. Barnard
William M. Clelland
Edward R. Toner
Richard C. Schulze
Robert B. McIntosh
Charles C. Renshaw II
William Fellner
Harry N. McCutcheon
Gearl M. English
Johnny L. Carter
Gene C. Martin
Alex H. Touchton
John A. Rapp
Hershel H. Henson
Jerry A. Harness
Talmadge R. Liles
Edward L. Zielinski
Maurice W. Collins
William C. Adams
Howard E. Pyles
Charles R. Livingston
Lytton F. Blass
Henry G. Roberts
Frank L. Bradshaw
William J. Varley
Jack F. Bailey
Hubert C. Grow

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Sidney R. Bader	Charles H. Knowles
William T. Baldwin	Richard L. Kussman
Roy L. Belli	Earl F. Lovell
Joseph A. Como	Michael Mura
William D. Conroy	Paul V. Murphy
Raymond F. Fitzsimmons	Roy I. Parker
	Donald D. Robinson
John A. Fullinwider	Hosea E. Taylor
George M. Garner	Joseph F. Taylor, Jr.
Louis Gasparine, Jr.	Dwight R. Timmons, Jr.
Thomas J. Gipson, Jr.	
Edward E. Grebenstein, Jr.	Raymond D. Walters
	John L. White
Thomas G. Henry	Loren G. Witty
William D. Hubbard	Richard H. Young
Thomas W. Jones	

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Russell W. Adamczuk	James F. Newell
James E. Anderson	John T. Nichols
Harry H. Bair	William H. Nulty
Eugene A. Bambic	John P. Oliver
David L. Battaglia	George E. Owings
Kenneth E. Baublitz	Donald C. Pauley
William V. Bicknel	John A. Sebring
Donald C. Bieger	Franklin R. Shoemaker
Joseph J. Bischoff	
Ira Blalock, Jr.	James D. Shubert
George A. Candea	William P. Shunkey, Jr.
Robert L. Carlisle	
Leroy R. Cates	Craig H. Stephenson
Robert E. Cleveland	Donald E. Sudduth
Jack L. Cole	Robert A. Utter
James L. Cooper	Ralph V. Walker, Jr.
Jerry J. S. Crittenden	Frank V. Weiler
John G. Fifield	Richard C. White
Clarence D. Foreman	Carl A. Zimmerman III
Jerald L. Frandsen	
Donald R. Gerber	Miguel E. Bustamante, Jr.
Clarence B. Grey	
Harold J. Horan, Jr.	Michael P. Cady
Ernest P. Lewis, Jr.	Arthur B. Carr, Jr.
Frank W. Martino	Bruce W. Emberton
Andrew G. Marushok	Edwin B. Henson, Jr.
Ronald A. Mason	Raymond C. Lafser
James F. McNelis	Charles P. Williams
Harry L. Mills	

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 13 (legislative day of June 11), 1956:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Frederick O. Mercer, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Illinois.

Frederick Van Pelt Bryan, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 13, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Ralph Silverstein, spiritual leader of Temple Sinai (the Arlington Temple), Brooklyn, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

Lord of the universe, Father of all mankind, bless, we pray Thee, the distinguished Members of this great deliberative body—the House of Representatives.

Bless our ailing President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and grant that he may enjoy a speedy and complete recovery.

In this hour of continuing world crisis, O Lord, when the dark clouds of hydrogen war continue to hover so menacingly overhead and when the very fate of civilization itself seems to tremble in the balance, we are deeply stirred and heartened by the knowledge that in our beloved land and elsewhere throughout the world men of all faiths are turning to Thee in ever greater numbers. For in the face of global events and movements so overwhelming in their very magnitude and complexity, we are but as helpless children groping for Thy light and Thy salvation. But Thy divine spirit, O God, moves within us in ways which passeth understanding. There are great and gifted men in this our Government, in this our House of Representatives. Inspire them, O Heavenly Father—enlarge their vision. Fill them with a holy zeal and a crusading spirit to bring the blessings of true brotherhood to our own beloved America so that none may be demeaned as second-class citizens, whatever be their faith or their race, for all are truly Thy children and Thou are our Father.

Make them unfailingly mindful that in many ways Washington is the capital of the world, that whatever is said and done here literally affects the very fate of mankind. Grant us the strength, the wisdom, and the determination to banish forever the dread scourge of war from the face of the earth and ordain, we beseech Thee, that our sorely troubled world may at long last enjoy Thy sweet blessings of universal peace and brotherhood under Thine all-embracing fatherhood, O God. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

VOTE TO RECOMMIT H. R. 5881

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, when you vote today on the most-favored 17 States in the Northwest legislation, conference report on H. R. 5881, small-projects legislation, vote to recommit this bill. Because you are voting a $100 million authorization to these 17 most-favored States to the exclusion of 31 other States which were included in the legislation; but after the conferees got through with H. R. 5881, these 31 States were excluded. The only participation the States in the East and the South will enjoy in this legislation—if it can be called enjoyment—is that your constituents will be called upon to pay the taxes to pay the $100 million incorporated in the bill in the report for the benefit of the 17 most-favored States. Vote to recommit the conference report.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION BEYOND THE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. Folsom, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I have just introduced legislation designed to carry out the first recommendation of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School which he recently appointed. It would authorize the appropriation of $800,000 for grants to the States to encourage the States to provide for a State committee on education beyond the high school to conduct studies and conferences and make recommendations for appropriate action to be taken by public and private agencies to meet our pressing problems related to higher education.

Our Nation cannot afford to lapse into a situation of desperation with respect to higher education. I commend the President of the United States for his insistence that there be advanced planning so that we can avert a crisis in higher education. My bill would carry out the President's, the administration's policy. The best explanation is set forth in a letter from Mr. Folsom to Speaker RAYBURN which is here set forth:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, June 11, 1956.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am enclosing for your consideration a draft bill to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school.

The draft bill would authorize the appropriation of $800,000, to be available until June 30, 1958, for grants to the States on the basis of their respective populations, in order to encourage and assist each State to provide for a State committee on education beyond the high school, which committee, through studies and conferences, would consider educational problems beyond the high school and make recommendations for appropriate action to be taken by public and private agencies at local, State, regional, and Federal levels. States would be required, through their Governors, to undertake to use grants solely for the purposes of the act and to have their State committees submit reports to the Commissioner of Education for use of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School.

You will recall that the President in his special message to the Congress on January 12, 1956, expressed his concern about the growing problems in the field of education beyond the high school and indicated that he would appoint a committee to develop proposals in this field, as follows:

"Shortages now exist in medicine, teaching, nursing, science, engineering, and in other fields of knowledge which require education beyond the level of the secondary school. Changing times and conditions create new opportunities and challenges. There are now possibilities for older persons, properly trained, to lead more productive and rewarding lives. The tide of increasing school enrollment will soon reach higher educational institutions. Within 10 years we may expect 3 students in our colleges and universities for every 2 who are there now.

"Higher education is and must remain the responsibility of the States, localities, and private groups and institutions. But to lay before us all the problems of education beyond high school, and to encourage active and systematic attack on them, I shall ap-

point a distinguished group of educators and citizens to develop this year, through studies and conferences, proposals in this educational field. Through the leadership and counsel of this group, beneficial results can be expected to flow to education and to the Nation, in the years ahead."

Composition of the committee was announced April 19 and on April 27 it met, organized, and agreed on basic objectives as follows: First, to collect, assemble, and disseminate information for the purpose of increasing public awareness of the vast challenge which lies ahead in the field of education beyond the high school; second, to encourage the planning and action which must now be undertaken by institutions and groups of institutions, locally and nationally, publicly and privately, to meet the impending demands upon our educational system; the third, to advise the President as to the proper role of the Federal Government in this field and to recommend appropriate Federal policies and relationships.

In order to provide immediate stimulus to the initiation of widespread planning, studies, and action which should be undertaken now by institutions, States, and localities, the committee recommended the provision of one-time grants to the States to encourage and assist each State to establish a State committee on education beyond the high school. These State counterparts to the national committee are essential not only for coordination of study and planning activities in the States but to provide a nationwide mechanism for liaison with the national committee. The instant draft bill is designed to accomplish these objectives.

This Department shares with the Committee on Education Beyond the High School and with the educational leadership of the Nation, the great concern we all have about the necessity of bringing concerted action to bear on the mounting problems which we foresee ahead in this field of education and in meeting our future manpower needs. We are, therefore, in accord with the recommendation of the committee.

I shall appreciate it if you would refer the draft bill to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

M. B. FOLSOM,
Secretary.

PROSPERITY OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks a clipping from the Longmont Times-Call, Longmont, Colo., which clearly indicates the prosperity of the State of Colorado. Income-tax collections are a definite barometer of the economic conditions of business interests. It is worth reading and answers some of the arguments of those who would have you believe we are on the verge of a depression.

STATE INCOME TAX COLLECTIONS $2½ MILLION AHEAD

DENVER.—Colorado State income tax collections are $2,500,000 ahead of the first 5 months of last year, Revenue Director Earl Blevins reported Friday.

He said receipts for the first 5 months of 1956 totaled $20,987,591, compared with $18,403,749 for the same 1955 period.

Income-tax receipts for all of 1955 amounted to $26,203,286.

Blevins said the department has processed 470,661 returns so far this year, as compared with 423,684 for the first 5 months of last year. Approximately 100,000 returns remain to be processed, he added.

The total number of returns last year was 500,847.

REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Friday to file their report on the bill H. R. 11742.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTING FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business before the House is the vote on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] to recommit the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects, and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

Without objection the Clerk will again report the motion to recommit.

The was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SAYLOR moves to recommit the conference report to the conferees.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SAYLOR) there were—ayes 10, noes 32.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 179, nays 209, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

YEAS—179

Abbitt	Bowler	Cunningham
Alexander	Bray	Curtis, Mass.
Andresen, August H.	Brown, Ohio	Dague
	Brownson	Davis, Ga.
Arends	Broyhill	Davis, Wis.
Ashley	Bush	Derounian
Ashmore	Byrne, Pa.	Devereux
Auchincloss	Byrnes, Wis.	Dodd
Barrett	Canfield	Dondero
Bass, N. H.	Cannon	Donohue
Bates	Carlyle	Donovan
Baumhart	Carrigg	Dorn, N. Y.
Beamer	Cederberg	Durham
Becker	Chelf	Feighan
Bennett, Mich.	Chiperfield	Fenton
Bentley	Chudoff	Fino
Betts	Church	Flood
Boggs	Clark	Flynt
Bolton, Frances P.	Clevenger	Ford
	Cole	Forrester
Bolton, Oliver P.	Colmer	Fountain
	Corbett	Frelinghuysen
Bonner	Coudert	Fulton
Bosch	Cramer	Gary
Bow	Cretella	Gavin
Gray	Latham	Sadlak
Green, Pa.	LeCompte	St. George
Gregory	Long	Saylor
Gross	McCulloch	Schenck
Gwinn	McGregor	Scherer
Haley	McVey	Schwengel
Hand	Macdonald	Seely-Brown
Harden	Martin	Sheehan
Hardy	Meader	Short
Harrison, Va.	Merrow	Shuford
Henderson	Miller, Md.	Siler
Heselton	Minshall	Simpson, Ill.
Hess	Morano	Smith, Miss.
Hoeven	Moulder	Smith, Va.
Holland	Mumma	Smith, Wis.
Hull	Nicholson	Taber
Hyde	O'Neill	Talle
James	Osmers	Taylor
Jenkins	Ostertag	Thompson, Mich.
Jennings	Patterson	
Jensen	Perkins	Tuck
Johansen	Philbin	Van Zandt
Jonas	Pilcher	Vorys
Jones, Mo.	Pillion	Vursell
Jones, N. C.	Poff	Walter
Judd	Polk	Watts
Kean	Preston	Wharton
Kearney	Quigley	Whitten
Kearns	Radwan	Widnall
Keating	Ray	Wigglesworth
Kilburn	Reece, Tenn.	Williams, Miss.
King, Pa.	Reed, N. Y.	Williams, N. Y.
Knox	Riehlman	Willis
Laird	Robeson, Va.	Winstead
Landrum	Robsion, Ky.	Wolcott
Lanham	Rogers, Mass.	Wolverton

NAYS—209

Abernethy	Frazier	Morgan
Adair	Friedel	Moss
Addonizio	Garmatz	Multer
Albert	Gathings	Murray, Ill.
Alger	Gentry	Murray, Tenn.
Allen, Calif.	Gordon	Natcher
Andrews	Grant	Norblad
Anfuso	Green, Oreg.	Norrell
Aspinall	Griffiths	O'Brien, Ill.
Avery	Gubser	O'Brien, N. Y.
Ayres	Hagen	O'Hara, Ill.
Bailey	Harris	O'Konski
Baker	Harrison, Nebr.	Passman
Baldwin	Harvey	Pelly
Barden	Hays, Ark.	Pfost
Bass, Tenn.	Hayworth	Phillips
Belcher	Healey	Poage
Bennett, Fla.	Hébert	Powell
Berry	Herlong	Price
Blatnik	Hiestand	Priest
Blitch	Hill	Rabaut
Boland	Hillings	Rains
Bolling	Hinshaw	Rees, Kans.
Boykin	Holmes	Reuss
Boyle	Holt	Rhodes, Pa.
Brooks, La.	Holtzman	Riley
Brooks, Tex.	Hope	Roberts
Brown, Ga.	Hosmer	Rodino
Buckley	Huddleston	Rogers, Colo.
Budge	Ikard	Rogers, Fla.
Burdick	Jarman	Rogers, Tex.
Burleson	Johnson, Calif.	Rooney
Burnside	Johnson, Wis.	Roosevelt
Byrd	Jones, Ala.	Rutherford
Celler	Karsten	Scrivner
Chase	Kee	Scudder
Chatham	Kelly, N. Y.	Selden
Chenoweth	Keogh	Shelley
Coon	Kilday	Sheppard
Cooper	Kilgore	Sieminski
Crumpacker	King, Calif.	Sikes
Curtis, Mo.	Kirwan	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	Klein	Spence
Dawson, Ill.	Kluczynski	Springer
Dawson, Utah	Knutson	Staggers
Deane	Krueger	Steed
Delaney	Lankford	Sullivan
Dempsey	Lesinski	Teague, Calif.
Denton	Lipscomb	Teague, Tex.
Dies	Lovre	Thomas
Dingell	McCarthy	Thompson, N. J.
Dixon	McCormack	Thompson, Tex.
Dollinger	McDonough	Thomson, Wyo.
Dorn, S. C.	McDowell	Tollefson
Doyle	McIntire	Trimble
Edmondson	Mack, Ill.	Tumulty
Elliott	Mack, Wash.	Udall
Ellsworth	Madden	Utt
Engle	Magnuson	Vanik
Evins	Mahon	Van Pelt
Fallon	Mailliard	Velde
Fascell	Marshall	Vinson
Fernandez	Matthews	Wainwright
Fisher	Metcalf	Weaver
Fjare	Miller, Nebr.	Wier
Fogarty	Mills	Williams, N. J.
Forand	Mollohan	Wilson, Calif.

Wilson, Ind.	Yates	Zablocki
Withrow	Young	Zelenko
Wright	Younger	

NOT VOTING—44

Allen, Ill.	Halleck	Morrison
Andersen, H. Carl	Hays, Ohio	Nelson
Bell	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Hara, Minn.
Carnahan	Hoffman, Mich.	Patman
Christopher	Holifield	Prouty
Cooley	Horan	Rhodes, Ariz.
Davidson	Jackson	Richards
Diggs	Kelley, Pa.	Rivers
Dolliver	Lane	Scott
Dowdy	McConnell	Simpson, Pa.
Eberharter	McMillan	Sisk
Gamble	Machrowicz	Thompson, La.
George	Mason	Thornberry
Hale	Miller, Calif.	Westland
	Miller, N. Y.	Wickersham

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Westland against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Horan against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Bell against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Carnahan against.

Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Hale for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Prouty for, with Mr. Cooley against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Machrowicz against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Sisk against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Hays of Ohio against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Davidson against.

Mr. Nelson for, with Mr. Wickersham against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Wier with Mr. George.

Mr. Richards with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. RABAUT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. QUIGLEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BELCHER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MERROW changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BEAMER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CHENOWETH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. KIRWAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PERKINS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this legislation plugs the gap in our present water conservation program. Prior to 1902, the pioneer residents of the arid western States had constructed on their own just about all of the reclamation projects that could be financed without assistance in the form of loans from the Government. The passage of the Reclamation Act of 1902 recognized that fact. Since that time, the Federal Government through the Bureau of Reclamation has made additional funds available on a repayable basis. This has enabled the rapidly growing West to meet its current water requirements.

There is an area, however, where an additional program is needed. Local financing takes care of the projects under $1 million. The Bureau of Reclamation program in the past has furnished the engineering know-how for the larger multipurpose projects. But in each of the western reclamation States there are feasible projects in the $1 million to $5 million class. The extensive engineering and supervision required for Bureau construction makes it uneconomical at the present time for these smaller projects to be constructed under present law. However, if funds were available for noninterest loans, and if the local sponsoring groups could furnish the engineering data and supervision, many fine, feasible projects would be built. That is the purpose of this legislation.

Much has been said about this being a special bill for a special region. That is true. What is being overlooked, however, is the basic reason for our reclamation act. The Federal Government, for example, owns over 70 percent of the land area of my State of Utah. We cannot tax this area. The major portion of the revenues from users of the area go into a special reclamation fund. Ten percent of the revenues go into the Federal Treasury.

Legislation establishing a program of development restricted to these 17 public land States is no more regional than legislation establishing beach control projects and rivers and harbor improvement. And let it be remembered, that the reclamation States repay the Treasury the cost of the project—a rather unique penalty we pay for having too little, rather than too much water.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on the motion to recommit the bill (H. R. 4090) amending the Communications Act of 1934.

Without objection, the Clerk will read the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PELLY moves to recommit H. R. 4090 to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

1. For the purpose of bringing about evaluation of reliability of device under actual operational conditions of sufficient variety and duration to determine value of the device for safety purposes;

2. To bring in line with international procedures and criteria for safety and distress; and

3. For purpose of determining alternative and more reliable methods of accomplishing the purposes of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and there were—yeas 151, nays 228, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—151

Adair	Dixon	Merrow
Alger	Dorn, S. C.	Miller, Md.
Allen, Calif.	Ellsworth	Miller, Nebr.
Andresen, August H.	Fjare	Minshall
Andrews	Ford	Mumma
Arends	Frelinghuysen	Nicholson
Ashley	Gentry	Norblad
Ashmore	Grant	Osmers
Auchincloss	Gross	Ostertag
Avery	Gubser	Pelly
Ayres	Hand	Phillips
Bass, N. H.	Harrison, Nebr.	Pilcher
Bates	Harvey	Poff
Baumhart	Henderson	Preston
Beamer	Hess	Prouty
Becker	Hiestand	Ray
Belcher	Hillings	Robeson, Va.
Bennett, Mich.	Hinshaw	Robsion, Ky.
Bentley	Hoeven	St. George
Berry	Holmes	Scherer
Betts	Holt	Scrivner
Bolton, Frances P.	Hosmer	Scudder
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hyde	Siler
Bosch	James	Simpson, Ill.
Bow	Jenkins	Smith, Kans.
Brown, Ga.	Jensen	Smith, Wis.
Budge	Johansen	Taber
Bush	Johnson, Calif.	Talle
Byrnes, Wis.	Jonas	Taylor
Cederberg	Jones, N. C.	Teague, Calif.
Chase	Judd	Thompson, Mich.
Chatham	Kean	Thomson, Wyo.
Chiperfield	Kearns	Tollefson
Church	Keating	Tuck
Clevenger	Kilburn	Utt
Cole	Kilgore	Van Pelt
Coon	King, Pa.	Velde
Coudert	Knox	Vorys
Cramer	Krueger	Vursell
Crumpacker	Laird	Wainwright
Cunningham	Landrum	Weaver
Curtis, Mass.	Latham	Wharton
Curtis, Mo.	LeCompte	Widnall
Dague	Lipscomb	Wigglesworth
Davis, Ga.	Lovre	Williams, N. Y.
Davis, Wis.	McDonough	Wilson, Calif.
Dawson, Utah	McVey	Wilson, Ind.
Derounian	Mack, Wash.	Wolcott
Devereux	Magnuson	Young
	Mailliard	Younger
	Marshall	
	Meader	

NAYS—228

Abbitt	Carlyle	Fernandez
Abernethy	Carrigg	Fino
Addonizio	Celler	Fisher
Albert	Chelf	Flood
Alexander	Chenoweth	Flynt
Anfuso	Chudoff	Fogarty
Aspinall	Clark	Forand
Bailey	Colmer	Forrester
Baker	Cooper	Fountain
Baldwin	Corbett	Frazier
Barden	Cretella	Friedel
Barrett	Davis, Tenn.	Fulton
Bass, Tenn.	Dawson, Ill.	Garmatz
Bennett, Fla.	Deane	Gary
Blatnik	Delaney	Gathings
Blitch	Dempsey	Gavin
Boggs	Denton	Gordon
Boland	Dies	Gray
Bolling	Dingell	Green, Oreg.
Bowler	Dodd	Green, Pa.
Boyle	Dollinger	Gregory
Bray	Dondero	Griffiths
Brooks, La.	Donohue	Hagen
Brooks, Tex.	Dorn, N. Y.	Haley
Brown, Ohio	Doyle	Harden
Brownson	Durham	Hardy
Broyhill	Edmondson	Harris
Burdick	Elliott	Harrison, Va.
Burleson	Engle	Hays, Ark.
Burnside	Evins	Hayworth
Byrd	Fallon	Hébert
Byrne, Pa.	Fascell	Herlong
Canfield	Feighan	Heselton
Cannon	Fenton	Hill

Holifield	Morgan	Saylor
Holland	Moss	Schenck
Holtzman	Moulder	Seely-Brown
Hope	Multer	Selden
Huddleston	Murray, Ill.	Sheehan
Hull	Murray, Tenn.	Shelley
Ikard	Natcher	Sheppard
Jarman	Norrell	Short
Jennings	O'Brien, Ill.	Shuford
Johnson, Wis.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Sieminski
Jones, Ala.	O'Hara, Ill.	Sikes
Jones, Mo.	O'Konski	Smith, Miss.
Karsten	O'Neill	Smith, Va.
Kearney	Passman	Spence
Kee	Patterson	Springer
Kelly, N. Y.	Perkins	Staggers
Keogh	Pfost	Steed
Kilday	Philbin	Sullivan
King, Calif.	Pillion	Teague, Tex.
Kirwan	Poage	Thomas
Klein	Polk	Thompson, N. J.
Kluczynski	Powell	Thompson, Tex.
Knutson	Price	Trimble
Lanham	Priest	Tumulty
Lankford	Quigley	Udall
Lesinski	Rabaut	Vanik
Long	Radwan	Van Zandt
McCarthy	Rees, Kans.	Vinson
McCormack	Reuss	Walter
McCulloch	Rhodes, Pa.	Watts
McDowell	Riehlman	Whitten
McGregor	Riley	Wier
Macdonald	Roberts	Williams, Miss.
Machrowicz	Rodino	Williams, N. J.
Mack, Ill.	Rogers, Colo.	Willis
Madden	Rogers, Fla.	Winstead
Mahon	Rogers, Mass.	Withrow
Matthews	Rogers, Tex.	Wolverton
Metcalf	Rooney	Wright
Mills	Roosevelt	Yates
Mollohan	Rutherford	Zablocki
Morano	Sadlak	Zelenko

NOT VOTING—53

Allen, Ill.	Gwinn	Morrison
Andersen, H. Carl	Hale	Nelson
	Halleck	O'Hara, Minn.
Bell	Hays, Ohio	Patman
Bonner	Healey	Rains
Boykin	Hoffman, Ill.	Reece, Tenn.
Buckley	Hoffman, Mich.	Reed, N. Y.
Carnahan	Horan	Rhodes, Ariz.
Christopher	Jackson	Richards
Cooley	Kelley, Pa.	Rivers
Davidson	Lane	Schwengel
Diggs	McConnell	Scott
Dolliver	McIntire	Simpson, Pa.
Donovan	McMillan	Sisk
Dowdy	Martin	Thompson, La.
Eberharter	Mason	Thornberry
Gamble	Miller, Calif.	Westland
George	Miller, N. Y.	Wickersham

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Carnahan against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Rains against.

Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Hays of Ohio against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. George for, with Mr. Davidson against.

Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Healey against.

Mr. Horan for, with Mr. Wickersham against.

Mr. Westland for, with Mr. Sisk against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Donovan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bell with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. McIntire.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Hale.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Christopher with Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. CANFIELD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BROYHILL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WOLVERTON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CRETELLA changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 10964.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EVERY AMERICAN IS ENTITLED TO A FAIR MINIMUM WAGE AND DECENT STANDARD OF LIVING

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, early in January of last year I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1.35. Some of my colleagues were of the opinion my proposed hourly rate of pay was too high, but I did not because I had first-hand knowledge of the substandard wages many of my friends and constituents in South Philadelphia were receiving. And believe me they earned every penny they made because the work was not easy and in most cases none too pleasant.

Nevertheless, since I could not obtain the full support of the committee or the House for my bill, I reluctantly agreed to support and vote for the $1 hourly minimum wage because I have learned through my 10 years' of experience here in Washington that "if you can't fight the foe and win, join them." I also remembered the trite phrase, "half a loaf is better than none."

Mr. Speaker, this coming Saturday, June 16, 1956, marks the 18th anniversary of one of the most outstanding pieces of legislation ever enacted by the Congress under the leadership of our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Eighteen years ago Congress passed a law which made it the policy of the Government of the United States to eliminate substandard wages. Since the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act, this Nation has enjoyed years of prosperity and economic growth. Nevertheless, the Congress has been entirely too silent in making effective the legislation it has enacted in the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Despite the increases in Federal minimum wages last year, I still find the mandatory minimum wage unrealistic and wanting. It was my firm conviction last year when the Congress passed the $1 minimum that it was utterly inadequate. With the passage of another year the new minimum of $1 has become even more obsolete.

Early next year when the 85th Congress convenes, I shall introduce a bill to raise the present $1 minimum to $1.50. I feel this action on my part will be more effective at that time since the present 84th Congress is now rushing toward adjournment within the next few weeks. I certainly do not wish to have the bill pigeonholed or hastily considered by the Committee on Education and Labor because of its vital importance to all working Americans. I submit that this proposed minimum is absolutely necessary if Congress is to attempt to make meaningful the law of the land which aims at eliminating substandard wages.

Studies by the United States Department of Labor indicate that a worker must earn more than $2 an hour and work steadily for 52 weeks a year in order to support a family of four with a minimum decent standard of living. Even a single woman without dependents requires, according to independent studies made by several State agencies, between a minimum of $2,000 to $3,000 a year to maintain a minimum decent standard of living.

In my own State of Pennsylvania, the minimum annual budget requirements of a single woman are estimated to be $2,400. This means that a woman working 50 weeks at 40 hours would require at least $1.20 an hour to earn the minimum requirements. That does not allow for any lay-offs, sicknesses, or other emergencies; and we know that most of the poorer paying jobs rarely offer steady employment. Thus, assuming that a single lady works 40 weeks during the year and 40 hours a week, she would require exactly $1.50 to maintain a dignified, though very modest, living.

I am also greatly concerned with the millions of workers who have been completely denied the benefits and protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act. At present, many of the giant corporations of the country are exempt from paying their employees a minimum wage and are also not subject to payment of overtime rates. This is true in the retail trade where some of the exempt companies are doing a billion-dollar business during the year. Some of our most luxurious hotels in the Nation are also paying many of their employees below subsistence wages. The same is true of the giant agricultural establishments—I am not referring to small farms but to the factories in the field that employ many farmhands—which very frequently pay starvation wages. Similarly, employees of small telephone companies, laundries, local transit companies, construction, wholesaling, finance, insurance, and real estate are entitled to receive at least the minimum wages which are mandatory in other businesses under Federal law.

I believe that all employees in our great country are entitled to fair treatment, and the Fair Labor Standards Act should be extended to these millions of unprotected workers.

It is my firm conviction that the Nation's economy can well afford to carry the proposed higher minimum wage. As a matter of fact, I believe that it can ill afford not to do so. The economy is still, by and large, prosperous; but many dangerous soft spots are appearing and this is the case in Philadelphia, which is classified as a distressed labor area. We have been confronted with a serious and continuing unemployment problem for many years. As of January 1956, according to the United States Employment Service, the rate of unemployment in the city of Philadelphia was 6.3 percent. The national average was 4.4 percent. Additional income received by millions of workers would protect and support the prosperity and make it possible to achieve a higher level of economic activity.

Common decency also requires that a prosperous and growing economy should not tolerate the existence of substandard wages. Increasing the minimum wage would help all areas alike. It would boost the purchasing power of people in low-income areas as well as in prosperous areas.

It would be wrong to assume that raising of the minimum wage would necessarily increase the cost of labor. It is a well-known fact that higher wages mean also more efficient employees and greater productivity per worker. Even in the few cases where the increases in wages would result in somewhat higher costs, I believe that the American public would favor the small sacrifice. I am firmly convinced that every fairminded American consumer is willing to pay the price necessary to assure his fellow American workingman at least a decent minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, on this, the 18th anniversary of the passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act, I appeal to you and the Members of the House of Representatives to give serious thought to my proposal. I sincerely hope I can count on your and their support of my bill to raise the minimum hourly wage to $1.50 during the 85th Congress—God willing.

YELLOWTAIL DAM

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower vetoed Senate Joint Resolution 135 declaring that the Bureau of Reclamation should pay the Crow Indian tribe $5 million for the land and powersite for Yellowtail Dam. This is consistent with other administrative actions. The line laid down by his administration has been—and continues to be—that public property is not something to buy, it is only something to be sold at bargain prices to friends of the administration.

When this administration took office, the taxpayers of this country owned 27 synthetic rubber plants. In the years since the end of World War II, these plants had been leased to private rubber companies and had earned an average of $68 million per year—or about 12 percent interest on the total investment of $500 million.

This $500 million public asset, which was earning an income of $68 million a year, was sold to big business for $27 million a year for 10 years. This is like buying a house for $27 a month that you have been renting for $68 a month—a real bargain for the purchaser.

When this administration took office, the taxpayers of this country owned a barge line in which they had $22 million invested. The administration sold it for $9 million plus interest on installments over 10 years.

When this administration took office, our public assets included a $35 million synthetic fuel plant in Louisiana, Mo. The administration knocked it down to the Hercules Powder Co. for $5 million.

These examples show that President Eisenhower and his administration officials don't know what property is worth. They don't know because they haven't bought any—all they have done is to conduct bargain sales.

To them—and there are many illustrations besides Hells Canyon—a dam site is not something you buy, it is something you give away to a commercial utility.

When this administration took office, fronted with buying a dam site—something he has not done before—he was unable to recognize a fair and equitable price, which he calls extravagant.

POLISH LIBERATION: THE KEY TO FREEDOM

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of note and moment that, according to a very appropriate custom followed for several years by the House, our membership on Polish Independence Day hails that historic event, lauds the gallantry, heroism, and fidelity to freedom of the grievously afflicted Polish people, and in compelling terms gives expression to our hopes and strivings for Polish liberation.

It is also very appropriate, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that at other times during our legislative sessions, we should address ourselves to the present, pitiful plight of millions of freedom-loving, God-fearing Polish people, who continue to be held in bondage by a ruthless and bestial Communist tyranny. Most Americans deplore the existence of this tyranny no less than they deeply resent the ill-advised, unjust, international, diplomatic concessions, which, in effect, gave colorable sanction, and originally made possible, the brutal subjugation of a great nation and its brave, indomitable people, who for centuries have struggled and sacrificed almost beyond measure to establish and preserve their God-given liberties.

History incontrovertibly proves and conclusively demonstrates the tenacious, undaunted, religious faith of Poland. It eloquently testifies to its unfaltering devotion to freedom. It clearly evidences its loyalty to the comradeship of arms, which succeeded after a welter of blood, sweat, toil, and tears in overthrowing the terrorism of the Nazi dictatorship—a struggle in which the Polish nation and its brave people became the first innocent victims of predatory, calloused aggression, suffered the pains of shameful betrayal, and yet clung to the end in bloody sacrifice until final victory came.

I have on many occasions referred to the abandonment and deliverance of Poland over to the Reds as constituting one of the great crimes of the ages, and I think no lover of freedom could validly dispute the fact that it is. I am at the moment more interested, however, in determining how and when this great crime can be expiated, how and when justice can be done, how and when self-determination and free institutions, national sovereignty, and autonomy can be restored to the valiant Poles.

In this battle for liberation of the Poles and other subject peoples suffering at present in the slave states of world communism, there are among others 2 barriers, so to speak, 2 serious obstacles, which stand in the way of ultimate recapture of Polish freedom. The first of these is the spirit of defeatism, which sometimes appears even among the proponents and champions of liberation. This view tends to accept, as it should not, the postulate that Polish domination by Russia and the Communists is an accomplished fact, and that efforts to change the situation would require a great world war and, therefore, are foredoomed to failure.

This specious view, held by many well-meaning friends of Poland and parroted by the pro-Soviet bloc, amplifies a certain sense of indifference blended with a pitying attitude of futility regarding the prospects for changing the status quo by American or international action.

The second barrier is the brazen, defiant policy of the Soviet, which in its foreign relations stresses its dictatorial sovereign power over Poland and enforces that satellite policy at the point of the bayonet and by ruthless liquidation of freedom-minded groups and continued, brutal suppression of the Polish people with one shocking outrage after another.

Both of these views are unfortunate and shortsighted. They fail to recognize the deep, profound vitality of the anti-Communist forces within Poland, in the United States, and the free world which is growing stronger every day.

It is of course morally and ethically wrong not to oppose Soviet control of Poland. From a practical viewpoint, it fails to calculate and give proper weight to the moral indignation of most free peoples, the essential grossness and unjust, inhuman nature of the subjugation process, and the unbending determination of the Polish people and other free

peoples of the world to fight this issue through to the bitter end.

I often think of the great words of an illustrious American patriot and founder—"the same God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time." It remains for soulless Communists and others who do not believe in God or in freedom and their atheistic pseudo-intellectual red and pinkish followers in this country to deride and scoff at this noble expression of principles, but true Americans will harken to it and accept it in its philosophy and its practice, because they realize well that liberty is in danger throughout the world, and that unless we are prepared to defend and preserve it, whatever the cost, it will soon disappear into the dark shadows of Communist tyranny.

This administration and this Nation and the American people must never cease to battle for the liberation of Poland and the subject nations until victory is at hand. This world, no less than this Nation, cannot long endure half slave and half free. We will either have freedom for all mankind or we will have oppression and slavery for all with consequent degradation of human values of dignity, decency, independence, and spiritual integrity and then the final collapse of the very last vestige and distinguishing characteristics of civilization.

This Nation must more vigorously project the leadership of this movement for liberation. It is a righteous cause—it is the cause of the Almighty, it is the cause of all free men and women wherever they live. Nothing should deter us from insisting on liberation—neither the braggart threats and blandishments of the Reds, or our own fears of atomic-hydrogen destruction. If we are not free, if our fellow humans are not free, it would be far better for ourselves and for the world to face destruction rather than live and die in serfdom.

But have no concern, my friends. This Nation will not be destroyed. The free world will not be destroyed by any foreign aggression. The only way this Nation can be destroyed is by its own hand—by easy living, by turning away from fundamental values, by seeking easy solutions for problems which can be solved only by the free, earnest, sustained attention and labor of all the people, by profound faith, high courage, and unceasing work.

Let us never fear or appease Russia. If a great war comes—and we must use every means to prevent it—let us be sure, as I believe we can be, that there will be more devastating destruction behind the Iron Curtain than in any other part of the world. I hope that war will never again plague and devastate this sorry globe and we must exert every effort for peace. But we must insist upon preserving our rights and liberties and command respect through overwhelming strength, if necessary, for our Nation and way of life.

There are other ways than force by which this end can be sought. One of the most potent has not yet been used, and that is to withdraw diplomatic recognition from that nation, or those nations, that persist in heaping insult after insult upon us, while they conspire and work for our destruction and conquest by world communism.

Perhaps this Government should seriously consider this course and this policy. Perhaps this change from appeasement to real firmness is the one thing we need today to bring some light into the international picture and truly convince the Soviet that we cannot be kicked around by any nation. Perhaps that would be the right and the best means of liberating Poland and reestablishing true freedom in the world. People of Poland—keep to your faith, keep your courage high. Never give in to Red tyranny. You will be free sooner than you think.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR CHILDREN OF SERVICEMEN WHO DIED IN LINE OF DUTY

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9824) entitled "An act to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean conflict," with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, after "during", insert "World War I."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "II" and insert "II,".

Page 2, after line 10, insert:

"(1) The term 'World War I' means the period beginning on April 6, 1917, and ending on November 11, 1918."

Page 2, line 11, strike out "(1)" and insert "(2)."

Page 2, line 14, strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)."

Page 2, line 16, strike out "(3)" and insert "(4)."

Page 2, line 19, after "during", insert "World War I."

Page 2, line 19, strike out "II" and insert "II,".

Page 3, line 1, strike out "(4)" and insert "(5)."

Page 3, line 7, strike out "(5)" and insert "(6)."

Page 3, line 10, strike out "(6)" and insert "(7)."

Page 3, line 18, strike out "(7)" and insert "(8)."

Page 4, line 1, strike out "(8)" and insert "(9)."

Page 4, line 7, strike out "(9)" and insert "(10)."

Page 4, line 13, strike out "(10)" and insert "(11)."

Page 4, line 16, strike out "(11)" and insert "(12)."

Page 4, line 18, strike out "(12)" and insert "(13)."

Page 24, line 2, strike out all after "payments" down to and including "person" in line 8 and insert "of compensation or pension under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration based on the death of a parent to an eligible person over the age of 18 by reason of pursuing a course in an educational institution, or of increased rates, or additional amounts, of compensation or pension under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration because of such a person."

Page 29, after line 21, insert:

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 513. The appropriations for the Veterans' Administration under the headings 'General Operating Expenses' and 'Readjustment Benefits' are hereby made available for expenditures necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 528 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9540) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks, I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 528 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 9540, a bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. It provides for an open rule and 2 hours of debate on the bill.

The purpose of the bill is to continue and improve cooperative programs the Public Health Service is carrying on with the State and interstate water pollution control agencies under the Water Pollution Control Act, Public Law 845, of the 80th Congress, as amended.

Provision is made for increased technical assistance to States on new and complex problems and to broaden research programs to determine the effects of pollution on public health and

other water uses and to develop more economic methods of treating waste.

The bill also provides that the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board would consist of the Surgeon General, or a sanitary engineering officer designated by him, and nine members appointed by the President, none of whom would be Federal employees.

Section 5 of the bill authorizes the appropriation for each of the next 5 years of $5 million for grants to States and interstate agencies to cover part of the cost of their water pollution control programs. Allotments to the States would be made by the Surgeon General in accordance with regulations on the basis of population, extent of the pollution problem, and the financial need of respective States. However, the Federal share could not exceed a maximum of 66⅔ percent, nor could it be less than 33⅓ percent of the cost. Allotments to interstate agencies would be made on a basis found reasonable and equitable by the Surgeon General.

Section 6 authorizes $50 million a year for grants to States, municipalities, and interstate agencies for preliminary planning and construction of treatment works. Provision is made that the amount so appropriated is not to exceed $500 million and grants are limited to 33⅓ percent of the estimated cost of the construction or $300,000, whichever is smaller. At least 50 percent of the funds are to be used for treatment works for communities of 125,000 or less, and priority is to be given to grants for advance planning.

The committee report complies with the Ramseyer rule and I urge the adoption of the resolution so the House may proceed to the consideration of H. R. 9540.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has so ably explained, the purpose of this resolution is to make in order the consideration of H. R. 9540, a bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. The measure is generally satisfactory, and I want to speak of it generally, insofar as it pertains to the extension of the present Water Pollution Control Act. It contains a few minor changes in connection with the present law; but there is one section in this bill which is, I think, a new Government policy and a new type of subsidy that would cost the people of America in my opinion untold millions, hundreds of millions, and finally probably billions of dollars, because it would not be a temporary measure. It has been our experience, I am sure, that whenever you embark upon any subsidy program as an emergency or for a short period of time somehow it becomes permanent before too long, and the amounts involved always become larger rather than smaller.

Section 6 of this bill which I understand was the real bone of controversy within the Public Works Committee, as well as the Rules Committee, provides for the Federal Government to give grants of $50 million a year for a 10-year period, or $500 million in all to local communities for the purpose of installing antipollution facilities, sewage disposal plants, and installations of that kind.

Remember, if you adopt this policy, it would be a return to PWA days of the depression and would of course favor certain communities only. In other words, the communities that have already attempted to support and abide by the Antipollution Act as it is now on the statute books, and have bonded themselves to install these different facilities, would not receive a single penny under this bill. They would have to pay for the local bonds they have issued for purposes of controlling pollution, and then, in turn, pay additional taxes in order to meet the cost of this gigantic new Federal subsidy program.

Let me point out to you, if I may, that in my home town of some 2,500 in southern Ohio, under the compact that has been entered into between the cities in the Ohio Valley to eliminate pollution in the streams of that area, on the request, insistence and demand of the Ohio Health Board, we bonded ourselves for some $500,000 to put in a sewage disposal plant, with the bonds running until the year 1999, with a cost to each property owner in addition to the taxes to retire the bond issue of some $3 a month or $36 a year. The same situation is true in some of the large cities of America. I believe the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] will discuss with you the situation in Cincinnati, Ohio. The gentleman from Boston, who has just preceded me, will tell you what has been done there in the way of eliminating pollution and to take care of sewage disposal. Yet those cities and communities would have to pay their own taxes to retire the bonds they have issued and not receive one penny of help in any way from the Federal Government. So this section would create an entirely unfair situation as between communities.

But further than that, as a matter of principle, let me point out to you, if I may, that there is not a single municipality in any single State in this Union of ours that is not in better financial condition and position than the Federal Government.

It is my understanding amendments will be offered by members of the Public Works Committee to eliminate section 6. I hope that the Members will give that section and the debate that will take place upon it their most careful consideration and attention.

Let me again point out that if this bill is passed with section 6 in it we will embark our Government, already in financial difficulty, upon a new program of subsidies to the States and to the local communities that in time will become, in my opinion, an unbearable burden upon the American taxpayers. I shall support the rulemaking consideration of the bill under 2 hours of general debate in order. It is an open rule so that amendments may be offered. If the amendment striking section 6 is adopted, of course, I will support the measure; otherwise, I may not be able to do so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the House on Monday and wish to record the fact at this time that on rollcall No. 65 had I been present I would have voted "yea."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to put on RECORD that I am for this Federal program to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution and Control Act. I believe the Federal Government should be interested in aiding the local communities in their regional sewage disposal programs. We people in western Pennsylvania are curing our own ills, but many of these areas cannot afford such programs as the problem even for western Pennsylvania is more than local.

I urge the House to adopt the rule and likewise support the bill, because it is going forward in an expanded program, a program that will protect the families and the children of future generations, as well as present generations.

The flies and insects living on open sewage on the rivers and streams of this country today find their way onto the tables in homes 5 or 10 miles away in most of the communities along the rivers in a comparatively short time. This is an open invitation to the spread of disease. So, I hope this bill passes to take a good step forward in cleaning up our rivers and streams, and to wipe out pollution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the bill which is the subject of this resolution is an excellent one generally, and it is certainly needed. The control and strengthening of the Water Pollution Control Act that now exists is vitally necessary, of course, to this country.

My colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, has referred to section 6 of the bill. There are some of us on the committee who vigorously opposed the adoption of section 6 in this bill, which provides, as he said, for a completely new Federal activity and a completely new Federal spending program. In these days when all of us are talking about limiting and reducing the activities of the Federal Government, when we are talking about balancing the budget, we should carefully examine section 6 in this bill, which provides for another huge spending program on the part of the Federal Government. For the first time we are going to bypass the States, if this section becomes law, and contribute Federal funds directly to municipalities. It will be the Surgeon General who will determine which municipalities shall be given Federal aid, how much, and what priority should be given to certain cities.

Let me point out, first, that section 6 was not in the Senate bill. Section 6 is not recommended; in fact, it is opposed by the administration. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare vigorously opposed this section in the hearings before the committee. Usually the Congress has to put some check on the agencies of the Government because of their requests for more money, for re-

quests that the Federal Government engage in new activities. Here we have a case where the Congress is attempting to foist upon the agency an activity and a program which it vigorously opposes.

The proponents of this bill argue that the small cities will not be able to comply with the enforcement provisions of this bill. That they will not be able to furnish adequate sewage disposal plants because they are not in a position to finance these projects. As my colleague from Ohio pointed out, the debt of the Federal Government exceeds the debt of all of the cities and all of the States and all of the other nations of the world combined. Therefore, who is best able to pay—the cities or the Federal Government?

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare made a survey and in its testimony clearly indicated that the cities who are asking for this new Federal-aid program failed conclusively to demonstrate the need for Federal aid. They pointed out that the only reason certain cities are not able to comply with the orders to stop pollution in their areas is because they have not given priority to pollution problems. They have been more interested in providing streets, even playgrounds and swimming pools than cleaning up the sewage that comes from the residences and the businesses in the area.

This bill, of course, provides only for the expenditure of $500 million. The original bill provided for an expenditure of $1 billion. But let us not be misled to believe that this is a program that is going to cost only $500 million, because that is just not so. We are getting our foot in the door. This is a new spending spree by the Federal Government. I shall show you that $500 million is only a drop in the bucket compared to the eventual cost of this program.

My own city of Cincinnati just completed a vast disposal plant installation at a cost of $50 million. That is $50 million for 1 city, while this program provides only $50 million of Federal aid for all of the cities of the United States in 1 year, over a period of 10 years. So what you are going to have is a program that will cost not $500 million, but a program that, before we get through, is going to cost about $7 billion. As soon as you give aid to some of these cities then the other cities are bound to come in and ask for aid. They will be entitled to it, and the Congress will not hesitate in future years to appropriate the necessary money.

What about the cities who have pioneered in water-pollution control—cities like Cincinnati and the city of my colleague from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and hundreds of others in this country, who have taxed the people of their communities, to eliminate pollution? As I said, the city of Cincinnati, which does not have a great deal of money has had to raise the money for its disposal plant. In fact, the city of Cincinnati had to impose an income tax in the last year in order to operate that city. When we provided for this disposal system which, as I said, cost $50 million, we provided the money to pay for it by placing an 8-cent tax on every 100 cubic feet of water. The cost for the plant is paid by those who use the sewers. Industry in the area that contributes excessive pollution is required to pay a surcharge.

The argument that small cities cannot do this job is fallacious. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare survey showed that it is fallacious. I know of some small cities upstream from Cincinnati. They do not have an income tax; they have not provided a sewage or water tax to take care of their pollution. In addition to that, the assessed value of real estate is about 25 percent of the actual market value, whereas the valuation in the city of Cincinnati is from 75 to 90 percent of the market value.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. Is it not a fact that it was developed that if we provide for these grants-in-aid, it will not prove of help to facilitate and expedite the building of sewage-control systems, but will only tend to delay them, because everybody will be waiting from here on out, for this aid?

Mr. SCHERER. The gentleman from New York is absolutely correct because, as I said, we provide only $500 million in this bill. The cities that do not come in the first time, instead of going forward with sewage-disposal plants as has been done in other communities, will wait until the Congress appropriates more money.

Mr. BECKER. The best thing we can do is to provide no money at all in this bill so that the cities and the towns will proceed with the erection of the facilities that they need, as they should.

Mr. SCHERER. That has been the almost uncontradicted testimony before the committee.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman continues to speak of those cities which have been able to solve their fiscal problems through the imposition of a city income tax. The gentleman also says that most of them have not seen fit to levy a local income tax. Is not the gentleman aware that in most of the States cities are not permitted by State law to levy city income taxes; that in most States State laws restrict cities as to the taxes they may levy, and that they are bonded to the hilt?

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to that question. There are two methods which can be followed by these cities. They can increase the assessed valuation of the real estate duplicate to furnish the necessary money to do this job; they can go at least to 50 percent of the market value of the real estate. Secondly, they can levy a sewer or water tax, as the city of Cincinnati has done in order to build its plant; and thirdly, the States can amend their State law instead of coming to the Federal Government, which is least able of all the segments of government to support a program such as this.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Is it not true that the National Municipal Association has been pushing very hard for this bill and that their statement before our committee was that the municipalities could not borrow money in sufficient quantity to carry out this program?

Mr. SCHERER. You would expect that professional group to do that. But I certainly do not agree with its testimony, and neither does the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I do not think anyone has refuted their testimony before our committee. And one other thing that directly points up the matter so far as the Federal Government is concerned, each year for the last 8 years we have been progressively dropping, dropping, dropping down in the matter of stopping stream pollution.

Mr. SCHERER. The new enforcement provisions of this bill are going to take care of that.

The gentleman represents the great State of West Virginia. There are a number of cities in West Virginia along the Ohio River. If Cincinnati has to contribute to this program, when we have taken care of our own pollution then we are going to have to pay twice in order to take care of the cities of West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. You do not want the polution from West Virginia coming down on Cincinnati. If we feel we cannot pay for it, you will continue to get the pollution from West Virginia.

Mr. SCHERER. What is the percentage of assessed valuation of the real estate of the West Virginia cities along the Ohio River?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I do not have those figures.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I wish to compliment the city of Cincinnati on the work it has been doing, just as Pittsburgh has, in cleaning up this sewage disposal matter. In eastern Ohio around the Youngstown area, I do not appreciate the people that are trying to come in here and get Federal funds on the basis of flood control to do what they ought to be doing on their own, taking care of the sewage disposal. They try to get it under another program unless you come right out and say the Federal Government is going to set up a program to help on sewage disposal. I would rather face it directly, even though Pittsburgh is well advanced on the program and has gotten ahead of the others. As the gentleman from West Virginia says, we fellows that are ahead of the game do not want other cities and villages tossing in the sewage and undoing our work.

Mr. SCHERER. Do not get me wrong. There are provisions in this bill for Federal assistance, technical assistance, for planning, research, and study. I agree with that section of the bill that provides for those things. But I want to

ask, how many cities that say they cannot support such a program as will be required under the enforcement provisions, I repeat, how many of them could not do it if they gave priority to sewage disposal rather than to parks, playgrounds, streets, and even recreational facilities?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Under the highway program we heard references to a pay-back for roads that States had already built which are going to be part of the national program. Is there any such provision in this bill to reimburse those cities which have recently built such facilities?

Mr. SCHERER. There are no provisions for reimbursement in this bill.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. As a member of the committee, may I ask if it is not a fact that this is the only controversial section of the entire bill?

Mr. SCHERER. I want to make it clear that those of us who oppose this section are not opposing this bill.

Mr. BECKER. As a matter of fact, they are in favor of it.

Mr. SCHERER. The chairman of this committee has done an excellent job. We need this bill badly.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I quote from the report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy of December 22, 1955:

> An orderly use and control of water resources requires a background of physical facts, understanding, and accumulated experience. For any problem involving water use and development, it is necessary to know when and how much water is available in a given area and how it is distributed. This involves the study of amounts and distribution of rainfall, the flow of rivers, the occurrence of water in the ground, the nature of the rocks and the soil, and other characteristics of both land and water.

This Committee has delegated responsibility for municipal and industrial water supply planning and pollution control to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of which Department the Public Health Service is a constituent agency. This delegation carries with it the responsibility for basic data collection in the water-resources development and conservation areas.

H. R. 9540 or S. 890, as reported by the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives, directs the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to collect and disseminate basic data on chemical, physical, and biological water quality and such other information related to water-pollution prevention and control as he deems necessary.

Thus the Public Health Service would be able to assume its proper responsibility and to share with other Federal agencies the total Federal responsibility of the overall basic data program.

Need exists for a national water quality basic data program relating to sewage and industrial waste pollution. Need also exists for a complete and current national inventory of water, sewage, and industrial waste facilities. Moreover, a detailed basic data program should be related to the economics of water supplies and pollution control.

More specifically, the country needs base lines for measuring progress in water quality improvement and for the purpose of anticipating deterioration of the Nation's waters. The damages to water uses should be identified as to nature, cause and extent. Where water supplies require a high degree of purity, information is vitally needed as to a selection of sources for domestic and industrial water supplies. It is also important to be selective in the matter of developing sources where a lesser degree of purity is needed. In areas where conservation or improvement of water quality is of major importance, intelligent planning cannot be accomplished without essential information on basic water data.

Other specific basic data needs for which the proposed legislation is designed to serve are: (a) inventory of present and future desired water uses of various streams, (b) the determination of trends in domestic and municipal water supply and sewage and industrial waste practices, (c) implementation of mobilization readiness planning for water supply, (d) provision of data for certification of interstate common carrier watering points, (e) provision of guides in industrial site selection, and (f) provision of guides to research needs relating to water, sewage, and industrial waste facilities.

I am informed that the basic data program contemplated under the proposed legislation will be planned to supplement and not to duplicate other basic data programs of other agencies. Whenever possible, cooperation will be carried on with the appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies to permit the maximum facility and economy.

This aspect of the measure now under consideration by the House is one that Members of this body can hardly reject. The cost of such a program is minimal compared with the need of protecting future investments of all agencies of government and of private industry in the conservation of the Nation's water.

PLANNING FOCUS

The development of additional water supplies to support expected population and industrial growth will present problems in areas where convenient and economical sources have already been fully developed. Consequently greater conservation of available water resources through pollution control is becoming more and more important in many areas.

It is also important that the Federal Government cooperate with the States in order to keep our streams reasonably clean, and thus anticipate the problem which confronts urban areas.

In a recent survey the Public Health Service found that more than 52 million people in communities of 25,000 and over now depend upon surface sources for their daily water supplies, as compared with fewer than 40 million—12 million increase—8 years ago. It should also be noted that dependence on untreated water cannot be relied on. Less than 1 percent of the population in communities of 25,000 and over today find it possible to use untreated water.

In the last 8 years the number of communities of 25,000 and over has increased from 422 to 570 and their combined population from 53 million to 64 million. Considering outlying suburbs to these communities, the population increase has been from 62 million to 83 million.

These population figures are impressive in relation to the water supply needs in a situation where the overall water resource is practically constant. The water supply problem is emphasized by the results of a nationwide inventory made by the Public Health Service of 1,532 community water facilities. One out of four of the larger urban areas have reported they will need additional water supplies to meet municipal and industrial growth. More than half the water supply facilities covered by the survey were reported as needing improvement or enlargement and some involved the development of new supplies.

In recent years, many cities have experienced water shortages during periods of low rainfall. Such situations are likely to increase in both number and severity as population and industry continue to expand. This obviously calls for extensive advance planning for water. In many instances, sizable water development projects will be needed. Adequate treatment of the ever-mounting quantity of wastes will permit more extensive use of available surface water. This is the logical answer to some of the present supply problems. For treatment of sewage and wastes to protect water quality makes possible the reuse of water as streams flow from city to city and from State to State.

The Federal Government is in an excellent position to cooperate with the States in planning for the control of pollution in river basins in which several States are involved. Such control must be approached in a practical manner. A balance must be struck which maintains quality of stream waters for desirable uses, and at the same time permits reasonable use of the streams for disposing of treated sewage and industrial waste. Planning of this nature is absolutely necessary for us to meet our future water supply needs. Such planning is urgent. According to the report of the Hoover Commission Task Force on Water Resources and Power, planning is not being carried out at present with necessary foresight.

An extension of the Water Pollution Control Act will permit more vigor and foresight to be put into planning for water pollution control. Therefore, I propose to vote for the enactment of the water pollution control measure now before the House of Representatives.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, being from a State and representing a district where our water resources, while certainly ranking among our greatest assets, present, too, some of our major problems, I am keenly conscious of the necessity for expanding and strengthening the Nation's Water Pollution Control Act, while in the process of extending it.

This holds especially true for areas, such as my own, where the availability of adequate, even abundant, water resources is resulting in increased industrialization. This industrial development is making it essential to provide for stronger and more comprehensive measures for the conservation of water resources and for effective means for pollution abatement and control.

It shall not be my purpose to enter into detailed discussion of provisions of the bill now before the House. My colleague from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] and others of his Public Works Subcommittee have clearly and effectively summarized and explained the legislation. It is my purpose, however, to declare my support for the bill as reported by the committee.

The need for Federal assistance to the States and political subdivisions, through financial grants-in-aid, for construction of sewage treatment and disposal plants is self-evident. Local interests have been, on the whole, unable to keep pace in providing such facilities, and, consequently, the unfilled need for pollution-control works has reached serious proportions.

With respect to this bill's provisions which would provide funds to train personnel in water control work, to conduct research and administer State programs, I am of the opinion that there can be but little, if any, valid opposition. And I fully concur in the bill's provisions which would give the Surgeon General stronger enforcement powers in instances where State agencies may be lax or slow in combating pollution. I believe that this power, which does not infringe upon the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution, will result in more prompt and effective remedial action in many cases, with the result being a substantial contribution to the public health and welfare.

It is my hope that enactment of this Federal legislation may have among its beneficial effects the adoption by the various States of measures to broaden and strengthen their own laws relating to the problems of water conservation and pollution abatement and control. I especially hope that the States may be encouraged to enact legislation requiring industrial users of water to return the water, purified after use, to the same artesian strata from which it was taken. Many current water-use practices are resulting in serious depletion of the artesian sources.

May I conclude by reaffirming my support of the Blatnik bill, with its provisions for the development and operation of comprehensive programs for eliminating or reducing the pollution of interstate waters and tributaries, and for improving the sanitary condition of surface and underground waters; and which also gives due regard to improvements which are necessary to conserve waters for public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agriculture, industrial, and other legitimate uses.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this section 6 of the bill is going to be quite controversial and I wish to discuss it for a few minutes. I might say about the history of this legislation that this bill is intended to be an extension of existing law. The present water-pollution bill would expire on the 30th of June. A bill was brought out some months ago, but there was so much controversy about it that the committee took it back and took out most of the features to which the various States were objecting. Somewhere along the line this section 6 appeared in the bill and that is what I want to talk about. The bill authorizes one-half billion dollars at the rate of $50 million a year to be distributed among cities that have not cleaned up their pollutions. Under the formula, a city that has done its duty and has cleaned up and gone to all the expense and done the work or provided for doing the work does not get a nickel out of the bill. On the contrary, the city that has not attended to its business and has not undertaken to clean up its pollution not only gets paid for its negligence and its indifference, but the cities that have helped and have done the work are penalized in that they have to pay their proportion of the Federal taxes that go into this project. That seems to me totally inequitable. I hope the House will see fit to strike that out. The bill can be completely adequate so far as the original intent is concerned without that section in it, and as has been said here it embarks the Federal Government on another tremendous spending program. Certainly, such an inequitable provision ought not to be carried into this bill.

I want to call attention particularly, however, to one section of this bill that has to do with the distribution of funds. I would hate to vote for this section, but I will vote for it if anybody in this House can tell me what it means. I want to read it to you. You will find it on page 10 of the bill.

On line 18, it says:

(h) (1) The "Federal share" for any State shall be 100 percent less than percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska), except that (A) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66⅔ percent or less than 33⅓ percent, and (B) the Federal share for Hawaii and Alaska shall be 50 percent, and for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 66⅔ percent.

I always thought, of course, that we have changed a lot of rules around here since I have been in the Congress. But we do still have some old rules which, I think, still stick. I thought 100 percent less than any figure was nothing.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may try to explain that?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman. I have been trying to get that straightened out. I asked the gentleman about it in the Committee on Rules the other day.

Mr. BLATNIK. The gentleman is quite right that at first sight it sounds like gobbledegook but the purpose and the meaning of it is very simple.

The program grant provisions of H. R. 9540—section 5—has two essential elements. The first provides for an allocation among the States of the Federal grant funds and the second provides for State matching of these allotments.

Most Federal grant programs contain these two elements. The following two programs administered by this Department are very similar in allotment and matching procedures to the proposals in H. R. 9540:

Hospital and medical facilities survey and construction—Hill-Burton.

Vocational rehabilitation.

But, the important thing is this: All that section does is to establish a formula by which these funds shall be distributed. Primarily, it is on the basis of the economic situation or the ability of these localities to pay for their own program plus population. What it means is this: If, in a given State, the per capita income is the same as the national income, that is 1 to 1—or 100 percent to 100 percent, then, the same ratio to 50 percent would be 50 to 50. That means the Federal funds are 50 and the State funds are 50. If, in the high income State that is economically well off, the per capita income is 120 to 100 as a national average, then one-half of 120 percent is 60 percent and you deduct that from 100 and that is 100 percent less 60 percent. That means the Federal share is only 40 percent and the State's share is 60 percent because their economic situation is favorable.

In an economic area where the per capita income is less, let us say it is 80 percent of the national per capita income, then half of 80 percent is 40 percent and you subtract that again from 100 percent, in other words, 100 percent less 40 percent and then the Federal share becomes 60 percent, to 40 percent for the States. It sounds complicated. The purpose is simple. It gives a little flexibility, so that in economically favorable areas they carry up to two-thirds of the cost, and the Federal Government one-third. In lower income areas the Federal Government will carry up to two-thirds and the State only one-third.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I hope that you smart boys know the answer if it is as simple as my friend says it is—and I want to say parenthetically that the gentleman has done a tremendous amount of work on this bill. It is an important bill and it ought to be adopted, but certainly there is no reason why it should not be plain. I want to help the gentleman get through his bill, but I want to get through a bill that somebody can understand. But I received a lot of my education in a little one-room red schoolhouse, and I was always told that "100 percent less" than something was nothing. If it is less 100

percent, I do not see how it can be anything, and I do not see why you could not have put in simple language to say that. I want to get something that we can understand. If somebody comes to me and asks me what it means, I would like to be able to tell them. I have been asking around, but I cannot find what it means. It seems to me there should be some simple language that we could put in there.

Mr. BLATNIK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield, and I want to compliment the gentleman on the tremendous amount of work he has done.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. We did raise that same point in committee, about having more simple language. This language was written by the Department of Health.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sure it was.

Mr. BLATNIK. It is the same language that is in other legislation, such as the Hill-Burton Act. It is simple to work out. When a community is more than the average, it pays more, and when it is less it pays less. It is within a range from one-third to two-thirds.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will tell you what I think it was. It was written by the Department of Health and Education, and I think it means if you pass this bill in its present form then the Department of Education will decide whatever they want to decide, and it can be done under this language. It cannot mean anything.

I now yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE.]

Mr. BURNSIDE. We have a committee amendment that will clear this somewhat.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is fine.

Mr. BURNSIDE. One other thing. The Senate passed this after thinking over it for a long time. It has been on the statute books for some time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Now, after we get this clarified, I just wonder how under this section 6 it is going to work and who is going to get what. It says that certain gentlemen shall distribute it and in such manner that will tend to result in a wide distribution of such funds amongst the several areas of the United States. Does that mean that the fellow who has the most creaky wheel, the wheel that creaks the loudest, is going to get the most grease? I am ashamed sometimes when people ask me about a law—"What does it mean?" I do not see why you cannot put these things into language that we know what it means and we do not have to ask the Department of Education what it means.

I join with the gentleman from Michigan in the hope that the House will strike out section 6 and not start on this tremendous campaign that was not contemplated in the original legislation. Why, in this terrible state of fiscal affairs of this Nation, should we do this thing which is going to make cities that have done their job pay for the cities that have not attended to business?

I hope the House will give that serious consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9540) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9540, with Mr. YATES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 9540 is an act to extend and revise the existing Water Pollution Control Act which was passed in 1948 after half a century of discussion and consideration of the water-pollution problem and the responsibility of the Federal Government in this field of water resources use. In 1948 the first comprehensive legislation of this kind was passed, which is the existing law, Public Law 845. I use the term "comprehensive" but I wish to call the attention of the membership of the House to the fact that at that time in the House Public Works Committee it was felt that that was merely an initial step in which some Federal responsibility was justifiable to stimulate, encourage, and to some degree assist, in a cooperative way, State and local action for abatement of water pollution, which, even at that time, 8 years ago, was recognized as of growing seriousness. The act, Public Law 845, has now been on the statute books for 8 years and it is time that we reassess the effectiveness of that act.

THE GOVERNMENT ROLE IN POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The increased concern of municipalities, States, industries, and the public generally over shortages of fresh water of acceptable quality—as evidenced by the attention that is being given to the problem by the press and other media and by the number of commissions that have studied the matter in recent years—directed attention to the proper role of the Government in relation to development and use of the Nation's water resources. The bill now under consideration further defines the functions of the Federal Government in cooperating with the States to meet the grave national water pollution-control problem. It has been developed after hearing the views of all interested parties.

Last year the other body passed a water pollution control bill, S. 890, extending, revising, and improving the existing act. When the bill came over to the House side, after rather brief hearings the House committee favorably reported the bill to the House floor. At that time we received many negative queries and objections from Congressmen all over the country, particularly in those areas where the industry people, especially the pulp and paper industries, raised objections about insufficient hearings. There was also serious controversy on the enforcement procedure in the existing law and in the proposed Senate act. In view of that we recalled the bill from the floor, went back into committee, and held extensive hearings. We heard over 78 witnesses in weeks-long hearings on the entire water pollution problem.

We asked the State health officers and State health agencies to get together and work out an enforcement procedure which would get the broadest possible support among the States. That was done in a most effective and laudable manner.

The State water pollution control administrators and health officials under the able leadership of Dr. Daniel Bergsma, commissioner of health of New Jersey and president of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, and Mr. Milton P. Adams, executive secretary of the Water Resources Commission, after consultation with representatives of conservation and industry and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, developed a number of amendments to meet objections raised by some of the States. These provisions were incorporated into H. R. 9540 which I introduced on February 27.

Because it was evident that the crux of the national pollution problem is the lag in construction of waste treatment works, I added section 6, which provides for direct Federal grants to assist municipalities in the construction of sewage disposal facilities. My original proposal called for $100 million of Federal grants each year for 10 years, or a total of $1 billion. This turned out to be the controversial section of the bill with the minority membership in strong opposition, and the majority in equal support. The Department of Health opposed it, although agreeing that we are seriously behind with our plants and facilities for coping with pollution abatement. So, to compromise, the majority membership of the committee went along with the minority in cutting the total amount in half, from $100 million a year to $50 million a year, for a total of 10 years.

MAIN PROVISIONS OF H. R. 9540

The legislation under consideration would continue the present Federal-State cooperative program which is based on the established principle of recognizing the primary rights and responsibilities of the States in controlling water pollution. The bill would correct the insufficiencies of present law in several specific ways:

First. It authorizes an intensified and broadened research program designed to tap the research potentials of universities, research centers, and other institutions throughout the country on all aspects of the water pollution problem.

Second. It provides for program grants to States to help them strengthen all aspects of their water pollution control activities. The present law contains a provision for grants to States, but it confines the grants to studies related to industrial pollution.

Third. It improves the enforcement provision of the present law relating to the abatement of interstate pollution—pollution originating in one State which endangers the health and welfare of persons in another State. It eliminates the provision of present law requiring the consent of the State in which the pollution originates before court action may be instituted. Court action under the proposed legislation could be brought either with the consent of the State in which the pollution originates or at the request of the State injured by the pollution. The improved enforcement procedures of the bill constitute a reasonable balance between the primary rights of the States to control water pollution within their boundaries and the rights of the States affected by pollution from another State to have available to them a practical remedy.

Fourth. The bill continues the principle in present law authorizing Federal financial aid for construction of treatment works. Instead of the construction loan provisions in the existing act, however, matching grants of $50 million a year to States, municipalities, intermunicipalities, and interstate agencies for the preliminary planning and construction of treatment works would be authorized. The aggregate of sums so appropriated would not exceed $500 million. Grants are limited to 33⅓ percent of the estimated reasonable cost of the construction or $300,000 whichever is the smaller. At least 50 percent of the funds so authorized are to be used for treatment works servicing communities of 125,000 population or under, and priority is to be given to grants for advance planning.

NEED FOR FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Testimony and evidence presented during the hearings on this bill clearly demonstrated the need for Federal financial assistance for the construction of sewage-treatment works. This is borne out by the record. The only time the construction of sewage-treatment works kept pace with the need for such construction was during the period 1933 to 1939 when Federal funds were made available through such programs as the Public Works Administration and the Works Progress Administration. Before that, and since, construction has lagged until today there is a huge backlog of needed treatment works.

Construction to take care of this backlog and at the same time keep pace with the ever-growing demands on cities and towns due to increased population and industrialization requires great capital outlay. Representatives of these cities and towns testified as to the need for financial assistance. Many communities are earnestly trying to solve these problems but have reached the limit of their legal bonded indebtedness. The tax resources of others are limited by State law and constitution. Many are simply financially unable to raise sufficient revenue to construct needed treatment works. In the meantime these communities continue to pollute the streams, jeopardizing the health of their neighbors, and degrading the Nation's most vital resource.

A small amount of Federal financial aid for construction as provided in this bill will serve to stimulate local programs of treatment works construction by providing an incentive to take action now to clean up and protect the waters of this Nation.

Before you can evaluate correctly as to whether a water pollution control program is too strong, whether, as some say, it has too many teeth in it, or, on the contrary, whether it is too weak, too inadequate and does not have enough teeth, we feel you should have as a background a broad, overall picture, a panoramic mental picture, of the water problem of America. Then you superimpose on that the mechanism, the machinery, with which you attempt to abate pollution. Thereby you can determine the relative merits or effectiveness of a pollution-control program.

So, briefly, to present the national picture of the water problem which we are here discussing, here is a chart which will aid you in a verbal description, covering the last 50 years of America's history. In 1900, the population was 75 million people, and industry was rather primitive as compared to today. From 1900 to 1950 what happened? In those 50 years, in a half century of America's progress, the population doubled, industry increased 7 times. Mind you, this is in terms of the fact that the water supply is constant. There is not any more water nor any less water than there was 50 years ago. It is in the use and reuse of the water that enables twice as many people to use water and more water per capita. People did not have so many showers and baths in 1900. People used more water per capita in 1950.

What is now happening? Let us project ahead only for 20 years. It is estimated that the population will go from 150 million to over 200 million, an increase of over 25 percent. More important is the industrial development. Industry will increase twice what we had in 1950, 14 times what we had in 1900, 75 years back. In the last 50 years the technological progress in America has been greater than in the last 2,000 years of the entire world. So that is the competitive situation that we now find ourselves faced with in regard to our fixed water supply. We have this situation, more and more water is going to be used and as more water is used more water is polluted, giving us less available usable water in the first place. It is a vicious circle. You have more and more industries using more water. The more used the more it is polluted, leaving us less water to begin with. Around and around she goes and where it will stop no one knows. Except we have the handwriting on the wall.

WATER POLLUTION AND THE NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES PROBLEM

Water use for all purposes is on the increase, particularly for municipal, industrial, irrigation, and recreational purposes, and for transportation of wastes. It is estimated that by 1975 the Nation's population will be in the range of 200 million persons and industrial capacity will be double the 1950 levels. Public water supply use will probably increase from 17 billion gallons per day to 30 billion gallons per day, and industrial water use, excluding power, will increase from 60 billion gallons per day to 115 billion gallons per day.

By 1975, reliable estimates indicate this country will require an increase in the current water supply of 145 percent—equal to the additional supply of 120 New York Citys, requiring the flow of about 11 Colorado Rivers or equal to the continuous flow over Niagara Falls. Further, as our economy expands, leisure time increases, and population grows, it will become necessary to provide more and more waters suitable for recreation, fish and wildlife, and other legitimate uses.

In meeting these increasing demands, the control of pollution has an essential role in the Nation's water-resources problem. Pollution is a waste of water. The greater the degree of pollution, the greater is the waste. Pollution can be just as effective in reducing a water resource for use as drought. Pollution control, therefore, is now recognized as a key to the national problem of water conservation. Pollution control will permit repeated reuse of the same water as it flows from its source to the sea.

In recent years, population and industry have spread to all parts of the country with the result that now almost all of the Nation's waters are affected by sewage and industrial wastes. As our population grows and our economy expands, pollution of the Nation's waters will continue to increase unless control measures are materially accelerated.

In 1920, the population equivalent of municipal wastes reaching our stream was about 40 million persons. This means the organic loading contained in the sewage, treated and untreated, discharged to streams amounted to the equivalent of the organic content in the raw or untreated sewage from 40 million persons. In 1955 the equivalent of raw sewage from nearly 55 million persons was being discharged to the Nation's waters.

The increase with respect to industrial wastes has been even greater. Reliable estimates indicate that in 1920 organic industrial waste accounted for a pollution load equal to the raw sewage from about 50 million persons and in 1955 accounted for an organic pollution load equivalent to the raw sewage from 110 million persons. Since 1920 the organic pollution load brought to bear on our water resources has increased by a population equivalent of approximately 75 million persons, despite the progress that was made in municipal sewage treatment plant construction under the Public Works Administration during the 1930's, and that which has been made by industry in recent years. In addition, ever-increasing quantities of inorganic wastes such as acids, toxic metals, cyanides, and radioactive materials are being discharged to our Nation's waterways.

A great deal needs to be done to control municipal and industrial pollution. It is estimated that projects to meet the present backlog of needs for sewage-treatment plants and intercepting sewers would cost in excess of $1.9 billion. During the period 1955–65 the cost of replacing sewage-treatment facilities reaching obsolescence is estimated to total $1.72 billion. Sewage-treatment requirements of an increasing population during the 1955–65 period are estimated to cost an additional $1.71 billion. This is a total cost for municipal pollution-abatement needs during 1955–65 of about $5 billion.

The estimated costs for new sewer systems and extensions to existing systems during 1955–65 total approximately $5.5 billion. Sewer needs reported as of today will cost an estimated $2.35 billion; replacement needs caused by obsolescence during the next 10 years will cost $1.09 billion; and during this same period new sewer requirements will cost approximately $2.06 billion. The present needs for industrial waste treatment and disposal projects to meet 1955 requirements will cost an estimated $2.5 billion.

A review of recently proposed State and Federal legislation and the findings of various commissions and committees studying water pollution and water resources development problems shows a growing consideration of the need for financial assistance to State and local governments. To illustrate, the final report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations—Kestnbaum Committee—recommends that study be given to the desirability of Federal assistance to cooperative programs for the construction of pollution-abatement facilities.

Once the Nation has caught up on the tremendous backlog of needed construction—assuming greater progress in research and the further development of State and interstate pollution control programs—the offensive against water pollution will be well underway. Today we are on the defensive on all fronts, especially in the brick and mortar job of building sewage treatment works.

During the hearings on H. R. 9540, Assistant Secretary Roswell B. Perkins of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare conceded that pollution of the Nation's water resources had become steadily worse during the last 5 years. In a subsequent speech, Mr. Perkins made this statement regarding the need for more pollution abatement works:

> I personally view the need for waste treatment works as ranking second only to schools in priority of claim on our capital outlay dollars for public works.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to my good friend from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that the conservation of our water resources and the maintenance of its purity is one of the great problems of the day and will become more serious as the years go by. I am in favor of this legislation, and want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota for sponsoring this bill, and the committee for reporting it favorably.

Moreover, it is a national problem and the United States Government should help the cities and States solve their problems of sewage disposal and water protection and conservation. Many of the local communities just do not have the income necessary to do the job themselves.

The appropriation necessary to finance this legislation is just a drop in the bucket compared with the money we are spending in foreign countries on similar projects. Some of these may be necessary, but at the same time we must take care of this problem at home. I will vote for the bill, and against this amendment that would eliminate section 6. The adoption of the Dondero amendment would make the bill largely ineffective.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank my good friend.

So that is the picture. Now, in 1948, when the Federal Government stepped into the picture for the first time, we had grants-in-aid for State pollution-control programs. But in the entire 8 years of the law, only for 3 years were these grants given to States to help build up their State pollution-control agencies. We found out that even as late as last year, 1954, and 1955, that of the 48 States 32 of them spent $50,000 a year or less for their whole State pollution-control programs. Twenty-three of them spent only $30,000 a year or less. Many States only spent $5,000 or $7,000 for a whole year for the entire pollution-control programs in their respective States. Why, in many of those cases that amount of money would not be sufficient to provide 1 cesspool for part of a suburb of 1 municipality. Then, when the Federal Government came along with $1 million for State program grants, look what happened [pointing to chart]. In 1950, 1951, and 1952, from $2 million total money spent by all of the States, it rose steadily in 3 years up to $4 million. In that year the Federal grants were cut off. What happened to the State programs? They froze. Their expenditures have been at a plateau for the last 4 years and will continue at that plateau.

So the point I wish to stress in the grants money as well as in the aid for sewage disposal facilities for municipalities, the Federal Government does not do anything like the major part of the job for either the States or the municipalities, but it merely provides an incentive plus a little assistance, and once the States start, they carry on on their own, because we want the primary responsibility to rest in the States and local governmental units in this water-pollution-control program.

A great deal was said during the discussion on the rule in opposition to grants-in-aid to municipalities for the construction of sewage disposal facilities. We went into this as carefully as was possible, consulting with the health authorities, with the health departments of the States, with industry, with conservation groups, with mayors, with the American Municipal Association; went back into the records; into the matter of six major studies made by the Congress itself on national water pollution policy, and in each one of them attention was called that the Federal Government should take a careful look into this field of giving Federal aid for the construction of sewage disposal facilities.

Here we have a chart showing the total amount of money spent by municipalities for sewage disposal facilities since 1915 up to 1950, a period of 35 years. The average for that entire period is $172 million. And, as you look over that period there is only one time in the 50 years of history we are talking about that construction of facilities was adequate enough to meet the pollution abatement problem, and that was in the WPA and the PWA days of 1933 to 1939 in which 60 percent of the money came from the Federal Government. That is the only time; never before and never since.

What has happened? There was an average of $172 million a year being spent for sewage disposal facilities. Then came the war. It dropped to $58 million a year. We were falling further and further behind and rapidly since 1940. The population increased rapidly. More homes were being built. More young people were getting married. There were more children. We had the highest birth rate in the history of America. We had one of the most phenomenal growths in industry at a time when we were doing so little in the matter of pollution abatement.

The complex organic chemicals that are finding their way into the streams and rivers of the country today are the result, of course, of the phenomenal development of new manufacturing processes all up and down the country.

Such industries as the synthetic fabrics, the plastics, and the detergents have become gigantic operations in the span of just a few years. The production of detergents, for example, has grown from almost nothing in 1940 to almost 2 billion pounds in 1955. It is expected to double by 1975.

The processes for waste treatment, on the other hand, differ very little from those that were developed in the early part of the century. Research in the field of waste treatment simply has not kept up with the increasing quantity and complexity of the wastes produced as a result of this phenomenal development of these modern industries.

Do you know what detergents do to the water? Somebody was talking about the facilities around Pittsburgh. I intend to cast no reflections on that city. But here in this container is water from Pittsburgh that was recaptured out of the Ohio River at Wheeling, W. Va., almost 100 miles downstream. When I shake it up, see what happens. It foams up like soapsuds in your sink. Look at that detergent, look at that foam. Yet we do not know how to get rid of that. The people in Wheeling, W. Va., and all the other communities downstream have to suck this in through their intake pipes and treat it by some expensive process to make it potable, so that they may drink it with safety.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHERER. The gentleman points out that the cities and the States of this country have spent very little in an effort to control water pollution. In that the gentleman is correct. May I ask the gentleman this question, however? Will not the new enforcement provision in this bill, which is a good one, compel the cities and States to spend the money that is needed?

Mr. BLATNIK. You cannot squeeze blood out of a turnip. Many of these municipalities have reached the limit of their bonded indebtedness. They do not have other financial resources. You cannot go to them and talk about a threat of prosecution by the Attorney General of the United States unless they go ahead and build sewage disposal plants. How can they comply? They are caught in a squeeze. We who are charged with the duty of enforcing that good enforcement provision which the gentleman refers to must have some little responsibility concerning that, to give them a little bit of help, in order that they may help themselves to comply with that enforcement provision.

Mr. Chairman, if I may review just once again, for the entire 50 years, the national average has been $172 million a year for municipal construction. The only time in all of our history when the amount was adequate was in the period 1933 to 1939, about 20 years ago. But in the last 8 years, what has happened? The existing law provides $22½ million in loans at 2 percent interest. It authorizes an advance of $1 million for planning. What has happened? In 8 years there has been not one single project approved. Why? Because municipalities just cannot borrow money. They cannot go out and seek loans because of the limitation on their bonded indebtedness, or some other constitutional limitation, whatever it may be.

That is the record. Only one time in our history was the amount that was used adequate and that was when we had direct grants, in the period from 1933 to 1939. In the last 8 years, the only time we have had any Federal law, the only time we tried to give any Federal assistance was in the form of loans, and there has been not one single project. As a matter of fact, this average of $172 million a year should go up to $450 million a year, for a total of $5 billion in the next 10 or 12 years, and the only way to do that, to clean up this mess that we have got in America today is under the program we are proposing in H. R. 9540. We are spending less than half of what is required.

Somebody has said, "But these municipalities do not want to do anything about it." The record will show you that these municipalities today are spending almost a quarter of a billion dollars a year for disposal facilities, doing everything they can to win a losing fight. They are spending a quarter of a billion dollars. How much has the Federal Government spent in the last 8 years under the existing law? Mr. Chairman, I will tell you—exactly $11 million in 8 years of a program. Under existing law, which had authorized $216,000,000.

You say that these municipalities are not exerting any effort. I think the figures I have given you are evidence that the States and municipalities are trying to exert every effort to solve a problem that has become a national problem.

So I do urge favorable consideration and adoption of section 6 when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule. Somebody has said that it would be unfair to those municipalities that have already built plants.

On this point that Federal construction grants would amount to penalizing the towns that have already built sewage-treatment works, there is this to be said:

For the most part, it is the downstream community which gets the greatest benefit from a sewage treatment plant. Therefore, cities which have built treatment plants will, in a great many instances, derive direct benefit from the construction grants provision. Take the case of the city of New York where they have already spent almost $250 million for sewage treatment work facilities. There has been not one complaint from New York City. On the contrary, the mayor of New York City, the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, who is president of the National Association of Municipalities, has repeatedly urged and encouraged that we adopt this grants-in-aid section 6 of the bill. The same is true of Chicago, which spent over $300 million, and many other cities. Without section 6, all you have is a lot of words. Like the weather, as Mark Twain said, "everybody talks about it and nobody wants to do anything about it."

We have had words come from the other side of the aisle regarding policy, need, and so forth, but we are not interested in only words. Just as the President said to Russia that we want deeds, not words, the test here is, "By their deeds ye shall know them," not by words said on the floor.

Every day the equivalent of the raw, untreated sewage of every man, woman, and child in America is going into our rivers, streams, and lakes; and this is increasing year by year. We have more pollution today than we had 8 years ago when the Federal act first went into effect.

All this bill is going to do, and I am sorry to have to admit it, but such a modest request is just to keep us from falling further behind, to slow up this negative rate of retrogression. If we can succeed and come back 8 years from today, and say, "Ladies and gentlemen, we must report a wonderful accomplishment. Today our water smells only as bad as it did 8 years ago," if we have not worsened our Nation's waters any more than they are now, then we shall have been successful. That is the maximum goal, that is the maximum that can be accomplished by this bill, which is certainly a rockbottom minimum. So, anyone who is trying to exaggerate or distort this matter by saying that we are engaging in a gigantic program in which the Federal Government is going to take over the whole field of pollution abatement, of course, is just misleading and distorting the facts. We are just trying to prevent ourselves from slipping backward any further.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky, who has been my good friend and close-working colleague these past 8 years.

Mr. PERKINS. First, I certainly wish to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota on his work before the subcommittee in bringing this bill to the floor of the House. I am particularly interested in section 6. If I correctly understand that section, a grant may be made up to $300,000. Is that correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. Any modification or construction, and it could exceed $900,000, but the most the Federal Government will match is one-third of the cost, not to exceed $300,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Under section 6 it is provided that 50 percent of the funds appropriated for each fiscal year shall be used for grants for the construction of treatment works, and so forth. This 50 percent is allocated to cities under 125,000 population. Is that correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is right. Of the $50 million a year, 50 percent of that shall go to muncipalities under 125,000; and I thank my good friend for his interest and support.

May I bring out just one more point. It was stated that many municipalities put sewage disposal at the bottom of their priority list; that hospitals, schools, airports, streets, parks, and other facilities come first. That is true to a large extent. But what happens? We have Federal aid now in almost every one of these, for airports, for hospitals, for schools, slum clearance, and housing. Look at the gigantic road program and urban extension roads for cities. So, for those projects which are already in a favorable priority position, we go ahead and make it more favorable with these Federal grants-in-aid funds, further pulling back on sewage-disposal projects that always had the lowest priorities.

I think it is a national disgrace that a country, such as ours, that has been blessed by the richest of resources, that we have in this country, should so shamefully neglect, mistreat, and foul up our waters as we have been doing for 200 years. The only thing that has saved us from a crisis long before this, and within the next 15 or 19 years just as sure as sour apples, we will reach that crisis; the only thing that has saved us so far is that we have had the good fortune to have such an abundance of surface water. As a Nation, we talk about technical assistance and economic aid to help raise the standard of living of people all over the world and to give them a little bit of hygiene and sanitation, yet how can we continue to have such an awful record here and be such an awful example to the rest of the world? Take a look at this polluted river, the Potomac River. This water in this glass is from the Potomac River. There are a lot of solids that have settled down at the bottom. Perhaps you cannot see too well, but I think you can see this much. Try to see the red line or band which is behind only 3½ inches of thickness of this polluted water. You cannot see an inch wide red line under a bright light through 3½ inches of this

glamorous, historic, traditionally rich Potomac River that flows right through Washington, a lovely city with parks and trees and gardens, the Capital City of America and of the world. It is one of the most shameful and disgraceful things we could have. We have this situation all over the country and not just in the Potomac. We have that problem all over the country.

This sample of polluted Potomac water has more things in it than you can shake a stick at. There are live bugs, little animals, little plants, and organic materials. There are solubles and insolubles and colloids and noncolloids and a whole lot of other things. It is really an interesting example.

Here is a specimen of clean treated water. It is a very unexciting specimen. There is really not much of interest in it. There is nothing much to it that you can see. You can see right through it. There is nothing there. It is colorless and odorless and tasteless outside of a little chlorine to kill some of the bugs. But even after it is treated, such as at the new plant that my good friend from Ohio and Cincinnati mentioned, they took the treated water that the people are drinking day in and day out and you extract that into a highly condensed concentrate and subject it to a chemical test—this is not propaganda—these bottles are from laboratories that have been chosen at random and you find this smelly residue from treated water that the people are drinking every day in Cincinnati, water which was taken out of the Ohio River. You ought to smell it. It is something the chemists do not even know what is in it and how to remove it and how to keep it out.

I do not mean to suggest that the American people are drinking unsafe water. The waterworks industry of this country has accomplished wonders in supplying our ever-increasing urban population with safe and palatable water, often from badly polluted raw water supplies.

I do say this situation is not one for complacency. Just holding our own in this pollution situation is not enough—and today we are not even holding our own.

We cannot go on indefinitely falling behind in the control of pollution without endangering the health and well-being of large numbers of people and finally the whole country.

Nor is it enough in this modern industrial world merely to have safe drinking water. We need more and more water for all purposes—for industry, for agriculture, for all kinds of municipal use—yes, and for recreation, for swimming and fishing and boating, for fish and wildlife.

It seems to me that we need to think not in terms of getting by but in terms of making it possible for our natural fresh water resources to serve all our needs.

That is why we are asking for more research funds and fellowships and scholarships in this bill. I have tried to point out the urgency of this. I have pointed out how our objectives are merely minimum. I do urge you to go along with this bill. The enactment of this bill is important. It is long overdue. We have the broadest area of agreement with municipalities, conservation groups, health agencies, State organizations, the Federal Department of Health. We have the broadest support on this bill that we have ever had on any piece of legislation on this matter that has come before the Congress. The health and well-being of millions of our people are at stake. You cannot avoid a showdown on this. You can delay it and you can stall, but you cannot avoid a showdown. You have to have a showdown, just as certainly as we are sitting here today on this problem, by 1975.

So, as I said, the extent to which streams are being polluted is a national disgrace. We ask for a modest bill, a minimum of machinery and mechanism to rectify the situation. I say that to delay is to default. To delay is a reflection of our unwillingness to meet this problem head on, a problem that until now had us on retreat.

I hope we pass the bill H. R. 9540 as written.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am interested in the figure which you have arrived at on pages 14 and 15 of the bill, "At least 50 percent of the funds appropriated for each fiscal year shall be used for grants for the construction of treatment works servicing municipalities of 125,000 population or under." How do you arrive at the figure of 50 percent going to municipalities of that size? Did you determine that half of the people or more lived in communities of that size?

Mr. BLATNIK. We tried, as closely as possible, to find out where people lived. We did not have all the facts. The information was not available, but we tried to find out where the people lived, and in many of our smaller communities they have no treatment facilities. The larger cities can go into a thirty or forty million dollar proposition without too much difficulty. They have sanitary districts and other means by which they can raise revenues, as the gentleman described. Now that is as good an estimate as we could arrive at. We feel that after operating 2 years we will be in a better position to analyze the nature of the applications coming in, and make adjustments as necessary.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to see this safeguard in the bill for the smaller communities, where a greater financing problem does exist in taking care of this sewage, and where there is a large movement of heavy industry into those communities.

Mr. BLATNIK. We recognize the seriousness of this, particularly for large municipalities, but if we have 50 million and five large communities take it all away, there is nothing left for the smaller communities. The larger ones need help, but because of the attitude of some of the members of the committee, particularly on the minority side, all we have been given is a small amount, and we are spreading the crumbs around so that the big birds do not get all the crumbs and the little birds get none.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I agree with the gentleman, and I think the gentleman is pointing his finger directly at one of the most pressing problems we have today. It is appropriate recognition of a national responsibility for a national problem, and I am supporting this bill.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. I am concerned with section 6 of this bill. I want to compliment the gentleman on the statement he has made concerning the bill, but as I understand it, section 6 provides that there will be direct grants to municipalities, but controlled by State water commissions. Is that right?

Mr. BLATNIK. No; not controlled. The project has to be approved first by the State agency.

Mr. MORANO. That is a grant-in-aid direct to the municipality, with the approval of the State commission?

Mr. BLATNIK. It will be made direct to the municipality, but it will be approved by the State health agency, and they are working together with the Surgeon General. Previously there will be a comprehensive program for the water users to work out, and the Federal Government will be working with the State agencies involved, to conform with the need.

Mr. MORANO. The next question is, Does this bill say that 33 percent of the estimated cost of a project in a municipality will be paid by the Federal Government?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes, but not to exceed $300,000.

Mr. MORANO. The bill authorizes an appropriation of $50 million for each fiscal year.

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes, each year for 10 years.

Mr. MORANO. And the aggregate amount is $500 million with this program expected to continue for 10 years.

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes.

Mr. MORANO. The last question is: Has the Congress ever before authorized an appropriation and appropriated money for this specific purpose as contained in the bill now before us.

Mr. BLATNIK. In the period 1933 to 1939, Congress gave direct grants through PWA and WPA projects for disposal facilities.

Nothing was done until the existing law, the one that is about to expire at the end of this month, was passed 8 years ago. There was a section providing for loans of $22,500,000, but no money was ever appropriated.

Mr. MORANO. Would it be accurate to say, if we enact this section, that it would be the first time we have specifically authorized the appropriation of money for this specific purpose?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct.

Mr. MORANO. It would be accurate to say that?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes; that is the record so far as I know.

Mr. MORANO. The other was just a blanket authorization not specifically directed to water pollution and the treatment of sewage.

Mr. BLATNIK. For public works generally.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I first want to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota for the excellent job he has done as the chairman of the subcommittee and the splendid presentation he has made here today. He referred a few minutes ago to some Members on the other side of the aisle who might by inference object. I want to say to the gentleman, and if I am in error I want to be corrected, that I know of no one on either side of the aisle, or either side of the table of our committee who is opposed to the general principles of this legislation. We are taking exceptions to grants-in-aid.

I might call the gentleman's attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that the first stream pollution control act passed by this Congress was passed by a Republican Congress, the 80th Congress; and we acknowledge the splendid support that the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle gave us at that time.

I know of no objection to this legislation, the reenactment of existing law with some corrections.

The gentleman mentioned Cincinnati. I think that has been ably taken care of by the Member from Cincinnati, but I want to say that the praise for very fine things that he said that Cincinnati has done in cleaning this up is certainly deserved, for they did it with their own money. They even put on a 1-cent income tax on the people and they paid for it.

I reiterate that we favor this legislation but we cannot go along with the grants-in-aid. I again congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. BLATNIK. I am very happy to clarify that. Perhaps in the haste of moving along rapidly I may have left, inadvertently, the wrong impression. We got excellent support from the gentleman's side of the aisle and from our side of the aisle on all but this financial aid section, the increasing of grants-in-aid.

In my view, however, these are the two most important sections of the bill, the enforcement and the grants-in-aid, the very heart of the bill.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to my neighbor from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I want to join with my distinguished colleague and neighbor in supporting this program. I think it is one of the most important bills this Congress has considered since we met here in January.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota, my friend and neighbor, this question: Without section 6, without Federal aid, does he think this bill really would mean anything to the people in America?

Mr. BLATNIK. Without this section 6, which I said was the heart of the bill, it would amount to very little. Section 6 provides the tools to carry out the objectives provided after research has pointed out what is necessary to be done. Without section 6 the bill would be about as effective as a person rapping on the windowpane with a wet sponge; no one would hear him. It would be about that effective.

Without this section I predict we will come back here 6 years from now in exactly the same situation we are in today except that the water-pollution problem will have grown steadily worse and again we will say that the pollution mess in our water is worse than it was 8 years ago.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, who has an outstanding record in behalf of conservation and national resource use.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota on the wonderful statement he has made. I would like to associate myself with his views to state that I have received letters from various organizations and individuals in the Ninth District and in the State of Wisconsin endorsing a strong water pollution control bill, such as the one Congressman BLATNIK is sponsoring.

I am glad to say that I introduced a similar bill, H. R. 5897, on April 27, 1955, and that this bill contained section 6 authorizing the Surgeon General to extend financial aid in the form of grants, loans, or both to any State or municipality for the construction of necessary treatment works to prevent the discharge by such State or municipality of untreated or inadequately treated sewage. I am very much in favor of retaining section 6 in H. R. 9540 as the grants-in-aid provision is needed to put teeth into the legislation.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota, my good friend and neighbor in northern Minnesota.

Mrs. KNUTSON. I would like to commend my distinguished colleague from Minnesota for his excellent presentation and in revealing the seriousness of this problem. I sincerely urge the support of all Members of the House of this piece of legislation.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I, too, want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota on his very splendid presentation. In my service as a Member of this House I have not seen a better presentation on any subject matter. I think it is well for those who assert that they believe in the principle of this program of stream pollution control to recognize the fact that the history of the previous legislation indicated that it was effective legislation only when there was a grant-in-aid program tied in with it. Many are losing sight of the fact that a number of municipalities would not be in a position to participate in such a program without some sort of Federal aid. The larger cities have greater taxing capacity. They have done a splendid job. They have invested millions of dollars in this program. But even their work will be adversely affected unless the smaller communities up the line of these rivers are able to participate wholeheartedly and fully in the program. They cannot now do that without some form of Federal aid. Just with reference to the matter of water systems, many small communities today are forced to forego a water system because they do not have the taxing capacity to support them. If you really believe in the principle of this program you have to show interest and you have to show that interest by putting the Federal participation in it backed up with Federal dollars.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman for his excellent statement.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I join with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR], a member of our committee, in commending the gentleman for his handling of this bill in the subcommittee during its consideration. The crux of the entire matter and the issue over which there is any dispute at all is the matter of grants-in-aid to the States. I note that the gentleman says $172 million were expended last year, or in recent years in each year, by municipalities in the building of sewage treatment plants. Let us assume that these municipalities will continue that work at an accelerated pace of 50 percent. That would call for an expenditure of $258 million as against the present $172 million. In that event the Federal Government would contribute $86 million, or it could under section 6. In other words, if we just increase the work we are now doing by one-third it would involve more than the $50 million carried in this bill. I think the gentleman should explain to the House how the $50 million is going to accelerate and increase the program rather than hold it back, because that is the argument that will be made against it.

Mr. BLATNIK. When we get to consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule I will be glad to answer that question.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HYDE. Under section 3 (b) consent of Congress is given to a State to enter into interstate compacts. It is the gentleman's understanding that will also give the States which are already operating under a compact the authority to amend those compacts so that they might take advantage of any of the provisions of this bill?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes. I know of no reason why they cannot amend or improve them and this provision is to encourage them to enter into such agreements.

Mr. HYDE. One other question. The argument has been made, as I understand, that if section 6 is deleted it would make the enforcement provisions practically worthless, because the communities would not be able to comply with them. Well, under the Interstate

Sanitary Commission operating in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut—and I understand very successfully—they have an enforcement provision in that compact, and so far I understand they have not even had to go to court on any of them. They have been successful in enforcing it. And their communities finance their own projects, do they not?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman and congratulate him and his colleagues who have labored so diligently to bring us this proposed legislation. I sincerely hope it passes. I would like to say to the gentleman that I have several communities in my district in Florida who have written to me about this legislation, and I am particularly pleased that those of us who represent the little towns and the little communities have an opportunity here, I think, to be of practical help to our people. Again I want to congratulate the gentleman and associate myself with him.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman for his considerate and thoughtful remarks.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 9540. This piece of legislation, to my way of thinking, is one of the most important bills that has come before this body in a long time. The municipalities all over the country are vitally concerned about water pollution and we must do something about the problem. The grants in Federal aid provided for in section 6 certainly should remain in the bill. The committee report recommends that the Water Pollution Control Act be extended and strengthened which is scheduled to expire June 30.

The report noted that reliable estimates indicate the Nation will require, by 1975, an increase in current water supply of 145 percent. This is equal to the additional supply of 120 cities the size of New York City. It would require the flow of about 11 Colorado Rivers, or equal the flow of Niagara Falls.

In meeting these increasing demands the control of pollution has an essential role; it is the key to the national problem of water supply, for polluted water is wasted water.

House Report 2190 of the 84th Congress, in favoring passage of the bill, noted that it would: First, authorize continuation of Federal-State cooperation in the development of water pollution control programs; second, increase technical assistance to States particularly on new and complex problems; third, intensify and broaden research to determine the effects of pollutants on public health and other waste uses and to develop fair and more economical methods of waste treatment; fourth, increase aid to the conduct of and grants for demonstrations, studies and training; fifth, broaden matching grants to States and interstate agencies for the construction of needed treatment works; sixth, continue encouragement of interstate cooperation; seventh, assist in the development of improved State water pollution control legislation; eighth, improve procedures for State-interstate-Federal collaboration on abatement of interstate pollution; and ninth, encourage prevention and control of pollution from Federal installation.

Section 6 of the bill provides for grants to States, municipalities, and other agencies, to help in the preliminary planning and construction of needed sewage treatment. This I regard as one of the key provisions of the bill and of utmost importance to our already tax-burdened municipalities.

As amended in the subcommittee which conducted thorough hearings on the bill, the section would provide Federal assistance to any one municipality up to one-third of the cost of sewage treatment facilities, or $300,000, whichever is smaller. At least 50 percent of such grants would be earmarked for aid to communities of 125,000 population or less. An appropriation of $50 million per year for such grants would be authorized by this section of the bill, to an aggregate not to exceed $500 million over a period of years. Grants are to be made only for projects approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency and the Surgeon General of the United States, and for projects included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to the terms of the bill, priority to be given to grants for advance planning.

That this is vitally needed is demonstrated by the evidence produced during the hearing that there is a backlog of sewage treatment needs amounting to $2 billion.

The predicament of the small city, for which section 6 offers some hope, was graphically presented by witness after witness during the hearings on this bill. It was testified that many communities have reached their legal limits of bonded indebtedness. Many are limited as to their tax resources and expenditures by State law. In city after city it was declared that their financial resources have been strained to the utmost by their current needs for such essential services as schools, water supply, police, and fire-protective services. They have simply exhausted their resources in many instances. And still the grave and increasing problem of providing sewage-treatment facilities has to be met.

The small or medium-sized city of up to 50,000 population, largely dependent upon one industry which contributes largely to water pollution, is at an additional disadvantage. In the event of a period of relatively depressed activity within that industry, the tax income available for public purposes decreases. The municipality is unable to attract new industry to provide a diversified tax base as it is unable to offer ample quantities of pure water upon which most modern industry is so dependent. So with lessened ability to meet the cost, they are met with the absolute need for construction of sewage-treatment facilities in order to attract new industry.

A spokesman for 35,000 municipalities, Robert Weatherford, American Municipal Association, has said that American cities are not looking for something for nothing. Anything they can finance they will finance. They are just not able to finance sewage-treatment plants fast enough. He said that at the present "we are losing the battle against water pollution. The only way we can win this battle is with Federal aid."

It is apparent that at the present rate of construction of sewage-treatment facilities that we are not only not making progress in solving the water-pollution problem, but are losing ground. There is the existing backlog of $2 billion worth of absolutely minimum construction. To this must be added the additional pollution which will result in the future from increased population, from new industries, and obsolescence of many existing treatment plants. It is truly a matter of public safety and health.

We have, on the one hand, a vast and dangerously increasing problem and on the other an equally increasing inability of the municipality to fully cope with this problem. Passage of this bill, H. R. 9540, by the Congress will go far toward an eventual solution. Especially needed and essential to the complete program is section 6, for grants to municipalities for advanced planning and construction of sewage-treatment facilities.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to pay tribute to and compliment my able colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], chairman of the subcommittee that handled this legislation. His presentation here on the floor of this bill has been excellent. No one could fail to understand the problem if he had listened carefully to what he had to say.

It is not pleasant, Mr. Chairman, to disagree with your chairman, and I do not disagree with him in principle. We are simply in disagreement on one section of the bill and there are good reasons for that disagreement. We, on the Republican side of the aisle, I am sure are in complete accord with the object of the bill, and the fundamental principles involved in it and the effort which the Federal Government is putting forth to see if we can solve this difficult problem of pollution of the waters of the United States. It is not a new subject. It has been here before. I have a personal interest in this bill, because 10 years ago, Mr. Chairman, in the 80th Congress there was presented to us Senate 418, amended by the House, which was the Nation's first comprehensive water pollution program enacted into law, and that became Public Law 845. A little of the history of that bill I think is in order at this point.

I might say that Senate 418 was introduced by the late Senator Taft, of Ohio, and the late Senator Barkley, of Kentucky. It was a bipartisan bill. There was no political approach to it at all. The Committee on Public Works of the House in the 80th Congress held ex-

tensive hearings on that bill as well as on H. R. 123, H. R. 315, and H. R. 470. There were several bills introduced. I had the privilege, as chairman of the committee, to appoint a subcommittee to study and bring back to the full committee recommendations for a stream pollution abatement bill. That was done, and a bill was perfected, passed, and became the first general law that we have had in the United States to deal with this very difficult subject of water pollution.

Now, I say that there are some reasons why we differ on section 6.

First of all, the water resources commission of my State is opposed to section 6 of this bill.

Secondly, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, when they filed their written report on this proposed legislation with our committee, stated in no uncertain terms that they believed section 6 should be deleted. They are opposed to it.

In addition to that, may I say that so far as section 6 is concerned, there was no great demand—certainly not before our committee—shown on the part of municipalities throughout the country indicating that it was needed or that it was necessary. So there is a basis for our difference of opinion.

As to the remaining portions of the bill, I want to join my colleagues in supporting it. I believe that every member of our committee, regardless of which side of the aisle he is on, desires to support it.

If I wanted to use the illustration that has been presented here today of the city of Cincinnati, all I can say is this. If we had 3 projects like Cincinnati, it would exhaust the $50 million provided for annual Federal aid, and that would be the end of it. This is a big country. $500 million or even $1 billion that was provided in the original bill would only scratch the surface. So that we are not embarking upon a financial program by the Federal Government with any idea that it is going to solve the problem. I can say this to the House and to every Member of the House, that during the last 10 years, since the enactment of the bill that is now on the books, and which will expire on June 30, tremendous progress has been made. I do not know what has happened in your section of the land, but in my part of the United States municipalities, large and small, have undertaken to solve this problem themselves, without asking aid from the Federal Government. And it can be done, in my opinion, without section 6 in this bill.

Here we are launching this Government upon a new program of expenditure that, when the next session of Congress comes around, will not be $50 million a year, but do not be surprised if it is increased 5 or 10 times that much, because the more that is given, the more will be asked.

I want to answer my chairman in regard to the $22½ million in the former bill. I think he was mistaken, of course not intentionally. That is in reference to the $22½ million provided in the original bill passed in the 80th Congress. Is it not a fact that the Committee on Appropriations of this House never appropriated a dollar and that is why no loans were made? If there were any demands made, I do not know of them; I have never heard of them. But that is the real truth of it, even though it provided low 2 percent interest on the loans made.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. Of course, I yield to my chairman.

Mr. BLATNIK. The gentleman is correct. The Committee on Appropriations never did appropriate any money. But my statement was that under the provisions of that authorization, not a single bit of Federal help was given to any of the municipalities in the last 8 years. And furthermore, if you go into the record of the Committee on Appropriations—they held hearings on this—you will find that they had such serious misgivings about the workability of the existing act that is now on the statute books that they said this enforcement provision cannot be worked out, cannot be carried out. And so they refused to make an appropriation.

Mr. DONDERO. If my able colleague believes that $50 million a year is all that is necessary to solve the problem in the United States, we would not be arguing here today very much. But this is just a door-opener. It is a foot in the door for millions upon millions and more, all to be paid by the Federal Government to do what the States, the cities and the municipalities should and can do themselves.

There are some tightening-up provisions in this bill, particularly as to the arm of enforcement. I agree with them. I want to support them. I am going to support them. And so will every member of the committee on the Republican side of the aisle as well as the Democratic side. This is not a political bill. This is a bill attempting to do something to benefit the people of the United States. I think it can be done without involving the Federal Government in untold millions of expenditures to come from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. My understanding is that the gentleman has made the statement, and I think we all realize it is true, that this $50 million will merely scratch the surface. Is there any formula by which these funds are to be allocated to the various communities that would determine which part of the surface is going to be scratched?

Mr. DONDERO. No, there is not, except that 50 percent of the amount provided in the bill will go to communities of 125,000 population or less. The other 50 percent can be distributed by the department which will administer this legislation.

I want to read to the House the language on which I base my argument against section 6. I am reading from the minority views filed on this bill. You will find this in the written report of the department. This is what is stated on page 31, referring to the department:

> We would not favor the grant proposal contained in H. R. 9540 and we would recommend amendment of the bill to delete the provisions of section 6.

There is no question on where they stand and why they think it should be taken out of this bill.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, not so long ago I came upon a very learned treatise on this general subject of water supply protection. May I read you one brief passage from that treatise:

> There are (areas) which can now keep nothing but bees but which, not so very long ago * * * produced boundless (nurture for civilization). The annual supply of rainfall was not lost, as it is at present * * * (but) was able to discharge the drainage of the heights into the hollows in the form of springs and rivers. * * * The shrines (of decayed civilization) that survive the present day on the sites of extinct water supplies are evidence of the correctness of my present hypothesis.

Does that sound to you as though it had been written by a Democrat or by a Republican? I am afraid I cannot tell you because those words were written by a man named Plato who lived 400 years before Christ.

If recent years have taught us nothing else, surely they have taught us that in this advancing civilization of ours there is no commodity which is more important to our future than water. For water is not merely a commodity used to float battleships and bathe children and run mills. Water is life itself. I am convinced that the time is rapidly approaching in much of the United States when that community which is blessed by an adequate supply of usable water will be in a far more advantageous position than that community with oil or gold or uranium or any other resource of the earth but lacking water.

The committee has made an effort to approach this problem of water pollution, which is presenting one of the principal deterrents to keeping pace with our growing water needs, with as broad-scale and comprehensive a plan as it could possibly devise.

The objection of the gentlemen to section 6 of the bill reminds me somewhat of a poem the late G. K. Chesterton wrote, in which he said:

> The Christian social union here
> Was very much annoyed—
> It seems there is some duty which
> We never should avoid.
> So we sang a lot of hymns
> To help the unemployed.

Of course, we all know that problems such as unemployment and water pollution will not be solved merely by the singing of hymns; nor can they in reality be solved merely by the passage of resolutions or merely by the appointment of study commissions or merely by investigations and research.

If we are going to stop pollution of the Nation's streams, we have to stop it at the source where it begins. Perhaps you may be wondering why it is that the Federal Government finds it

desirable and necessary to grant funds to municipalities. Are they not, after all, supposed to be self-supporting? Well, that is a fair question, and I think it deserves a fair answer.

Perhaps I can provide at least a partial answer from my own experience. It was my privilege for 4½ years to serve as mayor of a growing municipality in Texas and for one of those years to serve as president of the League of Texas Municipalities which represents some 672 incorporated cities, towns and villages.

The reason grants to municipalities are necessary to the achievement of the desired result is that the cities are the orphan children of American government. The reason they have not been able adequately to solve their pollution problems is that they have had neither the financial resources nor the legal means in many instances to raise the necessary revenues. The municipalities have been caught in a squeeze between rising costs and severely restricted sources of revenue. Most of our cities are growing. Growth means costly extensions of such things as sewer lines, water lines, paved streets, police protection and fire protection. Growth does not pay for itself, at least not for the first 20 or 25 years. Yet, confronted with these rising costs and the rising unit costs of providing these things for their citizens, the tax sources from which the cities of our Nation had traditionally until the last 25 or 30 years supported the needs of their communities have been preempted by the States and primarily by the Federal Government. Now, if we are going to look down the throat of a city and say, "Here, clean up your own backyard," then, we must in turn do something practical to make it possible for that city to clean up its own backyard.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER], a member of the committee.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I also desire to pay high compliment to the chairman of our subcommittee for the amount of work that he has done on this bill. We are thoroughly in accord with the purpose of extending the pollution act. We went along with raising the money for educational and scientific investigations. But there is a principle involved in this bill, particularly in section 6, that many of us cannot see our way clear to go along with. There is no dispute among any of us, I believe, on the proposition that we must conserve our waters. There is no dispute that we should control stream pollution and that was my thought as to the necessity for the passage of this bill. In other words, to improve the Federal control in order to enforce the proper regulations to prevent the contamination of our streams.

I believe we have accomplished that in this bill. I believe we have given to the Federal Government the authority to enforce the law and to stop States from dumping their sewage into the streams that will pollute the water of the users downstream. There is no dispute there. I think the bill will accomplish that. No one is more in favor of seeing that the water of our streams is property preserved for human use and fish and wildlife than I, but when we endeavor to embark on such a large program of more Federal grants, I think we are proceeding in the wrong direction. The original bill 8 years ago provided some $22.5 million for grants to States. The Appropriations Committee has made no appropriation in the 8 years since the bill was passed. Now we are going to authorize a new program, if section 6 remains in the bill, for a large sum of money. Not a dollar of that money will be available unless the Appropriations Committees and the Congress appropriates the money. That will mean it will be at least 2 years that all these cities that are proposing sewage disposal plants will be waiting for the money to be appropriated. We would be aggravating a situation in this country if we carry this section in the bill. I think we are going in the wrong direction. We are going to encourage pollution rather than stop it. I feel that this bill is a proper bill. I feel we should in all good grace eliminate section 6, and go ahead with the extension of this program, which will mean that we can give to the cities and States the proper amount of technical advice so as to improve the sanitary condition.

I do not believe that many of the cities have raised the amount of money they could raise. One community will take care of its sewage; another will not. The assessed valuations are different in the various cities and counties and States. If you desire to be equitable in the distribution of the Federal taxpayer's money, you should have a uniform assessed value throughout the entire country, so you will give each community or section of the State an equitable portion of the money. The cities are all willing to have a fine water system, a good fire department, and good streets, good lighting, and so forth, but when it comes to sewage disposal they say, "Well, let the fellow downstream worry about it." That is not fair. The very best measuring stick you could provide for sewage disposal are the users of the system and in each of the cities in accordance with their population. Section 6 should be deleted and the bill passed as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER], a member of the committee.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I think it has been truthfully established that the committee, both the majority and the minority, are entirely in accord with the provisions of this bill, and the necessity for enacting a Water Pollution Act.

I think the committee is unanimous in giving appreciation to our good chairman, Mr. BLATNIK, for the conduct of the hearings and the fairness with which everyone was heard.

I am in opposition to section 4, grants-in-aid.

There are many problems involved in this particular bill. All the emotion stresses the necessity of water; all the emotion stresses against the pollution of water streams, but I wonder how many know that when we were holding the hearings there were States that even failed to pass water pollution acts? Because of that they want Congress to appropriate money to give grants-in-aid to cities, and so forth, to alleviate water pollution.

Our good friend mentioned the city of New York, and Bob Wagner, the mayor, a former colleague of mine in the New York State Assembly. He said he endorsed these grants-in-aid. How he can do this I do not know. New York City would get nothing from this bill. Let it be known that the city of New York is greatly in debt. Through the years the city of New York finds it necessary, year after year, to go to the New York State Legislature and ask for new laws for taxing purposes, to provide facilities for the people of the city of New York. Those requests have been granted from time to time.

It was a Republican-controlled legislature and Republican Governor of the State of New York that bailed the city of New York out of its transit problem when it was losing $50 million a year or more on the city transit system. I am very happy to say that under the new transit authority the city of New York today shows a very different story and a very marked improvement. In the recent report of the transit commission they show a $10 million surplus as against staggering losses throughout the past years.

Outside of the city of New York in my own county we are spending tens of millions of dollars on sewerage-construction work obtained out of the sale of revenue bonds. How is it being done? It is being done because the State legislature, just as in the case of the city of New York, enacted special legislation to permit us to issue revenue-producing bonds outside our normal debt limit, and because of that we have been able to proceed with the necessary sewerage construction and reduce water pollution.

That same thing happened in the city of New York time and time again where the State legislature changed the law to permit the issuance of bonds by the city of New York outside its normal debt limit.

We heard testimony before this committee that various municipalities had reached their debt limit or where because of some other unknown factor they could not raise the necessary money because the State law would not permit. I asked the Representatives of one of our States if the legislature could not change the law, and they replied that they have not asked the State for a change.

There is one point I want to make clear and I think I can do so without offense to anyone if they will think the proposition through carefully and clearly. We have heard much lamentation recently over decisions of the United States Supreme Court overriding our State laws on sedition, our right to eliminate Communists or fifth-amendment Communists from holding jobs in our school system, and several other decisions of the United States Supreme Court: Wailing, lamentations, and tears over these decisions and invasions of States rights,

but when it comes to grants-in-aid, when it comes to getting money from the Federal Government, we forget our State responsibilities to take care of our own needs, to take care of our own wants, the health of our own people.

We forget about the fact that coupled with States rights is States responsibility. States rights work both ways: If we want the State to be left alone to take care of things within State borders, then, by the same token, we should also say that in respect to money needed that that is their responsibility.

I hope section 6 is deleted from the bill, in the best interests of control of water pollution.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS], a member of the committee.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the members of the committee that I think this is a good bill, a very good bill; and I include section 6 in that opinion. I also want to congratulate the chairman of our committee for the excellent way in which our hearings were conducted. I consider it a great privilege to serve under him. I hope I will serve with him for many years to come, although I do not know how long I want his party to continue as the majority.

Let us take a look at this section 6. What does it do? It appealed to me very much, and I was responsible for the amendment of section 6 in the committee. It appealed to me because it is an opportunity given to aid small communities to take care of this very difficult problem of stream pollution which is becoming more intricate every day on account of the industrial wastes which are being dumped into our streams.

Now what does the section further provide? It provides that a Federal grant may be given to a community that is ready to pay for at least two-thirds of the cost of a project. The Federal grant is only one-third of the cost and no appropriation or authorization could possibly be considered unless a municipality or the State itself was ready to pay two-thirds of the cost of the project. In addition to that, let me point out section 6 provides that at least 50 percent of the overall funds so appropriated for each fiscal year shall be used for grants for the construction of treatment works, and servicing municipalities of 125,000 population or under. This will enable the smaller communities throughout the country to do their share in clearing up this pollution problem.

Reference has been made to the previous legislation. I may say that I served on that subcommittee which wrote that bill. Under that legislation loans were authorized. It has been pointed out that no money has ever been appropriated for loans, but no municipality or no State has really come forward to ask to borrow money for such purpose.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. It did not work because the municipalities realized that they could not proceed to finance the construction of the facilities due to the fact that the Federal proposal was not liberal enough to give them the necessary assistance?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I think so.

Mr. BAILEY. The loans were only for 10 years.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. That is a true statement.

Mr. BAILEY. They would have to have 30 years to finance it from the revenues of the installation.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. The provisions of section 6 would not permit the Federal throwing away of money. A great many steps have to be taken before any such grant is given.

I hope the committee will retain section 6 in the bill and I say that with a certain feeling of regret because I do not like to be on the opposite side of the fence from my very dear friend and colleague whom I respect so highly, the gentleman from Michigan, who has been such a great power and strength in our committee for many years. He will be missed in the days to come and I am one of those who, if reelected, will miss him more than anybody else on the floor.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with those who have paid tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee which has brought this legislation to the floor. The gentleman who serves as chairman of the subcommittee has worked diligently and has spent a tremendous number of hours in getting this legislation into the form in which it now appears and in bringing it here for our consideration. It was his leadership that caused our committee to have additional days of hearings during the present session so that everyone who wanted to be heard would have the opportunity to be heard on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to refer to a section which has not come in for too much discussion today, but which I think is a tremendously important section so far as progress in water pollution control is concerned. That is section 8 which deals with enforcement measures against the pollution of interstate waters. The present Federal law provides that enforcement of action against a polluter at the present time can only take place if consent is given not only by the State which is polluted by the action, but also by the State which is the polluting State.

It seems to me that because of that particular provision in the existing law we have legislation which, when it comes to a test, would fail in many cases simply because the polluting State will not give the agreement that would be required. The committee has made a tremendous forward step in improving the water pollution control legislation. It has changed this provision and has now provided that the Attorney General of the United States is given authority to bring action to enforce control measures against a polluter upon the request of just 1 of those 2 States; in other words, if the request comes purely from the State which is polluted, the Attorney General can go forward and bring suit to see that corrective action is taken against the polluting agency in the other State which is involved. In my opinion, this is probably the greatest single forward step from the standpoint of enforcement that is involved in this whole bill.

Conservation groups and organizations throughout the United States have commended the committee because of their action in putting in this additional enforcement provision. I happened to have the opportunity a number of years ago as an attorney to represent a number of people who were being hurt by pollution on a stream, and to me it was an amazing thing to see how the action of a mine upstream, in this particular instance, could practically kill off enterprise downstream, including recreational facilities that might be using the water for a swimming pool or resort as well as farmers who might be using the water to water their livestock and every other person downstream who was dependent upon that stream for water. They practically had all their rights taken away by the action of one polluter upstream. That is the type of thing that this legislation is basically designed to attack. We are getting into a more complicated type of era with more and more people depending on the waters of these streams. In connection with interstate waters crossing State lines as well as lakes that border two or more States we will give the Federal Government, through this bill, the opportunity to take effective action necessary to correct pollution and make it possible for the people of this country to use the water in its natural form.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this legislation that has for its purpose the cleaning up of our rivers from the filth and pollution which now is so prevalent in many of our streams. As this bill seeks to do that, I will support it. I am in favor of its objectives in this respect. However, I do feel that certain portions of the bill could be amended to advantage without destroying its usefulness in accomplishing the purpose of cleaning up our rivers from the pollution that now exists.

I have particularly in mind the Delaware River. At one time within my memory this was a beautiful stream with clear and unpolluted water. Today it has become a stench in certain portions as a result of the dumping of raw sewage into it. The city of Camden and other municipalities on the New Jersey side, and some on the Pennsylvania side, are engaged in expensive operation to eliminate this improper disposal of raw sewage. We can look forward to the day, although it may be distant, when the waters of the Delaware River will again be clean as it once was.

The purpose of this bill is to encourage efforts of municipalities to undertake operations such as this by a partial grant of Federal funds to meet the expense of

such projects in conjunction with local participation.

The bill as reported reaffirms the policy of the Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in controlling water pollution.

The bill would authorize, first, continuation of Federal-State cooperation in the development of water-pollution control programs; second, increased technical assistance to States particularly on new and complex problems; third, intensified and broadened research to determine the effects of pollutants on public health and other water used and to develop better and more economical methods of waste treatment; fourth, increased aid through the conduct of and grants for demonstrations, studies, and training; fifth, broadened matching grants to States and interstate agencies for their water-pollution control programs; sixth, matching grants to municipalities, States, and interstate agencies for the construction of needed treatment works; seventh, continued encouragement of interstate cooperation; eighth, assistance in the development of improved State water-pollution control legislation; ninth, improved procedures for State-interstate-Federal collaboration on abatement of interstate pollution; and, tenth, encouragement of prevention and control of pollution from Federal installations.

In meeting increasing demands for water, the control of pollution has an essential role in the Nation's water-resources problem. Pollution is a waste of water. The greater the degree of pollution, the greater is the waste. Pollution can be just as effective in reducing a water resource for use as drought. Pollution control, therefore, is now recognized as a key to the national problem of water conservation. Pollution control will permit the use of the river water as it flows from its source to the sea.

This has been a subject that has been before Congress for many years. It should have congressional approval. It will mean much to the health and comfort of our citizens. It should not be delayed.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to take a couple of minutes' time to discuss an amendment that I intend to offer when amendments are in proper order, and I think it is an amendment that has been approved by both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out the significance of the section to which it refers, and that is section 6. In the italicized portion of section (e) on page 15 you will note there is the following wording in defining "construction" included "preliminary planning to determine the economic and engineering feasibility of treatment works."

In addition to that, with regard to the expenditure under this section of the $50 million a year, which is presently under some debate, as Federal grants, there is a proviso that was added on my motion in committee in addition to the previous provisc that I have just read to the following effect:

That is assuring that a fair distribution of grant funds hereunder is made available to the largest possible number of States, municipalities, intermunicipal or interstate agencies that have need for treatment works and in order that the initial feasibility of a project can be determined, the Surgeon General shall give priority to grants for advance planning in order to determine the preliminary economic and engineering feasibility of such project.

That will be clarified by my further amendment so that the minimum amount involved is 10 percent in this particular advance planning portion of the program, the reason for that being that if the words presently in the bill remain without this additional amendment, there is a question of tying up all of the funds and not permitting the Surgeon General to go ahead with the grant-in-aid program, and therefore I agreed with the amendment as proposed. I want to suggest to the House that so far as I can determine the position of some of the minority members of the committee is contrary to the suggestion that has been made by the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee to the effect that the Members on the left side of the aisle have been in opposition to any Federal aid or assistance in this program. I want to call attention of the House to the fact that in the committee those on the left side of the aisle unanimously supported a compromise proposal on section 6 that would have provided, instead of the $50 million a year grant, a program of $10 million a year grant for advance planning and engineering, which is what this advance planning proviso in section 6 now does, anyway. And in addition to that it would have reinstated the $22½ million program which is in the present law and which is deleted not only by this bill but also by the Senate bill, S. 890, that was passed there and sent over to the House for our consideration.

So I suggest to you that this proviso which was inserted in the bill on my motion provides that in order to get maximum distribution of funds throughout the entire United States, to the maximum number of municipalities and Government agencies involved—and that is going to be a real problem—some substantial funds should be made available for advance-planning purposes. The significance of it is this. The municipalities obviously do not like to accept their own full responsibility in providing sewage-disposal programs anyway, because they are not glamorous enough in comparison to some other types of public works projects. I go along with the idea of trying to provide some incentive that would encourage them to accept their responsibility in this kind of a program. But they do not give needed priority to sewage-disposal programs because they do not have enough glamor. So it has been difficult to get them to go into these programs. One of the fundamental reasons has to do with preliminary, advance planning, that is, with determining whether a project is economically and engineeringly feasible, and there the agencies have to spend tax money for advance planning before they can even go into a bond issue. That is risk money. If the bond issue does not prove feasible, they lose that money and have to explain to the taxpayers why they spent that money, in effect, without getting results. This proposal which I have advanced to provide advance-planning money is intended to provide aid to local agencies in getting sewage treatment plant programs initially under way.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it not a fact that the Senate bill, S. 890, did not contain the provisions of section 6 of the House bill?

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. It came to us without that section?

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct. And again with regard to the people on the left side of the aisle, the sewage-treatment program and the water-pollution program was a recommendation of the President of the United States a year ago. He recommended air-pollution legislation; he recommended water-pollution legislation. And last year we did pass air-pollution legislation and I am very glad to see us doing something about water-pollution legislation this year, in this session of Congress.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Do I understand that the gentleman's amendment would make certain that 10 percent of the amount authorized in this bill would be used for advance planning?

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. And is the gentleman's amendment limited to that objective alone?

Mr. CRAMER. It prevents the existing advance planning proviso from being limited to advance planning alone, by making a minimum of 10 percent available for advance planning in the discretion of the Surgeon General. It prevents doing the very thing the gentleman is concerned about, that is, the unnecessary limitation on grant expenditures and that I, too, was concerned about when it was called to my attention and when I agreed to this proposed modification of my advance-planning amendment which was unanimously adopted in committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I have been interested in the Water Pollution Act in the State of Michigan for many years. I believe it was in 1930 that Michigan enacted the Water Pollution Act and put it under the control of the Michigan Water Resources Commission.

I should like to inquire of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] as to what effect this bill would have, if enacted into law, with the exception of section 6, on the Michigan Water Pollution

Act that we now have, which has been passed on by the Supreme Court, the decision there being that the Water Resources Commission had full authority to enforce the provisions of the Michigan act.

Mr. DONDERO. The general purpose of the bill, of course, is to tighten up the control and also the enforcement provisions of the antipollution law as we now have it. If the State law takes care of things within the State they would have a right to proceed under the State law. If it did not furnish the relief, they could still come under the Federal law, if this bill passes.

Mr. KNOX. The gentleman undoubtedly is acquainted with the Michigan Pollution Act, is he not?

Mr. DONDERO. Not too thoroughly; but somewhat.

Mr. KNOX. The Supreme Court handed down its decision that the Michigan Water Resources Commission had full authority to impose upon cities the duty of constructing sewage disposal plants so that I believe we now have a law in Michigan that serves all of the purposes so far as pollution of rivers and streams is concerned.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct, and I may say great progress has been made in Michigan to clean up the waters of our State under that law and the previous antipollution law of the Federal Government. They are doing a great job under that law now, I know that.

Mr. KNOX. May I say also to the gentleman from Michigan, as we are both from Michigan, that we have some international boundaries and we have waters that are known as international waters. Is there any provision in this bill which is being presented to us here today to take care of the international situation?

Mr. DONDERO. I doubt that very much. That would come under the treaty existing between the United States and Canada. Canada is the country with whom we have our territorial borders and international waters.

Mr. KNOX. Is the gentleman of the opinion there is no legislation needed to control the international waters?

Mr. DONDERO. I made no such statement, but I do say that it would come under the treaty between the United States and Canada on that subject. It has not been rigidly enforced and we know that, because both nations may be polluting the international waters. I am satisfied, however, that both nations will take steps to solve the problem.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOX. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. A question has been asked on a matter with which I happen to be familiar. We are agreed here that our State of Michigan is perhaps one of the foremost in its attacks on pollution. This bill has been given very careful consideration by the committee to preserve the rights of States, the rights of participants in interstate and intermunicipal compacts, and also not to infringe upon treaties between the United States and other countries.

The bill first of all is set up to handle pollution in waters that flow along or across State boundaries. As such, there is very little of that kind of water within the State of Michigan. But there is an adequate safeguard in this bill which provides for what is tantamount to a waiting period of almost 18 months before there is any Federal action. During that 18 months the State has every opportunity possible to act to clean up whatever pollution may exist within its boundaries or these interstate waters. There is also a provision in the bill whereby Federal action will be delayed indefinitely and at the same time the State where the pollution exists is making some effort to clean up the pollution.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, certainly this problem of pollution of our streams throughout the Nation and its effect on the recreation, sports, and health of our people has become a most serious problem. Something must be done. We certainly cannot turn our head or stick our heads in the sand and expect the problem to solve itself. I am in sympathy with a lot of the views that have been expressed here today about anything in this bill or some parts of this bill being an infringement upon States rights. Certainly, if I felt any parts of the bill were an infringement on States rights, I would oppose it, because I am a States righter myself. However, we must recognize that this problem of pollution of our streams is somewhat of an interstate matter. These streams or practically all of them run through several States and there are several scattered jurisdictions involved. Most certainly there has to be some coordinated action to tie these States and these communities in together before we will ever begin to approach any sort of solution of the problem whatsoever. I believe this bill is possibly the minimum action that this Congress can take in the direction of helping to clear some of this pollution problem all over the country. Possibly, some of the Members of this body come from areas which are not involved or which are not suffering from the problem of pollution, and they may not be too familiar with it.

The problems involved in pollution control and abatement which are drawing more and more attention throughout the Nation are focused on the situation facing us today at our doorstep. Here, in the Washington metropolitan area, with the population growing by leaps and bounds, unless coordinated remedial action is taken to insure safe and adequate water supplies for the future and provide clean rivers for recreation and other uses, we will not keep apace with the needs of either this area or the Nation. It is to invite attention to these urgent needs that I rise in support of this bill. I have introduced H. R. 8108 which is, I believe, compatible with the spirit of the national legislation being considered by the House today to extend and strengthen a cooperative program for pollution control.

This national program is now being carried on by the State and interstate pollution-control agencies with the assistance of the Public Health Service. We are fortunate to have already functioning the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, whose primary mission it is to encourage the abatement of pollution in the Potomac River Basin and through such encouragement to bring about optimum use of the basin's waters. This Commission was formulated by legislative acts of the four States concerned, the District of Columbia, and the Congress. It has worked closely with authorities or governing bodies of the District of Columbia, adjacent Maryland jurisdictions, Arlington, and Fairfax Counties, Va., and the city of Alexandria, on all aspects of the pollution problem and also with the various Federal agencies concerned.

Just a word as to why a pollution problem exists in the Washington area when there is no large-scale industrial waste as in other parts of the Nation. Washington is located at the point where tidewater from Chesapeake Bay meets fresh water from the mountains. From Three Sisters Island above Key Bridge down to the bay, the Potomac is tidal. In the summer and fall when the flow of fresh water is low, the river behaves more like a lake. The water moves upstream and downstream with the tides and wind and circles between its banks. During the low summer flows a drop of water takes 40 days to travel from Three Sisters Island to Fort Washington, a distance of only 15 miles. Thus it can be readily understood that the Potomac in the summer and fall is not like an ordinary fresh water stream. The sewage entering from Washington, Arlington, and Alexandria is not carried away downstream. It stays right here and that is our problem today.

I do not wish to minimize in any way the work that has been accomplished up to this time to control and abate pollution in this metropolitan area. Much has been done with the limited funds available toward development of construction plans for waste treatment works. The various jurisdictions have completed the greater part of the primary treatment works and are proceeding with plans and extensive construction designed for secondary treatment and interceptor works. It is appropriate to mention briefly some of the important projects:

Construction in the District of Columbia of the secondary sewage treatment facilities at Blue Plains is scheduled for completion in 1959. This plant which is to treat both District of Columbia and Washington Suburban Sanitary District sewage will, on completion, provide 80 to 85 percent treatment. Further, extensive corrective work is under way or proposed to eliminate dry weather overflows and reduce frequency of wet weather discharges into the river from the combined sewer system.

In Arlington County, a primary sewage treatment plant is in operation but can only perform a partial job of treatment. Under the present program, it is estimated that the construction of secondary sewage treatment facilities may not be completed before 1970, the starting date of construction to be determined

primarily by river conditions subsequent to the District's plant additions. Remedial measures are now under construction to eliminate certain raw sewage discharges from the Rosslyn area and to remove Alexandria sewage from Four Mile Run in Arlington County.

Fairfax County is well under way in an extensive sewer construction program designed to remove the untreated overflows from septic tanks from the natural waters of the county. Further, several primary or secondary treatment plants are in operation or planned to provide essential pollution abatement needs.

Alexandria now has under construction much needed interceptors as well as a secondary sewage treatment plant being jointly financed with Fairfax County.

In the Maryland area construction is under way to deliver all Anacostia Valley sewage to the District system for treatment at Blue Plains. Partial but inadequate treatment is provided for Rockville and Gaithersburg sewage. In several locations in Maryland counties, subdivisions are without sewage disposal facilities; however, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission is undertaking extensive trunkline construction to serve such areas.

The above represents the briefest thumbnail sketch of the work under construction and programed in the metropolitan area. The value of major construction work done from 1950 to 1955 by the above-mentioned jurisdictions to abate pollution amounts to roughly $20 million. It has been estimated that $28 million to $30 million will be expended by these jurisdictions by 1960 on current pollution abatement programs.

Upon completion of the programed work now scheduled through 1960 there should be no dry weather discharges of raw sewage to the Potomac and except for Arlington, two proposed small Fairfax company plants and Fort Belvoir, all sewage discharges to the river will have received from 60 to 80 percent treatment. This is far from ideal but it shows the intensive efforts made by the local jurisdictions to improve a nearly intolerable situation and means that the backlog of acute requirements for pollution control facilities resulting from recent population expansion will be largely satisfied by these programs.

I wish to emphasize that a good job of engineering and programing has been accomplished but in a piecemeal or inadequately related fashion. The plans have not been adequately coordinated and a comprehensive metropolitan areawide plan must be developed if maximum benefit is to be obtained from the corrective programs of local jurisdictions.

I am told that the population of the Washington metropolitan area is now approximately 1,800,000. Competent authorities have estimated the population 25 years hence to be between 3,500,000 and 5 million. If this occurs, over twice as many people will be using area water and discharging wastes into area streams than do so today. I am also advised that a good part of this expansion has been anticipated at least in a general way in the programed work.

It is now apparent, however, that growth greater than considered in past studies may be expected as the central part of the area reaches saturation. For example, it is understood that a dozen or so agencies situated within the District of Columbia now have under consideration the possibility of relocating their activities to points elsewhere in the metropolitan area. Since adequate sites are scarce it is probable that the agencies when relocating will look to the generally undeveloped portions of the area.

This trend is illustrated by the selection of a site near Germantown, Md., by the Atomic Energy Commission and near Langley, Va., by the Central Intelligence Agency. Further, it is normal that new subdivisions and satellite communities develop near such installations. These all generate sewage and add to the complexity of the pollution abatement plans. The important conclusion is that the aggregate effect of such new developments, in spite of individual sewage treatment, can undermine or vitiate the beneficial effect to be expected from much of the remedial construction now planned or recently completed elsewhere in the metropolitan area.

The effect of decentralization coupled with the continued rapid growth of the area has caused greatest concern as it relates to future water supplies. There is of course a direct relationship between pollution and use of water for domestic purposes because the Potomac River and tributaries serve as the chief source of supply. I will not take time to cite detailed figures on increased use of water. I understand that because of population growth the deadline for greatly increased water supply in the area, originally envisioned for the year 2000, has of necessity been moved up to 1970. Per capita consumption, which has more than doubled in 50 years, will continue to increase. But one of the largest potential uses for water, the possibilities of which are just now being recognized, is that of supplemental irrigation. Unlike water for domestic or industrial use, a relatively small portion of water used for irrigation is returned to the stream. Furthermore, peak irrigation demands are concurrent with other maximum demands for water in drought periods.

The lowest flow of record in the Potomac, 506 million gallons per day at Great Falls, occurred during the summer of 1930. Normal maximum day requirements for the Washington water system, including Arlington County and Falls Church, are estimated to be 334 million gallons per day in 1985 with a potential national emergency requirement of 418 million gallons per day. Adding potential requirements of 43 million gallons per day for Fairfax County and up to 60 million gallons per day for the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission other than the Patuxent system, it can be foreseen that the water requirements for the Washington metropolitan area will equal or exceed the minimum natural flow in the next 30 to 35 years.

Increased irrigation usage, on top of the above-mentioned increased requirements during low flow periods when the degrading effect of pollution is most acute, could lead to a serious water shortage at a much earlier date than has heretofore been generally recognized. It is important to mention, therefore, that in the preparation of a comprehensive plan most careful attention must be given to the Washington area pollution and water supply problem in relation to other uses of Potomac River water currently under consideration by the Army engineers.

All of my remarks above bear on the need for a comprehensive areawide plan for pollution control. Under H. R. 8108, the bill I proposed, Federal financial assistance in the amount of $250,000 to the Interstate Commission is authorized for the preparation of a comprehensive master water pollution control plan and $50,000 to reimburse States and their political subdivisions for expenses incurred by them in obtaining information for the study. Under such a plan all future construction needs of the various jurisdictions and the time schedule for such construction could be developed.

Why provide Federal financial help for preparation of a master plan? There are several reasons. Because Washington is the Nation's Capital, there has been a tremendous growth in the surrounding areas as well as in the District of Columbia. Because of this, the pollution problem in the Washington metropolitan area can be considered unique in that the Federal establishment is both a major economic factor in the area as well as a large contributor to the problem. Further, Federal agencies occupy large areas within local jurisdictions which have high potential tax values but pay no taxes. This limits the ability of these jurisdictions to finance local improvements.

As proposed in H. R. 8108, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin appears to be the logical agency for coordinating the development and implementation of a pollution abatement and control plan for the metropolitan area. It has ample authority under the provisions of its interstate compact to work directly with the local jurisdictions and to employ or otherwise obtain whatever administrative or technical consultation or assistance is needed. It is envisioned that the Interstate Commission would work closely with the National Capital Regional Planning Council in order that a master plan would be fully coordinated with the information and plans of the council. Information relating to future population growth, land uses, densities of occupancy and distributions of Federal establishments within the area would be secured from appropriate agencies directly concerned with the problems.

In addition to authorizing Federal financial assistance for planning, H. R. 8108 also authorizes the Surgeon General, subject to certain limitations, to make grants to the States and their political subdivisions, during the Interstate Commission's study, of up to $10 million for construction of waste treatment works.

I consider this a most important item as it would provide for an accelerated program at the Nation's Capital. In many respects this is a showplace for the world and certainly sets a pattern for action in other parts of the country.

If I may digress a moment, I wish to emphasize that every year hundreds of thousands of visitors come to Washington from all over the Nation and all corners of the earth. They find magnificent buildings, beautiful trees, miles of parkland. In contrast they also find an unclean Potomac. Whether they are picnickers, strollers or motorists close to the Potomac's banks, are fishing from the banks or are on the river in boats, they all can attest to the foulness of the water, a condition which measurably detracts from the pleasures normally associated with a clean fresh water stream.

It is the intent that the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service administer the construction grant provisions of the bill. Provision in the bill for Commission approval would appear to provide assurance that works constructed under the grant provision would be compatible with the Commission's overall plan.

Considering the rapidly rising debt of all communities in the metropolitan area, much of which has been assumed for their current local abatement programs it is probable that future progress will depend on their ability to go further in debt as their credit approaches exhaustion or obtain some financial assistance from the Federal Government.

In this connection it is pertinent to mention that Federal responsibility for the Federal impact on other communities has been recognized in various enactments of Congress which have made available Federal funds for the construction of expanded public improvements.

In conclusion, may I emphasize the need for foresight by all concerned in providing authorization for financing both an areawide master plan for pollution control as a local-interstate-Federal cooperative effort and Federal construction grants for restricted use by the Public Health Service pending completion of this plan.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], the chairman of the committee handling this bill, has promised me separate hearings and consideration of my bill, H. R. 8108. However, due to the lateness of the session and due to the fact that the bill we are considering today, H. R. 9540, covers in broader terms most of the provisions of my bill, I would like to urge its passage and urge the Surgeon General of the United States and the Commission on the Potomac River Basin to exercise the provisions of the bill and let us start a program which will result in a cleaner and safer Potomac.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] has expired.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, year after year the Congress appropriates millions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money for the purpose of raising the living standards and improving the health standards of people in dozens of countries abroad. I think we certainly owe it to ourselves and to our future generations to provide the machinery and to authorize the appropriation of adequate moneys to meet this serious problem within our own country.

The bill under consideration, H. R. 9540, represents a real forward step in advancing the health and economic well-being of every community in our Nation. The committee is to be commended in the amendments it has recommended in extending and strengthening the Water Pollution Act of 1948, which authorizes the Public Health Service, under the supervision and direction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to carry on cooperative programs with the State and interstate water pollution control agencies. I am in favor of the purposes of the bill and wish to express my wholehearted support of the provisions to provide financial and technical assistance to our States in the prevention and control of water pollution.

Federal assistance to the States for this purpose is a proper function in carrying out our constitutional obligation to provide for the general welfare of our Nation. In this regard, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in its report to the Congress and the President in June 1955, in discussing the pollution problem, stated, in part:

> The Commission recommends that States vigorously enforce existing water pollution abatement laws and that they expand and improve their legislation in this field. The Commission also recommends that, as a stimulus to further action, the National Government provide technical and financial assistance to State and interstate pollution-control agencies. The Commission further recommends that study be given to the desirability of Federal financial assistance, for a limited time, to cooperative programs for the construction of pollution abatement facilities.

This is also an interstate problem, since in many cases our States are powerless to act due to the very interstate nature of water pollution. Take the Ohio, for example. It affects not only my State of West Virginia, but Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Tennessee, and Kentucky, as well.

It has been estimated that by 1975 our public water use will increase from 17 to 30 billion gallons per day, and industrial use, excluding power, will increase from 60 to 115 billion gallons per day. This added use will result in increased pollution that not only presents a serious public health problem but also decreases the amount of available usable water.

Many communities find it impossible to divert their limited funds to the construction of sewage facilities in the face of other local needs, such as increased educational facilities. It is also recognized that our municipalities are limited in their tax rates, their bonded indebtedness, and their expenditures. The State governments, for the most part, are not in a position to lend the necessary financial assistance, and for this reason we have the duty and responsibility to render such aid as is necessary—at the same time being mindful of the congressional policy to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary rights and responsibilities of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution.

Of utmost importance are the provisions in section 6 of the bill, which authorize the appropriation of $50 million per year over a 10-year period as grants to States, municipalities, intermunicipal, and interstate agencies for preliminary planning and construction of treatment works. Grants are limited to 33⅓ percent of the estimated reasonable cost of the construction or $300,000, whichever is the smaller. Moreover, section 6 provides that at least 50 percent of the funds so authorized must be allocated to municipalities of 125,000 population or under, and this is certainly a worthy feature which will enable communities to undertake the necessary planning and construction of sewage systems.

The fact that such provisions were not a part of the original Water Pollution Control Act is not relevant to the argument that has been made against their inclusion in this bill, on the ground that this is a major new undertaking and there has been no demonstration of need nor any widespread requirement for Federal assistance in financing the construction of sewage-treatment facilities. Actually, the bill reflects the experience of the Public Health Service during the past seven years in administering the Water Pollution Control Act.

Since the Congress originally acted in this matter, more than half the States have improved their legislation and strengthened their pollution-control programs.

West Virginia is a member of the Ohio River Valley Sanitation Commission, which is a compact of eight States devoted to the abatement of pollution in the Ohio Basin, the Ohio River, and its tributaries. The West Virginia Water Commission, as an agency of the Ohio Valley Commission, has ordered our State municipalities to put into effect measures to accomplish water-pollution control in the interest of our public health. Some of our municipalities, like those of other States, are powerless to act until financial assistance is made available to them. Through the means of the legislation here under consideration, we have the opportunity to encourage and strengthen local programs of pollution control.

Unfortunately, the present bill is not as generous as we might wish; however, there is no question but that Federal assistance measures in the bill will spearhead our local communities in their efforts to carry out much needed programs. Certainly, if we can authorize the appropriation of billions of dollars for foreign-aid programs, it should be possible to benefit our own people.

I therefore recommend, Mr. Chairman, that the bill be passed.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I was indeed happy to see the House pass H. R. 9540, the antipollution bill. As a Member of the House Committee on Public Works and the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, it was my privilege to play a small part in assisting our able chairman, the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, of Minnesota, with this bill in the committee and its final passage on the floor.

The need for accelerated action to abate the pollution of streams is long over due. I would like to quote from a speech made on May 4, 1956, in Cincinnati, Ohio, by the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Roswell B. Perkins. He had this to say about the water-pollution problem:

> Water pollution is the end result of a great variety of factors which by themselves attract only local and passing attention. The difficulty is that no bells ring and no lights flash to warn the people of a community that the danger point has been reached.
>
> A new factory here, a new housing development there, a new office building somewhere—these are the symbols of our national growth and prosperity, the symbols of 20th century progress. Multiplied all up and down a river system, they are also symbols—to the sanitary engineer—of water supply and water pollution control problems. But in the clamor and clang of a busy and prosperous world, with its endless competing demands for people's attention, the warning voice of the sanitary engineer and those of his associates in the health department are not always heard. And even when public interest is aroused, needed help for constructive action is frequently a long time materializing.

I think Mr. Perkins' statement is very forthright and I am only fearful that the $50 million per year authorization for grants in this bill for sewage disposal treatment plants will not be adequate to take care of the situation. I have many municipalities in my congressional district that are in need of sewage treatment facilities, but due to their limited bonding powers are unable to construct these facilities on their own. One city, Murphysboro, Ill., a fine community of approximately 8,000 people, has been ordered by the courts to build a sewage treatment plan and would be willing, but is financially unable. Legislation such as this will be of material benefit to those communities, which for economic and other reasons are not financially able to comply with abatement orders.

I am hopeful that the amount of money authorized in the bill will be allowed by the Appropriations Committee each year to carry out this very important program, and that the Congress will insist that it be pushed as expeditiously as possible.

I deeply appreciate the time and effort expended by all of the members of the House Committee on Public Works for their diligent and untiring efforts in working out a solution to this complicated problem. I particularly want to congratulate the author of the bill, the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, for doing an outstanding job.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to unqualifiedly endorse the legislation proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], and that includes section 6. Some time ago I received an invitation from my State petroleum association to address them. The supposition on their part was that I would talk about the conservation of natural gas and oil. Much to their surprise, when I arrived to address them, I had a prepared address under the caption "Water, The White Gold of the Future."

The Nation is awake to the necessity for conserving and taking care of our supply of water. It is more valuable than a lot of our other resources. I ask you what value is that to the citizens if it is given to them polluted? Here is an opportunity to do something toward clearing up the pollution of our Nation's inland bodies of water, in which the Government is particularly interested, in that they control all navigable streams. I cannot conceive of an organized effort to take from this legislation the very heart of it. I am going to say to my colleagues on the left, who are showing some semblance of an organized effort to strike section 6 out of this legislation, that if you do it you are going to do it over the protests and recommendations of over 12,000 municipalities in the United States, and I propose to read them into the RECORD.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, it is very gratifying to see the Congress take steps to amend its laws with respect to water pollution, so that the country may adequately start to do the job of cleaning the water of this Nation.

I have been working for the last year with the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, in an effort to get that Commission to do more than it has been doing with respect to pollution in the Potomac River Basin. That Commission was created back in 1938, pursuant to a resolution of this Congress. Unfortunately, pursuant to that resolution, that Commission took upon itself only the power to recommend and plan. I have been suggesting for some time that that Commission should take upon itself the power to control and regulate pollution and water conservation in the Potomac River Basin. For some reason the Commission has been a bit hesitant. There may have been some doubt as to whether or not they had the power to amend the compact under which they are operating in order to take on the greater powers suggested. So I am happy to get the reply from the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota, in answer to the question I directed to him a moment ago that, in his opinion, under section 3 (b) of this act, a commission already established under interstate compact could properly amend such a compact to include any broader powers it might need properly to take care of the pollution of streams over which it had jurisdiction. So I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin pays some heed to the words that have been said on the floor here today and not any longer be timid about increasing its authority, so that it may properly control and regulate pollution in the Potomac River Basin.

I am sorry to be in some disagreement with certain of my colleagues on section 6 of the bill. The Federal Government has jurisdiction over navigable streams and waters of the United States. That jurisdiction is recognized in the Constitution of the United States. It seems to me that pure water is as important as dams; clean water is just as important as controlling the flow of that water; I might say more so.

One of the great deterrents to many small communities to the construction of sewage-treatment plants is the tremendous cost of such plants. This seems to me to be a proper field for Federal assistance. I want to urge the support of this bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, borrowing the expression we have heard a number of times from the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]: "If section 6 was deleted" reminds me of the story of the fellow out fishing who had a wiggling catfish in his hand and said to the fish: "Hold still, fish; I ain't going to hurt you, I'm just gwine to gut you, that's all."

Look at these figures: Over here $172 million being spent; here, $450 million shown as needed. Each year we fall behind, year by year, when water is the most important thing in the country for industry and its cities.

Much is made of the point that Federal assistance in the construction of local sewage works would penalize the cities and towns that have already put out money for the construction of such plants.

By the same reasoning, the Federal Government should not assist in the construction of hospitals because some cities have already built hospitals.

The Federal Government assists in the construction of hospitals for the simple reason that the health of the American people is important not only to the individual citizen but to the whole country.

The same thing holds true with respect to the Nation's water resources.

Every civilization in history that has risen to a position of eminence has done so on an abundance of water and land resources.

That is true of the United States of America.

Today, the water resources of the Nation are in jeopardy. Some of the finest streams in America have been all but destroyed by sewage and industrial wastes.

It is not enough to say that this is a State and local responsibility. It is a national responsibility.

INDUSTRIAL FOCUS

The House of Representatives has before it a bill for extending and strengthening the Water Pollution Control Act. This bill would continue the authority of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to support and aid technical research relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, to provide Federal technical services to State and interstate agencies and to make joint investigations with any such agencies of the condition of any waters and of the discharges of any sewage, industrial waste, or other substance which may adversely affect such waters.

The basic public laws of the Federal Government authorize the Surgeon General to conduct similar activities relating to the causes of diseases and impairments of man, but not relating to the conservation of surface and underground waters for the propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses. Consequently, the Federal Government will lack authority after June 30, 1956, for water-pollution control other than for human consumption.

Although the quality of water for human consumption is our first concern, we cannot afford to neglect other uses of water which have a profound effect on our standard of living. The value of water-pollution control is measured not only in terms of important benefits accruing to the public health and well-being of the Nation, but in the more direct benefits related to water supplies for domestic and industrial purposes.

In all parts of the Nation today, waste discharges to streams by municipalities and industries have exceeded the abilities of many water bodies for assimilation and self-purification. Further impairment of water quality is undesirable, and this, in effect, places a ceiling on industrial development in these areas—regardless of whether the location may be advantageous from other standpoints. Certain industries have already adopted the policy of not permitting the construction of new manufacturing units until the wastes already produced could be properly handled without abusing the river receiving the wastes. Hence the economic advantage made available in many cases through plant expansion rather than by locating new facilities in other areas cannot be realized. While applicable to large industry, this is especially true for small industries where split location of facilities would increase costs to such an extent that increase in production would not be profitable.

The development of the highly industrialized sections of the North Atlantic States has been in part due to the availability of adequate volumes of water for industrial purposes. The industrial demands on water supply have in recent years become so great that future expansion may be limited unless adequate supplies can be provided and existing supplies protected from damaging pollution.

It is interesting to note that the weight of water used by industry is 50 times the weight of all other raw materials combined. In order to produce one ton of steel, 65,000 gallons of water are used in many mills. Over 31 gallons of water are needed to process one gallon of aviation gasoline. The processing of 100 pounds of hides for leather requires 650 gallons of water. It takes 180 gallons to produce a pound of rayon yarn, 510 gallons for 1 yard of woolen cloth.

The problem of supplying increasing amounts of water of satisfactory quality for industry is complicated by more and more complex types of waste compounds. Although industry is doing remarkable research in some areas, a great deal remains to be done in discovering ways to treat new types of waste and in reducing the cost of treatment methods already developed.

The Public Health Service under the legislation under consideration can add considerably to the much-needed research work. It can intensify and broaden its research program into the important phases of control of pollution caused by industrial waste whether injurious to health or not. The proposed law would permit the Public Health Service to bring to bear on the overall pollution problem available but either untapped or uncoordinated research potentials outside the Federal Government.

Among the new phases of research that can be carried out under the bill under consideration are the following:

First. Research and demonstrations into all phases of water resources development, conservation, and reclamation such as reservoir evaporation control; underground water storage; recharge of ground-water reservoirs; and prevention of salt-water intrusion along coastal areas.

Second. Research into the practicability of closed municipal water systems wherein water would be continuously recirculated after treatment to remove suspended and dissolved solids introduced by use. The only new water needed would be that required to make up losses during use. Such closed water systems may prove to be the answer to water-shortage problems, particularly in arid and semiarid regions.

Third. Develop and apply techniques and procedures for evaluating the beneficial effects of pollution control on the total economy of an area or region as a research demonstration project; also to determine monetary values for tangible and intangible benefits from pollution control.

I believe that our well-being, as will be reflected by the industrial future of the Nation, can be assured only by adequate water-pollution control. I believe the Federal Government can contribute to this industrial future if it has laws authorizing it to do so. I believe that the water-pollution control measure before this body will permit such Federal action. Therefore, I will vote for it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate with a great deal of interest, and I congratulate all the previous speakers in submitting to the committee the facts as they see them. The real reason for this particular legislation is that the existing law expires on June 30 of this year. The existing law, as you know, was enacted by the 80th Congress and we did carry certain allocations of funds in that law.

I would like to call your attention to what the existing law is and what would happen if we strike out section 6. Under existing law the communities got up to $1 million for each of the fiscal years from 1948 to 1956 for preliminary action relative to a construction program. Some of the previous speakers would lead you to believe that if we strike out section 6 you would have nothing left. The bill that has been introduced and passed by the Senate was approximately the same as existing law—S. 890.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. For a question.

Mr. BAILEY. Let us keep in mind the fact there was no money made available.

Mr. McGREGOR. I yielded to the gentleman for a question, not for a speech.

Mr. BAILEY. Let the gentleman provide us then with figures showing there were appropriations made to implement the plan he is taking credit for adopting.

Mr. McGREGOR. We are not taking credit for adopting anything. The 80th Congress passed the existing law and fish pollution bill. There were $22.5 million for loans and that money was available if a community wanted to borrow from the Federal Government.

What does section 6 do? Does it lend? Section 6 says that the Federal Government shall give to political subdivisions up to $500 million.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government has a greater indebtedness than all of the municipalities and all of the States in this entire Nation; yet some of my distinguished friends are saying: Let the Federal Government give us an additional $500 million.

The question has been brought up of just what will happen to some of those political subdivisions. I think the State of my distinguished friend from West Virginia has gone a long way in correcting some of the pollution problems of that State, the same as the great State of Ohio.

What are we doing to those political subdivisions that have gone ahead, that have taken the initiative, that have obeyed the law and that have even taxed their own local people? We are saying to them: It is just too bad, you obeyed the law too soon. Had you waited a few more years, Congress would have given you the entire cost of your project.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am interested in the point the gentleman is making at the present time. Did the committee consider making this retroactive?

Mr. McGREGOR. Yes; the committee did consider a retroactive clause because some of us felt it is unfair to penalize a community that takes the initiative and follows the law passed by the Congress and took advantage, some of

them did, of the $22,500,000 by borrowing. In addition to that, we had $1 million a year in grants for planning.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. If we were to make this retroactive, it would take a whole lot more than the $50 million to pay up the back amounts we owe?

Mr. McGREGOR. I think it would. The gentleman from Cincinnati has stated on the floor that it has cost more than $50 million for the city of Cincinnati alone. Yet you are going to penalize the city of Cincinnati and many of the political subdivisions of your districts because they have bonded the people, they have put a tax on the local people, because they recognized, and I repeat, that there is more indebtedness by the Federal Government than all the cities, all the political subdivisions and all of the States of this Union. And yet you are going to say, "Give us more money."

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I was a city official in a city that was involved in the building of a sewage-disposal plant prior to my coming to Congress. We issued $6 million worth of bonds. Now, if I understand this bill correctly, the maximum we could have gotten from the Federal Government in behalf of that construction would be $300,000, which is actually only 5 percent of the $6 million bond issue.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. That is the reason I said in my opening remarks that the figures in this bill are unrealistic. No $500 million is going to do this job. You ought to make it $7 billion so that you know what you are committing the Federal Government to.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is the situation. And may I call to the attention of the Members who are members of a State or political subdivision, who have paid for your own sanitary systems, you are going to have to pay for somebody else's sanitary system. This $500 million does not grow on trees. You are going to have to tax somebody to pay for it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HENDERSON. May I ask the gentleman if the city of Zanesville, which has recently voted a bond issue for a sewage system, would be able to participate in this program?

Mr. McGREGOR. Not at all, because there is no retroactive provision in this bill. I understand there is going to be an amendment offered to make it retroactive. If you do not care where the money is coming from and just want to spend it, certainly it is a fair proposition to make it retroactive.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Under section 7 there is provided a water pollution control advisory board. Under section 6 the Surgeon General of the United States is given tremendous power to locate these projects. Now, the question I want to ask is this: Does the control board have overriding authority over the Surgeon General?

Mr. McGREGOR. The man who tells you you are going to get the money is the Surgeon General.

Mr. GROSS. One man?

Mr. McGREGOR. He has the authority to make the decision. The board can make a recommendation, but the Surgeon General is the man responsible and he is going to tell you whether or not your political subdivision, your sanitation or pollution control program is in accord with his views. He does not have to follow the commission's report.

Mr. GROSS. To whom would you appeal if you felt you did not get the right treatment?

Mr. McGREGOR. I do not know, because you are giving somebody authority to spend it all.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. On the point of $500 million being unrealistic, the gentleman from Ohio is absolutely correct. Our original proposal was for $100 million a year to take care of not a backlog but just to take up and catch up at the rate we are falling behind, which is estimated at $2 billion, on a 50–50 matching basis.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am sorry. I cannot yield to my chairman for a speech. I want to say in closing if this bill is passed, the entire stream pollution program, in my opinion, will automatically halt, because they will say "Congress has passed a Federal law. Why should we spend our own money?" Then they will say to the next Congress, "This crowd gave us $50 million. Now you give us $100 million." And you will be taking the control away from your locality, your State people, Mr. Chairman, when you are putting it in the hands of the Surgeon General of the United States, who will tell you what to do.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman mentioned this figure of $500 million being unrealistic. Will the gentleman participate with me in an amendment to raise the amount which could be granted to any single municipality to, say, $500,000 or $1 million?

Mr. McGREGOR. Indeed I will not, because I realize our debt is so high now, our taxes are so high, and certainly we are not in debt near as much now as we would be if we had to raise this additional money. The cities, as I said before, have more money than we have, so why should we give them more? We are all in favor of the bill with the exception of section 6. Because we realize that section 6 will cost many millions of dollars and will have a tremendous bearing on our ability to balance the budget and reduce taxes.

The present water pollution control law—Public Law 845, 80th Congress—expires June 30, 1956. Enactment of new legislation at this session of Congress is required to continue the Federal-State cooperative program. The problem of stream pollution is becoming more serious.

The President in his state of the Union and health messages in 1955 and 1956 urged enactment of legislation to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. The administration bill—S. 890—passed the Senate in 1955 in modified form. In general, H. R. 9540 incorporates the principles of S. 890 with minor modifications recommended by the States. However, H. R. 9540 includes a new provision—section 6—added by the House Committee on Public Works, authorizing Federal grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works.

The administration strongly endorses H. R. 9540 except for section 6. Authority for construction grants is not considered necessary nor desirable.

PRINCIPLES OF H. R. 9540

H. R. 9540 would continue the basic principles of the present act—Public Law 845—namely, the primary responsibility for pollution control rests with the States, with the Federal role one of research, technical assistance, program grants to States, and collaboration on enforcement in interstate problems. Seven years experience with Public Law 845 indicated the desirability of the following modifications, which are incorporated in both S. 890 and H. R. 9540:

First. Broadened research, including research grants, fellowships, and contract research. This increased effort, enlisting the support of universities and other centers, is essential for developing the information basic to the entire program—section 4.

Second. Broadened program grants to States, on a matching basis, designed to strengthen all aspects of State pollution control programs—section 5.

Third. Simplified and more practicable enforcement procedures for control of interstate pollution—section 8.

This legislation would provide a sound basis for a concerted Federal-State effort to correct and control pollution. This collaborative effort, properly implemented, should help to curb the increasing seriousness of water pollution and avoid the need for a stronger Federal role in enforcement and for large Federal subsidies for construction.

CONSTRUCTION SUBSIDIES

While recognizing the importance of a great expansion in the construction of sewage treatment works, the administration opposes the inclusion of section 6 in H. R. 9540 for the reason set forth below:

POINTS AGAINST PROVIDING FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID FOR MUNICIPAL SEWAGE TREATMENT CONSTRUCTION (SEC. 6 OF H. R. 9540)

First. With minor exceptions, there is no evidence indicating financial inability of cities to construct necessary sewage treatment works. Even in the few

exceptions, actual financial inability to construct treatment works is predominantly a result of legal limitations or physical deficiencies rather than a true lack of financial resource.

Second. H. R. 9540 establishes the congressional policy that sewage treatment for pollution abatement is a responsibility of the States. The proposed legislation includes ample provisions to cover the Federal interest and Federal responsibility involved in pollution abatement without including Federal financial aid for construction (section 6). These provisions include program grants and technical assistance to the States, Federal aid for research, and a share of the responsibility to abate interstate pollution.

Third. The provision of Federal financial aid for construction in section 6 of H. R. 9540, even if implemented with appropriations, is likely to retard rather than stimulate construction. The $50 million authorized would aid about 200 cities. Even at the present rate of construction, almost 300 cities per year build sewage treatment plants.

Fourth. Federal subsidy for construction of municipal sewage treatment constitutes a type of class legislation and would encourage many other special interests to flock to Congress for similar type of aid.

Fifth. It is unrealistic to assume that Federal assistance will end with the $500 million total authorization in H. R. 9540. Once initiated, Federal subsides would be required on a continuing basis to meet new problems and to take care of obsolescence.

Sixth. Most cities are authorized to finance the cost of sewage treatment on a revenue bond basis, with charges apportioned on the basis of water use. This places the cost where it should be—on those using the system and causing the problem.

Seventh. In 1955 there were 280 municipal sewage treatment plants constructed. Even though this rate of construction is insufficient to halt the growing pollution problem, had the $50 million authorized been available in 1955, only two-thirds of these cities would have received assistance. The net result would have been delays in construction by the other third awaiting promised Federal aid.

Eighth. If water pollution abatement is primarily a State responsibility, as this bill says, the States should take the lead in helping cities financially to handle this problem. Not more than half a dozen of the wealthier States have ever taken that course. When the States have shown concern and acted, then there might be some justification for requesting Federal aid, if need is demonstrated.

Ninth. Bad pollution situations can be corrected by adequate enforcement of State laws. All of the States have the legislative power to abate pollution. Many of these chronic offenders who would profit by this financial assistance have been under orders and directions to clean up for some time. If the States and cities are not sufficiently interested to enforce their laws and spend their money to clean up, then why should the Federal Government do it for them? Furthermore, there is a provision in this legislation whereby the Federal Government can, in collaboration with the States, take action on interstate pollution situations. What is needed is more vigorous action on the part of the States to enforce the laws already on the books rather than coming to Washington for a reward for State and local negligence.

Tenth. In 1954, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare called in a group of financial consultants to consider the advisability of recommending some form of Federal financial aid for construction in the new water pollution legislation. After meeting with the Department to explore this situation, these experts did not see fit to recommend that provision for such Federal assistance be included. When asked on the desirability of extending the construction loan provision in the present law, on balance these consultants advised it was not sufficiently important or useful to recommend the Department's requesting of Congress its continuation.

I hope we delete section 6 and then pass the bill.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, it is a known fact that $100 million was in the bill and the opposite side cut it one-half by their amendment.

WE CANNOT HAVE EFFECTIVE POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS WITHOUT ADEQUATE ENFORCEMENT

Mr. Chairman, the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives has reported H. R. 9540, a bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. Among the strengthening features of this bill is section 8 which provides enforcement measures against pollution of interstate waters.

This bill states categorically that it is the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution. In keeping with this policy, the purpose of section 8 is to protect interstate streams where the responsible States are either unwilling or unable to control water pollution that adversely affects the health or welfare of persons in another State.

In the Water Pollution Control Act currently in force the Federal Government must carry out certain procedures, once interstate pollution has become apparent. But the Federal Government cannot move to abate interstate pollution through court action without first obtaining the consent of the State in which the pollution is contributed to an interstate stream. Nowhere else in Anglo Saxon jurisprudence is it customary to obtain the consent of a culpable party before taking legal corrective action against an offense.

Not only is this veto provision unfair to governmental agencies but in the case of interstate pollution it does not recognize the rights of the States that are adversely affected by interstate pollution. I am glad to say that this bill as reported would rectify this anomaly by permitting court action on the part of the Federal Government upon the request of the damaged State or with consent of the State responsible for the pollution. This degree of protection of States rights is a must. I believe the committee is to be congratulated on making this change.

The committee has also greatly improved the overall procedures which the Federal Government must follow in abating interstate pollution. These procedures are reasonable and, although somewhat time consuming, appear to be equitable among the various interested parties.

The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service would be required, either upon the request of a State or on the basis of information that interstate pollution is occurring, to give formal notification to all enforcement agencies within the area where the pollution is taking place. He would then be required to promptly call a conference of the water pollution control agencies of the interested States. A summary of the conference would be forwarded to those attending. If he saw fit, the Surgeon General could then recommend the necessary remedial action and allow at least 6 months for this to be taken.

If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution were not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare could then hold a public hearing near where the pollution originated. This hearing would be held before a nonpartisan board which would determine whether or not pollution was occurring and whether progress was being made toward its abatement. It would then submit its recommendations for reasonable and equitable abatement measures to the Secretary. The Secretary would in turn send such findings and recommendations to the culpable parties specifying a reasonable time for securing abatement. The same information would also be sent to the State enforcement agencies in which the pollution arises. Further action would be taken through Federal court if compliance with the Secretary's request was still not forthcoming.

I believe that section 8 of this bill has enough teeth in it to bring about the restoration of our water resources. This section, of course, is coupled with other provisions of the bill which make Federal financial and technical assistance available for developing water pollution control methods and constructing facilities.

The current Water Pollution Control Act will expire on June 30. I hope that the House of Representatives will act favorably on this bill and that immediate concurrence can be obtained from the Senate so that a hiatus in Federal water pollution control will not occur.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, of our natural resources, water has become the

No. 1 concern of the Nation. In testimony presented before our committee, it was brought out that during the past year more than 1,000 cities experienced domestic water shortages, and that an estimated 14 million Americans live in water-shortage areas. In most of these areas pollution is a large factor in the amount of usable water available. Many industries are finding it increasingly difficult to secure suitable water to maintain production. This is a national problem and clearly a responsibility of the Federal Government which must be met.

As acting chairman, I was most happy when the full Public Works Committee reported favorably H. R. 9540, the Blatnik bill, to extend and strengthen the expiring Federal water-pollution control law. There was overwhelming committee support for the measure. Even the section authorizing grants to municipalities for construction of sewage-treatment plants, which I wholeheartedly supported, was approved by a substantial majority. It is my earnest hope this section will be retained in the bill by the House today. In this connection, it is significant to point out that the only time that construction of sewage-treatment facilities has kept pace with increased pollution was in the period from 1933–39. This was the period when Federal financial assistance was available to municipalities for the construction of sewage-treatment plants.

I spent a large number of days in committee listening to voluminous testimony in support of this bill, all of which indicated plainly that each year we are going backward instead of forward in our fight against pollution. There is no doubt but that water-conservation policies are in the interest of the immediate and long-range needs of our Nation. In my opinion, the enactment of H. R. 9540 by the House today is the answer to this problem. The provisions contained in this bill will enable us to deal sensibly with water-conservation policies. I earnestly urge favorable action by the House on this very vital legislation.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to preface my remarks today by a sincere tribute to the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK]. The bill before this Congress today, H. R. 9540, is a monument to his patience, perseverance, and hard work, and I say that when this bill becomes law, it will be due to the wonderful work which my good friend JOHN BLATNIK has done.

I want to also compliment the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee and the whole Public Works Committee for a splendid job of work, well done, in bringing out this bill.

This bill is a good bill, it deserves to be passed, and will do much to clean up an intolerable condition. Our committee took over 400 pages of testimony from people representing all forms of organizations in all phases of activity, and it is significant to note that there was not one person who denied the need for a sound and vigorous pollution-control program.

I need not remind my colleagues that this problem of pollution will continue to grow as our population grows until and unless something be done. All of our streams and waters will be nothing but open running sores, full of contagion and filth, contributing to the disease and misfortune of our people, instead of the pure sparkling waters which our forefathers found in this country when they first arrived. Indeed that sad condition is well on its way to being a reality today.

The situation is such that U. S. News & World Report devoted a whole section of its April 27, 1956, issue to a discussion "Will water become scarce?" Its conclusion, I am sad to say, is not that it will or may become scarce, but rather that water is short now, will be shorter in the future, and that if something is not done now, and I quote from the magazine, "then 20 or 25 years from now it may be too late."

What does U. S. News & World Report say must be done? It sets forth the following program, storage, conservation, cleaning up and abatement of pollution, and possibly even purification of sea water.

Listen to these figures. In 1900 America used 40 billion gallons of water per day. In 1955 the use jumped to 262 billion gallons of water a day, and by 1975 the water need will be 453 billion gallons of water a day.

My dad used to say that there are three things which man must have over and above food and shelter to live. They are pure air, pure water, and sunlight. We had all of these things before we began to have industry, and we lived. We can continue to have these things if we are wise enough to have a forceful law to compel the cleaning up of our waters and air to permit us to again enjoy pure water and air. The cost of this in the case of industrial pollution will be a legitimate business expense which can be passed on to the consumers.

In the last 55 years daily water use has increased by 222 billion gallons; in the next 20 years America's water use will rise by 191 billion gallons. To quote U. S. News & World Report:

> United States will need to drill deeper wells, clean up its rivers, and use their waters more efficiently, maybe refine sea water—or face increasing water shortages.

The sad fact is that there is not enough water for America's needs, and the wasteful use of this priceless resource must stop. While water use grows, the supply of this priceless resource remains static or even diminishes.

I need not prove to the membership of this House how foul many of our once pure waters have become. But some facts are both obvious and frightening. Today with flood comes both danger of drowning and disease. When our rivers overflow typhoid danger zooms to astronomical heights. The damage of other diseases skyrockets. Floods are often followed by outbreak of disease and even by epidemics in this enlightened country. It is a tribute to our medical profession that the outbreaks do not become more frequent or severe following floods.

Many of us will be interested to note the parallel between the increase of pollution and the incidence of polio in our own country. At the founding of our country polio was unknown, and until the time that human waste and industrial pollution began to pour into our rivers in large amounts this disease did not become prevalent. It first came to be found with any frequency in the 1870's and 1880's when pollution of our rivers began to be an important factor. By the 1920's it began to be epidemic. Today, when the pollution situation has become serious, it is a common occurrence, and I need not mention the condition of our streams. A similar parallel, identical in effect, but at different times, chronologically, occurs in other countries, among them Argentina and Russia. The time difference is caused by later development of sewage systems and later industrialization.

We are, for example, within the city of Washington, D. C., giving our sewage only 15 percent treatment during dry times. During times when storms increase the flow through the sewers the Potomac receives raw sewage which is a flow too heavy for treatment from the District's sewers.

In the course of a year Washington dumps an amount of raw sewage into the Potomac in amount of billions of gallons. The amount of sewage if in the form of a cube would be higher than the Washington Monument, and longer on each side than that edifice is high. The Potomac River at our own door step is a national disgrace. It smells foul at night, and cannot be used with safety for recreational purposes.

As great a project as this bill sets up, it will not quite keep up with the amount of sewage, municipal and industrial, which will be dumped into our waters because of the anticipated growth of population, industry, and water use. In 1920, we deposited in our streams the equivalent of municipal sewage of 40 million people, and the industrial waste equivalent of 50 million people. Today we fill our streams with the industrial waste equivalent of 110 million people and the municipal waste equivalent of 55 million people.

This bill is better than the Senate bill 890 and the previous law for a number of reasons. One is that it provides for scholarships and fellowships which can be granted at the discretion of the Secretary.

This is not philanthropic, but rather is a cold-blooded provision to get good research and good men to work for far less than it would cost to have the same high quality research done by full-time salaried people. Incidental to this a number of badly needed sanitary engineers and high quality research people will be trained. I need not say that such a program as this will make great use of existing school and research facilities either without cost or at low or nominal cost. Such a program will offer use of some of the best teaching brains at no cost at all to the Government to cooperate with those receiving the fellowships.

I do not need to tell my colleagues that there is great need for research in this program with the rapid growth of indus-

try in the country. The fact of the matter is that this subject is still one of the relatively untouched frontiers of science.

The enforcement provision is strengthened so that abatement proceedings can be instituted without the consent of the State wherein the pollution occurs. Parenthetically, I will say that the bill offers more than adequate safeguards to the rights of the State wherein the pollution occurs. In order to adequately protect this State, wherein the pollution occurs, a period of delays and safeguards is provided which provides that real abatement proceedings do not commence until better than 18 months after the first complaint. Those proceedings do not begin so long as substantial effort is being directed against this pollution within the State of origin. Nevertheless, this provision will be a huge step forward.

As many of my colleagues well know, the old enforcement provisions were so ineffectual that not one abatement proceeding was instituted during the life of the old law which expires this year.

I think it is particularly significant that the Appropriations Committee of this House denied a request for $145,000 for enforcement of the old law on the grounds that the provision was simply unenforceable. As such it would be a waste of money to try to enforce that law. This law will be substantially better. It is not only an oversimplification, but a true statement to say that those who oppose this feature of the bill oppose the cleaning up of our rivers and streams. It is interesting to note that this particular feature of the bill is particularly unpalatable to those who are the worst and most unconscionable of the polluters.

The last feature which is a very significant advance over previous law is the feature providing for grants to States and municipalities. There are two such provisions in the bill.

Grants to States will be made on a matching funds basis for pollution abatement study and work. A sum of $5 million per year is authorized for this feature.

A more important feature of this bill is the provision for grants to municipalities for construction of sewage treatment works and disposal works.

The sum authorized is $50 million per year, for 10 years for a total of $500 million. Grants will be limited to 33⅓ percent of the cost of the work or $300,000 whichever is smaller.

First of all, it is a simple fact that municipalities today cannot finance the improvements that they need. That statement holds true for cities the size of my own city of Detroit.

Secondly, municipalities are faced by legal, charter and constitutional limitations which prevent them from increasing their debt limit.

Also it is a fact that they face the simple economic facts of life, that a large number of municipal bonds and debentures are not marketable today; and for that reason they have a further difficulty in financing needed improvements, especially of the sort such as sewage treatment works with which we are dealing today in this bill.

I have heard many people say that this is not a realistic figure. I am going to tell you how realistic it is. First, it provides up to $300,000 for any single project. If you figure that we finance an even number of projects at $300,000, we can finance 166 or 167 projects a year, and over the 10-year period that is provided, we would be able to finance, or the municipalities would be able to finance, if you please, a total of 1666 or 1667 of these projects. If that will not help to clean up the streams of this country, I am sadly mistaken.

Let us go a step further. We have heard people say that it will induce municipalities not to go into this field until such time as appropriations are available for these grants. Maybe that is so, maybe it is not. The fact of the matter is that municipalities are not going into this field today. Something has got to be done.

I am going to stir this water in the exhibit for you. It is the polluted water that is going down the rivers today and that is the water that you and your people back home are going to be drinking. Perhaps you have financed some of these pollution control projects and perhaps you will be penalized a little bit for it by this bill. But remember this: You are going to get pure water for every cent you spend, and it is a good investment.

With the present state of municipal finance and the current high interest rate, construction of large capital improvements without such a provision is impossible for many of the municipalities.

Some people object to this on a number of grounds. But the fact of the matter is that such expenditures will buy pure water for us and for our children in days to come.

Construction of municipal sewage treatment and disposal works has not kept pace with the growth of the country and expansion of the population, except in one period, and that was during the days of the WPA and PWA, when very substantial grants were made by the Federal Government to help in this construction.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I want merely to express my most sincere appreciation to the members of the subcommittee and the full committee on both sides for the excellent job that they have done. We have a record here of over 400 pages of printed hearings. We heard witnesses presenting all points of view. We feel we have covered the subject about as well as it has been covered to date.

We feel we have an excellent bill here. The only point of disagreement seems to be section 6, on grants in aid. I merely wanted to say that we have a well-rounded bill, for the first time, that will truly work. We have the broadest area of agreement among State organizations, State health agencies, conservation groups, Federal agencies and various geographical areas of the country that it is possible to have.

I strongly urge that H. R. 9540 be adopted by the House in its entirety, so it is not a dislocated or fractured bill which will only meet partially the minimum objectives which we have outlined in our earlier presentation.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this occasion to pay tribute to the conservation organizations that have worked long and diligently for enactment of this legislation. Indeed, this House would be remiss if the RECORD did not list, in recognition of their services, such great organizations as the National Wildlife Federation, the Izaak Walton League of America, the Sport Fishing Institute, the Wildlife Management Institute, the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, the National Parks Association, the Wilderness Society, the American Nature Association, the Outdoor Writers Association of America, the National Council of State Garden Clubs, and the Garden Club of America.

Along with these should be recognized the able and active conservation committees of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the League of Women Voters, and others. The ladies, God bless 'em, continue to be our most militant defenders of the public health. Always you find them exerting their charming and persuasive influence in behalf of the public welfare.

A glance at the contents of the published hearings on H. R. 9540 and S. 890 discloses the widespread and vigorous activity of the conservation groups in support of this legislation. If you listened to or read their statements, you realize their interest goes beyond the fish and wildlife and the recreational opportunities that are damaged or destroyed when human sewage or industrial wastes are allowed to flow untreated into our streams, lakes, and seashores.

Their testimony reveals a broad understanding of and concern for water-supply problems, the needs of industry and agriculture and of growing cities for clean water, the depressing effect of pollution on adjacent real-estate values, its menace to the public health, its destruction of many resource values, including natural beauty.

Mr. Chairman, the organized sportsmen of America, represented in various of the groups that I have named but notably by the big National Wildlife Federation with its State affiliates and the Izaak Walton League of America, have been in the forefront of the battle since the first stirrings of public conscience about the pollution of our public waters. The hunters and anglers have, I believe done more than any other group of citizens to bring about a cleanup. We find them active in support of pollution control and abatement measures in every State legislature. We find them crusading for bond issues when there is a sewage-treatment plant to be constructed. Certainly, we have felt the weight of their constructive influence during the considerations of this legislation.

Water pollution started in a small way, like soil erosion, and the first little gullies that marked the hillsides as a result of bad land use. It sort of sneaked up on us. No one paid any attention to it at first. But as it grew in volume and the streams became smelly, the fish started to die and the wild ducks flew away; the sportsmen were the first to take notice and to demand abatement. Let me quote from the words of Mr. Charles H. Callison, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation, as he explained this phenomenon in testimony last year before the Senate subcommittee:

The hunters and fishermen of America have long been noted for their crusading and constructive interest in water-pollution abatement. More than any other segment of our citizenry, they have worked and fought for clean waters upon which the health and economic welfare of every citizen depends.

There are several good reasons why hunters and fishermen are so keenly interested in this problem. In the first place, the sportsman naturally tends to become a conservationist. He soon learns that his own sport depends upon fertile lands and clean waters.

Secondly, the sportsman gets out on the streams and lakes and along the shorelines more than the rest of the population. He gets out where he can see and smell the pollution.

Thirdly, the typical sportsman is especially endowed with the kind of energy and enterprise that make this Nation great. He isn't the kind to sit idly by and say nothing when there is a mess that needs cleaning up.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if many of us may not have a superficial mental picture of the hunters and anglers among us. Do we think of them merely as funny characters in hip boots or canvas britches, loaded down with paraphernalia and fighting off mosquitoes while trying to bait a hook in the middle of the stream? Or do we think of them huddling futilely in a duck blind during a freezing rain?

Let us take a look through the guns and tackle and under the outlandish garb and see who they really are. We will find among this army of outdoorsmen bankers and merchants, farmers and assembly-line workers. You will discover captains of industry and the janitors who sweep out their offices. You will find among them doctors and lawyers and editors and teachers. Your sportsman may be a policeman on his day off, or a white-collar worker who escapes on weekends to the woods and streams. If you happen to find your sportsman on a certain trout stream in Colorado or among the quail coverts of Georgia, he may even turn out to be the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, if you have wondered about the strength and influence of sportsmen when they get worked up about a problem like water pollution, the explanation lies both in their numbers and in the fact that their fraternity cuts a broad cross-section squarely across the population of America. Scratch any constituent and he is likely to be a sportsman.

I pay tribute to them and to all the other conservation-minded citizens of this Nation. They are first-class citizens who campaign tirelessly for better management of our natural resources.

But let us not end merely with lip service to these the conservationists of America. The bill under consideration represents a major step forward in the national program to safeguard and conserve the vital water resources of the Nation. This then is a historic occasion. Let us grasp it with an outpouring of affirmative votes for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C. 466–466j) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SECTION 1. (a) In connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the waterways of the Nation and in consequence of the benefits resulting to the public health and welfare by the prevention and control of water pollution, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution, to support and aid technical research relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, and to provide Federal technical services and financial aid to State and interstate agencies and to municipalities in connection with the prevention and control of water pollution. To this end, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall administer this act through the Public Health Service and under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) Nothing in this act shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the States with respect to the waters (including boundary waters) of such States.

"COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMS FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

"SEC. 2. The Surgeon General shall, after careful investigation, and in cooperation with other Federal agencies, with State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, and with the municipalities and industries involved, prepare or develop comprehensive programs for eliminating or reducing the pollution of interstate waters and tributaries thereof and improving the sanitary condition of surface and underground waters. In the development of such comprehensive programs due regard shall be given to the improvements which are necessary to conserve such waters for public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses. For the purpose of this section, the Surgeon General is authorized to make joint investigations with any such agencies of the condition of any waters in any State or States, and of the discharges of any sewage, industrial wastes, or substance which may adversely affect such waters.

"INTERSTATE COOPERATION AND UNIFORM LAWS

"SEC. 3. (a) The Surgeon General shall encourage cooperative activities by the States for the prevention and control of water pollution; encourage the enactment of improved and, so far as practicable, uniform State laws relating to the prevention and control of water pollution; and encourage compacts between States for the prevention and control of water pollution.

"(b) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law or treaty of the United States, for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the prevention and control of water pollution and the enforcement of their respective laws relating thereto, and (2) the establishment of such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements and compacts. No such agreement or compact shall be binding or obligatory upon any State a party thereto unless and until it has been approved by the Congress.

"RESEARCH, INVESTIGATIONS, TRAINING, AND INFORMATION

"SEC. 4. (a) The Surgeon General shall conduct in the Public Health Service and encourage, cooperate with, and render assistance to other appropriate public (whether Federal, State, interstate, or local) authorities, agencies, and institutions, private agencies and institutions, and individuals in the conduct of, and promote the coordination of, research, investigations, experiments, demonstrations, and studies relating to the causes, control, and prevention of water pollution. In carrying out the foregoing, the Surgeon General is authorized to—

"(1) collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, the results of and other information as to research, investigations, and demonstrations relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, including appropriate recommendations in connection therewith;

"(2) make grants-in-aid to public or private agencies and institutions and to individuals for research or training projects and for demonstrations, and provide for the conduct of research, training, and demonstrations by contract with public or private agencies and institutions and with individuals without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes;

"(3) secure, from time to time and for such periods as he deems advisable, the assistance and advice of experts, scholars, and consultants as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);

"(4) establish and maintain research fellowships in the Public Health Service with such stipends and allowances, including traveling and subsistence expenses, as he may deem necessary to procure the assistance of the most promising research fellows and

"(5) provide training in technical matters relating to the causes, prevention, and control of water pollution to personnel of public agencies and other persons with suitable qualifications.

"(b) The Surgeon General may, upon request of any State water pollution control agency or interstate agency, conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of water pollution confronting any State, interstate agency, community, municipality, or industrial plant, with a view toward recommending a solution of such problem.

"(c) The Surgeon General shall collect and disseminate basic data on chemical, physical, and biological water quality, and such other information, relating to water pollution and the prevention and control thereof as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act.

"GRANTS FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, $2,000,000 for grants to States and to interstate agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining adequate measures for the prevention and control of water pollution. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

"(b) The portion of the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for a fiscal year which shall be available for grants to interstate agencies and the portion thereof

which shall be available for grants to States shall be specified in the act appropriating such sums.

"(c) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall from time to time make allotments to the several States, in accordance with regulations, on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the extent of the water pollution problem, and (3) the financial need of the respective States.

"(d) From each State's allotment under subsection (c) for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall pay to such State an amount equal to its Federal share (as determined under subsection (h)) of the cost of carrying out its State plan approved under subsection (f), including the cost of training personnel for State and local water pollution control work and including the cost of administering the State plan.

"(e) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall from time to time make allotments to interstate agencies, in accordance with regulations, on such basis as the Surgeon General finds reasonable and equitable. He shall from time to time pay to each such agency, from its allotment, an amount equal to such portion of the cost of carrying out its plan approved under subsection (f) as may be determined in accordance with regulations, including the cost of training personnel for water pollution control work and including the cost of administering the interstate agency's plans. The regulations relating to the portion of the cost of carrying out the interstate agency's plan which shall be borne by the United States shall be designed to place such agencies, so far as practicable, on a basis similar to that of the States.

"(f) The Surgeon General shall approve any plan for the prevention and control of water pollution which is submitted by the State water pollution control agency or, in the case of an interstate agency, by such agency, if such plan—

"(1) provides for administration or for the supervision of administration of the plan by the State water pollution control agency or, in the case of a plan submitted by an interstate agency, by such interstate agency;

"(2) provides that such agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Surgeon General may from time to time reasonably require to carry out his functions under this act;

"(3) sets forth the plans, policies, and methods to be followed in carrying out the State (or interstate) plan and in its administration;

"(4) provides for extension or improvement of the State or interstate program for prevention and control of water pollution; and

"(5) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the plan.

"(g) (1) Whenever the Surgeon General, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State water pollution control agency or interstate agency finds that—

"(A) the plan submitted by such agency and approved under this section has been so changed that it no longer complies with a requirement of subsection (f) of this section; or

"(B) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with such a requirement,

the Surgeon General shall notify such agency that no further payments will be made to the State or to the interstate agency, as the case may be, under this section (or in his discretion that further payments will not be made to the State, or to the interstate agency, for projects under or parts of the plan affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until he is so satisfied, the Surgeon General shall make no further payments to such State, or to such interstate agency, as the case may be, under this section (or shall limit payments to projects under or parts of the plan in which there is no such failure).

"(2) If any State or any interstate agency is dissatisfied with the Surgeon General's action with respect to it under this subsection, it may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State (or any of the member States, in the case of an interstate agency) is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The findings of fact by the Surgeon General, unless contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Surgeon General to take further evidence, and the Surgeon General may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless contrary to the weight of the evidence. The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Surgeon General or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"(h) (1) The 'Federal share' for any State shall be 100 percent less than percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska), except that (A) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66⅔ percent or less than 33⅓ percent, and (B) the Federal share for Hawaii and Alaska shall be 50 percent, and for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 66⅔ percent.

"(2) The 'Federal shares' shall be promulgated by the Surgeon General between July 1 and September 30 of each even-numbered year, on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the 3 most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the 2 fiscal years in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation.

"(i) The population of the several States shall be determined on the basis of the latest figures furnished by the Department of Commerce.

"(j) The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to subsection (d) or (e) shall be as follows:

"(1) The Surgeon General shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be paid to each State (or to each interstate agency in the case of subsection (e)) under the provisions of such subsection for such period, such estimate to be based on such records of the State (or the interstate agency) and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Surgeon General may find necessary.

"(2) The Surgeon General shall pay to the State (or to the interstate agency), from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by him for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid such State (or such interstate agency) for any prior period under such subsection was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to such State (or such agency) for such prior period under such subsection. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, in such installations as the Surgeon General may determine.

"GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION

"SEC. 6. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, intercity, or interstate agency for the construction of necessary treatment works to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste into any waters and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith.

"(b) Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations: (1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Surgeon General and unless such project is included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to this act; (2) no grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 50 percent of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Surgeon General or in an amount exceeding $500,000, whichever is the smaller; (3) no grant shall be made for projects under this section until the applicant has made provision satisfactory to the Surgeon General for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the works after completion of the construction thereof; and (4) no grants shall be made for projects under this section until the applicant has made reasonable assurance satisfactory to the Surgeon General that the rates of pay for laborers and mechanics engaged in construction of the project will not be less than the prevailing local wage rates for similar work as determined in accordance with Public Law 403, of the Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 30, 1935, as amended.

"(c) In determining the desirability of projects for treatment works and of approving Federal financial aid in connection therewith, consideration shall be given by the Surgeon General to the public benefits to be derived by the construction and the propriety of Federal aid in such construction, the relation of the ultimate cost of constructing and maintaining the works to the public interest and to the public necessity for the works, and the adequacy of the provisions made or proposed by the applicant for such Federal financial aid for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the works after completion of the construction thereof. The Surgeon General shall make Federal funds available for such treatment works, in a manner which will tend to result in a wide distribution of such funds among the several areas of the United States for which comprehensive programs have been prepared or developed pursuant to this act to the extent practicable and not inconsistent with the criteria and limitations contained in his section.

"(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year the sum of $100,000,000 for the purpose of making grants under this section: *Provided*, That the aggregate of sums so appropriated shall not exceed $1,000,000,000. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That at least 50 percent of the funds so appropriated for each fiscal year shall be used for grants for the construction of treatment works servicing communities of 125,000 population or under.

"(e) The Surgeon General shall make payments under this act through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury. Funds so paid shall be used exclusively to meet the cost of constructing the project for which the amount was paid. As used in this subsection the term 'constructing' includes the engineering, architectural, legal, fiscal, and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures and other action necessary to the construction

of treatment works; and the erection, building, acquisition, alteration, remodeling, improvement, or extension of treatment works; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of treatment works.

"WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD

"SEC. 7. (a) (1) There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, composed of the Surgeon General or a sanitary engineer officer designated by him, who shall be chairman, and nine members appointed by the President none of whom shall be Federal officers or employees. The appointed members, having due regard for the purposes of this act, shall be selected from among representatives of various State, interstate and local governmental agencies, of public or private interests contributing to, affected by, or concerned with water pollution, and of other public and private agencies, organizations, or groups demonstrating an active interest in the field of water pollution prevention and control, as well as other individuals who are expert in this field.

"(2) (A) Each member appointed by the President shall hold office for a term of 3 years, except that (i) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (ii) the terms of office of the members first taking office after June 30, 1956, shall expire as follows: 3 at the end of 1 year after such date, 3 at the end of 2 years after such date, and 3 at the end of 3 years after such date, as designated by the President at the time of appointment. None of the members appointed by the President shall be eligible for reappointment within 1 year after the end of his preceding term, but terms commencing prior to the enactment of the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1956 shall not be deemed 'preceding terms' for purposes of this sentence.

"(B) The members of the Board who are not officers or employees of the United States, while attending conferences or meetings of the Board or while otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not exceeding $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(b) The Board shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Surgeon General on matters of policy relating to the activities and functions of the Surgeon General under this act.

"(c) Such clerical and technical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the duties of the Board shall be provided from the personnel of the Public Health Service.

"ENFORCEMENT MEASURES AGAINST POLLUTION OF INTERSTATE WATERS

"SEC. 8. (a) The pollution of interstate waters in or adjacent to any State or States (whether the matter causing or contributing to such pollution is discharged directly into such water or reaches such waters after discharge into a tributary of such waters), which endangers the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates, shall be subject to abatement as herein provided.

"(b) Consistent with the policy declaration of this act, State and interstate action to abate pollution of interstate waters shall be encouraged and shall not, except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to court order under subsection (h), be displaced by Federal enforcement action.

"(c) (1) Whenever the Surgeon General, at the request of any State or States or on the basis of reports, surveys or studies, has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring, he shall give formal notification thereof to the State water pollution control agency and interstate agency, if any, of the State or States where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originates and shall call promptly a conference of the State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, if any, of the State or States where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originates and of the State or States claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution.

"(2) The agencies called to attend such conference may bring such persons as they desire to the conference. Not less than 3 weeks' prior notice of the conference date shall be given to such agencies.

"(3) Following this conference, the Surgeon General shall prepare and forward to all the water pollution control agencies attending the conference a summary of conference discussions including (A) occurrence of pollution of interstate waters subject to abatement under this act; (B) adequacy of measures taken toward abatement of the pollution; and (C) nature of delays, if any, being encountered in abating the pollution.

"(d) If the Surgeon General believes, upon the conclusion of the conference or thereafter, that effective progress toward abatement of such pollution is not being made and that the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates is being endangered, he shall recommend to the appropriate State water pollution control agency that it take necessary remedial action. The Surgeon General is to allow at least 6 months for the taking of such action.

"(e) If such remedial action is not taken or action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of such pollution is not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originated, before a board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State in which any discharge causing or contributing to such pollution originates and each State claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution shall be given an opportunity to select one member of the board and at least one member shall be a representative of the Department of Commerce, and not less than a majority of the board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At least 3 weeks' prior notice of said hearing shall be given to the State water-pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, if any, called to attend the aforesaid hearing and the alleged polluter or polluters. On the basis of the evidence presented at such hearing, the board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and whether effective progress toward abatement thereof is being made. If the board finds such pollution is occurring and effective progress toward abatement is not being made, it shall make recommendations to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and equitable to secure abatement of such pollution. The Secretary shall send such findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution, together with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than 6 months) to secure abatement of such pollution, and shall also send such findings and recommendations and of such notice to the State water-pollution control agency, and to the interstate agency, if any, of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate.

"(f) If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notice following the public hearing is not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the written consent of the State water-pollution control agency (or any officer or employee authorized to give such consent) of the State or States where the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is discharged or at the written request of the State water-pollution control agency (or any officer or employee authorized to make such request) of any other State or States where the health or welfare of persons is endangered by such pollution, may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

"(g) In any suit brought pursuant to subsection (f) in which two or more persons in different judicial districts are originally joined as defendants, the suit may be commenced in the judicial district in which any discharge caused by any of the defendants occurs.

"(h) The court shall receive in evidence in any such suit a transcript of the proceedings before the Board and a copy of the Board's recommendations and shall receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

"(i) As used in this section, the term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, State, municipality, and political subdivision of the State.

"COOPERATION TO CONTROL POLLUTION FROM FEDERAL INSTALLATIONS

"SEC. 9. It is hereby declared to be the intent of the Congress that any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, insofar as practicable and consistent with the interests of the United States and within any available appropriations, cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with any State or interstate agency or municipality having jurisdiction over waters into which any matter is discharged from such property, in preventing or controlling the pollution of such waters.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 10. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out his functions under this act. All regulations of the Surgeon General under this act shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Surgeon General may delegate to any officer or employee of the Public Health Service such of his powers and duties under this act, except the making of regulations, as he may deem necessary or expedient.

"(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the consent of the head of any other agency of the United States, may utilize such officers and employees of such agency as may be found necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act.

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions under this act.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 11. When used in this act—

"(a) The term 'State water pollution control agency' means the State health authority, except that, in the case of any State in which there is a single State agency, other than the State health authority, charged with responsibility for enforcing State laws relating to the abatement of water pollution, it means such other State agency.

"(b) The term 'interstate agency' means an agency of 2 or more States established by or pursuant to an agreement or compact approved by the Congress, or any other agency of 2 or more States, having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the control of pollution of waters.

"(c) The term 'treatment works' means the various devices used in the treatment of sewage or industrial wastes of a liquid nature, including the necessary intercepting sewers, outfall sewers, pumping, power, and other equipment, and their appurtenances, and includes any extensions, improvements, remodeling, additions, and alterations thereof.

"(d) The term 'State' means a State, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

"(e) The term 'interstate waters' means all rivers, lakes, and other waters that flow across, or form a part of, boundaries between two or more States.

"(f) The term 'municipality' means a city, town, county, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law and having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes, or other wastes.

"OTHER AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED

"SEC. 12. This act shall not be construed as (1) superseding or limiting the functions, under any other law, of the Surgeon General or of the Public Health Service, or of any other officer or agency of the United States, relating to water pollution, or (2) affecting or impairing the provisions of the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, or sections 13 through 17 of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors and for other purposes', approved March 3, 1899, as amended, or (3) affecting or impairing the provisions of any treaty of the United States.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 13. If any provision of this act, or the application of any provision of this act to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, and the remainder of this act, shall not be affected thereby.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the 'Federal Water Pollution Control Act'."

SEC. 2. The title of such act is amended to read "An act to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes."

SEC. 3. Terms of office as members of the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board (established pursuant to section 6 (b) of the Water Pollution Control Act, as in effect prior to the enactment of this act) subsisting on the date of enactment of this act shall expire at the close of business on such date.

SEC. 4. In the case of any discharge or discharges causing or contributing to water pollution with respect to which the actions by the Surgeon General prescribed under paragraph (2) of section 2 (d) of the Water Pollution Control Act, as in effect prior to the enactment of this act, have already been completed prior to such enactment, the provisions of such section shall continue to be applicable; except that nothing in this section shall prevent action with respect to any such pollution under and in accordance with the provisions of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended by this act.

SEC. 5. This act may be cited as the "Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1956."

Mr. DONDERO (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the bill be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 5, after "agencies", insert "and to municipalities."

Page 3, line 21, after "United States", insert "for."

Page 5, line 9, after "(4)" strike out "establish and maintain research fellowships" and insert "provide and maintain opportunities for study."

Line 14, strike out "fellows" and insert "students: *Provided*, That the total sum authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year for students pursuant to this subparagraph shall not exceed $100,000;".

Page 6, line 13, strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

Line 16, strike out "Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended."

Page 8, line 22, insert the following: "The Surgeon General shall not disapprove any such plan without first giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State water pollution control agency or interstate agency which has submitted such plan."

Page 12, line 12, strike out "installations" and insert "installments."

Line 16, strike out "intercity" and insert "intermunicipal."

Page 13, line 5, strike out "50" and insert "33⅓."

Line 7, strike out "$500,000" and insert "$300,000."

Line 8, after "smaller" insert ": *Provided*, That the grantee agrees to pay the remaining cost;".

Page 14, line 16, strike out "his" and insert "this."

Line 18, strike out "$100,000,000" and insert "$50,000,000."

Line 21, strike out "$1,000,000,000" and insert "$500,000,000."

Line 25, strike out "communities" and insert "municipalities."

Page 15, line 8, after "includes", insert "preliminary planning to determine the economic and engineering feasibility of treatment works."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 17, after "works", insert ": *Provided*, That in assuring that a fair distribution of grant funds hereunder is made available to the largest possible number of States, municipalities, intermunicipal or interstate agencies that have need for treatment works and in order that the initial feasibility of a project can be determined, the Surgeon General shall give priority to grants for advance planning in order to determine the preliminary economic and engineering feasibility of such projects."

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER to the committee amendment: On page 15, line 22, after "shall", insert the following: "specify annually a portion amounting to at least 10 percent of the sums appropriated pursuant to this section to be used for advance planning grants to the maximum extent possible, and with regard to such portion."

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment is agreeable to both sides of the aisle. Its purpose is to clarify the grant proviso that makes money available for advance planning. I think that is one of the problems that is the crux of this whole water pollution control legislation. The committee unanimously approved the proviso itself. This is a clarifying amendment to that proviso, so that all funds will not be tied up.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, this side agrees to the clarifying amendment. It is a good amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, in reporting on S. 890 and H. R. 9540, the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee offered an amendment to section 5, "Grants for water-pollution control program," which would increase the authorization for such grants.

The bill as originally introduced provided for authorization of $2 million annually for 5 years making grants to States and interstate agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining adequate measures for the prevention and control of pollution. The bill as reported to the full committee increased this authorization to $5 million annually.

This amendment was wisely conceived and properly supported by members of the subcommittee who understood the water-pollution problem and who wanted to deal with it realistically.

This provision is similar to one contained in the present Water Pollution Control Act, except that the Federal financial assistance in the bill under consideration is not restricted to studies anent industrial waste. It is designed to assist the States in any aspect of their water-pollution-control programs.

Experience under the present act indicates that such financial assistance not only directly aids the States but also stimulates their interest in giving increased financial support to their water-pollution control programs. At the outset of the Federal financial-assistance program, 1950, the total annual expenditure by States—excluding Federal money—for water-pollution control was about $2¼ million. The next year the total rose to $3 million, 1951, and the following year to $4 million, 1952. Then the Federal assistance was abruptly cut off. The following years, the total State expenditures not only ceased to rise but decreased.

Under the proposed authorization of $5 million for State aid in the bill reported by the subcommittee, the amount available for the respective States would vary according to population, extent of their water pollution control problem and financial need. Even under this increased amount, 11 States would receive less than $30,000 annually. But under

the amount provided in the bill as previously introduced, $2 million, 25 States would receive less than $30,000 annually. One State would receive less than $1,500.

Small amounts are not usually acceptable to States because the trouble of conforming to legal and administrative procedures of the Government is not worth the small amounts received. The larger amounts provided by the subcommittee and committee amendments will materially serve to eliminate such inhibitions.

A 5-year program of Federal aid as authorized by the subcommittee's and committee amendments would not necessarily permit States to add permanently to their professional staffs, but it would permit them to purchase needed laboratory and other equipment which would far outlast the 5-year program. Moreover, it would also help the States adjust the salary scales of technical personnel to hold and attract the kind of employees needed for successful State operation of vital water pollution control programs.

I believe we do not want to be too little and too late with a strengthened water pollution control program. I recommend the more realistic version of the subcommittee and committee in amount.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 17, line 1, strike out "None of the members" and insert "Members."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 17, line 2, after "shall" insert "not".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 18, line 6, strike out "water" and insert "waters".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 18, line 17, after "of" insert "the water pollution control agency or the chief executive of".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 22, strike out lines 1 to 5 inclusive.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 22, line 6, strike out "(h)" and insert "(g)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 22, line 10, after "court," insert "giving due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 22, line 16, strike out "(i)" and insert "(h)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: On page 10, line 9, after the word "less", strike out the word "than" and insert "that".

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, this merely corrects a typographical error changing the word "than" which is now in the bill to "that" which should be in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DONDERO: On page 12, line 14, strike out all of section 6, page 12, line 14, to page 15, line 24, both inclusive.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the full 5 minutes, and I hope I will not reiterate any argument made by me in general debate on the bill. I simply want to call the attention of the House to the three main reasons for opposing section 6 of the bill offered by the Department which will administer this law. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in their written report to the committee has this to say in recommending that section 6 be deleted from this bill. They say:

First, we do not believe that general municipal need for financial aid—and particularly Federal aid—for this purpose has been established. In developing our own legislative proposals relating to water-pollution control, we obtained the views of a number of municipal finance authorities and other persons familiar with this problem. We found no clear indication that municipal governments generally are unable to meet the costs of constructing waste-treatment works. The problem appears to be primarily one of the priority assigned by municipalities to the construction of sewage-treatment works in their capital financing programs, rather than one of financial inability.

Second, any justification for Federal construction grants in this field must, therefore, rest primarily on their value as an incentive to accelerate needed construction, rather than on a concept of financial aid to equalize the financial abilities of municipalities generally. Although a few States now have grant programs for this particular purpose, experience with such grants has been too limited to date to provide any clear evaluation of their advantages and limitations or of the most effective terms or conditions governing such aid.

Third, even if the need for Federal incentive grants were to be assumed, we believe that the grant provisions of H. R. 9540 are deficient in several important respects: (a) They do not provide for State sharing in the financing of the grant program or in the determination of relative needs and priorities; (b) the provisions relating to the geographical allocation of grant funds are so broad as to offer little guidance in project approval; (c) there are no criteria specified to govern the assignment of priorities among eligible construction projects; and (d) the preference given to smaller municipalities is unnecessarily great and does not conform to the relative need for construction from the standpoint of water-pollution abatement.

This brief summary of their views on this proposal is to be found on page 31 of the report. I call the attention of the Members of the House to the 6 or 7 reasons they set forth in their third paragraph. Here is a department of the Government that has gone into this matter thoroughly. They have made a thorough investigation. Now, they come forward and say to the Congress that section 6 is not needed and there is no need established, sufficiently at least, to put section 6 in the bill calling upon the Federal Government for the vast expenditures of money involved. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is apparent that the issue is pretty well drawn, and apparently there is going to be an issue decided more or less on the basis of political alignments in the House.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], who preceded me that there is no information coming from the municipalities that would be affected under section 6 to indicate that they are opposed to this type of legislation.

At this point I want to read into the RECORD the position of the American Municipal Association on this particular question, and section 6 in particular. This is addressed to me as a Member of Congress:

AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1956.

The Honorable CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BAILEY: On behalf of the 12,000 cities who are members of this association, we urge your support of the Water Pollution Control legislation, H. R. 9540, now being considered by the House. We are particularly anxious for your support of section 6 of the bill which provides for Federal grants to municipalities for the construction of sewage treatment plants.

We have set forth our reasons for favoring Federal construction grants in our testimony before the House Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors (see pp. 244–254, 268–276). Water pollution is a national public health problem and because of the interstate nature of pollution the Federal Government has a clear-cut responsibility to assist in its abatement.

It is significant that the only time that construction of sewage treatment facilities has kept pace with increased pollution was in the period from 1933–39. This was the period when Federal financial assistance was available to municipalities for the construction of sewage treatment plants.

One of our most valuable natural resources is water. Already an estimated 14 million Americans live in water-shortage areas. In nearly all of these areas pollution is a large factor in the amount of usable water available.

Each year we as a nation fall further behind in the fight against pollution. H. R. 9540 is the first bold step on the long road back to sensible water conservation policies. We urge your favorable action on this vital legislation.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICK HEALY, Jr.,
Executive Director.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow that up by asking that I be permitted to read into the RECORD the following telegrams:

MORGANTOWN, W. VA., *June 11, 1956.*

Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Residents of Morgantown and Monongalia County will appreciate your efforts for approval of H. R. 9540 Blatnik water pollution

and sewage disposal bill. Personally urge your support.

ELMER W. PRINCE,
City Manager.

CHARLESTON, W. VA., *June 12, 1956.*
Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The passage of the water pollution and sewage disposal bill is important to the sanitation, growth, and welfare of many communities located on the banks of many streams in West Virginia. As mayor of Charleston, W. Va., I respectfully urge you to lend your full support and effort to the passage of this piece of legislation.

JOHN T. COPENHAVER.

WESTON, W. VA., *June 12, 1956.*
Congressman CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Member, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

As president of the Weston Board of Trade, I urge the passage of a water pollution and sewage disposal bill that gives Federal aid to the cities to assist them in the construction of a sewage disposal plant.

HAROLD G. COTTRILL.

WESTON, W VA., *June 12, 1956.*
Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Congressman, Third West Virginia District,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand water pollution and sewage disposal bill comes up for vote Wednesday. We urge its approval.

NETTIE V. DAVIS,
Executive Secretary, Weston Chamber of Commerce.

WESTON, W. VA., *June 12, 1956.*
Congressman CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Member of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

As mayor of the city of Weston, I urge the passage of a water pollution and sewage disposal bill that gives Federal aid to the cities to assist them in the construction of a sewage disposal plant.

GERALD L. HAYES,
Mayor.

ELKINS, W. VA., *June 12, 1956.*
CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of the people of the city of Elkins, we request and urge your utmost support on H. R. 9540, now pending in Congress.

E. P. PHARES,
Mayor, City of Elkins.

CLARKSBURG, W. VA., *June 13, 1956.*
Hon. CLEVELAND BAILEY,
New Congressional Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Clarksburg Chamber of Commerce sincerely urges your utmost efforts toward including provisions in bill 9540 which enable cities to receive aid.

WALT SCHRADER.

CLARKSBURG, W. VA., *June 12, 1956.*
CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully urge approval of H. R. 9540.

W. WALTER NEELY.

MOUNT HOPE, W. VA., *June 12, 1956.*
Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Congressman, Third West Virginia District, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand H. R. 9540, Blatnik water pollution and sewage disposal bill up Wednesday. Passage is a must for all cities under 10,000 population. Please use every effort toward passage. Kindly write at once giving full particulars pertaining Bureau of Mines Building.

W. BERNARD ROCKE.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA.,
June 12, 1956.
CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

These cities need help. Would appreciate all your best efforts toward passage of water pollution and sewage disposal bill.

HUNTINGTON SANITARY BOARD.

PARKERSBURG, W. VA.,
June 12, 1956.
CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Citizens of Parkersburg, W. Va., hereby strongly urge the approval of House rule, bill 9540.

FRANK W. GOVE, Jr.,
Mayor, City of Parkersburg, W. Va.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA.,
June 12, 1956.
CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge all maximum efforts toward passage of H. R. 9540, Blatnik water pollution and sewage disposal bill. Cities must have assistance.

GEORGE E. THEURER,
Mayor, Huntington.

CHARLESTON, W. VA.,
June 11, 1956.
CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Member of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand H. R. 9540, water pollution bill, will be taken up June 12 or 13. Appreciate your favorable consideration.

Dr. N. H. DYER,
State Director of Health.

OAK HILL, W. VA., *June 12, 1956.*
Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.:

Urge passage H. R. 9540, water and sewage bill.

H. C. BROWN,
Mayor, Oak Hill, W. Va.

BUCKHANNON, W. VA., *June 12, 1956.*
Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:

We are for H. R. 9540, Blatnik water pollution and sewage-disposal bill, 100 percent.

J. D. HINKLE,
Mayor.

WESTON, W. VA., *June 13, 1956.*
Congressman CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Member, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Send copies of H. R. 9540. State ordered construction of sewage-disposal plants. Unbearable burden to small municipalities. Benefits not local but inure to both State and Nation. Urge passage of H. R. 9540.

JOHN HOLY,
City Attorney for City of Weston.

WESTON, W. VA., *June 13, 1956.*
Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Would appreciate your using your influence in behalf of H. R. 9540. Please call WHAW, Weston, collect, when you can give us a report. Regards.

GEORGE YAZELL.

WESTON, W. VA., *June 13, 1956.*
Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urgently request passage of H. R. 9540, Blatnik water-pollution and sewage disposal bill.

ROBERT S. EARLE,
Weston Democrat.

These communications are all pleading for the approval of this legislation, including section 6.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

First, I want to join in the tributes being paid to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], the author of this bill. He has done a wonderful job with this legislation. When this program becomes law, especially section 6, I hope it will be recognized by the country as due to the work of JOHN BLATNIK.

Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that an effort is being made to strike from the bill what a large section of the country believes to be the most important part of this legislation.

This section of the bill, of course, changes existing Federal authority, but it is nothing new. As has been pointed out earlier in the debate, the only time any real progress was made in this country in establishing municipal sewage disposal plants was during that period when there were matching funds from Federal grants under the PWA program. All the real major advance that has been made in this work was in the period of the thirties through the use of PWA funds.

I was surprised by the vehemence of the opposition to this section by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the insistence by the Department that all of this program should be done by municipal bond issues. In trying to find why there was such insistence about this I looked into the hearings and found that committee members raised that same question. They asked what was one of the reasons why the Department had arrived at the conclusion that there should be no Federal assistance, but that it should all be done through municipal bond issues.

They called a meeting of municipal finance authorities to help them make a decision on it, and according to the official record of the hearings on page 148 the people who made these recommendations against the Federal participation were representatives of the Chase National Bank, a representative of Stone, Rowe & Foreham, a representative of Wainwright & Ramsay, a representative of R. W. Ramspeck & Co., investment bankers, and a representative of the Life Insurance Company of America. In other words, these were all people who wanted to handle these loans. They recommended that the municipalities and States be required to make them. I do not blame those people for wanting to prevent the grants and I do not blame them for bringing what pressures they could exert upon the administration to keep them from supporting such a program to bring it about.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If I understand the gentleman's bill correctly, his bill is to encourage communities in issuing bonds, the same as the bankers did.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I cannot understand why they do not look at it from the long-range viewpoint.

Mr. CEDERBERG. So the argument of the gentleman is not valid in this case at all.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I quite agree that it is not valid in the long-range sense that these grants will bring about these programs.

I think the best experience we have had to show the value and necessity of this program is the experience we have had under the Hill-Burton Act. All of us are familiar with areas of the country where there was a crying need for more hospital facilities, just 10 years ago. Everybody recognized the fact, everybody recognized that it was primarily a municipal responsibility to provide those hospital facilities, but they did nothing about it until the incentive was provided in the Hill-Burton Act. As a result we are meeting the hospital crisis in the country; it is a major problem no longer.

This is the same type of program; unfortunately, the grants are not great enough, and they are not based upon the same type of formula as the Hill-Burton grants were based.

I have been constrained to refrain from offering an amendment to provide that the grants be in greater proportion along the lines of the Hill-Burton Act in the interest of preserving what we have here, but I think the history of what has happened under the Hill-Burton program makes clear the necessity for this program. There are many municipalities all over the country that need these programs but that are not going to establish them until they have the incentive of the grant. That is an unfortunate fact, but true nonetheless.

We have got to put through a program like this if we are going to enable the municipalities to meet that problem. The municipalities are entitled to that Federal grant. The type of taxation program we have means that the Federal Government takes the taxes from the small towns and it goes into the big areas and it has to come from there.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out something that I think we lose sight of when we debate the amount of money involved in this legislation. Detroit, for instance, has been mentioned and the need for money for a sewage disposal plant. But how much will $300,000 do? One municipal plant, any type of sewage treatment plan, will run into millions of dollars. I know of one treatment plant in my own county that was completed a short time ago, and we have spent $32 million on that plant. Here we want to appropriate a few thousand dollars, and it is claimed that is going to be a great deal of help.

Mr. Chairman, beyond that I want to make one other point. I wonder how many Members here realize when they say municipalities and the States do not have the money what their State legislatures do? Let them check the State legislatures and their local governments and see how many States have within the past year or two increased the taxes for highways within the States, how many of the States have increased the taxes for other types of facilities that it is said here are not half as important as water is to our people and the elimination of pollution. If we can tax our people within the States for these other facilities, it seems to me quite certain we can carry out our responsibilities within our States and within our municipalities and pay our own way as we go along.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I am happy to hear the gentleman express his solicitude for the municipalities. I would like to know if the gentleman will join with me in an amendment which would raise the amount of the grant to be made to any individual municipality and the total overall amount that could be granted?

Mr. BECKER. I am sorry I could not do that. I would not be consistent in my position and in my opposition to these grants-in-aid which are absolutely unnecessary, in my opinion.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall be brief since the things I might have said have been stated far better than I can say them.

I want to add one or two considerations, however, that I do not feel have been stressed sufficiently here today. We all agree we want conservation of our water resources. There is no argument about the goal; the argument is simply the means to be employed.

I call your attention to the bill and to the minority report. I strikes me that on the face of the bill itself we are asking for a stronger State program, more research, more technical assistance: a stronger State program. Then we say: Hold everything. We have a Federal grant coming for you. The bill is self-contradictory.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the States will be encouraged to strengthen their program if they know they can get it from Uncle Sam. Now where does this money come from? It comes out of the taxpayers' pocket. We will not have more but less money to build these plants by getting back our own money via the route of Washington.

In depression times, much was said for the public works projects which were proposed to create work and build systems like this. But at a time like the present, in the most prosperous period in our history, surely we can leave it to the localities to build their own systems. Here is another case of conflict between States rights and the huge expanding Federal bureaucracy.

The second point I would like to raise is simply this to point out the fallacy of the new grant-in-aid. If we are going to grant money who is going to get the money? Are we in each of our respective States going to start a race with each other competitively? Should I check my district and State and tell them to be on the alert so that we may get our share of the number of projects to be made available, and, of course, there cannot be many projects of this nature even with the grant money available.

I would like to call your attention to the minority report. I know you have many other things to do, and possibly you have not read it, but if you could read the minority report before the vote is taken, I believe you would find it to be of information.

Let us not lose sight of one thing: Everyone here is deeply interested in the conservation of the Nation's water resources. And I think we all agree that control of pollution is one of the major means of achieving water conservation.

Let us see what the experts themselves say about grants for sewage treatment construction.

One of the Nation's outstanding engineering publications—the Engineering News Record—recently called a group of experts together to consider this very question. Here is what one of these experts had to say about it.

I quote:

It is difficult to escape the kind of cynicism about the Federal grants-in-aid if you live long enough. As an old PWA director, I had considerable interest and considerable part in the initial legislation for public works grants-in-aid in the thirties.

And skipping a bit:

It is very interesting to compare the thirties with 1956. In the thirties we went to Federal grants-in-aid because we were literally in the dumps financially. We now talk of Federal grants-in-aid in the most prosperous period that this country has ever seen, and I confess it is a little difficult for me to prove to myself the necessity of turning to Washington for help when I believe the resources of the country are at their maximum. I myself feel that both States and others would be retarded in installations, not necessarily by the grant-in-aid but by the promise of the grant-in-aid, which is held dangling in front of you, and which in quantity is not really much of a stimulant. Unless you move to the billion dollar level you don't get the shot in the arm.

This statement was made by one of the Nation's outstanding engineering authorities in the water resources field—Prof. Abel Wolman, of Johns Hopkins University.

Dr. Wolman knows better than to be taken in by the glittering promise of Federal assistance.

To quote him again, very briefly:

I would remind you—

He told the conference—

that PWA grants increased costs of construction, did not decrease them. As a matter of fact, the record would show that the 45 percent grant just about represented the increased cost, and you would have been just as well off without it.

When a man of Abel Wolman's vast experience in the water resources field sends up a warning like that, I believe we should stop to take a long hard look before plunging into a program of the kind contemplated in the construction-grants section of this bill.

And let me say that a good many experts in the pollution-control field agree with Wolman. Many of them did at the recent meeting.

Further, I submit that the construction-grants section contradicts every other provision of the bill.

What is the use of strengthening State pollution-control programs, of perfecting the enforcement procedures, of stepping up the research effort, and so on, if you turn around in the same bill and say to the cities and towns of America: "Hold everything. There are grants-in-aid on the way."

I say, let us give our States and local communities the kind of help that they do need and can use to develop more effective pollution-control programs of their own. Let us not discourage that kind of initiative with the glittering promises of Federal financial assistance.

In short, let us strike this provision from the bill. I think then we would have the basis for a sound program of pollution control in this country.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during one summer between terms of school a classmate and I undertook to sell a set of volumes on agriculture to the farmers of our area. As I say, we undertook and offered to sell that set of volumes. We did not have too much luck. This friend of mine tells this story about an episode he said occurred to him. He said he was talking to one farmer and finally became so frustrated that in desperation he asked, "Well, don't you want to learn how to farm any better?" The farmer replied, spitting out a stream of tobacco, "I do not see how it would help me much, because I ain't farming half as good as I know how now."

I know some Members have the idea that is the attitude of the cities and municipal governments. Some Members are obviously under the impression that the cities are not tending to their jobs as well as they know how. Members have intimated that the municipalities are negligent or derelict in their duty; that they have failed to provide pollution control simply because they have not been willing. Friends, that is the farthest thing from the truth that could possibly be. The reason the cities of America have not been able to keep pace with this rapid growth and the rapid need of pollution control is because they have been caught in a squeeze, a fearlessly insistent and tenaciously gripping financial nutcracker between rising costs and restricted sources of income. In some areas of our country as many as 70 percent of the municipalities have exceeded or have reached their legal limits of debt assumption.

You say to them, "Here, take care of this problem," and I say to you that it is a national problem and a national responsibility and one that we cannot avoid, when we realize that by 1975 according to the most reliable statistics available, our Nation is going to need two and one-half times as much water as we are using today and when we realize that since 1920 the organic pollution in our streams has increased by 82 percent. So what has been a local responsibility has become a national problem; and so it thereby becomes a national responsibility. We can pass pious platitudes; we can say we believe in these things, but if we cut the heart out of the bill, then we share with those municipalities the responsibility for not keeping pace by falling farther and farther behind in this struggle to keep our waters safe from pollution.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. You say the cities are not able to take care of this problem. How is it that 30 percent of the municipalities of the United States have already done so?

Mr. WRIGHT. The city which is my home has done so, and the suggestion has been made that it is not fair to those who have temporarily—and I say "temporarily" because most of these cities are growing—have temporarily solved this problem to permit aid to other cities which have not. Well, that would be like saying it is not fair to those cities which have solved their hospital problems for us to have the Hill-Burton Act, or that it is not fair to give them aid toward the construction of schools in defense-impacted areas. Any kind of of a bill could be objected to on that ground. Any time we start a new program that argument could be lodged against it, that it is not fair to those who have already taken care of their own needs. I do not object and the city I represent does not object, even though they have temporarily, at least, taken care of that problem.

It has been suggested that $300,000 would not be particularly helpful. Three hundred thousand dollars is one-third of a $900,000 installation. On the basis of average costs across the country, it may be estimated that a $900,000 installation would be adequate, wholly, to serve a population of 100,000. I do not think it is a very realistic argument, therefore, to suggest that this is an inadequate sum to help in individual communities.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Is the gentleman suggesting if you have a $900,000 sewage disposal project that you can get a $300,000 loan?

Mr. WRIGHT. No; I am saying nothing about loans. The terms of the bill are that the Federal Government may grant in those cases where the State authority has approved the project up to one-third, but in no case to exceed $300,000 for the construction of a municipal sewage disposal plant.

We do not need to go any further than the Potomac River to see the sickening sight of a stream that once ran clear and fresh and pure, now contaminated by a careless civilization which has been too preoccupied with growth to take care of the preservation of the purity of that which nature gave us.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, section 6 of this bill is an idle gesture and we should recognize it for what it is. Ten years ago, when the Antipollution Act was passed, there was a provision for an authorization of $22½ million. Not one cent has ever been appropriated by the Committee on Appropriations of this House. When you get into a program as gigantic as this, I cannot imagine, knowing the members of the Committee on Appropriations, that they would ever recommend appropriation of one dime of the money that is sought to be authorized in this bill. That will mean that the entire sanitary program of this country will be delayed for at least 2 years. I have telegrams and letters from municipalities saying, in effect, sure, they want to get a free ride if they can. I have telegrams stating that they would like to know the outcome of this bill, because they are proposing a bond issue—in the case of one city, from whom I have heard in which they advise that they are calling for a bond issue of $10 million to put in a sanitary system, but, they advise "We are holding off until we know what is going to happen to this bill."

What you will be doing is this: You will be delaying the sanitary improvement program all over the United States.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCUDDER. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. BLATNIK. With reference to the gentleman's suggestion that the Committee on Appropriations has refused to appropriate money for that purpose, I should like to give him the answer to that, because I have those hearings right here.

Mr. SCUDDER. You will have to secure an appropriation in order to get the money to match or whatever the method would be to split up the money.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, to clarify that once and for all, here are the hearings on appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1957, and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], is questioning a representative of the Department. It went something like this:

"Last year the committee refused a request for $145,000 for certain activities on the ground that the act was really unenforceable. Do you agree with that or were we wrong?"

Repeatedly they had contended that the enforcement provisions in the existing law were unworkable and the Committee on Appropriations refused to appropriate the money. So instead of coming through with $22½ million and other aid, they appropriated only $11 million in 8 years. We now have an enforceable law, a workable law, and we think it will work. But they must have the means with which to do that which we are trying to do and that is to provide these sewage disposal facilities.

Mr. SCUDDER. The gentleman's guess and my guess may be equally good. But my guess is that the Committee on Appropriations will not appropriate money to start a new giveaway program

to be handled from Washington at this time. We are trying to balance the budget. We are trying to economize a bit. I do not believe this Congress is in any position to embark upon a program of this sort. I seriously feel that you will not do one bit of good with this bill if you leave in the appropriation.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCUDDER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I heard the gentleman say in general debate that the bill sent over by the Senate was almost identical with the bill passed by the 80th Congress.

Mr. SCUDDER. I did not mention that bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Somebody made that statement. Let me tell the gentleman why they have not asked for it and why there was not any appropriation. It is because it was not workable. A 10-year loan to a municipality does not mean anything because they would have to have at least 30 years to get revenues out of the use of the sewage facility to pay off the loan. It was not workable. Nobody asked for it. If the bill is not any better than that, you had better just put it in the wastebasket.

Mr. SCUDDER. The purpose of this bill was to extend the present law and amend it to give to the Federal authorities the proper law to stop pollution of our streams. I am in thorough agreement with the purpose of this bill, but feel that section 6 is an unnecessary gesture and will retard the building of proper sewage disposal plants. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, does not the gentleman from Minnesota think we had better limit the time on this amendment and all amendments thereto in order to get through with the bill? I understand two other pieces of legislation are to follow this one today.

Mr. BLATNIK. I am anxious to get through as soon as possible. However, we have 3 or 4 Members on this side who have kindly consented to wait this long to speak, but they would like to be heard. I suggest a limitation of 20 minutes. How would that be?

Mr. DONDERO. Twenty minutes would be all right.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. DURHAM and Mr. DEMPSEY objected.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. DURHAM. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, my object in taking the floor at this time is to support the bill. I notice Members on both sides of the aisle are for the bill, with the exception of section 6. That is where the money is provided. They will give you everything but the money needed to purify the waters of American streams, at an estimated cost of $50 million a year.

Some gentlemen have asked, "Where is the Federal Government going to get the money?" The same place it has been getting it down through the years, from the people of the respective States. The Federal Government has tapped them so severely that they are having trouble getting by in the States. The Federal Government has no money other than that which it obtains from the States, and the States, unfortunately, or perhaps fortunately, do not have the same authority the Federal Government possesses insofar as levying taxes is concerned.

The greatest natural resource known throughout the world is water. The water tables of America have been going down State by State, year by year. Not too long ago in the city of New York, the greatest city in the world, there was a sign in each bathroom, "It is patriotic to avoid taking a bath on Thursday." That was to conserve water.

We are not only trying to conserve water, we are trying to purify it so that that which we have will be usable and drinkable. You do not have to visit very many places in the United States until you find yourself where you cannot take a drink of water unless it has been purified and bottled. You just cannot drink it out of the faucet. If you do, you will be stricken with some kind of amoebic infection before very long.

We have authorized projects in the various States that make this appropriation, or authority for an appropriation, look very modest. So far as the need is concerned, there is not one project we have authorized this year which is of as great value as this project we are discussing now. And under those circumstances some say that we will authorize everything except the money to build the project, while at the same time we are giving to every country on the earth that will hold its hand out many times what we are asking for here. When we come to the foreign-aid programs, some among us do not ask, "Where is the Government going to get the money?" I think pretty soon we had better be asking that question, because we have been bled white. I think the time has arrived when the people of the United States of America should at least be sure that the waters that flow through the rivers of this country will not be poisonous and death-dealing. That is exactly what we are confronted with now. I think the House should approve this bill and certainly defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan to strike out the $50 million contained in the bill. This has to do with the health and welfare of the people of America. We, who are supposed to represent them—and I say "supposed" advisedly, I think, should just consider a little bit how far we should go in a matter of this kind and where we should stop. I should certainly not stop too soon when it comes to the health of the people of the United States.

As a Representative from a Southwestern State it is difficult indeed for me to understand why there should be the slightest objection to or question about the need for the enactment of this legislation. In our part of the country water is the veritable lifeblood. Whenever even a small percentage of that water is polluted or contaminated, especially during the recent years of extended drought in New Mexico and her neighboring States, it is a serious blow to virtually every phase of our economy. For that reason the people whom I have the honor to represent are perhaps more keenly aware of the vital necessity for this legislation than are most others.

We know from long and sad experience that our fight against pollution has not been very effective. In fact, I believe we are justified in calling it a losing fight up to now. This legislation proposes an extension of the present law which expires at the end of this month but, more important, it sets up a program of Federal, State and local cooperation that is essential for preservation of the health of our people throughout the Nation—for protection of human life. If it was intended to accomplish no more than that, there is ample justification for its enactment. But it goes farther. It not only will conserve our water resources but it will provide more adequate and effective protection for our wildlife resources as well—for our game and birds in the fields and the fish in our streams. It is so far-reaching in its potential benefits that it becomes one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before the Congress in this session.

There is a striking parallel between this water pollution control bill and the Federal Aid Highway bill which recently passed and is now in conference. Both are intended to provide a comprehensive, well-planned, long-term program to correct a condition that has become an increasingly dangerous threat to our country over the years. Experience has taught us that our previous approach to development of the Nation's highways has been ineffective. They have constantly deteriorated under the piecemeal policy we have followed. The same is fully true of the water pollution problem. It is just as vital to attack that problem with the same well-planned, thoroughly coordinated utilization of the combined resources and machinery of the Federal, State and local governments. Only in that way can we overcome this threat to our national health and welfare. And so I say there is a direct parallel in regard to development of the Nation's highways and protection of its water resources. The same basic reasoning should apply in both cases.

While this legislation has been pending, which is a long time in view of the urgency of its enactment, I have received from health officials, conservationists, farmers and ranchers and many others who are cognizant of the situation, fervent pleas for its passage. Those pleas were not based upon selfish interest. They were made by those who are in a position to have full understanding of the enormous toll in lives and resources that pollution of our waters is taking. The facts and the records that they present, based upon their firsthand knowledge, are so stark that they cannot be accepted with complacency. The losses incurred are even more disastrous

than those occasioned by the ravages of war, but they are not as spectacular, therefore we have not regarded them with the same concern.

There is every justification for the participation by the Federal Government provided in this legislation. Pollution of the waters of our streams does not stop at State lines. It cannot be controlled by the individual States or local communities, acting alone. Until we take action and provide the program set up by this bill we will not have met the responsibility with which we are charged. The only reason we are here, the only reason why the people of our respective districts send us to Congress, is to protect their welfare, their lives, their property and the security of their Nation—in short, the public interest. This legislation encompasses every one of those reasons. In my opinion, we are morally and legally bound to enact it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 20 minutes.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how much time would that give each Member standing?

The CHAIRMAN. That will allow approximately 2 minutes each.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was amazed a moment ago to hear the gentleman from Texas state that 70 percent of the communities of the country were already bonded to their complete limit of indebtedness and, therefore, he was making the argument that they could come to Uncle Sam for some money. I think Uncle Sam is going to come before the Committee on Ways and Means one of these days and ask for some more power to go over the debt limit right now. I believe, perhaps, Uncle Sam is having difficulties on his own. So, we should think in terms of Uncle Sam as well as in terms of our own communities.

Mr. Chairman, while I am in favor of the pending bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act, I am unalterably opposed to section 6. I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] to strike the section from the bill.

There is no question as to the value of the Water Pollution Control Act, originally enacted in the 80th Congress, as a Federal-State cooperative program to conserve our water resources and to promote national health. But, Mr. Chairman, the entirely new program proposed by section 6 is an absurdity.

This section would have the Federal Government make grants to States and municipalities for the construction of sewage-disposal plants. While the bill before us would authorize only $500 million in Federal grants for this purpose, we surely know that this would only be the beginning. If a few States or a few municipalities are given Federal aid, are not all the States and all the municipalities entitled to such aid? Once you begin, where do you stop? Where and how do you draw the line that there may be at least some equality of treatment?

Over the years we have seen any number of Federal grants-in-aid programs initiated. Once initiated we have seen them grow and grow, with the appropriation demands for this program and that increasing year by year.

Mr. Chairman, if we adopt the program proposed by this section we will embark the Federal Government not only upon an entirely new activity, which is a State or local problem and responsibility, but we will initiate one of the most gigantic Federal spending sprees we have ever seen.

Perhaps there can be a showing that some States and some municipalities have not adequately provided for waste-treatment facilities. But that does not mean they need, or should be given, financial aid from the Federal Government. On the contrary, the fact is that the respective States and municipalities are in much better financial condition than the Federal Government. Because some States and some municipalities have been negligent in meeting their sewage treatment needs is no valid reason why the Federal Government should undertake to grant them funds they can provide for themselves to meet the need.

There are any number of cities, some in my District, who have recognized their responsibility for pollution control and have raised the funds to build adequate disposal plants. Some have an existing bonded indebtedness. If we are to have a Federal-aid program of this character, is it not logical that the aid should also be extended to those who have met their local or State responsibility in this respect? Are the communities in my District now to be called upon to help others construct such plants while they struggle to pay off the debt on the plant they themselves out of their own funds constructed?

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly urge the adoption of the pending amendment to delete section 6 from this bill.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I realize it is getting late in the afternoon and the day has been very hard and trying on the Members of this body. After 18 years of service in this House, this afternoon is the first time I have ever objected to a unanimous consent request to limit debate on an amendment. I dislike especially to do this because I have such a high regard for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], whose service is going to be greatly missed in this body, as he is retiring after this sesison of Congress. His views and advice on all matters pertaining to flood control and related matters that come from this great Public Works Committee, I have always taken seriously; so I have no intention of needlessly detaining the House. But I think Members who are vitally affected by this legislation should have the opportunity of expressing their viewpoints.

I know the importance of this legislation; therefore I am opposing the amendment to strike out section 6, which provides some help in the way of matching funds for those communities throughout the country that are not in a position financially to meet the requirements laid down by this legislation and also by State laws. I am in such a position in my own State in North Carolina. There is a river running through my district which serves a community of approximately 300,000 people. This river has become so filled with organic matter that the pollution problem has become almost intolerable.

I do not think I have ever heard a better explanation of a piece of legislation than has been made here on the floor of this House this afternoon by the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. BLATNIK]. Certainly we all have different problems in different areas of the country. Yesterday we passed a bill primarily for water in the western part of the United States. Some 17 States will benefit from this legislation, which carries millions of dollars of authorization. I realize, of course, that it costs money to do anything of this nature; so in opposing this amendment which deletes matching funds, we are asking for an amount to at least initiate a program that we hope will not let us fall any lower in the pollution situation then we are at the present time in trying to clean up our streams here in the eastern part of the United States.

It has been shown here this afternoon by charts that we will not be gaining any ground on this problem due to the increased use of our streams by the people but we will only be able to probably remain in the position we find ourselves at the present time.

Today there is not a beach from Maine to Florida that is not involved in this pollution problem, as well as our commercial streams upstate. We are not only polluting our streams beyond the usable point, but we are running the pollution out over the recreation areas in the eastern part of the country and it is creating a serious problem from coast to coast.

We all are aware today of what recreation means to the dense populations here in the East. How long are we going to let this go on is the number one question.

I believe and have thought for many years that the efforts to meet this problem should be coordinated between the local communities, the State, and the Federal Government, if we expect to be successful in our efforts.

Those who have presented this amendment this afternoon to strike out the matching funds have given as their reason for not supporting section 6 the fact that a Government agency, namely, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has come before the committee and asked for no matching funds. I have never heard of a Government agency coming in here to Congress and asking us to adopt a policy on any problem and not requesting implementing funds to carry out the program. That is a strange procedure to me. So why should they come in here today and ask us to adopt a water policy for the entire country and then object to putting at least as a beginning sufficient funds to start the program off.

I hope this House this afternoon is not going to support an attempt to refuse at least sufficient funds to initiate a program which I feel will be appreciated by the whole country over the years to come. We can implement it later on if this is not sufficient, but let us lay down the policy completely as to what our intentions are so the country at large will know what the policy really is.

As I have mentioned before, I have a lot of small communities up and down Haw River, which traverses Alamance County and Orange County from one end to the other in my congressional district. If this enforcing provision in this act forces them to do certain things, these communities cannot meet the requirements of the act without assistance from some source.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am sure the gentleman is quite familiar with the bill, but I might call his attention to page 6, section 5 where funds are allocated to the extent of $5 million.

Mr. DURHAM. I know it does carry some money, but the amendment will knock out all of the matching funds. I am primarily interested in these funds, and I am opposing the amendment presently before us for this reason.

Mr. McGREGOR. I beg to differ with the gentleman. The amendment that is before us for consideration applies only to section 6. I am speaking of section 5.

Mr. DURHAM. The Dondero amendment applies to section 6, to which I addressed my remarks.

Mr. McGREGOR. But this money I am talking about is in section 5 and would not be affected by the amendment.

Mr. DURHAM. I am aware of the fact that the gentleman is speaking of section 5, which does nothing for these communities except offer advice and probably some research in trying to solve their problem. I ask the House to vote down this amendment for the reasons I have outlined to you this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to delay this House, at this late hour, any longer. This committee has brought out in my opinion a very sound measure and has implemented the measure of 1948 adopted by the 80th Congress.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to use this 1 minute to ask the chairman of the subcommitee a question. As the gentleman knows, I introduced the bill, H. R. 8108, to provide for a study of pollution here in the metropolitan Washington area and authorize an appropriation of $250,000, and also an authorization of $50,000 to assist the States in research and surveys along the lines of the study and assist in that study. Am I correct in my understanding that this bill would authorize such a survey, such a study by the Surgeon General in connection with an existing interstate compact, namely, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is my understanding; that is what it would do.

Mr. BROYHILL. It also provides funds to assist States in research and surveys in connection with the problem?

Mr. BLATNIK. Research and in enforcement, demonstration, and so forth.

Mr. BROYHILL. I think that is very important, and should encourage the Interstate Commission to proceed with this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] is recognized.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, permit me to join my colleagues in tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee on the splendid way in which he has handled this problem and the hearings on this bill, H. R. 9540. The committee also deserves much credit. This is a very important problem and this legislation is greatly needed. I support enthusiastically the bill before us with the exception of section 6. My interest and concern with this problem goes back a number of years when I served in the New York State Legislature and the chairman of the New York Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation. Together with the members of that committee, we participated in the creation of such interstate agencies as the Ohio River Valley Interstate Commission, the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission, the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin, the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, the Interstate Sanitation Commission, and the Lake Champlain Commission. All of these interstate organizations actively working in our section of the country have concerned themselves with the problem of water pollution and our water resources.

Under the guidance of our New York Interstate Committee, the State of New York enacted the Ostertag law which provides for the machinery of the State's water pollution control act. We are making progress under this law and I want to point out that it concerns itself with not only the health aspects but the conservation and industrial aspects as well. Primary responsibility rests with the municipalities under this statute.

Mr. Chairman, there is little disagreement that clean water is a natural resource precious to the physical and economic well-being of the Nation. The need for conservation of that resource through control of pollution also has unanimous support.

As with any legislation that affects all people and all levels of government, however, there has been healthy discussion as to the best methods by which the Federal Government can assist. The water pollution control agencies of the States deserve great praise for their cooperative and helpful role in the development of legislation to extend the present Water Pollution Control Act.

Beginning with the hearings in the Senate in April of last year, representatives of many of these agencies cooperated with the committees of the Senate and House in defining a proper Federal role in the national pollution control effort. I am confident that their assistance along with that of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been invaluable to the Committee on Public Works in their deliberations on this bill.

Between sessions of this Congress, leaders in the pollution-control field, including many administrators of State and local programs, met in Atlantic City, New York, and Washington to coordinate their views on the amendments to the existing act. Instrumental in the conduct of these three meetings were such able administrators of State pollution-control programs as David B. Lee, director bureau of sanitary engineering, Florida State Health Department; Milton P. Adams, executive secretary, Michigan State Water Resources Commission; and Dr. Daniel Bergsma, State commissioner of health, New Jersey State Department of Health.

The latest of the conferences, which took place last February, in Washington, included members of the executive committee of the Conference of State and Territorial Health Officers and representatives of independent State and interstate water-pollution control agencies, the Council of State Governments, national conservation organizations, industry, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This conference resulted in the development of a common position by the participants on proposed amendments to the existing act. The recommendations of the conference, representing the efforts of some of the best medical, legal, and engineering minds in the water-pollution control field today, were incorporated in the bill H. R. 9540.

These recommendations dealt specifically with the sections on assistance to States, the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, and enforcement of pollution-abatement measures in interstate waters. The wisdom of the recommendations was soon proven. During the extensive public hearings held by the Committee on Public Works, 58 witnesses appeared to give statements. These witnesses included Members of Congress, representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, administrators of State and interstate water-pollution control programs, and representatives of conservation organizations, municipalities, industry, and other groups interested in water conservation through pollution control. The amendments recommended by the Washington conference was approved almost unanimously by these witnesses in their testimony. Thirteen administrators of State water-pollution control agencies were among those who testified orally and gave their wholehearted endorsement to the amendments. Most of the other State water-pollution control agencies submitted statements confirming their support.

Protection of the Nation's water resources against degradation by pollu-

tion is the issue before us today. The primary role of local and State governments in a nationwide effort to conserve water quality is recognized in H. R. 9540 as it is in the existing Federal law enacted in 1948. The Federal role of support and assistance to State and local governmental agencies has been established as a vital one during the life of the existing act. Extension and improvement of this authority is now uniformly supported by the representatives of the States and others deeply concerned. Future pollution-control progress in the United States, aided by the passage of this legislation, will be a fitting tribute to the conscientious efforts of these people and the States which they represent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] stated that the position of the State of Michigan was in opposition to section 6 of the bill. I am going to cite to you a letter from Mr. Milton P. Adams, executive secretary of the Michigan Water Resources Commission.

In the middle paragraph of that letter to me, Mr. Adams states:

> Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. DONDERO, and the Public Works Committee have given earnest and extended consideration to this bill. Any remaining differences of opinion on section 6, or other details, should be compromised if possible, but in no event prevent your favorable consideration and vote on the bill as a whole.

I also call attention to the following statement by the assistant attorney general of the State of Michigan, Mr. Olds, who appeared on behalf of the bill before our committee and testified in favor of the whole bill, including section 6.

Under this bill, in a 10-year period there will be 1,660 of these facilities built, or a program at the rate of 166 a year if we pass this particular bill with section 6 included. That is substantial progress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I intend to support H. R. 9540, which is a bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act.

It is important that there be proper exercise of jurisdiction of the waterways of the Nation as a benefit to public health and welfare by the prevention and the control of water pollution. I will not develop further the purpose of the intention of the program which has been fully covered in the debate today.

I arise at this time for the purpose of opposing the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, which proposes to strike out section 6 of the act, which is the section which authorizes Federal grants to municipalities for construction of necessary treatment works to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage, or other waste, into any waters, and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith.

Time after time it was stated here today that municipalities in the Nation do not need any Federal help for such purposes. Let me say to you that my congressional district is a classic example that the contrary is the case beyond the peradventure of intelligent debate. In the State of Pennsylvania there is a so-called Clear Streams Act, and as a result of that legislation, many municipalities in my congressional district, particularly those bordering the Susquehanna River in the Wyoming Valley, are under citation of contempt issued by the attorney general's office of our State, because of alleged failure to comply with the provisions of the State law on this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I will not belabor the point again as to the distressed economic condition existing in the anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania. Many of the municipalities in that area are bankrupt and in many other cases have reached the constitutional limit of their borrowing power. Crushed between the two millstones of rising costs of municipal government, and no additional sources of revenue, at the same time faced with compulsory legal action by the Commonwealth to erect sewage disposal plants, these municipalities are between the "devil and the deep blue sea."

Section 6 of this bill is absolutely essential as a single ray of hope; a straw at least, at which these municipalities may grasp to comply with mandatory State directives for construction of the necessary treatment works.

There now exists in my valley a joint committee of honest and sincere municipal officials and civic community leaders working together to solve a seemingly insoluble problem on the financing of such facilities construction. For months and months these municipal leaders and officials have been meeting and planning and hoping to comply with the law of the State.

No one debates or disputes the value of this legislation; we all know the essentiality of conserving our national water supply and to clean up and prevent the pollution of existing supplies; but I say to you Mr. Chairman, in my district the municipalities simply cannot pay their way if they are forced to share the burden of the total cost of the necessary construction; either by themselves as single municipalities, or jointly with other adjacent municipalities.

That is why I opposed the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, that is why I shall support this bill, including section 6, for there is no section in the country more directly in point as the provision of section 6 of the act, than my own district. This is not just a question of large cities, or of cities even over 125,000 in population, but it affects seriously many small boroughs and townships, as well as smaller cities in the Nation, and specifically in my congressional district.

This problem in my district has been under study for several years. Our municipalities have contributed to a general fund to find the most reasonable, and the best plan or plans to comply with the State law; so there will be no danger of our municipalities going halfcocked in such a construction program. At the same time the municipalities in my district will not hold back on the issuance of bond issues for such construction, waiting for Uncle Sam's handout. If we could afford to do this ourselves we would not want any aid from the Federal Government, but we cannot afford, and we cannot raise the money, and that is that. This bill does not eliminate the home rule, it is not an extension of absolute Federal control over our municipalities; if it were, I would have nothing to do with it, but it is not. Nor does it deprive the State waters pollution control agency of jurisdiction. The bill provides for Federal participation and for local participation, as it should be. And no grant shall be made under the Federal law to any project in an amount exceeding 33⅓ percent over the estimated reasonable costs, or in an amount exceeding $300,000, whichever is the smaller. There are other and proper safeguards upon local control in the municipality and proper State jurisdiction.

Under all the provisions of this act, this is the very best kind and most desirable kind of association between the different governments to which each contributes for the good of all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

THE NEED FOR CONSTRUCTION GRANTS TO MEET OUR POLLUTION MENACE

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, after hearing and participating in the Public Works Committee debate on H. R. 9540, a bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act, I have been trying to understand why certain members of the Committee were so determined in their opposition to section 6. This section would simply make small Federal grants-in-aid available to municipalities for the construction of waste treatment works. The amount of money which could be given in support of any one project could not exceed $300,000 or one-third of the cost of the project whichever were the smaller. Obviously, these small grants would be most beneficial to smaller communities or for the improvement or addition to existing facilities of the larger communities.

In view of the large amounts of Federal tax money which have been expended on the conservation and development of water resources, it is difficult to understand the motive of those who oppose this minimal program to conserve water resources by keeping our rivers and streams reasonably free from pollution.

I cannot help but suspect that certain manufacturers, notably the pulp and paper companies, have opposed this section of the bill for their own selfish reasons. We suspect that these companies would like to continue to use the Nation's waters for waste disposal purposes without properly treating the damaging effluent from their mills. I cannot help but feel that they do not want our municipalities to set a good example in pollution abatement because this would make it even more apparent that all industry must follow suit by providing adequate waste treatment measures. It should be noted that some industries have played a role of leadership in development of pollution abatement facilities and that those who

have opposed this legislation are not supported by some of our most outstanding industrial concerns. Certain fallacious arguments were offered in opposition to section 6 in the minority report of the Public Works Committee on this bill. This incidentally is the only section which the minority chose to oppose publicly. In its arguments the minority claims that most of our municipalities are in better financial condition than the Federal Government. This statement is denied by the American Municipal Association, a group which should know as much about the financial condition of our municipalities as any other agency. The same argument might be raised against the expenditures of Federal money for protection against flood damage. I cannot believe that the minority is sincere in raising this kind of an objection to a program for Federal financial assistance which is designed to do a job and to fill a need that States and cities have been unable to meet.

The minority also objected to section 6 because people of certain municipalities, who have already paid for the construction of waste treatment works, will be taxed a few cents individually for helping other communities to construct much-needed treatment facilities. I am completely dumbfounded by this kind of argument for several reasons. One is that any city is benefited by the construction of treatment works upstream. Moreover, this line of reasoning ignores the fact that cities which now have treatment plants may find that these have to be expanded or altered. Federal grants would be available to the cities of this country for such improvements, remodeling, and necessary alterations.

The opponents to section 6 and to other provisions of this bill certainly must have only a subjective basis for their arguments. Anyone who wants a high standard of living for his children wants clean streams. We know from wide experience that we can conquer the water pollution menace only by making up for the losses that we have experienced in years past. We must go on the offensive with a realistic program for control of water pollution.

Everyone claims to be against pollution just as they are against sin. The time has passed to let George do it. We need action not platitudes. We know from experience that Federal action coupled with the cooperative programs of the States is the only way we can hope to get the job done.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 9540, the bill we are considering to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. This bill would authorize, first, continuation of Federal-State cooperation in the development of water pollution control programs; second, increased technical assistance to States particularly on new and complex problems; third, intensified and broadened research to determine the effects of pollutants on public health and other water uses and to develop better and more economical methods of waste treatment; fourth, increased aid through the conduct of and grants for demonstrations, studies, and training; fifth, broadened matching grants to States and interstate agencies for their water pollution control programs; sixth, matching grants to municipalities, States, and interstate agencies for the construction of needed treatment works; seventh, continued encouragement of interstate cooperation; eighth, assistance in the development of improved State water pollution control legislation; ninth, improved procedures for State-interstate-Federal collaboration on abatement of interstate pollution; and, tenth, encouragement of prevention and control of pollution from Federal installations. These are all most worthy and needed programs.

My interest in this legislation has been deepened by the several letters I have received in support of section 6 of H. R. 9540, which would provide Federal funds to municipalities for the construction of sewage treatment plants. Also, a letter from the American Municipal Association points out that water pollution is a national public health problem and because of the interstate nature of pollution the Federal Government has a clear-cut responsibility to assist in its abatement.

The association also makes the point that the only time that construction of sewage-treatment facilities has kept pace with increased pollution was in the period from 1933 to 1939. This was the period when Federal financial assistance was available to municipalities for the construction of sewage treatment plants.

As an example of the support H. R. 9540 has received from municipal officials in my district, I quote from a letter from the Honorable C. V. Jackson, mayor, town of Pulaski, Va.:

> We here in Pulaski have followed with considerable interest the activity in the Congress with regard to the possible establishment of Federal funds to localities for assistance in sewage treatment plant construction. The cost and necessity of treatment plants is currently being forceably impressed on us inasmuch as Pulaski is now in the process of developing plans for the calling of a bond issue which will amount to a total of $1 million.
>
> * * * We have delayed our work here in this direction, realizing the tremendous expense involved and the burden which would be placed upon property owners and sewer users to finance such a project.

Mayor Jackson explains that the Virginia Water Control Board has expressed concern over the pollution of the New River, and then points out that this river is a tributary to the Ohio River.

> It is our feeling that since the construction of a sewage treatment plant by a municipality in the situation that we in Pulaski find ourselves is a matter of concern well beyond our corporate limits, and is a matter of equal concern even beyond the limits of the State, that it should become a subject of Federal interest—

The mayor states.

I have other letters of a nature similar to Mayor Jackson's.

Mr. Chairman, one of our Nation's most valuable resources is water. Already an estimated 14 million Americans live in water-shortage areas, and in nearly all of these areas, pollution is a large factor in the amount of usable water that is available.

Federal financial aid for the building of sewage-treatment works will provide an incentive to local municipal officials to take immediate action to eliminate pollution from the waters of the Nation. This cost-sharing plan will make it possible for towns and cities that are already hard-pressed for funds to build sewage plants.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, the strength of this Nation does not depend exclusively upon the endurance, the staying powers of its pocketbook nerve. Contrary to a somewhat widely held viewpoint, our ability to defend ourselves is not confined solely to the number of aircraft we are able to purchase—the number of hydrogen bombs we can afford to stockpile—and the billions we manage to contribute to foreign aid.

Its real strength flows from the hearts, the blood, and the sinews of the American people. And the source is their physical well-being, their social contentment, and their economic stability. To advance and maintain these, gentlemen, is our responsibility.

It is, therefore, a continuing source of amazement to me that when so vital an issue as the health of this Nation is before us, we debate the cost of essential safeguards as though this richest of all nations was teetering on the brink of bankruptcy. We authorize the expenditure in a single fiscal year of $3.8 billion from our Treasury for foreign aid without a shudder. We see the wisdom of spending $51.5 billion over the next 13 years to improve our roads.

But when it comes to the one thing no man can live long without—a glass of drinkable water—we haggle over the pennies.

Many of our colleagues, Mr. Chairman, have traveled abroad extensively during the past 3½ years. I should like to inquire how many of them were warned not to drink the water in this or the other country until they were sure it was boiled. And, as they then thought longingly of the safe taps in their own kitchens, I wonder if this did not seem further convincing proof of the superiority of our American way of life.

This conviction would, however, be somewhat shaken, I fear, by a simple inspection tour of our Potomac River Basin here at home.

The legislation we are considering today, Mr. Chairman, is a bill entitled "to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act." It has been described as an improved water pollution control bill, passed after 8 years of experience under the old Water Pollution Control Act. But to my mind, it is the first really adequate legislation the Congress has yet considered to protect the vital water supply and to safeguard the health of the Nation. I am supported in this view by such responsible sources of public opinion as the American Municipal Association, the Conference of Mayors of the United States, State and interstate water pollution control administrators, conservationists, industries,

municipalities, and other affected interests.

There is no single doubt in my mind but that West Virginia, as well as the rest of the country, will benefit immeasurably from the enactment of this legislation.

The provisions of the bill strengthening research, technical assistance, and State programs are essential prerequisites to the cleaning up of the Nation's water. In particular, I wish strongly to endorse its construction grant provisions. These, to a large extent, incorporate the provisions of bills which I have introduced in previous sessions of the Congress.

We must recognize, Mr. Chairman, that there is a Federal obligation here. The waters of this country are no respectors of State boundaries. If we consider that the rivers of this country total 3 million miles and that the treated and untreated wastes of 95 million people are being discharged into these waters daily, we must see that pollution is not completely a local matter. Of course it affects local people. But it also affects the people below—on rivers hundreds of miles from the point where pollution takes place.

West Virginia, Mr. Chairman, is a State of winding rivers and fast-flowing streams. Consequently, it is a member of two interstate commissions founded under the Water Pollution Control Act of June 30, 1948—the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission and the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin. In accordance with the provisions of these compacts, the West Virginia Legislature has enacted effective measures to abate the pollution of streams and rivers.

Most of the cities in my district are on the Ohio River or its tributaries. The West Virginia Water Commission, as an agency of the Ohio River Valley Sanitation Commission, has ordered all these cities to construct sewage facilities to halt pollution of the Ohio River. I am proud to say that many of them are in various stages of compliance with this order.

Some communities, however, find themselves unable to act because they do not have the financial resources; because they have exhausted their constitutional debt limit; or because they are experiencing difficulty in finding a market for sewage revenue bonds, even though the interest rates here are relatively high.

As examples, the city of Benwood has been unable to interest a bonding company in financing a sewage system; the city of Weirton has been experiencing difficulty in securing advance funds for engineering services from HHFA; and in the city of Follansbee, I am informed, State limitations on bonded indebtedness prohibit the city from floating a bond issue sufficient to finance a sewage system.

As the American Municipal Association brought out during its excellent testimony on the bill, H. R. 9540, before the House Public Works Committee, thousands of municipalities which do not own their water systems cannot find money to construct sewage treatment plants, because bonding houses are uninterested in a revenue producing bond issue unless it is tied in with the water system.

Follansbee, Wellsburg, St. Mary's, and Sistersville, W. Va., find themselves in this predicament. All of these communities and their officials are now subject to citation for noncompliance with the order of the West Virginia Water Commission to build sewage plants. Yet, they are powerless to take remedial action until financial assistance is made available to them. This assistance will either come from the Federal Government through the enactment of this bill, Mr. Chairman, or there will be no sewage plants built in these municipalities—to the endangerment of the health of their populations.

To those who would argue that responsibility for water pollution control must rest with the local community, I should like to point out that this bill accomplishes just that. It undertakes to place responsibility upon the local community to initiate projects. So that while the Federal obligation is recognized, it has created a partnership between the Federal Government, the States, and the municipalities in the effort to clean up water pollution, which, as the testimony before the Public Works Committee has shown, has become a menace to the health and progress of this country.

The record will show that the only one time in our history, during the 1930's, when there was Federal aid available under the WPA and PWA programs, did construction of treatment works keep pace with the need.

If we are to begin to meet this serious problem of water pollution now, such Federal aid must again be made available. As I have pointed out, in many of the communities of my State, and, I am sure, in every other State, there is the will to clean up, but these communities just cannot afford it. The construction grants authorized by section 6 of H. R. 9540 would enable these communities to get the job done. If we postpone this urgently needed action, the alternative will almost certainly be much larger Federal expenditures in the near future—and possibly under the dire circumstances of the serious impairment of the public health in key production areas essential to the national defense.

There is one other thought which I would like to offer for the consideration of our colleagues. I have the greatest respect, Mr. Chairman, for the banking industry. I am deeply aware of the service it has rendered the Nation in providing the capital and the financing which has enabled the country to become the greatest industrial nation on earth.

Nevertheless, it would seem to me that this present legislation falls into the same category as highway and school construction. When a municipality is compelled to issue revenue bonds to construct sewage treatment plants, the interest paid on these bonds over a period of years is often double the actual cost of construction of the plant. I do not believe that the banker who, along with the baker and the candlestick maker, will also benefit from this construction in his community, desires to enrich himself at such cost to his fellow citizens.

The abating of pollution of the Nation's waters is not merely a dollar-and-cents proposition. It is a sound investment in the health, recreation, agriculture, and industry of our people—precious intangibles, immeasurable in terms of money.

I believe the enactment of this legislation, particularly the construction grant provisions, will enable the Federal Government and the States to initiate a long and urgently needed, aggressive program to abate the disgraceful pollution of this country's waters, so that we may, as part of our children's heritage, pass on to them, in usable condition, our most vital natural resource—clean water.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX.]

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to call to the attention of the House the interpretation as I understand section 6, and I refer to page 24, and I quote:

> The term "interstate waters" means all rivers, lakes, and other waters that flow across, or form a part of, boundaries between two or more States.

There is no relief for any city that is now polluting international waters.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the pending amendment. The same amendment was defeated in the Committee on Public Works by a decisive vote of 26 to 8 and I hope it will be defeated at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DONDERO) there were—ayes 98, noes 109.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BLATNIK and Mr. DONDERO.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 112, noes 118.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS: On page 21, line 19, strike out "or" and insert in lieu thereof the word "and."

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take any substantial part of the 5 minutes to debate the amendment. It is self-explanatory. I ask the Members to turn to page 21 and look at line 19. My amendment simply proposes to strike out the word "or", the fourth word on that line, and insert in lieu thereof the word "and."

As the paragraph now reads, the Attorney General is authorized to bring an action on behalf of the United States to abate a pollution nuisance upon the written consent of the State agency of

the State where the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is discharged or upon the written request of the State which complains.

In my opinion it would be unwise to authorize the Attorney General to bring such an action in the name of the United States at the request of only one of the States affected. I think both of the States ought to concur in any such request.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This amendment was considered very carefully in the committee. It was rejected by the States themselves, by all of them except 4, as I recall, 3 or 4 of the 44 that were involved.

The situation now is that neither party's rights are protected, the party discharging or originating the pollution or the party being harmed by the pollution, which may request the enforcement machinery to go to work. This means that if I am on a lower stream or downstream being polluted by you upstream, I can only request help from the Surgeon General if you agree to go along; and if you do not agree to it, there is nothing I can do. The States themselves have overwhelmingly turned this veto power of the polluting State down and by unanimous vote they adopted the language we now have in this bill.

I will say, not to be too facetious, that even though you own your own house you do not have any special right to throw garbage out of the second-story window onto the street below.

I do hope this amendment is rejected.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment were adopted it would take the heart right out of the enforcement provision of this bill. This amendment if adopted would mean that before you could bring an enforcement action by the United States Attorney General you would have to get the consent of the State where the polluter is located as well as the State that is being polluted. That would mean for all practical purposes that all the State where the polluter is located would have to do would be to refuse to give consent and we would have no enforcement.

I hope very much the Committee of the Whole rejects this amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Is this not proof that that is what is wrong with the watershed compact now? You never could get an agreement and you could not in this case.

Mr. BALDWIN. If this amendment were adopted, for all practical purposes we would have no enforcement of water pollution measures.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I agree with the gentleman's analysis of the amendment now pending before the Committee, I hope the amendment is rejected because if it prevails the enforcement section of the bill will be entirely lost.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment just to say that if this amendment is adopted it will destroy the enforcement provision of the bill, which is the heart of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACK of Washington: On page 5, strike out all of the lines 9 through 17.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offered this same amendment in committee when the bill was under consideration. The committee rejected my amendment 9 to 10. Because of the closeness of the committee vote on this amendment, I feel I should offer it here to allow the House an opportunity to work its will on the amendment.

My amendment in striking out lines 9 through 17 on page 5, if adopted, would remove from the bill authority for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to spend taxpayers' money to provide scholarships or fellowships to bright pollution engineering students. The funds would pay the traveling, tuition, and sustenance of these students while they were being educated to become pollution engineers.

The reason the Department wants to give these free scholarships or fellowships to students, officials of the Department told the committee, is because there is a shortage of pollution engineers and through scholarships the country could develop more competent pollution engineers.

The way to obtain pollution engineers, in my opinion, is not by providing free scholarships at taxpayers' expense to some students who want to study pollution engineering. The way to remedy the shortage is to pay pollution engineers adequate compensation to attract engineering students into that field of effort.

The bill as originally drawn had no limit on what could be expended in providing these scholarships. When I offered my amendment in committee, the committee did place a limitation of $100,000 a year on the amount that could be expended for these scholarships. That may be helpful, but it fails to meet my main objection to the Federal Government going into the new field of providing free pollution engineering scholarships.

There is an old-fashioned legislative practice here that is commonly called the technique of "getting the camel's nose under the tent" or "the foot in the door."

Under this technique, a department of Government gets a very small, often trivial amount into a bill for some new purpose. Then in following years the department comes back for larger and larger amounts until annual expenditure for the project which at first was very small grows into a gigantic annual cost to taxpayers. The final results of these many tiny items which eventually grow into giants digs deep into taxpayers' pocketbooks.

The present Federal income tax law is an example of how "the foot in the door" and "camel's nose under the tent" technique works.

The income tax grew from a tiny baby when it was first born in 1913, in the brains of Government officials, until today it is of gargantuan proportions.

The first income tax proposal of 1913 must have sounded unimportant and something not to be feared by taxpayers. This first income tax of 1913 provided that all incomes of single persons above $3,000 a year and married persons above $4,000 should be taxed 1 percent and that incomes about $20,000 to $50,000 a year should pay an additional surtax of 1 percent.

Under this income tax of 1913, a single person with an income of $20,000 paid an income tax of $170 a year and a single person with an income of $50,000 was taxed only $770.

Today, however, the tiny baby income tax law of 1913 has grown so large that the single person with a $20,000 annual income, instead of paying an income tax of only $170, as he did in 1913, now pays $6,412, and if his income is $50,000 he now pays $25,667 a year, instead of the $770 he paid in 1913.

The national "foot in the door" and "camel's nose under the tent" income tax law of 1913 yielded the Federal Government a total of only $71,381,275 in its first year. Last year, this original law with its taxes amended and increased year after year yielded the Federal Government $49,914 million which was 698 times, or 69,800 percent, the amount collected by this tax in its first year.

The gasoline tax is another example of how the "foot in the door" and "camel's nose under the tent" technique results in trifling items growing to enormous size by year after year additions to them. The first gasoline tax, a 1 cent a gallon tax, was adopted in Oregon in 1919. This 1 cent a gallon Oregon gas tax collected only $290,796 in its first year.

Now all States are levying this tax and have added to it and the Federal Government also collects gasoline taxes. Last year, the motorists of the Nation, instead of paying only $290,796 in gasoline taxes, as they did in 1919, paid a total of almost $5 billion in gasoline taxes to the States and Federal Government.

Congress should move slowly in entering into new fields of expenditures and taxation and not be lured into them by the siren's song that proposed new ventures in the beginning will cost little.

The item in this bill to provide free scholarships with travel and sustenance allowances to students who will study pollution engineering can open a new field of Government activity that eventually may cost many millions or even hundreds of millions annually.

Qualified engineers to carry on stream pollution engineering, admittedly, are scarce. Therefore it is argued Congress should vote taxpayers' money to provide a few special students with free tuition, free lodging, free food, free travel allowances, and free textbooks while they study pollution engineering. You may be sure the amount requested for this work now will be 2, 3, 5, or 10 times as large next year as the first request made in this bill.

Furthermore, if we start providing free scholarships to pollution engineers we may be sure we will soon be asked to provide free scholarships for prospective highway engineers, for engineers in the highway field also are scarce.

Then, also, there ought to be spent, and will someday, huge sums for flood control and river and harbor works. If we provide scholarships for pollution and highway engineering students representatives may be sure Congress will be asked to supply scholarships to students who want to become flood control or river and harbor engineers.

Starting these little new programs in new fields should not be undertaken by Congress lightly and without the fullest study of what these may lead to.

I am opposed to this proposal to provide free scholarships to prospective pollution engineers because I think such a new program eventually may establish a precedent that will result in a program that will cost the Nation's taxpayers an enormous sum annually.

The committee, when considering this bill, rejected my amendment by a 10 to 9 vote. Because of the closeness of the committee vote I offer my amendment to the consideration of the House.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this section was recommended by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as being one that would return probably 20 to 1 on your investment. You know that we are quite short of scientists, chemists, and physicists. This will help to train chemists and physicists. In my district alone in one plant, we are short 200 chemists. We cannot get them. The committee was very much in favor, as I remember it, of this research program. In a research program, this is what happens. A fellow may be working on a master's degree. He gets the direction of a number of Ph. D.'s to direct him in his research. Now with the doctor's dissertation he has his work directed where he gives a great amount of time and gets the very best attention by the best experts. The Government gets all that at a very, very low figure. I asked some of the members of the Department who came over to the committee, what ratio would we have, and they said about 20 to 1 ratio.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the defeat of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS: On page 22, line 6, strike out lines 6 through 9.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the great Committee on Public Works, and I have the highest respect for that committee, are here invading the realm of the Committee on the Judiciary. They are proposing to provide in this bill what shall be admissible evidence in a court of law, and with all due respect to the Committee on Public Works, I think such a matter should receive the attention and consideration of the Committee on the Judiciary. I really think those four lines should be stricken from the bill and that we should not undertake in a public-works bill to say what should be admissible in evidence in a court of law.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, that is another section which was discussed at quite some length. Mr. Minchner of the State of New Jersey was counsel for the Association of State Health Officers. They went over this point over and over and over again. They felt it should be retained. The vote was almost if not unanimous. There were, perhaps, 2 dissenting votes out of about 44. Then, in further consideration of some of the worries which the gentleman from North Carolina has, the committee went along and I urged it to add the additional language which follows on line 10 and I quote the language:

The court, giving due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement

The health officers were opposed to this section. But, the industry people, primarily the paper and pulp industry people, were for it. We made a compromise and inserted that language at the request of the industry people to allay what fears they might have about the language of the bill.

Mr. JONAS. I am not opposed to the provisions of that section from line 10 through line 15. My only point is the question of the advisability of the committee deciding what should be admissible evidence in a court of law.

Mr. BLATNIK. I know the gentleman is not opposed to the language that follows. The industry people asked for language to safeguard them, and to consider the practicability and the physical and the economic feasibility of any abatement order. So, we balanced it all. We put in a section which the State health agencies wanted and we counterbalanced that with a section that industry wanted, and we made a compromise. If you strike out the section that the health agency passed over, and leave only that which industry wanted, then the other should be stricken also.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The language which the gentleman seeks to strike out did not originate with the Committee on Public Works. It is my understanding that it came over as a part of the bill passed by the other body.

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. If we are going to take out any provision as to how the court should act on this matter, we should strike out the part that the gentleman does not object to, because that is a direction to the court also.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. CRAMER. I think the construction that the gentleman from North Carolina has is not necessarily proper, because in line 9 it says "evidence which the court in its discretion deems proper."

So it leaves it in the discretion of the court, whatever it wishes to receive.

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, it is most pleasing to me that there is a large group of Members present today. The little farmer at last gets a break.

I have here an article appearing in the Denver Post of June 11, "Wheat Acreage Suit Dismissed by Breitenstein":

WHEAT ACREAGE SUIT DISMISSED BY BREITENSTEIN

Federal District Judge Jean S. Breitenstein has dismissed a case in which the Federal Government sought $616 damages from two Durango farmers who allegedly planted more wheat acreage in 1954 than they were allotted by Uncle Sam.

The Government contended that Frank and John Bucovec, brothers, were allotted 20 acres but actually planted wheat on 42 acres.

Judge Breitenstein threw out the case in agreeing with Bentley M. McMullin, Denver attorney representing the farmers, the wheat was raised for use on the farms and had not been marketed under the Government parity laws.

So, at long last the little farmer is getting a break.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill. I wish to direct my remarks to the enforcement measures in section 8 which, although some improved over the expiring law, are entirely too weak. I sincerely hope this bill works. I hope that with the research and education and the grants proposed to help the States build up their own control programs, we can begin to make real progress toward halting and then removing this creeping cancer which threatens our economy and our security by destroying our vital water supplies.

The privilege of dumping municipal and industrial wastes untreated into the public waters amounts to a great, vested interest in this country. That is why any kind of pollution-abatement legislation, even the mildest kind, always has tough sledding, whether in a State legislature or in the Congress of the United States. That is why the mild and reasonable enforcement provisions of this bill have been attacked and misrepresented and amended in committee until they are larded with delays and entangled with redtape.

Mr. Chairman, let us take a look at the procedures under section 8 of this legislation:

First, a stream or lake or seashore that is polluted within the boundaries of a single State would not come under the

purview of this legislation. Pollution which arises in a State and damages the waters and the public welfare within the same State remains a cleanup task for that State, or for the local community. That is as it should be. I agree with the basic philosophy of H. R. 9540 which, like the Senate bill, S. 890, recognizes, preserves, and protects "the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution."

Section 8 (b) further declares that State and interstate action shall be encouraged and shall not, except as provided for cumbersomely by this act, be displaced by Federal enforcement action.

This law would apply correctly only to cases of interstate pollution, instances where pollution arising in one State flows through or across interstate waters and endangers the health and welfare of persons in another State.

But can the Federal Government simply move in and take direct action, after determining that such pollution does exist? Oh no, Mr. Chairman, the public is provided no such protecttion.

The first thing the Surgeon General must do is call a conference of the State or interstate agencies that should have acted long ago to bring about abatement. If they wish, the participating agencies can pack the meeting with outside persons and filibuster the conference to death.

Following the conference, can the Surgeon General take direct action? Oh, no, Mr. Chairman. Next he must prepare and send to the other conferees a summary of the conference, and he may recommend to the appropriate State water pollution control agency that it take remedial action. And before doing another thing, the Surgeon General must wait 6 months to see if the State agency is going to move. Meantime, Mr. Chairman, the poisonous and contaminating wastes continue to pour into the stream, and the public continues to suffer.

After 6 months, if the State agency fails to move, can the Surgeon General then take direct action to require abatement?

Oh no, Mr. Chairman. Now he must call a public hearing and go through all the redtape of selecting a hearing board, making the necessary local arrangements, giving 3 weeks' notice, reporting and summarizing the proceedings, and waiting for the board to make its recommendations. Here, Mr. Chairman, is a place where a State agency that is inclined to drag its feet can delay action almost indefinitely. First it can delay by failing to select its representative for the hearing board. Then it can use a variety of tactics to delay an agreement on recommendations.

So finally, Mr. Chairman, the hearing board agrees on recommendations for abatement. Now the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare can transmit the findings and recommendations to the person or persons causing the pollution. But the notice sent by the Secretary must specify a reasonable time—not less than 6 months—during which the poison can continue to pour into the streams and the public continues to suffer.

At last, after expiration of the reasonable time, the Secretary may resort to the courts, and bring suit to secure abatement. But he cannot go to court unless he is requested to do so by the State receiving the pollution or with the consent of the State in which the pollution originates. He must prove the pollution and that it is damaging the health or welfare of persons in another State. He must get around the loophole that directs the court to give "due consideration to practicability and physical and economical feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved."

Mr. Chairman, it could very well take 2 years at best to bring about abatement of interstate pollution under the provisions of this legislation. That is, 2 years after the situation becomes smelly enough to force the Surgeon General to call the first conference. Two years of delay and redtape while disease-laden sewage or poisonous chemicals continue to flow down the river, endangering the public health, destroying wildlife and recreation, depressing real estate values, eliminating business and industrial opportunities—because new industries cannot be established without clean water—destroying vital water supplies.

Two years, I say, at best. Let us add up the delays. Weeks or months setting up the first conference. Six months following the conference waiting for a State to act. More months selecting a hearing board and holding a public hearing. More weeks or months waiting for the board to make its recommendations. Another 6 months or more waiting for the polluter to secure abatement. Then, finally, all the delays of prolonged court proceedings that in themselves could take months or years.

Two years or more of redtape and delay, while the public suffers. Gentlemen, your tears for States rights under this legislation are crocodile tears. The rights really safeguarded by this bill are the vested rights of the polluters. What about the right of the general public to have clean water?

Mr. Chairman, I submit that it would be utterly impossible to execute an injustice under this legislation, except the very grave injustice of interminable delay while the public welfare suffers.

Mr. Chairman, I support this measure because it does represent some little improvement over the expiring law and because the public welfare demands some kind of program for abatement of interstate pollution. I hope it works and that the States and interstate agencies really cooperate. Because if it does not result in real progress toward pollution cleanup, Mr. Chairman, I predict the Congress will be writing much stronger legislation within very few years. The water-supply situation of this country is becoming that critical.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] for his masterful presentment of one of the most important legislative measures that have come to the attention of the 84th Congress.

It will not be long before we are in our home districts making reports to our constituents. If this measure should pass, which I feel confident it will, and should come unscathed from the conferees, we indeed will have a legislative accomplishment to the credit of the 84th Congress that we can take with pride to our constituents.

I was much impressed by the facts brought out in the argument of the gentleman from Minnesota. He has made it crystal clear in my mind that to a large extent the future of these United States depends on how well we develop and guard our water resources. It has been pointed out that at the present time we consume 17 billion gallons of water a day and that by 1975 the consumption will be 30 billion gallons a day. Pollution, it has been well said, is a waste of water. Pollution can be as deadly to water resources as the severest of droughts. This bill is aimed at minimizing that pollution.

It is a bill that reaches into and prepares for the future. But more than that, it gives protection to the health and the well-being of the men and women of today. Again I commend the able statesman from Minnesota for a great legislative contribution. His presentment has been outstanding. No one could have managed the floor fight with more earnestness or with more brilliant clarity.

During recent months I have received many letters from my constituents urging my support of this measure. I would say that the number of letters on this subject has been as large if not larger than that on any other matter. I have received no letters in opposition. Everywhere there has been shown an enthusiastic popular support.

Legislation providing for Federal participation in water pollution control was enacted in 1947. Almost 9 years of experience have shown the need of significant improvements over the legislation which will expire June 30.

Water pollution control is the key to water conservation. One of our greatest needs in the field of pollution control is to learn more about the complex substances that are reaching our streams and affecting the continued safety of our water resources for human consumption and other vital uses. The answer is in the broadened research which this legislation will provide.

State and interstate agencies will be supported by matching grants-in-aid to help them develop their programs to meet water pollution problems which are growing in magnitude and complexity.

The legislation under consideration incorporates several significant improvements over existing legislation, all based on experience gained since 1948. First, the new legislation permits the application of State grants to all essential phases of State programs on a matching basis. Secondly, research authority is broadened to permit contract research, research grants, and fellowship grants; and, thirdly, Federal enforcement procedures are clarified.

I trust the bill will pass by an overwhelming vote and without amendments weakening its purposes or narrowing its scope.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. YATES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9540) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act, pursuant to House Resolution 528, he reported the same back to the House, with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is qualified. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McGREGOR moves to recommit H. R. 9540 to the Committee on Public Works, with instructions to report the same back forthwith to the House of Representatives, with the following amendment: On page 12, line 14, strike out all of section 6, down to line 24 on page 15, inclusive.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 165, nays 213, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

YEAS—165

Abbitt	Church	Haley
Adair	Clevenger	Harden
Alger	Cole	Harrison, Nebr.
Allen, Calif.	Colmer	Harrison, Va.
Andresen, August H.	Coon	Harvey
	Coudert	Henderson
Arends	Cretella	Herlong
Avery	Crumpacker	Heselton
Bass, N. H.	Cunningham	Hess
Bates	Curtis, Mass.	Hiestand
Beamer	Curtis, Mo.	Hill
Becker	Dague	Hillings
Belcher	Davis, Ga.	Hinshaw
Bentley	Dawson, Utah	Hoeven
Berry	Derounian	Holt
Betts	Devereux	Hope
Boland	Dies	Hosmer
Bolton, Francis P.	Dixon	Jackson
	Dondero	James
Bolton, Oliver P.	Donovan	Jenkins
	Dorn, N. Y.	Jensen
Bosch	Dorn, S. C.	Johansen
Brown, Ohio	Ellsworth	Jonas
Brownson	Fino	Jones, N. C.
Budge	Fisher	Judd
Burleson	Fjare	Kean
Bush	Ford	Kearney
Byrnes, Wis.	Frelinghuysen	Keating
Cederberg	Gary	Kilburn
Chase	Gentry	King, Pa.
Chenoweth	Gross	Knox
Chiperfield	Gubser	Krueger
Laird	Pillion	Thompson, Mich.
Latham	Poage	
LeCompte	Poff	Thomson, Wyo.
Lipscomb	Radwan	Tuck
Lovre	Ray	Utt
McCulloch	Rees, Kans.	Van Pelt
McDonough	Rhodes, Ariz.	Velde
McGregor	Riehlman	Vorys
McIntire	Robeson, Va.	Vursell
McVey	Rogers, Mass.	Wainwright
Macdonald	St. George	Weaver
Mack, Wash.	Schenck	Wharton
Mahon	Scherer	Whitten
Mailliard	Scrivner	Widnall
Martin	Scudder	Wigglesworth
Meader	Short	Williams, Miss.
Miller, Md.	Shuford	Williams, N. Y.
Miller, Nebr.	Siler	Wilson, Calif.
Minshall	Smith, Kans.	Wilson, Ind.
Mumma	Smith, Va.	Winstead
Nelson	Springer	Withrow
Nicholson	Taber	Wolcott
Norblad	Talle	Young
Osmers	Taylor	
Ostertag	Teague, Calif.	

NAYS—213

Abernethy	Forrester	Norrell
Addonizio	Fountain	O'Brien, Ill.
Albert	Frazier	O'Brien, N. Y.
Alexander	Friedel	O'Hara, Ill.
Andrews	Fulton	O'Konski
Ashley	Garmatz	O'Neill
Ashmore	Gathings	Passman
Aspinall	Gavin	Patterson
Auchincloss	Gordon	Pelly
Bailey	Grant	Perkins
Baker	Gray	Pfost
Baldwin	Green, Oreg.	Philbin
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Pilcher
Bass, Tenn.	Gregory	Polk
Baumhart	Griffiths	Powell
Bennett, Fla.	Hagen	Preston
Bennett, Mich.	Hand	Price
Blatnik	Hardy	Priest
Blitch	Harris	Prouty
Boggs	Hays, Ark.	Quigley
Bolling	Hayworth	Rabaut
Bonner	Healey	Rains
Bowler	Holifield	Reece, Tenn.
Boykin	Holland	Reuss
Boyle	Holmes	Rhodes, Pa.
Bray	Holtzman	Riley
Brooks, La.	Huddleston	Roberts
Brooks, Tex.	Hull	Robsion, Ky.
Brown, Ga.	Hyde	Rodino
Broyhill	Ikard	Rogers, Colo.
Buckley	Jarman	Rogers, Fla.
Burdick	Jennings	Rogers, Tex.
Burnside	Johnson, Calif.	Rooney
Byrd	Johnson, Wis.	Rutherford
Byrne, Pa.	Jones, Ala.	Sadlak
Canfield	Jones, Mo.	Saylor
Cannon	Karsten	Schwengel
Carlyle	Kearns	Seely-Brown
Carrigg	Kee	Selden
Celler	Keogh	Sheppard
Chatham	Kilday	Sieminski
Chelf	Kilgore	Sikes
Chudoff	King, Calif.	Simpson, Ill.
Clark	Kirwan	Sisk
Cooper	Kluczynski	Smith, Miss.
Corbett	Knutson	Spence
Cramer	Landrum	Staggers
Davis, Tenn.	Lanham	Steed
Deane	Lankford	Sullivan
Delaney	Lesinski	Teague, Tex.
Dempsey	Long	Thomas
Denton	McCarthy	Thompson, N. J.
Diggs	McCormack	Thompson, Tex.
Dingell	McDowell	Tollefson
Dodd	Machrowicz	Trimble
Dollinger	Mack, Ill.	Tumulty
Donohue	Madden	Udall
Doyle	Magnuson	Vanik
Durham	Marshall	Van Zandt
Edmondson	Matthews	Vinson
Elliott	Merrow	Walter
Engle	Metcalf	Watts
Evins	Mills	Wier
Fallon	Mollohan	Williams, N. J.
Fascell	Morano	Willis
Feighan	Morgan	Wolverton
Fenton	Moss	Wright
Fernandez	Multer	Yates
Flood	Murray, Ill.	Younger
Fogarty	Murray, Tenn.	Zablocki
Forand	Natcher	Zelenko

NOT VOTING—54

Allen, Ill.	Bell	Davis, Wis.
Andersen, H. Carl	Bow	Dawson, Ill.
	Carnahan	Dolliver
Anfuso	Christopher	Dowdy
Ayres	Cooley	Eberharter
Barden	Davidson	Flynt
Gamble	Lane	Rivers
George	McConnell	Roosevelt
Gwinn	McMillan	Scott
Hale	Mason	Sheehan
Halleck	Miller, Calif.	Shelley
Hays, Ohio	Miller, N. Y.	Simpson, Pa.
Hébert	Morrison	Smith, Wis.
Hoffman, Ill.	Moulder	Thompson, La.
Hoffman, Mich.	O'Hara, Minn.	Thornberry
Horan	Patman	Westland
Kelley, Pa.	Phillips	Wickersham
Kelly, N. Y.	Reed, N. Y.	
Klein	Richards	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Anfuso against.
Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Klein against.
Mr. Hale for, with Mrs. Kelly of New York against.
Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Miller of California against.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.
Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Hays of Ohio against.
Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Bell against.
Mr. Phillips for, with Mr. Carnahan against.
Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Cooley against.
Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Morrison against.
Mr. Ayres for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. Sheehan for, with Mr. Moulder against.
Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.
Mr. George for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Davidson with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Westland.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Patman with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Horan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN. On that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 338, nays 31, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

YEAS—338

Abbitt	Belcher	Brownson
Abernethy	Bennett, Fla.	Broyhill
Adair	Bennett, Mich.	Budge
Addonizio	Bentley	Burdick
Albert	Berry	Burnside
Alexander	Betts	Bush
Allen, Calif.	Blatnik	Byrd
Andresen, August H.	Blitch	Byrne, Pa.
	Boggs	Byrnes, Wis
Andrews	Boland	Canfield
Arends	Bolling	Carlyle
Ashley	Bolton, Frances P.	Carrigg
Ashmore		Cederberg
Aspinall	Bolton, Oliver P.	Celler
Auchincloss		Chelf
Avery	Bonner	Chenoweth
Bailey	Bosch	Chiperfield
Baldwin	Bowler	Chudoff
Barrett	Boykin	Church
Bass, N. H.	Boyle	Clark
Bass, Tenn.	Bray	Colmer
Bates	Brooks, La.	Coon
Baumhart	Brooks, Tex.	Cooper
Beamer	Brown, Ga.	Corbett
Becker	Brown, Ohio	Coudert

Cramer	Hull	Powell
Cretella	Hyde	Preston
Crumpacker	Ikard	Price
Cunningham	James	Priest
Curtis, Mo.	Jarman	Prouty
Dague	Jenkins	Quigley
Davis, Ga.	Jennings	Rabaut
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Calif.	Rains
Dawson, Utah	Johnson, Wis.	Reece, Tenn.
Deane	Jonas	Rees, Kans.
Delaney	Jones, Ala.	Reuss
Dempsey	Jones, Mo.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Denton	Judd	Rhodes, Pa.
Derounian	Karsten	Riehlman
Devereux	Kean	Riley
Dies	Kearney	Roberts
Diggs	Kearns	Robeson, Va.
Dingell	Kee	Robsion, Ky.
Dixon	Keogh	Rodino
Dodd	Kilday	Rogers, Colo.
Dondero	Kilgore	Rogers, Fla.
Donohue	King, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.
Donovan	Kirwan	Rogers, Tex.
Dorn, N. Y.	Kluczynski	Rooney
Doyle	Knox	Rutherford
Durham	Knutson	Sadlak
Edmondson	Krueger	Saylor
Elliott	Laird	Schenck
Ellsworth	Landrum	Scherer
Engle	Lanham	Schwengel
Evins	Lankford	Scudder
Fallon	Latham	Seely-Brown
Fascell	LeCompte	Selden
Feighan	Lesinski	Sheppard
Fenton	Lipscomb	Short
Fino	Long	Shuford
Fisher	Lovre	Sieminski
Fjare	McCarthy	Sikes
Flood	McCormack	Siler
Fogarty	McDonough	Simpson, Ill.
Forand	McDowell	Sisk
Ford	McIntire	Smith, Miss.
Forrester	McVey	Smith, Va.
Fountain	Macdonald	Spence
Frazier	Machrowicz	Springer
Frelinghuysen	Mack, Ill.	Staggers
Friedel	Mack, Wash.	Steed
Fulton	Madden	Sullivan
Garmatz	Magnuson	Talle
Gary	Mailliard	Teague, Tex.
Gathings	Marshall	Thomas
Gavin	Martin	Thompson, N. J.
Gordon	Matthews	Thompson, Tex.
Grant	Meader	Thomson, Wyo.
Gray	Merrow	Tollefson
Green, Oreg.	Metcalf	Trimble
Green, Pa.	Miller, Md.	Tuck
Gregory	Miller, Nebr.	Tumulty
Griffiths	Minshall	Udall
Gross	Mollohan	Utt
Gubser	Morano	Vanik
Hagen	Morgan	Van Pelt
Haley	Moss	Van Zandt
Hand	Moulder	Velde
Harden	Multer	Vinson
Hardy	Mumma	Vorys
Harris	Murray, Ill.	Wainwright
Harrison, Nebr.	Murray, Tenn.	Walter
Harrison, Va.	Natcher	Watts
Harvey	Nelson	Whitten
Hays, Ark.	Nicholson	Widnall
Hayworth	Norblad	Wier
Healey	Norrell	Wigglesworth
Henderson	O'Brien, Ill.	Williams, Miss.
Herlong	O'Brien, N. Y.	Williams, N. J.
Heselton	O'Hara, Ill.	Williams, N. Y.
Hess	O'Konski	Willis
Hill	O'Neill	Wilson, Calif.
Hillings	Osmers	Winstead
Hinshaw	Ostertag	Withrow
Hoeven	Passman	Wolcott
Holifield	Patterson	Wolverton
Holland	Pelly	Wright
Holmes	Perkins	Yates
Holt	Pfost	Young
Holtzman	Philbin	Younger
Hope	Pilcher	Zablocki
Hosmer	Poff	Zelenko
Huddleston	Polk	

NAYS—31

Alger	Keating	Smith, Kans.
Burleson	Kilburn	Taber
Chase	McCulloch	Taylor
Clevenger	McGregor	Teague, Calif.
Curtis, Mass.	Mahon	Thompson, Mich.
Dorn, S. C.	Pillion	Vursell
Hiestand	Poage	Weaver
Jackson	Radwan	Wharton
Jensen	Ray	Wilson, Ind.
Johansen	St. George	
Jones, N. C.	Scrivner	

NOT VOTING—63

Allen, Ill.	Anfuso	Barden
Andersen, H. Carl	Ayres	Bell
	Baker	Bow
Buckley	Gwinn	Morrison
Cannon	Hale	O'Hara, Minn.
Carnahan	Halleck	Patman
Chatham	Hays, Ohio	Phillips
Christopher	Hébert	Reed, N. Y.
Cole	Hoffman, Ill.	Richards
Cooley	Hoffman, Mich.	Rivers
Davidson	Horan	Roosevelt
Davis, Wis.	Kelley, Pa.	Scott
Dawson, Ill.	Kelly, N. Y.	Sheehan
Dollinger	King, Pa.	Shelley
Dolliver	Klein	Simpson, Pa.
Dowdy	Lane	Smith, Wis.
Eberharter	McConnell	Thompson, La.
Fernandez	McMillan	Thornberry
Flynt	Mason	Westland
Gamble	Miller, Calif.	Wickersham
Gentry	Miller, N. Y.	
George	Mills	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Horan.

Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Doliver.

Mr. Klein with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Sheehan.

Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Cole.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Dollinger with Mr. McConnell.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Davidson with Mr. Westland.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Phillips.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. George.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Gwinn.

Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Hale.

Mr. Mills with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Cannon with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 890) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C. 466–466j) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SECTION 1. (a) In connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the waterways of the Nation and in consequence of the benefits resulting to the public health and welfare by the prevention and control of water pollution, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution, to support and aid technical research relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, and to provide Federal technical services and financial aid to State and interstate agencies in connection with the prevention and control of water pollution. To this end, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall administer this act through the Public Health Service and under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) Nothing in this act shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the States with respect to the waters (including boundary waters) of such States.

"COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMS FOR WATER-POLLUTION CONTROL

"SEC. 2. The Surgeon General shall, after careful investigation, and in cooperation with other Federal agencies, with State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, and with the municipalities and industries involved, prepare or develop comprehensive programs for eliminating or reducing the pollution and improving the sanitary condition of surface and underground waters. In the development of such comprehensive programs due regard shall be given to the improvements which are necessary to conserve such waters for public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses. For the purpose of this section, the Surgeon General is authorized to make joint investigations with any such agencies of the condition of any waters in any State or States, and of the discharges of any sewage, industrial wastes, or substance which may adversely affect such waters.

"INTERSTATE COOPERATION AND UNIFORM LAWS

"SEC. 3. (a) The Surgeon General shall encourage cooperative activities by the States for the prevention and control of water pollution; encourage the enactment of improved and, so far as practicable, uniform State laws relating to the prevention and control of water pollution; and encourage compacts between States for the prevention and control of water pollution.

"(b) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law or treaty of the United States, for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the prevention and control of water pollution and the enforcement of their respective laws relating thereto, and (2) the establishment of such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements and compacts. No such agreement or compact shall be binding or obligatory upon any State a party thereto unless and until it has been approved by the Congress.

"RESEARCH, INVESTIGATIONS, TRAINING, AND INFORMATION

"SEC. 4. (a) The Surgeon General shall conduct in the Public Health Service and encourage, cooperate with, and render assistance to other appropriate public (whether Federal, State, interstate, or local) authorities, agencies, and institutions, private agencies and institutions, and individuals in the conduct of, and promote the coordination of, research, investigations, experiments, demonstrations, and studies relating to the causes, control, and prevention of water pollution. In carrying out the foregoing, the Surgeon General is authorized to—

"(1) collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, the results of and other information as to research, investigations, and demonstrations relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, including appropriate recommendations in connection therewith;

"(2) make grants-in-aid to public or private agencies and institutions and to individuals for research or training projects and for demonstrations, and provide for the conduct of research, training, and demonstrations by contract with public or private agencies and institutions and with individuals without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes;

"(3) secure, from time to time and for such periods as he deems advisable, the assistance and advice of experts, scholars, and consultants as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);

"(4) establish and maintain research fellowships in the Public Health Service with such stipends and allowances, including traveling and subsistence expenses, as he may deem necessary to procure the assistance of the most promising research fellows; and

"(5) provide training in technical matters relating to the causes, prevention, and control of water pollution to personnel of public agencies and other persons with suitable qualifications.

"(b) The Surgeon General may, upon request of any State water pollution control agency or interstate agency, conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of water pollution confronting any State, interstate agency, community, municipality, or industrial plant, with a view of recommending a solution of such problem.

"(c) The Surgeon General shall collect and disseminate such information relating to water pollution and the prevention and control thereof as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act.

"GRANTS FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

"SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, $2 million for grants to States and to interstate agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining adequate measures for the prevention and control of water pollution.

"(b) The portion of the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for a fiscal year which shall be available for grants to interstate agencies and the portion thereof which shall be available for grants to States shall be specified in the act appropriating such sums.

"(c) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall from time to time make allotments to the several States, in accordance with regulations, on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the extent of the water pollution problem, and (3) the financial need of the respective States.

"(d) From each State's allotment under subsection (c) for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall pay to such State an amount equal to its Federal share (as determined under subsection (i)) of the cost of carrying out its State plan approved under subsection (f), including the cost of training personnel for State and local water pollution control work and including the cost of administering the State plan.

"(e) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall from time to time make allotments to interstate agencies, in accordance with regulations, on such basis as the Surgeon General finds reasonable and equitable. He shall from time to time pay to each such agency, from its allotment, an amount equal to such portion of the cost of carrying out its plan approved under subsection (f) as may be determined in accordance with regulations, including the cost of training personnel for water pollution control work and including the cost of administering the interstate agency's plan. The regulations relating to the portion of the cost of carrying out the interstate agency's plan which shall be borne by the United States shall be designed to place such agencies, so far as practicable, on a basis similar to that of the States.

"(f) The Surgeon General shall approve any plan for purposes of this section which is submitted by the State water pollution control agency or, in the case of an interstate agency, by such agency, and which meets such requirements as the Surgeon General may prescribe by regulation.

"(g) All regulations and amendments thereto with respect to grants to States and to interstate agencies under this section shall be made after consultation with a conference of the State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies. Insofar as practicable, the Surgeon General shall obtain the agreement, prior to the issuance of any such regulations or amendments, of such State and interstate agencies.

"(h) (1) Wherever the Surgeon General, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State water pollution control agency or interstate agency finds that—

"(A) the plan submitted by such agency and approved under this section has been so changed that it no longer complies with a requirement prescribed by regulation as a condition of approval of the plan; or

"(B) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with such a requirement, the Surgeon General shall notify such agency that no further payments will be made to the State or to the interstate agency, as the case may be, under this section (or in his discretion that further payments will not be made to the State, or to the interstate agency, for projects under or parts of the plan affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until he is so satisfied, the Surgeon General shall make no further payments to such State, or to such interstate agency, as the case may be, under this section (or shall limit payments to projects under or parts of the plan in which there is no such failure).

"(2) If any State or any interstate agency is dissatisfied with the Surgeon General's action with respect to it under this subsection, it may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State (or any of the member States, in the case of an interstate agency) is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The findings of fact by the Surgeon General, unless contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Surgeon General to take further evidence, and the Surgeon General may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless contrary to the weight of the evidence. The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Surgeon General or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"(i) (1) The 'Federal share' for any State shall be 100 per centum less that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska), except that (A) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66⅔ per centum or less than 33⅓ per centum, and (B) the Federal share for Hawaii and Alaska shall be 50 per centum and for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 66⅔ per centum.

"(2) The 'Federal shares' shall be promulgated by the Surgeon General between July 1 and September 30 of each even-numbered year, on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the 2 fiscal years in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation: *Provided*, That the Federal shares promulgated by the Surgeon General pursuant to section 4 of the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1955, shall be conclusive for the period beginning July 1, 1955, and ending June 30, 1957.

"(j) The population of the several States shall be determined on the basis of the latest figures furnished by the Department of Commerce.

"(k) The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to subsection (d) or (e) shall be as follows:

"(1) The Surgeon General shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be paid to each State (or to each interstate agency in the case of subsection (e)) under the provisions of such subsection for such period, such estimate to be based on such records of the State (or the interstate agency) and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Surgeon General may find necessary.

"(2) The Surgeon General shall pay to the State (or to the interstate agency), from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by him for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid such State (or such interstate agency) for any prior period under such subsection was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to such State (or such agency) for such prior period under such subsection. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, in such installments as the Surgeon General may determine.

"WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD

"SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a Water Pollution Control Advisory Board to be composed as follows: The Surgeon General or a sanitary engineer officer designated by him, who shall be Chairman of the Board, a representative of the Department of the Army, a representative of the Department of the Interior, a representative of the Department of Commerce, a representative of the Department of Agriculture, a representative of the Atomic Energy Commission, a representative of the National Science Foundation, and a representative of the Federal Power Commission, designated by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of the National Science Foundation, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, respectively; and seven persons (not officers or employees of the Federal Government) to be appointed by the President. One of the persons appointed by the President shall be an engineer who is expert in sewage and industrial waste disposal, one shall be a person who shall have shown an active interest in the field of wildlife conservation and recreation, and, except as the President may determine that the purposes of this act will be better furthered by different representation, one shall be a person representative of municipal government, one shall be a person representative of State government, one shall be a person representative of affected industry, one shall be a person representative of interstate agencies, and one shall be a person who shall have shown an active interest in the field of agriculture. Each member appointed by the President shall hold office for a term of 3 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occuring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after June 30, 1955, shall expire as follows: two

at the end of 1 year after such date, 2 at the end of 2 years after such date, and 3 at the end of 3 years after such date, as designated by the President at the time of appointment. None of the members appointed by the President shall be eligible for reappointment within 1 year after the end of his preceding term, but terms commencing prior to the enactment of the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1955 shall not be deemed 'preceding terms' for purposes of this sentence. The members of the Board who are not officers or employees of the United States, while attending conferences or meetings of the Board or while otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not exceeding $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(b) The Board shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to, the Surgeon General on matters of policy relating to the activities and functions of the Surgeon General under this act.

"(c) Such clerical and technical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the duties of the Board shall be provided from the personnel of the Public Health Service.

"ENFORCEMENT MEASURES AGAINST POLLUTION OF INTERSTATE WATERS

"SEC. 7. (a) The pollution of interstate waters in or adjacent to any State or States (whether the matter causing or contributing to such pollution is discharged directly into such waters or reaches such waters after discharge into a tributary of such waters), which endangers the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates, shall be subject to abatement as herein provided.

"(b) Whenever the Surgeon General, on the basis of reports, surveys, and studies, has reason to believe that any such pollution is occurring, he shall give formal notification thereof to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution and shall advise the water pollution control agency or interstate agency of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate of such notification. The notification shall specify a reasonable time to secure abatement of the pollution.

"(c) If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notification pursuant to subsection (b) is not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originate, before a board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary, who may be officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or of the water pollution control agency or interstate agency of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate (except that the water pollution control agency of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate shall be given an opportunity to select at least one member of the Board and at least one member shall be a representative of the Department of Commerce, and not less than a majority of the Board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare). On the basis of the evidence presented at such hearing, the Board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring. If the Board finds such pollution is occurring, it shall make recommendations to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and equitable to secure abatement of such pollution. The Secretary shall send a copy of such findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution, together with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than 6 months) to secure abatement of such pollution, and shall also send a copy of such findings and recommendations and of such notice to the water pollution control agency, and to the interstate agency, if any, of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate.

"(d) If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notice prescribed in subsection (c) is not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall send a further notice to such person or persons, and shall send a copy thereof to the water pollution control agency, and to the interstate agency, if any, of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate. Such further notice shall specify a reasonable time (not less than 3 months) to secure abatement of such pollution. If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in such further notice is not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may, with the consent of the water pollution control agency (or any officer or employee authorized to give such consent) of the State or States where the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is discharged or at the request of the water pollution control agency (or any officer or employee authorized to make such request) of any other State or States where the health or welfare of any person or persons is adversely affected by such pollution, request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

"(e) In any suit brought pursuant to subsection (d) in which two or more persons in different judicial districts are originally joined as defendants, the suit may be commenced in the judicial district in which any discharge caused by any of the defendants occurs.

"(f) The court shall receive in evidence in any such suit a transcript of the proceedings before the board and a copy of the board's recommendation; and shall receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

"(g) As used in this section, the term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, State, municipality, and political subdivision of the State.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 8. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out his functions under this act. All regulations of the Surgeon General under this act shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Surgeon General may delegate to any officer or employee of the Public Health Service such of his powers and duties under this act, except the making of regulations, as he may deem necessary or expedient.

"(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the consent of the head of any other agency of the United States, may utilize such officers and employees of such agency as may be found necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act.

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions under this act.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 9. When used in this act—

"(a) The term 'State water pollution control agency' means the State health authority except that, in the case of any State in which there is a single State agency, other than the State health authority, charged with responsibility for enforcing State laws relating to the abatement of water pollution, it means such other State agency.

"(b) The term 'interstate agency' means an agency of two or more States established by or pursuant to an agreement or compact approved by the Congress, or any other agency of two or more States, having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the control of pollution of waters.

"(c) The term 'State' means a State, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

"(d) The term 'interstate waters' means all rivers, lakes, and other waters that flow across, or form a part of, State boundaries.

"(e) The term 'municipality' means a city, town, county, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law and having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes, or other wastes.

"OTHER AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED

"SEC. 10. This act shall not be construed as (1) superseding or limiting the functions, under any other law, of the Surgeon General or of the Public Health Service, or of any other officer or agency of the United States, relating to water pollution, or (2) affecting or impairing the provisions of the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, or sections 13 through 17 of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors and for other purposes,' approved March 3, 1899, as amended, or (3) affecting or impairing the provisions of any treaty of the United States.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 11. If any provision of this act, or the application of any provision of this act to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, and the remainder of this act, shall not be affected thereby.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 12. This act may be cited as the 'Federal Water Pollution Control Act'."

SEC. 2. The title of such act is amended to read "An act to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes."

SEC. 3. Terms of office as members of the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board (established pursuant to section 6 (b) of the Water Pollution Control Act, as in effect prior to the enactment of this act) subsisting on the date of enactment of this act shall expire at the close of business on such date.

SEC. 4. As soon as possible after the date of enactment of this act the Surgeon General shall promulgate Federal shares in the manner provided in subsection (i) of section 5 of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended by this act (and without regard to the date specified therein for such promulgation), such Federal shares to be conclusive for the purposes of section 5 of such act for the period beginning July 1, 1955, and ending June 30, 1957.

SEC. 5. It is hereby declared to be the intent of the Congress that any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, insofar as practicable and consistent with the interests of the United States and within any available appropriations, cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with any State or interstate agency or municipality having juris-

diction over waters into which any matter is discharged from such property, in preventing or controlling the pollution of such waters.

SEC. 6. This act may be cited as the "Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1955."

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 9540 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its amendment and ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as conferees on the part of the House Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. DEMPSEY, Mr. DONDERO, and Mr. MCGREGOR.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the bill H. R. 9540 was passed be vacated and that that bill be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

THE FARM PROBLEM

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the farm problem.

The President may veto a farm bill, but he cannot veto the farm problem. It just will not go away. I know that most of the newspapers have told you that the Democratic farm bill was bad. They have told you that the President was right in vetoing it—it would not help the farm problem. But, most of the provisions which the President termed "unacceptable," in his veto message, were income-raising provisions. Because of what you have read and heard on the radio and TV you may have decided that this is a black-and-white issue with all the white on the President's side and all the black on the Democrats' side. Let me assure you that this is not true. It is not a black-and-white issue and the black is not all on the Democrats' side.

Many of you do not farm for a living. You live in the big cities and the large towns. You probably think that the farm problem does not touch you. Many of you think about the farmer only when you go to the grocery store and spend more and more of your pay checks for groceries. Your thoughts then are harsh ones. You do not realize that the farmer gets a very small portion of the dollars you pay for your food. And that portion is getting smaller. The farmer's share of the dollars you pay for your food was 53 percent in 1945. It was 41 percent in 1955. The farmer's share of your food dollar has been steadily declining, and so has his income. Our great American economy consists of many different groups, but they are all bound together. What hurts the small-business man in New Orleans is bound to hurt the farmer in Kansas. And when the farmer in Kansas is hurt, the rest of us will be in trouble.

Sometimes I think the city man has trouble with the farm problem because of words like "parity." But let us look at the word "parity." All it means is this: If a farmer could buy a hat 20 years ago for a bushel of wheat, the farmer ought to be able to buy a hat today for a bushel of wheat. All parity really means is a fair price. Now, we do not say that the farmer must get a fair price for his crop. All we say is that the farmer should get 90 percent of the fair price. Would you settle for only 90 percent of a fair wage? Do you think your telephone company would be happy with only 90 percent of the fair rate? They feel they are entitled to 100 percent. Parity is just an insurance policy. The Government has been issuing similar insurance to us for decades. Your social security payments are a kind of insurance. The protective tariff for business, the subsidies to airlines and to the shipping industry; the land grants which made our railroads great, the minimum wage for workers—all of these are Government insurance policies designed to protect you and keep our economy healthy. Ninety percent of parity does the same thing for farmers.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY AND DEPRESSIONS

Since 1952, wages have been going up. Corporate dividends have been going up. National income has increased $33.1 billion, from $289.5 billion in 1952 to $322.6 billion in 1955. But during this same period of time the income of the farmer has been going in the opposite direction—down. If the farmer cannot make a living he cannot buy the things he needs—the things produced by the other groups of the economy. We know that when one part of our country or our economy remains in a depressed state, the depression will ultimately fan out into other parts, seriously affecting continuing prosperity. The worker who is making automobiles, televisions, agricultural machinery and tractors must have a market for his product. If the farmer cannot buy, the size of the market for these products is reduced. This means that the workers—in the automobile, television, and agricultural machinery factories—will be thrown out of jobs. When they are unemployed, they cannot buy. The market is therefore reduced still further—thus more workers will be thrown out of work. And so it goes. Those of us who are over forty years of age know this from experience. We know that now is the time to do something about the depressed state of the Detroit, Mich., area and other industrial areas where so many workers are presently unemployed. We know that now is the time to stop the decline of the farmer's income, so that he may continue to buy the things he wants and needs. We know that now is the time, because soon it may be too late. Yes, we know that depression or threatened depression in any part of our economy is like a cancer. It will spread to all of the other parts of the economy.

There was a national depression in 1929. All industry was paralyzed until the Democrats came into power in 1933 and put the country back on its feet. But we older people remember that the farm depression started long before 1929. In fact, it started in 1920 and the agricultural economy remained depressed for the next 9 years in the midst of prosperity for the rest of the country—a prosperity which closely resembled the prosperity we have today. Those of us who have studied the farm problem are aware that this period of farm depression was due in large measure to changes in the world market and the inflation and speculation brought about by the war. But, we also know that the right kind of help to the farmer in the early 1920's would have stemmed the tide of depression. It would have helped to slow down the shrinkage in consumer buying power, and the enormous reduction of nonfarm production which led to the 1929 depression. For the past 7 years, the agricultural economy of our country has been sinking deeper and deeper into a state of depression. Farmers' income is declining. The costs of the things the farmer must buy have been increasing. He is caught in a squeeze between the high cost of goods to him and the low price he receives for his products. That is why we have worked so hard to help the farmer. His income must be bolstered, not only for his own sake but for our own sake; otherwise, we may well be on our way to another depression.

Under the leadership of Senator ELLENDER, the Agriculture Committee has traveled all over the United States exploring the farm problem. The House Agriculture Committee under the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has taken much testimony. Both committees have held hearings in an effort to determine what the farmer and farm experts thought should be done. The farm bill which we passed, and which President Eisenhower vetoed, was the product of years of hard work and searching study. Many Republicans who live in the farm areas supported the bill. They knew that something had to be done. They knew that by 1955 the average per capita income of farm people, from all sources, had fallen to $860 a year and to only $584 a year from farming alone. The 1955 average per capita income for city and town dwellers was $2,000 a year. The Democratic farm

bill was designed to bolster the farmer's income. Experts say that a level no lower than 90 percent of parity will halt the slide of farm prices.

REPUBLICAN PROMISES

Do you remember that last year, with the approval of President Eisenhower, the minimum wage was raised to $1 an hour? What would happen if this year it should be cut to 80 cents an hour? President Eisenhower campaigned for 90 percent of parity as the best thing for the farmer. During the campaign of 1952 when he was running for the Presidency he went up into the farm country in Kansas and Minnesota and made a farm speech. On September 6, 1952, he said he was "a 90 percent parity man with no ifs and buts." I want you to know exactly what President Eisenhower said in this speech in 1952—and this is exactly what he said—I quote:

> And here and now without any ifs or buts I say to you that the Republican Party stands behind the price-support laws now on the books. This includes the amendment to the basic Farm Act passed by the voters of both parties in Congress to continue through 1954 the price support on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity. All I know of farmers convinces me that they would rather earn their fair share than to have it as a Government handout, and a fair share is not only 90 percent parity, but is full parity.

But once the Republicans were in office their promises were forgotten. President Eisenhower's administration did away with 90 percent supports for the farmer. In its place was substituted something called the sliding scale. Farmers have been sliding down that scale ever since. The Republicans claimed that his sliding scale would do away with agricultural surplus. They said it was the way to get the farmers' income up—doing away with surpluses at the same time. That was their theory. The crop surpluses we have today are largely built up under the Republican administration. They cannot deny this.

Take wheat, for instance. The day before the Eisenhower administration took office we had enough surplus wheat on hand to last us less than 6 months. On the last day of 1955 we had enough wheat to last us more than a year. We had more than twice as much surplus corn and 12 times as much cotton as we had when this administration took office. Prices dropped, even on the farm products for which there was no Government surplus. Between January 1953 and January 1956 beef cattle prices fell 30 percent, and hog prices dropped 40 percent. In 1952 the average hog sold for $42. On March 15, 1956, the average hog sold for $29. In 1952 beef cattle sold for an average of $228 per head. In March 1956 the price was $135 a head. The farmer had lost $13 on hogs and $93 a head on beef cattle. Hogs and cattle are not supported at 90 percent of parity, but they, too, share in the farm decline. That is why the Congress wanted to go back to the 90 percent of parity. It worked in the past and will work again.

The President has completely abandoned the flexible supports, his sliding scale. The very day that he vetoed our farm bill, because it provided for 90-percent of parity he departed from the sliding scale and gave the farmer 82½ percent for cotton, 83 percent for rice, 84 percent for wheat, and 86 percent for corn. And he put into effect the same price support on milk and butterfat, which he had criticized the Congress for passing.

If the past is any guide to the future, I predict that should the Republicans be successful in this election, we will be back to the 75 percent of parity level next year. The Democrats feel that price-support programs should be consistent. They believe the programs should be such as to enable the farmer to plan his operations in election, as well as nonelection years. The administration promised 90 percent of parity in the last election year, but has since devised every conceivable means to grant farmers less than 90 percent of parity.

THE COST TO THE FARMER OF THE INCONSISTENCY OF THE REPUBLICAN FARM PROGRAMS

President Eisenhower's veto cost the farmer $2 billion for this year. The farmers' income in the last 3 years of the Republican administration has dropped from $15 billion to $11 billion. Corporation profits have increased 35 percent since 1952. Dividends are up 24 percent; landlords get 17 percent more; wages are up 13 percent. The farmer is not opposed to such splendid gains. He just wants to share them. But the farmer has not gained. His income has gone down more than 26 percent. The country prospers and the farmer goes deeper and deeper into debt. At the end of 1952 the total farm debt stood at $6,588 million. As of the end of 1955, it was $8,176 million—an increase of almost $2 billion.

The farm bill and the Presidential veto are only one chapter in the Democratic Party's fight for the farmer. We will fight for a more favorable credit for the farmer. We will fight to keep his interest rates low. And I promise you, my friends, to fight—with renewed determination—for 90 percent of parity. We will fight to stop this decline in farm income—and I predict that we will win.

THE SOIL-BANK PROGRAM

The soil bank was not a new idea of this administration. We have known for a long time that the cure for surpluses was to reduce crop acreage. But, if the farmer lets acreage lie idle he does not get any income from those acres. Under the soil bank plan the Government will pay the farmer to reduce his acreage of commodities which are now in surplus supply. Thus, the farmer will receive an income even though he does not plant these acres with crops to be harvested.

The Democratic Congress has favored this type of program for years. Since 1954 the President's Secretary of Agriculture has been calling the idea unworkable. It seems that a lot of things are workable in election years that do not work in other years. If the President had really wanted a soil-bank program he could have used the power already in existence under the provisions of the Soil Conservation Act of 1935. He now has the new soil-bank provisions and $1.2 billion with which to carry out its provisions but this will be of practically no benefit to the farmer this year. It is a case of too little, too late.

THE REPUBLICANS AND DEPRESSIONS

The first farm depression came to the United States under President Harding. The second depression came under President Hoover. The Republican Party is now pushing us into a third farm depression. This happens because of the basic differences between the aims and objectives of the two parties. The Democrats are concerned about the individual. The Republicans forget the individual and worry only about economizing. Since 1952 the farmer has been on the economic downgrade. The harder he has worked the deeper he has gone into debt. As I have indicated earlier, if the farmer does not prosper, you will not.

The Democratic Party is the party of many interests. Under its great tent gather people from different regions and people from different ways of life. No one interest can dominate, but all must have their rightful day in court. Today the farmer, faced with declining income, needs his day in court, not only for the farmers' good, but for the good of all.

In the days ahead, I hope that all of you—those of you who live in our big cities, in our large towns, on our broad prairies and our fertile fields, farms, and ranches—will give thoughtful consideration to the plight of the farmer and what each of us must do to protect him, and to protect our great economy.

A DECLARATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1956, the American people heard, from 19 Members of the Senate of the United States and 77 Members of the House of Representatives, through the agency of Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, a declaration of constitutional principles. With the exception of a few members, the congressional delegations of 11 Southern States signed the statement.

What did they so declare?

These signatory members declared to the Senate, the Congress, the Nation, and the world:

> We regard the decision of the Supreme Court in the school cases as a clear abuse of judicial power.

They drew the shield of the Constitution about them to protect them from a decision of the Court established by that Constitution to uphold and preserve the great principles of the Government of the United States of America. Because—they say—education is not mentioned in the text of the Constitution, the Supreme Court has no right to consider any question respecting it.

In the matter of desegregated schools, the facts have been with us for a long time. It was thought, by the adoption

of the Fourteenth Amendment, that a method of handling these facts had been given to the Nation within the framework of the Constitution. In fact, in the school case of May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court invoked this amendment and particularly the "equal protection of the laws" clause contained therein, as the basis for prohibiting any further action on the part of the States to maintain segregated schools.

The declaration is a grave matter. In the background, and, as it were, conjoined to it, are the resolutions passed by the legislatures of 5 of these 11 States, holding that the Supreme Court has trespassed on the reserved powers of the States. And behind both the declaration and the resolutions is a sharp echo of nullification, the political doctrine at large just a short century ago in the days preceding the Civil War.

In contrast to these dark portents is the fact that these Senators and Representatives have also solemnly stated:

> We pledge ourselves to use all lawful means to bring about a reversal of this decision which is contrary to the Constitution and to prevent the use of force in its implementation.

This declaration is an incredibly important incident in our national life. The stresses that brought up to the Civil War of a century ago are still subsistent and still have the same potential explosive force they did then. A nation may survive one civil war successfully, but it can never afford the "luxury" of another.

THE NEGRO AND EQUAL RIGHTS

When the Constitution was adopted, over a century and a half ago, the right to own Negroes as property was existent in all the Thirteen Colonies, but was little exercised except in those from Maryland south. We also had indentured servants, but these, once they either earned or worked their way out of service, both of which things they were free to do, became free citizens and merged readily with the totality of citizens of the Nation. Negroes, however, even when emancipated, either through some efforts of their own or through the generosity of their masters, continued under the stigma of their former servitude. Why? Because the Negroes, who were on the far side of the pigmentation chart from the Anglo-Saxon whites among whom they worked, were easy to differentiate by a color contrast. It was practically forgotten that these were people with the normal complement of ears and eyes, hands and feet, emotions, and intellects. Practically forgotten, but not quite.

Even in the Constitutional Convention there were lingering questions as how to handle the Negro question. Mr. Wilson, it is reported, "did not well see on what principle the proportion of three-fifths could be explained. Are they admitted as citizens? Then why are they not admitted on an equality with white citizens? Are they admitted as property? Then why is not other property admitted into computation?" Gouverneur Morris declared that reduced as he was to the dilemma of doing injustice to the Southern States, or to human nature, he found that he must do it to the former. Luther Martin of Maryland explained why the clauses respecting the three-fifths computation and the prohibition on importation of slaves were adopted after all:

> I found the eastern States, notwithstanding their aversion to slavery, were very willing to indulge the southern States, at least with a temporary liberty to prosecute the slave trade, provided the southern States would in their turn, gratify them, by laying no restriction on navigation acts.

He followed this statement with an impassioned oration that—

> We had appealed to the Supreme Being for his assistance as the God of freedom * * * [and] now, when we scarcely had risen from our knees, from supplicating his aid and protection, in forming our government over a free people * * * to have a provision not only putting it out of its power to restrain and prevent the slave trade, but even encouraging the most infamous traffic by giving the States power and influence in the Union in proportion as they cruelly and wantonly sport with the rights of their fellow creatures, ought to be considered as a solemn mockery of, and insult to that God whose protection we had then implored.

As you read the records of the convention, you find that the general tenor of thought was that only Georgia and South Carolina needed great numbers of slaves, and these for their rice fields. The facts of history turned this picture upside down. The cotton gin brought a new economic value to the Negro slave, and the great economic rise of the slave-owning cotton States began. The original unhappy compromise was followed by a series of equally unworkable compromises, the Missouri Compromise, and the Kansas-Nebraska Act. There were also counter proposals such as the Wilmot Proviso. The long 60 years ended in the Civil War and the freeing of the slaves.

But the mood of compromise did not end there. Although the Congress after the conclusion of the war set out immediately to insure the protection of the freedom and rights of the Negro, his newly found freedom traveled a rocky road in the courts.

In 1865, the Thirteenth Amendment, abolishing slavery, was ratified. In 1866, the Congress passed the first of the Civil Rights Acts, making it a misdemeanor to deprive any person or inhabitant, under color of law, of any of the political rights mentioned therein. In 1866 the Fourteenth Amendment was ratified, which outlawed discrimination by the States in principle. In 1868 the Fifteenth Amendment, protecting the right of suffrage from discriminatory action because of race or color, was ratified. All of these are still in effect.

In 1875, the second Civil Rights Act was passed, prohibiting discrimination by any person against any citizen with respect to accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of inns, public conveyances on land or water, theaters, and other places of amusement. This law was immediately challenged in a series of cases, all of them decided together by the Supreme Court in 1883 under the name civil-rights cases. The Court held that the Congress had no right to pass such legislation, since the Fourteenth Amendment was prohibitory only on action by the States. They drew a parallel between the prohibitory power of the amendment and the impairment of contract clause, holding that the power given the courts by the Judiciary Act of 1798 to "review final decisions of State courts, whenever they should be repugnant to the Constitution or laws of the United States" was the remedy in this situation, not an act of Congress.

When, however, a discriminatory State law did come up before the Court in Plessy versus Ferguson, in 1896, the Court, although it stated that the object of the Fourteenth Amendment was "undoubtedly to enforce the absolute equality of the two races before the law," took refuge in the "separate but equal" doctrine, which it based on the Massachusetts decision of 1849 in Roberts versus City of Boston, making it compatible with the uniformity of regulation that best assists interstate commerce. Mr. Justice Harlan, who fought the good fight to the last in all these cases, dissented, stating:

> In respect to civil rights, common to all citizens, the Constitution of the United States does not, I think, permit any public authority to know the race of these entitled to be protected in the enjoyment of such rights.

He said further:

> The fundamental objection, therefore, to the statute is that it interferes with the personal freedom of citizens.

He ended:

> In view of the Constitution, in the eye of the law, there is in this country no superior, dominant ruling class of citizens. There is no caste here. Our Constitution is color-blind, and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens.

In 1917, in the face of a contention by the defense counsel that Plessy versus Ferguson was controlling, the Court held in Buchanan versus Warley that an ordinance of the city of Louisville prohibiting sales of residential property to Negroes in blocks containing a majority of whites, and vice versa, was in direct violation of the Fourteenth Amendment preventing State interference with property rights except by due process of law.

In 1946, a State law within the scope of the separate but equal doctrine of Plessy versus Ferguson was held inapplicable to interstate carriage by rail in Morgan versus Virginia.

In 1948 came what has been called the new rule in Shelley's case, when the Supreme Court held that while the making of racially restrictive covenants was not prohibited by the 14th amendment, it was a real violation of the "equal protection" clause for State courts to enforce them.

THE QUESTION OF THE SCHOOLS

The Senators and the Representatives from the South have stressed the fact that—

> The original Constitution does not mention education. Neither does the Fourteenth Amendment nor any other amendment.

We can ask them quite simply: Why should it be mentioned?

The States themselves had not assumed the responsibility of education at the time of the Constitution. The New England States had, for the most part, schools supported by the townships, the

closest approach then extant to the public-school concept, although their roots in church schools are seen in the fact that the local minister was still an official visitant; the Middle States most frequently had church related schools; and the Southern States, for the most part, relied on private tutoring for children of the wealthier classes, and did little if anything for the poorer classes.

It was not until 1825 that it may be said to have been clearly recognized by thinking men that the only safe reliance of a system of State schools lay in the general and direct taxation of all property for their support. Concomitant with this rise in the public character of the schools was the diversity of opinion between those preferring centralization—meaning State control—and those in favor of local administration. This problem resulted in a working compromise at the beginning of the 20th century whereby the local school boards had charge of details, such as teacher hiring, and the States set the broad qualification standards, such as teacher training requirements. In the 50 years since then, the Congress has shown a willingness to share the responsibility for the school systems with the other two layers of control. It has, in the slight instances in which laws have been passed regarding it, erected a further effective compromise through certain Federal aids to education.

Surely, the Constitution is, and was intended to be, adaptable to the various social structures, such as public education, which the advancing times have brought into existence. The framers of that great document were planning not for their day alone, but for a future with unknown possibilities. In the debate on the Tenth Amendment, James Madison stated:

> There must necessarily be admitted powers by implication unless the Constitution descended to recount every minutiae.

Considering, now, the question of the Supreme Court and the theory of segregated education, we find that the Court never once made that theory the basis of a decision respecting the schools. There have been decisions of lower Federal courts and State supreme courts which did so; but in the Supreme Court, on such occasions as it was mentioned with approval, it was within dictum of certain cases. And as early as 1908, the Court, by implication, questioned whether it could be approved as consistent with the guaranty of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

The first instance in which the theory was mentioned by the Supreme Court was in 1877 in the concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Clifford in Hall versus DeCuir. This very case, together with Plessy versus Ferguson, was reversed by the decision in Morgan versus Virginia in 1946.

In Plessy versus Ferguson, relied on by the gentlemen from the South, the separate but equal doctrine was applied to travel in interstate commerce, and during the course of the opinion, the State school segregation theory was recited with approval. The decision itself, however, turned on the question of a burden on interstate commerce, not on segregation in education. The remarks concerning education were purely illustrative.

When in 1899, in Cumming versus Board of Education, the Court considered a question of separate schools for separate races, it expressly excluded from its consideration the validity of the statutes providing for racial segregation, and went ahead with its decision without referring to the Fourteenth Amendment.

In 1908, in the Berea College case, where the State contested the right of the college to conduct an integrated school, the Court stated that a "corporation is not entitled to all the immunities to which individuals are entitled" and distinctly presaged its action in the decision of May 17, 1954, with the following statement:

> Such a statute [Kentucky's compulsory school segregation act of 1904] may conflict with the Federal Constitution in denying to individuals powers which they may rightfully exercise, and yet, at the same time, be valid as to a corporation created by the State.

In the Gong Lum case in 1927, although the Court upheld the right of the local school board in an area of segregated schools to assign a Chinese student to the Negro instead of the white school as within the equal protection clause, it did so in reliance on its 1899 decision, which had not really decided the issue. Moreover, the facts show that the plaintiff did not question segregation in the schools, but merely wanted his daughter assigned to the white instead of the Negro school. The Court again assumed rather than decided the question.

The higher education cases which have arisen in the last 10 years have found the Court scrutinizing the facts much more carefully than in the earlier cases. Thus we find in Missouri ex rel Gaines versus Canada and in the Sipuel case, the Court decided that no student should be compelled to leave his State in order to get advanced education, but it did not controvert the concept that the State could, if it wished, erect a separate graduate school to supply the training. In Sweatt versus Painter, its glance at the situation was even sharper, and it held that the student could not possibly acquire the same professional proficiency in a newly established totally segregated school. Both the lack of accreditation and lack of access to the most renowned professors, and the lack of a normal body of acceptable students interested in the same type of education, militated against the Negro student's profiting to the maximum from his training.

And so we come to the case in 1954 which requires integration, in as reasonable a time as possible, in all the public schools. The concept negatively expressed in the Berea College case, that the individual's right to equal opportunity to education in unsegregated schools was within the "equal protection clause" may be within the purview of the Fourteenth Amendment; and the further concept expressed in the lucid analogy propounded by the Court in the Civil Rights case in 1883, that "the remedy which Congress actually provided was that giving the Supreme Court of the United States jurisdiction to review final decisions of State courts whenever they should sustain the validity of a State statute or authority alleged to be repugnant to the Constitution or laws of the United States" were fused into an epochmaking decision in behalf of the freedom of the individual, protecting and sustaining the rights of all citizens under the Constitution.

THE RIGHT OF THE COURT TO ADVANCE WITH THE TIMES

I shall not say too much on this point, but would like to point out that the Constitution is adaptable to changing times. I might also add that it is due to that adaptability that we have—although we seldom realize it—the oldest written Constitution under which a government is still actively functioning in the world.

Justice Stone once said:

> In determining whether a provision of the Constitution applies to a new subject matter, it is of little significance that it is one with which the framers were not familiar. For in setting up an enduring framework of government they undertook to carry out for the indefinite future, and in all the vicissitudes of the changing affairs of men, those fundamental purposes which the instrument itself discloses. Hence we read its words, not as we read legislative codes which are subject to continuous revision with the changing course of events, but as the revelation of the great purposes which we intended to be achieved by the Constitution as a continuing instrument of government.

And thus, about the same period that all these civil rights cases were coming to the courts, various cases under the Interstate Commerce Act were being decided, such as the Addyston Pipe and Steel case in 1899 which upheld the Sherman Act; the Minnesota rate cases of 1913 which held that State powers which affect interstate commerce may do so only incidentally and indirectly; and the 1937 case of West Coast Hotel Co. versus Parrish which upheld a State minimum wage law, holding it not a breach of freedom of contract. None of these ideas would have been within the purview of the framers of the Constitution, who did not dream of industrial combinations, extensive State taxation or other regulation of commerce; or in those days when the employers did all the dictating as to wages, that the State had any right to set a minimum wage of any sort.

CONCLUSION

Neither these gentlemen from the South nor any other persons can say that the court has substituted naked judicial power and personal political and social ideas for the established law of the land.

In the first place, as I have demonstrated in my comment on the civil rights cases, the power was given the court as far back as the Judiciary Act of 1798, to render an opinion in these premises. And it has, with restraint and justice, only carried out the great tasks that the oaths of the individual justices require them to carry out—the upholding of the Constitution of the United States and the rendition of equal justice under the law.

As for these concepts being personal political and social ideas, so long as the Constitution is adaptable to the new forces of life which spring up from age to age, these judges have done no more than carry forward the great principles of equality and justice into the present day. In the Boston school case, Mr. Sumner, who argued the brief for plaintiff said justly: "A public school, by definition, was for the benefit of all classes meeting together on terms of equality."

In the 1948 report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, entitled "Education for American Democracy," this idea is developed further:

If education is to make the attainment of a more perfect democracy one of its major goals, it is imperative that it extend its benefits to all on equal terms. We must renounce the practices of discrimination and segregation in educational institutions as contrary to the spirit of democracy. Education leaders and institutions should take positive steps to overcome the conditions which at present obstruct free and equal access to educational opportunities. Educational programs everywhere should be aimed at undermining and eventually limiting the attitudes that are responsible for discrimination and segregation—at creating instead attitudes that will make education freely available to all.

The Court did not ask immediate desegregation. It asked only that as plans were worked out that would be effective they be put into effect. But the desegregation case is a real benchmark in the onward march of true democracy. No longer can we say that the Court has not spoken; that the States may go on as they have in the past; that things that are equal but separate are also equal and identical.

The United States is committed to its destiny; to be and to demonstrate the ideal of a God-fearing democratic nation in the eyes of the whole world.

Fulfilling this destiny is a matter which has now taken on even more widespread ramifications than those of moral imperative and democratic tradition. It may now well be a condition for the survival of freedom in many parts of the world. The totalitarian rulers of the Soviet Union have carefully exploited the issue of segregation and discrimination in the United States and will continue to be successful in doing so as long as glaring examples of inequality actually exist in the United States and are not simply figments of Soviet propaganda.

A graphic demonstration of this fact came to my attention quite recently. An adolescent girl who only some weeks ago emerged from behind the Iron Curtain was in my office. I asked her many questions about the educational system behind the curtain and got the usual answers about the emphasis on the glorification of Lenin and theories of Soviet communism. I then asked her what was the first thing that came to her mind when she was asked what she had learned about the United States in the Czechoslovakian school she had attended. Without hesitation, her answer was, "You don't treat the colored people the same as you treat the whites." She then recited in detail the history of the Autherine Lucy case.

The only way we can successfully meet this Soviet propaganda abroad is to face the facts of discrimination and segregation at home and act to put our house in order. This is not an easy task, nor can it be accomplished instantaneously. Continuous progress is essential, however; retrogression could be seriously damaging. The Supreme Court decision did not insist on immediate compliance; it asked that plans for gradual compliance be inaugurated. This decision, coming 86 years after ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment and 84 years after ratification of the Fifteenth Amendment, is not unreasonable from a practical point of view. It is clearly in accord with the basic constitutional guaranties and must be complied with in spirit as well as letter, if the true promise of equal opportunity for all, set out in the Constitution, is to be meaningful to all—regardless of race or creed.

STATEMENT ON AMENDMENT TO THE CAREER COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, since the act of June 10, 1922, dependents of members of the uniformed services have been reimbursed, or otherwise privided transportation, when the member has been ordered to make a permanent change of duty station. Currently, such authority for payment of travel expenses is authorized in the Career Compensation Act of 1949. Not only must there be a change in permanent duty station and not only must the dependent have performed the travel for which they seek reimbursement, but, the Comptroller General has additionally ruled, the travel must have been incident to the establishment of permanent residence.

It is frequently the practice of dependents of members of the naval service to return to family homes in the Midwest when their husbands go to sea. After a separation of many months, these families quite naturally want to return to the home port when the ship comes in and the serviceman is to receive orders to a shore duty station. Under these conditions, the dependents, unless they have a permanent residence in the home port, are not eligible for reimbursement for travel expenses to the new permanent duty station. The imposition of the additional requirement that there be a permanent residence is, I believe, superfluous and is not in keeping with the legislative intent of the Career Compensation Act.

Thus I have today introduced a bill which would clearly and unequivocally establish as a basis for reimbursement requirements that there be a permanent change of station and that the dependents' travel, for which reimbursement is sought, is performed, but without regard to permanent change of residence. Passage of this legislation will, I believe, leave no doubt in the minds of these service families as to the attitude of the Congress toward travel of this type.

VETERANS' PENSION BILL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, very recently a bill was reported out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs granting certain benefits, pensions, and compensation to our veterans. I believe it will come up under a privileged resolution. I hope it will be taken up at the very earliest moment because, as I understand, the House is likely to adjourn about the middle of July. If this bill is not passed quickly, I fear the other body may not act.

SENT $1.5 BILLION SURPLUS BACK TO STATES FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks there has been a great deal of speculation and suggestion as to what should be done with the estimated $2 billion Treasury surplus anticipated for this fiscal year. I can well understand the reason for so much comment, because the novelty of having a budget surplus is a rarity to most of us.

However, if we turn the pages back far enough, all the way back to 1836, history shows that our predecessors in Congress had a similar problem at that time.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, despite the absence of economic and excise taxes our young American Nation found, much to its dismay, that the Treasury would yield some $40 million in surplus at the end of 1836. As a result, troubled and indignant Congressmen took the floor warning against this "evil" and pleaded the necessity of an immediate reduction. They felt, to use the words of one legislator, "that the reduction would be a less evil than that extraordinary and dangerous state of things, in which the United States should be found laying and collecting taxes for the purposes of distributing them among the States of the Union."

It would be interesting to note the reaction of these legislators to many of our subsequent Federal-assistance programs, despite my firm conviction that our great country has developed and prospers under most legislation of this nature.

But to return to this surplus of 1836, I have noted with interest that Congress passed an act ordering the distribution of this anticipated surplus, namely, $37,468,859.47, to the several States according to their respective numbers of Representatives in Congress. The sum finally amounted to $28,101,645, paid to 27 States.

Although the aim of this distribution was primarily to reduce the surplus, many States used the money to support local education. I include for the record, a chart showing this distribution and the use made of the grant by individual States. It is taken from the United States Office of Education, History of Federal and State Aid to Higher Education, Washington, United States Government Printing Office, 1890, LC 173.B6:

	Number of electors	Amount received	Objects to which applied
Alabama	7	$669,086.78	Education.
Arkansas	3	286,751.48	General purposes.
Connecticut	8	764,670.61	Education one-half, general purposes one-half.
Delaware	3	286,751.48	Education.
Florida			
Georgia	11	1,051,422.09	One-third education, two-thirds general purposes.
Illinois	5	477,919.13	Education and internal improvements.
Indiana	9	860,254.44	One-half education, one-half general purposes.
Kentucky	15	1,443,757.40	Education.
Louisiana	5	477,919.13	General purposes.
Maine	10	955,838.27	Do.
Massachusetts	14	1,338,173.57	Do.
Maryland	10	955,838.27	Education and general purposes.
Mississippi	4	382,335.31	General purposes.
Missouri	4	382,335.31	Education.
Michigan	3	286,751.48	Internal improvements.
New Hampshire	7	669,086.78	General purposes.
New Jersey	8	764,670.61	Do.
New York	42	4,014,520.71	Education.
North Carolina	15	1,433,757.40	Education in part, internal improvements.
Ohio	21	2,007,260.36	Education.
Pennsylvania	30	2,867,514.80	Education in part.
Rhode Island	4	382,335.31	Education.
South Carolina	11	1,051,422.09	Education one-third, general purposes two-thirds.
Tennessee	15	1,433,757.40	General purposes.
Vermont	7	669,086.78	Education.
Virginia	23	2,198,428.04	General purposes.

My own State of Connecticut used half its share for education and the other half for general purposes.

Regarding the money used for Connecticut education, a very unique town deposit fund was set up and is still in operation today. Under this system, each Connecticut town received a proportionate share of the $380,000 based on a population census, which fund was entrusted to a town custodian. The custodian is essentially a trustee for the corpus of the fund and must appropriate the entire annual income for the support of public schools. The corpus may be used as a loan fund but the money must be repaid within a year, or the town must forfeit a like sum to the State. The custodian, who is usually the town treasurer, has a duty to manage the fund wisely, and may invest, but must make annual reports to the State treasurer.

And so, in a sense, we have today, a situation similar to 1836, namely, a treasury surplus and a need for education improvements. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, what I propose is that the surplus, not all of it, but approximating the amount deemed necessary for school construction by the House Education and Labor Committee, be utilized as a direct "one shot in the arm" grant to the States for the sole purpose of constructing local schools.

Based on the type of administrative machinery created in 1836, I can see no reason why Federal aid could not be extended to public education. Clearly such a system of financial assistance would eliminate a popular criticism, that is, excessive Federal control. True, there are difficulties in a plan of this nature and although lack of time prevents the exhaustive discussion of them, here are a few:

Opponents of this plan may claim the bill would defeat the present aim to equalize national education because if distribution were made according to congressional representation, the States with larger populations would benefit more, and those are the States with the best school systems. But this disadvantage could be remedied by setting up some equitable standard of allocations to the States needing aid more critically.

Another contention: Since not all the States set up town deposit funds, as did Connecticut in 1836, the bill could not utilize the administrative framework. But the town deposit method could be set out and integrated in the bill, thus making it mandatory for each State to establish before the money is granted. There would be variations, since the Western States have differently controlled school systems.

Many will claim the surplus is mainly a result of money paid in by the individual taxpayer, and should be accordingly refunded since every taxpayer will not directly benefit by the construction of schools. But, although every taxpayer will not directly benefit, education furthers the progress of the entire Nation, including every citizen whose obligation it is to lend reasonable support. I am sure every citizen realizes this, and would be willing to support education in this manner.

Naturally, the element of Federal control superseding the existing local control over school systems is a main issue. The question is: How much supervision will the Federal Government retain in order to insure wise spending of the money? Of course, this is a procedural question and is relative to many factors. But based on the precedent of the act of 1836, I see no reason why funds could not be given directly to the States without strings, so long as they are used for school construction.

As it now stands, the Federal-aid bill grants $400 million a year for school construction and allocates this money to the States according to the number of schoolchildren, that is, 5 to 17 years. There are many among us who find it confusing and unacceptable without material alterations.

Admittedly, there are apparent mechanical difficulties in my proposal but the success of a workable solution to the Nation's educational plight insists on exhaustive but expeditious examination into all possible avenues of approach.

SPECIAL ORDER POSTPONED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for today be vacated and that I be given permission to address the House for the same length of time on tomorrow following the legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BAILEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE MICHIGAN DECLARATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, in Grand Rapids, Mich., the Democratic Party of the State of Michigan in formal convention assembled, deliberated upon and adopted the Michigan Declaration, a statement of fundamental principles and political goals. Although, by the nature of its origin, it is addressed first to the Democratic Party throughout the Nation, it is in fact written for all who have faith in democracy because it is a renewal of the spirit of America, and a militant call to action. Every American who is seriously concerned with the great turmoil of the times in which we live will recognize it as a spark that ought to start a fire in the hearts of men and women everywhere concerning a new realism about human values in worldwide economic, social, political, and spiritual relations. The pronouncements of the declaration reassert the Christian doctrines and constitutional mandates which undergird the greatness of America and ought to result in a rekindling of the zeal and resourcefulness of a great people in resolving their own problems and then reaching beyond to progress.

The Michigan Declaration is a 20th century emancipation proclamation for the entire American people. It covers foreign policy, segregation, civil rights, civil liberty, labor policy, atomic energy, automation, economic policy, agriculture, natural resources, health, education, and social security. It is a vitalized political philosophy whose diligent application can hasten us toward goals of justice, peace, and harmony, releasing Americans from the many inequities which shackle opportunities and fulfillment of needs for the family farmer, labor, minority, and other groups.

Already this statement has provoked wide comment across the Nation. We think: the Democratic Members of Congress from Michigan think it is a great document, worthy of a great political

party. It is a credo for today which we hope every American, North and South, East and West, will read well and ponder its meaning to our time. We therefore are proud to present the text of the declaration:

THE MICHIGAN DECLARATION

The Democratic Party of Michigan, in convention assembled on this June 2, 1956, declares its belief that the world is embroiled in total revolutions of great peril or promise in the affairs of men and of nations. In the true tradition of the Democratic Party, we issue a call and a challenged to meet these total revolutions with zeal, courage, and vision, with bold programs adequate to the opportunity and the need, with policies firmly based on unchanging principles of moral law.

We urge the Democratic Party in the several States and in its national entity, through the national platform we will adopt in August and through the voices of its leaders everywhere, to reject complacency and to relight with living thoughts and burning words the zeal and ardor of the American people for great accomplishments.

The mission of the Democratic Party, as the people's party, is to assess and report the needs and aspirations of the people and to be their instrument to achieve the greater tomorrows of true peace and real prosperity possible for all mankind.

The revolutions of peril and promise of which we speak are these:

The revolution of atomic energy, which, if harnessed to the benefit of all peoples, can furnish the means of achieving a goal sought by mankind from the beginning of time, namely, the end of degrading poverty and inhuman drudgery for all people everywhere.

The revolution of automation, by which material goods can be made in quantities inconceivable, and the leisure of workers to enjoy the fruits of their labor increased many fold. Through mechanization of farms, and greater seed and animal yield, food and fiber for all mankind can now be produced.

The revolution in the weapons of war. The annihilation of whole nations is possible with the weapons of today. Total war means total disaster for all contenders, aggressor and defender alike.

The revolution of anticolonialism. Since World War II millions of people have emerged or are emerging from colonial domination into national freedom. The course of history depends on whether these nations develop in the democratic philosophy of the dignity of man as created by God.

The revolution of conquest by Soviet imperialism, under which subjugated peoples from Czechoslovakia to China groan in misery and servitude. The industrialization and militarization of China under Soviet control is radically tilting the balance of power against the Western World.

The revolution of atheistic communism, an ideology which seeks the destruction of religion, the subversion of democracy by internal conspiracy and the conquest of the whole world.

The revolution of integration, as the evil pattern of segregation yields to the hammer blows of justice. This generation of Americans can and shall see the day when segregation in practice is as rare as human slavery, and as promptly prosecuted in due process of law.

The revolution of time and space, by which communications and travel have shrunk the world to such size that all men are neighbors.

The peril or promise of these revolutions cannot be met by part-time administration of half-way programs under indifferent leadership with lukewarm concern for the needs of the people.

The national Republican administration feeds Americans an opiate of complacency in these times of vast scientific and ideological turmoil. It commits a psychological betrayal of the people by not informing them of the true nature of events.

The national Republican administration has no sense of mission in world affairs, no sense of urgency in meeting the vast scientific and technological changes rolling on us, no sense of a call to greatness for the people.

Under the Republican national administration, workers are unemployed, the family farms go bankrupt, small business is depressed, public power programs wither, conservation policies are sabotaged, the aged are neglected, the education of our youth is frustrated by inadequate facilities and severe shortage of teachers, national highways are paralyzed with traffic, health needs are given lipservice, slum housing is tolerant, and from Tripoli to Shanghai peoples are in turmoil as American leadership of the free world falters.

America needs, and in her heart she wants, the fervor of our forefathers to meet the awesome challenge of a world teetering between a golden age of brotherhood and freedom on one side, and on the other, the dark night of Communist tyranny.

So long as one human being is hungry and we can feed him and do not, so long as one person is naked and we can clothe him and do not, so long as one person is sick and we can minister to him and do not, so long as one worker or farmer is deprived of a just living and we can remedy it and do not, so long as one person is unwillingly illiterate and we can educate him and do not, so long as one nation is subjugated by another against its will and we can work for freedom and do not, the American task is not done.

This Michigan declaration therefore asserts certain principles which we believe can guide the people through the perils and promise of the revolutions about us to the end of justice, freedom and peace for all mankind. Among these principles are:

1. God established the nature of man in wondrous dignity. This dignity is inherent in man and gives him certain rights—to life, to freedom, to the pursuit of happiness, rights independent of race, color, creed or national origins. These rights include ownership of property, justice under law, and the individual's right to a virtuous reputation among his fellow men unless he by specific action forfeits it. These rights apply every place in the world. They are not given by the State nor by society, and neither the State nor society can in justice take them away.

2. Man is his brother's keeper, responsible for the welfare of his fellow man to the limit of his ability.

3. The proper role of government, as Abraham Lincoln said, is to do for the people those things needing to be done which the people cannot do at all, or do as well for themselves. Conversely, government should leave to other associations of people, associations of labor and management, for example, or of consumers, and to individuals, those things which the people concerned can better do for themselves.

4. Communism and all other forms of totalitarian suppression are intrinsically evil and cannot be made right by historical or current circumstance.

5. The goods of the earth belong to the peoples of the earth. Neither any man nor any nation has the right to exploit the goods of the earth solely to his or its own aggrandizement.

6. The right of nations to democratic national existence, independence and self-determination shall be recognized by the United States, while concurrently we work ceaselessly to strengthen the United Nations, and to increase its influence and power to act.

7. A political or social policy of segregation is evil and is not made morally right by circumstances.

8. The fulfillment of man's rights requires civil order; civil order requires obedience to law; the decisions of the United States Supreme Court are the law of the United States, unless changed in proper process. The clear words of Gov. G. Mennen Williams precisely express this point:

"In our Democratic philosophy, the ringing words of the Declaration of Independence are more than pretty phrases. All men are created equal, are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. We can have no part of the corrosive doctrine that any American, rich or poor, colored or white, native-born or naturalized, north or south, east or west—can be one whit less than a full citizen. * * *

"We know that this is an ideal toward which we strive, not a condition which we enjoy. But this idea can never be realized unless we stand unrelentingly for the principles that the Constitution must be the law of the land, everywhere in the land; that no part of the Nation may be permitted to say it is not the law for them; that the President may not ignore enforcement, nor Congress support evasion."

On the foundation of these principles, and in the light of the great revolutionary changes for good or for evil apparent about us, we declare that the Democratic Party should assert bold, aggressive leadership through its national platform, and through the voices of its leaders to achieve these ends in these areas:

FOREIGN POLICY

The moral leadership of the Democratic Presidents of this century, from the fourteen points of Wilson and the four freedoms of Roosevelt to the point 4 program of Truman, gave new hope for the better life to the people of every land. We need now a forceful and meaningful reaffirmation of the great truths of our Declaration of Independence and of our Bill of Rights. Freedom, material sufficiency, and government by law for all peoples everywhere on earth should be the clear goal of our foreign policy.

SEGREGATION

The total elimination of segregation in the United States and the immediate end of discrimination in immigration.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Full rights of citizenship without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin, and immediate prosecution of any person who violates the civil rights of another any place in the land.

CIVIL LIBERTY

Protection of men and institutions against false smears and slanders; reaffirmation and support of the right of dissent, and of the right of the accused to face his accuser.

LABOR POLICY

The Republican philosophy expressed in the Taft-Hartley law that unions are barely to be tolerated shall be reversed and the growth of unions shall be encouraged to achieve equal bargaining power with management.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Since atomic energy was developed by the people at large through their Government, private exploitation of atomic energy shall be rigorously controlled in the public interest, and the incalculable potential of this power shall never be used for private advantage over public good. The export of atomic energy for peaceful use to underdeveloped nations of the world shall be energetically pursued.

AUTOMATION

For the welfare of all our people individually, and for the strength of the Nation, we welcome automation for the good that it can

do, and we believe government must facilitate the transition of industry and workers into an automated economy as rapidly as possible, and with the greatest possible protection against dislocation of individuals and business. The prodigious wealth of goods and services available through automation must be fairly distributed. A total review of all existing labor legislation, business legislation, and taxation should immediately be undertaken to assure to the people the advantages of the current revolution in energy and production.

ECONOMIC POLICY

Government has a dynamic responsibility to assist all the people to achieve the economic growth made possible by new science and skills and to see that there is equitable participation in that progress. In the expanding economy we anticipate, there is need for government to maintain competitive balance between business, labor, farmers, and consumers; between large enterprises, which are especially benefited by automation and atomic energy, and small ones; between areas benefiting from new developments and areas that may suffer disadvantages. We must protect small and independent business establishments against the crushing power of economic giantism. Tax policy needs to consider requirements for investment funds for new technical developments, the encouragement of small enterprises, and the purchasing power of consumers. The growth of industry will create great demands for credit, which, unless care is taken, will go to large enterprises and leave small ones at great competitive disadvantage. Expansion, taking place in waves, tends to create booms and subsequent recessions; government will need to supply the balance wheel to avoid both. Above all, we need a climate of opinion wherein growth is welcomed because there is assurance that there will be equitable participation in economic progress by every segment of the population.

AGRICULTURE

Competitive equality for the family farmer with the giant corporate farmer and programs to assure farmers of the opportunity to share in a rising standard of living. Recognition in farm policies of the unique nature of the farmer's risk and the need of others for his work in providing food and fiber.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The technological and power revolution requires planning for a century ahead in the development and conservation of natural resources. Protection of public domains, judicial use of mineral resources, and promotion of public power, flood control, irrigation, forest and soil conservation, public recreation, all must be geared to best judgments of a hundred years' needs.

HEALTH

Adequate hospital and medical care for everyone, for any illness, including mental illness, with the cost to be met by public and private insurance, supplemented by public reinsurance of disaster-type losses. Multifold increases in national expenditures for medical research, with particular attention to preventive medicine; expansion of medical training in all forms.

EDUCATION

Complete opportunity for every child to a full education commensurate with his ability at public expense in modern, safe schools staffed by teachers and administrators paid in proportion to the immense importance of their vocation. Federal aid to achieve this goal in any school district obeying the laws of the United States.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The aged, persons unable to work because of illness or injury, widows and minor children shall be provided through private and public insurance with adequate income to maintain their dignity as human beings, their health, and their opportunity to happiness and comfort. We assert that social-security programs are a proper function of Government and should be expanded in every aspect.

In conclusion, in this century the Democratic Party brought about fundamental reforms in the role of government in American life. These reforms were more than mere political stopgaps to meet emergencies; they were a peaceful revolution of everlasting consequence for this Nation and for the world. Among the many such reforms we cite these representative examples:

The concept that government has a deep responsibility in the social security of the people.

The concept of the Wagner Act, rightly called labor's Magna Carta, that free associations of workingmen into unions should be encouraged as a national policy to the end that labor and management might bargain on equal footing.

The concept that the family farm must be protected against the impersonal workings of the market.

The concept that government has a fundamental responsibility to the people in maintaining and advancing a full economy with full employment.

The concept that isolationism is basically defective as a foreign policy and that the United States must participate in the world community of nations for the advancement of freedom and the protection of human rights throughout the world; and the concept of the United Nations as a means to achieve these ends.

The concept that public power development where needed is a proper and necessary responsibility for the Government in the name of all the people.

The concept that recessions and depressions must be remedied by prompt Government action in the name of the whole people.

Many young Americans have no personal memory of how comprehensive a turnabout of American policy these concepts represent. In each instance, the Republican Party worked under policies of exactly opposite concepts. In result, the United States experienced its worst economic depression; and in the world arena, the American voice was muted by the narrow, restrictive, selfish policy of Republican isolationism, expressed in actions ranging from withholding support for the League of Nations to gigantic tariff walls barring foreign trade.

The Democratic Party must renew the great concepts with which it is identified, protect them against betrayal and reversal, enlarge their scope to make Government grow in service to the people. And we must go further:

To a new foreign policy, based not on mere reaction to the changing masks of Soviet imperialism and communism, but based on dynamic application of our Declaration of Independence and of our Bill of Rights to all mankind, on the export of our freedom and of our moral principles.

To a regearing of economic policies and programs for the second industrial revolution of atomic energy and automation. "We are in the midst of the greatest scientific and technological revolution ever known," Governor Williams said in January. "The face * * * of our whole continent will be made over within the next few years—made over for good or for bad, depending entirely upon the vision and the courage with which we face up to the challenge which confronts us, the greatest challenge ever to face any people anywhere in all history."

To a full facing of the integration of peoples, in the United States and in the world, not only because morality requires it, though this be reason enough, but also because it is inseparably a part of achieving material progress and a just and lasting peace.

The choice lies "not in our stars but in ourselves" to fulfill our destiny.

"As God gives us to see the right" in Lincoln's words, let us rise to the great tasks yet undone. Let justice be our shield, freedom our garment, brotherhood our strength, and peace on earth and well-being of mankind our constant goal.

Adopted by the Democratic Party of Michigan, Democratic State convention, June 2, 1956, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the principles asserted by the Michigan declaration touch upon a number of subjects with which I have been very closely related. My work with the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives has made me particularly aware of the impact that the harnessing of the atom will have upon all of our lives.

Unfortunately, many people think our atomic-energy program is devoted principally to the design and production of weapons and military devices. While it is true that the military program has consumed the major portion of the expenditures to date, the Government has also spent sizable sums for the development of reactors for research and industrial uses; for physical research and for applications in biology and medicine. When I speak of sizable sums, I am talking about millions of dollars which even today is a large amount of money. By the end of this coming fiscal year, the Government will have spent in excess of $15 billion for work with the atom.

This force, which this expenditure has produced, has already done much for us from the security standpoint. What it can do for us in the future defies imagination. There are miracles within our reach in medicine and science, production, and power. I am convinced that our investment will pay us off by giving us great medical and agricultural benefits and by revolutionizing industrial methods.

The contribution already made to health, one of the revolutions of promise, already has been tremendous. Brain tumors can be pinpointed by tracers, radio iodine arrests thyroid disorders, liver ailments can be detected and atom radiation curbs cancer. Atomic diagnosis has given hope to people with ailments once thought to be fatal. An intravenous injection of isotopes into a man's arm makes the functioning of the entire blood system visible. Though atomic science's contribution to our health has been great, there is no question but that it is in its infancy. Its future possibilities are immense.

Industry has already used radiation to toughen plastics, and tracers to help industrial efficiency by making measurements economically and quickly that once were costly and time consuming. Food preservation without refrigeration may soon be commonplace. Already it has been estimated that a billion dollars has been saved in the area of industrial use alone.

When or how soon economical atomic energy will be developed is not a question on which there is complete agreement.

There is nearly unanimous agreement that it is inevitable. We do have the comforting knowledge that if our coal and oil supplies are exhausted, we have a potential source of power that is practically limitless. We have the hope and a very reasonable one that a very cheap source of power is, in relative terms, just around the corner.

I personally am confident that we will have the wisdom to use for the benefit of all this law of nature which God has permitted us to discover. Surely He intended the unselfish to use it for the benefit of all.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I join with my Democratic colleague from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS] in urging the Members of the House to seriously consider and approve the Michigan declaration of policy. It is based on forward-looking democratic principles and is designed to give our Nation a progressive program designed to produce true peace and real prosperity for our country and for all mankind.

Other Members from Michigan have or will comment on some of the many important features of this declaration. I would particularly like to call to the Members' attention the clear, forthright and indisputable position taken on the important problem of civil rights.

Segregation has been outlawed by the Supreme Court of the United States. Its decisions are the law of the land and there can be no legal or moral excuse for failure to abide by those laws unless and until they are changed through proper processes.

The Michigan declaration calls for action for restoration of the inalienable God-given rights of every individual "to life, to freedom, to the pursuit of happiness, rights independent of race, color, creed or national origin." Can anyone sincerely dispute that right?

Governor Williams, of Michigan, has said about this:

> We know that this is an ideal toward which we strive, not a condition which we enjoy. But this idea can never be realized unless we stand unrelentingly for the principles that the Constitution must be the law of the land, everywhere in the land; that no part of the Nation may be permitted to say it is not the law for them; that the President may not ignore enforcement, nor Congress support evasion.

How can we in Congress justify our position if we fail to act on the civil-rights bill, H. R. 627, which has been voted out of the Judiciary Committee? That bill does not contain all the provisions needed to bring about all the progress that is needed in the field of civil rights. But it is a step in the right direction. It provides for a Commission on Civil Rights which would be empowered to investigate injustices. It provides for an additional assistant attorney general to take charge of civil-rights work and authorizes him to bring civil actions in Federal court to prevent or redress practices which violate civil-rights statutes.

On June 5, our colleague from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] has filed a discharge petition which would in effect make it possible for the House to take a decisive vote on this legislation. I am happy to say that I have placed my signature as the second on that petition, immediately after that of Mr. ROOSEVELT.

I urge my colleagues, regardless of party, to sign that petition. This is our opportunity to demonstrate how sincere we are when we speak of our faith and adherence to the lofty principles of our Nation, whether we really do believe in equal rights for all. If we are to keep faith with the millions of Americans and with all the free people of the world who look to us for leadership, we should demonstrate our sincerity by action. This is the time for all true believers in civil rights to stand up and be counted.

Once again, I wish to state that I am proud of the fact that the Democratic Party in Michigan has, by adopting the Michigan declaration, demonstrated its adherence to all those principles which have made that party a great party and a party of the people.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the money and credit policy of the Federal Government plays a vital role in the economic health of the Nation. We are now witnessing the unfortunate effects of a wrong decision on credit policy by the Federal Reserve Board—a repeat performance of the hard-money policy that meant misery to so many families in this country in 1953 shortly after this administration came to power.

We now see residential housing starts sharply reduced, an increasingly high discount rate for mortgages eliminating many families from the housing market, an unusual difficulty on the part of small business to obtain expansion loans at moderate interest rates, a severe recession in the auto industry because, among other things, credit policies have put potential buyers out of the market.

These hardships would have been avoided had the principles of the Michigan declaration been followed.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recent events highlight the timeliness of the civil-liberties principle of the Michigan declaration issued 2 weeks ago. This is a most appropriate time to examine the conduct of loyalty, security, and suitability programs with respect to Federal employees.

The last time I looked, the Bill of Rights was still a part of our Constitution. Yet, the spirit, if not the letter, of this great charter of human rights has been ignored in the so-called security program of the present administration.

There is spread on the record of the last 3 years a shameful blot on the Federal civil service. The myth of the notorious numbers game has been exploded. False and misleading statistics, put forth by public officials, reflected on the loyalty of not only the individuals involved but our great body of civil servants. They have been exposed and proved false. Willfully or through ignorance, it was a patent attempt to confuse loyalty, security, and unsuitability with political figures.

The technique of the "big lie" is a well-known tool of those who would destroy individual liberties.

Unfortunately, though the numbers racket is thoroughly repudiated, the harm it did is irreparable. No one knows how many innocent people will go through life under the shadow of suspicion of their loyalty—simply because of overzealous and indiscriminate labeling of all Federal employee separations in a manner reflecting on loyalty, to gain political advantage.

To achieve this result, laws enacted to protect the United States and at the same time guarantee against unjust invasion of individual rights have been maladministered. Public Law 733 of the 81st Congress is one such law. This legislation was reported by our House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Its history shows that it certainly never was intended for this purpose.

The recent Supreme Court decisions and statements of Mr. Harry P. Cain, of the Subversive Activities Control Board, are final proof of the manner in which the present administration has garbled the loyalty and security program in regard to Federal employment. The right to be heard in answer to charges and to face one's accusers is fundamental to our democratic way of life.

The administration has made no clear distinction between those separated for disloyalty, security, and unsuitability. Lasting misunderstandings have been created in the public mind and in official circles. There still exists a widespread and unhealthy state of public misconception that "security risk" and "disloyalty"—and even "unsuitability" imply one and the same thing.

To use the security program for political purposes, as the present administration has done, subverts our basic American principle of justice for the individual and raises serious concern about the future course of our country, for when justice is thrown out the window, fascism and communism are more likely to come in the door. The Federal employee security program was enacted for the protection of the Nation, not for the purpose of punishing and stigmatizing those who do not think the same as another individual or one political party. It was never meant to be the punitive law that it has become under the present administration.

I hold no brief for those who would truly endanger the security of our Nation, but we must be ever alert not to destroy our personal civil liberties by condoning the actions of the present administration in its handling of the security program. We have seen too many alarming signs that the present officials at the head of our Government appear to be more concerned with their political futures than with the basic principles upon which our country was founded. We have seen one sign in the recent action of the Post Office Department which tried to impose a gag rule, although it is now claimed to have been inadvertently done, on its employees to prevent them from exercising their rights to freedom

of speech and to petition for redress of their grievances, rights which have been guaranteed them under our Constitution. However inadvertent this may have been it reflects a basic thinking which bodes ill for the individual.

The present situation is intolerable. There may not be time remaining in this session to clean up the mess. Therefore, I strongly urge that corrective legislation for our loyalty and security program be the first order of business in the next Congress.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, speaking as a Michigan citizen and as a Representative of the Sixth District of that State, I am proud of the Michigan declaration which our distinguished colleague [Mr. DIGGS] has drawn to the attention of the House. I would like to mention one point of especial interest to me as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That is the matter of health, including mental health.

Over the Nation today there is a general recognition of the fact that we need more doctors. We hear, perhaps, of a family that cannot find a physician willing to come to their home. Perhaps we know of a community of some size, or perhaps a county, with no resident doctor at all. But, unfortunately, the typical citizen is not greatly alarmed. He may look upon certain situations as being unfortunate, but, for the most part, he puts the need for more doctors in the same class of social inconvenience as the underdevelopment of our highway system.

We ought not look on the shortage of doctors as the mere growing pains of a burgeoning civilization. The increase in the number of doctors being graduated is not keeping up with the growth of our population. At the same time, however, our need for trained medical personnel is increasing. Take, for example, the whole field of psychiatry. To be a psychiatrist, one must first be trained as a doctor of medicine. For all practical purposes we may say that there were no psychiatrists fifty years ago. Until very recently society scarcely knew how to make use of psychiatry. But, today, the field is coming into its own. Society could make good use of ten times the number of psychiatrists that we now have.

We have urgent need for doctors of medicine in the field of public health. Thousands of positions are budgeted over the country in public health for which there are no available candidates.

Consider, also, the field of industrial medicine. Large industrial concerns are coming to find more and more need for doctors in their plants—not merely to do first-aid work. That is a minor part of industrial medicine. Enlightened management wants to know scientifically the effects of certain jobs and certain working conditions on the health of workers. Management would like to know more specifically what physical tests should be given candidates for jobs. Management wants to know more about the effect of increasing age upon the ability to do various kinds of work. In spite of the fact that there's a great new field of industrial medicine, it can scarcely be touched because of the shortage of doctors.

But perhaps the greatest increase in the need for doctors is that our population wants, and feels it is entitled to have more medical attention. Throughout most of the world today children are brought into the world with the aid of midwives. In America we take for granted the need for skilled obstetricians. When I was a boy and stepped on a rusty nail, it never occurred to do more than wash the wound and perhaps wrap a strip of cloth around my foot. Today we look for some protection against infection—perhaps even inoculation.

Each year millions of Americans are given physical examination of one kind or another by well qualified physicians—perhaps it is in connection with their jobs, or their school; perhaps it is a widespread effort to discover tuberculosis or cancer in an early stage, or perhaps it is a regular, yearly checkup so widely advocated.

So it is that we in America are constantly raising our standards of health. We feel the need for doctors of medicine in more and more ways. But despite this increasing need, there is no comparable increase in the supply of doctors. And for the foreseeable future we shall continue to see public health, industrial medicine, and psychiatry continue to be throttled—to say nothing of the increasing needs of our families. Our State and National Government should develop more medical schools to supply these pressing needs.

But I should like to draw special attention to the great national need for attention to mental health. Recently I have read that outstanding book by Mike Gorman, executive director of the National Mental Health Committee, entitled "Every Other Bed." Legislators both in the State and National Governments ought to be familiar with the message of this book. The point of the title, "Every Other Bed," is that every other hospital bed in the United States is occupied by a mental case. On the jacket of this book is the statement, carefully documented throughout the volume, that mental illness costs this country 2½ billion dollars a year. In addition many people are suffering from mental disturbance, but for whom there is no room in any mental hospital.

We now know that there are vast possibilities for improvements in the treatment of mental illness. Tens of thousands of individuals who not only suffer themselves, but whose families likewise suffer, could be relieved, if not remedied, if only we had the skilled workers and the facilities to reach them. And many more tens of thousands could undoubtedly be treated with success by methods which now lie partly discovered, and need only further research to verify, to refine, and to make available for wider use.

And this is where Government comes in. I am proud of what the Democratic Party has done in the many fields of health. Traditionally ours has been the party of leadership in this legislation. I am glad to see in the Michigan declaration a continued concern for an ever-deepening interest and activity in this field so vital and so important to the happiness of our people.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to wholeheartedly associate myself with the statements made on the Michigan declaration by my colleague from our beloved State of Michigan.

That document is an expression of the Democratic Party of our State in the principles of the Constitution as construed by the Supreme Court, the body lawfully and constitutionally charged with the construction of that great document and the laws of our beloved country.

The Michigan declaration pledges our Democratic Party in the State of Michigan to unending efforts by constitutional and lawful means to secure full equality for all of our citizens, regardless of race, creed, color, or country of origin. It further commits us to seek legislation, at the earliest date possible to implement the recent so-called school cases where the Supreme Court overthrew the separate-but-equal doctrine. Under its language, with which I completely agree, we are going to seek such other implementing legislation as will guarantee full and equal rights to all our citizens in all fields.

It is pursuant to that policy that all our delegation has signed the discharge petition recently filed by our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] to bring before this Congress H. R. 627, the civil-rights omnibus bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

But the document goes further, it apprises the world of our position on foreign affairs, the approach to the problems of the new and developing world, among them automation, and the use of the new science of the atom.

It declares that we intend to make the policy of our party to serve to the fullest the needs of all our citizens. To do this we propose more housing for our people, more and better social-security benefits for the protection of our aged, and wise, and careful use of national credit and fiscal policy which promises prosperity if wisely used.

In conclusion, I hope that all will read this document, and I hope further that the Democratic Party of the Nation, and the Congress and people of our beloved country will espouse the principles of the Michigan declaration, and use it as a guidepost for peace, prosperity, and happiness for all our citizens for all time.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mrs. ROGERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HESELTON, for 20 minutes on Friday and on Tuesday of next week.

Mr. O'NEILL, for 20 minutes, on Thursday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. SULLIVAN and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KELLY of New York and include extraneous material.

Mr. SHEEHAN.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Mr. ALLEN of California and include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 40. An act for the relief of Mrs. William A. Curran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 911. An act for the relief of Eftalia G. Stathis and Ariadni Vassiliki G. Stathis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1104. An act for the relief of Zoltan Klar and his wife, Vilma Hartmann Klar, and their minor son, Tibor Klar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1324. An act for the relief of Salvatore di Morello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1627. An act for the relief of Alexander Orlov and his wife, Maria Orlov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1869. An act for the relief of George Papoulias and Irene Papoulias (nee Birbilis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1893. An act for the relief of Harold D. Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1921. An act for the relief of Ileana Issarescu and her children, Maria Ileana Habsburg-Lothringen and Alexandra Habsburg-Lothringen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2069. An act for the relief of Hsu Jen-Yuan, also known as Joseph Jen-Yuan Hsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2229. An act for the relief of Nina Greenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2294. An act for the relief of Oscar Beregi and Margareth Leiss von Laimburg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2342. An act for the relief of Yvonne Rohran (Tung) Feng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2530. An act to repeal the authority of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to issue bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2585. An act to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2586. An act for the relief of Annie Feig Hildebrand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2793. An act for the relief of Waclaw Tadeusz Nowosielski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2800. An act for the relief of David Chih-Wei Kwok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2805. An act for the relief of Harriet E. Van Tassel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2827. An act for the relief of Hazel Elizabeth Scott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2842. An act for the relief of Toini Margareta Heino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2864. An act for the relief of Waltraud Grete Schramm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2943. An act for the relief of Moses Rakocinski (Rakoczynski); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2954. An act for the relief of Christina Arutjuenjan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2959. An act for the relief of Edith Johanna Augusta Kienest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2999. An act for the relief of Modesto Padilla-Ceja and his wife, Maria Toscano-Padilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3000. An act for the relief of Francesco Zammuto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3009. An act for the relief of Kiyoshi Kinoshita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3024. An act for the relief of Donald Shang-Pek Kao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3032. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the middle Atlantic interstate forest fire protection compact; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3100. An act for the relief of Marianne Eder Dunbar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3120. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3145. An act to require the Bureau of the Census to develop farm income data by economic class of farm; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3208. An act for the relief of Moses Rosenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3212. An act for the relief of Sita Koppaka Rao and Vijayalakshmi Koppaka Rao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3235. An act for the relief of Cleopatra Vasiliades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3314. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3344. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Territory of Alaska certain lands in the city of Sitka, known as Baranof Castle site; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3402. An act for the relief of Roberto C. Bargas and Rosenda C. Bargas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3430. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3527. An act authorizing the State Highway Commission of the State of Maine to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 3559. An act to amend the act of August 31, 1954, as amended, so as to extend the availability of emergency credit to farmers and stockmen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3579. An act for the relief of Elizabeth M. A. de Cuevas Faure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3620. An act to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 3681. An act to modify certain restrictions with respect to holding more than one office under the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3698. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1920, as amended, providing for allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3723. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey certain land in the county of Alameda, Calif., and to accept other land in exchange therefor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3778. An act to amend the act for the protection of walruses; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3907. An act to amend section 345 of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3958. An act to improve the health of the people by assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses and professional public health personnel, assisting in the development of improved methods of care and treatment in the field of mental health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. J. Res. 178. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation to provide for certain costs of United States participation in the Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 692. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for peace";

H. R. 1482. An act for the relief of Santiago Gonzalez Trigo;

H. R. 1484. An act for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ann Elizabeth Doherty;

H. R. 2045. An act for the relief of Joe Bargas;

H. R. 3744. An act to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to substitute employees in the postal field service;

H. R. 4873. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Mortimer T. Clement, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired;

H. R. 5079. An act for the relief of Tom Wong (Foo Tai Nam);

H. R. 7702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Shenekji;

H. R. 7913. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to effect the exchange of properties between the United States and the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo.;

H. R. 8709. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended;

H. R. 9475. An act to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 9838. An act to authorize transfer of officers of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve to the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10721. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 565. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 581. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 590. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 607. Joint resolution to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 872. An act for the relief of Sam Bergesen;

S. 910. An act for the relief of Lino Perez Martinez;

S. 1067. An act for the relief of Tilbor Horvath; and

S. 1221. An act for the relief of the estate of Joseph Kelsch.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 692. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for Peace";

H. R. 1402. An act for the relief of Santiago Gonzalez Trigo;

H. R. 1484. An act for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty;

H. R. 2045. An act for the relief of Joe Bargas;

H. R. 3744. An act to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to substitute employees in the postal field service;

H. R. 4873. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Mortimer T. Clement, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired;

H. R. 5079. An act for the relief of Tom Wong (Foo Tai Nam);

H. R. 7702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Shenekji;

H. R. 7913. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to effect the exchange of properties between the United States and the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo.;

H. R. 8709. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended;

H. R. 9475. An act to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 9838. An act to authorize transfer of officers of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve to the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10721. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 565. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 581. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 590. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 607. Joint resolution to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 14, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1962. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 17, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the Ohio River and its tributaries requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on June 26, 1952, with a view to determining what protective works are advisable at this time to prevent further erosive action at and in the vicinity of Gallipolis, Ohio (H. Doc. No. 423); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1963. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize and direct the transfer of certain Federal property to the government of American Samoa"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1964. A letter from the Attorney General, relative to the awarding of the Young American Medal for Bravery to Miss Patricia Ann Strickland, of Atlanta, Ga., by the President of the United States at the White House on April 6, 1956, for bravery in rescuing her mother from the wreckage of a burning airplane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1965. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, relative to additional information relating to the case of Victor Wen-Hwa Chu, A-6986548, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1966. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, relative to an order entered in the case of Ashun Yung, A-4196469, relating to rescission of adjustment of status granted this individual, pursuant to section 246 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. 1256 (a)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1967. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1957 and prior fiscal years in the amount of $3 million as increased Federal payment to the District of Columbia and $18,358,310 out of District of Columbia funds (H. Doc. No. 424); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1968. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Army industrial fund, Maintenance and Industrial Division, Jeffersonville Quartermaster Depot, Quartermaster Corps, Department of the Army, for the period July 1, 1952, to March 31, 1955; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1969. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1957"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 11611. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Pea Ridge National Military Park, in the State of Arkansas, without amendment (Rept. No. 2346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 9591. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1037), relating to the acquisition of non-Federal land within the existing boundaries of any national park, and for other purposes, with amendment (Rept. No. 2347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 584. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to the Customs Court, without amendment (Rept. No. 2348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 977. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to duties of judges of the United States Court of Claims, without amendment (Rept. No. 2349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. S. 2771. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Fourth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2350). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. S. 2772. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in England in 1957; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURDICK. Committee on the Judiciary. S. 218. An act for the relief of the town of Clayton, N. Mex., without amendment (Rept. No. 2353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9500. A bill to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 10184. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey property to the county of Pierce, Wash.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2355). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 10964. A bill to provide for municipal use of storage water in Benbrook Dam, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 11695. A bill to extend until June 30, 1958, the programs of financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities under the provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and to make certain other changes in such provisions; without amendment (Rept. No. 2357). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 639. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. 2352). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 11740. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 11741. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 11742. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 11743. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 11744. A bill to amend the act providing for the construction of the Markham Ferry project in Oklahoma in order to authorize additional flood storage and pool elevations as approved by the Chief of Engineers; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 11745. A bill to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 11746. A bill to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 11747. A bill to amend section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950 so that it will apply to taxable years ending in 1954 to which the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 11748. A bill to facilitate the making of lease-purchase agreements by the Administrator of General Services under the Public Buildings Act of 1949, as amended, and by the Postmaster General under the Post Office Department Property Act of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 11749. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Clallam County, Wash., to the State Forest Board of Washington; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 11750. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Clallam County, Wash., to the State Forest Board of Washington; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 11751. A bill to establish on public lands of the United States a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of areas within this System by existing Federal agencies and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 11752. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 26, 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 11753. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 11754. A bill to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instructional material for the blind, to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 11755. A bill to determine the need for boat basins in the Apalachicola River, Fla., in the vicinity of Bristol and in the vicinity of Blountstown; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 11756. A bill to amend the acts of February 28, 1903, and March 3, 1927, relating to the payment of the cost and expense of constructing railway-highway grade elimination structures in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 11757. A bill to amend Public Law No. 298, 84th Congress relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Commission and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 11758. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land by the United States to the Cape Flattery School District in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 11759. A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide that allowances may be paid thereunder for the transportation of dependents in connection with a permanent change of station whether or not a change of residence is involved; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 11760. A bill to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 11761. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, with respect to certain unfair methods of competition and certain unfair practices in the distribution of new motor vehicles in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. R. 11762. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the purpose of aiding small- and medium-sized business, encouraging industrial expansion, encouraging competition, counteracting forces growing out of the present tax structure which are bringing about widespread corporate mergers and consolidations, and for the purpose of discouraging the growing concentration of business into a few giant corporations, by substituting for the nearly uniform tax rates now applicable to corporations of vastly differing sizes a moderate graduation of tax rates on corporate incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 11763. A bill to exempt from the tax on club dues amounts paid with respect to any nonprofit neighborhood swimming pool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 11764. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York (by request):

H. R. 11765. A bill to amend subchapter B of chapter 28 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 11766. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Horse Shoe Bend National Military Park, in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 11767. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans, U. S. A., National Memorial, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11768. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Con. Res. 251. Concurrent resolution authorizing reprinting of House Document No. 210 of the 83d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H. Con. Res. 252. Concurrent resolution for the establishment of a joint congressional committee to review the foreign military and economic assistance programs of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. Con. Res. 253. Concurrent resolution for the establishment of a joint congressional committee to review the foreign military and economic assistance programs of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. Res. 536. Resolution to provide for a flag for the Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H. Res. 537. Resolution to provide for a flag for the Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. Res. 538. Resolution to provide for the creation of an international food and raw materials reserve; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. Res. 539. Resolution establishing a flag for each Member of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 11769. A bill to provide for the advancement of W. O. Charles Burger, United States Army (retired), to the grade of chief warrant officer on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 11770. A bill for the relief of Way Tong Jung, Kin Koo Jung, Chor Yen Jung, Koo Ming Jung, and Poy Kee Jung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 11771. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine M. Castle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS (by request):

H. R. 11772. A bill for the relief of Ramon R. Minjares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11773. A bill for the relief of Pilar A. Centeno, M. D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 11774. A bill for the relief of Eric Forsyth Burtis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 11775. A bill for the relief of Jose Guadalupe Gonzales Rodriguez, also known as Lupe Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 11776. A bill for the relief of Maria Crocitto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11777. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Inga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11778. A bill for the relief of Francesco Di Lorenzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 11779. A bill for the relief of Alberto Teodoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 11780. A bill for the relief of Mikiko Uemura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11781. A bill for the relief of Salamon Jakab; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (by request):

H. R. 11782. A bill for the relief of Bernardo Prano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 11783. A bill for the relief of Alphonsus Ludovicus Rosalia Van Den Berghe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 11784. A bill for the relief of Miguel Barrenechea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 11785. A bill for the relief of Jang Ngoon Tom, also known as Doon Wee Tom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11786. A bill for the relief of Ismael Carrillo-Robles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. Res. 540. Resolution to provide for sending the bill H. R. 7740 and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1136. By Mr. BRAY: Petition of 241 persons of Monroe County, Ind., in favor of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1137. Also, petition of 37 persons of Greene County, Ind., in favor of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1138. By Mrs. CHURCH: Petition of the Advisory Board of Livestock Commissioners of the State of Illinois urging the Congress of the United States and the United States Department of Agriculture to locate the proposed animal disease laboratory in the State of Illinois and more specifically in the vicinity of the University of Illinois College of Veterinary Medicine and the agricultural experiment station; to the Committee on Agriculture.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Problem of East Prussia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian American Council in America has furnished me with the following facts which I feel are noteworthy.

In his speech of February 8, 1956, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] called attention "to one of the great tragedies and gross injustices in the wake of those agreements of Yalta and Potsdam, resulting in the present separation from Germany of East Prussia and the expulsion of its population of 2,519,000 people."

I wish to draw the attention of the House to the vital interests of one nation in the problem of East Prussia which the gentleman from Tennessee has omitted in his remarks; namely, those of the Lithuanian nation. East Prussia was, at Potsdam, not only separated from Germany, but also divided into two parts—the southern part being placed under the administration of the Polish state, the northern part under that of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Although this decision was only provisional "pending the final determination of territorial questions at the peace settlement," the Soviet Government has, one-sidedly and illegally, incorporated that part of East Prussia into the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic, naming it "Kaliningradskaja oblast."

Furthermore, it has completely Russified and bolshevized a territory which never belonged to Russia and was never inhabited by Russians. Having murdered, deported, and expelled that part of the original population which did not succeed in escaping the horrors of war and Russian occupation, the Soviet Government deliberately depleted the country of a population which had been living there for centuries and, as far as the population of Lithuanian origin is concerned, even since immemorial times. This population has been replaced by Russian soldiers and settlers, forcibly driven into a country to which they have no title except that of Russian inhumanity and brutality.

This is, of course, no final settlement of the problem of the northern part of East Prussia. On the contrary, a new human and political problem of particularly great dimensions has been created which one day has to be solved at the peace settlement.

Whatever the decision may be—the solution will not be found in the maintenance of the present status or in the restoration of the status prior to World War II. The conditions have already been changed—and probably will change—too radically.

Whatever the implications and elements of the decision may be—no solution will be just and definite which satisfies only one-sided revisionistic aims of one party concerned. The solution will have to take into account the interests of all parties directly concerned with the problem. The Lithuanian nation has so definitely the most vital concern in what the final settlement of the problem is going to be.

Since immemorial times, this part of East Prussia has been inhabited by the old Prussians—Borussians—and their kinsmen, the Lithuanians. It was conquered and subjugated by the German Knights of the Order of the Cross in the 13th and 14th centuries. It was under the vassalage of Poland and the Lithuanian-Polish Commonwealth for 2 centuries before it became part of the German Empire.

Through many generations the Lithuanian nation was a direct and active participant in the fight of the inhabitants for their freedom and independence. By united Lithuanian and Polish forces the knights were crushingly defeated at the battle of Grunewald in 1410, which stopped the German Drangnach Ostem for centuries. Subsequently Lithuania, under the leadership of its ruler Vytautas, settled her old border problem with the knights in 1422, drawing a kind of a demarcation line through Lithuanian territory which became the eastern boundary of East Prussia for 500 years until it, in 1919 at Versailles, was partly changed in favor of Lithuania; the territory north of the River Nemunas—Memel—was separated from Germany because of its still predominantly Lithuanian character and its close economic ties to Lithuania proper.

During centuries of their struggle for freedom and against slavery the old Prussians disappeared as a nation, leaving only their name to their conquerors. But the ethnic character of the northern part of East Prussia, now under Russian administration, remained Lithuanian until World War II. First in 1938, Hitler, under a supposedly final attempt to eradicate the most evident and significant proof of the Lithuanian character of the territory, changed the names of cities, localities, rivers, and so forth, into German ones.

The greater part of the territory surrounds the estuary of the River Nemunas flowing from Lithuania proper into the Baltic Sea. It connects Lithuania economically and geographically with the world. The economy of the country, its system of waterways and railway lines, is most closely connected with that of Lithuania and vice versa. It is the most vital part of Lithuania and its immediate vicinity as a geographic unit.

The problem of the northern part of East Prussia, therefore, directly affects

the vital interests of the Lithuanian nation by reason of its history, its ethnic character, its economic relations, and its geographic vicinity. The Government of the United States, as well as any other government responsible for the just solution of the problem of East Prussia, will be well advised to recognize these vital interests of the Lithuanian nation, and consequently her natural and undeniable right to actively participate in any consideration and decision concerning the political fate of East Prussia.

Schedule of Courthouse Visits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my practice to afford the residents of the 15th District of Ohio, whom I have the honor to represent, an opportunity to confer and talk with their Representative in Congress as often as possible.

In the past, I have established a schedule of courthouse visits and have announced that schedule as far in advance as possible. In so doing, residents of the district will know well in advance when they will have opportunities for such conferences.

Members of Congress receive many letters from constituents, and a great amount of assistance can be rendered through the use of correspondence, but there are some problems and some difficulties that cannot be adequately taken care of through the mails. I have found that these courthouse conferences not only permit constituents to bring their problems to their Congressman, but also the conference provides the Congressman with an opportunity to find out the needs and reactions of the people whom he represents.

After Congress adjourns I will be at the courthouse of each of the seven counties of the 15th District from 9 a. m. to 4 p. m., in accordance with the following schedule:

Perry County, August 6.
Muskingum County, August 7.
Monroe County, August 8.
Noble County, August 13.
Washington County, August 14.
Morgan County, August 20.
Guernsey County, August 21.

No appointment is needed, and I urge any individual or group to meet with me on the date most convenient. Of course, I shall be glad to meet with residents of the 15th District in my office in Cambridge at any time that Congress is not in session.

For those who are unable to attend the courthouse conferences, I should like to announce at this time that I will be present at each of the county fairs where those who wish to meet informally with me may do so. I shall be present at the fairs on the following dates:

Muskingum County Fair, August 16.
Noble County Fair, August 30.
Washington County Fair, September 3.
Morgan County Fair, September 6.
Guernsey County Fair, September 27.
Barlow Fair, September 29.

If Congress has adjourned by the dates of the Monroe and Perry County Fairs, I shall attend those fairs also, on the following dates:

Monroe County Fair, July 26.
Perry County Fair, August 2.

Alert in the Pentagon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the article, "Billion-Dollar Gamble That Failed?", which appeared in the June 15 issue of the U. S. News & World Report. I ask that particular attention be given the closing paragraphs of this article, subtitled, "Alert in the Pentagon," which follow:

ALERT IN THE PENTAGON

Tito's game, whatever it is, has shaken the United States. Senators heard Yugoslav exiles testify that Tito has helped Moscow all along. The House banned all aid to Tito unless the President orders that it be continued.

The Pentagon's experts, when United States military aid first went to Yugoslavia, had trouble finding out just how the aid was used. Now, however, several hundred United States military men are moving about in Yugoslavia checking up on United States equipment and providing the United States with valuable intelligence on the whole area.

Yugoslavia's army, these observers report, now has so much United States equipment that it is dependent on a $50 million flow of parts and supplies from the United States to keep going. Tito, once again, would become completely dependent on Russia if United States aid ended.

Tito himself, in Moscow, coolly said: "Our relations with the United States will not suffer." And Tito's friends say he knows he will be in trouble with his own Yugoslavs if he breaks his United States ties.

In the weeks just ahead, however, American policymakers will be taking another look at Tito. They must decide whether Tito has enough independence left to warrant any United States aid, or whether he is back on Moscow's side after a billion-dollar buildup from the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the foregoing statement that the United States has several hundred military men moving about in Yugoslavia were true. However, in the testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on the Mutual Security Act of 1956, it is brought out that we actually have 55 people assigned for this purpose in Yugoslavia. Following is a transcript of the committee testimony:

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I just wonder whether the question of Yugoslavia's cooperation in compliance with the law of inspection has come up. I would guess that came up for discussion.

Chairman RICHARDS. It hasn't come up, and it is a good question to raise.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Last year that formed quite an important part of the legislative history.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. MCGUIRE. That is right. General Waters, I believe, in the first week in February went out and made a complete inspection trip, which is the first time that has happened to our MAAG in Yugoslavia.

Mrs. KELLY. How many military are in our MAAG mission in Yugoslavia? I want to know that. I want to know how many are in all the countries.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mrs. KELLY, don't hold me to this figure, I am doing it from memory. That is one of the other questions, that we could have people in there. They did raise that ceiling.

I think, if I recall correctly, we had 45 and we now have 60.

Mrs. KELLY. How many have you in Turkey?

Mr. MCGUIRE. That I can't answer you. I will say you have a little different mission in Turkey; a substantial amount more. Because in Turkey you have a training mission along with the MAAG activity.

(The following information was supplied for the record:)

"As a result of the visit by Deputy Under Secretary of State Murphy last summer, the Yugoslavs have authorized an increase in the size of the MAAG to a total of 60 United States nationals. As of November 30, the following United States personnel were assigned: 27 Army, 8 Navy, 14 Air Force, 6 civilians—total 55.

"The strength of JAMMAT Turkey as of November 30, 1955, was as follows: 97 Army, 35 Navy, 51 Air Force, 34 United States civilians—total 217. These figures do not include 368 United States personnel engaged in training activities with the Turkish armed forces."

(Discussion off the record.)

Mrs. KELLY. Do you know how many personnel we have in the United States Embassy in Yugoslavia, and how many has Russia been permitted to send into Yugoslavia?

Mr. MCGUIRE. I don't know.

Mrs. KELLY. Will you find that out?

Mr. MCGUIRE. I think the State Department will have to answer that.

Mr. ELBRICK. I will find out. I am not sure that we have information here. We can give it to you.

Chairman RICHARDS. Will you provide that information?

Mr. ELBRICK. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

(The information requested is as follows:)

"The total number of United States Government personnel stationed in Yugoslavia at the present time is 172 persons, including Embassy and military personnel, ICA personnel, marine guards, USIA employees, etc. Of these, 55 are connected with the MAAG mission, 8 are stationed at the United States consulate in Zagreb, and the remaining 109 are connected with the Embassy in Belgrade.

"The exact number of Soviet Government personnel stationed in Yugoslavia is not known. The number of Soviet personnal with diplomatic status is known to be 16, which would indicate a total complement of approximately 50 persons. We have no information indicating that there are any Soviet military personnel in Yugoslavia in a status similar to our MAAG mission."

Chairman RICHARDS. Do you want to ask a question, Mr. BYRD?

(Discussion off the record.)

Mrs. KELLY. I was going to ask, Mr. Chairman, did you ever think—I am sure you did—of the other side of the equation, of their attitude of playing both sides against the middle. This attitude hurts the anti-Communist world to a degree where those nations we are trying to aline with the West become neutral. They can say, "Well, look what you do for Yugoslavia. Twice as much. We will do the same thing, play both sides against the middle." We are coerced into being blackmailed all along the line.

A Flag for Members of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a House resolution which would provide for a flag for Members of the House of Representatives.

All of us, particularly those who have been members of the armed services of the Nation from time to time and even more particularly those Members of the House who own small boats and pleasure craft, are conscious of the use of flags to designate the high civilian officials in a great variety of Government departments and to identify the presence of the flag officers in the military service on ships, on boats, on other conveyances, and over headquarters such flags are constantly used to indicate the presence of the persons which they respectively represent.

The conversations and suggestions of a number of Members of the House aroused my curiosity concerning the subject. I wrote to Mr. Griffith, Director of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, and learned that there is no official flag for Members of Congress in existence. He suggested that if it were desirable to have one the purpose might be accomplished by a simple resolution of the House. I will include as a part of these remarks his letter to me of August 22, 1955.

At Mr. Griffith's suggestion I got in touch with the Heraldic Branch of the United States Army, which handles such questions for the executive branch of the Government. Colonel Laux and Mr. DuBois of that agency furnished me with a study explaining how flags for the United States Government officials are designed and including a statement concerning the background of the suggested designs for flags for Members of Congress. I will include, as a part of these remarks, the letter, dated August 9, 1955, which was written to me by Colonel Laux and the statement which he entitled "Schematic Philosophy in Creating Flag Designs for United States Officials." The flag suggested would have a red or blue background on which would appear the shield of the coat of arms of the United States, in the usual red, white, and blue, encircled by a wreath of oak and all surrounded by 13 gold stars. The finial piece, which is the ornament on the top end of the flagstaff, might be a reproduction of the Capitol dome in gold color metal.

Either red or blue as a background would be appropriate to either House of Congress. Having in mind that the House Chamber is decorated in blue and gold while the Senate Chamber is decorated in red and gold, I concluded to use the blue background in describing the color of the flag for Members of the House of Representatives in drafting the resolution which I introduced.

With his letter Colonel Laux also furnished me with designs and sketches of the proposed flags in color and of the proposed finial piece. These I will submit to the chairman of the committee to which the resolution is referred if such is his desire.

The resolution which I have introduced is based upon a draft which was furnished to me, at my request, by the Office of the Quartermaster General.

The drafting service was very much appreciated as the subject is a technical one, and I express my thanks therefor. It was, I should note, a drafting service only and did not necessarily represent a policy position of the Department of Defense.

The letters and documents to which I have referred above read as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
August 22, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: Reference is made to your letter of July 19, 1955, concerning an official flag for Members of Congress.

So far as we have been able to ascertain, there is no such flag now in existence.

Regarding the appropriateness and symbolism of the proposed design which you mention; this is a fairly technical subject upon which we would prefer to refer you to a recognized authority. We suggest that you get in touch with the heraldic branch of the United States Army, which handles such questions for the executive branch. (Mr. DuBois, Code 131, Extension 52901.)

The third point which you mention concerns the necessity of legislative action for adopting such a flag. We have found no instance where a flag of a Government official has been adopted by means of a public law. The President's flag and that of the Governor of the Panama Canal are based upon Executive order. Those of the other officials are based upon departmental action. It would seem that comparable authority for a congressional flag would be found in a concurrent resolution (assuming that the Senate were asked to join) or by simple resolution of either House. Such authorization, however, would apparently not carry with it any legal obligation to official recognition by other Government agencies. If it is desired to insure official recognition, it would seem that it should be accomplished by a public law.

We are forwarding a copy of Lloyd's Register of American Yachts, containing a section in which the private signals of yachtsmen are reproduced, which indicates anyone or any group may adopt a private flag.

Sincerely yours,
ERNEST S. GRIFFITH, *Director.*

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE QUARTERMASTER GENERAL,
August 9, 1955.

Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: Reference is made to your letter, 19 July 1955, and letter from the Office of the Quartermaster General, 1 August 1955, concerning a proposed flag design for Members of Congress.

Careful study has been given to your request, and suggested designs are enclosed for your consideration. (See enclosure 1.) Also enclosed is an explanatory statement concerning the concept of this Office in creating the designs for flags for United States Government officials. This statement includes the background of the suggested designs for the flags for Members of Congress.

It is hoped the proposed designs are satisfactory. If they are approved, action will be taken, at your request, to prepare manufacturing the drawings for the flags.

Respectfully yours,
RAY J. LAUX,
Colonel QMC, Executive Officer.

SCHEMATIC PHILOSOPHY IN CREATING FLAG DESIGNS FOR UNITED STATES OFFICIALS

1. DESIGN (STAR ARRANGEMENT)

(a) Circle of stars around central design of the flag is reserved for the President and Vice President of the United States.

(b) Four stars in bend direction appear on the flag for the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

(c) Corner stars on flags are reserved for civilian appointive Secretaries of Departments and Governors of States.

(d) Deputies, Under and Assistant Secretaries of departments use the same design as that for Secretaries, but the colors are reversed.

(e) Rank for naval flag officers is indicated on vertical center line or extremity of imaginary geometrical figures.

(f) Army and Air Force military personnel have stars on horizontal center line and extremity of a geometrical figure.

2. DESIGN (COLOR OF BACKGROUND)

(a) President's flag: Dark blue.

(b) Vice President's flag: White.

(c) Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff: Red and white; diagonally divided.

(d) Secretaries of departments: Various colors, with white stars.

(e) Deputy Secretary, Under Secretary and Assistant Secretary of departments: White with colored stars.

(f) Navy flag officer: Dark navy blue, white stars.

(g) General officers of the Army: Scarlet, white stars.

(h) General officers of the Air Force: Ultramarine blue, white stars.

NOTE.—Military grade is indicated on uniforms by silver stars; it is symbolically represented on flag designs by white stars.

3. FLAGS FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND PRESIDING OFFICERS

(a) Vice President or President of the United States Senate (already adopted): White (Executive Order No. 10016, November 10, 1948.)

(b) President pro tempore of the Senate: To be determined.

(c) Members of the House of Representatives: Blue background, honor color from the flag of the United States, representing vigilance, perseverance, and justice.

(d) Speaker of the House: To be determined.

(e) Members of the Senate: Red background, color from the flag of the United States, representing hardiness and valor.

(f) Design: Inasmuch as the military ranks are represented by silver stars on the uniform and white stars on the flags, it is suggested the flag designs for Senators and Representatives have gold (or yellow) stars which will be distinctive to the legislative branch of the Government as distinguished from the executive branch. The shield of the coat of arms of the United States as described in RS 1793 (4 U. S. C. 4) is composed of 13 palys argent (white) and gules (red) alternated, a chief azure (blue). The 13 palys represent the Original Thirteen Colonies with the chief uniting the colonies and representing Congress. Therefore, this design encircled by a wreath of oak representing strength, all surrounded by 13 gold (yellow) stars, is most appropriate for use on flags of the legislative body. This central design would appear on both the Senators' and Representatives' flags. This central design could also appropriately be reproduced as a lapel

button for wear by Members or former Members of Congress.

(g) Sizes: The flags should conform in size to the normal Armed Forces systems and for private boat use they should be appropriate for the boat on which displayed.

(h) Finial piece: Inasmuch as the eagle is prescribed as a finial design for the President's flagstaffs (the gilt halberd ball, gilt star are used by the Navy, and acorn and spearhead by the Army and Air Force) it is suggested that a reproduction of the Capitol Dome in gold color metal be used by Members of Congress as their distinctive finial piece.

Appraisal of Air Force Public Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a most excellent speech entitled "Appraisal of Air Force Public Relations," which was delivered by our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], before the Air War College, Montgomery, Ala., on June 12, 1956.

I commend to my colleagues in the Senate the thinking of the junior Senator from Arizona with respect to the problems of the Air Force in its public relations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPRAISAL OF AIR FORCE PUBLIC RELATIONS

(By United States Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, delivered before Air War College, Montgomery, Ala., June 12, 1956)

Boiled down to its basic requirements, public relations is a simple practice. It calls for a measure of clear thinking to develop the problem, the application of commonsense to its presentation, and a great deal of energy all of the time.

I would add one more dimension to this operation: a recognition of the faith and confidence of the American people in the truth. The greatest lie-detector ever devised is the American mind in its constant search for the truth and the facts that are involved in the truth. Be phony about solving your problem and 165 million Americans will point a finger at you, and your public relations explodes like a tattooed bubble. Be factual and honest and these people will buy your product.

Our product is our Air Force. Our problem is how better to sell it to our citizens. With your permission, I should like to apply the public relations approach I have outlined to this problem. We can break it down into its several parts; look at each one separately; and, then, reassemble them into a whole to find conclusions that will strengthen our position.

This effort, in my opinion, encompasses an understanding of, one, the proper role of the military in shaping national policy; two, the development of airpower as the dominant force in our national military strategy; three, the effectiveness of the Air Force in interpreting the potentialities of airpower; and four, the public relations measures which could and should be taken to develop better understanding and support of airpower as the dominant factor in modern war.

Proceeding, then, to a discussion of the next part of our problem for today, the obstacles to the development of airpower as that dominant force, it is necessary to recall certain fundamentals. These are, of course, familiar to you, but to the American people they are news; for we have been too busy publicizing the speed of our planes to tell the people why that speed is needed. We have been too busy selling the glamour of flying to explain the hard, strenuous, and back-breaking work that goes into creating an air force of which glamour is only an incidental byproduct. Having great faith in the fable of the tortoise and the hare, I shall now assume the role of the tortoise in attempting to develop this broader viewpoint for our people and, at the same time, to offer some thoughts as to how we can overcome the existing obstacles to our goal.

The role of the military in the conduct of our national and international affairs has, in the past, been confined to the actual conduct of the wars in which we have been involved. During periods of peace, when a nation should be building up and maintaining its military strength, and reviewing carefully the role of the military in the formation of any national policy, our military, until recently, has been subservient to the needs of peace. That relationship is a historic one in this country, and I do not argue at this time that it is wrong, or that it should be changed. Rather, my discussion today will be along the lines of reconsidering the historic role of the military in the United States, and its relationship to our national and international policies, to the end of determining how we can best approach the problems that confront the military today as it accepts its responsibilities in the formation of these policies.

Prior to World War I, the United States was not particularly concerned with the impact of wars that raged in other parts of the world. In fact, those wars had only an economic impact on the United States and we grew up in our history as an island, separated from the troubles of Europe and Asia. With the exception of the war with Mexico, our relationship with our neighbors in North America has been on an exceedingly friendly basis, so we have not had to be concerned over the possibility of conflict with either Mexico or Canada.

Because of our isolated position, we never considered the necessity of alliances with other nations far removed from our shores. In contrast to this situation, we know that in Europe it has been a long-established practice for the various countries to give assurances of mutual assistance to each other or to give direct aid by the signing of offensive and defensive alliances.

After World War I we began to be concerned about the international aspect of war and its impact upon our own country; and by the conclusion of World War II it was obvious to our leaders that alliances of the kind long practiced in Europe should be entered into by this country with friendly nations in order to combat the growing threat of communism.

Alliances involve international politics and hence strongly affect national politics. Consequently, there are signs of a growing awareness in this country of the true nature of war itself and of war's position in our planning and strategy. Despite alliances with countries far removed from our immediate proximity, however, the understanding of military force as an instrument of national policy has as yet been too slowly and too narrowly developed.

War enters the field of politics again when we realize the need for unity among our allies. This unity is achieved in a large measure by the machinations of politics; therefore, war is only a part of political intercourse and is by no means an independent and isolated thing in itself. It is important that we realize this truth at this point in our discussion, because we are concerned with what you, as Air Force officers, and I, as a politician, can do to bring home to the American people the place of the military in forming and promulgating our national policy. To my mind, it is of the utmost importance to tell the American people—and the sooner the better—that military force is not an isolated thing, as we have in the past considered it to be, but that it is an integral and intimate part of our national policy—in fact, an instrument of national policy.

Now I do not propose that we create an hysteria among our people in connection with this program of education. Quite to the contrary, I suggest that we follow sane and sensible methods to bring home to our citizenry the realization of war's position today and the fact that we must be constantly alerted to its dangers as well as to its potentials for peace.

Having recognized that military force is an instrument of national policy and, because of the need for unity, that war is only a part of political intercourse and, therefore, is not an isolated thing, we must recognize, too, that the business of war has become the business of everyone. We must also admit that the conduct of war has become the business of everyone. This does not mean, of course, the actual direction of the military in the field, on the sea, or in the air, but the conduct of war insofar as the citizenry works in unity with the military to create the continuing sinews of war and to provide the giant manpower pools needed by the military, and the understanding needed for unity. Since war is everybody's business, the military joins the team and assumes an active part in the formation of national policy in times of peace as well as in times of war. In fact, we can say today that the recognition of the proper role of the military in the shaping of our national and international policies might well be the instrument by which we can maintain peace.

We have been discussing the broad role of the military in the formation of national policy. We have touched briefly upon the definition of war which I feel is the chief part of the problem under discussion today. If there can be accomplished through education a broad acceptance of these definitions and the logical conclusions they give to the military's role in forming national policy, then we in this Nation will be fully receptive to the place of the Air Force as the dominant force in our national military strategy.

In order more fully to develop the role of airpower in this regard, it is necessary to revert to history—to that portion of the history of transportation and the development of weapons systems that brought about seapower. Great Britain, you will recall, mastered ocean navigation and likewise mastered the weapons system of the sea when, in 1588, she defeated Spain in the first modern naval battle. Great Britain continued to be dominant in this new field of transportation and to be dominant, also, in the utilization of this new weapons system. By the judicious use of both, she was able to maintain a peaceful situation for many years.

In the air age, however, Great Britain no longer dominates the world as she did when seapower was her strength. The thesis of Admiral Mahan is now only valid as it applies to a new element—the air. Great Britain was quick to recognize this change, and accepted the fact that, with this new dimension in the element of power, surface forces and surface strategies were vulnerable and obsolete. The Royal Air Force replaced the Royal Navy as the key to her military doctrine. History having overtaken the British Navy, that country's air force has assumed the dominant role. The reasoning of Billy Mitchell now applies. Just as it once was necessary to bring matters to an issue upon the broad sea, it is now possible to resolve

conflict only in the medium of the limitless skies.

We should now examine our military policies to see how we can best bring matters to an issue in the vast expanse of the sky and, by so doing, maintain peace throughout the world, as England so successfully did when following that concept by the proper use of seapower. On January 12, 1954, Secretary of State Dulles made a speech which I feel was not too thoroughly understood by the American people. It was entitled "The Evolution of Foreign Policy," and it became controversial because it stated that the President had made a decision to depend primarily upon a great capacity to retaliate, instantly, by means and at places of our choosing. What people failed to notice was the continuing statement which said, "Now the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff can shape our Military Establishment to fit what is our policy instead of having to try to meet the enemy's many choices." In the past, the enemy's many choices were reflected in such areas as Greece and Turkey, Berlin, Korea, and Indochina. In the past our actions have been emergency actions which, while effective, were inadequate because, as Mr. Dulles said, "What we did was, in the main, emergency action, imposed on us by our enemies."

One of the basic concepts of warfare as expressed by Clausewitz is that a defensive position is strongest particularly when the defense has strong means of retaliation. Following this concept, what Mr. Dulles' statement implied was that the United States had decided to place more reliance on deterrent power and less dependence on local defensive power. Mr. Dulles went on to explain this by saying, "What the Eisenhower administration wants is an * * * international security system."

I see in that January 12, 1954, speech of Mr. Dulles the first official recognition by any person in a position such as he occupies that airpower has replaced seapower and landpower as the dominant force for peace in the world. What Mr. Dulles said, in effect, replaces a Mahan theory for the seas with a Mitchell theory for air, in that air, having developed as the strongest means of transportation, and the United States being dominant in this field, we can well accept airpower as our national strategy and build around it the organizations of the land and sea forces.

Just as England, when she had control of the seas, maintained a highly mobile and effective sea force, so must we today maintain a highly mobile and increasingly effective Air Force. The truth of this doctrine cannot be doubted with the results of World War II and Korea freshly in our minds. We have seen that military operations on land and sea cannot proceed without air superiority. We know, too, that transportation can be denied on the surface of the sea and underneath the sea by airpower. We know that land transportation can be completely destroyed by airpower. Knowing these things, we can generalize as follows: "Airpower is the national strategy which relies for force on a weapons system in which the land and sea forces are organized around the air forces."

At this point, let us inject the thinking of Douhet so that we might see what one of the pioneer thinkers in aerial warfare had to say on the subject: "Viewed in its true light, aerial warfare admits of no defense, only offense. We must therefore resign ourselves to the offensive the enemy afflicts upon us, while striving to put all our resources to work to inflict even heavier ones upon him. This is the basic principle which must govern the development of aerial warfare."

His thesis was based on the argument that command of the air would be won very quickly in any war and that the side that obtained this mastery would then have little to fear from enemy airpower. We know from experiences in war that there never has been, nor is there any hope in the foreseeable future for a one hundred percent defense against enemy air attack. Therefore, we must ask ourselves what it is we resign ourselves to when we talk of the offensives of the enemy. What damage could 50, or 25, or even 10 Russian planes inflict upon the American economy and the American people were they the only ones of fleets of thousands to penetrate our aerial defenses and drop their hydrogen bombs upon strategic targets in this country? We would then be resigning ourselves to possible complete destruction, or at least a destruction that could seriously disrupt the lives and the economy of our people.

Even Douhet admitted that control of the air could never be complete; but the introduction of nuclear bombs into modern warfare, particularly those launched by aircraft, must cause us to wonder just how resigned we can become. It seems plausible to me, therefore, to argue that, in the absence of any complete defense against aerial attack, and with the admission of nuclear weapons into our weapons system, the only deterrent to war will rest in an Air Force kept at a level of proficiency, both from the standpoint of equipment and of men, that will forever deter an enemy from making an offensive move against this country.

That is true, I believe, because if a handful of Russian planes could inflict major damage on our country, certainly the Russians would realize that, their defensive abilities being no greater or no less than ours, a similar handful of our planes could wreak comparable damage upon their homeland. It seems to me, then, that massive retaliation is the deterrent power we must rely upon, at least for the foreseeable future; and I do not think that, in this discussion, we should get into the probabilities of what might be developed tomorrow weaponswise.

Thus, airpower becomes the primary manifestation of national power in war and in peace because of its direct influence upon the social structure and warmaking potential of an enemy nation. If we, as a people, are willing to accept this new doctrine that peace can be maintained through airpower, then we will not be like the professional soldier of old who was most reluctant to give up his particular weapon or his particular pet strategy. We will become, instead, a people fully aware of the problems of war and a people determined to support this kind of an approach to peace—psychologically, industrially, and in every other way that is incumbent upon us. Such an attitude will better enable us to understand the necessity of evaluating existing and contemplated weapons systems.

This is not a question of subjugating one service at the expense of another. Rather, it is a matter of obtaining the greatest possible return from our dollar investment in the military forces as a whole. Once this is done, the force requirements can be determined accordingly and phased to meet the time requirements of our strategy.

It is hardly necessary to remind ourselves that nuclear weapons and modern delivery systems have become the cornerstone of modern military power. We all recognize them to be the key to American security. Military tasks, therefore, primarily consist of maintaining armaments in such a state of readiness and in such quantities that the Communists will find it disadvantageous to solve their problems by the use of nuclear weapons. They must not only be faced with the impossible task of neutralizing our retaliatory effort, but also must be made to realize that should retaliation on our part be necessary, such an action will be instant and complete.

Unfortunately, many in this country, both military and civilian, do not realize the full scope of these military responsibilities. These are the people whose thinking is clouded by historical prejudice. These are the proponents of balanced forces, supercarriers, duplications in military effort, conflicting service roles and missions. These are the wearers of the old-school tie in a day and age when a new school has been founded.

It is not suggested that we do away completely with surface forces merely because we are in a nuclear air age. It is difficult to understand, however, why many still do not see the need to tailor service needs and requirements to conform with modern patterns of political and military reality. This is not simply a question of money—although I believe that billions of dollars could be saved if forces were designed around service missions—but, more important, it is a recognition that nations control war, and therefore peace, by their dominance in modern weapons and the expeditious means of delivering them. We must accept the influence of powerful air forces upon international behavior. An understanding of the implications of this new weapon is not a matter of choice—it is the very condition of national survival.

Now, having determined that the military has a definite role in the shaping of our national policy, and having traced briefly the development of airpower as the dominant force in our national military strategy, we have proceeeded through two of the four points in our discussion prior to setting forth a final conclusion.

At this point, we can peek under the tent to see how effective the Air Force has been in getting these two and related points across to our people. I am a salesman and in this profession we have always had a good axiom, "To sell the steak, sell the sizzle." If we apply this to the efforts of public relations in the Air Force, then I would say that the Air Force has done a better than average job of selling the sizzle. However, I don't think that the Air Force has done the job that needs to be done to sell the steak, which is the more important item in this particular instance.

We might liken the sizzle to the glamour of the Air Force, the speed of its planes, the drama of rescues, the excitement of air combat, and the other things which have always been readily associated with flying. The steak, in this instance, is airpower and what airpower means, as well as the two points that we have already developed in this discussion.

There certainly is a definite need for selling the sizzle of the Air Force steak and we must continue to do that, but the important thing in public relations at this time is to sell the meat, or the steak, of our whole problem, so that people will not so much associate airpower with beautiful formation flying or high-speed jets or rescues, as with its true nature and its place in our national strategy.

I am not critical of Air Force public relations when I recognize a failure in its past performances, because I don't believe that we can ascribe this failure to the Air Force alone. Rather, I think, it should be placed upon the entire Military Establishment, upon the Congress of the United States, and upon others in high position who can and should interpret for the American people the role of the military in shaping national policy and explain to them what war really is.

Much of the current misunderstanding stems from an historic general disinterest on the part of the American people in the subject of war itself. You and I know that war in this country has always been looked upon as an isolated thing. We have gone into them unprepared materially because in periods of peace between the wars there has been a general disinterest in the Military

Establishment and its upkeeping. We have gone into them unprepared mentally because the people of the United States, having a natural and understandable abhorrence of war, have never concerned themselves with the true relationship of war to our national policy. It is well to recognize at this point, also, that we have gone into these wars weak in manpower because of a general apathy on the part of the youth of this country to participate in military training during the times of peace. Washington said something about this when he remarked: "The American people never sense danger till the bayonet is at their chest."

Generally, I think we can sum up this portion of the problem by recognizing that the American people, at all levels, do not understand war and do not yet understand the basic reasons for airpower being the force around which we must construct all of our military strategies.

While these obstacles have been discouraging, and at times frustrating, there are indications abroad in our country today that are encouraging both to the military and to those of us who are not in the military, but who are concerned with national defense and the maintenance of peace. Most important of the encouraging signs was the statement by Secretary Dulles earlier this year which inferred that we had the ability to go to the brink of war and return. In that statement, we see the first general recognition by a man in high position that military force is an instrument of policy and a weapon that can be used for the maintenance of peace even without its application in the accepted form of the word.

At the outset of this discussion I said: "Boiled down to its basic requirements, public relations is a simple practice. It calls for a measure of clear thinking to develop the problem, the application of commonsense to its presentation, and a great deal of energy all of the time."

We have developed the problems as I see them, so it is now necessary to approach their solution in the most logical way possible. This I would like to do by presenting to you gentlemen a list of suggestions which I think will help to solve the problems we are discussing today.

The first of these should certainly be an intensive campaign of education starting immediately. This campaign should embrace the schools of our country from the high school level, or even lower, on through, so that the students might have a complete opportunity to study the relationship of military force to our national policy, thereby enabling them to better understand the problems of the military when they become voting citizens.

This same program of education should be directed at the personnel of the Air Force. It should likewise be spread to include citizens of adult ages who can be reached through the media of luncheons, club meetings, and visits to air bases. In other words, let's take the public in on what we are doing. Trained and intelligent officers and enlisted men should be sent to talk before these various organizations about the very problems we are discussing today.

One of the finest means of accomplishing this, in my opinion, would be to downgrade the classification of briefings of the various major commands in the Air Force and send them around to the organizations just mentioned. A person could learn more about the problems involved in global airpower by listening to one of General LeMay's briefings than by reading many books on the subject. These briefings would necessarily have to be changed to eliminate some of the necessarily secret material that is passed on to officers; but, nevertheless, if we started with the mere assumption that people today do not realize that the globe no longer is measured from east to west and west to east, but rather from north to south and over the poles, we would lay a basis for a better understanding of airpower.

Air Force personnel, from the privates to the generals, should be imbued with the idea that airpower is our dominant power and they should speak of it on every occasion; but they should speak of it intelligently and speak of it not in terms of the speed of our aircraft, or the accuracy of our weapons, but, instead, in terms of the true concept of airpower and how it has reached its rightful place as the dominant force in our military strategy. I understand that a dozen officers out of this class are scheduled to travel throughout the country after graduation and speak on airpower. This is a good idea. It is a healthy thing. I know you are qualified to do this great public service.

The second suggestion that I wish to make depends entirely upon the success of the first, in that I will suggest that public relations should "trickle down." I mean by this that the top brass of our Air Force must be thoroughly cognizant of the problems which we discuss and must be able to transmit this understanding to their junior officers, and on down to the lowest grade of enlisted man. You have a very valuable program in the Air Force called Commanders' Call. I understand that once every month each commander talks to his people about airpower. He shows them films of top Air Force leaders who cover the subject. Keep this program going. Use it to best advantage. It is necessary that, in the Air War College, we teach the officers the extreme importance of public relations. We take away, by so doing, the stigma that has always been attached in one way or another to the Public Information Office. That office should become one of great importance; it should be occupied by men thoroughly trained in all aspects of public relations.

A vital point to remember in discussing public relations, and particularly in discussing the people engaged in public relations, is that if a job is done properly, by properly trained men, many of the attendant problems are taken care of before they start. For instance, if the citizenry were fully cognizant of all of the issues that we are discussing here, and understood them, there is a strong possibility that the difficulties that have developed over sound around jet air bases would long ago have been overcome. Objections raised by some of our citizens to the high expenditures necessary to maintain an Air Force would likewise be eliminated if the people were told how this money is spent, not just in a general way, but in a detailed way, having explained to them the needs as they relate to airpower and as airpower relates to peace.

We long ago discovered that the glamour of flying has pretty much worn off—that it is looked upon today as a job, as a hard and arduous job to which dedicated men are attracted. If this is true, and we know it to be true, then public relations directed at the young, with the objective of educating them along the lines we have been discussing, will develop in them a patriotic fervor for the Air Force and for military service in general, and cause them to come into the Air Force in increasing numbers. It is not a healthy thing for the Air Force, or any of the military, to have to rely on draftees to build up its manpower. It would be a much better thing for this country if our youth were so imbued with patriotism that they looked forward to their period of service with the Armed Forces, and, of course, we would hope, particularly service in the Air Force. That, I feel, would be one of the results of a public-relations program following the course that I have outlined.

The third suggestion that I would like to make will primarily aid public relations people, and the public only indirectly. This suggestion has to do with the classification of material. When a national aviation magazine, or any magazine, for that matter, publishes a detailed account or report of a modern airplane or a modern piece of equipment, it is to be assumed by the public that the material is not classified. How many times, though, have you public relations men been asked by local newspapers for information based on these magazine articles only to have to say that you cannot release it because it is still classified. The newspaperman goes away with a peculiar feeling that the Air Force's right hand does not know what its left hand is doing. This, of course, can only be accomplished from the Washington level; but a thorough check on releases before they are made to see that there will be no conflict with existing classifications would certainly be appreciated by your public relations men, by the press, and, I know, by the public, as well.

The fourth suggestion that I make is one which I direct to all officer personnel, whether they be in public relations or not. It is this: Have an open-door policy toward the press, and particularly toward the public. Do not build a fence around your office through which citizens, or their representatives, cannot pass. Being in public life, and having been in the military, I realize that this is easier to say than to do; but remember that one unhappy customer can undo the good of hundreds of men working to better your position and the position of the Air Force. Particularly is this important as far as the press goes, because I can assure you that nothing makes a press man madder than to be continually denied access to an executive's office, whether that executive be a Senator, a general, or the president of a corporation.

The fifth suggestion that I make is a rather basic one, but I make it because I feel that it is not being followed too wisely at the present time. The public information officer must be in the know. He must sit in on policymaking meetings; he must be kept informed of the latest developments in air doctrine, air plans, aircraft, and everything about the Air Force. As a commander, include your information services officer on your personal staff. You write his efficiency report. Get a sharp, intelligent man who has some commonsense for the job. Give him free access to your office and your confidence.

Sixth in the list of suggestions that I make to you gentlemen this morning concerns a failing that many of our public relations people seem to have which does not show up in the corresponding efforts of our sister forces. This is the tendency of a public relations officer to seek to be a public relations person for his own particular outfit—that outfit alone—and not for the Air Force in its entirety. I know that many times this is the fault of the commander; so if any of you gentlemen here, going out to assume command posts, have the tendency to seek publicity for your outfit above the Air Force as a whole, you would do well to bury those feelings immediately and allow your public relations man full rein in his development of a better understanding of airpower for the total Air Force. I might say that this is a rather common disease among all new institutions, whether they be in the fields of economics, in the professions, or in the fields of the military, as we have witnessed in the last 10 years during the swaddling days of the Air Force. It is a weakness and a tendency, as I say, but it is one that must be overcome before the organization as a whole, regardless of what field it is operating in, can go ahead and assume its rightful place of leadership in that area. Remember you are selling airpower, you are not selling the glamour of any particular outfit.

The seventh suggestion which I offer today is that the Public Information Officer work closely with the aircraft industry. The aircraft industry has probably done more to promote the Air Force than the Air Force has done itself; and these people continue to do so, and their efforts can be coordinated with the efforts of the Air Force to a degree that the public relations of both the industry and the Air Force will greatly improve. The Air Force can very well tap the vast reservoir of experienced public relations men who are connected with the aviation industry and they can also enjoy the fruits of the large amounts of money spent by this industry to promote their aircraft, and, at the same time, airpower.

The eighth and last suggestion that I want to leave with you gentlemen today is that the Air Force should make a more concerted effort to educate the Members of Congress concerning the true meaning of airpower and airpower's natural position as a pivotal force in forming our military strategies. How can this be done? Of course, you will say that Senators and Representatives are busy people. Well, I would suggest that you bring the briefings of the various commands of the Air Force into Washington, into the Senate and House Office Buildings, and stay there 2 weeks if necessary so that each and every Member of Congress could have the opportunity of being briefed, not on the glamour of flying, but on the basic essentials of airpower. Remember, gentlemen, that Congress is the legislative body of this Government which decides upon your appropriations—the body that can be openly critical of you—harmful to you, or helpful to you, depending on the attitude that it holds.

I can tell you from experience that Congressmen are interested in airpower and the problems of airpower; but not too many of them have had the opportunities that I have had to become intimately associated with the subject, and I feel that if more of them have that opportunity one of the great obstacles in your path today will be overcome. The Navy and the Army have sold their concepts in a wonderful way, chiefly because they've been at it longer; and then, too, because they have been associated in the peoples' minds with power, and with power in war. Now, however, we are locked in an argument as to whether the pivotal force will remain on the surface or go to the air, and we are not going to win that argument by continuing public relations efforts that merely "sell the sizzle." We must, as I have said before, "sell the steak."

Lastly, I want to remind you again that public relations takes a great deal of energy all of the time. The job of selling is not one that is done periodically, or spasmodically, or with a half-hearted effort. Selling is something that you gentlemen will be engaged in for the rest of your careers; in fact, you've been engaged in selling all of your lives, whether you know it or not. Your very first cries as babies were selling arguments to your mothers that you wanted to be fed. Your attempts to improve your dress and your appearances as you reached the age when you began to look at girls were only an effort to sell yourselves to some particular girls. The things you do through your careers as airmen and officers are attempts to sell yourselves to those people who are above you or to those people with whom you associate.

Apply exactly this same technique, then, to the issues we have discussed today, and the problem of public relations in the Air Force will improve rapidly and the people of the United States will develop a better understanding of airpower and will give it the proper support which it deserves as the dominant force in modern war.

The Measure of Greatness—Address by Senator Symington at Rally Honoring the Dean of Missouri's Congressional Delegation, the Honorable Clarence Cannon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, at the proceedings in Mexico, Mo., June 8, honoring the dean of the Missouri delegation in Congress, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, our junior Senator, the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, made an address entitled "The Measure of Greatness," which referred to the outstanding contributions of the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. We all know Congressman CANNON as a kind, gentle, wonderful friend and person, whose experience and skill in parliamentary matters help all of us in innumerable ways in our efforts to serve our constituents.

Therefore, I know there will be widespread interest among Members of the House in Senator SYMINGTON'S remarks as they refer to our esteemed friend, Congressman CANNON, and I submit the text of the Senator's speech for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

THE MEASURE OF GREATNESS

The wisest of all teachers once said, "By their fruits ye shall know them."

The lasting value of a civilization, a nation, a political party, or an individual is best determined by the simple test embodied in those immortal words.

By his fruits we know CLARENCE CANNON, of Elsberry, Mo.

CLARENCE CANNON'S entire life has been devoted to the service of people, and that is the most important service of all.

Today he serves as chairman of probably the most important committee in the Congress.

Highlight of that effort includes Mr. CANNON spearheading the 1945 postwar drive which returned to the Treasury $130 billion of unexpended wartime appropriations.

It was he who about that time also proposed that Congress require a minimum payment of $5 billion per year toward reducing the national debt.

It was he also who stated: "No agency should be allowed to have any funds for which it does not account to Congress annually and which it does not justify in hearings before congressional committees."

Mr. CANNON believes that Government money is public money; and therefore should be spent only in the public interest.

Would that we could say this basic policy of sound government was the policy of the present administration.

Many current top appointees in the executive branch came to Washington from private business.

Some of these appointees are mighty fine people. Some, however, apparently believe the Federal Government is just another big business corporation, to be run for their own interest, and that of their friends at the top, instead of the interests of all the stockholders.

Quite a few of the latter have been removed from the job; but only after a Democratic Congress disclosed their activities. The welfare of the stockholders in question, in this case the American people, appeared incidental to their selfish decisions.

Yes, there have been some surprisingly unbusinesslike operations on the part of this so-called business administration. As a result, all of us have been forced to foot the tax bill for such financial fiascoes as Dixon-Yates, the incredible deal in cheese, and the heavy and unnecessary increased interest cost on our national debt.

With respect to that last cost, the largest single component item of the $4 billion increase in the first 3 years of this administration outside of national defense, is the increased price for money this administration decided to give the bankers.

In contrast, CLARENCE CANNON'S policy of government for all the people is made completely clear by the record.

Since first elected to Congress in 1922, Mr. CANNON has been instrumental in the passage of legislation beneficial to every American.

Let's take a few examples.

For the benefit of the farmer, Mr. CANNON has supported legislation for parity prices, farm loans at low rates of interest, reclamation and soil conservation projects, REA, protection of crops from pests and livestock disease, construction of better farm-to-market roads, flood control, and improved scientific agricultural research.

In supporting the 1941 farm-loan bill, which provided for Government loans to farmers to 85 percent of the parity value of 5 basic commodities, Mr. Cannon said the bill "places a floor under farm prices similar to the floor already under wages. For the first time in history the farmer is guaranteed a parity price."

On this and many other agricultural bills Mr. CANNON fought long and hard for the farmer, against an opposition both you and I know is entrenched and powerful.

Nor has that fight ended.

As you also know, only last April, President Eisenhower vetoed a Democratic farm bill which would have been a start toward a fair share for the Nation's farmers.

In 1952, the average farmer had an income of 52 cents for every $1 taken in by his city neighbor.

By 1955 that 52 cents had dropped to 42 cents.

As a result, the 13 percent of our population which remains on the farm, and which today produces the abundance of food and fiber that makes America the best fed and best clothed Nation in the history of the world, nevertheless receives less than 5 percent of our national income.

And according to Department of Agriculture income forecasts for 1956, under the present policies of this administration, that already unfortunate situation is going to get worse instead of better.

Already this situation is being reflected in the small towns. As a lead editorial entitled "The Rural Towns Problem" in the Kansas City Star pointed out last May 20: "Rural towns or cities are the first to feel the effect of reduced purchasing power among farmers."

For that damaging effect to reach the large cities is certain, and only a matter of time.

This administration's answer to the plight of the American farmer has been, and is, lower price supports, less farm credit at higher interest rates, and less funds for REA.

Based on some of the statements made by those in charge, why should we be surprised?

As example, only last year an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in this Republican administration said: "Agriculture is now big business. Too many people are trying to stay in agriculture that would do better some place else."

Well, 500,000 farm families have left the farm in the last 3 years.

But where have they gone and what will they do?

Is it good for America that these people and their children leave the field and pastures and woodlands of our countryside, to roam the concrete of the big cities looking for work?

What irony that in most countries of the world today 90 percent of the people work in the production of food—and their problem is famine, whereas only 13 percent of our people produce food—and our problem is surplus.

Shortly after Mr. CANNON was first elected to Congress, another Republican President, Calvin Coolidge, made this statement: "Farmers have never made money. I don't believe we can do much about it."

Apparently today, 30 years later, that is still the philosophy of the Republican Party.

But for many years the Democratic Party, under the leadership of such men as CLARENCE CANNON, has believed that something can and should be done to help farmers get a fair share.

Let's look at the record.

In the 20 years of Democratic administrations, farm income rose from $2 billion a year to $13½ billion; and the parity index rose from 58 percent in 1932 to 100 percent in 1952.

Since 1952 annual farm income has dropped nearly $4 billion. Parity during the last 6 months averaged 82, with a low point of 80. That is the lowest point and the lowest 6-month average in 15 years.

The reason is clear. It was Secretary of the Interior McKay who said, "We're here in the saddle as an administration representing business and industry."

If he was talking about big business, that is true; and the backs of little-business men and farmers this administration is riding are getting plenty sore.

Mr. CANNON'S legislative record, however, has much in it besides sympathetic understanding and support of the farmers. He has consistently supported measures for help to our veterans; and to our small-business men, and to our average citizens.

In 1932 Mr. CANNON was one of those who worked hard to preserve $400 million of veteran benefits.

In recent years he has been one of the leaders behind legislation to provide maternity care for servicemen's wives, and also better hospitalization for veterans.

For the average citizen, Mr. CANNON has supported such welfare measures as aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, day nurseries, nurses training, pensions, and unemployment compensation.

For the small-business man, Mr. CANNON has fought against monopolistic practices. He has worked steadily for a fair deal for small business.

When and if they make any money, these farmers and businessmen are also taxpayers.

Let's review for a moment the tax policies of this administration.

In 1954, President Eisenhower proposed tax reductions.

Out of every dollar of tax relief obtained, the corporations received 73 cents.

Families earning over $5,000 received 18 cents.

Families earning less than $5,000 received 9 cents.

The Republicans said they couldn't afford to give tax cuts to everybody—so they gave a $1 billion tax cut to corporations, plus an $850 million tax cut to corporation shareholders.

This administration's record on small business is equally in conflict with the country's welfare.

Since 1952 the profits of companies worth $100 million or more have gone up 27 percent; but the profits of companies worth $250,000 or less have gone down 39 percent.

Business failures since 1952 have risen 36 percent—in fact, during the past 3 years, there have been more than twice as many business failures as there were during the previous 10 years.

Unless we put an end to the current program of helping the big get bigger while the small get squeezed out, capitalism, as we know it, will disappear.

As you know, over 80 cents of the tax dollar you pay today goes for past, present and possible future war—and 65 cents of your tax dollar goes to the Defense Department in the Pentagon to pay for the current programs.

Now a story is being spread around that because some of us believe in better organization of our military defenses—an organization based on progress instead of tradition—we are asking for more money for national defense.

This is not correct.

If the Pentagon was truly unified, the American people could obtain more security for far less money than is being spent today.

In this field also CLARENCE CANNON is a recognized authority. His voting record proves that he is dedicated to adequate national defense; but only on the basis of maximum return to the taxpayer for every dollar spent.

Another prominent American once agreed with that position.

On November 16, 1945, over 10 years ago, in testimony before the Senate Committee on Military Appropriations the then General Eisenhower stated:

"You could develop a more efficient fighting force with unification, with 75 percent of the men that you would have if you had separate forces. * * * I am certain that almost any professional officer that has studied this thing would agree."

A 25-percent reduction in the current personnel of our military establishment would save the American taxpayer many billions of dollars each year.

In his later published book, Crusade in Europe, General Eisenhower developed his point further when he said:

"The accomplishments in Europe of the three United States services operating under unified command strongly influenced my determined advocacy of a similar type of organization in postwar Washington."

And on February 7, 1948, in his farewell report as Chief of Staff of the Army, the general carried on his thought as follows:

"But our position of 5, 10, 15 years hence is being determined now. * * *

"We must do everything possible now to assure ourselves that we will fight another war with weapons more advanced than those of the enemy. * * *

"The constant aim of those concerned with integration of the Armed Forces must be the goal implicit in the act—a security program in which all fields of responsibility will be covered but from which all unnecessary duplication will be eliminated and in which each arm will be a member of an integrated team. * * *

"Study should be given to the proposition that each year a number of officers of proved experience, knowledge and judgment be withdrawn from their respective services and given commissions in the Armed Forces. The existence of a body of specially chosen officers representing all three services would act as a spur to junior officers to qualify for such selection, indirectly decreasing traditional barriers between the services. Free transfer among the services, without loss of rank, would, in appropriate cases, be a valuable measure for promotion of the national rather than the service viewpoint. Developments of this sort will come with time and I am confident that each succeeding year of unification will bring closer the goal of a fully integrated establishment."

It was not until he actually became a candidate for the Presidency, however, that General Eisenhower really "poured it on" with respect to his concept of deficiencies in the Department of Defense.

In a talk in Baltimore on September 25, 1952, the general said that we must obtain "the most defense at less cost with the least dollar."

And he continued:

"Our defense program has suffered from lack of farsighted direction.

"Real unification of our Armed Forces is yet to be achieved.

"The running warfare between Congress and the White House has made such blundering even more costly to us Americans. Both must share mutual confidence and common purpose. The cooperation must be sparked by executive leadership.

"We have had little of such leadership. Special interests in the armed services have repeatedly been carrying their appeals to Congress—sometimes without knowledge of any of their civilian superiors."

Then General Eisenhower said:

"Supplemental appropriations by Congress have been vetoed, passed over a veto, and sometimes held back by the President."

But only last year, the Congress appropriated $42 million to prevent any further reduction in the personnel strength of the Marine Corps, this action being taken on the theory that it was wrong to discharge many thousand Marine volunteers at the same time tens of thousands of men were being drafted off of the farms and out of the cities.

The Administration impounded the money Congress appropriated for this volunteer force. The Marine strength was permitted to decline. Actually, the Secretary of Defense used much of the impounded money for his own Department.

Also in Baltimore in 1952 General Eisenhower stated:

"Service disagreements have become public brawls."

Compare any disagreement between the services in 1952 with those flooding the press, television, and radio today.

General Eisenhower continued:

"Stranger than this is the almost inevitable demand of each service to do the research, development, and production work on new weapons. Each believes that it can do the work better. In this matter prompt adjudication among the services is mandatory—otherwise you will find all three engaged in spending public money for a single need."

* * * * * *

"This brings us to the supremely important matter of unification of the Armed Forces.

"When I became Chief of Staff upon my return from Europe in November of 1945, I felt that all our war experience had rendered obsolete the defense organization then existing. I was convinced then, as I am today, that effective coordination of the services in war requires central planning in time of peace. This is the essence of unity in the Armed Forces. That unity must also extend to the procurement and administration of all the costly materiel and paraphernalia of modern warfare. It was the hope and expectation of all of us who worked to achieve the passage of the National Defense Act of 1947 that this kind of unity was in the making.

"This has not proved to be the case. Such unity as we have achieved is too much form and too little substance. We have continued with a loose way of operating that wastes time, money, and talent with equal generosity. With three services, in place of the former two, still going their separate ways, and with an overall defense staff frequently unable to enforce corrective action, the end result has been not to remove duplication, but to replace it with triplication.

"All this must be brought to as swift an end as possible. Neither our security nor

our solvency can permit such a way of conducting the crucial business of national defense."

That was over 3½ years ago.

Not a single change in the law has been suggested by this administration to correct the situation described by General Eisenhower on September 25, 1952.

Instead of any proposals to bring "all this to as swift an end as possible," the President's own people volunteer that triplication and waste has increased heavily since he took office in January 1953.

The former Assistant Secretary of Air Force Research and Development, Mr. Trevor Gardner, resigned early this year in bitter protest at the current disorganization in the Pentagon.

Only last month Mr. Gardner wrote in Look magazine as follows:

"We must junk the creaking, decentralized reviewing and re-reviewing machinery we now so foolishly look to for decisions. In place of this bureaucratic Noah's Ark, we urgently need a streamlined mechanism capable of responding to new dangers as quickly as they become known."

As an illustration of what Mr. Gardner is talking about, this country fought and won the greatest war in history—and at that time its military departments contained a total of eight Secretaries.

Today, despite all this talk about the importance of further service unification in order to increase security and, at the same time, cut expenses, there are 31 Secretaries.

And the President has just asked the Congress to approve 3 more, for a total of 34.

Because of the rising criticism resulting from the bitter interservice rows which have recently broken out in the open, it is reported that something will be done about the deteriorating situation in the Pentagon.

Last week Time magazine stated:

"It is the duty of Commander in Chief Dwight Eisenhower to insure that the machine—in all its countless parts—adds up to a single unit meshed for a sole purpose: to keep war away by its total retaliatory power.

"That aim no longer permits the luxury of the three services and their many subservices wrangling for power and heading in different directions. For this reason President Eisenhower has come to one of the most important decisions of his administration: to move for a truly unified armed service that will work in practice as well as on paper, as a single machine. Last week he ordered his White House staff planners to start work immediately on mapping out a unification plan for completion this fall. If he is reelected he hopes to present his unification proposals to Congress next year."

But we heard all that in Baltimore, back in September 1952.

Why should be believe it now, any more than we should have believed it then?

For many years some of us have stated and restated that if President Eisenhower would only carry out what he said should be done in 1945, 1946, and 1948—and what he in effect promised would be done in 1952, many billions of dollars annually could be saved in our national defense cost, at no sacrifice whatever to our military strength.

The saving could mean a balanced Federal budget; and should mean a heavy reduction in income taxes.

Apparently some people believe that emphasis on the importance of national defense indicates a certain narrowness of viewpoint; a failure to recognize that military power is only a part of that much broader struggle which is rapidly shaping up for the political and economic control of the world.

Quite obviously the Communists, dedicated to world conquest, don't want to gain control of a devastated country. There is no profit in acquiring a lot of smoldering, radioactive real estate. They want to take over a going concern, at the peak of its productivity. Therefore their approach now is political and economic as well as military.

But their political warfare rests upon a military standoff. Note they did not even begin their successful recent developments on the political front until they felt they were at least within reaching distance of military equality.

It goes without saying that the political-economic struggle is an even larger, more difficult, and more challenging problem than the problem of maintaining military superiority.

To put it another way, the problem of military superiority is in itself a challenge to our resources. But it is small compared to the vast challenge of the overall struggle, including the struggle for the minds of men.

If the present leaders of this administration have been unable to cope with the current world-wide political struggle from a position of military strength, how will they manage from a position of military weakness?

If, during the Korean War our choices of action were limited by fear the enemy would "enlarge the war" (don't dare bomb beyond the Yalu, don't dare use atomic weapons), how will our policy and program be restricted if and when the Russians have a superiority in arms?

This is an intensely practical problem, one which must be faced if we are to continue in a free world.

Some future administration may have the genius to deal successfully in foreign affairs from a position of relative weakness; but this administration does not seem to be able to exploit its asserted position of relative strength.

We have a right to expect our Government to deal effectively with the broader problem, handling the military problem in stride. But this administration seems unable to handle either without a succession of obvious failure.

We might forgive the mistakes in foreign policy; but management—with a capital M—was to have been the great talent of the crowd now in office. (If you once ran General Motors, you are equipped to run the country.)

Yet in the very place where we were led to expect the pinnacle of competence, we have seen bungling and shortsightedness.

Again, preoccupation on my part with the military-defense problem does not mean any lack of awareness of the broader political struggle now taking place all over the world.

But the military problem is elementary. If we cannot handle that, how can we handle something far more complex?

If we—the United States—cannot maintain a superiority of arms, apparently cannot even maintain a military standoff, how can we expect to win the larger diplomatic and economic struggle?

The argument is made that America cannot spend for arms at the expense of its economy.

Who says we should? This is to avoid and evade the real problem. The real problem—the real measure of the problem—is to obtain the necessary capability without injuring the economy.

It can be done; and it will have to be done.

If we don't enlarge our vision, broaden our concepts, and achieve a better comprehension of the total problem, our failures in this field are just a foretaste of the much larger failures in store for us on the international political front.

We have come here today to honor a great Missourian, to honor him for what he has stood for over the years.

To him we express the gratitude of his party, his community, his district, his State, and his Nation.

Several weeks ago in the bright morning sun, I journeyed through the farms of western Kentucky. On the train was Alben Barkley, being carried to his eternal rest.

As we went by, farmers were kneeling among their crops in the fields, paying respect to one they loved, because they knew this great Democrat had devoted his life to attaining a better life for them.

Fortunately for us, another great Democrat is with us today, with many years of public service ahead of him.

We know, CLARENCE CANNON, that at the same time you participate in our most important national problem—the insurance of a more prosperous and a more secure America—the problems of your friends and neighbors are always in your heart and mind.

It is for that reason you have our respect, our affection, and our eternal gratitude.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 14, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, June 11, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee on this national day of pledged allegiance to the flag of our Republic, for all the memories and the faith and the principles which its folds symbolize wherever it floats on land or air or sea, making tyranny tremble. As we bow in reverence this day, beneath the white-domed shrine of each patriot's devotion, with grateful hearts we come in this night of global conflict between falsehood and truth, light and darkness, with joy that our flag is still there—emblem of freedom's holy light, and that, seeing it, captive and enslaved peoples thank God and take courage. Though the road to a just peace for our time and for our children's children be tedious and toilsome, still lead us on, with patience following the gleam of the flag with clear heads and pure hearts, worthy of the trust the Nation has committed to our hands. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 13, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 890) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its amendment; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. DEMPSEY, Mr. DONDERO, and Mr. MCGREGOR were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4090) to amend part II of title III of the Communications Act of 1934, so as to require the installation of an automatic radiotelegraph call selector on cargo ships of the United States carrying less than two radio operators, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 872. An act for the relief of Sam Bergesen;

S. 910. An act for the relief of Lino Perez Martinez;

S. 1067. An act for the relief of Tibor Horvath; and

S. 1221. An act for the relief of the estate of Joseph Kelsch.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4090) to amend part II of title III of the Communications Act of 1934, so as to require the installation of an automatic radio-telegraph call selector on cargo ships of the United States carrying less than two radio operators, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Special Committee Investigating Lobbying Activities and the Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Committee on Armed Forces were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, with statements limited to 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CONTINUANCE OF EFFECTIVENESS OF MISSING PERSONS ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1957 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENLARGEMENT OF WATER-SUPPLY FACILITIES, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif. area in order to insure the existence of an adequate water supply for naval installations and defense production plants in such area," approved October 11, 1951 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUDIT REPORT ON ARMY INDUSTRIAL FUND

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Army Industrial Fund, Maintenance and Industrial Division, Jeffersonville Quartermaster Depot, Quartermaster Corps, Department of the Army, for the period July 1, 1952, to March 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT, HOT SPRINGS NATIONAL PARK, ARK.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract in Hot Springs National Park, Ark. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

VALIDATION OF OVERPAYMENTS OF PAY AND ALLOWANCES TO CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to validate overpayments of pay and allowances made to certain officers of the Army, Navy, Naval Reserve, and Air Force while undergoing training at civilian hospitals, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor, Inc., at Asheville, N. C., relating to a pilgrimage of Gold Star Mothers to the graves of deceased servicemen buried overseas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor, Inc., at Asheville, N. C., relating to disability pensions for certain prisoners of war; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor, Inc., at Asheville, N. C., favoring a continuance of the studies of the effects of malnutrition and other hardships on the mortality and morbidity of former United States prisoners of war and civilian internees of World War II; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Niagara County Democratic Committee, Niagara Falls, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the development of electric power installations on the Niagara River; to the Committee on Public Works.

REORGANIZATION OF SAFETY FUNCTIONS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—EDITORIAL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the May issue of the Safety Maintenance and Production magazine contains an editorial about the bill (S. 3517) to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, introduced by me, which is now before the Committee on Government Operations.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the editorial was referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR SPONSORS SAFETY BILL

That the legislative branch of the Federal Government has good reason to concern itself with the safety of Federal employees is indicated by a bill introduced in the United States Senate by Senator H. H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota.

It seems ironic that the Government which should set an outstanding record for accident prevention among its own employees now finds itself in the position of lagging behind private industry in accident frequency. This is particularly true in certain agencies ordinarily considered far less hazardous than the so-called danger spots in heavy industry operated privately.

Sparked by Senator HUMPHREY and a number of Senators from other States, the bill would provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government and create within the framework of the Department of Labor a Federal Safety Division.

It must be emphasized that nowhere under the proposed legislation would the Government "take over" any functions of the safety movement operating so efficiently in private enterprise. Instead, if enacted into law, the bill would attempt to do for Government employees what private industry is doing to curtail the tragic losses resulting from preventable accidents.

According to the Senator from Minnesota, the direct and indirect costs of occupation accidents alone in the Federal Government amounted to well over a half billion dollars between 1950 and 1954 with a very meager reduction of about 10 percent compared with industry's reduction of 23 percent for the same period.

Elsewhere in this issue, Senator HUMPHREY gives high praise for the accident reduction accomplishments of some branches of the Government, such as the Navy Department, Atomic Energy Commission, and the outstanding safety work in the naval shipyards. These excellent records serve to underscore the deplorable toll of other less dedicated departments and pinpoint the need for proving that a better safety job can be done by all Government agencies.

The Senate bill carries provision for the appointment by the Secretary of Labor of a Director of Federal Safety who together with 10 qualified safety engineers, technically experienced, would be above all political considerations. Instead their appointments and promotions would be made on the basis of qualifications, merit, and efficiency under rules of the Civil Service Commission.

It would be the duty of the Director to collect and analyze data concerning safety standards and programs now in operation in the Federal agencies; to develop and establish minimum safe working standards to be maintained; to promote uniformity by cooperating with related health and fire prevention activities; to develop programs designed to reduce the claims against the Federal Government resulting from injuries to private persons and property; to set up a system for inspections looking toward a greater emphasis upon safety. Further, the Director of Federal Safety would recommend to the Secretary of Labor for transmittal to the Bureau of the Budget the amount needed to be

allocated in the budget of each Federal agency for carrying out the safety programs approved by the Federal Safety Division.

An analysis of the bill reveals that the method of selecting a Director provides for a leader who would possess the proper degree of experience and background in industrial safety. Moreover, the bill would promote a realistic safety educational program and safety inspection procedures designed to reduce the human suffering and financial losses incurred by accident victims employed in the Federal service.

It has been alleged over the years that, in the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, some individuals have discouraged employees and dependents from filing claims in bona fide injury and death situations, merely to show an apparently good but fictitious safety record. Senator HUMPHREY's bill would discourage such actions and impose sanctions and penalties where the forbidden acts are attempted or accomplished.

It is high time that all possible encouragement be given to developing safety consciousness in Federal employees in every agency of government.

Safety leaders, operating officials, and production men can perform no greater service toward reducing our national accident record than to write their respective Senators and Representatives urging a favorable vote on the Humphrey bill.

Enacted into law, the legislation would bring to the federally employed the same high degree of safety activity which has saved countless lives and financial loss in private enterprise over the past 50 years.—H. A.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment:

H. R. 8634. A bill to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in North Carolina to the city of Charlotte, N. C. (Rept. No. 2228).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 3467. A bill to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States (Rept. No. 2231).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 2881. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to collect and publish annually statistics as to the number of certain types of textile looms in place and in operation on a State-by-State basis (Rept. No. 2232); and

S. 3215. A bill authorizing the Postmaster General to provide for the use of special canceling stamps or postmarking dies in order to encourage registration for voting in general elections (Rept. No. 2233).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment:

H. R. 9842. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to hold and detain mail for temporary periods in certain cases (Rept. No. 2234).

By Mr. CLEMENTS, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H. R. 11473. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2236).

INTERPRETATION OF EFFECT OF ACTS OF CONGRESS ON STATE LAWS—REPORT OF COMMITTEE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, from the Commitee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 3143) to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws, and I submit a report (No. 2230) thereon.

I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. WOFFORD] may be added as cosponsors of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the names of Senators JENNER and WOFFORD will be added as cosponsors of the bill.

REPORT ENTITLED "MACHINE-TOOL PROGRAMS" (S. REPT. NO. 2229)

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, from the Select Committee on Small Business I submit a report entitled "Government Plans and Programs Relating to the Machine-Tool Industry" which I ask to have printed. This report is based on hearings held last February before the Subcommittee on Relations of Business With Government, of which I have the pleasure of serving as chairman. This report was unanimously adopted by the full Small Business Committee.

Mr. President, this report is a constructive effort to encourage a reexamination of Government machine-tool policy in this time of relative quiet, so as to avoid, in a future emergency, the serious machine-tool bottleneck which beset our defense efforts in World War II and again in Korea. This report points out that the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Secretary of Defense have a continuing responsibility to see that wise machine-tool policies are promptly devised and forcefully implemented. In particular, the Secretary of Defense has the duty of seeing that financial barriers are overcome, and that each Military Department accords adequate budgetary priority to its machine-tool program.

Mr. President, Government machine-tool policies bear heavily on our small-business community. Further, the bulk of the machine-tool industry, itself, falls within the category of "small business" and a healthy machine-tool industry is a defense asset of highest order. I commend this report to members of this body and to responsible officials of the executive branch of our Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING REPORT BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT (S. REPT. NO. 2235)

Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 286), and submitted a report thereon, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 185, extending the time for filing a report by the Subcommittee on Disarmament, 84th Congress, 2d session, agreed to February 8, 1956, is hereby amended as follows:

(a) In section 2, strike out "July 1, 1956" and substitute in lieu thereof "January 31, 1957."

(b) In section 3, strike out "July 1, 1956" and substitute in lieu thereof "January 31, 1957."

(c) In section 4, strike out "$35,000" and substitute in lieu thereof "$67,000."

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 9852) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, together with individual views of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and I submit a report (No. 2237) thereon.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, with the individual views of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, together with the individual views, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 4055. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain surplus real property in Seattle, Wash., for educational use in conformity wth section 203 (k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. JACKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 4056. A bill to repeal certain Federal excise taxes on facilities and services, and certain manufacturers excise taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. BEALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 4057. A bill for the relief of Nicholas P. Alessi; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (by request):

S. 4058. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 26, 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 4059. A bill providing for price reporting and research with respect to forest products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 4060. A bill to amend section 607 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 to include employees in the Motor Vehicle Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 4061. A bill to allow additional income-tax exemptions for a taxpayer or a spouse, or a dependent child, who is a full-time student at an educational institution above the secondary level; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 4062. A bill to facilitate the administration and development of the Whitman National Monument, in the State of Washington, by authorizing the acquisition of additional land for the monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 4063. A bill for the relief of Aida M. Shanafelt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were submitted or reported, and agreed to, referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. MUNDT):

S. Res. 283. Resolution providing for a compilation of material on the price-support program; agreed to.

(See the remarks of Mr. ELLENDER when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. Res. 284. Resolution to disapprove the sale of the Government-owned alcohol butadiene plant at Louisville, Ky.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

STUDIES REGARDING FOREIGN ASSISTANCE BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 285), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas there has been no public, nonpartisan examination of United States foreign aid policies since studies undertaken prior to the beginning of the Marshall plan; and

Whereas an important portion of the United States Government budget has been and is being devoted to foreign aid programs; and

Whereas since the inception of foreign aid programs fundamental changes have taken place in the world situation and in the relative strength of countries both friendly and unfriendly toward the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations shall arrange for exhaustive studies to be made of the extent to which foreign assistance by the United States Government serves, can be made to serve, or does not serve, the national interest, to the end that such studies and recommendations based thereon may be available to the Senate in considering foreign aid policies for the future.

SEC. 2. The committee shall, without limiting the scope of the study hereby authorized, direct its attention to the following matters:

(a) The proper objectives of foreign aid programs and the criteria which can be used to measure accomplishment.

(b) The capability of the United States to extend aid, in terms of the Nation's economic, technical, personnel, and other resources.

(c) The need and willingness of foreign countries to receive aid, and their capacity to make effective use thereof.

(d) The various kinds of foreign aid and alternatives thereto as well as the methods by which and conditions on which aid might be furnished.

(e) The related actions which should be taken to make foreign aid effective in achieving national objectives.

SEC. 3. The committee shall transmit to the Senate not later than February 15, 1957, the results of the study herein authorized together with such recommendations as may at that time be found desirable.

SEC. 4. In the conduct of this study full use shall be made of the experience, knowledge, and advice of private organizations, schools, institutions, and individuals. The committee may divide the work of the study among such groups and institutions as it may deem appropriate and may enter into contracts for this purpose. Full use shall be made of studies and plans prepared by executive agencies, and such agencies are requested to give the committee or any of its authorized study groups or consultants such assistance as may be required.

SEC. 5. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee is authorized to employ on a temporary basis through February 15, 1957, such technical, clerical, or other assistants, experts, and consultants, as it deems desirable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $300,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. Res. 286. Resolution extending the time for filing a report by the Subcommittee on Disarmament; reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations; placed on the calendar.

(See resolution printed in full which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

REPORTS OF RESULTS OF TESTS OF SAMPLES OF OPIUM SEIZED IN ILLICIT TRAFFIC

Mr. DANIEL (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. WELKER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. MANSFIELD) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 287), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas at present, the United Nations Narcotic Laboratory, in testing samples of opium seized in the illicit traffic, reports the results of those tests only to the determined country of origin and to the country in which the drugs were seized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is strongly recommended that the results of such tests, in every case, be also communicated to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs of the United Nations.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall forward a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of State for transmission to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

URGING CERTAIN COUNTRIES TO PROSCRIBE HEROIN

Mr. DANIEL (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. WELKER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. MANSFIELD) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 288), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the United States considers that the drug heroin is the most dangerous of addicting narcotic drugs; that the availability and use of this drug is conducive to a tenacious type of drug addiction which wreaks havoc upon and slowly destroys human lives; and

Whereas it has been established that the limited medical use formerly made of heroin can be met by other less dangerous narcotic drugs, and all except seven countries (Albania, Bahrein, Belgium, France, Hungary, Italy, and Paraguay) have taken action to proscribe heroin: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United Nations should urge the governments of those countries which have not yet taken action to proscribe heroin to do so at the earliest possible moment.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall forward a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of State for transmission to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH MEXICO FOR A MORE EFFECTIVE CONTROL OVER ILLICIT NARCOTIC DRUGS

Mr. DANIEL (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. WELKER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. MANSFIELD) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 289), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the Senate of the United States has learned with great concern that drug addicts and convicted narcotic law violators, who are residents of the United States and Mexico, are constantly crossing the United States-Mexican boundary for the purpose of obtaining, using, and trafficking in narcotic drugs and marihuana; and

Whereas the Senate of the United States believes that addiction to narcotic drugs is reprehensible, in that it wreaks havoc upon and slowly destroys human lives; and

Whereas the Senate of the United States believes that continued agitation along the United States-Mexican boundary relative to the sale and purchase of narcotic drugs might adversely affect the splendid and cordial relations existing between Mexico and the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President is requested to commence negotiations with the Mexican Government, for the purpose of concluding a treaty which will result in a more effective control of the traffic in illicit narcotic drugs and marihuana, such negotiations to include methods for the prohibition of boundary crossings by users of such illicit narcotics drugs, users of marihuana, drug addicts, and convicted narcotic law violators of both nations, and provisions for the exchange of specialized personnel for the purpose of providing closer liaison between both nations in the control of the traffic in such illicit narcotic drugs and marihuana.

URGING CERTAIN COUNTRIES TO RATIFY PROTOCOL OF 1953 RELATING TO CULTIVATION OF THE POPPY PLANT AND THE USE OF OPIUM

Mr. DANIEL (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. WELKER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. MANSFIELD) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 290), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the Senate of the United States has learned with regret that only 15 of the required minimum of 25 countries have ratified or acceded to the Protocol of 1953 for Limiting and Regulating the Cultivation of the Poppy Plant, the Production of, International and Wholesale Trade in, and Use of Opium; and

Whereas the Commission on Narcotic Drugs of the United Nations has been engaged for several years in the task of drafting a single convention on narcotic drugs designed to modernize, codify, and replace existing conventions and protocols on this subject: Therefore be it

Resolved, That (a) the United Nations should urge the Governments of all countries which have not yet ratified or acceded to the said Protocol of 1953 (particularly the producing countries, Bulgaria, Greece, Iran, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Yugoslavia) to do so at the earliest possible moment.

(b) The Commission on Narcotic Drugs of the United Nations and the governments of countries represented on that Commission are hereby urged to take appropriate steps to expedite the preparation of a final draft of the proposed single convention which may be acceptable as an improved international agreement to control more effectively the traffic in narcotic drugs.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall forward a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of State for transmission to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY IN SEATTLE, WASH.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the disposal of certain surplus real property in Seattle, Wash., for educational use in conformity with section 203 (k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4055) to provide for the disposal of certain surplus real property in Seattle, Wash., for educational use in conformity with section 203 (k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, in the heart of the south end of Seattle, about 8 blocks from the Boeing Aircraft Co. plant, and surrounded by the homes of workers, is the Seattle Christian School. This school is sponsored on a nondenominational basis by some 55 Seattle churches.

The 1.7 acres of property on which the school is located was acquired from the Federal Government for educational use and since this acquisition the school has grown until it now teaches approximately 300 students in 12 grades.

The Federal Government has now declared surplus approximately 9 acres of property which adjoins the present school site and the Seattle Christian School has made application for this property. The application has been approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

However, the General Services Administration has turned down the school's application, claiming this property should be used for industrial purposes. GSA has scheduled an auction for June 29 at the Olympic Hotel in Seattle at which this property will be offered to the highest bidder.

Mr. President, this property is not needed for industrial purposes—it is needed for expanding the fine work that is being carried on by the Seattle Christian School. If the property is occupied by industry, not only will expansion of the educational opportunities for students at the school be impossible, but continued operation of the school may be impractical.

A more detailed analysis of the background of this matter is contained in a letter I addressed to the Administrator of GSA on May 8. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point along with a copy of a reply received from the Commissioner of Public Buildings.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 8, 1956.

Mr. FRANKLIN G. FLOETE,
Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: I am writing to you with reference to your disposal of 8.831 acres of land and 1 building which were a part of War Housing Project, Wash., 45227.

I would like to review for you briefly the history of the disposal as I know it. When this property was originally released by the Public Housing Administration, the Seattle Christian Schools Association immediately made application for the property through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Seattle Christian Schools Association is sponsored by 57 local Seattle churches of the Protestant denomination. The guiding motivation of their school program is to impart Christian education as well as secular training. It is a nonprofit organization financed completely by donations from the membership of the 57 sponsoring churches.

It now operates very successfully a school on the acreage adjoining the property which is now up for disposal. The property which it now occupies is a part of War Housing Project No. 45227 and was obtained by the association through the disposal program on the recommendation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The association needs the additional acreage to expand the educational program and fill out a well-rounded educational program for its students.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reviewed the application of the association and recommended that this property be disposed of to the association. However, in accordance with the law, the General Services Administration had to circularize the various Federal agencies to see if any of them had need for this property.

On May 3, 1955, the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Properties, and Installations, requested that the disposal of this property be held in abeyance as the possible site of an Army Reserve training center. Subsequently, the Army released its hold on this property and I was informed on March 22, 1956, that the General Services Administration had determined this area to be surplus and issued notice that the property would be sold by auction sale to the highest bidder for a sale scheduled to be held during the month of June.

When I was advised of this action I immediately contacted the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and was informally advised that the agency's recommendation that the property be disposed of to the Seattle Christian Schools Association was still in effect. However, I was further informed both by that agency and by your agency that the GSA had rendered a decision that this recommendation could not be acceded to and that the property would be sold at public auction.

So far as I can determine the reason for this decision is that the property in question has been classified as "industrial" and would therefore not qualify for disposal for educational use.

I most respectfully and urgently request that this decision be reconsidered on the basis of the following factors:

(a) This property will be developed primarily to serve the needs of families of persons employed by a Government contractor, namely the Boeing Aircraft Co., Seattle, Wash. A majority of the students are from the families of Boeing workers. The Boeing Aircraft Co. has endorsed this proposal very strongly because it has been a great help to Boeing in meeting its defense labor requirements. This is particularly true where both parents are employed and they are able to deliver and pick up their children while on route to and from work. The school has made special arrangements in order to meet this need.

(b) A portion of the students are also from the families of the Federal civilian and military personnel of the cadre attached to Boeing Aircraft Co.

(c) This property is located only three blocks from the Boeing Aircraft Co. and as I mentioned above, is part of the same housing project, a portion of which has already been disposed of to the Seattle Christian Schools Association. The property in question adjoins the school which is now in operation and the additional property and surplus building would help them to meet their expanding needs and round out their educational program.

(d) A hospital adjoins this property on one side which would indicate that this area is not exclusively industrial in nature. It is also surrounded by a considerable residential area, mainly of low-income families.

For the above-named reasons I feel very strongly that this property should be disposed of in accordance with the recommendation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Seattle Christian Schools Association.

I feel that all factors considered, particularly the contribution which it is making to the national defense effort by providing schooling for children of Federal military and civilian personnel and employees of a Federal contractor engaged in the most vital type of work, disposal in this way would be the highest and best functional use of this relatively small area possible.

I would like to point out further that Congress, for the past decade, has recognized the responsibility of the Federal Government for the education of children belonging to families in the above classifications. I would like to call to your attention to the Lanhan Acts and Public Laws 815 and 874 which are currently in effect. Funds under these acts, of course, are allocated to tax supported institutions. However, the fact that the Seattle Christian Schools are supported by vountary donations and not supported by taxpayers' funds seems to me only to strengthen their case inasmuch as they are accomplishing the same results, namely the education of such children, to meet the requirements for Federal assistance.

While it is possible that public auction of this property conceivably could bring a moderately higher monetary return to the Federal Government at this moment, such a result in no way equals the overall contribution which this nonprofit institution will be making for years to come to the children of the Seattle community both in terms of dollar savings to the taxpayer and the successful efforts it will be making in the fight against costly juvenile delinquency.

In conclusion, I therefore most strongly urge that immediate reconsideration of this

decision be made and that every possible legal effort be made toward disposing of this property to the Seattle Christian Schools Association. Because of my deep personal interest in this problem I will certainly be most happy to provide you, upon request, with any further information or factual data that you may find necessary in reaching a favorable decision on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY M. JACKSON,
United States Senator.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1956.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: Your letter of May 8 to the Administrator states the reasons why you feel the decision classifying as industrial 8.831 acres of land and one building at the former war-housing project, WASH.-45227, Seattle, Wash., should be rescinded in favor of the school use application of the Seattle Christian Schools Association.

The assignment of surplus real property to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for transfer for educational purposes, under section 203 (k) of Public Law 152, 81st Congress, is discretionary on the part of GSA. In order that a policy commensurate with the best interest of the Government could be formulated a number of conferences were held during the past months, between officials of GSA, DHEW, and the Bureau of the Budget. Certain criteria developed from these conferences, among which were those applicable to industrial property.

Therefore, under the above circumstances, we must inform you that the property for which the Seattle Christian Schools Association made application should not be assigned for educational use. It has been classified as having its highest and best use as industrial property. The land is estimated to have a value in excess of $200,000 because of the industrial nature of the neighborhood.

The auction sale of this property is scheduled for Friday, June 29, at the Olympic Hotel in Seattle.

Sincerely yours,

F. MORAN MCCONIHE,
Commissioner of Public Buildings.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN EXCISE TAXES

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, it is becoming increasingly apparent each day that a number of killjoy taxes are putting an unfair burden on certain areas of our recreation.

This toll is being exacted somewhat ruthlessly, drawing from youngsters interested in athletics, from men and women out for a few hours of relaxation, and even from families who like to stay at home for an evening of playing cards.

The Federal revenue from this systematic raiding of our leisure hours was a mere $207 million last year, and the next few years do not offer any prospects for much more in the way of financial gain.

On the other hand, the so-called amusement taxes have a very important place in our economy when they appear in their true form—as the extra 10 percent or so that we have to pay for the recreation we seek.

These amusement taxes are, in effect, legal killjoys; and I now introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to remove them completely from admissions, sporting goods, playing cards, club dues, and cabaret checks.

Behind the measure I introduce is my basic belief that such taxes are not only unfair but even harmful.

I should also like to point out that my bill offers a measure of tax relief which would be reflected immediately in the pockets of every American.

I have consistently advocated that we balance the budget before making tax reductions, and present indications are that we can put our budget on an even keel and grant at least this $207 million cut.

Since this seems rather apparent in the light of present estimates on our expected surplus, and since this is actually a very secondary reason for my proposal, I shall not dwell on it.

My primary idea, as I have indicated, is to free our entertainments and sports from the taxes which make them less accessible.

Whether we balance the budget or not, the amusement taxes should be abolished.

Actually, they never should have been imposed in the first place, and the fact that our present financial outlook is such that we can now remove them without damaging our Nation's economy is just an added reason why we should act now.

It is completely incongruous, I think, for us to promote widespread recreation programs and, at the same time, maintain taxes which have such a hostile effect on our purpose.

Each day we encourage the young men and women of this country to expend their energies in sports and wholesome recreation instead of in gang fights.

We listen to our doctors' advice that relaxation is of prime importance to our physical and mental health.

Why, then, should we continue to tax the sources of our relaxation?

As I have said, it is ridiculous to admit that today's stresses and strains need to be counterbalanced, and then refuse to do everything possible to ease their effects.

In the past this Nation has spent billions of dollars for the treatment and correction of its citizens' mental and physical ailments.

My bill, I feel, will help place the emphasis where it should be—on prevention.

It has been argued that any tampering with our excise taxes will lead to additional demands and complications.

Even if this were true, our answer should be a blunt "So what?"

The taxes are bad.

They should be removed.

If complications arise, it will be unfortunate.

But let us get rid of the "killjoy taxes."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4056) to repeal certain Federal excise taxes on facilities and services, and certain manufacturers excise taxes, introduced by Mr. BEALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

COMPILATION OF MATERIAL ON THE PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, each year the high schools all over the country conduct a debate on some topic of general interest. For the year 1956–57, the topics are rigid versus flexible price supports, the soil bank, and the Brannan plan. In an effort to make available pertinent information on the subject it has been suggested that data be furnished in printed form. The information supplied would not be endorsed by any member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry nor by the Legislative Reference Service employees who assemble the material.

The data to be included would be in the nature of a summary of different arguments which have been advanced, and is not intended to be exhaustive or complete as to details. I have a resolution which I have discussed with the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished acting minority leader; the resolution proposes that the Library of Congress, together with the staff of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, prepare available data for this purpose.

Many Senators receive requests to send such information to their constituents, and all of us ask the Library of Congress to prepare the information. That is a very expensive process, and I believe that adoption of the resolution will result in relieving us of a great deal of work in that connection.

As I have stated, the purpose of the resolution is to have a summary made of the arguments on both sides of these questions, without in any manner expressing the views of any particular person or group. The proposed document will be used as a source of information for the debate contests which are to be conducted this year in the high schools throughout the country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Louisiana contemplate requesting unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has the Senator from Louisiana cleared the matter with the minority leadership?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I have no objection. I think the proposal is a very constructive one.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I submit the resolution, and request its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 283), as follows:

Whereas the high-school debate topic for the coming year is related to the price-support program, and many requests will be sent to the Congress for material on such topic: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Library of Congress and the staff of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry shall prepare a

compilation of material on such topic, to be printed as a Senate document at a cost of not more than $1,200 above the initial cost to the Senate of printing such a document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 283) was considered and agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to give notice of a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution (S. Res. 283) providing for a compilation of material on the price-support program was agreed to earlier today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be entered.

DISAPPROVAL OF SALE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED ALCOHOL BUTADIENE PLANT AT LOUISVILLE, KY.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution disapproving the proposed sale of the Government-owned alcohol butadiene plant at Louisville, Ky.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by me to the Honorable Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, dated June 6, 1956, and his reply dated June 12, 1956.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 284) was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor sale of the Government-owned alcohol butadiene plant at Louisville, Ky., known as Plancor No. 1207, as recommended in the report of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission.

The letters, presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT, are as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
June 6, 1956.

Hon. JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States,
General Accounting Office,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COMPTROLLER GENERAL: The Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, under date of May 26, 1956, transmitted a report recommending sale of the alcohol butadiene plant at Louisville, Ky., to Union Carbide & Carbon Corp. A copy of the Disposal Commission's pamphlet containing this report is enclosed for your information.

The Disposal Commission's transmittal letter states that:

"The Commission is prepared to effect prompt transfer of the plant to the purchaser unless the Congress should disapprove the sale."

Accompanying the report is a letter from the Acting Attorney General, Mr. William P. Rogers, dated May 23, 1956, which states, among other things:

"I do not view the proposed sale of the Louisville plant to Union Carbide & Carbon Corp. as being in violation of the antitrust laws. However, it is my view that the proposed sale would not best foster the development of a free competitive synthetic rubber industry, the standard set forth in section 3 (c) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as amended. Accordingly the proposed sale is not approved. My reasons for this conclusion are found in my attached statement of findings as required by section 9 (a) (4) of the act."

The statement of findings is also set forth in the Disposal Commission's pamphlet. It concludes with the following:

"Accordingly, the proposed sale is not approved."

Section 9 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as amended, reads in part as follows:

"SEC. 9. (a) Not later than 30 days after the termination of the negotiating period * * * the Commission shall prepare and submit to the Congress a report setting forth—

* * * * *

"(4) the statement from the Attorney General setting forth findings approving the proposed disposals in accordance with the standards set forth in section 3 (c) of this act."

Section 27 (c) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as amended by Public Law 433, 84th Congress, reads as follows:

"(c) Within 10 days after the termination of the actual negotiation period referred to in subsection (b), or, if Congress is not then in session, within 10 days after Congress next convenes, the Commission shall prepare and submit to the Congress a report containing, with respect to the disposal under this section of the Louisville plant, the information described in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, and 8 of section 9 (a). Unless the contract is disapproved by either House of the Congress by a resolution prior to the expiration of 30 days of continuous session (as defined in section 9 (c)) of the Congress following the date upon which the report is submitted to it, upon the expiration of such 30-day period the contract shall become fully effective and the Commission shall proceed to carry it out, and transfer of possession of the facility sold shall be made as soon as practicable but in any event within 30 days after the expiration or termination of the existing lease on the Louisville plant. The failure to complete transfer of possession within 30 days after expiration or termination of the existing lease shall not give rise to or be the basis of rescission of the contract of sale."

Section 5 of Public Law 433, 84th Congress, provides that:

"Except as otherwise provided in this act, the disposal or lease of the Louisville plant shall be fully subject to all the provisions of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953."

In connection with this requirement of section 9 (a) (4) of the act, it is pertinent to note the following quotation from the statement of the managers on the part of the House in the conference report presenting the final bill (H. Rept. No. 1055, 83d Cong., 1st sess.):

"The next important change from the original House bill is found in section 9 (a) (4) of the conference report. The Senate amendment to this section provided as follows:

"'(4) the statement from the Attorney General setting forth findings approving the proposed disposals in accordance with the standards set forth in section 3 (c) of this act;'

"It should be recalled that the Attorney General, in section 3 (c) of the conference report, requires the Attorney General to consult with and advise the Commission in order [sic]—

'to secure guidance as to the type of disposal program which would best foster the development of a free competitive synthetic rubber industry.'

"The original House language provided as follows:

"'(4) to the extent requested by the Attorney General the report shall transmit his advice concerning the sales which are proposed;'.

"The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment and thus the Attorney General shall be required to make actual findings, approving the proposed sales."

It may be noted that this provision of section 9 (a) (4) was written into the bill on the floor of the Senate as part of the so-called Maybawk amendment (99 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 7, pp. 9361, 9373), and the omission of the provision from the first conference report (Rept. No. 999, 83d Cong., pp. 6, 12–13) was one of the reasons for the rejection by the Senate of this first conference report (99 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 8, pp. 10288–10292).

It is also pertinent to note the following statements from the Attorney General's letter of January 4, 1956, set forth in the Disposal Commission's report on the disposal of the synthetic rubber plant at Institute, W. Va., a copy of which is also enclosed for your information (pp. 17–18):

"The act requires the Attorney General to advise the Commission as to whether the proposed disposal, if carried out, will violate the antitrust laws, and to make findings approving the proposed disposal in accordance with the standards set forth in section 3 (c) of the act. The Commission has advised me that in its opinion no report recommending disposal of the institute plant could be submitted to Congress for review in the event of my disapproval.

* * * * *

"Were this a private transaction rather than a sale by the Government subject to the review of the Congress, I would probably request a Federal court to enjoin consummation pending a determination of legality by the court under section 7 of the Clayton Act.

"In order, however, to permit the Congress to have the final determination, as the law anticipates, I set forth the considerations hereinabove mentioned, and am willing to, and do, express the opinion that the proposed disposal of the institute plant to Goodrich-Gulf would not violate section 7 of the Clayton Act."

In order to assist the committee in determining what course of action to follow in this matter, I should appreciate your answers to the following questions:

1. Is it your opinion that the report of the Disposal Commission, accompanied by the Acting Attorney General's letter and statement of May 23, 1956, disapproving the proposed sale, satisfies the requirements of section 27 (c) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as amended, particularly insofar as the requirements relating to section 9 (a) (4) thereof is concerned?

2. Is it your opinion that, under the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as amended, if no disapproval resolution is adopted by either House of Congress within 30 days of continuous session after submission of the report of the Disposal Commission, accompanied by the letter and statement of the Attorney General disapproving the proposed sale, the Disposal Commission is authorized and required to carry out the contract to sell the alcohol butadiene plant at Louisville, Ky., to the prospective purchaser as proposed in the report?

3. If no disapproval resolution is adopted by either House under the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as amended, and the Disposal Commission undertakes to carry out the sale to the prospective purchaser, is it your opinion that the title of the prospective purchaser to the alcohol butadiene plant will be free from cloud or question?

In view of the time schedule involved, I should appreciate your advice on these questions at the earliest possible moment.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, June 12, 1956.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of June 6, 1956, requests our views concerning the report of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission recommending sale of the alcohol butadiene plant at Louisville, Ky., to Union Carbide & Carbon Corp.

The question is whether the disposal report complies with the requirements of Public Law 433, 84th Congress, 70 Statute 51, and the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 Sixty-seventh United States Statutes at Large, page 408, because of the fact that the Attorney General has specifically disapproved the proposed sale.

Section 3 (d) of the 1953 act provides as follows:

"(d) Before submission of its proposed disposal report to the Congress, as provided for in section 9 of this act, the Commission shall submit it to the Attorney General, who shall within a reasonable time, in no event to exceed 90 days, after receiving such report, advise the Commission whether, in his opinion, the proposed disposition will violate the antitrust laws."

Section 9 (a) of the act provides in pertinent part as follows:

"(a) Not later than 30 days after the termination of the negotiating period provided in section 7 of this act, and in no event later than January 31, 1955, the Commission shall prepare and submit to the Congress a report setting forth—

* * * * *

"(4) the statement from the Attorney General setting forth findings approving the proposed disposals in accordance with the standards set forth in section 3 (c) of this act;".

Section 3 (c), which is referred to in section 9 (a) (4), is as follows:

"(c) From the time of its appointment and throughout the course of the performance of its duties, the Commission shall consult and advise with the Attorney General in order (1) to secure guidance as to the type of disposal program which would best foster the development of a free competitive synthetic rubber industry, and (2) to supply the Attorney General with such information as he may deem requisite to enable him to provide the advice contemplated by this section and sections 9 (a) (4) and 9 (f) of this act."

Public Law 433, approved March 21, 1956, extended the period for disposal of the Louisville plant, and contains the following provision:

"Within 10 days after the termination of the actual negotiation period referred to in subsection (b), or, if Congress is not then in session, within 10 days after Congress next convenes, the Commission shall prepare and submit to the Congress a report containing, with respect to the disposal under this section of the Louisville plant, the information described in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, and 8 of section 9 (a)."

Public Law 433 also requires the Attorney General to advise the Commission whether, in his opinion, the proposed disposition of the Louisville plant, if carried out, will violate the antitrust laws.

By letter dated May 23, 1956, the Attorney General advised the Commission that the proposed sale of the Louisville plant to Union Carbide and Carbon Corp. would not be in violation of the antitrust laws. However, the Attorney General also stated in his letter to the Commission that:

"It is my view that the proposed sale would not best foster the development of a free competitive synthetic rubber industry, the standard set forth in section 3 (c) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as amended. Accordingly, the proposed sale is not approved. My reasons for this conclusion are found in my attached statement of findings as required by section 9 (a) (4) of the act."

The Commission recognized that it was questionable whether under section 9 (a) (4) of the basic act the Commission could file a report with the Congress in the absence of affirmative findings from the Attorney General approving the proposed disposal in accordance with the standards set forth in section 3 (c) of the act, and asked the Attorney General whether, under the circumstances, the law permitted the Commission's report to be filed with the Congress for its consideration. In reply the Attorney General stated it to be his belief that it was "entirely appropriate to submit your report to the Congress for review."

Sections 3 (c), 3 (d), and 9 (a) (4) of the 1953 act were the subject of considerable dispute prior to enactment of the legislation. As originally drafted, section 9 (a) (4) would have required "to the extent requested by the Attorney General the report shall transmit his advice concerning the sales which are proposed." And, as approved by the first committee of conference, the bill did not contain the requirements of section 3 (d). The first conference report was rejected by the Senate. The second conference committee reached agreement on the bill in the form in which it was enacted, and the statement of the managers on the part of the House contains the following comment on these provisions:

"Thus under this section [3 (d)] the Attorney General will be required to render an opinion to the Commission as to whether the proposed disposition will violate the antitrust laws. * * *

* * * * *

"The next important change from the original House bill is found in section 9 (a) (4) of the conference report. The Senate amendment to this section provided as follows:

"'(4) the statement from the Attorney General setting forth findings approving the proposed disposals in accordance with the standards set forth in section 3 (c) of this act;'

"It should be recalled that the Attorney General, in section 3 (c) of the conference report, requires the Attorney General to consult with and advise the Commission in order—

"'To secure guidance as to the type of disposal program which would best foster the development of a free competitive synthetic-rubber industry.'

"The original House language provided as follows:

"' (4) to the extent requested by the Attorney General the report shall transmit his advice concerning the sales which are proposed;'.

"The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment and thus the Attorney General shall be required to make actual findings, approving the proposed sales." (H. Rept. No. 1055, July 30, 1953, pp. 12–13.)

It may also be noted that section 4 of Public Law 433, which permits lease of the Louisville plant if it is not sold, contains the following requirements:

"(b) * * * the Commission, before submission to the Congress of a lease or lease extension relative to the Louisville plant, shall submit it to the Attorney General, who shall, within 7 days after receiving the lease or lease extension, advise the Commission whether the proposed lease or lease extension would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws.

"(c) * * * The Commission shall submit at the same time the statement of the Attorney General approving the proposed lease or lease extension in accordance with the standard set forth in subsection (b) of this section."

The foregoing provisions of Public Law 433 appear to us to require the Commission's report on a proposed lease of the Louisville plant to include a statement of approval by the Attorney General on the grounds that the lease will not tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws. Obviously, the leasing of the plant for a maximum term of 15 years would afford less opportunity for monopolistic practices than would its outright sale. Hence, if an affirmative statement of approval by the Attorney General is required in the case of a proposed lease, it appears only reasonable to construe the law as requiring similar affirmative approval of a proposed permanent disposition of the plant by sale.

For these reasons it is our view that the law requires an affirmative approval by the Attorney General of the proposed sale of the Louisville plant; and that the report of the Commission, the sale having been disapproved by the Attorney General, does not satisfy section 27 (c) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Act of 1953, as amended. In answer to your specific inquiry, therefore, we believe that any title which Union Carbide & Carbon Corp. may receive to the Louisville plant, assuming, of course, that no resolution of disapproval is adopted by either body of Congress, would not be free from question.

We do not believe the Commission is authorized or required to carry out the proposed sale on the basis of the present report which does not satisfy the requirement of the law, even should no disapproval resolution be adopted by a House of the Congress. It must be recognized, however, that our opinion is not binding upon the courts. Furthermore, in the event of litigation involving the validity of any title received by Union Carbide & Carbon Corp., the opinion of the Attorney General to the contrary—if indeed that is the purport of the letter of May 23—might well be accorded considerable weight by the court. No doubt, too, some significance in the matter of congressional intent as to the necessity for the Attorney General's approval would be drawn if neither House of the Congress expressed the disapproving power reserved to it in connection with the contract or otherwise challenged the basis of the Commission's proposed disposal of the property.

Consequently we feel compelled to advise the committee that our opinion should not be deemed to make it unnecessary to initiate a resolution disapproving the Commission's report, if this otherwise would be the committee's action in the matter.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 14, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 872. An act for the relief of Sam Bergesen;

S. 910. An act for the relief of Lino Perez Martinez;

S. 1067. An act for the relief of Tibor Horvath; and

S. 1221. An act for the relief of the estate of Joseph Kelsch.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc.,

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address delivered by the Vice President at Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., on the problem of meeting the Soviet Union's tactics.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him at the annual dinner of the Liberal Party, in New York City, on June 13, 1956.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY NEXT—AUTHORIZATION FOR FILING OF BILLS AND REPORTS AND FOR SIGNING OF BILLS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief announcement I should like to make for the information of the Senate. It is the present intention of the leadership, following completion of business today, to move to adjourn the Senate until Monday noon. On Monday there will be available for Senate consideration the legislation appropriation bill, which it is hoped will be reported to the Senate today.

Also on Monday there will be a call of the calendar for the consideration of unobjected-to bills, beginning at the point where the last calendar call left off. I now ask unanimous consent that immediately following the completion of morning business on Monday, the unobjected-to measures on the calendar be called, commencing at the point where the last calendar call ended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be permitted to file bills and reports until midnight this evening, and that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized, during the adjournment of the Senate, to sign all bills found to be truly enrolled.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, since some of the measures scheduled for consideration today may, for one or another reason, not be disposed of, it is quite likely that such bills, as well as other bills not passed on the call of the calendar, but which are cleared by the majority and minority leadership, will be called for action next Monday.

Calendar No. 2169, S. 3982, the mining bill, which is the Senate's unfinished business, will probably be acted upon Monday, following action on the calendar and the legislative appropriation bill.

It may be possible to begin discussion in the early part of next week on the defense appropriation bill, as well as the foreign aid authorization bill. We are very anxious to have the foreign aid authorization bill acted on by the Senate, for the reason that the Senate will have disposed of, I think, next week, all appropriation bills in record time; but action cannot be completed in either House on the foreign aid appropriation bill unless and until the authorization bill is passed.

I give this notice so that all Members of the Senate may be properly notified and may arrange their schedules accordingly.

A number of important bills are in conference, particularly the road bill; but I hope, by the Senate's not being in session tomorrow, the conferees may complete the conference report on the road bill and that the Foreign Relations Committee will have opportunity to complete action on the foreign aid authorization bill.

EFFECTS OF RADIOACTIVITY ON HEREDITY, ENVIRONMENT, AND FOOD SUPPLY

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, the National Academy of Sciences yesterday released an extensive survey concerning the effects of radioactivity on heredity, environment, and food supply. The report reveals some alarming facts, reveals a great deal of information on the subject of radiation, and makes some positive suggestions as to what might be done to insure national safety and protection from the harmful effects of radiation.

The importance of the work which has been done by the National Academy of Sciences cannot be overestimated. We are indeed beginning an atomic age. If this age is to be one which will contribute to the welfare of mankind, it is essential that we have the fullest and clearest understanding possible of the collateral effects which the processes of atomic development and the use of radioactive materials will have on men and women and on future generations. As one who has been interested in the effects of radiation on all living things, I should like to commend the excellent study which has been made by the Genetics Committee of the National Academy of Sciences, under the leadership of the distinguished Dr. Warren Weaver, of the Rockefeller Foundation.

It is my hope that the magnitude of this study will not go unobserved, and that the recommendations made in the report will receive the attention which they merit. Implementation of these recommendations may in some cases require further study; implementation of some may require administrative or legislative action; and others may be implemented simply through the increased understanding of the effects of radiation which we now have as a result of the study made by the National Academy of Sciences.

Whatever implementation may be required, it is of the utmost importance that we proceed with due haste to insure that our continuing atomic development be carried on in such a manner as to guarantee maximum safety and benefit to mankind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Genetics Committee's report on the Biological Effects of Atomic Radiation and the text of the Digest of Findings and Recommendations on Effects of Radiation, which appeared today in the New York Times, be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Radiation and Man's Future," which appeared today in the New York Times; and an editorial entitled "Radiation," which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the report, article, and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 13, 1956]

TEXT OF GENETICS COMMITTEE REPORT CONCERNING EFFECTS OF RADIOACTIVITY ON HEREDITY

(Foreword)

The National Academy of Sciences, with the approval of the top Government authorities, is carrying out an overall study of the biological effects of atomic radiations. One part of that general study is being made by a genetics committee, and the present report is a preliminary one from that committee.

This genetics committee has 16 members, whose names and positions are listed at the beginning of this report. Thirteen of these have been directly and extensively concerned with research in genetics. This number includes specialists on the genetics of lower forms of life, on the genetics of such mammals as mice, on the more mathematical aspects of population genetics, and on human genetics. One member is specially experienced in the general biological effects of radiation, one in radiological physics, and one in pathology.

The problems of the Atomic Age affect every man, woman, and child—in fact, every living thing—in our country, and of course in the whole world as well. Although many of these problems are technical in character, it is nevertheless of importance to our democracy that these matters be as widely understood as possible. Therefore every effort has been made that this report be generally understandable.

This necessitates a certain amount of explanation of technical matters; but this report will use just as few unfamiliar terms as possible, and will define those that are used. It should be understood that many of the statements made in this report would require various qualifications and a lot more detail to attain full technical precision.

The subject is an inherently complicated one, and the reader must be prepared for a certain amount of detailed explanation, some of which is not easy to grasp. It is felt that the subject is important enough so that many citizens will wish to make the effort which is necessary to a careful reading of this report.

The simplifications and abbreviations which have been adopted in this report in order to achieve a generally understandable presentation will undoubtedly be recognized by, and it is hoped will not disturb, the more technical reader. The later sections of the present report will be supplemented by more detail and factual justification if this is later desired by any of the agencies (as for example, the National Committee on Radiation Protection, the Atomic Energy Commission, governmental and industrial groups concerned with radiation hazards, etc.), which have responsibility for the procedures and standards to which our recommendations apply.

This particular report is preliminary for two reasons. First, we wish later to make a fuller report with more technical detail. Second, the situation is changing at such a rate that there should be a continuing series of reports, each bringing the subject up to date.

The National Academy study is not directed toward the problems posed by wartime use of atomic weapons, nor toward the political aspects of atomic power. The study is only indirectly concerned with the social and economic aspects. In fact, the National Academy study, as its title indicates, is concerned with the possible biological hazards

due to atomic and other radiations. And the present report, made by the genetics committee, is concerned with the genetic aspects of the possible biological hazards. As this report is read, it should become progressively clearer what these genetic aspects are.

I. WHAT ARE WE WORRIED ABOUT?

The coming of the atomic age has brought both hopes and fears. The hopes center largely around two aspects: the future availability of vast resources of energy; and the benefits to be gained in biology, medicine, agriculture, and other fields through application of the experimental techniques of atomic physics (isotopes, beams of high-energy particles, etc.).

Gains in both of these areas can be of great benefit to mankind. Advances in medicine and agriculture are obviously desirable. The wide availability of power can also be of great benefit, if we use this power wisely. For not only should there be enough power to meet the more obvious and mechanical demands, there should be enough to affect society in much more far-reaching and advantageous ways, so as to reduce world tensions by raising the economic standards of areas with more limited resources.

On the other hand, the atomic age also brings fears. The major fear is that of an unspeakably devastating atomic war. Along with this is another fear, minor as compared with total destruction but nevertheless with grave implications. When atomic bombs are tested, radioactive material is formed and released into the atmosphere, to be carried by the winds and eventually to settle down at distances which may be very great. Since it does finally settle down it has aptly been named "fallout."

There has been much concern, and a good deal of rather loose public debate, about this fallout and its possible dangers.

Are we harming ourselves; and are there genetic effects which will harm our children, and their descendants, through this radioactive dust that has been settling down on all of us? Are things going to be still worse when presently we have a lot of atomic-power plants, more laboratories experimenting with atomic fission and fusion, and perhaps more and bigger weapons testing? Are there similar risks, due to other sources of radiation, but brought to our attention by these atomic risks?

II. WHAT COMPLICATIONS ARE MET IN REACHING A DECISION?

Now it is a plain fact, which will be explained in some detail later in this report, that radiations,* penetrating the bodies of human beings, are genetically undesirable. Even very small amounts of radiation unquestionably have the power to injure the hereditary materials. Ought we take steps at once to reduce, or at least to limit, the amount of radiation which people receive?

There are two major difficulties that make it very hard to decide what is sensible to do. First, although the science of genetics is as precise and as advanced as any part of biology, it has in general, and particularly in human genetics, not yet advanced far enough so that it is possible to give at this time precise and definite answers to the questions: Just how undesirable, how dangerous are the various levels of radiation; just what unfortunate results would occur?

Second, even if the relevant questions concerning radiation genetics could be answered definitively that would be only part of the story. The overall judgment (how much radiation should we have?) involves a weighing of values and a balance of opposing aim in regard to some of which the techniques of physical and biological science offer little help.

What is involved is not an elimination of all risks, for that is impossible—it is a balance of opposed risks and of different sorts of benefits. And the disturbing and confusing thing is that mankind has to seek to balance the scale, when the risk on neither side is completely visible. The scientists cannot say with exact precision just what biological risks are involved in various levels and sort of radiation exposure (these considerations being on one pan of the risk scale); nor can anyone precisely evaluate the overall considerations of national economic strength, of defense, and of international relations (all on the other pan of the scale).

III. MUST WE THEN MOVE ENTIRELY IN THE DARK?

Does this mean that geneticists have, at the moment, nothing useful to say on this grave subject? Fortunately, this is not the case. We do know something, though not nearly enough to give definite answers to a great many important questions. There is a considerable margin of uncertainty about much of this, and as a result, there are naturally some differences of opinion among geneticists themselves as to exact numerical values, although no disagreement as to fundamental conclusions.

Many people, moreover, suppose science to be definite—open or shut. Things are supposed to be so or not so. And therefore some persons may, quite mistakenly, conclude that geneticists are unscientific because they do not completely agree on all details.

In relatively simple fields, where both theory and experiment have progressed far, a comforting kind of precision does often obtain. But it is characteristic of the present state of human radiation genetics that one must carefully and painstakingly note a lot of qualifications, of special and sometimes very technical conditions, of cautious reservations. The public should recognize that the attitudes and statements of geneticists about this problem of radiation damage have resulted from deep concern and from attempts to exercise due caution in a situation that is in essence complicated and is of such great social importance.

It is not surprising that our knowledge of genetics—and especially human radiation genetics—is so fragmentary. What goes on inside cells, and the effects of radiations on these processes are extremely complicated and subtle problems. To attack them successfully requires a tremendous lot of time; for the inherent variability of certain of these effects is such that to establish something with certainty one must do not one experiment but many thousands of individual tests and observations. To attack these problems also requires a high degree of special skill—and perhaps most of all, imaginative ideas which can be tested.

Single-celled organisms, as well as fruitflies and corn plants, have been specially rewarding objects of genetic study. In evolutionary terms, however, insects and plants are clearly a long way from man, and we are really just beginning to get genetic information about the effects of radiation on some of the lower mammals, such as mice. Even so, several matters of profound importance have already become clear: Bacteria or fruitfly, mouse or man, the chemical nature of the hereditary material is universally the same; the main pattern of hereditary transmission of traits is the same for all forms of life reproducing sexually; and the nature of the effects of high-energy radiations upon the genetic material is likewise universally the same in principle. Hence, when it comes to human genetics, where the impossibilities of ordinary scientific experimentation are clear and only a tantalizing start has been made, we can at least feel certain of the general nature of the effects, and need only to discover ways in which to measure them precisely.

IV. HOW COULD WE REDUCE RADIATION RISK?

The major ways to reduce our present and future exposure to radiations would be: (a) to reduce medical and other use of X-rays as much as is feasible; (b) to set and observe reasonable regulations for the safe construction and operation of nuclear powerplants and for the methods used to dispose of their radioactive wastes as well as the methods used in mining and processing the fissionable material; (c) to reduce the testing of atomic weapons and hence to reduce radioactive fallout; (d) to place limits on the human exposures involved in certain aspects of experimentation in atomic and nuclear physics.

To carry out steps just mentioned would, in greater or lesser degree for the various items, reduce radiation risks. Progress with regard to step (a) can doubtless be achieved, although to go too far in reducing the medical use of X-rays would, of course, lead to the risk of poorer diagnosis and less effective treatment of disease. But to carry out steps (b), (c), and (d) would subject us to a different set of risks. We might thereby impede progress in the nuclear field. We might seriously weaken our country's position in the world. We might deny future generations some of the possible benefits of nuclear power and of other atomic discoveries.

V. RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL AND RADIATIONS

Now that the problem has been posed, and now that we are warned somewhat about the difficulties, we must begin to consider some of the more technical issues involved. What is radioactive material, what are radiations, and what biological effects do they have?

By radioactive material is meant those naturally occurring substances such as radium, or those man-produced atoms resulting from atomic experiments, which are inherently unstable. Instead of remaining unchanged, like ordinary atoms of familiar substances such as oxygen, gold, etc., the atoms of these radioactive substances act like alarm clocks set by mischievous gremlins for unknown times. Unpredictably (at least, in individual instances), but predictably for the average behavior of a large number, these atomic alarm clocks "go off"; that is to say, they disintegrate.

When radioactive material disintegrates, it emits, along with other less-penetrating and, hence, less-significant rays, certain high-energy rays known as gamma rays. Some of these rays are entirely similar to a beam of light, except for the important distinction that they readily penetrate human tissue which is nearly opaque to ordinary light. Also, the energy of these rays is much higher than that of light, and this enables them to produce chemical and biological changes in the tissue they traverse. Rays of this sort, which transport energy from one point in space to some other point, are in general referred to as radiations. We also class as radiations beams of minute particles traveling at high speeds, such as electrons or neutrons, which, when they hit matter, produce effects like those of radiation mentioned.

As indicated above, gamma rays are emitted by naturally occurring radioactive substances, such as radium. They are also emitted by the radioactive materials which are produced in the nuclear fission which occurs in atomic weapons testing, in nuclear power installations, and in various sorts of experimental installations. These same rays, in dilute amounts, impinge on and penetrate all of us all the time. For radioactive material is, as an inevitable and hence normal procedure, built into the soil, rocks, plants, etc., and for that matter is also built into our own bodies. Similarly, such material exists on the luminous dials of our watches and

*Throughout this report the word "radiation" is not used in its broadest sense, but refers to certain kinds of high-energy radiations which are described in section V.

clocks. The familiar X-rays of the hospitals and tuberculosis clinics, and in the offices of dermatologists and dentists, have properties of penetration and energy which are similar to gamma rays.

Throughout this report, the word radiation refers primarily to gamma rays and/or X-rays, sometimes to other sorts of radiations as will be more particularly mentioned later.

Everyone knows what a pound of beef steak is, or a yard of cloth. We do not have that sort of familiarity with amounts, or units, or dosages of radiation. X or gamma radiation is measured in units called roentgens (abbreviated r; for example, "a dose of 3r"). Dental X-rays involve a dose (to the reproduction organs or gonads, that being the important matter from the point of view of genetics) of about 0.005 r; and a general fluoroscopic examination may involve a dose of 2r or even more.

VI. SOME BASIC FACTS ABOUT GENETICS

Before we ask what effect radiations have on genetic processes, we must review a little basic information about genetics itself.

Every cell of a person's body contains a great collection, passed down from the parents, the parents' parents, and so on back, of diverse hereditary units called genes. These genes singly and in combination control our inherited characteristics.

These genes, as was just stated, exist in every cell of the body. But from the genetic point of view the ordinary body cells, which make up the body as a whole, are not comparably as important as the germ cells which exist in the reproductive organs, and which play the essential roles in the production of children.

The genes are strung together, single-file, to form tiny threads of genetic material called chromosomes, which are visible under a microscope. These chromosomes, in ordinary body cells, customarily exist as similar but not identical pairs. Human body cells normally contain 48 chromosomes, these constituting 2 similar but not identical sets of 24 chromosomes each. One of these sets of 24 chromosomes was inherited from the mother, for the egg cells carries a set of 24 chromosomes; and the other set of 24 chromosomes was inherted from the father, for the sperm cell also carries a set of 24.

All the genes that a person starts out with when the original egg cell is fertilized are in general kept unchanged as the cells divide and the person's body is elaborated and maintained. The process by which the dividing cells duplicate the genes may not always produce perfect copies, but it does so in general. But genes do nevertheless essentially change. They are changed by certain agents, notably by heat, by some chemicals, and by radiation. It is with the last of these three agents of gene change that we are concerned in this report.

When a gene becomes permanently altered, we say it mutates. The gene in its altered form is then duplicated in each subsequent cell division. If the mutant gene is in an ordinary body cell, then it is merely passed along to other body cells; but the mutant gene, under these circumstances, is not passed on to progeny, and the effect of the mutant gene is limited to the person in whom the mutation occurred.

However, it cannot safely be assumed that the effect is a negligible one on the person in whom the mutation occurred, nor can it properly be said that this effect is nongenetic, even though passage to offspring is not involved. For various kinds of cellular abnormalities are known to be perpetuated within an individual through body-cell divisions; so these effects are genetic in the broad sense.

What is involved here is not only mutant genes, but also larger scale disruption of the genetic material, such as breakage of chromosomes.

The quantitative relations are not yet clear, but it is established that certain malignancies such as leukemia and certain other cellular abnormalities can be induced by ionizing radiations. There is also some evidence that effects of this sort measurably reduce the life expectancy of the individual receiving the radiation. These risks have genetic aspects and therefore should receive mention in this report. Indeed these direct risks to the individuals exposed may well constitute another adequate genetic reason for limiting radiation exposures to the lowest practicable levels.

To return to a consideration of the risks which are passed on to progeny, the mutant gene may exist in a sperm or an egg cell as a result of a mutation having occurred either in that cell or at some earlier cell stage. In this case, a child resulting from this sperm or egg will inherit the mutant gene.

If we were to take the two chromosomes of a similar pair, stretch them out straight, and put them alongside each other, then each gene of one would be opposite a corresponding gene in the other. Thus the genes exist in pairs, so do the chromosomes. The two members of each pair of genes are not always identically the same. That is, in fact, why we call the chromosome pairs similar rather than identical. The two genes of a corresponding pair play similar roles, in that they both affect or help to determine the same characteristic of the whole organism. But one of the two may have a somewhat different, or a much more powerful effect than the other.

Thus of a certain pair of genes, both might be concerned with hair color. If both genes of this hair-color pair are the sort which favor red hair, then the person has red hair. If both genes are the sort which favor nonred hair (black, brown, or blond) then the person has nonred hair. But suppose that, of this pair of hair-color genes, one favors red hair and the other nonred hair. What happens then?

The answer (husbands and wives will understand this) is that one of the two usually dominates the situation and gets its way, although (and again this seems reasonable) the meeker one of the two usually manages to avoid being completely ignored.

Thus with one nonred gene (this being the powerful and dominant one of the two), and one red gene (this being the meeker one), the hair is ordinarily not red, but the red gene may nevertheless produce some effect, a little red showing in the hair so as to make it faintly rusty or tawny in color.*

The powerful type of gene, which gets all or most of its own way in contrast to its companion gene, is very naturally called a dominant gene. The less effective type is called a recessive gene. In this same terminology, nonred hair color is called a dominant characteristic, whereas red hair color is called a recessive characteristic. A recessive characteristic actually fully appears only if both of the relevant genes are of the recessive type. Of great importance for our present study is the fact that mutant genes—genes which have, for example, been changed by radiations—are usually of the recessive type.

It is now easy to see that any organism may have, latent in its genetic constitution, ineffectual or recessive genes that have not had much of a chance to become apparent in its developed external characteristics, since the recessive genes are masked by their dominant companion genes. Yet often, as we have seen, this dominance is incomplete, and the recessive gene is able to manifest itself partially.

When the 2 genes of a pair are alike—both recessive or both dominant—then they are called a homozygous pair; but when 1 is recessive and the other dominant, then the pair is called heterozygous. Thus, a recessive characteristic—like red hair—can be fully expressed only when the corresponding gene pair is homozygous.

VII. RADIATIONS AND GENETIC MUTATIONS

We are now in a position to indicate why it is that radiations, such as X-rays or gamma rays, can be so serious from the genetic point of view. For although the genes, as described above, normally remain unchanged as they multiply and are passed on from generation to generation, they do very rarely change, or mutate; and radiation, as we have already mentioned, can give rise to such changes or mutations in the genes. The change is presumably an alteration in the complicated chemical nature of the gene, and the energy furnished by the radiation is what produces the chemical change. Mutation ordinarily affects each gene independently; and once changed, an altered gene then persists from generation to generation in its new or mutant form.

Moreover, the mutant genes in the vast majority of cases, and in all the species so far studied, lead to some kind of harmful effect. In extreme cases the harmful effect is death itself, or loss of the ability to produce offspring, or some other serious abnormality. What in a way is of even greater ultimate importance, since they affect so many more persons, are those cases that involve much smaller handicaps, which might tend to shorten life, reduce number of children, or be otherwise detrimental.

The changed character, due to the mutated gene, seldom appears fully expressed in the first generation of offspring of the person who received the radiation and thus had one of his genes mutated. For these mutant genes are usually recessive. If a child gets from one parent a mutant gene, but from the other parent a normal gene belonging to that pair, then the normal gene is very likely to be at least partially dominant, so that the normal characteristic will appear.

But this is not all of the story. For, like the red-hair gene, the harmful recessive mutant genes are not usually completely masked. Even when paired with a normal and dominant gene—that is to say, even when in the heterozygous state—they still have some detrimental effect. This heterozygous damage is ordinarily much smaller than the full expression of the mutant when in the homozygous state, and yet there may be a significant shortening of the length of life or reduction of the fertility of the heterozygous carriers of the mutant. And the risk of heterozygous damage applies to many more individuals, indeed to every single descendant who receives the gene.

The relations of genes to ordinary traits (not to the most simply determined biochemical traits) are, of course, much more complex than the previous paragraph would seem to imply. Such gene-determined traits may vary from person to person, due perhaps to environmental differences, and often may not even appear at all. A single gene usually affects several such characters, and characters are practically always affected by many genes. Also the effect of a gene may depend on what other genes are present, often in a complex way. For example, a mutation tending to increase weight might be harmful to certain persons, but beneficial to others.

Some harmful effects

Indeed, it is likely that a large fraction of the genes that determine normal variability are of this rather ambiguous type that are sometimes deleterious, sometimes not. Mutations within this sort would not necessarily be harmful. Such mutations presumably occur, but geneticists do not know what fraction of all mutations are of this type, for they are not ordinarily detectable. However, the mutations that form the basis of

*The accurate and complete genetic story about red hair is more complicated than has been stated here. There are less familiar characteristics—thalassemia and sickle cell anemia for example—which more strictly conform to the simple pattern here described.

this report are those that are relatively detectable, and these, as mentioned earlier, are almost always harmful.

Individuals bearing harmful mutations are handicapped relative to the rest of the population in the following ways: They tend to have fewer children, or to die earlier. And, hence, such genes are eventually eliminated—soon if they do great harm, more slowly if only slightly harmful. A mildly deleterious gene may eventually do just as much total damage as a grossly and abruptly harmful one, since the milder mutant persists longer and has a chance to harm more people.

In assessing the harm done to a population by deleterious genes, it is clear that society would ordinarily consider the death of an early embryo to be of much less consequence than that of a child or young adult. Similarly a mutation that decreases the life expectancy by a few months is clearly less to be feared than one that in addition causes its bearer severe pain, unhappiness, or illness throughout his life. Perhaps most obviously tangible are the instances, even though they be relatively uncommon in which a child is born with some tragic handicap of genetic origin.

A discussion of genetic damage necessarily involves, on the one hand, certain tangible and imminent dangers, certain tragedies which might occur to our own children or grandchildren; and on the other hand certain more remote trouble that may be experienced by very large numbers of persons in the far distant future.

No two persons are likely to weigh exactly alike these two sorts of danger. How does one compare the present fact of a seriously handicapped child with the possibility that large numbers of persons may experience much more minor handicaps, a hundred or more generations from now?

There are thoughtful and sensitive persons who think that our present society should try to meet its more immediate problems, and not worry too much about the long-range future. This viewpoint is in some instances supported by the belief that new ways, perhaps unimaginable at the moment, are likely eventually to be found for meeting problems.

There are other thoughtful and conscientious persons who think that we are specifically responsible for guarding, as well as we can now determine, the long future.

Recognizing the inevitability and propriety of both viewpoints, and recognizing that they lead different persons to express their concerns through different examples and with differing emphases, the fact of major importance for this present study is that, traveling by different routes, different geneticists arrive at the same conclusion: Complexities notwithstanding, the genetic damage done, however felt and however measured, is roughly proportional to the total mutation rate.

VIII. MUTANT GENES AND EVOLUTION

Many will be puzzled about the statement that practically all known mutant genes are harmful. For mutations are a necessary part of the process of evolution. How can a good effect—evolution to higher forms of life—result from mutations practically all of which are harmful?

First of all, it is not mutations which, of themselves, produce evolution, but rather the action of national selection on whatever combinations of genes occur. Much of evolutionary progress probably depends on changes within the range of normal variability, and thus depends on genes of very small effect, and of the type mentioned in the previous section which are favorable or unfavorable, depending on what other genes are present. Thus evolution consists of a complex shifting of frequencies of such genes, accompanied by the continuous process of elimination of detrimental mutations and the occasional incorporation into the population of a favorable mutation.

Nature had to be rather ruthless about this process. Many thousands of unfortunate mutations, with their resulting handicaps, were tolerated, just so long as an advantageous mutation could be utilized, once in a long while, for inching the race up slightly higher to a better adjustment to the existing conditions. The rare creature with an advantageous combination of genes was better fitted to survive and displace his less favored companions, and thus evolution was served, even though there were thousands of tragedies for every success.

The reader may be troubled by a second difficulty. If mutation results in at least some favorable types, and if these are building blocks of evolution, why is an increase in mutation rate regarded as undesirable? Why wouldn't an increase in mutation rate produce a larger total number of the favorable types and so speed up evolution? If the favorable types are normally quite rare, wouldn't it almost seem that increasing the mutation rate would be desirable? The answer to this question lies in the consideration that the bad effect of mutation must be balanced against the good. Some mutation is necessary for evolution, but if the mutation rate is too high, the unfavorable mutations will be so numerous that the species and its future evolution will be handicapped. Under present-day conditions of living and medical care, it seems unlikely that the unfavorable results of mutation are being eliminated nearly as rapidly as was formerly the case. In other words, one of the consequences of the amazing mastery of his environment which man has achieved has been an actual decrease in the severity of natural selection.

Geneticists in fact believe that although favorable mutations are rare compared with unfavorable ones, the human population probably already has, and will continue to have as a result of its present mutation rate and without additional mutations from increased radiation, a large enough total supply of favorable, partially favorable, and potentially favorable mutations. In other words, with our present mutation rate we shall continue to have a degree of genetic variability adequate for further evolution.

IX. WHAT, THEN, CAN GENETICISTS SAY TO HELP RESOLVE OUR PROBLEM?

With the background furnished by the preceding discussion, we can now state rather concisely certain main points on which geneticists are in substantial agreement. Some of these points will partially repeat statements already made, but they are included here in order that this section be reasonably complete of itself.

1. Radiations cause mutations.

Mutations affect those hereditary traits which a person passes on to his children and to subsequent generations.

2. Practically all radiation-induced mutations which have effects large enough to be detected are harmful.

A small but not negligible part of this harm would appear in the first generation of the offspring of the person who received the radiation. Most of the harm, however, would remain unnoticed, for a shorter or longer time, in the genetic constitution of the successive generations of offspring. But the harm would persist, and some of it would be expressed in each generation. On the average, a detrimental mutation, no matter how small its harmful effect, will in the long run tip the scales against some descendant who carries this mutation, causing his premature death or his failure to produce the normal number of offspring.

Although many mutations do disturb normal embryonic growth, it is not correct that all, or even that most mutations, commonly result in monstrosities or freaks. In fact, the commonest mutations are those with the smallest direct effect on any one generation—the slight detrimentals.

3. Any radiation dose, however small, can induce some mutations. There is no minimum amount of radiation dose, that is, which must be exceeded before any harmful mutations occur.

4. For every living thing—bacterium, fruitfly, corn plant, mouse, or man—there exist mutations which arise from natural causes (cosmic rays, naturally occurring radiations from radium and similar substances, and also from heat and certain chemicals). These naturally occurring and hence unavoidable, mutations, are usually called "spontaneous mutations."

Like radiation-induced mutations, nearly all spontaneous mutations with detectable effects are harmful. Hence these mutations tend to eliminate themselves from the population through the handicaps of the tragedies which occur because the person bearing these mutants are not ideally fitted to survive.

We all carry a supply of these spontaneous mutant genes. The size of this supply represents a balance between tendency of mutant genes to eliminate themselves, and the tendency of new mutants to be constantly produced through natural causes.

5. Additional radiation (that is, radiation over and above the irreducible minimum due to natural causes) produces additional mutations (over and above the spontaneous mutations).

The probable number of additional induced mutations occurring in an individual over a period of time is by and large proportional to the total dose of extra radiation received, over that period, by the reproductive organs where the germ cells are formed and stored. To the best of our present knowledge, if we increase the radiation by X percent, the gene mutations caused by radiation will also be increased by X percent.

The total dose of radiation is what counts, this statement being based on the fact that the genetic damage done by radiation is cumulative.

A larger amount of radiation produces a larger number of mutations. But within the limits of the radiation doses being considered in this report there is every reason to expect that these additional mutants would be of the same general sort as those produced by the natural background radiation. That is to say, mildly larger doses of radiation would produce more, but not worse, mutants.

6. From the above five statements a very important conclusion results. It has sometimes been thought that there may be a rate (say, so much per week) at which a person can receive radiation with reasonable safety as regards certain types of direct damage to his own person. But the concept of a safe rate of radiation simply does not make sense if one is concerned with genetic damage to future generations. What counts, from the point of view of genetic damage, is not the rate; it is the total assimilated dose to the reproductive cells of the individual from the beginning of his life up to the time the child is conceived.

What is genetically important to a child is the total radiation dose that child's parents have received from their conception to the conception of the child. Since this report necessarily deals with averages, the significant total dose period should be, at least approximately, the number of years that normally elapses from the conception of a person to the average time at which offspring are conceived.

In the United States, based on 1950 data, the average age of fathers at the births of all children is 30.5 years, whereas the average age of both parents is 28.0 years. It therefore seems sensible for us to use the round figure of 30 years, especially since this figure is the one usually chosen to measure a

generation. Using this 30-year figure for characterizing the "total reproductive life radiation dose" would have the result that about half of the total offspring would receive the possible effects of a smaller, and about half the possible effects of a larger, radiation dose.

7. The problems of defining and estimating genetic damage are very difficult ones.

There are at least three different aspects which must be considered. The first aspect places emphasis on the risk to the direct offspring and later descendants of those persons who, from occupational hazard or otherwise, receive a radiation dose substantially greater than the average received by the population as a whole.

The second aspect refers to the effect of the average dose on the population as a whole.

The third aspect refers in still broader terms to the possibility that increased and prolonged radiation might so raise the death rate and so lower the birth rate that the population, considered as a whole, would decline and eventually perish. We are at present extremely uncertain as to the level of this fatal threshold for a human population. This is one reason why we must be cautious about increasing the total amount of radiation to which the entire population is exposed.

Assessing genetics damage

These three approaches to the problem of genetic damage involve estimating the damage in successive generations and also the total damage in all generations, due to an increase in the amount of mutation. The relative emphasis one places on these three aspects depends in part on whether one thinks primarily in terms of distress to individual persons, or whether one thinks in terms of the population as a whole. Necessarily involved is the contrast between manifest harm to a few, and less evident but no less unreal harm to many. Also involved is the contrast between a more short-term and a more long-range point of view.

One way of thinking about this problem of genetic damage is to assume that all kinds of mutations on the average procedure equivalent damage, whether as a drastic effect on one individual who leaves no descendants because of this damage, or a wider effect on many. Under this view, the total damage is measured by the number of mutations induced by a given increase in radiation, this number to be multiplied in one's mind by the average damage from a typical mutation.

Measuring total damage in terms of the number of mutations does indeed necessarily involve this concept of the average damage from a typical mutation, and some geneticists find this concept difficult and illusive. They would point out that mutations may be grouped in classes that differ, on a subjective scale, many thousandfold in the amount of damage per mutation. As examples they would cite a mutation which results in very early death of an embryo (which might cause very little social or personal distress), and a mutation which results in severe malformation to a surviving child (which would cause very great personal distress and which clearly involves a social burden).

Rather than utilizing this concept of the average total damage per mutation, some geneticists prefer to start with a consideration of the tangible damage which occurs now, as a result of the current rate of mutation and get an index of damage by multiplying this by the ratio of the expected new mutation rate to the current one. This procedure, however, admittedly deals with only part of the total damage, so an alternative difficulty faces those who prefer this procedure, namely the difficulty of estimating what part of the total damage they have dealt with.

As an illustration of the first aspect, suppose that 10,000 individuals were exposed to a large dose of radiation, of the order of 200 r. Then perhaps 100 of the children of these exposed individuals would be substantially handicapped, this being in addition to the number of handicapped from other causes. In this case the connection with the radiation exposure could be established by a statistical study.

As an illustration of the second aspect, suppose the whole population of the United States received a small dose of extra radiation, say one r. Then there is good reason to think that, among 100 million children born to these exposed parents, there would be several thousand who would be definitely handicapped because of the mutant genes due to the radiation. But these several thousand handicapped children might be, so to speak, lost in the crowd. Society might be more impressed by the 100 more obvious cases of the preceding paragraph than by the more hidden several thousand cases of this paragraph.

We should not disregard a danger simply because we cannot measure it accurately, nor underestimate it simply because it has aspects which appeal in differing degrees to different persons. Two conclusions seem to be clear and of importance. We should proceed with due caution as regards all agents which cause mutations; and we should vigorously pursue the researches which will in time give us a more precise way of judging all aspects of the risk.

X. SOME REMARKS ABOUT APPROXIMATE ESTIMATES

Up to this point of the discussion the conclusions of the geneticist are pretty clear; the mutant genes induced by radiation are generally harmful, and the harm cannot be escaped.

But as yet this report has not furnished much of a basis for converting these conclusions into practical advice. Remembering that we must eventually balance risk against risk, it is obviously desirable to try to learn, as definitely as circumstances permit, the answer to the question: how great would be the genetic harm done by various doses of radiation?

Section XII of this report will respond to this question. But before giving the various replies, there should be some preliminary explanation concerning the nature of the answers given.

Science, and particularly the branch which deals with the physical world about us, has succeeded in giving highly precise answers to many questions. When one talks about the velocity of light he does not need to say that it is something like 300,000 kilometers per second: he is justified in saying that it is 299,793 kilometers per second, and that the final integer is almost certainly not off by more than two units.

But when you ask an experienced surgeon what your chances are of surviving a serious operation, and if he answers "something like 9 chances out of 10," then you accept that as a reasonable and helpful estimate. You do not distrust him because he gives you a rough estimate. Indeed, you would have good cause to distrust him if he tried to give a highly precise answer.

In other words, there are many situations in which science can give only rough estimates. These estimates can nevertheless be very useful. No one should disdain such an estimate because it is rough, nor should anyone consider such estimates unscientific.

In section XII there will be stated the results of certain approximate calculations. The theory behind these calculations is on the whole well understood; but it is seldom the case that one knows with much accuracy the numerical values that enter into the calculations. One may, for example, say, "I don't know, in any direct measured sense, how many mutants would result if all the genes in a human fertilized cell received 1 roentgen of radiation. But using a pretty definitely known value for the mutation rate in certain genes of the mouse, and also knowing fairly well—in this case from experiments with fruitfles—how to pass from the measured rate for a few genes to the rate which probably applies to a germ cell as a whole; and then making the unfortunate but necessary assumption that these mouse and fruitfly figures apply reasonably well to man—using this procedure I come out with estimates for the number of mutants which would be produced in man by a given dose of radiation. Because of the uncertainties, I think it prudent to state not a single final result, but, rather, a range of results with estimated lower and upper limits. I wish that we had direct experimental evidence which would firm up this estimate. But I don't have to be too apologetic, for a large amount of biological reasoning has been successfully based on this sort of procedure. Man differs widely from lower forms of life in all the obvious, and in many other, respects. But the fundamental processes inside cells tend to be curiously alike, from the simplest creature of a single cell, up to man."

It may turn out that the uncertainties in the quantities which enter the calculation are so great that the resulting uncertainty in the final answer is itself so very broad that the calculation simply does not furnish a useful estimate. But it may also turn out that, despite some considerable uncertainty in the constituent factors, the answer can be stated with a range of uncertainty which is small enough so that the estimate is useful.

It seems necessary to emphasize this matter of approximate estimation, so that no one will improperly conclude that a statement is unreliable because it involves a range of values. On the contrary, such a statement, when made in a situation like the present one, should be viewed as all the more dependable precisely because it does not pretend to an unwarranted accuracy.

XI. HOW MUCH RADIATION ARE WE NOW RECEIVING?

If we are to talk about how harmful certain radiation doses maybe we should gain some idea of the amount of radiation we are already receiving from various sources.

The committee will release a report specially devoted to this particular subject, which summarizes in detail all the kinds, sources, and amounts of radiation. In the present report, only that minimum amount of information will be given which is necessary for our current discussion.

Neglecting several minor contributions (all of which will be treated in the longer report), man is at present receiving radiations from the following:

1. Background radiation

This is the radiation which results from natural causes (cosmic rays, naturally occurring radium, etc.) not under our control. Each person receives on the average a total accumulated dose of about 4.3 roentgens over a 30-year period. At high altitudes this dose is greater, because of the increase of cosmic rays. Thus this background is as high as 5.5 roentgens in some places in the United States.

2. Medical X-rays

The committee report estimates each person in the United States receives, on the average, a total accumulated dose to the gonads which is about 3 roentgens of X-radiation during a 30-year period. Of course, some persons get none at all; others may get a good deal more.

3. Fallout from weapons testing

The Atomic Energy Commission[1] is doing a technically competent and a socially conscientious job of measuring fallout; but it does not follow from this that one can answer, with high precision, all questions about the biological risks involved. What they usually measure (which, technically speaking, is a beta-ray activity in air) has to be translated over into what is genetically important (namely, the gamma ray dose to the gonads). The estimation of the latter of these quantities from the former is a pretty complicated business.

Beside those just mentioned, there are certain further uncertainties in the fallout values. The measurements are necessarily taken far apart, and there is known to be considerable local variation due to meteorological conditions and topography. The radioactive dust, when it settles out of the air, is subject to weathering, as when it is washed off of buildings by the rain and carried to locations where it may affect fewer persons. Also individuals inside houses, or other shelters, will be considerably less exposed than those in the open air.

Thus one cannot expect the figures on fallout to be very precise ones. We have been informed that the AEC scientists are confident that the actual true dose figures are less than five times their stated estimates, and are also greater than one-fifth of these stated estimates.

It should be noted that the figures on fallout as stated by the Atomic Energy Commission make only a conservative correction for weathering and shelter; and thus their figures, at least in regard to this point, tend to overstate the danger rather than the opposite.

With these understandings, it may be stated that United States residents have, on the average, been receiving from fallout over the past 5 years a dose which, if weapons testing were continued at the same rate, is estimated to produce a total 30-year dose of about one-quarter of a roentgen; and since the accuracy involved is probably not better than a factor of 5, one could better say that the 30-year dose from weapons testing if maintained at the past level would probably be larger than 0.05 roentgens and smaller than 1.25 roentgens.

The rate of fallout over the past 5 years has not been uniform. If weapons testing were, in the future, continued at the largest rate which has so far occurred (in 1953 and 1955) then the 30-year fallout dose would be about twice that stated above. The dose from fallout is roughly proportional to the number of equal-sized weapons exploded in air, so that a doubling of the test rate might be expected to double the fallout.

The figures just stated are based on all information now available from both the Atomic Energy Commission and the Armed Forces, and have been estimated as part of a study carried out for this committee by Dr. John S. Laughlin, chief of the division of physics and biophysics, Sloan-Kettering Institute, and Dr. Ira Pullman, loaned to this study by the Nuclear Development Corporation of America. In their estimation correction has been made for weathering and shelter effects in accordance with the latest experimental data.

4. Atomic powerplants

As yet the general population has not received radiation from atomic powerplants or from the disposal of radioactive wastes. These are future sources of radiation that might become dangerous.

[1] Under the Department of Defense other measurements, relating to fallout, are also being made.

5. Occupational hazards

The preceding four points apply to everyone. Unless proper precautions are taken, persons who are close to equipment emitting X-rays, who are engaged in experimental work in atomic energy, who operate atomic plants, who test weapons, who mine or otherwise handle radioactive material, etc., are subject to the risk of greater radiation exposure during their work.

XII. HOW HARMFUL ARE RADIATION-INDUCED MUTATIONS?

As has already been indicated, there are various ways of estimating genetic harm, various attitudes which can be taken as to what is most serious and significant. But this situation should not be allowed to confuse or conceal the massive fact that, by whatever chain of argument or reasoning, all geneticists come out with the same basic conclusions.

(A) Thus the first and unanimous reply to the question posed by the title to this section is simply this: Any radiation is genetically undesirable, since any radiation induces harmful mutations. Further, all presently available scientific information leads to the conclusion that the genetic harm is proportional to the total dose (that is, the total accumulated dose to the reproductive cells from the conception of the parents to the conception of the child). This tells us that a radiation does of 2X must be presumed to be twice as harmful as a radiation dose of X; but it still doesn't tell us the amount of harm we would be doubling.

(B) Second we remember that mankind has for ages been experiencing, as the so-called spontaneous mutations, a certain rate of (generally harmful) mutations due to natural and uncontrolled causes (cosmic rays, heat, chemicals, etc.). It is not entirely unnatural to think of this burden of mutations as a sort of normal burden on society.[2] Therefore it seems to be illuminating to ask: How much additional man-made radiation will it take before this natural amount of genetic mutation (to which we are at least in some senses adjusted) will be doubled?

The calculations which lead to an estimate of this doubling dose necessarily involve the rates of both spontaneous and radiation-induced mutations in man. Neither of these rates has been directly measured; and the best one can do is to use the excellent information on such lower forms as fruitflies, the emerging information for mice, the few sparse data we have for man—and then use the kind of biological judgment which has, after all, been so generally successful in interrelating the properties of forms of life which superficially appear so unlike but which turn out to be so remarkably similar in their basic aspects.

In view of the inevitable uncertainties, it is rather surprising that the final estimates, as made by numerous specialists of this committee and in other countries, do not differ more than they do. The lowest figure which has been responsibly brought forward for the doubling dose is 5 roentgens and the largest estimates range up to 150 roentgens or even higher. Recent work with mice (which are, after all, mammals) gives some basis for thinking that the doubling dose is not as high as 150 roentgens. The experience in Japan gives some basis for thinking that the doubling dose is larger than 5 roentgens. Indeed, it is clear that the doubling dose must be at least as large as the background radiation (which is between 4 and 5 roentgens over 30 years in the United States). This, in fact, would be the value of the doubling dose if spontaneous mutations were due to background radiation alone, heat and chemical agents making no contribution.

Thus, various arguments reduce the 5- to 150-roentgen range, and several experienced geneticists have recently made estimates in the narrower range of 30 to 80 roentgens.

In summary, then, of this particular point, each individual, on the average, inevitably experiences during his reproductive lifetime a certain number of harmful spontaneous mutations from natural causes. He would experience an additional equal number of harmful mutations if he received a certain dose of radiation during that same period. This is known as the doubling dose. The actual value of the doubling dose is almost surely more than 5 roentgens and less than 150 roentgens. It may very well be from 30 to 80 roentgens.

The first portion of this section XII said that twice as much radiation gives twice as much harm. This second portion goes a bit further. It says that something like 30 to 80 roentgens (or, at a further extreme, 5 to 150 roentgens) of extra radiation dose would do mankind twice the harm it is now experiencing from spontaneous mutations.

(C) The two preceding portions of this section are clearly not really satisfying. They do not indicate in quantitative terms how increases in radiation increase the harm. But anyone still wants to know in more specific terms, if possible, how serious is this harm that we may be doubling. If city traffic increases until the risk of crossing the street is doubled, then we will presumably still cross the street; for the risk per crossing is, after all, a very small one. If highway traffic increases until the risk in taking a thousand-mile drive is doubled, then many persons might well hesitate, for the risk is now unpleasantly high.

Different approaches cited

And this is the point at which it becomes most clearly evident that different geneticists find meaningful rather different approaches to the problem of genetic damage.

As has been stated previously, from one point of view the best index of genetic damage is the totality of tangible genetic defects of living individuals—say such things as mental defects, epilepsy, congenital malformations, neuromuscular defects, hematological and endocrine defects, defects in vision or hearing, cutaneous and skeletal defects, or defects in the gastrointestinal or genito-urinary tracts. Roughly 4 to 5 percent of all live births in the United States have defects of this sort; and all of these, perhaps about half—or 2 percent of the total live births—have simple genetic origin and appear prior to sexual maturity.

If mankind were subjected to a "doubling dose" of radiation, then the present level of 2 percent of such genetic defects would rise, and would eventually be doubled. More explicitly, consider the next 100 million births in the United States. This is about the number of children that will, in the future, be born to the presently alive population of the United States. Of these 100 million children, something like 2 million will experience genetic defects of the sort listed, these resulting from the deleterious "spontaneous" mutant genes which have been induced by natural causes excluding man-made radiation. If we were to be subjected, generation after generation, to an additional doubling dose of man-made radiation, then this present tragic figure of 2 million would gradually increase by 2 million more cases, up to an eventual new total of 4 million. It would, to be sure, take a very long time to reach this equilibrium double value. Perhaps 10 percent of the increase, or 200,000 new instances of tangible inherited defect, would occur in the first generation.

[2] There is some basis for hoping that we may eventually be able to control at least a part of both spontaneous and radiation-induced mutations.

Since at various places this report considers a radiation dose of 10 roentgens, it may be useful to state the tangible inherited defects from a dose of that size. A dose of 10 roentgens would, on the above basis, give rise to some 50,000 new instances of tangible inherited defects in the first generation, and about 500,000 per generation ultimately, assuming of course an indefinite continuation of the 10 roentgens increased rate and also assuming a stationary population.

These figures by no means measure all of the genetic damage that would result from a doubling dose; but they do make tangible and impressive the fact that a doubling dose of radiation would cause real personal and social distress.

(D) There is another way of looking at this problem of genetic damage, and that consists of trying to make some useful sort of really long-term, fully complete estimate. This consists of estimating the total number of mutant genes which would be induced in the whole present population of the United States and passed on to the next appearing 100 million children, were this whole population to receive a certain total radiation dose to the gonads. In this instance we will use a dose of 10 roentgens, since a dose of that magnitude appears later in this report in the recommendations. Having estimated this total number of transmitted mutants induced by a dose of 10 roentgens, one then can only say, when he wishes to translate this over into harm or damage, that each one of these mutants must eventually be extinguished out of the population through tragedy. This statement does, of course, not hold in the detailed sense that one thinks of tracing each individual mutant gene until the line which bears and transmits it is overcome by the accumulating handicaps it imposes. The statement holds only in a statistical sense. Some lines of mutant genes will die out merely through normal chance procedures of inheritance. Others will multiply through these same chance procedures. But these normal chance effects cancel out; and the statistical extinction of the mutant genes is accomplished only through tragedy.

Three factors cited

Concerning these estimates of total number of mutants, three things should be said. First, they are clearly not really satisfactory to any geneticist. Too much has to be assumed, too little is dependably known.

Second. This kind of estimate is not a meaningful one to certain geneticists. Their principal reservation is doubtless a feeling that, hard as it is to estimate numbers of mutants, it is much harder still, at the present state of knowledge, to translate this over into a recognizable statement of harm to individual persons. Also they recognize that there is a risk involved in extrapolating from mouse and Drosophila data to the human case.

Various remarks can, however, fairly be made in favor of this estimating attempt. Two largely independent methods lead to about the same results, and this increases one's confidence. Although the extreme ranges of the estimates differ widely, the mean estimate for any one geneticist is not very different from the mean for any other. Even the guessing which is involved hardly deserves that name, for it is based on long years of experience.

So that the final thing that should be said is that in spite of all the difficulties and complications and ranges in numerical estimates, the result is nevertheless very sobering.

Six of the geneticists of this committee considered the following problem: Suppose the whole population of the United States received 1 dose of 10 roentgens of radiation to the gonads. What is the estimate of the total number of mutants which would be induced by this radiation dose and passed on to the next total generation of about 100 million children?

Each geneticist calculated what he considered to be the most probable estimate and then bracketed this by his minimum and maximum estimates. Each thus said, in effect, "I feel reasonably confident that the true value is greater than my minimum estimate and less than my maximum. My best judgment, as stated in a single figure, is what I have labeled the most probable estimate."

The most probable estimates as thus calculated by the six geneticists do not differ widely. They bunch rather closely around the figure 5 million. Four of the six estimates are very close to that figure, and the other two differ only by a factor of 2.

These six geneticists concluded, moreover, that the uncertainty in their estimation of the most probable value was about a factor of 10. That is to say, their minimum estimates were about one-tenth and their maximum estimates about 10 times the most probable estimate.

This calculation assumes a stable value for the total population. This calculation is admittedly somewhat complicated and disappointingly vague. It is, to some geneticists, not a very meaningful way of looking at the problem. To others it adds up to something at least reasonably clear, and in any event very serious.

XIII. FALLOUT

There has been concern about the possible genetic harm due to the fallout of radioactive material which results from the testing of atomic weapons. Certain aspects of this problem will be discussed in the reports of the other committees of this study (fallout on grazing and cropland; fallout in the sea and possible concentration in marine organisms; the distribution of fallout material by the winds and in the upper atmosphere; possible pathological damage due to long-lived isotopes built into our bones; etc.). The present comments relate only to the question of genetic damage.

From the point of view of this committee there are two summary remarks that should be made.

First, since any additional radiation is genetically undesirable the fallout dose is genetically undesirable.

Second, the fallout dose to date (and its continuing value if it is assumed that the weapons testing program will not be substantially increased) is a small one as compared with the background radiation, or as compared with the average exposure in the United States to medical X-rays.

XIV. RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of the considerations which have been reviewed by this committee, and which have been, at least in major outline, summarized in this report, this committee has several recommendations.

These recommendations should all be interpreted in the light of the basic fact that any additional radiation is genetically undesirable. Therefore our society should hold additional radiation exposure as low as it possibly can. If certain figures (such as 10 roentgens) occur in a recommendation, it should most emphatically not be assumed that any exposure less than that figure is, so to speak, "all right"; nor should it be for a moment assumed that disaster will suddenly descend if one of these figures is exceeded.

In any case in which a figure is stated, it is with the idea. Stay just as far under this as you can; do not consider that this is an amount of radiation which is genetically harmless, for there is no such figure other than zero.

Opposing the fact that any further radiation is genetically bad is the practical fact that further radiation, from certain sources at least, is probably inevitable. The factors which argue for an increase in radiation are not genetic, and should obviously be appraised by a group much more representative than this committee. Thus our recommendations will have to be evaluated by others, who must decide what decisions society should or must make. As geneticists we say: keep the dose as low as you can.

Thus we recommend:

(A) That, in view of the fact that total accumulated dose is the genetically important figure, steps be taken to institute a national system of radiation exposure record-keeping, under which there would be maintained for every individual a complete history of his total record of exposure to X-rays, and to all other gamma radiation. This will impose minor burdens on all individuals of our society, but it will, as a compensation, be a real protection to them. We are conscious of the fact that this recommendation will not be simple to put into effect.

(B) That the medical authorities of this country initiate a vigorous movement to reduce the radiation exposure from X-rays to the lowest limit consistent with medical necessity; and in particular that they take steps to assure that proper safeguards always be taken to minimize the radiation dose to the reproductive cells.

(C) That for the present it be accepted as a uniform national standard that X-ray installations (medical and nonmedical), power installations, disposal of radio-active wastes, experimental installations, testing of weapons, and all other humanly controllable sources of radiations be so restricted that members of our general population shall not receive from such sources an average of more than 10 roentgens, in addition to background, of ionizing radiation as a total accumulated dose to the reproductive cells from conception to age 30.

(D) The previous recommendation should be reconsidered periodically with the view to keeping the reproductive cell dose at the lowest practicable level. If it is feasible to reduce medical exposures, industrial exposures, or both, then the total should be reduced accordingly.

(E) That individual persons not receive more than a total accumulated dose to the reproductive cells of 50 roentgens up to age 30 years (by which age, on the average, over half of the children will have been born), and not more than 50 roentgens additional up to age 40 (by which time about nine-tenths of their children will have been born).

(F) That every effort be made to assign to tasks involving higher radiation exposures individuals who, for age or other reasons, are unlikely thereafter to have additional offspring. Again it is recognized that such a procedure will introduce complications and difficulties, but this committee is convinced that society should begin to modify its procedures to meet inevitable new conditions.

XV. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The basic fact is—and no competent persons doubt this—that radiations produce mutations and that mutations are in general harmful. It is difficult, at the present state of knowledge of genetics, to estimate just how much of what kind of harm will appear in each future generation after mutant genes are induced by radiations. Different genetics prefer differing ways of describing this situation: But they all come out with the unanimous conclusion that the potential danger is great.

This report recommends that the general public of the United States be protected, by whatever controls may prove necessary, from receiving a total reproductive lifetime dose (conception to age 30) of more than 10 roentgens of man-made radiation to the reproductive cells. Of this reasonable (not harmless, mind you, but reasonable) quota of 10 roentgens over and beyond the inevitable background or radiation from natural causes, we are now using on the average some 3 or 4 roentgens for medical X-rays. This is

roughly the same as the unavoidable dose received from background radiation.

It is really very surprising and disturbing to realize that this figure is so large, and clearly it is prudent to examine this situation carefully. It is folly to incur any X-ray exposure to the gonads which can be avoided without impairing medical service or progress.

The 10 roentgen recommendation applies in an average sense to the population as a whole. We also include a recommendation concerning the upper limit of exposure that any one individual should receive. These limits would of course apply to persons whose occupations involve radiation exposure, but they are intended as broad and uniform regulations which apply to any and every individual.

The fallout from weapons testing has, so far, led to considerably less irradiation of the population than have the medical uses—and has therefore been less detrimental. So long as the present level is not increased this will continue to be true; but there remains a proper concern to see to it that the fallout does not increase to more serious levels.

One important lesson which results from this study is the following: The present state of advance in atomic and nuclear physics on the one hand, and in genetics on the other hand, are seriously out of balance. We badly need to know much more about genetics—about all kinds and all levels of genetics, from the most fundamental research on various lowly forms of life to human radiation genetics. This requires serious contributions of time, of brains, and of money. Although brains and time are more important than money, the latter is also essential; and our society should take prompt steps to see to it that the support of research in genetics is substantially expanded and that it is stabilized.

We ought to keep all of our expenditures of radiation as low as possible. Of the upper limit of 10 roentgens suggested in recomendation C, we are at present spending about one-third for medical X-rays. We are at present spending less—probably under one roentgen—for weapons testing. We may find it desirable or even almost obligatory that we spend a certain amount on atomic powerplants. But we must watch and guard all our expenditures. From the point of view of genetics, they are all bad.

TEXT OF THE DIGEST OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON EFFECTS OF RADIATION

It is generally agreed that, in the peacetime development of atomic energy, man has been lucky. He has been dealing with an enormous new force whose potential effects he has only dimly understood. Thus far, except for some tragic accidents affecting small numbers of people, the biological damage from peacetime activities (including the testing of atomic weapons) has been essentially negligible. Furthermore, it appears that radiation problems, if they are met intelligently and vigilantly, need not stand in the way of the large-scale development of atomic energy. The continuing need for intelligence and vigilance cannot be too strongly emphasized, however.

The problems of radiation fall naturally into two main classes: (1) the effects on human beings; (2) the various ways in which radiation can reach human beings through the environment.

EFFECTS ON HUMANS

The inheritance mechanism is by far the most sensitive to radiation of any biological system.

Any radiation which reaches the reproductive cells causes mutations (changes in the material governing heredity) that are passed on to succeeding generations.

Human gene mutations which produce observable effects are believed to be universally harmful.

Everyone is subjected to the natural background radiation which causes an unavoidable quantity of so-called spontaneous mutations. Anything that adds radiation to this naturally occurring background rate causes further mutations, and is genetically harmful.

There is no minimum amount of radiation which must be exceeded before mutations occur. Any amount, however small, that reaches the reproductive cells can cause a correspondingly small number of mutations. The more radiation, the more mutations.

The harm is cumulative. The genetic damage done by radiation builds up as the radiation is received, and depends on the total accumulated gonad dose received by people from their own conceptions to the conception of their last child.

So far as individuals are concerned, not all mutant genes or combinations of mutant genes are equally harmful. A few may cause very serious handicaps, many others may produce much smaller harm, or even no apparent damage.

But from the point of view of the total and eventual damage to the entire population, every mutation causes roughly the same amount of harm. This is because mutant genes can only disappear when the inheritance line in which they are carried dies out. In cases of severe and obvious damage this may happen in the first generation; in other cases it may require hundreds of generations.

Thus, for the general population, and in the long run, a little radiation to a lot of people is as harmful as a lot of radiation to a few, since the total number of mutant genes can be the same in the two cases.

A UNIT OF RADIATION

It is difficult to arrive at a figure showing how much genetic harm radiation can do. One measure is the amount of radiation, above the natural background, which would produce as many mutations again as occur spontaneously. It is estimated that this amount is 30 to 80 roentgens.

(The roentgen is a unit of radiation. To give an idea of its value, the average dental X-ray delivers 5 roentgens to the patient's jaw, but only five-thousandths of a roentgen of stray radiation to more remote parts of the body such as the gonads.)

It is also estimated that a dose of 10 roentgens to every person in the United States would cause something on the order of 5 million mutant genes which would then be a part of the population's inheritance pool. This figure is subject to considerable uncertainty.

At present the United States population is exposed to radiation from (a) the natural background, (b) medical and dental X-rays, (c) fallout from atomic weapons testing. The 30-year dose to the gonads received by the average person from each of these sources is estimated as follows:

(a) Background—about 4.3 roentgens.

(b) X-rays and fluoroscopy—about 3 roentgens.

(c) Weapons tests—if continued at the rate of the past 5 years would give a probable 30-year dose of about 0.1 roentgen. This figure may be off by a factor of 5; i. e., the possible range is from 0.02 to 0.5 roentgen. If tests were conducted at the rate of the two most active years (1953 and 1955) the 30-year dose would be about twice as great as that just stated.

If the exposure of the general population to radiation is limited to levels which the genetics committee believes reasonable (see recommendations at the end of this part), there should be practically no pathological effects in the persons receiving the radiation.

Larger exposures (say 100 roentgens and up) of the whole body or a large part of it are generally harmful. (Much higher doses may, however, be safely and usefully delivered to limited portions of the body under the controlled conditions of medical treatment.) Very little is now known about how to treat the pathological effects of radiation or how to protect the body against them in the first place. Much research is needed in these fields.

One of the effects is a shortening of life. This seems to involve some generalized action. Irradiated individuals may age faster than normally even if they do not develop specific radiation-induced diseases like leukemia. It has not been shown that exposures small enough to be genetically tolerable have this effect. Furthermore, the permissible exposure levels that have been established for persons working with radiation appear to be within the limits of safety. However, it is not yet known what minimum dose, if any, would be necessary to produce a statistically noticeable reduction of life span when very large numbers of people are concerned.

ENVIRONMENT AND FOOD SUPPLY

Radiation in the general environment has not yet become a serious problem. In a few decades, however, radioactive waste products from atomic powerplants will represent an enormous potential source of contamination. How much of this radioactivity will actually reach the population depends on how successfully it can be kept out of the great network—ocean and air currents, food and water supplies—which connect man to his surroundings.

At present test explosions of atomic weapons are the only significant source of radiation in the general environment, above the natural background.

Meteorologists have found no evidence that atomic explosions have changed the weather or climate. Nor do they believe that continued weapons tests, at the same rate and in the same areas as in the past, would have such an effect.

Radiation from explosions passes into the atmosphere and much of it eventually returns to the ground as "fallout."

Fallout divides into three classes: (1) close-in—material that comes down within a few hundred miles of the explosion and within 10 to 20 hours, (2) intermediate—material that descends in a few weeks after the explosion, (3) delayed—material that remains in the air for months or years.

Close-in fallout from test explosions affects only restricted, uninhabited regions.

Intermediate fallout would descend very slowly if it were pulled down only by gravity. It is mostly washed out of the air by rain and snow. It spreads over large parts of the earth, but its effect over a small area may be accentuated if there is heavy precipitation while the radioactive cloud is overhead.

Delayed fallout is stored for long periods in the stratosphere. Meteorologists know very little about the interchange of air between the stratosphere and lower layers, so they cannot predict exactly how long the material will stay up, or where it is likely to descend.

At this point the oceans are not receiving any significant quantities of radioactive material. But eventually they will undoubtedly be used as a repository for some of the radioactive waste products of atomic power plants.

Before this can safely begin on a large scale, much research is needed to determine the mixing rates between various parts of the seas. Materials deposited in some of the deep parts of the ocean may remain there 100 years or more, so that most of their radioactivity would be gone before they reach surface water. On the other hand, material dumped into coastal and other surface waters would directly affect marine life and, within a few years, would contaminate all parts of the world because of the relatively rapid circulation of surface layers.

FOOD SUPPLY CONTAMINATED

Radioactive tracers can be used to chart ocean and air currents and to study the interrelationships of marine animals. Many important experiments in these fields will be possible only within the next 10 or 20 years. Increasing radioactive contamination of the sea and atmosphere will make it impossible after that to detect the tracers against the heightened background.

Radiation from fallout inevitably contaminates man's food supply. Radioactive elements in the soil are taken up and concentrated by plants. The plants may be eaten by humans, or by animals which in turn serve as human food.

At present the contamination is negligible. But the maximum tolerable level is not known. There is not nearly enough information about the long-term biological effects on man or animals from eating radiation-contaminated food. Research in this area is urgently needed.

Probably the most important potential food contaminant is strontium 90–a radioactive element that concentrates in bone tissue. Already, detectable although biologically insignificant traces of it have turned up in milk supplies thousands of miles from the site of atomic explosions.

Food from the oceans is also subject to radioactive contamination. Marine plants and animals extract and concentrate various radioactive elements that get into sea water. The concentration is cumulative, increasing as it proceeds up the chain from microscopic plankton to edible fish.

Properly used, radiation can enhance man's food supply rather than damage it. Radiation techniques have already opened important new fields in agricultural research and will undoubtedly become increasingly valuable. No drastic change in agricultural production appears imminent, however.

Tracer studies will help us understand basic metabolic processes in plants and animals. They will also be applied to practical problems such as the use of fertilizers.

Mutation rates in plants are being artificially speeded up with radiation in the hope of producing new and superior strains. Thus far, only a few new economic varieties have been found, but the method is promising. The use of radiation to sterilize packaged food may have dramatic impact on food technology by reducing the need for refrigeration and extending the shelf-life of many products.

Holding radiation to a tolerable worldwide level will require adequate methods for disposing of, or, rather, for containing radioactive wastes from power reactors.

Some of these wastes will remain dangerously radioactive for centuries.

Research has indicated some apparently feasible systems for controlled disposal, but none is yet at the point of economic operating reality.

The major problem in routine disposal is what to do with the wastes resulting from the processing of reactor fuel. The wastes from normal operations of reactors themselves can be more easily handled.

A second major problem is to anticipate the accidents that will inevitably occur and to set up safety standards which will insure that they do not become catastrophes.

Considered in this light, it appears feasible to use nuclear reactors in central station powerplants and in naval vessels.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of these findings the study committees have made a number of recommendations. Those of the genetics committee apply most directly to all of us. They are:

I

Records should be kept for every individual, showing his total accumulated lifetime exposure to radiation.

II

The medical use of X-rays should be reduced as much as is consistent with medical necessity.

III

The average exposure of the population's reproductive cells to radiation above the natural background should be limited to 10 roentgens from conception to age 30.

IV

The 10-roentgen limit should be reconsidered periodically with a view to keeping the reproductive cell exposure at the lowest practicable level.

V

Individual persons should not receive a total accumulated dose to the reproductive cells of more than 50 roentgens up to age 30 years, and not more than 50 roentgens additional up to age 40. (About half of all United States children are born to parents under 30, nine-tenths to parents under 40.)

Other recommendations of general interest are:

VI

Techniques for monitoring worldwide fallout should be further improved.

VII

Measurements of the storage of radiation in the stratosphere should be continued and extended.

VIII

A national agency should control and keep records of all dumping of radioactive material in the ocean.

IX

An international body should set up safe standards for the marine and air disposal of radioactive materials as soon as possible, based on current knowledge.

X

Research in marine disposal should be carried out on a cooperative international basis.

XI

Until advances in reactor technology substantially reduce potential hazards buildings that house reactors located near populated areas should be sealed against the release of radioactive materials in the event of accident.

XII

Research should be continued and accelerated, particularly in the fields of:

Fundamental genetics, mammalian genetics, human and population genetics.

Pathological effects of radiation.

Mixing between various parts of the atmosphere.

Mixing between various parts of the oceans.

The role of plants and animals, both on land and in the oceans, in concentrating radioactive materials.

The tolerable levels of radioactivity in human and animal food.

Geophysical and geochemical aspects of the ultimate disposal of radioactive wastes.

Selection of biologically suitable sites for various atomic facilities.

Safety devices for the control of accidental power surges in reactors.

[From the New York Times of June 14, 1956]

RADIATION AND MAN'S FUTURE

The immediate and larger effects of atomic explosions on communities have been dwelt upon in countless monographs and articles, but what we are apt to regard as the minor effects have received less attention. What we have needed is a survey of what our new mastery of atomic energy means for the future of mankind.

With a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation such a survey is now presented by the National Academy of Sciences. It is a sober expression of opinion by scientists of high repute, an expression which cannot fail to have its effect on statesmen who are guiding the destinies of nations and which should drive home to them the urgent need of a new approach to the problem of avoiding inevitable catastrophe not only by sudden death but by death that creeps upon man, decade after decade, as he is bombarded by rays from many sources.

We have needed this report because it boils down the opinions of scientists who are aware of their social responsibility to the race and who know how to strike a balance between the good and the evil that lie in our new control of the atom. These men are concerned not only with what happens when nuclear weapons explode but with penetrating radiations in general. They are as much concerned with our growing utilization of X-rays and gamma rays in medical and biological research and in industry and with the baffling problem of disposing of dangerous radioactive wastes from atomic powerplants as they are with fallout.

The point is that we have as much to fear from the peaceful as from the military use of atomic energy. Every X-ray machine is a menace in its infinitesimal way. So are the cosmic rays that pass through every one of us, as well as the radium emanations from the earth. Add to this "background" radiation the rays that come from all other sources, small and large, and it is plain that the world has more to consider than what will happen if hydrogen bombs are exploded in ever-increasing numbers.

The geneticists of the National Academy of Sciences hold out a gloomy prospect of man's future if international action is not invoked to teach us how radiation hazards are to be avoided. The wild talk of monstrosities and freaks that can be produced by uncontrolled radiation is dismissed. It is the weakening of the human stock, the shortening of life, the lowered resistance to disease that is to be feared. The evidence is already at hand; for the radiologist who uses X-rays in diagnosing and treating disease shortens his life by 5 years. Such statistics are impressive. But they must not mislead us into thinking that genetics is an exact science. Very little is known about human genetics. It may take generations to bring about any noticeable genetic effects on mankind, but as we build more and more atomic powerplants, throw more and more radioactive wastes from reactors into the sea, install more and more powerful radiators to jolt the human genes the element of risk increases.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 14, 1956]

RADIATION

It is impossible to read the report of the National Academy of Sciences on the effects of nuclear radiation without a feeling of profound apprehension. The report itself is a fascinating, almost chatty, discussion of so vitally serious a subject. There is some reassurance in the conclusion that fallout from nuclear tests has not yet added dangerously to the general level of radioactivity. But there is a deeply disturbing note to the report's more fundamental conclusion: All radiation is harmful to the human reproductive system, and the more cumulative exposure there is the more harmful it becomes. Quite apart from the genetic effects, excessive exposure definitely shortens life. Thus the more radiation that is released, not merely from weapons explosions, but also from power reactors and disposal of wastes, the greater is the possibility of dangerous contamination.

Probably the most dramatic portion of the report is its warning against the indiscriminate use of X-rays. The maximum permissible accumulated exposure to manmade radiation for the average person from conception through age 30 is 10 roentgens (in addition to natural background radiation). X-rays received by the average person

through age 30 now account for 3 roentgens of the permissible 10. This exposure could become more dangerous if radioactivity from other sources should increase. The report urges caution against the overuse of X-rays for medical and dental purposes, particularly with expectant mothers, and it strongly condemns the use of X-rays for such nonessential purposes as fitting shoes.

The implications of radiation from the use of atomic energy, however, are of far greater significance. The report estimates that radioactivity from nuclear tests at the 1953–1955 rate would amount to as much as 1 roentgen over a 30-year period—a by no means inconsiderable factor, allowing for the probable conservatism of the report. Certainly this is enough to become alarmed about if the tests are continued or expanded. All radiation has an influence on genetic mutations, a subject on which the scientists acknowledge that they have only the beginnings of knowledge. Genetic damage is not immediately apparent; it takes several generations to show up. Moreover, the report admits that little is known about the effects of radio-strontium from fallout, particularly in the contamination of food.

Quite apart from radioactivity from nuclear explosions, the disposal of radioactive wastes from reactors already poses a major problem. Although the report does not discuss this particular matter, Canada has experienced great difficulty with contamination by wastes from its Chalk River experiment station. The report suggests some important questions that ought to be raised about the location of reactors in this country and their sealing against accident. It is worth inquiring whether there are sufficient safeguards against danger in the plan to locate an atomic powerplant only a short distance from the main source of New York City's water supply.

There are some individually heartening portions of the report, such as the debunking it does of the speculation that freak weather can be blamed on atomic explosions. But the net effect of this study by some of the Nation's most learned scientists, who recommend additional research in levels of tolerance, genetic effects, monitoring techniques and the like, is to emphasize how much we do not know about this new element we are playing with. Some rational control is imperative if our children are not to be subjected to new and possibly fatal perils—and neither the Atomic Energy Commission nor anyone else can afford to be doctrinaire about the effects of radioactivity.

MICHAEL WILLIAM CORMIER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Billings Gazette, of Billings, Mont., carried a great human-interest story, under the heading "Extra Points," which I think is deserving of the attention of the Senate of the United States. The story, written by Red Welsh, is about a fine young American, Michael William Cormier, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Clem Cormier, who are old and valued friends. Mike, who died at the age of 15 years, was a champion in every sense of the word. He will be missed by all his friends in the Midland Empire and in Montana as a whole. He will be remembered because of the great courage he displayed throughout his entire lifetime, because of his cheerfulness, and because of the fact that for him it was more difficult to live than it was for the other boys in his area. The physical and moral courage of this great all-American boy will serve as an inspiration, I know, for many others who will follow him in the Billings area.

We are saddened at Mike's passing, but because of our friendship with him, because of our knowledge of the great odds which he had to live under, because of his understanding and strength, we are better people. In the words of Red Welsh, Mike Cormier will be one of those who will be ready and who will be called for the fray "in football's distant Valhalla, where real guys play on the team," because, again in the words of Red, "there must be a job on the Great Coach's eleven for a kid named Mike Cormier."

I ask unanimous consent that this story be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRA POINTS

(By Red Welsh)

A CHAMP REPORTS FOR THE TEAM

Americans admire courage. This trait is always present on the athletic field because it takes sand to be an athlete. There are times, however, when intestinal fortitude can be noted elsewhere.

Here's a story about a boy who never took part in an athletic contest, yet he had the physical and moral courage of the greatest all-American who ever lived.

It's a story that obviously couldn't be told until now.

Last week funeral services were held for Michael William Cormier. He was only 15 years old when he died.

Mike loved sports with a passion, but activity for him was restricted to a place on the sidelines where he watched every move with intense interest.

For the last couple of years it took more plain, raw "guts" for little Mike to sit through a game than was necessary for the participating youngsters to play in the contest itself. He never missed a game. Sports were an important item in his life.

Mike was an active boy when fatal illness struck. The diagnosis was confirmed by the best medical talent in the country.

Adults are rarely told the truth about sickness when the road of life becomes a short, one-way street.

The same courtesy is extended to a boy.

Mike never knew how sick he really was. If he suspected, he was too brave to kick about it. Everything humanly possible was done to stop the disease, but to no avail.

Although it wasn't a matter of public knowledge, quite a few did know the score. While they cheered the athletes on the field, those who knew about Mike's battle for life silently handed him the hero's headlines.

Each passing day made the going progressively harder.

As his physical strength left, his moral courage grew. Through it all, the many long months of illness, the gallant little fellow never complained.

He kept plugging along, always looking for that tomorrow when he'd begin to feel better.

As lifetimes are measured, Mike drew a short tour of duty.

Those fortunate enough to have known him, and who were familiar with his struggle are more human and better people for his having been here.

In his brief span the little fellow displayed the attributes that make for true greatness.

When the air turns crisp in the Great Beyond and gridirons are chalked for play, when the experts check the records to see who's ready for the fray, then in football's distant Valhalla, where real guys play on the team, there must be a job on the Great Coach's 11 for a kid named Mike Cormier.

LEGISLATION BY THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have an important appointment, and I wish to make a statement which will require not more than 6 or 7 minutes, I believe. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak now for that length of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the best news that has come out of Washington in a long time was the announcement that the Supreme Court had concluded its final session of this term.

I interrupt myself at this point to say that when these remarks were prepared, I did not know that the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] had prepared a bill which would undo the damage done in the Cole against Young case by the Supreme Court. As Senators know, that case had to do with the right of a Government agency to discharge security risks. I had introduced a bill along the same lines. I would not have done so had I known that the Senator from South Dakota was introducing a like bill. I think he should be complimented for introducing that bill. I hope the committee will take action on the Mundt bill rather than on mine, although they are practically identical bills.

If the Supreme Court had another 3 or 4 months to hand down decisions which help the Communist Party, our Government and our institutions might well be at the mercy of the Communist conspiracy by the end of the summer. I have had little respect for the Supreme Court since, I would say, about the middle 1930's. I completely lost respect for it when it decided, about a month or 6 weeks ago, that the States had no rights. During the past 6 or 7 months the irresponsibility of that tribunal has sunk to unprecedented depths.

Not only has the Court completely abandoned its function of interpreting our laws, it has proceeded to legislate in national affairs as though it were a supercongress. It has done this in an area which affects the life and death of this country. It has done it especially in an area which affects the rights of the States to legislate and to prosecute under their laws.

With one sledge-hammer blow after another the Court has knocked away the defenses we have erected against communism. Measure after measure taken by the American people through their representatives in the national and State legislatures and in the executive branch of our Government to protect our society against Communist subversion has been nullified because a few irresponsible judges—I repeat, a few irresponsible judges—believe such measures to be unwise.

The Court has simply made its own determination of policy whenever it has disagreed with the views of the legislative or executive branches.

This morning I reviewed several speeches which I had made on the floor of the Senate during the past few months

on this subject. I find that I said in almost every one something to the effect that "this latest decision of the Supreme Court is the most outrageous example of judicial legislation on record." While I dislike to keep repeating this judgment, it so happens that it fits in every case. The decisions become worse and worse. I thought the Nelson decision was the worst on record. Then came the Slochower decision, followed by the decision in the case of Communist Party against United States. Now the same thing must be said about the Court's decision last Monday in the case of Cole against Young.

I digress to point out again that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] introduced a bill yesterday designed to take care of this situation. Whether it will be effective, of course, none of us knows. A more flagrant usurpation of the legislative and executive prerogatives than the Cole case is hardly imaginable, althought I have learned not to underestimate the ability of the Supreme Court to come up with an even greater travesty in the future.

After the Court's decision in the Nelson case, which held that the States had no power to enforce their antisedition laws on the wholly fallacious ground that Congress intended to exclude the States from the sedition field—and I call this particularly to the attention of the presiding officer, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]—I introduced a bill which reaffirmed the intention of Congress to recognize the concurrent rights of the States in this field. The Court's decision in Cole against Young confronts us with a somewhat similar situation. Once again the Supreme Court has reached its decision on a manifestly absurd and unjustifiable interpretation of the intent of Congress; and once again it is necessary for the Congress to reaffirm its intent by new legislation. I introduced a bill yesterday afternoon which will accomplish this restatement of congressional intent. But I want to repeat now what I said at the time I introduced the bill on the Nelson case: I deeply resent the fact that Congress is called upon to pass this kind of legislation. Congress has enough to do without having to spend its time repealing laws—I repeat, Mr. President, repealing laws—enacted by the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court's job is to interpret law, not to make them.

I may say, in passing, that the Supreme Court, since the appointment of Mr. Warren, has sunk to the greatest low in its history.

What is the Cole case all about? The question before the Court was whether the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was authorized under Public Law 733 of the 81st Congress, and the extension thereof by Executive Order 10450, to apply the summary dismissal provisions of that act to an employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Court ruled that the Secretary was not so authorized on the grounds that Congress did not intend that the act should apply to employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare since they hold what the Court calls nonsensitive positions. The utter absurdity of that contention can be demonstrated very briefly by looking at the provisions of Public Law 733 and of the Executive order issued pursuant thereto.

Section 1 of the act makes certain summary dismissal procedures available to the heads of 11 specified agencies and departments of the executive branch of the Government. Section 1, it is true, does not include the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Section 111 of the act, however, reads as follows:

> The provisions of this act shall apply to such other departments and agencies of the Government as the President may, from time to time, deem necessary in the best interests of national security. If any departments or agencies are included by the President he shall so report to the committees on the armed services of the Congress.

In Executive Order 10450, section 1, President Eisenhower directed, in addition to the departments and agencies specified in the said act of August 26, 1950, that the provisions of that act should apply to all the departments and agencies of the Government. This, of course, includes the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This extension of the act was duly reported to the Committees on Armed Services as required by the act.

Now, Mr. President, the question is: Was Executive Order 10450 a valid extension of the provisions of Public Law 733 to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the other Government agencies which were not enumerated in the act? It would surely seem to be, for the President carried out the explicit provisions of the act. Moreover, the majority of the Court says in the sixth paragraph of its opinion:

> We will * * * assume, for the purposes of this decision, that the act has validly been extended to apply to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. President, one would think that the Court's opinion would have ended then and there, and that its ruling would have been to uphold the authority of the Secretary to dismiss the employee pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 733; for the Court concedes that Executive Order 10450 is a valid extension of the provisions of the act. As Congress plainly intended they should be extended if the President so determined. But the Court's opinion does not end there. Mr. Justice Harlan, on behalf of the majority, proceeds to devote several thousand words explaining why the act was not validly extended—or, more concretely, why Congress never intended it to be so extended. I ask any Member of this body to read those several thousand words and come up with an intelligible explanation of how the Court arrives at precisely the opposite conclusion from that which its own premises dictate. I repeat: There is not a word in this opinion to the effect that Public Law 733 violates the employee's constitutional rights, or deprives him of his civil liberties; the Court rests its case entirely on its interpretation of the intent of Congress. What the Court actually does, of course, is to disregard completely the intent of Congress and substitute for the Congress' and President's views its own notions about what is necessary and advisable.

The Congress has plainly said that some departments of the Government are so sensitive that summary dismissal procedures should be made available by expressed congressional enactment. It has plainly said that other agencies and departments may be so sensitive as to make it advisable to permit the President to make summary dismissal provisions applicable to them. It has plainly said that the decision as to whether the act should be so extended should be made by the President. The President has determined, and very wisely I think, that all positions in the Federal Government are potentially sufficiently sensitive to warrant the application of summary dismissal procedures.

Mr. President, I apologize for taking more than the time allotted to me. I have only about 2 or 3 minutes remaining. I beg the indulgence of the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the individual members of the Court are, of course, entitled to their own opinions about what measures are necessary for national security. But the members of the Court are not entitled to inflict legislation on the American people in the form of a Court decision. And it is the rankest insolence for the Court to do so by saying that Congress intended something that Congress plainly did not intend. Let me quote from the excellent dissenting opinion in this case written by Mr. Justice Clark and joined in by Mr. Justice Reed and Mr. Justice Minton:

> We have read the act over and over again, but find no ground on which to infer such an interpretation. It flies directly in the face of the language of the act and the legislative history. The plain words of section 1 (of the Executive order) make the act applicable to "any civilian officer or employee in a sensitive position." The Court would require not only a finding that a particular person is subversive, but also that he occupies a sensitive job. Obviously this might leave the Government honeycombed with subversive employees.

The dissenting opinion points out further that the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] said at the time the act was passed:

> Section 3 gives the President the right to classify every agency as a sensitive agency * * * He could take the whole Government.

Many of the Senators who were in the Senate at that time will surely agree that the Senator from Virginia stated the opinion of all the Senators at the time the act was passed.

Mr. Justice Clark went on to say:

> We believe the Court's order has stricken down the most effective weapon against subversive activities available to the Government. It is not realistic to say that the Government can be protected merely by applying the act to sensitive jobs. One never knows just which job is sensitive. The janitor might prove to be in as important a spot securitywise as the top employee in the building. The Congress decided that the

most effective way to protect the Government was through the procedures laid down in the act. The President implemented its purposes by requiring that Government employment be "clearly consistent" with the national security * * *. The President believed that the national security required the extension of the coverage of the act to all employees. That was his judgment, not ours. He was given that power, not us.

What the dissenting opinion is saying, of course, is that the Supreme Court has usurped the powers of the Congress and the President. I say, Mr. President, that the dissenting judges are completely right in this respect, and I may add that the Supreme Court's practice of doing what the Constitution of the United States clearly denies it the right to do has become a regular habit. I say further that if Congress does not take some action to discipline the Court and to prevent the Court from passing laws, then the Congress might as well close up shop. We are simply wasting our time in this Chamber if the measures we pass can be arbitrarily overruled by a whim of the Supreme Court. In the near future, I plan to present a review of recent Supreme Court decisions and to point out how the very existence of our constitutional form of government has been placed in jeopardy; and at that time I shall have some suggestions to make as to measures Congress might take to remedy the evil.

The immediate business before the Senate, however, is to reconfer on the executive branch the authority to dismiss employees pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 733 irrespective of the position the employee may occupy. The bill I am sending to the desk restates the intent of Congress to permit the President to extend the provisions of the act to all departments and agencies of the Government. I confess that I had some trouble this morning in drafting language which would state the intent of Congress any more explicitly than it is already stated. However, the intent is spelled out somewhat in my bill, and I do not believe it is susceptible of misconstruction. But then I thought the same thing about section 3 of the act as it now stands, and look what happened to it. There is therefore no guaranty that the Supreme Court will not misconstrue the act, as amended by my bill, just as it has misconstrued the present act.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator for bearing with me in taking additional time during the morning hour. I did not anticipate taking such a long time.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, has the morning hour been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; it has not been concluded.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may speak for 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland discussed the matter with me, and we have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland that he be allowed to speak for 10 minutes at this time, during the morning hour? The Chair hears no objection, and the Senator from Maryland may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield so that I may move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for the purpose of acting on the nominations on the Executive Calendar?

Mr. BUTLER. I will yield for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Maryland may yield for that purpose without losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for the purpose of acting upon the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Arthur Kline, of Wyoming, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for a term of 5 years, expiring June 22, 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President I ask that the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS AND THE BALTIMORE FRIENDSHIP INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, last Friday America's pioneer overseas airline achieved another milestone in aviation annals. Pan American World Airways introduced in transatlantic service the new Douglas DC–7C, the latest version of an aircraft type which embodies the ultimate in swift, comfortable, long-range flight powered with conventional reciprocating engines.

The super DC–7 has a range of 5,000 miles, exceeding by 1,000 miles the range of any other airliner. It cruises at better than 350 miles per hour. On a precedent-making, 14-hour, nonstop demonstration flight from Miami to Paris, a distance of 4,800 miles, the DC–7C attained a maximum speed of 450 miles per hour.

The distance from Miami to Paris is equivalent to that of the Tokyo-Seattle route. The DC–7C is, therefore, capable of regular 14-hour schedules nonstop between Seattle and Tokyo with, of course, normal loads.

I may seem partial to Pan American in saluting its progressive and dynamic management for accomplishing a new first in leadership among the world's air carriers. I am partial to Pan American in that I am partial to Baltimore and to Maryland, which Pan American World Airways is ready, willing, and able to serve. Indeed, Pan American, in proceedings now before the Civil Aeronautics Board, proposes to fly the world's most heavily traveled air route, along the United States east coast from Boston to Miami, with Friendship International Airport as its main Baltimore-Washington terminal.

In these proceedings in the Northeast-Florida route case, Pan American has the vigorous, unqualified support of the Greater Baltimore Committee, Inc., the Baltimore Association of Commerce, the Maryland State Aviation Committee, and those people of the national capital-Baltimore area who are justifiably disturbed by the perilous congestion at Washington's National Airport.

Pan American proposes not only to avail itself of Friendship's unused capacity and ultramodern facilities but to provide DC–7C passenger service to Miami and the major cities of Latin America and Europe and beyond. Friendship would indeed become an international airport, a great hub and gateway of international friendship, linked by regular schedules and direct one-plane service to the seventy-odd countries in which Pan American flies.

Moreover, Pan American would offer DC–6 and DC–4 cargo clipper service for freight, express, and mail from my home

city, which is the sixth largest metropolitan area in the Nation, and the Nation's second port. Maryland, which figures by approximately 15 percent in the annual $7 billion trade between the United States and our good neighbors to the south, would enjoy the adequate air services to which Maryland is entitled.

We know that the DC–7C and other new model multiengine aircraft such as the Super-G Constellation represent the final chapter of an era, an era in which the piston engine was developed to supreme efficiency for civil air transport. It might also be said that the curtain is raising on a new era. We also recognize that Pan American, while awaiting delivery of the 30 or more additional DC–7C's on order, also acted to bring the jet era to commercial aviation in this country late last year by placing orders for the all-jet DC–8 and the Boeing 707.

Other air carriers have emulated Pan American's action. The first of these jet airplanes will be in regular service in 1958 or 1959.

The 3 million people of the Baltimore-Washington area whom Pan American would serve via Friendship Airport would be able to board these planes for journeys to Miami, Boston, and ports of call beyond our borders. Even now, with the DC–7C, the airlines can reduce the flying time on their swiftest schedules by as much as 3 hours. In view of this should anyone consider a 45-minute drive from downtown Washington to Friendship International Airport onerous? Is not the use of Friendship the most satisfactory answer to the ever-present prospect of disaster that haunts authorities in charge of Washington's overcrowded National Airport? Is not Friendship Airport, and the certification of Pan American to fly the east coast route, the most sensible solution to this problem and the growing needs of this area?

Despite the woeful neglect of Baltimore's Friendship Airport in the development of air passenger service—Baltimore is 38th in passenger boardings at local airports—there has been a steady rise in the air-cargo lift from Friendship this year.

As the Baltimore Sun observed some weeks ago:

Baltimore's air cargo potential is one of the main reasons behind Pan American's designation of Friendship for its Baltimore-Washington terminal in connection with its application for certification as a Northeast-to-Florida carrier. And Pan American's judgment is backed up by the latest figures (showing substantial increases in various categories of air express and freight movement).

The Baltimore News-Post notes that Pan American is the only applicant carrier equipped for immediate use of the Northeast-Florida route, the most heavily traveled air route in the world, "if certification is granted it during this year."

In view of this sentiment, Mr. President, I believe that Pan American's latest acquisition of new, improved equipment warrants the felicitations of all communities which, like Baltimore, have an important stake in the direct passenger, cargo, and mail transportation which a wholly experienced airline is eager to provide.

In closing, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the editorials from the Baltimore Evening Sun and Baltimore News-Post which I mentioned earlier.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun of May 24, 1956]

PLUG FOR PAN AMERICAN

In an impressive blue-and-gold brochure the greater Baltimore committee has outlined Baltimore's golden opportunity to obtain more air service. The brochure is for use in the pending case before the Civil Aeronautics Board in which Pan American World Airways is seeking certification for a route from New England to Florida, using Friendship Airport as the terminal for both Baltimore and Washington. The mayor and city council have also plugged hard for Pan American's getting east coast operating rights, as has the State aviation commission.

All this local backing for one airline is unusual, but is justified by the unusual situation. Pan American is the first airline to give official recognition to the fact that on long flights, Friendship is just as convenient as Washington's National Airport as a terminal for passengers throughout the Baltimore-Washington area. Pan American is also primarily an overseas operator, which means that its use of Friendship as a terminal would tie Baltimore into the worldwide air traffic and give some meaning to the International in its full name.

Then, too, Pan American is the one airline of many seeking east coast operating rights that plans to provide air-cargo service, and many feel that Baltimore, already a sea-freight center, has a logical future in the air-freight business, given the necessary start. And another point is that Pan American is moving fast into the jet airliner age, and Friendship, with its tremendously long runways and low traffic density, is ready and waiting to meet this new age.

In fighting the case of one airline, nobody should be blind to the fact that the airline is out to gain business for itself and not to put Friendship on the air map. But when an airline's interests and Baltimore's interests so closely coincide, it makes sense to throw as much local weight as possible into what is in this instance a joint cause. Pan American, and hence Baltimore, has already received one setback when a CAB examiner turned down the airline's New England-to-Florida bid. But the case is still pending before the full CAB, and as long as it remains open, Baltimore's stake in Friendship's future demands solid support for the airline that has recognized our airport's advantages.

[From the Baltimore News-Post of March 5, 1956]

AIR GATEWAY

The business community of Baltimore and the State and the air-traveling public have an important stake in the Northeast-Florida proceedings now before the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Pan American World Airways is seeking approval for a new route from Boston to Florida, with Friendship International Airport as one of its main terminals.

This would make Friendship truly an international air hub, for Pan American would provide direct passenger, cargo, and mail service from Baltimore to Florida and the principal cities of Latin America and also to Europe and beyond.

Direct services would eliminate the necessity for changing of planes at Miami or New York, Pan American World is said to be the only applicant carrier which will have aircraft for immediate use on this most heavily traveled air route in the world if certification is granted it during this year.

Pan American intends, if permitted, to serve the air needs of more than 3 million persons of the Baltimore-Washington area through the single terminal at Friendship.

Granting of the airline's application is a vital matter to Baltimore and the State, whose interests have been damaged severely by deficiency in flights for both passengers and cargo. This has obliged shippers and passengers often to use Washington, Philadelphia, or New York as terminals for flights to distant points.

Because of this fact Baltimore's great air traffic volume is unfairly represented in statistics. Traffic that originates or terminates in Baltimore appears in the statistics of other air terminals.

Baltimore, the Nation's sixth largest city and second largest port, with more than $3 billion worth of diverse manufactured products annually, certainly deserves much more adequate air services than it has been getting.

This area figures in almost 15 percent of the Nation's $7 billion of shipments to and from Latin America and carries on a heavy trade with Florida as well as with Europe. It is truly unfortunate that so much of its aerial transport must be carried on by inconvenient, costly, indirect means.

The Northeast-Florida air route, 50 percent heavier than any other, now is served by only 2 carriers, while many lighter ones are served by from 3 to 5.

Pan American World's application is supported solidly by the Greater Baltimore Committee, the Baltimore Association of Commerce, Governor McKeldin, Mayor D'Alesandro, the Maryland Aviation Commission, the Baltimore Airport Board, and other groups.

Maryland's delegation in Congress will do a valuable service for their constituents by being persistent and emphatic in requesting the CAB to act favorably upon the application.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared on the Pan American Airways be printed in the RECORD following the remarks of the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

I wish to endorse the remarks of the able Senator from Maryland and to join with him in congratulating Pan American Airways on once again pioneering new aviation developments with the introduction of the DC–7C. It has been my pleasure on many occasions to fly the routes of Pan American particularly to Latin America. This private enterprise airline has done a tremendous job in the field of international good will and the whole air transport system existing between North America and South America is a tribute to the pioneering spirit of Pan American and its able president, Mr. Juan T. Trippe.

Not only has Pan American made easy and comfortable travel between the Americas available to the public but it is now developing a substantial network of hotels, where international travelers can stop under the most comfortable and sanitary conditions. Intercontinental Hotels Corp. is a wholly owned subsidiary of Pan American Airways and rather than cost the American taxpayers any money it is actually making money for them through interest payments on loans negotiated through the Export-Import Bank. Not one penny of any subsidy money due Pan American Airways for flying

national interest routes goes into IHC. On the contrary, any profits accrued to IHC, and they are beginning to accrue, goes to further reduce subsidy payments to Pan American.

Airline competition around the world today is keen and severe. In almost every instance Pan American's competition stems from government-owned and highly subsidized foreign carriers. The fact that Pan American, in the face of this competition, is still ably leading the field in international air operations is a grand tribute to the airline and the American free enterprise system and I join my distinguished friend from Maryland in congratulating this splendid air carrier.

PRODUCTION OF TUNGSTEN, ASBESTOS, FLUORSPAR, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3982) to provide for the maintenance of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the majority leader the fact that the unfinished business has been laid before the Senate.

CITATION OF JOSEPH BRUNO FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2120, Senate Resolution 274, to cite Joseph Bruno for contempt of the United States Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 274) to cite Joseph Bruno for contempt of the United States Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to say in explanation that if the request is agreed to, it is the intention of the majority leader to suggest the absence of a quorum, so that Senators may be present to hear the statement of the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] justifying the resolution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have the resolution taken up as the pending business. Then I wonder if the majority leader will withhold the quorum call, so that I may speak for a couple of minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be delighted to do so. I am always delighted to accommodate my courteous and delightful friend from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 274) to cite Joseph Bruno for contempt of the United States Senate.

THE SO-CALLED BLATNIK ANTIPOLLUTION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not know how anyone could appreciate more than does the Senator from Oregon the wonderful cooperation he always receives from the majority leader. It is only indicative of the complete impartiality and fairness with which the majority leader treats his colleagues on the floor of the Senate in performing his duties as majority leader.

I rise, Mr. President, to pay a very brief but deserving word of commendation to Representative BLATNIK, of Minnesota, for what I consider to be a great act of statesmanship which he performed in the House of Representatives in connection with the bill known as the Blatnik antipollution bill. I speak as a member of the District of Columbia Committee of the Senate. As the record shows, for some years past I have been doing the best I could in the Senate in an effort to have Congress recognize the importance of enacting antipollution legislation.

As I have pointed out in past speeches, there flows through the Capital of the United States the filthiest river in the world. There is not in any other country a single river which is so filthy as the river which flows practically within stone's throw of the Capitol of the United States. It is a disgusting national disgrace that within the city boundaries of Washington, D. C., there flows a river so filthy that in some places there is sewage sludge of a depth of from 12 to 14 feet. Flowing through the Capital of the United States is a river which ought to be one of the great recreational streams of America, but it is so filthy that it is not safe for a single child to go wading in the river, let alone go swimming in it. The river is so filthy that when a canoe capsizes and throws the occupant into the river, a doctor is more concerned about what may happen to the body of the person by way of possible disease infection, than he is about the exposure to which the person may have been subjected, or the fact that he came near drowning.

Those are the facts, Mr. President. So the Representative from Minnesota is deserving of the commendation of every citizen of the District of Columbia for what he has succeeded in doing on the House side in getting the Blatnik bill passed, in the face of some claims of very false economy. I think the bill will stand to his everlasting credit.

I hope that we on the Senate side will be as wise as the Members on the House side were yesterday when they passed the Blatnik bill. As I said to Representative BLATNIK in a personal conversation this morning, and as I now want to say on the floor of the Senate, that, as a member of the District of Columbia Committee, I intend to do everything within my power to obtain favorable consideration of the Batnik antipollution bill in the Senate; and I call upon the members of the Senate District of Columbia Committee for the quickest possible action on the Blatnik proposal.

I hope the newspapers of the District of Columbia will wake up to this local issue and proceed to give us their help immediately, because they have a great social responsibility in the District of Columbia to be of maximum assistance in educating the public in regard to the meritorious features of the Blatnik bill.

I hope to live so long, Mr. President, as to see the Potomac River become a recreational river. I hope to live so long, Mr. President, as to see the Potomac become a river in which the youngsters of the District of Columbia, and of the Nation as they come here, can go swimming. I hope to see it become a beautiful recreational stream, as it should be. I hope also to live so long as to see the Congress of the United States use the Potomac River as a sort of pilot-plant operation, demonstrating to the Nation what can be done in the matter of cleaning streams and preventing their pollution, because here again, as in so many other phases of natural-resource problems, there is a great responsibility resting on the Congress to leave to future generations of Americans a heritage in their rivers and streams. We should see to it that we leave them in better condition than we find them. We ought to leave the Potomac River to the very next generation of American boys and girls as a clean river, a nonpolluted river; and, in my judgment, the passage of the Blatnik bill will be a good step in that direction.

Mr. NEUBERGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to add my comments to those of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] concerning the very able leadership of Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, of Minnesota, in securing the passage by the House of Representatives of the stream pollution bill.

We in the Northwest are particularly interested in this subject, because much of the aquatic life in our region, such as our great migratory runs of Chinook salmon, has been damaged by sewage and offal in our rivers. For this reason I am glad to join my colleague in expressing deep appreciation for the demonstrated leadership of Representative BLATNIK, of Minnesota, and for the very capable and enlightened manner in which he persuaded his colleagues in the House of Representatives to pass a very forward-looking bill for the elimination of stream pollution. It is my sincere and earnest hope that the Senate will likewise pass the bill when it comes before us in the near future.

EXTENSION OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 890) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C. 466–466j) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SECTION 1. (a) In connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the waterways

of the Nation and in consequence of the benefits resulting to the public health and welfare by the prevention and control of water pollution, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution, to support and aid technical research relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, and to provide Federal technical services and financial aid to State and interstate agencies and to municipalities in connection with the prevention and control of water pollution. To this end, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall administer this act through the Public Health Service and under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) Nothing in this act shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the States with respect to the waters (including boundary waters) of such States.

"COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMS FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

"SEC. 2. The Surgeon General shall, after careful investigation, and in cooperation with other Federal agencies, and State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, and with the municipalities and industries involved, prepare or develop comprehensive programs for eliminating or reducing the pollution of interstate waters and tributaries thereof and improving the sanitary condition of surface and underground waters. In the development of such comprehensive programs due regard shall be given to the improvements which are necessary to conserve such waters for public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses. For the purpose of this section, the Surgeon General is authorized to make joint investigations with any such agencies of the condition of any waters in any State or States, and of the discharges of any sewage, industrial wastes, or substance which may adversely affect such waters.

"INTERSTATE COOPERATION AND UNIFORM LAWS

"SEC. 3. (a) The Surgeon General shall encourage cooperative activities by the States for the prevention and control of water pollution; encourage the enactment of improved and, so far as practicable, uniform State laws relating to the prevention and control of water pollution; and encourage compacts between States for the prevention and control of water pollution.

"(b) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law or treaty of the United States, for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the prevention and control of water pollution and the enforcement of their respective laws relating thereto, and (2) the establishment of such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements and compacts. No such agreement or compact shall be binding or obligatory upon any State a party thereto unless and until it has been approved by the Congress.

"RESEARCH, INVESTIGATIONS, TRAINING, AND INFORMATION

"SEC. 4. (a) The Surgeon General shall conduct in the Public Health Service and encourage, cooperate with, and render assistance to other appropriate public (whether Federal, State, interstate, or local) authorities, agencies, and institutions, private agencies and institutions, and individuals in the conduct of, and promote the coordination of, research, investigations, experiments, demonstrations, and studies relating to the causes, control, and prevention of water pollution. In carrying out the foregoing, the Surgeon General is authorized to—

"(1) collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, the results of and other information as to research, investigations, and demonstrations relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, including appropriate recommendations in connection therewith;

"(2) make grants-in-aid to public or private agencies and institutions and to individuals for research or training projects and for demonstrations, and provide for the conduct of research, training, and demonstrations by contract with public or private agencies and institutions and with individuals without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes;

"(3) secure, from time to time and for such periods as he deems advisable, the assistance and advice of experts, scholars, and consultants as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);

"(4) provide and maintain opportunities for study in the Public Health Service with such stipends and allowances, including traveling and subsistence expenses, as he may deem necessary to procure the assistance of the most promising research students: *Provided*, That the total sum authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year for students pursuant to this subparagraph shall not exceed $100,000; and

"(5) provide training in technical matters relating to the causes, prevention, and control of water pollution to personnel of public agencies and other persons with suitable qualifications.

"(b) The Surgeon General may, upon request of any State water pollution control agency, or interstate agency, conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of water pollution confronting any State, interstate agency, community, municipality, or industrial plant, with a view of recommending a solution of such problem.

"(c) The Surgeon General shall collect and disseminate basic data on chemical, physical, and biological water quality, and such other information, relating to water pollution and the prevention and control thereof as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act.

"GRANTS FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, $5 million for grants to States and to interstate agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining adequate measures for the prevention and control of water pollution.

"(b) The portion of the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for a fiscal year which shall be available for grants to interstate agencies and the portion thereof which shall be available for grants to States shall be specified in the act appropriating such sums.

"(c) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall from time to time make allotments to the several States, in accordance with regulations, on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the extent of the water pollution problem, and (3) the financial need of the respective States.

"(d) From each State's allotment under subsection (c) for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall pay to such State an amount equal to its Federal share (as determined under subsection (h)) of the cost of carrying out its State plan approved under subsection (f), including the cost of training personnel for State and local water pollution control work and including the cost of administering the State plan.

"(e) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall from time to time make allotments to interstate agencies, in accordance with regulations, on such basis as the Surgeon General finds reasonable and equitable. He shall from time to time pay to each such agency, from its allotment, an amount equal to such portion of the cost of carrying out its plan approved under subsection (f) as may be determined in accordance with regulations, including the cost of training personnel for water pollution control work and including the cost of administering the interstate agency's plan. The regulations relating to the portion of the cost of carrying out the interstate agency's plan which shall be borne by the United States shall be designed to place such agencies, so far as practicable, on a basis similar to that of the States.

"(f) The Surgeon General shall approve any plan for the prevention and control of water pollution which is submitted by the State water pollution control agency, or in the case of an interstate agency, by such agency, if such plan—

"(1) provides for administration or for the supervision of administration of the plan by the State water pollution control agency or, in the case of a plan submitted by an interstate agency, by such interstate agency;

"(2) provides that such agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Surgeon General may from time to time reasonably require to carry out his functions under this act;

"(3) sets forth the plans, policies, and methods to be followed in carrying out the State (or interstate) plan and in its administration;

"(4) provides for extension or improvement of the State or interstate program for prevention and control of water pollution; and

"(5) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the plan.

The Surgeon General shall not disapprove any such plan without first giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State water pollution control agency or interstate agency which has submitted such plan.

"(g) (1) Whenever the Surgeon General, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State water pollution control agency or interstate agency finds that—

"(A) the plan submitted by such agency and approved under this section has been so changed that it no longer complies with a requirement of subsection (f) of this section: or

"(B) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with such a requirement, the Surgeon General shall notify such agency that no further payments will be made to the State or to the interstate agency, as the case may be, under this section (or in his discretion that further payments will not be made to the State, or to the interstate agency, for projects under or parts of the plan affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until he is so satisfied, the Surgeon General shall make no further payments to such State, or to such interstate agency, as the case may be, under this section (or shall limit payments to projects under or parts of the plan in which there is no such failure).

"(2) If any State or any interstate agency is dissatisfied with the Surgeon General's action with respect to it under this subsection, it may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State (or any of the member States, in the case of an interstate agency) is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The findings of fact by the Surgeon General, unless contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause

shown, may remand the case to the Surgeon General to take further evidence, and the Surgeon General may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless contrary to the weight of the evidence. The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Surgeon General or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"(h) (1) The 'Federal share' for any State shall be 100 percent less that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska), except that (A) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66⅔ percent or less than 33⅓ percent, and (B) the Federal share for Hawaii and Alaska shall be 50 percent, and for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 66⅔ percent.

"(2) The 'Federal shares' shall be promulgated by the Surgeon General between July 1 and September 30 of each even-numbered year, on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation.

"(i) The population of the several States shall be determined on the basis of the latest figures furnished by the Department of Commerce.

"(j) The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to subsection (d) or (e) shall be as follows:

"(1) The Surgeon General shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be paid to each State (or to each interstate agency in the case of subsection (e)) under the provisions of such subsection for such period, such estimate to be based on such records of the State (or the interstate agency) and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Surgeon General may find necessary.

"(2) The Surgeon General shall pay to the State (or to the interstate agency), from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by him for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid such State (or such interstate agency) for any prior period under such subsection was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to such State (or such agency) for such prior period under such subsection. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, in such installments as the Surgeon General may determine.

"GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION

"SEC. 6. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, intermunicipal, or interstate agency for the construction of necessary treatment works to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste into any waters and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith.

"(b) Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations: (1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Surgeon General and unless such project is included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to this act; (2) no grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 33⅓ percent of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Surgeon General or in an amount exceeding $300,000, whichever is the smaller: *Provided*, That the grantee agrees to pay the remaining cost; (3) no grant shall be made for projects under this section until the applicant has made provision satisfactory to the Surgeon General for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the works after completion of the construction thereof; and (4) no grants shall be made for projects under this section until the applicant has made reasonable assurance satisfactory to the Surgeon General that the rates of pay for laborers and mechanics engaged in construction of the project will not be less than the prevailing local wage rates for similar work as determined in accordance with Public Law 403, of the 74th Congress, approved August 30, 1935, as amended.

"(c) In determining the desirability of projects for treatment works and of approving Federal financial aid in connection therewith, consideration shall be given by the Surgeon General to the public benefits to be derived by the construction and the propriety of Federal aid in such construction, the relation of the ultimate cost of constructing and maintaining the works to the public interest and to the public necessity for the works, and the adequacy of the provisions made or proposed by the applicant for such Federal financial aid for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the works after completion of the construction thereof. The Surgeon General shall make Federal funds available for such treatment works, in a manner which will tend to result in a wide distribution of such funds among the several areas of the United States for which comprehensive programs have been prepared or developed pursuant to this act to the extent practicable and not inconsistent with the criteria and limitations contained in this section.

"(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year the sum of $50,000,000 for the purpose of making grants under this section: *Provided*, That the aggregate of sums so appropriated shall not exceed $500,000,000. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That at least 50 percent of the funds so appropriated for each fiscal year shall be used for grants for the construction of treatment works servicing municipalities of 125,000 population or under.

"(e) The Surgeon General shall make payments under this act through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury. Funds so paid shall be used exclusively to meet the cost of constructing the project for which the amount was paid. As used in this subsection the term 'constructing' includes preliminary planning to determine the economic and engineering feasibility of treatment works, the engineering, architectural, legal, fiscal, and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures and other action necessary to the construction of treatment works; and the erection, building, acquisition, alteration, remodeling, improvement, or extension of treatment works; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of treatment works: *Provided*, That in assuring that a fair distribution of grant funds hereunder is made available to the largest possible number of States, municipalities, intermunicipal or interstate agencies that have need for treatment works and in order that the initial feasibility of a project can be determined, the Surgeon General shall specify annually a portion amounting to at least 10 percent of the sums appropriated pursuant to this section to be used for advance planning grants to the maximum extent possible, and with regard to such portion give priority to grants for advance planning in order to determine the preliminary economic and engineering feasibility of such projects.

"WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD

"SEC. 7. (a) (1) There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, composed of the Surgeon General or a sanitary engineer officer designated by him, who shall be chairman, and nine members appointed by the President none of whom shall be Federal officers or employees. The appointed members, having due regard for the purposes of this act, shall be selected from among representatives of various State, interstate and local governmental agencies, of public or private interests contributing to, affected by, or concerned with water pollution, and of other public and private agencies, organizations, or groups demonstrating an active interest in the field of water pollution prevention and control, as well as other individuals who are expert in this field.

"(2) (A) Each member appointed by the President shall hold office for a term of 3 years, except that (i) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (ii) the terms of office of the members first taking office after June 30, 1956, shall expire as follows: 3 at the end of 1 year after such date, 3 at the end of 2 years after such date, and 3 at the end of 3 years after such date, as designated by the President at the time of appointment. Members appointed by the President shall not be eligible for reappointment within 1 year after the end of his preceding term, but terms commencing prior to the enactment of the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1956 shall not be deemed 'preceding terms' for purposes of this sentence.

"(B) The members of the Board who are not officers or employees of the United States, while attending conferences or meetings of the Board or while otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not exceeding $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(b) The Board shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Surgeon General on matters of policy relating to the activities and functions of the Surgeon General under this act.

"(c) Such clerical and technical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the duties of the Board shall be provided from the personnel of the Public Health Service.

"ENFORCEMENT MEASURES AGAINST POLLUTION OF INTERSTATE WATERS

"SEC. 8. (a) The pollution of interstate waters in or adjacent to any State or States (whether the matter causing or contributing to such pollution is discharged directly into such waters or reaches such waters after discharge into a tributary of such waters), which endangers the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates, shall be subject to abatement as herein provided.

"(b) Consistent with the policy declaration of this act, State and interstate action to abate pollution of interstate waters shall be encouraged and shall not, except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to court order under subsection (h), be displaced by Federal enforcement action.

"(c) (1) Whenever the Surgeon General, at the request of the water pollution control agency or the chief executive of any State

or States or on the basis of reports, surveys, or studies, has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring, he shall give formal notification thereof to the State water pollution control agency and interstate agency, if any, of the State or States where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originates and shall call promptly a conference of the State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, if any, of the State or States where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originates and of the State or States claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution.

"(2) The agencies called to attend such conference may bring such persons as they desire to the conference. Not less than 3 weeks' prior notice of the conference date shall be given to such agencies.

"(3) Following this conference, the Surgeon General shall prepare and forward to all the water pollution control agencies attending the conference a summary of conference discussions including (A) occurrence of pollution of interstate waters subject to abatement under this act; (B) adequacy of measures taken toward abatement of the pollution; and (C) nature of delays, if any, being encountered in abating the pollution.

"(d) If the Surgeon General believes, upon the conclusion of the conference or thereafter, that effective progress toward abatement of such pollution is not being made and that the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates is being endangered, he shall recommend to the appropriate State water pollution control agency that it take necessary remedial action. The Surgeon General is to allow at least 6 months for the taking of such action.

"(e) If such remedial action is not taken or action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of such pollution is not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originated, before a Board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State in which any discharge causing or contributing to such pollution originates and each State claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution shall be given an opportunity to select one member of the Board and at least one member shall be a representative of the Department of Commerce, and not less than a majority of the Board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At least 3 weeks' prior notice of said hearing shall be given to the State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, if any, called to attend the aforesaid hearing and the alleged polluter or polluters. On the basis of the evidence presented at such hearing, the board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and whether effective progress toward abatement thereof is being made. If the board finds such pollution is occurring and effective progress toward abatement is not being made it shall make recommendations to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and equitable to secure abatement of such pollution. The Secretary shall send such findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution, together with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than 6 months) to secure abatement of such pollution, and shall also send such findings and recommendations and of such notice to the State water pollution control agency, and to the interstate agency, if any, of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate.

"(f) If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notice following the public hearing is not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the written consent of the State water pollution control agency (or any officer or employee authorized to give such consent) of the State or States where the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is discharged or at the written request of the State water pollution control agency (or any officer or employee authorized to make such request) of any other State or States where the health or welfare of persons is endangered by such pollution, may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

"(g) The court shall receive in evidence in any such suit a transcript of the proceedings before the Board and a copy of the Board's recommendations and shall receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court, giving due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved, shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

"(h) As used in this section, the term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, State, municipality, and political subdivision of the State.

"COOPERATION TO CONTROL POLLUTION FROM FEDERAL INSTALLATIONS

"SEC. 9. It is hereby declared to be the intent of the Congress that any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, insofar as practicable and consistent with the interests of the United States and within any available appropriations, cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with any State or interstate agency or municipality having jurisdiction over waters into which any matter is discharged from such property, in preventing or controlling the pollution of such waters.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 10. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out his functions under this act. All regulations of the Surgeon General under this act shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Surgeon General may delegate to any officer or employee of the Public Health Service such of his powers and duties under this act, except the making of regulations, as he may deem necessary or expedient.

"(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the consent of the head of any other agency of the United States, may utilize such officers and employees of such agency as may be found necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act.

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions under this act.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 11. When used in this act—

"(a) The term 'State water pollution control agency' means the State health authority, except that, in the case of any State in which there is a single State agency, other than the State health authority, charged with responsibility for enforcing State laws relating to the abatement of water pollution, it means such other State agency.

"(b) The term 'interstate agency' means an agency of two or more States established by or pursuant to an agreement or compact approved by the Congress, or any other agency of two or more States, having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the control of pollution of waters.

"(c) The term 'treatment works' means the various devices used in the treatment of sewage or industrial wastes of a liquid nature, including the necessary intercepting sewers, outfall sewers, pumping, power, and other equipment, and their appurtenances, and includes any extensions, improvements, remodeling, additions, and alternations thereof.

"(d) The term 'State' means a State, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

"(e) The term 'interstate waters' means all rivers, lakes, and other waters that flow across, or form a part of, boundaries between two or more States.

"(f) The term 'municipality' means a city, town, county, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law and having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes, or other wastes.

"OTHER AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED

"SEC. 12. This act shall not be construed as (1) superseding or limiting the functions, under any other law of the Surgeon General or of the Public Health Service, or of any other officer or agency of the United States, relating to water pollution, or (2) affecting or impairing the provisions of the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, or sections 13 through 17 of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors and for other purposes,' approved March 3, 1899, as amended, or (3) affecting or impairing the provisions of any treaty of the United States.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 13. If any provision of this act, or the application of any provision of this act to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, and the remainder of this act, shall not be affected thereby.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the 'Federal Water Pollution Control Act.'"

SEC. 2. The title of such act is amended to read "An act to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes."

SEC. 3. Terms of office as members of the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board (established pursuant to section 6 (b) of the Water Pollution Control Act, as in effect prior to the enactment of this act) subsisting on the date of enactment of this act shall expire at the close of business on such date.

SEC. 4. In the case of any discharge or discharges causing or contributing to water pollution with respect to which the actions by the Surgeon General prescribed under paragraph (2) of section 2 (d) of the Water Pollution Control Act, as in effect prior to the enactment of this act, have already been completed prior to such enactment, the provisions of such section shall continue to be applicable; except that nothing in this section shall prevent action with respect to any such pollution under and in accordance with provisions of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, by this act.

SEC. 5. This act may be cited as the "Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1956."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. KERR, Mr. GORE, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, S. 890, just sent to conference, be printed as passed by the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CERTAIN RAILROAD REORGANIZATIONS AND INSOLVENCY PROCEEDINGS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7247) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of gain in certain railroad organizations. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7247) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of gain in certain railroad organizations, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 3.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 4. The table of sections for part IV of subchapter C of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'Sec. 374. Gain or loss not recognized in certain railroad reorganizations.'

"SEC. 5. Section 108 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to income of a railroad corporation from discharge of indebtedness) is hereby amended by striking out 'December 31, 1955' and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1957'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An act relating to recognition of gain or loss in certain railroad reorganizations and to amend section 108 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."

And the Senate agree to the same.

HARRY F. BYRD,
ROBERT S. KERR,
J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr.,
E. D. MILLIKIN,
EDWARD W. MARTIN,
By HARRY F. BYRD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JERE COOPER,
W. D. MILLS,
NOBLE J. GREGORY,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the conference report has been unanimously agreed upon. I have consulted with the majority leader and the minority leader, and there is no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

CITATION OF JOSEPH BRUNO FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Do I correctly understand that Calendar No. 2120, Senate Resolution 274, citing Joseph Bruno for contempt of the Senate, is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I yield to the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], so that he may explain the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is recognized.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, Calendar No. 2120, Senate Resolution 274, which has been reported from the Judiciary Committee, cites Joseph Bruno for contempt of the Senate, in connection with the investigation by the Committee on the Judiciary of the narcotics traffic. I had the privilege of serving as chairman of the subcommittee which conducted the investigation. Appearing on the calendar, Mr. President, are similar resolutions based on citations for contempt, growing out of the investigation into the illicit narcotics traffic by the Committee on the Judiciary, against the following individuals:

Joseph Bruno, who appeared in Chicago, November 22, 1955;

William Frazier Evans, who appeared in Detroit, November 23, 1955;

Robert T. Hosoi, who failed to respond to the subcommittee's subpena in Los Angeles, November 16, 1955;

Salvatore Santoro, who appeared in New York, September 21, 1955;

Jesse Alexander, who appeared in Chicago, November 22, 1955; and

Joseph Bendinelli, who appeared in New York, September 21, 1955.

These citations for contempt are submitted to the Senate on the basis of the flagrant contempt which these individuals showed for the narcotics investigation, for the Committee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code charged with this investigation, and for the United States Senate which authorized and directed the investigation. Our subcommittee considers it imperative that these individuals be cited for contempt.

Let me make this clear, Mr. President: These are not the pitiful victims of drug addiction, or small-time, petty pushers of dope. Our preliminary investigation and reports from the Bureau of Narcotics indicate that these persons had much information concerning top traffickers in narcotics, if not, in fact, personal knowledge of the traffic.

Senate Resolution 274, the pending resolution, would cite for contempt Joseph Bruno, 3540 North Newcastle Avenue, Chicago, Ill., who appeared in Chicago, November 22, 1955, with his attorney, Jack Arnold Welfeld. Bruno pleaded the fifth amendment 78 times in response to questions by the chairman of the subcommittee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the complete transcript of his testimony.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH BRUNO, CHICAGO, ILL., ACCOMPANIED BY JACK ARNOLD WELFELD, ATTORNEY

Senator DANIEL. Come forward, please, Mr. Bruno.

Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give to this subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BRUNO. I do.

Senator DANIEL. You may be seated. Is this your attorney?

Mr. WELFELD. Yes; I am counsel.

Senator DANIEL. Will you identify yourself, please?

Mr. WELFELD. My name is Jack Arnold Welfeld, W-e-l-f-e-l-d. I am an attorney at 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

Senator DANIEL. Will you state your name, please?

Mr. BRUNO. Joseph Bruno.

Senator DANIEL. Do you spell that B-r-u-n-o?

Mr. BRUNO. That's right.

Senator DANIEL. Are you also known by some other name?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer. It might incriminate me or degrade me.

Senator DANIEL. Let's leave off the "degrade me," because, Mr. Counsel, I am sure that you understand that the committee does not recognize that as a reason not to answer questions.

Mr. WELFELD. May I confer with my client?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Senator DANIEL. You understand that if you want to claim the fifth amendment on any of these questions, just claim it in the language that your attorney has advised you to use, except to claim it because you feel that a truthful answer might tend to incriminate you and not because it might degrade you. Do you understand what I mean?

Mr. BRUNO. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. And do you understand that in claiming the fifth amendment the committee naturally recognizes a man's right to claim it on any question where he feels that a truthful answer to a question might tend to incriminate you. I am sure that you do not intend to use it on anything

but that, but I just wanted to make that warning to you.

Will you state your business?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim the privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer because it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Well, will you state any legitimate business in which you are engaged.

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer because it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you have any kind of business which is not a violation of the law and on which you would not want to claim your privilege? Do you have any business for which you could not be prosecuted? Isn't there some work that you are in which you would tell the committee about?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer because it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Are you engaged in selling heroin in Chicago?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution because it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you been engaged in selling heroin during recent years here in Chicago?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer because it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you sold marihuana in Chicago?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer because it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Are you now selling marihuana or heroin in Chicago?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer because it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Where do you live in Chicago, or do you live in Chicago?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Well, now, on these other times in which you claimed the privilege I have recognized your right to claim it. I do not think that I am going to recognize your right to claim the fifth amendment on the matter of where you reside. Therefore, I am going to order you to tell the committee where you live.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Senator DANIEL. All right, gentlemen. Mr. Bruno, what is your answer as to where you live?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer because it might tend to incriminate me or degrade me under the Constitution.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Counsel, you understand that the chairman has ordered the witness to answer the question. If the chairman is right in saying that he is wrong in claiming the fifth amendment to such a question, that that is not the type of question on which he would be entitled to claim the fifth amendment, if the chairman is right in ordering him to answer and he refused to do so, it is understood, I am sure, by you that he would be subject to contempt citation by the United States Senate?

Mr. WELFELD. I understand that, Senator, and I have conferred with my client and advised him of his rights; what his duties and obligations are and he wishes to make the answer that he has made.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Bruno, you understand, having talked with your counsel and from my statement, that if the Chair is right in saying that he feels that you are required to answer this question that you would be subject to contempt citation by the Senate. Let me say this to you: You understand that on any question where a truthful answer could not possibly tend to incriminate you, it seems to me, the Chair could properly order you to, at least that is the policy that is followed in our congressional committees to answer the question.

Now, you may be right in your decision to still claim the immunity, or I may be right to claim that you have no right to claim it. It is a chance you are taking. All that I want you to understand is that if I am right and you are wrong you would be subject to contempt proceedings by the United States Senate.

Do you understand that? And please speak right out so that the reporter can hear what you are saying. He cannot get the nodding of your head. Do you understand that?

Mr. BRUNO. Can I talk to my counsel?

Mr. WELFELD. May we confer for about 30 seconds?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BRUNO. I'll answer.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Where do you live?

Mr. BRUNO. 4424 North Sheridan Road.

Senator DANIEL. I didn't understand you.

Mr. BRUNO. 4424 North Sheridan Road.

Senator DANIEL. How long have you lived there?

Mr. BRUNO. Three, four weeks.

Senator DANIEL. How long?

Mr. BRUNO. Maybe 3 weeks or so.

Senator DANIEL. Is that in Chicago?

Mr. BRUNO. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. Is it in any particular district or area? Is it known by any addition or name?

Mr. BRUNO. (No answer.)

Senator DANIEL. Speak out. The reporter has to get an audible answer.

Mr. BRUNO. You mean what's the name of the building?

Senator DANIEL. The district or the area.

Mr. BRUNO. There's no particular name for the area.

Senator DANIEL. Is it, for instance, the Gold Coast area? What do they call it here in Chicago?

Mr. BRUNO. Well, I don't know.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever hear anybody call it the Gold Coast area?

Mr. BRUNO. Not that particular section.

Senator DANIEL. What is it called?

Mr. BRUNO. 4400 North.

Senator DANIEL. It is not known by any other name, then?

Mr. BRUNO. Not that I know of.

Senator DANIEL. How old are you?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer under the Constitution that I might tend to incriminate myself.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I order you to answer that question.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BRUNO. Forty-three years old.

Senator DANIEL. Will you give us an answer as to any type of business you have ever been in here in Chicago since 1951?

Mr. BRUNO. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Why?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer under the Constitution. I might tend to incriminate myself.

Senator DANIEL. I am asking you now, Will you tell us about any business that you have been in during that time?

Mr. BRUNO. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. And I am especially referring to any absolutely legal business on which a truthful answer could not possibly tend to incriminate you. Could you name any kind of work or business that you have been in?

Mr. BRUNO. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Why?

Mr. BRUNO. I refused to answer, under the Constitution. I might tend to incriminate myself.

Senator DANIEL. Did you act as a source of supply—let me say this to you: I am sure that you know that you were not called before this committee if our investigations did not indicate that you knew something about the narcotic traffic. It may not be true, but you would not have been called before the committee. And the investigation shows this is what is in our committee record: That the investigators have reported that they have reason to believe that you have supplied heroin to 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 people, major violators, here in Chicago, and that you have been their principal source of supply for heroin.

Do you wish to deny that?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my right under the Constitution. I refuse to answer because it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. All right, I am going to name these people. Did you supply, or have you ever supplied heroin to Rupert Kelly?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer under the Constitution that I might tend to incriminate myself.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know Rupert Kelly?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer under the Constitution. I might tend to incriminate myself.

Senator DANIEL. Archie Robinson?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know Charles Venton?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever sell heroin or furnish heroin to Charles Venton?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know Marvin Moses?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever serve as the supply wholesaler of heroin for Marvin Moses?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer because it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know Aucklin Holmes?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever furnished heroin to Aucklin Holmes?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know Dorothy Johnson?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Now, about Marvin Moses—I asked you about him—who was caught with 82 ounces of heroin, did you sell that heroin to him, to Marvin Moses?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I am going to ask you next about Delphin McGee, it is a woman, or Delphin Schenault. Do you know a woman by either of those names?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution.

Senator DANIEL. She has a case pending in which a seizure was made of 9 ounces of heroin, which is a pretty large amount of heroin. Did you sell that heroin or any other heroin to Delphin McGee?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I am going to ask you next about a man who is a fugitive, who jumped a bail bond. I beg your pardon, he has not been arrested, but he is being looked for after a seizure of 40 ounces of heroin. J. C. Sadler or Saddler. Do you know him?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know his whereabouts?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know Mose Hightower or Harry Schenault?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever sold heroin to Mose Hightower or Harry Schenault?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you own two drugstores here in Chicago, or do you have any interest in them?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Well, now, I am asking you about the Drexel Drugs at 4300 South Drexel, Chicago, Ill. I will ask you this question: Do you know where that drugstore is?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I am going to order you to answer that question of whether you know where the drugstore is.

Mr. BRUNO. I know where it's at.

Senator DANIEL. What?

Mr. BRUNO. I know where it's at.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever been in there?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer.

Senator DANIEL. I am going to order you to answer the question of whether you have been inside that drugstore.

Mr. BRUNO. I probably have been in there.

Senator DANIEL. I don't want any "probably." Have you ever been in there?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BRUNO. Yes; I've been in there.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Do you own any interest in that drugstore?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I just want to test you out, because we have the right to do this when a man continues to claim the fifth amendment, especially when you ask him "does he have any interest," which would, apparently, on the face of it, seem to be a legitimate business. I am going to ask you if you honestly feel in your mind that a truthful answer to that question as to whether you own any interest in Drexel Drugs, at 4300 South Drexel, would tend to incriminate you.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer that question. I was putting you to the test to see whether or not your claim to the fifth amendment would be respected by this committee. Do you remember the question? Do you know what and understand what it is? It is whether you honestly feel that a truthful answer to that question might tend to incriminate you. I order you to answer the question.

Mr. BRUNO. I have no interest in there.

Senator DANIEL. You have no interest in that drugstore?

Mr. BRUNO. No; I don't.

Senator DANIEL. Well, of course, that is not the question that I asked you to answer. I asked you simply whether or not you honestly felt that a truthful answer to the question of whether you had an interest would tend to incriminate you. Would you answer that one first?

Mr. BRUNO. No; it wouldn't incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. It would not incriminate you. Therefore you are not going to claim the fifth amendment on that any further, are you, and you are going to answer it for the committee?

Mr. BRUNO. Depending on what the question is.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Do you have an interest in the drugstore that I have asked you about?

Mr. BRUNO. No; I don't.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever own any interest in that drugstore?

Mr. BRUNO. No; I don't.

Senator DANIEL. Haven't you hung out in that drugstore, and don't you stay there a considerable part of your time?

Mr. BRUNO. I don't stay there now.

Senator DANIEL. Haven't you bought quinine through that drugstore to mix with heroin?

Mr. BRUNO. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever bought any quinine?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever had any management or control over that drugstore?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you bring your financial papers and a copy of your income taxes since 1951, as requested?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BRUNO. No, I didn't.

Senator DANIEL. Why not?

Mr. BRUNO. Because I have that privilege under the Constitution.

Senator DANIEL. What privilege?

Mr. BRUNO. I don't have to bring them.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to produce any documents because it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Because they might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. BRUNO. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. I am going to ask you about every one of them. You were asked to bring a copy of your 1954 income-tax return. Do you have that with you?

Mr. BRUNO. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Where is it?

Mr. BRUNO. I don't know, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Did you file a 1954 income-tax return?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BRUNO. I did file.

Senator DANIEL. Did you keep a copy?

Mr. BRUNO. I did, but I don't know where it's at.

Senator DANIEL. When is the last time you saw it?

Mr. BRUNO. (No response.)

Senator DANIEL. Speak up, please. Would you sit up and speak out a little louder?

Mr. BRUNO. When I filed it.

Senator DANIEL. Where did you file your copy of the income-tax return?

Mr. BRUNO. I laid it at home. I must have misplaced it.

Senator DANIEL. Did you look for it to bring it here?

Mr. BRUNO. I looked around.

Senator DANIEL. You didn't think that by producing a copy of that as ordered in this subpena that that would tend to incriminate you; did you?

Mr. BRUNO. I still refuse to answer under the Constitution. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I asked you a question about that to lay a predicate for your claiming the fifth amendment, if you want to. But you have not laid the predicate yet. I ask you whether or not you feel that by bringing a copy of your income-tax returns for 1954 as ordered by this committee that it might tend to incriminate you.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer. I claim the privilege of the Constitution. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer that question.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I am going to test you out again on it. You have refused to answer after I have ordered you to answer. Again, you understand what the chances are that you are taking, that you might be subject to citation by the Senate for contempt. Do you understand that?

Mr. BRUNO. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. All right, I am going to ask you this question: Do you honestly believe that a truthful answer to that question would tend to incriminate you?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you understand what I am trying to do? As I understand it, and it has been done many times, a congressional committee can test out a witness when he claims the fifth amendment, to be sure that he is in good faith. I am not going to have you sit there and claim the fifth amendment on questions where you do not honestly believe they might tend to incriminate you. That is why I am putting the test to you.

Again, I am asking you whether or not you honestly believe that a truthful answer to the questions I have just asked you, the last two questions, would tend to incriminate you.

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution.

Senator DANIEL. Do you refuse to answer that question?

Mr. BRUNO. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Do you refuse to tell me whether you honestly believe that truthful answers would tend to incriminate you?

Mr. BRUNO. I am telling you that's why I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Then you will not tell me whether you honestly believe and are in good faith in claiming the fifth amendment on these last three questions?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BRUNO. I honestly believe that that answer might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. And does that apply to all of the last three questions?

Mr. BRUNO. I don't recall the last one.

Senator DANIEL. They all relate to the same thing.

Mr. BRUNO. I do.

Senator DANIEL. You honestly believe that a truthful answer to the questions, the last 3 questions—4 questions, now before you answered this last 1—might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. BRUNO. They might.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know where your income-tax return for 1953 is?

Mr. BRUNO. No. It's with the one for 1954. They're all together.

Senator DANIEL. Where is the one for 1952?

Mr. BRUNO. They're all together.

Senator DANIEL. Where is the one for 1951?

Mr. BRUNO. They're all together.

Senator DANIEL. Where did you leave them?

Mr. BRUNO. I don't know. I left them in the house and they probably got misplaced.

Senator DANIEL. Have you looked for them?

Mr. BRUNO. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Did you intend to bring them here if you could have found them?

Mr. BRUNO. I'd have held them.

Senator DANIEL. Held them where?

Mr. BRUNO. I might have brought them but I wouldn't have produced them.

Senator DANIEL. You would not have produced them to the committee.

Mr. BRUNO. No.

Senator DANIEL. Why?

Mr. BRUNO. I believe that it might tend to incriminate me if I showed them.

Senator DANIEL. What about your bank accounts, financial statements, and account books? Do you have any?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BRUNO. I have no financial statements; I have no bankbooks.

Senator DANIEL. Do you have a bank account in any bank?

Mr. BRUNO. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever had one in the last 4 years?

Mr. BRUNO. Myself?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. BRUNO. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Well, have you ever had any money since 1951?

Mr. BRUNO. Have I ever had any money?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. BRUNO. I've had a little bit.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever kept any in a bank either in your name or in anyone else's name?

Mr. BRUNO. Not my name; my wife's name.

Senator DANIEL. What is your wife's name?

Mr. BRUNO. Mary.

Senator DANIEL. That is the name of your wife. Did you put that money in the name of Mary Bruno?

Mr. BRUNO. I don't recall.

Senator DANIEL. All right. You said that you kept money in your wife's name.

Mr. BRUNO. I didn't keep it. That's her money.

Senator DANIEL. Is it her money or yours?

Mr. BRUNO. Not mine.

Senator DANIEL. Is any of it yours?

Mr. BRUNO. No.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever had any money of your own since 1951?

Mr. BRUNO. I keep that myself.

Senator DANIEL. Where do you keep it?

Mr. BRUNO. My pocket.

Senator DANIEL. Do you keep all of the money you make in your pocket?

Mr. BRUNO. I don't make that much.

Senator DANIEL. What? You don't make that much? What is the value of the home in which you live?

Mr. BRUNO. I don't know.

Senator DANIEL. You made enough money to buy a home; didn't you?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer because it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. You have said that you don't make much. You have waived any right under that.

You say you don't make much money. What is your annual income since 1951?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer that. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. You have already waived your right to that. You said that you didn't make much money. I order you to tell me what your annual has been since 1951.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Counsel, wait until your client counsels with you. You may advise him any time that he seeks advice, but only then.

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer that. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer that question. You understand, do you not, I am ordering you to answer it because the chairman feels that you have waived any right to claim the fifth amendment by saying to the committee that you did not make much money during that time.

Mr. BRUNO. Well, I didn't mean it that way. But I refuse to answer because it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Let's clear it up. How do you mean it?

Mr. BRUNO. I thought you were talking about a big amount of money.

Senator DANIEL. I am just talking about whatever you made. Why do you think I was talking about a big amount of money when I asked you what you made?

Mr. BRUNO. The way you put it.

Senator DANIEL. Well, whatever the amount was—did you keep it all in your pocket?

Mr. BRUNO. No, sir. I refuse to answer.

Senator DANIEL. I am ordering you to answer this question. You have waived any right to claim the fifth amendment on it, in my opinion. I could be wrong, but if I am right about it you may want to answer.

I want to know whether or not you made any money during the period since 1951.

Mr. BRUNO. If I have ever made any money?

Senator DANIEL. Since 1951.

Mr. BRUNO. I filed income tax; I must have made money; yes.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Did you keep all of the money that you made in your pocket?

Mr. BRUNO. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. No; you did not. You put it in a bank in your wife's name, didn't you?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer the question.

Senator DANIEL. I am going to order you to answer it because you volunteered that information to the committee that you put it in your wife Mary's name. I want to know, again, if you put all of the money that you made in your wife's name or just a part of it.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer because it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I think that you have waived your right, and that is why I have ordered you to answer it. I want you to know how the chairman feels about it. The same way on any of the other questions I ask you about the money you put in your wife's bank account.

Did you keep money in her bank account in 1954?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer.

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you keep any money in bank accounts in her name in 1953?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you keep any money in your wife's name in a bank account in 1952?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer the question.

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you keep any money in anybody else's name in a bank in Chicago or any place else in 1954?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer under the Constitution. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you honestly believe that a truthful answer to that question might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer under the Constitution. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer that question, asked for the purpose of testing the sincerity and good faith of your claim of the fifth amendment.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BRUNO. I honestly believe that it would.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Did you keep any money in a bank account in anyone else's name in 1953?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer because the question might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever been in Drexel Drug Store at 239 East 51st Street, Chicago, Ill.?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BRUNO. Have I ever been there?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. BRUNO. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. Do you own any interest in the Drexel Drugs?

Mr. BRUNO. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever owned any interest in that drugstore?

Mr. BRUNO. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever had any control or anything to do with the management of that drugstore?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer. Might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever been back to the prescription part of that drugstore, where they keep the medicines in the bottles?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever seen hundreds of bottles of quinine in that drugstore on the shelves of that drugstore?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever seen any quinine in the drawers of that drugstore?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. You do know that quinine is used to mix with heroin before it is sold on the retail trade; do you not?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever mixed any quinine with heroin?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer, it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you honestly believe that a truthful answer to that question might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer under the Constitution. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer the question for the purpose of again testing the sincerity and good faith in the claim of the fifth amendment.

Do you honestly believe that a truthful answer to that question, whether you have ever mixed quinine with heroin, would tend to incriminate you?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BRUNO. I believe it would tend to incriminate me. I honestly believe it would tend to.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know Angelo Giardini, of New York, known also as Tony?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim the privilege under the Constitution and I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever purchase 2 kilograms of heroin from Angelo "Tony" Giardini, of New York City?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim the privilege under the Constitution. I refuse to answer. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know Eddie Coco, also known as "Killer"?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim my privilege under the Constitution. The answer might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did the three of you, Eddie Coco or "Killer," Angelo Giardini, also known as Tony and you, meet in the Copa Club in Chicago any time during the last few months? Or few years?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer under the Constitution. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know that Eddie Coco has been one of the main sources of supply for heroin in New York?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer under the Constitution. That answer might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever see a handwritten note reading as follows:

"Mike or Carl, have ready today for Rocky 20 ounces of quinine sulfate." Dated August 13, 1954, 239 East 51st Street.

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer. That question might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Your answer, you mean, might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer under the Constitution.

Senator DANIEL. You do know that Mike and Carl both work at that drugstore at 239 East 51st Street; don't you?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BRUNO. I believe there's a man Mike that might have worked there, and a Carl that did work there.

Senator DANIEL. Mike who?

Mr. BRUNO. Well, you just gave me the name Mike.

Senator DANIEL. Give me his last name.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BRUNO. I believe his name is Conda.

Senator DANIEL. How do you spell it?

Mr. BRUNO. C-o-n-d-a, or C-o-n-d-i-k, something like that.

Senator DANIEL. C-o-n-d-a?

Mr. BRUNO. I think so. I'm not positive.

Senator DANIEL. All right. You knew Carl, too; didn't you?

Mr. BRUNO. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. What was his last name?

Mr. BRUNO. Friedken?

Senator DANIEL. F-r-i-e-d-k-i-n?

Mr. BRUNO. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. You gave them their jobs; didn't you?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer under the Constitution. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know another Mike who works there?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer under the Constitution. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know a Mike Corshak?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer. It might, under the Constitution, tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you employ the people who work at Drexel Drugs on South Drexel?

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer. It might tend to——

Senator DANIEL. You said on that drugstore that you owned no interest in it, exercised no supervision and management. That is the first Drexel drugstore that I asked you about. Now I am asking you if you employ the people who work there, and you are refusing to answer on the ground that it might tend to incriminate you. I order you to answer that question.

Mr. BRUNO. I don't recall. I may be incriminating myself if I don't refuse to answer. I may give an answer, and it is a bad answer. I refuse to answer under the Constitution. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I'm not asking you for a bad answer. I am just asking you if you employed any person who worked at Drexel Drugstore, 4300 South Drexel.

Mr. BRUNO. I refuse to answer under the Constitution. It might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you honestly believe that a truthful answer to that question might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. BRUNO. I honestly do, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Now, with what I have told you about the reason you were called here and what our investigation would indicate, that you were supplying the traffic here in Chicago with heroin, with what has been said—and I now say that I do not know whether it is true or not; I am just telling you what our preliminary investigation shows and why we asked you here—with all that in mind, would you like to make any statement——

Mr. BRUNO. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Concerning that matter or any denial?

Mr. BRUNO. No, sir; I refuse to make any statement.

Senator DANIEL. You do not wish to make any statement. Well, do you refuse to deny or say anything about it on the ground that it might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. BRUNO. I claim the fifth amendment under the Constitution. I refuse to answer.

Senator DANIEL. All right. You may stand aside.

(There was a brief interruption while the next witness was called.)

Mr. DANIEL. This witness should be cited for contempt on two major grounds:

First. Bruno refused to answer questions that he was ordered to answer by the chairman, after he, the witness, had waived his right not to answer by his answers to previous questions; and

Second. This witness also failed and refused to bring to the subcommittee hearing his bank statements, other papers, and copies of his income tax returns as ordered by the committee subpena.

According to reports which the subcommittee has received from the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, and which are a part of our records, Bruno is—

One of the narcotic financiers living on Chicago's west side, dealing in heroin in kilogram lots, and has been the source of supply for large quantities of this drug distributed in Chicago, Cleveland, St. Louis, and New Orleans. One of the recent seizures attributed to this trafficker total 150 ounces of heroin. Large quantities of quinine, an adulterant for heroin, have also been traced to this trafficker.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator is making a very important speech. I wonder if it might not be well to suggest the absence of a quorum, in order to enable more Senators to listen to him?

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator, but my understanding with the majority leader was that I would proceed with these six citations. The reports have been printed, and I believe most Senators have had an opportunity to acquaint themselves with them. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Bruno was asked by the chairman of the committee:

Did you bring your financial papers and a copy of your income taxes since 1951, as requested?

After conferring with counsel he said:

No; I didn't.

Senator DANIEL. Why not?

Mr. BRUNO. Because I have that privilege under the Constitution.

Senator DANIEL. What privilege?

Mr. BRUNO. I don't have to bring them.

As I understand from the Federal district attorneys who sat with us, witnesses are supposed to bring the papers asked for, even though they may have constitutional grounds on which they could claim the right not to present the papers requested or to make them a part of the record. However, this witness completely refused even to bring anything asked for in the subpena issued by our committee.

Mr. President, I think the Senate should vote the contempt citation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 274) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Joseph Bruno to answer questions before the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary, said refusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois, to the end that the said Joseph Bruno may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF WILLIAM FRAZIER EVANS FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2121, Senate Resolution 275.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 275) to cite William Frazier Evans for contempt of the United States Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 275 would cite for contempt William Frazier Evans, Chicago, Ill., who appeared before the subcommittee in Detroit, Mich., November 23, 1955, with his attorney, Samuel Posner. Evans repeatedly invoked the fifth amendment and attempted to disrupt the hearings by his unruly conduct.

With respect to some of the questions, it was apparent to the chairman that he had waived the right to invoke the fifth amendment. Certainly by reason of his conduct, he was in contempt of the committee and of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have the full transcript of this witness' testimony printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM F. "BUTCH" EVANS

Senator DANIEL. The committee will come to order.

William Evans? Will you hold up your right hand?

Do you solemnly swear the evidence, the testimony you are about to give to this subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. Now, are you counsel for this man?

Mr. POSNER. I am counsel.

Senator DANIEL. And will you identify yourself?

Mr. POSNER. My name is Samuel Posner, Senator.

Senator DANIEL. And you are a member of the Detroit bar?

Mr. POSNER. I am.

Senator DANIEL. All right; you may be seated.

Senator DANIEL. Your counsel may sit with you. I am sure counsel is familiar with the rules; he will not volunteer any advice to you. If you need to consult with him any time, you may do so.

Will you state your name?

Mr. EVANS. Sir?

Senator DANIEL. What is your name?

Mr. EVANS. William F. Evans.

Senator DANIEL. William F. Evans?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. Where do you live?

Mr. EVANS. Chicago, Ill.

Senator DANIEL. How long have you lived in Chicago?

Mr. EVANS. About 20 years.

Senator DANIEL. Are you selling heroin in Chicago?

Mr. EVANS. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever sold any heroin in Chicago?

Mr. EVANS. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever sold any heroin anywhere?

Mr. EVANS. Anywhere?

Senator DANIEL. Anywhere.

Maybe that's too broad. Have you ever sold any heroin here in Detroit?

Mr. EVANS. Here in Detroit?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. I have a record for it. I was convicted for selling it.

Senator DANIEL. Well, have you ever sold any this year in Detroit?

Mr. EVANS. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever sold any heroin this year in Chicago?

Mr. EVANS. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever sold any heroin this year in Cleveland?

Mr. EVANS. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. I don't know if I have asked you this, have you sold any heroin here in Detroit this year?

Mr. EVANS. I beg pardon, sir?

Senator DANIEL. Have you sold any heroin here in Detroit this year?

Mr. EVANS. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever delivered heroin to anyone to deliver to Detroit, this year?

Mr. EVANS. I didn't hear you, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever given any heroin to anyone to deliver over to Detroit this year?

Mr. EVANS. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever seen any heroin this year?

Mr. EVANS. Have I ever seen any?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. Well, I don't know.

Senator DANIEL. Well, have you ever held any heroin in your hand?

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever given any heroin to anyone this year?

Mr. EVANS. I didn't hear you.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever given any heroin to anyone this year?

Mr. EVANS. Let me see, now. I think I would like to invoke the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. Well, do you honestly believe that a truthful answer to that question might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. EVANS. I know it won't, but the lying will.

Senator DANIEL. You know it won't incriminate you?

Mr. EVANS. That won't, no; I can truthfully answer that question, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you don't think a truthful answer might in any way tend to incriminate you?

Mr. EVANS. It might.

Senator DANIEL. You said you knew it wouldn't. Now, which of these answers do you want to stand?

I am going to have to decide whether to order you to answer the question or not. I just want to know which of these answers you want to stand.

Mr. EVANS. I would like the fifth amendment to stand.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you would like the fifth amendment, but you are not going to be able to refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment, unless you honestly feel, in good faith, that a truthful answer to that question might tend in some way to incriminate you.

Mr. EVANS. Well, it might.

Senator DANIEL. You think it might?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know if it would or not.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I say, you honestly feel like it might?

Or, a minute ago, you said you knew it wouldn't incriminate you, a truthful answer, didn't you?

Mr. EVANS. Yes. Do you want me to answer the question?

Senator DANIEL. I want you to answer it——

Mr. EVANS. I ain't never given anybody no heroin at no time.

Senator DANIEL. At no time?

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever use heroin?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. How long did you use heroin?

Mr. EVANS. A week or two.

Senator DANIEL. When?

Mr. EVANS. 1947, 1948.

Senator DANIEL. Have you used any heroin this year?

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever had in your possession any heroin this year?

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. Will you move up a little closer to the table, so we can hear you a little better, and get those microphones a little closer?

Now, William Evans, I want to tell you that you are called before this committee because this committee, through preliminary investigation, has been led to believe that you are the largest seller of heroin coming into Detroit from Chicago, that you are also sending heroin not only to Detroit, but to Cleveland and to other midwestern cities.

Do you wish to deny that?

Mr. EVANS. I beg your pardon, I didn't hear that.

Senator DANIEL. I said you had been called before this committee because preliminary investigation made this committee believe that you were the largest seller of heroin in Chicago, designated for Detroit and for Cleveland and other midwestern cities, and I want to know whether or not you wish to deny that or comment on that.

Mr. EVANS. Well, what do you want me to deny? That I am a big seller or something? Or that you heard that?

Senator DANIEL. No, no, deny whether or not you are a big seller of heroin.

Mr. EVANS. I don't understand that kind of question. I don't know what you heard or nothing.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I told you what the preliminary investigation shows. Now, I just want your comment on it, whether or not—are you dealing in heroin at all?

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever dealt in heroin?

Mr. EVANS. 1949 I went to jail for it, in 1949.

Senator DANIEL. Since 1949?

Mr. EVANS. No. I think I had better use the fifth amendment on some of these.

Senator DANIEL. You think you had better use the fifth amendment on some of these questions? Well, you have already waived the fifth amendment on that. You said you hadn't sold any heroin, at no time.

Mr. EVANS. I didn't say that. I said I went to jail for selling heroin.

Senator DANIEL. I mean, since you served a term.

Mr. EVANS. When do you mean?

Senator DANIEL. How many times did you go to jail for selling heroin?

Mr. EVANS. The time I went to jail, I didn't sell the heroin. I was in the cross and didn't know no better, so I went to jail to take the least I could get.

Senator DANIEL. How much?

Mr. EVANS. I got a year.

Senator DANIEL. What year was that?

Mr. EVANS. 1949.

Senator DANIEL. Then were you ever convicted for selling heroin or for possessing it?

Mr. EVANS. Convicted again since 1949?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. You were sent one year in 1949 for the narcotics law, possession and sale of heroin; right?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know what. I just pleaded guilty to something. I don't know what I was pleading guilty to.

Senator DANIEL. Well now, you told us you sold some heroin once; didn't you?

Mr. EVANS. I said I went to jail for selling heroin.

Senator DANIEL. Well, did you ever sell any heroin in 1949?

Mr. EVANS. I used to pick up for a cat, and that constituted a sale.

Senator DANIEL. You picked up for a who?

Mr. EVANS. Some cat; I don't know.

Senator DANIEL. Well, what do you mean by a cat?

Mr. EVANS. Some guy. I don't know what his name was.

Senator DANIEL. Well, what does the term "cat" mean?

Mr. EVANS. Well, that means some guy using heroin, I guess. I don't know what you mean, that's what he called himself.

Senator DANIEL. Then later, after 1949, when you got out of prison, were you ever convicted again for possession or sale of heroin?

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. All right. When did you get out of prison?

Mr. EVANS. 1950.

Senator DANIEL. Since 1950, have you ever sold any heroin?

Mr. EVANS. Since 1950?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. That, I got to waive—I can't use the fifth amendment now? You are going to force me to answer questions like that?

Senator DANIEL. No, I am not. You can use the fifth amendment on some questions, wherever you honestly feel that a truthful answer might tend to incriminate you.

Mr. EVANS. Well, I think that anything I say will really get me in trouble one way or another.

Senator DANIEL. You think it will?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. If you make truthful answer?

Mr. EVANS. If I say anything at all it will get me in trouble some way.

Senator DANIEL. Why do you think so?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know; things just happen to people, that's all.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you have already told me to begin with, voluntarily——

Mr. EVANS. Voluntarily?

Senator DANIEL. Well, you didn't volunteer it, but in answer to a question you didn't claim the fifth amendment, that you hadn't sold any heroin to anyone.

Mr. EVANS. You asked me if I sold any heroin to anybody this year, and I said I hadn't.

Senator DANIEL. I also asked you before this year. I wanted to make it plain. That's why I am going back over it.

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. That we are not talking about this 1949 offense or charge, but since

you got out, in 1950, have you sold heroin to anybody?

Mr. EVANS. You are going to force me to answer that, right?

Senator DANIEL. I am asking you the question.

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to invoke the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I think you have already waived the fifth amendment on that question, so we will order you to answer.

Mr. EVANS. Then I have sold no heroin to nobody since 1950.

Senator DANIEL. And have you delivered heroin to anybody since 1950?

Mr. EVANS. What do you mean by that?

Senator DANIEL. I mean, have you ever delivered any heroin? You have seen it, haven't you? You know what it is?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know whether I have seen it or not.

Senator DANIEL. I say, you know what it is; don't you?

Mr. EVANS. What do you mean, I know what it is? I wouldn't know it if you put it up here besides some other powder, white powder or red powder or green powder, or whatever color; if that is what you mean?

Senator DANIEL. That's what I mean.

Mr. EVANS. No, I don't know it by looking at it.

Senator DANIEL. You have used some of it?

Mr. EVANS. But it is so long ago.

Senator DANIEL. You couldn't tell the difference between heroin and some milk sugar?

Mr. EVANS. By looking at it?

Senator DANIEL. No; not by looking at it, but tasting it?

Mr. EVANS. Not necessarily.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I didn't say necessarily. I just wanted to know, do you know anything about the heroin business?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know that much about it, that I can tell one from the other.

Senator DANIEL. You can't tell the difference. Well did you ever deliver any heroin, anything that was known to you to be heroin, to any person, since 1950?

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever give any person any heroin to sell for you, or to deliver for you?

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever ask anybody to pick up any heroin, or to deliver any heroin for you, since 1950?

Mr. EVANS. Pick up?

Senator DANIEL. Pick up from somebody, or deliver?

Mr. EVANS. Or deliver?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. I have discussed things like that with people, and I don't know what all the conversation meant, but whether picking up something or not, I ain't picked up nothing for nobody.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you have never had anybody else pick up heroin for you?

Mr. EVANS. I had somebody pick up something for me?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. I don't know what you are talking about.

Senator DANIEL. I asked you, did you ever have anybody go pick up some heroin anywhere for you?

Mr. EVANS. What do you mean, I have somebody to go do something?

Senator DANIEL. What?

Mr. EVANS. What do you mean, I have somebody to go do something?

Senator DANIEL. You know what I am talking about. You have been operating through girls, haven't you? Haven't they been selling heroin, delivering it for you?

Mr. EVANS. What girls?

Senator DANIEL. Well, I will ask 1 by 1 in a minute. I asked just the general question.

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. What?

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. You never have used any girls to pick up heroin or deliver it for you?

Mr. EVANS. I don't use girls for anything. I don't use people, no.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever use any men for delivering or picking up heroin for you?

Mr. EVANS. I didn't hear you.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever use any men or have any men pick up or deliver——

Mr. EVANS. What do you mean?

Senator DANIEL. Just a minute. Pick up or deliver heroin for you.

Mr. EVANS. And what if I don't answer these questions at all?

I mean I ain't got no rights in here; I see that. Just like I ain't got no rights anywhere else. But I have got a right to keep my mouth shut, ain't I?

Senator DANIEL. Why don't you ask your lawyer here about it? He is here to——

Mr. EVANS. You just told me I can't ask no fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. I didn't tell you any such thing.

Mr. EVANS. You said I had waived it. I didn't waive nothing.

Senator DANIEL. You waived it on the question of whether you had sold heroin because you answered it and said you hadn't sold heroin.

Now, if you want to counsel with your lawyer about your rights, he is sitting here.

Mr. POSNER. I will explain it to you.

Senator DANIEL. Let him come over to you. Yesterday I had it the other way, and I don't want to start it today.

What you want to do, if you want to ask about your rights here, you lean over to your lawyer, not him over to you. Lean over and ask him what you want to ask him.

Now, Mr. Reporter, what is the last question?

(The reporter again read the pending question.)

Mr. EVANS. Are you looking at me?

Senator DANIEL. Waiting for your answer.

Mr. EVANS. Would you read that question again?

(The reporter again read the pending question.)

Mr. EVANS. I want to use the fifth amendment, and deny it, and refuse to answer that question on the grounds that it might lead to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Now I want to tell you why you are called here, and tell you that you would not be here if we did not have sufficient evidence to lead us to believe you could tell us something about this interstate narcotics traffic, especially out of Chicago into Detroit; and also it has been reported to this committee that you not only have been selling into Detroit, but you have been delivering heroin out of Chicago into Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, Cincinnati, St. Louis, and Indianapolis.

Is that true?

(Witness confers with attorney.)

Mr. EVANS. Would you tell me those cities again?

Senator DANIEL. Detroit, Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, Cincinnati, St. Louis, and Indianapolis.

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to stand on the fifth amendment, and not answer that question, because it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you have said you didn't sell any to Detroit. Have you been selling any or sending any to Cleveland?

I am going to ask you one by one on them, now.

Mr. EVANS. I would like to use the fifth amendment one by one.

Senator DANIEL. You honestly feel that a truthful answer to that might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. Well, have you ever sold or sent any heroin to Columbus, Ohio?

Mr. EVANS. I would like to use the fifth amendment on that one.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever sold or sent any heroin to Dayton, Ohio?

Mr. EVANS. To Dayton, Ohio?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to use the fifth amendment on that.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever sold or sent any heroin to Cincinnati, Ohio?

Mr. EVANS. I would like to use the fifth amendment on that; it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever sent or sold any heroin to St. Louis, Mo.?

Mr. EVANS. St. Louis? I don't even know where St. Louis is.

Senator DANIEL. Go ahead.

Mr. EVANS. St. Louis, Mo.? I'd like to stand on the fifth amendment and not answer that.

Senator DANIEL. Indianapolis, same question.

Mr. EVANS. Same answer.

Senator DANIEL. Well, do you want to change your answer that you haven't sold any heroin during this year?

Mr. EVANS. I don't want to change anything.

Senator DANIEL. You still want that to stand, that you have not sold any heroin to anybody this year?

Mr. EVANS. I want to use the fifth amendment on everything.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you are not going to be able to use the fifth amendment on everything.

Mr. EVANS. That's all right.

Senator DANIEL. We are going question by question.

Mr. EVANS. Well, you can deny me the right to use the fifth amendment, that's all right.

Senator DANIEL. I am not denying you the right to use the fifth amendment. Your lawyer just said you were not.

Mr. POSNER. May I explain to him?

Senator DANIEL. You explain to him, that we go question by question.

(Witness confers with attorney.)

Mr. POSNER. I think he understands it, Senator.

Senator DANIEL. All right. You understand we are going question by question?

Mr. EVANS. What'd you say?

Senator DANIEL. We are going question by question, you see.

Mr. EVANS. No, I don't see, but——

Senator DANIEL. Well, your lawyer has explained it to you.

Mr. EVANS. Well, yes, he is an educated man. I can't understand what they are talking about.

Senator DANIEL. You have him here so he can explain it to you.

All right, do you still want your answer to stand that you have not sold any heroin during the last, since 1950, in Chicago?

Mr. EVANS. I want to employ the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. Well, now, I have told you that as far as the matter of selling heroin is concerned, you have waived that.

Mr. EVANS. I didn't waive anything.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I have ruled——

Mr. EVANS. You might have taken it away from me, but I didn't waive anything.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I have ruled that you have. Didn't you tell me that you hadn't sold any heroin since 1950 anywhere?

Mr. EVANS. I want to stand on the fifth amendment and not answer that, on the grounds that it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I tell you that you have waived any right to claim that, because you voluntarily told this committee you haven't——

Mr. EVANS. I haven't voluntarily done anything.

Senator DANIEL. In response to my question.

Mr. EVANS. Well, no; I didn't volunteer anything, sir. I am here because I was threatened and brought here by guns and police and everything.

Senator DANIEL. Who threatened you?

Mr. EVANS. A man with a gun come and got me. What am I supposed to do? I am not volunteering anything.

Senator DANIEL. Well, let's get this straight. He simply served a subpena on you.

Mr. EVANS. Well, I don't know. He had a gun.

Senator DANIEL. Where was the gun?

Mr. EVANS. In his holster. Said he would shoot me.

Senator DANIEL. Who said he would shoot you?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know his name. You know the man, what his name.

Senator DANIEL. Whoever served that subpena, I want him called.

Mr. EVANS. That was in Chicago.

Senator DANIEL. Who?

Mr. EVANS. In Chicago.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever get threatened before?

Mr. EVANS. No; I never seen him before. I might get shot because I hesitated to go with him, I don't know who he is.

Senator DANIEL. Well, did you give him any trouble?

Mr. EVANS. I don't give him no trouble.

Senator DANIEL. What did he do? Just hand you this paper?

Mr. EVANS. No; he took me to jail.

Senator DANIEL. When?

Mr. EVANS. Two nights ago, last night, night before, I guess.

Senator DANIEL. Where did he serve you the paper?

Mr. EVANS. In jail.

Senator DANIEL. Well, did you not want to accept the paper?

Mr. EVANS. He didn't have no paper.

Senator DANIEL. What did he take you to jail for?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know; he didn't tell me.

Senator DANIEL. What did he arrest you—

Mr. EVANS. You know, I don't know what you call it, just carried me to jail, that's all.

Senator DANIEL. Well, he didn't threaten you, did he?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know what you call it.

Senator DANIEL. I just asked you, did he threaten you?

Mr. EVANS. Well, I don't know. Words mean different things to different people. To me, it was a threat.

Senator DANIEL. You just tell us exactly what the man told you. Where were you when he served you?

Mr. EVANS. I was in a bar.

Senator DANIEL. A bar? What were you doing in a bar?

Mr. EVANS. Drinking.

Senator DANIEL. Drinking what?

Mr. EVANS. Drinking beer.

Senator DANIEL. How many had you had?

Mr. EVANS. One. I never drink but one.

Senator DANIEL. Never drink more than one bottle of beer?

Mr. EVANS. At a time.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever in the last year drank more than one bottle of beer?

Mr. EVANS. Yes; I have drank more than one bottle of beer.

Senator DANIEL. All right. How many bottles of beer do you usually drink?

Mr. EVANS. I don't usually drink at all.

Senator DANIEL. You don't usually drink at all. How many had you had the night you were served?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you just said you had had only one.

Mr. EVANS. There I had had only one; I had only been there a minute, 3 minutes, or so.

Senator DANIEL. Well, where had you had some more beer that night?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know, wherever I had been.

Senator DANIEL. How many had you had up to that time?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know. Three, four, maybe five or six, I don't know.

Senator DANIEL. Could you have had 7 or 8?

Mr. EVANS. I didn't have that many.

Senator DANIEL. You could have had as many as six?

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. What did this man do when he walked up to you? You understand that if you give a false answer to this question, if you give us an untruthful answer, and it is proved that, you could be subject to perjury and sent to the penitentiary for that.

Mr. EVANS. If what's proved?

Senator DANIEL. If it is proven that you gave a false answer under oath to this committee. Do you know that?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know anything about law.

Senator DANIEL. Well, will you please ask your counsel if I have instructed you correctly?

Mr. Counsel, have I instructed him correctly?

Mr. POSNER. You have. May I?

Senator DANIEL. All right. As I understand, the counsel said "yes."

(Witness confers with attorney.)

Mr. EVANS. What do you want to know?

Senator DANIEL. Do you understand what I have just told you?

Mr. EVANS. I don't understand it, but I will just answer what you want to.

Mr. POSNER. I have explained to him that in the event his answers are not truthful, that he can go to jail. I have explained the penalties to him.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Now, with that in mind, tell us exactly what happened here where you were drinking this beer, when the officer came up. Just all that was said and all that happened, from that time up until the time you went to jail.

Mr. EVANS. A man walked up behind me. I was talking to some girl at the bar. He hit me on the elbow. I turned around, he flashed something shiny, put it back in his pocket, said, "We want you."

And I said, "Who are 'we'?"

He says, "The police."

I said, "Yes?"

He says, "Yes; I am the police. You seen my star; didn't you?"

And I says, "No; I didn't see no star. I saw something shiny, but that don't mean you are the police."

He says, "You want to get shot here, or do you want to go to jail?"

So in the meantime another guy came up, and was less hostile, and the manager there knew him, so I went to jail.

Senator DANIEL. What did the other guy say to you?

Mr. EVANS. The other guy asked me if my name was William Evans. I think he asked me what my name was, first.

Senator DANIEL. What else did he say to you?

Mr. EVANS. That's all. He asked me where my coat was, I guess.

Senator DANIEL. And they took you to jail?

Mr. EVANS. That's right.

Senator DANIEL. At about 3 o'clock in the morning?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know what time it was.

Senator DANIEL. Well, was it after midnight?

Mr. EVANS. I am not sure, but I think it was.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know what they booked you for at jail?

Mr. EVANS. Booked me?

Senator DANIEL. What did they tell you they were taking you for?

Mr. EVANS. They didn't tell me nothing. Told me to go to jail, that's all.

Senator DANIEL. Those men, did they serve the subpena on you?

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. It was an entirely different man served the subpena on you at 9 o'clock the next morning; wasn't it?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know what time it was.

Senator DANIEL. Well, it says 9 o'clock, a. m., the 22d day of November 1955.

Mr. EVANS. Well, it was some time.

Senator DANIEL. The man that served this subpena on you, you never saw him the night before, did you?

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. And so therefore the man subpenaed you to come here didn't threaten you.

Mr. EVANS. I didn't say the man that subpenaed me did me nothing. I said the man that carried me to jail did me something.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I am talking about the man who served the subpena.

Mr. EVANS. Well, you don't pick out certain men. I don't know what the man—he didn't say nothing, give me that paper, that's all.

Senator DANIEL. I am asking you about this man for the first time, I think. I am asking you, did he threaten you?

Mr. EVANS. How did he get in here? We wasn't talking about him.

Senator DANIEL. I brought him in. I am talking about him now.

Mr. EVANS. Well now, you are talking about him. No; he didn't say nothing to me.

Senator DANIEL. Didn't threaten you in any way. He handed you this subpena?

Mr. EVANS. The man that gave me that paper said nothing to me.

Senator DANIEL. He just handed you the subpena.

Mr. EVANS. That's right.

Senator DANIEL. All right. I just wanted to be sure that not anybody working for this committee did any of these things that you are talking about.

Do you know Napoleon Williams?

Mr. EVANS. Do I know Napoleon Williams?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. Do I know Napoleon Williams?

Senator DANIEL. You understood the question?

Mr. EVANS. If you will let me explain this in other than yes or no, I will answer.

Senator DANIEL. I sure will. I will let you say yes or no, then explain it.

Now, wait, Mr. Counsel, don't volunteer.

Mr. POSNER. I just wanted to tell him to answer.

Mr. EVANS. What do you mean by "know him"? Like I know you, for instance?

Senator DANIEL. Yes; or better than you know me.

Mr. EVANS. Then I know him.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know him a little better than you know me?

Mr. EVANS. Yes; I know him better than I know you. I guess.

Senator DANIEL. How long have you known him as Napoleon Williams?

Mr. EVANS. Well, as Napoleon Williams, I only knew him a little while.

Senator DANIEL. What did you call him?

Mr. EVANS. I knew him as "Nap."

Senator DANIEL. "Nap"?

Mr. EVANS. "Nap."

Senator DANIEL. I am going to send you a picture, which will be marked "Exhibit 1 of the Detroit hearing," and ask you, can you identify this person?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. Who is it?

Mr. EVANS. That's the fellow I know as "Nap."

Senator DANIEL. All right, that's Napoleon Williams; is that right?

Mr. Reporter, will you mark that exhibit 1?

(The photograph above referred to was marked for identification as exhibit No. 1, Detroit hearing.)

Senator DANIEL. I will ask you if, in 1954, you sold 410 grains of heroin to this man, Napoleon Williams?

Mr. EVANS. Did do what?

Senator DANIEL. Now, you tell me what I asked you.

Mr. EVANS. I didn't hear what you asked me.

Senator DANIEL. I asked you if, in 1954, you sold 410 grains of heroin to this man, Napoleon Williams?

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to invoke the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. You mean you are going to refuse to answer that question?

Mr. EVANS. Yes, if I can refuse it.

Senator DANIEL. On the grounds that it might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I am going to order you to answer the question, because you have already waived the fifth amendment when you said you had never sold heroin to anybody.

Mr. EVANS. What did you say you are going to do?

Senator DANIEL. I ordered you to answer the question.

Mr. EVANS. You are going to take away from me my rights, in other words?

Senator DANIEL. Now, listen, let me tell you something. Listen to me for a minute. You understand? Look at me.

Mr. EVANS. Look at you?

Senator DANIEL. That's right, because I want you to understand something. I am not here to take away any rights you have. You have got a lawyer sitting there. You can turn to him at any time I ask you a question, to get advice from him, providing you are the one seeking the advice and it is not being volunteered to you.

Now, it has become a big habit, you know, in this country for people like you——

Mr. EVANS. What do you mean, people like me?

What's he talking about, people like me?

Senator DANIEL. Keep quite a minute. People who come before an investigating committee to say, "Oh, you are going to take away my rights."

Now, listen, I have got a lot of patience, and I am going to be patient with you, because you are not going to lose a right before my committee, none of them. They are all going to be properly protected.

But you are also going to be treated like other witnesses who waive any rights to claim the fifth amendment, because of having failed to claim it or declined to claim it.

When you sit there and tell us you never sold any heroin, I have got a right then to ask you about specific cases to see if you are telling the truth, and you can't claim the fifth amendment on those specific cases, after you have said you never sold any heroin. That's the way I have ruled, and that's why I am ordering you to answer the questions, and your lawyer will explain it to you.

(Witness confers with attorney.)

Senator DANIEL. Now, hasn't your lawyer told you I am not taking any rights away from you? Do you understand that now?

Mr. EVANS. I don't understand it, but he told me.

Senator DANIEL. He told you that. He verified what I told you, didn't he?

Mr. EVANS. How'd you say that?

Senator DANIEL. You understand it? He has explained it to you just like I did, hasn't he?

Mr. EVANS. I guess so.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Now, with that understanding, I will ask you whether or not—I have ordered you to answer the question whether or not you sold this heroin to Napoleon Williams in January 1954.

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to change all my statements and stand on the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I am not going to let you change your statement. You mean you want now to change your statement that you never sold anybody any herion since 1950?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. I am not going to permit you to do that.

Mr. EVANS. All right, then I ain't going to answer at all, then, if you ain't going to let me have my rights. I will answer it "No," then.

Senator DANIEL. Let me tell you, if anybody has taken away your rights to claim the fifth amendment, you did it when you told this committee that you never sold anybody any heroin. You did that. You didn't claim the fifth amendment.

Mr. EVANS. So I no longer can stand on the fifth amendment; right?

Senator DANIEL. You can stand on the fifth amendment on any question except questions involving the sale of heroin. There you yourself took away any right to claim that, and if you told me a truthful answer, you ought not to mind. If you haven't sold heroin to anybody, these questions are not going to bother you a bit.

Mr. EVANS. They ain't going to bother me anyway, as far as that is concerned. It ain't what I have done, it is what you have got somebody say I have done.

Senator DANIEL. All right. So therefore will you answer the question whether or not you sold in January of 1954, 410 grains of heroin to Napoleon Williams?

All right, what's your answer?

Mr. EVANS. The thing has become very complicated. Now, you guys got all this education and everything, and I don't know nothing, but the truth of the matter is, I didn't sell it, 400 or no other number of grains to Napoleon Williams.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever sold Napoleon Williams——

Mr. EVANS. Wait just a minute, now, don't take my right to tell something away from me, too.

The police can probably prove I did, what they use for proof against a guy in court, they can prove I did. But the truth of the matter is, I didn't make a sale, and didn't nobody in my organization make a sale. When I say organization, I mean nobody in my immediate family or friends didn't make the sale.

Senator DANIEL. What do you mean by your organization?

Mr. EVANS. That's what I mean, my girl friend and my boy friend that I hang with, and the people that I run with.

Senator DANIEL. Who is your girl friend?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know where she is now.

Senator DANIEL. Who was she, in 1954?

Now, wait a minute——

Mr. EVANS. I want to ask him something.

Senator DANIEL. Go right ahead.

(Witness confers with attorney.)

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Reporter, read the last question.

(The reporter read the pending question.)

Mr. EVANS. Oh, in 1954 I had several girl friends.

Senator DANIEL. Name them.

Mr. EVANS. Well, I don't know them by name. We don't call each other by name.

Senator DANIEL. Just tell us what you called them by.

Mr. EVANS. Tell what I called them?

Senator DANIEL. That's right.

Mr. EVANS. Well, Paula, Slim, Chubby. I call them a lot of names.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you said that your organization didn't sell any heroin to Napoleon Williams, and I asked you what you mean by your organization, and you said your girl friend and boy friend.

Now, what girl friend were you talking about?

Mr. EVANS. What particular girl friend?

Senator DANIEL. Right.

Mr. EVANS. Slim.

Mr. DANIEL. Who?

Mr. EVANS. Slim.

Senator DANIEL. Well, now, you know her by some other name than that don't you?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know what all names she gives. She don't have none to me.

Senator DANIEL. You don't know what name she might have given Napoleon?

Mr. EVANS. Napoleon?

Senator DANIEL. Is she the one that delivered the heroin to Napoleon?

Mr. EVANS. What you talking about? Are we still talking about the same thing?

Senator DANIEL. Yes, we are.

Mr. EVANS. Let me ask the lawyer what we are talking about, because I don't know.

Senator DANIEL. I will tell you what we are talking about.

(Witness confers with attorney.)

Senator DANIEL. All right. Do you understand what we are talking about now?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. Did she deliver the heroin that Napoleon Williams went to prison for?

Mr. EVANS. That Napoleon Williams went to prison for?

Senator DANIEL. That Napoleon Williams went to prison for.

Mr. EVANS. No, your Honor.

Senator DANIEL. Did she ever deliver any heroin for you?

Mr. EVANS. For me?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. Who you talking about?

Senator DANIEL. I am talking about Slim.

(The witness confers with attorney.)

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. Did anybody ever deliver any heroin to Napoleon Williams for you?

Mr. EVANS. I can't invoke the fifth amendment now?

Senator DANIEL. Well, you can try.

Mr. EVANS. All right, then, I invoke the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. I think that you have told me that you never had anybody deliver any heroin for you anywhere, and if I am right about that, I would order you to answer the question. But I am not sure, and I am not going to order you to answer that until I check the records.

I will ask you if you ever received a long-distance telephone call in January 1954, from Detroit, Mich.?

You are called Butch Evans; aren't you?

Wait, now, while I am asking you questions. You get the question. You understand? Because I am not going to keep on repeating them.

Do you understand it up to date?

Mr. EVANS. No, sir, I don't understand it.

Senator DANIEL. All right, I will start over again.

I will ask you if, in January 1954, you received a long-distance telephone call from Detroit, Mich., while you were in Chicago, asking if you could deliver some heroin over here?

Mr. EVANS. Are you asking me if I received such a call?

Senator DANIEL. Yes, I am.

Mr. EVANS. I invoke the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. Well, go on and say it like your lawyer explained to you to say it. You refuse to answer——

Mr. EVANS. Why do you say that?

Senator DANIEL. Do you refuse to answer that question because you feel that it might tend to incriminate you? Is that what you mean?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. What's your telephone number in Chicago?

Mr. EVANS. What's my telephone number?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. Aberdeen 4-8251.

Senator DANIEL. Was your phone number ever Butterfield 8-1786?

Mr. EVANS. Yes, I believe it was.

Senator DANIEL. When did you have that phone number?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know when I got it.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you had it in 1954; didn't you?

Mr. EVANS. 1954? I don't know. 1954, this is what, 1955? I am not sure, but I guess I did.

Senator DANIEL. That was last year.

Mr. EVANS. Yes. Well, then I guess I had it last year.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Didn't you tell this fellow, Napoleon Williams, when he called you, that you couldn't deliver it to him in Detroit, but you could arrange for somebody to do it? And "it," by that I mean heroin.

Mr. EVANS. Did he call me? I have forgotten——

Senator DANIEL. Well, I asked you, didn't you tell him on the telephone that you could arrange for somebody to deliver it to him?

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to invoke the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. You refuse to answer because you feel it might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. Now, didn't you arrange for a girl to bring him that heroin and to put it—I am going to ask you this, and to put it in a locker in the bus station here in Detroit?

(Witness confers with attorney.)

Mr. EVANS. Did you ask me if I had somebody deliver it, right?

Senator DANIEL. And put it in a locker in a bus station here in Detroit.

Mr. EVANS. In Detroit?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. A locker in the bus station?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to invoke the fifth amendment, sir, and refuse to answer that on the grounds it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. And didn't Napoleon Williams pay you $600, directly to you, for this heroin?

Mr. EVANS. Oh, God.

Senator DANIEL. I am going to repeat the question.

Mr. EVANS. I know the question.

Senator DANIEL. Did Napoleon Williams pay you $600 for the heroin which was put in the locker in a bus station here in Detroit?

Mr. EVANS. I would like to invoke the fifth amendment, and refuse to answer that on the grounds it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Let's go from there.

(Witness confers with attorney.)

Senator DANIEL. I want to admit to you, I think I got the lock box mixed up. The locker was at the airport in Chicago.

Mr. EVANS. In Chicago?

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever have any heroin delivered to a locker at the airport in Chicago?

Mr. EVANS. You know you have an awful advantage, sir.

Mr. GASQUE. Because we might have the facts?

Mr. EVANS. It is impossible for you to have any kind of facts. You don't get facts from informers.

Senator DANIEL. Why don't you go on and answer the question?

Mr. EVANS. Because you are going to ask something eventually that I ain't going to want to answer.

Senator DANIEL. Now, wait a minute. We can go at this only one question at a time.

Did you deliver or have delivered, to a locker at the airport in Chicago, the heroin for Napoleon Williams, in 1954?

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to invoke the fifth amendment, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I am going to order you to answer that question, whether or not you did that.

Mr. EVANS. All right, tell me this, then: You are going to order me this one, now, and then give me another one and ask me to answer that one?

Senator DANIEL. I am going to go one at a time.

Mr. EVANS. Well, you are smarter than I am, sir. I can't go along with you.

Senator DANIEL. I am going to order you to answer the question.

Mr. EVANS. I am going to invoke the fifth amendment, sir.

Senator DANIEL. You refuse to answer the question after being ordered to do so?

(Witness confers with attorney.)

Mr. EVANS. All right, I have no way of testing your honesty, sir. That's out of line, I know that might get me sent to jail; but, whatever it gets me, I am going to say it anyway and you can do whatever you want to do. I'd like to answer a whole lot of those questions you asked, truthfully, but I know what you are going to try to do to me.

I didn't have nothing to do with delivering no package to Napoleon Williams, but if you want to use that as a chain to waive my fifth amendment, which I am going to waive later, then I guess you are going to send me to jail for not answering that one.

Senator DANIEL. No; that's not going to be done to you at all, and your lawyer——

Mr. EVANS. He didn't tell me that.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I am sure he is a member of this bar, and he is there to tell you that, and I have every feeling that he and I probably agree on this whole matter as to what your legal rights are.

We have to go one question at a time. Now, if you want to answer some of these questions, give truthful answers to them, because you do not feel they will tend to incriminate you, you do it, and then when the others come around, you claim your privilege there.

It may be that I will feel that you have waived it previously at the very beginning of your testimony. I certainly am not going to say that you have waived it right here and now.

So if you want to answer it about whether or not you had any heroin delivered to Napoleon Williams, go on and tell us.

Mr. EVANS. I would like to answer it, but I know you are not going to stop, you are going to be asking me other questions.

Senator DANIEL. Certainly, I am going to ask you all the questions I want to ask. That's what I am here for.

Mr. EVANS. If you want to know something, I would like to know how he got it himself, if you want the truth. And I have been 3 years trying to find out how. And another package turned up the other day that I was supposed to deliver, and I am trying to find out how it turned up, too. And I can't answer the questions, because you are going to get me in trouble someway or another.

Senator DANIEL. We are trying to find out. There is a big traffic going on out of Chicago and here and these other States, and as I have told you, we have been advised, and certainly we have some preliminary investigation on it, that you are one of the kingpins in the traffic.

Mr. EVANS. That's what they tell you.

Senator DANIEL. Now then, I want to see about it. We want to see how this traffic operates.

Mr. EVANS. Well, that's——

Senator DANIEL. I want to know whether you ever made deliveries through women, and whether or not a woman turned the key to this locker over to Napoleon Williams. Did you have a woman do that?

Mr. EVANS. I can't invoke the fifth amendment. You just state it, right?

Senator DANIEL. You can try.

Mr. EVANS. Well, I invoke the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. You don't want to tell us about that?

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to tell you that, but you are going to ask something else about it.

Senator DANIEL. Why would you like to tell us?

Mr. EVANS. Because I don't know nothing about it. I don't know who turned in the locker, and why it got there, and what the name was.

Senator DANIEL. Then under those circumstances you couldn't possibly refuse, unless you feel that a truthful answer to that question would tend to incriminate you.

Mr. EVANS. It would tend.

Senator DANIEL. So that on that basis I am going to ask you to answer.

Mr. EVANS. I can't answer it, sir.

Senator DANIEL. You can't answer it?

Mr. EVANS. I want to ask my lawyer something.

Senator DANIEL. Go ahead.

(Witness confers with attorney.)

Mr. EVANS. This guy makes me nervous. I wish he would move.

Senator DANIEL. All right. He is moved. Go ahead.

The WITNESS. I would like to invoke the fifth amendment, sir, on the Napoleon Williams matter.

Senator DANIEL. On the Napoleon Williams matter?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. Let's go on to another one. Do you know Doris White?

Mr. EVANS. Doris White?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Have you known her a pretty good while?

Mr. EVANS. Have I known her for a good while?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

(Witness confers with attorney.)

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Counsel, he has asked you enough for advice, it looks to me like. Let's wait until he asks you for advice. I think you have been very considerate and careful under all the circumstances, but let's be sure it continues that way.

Now, is this Doris White?

(Photograph proffered to witness.)

Mr. EVANS. This is Doris White.

Senator DANIEL. Is that the girl you knew as Doris White?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. What else do you call her?

Mr. EVANS. What do I call her?

Senator DANIEL. What else did you call her?

Mr. EVANS. I call her "Chicken."

Senator DANIEL. What?

Mr. EVANS. I call her "Chicken."

Senator DANIEL. "Chicken"?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever call her "Slim"?

Mr. EVANS. I might have.

Senator DANIEL. Is she the "Slim" you were talking about a minute ago as your girl friend?

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. What?

Mr. EVANS. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. All right, will you mark that "Exhibit No. 2."

(The photograph above referred to was marked for identification as "Exhibit No. 2, Detroit hearing.")

Senator DANIEL. Are you also known as "Butch" Evans?

Mr. EVANS. People call me a lot of names.

Senator DANIEL. I asked you, are you also known as "Butch" Evans?

Mr. EVANS. By some people.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever deliver to Doris White 6 ounces of heroin?

(Witness confers with attorney.)

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to invoke the fifth amendment, sir, and not answer that.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I am going to order you to answer that, because you waived the right.

Mr. EVANS. I waived that right?

Senator DANIEL. To invoke the fifth amendment on that.

Mr. EVANS. When?

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever deliver any heroin to Doris White?

Mr. EVANS. When did I waive it?

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever deliver any heroin to Doris White?

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to invoke the fifth amendment, sir.

Senator DANIEL. I will order you to answer the question. Did you ever deliver any heroin to Doris White?

Mr. EVANS. What if I don't answer it?

Senator DANIEL. Well, if you don't answer it, you would be running the risk of a contempt citation from the United States Senate, providing the chairman is right in saying you have waived your right under the fifth amendment.

Mr. EVANS. How will I know you are right?

Senator DANIEL. Well, it is just a risk you will have to take, and if you will talk it over with your lawyer, I am sure that he will advise you.

Mr. EVANS. Well, he ain't got no time to explain all this to me now.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you can have all the time you need. I am here for as long as it takes to get all these answers from you.

(Witness confers with attorney.)

Mr. EVANS. I have forgot part of the question, sir.

Senator DANIEL. The question was whether or not you ever delivered any heroin to Doris White.

Mr. EVANS. To Doris White? I'd like to invoke the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. I have ordered you to answer the question.

Mr. EVANS. Now, can I ask a question before I answer that?

Senator DANIEL. Well, you answer the question, and then you can ask it. You can ask your attorney a question.

Mr. EVANS. I can answer this and say "No"?

Mr. POSNER. Go ahead and answer it.

Senator DANIEL. Now, I want it to be understood that it is your counsel who audibly said, "Go ahead and answer it," if you can answer it. I heard him tell you that.

Mr. EVANS. Yes; but I already made the mistake of leveling with you in the first place, so the truth of the matter is, I didn't deliver 6 ounces to her in Detroit. That's what you asked me; right?

Senator DANIEL. I didn't put Detroit on there the last time I asked it.

Mr. EVANS. Well, I didn't deliver it then, 6 ounces.

Senator DANIEL. You didn't deliver 6 ounces to Doris White anywhere?

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. Where did you deliver it? In Cleveland?

Mr. EVANS. What are you talking about? Where I delivered it? I didn't say I delivered it.

Senator DANIEL. I see. You didn't deliver any to Doris White at all?

Mr. EVANS. That's what you asked me, did I deliver 6 ounces to Doris White; right?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. And you are not going to let me to invoke the fifth amendment, then?

Senator DANIEL. I have already ordered you to answer it. You don't need to keep saying that over again. If you understand why I ordered it——

Mr. EVANS. I don't understand nothing, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Well, the only reason why I ordered you to answer any questions, when you invoked the fifth amendment, is if I feel that you have clearly waived the right to claim it.

Mr. EVANS. How do you mean, clearly?

Senator DANIEL. Well, I think you clearly said you never had delivered any heroin to anybody since 1950, and therefore, if you have, I am going to ask you about certain individuals. If that's what your answer was.

I feel that you have waived the fifth amendment. Now, if I am mistaken on that, and your lawyer thinks that I am mistaken, he could properly advise you, even after I order you to answer the question, to continue to claim the fifth amendment.

But as I say, if I am right and he is wrong, you would be subject to contempt citations by the Senate.

Mr. EVANS. What is this? I can't see over these things, they excite me. I am a sick man, I can't be looking in these things here.

Senator DANIEL. What's wrong with you?

Mr. EVANS. You know what's wrong with me, I am sick.

Senator DANIEL. Well, what is wrong?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know.

Senator DANIEL. You say I know what is wrong with you. I want the record to show I don't know what is wrong with you.

Mr. EVANS. Well, I am just sick. I am a nervous wreck, that's all. What is this, anyway? I thought you wanted to know something?

Senator DANIEL. You say you are a nervous wreck?

Mr. EVANS. Yes, I am a nervous wreck.

Senator DANIEL. How long have you been a nervous wreck?

Mr. EVANS. Three or four years, five years.

Senator DANIEL. Have you been under treatment of a doctor?

Mr. EVANS. When I can afford it.

Senator DANIEL. Well, how many times have you been to see a doctor in the last 3 or 4 years?

Mr. EVANS. Oh, 15 or 20.

Senator DANIEL. Sixteen or twenty times?

Mr. EVANS. Somthing like that—15 or 20.

Senator DANIEL. Well, are you sick at this time?

Mr. EVANS. Well, maybe not in the sense that you state I am sick. I am sick, though.

Senator DANIEL. You mean you are sick over the hearing, or something like that?

Mr. EVANS. No. These things excite me, I mean, emotional I get upset.

Senator DANIEL. Well, these questions are very simple. If you have given me truthful answers to begin with, that you never sold heroin to anybody, or you never delivered heroin to anybody, these questions are very simple.

I want to put it to you again, whether or not you ever delivered heroin to Doris White.

(Witness confers with attorney.)

Mr. EVANS. Would you explain to me where I waived the fifth amendment right to begin with? I don't remember having done it.

Senator DANIEL. I am going to ask your lawyer to explain wherein the chairman thinks you have waived your right to the fifth amendment. Now, you let your lawyer explain it to you.

(Witness confers with attorney.)

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Counsel, I will explain it one more time.

Mr. POSNER. I think I can get it to him.

Senator DANIEL. What you are telling him isn't in the record. Let me put it in the record, wherein I think you have waived the right to claim the fifth amendment on sales made by you or deliveries made by you of heroin.

I think you have waived this right when, without claiming the fifth amendment, you told me under oath, told this committee under oath that you had never delivered heroin to anybody, or never sold heroin to anyone since 1950.

Now then, go and see what else your counsel might wish you to hear.

(Witness confers with attorney.)

Senator DANIEL. Now, do you understand my opinion on where you have waived it?

Mr. EVANS. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Now I order you to answer the question. You understand you also have the right to claim the fifth amendment, even after I order you to answer a question, if your attorney thinks that I am wrong in this ruling. You understand that?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Now I am ordering you to answer.

Mr. EVANS. Well, I would like to withdraw the question where I said that I didn't do nothing, and invoke the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. I can't let you do that.

Mr. EVANS. You can't?

Senator DANIEL. We can't conduct hearings that way. You have told me under oath you never sold any heroin or delivered any heroin, and I am not going to let you withdraw those answers. I am going to order you to answer whether or not you ever sold to Doris White.

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. You never did?

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever deliver any heroin to her?

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever use Doris White as your contact for distributing heroin in Cleveland and Detroit?

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to invoke the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Do you know Lillian Bailey?

Mr. EVANS. Who?

Senator DANIEL. Lillian Bailey.

Mr. EVANS. I don't know if I do or not.

Senator DANIEL. All right. A picture will be shown to you.

She is the wife of Marcus Bailey. Do you know Marcus Bailey?

Is Lillian Bailey in the courtroom? Lillian Bailey, stand up.

Look around; do you know this woman?

Mr. EVANS. If that's Lillian Bailey, I think I know her.

Senator DANIEL. You know her. All right. The picture will be marked "Exhibit 3."

(The photograph above referred to was marked for identification as "Exhibit No. 3, Detroit hearing.")

Senator DANIEL. Do you identify this picture as being Lillian Bailey?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know by pictures. I don't see so well.

Senator DANIEL. Well, withdraw the picture, if he can't identify it.

Mr. Reporter, mark it as "Exhibit 3," though, as the picture we have been talking about.

Do you know her husband, Marcus Bailey?

Mr. EVANS. How'd you say that?

Senator DANIEL. Do you know her husband, Marcus Bailey?

Mr. EVANS. Marcus?

Senator DANIEL. Marcus Bailey.

Mr. EVANS. I didn't know her name was no Bailey.

Senator DANIEL. Well, did you know her husband? Did you ever see this woman before at her house?

Mr. EVANS. At her house?

Senator DANIEL. Yes; or anywhere.

Mr. EVANS. Yes; I have seen her.

Senator DANIEL. All right. You know the man that she calls her husband; don't you?

Mr. EVANS. No; I don't know who she calls her husband. She don't tell me what relation they are.

Senator DANIEL. Well, do you know a man by the name of Marcus Bailey, or that you call Bailey?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know nobody that I call Bailey.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever go to her house, 72 Alfred Street, apartment 302, Detroit?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know for sure where 72 Alfred Street is, but I might have gone there.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you know Bailey, a man by that name; don't you?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know, let's see the picture.

Senator DANIEL. There were 3 ounces of heroin found under her bed at this apartment. I want to know whether or not you

and Marcus Bailey left that heroin. Or did you and any other man leave heroin under the bed at that apartment, 3 ounces of heroin?

Mr. EVANS. Did we—What did we do about Marcus Bailey?

Senator DANIEL. Did you and any other man, Marcus Bailey or anyone else, leave 3 ounces of heroin under the bed at that apartment?

Mr. EVANS. I don't see how I can answer that, sir. I don't know what other people do.

Senator DANIEL. I say, did you? Did you see anybody put any heroin under the bed in this woman's apartment?

Mr. EVANS. Now, if I get the understanding of this, if I tell you no, now, you will ask me something else, and I can't say no on it, right? I can't employ the fifth amendment if I say no now, right?

Senator DANIEL. Well, I just let you employ the fifth amendment on just a question or two back there.

Mr. EVANS. I would like to employ the fifth amendment now, and say I can't answer it.

Senator DANIEL. I wish you would state it more nearly, since you have an attorney, like it ought to be stated, though. But I guess we will understand, Mr. Counsel and witness, that when you say you refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment, you say it that way, and we understand what you mean by that is that you decline to answer because you fear that a truthful answer might in some manner tend to incriminate you; is that correct? Is that what you mean?

Mr. EVANS. Yes; that's what I mean.

Senator DANIEL. All right.

Do you know Herbert Foreman?

Mr. EVANS. I know a guy named "Slim." I guess that's his name.

Senator DANIEL. All right. We will send you a picture down there, and ask the reporter to mark it "Exhibit 4," and see if you can identify this man.

Can you identify him?

Mr. EVANS. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know that man as "Slim"?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. That's exhibit 4.

(The photograph above referred to was marked for identification as "Exhibit No. 4, Detroit hearing.")

Senator DANIEL. You have also heard him called Herbert Foreman?

Mr. EVANS. I think so, I am not sure. I guess I have.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ask this man to handle heroin for you in Cleveland, Ohio?

Mr. EVANS. I would like to invoke the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. Well, did you ever deliver to this man any heroin for sale in Cleveland, Ohio?

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to invoke the fifth amendment in that answer, and not answer the question.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever deliver to this man, Herbert Foreman, any heroin at any time after 1950?

Mr. EVANS. I would like to employ the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer that question.

Mr. EVANS. What do you mean, you order me to answer the question?

Senator DANIEL. Exactly what I have meant when I have ordered you to answer the questions before, and for the same reasons heretofore explained several times.

Mr. EVANS. Well, I'd like to employ the fifth amendment and don't answer it.

Senator DANIEL. You understand you have been ordered to do it, and answer it, and you still want to invoke the fifth amendment and have refused to do it after having been ordered to answer the question?

Mr. EVANS. You say you order me?

Senator DANIEL. Yes; I order you to answer the question. And I ask you, you did decline again under the fifth amendment, and I said, is that what you want to do in spite of the fact that I have ordered you to answer the question? Because I feel you have waived the right to claim the fifth amendment.

I just want to be sure that you realize you are doing it after having been ordered to answer it, that is all, just to keep the record straight.

Mr. EVANS. Yes; just to keep the record straight.

Senator DANIEL. Yes; you understand it that way?

Mr. EVANS. I don't understand what you are doing. You say you ain't doing it, but I think you are, and you say no, so I can't argue with you, you know.

Senator DANIEL. You have been doing a pretty good job of it.

Mr. EVANS. I haven't disputed nary a word you have said, so far.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I just want to know if you understand that you are claiming the fifth amendment on this question, refusing to answer it after I have ordered you to answer it, and that you might be subject to a contempt citation if I am right in thinking you have waived the right to claim the fifth amendment. I just want to be sure that you know what you are doing, that's all.

And I want to ask you, do you know what you are doing? Do you understand it, after counseling with your lawyer? I don't want it to be said, if anything comes of this in a court later, that the chairman of this committee didn't sufficiently warn you about a contempt citation, and I have warned you several times, and I am warning you over again.

I just want to know if you still want to stand on the fifth amendment under these circumstances, after having been ordered to answer the question.

Mr. EVANS. There is nobody to say you do such a thing. Who is to say it? Who is going to accuse you of anything?

I don't want to answer the question. So if I can't employ the fifth amendment, I will have to employ something else. If there is nothing else to employ, just send me to jail.

Senator DANIEL. Well, all I asked you, do you understand——

Mr. EVANS. No, I don't understand the whole procedure. I don't understand.

Senator DANIEL. Do you want to claim the fifth amendment?

Mr. EVANS. That's right.

Senator DANIEL. You have a lawyer here to explain everything, and I have never had a witness who took more time counseling with his attorney than you have. And I want to give you more time, so you understand the risk you run in refusing to answer the question after I have ordered you to do it. That's all.

Mr. EVANS. All right, let's get something straight, sir, and I know you are a big man and everything, and I ain't nothing, and you are going to send me to jail sooner or later, so I am going to tell you the truth, I ain't delivered no drugs to "Slim," and that's the last question I am going to answer about "Slim," so you go and send me to jail now.

So I ain't going to sit up here answering a lot of questions when you say I can't employ the fifth amendment.

I didn't deliver no drugs to "Slim" no way, that's the truth.

Senator DANIEL. You never gave him any drugs to sell in Cleveland?

Mr. EVANS. I ain't give him no drugs to sell nowhere, but that's all.

Senator DANIEL. Didn't you tell him you would deliver it through——

Mr. EVANS. I don't know what I told him.

Senator DANIEL. You don't know what my question is yet.

Mr. EVANS. Whatever it is, I don't know.

Senator DANIEL. Didn't you tell him that you would deliver it to him through Nancy?

Mr. EVANS. Did I do what?

Senator DANIEL. You understood every word I said.

Mr. EVANS. No, I didn't. I couldn't possibly have understood. You couldn't have said what I thought you said.

Senator DANIEL. Didn't you tell him to make contact for delivery of the drugs through Nancy?

Mr. EVANS. I have got to answer that, then, right? I have got to say "Yes" or "No" to that? I can't employ the fifth amendment? That's what you said, right?

Senator DANIEL. I haven't ruled on this question at all.

Mr. EVANS. Well, I am employing the fifth amendment, then.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know a girl named Nancy?

Mr. EVANS. I employ the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. I told you to begin with, the way it was understood on our preliminary investigation, you were making your contacts and deliveries through women.

Mr. EVANS. Yes, but I didn't tell you these things.

Senator DANIEL. You understand, I am asking you about them to see if that's the way this racket works.

Mr. EVANS. I don't know about it. I can't keep answering that. I don't know these things.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Didn't he, in March of 1955, see you when you had in your company a girl named Josephine?

Mr. EVANS. How do I know what happened in March of 1955?

Senator DANIEL. Do you know a girl named Josephine?

Mr. EVANS. I see a lot of people when I am with Josephine.

Senator DANIEL. Well, did you ever have any contact with "Slim" or Herbert Foreman?

Mr. EVANS. We played golf every day, I don't know.

Senator DANIEL. Every day?

Mr. EVANS. "Coon canning," "pitty pat," a lot of things. I don't know what day I saw him and when and where.

Senator DANIEL. How long did you all play golf together every day?

Mr. EVANS. We started around May sometime.

Senator DANIEL. May of this year or last year?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know if it was the same year, I guess this year.

Senator DANIEL. I am asking you about before May; in March.

Mr. EVANS. I can't remember back.

Senator DANIEL. Didn't you tell him that your contact in Cleveland would be with a girl named Josephine?

Mr. EVANS. Did I tell him that?

Senator DANIEL. Yes. What's the answer?

Mr. EVANS. What answer?

Senator DANIEL. Did you contact him—did you tell him that he could make a heroin contact, your heroin contact, through a girl named Josephine?

Mr. EVANS. I would like to employ the fifth amendment and not answer that, on the grounds that——

Senator DANIEL. Well, did you ever deliver heroin in Detroit to a girl named Josephine?

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to employ the fifth amendment and not answer that.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer that question.

Mr. EVANS. Well, I am not going to answer it.

Senator DANIEL. What.?

Mr. EVANS. I am not going to answer it.

Senator DANIEL. For what reason?

Mr. EVANS. Because it might lead to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. All right. You understand I ordered you to do it.

Mr. EVANS. No, I don't understand what you have ordered me; all I know, you have asked me a question, and you say I can employ the fifth amendment, and now you say I can't.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you can still employ it if you want to take the risk of citation for contempt. You can still employ it; do you understand?

Mr. EVANS. No, I don't.

Senator DANIEL. Even after I order you to answer it, you can still employ it, if you want to take the risk.

Mr. EVANS. It seems like it only works part of the time.

Senator DANIEL. Well, it will work on any question where I feel like you have not waived it. But on these deliveries and sales of heroin, it isn't going to work.

Mr. EVANS. Oh?

Senator DANIEL. As long as I am chairman of this committee.

Mr. EVANS. Well, I don't know nobody can ever stop you from being.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Do you still want to refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment, after I have ordered you to answer?

Mr. EVANS. What did you ask me?

Senator DANIEL. Read the question, Mr. Reporter.

(The reporter read the question as follows: "Did you ever deliver heroin here in Detroit to a girl names Josephine?")

Senator DANIEL. And I asked you if you still wanted to refuse to answer.

Mr. EVANS. That is what I want to do. But what difference does it make what I want?

Senator DANIEL. Well, what do you do? That's all. I am not going to warn you any further on it.

Mr. EVANS. I don't want to answer any of your questions, Senator DANIEL.

Senator DANIEL. I am not asking you that. I just want to know if you understood I have ordered you.

Mr. EVANS. I don't understand them, sir.

Senator DANIEL. We will move on. I am sure you do. I don't believe that.

Mr. EVANS. Well, it is the truth, I don't.

Senator DANIEL. I am not going to warn you any more about it, or try to clarify it any further as to whether or not you understand. I will simply—where I think you have waived the fifth amendment, I am going to order you to answer, and if you refuse after that, I am going to assume that after having counseled with your lawyer as much as you have, that you realize the risk you are taking for a contempt citation.

Now, isn't this woman, Josephine, still handling heroin for you right now in Detroit?

Mr. EVANS. Isn't what?

Senator DANIEL. Is this woman, Josephine, still handling heroin for you here in Detroit?

Mr. EVANS. I refuse to answer on the grounds it might lead to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know a girl called Josephine Evans?

Mr. EVANS. I refuse to answer on the grounds it might lead to self-incrimination.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever deliver any heroin to a girl named Josephine Evans?

Mr. EVANS. I refuse to answer on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer.

Mr. EVANS. What you order me to answer?

Senator DANIEL. That question.

Mr. EVANS. What question?

Senator DANIEL. If you ever delivered heroin to a girl here in Detroit named Josephine Evans.

Mr. EVANS. You know I could answer that question, but you won't let me waive the fifth amendment no more, if I do, you know.

Senator DANIEL. I don't know any such thing. Your lawyer is shaking his head, and I know he agrees with me. He doesn't agree with what you are saying. He is shaking his head where I can see him shaking it. I have ordered you to answer the question. You just say whatever you want to do.

Mr. EVANS. Well, I didn't deliver any narcotics to Josephine Evans in Detroit.

Senator DANIEL. Did you deliver any narcotics, any heroin to Josephine Evans anywhere?

Mr. EVANS. Where is anywhere? What do you mean by anywhere?

Senator DANIEL. Just any old where. Did you?

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know this person here? Have you ever seen this person whose picture has been shown you?

That will be marked "Exhibit 5."

Mr. EVANS. Have I ever seen it?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. Sure I have seen it.

Senator DANIEL. What's her name?

Mr. EVANS. Just what you say Josephine Evans.

Senator DANIEL. Where did you know her?

Mr. EVANS. What do you mean, where I know her?

Senator DANIEL. Here in Detroit, Chicago, where?

Mr. EVANS. It is my wife, I know her everywhere.

Senator DANIEL. She is your wife?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

(The photograph above referred to was marked for identification as "Exhibit No. 5," Detroit hearing.)

Senator DANIEL. Is she also ever known as Josephine Foreman?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know what she was known as.

Senator DANIEL. Well, is there another Josephine here?

Mr. EVANS. How do I know who is here, sir? I mean, I can't answer those sort of questions.

Senator DANIEL. You don't know another Josephine?

Mr. EVANS. I am a sick man.

Senator DANIEL. Well, that will be easy if you don't. Do you know another Josephine here in Detroit?

Mr. EVANS. I know a lot of Josephines, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever delivered heroin to any girl named Josephine here in Detroit? And by that I mean, have you ever delivered heroin either in Chicago or Detroit or anywhere, to a girl named Josephine, who lives in Detroit?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know any Josephine who lives in Detroit.

Senator DANIEL. Well, then, you never have delivered any heroin to a girl named Josephine here in Detroit, have you? What?

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to employ the fifth amendment. And don't answer the question.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer it.

Mr. EVANS. Oh, you order me to answer it. Well, you have got a lot of power, you can make a guy say anything you want to. But you know I didn't deliver nothing to Josephine.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer the question. Don't tell me what I know. Just tell me what you know.

Mr. EVANS. I don't know anything.

Senator DANIEL. I have ordered you to answer the question whether you ever delivered any heroin anywhere, to a girl named Josephine.

Mr. EVANS. I have not delivered any heroin anywhere to a girl named Josephine.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Did Herbert Foreman, "Slim," pay you $625 for some heroin that you had delivered to him?

Mr. EVANS. I refuse to answer that on the grounds it might tend to incriminate me?

Senator DANIEL. Do you know Teresa Walker?

That will be marked: "Exhibit No. 6."

I ask you if you can identify this person, Teresa Walker?

Mr. EVANS. This could be Teresa.

Senator DANIEL. What?

Mr. EVANS. It could be, I guess it is.

Senator DANIEL. It looks like Teresa, does it not?

Mr. EVANS. Really, it doesn't.

(The photograph above referred to was marked for identification as "Exhibit No. 6," Detroit hearing.)

Senator DANIEL. Well, what did you know her by? Any other name?

Mr. EVANS. I knew a Teresa, but I don't remember what her last name was.

Senator DANIEL. Where did she live?

Mr. EVANS. I don't remember.

Senator DANIEL. Did she live in Detroit when you knew her, or where?

Mr. EVANS. She lived in Detroit.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever deliver any heroin to Teresa or have any delivered to her?

Mr. EVANS. I knew Teresa back in 1949. I don't remember what year it was.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever, at any time, deliver any heroin to Teresa Walker, or have it delivered to her?

Mr. EVANS. I can't remember back that far.

Senator DANIEL. You don't remember?

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know Lorenzo Friday?

Mr. EVANS. I guess his name is Lorenzo. I know somebody we call Friday.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever deliver any heroin to him?

Mr. EVANS. I don't remember.

Senator DANIEL. Isn't it true that you sold or had delivered through another person, 267 grains of heroin to Lorenzo Friday?

Mr. EVANS. How much is a grain. I don't know about grains and stuff like that.

Senator DANIEL. Let's forget the grains. Did you have any heroin delivered here in Detroit to Lorenzo, Friday?

Mr. EVANS. I invoke the fifth amendment.

Sentor DANIEL. I order you to answer that question.

Mr. EVANS. Now, how you going to tell me I can invoke the fifth amendment, then every time I say it, you order me to answer the question?

Senator DANIEL. Well, that is not true; I haven't told you every time. I think the last question you invoked the fifth amendment, and I allowed you to stand on it. But I am not going to allow you to stand on the fifth amendment relating to any sales or deliveries of heroin, since you have denied making any such sales or deliveries.

Mr. EVANS. What do you mean, I have denied making any sales or deliveries?

Senator DANIEL. I have ordered you to answer that question. Just tell me whether you are going to answer it or not.

Mr. EVANS. Did I deliver any drugs to Lorenzo?

Senator DANIEL. Any heroin, through yourself personally, or through some runner of yours, to Lorenzo Friday here in Detroit?

Mr. EVANS. I don't understand what you mean by runners.

Senator DANIEL. Well, if you don't understand the question, let me make it clear to you. Did you ever deliver any heroin, either yourself in person, or through some friend or associate, or member of your organization, or anybody else, to Lorenzo Friday?

Mr. EVANS. Let me see if I can understand you, sir. If I did it through somebody else, I had to give it to somebody and they gave it to him, is that what you mean?

Senator DANIEL. No; I sure don't mean that at all. As a matter of fact, your operation is entirely different from that, from the evidence we have. You don't handle it if you can keep away from it. You operate through other people, mostly women; that's the way we have the evidence before our committee, through our preliminary investigation. I am trying to find out whether it is true.

Mr. EVANS. How would I know if it is true or not? I didn't do it, I didn't write it.

Senator DANIEL. You didn't do it, then? You never delivered any heroin, either personally or through anybody else to Lorenzo Friday?

Mr. EVANS. What do you want me to say?

Senator DANIEL. Yes or no.

Mr. EVANS. I got to say one of them?

Senator DANIEL. Yes; I am going to order you to answer that question.

Mr. EVANS. You are going to force me to say yes or no?

Senator DANIEL. I am going to order you to answer that question. You know that you still have the right to claim the fifth amendment.

Mr. EVANS. What right have I got?

Senator DANIEL. Ask your lawyer.

Mr. EVANS. He just told me I got a right to invoke the fifth amendment, you say I ain't. So what do you mean?

Senator DANIEL. Answer the question.

Mr. EVANS. I ain't delivering nobody no drugs, and I don't know whether nobody else did or not, and I don't know what you mean when you say through other people, runners and things.

Senator DANIEL. You have never delivered to anybody any heroin?

Mr. EVANS. I didn't deliver Lorenzo Friday any heroin, and I don't know what you mean by runners.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Did you have anybody else deliver any heroin to Lorenzo Friday for you?

Mr. EVANS. I want to invoke the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. Even after I have ordered you to answer it?

Mr. EVANS. You have ordered me to answer it already?

Senator DANIEL. I have ordered you to answer it.

Mr. EVANS. I sure would like to know who wrote this fifth amendment and why. Maybe it is like that kidnaping down in Mississippi, it works for one, don't work for the other.

Senator DANIEL. Do you still want to claim the fifth amendment, after I have ordered you to answer it?

Mr. EVANS. I want to claim the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know Dolores Wright?

Mr. EVANS. I want to claim the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. On whether you know Dolores Wright?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I will ask you if you ever gave to Dolores Wright or ever delivered Dolores Wright any heroin?

Mr. EVANS. I want to invoke the fifth amendment and not answer that on the grounds it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer the question.

Mr. EVANS. What do you mean by ordering me to answer the question? What do you mean by that?

Senator DANIEL. Exactly what I have meant before when I have told you before to answer it; I think you have waived the fifth amendment. But you have the right to claim it over again, if you want.

Mr. EVANS. I am going to claim it. I don't know if I have got any rights or not, but I am going to say it anyway.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever use Dolores Wright as a distributor of heroin here in Cleveland and Detroit?

Mr. EVANS. Did I do what?

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever use Dolores Wright as a distributor of heroin for you in Cleveland or Detroit?

Mr. EVANS. Did I ever? Listen, I don't know, I might have done a lot of things 10 or 12 years ago, I don't remember back that far.

Senator DANIEL. Send this exhibit No. 7 down.

All right, do you identify that picture as Dolores Wright?

Mr. EVANS. Do I have to identify it?

Senator DANIEL. No. I just asked, can you identify it as her?

Mr. EVANS. I couldn't know by that picture whether it is Dolores Wright.

Senator DANIEL. All right, the picture will still be marked "No. 7" for identification.

(The photograph above referred to was marked for identification as "Exhibit No. 7, Detroit hearing.")

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever sell Dolores Wright or deliver to her any heroin?

Mr. EVANS. I would like to employ the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer the question.

Mr. EVANS. I would like to employ the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Now, you may stand aside, but remain under subpena to this committee.

* * * * *

(Short recess.)

Senator DANIEL. William Evans?

(Testimony of William "Butch" Evans—Resumed)

Senator DANIEL. William Evans, can you bring your income tax—copies of your income-tax returns for 1954?

Mr. EVANS. I don't have any.

Senator DANIEL. Did you file an income-tax return in 1954?

Mr. EVANS. No, sir; I didn't file any.

Senator DANIEL. Well, did you file one for 1953?

Mr. EVANS. No; I didn't file any.

Senator DANIEL. Did you file any income-tax return for 1952?

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. 1951?

Mr. EVANS. No; I didn't file any.

Senator DANIEL. You didn't file an income-tax return for 1951, either? 1951?

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. Well, take 1954. What was your business then?

Mr. EVANS. Can I talk to my lawyer?

Senator DANIEL. Sure, any time.

(Witness consults with attorney.)

Mr. EVANS. What was the question?

Senator DANIEL. What was your business in 1954?

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to employ the fifth amendment and not answer that.

Senator DANIEL. Well, were you doing any kind of work in 1954?

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to employ the fifth amendment, sir, and refuse to answer.

Senator DANIEL. Did you have any kind of bank account in 1954?

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to employ the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. Now, we have subpenaed your bank accounts, and asked you to bring copies of all your bank accounts with you. Have you brought any?

Mr. EVANS. Have I brought any bank accounts?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. No.

Senator DANIEL. Why haven't you brought copies of your bank statements in accordance with the subpena of this committee?

Mr. EVANS. Why I haven't brought my bank accounts?

Senator DANIEL. Right.

Mr. EVANS. On account that I don't have any.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever had any bank accounts, any bank statements, since 1951?

Mr. EVANS. Have I ever? 1951?

Senator DANIEL. What's the answer?

Mr. EVANS. I don't think so.

Senator DANIEL. Well, did you read this subpena, where it said for you to bring all bank statements, financial statements, showing assets and/or liabilities, and all account books relating to yourself or to any business in which you are or were engaged during the period of 1951 to date?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know if mine said that much or not; but if it did, I haven't got any books or papers or anything.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I am reading from one the same as yours, and I will introduce a copy of your subpena in the record here and now, and ask you to tell me why you didn't bring these records to this committee.

Mr. EVANS. Because I don't have any.

(The document above referred to was marked for identification as "Exhibit No. 8," Detroit hearing.)

Senator DANIEL. You don't have any records for any of those years?

Mr. EVANS. I don't have any records for any years.

Senator DANIEL. You never kept books at all?

Mr. EVANS. Kept books on what?

Senator DANIEL. On your business.

Mr. EVANS. I ain't got no business to keep books on.

Senator DANIEL. How much did that ring cost on your finger? Is it a diamond ring? How much did your diamond ring cost?

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to employ the fifth amendment, sir, and not answer, on the grounds it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. How much did your wristwatch cost?

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to employ the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. How much did your three automobiles cost?

Mr. EVANS. How many automobiles?

Senator DANIEL. Three. Haven't you got 3 automobiles? Don't you have 3 automobiles?

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to employ the fifth amendment, sir, and not answer, on the grounds it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you make more than $600 in 1954?

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to employ the fifth amendment, sir, and not answer on the grounds it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. And the truth about it is that your traffic in heroin has been running you over $50,000 a year net profit for many years.

Mr. EVANS. $50,000 in 1 year? In my lifetime? I don't even know what you are talking about.

Senator DANIEL. Well, has your traffic in heroin ever brought you $50,000 in your lifetime?

Mr. EVANS. What did you say, sir?

Senator DANIEL. Has your traffic in heroin brought you over $50,000 during your entire lifetime?

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to employ the fifth amendment, sir, and not answer on the grounds it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Anything else? Mr. Speer?

Mr. SPEER. No.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever sell any heroin to Shirley Aiston?

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to employ the fifth amendment, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever deliver any heroin to Shirley Aiston?

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to employ the fifth amendment, sir.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer that.

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to employ the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer the question as to whether or not you ever sold any heroin to Shirley Aiston.

Mr. EVANS. Could I talk to my lawyer?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. Oh, I got that right.

(Witness confers with attorney.)

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer it. What is your answer?

Mr. EVANS. Fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. You understand you are claiming it after I have ordered you to answer it. You still claim it?

Mr. EVANS. I don't understand nothing.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I order you to answer that question, so it will be clear to you.

Mr. EVANS. It ain't clear to me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer whether or not you ever sold any heroin to Shirley Aiston?

Mr. EVANS. The fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know Shirley Aiston?

Mr. EVANS. I'd like to employ the fifth amendment, sir, and don't answer that.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer the question, whether you know Shirley Aiston.

Mr. EVANS. I don't know what I am going to say, I don't know what to say now.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you can claim the fifth amendment again if you think I am——

Mr. EVANS. That's what I claim.

Senator DANIEL. If your attorney and you think I am mistaken in ordering you to answer it. Is that what you claim?

Mr. EVANS. That's what I claim.

Senator DANIEL. Did you see Shirley Aiston, the blond-headed girl who was here this morning?

Mr. EVANS. Which blond-headed girl?

Senator DANIEL. The one that testified, the first addict that testified here this morning. Is Shirley Aiston here?

This is the Shirley Aiston I am talking to you about right now. Do you know this lady here?

Mr. EVANS. I can't employ the fifth amendment?

Senator DANIEL. I just asked you, do you know this woman right here?

Mr. EVANS. I don't know her as Shirley Aiston.

Senator DANIEL. What do you know her as?

Mr. EVANS. I guess I just know her as Shirley.

Senator DANIEL. As Shirley. Did you ever live with her?

Mr. EVANS. I don't think that's very nice for you to ask me that.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I just asked you, did you ever live with her?

Mr. EVANS. I ain't going to answer it.

Senator DANIEL. Why not?

Mr. EVANS. Because it ain't none of your business, that's why not.

Senator DANIEL. What is the reason you won't answer it?

Mr. EVANS. I just ain't going to answer anything like that.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever live with her?

Mr. EVANS. I am invoking the fifth amendment, sir. I am not answering that.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever deliver her any heroin?

Mr. EVANS. I am invoking the fifth amendment and not answering that, sir.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer that question.

Mr. EVANS. I am invoking the fifth amendment, and not answering, on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever give her any heroin?

Mr. EVANS. I am invoking the fifth amendment, sir, and I am not answering.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever sell Shirley Aiston any heroin?

Mr. EVANS. I am invoking the fifth amendment, sir, and I am not answering.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer that question.

Mr. EVANS. I am invoking the fifth amendment, and I refuse to answer on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. How many people do you have selling heroin for you now?

Mr. EVANS. I employ the fifth amendment, and I don't answer that on the grounds it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. All right, stand aside, you are excused.

Mr. POSNER. Is he excused, sir?

Senator DANIEL. Yes; he is excused.

Mr. DANIEL. Evans, in the judgment of the subcommittee, should be cited for contempt for refusing to answer questions he was ordered to answer by the chairman after he, the witness, had waived the right not to answer by his answers to previous questions.

Testimony in both open and executive sessions in Detroit showed Evans to be a kingpin in the narcotics traffic in the Midwest—in Michigan, Ohio, and Illinois—working out of headquarters in Chicago. The Federal Bureau of Narcotics reported to the subcommittee that:

William F. Evans, alias "Butch," headquarters in Chicago's West Side, obtains his heroin from Italians on the west side of Chicago. He is an interstate trafficker in large quantities of heroin which he supplies to dealers in Detroit, Cleveland, and Chicago.

I ask that the resolution be agreed to, as recommended by the Judiciary Committee, and that William Frazier Evans be cited for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution

The resolution (S. Res. 275) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of William Frazier Evans, alias Butch, to answer questions before the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary, said refusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan, to the end that the said William Frazier Evans, alias Butch, may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF ROBERT T. HOSOI FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2122, Senate Resolution 276.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 276) citing Robert T. Hosoi for contempt of the United States Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 276 would cite for contempt Robert T. Hosoi, Los Angeles, Calif., who was subpenaed as a witness but failed to appear before the subcommittee investigating the narcotics traffic, in hearings in Los Angeles, Calif., November 16, 1955. He defied the subpenaing authority of the United States Senate. When he failed to appear, I made the following statement during public hearings:

As chairman of this committee, I shall recommend to the Senate that he be cited for contempt of the United States Senate for failing to appear. I might further say that the reason he was wanted before this committee is that this committee has evidence of the fact that he, a man who is now free on the streets, was engaged in the heroin traffic and that it tied in with heroin which came from Red China, and which is the type of heroin that this committee is particularly concerned about because of the evidence we have of Red China's efforts to get heroin into the free nations of the world.

Robert T. Hosoi is described by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics in its report to the subcommittee as:

Alias Robert Tanaka, a Japanese Nisei from Hawaii with a criminal history beginning in 1932. He is a smuggler of heroin from Red China, and distributes this heroin in kilogram lots on the west coast. In 1953, 2 kilograms of this heroin from Red China were seized in Los Angeles after it had been brought down from Oak Harbor, Wash., by a partner of Hosoi.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subpena and information concerning the service thereof be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

To ROBERT T. HOSOI, *Los Angeles, Calif., Greeting:*

Pursuant to lawful authority, you are hereby commanded to appear before the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate of the United States, on October 25, 1955, at 10 a. m., at their committee room 518, United States Post Office and Courthouse, 312 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif., then and there to testify what you may know relative to the subject matters under consideration by said committee. And to bring with you all bank statements, financial statements (showing assets and liabilities), and account books relating to yourself or to any business in which you are or were engaged, for the years of 1951 to date; and copies of your income tax returns for 1951 through 1954.

Hereof fail not, as you will answer your default under the pains and penalties in such cases made and provided.

To Lee Speer, chief investigator, or any narcotic agent of the United States Federal Bureau of Narcotics to serve and return.

Given under my hand, by order of the committee, this 1st day of August in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and fifty-five.

PRICE DANIEL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code.

The said subpena was duly served, as appears by the return thereof, by George R. Davis, who was duly authorized to serve such subpena. The return of the service by the said George R. Davis, bearing his endorsement, is set forth as follows:

SEPTEMBER 19, 1955.

I made service of the within subpena by handing copy to Robert T. Hosoi the within-named Robert T. Hosoi, at a point 30 feet south of First Street on the east side of San Pedro Street, Los Angeles, Calif., at 11:10 a. m., on the 19th day of September 1955.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate act favorably on the contempt citation, as recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 276) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Robert T. Hosoi to appear before the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary, said refusal to appear being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the southern district of California, to the end that the said Robert T. Hosoi may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF SALVATORE SANTORO FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2123, Senate Resolution 277.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 277) citing Salvatore Santoro for contempt of the United States Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 277 would cite for contempt Salvatore Santoro, 400 East 107th Street, New York, N. Y., alias "Tom Mix," who appeared at the hearing in New York September 21, 1955. Santoro absolutely refused to testify beyond the point of giving his name and address to the subcommittee. He refused to answer any and all questions, no matter how lacking in the elements of self-incrimination.

I ask unanimous consent to have the full transcript of this witness' testimony printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF SALVATORE SANTORO, LEONIA, N. J.

Senator DANIEL. Salvatore Santoro.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give to this subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. SANTORO. I do.

Senator DANIEL. You may be seated.

Will you give your full name?

Mr. SANTORO. Salvatore Santoro, 132 Longview Avenue, Leonia, N. J.

Senator DANIEL. That is S-a-l-v-a-t-o-r-e?

Mr. SANTORO. That is correct.

Senator DANIEL. S-a-n-t-o-r-o?

Mr. SANTORO. That is correct.

Senator DANIEL. And the town?

Mr. SANTORO. Leonia, L-e-o-n-i-a.

Senator DANIEL. New York?

Mr. SANTORO. Jersey.

Senator DANIEL. New Jersey.

Are you the same Salvatore Santoro who entered a plea of guilty in a narcotics case in 1942?

Mr. SANTORO. I refuse to answer——

Senator DANIEL. In Tucson, Ariz.

Mr. SANTORO. I refuse to answer any questions on the grounds that may tend to incriminate or degrade me; that is, from here on in, Senator.

Senator DANIEL. How is that?

Mr. SANTORO. That is from here on in, I invoke the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. You mean you are going to refuse to answer all questions that might be asked, regardless of what they are?

Mr. SANTORO. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. You mean even if we ask you a question as to whether or not you are married?

Mr. SANTORO. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. You would claim the fifth amendment to that?

Mr. SANTORO. I claim the fifth amendment from here on in.

Senator DANIEL. Without hearing the questions.

Do you have legal counsel here with you?

Mr. SANTORO. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Do you intend to claim the fifth amendment, regardless of what we ask you; is that correct?

Mr. SANTORO. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Whether you think it might tend to incriminate you or not?

Mr. SANTORO. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. I just want to say to you that I think you would be in contempt of the committee if you do that. We certainly have the right to do it.

Mr. SANTORO. You, the doctor.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I say you certainly have the right to do it on anything that you think honestly might tend to incriminate you, but if you are going to take the attitude of doing it on all questions, regardless of whether you think they might tend to incriminate you, it is my judgment that you would be in contempt of the committee.

Mr. SANTORO. All right, give me the questions.

Senator DANIEL. And I just wanted to warn you of that for your own good.

Mr. SANTORO. All right.

Senator DANIEL. Are you also known as Tom Mix?

Mr. SANTORO. I refuse to answer the questions on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know Joe Vento?

Mr. SANTORO. I refuse to answer the questions on the ground it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Were you convicted along with Joe Vento in 1952?

Mr. SANTORO. I refuse to answer——

Senator DANIEL. On a narcotics charge?

Mr. SANTORO. I refuse to answer on the grounds it might tend to incriminate or degrade me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever pleaded guilty on a narcotics charge, violation of the narcotics law?

Mr. SANTORO. I refuse to answer on the grounds that it might tend to incriminate and degrade me.

Senator DANIEL. On the same basis that we decided a moment ago that could not tend to incriminate you, to show that you were or had been convicted or had pleaded guilty on a previous charge, I am going to instruct you to answer that question.

Mr. SANTORO. I refuse to answer on the grounds that it might tend to incriminate or degrade me.

Senator DANIEL. You understand that if we are correct in instructing you to answer, regardless of your claim of the fifth amendment, if we are correct in that, we are entitled to have the answer on that question, that you may be held to be in contempt of this committee?

Mr. SANTORO. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. And in spite of that warning and having been cautioned and having been asked the question again, you still refuse?

Mr. SANTORO. I refuse to answer.

Senator DANIEL. To answer on the ground that it might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. SANTORO. Or degrade me.

Senator DANIEL. Well, now, this committee does not recognize the last part, so you can leave that off, "or degrade you."

Mr. SANTORO. All right, sir.

Senator DANIEL. But on the ground that it might tend to incriminate you, the committee will, of course, respect your right under the fifth amendment to refuse to answer some of these questions.

Do you know John Ormento?

Mr. SANTORO. I refuse to answer on the ground it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. What business are you now engaged in?

Mr. SANTORO. I refuse to answer on the ground that it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Are you engaged in a business of selling heroin?

Mr. SANTORO. I refuse to answer on the ground that it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Are you engaged in the business of selling other narcotic drugs?

Mr. SANTORO. I refuse to answer on the grounds it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. You feel that by telling this committee as to what business you are engaged in, you might incriminate yourself?

Mr. SANTORO. I refuse to answer on the grounds it might tend to incriminate or degrade me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know Lucky Luciano?

Mr. SANTORO. I refuse to answer on the grounds it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you been engaged with him in any type of activity whatever?

Mr. SANTORO. I refuse to answer on the grounds it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I believe that is all. You are excused.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, Santaro, in the subcommittee's judgment, should be cited for contempt for failing to answer questions he was ordered to answer by the chairman, relating to his conviction on a plea of guilty of narcotics law violations. Moreover, this witness stated unequivocally that he refused to answer any and all questions of the subcommittee, regardless of what they were and whether or not they might incriminate him. Santoro is described in the reports by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics as:

> Having a criminal history dating back to 1933 and is also an important member of the New York 107th Street mob which has access to the European sources of heroin and engages in the smuggling and wholesale distribution of heroin.

Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee, I pleaded with this witness not to put himself in contempt of the United States Senate. However, he would not heed the warning given to him by the chairman, and continually said he would not answer any questions, even questions which might not tend to incriminate him.

I ask that the Senate take favorable action on the contempt citation, as recommended by the Judiciary Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 277) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Salvatore Santoro to answer questions before the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary, said re-

fusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, to the end that the said Salvatore Santoro may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF JESSE ALEXANDER FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2124, Senate Resolution 278.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 278) citing Jesse Alexander for contempt of the United States Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 278 would cite for contempt Jesse Alexander, 4323 Forrestville Avenue, Chicago, Ill., who appeared before the subcommittee in Chicago, November 22, 1955, with his attorney, Frank Oliver. Alexander pleaded the fifth amendment 82 times in response to questions by the chairman of the subcommittee. Throughout the hearings Alexander was arrogant and hostile.

I ask unanimous consent to have the full transcript of this witness' testimony printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF JESSE ALEXANDER; ACCOMPANIED BY FRANK OLIVER, ATTORNEY

Senator DANIEL. Jesse Alexander? Jesse Alexander?

Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give this subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do.

Senator DANIEL. You may be seated.

Will you state your name?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Jesse Alexander.

Senator DANIEL. Where do you live?

Mr. ALEXANDER. 4323 Forrestville Avenue.

Senator DANIEL. And will you identify yourself, sir?

Mr. OLIVER. My name is Frank Oliver. I am here as counsel for Mr. Alexander.

(Attorney Oliver sat slumped in his chair directly facing his client.)

Senator DANIEL. Are you the same Jesse Alexander who was convicted of narcotics law violations in 1941?

Mr. ALEXANDER. 1941?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. What address?

Senator DANIEL. What?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Have you got an address there?

Senator DANIEL. Well, were you committed to a Federal correctional institution at Milan, Mich.?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Do you mean "Millan" or M-i-l-a-n, Milan?

Senator DANIEL. Well, either way. Do you know what I am asking you?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think so.

Senator DANIEL. Well, are you the same Jesse Alexander that was given 2 years and committed to that institution?

Mr. ALEXANDER. In 1941?

Senator DANIEL. In 1941.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. Did you serve that 2 years?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. And what was that for?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Conspiracy.

Senator DANIEL. To sell narcotics?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Not to sell narcotics.

Senator DANIEL. What was it to do?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Conspiracy with narcotic peddlers.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Did you serve the 2 years?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes; I did.

Senator DANIEL. Then did you get back into the narcotics traffic?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I didn't quite understand you.

Senator DANIEL. Were you arrested again in 1950, and convicted again for the possession of narcotics?

Mr. ALEXANDER. 1951, wasn't it?

Senator DANIEL. Well, you were arrested in 1950, this record shows, and charged with the possession of narcotics.

When were you convicted the next time?

Mr. ALEXANDER. 1952.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Counsel, will you face the committee, please?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes; I will. [Turning half around in chair.]

Mr. GASQUE. And will you put your feet straight under the table; this way?

Thank you. [Counsel sits up straight facing chairman.]

Senator DANIEL. What was your answer?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I didn't get that last.

Senator DANIEL. I say, when was the next time after 1951 that you were convicted on a narcotic charge?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I am going to ask you if you are one and the same person who was convicted for possession of narcotics?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer.

Senator DANIEL. And given a 3 years' sentence?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer that question. I am trying to identify whether or not you are one and the same person whose record I am reading from. You have already been convicted of it.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer on the ground I might be incriminated.

Senator DANIEL. I want to explain this to you, you have the right to claim the fifth amendment whenever you honestly feel that a truthful answer to the question would tend to incriminate you. I am asking you an identifying question now, as to whether or not you are one and the same person who has already served a sentence in the penitentiary.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that on the ground I might be incriminated.

Senator DANIEL. If I am right in saying that you should answer the question, and you refuse to answer it, you would be subject to a comtempt citation by the United States Senate, do you understand that?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think so.

Senator DANIEL. You think you understand that?

Mr. ALEXANDER. (No answer.)

Senator DANIEL. With that explanation in mind, I say, do you think you understand that?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer, I might be incriminating myself.

Senator DANIEL. My question is, Do you understand my explanation of what——

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that, I might incriminate myself.

Senator DANIEL. Let me be sure that you understand what I am asking you.

Mr. OLIVER. Senator, I wonder if I could consult with my client?

Senator DANIEL. He may consult with you, but not you with him.

Mr. OLIVER. Maybe he will ask me to consult with him.

Senator DANIEL. All right. I want to be sure that you understand what I have explained to you, and that is that if I am right in saying that you cannot claim the fifth amendment on some of these questions, and that you should go on and answer them, I will order you to answer them, and if you fail or refuse to answer, and I am right in ordering you to do so, you would be subject to contempt proceedings by the United States Senate for refusing to answer. Do you understand that?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I still refuse to answer.

Senator DANIEL. You mean you refuse to tell me whether you understand that or not?

Mr. ALEXANDER. May I have a word with my counsel?

Senator DANIEL. Yes; you may consult your counsel.

(Witness consults with counsel.)

Mr. OLIVER. Will you repeat the question?

Senator DANIEL. My question was whether you understand my explanation to you.

Mr. OLIVER. Thank you.

(Witness consults with counsel.)

Senator DANIEL. Are you ready to answer?

Mr. OLIVER. Will you ask the question again, Senator?

Senator DANIEL. Yes; the question was whether or not you understand my explanation to you that you might be subject to a contempt citation by the United States Senate, and to a trial and punishment for refusing to answer, if I am right in ordering you to answer. Do you understand that?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think so.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Now, I will ask you the question over again, whether or not you are one and the same person who was convicted of the offense of the sale of narcotics, and who served at Milan, Mich., beginning in 1952, a 3-year sentence, and then later sent to Leavenworth, Kans., for 3 years on another narcotics charge?

Mr. ALEXANDER. May I have a word with my counsel, please?

Senator DANIEL. At any time you may lean over and consult with counsel.

Mr. OLIVER. Thank you, Senator.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that question, because it might incriminate me.

Mr. GASQUE. Counsel, do you understand what the Senator——

Senator DANIEL. Let me go ahead. I think counsel understands—what did you have in mind, tell me?

(Counsel confers with Senator DANIEL.)

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. OLIVER. As I understand it, the last question was whether he was the same person; is that correct?

Senator DANIEL. One and the same person who was convicted again in 1952 for the sale of narcotics.

Mr. OLIVER. That is the question. Are you one and the same person?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you understand why I ordered you to answer it, because I do not think it is a privileged question and, therefore, I am ordering you to answer it, and you understand if I am right the chances that you are taking; do you?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer.

Senator DANIEL. I say, do you understand that?

Mr. ALEXANDER. On account it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I say, do you understand my explanation of the chances you are taking when I order you to answer the question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I still refuse to answer.

Senator DANIEL. You refuse to tell me whether you understand it, do you?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer on account it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. You refuse to tell me whether you understand the explanation, is that right?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I still refuse to answer.

Senator DANIEL. How old are you?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Forty-four.

Senator DANIEL. All right.

Mr. Counsel, don't volunteer anything.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not volunteering answers, sir.

Senator DANIEL. I heard you tell him to say something.

Mr. OLIVER. I spoke his name, I was hoping he might ask for a conference with me.

Senator DANIEL. Anyway, as I say, we cannot run these proceedings any other way except for the client to seek advice when he wants to.

All right, how old are you?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Forty-four.

Senator DANIEL. What kind of business have you been engaged in in the last year?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you have a family?

Mr. ALEXANDER. A family?

Senator DANIEL. A family. Are you married?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes; I am married.

Senator DANIEL. Do you have any children?

Mr. ALEXANDER. One.

Senator DANIEL. Do you live here in Chicago with them?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I don't live with them.

Senator DANIEL. Where do you live?

Mr. ALEXANDER. May I have a word with my counsel, please?

Senator DANIEL. I told you any time you want to consult your counsel, you may do it.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. OLIVER. Now, will you give him the question again?

(Reporter reads: "Where do you live?")

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think he got that already.

Senator DANIEL. No; where do you live?

Mr. ALEXANDER. 4323 Forrestville.

Senator DANIEL. Where does your wife and child live?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Well, I refuse to answer that because I may be incriminating myself.

Senator DANIEL. Do you honestly believe that a truthful answer to that question might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is right.

Senator DANIEL. Speak up.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I still refuse to answer any question pertaining to the subpena which might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. You mean you are not going to answer any questions I ask you?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I didn't say any questions—that question.

Senator DANIEL. What do you mean by "pertaining to the subpena"?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer the question, because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you understand my question was what do you mean by saying "pertaining to the subpena"? Do you understand that that is the question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. (No answer.)

Senator DANIEL. What did you mean when you said "pertaining to the subpena," a minute ago, refusing to answer any questions pertaining to the subpena?

Mr. ALEXANDER. That question.

Senator DANIEL. Do you mean any questions pertaining to the subpena you are going to refuse to answer?

Mr. ALEXANDER. (Nods head negatively.)

Senator DANIEL. Speak up. The reporter can't see you shaking your head; he can't hear that. He has to write something down.

Mr. ALEXANDER. May I have a word with counsel?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Senator DANIEL. All right; give us your answer.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Would you give that question to me again?

Senator DANIEL. All right. I will ask you again whether or not you intend to refuse to answer any questions pertaining to this subpena?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Not all questions.

Senator DANIEL. All right. I will ask you if you were convicted in 1952 on a narcotics charge, if you are one and the same person as the Jesse Alexander who was so convicted?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that. It might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I think you have waived any right. Mr. Counsel, please, please do not do that. Please don't say anything while I am asking a question, or before he asks you for advice or counsel.

I am asking you—a moment ago you voluntarily said in response to a question that you thought the next time you were convicted was in 1952. I am just simply trying to identify the witness before us. You volunteered that. I think I am entitled to this information, and that the committee is, and I order you to answer the question.

Mr. ALEXANDER. May I have a conference with counsel?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Would you give me the question again?

(Record read by reporter as follows: "I am asking you—a moment ago you voluntarily said in response to a question that you thought the next time you were convicted was in 1952. I am just simply trying to identify the witness before us. You volunteered that. I think I am entitled to this information, and that the committee is, and I order you to answer the question.")

Senator DANIEL. And the question was whether or not you are the one and the same Jesse Alexander who was convicted in 1952 of a narcotics violation?

Mr. ALEXANDER. 1952? Yes; I was.

Senator DANIEL. And what did that violation—was that for selling narcotics?

Mr. ALEXANDER. May I have a conference with counsel?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. OLIVER. I don't think the witness understands that if he wants to talk to me he has to tell you.

Senator DANIEL. All you have to do, if you want advice or counsel from your lawyer is to just simply turn to him and seek his advice. You don't have to ask me a thing in the world.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. What was that last question?

Senator DANIEL. Whether or not you were convicted, what were you convicted of, was it for the sale of narcotics?

Mr. ALEXANDER. No; it wasn't for the sale.

Senator DANIEL. What was it for?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thought it was for possession.

Senator DANIEL. And did you serve time in Leavenworth, Kans., on that charge?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Wait.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes; I did.

Senator DANIEL. How many years did you serve?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Senator DANIEL. Your answer.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Three years.

Senator DANIEL. How long was it after you got out of Leavenworth before you got back into selling narcotics?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that, because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Well, are you selling heroin here in Chicago now?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that, it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Are you selling marihuana here in Chicago now?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that, because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you tell the officers who served you with the subpena, "why didn't you wait a week, I would have been in Mexico"?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. You honestly think that a truthful answer to that question might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that, because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I am simply asking if you are in good faith in saying a truthful answer to that might tend to incriminate you.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will you give me that question?

(Reporter reads: "I am simply asking if you are in good faith in saying a truthful answer to that might tend to incriminate you.")

Mr. OLIVER. That was with regard to the previous question, Senator. Would you mind reading the previous question?

Senator DANIEL. That was in regard to the previous question which was whether or not you told the officer who subpenaed you "why didn't you wait a week and I would have been in Mexico."

Do you honestly believe that a truthful answer to that question might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Would you give that, that I also said what?

Senator DANIEL. "Why didn't you wait a week and I would have been in Mexico?"

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes; I told him that.

Senator DANIEL. Did you intend to go to Mexico?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I just said Mexico.

Senator DANIEL. What did you tell the office that for?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that, it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you intend to go to Mexico?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever buy heroin in Mexico?

(Conference with counsel.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that, because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you have a telephone?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I am going to order you to answer the question.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer, because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. You understand when I order you to answer it the chances that you take, do you understand that?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Now, do you know about the cocaine shipment that was made from South America up to New York recently, about a $2 million shipment of cocaine? Were you called from New York about that shipment of cocaine?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that, because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. This was the largest shipment of cocaine in recent history, if not ever, in the history of our country, and we have telephone records which show that A. K. Salem in New York telephoned you with reference to the purchase of cocaine received from this South American shipment.

Do you wish to deny that?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know A. K. Salem?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Senator DANIEL. Now, let me tell you, my patience is worn as thin as I am going to let it get worn. If you want to counsel with your attorney any more, you bend over and talk to him, and ask him what you want to ask him. Do you understand?

Mr. ALEXANDER. (No answer.)

Senator DANIEL. Do you understand me?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think so.

Mr. OLIVER. You told him if he looked at me that would be sufficient.

Senator DANIEL. I did not mean that, I said he can ask you for advice. He didn't ask you for advice. He just sits back there and looks at you, and you wheel over to him and give him the advice before he opens his mouth, and I am not going to tolerate it any further.

Do you know A. K. Salem?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer.

Senator DANIEL. If you want to counsel with your lawyer any more, you bend over and ask him what you want to ask him. Do you understand?

Mr. ALEXANDER. (No answer.)

Senator DANIEL. Do you understand me?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think so.

Senator DANIEL. In my whole experience on congressional committees I have never had a witness like you before me before, so far as absolute contempt is concerned.

Do you know Richard Brown?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. OLIVER. He is bending over, Senator.

Senator DANIEL. He sure is, for the first time, and he is asking you a question first without you telling him anything, and that is the way I want it done.

Mr. OLIVER. Lots of people aren't familiar with the procedure in these investigations.

Senator DANIEL. He is familiar now.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not either.

Senator DANIEL. He is familiar now, and he is doing what I told him.

Mr. OLIVER. All right.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever call Tremont 7-0790 in New York?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever used telephone Atlantic 5-1330 in Chicago?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Senator DANIEL. Go ahead and ask him anything you want to, ask your lawyer.

Mr. ALEXANDER. What was that question?

Senator DANIEL. I asked you, Did you ever use Atlantic 5-1330 in Chicago?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that, it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Are you one of the biggest peddlers of heroin in town?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that, because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Are you known as "Big Jesse" who supplies most of the South Side with heroin here in Chicago?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Would you give me that question?

Senator DANIEL. Are you known as "Big Jesse" who supplies most of the heroin that goes to the South Side here in Chicago?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Are you known as "Big Jesse"?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer that question.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Senator DANIEL. What is your answer?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Give me that question again.

Senator DANIEL. Are you known as "Big Jesse"?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. You know I have ordered you to answer that question; don't you?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. All right, you may stand aside.

Mr. Gasque, you will turn this record over to the Department of Justice to see if the witness has been guilty of such contempt that he could be cited and tried.

Just 1 minute. Come back to the stand just 1 more minute.

Did you bring your income-tax returns for 1951 through 1954?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Counsel, don't volunteer anything to the witness, please sit away from him until he asks you for help.

Mr. OLIVER. He is leaning over here.

Senator DANIEL. Let him ask you for something.

Mr. OLIVER. I am doing the best I can.

Senator DANIEL. I know you are doing the best you can. Let him ask for what advice he wants.

Mr. OLIVER. Lots of people in a tight spot don't know what advice they want, they just struggle along.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. What is that question?

Senator DANIEL. I asked you did you bring your copies of your income-tax returns as ordered in the subpena?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything that I bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I asked you did you bring them to the courthouse?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I said anything what I might bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I will order you to answer me the question, "Did you bring the copies of your income-tax returns for 1951 through 1954, to this courthouse?"

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything that I bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer the question whether or not you brought them here in response to this subpena. Answer "Yes" or "No," and then you can give any explanation you want.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything I bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Are you refusing to answer "Yes" or "No" whether you brought them to the courthouse?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything I bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer "Yes" or "No" whether you brought these income-tax returns to this courthouse where we are holding this committee hearing.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Give it to me again.

Senator DANIEL. I am ordering you to answer "Yes" or "No" whether you brought the income-tax returns of 1951 through 1954 to this courthouse as directed by the subpena.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything that I would bring in there might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I am asking you to answer "Yes" or "No" whether you brought them, and then you can add any explanation you want.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything that I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Are you refusing to answer "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything that I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Did you bring your bank accounts, as directed by this subpena?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Senator DANIEL. Answer the question: Did you bring your bank accounts?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything that I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer "Yes" or "No" whether you brought them.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything that I would bring there might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Are you refusing to answer whether or not you brought the bank accounts to this courthouse?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything that I bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I am asking you, are you refusing to tell me whether or not you brought them to this committee hearing in the courthouse?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Well, did you bring them?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything that I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you refuse to tell me whether or not you brought them? I am not asking you, now, to present them. I am asking you, did you bring them to the courthouse?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything that I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Is that the only answer you are going to give to——

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything that I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Is that the only answer you are going to give to that question?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will you give me it?

Senator DANIEL. Is that the only answer you are going to give to that question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. That is positively the only answer you will give to that question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is right.

Senator DANIEL. Even though I have ordered you to answer it "Yes" or "No," and then add such explanation or claim such rights as you wish, is that right?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything that I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Is that the only answer you are going to give to my question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. Did you bring your financial statements as ordered by the subpena?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything that I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you bring them with you? I am not asking you for the statements, or to put them in the record, or to show them to me, I am just asking did you bring them to the courthouse? As directed by this subpena?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I am telling you, anything I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Is that the only answer you are going to give to the question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer the question.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you refuse to answer the question?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Give it to me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you refuse to answer the question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything I would bring in there might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. That is not the question. I have ordered you to answer "Yes" or "No" as to whether you brought your financial statements to this courthouse?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Is that the only answer you are going to give to that question?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will you give it to me?

Senator DANIEL. I will. I am tired of repeating every question, though. It seems to me that if you want to get advice on the questions you can remember what the question is. Is that the only answer you are going to give to that question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is the onliest one I know to give.

Senator DANIEL. That is the onliest one you know to give?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. I am ordering you to give the answer of "Yes" or "No"—you either did or did not bring the financial statements called for to this courthouse, and I want you to know I am not asking for them in the record on this question, I am just wanting to know whether or not you brought them down here.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Senator DANIEL. What is your answer?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I didn't understand you, you have got to give it to me.

Senator DANIEL. I just want to know whether you brought these financial statements and I have ordered you to answer "Yes" or "No."

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Well, does that mean you did not bring them with you?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I said, does that mean you did not bring them with you?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I said, does that mean you did not bring the financial statements with you?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything that I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer that question "Yes" or "No," and then give any explanation or any rights you might claim.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I ordered you to answer. I am not talking about what you might bring, I am ordering you to answer "Yes" or "No"; does your answer mean that you did not bring the financial statements with you?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Any statements I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you have any financial statements?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that on account it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer, because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you have any bank accounts?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that, because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you bring the bank accounts called for in this subpena?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I am just asking you if you brought them, I am not asking you to produce them. If I ask you to produce them you can claim your privilege under the fifth amendment, if it is proper to claim it, we will rule on it then. I am just asking you whether or not you brought to this courthouse——

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything——

Senator DANIEL. Just a minute, let me finish the question. Did you bring to this courthouse any bank accounts, as called for in this subpena?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer that question "Yes" or "No."

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Is that the only answer you are going to give me to that question?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes; that is the only answer.

Senator DANIEL. Did you file an income-tax return in 1954?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that, it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you file an income-tax return in 1953?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you file an income-tax return in 1952?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer that one, because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Now, I am going to ask you one more time about all the papers we called for in this subpena, and I am not asking that they be produced, or that you let the committee even see them, I just want to know if you brought them down here with you to show to your attorney, or to bring them here for this hearing as required by this subpena?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I am ordering you to answer the question I asked you and answer it "Yes" or "No," with any explanation that you might want to give.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer "Yes," that you did bring all or some of these statements, or "No," that you did not bring all or any of these statements.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Would you give it to me again?

Senator DANIEL. I am asking you to say yes or no—I am not only asking you, but ordering you to say yes or no——

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything I would bring——

Senator DANIEL. Wait just a minute (continuing) "Yes" or "No," that you did bring some of these statements, or that you didn't bring any of them.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer the question "yes" or "no."

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you understand all I want to know is, did you bring them, do you have any such papers?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything that I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. The time, I think, to claim your rights under the fifth amendment not to show any of these papers is after you let it be known whether you answered this subpena properly and brought them, then you can claim the fifth amendment, if it is proper to do so, otherwise you can claim it when I ask you for some of these papers. I am just wanting to know, do you have any bank accounts, financial statements, account books, or copies of income-tax returns?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer it.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you bring any of such papers to this court house for this hearing?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Anything I would bring might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer that question.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I refuse to answer because it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. All right, you may stand aside.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, this witness, I might say, claimed the privilege of the fifth amendment. He would not answer any question as to whether or not he had complied with the subpena to bring the records the committee had asked him to bring to the committee room, and in various other ways he was in contempt because of his failure to answer questions when he was ordered by the chairman to give answers to them on subjects on which he had waived his right against self-incrimination.

In the judgment of the subcommittee, Alexander refused to answer the question that he was ordered to answer by the chairman as to whether he responded to the subpena ordering him to bring to the hearing, bank statements, other papers, and copies of his income-tax statement.

The Federal Bureau of Narcotics has reported Alexander to be:

An important trafficker living on Chicago's West Side. He supplies heroin and cocaine to Chicago, St. Louis, and Kansas City. He has connections with smugglers in New York who are able to supply him with these drugs in pound lots.

Mr. President, I ask favorable action by the Senate on this resolution, as recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 278) was agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Jesse Alexander to answer questions before the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary, said refusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois, to the end that the said Jesse Alexander may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF JOSEPH BENDINELLI FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2125, Senate Resolution 279.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 279) to cite Joseph Bendinelli for contempt of the United States Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 279 would cite for contempt Joseph Bendinelli, 400 East 120th Street, New York, N. Y., who appeared before the subcommittee in New York, September 21, 1955. Bendinelli, in his appearance before the subcommittee, refused to testify to anything except his name and address. Of 78 questions asked by the chairman of the subcommittee, Bendinelli pleaded the fifth amendment 76 times.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the full transcript of this witness' testimony printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH BENDINELLI, MALVERN, LONG ISLAND, N. Y.

Senator DANIEL. Joseph Bendinelli.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give to this subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BENDINELLI. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. Will you state your full name?

Mr. BENDINELLI. Joseph B-e-n-d-i-n-e-l-l-i.

Senator DANIEL. And your address?

Mr. BENDINELLI. 1441 10th Avenue, Malvern, Long Island.

Senator DANIEL. What is your age, sir; your age?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I plead the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. Sir?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I plead the fifth amendment on everything.

Senator DANIEL. You mean you refuse to testify as to your age on the ground it might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. BENDINELLI. That is right.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Bendinelli, in order that this committee may be absolutely certain that it is within its legal rights in asking these questions, and that there is a legal foundation laid, I would like to make this comment: That this committee will respect your rights under the fifth amendment as to any questions that might tend to incriminate you.

Senator DANIEL. That could tend to incriminate you.

Mr. GASQUE. Or that could tend to incriminate you; but that on any question where there is no conceivable means that it might or could tend to incriminate you, then the Senator, the chairman, orders you to answer that question.

If you fail to answer it, you may be held in contempt of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. BENDINELLI. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. You understand that, sir?

Mr. BENDINELLI. Yes.

Mr. GASQUE. With that in mind——

Mr. BENDINELLI. You want to ask me a question?

Mr. GASQUE. We should appreciate it if you would weigh each question carefully in your mind to determine whether it would incriminate you or would tend to incriminate you.

Mr. BENDINELLI. All right.

Senator DANIEL. All right. What is your age?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Now, in view of the caution that has been given you by counsel for this committee, and because of the fact that the committee is not of the opinion that that could, under any circumstances, tend to incriminate you, I hereby order you to answer the question.

Mr. BENDINELLI. What I am going to say? I am going to refuse to answer on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. You still refuse to answer, in spite of the fact that you have been ordered to do so, after the caution that has been given to you that you might be held in contempt of this committee if you claim the right under the fifth amendment on questions which, under no circumstances, could possibly tend to incriminate you, you still refuse to answer?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer any questions that might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you refuse to answer the question as to your age?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer the question, that it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Because it might incriminate you?

Mr. BENDINELLI. The fifth amendment on these things.

Senator DANIEL. Where were you born?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that question. It would tend to incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. The chairman orders you to answer that question.

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer any questions that might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. You understand that after you once claim the fifth amendment on a question, if the chairman feels that it is not a proper thing for you to claim the fifth amendment and you refuse to answer the question on the ground it might tend to incriminate you under any circumstances, that I will, under those circumstances, order you to answer it, and then, if you still refuse to do so, you will continue to tell us, but I don't want you to misunderstand; I do want you to know that if we are correct in asking you the question——

Mr. BENDINELLI. Senator——

Senator DANIEL. And you do not have the right to refuse to answer such questions, after being ordered to do so, that you could be liable and are probably making yourself liable for contempt of this committee and of the United States Senate.

Do you understand that?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I plead the fifth amendment; I am no lawyer; I don't know nothing about that.

Senator DANIEL. I say, do you understand what I just said?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I don't understand nothing; I just understand I won't answer any questions that might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you understand that you won't answer any questions that might incriminate you, but you understand this committee is going to rule on some of these questions, and this committee has ruled that under no circumstances could it tend to incriminate you to tell the committee your age, or where you were born. Do you understand that?

Now, do you still want to refuse to give us those answers?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to give any answer.

Senator DANIEL. You refuse to give any answers to this committee?

Mr. BENDINELLI. Senator, I gave you my name and address.

Senator DANIEL. What?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I gave you my name and address. I refuse to answer any other things that might incriminate me. I don't know anything else about it.

Senator DANIEL. I want to ask you this: Do you refuse to answer any other questions, other than your name and address?

Mr. BENDINELLI. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. And on what grounds?

Mr. BENDINELLI. Anything I might say might incriminate me; the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. Well, now, I am going to continue to ask you these questions one by one.

Mr. BENDINELLI. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. And cautioning you again that your refusal to answer some of these questions might cause you to be liable for contempt of this committee; and on each one where I think it would cause you to be liable for contempt if you do not answer, I will, after you have refused, order you to answer. Do you understand?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer anything on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you understand what I just said?

Mr. BENDINELLI. That is the only thing I understand; I don't understand nothing else.

Senator DANIEL. You what?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I don't understand nothing else; I am not a lawyer. I was called here——

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever attended school?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incrimnate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you—you appear to be well dressed. What type of suit do you have on?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever go to college?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. What business have you been engaged in?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Tell us any business in which you have ever been engaged and which did not involve any violation of the law.

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Now, I want to ask you that question again, and order you—I hereby order you to answer it: Tell us any business or businesses that you have ever been engaged in which did not involve any violation of the law.

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground I might incriminate myself.

Senator DANIEL. What type of automobile do you own?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever known Lucky Luciano?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever been engaged in any activity with Lucky Luciano?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Are you a barber?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer the question whether or not you are a barber.

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you have any interest in a barbershop here in New York?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer the question.

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Are you engaged in any legal business?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer that question.

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me; fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. You understand if you give a truthful answer to the question as to whether or not you are engaged in any type of legal business it could not possibly tend to incriminate you.

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I plead with you to answer some of these questions where you know honestly it could not possibly tend to incriminate you, because I say to you that I think you are incriminating yourself by asking for a contempt citation from the United States Senate.

I think you are asking to be held in contempt, tried, and punished by the courts of this country for refusing to give answers to this committee, and I think that is what you are doing.

I want to warn you again that on any of these questions where you know honestly in your mind truthful answers could not possibly tend to incriminate you, I plead with you to give us the answers to the questions.

I am going to go back over them. What is your age?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer any questions on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Where were you born?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer any questions on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. You refuse to answer any question on the ground it might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. BENDINELLI. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Do you mean to say that you are going to give that answer to every question I ask you, regardless of whether you believe it will incriminate you or not?

Mr. BENDINELLI. Yes, sir; I plead by the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. Your answer to that is, "Yes"; you plead by the fifth amendment?

Mr. BENDINELLI. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. That regardless of what the question is I might ask you or how relevant it might be, and how far it might be away from incriminating you or tending to incriminate you, you are still not going to answer it?

Mr. BENDINELLI. You say it and I will answer it then.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I say, I just asked you; you are not going to answer it?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. You mean you refuse to even tell me whether or not you are going to claim the fifth amendment on all questions, regardless?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you own the house in which you live?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you wear glasses?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that.

Senator DANIEL. On what ground?

Mr. BENDINELLI. On the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Bendinelli, do you honestly believe that a truthful answer to that question could under any stretch of the imagination tend to incriminate you?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on account of it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer the question.

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. You still refuse to answer even after being ordered to do so?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know anyone in New York or New Jersey who is connected with the narcotics traffic?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever used any type of narcotic drugs personally?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you know Michael Coppolla?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you have a telephone in your home?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I will be frank with you—I hate to see any person so clearly in contempt of the United States Senate as you have been in here today. I hate to see it from the standpoint of the public, but also from the standpoint of your own good.

Are you a family man?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer that.

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Are you married?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Where do you live?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I gave my address before.

Senator DANIEL. How long have you lived there?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Are you engaged in any type of business in New York City?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that, sir, on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever been engaged in the barber business?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you have any children?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever made a trip to Italy?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Do you have any relatives in Italy?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. With all the warnings I have given you, and the appeal I made to you, do you still refuse to answer all other questions that I might ask, regardless of whether or not you think they would tend to incriminate you?

Mr. BENDINELLI. You ask them and I answer them.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I just asked them.

Read the question to him, Mr. Reporter.

(Question read.)

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I want to say this to you: that I think it is relevant to this hearing, the questions I am going to ask you now, and I want to assure you that in the opinion of this committee no answer to these quesions could possibly incriminate you; that is our opinion.

But we do think it is relevant to the hearing that we are conducting, and that is, have you conferred with anyone other than your lawyer about your appearance before this committee?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer that question.

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you talked with Joseph Vento about your appearance before this committee?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you talked with Salvatore Santoro about your appearance before this committee?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you come to the committee room with Salvatore Santoro?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to aswer that.

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Did you come to the committee room with Joseph Vento?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer the question.

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever been to Washington?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever been to any city outside of New Jersey or New York for a purpose that had nothing to do with any illegal operation?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever taken a vacation——

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground that it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Would you let me finish the question. Have you ever taken a vacation anywhere from New York or New Jersey?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever attended any type of meeting outside of New Jersey or New York?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer that question.

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever attended any type of meeting in Miami, Fla?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer that question.

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you attended any type of meeting in Miami, Fla., that had no connection whatever with any criminal activity or violation of the law?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer the question.

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever been here in this courtroom before this afternoon?

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground it might incriminate me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you to answer the question.

Mr. BENDINELLI. I refuse to answer it; it might incriminate me.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman——

Senator DANIEL. Just a moment.

As I say, I regret it from your standpoint in the way in which you have acted, the contempt of this committee, and I regret it from the standpoint of the United States Government, which sends out a Senate committee, that a citizen of this country would not cooperate any more than you would have in giving answers to questions of this committee, and I am now referring not to the questions which could possibly tend to incriminate you, but to questions which are relevant to this committee's business, which could not in any way incriminate you, and which you know honestly in your heart and in your mind could not incriminate you one bit in the world.

It is a regrettable occasion, and the first time it has happened in my work on an investigating committee.

You are excused.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, this witness, Bendinelli, in the judgment of the subcommittee, should be cited for contempt for refusing to answer questions that he was ordered to answer by the chairman, the answers to which could not have possibly incriminated him. He invoked the constitutional privilege as to his age, whether he ever attended school, the type of automobile he owns, whether he is a barber, where he was born, and whether he wears glasses. I might say that he does wear glasses and that he was wearing them at the time of the hearing. Throughout the hearing, Bendinelli arrogantly rejected the plea of the subcommittee that he testify and avoid prosecution for contempt of the Senate. The chairman pleaded with him to answer the questions and not subject himself to contempt. I doubt whether any witness was ever warned more than Bendinelli not to subject himself to contempt of the United States Senate, particularly with respect to answers which could not possibly incriminate him.

The Federal Bureau of Narcotics describes Bendinelli as:

An important member of the New York 107th Street mob, whose close associates include top narcotic smugglers and interstate traffickers dealing in heroin in kilogram quantities.

I ask that the Senate act favorably on the resolution, as recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 279) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Joseph Bendinelli to answer questions before the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary, and refusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the southern district of New York, to the end that the said Joseph Bendinelli may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

DEATH PENALTY PROVISION OF NARCOTICS CONTROL BILL

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask that there be included in the RECORD at this point a letter from Marie Fitzgerald-Manion, to which are attached the signatures of 69 members of Our Lady of Peace Catholic Church of Stratford, Conn., in which the petitioners recommend the death penalty provided in the bill to control the narcotics traffic which the Senate approved recently.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRATFORD, CONN., *June 5, 1956.*

Senator PRICE DANIEL,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DANIEL: Enclosed are two papers with signatures of the women and our priest, Rev. John F. Cavanaugh, of Our Lady of Peace Catholic Church, all members of the Lady of Peace Church here in Lordship Stratford, Conn.

I am sorry, I should have had the ladies sign in ink instead of pencil, but I just passed it along to the ladies with a pencil for them to sign; and being a notary public here in Lordship, Conn., I witnessed each and every signature. They did not put their home addresses down, but all live here in Lordship, Conn.

They are all in favor of the death penalty to dope peddlers of narcotics. In fact, at our meeting we stayed much later than ever before discussing this urgent need of passing the bill for the death penalty.

Father Cavanaugh said we could really get all members of the church to sign, but that would be next week, and as I informed him this had to be sent to you immediately.

All praise to you, dear Senator DANIEL, for the great work you are doing to save our youth from being narcotic addicts.

Any answer from you I will read at our next church meeting, or our priest will read it from the altar, so all may know just what is being done to end this dope addiction.

Thanking you in advance,

Mrs. MARIE FITZGERALD MANION.

STRATFORD, CONN., *June 4, 1956.*

The undersigned are in favor of death penalty to dope peddlers amongst our teen-agers: Rev. John F. Cavanaugh, Mrs. Louis Legoure, Mrs. Thomas Bunting, Mrs. Thomas Cooney, Mrs. Claudette Palazzo, Mrs. Sisto Bardinelli, Mrs. Gertrude Clouctri, Rebrina Lockshire, Helen Conlish, Pearl Bercier, Marge Allen, Betty Tuck Achina, Wilda M. Carter, Mrs. Mary Mohr, Mrs. Lorraine Norton, Mrs. Yvonne Sorrentino, Mrs. Ann Jansson, Mrs. Joan Kyne, Mrs. Irene Schwartz, Mrs. Thomas F. Lynch, Mrs. Elinor Clancy, Mrs. L. J. Ackley, Mrs. Mary F. Stott, Mrs. Hazel C. Farmer, Mrs. Alexander Markis, Mrs. John Martino, Mrs. William Pancak, Mrs. James Canelli, Mrs. Carl de Lorenzo, Mrs. Alexander Budzinske, Mrs. Wilbert O. Jacob, Jr., Mrs. Robert Stone, Mrs. F. Hainsworth, Mrs. G. Luisi.

Mrs. Mae Priestley, Mrs. Mildred Finnegan, Mrs. J. A. Reynolds, Mrs. Oliver Martin, Mrs. Stephen Lewis, Mrs. Walter Dowse, Mrs. Joseph R. Ulichney, Mrs. Vincent V. Foley, Mrs. Vincent H. Massey, Mrs. Louis Prokop, Mrs. H. Florence Gill, Mrs. Mario Staffaroni, Mrs. Thomas Keating, Mrs. Elizabeth Mercier, Mrs. Wm. Siegler, Mrs. Pauline Hunyadi, Mrs. S. Salvaggio, Mrs. Ray Shepherd, Mrs. Milton Holcomb, Mrs. Edmund Hatch, Mrs. Vincent J. Garthwaite, Mrs. Chris Meehan, Mrs. Eileen Swaller, Mrs. Carl Valentine, Mrs. Frank Bray, Mrs. Charles J. Novey, Mrs. Fred Shannon, Mrs. Vincent Rackiewicz, Mrs. Mary C. Hawkes, Mrs. John Accard, Mrs. A. Mitchell, Mrs. A. Holt, Mrs. Margaret Mertin, Mrs. Marjorie Hessels, Marie F. Manion.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD at this point a letter from Donald J. Twiss, president of Optimist International, praising the Senate bill with reference to narcotics which was recently passed, and especially the portion of the bill which has to do with the death penalty prescribed for those who sell heroin to persons under 18 years of age.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 6, 1956.*

Senator PRICE DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DANIEL: With a deep sense of gratitude Optimist International extends congratulations to you and your subcommittee for your leadership in the fight to stop the illegal narcotics traffic. Your subcommittee's thorough investigation of the drug menace and their labors on behalf of Senate bill 3760 have wrought a major victory in the campaign to end nefarious drug operations. In keeping with their dedication to the well-being of youth, the 53,000 members of Optimist Clubs, known as "Friend of the Boy," greatly appreciate your efforts to establish the death penalty as the only effective deterrent for peddlers of dope to minors. Nothing less than the threat of capital punishment will influence the immoral and depraved agents who lure young people into the narcotics trap of living death.

At the 36th Annual Convention of Optimist International in June 1954, our organization adopted a resolution asking member clubs to urge legislation for more severe penalties against the illegal sale of narcotics. Since that time Optimist Clubs have campaigned vigorously by warning legislators and citizens of increasing drug addiction. Optimists recognized the crime of selling narcotics to minors as equal in magnitude to the crimes of murder and kidnaping. In June 1955, Optimist International passed a formal resolution endorsing the death penalty for the conviction of an illegal narcotics sale to minors.

Like all alert citizens Optimists welcome the enactment of Senate bill 3760. This bill includes many features, in addition to the death penalty, which will reduce narcotics crimes. The threat of a rising drug addiction rate and, consequently, rising crime rate will be diminished only by the passage of strong legislation. Optimist International salutes your courage in obtaining severe penalties for the dope peddler.

My very best regards.

Yours sincerely,

DONALD J. TWISS, M. D.,
President, Optimist International.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD editorials from the Washington Star, the Buffalo Courier-Express, the Lewistown (Pa.) Sentinel, the Birmingham (Ala.) Post-Herald, and the New York Mirror, supporting the bill dealing with narcotics, especially the portion concerning the death penalty in certain extreme cases.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of June 8, 1956]

PENALTIES FOR PEDDLERS

Congress is showing commendable determination to strengthen the narcotics laws so as to give convicted dope peddlers penalties commensurate with the viciousness of their crimes. Legislation to stiffen sentences and otherwise aid law enforcement officers in stamping out this slimy racket is overdue.

The Senate has passed a stern bill, including a provision for the death sentence when juries so recommend in flagrant heroin cases. Chairman DANIEL, of a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee, which recently completed an investigation of narcotics racketeering told the Senate that heroin accounts for about 80 percent of the drug addiction in America today. That means that heroin is responsible for most of the misery, degradation and crime resulting from the sale and use of dope in this country.

The House has before it a bill which also stiffens penalties for peddling, but would not provide for the death penalty. It would, however, lift to 40 years the maximum sentence for drug peddling and it would rule out suspended sentences or paroles for peddlers. These provisions would materially improve the effectiveness of enforcement agencies—although it stands to reason that a 40-year sentence is not as much of a deterrent as the threat of possible execution. However, the House bill has a number of good features, including a substantial increase in the number of Federal narcotics agents, authority for them to carry guns and make arrests in certain instances without warrants and the right to introduce in court evidence obtained by wiretapping.

A combination of the two measures that would preserve the strong provisions of both should be possible. Such legislation would strike a devastating blow at an illicit traffic that is breeding crime, moral corruption and physical suffering in most of our big cities.

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express of June 4, 1956]

MAKING PUNISHMENT FIT CRIME OF HEROIN PEDDLING

Traffic in narcotics is an old crime, but the alarming spread of the drug craze, particularly among youth, has posed a special challenge to Federal law enforcement. The Senate has passed a bill to crack down on the nationwide narcotics racket by outlawing all use of heroin and providing the death sentence for those who sell it to minors. Approval of a similar measure by the House is expected shortly.

Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas, who sponsored the Senate bill and headed a narcotics investigation conducted by a Judiciary Subcommittee, called the measure "the strongest blow against the cancerous narcotics traffic that has ever been passed." It

not only will compel removal of heroin from the market, but will make smuggling and selling heroin subject to severe penalties, ranging from 5 years to life imprisonment. Juries would be permitted to recommend the death sentence for sale of heroin to persons under 18. The minimum penalty for sales to juveniles would be 10 years in prison.

Because heroin has no medical use that cannot be served better by some other drug, all heroin now legally held by doctors and others would be sold to the Government. This is well in order, for there probably is no drug more sinisterly habit-forming and more harmful in its effects. Unsuspected addiction has precipitated stark—sometimes irremediable—tragedy in many homes, bringing youthful victims to a state of physical and mental agony like protracted, living death. Anyone who reduces a fellow human being to such misery for profit surely cannot expect justice to be tempered with mercy in the law's dealing with him.

[From the Lewistown (Pa.) Sentinel of May 31, 1956]

DEATH AND NARCOTICS

The Senate Judiciary Committee has unanimously approved a bill which provides for the death penalty—in some cases—for violating the narcotics laws.

The bill, authored by Senator PRICE DANIEL, Texas Democrat, provides for a possible death sentence for the third offense in the smuggling of heroin, and allows juries to recommend the death sentence for the sale of heroin to youths under 18 years of age.

In addition, the bill stiffens penalties for other violations, and sets the minimum penalty for dope sales to minors at 10 years. The bill would require that all doctors maintaining a supply of heroin sell their drug to the United States and that it hereafter be banned from the country.

Heroin cannot accomplish anything which certain other drugs, which are not as adaptable to abuse, can do usually well.

The Daniel bill is long overdue. The American people are in favor of stiffer penalties for convicted dope peddlers, and especially those who sell dope to youngsters, or who repeat their offenses. In many cases, the death sentence would be desirable from the standpoint of protecting society in general.

Not only do we hope for speedy passage of the bill, but we hope to see its use by the judges, in a stern fashion, in the near future.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) Post-Herald of June 2, 1956]

A MUCH-NEEDED LAW

Dope pushers deserve the most drastic penalties. Selling their narcotics, getting rich off the addicts they create, they and their trade are at the root of much of the crime of this country.

They are murderers by indirection, degraders of men and women and school children.

This week the Senate passed a bill that strikes the most severe blow any legislative body has ever directed at the dope traffic. Its penalties are severe; its terms permit the death sentence under certain conditions.

Moreover, the measure strengthens the arm of our Federal Narcotics Bureau, giving it more agents, greater strength to combat the dope pushers, added powers to help detect this horrible trade.

We hope the House passes a similar bill, and that this Congress with White House concurrence puts on the books a new narcotics law that will help all Federal law enforcement agencies do a better job of suppressing the narcotics traffic. Such a law will encourage the States adequately to arm themselves against this growing evil.

[From the New York Mirror of June 2, 1956]

FOR THOSE WHO SELL DEATH

Why not death for the sellers of death? The Senate poses that question in passing and sending to the House a bill setting up new and stiffer penalties for the creatures engaged in the sale of narcotics.

Sponsored by Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas, the measure permits the death penalty in certain extreme cases. It could be imposed, if recommended by juries, upon sellers of heroin to juveniles, or upon the third conviction of dope peddlers or smugglers.

The bill aims to completely outlaw heroin, the narcotic used by 80 percent of all addicts in the United States. Possession under any circumstances would be made illegal except under special regulations governing scientific research.

The merchant of narcotics profits by the destruction of human souls as well as bodies. Society should have the means also to destroy him. The House, which has its own narcotics control bill, should concur in the capital feature of the Senate bill. Those who sell death should know that they risk death.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a number of other editorials from States throughout the Nation concerning the narcotics bill recently passed by the Senate and concerning tightening our laws on the subject.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 4, 1956]

THE TRAFFIC IN HEROIN

No one can read without indignation and horror the report on the nationwide investigation of the illicit narcotic traffic which was authorized last year by the Senate. The findings justify two bills which are now before Congress. One has been passed by the Senate; the other has been reported by the House Ways and Means Committee. Both would stiffen the penalties now imposed for trafficking in narcotics, the Senate bill going so far as to impose life imprisonment and the death penalty in some circumstances.

The statistics used to justify these Draconian bills are appalling. We have more drug addicts than all other Western countries combined. There are at least 60,000 in the United States, and 13 percent are under 21 years of age. Fifty percent or more of all crimes committed in our larger cities and 25 percent of those committed in the Nation are attributed to the illicit drug business. An average of 2,000 persons are arrested every month on narcotic charges. The worst feature of the traffic is its contagious character. Addicts themselves have testified that each has corrupted at least four friends. Despite the penalties imposed, the traffic is increasing, and with it crime in general.

If the Federal Criminal Code is stiffened in the manner proposed by both branches of Congress there is some reason to believe that heavy drug profits—as much as 1,000 percent—will not be as tempting as they are. Long prison terms will remove some traffickers from the underworld organization. Experience has shown that condign punishment has some deterrent effect on drug traffickers. The Canadian Senate's narcotic investigating committee is as convinced of this as are the Members of the Senate's Judiciary Committee.

The bills now before Congress are likely to be passed in some form, with the probable elimination of the death penalty for third offenders. The Attorney General's office is in favor of a more stringent narcotics law but believes that convictions will be more difficult to obtain because of intensified resistance to prosecution that violators will turn to forms of narcotics other than heroin and marihuana, that the courts should be given more discretion than they would be allowed in imposing sentences under the Senate bill, and, finally, that some of the penalties if adopted may violate constitutional rights.

But these are risks we have to take. The traffic in narcotics touches the very bottom of criminal depravity. It is so iniquitous, morally so corrupting, that dealers and addicts cannot be allowed to take advantage of the legal technicalities still open to them.

[From the Albany Times-Union of June 3, 1956]

SELLING DEATH

Why not death for the sellers of death? The Senate poses that question in passing and sending to the House a bill setting up new and stiffer penalties for the creatures engaged in the sale of narcotics.

Sponsored by Senator PRICE DANIEL (Democrat, Texas) the measure permits the death penalty in certain extreme cases. It could be imposed, if recommended by juries, upon sellers of heroin to juveniles, or upon the third conviction of dope peddlers or smugglers.

The bill aims to completely outlaw heroin, the narcotic used by 80 percent of all addicts in the United States. Possession under any circumstances would be made illegal except under special regulations governing scientific research.

The merchant of narcotics profits by the destruction of human souls as well as bodies. Society should have the means also to destroy him. The House, which has its own narcotics-control bill, should concur in the capital feature of the Senate bill. Those who sell death should know that they risk death.

[From the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise of June 2, 1956]

BILLS TO PUNISH DRUG PEDDLERS

Senator PRICE DANIEL of Texas has a number of substantial achievements to his credit as a public official, but if he had never done anything else but lead the fight in Congress to put narcotics peddlers and smugglers behind prison bars for long terms or even execute them, he would deserve at least a footnote to history. Representative HALE BOGGS of Louisiana, author of a House bill similar to that of the Senate, also deserves much credit.

These two Members of Congress are determined to drive the drug peddler and the drug smuggler out of business, if that is possible. They may not succeed in accomplishing this purpose entirely, but since Senator DANIEL himself declares that the Senate bill is "the strongest blow against the cancerous narcotics traffic that has ever been passed," the drug traffic will not be as profitable or as safe in the future as it has been in the past, provided Congress enacts the Senate-House bills.

It is no reflection upon Harry J. Anslinger, United States Commissioner of Narcotics, or his department that drug peddlers are far too numerous in this country. Pursuit and prosecution of drug smugglers and peddlers has been conducted relentlessly by Federal agents, but they were handicapped in large measure because existing laws for dealing with these human vultures are too lenient.

Mr. Anslinger, therefore, approves the legislation pending in Congress which will make the illicit drug traffic hazardous with a "last mile walk" for those who persist in following it.

As for the complaint of Senator MORSE, of Oregon, who objects to the death penalty in the proposed legislation on the ground that a human life should be taken "only before the bar of God's judgment," a suitable reply

might be: The drug peddler who destroys the souls and bodies of youth, and in the process takes many lives, defies the laws of both God and man.

[From the Olympia (Wash.) Olympian of May 29, 1956]

CRACKING DOWN ON DOPE

At long last a bill with teeth in it has been put forward in the Senate to curb the frightening narcotic addiction that has spread across the country, particularly among young people.

Designed by a special subcommittee, the legislation was introduced by its chairman, Senator PRICE DANIEL, a Texas Democrat. The bill's sharpest edge which calls for the death penalty, at the discretion of a jury, for those who sell heroin to persons under age 18.

DANIEL has indicated there will be similar legislation from the House of Representatives, and he expects action on the bill to be taken during the current session.

That will hardly be soon enough. Every day that addicts and dope pushers roam the streets the well-being of our communities is in danger. For it has been proved time and again that all forms of crime are tied in with narcotics. And often it's the kiss of death.

The Daniel proposal follows nearly a year of nationwide hearings which made it brutally clear that there was no time to waste in cracking down.

The bill would completely outlaw heroin in the United States on the grounds that it is the "worst and most prevalent drug sold on the illicit market, and it has no medical use which cannot be served by other drugs."

Other important provisions include:

Permission to wiretap telephone calls between narcotic traffickers when authorized by a Federal court.

Penalties for the smuggling and sale of heroin ranging from 5 to 10 years for the first offenders up to life imprisonment or the death penalty for third offenders.

This is one piece of legislation to which Congress might well give immediate attention. The penalties may be stiff. But they're nowhere near as stiff as the life-wrecking jolt of a narcotic needle.

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen-Patriot of May 23, 1956]

CRACKING DOWN ON DRUGS

The Judiciary Committee of the Senate has put its stamp of approval on the toughest piece of antinarcotics legsislation ever to be considered by the Congress. Over on the House side of the Capitol the Ways and Means Committee has agreed unanimously to recommend stiffer penalties for those convicted in dope traffic cases.

The interest by the committees in the subject gives a measure of hope that more effective laws to curtail this fiendish trade may find their way into the books.

Particularly significant is the fact that the committees are basing their recommendations on an extensive study of the cause and effects of the illicit drug trade. A Senate subcommittee has been particularly active along this line. The members have seen with their own eyes what happens to individuals who become victims of narcotics. They feel the proper revulsion toward those who deal in the "living death."

There also is evidence that the views of Federal Narcotics Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger, a highly qualified and dedicated public servant, are being given more weight than ever before.

Mr. Anslinger probably knows the subject better than any living American, but his pleas for realistic laws, vigorous prosecution, and stiff penalties often have fallen on deaf ears. Now, at last, he is getting attention.

The control measures approved by the Senate committee are extreme, to say the least. They include the death penalty for persons convicted of selling heroin to juveniles, and for three-time offenders in heroin smuggling and peddling.

Anyone who has studied the effects of the drug traffic is likely to agree with the Senate committee. The death penalty for murder long has been more or less accepted as proper. The drug "pusher" is worse than a murderer. He affects more lives—destroys them although the victim may continue to breathe.

If capital punishment, life sentences, and other extreme measures are necessary to kill the illicit drug trade, then they should be used.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of May 24, 1956]

CRACKING DOWN ON DOPE

Connecticut law, quoted under the cartoon on this page today, is stiff. Twenty years for anyone convicted of peddling drugs to a minor on the first offense; life imprisonment for subsequent offenses. These depraved parasites, peddlers of narcotics, are operating in this State. They deserve no sympathy and the courts, we are confident, will give them the full treatment when brought before them.

Congress is now considering legislation to increase penalties for narcotic violations. The legislators are being asked to adopt measures even tougher than those against subversion, treason, and espionage. A bill unanimously favored by the Senate Judiciary Committee on May 14 provides death sentences for some offenders and would outlaw all uses of heroin, the deadly narcotic which seems to be in commonest use by unfortunate addicts.

The proposed law would permit judges to impose the death penalty on persons convicted of selling the stuff to minors, and upon three-time offenders in heroin smuggling and peddling. We would approve of that penalty to first-time smugglers, since they are behind the terrible traffic, in a big way.

Doctors no longer need heroin in medical practice. Under the new measure all physicians who have any would be required to sell it to the Government.

Equally strong legislation is appearing in the House. The following recommendations were unanimously approved by a Ways and Means Subcommittee on May 8:

Increase minimum and mandatory sentences and maximum permissible sentences for traffickers; make penalties more severe for sales to minors; increase maximum permissible sentences in all cases; remove suspension of sentence and probation for traffickers; grant immunity from prosecution to witnesses; permit use of wiretapping information in drug and marihuana cases; increase United States control of barbiturates and amphetamines.

In 1951 the Senate Crime Investigating Committee headed by Senator KEFAUVER urged penalties for 20 years to life, without probation for adults who peddle narcotics to youths under 17. No action was taken. We would like to see this provision incorporated into any new Federal law, increasing the age from 17 to 21.

Stiffer terms must be given to the traffickers They cannot peddle drugs in prison, and they should be kept behind bars until every day of the sentence is completed. No jury should hesitate to recommend the limit when a narcotic peddler is on trial.

The first thing to do is to catch these criminals, all of them, of every degree, then give them the limit, and we may be on the way to drying up the source of this evil. The situation should be made so tough that no man, not even the lowest, will dare enter the illicit business.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Tribune of May 22, 1956]

STIFFER PENALTIES STUDIED AS NARCOTICS TRAFFIC CURB

Seizure of a record load of marijuana at the border here recently draws attention to measures that are being studied to curb the Nation's menacing dope traffic.

Stiffer penalties, including the death sentence, are being urged in Congress.

The Senate Judiciary Committee on May 14 unanimously approved a bill providing for the death sentence for some narcotics offenders.

It would outlaw all use of heroin, most widely used and potent drug in the vicious traffic. Doctors would be required to sell all their legally held supplies to the Government.

Authorities have long pointed out that there is no need for this enslaving drug in view of the discovery of many other and safer pain relievers.

The death penalty provision is aimed at the most sinister aspect of the problem—the sale of heroin to juveniles.

In the Senate bill, juries would be permitted to impose the death penalty on persons convicted of selling to juveniles and on three-time offenders in heroin smuggling and peddling.

The House is considering equally stringent measures.

A Ways and Means Committee on May 8 unanimously agreed to recommend increasing both minimum mandatory sentences and maximum permissible sentences for traffickers in narcotics and marijuana.

In addition to harsher penalties, the committees reflect a mounting concern over the law enforcement officials in their constant war on illegal dope.

It favored granting immunity from prosecution to witnesses; permitting the use of wiretapping information in narcotics and marijuana cases, and increasing Federal control of barbiturates and amphetamines.

These actions by Senate and House committees reflect a mounting concern over the narcotics problem.

In 1951, the Senate Crime Investigating Committee urged immunity grants to key witnesses in Federal cases. It also recommended penalties of 20 years to life, without probation, for adults peddling narcotics to youths under 17.

But Congress at that time showed no readiness to go along even with those comparatively moderate measures. It did, however, pass the Boggs Act, tightening penalties for violations of the Harrison Narcotic Act of 1914.

The measure made prison sentences of from 2 to 5 years mandatory for second offenders and sentence of 10 to 20 years on third or subsequent convictions.

There are differences of opinion about the effectiveness of stiffer penalties as a deterrent.

Some opposition is based on the theory that the stiffer the penalties, the less likely juries are to convict, although the Federal Bureau of Narcotics reports that experience under the Boggs Act has not supported that theory.

Harry J. Anslinger, Federal Narcotics Commissioner, is a strong advocate of the hit-'em-harder school. He believes that the best way to curb the drug trade is to put the convicted trafficker out of business for longer periods of time.

The enormous profits to be made in this filthy business will always seem to make the risks worth the try if peddlers are convinced they will get off with paying an insignificant fine or spending a few months in prison.

This unsavory fact lends most weight to the current efforts to crack down harder—to persuade even the criminal that the dope trade doesn't pay.

[From the Tiffin (Ohio) Advertiser-Tribune of May 16, 1956]

IT'S ABOUT TIME

At long last a no-holds-barred bill has been put forward in the Senate to curb the frightening narcotic addiction that has spread across the country, particularly among young people.

Sponsored by a special subcommittee, the legislation was introduced by its chairman, Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas. The bill's sharpest edge is a provision which calls for the death penalty, at the discretion of a jury, for those who sell heroin to persons under age 18.

DANIEL has indicated there will be similar legislation from the House of Representatives, and he expects action on the bill to be taken during this session.

That will hardly be soon enough. Every day that addicts and dope peddlers roam the streets the well-being of our communities is in danger. For all forms of crime have been proven to be tied in with narcotics. And often it's the kiss of death.

The Daniel proposal follows nearly a year of nationwide hearings which made it brutally clear that there was no time to waste in cracking down.

The bill would completely outlaw heroin in the United States on the grounds that it is the "worst and most prevalent drug sold on the illicit market, and it has no medical use which cannot be served by other drugs."

Other important provisions include:

Permission to wiretap telephone calls between narcotic traffickers when authorized by a Federal court.

Penalties for the smuggling and sale of heroin ranging from 5 to 10 years for first offenders up to life imprisonment or the death penalty for third offenders.

This is one piece of legislation to which Congress might well give immediate attention. The penalties may be stiff. But they're nowhere near as stiff as the life-wrecking jolt of a narcotic needle.

[From the Savannah News of May 24, 1956]

CONGRESS CRACKS DOWN ON DRUGS

Subversion, espionage, and treason are very definite threats to this country. They are something which should be steadily guarded against every day and every hour.

But there are many things which should be even more closely guarded against than these things. There are things which undermine the national conscience, the national character, and the national welfare even more seriously than the above-mentioned evils. What we refer to specifically is dope. Whatever evils we may lay at the doors of communism, they still fall under the heading of ideology. One cannot, in justice, completely condemn another human being for adhering to a different political philosophy. Such reasoning is an integral part of our own democratic formula.

But there are crimes which supersede this category. One is the subversion of humanity by artificial means. Such lays the groundwork for all the evils to which man is heir. And of all the means by which humankind is traduced, there is none more evil than dope. There is no sin to which man is prone that is not the more easily promoted by the use of narcotics. There is no more sure incentive to crime than addiction to drugs.

For this reason Congress currently is being urged to adopt antinarcotic measures even more stringent than the laws against subversion, espionage and treason.

For example, a bill, unanimously approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee would provide death sentences for some narcotics offenders and outlaw all use of heroin. It would permit juries to impose the death penalty on persons convicted of selling heroin to juveniles, and on three-time offenders in heroin smuggling and peddling. It would require sale of all heroin legally held by doctors to the Government.

Legislation equally drastic is likewise forthcoming in the House. A Ways and Means subcommittee has unanimously agreed to recommend: (1) Increasing both minimum mandatory sentences and maximum permissible sentences for traffickers in narcotics and marihuana; (2) more severe penalties for adult traffickers selling to minors; (3) an increase in maximum permissible sentences in all cases; (4) removal of suspension of sentence and probation for traffickers; (5) granting of immunity from prosecution to witnesses; (6) permitting the use of wiretapping information in narcotics and marihuana cases; and (7) implementing of Federal control of barbiturates and amphetamines.

Various bills to implement this agreement have been literally pouring into the hopper. Some apply directly to the older type of narcotics, some are directly aimed at the newer barbiturates and amphetamines. But, by obvious inference, all the bills mean the same thing.

For contrast, only the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 applies anything as severe as the death penalty to peacetime espionage. It will be recalled that the Rosenbergs were executed in 1953 for wartime activities which violated the Espionage Act of 1917.

There is no glossing over the fact that narcotics have been one of the greatest incentives to United States crime. It is easily demonstrable from police files of major American cities that drug addicts are responsible for a great majority of the crimes committed. It follows naturally, therefore, that if we can cut off the sources of drug supply that we can control crime.

And certainly, with crime occupying the prominent place it does in our American scheme of things, the time when we should exercise sterner controls is long past. And the best of these, to our reasoning, is to control the drug traffic. For, as we see the matter, there is no criminal more reprehensible than the trafficker in drugs.

[From the Hannibal (Mo.) Courier Post of May 21, 1956]

BATTLING NARCOTICS

Congress appears to be set to enact a law which would give the Federal Government a stricter and more effective weapon to beat down the peddling of narcotics. A measure has been pushed along in the Senate to curb the frightening addiction of drugs which has continued to grow in this country. Especially alarming has been the trend of young people to their use.

A subcommittee of the Senate has sponsored a bill that bears the name of Senator PRICE DANIEL, of Texas, chairman of the group.

The sharpest teeth of the bill are contained in a provision which calls for the death penalty, at the discretion of a jury, for those who sell heroin to persons under age 18.

DANIEL has indicated there will be similar legislation from the House of Representatives, and he expects action on the bill to be taken during this session.

The Daniel proposal follows nearly a year of nationwide hearings which made it brutally clear that there was no time to waste in cracking down.

The bill would completely outlaw heroin in the United States on the grounds that it is the worst and most prevalent drug sold on the illicit market, and it has no medical use which cannot be served by other drugs.

Other important provisions include:

Permission to wiretap telephone calls between narcotic traffickers when authorized by a Federal court.

Penalties for the smuggling and sale of heroin ranging from 5 to 10 years for first offenders up to life imprisonment or the death penalty for third offenders.

This is one piece of legislation to which Congress might well give immediate attention. The penalties may be stiff. But they're nowhere near as stiff as the life-wrecking jolt of a narcotic needle.

[From the Pulaski (Va.) Southwest Times of May 21, 1956]

CRACKING DOWN ON DOPE

At long last a no-holds-barred bill has been put forward in the Senate to curb the frightening narcotic addiction that has spread across the country, particularly among young people.

Sponsored by a special subcommittee, the legislation was introduced by its chairman, Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas. The bill's sharpest edge is a provision which calls for the death penalty, at the discretion of a jury, for those who sell heroin to persons under age 18.

DANIEL has indicated there will be similar legislation from the House of Representatives, and he expects action on the bill to be taken during this session.

That will hardly be soon enough. Every day that addicts and dope peddlers roam the streets the well-being of our communities is in danger. For all forms of crime have been proven to be tied in with narcotics. And often it's the kiss of death.

The Daniel proposal follows nearly a year of nationwide hearings which made it brutally clear that there was no time to waste in cracking down.

The bill would completely outlaw heroin in the United States on the grounds that it is the worst and most prevalent drug sold on the illicit market, and it has no medical use which cannot be served by other drugs.

Other important provisions include:

Permission to wiretap telephone calls between narcotic traffickers when authorized by a Federal court.

Penalties for the smuggling and sale of heroin ranging from 5 to 10 years for first offenders up to life imprisonment or the death penalty for third offenders.

This is one piece of legislation to which Congress might well give immediate attention. The penalties may be stiff. But they're nowhere near as stiff as the life-wrecking jolt of a narcotic needle.

[From the Salt Lake City Tribune of May 21, 1956]

DOPE PROBLEM CALLS FOR SEVERE PENALTIES

The Daniel bill to stiffen penalties for illicit narcotics traffic is a good one, we believe. It fills a serious need but is not so extreme as to defeat its primary purpose, which is to dry up the sources of supply of heroin and other addicting drugs.

The measure as approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee appears to be superior to the House committee-advanced bill in that penalties are more severe. It is the product of extensive investigations by the Subcommittee on the Federal Criminal Code. Hearings by this group revealed that known drug addicts in the United States outnumber those in all the other western countries combined. One out of every 3,000 persons is addicted, and the number has been increasing since World War II.

Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, member of the committee, said that drug addiction and traffic are responsible for 50 percent of the crime in the country. It is inevitable, he warned, that the problem will become progressively worse unless more effective treatment procedures are provided and enforcement is tightened.

The Senate bill would outlaw all use of heroin, even that now in the hands of doc-

tors. Heroin, a morphine derivative and one of the drugs used most by addicts, serves no medical purpose which cannot be accomplished better by some other drugs, the subcommittee reported. This was bitterly disputed last year by the British Medical Association, which urged continued use in hospitals to deaden pain of certain serious diseases and injuries. The association acknowledged, however, that heroin used medically can cause strong addiction quickly.

The Daniel bill would increase penalties for smuggling and selling heroin as follows: first offense, 5 to 10 years in prison; second offense, 10 to 30 years; and third offense, life imprisonment or death upon specific recommendation of a jury. Persons convicted of transmitting heroin to persons under 18 years old would be subject to a minimum penalty of 10 years and a maximum of death, "if the jury in its discretion shall so direct."

No punishment is too severe for dope peddlers who prey on children and teenagers. Experience in some States with the death penalty for kidnaping, rape, and other crimes has shown, however, that juries are sometimes reluctant to convict if the penalty is really extreme. Penalties in this bill are increased with each offense. It is hard to believe many juries would have much compassion for a dope peddler convicted the third time.

The bill also provides for more severe penalties for smuggling marihuana, and it gives additional authority to the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Bureau of Customs to deal more effectively with the problem. It eliminates some redtape in dealing with traffickers, provides for excluding or deporting of alien narcotics offenders, and directs the Narcotics Bureau to maintain a central clearing house of information on addicts and former violators.

The bill aims only at enforcement. It will be a serious mistake if anyone is lulled into believing that it would attack the various other phases of the complex problem. The treatment of drug addicts remains a mountainous responsibility. International cooperation is the only overall solution, but it will take many years, under the best of conditions, to work out a compact and secure real cooperation and enforcement on a global basis.

Since narcotic addiction often starts with a desperate inner drive to escape boredom or an unsatisfactory way of life, the campaign must go on to relieve social conditions that contribute to this and other manifestations of maladjustment. Crowded, impoverished slums, racial tensions, unhappy home and school, and community experiences all contribute to a deep-seated social malaise.

We must tighten restrictions and make penalties more severe but we also must do all we can to eliminate the conditions which lower human resistance to all kinds of pleasure poisons.

[From the Aberdeen (Wash.) World of May 18, 1956]

CRACKDOWN ON DOPE

At long last a no-holds-barred bill has been put forward in the Senate to curb the frightening narcotic addiction that has spread across the country, particularly among young people.

Sponsored by a special subcommittee, the legislation was introduced by its chairman, Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, Texas. The bill's sharpest edge is a provision which calls for the death penalty, at the discretion of a jury, for those who sell heroin to persons under age of 18.

DANIEL has indicated there will be similar legislation from the House of Representatives, and he expects action on the bill to be taken during this session.

That will hardly be soon enough. Every day that addicts and dope peddlers roam the streets the well-being of our communities is in danger. For all forms of crime have been proven to be tied in with narcotics. And often it's the kiss of death.

The Daniel proposal follows nearly a year of nationwide hearings which made it brutally clear that there was no time to waste in cracking down.

The bill would completely outlaw heroin in the United States on the grounds that it is the "worst and most prevalent drug sold on the illicit market, and it has no medical use which cannot be served by other drugs."

Other important provisions include: Permission to wiretap telephone calls between narcotic traffickers when authorized by a Federal court; penalties for the smuggling and sale of heroin ranging from 5 to 10 years for first offenders up to life imprisonment or the death penalty for third offenders.

This is one piece of legislation to which Congress might well give immediate attention. The penalties may be stiff, but they're nowhere near as harsh as crime and death from dope.

[From the High Point (N. C.) Enterprise of May 22, 1956]

CRACKING DOWN ON DRUGS

Congress is being urged to adopt antinarcotics measures even more stringent than laws against subversion, treason, and espionage.

A bill unanimously approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee on May 14 would provide death sentences for some narcotics offenders and outlaw all use of heroin. It would permit juries to impose the death penalty on persons convicted of selling heroin to juveniles and on three-time offenders in heroin smuggling and peddling. It would require sale of all heroin legally held by doctors to the Government.

Legislation equally drastic is coming up in the House. A Ways and Means Subcommittee on May 8 unanimously agreed to recommend:

1. Increasing both minimum mandatory sentences and maximum permissible sentences for traffickers in narcotics and marihuana; 2, more severe penalties for adult traffickers selling to minors; 3, an increase in maximum permissible sentences in all cases; 4, removal of suspension of sentence and probation for traffickers; 5, granting of immunity from prosecution to witnesses; 6, permitting the use of wiretapping information in narcotics and marihuana cases; 7, increasing Federal control of barbiturates and amphetamines.

Bills to implement this agreement have been pouring into the hopper. Some apply directly to narcotics and marihuana; the others, to barbiturates and amphetamines.

For contrast, only the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 applies the death penalty to peacetime espionage. (The Rosenbergs were executed in 1953 for wartime activities which violated the Espionage Act of 1917.) However, Congress in 1953 extended the drastic wartime espionage-sabotage penalties, including the death penalty, for the duration of the Korean emergency and 6 months thereafter.

An immunity law adopted by Congress in 1954 limits such grants to witnesses whose testimony may be needed in cases affecting the national security. Even so, congressional committees or United States attorneys must petition Federal courts for the right to grant immunity from prosecution.

The House in 1954 voted to authorize wiretapping in national security cases, as requested by Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr. But it tacked on an amendment prohibiting wiretapping unless authorized by a Federal court, and that provision made the legislation unacceptable to the Justice Department.

The Senate Crime Investigating Committee, headed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER Democrat, of Tennessee, in 1951 urged immunity grants to key witnesses in Federal cases, also penalties of 20 years to life, without probation, for adults peddling narcotics to youths under 17.

No action was taken on these recommendations, but at the same session Congress did put through the Boggs Act tightening penalties for violations of the Harrison Narcotic Act of 1914. The measure made prison sentences of from 2 to 5 years mandatory for second offenders; sentences of 10 to 20 years on third or subsequent convictions.

Some opposition to stiffer penalties for drug peddlers is based on the theory that the stiffer the penalties the less likely juries will be to convict. The Federal Bureau of Narcotics, however, reports that experience under the Boggs Act has not supported that theory.

Federal Narcotics Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger continues to maintain that the drug trade can best be curbed by putting the convicted trafficker out of business for longer periods of time.

[From the Greeley (Colo.) Tribune of May 19, 1956]

THE DEADLY CHAIN

A Senate judiciary subcommittee has recommended a crackdown on violators of Federal narcotics laws. In a bill submitted after a thorough study of dope peddling and addiction in the United States, the subcommittee asks for much stiffer penalties than the law now provides.

The measure would permit juries to mete out life prison terms or the death sentence for a third conviction of selling heroin or smuggling it into the country. It would make the death sentence possible for those convicted of selling dope to children. The subcommittee also wants to broaden the investigative powers of the Federal Customs Bureau and Narcotics Bureau to make apprehension of dope peddlers more certain.

The need for tougher laws and stricter enforcement against the devilish crime that leads to dope addiction has been apparent for a long time. The subcommittee recommendations, based on evidence gathered in extensive hearings, merit the most serious consideration.

Strong laws and vigorous enforcement are not the whole answer to the dope problem, however. There is a deadly chain, from the smuggler to the peddler to the often innocent victim who may in turn become a thief or peddler, that must be broken. Homes, schools, and churches can do much to help break the chain. They can do their part by showing children and young people the terrible consequences of addiction.

Meanwhile, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee bill, or one much like it, should be quickly passed.

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Courier of June 3, 1956]

A MUCH-NEEDED LAW

Dope pushers deserve the most drastic penalties.

Selling their narcotics, getting rich off the addicts they create, they and their trade are at the spot of much of the crime of this country.

They are murderers by indirection, degraders of men and women and schoolchildren.

Yesterday the Senate passed a bill that strikes the most severe blow any legislative body has even directed at the dope traffic. Its penalties are severe; its terms permit the death sentence under certain conditions.

Moreover, the measure strengthens the arm of our Federal Narcotics Bureau, giving it more agents, greater strength to combat the

dope pushers, added powers to help detect this horrible trade.

We hope the House passes a similar bill, and that this Congress with White House concurrence puts on the books a new narcotics law that will help all Federal law enforcement agencies do a better job of suppressing the narcotics traffic. Such a law will encourage the States adequately to arm themselves against this growing evil.

[From the San Bernardino (Calif.) Telegram of May 31, 1956]

TOUGH ON DOPE SELLERS

Legislators in Washington are taking an approach to the narcotics situation that could gather momentum and lead to a nationwide crackdown on the evils of dope peddling.

Disturbed by the growth of the evil in recent years, Congress is being urged to adopt antinarcotics measures even more stringent than laws against subversion, treason, and espionage.

A bill unanimously approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee just a few days ago would provide death sentences for some narcotics offenders and outlaw all use of heroin.

This measure would permit juries to impose the death penalty on persons convicted of selling heroin to juveniles and on three-time offenders in heroin smuggling and peddling. It would require sale of all heroin legally held by doctors to the Government.

Legislation equally drastic is coming up in the House. A Ways and Means subcommittee on May 8 unanimously agreed to recommend:

Increasing both minimum mandatory sentences and maximum permissible sentences for traffickers in narcotics and marihuana; more severe penalties for adult traffickers selling to minors; an increase in maximum permissible sentences in all cases; removal of suspension of sentence and probation for traffickers; granting of immunity from prosecution to witnesses; permitting the use of wiretapping information in narcotics and marihuana cases; increasing Federal control over barbiturates and amphetamines.

Bills to implement this agreement have been pouring into the hopper. Some apply directly to narcotics and marihuana; others to the less potent, but just as harmful drugs.

A Los Angeles County grand jury last week heard a "get tough" plea in coping with the narcotics menace. It was asked to urge the Federal and local governments to adopt more stringent regulations and to provide for stiffer court penalties. Two recent San Bernardino County raids by State and local officers brings the problem closer to home.

Aroused public and official opinion may get the drastic measures which seem to be in order. For example, the stringent proposals developing in Congress are equal, and in some cases exceed, the laws that protect the security of the Nation. Only the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 applies the death penalty to peacetime espionage.

As for immunity from prosecution, a law adopted by Congress in 1954 limits such grants to witnesses whose testimony may be needed in cases affecting the national security.

The House in 1954 voted to authorize wiretapping in national security cases, as requested by Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr. But it tacked on an amendment prohibiting wiretapping unless authorized by a Federal court, and that provision made the legislation unacceptable to the Justice Department.

The Senate Crime Investigating Committee headed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee Democrat, in 1951 urged immunity grants to key witnesses in Federal cases and also penalties of 20 years to life, without probation, for adults peddling narcotics to youths under 17.

No action was taken on these recommendations, but at the same session Congress did put through the Boggs Act tightening penalties for violations of the Harrison Narcotics Act of 1914. The measure made prison sentences of from 2 to 5 years mandatory for second offenders; sentences of 10 to 20 years on subsequent convictions.

Some opposition to stiffer penalties for drug peddlers is based on the theory that the stiffer the penalties the less likely juries will be to convict. The Federal Bureau of Narcotics, however, reports that experience under the Boggs Act has not supported that theory.

Many thousands of persons have been wrecked by dope, and other thousands will be unless it is curbed. Stiff penalties are in order.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register of June 3, 1956]

WAR ON DOPE

The Senate has passed what has been described as the toughest dope bill in the Nation's history. It increases penalties all along the line for narcotics violations, outlaws the use of heroin even for medical purposes, and makes possible execution for certain extreme offenses.

A very similar measure has been approved by the House Rules Committee and is expected to pass without difficulty this week.

These two bills represent congressional reaction to evidence of the ravages of the dope traffic presented during extensive hearings in both branches.

Quite obviously, the use of narcotics has reached grave proportions and has wreaked havoc in our society to move lawmakers to such extreme steps.

It is reasonable to assume that harsher penalties and increased police activity made possible by whatever bill finally is decided upon will aid in the dope-traffic war. But a tough law and the addition of a few more Federal agents, even a great many more agents, will not of themselves prove adequate. If we are to make headway toward stamping out this great evil every police department in the land, every school authority, and every right-thinking parent must lend a hand, as the distressing fact is that the traffic has reached down to our school children.

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader of June 1, 1956]

CURBING THE DOPE TRAFFIC

The United States Senate has approved a bill to provide the death penalty for persons convicted of selling heroin to teen-agers. That's proper and we hope it becomes the law of the land promptly. The laws and the courts have in many instances been far too lenient with dope peddlers and a change in attitude is long overdue. The narcotic racket can be controlled if we apply sufficient pressure on the proper authorities and enact the right kind of laws.

[From the Fitchburg (Mass.) Sentinel of May 25, 1956]

WAR AGAINST DOPE PEDDLING

There is a definite need for better Federal and State cooperation in the war against illicit narcotics. A proposed Federal bill, being prepared by a committee headed by Senator PRICE DANIEL, of Texas, is designed to strengthen the narcotics laws while recognizing the rights and concurrent jurisdiction of the States.

Until recent years both Federal and State laws in this field fell far short of requirements. Too, enforcement often was lax, and was marked by insufficient coordination between officers on the various levels of government. Relatively few officers, in fact, had the special training needed for such enforcement.

The last decade has brought the enactment of tighter laws by Congress and by some of the States. Yet there are still loopholes, and Senator DANIEL'S committee is trying to plug them. We wish the committee success in its efforts.

[From the Houston Post of June 3, 1956]

NARCOTICS BILL, DUE FOR EARLY ENACTMENT, TO CURB DOPE RACKET

A long-overdue law that will deal adequately with dope peddling for the sinister curse that it is, now seems assured of enactment before Congress adjourns—probably in the next couple of weeks.

Senator PRICE DANIEL'S drastic bill outlawing all use of heroin and prescribing penalties ranging from 5 years' imprisonment to a possible death sentence cleared the Senate Thursday. At the same time the House Ways and Means Committee recommended a basically similar measure, and its author, Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, expects House approval next week.

This legislation is the end result of a nationwide narcotics investigation conducted by Senator DANIEL'S judiciary subcommittee. The Texas Senator has worked more strenuously on the effort to root out the cancerous dope racket than on any other measures save the tidelands bill and the natural gas bill. Both of the latter were of vital economic concern to Texas, but the new narcotics bill is of far greater potential human importance, for it will be the means of saving Americans from destruction.

Under the Daniel bill it will be unlawful for anyone even to possess heroin, the drug most used in the illicit traffic. The maximum penalties for repeat offenders, convicted of smuggling or selling the dope, are life imprisonment or even death. The minimum punishment for selling heroin to juveniles under 18 is 10 years; the maximum, death.

These are drastic penalties, but even they are not harsh enough to fulfill the eye-for-an-eye law of the Old Testament. A dope racketeer kills the mind and character of those he lures into addiction. He delivers them into an enslavement worse than imprisonment, into a life worse than death. Many are literally killed by drugs. Can any legal penalty be too drastic for perpetrators of such monstrous crimes?

The antinarcotics law now in prospect gives promise of drying up sources of illicit drugs and thinning out the hordes of racketeers. The effect will be a commensurate curb on the appalling nationwide spread of dope addiction. It may not cure the cancer, but should shrink it substantially.

[From the Austin (Tex.) Statesman of June 1956]

DOPE LAW WINS PRAISE OF OFFICIALS

The United States Senate's history-making antinarcotic bill was hailed as an excellent, long-needed measure here Friday by State and local law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges.

Former United States District Attorney Charles Herring praised the bill as "an excellent measure—one this Nation has sorely needed for many years."

Herring's personal investigation and report on the narcotics problem in Texas was credited with touching off the Nation's first full-scale congressional probe of illegal dope racketeering.

Senator PRICE DANIEL headed the Senate subcommittee in this probe and sponsored the bill in the Senate.

As passed by the Senate, the bill provides a death penalty for persons convicted of selling narcotics to teen-agers. It also provides the death penalty or life imprisonment for persons convicted on third offense, selling narcotics to adults.

District Judge Jack Roberts said Friday he believes the offense of dope peddling is "so

heinous that a penalty of that nature is indicated. That's the type of crime where not much clemency is warranted."

District Attorney Les Procter said the Senate bill is "a fine bill. Those who inflict the living death upon young people have got to be deterred and the penalty is not too severe."

Police Chief R. D. (Boss) Thorp and Department of Public Safety Director Homer Garrison both hailed the bill as a long-needed weapon for law enforcement officers.

Herring, who in January of 1955 branded the Texas border as the "international gateway for a deadly, multi-million-dollar narcotic racket," said Friday:

"This bill, if enacted into law, will give the Nation its first really effective weapon against dope pushers.

"For years we've been trying to fight them with 2 and 3 year prison sentences. Dope pushing is the worst kind of homicide. It's premeditated murder any way you look at it.

"A man who hands a kid a dropper of heroin is in effect killing that kid. More serious, this youngster will in turn take dozens of others down with him."

[From the Erie (Pa.) Times of June 2, 1956]

DEATH FOR DOPE PEDDLERS

The Senate Judiciary Committee has unanimously approved a bill which would authorize Federal courts to impose the death penalty for specific violations of the anti-narcotics laws.

The proposed bill which must be voted on the floor of the Senate and work through the House, would permit the death penalty for the sale of heroin to a minor, or for a third conviction involving sale to adults. The bill would also provide longer prison sentences, up to life, in some cases.

The bill is sponsored by Senator DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas, and the entire membership of his special subcommittee investigating the illicit drug traffic.

It is a strong measure but it should pass. Traffickers in heroin are murderers. They deal out living death. Their ruthless operations shriek for revenge, especially in the case of minors. They provide the diabolic dope that turns their victims and slaves to horrible crimes. The peddler, or big dealer, is the killer, the destroyer of reason, the breaker of morals. All for money.

The death sentence for these soul-killing jackals is demanding.

[From the Houston Press of June 1, 1956]

A MUCH-NEEDED LAW

Dope pushers deserve the most drastic penalties.

Selling their narcotics, getting rich off the addicts they create, they and their trade are at the root of much of the crime of this country.

They are murderers by indirection, degraders of men and women and schoolchildren.

Yesterday the Senate, spurred by investigation headed by one of our Senators, PRICE DANIEL, passed a bill that strikes the most severe blow any legislative body has ever directed at the dope traffic. Its penalties are severe; its terms permit the death sentence under certain conditions.

Moreover, the measure strengthens the arm of our Federal Narcotics Bureau, giving it more agents, greater strength to combat the dope pushers, added powers to help detect this horrible trade.

We hope the House passes a similar bill, and that this Congress with White House concurrence puts on the books a new narcotics law that will help all Federal law-enforcement agencies do a better job of suppressing the narcotics traffic. Such a law will encourage the States adequately to arm themselves against this growing evil.

[From the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times of May 21, 1956]

THE DEADLY CHAIN

A Senate judiciary subcommittee has recommended a crackdown on violators of Federal narcotics laws. In a bill submitted after a thorough study of dope peddling and addiction in the United States, the subcommittee asks for much stiffer penalties than the law now provides.

The measure would permit juries to mete out life prison terms or the death sentence for a third conviction of selling heroin or smuggling it into the country. It would make the death sentence possible for those convicted of selling dope to children. The subcommittee also wants to broaden the investigative powers of the Federal Customs Bureau and Narcotics Bureau to make apprehension of dope peddlers more certain.

The need for tougher laws and stricter enforcement against the devilish crime that leads to dope addiction has been apparent for a long time. The subcommittee recommendations, based on evidence gathered in extensive hearings, merit the most serious consideration.

Strong laws and vigorous enforcement are not the whole answer to the dope problem, however. There is a deadly chain—from the smuggler to the peddler to the often innocent victim who may in turn become a thief or peddler—that must be broken. Homes, schools, and churches can do much to help break the chain. They can do their part by showing children and young people the terrible consequences of addiction.

Meanwhile, the Senate judiciary subcommittee bill, or one much like it, should be quickly passed.

[From the Atlanta Constitution of June 2, 1956]

DEATH PENALTY ASKED FOR SOME DOPE SELLERS

Both Houses of Congress are about to get together on a bill stiffening Federal penalties for promoters of the narcotics racket.

The Senate has passed a bill outlawing the use of heroin by anybody at any time. Those who smuggle it into the country or peddle it are subject to a sentence of death.

The House, too, is working on a similar measure. In time one or the other, or a combination of both, will be passed.

The bills grew out of hearings on the illegal use and sale of narcotics, surely the most vicious of rackets. The addicts are the most tragic of all humans, for once in the grip of their particular drug nothing including murder can stand between them and their next charge.

The Senate did right in cracking down on the peddlers and smugglers of heroin, the most dangerous of the narcotics. We trust the House will concur in the Senate's very dim view of these racketeers.

[From the Easton (Pa.) Express of May 19, 1956]

DEATH SENTENCES FOR DOPE DEALERS?

Television viewers who remember the sinister faces that appeared on their screens in 1951 when a then relatively obscure fellow named ESTES KEFAUVER was running a Senate crime investigating committee may remember that one of the committee's recommendations had to do with increased penalties for convicted peddlers of narcotics.

If Congress had acted on this recommendation, there would have been a new law providing for prison sentences of from 20 years to life, with no probation, for persons convicted of selling drugs to buyers under 17 years of age.

At the time, Congress either failed to grasp the menace of the traffic in drugs or was unconvinced that the proposed penalties would serve the desired end. Instead of acting on the crime committee's recommendation, it passed the Boggs Act, bolstering the Harrison Narcotics Act of 1914, establishing prison sentences of from 2 to 5 years for drug sellers convicted as second offenders and sentences of from 10 to 20 years for peddlers convicted as third offenders or as offenders with more than three convictions.

In taking that action, Congress may have been restrained by the theory that making sentences more severe increases the reluctance of juries to convict, but regardless of its motivation, the years since have demonstrated tragically that the Boggs Act was not geared to its purpose.

The drug evil has swept on, engulfing more youngsters in its slimy tide, and Congress apparently has come to the point of admitting that it has failed to put proper weapons into the fight against it. This week the Senate Judiciary Committee unanimously approved a bill which would outlaw the use of heroin and establish the death penalty for persons convicted of selling heroin to juveniles and for third offenders in the smuggling and peddling of heroin.

Mention of the death penalty is, of course, a shocking thing, and as this issue is debated, comparisons will be brought into play.

It will, for instance, be noted that in peacetime, espionage carries the death penalty only when it is in violation of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

On the other hand, the drug traffic is a shocking thing, and it should be remembered that execution is a common penalty for taking one life, whereas a dope peddler who has corrupted a thousand teen-agers now risks only imprisonment for a few years, and not necessarily for the life of his sentence. In Pennsylvania in recent days we have watched the disheartening prospect of a pardons board compelled by existing State law to grant "good time" shortening of sentences in the case of dope peddlers, who probably were not the sort of criminals the lawmakers had in mind when they set up this incentive for good behavior in prison.

The debate in Congress, however, need not bog down into a debate on the morality of the death sentence or on the question of whether capital punishment is the ultimate deterrent to crime in general. This latter question probably will be debated academically for a long time, but the issue at hand is not academic.

This issue involves a particular kind of crime, one which tends by its nature to spread its vile seeds over ever-widening circles, to make every dope buyer into a peddler. If any crime justifies an attempt to limit an offender to one offense, this one does.

The framing of that attempt is up to the Congress, but we think it is self-evident that drastic action is indicated, and as the lawmakers consider its possible nature they should be reassured by the report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics that the penalties under the Boggs Act, more severe than those of the Harrison Act, did not tend to make juries squeamish about conviction.

That, it seems to us, is eloquent testimony that juries are alive to the evil at hand, aware that the menace here is to the welfare of their children. Let the Congress approach this question with comparable appreciation of the stakes involved, and if it needs any boost toward dispatch, let it ponder the fate of the young lives which have fallen before the heroin needle since 1951.

[From the Ogden (Utah) Standard-Examiner of May 30, 1956]

DOPE SELLERS' DEPRAVITY

Senator PRICE DANIEL, of Texas, told the Senate last week that if something had to happen to one of his boys he should deem it better the boy be shot with a bullet than with a heroin needle, "because to be addicted

to heroin is to experience a living death. Not only will heroin eventually destroy the life of a person * * * but it will cause the person to turn to crime." The Senator also pointed out that few cures of addicts are recorded.

The Senator's statement reflects how wrought up members of the investigating committee became as they heard evidence of dope sellers' depravity. In one city the committee found a narcotics peddler had started 40 or 50 high school boys on heroin to build a new supply of customers, and incidentally a new supply of criminals.

Senator DANIEL said the committee believes that a maximum penalty for sales of heroin to juveniles should be the death penalty.

We believe that a poll of the parents would reveal that the committee's stand for the death penalty for dope sellers to juveniles is endorsed.

[From the Corpus Christi (Tex.) Times of June 1, 1956]

MORE ENFORCEMENT

Senator PRICE DANIEL, Texas' junior Senator, finally obtained Senate passage of his bill to control the narcotics traffic. This bill includes a provision which would permit juries to assess the death penalty on persons convicted of selling heroin to teen-agers and persons who are thrice convicted of peddling the drug anywhere.

Missing from the bill was the controversial provision which would have permitted Federal officials to tap telephone wires in order to gather evidence on drug peddlers. Senator DANIEL insisted that the telephone is a key part of the drug-peddling racket, but Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, was successful in blocking the wiretap provision. Obviously, he considers the protection of a citizen's right to privacy more important than curtailing an ever-growing drug traffic that Senator DANIEL found to be corrupting more American youths every year.

It will be surprising if the death penalty interferes with the drug trade. This new law will have to be tested in Federal appellate courts since it is a major departure from the present Federal narcotics enforcement program which is based on tax evasion. There also is the trend away from capital punishment to be considered, although some juries might consider peddling heroin to minors to be a more serious offense than murder.

With or without the new Federal law, there is nothing to prevent local law enforcement officers from cracking down on narcotic pushers and thereby, obtaining the same results as those sought by the Daniel law.

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Herald Post of June 2, 1956]

A MUCH-NEEDED LAW

Dope pushers deserve the most drastic penalties. Selling their narcotics, getting rich off the addicts they create, they and their trade are at the root of much of the crime of this country.

They are murderers by indirection, degraders of men and women and schoolchildren.

The Senate has passed Senator PRICE DANIEL'S bill. It strikes the most severe blow any legislative body has ever directed at the dope traffic. Its penalties are severe; its terms permit the death sentence.

Moreover, the measure strengthens the arm of our Federal Narcotics Bureau, giving it more agents, greater strength to combat the dope pushers, added powers to help detect this horrible trade.

We hope the House passes a similar bill, and that this Congress with White House concurrence puts on the books a new narcotics law that will help all Federal law enforcement agencies do a better job of suppressing the narcotics traffic. Such a law will encourage the States adequately to arm themselves against this growing evil.

[From the Lawrence (Mass.) Tribune of June 2, 1956]

DEATH FOR DRUG PEDDLERS

One might have reservations about the wisdom of sending a defective personality such as Kenneth Chapin to the electric chair, but one would feel no such reluctance about condemning a narcotics peddler to die. We note that the United States Senate has passed a bill which calls for the supreme penalty for hardened offenders who traffic persistently in the living death which drug addiction means.

In view of the cold-blooded viciousness of such traffic, it is only fitting that such criminals—particularly those who are not addicts themselves, but are interested only in the huge profits to be made—should be permanently eliminated. The peddling of narcotics is an evil with which society can make no compromise. It is probably visionary to expect that other forms of crime will even be completely brought under control, but the drug traffic must be. There is no alternative.

The fact that the Senate has already acted and the fact that a similar bill, no less severe, has been approved by the House Ways and Means Committee, indicate that there will soon be a law on the books which should go a long way toward doing the job which has to be done. If it doesn't do the job, even sterner measures will have to be taken.

[From the Indianapolis Times of June 2, 1956]

A MUCH-NEEDED LAW

Dope pushers deserve the most drastic penalties. Selling their narcotics, getting rich off the addicts they create, they and their trade are at the root of much of the crime of this country.

They are murderers by indirection, degraders of men and women and schoolchildren.

The Senate now has passed a bill that strikes the most severe blow any legislative body has ever directed at the dope traffic. Its penalties are severe; its terms permit the death sentence under certain conditions.

Moreover, the measure strengthens the arm of our Federal Narcotics Bureau, giving it more agents, greater strength to combat the dope pushers, added powers to help detect this horrible trade.

We hope the House passes a similar bill, and that this Congress with White House concurrence puts on the books a new narcotics law that will help all Federal law-enforcement agencies do a better job of suppressing the narcotics traffic. Such a law will encourage the States adequately to arm themselves against this growing evil.

[From the Troy (N. Y.) Times-Record of June 2, 1956]

IT'S TIME TO STOP IT

The plan to permit the death sentence for those distributing heroin to high-school students ought to have general support. There are some timid, shrinking souls whose respect for human life is such that they decry the death penalty for any crime.

But most people wonder what wisdom there is in keeping a murderer or a traitor in prison for life, using the taxpayers' money and opening a permanent door for possible pardon. Individuals as unsocial as these have no right to live. And anyone who distributes a habit-forming poison to teen-agers, striving to make them addicts, has no right to live in a decent society. Nor has he the right to a long sentence, with the chance of pardon. He is a pariah, anathema to those who are looking forward. He is willing to destroy morals, possible success in life, even life itself, to further his financial objectives.

It is time we got out of the squeamish notion that hanging, the chair, or the gas chamber are always barbarous. It is the criminals who commit capital crimes who are barbarous. And any distributor of heroin to youth is certainly in that class.

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) World of June 2, 1956]

MAKING IT TOUGH ON DOPE PUSHERS

Public approbation will of a certainty follow congressional action toughening the criminal penalty for dealers in narcotics. The United States Senate has completed action on its own version of a narcotics law assessing the death penalty to hardened offenders. Similar, though not identical legislation, is underway in the House.

The tougher the penalty on dope sellers can be made, yet retain effectiveness in the courts, the better off the Nation will be. In the 10 years since World War II the use of narcotics in the United States has increased manyfold; there is much evidence that the smuggling of illicit contraband into the country has become another phase of the Communist cold war game. Hence, there is a reason not totally one of desire for the step-up in the use of illegal drugs; in many instances there is actual recruiting of users.

Whether the death penalty is the whole answer is subject to some question, though it is obvious Congress has met no opposition pressure in its deliberations. It is possible, though we do not believe probable, that too stiff a penalty for dope pushers could react against an effective cleanup, just as Oklahoma's 10-day mandatory jail sentence for drunken driving has at times seemed to defeat its own purpose before juries.

The essential ingredient in the Senate measure is, of course, the reference to hardened offenders. Certainly this will give juries leeway, and at the same time pattern a course for the court's instruction to jury members. An habitual peddler of narcotics would be the criminal most likely to feel the full force of the legislation; particularly those who are active in searching out and encouraging beginners. The Senate measure appears to present a wide enough choice to the juries, which should make the weight of the law felt.

Essentially the stiffer the penalty for illegal acts, the greater the safety of the general public—just so long, of course, as the penalty is not so strict as to defeat the intent of the law.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening of June 5, 1956]

CONGRESS AND THE DRUG TRAFFIC

Apparently Congress is going to pass legislation this year to curb the illicit traffic in narcotics. The Senate has already passed a bill. The House version has been reported by the Ways and Means Committee. Certainly legislation is needed. Existing laws are failing to keep the traffic under adequate control. Light penalties let addict-peddlers back into circulation early to resume their activities. Technicalities let too many of the guilty escape.

In consequence, the traffic has grown until there are more addicts in the United States than in all other Western countries combined. A Senate Judiciary subcommittee reported in January that there were 60,000 addicts in the Nation, and their number was increasing by 1,000 a month, which would mean about 65,000 by now. Dope addiction, according to the subcommittee, has been

causing 50 percent of the crime in big cities and 25 percent in the Nation generally.

The value of new legislation will of course have to be tested in practice. The Senate bill provides the death penalty for third offenders under some circumstances, but in view of the dubious value of capital punishment as a deterrent this provision may not stay in the bill. Drastic provisions to keep drug traffickers from using technicalities to escape punishment are certainly desirable, but some particular proposals are open to question. We can never afford to lose sight of the fact that some of the technicalities so casually denounced may be based on fundamental constitutional rights—and that many of the abuses could be eliminated by better preparation of cases.

Merely passing a new law would not, in any case, solve the problem out of hand. The duty of Congress goes further—to provide adequate funds for war against the drug traffic on all fronts. The way to save money in this field is to take the long view and adopt a crash program that will reduce the traffic to a minimum—to spend more money now to stop the contagion from spreading, and only later to save money by cutting down on personnel for investigation and prosecution.

There is much truth in the flip old saying: "To discourage vice, make it unprofitable." Drug traffic profits run as high as 1,000 percent, and the risk of being caught is not as great as it should be. Congress, we believe, is going to try to change that.

[From the Sunbury (Pa.) Daily Item of June 2, 1956]

A bad day for drug peddlers was marked off Thursday when the United States Senate passed a bill providing new and stiffer penalties for narcotics law violators including the death sentence in some instances. At the same time Governor Leader signed a measure passed by the Pennsylvania Legislature providing prison sentences up to life for drug addicts and vendors.

There is always the possibility that laws which the public considers too harsh in their application will fail of their purpose. However, the death sentence for those who sell heroin to juveniles, or for the third conviction in any case as provided by the United States Senate bill, is not, in any evaluation of the narcotic evil, too severe. Under the Pennsylvania law, now in full effect, third offenders in illegal drug cases may be imprisoned for life.

The realization that the narcotics traffic is responsible for an alarming proportion of the Nation's crime wave, especially among juveniles, is apparent in these legislative moves. Of no less importance than stiffer penalties, however, is the matter of ending overly lenient paroles for drug pushers and addicts. The tightening up process must go all the way.

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) News-Free Press of June 2, 1956]

PUNISHMENT FOR DOPE PEDDLERS

The United States Senate has passed a bill providing the death penalty for selling heroin to juveniles and for third convictions of heroin selling to anybody.

The House of Representatives, according to a prediction by Representative HALE BOGGS Democrat, of Louisiana, next week will pass a broader bill, aimed at increased penalties for all kinds of narcotic law violations. But the House bill does not provide the death penalty, Representative BOGGS explaining it was feared juries might think the death penalty too severe and let violators off lightly.

If the death penalty is justified for any offense, it would seem to be proper punishment for anyone vile enough to make dope addicts of children. It is not likely that the death penalty would often—if ever—be imposed for dope peddling, however, even if this penalty should be provided for by law. So whether the death penalty is provided is not as important as the duty of both Houses of Congress to pass legislation assuring dope peddlers much heavier punishment than they have received in the past.

The selling of narcotics, especially to juveniles, is not a trivial offense. It should be punished by long terms of imprisonment, at least.

[From the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette of June 4, 1956]

DOPE CRACKDOWN COMING

Action in both the House and Senate indicated a strong determination to toughen penalties for peddling narcotics, especially to minors. A Senate passed bill would provide for death penalties and a House bill would provide for mandatory prison terms of 10 to 40 years.

There can be little question that these measures reflect the general public attitude toward the viciousness of dope peddling and probably there is reason to hope that more severe penalties will have a deterring effect on the narcotics traffic.

Probably it is overoptimistic, however, to expect that severe penalties alone will put a deep crimp in the traffic. One of the peculiarly vicious aspects of dope peddling is that many of the peddlers are themselves addicts. That means that they are not always in a condition to evaluate the risk of heavy penalties rationally. And that, in turn, might make it difficult to get convictions in court.

Even so, the legislation shaping up indicates that Congress means business in its determination to curb narcotics peddling. If that mood persists—as it should—there is new hope of getting real results by one means or another.

[From the New York Times of June 8, 1956]

TO CONTROL DRUG TRAFFIC—RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONTINUED FIGHT AGAINST ADDICTION OUTLINED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I have read with considerable interest your editorial of June 4 regarding the proposed narcotic laws now being considered in the Senate and House following reports of subcommittees under the chairmanship of Senator PRICE DANIEL, of Texas, and Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, respectively.

I am in full agreement with the intent of the proposed acts and with most of their provisions. The sale of narcotics to addicts is a heinous crime and a social problem of frightening magnitude. One of the legislative means at hand for society to use against one of the most vicious of crimes is a vigorous penalty; indeed, the ultimate penalty is justified where minors are forced into lives of crime and narcotics addiction.

Punishment of the pushers, however, is but 1 part of the 2 needed elements in the field. The other is prevention and cure of narcotics addicts. In the past our primary failure in dealing with narcotics addiction has been our lack of understanding that precaution and cure of addicts are as vital as apprehension and punishment of peddlers and traffickers.

JAIL NO CURE

Drug addiction is a disease, and like any other medical problem it cannot be cured by incarceration of the stricken victim in jail. We would be shocked by a suggestion that the mentally ill be arrested and jailed. The drug addict is mentally and emotionally sick and requires medical attention and not—unless also a pusher, peddler, or trafficker—confinement in prison. Unless we are prepared to treat and rehabilitate drug addicts, we will not soon diminish their demand for narcotic drugs. So long as there are addicts who require drugs, experience teaches that there are likely to be sellers, who are criminals, eager and ready to supply this demand.

Our appalling lack of knowledge on prevention and cure of narcotics addiction is one of the tragic facts in this field. Though narcotics addiction claims almost twice as many victims, some 60,000 of record, compared with what polio claimed every year before the blessing of the Salk vaccine, I estimate that less than one-thirtieth of what was spent on research against polio is being spent on research against narcotics addiction.

Research projects are entitled to the greatest amount of support and are most brave and laudable—a special note should be taken of the work being done here under Dr. Marie Nyswander—but the effort needs enormous expansion and development.

FACILITIES NEEDED

We need facilities for clinical treatment and commitment of addicts with the necessary implementing laws. To that end I made the following recommendations to the National Association of Attorneys General a few weeks ago:

The existing Federal facilities at Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Tex., for the treatment of narcotics addicts need to be expanded and regionally dispersed.

We must further provide a suitable program for aftercare and outpatient surveillance, with psychiatric and social case work to assist the patient in full rehabilitation in the community in which he lives.

Given necessary clinical supervision, a controlled experiment might be set up to test a program of restricted legal distribution of narcotics as part, and only as part, of the program aimed at treating the drug addict as a medical case.

We should encourage voluntary organizations patterned along the lines of the National Committee on Alcoholism, such as Narcotics Anonymous, now operating with help from the Salvation Army on a limited basis, and others interested in this work to organize and enlist ex-addicts and the general public in a cooperative effort to help the drug addicts' rehabilitation and readjustment.

In fact, the National Association of Attorneys General acted favorably on the first, second, and fourth recommendations, and by calling for coordination between Federal and State penalties for violation of narcotic laws backed the stiffer penalties called for by the Daniel and Boggs bills.

The work of the 1956 New York State Legislature in the field of narcotics addiction was important and significant. A real advance was made in the effort to solve the drug problem, both by regulation of the illegal traffic in drugs and by rehabilitation of existing addicts. Much remains to be done. New York legislation is in the forefront of the Nation and could well serve as a model for the congressional committees currently considering the problem, but even in our own State the fight against addiction can and must be extended. We must learn to treat peddling, addiction and all the social problems attendant upon them as a whole and attack them together with all the means at our disposal.

J. K. JAVITS,
Attorney General, State of New York.
NEW YORK, *June 5, 1956.*

DEVELOPMENT OF ADDITIONAL INDUSTRIAL USES FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to speak a few minutes with reference to Senate bill 3503, to provide for a

scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products, so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers, and for other purposes.

I, together with some 30 other Senators, introduced that bill on March 21 of this year. The purpose of the bill is to find, by research, new uses and markets for farm products. Many persons have referred to the bill as a research bill. It asks for $100 million to carry out its provisions.

Not many days ago Congress passed a new farm bill. The administration at this moment is putting that bill into effect. One of its purposes is to place in operation the so-called soil bank under which American farmers are asked to reduce their production, to reduce the number of acres they plant of many different grains and other products, including cotton. The purpose of that bill was to accomplish two things. One was to get rid of existing surpluses which have been breaking the backs of American farmers and likewise the backs of the American taxpayers. The other was to increase farm prices.

My best judgment is that the bill will accomplish both objectives. However, that sort of situation, in which the farmers are asked to reduce their production and the American taxpayers are asked to contribute to the income of the American farmer, is certainly not a satisfactory one over a long period of time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I heartily endorse the efforts of the distinguished Senator from Indiana. I am convinced that he deserves and will receive the lasting gratitude of the farmers of Indiana and of every other agricultural State. He is putting his finger on the need for additional markets for our farm products over the long pull.

At the present time there is an agricultural surplus of only 5 percent. However, because of the great strides made in agricultural production, it is estimated that in a few years, notwithstanding the increase in population, our agricultural surpluses will represent 10 percent of our needs for food and fiber. Therefore, the salvation of the agricultural economy rests on getting new customers.

Mr. CAPEHART. As a businessman, I know of only two ways to increase business. One is to sell more goods to existing customers, and the other is to find new customers. We are selling all we possibly can to existing customers. So we must find new uses and new customers if we are going to solve permanently the farm problem.

Let me point out, if I may, what has happened during the past 50 years in the United States. I am not complaining about it. I am happy that it has occurred. But in the United States during the past 50 years, particularly—much longer than that, but we have been amplifying it during the past 50 years—as a government and as a people we have been spending millions and millions of dollars to show the farmer how to produce more and more. There is a county agent in every county in the land. There are 4–H Clubs. There are great agricultural schools. The Department of Agriculture has spent a great deal of money. Private industry has spent a great deal of money in developing new seeds and new fertilizers. By spending millions of dollars in research ways and means of killing weeds have been found, so that the farmer can grow more. Billions of dollars have been spent. Billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money have been spent in bringing into cultivation in the West, through irrigation, many acres which previously did not produce anything. The States of Arizona and California produce, I believe, or, at least, can produce, more cotton today than the original 11 cotton-growing States produce. Most of it is at the taxpayers' expense in connection with providing water to irrigate the land.

So, Mr. President, we have been spending billions upon billions of dollars to increase the farmers' production, but we have forgotten to whom the farmers would sell this increased production. So, the result is that the production is far up and the market is below the production.

What I wish to see Congress do is to spend as much time and as much money in the next few years in finding new uses for farm products and new market for farm products as we have been spending in showing the farmers how to produce more.

In other words, Mr. President, we must do either 1 of 2 things in the United States. We must either reduce farm production or we must provide markets which will utilize the farmers' production, and then increase evenly both the farmers production and the market.

To me, that is the only sensible way to do it. It is the only practical and sound way to do it. It simply must be done. To do otherwise will wreck the economy of America, and ruin the farmers by reducing their income.

If that should happen the income of every American would be reduced.

Mr. President, to me it is unthinkable that we should not do what I am advocating. The bill is before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Knowing of the interest which the able chairman of that committee [Mr. ELLENDER] has in agriculture, and the interest of the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. CLEMENTS], my hope is that the committee will report the bill promptly, and that it will be passed at this session of the Congress. I cannot help feeling that the committee will do so. Thus far, the committee has not announced any hearings. I am forced to say that if hearings are not held, the committee will have to accept the responsibility, in my opinion, for the failure to take the necessary actien to cure the farm problem permanently. But I do not believe the committee will fail to take action. I think hearings will be held, and a bill will be reported, because millions of farmers are looking to the committee to take action.

Let me cite an example of what I meant when I said a moment ago that the Government has spent millions upon millions of dollars to show the farmer how to grow more and more, but that very little has been spent to find new uses and new markets for farm products. I hold in my hand a table covering the 12 years from 1946 through 1957, and including the appropriation which was recently made for the fiscal year 1957.

I find that expenditures for agricultural research for State experimental stations from non-Federal funds, primarily State funds, during the 12 years amounted to $592,050,000. Almost $600 million have been spent, not to find new uses or new markets for farm products, but to show the farmer how to grow more and more and more.

Payments to State agricultural experiment stations from Federal grant funds during the 12-year period have amounted to $172,936,000. Again, that money was spent not to find new markets or new uses for farm products, but to show the farmers how to grow more and more.

For production research in the Agricultural Research Service, the amount spent in 12 years has been $276,320,000. In this instance, again, the money was not used to find new markets or new uses for farm products, but simply for research in agricultural marketing. The Government has simply been inviting farmers—and I am not quarreling with this—to grow more and more.

For marketing research in the Agricultural Marketing Service, $57,486,000 has been spent during the period 1946 through 1957. This agency is another branch of the Department of Agriculture.

The total amount spent for these items during the 12-year period amounted to $1,098,792,000—almost $1,100,000,000. I am not quarreling about that at all. I am glad the money was spent. I think it was a worthwhile expenditure.

But during the same 12-year period, what was the amount which was spent to find new uses and new markets for farm products? From 1946 through 1957, including the appropriation for fiscal 1957, $88 million, or 8 percent of what was spent to show the farmer how to grow more and to advise him what was going on, was spent to find new ueses and new markets for farm products. The $88 million was spent primarily in the four regional research laboratories which were established under the laws of 1938 and 1946.

I shall state the amount of money which was spent each year. In 1946, it was $5,117,000; in 1947, $5,766,000; in 1948, $7,675,600; in 1949, $8,053,600; in 1950, $8,686,400; in 1951, $8,122,400; in 1952, $8,002,400; in 1953, $7,713,000; in 1954, $7,956,000; in 1955, $9,047,000; in 1956, $9,575,000; and in 1957 it will be $12,488,500; a total of $88,202,900 in 12 years to find new uses and new markets for farm products. Contrast the $88 million spent for that purpose with the more than $1 billion spent to show the farmer how to grow more.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this table, which was fur-

nished me by the Department of Agriculture, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of moneys appropriated for utilization research to production and marketing research

Year	Expenditure for agricultural research for State experimental stations from non-Federal funds primarily State funds	Payment to State agricultural experiment stations, Federal grant funds	Production research, Agricultural Marketing Service	Marketing research, Agricultural Marketing Service	Total per year	Utilization research, Agricultural Marketing Service (research conducted by 4 regional laboratories)
1946	[1]	$7,206,000	$14,880,000	$2,000,000	$24,086,000	$5,117,000
1947	[1]	7,206,000	17,269,000	2,379,000	26,854,000	5,766,000
1948	$35,350,000	9,677,000	18,464,000	3,068,000	66,559,000	7,675,600
1949	40,305,000	10,718,000	22,285,000	4,845,000	78,153,000	8,053,600
1950	45,205,000	12,694,000	22,723,000	5,247,000	85,869,000	8,686,400
1951	50,972,000	12,712,000	21,860,000	4,712,000	90,256,000	8,122,400
1952	56,884,000	12,676,000	22,240,000	4,342,000	96,142,000	8,002,400
1953	61,971,000	12,676,000	22,804,000	4,680,000	102,131,000	7,713,000
1954	67,205,000	13,705,000	23,600,000	4,745,000	109,255,000	7,956,000
1955	72,158,000	19,408,000	25,640,000	6,104,000	123,310,000	9,047,000
1956	78,000,000	24,754,000	28,567,000	7,164,000	138,485,000	9,575,000
1957	[2] 84,000,000	29,504,000	35,988,000	8,200,000	157,692,000	[3] 12,488,500
Total	592,050,000	172,936,000	276,320,000	57,486,000	1,098,792,000	88,202,900

[1] Figures not available.
[2] Estimated figure for 1957.
[3] Present agriculture appropriation bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, does it not make sense that not less than $100 million should be appropriated to find new uses for farm products in industry? Does it not make sense that tests should be made of the new uses with which the Department of Agriculture has already been experimenting and has almost perfected in the four laboratories I have just mentioned? Pilot plants ought to be built to test the new uses. Something should be done to find new markets and new uses for the products of the farmer. What are we waiting for?

I dislike to think there is anything political about this matter. I feel certain there is not. So why are we waiting?

Many persons have reminded me of the four laboratories which are now in existence. Yes, there are four laboratories. I said that when I introduced the bill originally on March 21. I named the laboratories at that time. I stated that the laboratories were at present working on 11 new uses for farm products. I said I had been told that if those experiments were successful, and if some pilot plants could be built and some field tests made to determine whether the uses were practical, and means were developed whereby the products could be processed and marketed, the new uses might well consume more than three billion bushels of grain a year out of the total of 6,500,000,000 bushels raised in the United States annually.

So I ask again, Mr. President, What are we waiting for?

The year in which the largest appropriation was made to find new uses and new markets for farm products was 1956, when $9,575,000 was provided and spent. In the same year, $300 million was spent to show the farmer how to grow more. To me, that does not make sense. There are in the United States a thousand manufacturing concerns, oil refineries, and mining companies which spend more than $9 million a year on research.

The United States has a great farming industry. The gross income of the 6 million farmers involved is from $36 billion to $38 billion a year. But only some $9 million was spent last year in what is called fundamental research in the finding of new uses and new markets for farm products.

Mr. President, I urge the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, especially its chairman, to hold hearings immediately on the bill (S. 3503) and to report the bill. Let us give the four laboratories which are now in existence sufficient money to do the job. Let us provide them with money to build pilot plants in order to prove some of the uses with which they are now experimenting. Let us enable those laboratories to make field tests.

Let us solve the farm problem on a permanent basis. Let us solve it by increasing the income of farmers, rather than decreasing it. If we will increase the farmers' income and put them in a position profitably to grow more and more, we will be increasing the income of every American, because more jobs will be created, and there will be more business for the manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers. The construction business will be increased, because it will be necessary to build new processing plants in order to manufacture the new article which will be made from farm products.

I observe the able senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] on the floor. The citrus industry in his State has had some experience with what can be done by finding new uses for or methods of handling farm products, as was demonstrated by the processing of citrus fruit. The Department of Agriculture developed methods for the quick freezing of citrus juices. This has proved to be very beneficial to the citrus growers of Florida. New industries were developed there because new processing plants were required. So there is no limit to what can be done in the United States if only we can get our people busy at work on the matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement on this subject prepared for me by the Library of Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1956.

RESEARCH, LEGISLATION, AND PROGRAMS RELATING TO THE UTILIZATION OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

PUBLIC LAW 733

The current research programs relating to the utilization of farm products are operated under the provisions of Public Law 733, approved August 14, 1946, as an amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, to provide for a great expansion in research programs with more emphasis on marketing and the utilization of farm products. It was recognized that the marketing and utilization research in the Department of Agriculture and in the State experiment stations should be expanded greatly in relation to production research as a means of dealing with the postwar adjustment problems.

The Research and Marketing Act of 1946 contains three titles:

Title I: Amends the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 to provide further research into the basic laws and principles relating to agriculture;

Title II: May be cited as the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946; and

Title III: Provides for the establishment of committees advisory to the Secretary of Agriculture in the futherance of the research and service work authorized by the act.

Title I

In the statement of policy with reference to research, it is declared to be the intent of Congress "to assure agriculture a position in research equal to that of industry which will aid in maintaining an equitable balance between agriculture and other sections of our economy." For the attainment of this and other objectives, "the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to conduct and to stimulate research into the laws and principles underlying the basic problems of agriculture in its broadest aspects, including, but not limited to, research relating to the development of new and improved methods of production, marketing, and the utilization of agricultural products at all stages from the producer to the consumer."

The more specific directions with reference to utilization research include indications of the intent of Congress that it should contribute to the expansion of outlets for surplus products. In the language of the act, it is provided that the Secretary shall conduct and stimulate research "relating to the development of present, new, and extended uses and markets for agricultural commodities and byproducts as food or in commerce, manufacture, or trade, both at home and abroad, with particular reference to those foods and fibers for which our capacity to produce exceeds or may exceed existing economic demand * * *."

This is in line with the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 for the establishment of four regional laboratories for research relating to the utilization of agricultural products. Section 202 of that act provided that the laboratories to be established were to "develop new scientific, chemical, and technical uses and new and extended markets and outlets for farm commodities and products and the byproducts thereof." It is provided that "such research and development shall be devoted primarily

to those farm commodities in which there are regular or seasonal surpluses."

The Research and Marketing Act of 1946 provides that maximum use shall be made of existing research facilities of the Federal Government and the State experiment stations. It further provides that the research authorized is to be in addition to research provided under previous laws but should be coordinated with that research.

Appropriations were authorized with schedules increasing from the first fiscal year ending June 30, 1947 through fiscal 1950 or 1951, as follows:

Section 9 (a) authorizes increased appropriations for research for the State experiment stations beginning with $2,500,000 and increasing to $20 million for fiscal 1951. Section 11 provides that not less than 20 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated under this section shall be used by State agricultural experiment stations for conducting marketing research.

Section 10 (a) authorizes additional expenditures for further research on utilization and associated problems, beginning with $3 million and increasing to $15 million for fiscal 1951. This section provides that the research authorized shall be conducted so far as practicable in the laboratories of the Department of Agriculture. However, it provides also that the Secretary of Agriculture may contract with public or private organizations for research supplemental to and coordinated with the research of the laboratories.

Section 10 (b) provides for cooperative research with the State agricultural experiment stations and other appropriate agencies in fields other than utilization. Additional appropriations were authorized to increase from $1,500,000 to $6 million per annum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950.

Following each of the schedules for annual increases in appropriations, additional funds are authorized as Congress may deem necessary.

Title II

The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 provides for expansion of the marketing research and service work of the Department of Agriculture and cooperating agencies. The marketing research and service authorized include activities related to utilization, as follows:

"SEC. 203 (a). To conduct, assist, and foster research, investigation, and experimentation to determine the best methods of processing, preparation for market, packaging, handling, transporting, storing, distributing, and marketing agricultural products: *Provided*, That the results of such research shall be made available to the public for the purpose of expanding the use of American agricultural products in such manner as the Secretary of Agriculture may determine. * * *

"(e). To foster and assist in the development of new or expanded markets (domestic and foreign) and new and expanded uses and in the moving of larger quantities of agricultural products through the private marketing system to consumers in the United States and abroad.

"(f). To conduct and cooperate in consumer education for the more effective utilization and greater consumption of agricultural products."

Such activities by the agencies engaged in marketing research and service are essential to the full development and effective use of the results of the utilization research in the laboratories.

Section 204 (a) authorized appropriations for research and service work in connection with the preparation for market, processing, packaging, handling, storing, transporting, distributing, and marketing of agricultural products, increasing from $2,500,000 for the first fiscal year to $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951. Additional funds are authorized thereafter as the Congress may deem necessary. This section also authorizes the Secretary to make funds available to State departments of agriculture, bureaus and departments of markets, agricultural experiment stations, and other appropriate State agencies for cooperative projects in marketing service and in marketing research.

Title III

Section 301 provides for a national advisory committee consisting of 11 members, including representatives of producers and their organizations, to make recommendations relative to research and service work and to assist in obtaining the cooperation of producers, farm organization, industry groups, and Federal and State agencies.

Section 302 authorizes the Secretary to establish additional appropriate committees, including representatives of producers, industry, Government, and science to assist with reference to specific research and service programs.

The committees authorized by title III provide channels of communication for keeping the Secretary advised as to the most pressing needs for research and also contribute to maintaining goodwill working relations with the trade and industry.

ORGANIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT TO DATE

The Department of Agriculture proceeded after the passage of the Research and Marketing Act in August 1946, to request appropriations in line with the authorizations and directions of the act. But the schedules of increased appropriations have not been carried through. No additional funds authorized for the first fiscal year ending in 1947 were appropriated. For fiscal 1950 only $19 million was appropriated whereas the authorizations provided for $48 million. The schedule of authorizations for utilization (sec. 10 (a)) was to increase to $15 million in fiscal 1951, but the appropriations identifiable for this purpose in 1956 are still short of the authorization for 1951.

The responsibility for failure to appropriate funds in accordance with the schedules in the legislation to expand research activities is chargeable to both the Congress and the administrative agencies. The administrative agencies have been restrained to some extent by (1) the shortage of available qualified personnel to staff a rapid expansion of research along the several lines provided for in the act; and (2) the pressure for economy or restraint upon increasing Government expenditures. Possibly weaknesses in organization and scarcity of dynamic leadership have been contributory factors. An evaluation of the significance of these factors could be developed through the testimony of witnesses from the Federal and State research agencies at hearings.

The extent of the responsibility of the Congress for failure to provide the funds scheduled or requested could be checked by a review of the relation of the appropriations to the budget requests for research funds. However, it is probable that the requests by administrators are affected to some extent by known or expected attitudes of members of the Appropriations Committees of Congress.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I likewise ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a study made by the Library of Congress for me, which is headed "Research and the Utilization of Agricultural Products." There are many pages in the study, but I think it ought to be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1956.

RESEARCH AND THE UTILIZATION OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

1. RESEARCH BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The United States Government expenditures on research relating to the utilization of agricultural products including forestry, are small in comparison with expenditures on production. The total of the funds available for utilization research by the United States Department of Agriculture in the current fiscal year amounts to only $12,644,000 of a total of $58,614,000 available for research and development. The funds available for marketing research amount to $8 million, and the remainder, $38 million, is available for research relating to production.

The research designed directly for industrial utilization of surplus farm products is really only a small part of the funds available for utilization research. The utilization research programs included in the United States Department of Agriculture to which the funds indicated above are allocated, include research on human nutrition and home economics and the utilization of forest products. The direct obligations for utilization research to develop new and improved products, improving processing, and increasing the use of products are $9 million. A large part of this is utilized on improving feeds, foods, and clothing. Such research is directed toward improving qualities, protecting the products in relation to competition of nonfarm products, and satisfying special demands. It is practically impossible to determine a definite allocation of these funds for research designed primarily to increase the industrial use of surplus farm products, but it is evidently only a small proportion of the limited funds available for utilization research.

The State Experiment Stations and associated agricultural colleges and universities receive a substantial grant of funds from the Federal Government and a larger volume of funds from the State and other non-Federal sources for agricultural research and development, including some research on utilization.

The Federal Government in the current fiscal year has distributed $24,754,000 to the States and it is estimated that the State research agencies receive about $78 million from other sources. Only a very small proportion, less than $2 million, of the funds distributed by the Federal Government to the States is used for utilization research. The other agencies contributing to research in the States provide about $5 million for utilization research. Adding together all funds available in the current fiscal year for utilization research totals about $20 million, with about $126 million used for production and $16 million used in marketing research. The research directed at extending industrial uses for surplus farm products in the State institutions, as in the agencies of the United States Department of Agriculture, is probably only a small part of the total of the funds available for utilization research.

Agricultural research and development funds available fiscal 1956

Federal and State Government agencies, including agricultural colleges and universities:	
U. S. Department of Agriculture	$58,614,000
States, Federal funds	24,754,000
Non-Federal funds	78,000,000
Total	161,368,000

Agricultural research and development funds available fiscal 1956—continued

U. S. Department of Agriculture agencies:	
Distribution to types of research:	
Production	$38,257,000
Utilization	12,644,000
Marketing	7,714,000
Total	58,614,000
Agricultural Research Service payments to States:	
Distribution to types of research:	
Marketing	5,603,000
Utilization	1,658,000
Production	17,493,000
Total	24,754,000
Non-Federal funds available to State experiment stations, agricultural colleges and universities:	
Distribution to types of research:	
Marketing	2,730,000
Utilization	5,460,000
Production	69,810,000
Total	78,000,000

Type of research, distribution, funds available to Federal and State agencies, 1956

Distribution to types of research:	
Utilization: [1]	
USDA agencies	$12,644,000
State agencies, Federal funds	1,658,000
State agencies, non-Federal funds	5,460,000
	19,762,000
Marketing research:	
USDA agencies	7,714,000
Federal funds	5,603,000
Non-Federal funds	2,730,000
	16,047,000
Production research:	
USDA agencies	38,256,000
State agencies, Federal funds	17,493,000
State agencies, non-Federal funds	69,810,000
	125,559,000
	161,368,000

[1] Includes forestry products, home economics research, and allocations of library and other administrative funds.

Estimate of non-Federal funds and distribution by type of research supplied by budgetary reports, Agricultural Research Service, USDA.

The great disparity in the Government in use of agricultural research funds between production and utilization is an historical development. The authorization of Federal research in relation to production developed from the beginnings of research in the United States Department of Agriculture and the State experiment stations. Research in relation to marketing and utilization of farm products is a recent development. Recognition of the need for marketing research and services was registered in the establishment of the Office of Markets in the United States Department of Agriculture shortly before the outbreak of the First World War. The recognition of the need of utilization research as a contribution to the disposal of surplus farm products was formally recognized first in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Legislative provision for research on new uses and new markets for surplus farm commodities was included in title 2, section 202 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as follows:

"SEC. 202 (a). The Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to establish, equip, and maintain 4 regional research laboratories, 1 in each major farm-producing area, and, at such laboratories, to conduct researches into and to develop new scientific, chemical, and technical uses and new and extended markets and outlets for farm commodities and products and byproducts thereof. Such research and development shall be devoted primarily to those farm commodities in which there are regular or seasonal surpluses, and their products and byproducts."

The Secretary was authorized and directed to cooperate with other departments, agencies, and institutions in carrying out the purposes of this legislation. An appropriation not to exceed $4 million was authorized for the first year. The four regional laboratories have become important research centers.

However, the financial support for the development of agricultural utilization research has not kept pace with the problems to be dealt with nor with the national expenditures upon research generally. The Federal expenditures on research and development have multiplied many times within the last 15 years. Estimates of expenditures for Federal research and development indicate an increase from less than $100 million in 1940 to over $2 billion in fiscal 1955.[1] The research and development expenditures in the Department of Agriculture increased from about $28 million in 1940 to $72 million in 1955, whereas the expenditures on utilization research, initially authorized at $4 million in 1938, has increased to only $9 million for fiscal 1955.

While there is no practical measure of funds required to deal with the problems which are dealt with in the field of utilization research, it is obvious that expenditures are far short of what might be considered as required to deal with such problems.

Evaluation of the results of utilization research by the United States Department of Agriculture

The utilization research in the Department of Agriculture has contributed to a significant extent both directly and indirectly to expanding the industrial utilization and to increasing the use value and expanding the use of may farm products. Results of the utilization work of the Department were reviewed recently in an article entitled "More Dollars From New Markets," published in the March 1956 issue of Chemurgic Digest. It is quoted as follows:

"MORE DOLLARS FROM NEW MARKETS

"Industrial uses and new foods add millions to farm-product value.

"The wholesale value of farm products (not including cotton and wool) used annually today for nonfood uses is about $1 billion.

"Animal fats are used in making plasticizers—substances used to make plastics pliable and tough—at the annual rate of some 15 million pounds worth from $3 to $4 million. Stabilized fats used in feeds amounted to some 280 million pounds in 1955. Research has shown that use of inedible animal fats in the hotdip tinning of sheet steel could absorb 15 million pounds of fat annually and release the industry from dependence on imported palm oil.

"Research to improve the quality of cotton products has helped raise cotton consumption and enabled cotton to ward off competition from other fibers. Developments by USDA's Agricultural Research Service in cooperation with industry include a cotton opener, which permits better cleaning and blending of raw cotton; a differential dye test, used to preselect cottons that will dye to a uniform shade; and new equipment that permits textile mills to handle cotton of different fiber lengths. The cotton opener alone is saving mills more than $2 million annually.

"Cottons that are virtually new fibers have been prepared through chemical modification. One of them is partially acetylated cotton, highly resistant to rot, mildew, and heat damage. Another chemical treatment flameproofs cotton fabric and enables it to keep its flame resistance even after many launderings. Improved surgical bandages, made by chemically treating ordinary cotton gauze to make it stretchable and self-clinging, costs less than half as much as that of other suitable bandages. They have already saved the Armed Forces several million dollars.

"An important new use developed for corn is a fiber made from the corn protein zein. Zein fiber, used in blends with wool, cotton, and other fibers now has a market value of $5 to $6 million annually.

"Research developed processes have made the dry grinding of such agricultural residues as corncobs, fruit pits, nut shells, and rice hulls a well established business. Much of the ground material is used for airblast cleaning and polishing. Corncobs are a source of the industrial chemical furfural, used in making nylon and other products. Waste straw is going into paper and paper products. Waste feathers are used for feeds and fertilizers.

"Research on medicinals by agricultural scientists has been extremely rewarding. USDA investigators helped boost yields of penicillin more than a hundredfold, mainly through development of the submerged-culture method, using corn steep liquor (a byproduct of cornstarch manufacture) and lactose (milk sugar) in the culture medium. From an overripe cantaloup they isolated the mold that is the parent strain of all those now used for penicillin production. Following penicillin, a vast new era of antibiotic research and production was initiated, and a multimillion dollar antibiotics industry has been established.

"Development of the starchlike substance dextran, a synthetic blood-plasma extender, is of incalculable value in case of a large scale catastrophe. Commercial production is now sufficient to meet military and civilian stockpiling needs.

"Within the past 20 years, bulk groceries have been almost entirely supplanted by nationally advertised prepackaged goods. The entire retail frozen-food industry has come into being. From only 77 million pounds in 1935, United States production of frozen fruits rose to 523 million pounds in 1954. Frozen fruit-juice concentrates shot up from nothing in 1935 to 82 million gallons in 1954. Production of frozen vegetables starting from practically nothing in 1935, has reached about 1 billion pounds per year.

"Developments in food processing have given farmers a more assured market for their crops, considerable relief from seasonably glutted markets, and more demand for products that provide better return for invested capital and labor.

"Frozen concentrated orange juice, used by housewives the country over, returns tens of millions of extra dollars each year to orange growers and has prevented development of a glutted fresh-orange market. Orange juice, once a luxury, is now available to everyone the year round. Frozen concentrated grape juice, pineapple juice, apple juice, tomato juice are also on the market.

"Research has increased tremendously also the outlet for dairy products. It has shown, for example, that milk solids can be used in practically any type of baked goods, making them taste, look, and keep better, as well as making them more nutritious.

[1] Federal Funds for Science, published by the National Science Foundation, 1954.

"Research conducted on dried eggs during the past 20 years has resulted in a high-quality, versatile new product. An expanding industry, now exceeding $50 million annually in volume, has been built on this research. At least 20 million pounds of dried whole egg, yolk, and white are now being used annually in candy and noodle manufacture, in commercial baking, and in prepared mixes."

The above statement selects for appraisal some of the most significant results of the utilization research by the Department. In addition, basic research not yet applied has laid the groundwork for tangible results not yet realized, but having great potential value. A substantial increase in funds for application and development probably could multiply the tangible results to farmers from the results of research to date. The fruitfulness of the modest expenditures to date suggest the potential value of expanding greatly the funds available for basic research and development.

2. UTILIZATION RESEARCH BY INDUSTRY

The expenditures on research in the utilization of agricultural products in industry[2] are probably greater than the expenditures of the Government. Available information is not sufficient to provide a current estimate of the expenditures by industry for research relating to the utilization of farm products, but estimates of such expenditures in 1951 exceeded the total of research expenditures in the United States Department of Agriculture on all research and development in that year. Information from about 300 companies carrying on research relating to agriculture indicated that they were then spending about $90 million on the utilization of agricultural products, including forestry products. In addition, industry in 1951 was spending about $50 million on research relating to farm machinery, agricultural chemicals, feeds, etc., related to production. The total of research expenditures relating to agriculture by industry probably exceeded $140 million whereas the United States Department of Agriculture was spending only about $56 million on all research and development projects in that year.

The recent survey of the cost of research and development in private industry indicated an expenditure in 1953 of about $3,700,000,000. Preliminary information indicates that more than one-third of the cost of research and development conducted by private industry was for work done on Government contracts. Probably not more than 5 percent of the total, if that much, was spent upon the utilization of agricultural products, including forestry. In this connection, it was estimated that the total expenditures on research by business, Government, and educational institutions probably exceeded $5 billion, with industry accounting for about two-thirds of that total.

Examples of private industry research re industrial uses of agricultural products[3]

The Atlas Powder Co. is a pioneer in the development of new uses for agricultural products through chemistry and has long recognized the interdependence of industry and agriculture. In the early 1930's chemists of the Atlas Powder Co. developed a new process for turning corn sugar—that is, dextrose—into sugar alcohols. Up to that time, sugars, including corn sugar, had been confined in their uses almost entirely to sweetening substances; since sugar is not sufficiently heat-stable to undergo chemical reaction, it had only limited application to the chemical industry.

By hydrogenating corn sugar, the company was able to produce heat-stable compounds which have found widespread use as a raw material in many manufacturing processes, both food and nonfood. Today, modern chemical research has made it possible to utilize corn sugar in emulsifiers for the manufacture of cosmetics, foods, medical and pharmaceutical preparations, and insecticides; also in placticizers, in industrial finishes for manufactured products, and in moisture conditioners for tobacco, textiles, paper, and other products.

Atlas is a substantial user of farm products in virtually all its operations. In most cases, farm products are used to make nonfood products. The manufacture of explosives, for example, requires large quantities of glycerin processed from livestock and vegetable oils, corn flour, nitrocotton, cane sugar, beet pulp, oat hulls, and many other products of the land. The company used some 12 million pounds of corn sugar in its manufacturing processes last year and is the Nation's largest user of corn sugar for nonsweetening purposes. More than 8 million pounds of natural fats and oils were required to make emulsifiers; and, in total, the company consumed approximately 40 million pounds of ingredients derived from farm crops.

The E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc., in addition to developing and formulating products for agricultural use, through research, has found uses for many farm products and byproducts. For example, cotton linters (short-staple fiber still adhering to cottonseed after ginning) once preferred for the production of cellulose, which Du Pont uses in very large quantities for manufacture of rayon, cellophane, finishes, explosives, and other products. In recent years, cellulose from woodpulp has been raised in standard by Du Pont scientists until it is of sufficiently high quality to be satisfactory in practically all uses.

Farm products also enter substantially into manufacture of paints and lacquers by Du Pont. The company's finishes division uses large quantities of vegetable oils such as soya, linseed, and tung oil; butyl alcohol, which is derived from corn; and ethyl alcohol, derived from molasses which in turn is made from sugarcane.

Ely Lily & Co. for many years has used great quantities of agricultural byproducts in the manufacture of pharmaceuticals such as insulin, liver products, and thyroid extracts. In addition, Lily uses in the making of pharmaceuticals such agricultural products as corn sugar, cane sugar, cornstarch, and oil, potato starch, soya-bean meal and oil, cider and vinegar, orange and lemon oils, beeswax, casein (curd of milk), and milk sugar.

The Baker Castor Oil Co.'s program of research and development is concerned with vegetable oils unusual to United States agriculture, primarily castor oil, but also safflower oil and others. A spokesman for the company points out that its program is making possible higher incomes to farmers in areas where oil crops can be grown by providing new cash crops to be planted on acres retired from surplus crops, and thus permitting agricultural diversification with accompanying greater financial security.

Baker's research chemists work constantly to develop new products made from castor beans and thus increase the market demand for castor beans and other unusual oil seeds.

Spencer Kellogg & Sons, Inc., deals in oil-bearing crops which are converted into oils and protein concentrates. In producing protein concentrates, which it sells to mixed feed companies, the Kellogg Co. maintains its own research laboratories in which scientists evaluate meals, for feed, from a nutritional standpoint.

An extensive research laboratory is maintained in the company's soybean solvent extraction plant in which Kellogg scientists work continuously to improve soybean oil both for edible and for industrial purposes and thus increase consumption. For example, a method of chemically treating soybean oil to increase its drying properties and make it equal to linseed oil has been developed, and the company says, "We have a proven record that our product can be used in outside house paints and the results are equal to linseed oil for this work."

The National Canners Association has played an important part in the improvement of the United States canning industry's methods and products. In the field of scientific research carried on by trade associations for the benefit of an entire industry, the Canners Association was a pioneer and steadily has broadened the scope of its work in recent years to extend it to the industry's raw products problems.

The Gerber Products Co. has been concerned with the manufacture of baby foods since 1901. From a humble beginning this company grew into an industry which in 1954 used a tonnage of fresh fruits and vegetables which would require 8,500 railroad cars to move.

The corn refining industry, comprised of 13 plants, has through the Corn Industries Research Foundation, Inc., an extensive research program with projects handled by many agricultural colleges. The 13 corn-refining plants are capable of grinding 250 carloads of shelled corn daily (120 million bushels per year) and of shipping out a like amount of finished products—starch and oil, and their byproducts which principally are used by the mixed-feed industry for dairy and poultry feeds. As the result of research, practically nothing is wasted; even the steepwater in which the grain soaks before it is processed is an important nutrient for growing yeast and molds which in turn produce the antibiotics, such as penicillin, teramycin, streptomycin, and aureomycin.

Industry research and development activities related to farm products probably would be stimulated by an expansion of the basic research program of the Government agencies. Cooperation of Government and industry in research and development of new and extended uses for farm products is essential to obtain the most significant results.

ECONOMICS OF UTILIZATION

The greatest interest in increasing utilization research arises from the need of finding outlets for surplus production. In working toward this objective it is necessary to give careful consideration to the significance of the results of utilization research in terms of market outlets and the volume of products which may be channeled through the new and expanded outlets.

A recent article by K. Starr Chester published in the Chemurgic Digest, February 1955, calls attention to the tendency of industry to use substitutes for agricultural raw materials. The article is quoted in part as follows:

"There is a growing trend for industry to use substitute raw materials for the agricultural raw materials formerly used. As a few examples of this:

"Butanol and acetone, basic industrial chemicals, were formerly made from corn. Today the plants that made these chemicals from corn are idle, and the chemicals are being manufactured from petroleum or natural gas.

"Glycerol, another basic industrial chemical, was formerly made from tallow, and to some extent from cottonseed oil and soybean oil. Now synthetic glycerol is dominating the market.

"There is an extensive market for proteins in paper coatings. Either soybean

[2] Science and Engineering in American Industry, Preliminary Report on a Survey of Research and Development Costs and Personnel in 1953–54, prepared for the National Science Foundation by the U. S. Department of Labor, 1955.

[3] USA-Background, published by the U. S. Information Agency as Rept. No. 2099, dated September 12, 1955.

protein or casein from milk can be used for this. This market is supplied from casein purchased from Argentina, which is cheaper than either domestic casein or soy protein.

"Furfural, which could have a major outlet in nylon manufacture, is made from grain residues, the use of which aids the economics of grain marketing. Yet cyclohexane from petroleum is used to great extent rather than furfural in nylon manufacture.

"Synthetic raw materials are replacing linseed oil in the drying-oil field, in numerous applications.

"Synthetic textiles are supplanting cotton for a number of uses including tire cords, carpeting, window curtains, and shower curtains as well as clothing.

"Alpha cellulose is now being made of woodpulp instead of cotton linters, as formerly.

"Synthetic detergents are replacing soaps which are made from natural oils and fats.

"Carboxymethycellulose, which in part has its origin in petroleum, is replacing starch as a thickening agent.

"The reasons for this shift away from agricultural raw materials are chiefly economic ones, which might be overcome if industry had incentives to use the agricultural raw materials. Synthetic raw materials are used because they are cheaper to buy and use, and are in constant supply at relatively constant cost from year to year. In some cases, they are more uniform and of higher quality, but these advantages generally have less significance than cost and supply.

"A great many agricultural raw materials are at a disadvantage because their cost is abnormally high; they have priced themselves out of the industrial market. Industry has no prejudice against agricultural raw materials; it simply cannot afford to use them. There is no lack of technology for producing industrial products based on such agricultural raw materials. In the fields of the Department of Agriculture, of industry, and of the Patent Office are many hundreds of processes for converting the surplus farm commodities into industrial products. These processes are scientifically sound, practical, and workable, but they lie gathering dust because their economics are not favorable. There is no economic incentive to use them."

Research that does not find an outlet that will increase the demand for the products will not in itself make a significant contribution to the disposal of surpluses except to the extent that it is significant to find outlets at lower value uses as relief measures to reduce losses otherwise being realized. The author cited above recognizes the problem and suggests that the Government provide incentives for the lower value use.

With reference to economic incentives for the greater use of surpluses, he writes:

"To ask industry to make greater use of the surpluses, which it is able to do technologically but not economically, is to ask industry to undertake operations that are economically hazardous, yet are in the national interest, and, indeed, are in the nature of an emergency. The precedents for providing industry with economic incentives, in such cases, are well established.

"It is desirable that a thorough economic and technological study be made of the feasibility of relieving the surplus problem through providing such incentives to industry. This study should point out the industrial processes in which surplus agricultural commodities could be used to greater extent than at present, provided the economics were more favorable, and the extent to which this would relieve the surplus problem. The nature and amount of incentives that could stimulate such utilization must be determined. The cost of these must be calculated, and compared with existing costs related to the surplus problem. The study should consider the impact which such a shift in raw materials would have on other industries, and its economic and social consequences."

Improving the processing and the economic utility of an agricultural product resulting in a higher value use, is, of course, more to be desired than a program of incentives to permit or encourage lower value uses.

The position of cotton in relation to synthetic fibers is a case which illustrates the problem and the possibilities of maintaining and even developing higher value uses. Improvements in the use values of the synthetics and lower costs of production have made serious inroads on the outlets for cotton. The National Cotton Council reports that the synthetics industry is now spending at least $60 million on research annually but the entire research expenditures devoted to cotton by all public and private agencies combined is probably only about $14 million annually. However, the cotton utilization research has demonstrated that the utility of the cotton fibers can be improved and the competitive position of that crop thereby strengthened.

3. PROGRAMS FOR UTILIZATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The research and marketing advisory committees of the United States Department of Agriculture with the assistance of members of the staff of the Department, now provide a means of keeping in touch with research needs and the industrial research programs as well as the activities and research plans of the Government agencies and other research institutions. Through the Department and these committees, it would be possible to develop information as to the programs in operation, plans for future work, and obtain evaluation of needed research and funds required for research programs which have the greatest promise of significant results.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I hold in my hand many editorials which have appeared in the great newspapers and magazines of the United States in respect to this matter. I have not found anyone opposed to this idea. I have not found anyone who does not feel the purpose of the bill ought to be accomplished quickly. Many people do not quite understand why we have not heretofore passed such a bill. So I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, many editorials and articles from magazines and newspapers.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the South Bend Tribune of March 24, 1956]

CAPEHART'S FARM VISION

Senator CAPEHART'S suggestion that the Federal Government spend $100 million a year on a program for development of new uses of farm products commands serious consideration in the existing circumstances.

Already a lot of the taxpayers' money is going into subsidies, in one form or another, which evade the basic issue. At the root of the farm problem is overproduction. Too much is being produced in view of the existing need for farm products.

For decades, this has not been given proper consideration in the much-advertised "farm relief" laws. A series of evasive farm laws has merely aggravated the situation.

The Eisenhower administration is trying to create a less dangerous system for service while a program going completely to the root of the problem is being devised and applied. But the administration is literally besieged now by congressional advocates of measures that would prolong and intensify the basic trouble.

Perhaps an efficient crop production control system cannot be created. In fact, many authorities say that it is literally impossible.

So it is eminently sensible to consider ways and means of increasing demand for farm products. Incidentally, the remedies applied so far by the Federal Government, most notably rigid Government supports, have actually reduced demand for some farm products.

Senator CAPEHART specifically mentions "industrial use for agricultural products." The potential demand in that area may be unlimited.

The Indiana Senator thinks the markets for farm products can be increased 100 percent in the next 50 years. That could mean unprecedented prosperity for farmers.

This is not wildly fanciful. The surface has been barely scratched where new uses for farm products are concerned.

[From the Indianapolis Times of March 25, 1956]

HOOSIER FARM LEADERS BACK CAPEHART'S PLAN—BUREAU, FARMERS UNION CHIEFS ENDORSE UNITED STATES RESEARCH TO INCREASE PRODUCT DEMAND

(By Ted Knap)

Leaders of two major farm groups in Indiana yesterday endorsed Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART'S crash program to find new uses for agricultural products.

The Indiana Republican Senator said his $100-million-a-year research proposal would double the market for farm products. In introducing the measure last week, he said it would help solve the farm problem for all time.

Instead of concentrating on cutting farm production in line with the reduced demands, which has been Federal policy for more than 20 years, the Capehart plan would concentrate on boosting the demand so farmers can produce all their land will yield.

He called the plan staggering in impact.

Hassil Schenck, president of the Indiana Farm Bureau, said he is very enthusiastically in favor of the Capehart bill.

"It is one of the soundest investments the Government could make at this time," he said. "It would be a major step toward the long-range solution of the farm problem. The job is a big one, and the research program should get an appropriation big enough to carry it out."

John Raber, president of the Indiana Farmers Union—often opposed to the Farm Bureau—said his group also favors the Capehart plan.

Both the Farm Bureau and Farmers Union, at their recent State conventions, approved resolutions calling for more Government-sponsored research into industrial uses for farm products.

Both Mr. Schenck and Mr. Raber predicted the Capehart bill will pass in this election year when the farmers' plight is of major political concern. Mr. Schenck said some opposition is expected from those interests with which industrialized farm products would compete, like the gasoline industry.

"Its potential is virtually unlimited," Senator CAPEHART said. "I know enough about it that I have been saying to the farmers of Indiana: 'Don't sell your farmland. Buy more. The next 50 years on the American farm will see unprecedented prosperity.'"

"Its results," Senator CAPEHART said, "would include:

"More income for the farmer.

"More jobs—on farms, in new industries, and in transport.

"More retail business in farm communities and around the new industries.

"Lower taxes for all because it would wipe out, or at least reduce, the need for Government buying of surplus."

Senator CAPEHART pointed out that the $100 million he urges for research is less than

one-third of the $365 million Uncle Sam now spends just for storing surplus crops.

Main points of the Capehart bill are:

1. It creates an Industrial Agricultural Products Administration, headed by a Presidential appointee.

2. The IAPA would conduct research and experiments on old and new farm products to explore their usefulness in industry.

3. It would hire or contract with firms and research organizations, including universities, to conduct such study programs.

4. It would operate pilot plants to develop manufacturing processes to the point where it will be profitable for private industry to take over.

5. Pay private citizens for successful suggestions or inventions in this field.

6. Expand the research and pilot plant programs now being done on a limited basis by the Agriculture Department.

Senator CAPEHART said there are many possibilities for industrial use of crops, some of which have had preliminary exploration. Fo example, alcohol made from grain can be substituted for gasoline if cheaper manufacturing methods can be devised.

There has been considerable interest in a bamboo plant to be used as raw material for making paper pulp, which is in critically short supply.

"Some years ago, the citrus-fruit industry was in bad shape," Senator CAEPHART recalled. "Then our Agriculture Department, through research, aided in the perfection of the quick-frozen food process. I am told that this virtually saved the citrus-fruit industry."

[From the Hammond (Ind.) News of May 28, 1956]

NEW USES FOR FARM PRODUCTS

Mixing alcohol with automobile gasoline—a process used successfully in several foreign countries and which has received experimental approval in the United States—may go a long way toward solving the surplus grain problem. An estimated 2½ billion bushels of grain would be used annually in making alcohol for new uses—including 2 billion bushels for mixing with gas and 365 million bushels if alcohol can be produced economically enough to justify its use in the manufacture of synthetic rubber.

Study of the alcohol-from-grain possibility is among the proposals of many Senators who are seeking new uses for farm products to bolster the agricultural economy and reduce surpluces. Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART of Indiana has been among the leaders in advocating the establishment of a special agency devoted to exploring new industrial uses for farm products and has introduced legislation to that effect.

[From the Indianapolis News of March 23, 1956]

A KEY TO FARM PROSPERITY

Indiana Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART is to be commended for urging Congress to look beyond temporary farm relief measures toward establishment of a basis for permanent agricultural prosperity.

We believe that he is on the right track in introducing a bill to set up a broad Government-backed program of research to find new industrial uses for farm products.

Essentially, as the Senator explains, this is a solution of the farm problem based, not on the negative theory of curtailing production, but on a positive approach of creating new markets demanding full utilization of our agricultural capacity.

Industry in this country already has made great progress in using grain and other crop derivatives in processing rubber, plastics and other materials. But the surface has hardly been scratched.

Agricultural research, as far as Government programs have been concerned, has been a budgetary orphan. It presently has neither the facilities nor the personnel needed to bring it to the point of a breakthrough toward major accomplishment.

The $100 million annually to bring this about, as provided in the Capehart measure, is fractional when compared to the savings that could be made in farm subsidies and in Government storage of surpluses.

Senator CAPEHART believes enactment of such a research program would result in the creation of a farm market at least twice as great as any we have ever known.

Farmers could follow their natural instinct to get everything possible out of their land. Industry would profit. Doors would be opened to thousands of new jobs with the opening of plants to manufacture new products.

Our farm economy has been based too long on the notion that farm products are meant only to be eaten.

Research is disproving that now. But greatly expanded research is needed to bring the marketing of agricultural products for industry on a par with their marketing for grocery counters and feed mills.

As Senator CAPEHART says, much of the program he proposes should be carried on in existing public and private laboratories, particularly through our land-grant colleges, and through private industry itself.

The Government's role should be that of coordinator, not operator.

The main thing is to get the program started as soon as possible. Just that much sooner will farmers be brought into equality with other segments of our economy. And just that much sooner will the taxpayers be taken off the treadmill of paying for year-to-year high-cost farm relief bills.

When that time comes, we won't have the dismal spectacle of good Indiana corn rotting in storage.

[From the Indianapolis Star of March 25, 1956]

TO SEEK A PERMANENT CURE

Hoosier Senator HOMER CAPEHART has offered to the Senate a farm proposal which may justifiably be called exciting. It is a proposal that Government research in the industrial uses of farm products, long carried out on a limited scale by the Department of Agriculture, be elevated to the status of the major phase of the farm program.

All of American industrial experience suggests that Senator CAPEHART is merely stating a simple truth in saying that the possibilities of expanding the market for farm goods by this means are limitless.

Expansion of the farm market is the only kind of measure which can possibly bring permanent solution of the farm problem. The opposite measure—reduction of supply—has been the objective of the present Federal program since its inception during the New Deal. To date all the effort directed at this objective over more than 20 years has not been able to bring even a single season's respite from the problem. If the program ever were successful in shrinking production to the size of the market, there could be no sense of assurance that the market would not then contract further and bring the problem back.

If on the other hand relief from the problem can be obtained by expanding the market to absorb the existing production, even if production then expanded further, as it undoubtedly would, still there would be every possibility that a continued balance could be maintained by perpetuating the expansive trend of the market, once established.

We hope Congress will be quick to grasp the potentialities of this proposal.

We question the proposition that the idea should be implemented by creating a new administrative agency and a new section in the Department of Agriculture. To be sure this has been the standard method of launching a project in Washington over the past 25 years or so. But it is not necessarily the best method.

The establishment of new agencies would be dramatic. But it also would be time consuming. Funds and energies for a considerable period at the start of the program would be dissipated in the building of a new segment of bureaucracy. Only when it has firmly laid the groundwork for its own perpetuation and expansion is a new Federal Bureau ready to go to work at the task assigned to it.

It might be more effective to put the funds and energy into direct expansion of the existing research program of the Department of Agriculture. Surely sufficient emphasis could be achieved in the passage of the act to give the program initial impetus equivalent to that achieved by the psychology of establishing a new agency.

The basic proposal is a good one. The mechanics are important to the end that energy be applied as soon and as directly as possible to the achievement of the mission, with a minimum of diversion into the fields of new buildings, new plants, and new staffs.

Senator CAPEHART has hold of something.

[From the Indiana Farmers Guide]

MORE USES FOR FARM PRODUCTS

One of the constructive proposals to come out of current debate on the farm problem is the bill introduced by Hoosier Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART to establish a $100 million Government research program "to double the demand for farm products through discovery of new industrial uses and utilization of new processes already known." Although some research along this line has been conducted for a number of years on a limited scale by the United States Department of Agriculture and land-grant college experiment stations, this would be an intense, well financed effort to speed up and expand such research to alleviate the farm crop surplus problem as rapidly as possible.

Expansion of the farm market is the only real solution to our current crop surplus problems. Natural population growth and concerted efforts to find new markets for our crops as food and fiber will take care of part of the expanding production, but Senator CAPEHART'S proposal is designed to eliminate the slack entirely and to strengthen the American farmer's economic position in a constructive manner.

We are inclined to disagree with the Senator on one provision of his bill. This would establish a new Industrial Agricultural Products Administration to conduct the program and a new agency within the Department of Agriculture to carry out the work. It might be better if this entire project were made a part of the existing research program of the Department of Agriculture, rather than creating another office.

We hope Congress will give this program for expanded industrial uses of agricultural products serious consideration.

[From the Plymouth (Ind.) Pilot-News of May 2, 1956]

FARM PROBLEM SOLUTION

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana, has proposed a plan for the solution of the troublesome farm problem which he believes will make an unlimited market for our farm products. His plan: "A tremendous research and development program * * * to develop to the utmost the industrial uses we already know about for farm products * * * and at the same time find new uses creating a demand for at least double what we have considered normal farm production of the United States."

Senator CAPEHART has a big farm down near Washington, Ind., and knows something firsthand about the farmer's problems. He would have a sizable appropriation for the rapid and signal increase of research for

greater and greater uses of farm products until surpluses will be a thing of the past.

For many years the Chemurgic Council has been working on this matter of turning farm products into new uses, and considerable progress has been made. CAPEHART believes that there is no limit to the new products we can discover if we devote enough time to the subject.

The Senator may be right about this, for scientists have done far more wonderful things than this. The time has certainly come to give this idea a thorough trial. If science can solve our critical farm problem, that is without doubt the best and surest way to do it. Politics will never solve it.

[From the Washington Star of April 6, 1956]

CAPEHART'S FARM PLAN WORTH LOOK

A new line of attack on the farm problem, uniformly recognized as the number one headache in the national economy, has been proposed to Congress. It is, in brief, a greatly expanded and intensified research program to find new industrial uses for farm products. Legislation to launch the program, under a fulltime administrator, has been introduced by Senator CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana.

The idea of research in agriculture is not, of course, a new one. The Department of Agriculture, though its experimental stations and in cooperation with both public and private agencies, has engaged in research for many years. And Senator CAPEHART proposes that his vastly broader program should be built upon the foundations of this existing activity.

To a large extent, however, past research has been directed at improving production methods and quality of crops rather than seeking new uses for the products themselves. It is in this proposed change in emphasis, perhaps, that a substantial increase in research offers its greatest promise for utilization of our continuing and costly overproduction.

There are, in fact, certain lines of research under way—but with limited funds and attention—that might provide important new agricultural markets. One is the extraction of metallurgical oils and another of paint oils from grain. A third is the manufacture of synthetic rubber through the use of ethyl alcohol extracted from grain, or in the use of grain-derived ethyl alcohol for other industrial purposes.

The petroleum and chemical industries, as examples have demonstrated—particularly in the last decade—the unlimited horizons that can be discovered through research. The chemical companies already are directing attention to the possibilities in agricultural products.

The farming community itself, however, is not able, through organization or financing, to undertake research on any effective scale. The proposed program would be a long-term one and relatively costly in the first instance. It might, however, bring much greater dividends than those derived from spending money for the storage of surplus crops or for holding land out of production. The plan is worth a careful look.

[From the Indianapolis Star of March 25, 1956]

INDIANA FARMING: CAPEHART FARM-AID PLAN PUTS ACCENT ON GROWTH

(By Robert Kellum)

The United States Senate piled more confusion on the belabored farm problem last week—by passing a bill that has more pitfalls than a winter-ravaged county road.

But, behind the fanfare over what kind of price supports to provide for commodities, there's sentiment mounting among many agricultural leaders for an entirely new approach. They think it's time to look further ahead than 1 year on this job of putting better stability into rural buying power.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART's introduction of a bill to create an Industrial Agricultural Products Administration with a $100 million annual research fund is a step in this direction. The accent is on growth, not restrictions.

CAPEHART said:

"The United States must undertake at once a $100 million-a-year research and development program to find new and increased industrial uses for agricultural products. * * *

"It is my opinion that the Department of Agriculture and our research and development people know enough now that, given a real opportunity to prove it, they can find industrial uses for 5 million additional bushels of grain, such as corn, wheat, rye, barley, oats, rice, and sorghum grains, as well as potatoes, each year. Our total production now of these grains is only about 6,500,000,000 bushels."

He says that "as fast as the Government proves practicability of each new farm product in industry, the process should be turned over to private industry for production."

He lists 11 probable industrial uses for agricultural products "on which best available estimates indicate likely use of 2,500,000,000 bushels a year of agricultural products."

Here's his lineup: High protein food by fermentation; paint from vegetable oil; synthetic rubber; microbia rubber; increased use of starch in paper; industrial exploitation of oxystarch; raising disease-free poultry for export; new drug plans; hardboard, boxboard, and building board from wheat; development of high amylose corn; blending 10 percent grain alcohol with gasoline.

He also cited these possible uses for grain derivatives: Smokeless powder; plastics; medicinals; toilet preparations; soaps; cleaners; anesthetics; antifreeze; dyes; varnishes; power and fuel.

The research program, once it is given a full opportunity to work, would do these things, CAPEHART asserted:

"It would end our farm surplus problem, it would save the Government money, it would help relieve the tax burden, and give a chance for reduction of the national debt, it would create new industries, new jobs, stimulate sales, and provide better incomes for our people, including the Nation's 6 million farmers."

Without any direct reference to Senator CAPEHART'S plan, but relating to it, nevertheless, were comments by Dr. E. T. Weiler, head of the Purdue Department of Economics, at the 12th annual Indiana Bankers Association agricultural clinic on the West La Fayette campus last week.

Weiler stressed the fact that America doubles its output every 20 years.

This will continue, he added. Normal is an increase in total output of goods and products of 3 to 5 percent each year. With population gaining at a rate that is equal to South Bend-Mishawaka census figures every month, growth all along the line is inevitable, the economist said.

Commenting that "1956 may well see a record for gross national product in the United States," Weiler asserted that "research continues to open new frontiers for the American economy."

From another source, Dr. Vernon W. Ruttan, Purdue agriculture economist, writes in the Review of Economics and Statistics that:

"By 1975, United States food and fiber requirements can be met with approximately the same land requirements as at present with a farm-labor force at least 20 percent below present levels."

Actually, that's what the agricultural leaders see ahead when they say it's time for a new approach to this problem—something to replace billions of dollars worth of rotting corn or other grain that's kept off the market in an effort to bolster prices on farm products.

Dr. Ruttan adds:

"The important question facing American agriculture is not that of meeting requirements of food and fiber for an increased population but what combination of expenditures for research, land, labor, and capital is needed to produce this output at the lowest cost.

"The Nation's needs for foods and fiber are expected to increase 60 percent above the 1950 level by 1975. If past trends continue, half of this increase will be taken care of through increased efficiency resulting from the application of new research and technology.

"To produce the other half of the Nation's increased need for food and fiber, additional expenditures will be required for fertilizer, tractor fuel, insecticides, and antibiotics.

"As a result of these changes farm output will become more sensitive to price change and attempts to control farm output will become more difficult and costly than at present."

If anybody thinks Ruttan is wrong on his 1975 forecasts of farm productivity, let him look back on corn records in Indiana. Average yield per acre has about doubled in the last quarter century.

Growth deserves more attention in farm debates.

[From the La Porte Herald-Argus of March 28, 1956]

CAPEHART'S PROPOSAL

If there is anything which should make even the experts humble it is the constantly belabored farm problem, a matter about which the layman who resides in the city admittedly knows little. And that same layman is far from convinced that the experts, or even the farmers themselves, know many of the important answers. The farm problem will keep on being that, just as it has since the first farm movements began in the 1870's and 1880's of the last century.

There are some points on which there is agreement. The farm population continues to decline. Farm output can be stepped up constantly by improved methods and more machinery. And farm supports are a part of Government's business and will continue to be ad infinitum.

Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, offers a suggestion looking to the future of American farming which conforms to the pattern of probable American growth in population and productivity. The Senator wants an Industrial Agriculture Products Administration with an annual $100 million research fund. The research would be to discover new uses for agricultural products so that more of them rather than less would be necessary to supply expanding demand.

He lists some probable industrial uses for farm products, such as high-protein food for fermentation, paint from vegetable oil, synthetic rubber, increased use of starch in paper, new drug plants, hardboard, boxboard, and building board from wheat, blending of 10 percent grain alcohol with gasoline, and others. The Senator has apparently been communing with research chemists and what he says contains lively possibilities for the future. The farm and the laboratory must work hand in hand. Demand for food and fiber will increase as our population does. And there are many potential new uses for almost everything grown domestically.

There is no answer in this to the problem of maintaining farm prices. No matter what research shows can be made useful to man, there is always the question of how much the farmer gets for his products. His income has dropped sharply in recent years and understandably he is not happy about it. If he is able to produce more for new purposes there is no assurance his net income above expenses will be greater.

[From the Indianapolis News of March 27, 1956]

RESEARCH IS "KEY" TO HEALTHY AGRICULTURE

(By Frank Salzarulo)

Research can be given much of the credit for converting agriculture from a one-horse industry to a mechanized monster.

More research in the future may be the difference between doom and boom in our modern agricultural economy.

It used to be that 80 percent of our population on the farm produced food and fiber for 20 percent in the city.

Today, one farm worker provides enough for himself and 18 of his city cousins.

Great results have been chalked up by researchers and farmers, to wit:

For every 2 eggs laid by one hen in 1940, today's hen lays 3.

In 1939, farmers produced 2½ billion bushels of corn on 88 million acres. In 1955 they produced 30 percent more on only 80 million acres.

On the average, today's cow produces a half ton more milk in a year than a cow in 1940.

There are 95 million cattle on the same pastures and rangelands today that supported 70 million head in 1940.

There are 100 million hogs today on farms compared to the same farm plant that carried 75 million in 1940.

So the story goes.

In Washington, the politicians are haggling over what to do to buoy farm prices that have been sagging while prices farmers pay for things they buy continue to rise.

SENATOR CAPEHART OFFERS SOLUTION

One Senator, HOMER E. CAPEHART, believes he's got the answer—more research.

In a letter to Rural Route, he writes:

"This just has to be the answer to the farm problem. The sooner we all get behind such a program, the better off the United States and the world will be."

He's introduced in the Senate a bill proposing a $100 million research program, that would, in his opinion, double the demand for farm products through discovery of new industrial uses and utilization of new processes already known.

CAPEHART spells out 11 probable industrial uses for farm products, and estimates they'll use 2½ billion bushels a year of agricultural products out of 6½ billion bushels produced yearly. They are:

High protein food by fermentation; paint from vegetable oil; synthetic rubber, microbia rubber; increased use of starch in paper; industrial exploitation of oxystarch; raising disease-free poultry for export; new drug plants; hardboard, boxboard and building board from wheat; development of high amylose corn, and blending 10 percent grain alcohol with gasoline.

CAPEHART says the benefits of such a research project to the Nation would be limitless. He cites these benefits—full market for full farm production; end of farm surpluses; save Government money; relieve tax burden and reduce national debt; create new industries; create new jobs; stimulate retail sales; provide higher income for all people.

[From the South Bend Tribune of April 2, 1956]

NEW USAGE EXAMPLES

When Senator CAPEHART recently suggested use of some Federal money to encourage development of new uses for farm products he undoubtedly was thinking of what has been done already in the private-enterprise area. The meatpacking industry, among others, has set an encouraging example.

The Federal Government is already spending heavily for farmers' benefits. But the Government spending so far has not decisively reduced production or stimulated more consumption. The best approach to the overproduction problem would be promotion of greater usage of farm products.

The American Meat Institute reported 1,000-pound steers selling on the Chicago market recently at an average $203.80 per animal or 20 cents a pound. The meat yield from a 1000-pound steer averages 580 pounds.

Each pound of meat sells wholesale at about 32.9 cents or $190.80 from each 1,000-pound steer. In other words, choice beef was sold wholesale for $12.98 less than was paid for the 1,000-pound animal on the hoof.

Byproducts make the difference. "Glue factory" is no longer the last word in animal byproducts.

Scores of commodities are manufactured from meat products that were once considered unusable. They include drugs, medicines, fertilizer, and paint.

These new uses had to be developed carefully. That took work—and money. But private packers and the meat institute had the foresight to see that some day the expense would be practically justified.

It would be worthwhile to develop new uses for other farm products. Anyone paying Federal taxes would benefit because right now we are paying taxes for farm overproduction.

[From the Oil and Gas Journal of April 2, 1956]

GOP PUSHES PLAN TO PUT ALCOHOL IN GAS TANKS

WASHINGTON.—The drive to put alcohol into the Nation's automobile tanks and into its tires is rolling at high speed.

Eyeing the farm vote next November, Republicans in Congress are going all-out behind moves to develop new agricultural markets. And gasoline, they believe, offers a way, indirectly, to burn up a lot of grain.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana, proposes the creation of a Federal Industrial Agricultural Products Administration with a $100 million kitty. Thirty-three other Republicans immediately signed their names to his bill. A number of similar measures were introduced in the House.

CAPEHART'S bill came in a few days after the Senate adopted an amendment to the farm bill directing the President to set up a five-man commission to write legislation for industrial use of farm products. But his bill goes much further. It is a "crash program," the Senator said.

IMPLICATIONS STAGGERING

The proposed IAPA would have an almost unlimited field. It could conduct research, make field studies and experiments. It also could built pilot plants and, if necessary, operate manufacturing facilities to prove the commercial feasibility of volume production.

Development of nonfood agricultural products would not only make acreage limitation unnecessary but would induce farmers to work every possible acre, CAPEHART told the Senate.

It would create new industries and increased demand on present ones. Retail business would zoom billions of dollars, he said. Taxes could be eased because it no longer would be necessary to provide farm subsidies and other aids.

"The ramifications of such a plan are staggering," CAPEHART said.

Seeing an end to the surplus grain problem, CAPEHART said the Agriculture Department estimated that over 2.6 billion bushels of grain could be consumed in a mere 11 industrial products. A 10 percent blend of alcohol with gasoline would take 2 billion bushels. Another 365 to 400 million bushels would be used in synthetic rubber.

OIL MARKET WOULD SUFFER

"The petroleum industry might lose 10 percent of its market," CAPEHART admitted.

"However, the 90 percent in only a few years' time would be so much bigger in volume and so much more important to the industry that the two are hardly worth comparing."

At the moment it would cost more to produce alcohol than gasoline, CAPEHART conceded. "But know-how in America always gets the price down."

The reduction in crude production resulting from the blending of alcohol with gasoline would in the long run "be more than offset by increased consumptions in the hundreds of thousands of new tractors, trucks, transport vehicles, automobiles, and other petroleum-burning equipment in use because of this very program," he said.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 28, 1956]

CRASH PROGRAM FOR FARMS

(By Walker S. Buel)

WASHINGTON, March 27.—Dawn of a new and brighter day for the American farmer, as a result of a $100 million program to multiply industrial uses of agricultural products, is foreseen by Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, Indiana, in introducing legislation to launch such a plan. The bill, which the author says should be enacted immediately to provide all-time solution of the farm problem, has 35 Republican cosponsors, including Ohio's Senators BENDER and BRICKER.

Although a draft was circulated among all Members of the Senate before its introduction, no Democrat signed it, which is a fair indication that it has little chance in this Congress.

WANTS USE IN INDUSTRY STEPPED UP

Nevertheless, CAPEHART intends to push it as vigorously as he can. Several similar bills have been presented in the House by Indiana Representatives after conference with CAPEHART. The Senator believes the huge problem can only be met on the basis of more uses for farm products in industry—that it never can be licked by production for food uses alone. His measure would create an industrial agricultural products administration, as a separate executive agency, and provide also for an agency of similar title within the Department of Agriculture.

Duties of both would be to conduct research, test commercial production procedures, maintain pilot plants, operate manufacturing facilities, and generally promote the development of processes and techniques for industrial uses of greater quantities of farm products.

Senator ANDERSON, Democrat, New Mexico, former Secretary of Agriculture, called attention to the fact that a special agricultural research administration was established in the Department of Agriculture in 1946, but that it has been difficult to push Congress to get the necessary appropriations by the Budget Bureau. CAPEHART said he thought that with a mandate from Congress such as he proposed, programs now dragging would be accomplished more quickly.

The Indiana Senator said on many industrial uses some research already has been done. He named this list of 11 "probable" industrial uses for farm products, given him by the Department of Agriculture, which he said would require 2½ billion bushels annually:

High protein cattle food by fermentation; paint from vegetable oil; synthetic rubber; microbia rubber, a natural rubber produced from the gluten in grain; increased use of starch in paper; industrial exploitation of oxystarch; raising disease-free poultry for export; new drug plants; hardboard, box board, and building board from wheat; development of high amylose corn; and blending 10 percent grain alcohol with gasoline.

"I think," CAPEHART told his colleagues, "that through the proposed legislation Congress ought to mandate the administration, especially the Department of Agriculture. An administrator, whom I should like to call a czar, should be appointed to get the job done. I want to see one appointed who will start bumping heads together."

SENSIBLE—BUT WHAT OF ELECTION?

"Let us get the job done. The farmers are in a bad situation. I am trying to have Congress and the administration do for agriculture that which was done for the rubber industry during the last world war. During the war and in a hurry, the Government developed a synthetic rubber industry to the point where today more synthetic rubber can be produced in the United States than can be used.

"I do not want to delay the expenditure of the money. The program ought to be what might well be termed a crash program, and the administration ought to be mandated to proceed with it. It ought to be accomplished 2, 3, or 4 times as fast as any similar program that has been undertaken."

This all seems to make quite a lot of sense. Perhaps that militates against it on Capitol Hill in a campaign year.

[From the La Fayette Journal and Courier of April 2, 1956]

A NEW APPROACH

A radically new approach to the Nation's farm problem has been proposed in a bill introduced in Congress by Indiana's Republican Senator CAPEHART. Others in Congress are giving his proposal active support.

Senator CAPEHART would have the Government undertake a $100 million a year research program designed to find new uses for agricultural products.

In submitting his proposal, the Indiana Senator cited other fields which have utilized research to discover new industrial and commercial uses for their products. Senator CAPEHART would do the same for agriculture.

In a Senate speech accompanying his introduction of the bill, the Indiana Senator contended that his proposal would in a few years create a demand for farm products in industry at least equal to the amount now used for human consumption in the United States. He holds it offers a solution to the farm problem based not on the negative theory of curtailing production, but on the positive approach of creating new markets demanding complete and full utilization of our total agricultural capacity. He would develop to the utmost those industrial uses of farm products which we already know about and at the same time find new uses "creating a demand at least double what we have considered the normal farm production of the United States." His program, he promises, will bring about 50 years of the greatest agricultural prosperity in the history of the Nation.

Senator CAPEHART expressed the opinion that his program would end the tremendous tax burden now imposed to finance the Nation's vast agricultural assistance and storage programs. He cited the fact that present farm programs have built up surpluses costing some $9 billion, which serve to depress the market. The cost of the farm assistance program was placed at $3 to $5 billion for this year alone. The cost of the research program, at $100 million a year, would be but one-third of present annual storage costs for surpluses.

The Hoosier Senator further contends that his program would insure the American farmer his rightful share of an otherwise bountiful prosperity and at the same time put an end to the unsound practice of spending billions to preserve a bad situation when a lot less would provide a permanent cure.

What are the other possibilities? Besides ending the farm surplus problem, saving money for the Government, relieving the tax burden and helping reduce the national debt, the Senator believes his program would create new industries and new jobs and stimulate business generally, providing better incomes for all, farmers included.

Some research already is being conducted along the lines suggested, but at a snail's pace, the Senator holds. He would make it a crash program.

Experience would appear to indicate that the farm problem cannot be solved permanently by curtailing production. Price supports have not worked because of the vast surpluses they encourage.

It is apparent that the right answer has not yet been found for the agricultural problem. Certainly increased consumption and new markets for farm products would help. In this direction may lie the eventual and sole solution.

For this reason, Senator CAPEHART's program may offer unusual merit. Research has worked miracles in some fields of endeavor. It may provide agriculture's salvation. Under such circumstances, Senator CAPEHART's program would appear to deserve the most serious consideration by citizens and also by the Congress.

[From the Kokomo Tribune of May 26, 1956]

FINALLY, A FARM BILL

Probably no one is entirely satisfied with the farm bill that was finally passed by Congress after President Eisenhower had vetoed the first version April 16. Probably no one is entirely displeased with it, either. The bill is a compromise, an election-year compromise of the sort that results when both major parties want the farmer above all to understand that they are working for his benefit.

The most striking new feature of farm legislation in 1956 is the soil-bank program under which farmers will receive $1,200,000,000 annually for taking land out of production. This program recognizes the essential fact that the Nation's farm plant is overexpanded for the time being. The soil-bank plan will reduce the amount of land producing crops now in surplus, and at the same time it will store fertility against the day when it will be needed for production of food. That is good.

The measure directs Secretary of Agriculture Benson to start the soil-bank program at once. It is generally acknowledged, however, that getting such a program into full swing this late in the crop year will be all but impossible. That will have to wait until next year.

Though the administration sought authority to make advance payments this year under the soil-bank program, it is just as well that this authority was denied. That makes the plan much less vulnerable to charges that it is merely an attempt to buy the farm vote. Such charges might have done great harm to an interesting new program that deserves a full and impartial trial.

At the same time, if it is argued in this year's election campaign that the Republicans ignored immediate relief for the farmer, the Eisenhower administration can say that the Republicans attempted to ease the farmer's financial pinch this year. Congressional Democrats, fearing the immediate soil-bank payments proposed by the Republicans would win votes, defeated the plan for advance payments. The administration then turned to fill the gap by using discretionary powers contained in existing laws to deliver early aid.

The new bill doesn't solve the farm problems, but insofar as it will keep production in line with demand, it is sound. As a permanent policy, however, the Government ought to start a broad research program to find new uses for farm products. Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, has proposed just such a plan, deserving of much prompter attention than Congress is giving it.

[From the Indianapolis News of May 1, 1956]

WIDEN MARKETS—ATTACK SURPLUS BY DISCOVERING NEW CROP USES

(From Farm Journal)

Congress worked up a farm bill that became a political monstrosity. It ought to have served one useful purpose—to scare the daylights out of anyone who rests in Government his hopes for salvation.

The course of the bill disclosed blindness to facts, political fear, and demagogy. Commonsense and courage, too, were displayed. Some meritorious features survived the committees, debates, and conferences. The total result, however, was a mess of conflicting measures full of bad provisions.

Agriculture can't afford to leave the future to Government. Future Congresses may outdo this one—they may be able to pass still worse farm legislation.

Something substantial must be done for farmers this year—there's no doubt about it. Fortunately, quite a lot can be done—and will be done—even if the President has vetoed the bill. But, without minimizing the present problem, let's take a longer look ahead, toward something that might get us out of trouble permanently.

The political approach, year after year, has been negative and backward. It has said to farmers, "Retreat. Produce less. Do less. Go backward."

Temporarily this may be necessary. But in the long run no industry has ever advanced by going backward. Agriculture can't get ahead by backing up. Actually, farmers have repudiated the policy of retreat. When directed to reduce acres, they have increased yields to maintain their income. Those who could do so have enlarged their farms. The American habit is to go ahead.

Farmers have eagerly adopted ways to produce more. They have moved ahead with production. Output has advanced faster than marketing, and much faster than the development of new uses for the products.

The total surplus production runs now about 4 or 5 percent ahead of demand. New studies indicate that during the years ahead production likely will gain further over present rates of consumption.

This can only mean that more markets and more uses are absolutely vital. Piling more stuff into Government warehouses provides no answer. It only hangs over the market and reduces current prices. Someone must buy and use the output.

Senator HOMER CAPEHART, of Indiana, and 33 other Senators introduced a bill that has received practically no attention. It proposes $100 million for a "crash" program to find new uses and new markets. Wouldn't it make more sense to spend $100 million in ways that would use up some surplus rather than several billions to build up bigger surpluses?

[From the Indianapolis News of May 9, 1956]

WHERE'S THAT HOOSIER FARM REVOLT?

Yesterday's Indiana primary had been billed nationally as a possible yardstick of opposition to Eisenhower administration farm policies.

If nominally Republican rural Hoosiers cast Democratic ballots in the presidential preference primary in significant numbers—well.

But the outcome gave no sign of that farm revolt we have been hearing so much about.

Percentagewise, the Republicans ran better than they did in the 1952 primary.

ESTES KEFAUVER, the only Democrat in the presidential preference primary, made a respectable showing somewhere in the neighborhood of that of the Democrats in the 1952 primary.

But he fell somewhat short of running like a corncrib afire, let alone a house.

The Indiana primary need not upset Adlai Stevenson to the point of making any further folksy personality changes.

As for that farm revolt, we wonder whether many Democratic leaders may not be doing their party a disservice by making such a big to-do about it in Indiana and similar States.

To be sure, there is farm discontent here. But is it of such a nature as to cause sizable vote shifts?

In view of the fact that President Eisenhower ran strongly in Indiana rural areas despite his veto of the farm bill, Indiana Democratic leaders might consider whether a further inflation of the farm revolt bogey is worth bothering with.

[From the Omaha World-Herald of May 4, 1956]

MR. CAPEHART'S FARM BILL

A bill introduced by Senator CAPEHART, Republican, Indiana, would create an Industrial Agricultural Products Administration and authorize it to spend up to $100 million in developing industrial uses for farm crops.

The new agency would be empowered not only to carry out basic research, but to establish pilot plants and demonstrate the commercial feasibility of whatever it may discover.

Senator CAPEHART suggests that the Omaha alcohol plant, owned by the Federal Government and standing idle, should be reactivated immediately under such a program. He foresees an eventual potential industrial market for 6 billion bushels of farm commodities—which would push the productive resources of all the farmland in the United States.

These are known industrial uses for farm products which have not been fully exploited. Mr. CAPEHART proposes to go the full route and find out, for instance, whether alcohol made from grain can be used economically in motor fuel.

This appears to be a realistic, long overdue approach to the farm problem.

The Government now is spending about $350 million a year just to store nearly $9 billion worth of surplus commodities it has taken over in spite of efforts to restrict production.

If spending a mere $100 million a year would create new farm markets, take the Government out of the costly farm price-support business, and develop new industries and more jobs, it would be a mighty wise investment.

[From the Farm Journal for June 1956]

RUBBER FROM CORN?—BACKERS OF THE NEW "CRASH" RESEARCH PROGRAM ALSO SEE FURNITURE FROM GRAIN, DRUGS FROM NEW CROPS—AND MORE INCOME FOR FARMERS

We're on the threshhold of some amazing farm discoveries—with dividends for farmers everywhere—if we have the "push" to engineer a bold research program.

That's the idea behind a $100 million "crash" research program now before Congress. This is 10 times more than the USDA now gets for "utilization" research. "But it's still less than $1 for every $100 tied up in CCC surpluses," points out Senator CAPEHART, Republican, Indiana, who is pushing the increase.

Here are some promising grain projects that might be speeded up:

1. Ferment grain to make a substance very similar to sap of the rubber tree. This could replace 600,000 tons of imported natural rubber which could easily be cut off from us.

Grain needed to do this job: about 50 to 100 million bushels a year.

2. Another grain-fermenting process may yield a 20 percent protein concentrate—one that is rich in amino acid nutrients needed by livestock.

Possible use: 150 million bushels.

3. A grain starch mixture could stretch scarce, expensive paper pulp. It makes better paper, too.

Grain outlet: possibly 40 to 100 million bushels of corn or wheat.

4. We may be able to substitute 6-cent-per-pound wheat flour for 20-cent glues used in hardboard and boxboard. Puffed wheat might make a filler in "coreboard" used in furniture.

Possible use: 30 million bushels.

Here are some livestock and poultry projects to be developed:

Find out how to produce choice weaning lambs in the Southeast and promote it into a "favored" regional dish. If people in these States ate as much as the national average, it would use 3½ million lambs and boost farm income by $35 million.

Develop areas free of Newcastle and other important poultry diseases. Europe and South America won't take our poultry now for fear of infecting their own flocks.

If we cleaned up some areas and maintained a quarantine, we could ship as much as 200 million pounds a year.

Finish the work on a dried whole milk—one that will keep on the shelf without refrigeration. We're close; but still have some rancidity problems. There's a $227 million-a-year pot of gold at the end of this rainbow.

Find how to really tenderize the poorer cuts of beef. The USDA says that this could add 3 cents a pound to the retail price of meat—$1.8 billion a year to the value of cattle.

Finding new crops for planting in surplus areas and on diverted acres could be an unexplored gold mine.

1. One possibility is to learn to make paper from timber bamboo, hemp, flax and other fibrous crops. If this captured only 10 percent of the paper market, it could use as much as 3½ million acres.

2. The chances are good for developing new chemical compounds from safflower, flaxseed and castor beans.

The USDA feels that with better harvesting machinery castor beans could replace 400,000 acres of cotton in Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, Missouri, New Mexico, Arizona, and California.

3. An interesting variety of "medicinal" crops are possible, including Tephrosia vegelii, a legume yielding a low-cost rotenone; Dioscorea, whose tubers yield a cortisone-like drug; candelilla, a wax-producing shrub; and Rauwolfia, which furnishes some of the new drugs used in treating mental diseases.

Right now there's a market that would keep 235,000 acres busy.

Dr. Byron T. Shaw, head of USDA's Agricultural Research Service, tells Farm Journal that out of every $100 that industry takes in, it sets aside $2 for research and development.

Government farm research to expand uses comes to only 4 cents out of every $100 taken in.

The surplus story (CCC inventory and loans)

Commodity	Investment, Mar. 31, 1956 (millions)		Alltime high (millions)	
	Amount	Cost	Amount	Date
Wheat.....bushels	1,096	$2,821	1,119	February 1956.
Cotton.....bales	13.1	2,275	14.3	January 1956.
Corn.....bushels	1,141	1,911	1,141	March 1956.
Tobacco.....pounds	919	547	1,054	December 1955.
Grain sorghum.....hundredweight	70	141	76	January 1956.
Cheese.....pounds	295	115	463	October 1954.
Barley.....bushels	99	100	104	February 1956.
Butter.....pounds	114	70	521	September 1954.
Oats.....bushels	88	63	92	November 1955.
Dried milk.....pounds	142	24	656	April 1954.

Money tied up in CCC inventory and loans, including these commodities above, reached a record alltime high last month of $8.9 billion.

[From the Farm Journal of June 1956]

WANTED: "CRASH" RESEARCH

The most exciting new farm legislation in the congressional hopper is the Capehart bill. It proposes to set up a $100 million "crash research" program to find new crops and new uses for present crops. So far, 34 Senators have signed the bill.

Unless this bill gets snarled in election-year politics, its chances are good. The greatest question is whether the Democratic leaders on Capitol Hill will decide to sidetrack the bill because it is thus far solidly identified with Republican Senators.

Dr. Byron T. Shaw, USDA, tells Farm Journal that out of every $100 that industry takes in, it sets aside $2 for research and development. Farm research to expand uses comes to only 4 cents out of every $100 taken in.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of June 7, 1956]

DAY BY DAY ON THE FARM

(By Richard Orr)

LAB STUDYING NEW USES OF CORN

PEORIA, Ill., June 6.—A new kind of clothing material made from cornstarch is in prospect some day as the result of research in a Government laboratory here.

Scientists on the staff of the northern utilization research branch of the United States Department of Agriculture have devised a way to modify amylose, a cornstarch component, to form soft but tough fibers for clothing. The same material also may be used to make a film similar to cellophane and designed for similar uses, including food wrappers and containers.

The discovery is one of several outstanding achievements accomplished here since the laboratory was established in 1940 for the purpose of engaging in research to find new and improved industrial uses for agricultural commodities and thereby expand farm markets.

LIKENED TO CELLOPHANE

When and if amylose fiber arrives on the market it will be the second clothing material derived from a corn substance. One, zein, a component of corn protein, already is in use.

Dr. F. R. Senti, head of the laboratory's cereal crops section, explained that amylose film is as good as cellophane in some respects, having comparable strength and folding properties in dry form, though its wet strength is lower than that of cellophane. Amylose film also has the unique quality of being digestible, which means that, if packaging and merchandising plans were so designed, it could be eaten along with the food it contains.

The technological problems of producing amylose film are largely solved. However, Senti explained, at present it is relatively costly to separate the amylose from corn. This makes the product not yet commercially economical, compared with the less expensive cellophane which is made from regenerated woodpulp.

NEED NEW CORN VARIETIES

One approach to this problem is to develop new varieties of corn which yield a higher percentage of amylose. The laboratory's researchers now are cooperating with State agriculture experiment stations and private corn breeders to develop such varieties.

Most varieties of corn now yield about 27 percent amylose. Senti said it is hoped eventually to develop varieties that will boost the yield to above 80 percent.

Breeders already are growing new varieties that consistently yield 55 percent amylose and some which will yield as high as 70 percent, though not consistently. It is just a matter of time, however, before suitable varieties are developed.

[From the Syracuse (N. Y.) Post-Standard of May 20, 1956]

FARM AND FOOD: INDUSTRY SEEN AS HOPE OF USING SURPLUS CROPS

(By Dr. Karl Butler)

The excess production of agricultural products in 1955 over what was consumed has been estimated by a number of experts as being about 4 percent. The trouble is that we have been producing a great many things for which there is no immediate market, and the excess production continues to accumulate.

In trying to come to grips with this problem, many types of proposals are being brought forth. Only recently, Senator HOMER CAPEHART, who is up for reelection in Indiana, proposed a bill which would set up a czar and an agency, possibly within the United States Department of Agriculture, to explore and expand the industrial uses of agricultural products.

Senator CAPEHART, being a highly successful salesman and Hoosier farmer in his own right, speaks on this subject with great enthusiasm. Recognizing that farmers do not cherish the idea of having to decrease their production but actually would like to increase it, the Senator believes the best way to expand markets is through the industrial route. In 1954 (the most recent figures available) the following percentages of various important crops were used for industrial purposes:

Crop:	*Percentage*
Potatoes	2.5
Fruits	5.8
Vegetables	0.3
Corn	3.3
Soybeans	3.3
Wheat	0.01
Sugarcane and beans	4.9
Cattle and calves	8.7
Cotton	58.3
Tobacco	67.8
Wool	[1] 291.7

[1] Imports greatly exceeded domestic production.

All crops used for industrial purposes average not more than 3 or 4 percent of our total production. This doesn't sound too impressive, but even so it almost offsets the excess production of agricultural products for the same period.

A few weeks ago, several thousand Ohio farmers were asked what they thought should be done to solve the farm-surplus problem. In the survey, the farmers were submitted a list of 11 different approaches to the problem and asked what they considered to be the most promising. It is significant that "research for new uses and new markets" topped the list, with approval by more than 70 percent of those who responded.

Wheeler McMillen, vice president of Farm Journal, Inc., has pointed out that the American economy has an insatiable appetite for products other than food. He emphasizes the importance, not only of increasing the industrial use of current agricultural products, but of finding new crops. Although there are more than 300,000 known species of plants on earth, less than 200 are used for commercial agricultural production; and actually only 12 produce about 80 percent of all of mankind's food. Only rubber has been added to the list of our most important crops during the last century.

Some of the suggested increased uses of agricultural crops are: High-protein food by fermentation, paint from vegetable oil, synthetic and microbia rubber, increased use of starch in paper, the manufacture of hardboard, boxboard and building board from grain, and the manufacture of alcohol from grain for blending with gasoline. Most of these uses present difficult problems.

The amount of effort and money expended in agricultural research is relatively small compared with many other industries. Most manufacturing industries spend from 6 to 10 times as much for research as is spent with food and agricultural products. We could well spend more effort and money in finding new crops and new uses for our agricultural production.

[From the U. S. News & World Report of May 25, 1956]

WILL AUTOS SOLVE GRAIN SURPLUS?—YES, IF GRAIN CAN BE MADE INTO CHEAP ALCOHOL

Drive cars on grain alcohol—new approach to the farm problem.

A far-fetched dream? Maybe not. At least, 34 Senators think it's time to look into this idea again.

They're backing a big Federal program for research into new uses for farm products. Object: To rid the Government of those rising mountains of surplus grain.

There's a move afoot to revive the old plan for getting rid of surplus grain by mixing alcohol with the gasoline you burn in your car.

That's the key point in a program proposed by 34 Senators for increasing industrial use of farm products. The program would cost $100 million a year. But the Senators contend that's a small sum compared with $9 billion the Government has tied up in farm surpluses.

The program would be aimed at stimulating output of a wide variety of industrial products from agricultural crops, including plastics, building materials, smokeless powder, dyes, varnishes, and oil for paints. It's estimated that 365 million bushels of grain could be consumed annually in making alcohol from grain if such alcohol could be produced cheaply enough to justify its use in the manufacture of synthetic rubber.

In all, the Senators figure their plan could boost the outlet for grains by 2.6 to 2.7 billion bushels a year.

TWO BILLION BUSHELS FOR FUEL?

The potential of blending alcohol with gasoline, however, far exceeds other possible outlets for surplus crops. In the first place 10 percent of alcohol would make a high-test "premium" fuel out of ordinary gasoline. And, if the blend were used in all automotive gasoline, it would require 2 billion bushels of grain a year.

The biggest drawback is a simple one—cost. Gasoline at the refinery costs 12 to 14 cents a gallon. Alcohol made from corn costs 60 cents a gallon, if you can get the corn for $1.25 a bushel. A blend with 10 percent of this alcohol would cost 4.6 cents a gallon more than straight gasoline.

The Department of Agriculture figures it another way. Suppose the blend is priced a penny a gallon higher at the refinery than straight gasoline, because of the premium quality. Ten gallons would be $1.50. Of that, $1.26 would go for 9 gallons of gasoline, leaving 24 cents for the 1 gallon of alcohol. But alcohol at that price would require grain at 36 cents a bushel. Support prices in 1955 averaged $1.58 for corn, $2.08 for wheat.

Another complication is that just as good results can be obtained with a blend using ethyl alcohol made from natural gas, at 40 cents a gallon, or methyl alcohol, at 30 cents a gallon.

Obviously, a law to require blending wouldn't do much toward getting rid of grain surpluses unless it also specified that only grain alcohol—ethyl alcohol made from grain—could be used. Otherwise there would be a repetition of what happened with synthetic rubber. That product was made from grain alcohol early in World War II. Then processes were developed that produced ethyl alcohol more cheaply from natural gas, and grain alcohol was priced out of the picture.

TECHNICALLY SOUND

The blending of alcohol with gasoline as a motor fuel is technically sound. This has been proved by experiments in the United States and actual use of blends in other countries.

For more than 30 years, Sweden has required a blend containing 25 percent alcohol. Blends also have been used successfully in Germany, France, Cuba, Brazil, the Philippine Islands, India, and other countries. But, in every case, the higher cost was justified in terms of national defense or welfare.

The only substantial effort to put over an alcohol-gasoline blend in the United States was made some 20 years ago by a foundation that set up a trial plant in Kansas. The project was abandoned after a few years because the blend, using alcohol made from grain, couldn't meet the price competition of straight gasoline.

A different technique was tried several years ago by a firm in Cleveland, Ohio. A mixture of alcohol and water was injected into the engine of the car when extra power was needed for passing or for climbing a hill. But the petroleum industry soon increased the octane value of its gasoline and the Cleveland company dropped its project.

SPONSORS PERSEVERE

The huge outlet for surpluses that would be created by blending grain alcohol with gasoline, however, continues to make the idea tempting. Despite the cost problems of the plan, the sponsors contend it might be a lot cheaper than buying up surplus grains and then paying $365 million a year to store them.

[From the Indianapolis News of February 16, 1956]

GET RID OF THE FARM SURPLUS NOW

There is proper concern in Congress for getting some immediate help to the farmers. They need it.

Future price-depressing surpluses can be stopped through the administration's soil bank program to take acres out of production.

Certainly the idea of returning rigid 90-percent price supports is not the answer either to the immediate or long-range problem. That would only create more surpluses and refill the warehouses which the fallow acres would empty.

However, even if it is not saddled into ineffectiveness by high-rigid supports, the soil bank still is for the years ahead, not now.

What to do to give the farmers help now?

Indiana's Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART has come up with a plan which is sound and logical. It is the creation of a Federal agency which would be mandated to sell, barter, or give away as quickly as possible the vast stores of food the Government now is holding.

As long as that surplus hangs over the market it will continue to depress farm prices. And just as soon as it is cut down to size farm prices will rise.

If Congress will adopt the Capehart bill, the farm-price problem could be licked before the summer's end.

The surpluses would go to needy people in the United States and other countries who would not otherwise be able to purchase the foodstuffs. We would give away only what we could not sell and did not need for a national emergency reserve.

Senator CAPEHART told the Senate that he had traveled all over Indiana, meeting with farmers and farm leaders. And that he had not "found one who does not agree that the present low farm-commodity prices are due to the surplus."

He said, "If somehow, in some way, tomorrow we could get rid of the huge surpluses, farm prices would go up where they belong, and we would no longer have to worry about farm prices."

America's farm problem is a problem of abundance. We can serve humanitarian interests at the same time we serve the cause of our own farmers if we will only start spreading the abundance about.

It's as simple as that.

As Senator CAPEHART says, "There are thousands of people in the United States who are underfed. There are millions of people in the world who are underfed. Have we not sufficient intelligence in the Congress and as a people to give away some of these foodstuffs?"

It is a dog-in-the-manger attitude that is keeping these huge stores of food in Government warehouses.

Every Indiana farmer could have extra dollars in his pocket by July if the Government were only empowered to get rid quickly of this load.

Cosponsors of Senator CAPEHART's bill include Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER, of Indiana, as well as influential members of both parties like MUNDT, of South Dakota, THYE, of Minnesota, YOUNG, of North Dakota, BUTLER, of Maryland, WELKER, of Idaho, GEORGE, of Georgia, CASE, of South Dakota, and BARRETT, of Wyoming.

Congressmen ought to forget about politics in this matter. If they want to do something for the farmer now—and they certainly should—then let them boost farm prices by getting rid of the present surpluses.

They can start a flow of greenbacks farmward by oats seeding time if they only will put their mind to getting the Capehart disposal formula going right away.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 11, 1956]

WORLD DILEMMA: TOO MUCH FOOD; TOO MANY HUNGRY

President Eisenhower's farm message disclosure that a Surplus Disposal Administrator will be appointed and other measures taken to spur the disposition of excess agricultural products points to one of the major dilemmas of our times.

On one side many countries of the world—and notably the United States—have more food than they can use. On the other, half the world's population hasn't enough to eat.

This grave problem hangs over the American farm situation. The surplus farm products we have accumulated—nearly $8 billion worth, which cost a million dollars a day just to handle—reflect both our success in growing crops and our failure to find ways to distribute them. Even though vigorous efforts on the part of the administration resulted in a greatly increased disposition of the surplus, President Eisenhower said that for every bushel moved out of the huge Government stores another bushel and a half took its place.

Appointment of an administrator to devote full time to finding ways of decreasing the surplus is a wise move. The President's recommendation that Congress permit sale of our agricultural surplus behind the Iron Curtain offers an additional method of coping with the problem.

But it is evident that the dilemma will exist for some time. When we have $7,700,000,000 worth of surplus farm products, arranging to get $192 million worth to the needy of other lands—the figure for the last fiscal year—won't make much of a dent. Nor will it do much to relieve the hardships of a billion people in the world who go to bed hungry every night.

That the dilemma is difficult to resolve is painfully obvious. Selling surplus food at home or abroad at less than prevailing market prices would have a disruptive effect. Even giving the food to countries whose people need it might cause severe economic dislocation.

Because the problem is difficult, however, is no reason why efforts shouldn't be made to find a solution. Plans put forward by Senator HOMER CAPEHART and others deserve serious study. Congress this year could hardly perform a greater service than making real progress toward answering the problem of distribution of farm products which plagues both our farmers and hungry people throughout the world.

[From Chemurgic Digest for April 1956]

SENATOR CAPEHART, OF INDIANA, PROPOSES $100 MILLION FOR INDUSTRIAL USES—"CRASH" RESEARCH PROGRAM URGED IN NEW BILL INTRODUCED WITH 33 SENATORS AS SPONSORS

A "crash" research program to produce industrial outlets for farm products has been proposed in a bill introduced March 21. Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART presented the measure, with 33 other Senators joining him as sponsors.

"If and when we solve the farm problem, it will be solved on the basis of more uses for farm products in industry," Senator CAPEHART told the Senate. "We shall never solve the farmers' problem by producing for food users alone."

The measure asks for an appropriation of $100 million. It proposes to create an Agricultural Industrial Production Agency. The administrator in charge, appointed by the President, would have wide powers, and report semiannually to Congress.

Known as S. 3503, it was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The following excerpts are taken from the speech made by Senator CAPEHART in introducing the bill:

"Mr. President, I am about to propose a far-reaching, permanent solution of the farm problem so vast that its potential is virtually unlimited.

"While the economic, industrial, and social implications of this program cannot, with any degree of accuracy, at this moment be estimated, it is clear that this program will tend to solve, if not wholly solve, the farm problem for all time.

"After months of painstaking examination of its possibilities, I have reached the altogether justifiable conclusion that this plan would, within a few years, create a demand for farm products in industry at least equal in amount to that now consumed for human consumption in the United States. It would double the farm market.

"We are only asking for $100 million or less than one-third of the cost to store for 1 year the surplus agricultural commodities the Government of the United States now owns.

"No, Mr. President, we cannot solve our farm problem permanently by curtailing production. We must increase consumption; we must find new markets. Since, generally speaking, the vast majority of our people are well fed, our only alternative is to find new and increased industrial uses for our agricultural products.

"We are not going to help the farmer very much by reducing his production. We can help him only by increasing his production, and this bill provides for that. The White House is already behind it. It is very enthusiastic about the objectives and purposes of the bill.

"As an inherent part of the legislation, we wish to set up an administrator who will have almost the title of czar. He will proceed to get the job done, in the same fashion in which the Government developed synthetic rubber during the war.

"The proposed program might well be called a crash program.

"I am thinking in terms of $100 million in addition to that which the Congress has already appropriated, or might appropriate.

"It is my belief that as fast as the Government proves the practicability of each new farm product in industry, the process should then be turned over to private industry for production.

"The program we propose should be built on the framework of and within the existing research activities of the Department of Agriculture.

"The potentialities are so vast that any attempt to evaluate the benefits to this Nation and its people dollarwise is an almost hopeless task. I have been unable to select any segment of our economy—any group of our people—who would not lead more comfortable lives and enjoy higher standards of living and benefit generally from the fruits of such a program.

"It would mean the assurance of a full market for full farm production.

"It would end our farm-surplus problem.

"It would save the Government money.

"It would help to relieve the tax burden and give us a chance to reduce the national debt.

"It would create new industries.

"It would create new jobs.

"It would stimulate retail sales.

"It would provide better incomes for our people including the Nation's 6 million farmers.

"It is, in our opinion, in all modesty, the most constructive approach to the farm problem yet devised.

"I have always said that when handed a lemon, make lemonade out of it."

BRICKER, MUNDT SPEAK

In the course of the colloquy on the floor during Senator CAPEHART's presentation, Senator BRICKER referred to the work of the Chemurgic Council while its headquarters were in Columbus.

Senator MUNDT of South Dakota said:

"What is sought to be done by the bill is to take the program of farm chemurgy out of low gear and to put it into high gear."

Senator MUNDT also referred to the "crash" programs which produced the vital domestic dye industry during World War I, and those which developed synthetic rubber and atomic energy during World War II.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a few, and only a few, a small percentage, of the letters I have received from persons in a position to know what can be done as a result of such legislation as I propose, setting forth why such legislation should be enacted, and why we should proceed to do something permanent for the farmers of America, rather than ask them to reduce their production in order to get rid of their surpluses, which I am in favor of at the moment, in order to eliminate future surpluses.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WARNER BROODER CORP.,
North Manchester, Ind., June 7, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPEHART: Several weeks ago, I received, from you, a copy of your speech

made on the floor of the Senate on March 21, 1956, for which I thank you very much.

First, let me state that you are to be commended very highly for your analysis of this farm problem. I have 260 acres near North Manchester, Ind. I have been directly connected with farming for some 40 years, as well as being a manufacturer of poultry and hog equipment for the last 20-some years. I, therefore, feel that I may be somewhat qualified in making the following remarks.

Your proposed solution, in Senate bill 3503, to our farm products surplus problem, is certainly the most practical approach that has come to my attention.

It seems to me that subsidizing the average farmer only provides for a meager existence, with small chance to improve his farm surroundings and living standards. Whereas, this proposal of yours has a good chance of not only improving the lot of the farmer to the utmost in many ways, but may very well be a sizable boost to our economy in general.

Nothing has come to my attention that would indicate this bill is receiving any kind of action. Will you advise me of the present status? May I encourage you to promote, to the best of your ability, the proper study and enactment of this bill. In my opinion, this is one of the most worthwhile and timely pieces of legislation presented on the Senate floor in quite some time.

Sincerely yours,

BOYD C. WARNER, *President.*

PURDUE UNIVERSITY
AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE,
Columbia City, Ind., April 25, 1956.

HOMER E. CAPEHART, M. C.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

HONORED SIR: I have read your speech about agricultural research made in the Senate March 21, which you submitted with a letter requesting comments, pro and con.

The basic theory of the bill is sound, as I see it. In addition to expanding industrial uses, there is opportunity for expanding export markets through the exchange of goods. Here a slight reduction in the industrial boom can be made to step up the agricultural economy and put it on a more equitable level.

It is basic that farmers should operate the land at the peak of their ability and skill. And it follows they should be rewarded for their thrift and industry on the same plane as other producers with similar investments, ability and skills. The limiting of production continuously is wrong and unnatural. Subsidies tend to penalize the efficient and reward the incompetent. A businesslike administration of quotas and subsidies in agriculture is most difficult and mostly not attained.

Real help on the part of the Government can come from finding outlets for farm products which will challenge rural people to create maximum wealth from the lands they control.

Such expanded outlets appear to lie in the fields of industrial uses and foreign markets. Some expansion in domestic consumption of foods is a possibility and deserves exploration.

I hope you succeed in getting established farm aid that is real, permanent and beneficial to all segments of society. The proposed bill, S. 3503, appears to be a big step in that direction.

Respectfully,

B. V. WIDNEY,
County Agricultural Agent.

ALBANY, IND., *April 5, 1956.*

DEAR MR. HOMER E. CAPEHART, OF INDIANA: Your recent letter received and your material on different things are fine.

If you can bring it through, it sure would help everything. This is a grand old world with lots and lots of opportunities in it. If people would work to find out what's in it instead of trying to destroy it and themselves also, what a world it would be to live in.

Thanks for your fine letter.

Sincerely,

MARY INEZ DAY.

BLOOMFIELD, IND., *April 15, 1956.*

DEAR MR. CAPEHART: I read your copy of the speech made before the Senate, March 21, and want to commend you on your interest in the current farm situation.

In my contacts with farmers in this county it seems to be the general opinions that the soil-bank plan plus 90 percent supports is the best alternative for a period until some other cure comes to light.

Your proposal of legislation adequate funds for research to increase use of agricultural products sounds like a wonderful thing, as farmers will benefit as well as all economies from research.

Glad to hear that you voted for the farm bill on last passage in Senate, which may not have been perfect in your opinion but keep us farmers in mind.

We want a farm bill this year.

Yours truly,

DON CALVERT,
A. S. C. Grain Inspector, Greene County, Ind.

HOWE, IND., *April 16, 1956.*

To the Honorable Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: First I want to thank you for your copy of your speech to the Congress as to your views on disposing of the surplus grains now held by the Government.

Your plan made more sense to me than anything I have read pertaining to this problem than anything I have seen in the last 15 years.

A lot of young farmers, 30 years old and down, have known nothing in this productive life but to expect help from the Government in one way or another or should I say interference from the Government.

I have just finished reading your research program for the future, it makes sense to me and I agree with you wholeheartedly.

Why not give the farmers the right to think for themselves and to gain back their self-respect.

I say scrap the present program of doling out a few dollars to the farmers and taking back more in taxes. Go ahead with your research plan.

Keep up the good work; I am with you all the way. Give the farmers back their independence.

WINFORD LEWIS,
Auctioneer.

CLYDE G. HARLOW & SONS,
Tipton, Ind., April 16, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPEHART: I am pleased to reply to your letter of April 6 with copy of speech enclosed.

I have heard nothing but favorable comment for the gist of your formula as a solution of this giant farm problem.

Personally, I feel the intent and purpose are 100 percent right, and if successful research is carried out to the point you suggest, I can see nothing but good coming from it.

I hope those in authority give your proposal the attention it deserves, since to me it seems the sound solution and would in itself handle the parity problem much better than any proposed farm bill past or present.

Thanking you for this recognition, I am

Yours very truly,

CLYDE G. HARLOW.

OAKLAND CITY, IND., *April 3, 1956.*

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART: I read your speech with much interest and as you say it's a tough problem and all legislation will not solve the problem unless we find ways and means to find a market for our goods.

Thanks for sending me this.

Yours truly,

HERMAN G. SCHMIDT.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE,
Crawfordsville, Ind., April 10, 1956.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Replying to your letter received April 7, I have studied with interest your far-reaching permanent solutions of farm problems.

I think that from the long viewpoint, this research program is a most dependable and sure solution to our farm surplus problem. I would like to personally encourage you to pursue the enactment of this proposed research program if at all possible to get the support to do so.

In my contacts with farmers in Montgomery County, I do not find that the majority of them are expecting all of their farm problems to be solved by enactment of legislation for temporary relief. I think as a group, our farmers are very tolerent and understanding.

The young farmer has been affected the most in our county by this adjustment of the agricultural economy. I know that most of the farmers that have been farming back through the war years have been expecting and preparing their operations for an adjustment period.

I personally subscribe to the manner in which you are representing your people.

Very truly yours,

GORDON A. SOWERS,
County Agricultural Agent.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION DEPARTMENT,
New Castle, Ind., April 9, 1956.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I received the copy of your speech before the Senate concerning your proposal of additional effort to find new markets for agricultural products and also was privileged to hear you discuss this issue at the New Castle "Third House" last Thursday.

It seems self-evident that the creation of new uses for agricultural products would do much to remedy our present situation. As you state, the program is a continuing and long-term approach. Many facilities now exist and much is being done along this line, but doubtless the whole program needs activating and coordinating. Those engaged need to feel the urgency of doing it now. Your proposals would doubtless get this job done.

There is a little concern in my mind that new emphasis will need to be placed on soil conservation when and if new demands give wartime incentive to production. In other words, we must be interested in continued high production as well as getting ourselves out of a present difficulty.

As you know, farmers live to produce and with price encouragement, they are apt to forget long time soil needs.

We certainly commend you for your interest and leadership in this matter.

Sincerely,

W. G. SMITH,
County Agricultural Agent.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MACHINISTS,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1956.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United State Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: This will acknowledge your letter relative to the proposed legislation which you have sponsored to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing industrial uses of agricultural products. I have studied the proposed draft and believe it merits serious consideration and action by Congress. We have in the past supported the broad objectives of an expanded agricultural program, fully realizing that the welfare of the farmer cannot be divorced from the welfare of the working people in industry.

At the present time we are actively supporting the proposed certificate amendment as sponsored by Senator KERR and others in connection with the social-security legislation now pending in the Senate Finance Committee which would provide food and fiber commodities to dependent widows and children and those permanently and totally disabled. It is our sincere desire to see this legislation enacted because we believe that this would relieve much hardship now faced by our older citizens and those unable to earn a livelihood. In so doing, this could expand our consumption of farm commodities and eliminate much of the unnecessary waste and unnecessary expense of storage.

If the Senate Agricultural Committee holds hearings on the legislation which you have proposed, we will be prepared to support this measure.

Sincerely,

GEORGE R. NELSON,
Legislative Representative.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE,
Jeffersonville, Ind., April 10, 1956.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HON. SENATOR CAPEHART: With your letter of April 5, you included a portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD comprising your speech and provisions of your agricultural bill presented to the Senate on March 21. I have read this speech and provisions of the bill with interest and believe that you have struck at the real heart of the agricultural problem. Farmers, as well as almost everyone else, realize that their income cannot be enhanced by reducing production. They realize fully that any programs of acreage allotments, based on previous history, are by their very nature unjust to some farmers. They realize that reduced production would not allow them the opportunity of managing their business in the most efficient manner. Farmers in this area are so opposed to acreage allotments that many of them have expressed the willingness to eliminate any national program in order to abandon acreage controls. You I am sure realize that it would be tragic for the Government at this point to pull out of agricultural programs when the farmer is being depressed by surpluses encouraged by previous Government programs.

It seems to me that your approach of immediate action to get pilot plants and industry using agricultural products and at the same time promoting greater research in this field, should give the answer in reasonably short time. I read a news release last week of a product developed by a starch factory in Columbus, Ind., which holds tremendous possibilities in this field. That plant has developed through research a starch product made from corn which has proven effective in soil stabilization. That is, it eliminates water penetrating into the soil and gives the soil so treated a consistency almost that of paving. I understand that it is being used to stabilize the soil beds under roadways, and that it could be used for paving farm yards, driveways, and would prove a tremendous market for corn. The cost at the moment is very high, but with proper testing, no doubt, it could be lowered. I believe this is the kind of thing you are talking about in your bill.

My suggestion, whenever possible, is that the pilot testing and research be carried out by industry under contract rather than by the Government, and that the land-grant colleges be called upon to do whatever they can in the program, but that their regular research programs not be disturbed, and that they not be given a major responsibility in this industrial type of program. Where industry could foresee an opportunity to take over the product and profit by it, they would work faster and more effectively than pure research. Of course, this type of program would not solve all the immediate problems of agriculture, but would give confidence which is desperately needed, and then, coupled with a simple but effective farm program for a few years, could solve the agricultural problem and have going at full capacity a farm production plant ready to meet the needs of any emergency, or of the natural growing population demands. If we build agricultural programs on the basis of controlled production, we could in the not too distant future, find ourselves with a problem of shortage. In a program of all-out production and utilization by both industry and for food, in any emergency, the amount used in either place could be expanded or reduced to keep a safe balance.

I have worked almost 24 years as a county agricultural agent and have observed with interest the coming and going of national farm laws and it appears to me that we are today further away from the real solution to the problem with our present programs than we have been through all the years. It seems to me that for the immediate future, an abandonment of all acreage allotments, and maintaining price supports at a reasonably low level, that the greatest good could be accomplished by simply making direct payments to farmers for any acreage he might have or wish to put into hay and pasture crops, and at the same time permit him to use and harvest those crops. This in my opinion would not increase greatly the amount of roughage consuming livestock and the amount of meat and milk, which is feared by so many people, because we all know that the great amount of meat, milk, and other livestock products are produced by grain rather than by grass. A simple 2- or 3-year program of direct help to farmers based on the acreage of land in grass, would give immediate help and would reduce the acreage in grain crops and the tremendous storage problem involved with high supports. The longtime problem could be solved, as you indicate, by the utilization of agricultural commodities through industrial markets.

Yours truly,

M. F. GOODE,
County Agricultural Agent.

CORYDON, IND., *April 16, 1956.*

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May I first state that any comments which I make are of my own personal opinion and not necessarily the thinking of the Department of Agriculture by which I am employed.

I would like to wholeheartedly compliment you for the speech made before the United States Senate March 21, 1956, concerning your proposed research program.

In my daily contact with farmers I find that they are not a type of people who desire a giveaway program. Farmers at this time need assistance and guidance to lift them from the present farm recession created by the great surplus of basic commodities.

However, I personally feel that we should at all times have a nominal amount of grain in reserve and also an adequate incentive program for conserving our water, land, and forest resources.

Again may I congratulate you on your proposed research plan. In order that agriculture can compete with modern industry they must acquaint themselves with the common facilities used by industry.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. MARY R. EISENMENGER.

RENSSELAER, IND., *April 13, 1956.*

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I appreciate very much receiving a copy of your speech made in the United States Senate on Wednesday, March 21, 1956.

I commend you highly for your stand in reference to the agricultural problem. An improved market through more uses of agricultural products is the only sound and lasting answer to the agricultural problem. It may be that new and different crops will be grown for some of the needs of industry, but farmers can adjust to the kind of crops or livestock if they have a market for the product.

I hope the idea of using farm-produced products as part of the fuel used in automobiles, trucks, etc., can be further developed. Conserving the supply of natural resources such as oil and coal is just as important for the future as conserving the soil.

Sincerely,

J. A. CARROLL,
County Agricultural Agent.

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION
DEPARTMENT, PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
Washington, Ind., April 13, 1956.

The Honorable HOMER CAPEHART,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I studied with interest your speech of Wednesday, March 21, and your bill, S. 3503, and hope that Congress may be persuaded to adopt this promising measure.

It is true that we have spent large sums of money for increased production, but have left the consumption and utilization of farm crops more or less take care of itself. This, of course, has not been the case.

Research has done wonders in making more goods for a higher standard of living in America. There is no reason why a vigorous research program directed in the proper manner with sufficient funds cannot go a long way in solving the critical problem facing the farmers today in a relatively few years.

Congratulations on the positive, forceful way in which you presented your bill.

Sincerely,

EARL KUMPF,
County Agriculture Agent, Daviess County.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
AGRICULTURE EXTENSION DEPARTMENT,
Princeton, Ind., April 13, 1956.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I don't think you are out of line on setting up a research program such as outlined in your speech of March 21, 1956, to the Senate.

You have one more fan believing in your proposal. I'm keeping your report on file.

I would like to see more research for agriculture. It looks to me that what nature made in the way of coal, oil, and other things, science can make it better from agricultural products.

It may be that we may approach an era when we won't have the farmer as we know of him today. Research is the only approach to solve this problem.

Very truly yours,

ALFRED H. GESELL,
Agricultural Agent.

HUNTINGBURG, IND., *April 17, 1956.*

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HOMER: I want to congratulate you on the idea for expanding the market for farm products as well as the presentation that you made in the Senate.

This would seem to be one of the most constructive things that has been done in a long time and certainly is a new and fresh approach.

It is an odd situation that in a country like America, that a bumper crop should create so many problems as to almost be a catastrophe. While there has long been talk of using the products of the farm for industrial purposes, of course, nothing has been accomplished in a big way.

We would be so conscious of this situation in southern Indiana where so much of the land is marginal and it would seem to us that some development might be made in the hybridization of trees. I found in Macon, last month, that the time for growing pulpwood, for instance, has been reduced from 30 years to 15 years and that they think with the further selection through the hybridization of the trees themselves, it would be possible to get pulpwood as a crop on a 7-year cycle. If that could be done, there would be untold prosperity in this particular area.

Again congratulations and with warmest regards, I remain,

Yours truly,

R. H. MCMURTRIE.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY
AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE,
Newport, Ind., April 12, 1956.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I like your approach to the farm problem. I can see no future in the farm program for farmers on tax papers either when the Government pays farmers not to produce. It costs the consumer more for his products and as taxes. The farmer is hurt with less income. Corn is a good crop, but a 100-acre farm that can grow only 20 acres of corn is in bad shape no matter what the support price is.

America was built on more production—making items cheaper and better. Your approach is the only one that looks toward more production.

It seems that our farm problem is one of losing foreign and domestic markets for our crops. One answer is to cut production to meet the demand. The other is to establish new and better markets to use the present or increased production.

I am not sure as to what existing agencies can do or what new ones are needed, but it seems that this is the only approach left.

Yours truly,

JOHN L. STARK,
County Agricultural Agent.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY AGRICULTURAL
EXTENSION DEPARTMENT,
Bloomington, Ind., April 17, 1956.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I have your letter of April 5, together with a copy of your speech before the United States Senate on Wednesday, March 21.

When can we learn that there is no reverse gear on progress, and quit looking backwards. Your suggestion of enough basic research to find profitable uses for his agricultural production, is the first sound approach I have seen taken, regarding our farm problem.

I would hope that it would not be necessary to set up a whole new Federal bureau to get the job done. We have only so many scientists and research men in the country anyway, so they will have to do the research work, regardless of the organization within which they do it. We have an experiment station in each State, and also a few Federal research institutions. Strikes me as being more practical to provide more facilities and equipment—and if possible, more scientists—to these institutions to broaden their activities, than to set up a complete new Federal agency.

Very sincerely yours,

CORRY ALCORN,
County Agricultural Agent.

MONTICELLO, IND., *April 17, 1956.*

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Thank you for your letter of April 6 and copy of your speech before the Senate.

I have read your speech very carefully and discussed it with a great many farmers. I have met no one who thinks in a straight line, that does not believe it is the right approach to the solution of this whole complex problem.

On page 2, column 2, paragraph 5, which begins, No, Mr. President, we cannot solve—etc., indicates to me that you know what is wrong with present thinking regarding this whole situation.

Your proposed plan of research to discover and create new uses for farm commodities just can't miss being the right plan of attack.

Very truly yours,

LLOYD MIKESELL.

THE PRAIRIE FARMER,
Chicago, Ill., March 29, 1956.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Mr. Johnson is serving as an adviser at the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences at Turialba, Costa Rica. He will not be back until the first of May.

Thanks very much for sending us the bill which you are introducing into the Senate.

I sincerely doubt if the bill is the answer to the farm problem. On the other hand, Prairie Farmer is certainly in favor of research investigating the possibilities of expanding farm crop markets. There is little doubt but that we would be up to our ears in soybeans now if it had not been that soybeans have so many uses. We are certainly in favor of expanding our research to find new and improved uses for agricultural products.

Very truly yours,

RALPH S. YOHE,
Associate Editor.

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE,
Crown Point, Ind., May 29, 1956.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I am very sorry for the delay in answering your letter regarding the speech which you made before the United States Senate on Wednesday, March 21. I have been very busy and wanted to study the excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which you sent me, in detail.

I think it is very desirable that the Federal Government follow an aggressive research program with regard to the industrial use of farm products. In all of our world history so far no government has ever been able to permanently set aside the law of supply and demand with laws and regulations. I do believe, however, that it is the duty of our Federal Government to do what it can to prevent extremely wide fluctuations in the prices of farm products. Farming is, by its nature, largely a small enterprise business and, inasmuch as it is one of our basic industries, I think that it is the duty and obligation of our Federal Government to engage in research which in other industries might be undertaken by large corporations. It seems also that it is a sound development to expect our Federal Government to engage in exhaustive investigations of the possible industrial uses of farm products so that private industries can immediately avail themselves of up-to-date information on this subject whenever it is economically sound to do so. A research program such as you suggest would undoubtedly develop many industrial uses that manufacturers would want to avail themselves of immediately.

I hope my opinions are of some value to you.

Sincerely yours,

LLOYD E. CUTLER,
County Agent.

CARMEL, IND., *April 4, 1956.*

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Your speech sponsoring a bill to set up an Agricultural Products Administration and an Industrial Agricultural Products Agency was received yesterday, and I have just finished reading it. This is a plan which fires the imagination. The first 21 years of my life were spent on a farm, and my determination to obtain a technical education came about because all the farmers in our neighborhood seemed to be at a terrible disadvantage due to lack of anything resembling an industrial approach to their problems of production and marketing. Since my personal interest was in electricity, I planned to work in rural electrification when I finished my college work. However, I graduated in 1936, and there weren't any jobs available in that area, so I ended up on the industrial side of the fence, where I have been ever since.

It seems to me that you and the other distinguished sponsors of this bill have spotlighted the basic farm problem very clearly. Finding markets for farm produce must be just as much of the overall effort as finding ways and means to increase production. The automotive people probably do the best job of creating markets for their product of any specific group in industry. The analogy to the farm problem is not strictly accurate, but it is close. The auto industry spends millions of dollars yearly to develop new components, new styles, new safety devices, and they also spend millions to merchandise these new ideas, so that there is always a newer, better car on the market than the one you presently own. The result, in terms of customer demand, is a matter of record. An ever-increasing demand for farm products must be built up in industry.

Deliberately legislating a sense of urgency into the program you recommend seems to me to be essential. We are all well aware of the tension which surrounds our national-defense projects. I have heard many an industrialist refer wryly to his defense commitments as operating on a madhouse basis. This does not mean that they are disorganized, but that everyone is striving to accomplish great technical and manufacturing strides in the shortest possible time.

One of the problems in carrying out the program envisioned in your bill will be to divert the necessary technical talent to it. As you well know, a great percentage of our young scientists and engineers are struck with the idea of participating in glamorous enterprises like atomic energy, supersonic flight, space satellites, color television, and so on. During the Korean war, I was in Washington, calling on such laboratories as

Naval Research, Naval Ordnance, the Bureau of Standards, the Army Engineer Center, and others. I was quite depressed by the great numbers of young men and women who had started their professional life in the business of producing materials for human destruction, and who, unless the pattern changes, will never know the satisfaction of doing something which will improve man's lot, instead of reducing him to an expendable part of a weapons system. National defense is necessary, and it must be maintained at a level which will avoid war, if possible, but some way must be found to lead an adequate number of technical people into the fields of human needs. After all, the producing part of the economy must be big enough and healthy enough to support the cost of the defense program.

If the money is appropriated and put in the hands of people who will get the job done, I think there is no question but what the predictions made in the early part of your speech will come true, and the results will begin to show up in the first year of operation.

As a suggestion (and you undoubtedly have already considered this), it seems to me that the administrator would find an advisory committee very useful. The members of the committee would represent both agriculture and industry, and the membership should change frequently enough to continually bring in fresh points of view, and to avoid criticism that some group was becoming dominant. The Defense Department uses this system very widely, and I am sure that it provides them with assistance and guidance which simply could not be purchased. This system can be used at lower levels, also, to obtain resistance on specific projects.

I hope that you obtain adequate support for this bill, and I am sure that there are many people across the Nation, like me, who feel that some of the techniques developed in national-defense programs and industrial programs would work wonders in the agricultural area. The return from such a program, in terms of better living and greater security for our people as well as others around the world would be nothing short of stupendous.

Sincerely yours,

PHIL WATSON.
P. R. WATSON.

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
New Bruswick, N. J., May 16, 1956.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Thank you for sending me the text of your bill proposing a federally sponsored research and development program to find new and increased industrial uses for agricultural products. We are greatly interested in the bill, as you can imagine, and are appreciative of what you are doing.

Sincerely,

LEWIS WEBSTER JONES.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
Ithica, N. Y., May 15, 1956.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Thank you so much for sending me a copy of your speech regarding the unlimited market for farm products. You certainly are to be congratulated on this forward-looking approach to the solution of one of our most basic problems and I am delighted to have had the chance to learn in detail of the bill which you have introduced.

With sincere personal regards,

Cordially,

DEAN W. MALLOTT, *President.*

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS,
Urbana, Ill., May 9, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CAPEHART: Thank you very much for sending me a copy of your speech and the bill which you and other Senators and Congressmen have introduced pertaining to the ultimate solution of the farm problem. I have read this carefully and it is refreshing to see an approach which is different from that which seems to have become standard in the last several decades.

As soon as I return from a trip I shall write to Senator EARLE C. CLEMENTS regarding the desire of the university to be represented at the hearings. The only thing which I note about the bill that would be of immediate concern would be the securing of the personnel needed to conduct the research studies provided by the bill. However, even this difficulty should not deter us in the effort.

Very truly yours,

W. G. KAMMLADE,
Associate Director of Extension.

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE
AND HOME ECONOMICS,
OFFICE OF DEAN AND DIRECTOR,
Fayetteville, May 12, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: The subject of your letter of May 1 relative to the bill which you introduced in the Senate on March 21, 1956, has been discussed with President John T. Caldwell. He has written you to the effect that he should like to have the university represented at the hearings to be arranged by the Honorable EARLE C. CLEMENTS by the dean of our College of Agriculture and Home Economics.

The subject of your bill is of very real interest to us and we shall be preparing ourselves to appear before the hearings called by Senator CLEMENTS. If at any time, additional information is issued with reference to your bill, we would appreciate receiving copies.

Sincerely yours,

LIPPERT S. ELLIS,
Dean and Director.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND,
EXTENSION SERVICE,
College Park, Md., May 10, 1956.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Thank you for your letter of May 2 with copy of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing speech and text of bill which you introduced. I certainly agree with you that new uses for farm products in industry and new markets created thereby would aid in an ultimate solution of the farm problem.

I am happy to have your speech and text of bill and I wish to congratulate you.

Very truly yours,

PAUL E. NYSTROM,
Director.

STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON,
INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Pullman, Wash., May 9, 1956.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your recent letter addressed to Director M. T. Buchanan has been referred to me for reply. I am certainly in agreement with you that part of the ultimate solution to the farm problem lies in new uses of farm products in industry. Much of the data which is needed to develop these new uses of farm products must come from public funds appropriated for research. I am sure that you agree heartily with this approach.

I wish it were possible for someone from our institution to attend the hearing to be held by Senator EARLE C. CLEMENTS, but because of the distance and the expense it will be impossible at this time.

Let me express our appreciation for your kind invitation.

Sincerely yours,

J. S. CARVER,
Acting Director.

ALABAMA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE,
EXTENSION SERVICE,
Auburn, Ala., May 7, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: This is another reply to yours of May 1. At home yesterday I studied your speech and bill in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 21.

There seems to be no evidence against what you are proposing to do. In my judgment it makes sense in every way.

In addition to funds for public research I hope that corporations that use and process farm products will spend more money and energy on research to find new markets and bigger markets. There is a big opportunity for them.

Some time in Washington I hope to discuss this with you because I'm genuinely encouraged by what you are proposing to do.

Sincerely yours,

P. O. DAVIS, *Director.*

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI,
DIVISION OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES,
Columbia, May 9, 1956.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Your letter of May 2, with the enclosed copy of the speech which you made concerning research on new uses of farm products, has been received. I greatly appreciate your sending me this statement.

The need for additional research to aid the entire agricultural industry with its problems is just as important as research in the chemical industry or any of the other great manufacturing industries.

I will write to Senator CLEMENTS regarding this matter.

Very truly yours,

J. H. LONGWELL,
Director.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY AND
AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE,
Baton Rouge, La., May 8, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I appreciate very much a copy of your address and a copy of the bill which you jointly sponsored to appropriate additional funds for agricultural research. Since our extension program is based very largely on the research results of the State experiment stations and the United States Department of Agriculture, we do have a deep, abiding and continuing interest in an expanded agricultural-research program.

I wish for your great success.

Very truly yours,

H. C. SANDERS,
Director, Agricultural Extension.

IOWA STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND MECHANIC ARTS,
DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE,
Ames, Iowa, May 10, 1956.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
The Westchester,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I received your letter of May 1 and the copy of the bill which

you introduced on new uses for farm products in industry and new markets created thereby. I have discussed this bill with some of our outstanding farm leaders and asked that they write their Senators and Congressmen. Tomorrow I am going to review the bill with Mr. Howard Hill, president of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, and perhaps he will follow up in that organization.

As you suggested, I also wrote Senator EARLE C. CLEMENTS, of Kentucky.

Dean Harry Reed, of Purdue, has told me of your genuine interest in constructive agricultural programs. I am happy to participate and grateful to you for the contributions you have made.

Sincerely yours,

FLOYD ANDRE,
Dean and Director.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE,
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION,
Knoxville, May 23, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: This is in regard to your bill, S. 3503, which is a proposal to authorize large appropriations for support of research in the utilization and marketing of farm commodities. You may feel assured that we are keenly interested in this bill and would like to see it passed.

You are perhaps aware of the fact that we have a legislative committee for the experiment stations representing the land-grant colleges. Dr. L. E. Hawkins, of Stillwater, Okla., is chairman of this committee. If you have not already done so, I think he would be the appropriate person for you to write. Then, if he needs any assistance, he will call upon those whom he feels might be the appropriate persons to have appear before the committee.

You also are perhaps aware of the position taken by the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges in regard to this particular work. I am quoting same below:

"The association believes that progress can be made in the industrial utilization of agricultural products, and that the best way of making progress is to provide additional funds for this purpose to the established agricultural research agencies of the land-grant institutions and the United States Department of Agriculture."

Sincerely yours,

J. H. MCLEOD,
Dean and Director.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY,
OFFICE OF THE DEAN AND DIRECTOR,
Lexington, Ky., May 30, 1956.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: This is a belated reply to your letter of May 1, with reference to your proposed research program in the field of chemurgy.

We, of course, are vitally interested in finding new uses for farm products, to the end that farmers may profit by such markets and that consumers will have the benefit of new or improved products.

If and when Senator CLEMENTS holds hearings on this bill, we probably will be in a position to make a statement on it.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. WELCH,
Dean and Director.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
May 28, 1956.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Thank you for your letter of May 2, 1956, with information about S. 3503 to provide expansion for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and industrial uses of agricultural products so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers.

Expanded research designed to find new crops and new industrial uses of present crops, now in surplus, is a worthy effort which our research people have long had as an objective. The framework upon which to build this type of research exists in the United States Department of Agriculture and land-grant colleges of the Nation, but the financing has been meager when compared to general industrial research financing. Unfortunately, the research path is slow and the rewards materialize some time in the future. This is not an argument against expansion of such a program now but it is important to realize that immediate large results will not likely be forthcoming.

The director of our agricultural experiment station, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, is a member of the legislative committee of the directors of the 48 States and 3 Territories. His committee, I understand, is planning to request permission to appear before the appropriate committees of Congress considering this bill, to present the combined thoughts of the agricultural experiment station directors of the United States.

As the research program develops, the university, as usual, is prepared to cooperate in the areas where it can contribute substantially.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT G. SPROUL.

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
Kingston, R. I., May 21, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I am in receipt of your letter together with the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD giving your speech together with a copy of the bill which you have introduced into Congress. As a station director, I am happy to lend support to this bill.

In our experiment station organization we have a committee known as the organization and policy committee which is represented by directors from the four areas of the country. This committee appoints a legislative committee consisting of one director from each region. We have found in the past that it is desirable for us to have all legislative matters handled by the members of this committee. They are authorized to speak for the directors.

The chairman of our organization and policy committee has requested that the legislative committee handle the testimony for the station directors in support of your bill. I trust, therefore, that having the matter handled in this way will prove satisfactory to you.

Very sincerely yours,

MASON H. CAMPBELL,
Dean and Director.

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE,
V. P. I. AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE,
Blacksburg, Va., May 19, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: On my return to the office, I found your letter of May 2 and the speech which you made on the uses for farm products in industry and new markets created thereby. I deeply appreciate this and feel that you are on the right track. Certainly, we need a great deal more research in the utilization of farm products. The bill and your speech certainly indicate a thorough consideration of this long-range problem. I sincerely hope that we can be of assistance in this field and will collaborate at the very first opportunity with Dr. H. N. Young, the director of our agricultural experiment station.

Thanking you for your thoughtfulness, I am,

Respectfully yours,

W. H. DAUGHTREY,
Associate Director.

NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE,
SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE,
Raleigh, N. C., May 16, 1956.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Reference is made to your letter of May 2, in which you enclose the bill that you introduced which would provide an attack toward the solution of the farm problem by developing new uses for many of our surplus farm products. I am sure that all of us feel that there are real possibilities in exploring further such uses and we are pleased that the Congress is giving attention to this most important subject. The organization of State Agricultural Experiment Station Directors has a legislative committee, of which Director Louis Hawkins, of the Oklahoma Agricultural Experiment Station, at Stillwater, Okla., is the chairman. I am sure that you would consider it most appropriate for our appearance in your hearings to come through such a committee. I am assuming, therefore, that you wrote to him also and, furthermore, that when the opportunity arises for hearings that he and members of his committee will represent all of the rest of the experiment station directors.

Very sincerely yours,

R. L. LOVVORN,
Director of Research.

EXTENSION SERVICE,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
New Brunswick, N. J., May 17, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I am appreciative of the fact that you have sent me the copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing your suggestions relative to a new research program leading toward greater utilization of farm products.

If uses for agricultural products can be developed on a basis which will make it economically sound to produce and process the crops in question, I am sure that the farm problem will be solved.

We are very much interested in the plans which you propose but must confess that over the years we have been discouraged by the chemurgic attempts which have, for the most part, met with failure because of the prohibitive costs involved in processing the various agricultural products. Certainly, however, we should not permit such a defeatist attitude to occupy our minds, and we, therefore, will follow with the greatest interest the results of your research campaign.

Sincerely yours,

LINDLEY G. COOK,
Associate Director.

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE,
SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE,
Newark, Del., June 4, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: This is in response to your letter of May 2, 1956, which accompanied the copy of the speech which you made before the Senate March 21, 1956, concerning a $100 million research program to double the demand for farm products through discovery of new industrial uses and utilization of new processes already known. I have read your remarks and those of your distinguished colleagues with considerable

interest. I am enthusiastic about the possibilities of such a research program. I believe it could be made to yield extremely worthwhile results.

One may wonder why land-grant colleges and agricultural experiment stations have not made more progress on this problem in the past. I would suggest that part of the difficulty arises out of the fact that, as you have indicated in your speech before the Senate, the approaches in the past have only been nibbling at the fringes of the problem. Each new increment in available research funds has been too small to accomplish the large purposes such as you visualize. Each of these increments have been programed well in advance and by and large have been programed primarily in terms of the facilities and research personnel available. This has tended to keep us in something of a rut.

Your approach provides for a stimulus for a new approach not committed to present proposals or programs. We hope that this proposal receives the consideration which it merits.

Sincerely yours,

G. FRED SOMERS,
Associate Dean and Associate Director.

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE OF THE
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY,
Columbus, Ohio, May 23, 1956.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of recent date concerning the importance of marketing programs as the ultimate solution to the farm problem. We appreciated very much the attached copy of your speech made in the Senate on March 21.

The Agricultural Extension Service has given major emphasis to marketing education programs during the years past with added emphasis to this phase of the program during the last few years. We operate in the area of overall marketing education in assisting rural people in developing new markets, new marketing facilities, and in the orderly movement of agricultural products. During recent years we in Ohio have become involved in a broad consumer marketing program by assisting the consumers in general by furnishing marketing information on seasonal supplies and buys and in an effort to further promote the orderly marketing of agricultural products. We appreciate very much your interest in this area and agree that much can be accomplished by promoting still further the marketing program.

Very truly yours,

W. B. WOOD,
Director.

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING,
Blacksburg, Va., June 7, 1956.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I regret that I have not replied to your letter in reference to your speech on the farm problem. I have read your speech and the comments by yourself and others with a great deal of interest. The solution of many agricultural problems, as you have indicated, lies in research and education. The amount of money spent for research in agriculture is very small compared to that spent in industry. Additional funds expended for research could go a long way toward helping to solve some of our most vexing farm problems.

Thanking you for your courtesy in sending me a copy of your talk, I am,

Very truly yours,

L. B. DIETRICK,
Dean of Agriculture and Director of Extension.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, why do we ask the American farmer to cut back his production? Why do we not say to him, "We are going to find new uses for farm products in industry. We are going to find new uses for your products. We want you to grow more, not less. We want your income to be greater, not smaller. We want to create new jobs in America, not fewer"?

Mr. President, I wish to say a word or two about a certain school of thought to whose expressions I have listened occasionally. I refer to the thought which is entertained by many persons that the small or marginal farmer must be eliminated, that such a farmer has no place in the scheme of things today. I say shame on any man who makes such a statement. The small farmer can be eliminated, if it is desired to do that, and his land can be turned over to the big farmer. But what will happen? The big farmer will grow more on the land which will be turned over to him than did the small farmer. So we shall have more production. We shall have more surpluses. We shall not have solved any problem by transferring the acreages of the small farmer to the big farmer. We will increase the problem rather than decrease it. What made America great was having a multitude of small farmers and a market for the products they grew.

Let us establish a research laboratory. Let us appropriate the necessary money for it. Let us get the American people thinking about the problem. Let us spend as much time and money in trying to find new uses for farm products as we have spent in showing the farmers how to grow more, so the small farmer on a 40-, 80-, or 100-acre farm can remain in production. A farmer today can produce about twice as much as he used to, by the use of new types of fertilizer and seeds. Let us find new uses for his products, so he can live on the farm and can produce on his acres, regardless of how small his farm may be, and receive sufficient income to make a living. If we do not do that, if we go in the opposite direction, we shall travel backward and bring about a peasant system, a feudal system in America, in which a few farmers will own all the land. That is not what we want. That is why hundreds of thousands of Europeans left Europe originally and came to America. They left to get away from big landowners, so they might own a few acres and make a living from them. Let us create new markets for farm products. Let us find new uses for farm products.

I again say I hope the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will hold hearings on the bill. I dislike saying this, but I hope we shall not have to make a political issue of the matter, because the farm problem is not a political problem; it is an economic problem. Let us handle it as an economic problem. Let us have the bill reported, or if the bill I have introduced is not reported, let some bill which is similar to it in substance be reported, and let us go forward in finding new uses for farm products and new markets.

Mr. President, I previously asked permission to have printed in the RECORD letters I have received from people scattered all over the United States, who have shown a keen interest in this proposal. I have many more letters. I think I shall withhold them until I make another speech on this subject, which I hope I shall not have to make.

I trust the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will hold hearings on the bill and report it. As Senators know, Congress passed a farm bill. It was not entirely satisfactory to everybody, but, generally speaking, I think it was a good bill. It was as good as any which could be had. I am not criticizing the bill or anyone who had anything to do with it at all. We found ourselves faced with huge surpluses, and we had to get rid of them somehow. We found ourselves faced with the surplus production of farmers who, as a result of help from the Government over a period of years, amounting to billions of dollars, produced crops in such quantity that the market could not absorb them. If we will spend as much time, money, effort, and ingenuity in finding new uses for farm products as we have spent time, money, effort, and ingenuity in showing the farmers how to produce more, we will permanently solve the farm problem.

I appreciate the remarks made by the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. I am directing my closing remarks to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the chairman of the subcommittee which would handle the bill I have introduced. I request them, I urge them—yes; I even beg them—not on behalf of myself as the author of the bill, not on behalf of myself as a farmer, but in behalf of all farmers and all Americans, to report the bill; so that we may proceed in an earnest effort, not next year, but this year, to find new uses for farm products, and new markets, thus assuring prosperity to the farmers of America, and eliminating the idea that they can become more prosperous by reducing farm production. Moreover, by finding new uses for farm products, we shall be able to eliminate the great price which the farm program has been costing the American taxpayers. I have been told that it will cost $365 million this year to store surplus commodities. My bill asks only for $100 million in the next year to find new uses for farm products. I hope we can get the job done before Congress adjourns, which I hope will be within the next 30 days.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6376) to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, and Mr. SAYLOR were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also anonunced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7471) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Board of Commissioners of St. Johns County, Fla.

The message also announced that the the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10899) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 22, 23, and 28 to the bill, and concurred therein.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I understand that the conference report on H. R. 10899, the appropriation bill for the Department of Commerce and related agencies, has been acted upon by the House and has reached the Vice President's desk. Preliminarily to calling it up, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before calling up the conference report, I wish to state that the report is signed by all the conferees on the part of both the Senate and the House of Representatives; that I have notified the Senate leadership on both sides of the aisle, and there is no objection to taking up the conference report; and that I have notified the ranking minority member of the Commerce Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, who has asked me to proceed without further delay. So far as I know, there is no opposition to consideration of the report at this time.

Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10899) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 14, 1956, pp. 10415–10416, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am glad to see that the ranking minority member of the subcommittee which handled this measure [Mrs. SMITH of Maine], and who also served in the same capacity as one of the conferees on the part of the Senate, is present.

In making a brief summary of the conference report—which, as I have said, is signed by all the conferees of both the Senate and the House of Representatives—I wish to give a few figures.

Under the conference report, the amount to be appropriated for the agencies covered by the bill is $1,416,732,000 for the fiscal year 1957. This amount is $29,584,000 less than the amount included in the Senate version of the bill, which the Senate passed some days ago. It is $34,729,000 more than the amount included in the House version of the bill. It is under the amount of the Budget estimates by $105,941,000, and is under the amount of the 1956 appropriations for the same agencies by $62,266,500.

Mr. President, in connection with the conference report, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a table showing the conference committee's action on the bill, as contrasted with the Budget estimates, the amounts carried in the House version of the bill, and the amounts carried in the Senate version of the bill, for each of the agencies and objectives separately covered in the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Department of Commerce and related agencies appropriation bill 1957 (H. R. 10899)

Appropriation	Appropriations, 1956 [1]	Budget estimates, 1957	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
TITLE I. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses	$2,312,500	$2,500,000	$2,425,000	$2,465,000	$2,450,000
CENSUS BUREAU					
Salaries and expenses	7,415,500	7,620,000	7,413,000	7,575,000	7,475,000
Census of governments		2,100,000	1,750,000	2,100,000	1,750,000
National housing inventory		1,800,000	1,000,000	650,000	1,000,000
1958 censuses of business, transportation, manufactures, and mineral industries		150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Censuses of business, manufactures, and mineral industries	4,304,000	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]
Census of agriculture	5,412,500				
	17,132,000	11,670,000	10,313,000	10,475,000	10,375,000
CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION					
Operation and regulation	112,640,000	128,500,000	125,000,000	128,608,000	126,804,000
Establishment of air-navigation facilities	16,000,000	40,000,000	37,500,000	40,000,000	40,000,000
Grants-in-aid for airports (liquidation of contract authorization)		30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
Washington National Airport:					
Maintenance and operation	1,388,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Construction	3,125,000				
Maintenance and operation, public airports, Territory of Alaska	617,500	618,000	618,000	618,000	618,000
Air navigation development	1,050,000	2,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Establishment of air navigation facilities (liquidation of contract authorizations)	7,000,000				
Grants-in-aid for airports	20,000,000				
Federal-aid airport program (liquidation of contract authority)	7,500,000				
	169,320,500	202,618,000	196,118,000	202,226,000	200,422,000
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD					
Salaries and expenses	4,390,000	4,700,000	4,550,000	4,700,000	4,625,000
Payments to air carriers	52,500,000	20,000,000	15,000,000	17,400,000	16,200,000
	56,890,000	24,700,000	19,550,000	22,100,000	20,825,000
COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY					
Salaries and expenses	10,724,000	11,020,000	10,800,000	11,020,000	10,900,000
Construction of a surveying ship		3,700,000	3,400,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
	10,724,000	14,720,000	14,200,000	14,720,000	14,600,000

[1] Includes funds contained in the "Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956."

[2] Transfer of not to exceed $900,000 from "Census of Agriculture, 1956."

Department of Commerce and related agencies appropriation bill 1957 (H. R. 10899)—Continued

Appropriation (1)	Appropriations, 1956 (2)	Budget estimates, 1957 (3)	House bill (4)	Senate bill (5)	Conference action (6)
TITLE I. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—Continued					
BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses	$6,600,000	$7,500,000	$7,200,000	$6,900,000	$6,900,000
BUREAU OF FOREIGN COMMERCE					
Salaries and expenses	2,130,500	2,450,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
Export control	2,836,000				
	4,966,500	2,450,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS					
Salaries and expenses	960,000	1,200,000	1,000,000	900,000	960,000
MARITIME ACTIVITIES					
Ship construction	86,450,000	[3] 151,600,000	54,800,000	108,880,000	82,700,000
Operating-differential subsidies	140,000,000	124,000,000	124,000,000	124,000,000	124,000,000
Salaries and expenses	14,875,500	15,500,000	15,187,000	15,500,000	15,350,000
Maritime training	2,185,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
State marine schools	660,000	660,000	660,000	660,000	660,000
Shipyard mobilization planning		1,000,000			
Vessel operations revolving fund	Language	Language	Language	Language	Language
Repair of reserve fleet vessels (liquidation of contract authorization)	6,000,000	[4] (156,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)
War Shipping Administration liquidation	[5]	[6]	[6]	[6]	[6]
	250,170,500	294,960,000	196,847,000	251,240,000	224,910,000
INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION					
Administrative expenses limitation	(14,000)	(14,000)		(14,000)	(14,000)
PATENT OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses	14,500,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS					
Federal-aid highways	740,000,000	800,000,000	775,000,000	775,000,000	775,000,000
Forest highways	24,750,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000
Public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization)	2,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Inter-American highway	62,980,000				
	829,730,000	824,000,000	799,000,000	799,000,000	799,000,000
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS					
Expenses	7,413,500	9,000,000	8,750,000	8,750,000	8,750,000
Plant and equipment	995,000	500,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
Construction of facilities		2,750,000		930,000	930,000
	8,408,500	12,250,000	9,200,000	10,130,000	10,130,000
WEATHER BUREAU					
Salaries and expenses	34,150,000	35,500,000	35,400,000	35,400,000	35,400,000
Establishment of meteorological facilities	7,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
	41,650,000	38,000,000	37,900,000	37,900,000	37,900,000
Total, title I	1,413,364,500	1,453,568,000	1,313,153,000	1,377,456,000	1,347,872,000
TITLE II. THE PANAMA CANAL					
CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT					
Operating expenses	14,948,000	15,660,000	15,410,000	15,410,000	15,410,000
Capital outlay	1,800,000	[7]	[7]	[7]	[7]
	16,748,000	15,660,000	15,410,000	15,410,000	15,410,000
PANAMA CANAL COMPANY					
Administrative expense limitation	(3,789,000)	(3,679,000)	(3,562,100)	(3,679,000)	(3,679,000)
Total, title II	16,748,000	15,660,000	15,410,000	15,410,000	15,410,000
TITLE III. INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	275,000	[8]	[8]	[8]	[8]
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation:					
Administrative expense limitation	(280,000)	(325,000)	(315,000)	(325,000)	(325,000)
Small Business Administration:					
Salaries and expenses	2,128,000	[9] 1,890,000	1,890,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
Revolving fund	45,000,000	[9] 50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
Total, Small Business Administration	47,128,000	51,890,000	51,890,000	51,900,000	51,900,000
Tariff Commission	1,483,000	1,555,000	1,550,000	1,550,000	1,550,000
Total, title III	48,886,000	53,445,000	53,440,000	53,450,000	53,450,000
Grand total, titles I, II, and III	1,478,998,500	1,522,673,000	1,382,003,000	1,446,316,000	1,416,732,000

[3] Includes reduction of $13,000,000 contained in H. Doc. 365.
[4] Contained in H. Doc. 365.
[5] Not to exceed $24,000,000 of unexpended balance continued available.
[6] Unexpended balance to be continued available as contained in H. Doc. 365.
[7] Language authorizing use of funds for purchase of passenger motor vehicles.
[8] Unobligated balance to be continued available through July 30, 1956.
[9] As amended by H. Doc. 379.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, by way of a brief reference to the principal changes to be found in the conference report on the bill, as compared with the form in which the bill was passed by the Senate, I wish to call attention to five items, which constitute the principal changes, although not the only ones.

In connection with the establishment of an air-navigation facilities program of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Senate will recall that it supported the full amount to begin carrying out the 5-year plan for modernizing our air-navigation facilities, the full amount being $40 million. The House had approved an amount slightly smaller than that. After discussion, the conferees were in unanimous accord that the full amount of $40 million should be made available, in order that there be no discouragement whatever to the completion on schedule of the badly needed im-

proved system of air-navigation facilities.

The second of the notable changes made in the Senate version had to do with the appropriation for payments to air carriers by the Civil Aeronautics Board. The House had allowed for this particular objective $15 million. The Senate had allowed $17,400,000. The conferees, in their judgment, split the difference evenly as between the two amounts, and the conference report carries for this item $16,200,000.

The third notable change comes under the Coast and Geodetic Survey. The Senate will recall that the new item for this Agency was for the construction of one of the two new surveying ships which have recently been authorized by the Congress. The conference committee approved the action of the Senate in providing the full amount needed, not only for the construction of the ship, but for the installation of the very complicated facilities which must be built into the ship in most cases, and therefore must be bought and made available at the time the ship is actually being constructed. That item, therefore, is the same as the amount allowed by the Senate, namely, $3,700,000.

The largest change in the conference report has to do with the ship construction item under Maritime Activities in the Department of Commerce. The House had allowed $54,800,000. The Senate had allowed $108,880,000 for this very important objective. After considerable discussion, the amount which was agreed upon by all the conferees, and which appears in the conference report, was $82,700,000 for ship construction.

The fifth principal change to which I call attention is that the action of the Senate was followed in providing for the purchase of a site for new headquarters for the National Bureau of Standards and the construction of facilities at such headquarters. Senators may recall that pursuant to a recommendation of the Senate committee a very modest beginning was made on that important objective by including in the Senate version of the bill $930,000, subject to certain conditions, which have been fully met.

The conferees were unanimously of the feeling that that item should stand in the bill, and that the important acquisition of land and construction of new facilities should get underway. So the item for construction of facilities for the National Bureau of Standards, in the amount of $930,000, remains in the bill.

There are, of course, other interesting items in the report. However, unless there are questions from my distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], or from other Senators, I shall be very happy to submit the report at this time for action by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 10899, making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.
June 14, 1956.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 22, 23, and 28 to the bill (H. R. 10899) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I notice that my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is not present in the Chamber. He expected to be present, if possible, at the time of consideration of the conference report, but was detained in committee and was not sure he could be present. He asked me to request unanimous consent for the printing in the RECORD at this point of a statement he prepared with respect to certain items in the conference report. Attached to his statement are certain letters, as well as a copy of an editorial from the June 12 issue of the Journal of Commerce.

I ask unanimous consent that all those items be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement, letters, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPARKMAN

I regret that the conference committee on the Commerce appropriation did not find it possible to include funds for the improvement of construction statistics and the improvement of a number of important statistical series compiled by the Office of Business Economics, including data on manufactures, inventories and orders, new plant and equipment, and consumer expenditures for goods and services. Since the House-passed bill had provided modest amounts for both of these programs it was hoped that the conference would accept the House figure.

Senator PAYNE and Senator FLANDERS, who proposed amendments providing for these programs during the Senate debate, explained the urgent need for improving these basic statistical tools. Several members of the joint Economic Committee joined with Senator FLANDERS and me in supporting these amendments. The amendments were subsequently withdrawn in an effort to expediate passage of the bill. In response to the request of the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator HOLLAND, Senator FLANDERS, and I submitted letters to him giving further explanation of why the joint Economic Committee was particularly concerned about improving the statistics in these areas. In connection with possible future actions, I ask that these letters be included as part of the record. I also ask that there be included a copy of the letter which I sent to the Appropriations Subcommittee prior to their consideration of the bill, pointing out the need for assuring funds in this area.

I am sure it will be of interest to Members of the Senate also to know that the Journal of Commerce only day before yesterday pointed out the acute need for doing something to improve key data which are needed for economic decisionmaking. I ask that the editorial from this well-known business paper be included also in the RECORD.

These data are needed not only by private business, but by the Government—executive and legislative—in Government policymaking. I hope there will be another opportunity to provide these needed funds.

JUNE 4, 1956.

The Honorable SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: During the Senate debate on the Department of Commerce appropriation, you invited written statements for consideration by the conferees in reaching agreement on this appropriation.

I should like to express again my interest, and that of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, in two items in the Commerce appropriation, and urge that the Senate conferees accept the higher amount passed by the House for each of these two items:

(1) Improvement in construction statistics, by the Business and Defense Services Administration.

(2) Improvement in economic statistics, by the Office of Business Economics.

The direct concern of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report in these two programs was indicated in my letter to you of May 9, printed on page 535 of the Senate Hearings on the Commerce appropriation. Needed improvements in these programs have been specific subjects of investigation by the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, of which I am the Senate member.

On the construction statistics program, the committee supported the increase requested last year for the construction statistics program, and in Senate Report No. 1309, issued January 5, 1956, urged again that funds be provided this year to make possible the extensive improvements needed in this program. As pointed out by the committee, better data are needed in this area because of the importance of construction to our economy and the need for accurate information on the health of this industry in appraisal of the economic outlook.

Some confusion seems to have arisen, understandably, over the relationship of the construction statistics program in the Business and Defense Services Administration and the National Intercensal Housing Survey to be made by the Bureau of the Census. Although it appears that these two items are similar, actually they are quite distinct, each contributing separate information needed in appraising change and determining policy in the housing and construction areas. The Census Bureau's housing survey is planned as a one-time survey, approximately midway between the 1950 and 1960 Censuses of Housing, to provide national figures on the number of dwelling units and the changes which have taken place since the 1950 census. The construction statistics program in the Business and Defense Services Administration, on the other hand, is not a one-time survey of the census type, but a continuing program which supplies the current measures of construction activity used in economic analysis. The housing survey is concerned primarily with what has happened to houses already in existence, while the construction statistics are designed to provide more reliable information on dollar expenditures currently being made for all types of construction—nonresidential as well as housing, new construction as well as additions, alterations and repairs.

I hope that the Senate conferees will agree to the $350,000 allowed for this item by the House. This amount will not make possible all the improvements planned for next year, but will at least make a beginning on strengthening these series so that they may more adequately meet the important purposes for which they are used.

In the Office of Business Economics, most of the increases proposed for 1957 were for

specific improvements which had been recommended by the Joint Economic Committee. The House allowance of $1 million out of the $1,200,000 included in the budget estimate means an increase of only $40,000 out of $240,000 requested. I feel that it is important that provision be made at the earliest possible opportunity for the full amount of the increase requested for this agency. In the meantime, I sincerely hope that the Senate conferees will accept the House figure of $1 million in place of the Senate figures of $900,000, which would actually decrease funds available for these key economic series below the level available this year.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN SPARKMAN.

The Honorable SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: I should like to take this opportunity to comply with your kind request, in the Senate debate on the Commerce appropriation bill, to give you a written statement in support of increased funds for the Office of Business Economics.

The 1957 budget included an increase of $240,000 for this agency, to finance improvements needed in four areas:

(1) Consumer expenditures for goods and services ($55,000);

(2) Manufacturers' inventories and orders ($70,000);

(3) Anticipated expenditures by all business for new plant and equipment ($95,000); and

(4) Resumption of quarterly reports on businesses started and businesses discontinued ($20,000).

Late in 1954 the Joint Committee on the Economic Report asked the Federal Reserve Board to establish consultant committees of experts to appraise the adequacy of present statistics on consumer and business expectations, inventories, and savings. The reports of these committees were submitted to the joint committee during the summer and fall of 1955, and discussed in public hearings. Recommendations made by the expert consultants were reviewed by the Joint Committee's Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, and this subcommittee in turn made a number of recommendations on immediate needs in these areas. Each of the four increases requested for the Office of Business Economics is designed to meet the needs expressed in these studies made and sponsored by the Joint Economic Committee.

The $1 million allowed by the House for this agency provides for an increase of only $40,000. The $900,000 allowed by the Senate reduces the funds for this agency, which is responsible for many of our key economic indicators, below the level available for the present year.

As I stated on the floor of the Senate, I feel very strongly that the full amount asked for in the budget estimate for this agency is justified. The statistical series which it is proposed to strengthen are series which are essential to Government and business alike in appraising the condition of the economy, and it is important that they be as reliable as we can make them. At the earliest opportunity I believe the full amount of the increase should be made available for the purposes stated in the 1957 budget estimate.

I respectfully urge that you concur in the House figure of $1 million for the Office of Business Economics. This amount would protect the present level and allow for an increase of $40,000. With this small increase, the office would at least be able to utilize data now becoming available from the 1954 censuses of manufactures and trade to improve the estimates of consumer expenditures in our national accounts.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH E. FLANDERS.

MAY 9, 1956.

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Department of Commerce and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: I am writing to express my interest and the interest of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report in certain statistical programs included in the budget request for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1957.

Statistical data are essential in appraising the welfare of the economy and in determining economic policy. Because of this, the Joint Committee has been increasingly concerned with the adequacy and accuracy of the data upon which it must rely. Through hearings, studies and reports it has attempted to determine how adequate our present statistics are for the important purposes for which they are used, and many of the increases included for statistical programs in 1957 have resulted from the committee's studies and recommendations during the past 2 years.

In its report on the 1956 Economic Report of the President (S. Rept. No. 1606, p. 6) the Joint Economic Committee stated:

"We urge the Congress to give strong support to the proposals in the current budget for additional funds for improving our sources of economic intelligence. In the long run, such expenditures to enable early and correct diagnosis of imbalances will make a greater contribution to our economic stability and growth per dollar spent than the much larger sums needed to correct difficulties discovered only after they have become large and menacing."

We are pleased that many of the basic improvements needed have been passed by the House for the 1957 appropriations. I am concerned, however, that there are still a few places in the bill which the House passed that need strengthening if we are not to impair the statistical program proposed for 1957. Most of these instances are in programs to be conducted by the Department of Commerce, as follows:

(1) In the Office of Business Economics, the 1957 appropriation request was $1,200,000—an increase of $240,000 over the amount available in 1956. This increase was to provide for four projects of direct concern to the Joint Economic Committee—improving and remedying present inadequacies in (a) estimates of consumer expenditures in the national income and product accounts; (b) estimates of manufacturers' inventories; (c) estimates of expenditures for plant and equipment; and (d) estimates of changes in the business population. The House allowed only $40,000 of this $240,000 increase, which would be insufficient to bring about the immediate improvements which we have recommended in these areas.

(2) In the Business and Defense Services Administration, the 1957 request included an increase of $600,000 for construction statistics; and the House reduced this amount to $350,000. This is a great improvement over any previous bill but since the present data for measuring changes in this significant economic activity are particularly weak, I hope it will be possible to provide the full amount necessary to remedy the major existing inadequacies. The Joint Economic Committee was unanimous in its support of this last year when we stated in Senate Report No. 1309 (p. 2):

"One of the most important forces in our current prosperity has been the continued high level of construction. In any appraisal of the economic outlook it is essential to know as much as possible about the health of this industry."

(3) Of particular interest to the Joint Economic Committee, too, is the request in the item for the Bureau of the Census for $82,800 for monthly estimates of retail inventories, as recommended by the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics. The reduction of the request of the Census Bureau from $1,800,000 to $1 million for the National Housing Inventory would drastically curtail the amount of local area data which could be obtained from the survey, seriously limiting the usefulness of the information. The national data which could be obtained with the $1 million are greatly needed, but so also are indications of the variations in the housing supply in different areas, which would require additional funds.

On behalf of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and of its Subcommittee on Economic Statistics on which I have served since its founding 2 years ago, I sincerely hope that the Senate Committee on Appropriations may restore funds for as many of these programs as possible.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Subcommittee on Economic Statistics.

[From the Journal of Commerce of June 12, 1956]

TODAY ON CAPITOL HILL

Congress today holds public hearings on the Federal Reserve Board's decision to raise the rediscount rate at a time when top administration economic and fiscal authorities believed the economic situation did not require this further move of credit stringency.

Coming on the heels of widespread criticism of the Federal Reserve move, this inquiry will focus national attention on how authorities can coordinate strategic monetary and economic decisions where the responsibility for decisionmaking is divided as it now is.

But just as worthy of close study are the methods by which the economic and monetary authorities arrive at their decisions as to the timing of action to influence the overall direction of the economy. This involves the use they make of the key economic data which are at their command. That, in turn, raises the all-important question of whether they are getting the kind of information they must have and whether they are getting these data in time to use them in their decisions.

Obviously if key information comes limping along so late that it merely makes good reading in economic history, it may contribute little to the difficult decisions as to what to do at a given crucial moment. And if the information is so inadequate as to make guesswork necessary, the likelihood that the guesses will differ, leading to significant disagreements on economic policy, is vastly increased.

For actually, the Federal Reserve took the view that the monetary screws ought to be twisted further on the basis of the statistical information that it had available. And Economic Council Chairman Arthur Burns, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, Secretary of Commerce Weeks—and, indeed, the President—took the contrary position on the basis of the economic data that they had at hand.

And what were these key data? In the economic field, the data are made available to these authorities through the appropriation acts of Congress, so if we are concerned about the basis for arriving at the economic decision, that is all the more reason to improve the basic information and to reduce the area of guesswork where differences are most likely to breed.

It just so happens that extremely important decisions affecting the availability of key economic information will be made today in meetings which will take place in the Capitol at the same time that the Joint Economic Subcommittee is studying the administration-Federal Reserve conflict over the April rediscount rate increase.

At issue are precisely the kind of data which the administration ought to have at

hand if it is to make a clear case, for instance to FRB concerning the economic implications of a particular move in the credit field.

For the stunning fact is that this year, in the midst of a tremendous construction boom (one of the strong elements in our economy) and in the midst of a lag in residential housing (one of the elements of weakness), Congress is taking a most niggardly attitude in the voting of funds for essential data in these fields. Other vital essential data are also at issue. All are involved in the appropriations bill for the Commerce Department and related agencies, which Senate and House conferees are meeting to decide finally in sessions which begin today.

Here is the disappointing score:

The administration asked $600,000 to make good the grossly inadequate data now available on construction, especially nonresidential, including information on State and local activities, which are becoming more important all the time. Included were funds for burgeoning activities in the field of expenditures for alterations and repairs. These have a significant but unknown impact on overall housing demand and needs.

The House approved a meager $350,000 of the $600,000 asked to make a good data in these fields. The Senate approved a meager $350,000 of the $600,000 asked to improve data in these fields. It struck the whole amount of $1,800,000 asked for an intercensal housing inventory (we have not taken stock of our housing since 1950), and the House voted only $1 million. The Senate cut this to $650,000. What this means is a smaller sample, which is the poorest economy in the world, and greatly reduced local data.

Finally, the administration asked $240,000 for improved data on plant and equipment expenditures; on monthly estimates of manufacturers' inventories, sales and orders; consumers' expenditures; and business births and mortality. The House approved a mere $40,000 for the first three, leaving out provision for improved business vital statistics altogether. And the latter in the face of all of the howl about whether or not small business has participated in the Eisenhower prosperity.

The Senate, not content with the House slash of the $240,000 administration request to $40,000, not only struck this totally inadequate sum but cut existing funds by $60,000.

The economic subcommittee probe into the FRB rediscount action dramatizes the difficulty under which authorities operate today in determining actually what are the significant economic trends. All authorities and competent economists are agreed that the economic data, at stake in the Senate-House appropriations sessions, are essential to the interpretation of national economic developments.

Economy in dispensing such needed funds is the worst kind of extravagance.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST FARM PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have been absent from the floor attending a meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee, but I read on the ticker this item:

The Senate came to the aid of high school debaters throughout the country.

It voted to have the Library of Congress prepare a summary of arguments for and against farm-price supports. The summary will be printed as a Senate document.

Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, said the summary will be useful to school debate teams.

Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that although I am not undertaking to thwart the desires of the majority of the committee, I do not concur in the statement that the Senate came to the aid of high school debates throughout the country. In my opinion, from a general reading of it, it is very heavily loaded in favor of the Brannan plan, and any high school student reading it would naturally come to the conclusion that the Brannan plan might be the logical solution of all our farm problems. I do not concur in the material included in the document which the Senate has directed to have printed.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S CREDIT POLICY—CONFUSION CONFOUNDED

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the few moments I have today I should like to call to the attention of the Senate the apparent culmination of months of confusion and discouraging lack of foresight in the administration's credit policy. In Tuesday's testimony before the subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, William McChesney Martin, Jr., candidly admitted that he was "not at all sure that member banks reserve requirements are not too high." Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey, in a forthright if amazing statement before this same subcommittee, reversed his recently declared opposition to the Federal Reserve Board's discount policies and once again flip-flopped back into the traditional tight money camp of his party where he properly belongs. Mr. Humphrey confided that the policy of tight credit which he now readvocates is one of the causes for the present trouble in the auto industry. This industry has now laid off some 200,000 workers, a fact which worries some of us more than it does Secretary Humphrey. The Secretary claimed, however, that he was not apprehensive over tight money, implied that he no longer disagreed too strongly with the Federal Reserve Board's squeeze on credit, and concluded by saying with direct reference to our Nation's economy that "it is just as well to hesitate a little."

Mr. President, this type of hesitation or pause in our economy which the Secretary recommends sounds to me like the calm before the storm. I am not a pessimist, but it seems to me that the clouds preceding this storm have been increasingly ominous lately. One gets the impression that the Secretary with his gyrations and reversals has not yet had time to figure out just what a tight money policy means or could mean for many vital segments of our American economy. Typical of many recent articles estimating the present overall economic situation and the recent readjustments in it is a definitive editorial appearing in the June 11, 1956, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald by Mr. Harold B. Dorsey, and entitled "Conflicting Factors Appear."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Joint Economic Subcommittee on Monetary Policy is scheduled to hold hearings Tuesday on the controversy between the Federal Reserve and other Government agencies over the last move of the Federal Reserve to tighten credit.

Business analysts have an unusually keen interest in these hearings, not only because of the basic principles involved, but also because the credit authorities may divulge some of their most recent thinking about credit policies. By coincidence, it happens that a change in credit policy at this juncture, and the degree of such a change, might have an unusually important effect upon a delicately poised business situation.

Within the past 2 or 3 weeks, there has been an increasing tendency among business analysts to "run scared," because some of the evidence suggests a rather noticeable deterioration in the important confidence factor. The fast 10-percent decline in the stock market constitutes one piece of evidence. There is a rule of thumb that business confidence is not influenced very much by a 10-percent move in the market but, if it goes noticeably beyond that proportion, the market's behavior usually becomes a cause factor as well as a result of the many forces that usually dictate stock price trends.

Historical performance suggests that any further important weakness in the market may well cause business executives and individuals to reduce their forward commitments, because the market would be telling them that there might be something ominous in the business outlook. Such a psychological reaction would, of itself, tend to accelerate any business or stock market weakness.

Nor is the evidence of confidence deterioration confined to the stock market. Some of the more sensitive raw material commodity price indices, which sometimes anticipate business trends, have been behaving in a negative fashion in the last few weeks.

Furthermore, in the personal conversations which this writer and his staff have had with business executives recently, we hear more expressions of concern about the business outlook. This sentiment has not reached the state where expansion programs are being canceled. However, we hear about the cessation of inventory accumulation and some thoughts about stretching out expansion programs. There is a steadily expanding anticipation of some rather sour-looking figures for certain key industries within the next 6 weeks, and, if they materialize, their publication is not likely to enhance confidence.

All of this is quite different from the condition which encouraged the Federal Reserve to tighten credit again in April. At that time, businesses were very confident of the outlook and were sharply increasing their borrowing from banks to obtain funds to finance temporarily portions of their capital expansion programs and also to finance sharp inventory accumulation. Clearly, it was the function of the Federal Reserve to do what it could to retard this creation of a maladjustment that would have to be corrected subsequently in terms of lower business activity.

As it has turned out, the Federal Reserve was not entirely successful in reaching its objectives, even though it did tighten credit. Inventories of steel in the hands of consumers are now high, new automobiles in the hands of dealers are very high, and inventories of tires and some appliances are high. That is one reason why productive activity in these particular industries is going to be lower in the third quarter.

Then too, there is every indication that the tight credit policy is not going to prevent increased wages and prices in the steel industry, which is inflation per se. The pattern established in the important steel industry is likely to spread to other industries.

In addition, it might be contended that the sharply rising trend of business capital expenditures is temporarily inflationary, because new purchasing power is created while

these expenditures are made, without a commensurate increase in the supply of goods upon which this purchasing power can be spent. At this juncture, however, there would not seem to be any shortage of supply for most of the consumers' durable and nondurable goods lines.

It is obvious, however, that a mixture of inflationary and deflationary elements is present today, in contrast with the situation a couple of months ago when the inflationary pressures seemed to dominate the scene. The deflationary clues are still indecisive and it is too early to conclude that they will develop to a degree that would have an important adverse effect on the economy as a whole. And it must be remembered that the Federal Reserve is primarily interested in the economy as a whole. It cannot adjust the credit policies of the country to protect an individual industry that might seem to be threatened with a slump.

In spite of the emphasis that has been placed recently on slackening conditions of individual industries, it probably is a fact that the overall measurements of the status of the economy are not far below peak levels.

Nevertheless, the business analyst today—possibly overemphasizing the deflationary clues that he sees developing at the moment—is wondering if the Federal Reserve is going to do anything about it in terms of credit policy. And there is considerable logic in his curiosity about the thinking of the credit authorities now, because there is a rather marked difference between conditions today and those which justified a policy of further restraint 2 months ago.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is elemental that the effects of our national credit policies are not evenly felt throughout our economy. The many varying effects of the administration's program are typically discussed on page 27 of the May 5, 1956 issue of Business Week, a magazine accepted nationwide by the business community as a most reliable and authoritative news source. Here the darkening picture of just how our tight money has been penalizing certain areas of our Nation's economy is dramatically set out. As this article succinctly puts it, results of a Business Week survey "showed that though many businesses are feeling the pinch, the squeeze is tighter in some sections than in others."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article, entitled "Squeeze Is Hurting Now," printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A Texas manufacturer says the Federal Reserve's tight-money policy has "dried up all the usual sources of credit." In Los Angeles a businessman complains that his bank not only cut down the amount he could borrow, but made him keep 20 percent of the loan on deposit. A capital-goods manufacturer in Minneapolis says tight money has forced him to review his expansion plans. And a small Virginia firm is finding it "rough" to pay 6 percent for a new loan, as compared to 4½ percent a year ago.

These comments reflect the views of businessmen who have been hit by the Federal Reserve's current squeeze on credit. This week Business Week reporters questioned a cross section of businessmen, State and local government officials, and bankers on how they have been affected by tight money. Their answers showed that though many businesses are feeling the pinch, the squeeze is tighter in some sections than in others.

Tougher than 1953: Some companies say they haven't been squeezed at all, aside from having to pay more for their loans. But even these are afraid of what might happen if the pinch gets any tighter. In fact, a good many businessmen and a number of State and local government officials say today's market is even tighter than in 1953.

The responses to this week's survey contrast sharply with those Business Week reporters collected last fall, just after the Federal Reserve raised the discount rate to 2½ percent (Business Week, Sept. 24, 1955, p. 26). That survey revealed most businesses were having no difficulty in borrowing, and only newly formed or marginal companies were feeling any pinch. There were no cases of capital expansion or inventory accumulation plans being stopped for lack of credit.

Who's getting hurt? But now, with the discount rate up to 2¾ percent in 10 Federal districts and at 3 percent in 2 others, the squeeze is much more apparent. This is today's picture:

All borrowers are paying more for their loans—anywhere from ¼ to 1½ percent more than they did a year ago.

Many businesses, particularly small- and medium-sized companies, cannot borrow all they need, whatever the rate. As a result, some are being forced to cut back on inventories, go slower on expansion plans.

Most companies that are being squeezed for credit prefer to cut down on inventories rather than postpone capital projects.

Most of the companies surveyed say their business customers are slower in paying bills. They fear they will be hurt by this.

Businesses that have not had to borrow fear that if credit stays tight, they'll be hurt by declining sales.

City and State governments are squeezed even harder than most businesses, primarily because they are vulnerable to higher interest rates.

By and large, businessmen are not bothered by rising interest rates. They complain about the higher cost of loans, but in almost all cases they are willing to pay the going rate. The scarcity of credit is the real stinger.

Sudden pinch: The squeeze on business seems to have begun hurting only recently. Most companies say they were not concerned until the last few weeks. But right after the March 15 tax date many discovered that they would have to borrow more than they anticipated they would need; and now they are finding it much more difficult to get as much as they want.

This upsurge of demand, of course, is one of the main reasons for the Federal Reserve's latest turn on the credit screw. The monetary managers were surprised by business's overwhelming demand for credit. They cut funds furnished to the banks in order to hold down the demand.

Big times touched: The bigger, longer established companies with good lines of credit are not having too much trouble, provided they are willing to pay the rate.

This confirms another survey made by Standard Factors Corp., which found that 82 percent of companies with a net worth of $5,000 to $25,000 could not get bank loans, and almost 50 percent in the $25,000 to $100,000 bracket have lost their lines of credit with the banks. But only 12 percent of the companies in the $100,000 to $500,000 class have been badly squeezed, and those in the upper brackets have been virtually unaffected.

This week though, Business Week reporters found that some big companies are feeling the pinch. One big Milwaukee hard-goods company revealed that it is being squeezed much more severely than in 1953, mainly because it has grown rapidly and needs much more credit. And a big California home appliance outfit also frankly admits that it is cutting back its expansion plans to the limit of available borrowing.

Small ones worst: The smaller companies, even long-established ones, are hurt the most. A Seattle plywood manufacturer who has just started a new plant found the banks unwilling to provide the term loan he needed at any price. A Chicago builder needing $800,000 to finance a new building is so far unable to raise more than $650,000, not enough to start the project.

Although the unavailability of credit is the first complaint among businessmen, many are also worried about higher rates. A Minneapolis tool maker says he will cut down on expansion if the cost of borrowing gets any higher. And a Dallas durable goods manufacturer definitely has cut back both inventory and capital spending.

Some on the fringe: Companies that say they haven't felt the pinch usually haven't been borrowing over the last few months. And those that feel sure they can get all the money they need may be whistling in the dark. A Boston company admits it has not asked for a loan for fear it will be turned down.

It is also clear that many companies don't realize how much rates have climbed. A New York soft-goods outfit borrowed $750,000 at 4½ percent, but had to keep $250,000 on deposit. Thus, it is really paying 6¾ percent for the money it can use.

Governments' troubles: The rise of interest rates has been more of a burden to States, municipalities, and local governments than to businessmen. All are paying more for what they borrow, but public bodies unlike corporations, can't charge part of the increase off to income tax. They must get more out of their tax revenues if they are to pay for their borrowings.

However, Business Week reporters found that no major public construction job has been stopped for lack of credit so far. Where the need is really critical, the public body is raising money even if it does cost more.

A number of public authorities are temporarily postponing borrowings, waiting to see if there's to be an end to tight money.

Others guess that waiting also has its hazards. For instance, Detroit figures that lower interest rates later on might easily be offset by higher costs for labor and materials. Its officials point out that the 1954 estimate for building a convention hall was $29.6 million; the latest estimate, taken last month, was $35.3 million.

Postponements: But for the most part, governmental bodies are deferring if they can. Ohio, for example, may decide against going into the market soon to borrow $500 million for a new turnpike. Last week, the State had only one bid, 3.09 percent, for $50 million of highway bonds. It had to take this offer, because it needed the money immediately. But the turnpike may be postponed.

In Los Angeles, the Board of Education is selling no bonds in June, as it normally would, instead it will wait until September in the hope of a return to easier money.

Some cities are handicapped by statutory limits on interest. Philadelphia, for example, couldn't take bids last week on a refunding issue and on a borrowing for the transit company because it can pay no more than 3 percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, everyone knows that the economy of this country of ours is the most complex and extensive one in the world. Not all of the areas of our American economy are affected in like manner by policies pursued on a national level. It is difficult to understand all of the intricate facets and functions of our economy, but as this article in Business Week demonstrates, the administration seems either unaware or negligent of the effects of its credit policy on such areas as our great farm

population, our small independent businessmen, our young homeowners, and other important and identifiable groups.

A few facts and figures will illustrate what I have in mind. In my remarks on May 15 on the Senate floor, I reminded my colleagues of certain statements by bank officials from our great Midwest Farm Belt, telling how the already hard-hit farmers of our area were again being severely pinched by this drought of credit. Since 1952, when the tight money men entered office, the profits of small-business men with assets under $250,000 have gone down 28 percent, while the profits of big-business men with assets over $100 million have spiraled up by 61 percent. At the same time, let us never forget in these days of increasingly higher interest rates, that the cost for a newly married couple buying a small house and carrying a mortgage on it is increased approximately $225 a year by a 1½-percent increase in rates.

Mr. President, even a casual glance at newspaper headlines would show what the administration's vacillating credit policy has done to many of these sections of our economy. Here is an article from the May 22 New York Times entitled "Money Shortage Found Worsening: Head of Home Builders Group Says Scarcity of Mortgage Funds Is Now Severe." In the Wall Street Journal of April 24, 1956, we find an article headlined: "Tighter Credit Curbs Hurt Small Concerns." In the April 30, 1956, issue of the New York Times there is another which reads: "United States Credit Policy Held School Curb: Levitt Contends That Rise in Interest Rate Hinders Building in State."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the contents of these three articles describing the effects of the present credit squeeze be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 22, 1956]

MONEY SHORTAGE FOUND WORSENING—HEAD OF HOME BUILDERS GROUP SAYS SCARCITY OF MORTGAGE FUNDS IS NOW SEVERE

WASHINGTON, May 21.—The president of the National Association of Home Builders said today that mortgage money conditions now "are more severe than at any time since World War II—more severe than in the mortgage drought of 1953."

Joseph B. Haverstick, the official, said in an interview, that if the conditions persisted, housing starts this year would probably drop below 1 million. Last year they were slightly more than 1,300,000, and in the last 3 months they have been running at a rate of 1,100,000.

Mr. Haverstick laid the squeeze to the money-tightening moves of the Federal Reserve System. He said the industry was not being hurt badly yet, but that conditions are present that could hurt seriously. He said conditions in the mortgage market had worsened considerably in the last 30 days.

At the same time the Association of Home Builders made public a survey of 100 builders around the country. The builders mostly reported difficulties in getting financing for their houses, but they planned to start only 4 percent fewer houses than last year.

The survey showed that large builders—those who started more than 100 houses last year—would cut back this year much more than the smaller builders. Many of the latter are planning to start more houses this year than last.

These were some of the highlights of the survey:

The prices of houses are going up and builders are shifting into higher priced housing brackets. Starts in the price bracket below $12,500 will go down as much as 40 percent this year.

A third of the builders reported a slight improvement in sales in the last 30 days in the face of the money squeeze. No change was noted by 38 percent and 29 percent said sales were worse.

Half of the builders are starting their houses without firm financing commitments in hand. Half also reported more buyers than last year being rejected on the grounds of credit rating.

The builders reported relatively little effect on their own operations from the 2 percent increase in down payments imposed last summer by the Government, on the mortgages it insures. But 9 out of 10 said it was having some effect on the total market in their communities.

Land prices are up an average of 17 percent in the last year.

[From the Wall Street Journal of April 24, 1956]

TIGHTER CREDIT CURBS HURT SMALL CONCERNS, STANDARD FACTORS SAYS—STUDY INDICATES LARGER MANUFACTURERS HARDLY FEEL RESTRICTIONS ON BANK LOANS

NEW YORK.—Tightening credit restrictions over the past 12 months have hurt smaller and medium-sized manufacturers but have had little effect on larger corporations, according to a study by Standard Factors Corp.

The report, which covered 727 manufacturers in 33 major industries and 127 banks throughout the country, said the biggest borrowers were able to supplement their bank credit by selling commercial paper, or borrowing from insurance companies or the public. For the most part, this avenue was closed to the smaller and medium-sized manufacturers.

The study noted that prior to the first Federal Reserve Board increase in the rediscount rate last April, 53 percent of the companies with a net worth of $5,000 to $25,000 were regular borrowers from commercial banks. At the end of last month, only 18 percent of the companies in this group had credit lines with banks.

In the $25,000 to $100,000 class, the proportion of regular borrowers declined to 44 percent from 82 percent in March 1955. At the end of last month, 79 percent of the companies in the $100,000 to $500,000 group had bank credit lines against 94 percent a year earlier. Manufacturers in the $500,000 to $2,500,000 category were virtually unaffected, 98 percent having bank credit on March 31, or only 1 percent less than a year before.

Although many of the small- and medium-sized manufacturers sought credit from commerical finance companies, the report said the finance companies, which operate with their own capital plus bank credit, were also strapped by the tighter controls on loans. Only the larger commercial finance companies with access to public financing, insurance company loans and the commercial paper market were able to make any headway in meeting the need, the report said.

According to the study, while banks are anxious to help all customers, the pressure exerted by credit restrictions tends to work its way down to the smaller customer. This is so, the report explains, because it costs the bank almost as much in time and expense to administer a $10,000 line of credit as it does to administer a $100,000 line.

The report states, "Since lendable funds and bank personnel are at a premium, and since the risk on one $1 million account is less than the risk on a hundred $10,000 accounts, banks tend to hold on to their biggest and most stable customers."

The report suggests that in view of these circumstances the Federal Reserve System might reconsider whether the country can afford to maintain uniform credit controls which affect industry members so differently and which bankers themselves do not like.

[From the New York Times of April 30, 1956]

UNITED STATES CREDIT POLICY HELD SCHOOL CURB—LEVITT CONTENDS THAT RISE IN INTEREST RATE HINDERS BUILDING IN STATE

State Controller Arthur Levitt declared yesterday that Federal monetary policies were seriously threatening the State's school-construction program. It is virtually impossible, he said, for school districts to borrow money at interest rates that they can afford.

The State's chief fiscal officer called for a revision of Federal policies that would maintain guards against inflation but permit public construction to proceed.

Mr. Levitt attributed the tight credit situation partly to the recent decision of the Federal Reserve Board to increase the discount rate from 2½ to 2¾ percent. The discount rate is the interest that banks must pay to borrow from the Federal Reserve System. The increase was designed to curb inflationary trends by making borrowing less attractive.

"The impact of that policy on the State level," Mr. Levitt said, "has been to make it virtually impossible for school districts to borrow money to finance school construction."

He called it an alarming spectacle that the city of Philadelphia failed to get a single bid last week on a bond offer of $4,900,000 at 3 percent.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Has the Senator from Minnesota made reference to the fact that the Eisenhower policy of increasing interest rates will cost approximately an additional $800 million in payments on the national debt?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have not referred to it yet. I wish to say to the Senator from Louisiana that the information he has supplied is certainly germane to my discussion, and is a very timely comment. I knew that the increase in interest rates would amount to a very great additional cost in the financing of the public debt. I recall that a few years ago the administration increased the cost of financing the public debt by about $475 million. With the increase of the public debt since that time and with this new increase in interest rates, the figure which the Senator has given is undoubtedly accurate. It is indicative of what we mean when we talk about the administration's credit and interest-rate policies.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do.

Mr. LONG. The Senator will recall that a year ago we were trying to give some tax relief to the average American family which had been ignored in the previous tax-reduction bill that had been enacted and under our proposal

the average American family would have received a reduction of about $80 in taxes. That proposed reduction was defeated because, the administration said, we could not afford to give tax relief to the average American family. Nevertheless, under the new interest-rate policy, it is going to cost as much money in additional payments on the national debt in the next year alone as the tax relief we wanted to give the average American family would have cost. Apparently, it is all right to give away $800 million a year to the banks, but when we want to give some tax relief to the average American family we are told it will cost too much.

Furthermore, when this administration gets through with refinancing the national debt at these new, high-interest rates, it will cost about $1,500,000,000 extra merely by way of interest payments on the national debt because of the new Republican high-interest rates.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his comment. He is recognized in the Senate as a student of this subject. I recall his very intelligent and enlightened participation in the debate on the tax bill. I wish to say to the Senator that that is exactly what I am protesting, as the Senator knows. This rise in interest rates not only places an increased burden upon the taxpayers, as such, but, as I shall indicate in my concluding comments today, it is acting as a squeeze upon independent business enterprises. The smaller firms are literally being choked out of existence.

Either today or in forthcoming comments on this subject—and I might say that I intend to make 2 or 3 more speeches on this particular subject, namely, the policy regarding interest rates which is being followed by the administration—I shall cite instances where lines of credit to independent business firms have been cut off. Because of the new interest rate and credit policy of the administration, independent small business enterprise has been choked out of existence and strangled, so to speak; it has been unable to obtain the necessary credit and to maintain its present operations and make expansions.

At the same time we have seen an increase in mergers and a stepping up in the growth of large economic combines and a reduction in the number of new small businesses that are coming into the economic field.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. While the administration has been increasing the interest rates to everyone, is it not true that it has been cutting the interest rates on money belonging to the Federal employees in their retirement fund? Ever since the fund has been in existence the interest rate has been set at 4 percent. Now that interest rate has been cut down to 3 percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his observation. I had heard about it, but it had completely escaped my recollection during this discussion. It again demonstrates what I think is the attitude of the administration in its fiscal policies, as well as in connection with its legislative policies relating to human beings.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as I am also. Is it not correct to say that the administration has tried its best to raise the interest rates on rural electrification?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There have been several proposals made along that line. As the Senator knows, the interest rates on Commodity Credit Corporation loans have gone up. The Secretary of Agriculture tried to increase the interest rates on disaster loans, until the Senator from South Carolina introduced proposed legislation to compel the Secretary to restore these rates at 3 percent, instead of keeping them at 4 percent. The people affected had been literally rubbed out by disaster, and they had no place to go but to their Government, to get short-term loans to restore their economic productivity.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true also that the Government, in its attempt to balance the budget, has failed to put into the retirement fund approximately $1,200,000,000 to match what the employees have been putting into the fund during the past 3½ years?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will accept that statement from the Senator, because there is no Member of the Senate who knows more about the civil-service retirement fund than the Senator from South Carolina. I know he has been conducting extensive hearings on the subject and his staff has been making a full-scale study of it. Again, I thank him for the contributions he has made to this discussion.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Minnesota has made some reference to the cost of buying a home under high interest rates. My impression has been that the amount the average veteran has to pay in buying a home now is approximately 1 percent higher than it was under a previous administration when we tried to make it possible for the veteran to buy his home at an interest rate of 4 percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And we can add to that the fact that when a veteran takes his paper into a bank in order to get a loan, the discount on the paper is so large that the cost of financing a home has increased appreciably.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is correct. If anyone cared to calculate the additional cost, he would find that if a veteran is buying a $10,000 home the increase in the interest rate makes it necessary for him to pay an extra $300 above what he had to pay before these high interest rates were put into effect. If it is a $15,000 home, he has to pay $500 more in interest under the Eisenhower and Humphrey policy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is, George Humphrey.

Mr. LONG. Yes. I know the Senator is for lower interest rates.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am, indeed.

Mr. LONG. The Senator realizes that high interest rates are not good for the workingman, not good for the small-business man, and not good for the Nation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What has happened is that under the Eisenhower-George Humphrey administration interest rate policy a man who buys a $10,000 home lost a bedroom out of that home because of the increase in the interest rate.

If he would spend no more money over the duration of the mortgage, he would have to chop off one bedroom. If he should buy a $15,000 home, he would have to chop off a bedroom and slice in half a bathroom. I do not know just what would be left.

Mr. President, let us take a brief look at some of the specific dislocations in our economy which are described in these articles and which are caused by the administration's tightening of the screws on credit.

The president of the National Association of Home Builders tells us that "housing starts this year would probably drop below 1 million. Last year they were slightly more than 1,300,000." And yet, Mr. President, only a few weeks ago, by passing the new housing bill, the Senate indicated its own determination that a dramatic and serious effort must be made at once to correct the critical housing shortage now facing this country.

The same gentlemen tells us that "conditions are present that could hurt seriously," and that the "mortgage market had worsened considerably in the last 30 days." The prices of houses are going up and builders are shifting into higher priced housing brackets. Mr. President, I wonder if this is consistent with the national policy embodied in the housing bill just passed by the Senate, with its emphasis on meeting the need for a rapid expansion in low-cost housing.

Half of the builders are starting their houses without firm financing commitments in hand. Half are also reporting that more buyers than last year are being rejected on the grounds of credit ratings. These factors too, Mr. President, fill in a picture of considerable discouragement judged from the perspective of our national housing policy.

Another aspect of the situation is the serious impact which the credit curb has had on States and municipalities. Arthur Levitt, State controller of New York, tells us that the rise in interest rates, and I quote: "makes it virtually impossible for school districts to borrow money to finance school construction."

Mr. President, our Nation, especially now, desperately needs the construction of new schools to handle adequately the increasingly large number of children that the experts expect soon to overcrowd our classrooms. Many of our present public-school facilities are not up to standards that the American people have a right to expect, and here, as Mr. Levitt indirectly tells us, the administration's money policy is placing definite roadblocks in the way of future progress in the education of our children.

The bare statistics for one of the areas which has suffered the most severe credit pressures are contained in the Wall Street Journal's story on small-business men. This article, quoting conclusions from a study on credit tightening says:

> Prior to the first Federal Reserve Board increase in the rediscount rate last April, 53 percent of the companies with a net worth of $5,000 to $25,000 were regular borrowers from commercial banks. At the end of last month, only 18 percent of the companies in this group had credit lines with banks.

Mr. President, behind these statistics lie the discouraging examples of small-business declines which are occurring daily in communities across the land.

Mr. President, the administration has both desired and promoted these interest policies, and inevitably they have led to these results.

With many other Americans, I am deeply concerned over these effects of our present credit and monetary policies. I am happy to see that the Secretary of the Treasury has quit wandering all over the economic lot, though I of course disagree with his present position and the stand of the Federal Reserve Board on this matter. While all of us respect the independence and inviolability of the Board, that fact should not render its policies immune from analysis and criticism. We need to be assured that the Federal Reserve authorities in formulating credit policies are considering the obligations imposed on the Government by law to prevent a sharp decline in business activity and widespread unemployment. I am not at all satisfied with the administration's complacency on what its credit squeeze has done or can do to the American economic picture. I warn those responsible that such policies may not just slow down our economic machine, but throw it into reverse.

Mr. President, to me there is increasing evidence that this whole field of credit policy should be comprehensively and authoritatively reviewed.

Mr. President, when we consider the fact that more than $40 billion of Government money in terms of defense contracts for our national security at home and our foreign aid abroad goes into the American industrial and economic system, we should not permit ourselves to be deluded as to the effects of credit policies if that kind of an expenditure were in any way reduced or curtailed. It is one thing to inject into an industrial and economic system a tremendous sum of Federal money through defense contracts and thereby be able to gloss over the weaknesses of the system, but once those contracts are reduced or cut back, then, indeed, will the credit policies and tax policies show themselves in full view.

This week we are particularly gratified over the initiative of the distinguished members of the Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report in the hearings which they held on Tuesday. I should like to suggest to the committee that these valuable hearings be continued, and broadened in scope to cover a review of the overall effects of our Federal Government's entire credit policy. If this proves impracticable, perhaps we should consider the establishment of a special commission to undertake a thorough examination. Several nonpartisan, economic experts, including Dean G. R. Collins and Dr. Nadler, of New York University, have urged such a study. If we are to meet adequately the new demands of our dynamic, ever-changing economy, we must constantly be reviewing and readjusting our economic thinking, our laws, and our regulations on which the activities of our system are based.

Attention should be specially directed to these definite symptoms and signs of hardship caused by credit policies in the particular areas which I have mentioned, and I shall mention them again: agriculture, small business, municipal building programs, and the mortgage market generally.

Mr. President, I should like to express my continuing interest and deep concern over all the aspects of this situation, and next week I should like to extend today's general, preliminary remarks into a more specific discussion of the situation which we face in the State of Minnesota as a consequence of the administration's tight money and tight credit policy.

I submit it is time for the administration to wake up and to take a frank and honest look at its misguided policies in the field of taxation and credit. A study of the total fiscal policy is long overdue. The American public is being compelled to pay and pay and pay because of these policies. Many areas of American business are suffering from either merger or the inability to expand; or they are suffering because they are being forced to the wall by the Government's fiscal and credit policies.

It is not good enough to equate American prosperity with big business. To be sure, big business is big. To be sure, it is getting bigger. But I think we ought to ask ourselves whether or not this is the kind of economic profile we want for America. I think we must ask ourselves whether the credit policies of this administration have not accelerated the pace of merger and of monopolistic growth; whether the credit policies of this administration are not aggravating, implementing, and encouraging the concentration of economic power at the expense of a free enterprise economy. A free enterprise economy requires that the Government's fiscal, tax, and credit policies be fair and equitable and, I may say, sound. The present policies are not fair, they are not equitable, and they are anything but sound and constructive.

COLUMBIA RIVER FLOODS AND THE HELLS CANYON DAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the vast drainage of the Columbia River is presently experiencing one of its most serious floods on record. From the upper reaches of the Snake, from the Clearwater, Salmon, and Kootenai, the melting snow water of the mountainous Pacific Northwest boils into the main stream of the Columbia River. Already thousands of acres of land have been inundated, hundreds of families evacuated from their homes, and business and industry along the river banks idled by the rise of swirling floodwaters.

Even as I speak today, it is believed that the peak of the flood crest has been reached. Much snow remains in the upper elevations and only the most favorable weather conditions will prevent further havoc. The toll of the present flood—second to the disastrous flow which wiped out the city of Vanport in 1948—is not yet known. But it is safe to predict that it will aggregate many millions of dollars before the high water recedes and the task of repair and reconstruction can be undertaken.

The floods now suffered are a recurring burden of cost and heartbreak to the people of the vast Columbia River Basin. This is the third flood of major proportions to strike the region in the past 8 years. I am calling the attention of the Senate to our region's recurrent flood difficulty not only because it constitutes one of the Nation's unsolved major problems, but also elimination of the Columbia floods is possible.

The geography of the Columbia Basin lends itself to the construction of storage reservoirs which can harness the water of the 1,280-mile long stream and turn it to beneficial uses of power production, navigation, and irrigation. The Army's Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have developed plans to curb the fury of the Columbia's falling waters.

I am pleased that the Congress has taken steps to put this know-how of river control and development into action. Already such dams as Grand Coulee and Hungry Horse and many other smaller units have been built by the Federal Government to trim the crest from the river's floodtide. But much remains to be done. It will require far-sighted determination to achieve control of the Columbia's floods.

The present Congress has taken positive action to advance the solution of flood problems. At the last session, funds were provided for start of new flood-control dams at the Cougar site and Hills Creek site on tributaries of the Willamette River. Funds also were provided to advance the planning of flood-control units at John Day on the Columbia main stem, and at Green Peter on the Santiam River. It is my hope that further progress will be made at this session to assure the early construction of these dams as units in the Federal system.

In the development of an omnibus Rivers and Harbors Act of 1956, every effort should be made to include authorization of all those projects necessary to complete the plan for eventual control of the Columbia River floods, giving priority to those which do not conflict with other uses of natural resources. As the committees of the House and Senate consider the public works to be included in the scope of the 1956 flood control, the results of the present flood offer ample justification for an expanded river development program.

A few weeks ago, the Senate approved a Federal flood-insurance program which will give a measure of protection to homeowners, farmers, and businessmen who suffer from the ravages of floods and

other natural disasters. It is hoped that the House will add its endorsement to the insurance program, so that future flood victims will have an opportunity to minimize the financial losses now being suffered by those to whom no similar protection is available at present.

The present situation focuses attention sharply on the greatest need in control of Columbia floods. That is to end the stalemate which has prevented progress toward construction of storage dams which involve Columbia waters crossing the international boundary between the United States and Canada. It was my pleasure last fall to study, at the request of the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the dispute which had arisen over apportioning benefits of the boundary waters. Hearings have been held by the Senate Interior Committee to determine the status of United States negotiations with Canada on this matter, and coincident with the conclusion of the hearings, the Governments of Canada and the United States announced a decision to engage in joint examination, at a high diplomatic level, of the issues arising from use and development of upstream portions of the Columbia.

Recommendation for the joint United States-Canadian discussions was one of the proposals advanced as the result of my study for the Interior Committee last fall. It is a cause for renewed hope in the Pacific Northwest that this recommendation has been accepted, because action on upper Columiba River storage dam construction had become completely stalemated in the International Joint Commission. I hope we may now look forward to early settlement of the differences which have stalemated dams with international complications. It is essential that American and Canadian projects go forward at the earliest possible date because it is in this area that a large amount of the flood-control storage must be obtained to tame the surging force of the Columbia.

The objective of flood control in the Columbia Basin cannot be achieved unless the maximum potential of each available site is fully utilized. The flood water cannot be kept from pouring over the dikes near Portland, Vancouver, St. Helens, or Longview—near the mouth of the river—unless the flow is contained in upstream storage dams. It cannot be achieved by following a policy of sacrificing the capacity of one storage dam on the mistaken and shortsighted theory that equivalent flood control can be gained elsewhere. Unfortunately, this is a theory which has prevailed in recent policymaking decisions affecting Columbia River development. It is not a sound or wise or economical theory because it is wasteful of one of our Nation's finest assets—a river capable of furnishing 40 percent of the Nation's hydroelectric energy, a river which can provide waterborne transportation through hundreds of miles of rich farming and industrial potential, a river capable of giving habitat to fish and wildlife and recreation to thousands of water-sport enthusiasts.

It is my hope that Congress will reverse the policy trend which has reduced the hopes of Northwest citizens to achieve control of a river which can become slave or master. The future of the region is dependent on the manner in which the Columbia's potentials are developed. I feel certain that the Senate will uphold its role of leadership in carrying out this responsibility.

I call to the attention of the Senate one very salient fact, which I feel certain will be considered by Senators when finally they vote on the question of the Hells Canyon Dam. The Oregonian, of Portland, on June 6, 1956, reported an address made by Brig. Gen, L. H. Foote, division engineer of the Corps of Army Engineers for the North Pacific Division. In that speech, which General Foote delivered in Spokane, Wash., in April, he said:

> The development of the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River by the 5-dam plan of the private power companies would provide about 1,500,000 acre-feet of storage (Brownlee and Pleasant Valley Dams) as compared with 2,600,000 at Hells Canyon Dam.

In other words, if the plan of the private utilities for the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River is allowed to be consummated, the Pacific Northwest will lose at least 1,100,000 acre-feet of beneficial storage for flood control. It is my opinion that Members of the Senate and, I feel certain, of the House of Representatives, should think very carefully before they deprive a great region of the United States of that amount of flood-control protection. This is particularly important during a year which has come after some of the most disastrous floods in American history, not only in the Pacific Northwest, but elsewhere in the Nation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that one of the great advantages of constructing a high dam at Hells Canyon will be that such a dam can store the spring runoff of melting snow, and then release the water in the late summer and fall? The water will then go through successive spillways or successive penstocks in power-generating plants farther down the river, and hence will be used for power purposes again and again; whereas the construction of low dams will mean that the spring runoff will go over the spillways in the lower dams and will not generate the amount of power which the high dam would indirectly generate. Is not that correct?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The able Senator from Illinois is eminently correct. A high dam would fulfill a dual purpose. It would prevent the spring runoff from causing floods downstream in the lower valleys of the Columbia River. Second, it would store the water for the later period and thus would provide downstream benefits at hydroelectric projects such as Bonneville, McNary, The Dalles, John Day, Ice Harbor, and possibly elsewhere. The amount of water flowing through the penstocks could be increased in the low-water period.

To lose this great benefit for all time would be particularly disastrous now, because I read only last Sunday in the Washington Star that the Soviet Union is about to start an all-out dam building program on the great rivers of Russia. If I understand the article correctly, the Soviet Union has plans under way for the building of three dams, each of which will be larger than the Grand Coulee Dam, which at present has the greatest powerplant in the world. For the United States to sacrifice the Hells Canyon site the less than full advantage under these conditions, when the Nation which is so opposed to our free way of life is developing its vast rivers to the full, simply does not make good sense to me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I correct in my understanding that the Senator from Oregon has made frequent trips into Hells Canyon by boat, by mule, on foot, and so forth?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator is correct. I have gone into Hells Canyon by every possible method of transportation, I believe, except possibly by rickshaw; and I do not know whether that is feasible in Hells Canyon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have flown over Hells Canyon and have flown into Hells Canyon. Is it not true that that canyon is almost unique, in that it is deeper than Grand Canyon and its walls are almost perpendicular?

Mr. NEUBERGER. As the Geological Survey has pointed out in its surveys, Hells Canyon is the deepest chasm, certainly in the United States, and perhaps in North America.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If a high dam were erected, since the walls of the canyon are almost vertical, very little adjoining land would be flooded; is that correct?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Because the depth is so great and there is so very little width for a reservoir. Is not that true?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct. There would be a reservoir of enormous depth. It is my understanding, and again I must rely on memory, that the property to be inundated behind Hells Canyon Dam would cost the Government approximately only three or four million dollars, whereas at some other great proposed dams, such as at Libby Dam, which is a marvelous proposed project, the cost of the property which would be flooded would be in the neighborhood of 80 or 90 million dollars. Hells Canyon is in a totally wild and relatively unpopulated area, so there are no railroads, utility lines, highways, or settled communities to be drowned out for the reservoir.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the annual flow of the Columbia at Portland is approximately 180 million acre-feet a year?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I think that is absolutely correct. It is either in Portland or a little below Portland, that the Columbia carries down to the sea about 180 million acre-feet a year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In contrast with that, the Colorado River never carried much more than 18 million acre-feet, and I believe it is now averaging something less than 17 million acre-feet. Is that correct?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Again the Senator is substantially correct, if not absolutely correct. It is my recollection that the Columbia River carries down

to tidewater about 10 times the average flow of the Colorado. Yet this session of the Congress has authorized the ultimate expenditure of approximately $800 million on the Colorado River, and it has refused, thus far, to authorize an expenditure of approximately $300 million in the basin of the Columbia River, which carries 10 times as much water down to the ocean. I refer, of course, to Hells Canyon Dam.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As the Senator from Oregon knows, I was very much opposed to the development of the upper Colorado River. I am in favor of the development of the Columbia and the Hells Canyon Dam, because of their greater volume of water and much lower generating power costs. Is not it extraordinary that an administration which says it wants private enterprise should take upon itself developments on the upper Colorado which will be very costly and where the generating costs will be very high?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Of course; again the Senator is correct. This administration has a policy of proposing for public development only those power sites which the private companies spurn. In other words, the policy is one of skim milk for the public and whipped cream for the private utilities. The Senator from Illinois has never quite wholly agreed with the junior Senator from Oregon on the upper Colorado project, because while he opposed it, I voted for it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator from Oregon has a grave sin on his reputation for that, for which he should be sorry the rest of his life.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Illinois knows the Senator from Oregon is committed to the development of the whole West, not merely a part of the West.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No matter how much it costs?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I believe our Government has had to make very substantial investments in many parts of the country. These investments are in the public interest. In some places that investment has taken the form of rivers and harbors, and in others the form of dikes and levees, such as on the Mississippi. I have supported all such improvements. But an inconsistency I have never understood—and I mention it only because I have seen it also mentioned in the Denver Post, that great newspaper of the Rocky Mountain area—is that some Senators from the Rocky Mountain region who promoted, supported, and sponsored the $800 million development on the Colorado River, which has only 10 percent of the flow of the Columbia River watershed, have taken a lead in opposing a $300 million expenditure in the Columbia Basin.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not want to criticize my colleagues on this matter, but is it not extraordinary that the administration should sponsor the measure?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I would say the inconsistency is strange in any event. I am perfectly willing to quote the Denver Post, the great newspaper of the Rocky Mountain area. I recently read an editorial in which that very eminent newspaper of the Rocky Mountain region wondered how it was possible for Senators from that area to support the upper Colorado project, and yet oppose projects like Hells Canyon and Niagara Falls. I try, within the limits of my ability, to be consistent. I supported the upper Colorado project, which is in another region, and I am supporting Hells Canyon and similar projects, which are in my own region. As I have said, I cannot understand an administration which says it wants public power on the upper Colorado, but is against public power in the basin of the Columbia.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it possible this administration believes in the socialization of losses?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That certainly is one possible conclusion.

I thank the Senator from Illinois for the very careful consideration he has given to the Hells Canyon project, which is the finest water power site left for full development in the United States. That site merits complete use in the public interest.

AMENDMENT OF ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT WITH REFERENCE TO EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on May 25, I pointed out to the Senate that Senate bill 11 had been pending since the first day of the 84th Congress, when it had been introduced jointly by 30 Senators.

At that time I predicted that favorable House action would be taken on the companion bill, which was H. R. 1840.

I have noted with considerable pleasure that, on Monday of this week, the House of Representatives passed a bill of vital significance to the small-business community. This measure is H. R. 1840, a companion measure to Senate bill 11, the well-known equality of opportunity bill. H. R. 11 was introduced by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Small Business Committee. The bill, H. R. 1840, was passed by an overwhelming vote of 393 to 3, thus demonstrating in dramatic fashion that the House is not only aware of, but is also ready to meet, the legislative needs of small business in this period of increasing economic concentration.

In the hierarchy of unfair trade practices injurious to small business, that of price discrimination ranks as the most descriptive. This is because price concessions critically affect the margin between the acquisition cost and the selling price of an article, the competitive area in which small business traditionally finds its greatest opportunity to demonstrate efficiency. To the extent that a price concession can and invariably does exceed whatever relative efficiency small business may possess, it represents a mortal threat to the small entrepreneur. Certainly, there can be no reasonable chance for the survival of small firms engaged in a competitive struggle where they must pay a higher price for their supplies than do their larger competitors. The handicap of subsidizing the price concessions enjoyed by their larger competitors is much too great for even the most efficient of small firms to overcome.

As is customary whenever Congress moves to consider legislation designed to protect small-business interests, dissenting voices are raised. These voices are now being heard as H. R. 1840 or S. 11 nears consideration by the Senate. Lest these shrill voices of protest create some confusion regarding the merits of H. R. 1840 or S. 11, I wish at this time to explain, first, why there exists a need for such legislation, and, second, what the measure is designed to achieve in terms of competitive equality and opportunity.

That legislation is necessary to deal effectively with anticompetitive price concessions stems from the inadequacy of the Robinson-Patman Act, as currently interpreted by the Supreme Court, to prevent price discriminations that may substantially lessen competition or tend toward monopoly. In the celebrated Standard Oil of Indiana case, it will be recalled, the crucial issue presented was whether the good faith proviso of section 2 (b) of the Robinson-Patman Act was merely a procedural or an absolute defense to a charge of price discrimination (*Standard Oil Co. (Indiana) v. Federal Trade Commission*, 340 U. S. 231 (1951)). The Federal Trade Commission contended that meeting a competitor's equally low price served only to rebut a prima facie case made—under section 2 (a) of the act—by showing sales at different prices, and that such rebuttal was offset by affirmative proof of competitive injury resulting from the challenged differential. In rejecting this contention, the Supreme Court, divided 5 to 4, stated:

> The proviso in 2 (b), as interpreted by the Commission, would not be available when there was or might be an injury to competition at resale level. So interpreted, the proviso would have little, if any, applicability as to be practically meaningless. We may, therefore, conclude that Congress meant to permit the natural consequences to follow the seller's action in meeting in good faith a lawful and equally low price of its competitor.

Thus, the Court held that the "good faith" proviso of section 2 (b) of the act afforded an "absolute" defense to a charge of price discrimination, even though such discrimination might produce substantial injury to competition or tend toward monopoly in any line of commerce.

With the ruling in the Standard Oil of Indiana case, the Supreme Court exposed the basic weakness in section 2 that had been warned against in the Senate report on the Robinson-Patman bill—Senate Report No. 1502, To Amend Antitrust Act, January 16, 1936, 74th Congress, 2d session. In the report a caveat was taken to section 2 on the grounds that "it permits discrimination to meet competition, and thus to substitute the remedies of retaliation for those of law, with destructive consequences to the central object of the bill. Liberty to meet competition which can be met only by price cuts at the expense of customers elsewhere is in its unmasked effect the liberty to destroy competition by selling locally below cost, a weapon progressively

the more destructive in the hands of the more powerful and most deadly to the competitor of limited resources, whatever his merit and efficiency." This remarkable insight into section 2's deficiency preceded the Standard Oil of Indiana case by 15 years.

Once the Supreme Court had held that section 2 (b) could operate to authorize price discrimination that produced substantial competitive injury or tended toward monopoly, remedial legislation was changed from an academic issue into an urgent duty. For the rule of law enunciated in the Standard Oil of Indiana case sharply conflicts with the basic policy and prime purpose of the Clayton Act and its Robinson-Patman amendment "to arrest in their incipiency those acts and practices which might ripen into a violation of the Sherman Act"—*Transamerica Corp.* v. *Board of Governors of Federal Reserve System* (C. A. 3, 1953, 206 F. 2d 163, certiorari denied, 346 U. S. 901). Nor could the decision be reconciled with the long-established antitrust policy that monopoly should be suppressed, whether efficient or not, and whether attained by practices in themselves not illegal.

Now let us turn directly to the "equality of opportunity" bill, H. R. 1840, or Senate bill 11. The bill is in the nature of an amendment to section 2 (b) of the Robinson-Patman Act. It seeks to limit the "meeting competition" proviso of section 2 (b) only to the extent that the "good faith" defense will be made unavailable in cases of price discrimination where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce. In essence, this means that the bill makes the defense of meeting competition inoperative in a case of price discrimination where the reasonably probable effect of the discrimination is to injure competition substantially. However, enactment of the proposed amendment will not prevent the operation of "good faith" as a complete or "absolute" defense in cases of discrimination whose effects, while establishing a prima facie case under section 2 (a), nevertheless, fall short of substantially suppressing competition or tending toward monopoly. To illustrate, the "good faith" defense will remain available to parties charged with price discriminations which "injure, destroy, or prevent competition" with a particular person, but which fall short of substantially lessening competition or tending to create a monopoly in any line of commerce. Therefore, the impression held by some that H. R. 1840 or S. 11 will abolish the "meeting of competition" proviso as a defense in all cases of price discrimination is without substance. As stated before, the "good faith" defense will be denied a seller charged with price discrimination only where the effect of the discrimination may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce.

The adoption of the amendment proposed in H. R. 1840 or in S. 11 will bring the Robinson-Patman Act into full harmony with other provisions of the Clayton Act. Under existing section 3 of the Clayton Act, for example, exclusive dealing arrangements and "tie-in" practices are prohibited where their use may substantially lessen competition or tend toward monopoly in any line of commerce. This proscription applies notwithstanding the beneficence of purpose for which exclusive dealing or the "tie-in" practice is established. So, too, under the Clayton Act's section 7, corporate mergers that may substantially lessen competition or tend toward monopoly are prohibited, no matter what may be the motives of the acquiring corporation. Consistency requires that the Clayton Act, while prohibiting exclusive dealing and "tie-in" practices, should as well interdict price discriminations that produce the same injurious effects upon competition in any line of commerce.

In the light of these considerations, I am hopeful that a full understanding of the motive and purpose of H. R. 1840 or S. 11 will be facilitated. I am also hopeful that the Senate may very soon be afforded an opportunity to express its sentiment on the merits of this proposed legislation. It is with great confidence that I predict that the support of H. R. 1840 or S. 11 in the Senate will be equally as enthusiastic as that evidenced by Members of the House.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REINVESTMENT BY AIR CARRIERS OF THE PROCEEDS FROM THE SALE OF PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2039, Senate bill 3449.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3449) relating to the reinvestment by air carriers of the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of certain operating property and equipment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "losses resulting from the sale or other" and insert "net gains (after any losses and expenses resulting from the disposition of flight equipment) derived from the"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "such", to strike out "sale or other"; and in line 22, after the word "retained", to strike out "may" and insert "shall"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"In determining all other revenue of the air carrier, the Board shall not take into account the net gains (after any losses and expenses resulting from the disposition of flight equipment) derived from the disposition of any flight equipment of such carrier, or the gains derived from such disposition if (1) the carrier notifies the Board in writing that it intends to reinvest the proceeds derived from such sale or other disposition, and (2) within a reasonable period to be determined and fixed by the Board, such proceeds are actually reinvested by such carrier in other property which is similar to or related in service or use to the property so sold or disposed of. In any such case, an amount equal to the amount of such proceeds, less all applicable taxes, shall be placed in or credited to a reinvestment reserve immediately upon the receipt thereof. All amounts placed in or credited to such reserve shall be used for the purpose of reinvestment as herein specified and shall not be used for the payment of salaries, operating or nonoperating expenses, interest, dividends, or taxes. If the Board determines, after notice and opportunity for hearing, that such air carrier (1) has used all or any portion of such reserve for purposes other than such reinvestment, or (2) has retained all or any portion of such reserve for the purpose of such reinvestment for a longer period than that determined and fixed by the Board as herein provided, amount so used or retained shall then be taken into account by the Board in determining all other revenue of such air carrier."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act to such section 406 (b) shall be effective as to all gains or losses realized on or after January 1, 1956, with respect to the sale or disposition of flight equipment whether or not the Board shall have entered a final order taking account thereof in determining all other revenue of the air carrier.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the purpose of S. 3449 is to exclude capital gains realized by air carriers from the sale of flight equipment in the computation of "all other revenue" by the Civil Aeronautics Board when it is determining the amount of subsidy payments under section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act. This exclusion would be effective only when the proceeds of such a sale, after the payment of all taxes, were to be reinvested in new flight equipment.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reports two amendments to the bill. The first amendment, on page 1, lines 7 and 8, would strike out the words "losses resulting from the sale or other" and substitute therefor the language "net gains (after any losses and expenses resulting from the disposition of flight equipment) derived from the."

The purpose of that amendment is very clear. It carries out a suggestion made by the staff of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which pointed out that the bill, in the form in which it was originally introduced, would have taken away from the Board the right to consider losses which might ensue from the sale of flight equipment in the determination of subsidy payments.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BIBLE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understand the purpose of that amendment is to allow the air carriers to separate from the computation of the subsidy formula their gains, but when they lose, they can compute such losses in the formula. In other words, the Government reimburses them for losses, but their gains can be placed in a separate account, and they can keep them. Is that correct?

Mr. BIBLE. The theory was to consider losses sustained in the sale of equipment. Consider, for example, the sale of obsolete planes. It might be possible at a particular time that the market would not absorb such planes. The company should not be penalized by being deprived of the right to take advantage of the capital loss. I think that is a substantially correct statement. That is the existing law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. I believe that under the existing law, without the bill, the Board takes into consideration both gains and losses, whereas, if this bill were passed, it would take into consideration only losses, which means that the carriers would be reimbursed for their losses in the computation of the subsidy formula, but when they made money, they could put it in a separate account.

Mr. BIBLE. I do not think they would put it in a separate account. They would merely reinvest the net gain from the sale of equipment in other equipment within a reasonable time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They would use a bookkeeping system which would set this aside to prevent any reduction in the subsidy.

Mr. BIBLE. That is substantially correct. We admit that the result would be to increase the subsidy. There is no question about that.

The second amendment is, on page 2, line 2, after the word "such", to strike out "sale or other"; and in line 22, after the word "retained", to strike out "may" and insert "shall."

Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

Without objection——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, there will be objection to the passage of the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am not calling for final passage of the bill at this time, because I realize the interest of the distinguished Senator from Delaware. I should like to make a further explanation of the bill. I am not asking for final passage at this time.

This particular bill was reported first from the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce unanimously to the full committee, and by the full committee unanimously to the Senate. I believe that a little background would be helpful in explanation of the bill.

Section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, which is the section involved in this particular bill, provides that the Civil Aeronautics Board, in computing subsidy rates, is authorized to consider "the need of each air carrier for compensation for the transportation of mail sufficient to insure the performance of such service."

I particularly emphasize these words: "and, together with all other revenue of the air carrier, to enable such aircraft under honest, economical, and efficient management, to maintain and continue the development of air transportation to the extent and of the character and quality required for the commerce of the United States, the postal service, and the national defense."

The Civil Aeronautics Board has interpreted the language "together with all other revenue" as including capital gains from the sales of aircraft or other property of the carrier. The Board has construed that language as applying to cases of so-called open-rate periods.

I think it is of value to the Senate to point out that in considering the amount of subsidy payments to airlines, the Civil Aeronautics Board endeavors to give the carrier approximately an 8-percent return on its capital investment if it is a national carrier, and a 9-percent return on its capital investment if it is an international carrier.

The so-called open-rate period in which this particular ruling applies is the period during which the Board has not yet set the new rate. The closed-rate period, conversely, is the period of time following the final determination by the Board of what the subsidy payment should be.

There is no fixed period during which these rates remain closed. A rate period becomes open upon the filing of a petition by the carrier or by the Postmaster General, requesting the Board to reconsider the payment. Likewise, a period becomes an open period upon an order from the Board to reconsider the payment.

The application of this particular language in the CAB act by the Board during the open-rate period has resulted in a treatment of capital gains which makes it impossible for various air carriers to apply the proceeds from the sale of the planes to the acquisition of new planes. I need not point out to my distinguished friend from Delaware that today the feeder airline services, particularly, are faced with a tremendous problem in replacing obsolete equipment, such as the DC–3's, which are almost the standard workhorse of the feeder-line services.

In order to meet the demands of the fast-expanding air age in which we live, the feeder lines have found it necessary to replace the DC–3's with more modern, faster, and more efficient equipment, at a tremendously increased cost.

One of the lowest priced planes which can be used as a replacement for the DC–3 costs between $1,500,000 and $1,800,000.

It was the thought of the committee that we should be greatly interested in strengthening our airlines by giving them the opportunity of offering to the people the very fastest and most modern and safest type of air transportation.

Admittedly, during the first year of the application of a capital gain under the bill which is now before the Senate the result would be an increased subsidy. The committee recognized that fact. The committee, however, felt that although there would be a temporary increase in subsidy—and there was testimony before the committee which made that clear—within the second, third, or fourth year the subsidy would be decreased, for the very simple reason that with modern and faster and safer equipment the cost of operation per revenue mile would decline.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Can the Senator tell the Senate what is estimated will be the reduction in the subsidy that might be expected to go into effect if the bill is passed?

Mr. BIBLE. I have been furnished with an assumed table. I shall be very happy to make the table a part of the RECORD. We would have to assume so many factors in saying exactly what the amount of the reduction would be so far as the subsidy is concerned, that it would be difficult—and I am sure the Senator from Delaware understands this—to give a categorical answer to the question of the Senator. However, there would be some reduction in the subsidy in the year after the first year of operation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I understand correctly, the table which the Senator wishes to have printed in the RECORD was agreed upon by the airlines and the committee as being reasonably accurate. If I interpret the table correctly, it is estimated that in the second year there will be a reduction of between 40 to 50 percent in need for subsidy. That reduction supposedly will result from greater efficiency, as I understand.

Mr. BIBLE. I believe that is substantially correct percentagewise. That is the estimated reduction in the subsidy during the second period and fourth year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In view of the fact that the industry feels, if Congress passes the bill in the form in which it is now before the Senate, that within the second year it would result in a 40 to 50 percent reduction in the subsidy need, would the Senator from Nevada be willing to accept an amendment to the bill which would provide that as of December 21, 1958, using the existing subsidy as a base, all subsidies would be reduced by 40 percent? That would be taking the minimum figure of 40 percent claimed by the industry as a projected saving.

Mr. BIBLE. No; I do not believe I could agree to accept an amendment like that. I say that because in computing subsidy payments, it is necessary to consider a great number of factors. First, there would be the sale of obsolete equipment. Then there would be the acquisition of new equipment. The delivery date on the new equipment might be some 2 or 3 years in the future. Therefore, it would be impossible to accept such an amendment as the Senator from Delaware suggests.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is my understanding that in preparing the report, which the Senator intends to put into the RECORD—and which was agreed upon unanimously by the industry in supporting the bill—all those factors were taken into account. Presumably the committee considered all the factors and came up with an agreement to the effect that, as a result of greater efficiency because of the acquisition of new equipment, the subsidies could be reduced from 40 to 50 percent. I am asking the Senator to accept the minimum figure of 40 percent.

Mr. BIBLE. The Senator in charge of the bill is not willing to accept such an amendment. The Senator from Delaware characterized the table as an agreement. I do not believe it should be termed an agreement. The table I shall put into the RECORD is simply a calculation intending to show and to establish that after several years of operation——

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was after the second year of operation.

Mr. BIBLE. That after several years of operation the subsidy payments will decline. Of course it is impossible for me categorically to assure the Senator from Delaware that they will positively decline from 40 to 50 percent. That is impossible for me to do. Various uncertainties are involved. First there is the question, in repetition, of the sale of obsolete equipment and the purchase of new equipment. Then there is the differential in the price factors. Of course the table which I am putting in the RECORD, and which the Senator has already read, has been furnished simply as an example of what will be the ultimate result. It is not intended to be complete in any way.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BIBLE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Nevada knows that that is my main objection to the bill. It does not appear to me that it will now or in the future result in any reduction in the subsidy. Quite the contrary, as I interpret the bill, it will bring about a perpetual increase in the annual subsidy. As I understand, the Senator from Nevada and a majority of the committee and the airlines differ with those conclusions and feel sure that the bill would definitely result in a reduction in the subsidy from between 40 and 50 percent.

If so, I am perfectly willing to accept their statement that there would be a 40-percent saving, providing the sponsors of the bill are willing to accept the amendment I have suggested spelling out such reduction. If those who are backing the bill are not sure of their estimate, then it should not be offered. Surely the report was not prepared merely to get the bill passed. After all, it is not my report or estimate the Senator is offering to put into the RECORD. I had nothing to do with preparing it. If those who prepared the report have any faith in it at all, I should think they would be willing to accept their own minimum estimate in the form of an amendment.

Frankly I do not believe the estimate of savings is accurate. It is my opinion that the bill will substantially increase the subsidy, not lower it.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM REGARDING S. 3449

S. 3449 is designed to make it possible for subsidized air carriers to finance the replacement of obsolete flight equipment with more modern and efficient equipment. A question has been raised as to whether the effect of the bill would not be simply to increase the amount of subsidy to be paid by the Government. It is believed that the effect of the bill would be exactly the reverse—that it would reduce subsidy requirements rather than increase them. In order to show why that is so, the following hypothetical example is offered.

Let us assume that a subsidized air carrier is operating a fleet of obsolete aircraft (which we will call Model A aircraft). A more modern type of aircraft which will operate at a lower direct cost (and which we will call Model B aircraft) becomes available. The carrier makes a comparison of the results which it could expect if it were able to replace its Model A aircraft with Model B aircraft without considering any increase in revenues or volume of service.

	Operation with—	
	Model A	Model B
1. Revenue ton-miles to be carried	50,000,000	50,000,000
2. Revenue yield per revenue ton-mile (from all sources other than mail) (cents)	50	50
3. Number of aircraft required	15	10
4. Cost of aircraft per unit	$700,000	$1,800,000
5. Total original cost of aircraft	$10,500,000	$18,000,000
6. Investment in other operating equipment and working capital	$4,000,000	$4,000,000
7. Aircraft operating expense per revenue ton-mile (cents)	30	24
8. Ground and indirect costs per revenue ton-mile (cents)	30	30

On this basis, the carrier's operating results and its mail-pay and subsidy requirements compare as follows:

	Operation with—	
	Model A	Model B
Total revenues from all sources other than mail	$25,000,000	$25,000,000
Expenses:		
Aircraft operating	15,000,000	12,000,000
Ground and indirect	15,000,000	15,000,000
Total expenses	30,000,000	27,000,000
Break-even need	5,000,000	2,000,000
Return on average investment[1] at 8 percent per annum including provision for income tax	1,663,000	2,317,000
Total mail pay required	6,663,000	4,317,000
Less service mail pay	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subsidy	5,663,000	3,317,000

[1] In order to make the comparison comparable, the average value of aircraft over a 7-year depreciable life has been used for investment purposes.

Thus it is apparent that if the carrier can finance the purchase of the more efficient Model "B" aircraft, it can reduce the amount of subsidy required annually from $5,663,000 to $3,317,000 without any increase in revenues.[1] Its problem, however, is whether it can finance the purchase of the new equipment.

Because of the tremendous inflationary increase in the price of new aircraft, the market price of its used aircraft has also been inflated, with the result that the carrier can, let us assume, realize a profit of $5 million on the sale of its old equipment. Under the present law as administered by the Civil Aeronautics Board, however, that $5 million profit would not be available to help finance the purchase of the new equipment. The Board has followed the practice of offsetting capital gains realized during open-rate periods against the subsidy payable for the period and has recently started a proceeding to determine whether such profits should not be applied to reduce subsidy even during closed-rate periods. Consequently, if the carrier sells its old equipment at a book profit of $5 million its subsidy will be reduced by a corresponding amount (after tax adjustments). The carrier, therefore, is faced with the problem of financing a reequipment program without having available to it the profit which it can realize on the sale of its old equipment. As a result, the amount of financing which it must arrange in order to place firm orders for the new equipment may well be beyond its financial capacity.

S. 2449 is designed to facilitate the financing of the new equipment by directing the Board not to offset profits on the sale of equipment against subsidy, provided the profit is, within a reasonable time, reinvested in new equipment. To be sure, that means that, in the period in which the sale takes place, the Government will pay a higher subsidy to the carrier than it would under the Board's present policy. But that additional subsidy will be recouped by the Government within a very short period by reason of the reduction in the carrier's subsidy requirements resulting from the lower operating costs of the new equipment. Thus, in our example, while the Board would not be permitted to reduce the $5,663,000 subsidy payable in the year in which old equipment was sold, it would be in a position, promptly after inauguration of operations with the new equipment, to reduce the carrier's subsidy by more than $2 million a year. And that reduction would, within a period of about 2 years, more than offset the saving which the Government might have realized by maintaining the present policy of offsetting the capital gain against the current subsidy payments.

It will be noted in the example given, that the carrier has assumed that its operating results would be affected only by a reduction in operating costs. That, of course, is not the history of air transportation. More modern and efficient aircraft attract additional revenues, as well as producing lower unit costs. The result, therefore, is that the reduction in subsidy requirements resulting from the acquisition of more modern and efficient equipment can be expected to exceed the reduction in operating costs.

While the above example is directed purely to the dollars-and-cents question whether S. 3449 will cost the Government more or less in the form of subsidy, it must be remembered that there are other tangible and intangible benefits accruing to the Government from the modernization of airline fleets. Not only does the Government benefit from the

[1] The saving in subsidy by reason of reduction in aircraft operating cost can be demonstrated by comparison of the operating cost of DC–6's with the manufacturer's estimated cost of operating the DC–8. The direct revenue-ton-mile cost for DC–6 aircraft in domestic operation for the year 1955 was 17.7 cents. This compares with manufacturer's estimated cost per revenue ton mile for the DC–8 of 14.5 cents (assuming the same load factor).

improved commercial and postal facilities made available, but every modern aircraft in the hands of United States-flag air carriers is a national-defense asset of incalculable value.

The air transport industry is faced today with the most enormous financing and modernization program in its history. The larger trunk carriers and the international carries are in the process of converting to turbine-powered aircraft. The local-service and the Alaskan carriers are faced with the necessity of replacing the old workhorse DC-3's with more modern equipment which is expected to become available within the next 2 or 3 years. The helicopter operators must likewise convert to more efficient and economical aircraft as rapidly as it becomes available, and some orders have already been placed. The amount of capital which must be raised to carry through this reequipment program is truly staggering for an industry the size of the present air-transport industry. The ability of many companies to carry through such a program may well depend on their ability to use the book profits realized from the sale of existing fleets for reinvestment in the new aircraft.

The carriers which receive no subsidy can, of course, retain those profits and use them for that purpose. The bill would place the subsidized carriers in a comparable position. With that assistance, those carriers can modernize their equipment and accelerate their progress toward a subsidy-free status. In the final analysis, the carriers, the taxpayers, the postal service, the commerce, and the national defense will all benefit.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the views expressed by the distinguished Senator from Delaware. Again, in repetition, I should like to say that the hypothetical table illustrates what appeared to the committee to be clear, namely, that with an improvement in transportation and with a reduction in operating expenses for each revenue ton-mile, it was logical to assume that after a few years of operation the costs of the subsidy would certainly be reduced.

The committee, in considering and reporting the proposed legislation, had in mind not only the domestic value of the air industry, but also the 48-hour standby basis on which it is maintained as a strong reserve to defense. I believe some 300 aircraft are available for defense reserve duty on about a 48-hour notice.

It was felt by the committee that we were completely justified in giving this strong, adequate standby effect. The committee felt that even though the subsidy payments in the first few years might be increased, the possibility of decreasing the payment of subsidies in the future was greatly enhanced.

History has indicated and proved that we are getting closer and closer to the point where the airlines will not need subsidies. It is the feeling of the committee that this is a worthwhile bill and that it should be enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN of Iowa in the chair). The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I dislike to disagree with my good friend from Nevada. The bill boils down to one simple point. The subsidized airlines are guaranteed 8 percent on invested capital on domestic operations and 9 percent on capital invested in foreign operations. In computing the subsidy the Government takes into consideration the cost of equipment plus all operating expenses. If this bill should pass, the companies could still charge off the cost of new equipment and all the expenses of operation, but the salvage value of the equipment when it is sold, could be set aside and not counted as a part of operational income. It would be considered extra from the 8 percent formula. It is an extra method of increasing the subsidy. The bill really is more or less in the nature of a private bill. It is not a general airline bill, because practically all the benefits will go to one airline.

Mr. President, I asked the Department of Commerce to compute what would have happened during the past 5 years had this bill been in effect, and I have the figures which I will later incorporate in the RECORD. They show that this bill would have increased the subsidy payments by $21,900,790 over and above that amount which was actually paid.

Furthermore it is estimated that if the bill should pass, the companies would in the future take advantage of this formula to a greater extent than they ever did before, and that the future cost would be many times more than shown in this report. That is true because, in the past, there was no advantage gained from such sales therefore they were not so numerous as would be the case after this bill is passed. Under this bill the salvage value of all the secondhand equipment will be set aside and counted as additional profit. It raises the subsidy formula substantially.

If the bill had been in effect 5 years ago, Pan American would have received $17,288,000. Trans World—International—would have received $1,295,000. Delta would have received $1,400,000. Braniff would have received $1,515,000. So that $21,498,000 out of $21,900,790 would have gone to 4 companies.

I am sure the Senator from Nevada will now agree with me that we are not talking about a bill which will benefit the small feeder airlines. They would have received very little, if any, benefits, as this bill would have been administered had it been in effect during the past 5 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the chart prepared by the Department of Commerce may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of capital gains used to reduce subsidy payments and capital losses underwritten with subsidy under final mail rate orders

	Calendar year					
	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	Total
Braniff:						
Domestic	0	0	$1,373,000	$58,000	$84,000	$1,515,000
International	[1]	[1]	[1]	0	0	0
Capital	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chicago & Southern	0	0	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]
Colonial	0	0	0	[3]	[1]	0
Continental	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delta	0	0	0	700,000	700,000	1,400,000
Inland	0	[4]	[4]	[4]	[4]	[4]
Mid-Continent	0	[5]	[5]	[5]	[5]	[5]
National	0	0	0	0	0	0
Northeast	$42,000	$254,000	0	0	0	296,000
Northwest	[1]	0	0	[1]	0	0
Western	0	0	0	0	0	0
Allegheny	0	0	0	0	[3]	0
Bonanza	170	0	0	0	[3]	170
Central	2,032	30	1,224	0	0	3,286
Empire	0	[6]	[6]	[6]	[6]	[6]
Frontier	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake Central	43,604	28,242	450	0	0	72,296
Mid-West	0	[7]	[7]	[7]	[7]	[7]
Mohawk	0	0	0	0	[3]	0
North Central	24,037	0	0	0	0	24,037
Ozark	0	0	0	0	[3]	0
Piedmont	0	0	0	0	[3]	0
Pioneer	0	0	0	0	[3]	0
Southern	0	168	0	0	0	168
Southwest	0	$16,083	0	0	0	$16,083
Trans Texas	0	0	$2,150	$50	0	2,200
West Coast	0	0	[3]	[1]	[1]	0
Wiggins	0	0	[9]	[9]	[9]	[9]
Helicopter	−$4,872	0	0	0	0	−4,872
Los Angeles	0	364	533	335	0	1,232
New York	0	−199	−1,067	−3,022	0	−4,288
Alaska Airlines	[1]	[8]	0	0	−$2,231	−2,231
Alaska Coastal	−2,126	0	0	0	0	−2,126
Byers	2,242	724	0	0	0	2,966
Christensen	0	[10]	[10]	[10]	[10]	[10]
Cordova	−1,842	0	0	0	0	−1,842
Ellis	183	0	0	0	0	183
Northern Consolidated	−5,854	550	0	0	8,400	3,096
Pacific Northern	37	0	0	[3]	[1]	37
Reeve	215	1,410	0	0	0	1,625
Wien	−4,678	−1,769	0	0	0	−6,447
Hawaiian	2,071	0	−360	0	0	1,711
Trans-Pacific	0	0	−494	0	0	−494
Pan American	3,085,000	[11] 2,935,000	3,419,000	[12] 613,000	7,236,000	17,288,000
Trans World (International)	287,000	504,000	504,000	0	0	1,295,000
Caribbean	0	0	0	0	0	0
Panagra	0	0	0	0	[1]	0
Total	3,469,219	3,738,603	5,298,436	1,368,363	8,026,169	21,900,790

[1] Mail rate open for entire year.
[2] Merged into Delta May 1, 1953.
[3] Mail rate open for portion of year.
[4] Merged into Western Apr. 10, 1952.
[5] Merged into Braniff Aug. 16, 1952.
[6] Merged into West Coast Aug. 1, 1952.
[7] Ceased operations Apr. 15, 1952.
[8] Merged into Continental Apr. 1, 1955.
[9] Ceased operations Aug. 1, 1953.
[10] Ceased operations July 6, 1952.
[11] Mail rate for Latin American Division open for caldenar year 1952.
[12] Mail rate for Pacific Division open for calendar year 1954.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I point out that the major percentage of the airlines involved would have received absolutely nothing had this bill been in effect during the past 5 years.

Certainly there can be no possible justification for passing this bill. It is merely a private bill for the benefit of four major airlines which are already receiving a Government subsidy which guarantees them an 8-percent return on their invested capital.

If Congress wants to consider a change in the subsidy formula, let the committee bring in a bill over which Congress will have some control. If the present bill is passed Congress will have no control. The airlines can regulate their percentage of subsidy payments themselves. They can make it 10 percent or 12 percent or 15 percent or almost any percent they wish. That is wrong and Congress will later be greatly embarrassed at some of the high payments that are sure to follow.

All a company would have to do would be to sell some of its equipment and charge the new equipment at 100 percent to the company for depreciation purposes.

Certainly any amount salvaged from sale of second-hand equipment should be considered by a company when it computes its operations results.

That is a standard practice of operations for all business operations and most certainly should be the practice of companies that have one hand in the Federal Treasury.

This bill should be defeated.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it is very clear that any capital gain charged because of the sale of aircraft must, of course, be reinvested in other aircraft.

I cannot agree with my distinguished friend from Delaware that the bill would have the result he suggests. Those of us on the committee who heard the testimony—and there was considerable testimony—were firmly convinced that although there would be an increase in subsidies in the first couple of years, certainly, beyond that, there would be a decrease in subsidy.

I should like to point out to my distinguished friend from Delaware that the large airlines to which he has referred, by and large, are off the subsidy at the present time. My understanding is that the major part of the subsidy is still being paid to the feeder lines to the extent of some $25 million a year out of a total payment of some $40 million. As we continue to modernize our aircraft, the subsidies will be reduced.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada says he disagrees with the figures which I have placed in the RECORD. I am perfectly willing to accept his figures if he will amend the bill in accordance with his own claim. Since he estimates that the savings at the end of the second year would be from 40 to 50 percent, will the Senator accept an amendment providing that the subsidies shall be cut at the end of 1957, 25 percent? That is only half of the claimed savings.

Mr. BIBLE. I am unable to agree with the Senator's analysis, and I am unable to accept such an amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think that answer confirms my argument, because, in my opinion, it clearly shows that not even the author of the bill has any confidence that there will be future savings under the bill. The committee and industry claim that within 2 years, if the bill is passed, they will through greater efficiency of the new equipment be able to reduce their subsidy requirements by from 40 to 50 percent. I disagree with that claim, but I propose that if the sponsors of the bill will settle for an amendment requiring only one-half of their claim, then I will go along with the bill. That seems more than fair unless they too have no confidence in these claimed savings.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I have nothing further to say on the bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Do I understand correctly that the exemption applies only to those sums received by the companies and which are to be reinvested in new equipment?

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct. The capital gains received from the sale of obsolete equipment must be plowed back into the purchase of new equipment within a reasonable period of time.

There was some question, as the bill was first introduced, about broadening the coverage. It was limited to flight equipment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Am I to understand further that if the money is not reinvested within a reasonable time the capital gains tax will still apply?

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct. If it were not reinvested in new equipment, the amount received would have to be computed as capital gains.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I point out again that the capital gains tax formula is not in any way affected. That is now in the law. The bill merely provides that the companies can set aside the salvage value of their equipment which would represent capital gains and not count it in computing the amount of the subsidy of which the companies would be requiring. This is a subsidy bonus on an already high subsidy rate.

The bill as amended provides however that if the companies lose on the sale of capital equipment, they can charge that loss to the Government through greater subsidy requests. But if they sell the equipment over and above the figure to which it has been depreciated, they can keep the profit and not have it computed for subsidy formula purposes as a part of their operations.

It was claimed that this was to help the small airlines. But I placed in the RECORD figures prepared by the Department of Commerce showing that over the past 5 years, had the bill been in effect, it would have cost an additional $21,900,790, of which $17¼ million would have gone to Pan American and three other companies getting most of the remainder. Trans World International Airlines would have received $1,295,000; Braniff would have received $1,515,000; and Delta Airlines would have received $1,400,000.

In other words, all but about $400,000 of this total amount would have gone to four of the major airlines and would have increased their subsidies that much over and above the amount which they had already received. There are a lot of people who think they are already getting too much.

The point made by the chairman to the effect that the companies would have had to reinvest the money in new equipment means nothing, because it is not additional equipment they must buy. The bill merely provides that they must set aside the money they receive from the sale of equipment and use it in the payment of new equipment. They can by so doing merely spend less of their general funds and have that much more for their stockholders. The American taxpayer to that extent would be the sucker.

There is no dispute over the fact that by using this formula, a company can regulate its subsidy payments higher to most any extent. Under the existing law, they are guaranteed 8 percent on their domestic operations and 9 percent on international. Under this bill they could manipulate this rate to 10, 12, or 15 percent, depending on the amount of equipment the company wants to sell in any given year. Congress would have no control over the formula.

The chairman in charge of the bill presented a statement which had been agreed upon unanimously by the industry and the committee, in which it was claimed that the new equipment purchased would result in more efficient operations whereby at the end of 2 years, it would enable the companies involved to reduce their claims on the Government for a subsidy by a minimum of from 40 to 50 percent.

I said that if that were true, this was a good bill, and I would vote for it. But the proposal that this he spelled out as a requirement in the bill was for some reason rejected. I then asked the representatives of the committee if they would take half of estimate as a requirement for the bill and they said, "No." That rejection surely proves my contention, namely, that this will result in a perpetual increase in subsidy. The actual amount of the increase in the subsidy formula will then be solely at the discretion of the airlines. Congress in adopting this bill loses its control.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator trying to convey the impression that the provision to which he objects may not be an effort to help the common man?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I said this should really be classified as a private bill for the benefit of four major airline companies, and that the other companies were being mentioned in order to sell the bill to the public.

The only part the so-called common man will have in this bill will be to pay

taxes to underwrite its additional multi-million-dollar cost.

In reading down the long list of airlines affected we find that during the past 5 years many smaller companies would have received no benefits from this liberalized formula. That is true because the subsidy of most of the smaller lines is computed on a per mile basis rather than 8 percent of invested capital. It is very clear that this is nothing more than a private bill for the benefit of four major airlines.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator have the names of those four transport companies?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I placed them in the RECORD, along with the statement that in the future the cost would be proportionately higher. I ask the Department of Commerce to supply these figures for the past 5 years on the basis of what would have happened had this arrangement been in effect. The Department said that it would have cost the Government $21 million. Of that amount, Pan American would have received $17,288,000. Trans World International would have received $1,295,000. Braniff would have received $1,515,000. Delta would have been paid $1,400,000.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The bill does not apply, then, only to the international operators, does it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no; it applies to all subsidized lines.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is not the Senator from Delaware upsetting the calculations of some of the operators, particularly the leading international operators? I read recently that the stock of one airline operator had increased in value about 50 percent and was recommended as an outstanding investment because of the future possibilities for enhanced value. The Senator from Delaware should be commended for calling attention to this company expanding its operations and increasing its profits through subsidies from the Federal Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should say that if the bill passes, the economist who made the prediction that some of the companies will have a great future ahead of them was 100 percent correct, because under the bill the managements of these companies, could at their own discretion, after they have fully depreciated their equipment sell the equipment on the side, put the proceeds into a separate account for their stockholders and then collect a subsidy computed as if nothing at all was received from the sale. There would be no limit to the height to which they could pyramid such increases, depending only on the amount of capital gains that wanted to absorb in 1 year. True they must reinvest these proceeds in new equipment, but that is merely a bookkeeping transaction. To the extent they use these funds they will have that much more in the general fund for other purposes. If this bill is to be passed, then every grocer and every farmer, when he buys a new delivery truck or a new tractor should be allowed not to count the salvage value of his old equipment in computing his income. Why should we allow only these subsidized airlines this special privilege?

Mr. DWORSHAK. The report indicates that the Department of Commerce and the General Accounting Office have indicated opposition to the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. They all opposed the bill for good sound reasons.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Notwithstanding that opposition, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has urged the passage of the bill at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The bill is before the Senate for consideration. The Department recommended against its passage, and I think the Department is right. The rule is now that these airline companies can compute their formula at 8 percent of their total capital investment after allowing for all expenses but taking into consideration the salvage value of their equipment. This salvage value should go to reduce the cost of operation. In no other computation of a subsidy formula has such a proposal been made that this not be done.

I objected the other day to a shipping bill which was sponsored by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER]; but that bill did not go anywhere near so far as this bill goes.

This bill would adopt an entirely new formula for our subsidy programs. Rather than Congress working toward reduction or ultimate elimination of this expensive policy, it removes all limits and allows the companies to write their own ticket.

No one can challenge the statement that the airlines could under the provisions of this bill manipulate their formula and Congress could not stop it.

Certainly this is not a sound proposal for the Senate to agree to. I say again that if 8 percent formula is not high enough, let the committee examine the question, hold hearings, receive the testimony, then make a report to the Senate. Then if the amount is to be raised to 10 or 12 percent, at least Congress will have some control over the situation and be fully aware of what steps they are taking. As the bill now stands, Congress will have no control over the formula in the future.

I myself think 8 percent is high enough and we should be reducing rather than raising.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I correct in my understanding that the administration opposes the enactment of the bill, particularly until such time as an explanation is made of the needs of these companies?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. The administration is against the bill, and it should be commended for its stand against it.

Mr. AIKEN. If this proposed legislation is enacted, the four big companies will have received their—what should we call it?—gratuities, perhaps, or handouts, before the public or Congress can be made aware of the actual earnings and the needs of the companies.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the bill passes, these companies can, by regulating the sale of their equipment, raise or lower their subsidy benefits from the Government. They can increase the amounts of their subsidies to the extent that they sell old equipment.

It must be understood, however, that the secondhand equipment would have to be depreciated completely, or fairly low, in order that the sales price would be over and above the depreciated valuation.

However, they were careful enough to put a safety catch in the bill, so that if these companies sold a piece of equipment below the depreciated value, whereby there was a loss instead of a gain, then the loss, instead of being a capital loss, would be charged to the subsidy. The companies would include in the computation of the subsidy formula all losses, for which the Government would reimburse, but all the profits would be put on the other side and used for their own benefit. It is a one-way street with Uncle Sam at the dead end.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Has the Civil Aeronautics Board made any recommendations concerning this proposed legislation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Civil Aeronautics Board has ruled that the salvage value of the equipment is to be considered a part of the operating expenses or income. To the extent that the company salvages a few million dollars in sale of its secondhand equipment, it reduces its expenses. I do not know of a business in the United States that does not operate in that way. The Government operates that way. The Government buys trucks, and there is a salvage value for the old trucks which goes into the same fund from which the new trucks are bought. Why should it not be so?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Are all the members of the CAB unanimous in their attitude as to the need for the proposed legislation?

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I can answer the question. The members of the Civil Aeronautics Board were evenly divided on the bill; 2 were for it, and 2 were against it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I notice from the report that the Comptroller General and also the Secretary of Commerce object to the enactment of the bill at this time. I should like to read the following from the report:

> The Department of the Treasury and the Office of Defense Mobilization expressed no opposition to enactment of the bill.

Did not the Department of the Treasury and the Office of Defense Mobilization take the position that the bill was outside their jurisdiction?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. They did not advocate its passage?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. To my knowledge, no agency of the Government advocated the passage of the bill. Some stated it was outside of their jurisdiction, and made no comment, but all those agencies which felt it was appropriate for them to comment expressed

their opposition. The General Accounting Office raised the same point I am raising, namely, that the bill would leave in the hands of management the power to regulate their own subsidies. This would be a dangerous precedent for us to establish and a most expensive one.

Mr. AIKEN. It looks as though the common man would get the short end of the bill if it should become law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The common man is considered by Congress only to the extent that he pays the bill. He pays the bill for these increased benefits for about four companies.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I confess that I know very little, indeed, about the operational procedures of the aviation companies or their bookkeeping procedures. As I read the bill—my study of it has been quite hurried, of course—I understand the provision will not become effective unless the money which is obtained by the companies from the sale of obsolete equipment is reinvested in new equipment. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct, but there is this catch: The companies do not reinvest that much in new equipment over and above what they would normally buy. A going company is always buying new equipment, the same as it is selling old equipment. That is automatic. This merely represents a reshuffling of funds. It was estimated that had the provisions of the bill been in effect a year ago, Pan American would have drawn an extra seven and a quarter million dollars. They could have taken that seven and a quarter million dollars and used it to buy new equipment, and have saved seven and a quarter million dollars in the general fund from which they would ordinarily buy such equipment, and have used that amount for other general purposes. As I pointed out before, it would be the same as if we said to a farmer who sold a secondhand tractor that he did not have to count it as income if he reinvested it, but that he could still deduct the full cost of his new equipment without regard to the fact that this salvage sale would reduce his new cost.

It would be a simple matter for the airlines to reinvest these funds and keep that much extra from other sources.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Again I confess I have no knowledge as to the accounting practices or the basis on which subsidies are given. But is it not a fact that if the money received as the salvage value of obsolete planes is then used for the purchase of new planes, the cost of the new planes is reduced by that amount?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the calculation of the formula?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. If that were done, there would be no objection. However, if the salvage value of an old plane were $1 million, and the cost of a new plane were $3 million, the $3 million would be written on the books and depreciated as the 100-percent cost of the equipment. The salvage value which would be set aside as extra money would not be used in the calculation. If the depreciation value were taken into consideration, there would be no need to pass the bill. What the airline companies want is the right to use the cost of new equipment and depreciate it as an expense item but make no allowance for the salvage value of the old equipment. Since a subsidized line is involved, that expense is reimbursable from the Federal Treasury. So the Federal Government reimburses the depreciation of new planes. Then when the planes are depreciated and sold, the salvage value is put in another bracket. And Uncle Sam keeps on paying as though it were a complete loss. If by chance the company should be caught with a plane which goes bad before it is fully depreciated, and it has to be sold at a loss, the company would not pay for this loss out of its own pocket; it would be put on the books as an operational loss, and the Government would reimburse the company in the subsidy formula. The gains are kept in a separate fund for company use, but they still allow Uncle Sam to keep underwriting all their losses.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is not the sale of obsolete equipment given effect at all in the computation of subsidies?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not at all. The depreciation is counted in the computation of the formula. But if the salvage value of it should be $1 million, for example, the figure of $1 million received as salvage would not be counted at all in the computation of the formula. Should the owner of a store who owned a number of delivery trucks, the cost of which, under the law, could be charged off—both operating cost and depreciation—be allowed when he sold the secondhand trucks, to set the salvage value aside and not include it as a part of his annual report on operating results? Uncle Sam does not allow anything like that. My colleagues know that is not the way business is run. To the extent anything is salvaged from secondhand equipment, it automatically goes to reduce the cost of operations.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question, because I am somewhat confused on the accounting arrangement?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Suppose a company has paid $2 million for a plane and it becomes obsolete or, for reasons best known to the company, the company wishes to dispose of it, and does dispose of the plane for $1 million, and receives $1 million. At the same time the company purchases a new plane for $3 million. Is the $1 million which has been received by the company from the sale of the first plane applied in whole or in part to the purchase of the $3 million plane, and is it given effect in the computation of the subsidies?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I repeat it is given no effect at all. The salvage value of the $1 million is set aside in a different account. The new plane which was purchased at $3 million is depreciated just as if it had been an outright purchase and no salvaged plane had been involved. The depreciation on the full $3 million would be charged off in the computation of the next year's formula. The salvage value would not be considered.

The chairman in charge of the bill was very fair about it when he presented his case and stated that the bill did have the effect of raising the subsidy formula; but instead of Congress raising it to X point, we are asked to confer on management the power to compute their own formula, depending on the extent to which they want to sell secondhand equipment. I think it is an unsound way to approach the solution of the problem.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for an observation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. Although the Senator in charge of the bill said it would increase the subsidies during the first few years, he also pointed out that it was the feeling of the committee that over a period of 4 or 5 years the net result would be to decrease the subsidy, because of the improvement in the aircraft put into service.

I wish to make a comment, without particularly laboring the point or prolonging the debate: In connection with the 5-year period to which the Senator from Delaware his referred in commenting on the amount of increased subsidy, we must bear in mind that the past 5 years constitute a period of time during which the airlines were purchasing new equipment at tremendous cost, and that is reflected in the 5-year study. It is obvious that during that period of time no benefit is shown to the feeder lines, because I believe that almost without exception every feeder line in operation in the United States is still flying DC–3's, although I think they are doing their best to use better aircraft. So the mere fact that there is no increased subsidy payment to them is not of particular importance when we understand that during that period they did not sell old aircraft or place new aircraft into service.

We admit that the bill increases the subsidies; but we feel that it is a step in the right direction, in order to strengthen the airline industry.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the Senator from Nevada will likewise admit, I am sure, that this increase in the subsidy will be more or less at the discretion of the management of the respective companies. In other words, it is impossible for anyone to say that the subsidy will be a certain amount, for the amount of the subsidy will more or less be dependent on the amount by which the management wishes to increase the subsidy, by means of the sale of old equipment and the purchase of new equipment.

Mr. BIBLE. It is difficult for me to imagine that an airline would spend time in manipulating the sale of obsolete aircraft, for the purchase of new aircraft, in order to show a profit. I think the companies are interested in getting away from the subsidy and in standing on their own feet and making themselves good, healthy, airline companies.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, we must remember that in the case of domestic lines the companies are already guaranteed an 8 percent margin of profit on a $3 million investment, or whatever

such an airplane has cost. They are guaranteed a measured return on the total investment over a given period of time. Therefore, so long as Congress is that liberal, the companies will not have too much concern or worry as to whether they get away from the subsidy.

Mr. President, I shall conclude my remarks; I do not wish to detain the Senate any further. It is very clear that the pending bill provides an indirect method of raising or increasing the airline subsidy and gives the major benefit of the new formula to four airlines. If Congress wishes to do that, that is for Congress to decide. But I think the bill should go back to the committee for further study.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the bill be recommitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware that Senate bill 3449 be recommitted. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE TRUMAN SCANDALS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, today the United Press reported the conviction of two former officials of the Truman administration. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the announcement referred to.

This is a part of the cleanup program begun back in 1951. In fact it was on May 7, 1951, over 5 years ago, that I first made the charge that tax cases in the St. Louis area were being improperly handled and asked for an investigation of that office. The collector, Mr. Finnegan, has long since been sent to the penitentiary, but the wheels of justice keep on rolling.

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LOUIS.—Two high Truman administration officials were convicted today of charges of conspiracy to defraud the Government in the handling of a tax case.

The jury of 8 men and 4 women deliberated 9 hours and 5 minutes before reaching its verdict.

Both Connelly and Caudle took the verdict calmly. Bond for Connelly was renewed pending motions for a new trial but Caudle had to furnish new bail of $5,000 because his bondsman died 2 days ago.

Maj. Gen. Ralph Truman, retired, a cousin of the former President, signed Caudle's new bond.

Hulen thanked the jury for its patience through the 6 weeks of hearing evidence. He told the jurors they should not discuss their verdict with anyone nor be photographed.

The announcement that the jury had reached a verdict after prolonged deliberations caught the court by surprise. Hulen had just overruled two motions by Caudle's attorney, Charles Margiotti, concerning the selection of evidence studied by the jury, and was leaving the courtroom when the marshal announced the jury was ready.

After some delay while court attachés gathered, Hulen warned spectators against any demonstration and told attorneys for both sides to remain seated.

After the verdict was read, Margiotti asked that the jury be polled. One by one they announced it was correct.

Hulen said he would rule on the motions for a new trial on the day set for sentencing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, these items call attention to the fact that two high Truman administration officials were today convicted in St. Louis on charges of conspiracy to defraud the Government in the handling of tax cases.

I next ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 1, 1954. The article points out that Messrs. Caudle, Connelly, and Schwimmer had been indicted by a Federal grand jury. The article includes the basis of the indictment upon which they were today convicted.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

CAUDLE, MATT CONNELLY, SCHWIMMER INDICTED BY UNITED STATES—PLOT TO DEFRAUD THE GOVERNMENT ALLEGED IN TRUE BILL VOTED HERE—NAMED AS COCONSPIRATORS ARE ELLIS N. SLACK, SHOE BROKER IRVING SACHS AND FIRM HE HEADS

Matthew J. Connelly, who was appointments secretary to former President Truman, and Theron Lamar Caudle, former head of the Justice Department's Tax Division, were indicted here today on a charge of conspiracy to defraud the Government.

Harry I. Schwimmer, Kansas City attorney, named in a perjury indictment November 18, was indicted jointly with Caudle and Connelly today.

Named as coconspirators were Ellis N. Slack, former assistant attorney general in the Tax Division; Irving Sachs, head of Shu-Stiles, Inc., shoe brokerage firm, and the Shu-Stiles firm.

Slack has been relieved of duty as a trial attorney in the Justice Department, it was announced in Washington.

It was charged that Connelly was paid $1,650 in January 1952 by Schwimmer, who was defense counsel for Sachs. While there was no allegation that Caudle received cash, the indictment declared Caudle, "influenced by the hope of reward and personal gain, would recommend that prosecution (of Sachs) be declined."

The alleged conspiracy was in connection with delays in the prosecution of the Sachs income tax case.

BOND SET FOR ALL THREE

Bond for Schwimmer was fixed at $30,000, to cover both indictments against him. Bond for Caudle and Connelly was set at $5,000 each. To account for the higher bond for Schwimmer, it was explained he now lives in Puerto Rico, and "many persons have strong motives against his appearance in court."

The indictments, returned to United States District Judge George H. Moore, charged that Connelly, Caudle and Schwimmer "willfully, knowingly and unlawfully conspired and agreed with Irving Sachs to defraud the Government."

The defendants were charged with conspiring to commit five violations of the United States Code—bribery, perjury, making false statements and entries, and violations of the corrupt practices act and the internal revenues laws.

The charge is a single count indictment with a maximum penalty on conviction of 5 years in prison and a $10,000 fine.

By their actions, the indictment said, the defendants conspired to defraud the Government of its "function and right to administer the internal revenue laws of the United States and regulations duly issued and pertaining thereto, free from unlawful impairment and obstruction and free from corruption, improper influence, dishonesty and fraud."

Further, they denied the Government its right of administering the office of appointments secretary, which Connelly held, the Justice Department's Tax Division, which Caudle headed, the Internal Revenue Service and its predecessor, the Internal Revenue Bureau, "free from unlawful impairment and obstruction, and free from corruption, improper influence, dishonesty, and fraud." the indictment said.

FURTHER CHARGES

Actions of the defendants were a conspiracy to make it impossible for the Government to "fairly, honestly, and free of fraud, deceit, partiality, concealment, interference, obstruction, and corruption," make dispositions in business matters effecting Caudle's and Connelly's offices, the indictment alleged.

By virtue of the defendants' "personal and pecuniary interests in the successs of persons concerned and affected by the outcome" of Government decisions in matters pending before the Tax Division or the appointments secretary's office, the indictment said, they conspired to defraud the Government of its right to make "conscientious, faithful, disinterested, and unbiased judgments."

ANNOUNCED HERE AND IN CAPITAL

The indictments were announced simultaneously here and in Washington, where J. Fred Mullen, press officer for the Department of Justice, said this was not the end of the investigation.

"The grand jury will continue," he added.

In response to questions, Mullen said the St. Louis investigation was tied in with an earlier inquiry at Omaha, Nebr. He said nothing was going on in Omaha at this time but the present inactivity did not mean the Omaha phase would not be reopened.

Asked whether some individuals might be reindicted at Omaha, Mullen answered cryptically: "There might be others."

The St. Louis indictments were the result of evidence uncovered within recent weeks.

The indictment said that during the course of the conspiracy, which allegedy continued to the present time, there was pending in the Internal Revenue Service and in the Tax Division of the Department of Justice an income-tax fraud proceeding concerning alleged coconspirators Irving Sachs and Shu-Stiles, Inc.

REFERENCE TO SACHS

The indictment states that "it was an essential part of the conspiracy that Sachs, having willfully evaded large amounts of income tax over a period of years, should nevertheless escape indictment and, if indicted, should escape prosecution, and if convicted, should escape imprisonment."

It was charged that Caudle, without reference to the merits of the income tax fraud case pending before him in his official capacity, and "without making an honest and unbiased decision which it was his duty to do * * * but influenced by the hope of reward and personal gain, would persuade and coerce his subordinates in the Tax Division to recommend that prosecution be declined and, if persuasion and coercion were unsuccessful, to decline prosecution himself."

It was a further part of the conspiracy, the indictment continued, "that if indictment of Sachs could not be prevented, defendants would make and cause to be made false,

fictitious and misleading statements to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri in order to procure the dismissal of the indictment.

"If the conviction of Sachs could not be prevented, they would make false statements to the court and its probation service to attempt to influence the court with respect to the imposition of a sentence."

"It was a part of the conspiracy," the indictment said, "that Schwimmer and coconspirators Sachs and Shu-Stiles, Inc., would promise, offer and give money and other things of value to Connelly and Caudle and other persons unknown to the grand jury, with the intent to influence their official decisions and actions on proceedings pending in their offices, and with intent to influence them to commit and allow fraud on the United States and to induce them to act in violation of their lawful duties."

AMOUNTS NOT KNOWN

The grand jury noted in the indictment that the exact amount of money and the nature of the other things of value given to Connelly and Caudle were not known.

Also a part of the conspiracy, the indictment continued, was a plan under which Connelly "without reference to the merits of the income tax fraud investigation and influenced by the promise of reward and personal gain, would use all his power and influence and that of his office to persuade employees of the Internal Revenue Service to recommend against the criminal prosecution of Sachs and Shu-Stiles, Inc."

Connelly also was to use his power to persuade Caudle and other employees of the Tax Division to decline criminal prosecution, the indictment said.

It was charged that the defendants, aware that investigations of the subject matter of the conspiracy would be made by many agencies, made every effort to conceal the conspiracy and in doing so were guilty of furthering the original conspiracy.

The extensive grand-jury inquiry included an investigation of oil royalties purchased for Connelly and Caudle. Schwimmer paid for both royalties, the evidence showed.

PROFIT FOR CONNELLY REPORTED

Caudle said he returned dividend checks and the deed to oil property to Schwimmer, and reprimanded the attorney for buying the royalty. Connelly was reported to have kept his oil investment a year, then sold at a substantial profit.

In addition to the oil deal, Connelly is alleged to have received a check for $1,650 from Schwimmer several months after Sachs pleaded guilty and was fined, but escaped going to prison.

Government attorneys told reporters Slack and Sachs were designated coconspirators, and not defendants, because they "are part of a small agreement, which is part of a larger conspiracy." The attorneys indicated the investigation of the larger conspiracy would continue.

Following the hearing on bond for the defendants, Judge Moore disqualified himself from further connection with the indictment. It also was announced that the grand jury would recess for at least 10 days.

Special Assistant Attorney General Wyllys S. Newcomb informed the court that the evidence on which the indictment was returned was "part of a pattern."

"There was bribery in our Government close to the top," Newcomb stated. He asked that the case be set for trial as soon as is consistent with the rights of the defendants, and added that the grand jury would proceed "with full steam ahead."

"And damn the torpedoes," observed Judge Moore.

Warren Olney III, head of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice and in overall charge of the investigation, was here when the indictment was returned. He came to St. Louis 3 days ago.

TWENTY-FOUR OVERT ACTS LISTED

The alleged conspiracy was outlined by the grand jury in the following 24 overt acts of the defendants and coconspirators.

1. On or about January 20, 1948, defendants Harry I. Schwimmer and Matthew J. Connelly conferred in Washington, D. C.

2. On or about January 20, 1948, defendant Matthew J. Connelly had a telephone conversation with one George J. Schoeneman, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in Washington, D. C.

3. On or about August 10, 1948, defendants Schwimmer and Connelly conferred in Washington, D. C.

4. On or about August 10, 1948, defendant Connelly had a telephone conversation with one Charles Oliphant, chief counsel of the Internal Revenue Bureau, in Washington, D. C.

5. On or about October 12, 1949, in St. Louis, Mo., coconspirator Irving Sachs caused a check to be drawn in the amount of $10,000 payable to defendant Harry I. Schwimmer.

6. On or about October 26, 1949, defendants Harry I. Schwimmer and Matthew J. Connelly conferred in Washington, D. C.

7. On or about October 26, 1949, defendants Connelly and T. Lamar Caudle had a telephone conversation in Washington, D. C.

8. On or about October 26, 1949, defendants Caudle and Schwimmer conferred in Washington, D. C.

9. On or about December 30, 1949, in Kansas City, Mo., defendant Schwimmer drew a check in the amount of $3,600 payable to one Chris Rhodes.

10. Sometime between December 28, 1949, and January 19, 1950, in Washington. Defendant Connelly accepted as transferee an oil royalty interest in Logan County, Okla.

11. On or about January 12, 1950, in St. Louis, coconspirators Irving Sachs and Shu-Stiles, Inc. issued and caused to be issued to defendant Schwimmer a check in the amount of $10,000.

12. On or about July 15, 1950, in St. Louis, Mo., coconspirators Sachs and Shu-Stiles, Inc., issued and caused to be issued to defendant Schwimmer a check in the amount of $3,600.

13. On or about July 17, 1950, in Kansas City, Mo., defendant Schwimmer drew a check in the amount of $3,300 payable to one Chris Rhodes.

14. On or about January 11, 1951, at Washington, defendant T. Lamar Caudle directed one Arthur B. Cunningham, an attorney in the Tax Division, to prepare a letter addressed to one George J. Schoeneman, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

15. On or about January 11, 1951, at Washington, defendant T. Lamar Caudle directed said Arthur B. Cunningham to prepare a letter addressed to defendant Harry I. Schwimmer.

16. On or about January 16, 1951, defendant Connelly had a telephone conversation with one Charles Oliphant, chief counsel, Internal Revenue Service, Washington.

17. On or about January 19, 1951, in St. Louis, coconspirators Irving Sachs and Shu-Stiles, Inc., issued and caused to be issued to defendant Harry I. Schwimmer a check in the amount of $2,000.

18. On or about September 13, 1951, in St. Louis, defendant Schwimmer had a conversation with one Milton Weiffenbach, chief United States probation officer, United States District Court, Eastern District of Missouri.

19. On or about September 21, 1951. Defendant T. Lamar Caudle telephoned the aforesaid Milton Weiffenbach at St. Louis.

20. On or about September 26, 1951, defendant Caudle caused a letter to be delivered in St. Louis to the aforesaid Milton Weiffenbach.

21. On or about November 2, 1951, defendant Harry I. Schwimmer appeared before the United States district court at St. Louis, Mo.

22. On or about November 7, 1951, in St. Louis, coconspirators Irving Sachs and Shu-Stiles, Inc., issued and caused to be issued to defendant Schwimmer a check in the amount of $3,000.

23. On or about January 14, 1952, defendant Schwimmer caused the sum of $1,650 to be paid to defendant Matthew J. Connelly in Washington, D. C.

24. On or about February 27, 1952, in St. Louis, coconspirators Sachs and Shu-Stiles issued and caused to be issued to defendant Schwimmer a check in the amount of $2,500.

NO COMMENT BY TRUMAN

Truman, who was in St. Louis today, declined to comment on the indictments. When reporters asked him if he had anything to say on the grand jury's action, he replied tersely: "No comment."

Slack was appointed to the Tax Division in 1934. After military leave he returned to the same position in 1946 and served until July 1948, when he was named an assistant to the attorney general in the Tax Division, one of the top jobs in the section. After the tax scandal revelations of 1952 and 1953 he became a trial attorney in the Tax Division.

It was Slack who reported back to Washington, concerning the complaint of Judge Moore of irregularities in the collector's office, that "there was some smoke but no fire."

The jury began its lengthy investigation with an inquiry into efforts by former high officials to whitewash the official conduct of former Collector of Internal Revenue James P. Finnegan here. More recently, the jury has been seeking to learn whether politically influential lawyers were able to block prosecution of income tax violators.

COMMENT BY CAUDLE'S EX-AIDE

Turner L. Smith, who was first assistant to Caudle in the Justice Department's Tax Division, told the Post-Dispatch today he would have withheld a recommendation in the Sachs case, had he known that Caudle had received an oil royalty from Sach's attorney.

"I had no knowledge of Caudle's oil royalty until I came here this week as a grand jury witness and read about the transaction in the newspapers," Smith, a Georgia attorney, told a reporter. He had recommended there be no prosecution of Sachs, who eventually pleaded guilty and was fined $40,000 in 1951.

Caudle told reporters he received a $750 oil royalty from Schwimmer in exchange for a stockmarket tip. He said the oil deal was made without his knowledge, in 1951, and was terminated by him as soon as he learned of it.

Smith, a grand jury witness yesterday, said he had originally recommended in 1950 that Sachs be prosecuted, after studying investigators' reports, but changed the recommendation "on the basis of medical reports." Sachs is an epileptic, and Schwimmer had argued that the excitement of a trial, that a trial or prison sentence, might prove fatal.

"I would not have made any recommendation if I had thought anything was wrong," Smith observed. "If I had heard about the oil royalty there would have been no recommendation."

Smith added that he "received nothing, and I told the grand jury that."

United States District Judge Roy W. Harper, who fined Sachs the maximum $10,000 on each of four counts of an indictment, was a grand-jury witness yesterday. When passing sentence on Sachs, president of Shu-Stiles, Inc., in November 1951, Judge Harper called the case "one of the most vicious ever brought to my attention." Sachs, charged with evading $128,721 in income taxes in the war years 1942–45, was spared a prison sentence because of his health.

Schwimmer, who was indicted on a charge of perjury November 18, following testimony

before the grand jury, yesterday filed suit for a restraining order to keep from the grand jury certain records of his and of Chris Rhodes, a Tulsa, Okla., attorney. The petition contends the records are protected by attorney-client privilege, and that he has not waived that privilege. His plea probably will be acted on today.

Rhodes, a grand-jury witness, is reported to have obtained oil royalties for Schwimmer about the time the Sachs case was dragging on. Records of Schwimmer, obtained from a Kansas City warehouse, have been studied by the jury.

The grand jury charged that Schwimmer's testimony relative to $10,000 given him by Sachs was false. He testified the money represented a legal fee, but the jury termed it a fund to bribe and corrupt public officials.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I also ask unanimous consent—lest we forget about the scandals that were going on in the Truman administration—that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article appearing in Human Events for April 21, 1956. The article is a condensation from a recent book entitled "The Truman Scandals," written by Mr. Jules Abels.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRUMAN SCANDALS

(By Jules Abels)

(This article is a 1,800-word extract from the sensational fully documented book, The Truman Scandals, by Jules Abels, distinguished attorney and economist.)

"Scandals in Government are not a new phenomena. What seems to be new about these scandals is the moral blindness or callousness which allows those in responsible positions to accept the practices which the facts reveal. It is bad enough for us to have corruption in our midst, but it is worse if it is to be condoned and accepted as inevitable."—Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat from Arkansas, March 1951.

Prior to the Presidency of Harry Truman, there had been two administrations in which corruption had reached to the heart of the administration—that of Ulysses S. Grant and that of Warren G. Harding.

Both Grant and Harding reacted keenly to the disclosures of corruption in their administrations.

President Grant received a letter from a St. Louis banker which quoted revenue officials as saying Grant could not give them up for fear that their disclosures might hurt the administration. Grant at once referred it to Secretary of the Treasury Bristow, on July 29, 1875:

"I forward this for information and to the end that if it throws any light upon new parties to summon as witness, they may be brought out. Let no guilty man escape if it can be avoided. Be specially vigilant—or instruct those engaged in the prosecution of fraud to be—against all who insinuate that they have high influence to protect—or to protect them. No personal consideration should stand in the way of performing a public duty."

Teapot Dome killed President Harding. Prior to his last trip, his journey to Alaska, Harding had apparently learned the truth from his own sources. Samuel Hopkins Adams, in the Timely Death of President Harding, gives this vivid description of the last days aboard train:

"From Tacoma on, the President was in a state of chronic jitters. To escape from thinking, he organized a bridge game with Secretaries Wallace, Work, and Howe, Speaker Gillett and Admiral Rodman. The President played to exhaustion, 12, 14, or 15 hours a day.

"By the time the west coast was reached, his nervous demoralization was painfully apparent. He sought out Secretary Hoover. "Mr. Secretary," he said, "there's a bad scandal brewing in the administration."

Hoover, who had an inkling of what it was all about, urged the President to meet the scandals with public frankness, but the President's tension and anxiety were not assuaged. He died a few days later.

The new President was Calvin Coolidge. He appointed two special prosecutors, ousted Secretary of the Navy Denby, and fired Attorney General Daugherty without haggling when Daugherty refused to open up Justice Department files. In January 1924, Coolidge said:

"If there has been any crime, it must be prosecuted; no one will be shielded for any party, political, or other reason * * * if there is any guilt it will be punished; if there is any fraud, it will be revealed; and if there are any contracts which are illegal, they will be canceled."

All previous cases of corruption, serious as they were, are very small compared with those of the Truman administration. Never had there been so much corruption practiced by so many public officials in so many different places.

Corruption invaded almost every department of the Government, not only in Washington but all over the country. The tax collection machinery of the Nation was infested with graft from top to bottom.

The civil recovery in Teapot Dome amounted to $13 million. The amount lost through the wholesale tax frauds alone of the Truman administration, must have run into the billions.

The loss of the graft-ridden GI educational programs ran into the "hundreds of millions." In the section 608 swindles under FHA, profits of 20,000 percent in less than 2 years were not uncommon, as we have seen, and one financing company netted $26 million.

Teapot Dome and other cases of corruption were isolated transactions of individuals accomplished by stealth. The cases in the Truman era were a continuous band covering many agencies and localities.

Instead of taking effective action to wipe out corruption, Truman was, in some cases, protecting the wrongdoers; in other cases, he was indifferent, and in other cases, he blocked and thwarted the investigators of corruption.

TRUMAN'S ASSOCIATION WITH THE CORRUPTION

Boss Tom Pendergast gave Harry Truman his first political job as judge of the county court (that is, county commissioner) of Jackson County because he was recommended by his nephew Jim Pendergast. In his Memoirs, Truman says that Pendergast asked nothing of him. He did not have to ask anything of Judge Truman; there was only one concrete company, the Ready-Mixed Concrete Co., supplying the building projects voted by the county commission. It was owned by Pendergast.

In 1934 Pendergast was on the defensive because of bloody and shocking outrages in the March elections. Needing a candidate not too prominently identified with him, he chose Harry Truman for the Senate; in a three-way fight, Truman won the nomination. His statewide plurality was 41,000 votes; Jackson County and Kansas City gave him 138,423 votes to the combined votes of his two opponents of 10,437. That measures his debt to Pendergast who could dispose of up to 60,000 ghost votes.

In the same year, Roosevelt appointed Maurice Milligan, United States attorney for western Missouri. He broke the Pendergast machine, securing 259 convictions for frauds in the 1936 elections, and Tom Pendergast himself went to jail for income-tax evasion in 1939.

In February 1938 Senator Truman attacked Milligan violently on the floor of the Senate saying that "a Jackson County, Mo., Democrat has as much a chance of a fair trial in the Federal District Court of Western Missouri as a Jew would have in a Hitler court." A Republican Senator arose to ask Senator Truman if he wished to go on record as condoning vote frauds.

In 1945, when Pendergast died, the Vice President flew out to his funeral. A few weeks after Truman became President, he fired Maurice Milligan. In his place he appointed Sam Wear as United States attorney; Wear had been chairman of the Democratic State Committee of Missouri. He pardoned 15 of the Pendergast people who had been in prison for the vote fraud.

On December 7, 1945, the President wrote to Jim Pendergast, Tom Pendergast's nephew, who was the heir to the Pendergast machine: "Dear Jim: I am enclosing you a check for $6 in payment of my Jackson Democratic Club dues. I hope the outfit is still going good. Sincerely yours, Harry."

On July 18, 1946, President Truman announced that he opposed the renomination of Congressman Roger C. Slaughter from the Fifth District of Missouri, which included Kansas City. Slaughter had offended him by his vote in the House Committee on Rules to bottle up the FEPC bill which the President considered politically important for the 1946 congressional elections. The President favored Enos Axtell.

The President himself went to Kansas City on primary day to lend his prestige to his fight against Slaughter. Axtell won by 2,300 votes. He lost in November, but the President had purged Mr. Slaughter.

The primary was as crooked as any ever held even in Kansas City. In many precincts, Slaughter received no votes. In 4 wards, the vote was 6 to 1 in favor of Axtell. The Kansas City Star cried fraud. It sent around investigators to collect affidavits, and over 1,000 were collected.

In October the general clamor forced Attorney General Tom Clark (now on the U. S. Supreme Court) to permit an FBI investigation of the vote.

United States Attorney Sam Wear submitted a highly misleading synopsis of the FBI report to three Federal judges who concluded there was no basis for a grand jury investigation. These judges testified that on the basis of the full FBI report, their opinion would have been different. A Jackson County grand jury declared that evidence showed that "there had been a deliberate and calculated plan to miscount votes and otherwise steal the election." It said Slaughter had been deprived of the nomination by fraud. All ballots and records used by the jury in investigation were returned to the vaults of the Kansas City Board of Election Commissioners for safekeeping.

Attorney General Clark was called to testify about the FBI report before a Senate subcommittee. While he was on the witness stand, Senator Ferguson, the chairman, announced he had just received a wire from Kansas City: "Last night primary ballots were stolen from election commissioner vault."

The vault in Kansas City had been blown open with nitroglycerin and the ballots and other records needed for prosecution had been stolen.

The President had been sleeping in a hotel three blocks away when the theft was carried out.

Before the explosion, 71 persons had been indicted; but without the evidence, prosecution was fruitless.

The report of Senator Ferguson, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee, condemned Clark: "The replies of the Attorney General indicate an intentional misrepresentation of facts to a Member of the United

States Senate in answer to an official inquiry." The report pointed out that in Clarks' own file, there were 28 memos with a summary of evidence showing that 159 persons were shown to vote who did not vote; 10 persons voted who were not on the election records and 14 persons could not vote because they had already been voted.

All in the Department of Justice who took part in the Kansas City vote fraud case were rewarded. Tom Clark was promoted to the United States Supreme Court. Peyton Ford built an administrative empire and went on to become Deputy Attorney General. Herbert Bergson moved ahead to become head of the Antitrust Division. The Chelf subcommittee pointed out that William Holloran, who did the leg work in the case, "got a coveted assignment in the overseas branch of the Antitrust Division"—far removed from the interrogations of congressional committees. T. Lamar Caudle, Assistant Attorney General, was given the choice plum of the management of the Tax Division of the Department of Justice.

The Truman years constitute the great plunder period in United States history. Tax revenues increased from under $10 billion to over $60 billion. Thousands of businesses could save untold amounts of money by getting a nod from the right Treasury official. One man's say so could mean the difference of a million dollars, and if an individual was in a 90-percent income bracket he would have to earn $10 million in income to get the equivalent of that $1 million nod.

There was gravy in Government loans, particularly in the huge loans being made by the RFC, in which decisions were made on purely arbitrary grounds. There was gravy in Government contracts. There was a huge Government surplus for sale.

There were permits worth a million dollars or more to be given out for radio-TV stations by the Federal Communications system, and equally valuable new routes for the embryonic airline industry.

These privileges could lay the foundations of fortunes for decades to come.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think today's convictions once again remind the American people the extent to which corruption under the preceding administration had reached to the top echelon in the Government.

Several months ago I asked the Treasury Department to compile a report showing the record of the indictments and convictions since the first exposures of the tax scandals which began back in 1951, under the preceding administration. As of November 20, 1954, for the period between 1950 and 1954, there had been 214 indictments and 101 convictions in Federal courts. The remaining defendants were either awaiting trial, at that time, or in some instances, they had been exonerated by juries. But there were 214 indictments altogether of corrupt officials in the Treasury Department under the preceding administration. Eighty-eight had been indicted for accepting bribes for fixing tax cases. Some of them were involved in fixing tax cases of the biggest racketeers in the United States.

There were 40 indictments for embezzlement of Government funds, 51 indictments of Treasury officials for failure to pay their own income taxes; and 50 indictments for falsification of Government records or reports. Three were indicted for operating what, in effect constituted a blackmail ring, in that they admitted that their policy was to go to taxpayers, audit their accounts, and fake a large assessment, or threaten them with prison sentences, on the basis that they could shake them down on the side to settle what, in effect, was a nonexistent tax case.

Two were indicted for operating a bookmaking establishment in the second largest tax office in the United States.

Mr. Connelly, who was convicted in St. Louis today, was one of the top officials of the Truman administration. He was a White House assistant to the President of the United States. T. Lamar Caudle was Chief of the Tax Division, as Assistant Attorney General in the Department of Justice. Two more top officials of the Truman administration on their way to the penitentiary.

There has also been convicted a former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Joseph Nunan. The Assistant Commissioner, Daniel A. Bolich, was convicted. One Alcohol Tax Commissioner was under indictment, and the trial was postponed because of his health.

There are only 64 tax offices in the United States, but 8 directors were indicted in Federal courts, and 5 ultimately were sent to the penitentiary. Eight out of 64, or 12½ percent of the top tax collectors in the United States, were indicted in the Federal courts for having accepted bribes or otherwise violated the law.

I point out those statistics to remind the American people once again of the extent to which corruption had obtained a strangle-hold in the preceding administration.

Furthermore, the damaging indictment against the Truman administration is that these scandals had to be exposed over the opposition of the administration rather than through their cooperation. The fact that so many high officials were involved explains this determined effort on the part of the preceding administration to cover up and protect these scoundrels.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I express my appreciation, as one Member of the Senate, to the Senator from Delaware, who certainly has earned the title of watchdog of the Internal Revenue Service.

I recall that 4 or 5 years ago, when the Senator first started bringing to the attention of the country the scandalous conditions existing under the Truman administration in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, there were many skeptics who simply could not believe things were that deplorable. But with his typical bulldog tenacity the Senator from Delaware continued to compile the evidence and present it day after day on the floor of the Senate and to the country. He continued to insist on the right to obtain from the Bureau the facts and information to which he was entitled as a member of the Committee on Finance.

Certainly the startling atrocious conditions which were finally uncovered have amply vindicated the persistence of the Senator from Delaware.

At that time a great many of my friends over the country were writing me to point out that, with an utterly corrupt Internal Revenue Service—which we then had, as has now been demonstrated by the fact that one individual after another has gone to the Federal penitentiary—our whole tax-collection system was on the verge of breaking down.

I have said many times that if we were to take the element of integrity out of the tax-collection office, if we were to develop a general attitude that it is as appropriate to violate the tax laws as many people felt for a long time it was appropriate to violate the 18th amendment, for example, we would wreck democracy from within, without a single saboteur, a single Communist agent, or a single attack by any outside enemy. We simply could not collect the taxes necessary to operate the ordinary functions of Government. If we had to rely solely upon the people's fear of reprisal, fear of conviction, or fear of exposure as a device for collecting taxes, if the only people who would pay income taxes were those who were afraid that if they did not do so they would go to jail, we would pauperize this democracy.

We must have confidence in the Government. We must have integrity on the part of individual citizens. We must have the realization that when we pay our taxes they go to support Uncle Sam and not the tax collector.

One of the reasons why we had all that red ink during the New Deal and the Fair Deal was that so much of the money paid in by taxpayers never went into the Treasury. Instead, it went into the pockets of the tax collectors or went to those who were playing favorites with cronies in the tax-collecting agencies.

Now we have honesty in the tax-collecting agencies. Honesty has been restored. Now we have integrity. Now we have a tax-collection service which is operating impartially and objectively and honestly. So, of course the budget is back in balance. It is back in balance at least in part, because the money the taxpayers pay is going into the Federal Treasury, instead of into the pockets of some corrupt political cronies who serve in the office of the tax-collection agencies. Therefore, I certainly desire to congratulate the Senator from Delaware on the outstanding job he has done in exposing this tax-collection racket by political racketeers. It was one of the outstanding jobs that has been done in our Government, and President Eisenhower deserves our undying gratitude for restoring honesty in Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. The American people have a right to know that the tax laws are being administered impartially, without favoritism, without being based on the political affiliation of those who may benefit, and without any pull or influence. I believe it is one of the outstanding achievements of this administration that integrity and honesty has been insisted upon at all times. The confidence of the American people in the integrity of their Government has been restored.

Corruption can develop under any administration. But the answer lies in the manner in which the administration in power meets the challenge once the cor-

rupt conditions have been called to their attention.

I should like to make clear in the RECORD that even in spite of the deplorable conditions which developed in the preceding administration, even then the overwhelming majority of the employees under that administration, as under all other administrations, have been honest and have tried to do the best job they could. That applies likewise to the overwhelming majority of employees of the Treasury Department which agency was most severely criticized.

The fact is that there were a few scoundrels in those agencies. As in the case of a rotten apple, one rotten apple in a barrel can ruin all the apples. So it is in Government. A few crooks can break down the morale of the whole tax collection system. The American taxpayers will pay their taxes if they are convinced and know their taxes are being levied and collected on a basis of equality and without any favoritism.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to associate myself with the Senator's remark. I, too, know that the vast majority of the employees of the Internal Revenue Service are honest and patriotic and career public servants. I happen to be a member of the Subcommittee on Investigations which went into these tax matters. From my own experience I can say that by far the vast majority of the career personnel were honest and that those who proved to be corrupt, or to be crooks, were not career employees at all, but were men appointed to their jobs or who got their jobs as a part of the political patronage system and as a part of the idea that public office gives the right to steal, instead of public office being a public trust.

I certainly wish to associate myself with the Senator's statement that the vast majority of the employees are faithful. However, I believe it should be apparent to even those who run and do not stop to read that if the chief tax collector of the Internal Revenue Service himself is convicted of dishonesty in office, it is difficult to get people in the body politic as a group freely to pay their taxes, particularly when there is, as has happened in the past, such little likelihood of the full amount of the tax payments going into the Treasury. Am I not correct in saying that the top tax collector of them all was indicted and found guilty of corruption?

Mr. WILLIAMS. A former Commissioner of Internal Revenue was indicted and convicted. He was the top official. The five top officials in the United States Government in the tax-collecting service are the Commissioner, the Deputy Commissioner, the Chief of Alcohol Tax Division, the Chief Counsel of the Treasury Department, and the Chief of the Tax Division in the Department of Justice. Of that group, three went to the Federal penitentiary and the other two resigned within a few weeks after the exposures started, for reasons of health. You will no doubt recall that there was quite an epidemic of heart failures and resignations during the early days of the exposures.

Mr. MUNDT. Am I to understand the Senator from Delaware to say that 60 percent of the top tax-collecting officials of the Truman administration were found guilty of dishonesty or corruption?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was 60 percent of the five top officials.

Mr. MUNDT. That is what I asked.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do not forget that those five men have more to say about how John Q. Public shall pay his taxes and how the tax laws shall be administered than any 5,000 other men in the service of the United States Government.

Mr. MUNDT. I find myself in the position where there is jumping through my mind a thousand and 57 other good reasons why this country should be grateful for the election of President Eisenhower.

However, if getting rid of that kind of racket, whereby three out of the top five tax-collecting officials of the country were stealing money from Uncle Sam and accepting bribes and using tax-collection money for their own purposes and using money to fatten their own fortunes, were the only reason that would be reason enough for the overwhelming victory I feel President Eisenhower will win at the polls next November.

Certainly, above all, we need honesty in the tax collecting machinery. No one likes to pay taxes. We pay taxes as patriotic citizens in the conviction that they constitute the rent we owe this Government for the right to live in this the greatest country in the world.

However, the rent ought to go to the landlord, whose name is Uncle Sam and who lives in Washington, D. C. We do not want the rent to be placed in the private and hidden safe deposit boxes which we heard so much about in the committee of which I am a member, in our investigation of this situation, and we do not want the rent to go into the safety deposit boxes of the political cronies of the occupant of the White House.

I salute the Senator from Delaware for the fact that he initiated this long and drawnout series of investigations and trials and convictions and imprisonments, which have done so much to clean up the situation. We can be sure that as long as we have men like President Eisenhower in Government it will never again happen.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from South Dakota mentioned the fact that some officials were using their powers to administer the tax laws in such a way as to fatten not only their own personal fortunes but the fortunes of their political party. I call attention to——

Mr. MUNDT. Will the Senator elaborate on that point? It is a startling thing that he is saying. I did not know anything about that. Does the Senator mean to say that the tax collectors were obtaining money from the American taxpayers and using the money in order to elect to office the party that had given them their jobs, so that they could continue to steal additional sums of money from the Government?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In 1948 it was pointed out, and it was admitted, that the Democratic Party was rather disturbed about the question of winning the election. They were desperate for funds in that election. On the eve of that election, for the first time in the history of the United States, and without any change in the law, but as the result of a conference downtown, there were issued five memorable rulings by the Treasury Department, the purpose of which was to allow large contributions to the Democratic Party to be written off as normal business expenses. In effect, they classified gifts to the Democratic Party in the same category as gifts to charitable organizations.

They collected over a half million dollars in that crooked manner. This meant to that extent they were financing the Democratic campaign of 1948 indirectly out of the Federal Treasury.

Never before or since has any political party in power attempted such a bold operation or stooped so low.

Large contributors to the Democratic Party were given special treatment by being permitted to write off their contributions to the Democratic Party, to the extent of about a half million dollars. I repeat, that was an indirect way of financing the Democratic campaign of 1948 out of the Federal Treasury, at the expense of the American taxpayers.

Mr. MUNDT. I know the Senator from Delaware is always meticulous in his facts and painstakingly accurate in what he is saying. What he has just said is so shocking and astounding, however, that I wonder if he is positive of his facts in the charge which he is now making. It is so preposterous that it staggers the imagination.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No one has challenged these facts. The courts have since upheld these charges. I agree with you, it is astounding. These charges were placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 29, 1952, and later it was admitted before the Finance Committee by the top Treasury officials.

It might be well to have the record of this case placed in the RECORD again since these convictions today were part of this whole corrupt conspiracy.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say that if the Senator is sure of his facts, the information should be placed in the RECORD so that those who desire to challenge it may do so. I assume that now that the trial in Missouri is over, President Truman will be returning to this country from his tour of Europe and may wish to take up the cudgels in defense of his late and unlamented administration.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The information was put into the RECORD on April 29, 1952. It goes unchallenged, but it is worthy of repetition.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on that day be reprinted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN J. WILLIAMS IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE, APRIL 29, 1952

Mr. President, several months ago it was called to my attention that through favorable rulings by the Treasury Department

certain large contributors to the Democratic Party were being allowed to deduct their campaign contributions from their income taxes.

According to the information which I received this was being done by the contributors' classifying their donations as loans and taking notes signed by the treasurer of the Democratic Committee.

Then after the election, with the treasury of the political party exhausted by the campaign, the contributors agreed to accept a small token payment as full settlement of their claims. Then they appealed to the Bureau of Internal Revenue for permission to write off the unpaid balance as a loss incurred as a nonbusiness debt.

A loss classified as a nonbusiness debt is deductible from any outside income such as profits on stocks, bonds, real estate, etc.

At the same time they asked the Treasury Department to waive the enforcement of the normal gift tax on amounts in excess of the usual $3,000 exemption.

A check of the records substantiated this rumor, and it has been found that in three particular instances contributions aggregating more than $400,000 have been ruled as not being subject to gift tax, but would be recognized as legitimate tax deductions.

The first ruling found, dated December 30, 1948, and signed by Mr. E. I. McLarney, Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue, gave Mr. Richard J. Reynolds of Winston-Salem, N. C., a favorable decision on contributions (or loans as they were classified) made to the Democratic State Committee of New York.

It is interesting to note that in this instance the favorable ruling was issued less than 48 hours after the application was received in Washington.

It is also interesting to note that certain officials in the Bureau can recollect a conference having been held relative to this decision but so far they have been unable to find any minutes of such conference, nor can anyone remember who participated either in the decision or in the recommendations.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a copy of that ruling of December 30, 1948:

DECEMBER 30, 1948.

Mr. RICHARD J. REYNOLDS,
Winston-Salem, N. C.
(Attention of Mr. Stratton Coyner.)

DEAR MR. REYNOLDS: Reference is made to a letter written in your behalf by Mr. Stratton Coyner, attorney, dated December 28, 1948, in which it is stated that you have received a final settlement offer from the Democratic State Committee of New York of 10 percent of the aggregate face amount of unpaid demand notes issued by the committee, which you now hold for collection.

A ruling is requested as to whether (1) the acceptance of such offer would, for Federal income-tax purposes, constitute a gift, and (2) the loss representing the difference between the aggregate face value of the notes and the amount received in full settlement would be considered as a nonbusiness debt.

The letter states that you now hold the following notes of the Democratic State Committee of New York:

Note dated February 27, 1947, payable on demand, signed by Carl Sherman, treasurer, $75,000.

Note dated February 27, 1947, payable on demand, signed by Carl Sherman, treasurer, $100,000.

Note dated October 14, 1944, payable on demand with interest after demand at rate of 1 percent, signed by Carl Sherman, treasurer, $96,000.

Note of Democratic State Committee of New York dated February 27, 1947, payable on demand to Democratic State Committee of New Jersey, endorsed without recourse by the Democratic State Committee of New Jersey, by (not stated in letter), $39,110.45.

The notes presently held by you are represented to have been issued in consummation of a series of transactions involving advances to the Democratic State Committee of New York. In all transactions it is represented that the advances were in the nature of loans inasmuch as notes were received as evidence of the obligations incurred by the committee. The representations in respect of advances made over a period of years extending back to the year 1940, the notes issued in respect of the obligations, and the payments made on such notes are fully disclosed in the letter of your attorney.

It is stated in the letter that you were assured at the time the loans were negotiated that repayment of the loans, fully covered by demand notes, would be made on an annual basis. Subsequent events, however, precluded the committee from discharging, as contemplated, the several notes issued as evidence of its obligation to repay the advances made by you. It is stated further that demands have been made at various times for the payment of the notes which have resulted only in the receipt of renewal notes.

The possibility of instituting legal action against the committee, it is stated, was of no avail inasmuch as reducing the notes to judgment and throwing the committee into bankruptcy would have accomplished nothing toward the payment of the obligations. Furthermore, it is stated that the Democratic State Committee of New York has no assets of any consequence, and no uncollected enforcible pledges. A certified page from the official report of the Democratic State Committee of New York dated November 2, 1948, showing the outstanding loans payable by that committee has been submitted and, supplementary thereto, it is stated that the Democratic State Committee of New York has only a small bank balance of less than $5,000 and office furniture for four offices and a reception room in the Biltmore Hotel in New York City.

It appears that your demands for payment of the notes finally resulted in the submission of an offer on the part of the Democratic State Committee of New York to pay in full settlement, in cash, 10 percent of the aggregate face amount of the outstanding notes. The offer is contained in a letter addressed to you under date of December 23, 1948, and signed by Mr. Carl Sherman, treasurer, Democratic State Committee of New York.

In view of the representations and data submitted it is concluded that (1) the acceptance of the offer of the treasurer, Democratic State Committee of New York, would not, for Federal income-tax purposes, constitute a gift, and (2) any loss incurred resulting from such acceptance would be considered as a nonbusiness debt within the meaning of section 23 (k) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Very truly yours,

E. I. MCLARNEY,
Deputy Commissioner.

I now ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD 2 other rulings—the second dated May 18, 1949, signed by E. I. McLarney, deputy collector, covering a $50,000 contribution (or loan) given by Mr. Marshall Field to the Democratic State Committee of New York; the third represents a ruling under the same date, signed by Deputy Commissioner McLarney in favor of Mr. David A. Schulte of New York, covering a $50,000 contribution (or loan) which he made to the Democratic State Committee in 1944:

MAY 18, 1949.

Mr. MARSHALL FIELD,
Care of Mr. Howard A. Seitz, 61 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR FIELD: Reference is made to a letter written in your behalf by Mr. Howard Seitz, your attorney, dated April 15, 1949, in which it is stated that you have received an offer from the Democratic State Committee of New York, hereinafter referred to as committee, of 10 percent of the aggregate face amount of a note of the committee in full settlement thereof.

A ruling is requested as to (1) whether the acceptance of such offer would, for Federal income tax purposes, constitute a gift; and (2) whether the loss thus incurred by your acceptance of the offer of settlement would be considered a nonbusiness bad debt loss.

It is stated that in 1940 you were asked to lend to the committee the sum of $50,000. The loan was made and you accepted a promissory note. The matter of payment has been discussed with the committee, and the officers of the committee have informed you that they have insufficient funds to make payment. In December 1948, you were informed by the committee that it would be unable to make payment of the note to you or its other note holding creditors. You have decided to accept the offer of settlement of 10 cents on the dollar.

You have been informed that Mr. Richard J. Reynolds, the principal creditor of the committee, has already accepted a similar offer of the committee, and that Mr. David A. Schulte, another creditor, has consented to do likewise.

Based upon the information submitted it is the opinion of this office that acceptance of the offer of the committee will not, for Federal income tax purposes, constitute a gift, and that the loss resulting from such acceptance will be considered á nonbusiness bad debt within the meaning of section 23 (k) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Very truly yours,

E. I. MCLARNEY,
Deputy Commissioner.

MAY 18, 1949.

Mr. DAVID A. SCHULTE,
Care of Gale, Bernays, Falk & Eisner, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. SCHULTE: Reference is made to a letter written in your behalf by Gale, Bernays, Falk & Eisner dated April 26, 1949, in which it is stated that you have received an offer from the Democratic State Committee of New York, hereinafter referred to as committee, of 10 percent of the face amount of a note of the committee in full settlement thereof. The letter dated April 8, 1949, from Mr. Carl Sherman, treasurer of that committee making such offer was submitted with the letter of April 26, 1949. In the absence of a power of attorney authorizing Gale, Bernays, Falk & Eisner to represent you this letter is being addressed to you.

A ruling is requested as to (1) whether the acceptance of such offer would, for Federal income tax purposes, constitute a gift; and (2) whether the loss incurred by your acceptance of said offer would constitute a nonbusiness bad-debt loss.

It is stated that in 1944 you were asked to lend the committee $50,000; and that you were assured that after the campaign in 1944 the note would be gradually repaid as different finance programs made funds available. The $50,000 was loaned to the committee and you were given a promissory note in that amount. Such note has not been paid, and the committee has informed you that it would be unable to make payment on the note or to its other note-holding creditors, but that it has been promised sufficient money to offer in settlement 10 cents on the dollar to all of its creditors.

The committee has also informed you that its principal creditor, Mr. Richard J. Reynolds, has accepted its offer and received payment, and that Mr. Marshall Field, another noteholder, had also consented to accept the offer.

Based upon the information submitted it is the opinion of this office that acceptance of the offer of the committee will not, for Federal income-tax purposes, constitute a gift, and that the loss resulting from such acceptance will be considered as a nonbusiness bad debt within the meaning of section 23 (k) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Very truly yours,

E. I. McLARNEY,
Deputy Commissioner.

In the absence of information as to the income tax bracket of the three aforementioned taxpayers, it is impossible to state the exact amount of loss to the Federal Treasury as a result of these rulings; however, it should be pointed out that the Treasury's loss was a gain to the Democratic Party.

Contributors of sums such as these unquestionably are from men whose incomes are in the high brackets and the percentage could run as high as 80 percent in the years in which they were allowed.

In another letter dated July 26, 1951, signed by George J. Schoeneman, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and addressed to Mr. William Neale Roach, Assistant Treasurer of the Democratic National Committee in Washington, D. C., the Commissioner allowed as legitimate business deductions, contributions to the various Young Democratic Clubs of America provided such contributions were not made on a political basis but rather made with reasonable expectation of a financial return.

I do not understand just what they mean by this—it was always my understanding that any contribution to either the Young Democratic Club or the Young Republican Club would be political, and in the light of the recent disclosures of widespread political favoritism I am very suspicious of any political contribution made on the basis of a "reasonable expectation of a financial return."

I ask unanimous consent that the letter to Mr. Roach be incorporated in the RECORD a this point.

JULY 26, 1951.

Mr. WILLIAM NEALE ROACH,
Assistant Treasurer, Democratic National Committee, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROACH: Reference is made to your letter of July 12, 1951, transmitting a letter from Mr. Wilson Gilmore, president of the Young Democratic Clubs of America requesting a ruling concerning the deductibility by corporations of contributions to the Young Democratic Clubs of America for their convention.

He has stated that such clubs will hold their national biennial convention at the Jefferson Hotel in St. Louis, Mo., on October 4–6, 1951. In order to defray the large amount of expenses that will be incurred by the convention program, they are seeking contributions. It is stated that it has been their idea to organize a convention corporation under the benevolent corporation laws of Missouri and to obtain a pro forma decree for this nonprofit corporation. Such corporation would be the recipient of all convention funds and would pay all expenses and attend to all other official business of the convention. After the convention such corporation would be dissolved. A ruling is requested as to (1) whether contributions from corporations would be deductible by them for Federal income tax purposes as business expenses if given to the Young Democratic Clubs of America, and in the alternative (2) whether such contributions would be deductible if given to the proposed convention corporation.

On the basis of the information submitted it is held that contributions for the purposes of the convention made to either the Young Democratic Clubs of America or in the alternative to the convention corporation when organized by corporations engaged in a trade or business in the city of St. Louis and its environs would constitute allowable deductions as ordinary and necessary business expenses under the provisions of section 23 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code in the Federal income returns provided that such donations are made with reasonable expectation of a financial return commensurate with the amount of donations.

Very truly yours,

GEO. J. SCHOENEMAN,
Commissioner.

On April 19, 1950, another favorable and similar ruling was made by Commissioner George J. Schoeneman to Mr. Stuyvesant Peabody, Jr., of Chicago, Ill., in reference to contributions to the Chicago Host Committee for National Jefferson Jubilee scheduled to be held in Chicago in May 1950.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a copy of that favorable ruling.

APRIL 19, 1950.

Mr. STUYVESANT PEABODY, Jr.,
Morris Hotel, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. PEABODY: Reference is made to your inquiry as chairman of the Chicago Host Committee for National Jefferson Jubilee to be held in Chicago on May 13, 14, and 15, 1950, with respect to whether contributions made to the committee by corporate and individual taxpayers engaged in business in the city of Chicago would be deductible for Federal income-tax purposes.

You state that the Chicago Host Committee is playing host to thousands of guests who will participate in extensive panel discussions pertaining to the issues of the day. It is also intended to pay tribute to Thomas Jefferson through parades and pageants depicting his contributions to the welfare of our country. It is expected that the thousands of guests and visitors spending 3 days in the city of Chicago will bring new money into the community and will benefit the business of the community.

The contributions from local tradesmen are solely intended to defray the expenses to be incurred in playing host and running the above-mentioned functions. It is understood that the contributions referred to in your letter will not be used to defray the expenses of the political aspects of the event.

On the basis of the information submitted, it is held that contributions made to the Chicago Host Committee for National Jefferson Jubilee by corporate and individual taxpayers engaged in a trade or business in the city of Chicago would constitute allowable deductions as ordinary and necessary business expenses under the provisions of section 23 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, in their Federal income-tax returns, provided that such donations are made with a reasonable expectation of a financial return commensurate with the amount of the donations.

Very truly yours,

GEO. J. SCHOENEMAN,
Commissioner.

Four months later, Mr. Schoeneman, on September 12, 1950, wrote John J. Dickerson, chairman of the New Jersey Republican State committee, that "it is well established that political contributions are not deductible."

Mr. Dickerson had written to the Revenue Bureau, asking if purchasers of tickets to a dinner at Atlantic City, N. J., could deduct the cost from their income tax returns. Mr. Schoeneman pointed out to Mr. Dickerson the same ruling he had made in the Chicago case regarding contributions but added:

"If tickets are purchased to support the political aspects of the occasion in question (as distinguished from the business aspects attendant on obtaining new money and customers from the event) a deduction is not allowable.

"Since the occasion for which the tickets are to be purchased is apparently a political one, it cannot be assumed that the purchase of such tickets by a business concern will give rise to a deduction."

I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of that ruling incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

SEPTEMBER 22, 1950.

Hon. JOHN E. MANNING,
Collector of Internal Revenue, Post Office and Courthouse, Newark, N. J.

MY DEAR MR. MANNING: Reference is made to your letter dated September 12, 1950, in which you request advice with respect to a letter from Mr. John J. Dickerson, chairman of the New Jersey Republican State Committee.

In his letter Mr. Dickerson states that the New Jersey Republican State committee is sponsoring a dinner in Atlantic City on September 30, 1950, and that a question has arisen as to whether or not the purchase of tickets would constitute a deduction for Federal income tax purposes. Mr. Dickerson further states that it is his "understanding of the State law that if the taxpayer can clearly show that the purchase of the ticket was in the ordinary course of business and if his business was benefited thereby, he is entitled to deduct the cost of the ticket as a business expense."

It appears that the view expressed by Mr. Dickerson is based upon his belief that the purchase of the tickets in question may be deducted under section 23 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code as an ordinary and necessary business expense. The application of this provision of the law, however, depends upon the existence of facts which have not been given by Mr. Dickerson, such as the purpose in the purchase of such tickets and the use to which the money so expended will be put. It is well established that political contributions are not deductible. See section 29.23 (q)–1 of Regulations 111; *Textile Mills Securities Corporation* v. *Commissioner*, (1941) 314 U. S. 326, C. B. 1941–42, 201; I. T. 3276, C. B. 1939–1 (part I), 108. On the other hand, contributions made by local tradesmen to business or civic organizations for the purpose of attracting and playing host to conventions or similar gatherings which will draw sizable numbers of guests and visitors to the community, may be deducted provided that such contributions are made with a reasonable expectation of a financial return commensurate with the amount contributed. See section 29.23 (a)–13 of Regulations 111, and I. T. 3706, 1945, C. B. 87. Accordingly, if the tickets are purchased to support the political aspects of the occasion in question (as distinguished from the business aspects attendant on obtaining new money and customers from the event, regardless of its nature), a deduction is not allowable.

Since the occasion for which the tickets are to be purchased is apparently a political one, it cannot be assumed that the purchase of such tickets by a business concern will give rise to a deduction.

Mr. Dickerson also asked to be advised whether or not a corporation is permitted to purchase tickets. Since this question concerns matters not necessarily in the jurisdiction of the Bureau and detailed information is not furnished, it does not appear to be appropriate for comment by the Bureau.

Very truly yours,

GEO. J. SCHOENEMAN,
Commissioner.

There was one minor ruling, however, in which I found that the Republican contributors did get an equal break with the Democrats.

On April 24, 1951, a Citizens Committee of Chicago, Ill., requested an opinion from the Bureau of Internal Revenue concerning the deductibility by corporations of contributions made to that committee which was being set up for the purpose of bringing

the Republican and Democratic National Conventions of 1952 to Chicago.

These donations were ruled legitimate business deductions provided that they were made with reasonable expectation of a financial return commensurate with the amount of the donations.

It is my understanding that this is the customary ruling which is given to any citizens group under such circumstances.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a copy of that ruling.

"APRIL 24, 1951.

"Mr. BARNET HODES,
Secretary of Citizens Committee to Bring the Republican and Democratic National Conventions to Chicago, 1952,
Care of Arvey, Hodes & Mantynband, 1 La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

"DEAR MR. HODES: Reference is made to your letter of April 11, 1951 requesting an opinion from the Bureau of Internal Revenue concerning the deductibility by corporations of contributions to the Citizen's Committee to Bring the Republican and Democratic National Conventions to Chicago—1952.

"You have stated that the Citizen's Committee is a nonpartisan committee which will play host to thousands of guests who will come to Chicago if the conventions are held there. New money will be brought into the community which will benefit business of the community. In the sample letter to be sent out to prospective contributors, it is stated that the tentative plan is to obtain, as soon as possible, the necessary subscriptions, one-half to be paid not later than December 1, 1951 and the remaining half not later than March 1, 1952. If only one convention is obtained then half of the subscription is to be canceled, and if neither convention is obtained then the entire subscription is to be canceled.

"On the basis of the information submitted it is held that contributions made to the Citizen's Committee to Bring the Republican and Democratic National Conventions to Chicago 1952 by corporate and individual taxpayers engaged in a trade or business in the city of Chicago and its environs would constitute allowable deductions as ordinary and necessary business expenses under the provisions of section 23 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code in their Federal income tax returns, provided that such donations are made with reasonable expectation of a financial return commensurate with the amount of the donations."

Mr. President, a summary of these decisions shows that the Democratic Party has through these favorable rulings been financing a part of their political campaign indirectly out of the Federal Treasury.

I am opposed to either political party financing its campaign either directly or indirectly out of the Federal Treasury; however, if the Treasury Department is going to allow large contributions to the Democratic Party to be classified as loans and thereby become legitimate income tax deductions, then I shall insist that the same consideration be given to the contributors of the Republican Party.

Likewise, if large contributors are to be given this special consideration, then every small contributor is entitled to equal consideration.

Unless this ruling is publicly reversed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, all contributors to the Republican Party and all contributors to the Democratic Party who have not been recipients of this favorable treatment, should make their 1952 campaign contributions in the form of loans and after November 1952, call for the payment of such loans, take what they can get, and deduct the rest from their income taxes.

On the other hand, if the present Commissioner reverses these obviously questionable rulings, as I think he should, then the Commissioner should collect the taxes from the contributors mentioned here today.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I will mention another example to illustrate the low state of morals which developed under the preceding administration. There was a gentleman in New York who had a large tax case which he was having difficulty in settling. He approached the then chief counsel of the Democratic National Committee, Mr. Welburn Mayock, and offered him $65,000 if he could get a favorable ruling from the Treasury Department. The record is very clear on this. Mr. Mayock approached officials of the Treasury Department on the basis that it was a political matter, and one upon which the Democratic Party could receive some funds. They promptly obtained a favorable ruling. As a result of that ruling Mr. Mayock received $65,000, putting $35,000 in his own pocket and turning over to the Democratic National Committee $30,000. But, recognizing that the law provided that no one could give over $5,000, under the Hatch Act, he used the names of 7 individuals who had nothing to do with the contributions. The contributions were registered in the names of those individuals but each admitted they put up no money.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this statement, which was called to the attention of the Senate on February 8, 1955, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN J. WILLIAMS

Mr. President, on August 4, 1953, Mr. Welburn Mayock, an attorney in Washington, D. C., was testifying before the Kean subcommittee. At that time the Kean committee was investigating the scandal-ridden Bureau of Internal Revenue.

In his testimony of that date Mr. Mayock explained how in 1948, while serving as the chief counsel of the Democratic National Committee, he had entered into an agreement with Mr. William S. Lasdon, Katonah, N. Y., whereby he was to obtain for Mr. Lasdon a favorable ruling from the Treasury Department on his then pending tax case.

In return for obtaining this favorable ruling, which would save nearly $7 million for Mr. Lasdon, Mr. Mayock was to receive a $65,000 cash fee with the understanding that $30,000 of this amount was to go to the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. Mayock without any power of attorney to represent this taxpayer but solely in his capacity as chief counsel of the Democratic National Committee then contacted Mr. John W. Snyder, the Secretary of the Treasury, and promptly obtained the favorable ruling on Mr. Lasdon's tax question.

Mr. Lasdon previously had been denied a favorable decision upon this same question by the Treasury Department.

After this tax-fix scheme had been arranged and after Mr. Mayock had collected his $65,000 fee, he was confronted with the problem of how to get the $30,000 into the Democratic campaign fund without obviously violating the Hatch Act. (The Hatch Act prohibits contributions to a political campaign in excess of $5,000 by any one individual.)

However, once having agreed to fix a tax case for $65,000 the question of violating the Hatch Act apparently was not bothersome to Mr. Mayock and his associates.

Accordingly, as Mr. Mayock explained it, he merely arranged to have some of his friends write their personal checks payable to the Democratic National Committee in exchange for an equivalent amount of cash. In this manner he siphoned the $30,000 of "hot money" into the treasury of the Democratic National Committee.

While freely admitting all of the above transactions during his testimony before the Kean subcommittee under date of August 4, 1953, Mr. Mayock flatly refused to tell that committee the names of the individuals who cooperated in this underhanded method of financing a political campaign. Each time the committee pressed him for the names of these individuals Mr. Mayock replied, "That I am going to refuse to answer."

Since Mr. Mayock was reluctant to publish the names of the individuals who exchanged their personal checks payable to the national committee for an equivalent amount of this "tax-fix fee," I shall read that list to the Senate along with a breakdown of the amount handled by each individual plus the dates of the transactions:

Oct. 13, 1948: Democratic county central committee, William H. Malone, chairman, 955 Mills Tower, San Francisco	$10,000
Oct. 14, 1948: Harold A. Berliner, 10 Crown Terrace, San Francisco	5,000
Oct. 14, 1948: William J. Mahaney, 2412 Russ Bldg., San Francisco	5,000
Oct. 18, 1948: Roy G. Owens, 1204 South Hill St., Los Angeles	2,500
Oct. 18, 1948: Willis Allen, 634 North Cherokee Ave., Los Angeles	2,500
Oct. 18, 1948: William B. Peeler, 7133 Sunset Blvd., Hollywood	2,500
Oct. 18, 1948: Lawrence W. Allen, 2104 North Highland Ave., Hollywood	2,500
Total	30,000

This was not the only time that the Treasury Department, under the New Deal administration resorted to the issuance of questionable rulings for the purpose of financing the 1948 political campaign.

On April 29, 1952, I incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies of a series of political rulings which had been issued by the Treasury Department while Mr. John W. Snyder was Secretary of the Treasury, wherein Mr. Richard J. Reynolds, Winston-Salem, N. C., Mr. Marshall Field, and Mr. David A. Schulte, both of New York City, were permitted to charge off as bad business debts their approximately $400,000 contributions to the 1948 Democratic campaign.

Since incorporating those rulings in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I have discovered that this same Mr. Welburn Mayock was one of the prime factors behind those rulings.

On December 27, 1948, Mr. Mayock, without any power of attorney to represent Mr. Reynolds or the others involved but solely in his official capacity as chief counsel of the Democratic National Committee, held a conference with Mr. Edward H. Foley, Under Secretary of the Treasury, and Mr. Thomas J. Lynch, General Counsel of the Treasury Department. At that meeting they discussed the Richard W. Reynolds case, which involved a $300,000 contribution to the Democratic Party, as a party case and arranged for the issuance of a favorable ruling allowing him to write off this contribution as a bad business loan.

As further evidence of the callousness of the political regime then in power we find that the Treasury Department even permitted Mr. Mayock to get away with reporting on his 1948 Federal income tax returns only $17,500 of this $65,000 fee collected from Mr. Lasdon. Before computing his taxes he was permitted to deduct from the fee the $30,000 which he set aside for the Demo-

cratic National Committee. He deducted from the gross fee another $17,500 solely upon his claim that he paid $8,750 each to Mr. William Solomon, 275 Central Park West, New York City, and Mr. Louis Markus, 9445 86th Road, Woodhaven, Long Island, as their share of the tax-fix payoff.

This latter deduction was allowed notwithstanding the fact that when both Mr. Markus and Mr. Solomon testified under oath (August 5, 1953) before the Kean subcommittee, they emphatically denied that they had received any of this fee, and accordingly they had paid no taxes on their alleged share.

But the mere fact that no one was paying any tax on this $17,500 in controversy did not in the least bother the Treasury Department. They merely placed it in the same category as the $30,000 contribution to the Democratic National Committee and allowed everybody to write it off their tax returns.

This procedure of issuing favorable Treasury rulings in exchange for contributions to a political party was extremely costly to the American taxpayers from two angles:

First, the granting of these favorable rulings which apparently would not otherwise have been extended resulted in a substantial loss in revenue.

Second, the issuance of these rulings had the indirect effect of financing a part of the 1948 Democratic campaign out of the Federal Treasury.

The disclosure of these transactions was a shock to the American people and the overwhelming majority of the members of the Democratic Party were just as indignant as were the members of the Republican Party to find that certain high officials in that administration had stooped to such low tactics for the purpose of financing a political campaign.

Even after publishing the additional list of names of those involved in this deal there are still many questions left unanswered in this case, and I suggest that both the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department reexamine the conflicting testimony given before the Kean subcommittee in August 1953.

For instance, the conflict of testimony wherein Mr. Mayock under oath told the committee that he paid $8,750 each to Mr. William Solomon and Mr. Louis Marcus and their testimony of the following day emphatically denying this statement obviously is the basis of a perjury charge.

The statute of limitations may have expired on violations of the Corrupt Practices Act in 1948, but it has not expired on any possible perjury charges resulting from testimony given before the Kean subcommittee in 1953, nor has it expired upon the ability of the Treasury Department to collect back taxes due on the erroneous deduction of the $30,000 fee to the Democratic National Committee as well as the controversial $17,500 referred to above.

Grand juries are now in session at both Omaha and St. Louis, and their work should shed additional light upon the scandal-ridden Tax Bureau of that era.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, that report gives the history of the case, along with the manner in which the money was ultimately siphoned into the Democratic National Committee. In other words, the chief counsel of the Democratic committee thought he had the right to fix a tax case and get a favorable ruling for a taxpayer in return for $65,000, of which he would keep $35,000 and turn over the balance of the "hot money" to his political party.

The American people can be thankful that that corrupt gang has been thrown out, and that we now have an administration in Washington under the leadership of President Eisenhower who will condone no such crooked work.

I think the Department of Justice also should be commended for the job they have done in St. Louis.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am sure that a number of my good Republican friends in South Dakota will not be happy to learn that their tax money was, in turn, turned over to the Democratic National Committee to help elect a candidate to whom they were opposed. I imagine that there are quite a few good Democrats south of the Mason-Dixon line also who are not too happy to learn about it. That is really taxation without representation.

I am glad the Senator from Delaware has placed the information in the RECORD, and I think time should be made available for any Democratic Senator who desires to reply. Mr. Truman will undoubtedly read this RECORD, and he may wish to comment on it himself. We want fair play. We want those who are accused to answer the accusations—if they can—and, Mr. President, we would like their answers to be as carefully documented as Senator WILLIAMS' charges.

The Senator from Delaware mentioned a book a little earlier in his remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The book is entitled "Truman Scandals." I simply put into the RECORD a summary of that book.

Mr. MUNDT. Does the writer of it have all these facts in his book?

Mr. WILLIAMS. He has many of them. No one book can hold them all. To paraphrase the recent quotations of a great world leader it could be said that "Never in such a short time have so many been found to have been so crooked."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to inquire how much time the Senator from Delaware will occupy, because I wish to have action on a bill. I thought the Senator was about through, and I wondered how much longer the Senator will require.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think we shall take very much longer. I have to stop somewhere. Of course, I could talk all night on this question of scandals of the previous administration, but I certainly shall not do that. I shall finish in a few moments.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has been talking about things that happened as far back as 20 years ago. I wondered if he would continue indefinitely on matters which were long ago disposed of, anywhere from 2 to 10 years ago.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No doubt there are many who wish these events took place 40 years ago but I remind the Senator that only today two of the highest officials in the Truman administration were convicted in the St. Louis courts.

Let no man attempt to brush off lightly the scandalous condition found to exist in our Government only a few short years ago.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. There was a case disposed of only yesterday or today. That is not really very long ago. We will have to discuss them as they are disposed of, I presume.

Could the Senator supply us with the name of the publisher of the book to which he has referred?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That information is in the report which I placed in the RECORD earlier today.

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly, if it is in this book "The Truman Scandals," and not said on the Senate floor, those accused have access to the courts to sue for libel or slander. Certainly anyone who is not guilty of that of which he is charged has recourse to the courts.

I recommend that they use the courts for that purpose, although my own experience would not be too encouraging, because I remember conducting a hearing with reference to a man named Alger Hiss, who was accused of being a Communist. He said, "If any man makes that statement without immunity I will sue him in court." Members of the press asked Mr. Chambers if Alger Hiss was a Communist, and he said he was. Mr. Hiss did not get around to suing Mr. Chambers that day, or even the next month. He was repeatedly asked, "Why do you not sue this fellow who has said you are a Communist?" So he was forced to sue, but in the suit it was disclosed that there was documentary evidence proving Hiss to be a Communist agent, and he went to the Federal penitentiary, where he belonged.

So, if there are accusations in this book it would be a friendly suggestion to make to those accused that they sue in court—provided only if the accusations are false.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say to the Senator from South Dakota that the cases placed in the RECORD again today have been presented to the courts, there have been indictments and convictions. The courts have upheld the position which I took at that time. In conclusion I repeat again that the damaging indictment against the Truman administration is not that these scandals developed during those years but that even after it was called to their attention by Congress they refused to act.

The successful exposure of the crooked officials was accomplished in spite of and not as a result of any cooperation received from the administration then in power.

REINVESTMENT BY AIR CARRIERS OF THE PROCEEDS FROM THE SALE OF PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 2039, S. 3449, relating to the reinvestment by air carriers of the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of certain operating property and equipment be temporarily laid aside. I may state in that connection that it is the hope of the acting majority leader that this bill may be called up on Monday.

It is very obvious that it would be impossible to reach a sufficient number of Senators at this late hour in the afternoon in order to dispose of the bill. A very important conference is in progress

on the highway bill, requiring the attendance of a large number of Senators. Likewise, practically the entire membership of the Committee on Foreign Relations is occupied in a hearing.

It is hoped that S. 3449 may be called up sometime on Monday; but at this time I ask unanimous consent that it be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REGULATION OF EXPORTS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar 2170, H. R. 9052.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9052) to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments: on page 1, line 8, after the numeral "2", to strike out "The Secretary of Commerce" and insert "The Bureau of Mines", and on page 2, line 3, after the numerals "1957", to strike out "Such survey shall be made by full time employees of the Department of Commerce without limiting, however, the Department of Commerce from calling upon other departments of the Government to make available to the Department of Commerce such information as is available to them," and, in lieu thereof, to insert "The Bureau of Mines is authorized to make use of such assistance in making this survey as the Director of that Bureau deems desirable: *Provided, however*, That the survey shall be made under the authority and direction of the Bureau of Mines."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the bill (H. R. 9052) would extend the Export Control Act of 1949 for a period of 2 years.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in explanation of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

The Export Control Act of 1949 which we are considering today authorizes the President to reduce or prohibit exports of any articles, materials or supplies, including technical data. These controls may, under the act, be exercised to the extent necessary (a) to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand; (b) to further the foreign policy of the United States and to aid in fulfilling its international responsibilities; and (c) to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of their significance to the national security.

The President has delegated this authority to the Secretary of Commerce, subject to the statutory requirement that no short supply controls may be exercised over any agricultural commodity if the Secretary of Agriculture has determined that the supply of the commodity is in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy.

Extension of the act is recommended by the administration, and I believe there can be no question that the world situation requires this extension. The House has already passed H. R. 9052, which is before the Senate with a favorable recommendation from the Banking and Currency Committee.

I do not believe it is necessary to go into the details of the activities of the Department of Commerce and other agencies administering this act. They have been set forth in detail in the quarterly reports which have been filed by the Secretary of Commerce with the Congress. In general, it may be noted that the powers are used to embargo all shipments from the United States to Communist China and North Korea; that rigorous security controls are exercised over shipments to the European Soviet bloc; and that care is exercised to prevent transshipments and diversions to the Soviet bloc of strategic materials exported to friendly foreign nations. The committee was impressed with the efforts made by the Department of Commerce and other agencies administering the act to carry out the security requirements of the act, and urges that these efforts be maintained and intensified. The job is a difficult one, and I believe the Appropriations Committee should view with a friendly eye any requests for additional staff for enforcement purposes.

The short supply controls exercised under the act are much more limited at the present time. Only 8 commodity groups are under short supply controls, and most of the items involved are of considerable strategic importance.

During the course of the hearings, it became evident that a serious problem existed in the fields of iron and steel scrap over which a limited degree of control is now being exercised by the Commerce Department. The committee went into this question at considerable length and heard from the representatives of the Department of Commerce and also representatives of the scrap-consuming industries—the steel industry, and particularly, the foundries—and also from representatives of the scrap industry.

The basic facts are clear. The conclusions, however, to be drawn from these facts are not so clear.

During 1955 a record production of steel ingots was achieved by the steel industry—100,174,434 gross or long tons, and a record consumption of scrap was required to achieve this production—72,654,925 gross or long tons. Generally speaking, the scrap required was supplied, though there was indication that occasional instances occurred where scrap supplies were extremely low. Scrap exports also attained a record height—4,537,372 gross or long tons (including exports to Canada). This figure is also stated as 4,955,000 short tons. This figure is far in excess of the shipments of scrap in recent years and is even larger than the highest figure reached in the thirties. Exports during the first 4 months of 1956 are running slightly over the rate of the same months in 1955.

The price of scrap has also increased sharply—in fact, has almost doubled since the low point reached in 1954. The price of scrap fluctuates rapidly. In April of 1956, the composite price of No. 1 heavy melting scrap at Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Chicago reached a high of $55.50. The price has, however, declined since that date to $44.83 on June 12, 1956, according to Iron Age figures.

The Department of Commerce, recognizing the problem, has kept scrap exports under very close scrutiny. It has also imposed controls in the sense of limiting exports to scrap available to the exporter within 90 days, on a cargo-by-cargo basis, in order to prevent speculation in export licenses, and does not grant a second license to an exporter until the scrap previously licensed has already been exported. The Commerce Department has not, however, imposed any quantitative limits on exports of scrap. It should be noted also that there has been no suggestion that any of the scrap exported was going behind the Iron Curtain.

The high prices of scrap and the great demand for it have had a particular impact on semi-integrated steel mills and foundries which have no captive source of pig iron and are largely dependent on purchased scrap.

The committee was concerned about these scrap exports for two reasons. First, because excessive exports of scrap might reduce the supply of scrap in this country to a point where the steel industry might be prevented from supplying the needs of national defense in an emergency, and second, because shortages of scrap and undue increases in the price of scrap might create severe hardships on firms dependent on scrap and might have an inflationary effect.

The committee, however, on the basis of the information made available to it, was not satisfied that either of these situations had reached a point where exports of scrap must be reduced.

The committee noted that the information and statistics available on certain aspects of the scrap business were less than complete. Accordingly, it agreed that it was desirable and necessary to have a survey made of the scrap business. The bill, as reported contains this requirement.

The proposal to make a survey has raised a number of questions which were considered by the committee. The survey required by the House bill was to be made by the Secretary of Commerce, subject to the requirement that the survey must be made by full-time employees of the Commerce Department. This requirement would have prevented the use of private research organizations, without compensation employees, or employees of other Government agencies in making the survey. The committee was advised by the Secretary of Commerce that this requirement of using full-time employees was undesirable, that a more effective survey could be made at less expense if private research organizations were to be used.

The committee took this recommendation into account and also took into consideration the fact that the Bureau of Mines has for some time been collecting certain information on scrap from scrap consumers. On this basis the committee amended the provision so as to have the survey made by the Bureau of Mines, without limitation on the method of making the survey.

I should call to the attention of the Senate the fact that I have now received a letter from the Secretary of Commerce dated June 11, 1956, opposing the requirement that the survey should be made by the Bureau of Mines. His arguments may be summarized as follows: The generation, collection, and use of ferrous scrap is part of the industrial operations for which Commerce is responsible, both as a general proposition and under the delegations of authority under the Defense Production Act. The Bureau of Mines' activities relating to consumers of scrap do not cover the generators of scrap which the survey is designed to study. The Department of Commerce has already undertaken studies in the field of home scrap and prompt industrial scrap and is working up plans to accomplish the third study—relating to obsolete scrap. The Commerce Department, before this requirement was in-

serted in the House bill, had started proceedings to obtain an appropriation to pay for the survey, and hearings have been held before the Commerce Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

While I consider it appropriate, as chairman of the committee, to call this letter from Secretary Weeks to the attention of the Senate in order that the Senate may have full information on this matter, I do not feel that the arguments made by Secretary Weeks are conclusive. If a survey is to have real value, it must be completely reliable and objective. Otherwise, any money spent on it is wasted or worse than wasted. The Business and Defense Services Administration in the Department of Commerce, which would ordinarily be responsible for the survey, is manned largely, in the top positions, by employees of the steel companies which are the principal scrap consumers. These are the firms which have been arguing vigorously for limitations on exports of scrap. I do not question the right or privilege of these firms to argue for limitations on exports of scrap. However, it does not seem to me appropriate to place these steel company representatives in charge of the survey of ferrous scrap, with power to say what the scope of the survey shall be, with power to influence the way in which it is carried out, and with power to influence the conclusions to be drawn from the survey. In my judgment, a more objective survey would be conducted by the Bureau of Mines.

In conclusion, I urge that the Senate approve the extension of the Export Control Act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement in explanation of the attitude of the committee toward an amendment submitted by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT CONCERNING AMENDMENT SUBMITTED BY SENATOR MCCLELLAN

The committee considered Senator MCCLELLAN's amendment and decided that the subject was of such a broad scope and involved such an important constitutional principle that it would be inappropriate to include the provision as an amendment to the Export Control Act. The committee, of course, wanted to make it clear that the omission of the amendment from the bill, as reported, was not intended as any indication whatever of the committee's view on the subject of the amendment. The committee did not want the omission of the provision to be interpreted as an indication of disagreement with the proposal, or as indicating its conclusion that the Commerce Department letter opposing the amendment is correct.

On the contrary, the committee's omission of the provision from the bill, as reported, should be considered only as an indication that the committee feels the subject should be explored more fully in the appropriate committee.

It is my understanding that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Judiciary Committee is conducting a study on this subject. I believe this is a more appropriate group to consider this proposal than is the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have received three letters, two from the Secretary of Commerce and one from the Secretary of the Interior, commenting upon a provision of the bill requiring the Bureau of Mines to make a survey of the situation with regard to scrap iron. I ask unanimous consent that the letters may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, May 29, 1956.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We understand that your committee is currently considering H. R. 9052 as passed by the House on May 21, 1956. Section 2 of the bill provides as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby directed to immediately make a complete survey of the iron and steel scrap available and potentially available and to file with the Congress an interim report within 3 months and a final report not later than January 31, 1957. Such survey shall be made by full-time employees of the Department of Commerce without limiting, however, the Department of Commerce from calling upon other departments of the Government to make available to the Department of Commerce such information as is available to them."

We believe that it is unnecessary to enact into law a direction that the Secretary of Commerce make the desired survey of iron and steel scrap availability. We are fully aware of the recommendation of the House Committee on Banking and Currency in House Report No. 1998 and are in full agreement as to the desirability of such a survey. Officials of this Department have testified in support of a request for a supplemental appropriation of $75,000 for this purpose which is currently being considered by an appropriations subcommittee of the House of Representatives. In addition, we feel that we have ample authority without need for additional legislation.

As a matter of fact, the Department of Commerce is already engaged in preparing studies on three broad aspects of iron and steel scrap availability. Two of these aspects, that is, those relating to home scrap and prompt industrial scrap, would be carried out directly by the Department of Commerce since, in essence, they involve collecting and compiling data from those industries which generate those types of scrap and with whom we are in regular contact.

A study of the third broad aspect, namely, that of obsolete scrap, presents problems of much greater complexity since the generation of scrap of this type is diffused through many areas of our economy and indeed the public generally. We have discussed these problems at length with technical personnel representing both the scrap-consuming and scrap-collecting industries and have generally received assurances of cooperation in a survey of obsolete scrap by a private qualified industrial research organization selected by the Department. We are convinced that from the standpoint of the Government it would be highly preferable to have such a study made by a private organization. The language of section 2, quoted above, would not permit this to be done, and we think that in any event the bill should be amended in this respect.

To perform a complex study of the availability of obsolete scrap requires highly specialized research skills and experience which are not to be found within the ranks of persons presently within the Department of Commerce. To assemble the requisite group of specially qualified persons as Government employees would be prohibitive both in terms of cost and time. The importance of the time factor was emphasized in the debates in the House of Representatives and is expressed in the time limits set out in section 2 as it now stands. Recruitment would be rendered difficult by the temporary character of the work.

On the other hand, private research organizations, and it is believed that there are a number of such firms qualified to do this study, have readily available to them permanent staffs of specialists in the fields of metallurgy, engineering, and economic and marketing research. These individuals are already generally familiar with the technical and economic problems involved in an analysis of obsolete scrap supply. Such organizations therefore would require a minimum of outside help, and would be prepared to undertake such a study with a minimum of delay. They would offer reasonable assurance of completion within the time allowed.

Were the Department of Commerce forced to perform this phase of the survey it seems quite clear that the cost would substantially exceed the charge made by a private organization, and in addition there appears no possibility that it could meet the deadlines imposed in section 2 as it now stands.

I hope that the foregoing serves to make clear the position of this Department in this matter and will be of assistance to the committee in its deliberations.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, June 11, 1956.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We note that section 2 of H. R. 9052 (to amend the Export Control Act of 1949, etc.) as reported out by your committee (Rept. No. 2147) provides that the Bureau of Mines shall make a complete survey of the iron and steel scrap available and potentially available and report thereon to Congress. H. R. 9052 as passed by the House of Representatives would provide that this survey is to be made by the Department of Commerce.

We are of the opinion that this shift of responsibility from the Department of Commerce to the Bureau of Mines is not in the interest of efficiency nor consonant with the respective areas of responsibility of the two agencies concerned. Our reasons are as follows:

(1) The generation, collection, and utilization of ferrous scrap is essentially a part of the industrial operations which fall within the basic responsibility of the Department of Commerce. Scrap is a secondary material. It is not a raw material in the same sense as metal ores which are mined and processed, which operations do properly fall within the assigned area of the Bureau of Mines. The Department of Commerce has long been concerned with ferrous scrap under the Defense Production Act. It has also had full responsibility for ferrous scrap under the Export Control Act.

(2) Within the executive branch of Government the defense production and mobilization responsibilities with respect to ferrous scrap have been assigned to the Department of Commerce by the President and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

(a) Executive Order 10480, as amended (18 F. R. 4939), particularly section 201. (Delegation of functions under the Defense Production Act, as amended.)

(b) Executive Order 9630 (10 F. R. 12245); Executive Order 9919 (13 F. R. 59); (sec. 11 of Export Control Act; 50 U. S. C. App. 2031). (Delegation of export control functions.)

(c) Defense mobilization order I–7 (18 F. R. 6736). (Delegation of functions under the Defense Production Act, as amended.)

(d) Defense mobilization order I–8 (19 F. R. 875). (Assignment of defense mobilization responsibilities to the Department of Commerce.)

(e) Defense mobilization order VII–5, as amended (18 F. R. 6408; 19 F. R. 7349). (Designation of supply and requirements agencies.)

(3) The Bureau of Mines activities in this area relate only to the collection of data on consumption of scrap by users and inventories in the hands of such users. They do not go to the generators of scrap, and it is information in this area which lies at the heart of the proposed survey. Scrap is generated in large part by industrial activities which lie within the assigned responsibility of the Department of Commerce.

(4) It is illogical, particularly as a matter of administration, to provide that an agency without direct responsibility in a particular area shall nevertheless perform a survey the results of which are to be acted upon by another agency bearing responsibility in that area.

(5) The Department of Commerce is already in process of preparing studies on all aspects of the ferrous scrap situation. Two of these studies, those relating to home scrap and prompt industrial scrap, are underway. The Department is working up plans for accomplishing the third and remaining study, namely, that of obsolete scrap. It is in regular contact with both the scrap-consuming segments of industry and the scrap collectors and dealers. It has discussed the proposed scrap survey at length with these elements of industry, has their general concurrence and has had expression of their views as to the type of survey required as well as assurances of cooperation on their part.

(6) The Department had, prior to the passage of the bill by the House, submitted to the Bureau of the Budget a request for a supplemental appropriation for the purpose of having the Department undertake a survey and study of obsolete scrap resources. This request was approved by the Bureau of the Budget, transmitted to the Congress, and hearings have been held on the request before the Commerce Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. As of this date the subcommittee has not reported.

Accordingly, we strongly urge that appropriate action be taken to substitute the "Secretary of Commerce" for the "Bureau of Mines" in section 2 of H. R. 9052 as reported out by your committee.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., June 14, 1956.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: This refers to the action taken on H. R. 9052 (to extend the Export Control Act) by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency (Rept. No. 2147). The bill as passed by the House of Representatives would have required the Secretary of Commerce to make a complete survey of the iron and steel scrap available and potentially available. Your committee amended the bill to transfer this responsibility to the Bureau of Mines. We understand that this is to be a single survey rather than a continuing statistical study.

It is my view that this particular single survey should be made by the Department of Commerce rather than the Bureau of Mines. I have been informed that that Department has already initiated studies of the home scrap and prompt and industrial scrap phases of the iron and steel scrap problem and that it is making preparation for a study of so-called obsolescent scrap. In view of the time and effort which have already been put into these studies, I believe it would be desirable that responsibility for this survey be assigned to the Department of Commerce.

In expressing this view, I am mindful of the statistical data relating to iron and steel scrap consumption and inventory which the Bureau of Mines compiles, and has been collecting since before World War II, as an integral part of its authorized responsibilities of compiling and disseminating pertinent information affecting the minerals-producing industries and for guiding its technical research program. It is our understanding that the authorization of the particular single survey provided for in section 2 of the bill is not intended to supplant or duplicate this continuing program of the Bureau of Mines.

Sincerely yours,

FELIX E. WORMSER,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I conferred a few moments ago with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] with regard to the bill. He informed me that he has no objection to the passage of the bill, but that he had to be away from the floor at this moment.

I do not believe there is any objection at all to the bill. It is a routine bill, similar to bills which have been under consideration before, extending the Export Control Act for 2 years.

The only provision in the bill which occasioned any serious discussion was the provision relating to the survey of the scrap iron situation. The question was not as to whether there should be such a survey, but as to who should make the survey. The committee decided that the survey should be made by the Bureau of Mines, because it was felt that if it were made by the Bureau of Mines confidence in the result of the survey would be assumed. The Bureau of Mines, we believe, is an agency which will conduct an impartial survey. So I do not believe there is any controversy with regard to the extension of the law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF PORTION OF FORMER PRISONER-OF-WAR CAMP TO THE STATE OF WYOMING

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2217, H. R. 8404. I particularly invite the attention of the senior Senator from Wyoming to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8404) for the conveyance of a portion of the former prisoner-of-war camp, near Douglas, Converse County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nevada?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to transfer to the State of Wyoming 39 acres of land formerly held as a prisoner-of-war camp at Douglas, Wyo. The land will be used, according to the bill, for the activities of the Wyoming National Guard.

The bill was reported unanimously by the committee. The Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of Defense, and the General Services Administration have submitted reports approving transfer of the property to the State of Wyoming for the benefit of the National Guard.

The usual reservations are contained in the bill.

An identical bill was introduced by myself and my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], in the early part of the year.

The pending bill was passed unanimously by the House. So far as I know, there is no objection whatsoever to the bill from any source.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOSS OR DAMAGE TO MILITARY MATERIAL IN TRANSIT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2113, H. R. 8102.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8102) to provide for the disposition of moneys arising from deductions made from carriers on account of the loss of or damage to military material in transit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the bill would create a uniform procedure among the military departments in the handling of moneys recovered from common carriers because of loss or damage to military or naval material in transit.

The Army and the Air Force now are permitted to utilize such recoveries for the replacement of the material damaged or lost, while the Navy is required to cover such moneys into the Treasury under miscellaneous receipts.

Under the bill, all three military departments would be allowed to use these recoveries to replace the material lost or damaged. The bill would permit the accomplishment of the purposes for which the appropriation was initially granted, rather than require new appropriations for the same purpose, as is the case with the Navy today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REFUND OF REENLISTMENT BONUSES

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2114, House bill 8693.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8693) to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, in relation to the refund of reenlistment bonuses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, this measure would repeal a requirement of existing law that disbursing officers who collect an unearned reenlistment bonus from a member of the uniformed services who does not complete the term of enlistment for which the bonus was paid must subtract from the amount recovered any amounts paid in Federal or State income taxes on the refundable part.

There are two sections of the Career Compensation Act dealing with reenlistment bonuses. Both of these sections provide that when a person does not complete a term of enlistment for which he received a reenlistment bonus, he must refund the unearned part of the bonus. One of the sections, section 207 (a), provides that there will be subtracted from the amount the member must refund any amounts paid in Federal or State income taxes on such refundable part. Section 208 does not contain the same requirement.

The effect of this requirement is to cause disbursing officers troublesome computations, in that they must secure copies of the tax returns involved and recompute the taxes to determine how much is attributable to the refundable amount. Even then, the original returns could be amended, or the Internal Revenue Service could make a future adjustment of the tax due.

If the bill is enacted, disbursing officers collecting unearned portions of reenlistment bonuses would furnish the member concerned a certificate of the amount collected that would serve as the basis for a tax refund claim initiated by the member, if this action is appropriate.

Since most enlistments are now being entered into under section 208, rather than section 207 (a), it is believed that this bill will not work any undue hardship on the members of the services who may be affected by it.

The bill was reported unanimously from the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 8693) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPLY BY SENATOR FLANDERS TO REMARKS BY SENATOR McNAMARA ON YESTERDAY

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, yesterday the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reported the remarks of the junior Senator from Michigan, in the course of which remarks it was said:

> Mr. President, each time I think the Eisenhower administration has gone about as far as it can go in its cold-blooded attitude toward human problems, I get a new surprise.
>
> The latest example of this callous approach to suffering is the news story that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey depicts our economy as enjoying a refreshing pause.

Now, this speech of the junior Senator from Michigan disturbed me very much. So I have been examining the record to see just what it was that the Secretary of the Treasury said.

In the first place, I wish to put into the RECORD the fact that he never said anything about a "refreshing pause." Those words were in the headline which the headline writer placed over the report of the Secretary's remarks, but they were no part at all of the Secretary's testimony, and were not used by him.

I should like to go on a little further with the Secretary's testimony and with the remarks of the junior Senator from Michigan to see what warrant there was, if any, for the use of that headline.

The junior Senator from Michigan said:

> As he was quoted in press reports this morning, Mr. Humphrey told a congressional subcommittee that it is "just as well to hesitate a little."

I have gotten hold of the records of the hearing at which those words were said, and wish to put the context of that remark into the RECORD, so that those words will not be taken out of context and given a meaning which they do not have. So, going through the records of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I find, on page 4 of those records a statement by the Secretary referring to the big inventories, particularly in the automobile field. He said:

> So that when you get up to a very high level and you have got your head against the ceiling, it is well to just have it hesitate a little bit.

An entirely different turn of meaning is given to those words when they are taken in context than appears in the remarks of the junior Senator from Michigan.

Then Secretary Humphrey said:

> And that is what is going on, and I think it is very good and very wholesome."

I would say the whole trend of the Secretary's remarks was that when one had gotten into trouble, it was a good idea to get out of it and not get into deeper trouble.

A further reference in the remarks of the junior Senator from Michigan was this quotation from the Secretary's testimony:

> Conditions are now proceeding in a very satisfactory manner.

Again, we have to refer to the transcript of the remarks to see what he meant by that. Speaking of the layoffs in the automotive industry the Secretary said:

> Well, I think their difficulties arise from a number of things. * * *
>
> On the other hand, I think that as you look at it now, conditions are proceeding in a very satisfactory way, and I believe that over a relatively short time some of these inventory difficulties will be behind us, and we can forget them.

Mr. President, to these two quotations from the text in which the Secretary's words are put in their context, I wish to add two observations of my own. The first observation I wish to make is that I myself feel that the automotive industry itself is not blameless in the recession which it is suffering and which its workmen are suffering at the present moment. There seemed last year to be an insane desire to push as many automobiles as possible on to the market. The manufacturers pushed them on to the dealers, and the dealers did the best they could to get them into the hands of the public. In my judgment, that process was bad for the automotive industry, bad for its employees, and bad for the country as a whole. I sincerely hope this incident of indisposable, or slowly disposable, inventories and a decrease in employment will be taken to heart by the leaders of the automotive industry, and that they will do their selling with such wisdom and restraint as will tend to keep a constant market for automobiles and a constant high level of employment for those engaged in the automotive industry.

The next point I wish to make, Mr. President, in connection with this incident is this: I have the very strong conviction that the two principal political parties, which in fact are practically the only parties on the United States political scene, have different functions to perform. I shall not take it upon myself to assign any functions to the party represented by our distinguished friends on the other side of the aisle. But I have a very clear and distinct idea of what is the function of the Republican Party, to which I am glad to belong. It is our particular function—because it is in large measure left to us—to see to it, insofar as we can, and insofar as it can be obtained by Government action, where action is required, or by inaction, where action is not required, that the level of business production and the level of business employment remain high. If at times that has the aspect of appearing to support business, whether big or little, that aspect is a true reflection of the situation. We do try so to support the business of this country that there will be high production and high employment. I, for one, Mr. President, expect to pursue that responsibility as a member of the Republican Party, without being disturbed by any criticisms which would attribute such action and such

policies to an endeavor to maintain profits for the well-to-do. What we are maintaining is production and employment.

In accordance with this same idea of party responsibility, it is my judgment that Secretary Humphrey has spoken and acted, and is now speaking and acting, in the way which best serves to maintain production and employment in this country.

COL. JOHN A. O'KEEFE

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives with respect to Senate bill 2984.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2984) for the relief of Col. John A. O'Keefe, which were, on page 1, line 4, strike out all after "pay," over through "appropriated," in line 5, and insert "out of the funds of the District of Columbia,", and on page 1, line 7, strike out "United States" and insert "District of Columbia."

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief explanation. On April 30, 1956, Senate bill 2984, for the relief of Col. John A. O'Keefe, was passed by the Senate. The bill has now been passed by the House of Representatives with an amendment providing for the payment out of the funds of the District of Columbia, rather than out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. A study of the House amendment discloses that a subsequent report was received by the House committee from the District of Columbia, which recommended that this amendment be included, pursuant to a recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

ERNEST B. SANDERS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives regarding Senate bill 415.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 415) for the relief of Ernest B. Sanders, which was on page 2, line 2, after "act", insert "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, a brief explanation of the amendment is that on June 30, 1955, the Senate passed Senate bill 415, for the relief of Ernest B. Sanders. The bill has now been passed by the House, with an amendment which provides for the payment of an attorney's fee not to exceed 10 percent.

A study of the House amendment discloses that services of an attorney were actually rendered in connection with this claim.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 415.

The motion was agreed to.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE CITY OF ROSEBURG, OREG.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2223, Senate bill 3316; and I invite the attention of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] to this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3316) authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3316), which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "and directed"; in the same line, after the word "deed", to strike out the comma and "without consideration"; and on page 2 after line 7, to insert:

Any such conveyance shall be conditioned upon—

(1) the payment by the city of Roseburg, Oreg., to the United States of a sum equal to 50 percent of the fair market value of all such property, including the dwelling structure situated upon such land and the contents of such dwelling, based upon the highest and best use of such property at the time of such conveyance;

(2) the use of the land so conveyed by such city for public park or public recreational purposes for a period of not less than 20 years after such conveyance, and the reversion of all or any part of such land to the United States, in its then existing condition, at the option of the United States in the event that the Secretary of the Interior determines at any time during such period that such land has ceased to be used or maintained by such city for any such purpose; and

(3) an undertaking by such city that the dwelling structure situated upon such land and the contents thereof will be disposed of by such city only to the Douglas County Historical Society.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to (1) that parcel of land, together with any improvements thereon, which comprises a part of the property commonly known as the Lillie Lela Moore estate, and which is described as lots 5, 6, and 7, block 29, Douglas County, Roseburg, Oreg., and (2) that part of such estate consisting of furniture, personal effects, and jewelry which has been designated by the said Administrator as lot A personalty, such property having been devised to the United States by Lillie Lela Moore under the provisions of her will probated in 1940, and which has since been declared surplus to the needs of the United States.

Any such conveyance shall be conditioned upon—

(1) the payment by the city of Roseburg, Oreg., to the United States of a sum equal to 50 percent of the fair market value of all such property, including the dwelling structure situated upon such land and the contents of such dwelling, based upon the highest and best use of such property at the time of such conveyance;

(2) the use of the land so conveyed by such city for public park or public recreational purposes for a period of not less than 20 years after such conveyance, and the reversion of all or any part of such land to the United States, in its then existing condition, at the option of the United States in the event that the Secretary of the Interior determines at any time during such period that such land has ceased to be used or maintained by such city for any such purpose; and

(3) an undertaking by such city that the dwelling structure situated upon such land and the contents thereof will be disposed of by such city only to the Douglas County Historical Society.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the bill can be explained very briefly.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to convey all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to three lots and improvements thereon, including furniture and other personal property, to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., for public park and historical museum purposes.

Public-spirited people of the city of Roseburg, Mr. President, have taken the lead in urging that this building and site be reserved for historical and public purposes, rather than be surrendered to commercialism. That is why I have introduced this proposed legislation, and why I hope the Senate will pass the bill today.

The bill has been reported to the Senate with several amendments which have been recommended by the General Services Administration. The amendments provide that the city must pay 50 percent of the fair market value of the property at issue, and restrict use of the property to the purposes I have described, namely, either for public park purposes or for museum purposes.

The bill also—and very properly, in my opinion—provides that the building thereon and the contents may be disposed of by the city of Roseburg only to the Douglas County Historical Society.

Mr. President, the bill is a very worthy one, and it will perpetuate a very valuable and strategically located property in the city of Roseburg, to be used for public purposes, and to assure that all the property—both the land and the building thereon—will be used for these public purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3316) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2115, House bill 8922.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8922) to provide for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, this bill will validate overpayments of reenlistment allowances aggregating more than $6 million. The number of persons who have received these payments is 18,365. The payments were made in accordance with Department of Defense regulations, and were received by the members in good faith.

The Comptroller General took exception to the payments, as he was required to do under a strict construction of the law; but the Comptroller has advised the committee that he has no objection to the enactment of this bill.

An understanding of the overpayments that this bill would validate necessarily involves consideration of the history of reenlistment allowances.

Prior to the Career Compensation Act of 1949, members reenlisting received an enlistment allowance computed on the basis of past service, that is, the number of years served by a member in his prior enlistment. The basic concept of an enlistment allowance was changed by the Career Compensation Act, which provides in section 207 thereof for a reenlistment bonus based on future service, that is, the number of years for which the member reenlists. The Career Compensation Act also had a savings provision that members who reenlisted within 3 months after discharge from an enlistment entered into prior to the effective date of the Career Compensation Act, October 1, 1949, would be entitled to receive either—First, the enlistment allowance in effect prior to October 1, 1949; or second, the reenlistment bonus authorized under the Career Compensation Act, whichever was greater. Department of Defense regulations provided that enlisted members entitled to the benefit of the savings provision would get the greater amount, without any election on their part.

The act of July 16, 1954, provided an alternative system of reenlistment bonuses, with a relatively large bonus for first enlistments and decreasing bonuses for the second, third, and fourth reenlistments. The 1954 act also provided that any reenlistment when a bonus was not authorized would not be counted in determining whether the new reenlistment was the first, second, third, or fourth enlistment. In decision B–121690, dated March 30, 1955, the Comptroller General ruled that those persons who had the benefit of the savings provision mentioned above, under which they received an enlistment allowance, as distinguished from a reenlistment bonus, because the former was larger, had nonetheless reenlisted "when a bonus was authorized." Consequently, a reenlistment after the 1954 act for these members was treated by the Comptroller as a second, third, or fourth reenlistment, rather than the first, second, or third one, with the result that the members received more bonus than they were entitled to under a strict construction of the law.

This bill was approved by the Armed Services Committee in the realization that the amount of the bonus to which these members apparently were entitled was a consideration affecting their decision whether to remain in the military service, and because the payments were made in accordance with Department of Defense regulations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 8922) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BIBLE. Will the Chair advise the acting majority leader what is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the unfinished business is Senate bill 3982, a bill to provide for the maintenance of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO THE PORT OF PORT TOWNSEND, WASH.

Mr. BIBLE. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2193, Senate bill 3388.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3388) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States of America to the port of Port Townsend, Wash.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with an amendment, on page 2, after line 3, to strike out:

SEC. 2. (a) The Administrator shall determine, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, the fair market value of the real property subject to conveyance under this act and if the port of Port Townsend fails to tender to the Administrator an amount equal to such fair market value on or before the 120th day after the date such fair market value is made known to the port of Port Townsend by the Administrator, this act shall cease to be in effect after such 120th day.

(b) Fair market value as used in this section means an amount equal to the average of the two appraisals of such land which were made July 1954 and October 1955 at the request of the Administrator.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 2. The Administrator shall determine the fair market value of the real property subject to conveyance under this act and if the port of Port Townsend fails to tender to the Administrator an amount equal to such fair market value on or before the 120th day after the date such fair market value is made known to the port of Port Townsend by the Administrator, this act shall cease to be in effect after such 120th day.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That the Administrator of General Services (herein referred to as the "Administrator") is authorized and directed to convey to the port of Port Townsend, Wash., subject to the provisions of sections 2 and 3 of this act, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property consisting of 30.62 acres, more or less, located in Jefferson County, Wash., comprising a part of the real property commonly known as Hudson Point, formerly used by the Department of the Army for amphibious training purposes, the exact legal description of which shall be determined by the Administrator.

SEC. 2. The Administrator shall determine the fair market value of the real property subject to conveyance under this act and if the port of Port Townsend fails to tender to the Administrator an amount equal to such fair market value on or before the 120th day after the date such fair market value is made known to the port of Port Townsend by the Administrator, this act shall cease to be in effect after such 120th day.

SEC. 3. There shall be reserved to the United States all minerals including oil and gas, in the real property authorized to be conveyed by the first section of this act, and the deed of conveyance shall contain such additional terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as the Administrator determines to be necessary to protect the interest of the United States.

SEC. 4. The Administrator shall cover into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts all proceeds under this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation of the bill.

The purpose of this bill is to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to convey to the port of Port Townsend all right, title, and interest of the United States in 30.62 acres of land of which 28.44 acres was originally donated by the town of Port Townsend to the United States. This property has been declared excess to the needs of the Department of Defense and referred to the General Services Administration for disposal as surplus property. The bill, as amended, further provides that, if the port of Port Townsend agrees to pay the fair market value of the property, such payment must be tendered to the Administrator on or before the 120th day after receiving notice of the fair market value, to be determined by the Administrator. The United States reserves all minerals including oil and gas; and the imposition of such additional terms as the Administrator determines to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

Since the property covered by this bill, originally donated for patriotic reasons by the citizens of Port Townsend, Wash., to the Federal Government, has now been abandoned by the United States and the property declared surplus to the needs of the Government, it is the view of the committee that the approval of

S. 3338 is a matter of equity, and in the public interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE TOWN OF NORTH KINGSTOWN, R. I.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2214, Senate bill 3195.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3195) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Rhode Island to the town of North Kingstown, R. I.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to convey by quitclaim deed all right, title, and interest of the United States to approximately 3.4 acres of land, including improvements thereon, to the town of North Kingstown, R. I. Such land is part of a tract formerly held by the Department of the Navy and declared surplus to the needs of the Navy. The town of North Kingstown, R. I., agrees to pay to the Administrator of General Services as consideration for the land conveyed an amount equal to 50 percent of its fair market value as determined by the Administrator after appraisal of said land. The bill further provides if the land conveyed is not used for public purposes all right, title, and interest shall revert to the United States.

The committee of taxpayers appointed by the city have made a thorough study of the present facilities, and recommended building a new combined fire and police department on higher grounds to avoid damage from future floods and hurricanes. The site approved by the committee as most suitable is described in detail in S. 3195.

The Quonset Naval Air Station and the Davisville Supply Depot are located in North Kingstown. The taxpayer committee reports that the servicemen and families and the civilian employees and their families will benefit by a true fire and police protection if S. 3195 is approved. The committee further states that North Kingstown is unable financially to complete necessary improvements to the existing buildings, or to enter into competitive bidding for the land needed for the proposed site for the new building to house the fire and police departments.

The bill comes from the Committee on Government Operations with unanimous approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the town of North Kingstown, R. I., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 3 1/10 acres of land, including improvements thereon, in such town. Such land, which is part of a tract formerly held by the Department of the Navy and declared surplus to the needs of such Department, is more particularly described as follows: Beginning at a point in the easterly line of Post Road which point is 100 feet northerly from a concrete bound at the northwest corner of land now or formerly of Dot Seafood Company; thence the line runs in a northerly direction 500 feet bounded westerly by said Post Road; thence turning an interior angle of 90 degrees, 5 minutes, 20 seconds, the line runs in an easterly direction 262.74 feet; thence turning an interior angle of 96 degrees, 32 minutes, 1 second, the line runs in a southern direction 503.27 feet; thence turning an interior angle of 83 degrees, 27 minutes, 59 seconds, the line runs in a westerly direction 320.0 feet to the point of beginning; said line being 100 feet from and parallel to the northerly line of land now or formerly of the Dot Seafood Company and making an interior angle of 89 degrees, 54 minutes, 40 seconds with the first described line; the last three courses being bounded northerly, easterly, and southerly by land of the United States of America. The above-described tract contains three and four-tenths acres more or less.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this act shall be subject to the conditions (1) that the town of North Kingstown, R. I., pay to the Administrator of General Services as consideration for the land conveyed an amount equal to 50 percent of its fair market value as determined by the Administrator after appraisal of such land, and (2) that in the event the land conveyed pursuant to this act ceases to be used for public purposes all right, title, and interest so conveyed shall revert to the United States.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 158 OF THE REVISED STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2215, Senate bill 3768.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3768) to amend section 158 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, so as to include the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare among the executive departments there listed, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill, introduced in the Senate at the request of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is to add the Department, established by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, to the list of executive departments in section 158 of the Revised Statutes, title 5, United States Code, section 1. Plan No. 1 of 1953 failed to provide for the inclusion of the Department in section 158 of the Revised Statutes. Approval of S. 3768 would give the Department full statutory parity with other executive departments. The bill makes adequate provision to assure that nothing therein would be inconsistent with Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, or with various other statutes applicable to the Department, or with laws which are antiquated and not generally applicable to other departments.

Section 2 provides for the appointment by the President of a General Counsel, with Senate confirmation, who shall be the chief legal officer of the Department, and act as Secretary during the absence or disability, or in the event of a vacancy in the office, of the Secretary and of the Under Secretary and the Assistant Secretaries. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare states that this provision is desirable to conform the status of this position with that of the chief legal officers of other executive departments having comparable functions and responsibilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 158 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 158. The provisions of this title shall apply to the following executive departments:

"First. The Department of State.
"Second. The Department of Defense.
"Third. The Department of the Treasury.
"Fourth. The Department of Justice.
"Fifth. The Post Office Department.
"Sixth. The Department of the Interior.
"Seventh. The Department of Agriculture.
"Eighth. The Department of Commerce.
"Ninth. The Department of Labor.
"Tenth. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall not be construed to make applicable to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare any provision of law inconsistent with Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 or Public Law 13, 83d Congress, or to supersede or limit any function or authority of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or any officer thereof, under any law in effect prior to the enactment of this act, or prevent or limit the expenditure of funds for any such function or authority.

SEC. 2. (a) There shall be in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a General Counsel who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter provided by law for assistant secretaries of executive departments. The General Counsel shall be the chief legal officer of the Department and shall perform such functions as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may prescribe.

(b) The General Counsel shall act as Secretary during the absence or disability, or in the event of a vacancy in the office, of the

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and of the Under Secretary and the Assistant Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare.

LEASE-PURCHASE AGREEMENTS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous censent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2194, S. 3866.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3866) to facilitate the making of lease-purchase agreements by the Administrator of General Services under the Public Building Act of 1949, as amended, and by the Postmaster General under the Post Office Department Property Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the bill proposes to amend the provisions of the Lease-Purchase Act of 1954, relating to approval of lease-purchase agreements by the Bureau of the Budget.

Under present law the Bureau must approve a proposed lease-purchase agreement for the General Services Administration or the Post Office Department, before the agreement can be sanctioned by Congress; and after congressional authorization, the Bureau must again review the agreement as to its specific terms and provisions.

This double review results, it is believed, in unnecessary duplication and expense. The bill would obviate the requirement that the Bureau make the second review of the agreement. The Bureau would still be required to approve the general desirability of the proposed agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (e) of section 411 of the Public Buildings Act of 1949, as added by section 101 of the Public Buildings Contract Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 518), is further amended—

(1) by repealing so much of said subsection (e) as reads: "No proposed purchase contract agreement shall be executed under this section unless such agreement has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, as evidenced by a written statement of such officer to the effect that the execution of such agreement is necessary and is in conformity with the policy of the President."; and

(2) by adding at the end of subparagraph 8 of said subsection (e) the following: "Such statement by the Director shall be based on budgetary and related considerations and shall not be deemed to constitute approval by the Director of the specific terms or provisions of any proposed agreement or of the selection of any particular contractor or lessor."

SEC. 2. Subsection (g) of section 202 of the Post Office Department Property Act of of 1954, 68 Stat. 521, is amended—

(1) by repealing so much of said subsection (g) as reads: "No proposed lease-purchase agreement shall be executed under this section unless such agreement has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, as evidenced by a written statement of such officer to the effect that the execution of such agreement is necessary and is in conformity with the policy of the President."; and

(2) by adding at the end of subparagraph 8 of said subsection (g) the following: "Such statement by the Director shall be based on budgetary and related considerations and shall not be deemed to constitute approval by the Director of the specific terms or provisions of any proposed agreement or of the selection of any particular contractor or lessor."

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE CITY OF HOGANSVILLE, GA.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2216, H. R. 7896.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7896) to provide for the conveyance of certain land in the city of Hogansville, Ga., to the city of Hogansville.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the bill would authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey to the city of Hogansville, Ga., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain surplus Government land, upon payment by the city of the sum of $3,000 in consideration thereof. The bill provides for the reversion of title to the United States in the event that use of the land for public purposes should be discontinued at any time within 20 years after conveyance.

The bill has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Government Operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time and passed.

SALE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO THE EAGLE ROCK YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIF.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2218, H. R. 9377.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9377) to provide for the sale to the Eagle Rock Young Men's Christian Association of certain real property located in Los Angeles County, Calif.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the bill would authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to sell to the Eagle Rock Young Men's Christian Association certain surplus Government realty situated in Los Angeles County, Calif., upon payment to the Government of an amount equal to the fair market value of such property at its highest and best use as determined by the Administrator.

The bill has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Government Operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NOTICE IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER OF PROCLAMATIONS, ORDERS, ETC., FOLLOWING AN ATTACK UPON THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2219, H. R. 10417.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10417) to amend the Federal Register Act, as amended, so as to provide for the effectiveness and notice to the public of proclamations, orders, regulations, and other documents in a period following an attack or threatened attack upon the continental United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. The purpose of the bill is to provide statutory authority for the promulgation, filing, or publication of certain official documents, now required by law to be filed with the Federal Register Division of the National Archives Establishment and published in the Federal Register, in the event of a determination by the President that an attack or threatened attack on the continental United States, by air or otherwise would make compliance impracticable or would fail to give the public appropriate notice of the contents of such documents.

The bill seeks to accomplish this objective by authorizing the President, after making such determination, to, first, suspend all or part of the legal requirements for promulgating, filing, or publishing such documents; and second, establish such alternate systems for promulgating, filing, or publishing such documents, including requirements relating to their effectiveness or validity, as may be deemed practicable to provide

public notice of the issuance and contents of such documents.

The bill has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Government Operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PREMISES LEASED FOR GOVERNMENT PURPOSES

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2221, S. 3843.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3843) to adjust the application of section 322 of the so-called Economy Act of 1932 to premises leased for Government purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with an amendment, after line 7, to strike out:

SEC. 2. The act of April 28, 1942 (56 Stat. 247, as amended; 40 U. S. C. 278b), is hereby amended by inserting, immediately after the words "Secretary of the Navy", the words "or the Administrator of General Services."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended by section 15 of the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1517, 40 U. S. C. 278a), is hereby amended by striking "$2,000" in the final proviso and substituting "$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill, which was introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services, is to simplify the making and administration of leases for the rental of premises for Government purposes in the light of changes in circumstances which have occurred since 1933, when certain effected provisions of law were enacted.

The act of June 30, 1932, prohibited the Government from paying a rental for leased premises in excess of 15 percent of the fair market value of such rental premises, and limited the expenditure for alterations, improvements, or repair thereof to no more than 25 percent of the amount of the rent for the first year of the rental term. Subsequently, the act of March 3, 1933, exempted annual rentals amounting to $2,000 or less from the 15 percent rental limitation in order to avoid the disproportionate expense and difficulty involved in appraising and determining the fair market value of small properties for this purpose. This bill would raise this exemption from $2,000 to $5,000, which the Administrator of General Services reports is necessary in order to continue to avoid unnecessary appraisal expenses since statistics indicate that $5,000 today will rent approximately the same amount of space as did $2,000 in 1933.

The bill has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Government Operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce for the information of the Senate that, following morning business on Monday, there will be a call of the calendar. It is the intention of the leadership to proceed with the legislative appropriation bill which has been reported by the committee today, and the report will be available to Members.

Following consideration of the legislative appropriation bill it is planned to consider Calendar No. 2169, Senate bill 3982, to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes, and Calendar No. 2139 relating to the reinvestment by air carriers of the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of certain operating property and equipment, together with any bills which may have been objected to on the call of the calendar.

I hope, Mr. President, that on Monday the committee may be able to work up the defense appropriation bill. Hearings were concluded on that bill on Monday of this week, but we have been delayed in marking up the bill because of the absence from the city of certain Members and because of some very important conferences which have been taking place. It is an extremely important appropriation bill, and, with the exception of the foreign aid bill, it is the last appropriation bill.

It is the hope of the leadership that the Senate may be able to consider the bill as soon as it is reported, perhaps on Tuesday, or, at the latest, on Wednesday. We are also working diligently to report the foreign aid bill. The road bill is in conference, and it may be that we shall have a report on it early in the week.

I give this advance notice, Mr. President, so that all Senators may know of the plans of the leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are no other Senators who care to address the Senate, I move that, in accordance with the order previously entered, the Senate stand in adjournment until next Monday at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, June 18, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 14 (legislative day of June 11) 1956:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Arthur Kline, of Wyoming, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission, for a term of 5 years, expiring June 22, 1961.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To be consuls general

Edward Page, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Henry H. Ford, of Florida.
Frederick C. Oechsner, of Louisiana.
Robert P. Chalker, of Florida.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries

Ralph J. Burton, of Illinois.
Basil Capella, of Maryland.
Loren Carroll, of Illinois.
Arch K. Jean, of Pennsylvania.
Arthur G. Jones, of Virginia.
Robert N. Magill, of Maryland.
George H. Owen, of New York.
David H. Popper, of New York.
Walter A. Radius, of Virginia.
Donovan Q. Zook, of Ohio.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries

Kenneth W. Calloway, of Illinois.
Mary Mulloy Carmichael, of Montana.
Daniel H. Clare, Jr., of Virginia.
Robert A. Conrads, of the District of Columbia.
William E. Fee, Jr., of New York.
Bernard J. Humes, of Virginia.
Albert E. Irving, of Maryland.
Robert H. Kranich, of Maryland.
Richard S. Leach, of Connecticut.
Albert P. Mayio, of Michigan.
George T. Moody, of Maryland.
George S. Newman, of New York.
George A. Pope, of Idaho.
Ralph Scarritt, of Illinois.
Leslie C. Tihany, of Illinois.
Harold N. Waddell, of Georgia.
Findley Weaver, of Oklahoma.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries.

Edward S. Benet, of Texas.
Waldemar B. Campbell, of Washington.
John Warner Foley, Jr., of New Hampshire.
Alvaro F. Galván, of New York.
Lawrence E. Gruza, of Connecticut.
Paul M. Kattenburg, of Virginia.
Stanley R. Kidder, of Oregon.
Oris F. Kolb, of Virginia.
Glenwood B. Matthews, of California.
Saul Moskowitz, of New York.
John P. Reddington, of New York.
Everett W. Schoening, of Illinois.
Miss Eulalia L. Wall, of Texas.
Robert L. Ware, Jr., of New Jersey.
Samuel H. Young, of Florida.

To be consul

George R. Phelan, Jr., of Missouri.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries

Charles W. Brown, of California.
Edward H. Brown, of Pennsylvania.
Joseph F. Christiano, of New York.
Thomas W. Fina, of Florida.
Wayne R. Gilchrist, of Missouri.
Walter T. Kamprad, of California.
George R. Kaplan, of Massachusetts.
Earl A. Kessler II, of Oregon.
Mrs. Elvira L. Lawyer, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Margaret McDonald, of South Dakota.
Miss Alice C. Mahoney, of Arizona.
Miss Colette Meyer, of California.
Miss Helen J. Mullen, of New York.
John G. Panos, of Illinois.
Miss Wilma C. Patterson, of Indiana.
Edward M. Peach, of Virginia.
Miss M. Adelaide Roberts, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Margaret A. Stanturf, of Missouri.
Robert G. Sturgill, of Utah.
Abraham Vigil, of Colorado.
Daroslav S. Vlahovich, of New Jersey.
Henry C. Wechsler, of Ohio.
Miss Hertha C. Wegener, of New York.
Mrs. Margaret P. A. Welsh, of Louisiana.
Miss Helen B. Wilson, of California.
Miss Jane B. Young, of the District of Columbia.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries

Thomas A. Bartlett, of Oregon.
Carlton Brower, of California.
Davis S. Chamberlain, of New Jersey.
Edward M. Cohen, of New York.
John G. Dean, of New York.
Miss Sharon E. Erdkamp, of Nebraska.
Donald C. Ferguson, of California.
Lewis P. Fickett, Jr., of Maine.
Miss Catherine M. Frank, of Connecticut.
Roderick N. Grant, of California.
Charles W. Grover, of New York.
Mrs. Winifred T. Hall, of New Jersey.
Robert M. Immerman, of New York.
Donald A. Johnston, of New York.
Ernest B. Johnston, Jr., of Alabama.
Gordon A. Klett, of California.
Gerald Lamberty, of Wisconsin.
Jay H. Long, of California.
David R. McClurg, of Illinois.
Edward R. O'Connor, of New York.
Robert K. Olson, of Minnesota.
Miss Mary Hoxton Pierce, of Florida.
William B. Pounds, Jr., of Ohio.
Ernest G. Reeves, of North Carolina.
J. Harden Rose, of Illinois.
Edward M. Rowell, of California.
Miss Edith M. Scott, of the District of Columbia.
Peter Semler, of New York.
William Slany, of the District of Columbia.
John T. Tinny, of Florida.
Julius W. Walker, Jr., of Texas.

To be consuls

Robert W. Ades, of Oregon.
Jay Castillo, of Nevada.
Gordon P. Hagberg, of California.
James Moceri, of Washington.
Miss Barbara M. White, of Illinois.
Louis C. Bosetti, of Conecticut.

To be consuls and secretaries

Douglas S. Blaufarb, of Maryland.
George F. Wilson, of California.

To be secretaries

Paul Garbler, of North Carolina.
Lloyd A. Harnage, of Florida.
Robinson McIlvaine, of Pennsylvania.

To be vice consuls

William P. Boteler, of the District of Columbia.
James P. Hurley, of New York.
Theodore L. Lewis, of New York.
Jean M. Nater, of Virginia.
Richard H. Snowdon, of the District of Columbia.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

To be Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years, effective August 10, 1956

Robert W. Knox

The following persons for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenants

Donald L. Campbell
Robert C. Munson
Gerard E. Haraden

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

James P. Randall

To be ensigns

Vastine C. Ahlrich	Robert A. Hoyt
Jordan S. Baker	William A. Hughes
Ronald D. Bernard	William M. Lee
Merlyn D. Christensen	Allen J. Lewis
Larry H. Clark	Michael G. Lusk
Arthur M. Cook	Earl R. Scyoc
Robert D. Frost	Lawrence L. Seal
Charles E. Fuller	Richard F. Shoolbred
Lawrence C. Haverkamp	G. Thomas Susi
	Philip J. Taetz

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 14, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou great God of men and of nations, we rejoice that in the calendar of our national life there are many special days which we commemorate and celebrate with feelings of pride and patriotism.

Grant that this day, which we call Flag Day, may inspire and kindle within our minds and hearts a greater love and loyalty for our country and its democracy.

Make us more truly grateful for Thou hast given us a goodly heritage and hast not dealt so bountifully and graciously with any nation.

Wherever our flag is unfurled may it be the symbol of justice and righteousness and the glorious herald of proclaiming the dawning of a new day of freedom and peace for all mankind.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The JOURNAL of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 7, 1956:

H. R. 3996. An act to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

H. R. 4656. An act relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina; and

H. R. 9429. An act to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

On June 13, 1956:

H. R. 1671. An act for the relief of Clement E. Sprouse.

H. R. 5268. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowances for overland travel by private conveyance outside the continental limits of the United States;

H. R. 6268. An act to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects;

H. R. 7679. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Muskogee, Okla.;

H. R. 9390. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9536. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10251. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to deed certain land to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 11319. An act making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. KERR to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate requests the House of Representatives to return to the Senate House Joint Resolution 472, entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens," as amended.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 56–16.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 6, 1956, the Chair declares the House in recess for the purpose of commemorating Flag Day.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess.

FLAG DAY

During the recess the following proceedings took place in honor of the

United States flag, the Speaker of the House of Representatives presiding:

FLAG DAY PROGRAM. UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 14, 1956

Presiding Officer: The Speaker, Hon. SAM RAYBURN.

United States Marine Band (Capt. Albert Schoepper, leader, conducting) and the Interservice Choral Group enter the door to the left of the Speaker and take positions assigned them.

Doorkeeper announces The Flag of the United States.

Members rise.

Marine Band plays The Stars and Stripes Forever.

The flag is carried into the Chamber by marine colorbearer and a guard from each of the other branches of the Armed Forces (Capt. George B. Crist, U. S. Marine Corps, commanding).

The color guard salutes the Speaker, faces about, and salutes the House.

Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT is recognized.

The Interservice Choral Group, accompanied by the Marine Band, sing the song The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, by Irving Caeser, ASCAP, arranged by Donald Hunsberger, United States Marine Band. Soloist: S. Sgt. William Jones, United States Marine Band. (Members remain seated.)

Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT is recognized.

Members rise and sing the National Anthem, accompanied by the Marine Band and the Interservice Choral Group.

Members remain standing while the colors are retired from the Chamber, the Marine Band playing the National Emblem March.

The Marine Band and the Interservice Choral Group leave the Chamber.

Mr. RABAUT was recognized by the Speaker and delivered the following address:

Mr. Speaker, we are gathered here this Flag Day to rededicate our spirit and our might to national patriotism and national unity. The flag is a physical symbol of nobler and loftier things. It is far more than a standard of grace and beauty. In its folds is written the history of a great people; in its rustling may be heard the footsteps of patriot bands, at Lexington and at the bridge of Concord, immortalized in Emerson's phrase:

By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
Here once the embattled farmers stood,
And fired the shot heard 'round the world.

This flag reflects the radiance that glowed at Yorktown where Washington's ragged legions overwhelmed the armies of a king and lifted in triumph the banner of a free people.

It waved on land and sea in 1812. It carries in its bright stars and glorious stripes the triumph of our armies from Vera Cruz through mountain passes and spreading plains to the heights of victory. It represents a country and people reunited after 4 bloody and tragic years in which sections and brothers uselessly but gallantly poured out upon a hundred fields the finest blood of the North and the South. A part of its fabric stretches from the battlefields of Cuba to the distant jungles of the Philippines. It recalls the vivid and stirring recollections of 1918 and 1945, when our men carried the colors of the Republic to glorious triumph and helped restore peace to a warring world.

This flag represents something more than armies and navies, and wars and victories. It represents a mighty and yet a peaceful people. It is the ensign of a great and devoted Republic—a land of free men, which nurses no dream of aggression or conquest.

Whenever these colors are lifted they signify a concept of nationality, and an ideal of democracy and self-government that are distinctly American. This flag is emblematic of the making of America—of the moving, thrilling, and enthralling story of struggle and hardship and suffering in humble beginnings—of youthful and healthful growth, and, now, of mature strength. It represents the industry and enterprise of pioneers who mastered the wilderness and conquered the plains and deserts. It proclaims the inventive genius, the toiling labor and business leadership which have developed an industrial structure that commands the admiration of the modern world. It speaks of the educational and cultural and spiritual forces that have ennobled and uplifted the life of this mighty people.

This flag symbolizes the government and political institutions of the most splendid Republic ever builded by the genius and statesmanship of man.

It is based upon a noble concept of the rights of the individual—that government rests upon and is created to serve—the individual—for in his personal responsibility lies its weakness or its strength.

These colors are emblematic of the Constitution of the United States and its distribution and separation of governmental power. Every American knows that the Constitution is a great barrier between his liberty and tyranny.

Americans should remember that its covenants have preserved for them and for posterity that which was wrested by turbulent barons from an unwilling king. Through its lines is woven the brave spirit of a Parliament that dared defy the Crown. It throbs with the spirit of that ringing declaration that circled the globe and thrilled the world. In its stately stanzas, they may catch the drum beat and hear the tramp of Continental Armies, and majestically moving through its pages are the statesmanship of Madison and Franklin and other patriot fathers, and the calm courage and lofty patriotism of Washington.

That is the America our fathers gave us. This is our America, we are determined that it shall remain our America. If it is to remain ours, we—and we alone—can preserve it—and protect it—and hand it down to our sons, stronger and nobler for our having lived, and served, and sacrificed. Every citizen of this Democracy has a task and a duty to preserve it. Individual right, individual privilege, carries with it individual responsibility.

This is our country, our democracy, ours to govern, ours to advance, ours to perfect and protect, and ours to make more glorious. Every American has a solemn and lofty duty laid upon him, a duty commensurate with his ability, his resources, and his intellect. We must stamp out and extirpate communism and all other foreign "isms" and subversive influences which seek to undermine things American.

We shall tolerate neither the espionage agents assigned to local embassies, nor the treachery of any domestic influence or group.

It is a manifest obligation to our people, to our institutions, to our territory and to our lives; to the heroic traditions of a great and glorious past; to those whose blood, labor, and treasure established this Nation; to the martyred dead who have defended and protected it—it is our manifest obligation to all these to keep America strong, morally and physically.

To attain these noble ends we look back through our history and treasured traditions of 180 years. We salute the Continental Congress that gave us the Declaration of Independence and with them exclaim, "With a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, fortunes, and our sacred honor."

To the Star Spangled Banner, proudly displayed in this Chamber, we pledge a firm devotion, which springs from a heart fired with true loyalty, and a mind tempered and cooled with a patriotic realization of the necessities of the moment.

"Long may it wave o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

At this time, I should like to introduce the world-famous United States Marine Band under the very capable direction of Capt. Albert Schoepper, who will conduct the band, and Choirmaster S. Sgt. William Jones, of the Interservice Choral Group, who will perform their arrangement of the song The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. This pledge song, incorporating the words "under God," aptly stresses our dependence upon Almighty guidance in national and international affairs.

After the singing of the song, The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, Mr. RABAUT made the following statement:

Mr. Speaker, you have heard our song and music to the flag. The highest form of praise is expressed in music and song, when Christ was born the angels sang. This Nation, under God—God who is the sole dispenser of authority has singularly blessed America. Long may its banner fly as a beacon of freedom to people everywhere and to the greater honor and glory of the Creator of the world.

Now, the membership will rise and sing the national anthem, accompanied by the United States Marine Band and the interservice choral group.

After the singing of the national anthem the colors were retired from the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m. the proceedings in honor of the United States flag were concluded.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill

(H. R. 10899) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2344)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10899) "making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 4, 5, 15, 25, and 26.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 12, 13, 24, 27, 29, 30, and 31, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,475,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "one hundred"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$126,804,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$16,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$960,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$82,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,115,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "$15,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 22, 23, and 28.

PRINCE H. PRESTON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
JOHN F. SHELLEY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
FRANK T. BOW,
EDWARD T. MILLER,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
WARREN MAGNUSON,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
STYLES BRIDGES,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10899) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

General administration

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $2,450,000 instead of $2,425,000 as proposed by the House and $2,465,000 as proposed by the Senate, and eliminate language inserted by the Senate providing funds to be expended upon the certificate of the Secretary.

The conferees concur in the statement contained in the Senate committee report concerning the handling of personnel transfers to the Office of the Under Secretary for Transportation.

Bureau of the Census

Amendment No. 3—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $7,475,000 instead of $7,413,000 as proposed by the House and $7,575,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4—Census of governments: Appropriates $1,750,000 as proposed by the House instead of $2,100,000 as proposed by the Senate. The action of the conferees is not intended to reduce any of the functions proposed under this program.

Amendment No. 5—National housing inventory: Appropriates $1,000,000 for a survey of housing as proposed by the House instead of $650,000 for a national intercensal survey of housing as proposed by the Senate.

Civil Aeronautics Administration

Amendment No. 6—Operation and regulation: Authorizes the replacement of 100 passenger motor vehicles instead of 90 as proposed by the House and 110 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7—Operation and regulation: Appropriates $126,804,000 instead of $125,000,000 as proposed by the House and $128,608,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed to by the conferees includes the sum of $108,000 to permit continued operation of 39 intermediate landing fields scheduled for discontinuance in the coming year.

Amendment No. 8—Establishment of air navigation facilities: Appropriates $40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $37,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Civil Aeronautics Board

Amendment No. 9—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $4,625,000 instead of $4,550,000 as proposed by the House and $4,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10—Payments to air carriers: Appropriates $16,200,000 instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House and $17,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Coast and Geodetic Survey

Amendment No. 11—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $10,900,000 instead of $10,800,000 as proposed by the House and $11,020,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12—Construction of a surveying ship: Appropriates $3,700,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Business and Defense Services Administration

Amendment No. 13—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $6,900,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of Business Economics

Amendment No. 14—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $960,000 instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Maritime activities

Amendment No. 15—Ship construction: Reinstates House language authorizing reconditioning and betterment of one ship in the national defense reserve fleet which was stricken by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 16 and 17—Ship construction: Appropriates $82,700,000 instead of $54,800,000 as proposed by the House and $108,880,000 as proposed by the Senate, and approves $1,115,000 for transfer to salaries and expenses instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,232,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The appropriation agreed to by the conferees includes $2,300,000 for the conversion of two mariners for the American President Lines, $65,000,000 for the ship replacement program, $10,000,000 for acquisition of replaced ships, $4,000,000 for research and development, and $1,400,000 for administrative and warehouse expenses.

Amendment No. 18—Operating differential subsidies: Approves 2,040 voyages instead of 2,000 as proposed by the House and 2,075 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 19, 20, and 21—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $15,350,000 instead of $15,187,000 as proposed by the House and $15,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, and authorizes $6,500,000 for administrative expenses, instead of $6,482,000 as proposed by the House and $6,600,000 as proposed by the Senate, and $1,600,000 for maintenance of shipyards and reserve training facilities and operation of warehouses, instead of $1,445,000 as proposed by the House and $1,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Inland Waterways Corporation

Amendment No. 22—Reported in disagreement.

National Bureau of Standards

Amendment No. 23—Construction of facilities: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE II—THE PANAMA CANAL

Amendment No. 24—Panama Canal Company: Authorizes $3,679,000 for general and administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,562,100 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26—Panama Canal Company: Authorize the purchase of not to exceed 18 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the House.

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Amendment No. 27—St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: Authorizes $325,000 for administrative expenses instead of $315,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28—St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 29—St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: Authorizes the purchase of four passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of three as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 30 and 31—Salaries and expenses, Small Business Administration: Appropriate $1,900,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,890,000 as proposed by the House, and authorize the transfer of $4,634,000 from the revolving fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,610,000 as proposed by the House.

PRINCE H. PRESTON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
JOHN F. SHELLEY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
FRANK T. BOW,
EDWARD T. MILLER,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 22, on page 17, line 4, insert "Inland Waterways Corporation administered (under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Commerce): Not to exceed $14,000 shall be available for administrative expenses to be determined in the manner set forth under the title 'General expenses' in the Uniform System of Accounts for Carriers by Water of the Interstate Commerce Commission (effective January 1, 1947)."

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 23, page 22, line 17, insert: "Construction of facilities: For acquisition of necessary land and to initiate the design of the facilities to be constructed thereon for the National Bureau of Standards outside of the District of Columbia to remain available until expended, $930,000 to be transferred to the General Services Administration."

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 28, page 29, line 15, insert "including not to exceed $1,500 for official entertainment expenses, to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator."

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and concur therein.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Was this bill increased over the bill as it left the House?

Mr. PRESTON. This bill is $105,941,000 below the budget estimate. It is $24,729,000 above the House figures. I may say that represents the amount of funds put in the bill for ship construction that was eliminated by the committee. We took a very heavy cut on ship construction in the House. This was a compromise figure on that item.

Mr. GROSS. One other question: Were there any supergrade employees provided in this bill?

Mr. PRESTON. There are none.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. BOW. Is it not true that under this report we are now $29,584,000 under the Senate bill?

Mr. PRESTON. That is correct.

Mr. BOW. The conference came back with a saving of $29,584,000?

Mr. PRESTON. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Although there has been a cut in ship construction money, it is the fact, is it not, that there has been allowed new construction of six cargo ships for American Export Lines and Moore-McCormack Lines?

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman is correct. Funds are provided for that purpose in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

MRS. ANNA ELIZABETH DOHERTY—RETURN OF BILL BY THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with the request contained in the resolution of the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring therein), I return herewith H. R. 1913 entitled "An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty."

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 14, 1956.*

PROCEEDINGS DURING RECESS ORDERED PRINTED

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings that took place during the recess of the House be inserted in the RECORD prior to action taken on the conference report just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20 AND JUNE 27, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday on June 20 and June 27 may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY JUNE 18

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HOSPITALIZATION AND CARE OF MENTALLY ILL OF ALASKA

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6376) to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the amendment of the Senate and ask for a conference with the Senate.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman asking for a conference or to agree in the Senate amendment?

Mr. ENGLE. I am asking for a conference, following our understanding.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This is the mental health bill for Alaska?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from

California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. O'BRIEN of New York, EDMONDSON, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Messrs. MILLER of Nebraska, and SAYLOR.

LIMITING THE APPELLATE JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Article 3 of the Constitution provides that the judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. Section 2 of article 3 provides that the judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity arising under the Constitution and the laws of the United States, to all cases of admiralty, to controversies which the United States shall be a party, to controversies of two or more States, between a State and citizens of another State, and between citizens of different States.

The only original jurisdiction granted to the Supreme Court are those cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and counsels, and those in which a State shall be a party.

Section 2 of article 3 also contains language, however, which provides that the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction both as to law and fact "with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make."

Thus the bill, if enacted into law, will carry out the constitutional power of the Congress to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

My bill recognizes the fact that after a decision, judgment, or decree of the Supreme Court has been in effect for 50 years or more it should be considered as well accepted law. And it may not thereafter be reviewed on appeal or otherwise except when Congress specifically passes an enabling act authorizing the precedent to be reviewed. This is simply a statutory extension of the well accepted doctrine of stare decisis and a recognition that the stability of our courts and their decisions, which have over a period of time attained the status of well accepted doctrine, shall not be disturbed.

And having limited the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, the remainder of the bill reestablishes the long and honored decisions of the Supreme Court which have remained in effect for 50 years or more by providing that any decree, judgment, or decision handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States since January 1, 1954, which reverses, alters, or modifies a decision that has stood for 50 years or more shall be of no force and effect whatsoever.

The purpose of the proposed bill is to restore the faith of the American people in the stability of accepted law, and to surround the time-honored traditional decisions which have stood the test of time with the statutory protection to which they are entitled.

PRESCRIBING POLICY AND PROCEDURE IN CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS MADE BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight Friday to file a report on the bill (S. 1644) to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Monday is Consent Calendar day, and also there will be four suspensions called up as follows:

S. 1749, adopting and authorizing the improvement of Rockland Harbor, Maine.

S. 3076, to provide for a continuing survey and special studies of sickness and disability in the United States, and for periodic reports of the results thereof, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5257, to amend the act entitled "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids."

H. R. 9592, to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit air carriers and foreign air carriers, subject to certain conditions, to grant reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion.

If a rule is granted, H. R. 4054, a bill having to do with agriculture, marketing facilities, and so forth of perishable food may be considered during the week. This bill may not necessarily be called up on Monday, but it will be placed on the calendar so it can be brought up some day next week.

Mr. Speaker, I may say that the Members may want to look into certain aspects of that bill. I imagine some Members might be interested in analyzing the provisions of that bill. I know I will.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day. Incidentally, I may say if there are any rollcall votes on Monday or Tuesday, they will take place on Wednesday, because Maine has its primary and Connecticut has its convention on Monday and Tuesday.

After call of bills on the Private Calendar and on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday—but not necessarily in the following order—House Concurrent Resolution 244, creating joint committee for the unveiling of Commodore John Barry statue.

Also House Resolution 524, disapproving the sale of the alcohol butadiene manufacturing facility at Louisville, Ky.

H. R. 11544, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, if a rule is granted.

H. R. 7850, having to do with the Little Wood River reclamation project in Idaho, if a rule is granted. I do not know whether a rule has been granted or not, but I think one will be granted.

H. R. 11040, having to do with advance research and development programs. That is a bill that is on the program today but it will not be called up for consideration due to the request of the chairman of the committee by reason of a death in his family.

Then H. R. 11742, the Housing Act of 1956, if a rule is granted.

I may say that I noticed certain contempt proceedings in the papers have been voted by a committee. Whether or not the Committee on Un-American Activities will want those brought up next week I am unable to say, but if the chairman of that committee does want them to be brought up, I am announcing now that they will be called up for consideration, but not before Wednesday. They will be put on the program.

While I am unable to give in advance the information, much depends on the Rules Committee. However, I expect rules will be reported on all of the bills, although no rules have been reported up to the present time.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I notice that in the number of bills to which the gentleman called attention he did not refer to the postal rates adjustment bill. We have a rule on that already.

Mr. McCORMACK. To be perfectly frank with the gentleman, I deliberately refrained from programing that bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I just wondered why.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts did not program the bill and he does not intend to program it at the present time or in the foreseeable future unless forced to do so. I would regret very much if any Democratic members of the Committee on Rules would undertake to force the leadership to do it. If it is going to come, I hope it will come from the Republican side. After 7 legislative days a member of the Committee on Rules can call it up. Before doing that, I would expect him to confer with the leadership. If he did not, I would consider it very discourteous, to say the least.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It just seems to me that when a bill has been approved by a majority vote of the committee to which it is referred, and approved by the

Committee on Rules, it certainly ought to come to the floor.

Mr. McCORMACK. That does not necessarily follow. Sometimes there are exceptions to the rule. This is an exception, as far as I am concerned. The gentleman ought to be perfectly contented with my frank statement to him. There is no necessity of him drawing inferences.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I could not be contented.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not trying to content my friend on this bill. I am trying to tell him he ought to be contented with my frankness.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FLA.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7471) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Board of Commissioners of St. Johns County, Fla., with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out "Board of Commissioners of St. Johns County, Fla.," and insert "city of St. Augustine, Fla., a municipal corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Florida."

Page 4, line 4, strike out "degrees" and insert "feet."

Page 5, strike out lines 7, 8, and 9, and insert:

"SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by the first section of this act shall be subject to the condition that the city of St. Augustine, Fla., pay to the Secretary of the Treasury, as consideration for the land conveyed, an amount equal to 50 percent of its fair market value as determined by independent appraisal, and the deed of conveyance shall reserve to the United States all mineral rights, including oil and gas, in the land so conveyed, and shall be subject to such other reservations, limitations, or conditions as may be determined to be necessary by the Secretary to protect the interests of the United States."

Page 5, strike out line 10 and insert:

"SEC. 3. The deed shall contain a covenant that no structure shall be erected on the land which will in any way adversely affect the operation of the Coast Guard facilities, and a covenant that the".

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., a municipal corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Florida."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE JOHN J. EAGAN

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I convey the sad news of the death of Mr. John J. Eagan, of Weehawken, N. J., my predecessor in this House, from the 14th Congressional District. Mr. Eagan passed away yesterday. He was one of Weehawken's most illustrious citizens. He served in this House from 1913 to 1921, inclusive, and thereafter from 1923 to 1925. During the course of his term he was a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, was a devoted friend of President Woodrow Wilson, and joined with the President in the making of his historic reforms and also voting for World War I against imperialist Germany. At home he was beloved and regarded with affection by everyone. He was a successful businessman and had an honorable political career for over half a century. Over 62,000 men and women graduated from the Eagan Business School, which he founded.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Weehawken and the people of the 14th Congressional District will miss him. We are buoyed up in this hour of sorrow by the fact that he was a noble and great American, and we know that he has gone to his eternal reward. May he rest in peace.

SPECIAL ORDER POSTPONED

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for tomorrow afternoon may be postponed until next Thursday afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEANE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE POSTAL RATE BILL

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked at the comments of the majority leader although I admired his frankness, in stating that the reason he is not scheduling the postal rate bill is because he does not believe in the bill.

I make these as a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service, which sat for 6 weeks listening to witnesses on both sides of the question. The committee approved the bill and it has been approved by the Committee on Rules. I regret and resent one-man gag rule, resulting in not permitting the House to debate this issue.

I think it is time that the people of the United States are made aware of the problems of the Post Office Department and the need for rate increases which are long overdue. I think when they understand the problem they will become aware of the fact that in order to make the Post Office Department more efficient we are going to have to do something about rates. A $500 million a year deficit in the Post Office Department is unthinkable and unforgiveable. I think this Congress is derelict in its duties unless it faces the question head on. As far as I am concerned personally, I am perfectly willing to tell my constituents my stand on the question of postal rate increases. I am for them because I believe they are long overdue. We have added to our national deficit the $4½ billion postal deficit since 1945. This is a matter that I think we should consider very carefully very soon.

It is significant to note that the Democratic chairman [Mr. MURRAY] of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee favors the rate increase as does the Democratic chairman of the Subcommittee on Post Office Appropriations [Mr. GARY]. The former Democratic Postmaster Generals of the United States, Mr. James Farley and Mr. Jess Donaldson, testified before our committee in behalf of this increase. Any one of these four men has forgotten more about the Post Office Department and its operations than the majority leader will ever know. This is a problem which faces the Democrats and Republicans alike and should be met on a completely nonpartisan basis. I regret very much that it appears that the majority leader is going to make this a political issue and delay an opportunity for Congress to work its will on this postal rate question. Each day that this matter is delayed it is costing the taxpayers an additional $1 million.

WEMBLEY TIES ON FATHER'S DAY

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, as you know, next Sunday is Father's Day. Last year on the occasion of Father's Day I had the privilege of presenting to each Member of Congress, including the bachelor Members as well as the ladies, a necktie which was created by Wembley, of New Orleans, who is, of course, in my district and who is the largest manufacturer of neckwear in the world.

The Pulitzer brothers, Sam and Emanuel, the owners of Wembley, were so enthused over the reception which the Members gave their ties last year that they have again asked me this year, on the occasion of Father's Day, to distribute a tie to each Member of the Congress and the official staff. So this afternoon, either to your office, or tomorrow morning, there will be delivered a tie from Wembley, of New Orleans.

I hope you enjoy wearing it.

In connection with the distribution of these ties on Father's Day, Roll Call, which is the most informative news media on Capitol Hill, and which is accepted as the official organ of the Hill, had a very interesting story.

In it I can see the fine and delicate hand of Ann Corrick, who always does a fine job for Sidney Yudain's Roll Call.

Here is this year's story of Wembley ties:

HILL FATHERS WILL BE FIT TO BE TIED

It seems to be an American tradition to present the father of the family with a necktie on Father's Day.

Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana, is seeing to it that President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, and all Members of the House and Senate will receive ties for Father's Day next Sunday.

He is sending out more than 1,000 neckties created by Wembley, of New Orleans, to the White House officials, all Members of Congress, and a selected list of congressional officials. The generosity of the Pulitzer brothers, owners of Wembley's, is limited, HÉBERT explained, only by the limitation of supply.

President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON will get a dozen each of the Father's Day neckwear. House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, will will get a dozen, too, even though he's a bachelor.

This is the second year HÉBERT has taken upon himself to be the "tie daddy" of Capitol Hill. Last year his gifts drew hundreds of letters of appreciation from President Eisenhower and Congressmen.

The National Father's Day Committee says the purpose of Father's Day is to "inculcate citizenship into the young through the father of the home." It is hoped this high purpose will be maintained when Junior tries to borrow Pop's HÉBERT Father's Day tie.

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, THE OLDEST SENATOR OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to announce to the House that on Sunday Rhode Island will chalk up on its historical pages another achievement, because on that day its senior Senator, the Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, will become the oldest man in point of age ever to serve in the United States Senate.

Senator GREEN is not only a great statesman, he is also a great humanitarian. On Sunday he will be 88 years 8 months and 15 days old. The person now holding the record for having served in the Senate at the most advanced age is Senator Justin Smith Morrill, of Vermont, who was 88 years, 8 months, and 14 days old.

So, on next Sunday, in the Senate caucus room, Rhode Islanders in Washington and many from my home State will not only greet Senator GREEN, but pay him the tribute which he so justly deserves.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry it will not be possible for me to be there next Sunday, as I shall have to be away from Washington. But I should like to join in this fine tribute to the senior Senator from Rhode Island, Senator GREEN.

Senator GREEN was the chairman of a delegation of which I was a member several years ago. We took a trip to Europe. There were 14 of us. Every one of us was incapacitated for at least one day during the whole day, except Senator GREEN. He showed a remarkable degree of physical endurance. Not only that, but he was charming at all times and thoughtfully considerate of all members of the delegation. Despite political differences on domestic issues and widely divergent viewpoints among the members of this delegation, I am sure we would be unanimous in our high appraisal of Senator GREEN as a charming man and delightful traveling companion as well as an able and hard-working chairman.

I am very happy that he has set this record in the Senate. May he enjoy many happy years.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I join in the congratulations to Senator GREEN on his becoming the oldest man who has ever served in the Senate. But what is even more remarkable is that he is one of the youngest men who ever served in the Senate, in his physical vigor, his intellectual alertness, and the gentleness of his spirit.

Mr. FORAND. I thank the gentleman. What my colleague has just said confirms what I have been saying right along. He may be old in years but he is younger than most of us in spirit and in energy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to join my friend from Rhode Island in the deserved compliments being paid to that distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island, Senator GREEN. I have known him for a number of years. I admire him very much. At his age, it is remarkable how indefatigable he is in performing his duties. He is more energetic than many men 40 years younger than he is. He is an inspiration to all of us. His contributions during his service to the Congress of the United States and to the best interests of our country have been outstanding.

Mr. FORAND. I thank the gentleman.

COMMUNISM UNDER THE GUISE OF CULTURAL FREEDOM — STRANGLING AMERICAN ART

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEANE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, when and if the time comes that the United States State Department capitulates to pressure organized in the brainwashing cells of Marxist minds conspiring against our form of government—that is the day we will have lost the ideological battle against world socialism, the ultimate goal of the Communist conspiracy.

CULTURE REPLACES COMINTERN (COMMUNIST) (INTERNATIONAL)

The dictation of the terms of "peaceful coexistence" policy by the Soviet Union where assassination and murder replace free choice of leadership is unthinkable and most dangerous. The erasure of Stalin and the dissolving of the Comintern are covered by this Leninist maxim:

Communist morality is identical with the fight to strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Well-publicized Soviet news releases reveal that culture is a major weapon that the Communist conspiracy has selected from its propaganda arsenal for use in non-Communist countries at this time.

RED SPEARHEADED CAMPAIGN ATTEMPTS TO INFLUENCE THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Currently, cultural pilgrimages to the Red Mecca, as well as recent kidnappings, are gaining publicity in our press. David Burliuk, described by Soviet poet Mayakovsky as one of the "Bolsheviks of art" and eulogized by Communist Michael Gold in the Daily Worker as "the father of Russian futurism," has returned, according to the New York Herald Tribune of June 2, 1956, to Moscow as a "United States modernist painter" at the invitation of the Soviet Union of Writers, all expenses paid.

In line with the above, the leftwing culturalists have adapted their collective leadership into an all-out attack on the State Department's recent cancellation of the Sport in Art exhibition originally booked to be shown under its auspices in Australia during the Olympic Games in the fall.

In an effort to force a reversal of the State Department's position in the matter, all Red and left-wing publications have become boisterous in their attacks on the State Department, and all the forces of Marxism have been put into the play.

The break against them came in Dallas, where citizens arose in indignation. Though inside influences overruled the citizens, the incident encouraged the State Department to take action.

On this premise the leftist indignation has been aroused and mobilized, and one of the artists struck by the public indignation is being given wide favorable publicizing by the Red and general press—he is Leon Kroll. A leading daily in our Nation's Capital devoted a quarter of a page to Kroll. He denied all allegations of subversiveism.

Is it culture to promote a propaganda division in behalf of the Soviet Government? Kroll has served as Director of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship and has promoted its propaganda art division. This is on the Department of Justice's list of Communist organizations.

Is it cultural to openly defend the Hollywood 10 convicted for contempt of Congress?

Is it cultural to take a prominent part in the Soviet's propaganda scheme, the

Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, Waldorf-Astoria, New York City, which our State Department—Secretary Acheson—labeled "a Moscow propaganda vehicle"?

They go further, and I could if Mr. Kroll insists.

Yet Kroll holds the distinction of being president of the United States Committee of the International Association of Plastic Arts sponsored by UNESCO which the State Department promotes and finances.

It is my suggestion that the House Committee on Un-American Activities hold a full-scale investigation in Communist control in the great field of American art, which it has increasingly and ruthlessly dominated until it is a menace and a monopoly detrimental to our American artists and to our culture.

The Red, pro-Communist professional is of great value to the Communist conspiracy. It never gives up and is always devising new ways of accomplishing its end. Let Americans be on guard against all phases of this sinister ideology which threatens to undermine and destroy our form of government.

Through these Red artists and allied professionals it knows it can even infiltrate into the United States Government. Therefore, it is understandable why such an intense effort is being made at this present time to protect and build up the reputations of artists and so-called artists with Communist and Communist-front associations.

AMERICAN ARTISTS CONGRESS AND LEAGUE OF AMERICAN WRITERS INITIATE RED ART MONOPOLY

Picasso is rated an esthetic hoax, a charlatan and a fraud by artists of note. He calls himself a Communist and describes his distorted art spasms as "Communist painting." But to the regimented, brainwashed artists-in-uniform of the Red art brigade, he is a symbol of the power of organized Communist propaganda.

These remarks are attributed to him in 1935 and taken down by Christian Zervos:

> There ought to be an absolute dictatorship—a dictatorship of painters—a dictatorship of one painter—to suppress all those who have betrayed us, to suppress the cheaters, to suppress the tricks, to suppress mannerisms, to suppress charm, to suppress history.

In December of 1937 a message and greeting from Picasso was relayed by transatlantic telephone to the faithful at the Second American Artists Congress in session at Carnegie Hall, New York. This was fit and proper for this organization has been officially cited as a Communist created and controlled organization.

The first American Artists Congress was held in New York City February 14, 15, and 16, 1936. Unless one takes into account the subversive and sinister affiliations of this organization, one cannot fully understand the ruthlessness of the Marxist domination that loyal American artists have been fighting for two decades without being conscious of the identity or nature of their well-hidden enemy.

After a year of planned effort this American Artists Congress emerged as a sister congress of the League of American Writers termed "Communist and subversive" by Attorney General Tom Clark. Both were affiliates of the International Union of Revolutionary Artists and Writers with headquarters in the Soviet Union.

The planners of this un-American conclave were the late George Ault, Arnold Blanch, Henry Billings, Peter Blume, Maurice Becker, Nicolai Cickovsky, Aaron Douglas, Stuart Davis, Adolph Dehn, William Gropper, Hugo Gellert, Harry Gottlieb, Minna Harkavy, Eitaro Ishigaki, Jerome Klein, Louis Lozowick, the late Jan Matulka, Sid Schary, William Seigel, the late Niles Spencer, Harry Sternberg, and Moses Soyer, and they worked in close connection with IWO brother, Herman Baron of the Red ACA Gallery in New York.

The out-and-out Communist nature of this congress, its main purposes, of seizing the machinery of the American art world—museums, galleries, art associations, and so forth, the establishment of socialized art—and the use of art to transform the world to the pattern of Karl Marx is boldly reported in its book on the congress.

The League of American Writers composed of hundreds of writers even more insolent in their revolutionary stand than their artist comrades, pledged themselves to promote by critical evaluation their pro-Red comrades of the other arts, and to use their literary work to promote policies in accordance with the Soviet world conspiracy.

Waldo Frank was elected chairman of the league whose signers included Earl Browder, Alexander Trachtenberg, Robert Coates, Lewis Mumford, M. J. Olgin, Louis Lozowick, Lincoln Kirstein, and Michael Gold.

Malcolm Cowley, now heading the Communist front, the National Institute of Arts and Letters, addressed the first convention of the literary disciples of Marx and Lenin on this topic: "What the Revolutionary Movement Can Do For a Writer."

One of the many foreign Communists who were members of the honorary presiding Committee of the League of American Writers was the Soviet writer, Sergei Tretiakov, who has described so-called modern art as "clever" because "it makes people stupid very cleverly."

The four artists in this recent Dallas affair, Leon Kroll, Kasuo Kunyioshi, William Zorach and Ben Shahn, were all members of the Red American Artist Congress.

The first name listed on the "call" of the Congress is Berenice Abbott, photographer—the last, William Zorach, who joined with their radical cohorts to agitate and organize for their Red objective—a permanent Federal arts program.

Twelve years later, in 1948, the names of Berenice Abbott and William Zorach are again on a list of sponsors of a pro-Soviet organization—the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions—still agitating for an art bill similar to the Socialist setup for artists in the Soviet Union. Milton Avery, Robert Cronbach, Lyonel Feininger, Rockwell Kent, Marion Greenwood, Ruth Reeves, Ben Shahn, Byron Browne, and Russell Twiggs are a few of the other supporters of this platform for artists of this Communist front. They threw their political support to the Progressive Party this time. Most of this crowd were in the Red Art Congress, and the majority are members of Artists Equity, their latest agitation vehicle.

LEGISLATION NOW BEFORE CONGRESS

Now I come to the present, 1956. Bills are before both Houses of this Congress for establishing a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts. This is in principle the demand for Federal subsidy that was urged by the leftists of President Truman, who turned it down. Although the sister professions are included in this bill, it was originally hatched in 1948 by Lloyd Goodrich, of the Whitney Museum of American Art, and has been steadfastly supported by the Red-dominated Artists Equity Association.

Goodrich's brain child, the National Council on the Arts and Government, is located at 22 West 54th Street, New York City, which is the address of the Whitney Museum. Ten of the thirty-three members of this council are active in the art world. They are Rene d'Harnoncourt, Museum of Modern Art; Lloyd Goodrich, Leon Kroll, Jonathan Marshall, Art Digest; Grace M. Morley, San Francisco Museum; George L. K. Morris; Ruth Reeves; Theodore J. Roszak; Harold Weston; and William Zorach. These all may safely be said to be supporters of the leftist art movement in this country. Please note that this council includes Kroll and Zorach of the Dallas affair.

The first name listed as a member of this council is the Red fronter, Berenice Abbott, and the last, William Zorach, supporter of Communist and Communist-front organizations. After 20 years, here are the two pro-Red members of the American Artists Congress together again in their untiring effort to use culture as a wedge to put across socialism in art.

This is the reason for the big cry for cultural freedom. This is the use in the Communist conspiracy of artists to help make this Government over into the image of the U. S. S. R. Here is the answer to the bleeding heart campaign for Kroll, Zorach, and Shahn, whose Red-made reputations are of political value to anti-American, pro-Soviet forces in this country.

The Communist Daily Worker has gone on record supporting one of these bills, the Lehman bill, S. 3419. In its issue of April 13, 1956, in a full page devoted to this legislation, it states:

> That bill * * * deserves the support of every American who wants to see our culture flourish and become great again. * * * We are printing below portions of the National Council's document and urge that it be talked up.

When the official Communist organ, the Daily Worker, wants legislation talked up, I want it talked down.

REDS TRY AGAIN

In 1946 an exhibition loaded with works by pro-Communist artists was sent to Europe by our State Department. This misrepresentative exhibition was recalled by Secretary Marshall. It was

a costly venture to the American taxpayer.

Another American exhibition is now being circulated in France at the expense of the French Government. The United States Committee for the International Association of Plastic Arts, sponsored by UNESCO, nominated the jury of selection.

According to the Red-dominated Artists Equity Association's Newsletter of March 1956, the "costs of organizing the exhibition at this end are being raised by the United States Information Agency and private individuals."

Here again are United States funds from the State Department being used for organizing an exhibition which includes such notorious Red and pro-Red artists as Paul Burlin, Philip Evergood, Leon Kroll, Sidney Laufman, I. Rice Periera, Ad Reinhardt, Rapheal Soyer and Ben Zion, all sponsors of the pro-Soviet propaganda vehicle, The Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace. Let us put a stop once and for all to this device of including such flagrant Communist-fronters in exhibitions our Government finances in any way.

Gregorio Prestopino, Byron Browne, Stuart Davis, Arnold Blanch, Isabel Bishop, Joseph Solman are some of the other Red-fronters included. Twenty-two of the so-called artists in this show were included in the 1946 exhibition recalled by Secretary Marshall.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTS STILL IN THE RED

The president of the United States Committee of the International Association of Plastic Arts is Leon Kroll, conservative painter, who has passed muster with crusading modernist critics of the left.

He is the type responsible for the National Institute of Arts and Letters, formerly a respected honor society now infiltrated by brainwashed Marxists, being officially listed by this Government as "a Communist front for artists, writers and musicians." Significantly, the institute is headed by Malcolm Cowley, advocate of packaged thinking in literary work, witness for Alger Hiss in his treason trial, with a shocking list of Communist affiliations.

Let us see how these pro-Red culturalists boost one another. Ben Shahn, of the Dallas "Sport in Art" exhibition, a Red supporter of deep crimson hue, has just been given the dubious distinction of being elected a member of this Communist front. Kroll is chairman of the committee on art of the National Institute of Arts and Letters, and the other booster of Communist causes, William Zorach, is its vice president.

Just last month this institute awarded grants of $1,000 to Philip Evergood, now editor of the Communist publication, Masses and Mainstream, and to "brother" Chaim Gross, a member of the Communist International Workers Order, the Red insurance company ordered dissolved by the State of New York. It would take me at least a half hour to read the House Committee on Un-American Activities Red citations on these six individuals just mentioned as members and award winners of the once great National Institute of Arts and Letters.

The disgrace and degradation of this organization by Red infiltration should be a warning to other tax-free organizations bearing the word "National" in their titles.

The United States Committee of the International Association of Plastic Arts has bestowed the title "Liaison" on Henry Billings. Billings has been active for 20 years in radical art organizations. He was an initiator of the American Artists Congress of 1936 which this Government has cited as a "Communist created and controlled organization." Billings' talent as an organizer, his knowledge of art organizations, his influence in certain sections of the slick-magazine press, have been very useful to the Red art periphery.

ARTISTS EQUITY ASSOCIATION RED-DOMINATED

Henry Billings and Leon Kroll are honorary presidents of the Red-dominated Artists Equity Association, of 9 East 45th Street, New York City, an organization in which the hard core of Communist and Communist-front artists are gathered. In the 1955 Cumulative Index to Publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities, 20 present officers and directors at large of Artists Equity Association are listed. Among them I find Ben Shahn, Ruth Reeves, Maurice Becker, Nicolai Cikovsky, Robert Gwathmey, Stuyvesant Van Veen, Lena Gurr, Jack Levine, Joseph Hirsh, Hudson Walker, Lincoln Rothschild, Jacob Lawrence, and Minna Harkavy, one of its present vice presidents.

MODERN ART AND MURDER

This woman, Minna Harkavy, a modern art sculptress, is given a good deal of anonymous space in a book, The Whole of Their Lives, by Benjamin Gitlow, a man who has risked his life and fortune to help expose the Communist conspiracy. This fearless ex-Red has in the past held every important Communist Party post in this country, including the office of general secretary of the Communist Party, U. S. A., and a member of the presidium of the world Communist movement. I quote from Mr. Gitlow's book:

> An affair with a Communist sculptress, whose reputation was well established in the art world, brought (Carlo) Tresca (Italian anarchist) in contact with the OGPU * * *. Her wealthy husband was a Communist zealot * * *. And, in addition, she was having a love affair with Olgin, one of the top leaders of the Communist Party in New York * * *. Both lived under the one studio roof * * *. The OGPU agents often visited the studio. Carlo met them and became enmeshed in their works.

On January 11, 1943, Carlo Tresca was assassinated on the street in New York. To quote again from Gitlow:

> He dared to buck the OGPU.

Moissaye Joseph Olgin, according to Walter S. Steele, editor of National Republic magazine, Washington, D. C., in his testimony before the McCormack-Dickstein committee in 1934, was at the time a top agent of the Soviet and American Communists in the United States of America. He, according to Mr. Steele, was secretly selected to outline the master plan for seizure of the United States Government, which plan was exposed in detail by Mr. Steele.

A modern monstrosity by this woman was awarded first prize of $3,500 by the Metropolitan Museum of Art in its exhibition American Sculpture, 1951. This exhibition, which was engineered by the Red-dominated Artists Equity Association, was applauded and upheld by Lloyd Goodrich, assistant director of Whitney Museum of American Art, as representative of our sculpture. That is understandable from a man who publicly complained in 1951 that a Federal art project was being stymied because of "secondary issues, such as, is this or that artist subversive, or does he paint subversively, or does he belong to certain groups."

TWO RED FRONTERS AWARDED BALLYHOOED U. N. ART COMPETITION

An item in the New York Times, January 17, 1954, states:

> Through the inspiration of Artists Equity Association, a nationwide movement among museum directors, art patrons, and collectors to place contemporary American art in the United Nation's headquarters has resulted in the birth of an organization for this purpose to be known as the National Council for United States Art, Inc.

Under this high-sounding name we should expect this Nation to be well represented on the walls of the United Nation's building.

But what will deface the walls and go in the grounds as representative United States art if the council's grandiose plans receive sufficient financial support from the public and if the juries' choices are accepted?

Abstract and social protest mural work by two veteran supporters of Communist and Communist-front causes, Stuart Davis and Jacob Lawrence, secretary of Artists Equity Association, and a sculpture by another Artists Equity member.

The roots of Stuart Davis are deep in subversive movements and time does not permit of a detailed account of his Red activities, but let us look at the shameful record of the secretary of Artists Equity Association, Jacob Lawrence, as compiled by the Un-American Activities Committee.

JACOB LAWRENCE

This is by no means complete as time does not permit a full reading of the committee's report. I quote in part:

> The Daily Worker of March 15, 1947 (p. 5), reported that Lawrence signed a protest against the ban on the Communist Party.
>
> He was listed as a sponsor of the arts, sciences, and professions for May Day in the Daily Worker of April 30, 1948 (p. 5).
>
> Jacob Lawrence was honored at the New Masses awards dinner as reported in the Daily Worker, January 7, 1946 (p. 11).
>
> He has contributed to Masses and Mainstream February 1949, and the Worker of January 23, 1949 (p. 5).
>
> These are all Communist publications.
>
> Jacob Lawrence illustrated the book One Way Ticket written by Langston Hughes. (The Worker, February 13, 1949.)
>
> Lawrence signed a letter upholding the right of V. J. Jerome to publish his pamphlet, Let Us Grasp the Weapon of Culture, cited an overt act in the Smith Act indictment of Jerome, as shown in Masses and Mainstream May 1952 (p. 27).

It is outrageous that an organization which elects a Red of this deep hue to the sensitive post of secretary should have

the audacity to attempt to influence legislation in this Congress as the Artist Equity Association has done.

Kroll and Zorach served on the juries that judged this peculiar competition. Lloyd Goodrich was on the technical committee.

RED ART BRIGADE INVADES WASHINGTON

Right here in the city of Washington this Red-dominated Artist Equity Association is recruiting artists into its organization.

In January of this year a member of my staff attended a recruiting meeting of this outfit held in our Corcoran Museum. On the platform was its national membership committee chairman, Anthony Toney.

Who is this Toney? I will tell you in condensed form from the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

The Daily Worker of August 24, 1950 (p. 3), listed Anthony Toney, artist, as a signer of a statement urging bail for Communist leaders.

Anthony Toney, according to the Daily Worker, April 9, 1953 (p. 7), was one of the sponsors of the Second Veterans' Art Show of the American Veterans for Peace, New York City, a Communist front.

Anthony Toney was an illustrator for Masses and Mainstream, Communist cultural magazine.

According to the Daily Worker of November 10, 1952 (p. 3), Anthony Toney, artist, signed brief urging a new trial of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg.

A list of persons who served in the Loyalist Army in Spain, 1936–39, named one Anthony Toney, Gloversville, N. Y., as a member of the Veterans of the International Brigade. The House Committee on Un-American Activities cited this Red brigade, as follows: "The Communist Party was active in recruiting American boys for the so-called Abraham Lincoln Brigade in behalf of Loyalist Spain. Earl Browder boasted that 60 percent of the brigade was composed of Communist Party members."

Now, this individual, Anthony Toney, is busy recruiting American artists into Artists Equity Association, the organization which has campaigned for years, along with Lloyd Goodrich, of the Whitney Museum, for legislation that would put the American artists into a cultural straitjacket similar in design to the one worn by Soviet artists.

The Communist Party has given its cultural directive in a publication entitled "Let Us Grasp the Weapon of Culture." Indirectly leading the fight from his cell in the Federal penitentiary at Lewisburg, Pa., is its author, V. J. Jerome, educational director of the Communist Party, and member of its central committee. He is serving his term after being convicted under the Smith Act of conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of this Government by force and violence.

RED BLUEPRINT

I will let Jerome explain this blueprint by quoting from his treasonable tract, Let Us Grasp the Weapon of Culture.

He says:

Cultural activity is an essential phase of the (Communist) party's general ideological work, and as such is interconnected with the party's struggles in the economic and political spheres. * * * Therefore the question arises of establishing leading bodies in this field—commissions, committees, etc., and assignments of leading comrades on National, State, county, and section levels * * *. We must go forward to the people with the message of peace, of freedom, of Socialist humanism.

Here is the Red directive to use art to infiltrate, to organize, to rally sympathy, and to do it as Socialist humanists under the banners of peace and freedom as the entering wedge to a nationwide WPA of art to be eventually under the control of infiltrated art groups.

CHANGEOVER

Anticipating the conviction of the top Communist leaders being tried by Judge Medina, Paul Robeson declared in March 1949 that Marxism is "a cultural philosophy."

This changing of masks from politics to culture was given vast publicity by the Red-staged Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace in New York, March 25, 26, and 27, 1949, under the auspices of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

Supporters of the political-cultural activities of the Communist conspiracy who sponsored this turnabout include in the field of art Berenice Abbott, photographer; Aaron Bohrod; Paul Burlin; David Burliuk; Nicolai Cikovsky; Robert Coates, art critic; the late Jo Davidson; Adolph Dehn; Stuart Edie; Philip Evergood; Vincent Glinsky; Harry Gottlieb; William Gropper; Robert Gwathmey; Minna Harkavy; Joseph Hirsch; Alfonso Ianelli; Rockwell Kent; Leon Kroll; Sidney Laufman; Jack Levine; Elizabeth McCausland, art critic; Elizabeth Olds; I. Rice Periera; Anton Refregier; Ad Reinhardt; Ben Shahn; Mitchell Siporin; the late John Sloan; Raphael Soyer; Paul Strand, photographer; Max Weber; and Ben Zion.

What did the wheelhorses of the Communist conspiracy do concerning the dilemma facing them, these artists and their other professional comrades whose so-called political associations were soon to be unmasked as treason by this Government?

They passed resolutions in which they said:

We solemnly declare that no official, high or petty, has the right to decree what is orthodox in opinion or association, or penalize those whose beliefs or activities are unsatisfactory to Government inquisitors.

They further state they intend to hide behind the Constitution and its Bill of Rights in their determination to continue their efforts toward the destruction of the form of government of this Republic. They boldly state:

We are determined to maintain the Bill of Rights as a charter of cultural freedom.

JEROME CALLS FOR BROAD UNITED FRONT TO PROTECT RED PROFESSIONALS

Needing the immunity the American people give to creative artists, the Communist Jerome points out the "Manifestations of Resistance" to exposure of this Red racket in these words:

Against the Fascist blacklist and censorship campaign * * * there is gathering resentment which can be organized into a storm of protest. * * * Statements * * * branded the censorship of content and the blacklisting of artists for their political opinions as practices smacking of Hitlerism. * * * The National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions (ASP) has not only condemned these attacks, but has shown their close tieup with the attempt to silence the voices of peace. These protests can be consolidated into a broad united-front movement for cultural freedom.

There we have the concrete plan. A broad united-front movement ostensibly designed to protect the freedom of culture, but actually organized to protect Communist professionals and those who have rallied to the defense of the Communist Party and who have supported its fronts of subversive operation.

Jerome wants "no concessions to Red-baiting," as he terms exposure. He says:

This imposes on Communists and all progressives the duty to warn against this trap and to point out the inseparable connection between the attacks on the citizenship of Communists and the rights of all Americans.

SUPPORTERS OF COMMUNISM ARE ENDANGERING FREEDOM

I quote from the Communist Control Act of 1954:

Findings of fact, section 2: The Congress hereby finds and declares that the Communist Party of the United States, although purportedly a political party, is in fact an instrumentality of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States. It constitutes an authoritarian dictatorship within a republic, demanding for itself the rights and privileges accorded to political parties, but denying to all others the liberties guaranteed by the Constitution. * * * The policies and the programs of the Communist Party are secretly prescribed for it by the foreign leaders of the world Communist movement.

DALLAS, TEX., CITIZENS ABUSED FOR REFUSING TO FOLLOW RED CULTURAL BLUEPRINT

Alert and well-informed citizens of Dallas, Tex., including those in the Public Affairs Luncheon Club, noted art organizations, veterans organizations, and patriotic societies joined forces in the Dallas County Patriotic Council to protest the showing of an exhibition called Sport in Art, at the Dallas Museum, March 25 to April 20, 1956.

They objected to the showing in a museum partly supported by public funds of work by William Zorach, Kroll, the late Kunyioshi, and Ben Shahn, all four having records of Communist and Communist-front associations, who were included in the exhibition. They overlooked Antonio Frasconi, Communist Daily Worker favorite, and artists for the Communist publication, Masses and Mainstream, as well as several other Red fronters.

Sports Illustrated, of Time, Inc., was the originator and sponsor of the art show which was arranged and circulated for it by the American Federation of Art. Neiman-Marcus was the cosponsor of the exhibit in Dallas.

Originally the final showing of this exhibition was to be sponsored by the United States Information Agency of the State Department in Australia during the Olympic Games in the fall of 1956.

This was exploited by the so-called liberal press and may have had some bearing on the refusal of the trustees of the Dallas Museum to heed the protest of the Dallas County Patriotic Council.

DOES SPORTS ILLUSTRATED, OF TIME, INC., USE RUSE TO CLEAR KROLL, SHAHN, KUNYIOSHI, AND ZORACH?

A misleading statement issued by the board of trustees and signed by Jerome Crossman, Gerald Mann, and Waldo Stewart and given wide circulation in Dallas and New York attempts to clear the four exhibitors of any and all Communist and Communist-front associations.

The method employed by the Dallas Museum to whitewash these Red fronters should be of interest to every Member of this House and should be brought to the attention of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The Dallas Museum wired Harry Phillips of Sports Illustrated, sponsor of the show, requesting specific information regarding the four artists. Mr. Phillips replied:

> The Subversive Activities Control Board has a huge file listing almost everyone mentioned in its lengthy hearing on the Communist Party in the United States—a hearing that lasted 15 months and totaled some 5 million words of testimony. None of the artists is listed in the file.
>
> Similarly, none of the artists has ever been identified as a Communist before the House Un-American Activities Committee, nor have any of them appeared as witnesses before it.

Instead of checking with the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. Phillips turned to the Subversive Activities Control Board, an independent agency of the executive branch of the Government, which was not equipped to supply Communist or Communist-front records of Kroll, Kunyioshi, Shahn, or Zorach.

This fact was brought out in a letter dated February 13, 1956, addressed to Mr. John W. Mayo, of the Dallas County Patriotic Council, and signed by Charles C. Wise, Jr., executive secretary of the Subversive Activities Control Board, from which I quote in part:

> The Subversive Activities Control Board is an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government whose sole function is the conduct of formal hearings based upon petitions brought by the Attorney General against organizations which he alleges are Communist action, Communist front, or Communist infiltrated.
>
> It is true that the four artists named in the second paragraph of your letter are not listed in our file of persons referred to in the Communist Party hearings. However, this fact has as little significance in establishing whether or not they have Communist Party or Communist-front affiliations as it would have in establishing their artistic competence or lack of it. Our file does not in any sense purport to be an attempt to list all persons active in Communist organizations.

It is an outrage that the loyal citizens of Dallas in the Dallas County Patriotic Council should be subject to nationwide vituperation and ridicule as a result of a valueless, so-called clearance initiating from Sports Illustrated, of Time, Inc. And, furthermore, I believe most editors in our press know that to date no special hearings have been held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities on the subject of Communist infiltration of art. However, the lengthy records in the committee's files on Kroll, Shahn, and Zorach and, to a lesser degree, Kunyioshi, bear witness to the support these individuals have given to Communist and Communist-front causes.

Here is a local situation that by clever manipulation is being made a cause célèbre around which the Reds can rally public attention.

NEW YORK TIMES AND DAILY WORKER BOOST SAME LINE

Let us see the subsequent steps in this fast-growing united front cultural movement called for by Jerome to protect Red professionals.

In the New York Times of February 12, 1956, Aline B. Saarinen, publicist for so-called modern art, writes an article entitled "Art Storm Breaks on Dallas" in which the enlightened citizens of Dallas are termed "vigilantes" and in which she attempts to insert the racial issue—a typical leftist device.

So well worded for the purposes of Red propaganda was the Saarinen article that the editor of the Communist Daily Worker, in the February 15 issue, digested parts of Mrs. Saarinen's article in an editorial called "Defending the Arts."

On February 19, 1956, the misleading statement of the Dallas Museum was given complete coverage on the art page of the New York Times.

In the New York Times of May 21, 1956, a belated tear-jerking story appears on William Zorach, one of the exhibitors in the Dallas Museum. I shall discuss this inaccurate whitewash later.

On the 26th of May 1956, weeks after the USIA had informed Sports Illustrated of its reversed decision, the New York Times gives front-page attention to the episode.

The following day an editorial which was factually incorrect appeared in the New York Times called "Art in the Heart of Texas."

This editorial ignores the real issue brought forth by the Dallas County Patriotic Council which is the continued monopoly of American art by Reds and Red fronters, and its danger to our culture and society.

Col. Alvin M. Owsley, of the Dallas Council, states:

> It is one of the basic premises of Communist doctrine that art can and should be used in the constant process of attempting to brainwash and create public attitudes that are soft toward communism.

The gentleman from Texas and the alert citizens of Dallas are better informed concerning the Communist conspiracy and its directive "Let Us Grasp the Weapon of Culture" than certain writers in the press.

MODERN ART PUBLICIST UP TO OLD TRICKS

Emily Genauer, modern art publicist on the New York Herald Tribune, is an old hand at ridicule, distortion, and defense of the left culture bund. She enters the Dallas controversy armed with a new weapon—insinuation. She infers that the Dallas County Patriotic Council has been duped by academic artists omitted, as she admits, "from most museums and other shows." The fact that both the public and loyal American artists abhor communism and its abuse of art to the detriment of the culture of this Nation is ignored by Miss Genauer in her article of June 3, 1956.

Referring to the State Department exhibition of 1946 and its withdrawal due to predominance of Reds and fellow travelers, she says, "a charge, incidentally, no one was ever given a chance to disprove."

William Gropper was given the chance before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and answered by hiding behind the fifth amendment.

Miss Genauer boldly uses what she claims are direct quotations from me. It might interest the editors of the Herald Tribune to know that these garbled, puerile-sounding statements attributed to me are, in fact, the twisted distortions of Miss Genauer's confused thinking as I brought out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 13, 1949.

The American Federation of Art, 1083 Fifth Avenue, New York, is described by Miss Genauer as highly respectable, a description used frequently in this Dallas affair.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF ART

Information sent me from the USIA reveals that at least $53,350 has been paid the American Federation of Art in a period of 3½ years to arrange exhibitions sent abroad for this Government.

It is pertinent to examine this organization since it describes itself as a nonprofit, educational institution and is influential in establishing cultural standards.

The American Federation of Art has taken a stand and issued a resolution that entitles them to membership in the broad united front cultural movement important to the Communist conspiracy in its determination to continue its strangle hold on United States art.

At the AFA convention, October 1953, Francis Brennan, art adviser to Time, Inc., states:

> We can buy the artifacts all right, but where is that great unified critical body that will rise up in civilized outrage against the injustice of discharging either an artist or a clerk for some minor youthful adherence to a now unpopular political alinement?

This is fuzzy-headed advice both for Time, Inc., and the American Federation of Art.

Communism is not politics and Brennan should know that most of the Red artists have been faithful supporters of and faithfully supported by the Communist conspiracy for extensive periods. Some such as Zorach, Burliuk, Gropper, Sloan, Shahn, Becker, Dehn, Refregier, and Kent, and scores of others, have supported Communist and Communist-front organizations for decades.

AEA PLUS AFA EQUALS MONOPOLY

On the board of trustees of the American Federation of Art, I find Red-dominated Artists Equity represented by Henry Billings, an initiator of the Communist American Artists Congress, and Hudson D. Walker, director of Artists Equity Fund, Inc., and former president of this same American Federation of Art.

Walker describes himself as an art specialist. For years Walker was a director of the subversive and Communist National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., and the treasurer of its art committee. As a dealer in Boston and New York, Walker has promoted the

leftist radical artists. Associating with Herman Baron, director of the Red art clearing house for radicals, they jointly sponsored the Communist front, United American Artists.

RED PAINTINGS FOR PEANUTS

The Red ACA Gallery at 61–63 East 57th Street in New York is run by Herman Baron, member of the Communist International Workers Order, and in whose gallery the American Artists Congress was organized. For over 20 years the ACA Gallery has been the headquarters for art auctions, sales, and benefits for Communist Party publications, organizations, and causes.

Usually the artists and Communist cause divide the sales price equally. Thus the artist helps the Communist Party and the party helps the artist. Baron brags "that many important collectors of contemporary art have had their start there."

These paintings auctioned or sold for Communist causes are cheap. If any of this so-called art collected by this manner, that is, to support the Communist conspiracy, has been resold at inflated prices to our museums, it too is a field for investigation.

Elizabeth McCausland, Red art publicist, has pamphleteered for the ACA Gallery. Her brochure on Picasso is a typical publication of that organization. Miss McCausland also writes for the American Federation of Art. She wrote a "Selected Bibliography on American Art," for its publication Who's Who in American Art, 1947.

She is one of the sinister group of literary sneaks who joined the subversive League of American Writers, and therefore did a good job of Marxist cultural evaluation on our art history by including Zorach, Rockwell Kent, Stuart Davis, Philip Evergood, William Gropper, Moses Soyer, and Max Weber as being part of the historical stream of great American artists.

The American Federation of Art is not performing as an educational institution if it permits notorious Red publicists intent on brainwashing and propaganda to evaluate our culture.

Exhibitions sent abroad by our Government as representative of American art must fulfill that purpose. Imposed downgraded standards of evaluation to include what so-called art experts call leading tendencies in American art permit the many subdivisions of the Red contortionists to hold predominance in many art exhibitions. This should not be permitted in our Government-financed shows.

MORE AEA INFLUENCE

Hudson Walker is the grandson of the founder of the Walker Art Center in Minneapolis, whose present director, H. Harvard Arnason, is a trustee of the American Federation of Art. According to the Art Digest of July 1, 1943, the Walker Art Center was reorganized with community and WPA help. Attesting the strength of Red-dominated Artists Equity's influence on the board of trustees of the American Federation of Art is the fact that its trustee, Daniel S. Defenbacker, assistant to the National Director of the WPA, 1936 to 1939, was director of the Walker Art Center from 1939 to 1951. His wife, Louise Walker Defenbacker, was a curator of this same art center.

The Artists Equity Fund, Inc., for art promotion, which Walker heads is sponsored by the following trustees of the American Federation of Art, Alfred H. Barr, D. S. Defenbacker, Paul S. Harris, Rene d'Harnoncourt, Bartlett H. Hayes, William M. Milliken, and Charles Nagel, Jr.

AFA PROTECTS WORK OF NOTORIOUS RED PROPAGANDIST

The pro-Soviet National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, initiator of protests designed to protect Red professionals, was very active in mobilizing the broad united front movement into action to defend the mural work by Anton Refregier.

V. J. Jerome, educational director of the Communist Party, says of this organization:

> This movement for independent progressive expression in the arts is not limited to New York * * * it extends to San Francisco.

The shocking Red record of Anton Refregier is indicative of a career of a radical made under and with the influence of the Communist Party. He taught the technique of infusing Communist propaganda into works of so-called art in the early thirties at the Communist John Reed Club. The defense of the Soviet Union was of prime importance to the members of this Communist organization.

In fact, Refregier for over 25 years has repaid the Communist conspiracy for his Red-made career by continually supporting causes against the recognized interest of the United States in international situations, against the decisions of our courts, the laws of our land and the safety of our people. He is a supporter of the committee to defend V. J. Jerome, and demanded clemency for the Rosenbergs, convicted spys.

In 1941 Refregier got the contract to do murals in the Rincon Annex Post Office in San Francisco.

The citizens of San Francisco who would not under any circumstance permit their children to attend the Communist California Labor School at 216 Market Street in San Francisco, cited by Attorney General Clark as a subversive and Communist organization, are forced in the name of "cultural freedom" to let their children be the victims of pictorial brainwashing, taste-degrading art attempts by Anton Refregier, who served in 1947 on the faculty of this same Communist school.

An idea of the Communist code of ethics may be judged by the fact that Victor Arnautoff, also on the faculty of the Red California Labor School, and Arnold Blanch, another Red fronter, served as bestowers of this contract on Refregier. Being 2 of the 3 artist jurors they selected their comrade as the one artist well able to give a Marxist interpretation of California's history.

In May of 1953 hearings were held before the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House Committee on Public Works to pass on a House Joint Resolution 211, introduced by Congressman SCUDDER, of California, to remove these offensive works by this acknowledged propagandist for communism, Anton Refregier, from the walls of this United States post office.

Indignant citizens, patriotic societies, veterans' organizations and better known artists of California in the Society of Western Artists condemned them as displeasing, derogatory to the history of California and as esthetically poor.

Now who sprang to the defense of this Russian-firster, Refregier, who received this mural contract through a loaded jury?

Let me mention first that Communist Jerome's pet Communist front, the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, was there whipping up a storm of protest according to his directive.

Edward Biberman, brother of the notorious Communist-fronter Herbert J. Biberman.

Stanley Marcus, merchant of Dallas, a trustee of the American Federation of Art.

Jerry Bywaters, director of the Dallas Museum.

Red-dominated Artists Equity Association.

Alfred H. Barr, Jr., and Rene d'Harnoncourt, of the Museum of Modern Art, who have probably wasted more capitalists' dollars on works by Communist artists than any other institution in this Nation. Real Communists should not believe in angels, but they must put a lot of trust in Barr and d'Harnoncourt.

Grace L. McCann Morley, hostess to Red-dominated Artists Equity Association.

Hudson D. Walker backed up with a letter from Julian Huxley, British leftwinger, which had to be struck from the record.

John Hay Whitney, of the Museum of Modern Art, who telegraphs that it is an act of vandalism to remove the murals.

What about the "dadaists" in the collection of the Museum of Modern Art, who consciously set out on a course of systematic destruction of art, culture, and Western society? And what of the Communist surrealists movement which, according to their spokesman, Herbert Read, "had taken upon itself the duty of destroying the esthetic and moral conventions of contemporary bourgeois civilization"?

A big proportion of so-called modern art is organized international vandalism in the true sense of the word.

The so-called critics are international, too, now. Just the American section of their outfit sent their support to Refregier. It included Robert Coates and Elizabeth McCausland, of the Communist League of American Writers, and James Johnson Sweeney, of the Red American Artists Congress.

Lloyd Goodrich protested individually to preserve the murals and also as a member of the board of trustees of the American Federation of Art, which sent a representative for the organization.

This is a very broad united front. I could list more supporters if time permitted.

BROAD UNITED-FRONT MOVEMENT PROMOTES ZORACH

Time magazine of Time, Inc., the sponsor of the Sport in Art exhibition, has elected Zorach as dean of United States sculptors in its June 11, 1956, issue. Almost a full page is devoted to building prestige and gathering sympathy for this Red fronter.

On page 27 of the May 21, 1956, New York Times, there is an article entitled "Sculptor Is Paid for Unused Work." It is subtitled "Zorach Accepts With 'Broken Heart' $56,515 from Texas Bank for Three Panels"; and the writer of it attempts not only to create sympathy for Zorach, consistent supporter of Communist and Communist-front causes, but also gives the false impression to readers that Zorach had been officially cleared of any and all left-wing connections by a new, absurd method, that is, by his Congressman.

The Communist and Communist-front record of this individual in the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities was made by William Zorach, himself and by no one else.

Mrs. Saarinen chose not to accept this fact. She stated in the New York Times of March 27, 1955:

Item: Congressman DONDERO's serial attacks on modern art and reckless accusations of subversion by artists.

Item: The State Department forbade the publication of a rather traditional torso by one of America's most eminent sculptors in a book on American art being sent abroad, because its mysterious and publicly denied "grey list" included him as having belonged to the John Reed Club over 20 years ago.

The fact that the artist categorically denied this, or any other Communist affiliation, seems only to make a ridiculous censorship outrageous.

Mrs. Saarinen wants all Congressmen to quit telling the truth about her Red proteges whose careers she is promoting, and she wants us to hurry up and mature and leave such matters with admiring trust in the hands of art experts.

I disagree entirely. There is too much opportunity for sly venality and esthetic dictatorship possible under the guise of so-called art appraisal. The tendency of Mrs. Saarinen and certain other cultural evaluators to ignore truth deserves neither admiration nor trust.

CONGRESSMAN HALE DID NOT CLEAR ZORACH

Since I mentioned Mr. Zorach in my speeches before this House several years ago on the subject of Communist conspiracy against our art and artists, first I am giving here from the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities the record William Zorach has made for himself, and then I am supplementing that record with added data in my possession.

In order to save time, I find I am forced to condense the four pages of Zorach's record from the committee files:

William Zorach, Brooklyn, N. Y., was signer of a statement against anti-Communist legislation. (Daily Worker, June 15, 1948, p. 11.)

He signed a statement defending the 12 Communist leaders. (Daily Worker, Feb. 28, 1949, p. 9.)

He signed a statement against denaturalization released by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. (Daily Worker, Aug. 10, 1950, p. 5.) This committee was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General.

Zorach sponsored American Continental Congress for World Peace, September 5–10, 1949, cited as "another phase in the Communist peace campaign aimed at consolidating anti-American forces throughout the Western Hemisphere."

Zorach signed a statement of Civil Rights Congress in defense of the Communist Party's ballot rights in New York State. (Daily Worker, October 7, 1946.)

He signed a statement of Civil Rights Congress defending the Communist Party.

William Zorach signed a statement of that organization cited by the Attorney General as "subversive and Communist" in defense of Gerhart Eisler. (Daily Worker, Feb. 20, 1947, p. 2.)

The Daily Worker of May 21, 1930, named William Zorach as a member of the John Reed Club, named after the founder of the American Communist Party. (Special committee report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 175.)

William Zorach signed a brief submitted in behalf of John Howard Lawson and Dalton Trumbo October 1949, by the Cultural Workers in the Supreme Court of the United States, October term, 1949:

Lawson and Trumbo were convicted of contempt of Congress and served jail sentences of 1 year each. They refused to affirm or deny membership in the Communist Party—the committee presented evidence of affiliations with Communist organizations and a copy of the witness' Communist Party registration card.

Zorach's record in the committee's files contains over a dozen more listings as supporter, signer, sponsor of Communist, subversive and front organizations.

I list a few from my own records:

Zorach was signer of call of American Artists Congress, 1936, cited as Communist created and controlled.

Zorach was lecturer at John Reed Club, subject: Sculpture and Its Relation to Revolutionary Art—files of Walter Steele.

He signed John Reed Club statement defending the Communists, May 19, 1930, page 254, Walter Steele report, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1938.

Zorach contributed art work to be auctioned for the benefit of the pro-Soviet Waldorf conference of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions—cited a Communist front April 10, 1949.

This is the shameful and outrageous record of a man the New York Times is attempting to whitewash in a bleeding-heart article. I shall quote from it:

The bank official (Mr. L. R. Bryan, vice chairman of the Bank of the Southwest, Houston, Tex.) denied Mr. Zorach's suspicion that the rejection stemmed from political implications. Mr. Zorach was 1 of 4 artists whose works were denounced earlier this year by the Dallas County Patriotic Council. The council accused the artists of having Communist or Communist-front records, charges that Mr. Zorach, for one, has vigorously denied.

The Lithuanian-born sculptor who came here at the age of 4 said he had voted Republican and Democratic all his life in Maine, where he has a farm; and that his Representative there, ROBERT HALE, Republican, had cleared him of all suspicion.

The only thing Congressman HALE did was to place in the RECORD a letter written by Zorach. This procedure in no way clears Mr. Zorach of his Communist-front record, nor does it infer that Congressman HALE is a character witness for Zorach. It is obvious that Zorach never made known to Congressman HALE his long list of Communist and Communist-front associations.

Zorach states that he had voted Republican or Democratic all of his life in Maine. However, I believe the editors of the New York Times should look on page 32 of the October 20, 1948, issue of their own paper. In it they will find the name of William Zorach in a large advertisement for the election of Henry Wallace. This advertisement was issued by an officially cited Communist front, the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, the organization lauded by V. J. Jerome.

I find him designated as one of the Manhattan Committee of Artists for Wallace, which gave as its address 23 West 26th Street, New York City, the building donated by Frederic Vanderbilt Field to the subversive and Communist Civil Rights Congress and a host of other subversive fronts. The chairman of this committee was Max Weber and the secretary was Joseph Rascob. Besides Mr. Zorach, it included David Burliuk, Philip Evergood, Ernest Fiene, Marion Greenwood, Chaim Gross, Rockwell Kent, Arthur King, Frank Kirk, and Raphael Soyer.

TRUTH IS A POWERFUL WEAPON

Through years of steadfast Communist-directed organization, cultural termites have bored deeply into the foundation of the structure of our American art world. The damage they have done and are doing is very great. They intend to do more. But if the truth is told and not suppressed, the loyal American artists will rise up against the domination of this radical clique which is directed by individuals dedicated to the aims of international communism.

Appraisal of art must be restored to writers who possess knowledge and honor and are not Marxist evaluators posing as critics. Art juries should not be loaded with crusading leftists intent on bestowing recognition and awards on their fellow-traveler comrades. Museum funds left in trust to advance American art should be used for that purpose and no other.

Let the Soviet conspiracy support Picasso, Leger, Rivera, Max Ernst, and the band of antiart contortionists outside the Soviet Union, as well as the social-realist painters and sculptors inside Russia who are developing their talents to build, strengthen, and propagandize for socialist humanism.

Let our great Republic repudiate in no uncertain terms this Marxist scheme to grasp our culture and use it against our way of life. Let our art be an expression of the beauty, spirit, and aspirations of our great Nation.

Too long have tyrants, fearful even of the image of virtue, kept thought itself in chains—encouraged license and stamped out genius.

CITIZENS OF CHARLESTOWN, MASS., TO CELEBRATE ANNIVERSARY OF BATTLE OF BUNKER HILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, this year, as in every year for 181 years, the people of Charlestown, Mass., celebrate the anniversary of the historic Battle of Bunker Hill. This decisive engagement, the turning point which signaled the final defeat of the English forces and the loss of the American Colonies to the British Empire, is marked with appropriate ceremonies. On the night before banquets are held to commemorate the occasion. There are festivities throughout the whole day of celebration. This year, participating in the magnificent parade will be detachments of color guards and troops from the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Marine Corps. The people of Charlestown open their homes, and all are welcome to join with them.

In Monument Square in Charlestown there stands a granite shaft in majestic tribute to the high courage of the men who staked not only their lives but their reputations on the uncertain issue of Revolutionary War. This great monument serves to recall the place of battle which climaxed the 60-day siege of Boston between Lexington and Bunker Hill; the thrilling story of the June day of so many years ago, and the vision and ideals of the citizen soldiers who fought there.

As the Representative of the Charlestown area, I am privileged and proud to make a special announcement at this time. The Boston National Historic Sites Commission, established by the Congress of the United States and of which I am a member, proposes to accept the Bunker Hill Monument from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as an outstanding example of America's historical heritage. The monument is to be converted to a national shrine to be enjoyed not only by the people of Massachusetts but by all of the citizens of this great Nation.

All of us know the story of the lack of ammunition of our embattled patriots who fought on the slopes of Bunker Hill; how they were forced to hold their fire until the British were in sure range. In the mighty struggle on that blazing June day the forces of King George III were able to capture some of the arms of our Colonial troops. On the Plains of Abraham, outside the city of Quebec in Canada, stands one of the cannons fired at Bunker Hill. In this connection, I believe that my colleagues in the House would like to know of a letter which I have just addressed to the Prime Minister of Canada, asking for the return of the cannon to be placed in our national shrine:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 14, 1956.

The Right Honorable LOUIS STEPHEN ST. LAURENT, K. C.,
Prime Minister of Canada,
Ottawa, Canada.

MY DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER: I know that you and your countrymen are well aware that they occupy a very special place in the hearts of all Americans. History has inextricably intertwined the fortunes of our two countries, and we enjoy 3,000 miles of unprotected border between us, a symbol of the peace and friendship in which we dwell. The closeness of our friendship is demonstrated not only in the mutual respect which we hold for each other, but also in the fact that we have ben comrades-in-arms, sharing in the fight for freedom, and in the defense of our homes and families.

As a Member of the Congress of the United States, I have the privilege of representing Charlestown, Mass., in which is located a magnificent monument commemorating the great Battle of Bunker Hill. The Bunker Hill Monument stands as a tribute to the courage of the citizen soldiers of the American Colonies, and as an inspiration to all Americans of their devotion to principle and their love of country.

It is the proposal of the Boston National Historic Sites Commission, established by the Congress of the United States, to convert the Bunker Hill Monument to a national shrine as an outstanding example of America's historical heritage.

At the time of the momentous engagement, the forces of King George III were able to capture one of the cannons fired on that day in June so many years ago. It stands today on the Plains of Abraham, just outside the city of Quebec in Canada.

It is natural for the American people to have a high regard for this remarkable remembrance of an occasion which marked the beginning of the rise of our great Nation to world leadership.

The Bunker Hill National Monument would not be complete without the addition of this historic cannon, and so I am submitting this formal request to you for the return of the cannon to the people of the United States as a further demonstration of the harmony, unity, and friendship in which we live.

Sincerely,

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today be vacated and that I may have permission to address the House for 5 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RELIEF IN AREAS OF EXCESSIVE UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, some months ago I introduced the bill H. R. 7856 which was referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means. It is a bill to alleviate conditions in areas of excessive unemployment, the so-called distressed economic areas.

Coming from the anthracite coal fields of Pennslyvania, where we have a condition of excessive unemployment and distressed economic conditions, together with Senator DOUGLAS of Illinois in the other body, we have held hearings in several States, and, as a result, the Senator from Illinois and I have revised this bill, and it has been introduced in the other body by him and introduced here by me.

Now, the bill here is referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency in this House, since the tax clause of the first bill is removed. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that that distinguished committee will give immediate consideration to that bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. DEANE]. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has expired.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. O'NEILL, for 20 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. SIKES, for 20 minutes on Wednesday and Thursday of next week.

Mr. BAILEY, for 15 minutes on Tuesday next.

Mrs. SULLIVAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 30 minutes on Monday next.

Mr. JOHNSON of California, for 30 minutes on Wednesday, June 20, 1956.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. OSMERS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois (at the request of Mr. TUMULTY) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HYDE.

Mr. KEATING and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 18, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1970. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif., area in order to insure the existence of an adequate water supply for naval installations and defense production plants in such area,' approved October 11, 1951"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1971. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to validate overpayments of pay and allowances made to certain officers of the Army, Navy, Naval Reserve, and Air Force, while undergoing training at civilian hospitals, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1972. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, as amended, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits until July 1, 1957"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 10679. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the establishment by the States of Mississippi and Arkansas of a bi-State commission to investigate the possibilities of constructing a railroad bridge across the Mississippi River; without amendment (Rept. No. 2358). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. S. 1749. An act adopting and authorizing the improvement of Rockland Harbor, Maine; without amendment (Rept. No. 2359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HÉBERT: Committee on Armed Services. House Resolution 524. Resolution disapproving the sale of the alcohol butadiene manufacturing facility at Louisville, Ky., Plancor No. 1207; without amendment (Rept. No. 2360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 8407. A bill to require enlisted members of the Armed Forces to make up time lost during enlistments; with amendment (Rept. No. 2361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 11787. A bill to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 11788. A bill to establish a teaching hospital for Howard University, to transfer Freedmen's Hospital to the university, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 11789. A bill to provide tax equity through the taxation of cooperative corporations and to provide tax credits for recipients of dividends from genuine cooperatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 11790. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 11791. A bill to establish on public lands of the United States a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of areas within this System by existing Federal agencies and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 11792. A bill to amend section 1 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, relating to hazardous employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 11793. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in operation of industries affecting commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 11794. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 11795. A bill to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Res. 541. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 17, 1956; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 11796. A bill for the relief of Patrick Brendan Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 11797. A bill for the relief of Laibeck Teitelbaum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1139. By Mr. BOW: Petition of Mrs. Margaret Kavanagh and others of Stark and Summit Counties, Ohio, to repeal an act of 1935 which permitted the affiliation of this Nation with the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1140. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Niagara County Democratic Committee, Niagara Falls, N. Y., requesting passage of legislation that would authorize the construction of a new hydroelectric plant in the vicinity of Niagara Falls, etc.; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Status-of-Forces Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, in the debate on the amendment I offered to the Mutual Security Act my colleague from Mississippi expressed a resentment toward military men, which is surprising when you consider his Army service and his membership in veterans' organizations. He made no distinction between the criminal inclinations of foreign soldiers and our own servicemen.

He expressed his fear of the foreign soldiers' training at the airforce base in his district with these words:

What if any one of those foreign soldiers in my district went on a rampage and committed some crime? Suppose it was a case of rape, murder, arson, or some of the other crimes we hear about.

In fact, my colleague seems to be obsessed by thoughts of these particular crimes. He had this to say about his fellow citizens:

I am getting tired of people saying that because a man is wearing an American uniform that he is perfect, that he could not commit murder, or rape, or arson, and that if he did, we should forgive him. I think that we should demand that American soldiers who do not live up to the laws of foreign countries should be subject to punishment.

I, for one, as a Member of Congress do not intend to take part in any effort to defend murders and worse by this type of indirect action.

Now the gentleman knows that the amendment I proposed to the Mutual Security Act was not a defense of murderers. He knows that no one has ever advocated that a wrongdoer in the service be granted immunity from punishment. But some of us still believe that punishment should be meted out the American way; that it should be uniform no matter where our servicemen may be; that the same offense should not be punished by a term of 90 days in one country and 4 years in another.

I was curious as to what heinous acts might have been committed in my colleague's district by foreign soldiers to

develop his obsession about murder, rape, and arson. So I asked the Air Force. I am told that the Greenville Air Force base has been in operation about 2 years. During that time there has not been one single crime committed by any foreign serviceman assigned to that base for training. One man had a little trouble with a check being returned, but the commander of the base considered it minor. So there lies the bogey of crime in my colleague's district.

The gentleman from Mississippi did not claim any great success as defense attorney at courts-martial when he served in the Army. He said none of the dozens of men he represented were acquitted. This is quite understandable. He must have suffered even then from the virus that has attacked so many proponents of the status-of-forces agreements—the presumption that all accused servicemen are guilty. He must have represented the accused he was assigned to defend in much the same manner that some counsel act who are appointed by foreign courts to defend our accused servicemen. An observer of a serviceman's trial in Japan said: "The dedication of counsel to the defense of the accused left much to be desired."

Brotherhood Marks Rabbi Simon's Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there has been celebrated in Chicago this last week Rabbi Ralph Simon's silver anniversary in the rabbinate. Congregation Rodfei Zedek, in the district that I have the honor to represent, set aside the weekend to pay tribute to its spiritual leader. It seems to me fit and proper that we here in the Congress should take notice of such events. The strength of our Nation is in the depth of its spiritual tones.

How closely bound in brotherhood are the people of the Second Congressional District again was shown at the Friday evening services that began the weekend of festivities. Speakers who paid tribute to Rabbi Simon were prominent leaders of the Chicago community, including Rabbi Ira Eisenstein, of Congregation Anshe Emet; Dr. Samuel Hollander, president of the Jewish Federation of Chicago; and the Reverend E. Jerry Walker, pastor of St. James Methodist Church and president of the Hyde Park-Kenwood Council of Churches and Synagogues.

Rabbi Ralph Simon, who was born in Newark, N. J., was ordained with distinction and received a master of Hebrew literature degree from the Jewish Theological Seminary, in 1931, and also holds a master's degree from Columbia University. He has served at various times as president of the Chicago Rabbinical Association, and vice president of the Zionist Organization of Chicago, and is presently treasurer of the Rabbinical Assembly of America.

Speech by Vice President Nixon on Meeting Soviet Union's Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is not often that I have been prompted to compliment the Vice President of the United States in broad and unqualified terms. That I do so today reflects my enthusiastic admiration and complete agreement with the substance of Vice President NIXON's remarkable address delivered at the commencement exercises at Lafayette College last Friday night, June 8. I consider this speech a major contribution to our national evaluation of world affairs. The Vice President has given us both a comprehensive and constructive summary of the world situation. It is a statement which should be read and reread, and its message should be reflected in what we say and what we do.

I congratulate the Vice President on making this speech and commend it to the attention of the Members of Congress, asking unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF NIXON'S SPEECH ON MEETING SOVIET UNION'S TACTICS

I was tempted in preparing my remarks for this occasion to discuss at length the economic prospects for the years ahead.

We are fortunate to be living in a period when, for the first time in a quarter of a century, we have had 3 consecutive years of unparalleled prosperity.

The college graduates of 1956 will find available to them the most jobs at the highest wages in the Nation's history.

And it would be fascinating indeed to explore the almost limitless possibilities for expansion of the American economy during the years ahead as we begin to harness the new sources of energy which our scientists have untapped.

Tonight, however, I believe there is a subject of greater importance to this graduating class and to the Nation.

I refer to the titanic struggle between two opposing concepts of life in which we are engaged. The next few years will determine whether we can live in peace and at the same time avoid surrender.

And that question will be answered by how well we are able to meet and defeat the changing tactics of the dictatorial forces which threaten the free world.

From the end of World War II to the death of Stalin in 1953, our problem was a relatively simple one.

Communist leaders all over the world used open threats of force coupled with thinly veiled support of revolutionary and subversive movements in countries designed for conquest. These actions of bluster and abuse inevitably drove the free world together in self-defense.

Then came the death of Stalin and the New Look in Communist foreign relations.

The leaders of the Soviet Union invited the rest of the world to a period of peaceful coexistence. In doing so they seemed to abandon their previous tough line and they have even repudiated some of the excesses of past regimes.

NOT THE WHOLE ANSWER

This change of tactics has understandably created considerable confusion in the non-Communist world.

I think there will be little dissent from the conclusion that in view of the record of the men in the Kremlin the lines of military and diplomatic policy that we have hammered out over the past 10 years must continue to govern our conduct at this time.

But, is this the whole answer?

Do we stand pat and leave all the initiative to the other camp?

Do we act as if nothing has happened in the 3 years since Stalin died?

I answer these questions by saying that we could make no greater mistake than to rest on our oars and to ignore the "new look" in Soviet diplomacy.

If it is made to appear that our primary concern is military hardware, we may find ourselves isolated in a world that has been convinced by the traveling salesmen of the Soviet Union selling other products.

What we face today is a new line which could be far more dangerous in the long run than the Stalin line of bluster and brute force.

It is basically a war for men's minds, a struggle for their allegiance, an effort to win them peacefully to the Soviet camp.

In this struggle, ideas—not guns or aircraft—are weapons.

In this war, our armies wear the university cap and gown, not the uniform of the soldier. Books and pamphlets, rather than tanks and battleships, will be decisive in this contest.

One of the major reasons for the change in Soviet policy becomes apparent.

It was obvious to the successors of Stalin that they could not sell their new line so long as people remembered slave-labor camps, mass purges, and the ever-present terror of the secret police.

Yet, to the outside world, there would appear to be a break with the past and a writing off of the handicaps derived from more than 30 years of terror.

WHAT THE NEUTRALS WANT

And the "new look" was sufficiently appealing in contrast to the old that there was every chance of selling this policy to uncommitted nations, and of breaking off one by one those who had allied together in a common policy of defense.

In the cold light of history it seems fantastic that a nation with the Soviet record of terror and aggression could hope to make widespread gains by announcing a simple change of policy.

At the least, one would expect that all non-Communist countries would adopt a policy of watchful waiting and not make any shift of program until the "new look" had been tried for 5 to 10 years.

Unfortunately, this is not the case.

We must recognize that there are powerful assets which work to the benefit of the Soviet in this contest. Unless we examine them and face them realistically, we may well lose out in the battle for men's minds.

First, let us see what is at stake. Approximately 600,000,000 people live in the so-called uncommitted or neutral nations. It is easy to see that the world struggle will be determined by what happens to these people.

On the basis of my travels through most of this part of the world, may I tell you what I believe the people in the uncommitted nations want and contrast the Communist appeal with our own.

First, there is the desire for peace throughout the world, a desire which is particularly strong in the nations newly freed from colonial ties. This is not merely negative in the sense of war-weariness or fear. It is often something much more positive.

They wish the time and freedom to build their countries economically, politically, and culturally.

To such nations the Communist world talks and promises peace. It appears to respect their desire for neutrality.

By contrast we often seem to be talking war and military alliances.

I do not say that these impressions are correct, but they are more widespread and sincerely held than we often realize.

Second, there is the understandable desire for economic progress in nations less developed than those in the West.

To these nations, the Soviet Union holds up the example of its own dramatic industrial progress under communism.

On the other hand, the almost unbelievable prosperity of the United States appears to many of these nations as a goal impossible of attainment.

Third, there is the desire for recognition, prestige and independence.

In much of Asia and Africa, strong resentments have been built up against Western nations because of past or present colonial and imperialistic policies.

Often there is the deep hurt that springs from real or imagined racial discrimination.

SOVIET ADROITNESS CITED

Here we find that there is a fear of what they term cultural imperialism, an effort by the West to dominate the thinking of other nations rather than to respect their cultures and religions on an equal basis with ours.

And here again the Soviet has been adroit in recognizing this desire. Compare, for example, the tactics of (Premier Nikolai A.) Bulganin and (Nikita S.) Khrushchev (Soviet Communist Party leader) in dealing with the peoples of the Far East and their tactics in Great Britain.

A fourth point to note is the attitude of many peoples toward material things in contrast to the intellectual and the spiritual. This is difficult to express accurately.

In one sense, all peoples are concerned with economic and material problems. They must produce to live.

Yet, at the same time, there are often profound differences in the relative place assigned to these activities.

In many areas of the world a place of honor is given to leaders in the arts and intellectual fields and in religious activities.

The intellectual is not dismissed as an egghead. The artist is not called a longhair. The minister of religion is not considered an impractical idealist.

Here again we find that many peoples think that we in America are too materialistic to have such ideals. We are considered antiintellectual, deficient in culture, superficial in religion. Again, I am not passing judgment on the truth or falsity of these charges. The important point is that they are widely believed.

And what is truly amazing is this: That the apostles of communism can parade as exponents of the very ideals that they accuse us of neglecting when their own philosophy is the ultimate in materialism and the antithesis of religion.

THE BASIC QUESTION

But we find again how cleverly they present their case.

They point out that the scientist and the intellectual is held in high esteem in the Soviet Union.

Artists and writers are among the highest paid and most honored citizens in their regime.

Even the persecution of religion is played down by the claim that worship is free, and that only political activities of the churches are suppressed.

We now come to the basic question: What should our policy be in the light of the new Soviet tactics?

We must, of course, continue to maintain adequate military strength at home and we must try to keep alive our vital alliances abroad.

We must continue our programs of economic assistance and avoid, if we can, the possibility that less-developed nations will be forced to become economic satellites of the Soviet Union.

But our military and economic programs, essential as they are, may not prove to be the most important elements in this battle.

Of this we can be sure: The uncommitted nations are not going to be frightened into alliances with the West by military power, nor can their allegiance be purchased by dollars.

What will probably be decisive in this struggle is not how much each side does, but how it is done.

That is why we must, at whatever cost, place additional emphasis on developing the kind of ideological program which is designed to win the minds and hearts of men.

Before I discuss details of such a program, may I suggest one fundamental condition that can make the difference between success and failure?

Whatever we do, we must deal with other people as our moral and spiritual equals.

Nothing is more infuriating or more likely to make our program fail than a boastful or condescending attitude on our part.

It is dangerous to parade our material wealth or economic achievement.

This may merely create envy, rather than admiration, on the part of other peoples.

IN A MISSIONARY SPIRIT

In a sense, we must deal with other nations with the tact, humility, and friendliness of missionaries.

Indeed, we could learn a great deal in our foreign relations by studying the attitudes and methods of the Christian missionaries who have won friends throughout the world.

They came to help the nations to which they were sent.

They learned their languages and customs.

By taking literally the truth that all men are brothers under God, they were accepted into families and homes of distant peoples.

Once we have this attitude, our task is to convince others that democracy and freedom and all the rights and privileges we hold sacred are better for them than is the Soviet way of life.

It is not enough to denounce or expose communism. We must show that we have a better alternative.

We do not do this by parading our superior material standard of living.

It is the total pattern of life that must prevail—not merely one phase of it.

May I make one point clear at this time?

There is no question but that we have the better case to sell.

Because basically we are on the right side. The side of freedom and justice, of belief in God—against the forces of slavery, injustice and atheistic materialism.

Ours is the truly revolutionary dynamic idea. It is the Communist idea which is repressive and reactionary.

How do we get our message across?

I believe that often too much reliance is placed upon the effectiveness of bombarding the uncommitted countries with radio broadcasts, motion pictures and press releases which present the American viewpoint.

These programs are important and necessary, but, in the long run, I believe there are others which are more effective.

FOR THE COST OF A BOMBER

May I emphasize first the overwhelming importance of expanding our program for exchange of persons. This includes high-school youngsters who spend a year living with American families and going to our schools; college and university students who get their degrees in American schools; and the leaders program under which each week 50 or more foreign visitors—leaders in business, government, labor, and education—come to the United States as guests of our Government to talk with Americans who are in the same field as theirs.

In this way our guests learn about us firsthand, correcting false impressions they may have had about us.

It is particularly important that we expand this program in countries newly released from colonial status.

Here the need for trained leaders is often the greatest. Many times students will graduate from a university and almost immediately take a high political position in their native lands.

From a long-range point of view, we can gain immensely by programs of this nature.

For the cost of one large bomber we can make friendships that will benefit the free world for generations to come.

President Eisenhower's brilliant proposals to American educational institutions and foundations to aid in expanding educational opportunities throughout the world is in line with this approach.

If the free world can teach the leaders of tomorrow in areas that may well dominate tomorrow's world, we need not fear the contest between communism and freedom.

There are those, of course, who may point out the fact that many of those who today oppose western policies were trained in western universities.

But they oppose us because we taught them ideals of freedom while we were keeping their lands in colonial bondage.

Now that great areas of the world are free from colonialism, we have a good chance to win back the friendship and loyalty of leaders of these lands.

In addition to Government-sponsored activities, it is important that every American who goes abroad or who deals with foreign guests in our own land realizes that he is an ambassador representing our Nation.

All of us must try to be sensitive, understanding, and helpful.

Arrogance and boastfulness make enemies—not friends.

And particularly we must appreciate the high place given to intellectual and spiritual values in many areas of the world. This places a tremendous responsibility upon our tourists and business visitors, upon the exporters of motion pictures and books; indeed, upon anyone who is likely to be taken as a representative of our way of life.

I was reading an article the other day that showed the importance of these attitudes. It concerned the great atomic scientist, Bruno Pontecorvo, who left Great Britain to devote his genius to Soviet atomic research. One of the important reasons for his defection, according to his colleagues, was the fact that he thought he would have more honor, prestige, and even greater freedom of research in the Soviet Union. Likewise, many of the scientists who got caught in the Soviet espionage network in the United States, Canada, and Great Britain were partially influenced at least by the feeling that they were not sufficiently appreciated in the free world. The world of tomorrow belongs to the nations that lead in scientific research and technical skill. We shall pay a great price if we fall behind in this contest.

In discussing our need to win the war for men's minds, I have said little about direct

contacts with the people behind the Iron Curtain.

Today we can have such contacts almost for the asking.

If the present trend continues in the Soviet Union and in many satellite countries, it will be possible to meet broadly with these peoples, to exchange ideas, to compare our respective ways of life.

Many of my fellow Americans are rather skeptical about this new move. They suspect, with some justification, a hidden trick; possibly a device to make communism respectable and to discourage the peoples held in submission by Red armies.

I do not fully share this point of view. I think that the explosive power of freedom is greater than the combined effect of all the atomic and hydrogen weapons in the world today.

Whatever be the motives behind these new moves, I think that in the long run the cause of freedom will be served by breaking through the Iron Curtain wherever an opportunity is presented.

The task ahead of us is a task for all the American people, and not Government alone.

In time of war we are prepared to risk our lives serving with the Armed Forces of our country. But the war for men's minds is a real war and just as important as the struggle of armies, navies, and air forces.

You in the academic world are particularly fitted to serve in this contest. May I suggest that you graduates and you of the faculty give thought to the part that you can play.

On an even broader sphere, I hope that the learned societies of the United States with their counterparts in other free nations will devote time and energy to extend their study to this great struggle for allegiance.

Jointly, you should embark upon a peaceful crusade for freedom.

Some should volunteer for service abroad, just as soldiers volunteer for special missions.

The best thought of our best minds should be given to this burning problem.

It was once said that "You shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

This challenge has echoed through the ages. It is as valid today as it was when it was uttered more than 19 centuries ago.

We believe in truth and in the power of truth.

We believe in such basic truths as man's equality under God, the dignity of man, the rights of each individual to live his life in peace, the sacredness of law, the benefits of political freedom including the freedoms guaranteed in our Bill of Rights.

These truths are the great heritage of mankind.

We are confident that they will prevail.

And it is the task of this generation to make sure that our confidence is not misplaced and that all Americans will rise to the challenge that faces us.

Nation's Drycleaners Participate in Flag Day Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DeWITT S. HYDE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include my statement pertaining to the participation of the Nation's drycleaners in the Flag Day program:

NATION'S DRYCLEANERS PARTICIPATE IN FLAG DAY PROGRAM

The National Institute of Drycleaning in Silver Spring, Md., has gained the cooperation of the Nation's drycleaners to provide "new glory for Old Glory" by cleaning flags without charge between June 1 and June 12. This is the third consecutive year that the drycleaners of the Nation have rendered this service, and as a result more and more homes and businesses are flying clean American flags on Flag Day, June 14. The drycleaners of the Nation and the Legion posts cooperating with them deserve recognition for their patriotic services to the public in recognition of Flag Day.

Status of Forces Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], in his remarks in debate on the amendment which I offered to the Mutual Security Act on June 8 said this:

While it is only the sense of Congress, knowing the President as I do, if this were to become law he would feel himself compelled to take the steps here advocated.

I heartily concur in this expression of confidence. In my appearances before the Foreign Affairs Committee I said I firmly believed that if my resolution was adopted that the President would recognize the will of the people and would fulfill his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

My colleague expressed his conviction that if the operation of any of these agreements should be demonstrated to be harmful to our men in the service, the first man to move as the Chief Executive, the Commander in Chief, would be the President. I like to believe that too.

Unfortunately I do not believe the President has been fully informed of the cases in which there has been a miscarriage of justice in foreign courts. Does he know there is a marine now serving a sentence of imprisonment in Japan whose conviction was described by official observers as manifestly unfair and unwarranted? Has he heard the reports of observers of the trials of any other of the more than 80 servicemen still in prison?

Does the President know that the Army commander in France said that the French procedure of combining trial of criminal and civil actions is a persistent source of irritation and dissatisfaction? That the French have tried servicemen for alleged offenses and found them guilty so that civil damages could be assessed, when our own court-martial board did not consider the evidence warranted prosecution?

Does the President know the Judge Advocate General has said there are certain basic constitutional rights which an accused may be denied in French courts? And, the same is true of all NATO countries?

Last July I requested the Secretary of the Army to furnish copies of the observers' reports in all cases of criminal prosecution of our servicemen by foreign authorities resulting in sentences of imprisonment. It was told the Defense Department had not required these reports to be forwarded to Washington, except in cases which had attracted particular notice in the press, or which had been the subject of congressional inquiry, or in which the Senate resolution procedure was involved. I understand this has now been remedied. But has it been remedied to the extent that the President is informed of the real situation?

With the same conviction expressed by my colleague from Indiana I am obliged to conclude that the full facts have not been presented to the President.

Two Hundred Thousand Find Nothing Refreshing in Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when 200,000 workers in the automobile industry have been laid off and are unemployed they and the members of their families find nothing refreshing in their experience. For them these are days and nights of anxiety. They derive no joy in "the right to suffer." They find in hopeless unemployment no "refreshing pause."

I deeply regret that the spokesmen for this administration are meeting the situation in the exact pattern of the spokesmen for the Hoover administration.

When unemployment had started in the last Republican administration members of the President's Cabinet assured the unemployed that they had nothing to worry about. All they had to do was wait long enough for right around the corner was a "chicken in every pot." In mid-July of 1929 a member of President Hoover's Cabinet, speaking at Jackson, Mich., said that complacency would solve all the problems of hunger. A few weeks later the great crash came and the country was plunged into the most devastating depression in history.

When people are out of work action is necessary to get things straightened out. It is no time to sit down in the rocking chair and be complacent.

The "chicken in every pot around the corner" philosophy brought on by the depression of 1929. I hope and pray we will never again have such a depression. Why cannot the spokesmen for this administration realize what they are doing by giving us in 1956 a full-size rerun of the "chicken in every pot around the corner" philosophy of 1929.

It was bad enough when a Presidential assistant told an audience in Detroit that

"the right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy." At the time there were many thousand unemployed in Detroit. Did this assistant to the President think that he was alleviating their condition by a verbal glorification of their misery? I wonder to what heights of joy he would have risen if the President had repudiated his remarks by cutting him off the payroll.

No sooner had this spokesman for the administration finished explaining that it was only a slip of the tongue than another spokesman, this time no less a personage than a member of the President's Cabinet, bobbed up with the same thought. By this time unemployment in the automobile industry had mounted. Among the workers there was real concern. But Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey said it was a "refreshing pause."

Mr. Speaker, if I went up to a man who had lost his job, could not find another job and was going sleepless worrying how he was going to support his family, and congratulated him on his good fortune in having the opportunity to enjoy a refreshing pause, what would be his reaction?

In the June 16, 1956, edition of Labor is an expression of the reaction of the 200,000 unemployed automobile workers to Secretary Humphrey's remark. By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the article from Labor, as follows:

DO JOBLESS AUTO WORKERS ENJOY REFRESHING PAUSE?

Has a high administration official pulled another boo-boo? That's what some observers were wondering after a Washington newspaper this week reported Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey told Congress the Nation's economy is presently enjoying a refreshing pause.

The remark came in testimony before a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee headed by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas. Humphrey also predicted the auto industry's difficulties will be behind us in a relatively short time.

The Humphrey remark recalled an earlier slip by Howard Pyle, an assistant to President Eisenhower, who told a Detroit audience "the right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy."

Some 200,000 jobless auto workers, who had trouble swallowing Pyle's statement, may find Humphrey's refreshing pause equally hard to believe.

The Freedom Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under terms of the Geneva talks the Communist Government of China agreed to release all American prisoners. The action of the Reds in keeping in captivity 13 Americans after having made this promise is a matter which rankles us all.

We have been fortunate that one of those imprisoned has subsequently gained his freedom and has returned to this country to tell of the horrors of captivity. He has made vigorous efforts since his return to arouse Americans to the plight of those who remained behind.

This man, Father Harold Rigney, S. V. D., in conjuction with the Back Yards Council of Chicago, is spearheading the freedom crusade in an endeavor to free those innocent American citizens who are still held in prison. The crusade is a national letter-writting campaign aimed at convincing publicity-conscious Mao Tse-tung of the advisability of releasing our countrymen.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members and all other citizens of our Nation to join in this great movement. I have a special interest in the freedom crusade because one of my constituents, Rev. Joseph Patrick McCormack, of Palmyra, N. Y., is among those being held, but I feel the seriousness of the situation should impel all Americans to take pen in hand to aid this program.

Address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, at Dinner of the Liberal Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address I delivered on June 13 at the annual dinner of the Liberal Party, which was held in New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, OF NEW YORK, AT THE 12TH ANNUAL DINNER OF THE LIBERAL PARTY, GRAND BALLROOM OF THE COMMODORE, NEW YORK CITY, JUNE 13, 1956

At this hour, we are all deeply perplexed by the incongruous paradox of the present world situation.

At this hour, the international Communist movement should be wasting away with sickness in its soul, as a result of the posthumous trial and conviction of Joseph Stalin by the men who knew him best.

Yet at this very hour, when the late leader of world communism has been found guilty, by his own colleagues, of tyranny, torture, murder and genocide—at this very hour, world communism appears to be making new friends and influencing great numbers of new people.

To understand this paradox requires insight. To meet the resultant challenge demands imagination.

As for the challenge, we surely have the capacity—mental, moral and physical—to win the age-old struggle for human freedom against inhuman tyranny.

But we cannot win this titanic battle with cardboard weapons of self-delusion, self-complacency and self-adulation.

We dare not delude ourselves into believing that world communism is weakening when it is actually renewing its drive, using new methods, to extend its world influence.

We dare not be complacent about our alliances and our relations with our allies while they are being assiduously and seductively wooed with large-scale, easy-term Soviet trade and aid.

Above all, we dare not give even tacit acceptance to the dangerous claim of the present administration that all is well, that the cause of peace and freedom has been advanced, and that happy progress has been made toward a better, a more just, and a safer world.

Yet this unwarranted atmosphere of smug self-satisfaction seems, in fact, to have become widely substituted for reality in America today.

I have before me page 1 of the New York Times of June 1.

In column 5 is a story in which Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, Supreme Military Commander of NATO, is quoted as saying that "the Western alliance was approaching its supreme crisis in the face of dangerously powerful Soviet world propaganda." That is a grim and, I believe, a true warning.

In column 8, on the same page, is a story quoting President Eisenhower as saying that "certainly the prestige of the United States since the last World War has never been as high as it is today."

Which of these two contradictory statements reflects the truth of the present situation?

In a further comment, General Gruenther emphasized the assertion that the Communists are relying heavily on their armed strength. Their recently announced reduction in armed forces, said General Gruenther, according to the New York Times, was "a small chip from what is still a vast monolith of power." Nothing the Russians have done "in their new policy of smiles, happy talk, and receptions," added General Gruenther, "could justify the least reduction in United States assistance to NATO." General Gruenther was talking realistically, based on factual observation.

But, on the very same day, the President of the United States is reported as saying, "We have largely nullified the Soviet Union's reliance upon force and threat of force." The proof of this change, he said, lies in the fact that the Soviet Union "has gone to different kinds of influence."

Now, which of these statements corresponds more to fact and to the truth?

I fear that we are making a philosophy out of smugness. The present atmosphere that all is well in the world, generated through every possible medium of mass communications, seems to reflect little awareness of the tensions and problems which confront us in Cyprus, in Israel, in the Arab States, in Yugoslavia, in Soviet infiltration of the Middle East, in north Africa, in Formosa, and Asia; in Montgomery, Ala., in Tallahassee, Fla., and in Washington, D. C. In short, we have been and are being encouraged, no matter what we may hear or see, to believe that all problems have either been solved or are on the way to solution—as a result of the brilliant leadership of the administration team.

I say that we cannot afford the delusive and narcotic effects of such smugness.

To be smug is to set ourselves apart from the millions of people who are on the move in Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America. Those millions are restless, trying to shake off the cold grip of poverty and oppression that has held them tightly for centuries. Those millions of people want status—and not the status quo.

In terms of the world struggle for human rights, the smug side is the losing side.

We cannot win by talking big—and acting small.

We cannot win by preaching equality and practicing discrimination.

We cannot win by wooing our foreign friends and then slamming the doors in

their faces with the loud thud of our present discriminatory Immigration Act.

We cannot win the hearts of the underprivileged of vast continents while serving privilege at home.

We cannot launch a vast offensive for freedom while Congress pinches every penny for foreign aid.

The world is on the march. We cannot afford to mark time.

We can win the day if our deeds match our words. We can win if our hands do what our lips say. We can win if we apply the pioneer spirit to our newest frontier: the struggle for human rights.

In the past our great democracy has shown an infinite capacity to deal with mammoth problems: economic, political, and social.

We have made great progress in human rights, in scientific development and social justice.

The saga of America's past and recent progress as a nation, honestly told, is an inspiration to any people in the world about to embark upon the great and challenging experience of self-government.

But while giving an honest picture to the world of what we are, we must also look deeply and constantly at ourselves to see what we still have to do. In assessing and describing our own unsettled problems, we will find a closer identity with the millions of restless ones around the world; and perhaps they, too, will find in us a common soul and a common purpose.

Chief of all our domestic problems is the plight of those who are still denied equal civil rights to a major degree in some parts of our country, and to some degree in all parts of our country.

In this field, as in others, we have of course, made progress. In the last decade, we have seen the white primary ended in the South; racial covenants in real estate deeds are no longer enforceable in the courts; segregation and other forms of discrimination in interstate travel have been abolished; in the District of Columbia and in many States, discrimination and segregation have been outlawed; an increasing number of States and localities have passed fair employment practices acts.

During the last 4 years the single most historic development was the Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in public schools.

But the single, most dramatic development, in my judgment, has been the emergence of the Negro people of the South, themselves, as active factors in the struggle. They, themselves, with strength, patience, unity, and forbearance have made the Montgomery bus strike a symbol of their new and active role, and of their deep understanding of both the will and the way to win.

The movement toward full civil rights in America has, like all progress, elicited cries of panic from its opponents. As they see the old order changing, they mobilize desperately for the counterattack, to halt further movement and to attempt to recapture ground already lost.

Recent acts of racial repression have shamed America. We have seen social ostracism, economic boycott, political disenfranchisement, and physical violence directed against white and black, who have sought to advance the democratic process.

We seem to have come to that point, in this struggle, where it is no longer possible to contain the situation with shreds of compromise. The issue must be resolved.

On this issue, the voice of the Nation is clear and resonant.

The Supreme Court decision was that voice, speaking in restrained tones, from the most august level of government. That voice has spoken the conscience and determination of millions of Americans: Black and white, North and South, Democrat and Republican.

In this struggle between law and those who would evade and defy the law, I do not see how any responsible American can be neutral. I am not neutral. I stand on the side of the law.

In this struggle between the oppressed and the oppressors, I am not neutral. I stand with the victims of oppression.

I confess I am no neutral in the conflict between the law and the Constitution, as stated by the Supreme Court, and the defiers of the law, as organized by White Citizens Councils.

I do not believe that the President of the United States can or should be neutral, as between the Government he swore to uphold and those who would paralyze and shame that Government.

Nor do I believe that the Congress of the United States can or should be neutral.

In the Congress, the Supreme Court decision must stimulate the enactment of the necessary legislation for the realization of all the goals set forth in that decision.

The first step in this direction is the repeal of that great roadblock to civil rights legislation in the United States Senate—Rule 22, that rule which permits a minority to frustrate the will of the overwhelming majority. And after the repeal of rule 22, or even without it, legislation must be pressed to assure to every American equal opportunity for political participation, equal access to public facilities, including schools, and the equal protection of all the laws, regardless of race, creed, or color.

These things must and will come to pass. Let them come now.

We must finish the job of winning full civil rights for all Americans—first, because it is morally right and legally correct; second, so that all the world may know that America, in 1956, like America in 1776, carries high the torch of human liberty. I find it not only appropriate, but important, to discuss this matter—America's role in holding up the torch of liberty—before this gathering of the Liberal Party of New York.

I consider the Liberal Party to be one of the principal forces in New York State and in the Nation, in steady support of advance and progress toward the goals of freedom and fulfillment for every man, everywhere.

Around me at the head table, and at almost every table in this gathering tonight, I recognize valiant fighters for liberty—economic, political, and social. These are not only fighters, but veterans of years of successful struggle—men and women whom I have known as fighters for these causes long before the Liberal Party came into existence.

I know of no more gallant, dedicated, and devoted leaders of the forces of liberty and progress than my old and close friends, Dave Dubinsky, Alex Rose, Adolf Berle, Dr. Counts, and Dr. Childs.

I am a lifelong member of the Democratic Party and I have never belonged—and never shall belong—to any other. But I am proud that I have had, in every political race I have ever run, the support of these men and their associates and friends. My friends too. Men like Luigi Antonini, Charlie Zimmerman, Isador Nagler, Ben Davidson, and many others too numerous to mention. May I say tonight, as I have on many other occasions, that I have considered it an honor and a great privilege to have received the endorsement of the Liberal Party each time I have run for public office since the Liberal Party has been in existence.

I have been glad to publicly acknowledge the vital support I have received from you by joining the name of the Liberal Party to my own party in my designation of affiliation in the records of the Senate.

And, above all, I have valued with pride the personal friendships and associations I have made—friendships which have been above and beyond politics or political purposes—friendships and associations I will cherish so long as I live.

And now, some brief and final thoughts on the problems which we all face.

We face the challenge of the future of America, and of the cause of democracy and freedom.

We are not meeting that challenge today. We are shrinking from it. We are hypnotizing ourselves into a trance of self-contentment and complacency.

There is so much to be done; there are so many evil forces to beat back, so many looming dangers to be confronted, and so many problems to be resolved lest they overwhelm and overcome us.

There are great new frontiers to be opened; mighty mountaintops of human progress to be climbed. Yet we hear today few clarion calls to action and achievement.

We must move forward in the field of housing, in the field of immigration and citizenship legislation, in the field of minority rights, in the field of atomic energy and its peacful uses, in the field of social security and social justice. We must learn how to share our great technical know-how with other peoples and how to learn from other peoples the great know-how of philosophic and historic experience and cultural appreciation. Above all, we must seek to achieve a just, free, and peaceful world. All these are goals, some immediate and some long range, to challenge the best and most that there is in us.

For new ideas on ways of achieving these goals, we must look to individuals and groups of individuals who dare to think in new and different terms; who dare to be nonconformists; who dare to be unorthodox—who dare to move ahead into uncharted areas of thought.

I consider the Liberal Party to be a group of such trailmakers. I hope that it will always continue, and even intensify, its explorations in these vital areas. I can think of no greater or more pressing need for our country, for the free world, and for humanity itself.

Let us set our sights on these distant goals and proceed to march forward with strong and active faith in ourselves and in the principles of freedom and democracy.

Genocide Day for the People of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, today, June 14, is genocide day for the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

This is the day 15 years ago that the Russian Communists deported thousands of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians to slave labor camps.

As a member of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, I heard firsthand the dreadful story of these mass deportations. It is without doubt one of the blackest pages in all human history.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who would have us forget what happened in these Baltic countries.

There are those who have suggested that the forced occupation of these independent nations is an accomplished fact.

There are those who denounce colonialism.

The free world can never forget what happened to the Baltic countries on June 14, 1941. Nor can the free world ever accept the forced incorporation of these countries into the Soviet Union.

In these days of soft talk from Communist tyrants, it is just and necessary that we should remind ourselves that millions of people have been forced under Communist despotism and that once free and independent countries are now captives of the Communist tyrants.

No amount of soft talk can change these facts. And the conscience of the free world can never be easy until these wrongs have been righted.

Spanish War Widows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by invitation of the national legislative committee of the United Spanish War Veterans I introduced H. R. 2867, a bill to increase the pensions of Spanish War widows from $54.18 to $75 a month. I deeply appreciate the honor and the privilege given me of presenting to the consideration of my colleagues this most meritorious measure. I deeply appreciate, too, the fine cooperation of the distinguished gentleman from California, [Mr. McDONOUGH], who has introduced a companion bill and has been most active in support of our efforts to get relief for the widows of Spanish War veterans in their pitiable fight to make both ends meet on a monthly pittance of $54.18.

The widows of Spanish War veterans are not young in years or many in number. They have passed the age when they can find employment. Most of them have no other means of subsistence than the meager pensions they receive. If the Congress takes no action this session, for many of these aged widows what the next Congress might do would be of no concern. Let me be realistic in speaking of the immediate need for this legislation. The widows of the men who fought a war now almost six decades ago are falling as leaves of a tree in approaching winter. Steel indeed would be the structure of the congressional heart if for the few days or months or years remaining we should deny these aged women this pittance of $75 a month.

The Spanish War veterans have set for us the pattern. They ask nothing for themselves. Their claims as a veteran group upon the consideration of the Congress they lump in this one request—a little aid, a bit of a pension boost, to the aged widows of comrades gone to the beyond.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 31 I extended my remarks to include the statement of the Honorable Lloyd Thurston before the House Committee on Veterans Affairs. Mr. Thurston was accompanied on that occasion by Past Commander in Chief William S. Otjen, chairman of the national legislative committee of the United Spanish War Veterans; Hattie B. Trazenfeld, national secretary of the Auxiliary United Spanish War Veterans and cochairman of the auxiliary legislative committee; and James Craig, adjutant general, United Spanish War Veterans.

WILLIAM OTJEN'S STATEMENT

At the conclusion of Mr. Thurston's statement Chairman TEAGUE inquired as to the rules in the Spanish-American War as to service conection and line of duty. The testimony of Past Commander in Chief Otjen follows:

Mr. OTJEN. It is my view, Mr. Chairman, that during the Spanish War and the Philippine Insurrection you had to be able to trace the injury to the actual service.

For instance, I had a man in my company who came off of guard one night and put his arm over his rifle and pulled the trigger. He was denied any pension on the ground that the injury was self inflicted; and in every case that I knew about, I did not know of any of the Spanish War veterans who received pensions when we got out other than when, at time of discharge, they were given simply a cursory examination.

My personal experience was that clothes were removed and a doctor walked down the line in front of them and walked down the line in the rear and looked them over.

In my personal acquaintance with Spanish War veterans I did not know of any that drew a pension until they could show injuries which were attributable to the service and, because of the lack of records, it was very difficult for them to do so.

I would also like to call the attention of Mr. Thomson, who asked about the average length of service, to the fact that this states 7½ months, but you will note that the note below says:

"Information and length of service during the Boxer Rebellion-Philippine Insurrection not available."

Now, my own service in the Philippines was that there were 24 United States regiments called United States Volunteers, who went to the Philippines for 2 years' service. Some of us were held overtime. About all the soldiers who went to the Philippines and the Boxer Rebellion served, at the least that I know, about 2 years except the State regiments which went, like the 10th Pennsylvania, and the Iowa Regiment.

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. The point I was making was the point of need. I believe that the people of this country will support any kind of veterans' program to take care of widows, orphans, and disabled, and people in need; but I do not think you will get them to give a man with 91 or 92 days service a pension for the rest of his life if he does not need it. I do not think that the people of this country will accept that.

If we had just the Spanish-American War Veterans and widows, it would be different.

Mr. OTJEN. I would be against such a thing myself. I attended the briefing that General Bradley gave to the veterans representatives. As I understand his statements, and I think he discussed them before you, the theory on which that Commission made the report was that for the period following the earlier wars, commencing with World War I, that many of the men were actually benefited by their period of service. He advanced that argument and said that they found much to support it by reason of the fact that they did not suffer any injury when they were in the service; they were also given liberal pay, and educational opportunities were afforded to the younger men when they came out; various loans were made available to them; so that they were actually benefited by the service they incurred. I don't think it would probably be proper to quote him personally. I talked to him afterward and so did Mrs. Trazenfeld.

As he discussed it, he said that the theory they were following was that need was necessary but, referring to the Spanish War veterans, he said that he considered the advantages which were given and the pay which was given to the later veterans as so much more of an assistance toward making progress in either profession or business or getting started.

* * * * * * * *

Now, my understanding is that, as to the law at this time, there is no financial limit to the service-connected veteran. On that theory, as I say, the Spanish War veterans feel that the Congress has treated them liberally, and I don't know of any man in the Spanish War category who was asking that more be paid to the men, but on the widows it is a different story.

The pay when a private was $13. When I went abroad, my pay was $15 and when I got to be a noncommissioned officer, it jumped $1 or $5. However, for the 2 years I was over there, I thought I did awfully well when I saved on discharge about $156.

When I came home I studied law and, goodness, if I could have had that educational course, I don't think I would have ever felt I ought to have a pension even though I was in very severe fighting.

WIDOWS HAVE NO INSURANCE

As to the widows of the Spanish War veterans, I know that you have been receiving letters from widows of other wars and they would say, "Why should the widow of a Spanish War veteran receive more?"

Well, we fellows, when we went out and got a job and got to working and got married, could not very well pay for insurance and, if any of us did do well, it took a long time. There are so few of these Spanish War widows that have any insurance available. I think it was a splendid feature that you gentlemen of the Congress put on when you provided the Government insurance available for the men in the service. I would certainly have liked to have been eligible for it. It is a thing to be considered with the widows of the Spanish War for whom we are asking this raise.

I can appreciate the situation you men are in when you are asked those questions of why should the Spanish War widows' pension be raised.

In reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD here with Senator LANGER'S discussion of this very Bradley Commission report, he narrates how he obtained a pension for a World War veteran who had most of his stomach removed. His wife was driving a taxicab and, when he got that pension of $66.15 per month, he states that the wife wept with joy but he just felt sad at heart that it wasn't more. I would heartily agree with that.

Now, few of our widows had the benefit of any insurance, or any insurance amounting to anything. They might have a thousand dollars.

I think that should the needs provision be applied right down the line, it ought to also have an age provision attached to it, or, when a man comes up into the 75's and 80's, it costs him far more to live because of medical treatment, hospitalization, and things of that kind; and not all of them by any means can get in the veterans' hospitals.

On the married ones, if they have that, I think that there should be a higher limit on income than $2,700 for the married couple because, when they become aged, it is so much more expensive for them to live.

I appreciate, gentlemen, the situation that you are in with the increase in pension demands, and the graphs that were pictured there of the enormity of the expenses that went along with it.

However, I think it would be well said that, even as the pension load of this country has increased, the national income has also increased proportionately, and the heavier taxation is not simply represented by that. There has been a heavier national income almost commensurate with the increase in the pension rolls. That argument has been advanced by some of those who have appeared before you, but I can appreciate the difficulty you have in reconciling all of the situations that arise.

I do feel that it is a very meritorious bill that the Spanish War veterans have here, and that it is seriously needed by those widows.

Now, so few of either the veterans or the women are eligible for social security. Their husbands, if they worked, were not under positions where they would get social security because nearly all of them were so old that they couldn't work in such an occupation after the social security became available.

However, as I say, the Spanish War veterans have not asked an increase of pension for years, and I do feel that it is a meritorious thing for these widows to have this even though it is more than the widows of the World War I and World War II veterans for the reason that the age makes for more expense and more infirmity.

I think that, if you would put an age provision on there for the older widows of World War I and World War II, it would be a just measure.

Could Mrs. Trazenfeld say a word?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

STATEMENT BY MRS. TRAZENFELD

Mrs. TRAZENFELD. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I think that our own Mr. Thurston and our chairman have covered pretty well our opinion of the report of the Bradley Commission. They have covered our thinking in regard to not downgrading the veteran in any instance.

I would like to speak for the opinion of the widows. Now, in listening to the briefing and in studying the report, and also from the hearings before this committee, it would seem that the Commission took the stand that our veterans when they returned from the wars were compensated in many ways. They received—I think it enumerated—rehabilitation, hospitalization, mustering-out pay, vocational training, home loans, and what have you, and many of them took advantage of that and it made it possible for them to assume a higher scale of living than they would have otherwise had.

Now, our war, the Spanish-American War, terminated on July 4, 1902. The records will show that nothing was requested from the Congress until 1918. In 1918 the widow of a Spanish War veteran was awarded $12 a month and $2 a month for each minor child.

They did not receive mustering-out pay, hospitalization, rehabilitation of any kind, vocational training, home loans, or anything.

The Spanish War veteran in the majority came from the mines, the fields, the stores, the jobs of any kind that were just salaried jobs. Very few came from the big industrial firms, from the stock market, or from the banks or from that category of men. We have a few, but very few.

The records will also reveal that.

When they were discharged from the service, many of them didn't care whether they were examined. There were no records of disabilities. They wanted to get home. You can talk to any of them, and those were the facts. They went back to those same jobs if they could get them, and they asked for nothing.

They increased the widows' pension in 1922 to $20 a month and $4 for the child.

In 1922 the veteran received nothing. He received none of the other things that would enable him to make a better living.

Certainly you cannot apply the findings or the treatment of the Bradley Commission to the Spanish War veteran or his dependents.

There is another thing that is pretty important. In the latter years since World War I, the wife has been able to go out and supplement the husband's income, and in many, many instances they do. Many make as much as their husbands, and some make more. Back in the Spanish-American War period and following up until World War I, it was almost a disgrace for the wife to work, and the average husband would almost rather have seen his family go hungry than for her to be employed. They did not have a chance to add to their income.

May lose their homes

Many bought homes and had small mortgages on them. They could not amortize them every month. They had to be renewed every 3 or 5 years. The only worry they had was that they were going to be unable to renew that because they knew that they couldn't pay it off. They bought a home with a mortgage and usually died with that home and a mortgage. Many widows still have that home.

Many widows have written to me in the last spot poll we took, saying that they had a home but are having difficulty in keeping up the water rent and the necessary repairs on that home on the pension they receive. Therefore, I do not believe that the report of the Bradley Commission can conscientiously be made applicable to the Spanish War veterans or their widows or those of prior wars, and I speak certainly for those of prior wars—the Civil War veterans' widows. It cannot be made applicable to them if we are going to consider all the angles.

I am just stacked up in the office with letters of fear. It would wring your hearts to read them: "What is going to happen to us because of the Bradley Commission report?"

Certainly this Veterans' Committee has it within its power to grant the greatest happiness in the world if you could give a word of comfort to them that this Bradley Commission, in your opinion, should not apply to them.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been present here most of the time. This committee has tried to point out that this commission report is just a recommendation to the President, not a law. We are getting letters saying that pensions and compensations are going to be cut off. The Bradley Commission report is by no means a law. It is merely a recommendation to the President of the United States. Many people read the headlines and assume that it is a law. We are getting a lot of those letters, and we have done everything we could to try to get the information out that it is a recommendation and not a law; that no one is fixing to be cut off of the pension rolls because of it.

Compulsory Swimming Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, one of my distinguished constituents, Mrs. Mary Macfadden, has strongly urged that swimming training be compulsory in the armed services and in our schools. Mrs. Macfadden is the author of the best seller Dumbbells and Carrot Strips, which describes her life with the late Bernarr Macfadden.

Because of the wide interest in swimming which was aroused by the recent tragic drowning of six marines who were in training, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter from Mrs. Macfadden, dated May 25, my reply of May 28, an editorial from the Englewood (N. J.) Press Journal of May 31, and another letter from Mrs. Macfadden, dated June 7:

URGES COMPULSORY SWIMMING LESSONS

TO THE EDITOR:

I would appreciate it if you could find space for the enclosed letter to Congressman FRANK C. OSMERS, Jr., as I feel it brings up an important point:

ENGLEWOOD, N. J., *May 25, 1956.*

Congressman OSMERS.

DEAR SIR: I am inspired to write you the following letter on this propitious day (Mother's Day) after attending my church. My heart was heavy for those mothers whose sons' lives had been taken in vain. I'm referring to the six marines recently drowned. Reflecting upon my memory in such a disaster, I recall some years ago that there was a bill in Washington to make swimming compulsory. Had this bill gone through, there no doubt would have been many lives saved. It is my thought on this day that such a worthwhile bill should be resuscitated by you or your colleagues in Washington. What more worthy cause could they participate in than this? To save a life is the most important thing anyone can do.

It was because of a very sad experience in my girlhood that I learned to swim. My school chum and I delighted in going across the canal locks. She slipped in one day and was drowned. This tragic situation was a nightmare to me for many years.

Although not in good health, I prevailed upon my father to let me learn to swim, although I was forbidden by my doctor. Not only did I learn to swim, I became a very healthy girl because of it. My interest in swimming knew no bounds. Competition and life saving I also took up. Of all the awards I won, I am proudest of my "Award of Merit" from the Royal Life Saving Society. Because of this knowledge I was subsequently able to save three persons that I know would have perished but for my efforts on their behalf.

I was very much interested in reading that our wonderful President took swimming in his health rehabilitation program. How can one beat a man with such wisdom. I could never have stood the great problems I've met with had it not been for what swimming did for me mentally and physically. It is my sincere desire, this day of all days, to call to your attention that mothers are the backbone of this democracy and you must help to protect the fine sons we gave you custody of.

A bill of this kind will not only save lives it will give our children better health and happiness and will help prevent much delinquency. For 30 years I have kept constant vigilance on my lake to prevent drownings which could have occurred. Some very young children, without supervision, often trespass and it is a shame not to protect them. If I had any say-so in a bill to compel children to swim, it would be when they were quite young. I taught my many children (seven) between the ages of 2 and 4. What better cause could you foster?

Cordially yours,

(Mrs.) MARY MACFADDEN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 28, 1956.

Mrs. MARY MACFADDEN,
Englewood, N. J.

DEAR MRS. MACFADDEN: Thank you very much for your letter of May 25, and I want

to tell you how much I appreciate having your thoughts on the subject of compulsory swimming instruction in the Armed Forces.

I have inquired at the Marine Corps with regard to swimming instruction, and I am happy to report that all recruits are required to take at least 10 hours of training which is sufficient to teach all of them except those very few who are unable to qualify due to their great fear of the water.

My own mother and father were both good swimmers and taught me to swim at an early age. I have always enjoyed swimming as a form of recreation and upon occasion I have been able to use my knowledge of swimming to be very helpful to others.

The drownings in the Marine Corps recently were tragic, but I can report that steps are being taken to prevent a recurrence.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK C. OSMERS, Jr.

From the Englewood (N. J.) Press Journal of May 31, 1956

LEARN TO SWIM

In the Letters to the Editor colums in last week's Press-Journal Mrs. Mary Macfadden of Englewood, widow of the late Bernarr Macfadden, calls upon Congress through Representative FRANK C. OSMERS, JR., of this district to make it compulsory for children to learn to swim.

If there is any way in which this could be done it would mean the saving of thousands of lives and the wiping away of incalculable fears among men and women when they are in, on or over water.

Ability to swim should be as natural as ability to walk or run—unless one intends never to be near water during his life.

The newspapers are full of stories of water tragedies caused by inability to swim. Most colleges make swimming an integral part of the curriculum. Public schools do not because they lack facilities, but there again, we need more swimming pool facilities, not alone for recreational purposes but for this vital educational purpose.

And until something is done on a large public scale, it is the wise parent who insists upon his child learning to swim. This is the modern age in which you cannot stay away from the water.

ENGLEWOOD, N. J., *June 7, 1956.*

FRANK C. OSMERS, Jr.,
Congressman, Ninth District, New Jersey,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I greatly appreciate your letter to me of May 28 in answer to mine. Its contents interest me very much, and I would like to comment upon what you have written. In your first paragraph, "and I want to tell you how much I appreciate having your thoughts on the subject of compulsory swimming instruction in the Armed Forces," it is my opinion that compulsory swimming instructions should be put into effect long before a boy gets into the Armed Forces.

Your second paragraph—and I quote: "I have inquired at the Marine Corps with regard to swimming instruction, and I am happy to report that all recruits are required to take at least 10 hours of training, which is sufficient to teach all of them except those very few who are unable to qualify due to their great fear of the water." This is my answer to it: Let us assume that these boys had had compulsory swimming in their earlier years, then the 10 hours of training now given them should be used to teach them the art of lifesaving, the rescue, release, and resuscitation methods which are very necessary in some cases to save the lives of the distressed swimmer and himself. Without this knowledge, I could never have saved the life of Mr. Macfadden in the English Channel, of which I give an example in my book, Dumbbells and Carrot Strips.

Queen Elizabeth of England is the patron of the Royal Life Saving Society, in which I got my early training in the methods to save a drowning person. Never could I forget the slogan of this wonderful society. When I saw Mr. Macfadden in difficulty in the English Channel, my subconscious mind was repeating: "Whomsoever you see in distress, recognize in him a fellowman." Without this knowledge I had acquired from this society, he would never have lived. That was in 1913, and I was a bride of only months.

The third paragraph is most interesting—and I quote: "My own mother and father were both good swimmers and taught me to swim at an early age. I have always enjoyed swimming as a form of recreation, and upon occasion I have been able to use my knowledge of swimming to be very helpful to others." In my thinking it proves my contention, and I am happy that I presented my idea of compulsory swimming to you.

Apropos of what swimming can mean to one, I was saddened this week to learn of the death of my old friend, Sir Frank Beaurepaire, of Australia. His obituary told of his great success—financial and civic attainments. Sir Frank as a poor boy swam in 1 of the 15-mile swims through London in which I participated. After the Olympics in London in 1948, he told me this story: That he owed his great success to swimming. He said to me that after the First World War he was very badly hurt and that his doctor advised him to get into swimming again to get his health back. Not only did he get his health back, but he went into competition again, and it was only at 38 he retired from racing. I am enclosing his wonderful record for your perusal.

May I say that I feel perhaps some of your success may be due to the swimming your mother and father taught you at an early age. There is no doubt about it, if you learn to swim when you are young, you get a certain confidence that enables you to feel that you can master other pursuits and life's many challenges.

I am interested in what you say in the last paragraph: "The drownings in the Marine Corps recently were tragic, but I can report that steps are being taken to prevent a recurrence."

This long letter to you is written in the hope—and please excuse the length of it—that society is not too busy to do something to make some permanent achievement along the lines I have called to your attention.

I thank you for your kind interest.

Cordially yours,

MARY MACFADDEN
(Mrs. Mary Macfadden).

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 18, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, who with each new dawn renewest our sight with the fresh gladness of the morning, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth. Through the changing pageant of nature, with form and color that thrill the senses, Thou makest Thyself known to us; for beauty is but Thy handwriting. Through shining lives of men and women that rise in moral splendor far above the sinking sands of self-seeking and expediency we glimpse the heights of Thy holiness.

We give Thee thanks for all interpreters of Thy mind who, with brush or pen or uttered word, bring to our perplexed day even one syllable of reality, one more gleam of the truth which makes men free. Give us, we pray Thee, inner greatness of spirit and clearness of vision to meet and match the large demands of this glorious yet demanding time, that we may keep step with the drumbeat of Thy truth which is marching on and against which the gates of hell cannot prevail. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 14, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 7, 1956:

S. 767. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1111. An act to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

S. 2822. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer approximately 9 acres of land in the Hualapai Indian Reservation, Ariz., to School District No. 8, Mohave County, Ariz.

On June 13, 1956:

S. 3515. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provision of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces.

On June 18, 1956:

S. 1026. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1053. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands in the State of Montana to the Phillips County Post of the American Legion;

S. 1244. An act to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 2498. An act to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Clatsop, Oreg., as a national monument;

S. 3332. An act to amend the Employment Act of 1946, as amended; and

S. 3920. An act to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in allotted lands in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee investigating television, of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Air Force Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

OBJECTION TO MEETING OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE TODAY AND TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to file my objection against the Committee on the Judiciary meeting today and tomorrow while the Senate is in session.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] be excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Public Works and assigned to service on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be today the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection with the business of the morning hour be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the United States Soldiers' Home for the fiscal year 1955, together with a report of annual inspection, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

INCREASED RETIREMENT ANNUITIES OF CERTAIN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF NAVAL ACADEMY AND NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the retired annuities of the civilian members of the teaching staffs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO BONDS OF UNITED STATES MARSHALS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 544 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the bonds of United States marshals (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WAR-RISK HAZARD AND DETENTION BENEFITS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, as amended, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits until July 1, 1957 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE LATE ALBEN W. BARKLEY—RESOLUTION OF PHILIPPINE SENATE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following resolution adopted by the Senate of the Republic of the Philippines, which was read, and ordered to lie on the table:

Whereas press dispatches have brought the shocking report of the sudden death of Senator Alben W. Barkley of the United States Congress; and

Whereas, as former Vice President and Senator before and at the time of his demise, Alben W. Barkley was a great friend of the Filipinos and contributed much to harmonious Philippine-American relations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, To request and authorize the President of the Senate of the Philippines to transmit a message of sincerest sympathy and condolence of this legislative body for the untimely death of Senator Alben W. Barkley to the Senate of the United States, as well as to his beloved family.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted at a mass meeting of Americans of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian descent, at Racine, Wis., relating to the occupation of the Baltic States by Soviet Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the United American Indians, at Spokane, Wash., remonstrating against the O'Mahoney amendment to House bill 5566, relating to settlement of claims for lands, goods, and chattels taken from the Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted at a public meeting of citizens of Hawaii, at Honolulu, Hawaii, favoring an investigation of Hawaii's economy; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Resolutions adopted by the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor, Inc., at Asheville, N. C., favoring the enactment of the bill (H. R. 175) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the claims of prisoners of war permanently disabled; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Josephine S. Hughes, of Sand Springs, Okla., relating to the United States Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the California Federation of Post Office Clerks, Huntington Park, Calif., protesting against the transfer of Government activities to private business, and so forth; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A telegram, in the nature of a petition, from the Kaweah River Property Owners Association, Three Rivers, Calif., signed by Darrell Hall, president, board of directors, relating to the construction of an upper watershed flood-control program on the Tule and Kaweah Rivers, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Niagara Falls, N. Y., favoring the immediate restoration of power facilities recently destroyed by a rockslide in the Niagara River; to the Committee on Public Works.

A telegram, in the nature of a petition, from the Ketchikan, Alaska, Chamber of Commerce, signed by W. K. Boardman, manager, favoring the inclusion of Alaska in the national highway bill; ordered to lie on the table.

RELEASE BY RUSSIA OF TRADE UNIONISTS AND DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISTS—LETTER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, 18 internationally known labor leaders have joined in petitioning Moscow for the release of "all trade unionists and democratic socialists imprisoned in the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and China."

Their petition was in the form of a letter to the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union; and the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union.

The letter noted Nikita Khrushchev's "opposition to world labor's just demand," a reference to Khrushchev's antagonism expressed in London to British Labor's request for the release of the political prisoners.

The letter was made public by S. M. Levitas, of the Labor Committee, to release imprisoned trade unionists and democratic socialists.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 25, 1956.

PRESIDIUM OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION,
COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE SOVIET UNION,
Moscow, U. S. S. R.

SIRS: You will understand that the world labor movement can never rest until all trade unionists and democratic socialists imprisoned in the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and China have been released and until the memory of those who perished in free labor's cause has been cleared.

We are not discouraged by Mr. Khrushchev's opposition to world labor's just de-

mand. We are certain of the outcome because what we demand reflects the will of the workers of the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and China no less than that of their brothers in the entire world.

Please give this matter your immediate attention.

Bjarne Braatoy, Secretary, Socialist International, London, England; James B. Carey, President, International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers; M. J. Coldwell, M. P., National President, Lorne Ingle, National Secretary, Canadian Cooperative Commonwealth Federation; E. Lloyd Evans, Vice Chairman, Gambia Labor Union, British West Africa; William Farson, Executive Vice President, American Newspaper Guild; Adolph Held, Chairman, Jewish Labor Committee; Fotis Makris, Secretary General, Greek General Confederation of Labor; Emil Mazey, Secretary Treasurer, International Union United Auto Workers; David J. McDonald, President, United Steel Workers of America; Franz Neumann, Chairman, Berlin Social Democratic Party, Germany; T. Nishimaki, International Representative, All Japan Seamen's Union; Giulio Pastore, General Secretary, Confederazione Italiana dei Sindicati dei Lavoratori; A. Philip Randolph, International President, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; W. J. Smith, National President, Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Employees; Norman Thomas; Stefan Thomas, Chairman, Ostburo German Social Democratic Party; Italo Viglianesi, National Secretary, Unione Italiana del Lavoro.

COMPULSORY POULTRY INSPECTION—LETTER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, has just written me in support of S. 3176, the so-called poultry inspection bill sponsored by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I am delighted to be a cosponsor of this measure, and would like to bring the endorsement of the AFL–CIO to the attention of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Meany's letter be printed at this point in my remarks, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., May 31, 1956.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations is deeply concerned over legislation for mandatory poultry inspection. Both because we are consumers—our members and their families—and have in our ranks poultry workers, we want to see an effective poultry inspection law enacted by this Congress

S. 3176, the Murray bill, would truly provide consumer protection. It has the support of top health organizations including the State and Territorial Health Officers Association and the Association of Food and Drug Officials of the United States, as well as women's groups, professional organizations, and some farm organizations.

Another bill, S. 3588, before the Agriculture Committee, does nothing to protect the consumer or poultry worker against the dangers of filthy or diseased poultry.

The AFL–CIO believes enactment of meaningful legislation is necessary to stop illness and death among consumers and poultry workers.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEANY, *President.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BENDER, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

H. R. 9671. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the village of Carey, Ohio (Rept. No. 2238).

By Mr. MCNAMARA, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H. R. 10060. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, as amended (Rept. No. 2240).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 101. A bill relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9, subsection (d) and (e), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (Rept. No. 2241).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 3663. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 2242);

S. 3838. A bill to provide for the maintenance and operation of the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River from Jones Point, Va., to Maryland (Rept. No. 2243);

H. R. 8493. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 2244); and

H. R. 10768. A bill to amend section 5 of the act of August 7, 1946, entitled "An act for the retirement of public schoolteachers in the District of Columbia," as amended (Rept. No. 2245).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

S. 2704. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction of certain highway-railroad grade separations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2246); and

H. R. 11487. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937, as amended (Rept. No. 2247).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 2895. A bill to amend the acts of February 28, 1903, and March 3, 1927, relating to the payment of the cost and expense of constructing railway-highway grade elimination structures in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 2248); and

H. R. 7380. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 to correct certain inequities (Rept. No. 2249).

By Mr. BIBLE (for Mr. MORSE), from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 2896. A bill to amend the act relating to cemetery associations (Rept. No. 2250);

H. R. 9582. A bill to provide for the delayed reporting of births within the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 2251); and

H. R. 10374. A bill to amend the act to incorporate the Oak Hill Cemetery, in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 2252).

By Mr. BIBLE (for Mr. MORSE), from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 313. A bill to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood, urine, or breath of persons tried in the District of Columbia for certain offenses committed while operating vehicles (Rept. No. 2253);

H. R. 3693. A bill to amend title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended (Rept. No. 2255); and

H. R. 11320. A bill to effect the control of narcotics, barbiturates, and dangerous drugs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2254).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

S. 2429. A bill to amend section 212 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize research and experimental work with vessels, vessel propulsion and equipment, port facilities, planning, and operation and cargo handling on ships and at ports (Rept. No. 2256); and

H. R. 5790. A bill relating to the application in the Territory of Hawaii of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act (Rept. No. 2257).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments:

S. 2523. A bill to amend section 212 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the construction of a nuclear-powered prototype merchant ship for operation in foreign commerce of the United States, to authorize research and experimental work with vessels, port facilities, planning, and operating and cargo handling on ships and at ports, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2258); and

S. 3821. A bill to authorize the construction of 2 prototype ships, and the conversion of 1 Liberty ship, by the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce (Rept. No. 2259).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H. R. 10986. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2260).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. Res. 249. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1708. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest M. Kersh (Rept No. 2261).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1184. A bill for the relief of Frank R. Davis (Rept. No. 2262).

REPORT ENTITLED "SWISS WATCHES—ADJUSTMENTS" (S. REPT. NO. 2239)

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, about a year ago it was alleged to the Permanent Investigating Subcommittee that a serious situation exists in the watch industry, because of the failure of the Treasury Department to collect certain tariffs on imported watches.

It was stated that this alleged enforcement failure entailed three unfortunate results:

First. The loss of revenue to the United States Government of at least $238 million since the act was passed.

Second. The placing of the United States watch-producing industry at a severe competitive disadvantage as compared to its counterpart abroad, particularly in Switzerland.

Third. The loss of skills developed in the production of watches which are applicable and necessary to defense industries.

The Permanent Investigating Subcommittee has conducted an inquiry into this subject matter, during the course of which it held hearings last summer and earlier this year. The subcommittee concluded that the situation is such that it requires early corrective action. However, this action does not lie within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee, since to correct the existing condition would require either a court decision or clarifying tariff legislation.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, I submit a report of the committee, as made by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, and ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it is our hope that the submission of this report today will stimulate corrective action by the committees having proper jurisdiction over the subject matter.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

Willard Frank Libby, of Illinois, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 4064. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to donate to the Philippine Republic certain records captured from Insurectos during 1899–1903; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 4065. A bill to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 4066. A bill for the relief of Bizar Gulian Nazarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 4067. A bill to amend section 82 of title 28 of the United States Code in order to authorize holding terms of the United States District Court at Yuma, Ariz.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS (by request):

S. 4068. A bill for the relief of the McGehee Co., Inc., Wallace L. McGehee, and Robert W. Bender; and

S. 4069. A bill for the relief of the Sanitary Equipment Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. FLANDERS):

S. 4070. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility in the State of Vermont; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 4071. A bill for the relief of Joseph L. Barrow; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 4072. A bill for the relief of Gioachino Macchiarella; and

S. 4073. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Geordt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 4074. A bill for the relief of Santo Rea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself and Mr. COTTON) (by request):

S. 4075. A bill to provide for the appointment of certain officers in the grade of rear admiral in the Retired Reserve to the grade of vice admiral in the Retired Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 4076. A bill to provide for the appointment of the chief legal officers of certain departments in the executive branch by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. 4077. A bill to provide for the transfer to the Yorktown Battlefield Area, Colonial National Historical Park, Va., certain howitzers surrendered by the British at Yorktown; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. BENDER):

S. 4078. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 and part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a) so as to require certain private educational institutions and training establishments to file non-Communist affidavits with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and to require disapproval under such act or such part of any such institution or establishment which fails to file such an affidavit; to the Committee on Labor and Public Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 4079. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the Padbloc Co., Inc., and Harry G. Lankford, of Wichita, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 4080. A bill to amend the act of April 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 44, 25 U. S. C. 631 et seq.), so as to permit the Navaho Indian Tribe to lease tribal lands for residential and other purposes for a term of not to exceed 99 years; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON relating to the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were submitted and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. Res. 291. Resolution opposing Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1956; referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. Res. 292. Resolution favoring the retention of the name "Minneapolis" on the Navy's active ship roster and its subsequent assignment to a new Navy ship; referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

DONATION OF CERTAIN CAPTURED RECORDS TO THE PHILIPPINE REPUBLIC

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, July 4 is our Independence Day. It is also the day on which the Republic of the Philippines celebrates its independence.

As a gesture of friendliness toward our close friend and ally, the Philippines, it is appropriate at this time that authorization should be given to return to the Philippine Government historical records of the Philippine insurgent movement now in our possession. These papers were captured from the insurgents by the United States during the Philippine revolt of 1899–1903.

Before returning these records, which mean so much to the people of the Philippines, the National Archives wishes to have them microfilmed. It is estimated that this will cost $35,000.

In order to accomplish the return of these records and so that the National Archives may be provided with the necessary funds for microfilming, I introduce a bill which has the full support of our State Department, and I ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4064) to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to donate to the Philippine Republic certain records captured from insurrectors during 1899–1903, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

FEDERAL RECREATION SERVICE IN DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. A corresponding bill was introduced in the other House on June 4, by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey, I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill, prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD, together with the text of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4065) to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor

and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a service to be called the Federal Recreation Service, the Director of which shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Department.

SEC. 2. The functions of the Federal Recreation Service shall be to furnish consultant services with respect to recreational needs of youth, the aging, and the hospitalized and institutionalized; to conduct research, and to provide information to public agencies and nonprofit private agencies toward determining and meeting the expanding needs of the public for recreational services; to cooperate with other Federal agencies and with the States in planning for recreational services for the people of the United States; and to enter into agreements and contracts with Federal and State agencies and educational and research institutions for such services as, in the judgment of the Secretary, will promote the purposes of this act. The Service so established shall have the necessary general administrative powers to carry out its functions efficiently and in the public interest.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall establish a National Advisory Board on Recreation Services which shall consist of the Secretary of the Department, or his representative, who shall be Chairman of the Board, and such other members as the Secretary finds necessary, to be appointed by him without regard to the civil-service laws. The appointed members shall be selected from leaders of national standing in the fields of public recreation and in related fields and shall be broadly representative of the recreation interests of the Nation. Those members of the Board who are not officers or employees of the United States, while attending conferences or meetings of the Board, or while otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary of the Department in carrying out the purposes of this act, shall be entitled, while serving away from their places of residence, to actual and necessary traveling expenses and not more than $25 per day for subsistence expenses. The Board shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on matters relating to the administration of this act.

SEC. 4. The Federal Recreation Service established pursuant to this act shall not duplicate any functions performed by the Federal Inter-Agency Committee on Recreation or by any other agency administering recreational facilities and services; and nothing contained in this act shall limit or impair the authority or responsibility of any other department or agency of the Federal Government under any other act. In carrying out the purposes of this act, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall cooperate and receive the cooperation of other Federal departments and agencies which perform functions in the field of recreation services.

SEC. 5. As used in this act, the term "State" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The statement presented by Mr. NEUBERGER is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER

Briefly, this bill would permit the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to act as an advisor and consultant to public and nonprofit private agencies on any matter regarding the planning and operation of recreation facilities. This would include services to recreation for youth, the aged, and the hospitalized, and the otherwise institutionalized.

There are a number of reasons why I believe that a Federal Recreation Service could provide valuable services to local agencies in this field.

Today it is widely recognized that recreation is an integral part of our daily lives. Healthy individuals require not only food and sleep but play, as well. Recreation is a basic factor in the general well-being of society, not only because it contributes to the physical and mental health, morals, education and culture of people, but also because it can materially help curb crime and delinquency, encourage good citizenship, and enhance family and community relationships.

The relationship of recreation services in the community to the other social services is a direct and close one. Recreation should logically be a part of the field of activities of the United States agency concerned with the health, education, and welfare of this Nation. There are a great many ways in which such a service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare could effectively promote the general welfare. This was well pointed out in the report of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor which reported out favorably a similar bill to this one in 1946. In that report, for example, the president of the Society of Recreation Workers of America, Mr. Milo Christiansen, was quoted as follows:

"Thousands of communities throughout this great country of ours are anxious for advice, guidance, and counseling on how they can best meet their responsibilities for providing recreational facilities and opportunities. Many are anxious to adjust and correct these deficiencies."

He goes on to point out:

"Lack of knowledge as to how best this can be done is due to the comparative newness of recreation as a community responsibility. These communities are anxious and eager to learn about statutory and legislative requirements and limitations. They want to know the most effective procedures for community organization; they want to know the best methods for utilizing the community resources including municipal, park, school, and housing properties."

Local communities need to know about the best methods of financing vital recreation services. They need to know what standards they should use in employing personnel and how they can integrate new programs with existing facilities. Through proper counseling and guidance, communities can benefit from the experience of others already engaged in providing recreation programs.

As I have pointed out, this proposal is not a new one. In 1946 and in each following Congress a bill similar to the one I am introducing today was submitted. A large number of prominent public organizations have long supported such legislation. They include the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, various State organizations of the American Legion, the American Association of Group Workers, the AFL and CIO, the Cooperative League of the United States of America, the National Sheriffs' Association, the Association for Family Living, the American Recreation Society, and an overwhelming number of local and State recreation societies and commissions as well as State welfare organizations.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that this bill does not call for the creation of a new agency or the setting up of extensive new machinery. The purposes of this bill can easily be carried out within the existing framework of organization. The costs of a Federal Recreation Service would not be great. The benefits would be enormous, both to other Federal agencies directly concerned with the welfare of American citizens and to the many public and private agencies striving to improve the recreation activities so important to our lives.

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1952 AND VETERANS REGULATION NO. 1 (A), RELATING TO FILING OF NON-COMMUNIST AFFIDAVITS

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], all of the members of the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend Public Law 346, 78th Congress, and Public Law 550, 82d Congress, which laws grant, among other things, educational benefits to World War II and Korean war veterans.

In essence, the bill would require private schools below the college level which are training veterans or seeking approval to train veterans to submit to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs affidavits signed by the owner or owners and by the members of the governing body that he is not and never has been a member of the Communist Party or any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by illegal or unconstitutional methods. In the event a school fails to file an affidavit, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs will not approve the enrollment of veterans in such school. An individual who has been a member of the Communist Party in the past can comply with provisions of the proposed legislation if he files an affidavit that he has terminated his membership and since such termination, is opposed to the doctrines, program, principles, and ideology of such organizations.

This bill is being introduced with a view to correcting deficiencies in Public Laws 346 and 550. During hearings held by the subcommittee earlier this year on Communist ownership of GI schools, it was developed that under the existing provisions of these laws, the Veterans' Administration has been and is required to expend Federal funds for tuition of veterans attending schools which are Communist owned. Over three million dollars was paid by the Veterans' Administration to four schools which were the subject of the subcommittee hearings, and which, because of Communist connection, should be ineligible to participate in the veterans' training program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4078) to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 and part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to require certain private educational institutions and training establishments to file non-Communist affidavits with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and to require disapproval under such act or such part of any such institution or establishment which fails to file such an affidavit, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself

and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REHABILITATION OF NAVAHO AND HOPI TRIBES OF INDIANS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon, I introduced, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to promote the rehabilitation of Navaho and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of resources of the Navaho and Hopi Indian Reservations and for other purposes," approved April 19, 1950. The bill would amend section 5 of the act in two respects:

First. It would authorize long-term leases for residential purposes in addition to the purposes for which leases may now be made, and

Second. It would authorize the Navaho Tribe to lease tribal lands for a term of not more than 99 years.

If the bill is enacted, section 5 of the act, with the proposed amendments shown in quotation marks, would read as follows:

SEC. 5. Any restricted Indian lands owned by the Navaho Tribe, members thereof, or associations of such members, or by the Hopi Tribe, members thereof, or associations of such members, may be leased by the Indian owners, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, for public, religious, educational, recreational, "residential," or business purposes, including the development or utilization of natural resources in connection with operations under such leases. All leases so granted shall be for a term of not to exceed 25 years, but may include provisions authorizing their renewal for an additional term of not to exceed 25 years, and shall be made under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary. *Provided, however,* "That leases of Navaho tribal land may be for a term of not to exceed 99 years." Restricted allotments of deceased Indians may be leased under this section, for the benefit of their heirs or devisees, in the circumstances and by the persons prescribed in the act of July 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 745; 25 U. S. C. 1946 ed., sec. 380). Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to repeal or affect any authority to lease restricted Indian lands conferred by or pursuant to any other provision of law.

This will conform the Navaho-Hopi Act with Public Law 255 of the 84th Congress, 1st session (69 Stat. 539; 25 U. S. C. 415) which includes "residential" among the purposes for which general leasing authority is conferred upon tribes.

The proposed proviso authorizes the Navaho Tribe, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to lease tribal lands for terms up to 99 years. At the present time the maximum term for which Navaho lands may be leased is 25 years, with an option to renew the lease for 1 additional term of not to exceed 25 years. By resolution No. CJ–12–56 adopted on January 23, 1956, the Navaho Tribal Council specifically requested authority from the Congress of the United States to make leases for terms of 99 years. There are two reasons why it is believed desirable that the Navaho Tribal Council have authority to grant 99-year leases. The first is, that for extensive industrial developments which require great investment in plant, the present limit of 25 years, subject to a 25-year renewal, does not provide an adequate amortization period. I am advised that lack of authority of the tribal council to grant 99-year leases is delaying progress in plans of the Utah Construction Co. to build a thermal electric plant on tribal land near Shiprock, N. Mex., to utilize the huge low-cost strip coal reserves of the eastern Navaho Reservation. Tribal officials have informed me that a representative of this company has stated that there is a sufficient supply of low-cost coal in this area to fuel a million kilowatt powerplant for 100 years. The company hesitates to build such a plant, however, not because of its own land-tenure problem, since it would hold under a mineral lease, which continues in effect so long as mineral is produced in paying quantities, but because of the reluctance of the industries that would be its customers to locate on Navaho tribal lands the plants to utilize Utah Construction Co. power.

The dire necessity for large-scale industrial development in the Navaho Reservation is shown by the chronic underemployment existent there. The Krug report of March 1948, states that the Navaho Reservation is capable of supporting only 35,000 people at a minimum subsistence level. Yet today there are 80,000 Navahos. The authors of the Krug report were speaking only of livestock and agriculture as population supporting resources. It is obvious that these became inadequate for the increasing Navaho population many years ago. Relocation has proved inadequate to the problem and exceedingly expensive to the Government. Industrialization of the type contemplated by the Utah Construction Co. can do the job without cost to the taxpayers—provided outmoded legal barriers are removed, as the Navaho Tribal Council proposes in seeking revision of the Navaho-Hopi Rehabilitation Act.

The second reason for requesting 99-year-lease authority is that lending agencies are reluctant to grant home building or business loans for construction on lands held under lease for a shorter term. This has resulted in the fact that Navaho veterans have been unable to take advantage of their rights to G. I. loans. It is believed that 99-year leases will provide sufficiently secure land tenance to satisfy the lending agencies, and at the same time avoid any outright sales of Navaho Indian land.

Mr. President, in connection with this proposed amendment, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Scott Preston, Acting Chairman of the Navaho Tribal Council, and a copy of the resolution CJ–12–56 referred to above.

There being no objection, the resolution and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NAVAHO TRIBE,
Window Rock, Ariz., June 15, 1956.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Senator From New Mexico, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: The purpose of this letter is to express very strong support on behalf of the Navaho Tribe for legislation to permit our tribal council, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to issue 99-year leases of Navaho tribal lands. Enclosed is a resolution of the Navaho Tribal Council, passed on January 23 of this year, by which the tribe has declared itself in favor of 99-year leases.

While the following is by no means the only reason why we believe it essential for us to have authority to grant 99-year leases, it is the most urgent reason, and the reason we are presuming to ask Congress to act on the subject so late in the present session: We have granted Utah Construction Co. an option to take a mineral lease on a large coal deposit in district 13 of our reservation in San Juan County, N. Mex. This option expires January 1, 1957. Representatives of the Utah Construction Co. have told us that our coal, which is very close to the surface and can be strip mined at exceptionally low cost, offers one of the greatest thermal energy potentials in the United States for generations of electricity. They have told us we have enough coal available in the area to run a 750,000-kilowatt powerplant for at least 50 years, and probably much longer. They have compared the power project they are contemplating to Grand Coulee and Bonneville.

Naturally we expect such an abundant source of low-cost power to cause tremendous industrial development in San Juan County, which we hope will go a very long way toward solving our chronic Navaho unemployment problem. However, we are informed that corporations interested in putting up the large-scale plants that can utilize the Utah Construction Co.'s electricity must have greater security for their investment than we can offer with 25-year or 50-year leases, which are the longest term leases we are presently authorized to grant.

We are very much afraid that if we do not promptly get authority to grant 99-year leases, these large-scale industrial operations will locate north of the San Juan River, off our reservation, where they can buy land, and we will lose much of the employment opportunities we need so desperately for our people.

The foregoing is the reason we are presuming to ask the Congress to take action at this session on a bill to authorize us to grant 99-year leases of tribal lands.

Please let me thank you for any support you can give to legislation to give us authority to grant 99-year leases.

Sincerely yours,

SCOTT PRESTON,
Acting Chairman, Navaho Tribal Council.

RESOLUTION OF THE NAVAHO TRIBAL COUNCIL REQUESTING LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE 99-YEAR LEASES ON NAVAHO TRIBAL LANDS

"Whereas

"1. Present law permits the leasing of areas of tribal land for a period of 25 years with option to renew;

"2. The 25-year lease is not sufficient to meet the requirements of industrial and community development; and

"3. It is to the best interest of the Navaho Tribe to request action by Congress to amend the Navaho-Hopi Rehabilitation Act to permit, under such terms and conditions as the Navaho Tribal Council may specify, the execution of 99-year leases when, in the opinion of the Navaho Tribal Council, circumstances so warrant in specific instances: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That:

"1. The chairman of the Navaho Tribal Council, by and with the aid of the Advisory Committee, and the tribal attorneys be, and he is hereby instructed to prepare for submission to the Congress appropriate legislation to permit the granting, by the tribal council, of 99-year leases on tribal lands."

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was duly considered by the Navaho

Tribal Council at a duly called meeting at Window Rock, Ariz., at which a quorum was present, and that same was approved by a vote of 48 in favor, and 21 opposed, this 23d day of January 1956.

J. MAURICE MCCABE,
Secretary-Treasurer.
For PAUL JONES,
Chairman, Navaho Tribal Council.

DISAPPROVAL OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], I submit a resolution opposing Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1956. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on the resolution for not more than 5 minutes, to explain its purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

The resolution (S. Res. 291) was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1956 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 17, 1956.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have just submitted a resolution of disapproval with respect to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1956, submitted to the Congress on May 17, 1956. Joining with me in the sponsorship of the resolution are the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, and the ranking minority member of the committee, Senator CAPEHART.

Reorganization Plan No. 2 would separate the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and establish it as an independent agency. This is a major organizational change, vitally affecting the savings and loan associations of the Nation which are currently supplying approximately 37 percent of all home financing. Such a major change should be undertaken only after a most thorough and careful study and with full examination into the possible consequences of dividing the responsibility for authority and control in this important financial field.

The Senate Banking and Currency Committee has processed a great deal of legislation affecting these Government agencies, and over the past year has heard testimony from scores of experts from the industry and the affected agencies. None of these experts has ever suggested to the committee the desirability of a basic change in the organization structure. The committee has always been open minded to suggestions for improvement; and it would, I am sure, hold hearings on, and give careful consideration to, this or any other suggested changes in the system. Pending a careful and thorough study of the matter it seems imperative that Reorganization Plan No. 2 be rejected.

Briefly, the objections to Reorganization Plan No. 2 may be stated as follows:

First. The plan would be disadvantageous to the savings and loan associations, which would be under the direction of two separate agencies, with duplicating, overlapping, and possibly contradictory powers over the associations. The associations are strongly opposed to the plan, and appear not to have been consulted in advance of the plan's submission. These institutions provide all of the capital for the Federal Home Loan Banks, pay all of the costs of the affected agencies, and should have some reasonable voice in this matter.

Second. The plan does not effect any economies or reduce the number of agencies; but, on the contrary, it would provide 2 agencies, where now there is 1, and would increase substantially the cost of operating these agencies.

Third. The plan appears to have some technical defects, in that it fails to provide for any term of office for the trustees, and fails to provide for bipartisanship on the board of trustees. From the time when it was established in 1932, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board has by law been a bipartisan Board.

Fourth. The plan is contrary to recommendations of the Task Force on Lending Agencies of the Hoover Commission; is contrary to the views stated by the affected agencies in official communications dated September 13, 1955, and is contrary to the views of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, as set forth in an official communication of May 23, 1955.

In view of these apparent disadvantages of the plan to the public, to the Congress, and to the associations, the plan should be rejected, and I urge the Members of the Senate to support the resolution of disapproval.

THE U. S. S. "MINNEAPOLIS"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the proud names in the long history of the Navy's fighting ships has been that of the cruiser, U. S. S. *Minneapolis.*

The *Minneapolis* fought through 24 engagements during World War II—from the Solomons campaign through Okinawa—accounting for 15 enemy aircraft and 4 enemy warships. She was hit seriously in 1942 during the bitter campaign at Guadalcanal, but was repaired and returned to the war to serve well under a succession of fine commanding officers.

All during the war, the exploits of the *Minneapolis* cheered the people of Minnesota, who were also heartened by the records of the cruisers *St. Paul* and *Duluth* during both World War II and the Korean conflict.

Since February 10, 1947, the *Minneapolis* has been in mothballs. In the past few days, I have learned that she is to be included among the more than 100 ships which the Navy now proposes to scrap.

Mr. President, I fully recognize that the Navy has a continuing program to modernize our fleet and to keep abreast of the newest developments in tactics and weapons, and that in this process, many grand old ships must go into the discard.

But I did not want to let the *Minneapolis* go to the scrap heap without calling to the Nation's attention her splendid record.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Navy will be building new ships; and one of the finest traditions of the United States Navy is its long record of naming new ships after old—to maintain the name and the honor of the great fighting ships which have defended the Nation on the seas of the world.

It would seem to me eminently fitting that the name of the cruiser *Minneapolis* be retained on the Navy's active roster of ships, and I therefore wish to submit a resolution which would indicate the interest of the Congress in perpetuating the name of the *Minneapolis* by assigning it to one of the Navy's new ships.

Mr. President, I submit the resolution, for referral to the appropriate committee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, a pamphlet sent me by the Navy Department entitled "Battle Record of the *Minneapolis.*"

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the pamphlet will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 292) was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Whereas the cruiser U. S. S. *Minneapolis* has long been a proud name in the long history of the United States Navy's fighting ships; and

Whereas during World War II, the U. S. S. *Minneapolis* fought through 24 engagements, accounted for 15 enemy aircraft and 4 enemy warships, was hit seriously during the bitter campaign at Guadalcanal but was repaired and returned to the war to serve well under a succession of fine commanding officers; and

Whereas it is understood that the U. S. S. *Minneapolis* is to be scrapped by the United States Navy due to a continuing program to modernize and to keep abreast of the newest developments in tactics and weapons; and

Whereas it has long been one of the finest traditions of the United States Navy to name new ships after old ones thus maintaining the name and the honor of the great fighting ships which have defended the Nation on the seas of the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy is requested to retain the name *"Minneapolis"* on the United States Navy's active roster of ships and, as soon as practicable, to assign such name to a new Navy ship of comparable size to the present cruiser which bears such name.

The pamphlet presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

BATTLE RECORD OF THE "MINNEAPOLIS"

December 7, 1941: Returning from gunnery practice at the time of the Japanese attack. Joined in pursuit of the enemy forces.

February 20, 1942: Participated in Battle of Bougainville, Solomon Islands.

March 10, 1942: Participated in the Battle of Salamaua, New Guinea.

May 6–8, 1942: Participated in the Battle of the Coral Sea.

June 4–6, 1942: Participated in Battle of Midway.

August 7–30, 1942: Participated in expedition for the occupation of the Guadalcanal-Tulagi area, Solomon Islands.

September 14–21, 1942: Participated in expedition for the reinforcement of Guadalcanal.

October 1–4, 1942: Participated in expedition for the occupation of Funafuti, Ellice Islands.

Night of November 30–December 1, 1942: Participated in the Battle of Tassafaronga, receiving damage from two torpedo hits.

October 5, 1943: Participated in the bombardment of Wake Island.

October 20–24, 1943: Participated in the assault and capture of Makin Island, Gilbert Islands Group.

December 4–5, 1943: Participated in assault on Kwajalein Atoll, Marshall Islands.

January 30, 1944: Participated in bombardment of Taroa Island, Maleolap Group, Marshall Islands.

January 31–February 5, 1944: Participated in bombardment and capture of Kwajalein Group, Marshall Islands.

February 16–17. 1944: Participated in air assault on Truk Group, Caroline Islands. Assisted in sinking 1 light cruiser and 1 destroyer in a surface action.

February 21–22, 1944: Air assault on Saipan and Tinian, Marianas Islands.

March 30–April 1, 1944: Participated in air assault on Palau, Yap, and Woleai, Caroline Islands.

April 21–28, 1944: Air assault and suppport for landings in northwest New Guinea, Hollandia area.

April 29, 1944: Air assault on Truk, Caroline Islands.

April 30, 1944: Bombardment of Satawan Island, Nomoi group, Caroline Islands.

June 14–15, 1944: Bombardment and air assault on Tinian and support for landings on Saipan, Marianas Islands; under enemy air attack off Tinian.

June 16, 1944: Participated in bombardment of Guam Island.

June 17–20, 1944: Attached to Task Force 58 during first battle of the Philippine Sea. Under enemy air attack off the Marianas Islands by a Japanese carrier force.

July 18–20, 1944: Participated in bombardment of Guam Island.

July 21–August 9, 1944: Participated in support for landings, bombardment and capture of Guam.

July 26, and August 8, 1944: Bombarded Rota Island, Marianas group.

September 12–21, 1944: Bombardment and fire support for landings and capture of Angaur, Ngesebus, and Peleliu Islands, Palau group.

October 17–29, 1944: Bombardment and fire support for landings on Leyte Island, Philippine Islands.

October 24–25, 1944: Participated in the Battle of Surigao Straits, Leyte Gulf, Philippine Islands, while attached to Task Force 77.2. Night surface engagement against elements of the Japanese Fleet.

November 5–16, 1944: Engaged as screening force attached to Task Group 38.4 during air strikes on enemy shipping in Manila Bay and enemy airfields on Luzon, Philippine Islands.

November 17–December 26, 1944: Defending force in Leyte Gulf, attached to Task Group 77.14, Philippine Islands.

December 27–28, 1944: Defending force for beachhead on southwest Mindoro, Philippines, attached to Task Group 77.14.

January 6–February 10, 1945: Bombardment and fire support for landings and capture of Lingayen Gulf, Luzon Island, Philippines.

February 11–15, 1945: Defending force in Lingayen Gulf, attached to Task Unit 77.3.5.

February 16, 1945: Bombardment and support for capture of Corregidor Island, Philippines.

February 17–26, 1945: Defending force in Lingayen Gulf, Philippines, attached to Task Unit 77.3.5.

March 31–April 12: Participated in the bombardment of, assault, and capture of the Kerama Retto group, and the bombardment of, assault, and landings on Okinawa Shima, Ryukyu Islands.

August 15, 1945: At Subic Bay, Philippine Islands, when first word of the Japanese capitulation was received.

September 2, 1945: Flagship of the 7th Fleet on patrol in the Yellow Sea when the Japanese surrender was signed in the Bay of Tokyo.

September 8, 1945: Participated in support for initial landings for occupation of Korea, at Jinsen Harbor, Korea; attached to Task Force 71.

September 30, 1945: Participated in support for landings at Taku, China; attached to Task Unit 71.1.5.

October 3, 1945: Participated in support for landing party at Chinwangtao, China; attached to Task Unit 71.1.55.

October 7, 1945: Ship's landing force investigated conditions and established cordial, unofficial contact with elements of the Chinese 8th Route Army at Wei Hai Wei, China; attached to Task Unit 71.6.45.

October 30, 1945: Participated in support for landing of the Chinese 13th Army at Chinwangtao, China; attached to Task Unit 71.6.45.

WARTIME COMMANDING OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES SHIP MINNEAPOLIS

Capt. F. J. Lowry, United States Navy, October 2, 1940–September 8, 1942.

Capt. C. E. Rosendahl, United States Navy, September 8, 1942–April 7, 1943.

Comdr. R. G. McCool, United States Navy, April 7, 1943–July 19, 1943.

Capt. R. W. Bates, United States Navy, July 19, 1943–May 29, 1944.

Capt. H. B. Slocum, United States Navy, May 29, 1944–June 16, 1945.

Capt. R. C. Hudson, United States Navy, June 16, 1945, to date.

SUSPENSION OF DUTIES AND IMPORT TAXES ON METAL SCRAP—AMENDMENT

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 8636) to continue until the close of June 30, 1957, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON VARIOUS CIVIL-RIGHTS PROPOSALS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the committee will resume hearings on the various civil-rights proposals beginning at 2:30 p. m., Monday, June 25, 1956, Tuesday, June 26, 1956, Wednesday, June 27, 1956, and Thursday, June 28, 1956, in the committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF A NOMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator, and as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair desires to announce that the Senate received today the nomination of Frederick Blake Payne, of New York, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Regional Organizations.

Notice is given that this nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that following consideration of H. R. 11473, Calendar No. 2258, the legislative appropriation bill, which will take precedence, we expect to consider:

Calendar No. 2169, Senate bill 3982, the mining bill;

Calendar No. 2039, Senate bill 3449, the Air Lines reinvestment bill;

Calendar No. 2155, H. R. 7763, to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act;

Calendar No. 2063, Senate bill 3365, to amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, and

Calendar No. 2222, H. R. 7855, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

If those bills are not called up today, we shall proceed to their consideration tomorrow.

I should also like to call to the attention of the Senate, and particularly to my distinguished friend, the minority leader, that H. R. 9852, to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, is on the calendar as Calendar No. 2259.

I should like him to approve the request for the consideration of Calendar No. 2095, Senate bill 3879, the so-called dealers' day in court bill. We should like to schedule the bill for early action perhaps tomorrow, if that is agreeable. I should like to have the distinguished minority leader advise me if that is not agreeable. Calendar No. 2175, Senate bill 2572, the Agriculture-Defense lands exchange bill, is also scheduled for consideration.

Those are all bills which may possibly be considered during the week.

Of course, we are hopeful that we shall be able to consider at an early date the Defense Department appropriation bill, which is being marked up in committee today, and the foreign aid authorization bill, which we expect the Foreign Relations Committee to report at an early date.

It is anticipated that a conference report on the road bill will be submitted sometime during the week, as well as a conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill.

As soon as we take action on the legislative appropriation bill and the Defense Department appropriation bill, which is being marked up today, we shall have only two appropriation bills to be considered, namely, the foreign aid appropriation bill, which must wait on action on the authorization bill, and the supplemental appropriation bill.

Action is being taken in the Armed Services Committee to expedite the bill on the so-called military public works construction bill, and the supplemental appropriation bill will be held up until action can be taken on the military public works construction measure, because there are some items in that bill which the department wants to have included in the supplemental appropriation bill.

I make this announcement so all Senators may be aware of the hopes and plans of the leadership.

If no Senator desires to address the Senate at this time, Mr. President, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I withhold that request.

DANGERS OF ADMINISTRATION VIEWPOINT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have on many occasions spoken on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere of the unfortunate and highly dangerous impression that is being created by the administration and some of its officials that "all was well in the world" and that efforts to secure a peaceful and secure world had met with success—all this in spite of the tragic tensions and problems that exist in Cyprus, in the Near East, in Israel and the Arab States, in Formosa and the offshore islands, in North Africa, in Asia, and in other critical areas. My colleagues, things are far from well in the world. We are hypnotizing ourselves into a trance of self-contentment and complacency. We are lulling ourselves into an utterly false sense of security which may destroy us.

On June 12, the New York Times carried a most interesting article by a well-known author, columnist, and reporter, entitled "Serendipity in Capital—A Critique on New Administration Mood of Finding Everything But Soviet Good." This article is so true and contains so much food for thought and for deep concern that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in my remarks in the body of the RECORD. I hope that it will be widely read by Members of the Congress and by the American public generally.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERENDIPITY IN CAPITAL—A CRITIQUE ON NEW ADMINISTRATION MOOD OF FINDING EVERYTHING BUT SOVIET GOOD

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, June 12.—The administration has found a cureall. It is a rare tonic called serendipity, originally discovered by the English writer, Horace Walpole.

The word was coined by Mr. Walpole in allusion to a fairy tale, "The Three Princes of Serendip," who were never dismayed by misfortune, but always managed to discover, by chance or sagacity, wonderful things they had not sought.

This is what is happening here now. Others may be gloomy about the illness of the President, the state of the Atlantic Alliance, or the future of Germany, but the administration, like the Three Princes of Serendip, always finds something valuable or agreeable to say about everything, except, of course, the Soviet leaders.

Secretary of State Dulles was in a particularly serendipic mood today. He downgraded the President's illness to an indisposition. He saw no reason why this indisposition should hamper the efforts of the administration to restore the $1,100,000,000 cut in the foreign-aid appropriation. And he was full of bounce and optimism about many other things.

REMARKS ON NEUTRALS CITED

He was questioned closely, for example, about the President's recent sympathetic remarks about the reasons why some states preferred to remain neutral in the world struggle, and about his own references last Saturday to the immorality of neutrality.

But he saw no difference between them on this subject. "I had a long discussion with him [the President] in the course of other matters on Thursday afternoon, and I can assure you that there is no difference whatever in our points of view," he said.

Similarly, the Secretary of State was asked about the criticisms in Asia, about the weakness of the southeast Asian alliance, but he said he was not aware of any "general rising criticism in Asia."

Also, he was pleased with the progress that was being made in strengthening the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance and he denied that the disarmament talks with the Soviet Union were in a state of stalemate.

This was Mr. Dulles in his most optimistic mood. When he was asked about the forthcoming visit of Dimitri T. Shepilov, Soviet Foreign Minister, to Egypt, his only comment was that Mr. Shepilov seemed to be following the Dulles habit of relying on personal diplomacy rather than on written communications through the embassies.

And his main point about the recent speech by Nikita S. Khrushchev on the wickedness of Stalin was that he, Mr. Dulles, had known about this all along and had written about it in his book, War or Peace.

Like Mark Tapley in The Life and Adventures of Martin Chuzzlewit ("my constitution is to be jolly and my weakness is to wish to find a credit in it"), Mr. Dulles is always full of hopeful visions, especially when things are going badly. And the habit seems to be spreading.

A conscious effort is now being made to give the impression that the President already is back in command of the administration, 5 days after an emergency operation.

Though the administration originally had the Pentagon deal with the Soviet invitation to Gen. Nathan F. Twining—so as not to give that invitation too much importance—the White House made a special point yesterday of having the President personally take charge of the decision to reject the additional Soviet suggestion that the rest of the Joint Chiefs of Staff accompany the Air Force Chief of Staff to Moscow.

ASSURANCES ON PRESIDENT

Similarly, though nobody, so far as can be learned, has talked with the President since his illness about his campaign plans, his Cabinet members are asserting to all comers that the President will certainly run and that his convalescence will be brief and successful.

Coming on top of the President's recent statement that United States prestige in the world was greater today than at any time since World War II, and his other statement that "European union * * * seems nearer today than at any time in centuries," all this suggests to observers here a calculated effort to encourage the popular belief that everything is going well.

It is only fair to say, however, that this theme, while useful politically, is widely regarded as highly fanciful. The President's illness, has occurred at a critical time in the legislative program. It has occurred, too, during a period when the whole policy of the Western World toward the Communists is in transition.

This is why Lestor B. Pearson, Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, was here yesterday, why Chancellor Konrad Adenauer is here today, and why Christian Pineau, French Foreign Minister, and Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, have planned visits to the Capital in the forthcoming few weeks.

For the time being, however, "serendipity" is the word, and since this coincides with the mood of the country, it seems to be a valuable addition to the administration's political arsenal.

WHY THE UNITED NATIONS SHOULD BAR RED CHINA

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a most cogent article entitled "Why the United Nations Should Bar Red China," by the distinguished and able senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. The article was published in the June 11, 1956, issue of the New Leader magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE UNITED NATIONS SHOULD BAR RED CHINA

(By PAUL H. DOUGLAS)

One of the major diplomatic aims of international communism is the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. The greatest obstacle to this effort has been the strong opposition of the United States. The Communists have done everything in their power to discredit our stand on this question. They have tried to foster the belief that all those in the United States who oppose admitting Communist China to the U. N. and who favor strengthening our Nationalist Chinese allies, are lunatic-fringe reactionaries, conservatives, or members of the nebulous China lobby and represent a tiny minority of American opinion. Unfortunately, many people among our allies and in our own country have fallen for this line.

For this reason among others, I became a member of the Committee of One Million and am honored to serve on its steering committee. This group was organized to mobilize American public opinion against the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. It is unique in that its membership represents not only both major political parties, but also a wide divergence of opinion within each party which has come together on this one issue. It includes 24 Senators of both parties, 97 Congressmen of both parties, 9 governors of both parties, 8 former ambassadors, and 1 former Secretary of State (Gen. George C. Marshall). Over 1,037,000 Americans signed the committee's petition against admitting Red China. In addition, every major national labor, fraternal, veterans and civic organization has endorsed the petition or its purpose. This is hardly a tiny minority of American public opinion.

To further give the lie to Communist propaganda, I would like to recall that the Congress of the United States has passed four unanimous resolutions opposing the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. One need only consult back newspaper files to find categorical statements to the same effect by virtually every American leader, including Presidents Truman and Eisenhower. I stress these points because I feel it important that our allies should realize that opposition to the Peking regime is the considered opinion of the great majority of all Americans. It is based on realism plus morality rather than mere theoretical idealism.

To present the basis of our opposition to admitting Red China to the U. N., let me cite article IV of the Charter of the United Nations, the first clause of which reads as follows:

"Membership in the United Nations is open to all peace-loving States which accept the obligations contained in the present charter and which, in the judgment of the organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations."

I believe that this particular article was framed with the history of the League of Nations in mind. I was in Italy in 1935 when the League was struggling with the question of whether effective sanctions could

be invoked against Italy because of its invasion of Ethiopia. At that time, it was quite apparent that the League had bogged down as an agency for collective security, because it had among its members nations which were not peace-loving but aggressive.

Under the League's provisions for unanimity, these aggressive nations were able to stalemate any proposal to make that body work for collective security. I think it was this experience of the League which caused the Charter of the United Nations to be drafted so that membership was limited to peace-loving countries. This clearly means that the U. N. was not meant to be universal and that it should not embrace aggressors.

It is true that the original United Nations admitted a number of Communist nations, including Russia, which since have thoroughly indicated that they are aggressive. Because of the veto power held by members of the Security Council, it is not now possible to expel these members. But should we add to their strength by admitting more nations which, by their record, are clearly aggressive and have indicated no real desire to change?

It is quite plain that Red China stimulated the original invasions of South Korea, in 1950, and gave effective aid to the North Koreans throughout the war. It should also be remembered that Red China invaded North Korea in October and November 1950, before her own borders were transgressed. In fact, she was never invaded during the entire course of that police action.

During the Korean war, we were scrupulous in not attacking Chinese staging areas, or transportation and supply centers, within China itself. We confined our attack or defense to the Korean Peninsula. Some of my colleagues probably think that we should have attacked the Communist centers in China. I do not. I think that our policy was one of wise restraint. We not only tried to follow all the rules of international law; we also exhibited an extraordinary degree of moral principle. China was twice the aggressor in the Korean war. Yet, we leaned over backward in making a cease-fire agreement with her.

I think we ultimately agreed to terms which were a threat to peace in the Far East. I had hoped that, before calling off the Korean struggle, we might be able to get an effective pledge that the Chinese forces would not be transferred to the border of Indochina. I will not blame anyone for not guarding against this danger. But certainly the record shows that we were anxious for peace.

There is no question that Red China has been, and is an aggressive agency in southeast Asia. It supplied the Communist armies in northern Indochina. It is inciting subversion among the overseas Chinese in Malaya and elsewhere. Peking has completely failed to live up to its commitments under the Korean armistice agreement. It has violated every rule of civilized warfare by torturing and brainwashing our boys who were captured. Nor has it returned all the prisoners; hundreds of young Americans are still unaccounted for, somewhere behind the Bamboo Curtain.

The Chinese Communists' record in international affairs is sufficient in itself to bar them from a seat in the United Nations, for they have violated every principle of the U. N. Charter. But the Peking regime has also violated every precept in the United Nations declaration on human rights. In a recent official report, made by Secretary General Hammarskjold to the 21st session of the United Nations Economic and Social Council, documented facts were cited showing Communist China's inhumanity to its own people. The Peking regime has literally enslaved 25 million Chinese—perhaps the greatest slave-labor force in modern times, exceeeding even that in the Soviet Union. This regime, which promised the Chinese people peace and plenty, not only presses its subjects into slavery in their own country but, according to the U. N. report, exports slaves to European Communist countries as payment for weapons and ammunition. The report estimates that 1.5 million Chinese have been shipped to Eastern Europe to work as slaves.

In view of these facts, and countless others that show the true nature of the Peking regime, I can see no ethical justification for admitting Red China to the United Nations. If the latter is to be an agency for collective security, we certainly should not admit a flagrantly aggressive nation. We should remember that, if we admit Peking to the U. N., we are admitting it not only to the 76-member General Assembly but also to the all-important Security Council. With Soviet Russia, we would then have two aggressive nations on that vital body. A footpad is not normally escorted to the bench and asked to judge burglary and assault cases.

What would be the practical effect of admitting Red China to the United Nations? It would give that regime desperately needed prestige in Asia. It would be a bitter blow to the morale of those Asian peoples willing to resist the spread of communism. Admission to the U. N. would give Peking respectability and imply that Communist China was now in effect recognized by the free world. If the strong non-Communist nations yield on this, why should we expect small young nations like Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Indonesia and Burma to stand fast? A seat for Red China in the United Nations would mean the beginning of the end for Asia. It would weaken nations like the Philippines, which have been opposing Peking, and it would strengthen the countries sympathetic to Peking. It would establish Red China as the leading power in Asia.

To my mind, this would be a disaster. If the Communists take Asia, Communist strength everywhere will be enormously increased, especially in Europe. Despite all wishful thinking, it is not possible to divorce Europe from Asia. The view that the new nations in Asia are tiny, out-of-the-way places with which Europeans have no concern is as ill founded as Neville Chamberlain's position on Czechoslovakia in 1938. Just as the Europeans, when they faced the Nazi onslaught, called on the United States to abandon isolationism, so we must now call on Europe to abandon isolationism before the Communist onslaught.

Under what conditions then, if any, could Red China be admitted to the United Nations? I would insist that the test for admission be actual performance and not mere promises. The Communists can switch their propaganda on and off at will. They can make all kinds of promises, but the test is whether they are willing to abide by them. And, while I believe in the doctrine of repentance and forgiveness, repentance should be proved by atonement and concrete performance for a decent period of time before the guilty person or nation is accepted into civilized company.

There is a very powerful and able group in this country working for the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. I believe that many of those who think that Red China should win a U. N. seat do so with the best of motives. I am not criticizing their motives, but I believe these men and women to be desperately wrong.

Appeasement of tyranny never pays off. Those urging admission of the Peking regime to the United Nations do not, in my judgment, represent the majority of the American people. I do not believe that our people will ever sacrifice morality and decency to expediency. When every one of the soldiers, civilians, missionaries and businessmen still held captive in Red China is returned to freedom, when the 25 million Chinese slave laborers are freed, and when the Chinese people have the opportunity to choose the government it wants in free elections supervised by truly neutral nations, then and only then should Red China be considered for membership in the U. N.

IS THE "NEW RUSSIA" A NEW MYTH?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a very significant article entitled "Is the 'New Russia' a New Myth?" written by Leo Cherne, and published in the magazine section of the New York Times for yesterday, June 17, 1956. I believe that the article merits the attention of each Member of the United States Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THE "NEW RUSSIA" A NEW MYTH?

(By Leo Cherne)

For at least 30 of the 39 years since the Revolution, the Soviet Union has presented a false front to the world. But now the false face has been lifted off, revealing the familiar likeness of Joseph Stalin. He and not the Soviet system, we are told, was responsible for all the evils now being admitted. Stalin, we are told, was a useful man—but one who turned his country toward the night Now, with Stalin dead, democratic centralism in the hands of the collective leadership assures the true functioning of a people's democracy.

Thus a new myth is born. The old myth said that all that happens in the Soviet Union is good. Now we are told that the good was infected with evil. But the evil man is safely dead, and goodness at long last reigns supreme.

Admittedly, changes are taking place in the Soviet Union, as they are in all societies. Without doubt the new leaders are different from Stalin and unlike each other. A precise repetition of the brutalities now being confessed is unlikely because history never repeats itself precisely. Tomorrow may well be better. It could conceivably be as bad. If, however, the nature of the Soviet Union today and tomorrow is to be understood and anticipated, the past must be fully comprehended.

In the few short years since Stalin's death, the shifting leadership in the Kremlin has admitted defects of terrifying magnitude in Soviet society. With frenzied cries of sua culpa, the Soviet leaders have scrambled over one another in their frantic effort to reveal for the first time some of the extraordinary features of actual Soviet history and to fasten responsibility on Stalin's corpse. These indictments have been made by the present leaders of the Soviet Union, by party leaders in the satellite states, or in official Russian publications. The catalog is so extraordinary that its range and violence militate against assimilation by reasonable minds.

What are these facts that now multiply daily? What was life like behind the Iron Curtain and within the various Communist Parties throughout the world?

During the last 25 years virtually every original leader of the Soviet Revolution has been killed or exiled. Many of Russia's leading citizens, members of the Communist Party Central Committee, the ranking generals of the Soviet Army, leading publishers, journalists, scientists, economists, and artists were convicted of treason. It is now admitted that a substantial portion of the convictions against these men was produced by fraudulent evidence. A number of those convicted were admittedly innocent. Many who publicly confessed were tortured into admitting to crimes that had never been

committed. The testimony was imaginary, the confessions false, the courts unconstitutional, the judicial process illegal—even under Soviet law.

The Soviet Union has admitted that its Government, in executing the innocent, used the police force not to protect the state against crime or to provide vigilance against external danger, but to destroy leading officers of the state, outstanding citizens of the community, and even former leaders of its own police apparatus. It is now admitted that the secret police of the Soviet Union was all-pervasive. It might almost be said that here was not a state with a police force but a police force with a state.

The revelations include the charge that men were destroyed not for any act of opposition, real or imagined. The truth is that several among the accused were, in fact, in opposition to Stalin. But to admit this would further expose the present leaders' failure to oppose the evil. Under the charge of paranoia leveled against Joseph Stalin, we are left to conclude that the executions were ordered by the dictator out of whim or his suspicion of some future opposition or because bungling required a scapegoat.

It is now conceded that even the party, the elite minority of Soviet society, failed to protest. Debate and criticism did not exist within the organs of the party, not to mention the more than 95 percent of the community outside the party. It has been specifically acknowledged that even those high enough in the hierarchy to share the platform with Joseph Stalin were "compelled" to be equally acquiescent.

Count after count follows in this endless indictment. It is now charged that the alliance between the Soviet Union and Fascist Germany was a betrayal, that the subsequent attack by the Nazis should have been anticipated and was not. It is admitted that millions of Russian lives were needlessly lost, that adequate defense was prevented. It is conceded that the major instruments of Soviet society—the party, the army, industry, the secret police—were in constant fear of each other and in constant danger from the top.

Anti-Semitism, it is now revealed, not only existed in the Soviet Union but was, as in Nazi Germany, fostered as an instrument of the state. It is admitted that cultural leaders have been executed for political reasons, that scientific theory was distorted at the whim of politicians and by the fantasies of the dictator. Soviet historiography, we now learn, was purposefully untruthful. Soviet literature did not reflect the realities of Soviet life, and the boasts about the technological superiority of the Soviet Union were untrue.

It is now confirmed that Communists outside the Soviet Union have been sacrificed with the same ruthless agility as those within. And with this, it is conceded that the Soviet Union controlled the various national Communist parties; that, in fact, the purges, in these parties were mechanical duplications of the purges in the mother country, based on the same falsifications.

We learn that the Soviet Union admits the existence of slave-labor camps. There is also an implied admission that a primary purpose of the forced labor establishments was the need for coerced production. It has been admitted, in Poland, that labor and management do not have an identity of interest in the Soviet system. Unions, we are now told, have been merely tools of the state for increasing production and exploiting workers.

It is conceded that imprisonment was an accepted punishment for infractions on the job, such as absenteeism, lateness, or the illegal effort to change employment. In this connection, too, it is admitted that the trade-union officials who represented the workers were not even selected by labor, but were appointed by the government, in short, by the employer.

So the 30-year myth is whittled away to reveal the catalog of past falsehood. But the real falsehood is the new myth that takes the place of the old.

If the earlier Soviet was a riddle wrapped in an enigma, the new Soviet must be described as the truth surrounded by a lie. All the accusations are directed against Stalin himself and the orders he gave his lackeys in his dictatorial cult of personality. Monolithic praise of Stalin is now replaced by monolithic denunciation. The Russians who could not dissent from the apotheosis of Stalin may not now dissent from his demonization. There is not the slightest concession that the state or the system, the party or the dynamic of Soviet Government was responsible for the admitted crimes.

The party remains infallible. The state's hands are clean. Consequently, of course, all but those directly charged are innocent. And since those charged are dead, the Soviet expects its people and the world to believe it can't happen again.

If this new myth is accepted, the world will have misread the meaning of the indictment and will be the victim of a more deadly falsehood. The collective leaders must obviously relax the burdens if they are to assure themselves the ultimate conquest of power and protect themselves against the danger each represents to the other. But the record now emerging from their lips is the clearest proof that the appetite for power is insatiable where no counterveiling force exists as in a democracy.

The unchallengeable dictator is never content with the power he already has; he must reach for more until his rule is absolute. And when ultimate power is attained, history tells us the holder of that power will experience a kind of madness, a pathological suspicion of his closest colleagues and a deep fear of the rumbling masses whose every activity he must control.

Lenin, in a moment of foreboding, warned his fellow-Communists that the revolution must not be permitted to devour its own children. What the Founding Father of communism failed to realize was that the inner logic of totalitarianism makes it inevitable that the state will consume its own sons.

Why does it happen? Why does the dictator always conclude that his most trusted lieutenants will betray him unless he destroys them first? Why, in our time, do we find that in Western countries the total number of Communists who have been indicted and tried for subversion is infinitesimal compared to the number of Communists who have been executed by the Soviet state?

Reinhold Niebuhr suggests the answer in his book, Moral Man and Immoral Society. "Power once attained," says Niebuhr, "places the individual or the group in a position of perilous eminence so that security is possible only by the extension of power." The greater the power, the more threatened its possessor feels. The men who exercise total power must especially fear those most able to challenge it, their own associates and viziers.

The lesson is older than ancient Rome. Tiberius, for example, at first sought to restrain those around him from the too zealous hunt for imagined conspirators. But the logic that makes every dictator distrustful if he lives long enough, finally led Tiberius to kill his most trusted aides with barbaric cruelty. In the end, Tiberius had faith in no one. One day he fainted, and his retinue ended the fears of the old man by smothering him in his pillow.

Even Domitian, who early in his reign drove political slanderers and informers out of Rome, welcomed them back and listened to their warnings of conspiracy on every side. At the age of 45, he died under the dagger. In those last years, his fear of assassination was so great that he hung mirrors all around him that he might be sure to see the approach of his would-be murderers.

Now the Communists themselves tell us that Stalin suffered from the occupational disease of the absolute monarch. But in the process of making these revelations, they reveal to the world the nature of their own system. It is now official doctrine that under communism a madman can attain absolute power and nobody can do anything about it except sit around and wait for him to die. Under communism there is no method for correcting such a condition. Khrushchev himself has presented the real indictment against communism as an unworthy system of government when he tells us that he and his associates were aware of Stalin's crimes. Yet they administered his deadly purposes.

If every major leader now in the party was implicated as an accessory during and after the fact, how is the party guiltless? Why are the present leaders, yesterday's collaborators, innocent?

There are obviously no clean hands among today's rulers of the U. S. S. R. There is an equally obvious effort to persuade the world that they have reformed. The world will be eager to believe that its danger has passed and that humanity is no longer threatened among the third of the world's population who still live behind the Iron Curtain.

But has the mechanism that produced disaster been altered? Does the pinnacle, the Kremlin, attract the madmen or create them? Was the Communist Party subverted by Stalin or was he himself the inevitable product of communism? Sidney Kingsley, in closing his dramatization of Darkness at Noon has Rubashov, the old Bolshevik, address his torturer, Gletkin, the new Soviet man.

"RUBASHOV. My son. * * *

"GLETKIN. I am not your son.

"RUBASHOV. Yes, you are. That's the horror. * * * The means have become the end; and darkness has come over the land."

In these prophetic lines may be found the only responsible position for America: a recognition that sons may disown their father, yet offer no assurance that their conduct will be more civilized than the acts of terror which gave them birth.

In one respect the new leadership of the Soviet Union has been civilized. The nuclear weapons of total destruction and the atomic stalemate make war too awesome to risk. The probability of retaliation has made military adventure less likely, at least for the immediate future.

But the world can be destroyed by a weapon almost as devastating as the split atom. It can be destroyed by the remorseless economic, political, and diplomatic piecemeal penetration by the Soviet Union of the still-free countries. That destruction can be aided by an indifferent, disarmed, supine, and sentimental neutralism.

The shadows of war have diminished. Those that portend the destruction of freedom are unhappily still clearly visible.

What should our policy be in the light of the new, if momentary, environment within the Soviet orbit? Primarily, all of our actions in relation to the Soviet Union, the satellites, and the uncommitted world should flow from recognition that the fundamental conflict between us has not been resolved, that the Soviet blueprint for world conquest has not been revised, and that the recent changes are merely a temporary transfer of that conflict from the battlefields of Korea and Indochina to the psychological, economic, and diplomatic arena. It is urgent that we permit neither pique nor pride to weaken our relationship with our allies, divorce us from nations which remain truly neutral, or drive more deeply into the Soviet camp those countries which still fail to understand the expansionist nature of totalitarian states.

At the same time, it would be folly to increase the economic resources upon which the Soviet now relies to compete with and destroy us. The resources of the Communist nations are not yet adequate to sustain their own populations, increase their standards of living, enlarge their capital plant, and pursue an aggressive economic policy abroad. Any increase in trade or assistance which will relieve the Soviet Union's economic embarrassment will directly increase the Soviet's power to free scarce manpower and limited resources for its international objectives.

We should, to the extent of our talent and resources for public persuasion, enlarge the desire of the Russian and captive peoples for a better life under a government of their own choosing. We should, wherever possible, emphasize and encourage the anger against injustice and the will for freedom which exists behind the Iron Curtain—where there are more devoted anti-Communists than in the rest of the world put together.

We should immediately and radically increase the measure of our assistance to those who have risked their lives to escape to freedom in the West. We must resist and prevent large-scale Soviet efforts to accomplish redefection by force and blackmail.

We should recognize that those who travel to the United States from the Soviet Union are trained, skillful observers, propagandists and, in certain instances, spies. Our hospitality must neither overwhelm our good judgment nor destroy our well-grounded apprehension. Those of our citizens who have occasion to travel behind the Iron Curtain are free citizens performing none of these subversive functions. They should, however, be apprised of the possible reverberations of everything they say or do behind the Iron Curtain, and we must provide them with every opportunity to increase beforehand their ability accurately to present the facts of American life.

We should greatly increase the opportunity for young citizens of the uncommitted countries to visit and study in the United States. Our self-portrayals are cavalierly disbelieved. Direct exposure to the truths of our ways of living cannot readily be dismissed. We may wisely offer sharply increased opportunities for the training of the technicians, teachers, doctors, nurses and public administrators so urgently needed in much of the world. This program alone may more permanently assist and persuade than some aspects of our direct economic aid.

Above all, there should be no confusion within the Government as to the nature and purposes of the new Soviet moves. Whether for reasons of political motivation, internal struggle for position within our own administration or sheer misinterpretation of the events, it is harmful to the extreme for any representative of the United States Government to leave the impression that the Iron Curtain is crumbling when it is not, that reliable disarmament is in process when it is not, or that permanent tranquillity is a realistic prospect for Soviet-American relations.

The new confessions of the Soviet leaders may well have opened a closet in which the skeletons will continue to rattle and from which forces may emerge which the Soviet leaders cannot wholly control. It is urgent that we not assist the Soviet Union in whatever difficulties it may now confront by parroting the impression that the "darkness at noon" has turned into lightness—an impression which the Kremlin is so eager to convey.

EFFECT OF PRESIDENT'S ILLNESS ON FUNCTIONING OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the New York Times this morning carries the first in a series of articles by James Reston on the Presidency of the United States. The first installment today contains an important analysis of the effect of the President's illness on the functioning of the executive branch of the Government.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Reston's column appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENCY—I. A STUDY OF EFFECT OF EISENHOWER'S ILLNESS ON FUNCTIONING OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, June 17.—The illness of President Eisenhower has focused attention here not only on the personal well-being of the President but also on the workings of the institution of the Presidency during his absence from the White House.

The two illnesses in the last 9 months have coincided with 2 important events that influence all interpretations of the subject. These are:

The presidential election, in which Republicans are trying to retain and the Democrats to regain control of the White House.

The atomic revolution, which has confronted all major governments with major adjustments in their policies, and a new political and economic offensive by the Communist powers for control of the uncommitted or neutral nations.

These two events, involving not only the political control of the most powerful nation in the free world but the balance of power in the world struggle with communism, have sharpened and distorted all comments on the subject and raised a number of specific questions.

TWO CONTRADICTORY ANSWERS

Have the President's illnesses affected the efficient conduct of the Nation's business? Has the Eisenhower staff system strengthened the institution of the Presidency to the point where it can make up for his prolonged absences from the White House?

So far, the public has been given two contradictory and politically inspired answers to these questions. They are:

1. The official administration answer is that the President's illness have not affected the efficient operation of the Executive. But this answer contains an obvious contradiction.

When the President was well, his closest associates made a great deal, and justifiably, of the profound effect of his character and personality on administration leadership, particularly in the deliberations of the National Security Council, the Cabinet and the Tuesday morning meeting with Republican legislative leaders.

When the President was unable through illness to carry on these personal and institutional metings, however, the same officials maintained that the President's absence did not affect the administration's efficient conduct of business.

2. The Democratic line has been equally contradictory. The Democrats have tended to argue from the first that General Eisenhower was an absentee President a good deal of the time, even when he was well, and that he relied almost wholly on his White House staff and Cabinet. But when he was taken out of action, they rejected the argument that the Cabinet could carry on effectively and contended that his loss tended to cripple the Government.

PRESIDENCY STRENGTHENED

No reporter can say with assurance where the truth lies between these two points of view, especially since the administration is not in a mood to cooperate with anybody trying to get at the facts. But some points are fairly obvious, among them are the following:

This administration has strengthened the institution of the Presidency by more effective staff work in the White House office headed by former Gov. Sherman Adams, of New Hampshire; in the National Security Council, which is a Cabinet committee recommending coordinated security decisions to the President on the basis of carefully prepared staff papers, and in the Cabinet, which now deals primarily with domestic questions and has, at last, an operating Cabinet secretariat.

In the first 115 weeks of this administration, the National Security Council met 115 times, usually for about 2 hours each time, with the President in the chair. During that period before the President's heart attack it reduced to writing basic security policies that undoubtedly continue to provide policy guidance to the administration leaders during the President's absence.

From the start, the President gave extraordinary power to Governor Adams to bring questions to the point of decision, just as he had given unusual power to his wartime Chief of Staff, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, and his North Atlantic Treaty Organization and his Chief of Staff, Gen. Al Gruenther.

He gave similar latitude to his Cabinet members, just as he gave wide latitude to his theater commanders in the war.

Meanwhile, an elaborate system of secretaries, special assistants, and administrative aids was established to try to keep up with the rapid growth of the President's responsibilities. A competent staff secretary, Col. Andrew J. Goodpaster, was appointed to supervise the paperwork and maintain personal contact for the President with the Pentagon.

THE NEW AND THE OLD

It is generally agreed here that these things were all to the good, that they were necessary and useful refinements of the system that was originally put into operation at the White House in the late forties after years of prodding by the late James Forrestal.

A sharp distinction should be made, however, between the operation of this system on the administration of established policies, which the President had personally reviewed and settled, and the effectiveness of the system in producing new policies or modifications of old policies when the President is absent.

The Cabinet can carry on, for example, the established policy of this administration toward Latin America or Japan or Canada. Everybody knows what it is: the policies have been reduced to writing and kept up to date.

It is the range of new problems—created by the new weapons, the new post-Stalin, posthydrogen bomb policies in Moscow and Peiping, the rising strength and importance of the neutral nations and the new political and legislative factors on Capitol Hill—that highlights the absence of the President.

What happens when a fundamental question such as United States disarmament policy has to be hammered out without the personal participation of the President?

What happens when sincere differences between the Army, Navy, and Air Force over their missions and their development and use of the new atomic weapons and guided missiles reaches such a point that official documents are leaked out of the Pentagon to bring public opinion into the dispute?

Is it reasonable to suppose that the President's personal intervention was not missed last Tuesday in the White House when the legislative leaders came to discuss the $1,100,000,000 cut made by the House of Representatives in the administration's foreign-aid program?

QUESTIONS ARE POSED

What happens when the evidence piles up that the country is still unconvinced about

the importance of a foreign aid and liberal foreign trade policy that the President himself regards as vital to the success of his whole cold war policy?

Who is to straighten out the confusion over the administration's policy toward the neutrals when Secretary Dulles says precisely the opposite from General Eisenhower and then merely proclaims that there is no difference?

What is there in the impressive big black policy books that the Cabinet members take to the National Security Council about the reorganization and redirection of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

The answer to all these questions is that they remain to be settled, that they have been in need of prolonged discussion and revision for many months and that the illnesses of the President have had a profound effect in delaying necessary decisions.

This administration, bound together by loyalty to the President, has been far less guilty than any of its Democratic predecessors in the last generation of squabbling in public. But it does not follow from this that its leaders are agreed on what to do about many of these questions.

On the contrary, there are basic differences about the new disarmament policy now under discussion, about the whole question of foreign trade and foreign aid, about the attitude the United States should take toward the new Soviet policy of subversion, capital development, and political resiliency, and about the meaning of the Soviet military manpower reduction.

Ever since the Geneva Conference, where agreement was reached not to use the ultimate weapons to settle the cold war, it has been almost unanimously agreed among foreign policy experts here that the United States had to review its propaganda effort, its diplomacy, and its foreign economic policy if it were to avoid a steady deterioration of the free world's position.

NEED FOR REVISION DENIED

For months it was denied that any need for revision existed. From early August until late in September, the President was in Denver on vacation. Thereafter, he suffered his first illness and did not get back to his full duties until January 9.

Meanwhile, there was divided counsel within the administration about how to respond to the new Soviet and political offensive. The spirit of Geneva had faded and the Communist arms deal with Egypt had been completed but it was not until January 19 that the President called his principal aids to the White House study to try to settle the differences over the foreign-aid budget. And then this was compromised in the budget and a decision made to have Joseph Dodge, the President's foreign economic adviser, study the meanings of the whole Soviet economic drive.

Some progress was beginning to be made on disarmament policy, East-West contacts policy and one or two others, when the President suffered his second illness. The backlog of unsettled questions and the divisions in the Government, therefore, remain.

The price of three divisions and of the President's absences has not been catastrophic or irretrievable. It cannot be said that any fundamental change has taken place in the world balance of power during these 9 months, though the entrance and growing influence of the Soviets in the Eastern Mediterranean is a historical and disturbing fact.

The price, however, has been delay and a sense of uncertainty about the leadership of the United States. The administration has reacted by saying that America's prestige is higher than at any time since the war, that European union is closer than ever in history and that the Government, despite the President's illness, has lost none of its effectiveness.

All a reporter can do is check these observations with rsponsible officials and diplomats. What he finds is simply that they do not believe it. In fact they seem to be more conscious of the value of the President's leadership than many of his associates.

They think, in short, that the President is sorely missed, that his relations with Congress and with other governments have deteriorated, and that no amount of staff work or orderly committee analysis makes up for the unremitting leadership of the President in the White House.

UNCONTROLLED USE OF ATOMIC REACTORS SHOULD HALT UNTIL FULL EFFECT OF RADIATION ON HUMAN HEALTH CAN BE STUDIED FURTHER

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, all of us have been both interested and disturbed by the recent report of the National Academy of Sciences concerning the impact on health and longevity of radioactive materials. This is of great concern because the report announced flatly that radiation, no matter how small the dose, shortens human life.

This is nothing to trifle with, to be casual about, Mr. President. Man is challenging the cosmic, he is invading the unknown realms of the universe, when he unleashes radioactive forces. Thus, it seems to me imperative that no atomic reactors be built for civilian purposes, and by private organizations, until we can learn a great deal more than we know today about what radiation can do to human beings in the way of adverse effects.

Even the Government itself should go slow in undertaking such projects, while there exists the slightest peril that the result could be unfortunate for the propagation of the human race. This is not a new worry with me, Mr. President, something which dates only from the release of the National Academy of Sciences report this month. Half a year ago, in a brochure written for the Public Affairs Committee under the title "Our Natural Resources and Their Conservation," I warned:

The production of nuclear fuel yields the most dangerous refuse ever known. A cupful of this material, even after cooling for 3 months, can be at least 750 times more radioactive than radium and, of course, fatal to man or beast. If atomic reactors become numerous, this industry could release 250,000 gallons of the lethal fluid each day by the year 2000. There then would be only one place remotely safe to dump it, and that would be the ocean. Some oceanologists fear this would contaminate all fish native to salt water, making them unfit, for food. Bathing in the surf might also be hazardous. Unless waste material from nuclear production can be safely disposed of, a Frankenstein's monster could be the companion of a marvelous resource which is still in its infancy.

So that the health of mankind can be guarded—and so that the human race may be preserved—I therefore urge that all future use of atomic reactors as a source of fuel and power be carefully held in check, until medical scientists actually know how much radiation people can absorb without fatal or deleterious results.

I ask unanimous consent to include at this pertinent point in the RECORD certain appropriate articles which should be called to the attention of the Senate. These are a story from the Christian Science Monitor of June 14, 1956, entitled "Atomic Waste Hazard to World Underlined," by Robert C. Cowen; an editorial from the New York Times of June 14, 1956, entitled "Radiation and Man's Future"; and an article from the Washington Sunday Star of June 17, 1956, entitled "Man Versus Roentgens." These are all extremely significant dispatches and comments.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of June 13, 1956]

ATOMIC WASTE HAZARD TO WORLD UNDERLINED

(By Robert C. Cowen)

WASHINGTON.—A special study group of leading American natural scientists has concluded that there is no radiation danger to human life from the present rate of atomic weapons tests. This cuts the technical ground from under the repeated demands that such tests be stopped because of the radioactive materials they release into the atmosphere.

But, at the same time, these experts warn that the full worldwide development of peaceful uses for the atom could produce more of a radiation hazard in the form of radioactive wastes than would an all-out atomic war. In fact, this "hot" waste disposal problem is growing so quickly today that their report urges its immediate and urgent consideration at the international level to determine and set up adequate safeguards.

This report by responsible natural scientists should help to bring more balanced thinking than has been evidenced in the past to bear on the vexing question of whether or not the human race is endangering its own future by releasing atomic radiations into its environment.

The report was based on extensive studies by 145 natural scientists conducted under the auspices of the National Academy of Sciences and financed by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. The studies were set up specifically to help resolve the worldwide controversy over radiation hazards and to provide some useful data in a field that is beset with ignorance and uncertainties.

BACKGROUND RADIATION

The controversy, which has resounded in parliaments around the free world, springs from the fact that natural scientists consider atomic radiations a definite hazard to human life. Here the issue has not been one of immediate danger to individual health. It turns rather on the contention that even relatively small amounts of radiation can damage the human reproductive mechanism in a way that may produce deformed children in future generations.

This is the so-called genetic hazard from radiation which has long-range implications for the healthy propagation of the human race.

Everyone is subjected to a certain amount of natural radiation—the so-called background radiation of cosmic rays and the like. But, ever since atomic weapons testing began, the intensity of this background has been rising.

Some natural scientists have been considerably alarmed at this increase because of its genetic implications. They have called for stopping all nuclear weapons tests until it could be definitely determined whether or not it is safe to continue them.

These demands have been picked up in various national legislatures and in the United Nations. Strong international and domestic pressures have been brought on the

United States Atomic Energy Commission to discontinue its tests because of the alleged genetic danger. The Soviets, who also hold extensive atomic tests, have somehow managed to avoid this particular international spotlight.

The AEC, of course, has refused to ban its tests, while assuring the public that no genetic hazard is involved. But its assurances, based on secret data, have been received with strong reservations in many quarters.

STUDY REQUIRED YEAR

This was the atmosphere in which the NAS study group took up its task.

The NAS report, which has been a year in the making, is expected to do much to pull the radiation issue into perspective. It is a completely open report which will be available in all pertinent scientific detail to the natural scientists of the world. The experts who made the studies did not have any special security clearance for their work.

However, some of them have had such clearance for other reasons and have assured their colleagues that there is nothing in the secret files that would alter their conclusions.

These conclusions show the weapons test issue, so far as radiation hazard is concerned, to be illusory, so long as there is no substantial increase in the rate of the tests. The radiation dosage traceable to this source would amount at most to only about 5 percent of what the NAS experts set as a genetically safe radiation level.

Instead, their report focuses attention on what they called the very real and immediate radiation problem with the peaceful development of atomic energy.

FALLOUT RECORDS URGED

In this connection, the report points out that when a worldwide atomic power industry is fully developed, its accumulated waste products may represent more radiation than an atomic war. Thus the successful development of atomic energy will depend on man's ability to keep these dangerous wastes out of the network of air and ocean currents of the world.

This, the report said, is the big radiation problem facing the world today and the one that should be tackled with all available resources.

Accordingly, the NAS group recommended that:

"We should develop improved techniques to monitor worldwide fallout from atomic radiation.

"A national agency should control and keep records of all dumping of radioactive material in the ocean.

"An international body should set up safe standards without delay, based on present knowledge, for the marine and air disposal of radioactive materials."

[From the New York Times of June 14, 1956]

RADIATION AND MAN'S FUTURE

The immediate and larger effects of atomic explosions on communities have been dwelt upon in countless monographs and articles, but what we are apt to regard as the "minor" effects have received less attention. What we have needed is a survey of what our new mastery of atomic energy means for the future of mankind.

With a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation such a survey is now presented by the National Academy of Sciences. It is a sober expression of opinion by scientists of high repute, an expression which cannot fail to have its effect on statesmen who are guiding the destines of nations and which should drive home to them the urgent need of a new approach to the problem of avoiding inevitable catastrophe not only by sudden death but by death that creeps upon man, decade after decade, as he is bombarded by rays from many sources.

We have needed this report because it boils down the opinions of scientists who are aware of their social responsibility to the race and who know how to strike a balance between the good and the evil that lie in our new control of the atom. These men are concerned not only with what happens when nuclear weapons explode but with penetrating radiations in general. They are as much concerned with our growing utilization of X-rays and gamma rays in medical and biological research and in industry and with the baffling problem of disposing of dangerous radioactive wastes from atomic power plants as they are with fallout.

The point is that we have as much to fear from the peaceful as from the military use of atomic energy. Every X-ray machine is a menace in its infinitesimal way. So are the cosmic rays that pass through every one of us, as well as the radium emanations from the earth. Add to this background radiation the rays that come from all other sources, small and large, and it is plain that the world has more to consider than what will happen if hydrogen bombs are exploded in ever-increasing numbers.

The geneticists of the National Academy of Sciences hold out a gloomy prospect of man's future if international action is not invoked to teach us how radiation hazard are to be avoided. The wild talk of monstrosities and freaks that can be produced by uncontrolled radiation is dismissed. It is the weakening of the human stock, the shortening of life, the lowered resistance to disease that is to be feared. The evidence is already at hand; for the radiologist who uses X-rays in diagnosing and treating disease shortens his life by 5 years. Such statistics are impressive. But they must not mislead us into thinking that genetics is an exact science. Very little is known about human genetics. It may take generations to bring about any noticeable genetic effects on mankind, but as we build more and more atomic powerplants, throw more and more radioactive wastes from reactors into the sea, install more and more powerful radiators to jolt the human genes the element of risk increases.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of June 17, 1956]

MAN VERSUS ROENTGENS

A committee of outstanding scientists last week warned the American Government—and the world—that man must not wade into the atomic age with eyes closed.

The warning, a broad report by the National Academy of Sciences on the effects of atomic radiation, took pains to avoid alarmism in outlining the conceivable consequences of man's tapping the secrets of the universe.

Its most shaking section was written by the geneticists, who had some prudent advice for all mankind. They said:

Radiation, no matter how small the dose, shortens human life.

Americans are using about one-third of the safety limit on medical and dental X-rays.

The effects of radiation are cumulative. There is no safe daily, weekly, or monthly dose—it's the total that counts.

All-out nuclear war could make the earth uninhabitable.

The geneticists recommended that a record showing total accumulated exposure to atomic radiation be kept for every person. They said, in effect, that the world could stop worrying about the radiation it is exposed to by nuclear weapons testing—if the testing is kept at the present rate. Bomb explosion, they declared, is the least harmful radiation source, from the point of view of populations. They stressed, however, that every additional amount of radiation, no matter how small, is harmful to man.

The panel explained the three general sources of radiation as follows:

Background radiation: Cosmic rays, chemicals, heat, naturally occurring radium and other sources in nature not under man's control are a primary cause of radiation. From this source, the average person receives a total of about 4.3 roentgens, which are units used in measuring radiation, over a 30-year period.

Medical X-rays: The average American receives over a 30-year period an average accumulated dose to the gonads (the sexual organs) of about 3 roentgens from medical X-radiation. (Doctors were warned against overuse of the X-ray.)

Fallout from weapons testing: Persons in the United States have been receiving over the last 5 years a dose of radiation that would produce one-tenth of a roentgen in 30 years at the present rate of test explosions. The committee conceded that such an estimate could hardly be made with "high precision."

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

The geneticists were naturally most concerned with the extent of radiation effects on the reproductive organs and the long-term damage to succeeding generations.

Repeatedly throughout the report they cautioned that all radiation, even the slightest amount is harmful. There is no minimum amount of radiation which must be exceeded before mutations, or changes in the material governing heredity, occur, the panel warned.

Any radiation that reaches the reproductive cells causes mutations, which may result in shorter lives, tendencies to overweight, rheumatism, high blood pressure, etc., or even a lower intelligence quotient in succeeding generations until the line dies out.

The committee demolished the old wives' tale that the mutations frequently are manifested in the birth of monsters. While this may occur, it said, it would be quite rare. The radiation damage to reproduction is cumulative and depends on the total accumulated dose received by the gonads from the conception of a person to the conception of the last child.

Of more immediate concern is the shortening of the life spans of persons exposed to radiation. The panel cited data compiled by another of the committees, that on pathology, showing examples of shortened life spans among radiologists and others who work with irradiating materials.

Physicians having no known contact with radiation have an average life span of 63.7 years, compared to 63.3 years among the specialists such as urologists and dermatologists whose contact with radiation is slight, and 60.5 years for radiologists. The average American over 25 years old can expect to live 65.6 years.

The National Academy's report, while making it clear that there is no such thing as a tolerable limit of radiation dosage, did set a limit beyond which serious damage to mankind might result. "Individual persons," it warned, "should not receive a total accumulated dose to the reproductive cells of more than 50 roentgens up to age 30 years and not more than 50 roentgens additional up to age 40."

PREVENTIVE BEING SOUGHT

The geneticists' report took cognizance of the possibility that presently unknown measures may someday lessen greatly the effects of radiation on both the recipient and his descendants. Experimentation along these lines has been going on for some time at the Oak Ridge laboratory.

Success in the application of such measures shortly before or immediately after exposure has been realized in experiments with bacteria, even in cases where mutations were produced. Scientists are generally in agreement, however, that there is little hope that

any simple, harmless vaccination-type measure will become available in the foreseeable future.

As the dreams of a peaceful role for the atom become more fully realized, the dangers of radiation effects will become greater and the need for prophylaxis and therapy more pressing. On a limited scale, radioisotopes are already being used in plant-growth studies, checking wear in automotive parts, studying the processes in living organisms, and in improving steelmaking. Radioactive materials are also used in industrial thickness gages, preservation of foods, medicine, and catalysing chemical reaction in the making of new materials. There is discussion of the apparently remote day when there will be atomic-propelled automobiles and aircraft. When and if that day comes, there will be the problem of contamination caused by accidents which turn loose radioactive materials.

ATOMIC-AGE GUIDEPOSTS

The geneticists, aware of the tremendous health implications of atomic advances, laid down a set of recommendations which they urged as guideposts. In addition to suggesting that individual radiation exposure records be kept, they urged:

Reduction in the use of X-ray as much as is consistent with medical necessity.

Improvement in techniques for monitoring worldwide fallout.

Extension of measurements of radiation storage in the stratosphere.

A national agency to control and keep records of all dumping of radioactive materials in the ocean.

International cooperation in the marine and air disposal of radioactive materials.

Continued and accelerated research.

The last words of the report may have had some sort of moral: "The present state of advance in atomic and nuclear physics, on the one hand, and in genetics, on the other hand, are seriously out of balance."

SENATOR THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, because of the vigor, the good humor, and the hearty outlook on life of one of our senior colleagues, the Senate's session today is an historic occasion.

The colleague is the distinguished and honored THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, who has been serving Rhode Island for more years than most of us can remember. The occasion is the fact that he has broken all records and has become the oldest Member in the Senate's history.

The record up until today was held by another Senator from New England—Justin Smith Morrill, of Vermont. There must be something about the air of New England that keeps men hale and hearty.

When I say that Senator GREEN is the "oldest," however, I want to add that I am referring only to chronology. In terms of vigor, health, spirit, and spriteliness, THEODORE GREEN is easily the youngest Member in this Chamber.

Each passing year has brought him rich rewards in experience and friends. But his eyes have not dimmed, his mind has not lost its keen edge; and his step still has the spring and the bounce that characterized him before the turn of the century.

Every Member of this body has a special spot in his heart for the senior Senator from Rhode Island.

We see him in the morning when we first arrive at the Capitol. But there is a slight difference. He walked the 2½ miles, while most of the rest of us drove to the Capitol.

We see him in the evening as we leave the Capitol. But, again there is a slight difference. We are tired and ready to rest, while he is still as fresh and cheerful as he was at the beginning of the day.

And I believe we all agree that the social life of the Nation's Capital would be dull indeed without THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN is a real inspiration to every Member of the Senate. We know he will be with us for many years to come, and we also know he is the living proof that age and youthfulness can go hand in hand.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would not want this opportunity to pass without joining my colleague, the distinguished majority leader, in paying tribute to THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, who has passed a rather significant milestone in the history of the Senate. Those of us who have known him over the years, and who have traveled with him on occasion both in the United States and in foreign lands, know of his energy and his vigor as he meets the full responsibilities of the burdens which rest on the shoulders of the members of this body. As minority leader, I wish to join in extending to him our best regards on this happy anniversary date.

Mr. PASTORE obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that he shall not lose the floor?

Mr. PASTORE. I am glad to yield, with that understanding.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, June 17 is a day of historic values for America.

The first June 17 was in 1775—marking the Battle of Bunker Hill. This served to prove to the world that America could and would fight for the principles of freedom.

One hundred and eighty-one years later comes another historic June 17. It is a milestone in a human life that covers almost half the period of time since Bunker Hill. It is a lifetime spanning half the existence of our country as a nation, attaining to a nobility of years unequaled in the proud record of this august body, the Senate of the United States.

This is the honor that befalls my colleague, the senior Senator from the State of Rhode Island—THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

As of yesterday, June 17, 1956, Senator GREEN was 88 years 8 months 15 days young.

But while years and months and days are a convenient measure for a calendar, it is no measure of a career or the accomplishments of an individual. There is a dimension more important than time—there is the measure of dedication, of devotion to service outside of self.

Age refers only to the life period of a person. Achievement applies to his influence on the lives about him—his effect on the era in which he lives.

If a life were to be measured by antecedents and antiquity, we would speak of THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN in terms of colonial days in Rhode Island, of governors under the charter; and of collateral descent from heroes of the Revolution. We would speak of his entry into the practice of law, in keeping with family tradition for four generations that law should be the calling of the oldest son. He became a practicing lawyer in 1892.

By the turn of the century, he had enjoyed a full career—as Phi Beta Kappa scholar at home—and in the universities abroad—as lawyer and teacher of Roman law at Brown University, and as a soldier in the Spanish-American War.

In the next 33 years he achieved what we may well call a second career. The end of the period found him Governor of Rhode Island—a victory achieved after three defeats—each time whittling the margin of failure as he converted the State to the principles of the Democratic Party, of which he was the stanch exponent.

It was not common for a man of his family background and of his means to espouse the cause of the underprivileged—the minority, the disenfranchised, those not allied to the so-called vested interests. I am saying this, not in bitterness, not in political partisanship, but merely by way of relating the facts of life as our industrial state faced them at the beginning of this century.

These were facts faced by a man who could have chosen leisure, rather than the sharp exchanges of the hustings and the uphill struggle to make government conscious of its social responsibilities.

Though in this period he held only the office of State representative for one term, he never shirked the duties of a good citizen. Whether it was war savings stamps, or the work of the four minute men, or the council of Defense, or whether it was work among Rhode Island's new arrivals from many lands, year in, year out THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN was interested and active. He was alive to human needs in the State of his great loyalty and love. More than 50 Rhode Island groups—charitable, civic, cultural—boast his active membership.

He has played and still plays a large part in the industrial health of our State—prominent in its business, banking, industrial progress.

Its educational health was always his concern. All the years of this century he has been a trustee of the Rhode Island School of Design. All the years of this century, too, he has been a member of the corporation of Brown University. This great school, which is within arm's reach of his home, has always been in reach of his heart.

And a fortnight ago, at commencement, the faculty of Brown University conferred upon THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN the greatest award in its power—the Susan Culver Rosenberger medal for

specially notable and beneficent achievement.

In 1933, as Gov. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, he began what we may call his third career. The first 33 years formed a period of preparation. The second 33 years furnished a period of apprenticeship. His third career made possible the application of his principles of service from a position of power.

In our State he made the great beginnings of social legislation, the modernizing of institutions, a revolution in welfare thinking, a revolution in the promotion of honest and intelligent voting—and a new pride in the State and the sense of its ability to grow.

It is a symbol that the State airport, which connects our State with all the world, bears his name.

It is significant that in his return to office—as Governor and as Senator—his victories have been uninterrupted and by constantly increasing majorities, representing the valid expression of the affection and appreciation of his neighbors.

The record of his years in the Senate needs no repetition from me. His early sense of war preparedness and international cooperation reflect his firsthand knowledge of world peoples and world problems. He has continued to fortify himself with firsthand knowledge. No journey is too arduous, no research too painstaking for this Senator who labors for the future and does not live in his triumphs of the past.

I wonder what single performance or accomplishment Senator GREEN would select if he were asked to choose the outstanding contribution of his life.

I have chanced on what is, perhaps, a very obscure performance.

But, Mr. President, if you read over with me a very humble newspaper story of January 22, 1917, you may set high value upon it.

It tells of a little meeting on the Sunday night before, in the Providence Public Library. It is under an Americanization program. Gathered is a small group of new Rhode Islanders of Portuguese descent.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN—then not in public office and not engaged in any campaign—speaks to them of citizenship. He praises the hospitality of their homeland, where he has recently been traveler and guest.

And he lays down these six minimum conditions of good citizenship:

First. Knowledge of English;

Second. Establishment of a home;

Third. Thrift;

Fourth. Interest in education;

Fifth. Respect for religious truth; and

Sixth. Interest in honest and intelligent voting.

Today—this mid-June day of 1956—two world wars and 39 years later—I wonder if the best tribute to this good American, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, could be this remembered guidance to his new neighbors, that they, too, might be good Americans.

In its simple language is the pattern of patriotism, the uprightness and honor of our political institutions, the unity of language, the love of home, the ambition to learn, the will to security and opportunity, the tolerance of one's neighbor, and the dignity of man under our common God.

I can vouch that the talk of that night was seed that fell upon good ground.

For the history of Rhode Island is the record of good citizenship written in the sincere service and supreme sacrifice of all her people, wherever their origin, and whenever they came to call Rhode Island their home.

The true tribute to THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN today is the affection and appreciation of all the people of Rhode Island—beyond the limitations of the ballot box, beyond the laudations as a great leader—their appreciation and affection for him as a good citizen, a good neighbor, and indeed a very good friend.

And so, in this moment of a new and added distinction to a career already resplendent with many brilliant achievements and recognitions, I extend to you, Senator GREEN, my friend and senior colleague, my warm and sincere congratulations and wish you many more years of service to your State and country.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I rise to perform a duty which, though painful in some ways, is also pleasant.

In the year 1855 a new Representative from Vermont took his seat in the Congress. His name was Justin S. Morrill. For 12 years he served in the House of Representatives. Among his most notable achievements was the sponsorship of legislation which opened up the great West to settlement—the Homestead Act—and also the passage of the Morrill Act, which established the land-grant colleges of the United States.

After the Civil War, in 1867, Justin Morrill took his seat in the Senate as a Senator from Vermont, and for the next 31 years he performed great and meritorious service to his State and to the Nation. He made his last speech in the Senate on December 13, 1898. The subject of that speech was a bill which was brought up at that time, providing for the purchase of a site for a building for the accommodation of the Supreme Court of the United States. His speech at that time was so interesting and also somewhat a reminder of present-day difficulties that I ask unanimous consent to have Senator Morrill's speech of December 13, 1898, printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 13, 1898]

SUPREME COURT BUILDING

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President, a week ago today I gave notice that I would call up this morning the bill (S. 1876) authorizing the purchase of a site for a building for the accommodation of the Supreme Court of the United States. I now ask leave, if there is no further morning business, to call up that bill for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. At the request of the Senator from Vermont unless there is objection, the Chair lays before the Senate, Senate bill 1876.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President, the recent gas explosion and fire in that portion of the Capitol occupied by the Supreme Court and the law library sternly indicates the propriety of promptly providing elsewhere a more appropriate home and accommodations for the Supreme Court, that rather neglected coordinate branch of the United States Government. Congress, having some years ago enlarged and improved the building for its own use and occupation, can well afford to give some attention to the comfort and dignity of our judicial tribunal, whose character and special learning may fairly be claimed to stand among similar tribunals unrivaled in the history of the world. In the early part of the career of the American Republic the Supreme Court doubtless contributed to its success by its aid in the solution of some perplexing constitutional problems, not only by its firm and patriotic statesmanship, but by its thorough and ample judicial knowledge.

This bill introduced by me has twice passed the Senate unanimously, the first time on June 6, 1888, and again April 22, 1890, as I hope it will pass today. Since then it has had the approval of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of every Congress, but it has been thought well not to urge its passage until the completion of the Library and the city post office. Happily no other Government buildings are now in the way. The bill has received thorough and careful revision and will protect the interests of the United States, as well as the just rights of the landowners.

The bill covers a like amount of ground on the east front of the Senate corresponding to that occupied by the Library on the east front of the House of Representatives. The large avenue and street running through the squares to be taken, of course, will cost nothing.

Nearly all of the present owners of the land described in this bill have with much earnestness petitioned Congress to put the question of its purchase at rest by a final decision in favor or against taking the land for public use, which now appears, like Mahomet's coffin, to hang suspended between heaven and earth and, as the owners say, can neither be sold nor rented.

Formerly the land here under consideration was appraised at a little more than that taken for the Library, or between five and six hundred thousand dollars. The ground is so obviously indispensable to complete the symmetry of the grounds on the eastern front of the Capitol that no Senator would deny that its ultimate acquisition is, as I have once before said, as fixed as Milton's "fate, free-will, and foreknowledge absolute." How fortunate are we that the grounds will also be so appropriate and altogether admirable as the site of our temple of justice.

This bill is only for the acquirement of ground actually essential to the beauty and equal proportions of the grounds on the east front of the Capitol, upon which, however, it is also proposed that a proper building shall hereafter be placed for the Supreme Court, not one of great extravagance, yet necessarily a large, convenient, and elegant structure, as the United States can hardly afford to build any other, certainly not for the Supreme Court.

It is probable that Congress will decide to have a United States Court of Claims and the District court of appeals suitably provided for in the same building.

Among other needful rooms will be a room for the Attorney General, a robing room, the rooms of the clerk, the marshal, the reporter, and the Solicitor General, and a room for the general use of attorneys.

The law library should also be considerably larger than the present one, as the Supreme Court reports, with the accretions from the circuit and district courts and the additions from State courts, as well as what may be re-

ceived from judicial tribunals abroad, will bring together ere many years a great law library of rare value.

A fine hall should also find a place in this building for the use of international commissions, for which we have much and frequent use.

The room now in use by the Supreme Court is hardly large enough; for instance, whenever an important case is on trial, where eminent attorneys are expected to appear, it frequently happens that several Members of the House of Representatives, and of the Senate, desire to be present, but find they should have gone earlier, as all the seats are in the possession of other spectators.

In 1789 the Supreme Court was organized, with a Chief Justice and 5 Associate Justices, any 4 of whom were to be a quorum. In 1807 a sixth Associate was authorized. In 1837 the Associate Justices were increased to 8, and in 1863 to 9, but in 1866 the number was reduced to 6.

In 1869 the Court was made to consist of the Chief Justice and 8 Associate Justices, any 6 of whom were to constitute a quorum. This statute is still in force.

It is sufficient to say that among the great historic names of our country this Court has been honored by its full share.

As the years go by there is a general concurrence on the part of the American people that the present site of the Capital of the Republic, chosen by our forefathers when they had the pick from a whole continent, was most happily selected. Its genial and healthy climate never forfeits its high reputation. The plan of Washington grows in favor as the city grows older and larger.

The chief blunder which can be justly charged against our predecessors is that they have persistently underestimated the dimensions required for nearly every public building here erected. The rapid growth of the country from 13 to 45 States (and how many more now in the womb of time no one can tell), having a corresponding enlargement of business and representation in Congress, is the abounding evidence of this growth and shows why both the House of Representatives and Senate have so long suffered from a shortage of committee rooms. Eleven committees of the Senate occupy rooms at the Maltby House. Sixty-six Members render services there—that is to say, whenever the attendance there of a quorum can be secured.

Congress imperatively requires every foot of room in the Capitol, yet does not now propose the removal of the Supreme Court, but will first provide more comfortable and attractive accommodations, and then invite the Chief Justice and Associates to take possession. It may take several years for its completion, and the sooner it is begun the better.

The elevation upon which the Capitol stands, while not high, adds immensely to its dignity, and with the Library and Supreme Court buildings situated not far apart thereon, they will form a harmonious group of large public structures on Capitol Hill of unequaled grandeur, and will be appreciated by the American people forever.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator desire action upon the bill at this time?

Mr. MORRILL. I ask for a vote.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, my personal regard and reverence for the Senator from Vermont make it excessively disagreeable to me to object to anything he asks.

A bill similar in its provisions to the one now pending has passed the Senate twice, and whilst I entertained the same opinions I shall now express briefly at the time of the passage of that measure, to be entirely frank, I did not think that the bill could pass the coordinate branch of the legislature, and therefore made no decided objection to it.

I have always entertained the opinion, when this question has been before Congress as to the erection of a building for a Supreme Court, that we ought to utilize the property we now own opposite Lafayette Square and upon which is located the Attorney General's Office. I urged upon the Senate when the Blaine Building, which is now occupied as an opera house, was for sale that it should be purchased by the Government so as to extend our ownership to the alley between the Cameron property and the Blaine Building. Congress thought proper to defeat that purchase. But there is still ample area for the construction of a building large enough to accommodate the Supreme Court immediately contiguous to the White House, to the departments, and to the business portion of the city.

I do not think the purchase of this large extent of ground upon Capitol Hill at the present time is necessary. I have an old-fashioned idea that a representative of the people should conduct the public business with the same economical and prudent care that he would conduct his own.

We have owned the property upon which the Attorney General's Office is located for 18 years. It was bought from the Freedman's bank, being all of the assets of that institution that were left. At the instance of the late ex-Senator Bruce, of Mississippi, a bill was passed by which we purchased that ground for $250,000, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Morrill] and myself labored earnestly to effect that transaction. It was the best purchase the Government of the United States has ever made in real estate. It is by all odds the best lot in the city of Washington, without exception; but it lies there today vacant, although the Attorney General under Cleveland's first administration, Mr. Garland, repeatedly urged upon Congress the purchase of the ground, together with the Blaine Building, and the erection of a suitable building thereon for the accommodation of the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I have felt it a duty to myself to make this statement. I shall not antagonize the consideration of this measure. I have served upon the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds for nearly 20 years—within a few months of 20 years—with the Senator from Vermont. I know the fidelity, the earnest, patriotic fidelity, with which he has discharged his duties as a member of that committee.

There is great force in what he says about erecting a building which will complete the architectural symmetry, if I may so express it, of the Government ownership upon Capitol Hill, but what are we to do with this expensive and valuable property we now own and have paid for in the central portion of the city? It is vacant, it is appropriate for the purpose which is contemplated by this bill; and I have felt constrained, with these convictions, to say what I have.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President, I regret that the distinguished Senator from Missouri should at this late hour show some opposition to this bill. I am sure that I never discovered his opposition until last year, and we have heretofore had the advantage of the Senator's suggestions in the way of perfecting the bill, which, of course, are always valuable.

In relation to the need of the General Government for this tract of land, the Senator from Missouri may be sure that for any land we now own there will be a legitimate and immediate demand in the near future. At the present time the Attorney General's Office is located there, and we are to very soon find quarters either for the Patent Office or for the Interior Department. So there is no question but that there will be a demand for any land we now have.

I must say that while this bill has been under consideration for nearly 10 years and has twice passed after discussion, the Senator from Missouri did not appear as an objector. I have conversed, I suppose, with nearly every Member of the Senate, certainly with a very large number of Senators, and I have never yet found a single Senator who was not ready to say he would support the bill. I have no fear of its rejection, Mr. President, and I ask for a vote.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, we have all had some experience in regard to the cost of land when condemned by juries, a glaring instance of which occurred in condemning some land down on the Potomac, which we could have bought at $10 an acre, but when we had it condemned we had to pay about $50 an acre for it.

Section 4 of this bill provides:

"That if the Secretary of the Interior shall be unable to purchase the whole of said land by agreement with the respective owners * * *."

The previous section giving authority to purchase, which is a very wise and judicious provision, because he may be able to purchase the land; but this provision says:

"That if the Secretary of the Interior shall be unable to purchase the whole of said land by agreement with the respective owners within 30 days after the passage of this act, he shall, at the expiration of such period of 30 days, made application to the supreme court for the District of Columbia * * *."

For condemnation.

I do not think 30 days is sufficient time to enable him to negotiate properly. It is equivalent to simply saying to him, "You will have to go into court." I think he ought to have at least 90 days, if not 120 days, to negotiate with the owners of the land before he is compelled to institute proceedings in court.

I suggest to the Senator in charge of the bill that additional time be allowed, so as to give the Secretary time to negotiate and determine. That will give him time to ascertain as to the title of the property. He is not allowed to purchase this property until the Attorney General has certified to the correctness of the title, and that cannot be done in 30 days. You might just as well say that you will have no negotiation as to keep in the bill the limitation of 30 days.

Mr. MORRILL. If it will suit the Senator from Missouri and the Senate, I have no objection to making the time 60 days, but I wish to say to the Senator that the matter will be greatly facilitated in consequence of the offers of all persons interested in this property 10 years ago to sell it for a given sum; and most of them say today that the land is worth no more than it was then.

Mr. COCKRELL. But the Senator knows that when parties come to negotiate it is very easy to change the price. The limit should not be less than 90 days.

Mr. MORRILL. Sixty days, I think, will be enough.

Mr. COCKRELL. Sixty days would not give time enough to negotiate with the parties and pass upon the title to the property. There are a great many lots, and the Secretary of the Interior could not inside of 60 days confer with 30 or 40 different persons if he had to do nothing else.

Mr. MORRILL. I have so much confidence in the Senators from Missouri that I have no objection to accepting an amendment offered by either of them. I will therefore accept the amendment of the Senator making the limit 90 days.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then I move to amend, in section 4, line 25, before the word "days," by striking out "thirty" and inserting "ninety;" and I also move the same amendment in line 1, at the top of page 3, and the same amendment in line 24, on page 3.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 4, line 25, page 2, before the word "days", it is proposed to strike out "thirty" and insert "ninety"; on

page 3, at the end of line 1, before the word "days", to strike out "thirty" and insert "ninety"; and in line 24, on page 3, before the word "days", to strike out "thirty" and insert "ninety", so as to make the section read:

"SEC. 4. That if the Secretary of the Interior shall be unable to purchase the whole of said land by agreement with the respective owners within 90 days after the passage of this act, he shall, at the expiration of such period of 90 days, make application to the supreme court of the District of Columbia, at a general or special term, by petition containing a particular description of the property required, with the name of the owner or owners thereof, and his, her, or their residence, as far as the same can be ascertained, which court is hereby authorized and required, upon such application, without delay, to appoint five commissioners, freeholders of the District of Columbia, who shall, before entering upon their duties, take and subscribe an oath, before some officer in the District of Columbia authorized to administer oaths, that they are entirely disinterested in the purchase or sale of said real estate, and that they will well and truly discharge their duties as such commissioners; and they shall then proceed to make a just and equitable appraisement of the cash value of the several interests of each and every owner of the real estate and improvements thereon necessary to be taken for the public use in accordance with the provisions of this act, which appraisement shall be subject to ratification by said court; and when the question of ratification is considered by the court both the United States and the owner of the land shall have the right to introduce testimony as to the value of the property and to be heard by counsel or otherwise; and if at the expiration of 90 days after the passage of this act said court shall not be in session in general or special term, a special term shall be held, commencing on the day next thereafter, for the purpose of making the appraisement and ratification herein provided for: Provided, That written notice of the time and place of appraisement shall be given by said commissioners to each owner of real estate the purchase of which is contemplated by this act at least 30 days before proceeding to appraise the same; and in the case of a nonresident owner a similar notice shall be given by publication in two daily newspapers of general circulation published in the city of Washington; and if it shall appear that any owner or party otherwise interested in any portion of said real estate be a minor, or otherwise incapacitated, said court shall, before proceeding to the appointment of said commissioners, appoint some suitable person as guardian ad litem to represent such person in all further proceedings in reference to such portion of said estate under this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAFFERY. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Vermont how long it has been since the site of the proposed building for the Supreme Court was selected?

Mr. MORRILL. It has not been selected.

Mr. CAFFERY. How long has the committee had in contemplation the selection of this site?

Mr. MORRILL. That has been in contemplation for many years.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on December 28, 1898, Senator Morrill died. At that time he was 88 years, 8 months, and 14 days old. He had then served in the Senate at a greater age than any other man.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks which were made in the Senate on January 4, 1899, by Senator Allison, of Iowa, in announcing the death of Senator Morrill.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 4, 1899]

DEATH OF SENATOR JUSTIN S. MORRILL

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Proctor], it is my painful duty to announce to the Senate the death of the late senior Senator from Vermont, Mr. Justin S. Morrill, who died on the 28th ultimo at 1:30 o'clock in the morning.

Senator Morrill was the oldest Senator in this body, and he served here for a longer period consecutively than any other Senator. Including his terms in the House of Representatives, his was a longer continuous service in the two bodies than that of any other person since the organization of the Government.

He came here at the opening of the present session of Congress and took part every day in our deliberations until the time of the taking of the holiday recess. Although enfeebled in body, his mind was clear, his mental vision undimmed, and his mental processes in full vigor and activity, which led us to believe that he would be spared for a while longer in the service of his country. But an inscrutable providence, that guides the destinies of men and nations in their progress, development, and decay, had ordained otherwise. So he passed from us suddenly, and his death naturally gave a shock to his associates here at the Capitol.

Suitable arrangements were made for his funeral in this Chamber, and in the charge of the officers of the Senate and a committee of the two Houses the casket containing his remains was borne during the vacation to his last resting place, where he was born 89 years ago.

On some future occasion proper resolutions of respect for his memory and commemorative of his great services will be offered in this body. At this time I submit the resolutions which I send to the desk, and ask for their adoption.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa offers resolutions, which the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

"Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep and profound sorrow of the death of Hon. Justin S. Morrill, late a Senator from the State of Vermont.

"Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives."

The resolutions were considered by unanimous consent and unanimously agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I now offer the following resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa offers a resolution, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

"Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn."

The resolution was unanimously agreed to; and the Senate (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 5, 1899, at 12 o'clock meridian.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as I have pointed out, Senator Morrill served in the Senate at the age of 88 years, 8 months, and 14 days. For more than 57 years Vermont has proudly claimed the crown which was won by the great and lengthy service which Senator Morrill performed.

Now, Mr. President, we have lost that crown. Vermont does not like to surrender her trophies and her laurels which have been won by such hard and long periods of service, but the time has come when we have to do so. When we have to do it we bow to the inevitable, and when we have to do it, we are certainly glad that the crown goes to a neighbor in our own New England section of the Nation.

So, Mr. President, it becomes my duty, which I say is both painful and pleasant, to surrender to the senior Senator from Rhode Island the scepter and crown won by Senator Morrill and of which we of Vermont have had proud possession for more than 57 years.

Attached to the scepter, Mr. President, are medallions setting forth the traits which have enabled the Senator from Rhode Island to achieve his proud and dignified position, which he has now held for 2 days and which to a certain degree has humbled the proud spirit of Vermont.

The traits which are engraved on these medallions are as follows:

Simplicity. Certainly, the Senator from Rhode Island is noted for his simplicity.

Veracity. No one ever has questioned the word of THEODORE GREEN, once he made his position clear.

Sagacity. There is not a fox in New England [laughter]; this is not a prepared speech, Mr. President. There is not a Member of the Senate who excels the Senator from Rhode Island in sagacity.

Tenacity. Did any Members of the Senate ever know the Senator from Rhode Island to give up, once he set his sights on a definite objective?

Capacity. Certainly, the Senator from Rhode Island is more than well known for his capacity—capacity for work and capacity to match wits, if necessary, with any of his colleagues.

Finally, Mr. President, the trait which has enabled the Senator from Rhode Island to achieve the very proud position which he has held for 2 days is that of maturity. No one of his more adolescent colleagues in the Senate can say that the Senator from Rhode Island has not at last actually arrived.

However, Vermont does not yield in all respects to the Senator from Rhode Island. As I have pointed out, Justin Morrill, as a Representative and as a Senator, served for more than 43 years as a Member of Congress. We now challenge the senior Senator from Rhode Island to go on from here and to see if he can excel Senator Morrill's record of 43 years of service in Congress. Knowing the Senator from Rhode Island as I do, I think he will probably do it.

I now present the scepter and crown to the Senator from Rhode Island. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I cannot let this occasion pass without adding a few brief words to what has been said about my distinguished col-

league from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], with whom I have the great privilege of serving on the Committee on Foreign Relations. Because of my service on that committee I have had the honor and privilege of engaging in a peripatetic stunt, as it is called, namely, that of traveling almost yearly to remote areas of the world. Frequently I have been able to go with the Senator from Rhode Island. I have enjoyed not only the stimulation and inspiration of his presence, but also his scintillating wit and his knowledge of the art treasures of the world.

For example, in Spain, where I wanted to know about the famous paintings of the past, all I needed was to have THEODORE GREEN give me the right direction. I am an innocent person in that field, but he has so greatly stimulated my interest in it that now I have become a great lover of art and enjoy visiting the National Museum of Art in Washington. I give THEODORE GREEN the credit for stimulating my interest in art.

But beyond that, I am interested in his athletic prowess. He told me this morning that the New York Herald Tribune had almost scandalized him by an article which was published recently and which stated that 2 or 3 times a week Senator GREEN walks from his home to the Capitol and back. He called my attention to the fact that on every day the Senate is in session he walks from his home at the University Club to the Capitol and back, a distance of 2 miles each way. That is a challenge to any of us, and I commend him for it.

I asked Senator GREEN today whether he had given up playing tennis singles. His reply was that his physician had told him that he should not engage in the playing of tennis singles, although he could play doubles. But Senator GREEN then told me that because—and only because—the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations kept him so close to the grindstone he did not have time any more to play tennis. That appears to be his chief complaint against the Committee on Foreign Relations; otherwise, I think he likes it.

Mr. President, one of the joys of membership in the Senate is the friendships and associations we form and the respect and affection we have for those who are associated with us. THEODORE GREEN always has been a person for whom I have great affection and whose company I have enjoyed.

On this occasion I congratulate him heartily, and I hope he makes the record of 100 years and more which I know he is planning to make.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this is a most joyful and happy occasion for the colleagues of Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN. To be sure, we are paying tribute today to Senator GREEN because of his years of service in public life, but also because he is, as his junior colleague has said, 88 years, 8 months, and I believe, today, 16 days young. That, in itself, is something to be heralded, but I should like to use that fact only as a means of stating some other thoughts which are on my mind about this very wonderful American, this great citizen, this good friend.

We have already heard a recitation of the political record, the civic record, and the great personal record of THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN. I suppose it could be summarized by saying that he has lived through one of the most tumultuous and interesting periods of human history. Not only has he lived through it, but he has lived well within it. He has contributed immeasurably to all the developments for good during this period. Furthermore, he has had the courage and the capacity to deal with the difficult problems of the period.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN combines many unique qualities. Oftentimes we refer to a person as a student, a teacher, or a scholar; but sometimes, I regret to say, there is not so much evidence to support those conclusions as one would like. However, in the instance of THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, I feel certain no one would deny that he has been a student from the very first days of his life. Senator GREEN is one of the truly great students of government in the United States Congress.

So far as his being a teacher is concerned, his record is complete on that score. He was a teacher at the great Brown University. So far as his being a student is concerned, I recall that when we were at Bonn, Germany, in 1951, it seemed to me that THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN knew more persons in Bonn than Chancellor Adenauer. One of his achievements is his ability to speak the German language.

He was loved and respected, and the faculty of Bonn University was delighted to see this favorite American return to their city and again enjoy splendid and wholesome association with him.

Anyone who is a student of Roman law should be qualified as a scholar in the field of law. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN is a student of Roman law, common law, and American law.

Besides these attributes, Senator GREEN is to us in the Senate a living example every day of his life. Because he is a teacher and a student, he teaches many of us lessons we ought to have learned long ago. So far as his being a scholar is concerned, we who serve with him on the Committee on Foreign Relations know that he is ahead of us 95 percent of the time, much to the embarrassment of the younger Members of the Senate.

Senator GREEN has a record of patriotic service to his country as a soldier and a statesman. These attributes, again, are documented by the facts of his life. But what I like to note most of all is that, as his junior colleague [Mr. PASTORE], whom we love also, has stated so beautifully and appropriately today, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN really just began to live when some persons would be ready to gracefully retire. In 1933, when many other men might well have said it was time to take things easy, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN was ready to roll up his sleeves and go to work again. He never gave up in his pursuit to improve the political life of his State and country.

Finally, the fine people of Rhode Island—and they are a wonderful people—honored THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN with the title and position of Governor. I shall not take the time to repeat what I have heard about his two terms as Governor; I shall merely say that things began to happen. If ever there was an exemplification of youthful spirit, exuberance, and dynamic personality, it was during the administrations of THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN when he was Governor of Rhode Island. Rhode Island was good before THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN became Governor; it is now really great. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN really started that movement by his wonderful service as the chief executive of his State.

As all of us know, Senator GREEN has been a Member of the Senate for more than 19 years and during those years has endeared himself not only to his colleagues but to people all over the world.

I recall one trip which some of us were making with Senator GREEN. Many persons were complaining about being tired. We were complaining about being tired, although Senator GREEN had been up hours earlier in the morning and had seen to it that all of us had gone to bed not too late in the evening.

I recall an occasion when our good friend was to have taken a trip to Europe. He took off with our former colleague, Senator Lodge, from one of the great airports in Massachusetts. When they got halfway across the Atlantic, the plane had to return to its base because of some difficulties. They started out again the next day and flew to the Azores, and then flew on to Europe. When I talked to Senator Lodge, he said it was going to take him a week to rest up. But Senator GREEN wanted to know when the next trip would start.

I think these examples are not exaggerations of the vigor, vitality, and enthusiasm of our good friend.

I wish to conclude by saying that the greatest title any man can have in a republic is that of citizen. That is the only title we deserve or desire, and Senator GREEN is a citizen in the fullest sense of that wonderful word. He is a citizen with love of country. He is a citizen who has given the full measure—yes, an overflowing measure—of service to his country. He is a citizen who has profound and abiding respect for his fellow citizens. He is a citizen who has been interested in "the least of these," in the underprivileged, in the needy, in those who were without some of the necessary things of life. This generous, good, and faithful American has exemplified the attributes and principles of religious spirit and democratic leadership in this great Republic, not only by his words, which have always been succinct, concise, and profound, but more, I may say, by his deeds.

Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, I want to pay you my personal respects and tribute, and if you do not mind, I should like to put in a word for my wife, who joins me in this tribute. I think it is appropriate for me to say "Thank you" for both of us.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, it is a privilege to have an opportunity to join in this most deserving tribute to the senior Senator from Rhode Island. While Senator GREEN may be the oldest Senator, not only among us, but in the entire history of the United States Senate, I think he is young in spirit and heart.

As you may know, Mr. President, the distinguished Senators from Oregon, Montana, and I represented the Senate in a softball game with members of the press. I must report, somewhat shamefully, that we lost by a score of 5 to 4. I must say that what we needed was Senator GREEN. With him, we would have decisively defeated the press players. I regret that other athletic commitments prevented Senator GREEN's joining us yesterday. We shall count on him to strengthen our lineup next year.

Speaking seriously, Senator GREEN came to the Senate with a fine background of public service. That background included long experience in business, law, and education. He has made, and he will continue to make, an invaluable contribution to the good of his country and the world.

I am happy to corroborate the many fine tributes which have been made to our distinguished colleague, scholar, and statesman.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to add my unstudied tribute to THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN. I wish to say it has been a very great pleasure for me to serve with him for many years on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. He has been a most diligent Member of this body, and although he is my senior in point of time, if time counts in the life of a man, since I have been a Member of the Senate longer than he has, I want to say in his presence now that one of the great assurances I shall have when I leave the Senate is that Senator GREEN will succeed me, I have no doubt, as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, where I hope he may continue to serve until he reaches the ripe age of 100.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am glad to have the opportunity to join my colleagues in saying a few brief words about my good friend and fellow worker on two different committees, the senior Senator from Rhode Island, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

I enjoyed particularly the biographical sketch which was given by the junior Senator from Rhode Island portraying so many of the fine accomplishments of Senator GREEN. I count it my good fortune to have been associated rather closely with Senator GREEN as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and, perhaps in even more detail, on another committee about which a great deal is not known today, but which handles matters concerning the new Senate Office Building. Certainly, if there is a group with a task that requires the most detailed attention, it is that committee. I can bear testimony to the ever-readiness and the thoroughness of this man in dealing with whatever the subject matter may be.

Some comment has been made about Senator GREEN's ever being ready to go to other places and to look to the future. That is one fine thing about this man, who is old by the calendar, but not in body, mind, or spirit.

Several of us were with Senator GREEN one time in Athens, Greece, as members of the Foreign Relations Committee. It was an extremely hot Sunday. The Premier of that country had invited us to a luncheon, which was a very delightful one. Our advisers from the Foreign Service said to us after the luncheon, "It is so hot now we believe you ought to go back to your hotel and rest, and in the cool of the evening we shall go to the Acropolis." Most of us took that advice. Later that afternoon I ran into the young man from the Foreign Service, who was escorting Senator GREEN, and, almost literally, the young man's tongue was hanging out. He told me that Senator GREEN would not take his advice to go back to the hotel, but wanted to be busy. So Senator GREEN was occupied all afternoon, going to interesting places in Athens. Then in the cool of the evening, the late beloved Senator McMahon and I proceeded to go to the Acropolis, where other members of our group were to meet us. About the time we got to the top, taking our slow, leisurely time, we heard a scrambling behind us, and there was Senator GREEN, followed by a young man from the Foreign Service, who was coming up the steps to join us at the Acropolis. Senator GREEN was looking for something new all the time.

From that trip, which was made for the purpose of studying how the Mutual Security Act and the Marshall plan had worked out, we returned through Paris. On our way back we received a radiogram. One of our representatives in another capital of Europe wanted us to visit there. We simply could not work it into our schedule, because we were so busy. Senator GREEN started talking and urging that we go there. He arranged for us to fly to Paris, have dinner, and fly back that night. I was foolhardy enough to accept his challenge, but we went, nevertheless, under his leadership.

Senator GREEN is thorough. He is competent. He is kind. He is a good man to work with; one whose counsel and advice we enjoy taking. I like the idea which has been expressed today, to the effect that he does not live in the past, and he is not content to live merely in the present. He looks to the future all the time. We can say that about him in his service in the Senate and in his work in committees.

There is another little incident I like to remember. To me it is humorous; nevertheless, it illustrates a point. Just after we returned to Washington, following the election in 1954, in which both Senator GREEN and I had confronted our constituencies—and successfully, I am glad to say—I said to Senator GREEN, as soon as I saw him, "THEODORE, just think. Before this term is up, you will have been the oldest man in the history of the United States to serve in the Senate."

Rather disdainfully he replied, "That's nothing. I want to be serving here when I am 100 years old." Then he said, "What bothers me is that I cannot attain that with just one more election; I will have to return two times in order to do that, because I will be only 99 when my next term ends."

Mr. President, Senator GREEN lives for the future, he looks to the future, and he works for the future. He is an outstanding citizen, a fine friend, a great Senator, and a brilliant statesman. I am glad to join my colleagues in paying tribute to him today and in hoping that he will continue to serve in the Senate of the United States for as many more years as he wishes.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I understand that our colleague, Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, intends to run for another term in the Senate, after his current term expires in 1961. That would make him 99 years of age when he finished the new term.

This might startle some people who do not know THEODORE GREEN. But to us, who know the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, it seems like the most natural thing in the world. I hope he does not change his mind, because the Senate would never be quite the same without him.

Today marks Senator GREEN's 88th year, 8th month, and 16th day. This sets a new record in longevity for a Senator.

But the record I like to think of is the record THEODORE GREEN has made during his 19 years in the United States Senate. During this time, he has been a wonderful servant of the people of his State of Rhode Island. More than that, however, he has been a very able representative of the best interests of all the people of our country.

His spirit, his philosophy, and his devotion to duty are not measured by the calendar, Mr. President. They are attributes that never grow old in Senator THEODORE GREEN.

I am happy to add these few words of congratulation to this great American.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for yielding to me.

Mr. President, I deem it a very great privilege and honor to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues in paying tribute to Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island.

Mr. President, the career of Senator GREEN is a great encouragement to a mere youngster such as myself, who has attained the age of only 78 years, because the Senator has demonstrated beyond any question that age alone does not serve as a bar to useful service in whatever field a man may be called upon to do his duty.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN and I were elected Governor of our respective States on the same day in 1932, and I imagine that we were inaugurated on the same day. During the years when he was Governor of Rhode Island and I was Governor of New York I was privileged to work closely with him, and to gain from his wide experience in civic and political life as well as in many other fields of personal endeavor. Our friendly cooperation was, I think, of benefit to both States and brought many activities in each to a successful conclusion.

When I came to the Senate, Mr. President, 7 years ago Senator GREEN had already served usefully in this body for 10 years. To me THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

has been a source of wisdom, of constant inspiration, and of friendly help from the day when I entered the Senate to the present time. I am deeply grateful to him for the encouragement and the counsel he has given me, for the stimulus of his example, and for the wisdom he has provided. He has been kindly, gracious, hard-working, and indefatigable, and has set a record of useful service that has never been surpassed by any Member of the United States Senate or the United States House of Representatives, regardless of age.

THEODORE, I want to congratulate you for a job superlatively well done, both as Governor and as a Senator of the United States. Furthermore, because I am not sure that I will be here or anywhere else on the face on the earth at the time, I want to congratulate you in advance on the completion of your first 100 years—12 years hence. I know that so long as the Lord will provide you with the strength, as he already has provided you so amply for 88 years, you are going to continue to serve your people patriotically, wisely, and without any thought of self, but solely in the interest of the people of your State and of the Nation and of the world.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in congratulating the youngest Member of the Senate in mind and spirit, on attaining the distinction of being the oldest Member, in years, of this body.

Senator GREEN has a distinguished career; and I hope, pray, and confidently expect that he is to have many, many more years of distinguished service. I am happy to join in paying tribute to his life, his accomplishments, and his character.

Already Senator GREEN can look back to the Spanish-American War, in which he served with distinction; and I know that throughout the history of his country since that time he has been in the forefront of those who have served well, and of those who have made the policies and have executed the decisions during two generations.

The first time I obtained a recipe from Senator GREEN about how to stay young was when I tried to give him a ride in an automobile, when he was walking from the University Club to the Capitol, one day. He said he always walked back and forth; and he also said that if some of us younger fellows would do that, we might profit by the example he was setting.

Last year I had the opportunity of being in Indochina. The young man who was assigned to show me around said he was very, very tired—in fact literally worn out; he said that he had been taking Senator GREEN around Cambodia and Indochina, and in the process had walked up hundreds of steps, and that the whole staff was physically depleted when Senator GREEN was going strong.

Senator GREEN is an example and an inspiration to all of us.

Senator GREEN, I congratulate you, and I am proud to be privileged to serve in the Senate with you.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, although I am a new Member of the Senate with only a year and a half of service as a Member of this body, I have come in that time to love and respect the senior Senator from Rhode Island, whom our Nation honors today.

Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN is a man of great understanding, profound knowledge, and high character of purpose. I can well remember when I testified in 1955 before a Senate Foreign Relations Committee meeting over which he presided. The subject was a resolution for Atlantic Union, and it was my first opportunity to appear before that august committee. Naturally, I was somewhat awed. Senator GREEN could not have been more helpful, more understanding, more tolerant or more charitable to a freshman Senator.

Senator GREEN is also a man of great courage with a cheerful and grave outlook on the future. I remember the day when Mrs. Neuberger and I sat behind him at the Foundry Methodist Church on the occasion of paying our final farewell to the great Senator from Kentucky, the late Alben W. Barkley. As we left, Senator GREEN said to me: "Alben died with his boots on—speaking to the youth of America in behalf of the Democratic Party and liberalism. How much better that he went that way, instead of lingering agonizingly in some hospital bed." How characteristic is that brave statement of the Senator from Rhode Island.

In concluding this brief tribute to Senator GREEN, I should like to add the fact that I also am speaking on this occasion for Mrs. Neuberger. Some 16 years ago my wife, Maurine, who is by profession a schoolteacher, was an exchange teacher at Classical High School in Providence, R. I. She remembers an occasion when the teaching staff had an opportunity to meet the distinguished Senator, then a lively and buoyant 72. She still speaks of the favorable impression which Senator GREEN made, and of the words of wisdom which he spoke to her and other members of the teaching staff.

Let me say that Mrs. Neuberger taught physical education and folk dancing. Last summer we attended a party at the Austrian Embassy, where polkas and other lively dances were the order of the evening. Maurine and Senator GREEN cut a lively pair on the floor. I have never been able to dance the polka. Later, my wife admonished me, "You should learn to polka—just like Senator GREEN. He dances the best polka I ever danced." That was when Senator GREEN was 87, Mr. President.

Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN truly qualifies for the description which President Franklin D. Roosevelt once applied to Senator George W. Norris—that of a man "old in years but young in heart."

It is a privilege to serve with a Senator like THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, who each day goes about his duties to his country without selfishness and without fear. May he be among us and among his friends and relatives for many years to come.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am very happy indeed to join my colleagues in extending our collective congratulations to one of the youngest, if not the youngest, Member of the United States Senate.

I have the privilege of serving under this distinguished statesman on the Committee on Rules and Administration. I am sure that very soon I shall have the privilege of serving under his leadership as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

This outstanding scholar, athlete, and statesman has seen much in his lifetime—more, I believe, than almost any other man now alive; certainly any other man in responsible position. He has seen Europe since before the turn of the century. He has noted the changes there, as well as the changes in his own country and in other parts of the world.

The Senate is much better off with a man of Senator GREEN's attainments and talents serving among us. I know that when my colleagues say that they hope he will be here until he is at least 100 years old, they speak from the bottom of their hearts. They make this statement in admiration of a man who has achieved much in life, and who has contributed much to the welfare of all mankind.

I should like to read a telegram sent to our distinguished majority leader the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] by our colleague the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. It reads as follows:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 18, 1956.*
Senator LYNDON JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I am happy to join all my colleagues in congratulating THEODORE GREEN on the happy occasion of breaking the record of longevity for active service in the United States Senate. America is fortunate to have his competent, able, and distinguished service in important posts despite his advanced years. While he is old in wisdom, he is young in heart and spirit and has maintained a record of extraordinary activity even the youngest Senator would envy. My heartiest congratulations to a most distinguished and able colleague on this happy occasion.

MIKE MONRONEY.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am very happy to be here on this very interesting occasion to pay tribute to my very good friend the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. I have served with him ever since he arrived in Washington, and I must say that he has been one of my best friends. I have sincere regard and admiration for him.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, is a man of most remarkable talents and achievements. His education was extensive. After going through the private schools and Providence High School in his home State, he received a degree of bachelor of arts at Brown University as early as 1887, and master of arts in 1890. He studied law at Harvard University and took courses in the Universities of Bonn and Berlin, Germany.

He was engaged in the practice of law for many years before entering public activities. He has held high political positions in Rhode Island over the years, and was elected Governor of his State in 1932, and reelected in 1934 by the largest vote ever cast for any State office in Rhode Island. He has held high positions in various public activities and is probably one of the most experienced

men in public affairs ever to come to the Senate of the United States.

Senator GREEN is perhaps the outstanding example of a man who has discovered the true fountain of youth. He has been drinking from that fountain copiously during his years in the Senate, and the older he gets the more effective he appears to be in the performance of his duties. Early in life he discovered that the real elixir of youth is the art of friendliness and courtesy. He is one of the kindest and most gracious men I ever knew. All through his career he has avoided serious conflicts with his colleagues and has always kept his heart free from malice, envy, and ill-will, devoting himself completely to the performance of his duties on the basis of what is right and just and for the good of the Nation. Never has he uttered a word of criticism or condemnation toward any of his colleagues; and therefore today, at the age of 88, he is held in high regard by all his friends in the Senate and in the Nation as an outstanding American statesman.

Senator GREEN:

CONGRATULATIONS

My congratulations, sincere and true,
I am extending to you today:
May the happy light from your well-spent years
Shine soft and warm o'er your way.
May the fruit of unselfish service sweet,
The ripened sheaves of a life that cheers,
Bring their harvest of peace and joy to you
Through many more beautiful years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we all find Senator GREEN to be a truly amazing figure. First of all, we are struck by his extraordinary physical vigor and his mental acuteness. But he is remarkable for many other things as well.

When he grew up and began the practice of law and entered politics in Rhode Island, that State was dominated by a relatively small group of very wealthy men who, while they did not run for office themselves, managed the State, either directly or through intermediaries. While efforts were made to change this control of Rhode Island by a few, it was not really until Senator GREEN became Governor that the hold of this group upon the politics of the State was largely broken.

By birth, family connections, and economic wealth, Senator GREEN belonged to the group which had controlled Rhode Island, and it would have been relatively easy for him to have cast his lot with his friends and associates, rather than to defend the interests of the lower-income people of that State. But he made his choice on the side of the people. That choice shows the warm heart which he has always had. Along with the warm heart has gone a knowledge of tactics and ripe and mature wisdom.

One of the troubles with life is that we just begin to learn how to live when death comes along and terminates the chapter; or, as Milton put it, "comes the blind Fury with th' abhorred shears and slits the thin-spun life."

Senator GREEN has always had a good deal of wisdom; however, he has acquired more of it with time, and he has added to the enthusiasm of his early years a certain New England quality of astringent comment upon life which I think may have been derived by him from the fishing industry. As Senators probably know, it was the habit of Cape Cod and Marblehead fishermen, when they caught codfish, for which they were seeking, to put the fish in the sun and to sprinkle them with plentiful quantities of salt.

Senator GREEN can be depended upon to scatter salt with a liberal hand upon various propositions; and it is his treatment which often saves those subjects from disintegration.

I am reminded of a character in Gilbert and Sullivan's Iolanthe, of whom it was said:

On fire that glows with heat intense,
He pours the hose of commonsense.

Senator GREEN plays the hose of his wit and of his commonsense on many proposals without in the slightest degree showing any abatement of his early enthusiasm. Long may he live.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, when I contemplate the career of our able and distinguished friend from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], I am forced to recognize the fact that sometimes we need the example of the lives of men to understand the things we have been reading and studying and thinking about.

I have many times read a little quotation that goes something like this:

Grow old along with me.
The best is yet to be:
The last of life for which the first was made.

I always thought that was a nice and pleasant sort of sentiment, suggesting to people that as they went along in years they would have compensation which would make it desirable for them to continue to live a long time, but that they would have to depend upon a realization of former things in order to enjoy their later years. Yet, as I have watched the able Senator from Rhode Island, I have become persuaded that if we were able to grow old in the fashion in which he has moved along in years, the last of life could be the best—the portion of life "for which the first was made."

In connection with his career in public life we must realize that he became a Member of the United States Senate almost at three score and ten, which is the accepted normal standard of the length of human life. At a time when statistics and things of like nature would suggest that a man would surely be in a period of complete retirement from any activity, and faced the probability, actuarially, of a very short remaining life span, the Senator from Rhode Island moved into the United States Senate and took up anew a different career.

I believe the most remarkable thing that has happened in the Senate, certainly since I have been watching its activities, is that a man, who had fulfilled an active business life, who had demonstrated his business capacity, and his political capacity by serving as Governor of his State, should, at almost three score and ten, begin a career in the United States Senate.

I am sure that many men who might have done that would have served a short time and then have said, "I have achieved a great ambition. I will now go back to my ease and contentment, which I am entitled to pursue if I wish to do so." But not the Senator from Rhode Island.

As has been said over and over and over again, he is one of the most active and vigorous Members of the Senate. I believe that the life he has lived has prepared him for "the last of life for which the first was made." He will very likely be, as the able senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] suggested a moment ago, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I am sure that his long period of service in private life and in public life, and his constant travels to many parts of the world, have equipped him, as few men have been equipped, to be chairman of that important committee.

It is very fortunate that in the very pressing tasks that lie ahead of us he will be able to draw on the great experience he has had. Some of those tasks involve financial problems, such as foreign aid—and he has demonstrated his great ability in that field; some of them depend on diplomacy, and he has demonstrated his great talents in that direction.

I am glad he is determined not to sit out his years in retirement until he reaches 100.

In the State of Nebraska, a very interesting writer, who was regarded as a sort of poet laureate of the State, wrote some lines which suggested that he did not want to be very careful and cautious about his life. He said:

Let me be as a tune-swept fiddle string that feels its master melody—and snaps.

He did not care to go through the resting period many men can have.

I hope THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN will stay in the Senate, and live out his life here, so that he may be as a tune-swept fiddle string feeling the master melody of public service as his life unfolds and progresses through the succeeding years.

Mr. President, I am sure it has been a great source of inspiration to every Member of the Senate to see the ability which he brings to his high office and to see the splendid qualities of mind and heart he has exhibited which have endeared him to the people of Rhode Island, to all his colleagues in the Senate, and to the people generally throughout the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a fellow New Englander, I should like to join with my colleagues in congratulating the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] upon his fine career of public service and upon his energy and health which enable him to continue that fine service at an age when most of us would like to seek rest, quietude, and repose.

When he was Governor of Rhode Island, I served as speaker of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts. We came in contact at various times during that period. Then when I came to Washington I found him here as a United States Senator.

At all times his colleagues have found the Senator from Rhode Island to be possessed of a great sense of humor whenever the occasion arises for an exchange of friendly barbs.

He is conscientious in carrying out his duties, and he performs them with energy and ability. I believe one of his qualities which most appeals to me is his great love of people and his desire to obtain other points of view of a business character and of a social character.

As long as I am in the Senate I hope he will also be in the Senate, because in that way we can continue to carry on for the best interests of New England and also as friends.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to concur in all that has been said about my good friend, Senator GREEN. It was my privilege to take the oath of office as a Senate on the same day on which Senator GREEN took his. At that time, as I recall, there were 13 new Senators; today, there are only 3 of that group of 13 still in the Senate. Some died; others were defeated for reelection. The three of us who are still in the Senate are Senator BRIDGES, Senator GREEN, and I. I am proud to be a member of this threesome.

Senator GREEN has had a long and distinguished career, and I wish for him a long and fruitful continuation of that career. Perhaps many of us are prone to accept too literally the old adage that age brings only infirmities. If we are, then it would behoove us to look carefully at Senator GREEN. He is proof that age can bring wisdom without also bringing disability.

Not too long ago, one of the Washington newspapers carried an article to the effect that Senator GREEN, caught in the middle of a busy thoroughfare during the morning rush hour, picked his way across the street with all the agility of a first-string halfback scoring a winning touchdown. I have no doubt but that if Senator GREEN decided to reenroll in school, he could make the first team. He is, certainly, now on the Senate "varsity," and I know I speak for the Senate as a whole when I state, Mr. President, that Senator GREEN's mental agility is even greater than his physical agility.

When Senator GREEN took his oath of office he was 3 years older than I now am, and I have often wondered how it was possible for a man of his age to travel around as he did, how he was able to keep up with those of us who are his juniors in years by many years.

I well recall that in 1949 Senator GREEN, former Senator Ferguson, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and I had the privilege of making a world trip together. To be frank and candid, some of us were not too sure that Senator GREEN, who was then almost 80 years of age, could stand the pace. We were afraid that the strain of the journey might be injurious to his health. It was not long after we left the United States that we found he could do as much as we could, if not more.

One of the members of the committee which made that world tour—I shall not mention his name—was fearful that he might become ill because of eating food to which he was unaccustomed. He decided upon reaching Asia that he would eat only fruit and drink only tea. Senator GREEN, on the other hand, had no such fear. He ate where it pleased him to eat and what was placed before him. The only member of the committee who became sick was the one who decided to eat only fruit and drink tea; Senator GREEN thrived on his unrestricted diet.

Mr. President, last year I celebrated my 65th birthday in Hong Kong. Senator GREEN arrived on my birthday. There was a typhoon raging at the time his plane landed. How his plane managed to land safely I do not know, but Senator GREEN was there, and I was very much surprised that, even after the strenuous and dangerous trip he had experienced in reaching Hong Kong, he was in absolutely a vigorous state of health. I felt then and I feel now that his wish to live 100 years, and to remain a Member of the Senate, will come true. I feel confident that the people of Rhode Island will continue to reelect him as long as he lives. He has made a great Senator; he is a great statesman, and I know he will continue to do credit to his great State and the Nation by remaining in the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it is a genuine personal pleasure to extend congratulations and good wishes to the distinguished, able, and lovable senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

Many generous comments have been made regarding his character, his ability, his vision, his industry, his sagacity, and his devotion to public duty. In all those sentiments I certainly concur.

There is one characteristic of this distinguished gentleman to which I wish to invite the attention of the Senate, namely, his sense of humor and the warmth of his personality.

I was present at a party one evening last year. When Senator GREEN arrived there was a line of people standing, waiting to greet him. He greeted each one with a smile and a pleasant remark. A little later, I noticed him looking at a small book on which he had made some notations regarding engagements. Knowing that Senator GREEN was a great favorite at parties and social functions in Washington and that he likewise enjoyed them, I said, "Senator GREEN, are you looking at your book to find out where you go next?"

With his typical flash of a smile and quick humor, he said, "No, I am trying to find out where I am now." [Laughter.]

In all good humor, he related that he had been to another party, or 2 or 3 parties, before, and was going to another.

Mr. President, there is another place where I frequently enjoy his fine wit and pleasant sense of humor. It is at the luncheon table downstairs around which only Democratic Senators gather. Senator GREEN has a chair, which he does not claim, but at the head of the table, somehow, I always find him occupying the same chair. I must say that when I go down and approach the table, and that chair is the only one left, I inquire, before I take, if Senator GREEN has had his lunch. I do not wish to take his chair from him. He graces it, and I know he enjoys it, and all of us who have the pleasure of hearing his stories enjoy his sparkling wit.

So, Mr. President, to Senator GREEN, who has reached this historic milestone, I pay tribute for all the noble qualities which have gone and now go to make of him a man who is beloved, a man who is trusted, a man who is revered, a Senator of industry, vision, and ability, for whom I predict that the glories of the future will outshine all the accomplishments of the past.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am more than happy to have a small part in these felicitations to our distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Rhode Island. This institution, the Senate of the United States, is one which is rich in tradition, and I am glad that is so. I doubt if there will ever be any tradition which will be more cherished than the fulfilment by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island of the number of years which have given him the accolade for serving in the Senate to the ripest age of any Senator in the life of our Nation.

It seems almost impossible for me at this moment, when I look at him, to realize how really young he is in years and in all the things which go to make up a youthful and active life.

There are two things with reference to the distinguished Senator which I believe have not been mentioned—at least, I hope they have not. One of them is his continuing scholarly interest in the subject of the succession to the presidency. My first assignment when I came to the Senate was to the Committee on Rules and Administration. The first major hearing in which I participated was one in which the Senator from Rhode Island gave us the benefit of his long study on the subject of the succession to the presidency. I have never heard a more thoroughly scholarly presentation of any complicated subject matter than that given to us by him on that occasion.

The Senate will recall that our people have, since that time, adopted one constitutional amendment on that subject, and the Congress has also enacted a statute which changed the line of succession from that which prevailed prior to the date of its enactment. I do not know what part the argument and the long planning and thinking of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island may have had upon those two pieces of major legislation, but I feel certain that they played an important part. I want the record to show that I regard that as a fact, so that the name of the senior Senator from Rhode Island may ever be associated with the changes which have been made, and I think for the better, in that important field.

The second matter I wish to mention is that the senior Senator from Rhode Island actually accomplished something that every Senator sometime in his life has wanted to do, and which I do not believe anyone else in the history of the United States has been able to do, namely, as Governor, he unseated at one time a whole supreme court. I am sure there have been times in the recent past when some persons, and perhaps some Senators, may have had a desire in that connection with reference to another court. But there has been no other person in the history of the United States,

as I believe, who in a perfectly legal manner, in a moment, and in a very wise action, as I have heard the matter related, unseated a complete supreme court and set up a new one according to his own liking.

I became interested in that subject matter when I first heard of it. I examined the constitution of the State of Rhode Island. Rhode Island, by the way, although it is the State having the smallest area, has the longest name of any of the States. I believe its full name is the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. So the State which is smallest in area but which has the longest name now becomes the State having a distinguished public servant who has served to the greatest age of any Senator who has ever occupied a seat in the Senate. So it is a State having many more assets to commend it and to plead for its high recognition than its smallness of size might otherwise entitle it to. One of those assets is the senior Senator from Rhode Island and his very great service and the excellent record which he has made here and everywhere.

I hope Senators may become intrigued by what I have said about the unseating of an entire supreme court, to the degree that they will read the history of that matter. I believe no comparable history will be found anywhere else in the whole period of the life of the United States. The senior Senator from Rhode Island was clothed with sufficient courage and sufficient resourcefulness to take that bold step, and to take it in such a remarkable way that while we hear about some persons who have, so it is said, tried to pack the courts and while we hear about some persons who, so it is said, have tried to handicap the courts unduly, unfortunately we do not hear enough about the one man in the history of the United States who positively did away with a supreme court and then created one which was more to his own liking and to that of the people of his State.

In closing, I refer to a broadcast made yesterday in which our friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, participated. I did not have the pleasure of hearing the broadcast, but I was told by others who heard it that the Senator admitted in high good humor that he expected to run again for reelection to another term, which would take him up to his 99th year; but that he thought a moral or ethical question was involved as to whether he should run for a term beyond that, because to do so would take him well beyond the time when he would have become a centenarian.

I cite this by way of illustration of the fact that the distinguished Senator is always thinking about moral issues and is always thinking about things which I do not believe would disturb the minds of many of us. It illustrates to what a fine degree he cherishes these values of high ethics, which in the case of some of us do not prevail to the degree, perhaps, that they should.

I have been hoping rather secretly for some years that the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island would become a senior citizen; and that having retired from the Senate simply because he wanted to, he would come down to a State whose name I need not mention, but which I have the privilege of representing, in part; a State which believes it has a peculiar appeal to citizens after they have reached middle age, so that many of them come down and make their homes with us.

I had almost given up my hope when I heard about the speech of yesterday. Having heard about it more fully this morning, I am now convinced that we shall have a chance to gain the Senator from Rhode Island as one of our residents the very year he becomes a centenarian.

All I would say at this time is that if I am so honored as to be a Member of the Senate at that time, there will be one of his former colleagues who will be present to lay down the red carpet and welcome him to Florida, so that he may spend his declining years with us. I hope they will be very, very happy years.

Mr. President, I join with all other Members of the Senate in paying a full meed of high respect and deep affection for a very grand person, one of the finest Americans we have in all our country—THEODORE GREEN, senior statesman of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am very happy to join in these deserved tributes to my esteemed friend from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. As he knows, I come from the Silver State of Nevada, and although there may be some slight differences of opinion between the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Nevada on the subject of silver, there certainly are no differences of opinion on the question of gold.

The gold crown which was presented to the Senator from Rhode Island today is well deserved. It symbolizes and typifies the gold of his integrity, the gold of his achievements here and his native State, and particularly the gold of his friendship.

So, Senator GREEN, in this new achievement, for which we humbly honor you today, I am happy to join with those who have so eloquently paid you just tribute.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am happy to join with those who are paying tributes to the senior Senator from Rhode Island.

I understand the Senator from Rhode Island carries with him a notebook which contains his various appointments.

I am now making a date with the senior Senator from Rhode Island to walk with him on his 100th birthday from the University Club to the capitol steps.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, in this greatest of all deliberative bodies the word "senior" has always had a special and honorable meaning. Yesterday the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island became, in point of age, the senior Senator of the United States. He is today the senior Senator, in point of age, in all this country's history.

To attain the age of 88 years, 8 months, and 15 days is in itself a very considerable accomplishment. But even more important, in my humble judgment, is the fact that each of Senator GREEN's years, for the last half century, have been years full of service to his Nation, his State, and the American people. His life has been, and remains to be, a life of accomplishment.

It has been a distinct pleasure for me to have had the high honor of serving with Senator GREEN. Like so many others, I have profited from the benefit of his experience and have found our association an inspirational one.

Mr. President, in my judgment, Senator GREEN is the most distinguished member of a most distinguished family, a family that has served this country since 1782. Senator GREEN counts seven lineal and collateral ancestors who served in the Congress of the United States from Rhode Island.

Mr. President, Senator GREEN has proved beyond question that age is relative and that it is possible for a man to be young in heart, in mind, and in body at any age. The motto of Rhode Island is "Hope." Let me use that motto now, and express the hope that our friend, the senior Senator of the United States, will go on to become the youngest centenarian in America's history.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I should like to add a few words of tribute to those already expressed by my colleagues earlier today in behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

Certainly, the years of service which Senator GREEN has given to the people of his State and of the Nation are in themselves sufficient to warrant our warmest commendation. But through this long period of faithful attendance to the needs of his constituents, the friendly and understanding attitude which he has demonstrated toward his responsibilities has proved to be the tonic of long and vigorous life.

Senator GREEN is my close neighbor in the Senate Office Building and we have the occasion to see and visit each other from time to time. However, the Senator from Rhode Island is so busy and active in all of his undertakings that the junior Senator from Delaware cannot always sustain the pace of his friend from New England.

Mr. President, I join in extending heartiest congratulations and best wishes to Senator GREEN as he achieves a milestone in the history of this great body, and I join in the hope that we, too, can successfully find the secret of his zest and energy which today makes him the eldest Member ever to serve in the United States Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this is, indeed, a historic and happy occasion as we pay tribute to THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN. One of my greatest privileges in the Senate has been to serve with him. I am proud to be his friend.

In spite of his years he is ever young, ever scintillating with rare and rich humor. He is always the gentleman and the scholar, the friend and the patriot. The example of his life, his courage, his perseverance, his character, his humanity, and his devotion to our country has been an inspiration to us all.

A traveler to many places and many lands, he has a profound understanding of the world in which we live today, its peoples, and its problems. Wise and far-seeing, he labors incessantly for peace for our Nation and for all nations. Of noble heart, he has waged the battle through the years for the underprivileged, for the less fortunate, for human liberty, and for a higher and better civilization for all men. He stands first because he has been the servant of all.

We rejoice to salute him today, the steadfast friend, the outstanding statesman, the great American. We wish him many more years of health, usefulness, and happiness.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in expressing the highest opinion of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island.

Senator GREEN is known for his great capacity for work, his courage with respect to legislation, and his rare personal charm, graced by a wit that is unsurpassed.

One of the greatest privileges that has ever come to me has been the good fortune to serve with him.

May he be just as hale and hearty and intelligent in his service to the people of Rhode Island when he reaches the age of 100 as he is today.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I think everyone will know that I have been in a most embarrassing position as I have sat here and listened to encomiums of an imaginary THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN. I wondered who this hero and idol could be, and as I gradually came to the conclusion that they were pointing at me, I became still more embarrassed. Then I pinched myself now and then to ascertain whether I was still alive or whether I was attending some mortuary service after my death, when all the evil of one's life is forgotten, and all the good greatly exaggerated.

My colleagues have heard too much about THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN today. I wish I could, in modesty, accept a certain part of what has been said, and verify some of the anecdotes which have been related, but I shall not keep my colleagues here any longer. I have taken, I fear, too much of the time of this august body.

I was very much interested in what the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] had to say about my predecessor in title, Justin S. Morrill. After all, so far as both of us are concerned, the lapse of a certain amount of time means nothing whatever. In reading history, it never seemed to me that time mattered so much; it was what happened during that time that was important. Most of the remarks of the Senator from Vermont were spoken from a sense of loyalty to Vermont, and I wondered whether it was Senator Morrill or I who was the subject of his address, until he explained at the end.

There was a little celebration held for me. My family from Rhode Island came to attend it, and among them was a small boy of 10 years of age, who seemed to have a remarkable knowledge of the history of the times and what was going on. He is a very deserving lad. When he got off the elevator he looked up and saw a portrait, and said, "Oh, that is a portrait of Senator Morrill." Another one in the group, who happened to be his little sister, wanted to know who that was. The little boy said, "Oh, that's the guy that Uncle Theodore sent to the showers." [Laughter.]

I thought that expressed very well the attitude of mind of the rising generation, and I was pleased to hear it. Seriously, the 19½ years I have spent in the Senate have certainly been wonderful, and I cannot imagine a more interesting place to have spent them than in the place where all the affairs of the world are so constantly discussed.

I have been very much moved by the friendliness shown in the addresses made about me, to which I have been listening. I never realized that so many of my colleagues had such a warm feeling of friendship toward me as they have shown today. My time in the Senate has been a very happy one, possibly because it gave me an opportunity to be of service to my State and my country, and, in addition to that, because I have come in such close contact with so many fine men. After all, the Senate is made up of Members carefully selected from all parts of this great land for outstanding qualities of one kind or another. It has been a great privilege to be with them and to work with them, many of them to be won as friends, others to be pleasant associates.

I was glad today when the tributes came from both sides of the aisle, because I have noticed that during the times to which reference has been made, there has been a great deal more freedom of action between men of different parties than ever before during my stay in the Senate. It is a very desirable thing that debate should be based on the possibility of winning Senators on the other side of the aisle to one's point of view.

Another thing I have observed is that there is a great deal more tolerance for the views of those opposing one's own view. We are just as firm in our own convictions, I am sure, but we also give the other man credit for being just as firm in his conviction. We realize the possibility that, after all, he may be right. We do not think he is, but there is that possibility, and we want to give him the benefit of the doubt. I think it will make a great deal of difference to this body when that feeling becomes general. A Senator should advance his argument from his point of view, and try to convince a colleague having a different point of view; but he should listen with respect to the colleague's point of view.

I shall not delay my colleagues any longer. I wish to thank them all. I have been away from my committee meeting, but I am glad, because of the opportunity afforded me to express my deep appreciation for what has been said here about me today.

There is one little postscript I may add. I have just received a telegram, and I now read it. It is very short. It reads:

Oh, pshaw.

It is signed "Justin Smith Morrill." [Laughter.]

That is all I know about the sender.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1749) adopting and authorizing the improvement of Rockland Harbor, Maine.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2106) to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets or midshipmen at the Military, Naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard Academies, or as midshipment in the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6143 to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that for taxable years beginning after May 31, 1950, certain amounts received in consideration of the transfer of patent rights shall be considered capital gain regardless of the basis upon which such amounts are paid.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7247) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of gain in certain railroad reorganizations.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. FOGARTY, Mr. RILEY, Mr. EVINS, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. MURRAY of Illinois, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. HAND, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 415. An act for the relief of Ernest B. Sanders;

S. 2984. An act for the relief of Col. John A. O'Keefe;

H. R. 7247. An act relating to recognition of gain or loss in certain railroad reorganizations and to amend section 108 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H. R. 7471. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., a municipal corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Florida;

H. R. 7896. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land in the city of Hogansville, Ga., to the city of Hogansville;

H. R. 8102. An act to provide for the disposition of moneys arising from deductions made from carriers on account of the loss of or damage to military or naval material in transit, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8404. An act to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former prisoner-of-war camp, near Douglas, Converse County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8693. An act to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, in relation to the refund of reenlistment bonuses;

H. R. 8922. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services;

H. R. 9377. An act to provide for the sale to the Eagle Rock Young Men's Christian Association of certain real property located in Los Angeles County, Calif.;

H. R. 9824. An act to establish an educational-assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict;

H. R. 10417. An act to amend the Federal Register Act, as amended, so as to provide for the effectiveness and notice to the public of proclamations, orders, regulations, and other documents in a period following an attack or threatened attack upon the continental United States; and

H. R. 10899. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 472) for the relief of certain aliens.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the arrival of the hour of 2 o'clock, the Senate proceed with the call of the calendar for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Pursuant to the order previously entered, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, commencing at the point at which the previous call was concluded.

The clerk will state the first order of business.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 110) directing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study and investigation of Indian education in the United States was announced as first in order.

Mr. BARRETT. I ask that the joint resolution be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

KYU LEE

The bill (S. 1243) for the relief of Kyu Lee was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kyu Lee shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-contol officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

EVELYN LEVENSTON HARRIS

The bill (S. 2779) for the relief of Evelyn Levenston Harris was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Evelyn Levenston Harris may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

LOUIS HENRI STASSART

The bill (S. 2833) for the relief of Louis Henri Stassart was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Louis Henri Stassart may, if found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act, be admitted to the United States for permanent residence under such conditions and controls as the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose. A suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, shall be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of such act.

CHOH-YI ANG

The bill (S. 2836) for the relief of Choh-Yi Ang was considereed, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Choh-Yi Ang shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JOSEPHINE LANGTON

The bill (S. 3029) for the relief of Josephine Langton was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third itme, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (4) and 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Josephine Langton may, if found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act, be admitted to the United States for permanent residence under such conditions and controls as the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose. A suitable and proper bond or undertaking approved by the Attorney General, shall be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of such act. These exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

ANNEMARIE APPELT AND TWO MINOR CHILDREN

The bill (S. 3050) for the relief of Annemarie Appelt and her two minor children, Karin Amelia Green and Sylvia Green was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Annemarie Appelt, the fiance of S. Sgt. William D. Green, a citizen of the United States, and her minor children, Karin Amelia Green and Sylvia Green, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months, if the administrative authorities find (1) that the said Annemarie Appelt is coming to the United with a bona fide intention of being married to the said S. Sgt. William D. Green, and (2) that they are otherwise admissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Annemarie Appelt and her minor children, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Annemarie Appelt, and her minor children, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Annemarie Appelt and her minor children as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees. The provisions of this act shall apply only to a ground for exclusion under section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

DR. TSCHENG-SUI FENG

The bill (S. 3221) for the relief of Dr. Tscheng-Sui Feng was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Tscheng-Sui Feng shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent resident as of

the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in the act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

KURT JOHAN PARO

The bill (S. 3473) for the relief of Kurt Johan Paro was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kurt Johan Paro shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

RUMIKO FUJIKI KIRKPATRICK

The bill (H. R. 6742) for the relief of Rumiko Fujiki Kirkpatrick was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INNA HEKKER GRADE

The bill (H. R. 6955) for the relief of Inna Hekker Grade was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 591) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 609) for the relief of certain aliens was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JANOS SCHREINER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2849) for the relief of Janos Schreiner, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of section 101 (b) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Janos Schreiner shall be held and considered to be the natural father of Miss Maria Lukats, a citizen of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LUCIE TOEHL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3166) for the relief of Lucie Toehl, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lucie Toehl shall be deemed to have been born in Germany.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN JORDAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1156) for the relief of John Jordan, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of John Jordan. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said John Jordan shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MARGARETE LEWIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2863) for the relief of Margarete Lewis, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "Margarete Lewis" and insert "Margarete Emma Lewis, nee Guschmann", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Margarete Emma Lewis, nee Guschmann may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Margarete Emma Lewis, nee Guschmann."

WAIVING OF CERTAIN SUBSECTIONS OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT IN BEHALF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 606) to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 4, to insert "and (12)", and on page 2, line 8, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of that act."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

CERTAIN RELATIVES OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 611) for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "be", to insert "issued visas and be"; on page 2, line 13, after the name "Mayer", to strike out "Reinhold H. Meric"; in line 17, after the name "Villani", to strike out "and", and in the same line, after the name "Wai", to insert a comman and "Liesel H. H. Chapman, Aldo D'Amico, Natsuko M. Dean, Lino Giuliani, Martha M. B. Hawn, Anastasia Kerlangitis, Kiyoko M. Malone, Isabella Mezzina, Masako H. Mindermann, Fanny Z. Muskatt, Kinuyo K. Nicolini, Jenney P. Novo, Monica H. Osborne, Daniele Pantera, Ljuba S. Prodanic, Katsuko H. Robbins, Margarita G. de Rodriguez, Antonio Romanelli, Michiko M. Schlottmann, Reiko T. Stille, and Karlis B. Zvirgzdins."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED TO NEXT CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The bill (S. 2654) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over, at the request of a Senator who is unable to be present.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request for a moment?

Mr. BIBLE. I am happy to withhold it.

Mr. BARRETT. Will the Senator yield in order that I may ask that the bill be passed over until the next call of the calendar?

Mr. BIBLE. I am very happy to ask that the bill be passed over until the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill will be passed over until the next call of the calendar.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

The bill (H. R. 7855) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to extend until June 30, 1956, the period during which disposals of surplus property may be made by negotiation was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. I ask that the bill be placed at the foot of the present calendar call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I am authorized by the committee to state that when the committee met on June 7 to report H. R. 7855, as amended, the committee agreed to include in its report the following statement confirming that passage of the bill would permit General Services Administration to carry out certain negotiated sales which were not consummated by transfer of title prior to June 30, 1955, and which have accumulated since that date. Although this paragraph was approved by the committee, it was omitted from the printed report by inadvertence.

The paragraph, which should be inserted at the bottom of page 3 of Senate Report No. 2199 to accompany H. R. 7855, is as follows:

The enactment of H. R. 7855 will enable the GSA to complete a number of transactions by negotiated sale which were not consummated by transfer of title prior to June 30, 1955, and which have accumulated since that date. Reports on three such transactions relating to the disposal of a foundry at New Castle, Pa., an aluminum-forging plant at Erie, Pa., and of the armor-plate plant at Gary, Ind., were submitted after the June 30, 1955, expiration date. The Senate and House Committees on Government Operations received explanatory statements on these proposed disposals from the GSA several months after the authorizing act and the requirement for the submission of the outlines of the proposed sales to the committees had expired. The GSA was notified by both committees that these proposed negotiated sales were considered to be matters for administrative determination, since the act requiring the committees to concur was no longer in effect. The members of this committee were not informed of the details of the proposed transaction, to accord with the normal procedure, and no official committee action was taken in regard thereto.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I note that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who is very much interested in this proposed legislation, has just come into the Chamber. I therefore withdraw my request that this particular bill be placed at the foot of the calendar, and ask that it be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 7855?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "thereof", to strike out "June 30, 1956" and insert "July 31, 1958."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I had asked the calendar committee to delay consideration of this bill until I could say a word about it. I appreciate the courtesy which has been extended to me.

Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Committee on Government Operations which has considered H. R. 7855, I supported the decision to report this bill favorably to the Senate. I should like to note specifically, however, as a part of the legislative record, that the National Surplus Dealers Association has recently been concerned with the possible adoption of a so-called industry-contractor plan by the General Services Administration and the Department of Defense. At one point spokesmen for the surplus dealers of America felt that the passage of H. R. 7855 without certain clarifying and protective language might seem to acquiesce in, or even ratify, a new interpretation of old statutory language in order to provide for the adoption of the industry-contractor plan.

On May 28, 1956, I received a telegram from the president of the Institute of Surplus Dealers opposing H. R. 7855. On June 5, 1956, the president of the National Surplus Dealers Association wrote me a letter outlining that association's view on H. R. 7855. I ask unanimous consent that both the telegram and letter just referred to be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 28, 1956.*

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

H. R. 7855 now pending before Senate Committee on Government Operations, which permits the appointment of industry contractors, is overwhelmingly opposed by membership of the Institute of Surplus Dealers. This provision would divert huge quantities of surplus material from the competitive open market to a favored few. It would not be in the best interests of the Government and would jeopardize the very existence of thousands of small businesses. We urge that surplus dealers from all sections of the country be heard by your committee prior to any final action.

BERNARD LEAVITT,
President, Institute of Surplus Dealers, Inc.

NATIONAL SURPLUS DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., June 5, 1956.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: We have been advised that the subcommittee of the Standing United States Senate Committee on Government Operations, of which you are a member, has considered and is favorably recommending to the standing committee, the passage of H. R. 7855, this being a time extension bill to authorize the further administration of Public Law 152. It is scheduled for adoption on the calendar for your committee meeting to be held on the 7th day of June 1956.

Public Law 152 is a necessary, vital and good law. The administration of said law has been under the General Services Administration. In general, the said administration of the disposal of surplus property of Public Law 152 has been satisfactory except that experience in the surplus property industry indicated that a more effective program of sale of surplus property with a greater monetary return to the United States Government could have been accomplished if the General Services Administration would have adopted certain suggestions of the disposal agencies in the field and of the surplus property dealers industry having to do with GSA adopting a more fair and equitable and less arbitrary contract, including among other things, more liberal inspection opportunities, proper and more sufficient detailed descriptions, lotting, handling of removal, etc. In addition to these suggestions, relative to the proper contract, it has been heretofore indicated to GSA by the surplus property industry that while Public Law 61 administered by GSA is an excellent law, GSA could more effectively police the disposal of surplus property through donations under Public Law 61 with the result that qualified agencies would receive the surplus property they need and not receive excess surplus property which is wasted and does not find its way into the channel of proper Government liquidation to the surplus property industry and the general public with resultant substantial and increased remuneration to the United States Government. Additional recommendations made to GSA had to do with methods of the type of sales employed.

GSA has never adopted these suggestions or in the alternative has given them so much consideration as to couch them in the arms of Morpheus. Nevertheless, and notwithstanding the fact that our industry has tried to show how the surplus property disposal mechanics could be altered, modified, and changed to bring in greater revenue to the Government without doing away with the beneficial part of GSA's administration having to do with open bidding so as to secure the highest and best price for surplus property and give all people interested in surplus property, big or small, a right to bid on a strictly competitive basis, GSA orally and the Department of Defense in writing, have indicated to us that they are adopting a theoretical plan for disposal of surplus property known as the industry contractor plan. This plan being a theoretical plan without having passed through the crucible of experience is being adopted in lieu of the recommendations suggested by the surplus property industry which were hammered out and forged by over 8,000 small-business establishments throughout the United States on the anvil of good commonsense business experience and in essence are a statement to the United States Government—give us the right to inspect, give us a fair contract, properly describe the merchandise you want us to buy, and we will pay more money for surplus property merchandise. In other words, the adoption of the industry's suggestions would allow the surplus-property dealer to take less of a gamble resulting from proper inspection and description of merchandise and thus allow him to make a greater bid for the merchandise involved.

The adoption of the industry contractor plan is fraught with possible and probable abuse in that it will allow for the concentration of the surplus property disposal industry in the hands of a few large business interests and without public bidding by the thousands of surplus-property dealers now in the industry and will be a fertile field for the exploitation of the Government by, if not collusive, favored arrangements.

A staff member of the subcommittee was of the opinion that the passage of H. R. 7855 involved only real property, and after checking at our request found that it affected personal property as well.

In March of 1956 we requested the right to appear before the subcommittee to sustain the statements contained in this letter with proper, good and sufficient evidence and were told that we would be given the opportunity to appear at the time the subcommittee holds its hearings. We have not heard as of the date of this writing in connection therewith, and it is for this reason that we file this appeal with you, having been told that the subcommittee has completed its hearings.

We respectfully request that your committee give us the opportunity to present in detail our recommendations and to proffer evidence that will indicate to the committee beyond any doubt that if GSA adopts our recommendations, there will be a more effective disposal of surplus property with a greater amount of money for the United

States Government as against the adoption of the industry contractor plan, which not only brings less money to the Government, but will destroy over 8,000 small businesses in the United States and Territories—with resultant unemployment of many, many thousands of people.

We request that H. R. 7855 be adopted, but only with proper provision that GSA does not adopt the industry contractor plan.

Very sincerely yours,

JOE M. PINKWATER,
President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is now my impression that the fears of the National Surplus Dealers Association have been shown to be unwarranted. I am supporting H. R. 7855 with that understanding.

The proviso of section 203 mentioned on page 5 of report No. 2199 is one means of protection against any discriminatory treatment in the disposal of surplus property. I am certain that the committee intends to use its prerogatives to police or prohibit surplus property disposals in any instances where discriminatory treatment is involved.

Mr. President, the main concern of the surplus dealers is that the smaller dealer might be discriminated against under a so-called industry contractor plan, which would perhaps facilitate the administration of the surplus disposal program by GSA, but which at the same time would deny some of the smaller dealers an opportunity to participate in the program on an equitable basis.

The president of the National Surplus Dealers Association expressed his concern in this language:

GSA orally and the Department of Defense in writing have indicated to us that they are adopting a theoretical plan for disposal of surplus property known as the Industry Contractor Plan. This plan being a theoretical plan without having passed through the crucible of experience is being adopted in lieu of the recommendations suggested by the surplus property industry which were hammered out and forged by over 8,000 small-business establishments throughout the United States on the anvil of good commonsense business experience and in essence are a statement to the United States Government—give us the right to inspect, give us a fair contract, properly describe the merchandise you want us to buy, and we will pay more money for surplus property merchandise. In other words, the adoption of the industry's suggestions would allow the surplus-property dealer to take less of a gamble resulting from proper inspection and description of merchandise and thus allow him to make a greater bid for the merchandise involved.

Then the letter goes on to say:

The adoption of the industry-contractor plan is fraught with possible and probable abuse in that it will allow for the concentration of the surplus property disposal industry in the hands of a few large business interests and without public bidding by the thousands of surplus-property dealers now in the industry and will be a fertile field for the exploitation of the Government by, if not collusive, favored arrangements.

Mr. President, I can understand the fears and doubts of the association which are responsible for the letter from which I have read. However, I think the record ought to be clear that the committee does not want that to happen. The committee, in processing the bill, recognizes that there is in existence an established pattern of surplus disposal, which has been worked out by the experience, and that it should be stated as a part of the legislative history of the bill that that pattern should continue.

I am happy that as of this date the chief clerk of the Committee on Government Operations has addressed a letter to the president of the National Surplus Dealers' Association, Mr. Joe M. Pinkwater, in explanation of the bill, in which Mr. Reynolds, the chief clerk of the committee says:

You will note that there is nothing in the bill, as reported by the committee, which would in any way authorize such a program as you have indicated that GSA and the Department of Defense are proposing. A broader bill, S. 2668, a copy of which I am enclosing, might have permitted the establishment of such a plan as you outlined, but in view of the fact that the committee realized the broad policy problems involved which would have required extensive hearings, action on the latter bill (S. 2668) was postponed indefinitely, as you will note from the report on H. R. 7855.

Under the operation of the program authorized by H. R. 7855, it will be necessary for GSA to submit to this committee and to the House Committee on Government Operations a statement setting forth all the facts in relation to any proposed disposal 30 days prior to the actual sale of the surplus property. Under the previous authority granted to the GSA, this committee has received approximately 250 such proposals, of which only a very limited number involved personal property, the remainder covering the disposition of surplus real property. Only in 2 or 3 cases in the history of this legislation has there been any real objection expressed to the disposal of property as provided under the program, and should members of your association find that there is any indication of favoritism or any deviation from the intent of the pending bill if approved by Congress, the committee would welcome any information you care to submit in relation to any such proposed disposal.

Mr. President, with that statement in the RECORD, I have no objection to the bill; in fact, I believe it is a bill which will meet the needs of the Government and protect the interests of the taxpayers, who have a substantial investment in this surplus property, and, if properly administered within the intent of the proposed legislation and in accordance with the expressed desire of the committee which processed the bill, will protect the legitimate rights of the independent surplus dealers, and not provide for any kind of favored treatment for a segment of the industry.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I should like to comment on the statement of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. The committee considered this subject very thoroughly, and reported the bill unanimously. What the Senator from Minnesota has said is in accord with the committee's point of view.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure it is the understanding, in accordance with the commitments which have been made in the report and in the letter of the committee from which I have read, that the committee will be watching this subject very carefully and that we will have a sort of policing of the matter; and that we are anxious to have the GSA and the Department of Defense administer the bill in a manner which will be satisfactory to the surplus dealers throughout the country. Is that the understanding of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BENDER. I assure the Senator that his statement is an entirely accurate statement and appraisal of the whole situation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 7855) was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to extend until July 31, 1958, the period during which disposals of surplus property may be made by negotiation."

W. R. ZANES & CO.

The bill (H. R. 5382) for the relief of W. R. Zanes & Company of Louisiana, Inc., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF ROBERT BRADFORD BICKERSTAFF

The bill (H. R. 5453) for the relief of the estate of Robert Bradford Bickerstaff was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF F. M. BRYSON

The bill (H. R. 8867) for the relief of the estate of F. M. Bryson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROY COWAN AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 11205) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Roy Cowan and others was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. CLARENCE M. AUGUSTINE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1963) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence M. Augustine, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, line 9, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Mississippi can give us a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, this bill, if enacted, would pay to Mr. and Mrs. Clarence M. Augustine, of Natick, Mass., the sum of $10,000 as the proceeds of a policy of national life insurance under the provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940.

The deceased, George Augustine, son of the claimants herein, entered naval duty on April 9, 1945. He was admitted to the naval hospital at Memphis, Tenn., on April 14 and died on April 24, 1945, the cause of death being rheumatic fever. Prior to going to the hospital, he had his necessary inoculations. There is no particular evidence that the inoculations contributed to the rheumatic fever. On April 21, the unit of which George Augustine was a member was called up for instruction as to national life insurance coverage but he was unable to be there, due to his illness. He, therefore, had no opportunity during his short term of service to make coverage. The Veterans' Administration is opposed to the legislation and, as a matter of law, it is on sound grounds in that respect, but it is the belief of the committee that had the serviceman had the opportunity to apply for national life insurance, he most certainly would have done so. The committee sees no reason why the parents of this serviceman should not be accorded the general treatment given to others when he, through no fault of his own, was unable to establish the benefits provided for them by law. The insurance is not believed to be in payment for any particular duty but is an attempt on the part of the Government and the citizens of the United States to compensate the kin of servicemen should they die while serving the cause of the security of the United States.

The committee has deleted the provision for attorney's fees and recommends that this bill, as amended, be given the favorable consideration of the Senate.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9285) to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, so as to extend for 2 additional years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared dealing with H. R. 9285 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

The Committee on Banking and Currency has reported unanimously the bill (H. R. 9285) to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act. It will have the effect of extending for 2 years beyond June 30, 1956, the authority of the Federal Reserve banks to engage in direct transactions with the United States Treasury for the purchase and sale of United States obligations. The Federal Reserve banks will be required to exercise this authority under the direction and regulation of the Federal Open Market Committee. The obligations may be bonds, notes, or other forms of evidence of indebtedness. They may be either direct obligations of the United States or fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States. While the obligations may be of any maturity, in the past it has been customary to limit them to Treasury certificates of not more than a few days' maturity. Under the bill, a limit of $5 billion is prescribed for obligations held at any one time by the 12 Federal Reserve banks acquired through this procedure. Whenever the authority is used, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System must include detailed information concerning such use in its next annual report to the Congress. Under the provisions of the bill, purchases and sales of United States obligations by the United States Treasury and the Federal Reserve banks can take place only in the open market, after June 30, 1958.

This power to engage in direct transactions with the Treasury was expressly given to the Federal Reserve banks in 1942. It has been kept in continuous force since then by successive extensions. It is presently scheduled to expire on June 30, 1956. Passage of this bill will keep the power alive for an additional 2 years.

In the past, this authority has proved helpful to the United States Treasury in tiding it over a period of lean receipts, usually just before the quarterly dates for payment of Federal income taxes. As shown by the table set forth on page 2 of the Senate report accompanying this bill (Rept. No. 2206), the authority has been used only infrequently. It has been used for only a total of 157 days from 1942 to June 11, 1956, a period of almost 14 years. At no time has more than $1,320,000,000 of obligations been outstanding at any one time through use of this procedure. As used in the past, this authority has in effect given the United States Treasury an overdraft privilege on the Federal Reserve banks.

It is a technique which can be used regardless of the momentary condition of the open market. In the absence of this authority, in order to supply a need for Federal funds, the Treasury would be obliged to float its obligations in the open market or to draw down its balances with commercial banks. Either method might well exert an undesirable influence on market conditions. Such a result would be wholly unwarranted in the event all the Treasury needed to do was to raise money for a few days, knowing that it would receive a sizable amount from income tax payments on the next quarterly payment date.

As used in the past, the authority has in effect brought about a stabilizing influence on the market. Operations under it can be conducted by the Federal Reserve banks under regulations of the Federal Open Market Committee and the United States Treasury Department. Sums so raised have no direct effect upon interest rates in the open market, since the interest rates on obligations directly sold to the Federal Reserve banks under this authority are fixed by negotiation between the Federal Reserve authorities and the Treasury Department. A nominal rate of one-quarter of 1 percent per annum has been used as the interest rate for these transactions.

Used on rare occasions to meet the situation outlined above, this authority serves the public interest.

The Under Secretary of the Treasury has also noted that this direct purchase authority may be useful in raising funds for the Treasury during an emergency when the money market is badly disrupted. It is true that, under the terms of the bill, direct purchase authority is available for use on such occasions. I would assume, of course, that the Treasury would make such use of this authority only as a measure of last resort. Too frequent use of the direct purchase method would seem to run counter to the sound money policies frequently emphasized by the present administration. It must be recognized that the authority in effect grants the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve System a means of bypassing the open market. This in turn removes the restraints normally exercised by open-market conditions on Federal debt management.

Your committee received a suggestion that it allow this authority to lapse in order to increase the soundness of money by closing one door to the monetization of Federal debt. It is true that funds received by the Treasury through this procedure enable it to continue its desired rate of spending, thus adding to the reserve structure of banks throughout the Nation. However, the committee was persuaded by the requests of representatives of the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve Board of Governors that the direct purchase authority be extended for primary use during periods of lean Treasury receipts and secondary use in an emergency disruption of the normal money markets. Under such circumstances, the committee is convinced that this direct purchase authority can be used to perform a true public service. It, therefore, unanimously recommended continuation of such authority for an additional 2-year period. The present bill granting such an extension has already been passed by the House of Representatives. Its early enactment by the Senate without amendment will enable it to be forwarded to the White House in ample time to become law prior to July 1, 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 9285) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PURCHASE OF LANDS WITHIN THE CACHE NATIONAL FOREST, UTAH

The bill (S. 3132) to provide for purchase of lands within the Cache National Forest, Utah, to promote prevention of floods and minimization of soil erosion, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and, obviously, I shall not object, since I am the author of the bill—I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I have prepared in explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT ON CACHE NATIONAL FOREST LAND PURCHASES (S. 3132)

S. 3132 which I introduced for myself and Senator WATKINS authorizes a Federal expenditure of $200,000 to assist in completing a model local-Federal partnership program known as the Cache Purchase Unit of the Cache National Forest.

For the greater part of the past two decades, the people of Ogden and Brigham City, Utah, have united to protect their common watersheds in the Cache National Forest. Some of the most critical lands on the watershed from the standpoint of conservation have been and are privately owned, although they are within the national forest. Unfortunately, important portions of these

private lands in the forest have become denuded as the result of overgrazing, logging and fires. Flash floods and mud-rock flows originating on these damaged lands have plagued Ogden and Brigham City and done damage which will take many years to correct. Pine View Dam serving the Ogden area has been filled with 10 feet of silt in 14 years largely because of poor conservation practices on the watersheds feeding the dam.

The local people determined that this menace could best be met by having the Forest Service administer that part of the conservation program within the Cache National Forest proper. A remedial program was begun in the 1930's and from that time through fiscal year 1955, the local people in a fine display of community spirit and unity have raised $96,023 to purchase over 15,000 acres of private land within the national forest and then deed the land to the Federal Government. Moreover, downpayments have been made from 1954 to 1956 by the local people in the amount of $10,190 to which must be added purchases in 1956 amounting to $47,000. In addition, the local counties have voluntarily foregone their 25 percent share of forest receipts which would otherwise have gone to local schools and roads so that the funds might be used in the land purchase program. Their one-quarter share of these receipts through fiscal 1955 totals $21,291.

The local people have now virtually exhausted their resources and are in need of the emergency assistance of the Federal Government since there are about 20,000 additional acres of critical importance for which immediate action is needed for flood prevention and erosion control. Much of this land has not hitherto been available.

The Department of Agriculture has approved the bill and suggested an amendment which the committee adopted requiring local matching of funds authorized under S. 3132. It seemed only fair to me and to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, ably chaired by Senator ELLENDER, that the local people should receive credit for their great efforts in the past. The committee report on S. 3132 therefore expressly provides that past local donations including the local share of forest receipts shall be counted as local matching funds to the extent that they exceed past Federal contributions.

The effect of the committee language is to give the people retroactive credit for matching purposes the $96,032 which the local people have contributed through fiscal year 1955 since I understand that all or virtually all of that amount was used to acquire lands for the purpose of donation to the Federal Government. The committee states that the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine the value of lands donated by local groups on the basis of acquisition costs if the lands were purchased for purposes of donation.

The committee states that local groups shall also be credited with their 25 percent share of forest receipts, a total of $21,291 through 1955, which when added to the $96,023 aggregates $117,314. From this total must be subtracted the Federal contribution through fiscal 1955, or $63,874, giving a total net local credit of $53,440 for future matching purposes. As soon as the 1954–55 downpayments and 1956 purchases amounting to $57,190 are deeded over to the Federal Government, the local people have a potential credit of $121,063 for matching purposes.

In summary, the Federal contribution authorized in this bill is more than justified for the following reasons:

1. The lands involved are within the national forest boundaries.

2. The lands are deeded over to the Federal Government and are not kept by local people.

3. The local people have shown a united willingness to bear their full share unselfishly.

4. The Federal Government should protect its $7 million investment in Pine View Dam.

5. There is an emergency need to purchase 20,000 acres of critically needed watershed lands.

6. The local people have exhausted their resources and need Federal help.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate my colleague for bringing this long-standing matter to a head. The people in the area of this national forest have been trying for years to acquire for the national forest privately owned lands within the forest boundaries, and other lands which are being heavily eroded. The bill provides for a cooperative arrangement whereby the people will match the contributions made by the United States in buying these lands, making it possible to complete the program which they have had in mind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement with respect to the bill and some tables showing donations and appropriations and expenditures.

There being no objection, the statement and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

By an act approved May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), and amended by the act of May 26, 1944 (58 Stat. 227), Congress has authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase lands within the boundaries of the Cache National Forest in the State of Utah to assure that such lands will be managed, with nearby national forest lands, so as to minimize soil erosion and damage from floods. This act also authorizes a $10,000 appropriation by the Congress of the receipts from the Cache National Forest in Utah to pay for the lands acquired under the act. Proposed purchases must be approved by the National Forest Reservation Commission as established by section 4 of the Weeks law of March 1, 1911.

A primary purpose of this law is to facilitate protection and improvement of watersheds within the Cache National Forest on which many communities depend for domestic water and on which a substantial farm area depends for irrigation water.

The Cache purchase unit, beginning during the years 1936 to 1938, was the last of the Wasatch Mountain chain to be brought under organized fire protection and administration. It contained over one-half million acres of watershed lands, above 20 municipalities, and 2 Federal reclamation reservoirs and irrigation systems—the Pine View and the Hyrum projects.

Purchase of critical watershed lands permits reduction or termination of grazing use, assures utilization of timber under good forestry practices, and permits the restoration of an adequate vegetative cover through reseeding, terracing, and similar measures, if such are necessary, in conjunction with like activities on other national forest lands in the vicinity.

The west slopes of the Wasatch Mountains and the watersheds of the Ogden and Weber Rivers, all in northern Utah, descend steeply to the relatively level lands which adjoin the Great Salt Lake on its east side. Water from the streams that rise in this mountain area supports the cities and towns at the foot of the mountains and the irrigation agriculture which utilizes the fertile flat lands. Ogden, Willard, Brigham, and other towns depend on these short and swift streams for their water supplies. These streams are also the sole source of irrigation water for farms. In relation to needs, water resources in this area are limited and careful conservation and use is essential.

A good part of these watersheds is within the Cache National Forest. Intermingled with the national forest lands are substantial acreages of privately owned range and timberland of high watershed importance. The area of privately owned lands, which are not subject to national forest administration, is proportionately greater in those parts of the national forest established in more recent years, as the Wellsville Mountain area which was added to the forest in 1937.

Some of these privately owned lands have been abused through overgrazing, overcutting of timber, and destructive fires. As a consequence, on such lands, the vegetative cover often has been destroyed or seriously impaired, soil has been gullied or eroded away, and the water absorptive capacity of the topsoil has been reduced. Private owners often are under economic pressure to obtain maximum returns from their lands and find it difficult to decrease or terminate grazing or other use in the interest of sound watershed management. In many instances the use and value of these lands for watershed purposes, which is of overriding importance to the public, is of little direct concern to the owners. Also, private owners often are unable to install and maintain the restoration measures which are needed to stabilize the more seriously depleted land and to reduce downstream damages.

Deterioration of the steep, erodible mountain watersheds in this area has in the past resulted in serious flash floods affecting the valuable lowlands. The dangers of this situation were demonstrated in 1936 when a flood and resultant mud flow, directly attributable to watershed impairment, descended upon the town of Willard and nearby areas. It destroyed or damaged many homes, caused two deaths, destroyed the local powerplant, damaged irrigation and municipal water systems, orchards, and crops, and otherwise caused a material loss of property. Costs of removing the mud and rock flows from the highways, irrigation systems and other facilities, and repairing the damage were, of course, large. Similar floods of varying degrees have affected other areas along the base of this mountain range. The lands are also a critical part of the watershed of the Ogden River.

There is urgent need for good management of these lands in order to prevent damaging floods, serious erosion, and sedimentation of a reservoir constructed with Federal funds. They can be propertly managed with very little additional cost to the Forest Service. In addition to the hazard to the people of Ogden City and Weber County, these damaged watershed lands are also a hazard to very large Federal investments. In this area the Federal Government has Hill Field Air Force Base, employing nearly 10,000 people; the Clearfield Naval Base, with its 7 million square feet of space under roof; and the huge Army General Supply Depot at Second Street in Ogden, with 5 million square feet of storage space. These Federal installations cost the Government hundreds of millions of dollars to construct. The annual maintenance of these as an essential part of our national defense runs into the millions of dollars. They depend upon the watersheds above the city of Ogden for their water supply.

The Pine View Reservoir, which cost nearly 3 million dollars to construct, is endangered by floods and sedimentation from these damaged watersheds. A flood from these damaged lands in the North Fork of Ogden River deposited gravel, rocks and sediment in the Pine View Reservoir and did considerable damage to homes in the area. A flood from Cutler's Basin came down the North Fork of Ogden River and filled homes on the North Fork with gravel up to the middle of the first-story windows. Several people were

forced to abandon their homes as a result of this damage and the threat which hangs over them. Continued destruction by floods and erosion seems probable unless the land is purchased by the Federal Government and placed under protection and management. The Federal Government is now in the process of enlarging the Pine View project at an additional cost of 10 million dollars.

The need for action to avoid repetition of such floods led to formation of two local nonprofit organizations, the Weber County Watershed Protective Corp. and the Wellsville Mountain Area Project Corp., to aid in rehabilitation and protection of these critical watershed areas. Financed by local contributions, these and other organizations have cooperated closely with the Forest Service in promoting protection and better use of watershed areas in the national forests. They have incurred a total cost of $117,314 through the 1955 fiscal year as follows:

1. 15,726 acres of land have been acquired at a cost of $91,805 and donated to the Federal Government (see exhibit No. 1).

2. Five thousand three hundred and two acres of other land has been purchased and conveyed to the United States at a loss of $4,218.

3. The countries wherein the Cache National Forest is located have foregone $21,291 which ordinarily would have been received by them under the 25-percent provision of the Forest Receipts Act, if the lands had not been used by the Forest Service for the purchase of private lands.

In addition, I also call your attention to the fact that Weber County and the Weber County Watershed Protective Corp. have agreed to make a strategic purchase exceeding $60,000. In fact, they recently have paid $20,000 on 1 option, and also $86,800 on an escrow agreement.

Since enactment of the act of May 11, 1938, referred to a moment ago, Congress has appropriated funds thereunder each year, beginning with fiscal year 1940, except for the years 1943 to 1946, inclusive. Since 1947 and through the 1955 fiscal year, Congress has each year appropriated $10,000 from the receipts of the Cache National Forest for purchase of lands in accordance with the act. Through the 1955 fiscal year, $85,165 has been used to acquire lands for which public ownership was deemed necessary to accomplish the purposes of the act and which the owners were willing to sell at a reasonable price (see exhibit No. 2). The parts of these appropriations not used to buy essential lands were returned to the Treasury for distribution in the same way as other national-forest receipts. However, the net Federal expenditure through the 1955 fiscal year is $63,874, since $21,291 is money spent by the Federal Government, which otherwise would have gone to the counties concerned for schools and roads. In effect, this latter amount is a local contribution, not a Federal expenditure.

There remain probably 20,000 acres or more of privately owned land within these watersheds which have been, and can again be, the cause of destructive floods and a continuing source of sedimentation damage to irrigation lands, canals, and reservoirs, and which should be purchased. Many of the options to purchase these lands will expire long before funds are available under the present law which limits the annual appropriation to $10,000 of the receipts from the Cache National Forest in Utah. The major lands to be purchased include the following "section, township, and range" location:

	Acres
T. 6 N., R. 1 E., salt Lake base and meridian secs. 6, 26, 34, and 35	1,400
T. 7 N., R. 1 E., sec. 32	320
T. 7 N., R. 1 W., secs.13, 15, 16, and 17	1,100
T. 8 N., R. 1 W., secs. 3, 4, 6, 7–10, 15–19, 21 27, 28, 32	6,600
T. 8 N., R. 2 W., secs. 12 and 13	960
T. 9 N., R. 1 W., secs. 4, 5, 7–9, 16–21, 28, 33	5,540
T. 10 N., R. 1 W., secs. 17, 18, 20, 29	780
T. 11 N., R. 1 W., secs. 3, 4, 10	1,060
T. 12 N., R. 2 W., secs. 26, 33–35	1,330
Total	18,830

The Weber County Watershed Protective Corp., one of the groups which has played a major role in acquiring and donating these private lands to the Federal Government, informs me that $65,000 could be used during the next fiscal year if Federal funds in that amount were made available.

The Department of Agriculture in its report upon the bill, indicated that it had no objection to its passage if it were amended to provide that funds authorized to be appropriated are to be expended only to the extent that such funds are "matched by local donations of money or land of not less than equal value" (Rept. p. 2). This the committee has done. I understand also that the local Utah groups concerned are willing to concur in this amendment, but are of the opinion, and I agree, that for the purposes of matching funds, past local contributions, including forest receipts foregone due to Federal land purchases, shall be counted, to the extent that they exceed past Federal contributions to the project.

This the committee report indicates will be the case. It also makes it clear that "the value of land donated by local groups shall be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture on the basis of acquisition costs * * *" (p. 1). As of the end of the 1955 fiscal year, based upon this statment in the report, it appears that total local contributions exceed the Federal contribution by $53,440. This represents the difference between the total net Federal expenditure (purchases costing $85,165 less 25 percent, $21,291, which otherwise would have gone to the counties concerned) of $63,874 and the total local contribution (acquisition costs of $96,023 and $21,291 of forest receipts funds foregone) of $117,314.

This project is in the best interest of all parties—the local people, the Forest Service, the owner of these private lands—and ought to be concluded as rapidly as possible. Another 15 to 20 years is too long to wait for proper soil erosion control and water conservation on these valuable watershed lands. Floods in that area are not respecters of persons and property.

I urge the Senate to pass S. 3132 which authorizes the appropriation of $200,000 to be used by the Department of Agriculture to purchase these lands. The people of Utah living in Weber, Box Elder, and Cache Counties are not unmindful of the assistance the Federal Government has rendered, and they stand ready to continue to assist in every possible way toward the completion of this worthy water and soil-conservation and flood-prevention project.

EXHIBIT 1.—*Donations*

Donor	Acres	Forest Service appraisal and estimated value of land, time of donation	Actual or estimated cost of land to donor	Other estimated cost	Total cost, actual and estimated, to donor
Willard City	1,807.32	$5,522	$6,300	[1] $300	$6,600
Box Elder County	980.36	2,743	12,000		12,000
Hyrum City	665.53	1,675	2,000		2,000
Cache County	279.79	922	700		700
Wellsville Mountain	4,174.75	12,693	16,520		16,520
Weber County	3,085.26	7,627	11,000		11,000
Ogden City	3,976.98	11,154	38,732	[1] 1,205	39,937
Boy Scouts	116.00	1,000	1,000		1,000
George W. Swan	640.00	2,048	2,048		2,048
Ogden Chamber of Commerce and local civic clubs bought 560 acres and sold to the United States at a loss of			680		680
Weber County Watershed Protection Corp. bought 4,742 acres and sold to the United States at a loss of			3,538		3,538
Total	15,725.99	45,384	94,518	1,505	96,023

[1] Estimated court costs in condemnation suits.

EXHIBIT 2.—*Appropriations and expenditures under the Special Forest Receipts Act, Cache National Forest, Utah*

Fiscal year	Appropriation	Total obligations [1]	Decrease in 25 percent fund payments due to expenditures
1940	$6,000	$5,881.41	$1,470.35
1941	6,000	5,891.52	1,472.88
1942	10,000	9,904.57	2,476.14
1943			
1944			
1945			
1946			
1947	10,000	8,890.95	2,222.74
1948	10,000	9,973.36	2,493.34
1949	10,000	8,377.52	2,094.38
1950	10,000	9,995.46	2,498.87
1951	10,000	6,994.35	1,748.59
1952	10,000	8,978.55	2,244.64
1953	10,000	483.63	120.91
1954			
1955	10,000	9,793.67	2,448.42
	102,000	85,164.99	21,291.26
1956	10,000	[2] 9,862.00	2,465.50

[1] Includes purchase price of land and all other obligations under each appropriation.
[2] Obligated to Apr. 30, 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment on page 2, line 15, after the word "amended", to insert a colon and *"Provided further*, That the funds authorized to be appropriated under section 2 of this act shall be available for the expenditure only to the extent that such funds are matched by donations of lands of not less than equal value to the United States of America within the Cache National Forest or funds of equal amount contributed by local agencies, organizations or persons, which contributed funds are hereby authorized to be expended in payment for lands acquired under this act and to defray the cost of work to rehabilitate watersheds on national-forest lands within the Cache National Forest as authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture, with the approval of the National Forest Reservation Commission as established by section 4 of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), is authorized to purchase those lands, or interests in lands, situated within the boundaries of the Cache National Forest in the State of Utah public ownership of which in his judgment will promote and facilitate prevention or control of floods and mud-rock flows or minimize soil erosion, and so prevent or reduce damage to lands of the United States, to improvements and facilities constructed in whole or in part with Federal funds, to municipal water supplies, and to highways, homes and irrigation works in or near the said national forest: *Provided*, That said lands, or interests in lands, may be acquired subject to such reservations or outstanding rights as the Secretary of Agriculture finds will not materially interfere with use and management thereof for the foregoing purposes: *Provided further*, That any lands purchased under this act shall upon acceptance of title become parts of the Cache National Forest and subject to all laws, rules, and regulations applicable to lands acquired under the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961) as amended: *Provided further*, That the funds authorized to be appropriated under section 2 of this act shall be available for expenditure only to the extent that such funds are matched by donations of lands of not less than equal value to the United States of America within the Cache National Forest or funds of equal amount contributed by local agencies, organizations or persons, which contributed funds are hereby authorized to be expended in payment for lands acquired under this act and to defray the cost of work to rehabilitate watersheds on national-forest lands within the Cache National Forest as authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $200,000 which shall remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

APPOINTMENT OF TWO UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS FOR CUMBERLAND, GA., NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

The bill (S. 3180) to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of 2 United States commissioners for Cumberland, Ga., National Historical Park was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wonder if we may have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I believe I can make an explanation of the bill. It was reported from the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It provides for the appointment of two United States Commissioners for Cumberland Gap National Historical Park. The park is located in Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia. The United States district court for Kentucky will appoint one commissioner and the courts of eastern Tennessee and western Virginia will appoint the other.

The park did not exist when section 631 of title 28 was enacted, providing for commissioners in certain named parks. It was necessary to provide for it by this particular measure.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator from Nevada. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That section 631 (a) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after the third paragraph of such section the following new paragraph:

"Two United States commissioners may be appointed for Cumberland Gap National Historical Park. One, whose jurisdiction shall be limited to the portion of the park situated in Kentucky, shall be appointed by the District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky; the other, whose jurisdiction shall be limited to the portion of the park situated in Tennessee and Virginia, shall be appointed by joint action of the District Courts for the Eastern District of Tennessee and the Western District of Virginia."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2691) for the relief of Cale P. Haun and Julia Fay Haun was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed to the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

WALTER C. JORDAN AND ELTON W. JOHNSON

The bill (S. 3945) for the relief of Walter C. Jordan and Elton W. Johnson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Walter C. Jordan, of Pryor, Okla., the sum of $303 and to Elton W. Johnson, of Chelsea, Okla., the sum of $67, which amounts represent the estimated costs of replacement of two abstracts of title and duplicates of two mortgagee's title insurance policies, belonging to the above-named individuals and which abstracts and original policies were destroyed when the mail bag in which they were being dispatched by the Postal Transportation Service slid under the wheels of the train at Pryor, Okla., on or about May 3, 1954: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ESTATE OF RENE WEIL

The bill (H. R. 2709) for the relief of the estate of Rene Weil was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ZELLA K. THISSELL

The bill (H. R. 3373) for the relief of Mrs. Zella K. Thissell was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EUGENE G. ARETZ

The bill (H. R. 7373) for the relief of Eugene G. Aretz was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLYDE R. STEVENS

The bill (H. R. 8041) for the relief of Clyde R. Stevens was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SGT. AND MRS. HERBERT G. HERMAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3150) for the relief of Sgt. and Mrs. Herbert G. Herman, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "of", where it appears the second time, to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$5,361.19" and, on page 2, line 4, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sgt. and Mrs. Herbert G. Herman, of Las Cruces, N. Mex., the sum of $5,361.19. Such sum shall be in full satisfaction of the claims of the said Sgt. and Mrs. Herbert G. Herman against the United States for compensation for the death of their minor child, Herbert G. Herman, Jr., who was fatally injured as the result of being struck by a United States Army vehicle on March 13, 1953, in Gradignan, France, and reimbursement for burial and other expenses incurred by the said Sergeant and Mrs. Herman as a result of such death: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM MARTIN, OF TOK JUNCTION, ALASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 906) for the relief of William Martin, of Tok Junction, Alaska, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "of," where it appears the first time, to strike out "$1,135" and insert "$1,080" and on page 2, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. CHARLES C. PHILLIPS

The bill (S. 1798) for the relief of Mrs. Charles C. Phillips was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, this bill would pay the sum of $10,000 to the widow of a man who while serving with the Corps of Engineers was loaned, along with two other persons, to a Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee and who, while serving in that capacity, performed exemplary services resulting in a reduction of expenditures of nearly $500 million to the United States. The nature of the services of the claimant is attested to by the junior Senator from Louisiana, Senator LONG, who served as chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the military public works bill during the period when Mr. Phillips performed his services for the legislative branch.

Had this claimant been in the executive branch of the Government and performed similar meritorious service, he would have been eligible for a monetary award under the Government Employees Incentive Awards Act. However, since the services which he performed were for the legislative rather than the executive branch of the Government, the claimant could not receive compensation under that act. Consequently, this legislation represents the only method by which the meritorious services of this individual may be adequately recognized.

Since the approval of this bill is primarily a matter for consideration of the legislative branch the Civil Service Commission and the Department of the Army prefer to make no recommendation with respect to its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 5, after $500,000,000," to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Charles C. Phillips of Vicksburg, Miss., the sum of $10,000 as an extraordinary monetary award for special services rendered to the United States by her husband, the late Charles C. Phillips, during June and July 1952, at which time, while employed by the Department of Defense, he was on loan to and rendered outstanding service for a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, which subcommittee, following detailed hearings and an intensive study to which Mr. Phillips contributed greatly, recommended, and was instrumental in the eventual reduction of the Military and Naval Construction Act of $500 million: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any such not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. SHAN YAH GIN

The bill (S. 2804) for the relief of Dr. Shan Yah Gin was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Shan Yah Gin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ROSETTA ITTNER

The bill (S. 2839) for the relief of Rosetta Ittner was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act Rosetta Ittner may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

JOSEF KRANZ

The bill (S. 3232) for the relief of Josef Kranz was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Josef Kranz may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

MRS. MARIA (SCHANDL) COTE

The bill (S. 3292) for the relief of Mrs. Maria (Schandl) Cote was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Maria (Schandl) Cote may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

ZYGMUNT SOBOTA

The bill (S. 3380) for the relief of Zygmunt Sobota was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Zygmunt Sobota may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

THERESIA SCHNEIDER

The bill (S. 3522) for the relief of Theresia Schneider was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (6) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Theresia Schneider may, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act, be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under such conditions and controls as the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States, deems necessary to impose. A suitable or proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, shall be given by or on behalf of the said Theresia Schneider in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as bonds or undertakings given under section 213 of such act: *Provided*, That this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under paragraph (6) of section 212 (a) of such act known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

GIOVANNA SCANO

The bill (H. R. 1410) for the relief of Giovanna Scano was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 592) for the relief of certain aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, after line 10, to insert:

SEC. 3. Within 6 months immediately following the effective date of this act, Sirijo Tanfara may file an application for adjustment of his immigration status under the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 403; 68 Stat. 1045), notwithstanding his status at the time of entry into the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6888) to amend the act of September 3, 1954, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, by request——

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I withhold my request and will yield to the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I think I am entitled to 5 minutes, under the rule, even though the bill may be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah may proceed.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, this measure has to do with a situation which exists in the West wherein herd masters in that area have to have foreign help to manage their herds. We call this the sheepherders' bill.

This measure is very much needed by sheep raisers in the Intermountain States who employ large numbers of sheepherders. The persons provided for in the bill would be immigrants who would help solve the problems which now confront the sheep raisers.

Since it is an immigration bill, I wanted to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that it constitutes in no way an immigration program for this year. The President of the United States, in his message to Congress early this year, called attention to the need for some amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act, amendments which he felt were reasonable and should be adopted by Congress. I introduced four bills to cover the recommendations made by the President.

Hearings have been held on the bills. In fact, the hearings started last November on the general subject of amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act.

A year ago last May—in May 1955, to be exact—I introduced a bill to amend the Refugee Act of 1953. The proposed amendments were suggested by the Administrator of the Refugee Act, in the State Department. I felt that they were sound amendments and should have been adopted. Numerous hearings have been held on this particular bill and on other bills which were introduced for the purpose of amending the Refugee Act. Nothing has resulted from those hearings except the hearing records. No progress has actually been made to secure the amendments proposed.

I serve notice now that, so far as the administration is concerned, it is still greatly to the advantage of this country, as a matter of national policy, that the program suggested by the President to amend the Refugee Act and the Immigration and Nationality Act be adopted. I urge Senators, especially the members of the Committee on the Judiciary, to secure the fulfillment of this program.

I have called attention to the program in connection with the bill now under consideration. The so-called sheepherders immigration bill is not a program. It is merely designed to alleviate a particular situation within the United States. I am very much in favor of it, and I hope it will be finally adopted.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, by request, I suggest that the bill go over until the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over until the next call of the calendar.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 605) for the relief of certain aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the name "Karady", where it appears the second time, to strike out "Anesti N. Baicousheff,"; in line 7, after the name "Lauria", to strike out "Katherine Pui King Loo (Feun), Lindson Feun, Lindgoy Feun, Amie Feun,"; and on page 3, line 18, after the word "residence", to strike out "upon payment of the required visa fees, and section 212 (a) (28) of the said act shall be inapplicable in the case of each such alien" and insert "as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees, and their past membership in the classes defined in section 212 (a) (28) of the said act of which the Attorney General has knowledge prior to the date of the enactment of this act shall not hereafter be a cause for their exclusion from the United States."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE, N. C.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8634) to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in North Carolina to the city of Charlotte, N. C., which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with an amendment, on page 2, line 4, after the word "Congress", to strike out "(62 Stat. 770. 350)" and insert "(62 Stat. 350)".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EFFECTS OF ACTS OF CONGRESS ON STATE LAWS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3143) to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Over by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CONVEYANCE OF TRIBAL LANDS OF THE WIND RIVER RESERVATION, WYO., TO THE UNITED STATES

The bill (S. 3467) to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation, in Wyoming, to the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Over, by request.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada amend his request so as to have the bill go over to the next call of the calendar?

Mr. BIBLE. I shall be happy to amend my request so as to have the bill go over until the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over until the next call of the calendar.

PUBLICATION OF STATISTICS REGARDING CERTAIN TYPES OF TEXTILE LOOMS

The bill (S. 2881) to direct the Secretary of Commerce to collect and publish annually statistics as to the number of certain types of textile looms in place and in operation on a State-by-State basis was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the bill requires the Secretary of Commerce to collect and publish annually statistics as to the number of certain types of cotton, synthetic, wool, and blended textile looms in place and in operation in the various States.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the bill provides that the Secretary of Commerce collect and publish annually, by States, statistics on the number of cotton, synthetic, wool, and blended textile looms in place and in operation.

Statistical data of the kind to be provided would be helpful to many States wherein there is a density of textile mills. The lack of such data has had an adverse effect on the economy of such States under certain circumstances.

The cost of collecting and providing the data would be small as compared with the benefits to be derived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BARRETT. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That subchapter 3 of chapter 3 of title 13 of the United States Code, as amended, is amended by adding after section 103 a new section as follows:

"SEC. 104. Statistics on textile looms in place and in operation

"(a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to collect and publish annually statistics as to the number of the following types of textile looms in place and in operation on a State-by-State basis: (1) cotton, (2) synthetic, (3) wool, and (4) blended. Such statistics shall be published in bulletin form and distributed in such manner as may be directed by the Secretary.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

SEC. 2. The analysis of subchapter 3 of chapter 3 of title 13 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"104. Statistics on textile looms in place and in operation."

SPECIAL CANCELING STAMPS TO ENCOURAGE REGISTRATION FOR VOTING IN GENERAL ELECTIONS

The bill (S. 3215) authorizing the Postmaster General to provide for the use of special canceling stamps or postmarking dies in order to encourage registration for voting in general elections was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to encourage the general public on a continuing basis during election years to register, so that a greater number will be qualified to vote in the general election.

The general apathy of the public toward our national elections has long been of concern to both major political parties and to all who are interested in a more representative Government. It is believed that public notice of the type proposed in the proposed legislation will have a worthwhile effect on the general public.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized to provide for the use in each first- and second-class post office, during the period beginning on February 1 and ending on September 30 of each even numbered year, of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the legend "Are you registered to vote?"

DETENTION OF MAIL FOR TEMPORARY PERIODS IN CERTAIN CASES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 9842) to authorize the Postmaster General to hold and detain mail for temporary periods in certain cases was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Over by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING REPORT BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT—RESOLUTION REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The resolution (S. Res. 286) providing for an additional extension of time for filing a report by the Subcommittee on Disarmament was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 11473) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 1957, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, this is obviously not calendar business. It will be taken up by motion, possibly today. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 9852) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Over by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

This concludes the call of the calendar.

RECOGNITION OF POSTAL AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the establishment of a definitive policy with respect to employee-management relations in the Federal civil service is a sound and also a desirable objective of Federal employee organizations. It should be productive of substantial benefit to the Government as well as be advantageous to the employees.

Objections which have been raised to this type of legislation seem to be overdrawn and not consistent with industrial experience or with the Government's own policy concerning labor relations in industry. The purpose of such a bill as S. 3593 or of S. 1191, which I cosponsored, has been termed unnecessary, and the practices for which it provides have been represented as being likely to retard efficient personnel management. The accuracy of such forebodings impresses me as questionable.

Certainly the formulation of a policy and program which will bring Government employees and management into closer harmony and create better understanding of mutual problems is neither superfluous nor undesirable. On the contrary, I look upon it as essential to the development of good personnel relations in the Government service.

Basically the employer-employee relationship in the civil service is the same as it is in private employment. Management has the responsibility for devising and executing those policies which will fulfill efficiently the functions of the organization or enterprise it is directing. Those functions consist of such broad categories as finance, procurement, production, and distribution. They also include a personnel function which includes the hiring, utilization, and compensation of persons needed for the operations of the concern.

It has come to be a well-recognized principle of industry management that good employer-employee relations are an important element in a satisfactory operating program. Good management has come to realize the worth of the satisfied employee and to know that it is of positive benefit to the enterprise to have the employee feel that he can have a voice in the determination of his basic working conditions. He achieves this voice through organization. Management can use that organization to its advantage by cooperating in its development into an effective means of employee representation, or it can adopt a combative attitude or ignore the potentialities for good which are inherent in it.

The Federal Government does not permit industry to make a choice. The Federal labor-management relations laws have required industry to recognize and deal sincerely with a union which can demonstrate that it has the right to represent a particular group of employees. The Federal Government should not hesitate to accord to its own employees the same fundamental right to have a voice in the determination of their working conditions. I agree with the objective of establishing an employee-management policy by the Federal Government toward its own employees.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of S. 3593 be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3593) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 5, sec. 652), as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new subsection to read as follows:

"(e) (1) The right of officers or representatives of national employee organizations or local officers of such national organizations representing employees of a department or agency or subdivision of such department or agency, to represent grievances in behalf of their members without restraint, coercion, interference, intimidation, or reprisal is recognized.

"(2) (A) Within 6 months after the effective date of this act, the head of each department and agency shall, after giving officers or representatives of employee organizations having members in such department or agency an opportunity to present their views, promulgate regulations specifying that administrative officers shall at the request of officers or representatives of the employees' organizations confer, either in person or through duly designated representatives, with such officers or representatives on matters of policy affecting working conditions, safety, in-service training labor-management cooperation, methods of adjusting grievances, transfers, appeals, granting of leave, promotions, demotions, rates of pay, and reduction in force. Such regulations shall recognize the right of such officers or representatives to carry on any lawful activity, without intimidation, coercion, interference, or reprisal.

"(B) Disputes resulting from disagreement between employee organizations and departments or agencies on the policies enumerated in subsection (e) (2) (A) shall be referred to an impartial board of arbitration to be composed of one representative of the department or agency, one representative of the employee organization, and one representative appointed by the Secretary of Labor who shall serve as chairman. The findings of the board of arbitration shall be final and conclusive.

"(3) Charges involving a violation of this subsection shall be referred to an impartial board of arbitration to be composed of 3 members, 1 to be selected by the organization making the charge, 1 to be selected by the head of the department or agency involved, and the third, who shall act as chairman, to be designated by the Civil Service Commission. The findings of this board of arbitration shall be final and conclusive as

to the fact of violation and the head of the department or agency involved shall take such action as may be necessary to cause the suspension, demotion, or removal of any administrative official found by the board of arbitration to have violated this subsection.

"(4) This subsection shall not apply to the Central Intelligence Agency or the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

CONSIDERATION OF THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that H. R. 10986, the Defense Department appropriation bill, which is to be reported to the Senate today by the Committee on Appropriations, be taken up on Thursday at the conclusion of the morning business, with the understanding that there will be a general discussion of that bill on Thursday and, if any Senators so desire, on Friday, but with the further understanding that there will be no votes taken on the bill on Thursday or Friday.

I have cleared this request with the distinguished minority leader, and he concurs in it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, calendar 2169, S. 3982, be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2258, H. R. 11473, better known as the legislative appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11473) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the committee recommends appropriations totaling $117,804,058 for the expenses of the legislative branch of the Federal Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. The sums recommended are $28,427,608 over the amount allowed in the House bill, $4,692,875 below the budget estimates, and $14,652,351 over the appropriations for the current fiscal year.

Mr. President, of the increase of $28,427,608 over the amount in the House bill, a total of $28,404,315 is for Senate items on which the House took no action. As you know, Mr. President, this procedure has been the practice for a number of years.

Of the increase of $14,652,351 over the appropriations for the current fiscal year, $13,808,310 is for the Architect of the Capitol. This increase is for the continued construction of the new Senate and House Office Buildings and for the extension of the east front of the Capitol.

Mr. President, the bill provides for 30 new positions under the jurisdiction of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate. Of the 30 new positions, 10 are for the service department. As chairman of the legislative subcommittee, I have had numerous requests from the Members of this body to look into the problems of the service department in order to provide for better service. Let me say that this situation in the service department is the result of an ever-increasing workload. I think they have done a wonderful job, with what they had to do with.

Mr. President, I did look into the matter and came to two conclusions. If this department was to render the type of service desired by the Senators, we had to provide modern equipment and skilled personnel to operate it; and, secondly, there is involved the matter of space. New equipment has been provided, and the committee recommends the allowance of funds for personnel to operate the equipment. As we all know, this matter of space will have to wait for the completion of the new office building.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that five of the new positions are for the proposed Senate Recording Facility. I shall discuss this in detail in a few moments.

Mr. President, the committee made a thorough study of the salary scale of the employees of the Senate last year; and made recommendations for an extensive overhaul of the existing salary structure. These recommendations were adopted by the Senate. In making these revisions, the committee considered the responsibilities of the positions involved, and not the individuals holding such positions. Neither did the committee feel that it was bound by any salaries set by the House for its employees. We have had very few complaints from either employees or Senators on the revised scale.

I do not mean by that statement that we have not had some complaints, but there certainly has been a minimum of complaints.

The committee did receive some recommendations for changes which we considered. We recommend certain revisions which are in the nature of correcting adjustments to the recommendations of last year.

Mr. President, the most important provision in this bill deals with the establishment of the Senate Recording Facility. As all of us know, we have been participating with the other body in the operation of the Joint Recording Facility. The Joint Recording Facility has rendered good service to the Members of this body, but I know we all feel that due to the distances involved, not to mention the problems of administration, a separate facility is desirable. The House has established a separate facility. Therefore, if we are to have this type of service, a Senate Recording Facility will have to be established.

The committee recommends that the Recording Facility be under the jurisdiction of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and to be operated under rules and regulations established by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. President, the committee has worked out a proposal which we believe will work, and it will work with a minimum of problems. Therefore, it is worthy of the support of the Members of this body.

Mr. President, the committee recommends appropriations totaling $10,637,608 for the Library of Congress. This sum is an increase of approximately $375,000 over the appropriations for the current fiscal year; $22,693 over the House allowance; and $39,645 below the budget estimate of $10,677,253. The recommendations of the committee are adequate to assure the operations of the library at its long recognized standard—the best library in the world.

Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendments to the bill be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for the purpose of amendment as original text; provided, that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

At the top of page 2, to insert a new heading, as follows:

"SENATE"

On page 2, after line 1, to insert a new subhead, as follows:

"SALARIES OF SENATORS, MILEAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND OF SENATORS, EXPENSE ALLOWANCE OF THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS OF THE SENATE, AND SALARY AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT"

On page 2, after line 6, to insert:

"For compensation of Senators, $2,166,240."

On page 2, after line 7, to insert:

"For mileage of the President of the Senate and of Senators $51,000."

On page 2, after line 9, to insert:

"For expense allowance of the majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate, $2,000 each, in all, $4,000."

On page 2, after line 11, to insert:

"For the compensation of the Vice President of the United States, $35,070."

On page 2, after line 13, to insert:

"For expense allowance of the Vice President, $10,000."

On page 2, after line 14, to insert:

"SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

"For compensation of officers, employees, clerks to Senators, and others as authorized by law, as follows:

"OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

"For clerical assistance to the Vice President, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him in multiples of $5 per month, $86,925."

On page 2, after line 21, to insert:

"CHAPLAIN

"Chaplain of the Senate, $5,000."

At the top of page 3, to insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"For office of the Secretary, $572,915: *Provided*, That effective July 1, 1956, the compensation of the Chief Clerk and Parliamentarian of the Senate shall be $15,500

gross per annum each in lieu of $8,820 basic per annum each; and the basic annual compensation of the following positions shall be: legislative clerk $7,620 in lieu of $7,260; Journal clerk $7,620 in lieu of $7,260; assistant parliamentarian $7,620 in lieu of $7,260; keeper of stationery $6,060 in lieu of $5,580; librarian $6,060 in lieu of $5,580; superintendent, document room $6,060 in lieu of $5,580; secretary to Parliamentarian $3,240 in lieu of $3,000; assistant Journal clerk $3,240 in lieu of $3,060; assistant bill clerk $3,240 in lieu of $3,000; assistant executive clerk $3,240 in lieu of $3,000; and custodian of records $3,240 in lieu of 3,000."

On page 3, after line 15, to insert:

"COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

"For professional and clerical assistance to standing committees, and the Select Committee on Small Business, $2,030,650."

On page 3, after line 19, to insert:

"CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

"For clerical assistance to the conference of the majority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, $40,000."

At the top of page 4, to insert:

"For clerical assistance to the conference of the minority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, $40,000."

On page 4, after line 3, to insert:

"ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS TO SENATORS

"For administrative and clerical assistants and messenger service for Senators, $9,604,000."

On page 4, after line 7, to insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

"For office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, $1,755,770: *Provided*, That effective July 1, 1956, the basic annual compensation of the following positions shall be: secretary $2,760 in lieu of $2,520; clerk $2,880 in lieu of secretary $2,460; chief telephone operator $3,180 in lieu of $3,000; 3 assistant chief telephone operators at $2,580 each in lieu of $2,460 each; 26 pages at $1,800 each in lieu of 24 pages at $1,800 each; 79 privates, police force, at $2,160 each in lieu of 75 privates, police force, at $2,160 each; postmaster $6,060 in lieu of $5,580; chief clerk, post office $2,760 in lieu of $2,660; 30 mail carriers at $2,100 each in lieu of 28 mail carriers at $2,100 each; superintendent, periodical press gallery at $4,740 in lieu of $4,320; clerk-stenographer, service department at $2,160 in lieu of clerk-typist at $1,920; chief machine operator at $2,880 in lieu of $2,760; foreman of duplicating department of $3,180 in lieu of $2,880; 2 offset press operators at $2,580 each and 1 offset press operator at $2,340 in lieu of 3 offset press operators at $2,340 each; 2 messengers at pass door at $2,400 each; superintendent of mails at $2,400; superintendent, press photographers gallery at $4,020; night supervisor, service department at $2,700; senior addressograph operator at $2,400 and 5 addressograph operators at $2,160 each in lieu of 4 addressograph operators at $2,160 each; 7 messengers at $1,740 each in lieu of 6 messengers at $1,740 each; 5 inserting machine operators at $1,980 each; 2 photostat operators at $2,400 each in lieu of 1 photostat operator at $2,400; 4 laborers at $1,620 each in lieu of 3 laborers at $1,620 each; auditor $2,220; administrative assistant $7,320; director, recording studio, $7,020; director of photography $5,100; chief sound engineer $4,080; laboratory supervisor $4,020; cameraman $3,600; film and radio recording engineer $3,120; shipping and stock clerk $1,800; traffic manager $2,520; production assistant $3,420; editor and printer $3,000; administrative officer $3,780; and projectionist, film inspector $2,280."

On page 5, after line 20, to insert:

"OFFICES OF THE SECRETARIES FOR THE MAJORITY AND THE MINORITY

"For the offices of the secretary for the majority and the secretary for the minority, $94,950: *Provided*, That effective July 1, 1956, the gross compensation of the secretary for the majority and the secretary for the minority shall be $15,500 per annum each; and the basic annual compensation of the assistant secretary for the majority and the assistant secretary for the minority shall be $6,300 each in lieu of $5,580 each."

On page 6, after line 5, to insert:

"OFFICES OF THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY WHIPS

"For two clerical assistants, one for the majority whip and one for the minority whip, at not to exceed $5,580 basic per annum each, $20,045."

On page 6, after line 9, to insert:

"In all $14,250,255, and the agency contribution for Federal employees group life insurance authorized to be paid from this appropriation by Public Law 598, 83d Congress, shall be paid without regard to the above limitations."

On page 6, after line 14, to insert:

"CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

"Legislative reorganization: For salaries and expenses, legislative reorganization, including the objects specified in Public Law 663, 79th Congress, $100,000."

On page 6, after line 18, to insert:

"Senate policy committees: For salaries and expenses of the majority policy committee and the minority policy committee, $105,000 for each such committee; in all, $210,000."

On page 6, after line 21, to insert:

"Joint Committee on the Economic Report: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, $135,560."

On page 6, after line 24, to insert:

"Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, including the objects specified in Public Law 20, 80th Congress, including $825 for expenses of compiling and preparing year-end joint committee reports, which sum, or any part thereof, may be paid as additional compensation to any employee of the United States, $222,775."

On page 7, after line 6, to insert:

"Joint Committee on Printing: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Printing, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the committee, $59,085; for expenses of compiling, preparing, and indexing the Congressional Directory, $1,600; and for compiling, preparing, and indexing material for the biographical directory, $2,500, said sum, or any part thereof, in the discretion of the chairman or vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, may be paid as additional compensation to any employee of the United States; in all, $63,185."

On page 7, after line 16, to insert:

"Committee on Rules and Administration: For reimbursement to General Services Administration for space furnished for United States Senate, $27,515; and for expenses of compiling, preparing, and indexing material for the Senate Manual, $2,050, said sum, or any part thereof, in the discretion of the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, may be paid as additional compensation to any employee of the United States; in all, $29,565."

On page 7, after line 24, to insert:

"Vice President's automobile: For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the Vice President, $8,785."

On page 8, after line 2, to insert:

"Automobile for the President pro tempore: For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the President pro tempore of the Senate, $3,785."

On page 8, after line 5, to insert:

"Automobiles for majority and minority leaders: For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of two automobiles, one for the majority leader of the Senate, and one for the minority leader of the Senate, $17,570."

On page 8, after line 9, to insert:

"Reporting Senate proceedings: For reporting the debates and proceedings of the Senate, payable in equal monthly installments, $170,250."

On page 8, after line 12, to insert:

"Furniture: For services and materials in cleaning and repairing furniture, and for the purchase of furniture, $31,190: *Provided*, That the furniture purchased is not available from other agencies of the Government."

On page 8, after line 16, to insert:

"Inquiries and investigations: For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate or conducted pursuant to section 134 (a) of Public Law 601, 79th Congress, including $400,000 for the Committee on Appropriations, to be available also for the purposes mentioned in Senate Resolution No. 193, agreed to October 14, 1943, and Public Law 20, 80th Congress, $2,000,000."

On page 8, after line 23, to insert:

"Folding documents: For the employment of personnel for folding speeches and pamphlets at a gross rate of not exceeding $1.61 per hour per person, notwithstanding any other provision of law, $29,000."

On page 9, after line 3, to insert:

"Senate restaurants: For repairs, improvements, equipment, and supplies for Senate kitchens and restaurants, Capitol Building and Senate Office Building, including personal and other services, to be expended under the supervision of the Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate, $55,000."

On page 9, after line 9, to insert:

"Motor vehicles: For maintaining, exchanging, and equipping motor vehicles for carrying the mails and for official use of the offices of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, $16,560."

On page 9, after line 13, to insert:

"Miscellaneous items: For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, $1,370,000."

On page 9, after line 15, to insert:

"Postage stamps: For Office of the Secretary, $650; Office of the Sergeant at Arms, $225; offices of the secretaries for the majority and the minority, $100; and for airmail and special-delivery stamps for Senators and the President of the Senate, as authorized by law, $33,800, in all, $39,775, and the maximum allowance per capita for airmail and special-delivery stamps of $300 is increased to $400 for the fiscal year 1957, and thereafter."

On page 9, after line 23, to insert:

"Stationery: For stationery for Senators and for the President of the Senate, including $12,900 for stationery for committees and officers of the Senate, $187,500."

On page 10, after line 2, to insert:

"Communications: For an amount for communications which may be expended interchangeably for payment, in accordance with such limitations and restrictions as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration, of charges on official telegrams and long-distance telephone calls made by or on behalf of Senators or the President of the Senate, such telephone calls to be in addition to those authorized by the provisions of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 392; 2 U. S. C. 46c, 46d, 46e), as amended, and the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949 (63 Stat. 77; 2 U. S. C. 46d–1), $14,550."

On page 10, after line 13, to insert:

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, each Senator may fix the basic

compensation of one employee in his office at a rate of not to exceed $8,040 per annum in addition to other positions authorized by law."

On page 10, after line 18, to insert:

"The Sergeant at Arms hereafter is authorized and directed to secure suitable office space in post office or other Federal buildings in the State of each Senator for the use of such Senator and in the city to be designated by him: *Provided*, That in the event suitable space is not available in such buildings and a Senator leases or rents office space elsewhere, the Sergeant at Arms is authorized to approve for payment, from the contingent fund of the Senate, vouchers covering bona fide statements of rentals due in an amount not exceeding $1,200 per annum for each Senator."

On page 11, after line 3, to insert:

"The Sergeant at Arms hereafter is authorand directed to approve for payment from the contingent fund of the Senate to each Senator an amount not to exceed $150 quarterly, upon certification of each such Senator, for official office expenses incurred in his State: *Provided*, That in the case of the death of any Senator the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration may certify for such deceased Senator for any portion of such quarterly allowances already obligated but not certified to at the time of such Senator's death, and for an amount at the same quarterly rate which may be reasonably needed for the purpose of closing such deceased Senator's State office, for payment to the person or persons designated as entitled to such payment by said chairman."

On page 11, after line 17, to insert:

"Effective July 1, 1956, the paragraph relating to official long distance telephone calls to and from Washington, District of Columbia, under the heading 'Contingent Expenses of the Senate' in Public Law 479, 79th Congress (2 U. S. C. 46c), as amended, is amended by striking out the word 'ninety' and inserting in lieu thereof 'one hundred and twenty' and by striking out the words 'four hundred and fifty' and inserting in lieu thereof 'six hundred'."

On page 12, after line 2, to insert:

"The Secretary of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms hereafter are authorized and directed to protect the funds of their respective offices by purchasing insurance in an amount necessary to protect said funds against loss. Premiums on such insurance shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration."

On page 12, after line 9, to insert:

"Salaries or wages paid out of the foregoing items under 'Contingent Expenses of the Senate' shall be computed at basic rates, plus increased and additional compensation, as authorized and provided by law."

On page 12, after line 13, to insert:

"No part of the foregoing appropriations made under the heading 'Contingent Expenses of the Senate' hereafter may be expended for per diem and subsistence expenses (as defined in the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended) at rates in excess of $12 per day; except that (1) higher rates may be established by the Committee on Rules and Administration for travel beyond the limits of the continental United States, and (2) in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, reimbursement for such expenses may be made on an actual expense basis of not to exceed $25 per day in the case of travel within the continental limits of the United States."

On page 13, after line 2, to insert:

"Compensation for stenographic assistance of committees paid out of the foregoing items under 'Contingent Expenses of the Senate' hereafter shall be computed at such rates and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration, notwithstanding and without regard to any other provision of law."

On page 13, after line 8, to insert:

"The contingent fund of the Senate is hereafter made available for reimbursement for mileage, at the rate of 10 cents per mile, for one round trip in each fiscal year by the nearest route usually traveled between Washington, District of Columbia, and a Senator's residence in his home State, to not to exceed two employees in each Senator's office, such reimbursement to be made upon vouchers approved by the Senator and containing a certification by him that such travel was performed in line of official duty."

On page 13, after line 17, to insert:

"Unless otherwise specifically authorized by law, no part of any appropriation disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate shall be available for payment of compensation to any person holding any position, for any period for which such person received compensation for holding any other position, the compensation for which is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate."

Under the heading "Capitol Police," on page 20, line 6, after the word "Plant", to strike out "$82,495" and insert "$83,095"; and on page 21, line 17, after the word "incumbents", insert "and that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are directed to pay the deputy chief detailed under the authority of this paragraph the same salary as that paid in fiscal year 1956 plus $600 and such increases in basic compensation as may be subsequently provided by law so long as this position is held by the present incumbent."

On page 22, after line 7, to insert:

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

"For an amount to enable the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures to carry out the duties imposed upon it by section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 726), to remain available during the existence of the committee, $22,500, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate."

Under the heading "Architect of the Capitol—Capitol Buildings and Grounds," on page 26, line 3, after the word "amended", to strike out "$282,600" and insert "$932,600."

On page 26, after line 4, to insert:

"Subway transportation, Capitol and Senate Office Buildings: For maintenance, repairs, and rebuilding of the subway transportation system connecting the Senate Office Building with the Capitol, including personal and other services, $6,600."

On page 26, after line 9, to insert:

"Senate Office Building: For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, including furniture, furnishings, and equipment, and for labor and material incident thereto, and repairs thereof; for purchase of waterproof wearing apparel and for personal and other services; including 5 female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms at $1,800 each, for the care and operation of the Senate Office Building; to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol; in all, $1,248,600."

On page 26, after line 18, to insert:

"ADDITIONAL OFFICE BUILDING FOR THE UNITED STATES SENATE

"Construction and equipment of additional Senate Office Building: To enable the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, to continue to provide for the construction and equipment of a fireproof office building for the use of the United States Senate, in accordance with the provisions of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948 (62 Stat. 1029), $5,250,000: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be obligated or expended for construction of the rear center wing of said building, from the ground floor up, provided for under the building plans heretofore approved by such Commission."

Under the heading "Library of Congress," on page 30, line 11, after the word "Board", to strike out "$5,300,000" and insert "$5,310,593."

Under the subhead "Distribution of Catalog Cards," on page 31, line 6, after the word "Library", to strike out "$1,475,000" and insert "$1,487,100."

Under the heading "Government Printing Office—Revolving Fund," on page 34, after line 17, to insert:

"The paragraph in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1954 (67 Stat. 330), establishing the Government Printing Office Revolving Fund is hereby amended by striking out the words '(except buildings and land)', where they occur, and inserting in lieu thereof 'and building appurtenances (except building structures and land)'."

On page 34, after line 23, to insert:

"The Public Printer is authorized to provide for the improvement of electrical facilities and extension of air conditioning as necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Government Printing Office. The operation shall be financed from the revolving fund in accordance with provisions of law (44 U. S. C. 63; 63 Stat. 301, Aug. 1, 1955)."

Under the heading "General Provisions," on page 36, after line 10, to strike out the following section:

"SEC. 105. (a) There is hereby established a House Recording Studio (hereinafter referred to as the Studio) under the House of Representatives.

"(b) The Studio shall assist Members of the House of Representatives in making disk, film, and tape recordings, and in performing such other functions and duties in connection with the making of such recordings as may be necessary. The Studio shall be for the exclusive use of Members of the House of Representatives (including the Delegates and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico).

"(c) The Studio shall be operated by the Clerk of the House of Representatives under the direction and control of a committee which is hereby created (hereinafter referred to as the committee) composed of three Members of the House. Two members of the committee shall be from the majority party and one member shall be from the minority party, to be appointed by the Speaker. The committee is authorized to issue such rules and regulations relating to operation of the Studio as it may deem necessary.

"(d) The Clerk of the House shall, subject to the approval of the committee, set the price of making disk, film, and tape recordings and collect all moneys owed the Studio.

"(e) No moneys shall be expended or obligated for the Studio except as shall be pursuant to such regulations as the committee may approve.

"(f) The Clerk of the House is authorized, subject to the approval of the committee, to appoint and fix the compensation of a Director of the Studio and such other employees as are deemed necessary to the operation of the Studio.

"(g) (1) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States, a revolving fund within the contingent fund of the House of Representatives for the Studio for the purposes of administering the duties of the Studio.

"(2) All moneys received by the Studio from Members of the House of Representatives for disk, film, or tape recordings, or from any other source, shall be deposited by the Clerk of the House in the revolving fund established for the Studio by the preceding paragraph. Money in such fund shall be available for disbursement therefrom by the Clerk of the House for the care, maintenance, operation, and other expenses of the Studio

upon vouchers signed and approved in such manner as the committee shall prescribe.

"(3) Following an equal distribution of all stock, supplies, materials, and equipment, as well as the liquidation of receivables and liabilities, of the Joint Senate and House Recording Facility, which shall include the purchase of such additional equipment as may be necessary to properly equip the Studio; one-half of all sums remaining in the Joint Senate and House Recording Facility revolving fund created by the joint resolution of August 7, 1953 (2 U. S. C., sec. 123), shall, on that date, be transferred to the revolving fund established by the first paragraph of this subsection.

"(h) (1) Pending acquisition of the stock, supplies, materials, and equipment necessary to properly equip the Studio, the present services and facilities shall be made available to the Studio in order that it may carry out its duties.

"(2) No person shall be an officer or employee of the studio while he is engaged in any other business, profession, occupation, or employment which involves the performance of duties which are similar to those which would be performed by him as such an officer or employee of such studio unless approved in writing by the committee.

"(3) (A) The Joint Recording Facility positions and salaries established under the House of Representatives pursuant to the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1948, and all subsequent acts are hereby abolished.

"(B) Effective with the completion of the transfer provided for by subsection (g) hereof, the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution establishing in the Treasury of United States a revolving fund within the contingent fund of the House of Representatives," approved August 7, 1953 (2 U. S. C. 123), shall not be effective insofar as the House of Representatives is concerned.

"(i) The Director of the Studio shall give bond to the Clerk of the House with one or more sureties in the penal sum of $20,000, with condition for the faithful performance of his duties and the preservation and security of all property in his care.

"(j) Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section are hereby authorized to be appropriated."

And in lieu thereof, to insert the following new section:

"SEC. 105. (a) There is hereby established a House Recording Studio and a Senate Recording Studio.

"(b) The House Recording Studio shall assist Members of the House of Representatives in making disk, film, and tape recordings, and in performing such other functions and duties in connection with the making of such recordings as may be necessary. The Senate Recording Studio shall assist Members of the Senate and committees of the Senate in making disk, film, and tape recordings, and in performing such other functions and duties in connection with the making of such recordings as may be necessary. The House Recording Studio shall be for the exclusive use of Members of the House of Representatives (including the Delegates and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico); the Senate Recording Studio shall be for the exclusive use of Members of the Senate, the Vice President, and committees of the Senate.

"(c) The House Recording Studio shall be operated by the Clerk of the House of Representatives under the direction and control of a committee which is hereby created (hereinafter referred to as the committee) composed of three Members of the House. Two members of the committee shall be from the majority party and one member shall be from the minority party, to be appointed by the Speaker. The committee is authorized to issue such rules and regulations relating to operation of the House Recording Studio as it may deem necessary.

"The Senate Recording Studio shall be operated by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate under the direction and control of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate. The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to issue such rules and regulations relating to operation of the Senate Recording Studio as it may deem necessary.

"(d) The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall, subject to the approval of the committee, set the price of making disk, film, and tape recordings, and collect all moneys owed the House Recording Studio. The Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate shall set the price of making disk, film, and tape recordings and all moneys owed the Senate Recording Studio shall be collected by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate.

"(e) No moneys shall be expended or obligated for the House Recording Studio except as shall be pursuant to such regulations as the committee may approve. No moneys shall be expended or obligated by the Director of the Senate Recording Studio until approval therefor has been obtained from the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate.

"(f) The Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized, subject to the approval of the committee, to appoint and fix the compensation of a Director of the House Recording Studio and such other employees as are deemed necessary to the operation of the House Recording Studio.

"(g) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States, a revolving fund within the contingent fund of the House of Representatives for the House Recording Studio for the purposes of administering the duties of that studio. There is also established in the Treasury of the United States, a revolving fund within the contingent fund of the Senate for the Senate Recording Studio for the purposes of administering the duties of that studio.

"(h) All moneys received by the House Recording Studio from Members of the House of Representatives for disk, film, or tape recordings, or from any other source, shall be deposited by the Clerk of the House of Representatives in the revolving fund established for the House Recording Studio by the preceding paragraph; moneys in such fund shall be available for disbursement therefrom by the Clerk of the House of Representatives for the care, maintenance, operation, and other expenses of the studio upon vouchers signed and approved in such manner as the committee shall prescribe. All moneys received by the Senate Recording Studio for disk, film, or tape recordings or from any other source, shall be deposited in the revolving fund established for the Senate Recording Studio by the preceding paragraph; moneys in such fund shall be available for disbursement therefrom upon vouchers signed and approved by the Sergeant at Arms for the care, maintenance, operation, and other expenses of the Senate Recording Studio.

"(i) (1) As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this act but no later than September 30, 1956, the equity of the Joint Senate and House Recording Facility Revolving Fund shall be distributed equally to the Senate and House of Representatives on the basis of an audit to be made by the General Accounting Office.

"(2) The Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall, subject to the approval of the committees mentioned in subsection (c) hereof, determine the assignment of existing studio facilities to the Senate and the House of Representatives, and also the existing equipment, materials, and supplies to be transferred to the respective studios. The evaluation of equipment, materials, and supplies transferred to each studio shall be on the basis of market value. Any other equipment, materials, and supplies determined to be obsolete or not needed for the operation of the respective studios shall be disposed of to the best interest of the Government and the proceeds thereof deposited in the Joint Senate and House Recording Facility Revolving Fund.

"(3) Accounts receivable, which on the effective date of liquidation, are due from Members and committees of the Senate shall be transferred to the Senate Studio, and those due from Members and committees of the House of Representatives shall be transferred to the House Studio.

"(4) A sufficient reserve shall be set aside from the Joint Senate and House Recording Facility Revolving Fund to liquidate any outstanding accounts payable.

"(5) After appropriate adjustments for the value of assets assigned or transferred to the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, the balance in the Joint Senate and House Recording Facility Revolving Fund shall be distributed equally to the Senate and House of Representatives for deposit to the respective revolving funds authorized by this section.

"(j) Pending acquisition of the stock, supplies, materials, and equipment necessary to properly equip both studios, the present services and facilities shall be made available to both studios in order that each studio may carry out its duty.

"(k) No person shall be an officer or employee of the House or Senate Recording Studio while he is engaged in any other business, profession, occupation, or employment which involves the performance of duties which are similar to those which would be performed by him as such an officer or employee of such studio unless approved in writing by the committee in the case of the House Recording Studio and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration in the case of the Senate Recording Studio.

"(l) The Joint Recording Facility positions and salaries established pursuant to the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1948, and all subsequent acts are hereby abolished.

"(m) Effective with the completion of the transfer provided for by subsection (i) hereof the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution establishing in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund within the contingent fund of the House of Representatives,' approved August 7, 1953 (2 U. S. C., sec. 123), is repealed.

"(n) The Director of the House Recording Studio shall give bond to the Clerk of the House of Representatives with one or more sureties in the penal sum of $20,000, with condition for the faithful performance of his duties and the preservation and security of all property in his care. The Director of the Senate Recording Studio shall give bond to the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate with one or more sureties in the penal sum of $20,000, with condition for the faithful performance of his duties and the preservation and security of all property in his care.

"(o) Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section are hereby authorized to be appropriated."

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I submit and send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated for the benefit of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 26, in line 4, after "$932,600", it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "of which $650,000 shall be available for construction of a combined sanitary-storm water sewer extending from the additional Senate Office Building to the ex-

isting sewer crossing Constitution Avenue just west of New Jersey Avenue NW."

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the appropriation for this needed sewer is in the bill. Inadvertently we left out the specific language to provide the necessary authority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President——

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield to my friend the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. I should like to ask several questions of the Senator from Kentucky.

What amount does the appropriation bill carry for the Chaplain of the Senate?

Mr. CLEMENTS. The appropriation is the same as last year, namely, $5,000.

Mr. FREAR. What is the appropriation for the Chaplain of the House of Representatives?

Mr. CLEMENTS. According to my understanding, it is $7,447.

Mr. FREAR. Let me ask the Senator from Kentucky why he feels there should be such a difference.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I would say to my friend the Senator from Delaware that I would not think that any body had a more capable person to perform the duties of Chaplain than does the Senate of the United States. I could make a similar statement to my friend the Senator from Delaware about a number of other employees of the Senate. It was the judgment of both the subcommittee and the full committee that we were to relate salaries within our own body, rather than to relate the salaries in the Senate to what might be done in the other body. It was the feeling of the committee on which I served—and I concur in it fully—that the pay was adequate in view of the services.

I would say to my friend the Senator from Delaware that, in some instances, there are greater disparities between salaries paid in the House of Representatives and salaries paid in the Senate than the one the Senator from Delaware has mentioned.

Mr. FREAR. Would the Senator from Kentucky be inclined to accept an amendment to increase the appropriation for the salary of the Chaplain of the Senate to $7,450?

Mr. CLEMENTS. The chairman of the subcommittee and the manager of the bill on the floor of the Senate is not in a position to accept any amendment for any adjustment in salary. It would be my judgment that if I were to accept such an amendment on the basis of submitting it for consideration when the conferees meet, it would have little effect.

Mr. FREAR. I am inclined to disagree on that score with the Senator from Kentucky. I believe he is a very important person, and that if he accepted such an amendment, the conferees would go along with his acceptance of it.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I say that to my friend, the Senator from Delaware, for the reason that the members of the subcommittee and such members of the full committee who were in attendance went over this particular item. They compared the pay schedule of the House with the pay schedule of the Senate, and no voice was raised in objection to the conclusion that is expressed in the report and in the bill.

I am sure that my friend, the Senator from Delaware, knows that a substantial increase was made in the salary for this position when the policy was established, last year, to rate the position, rather than the individual; and I think the change was from approximately $3,000 to $5,000 at that time.

Mr. FREAR. I am sure the Senator from Kentucky is familiar with the duties and chores of the Chaplain of the Senate. I recognize readily, also, the accuracy of the statement the Senator from Kentucky has made; namely, that if we were to base the salary on the services of the present Chaplain of the Senate, the Senator from Kentucky probably would accept an amendment for an amount much larger than the one I may propose. I feel very confident of that.

At what time in connection with the consideration of this bill could such an amendment be offered, let me ask the Chair or the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. CLEMENTS. It is the understanding of the Senator from Kentucky that the bill is now open to amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; the bill is open to amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, let me inquire whether it is proposed that an increase be made merely because the House has provided a larger amount.

Mr. FREAR. Does the Senator from Louisiana ask why I would propose that an increase be made?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. Because there are more sessions of the Senate than there are sessions of the House of Representatives, during a particular session of Congress; and therefore the Chaplain of the Senate is required to attend a greater number of sessions than is the Chaplain of the House. I also believe that the Chaplain of the Senate is called upon to perform public service many times more than is the Chaplain of the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. What salary is provided in the bill?

Mr. CLEMENTS. The salary provided in the bill is $5,000, which is a $1,900 increase over the salary 2 years ago, and is $2,000 under the salary that is paid to the Chaplain of the House of Representatives, which was paid last year, and which is also provided for in the pending bill. But, as the Senator from Louisiana knows, that is true in many instances, as between the House and Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe some effort was made to increase the salaries of other officials serving us in the Senate, on the basis of the House paying a greater amount. I do not believe we ought to base the salaries of Senate officials upon that comparison.

Mr. CLEMENTS. As the Senator from Louisiana well knows, that subject was discussed before the full committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It was the judgment of the full committee that we should act on our own in evaluating the salaries of the employees of the Senate, and permit the House to act independently.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. I know that we discussed the subject at length. I do not think we should try to follow the House.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am glad to have the observation of my friend from Louisiana; and I heartily agree with him.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. FREAR. I hope the Senator from Louisiana did not draw any inference from what I said that I thought we had to follow the House procedure in determining salaries of the officers or employees of the two bodies of Congress. What I am trying to say—not very effectively, perhaps—is this: If a person is employed in the other body for a particular service, and his services are not required as many days as are those of the comparable person on this side, and if his outside demands are only 25 percent of those made upon our officer, I feel that we should give consideration to a change in the salary. I did not want the Senator to think that because the House was paying a certain amount, I thought the Senate should pay the same amount.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is not that the basis of the request? Is it not based upon the argument that, because the House pays $7,447, the Senate ought to pay its Chaplain $7,447?

Mr. FREAR. Is it a basis for argument.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the reason for advancing the argument.

Mr. FREAR. So far as I am personally concerned, the salary of the House Chaplain might have been less than the salary of the Chaplain of the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I will say to my friend from Delaware—and I wish to have the Senator from Louisiana hear the statement—that I believe the Senate Appropriations Committee would have taken the same salary action with respect to the Chaplain if the salary of the Chaplain in the House had been less than $5,000. If the salary in the House had been $3,000, I still think the Senate Committee on Appropriations would have recommended a salary of $5,000 for the Chaplain of the Senate.

Mr. FREAR. I must admit that I believe that is true.

Mr. CLEMENTS. There are a number of instances in the bill in which salaries on the Senate side are lower; and there are some which are higher than the salaries for comparable positions on the House side.

Mr. FREAR. The Senator from Kentucky certainly thinks the Senate employees deserve such salaries, and are worthy of them, or he would not have voted for them.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct. We endeavor to evaluate the job rather than the person.

Mr. FREAR. I do not wish to force the issue. I have heard the expression of the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Louisiana, and I think they are expressing the views of the Committee

on Appropriations. Sometimes the junior Senator from Delaware differs with the majority of the Senate, and his views are not adopted.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Does not that happen to all of us at times?

Mr. FREAR. I think the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Louisiana are very persuasive in their arguments and in debate on the floor of the Senate. Much of the legislation which they recommend is enacted, and I think rightfully so. I think it is very good legislation. I merely happen to disagree in this instance.

Mr. CLEMENTS. May I make an observation to my friend from Delaware?

Mr. FREAR. Certainly.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I, too, have a high regard for the Chaplain of the Senate. I do not think this body will at any time be served by a more capable person than the one who serves it today. It was our judgment in committee, and it is my judgment now, that the salary carried in the bill is adequate. It is certainly adequate in relation to other salaries.

Mr. FREAR. I know the high regard which the Senator from Kentucky has for the Chaplain, and I believe that if there were anything he could personally do for the Chaplain, he would leave no stone unturned.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Those who made the recommendation a year ago made the recommendation to reevaluate the job, on the basis of salary, from approximately $3,000 to $5,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I shall not press my amendment.

Will the Senator from Kentucky yield for another question?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FREAR. I refer to the language on page 21 of the bill, beginning on line 11. I believe that represents an increase for certain lieutenants on the police force employed by the District of Columbia.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I advise my friend from Delaware that that is the same salary as was carried in the appropriation bill last year. The only change is with respect to the chief. His salary was only $126 above that of the lieutenants under him. His salary was increased by $600, so as to provide a spread of a little more than $700.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment, if the Senator from Delaware will bear with me?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Am I to understand that the bill provides for a substantial increase for the policemen downtown, but nothing for the policemen on Capitol Hill?

Mr. CLEMENTS. It does not provide for any increase for policemen downtown. Does the Senator have reference to the $625 item?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That was in the bill last year. It represents no increase over the bill last year. This bill provides only for an increase to the deputy chief assigned to the Capitol. There was a difference of only a little more than $100 between his salary and the salary of the lieutenants under him.

Mr. McCARTHY. How about House bill 11473? Does that provide for an increase downtown? I am not objecting to any increase for the policemen downtown.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I have been handed certain figures with regard to starting salaries. The figures show that for the Metropolitan Police Department downtown, the starting figure is $4,193. For the Capitol police, the starting figure is $4,295.97.

The only change in the bill involving the police is that the chief of the Capitol Police received only a little more than $100 above what his two lieutenants received, and the bill carries an increase of $600, which the committee thought was justified on the basis of the responsibility which the chief of police has.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I impose further on the Senator?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I assure my friend that it is no imposition.

Mr. McCARTHY. It so happens that I am no authority on this subject. However, I understand that House bill 11473 increased the salaries of policemen downtown, which I think is a good idea. I believe they are underpaid.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I assure my friend from Wisconsin that the person who advised him was in error.

Mr. McCARTHY. I take the Senator's word for that.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky has said that there is no change in the salary so far as the deputy chief is concerned. Is that correct?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. That is with reference to the $600 item.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. Last year, when the District police lieutenants were given an increase in their salary, was the subject of raising the Capitol police lieutenants' salary discussed?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Am I to understand that the question involves the two lieutenants?

Mr. FREAR. I thought I understood the Senator from Kentucky to say a moment ago that during this fiscal year, which ends on June 30 of this year, the District police lieutenants are receiving $625 more than they received during the previous year.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator refers to the two District police lieutenants who are assigned to the Capitol Police force. Is that correct?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FREAR. At the time the two District police lieutenants were given an increase of $625 in their salary, was there any discussion had about increasing the salary of the lieutenants of the Capitol Police force?

Mr. CLEMENTS. At that time there was a bill pending before the appropriate committee of the Senate, which was considering that measure.

Mr. FREAR. What happened to that bill?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am not in a position to advise the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. Is the committee still considering the bill?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I think the bill is still being considered by that committee. At any rate, it is not before the Appropriations Committee, and it has not been reported to the Senate.

Mr. FREAR. That was a year ago. Is it still being considered? Is it not the opinion of the Senator from Kentucky that perhaps we ought to consider that matter in the pending appropriation bill?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Does the Senator refer to the appropriation for the Metropolitan Police Department?

Mr. FREAR. No; for the lieutenants on the Capitol Police force; so that their salary will correspond to the salary of the two lieutenants of the District Police Department.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It was certainly the judgment of the subcommittee that that was a matter which was still being considered by the appropriate committee of the Senate. Certainly it is a jurisdictional matter.

Mr. FREAR. I understand. So far as the chairman of the subcommittee understands, that bill is still being considered in committee?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. What is the difference in the duties of the Capitol Police and the Metropolitan Police, particularly with reference to the lieutenants?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I would say they are very much the same.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is the salary about the same?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I do not have the figures of the Metropolitan Police salaries.

Mr. FREAR. Does the Senator feel that the salary should be the same for the Capitol Police and for the Metropolitan Police?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I would take the same position with respect to that that I took with reference to salaries of employees of the House and employees of the Senate. I gave some figures a few moments ago which showed that the starting salaries of the two police departments are different. I believe they are matters which must be judged separately on their own merits, rather than being related to a consideration of what may be the case in different organizations.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator from Kentucky have in mind any plan for the future under which we could regulate the salaries paid to House employees and Senate employees and to the District and Capitol Police Departments, to bring them into some uniformity?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I would say to my good friend from South Carolina that I think it would be very advisable to do so. I believe it would be advisable to have a committee or a mechanism by which that could be done. However, I seriously doubt that it would be possible to get either the Senate or the House quickly to give up a prerogative which either House has taken to itself.

Does the Senator from Delaware have another question to ask?

Mr. FREAR. The Senator from Kentucky is very persuasive, and I shall not offer the amendment I had intended to offer with respect to the Capitol Police lieutenants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 11473) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE PLIGHT OF THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, for more than a year I have been attempting to impress upon the present administration the grave position the American textile industry has been placed in as a result of the State Department's concessions made to Japan at Geneva last year.

The negotiations, which were conducted in secrecy, when announced, received the most complete and vigorous protest from me and those interested in the welfare of the textile industry of America.

From that day forward the dangers of which I warned have become more and more realistic.

I have protested to the Agriculture Department, State Department, Commerce Department, and to the President. On each occasion I have received a different story, all implying that the administration plans to do nothing to bring relief to the textile industry.

We have all seen the reports of mills closing down, of thousands of textile workers being thrown out of work or put on curtailed schedules, and of reduced production schedules. In my own State one company has called off a multi-million-dollar expansion program. In each instance the industries, the workers, and everyone concerned has blamed the influx of cheap Japanese goods for the troubles besetting the textile industry.

I shall read a report of Japanese imports to the United States, drawn up by the textile industry. It is, as follows:

United States imports of cotton cloths and apparel from Japan have continued to increase at an alarming rate during the first quarter of 1956. Imports of cotton cloths, excluding velveteens, are now at the annual rate of 244 million square yards—which is an increase of almost 700 percent over total imports from Japan during 1953.

The imports of certain specific fabrics, predominantly those with high labor content, have increased in an even more drastic fashion during the past 3 years. Imports of cotton velveteens from Japan reached the staggering total of almost 6 million square yards during 1955—an increase of close to 2,000 percent over 1953. During the month of March alone imports of Japanese ginghams totaled 16 million square yards—almost three times as much gingham as was imported during the entire year of 1954. The current annual rate of gingham importations based on first-quarter shipments to the United States is 121 million square yards—an increase of 1,876 percent over 1954.

In addition to cotton cloths, United States imports of finished sheets and pillowcases from Japan increased 791,000 units in 1953 to almost 12 million units during 1955—an increase of 1,382 percent.

Just as fantastic have been imports of cotton wearing apparel, the bulk of which are cotton blouses and shirts, which jumped from a combined total of $1,315,200 during both 1953 and 1954 to an annual rate of $44,056,600 during 1955—an increase of more than 3,000 percent.

Examples of why imports from Japan are increasing at these astonishing rates is found by comparing the prices of some domestic and Japanese cotton fabrics. Japanese ginghams are selling in New York, duty paid, at 33¼ cents per yard, while it costs American mills 37½ cents per yard to make the same fabric. Japanese broadcloth sells in New York, duty paid, at 26 cents per yard, which is 4 cents below the cost of production in many American mills.

The invasion of the cotton textile market is only the start of what can be expected from Japan in the near future. Equipped with modern machinery and average hourly earnings of approximately 15 cents, the Japanese textile industry will soon be ready to export synthetic textile fabrics, as well as woolens and worsteds, at prices so far below the cost of manufacturing these fabrics in domestic mills that American producers will be completely unable to compete.

END TEXTILE INDUSTRY INFORMATION

The administration is either purposely or through ignorance conducting a confused program of promises and inaction while the American textile industry continues to slide into a very real depression of idle looms, idle goods, and idle employees.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson just last week made misleading and vague statements raising false hopes in the domestic textile industry that real relief was being promoted by the industry.

One day he gets the headlines with his false promise, and the next day he backs out of his promise with an unsensational retraction. I am referring to Benson's statement of last week in which he indicated a program of imposing import quota restrictions on Japanese goods was being drafted by the administration and the Secretary's later denial.

On the same day Mr. Benson was making his rather confused promise, I received a letter from Secretary of Commerce Weeks stating the administration planned to do nothing to bring relief to the American textile industry except to continue to depend on voluntary Japanese curtailment of imports to the United States and to try to extend exports from this country.

This is ridiculous. The Japanese are going to ship all they can sell us. It is stupid for the administration to render the American textile industry prostrate at the mercy of the Japanese industry's possible good nature or whims.

This mess of confusion is only further destroying the American textile industry. Between Mr. Dulles, Mr. Benson, and Mr. Weeks lie great chasms of inaction and confusion into which our entire textile industry is falling.

I have appealed to Mr. Benson, to the President, and to others in authority in the administration on several occasions, outlining the crisis confronting the industry. For more than a year I have cited rising unemployment in the industry, I have furnished authoritative figures, I have pointed out the closing down of mills, the curtailment of production, the rising flood of Japanese textile goods, and the ever-growing signs of a major depression within the textile industry. On every occasion the results of my appeals have been only replies that we must continue on the present course of submission to the mercy and whims of the Japanese industrialists such as Mr. Week's letter to me outlined.

There no longer is an impending crisis. The crisis is here, and it will become a tragedy in a very short time unless someone in the administration reverses this stupid policy of building up foreign industry and trade at the price of throwing thousands of Americans out of work and idling millions of dollars of American industry. These workers and mills clothed the United States and its armed services to win the war to protect our country from hordes of invading foreign soldiers. It is now the duty of our Government to protect these workers and this industry from the invading hordes of foreign textile goods. Anything short of this, in my way of reasoning, is comparable to that of a soldier lying down on the job in the battlefield.

The administration's policy amounts to saying that this Nation is so weak that we must sacrifice our people at home by destroying their jobs and their industries in order to win friends and influence people abroad.

Today a group of citizens from Chester, S. C., are in Washington to protest the GAAT treaty provisions and to request Secretary of State Dulles to secure a reversal of the tragic trend in the textile industry.

The group is here because the textile industry of their county, like the textile industry all over my State and the Nation, is in trouble and needs help. They are asking Mr. Dulles to apply textile import quotas against the influx of cheap Japanese goods. The group bears a petition having more than 5,000 signatures of Chester citizens protesting Japanese imports to America and a request that the State Department apply import quotas against the Japanese goods.

Frankly, with things as they are, I do not know what else can be done other than to have the entire industry and its friends rise up in arms and alarm the country of the impending disaster facing the industry as these good citizens from Chester in my State of South Carolina, are doing. Perhaps this will make responsible officials of the administration have a change in policy.

I urge every segment and relative of the American textile industry to do as these people have done, namely, to exert every effort and pressure possible upon the Eisenhower administration to bring about a uniform and definite program

of relief to the textile industry from the destruction it is surely facing.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the letter to Secretary Dulles from the Chester citizens accompanying the petition from the people of Chester bearing more than 5,000 signatures asking for help.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHESTER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Chester, S. C., June 16, 1956.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MR. SECRETARY: Over a period of several months, the citizens of textile areas have become increasingly alarmed because the Government's policy of importing Japanese textiles has had an unfortunate effect upon the sale of textiles produced in this country. Your import policy makes it possible for textile goods produced in Japan to be sold in retail stores in the United States at a much lower price than American goods. The American textile industry, generally, has been forced to reduce production, since American markets have been flooded with cheap Japanese goods.

The immediate effect of your tariff policy is, by reducing consumption of American textile goods, to deprive many persons of jobs and to decrease the work-hour week of those still employed in American textile plants.

As you should realize, the American workman has earned, and enjoyed, a relatively high standard of living. While it is to be regretted that the Japanese workman receives an extremely low rate of pay for his services, we do not feel that to be a sufficient justification for you to jeopardize the position formerly enjoyed by American citizens who are, or have been, employed in textile plants in the United States of America.

We are delivering to you a petition showing the sentiment of the citizens of Chester County toward your present tariff policy. This petition has been signed by approximately 5,000 citizens of our county. It is our hope that this petition will indicate to you our feeling concerning this grave situation.

We realize that you face many problems in adjusting our balances in world trade; but we do call to your attention the fact that you are dealing rather harshly with the textile industry and those whose livelihood is dependent upon the American cotton mill.

Yours respectfully,

W. T. WRENN,
President.

EFFECT OF TECHNOLOGICAL MARVELS OF THE AIR AGE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Science, Sickness, and Character," concerning President Eisenhower, and published in Life magazine of June 18, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The technological marvels of the air age are changing American society faster than the automobile changed it, faster than it has ever been changed before. The air age is playing hob with the tempo of life and even the sense of time. It has transformed not only war but world politics, bringing heads of distant states face to face overnight. It is changing our educational system, offering rewards to the man with a slide rule that give a feeling of obsolescence to the man with a knowledge of Greek. It is forcing us to face the imminent fact of flights to the moon.

All this and more the age of high technology of which aviation is just one striking example, is doing to us. But one thing it has not done, and never can. It has not diminished by one jot the value, the supreme importance of an individual and his character. This was never plainer than when President Eisenhower went to Walter Reed for his sudden operation last week.

There are probably at least 20,000 surgical operations in the United States every day. Every one of these personal crises, small or serious, radiates throughout the circle of the patient's friends and family and colleagues; life for a few, perhaps for hundreds or thousands, will not be the same if the operation fails. Every one of us, man, woman, or child, is a "key man" in that sense. And it is our character, gifts and personalities, and not our slide rules, drills, desks, or kitchens, that make this difference to the life around us. When the key man happens to be the President of the United States, this central importance of individual character comes home with a thud.

Eisenhower may or may not turn out to be one of our great Presidents. Some have been disappointed but Prof. Clinton Rossiter, in a book, The American Presidency, evaluates Eisenhower in what may be the middle of his service and makes an intriguing guess as to what history will say. History, says Rossiter, "usually prefers to ignore the President who promises peace rather than progress," but it "ought to make a special effort" to remember Eisenhower for having "done a job that the American people wanted to have done." This job was to heal our internal dissensions and give us external peace. He has so succeeded that "the country is basking in a climate of unity it has not enjoyed for 30 years or more."

Peace at home and abroad. "We were weary of reform in the one area and of adventure in the other. * * * Almost by definition, then, the times are the kind in which a President may win fame and gratitude but not immortality. Eisenhower has not been cut off completely from greatness by the nature of his times and mission, but he, like Theodore Roosevelt, must travel farther and faster in search of it. And as a gradualist in a time of gradualism, he has never really put his heart in the attempt."

Perhaps he has not. Perhaps he is too humble for that. But what he has done, and what nobody could have done so well, is to put his character, including its humility, at the service of our country's and the world's peace. That character is so honest, generous, and clear, and shines through a personality so winning, that he probably enjoys the confidence of more people than any man alive. One small testimony to that confidence: Although everybody is expressing an opinion on whether he should now reconsider his candidacy for a second term, none of these opinions will be firm until Eisenhower gives us his own, and most of us will probably be guided by that.

One of Eisenhower's good qualities as a President, says Rossiter, is his luck. Thank God for it, and here's hoping it stays with him through this unexpected setback. Even that may serve a good purpose if it reminds us how much we owe to Dwight Eisenhower's character, and how much even an age of scientific marvels depends on human character in all its forms.

PRODUCTION OF TUNGSTEN, ASBESTOS, FLUORSPAR, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3982) to provide for the maintenance of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the bill, S. 3982, provides for the maintenance of domestic production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum, all essential minerals important for the national defense and industry. It is a bill of the greatest importance in expanding our mobilization base and preventing widespread economic distress in mining areas all over the country. It is emergency legislation and was introduced as a result of extensive hearings attended by producers of the minerals and by representatives of the executive departments. The bill was reported favorably and unanimously from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with two amendments which are stated in the report on the bill, No. 2146.

The bill will help small domestic producers of these strategic minerals whose mines are shutting down and who are in a serious plight. If these mines are allowed to close, it will produce a bad unemployment situation in the areas involved; and the closing of the mines, in many instances, would mean the minerals contained therein would be lost forever as the cost of reopening the properties would be prohibitive.

The Government tungsten program has ended. Some 700 tungsten mines are affected, mostly small producers, and the workmen are now being laid off.

The asbestos purchase program also is completed, and if the program is not continued all the mines producing strategic iron-free spinning asbestos, important to the national defense, will have to close. Furthermore, these asbestos mines are the main support of the population of the San Carlos Apache Indian Reservation.

Fluorspar, one of the minerals included in the bill, is produced in Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Nevada, Illinois, Kentucky, New Hampshire, Montana, New Mexico, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. Colorado, Illinois, Kentucky, Montana, New Mexico, and Utah have the largest production records. Idaho, according to the Bureau of Mines, has extensive fluorspar reserves.

Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, in his testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, recommended that Congress pass legislation to continue the overmarket price purchase programs for tungsten and asbestos and establish one for acid-grade fluorspar. Assistant Secretary of the Interior Wormser concurred in Dr. Flemming's recommendation.

Dr. Flemming said, in part:

I have taken action necessary to insure the continuance of domestic purchase programs for six minerals under the authority of the Stock Piling Act or the Defense Production Act. These six minerals are: mica, muscovite bloc, and film; metallurgical manganese; metallurgical fluorspar, antimony; metallurgical chromite; and beryl.

Dr. Flemming further said:

I also recommend that in case of these minerals: chrysotile asbestos, acid-grade

fluorspar, and tungsten—for which all defense needs have been met, that the Congress pass such legislation and appropriate such funds as it deems necessary to provide interim assistance pending consideration by the Congress of a long range nondefense program.

The committee, after hearing from the Secretary of the Air Force of the necessity for using increasing quantities of columbium-tantalum in jet engine manufacture, included these minerals in the bill to stimulate the discovery of new domestic deposits. It may be noted that the Air Force has rescinded its directive limiting the use of columbium and tungsten. At present nearly all columbium-tantalum is imported.

The facts are stated in detail in Report No. 2146 accompanying S. 3982, and I feel sure that a study of them will convince the Senate that this legislation should be passed without delay.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been flooded with telegrams, letters, and petitions from producers of these minerals in the various sections of the Nation. As I have said, it is emergency legislation and has the approval of the Departments of the Government having jurisdiction in these matters.

Mr. President, I have received a number of letters and telegrams on this subject. While I shall not take the time to read all of them, I wish to call attention to excerpts from a few of them.

The first is a telegram from Dillon, Mont., in which we are urged as follows:

> We sincerely hope that the bill will receive immediate attention because the tungsten mining industry in this county which has given employment to approximately 100 men has been obliged to shut down pending further legislation. This has resulted in considerable hardship to the mine and mill men involved and has had widsespread adverse effect within the community.

The telegram is signed by the Beaverhead Chamber of Commerce.

Another telegram I have received is from Cowdrey, Colo., and reads as follows:

> We urge you to do all possible to enact Senate bill 3982. If fluorspar mines are forced to close for lack of market our miners and mill men will be idle thereby causing much hardship.

The telegram is signed by Fred Follett, president, United Mine Workers of America, Local Union No. 113701, District No. 50, Cowdrey, Colo.

Another telegram is from Rosiclare, Ill., and reads:

> This company and its employees plead for assistance to create an outlet for our fluorspar ore. Passing S. 3982 will help greatly at this critical time.

The telegram is signed "Hobe Mining Co., by Lowell Oxford, manager."

Another telegram I have received is from Eldorado, Ill. It reads:

> Our fluorspar mills are operating only part time due to unfair competition from imports and face complete and immediate shutdown unless can obtain relief such as can be granted by enactment of S. 3982.

The telegram is signed by Gill Montgomery, general manager, Fluorspar division, Minerva Oil Co.

I have another telegram from Bishop, Calif., addressed to me, which reads:

> Black Rock tungsten mines' 700 employees and families urge passage your bill 3982 to assure them continued employment.
>
> GEORGE F. REED,
> *Black Rock Mine.*

I have another telegram from Bishop, Calif., which reads:

> This community of 5,000 people is dependent on the continuation of tungsten mining in this area, and the people strongly urge passage of your bill 3982.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> WILLIS SMITH,
> *City Attorney, Bishop, Calif.*

I have, as I say, a large stack of telegrams, which I merely indicate for the RECORD. I only ask to have the excerpts which I have read printed in the RECORD.

The distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], who is a mining engineer, has made a very extensive study of this problem as chairman of the subcommittee on minerals. He has conducted extensive hearings throughout the country, and has made a long-time study of the problems involved. He will explain the bill further.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, before he yields the floor?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did I understand the Senator from Montana to say that the agencies of Government involved had recommended the enactment of the bill?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. Representatives of the agencies appeared before the committee and testified, namely, Dr. Flemming, and Mr. Wormser.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have before me the printed hearings. I am sure the Senator from Montana is correct, but I am unable to find such a recommendation. I am wondering where in these hearings it appears that Mr. Flemming recommended enactment of the legislation.

Mr. MURRAY. Throughout the testimony of Mr. Wormser and Dr. Flemming they made reference to the pending bill. In the statement I have just concluded I referred to the fact that they requested that we enact the legislation to protect the minerals I have mentioned. They referred to stockpiling of other minerals not included in this list, through authority they already had.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understand, there were several bills before the subcommittee on which hearings were being held simultaneously. Is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On page 17 of the hearings there is printed a letter from Mr. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, with reference to S. 3497, and I quote him:

> In view of the above, the enactment of S. 3497 would not appear to be necessary from the standpoint of defense.

Going now to page 18 of the same report, we find that Mr. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, in a letter dated April 19th, commented on another bill, S. 3486, and I quote from the letter:

> In view of the foregoing, we do not recommend enactment of S. 3486.

On the same page we find another letter from Mr. Flemming, addressed to the Senator from Montana, under date of April 19, this time commenting on S. 3485:

> In view of the foregoing, a defense justification cannot be established for extension of the termination date of the domestic purchase program and accordingly we do not recommend enactment of S. 3485.

Turning to page 128, we find another letter signed by Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director, this time addressed to the chairman of the committee, and commenting on S. 3499, in which letter he said:

> In view of our very satisfactory defense position in chrysotile asbestos, it is our opinion that there would be no defense justification for enactment of S. 3499.

On page 239 of the hearings we find another letter from Mr. Flemming commenting on another bill, S. 3455, in which he stated:

> Accordingly, we do not recommend enactment of S. 3455.

On page 240 of the hearings, in another letter addressed to the chairman of the committee, commenting on S. 3496, he stated:

> In view of the foregoing, it does not appear that there would be any defense justification for an antimony purchase program of the type proposed by S. 3496.

I cannot find where S. 3982, the bill presently before the Senate, is mentioned in the hearings.

Can you tell me of any letter from any agency approving this bill? It is my understanding that the agencies are all opposed to the bill, and the letters referred to all support this conclusion.

Can you refer to any letter showing differently?

Mr. MURRAY. All the letters the Senator from Delaware has been referring to were letters written several weeks before the bill was brought up for hearing. After we got in contact with these officials, they immediately began to recognize the need for the legislation, and in the testimony they gave before the committee they so stated. I refer to the statement made by Dr. Flemming——

Mr. WILLIAMS. They are in your report. Did he write a letter in behalf of S. 3982?

Mr. MURRAY. In the testimony of Arthur S. Flemming, which was given on May 24, and which starts at the bottom of page 310 of the hearings, it will be found that Dr. Flemming testified with reference to these minerals and approved the program we have recommended.

EXTENSION 1953 MALONE-ASPINALL ACT CRITICAL MATERIALS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will turn to page 2 of the report on S. 3982, Calendar No. 2169, he will find Dr. Arthur S. Flemming's—Director, Office of Defense Mobilization—testimony wherein he refers directly to the minerals he has continued to purchase under the Stockpiling Act. The report then reads:

> Dr. Flemming also told the committee:
> "I have taken action necessary to insure the continuance of domestic purchase pro-

grams for six minerals under the authority of the Stockpiling Act or the Defense Production Act. These six minerals are: mica, muscovite bloc, and film; metallurgical chromite, beryl; metallurgical manganese; metallurgical fluorspar and antimony. In the case of mercury a review will be made at a later date to ascertain whether there is any need for extension or intensification of the program."

Dr. Flemming also told the committee:

"I also recommend that in the case of three minerals: chrysotile asbestos, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten—for which all defense needs have been met, the Congress pass such legislation and appropriate such funds as it deems necessary to provide interim assistance pending consideration by the Congress of a long-range nondefense program."

As certain segments of the purchase programs have already expired and others will expire before the end of the time limit set by the Malone-Aspinall Act (Public Law 206), the committee feels that the passage of S. 3982 is a matter of considerable urgency and recommends early floor action.

If the Senator will yield further, I call further attention to the report on page 2, and read from it:

S. 3982 was introduced as a result of extensive hearings attended by producers of the minerals under discussion herein and by representatives of the executive departments. The terms of the bill as amended are in line with suggestions offered in testimony of both the Office of Defense Mobilization and Department of the Interior, and meet the immediate emergency needs of the producers of these four materials vital to the national economy and security.

The hearings covered seven critical minerals which have been acquired under the domestic purchase program; namely, asbestos, beryl, chromite, columbium-tantalum, manganese, mica, and tungsten. Purchase of these minerals was authorized under Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and on August 7, 1953, Public Law 206 (Malone-Aspinall Act) was approved extending the time limit for 2 years, or until quantity limitations were reached.

The programs have terminated for asbestos, columbite-tantalite, tungsten, and the manganese purchase depots at Deming, N. Mex., and Wenden, Ariz., due to the acquisition of the full quantity. The statutory termination dates for others are as follows:

Beryl	December 1956
Chromite	June 1957
Manganese: Butte-Philipsburg and carlot program	June 1958
Mercury	December 1957
Mica	June 1957

That is when Dr. Flemming recommended the passage of a bill such as Senate bill 3982, which the distinguished chairman of the committee has just described, as an interim program to continue until such time as a permanent program could be brought down by the President's Cabinet Committee. The President's Cabinet Committee is supposed to make recommendations later for permanent legislation.

Mr. MURRAY. I think the misunderstanding results from the fact that the Senator from Delaware has been reading from letters written several weeks before the hearings were held. But at the hearings we met with representatives of the agencies, and went into these matters thoroughly, and had their approval; and the bill is based on the understandings at which we arrived as a result of the hearings.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Some of the letters were prior to the date of the testimony on May 24. However, it is also a fact that included in the report now before the Senate are many letters from Mr. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, in which he takes exception to, and recommends against, each of the bills at that time before the committee.

Furthermore, on May 24, the bill now before the Senate was not before the subcommittee. The bill was not printed until June 4. I do not understand that Mr. Flemming has ever commented on Senate bill 3982. He recommended against the bills which were before the committee. The bill now before the Senate was not before the committee at the time of Mr. Flemming's testimony.

Mr. MURRAY. He recommended against it before he had given it the thorough study which was given to it during the course of the hearings.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How could he give thorough study to a bill which no one then had seen, and which was not printed until 2 weeks after he testified?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

CONFERENCES—COOPERATION WITH ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say that conferences were held with Mr. Flemming and with other officials of the administration; and as a result, the bill now before the Senate was introduced to conform.

Before the bill was introduced we heard from Mr. Flemming and from Mr. Wormser, the two spokesmen, presumably, for the White House and for the Department. Mr. Flemming did recommend—and again I read from the testimony, which was taken just before the committee acted:

I also recommend that in the case of three minerals—chrysotile asbestos, acid grade fluorspar, and tungsten—for which all defense needs have been met, the Congress pass such legislation and appropriate such funds as it deems necessary to provide interim assistance pending consideration by the Congress of a long-range nondefense program.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will yield, I should like to call attention to the fact that Mr. Flemming said we should pass such proposed legislation as Congress might deem necessary. But as I understand, he has not made any recommendations as Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Mr. MALONE. His testimony is clear as I have just read into the RECORD as he was talking in his official capacity. This is the recommendation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On that basis, Congress could pass a bill providing for only one ton.

Mr. MALONE. Yes, if Congress were silly enough to do that, which he evidently did not believe, and which I certainly did not believe.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But that would have his approval—judging from the testimony which has been received.

Mr. MALONE. I think he had more confidence in the Senate than that, and I certainly do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask again, Is there any testimony from any agency of the Government making a specific comment on Senate bill 3982? I do not say that no department has made such a comment, but no one has produced it. I simply ask whether any department of the Government has specifically commented on Senate bill 3982.

Mr. MALONE. They recommend the passage of "interim" legislation just as represented in price and amounts in this bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But all the recommendations were made prior to the introduction of Senate bill 3982, and they were against any such program.

Mr. MALONE. As a result of the letters, conferences were held; and later Mr. Flemming requested permission to come before the committee. I have just read his testimony, which is final and complete.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will yield, I should like to make a further comment to the senior Senator from Nevada. I think that if the Senator from Delaware will examine page 316, he will see the testimony of Mr. Flemming in regard to the three minerals which are included in the bill now before the Senate. Likewise, if the Senator from Delaware will examine page 335, he will see the testimony of Mr. Wormser, Assistant Secretary for Mineral Resources. In that testimony, he specifically outlines his recommendations to the committee. As a result of those recommendations and as a result of the hearings, the pending bill became the sense of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and was reported to the Senate by that committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Was the bill submitted to the departments after the bill was printed, and were the departments asked for their suggestions as to whether the amounts included in the bill were proper or whether the price set forth in the bill was proper? Was there any agreement that the changes set forth in the bill are needed or that the price called for by the bill would be a fair one?

Mr. BIBLE. The answer to that question is "Yes." If the Senator from Delaware will read the testimony of Mr. Wormser, on page 335, he will find a very definite and positive recommendation as to the three minerals alluded to by Mr. Flemming; and the Senator will also find that on the very able examination of the senior Senator from Nevada, each of the points to which the Senator from Delaware has referred was very definitely clear up.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The junior Senator from Nevada has just called attention to a certain page of the hearings wherein Mr. Wormser, the Assistant Secretary, made some comments allegedly supporting this proposed legislation. I should like to call attention to page 342 of the hearings, wherein is published a letter signed by Mr. F. E. Wormser, Assistant Secretary of the Interior. At that point Assistant Secretary Wormser testified before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs as to the viewpoint of the Department of the Interior and, presumably, his own viewpoint, as the Assistant Secretary in charge of mining operations. In his letter he said:

The Department of the Interior is of the opinion, therefore, that if it be the will of the Congress to provide such assistance to the tungsten-producing industry through a transition period, an extension and modification of the purchase program would be the most effective means of accomplishing this objective. We suggest that consideration be given in that event to a purchase program for a period of not more than 2 years, with purchases being limited to a total quantity of 1 million units and at a price of not to exceed $52.50 per unit. The quantities which could be delivered to the Government from any one mine should be limited in order to keep in being the broadest base of production.

My question is this: Assistant Secretary Wormser suggested that if it be the will of Congress, there be a continuation of the purchase program for tungsten; and he submitted three recommendations. Have any of those recommendations been incorporated in the pending bill?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; all of them have been. The bill was constructed on the basis of their testimony and their conferences with the committee.

If Senators will refer to page 354, they will find there the following colloquy:

Mr. WORMSER. I am talking about the domestic economy.

Senator MALONE. Then let our own producers compete on a basis of fair and reasonable competition in our own economy for the American market. That is all our people want. But you cannot do that with everything in charge of a Government official. You go into a long dissertation that you want something that is going to cut our producers down gradually. That is what is the matter with the Government today. We have a lot of people in Washington who, if they are here over 3 years, simply forget the producers and the taxpayers. I don't know why that is:

Now let us make a little more progress. As long as the price of the raw material does not mean anything in the cost of the end product—jet engines for example—are you satisfied with any price that this committee might fix between $52 and $55—you yourself?

Mr. WORMSER. I certainly would give it every consideration.

Senator MALONE. What do you mean by that? And how long will it take?

Mr. WORMSER. I personally would probably accept it, sir.

Senator MALONE. That is all I ask of you.

As a result of the give and take during the course of the hearings a bill was drafted which was satisfactory to the various agencies.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I am not questioning the action which was finally taken by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which the distinguished Senator from Montana is chairman. I merely inquire whether the recommendation of Assistant Secretary Wormser, submitted to the committee on May 24, suggesting a total quantity of 1 million units, was followed in the bill.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like very much to answer that question. The Senator is reading from a letter which was written prior to the testimony and prior to any conferences—and the testimony already in the record is clear that the change of position was affected.

Mr. DWORSHAK. What is the date of the letter?

LETTER PRIOR TO TESTIMONY

Mr. MALONE. The date of the letter is prior to his testimony. When he appeared before the committee he agreed with the price per unit and amounts to be purchased. I read from page 354 of the hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. We are making progress here.

Senator MALONE. It took quite a while. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

Now let us get to the amounts. I think the amount you recommended in the letter to the chairman was 1 million units; was it not?

Mr. WORMSER. Yes, sir.

Senator MALONE. The chairman, Senator BARRETT, and I, and I am sure others, have conferred and have heard testimony, and we feel—I say "we" but I will speak only for myself, because we are going into executive session after we get through with your testimony—we feel that perhaps 1 million units is not quite enough. I have discussed the matter with the proper people who suggest 1,250,000 might do the job. It might or might not be enough, but it would be a good start.

On the same basis would you personally be willing to accept the amount in units from 1,000,000 to 1,250,000 if this committee, after considering your testimony, Dr. Flemming's testimony yesterday, and all of the evidence we have before us, should arrive at that figure?

Mr. WORMSER. I certainly would not want to quibble about the amount that the committee decides in its own judgment it should be.

Senator MALONE. Personally, you think it would be all right?

Mr. WORMSER. I would have no objection to it.

Then we passed on to the next point raised in his letter—the testimony is revealing. The question of what minerals should be included in the bill—the price per unit and the amounts of each, together with the question of legislation was raised and disposed of by the Secretary—Wormser—by agreeing with the bill as written. The question of the price was raised and was covered in the same way.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Apparently, the letter submitted by Assistant Secretary Wormser on May 24, when he appeared before the subcommittee, should be repudiated and removed from the RECORD, because obviously he submitted three recommendations, not a single one of which was incorporated in the proposed legislation.

Mr. MALONE. He agreed with the legislation as written, as did Dr. Flemming. The new Secretary of the Interior said that he approved the bill as written. That was prior to the inclusion of the $63 price for producers under 1,000 units per year.

Mr. DWORSHAK. What about the next Secretary, who will be serving 5 years from now? Is his statement in the RECORD?

Mr. MALONE. Let him make his statement when the time comes. For 20 years, under one Secretary—Mr. Ickes—we had no tungsten in the United States.

We had no manganese—we had no petroleum. Now oil and tungsten is running out of our ears. Neither is in the strategic category.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Where is Secretary Seaton's statement?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Montana stated that the Secretary of the Interior was in favor of the bill and that it had been written in accordance with his recommendation. The letter to which the Senator from Idaho has referred was dated May 24 and was signed by Assistant Secretary Wormser. In that letter he recommended a quantity of 1 million tons, with a ceiling of $52.50, which recommendation was not adopted. That recommendation was presented on the same day when he gave the testimony to which reference has been made. I ask the Senator from Montana what recommendations was taken into consideration. I do not see where there is any report from any agency of the Government recommending this particular type of legislation. The committee has gone far beyond the 1 million tons recommended, and far beyond the recommended price. The letter of Mr. Wormser's, quoted by the Senator from Idaho, was presented to the committee on the same day he testified, and included in the record.

Mr. MURRAY. It is true that prior to the hearings certain representatives of the agencies did have some differences of opinion. But as a result of the discussions which took place in the committee hearings they changed their minds and went along with us. I never saw a more harmonious meeting with representatives of the Government since I have been here than this particular meeting. All the department representatives acted on a friendly basis. They were eager to agree upon a program which would protect these industries from being forced to shut down.

The need for this proposed legislation was recognized. Throughout their testimony, the departmental representatives seemed to agree with us as to the need for the legislation.

I read from page 354 of the hearings:

Mr. WORMSER. I am talking about the domestic economy.

Senator MALONE. Then let our own producers compete on a basis of fair and reasonable competition in our own economy for the American market.

Later in the hearings the Senator from Nevada said:

The chairman, Senator BARRETT, and I, and I am sure others, have conferred and have heard testimony, and we feel—I say

"we," but I will speak only for myself, because we are going into executive session after we get through with your testimony—we feel that perhaps 1 million units is not quite enough.

As a result of the lengthy hearing and the discussion back and forth between representatives of the Government and members of the committee, we arrived at a bill which appeared to be entirely satisfactory, and the departmental representatives agreed to take care of some metals under authority which they already had, and we limited the bill which we were to report merely to these four metals.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not question the accuracy of the Senator's statement, but I believe that those of us who were not on the committee and did not hear the statements should have the benefit of a letter from the Department recommending the bill. Every letter in the record indicates that the departments were not recommending the bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Those letters were all written long before the report was made, and long before the hearings were held.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Reference was made to the testimony on pages 342 and 343. If the Senator will turn to page 370, he will find another letter from Mr. Wormser commenting on the legislation. The letter is addressed to the Senator from Montana, as chairman of the committee. I quote from the second paragraph of the letter, on page 370:

We recommend that the bill not be enacted.

There are only a few more pages remaining in the printed hearings. Can the Senator show anything in the record which indicates that any agency of the Government recommended the proposed legislation?

Mr. MALONE. I just read the statements of the administration witnesses to the Senate—both agree.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am speaking of letters to the committee. I do not say that there are no such letters, but I am asking for one. A dozen letters say that the writers are against the bill.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. After the letter—by Mr. Wormser, Assistant Secretary of Interior—was written the writer of the letter changed his mind as a result of the hearings, and definitely stated that he did not favor a limitation, and definitely stated that he favored a price to be fixed between $52 and $55 on tungsten, for example. He also stated that he agreed to the figure of one and a quarter million units. Where else can we go? The testimony was subsequent to the writing of the letter, and is conclusive.

I do not know how far the Senator from Delaware wants to go, or whether he is merely looking for something to talk about. Can he not accept the word of the man who is Assistant Secretary of the Interior? I think it would be very easy to obtain confirmation over the telephone from the Secretary of the Interior that he is for the bill.

When his nomination was before the committee for consideration he was asked the definite question, and he said, "Yes; I am in favor of the bill" understanding that an amendment for small producers was added after he testified—but that is a small matter to which no objection has been raised.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be stated.

The amendments of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were, on page 2, line 9, after the word "unit", to insert "free on board mine: *Provided, however,* That for production from mines with an annual production which has not heretofore and does not exceed one thousand short ton units during any one year the price shall be $63 per short ton unit, free on board the mine."; on page 3, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "$57.50" and insert "$53", and in the same line, after the word "short", to strike out "ton" and insert "ton, free on board mine,", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956."

SEC. 2. The General Services Administration is hereby authorized and directed to establish and maintain—

(a) a program to purchase a minimum of 1,250,000 short ton units of tungsten trioxide (WO_3) contained in tungsten ores or concentrates mined subsequent to termination of the purchase program established under Public Law 206, which meet specifications set forth in General Services Administration regulations in effect on May 1, 1956, from mines located within the United States, its Territories, and possessions at a price of not less than $55 per short ton unit free on board mine: *Provided, however,* That for production from mines with an annual production which has not heretofore and does not exceed 1,000 short ton units during any one year the price shall be $63 per short ton unit, free on board the mine.

(b) a program to purchase nonferrous chrysotile asbestos from mines located within the United States, its Territories, and possessions meeting the same specifications and under the same regulations and at prices in effect on January 1, 1956, for purchases of this material by the General Services Administration under the authority of the Defense Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953, in the amount of 2,000 tons of crude No. 1 and crude No. 2 combined, and 2,000 tons of crude No. 3, excepting the crude No. 3 may be purchased only when offered with crude No. 1 or crude No. 2, or both, at a ratio of not in excess of 1 to 1.

(c) a program to purchase not less than 250,000 tons newly mined acid grade fluorspar containing not less than 97 percent CaF_2 at a price of $53 per short ton, free on board mine, from mines located within the United States, its Territories and possessions.

(d) a program to purchase columbium-tantalum from mines located within the United States, its Territories and possessions, meeting the same specifications, and under the regulations, and at prices in effect on December 1, 1955, for purchases of this material by the General Services Administration under the authority of the Defense Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953, in the amount of 250,000 pounds.

SEC. 3. All materials so purchased shall be held by the General Services Administration to be made available to the strategic stockpile or to be turned over to the supplemental stockpile created for strategic and critical materials in accordance with the provisions of the act of July 10, 1954 (Public Law 430, 83d Cong. (68 Stat. 454)).

SEC. 4. This act shall terminate on December 31, 1958.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, on many occasiones in the past I have fought shoulder to shoulder with the senior Senator from Nevada and other Senators from mining States in promoting legislation intended to stabilize the domestic mining industry. I regret that I cannot join forces now in support of the pending bill, as I am convinced that it is highly discriminatory, and instead of bulwarking even the tungsten segment of the industry will prove harmful because of its long-range implications.

More than 2 years ago a bipartisan senatorial group from the West initiated action to bring some relief through higher prices to our domestic mining industry. Various proposals were submitted, but it was difficult to concentrate on any particular policy. However, after several conferences at the White House they were successful in getting a stockpiling program as an emergency measure for various minerals. The President is deserving of commendation for the sympathetic interest displayed in bulwarking the mining industry as a vital part of our national preparedness program. Stockpiling of domestic minerals stimulated exploration and production so that considerable progress has been made in this important industry. The President also gave assurances 2 years ago that if stockpiling proved inadequate other policies would be formulated to bring stability to mining.

After extensive study the President's Cabinet Committee on Minerals Policy made some recommendations, including one that there be established an agency to develop a long-range program. One year ago the Office of Minerals Mobilization was established with an appropriation of $300,000 to undertake this planning. In February when the Appropriations Subcommittee held hearings on the Interior Department budget, Assistant Secretary Felix Wormser presented some pertinent observations and gave assurances that the Office of Minerals Mobilization would soon be prepared to make a report on minerals long-range planning.

As Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Dr. Arthur Flemming has testified on numerous occasions that his authority was contingent upon the stockpiling of strategic minerals required for the national defense. He has endeavored to draw a distinction between this stockpiling of strategic minerals and any policies designed primarily to stimulate domestic-minerals production through subsidies or other means. Although much of the data and information related to our stockpiling of minerals is classified, Dr. Flemming has been extremely cooperative and forthright in

his testimony before various Congressional committees.

Assistant Secretary Felix Wormser of the Department of Interior has also been cooperative and has continually recognized the need of administrative and legislative policies to stimulate domestic production as a source for replenishing exhausted stockpiles in time of war or emergency. On May 25, 1956, Assistant Secretary Wormser, testifying before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, declared:

> In my opinion, continuing Government subsidization of the mining of submarginal ores in peacetime will weaken rather than strengthen the domestic mining industry. Under our system of free enterprise, healthy competition stimulates rather than retards economic development. Should the Federal Government undertake to maintain over an extended period of time the domestic price for any mineral or metal at an artificially high level, the domestic producer runs the very real risk of permanent loss of his market outlets by the development and introduction of a cheaper substitute.

Now let us consider the pending bill which is designed to maintain the production of tungsten and three other minerals under a procurement program by the Federal Government at an estimated cost of more than $87 million.

The report accompanying this bill adroitly implies that this proposed legislation has the approval of various Federal agencies dealing with minerals programs. A year ago the President vetoed a similar bill which included the procurement of tungsten and six other minerals which had received Government assistance, first under the Defense Production Act of 1950 as amended, and subsequently under Public Law 206 of the 83d Congress. Involvement in the Korean war provided the initial stimulus but in the postwar years the program was so successful especially in the case of tungsten and manganese, the production goals were quickly achieved.

The report on this bill declares that the purchase of tungsten initiated August 1, 1952, and scheduled to continue until July 1, 1956, or until 3 million short-ton units had been delivered to the Government, has been most successful, although the cost of this effort on March 31, 1956, amounted to a total of $166,580,758, of which about one-third was in the nature of a subsidy based upon a price paid by the Government of about $63 as compared with the price for foreign tungsten in this country of $43. As a justification for this bill the report stresses the difficulty faced by the tungsten industry in meeting low-cost competition abroad. It is pointed out that wages of foreign producers are much less than the high wages paid in American mines. Certainly, it must be conceded that the same operating difficulties and high costs encountered by the tungsten producers are also faced by producers of all other minerals in this country.

A report submitted by the General Services Administration shows that domestic tungsten purchases in fiscal year 1952 totaled 16,048 short-ton units; in 1953 the total was 253,264 units; in 1954 purchases totaled 765,268 units; in 1955 purchases amounted to 895,448 short-ton units, while during 9 months of 1956 fiscal year the purchases totaled 722,300 units, or a total of 2,652,328 units.

Testimony of tungsten producers at a hearing several weeks ago before the Interior Committee in the Senate indicated that about 18 million pounds of tungsten, or approximately 900,000 short-ton units, were produced in the fiscal year 1955. This is about twice our normal consumption and it is most significant that every pound of this domestic production was sold to the Government for stockpiling, and that tungsten required by users in this country was purchased from foreign sources at much lower prices.

This was not only considered a most uneconomic development, but it is particularly indefensible when it is known that several of the large industrial users of this country produced tungsten in mines partially controlled by them to be sold to the Government while their own requirements were purchased at the lower world prices.

I have heard the senior Senator from Nevada state that continued Government purchases of domestic tungsten is essential for maintaining the production of small-mine operators. According to GSA records, a dozen of the largest producers account for approximately three-quarters of the total production.

Figures contained in a report submitted by GSA show that the 3 top producers of tungsten mine 45 percent of the total quantity of tungsten purchased by the Government, and that the 12 top producers furnish 77 percent of the tungsten purchased by the Government.

Therefore the pending bill is a bill to bail out the 700 small producers of tungsten. Oh, Mr. President, I join with my colleagues from the Western States, who must recognize that if the 12 top producers furnish 77 percent of the total tungsten purchased by the Government, the other 700 producers get a few crumbs when they sell a few short units of tungsten to the Federal Government.

The bill contains no restriction on the amounts of tungsten which may be sold to the Government under this subsidized program, and instead of insuring continued benefits for the small operator, it is obvious that if the rate of production of the past 2 years is continued the tungsten procurement program would probably last only another year. These producers have had 5 years to produce a stockpile which, according to Dr. Flemming, will take care of our wartime consumption for not less than 5 years, and will take care of normal peacetime requirements for 10 years.

Mr. President, foreign purchases of tungsten have cost almost twice as much as the domestic program with the result that the Government currently has approximately one-half billion dollars worth of tungsten in stockpile.

It is not classified information, because articles appear in newspapers and magazines frequently, and statements have been released downtown, to the effect that there is no justification for continuing a program based upon the requirements of national defense, notwithstanding what any person supporting the bill may say on the floor of the Senate, because the record shows that when we have 10 years stockpiling of tungsten there is little, if any, justification for the continuation of this program on the basis of our requirements for national defense.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did not Dr. Flemming say that in the event of all-out war we have enough tungsten to last us 5 years without the production of a single ton, domestic or foreign?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes; Dr. Flemming said exactly that.

Under such circumstances it is obvious that the sooner the domestic tungsten mining industry faces a realistic appraisal and readjusts its operations in line with domestic requirements the sooner there will be complete stability in this industry.

During the deliberations of the Interior Committee I have pointed out that there is little justification for highly discriminatory treatment for domestic tungsten at a time when other minerals have received little if any consideration from either the Congress or the executive department. To be specific, I should like to point to the production of antimony in the United States which is virtually nonexistent. Several years ago the mine at Stibnite, Idaho, produced some tungsten.

Four years ago this antimony operation at Stibnite was closed down and 300 miners and smelter employees were discharged. On June 5, 1956, a news dispatch in the Salt Lake (Utah) Tribune stated that the Bradley Mining Co. contracted to dismantle its crushing and concentrating plant at Stibnite which had a capacity of 2,500 tons daily. In the intervening 4 years it is noteworthy that all of the antimony purchased by the Government for the stockpile came from foreign sources and little has been done to make possible the production of antimony from domestic mines. Since 1952, efforts have been made constantly to convince the Federal authorities of the importance of maintaining antimony mines and mills on a defense mobilization basis, but these efforts have proved vain.

Idaho also has produced most of the cobalt from domestic sources at the Blackbird mine in south central Idaho. This mining operator, early in the Korean war, negotiated a contract to sell cobalt at the world price and although a second contract was negotiated at a slight bonus in order to insure the doubling of the output of cobalt at that mine, recent developments have nullified that second contract, with the result that the world price of cobalt has been the yardstick applied to this strategic mineral. Only a small percentage of our total requirements is being produced in this country.

So, Mr. President, from a national standpoint, it is entirely sound, economically, so the supporters of the bill contend, to add to the half-a-billion-dollar stockpile of tungsten owned by the Federal Government, and, at the same time, it is not justifiable to pay a single penny beyond the world price of $2.60 a pound

for cobalt to produce that strategic mineral in the United States. Why that discrimination?

Mr. President, it is most difficult for my State to understand why it is necessary to subsidize the production of tungsten far in excess of our normal requirements with a huge stockpile already available, while at the same time, a strategic mineral like cobalt is completely ignored and the Federal Government refuses to make any allowances which even partially will compensate for the much higher costs of production in this country as compared with foreign production of cobalt.

Obviously, Mr. President, when it is pointed out that the tungsten industry is competing with low-wage production abroad the same competition faces the producers of other strategic minerals in the United States.

I have already mentioned that the stockpiling program has proved quite effective, and prices of lead and zinc have been stabilized at price levels which make it possible for efficient producers to mine profitably. However, the producers of lead and zinc are likewise subjected to the same low-cost competition which is made the basis of this special legislation pending before the Senate to subsidize tungsten producers. I contend that all of the other minerals should receive the same equitable treatment as tungsten if we are to have any stability for domestic mining.

It is unfortunate that neither Congress nor the administration has recommended long-range policies for the domestic mining industry. However, such failure should not justify continued emergency, subsidized Federal programs for one mineral, of which we have an abundance. It is apparent that ODM, the Department of the Interior, and other related Federal agencies are fully aware of the purport of this bill. When we recall that the President vetoed a similar bill a year ago it is quite difficult to understand why there should be any intimation contained in the report on this bill that the administration is favorable to continued discriminatory treatment at a time when all-out efforts should be made to adopt long-range policies to bulwark the production of minerals as a vital part of our national preparedness.

When this bill was reported by the committee there was a general assumption that it would benefit the small producer of tungsten. In fact, one of the committee amendments would continue a higher price for the small operator with an annual production which does not exceed 1,000 short-ton units during any one year. However, without any restriction on large operators, it is conceivable that a few extremely large tungsten mines may continue to monopolize this program if continued, so that there will be extremely limited benefits for the high-cost small operator.

I recall that a few years ago potato growers produced potatoes to sell to Uncle Sam instead of for human consumption. We have also had recent debates showing that producers of some basic commodities under the farm program have been more interested in selling their products to the Government for storage instead of for human consumption. Now we face a similar situation where tungsten is produced excessively in this country for sale to the Federal Government while industrial consumers of tungsten, because of the price advantage, get their supplies from foreign sources.

Mr. President, surely real friends of the mining industry—and I include in that category my distinguished colleagues who serve with me on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—will recognize the need of becoming more realistic in dealing with tungsten and other minerals produced within the United States.

So in trying to serve and promote the best interests of the tungsten mining industry, which has been operating under a subsidized program for 5 years, we should assume a realistic attitude at this time. If the plan really is to aid the tungsten industry—and tungsten is important as an integral part of our national defense—then, instead of maintaining a subsidized program, such as the one which has been in effect for more than 5 years, let us give immediate consideration to the recommendations which have been made by the Department of the Interior and by Assistant Secretary Wormser that there be a gradual tapering off of the program, because certainly we do not want the uneconomic condition to continue whereby every pound or every short ton unit of tungsten purchased by the Government will go into the stockpile, instead of being made available at a fairly competitive price, so that the industrial users in the United States will condescend to display patriotism justifying the purchase of domestically produced tungsten instead of relying 100 percent upon the purchase of tungsten produced in foreign low-cost countries.

I do not for a moment think that the President, through his representatives, to whom reference was made earlier in the debate, has made any commitment that he will sign the bill. One year has passed since he vetoed a similar bill. Certainly if the bill were obnoxious at that time, I cannot understand why, a year later, the present bill should be less obnoxious.

I believe that just as the members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on both sides of the aisle, desire to render worthwhile service to the tungsten industry, so the President, Assistant Secretary Wormser, Dr. Flemming, and others in the executive department wish to do something constructive to maintain in this country a tungsten industry which will not be contingent entirely upon the stockpiling of every pound of tungsten which is produced. I challenge any member of the committee to justify that kind of approach, as we consider doing something worth while and constructive to maintain the important tungsten industry.

I think that both the large and the small producers of tungsten in the United States have performed outstanding service by demonstrating that they can produce tungsten, instead of forcing industrial users to rely entirely upon foreign-produced tungsten.

It has been said that probably the main reason for the bill is its political implications. I do not believe that to be so, because members of both parties, including members and nonmembers of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, have been cosponsors of the bill. It is beyond my comprehension to understand how any individual Member, whether he be a Republican or a Democrat, can make any political capital out of a continuance of the subsidized purchase of domestic tungsten.

I refer finally to the contentions which have been made frequently on the floor during the debate and on previous occasions when comparable programs for the benefit of small and submarginal producers have been under consideration. In view of the fact that Assistant Secretary Wormser suggested, not once, but several times, that a limit be placed in the bill, so that the large producers could not continue to sell ten twelve, fifteen, or eighteen thousand short-ton units of tungsten to the Federal Government each month at a 50 percent subsidy, I feel certain that the Senators in charge of the bill will be glad to accept the amendment which I now submit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 2, at the end of the line, it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided, however*, That no deliveries in excess of 5,000 short-ton units may be accepted by the General Services Administration from any one producer in any single calendar month."

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, it has not been a happy occasion for me to disagree with my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] with whom I have been engaged in many crusades and battles on behalf of the domestic mining industry. But I must confess that I am a realist, and that even in an election year I believe we shall be performing a disservice to the tungsten mining industry if we try to pass a bill which plainly shows that at this particular time it is not defensible as a part of the national defense program. If it is not related to the national defense, then certainly, I contend, we cannot justify continuing a 5-year-old subsidy program in behalf of a single specific mineral when we refuse to give any consideration to all other minerals which are in the same embarrassing position of competing with low-cost production abroad.

Mr. President, that is the situation which confronts us today. I certainly do not want to embarrass the President at this time, when he will be confronted with the necessity, probably, of vetoing a bill which is almost identical with the one he vetoed a year ago.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in view of the fact that Mr. Wormser has been mentioned in this connection, I should like to read from the testimony on page 355 of the hearings.

When I asked him why he mentioned a limitation in his letter I was under the impression that he had. But he said:

We did not suggest that.

I then said:

I am sorry. I thought you mentioned it in your letter.

So Mr. Wormser did not suggest a limitation, and testified that he would accept the bill as written.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I should like to take a moment or two to address a question to the chairman of the committee or to the Senator from Nevada. The first paragraph of the bill reads:

The General Services Administration is hereby authorized and directed to establish and maintain—

(a) a program to purchase a minimum of 1,250,000 short-ton units of tungsten trioxide (WO_3) contained in tungsten ores or concentrates mined subsequent to termination of the purchase program established under Public Law 206.

The question which occurs to me is this: The termination date of Public Law 206 is July 1, 1958. Certainly it is not intended that this program shall take effect after July 1, 1958, is it?

Mr. MALONE. It is intended that the program shall extend to December 31, 1958, from the expiration of the amounts to be purchased under the original 1953 Malone-Aspinall Act, which amounts were fulfilled a few weeks ago, just as is indicated in the bill.

Mr. BARRETT. The bill provides:

Subsequent to termination of the purchase program established under Public Law 206.

Mr. MALONE. I might add: or until the amounts authorized are purchased.

Mr. BARRETT. I am a little uncertain about the language on page 2, line 3, where reference is made to "subsequent to termination of the purchase program established under Public Law 206." The termination date set in that statute was extended to July 1, 1958. I want to make it abundantly clear that it is not intended to wait until July 1, 1958, to institute the program provided in the bill which is now being considered.

Mr. MALONE. Oh, no; not at all. In other words, it is retroactive simply because the amounts of tungsten authorized in the other bill have already been purchased. Some of the mines have already shut down. So if there are a few tons which have been produced between the fulfillment of the other program and the start of the proposed program, the bill is retroactive to that extent.

Mr. BARRETT. The committee contends and assumes that the program under Public Law 206, so far as tungsten is concerned, has been completed and fulfilled, and it is the intention to start a new program immediately. Is that correct?

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I think that is a correct statement. Public Law 206, so far as it relates to tungsten, is in the alternative. It expires either on July 1, 1958, or until 3 million units of tungsten have been procured. I would say to my good friend from Wyoming that the previous program of 3 million units has been reached. I think it was reached somewhere around the 20th of May.

Mr. MALONE. Two or three weeks ago. But this bill is designed to take up where the 1953 Malone-Aspinall Act left off.

Mr. BIBLE. Two or three weeks ago. So actually, as we construe it, the program under Public Law 206 has been completed.

Mr. BARRETT. If the bill is passed, its provisions will commence to run as of the date of the enactment of the bill until December 31, 1958, or until the full amount has been acquired. Is that correct?

Mr. BIBLE. That is a correct statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question at this point?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I understand the Senator from Montana is agreeable to accepting the amendment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]?

Mr. MURRAY. No. The committee considered that proposal. It did not seem to be in favor of any limitation of that kind.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator from Idaho would like to have a record vote on his amendment, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Senate is about to consider the mutual security bill and to make decisions of the highest importance to our foreign policy. I want to take this occasion to raise certain basic questions which relate to our mutual security program.

We are now in competition with an enemy who intends to shift the balance of world power in his favor, if he can. To deter the enemy from starting an all-out war, and to help defeat him if that deterrence fails, we require both air-atomic power and modern surface forces. These should be flexible enough to fight both nuclear or limited wars.

But, Mr. President, we could maintain a superior force-in-being, and still find the balance of power shifting against the free world.

In all probability, the Kremlin now hopes for a warless conquest. The Soviets continue to build the greatest military machine in their history. They would not hesitate to use it if the gains seem worth the costs. Our defense policy should be so designed that the costs are always too high to invite attack. Faced with such strength, the Soviets will doubtless prefer to inherit the world, if they can, rather than obliterate it.

Khrushchev states the matter this way:

We do not need war. We believe that communism will vanquish capitalism without war.

The Kremlin's center of interest is still Western Europe, notably the military-industrial potential of Germany. In time, Russian leaders hope to undermine the NATO alliance, win control of Germany and exclude us from vital overseas bases. But the first round in Western Europe has gone against them. Our historic ties with Europe gave us an edge there which communism has yet to overcome.

Adopting shrewd new techniques, the Kremlin has now turned its sights toward the billion peoples of Asia and Africa. Thus, the free world is confronted with an unprecedented threat.

What policies can the United States adopt to meet this challenge? Clearly, present policies no longer correspond with the demands of the situation.

We have emphasized military pacts, but SEATO and the Baghdad Pact are in deep trouble. We have pressed peoples to join us as allies, but the neutrals have refused. Our eagerness has bred suspicion. We have been generous with our aid, but we have won few friends. From Cairo to Calcutta across the broad sweep of the Afro-Asian arena we are clearly on the defensive.

Why are we doing so badly? Mr. President, I believe the major difficulty is our attitude—our approach to other peoples. We are plagued with the habit of applying the same formula to different peoples, without regard for the enormous diversity in their problems and objectives.

Take, for example, our attitude toward allies. We think of allies as people who should agree with us. We expect them to do what we want. We protest when they do not.

Yet, Mr. President, what is the net result of this drive for conformity? The net result is that we only alienate our best friends.

After all, our allies are independent nations. Each one of them has special interests. They recognize that their interests are best served by standing with us in defense of their independence. But they are, and should be, free to take stands which differ from ours on particular issues.

We need willing allies who sustain common policies because they agree with them. Such agreement is possible only on the basis of consensus, not dictation. Efforts on our part to pressure support not only delay agreement, but strengthen elements which oppose American policies.

We want allies. We think it to our best interests to join with other nations in common defense arrangements. But we want allies, not satellites.

As another example, take our attitude toward neutral nations. We think of neutrals as people who have gone astray. We do not always understand why they reject close ties with the free world.

I believe that many Asian leaders are too indifferent to the Communist threat. I believe that in many cases the interests of a neutral nation would be better served in formal alliance with free nations. But what happens, Mr. President, when we pressure them against their will? We simply drive them further away.

Americans are apt to forget the emotional and political drive behind what the uncommitted people call their "age of nationalism." We often consider the underdeveloped countries as mere pawns in the great power game, when, in actual fact, they have national interests and goals of their own.

We tend to overlook what these young nations are up against. At their stage of development, political stability and economic improvement are vital. Their leaders are under strong pressure to institute economic and social reforms. Even when they recognize the menace of communism, these other problems still loom large.

Men like Diem, of Vietnam, must get results or give way to more radical leadership. A nation like India, absorbed in its own domestic problems, tends to thrust major foreign issues out of sight. Most of these new nations prefer neutrality to the additional burdens of an alliance.

We must remember that neutrality is not an unusal phase in the development of young nations. It is an obvious step for countries which have just won their independence and which are trying to consolidate their position. Such nations are in no mood to accept what they think of as entangling alliances.

There is an obvious hazard where the naivete of soft neutrals leads them to overdependence on Communist offerings. But a hard neutrality which recognizes the full dangers of Russian tactics is not necessarily a disadvantage. Since these nations will clearly not join with us at this stage, perhaps our best course is to do what we can to help them be truly neutral. We need not be upset when Nehru or Sukarno tell us they do not intend to be pushed around—as long as they say the same thing to Peiping and Moscow, and can make it stick.

Instead of trying to mold other peoples in our own image, we should base our approach to them on the principles of the good politician. I need hardly remind the Senate that the good politician recognizes that different groups have diverse interests. He makes it his business to understand the state of mind of his constituents. He gets around to learn what people are thinking. He finds out what they want, and tries to help them reach their goals. Where possible, he strives to assist each group in pursuit of its objectives.

This should be our approach to other peoples, both neutrals and allies. We should try to understand and appreciate their special problems. We should help them achieve their national objectives, whenever those objectives do not conflict with ours.

After all, our national interests are served if our allies and the uncommitted peoples remain on this side of the Iron Curtain. We do not want any state which is now independent to fall victim either to internal subversion or to external aggression. Our objective is identical with what is the deepest concern of all independent states themselves—simply that they remain free and have a chance to progress.

This approach to other peoples has important implications for our entire foreign policy. Mr. President, I believe that if we took this approach seriously we could now develop appropriate overseas military and economic programs. certainly present programs will have to be revised.

Take a case in point—our military policies in the Asian area.

Our early success in Europe with the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance led us to believe that military pacts per se have an inherent value. But we have not succeeded in our attempt to make SEATO another NATO. Of the mainland Asian nations, only Thailand and Pakistan are members. The most important non-Communist power of the region, India, is hostile to SEATO and to all its works. There is no unified military command and no pooled strength. Nor is an attack against one SEATO member an attack against all—as in the case of NATO. SEATO, in reality, is an organizational skeleton defending a phantom line.

Perhaps in this region a multilateral pact is not an appropriate instrument. In this area bilateral agreements may be more effective in limiting local wars. Given the nature of the area, it could prove a serious mistake to so organize alliances that many nations would be obligated to respond to a local attack.

Even if it were decided that a multilateral pact might in principle be useful, the conditions in Asia are not favorable. Unlike Western Europe, there is no geographical cohesion, which almost of necessity makes an attack against one an attack against all. Committed states are intermixed with uncommitted states. No binding regional sentiment exists at this time.

We do not promote our objectives by pushing military pacts or aid on nations that are unprepared to handle them. Military aid should be given selectively in accordance with the capacity of the recipient to put it to good use. Actually, in Asia there are very few of these nations. Most of these countries do not have the industrial base to utilize and complement large amounts of aid.

Japan and the Philippines are advanced enough to support a small modern military establishment. Korea and Formosa are special cases—cases in which the ordeal of war made possible the creation of modern military forces. For the rest of Southeast Asia we would be foolish to expect substantial results, no matter how much military aid we might give. A nation like Cambodia, for example, lacks the capacity to make effective use of much military aid. In such cases we should concentrate on other forms of help.

At the same time, our programs for the training of native troops should be quietly continued wherever possible. In any event, competent troops and leaders can be utilized to maintain internal order. Even when it comes to native troops, however, we must not unduly press our allies where an effort would undermine their economy.

It is not in our interest to disrupt vulnerable nations by insisting on an excessive military effort. It would be preferable for us to increase our own air and ground forces as a deterrent in this region. Being realistic, we must recognize that for the present and for some time to come, we and our western allies will have to bear the chief burden of providing a deterrent force in Asia.

If we and our major allies must bear the chief burden, our first task is to reach closer agreement on our objectives in that area. We should reassess the contribution that each of us can make to a joint command. We must plan an intelligent and coordinated use of the available forces.

Above all, as I said earlier, the United States should maintain a superior force in being, to buy time for the countries of Asia and Africa to come to stand on their own feet.

Moreover, if we help the uncommitted peoples get what they want to fortify their stability and independence, we may succeed in cementing relations and building confidence in our leadership. There is, then, some chance that if and when the Kremlin openly moves to crush any one of them, even the most reluctant Asian leader will join us in a common defense effort.

Mr. President, I wish to mention another aspect of our foreign policy that needs a thorough review, namely, our entire economic aid program.

The United States is a well-to-do nation, blessed with abundance. The less fortunate peoples of the world now look to us for help in shaping a better life for them and their children. But giving aid is at best a difficult enterprise.

The grantor-grantee relationship has built-in hazards. Dependence on the help of others is bound to be frustrating, especially for self-respecting nations. Probably we cannot expect aid in itself to gain us friends. Our hope should be that it will help create more stable and effective nations, that can better maintain their independence. We should be content if our aid makes a useful contribution in this direction, even though it does not markedly improve our relations with other peoples.

But there is no good reason for our aid program to lose us friends; and that is just what is happening.

As it now operates, our aid program breeds wide suspicion of our motives. Recipients fear that we will use our aid as a lever to determine issues far removed from the specific purpose of the aid.

Some neutrals fear that even economic aid will compromise their neutrality. Some allies fear that we will use our aid to dominate them. We in the United States know that it is very difficult for a donor to exercise much influence, even if he wishes to do so. But fear that he might can be persistent and corroding.

I am now convinced that we must clarify the motive behind our aid program.

When we say we are giving aid only because of the Communist threat, we do not do our motives justice. The Russians are shrewd in this respect. For example, Moscow does not announce that it is aiding Burma in order to counter the threat of American imperialism. Soviet leaders simply tell Burma that because of Russian industrial prog-

ress they are now able to extend some friendly help.

It is true that the Soviet threat first aroused our country to the present programs of widespread economic assistance. But this threat should not be the sole motivating force. The recipients of our aid should know that we would share a portion of our abundance, whether or not there was a Soviet Union. They should know that we want to help make life less miserable for their peoples—that we want to be a good neighbor. Americans have always responded to distress signals everywhere in the world.

As we restate the motives behind our air program, we must keep in mind our fundamental objective of a more decent, prosperous, and peaceful world. That objective reflects the common interest of all free peoples. We can all benefit from world economic development and progress. Before long, our own expanding economy will need the untapped markets of countries like India, with her population of some 360 million people.

We cannot purchase a decent world by our aid program in any one year. This sort of world can come only in the long-run. But if each year's aid program is properly conceived and operated it can move us a step forward.

Once we are clear as to our own motivations, then questions arise as to the best way to handle the aid program so that our motives are understood. For it is now obvious to everyone that the present kind of aid program has not achieved this understanding.

The mutual security program was originally organized on the assumption that we were aiding military allies. The methods of asking for money, of giving money, and of judging projects were developed on this premise. These methods have been modified from year to year, but the result is a clumsy patchwork. At least two years have passed since it was perfectly clear that both military and economic aid must undergo a full reappraisal.

Yet again this year Congress is presented with a jumbled program along the old lines, adorned with the same old clichés. Frankly, it is not persuasive. No wonder the program has run into trouble here in Congress.

There are fundamental questions which the administration should have studied and raised with us long ago.

For example, should we separate technical assistance and economic development aid from military and defense support aid? If we took technical assistance and economic development aid entirely out of the context of the "military ally," even for allies themselves, the true nature of our motives might be more apparent.

Should we ask the South Asians to set up a regional economic agency, perhaps along the lines of the OEEC, with our participation? Such an organization might be given the responsibility for reviewing economic aid projects and for allocating available funds among the South Asian nations. Possibly the Colombo plan organization could be adapted to serve this purpose. By this kind of arrangement the doubt about our motives might be removed.

These are illustrations of basic issues which must be resolved. I do not mean to judge these matters here. We shall have to pass on this year's mutual security bill without the benefit of the basic study and recommendations which we need. I, for one, deeply regret this. I believe we should now put the executive branch on notice that we expect to be presented at the earliest possible time with a full study of the aid problem, and with recommendations based on that study.

In conclusion, let me say this: The approach I have suggested will not be easy for us. Both allies and neutrals will do much that is distasteful. They will form governments which dissatisfy many of us. They will talk back. They will vote against us in the United Nations. We shall have to learn to take many unhappy episodes in stride.

This is the price we must pay for a world in which our democratic institutions can prosper and be secure.

As military power piles up on each side of the Iron Curtain, the best we can expect is a military stalemate. In the nuclear age most things about the future are in doubt. But if increasing numbers of people move to the Soviet side, communism and not freedom can inherit the world.

We must hold our present allies. We must help uncommitted peoples acquire the strength to remain free. And we must help non-self-governing peoples who still struggle for liberation to find it in partnership with the free world. Let us never forget that the ranks of freedom include all free and independent peoples.

We must now call into play our best judgment and our commonsense to perfect our skills in dealing with other peoples. Upon these skills, as well as upon our military power, depend the future of America and its free institutions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First, I should like compliment the Senator from Washington upon his very fine and strong presentation of some of the problems which concern us today and which ought to have our very closest study and most serious consideration.

The Senator from Washington has performed an outstanding service in drawing the lines of distinction he has drawn in several different respects, namely, with reference to our leadership, our building of friends, our building of allies, our attitude toward the Communist world, our attitude toward the free peoples of the world, military aid, defense-support aid, economic aid, and all the other problems which sometimes, I believe, become confused in the thinking of all of us, certainly in the minds of most people who do not give the subject the careful thinking through which has been demonstrated by the Senator from Washington.

There is one point I should like particularly to make. The Committee on Foreign Relations a few minutes ago finished its work on this year's mutual security bill. That committee is in complete accord with the suggestion made by the distinguished Senator from Washington about the need for a thorough study and, most likely, a thorough reshaping of the whole program which is referred to as our foreign aid program.

I believe the Senator from Washington will be pleased to learn that immediately after reporting the foreign aid bill, by virtually a unanimous vote, the committee also reported a Senate resolution to provide for a study to be made by the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. We recognize it as our responsibility. Such a study will be made exclusive of the study which the executive branch ought to make. We feel that it is our responsibility to make such a study independently of any other study which may be made.

I hope—and I know the Senator from Washington also hopes, because he said so throughout his remarks—that before we are called upon to vote on another mutual security bill, or foreign aid bill, or whatever such a bill may be called, we may have a clearer delineation and a clearer picture and a clearer idea of the whole situation than we have had so far.

The Senator from Washington has made a very fine contribution in the presentation he has made to the Senate today. I compliment him and thank him for it.

Mr. JACKSON. I am very pleased to hear that the Committee on Foreign Relations will undertake such a study. I hope that the executive branch will present to Congress a more specific plan than it has given us up to now. I appreciate the very timely comment made by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, who has served so long and so faithfully as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to take this opportunity to compliment the Senator from Washington on a very able statement. I particularly like his view on the SEATO Pact, and the situation in Asia. That particular part of the world disturbs me perhaps more than any other.

The administration, probably as a result of momentum, has carried into that area, where conditions are not the same, the same idea that we had in connection with NATO. NATO has served a great purpose. I believe it has been very useful, and still is. However, I do not believe that SEATO has been so useful as has NATO, and, as the Senator from Washington pointed out, it has created some difficulties.

I believe that a restudy of the program, under the resolution submitted by the Senator from Montana, will go far toward clarifying that situation. As I understand, the Senator from Washington is strongly in favor of the purposes of that resolution. I certainly believe that he has performed a great service in clarifying many of these problems. We need such clarification very much in the Senate and throughout the country.

Mr. JACKSON. I appreciate the fine comments of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, who is likewise a ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to join my colleagues in complimenting the Senator from Washington on an extremely timely and good address. I hope the Senate and the American people will take to heart what he has said, because it is the result of a good deal of study and a fine comprehension.

I note that in his speech the Senator from Washington states that in time the Russian leaders hope to undermine the NATO alliance, win control of Germany, and exclude us from vital overseas bases.

I consider that to be a very pertinent statement, because I believe, and I am sure the Senator will agree with me, that the first aim of the Soviet Union, so far as America overseas is concerned, is to get us out of the bases which we have built, not in defense of Europe primarily, but in defense of the United States. Would the Senator say that the position which Germany occupies on the western end of the periphery is comparable to the position occupied by highly industrialized Japan on the eastern end of the periphery?

Mr. JACKSON. I think that is an excellent comparison.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If those two nations were to become a part of the Soviet Union, either directly or indirectly, then, indeed, the balance of world power would be turned against us. Is not that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. Western Europe is the workshop of the world, outside of the United States. In other words, Western Europe has the largest industrial plant of any area of the world except the United States. The Soviets would be able to shift industrial supremacy from the United States to the Soviet Union by acquiring Japan, Germany, and other Western European nations. Certainly, that is one of their long-range objectives.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator says in his speech that the first round in Western Europe has been against us, and favorable to the Soviet Union. Is it not true that it is not the first round that wins the final battle; it is the knockout punch that delivers the most devastating blow in the last round that is effective?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I gather that what the Senator is pointing out is that the fight is just beginning, and we have a long row to hoe and there will be many difficulties ahead of us in the years to come.

Mr. JACKSON. We have fought the first battle. We have still to win the war, to use a figure of speech. We hope, of course, that there will not be a war, as such.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Another important point which the Senator brings out is that the Kremlin has now turned its sights toward the people of Asia and Africa. That, I think, is extremely pertinent, because I know, after talking to the Senator, that he is well aware of the influence of the Bandung Conference, and because of that conference there has emerged the so-called Afro-Asian bloc which collectively forms a component of great strength which is becoming more and more significant.

The Senator is to be commended for bringing that aspect of the new situation to the attention of the American people.

Will the Senator permit another question?

Mr. JACKSON. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I note that in the Senator's speech he mentions the possibility of an executive commission or committee to investigate the foreign-aid program. I am extremely happy that the distinguished Senator from Alabama has given us the information that the Senate is going to investigate this program, so that before we vote on a program next year we shall have some exact knowledge concerning the objectives of the administration, because there is a great deal that we do not yet understand.

I think the Senator from Washington should know that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the chairman of the committee [Mr. GEORGE] have had a great deal to do with bringing this resolution into existence.

We look forward to having a great deal of needed information by the first of next year. Does the Senator think this particular proposal will be of greater value than would a committee set up and supervised by the executive department?

Mr. JACKSON. Knowing the fine talent we have on the Foreign Relations Committee, on both sides of the aisle, I think that committee can do the job if it receives proper support from the executive branch.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am sure it will receive the proper support.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington permit me to interrupt at this point?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Washington recalls, I am sure, as does the Senator from Montana, that on the eve of the enactment of the Marshall plan a very thorough study was made by a committee of the House of Representatives, known as the Herter committee.

Mr. JACKSON. They did an excellent job.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; but at the same time the executive branch likewise made a careful study of the program. I am sure both Senators would agree with me that it would be fine in the instant case to have the executive department make its own study and to carry it on contemporaneously with the study being made by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, in order that we might have both viewpoints.

Mr. JACKSON. I certainly wish to commend the Foreign Relations Committee for taking the lead in providing something which is absolutely indispensable to a proper aid program, whether it be economic or military aid.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield further?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Before I sit down I wish again to compliment the Senator for his very fine speech and again to express the hope that what he has said will be given full publicity for the benefit of the American people.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank my distinguished friend from Montana.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I notice in the early part of the Senator's address he states that the Soviets continue to build the greatest military machine in their history. I wonder if the Senator has seen the statement by the head of the CIA which implied that he had an evaluation of the Soviet equipment. Did the Senator see that statement?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; I saw it, and I was very sorry to see that the head of the CIA discussed a subject matter on a television program which he has said he would not discuss in public before a congressional committee.

Mr. ANDERSON. It certainly was my understanding that he did not wish to appear in an open session of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, but preferred to be heard in private. We now find that it is quite permissible to appear on television——

Mr. JACKSON. I should rather withhold final comment until we have received the complete text of his statement. If the news story is correct, it is most unfortunate that the head of the CIA should make a television statement of this kind. I think we should ask for a full and complete statement from Mr. Allen Dulles. Mr. Dulles has never made such a public statement heretofore.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to compliment the Senator from Washington on his very fine statement. I am glad he recognizes, after long hearings in which he has participated as chairman of the subcommittee, that the Russians are continuing to build the greatest military machine in history and one which causes concern to many of us.

I appreciate the fact that the Senator is alert to the possibilities, and I am glad he has taken the time this afternoon to make his very fine address.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I should like to say to the Senator that I am very grateful that he was thoughtful enough to give some of his colleagues a copy of the address he was to deliver this afternoon. That copy came to my office, and I had an opportunity to read it even before the noon hour, as I told the Senator earlier in the day.

I particularly compliment the Senator from Washington upon his analysis of the foreign policy of our country as it relates to the Far East. I think his analysis is deserving of the most careful and considerate attention, not only

on the part of Congress, including every Member of the Senate, but also of the executive branch of the Government.

I particularly note the Senator's discussion of the differences between NATO and SEATO. I think it is a most pertinent and, let me say, perceptive analysis of what those differences really are.

Furthermore, I believe the Senator from Washington has done a great service in pointing out what our motives are or should be. I was particularly impressed when the Senator said:

> I am now convinced that we must clarify the motives behind our aid program.
>
> When we say we are giving aid only because of the Communist threat, we do not do our motives justice.

The Senator is correct. There are some things we would do and should be doing even if Karl Marx had never been born, if Lenin had never lived, and if Stalin had never been in power. There are some things which the people want to do with respect to foreign aid which are very important.

So far as emphasis upon the military is concerned, the Senator from Washington has wisely pointed out that military assistance must be judged not only on the basis of our desire to assist, but also on the capacity and ability of the recipient country to be an effective military partner. The Senator has pointed this out very well.

In my opinion, so far as some of our military assistance is concerned, it is regrettable to note that we have within a region actually aroused antagonisms between nations which ought to be working in cooperation, rather than having fortified a group of nations against the Communist threat which is upon their borders.

The junior Senator from Washington has been very effective in his presentation of this matter. I shall not take any more of the time of the Senate to comment on it and on several other details, because I know there is other business to transact.

I join with my colleagues in commending and thanking the junior Senator from Washington, because the very philosophy he has discussed and the observations he has made have been of deep concern to some Senators who have spoken this afternoon in response to the address by the Senator from Washington. I concur in practically all the Senator has said in terms of his general point of view and of his recognition of the urgent necessity to reevaluate and reassess our foreign program.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], following the earlier comments by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], has brought to our attention the necessity of a review. That review will, we trust, soon be underway, because it is long overdue.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank my distinguished friend from Minnesota for his excellent comments.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have listened to the distinguished junior Senator from Washington with pride and approbation. His analysis is concise and yet penetrating. I congratulate him and express my own appreciation.

The junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, interrogated the able Senator from Washington about a press release or a newspaper article regarding the appearance of Mr. Allen Dulles, the head of the CIA, on a television quiz program. The junior Senator from Washington said he would like to reserve judgment until he saw the full text of the comments of Mr. Dulles. I will join the Senator in that statement and will ask him this question:

If it should appear, after we have received the full text of Mr. Dulles' comments, that he has made statements in public or has expressed sentiments in public which do not comport with what he and other members of his agency have said in a secret session, would not the Senator think it would then be necessary to have a public session and accord to Mr. Dulles an opportunity to express his views with respect to that matter?

Mr. JACKSON. I certainly agree with my distinguised colleague that if such were the case, Mr. Dulles should make a statement in a public session to explain fully the possible contradiction.

I noted in the second paragraph of a United Press article which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning the following statement attributed to Mr. Dulles:

> He also said he feels "quite sure" the Soviets "are not ahead of us" in developing atomic energy to create electric power despite the "very dramatic program announced recently in their sixth 5-year plan."

Then, from the first paragraph of the article, I read:

> Director Allen W. Dulles, of the Central Intelligence Agency, said yesterday he has "no evidence" that Russia is ahead of the United States in the field of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

If it is a fact that Mr. Dulles discussed the intercontinental ballistic missile and the atomic power development program in the Soviet Union with a Representative from New York on a television program, then he has an obligation, in my judgment, to explain these matters in a public session before the appropriate committees.

He has an obligation also to explain in public to the Armed Services Subcommittee investigating air power, his position with reference to the Soviet Union on the ICBM. He should also make a full explanation of the relative capabilities of the United States and the Soviet Union with respect to the IRBM, which is the intermediate range ballistic missile.

Mr. Dulles, according to the article, if it is true, has said something in public which comes as a great surprise to many of us. I assume my distinguished colleague from Tennessee agrees with me in that statement.

Mr. GORE. I do agree. I agree also with the Senator that we shall read with interest the full text of what the head of the CIA had to say publicly.

Mr. JACKSON. Even though the text as released may vary from the implication or the inference which is drawn from the article, if in fact the head of the Central Intelligence Agency discussed the ICBM and the atomic power program on a public television broadcast, he has an obligation to explain this to Congress.

What concerns me is not what was said, in so many words. What concerns me is that Mr. Dulles took the liberty to discuss these matters at all with one Member of Congress in a television broadcast, when he has always declined to discuss such matters publicly before congressional committees. I thought his past policy was sound. I do not think the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency should discuss matters of this kind in public.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Washington has just said what I was about to ask him, namely, if there is any question in his mind as to whether the head of a supersensitive agency, such as the Central Intelligence Agency, should be making public statements at all relating to the subject matter of his agency.

Mr. JACKSON. I do not feel he should.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 18, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 415. An act for the relief of Ernest B. Sanders; and

S. 2984. An act for the relief of Col. John A. O'Keefe.

PRODUCTION OF TUNGSTEN, ASBESTOS, FLUORSPAR, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3982) for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, unfortunately from my point of view, I was not present when the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] presented his amendment. I wish to say that I have heard from the mining people of my State, and they favor the Dworshak amendment, which would provide for a limitation upon the quantity of the mineral to be purchased from one company or one person. It seems to me that is absolutely essential in this program. The larger groups are not in the same position as the small producers. If the bill is intended to aid the small producers, then it should contain this limitation. I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, it is that the

Dworshak amendment is now before the Senate. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. I urge that Senators from the West or those who represent persons who are engaged in the mining business see to it that a fair bill is passed. I think it would be unfair if we made it possible for the larger groups, which have the productive capacity to produce at a much lower cost, to be given, in effect, a sort of bonus or subsidy, when it is not needed whatsoever, in order to create production for the stockpile. As I understand, the stockpile is practically completed, anyway. If we are going to keep the industry alive, the large producers do not need as much as do the smaller producers. A 5,000-ton limitation is a just one, and the amendment should be adopted. I urge the Senate so to vote.

NO LIMITATION ON PRODUCERS

Mr. MALONE. In answer to the Senator from Utah, I might say the limitation is not 5,000 tons, but 5,000 units.

However, there are two reasons why a limitation is not the best way to promote production, which was the intention of the 1953 Malone-Aspinall Act, which opened up the mines after they had been closed down as a result of the enactment of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

A price was fixed on the minerals, which in our judgment would make up the difference between the cheap labor costs in the chief competitive country and the higher standard of living labor cost in our country.

The 1953 Malone-Aspinall legislation proved that there was plenty of tungsten in this country.

We are now producing more tungsten than we use in the United States. So both Dr. Flemming and Mr. Wormser testified. Mr. Wormser agreed that the limitation was not necessary. He did not even suggest it in his first letter written previous to the time he appeared before the committee.

Dr. Flemming stated that an interim bill was needed to keep the industry going until such time as the Cabinet committee appointed by the President could come up with a permanent plan.

The two reasons why a limitation should not be placed in an intermediate bill are very simple. One is that some of the mills to which small producers sell are custom mills. If the bill was limited in the manner proposed, the small producer would be the first to suffer.

The second reason is that if we are trying to prove to people that there is tungsten in this country, no one will go into the mining business if his production is going to be limited.

By proceeding as we have, tungsten has been taken out of the critical material category. It is no longer a strategic material—since strategic and critical as applied to any product means that we cannot produce the necessary amounts in this Nation. We are now producing at twice the rate of consumption. For 20 years we bought tungsten, even from Korea, at three times the price which is being proposed. One of the reasons for protecting Korea as our source of supply was that our citizens were told that we could not produce it, therefore our boys had to go there to protect that source of supply. We do not need to obtain tungsten from anywhere in the world except the United States of America—and the 1953 Malone-Aspinall Act proved that fact to the American people.

The suggested interim legislation is for the purpose of keeping us that way.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Nevada has pointed out that we are producing large quantities of tungsten. The record shows we are producing as much tungsten as our annual requirements make necessary. What does the Senator from Nevada propose to do with the tremendous surplus production of tungsten, in view of the record that last year not a single ton of domestically produced tungsten went into industrial use in this country? Why would the Senator want more tungsten? What is the use of expanding the production of tungsten at a time when we are already stockpiling tungsten twice as rapidly as we can use it?

Mr. MALONE. This is exactly what the Senator from Nevada would do: He would have, as Dr. Flemming suggested, an interim bill to keep the mines open, until the President's Cabinet Committee can formulate a permanent plan. Keep the mines running, so that we may know we shall not be dependent on Burma, China, and South Africa for tungsten, in case of war.

The reason why we are not using for industrial purposes any of the tungsten produced in the United States is that there is no duty on tungsten and nothing to equalize the difference between the labor cost of production in this country and in the chief competitive nation. Wages are 50 cents a day in South Africa, they are a dollar a day in Burma, they are $3 a day in Mexico. As long as there is no flexible duty or tariff to take the profit out of cheap foreign wages at the water's edge or at the boundary of our Nation—then we must have a guaranteed unit price making up the difference in wages here and abroad or go back to depending upon foreign nations for a material which we cannot fight without.

It was shown that, under the Malone-Aspinall Act, tungsten could be produced here in the United States for war or peace. It was not necessary to import a part of it. All American producers needed was enough above the world price to make the difference in wages—of course, unless there is a duty making up the difference the American production would be sold to the Government, and then the consumption would be bought at the $43 a unit world price, and used at Pittsburgh and steel plants in other parts of the country. All that needs to be done is to follow through and equalize the cost of production through a duty at the water's edge.

First, let us wait until the Cabinet committee proposes its best plan. But do not close the mines, keep them open through this interim bill as suggested by Dr. Flemming. For 23 years it was claimed that there was no tungsten in the United States; that we had to get it from Korea, at 3 or 4 times the price we are paying now. If personnel and munitions were counted into the cost or if the same should be done from other places, the cost would be incalculable.

We were sold a phony bill of goods, to start with, by persons who said that tungsten could not be produced in the United States.

So all that was accomplished by the bill which passed in 1953—all that we sought to accomplish was to prove that it was not necessary to have tungsten included in the critical or strategic list—that American producers could furnish it at a price above the market price making up the difference in wages and the cost of doing business here and abroad.

Manganese can be produced from the Cayuna Range in Minnesota. From developments taking place from laboratory experiments, it has been proved that we can now produce all the manganese we need in the United States.

Mr. President, all we have to do is to use our heads and to realize that the difference in wages must be made up. There are two ways to do that. One is by the use of the provisions of the Malone-Aspinall Act of 1953, as is presently proposed, until a better plan is proposed by the President's Cabinet committee; or a flexible duty can be placed on imports, by the exercise by the United States Congress of the power and duty which the Constitution gave it, and letting the Tariff Commission adjust such flexible duty to make up the difference between labor costs in this country and in the chief competitive nation. Then the people of this Nation would compete for the American product, and the price would automatically go up.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

CONGRESS REGAINS ITS RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator from Nevada have any suggestion to indicate that the industrial users of tungsten will be willing to pay $63 a short ton unit instead of buying foreign tungsten at a cost of about $41 or $43 a unit? Does he have any suggestion as to how we can get the cooperation of the industrial users?

Mr. MALONE. Yes; I most certainly do. The suggestion is that the Congress of the United States take back its responsibility as contained in article I, section 8, of the Constitution, to regulate foreign trade and the national economy. Let Congress discharge its responsibility to the people of the United States, at least as to minerals without which jet engines cannot be manufactured. Most of our manganese comes from India.

Most of the tungsten comes from Korea, South Africa, and Mexico. Right now it does not come from China, because the Reds will not let us have it—but it comes from South Africa and other places not available in wartime. We could not get a pound of tungsten from across an ocean if war should start. I say if Congress regained its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade and our national economy—and let

its agent, the Tariff Commission, adjust the flexible duty or tariff to take the profit out of low-cost labor at the water's edge, domestic production would take care of all our needs in this indispensable mineral.

To answer specifically the question of the Senator from Idaho, Americans would compete for the American market under that system—and the less efficient would be eliminated which is the true American system—but the American producer paying $11 per day would not be competing with $1 or less per day labor for the American market. The cost of the mineral, whether $43 or $55 per unit, is not an item, because you cannot find the difference in a jet engine. It is like the soda in the biscuits—no difference in the price of the biscuits no matter what you pay for the soda—there is so little used.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield further?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Since coming to this body in 1946, the senior Senator from Nevada has been most aggressive and persistent in his efforts to promote a program to provide some protection and safeguards for American industry as against low-cost competition by foreign producers.

Mr. MALONE. That is correct. We are dividing our wealth by dividing our markets with low-wage nations.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Has the Senator from Nevada made any progress in those 10 years, and does he anticipate that the industrial users of tungsten will, within a few weeks, say that out of the bigness of their patriotic hearts they will be willing to pay $63 a short ton, instead of $43?

Mr. MALONE. Which question does my colleague wish me to answer first? If it does not matter to him, I shall answer at this time his first question.

If the United States Congress has the courage to take back its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign commerce and the national economy—there would be no problem since the flexible duty or tariff adjusted by the Tariff Commission would take the profit out of the "sweatshop" wages at the water's edge. In this connection I do not refer to tungsten alone; I also refer to textiles, machine tools and hundreds of other American products. In the South and in the New England States the textile industry is closing down. Hundreds of other United States industries are in a similar situation. A flexible duty or tariff adjusted by the Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress, would take the profit out of "sweatshop" labor at the water's edge. Let the American producers compete for the American market. Let us at least produce the commodities without which we cannot win a war.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield further to me?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Nevada knows that on many occasions in the past I have joined with him in trying to obtain congressional approval of proposed legislation to accomplish the purposes he has just outlined.

Mr. MALONE. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Idaho that we are going to get it, although I do not know how long it will take. I believe that within a reasonable time the workingmen of America will tell their women folks to look for the American made mark before they lay their money down, when they finally realize that their jobs are at stake.

Mr. DWORSHAK. On many occasions I have joined the Senator from Nevada in trying to safeguard American industry. I should like to ask him if it would not be more logical, and have greater chances of success, to apply this program of tariff protection in such a way as to affect all products being imported, rather than to single out one specific mineral, such as tungsten, and provide for taking care of it, to the exclusion of everything else.

Mr. MALONE. I have never advocated taking care of one commodity. I beg the pardon of the distinguished Senator from Idaho, but I have never in my life said that, and I am not saying it now.

I am simply saying that for 20 years the Department of the Interior took the position that there was no tungsten in the United States and there was no manganese in the United States. In fact, one Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, even said there was no oil in the United States.

He died, thinking that in the United States there was no tungsten, manganese, or oil.

However, today we have oil and tungsten running out of our ears; and we shall have enough manganese to run out of our ears if we make adjustments for the difference between the labor costs and the standard of living in the United States and those in India, from which we get most of our manganese.

So today we are saying, "Do not close down the mines that have opened up on the basis of this program since only the difference between the price of $55 a ton and the price of $43 a ton is to be paid.

Let me say that we are fixing the price per unit based on the difference between the cost of producing tungsten in the United States and the cost of producing tungsten in foreign countries.

The difference in the cost of a pound of steel or in the price of a jet engine, in terms of money between the fixed domestic price and the foreign price is nothing. We are talking about protecting the people of the United States and maintaining their safety and the economic stability of our communities by making it possible to obtain strategic materials which cannot be imported after a war begins.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield further to me?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. In the Senator's great State of Nevada there are not only tungsten mines but also mines which produce copper, lead, zinc, manganese, and many other critical and strategic materials and minerals. Why would not it be logical for us to take some remedial action which would give equitable treatment to the producers of all these minerals, instead of picking out only one mineral, such as tungsten?

Mr. MALONE. I think that would be the logical thing to do. The point at the moment is that we were told that we had no tungsten and that we did not have any of these other materials. But we are saying that we do have them and the program proved it.

Here on the floor of the Senate, Senators voted in favor of free trade and in favor of $2 labor imports from foreign countries, as opposed to $15 labor in the United States. So long as Senators do that, and so long as the Congress votes to send their constitutional responsibilities to the President of the United States, instead of in the Congress, where the Constitution put it, we shall be in serious difficulty. Furthermore, the Congress gave the President full power to place the authority wherever he might choose. So he could place it in Geneva, Switzerland, in the hands of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; or he could give that power to any organization in any country he might choose.

In fact, the President is now at liberty to send it to an organization in Moscow or to an organization in Peking. I am not saying that the President would do that, but Congress has given him the authority to do so if he wishes.

Congress, whom the Constitution charges with the responsibility to regulate foreign trade and the national economy, is as helpless as a baby.

It is their own doing through the passage of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—and extended for 3 years in 1955. The Congress gave that authority to the President. The people should and will insist that they take it back.

This bill simply keeps these mines open until a plan can be submitted to Congress by the President's Cabinet Committee better than the one on the floor today. But to limit the purchases for any one producer would be to say to those who have money to invest, "Yes, you can be a small producer, but not a large producer. We will not permit customs mills to be established." The small producers would be the first to be cut off.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. In answer to what the Senator from Nevada just said, I merely wish to point out that the membership of the Mining Association of Utah have been very strong in their advocacy of tariffs, just as the Senator from Nevada has been. However, as I view this program, it does not relate to the tariff commission. The program began as a stockpiling program to secure for the United States a supply of tungsten produced domestically. The program has fairly well accomplished that purpose.

Now it is proposed that the program be extended for a time, so as to help those who need employment. My opinion is that the large groups do not need such assistance, and I think that view is taken by my constituents who are miners, many of whom have been in the mining

business on a large scale for many years. That is their opinion, and I have great respect for their opinion on a subject of this kind.

This is not a tariff measure, and we cannot legislate tariffs in this way. That is one reason why I urge, with all the earnestness I possess, that the the Senate adopt this amendment. There will be a good many red faces if we permit the big producers, who can produce at a much lower rate than is fixed in the bill, to receive the benefit of the proposed legislation when they do not need it to remain in production.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in answer to the argument of the Senator from Utah, let me say that the Mining Association in Nevada is against any limitation, which means nothing except that there is a difference of opinion as between the two mining associations with regard to the amount which should be produced by one company—the size to which they would be allowed to grow.

I point out that the mills which act as custom mills for the small producers—the small producers would be cut off first if there were a limitation.

We are trying to show, and we have so far shown, that we need not consider tungsten as a critical material at all; but to keep people in that business, there must not be a limitation as to how big a producer can become if he is willing to put his money into the business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Barrett	Humphrey	Millikin
Bender	Jackson	Mundt
Bennett	Jenner	Murray
Bible	Johnson, Tex.	Neuberger
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Clements	Kefauver	Payne
Cotton	Kennedy	Potter
Curtis	Kerr	Robertson
Dirksen	Knowland	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kuchel	Scott
Dworshak	Laird	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Langer	Sparkman
Frear	Lehman	Stennis
Fulbright	Long	Symington
Gore	Malone	Thye
Green	Mansfield	Watkins
Hayden	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Hill	Martin, Pa.	
Holland	McClellan	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announced that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. WOFFORD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER and Mr. BEALL], the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH and Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the wedding of his daughter.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, this subject has been debated sufficiently this afternoon, and I shall not delay the Senate. However, I should like to read into the RECORD at this point a short telegram which I received from the Utah Mining Association. It is dated June 14, 1956, and is addressed to me. It reads as follows:

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *June 13, 1956.*

Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Have talked with Utah operators about tungsten bill being discussed Senate floor today and find they favor 5,000 units per month limitation on receipts from any one mine which proposal understand Senator DWORSHAK plans offer as amendment today. Reasons for this position are: (1) The limitation would prevent any large producer from filling major portion of quantity provided in bill should any such producer be inclined to do so; (2) production of any company in excess of 5,000 unit limitation would seek industrial market, thus establishing trend for ultimate marketing of domestic tungsten on industrial market; (3) no small producers would be hurt by limitation and large producers would be encouraged to recapture domestic outlets, present being filled entirely for foreign tungsten. Thanking you for consideration.

MILES P. ROMNEY.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator know the approximate cost of the 2½-year program.

Mr. BENNETT. The junior Senator from Utah does not have any specific information on the subject. I understand that it is something like $70 million.

Mr. WATKINS. I have the report here. It is estimated to cost $69,670,000. So, it is not unlimited, and the argument made by the Utah Mining Association that the larger producers could use up practically all the money set aside for this program and the small producers would get very little of it is probably valid.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the reason for supporting the proposal that the amount which any single producer could sell to the program would be limited to 5,000 short-ton units a month.

Mr. WATKINS. The small producers, under this amendment, would be protected; is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. That is my understanding.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield for a question?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the senior Senator from Utah if it is not true that the committee amendment already contains a provision for paying the producers?

Mr. WATKINS. I am not on the committee. I am not familiar with all the amendments which have been placed in the bill. I know this one amendment is needed.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will yield further, my understanding is that the bill contains a rate of $55 for the large producers, $63 for the small producers, and that the purpose is to give needed assistance to the small producers. As I understand the pending amendment, it proposes to limit the production of the large producers so as to handicap them in their operations.

Mr. WATKINS. The money may be used up, under the terms of the bill, by the large producers, and there would be very little of it going to the small producers.

I am not very well informed on this particular bill, because I have not been serving on the subcommittee which prepared it, but I am advised by the Utah Mining Association that there is a classification in the bill itself as to the amounts to be paid to the large producers and to the small producers. But the large producers could receive during the 9-month period the major portion of the money to be allotted to the program. It is not an unlimited program.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is my understanding that it is an interim program to allow Congress to determine a permanent program. As I read the report and the hearings, there is already made, by committee amendment, an adequate allowance by way of a preferential price to the small producers who produce less than a thousand tons a year. There is no mining of any of these products in my own State. I simply want to be fair about it. It seems to me that the amendment offered by the Senator from

Idaho questions the wisdom of the decision of the committee, which was that this differential would be adequate to protect the small producer, and it seeks to impose a limitation on the production of the large producers which would so cripple them that they would not remain in business.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I should like to clear up this misunderstanding. Under the present program, 3 top producers get 45 percent of the tungsten sales, and 12 top producers get 77 percent. They would be restricted to 5,000 short tons a month.

When the Senator from Florida asks whether there are any inequitable restrictions or restraints placed upon the large producers, I would say, "No"; they would merely be limited to selling for stockpiling purposes 5,000 short tons a month, but if they produce 2 or 3 times that amount, certainly they would be free to sell in excess of 5,000 short tons to industrial users. Currently, they receive a 50 percent subsidy, and so they prefer to sell their output to the Government. Certainly, there is nothing inequitable about the proposal in the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that the amendment would provide a 5,000 short-ton unit limitation on the large producers, and would also provide that the price allowed them would be $55 per unit, whereas in the case of the small producers the committee amendment allows them a price of $63 for the same unit?

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is not my amendment. In order to qualify for the price being currently paid of $63 the producers would have to sell less than 1,000 short-ton units to the Government. One thousand short-ton units annually is certainly different from 60,000 short-ton units.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield further?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry the distinguished Senator from Idaho did not answer my question. I ask it again.

Is it not true that under his amendment the large producer would be limited to 5,000 short-ton units a month, and also, at the same time, be limited under other provisions of the bill, to $55?

Mr. DWORSHAK. The answer is, "Yes," but the large producer could sell any of his production in excess of 5,000 short-ton units to industrial users at $41 or $43. Certainly, the Senator would not contend that the Federal Government is obligated to continue to pay almost a 50 percent subsidy when it already has a peacetime stockpile adequate to take care of our requirements for 10 years.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no contention either for the large producer or the small producer. I merely want to be fair. But if the Senator reads the committee report accurately, and also the bill and the amendment, he will see that the deliberate judgment of the committee has been that we have made adequate allowance for the economic difference between the large and the small producers. But now the Senator from Idaho seems to place an additional handicap upon the larger and more successful operators. I would rather stand by the judgment of the committee on that than to shoot out into the dark and seek to impose an additional handicap which the Senator, coming from a State which has only small producers, seeks to apply by his amendment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Florida is taking an indefensible position when he suggests that the Senator from Idaho is trying to protect the small producers in his own State. We have very few small producers. We have one large producer. But I wish to point out that we are not rendering constructive service to the tungsten mining industry when we continue the Government program to maintain a price 50 percent above the world price level, when we already have a stockpile amounting to half a billion dollars.

I am not trying to discriminate against either the large or the small producers, but when the small producer is limited to $63 for an annual production of 1,000 short-ton units, it is certainly feasible and fair to restrict the large producer to 60,000 short-ton units. Even if his price is less than that currently paid, it would be approximately $12 to $14 above the competitive world price.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield that I may ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the Dworshak amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, before the vote, I ask unanimous consent that the veto message of the President dated August 14, 1955, on a similar bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the veto message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have withheld my approval of H. R. 6373, an act to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to extend the programs to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals.

This bill, by congressional action, would direct the continuation of the existing domestic minerals purchase programs under the Defense Production Act for certain minerals after defense needs have been met. Moreover, it would continue such purchases at prices considerably in excess of market price. It would direct the establishment of two new manganese buying depots and the reopening of a third. It would commit an additional $150 million for the purchase of double the original program quantities of these minerals.

Pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, certain purchase programs were established for these minerals during the Korean hostilities, Public Law 206 of the 83d Congress extended for 2 years the termination dates of these programs. H. R. 6373, in effect, would direct the expansion of these programs so as to require the Government to buy far greater quantities of these minerals than are necessary for defense purposes. As a result, Government assistance to the producers of several minerals will be continued under the guise of defense needs when such needs do not exist.

Furthermore, the fiscal arrangements that are provided for in H. R. 6373 are unsound. The bill would bypass the usual budgetary processes and the customary review by congressional committees. It would direct the use of the defense borrowing authority conferred by the Defense Production Act.

Finally, the provisions of H. R. 6373 would apply to only a small segment of the domestic minerals industry and would not reach the fundamentals of the problem. Indeed this bill would make solution of the overall problems of the industry more difficult.

I am conscious of the desirability of developing a long-range minerals program for the United States to assure an adequate mobilization base and to preserve a sound minerals economy. The Advisory Committee on Minerals Policy so advised and the Office of Minerals Mobilization has been established in the Department of the Interior to determine and recommend such a program. The funds to make the necessary studies have just become available, and work toward the development of a long-range program has begun.

The interests of the domestic minerals industry will be better served by proceeding with the careful development of a long-range minerals program than by approving a stopgap measure extending substantial Government aid to only a segment of the industry. Meanwhile, with the exception of a single manganese depot, the existing domestic minerals procurement program remains uncompleted, and sales by domestic miners to the Government will continue under the provisions of the regulations now in effect.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 14, 1955.*

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho should be agreed to, because it will greatly restrict the bill.

In my opinion, there can be no possible justification for the enactment of the bill, in the first place. It proposes to commit the United States Government to buy the minerals at about 50 percent above the prevailing price. Director Flemming, of the Office of Defense Mobilization, has stated that there is enough of these minerals now in the stockpile to last us 5 years in the event of an all-out war without the necessity of procuring another single pound either domestically or abroad. So there can be no possible justification for the bill in the name of national defense.

Every agency of the Government sent letters to the committee opposing the enactment of such legislation.

All that is being sought is authorization for the Government to take $70 million of the taxpayers' money to buy the minerals, which will be taken out of the ground, transported a few miles to the scales where they can be weighed by the Government, and then be dumped into a hole in the ground for some future generation to take them out again.

As the President pointed out in his veto message, there can be no justification in the name of national defense for such legislation. I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho greatly restricting this give-away program should be adopted, and after that the bill should be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. The yeas and nays

having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. WOFFORD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER and Mr. BEALL], the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH and Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the wedding of his daughter.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont, Mr. AIKEN, and the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH, would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado, Mr. ALLOTT, is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. MCCARTHY. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas, 22, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—22

Bender	Jenner	Potter
Bennett	Knowland	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Martin, Iowa	Thye
Curtis	Martin, Pa.	Watkins
Douglas	Mundt	Williams
Dworshak	Pastore	
Eastland	Payne	

NAYS—32

Barrett	Humphrey	Mansfield
Bible	Jackson	McClellan
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Millikin
Dirksen	Kefauver	Murray
Frear	Kennedy	Neuberger
Fulbright	Kerr	Robertson
Gore	Laird	Scott
Green	Langer	Sparkman
Hayden	Lehman	Stennis
Hill	Long	Symington
Holland	Malone	

NOT VOTING—41

Aiken	Duff	Monroney
Allott	Ellender	Morse
Anderson	Ervin	Neely
Beall	Flanders	O'Mahoney
Bricker	George	Purtell
Bridges	Goldwater	Russell
Bush	Hennings	Schoeppel
Butler	Hickenlooper	Smathers
Byrd	Hruska	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Ives	Welker
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Wiley
Case, S. Dak.	Magnuson	Wofford
Chavez	McCarthy	Young
Daniel	McNamara	

So Mr. DWORSHAK's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill——

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate in a lengthy discussion of a matter which is of considerable importance to two States, namely, Kentucky and Illinois; but I should like to make some legislative history, if I may, tonight.

I should like to address a question or two to the chairman of the committee. It is my understanding of the chairman's statement that he suggested certain benefits which would come to the State of Kentucky if the bill were enacted into law, and I should like to have my friend from Montana advise me of the benefits which would come to the State of Kentucky as a result of the passage of the bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Fluorspar is the metal in which the Senator is interested, is it not?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, we should all like to hear the benefits to the State of Kentucky. We did not hear the answer to the question.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am sure the Senator from Montana would like to express himself so that all Members on both sides of the aisle may hear him.

Mr. MURRAY. At the hearings, the subject of fluorspar was considered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. If my friend from Montana will yield to me for a moment, I not only suggest that he outline the benefits which would accrue to the State of Kentucky with respect to fluorspar, which is covered by the bill, but also the benefits which would accrue to Illinois, the State of the present occupant of the Chair [Mr. DOUGLAS], since Kentucky and Illinois produce a substantial portion of domestic metallurgical fluorspar.

Mr. MURRAY. The committee had the matter under consideration, and at the hearings of the committee Dr. Flemming, who is Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, testified on this subject. I read from the committee's report:

> There is clearly no defense justification for a continuation of this program because even without any access to either domestic or foreign sources of supply in the event of war, we would have enough in the stockpile to meet total requirements for approximately a 5-year period.
>
> "In view of the fact that the purchase program is about to terminate and that all defense needs have been met, we believe that this also is a situation where Congress should take appropriate action to assist the industry by providing for the purchase of specified amounts from nondefense funds until Congress has had time to consider recommendations from the Department of the Interior for a long-term program."
>
> Thus the Minerals Policy Committee recognized that there may be nondefense problems in the minerals industries, and, therefore, that, as is evident later in the report, these problems are beyond the scope of the Office of Defense Mobilization as a defense agency.

He also said:

> I also recommend that in the case of three minerals: Chrysotile asbestos, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten—for which all defense needs have been met, the Congress pass such legislation and appropriate such funds as it deems necessary to provide interim assistance pending consideration by the Congress of a long-range nondefense program.

Mr. Flemming also testified:

> I suggest, however, that where a domestic purchase program is about to terminate and where all defense needs have been met, the Congress should make provisions beyond the scope of defense legislation to assist the industry by providing for the purchase of specified amounts from nondefense funds until the Congress has had time to consider recommendations from the appropriate nondefense agency, namely, the Department of Interior, for a long-range program.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it not a fact that there are two grades of fluorspar in question? One is acid fluorspar, and the other is metallurgical fluorpar?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I may say to my friend from Montana that a very large percentage of the fluorspar which is produced in Illinois is of the metallurgical type, and practically all of that which is produced in Kentucky is of the metallurgical type. Dr. Flemming stated in his testimony that he will meet the needs of the producers of metallurgical fluorspar by his stockpiling arrangements. But will the chairman of the committee tell us, with reference to the stockpile that is presently in existence, how much of that stockpile was provided by domestic producers and how much of it was provided by imports? The reason I ask that question is that it is my understanding that very little of acid-grade fluorspar in stockpile has come from domestic producers, and one of the reasons for that is the difference in the price.

Mr. MURRAY. Acid-grade fluorspar—that means 97 percent or better calcium fluoride—has a duty of $1.87 a short ton. The lower grade material has a duty of $7.50 a ton. So there is a very high tariff on the low grade, and a low tariff on the high grade fluorspar.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Which means the producer outside continental United States, who uses unusually cheap labor, can upgrade what otherwise would be metallurgical fluorspar, ship it into the United States in that high-grade form under a very low duty, and after it comes into this country he can downgrade that fluorspar and sell it on the American market at such a low price that today the fluorspar mines in this country are practically closed. Is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. CLEMENTS. When they excluded metallurgical fluorspar, did they exclude it for the reason that they had confidence that Dr. Flemming would reopen the mines in this country, by stockpiling fluorspar purchased from domestic mines?

Mr. MURRAY. That is my understanding of the testimony.

Mr. CLEMENTS. If that is the chairman's understanding, let me ask this question: If the committee had thought differently, the committee would not have excluded metallurgical fluorspar from this bill; would it?

Mr. MURRAY. That is certainly true.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Then I understand that the chairman of the committee and the committee felt that Dr. Flemming was acting in good faith; that by stockpiling metallurgical fluorspar, he was going to provide an opportunity for the domestic mines to reopen, so as to produce and to fill the needs of his country in connection with the stockpiling program, without using imported fluorspar to fill our domestic needs for stockpiling. Is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. We took Dr. Flemming at his word. We had an amendment before us; but as a result of Dr. Flemming's assurances, we did not adopt that amendment.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I will say to the Senator from Florida——

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, Florida is a great sunshine State, and I love it. But for the moment I get mine in Kentucky.

Mr. MALONE. I am sorry; I meant to say "the distinguished Senator from Kentucky."

We had testimony from Dr. Flemming, representing the administration, and also from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior representing the Secretary. From the 1953 Malone-Aspinall Act, which called for the purchase of seven different minerals, we excluded the minerals that Dr. Flemming testified that he could and that he would continue to buy for the length of the program or until the President's Cabinet Committee came in with a permanent plan.

I wish to read what Dr. Flemming testified. I think the distinguished Senator from Kentucky is absolutely correct, and the record should show why we included certain minerals and excluded others. As regards fluorspar, this is exactly Dr. Flemming's testimony——

Mr. CLEMENTS. From what page is the Senator from Nevada about to read?

Mr. MALONE. From page 313 of the hearings, at the bottom of that page. This is Dr. Flemming's statement:

> Next, fluorspar—metallurgical grade.
>
> Inventories plus orders are substantially below the minimum stockpile objective, which for this material is the same as the long-term objective.
>
> The Government does not have any fixed-price purchase program for metallurgical fluorspar.

Metallurgical fluorspar is any product below the 97-percent grade. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky is entirely correct; when the tariff is fixed, only low-grade fluorspar was imported; therefore, the higher tariff was on the lower grades. But in order to get the benefit of the low tariff, they beneficiated the low-grade ore up to 97 percent or better. Later it was reduced to the metallurgical grade below 97 percent.

Further in the hearings on this bill, Dr. Flemming said:

> The existing stockpile directive instructs the General Services Administration to give preference to domestic metallurgical fluorspar.
>
> The General Services Administration has been authorized to determine by actual negotiations the premium that would have to be paid to accomplish domestic procurement of metallurgical fluorspar. As soon as this information is available the General Services Administration will be authorized to pay an appropriate premium price for domestic procurement.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Nevada refer to the sentence:

> The existing stockpile directive instructs the General Services Administration to give preference to domestic metallurgical fluorspar.

Can the Senator from Nevada give me any information to show that any preference has been given to the domestic producers of fluorspar?

Mr. MALONE. I think I can say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that this is about the first time we ever got down to bedrock in discussing the situation with the administration officials, and they understood it.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator from Nevada does not know of any preferential treatment which has been given to the domestic producers of fluorspar, does he?

Mr. MALONE. I think very little preference has been given to any domestic producer for 20 years. But I wish to say this is the first time that a representative of the administration—and Dr. Flemming, who is the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, really represents the administration in this field—has appeared before the committee and has definitely said that he could and that he would purchase certain minerals at a price to keep the domestic producers in business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. My distinguished friend the Senator from Nevada has read from the hearings and from the testimony given by Dr. Flemming. The Senator from Nevada read from the testimony of Dr. Flemming the statement:

> The existing stockpile directive instructs the General Services Administration to give preference to domestic metallurgical fluorspar.

In the next sentence Dr. Flemming said:

> The General Services Administration has been authorized to determine by actual negotiations the premium that would have to be paid to accomplish domestic procurement of metallurgical fluorspar.

That in itself practically defeats the hope what was expressed in the first sentence.

Mr. MALONE. I would not say that, and for this reason: That is why we arrived at the price on acid-grade fluorspar, which he—Flemming—cannot buy by negotiation.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Can the Senator from Nevada tell me how long Dr. Flemming and the General Services Administration have had this authority?

Mr. MALONE. I cannot say; but I will say that, if Dr. Flemming does not keep his word in doing the things he has said he will do in the case of five of these materials, I am ready to join with the Senator in January in calling him before the committee and find out why he has not kept his word.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator from Nevada would say, would he, that Dr. Flemming had that authority for a long time?

Mr. MALONE. I assume he has, but this is the first time he ever testified before to the committee that he would do it.

Mr. MURRAY. I may say here that it is the intention of the committee to see that he carries out his word.

Mr. MALONE. That is a fine statement.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Yes; that is a fine statement.

I ask the Senator from Nevada, who is a distinguished engineer, and who has given long study to this subject, whether he heard the questions I propounded a few minutes ago to the distinguished chairman of the committee; and I also wish to ask him whether he concurred in the answers which were given by the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. MALONE. I not only concur but I wish to say further that the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and I have worked together and will continue to work very closely together, because we regard it as a national problem. It involves the national defense and the national economy.

I think I can say that in this field there is no difference of opinion between the chairman of the committee and the senior Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I understand that the Senator from Nevada and other members of the committee were willing to give to Dr. Flemming, of the Office of Defense Mobilization, an opportunity to reopen these mines, through the stockpiling program; and the only way he could reopen them was to pay a price which was above what it cost to produce the fluorspar.

Mr. MALONE. I would say very distinctly—and I have said it many, many times to the Congress—that in the case of fluorspar, the price paid will have to represent the difference between the wages and cost of doing business in this country and those in the chief competing countries, in order to open the mines; and such a price should be paid—whether it be a negotiated price or a price arrived at on some other basis or by means of some other principle. The flexible duty adjusted by the Tariff Commission, as agent of Congress, representing the difference in wages and the cost of doing business here and in the chief competitor nation is the constitutional way to do it—but this is the only way it can be done now—unless Congress takes back its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade and the national economy.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Certainly there would be no desire on the part of the Senator from Kentucky to delay this proposed legislation, even if he could. But certainly I wish to have the RECORD show the understanding that if this is not accomplished in the field of metallurgical fluorspar, then the committee expects to take action in the early part of next year, in order to give the domestic mines the opportunity to produce this strategic mineral.

Mr MALONE. I defer to the chairman.

Mr. MURRAY. That is the well-known intention of the committee. We have studied the problem very carefully. Our whole ambition would be to get a bill which would be effective and fair to the small producers as well as to the big producers.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I thank the distinguished chairman.

With that information and that legislative history, I will not offer the amendment which I had prepared to offer to the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I doubt whether we could cite any industry in the United States which has become the victim of governmental action to a greater extent than has the fluorspar industry. During the war period foreign producers made contracts with the United States Government and actually received help in order to erect their necessary beneficiation plants, flotation plants, and so forth, and then they proceeded to send fluorspar into the United States to such an extent as virtually to put our own producers out of business.

Many efforts were made before the United States Tariff Commission to obtain some tariff relief for the fluorspar industry. They all failed. I appeared before the Tariff Commission with representatives of that industry. The tariff had been dropped from $5.60 to $2.10. In Colorado, Illinois, and elsewhere the mines had been closing.

The astounding thing is that foreign producers have managed to increase their production by reason of assistance from the United States. On the basis of July and August imports last year of the acid grade, imports are running at the rate of more than 100,000 tons a year in excess of the domestic use. If ever an industry needed some assistance in the form of stockpiling of a material which is absolutely indispensable in the aluminum industry, and the second most indispensable item so far as atomic energy is concerned, it is the fluorspar industry. I am delighted indeed that the provision recommended by the committee is contained in the bill. I thank the chairman of the committee for being alert to the situation.

Mr. MURRAY. We are in thorough accord with the ideas which the Senator from Illinois has expressed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for one brief question?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee one very brief question with respect to our chrome industry in Oregon, which he knows to be in a critical situation. Is it the estimate of the chairman that this bill will take care of that industry—or, I should say, that its omission from the bill will not adversely affect chrome in the long run?

Mr. MURRAY. I believe chrome is to be taken care of under some other provision.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I did not wish to intrude upon the discussion of the Senator from Illinois with respect to fluorspar.

Mr. MURRAY. Chrome is not included in this bill because we have a pledge from Dr. Flemming that it will be taken care of under the authority which he already has as Director of the Defense Mobilization program.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The point I should like to establish, briefly, for the legislative history, is this: Is it the opinion of the chairman of the committee that the pledge which he has from Dr. Flemming will be satisfactory so far as the chrome situation is concerned? Does he have confidence in that promise?

Mr. MURRAY. We were satisfied with his sincerity, and we believe he intends to carry out the program as he outlined it to us. I am sure it will be carried out. It is the intention of the committee to see that it is carried out.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In effect, the committee will patrol and police his pledge, to see to it that it is observed as diligently as possible.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the chairman for the inclusion of a provision in the bill for the purchase of fluorspar. There are two counties in Illinois, at the extreme southern portion of the State, which depend on the fluorspar industry for maintenance. They have been hit very severly in recent years.

Some time ago I urged that the Government start purchasing fluorspar for stockpiling, and I thought I had obtained a pledge to that effect from Dr. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. I am sure that Dr. Flemming has moved in good faith in this matter, but I am very glad to see that there is a legislative mandate in this respect. I again thank the Senator from Montana for his care and attention to this subject.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator may be sure that we will carry out that program, and see to it that the promises and pldeges which have been made are carried through.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 3962) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That this act may be cited as the "Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956."

SEC. 2. The General Services Administration is hereby authorized and directed to establish and maintain—

(a) a program to purchase a minimum of 1,250,000 short ton units of tungsten trioxide (WO_3) contained in tungsten ores or concentrates mined subsequent to termination of the purchase program established under Public Law 206, which meet specifications set forth in General Services Administration regulations in effect on May 1, 1956, from mines located within the United States, its Territories, and possessions at a price of not less than $55 per short ton unit free on board mine: *Provided, however*, That for production from mines with an annual production which has not heretofore and does not exceed 1,000 short ton units during any 1 year the price shall be $63 per short ton unit, free on board the mine.

(b) a program to purchase nonferrous chrysotile asbestos from mines located within the United States, its Territories, and possessions meeting the same specifications and under the same regulations and at prices in effect on January 1, 1956, for purchases of this material by the General Services Administration under the authority of the Defense Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953, in the amount of 2,000 tons of crude No. 1 and crude No. 2 combined, and 2,000 tons of crude No. 3, excepting that crude No. 3 may be purchased only when offered with crude No. 1 or crude No. 2, or both, at a ratio of not in excess of 1 to 1.

(c) a program to purchase not less than 250,000 tons newly mined acid grade fluorspar containing not less than 97 percent CaF_2 at a price of $53 per short ton, free on board mine, from mines located within the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

(d) a program to purchase columbium-tantalum from mines located within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, meting the same specifications, and under the regulations, and at prices in effect on December 1, 1955, for purchases of this material by the General Services Administration under the authority of the Defense Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953, in the amount of 250,000 pounds.

SEC. 3. All materials so purchased shall be held by the General Services Administration to be made available to the strategic stockpile or to be turned over to the supplemental stockpile created for strategic and critical materials in accordance with the provisions of the act of July 10, 1954 (Public Law 430, 83d Cong. (68 Stat. 454)).

SEC. 4. This act shall terminate on December 31, 1958.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

AMENDMENT OF JAPANESE-AMERICAN EVACUATION CLAIMS ACT

Mr. CLEMENTS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2155, House bill 7763, the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7763) to amend the Japanese-American Claims Act to expedite the final determination of the claims.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 19, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 18, 1956:

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AND EUROPEAN REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Frederick Blake Payne, of New York, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Regional Organizations.

BUREAU OF MINES

Marling J. Ankeny, of Maryland, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines, vice John J. Forbes, resigned.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

John Lewis Smith, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, for a term of 3 years, expiring June 30, 1959, vice Robert M. Weston, term expiring.

IN THE COAST GUARD RESERVE

Kenneth S. Harrison for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the United States Coast Guard Reserve.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commissioned captains

Joseph P. Lushene
Walter J. Chovan

To be commissioned ensigns

John A. Alexander
Lawrence H. Anderson
William D. Barnum
Dale V. Bedenkop
Ogden Beeman
Robert B. Bowman
Bernard L. Gabrielsen
Richard H. Garnett, Jr.
Richard G. Hajec
K. William Jeffers
Alveric B. Kegerreis
James E. Long
Bernard W. McCray, Jr.
Verle B. Miller
Kerry F. Pitts
Joel P. Porcher
James K. Richards
Joseph M. Rodgers
Paul L. Schock
James R. Schwartz
Thomas E. Simkin
C. Eugene Skinner
Matthew J. Stahl
Victor V. Tilley, Jr.,
effective June 18, 1956

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major general

Maj. Gen. Gilman Clifford Mudgett, O14966, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. Ira Kenneth Evans, O16215, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Elmer Peter Hardenbergh, O28940, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Wiltz Gardes, O28840, Army of the United States (colonel, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Preston Corderman, O16387, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George William Hickman, Jr., O16420, Army of the United States (colonel, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harry Purnell Storke, O16468, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Herbert Butler Powell, O16684, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Frank Sayles Bowen, Jr., O16434, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Francis Collins, O16819, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Conrad Stanton Babcock, O16104, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Henry Randolph Westphalinger, O16130, Army of the United States(colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Clyde Baker, Jr., O16371, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Keith Richard Barney, O16377, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Clerin Rodney Smith, O16388, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harry Warren Johnson, O16391, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ralph Morris Osborne, O16399, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Lewis Sherrill Griffing, O16413, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Waldo Eugene Laidlaw, O16414, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Holger Nelson Toftoy, O16422, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Peirce Ennis, Jr., O16436, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Lawrence Ryan, Jr., O16451, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edward Harold McDaniel, O16497, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Olaf Norman Lodoen, O16580, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Gibson Van Houten, O16669, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Vernon Lee, O28882, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Max Sherred Johnson, O16745, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named person for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of section 407, Public Law 351, 81st Congress (Career Compensation Act of 1949):

To be major

Daniel B. Dockstader, 6856A.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of title II, Public Law 365, 80th Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947), as amended; and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, 82d Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951), with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated:

To be major, USAF (Medical)

William O. Bellnoski, Jr., AO481302.

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

Harry R. Bratt, AO725668.
Randall L. Clark, AO1906329.
Thomas S. Culley, AO3002266.
Fred W. Dierdorf, AO3001573.
Fredric K. Kratina, O2276752.
Thomas C. Lee, O4034477.
Robert L. Madison, AO3000992.
Joseph L. Mays
Max I. Michels, AO2261387.
William F. Nicol, AO2240370.
John G. Nork, AO3041669.
Thomas M. O'Hern, AO2253710.
John R. Pfrommer, AO2239476.
George B. Smith, Jr., AO2240462.
William A. Stark, O4001715.
Alfred R. Stumpe, AO2212148.
Terry J. Swaim
Jerrold L. Wheaton, AO2260257.
Richard L. Whittaker

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

James B. Cole
Sherman M. Debacher, AO2247379.
Edward T. Dehan
John E. Devlyn, AO2074956.
Jackson W. Fritz, AO2239942.
Arthur T. Linthicum, AO2084922.
Herman R. Muns
Robert E. Pedersen
John C. Rhoades, O1546796.
Louis H. Roth, AO975829.
Alfred K. Williams, AO1906578.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical)

Thomas H. Alexander, AO3043102.
Sam T. Allen, AO3043213.
George C. Babcock
George W. Barnard, O2275362.
Jack D. Bashaw, O1020513.
Jack O. Benson, AO3043101.
Charles A. Borgia, AO3044503.
Julius W. Bosch, AO3043219.
Charles T. Brierty, AO3044915.
David J. Bunnell, Jr.
William H. Bunstock
John R. Calverley, AO3044669.
Thomas F. Camp, Jr., AO3043223.
Albert D. Carilli
William B. Clark, AO3002393.
John C. Clarke, AO3041719.
John F. X. Cline, Jr., AO1859576.
John P. Connelly
Robert F. Conti, AO3044663.
John D. Crummett
John G. Daley, O2275460.
W. Harley Davidson, O1876858.
Jerry G. Dodson
Byron N. Dooley, AO3000603.
James B. Dunaway, AO965404.
Maurice E. Dyer, AO3043229.
John F. Fulton, AO3043237.
Thomas T. Harkness, AO3044266.
Raymond W. Henry, AO3044331.
Lloyd M. Higgins, AO3044340.
Theodore Jacobs

William C. Johnson
Adrian R. Kristeller, AO2201121.
John E. Leigh, AO3043249.
Charles W. Markham, AO3043729.
James W. Mason, AO2202938.
LaMar S. McGinnis, Jr., AO1865465.
Louis G. Neft, AO1862501.
Joe Netick, Jr.
David H. Newbern, AO3044080.
Louis G. Nuernberger
Lewis T. Patterson
Marcene Pearcy, O2275580.
James K. Penry, AO3043262.
David E. Perkins
Robert S. Phillips, AO3041851.
Cedric J. Priebe, Jr., AO3044365.
Richard Rabkin, AO3043969.
Howard D. Richardson
Lawrence T. Rollins, AO3043268.
Rudolph J. Ross, AO3043271.
John C. Roy, AO3042002.
Robert J. Russell
Joseph D. Sabella, AO3044869.
James J. Schubert, AO3000294.
Robert F. Spicer, AO3044187.
Paul A. Steinman, AO3043136.
William C. Story, AO2216226.
John B. Sullivan
William G. Sutlive, AO3044375.
Frank W. Thomas, Jr., AO3043277.
Charles O. Titus, AO3043912.
John N. Todd III
William L. Walls
Carlos O. Welch, Jr.
Lynn C. White, AO3043211.
J. O. Williams, Jr.
Galen S. Woolley, AO3043281.
Hiroshi Yamauchi, AO3043282.
Clyde C. Zirbel, Jr., O2275455.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Dental)

Gerald A. Audette
Ralph O. Gillham
Edward K. Hahn
Thaddeus S. Kaczka
William C. Roche
Gary P. Sharbondy
Jack R. Sheneman, AO2230342
George D. Yent, Jr.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, 82d Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951), with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated:

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Medical Service)

James M. Crews, Jr., AO1905743.

To be second lieutenants, USAF (Medical Service)

Vincent T. Penikas, AO3000202.
Dean L. Peterson, AO2262029.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of sections 101 (c) and 102 (c), Public Law 36, 80th Congress (Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947), as amended by section 5, Public Law 514, 81st Congress, and Public Law 37, 83d Congress; with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated under the provisions of section 307, Public Law 150, 82d Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951):

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Nurse)

Barbara V. Feistel, AN2242653.
Mary A. Goddard, AN2242332.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Medical Specialist)

Ernestine Neuhardt, AR2261565.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be first lieutenants

Robert W. Bailey, AO3002665.
George D. Brown, AO3005486.
Ted Brunson, AO3005552.
Lawrence D. Conway, Jr., AO3009889.
John C. DeHoogh, AO3005344.
George L. Draper, AO3005555.
James W. Gray, AO2254679.
John W. Haken, AO3005280.
Arthur J. Hartmann, AO2229999.
David F. Johnstone, AO3005281.
Wilson M. Jones, AO3005814.
John R. Manire, AO3005527.
William Marscher, AO2253507.
Howard E. McKenzie, AO3005529.
Mearl S. Parsons, AO3005391.
Herman E. Rhoads, AO3005360.
Clifton C. Schrader, AO3005454.
Robert H. Thompson, AO3005457.
Victor J. Uebel, Jr., AO3006149.
Donald J. Underwood, Jr., AO3005658.
Robert C. Ward, AO3005545.
Frank R. Wight, AO3005122.

To be second lieutenants

Clark E. Aamodt, AO3058442.
Donald T. Aukerman, AO3058304.
James W. Bergstrom, AO3058729.
Gerald L. Biggs, AO3064188.
Joe Boone, AO3059161.
Richard A. Bowen, AO3058651.
Gayle A. Coffman, AO3058913.
Karl L. Craton, AO3058979.
Freddie D. Dickens, AO3058549.
Billy L. Dillard, AO3058981.
William W. Dutcher, AO3058496.
Richard E. Dyer, AO3058662.
Einar K. Enevoldson, AO3058360.
Edsel R. Field, AO3064343.
Kenneth W. Field, AO3058915.
James C. Forrest, AO3064257.
Eugene Garove, AO3058498.
John F. Gaylord, Jr., AO3064240.
Eugene D. Hamilton, AO3064241.
Lowell K. Hansen, AO3059093.
William F. Harlin, Jr., AO3059026.
George B. Hathaway, AO3064262.
George R. Hennigan, AO3059077.
Thomas A. Hicke, AO3058921.
Russell A. Hixon, AO3059098.
Richard L. Kasper, AO3058998.
Jackson L. Lillibridge, AO3058512.
Claude B. Locke, III, AO3059031.
William G. S. Lodge, AO3058705.
Frank N. Markey, AO3059057.
Martin W. Marquardt, AO 3058754.
Curtis D. May, AO3064385.
Homer C. McIntyre, Jr., AO3059107.
Joseph P. Murphy III, AO3058939.
James D. Murray, Jr., AO3058516.
Stephen M. Orenstein, AO3058388.
Harold E. Pankey, AO3058602.
William F. Pitstick, AO3058329.
Robert J. Rezac, AO3058594.
Raymond D. Rice, AO3058823.
Albert G. Rogers, AO3058523.
Joseph A. Rogers, AO3058908.
Edward P. Roscoe, AO3064245.
Robert S. Russell, AO3058595.
Richard B. Salsman, AO3058331.
Carl R. Sanders, AO3058843.
Robert N. Schlichter, AO3058392.
Gerald T. Sedik, AO3058951.
William Sheringo, AO3058400.
Albert P. Simmons, AO3064389.
Sven E. Sloth, AO3058333.
Robert K. Slussar, AO3058774.
Robert L. Smith, AO3058877.
James D. Suver, AO3009400.
Douglas J. Terman, AO3059122.
Virgil D. Thomas, AO3058532.
Wayne H. Thomas, AO3058691.
James L. Tollefson, AO3064393.
William P. Vaughn, Jr., AO3064296.
Robert B. Ward, AO3058470.
Donald A. Wiles, AO3058472.
Leland Wolford, AO3058401.

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following-named distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

Shelton S. Alexander
Francis J. Andrijeski
Thomas J. Anessi
Larry M. Austin
Paul Bachar, Jr.
Robert E. Baldauf
Robert C. Barlow
William S. Barquist
Richard C. Berry
Ernest F. Biehunko
Alonzo O. Bliss III
Robert O. Boardman
Harold L. Bockelman
Robert M. Bowman
Robert U. Bowman
John C. Brannen
Leslie H. Brenner
Dennis W. Brown
Richard C. Brown
Richard H. Bucher
Glenn D. Buell, Jr.
Martin M. Burdick
Donald W. Burger
David L. Burke
David P. Burke
Donald M. Burke
Hiram J. Callahan
Joseph W. Chope
Paul W. Clark
Mitchell E. Clary
Albert J. Cox
Thomas A. Cox
John E. Craig II
Wallis R. Cramond
Lawrence R. Dausin
William E. Davidson
Russell L. Davison
Donald J. Dierschke
Earl S. Doderer
Arnold G. Dolejsi
Selmer R. Erickstad
Norman L. Farmer
Floyd J. Ferrell, Jr.
Donald L. Firestone
Duane W. Fisher
Joseph D. French
Anthony J. Gangol
Richard E. Gentry
Billy G. Geren
Harvey B. Gilbert, Jr.
Richard T. Goetz
William C. Gossett
David C. H. Grant
Robert S. Hamrin
Joseph W. Hanna
Jasper H. Hardison
Thomas E. Harvey
Norman E. Hearn
Dennis M. Heitkamp
Richard A. Hendrickson
Eugene T. Hickman
Ronald L. Hillier
Edward E. Hoffman
Lawrence E. Hooks
Alvin H. Hufford
St. Clair L. Hultsman
Guy A. Hummon II
Bobby P. Huskey
Harold G. Jacobson
John W. Jenkins
Elling Z. Johnson
Stewart W. Johnson
Charles H. Jundt
Ronald H. Kato
Donald L. Keyt
Keith E. Kiplinger
Edwin A. Korzun
Ronald L. Kreiling
Vernon M. Kulla
John S. Kurtak
John G. Larum
Terry N. Lauritsen
Gail L. Legate
Neal A. Long
John Longden
Richard W. Lytle
James L. Mann
Calvin H. Markwood
Donald D. Marler
Bruce A. Mathews
David W. Matthews
Raymond C. Mayo
John R. McChesney
John T. McIntire
Daniel P. McLaughlin
James R. McLaughlin
Lester G. Menchhofer
Roy D. Merrill, Jr.
James A. Michael
Ralph D. Miller, Jr.
Richard O. Montgomery
Richard P. Moore
Richard M. Narkewicz
John H. O'Connor
Francis B. O'Donnell, Jr.
Paul B. Oldam
Billy Passinos
James R. Patterson, Jr.
Robert B. Patterson
John L. Price
Tom G. Purnhagen
Norman H. Racine
Thurlow H. Ralph
Robert M. Raymond
William D. Rice
Daniel P. Roberson
Robert E. Ross
Renalds D. Salvador
Vernon T. Sanford, Jr.
Donald L. Scott
Robert H. Scott
Robert W. Sears
Howard B. Simpson
Paul B. Smith, Jr.
Ronald C. Smith
Jackie K. Snow
Robert P. Speedy
Martin J. Spellman, Jr
Harry R. Statler
Charles P. Stephens
Ronald G. Strack
Ray E. Stratton
Jerry D. Stroh
Donald D. Swofford
Charles R. Thomas
Glendon G. Trew
Robert L. Usher
John R. Vipond
Bobby E. Walker
Joseph S. Walker, Jr.
Richard F. Weick
Harrison D. Welles
James J. White
John F. Whitman
John F. Whitney
Frank S. Wiggins
Bob F. Williams
Richard D. Williams
Richard L. Wing
George E. Woods

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

James A. Boatwright, Abbeville, Ala., in place of J. R. Solomon, transferred.

Luther W. Bowen, Horton, Ala., in place of J. L. Stephens, resigned.

Lewis L. Buttram, Goodwater, Ala., in place of Daisy Buice, retired.

Fred Clardy, Roanoke, Ala., in place of C. W. Jordan, retired.

ARIZONA

Catherine L. Lockhart, Tonalea, Ariz., in place of June Patterson, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Robert E. Patton, Carlisle, Ark., in place of Frank Welch, retired.

Marguerite S. Partin, Dell, Ark., in place of Lennie Watts, resigned.

Elbert R. Robinson, West Fork, Ark., in place of E. A. Stockburger, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Stanton H. Meyer, Al Tahoe, Calif., in place of E. R. Globin, resigned.

Agnes C. Richmond, Beverly Hills, Calif., in place of M. J. O'Rourke, retired.

Norman H. Wilson, Hemet, Calif., in place of S. C. Moon, retired.

Herbert H. Harrison, Livermore, Calif., in place of P. M. Murray, retired.

Margaret E. Anderson, Piercy, Calif., in place of C. C. Kirk, retired.

Etta F. Ettleman, Rough and Ready, Calif., in place of G. M. Rogers, resigned.

Rose L. Harmon, Verdugo City, Calif., in place of H. M. Voltz, removed.

Russell F. Bragg, Victorville, Calif., in place of F. E. Chambers, removed.

COLORADO

Keith E. Rundall, Ovid, Colo., in place of H. S. McCullough, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Andrew J. Sataline, Plainville, Conn., in place of W. J. Foran, removed.

Genri M. Palmieri, Plantsville, Conn., in place of J. A. DePaolo, Jr., resigned.

FLORIDA

Joel L. Adams, Laurel Hill, Fla., in place of J. W. Harrison, transferred.

GEORGIA

Noble T. Westbrook, Bremen, Ga., in place of J. D. Long, deceased.

Thomas E. Sikes, Columbus, Ga., in place of A. I. Young, deceased.

Willard E. Thomas, Lafayette, Ga., in place of W. A. Enloe, Jr., resigned.

J. F. Hudson, Stillmore, Ga., in place of P. E. Hughs, retired.

IDAHO

Joseph P. Lambert, Burley, Idaho, in place of T. S. Lambert, retired.

Martin L. Fry, Horse Shoe Bend, Idaho, in place of J. J. Quinn, retired.

Lloyd S. Luke, Sugar City, Idaho, in place of E. L. Holman, retired.

ILLINOIS

George L. Wall, Bridgeport, Ill., in place of F. H. Stoltz, deceased.

Robert V. Loft, Capron, Ill., in place of M. M. Boyd, removed.

Harlow D. Snoke, Cerro Gordo, Ill., in place of J. E. Pollard, resigned.

Thomas M. Balk, Franklin Park, Ill., in place of W. J. Dolamore, retired.

Kenneth L. Pflaum, Genoa, Ill., in place of J. R. Sester, removed.

Eric R. Kylen, Hinsdale, Ill., in place of A. W. Wolf, retired.

Louis D. Hobaker, Mackinaw, Ill., in place of G. H. Kinnsey, retired.

Charles E. Turvey, Pana, Ill., in place of C. V. Fellers, deceased.

INDIANA

Albert T. Morris, Eaton, Ind., in place of R. R. Saunders, retired.

Wayne W. Sloan, Marengo, Ind., in place of L. R. Davis, deceased.

Robert M. Brett, Shoals, Ind., in place of M. B. Canfield, resigned.

IOWA

Judson M. Hersman, Albia, Iowa, in place of R. F. Hollingshead, retired.

Max E. Butler, Baxter, Iowa, in place of W. G. Lane, retired.

Marquette L. Neal, Clarksville, Iowa, in place of M. W. Brockman, retired.

Clover A. Stiles, Floyd, Iowa, in place of Gertrude Hunter, resigned.

Clarence Starkweather, Jr., Greene, Iowa, in place of A. B. Mahnke, retired.

Kenneth B. Fairall, Muscatine, Iowa, in place of A. S. Barry, retired.

Lyle E. Van Scyoc, Tabor, Iowa, in place of J. L. Weatherhead, resigned.

KANSAS

Merle B. Hayes, Agra, Kans., in place of William Merrified, retired.

Olive M. Rudd, Belpre, Kans., in place of D. M. Phillips, deceased.

Lloyd E. Cope, Netawaka, Kans., in place of F. W. Bottenberg, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Shirley H. Ashby, Auburn, Ky., in place of J. R. Wilson, resigned.

Presley M. Perkins, Bowling Green, Ky., in place of B. G. Leichardt, removed.

James R. Rash, Jr., Henderson, Ky., in place of Claud Brown, retired.

John O. Boardman, Jr., Whitesville, Ky., in place of B. M. Matheus, retired.

LOUISIANA

Nola B. Romero, Avery Island, La., in place of E. P. Terrell, Jr., retired.

Howell H. Smith, Bossier City, La. Office established September 1, 1955.

Alex M. McCabe, Jones, La., in place of W. R. Boone, deceased.

MAINE

Wesley A. Sawyer, Anson, Maine, in place of J. L. Tarr, retired.

Willie H. Laverriere, Biddeford, Maine, in place of A. J. Remillard, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

John L. Brigham, Boylston Center, Mass., in place of K. S. Taylor, retired.

Thomas J. Mason, Clinton, Mass., in place of W. F. McNamara, removed.

John R. Fisher, West Dennis, Mass., in place of P. R. Robie, retired.

MICHIGAN

Myron L. Newman, Martin, Mich., in place of S. A. Synden, resigned.

Guy R. Van Nortwick, Pentwater, Mich., in place of P. N. O'Brien, removed.

George A. Malloy, Petoskey, Mich., in place of A. W. Worden, retired.

Donald D. French, Portland, Mich., in place of P. J. Trierweiler, removed.

George J. Ruff, Rockwood, Mich., in place of A. J. LaBo, deceased.

Milton E. Fairbank, Wheeler, Mich., in place of J. C. Haynor, retired.

Clarence A. Broemer, White Pine, Mich. Office established February 1, 1954.

MINNESOTA

Stanley A. Torgerson, Hawley, Minn., in place of R. H. Burrill, retired.

Ralph W. Myers, Owatonna, Minn., in place of J. E. Cashman, retired.

Vera E. Harris, Ponsford, Minn., in place of I. M. Vizenor, removed.

MISSISSIPPI

Carroll N. Yelverton, Hattiesburg, Miss., in place of J. L. Brown, removed.

Billy M. McEachern, Ruleville, Miss., in place of D. D. McEachern, resigned.

William B. Askew, Sardis, Miss., in place of J. F. Howry, retired.

MISSOURI

William E. Wise, Aurora, Mo., in place of M. L. Coleman, removed.

Alfred W. McKenzie, Parma, Mo., in place of R. M. Hall, retired.

MONTANA

John K. Pendergraft, Corvallis, Mont., in place of D. R. Lamoreux, transferred.

NEBRASKA

Vernon A. Lamb, Hubbell, Nebr., in place of Vera Fisher, resigned.

Ivan Jack Gemmell, Ogallala, Nebr., in place of K. V. McCusker, retired.

Irene I. Bopp, Spalding, Nebr., in place of C. A. Weber, deceased.

NEW MEXICO

Louise V. Maestas, Fairview, N. Mex. Office established January 1, 1952.

Edwin L. Shiplet, Jal, N. Mex., in place of E. R. Frame, resigned.

NEW YORK

Bernard J. Davis, Bouckville, N. Y., in place of F. G. Shattuck, retired.

Christopher Raymond Cole, Jr., Croton Falls, N. Y., in place of J. C. Miller, retired.

Ruth Clark, Fort Johnson, N. Y., in place of M. W. Heinze, resigned.

Herman E. Story, Freehold, N. Y., in place of L. W. Wood, deceased.

Louis G. B. Stebbins, Glens Falls, N. Y., in place of D. J. Fitzgerald, Jr., retired.

James Gordon Thomson, Huntington, N. Y., in place of R. H. LaClair, retired.

Gus J. Cutrone, Marlboro, N. Y., in place of E. V. Shortt, retired.

William E. Way, Peconic, N. Y., in place of K. S. Wolosik, resigned.

Donald E. Anderson, Saranac Inn, N. Y., in place of W. E. Butler, deceased.

Edward P. Humbert, Spring Valley, N. Y., in place of E. H. Lawler, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Charles Michael Crawford, Erwin, N. C., in place of J. F. Lynch, retired.

Leonard R. Odham, Fair Bluff, N. C., in place of A. E. Waller, retired.

Richard E. Gordon, Tabor City, N. C., in place of S. W. Garrell, Jr., resigned.

Harry R. Sams, Woodland, N. C., in place of M. G. Blanchard, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Edward A. Harrick, Abercrombie, N. Dak., in place of E. G. Ottis, retired.

Raymond F. Pfeifer, Buffalo, N. Dak., in place of J. U. Pavlik, deceased.

Thomas A. Barry, Buxton, N. Dak., in place of R. B. Halvorson, resigned.

Roland G. Swen, Gilby, N. Dak., in place of G. A. Swen, deceased.

OHIO

Gay W. Smyth Bergholz, Ohio, in place of M. M. Morrow, retired.

Voldo P. Smith, Cygnet, Ohio, in place of E. L. Martin, transferred.

John H. Scott, Newcomerstown, Ohio, in place of K. H. Baxter, retired.

Leo F. Davis, Payne, Ohio, in place of H. M. Riley, resigned.

Robert L. Murdock, Ridgeway, Ohio, in place of J. W. Neal, resigned.

Clarence B. Stahl, Saint Henry, Ohio, in place of E. V. Grevencamp, resigned.

Fern Pittenger, Shiloh, Ohio, in place of D. E. Bushey, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

William N. Hamm, Covington, Okla., in place of L. F. Dievert, retired.

Richard W. Lilly, Fletcher, Okla., in place of M. A. Peacock, deceased.

Fred W. Loula, Lookeba, Okla., in place of S. M. Scholl, retired.

Wayne Coffman, Pauls Valley, Okla., in place of Earl Witten, deceased.

OREGON

Marie E. Marshall, Cannon Beach, Oreg., in place of O. B. Cole, retired.

Milton H. Ringe, Dundee, Oreg., in place of Arlena Jeppesen, resigned.

Audrey S. Phillips, Island City, Oreg., in place of J. H. Decker, declined.

Stella G. Lowe, Rickreal, Oreg., in place of R. V. Carleson, resigned.

PUERTO RICO

Jose Alberto Poventud, Ponce, P. R., in place of I. E. Kryzanowsky, retired.

TEXAS

Ray W. Mulhollan, Belton, Tex., in place of E. L. Upshaw, removed.

Loren A. Turner, Burleson, Tex., in place of A. H. Loyless, retired.

David L. Clabaugh, Carthage, Tex., in place of E. C. Brannon, retired.

James D. South, Clyde, Tex., in place of Earl Slater, retired.

Hargrove Smith, Eagle Lake, Tex., in place of W. E. McRee, retired.

Thelma O. Houtchens, Harrold, Tex., in place of J. A. Nesbitt, transferred.

Mixon C. Stamper, Jacksboro, Tex., in place of W. A. Ham, retired.

Albert B. Russell, Reklaw, Tex., in place of R. M. Carson, deceased.

John W. Word, Whiteface, Tex., in place of D. K. Bowden, removed.

UTAH

J. Stanford Staheli, Enterprise, Utah, in place of Ivor Clove, retired.

VIRGINIA

Thomas N. Langhorne, Evington, Va., in place of A. W. Arthur, transferred.

Frank J. Horlander, Jr., Meherrin, Va., in place of W. R. Beery, Jr., resigned.

Virginia M. Deane, New Canton, Va., in place of B. J. Deane, retired.

WASHINGTON

Charley T. Garrison, Hoquiam, Wash., in place of O. E. Foster, retired.

Jackson D. Hubbard, Othello, Wash., in place of B. H. Barton, retired.

Ruby Irene Paulson, Outlook, Wash., in place of C. W. Green, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Clarence R. Roberts, Mannington, W. Va., in place of H. V. Burt, deceased.

WISCONSIN

Robert J. Besse, Butternut, Wis., in place of George Heiderer, removed.

James E. Davidson, Markesan, Wis., in place of C. G. Lockwood, retired.

Patrick H. Peterson, Valders, Wis., in place of T. E. Brennan, resigned.

Henry W. Luebke, Winneconne, Wis., in place of M. J. Williams, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 18, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, whose goodness we cannot doubt and whose guidance we dare not disobey, may we begin this new week with minds and hearts that are inclined and intent upon bringing all our plans and purposes into harmony with Thy holy will.

Inspire us with those desires and aspirations which Thou dost delight to satisfy and fill us with courage and confidence, for if God be for us, who can be against us.

Show us how we may fortify ourselves against fear and frustration and be lifted above life's confusions and seeming contradictions.

Help us to be patient and strong in bearing and enduring whatever burdens and hardships may come to us as we seek to follow the way of blessedness which Thou hast ordained and marked out for us.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 14, 1956, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7896. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land in the city of Hogansville, Ga., to the city of Hogansville;

H. R. 8102. An act to provide for the disposition of moneys arising from deductions made from carriers on account of the loss of or damage to military or naval material in transit, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8404. An act to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former prisoner of war camp, near Douglas, Converse County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8693. An act to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, in relation to the refund of reenlistment bonuses;

H. R. 8922. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services;

H. R. 9377. An act to provide for the sale to the Eagle Rock Young Men's Christian Association of certain real property located in Los Angeles County, Calif.; and

H. R. 10417. An act to amend the Federal Register Act, as amended, so as to provide for the effectiveness and notice to the public of proclamations, orders, regulations, and other documents in a period following an attack or threatened attack upon the continental United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3195. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Rhode Island to the town of North Kingstown, R. I.;

S. 3316. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.;

S. 3388. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the port of Port Townsend, Wash.;

S. 3768. An act to amend section 158 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, so as to include the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare among the executive departments there listed, and for other purposes;

S. 3843. An act to adjust the application of section 322 of the so-called Economy Act of 1932 to premises leased for Government purposes; and

S. 3866. An act to facilitate the making of lease-purchase agreements by the Administrator of General Services under the Public Buildings Act of 1949, as amended, and by the Postmaster General under the Post Office Department Property Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9052. An act to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 415. An act for the relief of Ernest B. Sanders; and

S. 2984. An act for the relief of Col. John A. O'Keefe.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 890) entitled "An act to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act," and agrees to a conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. KERR, Mr. GORE, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7247. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of gain in certain railroad reorganizations; and

H. R. 10899. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, RABAUT, KIRWAN, FOGARTY, RILEY, EVINS, BOLAND, MURRAY of Illinois, MAGNUSON, DAVIS of Wisconsin, JENSEN, H. CARL ANDERSEN, PHILLIPS, HAND, and TABER.

AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODES OF 1939 AND 1954

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6143) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that for taxable years beginning after May 31, 1950, certain amounts received in consideration of the transfer of patent rights shall be considered capital gain regardless of the basis upon which such amounts are paid, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2253)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6143) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that for taxable years beginning after May 31, 1950, certain amounts received in consideration of the transfer of patent rights shall be considered capital gain regardless of the basis upon which such amounts are paid, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 3.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 2 of the Senate engrossed amendments, beginning with "For" in line 5, strike out all through line 12, and in lieu thereof insert the following: "'In applying section 291 (a) (relating to additions to the tax for failure to file a return) in any case to which paragraph (b) of this section applies, the term "reasonable cause" shall include the filing of a timely incomplete return under circumstances which led the taxpayer to believe that no tax was due on amounts received under a settlement with the United States'."

"(b) The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1948, notwithstanding the operation of any law or rule of law (other than section 3760 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 or section 7121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to closing agreements, and other than section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 or section 7122 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to compromises). Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, no claim for credit or refund of any overpayment resulting from the amendment made by this section shall be allowed or made after the period of limitation applicable to such overpayment, except that such period shall not expire before the expiration of one year after the date of the enactment of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 3 of the Senate engrossed amendments, beginning with line 12, strike out all through line 24 and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"'(2) If any portion of a distribution of property by a corporation to its shareholders, with respect to its stock, is a dividend solely by reason of the last sentence of subsection (a), then—

"'(A) paragraph (1) shall not apply to such distribution, but

"'(B) such distribution shall be considered to be a distribution which is not a dividend (whether or not otherwise a dividend) to the extent that the fair market value of such property exceeds the Subchapter A net income referred to in the last sentence of subsection (a), adjusted as provided in such sentence.

In applying this paragraph, distributions described in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (3) shall be taken into account before other distributions."

On page 4 of the Senate engrossed amendments, in line 12, strike out "1939." and in lieu thereof insert the following: "1939, except that it shall not apply to any taxable year of a shareholder which was a corporation and which filed a return for such year reporting dividends in accordance with publicly announced litigation policies of the Secretary or his delegate which had not been revoked at the time such return was filed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 4. Trademark and trade name expenditures.

"(a) Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by inserting after section 176 thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 177. Trademark and trade name expenditures.

"'(a) ELECTION TO AMORTIZE.—Any trademark or trade name expenditure paid or incurred during a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1955, may, at the election of the taxpayer (made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate), be treated as a deferred expense. In computing taxable income, all expenditures paid or incurred during the taxable year which are so treated shall be allowed as a deduction ratably over such period of not less than 60 months (beginning with the first month in such taxable year) as may be selected by the taxpayer in making such election. The expenditures so treated are expenditures properly chargeable to capital account for purposes of section 1016 (a) (1) (relating to adjustments to basis of property).

"'(b) TRADEMARK AND TRADE NAME EXPENDITURES DEFINED.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term "trademark or trade name expenditure" means any expenditure which—

"'(1) is directly connected with the acquisition, protection, expansion, registration (Federal, State, or foreign), or defense of a trademark or trade name;

"'(2) is chargeable to capital account; and

"'(3) is not part of the consideration paid for a trademark, trade name, or business.

"'(c) TIME FOR AND SCOPE OF ELECTION.—The election provided by subsection (a) shall be made within the time prescribed by law (including extensions thereof) for filing the return for the taxable year during which the expenditure is paid or incurred. The period selected by the taxpayer under subsection (a) with respect to the expenditures paid or incurred during the taxable year which are treated as deferred expenses shall be adhered to in computing his taxable income for the taxable year for which the election is made and all subsequent years.

"'(d) CROSS REFERENCE.—

"'For adjustments to basis of property for amounts allowed as deductions for expenditures treated as deferred expenses under this section, see section 1016 (a) (16)'."

"(b) The table of sections of part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof

"'SEC. 177. Trademark and trade name expenditures.'

"(c) Subsection (a) of section 1016 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to adjustments to basis) is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (15) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by adding at the end of such subsection the following new paragraph:

"'(16) for amounts allowed as deductions for expenditures treated as deferred expenses under section 177 (relating to trademark and trade name expenditures) and resulting in a reduction of the taxpayer's taxes under this subtitle, but not less than the amounts allowable under such section for the taxable year and prior years'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 5. Livestock sold on account of drought.

"(a) Section 1033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to involuntary conversions) is hereby amended by redesignating subsection (f) thereof as subsection (g) and by inserting after subsection (e) of such section the following new subsection:

"'(f) LIVESTOCK SOLD ON ACCOUNT OF DROUGHT.—For purposes of this subtitle, the sale or exchange of livestock (other than poultry) held by a taxpayer for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes in excess of the number the taxpayer would sell if he followed his usual business practices shall be treated as an involuntary conversion to which this section applies if such livestock are sold or exchanged by the taxpayer solely on account of drought.'

"(b) The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1955, but only in the case of sales and exchanges of livestock after December 31, 1955."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

JERE COOPER,
W. D. MILLS,
NOBLE J. GREGORY,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
By R. S. K.,
ROBT. S. KERR,
J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr.,
E. D. MILLIKIN,
EDWARD MARTIN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6143) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that for taxable years beginning after May 31, 1950, certain amounts received in consideration of the transfer of patent rights shall be considered capital gain regardless of the basis upon which such amounts are paid, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment adds a new section to the House bill which amends section 106 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to claims against the United States involving acquisition of property). Section 106 of the 1939 Code limits the surtax applicable to individuals to 30 percent in the case of amounts received from the United States on claims involving acquisition of property. The Senate amendment would extend the application of this section to payments received from the United States arising under a contract for the construction of installations or facilities for any branch of the armed services of the United States and remaining unpaid for more than 5 years from the date such claim first accrued and paid prior to January 1950. The amendment also provides that for purposes of section 291 (a), relating to additions to the tax for failure to file a return, the term "reasonable cause" shall include the filing of a timely incomplete return under circumstances which led the taxpayer to believe that no tax was due on amounts received under a settlement with the United States.

The House recedes with an amendment. The amendment makes two changes. The first change makes it clear that the provision relating to section 291 (a) applies only to a case to which the new paragraph

(b) of section 106 applies. The second change provides that the effective date provided in the Senate amendment (that is, that the amendment is to apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 1948) is to apply notwithstanding the operation of any law or rule of law (other than provisions relating to closing agreements and compromises). However, no claim for credit or refund of any overpayment resulting from the amendment is to be allowed or made after the period of limitation applicable to the overpayment, except that such period is not to expire before the expiration of 1 year after the date of the enactment of the provision.

It is the understanding of all the conferees that the action taken with respect to this amendment is not to be considered a precedent for future legislative action.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment adds a new subsection (n) (relating to certain distributions of property by corporations) to section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. The amendment provides rules for corporate distributions to stockholders of property having a fair market value in excess of the corporate earnings and profits. Paragraph (1) of the new subsection (n), in general, limits the amount of a corporate distribution of property which is taxable as a dividend to the amount of the earnings and profits of the distributing corporation. Paragraph (2) provides an additional rule for distributions of property made by personal holding companies. The new subsection (n) added by the Senate amendment is to be effective as if it were a part of section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 on the date of enactment of such code. No interest is to be allowed or paid in respect of any overpayment of tax resulting from the amendment.

The House recedes with amendments. The first is a technical amendment designed to permit the continued application of the last sentence of section 115 (a) of the 1939 Code, including the taking into account sections 504 (c) and 506 of such code, in a manner consistent with the purposes of this legislation. In addition, under the conference agreement, it is provided that the amendment made to the 1939 Code is not to apply to any taxable year of a shareholder which was a corporation and which filed a return for such year reporting dividends in accordance with publicly announced litigation policies of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate (such as nonacquiescence of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to decisions in litigated cases) which had not been revoked at the time such return was filed.

Paragraph (3) of the new subsection (n) provides that subsection (n) does not apply to any distribution of (A) money, (B) inventory assets, as defined in section 312 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, or (C) distributions described in section 312 (j) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. It is the intention of the conferees both on the part of the House and the Senate that no implication is to be drawn from this paragraph which would adversely affect a taxpayer under existing law with respect to any litigation pending or decision made as to which he was a party with respect to such types of distributions.

Amendment No. 3: This amendment provided that the tax on transportation of property imposed by the Internal Revenue Codes of 1939 and 1954 shall not apply to amounts paid for the transportation of poultry in continuous movement from the farm where the poultry was raised to a dressing plant, located within the local area of such farm, for processing. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 4: This amendment adds a new section 177 to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to trademark and trade name expenditures. Under the amendment, a trademark or trade name expenditure (as defined in the amendment) paid or incurred during a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1955, may, at the election of the taxpayer (made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) be treated as a deferred expense.

The House recedes with an amendment which makes technical and clarifying changes. As agreed to in conference, any trademark or trade name expenditure paid or incurred during a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1955, may, at the election of the taxpayer (made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate), be treated as a deferred expense. In computing taxable income, all expenditures paid or incurred during the taxable year which are so treated are to be allowed as a deduction ratably over such period of not less than 60 months (beginning with the first month in such taxable year) as may be selected by the taxpayer in making such election. Under the conference agreement the election with respect to any taxable year is to be made within the time prescribed by law (including extensions thereof) for filing the return for the taxable year during which the expenditure is paid or incurred. The period selected by the taxpayer for any taxable year is required to be adhered to (with respect to all expenditures to which the election for such year applies) in computing the taxable income of the taxpayer for the taxable year for which the election is made and all subsequent years. Under the conference agreement it is made clear that the expenditures covered by the bill are expenditures properly chargeable to capital account for purposes of section 1016 (a) (1) of the 1954 Code (relating to adjustments to basis of property) and that proper adjustment to basis is to be made for the amounts allowed as deductions as deferred expenses under the new section.

Amendment No. 5: This amendment adds a new subsection (f) to section 1033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to involuntary conversions). The Senate amendment provided that the sale of livestock (other than poultry) held by taxpayer for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes in excess of the number the taxpayer would sell if he followed his usual business practices shall be treated as an involuntary conversion to which section 1033 applies if such livestock—

(1) Are held in an area (A) in respect to which the President determines under the act of September 30, 1950, that a major disaster exists because of drought and (B) which is found eligible by the Secretary of Agriculture for certain assistance or relief under provisions administered by the Department of Agriculture; and

(2) Are sold (whether before or after such determination) by such taxpayer solely on account of such drought.

The Senate amendment applied only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1955.

The House recedes with an amendment. Under the conference agreement the section applies if the livestock are sold or exchanged because of drought. The requirements contained in the Senate amendment with respect to the existence of a major disaster proclaimed by the President and a finding of eligibility by the Secretary of Agriculture for assistance or relief are eliminated. Under the amendment a drought is a condition which exists in an area by reason of precipitation conditions which are abnormally low for such area. Under the conference agreement the amendment applies with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1955, but only in the case of sales and exchanges of livestock after December 31, 1955.

JERE COOPER,
W. D. MILLS,
NOBLE J. GREGORY,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the ranchers and farmers of the Nation join me today in urging the adoption of the conference report on H. R. 6143, because of their vital economic interest in its provision to treat as an involuntary conversion the sale of livestock because of drought.

Perhaps it would be difficult for those of you who live in the verdant lands of this section of our Nation to comprehend the widespread hardship apparent in certain semiarid areas when the rains fail to provide sufficient pasture for our livestock, and when the creeks and rivers dry up and cannot provide water for the livestock to drink. It might even be hard for you to imagine that when one area has sufficient moisture in a year to provide good pasture and good watering holes, just over the hill there could be yet another area that might be termed "bone dry." But these conditions do exist—and the areas of sufficient water and rainfall vary from year to year—making the sustaining of a good herd of breeding livestock a necessary risk, but one that is impossible to calculate.

Add to this hazard the fact that a great number of our ranchers and farmers in the semiarid States are small operators, and as such report their income on a cash basis or on a farm-inventory basis, and you can better understand the real meaning and true importance of this provision in H. R. 6143.

If the conference report is adopted, as I feel confident it will be, the ranchers and farmers who, because of an act of God over which they have no control, are forced to sell livestock held for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes because of drought conditions, will be able to claim such a sale as an involuntary conversion for Federal tax purposes, and thus not pay a tax—providing of course that the money thus realized is reinvested in other livestock as provided by this section of the code.

There is a very sound and basic reason why this new amendment to the Internal Revenue Code is the only fair treatment to be accorded to these ranchers and farmers. I think you all are cognizant of the laws of supply and demand and that you can apply these basic laws in this case. For instance—when a lot of stock is being sold, as would happen when many ranchers and farmers are faced with drought conditions, the supply will drive the price down. When the drought conditions are finally alleviated and the farmers or ranchers can once again resume normal operations, the demand factor enters, and the purchases are made on a rising market.

Say that the rancher had been forced to pay a capital gains tax at the time he sold his livestock. That would mean that, despite a rising market, and at a time when he is hard pressed in every other way during a recovery period, he would have only 74 cents of every dollar

he had realized on the drought-period sale to spend for replacement livestock. That comes about as close to being an impossible situation for a small operator as I can imagine. And that is why we are well pleased that our efforts in behalf of these small operators have met with success after the long pull. I think all of you can recognize the justice of this amendment. I wish to thank the conferees and the members of the committee for their sympathetic understanding of the problem and the fairness of the solution. It will mean fair tax treatment to the ranchers and the farmers of the Nation.

I am particularly pleased that the provisions of the Senate amendment to limit the application of this to livestock held in an area designated by the President as an emergency drought area and certified by the Secretary of Agriculture for an emergency feed program were eliminated. These would have resulted in gross tax discriminations and inequities to our individual taxpayers.

To see this, one need only look at the situation pertaining in the State of Wyoming last year. About one-half of the State would not have qualified under the restrictions of the Senate amendment. Yet, within this half of the State there were many instances where breeding herds were reduced because of drought conditions. In 1952 and 1953, none of this State was designated as an emergency area. Yet, because of drought, large numbers from breeding herds were sold.

I introduced a bill to provide for this involuntary conversion treatment for drought sales of livestock on January 5, 1955, and am certainly gratified that the provisions of that bill are included in the conference report we have before us now. The bill as approved in conference will extend this long overdue fair tax treatment to all of our ranchers and farmers. Regarding this the conference report provides:

> The sale of livestock (other than poultry) held by a taxpayer for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes in excess of the number the taxpayer would sell if he followed his usual business practices shall be treated as an involuntary conversion to which this section applies if such livestock are sold by such taxpayer solely on account of such drought.

I urge adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6143 as it passed the House provided that the special rules regarding capital-gains treatment for patents contained in section 1235 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are to be applicable to taxable years beginning after May 31, 1950.

The provisions of H. R. 6143 as it passed the House were adopted by the Senate. However, the Senate made five substantive amendments dealing with other areas of the Internal Revenue Code. The first of these amends section 106 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939—relating to claims against the United States involving acquisition of property—to extend the application of that section to payments received from the United States arising under a contract for the construction of installations or facilities for any branch of the Armed Forces of the United States if the claim remained unpaid for more than 5 years but was paid prior to 1950. This amendment also provides that for purposes of section 291 (a) of the 1939 Code "reasonable cause" is to include the filing of a timely incomplete return under circumstances which led the taxpayer to believe that no tax was due on amounts received under a settlement with the United States.

As a result of the conference agreement the House recedes with an amendment which makes two technical changes. These changes operate to make it clear that the provision relating to section 291 (a) applies only in cases to which the new paragraph (b) of section 106 applies and that the rule provided by the amendment is to apply notwithstanding the operation of any law or rule of law other than provisions relating to closing agreements and compromises.

The second Senate amendment adds a new subsection (n) to section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 which in general provides that the amount of a corporate distribution of property to stockholders which is to be taxable as a dividend is to be limited to the earnings and profits of the corporation without regard to the fair market value of the property. This is the so-called Godley-Hirshon amendment and is effective for corporate distributions to which the 1939 code applies.

As a result of the conference agreement the House recedes with two amendments. First, a technical amendment provides that in distributions of property by personal holding companies, by companies which at one time were personal holding companies, the last sentence of section 115 (a) of the 1939 code is to continue to apply. This sentence treats as a dividend for these personal holding companies any amount distributed to shareholders to the extent of subchapter A net income, with certain adjustments. In addition, under the conference agreement the new provision is not to apply in the case of a shareholder which was a corporation and which filed a return for a taxable year, reporting dividends in accordance with the publicly announced litigation policies of the Secretary of the Treasury such as nonacquiescence in litigated court cases.

Paragraph (3) of the Senate amendment I have been describing provides that the new section 115 (n) of the 1939 code is to apply to any distribution of property except money, inventory assets—as defined in section 312 (b) (2) of the 1954 code—or distributions of proceeds of loans insured by the United States—as described in section 312 (j) of the 1954 code. The statement on behalf of the managers on the part of the House makes it clear that it is the intention of all of the conferees that no implication should be drawn from this new paragraph (3) which would adversely affect a taxpayer under existing law with respect to any litigation pending, or decision made as to which he is a party with respect to such types of distributions.

The third Senate amendment provided that the tax on the transportation of property imposed under both the Internal Revenue Codes of 1939 and 1954 was not to apply to amounts paid for the transportation of poultry in continuous movement from the farm where the poultry was raised to a dressing plant, located within the local area of the farm, for processing. The Senate conferees receded on this amendment.

The fourth Senate amendment adds a new section 177 to the 1954 Code to provide that expenditures paid directly in connection with the acquisition, protection, expansion, registration, or defense of a trademark or trade name may, at the election of the taxpayer, be treated as a deferred expense and taken as deductions ratably over a period of 60 months or more. This applies only to expenditures paid or incurred after December 31, 1955, and to taxable years beginning after that date. Pursuant to the conference agreement the House receded to this Senate amendment with certain technical and clarifying changes.

The fifth Senate amendment added a new subsection (f) to section 1033 of the 1954 code. This provides that the sale of livestock—other than poultry—held for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes, to the extent the taxpayer sells more than he would under his usual business practices is to be treated as an involuntary conversion if certain conditions relating to drought exist. The conditions which must exist are as follows: First, the livestock must be held in an area which the President declares to be a drought-disaster area which is eligible for assistance or relief under provisions administered by the Department of Agriculture. Second, the livestock must actually be sold because of the drought. This provision is to apply to sales in years beginning after December 31, 1955.

The taxpayer, where these conditions are met under the regular involuntary conversion provisions, is allowed 1 year to replace the livestock sold because of the drought. If he does so, to the full extent of the proceeds realized from the sale, he realizes no gain and retains as the basis for the new livestock the basis he had for the livestock he sold.

The House conferees agreed to this Senate amendment on livestock but with certain changes. As agreed to by the House conferees, the drought is not necessarily a major disaster proclaimed by the President which has been declared eligible for assistance or relief by the Department of Agriculture. Instead, the presence or absence of a drought is to be determined on the basis of whether or not precipitation in an area is abnormally low. Also, the amendment is to apply only to sales or exchanges of livestock occurring after December 31,

1955, and in taxable years ending after that date.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. COOPER, of Tennessee, has explained carefully the technical details of the amendments which were agreed to by the conference committee on H. R. 6143. I shall endeavor not to cover the same ground. I would like to point out the House bill was introduced by my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, Representative SADLAK, of Connecticut. The bill which Mr. SADLAK sponsored and which this House passed unanimously last year made applicable the special rules providing capital gains treatment for sales or exchanges of patents in section 1235 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to taxable years beginning after May 31, 1950. Ever since the enactment of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by the 83d Congress when I was privileged to be chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, there has been a constant demand to make many of the new provisions of that code retroactive to years prior to 1954. This is convincing evidence, I think, of the almost universal acceptance of the sounder and more fair tax treatment extended by the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

RAILROAD REORGANIZATIONS AND INSOLVENCY PROCEEDINGS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7247) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of gain in certain railroad organizations, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2252)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7247) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of gain in certain railroad organizations, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 3.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 4. The table of sections for part IV of subchapter C of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" 'SEC. 374. Gain or loss not recognized in certain railroad reorganizations.'

"SEC. 5. Section 108 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to income of a railroad corporation from discharge of indebtedness) is hereby amended by striking out 'December 31, 1955' and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1957'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"Amend the title so as to read: 'An Act relating to recognition of gain or loss in certain railroad reorganizations and to amend section 108 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JERE COOPER,
W. D. MILLS,
NOBLE J. GREGORY,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
ROBERT S. KERR,
J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr.,
E. D. MILLIKIN,
EDWARD W. MARTIN,
By HARRY F. BYRD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7247) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of gain in certain railroad reorganizations submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: Subsection (b) of section 108 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 provides that no amount is to be included in gross income by reason of the discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation, if the discharge is effected pursuant to a court order issued in a receivership proceeding or in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act. The last sentence of such subsection now provides, however, that this provision will not apply to any discharge of indebtedness occurring in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1955.

Senate amendment No. 1 extended the applicability of section 108 (b) to any discharge of indebtedness occurring in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1955, and before January 1, 1958.

The House recedes with an amendment which inserts the language contained in Senate amendment No. 1 and also makes a clerical amendment to a table of sections in the 1954 Code.

Amendment No. 2: Senate amendment No. 2 added a new section 5 to the bill which proposed to amend section 723 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to the computation of equity invested capital in special cases under the World War II excess-profits tax) with respect to certain recapitalizations of railroad corporations. The Senate recedes.

In acting on this amendment it was the understanding of all the conferees, both on the part of the Senate and on the part of the House, that the action taken is without prejudice as to the merits of the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 3: Senate amendment No. 3 provided an effective date for the provision added by Senate amendment No. 2. The Senate recedes.

JERE COOPER,
W. D. MILLS,
NOBLE J. GREGORY,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7247 as it passed the House added a new section 374 to the 1954 code to provide that no gain will be recognized to a railroad corporation where its properties are transferred (a) pursuant to a court order in a receivership proceeding, or (b) as a result of a proceeding under the Bankruptcy Acts in a reorganization approved by a court in exchange solely for stock or securities in another railroad corporation.

The Senate adopted the provisions of H. R. 7247 as it passed the House. However, it made two substantive amendments to the bill dealing with other areas of the Internal Revenue Code. The first of these amends sections 108 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which presently provides that no amount is to be included in gross income by reason of the discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation if the discharge is effected pursuant to a court order issued in a receivership proceeding or in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act. However, this provision will not apply to any discharge of indebtedness occurring in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1955. The amendment extends the applicability of section 108 (b) to such discharges of indebtedness occurring in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1955, and before January 1, 1958. The provisions of this amendment are similar to those of H. R. 6887, as it passed the House in the first session of this Congress and modified only by the substitution of a new cutoff date of December 31, 1957, for the December 31, 1956, date of the House bill. As a result of the conference agreement, the House recedes with a clerical amendment to a table of sections in the 1954 code.

The second Senate amendment would have added a new section 5 to the bill amending section 723 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939—relating to the computation of equity invested capital in special cases under the World War II excess-profits tax provisions—with respect to certain recapitalizations of railroad corporations.

Pursuant to the conference agreement the Senate recedes. The statement on behalf of the managers on the part of the House states that in acting on this

amendment it was the understanding of all conferees that the action taken was without prejudice as to the merits of the Senate amendments.

I urge that the bill, as agreed to in conference, be adopted by the House.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I shall not repeat the detailed explanation of this bill and the Senate amendments which Chairman COOPER has just given the House. I would like to point out, however, that the second Senate amendment, with respect to which the Senate conferees receded, and which is not contained in the bill as agreed to in conference, is the subject of a bill, H. R. 3256, introduced by my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. MASON, of Illinois. That bill, which was approved by our committee in the last session, but which has not been actually reported to the House, would, like the Senate amendment to which I have referred, have amended section 723 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939—relating to the computation of equity invested capital in special cases under the World War II excess-profits tax—with respect to certain recapitalization of railroad corporations. I would like to point out that in eliminating this amendment from the pending bill it was definitely the express understanding of all the conferees, both on the part of the Senate and on the part of the House, that the action taken is without prejudice as to the merits of the Senate amendment.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 11619.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

WE CONTINUE TO WANDER (OR GET PUSHED) FROM BRINK TO BRINK

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, our Secretary of State has earned another feather for his cap. Today marks the "success" of another of his great efforts. This is the one by which he pushed the British over the brink of the Suez Canal and into the Mediterranean Sea.

The Egyptians are today celebrating a great event, the evacuation of the British from the Suez Canal. That was done only because our Mr. Dulles urged it. It, he said, would create greater friendship and closer ties between Egypt, Britain, and the United States. The result is that both countries are angrier than ever with us. Neither the British Prime Minister nor his representative are there to celebrate the exodus of the British from Egypt.

Not only is no representative of our own Secretary of State there, but I doubt whether Mr. Dulles was even invited. But, the foreign minister of Russia, Mr. Shepilov, will be there and will receive and give all the honors in connection with this latest if not greatest "success" of our Secretary of State.

The mighty Nasser and his controlled press and radio daily denounce us and our friends and daily commend and emulate our potential enemies, the Communist dictators, then threaten the extinction of friendly Israel and offer Egypt's Arab allies the choice of extinction or collaboration, the latter meaning subjugation to dictatorial Communist domination.

How long, Mr. Secretary, will you continue to dream?

THE LATE WILLIAM A. PATTEN

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow I announce the death last Friday of William A. Patten, one of the oldest of Capitol employees. For over 57 years he served with fidelity and efficiency. For the last 17 years he has been part of my staff, and no one could have a more faithful and conscientious worker than William, as he was known to everybody.

William Patten came to the Capitol first as an employee in the Architect's office on March 1, 1899. He alternated in working for the Architect and in the Senate restaurant for 22 years. In 1921 he was appointed as messenger for the Rules Committee by Bertrand H. Snell, of New York, who was chairman. Later he became messenger to Mr. Snell as minority leader, and he continued on my staff in 1939 when I succeeded Mr. Snell.

William owned a home in Harper's Ferry, where he spent his vacations and where he hoped to pass his final days when retired.

Retirement, although long earned, was not to come to William. He loved his work and associates on Capitol Hill. When I was first elected Speaker it was called to my attention, not by William but by another member of the staff, that he was working for less than he could secure by retirement. We, of course, corrected that situation.

He was extremely courteous to everyone; he liked to help folks and he never had a bad word to say of anybody. He performed his work cheerfully and through his personal life was really an inspiration. A fine, faithful, true friend passed away when William Patten died.

FOR THE RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following request from the Senate.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate House Joint Resolution 472, entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens," as amended.

Attest:

FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the majority leader when the so-called veterans' pension bill will be programed. I was in Massachusetts over the weekend, and there was word that it would come up on Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. The majority leader should speak for himself if he is here.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. He is not here. Would the Speaker answer the question?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not answering that question this morning.

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan.

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, on June 8, I introduced House Joint Resolution 645, a proposed amendment to the Constitution that would permit children of American parents on active duty overseas to be eligible to the office of President. As it now stands, the section of the Constitution relating to the qualifications for President has never really been clarified or tested. House Joint Resolution 645 would preclude any friction relating to this vital issue.

What an ironical situation could develop in the not too distant future if thousands of Americans were excluded from even the possibility of ever becoming President. It would be doubly galling to disqualify the children of Americans who are now defending their country thousands of miles from home. I believe my proposed amendment is a step in the right direction toward guaranteeing every American the basic rights intended by the Founding Fathers.

NOW LET THE MOVIES DO ONE ON REPUBLICAN BOSSES

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I heard Drew Pearson report on the radio recently that Hollywood was coming out with a new movie, called The Boss, about the old Pendergast political machine.

I imagine that this will make the Republicans happy and give them something to crow about during the coming campaign. My Republican friends are always happiest when they are looking backward to the past, inasmuch as they can do little crowing about the present state of affairs in the country.

For myself, I have always been against political bosses and am gratified that they no longer have any real voice in the Democratic Party.

However, if Hollywood wants to be objective, it should produce another movie about the bosses who now run the Republican Party. I refer to the big-time lobbyists, the oil billionaires and others, who finance the GOP and dictate its policies in the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

As a movie fan, I would like to see Hollywood turn its cameras on these real political bosses of the present, instead of reviving ghosts from the past.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ELECTION EXPENDITURES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 483, Rept. No. 2364), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Members be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to investigate and report to the House not later than January 3, 1957, with respect to the following matters:

(1) The extent and nature of expenditures made by all candidates for the House of Representatives in connection with their campaign for nomination and election to such office.

(2) The amounts subscribed, contributed, or expended, and the value of services rendered, and facilities made available (including personal services, use of advertising space, radio and television time, office space, moving-picture films, and automobile and other transportation facilities) by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any convention or election held in 1956 to which a candidate for the House of Representatives is to be nominated or elected.

(3) The use of any other means or influence (including the promise or use of patronage) for the purpose of aiding or influencing the nomination or election of any such candidates.

(4) The amounts, if any, raised, contributed, and expended by any individual, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, including any political committee thereof, in connection with any such election, and the amounts received by any political committee from any corporation, labor union, individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, or partnership.

(5) The violations, if any, of the following statutes of the United States:

(a) The Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

(b) The act of August 2, 1939, as amended, relating to pernicious political activities, commonly referred to as the Hatch Act.

(c) The provisions of section 304, Public Law 101, 80th Congress, chapter 120, first session, referred to as the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947.

(d) Any statute or legislative act of the United States or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or reelection to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the House of Representatives within the meaning of article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.

(6) Such other matters relating to the election of Members of the House of Representatives in 1956, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which in its opinion will aid the House of Representatives in enacting remedial legislation, or in deciding contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the House of Representatives.

(7) The committee is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable. Upon complaint being made to the committee under oath, by any person, candidate, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution, it would be the duty of said committee to investigate, the committee shall investigate such charges as fully as though it were acting upon its own motion, unless, after a hearing upon such complaint, the committee shall find that the allegations in such complaint are immaterial or untrue. All hearings before the committee, and before any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall be public, and all orders and decisions of the committee, and of any such subcommittee shall be public.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such public hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the 84th Congress, to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

(8) The committee is authorized and directed to report promptly any and all violations of any Federal or State statutes in connection with the matters and things mentioned herein to the Attorney General of the United States in order that he may take such official action as may be proper.

(9) Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties prescribed by law.

That said committee is authorized and directed to file interim reports, whenever in the judgment of the majority of the committee, or of a subcommittee conducting portions of said investigation, the public interest will be best served by the filing of said interim reports, and in no event shall the final report of said committee be filed later than January 3, 1957, as hereinabove provided.

TO AMEND BANKHEAD–JONES FARM TENANT ACT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 542, Rept. No. 2365), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11544) to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AMENDING FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2364) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AMENDING PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO PROVIDE MENTAL HEALTH STUDY GRANTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9048) to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to improve the mental health of the Nation through grants for special projects to develop improved methods of care, treatment, and rehabilitation of the mentally ill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL HEALTH SURVEY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3076) to provide for a continuing survey and special studies of sickness and disability in the United States, and for periodic reports of the results thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I understand that this bill is scheduled to be called up under suspension of the rules. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

DEFINITION OF "NONFAT DRY MILK"

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5257) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids" (21 U. S. C., sec. 321c).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN RESERVE MINERAL DEPOSITS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6501) to amend the act of July 17, 1914, to permit the disposal of certain reserve mineral deposits under the mining laws of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for agricultural entry of lands withdrawn, classified, or reported as containing phosphate, nitrate, potash, oil, gas, or asphaltic minerals," approved July 17, 1914 (38 Stat. 509; 30 U. S. C. 122), is hereby amended by striking out "such deposits to be subject to disposal by the United States only as shall be hereafter expressly directed by law" and inserting in lieu thereof "such deposits to be subject to disposal by the United States only as shall be hereafter expressly directed by law: *Provided, however*, That all mineral deposits heretofore or hereafter reserved to the United States under this act which are subject to valid and subsisting rights acquired by discovery and location under the mining laws of the United States made prior to the date of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), shall hereafter be subject to disposal by patent under the mining laws of the United States in force at the time of such disposal."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, following the word "subject", insert the words ", at the time of application for patent."

Page 2, line 8, following the word "disposal", insert the words "to the holders of those valid and subsisting rights."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REDUCED-RATE TRANSPORTATION TO MINISTERS OF RELIGION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9592) to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit air carriers and foreign air carriers, subject to certain conditions, to grant reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this bill is to be called up under suspension of the rules. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF PINE RIDGE SIOUX TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5338) to provide that payments be made to certain members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians as reimbursement for damages suffered as the result of the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range, and to provide a rehabilitation program for the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to pay the sum of $3,500 to the head of each of the 125 Indian families determined by the report entitled "Investigation of the Pine Ridge Aerial Gunnery Range Taking for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States House of Representatives," submitted by the Department of the Interior on April 10, 1952, in response to a resolution of the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives, adopted March 4, 1950, to have actually been domiciled on August 1, 1942, on the land belonging to the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians, South Dakota, which was taken by the Department of the Army in 1942 for the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range. The Secretary of the Interior shall make such payment of $3,500 to the heirs of any such head of a family who is deceased. Payment of such sum shall be in full and complete settlement of all claims of such Indians and their heirs against the United States for damages suffered as a result of being forced to move from their homes, and being forced to relocate and reestablish themselves elsewhere because such lands were taken for an aerial gunnery range.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to undertake a program of rehabilitation for all enrolled members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians, without regard to whether any particular member of such tribe was actually resident within the area taken for the aerial gunnery range at the time of such taking. Such program of rehabilitation shall be directed to the improvement of the economic, social, religious, and community life of all such Indians, to the end that such Indians will be placed in a condition at least as advantageous as the condition they would have been in if their land had not been taken for an aerial gunnery range.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purpose of the first section of this act the sum of $437,500.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $13,426,800 which shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States, to the credit of such Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians, which sum shall draw interest upon the principal at the rate of 4 per centum per annum, until expended by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out the provisions of section 2 of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 10, following the word "heirs" insert the words "or devisees."

Page 2, line 12, following the word "heirs" insert the words "or devisees."

Page 2, line 16, change the period to a comma and add the words "and the distribution of funds under this act shall not be subject to any lien, except for debts owed to the United States or to Indian organizations indebted to the United States, and shall not be taxable."

Page 2, line 17, strike all of section 2 through page 3, line 3.

Page 3, line 4, renumber SEC. 3 (a) to read "SEC. 2."

Page 3, line 7, strike all of subsection (b) through page 3, line 13.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide that payments be made to certain members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians as reimbursement for damages suffered as the result of the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING PRESCRIBED FEES OF UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10949) to amend section 633 of title 28, United States Code, prescribing fees of United States commissioners.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 633 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"United States commissioners in each judicial district, except national park commissioners, shall receive the following fees only for all services rendered, not to exceed $10,500 for any one calendar year:

"(1) For attending to any reference by order of court of a litigated matter in a civil case or in admiralty, $8 a day.

"(2) For taking and certifying depositions, 30 cents for each folio and for each copy thereof furnished on request, 20 cents per folio.

"(3) A fee graduated according to the aggregate number of cases in each quarterly accounting period, in the sum of $14 for each of the first 25 cases, $9 for each of the next 25 cases, $8 for each of the next 50 cases, and $2 for each additional case, of the following kinds:

" 'Issuance of an attachment and subsequent hearings in internal revenue matters pursuant to section 7604 (b) of title 26;

" 'Settling or certifying the nonpayment of a seaman's wage pursuant to sections 603 and 604 of title 46;

" 'Preliminary proceedings to hold an accused person to answer in district court, payable to the commissioner who disposes of the case by discharge or binding over, for all services rendered after presentation of the accused;

" 'Each accused person brought before the commissioner for holding to answer in district court shall be considered a case for the purpose of computation of fees.'

"(4) For all services rendered for each accused person presented before him for purposes of bail only and not for holding to answer in district court, whether or not bail is taken or commitment ordered, $4.

"(5) Upon the filing of a sworn, written complaint, for all services rendered prior to presentation of the accused before the commissioner, $4 for each person accused.

"(6) For all services in connection with each formal, written application for a search warrant, whether granted or denied, $6.

"(7) For each proceeding for the discharge of an indigent prisoner, $6.

"(8) For each defendant tried or sentenced by him for a petty offense, in lieu of all other fees provided in this section, a fee graduated according to the aggregate number of cases in each quarterly accounting period, in the sum of $16 for each of the first 25 cases and $12 for each additional case."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after the numerals "633" insert the following: "(a)."

Page 1, line 5, insert between the quotation marks and the words "United States" the following: "(a)";

Page 2, line 8, following the colon, insert "—";

Page 3 add the following new section:

"SEC. 2. Subsection 633 (b) of title 28, United States Code is hereby repealed."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill just passed (H. R. 10949) the enrolling clerk be authorized to make the necessary clerical corrections.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

WAIVER OF REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 142, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9137) to waive section 142, of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina holding court at Bryson City, N. C.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limitations and restrictions contained in section 142, title 28, of the United States Code, shall be waived insofar as pertains to holding court by the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina at Bryson City, N. C.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL CEMETERIES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2512) to amend the act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving in such forces.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of members of the Armed Forces missing in action," approved August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 880), is amended by striking out "missing in action" and inserting in lieu thereof "who died or were killed while serving in such forces, and whose remains have not been identified, have been buried at sea, or have been determined to be nonrecoverable."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the act entitled 'An act to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of members of the Armed Forces missing in action', approved August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 880), is amended by adding after the word 'action', the words 'or who died or were killed while serving in such forces, and whose remains have not been identified, have been buried at sea, or have been determined to be nonrecoverable.'"

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

In order that there be a clear understanding as to the pension bill, for apparently there was some rumor that it was coming up this week—I do not know where the rumor came from—I intend to program that bill for next week.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KANOSH BAND OF INDIANS, UTAH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9828) to transfer 600 acres of public domain to the Kanosh Band of Indians, Utah.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-described public domain is hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Kanosh Band of the Paiute Indian Tribe in Utah, subject to the provisions of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1099), with respect to the termination of Federal supervision over all property of such Indians: The southeast quarter, east half northeast quarter, and the northwest quarter northeast quarter, section 35, township 22 south, range 5 west; the west half west half, section 14, and the east half east half, section 15, township 23 south, range 5 west, Salt Lake meridian, Utah, containing 600 acres.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMISSION ON THE APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LAWS TO GUAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11522) to implement section 25 (b) of the Organic Act of Guam by carrying out the recommendations of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 101 (a) (1) of the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275; 7 U. S. C. 1561 (a) (1)), is amended by inserting immediately after the word "Hawaii," the word "Guam,".

(b) Section 101 (a) (8) (A) (ii) of the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275, 1277; 7 U. S. C. 1561 (a) (8) (A) (ii)), is amended by inserting immediately after the words "Puerto Rico," the word "Guam,".

(c) Section 101 (a) (9) (A) (ii) of the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275, 1277; 7 U. S. C. 1561 (a) (9) (A) (ii)), is amended by inserting immediately after the words "Puerto Rico," the word "Guam,".

SEC. 2. The National Bank Act, and all other Acts of Congress relating to national banks, shall, insofar as not locally inapplicable hereafter, apply to Guam.

SEC. 3. The Federal Deposit Insurance Act (64 Stat. 873; 12 U. S. C., secs. 1811–1831), is amended—

(a) by inserting the word "Guam," after the words "Puerto Rico," in subsection (a) of section 3;

(b) by inserting the word "Guam," after the words "Puerto Rico," in each place where they appear in subsections (d), (e), and (o) of section 3;

(c) by inserting the word "Guam," after the words "Puerto Rico," in the first proviso of subsection (l) of section 3; and

(d) by inserting the words "of Guam," after the words "of Puerto Rico," where they appear in subsection (m) of section 3.

SEC. 4. Section 5 of the act of March 9, 1945 (59 Stat. 33, 34; 15 U. S. C., sec. 1015), is amended by inserting immediately after the words "Puerto Rico," the word "Guam,".

SEC. 5. Section 2 of the act of June 3, 1948 (62 Stat. 334; 16 U. S. C., sec. 8f), is amended by inserting immediately after the words "Puerto Rico," the word "Guam,".

SEC. 6. Section 4 of the act of June 23, 1936 (49 Stat. 1894, 1895; 16 U. S. C., sec. 17n), is amended by inserting immediately after the words "Puerto Rico," the word "Guam,".

SEC. 7. Subsection (a) of section 8 of the act of September 2, 1937 (50 Stat. 917), as amended (16 U. S. C., sec. 669g–1), is further amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cooperate with the Alaska Game Commission, the Division of Game and Fish of the Board of Commissioners of Agriculture and Forestry of Hawaii, the Commissioner of Agriculture and Commerce of Puerto Rico, the Governor of the Virgin Islands, and the Governor of Guam, in the conduct of wildlife-restoration projects, as defined in section 2 of this act, upon such terms and conditions as he shall deem fair, just, and equitable, and is authorized to apportion to said Territories, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, out of money available for apportionment under this act, such sums as he shall determine, not exceeding $75,000 for Alaska, not exceeding $25,000 for Hawaii, and not exceeding $10,000 each for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, in any one year, which apportionments, when made, shall be deducted before making the apportionments to the States provided for by said sections; but the Secretary shall in no event require any of said cooperating agencies to pay an amount which will exceed 25 percent of the cost of any project. Any unexpended or unobligated balance of any apportionment made pursuant to this section shall be available for expenditure in the Territories, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or Guam, as the case may be, in the succeeding year, on any approved project, and if unexpended or unobligated at the end of such year is authorized to be made available for expenditure by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out the provisions of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act."

SEC. 8. Section 12 of the act of August 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 430, 434; 16 U. S. C., sec. 777k), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cooperate with the Alaska Game Commission, the Division of Game and Fish of the Board of Commissioners of Agri-

culture and Forestry of Hawaii, the Commissioner of Agriculture and Commerce of Puerto Rico, the Governor of the Virgin Islands, and the Governor of Guam, in the conduct of fish restoration and management projects, as defined in section 2 of this act, upon such terms and conditions as he shall deem fair, just, and equitable, and is authorized to apportion to said Territories, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, out of money available for apportionment under the act, such sums as he shall determine, not exceeding $75,000 for Alaska, not exceeding $25,000 for Hawaii, and not exceeding $10,000 each for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, in any one year, which apportionments, when made, shall be deducted before making the apportionments to the States provided for by this act; but the Secretary shall in no event require any of said cooperating agencies to pay an amount which will exceed 25 percent of the cost of any project. Any unexpended or unobligated balance of any apportionment made pursuant to this section shall be available for expenditure in the Territories, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or Guam, as the case may be, in the succeeding year, on any approved project, and if unexpended or unobligated at the end of such year is authorized to be made available for expenditure by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying on the research program of the Fish and Wildlife Service in respect to fish of material value for sport or recreation."

SEC. 9. (a) Guam shall be entitled to share in the benefits of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 775), and any act amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, upon the same terms and conditions as any of the several States. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and annually thereafter, the sum of $80,000, to be available for allotment to Guam under such act and the modifications hereinafter provided.

(b) Sums appropriated under the authority of subsection (a) of this section shall be allocated for vocational education in (1) agriculture, (2) home economics, (3) trades and industries, and (4) distributive occupations, in the proportion which the amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4), respectively, of section 3 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, bears to the sum of such amounts except insofar as the Commissioner of Education, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare deems it necessary to modify said proportions to meet special conditions existing in Guam.

(c) The provisions of section 3 (60 Stat. 775; 20 U. S. C., sec. 15j), section 7 (60 Stat. 775, 777; 20 U. S. C., sec. 15o), and section 8 (b) (60 Stat. 775, 777; 20 U. S. C., sec. 15p (b)), of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, shall apply to sums appropriated under this section with such modifications as the Commissioner of Education, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall deem necessary to meet special conditions existing in Guam.

(d) In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated under section 9 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 775, 777; 20 U. S. C., sec. 15q), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, such sums to be expended for the same purposes and in the same manner as provided in section 7 of the act of February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929, 933), as amended (20 U. S. C., sec. 15).

SEC. 10. The act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1100; 20 U. S. C., sec. 236 and the following), as amended by Public Law 248, 83d Congress (67 Stat. 530), is further amended by adding the word "Guam," immediately following the words "Wake Island," wherever they appear in such act.

SEC. 11. Paragraph (14) of section 210 of the act of September 23, 1950 (64 Stat. 967, 977), as amended, is further amended by inserting immediately after the words "Puerto Rico," the word "Guam."

SEC. 12. (a) The heading of section 4735 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by inserting the word "Guam," immediately following the words "the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

(b) Section 4735 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(d) Guam: In Guam the administration of sections 4701 to 4707, inclusive; sections 4721 to 4726, inclusive; sections 4732 to 4734, inclusive; and insofar as they relate to narcotic drugs, sections 4771 to 4776, inclusive; the collections of the special tax imposed by section 4721 and the issuance of the order forms specified in section 4705, shall be performed by the appropriate internal revenue officers of Guam, and all revenues collected thereunder in Guam shall accrue intact to the general government thereof."

(c) Section 4705 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For issuance of order forms in Guam, see section 4735 (d)."

(d) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the third month which begins more than 10 days after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 13. Subchapter B of part I, subchapter A, chapter 39 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by inserting immediately after section 4715, the following new section to be numbered section 4716:

"SEC. 4716. Application to Guam.

"The provisions of this subpart shall be applicable to Guam, and in Guam the administration of this subpart shall be performed by the appropriate internal revenue officers of the Government of Guam, and all revenues collected thereunder in Guam shall accrue intact to the government thereof."

SEC. 14. Section 4774 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That (notwithstanding sec. 7651), sections 4741 to 4742, inclusive, and insofar as they relate to marihuana, sections 4771 to 4776, inclusive, shall not apply to Guam."

SEC. 15. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to produce, manufacture, compound, possess, sell, give away, deal in, dispense, administer, or transport marihuana in Guam, or to import marihuana into or export it from Guam.

(b) As used in subsection (a) of this section, the term "marihuana" shall have the meaning now or hereafter ascribed to it in section 4761 (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, and the term "produce" shall mean (a) plant, cultivate, or in any way facilitate the natural growth of marihuana, or (b) harvest and transfer or make use of marihuana.

(c) Any person who shall violate subsection (a) of this section shall be punished for the first offense by a fine of not more than $2,000, or by imprisonment in jail for not less than 2 or more than 5 years, or by both, and shall be punished for each subsequent offense by a fine of not more than $2,000, or by imprisonment in jail for not less than 5 years or more than 10 years, or by both; and any marihuana involved in any violation of subsection (a) of this section may be seized, and the court may order its confiscation and destruction.

SEC. 16. (a) Subsection (g) of section 11 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (68 Stat. 652, 662), is amended by striking the words "and for the purposes of section 4, includes also Guam" and inserting the words "and Guam."

(b) Subsection (h) of section 11 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (68 Stat. 652, 662), is amended by inserting immediately after the words "Puerto Rico" the word "Guam."

(c) Subsection (i) of section 11 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (68 Stat. 652, 662), is amended by inserting immediately after the words "Puerto Rico" the word ", Guam."

SEC. 17. (a) Subsection (b) of section 3 of the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113, 114), as amended (29 U. S. C., sec. 49b (b)), is further amended by inserting immediately after the words "Puerto Rico," the word "Guam."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 5 of the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113, 115), as amended (29 U. S. C., sec. 49d (b)), is further amended by inserting immediately after the words "Puerto Rico," the word "Guam."

SEC. 18. Effective July 1, 1956, section 314 of the Public Health Service Act (58 Stat. 682, 693), as amended (42 U. S. C., sec. 246), is further amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(l) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the provisions of this section shall be applicable to Guam in the same manner in which they apply to the States. Amounts paid to Guam from its allotment under subsections (a), (b), (c), or (e) of this section, together with matching funds of Guam, may, with the approval of the Surgeon General, be expended in carrying out the purposes specified in any such subsection or subsections other than the one under which the allotment was made."

SEC. 19. (a) Subsection (a) of section 631 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C., sec. 291i (a)), is amended by inserting immediately after the words "Puerto Rico" the word ", Guam."

(b) Subsection (d) of section 631 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C., sec. 291i (d)), is amended by inserting immediately after "Puerto Rico," the word "Guam."

(c) Sections 624 and 652 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C., secs. 291g and 291t) are each amended by inserting immediately after the words "the Virgin Islands" the words "or Guam."

SEC. 20. Section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 601, 612), as amended (44 U. S. C., sec. 183), is further amended by inserting the word "Guam," immediately after the words "Puerto Rico,".

SEC. 21. The language preceding the proviso in subsection (a) of section 26 (64 Stat. 384, 391; 48 U. S. C., sec. 1421d (a)), of the Organic Act of Guam is amended to read as follows: "The Governor shall receive an annual salary at the rate provided for the Governor of the Virgin Islands in the Executive Pay Act of 1949, as heretofore or hereafter amended, to be paid by the United States."

SEC. 22. The act of August 9, 1939 (53 Stat. 1291), as amended (49 U. S. C., secs. 781–788), is further amended by adding at the end of section 8 the following new section 9:

"SEC. 9. (a) In Guam the enforcement and administration of this act shall be performed by the Governor of Guam, acting through such officers of the government of Guam as he may designate.

"(b) The Governor of Guam is authorized to carry out the provisions of the related laws set forth in section 4 of this act, with such modifications as he shall deem necessary to meet special conditions on Guam; and the Governor is further authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act on Guam."

SEC. 23. Paragraphs (11) and (12) of article 2 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (64 Stat. 108, 109; 50 U. S. C., sec. 552 (11) and (12)), are amended by inserting immediately after the words "Puerto Rico," the word "Guam,".

SEC. 24. The laws of the United States relating to copyrights, and to the enforcement of rights arising thereunder, shall have the same force and effect in Guam as in the continental United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNSURVEYED PUBLIC LAND IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10504) to allow a homesteader settling on unsurveyed public land in Alaska to make single final proof prior to survey of the lands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of July 8, 1916, as amended (48 U. S. C. 375) is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The entryman may, after due compliance with the terms of the homestead laws, file his final homestead proof in accordance with applicable regulations of the Secretary of the Interior regardless of whether or not the system of public surveys has been extended over the land included in a homestead entry. The Secretary of the Interior shall, within 1 year after the filing of such proof, issue proper instructions for the survey of the land so entered, without expense to the entryman, and if the entryman has complied with the requirements of the homestead law and applicable regulations a patent based on such survey shall be issued. Nothing in this section, however, shall prevent the homesteader from securing earlier action on his entry and proof by a special survey at his own expense, if he so elects."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of the act of April 29, 1950 (48 U. S. C. 371c) is amended to read as follows:

"A homestead settler on unsurveyed public lands shall make final or commutation homestead proof within 5 years from the date of the filing of notice of the settlement claim in the district land office, as a basis for a free survey under section 2 of the act of July 8, 1916, as amended (48 U. S. C. 375) in accordance with regulations of the Secretary of the Interior."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT OF ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10946) to provide for the disposition of surplus personal property to the Territorial government of Alaska until December 31, 1958.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of surplus personal property to the Territorial government of Alaska," approved August 24, 1954 (68 Stat. 794), is amended by striking out "December 31, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1958."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the act entitled 'An act to provide for the disposition of surplus personal property to the Territorial government of Alaska', approved August 24, 1954 (68 Stat. 794), is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'December 31, 1956' where it appears in the first section and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1958'; and

"(2) by adding a new section to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 3. Disposals of surplus property pursuant to section 1 of this act shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator of General Services, including provision for reimbursement for costs of care and handling.' "

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4652) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain property to the Panama Canal Company, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the author of this bill or some member of the committee as to who owns the Panama Canal Company?

Mr. BONNER. The United States Government.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is the United States Government the sole stockholder?

Mr. BONNER. I know of no one else.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I have been advised it is a private corporation authorized by the Congress, but the Government is not necessarily the stockholder.

Mr. BONNER. The Government owns the entire investment in the Panama Canal Company.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it an arm of the Government?

Mr. BONNER. It is.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Then any expenditure by the Panama Canal Company would be equivalent to an expenditure by the United States Government?

Mr. BONNER. Of course it would.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer to the Panama Canal Company, without exchange of funds, all or so much of the facilities, buildings, structures, improvements, and equipment comprising aids to navigation maintained by the Coast Guard at or on Roncador Cay, Serrana Banks, Quita Sueno Banks, Christobal Mole, Cape Mala, Jicarita Island, and Morro Puercos Island, as may be mutually acceptable for transfer.

SEC. 2. Upon completion of any transfer authorized by this act, the functions of the Treasury Department concerning the pertinent aid to navigation and its jurisdiction over the site upon which the aid is located are transferred to the Panama Canal Company.

SEC. 3. Transfers made under this act shall be subject to the provisions of section 246 (b) of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as added by the act of June 29, 1948 (ch. 706, sec. 2, 62 Stat. 1076), except so far as said section would require payment to be made for the transferred property and assets.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BONNER: On page 2, line 9, change the comma to a period and strike the phrase, "except so far as said section would require payment to be made for the transferred property and assets."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6245) to authorize the Panama Canal Company to convey to the Department of State an improved site in Colon, Republic of Panama.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from North Carolina could explain why we are transferring this property to the State Department?

Mr. BONNER. The report clearly states the purpose. The State Department, under a treaty with Panama, has agreed to transfer certain property down there to the Government of Panama. This does not interfere in any way with the functions or the operation of the Panama Canal Zone government or the operation of the Panama Canal.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Panama Canal Company, represented by its president or vice president, is authorized to convey to the United States of America, represented by the United States Ambassador to the Republic of Panama, free of cost and for use by the Department of State for diplomatic and consular purposes, all of the right, title, and interest of the Panama Canal Company in and to a certain parcel of land situated in the de Lesseps area of the city of Colon, Republic of Panama, together with Canal Company buildings Nos. 621 and 622 located thereon. Said parcel of land fronts on the westerly side of Colonel Shaler Street, is bounded by Limon Bay on the west, has an area of 78,762 square feet, more or less (7,317 square meters, more or less), and is as shown on Panama Canal Company drawing No. S-6117-37, entitled "United States consulate site, de Lesseps area, Colon," scale 1:1,000, dated December 28, 1954, and as described more fully by metes and bounds in a metes and bounds description of the same date accompanying said drawing, both of which are on file in the office of the Governor, Balboa Heights, C. Z. The lands and buildings conveyed under authority of this act shall be administered and dealt with pursuant to the authority contained in the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended, just as though they were acquired under the authority of that act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PANAMA CANAL BRIDGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9801) to authorize and direct the Panama Canal Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Panama Canal at Balboa, C. Z.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In view of the answer that I received to my question

concerning the bill H. R. 4652 previously; namely, that the Panama Canal Company is an arm of the Government of the United States and that any money expended by it is the same as money spent by the United States of America, and due to the fact that this bill would cost approximately $20 million, which is entirely too much money to be considered on the Consent Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMENDING CANAL ZONE CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7811) to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions relative to the registration of the practice of architects and professional engineers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 2 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by adding thereto a new chapter 25 embracing sections 501–505, and reading as follows:

"CHAPTER 25—REGISTRATION OF ARCHITECTS AND PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS

"Sec.
"501. Practice of architecture and engineering declared to be subject to regulation.
"502. Regulations authorized.
"503. Punishment for violations.
"504. Injunction to restrain violation.
"505. Investigations; attendance of witnesses; production of books and papers; subpena procedure; witness fees.

"§ 501. Practice of architecture and engineering declared to be subject to regulation

"In order to safeguard life, health, and property and to promote the public welfare, the practice of architecture and engineering in the Canal Zone are hereby declared to be subject to regulation in the public interest. It is further declared to be a matter of public interest and concern that the professions of architecture and engineering merit and receive the confidence of the public and that qualified persons be permitted to engage in the practice of architecture and engineering.

"§ 502. Regulations authorized

"The Governor of the Canal Zone is hereby authorized to prescribe, and from time to time alter and amend, regulations for the Canal Zone governing the registration, and regulating the practice, of architecture and professional engineers. Such regulations may include provisions covering issuance, suspension, revocation, and reissuance of certificates of registration, and may also provide for the certification of architects-in-training and engineering in training, and for the levying of appropriate fees.

"§ 503. Punishment for violations

"Any person who shall violate any regulation established under authority of the next preceding section shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $500, or by imprisonment in jail for not more than 1 year, or by both.

"§ 504. Injunction to restrain violation

"The District Attorney for the Canal Zone is hereby authorized to apply for relief by injunction to restrain a person from the commission of any act which may be prohibited by the regulations established under authority of section 502 of this title. In such proceedings it shall not be necessary for the District Attorney to allege or prove either that an adequate remedy at law does not exist, or that substantial and irreparable damage would result from the continued violation thereof.

"§ 505. Investigations; attendance of witnesses; production of books and papers; subpena procedure; witness fees

"In the administration and enforcement of the provisions of this chapter and of the regulations prescribed under authority thereof, the Governor or such officer or officers as he may designate shall have power (a) to investigate for unauthorized and unlawful practice, to require the attendance of witnesses and the production of books and papers, and to require such witnesses to testify as to any and all matters within his jurisdiction, and (b) to issue subpenas and to administer oaths. Upon the failure of any person to attend as a witness, when duly subpenaed, or to produce documents when duly directed, the Governor or other designated officer shall have power to refer the matter to the judge of the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, who may order the attendance of such witness, or the production of such documents or require the said witness to testify, as the case may be, and upon the failure of the witness to attend, to testify, or to produce such documents, as the case may be, such witness may be punished for contempt of court as for failure to obey a subpena issued or to testify in a case pending before said court. Witnesses in proceedings before the Governor or other designated officer shall be paid the same fees that are paid witnesses in the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 9, following the word "that", insert "only."

Page 2, line 16, delete the word "architecture" and in lieu thereof insert the word "architects."

Page 2, line 20, delete "engineering-in-training" and insert in lieu thereof "engineers-in-training."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions relative to the registration of architects and professional engineers, and the regulation of their practice."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING REARING PONDS AND A FISH HATCHERY IN WESTERN OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 221) to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery in western Oklahoma.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is ordered.

There was no objection.

OKEFENOKEE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9742) to provide for the protection of the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge, Georgia, against damage from fire and drought.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) for the purpose of protecting the natural features and the very substantial public values represented in the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge, Ga., from disastrous fires such as those which swept over 80 percent of the area between October 1954 and June 1955, and for the purpose of safeguarding the forest resources on more than 400,000 acres of adjoining lands recently damaged by wildfires originating in or sustained by the desiccated peat deposits in the Okefenokee Swamp, the Secretary of the Interior shall construct a continuous perimeter road around the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge with additional fire access roads (leading from such perimeter road) in and around such refuge; and for the purpose of protecting such refuge against damage from drought he shall construct a sill and dike in the Suwanee River near the point where the river leaves the refuge together with additional sills in the Old St. Marys River Canal and at such other points within the refuge as he may determine to be necessary to prevent drainage of the Okefenokee Swamp during periods of drought such as those which occurred in 1953–55 and other years.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to conduct such surveys as he deems necessary to provide more adequate protection for the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge, through the development and construction of perimeter and fire access roads and the installation of water controls as described in subsection (a), against the damaging effects of fire and drought.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to cooperate with State and local authorities in protecting public and private lands from wildfires originating in or sustained by the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge by integrating the perimeter road and fire access roads with existing woods roads in such manner as he determines will best carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this act (1) the sum of $453,500 for the construction of a continuous perimeter road around the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge and approximately 162 miles of fire access roads, together with necessary bridges and culverts, in and around such refuge, and (2) the sum of $275,000 for the construction of a sill and dike in the Suwanee River and sills at other appropriate points in the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OJO DEL ESPIRITU SANTO GRANT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5712) to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Pueblos of Zia and Jemez a part of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant and a small area of public domain adjacent thereto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title to the following land and the improvements thereon owned by the United States of America, situated within Sandoval County in the State of New Mexico is hereby declared to be in the United States of America in trust for the Pueblo of Zia, subject to valid existing rights: Beginning at the southeast corner of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant as described on the plat of said grant approved

by Clarence Pullin, surveyor general of New Mexico, Santa Fe, New Mexico, June 29, 1885, said corner being in section 8, township 15 north, range 1 east, New Mexico principal meridian; thence west along the south boundary of said grant approximately 5 miles, 42 chains; thence north approximately 1 mile, 20 chains; thence west 40 chains; thence north 3 miles; thence east 40 chains; thence north 7 miles to the northeast corner of unsurveyed section 17, township 17 north, range 1 west, New Mexico principal meridian; thence east approximately 5 miles, 68 chains to the east boundary of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant as described on the plat of township 17 north, range 1 east, New Mexico principal meridian, approved in the Department of the Interior, General Land Office, Washington, District of Columbia, August 18, 1930, which point is common to the west boundary of the Canon de San Diego Grant as described on the plat approved August 18, 1930; thence south approximately 16 chains along the common boundary of said two grants; thence continuing south along the west boundary of the Canon de San Diego Grant approximately 3 miles, 64 chains to a point which is north 18.61 chains from the southwest corner of the Canon de San Diego Grant; thence west 37.01 chains to the east boundary of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant as described on the plat of said grant approved by Clarence Pullin, surveyor general of New Mexico, Santa Fe, New Mexico, June 29, 1885; thence south along the east boundary of said grant a distance of approximately 7 miles, 20.38 chains to the point of beginning, containing approximately 41,856 acres, excepting therefrom approximately 640 acres of land and the improvements thereon used by the United States of America for administrative purposes, which exception, when surveyed, will probably be described as west half section 15 and east half section 16, township 17 north, range 1 west, New Mexico principal meridian.

SEC. 2. That title to the following-described land and the improvements thereon owned by the United States of America, situated within Sandoval County in the State of New Mexico is hereby declared to be in the United States of America in trust for the Pueblo of Jemez, subject to valid existing rights: Beginning at the northwest corner of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant as described on the plat of said grant approved by Clarence Pullin, surveyor general of New Mexico, Santa Fe, New Mexico, June 29, 1885, said point being in section 6, township 18 north, range 1 west, New Mexico principal meridian; thence east along the north boundary of said grant approximately 6 miles, 9.49 chains to the east line of section 6, township 18 north, range 1 east, New Mexico principal meridian, which point is 7.51 chains west of the northeast corner of said grant as described on the plat of township 18 north, range 1 east, of the New Mexico principal meridian by the Department of the Interior, General Land Office, Washington, D. C., August 18, 1930; thence north 39.70 chains; thence east 34.33 chains to the west boundary of the Canon de San Diego Grant as described on the plat approved August 18, 1930; thence south along the west boundary of said grant approximately 7 miles, 76.02 chains; thence west approximately 7 miles, 68 chains to the northeast corner of unsurveyed section 13, township 17 north, range 2 west, New Mexico principal meridian; thence north 1 mile; thence west approximately 40 chains to the west boundary of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant as described on the official survey plat of said grant; thence following the west boundary of said grant a distance of approximately 6 miles to the point of beginning (the northwest corner of said grant), containing approximately 36,515.76 acres, excepting therefrom lots 2, 5, south half southwest quarter of section 5 and lot 9 of section 6, township 18 north, range 1 east, New Mexico principal meridian, containing 163.76 acres, more or less, as shown on the plat of township 18 north, range 1 east, New Mexico principal meridian, approved in the Department of the Interior, General Land Office, August 18, 1930.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 17, strike the figure "16", and insert in lieu thereof the figure "5.25."

On page 2, line 20, strike the figure "64", and insert in lieu thereof the figure "74.75."

On page 4, line 4, strike the figure "34.33" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "44.13."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANT OF PUBLIC LANDS TO THE STATES FOR SCHOOL PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11127) to clarify the law relating to the grant of certain public lands to the States for school purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (d) of the first section of the act of January 25, 1927 (43 U. S. C. sec. 870), is amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) Notwithstanding subsection (c), the fact that there is outstanding on any numbered school section, whether or not mineral in character, at the time of its survey a mineral lease or leases entered into by the United States, or an application therefor, shall not prevent the grant of such numbered school section to the State concerned as provided by this act.

"(2) Any such numbered school section which has been surveyed prior to the date of approval of this amendment, and which has not been granted to the State concerned solely by reason of the fact that there was outstanding on it at the time of the survey a mineral lease or leases entered into by the United States, or an application therefor, is hereby granted by the United States to such State under this section as if it had not been so leased; and the State shall succeed the position of the United States as lessor under such lease or leases.

"(3) Any such numbered school section which is surveyed on or after the date of approval of this amendment and on which there is outstanding at the time of such survey a mineral lease or leases entered into by the United States, shall (unless excluded from the provisions of this section by subsection (c) for a reason other than the existence of an outstanding lease) be granted to the State concerned immediately upon completion of such survey; and the State shall succeed to the position of the United States as lessor under such lease or leases.

"(4) The Secretary of the Interior shall, upon application by a State, issue patents to the State for the lands granted by this act, in accordance with the act of June 12, 1934 (48 Stat. 1185, 43 U. S. C. 871a). Such patent shall, if the lease is then outstanding, include a statement that the State succeeded to the position of the United States as lessor at the time the title vested in the State.

"(5) Where at the time rents, royalties, and bonuses accrue the lands or deposits covered by a single lease are owned in part by the State and in part by the United States, the rents, royalties, and bonuses shall be allocated between them in proportion to the acreage in said lease owned by each.

"(6) As used in this subsection, 'lease' includes 'permit' and 'lessor' includes 'grantor'."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5147) to change the distribution of Coast and Geodetic Survey charts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 246 of title 44 of the United States Code be amended by striking from the last clause thereof the word "ten" and inserting in place thereof the words "one hundred."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COASTWISE TRADE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6025) to amend the shipping laws, to prohibit the operation in the coastwise trade of vessels rebuilt outside the United States, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 46, sec. 883), is further amended by inserting the following new proviso at the end of the first proviso thereof: *"Provided further,* That no vessel rebuilt outside the United States, its Territories (not including trust territories), its possessions, or the District of Columbia, shall be deemed to be a vessel built in the United States for the purposes of this section:".

SEC. 2. The first paragraph of section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 46, sec. 808), is further amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "No vessel rebuilt outside the United States, its Territories (not including trust territories), its possessions or the District of Columbia, shall be entitled to engage in the coastwise trade under any provision of this section.".

SEC. 3. When used in this act, the term "rebuilt" means altered in form or burden, by being lengthened or built upon, or from one denomination to another, by the mode or method of rigging or fitting.

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this act shall be effective only as to vessels rebuilt after the date of enactment hereof.

With the following committee amendment:

Delete all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 46, sec. 883), is further amended by inserting the following new proviso at the end of the first proviso thereof: '*Provided further*, That no vessel of more than 500 gross tons which has acquired the lawful right to engage in the coastwise trade, either by virtue of having been built in or documented under the laws of the United States, and which has later been rebuilt outside the United States, its Territories (not including Trust Territories), or its possessions shall have the right thereafter to engage in the coastwise trade.'

"SEC. 2. If any vessel of more than 500 gross tons documented under the laws of the United States, or last documented under such laws, is rebuilt outside the United States, its

Territories (not including Trust Territories), or its possessions, a report of the circumstances of such rebuilding shall be made to the Secretary of the Treasury upon the first arrival of the vessel thereafter at a port within the customs territory of the United States in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe. If the required report is not made, the vessel, together with its tackle, apparel, equipment, and furniture, shall be forfeited, and the master and owner shall each be liable to a penalty of $200. Any penalty or forfeiture incurred under this act may be remitted or mitigated by the Secretary under the provisions of section 5294 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 46, sec. 7).

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 4. This act shall be effective from the date of enactment hereof: *Provided, however,* That no vessel shall be deemed to have lost its coastwise privileges hereunder if it is rebuilt under a contract entered into before such date of enactment and if the work of rebuilding is commenced not later than 6 months after such date of enactment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6850) to create an academic advisory board for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law 214, 80th Congress (61 Stat. 401), be amended to read as follows: "The Secretary of Commerce may appoint an advisory board to the United States Merchant Marine Academy consisting of not more than seven persons of distinction in education and other fields relating to the purposes of the academy, who shall serve without pay. Members of the advisory board shall be appointed for terms of not to exceed 3 years and may be reappointed. The Secretary of Commerce shall, in June of each year, appoint one of the members to serve as chairman. The members so appointed shall visit the academy at least once during the academic year on the call of the chairman and may convene once each year in Washington, at the call of the Maritime Administrator, for the purpose of examining the course of instruction and the management of the academy and advising the Maritime Administrator, with a copy of such advice to the superintendent, relative thereto. The expenses of the board while engaged in these duties, including the expense of travel, shall be defrayed under Government travel regulations from any appropriation for the authorized work of the Maritime Administration."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT LAND TO VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9774) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Board of Commissioners of Volusia County, Fla.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10261) to provide a further increase in the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, since there is no objection to the present consideration of the House bill H. R. 10261, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the Senate bill (S. 3581) to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service, in lieu of the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the annual rate of retired pay of each person retired under section 6 of the act of June 20, 1918, as amended and supplemented, shall be increased, effective on the first day of the first calendar month following the date of enactment of this act, in accordance with the following schedule:

If retired pay commences between—	Retired pay not in excess of $1,500 shall be increased by—	Retired pay in excess of $1,500 shall be increased by—
January 20, 1918, and June 30, 1955	12 per centum	8 per centum
July 1, 1955, and December 31, 1955	10 per centum	7 per centum
January 1, 1956, and June 30, 1956	8 per centum	6 per centum
July 1, 1956, and December 31, 1956	6 per centum	4 per centum
January 1, 1957, and June 30, 1957	4 per centum	2 per centum
July 1, 1957, and December 31, 1957	2 per centum	1 per centum

Such annual increase in retired pay shall not exceed the sum necessary to increase such retired pay to $4,104. The monthly installment of each retired payment so increased shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 10261, was laid on the table.

EXPERIMENTAL OPERATION AND TESTING OF VESSELS OWNED BY THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11027) to amend title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for experimental operation and testing of vessels owned by the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U. S. C., secs. 1191–1204), is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 715. The Secretary of Commerce, for the purpose of practical development, trial, and testing, is authorized without regard to other provisions of this title or other laws relating to chartering and general agency operations, to operate, under general agency agreements or bareboat charter, vessels owned by the United States (including any national defense reserve vessel) which have been constructed, reconditioned, or remodeled for experimental or testing purposes, in the foreign or domestic trade of the United States or for use for the account of any agency or department of the United States, under such reasonable terms or conditions as the Secretary of Commerce determines to be necessary to carry out the objects of this act. Bareboat charters entered into under this section shall be made at reasonable rates of charter and shall include such restrictions and conditions as the Secretary of Commerce determines to be necessary or appropriate to protect the public interest, including provisions for recapture of profits as provided for in section 709 of this act, as amended. Charters and general agency agreements entered into under this section shall be reviewed annually for the purpose of determining whether conditions exist which would justify continuance of the charter or agreement. Those provisions of law prescribed or incorporated under the heading 'vessel operations revolving fund' in chapter VIII of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 45, 82d Cong.; 65 Stat. 52, 59), which relate to vessel operating activities of the Secretary of Commerce and to employment of seamen through general agents, shall be applicable in connection with charters and agreements entered into under this section."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, after the word "act", insert : "*Provided, however,* That not in excess of 10 such vessels shall be operated and tested under the authority of this section in any 1 year."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING APPLICATION OF TEMPORARY PROMOTION ACT OF 1941 TO THE COAST GUARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11402) to extend the existing application of the Temporary Promotion Act of 1941, as amended, to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 16 of the act of July 23, 1947 (ch. 301, 61 Stat. 413), as amended, is amended by deleting the words "January 1, 1957" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "January 1, 1962."

SEC. 2. Section 42 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the words "two

thousand two hundred and fifty" in the first sentence of the section and inserting in lieu thereof the words "three thousand five hundred", and by amending the fifth sentence of the section to read as follows: "The Secretary shall, at least once each year, make such a computation, and the resulting numbers in the various grades as so computed shall be held and considered for all purposes as the authorized number in such various grades, except that the authorized number for a grade is temporarily increased during the period between one computation, and the next by the number of officers originally appointed in that grade during that period and the number of officers of that grade for whom vacancies exist in the next higher grade but whose promotion has been delayed for any reason."

SEC. 3. (a) Title 14, United States Code, as amended by inserting the following new section:

"§ 439. Oath of Office.

"A commissioned or warrant officer of the Coast Guard or Coast Guard Reserve who has served continuously since he subscribed to the oath of office prescribed in section 16 of title 5, is not required to take a new oath upon his promotion to a higher grade."

(b) The analysis of chapter 11, title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting the following item:

"§ 439. Oath of Office."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARIFYING SECTION 1103 (D) OF TITLE XI OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11255) to clarify section 1103 (d) of title XI (Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the bill S. 3857, an identical bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective September 3, 1954, section 1103 (d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of the interest on and 90 percent of the unpaid balance of the principal amount of each mortgage and loan insured under this title, but in the case of special-purpose vessels certified by the Secretary of Defense to be essential to national defense, the faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of the interest on and 100 percent of the unpaid balance of the principal amount of each mortgage and loan insured under this title if the insurance contract obligates the United States to pay the interest on and 100 percent of the unpaid balance of the principal amount of such mortgage or loan."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 11255) was laid on the table.

INCREASING BENEFITS PAYABLE TO WIDOWS OF CERTAIN FORMER EMPLOYEES OF THE LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2937) to increase from $50 to $75 per month the amount of benefits payable to widows of certain former employees of the Lighthouse Service.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CIVIL PENALTIES FOR FAILURE TO FILE VESSEL UTILIZATION AND PERFORMANCE REPORTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3265) to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for filing vessel utilization and performance reports by operators of vessels in the foreign commerce of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U. S. C. 1111–1127), is amended by inserting after section 212 (46 U. S. C. 1122) a new section 212 (A) to read as follows:

"SEC. 212. (A) The operator of a vessel in waterborne foreign commerce of the United States shall file at such times and in such manner as the Secretary of Commerce may prescribe by regulations, such report, account, record, or memorandum relating to the utilization and performance of such vessel in commerce of the United States, as the Secretary may determine to be necessary or desirable in order to carry out the purposes and provisions of this Act, as amended. Such report, account, record, or memorandum shall be signed and verified in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary. An operator who does not file the report, account, record, or memorandum as required by this section and the regulations issued hereunder, shall be liable to the United States in a penalty of $50 for each day of such violation. The amount of any penalty imposed for any violation of this section upon the operator of any vessel shall constitute a lien upon the vessel involved in the violation, and such vessel may be libeled therefor in the district court of the United States for the district in which it may be found. The Secretary of Commerce may, in his discretion, remit or mitigate any penalty imposed under this section on such terms as he may deem proper."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YUMA RECLAMATION PROJECT, ARIZONA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6940) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an additional contract with the Yuma County Water Users' Association with respect to payment of construction charges on the valley division, Yuma reclamation project, Arizona, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that S. 2202, an identical bill, be considered in lieu of H. R. 6940.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, hereinafter in this act referred to as the Secretary, is hereby authorized to enter into a contract with the Yuma County Water Users' Association, an Arizona corporation providing for the collection and retention by the association of all construction charge payments made subsequent to the date of such contract under water-right applications on the valley division of the Yuma reclamation project outstanding on the date of said contract and water-right applications thereafter approved on said division and the release of the association from its guaranty to the United States of all amounts then due or thereafter to become due on said applications in consideration of the assumption by the association of the general repayment obligation defined in section 2 hereof payable to the United States without interest in annual installments not smaller than the aggregate of the payments which, in the opinion of the Secretary, would have become due pursuant to the provisions of said water-right applications.

SEC. 2. The general repayment obligation payable under the contract authorized by section 1 of this act shall be ascertained by the Secretary (a) by adding to $165,605.46 any operation and maintenance costs incurred on or after January 1, 1955, which are unpaid on the date of the contract, (b) by subtracting from the sum thereof (i) any payments under water-right applications heretofore or hereafter approved by the Secretary on the valley division which have become due and payable and which have been received beginning with January 1, 1955, and prior to the date of the contract, and (ii) net profits earned on or after January 1, 1955, and prior to June 30 preceding the date of the contract which are determined by the Secretary to be properly allocable to the valley division, all as provided in section 3 of this act, and (c) by adjusting the difference between (a) and (b) to reflect an appropriate share, as determined by the Secretary, of any amount by which the cost to the Government of a certain trestle to be constructed by the Southern Pacific Railway Co. across the Yuma Main Canal pursuant to the contract dated April 15, 1912, between it and the United States varies from $175,306. The Secretary is hereby authorized to transfer to the association, (a) those structures covered by agreement between the United States and the association dated April 1, 1953, and bearing contract No. 14–06–303–490, as amended March 29, 1955, and a 24-stall garage in the vicinity of said structures in consideration

of the cash payment or addition to the said general repayment obligation of the net book cost of $15,000 less the aggregate of payments made by the association to the United States prior to the date of such transfer under said agreement and under agreement between the United States and the association dated November 6, 1952, and bearing contract No. 14–06–303–79; and (b) the buildings located at 105, 115, and 121 North Fifth Avenue, respectively, and at 460 First Street, within the exterior boundaries of the city of Yuma, Ariz., in consideration of the cash payment or addition to said general repayment obligation of the further sum of $3,756.87: *Provided,* That such transfers shall not include title to the lands on which any such structures or buildings are located.

SEC. 3. The net profits to be deducted pursuant to section 2 hereof shall constitute the portion determined by the Secretary to be allocable to said valley division of such profits derived to and including the June 30 immediately preceding the date of said contract from the following: leases, permits, and other arrangements for use of project lands and other project property within the division, the sale or use of townsites within the division, the sale of small tracts within the division pursuant to the act of March 31, 1950 (64 Stat. 39; 43 U. S. C., secs. 375b–375f), and the furnishing of water or water service to other than water-right applicants from the irrigation works of the division. The contract authorized by section 1 hereof may also provide that for each subsequent fiscal year that portion of the net profits derived from the above-mentioned sources as well as the net profits from the Siphon Drop powerplant after reserves for replacements, and/or depreciation and/or other appropriate purposes determined by the Secretary to be allocable to the division shall be credited annually, first, on account of general repayment installments under said contract to become payable for the calendar year next following such fiscal year and, second, on account of operation and maintenance charges to become payable by the association to the United States for such calendar year, including but not limited to advance payments by the association for operation and maintenance of Siphon Drop powerplant and payments for any rehabilitation work undertaken by the United States on behalf of the division. There is authorized to be transferred and deposited from time to time to the credit of the operation and maintenance appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation from project revenues deposited in the reclamation fund amounts equal to the credits so applied on account of operation and maintenance charges payable by the association to the United States. The amounts thus credited to the operation and maintenance appropriation may be expended for the same objects and in the same manner as sums advanced by the association for the operation and maintenance of works retained by the United States: *Provided,* That if the Secretary determines that the portion of such net profits allocable to the division and available for such credit during any calendar year exceeds the aggregate of the general repayment installment, if any, and the operation and maintenance charge payable by the association to the United States, he may pay the amount of such excess to the association from the reclamation fund.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

ZION NATIONAL PARK IN THE STATE OF UTAH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10535) to include the present area of Zion National Monument within Zion National Park, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows :

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of combining Zion National Park and Zion National Monument, Utah, in a single national park unit, in the interest of efficient administration and to preserve adequately the features thereof, Zion National Park hereafter shall comprise the present area of the national park and the present area of the Zion National Monument: *Provided,* That the enactment of this act shall not affect adversely any valid rights or privileges heretofore existing within the areas hereby established as the Zion National Park.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to administer Zion National Park as hereby established in accordance with his authority over the park heretofore granted by the Congress and in accordance with the general laws governing areas of the national park system.

SEC. 3. All funds heretofore made available for purposes of Zion National Park and Zion National Monument may be used for purposes of Zion National Park as established by this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the able.

AUTHORIZING THE CUTTING OF TIMBER AND PRESERVATION OF FORESTS ON MENOMINEE INDIAN RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9974) to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the cutting of timber, the manufacture and sale of lumber, and the preservation of the forests on the Menominee Indian Reservation in the State of Wisconsin," approved March 28, 1908, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the cutting of timber, the manufacture and sale of lumber, and the preservation of the forests on the Menominee Indian Reservation in the State of Wisconsin," as amended, be, and hereby is amended by deleting the words "*Provided,* That not more than 20 million feet of timber shall be cut in any 1 year" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided,* That not more than 20 million feet of saw logs, veneer logs, and comparable timber, and not more than 2 million board feet of poles, posts, bolts, pulpwood, and other miscellaneous forest products shall be cut in any 1 year."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ATTORNEYS FEES UNDER TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1146) to further amend section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, relating to fees of agents, attorneys, and representatives.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (60 Stat. 54; 50 U. S. C. App. 20), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 20. No property or interest or proceeds shall be returned under this act, nor shall any payment be made or judgment awarded in respect of any property or interest vested in or transferred to any officer or agency of the United States under this act unless satisfactory evidence is furnished to the President or such officer or agency as he may designate, or the court, as the case may be, that the aggregate of the fees to be paid to all agents, attorneys at law or in fact, or representatives, for services rendered in connection with such return or payment or judgment does not exceed 10 percent of the value of such property or interest or proceeds or of such payment. Any agent, attorney at law or in fact, or representative, believing that the aggregate of the fees should be in excess of such 10 percent may, in the case of any return of, or the making of any payment in respect of, such property or interest or proceeds by the President or such officer or agency as he may designate, petition the district court of the United States for the district in which he resides for an order authorizing fees in excess of 10 percent and shall name such officer or agency as respondent. The court hearing such petition, or a court awarding any judgment in respect of any such property or interest or proceeds, as the case may be, shall approve an aggregate of fees in excess of 10 percent of the value of such property or interest or proceeds only upon a finding that there exist special circumstances of unusual hardship which require the payment of such excess. Any person accepting any fee in excess of an amount approved hereunder, or retaining for more than 30 days any portion of a fee, accepted prior to approval hereunder, in excess of the fee as approved, shall be guilty of a violation of this act."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ACT FOR THE PROTECTION OF WALRUSES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10412) to amend the Act for the Protection of Walruses.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, S. 3778, an identical bill, be considered in lieu of the bill, H. R. 10412.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of August 18, 1941 (ch. 368, 55 Stat. 632; 48 U. S. C. 248), is amended by changing the colon at the end of the first proviso to a comma and by inserting thereafter: "and

said skins or hides may be exported from the Territory subject to such limitations on numbers and sizes of skins or hides exported as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe for the purpose of protecting and conserving the walrus herds."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of said act of August 18, 1941, is further amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and by inserting thereafter: "*Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe by regulations the extent to which, the times when, and the means by which, walruses may be taken for purposes other than food and clothing and the extent to which such walruses or the parts thereof may be possessed, sold, bartered, purchased, or exported. Any regulations so prescribed shall prohibit the hunting of walruses with the use of airplanes and helicopters and shall prohibit the taking of any walrus by a nonnative other than one bull walrus per year which may be taken only when the nonnative is accompanied by a native guide. The meat of any walrus taken by a nonnative shall be given to natives, and the Secretary of the Interior is directed to prohibit the taking of walruses by nonnatives whenever he determines that such taking may endanger the food supply of the natives. No nonnative shall take any walrus under any regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior without first having procured a walrus hunting license which shall be issued in the manner prescribed by subdivision I, section 10, of the Alaska game law of January 13, 1925, as amended (43 Stat. 744; 48 U. S. C. 199). The fee for such license shall be $25 for nonnative residents of the Territory of Alaska and $50 for nonresidents. For the purposes of this act, residence shall be governed by the conditions prescribed in section 3 of said Alaska game law. After deducting the amount that may be retained as compensation by persons authorized to sell such licenses, the amount of such retained compensation to be determined in accordance with subdivision K of section 10 of said Alaska game law, the proceeds from the sale of walrus hunting licenses shall be accounted for and disposed of in the manner prescribed by the said subdivision K."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 10412, was laid on the table.

AMENDING TEXAS CITY DISASTER CLAIMS ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11499) to amend the Texas City Disaster Claims Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 707), as amended by striking out "prior to" where it appears in section 3 (a) and substituting in lieu thereof "on or before" so that the second paragraph of section 3 (a) will read as follows:

"No claim shall be entertained by the Secretary of the Army unless it shall appear to his satisfaction that such claim was a part of a civil action filed against the United State in a United States district court on or before April 25, 1950, except that, for good cause, the Secretary may waive the limitation date of April 25, 1950, where it is shown that claimant, by reason of infancy, insanity, or other legal reason, was unable to bring such civil action."

The bill was ordered to engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND IN FORREST COUNTY, MISS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11558) to relinquish any right, title, and interest which the United States may have in and to certain land located in Forrest County, Miss., in order to clear the title to such land.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States hereby declares that it has no right, title, and interest in and to the lands described in the patent which was issued to Newton D. Smith on October 31, 1906, and a copy of which is filed in the office of the United States Bureau of Land Management in volume 332 of the record of Mississippi patents, page 320: *Provided*, That this disclaimer is only applicable to any right, title, and interest arising out of the circumstances attendant upon the issuance of the aforesaid patent.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEA RIDGE NATIONAL MILITARY PARK, ARKANSAS

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 11611) to provide for the establishment of the Pea Ridge National Military Park, in the State of Arkansas.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when not less than 1,200 acres of the non-Federal lands hereinafter described (together with improvements thereon) and known as the Pea Ridge Battlefield, near Bentonville, Ark., shall have been acquired and transferred free and clear of all encumbrances to the United States without expense to the Federal Government, such areas shall be, and are hereby, dedicated and set apart as a unit of the National Park System for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States, under the name of the Pea Ridge National Military Park.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make an examination of the Pea Ridge Battlefield with a view to determining the area or areas thereof deemed desirable for inclusion in the Pea Ridge National Miliary Park and which—except for not more than 20 acres of any other lands adjacent to such battlefield found by the Secretary to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act—lie within the lands particularly described as follows: sections 17, 18, 19, 20, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33, all township 21 north, range 28 west, Fifth principal meridian; sections 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, all township 20 north, range 28 west, Fifth principal meridian; sections 13, 14, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, and 36, all township 21 north, range 29 west, Fifth principal meridian; and sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12, all township 20 north, range 29 west, Fifth principal meridian.

SEC. 3. (a) The National Park Service under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall administer, protect, and develop the park, subject to the provisions of the act entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended.

(b) In order to provide for the proper development and maintenance of the park, the Secretary of the Interior shall construct and maintain therein such roads, trails, markers, buildings, and other improvements, and such facilities for the care and accommodation of visitors, as he may deem necessary.

SEC. 4. This act shall become effective if and when the requirements of sections 1 and 2 hereof shall have been fully complied with to the satisfaction of the President of the United States, who shall then issue a notice declaring that the requirements herein have been met, and said notice shall formally dedicate and set aside the areas transferred to the United States in accordance with the provisions of section 1 hereof.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MUNICIPAL USE OF STORAGE WATER IN BENBROOK DAM, TEX.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 10964) to provide for municipal use of storage water in Benbrook Dam, Tex.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the project for improvement of the Trinity River and tributaries, Tex., authorized by the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945, is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army to contract with the city of Fort Worth pursuant to section 6 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (33 U. S. C. 708), for the use of water supply storage in the Benbrook Reservoir for municipal water supply until such time as the water supply storage is needed for navigation purposes.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OBLIGATED SERVICE OF CADETS AND MIDSHIPMEN

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2106) to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets or midshipmen at the Military, Naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard Academies, or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes, do pass with a Senate amendment and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 7, strike out "allowances" and insert "allowances, compensation, pensions or benefits."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING THE MISSING PERSONS ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9500) to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have a brief explanation of the necessity for this legislation?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Certainly. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that the Missing Persons Act runs out by its own terms on July 1 this year. This bill, H. R. 9500, merely extends it for another year. We have stricken out everything in the bill except the one sentence which extends it to July 1, 1957.

Mr. GROSS. Is this made necessary by virtue of the war in Korea?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes, there are some cases growing out of that action that still have to be handled under the Missing Persons Act.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me how many American military personnel are still listed as missing in Korea?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I cannot give the gentleman that particular information. I can say that the Armed Services Committee is studying this matter of missing persons and whether or not the Missing Persons Act should be made permanent. In the interim we are simply asking that it be extended for 1 year.

Mr. GROSS. So that operations can still be carried on under the act? What is the proposed extension?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It is proposed to extend it for 1 year. Under the Missing Persons Act in the case of a member of the Armed Forces listed as missing and not dead, payments can still be continued on his behalf.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Missing Persons Act (56 Stat. 143), as amended, is further amended as follows:

(a) Section 1 (a) (3) is amended to read:

"(3) Civilian officers and employees of the departments, except that the following categories of civilian officers and employees shall be covered only upon a determination by the head of the department concerned that such status is the proximate result of employment by the department;

"(i) Persons who enter any status listed in section 2 of this act within the continental limits of the United States; and

"(ii) Persons who enter any status listed in section 2 of this act who are residents at or in the vicinity of their places of employment in the Territories and possessions or in foreign countries and who were not living there solely as a result of their employment."

(b) Section 2 is amended to read:

"SEC. 2. Any person who is in the active service, or is performing full-time training duty, other full-time duty, or inactive duty training and who is officially determined to be absent in a status of missing, missing in action, interned in a foreign country, captured by a hostile force, beleaguered by a hostile force, or besieged by a hostile force shall, for the period he is officially carried or determined to be in any such status, be entitled to receive or to have credited to his account the same pay and allowances to which he was entitled at the beginning of such period of absence or may become entitled thereafter, and entitlements to pay and allowances shall terminate upon the date of receipt by the department concerned of evidence that the person is dead or upon the date of death prescribed or determined under provisions of section 5 of this act. Such entitlement to pay and allowances shall not terminate upon the expiration of a term of service during absence and, in case of death during absence, shall not terminate earlier than the dates herein prescribed. There shall be no entitlement to pay and allowance for any period during which such person may be officially determined absent from his post of duty without authority and he shall be indebted to the Government for any payments from amounts credited to his account for such period. Persons performing full-time training duty, or inactive duty training shall be entilted to the benefits of this section only when such persons or officially determined to be absent in a status of missing, missing in action, interned in a foreign country, captured by a hostile force, beleagured by a hostile force, or besieged by a hostile force as a result of the performance of prescribed duty ordered by competent authority."

(c) Section 9 is amended by the addition of a subsection (a) to read:

"SEC. 9. (a) A dependent of any person in active service, as defined in this act, is a 'person' under this act for the sole purpose of determining status as provided in sections 5 and 9, and any determination under those sections by the head of the department concerned shall be conclusive on all other departments of the Government: *Provided,* That nothing in this section shall be construed as conferring upon any dependent any right to pay, allowances, or other compensation to which not otherwise entitled."

(d) Section 12 is amended to read:

"SEC. 12. The dependents and household and personal effects of any person in active service (without regard to pay grade) who is officially reported as dead, injured, missing for a period of 30 days or more, interned in a foreign country, or captured by a hostile force, may be moved (including packing, crating, drayage, temporary storage), and unpacking of household and personal effects) to the official residence of record for any such person or to the residence of his dependent, next of kin, or other person entitled to receivve custody of the effects in accordance with regulations issued by the head of the department concerned; or, upon application by such dependent, next of kin, or other person, or upon the person's application if injured, to such other location as may be determined in advance or subsequently approved by the head of the department concerned or by such persons as he may designate. When the head of the department concerned determines that an emergency exists and that such sale would be in the best interests of the Government, he may provide for the disposition of the motor vehicles and other bulky items of such household and personal effects of the person by public or private sale. Prior to any such sale, and if practicable, a reasonable effort shall be made to determine the desires of the interested persons. The net proceeds received from such sale shall be transmitted to the owner or to other persons in accordance with regulations issued by head of the department concerned; but if there be no such persons or if such persons or their addresses are not ascertainable within 1 year from the date of sale, the net proceeds may be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. Claims for net proceeds which are covered into the Treasury under the authority of this section may be filed with the General Accounting Office by the rightful owners, their heirs or next of kin; or their legal representatives at any time prior to the expiration of 5 years from the date the proceeds are covered into the Treasury; and, if so filed, the General Accounting Office shall allow or disallow the claim. If claims are not filed prior to the expiration of 5 years from the date the proceeds are covered into the Treasury, they shall be barred from being acted on by the courts or the General Accounting Office. The provisions of this section shall not be construed as amending or repealing the act of March 29, 1918 (ch. 31, 40 Stat. 499); section 1, subchapter II of the act of June 4, 1920 (ch. 227, 41 Stat. 809) as amended; the act of February 21, 1931 (ch. 268, 46 Stat. 1203) as amended; the act of December 28, 1945 (ch. 597, 59 Stat. 662) as amended; the Federal Tort Claims Act (60 Stat. 842–847), as amended; the act of April 14, 1949 (ch. 50, 63 Stat. 44); or section 507, title 14, United States Code. The head of the department concerned is authorized to store the household and personal effects of the person until such time as proper disposition can be made. The cost of such storage and transportation, including packing, crating, drayage, temporary storage and unpacking of household and personal effects, shall be charged against appropriations currently available. In lieu of transportation authorized by this section for dependents, the head of the department concerned may authorize the payment in money of amounts equal to such commercial transportation costs or a monetary allowance in lieu of transportation as authorized by law for the whole or such part of travel for which transportation in kind is not furnished, when such travel shall have been completed. When the person is in an 'injured' status, the movement of dependents or household and personal effects provided for herein may be authorized only in cases where the anticipated period of hospitalization or treatment will be of prolonged duration. No transportation shall be authorized pursuant to this section upon application by dependents unless a reasonable relationship exists between the conditions and circumstances of the dependents and the destination to which transportation is requested. Beginning June 25, 1950, and for the purposes of this section only, the terms 'household and personal effects' and 'household effects' may include in addition to other authorized weight allowances, not to exceed one privately owned motor vehicle, shipment of which at Government expense is authorized in those cases where the vehicle is located outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska."

(e) Section 15 is amended to read:

"SEC. 15. This act, except sections 13, 16, and 17, is effective from September 8, 1939."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this act shall be effective upon the date of enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That section 15, Missing Persons Act (56 Stat. 147, 1093), as amended, is further amended by deleting 'July 1, 1956,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1957'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1957."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT OR NEAR MUSCATINE, IOWA

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 11010) creating the Muscatine Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, this is the bill the gentleman discussed with me this morning on two occasions. It has been screened with the leadership on both sides?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the Muscatine Bridge Commission (hereinafter created, and hereinafter referred to as the "commission"), and its successors and assigns be, and are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges and approaches thereto, across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Rock Island County, Ill., at a point or points suitable to the interest of navigation, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act. For like purposes said commission, or its successors and assigns, are hereby authorized to acquire by purchase or condemnation, and to reconstruct, maintain, and operate any existing bridge for vehicular traffic and pedestrian traffic crossing the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and may acquire control of any such existing bridge by purchase of stock in any corporation owning any such bridge, or by a conveyance from such corporation, or by purchase or conveyance of any interest in such bridge from an individual, partnership, company, or other legal entity which might have ownership in such bridge, and in any case the existing right or rights, if any, of the city of Muscatine, Iowa, to acquire any such bridge shall be merged into and represented by acquisition thereof by the commission and said commission shall be authorized to maintain and operate said bridge subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act: *Provided*, That the power granted in this act with respect to the acquisition and purchase of any bridge shall not be exercised by said commission until all terms of the proposed acquisition and purchase of any such bridge shall have been approved by the highway departments of the States of Iowa and Illinois.

SEC. 2. Jurisdiction of all condemnation proceedings under this act for the acquisition of any existing bridge is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa, and for such purpose the process of such court may be served outside of the State or district in which such court is located. Such proceedings shall follow as nearly as may be the law of the State of Iowa governing the proceedings for the condemnation of private property for public purposes by said State. Copies of any final judgment, decree, or order of such court in any such condemnation proceedings relating to land located outside said district shall be filed with the clerk of the court of the Federal district in which such land is located. In any such condemnation proceedings the commission shall be authorized to condemn all right, title, and interest in the bridge or bridges and approaches, and all right, title, and interest in real property necessary therefor.

SEC. 3. There is herby conferred upon the commission and its successors and assigns the right and power to enter upon such lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use such privately owned real estate and other property in the State of Iowa and the State of Illinois as may be needed for the location and construction of any such bridge or bridges and for the operation and maintenance of any bridge and its approaches hereby authorized to be acquired or constructed, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation of private property for public purpose in said State, respectively. The commission and its successors and assigns are further authorized to enter into agreements with the States of Illinois and Iowa, and any political subdivision thereof, for the acquisition, lease, or use of any lands or property owned by such State or political subdivision. The commission and its successors and assigns are further authorized to enter into agreement with the United States of America, or any of its agencies for the acquisition, lease, or use of any lands or property owned by or under the jurisdiction of the United States or its agencies.

SEC. 4. The commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to provide for the payment of the cost of such bridge or bridges as may be acquired, reconstructed, or constructed, as herein provided, and approaches (including the approach highways, which, in the judgment of the commission, it is necessary or advisable to construct or cause to be constructed to provide suitable and adequate connection with existing improved highways) and the necessary land easements and appurtenances thereto, by an issue or issues of negotiable bonds of the commission, bearing interest, payable semiannually, at the rate of not more than 6 percent per annum, the principal and interest of which bonds shall be payable solely from the funds provided in accordance with this act, and such payments may be further secured by mortgage of the bridge or bridges. All such bonds may be registered as to principal alone or both principal and interest, shall be payable as to principal within not to exceed 30 years from the date thereof, shall be in such denominations, shall be executed in such manner, and shall be payable in such medium and at such place or places as the commission may determine, and the face amount thereof shall be so calculated as to produce, at the price of their sale, the cost of the bridge or bridges acquired or constructed, and approaches and the land easements, and appurtenances used in connection therewith, when added to any other funds made available to the commission for said purposes. The commission may reserve the right to redeem any or all of said bonds before maturity in such manner and at such price or prices not exceeding 105 percent of the face value and accrued interest as may be fixed by the commission prior to the issuance of the bonds. The commission when it deems it advisable may issue refunding bonds to refinance any outstanding bonds at maturity or before maturity when called for redemption: *Provided*, That such refunding bonds shall mature within not to exceed 30 years from the date thereof and shall not exceed in principal amount the principal amount of outstanding bonds replaced by such refunding bonds. The commission may enter into an agreement with any bank or trust company in the United States as trustee having the power to make such agreement, setting forth the duties of the commission in respect to the acquisition, construction, maintenance, operation, repair, and insurance of the bridge or bridges, the conservation and application of all funds, the security for the payment of the bonds, the safeguarding of money on hand or on deposit, and the rights and remedies of said trustee and the holders of the bonds, restricting the individual right of action of the bondholders as is customary in trust agreements respecting bonds of corporations. Such trust agreement may contain such provisions for protecting and enforcing the rights and remedies of the trustee and the bondholders as may be reasonable and proper and not inconsistent with the law.

Said bonds may be sold at not less than par after public advertisement for bids to be opened publicly at the time and place stated in such advertisement and at the price bid which will yield the greatest return to the commission for the bonds to be sold. Such advertisement for bids shall be published at least once each week for 4 consecutive weeks in a newspaper or financial journal having recognized circulation among bidders for bonds of the type and character offered. The price to be paid for the bridge or bridges acquired hereunder shall not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by the commission at the time of acquisition. The cost of the bridge to be constructed as provided herein, together with the approaches and approach highways, shall be deemed to include interest during construction of the bridge and for 12 months thereafter, and all engineering, legal, financing, architectural, traffic surveying, condemnation, and other expenses incident to the bridge and the acquisition of the necessary property, including the cost of riparian rights relating to the bridge. If the proceeds of the bonds shall exceed the cost as finally determined the excess shall be placed in the fund hereafter provided to pay the principal and interest of such bonds. Prior to the preparation of definitive bonds the commission may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or interim certificates without coupons, of any denomination whatsoever, exchangeable for definitive bonds when such bonds that have been executed are available for delivery.

SEC. 5. The commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge or bridges in accordance with the provisions of this act, and as provided by the act of Congress approved March 23, 1906, as amended or supplemented. The rates and schedule of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge or bridges shall be adjusted from year to year and maintained so as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge or bridges and approaches under efficient management, and to provide a fund sufficient to pay the principal and interest of such bonds as the same shall fall due and the redemption or repurchase price of all or any thereof redeemed or repurchased before maturity as herein provided. All tolls and other revenues from said bridge or bridges are hereby pledged to such uses and to the application thereof as hereinafter in this section required. After payment or provision for payment therefrom of all such cost

of maintenance, repair, and operation, and the reservation of an amount of money estimated to be sufficient for the same purpose during an ensuing period of not more than 6 months, the remainder of tolls collected shall be placed in a fund, at intervals to be determined by the commission prior to the issuance of the bonds, to pay the principal and interest of such bonds. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge or bridges and approaches; the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same; and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested. The commission shall classify in a reasonable way all traffic over the bridge or bridges so that the tolls shall be so fixed and adjusted by it as to be uniform in the application thereof to all traffic falling within reasonable classes, regardless of the status or character of any person, firm, or corporation participating in such traffic, and shall prevent all use of such bridge or bridges for traffic except upon payment of tolls so fixed and adjusted. No toll shall be charged officials or employees of the commission, nor shall toll be charged officials of the Government of the United States while in the discharge of duties incident to their office or employment, nor shall toll be charged members of the fire department or peace officers when engaged in the performance of their official duties.

Within a reasonable time after the construction of any bridge or bridges, or the acquisition of any bridge or bridges, the commission shall file with the Commissioner of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, a sworn itemized statement showing the cost of constructing or reconstructing or purchasing the bridge or bridges and their approaches, the cost of acquiring any interest in real or other property necessary therefor, and the amount of bonds, debentures, or other evidence of indebtedness issued in connection with the construction or reconstruction or acquisition of said bridge or bridges.

SEC. 6. Nothing herein contained shall require the commission or its successors to maintain or operate any presently existing bridge acquired hereunder, if and when all bonds issued for account of such bridge shall have been retired or provision for the payment of interest on and the retirement of such bonds from the revenues from any other bridge shall have been made at the time of issuance of such bonds. Any such presently existing bridge so acquired and any appurtenances and property thereto connected and belonging, may be sold or otherwise disposed of or may be abandoned or dismantled whenever in the judgment of the commission or its successors, and subject to the approval of the Commissioner of Public Roads, and the Secretary of the Army, it may be declared expedient so to do, and provisions with respect to and regulating any such sale, disposal, abandonment, or dismantlement may be included in proceedings for the issuance and sale of bonds for account of any such bridge. The commission and its successors may fix such rates of toll for the use of such bridge as it may deem proper, subject to the same conditions as are hereinabove required as to tolls for traffic over the bridge to be constructed, provided tolls shall be fixed and revised from time to time for traffic over all bridges so as not to adversely reflect upon the earnings of any bridge or bridges for account of which bonds may be outstanding. An accurate record of the cost of acquiring or constructing each such bridge; the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same; and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 7. (a) After payment of the bonds and interest, or after a sinking fund sufficient for such payment shall have been provided and shall be held solely for that purpose, the commission shall deliver deeds or other suitable instruments of conveyance of the interest of the commission in and to that part of said bridge or bridges within Iowa to the State of Iowa or any municipality or agency thereof authorized by or pursuant to law to accept the same (hereafter referred to as the "Iowa interests"), and that part of said bridge or bridges within Illinois to the State of Illinois or any municipality or agency thereof authorized by or pursuant to law to accept the same (hereafter referred to as the "Illinois interests"), under the condition that the bridge or bridges shall thereafter be free of tolls and be properly maintained, operated, and repaired by the Iowa interests and the Illinois interests, as may be agreed upon; but if the Iowa or Illinois interests, as the case may be, fail to accept, or are not authorized to accept, their respective portions of said bridge or bridges, then the commission may deliver deeds, or other suitable instruments of conveyance of said portions, to any other interest which may accept and may be authorized to accept the same, under the condition that the bridge or bridges shall thereafter be free of toll and be properly maintained, operated, and repaired by the interests to whom said conveyances are delivered; but if either the Iowa interests, or the Illinois interests, or any other interest hereinabove mentioned shall not be authorized to accept or shall not accept the same under such conditions, then the bridge or bridges shall continue to be owned, maintained, operated, and repaired by the commission as a toll bridge, tolls to be charged being reduced so as to provide only such money as may be necessary to pay maintenance, operators expense, and repairs, until such time as the Iowa interests, the Illinois interests, or any other interest hereinabove mentioned shall be authorized to accept and shall accept such conveyance under such conditions. The rate or rates of toll for crossing any bridge now existing or hereafter constructed or reconstructed which abuts upon or enters into the corporate limits of the city of Muscatine, Iowa, shall not be reduced below the rate or rates now in effect on existing bridges so long as any indebtedness of said commission for the account of any bridge or bridges shall be outstanding and unpaid. Before deeds or other suitable instruments of conveyance are offered to the Iowa interests and the Illinois interests for acceptance, the commission shall place the bridge or bridges in a state of repair which will meet the approval of the highway departments of the States of Iowa and Illinois, and if in the opinion of said highway departments said bridge or bridges will need repainting within 2 years after the date of conveyance of title, the commission shall turn over to the Iowa interests and the Illinois interests sufficient funds to pay the cost of repainting.

(b) Notwithstanding any restrictions or limitation imposed by the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, the Commissioner of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, or any other Federal department or agency of the United States Government may extend Federal aid under such act for the acquisition, reconstruction, or construction of said bridge or bridges out of any moneys allocated to the State of Iowa with the consent of the State highway commission of said State, and out of moneys allocated to the State of Illinois with the consent of the department of highways of said State.

SEC. 8. For the purpose of carrying into effect the objects stated in this act, there is hereby created the Muscatine Bridge Commission, and by that name, style, and title said body shall have perpetual succession; may contract and be contracted with, sue and be sued, implead and be impleaded, complain and defend in all courts of law and equity; may make and have a common seal; may purchase or otherwise acquire and hold or dispose of real estate and other property; may accept and receive donations or gifts of money or property and apply same to the purposes of this act; and shall have and possess all powers necessary, convenient, or proper for carrying into effect the objects stated in this act.

The commission shall consist of L. R. McKee, E. W. Boynton, H. W. Ogilvie, G. J. Volger, and C. A. Rehwaldt, and a representative from the highway department of each of the States of Iowa and Illinois, such representative from Iowa to be designated by the State Highway Commission of Iowa and such representative from Illinois to be designated by its division of highways, department of public works and buildings; such commission shall be a public body corporate and politic, but is hereby declared not to be an agency of the Federal Government. Of the members of the commission hereinabove named, L. R. McKee and E. W. Boynton shall serve for a term of 3 years each, H. W. Ogilvie and C. A. Rehwaldt for a term of 4 years each, and G. J. Vogler for a term of 5 years, from the date of approval of this act, and thereafter each member appointed on the commission shall be for a term of 5 years, except when such appointment is to fill an unexpired term. Each member of the commission shall qualify within 30 days after the approval of this act by filing with the secretary of the commission an oath that he will faithfully perform the duties imposed upon him by this act, and each person appointed to fill a vacancy shall qualify in like manner within 30 days after his appointment. Any vacancy in said commission, other than of members to be designated by the highway departments of Iowa and Illinois, occurring by reason of failure to qualify as above provided, or by reason of death, expiration of term, or resignation, shall be filled by two-thirds majority vote of the remaining members of the commission or by the Iowa State Highway Commisssion in the event the remaining members of the bridge commission are unable to agree upon such appointment within a period of 90 days from the date the vacancy occurred. Before the issuance of bonds as hereinabove provided, each member of the commission shall give bond in the sum of $10,000: *Provided,* That the chairman, and the secretary and the treasurer if they are members of the commission, shall give bond of $25,000 each conditioned upon the faithful performance of all duties required by this act; the cost of such surety prior to and during the acquisition of the existing bridge or the reconstruction or the construction of a bridge shall be paid or reimbursed from the bond proceeds and thereafter such costs shall be deemed an operating expense. Bonds of the commission members shall be filed with the secretary of the commission. The commission shall annually elect from its members a chairman and a vice chairman, who shall each serve until his successor is elected, and may establish rules and regulations for the government of its own business. A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

SEC. 9. The commission shall have no capital stock or shares of interest or participation, and all revenues and receipts thereof shall be applied to the purposes specified in this act. The members of the commission shall be entitled to a per diem compensation for their services of $20 for each day actually spent in the business of the commission, but the maximum per diem compensation of the chairman in any 1 year shall not exceed $3,000, and the maximum annual per diem compensation of each other member shall not exceed $2,000. The members of the commission shall also be entitled to receive traveling expense allowance

of 10 cents a mile for each mile actually traveled on the business of the commission. The commission shall employ a secretary and may employ a treasurer, engineers, attorneys, and other such experts, assistants, and employees as they may deem necessary, who shall be entitled to receive such reasonable compensation as the commission may determine. All salaries and expenses shall be paid solely from the funds provided under the authority of this act. After all bonds and interest thereon shall have been paid and all other obligations of the commission paid or discharged, or provision for all such payment shall have been made as hereinbefore provided, and after the bridge or bridges shall have been conveyed to the Iowa interests, and the Illinois interests, as herein provided, or otherwise disposed of as provided herein the commission shall be dissolved and shall cease to have further existence by an order of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa made upon application of the commission or upon application of any other party in interest, but only after a public hearing in the city of Muscatine, Iowa, notice of the time and place of which hearing and the purpose thereof shall have been published once, at least 30 days before the date thereof, in a newspaper published in the city of Muscatine, Iowa. At the time of dissolution all money in the hands of or to the credit of the commisison shall be divided into equal parts, one of which shall be paid to said Iowa interests and the other to said Illinois interests, or to any other interest to which the bridge or bridges is conveyed.

SEC. 10. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this act, the commission shall have full power and authority to negotiate and enter into a contract or contracts with the State highway commission of Iowa and the department of highways of Illinois, or any governmental entity in the State of Illinois or the State of Iowa, or any nongovernmental group in the State of Iowa or any nongovernmental group in the State of Illinois or the United States Government or any agency or department thereof, whereby the commission may receive financial aid, or any other aid, in the acquisition and maintenance of an existing bridge and approaches and appurtenances thereto; or the reconstruction or construction of a bridge and approaches and appurtenances thereto.

The said commission may avail itself of all the facilities of the State highway commission of the State of Iowa and the department of highways of the State of Illinois, or any subdivision of either State, or any department or agency of the United States Government, with regard to the acquisition of the existing bridge or the reconstruction or construction of a bridge. The commission may make and enter into any contract or contracts which it deems expedient and proper with the State highway commission of Iowa, or the department of highways of Illinois, or any governmental agency, department, or subdivision of either or both States, or the United States Government or any department or agency thereof, whereby they or any of them may, by contract, participate with the commission in the financing, acquisition, operation, and maintenance of an existing bridge and the approaches and appurtenances thereto, or may participate with the commission in the financing, reconstruction or construction, operation, and maintenance of a bridge and approaches and appurtenances thereto. It is hereby declared to be the ultimate desire and purpose of Congress to facilitate the construction of a bridge and proper approaches and appurtenances thereto across the Mississippi River at or near Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Rock Island County, Ill., and to empower the Muscatine bridge commission to promote said object and purpose. The powers given to the commission shall be broadly construed so that the ultimate desire and purpose of Congress may be fufilled, which will facilitate interstate commerce, facilitate the postal service, and provide modern adequate bridge facilities for the military and promote national defense and security.

SEC. 11. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to authorize or permit the commission or any member thereof to create any obligation or incur any liability other than such obligations and liabilities as are dischargeable solely from funds contemplated to be provided by this act. No obligation created or liability incurred pursuant to this act shall be a personal obligation or liability of any member or members of the commission, but shall be chargeable solely to the funds herein provided, nor shall any indebtedness created pursuant to this act be an indebtedness of the United States.

SEC. 12. The design and construction of any bridge which may be built pursuant to this act shall be in accordance with the standard specifications for highway bridges adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials, and the location and design of any such bridge shall be subject to approval by the highway departments of the States of Iowa and Illinois.

SEC. 13. Any bridge or bridges constructed, acquired, or reconstructed under authority of this act shall be constructed, maintained, and operated in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, as amended or supplemented. By reason of the commission hereinbefore created being a public body the provisions of the Securities Act of 1933 and of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and any amendments to either or both of said acts, shall not apply to bonds authorized to be issued by this act.

SEC. 14. The bridge or bridges purchased or constructed under the authority of this act shall be deemed to be Federal instrumentalities for interstate commerce, the postal service, and military and other purposes authorized by the Government of the United States, and said bridge or bridges and the bonds issued in connection therewith and the income derived therefrom shall be exempt from all Federal, State, municipal, and local property and income taxation.

SEC. 15. Upon complaint of the attorney general of the State of Iowa or the attorney general of the State of Illinois or upon complaint of any other party in interest the United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa shall have jurisdiction over the commission with respect to the enforcement and prevention of violation of the provisions of this act.

SEC. 16. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE IMPROVEMENT OF ROCKLAND HARBOR, MAINE

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1749) adopting and authorizing the improvement of Rockland Harbor, Maine.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the modification of the project for improvement of Rockland Harbor, Maine, is hereby adopted and authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers contained in Senate Document No. 82, 84th Congress, 1st session, at an estimated cost of $710,000, and subject to the conditions set forth therein, the work to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? [After a pause.] The Chair hears no demand for a second.

The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

NATIONAL HEALTH SURVEY ACT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3076) to provide for a continuing survey and special studies of sickness and disability in the United States, and for periodic reports of the results thereof, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Health Survey Act."

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(1) that the latest information on the number and relevant characteristics of persons in the country suffering from heart disease, cancer, diabetes, arthritis and rheumatism, and other diseases, injuries, and handicapping conditions is now seriously out of date; and

(2) that periodic inventories providing reasonably current information on these matters are urgently needed for purposes such as (A) appraisal of the true state of health of our population (including both adults and children), (B) adequate planning of any programs to improve their health, (C) reseach in the field of chronic diseases, and (D) measurement of the numbers of persons in the working ages so disabled as to be unable to perform gainful work.

(b) It is, therefore, the purpose of this act to provide (1) for a continuing survey and special studies to secure on a noncompulsory basis accurate and current statistical information on the amount, distribution, and effects of illness and disability in the United States and the services received for or because of such conditions; and (2) for studying methods and survey techniques for securing such statistical information, with a view toward their continuing improvement.

SEC. 3. Part A of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. ch. 6A) is amended by adding after section 304 the following new section:

"NATIONAL HEALTH SURVEYS AND STUDIES

"SEC. 305. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized (1) to make, by sampling or other appropriate means, surveys and special studies of the population of the United States to determine the extent of illness and disability and related information such as: (A) the number, age, sex, ability to work or engage in other activities, and occupation or activities of persons afflicted with chronic or other disease or injury or handicapping condition; (B) the type of disease or injury or handicapping condition of each person so afflicted; (C) the length of time that each such person has been prevented from carrying on his occupation or activities; (D) the amounts and types of services received for or because of such conditions; and (E) the economic and other impacts of such conditions; and (2) in connection therewith, to develop and test new or improved methods for obtaining current data on illness and disability and related information.

"(b) The Surgeon General is authorized, at appropriate intervals, to make available, through publications and otherwise, to any

interested governmental or other public or private agencies, organizations, or groups, or to the public, the results of surveys or studies made pursuant to subsection (a).

"(c) For each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1956, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as the Congress may determine for carrying out the provisions of this section.

"(d) To assist in carrying out the provisions of this section the Surgeon General is authorized and directed to cooperate and consult with the Departments of Commerce and Labor and any other interested Federal Departments or agencies and with State health departments. For such purpose he shall utilize insofar as possible the services or facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, of any appropriate State or other public agency, and may, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, utilize the services or facilities of any private agency, organization, group, or individual, in accordance with written agreements between the head of such agency, organization, or group, or such individual, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Payment, if any, for such services or facilities shall be made in such amounts as may be provided in such agreement."

SEC. 4. Section 301 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. 241) is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (f), redesignating paragraph (g) as paragraph (h), and inserting immediately following paragraph (f) the following new paragraph:

"(g) Make available, to health officials, scientists, and appropriate public and other nonprofit institutions and organizations, technical advice and assistance on the application of statistical methods to experiments, studies, and surveys in health and medical fields; and."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, this bill was passed by the Senate and referred to our committee where we amended it in certain respects and improved the bill.

It provides for a continuing study and survey of sickness and disability in the United States. There is an urgent need for such study. It has been 20 years since there has been a similar study. At the present time there is a serious lack of statistical information that is so necessary for the planning and execution of health programs by the States or the Federal Government or by local organizations.

It is contemplated this survey will be conducted by the Census Bureau. There will not be an increase in personnel and it is on a non-compulsory basis. The committee has reported the bill unanimously.

If anyone desires any information I will be glad to answer questions.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The only reason for my demanding a second was so that we might have a full understanding of what the bill is all about. It did not indicate an objection to the bill at all.

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us whether there are departmental reports on the bill S. 3076 which is before us and what the departmental reports were?

Mr. DIES. The bill was recommended by the administration. As a matter of fact, it was the subject of a special message sent to the Congress by President Eisenhower. We also have a letter of recommendation from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There is no opposition from any quarter to the bill and it is very necessary that we pass it quickly. The Surgeon General will conduct the study in cooperation with State and private agencies, which will avoid duplication of effort.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman may have answered this question already, but what about an estimate of the cost of this survey? Is there any estimate?

Mr. DIES. So far as I know we do not have any definite estimate of the cost but since it is contemplated to use existing personnel there will be no necessity to enlarge the personnel in the Department of Public Health. They will utilize the personnel in the Census Bureau to take these samplings geographically.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman from Texas is absolutely correct in that respect. There was a possible estimate that came to the chairman later, after the hearings, that it might amount to as much as $1,250,000 out of the regular budget; that is, that much of the regular budget might be used in paying the personnel already employed to do this job.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. My understanding then is that the real reason for this bill is to authorize the departments to use funds that they presently have to engage in this activity; that there is not today on the books any authorization to make this survey, or am I wrong in that?

Mr. DIES. No; there is no authorization to make this survey. It is necessary that we pass this to authorize it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that all matters which he has had under discussion were carefully gone into by the committee. This bill was unanimously approved by those on both sides of the aisle. The cost was very, very carefully surveyed before we decided to do anything on this bill. I believe, in view of that finding of the committee, that this bill is very much in order.

Mr. DIES. If there are no other questions, Mr. Speaker, that will conclude my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

DEFINITION OF "NONFAT DRY MILK"

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1614) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids."

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law 244, 78th Congress, 2d session, approved March 2, 1944, title 21, United States Code, section 321c, entitled "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids" is amended to read as follows: "That for the purposes of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 26, 1938 (ch. 675, sec. 1, 52 Stat. 1040), nonfat dry milk is the product resulting from the removal of fat and water from milk, and contains the lactose, milk proteins, and milk minerals in the same relative proportions as in the fresh milk from which made. It contains not over 5 percent by weight of moisture. The fat content is not over 1½ percent by weight unless otherwise indicated.

The term "milk," when used herein, means sweet milk of cows.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, this bill which has already passed the other body comes to us as S. 1614 and is, I think, best explained in the report. It is a very simple bill. It merely has to do with eliminating some definitions and simplifying Public Law 244 which was passed by the 78th Congress. I will read the law:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 26, 1938 (ch. 675, sec. 1, 52 Stat. 1040), nonfat dry milk "solids or defatted milk solids" is the product resulting from the removal of fat and water from milk, and contains the lactose, milk proteins, and milk minerals in the same relative proportions as in the fresh milk from which made. It contains not over 5 percent by weight of moisture. The fat content is not over 1½ percent by weight unless otherwise indicated.

The term "milk", when used herein, means sweet milk of cows.

This bill was sponsored by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] and I am positive that if it had any substantial opposition from the fresh-milk industry in that State, he would certainly not have introduced it. It was unanimously approved by the Health and Science Subcommittee. There was no

opposition to the bill in the full committee. Representatives of the American Dry Milk Institute appeared and testified in behalf of the bill. The Department of Agriculture approved the bill but felt it unnecessary to testify in behalf of it.

In simple terms, when a housewife goes to the grocery store and calls for dry milk, she does not ask for nonfat dry milk solids or defatted milk solids. She asks for dry milk. All this bill does is to remove the word "solids" or "defatted milk solids" and what you have left is nonfat dry milk. That is all it is. In the interest of free enterprise and in order not to load down a definition on the cartons or bottles in which it is sold, I think this is a good amendment.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, this bill came from the Subcommittee on Health and Science of which I am a member. The bill was reported out of the committee unanimously. We felt there was a need for this redefinition. It was in order. In my estimation this bill should be passed under suspension of the rules.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1614) as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

TO PERMIT CERTAIN AIR CARRIERS TO GRANT FREE OR REDUCED RATE TRANSPORTATION TO MINISTERS OF RELIGION

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3149) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to permit certain air carriers to grant free or reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 403 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following sentence: "Any air carrier or foreign air carrier, under such terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe, may grant reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion, except that such a carrier may not grant such reduced-rate transportation during any period with respect to which it receives any compensation, determined under section 406 of this act, which is payable by the Board pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 10 of 1953."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CARLYLE], the author of the House bill.

Mr. CARLYLE. Mr. Speaker, this proposed legislation has been carefully considered by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We feel that it is a good bill. It is permissive legislation. There is nothing compulsory about it.

The air carriers are permitted to grant to ministers of religion reduced fares if they elect to do so. It is a bill that has been carefully framed so that it will not cost this Government any money. Air carriers who are receiving any subsidy from the Government are not permitted to grant such reduced rates. We think it is a good bill and we ask that it pass the House.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the gentleman for having brought this bill so quickly to the attention of the House. From every side of my district I have received evidence of support of the clergy and of other citizens for this proposed legislation.

Mr. CARLYLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLYLE. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my friend from North Carolina. I should like to say also that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CARLYLE] is one of the most substantial Members of the House. His contributions have been noted by his colleagues who are aware of his quiet, but effective judgment, which has contributed so much to the drafting and enactment of legislation to the benefit of the people of his district, his State, and of the Nation. Also I should like to convey to my friend from North Carolina the fact that I have always valued his friendship and always shall. I want to emphasize as strongly as I can that the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CARLYLE] every since his service in this body has been one of its most respected Members.

Mr. CARLYLE. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have had the great honor and privilege of serving for several years in this body and on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with our distinguished colleague from North Carolina. You get to know Members much better by working with and serving on committees together. It has been my pleasure to sit in the same committee room and work with my distinguished colleague and friend on highly important legislation affecting our people throughout the Nation. I have always observed him to be one of the most able and outstanding members of our committee. He has been industrious, resourceful and faithful to duty and public trust.

Mr. CARLYLE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to commend him for sponsoring this bill. It is an example of the fine service he is rendering and has rendered in the Congress.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I have been a member of this committee for some 4 years. All of that time the gentleman from North Carolina has been a member of the committee. In all the legislation he has brought forth from that committee I have not known anything that has not been to the best interests not only of his district but of all the people of the country. He has been a conscientious servant of the people he represents. He has been a regular attendant at committee meetings. In my opinion, he has been one of the outstanding members of this committee. I congratulate him on bringing forward this piece of legislation, for which he has fought for a number of years in attempting to enact it into law. This is the culmination of all those efforts and all the time he has spent on this proposed legislation.

Mr. CARLYLE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. As chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I join with our distinguished majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], in expressing my own appreciation for the services of the gentleman from North Carolina to the committee, the Congress, and the country. I have had ample opportunity to observe the industry and diligence with which he has pursued legislative matters as a member of that committee. I want to make it a matter of record at this point that he has been one of our most able and valuable members.

Mr. CARLYLE. I thank my chairman.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I join my chairman and the other members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in paying tribute to our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CARLYLE]. Having served with him on the Health and Science Subcommittee for the past 2 years, I know the fine work he has rendered in behalf of his district, the State, and of the Nation. He has served as chairman of the Carlyle Subcommittee on Refrigerator Safety. He will be sorely missed not only as a coworker here but as a sincere colleague and friend.

Mr. CARLYLE. I thank the gentleman from Alabama very much.

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RADWAN].

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I join the sentiments expressed on this legisla-

tion and particularly commend the gentleman from North Carolina, the author of this legislation. I also congratulate and commend the committee on reporting favorably this legislation. It is legislation which I had introduced in a previous Congress, and I am very happy to support it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask a question of the chairman of the committee.

Is this proposal for reduced fares to members of the clergy limited only to airlines that are not receiving subsidies?

Mr. PRIEST. Under the terms and provisions of the bill, as reported to the House, it is limited to airlines that do not receive subsidies. That is, the permissive authority to give these reduced rates is limited to airlines which are not on subsidies. May I say to the gentleman that this question was before the committee last year, perhaps, and the year before, and one of the great objections that were made at that time as to the legislation was that if this authority were granted to the airlines not on subsidy, we faced the possibility of getting into the question of, let us say, the separation of church and state and of getting that question involved in the picture, which, of course, is a matter which rightly should not enter into the problem at all and, yet, which we found was to be considered if it applied to airlines which were on subsidies.

Mr. GROSS. Then, this is a limited proposition; is it not?

Mr. PRIEST. No, it is not. It is not nearly as limited as it was a year ago. At the present time practically all of the major airlines are not operating on subsidies and others are being removed from the subsidy list, let us say, rather rapidly so it is not in any sense a limited proposition.

Mr. GROSS. The transportation of mail under certain conditions is considered a subsidy; is it not?

Mr. PRIEST. No. The payments made by the Government for the transportation of mail is for services rendered. That is not a subsidy. The gentleman will recall the rather extended controversy which was had here on the floor of the House on the question of the separation of mail pay and subsidies so that the public, the Congress, and everybody would know what was actually paid for the transportation of mail and what was paid simply as a subsidy. They are not the same thing.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CARLYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. CARLYLE. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa that this same consideration which is being extended to ministers of religion is now given by railroads and buslines under similar legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the gentleman knows that I am not opposed; I think this is reasonable legislation. Certainly, I am not opposed, but I am under the impression that it is severely limited, however, when it is applicable only to airlines which are not subsidized.

Mr. CARLYLE. I was confident, I assure the gentleman, that he was not opposed to the legislation.

Mr. GROSS. I support it, and merely seek clarification as to the limitations.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, while I am not a member of the subcommittee which considered this legislation, I do know what was said in the committee when it came to the full committee. The bill came unanimously from the subcommittee on transportation, which had to do with this particular problem. All of the evidence which came to us in the full committee, I thought indicated that we should have this kind of legislation. I think that the best thing about the bill is that it is not compulsory in nature. Any airline that does not want to grant such a benefit to a minister of religion does not have to do so. However, the bill does grant the airlines the same right on a competitive basis with railroads as far as this class of passenger is concerned. I feel that it is good legislation. I supported it in committee and I support it today. It is in the spirit of the same type of legislation which we have passed heretofore here in the Congress with reference to other kinds of transportation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. As chairman of the subcommittee which heard the testimony and considered this legislation, I think the record should show that this legislation has been before the Congress for several years now. In the last Congress, the bill was taken up and considered. Objection was offered at that time within the committee on the basis that we were having difficulty in bringing airlines out of the subsidy character and, therefore, objection was made on the basis that the Treasury of the United States through the subsidy of certain airlines would have to stand this extra expense.

Because of that, and that fact alone, primarily, certain objections did arise. It was the effect of that information in the committee that the bill was not reported. However, in time that objection was met, and in this Congress, when our distinguished friend and colleague from North Carolina introduced the bill he had conferred with the objectors to the bill before the committee, and, therefore, met the objection with reference to subsidization, and the committee accepted their recommendation and finally reported the bill and we have it before us today. I agree with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] that there is a limitation here. It is rather restricted in its nature, because 13 local airline service carriers throughout the country are practically all subsidized. Those airlines, together with the airlines overseas, are not affected by this proposed legislation. Ministers who need this privilege most, I think, are those who live in the rural areas of this country. They will not be benefited and cannot be benefited at all. Therefore, I was favorable to the other viewpoint. But, nevertheless, because of the fact that there was objection to it on the basis of subsidies to those airlines, consequently, under the provision where permissive authority was given for the nonsubsidized airlines to give the ministers this privilege, I was glad to join my colleagues on the committee and go along with it. I thought the record should be clear.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] for bringing out what I thought was a deficiency in the bill. That is, the fact that the ministers in the rural areas will not benefit under the provisions of this bill, to the extent that they should.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. That was brought out fully in the discussion on the legislation, and I expressed myself that I thought the people who need it most, and I expressed myself that I thought the people who need it most were the people who were not being benefited by it. But the other viewpoint, of course, is an important viewpoint to be considered. Consequently, since that objection had to be eliminated before any legislation could be passed, I agreed to go along.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say the gentleman from Arkansas did an excellent job on this, but in answer to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], may I say the ministers were asked very pointed questions about this matter. They thought that this was the only thing the Congress could do—to restrict it to those airlines which were profitably making sufficient to allow this to be done. They also felt that they simply could not call upon the subsidized airlines for reduced fares.

I thought the clergy took a very fair view in connection with this matter.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 3149, as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit air carriers and foreign air carriers, subject to certain conditions, to grant reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

CLOSING THE LOOPHOLES IN THE MEAT INSPECTION LAWS TO PROTECT THE CONSUMER AGAINST DISEASED POULTRY

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today in order to call to the attention of the House of Representatives a bill which I have just introduced this afternoon to close one of the most glaring loopholes in our pure-food laws.

It is a bill to require Federal inspection for wholesomeness of all poultry or poultry products in interstate commerce or which directly burden, obstruct, or affect interstate commerce.

My bill would accomplish this long-overdue reform by amending the Meat Inspection Act to include poultry and poultry products along with beef, pork, lamb, and the other red meats now covered by the terms of this law.

The bill states that Congress finds that poultry and poultry products are being marketed through the channels of interstate and foreign commerce without adequate inspection to protect the public against poultry and poultry products which are diseased, unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit for human food.

OBJECTIVE: TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC

It further states as its objective: To protect the general consuming public, to protect the health of persons engaged in the processing and distribution of poultry and poultry products, to prevent the spread of disease through shipments in interstate and foreign commerce of unwholesome poultry and poultry products, and to promote the wider use of poultry through assurance to the consuming public of its wholesomeness and freedom from disease, thus assisting agriculture and the food-marketing industries in expanding their sales and augmenting their important contributions to our economic system, the following amendments are made to the Meat Inspection Act—34th United States Statutes at Large, page 1260, as amended—and the Tariff Act of 1930—46th United States Statutes at Large, page 689, section 306—giving the Secretary of Agriculture power to inspect, condemn, or regulate any shipments of poultry in interstate or foreign commerce, or any shipment thereof which directly burdens, obstructs, or affects interstate or foreign commerce in such commodity.

FIFTY YEARS OF MEAT INSPECTION

The Meat Inspection Act will be exactly 50 years old this month. During all of that time, we have had compulsory inspection for wholesomeness of all red meats shipped in interstate commerce. This law represented a great reform following the disclosures of the filth and complete lack of sanitation in the meat industry a half-century ago. The law has worked fairly and well to protect the consumer. It has also been a great thing for the legitimate meat-packing industry.

The effectiveness of this program can be seen, Mr. Speaker, right in the bare figures and statistics of the Federal budget. We find on page 359 of the budget document for the coming fiscal year that in fiscal 1955, the year which ended last June 30, nearly 100 million meat animals were inspected by Federal meat inspectors, both before and after slaughter, to make sure the animals were healthy and the meat was wholesome. Out of this number, more than a quarter million carcasses were condemened as unfit for human consumption.

Just imagine how many illnesses those quarter million disease or unfit steers, lambs, pigs, or other animals could have caused if the meat inspectors had not condemned the meat from them.

The budget shows that more than 16 billion pounds of processed meat and meat-food products were inspected by the Federal meat inspectors in that fiscal year, at a cost to the Federal Government of nearly $15 million that year. The estimate for meat-inspection work for the coming year is nearly $16 million, and it is money well spent—to protect our health.

NO COMPULSORY INSPECTION OF POULTRY

But while we have had compulsory inspection for wholesomeness of the red meats in interstate commerce, we have had no such requirement for poultry and poultry products. Consequently, we have been victimized as consumers many, many times by being sold poultry products which should have been condemned and destroyed. We have been defrauded by being sold products unfit for human food. We have been poisoned by the consumption of poultry products which carried disease. And, even more tragically, we have seen some employees in the poultry-processing industry die as a result of extremely serious disease transmitted to them by poultry which should have been detected as diseased before slaughter and thus never should have been brought in contact with the workers whose death they caused.

I have cited the consequences to consumers, to the general public, and to workers in the poultry-processing industry because we have not had adequate inspection of poultry and poultry products to insure that these foods are wholesome. Let me add an additional group which is being adversely affected—the poultry processors themselves and the food-distribution industry.

The spread of illness through sale of diseased poultry has caused many housewives to hesitate about buying poultry, particularly frozen poultry. A number of people in this line of business have told me that sales are adversely affected by the lack of confidence of many housewives in the wholesomeness of poultry products offered for sale. As they point out, this affects not only the fly-by-night or unscrupulous operator, but the legitimate concern as well. Firms which sell only the most wholesome commodities suffer from the lack of public confidence in the wholesomeness of poultry products generally.

IN BEST INTEREST OF PRODUCERS, TOO

So it is to the advantage of the consumer, then, the general public, the poultry processing plant worker, and to the poultry farmer and the poultry processor and the poultry distributor that we close this 50-year-old loophole in our meat inspection laws and include poultry as well as the red meats under the terms of the Meat Inspection Act.

It may come as a shock to some Members, Mr. Speaker, to learn that the chicken or duck or turkey which you buy in the store could be shipped in interstate commerce without Federal inspection as to its wholesomeness—its purity—its fitness as human food. Do we not have laws to prohibit the sale in interstate commerce of food products unfit for human consumption? Of course we do.

We have the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act which prohibits the sale in interstate and foreign commerce of contaminated, unfit, filthy, adulterated foods. Since we have such a law on the books, we are inclined to sit back and be complacent in the belief that everything is nicely taken care of.

FOOD AND DRUG FUNDS INADEQUATE

As many of the Members know, I have been protesting ever since coming to Congress that we live in an atmosphere of false security about the purity of our foods, drugs and cosmetics—despite a good law on the subject—because we treat the Food and Drug Administration like a stepchild. We starve out the agency responsible for protecting our own health against poisonous foods and drugs and cosmetics. It is a shortsighted and tragic thing.

The Food and Drug Administration hopes in this coming year—with the help of a very substantial increase in its appropriation—to expand back to the level of 1952 and have as many as 300 inspectors on its staff for food, drug and cosmetic enforcement work.

It has been able to spare only about 7 or 10 men, at the outside, on a man-year basis, for poultry inspection. It has been able to send an inspector around to the various poultry processing plants engaged in interstate commerce about once every 3 or 4 years.

Yes; occasionally they do uncover a shipment of unfit, rotten poultry, which they then seize and remove from the channels of commerce. But this is hardly the kind of procedure which can assure the wholesomeness of the poultry we consume in this country.

Obviously, a visit every 3 or 4 years for a few hours by a Food and Drug inspector to a poultry-processing plant is not the answer.

PRESENT POULTRY INSPECTION ONLY PARTIAL PROGRAM

Well, then, do we not have Federal inspection of poultry by the Department of Agriculture? We do. Primarily such inspection was to protect the farmer and his poultry flock from diseased birds. It is illegal to ship diseased live poultry in interstate commerce and it is illegal to ship the carcasses of poultry which died from certain specified diseases.

But the loophole here is interesting. If the diseased birds suffering from such illnesses are slaughtered, the carcasses can be shipped, nonetheless, because they did not die of these specified diseases. Is that not, indeed, a ridiculous distinction?

The diseased poultry would not have been shipped live in violation of the act,

nor would they actually have died of the disease from which they suffered.

Therefore, we cannot depend upon this particular statute to protect the consumer, or to protect the health of the poultry-processing-plant worker, or to reassure the public as to the wholesomeness of the poultry they see offered in the stores.

Under the terms of another law, however, there is Federal inspection of poultry for wholesomeness. This is in the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, which provides for a voluntary inspection program, with the full cost of the service being paid for by the processors which use the service.

Hence, you can now find federally inspected poultry, certified as to its wholesomeness, in many stores today. When you see such poultry in the stores carrying the Department of Agriculture seal attesting that it has been inspected for wholesomeness, you can be sure this poultry is good—that it is wholesome. I am very pleased by the actions of so many food-merchandising companies in emphasizing in their advertising that they sell only United States inspected poultry, approved for wholesomeness. The customer should insist on this.

But, unfortunately, this voluntary program—which the processing industry must pay for—covers only a small proportion of our poultry supplies and is utterly inadequate in protecting the public.

Only about 25 percent of the Nation's poultry supply is inspected by the Federal Department of Agriculture for wholesomeness. The present Federal poultry inspection program, as I said, is purely voluntary on the part of the processors willing to participate under it, and willing to pay for the inspection service on a fee basis. That is why 75 percent of our poultry is not inspected by the Federal Government.

ILLNESS AND DEATH FROM DISEASED POULTRY

On the other hand, the Federal Government pays the full cost—now more than 15 million dollars a year—for inspection of the red meats for wholesomeness. When you stop to consider that we consume more than 6½ billion pounds of poultry a year, it is obvious there is a big gap in our machinery for protecting the consumer from unwholesome poultry products. We know that many diseases are transmitted from poultry to humans. We know that diseased poultry in the last few months in the Far West, and in the last few years in Texas and elsewhere has caused the death of a number of poultry processing workers and the serious illnesses of many workers—epidemics, for instance, of psittacosis. And we know that diseased, unfit poultry has caused an unusually high percentage of all food poisoning illnesses, particularly salmonellosis and gastroenteritis.

I mentioned the Food and Drug Administration's efforts to combat this menace. Let me again point out that the Food and Drug Administration, with a total appropriation for all purposes of less than one-half of what we appropriate each year to the Federal Meat Inspection Service, cannot begin to do the job of protecting the public against all unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome poultry. There are 1,300 or more interstate poultry dressing, freezing, or canning establishments in the United States, and the Food and Drug Administration can visit them, as I said, only about once every 3 or 4 years.

Obviously, we need full-time inspectors to examine this poultry before it is killed—antemortem—and again after it is killed, exactly as it is done with the red meats.

MEAT CUTTERS UNION HAS ALERTED PUBLIC

My attention first was called to this problem by the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, whose president, Mr. Earl W. Jimerson, and secretary-treasurer, Patrick E. Gorman, along with other officers and members, have been deeply concerned by the danger to the health of their fellow-members from diseased poultry. Members of this union have sickened and, in some cases, died, from handling diseased poultry. Others have been made violently nauseous by the conditions in some of the plants, and by the unfit products—filthy products—they have had to process.

Two years ago, on June 15, 1954, after officials of this union called some of these matters to my attention in connection with my efforts to obtain higher appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration, I directed an inquiry to Mr. Charles W. Crawford, then Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, asking what was being done to overcome the menace to public health of diseased poultry being shipped in interstate commerce, and also asking of any instances known to his agency of the transmission of disease from poultry to humans. I received a most interesting answer from him on June 23, 1954. Subsequently, on July 26, 1954, I called this material to the attention of the House in the following statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

DISEASED AND "NEEDLED" POULTRY ENDANGER AND CHEAT THE PUBLIC, AND OTHER RACKETS FLOURISH IN FOODS, DRUGS, AND COSMETICS, AS FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION AGAIN IS CUT

(Extension of remarks of Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri, in the House of Representatives, Monday, July 26, 1954)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope that many Members of the Congress, and also officials of the administration, particularly those with policymaking responsibilities in the field of health and welfare, read the excellent article in the Washington Evening Star on Wednesday, July 21, dealing with the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The article was entitled "Food and Drug Watchdogs Face Work With Less Funds."

I have tried during my tenure in the Congress to keep abreast of the work of the Food and Drug Administration and to do what I can to assure it adequate authority to do the work we expect of it, and also adequate funds. Last year, as a result of the Supreme Court decision, a loophole was disclosed in the basic authority of the Food and Drug Administration which prohibited inspectors of the agency to gain admission to factories preparing food, drug, or cosmetics preparations, except on the invitation of the operators of those factories. We succeeded in closing that loophole in the legislation. It was a great victory for the consumer, for it restored the right of our Government to inspect the conditions under which these products are prepared and processed, and to act against insanitary conditions threatening the health of the public.

The fact remains, however, that the Food and Drug Administration has not been getting adequate funds to enable it to make the number of inspections it should make each year in preventing products which are dangerous to health, or which are fraudulently packaged, from getting into interstate commerce. The administration this year asked for only $5,200,000 for the appropriation of the Food and Drug Administration, as against the $5,600,000 appropriated under the Truman administration. The Congress then cut the administration's request by another $100,000, leaving the Food and Drug Administration only $5,100,000. That means a cut in the staff of this very essential Government agency by about 11 percent since 1952. Considering the work which the Food and Drug Administration does for all the people of the United States by seeking to eliminate poisoned, or adulterated, or mislabeled foods, drugs, and cosmetics from being sold to the public, I think this was one of the most shortsighted cuts ever made in an appropriation.

THE DISEASED POULTRY SITUATION

The work of the Food and Drug Administration has come in for renewed attention in recent months as a result of disclosures dealing with the sale in interstate commerce of diseased poultry and of frozen poultry which has been fraudulently weighted with water prior to freezing. Estimates on the extent of this dangerous and immoral racket have varied, but all the facts indicate that it has been an extensive problem. With its cut in funds in both last year's appropriation and this year's, the Food and Drug Administration has had to cut its enforcement work in this field by about 30 percent.

Following disclosures of this diseased poultry racket, I wrote last month to Mr. Charles W. Crawford, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, asking for full information on the work of the FDA to protect the consumer against the sale of this diseased poultry, the time devoted to this work, the number of poultry processors in the country doing interstate business, the frequency with which they are inspected, etc. I also asked for any information he might have indicating transmission of diseases to humans as a result of the processing or consumption of diseased poultry. His reply, I believe, will be of extreme interest to every Member of the Congress concerned about protecting the health of the people of the United States and protecting them against fraud.

With the unanimous consent of the House, Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the article Food and Drug Watchdogs Face Work With Less Funds, from the Washington Evening Star of July 21, and also an exchange of correspondence between myself and Commissioner Crawford, of the Food and Drug Administration, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of July 21, 1954]

"FOOD AND DRUG WATCHDOGS FACE WORK WITH LESS FUNDS

"Housewives might do well to provide themselves with scales to check the weight of packages of food they buy.

"They would thus be taking over part of the work of the Food and Drug Administration. But that agency, its budget cut and its staff reduced, has assigned a low priority to the checking of the net weight of packaged food against the statement of weight on the label.

"Wallace F. Janssen, assistant to the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, said he does not believe the housewife would find many packages not full weight.

But it would provide a check the Administration is not able to make.

"The budget of the agency has been trimmed steadily in the last 4 years. For fiscal 1952 Congress appropriated $5.64 million. The next year the appropriation was $5.6 million. Last year it was $5.2 million, and for this fiscal year, 1955, it is $5.1 million.

"Eleven percent cut since 1952

"The estimated number of the staff for this year is 815, an 11 percent reduction since 1952. That number includes laboratory scientists, administrators, clerical workers, and, finally, the front-line troops, the inspectors.

"There were only 230 inspectors in 1950. Last year the number was 195. These figures leave out about 170 persons employed in testing certain products as they are produced, with the manufacturer paying the salaries through fees.

"The head of the Food and Drug Administration is Charles W. Crawford, a career man with 37 years' experience. He has applied for retirement.

"The staff cuts have led the Agency to the conclusion that it is more important to direct its efforts toward activities that protect health rather than those that protect the pocketbook. Therefore, it has assigned lower priorities on checking weights of packaged goods, checking the contents of cans and packages to make sure their composition is what the label says, and proceeding against those who make extravagant claims for products unless danger to health is involved.

"Occasional cases on these grounds are made, it is true, but usually they are incidental to other activities.

"The Agency admits frankly it would take 200 inspectors 12½ years to make inspections of each of the 96,000 food and drug company plants and warehouses. Last year 8,650 plants and warehouses were inspected.

"Lacks followup facilities

"While the Agency is alert to cases in which public health is involved, it says it lacks the facilities to keep up with the testing of new products and materials which are being developed in increasing numbers. It cannot make followup investigations of the safety of new drugs after they are placed on the market. Important cases involving serious frauds have been delayed by a lack of medical and legal manpower.

"The Agency does continue to seize contaminated and spoiled foods in large amounts. It goes after medical devices and products which make false claims. It prosecutes druggists who sell barbiturates and other prescription drugs without a physician's prescription.

"After coffee prices went up the Agency decided it should check attempts by unethical dealers to take advantage of the higher prices. It seized a number of consignments of coffee.

"It was learned that chickpeas, imported for canning, had become infested with insects. The chickpeas were diverted to coffee roasters. Coffee shipped by some firms were found to contain, in addition to the chickpeas, spent coffee grounds, barley, chicory, and soybeans.

"Frozen food adds work

"The expanding market for frozen foods has added to the Administration's work. One plant producing frozen turkeys was found to operate with a water hose having a hypodermic needle as a nozzle. Water was injected into the turkeys before they were frozen.

"When one turkey was thawed 2 pounds of water seeped out. It was part of a lot of turkeys weighing 50,000 pounds. Taking the average weight of a turkey at 15 pounds, allowing for 1 pound of water per bird and taking the price at 75 cents a pound, the buyers were thus paying $2,500 for 3,300 pounds of water.

"May be political appointee

"With the retirement of Mr. Crawford pending, the agency has this question:

"Will the new Administrator be a professional man, perhaps trained in the agency, or a person from some other category whose appointment is cleared with the Republican National Committee?

"When the Eisenhower administration directed that Government policymaking jobs be listed and that they be taken from under civil-service coverage, various trade associations in the food and drugs fields urged that politics be kept out of the Food and Drug Administration. Mr. Crawford was not replaced.

"With the prospect of his retirement the requests are being repeated. Carlos E. Campbell, secretary of the National Canners Association, said his organization has urged that the appointment be kept in the professional category. Other organizations have done the same."

JUNE 15, 1954.

Mr. CHARLES W. CRAWFORD,
Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CRAWFORD: In view of the recent publicity given the sale of diseased poultry and the action of the AFL Meatcutters Union to try to bring about legislation to protect the American consumer against this menace, I would appreciate your sending me a statement on what the FDA is doing and intends to do to correct this situation. I would specifically like to have answers to the following questions, as well as any other information you can properly send me in connection with this problem.

What does the FDA do to protect the consumer against the sale of diseased poultry?

How much time is devoted to the inspection of that one particular item?

Are there any diseases of poultry that can be transmitted to humans through the consumption of diseased poultry being put up for sale?

If so, do you know of any instances where diseases of poultry have been transmitted to humans?

Do you know how many poultry processors there are in the country that do interstate business?

How often does the FDA inspect them?

I would appreciate it if you would send me your reply to these questions in quadruplicate.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. JOHN B. (LEONOR) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 23, 1954.

Hon. LEONOR SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives:

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: We have your letter of June 15 in which you ask several questions concerning our enforcement program on diseased poultry. We are answering your questions in the order in which you have asked them.

Under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, a food is deemed to be adulterated if it is the product of a diseased animal or of an animal which died otherwise than by slaughter. This section of the act takes into account the basic objections of the consumer to the diseased product, whether or not actual danger to health can be demonstrated.

We have a carefully planned enforcement program under this section of the law, which includes inspection of poultry dressing and eviscerating plants and of other poultry processors, and sampling surveys in consumer markets to find diseased or otherwise unfit poultry. Under this program for fiscal 1953 and the first 11 months of fiscal 1954, we approved 106 seizure actions for the removal of unfit birds from the market, of which 64 actions included charges that the article was in whole or in part the product of a diseased animal. During the same period we also approved 33 criminal actions, 22 of which involved diseased poultry.

During fiscal 1953 we devoted 10 man-years to the poultry project, of which the work on diseased poultry is a part, along with work on filthy, decomposed or otherwise unfit poultry and poultry which has been "needled" or otherwise fraudulently watered to increase its weight. During fiscal 1954 this work has necessarily been reduced. We estimate, based on reports for the first 3 quarters, that 7 man-years will have been expended this year on this project.

The question of whether poultry diseases may be transmitted to man through the sale of diseased poultry cannot be answered with assurance. It is well established that certain poultry disease are transmissible to man. These would include, for instance, psittacosis (parrot fever) and Newcastle disease. However, outbreaks of these diseases, so far as we know, have occurred only among persons handling live poultry or working in poultry dressing establishments. We do not know of any instances in which it have been proved that a specific disease was contracted through the consumption or preparation in the kitchen of a diseased bird. On the other hand, the possibility cannot be ruled out.

Several outbreaks of psittacosis have occurred recently among workers in turkey processing plants in Texas. In cooperation with the Public Health Service of this Department we are currently investigating these outbreaks to determine whether diseased birds have been shipped in interstate commerce and the degree of hazard, if any, to the purchaser of such birds.

There is another group of diseases common to poultry and to man and apparently caused by the same disease organism in both, in which definite transmission has not been established. However, it is believed that poultry may at least serve as a reservoir of human infection by routes still unknown. Certain types of encephalitis and meningitis, pseudotuberculosis, and pasturella infections are in this group.

In a closely related category are the food-poisoning illnesses—salmonellosis and gastroenteritis—which are attributed to poultry and poultry products or in which such products are suspected as the vehicle of infection. Poultry which are actively infected with salmonella or which are carriers of the organisms, though apparently not diseased in the ordinary sense, undoubtedly are involved in many of these instances, and fecal contamination during processing may be a factor. For your further information on this phase of your inquiry, we are enclosing a mimeograph entitled "Poultry Diseases Transmissible to Man—Including Summary Report of Outbreaks," prepared by the Communicable Disease Center of the Public Health Service.

We estimate that there are approximately 1,300 interstate poultry dressing, freezing, or canning establishments in the United States. For the past 2 years we have made about 400 poultry-establishment inspections each year, of which we estimate that perhaps one-fourth represents reinspections of the same firms. Thus our program contemplates complete coverage of this industry about once every 3 or 4 years.

If we can be of further service, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Sincerely yours,
C. W. CRAWFORD,
Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

FULL REPORT ON TRANSMISSIBLE DISEASES

I did not, at that time, include in the RECORD the report which Mr. Crawford

referred to—"Poultry Diseases Transmissible to Man Including Summary Report of Outbreaks"—but I believe it is relevant now in light of the bill which I have introduced and the goal I am trying to achieve. I therefore am including it today as part of my remarks, identified as exhibit A at the end of my discussion. It is rather long, and for that I apologize, but I do believe it is important enough to the legislative process—if we are to achieve the goal of assuring the wholesomeness of the poultry we buy and eat—to include it in the RECORD. I hope that Members will be able to find the time to read it and to note especially the many incidents of food poisoning in the 1951–52 period studied which were directly attributable to diseased poultry.

For 2 years, then, Mr. Speaker, I have been actively interested in this problem of diseased poultry, and finding a solution to it which would protect the consumer and the public generally. I think the bill which I have today introduced is the best approach which has yet been made to solving the problem.

I have mentioned the intense interest of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters Union in this whole field, and I am pleased to acknowledge their leadership in bringing the matter to public attention and in enlisting my help and the help of other Members of Congress in seeking a solution. Since the Amalgamated's proposed solution has been somewhat different from mine, although our objectives are identical, I think it only fair to point out the development of our respective legislative approaches.

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION SOUGHT

The Meat Cutters Union at first sought to meet the increasing problem of diseased poultry in interstate commerce through the vehicle of a congressional investigation, and several bills were offered in the Congress calling for such investigations. Unfortunately, however, no action was taken on these bills last year in either House or Senate.

EXCELLENT ASSISTANCE FROM LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Over the congressional recess, as I thought about this problem I turned to the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress for some guidance and assistance on the best way to accomplish the goal of assuring the wholesomeness of poultry in interstate commerce. I want now to acknowledge the outstanding assistance I have received on this from Miss Margaret M. Conway, of the American Law Division, who in December submitted to me a comprehensive and truly excellent exposition of the legal aspects of the problem. Her report to me was as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., December 12, 1955.

To: Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN.
(Attention: Mr. Holstein.)

From: American Law Division.

Subject: Suggestions as to legislation to require inspection of all poultry shipped in interstate commerce.

For your information, and to place the question in a proper perspective, we are reviewing here for you, first, the laws already on the books providing certain types of inspection of poultry, and also the meat inspection laws which require compulsory inspection of meat shipped in interstate commerce.

POULTRY INSPECTION

There are at present the following several laws in effect which permit agents of the Federal Government to inspect poultry. Each of them has certain limitations in its coverage which we point out below.

1. The act of February 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 49): This law included live poultry within the purview of several previous inspection acts administered by the Department of Agriculture. By it, live poultry was made subject to the provisions of the act of May 29, 1884, establishing the Bureau of Animal Industry (23 Stat. 31; 7 U. S. C. 391); of the act of February 2, 1903, enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to suppress and prevent the spread of contagious diseases among livestock (32 Stat. 791; 21 U. S. C. 111–121); and of the act of March 3, 1905, enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain quarantine districts and regulate the movement of cattle and other livestock therefrom (33 Stat. 1264; 21 U. S. C. 123–130).

The regulations concerning poultry hereunder are incorporated in the Federal regulations concerning the interstate transportation of animals and poultry suffering from specified contagious diseases (9 C. F. R. 71.1 through 81.2. The sections concerning poultry are 9 C. F. R. 81.1 and 81.2). They prohibit the interstate transportation of "live chickens, turkeys, or geese affected with or directly exposed to the contagious disease known as European fowl pest or other similar contagious poultry disease, [or the] carcasses of such animals which have died from any such disease."

The regulatory power of the Secretary of Agriculture in this instance is compulsory (21 U. S. C. 111). The wording of the law states that he has power "to seize, quarantine, and dispose of any hay, straw, forage, or similar material, or any meats, hides, or other animal products coming from an infected foreign country * * * or from one State or Territory in the United States in transit to another." The regulation, in itself, however, is deficient, so far as the alleged practices of some of the modern poultry packers are concerned (see daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 8, 1954, p. A4245). Its wording is such that chickens, not yet dead but suffering from any of the prescribed diseases, could be slaughtered and packed within a State for interstate shipment. In such instances, the poultry would not be shipped live, nor would it actually have died from any such disease, so that the shipment of the carcasses would come under the prohibition.

2. The second act which provides for inspection of poultry is the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 1087; 67 Stat. 205; 7 U. S. C. 1622–1627). The aim of this act was to promote a scientific approach to marketing of agricultural products. In order to accomplish this, it was suggested that the various types of activity required, such as inspection, regulatory work, and other services, be done in cooperation with State agencies and State departments of agriculture, and State bureaus and departments of markets.

The inspection and certification provision is contained in 7 U. S. C. 1622 (h):

"To inspect, certify, and identify the class, quality, quantity, and condition of agricultural products when shipped or received in interstate commerce, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, including assessment and collection of such fees as will be reasonable, and as nearly as may be to cover the cost of the service rendered, to the end that agricultural products may be marketed to the best advantage, that trading may be facilitated, and that consumers may be able to obtain the quality product which they desire, except that no person shall be required to use the service authorized by this subsection. Any official certificate issued under the authority of this subsection shall be received by all officers and all courts of the United States as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein contained."

The regulations issued hereunder are contained in 7 C. F. R. 70.1 through 70.410. They make provision for three main inspection activities: (1) the grading of poultry; (2) the inspection of poultry; and (3) the inspection of sanitary standards. A certificate to be used in marketing the poultry is given showing the completion of one, or a combination, or all of the above services.

Without going into the regulations in detail, certain determinative statements therein are herewith pointed out.

(a) Definitions (7 C. F. R. 70.01):

"Grader" means any employee of the Department authorized by the Secretary, or any other individual to whom a license has been issued by the Secretary, to investigate and certify, in accordance with the regulations In this part, the class, quality, quantity, and condition of live poultry. By 7 C. F. R. 70.384, however, the grader is permitted to confine himself to the condition only, and the mark he then issues is a statement as to the sanitary standards of the handler, rather than a certification of the quality of the product.

"Inspector" means any graduate veterinarian or layman who is an employee of the USDA or of a State, who has been licensed by the Secretary of Agriculture to inspect (1) the condition and wholesomeness of dressed poultry; (2) the condition and wholesomeness of any edible product at any stage of the preparation or packaging thereof in the official plant where inspected and certified; (3) the condition and wholesomeness of any previously inspected and certified product which has not lost its identity; (4) the condition of dressed poultry. The comment on 7 C. F. R. 70.384, above, is also applicable here.

(b) Services performed (7 C. F. R. 70.3):

Grading and inspection services of the following types may be rendered: (1) grading of live poultry; (2) certification of dressed poultry produced under sanitary conditions in official plants; (3) grading of dressed poultry, in an official plant, or at terminal markets and other receiving points; (4) inspecting of dressed poultry in official plants for processing as ready-to-cook poultry; (5) grading of ready-to-cook poultry, in an official plant, or at terminal markets and other receiving points; (6) inspection service in official canning plants.

Sanitary requirements are mandatory in official plants (7 C. F. R. 70.44). There is no similar regulation as to other places.

(c) Inspection (7 C. F. R. 70.151, 70.152 and 70.191):

The section outlining the Department of Agriculture inspection service states that antemortem examination may be required by the Administrator. Both the Federal and the Federal-State Cooperative services provide postmortem examination. (9 C. F. R. 70.152 and 70.191.)

(d) Fees and charges (7 C. F. R. 70.130):

Any person requesting grading or inspection service shall pay certain fees and charges; the fees for services by United States agents shall be payable to the Treasurer of the United States; and the fees for services performed under any cooperative agreement with a State shall be payable as provided for in the agreement.

(e) Marks placed on poultry (7 U. S. C. 70.380–70.384):

The facsimile marks contained in the regulations, and the accompanying explanatory material show that four types of markings are provided: (1) grade mark (quality); (2) inspection mark (wholesomeness); (3) a

combination of the above; (4) dressed poultry (graded and inspected for condition only—not for quality or wholesomeness).

3. Two laws which permit inspection of a very limited nature, and whose chief purpose is other than detection of diseased fowl or protection of the public health are:

(a) The Department of Agriculture Organic Act (58 Stat. 734, sec. 101 (b), amended and superseded by act of August 4, 1950 (64 Stat. 413). This made permanent an authorization carried in the appropriations acts of 1935 and subsequent, allowing the USDA to administer regulations for the voluntary program of improved poultry breeding, and incidentally to aid in eradicating a disease called pullorum. The regulations hereunder are contained in 9 C. F. R. 145.1 through 145.30.

(b) The act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1355; 7 U. S. C. 491–497) which permitted inspection of poultry by the USDA on behalf of any person aggrieved by malicious dumping or destruction of his products by any handler in interstate commerce.

MEAT INSPECTION

Meat inspection is currently conducted under the authority of the Meat Inspection Acts, beginning with the temporary act of 1906, made permanent by the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1260; 21 U. S. C. 71–91, 96) and the Imported Meat Act of June 17, 1930 (46 Stat. 689; 19 U. S. C. 1306). The regulations under these acts will be found in 9 C. F. R. 1.1 through 28.1.

The three chief aspects of these laws are (1) the inspection extends only to cattle, sheep, swine, and goats, and meat and meat-food products made therefrom, (2) the inspection is mandatory except as to certain farmers and retailers under prescribed circumstances, and (3) the primary object of the inspection is to determine the wholesomeness of the meat for human consumption.

Paralleling the major provisions of the poultry-inspection service which we outlined above, the regulations for meat inspection provide the following:

(a) Definitions (9 C. F. R. 1.1):

Limiting ourselves here to the qualifications for inspectors contained in the definitions, we find that inspectors and division employees are those "who are authorized by the director or chief of division to do any work or perform any duty in connection with meat inspection."

(b) Services performed (9 C. F. R. 9.1, 12.1, and 10.1):

Although an antemortem examination by law is discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture (21 U. S. C. 71), he has exercised his discretion to make it mandatory. (9 C. F. R. 9.1 and 12.1.) The postmortem examination is mandatory by law (21 U. S. C. 72) and also required by regulation. It must be conducted, except in emergencies, at the time of slaughter. (9 C. F. R. 10.1.)

(c) Inspection (9 C. F. R. 2.1 and 5.3):

In section 2.1 of the regulation, it is stated that "every establishment" in which cattle, sheep, swine, or goats are slaughtered, or their products processed, is subject to mandatory inspection. Further, as a concomitant of such inspection, section 5.3 requires that inspection "shall not be begun if the establishment is not in a sanitary condition." Part 8 of the regulations, i. e., section 8.1 through 8.15 govern standards of sanitation required.

(d) Fees and charges: None.

(e) Markings (9 C. F. R. 1.1):

(1) "Inspected and passed" or "U. S. inspected and passed" or "U. S. inspected and passed by USDA." This shall mean that at the time they were inspected, passed, and so marked, they were found to be sound, healthful, wholesome, and fit for human food.

(2) "U. S. passed for cooking." These have been passed on condition they be cooked, rendered, etc., before used for human consumption.

(3) "U. S. passed for refrigeration." These must be refrigerated, or handled as required in section 11.1 through 11.34, governing carcasses of animals suffering from specified diseases.

(4) "U. S. inspected and condemned," found unwholesome, and must be disposed of; "U. S. retained," there is some doubt and the carcass or meat product is held for further examination; "U. S. suspect," also held for further examination; and "U. S. condemned" where the live animal is found in a dying condition from a disease that would cause condemnation of its carcass.

An inspection service similar to that conducted with respect to poultry is also conducted with respect to meat under the authority of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 1087; 67 Stat. 205; 7 U. S. C. 1622–1627). It provides grading service, for a fee, at any designated market or location. However, it states that products to be eligible for grading service must be prepared under Federal inspection (that is under the Meat Inspection Acts, above) or under other official inspection services. It also contains regulations governing this inspection, including a requirement of both antemortem and postmortem inspection of each animal (7 C. F. R. 53.3). If the grading service is withdrawn, public notice must be given of the withdrawal (7 C. F. R. 53.5). This is the service which results in markings on meat and meat products of "prime," "choice," "commercial," etc.

SUGGESTIONS FOR DRAFT OF BILL

There are certain considerations which must be paramount in order to accomplish the objective of an effective inspection of poultry being shipped and marketed in interstate commerce. Among these we would suggest: (1) that the bill put inspection for wholesomeness on a mandatory basis, ahead of all other types of inspection service; (2) that the bill obviate the deficiency in the regulations under the act of February 7, 1928 (noted above) respecting ill fowl being slaughtered and then shipped in interstate commerce; (3) if possible, the continued operation of the grade classification services under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 should not be unduly hampered; (4) such mandatory poultry inspection service should be able to be effectuated in the most expeditious manner possible; and (5) the bill should contain adequate penalty provisions to enforce the law.

Under point (4) above, there are two things we have not gone into: first, an estimate of the cost of a mandatory inspection service, and secondly, the marketing pattern for live and/or dismembered poultry. The appropriation for the present meat inspection service for fiscal 1956 was $14,325,000 (Public Law 40, 84th Cong.). The size and cost of an increased inspection force will undoubtedly depend on the marketing pattern. At present, live poultry dealers and handlers are licensed under the Packers and Stockyards Act (7 U. S. C. 218), but this regulation extends chiefly to financial responsibility. It is indicative, however, of the market pattern.

The only two previous bills which we have been able to find were introduced in 1929 and 1930 respectively. They are S. 5376 of the 70th Congress, and S. 5371 of the 71st Congress.

S. 5376 of the 70th Congress was based upon provisions of the Meat Inspection Act. The bill, in our opinion, is deficient in the following respects:

(a) All the material after the first semicolon in Twenty-first United States Code, at page 71, dealing with separate slaughter of suspected animals (it would be poultry in the bill) is omitted.

(b) The language of the bill with respect to both the ante mortem and post mortem inspection is a permissive "may cause to be made." In the law (21 U. S. C. 72), the post mortem inspection is mandatory.

(c) The following several provisions of the Meat Inspection Act are not included (21 U. S. C. 73, 74, 75).

(d) Section 5 of the bill, which, of course, is dated 1929, completely exempts retailers and farmers from inspection. The Meat Inspection Act on the other hand was modified by the act of June 29, 1938 (52 Stat. 1235), to provide a limited supervision over farmers and retailers, plus a penalty provision for transporting unwholesome meat (poultry) in interstate commerce by either of these.

S. 5371, 71st Congress, would provide a mandatory inspection service for drawn poultry and on through all the other processing stages. This bill makes mandatory an inspection service starting with a post mortem inspection and following through all the other stages of preparation and handling under regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture. The principal defect of the bill is that it limits inspection to chicken and turkey.

We would suggest as the simplest and most effective method of accomplishing the objective of a mandatory inspection of poultry would be to make necessary changes in the Meat Inspection Act (34 Stat. 1260). This act itself is not divided into sections. For your convenience, the examples given are based on the section distribution in the code.

(a) Where the present phrase reads "meat and meat products" change it to "meat and poultry, and meat and poultry products" or "meat and poultry, and meat products and poultry products" (21 U. S. C. 71).

(b) Where the present phrase reads "cattle, sheep, swine, and goats" change it to "cattle, sheep, swine, goats, and poultry" (21 U. S. C. 71).

(c) Where the present phrase reads "any slaughtering, meat-canning, salting, packing, rendering, or similar establishment", add the term "dismembering" or some other comprehensive term that would cover the ready-to-cook processors in the poultry industry (21 U. S. C. 72).

We would also suggest that in 21 U. S. C. 71 the phrase the "Secretary of Agriculture, at his discretion, may cause to be made" be changed to the "Secretary of Agriculture shall cause to be made" and thereby give him legislative support for the regulation he has already promulgated relating to mandatory ante-mortem inspection of animals subject to inspection under the act. This, together with the fact that all the phraseology after the semicolon of that section would be applicable to poultry suspected of disease, should obviate the deficiencies under the current regulations. Since a parallel grade classification of meat is carried on at the same time as the mandatory meat inspection, the suggested amendment of the act to include poultry, should not hinder the continuance of the grading service under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946. The Meat Inspection Act contains penalties, which would then become applicable to poultry handlers and dealers. We also call your attention to the fact that the above suggested changes in terminology are also applicable to the act of June 29, 1938 (52 Stat. 1235; 21 U. S. C. 91), governing sale of products by farmers and retailers.

MARGARET M. CONWAY,
American Law Division.

DECEMBER 15, 1955.

Subsequently, Mr. Speaker, I turned this report over to the House Legislative Council for actual drafting of a bill to carry out the suggestions made by Miss Conway and the American Law Division.

The first draft of the bill which I received back was as follows:

FIRST DRAFT OF THE BILL

A bill to amend the Meat Inspection Act to provide for the inspection of poultry to be shipped in interstate or foreign commerce

Be it enacted, etc., That the portion of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908," which appears after "For meat inspection:" under the heading "Bureau of Animal Industry" (21 U. S. C., sec. 71–93), is amended—

(1) by striking out "cattle, sheep, swine," or "cattle, swine, sheep," each time either appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "cattle, poultry, sheep, swine,";

(2) by striking out "cattle, calves, sheep, lambs," each time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "cattle, poultry, calves, sheep, lambs,";

(3) by inserting "or poultry" after "animals" each time it appears therein;

(4) by inserting "dismembering", after "rendering," each time it appears therein;

(5) by striking out of the first paragraph "the Secretary of Agriculture, at his discretion, may cause to be made" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Secretary of Agriculture shall cause to be made"; and

(6) by inserting "poultry" after "beef" in the 15th paragraph thereof, beginning "And no clearance shall be given."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this act shall take effect ——— days after the date of its enactment.

AMALGAMATED PROPOSES INSPECTION BY FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Meanwhile, the top leadership of the Meat Cutters Union was also working on the drafting of legislation, and came forward with bills which provided for compulsory poultry inspection by the Food and Drug Administration. When a draft of this legislation was brought to my attention, it was my view that it would be better to lodge this assignment with the Meat Inspection branch of the Department of Agriculture because I knew the Food and Drug Administration is and has been terribly undermanned and is and has been unable to obtain sufficient funds to do the tremendous job we have already placed upon its shoulders.

As a result of this difference of opinion on the best way to proceed, I agreed to hold off on the introduction of my bill in order to give the union officials an opportunity to obtain legislative action on the bill which they had prepared and sponsored. The important thing, of course, is to get legislation enacted.

In recent weeks, the Food and Drug Administration has definitely gone on record against being given the powers to administer a compulsory poultry inspection law. The Department of Agriculture, meanwhile, has gone on record as promising effective administration of a compulsory poultry inspection law if one were to be enacted putting this responsibility on the Department of Agriculture.

I have consequently introduced my bill after very substantial changes and elaboration from the first draft provided me by the legislative counsel. Although I am not a lawyer, it seemed to me the first draft did not cover the ground completely.

The bill which I introduced today is as follows:

H. R. 11800

A bill to amend the Meat Inspection Act (34 Stat. 1260, as amended) and the Tariff Act of 1930 (46 Stat. 689, sec. 306) to require compulsory inspection for wholesomeness of poultry and poultry products

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress of the United States finds that poultry and poultry products are being marketed through the channels of interstate and foreign commerce without adequate inspection to protect the public against poultry and poultry products which are diseased, unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit for human food.

To protect the general consuming public, to protect the health of persons engaged in the processing and distribution of poultry and poultry products, to prevent the spread of disease through shipments in interstate and foreign commerce of unwholesome poultry and poultry products, and to promote the wider use of poultry through assurance to the consuming public of its wholesomeness and freedom from disease, thus assisting agriculture and the food marketing industries in expanding their sales and augmenting their important contributions to our economic system, the following amendments are made to the Meat Inspection Act (34 Stat. 1260, as amended) and the Tariff Act of 1930 (43 Stat. 689, sec. 306) giving the Secretary of Agriculture power to inspect, condemn, or regulate any shipments of poultry in interstate or foreign commerce, or any shipment thereof which directly burdens, obstructs, or affects interstate or foreign commerce in such commodity.

SEC. 2. The first paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1260; U. S. C. 71) authorizing inspection of cattle, sheep, swine, and goats before slaughter is amended to require such ante mortem inspection of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, and poultry, as follows:

(a) by striking out the phrase "meat or meat products" and inserting "meat or poultry, and meat or poultry products";

(b) by striking out the words "at his discretion may" following the words "Secretary of Agriculture" and inserting the word "shall";

(c) by striking out the phrase "cattle, sheep, swine, and goats" wherever it appears, and inserting "cattle, sheep, swine, goats, and poultry";

(d) by adding to the phrase "any slaughtering, packing, meat-canning, rendering, or similar establishment", the words "or poultry processing plant";

(e) By striking out the phrase "the meat and meat food products thereof are to be used in interstate or foreign commerce" and inserting "the meat or poultry or poultry pieces, and meat or poultry food products thereof are to be used in interstate and foreign commerce";

(f) by adding at the end of said paragraph "*Provided,* That at his discretion the Secretary of Agriculture may also regulate any shipments of poultry or poultry products which directly burden, obstruct, or affect interstate or foreign commerce."

SEC. 3. The second paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1260; 21 U. S. C. 72) dealing with post-mortem inspection of carcasses, labeling and marking, destruction of condemned carcasses and reinspection, is amended:

(a) by striking out the phrase "cattle, sheep, swine, and goats" wherever it appears, and inserting "cattle, sheep, swine, goats, and poultry";

(b) by adding to the phrase "any slaughtering, meat-canning, salting, packing, rendering, or similar establishment", the words "or poultry processing plant";

(c) by adding after the words "and carcasses and parts thereof of all such animals", wherever they appear, the words "or poultry";

(d) by adding "or poultry processing plant" after the words "any such establishment" and "any establishment" in the clauses dealing with removal of inspectors from establishments failing to comply with requirements hereunder.

SEC. 4. The third paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1261; 21 U. S. C. 73) dealing with the examination of carcasses brought into slaughtering or processing establishments, and meat-food products issued from and returned thereto, is amended:

(a) by striking out the phrase "cattle, sheep, swine, and goats" and inserting "cattle, sheep, swine, goats, and poultry";

(b) by striking out the phrase "meat or meat products" and inserting "meat or poultry, or meat or poultry products";

(c) by adding to the phrase "any slaughtering, meat-canning, salting, packing, rendering, or similar establishment", the words "or poultry processing plant";

(d) by striking out the phrase "treated and prepared for meat food products" and inserting "treated and prepared for meat or poultry food products."

SEC. 5. The fourth paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1261; 21 U. S. C. 74) dealing with the powers of meat inspectors in approving sound, healthful, and wholesome products and in condemning and causing the destruction of unsound, unhealthful, and unwholesome products, is amended:

(a) by striking out the phrase "meat food products" wherever it appears and inserting "meat or poultry food products";

(b) by adding to the phrase "any slaughtering, meat-canning, salting, packing, rendering, or similar establishment" the words "or poultry processing plant";

(c) by striking out the phrase "meat or meat food products" and inserting "meat or poultry, or meat or poultry food products";

(d) by striking out the phrase "condemned meat food products" and inserting "condemned meat or poultry food products."

SEC. 6. The fifth paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1261; 21 U. S. C. 75) dealing with labeling requirements, is amended:

(a) by striking out the phrase "meat or meat food products" in the four instances where it appears, and inserting "meat or poultry, or meat or poultry food products."

SEC. 7. The sixth paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1262; 21 U. S. C. 76) governing sanitary inspection and regulation of the premises of slaughtering and packing establishments, and rejection of products of unsanitary establishments, is amended:

(a) by adding to the phrase "any slaughtering, meat-canning, salting, packing, rendering, or similar establishment", the words "or poultry processing plant";

(b) by striking out the phrase "cattle, sheep, swine, and goats" and inserting "cattle, sheep, swine, goats and poultry";

(c) by striking out the phrases "meat and meat products" and "meat or meat products" and inserting "meat or poultry, or meat or poultry food products."

SEC. 8. The seventh paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1262; 21 U. S. C. 77) permitting inspections during the nighttime as well as during the daytime, when slaughtering is conducted during the nighttime, is amended:

(a) by striking out the phrase "cattle, sheep, swine, and goats" and inserting "cattle, sheep, swine, goats, and poultry."

SEC. 9. The eighth paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1262; 21 U. S. C. 78) dealing with transportation of carcasses,

meat, or meat food products not properly inspected and marked, is amended:

(a) by striking out the phrase "meat or meat food products" and inserting "meat or poultry, or meat or poultry food products";

(b) by adding at the end of said paragraph *"Provided,* That nothing in this section shall preclude the Secretary of Agriculture from regulating shipments of poultry or poultry products which directly burden, obstruct, or affect interstate or foreign commerce."

SEC. 10. The seventeenth paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1264; 21 U. S. C. 87) dealing with transportation or sale of meat or meat food products not complying with the inspection laws, is amended:

(a) by striking out the phrase "meat or meat food products" wherever it appears, and inserting "meat or poultry, or meat or poultry food products";

(b) by adding to the phrase "any slaughtering, meat-canning, salting, packing, rendering, or similar establishment" the words "or poultry processing plant."

SEC. 11. The nineteenth paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1264; 21 U. S. C. 89) dealing with the appointment, duties, and regulations governing inspectors, is amended:

(a) by striking out the phrase "cattle, sheep, swine, and goats" and inserting "cattle, sheep, swine, goats, and poultry";

(b) by striking out the phrases "meats and meat food products" and "meat and meat food products" and inserting "meat or poultry, or meat or poultry food products";

(c) by striking out the words "meat food products" wherever they appear and inserting "meat or poultry food products."

SEC. 12. The twenty-first paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907, as amended (34 Stat. 1265, as amended by 52 Stat. 1235; 21 U. S. C. 91) exempting certain farmers, retail butchers and retail dealers from the inspection provisions of the Meat Inspection Act, is further amended by adding the following subsection thereto:

(d) The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to establish the basis on which certain categories of poultry raisers, retail poultry butchers, and retail poultry dealers are exempted from the inspection requirements of this act; *Provided,* That these exemptions shall be based on maximum volume limitations which are fair and reasonable in relation to other exemptions in this Section; *And provided further,* That such exempt poultry raisers, retail poultry butchers and retail poultry dealers shall be subject to the provisions of the second paragraph of subsection (c) above for violations of the requirements of this Act.

SEC. 13. The authorization included in the Act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 679, as amended by 48 Stat. 1225; 21 U. S. C. 95) is amended:

(a) by striking out the phrase "cattle, sheep, swine, and goats" and inserting "cattle, sheep, swine, goats and poultry";

(b) by striking out the phrase "meat and meat food products" and inserting "meat or poultry, and meat or poultry food products."

SEC. 14. The act of June 5, 1948 (62 Stat. 344; 21 U. S. C. 98) providing for payment of costs of the inspection service by the United States, is amended by striking out the phrase "meat and meat food products" and inserting "meat and poultry, and meat and poultry food products."

SEC. 15. Section 306 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (46 Stat. 689; 19 U. S. C. 1306) dealing with the importation of meat and meat products is amended:

(a) by inserting the words "or poultry" in subsection (b) thereof after the words "meat" or "meats" wherever they appear;

(b) by striking out the phrase "cattle, sheep, and other domestic ruminants, and swine" in subsection (c) thereof, and inserting "cattle, sheep, and other domestic ruminants, poultry and swine"; and in the same subsection (c) thereof, inserting after the word "meats" the words "or poultry."

SEC. 16. The compulsory poultry inspection provided for by this Act shall commence on the first day of the sixth month after enactment hereof.

ANTE MORTEM INSPECTION MADE MANDATORY

It will be noted, Mr. Speaker, that my bill not only amends the Meat Inspection Act to include poultry and poultry products in the same way that cattle, sheep, swine, and goats are covered under that act, but that, in one particular, it also amends the act as it applies to those other meat animals. That is in section 2, which would make it mandatory to have ante mortem inspection not only of poultry but of the other animals as well.

The act presently says that the Secretary of Agriculture may at his discretion require such ante mortem inspection of cattle, sheep, swine, and goats. Actually, by regulation, he requires this type of examination before slaughter. In order to make it clear that it is the intent of Congress to require such ante mortem inspection of poultry, also, I have proposed in my bill this change in the basic statute to make ante mortem inspection mandatory for all of the meat varieties covered.

APPLICATION TO INTERSTATE SHIPMENTS

Another provision of my bill which involves more than merely including poultry along with beef, lamb, pork, and so on under the Meat Inspection Act, also contained in section 2 of my bill, would empower the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate certain shipments of poultry in intrastate commerce. These would be shipments which "directly burden, obstruct, or affect interstate commerce."

The concept of including some intrastate as well as all interstate shipments of poultry under compulsory inspection laws has been suggested, as I understand it, by the poultry industry itself. The feeling on the part of some of the industry people, as it has been reported to me, is that where interstate and intrastate shipments are commingled in the same establishments, or where they directly compete in such way as to affect the interstate sales, that fairness requires all shipments be inspected.

While this raises legal issues I do not personally feel qualified to discuss, nevertheless I am informed by experts in the legal questions involved that the Supreme Court has upheld this concept as it applies to milk marketing and that it could, therefore, be applied to poultry. I have included this in my bill, because it is my understanding that there is widespread support within the poultry industry for compulsory inspection if it is fairly extended to all groups competing in the major market areas.

EXEMPTIONS

The Meat Inspection Act presently exempts farmers and certain categories of retail butchers and retail dealers, providing, of course, that they do not ship in interstate commerce products which are diseased or unfit in violation of the law. The exemptions for butchers and dealers are based on the number of animals or carcasses they ship per week. Having no means by which I could translate these standards into terms of chickens, ducks, or turkeys, for instance, I have instead provided that the Secretary of Agriculture should determine such exemption standards as they should apply to poultry raisers, butchers, or dealers. He would be expected to set standards which would be fair in relation to those now applying to butchers and dealers under the Meat Inspection Act.

PRIOR TO 1956, LAST SUCH BILL WAS IN 1930

The research material which I have received from the Library of Congress, and which I have inserted above, shows that up to the time this memo was prepared for me in December, there had not been a bill introduced in the Congress dealing with this subject of compulsory inspection of poultry since 1930.

This year, we have seen the introduction of a number of bills, and I think all of us are pleased to see such interest in the serious problem of assuring wholesome poultry supplies.

My bill differs from the others in that it is the only one, I believe, which provides for compulsory inspection of poultry on exactly the same basis as we now inspect the other meats. The penalties are the same. The exemptions would be the same. The procedures would be exactly the same. The valuable enforcement history built up by the Meat Inspection branch these past 50 years would now become available for the enforcement of poultry inspection. No elaborate new definitions, subject to endless litigation, would be necessary.

This has been the approach suggested to me by the research people in the American Law Division, and I think it is the best of the various approaches proposed to this important issue.

ADEQUATE APPROPRIATIONS WILL BE REQUIRED

Recently, a friend in St. Louis, Mr. August Gieseke, secretary-treasurer of the Meat Cutters Union Local 88, wrote to me on behalf of the local, urging my support for the bills which the International has sponsored on this subject. Our exchange of correspondence was as follows:

AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS
AND BUTCHER WORKMEN
OF NORTH AMERICA,
AFL–CIO, LOCAL NO. 88,
St. Louis, Mo., March 9, 1956.

The Honorable Congresswoman Mrs. JOHN B. SULLIVAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: Our union membership of 3,100 people, which consists of retail meatcutters and poultry workers who slaughter and dress poultry, are very much interested in bills H. R. 8599, H. R. 9006, and S. 3176, pertaining to Federal poultry inspection and industrial safety for poultry workers.

We are in a position to know firsthand that an inspection law is sadly needed to protect the consumer. Fowl is subject to tuberculosis and is also a disease carrier, same as any farm animal.

The consumer is not aware how dangerous it is to consume fowl which is not processed in a sanitary condition, especially diseased poultry.

We strongly urge you to support these bills for the public's protection.

Thanking you in advance for your favorable support, I am

Sincerely yours,

AUG. GIESEKE,
Secretary-Treasurer, Meat Cutters Union Local No. 88, AFL–CIO, St. Louis, Mo.

MARCH 14, 1956.

Mr. AUG. GIESEKE,
Secretary-Treasurer, Meat Cutters Union Local 88, AFL–CIO, St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. GIESEKE: I appreciated hearing from you in regard to the bills for the inspection of poultry, as urged by local 88 and also by the international officers of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen. I am sure you know that this matter of diseased poultry being sold in interstate commerce is of very great concern to me as a Member of Congress interested in the consumer.

I have been in correspondence with the international officers of the Amalgamated on this question, and at their request I have held back on introducing a bill which I have had prepared. My bill would call for the inspection of poultry on exactly the same basis as beef and pork are inspected by the Department of Agriculture. However, the bills which the Amalgamated is sponsoring would place poultry inspection under the Food and Drug Administration.

We are in some disagreement as to the best basis for proceeding, but there is no disagreement between us as to the need for legislation. Because of the work the Amalgamated has done in bringing this matter to public attention, I am deferring to President Jimerson and the other officials of the Amalgamated on the question of strategy for the time being. So I am holding up on it for the time being, as I said.

Please be assured I will do everything I can to get legislation enacted for effective poultry inspection by the Federal Government. But even if we succeed in that, then there is the additional need for adequate appropriations. These are among my main objectives in Congress.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (MRS. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, Third District, Missouri.

As I pointed out to Mr. Gieseke, Mr. Speaker, our responsibility here is not only to enact laws which will require inspection of poultry for wholesomeness, but—wherever we put the authority or regardless of the type of bill we pass—we must make sure adequate funds are appropriated to carry on the work. That is where we have fallen down in the past in our handling of pure food and drug laws. We write laws providing for penalties for selling unsafe or unwholesome foods or drugs or cosmetics, but we have not given the Food and Drug Administration the money it needs to police these very excellent laws.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the introduction today of my poultry inspection bill, H. R. 11800, and in connection with these remarks on the House floor, I have submitted some rather lengthy material for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Normally, I do not like to load down the RECORD with extraneous material. In this instance, I think it serves a highly useful purpose in bringing together in one place the basic information available on this important issue. I am including one further document, as exhibit B following my remarks, in the form of a memorandum from the Amalgamated Meat Cutters Union going into the actual conditions under which poultry is now being marketed.

I have received and read a vast amount of material on this subject. Some of it has been so graphic, so shocking, that I have decided against using it here. But this memorandum is a calm and objective report which, I believe supplements the other document from the Public Health Service, and so I include them both. I hope, as I said, that the Members can find the time to read these reports. If so, I know we will act to stop this evil.

Mr. Speaker, Exhibit A: Poultry Diseases Transmissible to Man, is as follows:

EXHIBIT A

POULTRY DISEASES TRANSMISSIBLE TO MAN, INCLUDING SUMMARY REPORT OF OUTBREAKS

(By Mildred M. Galton, bacteriologist, Communicable Disease Center, Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, Atlanta, Ga., assigned to Bureau of Laboratories, Florida State Board of Health, Jacksonville, Fla., prepared for the Chief Veterinary Public Health)

The diseases of poultry to which man is also susceptible comprise a rather large group. In his excellent review Ingalls (1) lists 26 such diseases including those caused by bacteria viruses, fungi, and protozoa. It is apparent that some of these diseases constitute a considerable hazard to public health.

In a more recent discussion of this subject, Brandly, C. A. B., (2) pointed out that interspecies infection cycles usually favor similar hosts, thus, a disease in animals generally would have a greater chance of thriving if transmitted to related species than to avian hosts. He emphasized, however, that this may not always be true and discussed the nature of the host-parasite relationship of certain diseases common to man and fowl. Earlier, these infections were discussed by Brandly, P. J., (3) from the standpoint of poultry inspection and public health. In the present report the current status as public health hazards of the following diseases common to man and fowl will be reviewed:

Bacterial: Salmonellosis, paracolon infections, erysipelas, staphylococcosis, streptococcosis, tuberculosis, brucellosis, listeriosis, tularemia, pseudotuberculosis, and diphtheria.

Viral: Equine encephalomyelitis, Newcastle disease, psittacosis, and rabies.

Fungal: Favus, thrush, and aspergillosis.

Parasitic: Dermanyssus gallinae, Toxoplasmosis.

SALMONELLOSIS

The role of fowl, swine, cattle, and many other animals as a source of outbreaks of salmonellosis in man has been established but only during the past decade has great emphasis been placed upon the public health significance of these reservoirs in the epidemiology of Salmonella infections. There have been numerous reports incriminating poultry or poultry products in outbreaks of the disease in man. The studies of Edwards, Bruner, and Moran (4) indicate that fowls are the largest single reservoir of Salmonella in this country. While S. pullorum and S. typhimurium are the most common types, these authors found a greater number of Salmonella types (60) in fowl than any other species except man. Of these at least 56 have been found in humans. As pointed out by Hinshaw and McNeil (5, 6) "there may well be no truly avian nor truly human types; in fact such a description frequently means only priority in isolation." They observed 7 cases of gastroenteritis among attendants on poultry farms caused by contact with acute outbreaks in poultry. Further evidence indicated the transmission of Salmonella to fowl by human carrier attendants on the ranch. All types are potentially pathogenic for man, animals, and fowls. In poultry as in man (8, 9) and other animals (4) Salmonella infection depends largely upon age and general resistance rather than upon the type of Salmonella, the young appearing most susceptible. S. pullorum until recently considered relatively nonpathogenic for man has been incriminated as the cause of one large outbreak of food poisoning (10) and several sporadic cases (11, 12). In Florida, S. pullorum has been isolated from cases of mild enteric fever and gastroenteritis in three individuals.

Considerable evidence is accumulating concerning the presence of Salmonella in poultry meat. Cherry, Barnes, and Edwards (13) report the recovery of a nonmotile Salmonella from the skin of frozen turkeys. Galton, Mackel, and Haire (14) isolated anatum, from material appearing to be encysted egg yolk in a frozen chicken. Schneider and Gunderson (15) found 4 Salmonella types on the skin of 4.4 percent of 1,014 eviscerated chickens. They concluded that the customary methods of sanitation in the plant did not eliminate Salmonella. Most of these birds had been frozen and stored for some time. Browne (16) found that S. typhimurium survived for at least 13 months on the skin of frozen turkeys. It is thus apparent that freezing does not kill all of the Salmonella.

More recently, attention has been given to the study of Salmonella in the environment of poultry processing plants. Browne (16) studied a turkey processing plant and isolated S. typhimurium from trays on which viscera were placed, pans in which cleaned giblets were stored, waste buckets and hands of eviscerators, trimmers, and inspectors. These organisms were also obtained from the loading platform, scalder chute, and floor, from the final wash trough, and even from dust on the rafters.

During an extensive study of the bacteriology of commercial poultry processing, Kyle, McFadden, and Gunderson (17) isolated Salmonella from the hands of workers on the evisceration line, from the skin of birds ready for storage, from organs of the chickens, and other items on the evisceration line. Reports of outbreaks of food poisoning following the consumption of poultry meat are numerous as evidenced by the weekly reports of the National Office of Vital Statistics (see table 1).

Reports implicating raw, frozen, or dried eggs as sources of Salmonella outbreaks appear frequently. Watt (18) reported such an outbreak attributed to raw eggs which contained S. montevideo. S. tennessee was isolated from frozen whole eggs and from powdered eggs by Schneider (19). Extensive studies on the occurrence of Salmonella types in dried egg powder have been reported by Schneider (20), Solowey (21) and associates, and the British investigators (22). Further studies on heat resistance and destruction by pasteurization of Salmonella organisms isolated from spray dried or liquid whole egg have been reported by Solowey et al. (23), Winter et al. (24, 25), and Goresline (26 et al.). The investigation carried out by Goresline et al. revealed that pasteurization can be used successfully, under processing-plant conditions, to produce liquid, frozen, and dried whole eggs free of Salmonella. They recommend flash heating the liquid whole egg to 140° F. and holding at that temperature for 3 minutes to kill any Salmonella present.

That breaks in the pasteurization procedure do occur in large processing plants is indicated by a recent announcement in the Associated Press (November 28, 1952) in which the Food and Drug Administration issued a warning to the public to discontinue use of Swift & Co.'s canned dried egg yolk due to the presence of Salmonella organisms. This product had been pasteurized.

McCullough and Eisele (27) were able to produce clinical Salmonellosis in 32 human volunteers by experimental infection with strains of Salmonella meleagridis and Salmonella anatum derived from spray dried whole egg. Similar studies (28) with S. newport, S. derby and S. bareilly resulted in clinical illness in 15 subjects, and with 4 strains of S. pullorum (29) there were 27 cases of human illness.

It is thus obvious, as emphasized by Hinshaw and McNeil (5) that "both from a poultry economic and public health standpoint, Salmonellosis is a hazard which should be eliminated." These investigators present the following essentials for prevention of the disease in poultry: (1) "elimination of known infected flocks as sources of replacements for breeding flocks (2) the use of separate hatching facilities for eggs from such flocks (3) the frequent use of diagnostic laboratories, to discover new outbreaks which may endanger future replacement sources (4) the recognition of numerous animal reservoirs of these diseases which must be controlled to prevent transmission (5) fly control, and (6) cooperation of growers, hatcheries, veterinarians and State agencies in securing replacements from Salmonellosis free sources.

PARACOLON INFECTIONS

The significance of the etiological relationship between paracolon organisms and enteric infections in man is difficult to determine due to the frequent recovery of some of these strains from the feces of apparently healthy persons and the lack of adequate methods of classification of different types. However, there have been numerous reports (8, 9, 30, 31) indicating pathogenicity of some types.

Many of the paracolon organisms contain antigens common to the Salmonella and Shigella groups. This is particularly true of the Arizona group of paracolons which are closely related to the Salmonella. The excellent work of Edwards and his coworkers (32, 33, 34, 35) in establishing a satisfactory serologic classification for the Arizona group and presentation of epidemiological data leaves no doubt that these paracolon organisms are pathogenic for animals. The majority of cultures of this group that have been studied were isolated from fowls, egg powder, and reptiles. Many cultures were obtained by Hinshaw and McNeil (36,37) during studies of infections among reptiles and turkeys. The symptoms and pathology in birds infected with these paracolon bacilli are comparable to those which occur in salmonellosis in fowls. The organisms have been isolated from heart blood, and all organs indicating a definite septicemia; young fowls, particularly poults, appear more susceptible. Mortality in flocks was comparable to that found in Salmonella infections. The spread of the infections by hatcheries and through eggs has been clearly established (35, 36).

There have been scattered reports of the isolation of Arizona paracolon bacilli from man. Of 456 cultures studied by Edwards, West and Bruner (35) 5 were from human sources. All were from cases of enteric infection in which no other pathogenic organisms were recognized. Verder et al (38) isolated a paracolon identified by Edwards as Ar. 1, 2: 1, 2,5 from 70 percent of patients cultured during an outbreak of gastro-enteritis involving 51 student nurses. The organism was not obtained from 16 normal students cultured. Buttiaux and Kesteloot (39) reported the isolation of paracolon bacilli similar to the Arizona group from 6 patients, 3 with acute enteric disease, 2 with chronic colitis, and 1 with a typhoidlike fever. In 1950, Murphy and Morris (40) described 2 small outbreaks of gastroenteritis, both of which were associated with a member of the Arizona paracolon group. In both episodes, evidence relating to source of infection, incubation period and symptoms of individuals involved resembled the pattern observed in food infections due to Salmonella. Bacteriological findings indicated the paracolon bacillus was the etiologic agent.

Thus, the necessity for the prevention and control of this infection in fowl is obvious.

ERYSIPELAS

The occurrence of a septicemia associated with Erysipelothrix rhusiopathiae the causative agent of swine erysipelas and erysipeloid infection in man, has been reported in many species of birds. Fish though not susceptible carry the organism on the slime. The disease is relatively common in turkeys and ducks (41, 42, 43). It is characteried in acute cases by febrile symptoms and occasionally diarrhea; death may occur in 1 to 2 days; in chronic cases by loss of appetite, diarrhea and gradual emaciation (44). Diagnosis depends upon bacteriological examination as lesions are indefinite and not usually considered pathognomonic. The infection in man, first recognized by Rosenbach, in 1884, may occur as a mild, localized cutaneous lesion, sometime accompanied by mild arthritic symptoms; as a diffuse or generalized cutaneous eruption, with arthritic symptoms and negative blood culture or as a septicemic form with endocarditis (45). Chronic cases of long duration have also been reported (46).

Ersipeloid has long been recognized as an occupational disease of abattoir employees, veterinarians, butchers, kitchen workers and those handling poultry and fish (47). In a review of 100 cases Klauder (48) was able to obtain a history of contact with animals, animal products or fish. Stiles (41) reported cutaneous lesions and symptoms of erysipeloid in the owners of an infected turkey flock. Successful treatment of the disease in man with penicillin has been reported frequently (46, 49, 50). Stiles considered the public health significance of marketing possible infected turkeys and outlined the procedure followed in an outbreak in one flock. Apparently healthy fowls were marketed to a processing plant where they were subjected to Federal inspection. Questionable birds were rejected and the slaughtered birds were boned and sterilized by canning.

According to Klauder (48), the virulence of E. rhusiopathiae varies in different species and in the same species. The organism has the capacity to change suddenly from a harmless saprophyte to a pathogenic parasite. Although man is relatively immune when the organism enters the gastro intestinal tract, cutaneous infections appear rather commonly. Skalova (51) in Yugoslavia has reported one fatal case of infection with E. rhusiopathiae.

STAPHYLOCOCCOSIS

Staphylococci are widely distributed in nature but they may cause a variety of disease entities in man, domestic animals and fowl. Avian staphylococcosis has been reported in turkeys by Jungherr (52) Hinshaw and McNeil (53) and Hinshaw (54), in geese by Lucet (55), in ducks by Van Heelsbergen (56), and less frequently in chickens (57, 58). In fowl the infection occurs as an acute septicemia or chronic arthritis also known as bursitis, hock disease, ostitis or synovitis. In man, the most frequent manifestation is food poisoning, produced by an enterotoxin liberated by the growth of some staphylococcus strains in food prior to ingestion. Septicemia occurs occasionally in man. Although, no reports have been found concerning the transmission of fowl staphylococcosis to humans McNeil (59) states that they have isolated Micrococcus pyrogenes from boils on the hands of workers in poultry killing plants. This potential source of infection in man warrants further study.

STREPTOCOCCOSIS

Streptococcus infections occur in both man and birds. Ingalls (1) is of the opinion that the infection in poultry does not play a prominent part in human disease, however, he has observed that the handling, dressing or eating of infected birds may serve as a source of infection in man. Acute streptococcic septicemia in fowls was first observed in this country by Norgaard and Mohler, 1902 (60) and later by Hudson (61). The disease is highly fatal. A chronic infection of hens due to hemolytic streptococci (group C) was reported by Edwards and Hull (62). Buxton (63) in England reports an acute infection of poultry due to streptococcus zooepidemicus which became chronic after 4 weeks. Edwards (64) states that all streptococcal infections of poultry that he has encountered have been due to the so-called animal group C types. A search of the literature revealed no reports of infection of fowls due to group A streptococcus strains.

TUBERCULOSIS

Avian tuberculosis is widely distributed in poultry throughout the central and north central sections of the United States. It frequently also infects swine, occasionally cattle and rarely man. It is most common in chickens and pigeons, although it does infect other species of fowl. Chickens are susceptible only to the avian type of the tubercle bacillus. The question of the pathogenicity of avian tubercle bacilli for man has received much speculation. Feldman (65) has reviewed the literature up to 1938 and concluded that although human infection does occur, it is very rare. He further observed that many of the reported cases were inadequately or incompletely studied resulting in a questionable diagnosis of avian tuberculosis. Rich (66) reviewed the data available up to 1944 and noted "that if progressive tuberculosis is ever produced in the human being by the avian tubercle bacillus it must be only rarely."

There have been a few confirmed cases, however, in which the organisms were identified. Bradbury and Younger (67) reported a case of pulmonary tuberculosis in a man from whom organisms were identified as the avian type on three occasions. This man had consumed 1 or more raw eggs a day for 30 years providing a possible source of infection. Avian tubercle bacilli were also isolated from a mediastinal lymph node from a man (68). A diagnosis of Hodgkin's disease had been made. Another isolation was reported from a case diagnosed as Boeck's sarcoid in a 50-year-old woman who had lived on a farm in Norway where tuberculosis of chickens was common (69).

In chickens the disease is characterized by its chronicity and by lesions in the liver, spleen, kidneys, ovaries, intestines, and bone marrow. Large numbers of organisms are disseminated in fecal material. The bacilli are occasionally present in eggs from tuberculous hens.

Feldman (70) makes the following statements concerning the suitability of tuberculous fowl for human consumption: "When food markets are supplied from territories where tuberculosis is prevalent among chickens, the question of the suitability of the tuberculous fowl for human consumption is important. The problem is pertinent, not only because of the possible transmission of avian tuberculosis to human beings, but also

because of the natural aversion of most people to food prepared from diseased animals. In the absence of a nationwide, efficient postmortem inspection of poultry, the only assurance to the consuming public that carcasses of dressed poultry represent healthy animals is the integrity of the merchant and the ability of the laity who dress fowl to recognize morbid processes."

BRUCELLOSIS

Natural outbreaks of Brucella infection on poultry farms have been described in Italy by Fiorentine, in France by Dubois (71) and in the United States by Emmel (72). The symptoms in birds appear quite variable. In some, general debility, diarrhea, and paralysis are observed with high mortality; in others, no symptoms appear. Post mortem examination shows enlargement of spleen, degeneration of liver and kidney with necrotic foci and enteritis. Emmel and Huddleson (73, 74) were able to produce infection in fowl by feeding naturally infected milk, portions of an aborted fetus and cultures. They also reported the occurrence of natural infection in four flocks. Pagnini (75) attempted to infect chickens by giving them gelatin capsules containing Brucella. He succeeded only when employing large numbers of organisms and concluded that chickens were not of great significance in the spread of brucellosis. Pavlov (1938) (76) reported 5 of 7 rabbits placed with infected chickens became infected and died in 3 months. Brucella organisms were isolated from the rabbits. None of 3 normal chickens and 10 normal guinea pigs, placed with the infected chickens showed evidence of infection. Eggs from chickens infected with massive doses of Brucella were found to contain the organism only between the 4th and 14th day after infection.

The experiments of Felsenfeld and his associates (77) showed that intramuscular, and intraperitoneal infections and feeding of Brucella, caused bacteriemia, fecal excretion of organisms and the appearance of significant serum agglutinin titers. They also observed cross reactions with Vibrio cholerae, Proteus OX–19 and S. pullorum antigens. Brucella were transmitted to normal chickens by feces from infected chickens. These investigators point out the possibility of misinterpreting pullorum disease in flocks of chickens with Brucella infection due to the cross reactions with pullorum antigens. They have observed also the difficulty in detecting infected chickens during inspection due to the frequent absence of significant pathology.

Since birds can become infected with Brucella and may thus transmit the disease to other fowl, domestic animals and man, efforts to prevent the contact of poultry with infected mammals should be taken.

LISTERIOSIS

Listeria monocytogenes is a causative agent of sporadic cases of meningitis in man and also has been isolated from the blood of patients with an infectious mononucleosis-like syndrome (78). In chickens it produces a specific septicemia with apparently few clinical symptoms. Necrotic lesions of the heart muscle and generalized edema may occur. Many other hosts are susceptible to spontaneous infection including the goat, sheep, cow, fox, guinea pig, and rabbit. It is noteworthy that the encephalitic symptoms, characteristic of listeriosis in domestic mammals have not been observed in naturally affected chickens.

Distribution of the infection in man and animals appears to be worldwide (78, 79); in chickens outbreaks have been reported in many parts of the United States and England (80, 81, 82).

Although no reports have been found to indicate direct transmission of Listeria infection from poultry to man the fact that both are susceptible warrants consideration of the situation from a public-health standpoint.

PASTEURELLA

Tularemia

According to Burroughs (83) grouse, sage hen, quail, and horned owl have been found naturally infected with tularemia. At least two cases of tularemia (84, 85) have occurred in man where the source of infection was attributed to pheasants dressed by the individuals. Apparently the disease does not exist or is very rare in poultry since it is not referred to in Disease of Poultry edited by Biester and Schwarte in 1948.

Pseudotuberculosis

Pseudotuberculosis caused by Pasteurella pseudotuberculosis rodentium, is a disease occurring in birds, animals, and man (86, 87). It is characterized by an acute septicemia of short duration followed by a chronic focal infection which gives rise to tubercular lesions in various organs. In fowl, outbreaks have been reported chiefly in turkeys and rarely in ducks, pigeons, and chickens causing considerable losses in the former. In man it appears to be rare but highly fatal. Meyer (88) refers to reports of 14 human cases, 11 of which terminated fatally. According to Meyer the mode of transmission is not definitely known, but it is believed that P. pseudotuberculosis, widely distributed in nature and disseminated through infectious excretions of affected birds or rodents, attacks susceptible animals through the digestive tract. Usually the abdominal viscera are primarily diseased. Injuries of the skin may also serve as portals of entry. Direct or indirect contact may introduce the infection into a flock of birds. Hygenic conditions and prevention of exposure to infection are the usual prophylactic procedures.

Pasteurella multocida, as the name indicates has more than one host. The many strains of this group change continuously in physiologic functions, antigenic structure, and pathogenic ability. The total range of susceptible animal species is wide including man, rodents, herbivores, fowls and possibly carnivores but each host has its characteristic limitations beyond which it rarely goes in spontaneous disease. The first bacteriologically proved human case was reported by Brugnatelli (88) in 1913. Since that time human infections with P. multocida are being recognized more frequently.

A review of the literature since 1930 by Schipper (90) revealed 21 bacteriologically proven cases from reports on 39 cases. Further evidence to support the occurrence of more frequent infection in man was presented by Needham (91). He isolated P. multocida from 11 patients of the Mayo Clinic during 1947. Later Olsen and Needham (92) reported the isolation of this organism from an additional 26 cases bringing the total to 37 cases observed at the Mayo Clinic during the period from October 1946 to July 1951. Twenty-seven of the 37 patients were either farmers or members of a farmer's family. The source of material for bacteriologic study included bronchial secretion 17, sputum 15, empyema fluid 2, abscess of frontal sinus 1, appendiceal abscess 1, and purulent drainage from joint 1. All strains from these case were found to be sensitive to low concentrations of penicillin. Although most of the patients had bronchiectasis, the authors consider P. multocida a probable "secondary invader." They emphasize, however, that the isolation of animal Pasteurella in cases of human disease has a definite significance. In view of the relative prevalence of human infection they recommend a more thorough search be made for this organism in infected material. Neter and associates (93, 94) have observed P. multocida wound infections in four children following bites by or contact with animals. These investigators (95) found aureomycin superior to terramycin treatment of P. multocida infection in mice.

Numerous outbreaks of Pasturella infection (fowl cholera) in poultry have caused considerable losses. Murray (96) states that "while man may generally consume without harm fowls that are suffering from the disease, it is advised that their meat should under no circumstances be used as human food."

DIPHTHERIA

Although there appears to be no evidence indicating that diphtheria in poultry is of public health significance, at least one human case has been reported in which evidence pointed to chickens as the source of infection. In a study of 256 cases of human diphtheria where contact with chickens was established, Litterer (97) reported 2 instances in which fowl harbored the virulent organisms. Identical organisms were isolated from a child in the family who owned the fowls. He was able to infect chickens with cultures obtained from infected children and chickens and concluded that fowl can transmit virulent diphtheria to man. According to Huyyra and Marek (44) the "so called" fowl diphtheria or "roup" is caused by a virus and the disease is now known as the muco-membranous form of fowl pox.

VIRUS DISEASES

Eastern equine encephalomyelitis

Eastern equine encephalitis, primarily a summer disease of equine and avian animals, is transmissible to man, in whom it is usually characterized by extensive inflammation and destruction of the central nervous system. It was first recovered from human CNS tissue by Fothergill et al. (98), 1938; in the same year the first natural outbreak in birds was reported by Tyzzer, Sellers, and Bennett (99) who encountered fatal infection in ringnecked pheasants in Connecticut. Also in 1938 Fothergill et al. (100) observed natural infection in pigeons in Massachusetts. Beaudette and Black (101) have reported the appearance of natural outbreaks in pheasants in New Jersey from 1938 through 1946 except in 1940 and 1941.

Davis (102) found that 6 species of Aedes mosquitoes were capable of transmitting the virus from infected birds to normal animals after a 9-day incubation period. Mosquitoes fed on infected birds transmitted virus to mice and birds; those fed on mice transmitted it to birds, mice, and guinea pigs.

The symptoms reported in pheasants include paralysis, staggering, head drawn over back, and anorexia. Death occurred in 1 or 2 days or the birds recovered slowly. The infection has been produced experimentally in chickens and turkeys. After experimental inoculation, Ten Broeck (103) and Tyzzer (104), working independently, showed that chickens may develop a viremia without visible signs of infection.

In man, children appear more susceptible. A mortality rate of 65–70 percent has been reported in the age group under 10 years.

Western and St. Louis encephalitis

The western and St. Louis types of encepholamyelitis are similar in many respects and although they are quite distinct from the eastern type, they also infect a wide range of hosts including equine animals and fowl. The extensive studies of Hammon have shown the important role that birds play in the epidemiology of these diseases. During the summer of 1941 Hammon et al (105, 106) in the Yakima Valley, Wash., found that Culex tarsalis mosquitoes were infected with the viruses of western and St. Louis

equine encephalitis, and that approximately 50 percent of the chickens of the area had specific antibodies for these viruses, but no chicken epizootic had been observed. Experimental infection with both viruses produced a viremia but no signs of illness. Evidence indicates that viremia of man and horses is of short duration. Virus isolations from blood are rare. These authors also observed that Culex tarsalis fed predominantly on birds. Recently (107, 108) the chicken mite Dermanyssus gallinae has been found infected with the St. Louis and western type viruses. These findings have focused even more attention on the chicken as an important source of mosquito infection. In further studies in the Yakima Valley, Hammon (109) examined 576 sera from mammals and wild and domestic birds by the neutralization test for antibodies against both viruses. Each of the viruses were positive in approximately 50 percent of sera from domestic fowl; 17–22 percent in wild birds, and only 8 percent from wild mammals.

JAPANESE B ENCEPHALITIS

Another of the summer encephalitides, chiefly prevalent in the Far East, is characterized by varied clinical symptoms, and caused by a virus similar in many ways to that of St. Louis encephalitis. According to Hammon less certainty is felt about the source of mosquito infection in this type. Hammon et al. (110) have demonstrated virus in mosquitoes caught in Japan. Thus the virus must be available in the blood of some animal. They have been able to detect small amounts of virus in the blood of inoculated chickens. More recent studies (111) have indicated wild birds as potentially important as a source of mosquito infection.

Thus, it appears that poultry, especially chickens, may serve as an important source of infection with the eastern, western, and St. Louis encephalitis viruses and possibly also the Japanese B type.

NEWCASTLE DISEASE

Newcastle disease (avian pneumoencephalitis) primarily a disease of world-wide distribution in fowls was first recognized in man in 1943, by Burnet (112) who isolated the virus from a case of conjunctivitis in a laboratory worker. Subsequently, reports have appeared of virus isolation from 8 cases of conjunctivitis in man (113, 117). Anderson (113), 1946 in Australia reported 2 laboratory infections. The remaining cases were in the United States Ingalls (115) encountered 2 cases of natural infection; one in a broiler plant operator and the other in a veterinary student. Both cases were related to recent contact with NDV infected chickens. More recently, Nelson, et al. (118) have reported the occurrence of an outbreak of conjunctivitis in poultry plant workers. Of the 40 cases, virus isolation was successful in 4 of 10 acute cases. Specimens were obtained from the conjunctiva. They obtained a high SN index on specimens from employees in the plant showing no symptoms and observed that this may indicate resistance.

In a recent study on food poisoning bacteria in poultry and poultry products, Kyle, MacFadden and Gunderson (17) isolated Newcastle disease from chicken livers and spleens collected on the evisceration line of a commercial poultry processing plant in Nebraska. The relative frequency of cases of conjunctivitis occurring in workers on the evisceration lines of poultry processing plants prompted this study. These investigators (17) studied 3 additional cases of conjunctivitis in humans from which Newcastle disease virus was isolated at the University of Nebraska Hospital. All patients had dressed chickens prior to onset of symptoms.

An earlier report of an outbreak of conjunctivitis among kitchen workers handling poultry in an agricultural school in Israel was made by Yatom (119).

It is obvious from the evidence presented that Newcastle disease of poultry is capable of infecting the mucous membrane of the human eye. Thompson (120) has observed that the high prevalence of the disease in poultry as compared with the scarcity and mildness of reported cases in man indicates that general alarm concerning human infection is not warranted. More recently, evidence obtained by several workers indicates that NDV is capable of causing systemic involvment in man. Mitchell and Walker (121) report a laboratory infection apparently acquired through the respiratory tract which produced an influenza-like attack lasting about 5 days. NDV was isolated from bronchial mucus. There was no evidence of conjunctivitis. A case of acute hemolytic anemia with autohemagglutinative vascular phenomena was reported by Moolten and Clark (122) in which NDV was isolated from the patient's blood shortly after the acute phase of illness had subsided. The isolation of the virus from 5 additional cases of human infection has been reported by Quinn, Hanson, Brown, and Brandly (123). These authors have noted the possibility of man to man transmission of the disease in view of the demonstration of virus in saliva, nasal discharge and conjunctival sac washings. In one of their cases NDV was isolated from the urine. Kyle, MacFadden and Gunderson (17) observed that due to the inherrent resistance and potential adaptability of the virus, it may well become a significant public health problem.

PSITTACOSIS

Psittacosis (Ornithosis) an apparent, or more frequently an inapparent infection found in parrots, parakeets, canaries, pigeons, and many other birds is also communicable to man. The infection is caused by Miyagawanella psittaci, coccoid elementary bodies intermediate between Rickettsiae and true viruses. It was formerly thought to be contracted through association with psittacine birds however, more recent reports have incriminated ducks (124), chickens (125) and turkeys (126) as the source of infection in man. Of great importance was the discovery that visibly healthy birds harbor the virus and as shedders or chronic carriers distribute the infective agent. Irons (126) has observed that the importance of common barnyard fowl in the spread of psittacosis frequently is overlooked.

According to Meyer (127), the significance of the demonstration of psittacosis virus in the organs and intestinal contents of ducks to the duck raising industry has not been assessed. He further states that there is evidence that the virus, present in approximately one-third of the bird population, occasionally infects workers on commercial farms, or persons who keep ducks as pets. In a study of the problem in ducks on Long Island, during a period when psittacosis occurred in man in the area, 38 percent of 115 ducks and ducklings on 9 different farms yielded psittacosis-like virus similar to the pigeon strain.

A recent report by Irons (126) et al. described an outbreak of psittacosis in turkey dressers in a poultry plant in Texas. There were 22 cases and 3 deaths among 78 employees of the plant. All cases had been killing, picking feathers, or wrapping heads of turkeys. Few cases had been dressing chickens. It appeared that discharges from a group of turkeys was the source of the outbreak. Clinical findings varied widely in severity of illness, from mild influenza-like attacks to fatal illness.

A recent communication from Dr. Irons stated that they have encountered a second outbreak of ornithosis in a Texas poultry and egg plant attributed to dressing turkeys for the 1952 Christmas market. In this outbreak psittacosis virus isolations were made.

Pigeons have frequently been incriminated in outbreaks in man and in some instances chickens have been involved also. A human infection was traced to a chicken in New Jersey. Four of 31 birds examined harbored psittacosis virus resembling the pigeon strain. Study of 2 other human cases attributed to pigeons revealed that the infected birds were caged over a chicken pen; pigeon-psittacosis virus was recovered from the organs of 2 of the chickens. Determination of the extent of spontaneous psittacosis in chickens depends upon the development of a simple serological test for mass examination of barnyard fowl (127). A newly devised indirect complement-fixation-inhibition (128) test has improved detection of the disease in chickens.

Mandel and Jordan (129) report the demonstration of psittacosis antibodies in seriums from a poultry worker with pneumonitis, in serums from other poultry workers, and in sera from fowl slaughtered in local stores.

A case of atypical pneumonia in a poultry dealer has been reported by Duncan, Thomas and Tobin (130) in England. Virus of the ornithosis type was isolated from throat washings. Ward and Birge (131) describe a case of psittacosis in the owner of a pheasant ranch. Complement fixation tests on the patient were performed by the Illinois State Department of Health. Indirect complement fixation tests on the pheasant serums were performed by Dr. K. F. Meyer.

The frequency with which psittacosis has been associated with poultry workers in recent years warrants its consideration as an occupational disease problem.

RABIES

Although fowl may be infected experimentally with the rabies virus, there is little evidence of spontaneous rabies in poultry. Remlinger and Bailey (132) reported transmission of the disease to the chicken by bites on the comb by a rabid dog. Thus it appears that chickens can, if bitten by a rabid animal, become infected and serve as a source of human infection.

FUNGUS DISEASES

Probably of less hazard to poultry workers are the mycotic infections of fowls. Those which deserve mention are aspergillosis, favus, and thrush. Although these infections are rare in man and frequently of a mild nature they do occur. Emmons (133) states that fungus diseases of poultry are of little danger to man unless there is heavy exposure and the individual has other predisposing factors.

ASPERGILLOSIS

Aspergillus fumigatus is especially pathogenic for birds and occasionally causes aspergillosis in man. The disease is common enough in domestic birds, pigeons, chickens, and ducks to be of some economic importance. In young chicks it frequently occurs in epidemic form and is known as brooder pneumonia (134). The disease may be localized or generalized but usually occurs in the lungs and air sacs.

The infection appears to be acquired following inhalation of spores from moldy grain or litter. In man observations have indicated that infection also frequently follows exposure to air carrying many spores. Infections of the external ear have been attributed to aspergillus spores. However, the recent studies of Singer, Freeman and Hardy (135) on otitis externa indicate that this fungus is of minor importance.

According to a communication from Dr. W. L. Sippel, of the Georgia Coastal Plains Experiment Station they have encountered outbreaks of aspergillosis in birds in South Georgia.

FAVUS

Favus is a type of ringworm caused by several species of the genus Trichophyton (Achorion). The agent of favus or white comb in poultry is Trichophyton gallinae. In his excellent review of mycotic diseases of animals Gordon (136) states that despite the numerous references to the disease in American literature, there have been only 2 instances that an organism has been cultured which could be identified as T. gallinae according to published reports. It has been isolated from a human infection in France (137) and on many occasions from fowl favus in Europe and South America.

THRUSH

Thrush (candidiasis, moniliasis) is another fungus infection that has caused high mortality in poultry flocks, especially young birds. It is caused by the yeast-like organism Canadian albicans. The disease has been observed in chickens, pigeons, turkeys, pheasants and other birds, and in man. In poultry lesions are localized in the mucosa of the upper alimentary canal and appear as whitish ulcers or psuedo-membranes in the crop, and gizzard.

In man (137) Candida albicans may cause infections of the mucous membranes of the mouth and vagina; infections of the skin and nails; systematic infections or a mild broncho-pulmonary infection.

No reports have been found indicating transmission of the disease from infected fowl to man although this may occur.

PARASITES

Infestation with Dermanyssus gallinae the poultry mite frequently causes irritation and an itching dermatitis in poultrymen.

TOXOPLASMA

According to Manwell et al (138 toxoplasmosis is one of the least understood of human infections as well as one of the most recently recognized.

It is still uncertain whether birds are naturally infected with any strain of toxoplasma infective for mammals. But Manwell et al. (138) found that certain species including the duck, chicken, pigeon, canary, and wild birds are highly susceptible to experimental infection with a toxoplasma strain of human origin.

The uncertain knowledge of this disease in man and birds, for the present, obscures its significance.

It should be mentioned that Ingalls (1) has pointed out one other disease, leptospirosis, as an occupational hazard to poultry dressing plant employees, although the birds are rarely, if ever, infected.

The predominance of poultry workers among the first patients found to have leptospirosis in the Detroit area led Molner (139) to study the problem in poultry dressing plants. It was found that rats were commonly in and around the plants. By washing work tables with Ringer's Solution in the morning after exposure to the rats at night and infecting guinea pigs with the washings a clinical picture of Weil's disease was produced. No mention is made of isolation of the organism. This probable source of infection could, however, be eliminated by adequate sanitation measures and rat control.

Some of the diseases reviewed in this report are of interest chiefly from an academic standpoint, whereas others present a definite public health problem.

Measures toward controlling the incidence of infections that man may acquire from poultry have been adequately summarized by Brandly (C. A.) 2 as follows: "It may be emphasized that suppression and eventual eradication of transmissible diseases common to birds and man require, at the onset, thorough elucidation of epizootiology together with adequate and often needed improvements in detection and diagnostic methods. These knowledges and skills, supplemented by sound long-range perspectives and practices and abetted by persistent educational programs must inevitably lead to success against this costly and needless loss and waste. Now, and in the future, necessary safeguards must aim to reduce the "occupational hazards" both against established bird to man infection chains, and against the factors of contact and exposure which may favor adaptation of other infectious agents to man from birds, and vice versa. Finally, a sound and inclusive poultry inspection service based on established practices and under competent veterinary supervision must be our primary bulwark toward protecting both the health of the public and the integrity of one of our major sources of food."

TABLE 1.—*Reported outbreaks of salmonellosis attributed to poultry or poultry products reported by FSA (National Office of Vital Statistics), 1951–52*

Date of outbreak	Location	Number of persons involved	Type isolated	Probable vehicle	Type isolated from material
Jan. 13, 1951	California	11	S. anatum	Turkey	S. anatum.
May 19, 1951	Minnesota	10	S. typhimurium	Raw turkey eggs	Not stated.
June 9, 1951	Illinois	340	None	Egg white	S. montevideo.
Sept. 8, 1951	California	30	S. typhimurium	Duck eggs in ice cream	No ice cream examined.
Sept. 15, 1951	Washington	16		Roast turkey	Salmonellalike organism.
Nov. 24, 1951	California	31	S. typhimurium	Roast turkey sandwiches	Negative.
Dec. 22, 1951	do	33	do	do	Do.
Jan. 19, 1952	do	41	S. newport	Sliced turkey	S. newport.
May 17, 1952	do	14	S. typhimurium	Pudding with eggs, chicken and turkey fat	S. typhimurium.
June 28, 1952	do	10	S. montevideo	Eggs in homemade ice cream	S. montevideo from ice cream.
July 5, 1952	Massachusetts	84	S. typhimurium	Roast turkey	Not examined.
July 12, 1952	Illinois	11	do	Turkey dinner	Do.
July 26, 1952	California	27	S. newport	Chicken chilli	Do.
Oct. 4, 1952	Maryland	7	Sal. Sp	Eggnog	Do.
Nov. 15, 1952	New York	2	S. heidelberg	Turkey	None.
Dec. 20, 1952	14 States and District of Columbia	68	S. montevideo	Commercial canned powedered egg yolk	S. montevideo.
Do	Mississippi	14	S. oranienburg	Partly cooked turkey	Not examined.

Reported outbreaks of gastroenteritis in which poultry or poultry products were the suspected vehicle of infection, FSA (National Office of Vital Statistics), 1951–52

Date	Location	Number of persons ill	History
June 16, 1951	Connecticut	65	Both reported in a private school. Onset 10 to 24 hours after eating turkey. Laboratory examination incomplete.
Do	do	70	Do.
June 23, 1951	California	300	Poorly cooked turkey indicated as vehicle of infection.
July 7, 1951	Tennessee	[1] 247 [2] 27	Outbreak in State institution. *Hemolytic Staph. aureus* isolated from chicken salad.
Aug. 18, 1951	Maine	4	Commercially canned chicken and commercial mayonnaise probable vehicle of infection.
Aug. 25, 1951	California	9	Passengers on plane from San Francisco to Honolulu. *Staph. aureus* isolated from casserole diced ham and creamed boiled eggs.
Apr. 14, 1951	do	8	Chicken sandwiches suspected source of infection.
May 12, 1951	New York	21	Turkey dinner. Investigation incomplete.
June 2, 1951	Connecticut	94	Roast chicken in restaurant suspected source infection.
Sept. 22, 1951	California	7	*Hemolytic Staph aureus* isolated from turkey dressing.
Sept. 29, 1951	Connecticut	19	Onset 7 to 18 hours after eating turkey. A paracolon organism isolated from turkey meat.
Oct. 6, 1951	Minnesota	110	Chicken loaf sandwiches. Bacteriological examination revealed gamma Streptococcus, E. freundii and A. aerogenes.
Dec. 22, 1951	New York	40	Onset 2 to 5 hours after eating egg salad. Staphylococci, enterococci and coliform organisms isolated from egg salad.
Jan. 5, 1952	Maine	8	Cooked chicken eaten. No other information.
Jan. 19, 1952	Idaho	34	Onset 6 to 12 hours after eating creamed chicken. No laboratory examination reported.
June 24, 1952	California	4	Onset 3 hours after eating turkey a la king. Staph. aureus isolated from turkey.
July 12, 1952	do	6	Onset about 3 hours after eating roast chicken. A Staphylococcus organism isolated from chicken, ham, and cake.
Nov. 22, 1952	Washington	120	Onset 10 to 12 hours after eating chicken. A gram positive micrococcus isolated from chicken.
Dec. 20, 1952	Arkansas	50	Turkey probable vehicle of infection. None available for laboratory examination.

[1] Patients.
[2] Employees.

Reported cases of Psittacosis FSA (National Office of Vital Statistics), 1951–52

Date	Location	Number persons ill	Laboratory findings	Contact with birds
Mar. 31, 1951	Chicago	2	Rise in complement fixation titer	Parakeet.
June 23, 1951	New York	1	do	Psittacine birds in home, 1 died. Psittacine virus isolated by Dr. K. F. Meyer.
Do	do	1	Unknown	Pigeons.
July 28, 1952	Minnesota	1	Complement fixation	Homing pigeons. Psittacine virus isolated.
Jan. 26, 1952	Chicago	1	Complement fixation positive	Parakeet and pigeons.
Feb. 16, 1952	Minnesota	2	do	Florida parakeet. Died.
Feb. 23, 1952	Connecticut	1	Incomplete	Florida parakeet. Psittacine virus isolated.
Mar. 1, 1952	Texas	29	Complement fixation positive virus isolated	Poultry packinghouse.
Mar. 8, 1952	Connecticut	1	Complement fixation positive	Lovebirds.
Do	Kentucky	2	do	Parakeet.
Do	Indiana	2	Not stated	Do.
Mar. 29, 1952	District of Columbia	1	do	Maryland parakeet. Psittacine virus isolated from bird at NIH.
Do	Connecticut	1	Complement fixation suggestive	None known.
Apr. 12, 1952	do	1	Complement fixation positive	Florida parakeet (mother of Connecticut case Feb. 23, 1952).
Do	Minnesota	1	Rise in complement fixation titer	Parakeet (local).
Apr. 19, 1952	Colorado	1	Rise plus in complement fixation titer	Exposed to Florida parakeets in Minnesota.
May 12, 1952	Missouri	2	Not stated	Parakeet in Kansas City pet shop.
May 10, 1952	New York	1	Rise plus in complement fixation titer	Florida parakeets.

REFERENCES

1. Ingalls, W. L. The public health aspects of poultry diseases. Proceedings American Veterinarians Medical Association. 87th annual meeting, Aug. 1950, p. 282.

2. Brandly, C. A. Poultry diseases as public health problems. Public Health Reports, 66: 688–671, 1951.

3. Brandly, P. J. Poultry inspection as a part of the public health program, JAVMA, 112: 10–17, 1948.

4. Edwards, P. R., Bruner, D. W., and Moran, A. B. The Genus Salmonella: Its occurrence and distribution in the United States. Kentucky Agricultural Experimental Station, Bulletin 525, 1948.

5. Hinshaw, W. R., and McNeil, E. Avian Salmonellosis; its economic and public health significance. Report of the eighth World Poultry Congress, 1948.

6. Hinshaw, W. R., and McNeil, E. Salmonella infection as a food industry problem. Advances in Food Research, volume 3, 209, 1951.

7. Hinshaw, W. R., McNeil, E., and Taylor, T. J. Avian Salmonellosis. Types of Salmonella isolated and their relation to public health. Am. Jour. Hyg., 50: 264–278, 1944.

8. Stuart, C. A., and Van Stratum, E. Antigenic relationships of coliform and related bacteria isolated from infants in the nurseries of two institutions. Jour. Ped. 26: 464–469, 1945.

9. Friedman, I. A., and Goldin, M. Paracolon endocarditis. Am. J. Clin. Path. 19: 840–845, 1949.

10. Mitchell, R. B., Garlock, F. C., and Broh-Kahn, R. H. An outbreak of gastroenteritis presumably caused by Salmonella pullorum. J. Infect. Dis. 79: 57–62, 1946.

11. Edwards, P. R., Bruner, D. W., and Moran, A. B. The genus Salmonella: Its occurrence and distribution in the United States. Ky. Agri. Exp. Station. Bulletin 525, 1948.

12. Judefind, T. F. Report of a relatively severe and protracted diarrhea presumably due to S. pullorum from the ingestion of incompletely cooked eggs. J. Bact. 54: 667–668, 1947.

13. Chery, W. B., Barnes, L. A., and Edwards, P. R. Observations on a monophasic Salmonella variant. J. Bact. 51: 235–243, 1946.

14. Galton, M. M., Mackel, D. C., and Haire, W. C. Studies of Salmonellosis in poultry in Florida. To be published.

15. Schneider, M. D., and Gunderson, M. F. Investigators shed more light on Salmonella problem. United States Egg and Poultry Mag. 55: 10–11, 22, 1949.

16. Browne, A. A. The public health significance of Salmonella on poultry and poultry products. Ph. D. thesis, Univ. of Calif., Berkeley, Calif., cited by Hinshaw and McNeil in Ref. 6.

17. Kyle, T. S., McFadden, H. W., Jr., and Gunderson, M. F. The bacteriology of commercial poultry processing. Manuscript, University of Nebraska, Omaha, Nebr., 1952.

18. Watt, J. Salmonella infection from infected chicken eggs. Public Health Report, 60: 835–839, 1945.

19. Schneider, M. D. Isolation of S. tennessee from frozen whole and powdered egg. Army Medical Bulletin, 4: 477, 1945.

20. Schneider, M. D. Investigation of Salmonella content of powdered whole egg with not more than 2 percent moisture content. II. General survey on the occurrence of species of Salmonella in high quality egg powder. Food Research, 11: 313, 1946.

21. Solowey, M., McFarland, V. H., Spaulding, E. H., and Chemerda, C. Microbiology of spray-dried whole egg. II. Incidence and types of Salmonella. Am. J. Pub. Health 37: 971–932, 1947.

22. Medical Research Council of Great Britain. The bacteriology of spray-dried egg with particular reference to food poisoning. Various authors. Spec. Report Series No. 260. London, 1947.

23. Solowey, M., Sutton, R. R., and Calesnick, E. J. Heat resistance of Salmonella organisms isolated from spray-dried whole egg powder. Food Research, 11: 380, 1946.

24. Winter, A. R., Greco, P. A., and Stewart, G. F. Pasteurization of liquid egg products. I. Bacteria reduction in liquid whole egg and improvement in keeping quality. Food Research, 11: 229, 1946.

25. Winter, A. R., Stewart, G. F., McFarlane, V. H., and Solowey, M. Pasteurization of liquid egg products. III. Destruction of Salmonella in liquid whole egg. Am. J. Pub. Health, 36: 451, 1946.

26. Goresline, H. E., Hayes, K. F., Moser, R. E., Jr., Howe, M. A., Jr., and Drewniak, E. E. Pasteurization of liquid whole egg under commercial conditions to eliminate Salmonella. U. S. D. A. Circular No. 897, Oct. 1951, Wash., D. C.

27. McCullough, Norman B., and Eisele, C. W. Experimental human salmonellosis. I. Pathogenicity of S. meleagridis and S. anatum obtained from spray-dried whole egg. J. Infect. Dis. 88: 278–289, 1951.

28. McCullough, N. B., and Eisele, C. W. Experimental human salmonellosis. III. Pathogenicty of strains of S. newport, S. derby, and S. bareilly obtained from spray-dried whole egg. J. Infect. Dis. 89: 209–213, 1951.

29. McCullough, N. B., and Eisele, C. W. Experimental human salmonellosis. IV. Pathogenicity of strains of S. pullorum obtained from spray-dried whole egg. J. Infect. Dis. 89: 259–265, 1951.

30. Luippold, G. F. A paracolon organism antigenically related to the Sachs Q–1030 Bacillus and associated with chronic enterocolitis. Gastroenterology, 8: 358–366, 1947.

31. Kraft, J. R. Paracolon pneumonia. Am. J. Clin. Path. 21: 666–671, 1951.

32. Peluffo, C. A., Edwards, P. R., and Bruner, D. W. A group of coliform bacilli serologically related to the genus Salmonella. Jour. Inf. Dis. 70: 185–192, 1942.

33. Edwards, P. R., Cherry, W. B., and Bruner, D. W. Further studies on coliform bacteria serologically related to the genus Salmonella. Jour. Inf. Dis. 73: 229–238, 1943.

34. Edwards, P. R., West, Mary G., and Bruner, D. W. Arizona group of paracolon bacteria: A new group of bacteria pathogenic for animals and probably also for man. Kentucky Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 499, 1947.

35. Edwards, P. R., West, Mary G., and Bruner, D. W. The serologic classification of the Arizona group of paracolon bacteria. Jour. Inf. Dis., 81: 19–23, 1947.

36. Hinshaw, W. R., and McNeil, E. The occurrence of type 10 paracolon in turkeys. Jour. Bact., 51: 281–286, 1946.

37. Hinshaw, W. R., and McNeil, E. Paracolon type 10 from captive rattlesnakes. Jour. Bact., 51: 397–398, 1946.

38. Verder, E. cited by Murphy, W. J., and Morris, J. F., in Ret. 34. Personal communication.

39. Buttiaux, R., and Kesleloot, A. Les "B. Para-Coli" du groupe arizona leur pouvoir pathogene chez l'homme. Ann. Inst. Past., 75: 379, 1948.

40. Murphy, W. J., and Morris, J. F. Two outbreaks of gastroenteritis apparently caused by a paracolon of the arizona group. Jour. Inf. Dis., 86: 255–259, 1950.

41. Stiles, G. W. Observations of swine erysipelas in turkeys (including the public health aspect and possible human cases). JAVMA, 109: 65–69, 1946.

42. Beaudette, F. R., and Hudson, C. B. An outbreak of acute swine erysipelas infection in turkeys. JAVMA, 88: 475–488, 1936.

43. Graham, R., Levine, N. D., and Hester, H. R. Erysipelothrix rhusiopathiae associated with a fatal disease in ducks. JAVMA, 95: 211–216, 1939.

44. Hutyra, Marek and Manninger. Special pathology and therapeutics of the diseases of domestic animals. Vol. I, 5th edition, Alexander Eger, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

45. Klauder, J. V. Erysipelothrix rhusiopathiae infection in animals and in human beings. Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci., 48: 535–551, 1947.

46. Stiles, G. W. Chronic Erysipeloid (Swine Erysipelas) in a man. The effect of treatment with penicillin. JAVMA, 134: 953–955.

47. Sneath, P. H. A., Abbott, J. D., and Cunliffe, A. C. The bacteriology of erysipeloid. Brit. Med. J., 2: 1063–1068, 1951.

48. Klauder, J. V. Erysipeloid as an occupational disease. JAMA III: 1345–1348, 1938.

49. Price, J. E. L., and Bennett, W. E. J. The erysipeloid of Rosenbach. Brit. Med. J., 2: 1060–1063, 1951.

50. Barber, M., and Nellen, M. Erysipeloid of Rosenbach. Lancet, 250: 125–127, 1946.

51. Skalova, R., and Falisevae, J. A systemic human infection caused by Erysipelothrix rhusiopathiae. Acta Med. Yugoslavica, 5: 238–249, 1951. Biol. Abs. No. 28609, October 1952.

52. Jungherr, E. Staphylococcal arthritis in turkeys. JAVMA, 82: 243–249, 1933.

53. Hinshaw, W. R., and McNeil, E. Staphylococcosis (synovitis) in turkeys. Poul. Sci., 31: 320–327, 1952.

54. Hinshaw, W. R. Diseases of turkeys. In Diseases of Poultry by H. E. Biester and Schwarte, L. H., second edition. Iowa State College Press, Ames, Iowa.

55. Lucet, A. Del'osteo-arthrite aigue infectieuse disjeunes oies. Ann. Inst. Past. 6: 841, 1892—cited by J. L. Noordsy in Diseases of Poultry. Second edition edited by H. E. Biester and L. H. Schwarte, Iowa State College Press, Ames, 1948, 393.

56. Van Heelsberger, T. Gemengde staphylococcenen colinfecte bij eenden. Zentralbl. f. Bakt. I. Ref. 68: 272, 1919. Cited by J. L. Noordsy in Diseases of Poultry. Second edition (see above #48).

57. Jungherr, L. and Plastridge, W. N. Avian staphylococcosis. JAVMA, 98: 27–32, 1941.

58. Van Ness, G., Staphylococcus citreus in the fowl. Poul. Sci. 25: 647, 1946.

59. McNeil, E. Personal communication.

60. Norgaard, V. A., and Mohler, J. R. Apoplectiform septicemia in chickens. U. S. D. A. Bul. 36, 1902.

61. Hudson, C. B. A specific infectious disease of chickens due to a hemolytic streptococcus. JAVMA, 82: 218–231, 1933.

62. Edwards, P. R., and Hull, F. E. Hemolytic streptococci in chronic peritonitis and salpingitis of hens. JAVMA, 91: 565–660, 1937.

63. Buxton, J. C. Disease in poultry associated with Streptococcus zooepidemicus. Vet. Rec. 64: 221–223, 1952.

64. Edwards, P. R. Personal communication.

65. Feldman, W. H. Animal tuberculosis and its relation to the disease in man. Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. 48: 469–505, 1947.

66. Rich, A. R. The Pathogenesis of Tuberculosis: 29–116—Charles C. Thomas, Springfield, Ill., 1944.

67. Bradbury, F. C. S., and Young, J. A. Human pulmonary tuberculosis due to avian tubercle bacilli: Report of a case. Lancet, 250: 89, 1946.

68. Bonnet, H., Thieffry, S. and Montefiore. Presence d'un bacille tuberculeux de type aviare dans unganglion de lymphogranulomatose maligne. Compt. rend. Soc. de biol. 128: 583–585, 1938. (Cited by W. H. Feldman, see ref. no. 58.)

69. Danbolt, N., and Brandt. Sarkoidahnlichtre Hauttuberklose durch Huhnertuberkelbacillen hervorgerufen. Arch f. Dermat u Syph. 178: 76–86, 1938. Cited by Feldman, W. H. Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. 48: 469–505, 1947.

70. Feldman, W. H. Avian Tuberculosis Infections. Williams and Wilkins Co. Baltimore, Md. 483, 1938.

71. Stafseth, H. J. Brucellosis. In Disease of Poultry. Second edition, edited by H. E. Biester and L. H. Schwarte, 353, 1948.

72. Emmel, M. W. An outbreak of brucella disease in fowl. JAVMA, 76: 564–565, 1930.

73. Emmel, M. W. and Huddleston, I. F. Abortion disease in fowl. J. A. V. A. 75: 578–580, 1929.

74. Huddleston, I. F., and Emmel, M. W. Pathogenicity of the genus brucella in fowl. Mich. Agr. Exp. Sta. Tech. Bull. 103, 1929.

75. Pagnini, P. I. Palli nella diffusione della brucellosi. La Clin. Vet. 62: 75, 1939. Cited by H. J. Stafseth in Diseases of Poultry, 2d edition. Edited by H. E. Biester and L. H. Schwarte, 1948.

76. Pavlov, P. La brucellose chez les volailles. Pec. de Med. Vet. 62: 75, 1938. Cited by H. J. Stafseth in Diseases of Poultry. 2d edition edited by H. E. Biester, and L. H. Schwarte, 1948.

77. Felsenfeld, O. A study of the nature of brucellosis in chickens. Am. J. Vet. Res. 12: 48–54, 1951.

78. Weller, T. H. Listeria. In Bacterial & Mycotic Infections of Man, edited by R. J. Dubos, J. B. Lippincott, Philadelphia. 1948.

79. Felsenfeld, O. Listerella monocytogenes strain isolated from a human source in Puerto Rico. P. R. Jour. Pub. Health & Trop. Med. 24: 1–4, 1948.

80. Seastone, C. V. Pathogenic organisms of the genus Listerella. J. Exp. Med. 62: 203, 1935.

81. Patterson, J. B. The present position regarding Listerella monocytogenes infection in animals and man. Vet. Rec. 51: 873, 1939.

82. Hoffman, H. A. and Lenarz, C. A case of listerellosis in chickens and an additional case in sheep. J. A. V. M. A. 100: 340–342, 1942.

83. Burroughs, A. L., Holdenried, R., Longanecker, D. S., and Meyer, K. F. A field study of latent tularemia in rodents with a list of all known naturally infected vertebrates. Jour. Inf. Dis. 76: 112–119, 1945.

84. Leser, R. U. and Wilbur, D. L. Report of a case in which the carrier probably was a pheasant. Proc. Staff. Meet. Mayo Clinic 11: 52–54, 1936.

85. Kursban, N. J., and Toshay, L. Tularemia acquired from a pheasant. J. A. M. A. 131: 1943, 1946.

86. Moss, E. S., and Battle, J. D. Human infection with Pasteurella pseudo-tuberculosis rodentium of Pfeiffer. Report on case. Am. J. Clin. Path. 11: 677–699, 1941.

87. Rosenwald, A. S., and Dickinsen, E. M. A report, Pasteurella pseudotuberculosis infection in turkeys. Am. J. Vet. Res., 5: 246–249, 1944.

88. Meyer, K. F. The Pasteurella 409–446 in Bacterial and Mycotic Infections of Man. Edited by Dubos, R. J. J. B. Lippincott Co., Phila. 1948.

90. Schipper, G. J. Unusual pathogenicity of Pasteurella multocida isolated from the throats of common wild rats. Bull. Johns Hopkins Hosp. 81: 333–356, 1947.

91. Needham, Gerald M. Penicillin in the treatment of experimental infections with P. Multocida. Proc. Staff. Meet. Mayo Clinic. 23, 361–367, 1948.

92. Olsen, Arthur M., and Needham, G. M. Pasteurella multocida in suppurative diseases of the respiratory tract. Am. J. Med. Sci. 224: 77–81, 1952.

93. Neter, Erwin. Pasteurella multocida wound infection in children following bites by or contact with animals. Proc. N. Y. State Assoc. of Pub. Health Labs. 31: 6–8, 1951.

94. Neter, E., DeKleine, E. H., and Egan, R. W. Treatment with aureomycin of localized Pasteurella multocida infection. J. Ped. 38: 242–243, 1951.

95. Neter, E., Gorzynski, G. A., and Cass, W. A. Aureomycin and Terramycin treatment of P. multocida infection and Neomycin's in vitro effects on P. multocida. Proc. Soc. Exp. Biol. Med. 76: 493–495, 1951.

96. Murray, Chas. Fowl cholera in Diseases of Poultry. 2d edition, edited by H. E. Biester, and L. E. Schwarte, 1948. Iowa State Coll. Press. Ames.

97. Litterer, W. Further observations of virulent diphtheria bacilli in fowls. Sou. Med. J. 18: 577, 1925.

98. Fothergill, L. D., Dingle, J. H., Farber, S. and Connerley, M. L. Human encephalitis caused by the virus of the eastern variety of equine encephalomyelitis. New Eng. J. Med. 219: 411, 1938.

99. Tyzzer, E. E., Sellards, A. W., and Bennett, B. L. The occurrence in nature of equine encephalomyelitis in the ring-necked pheasant. Sci. 88: 505, 1938.

100. Fothergill, L. D., and Dingle, J. H. A fatal disease of pigeons caused by the virus of the eastern variety of equine encephalomyelitis. Sci. 88: 549, 1938.

101. Beaudette, F. R., and Black, J. J. Equine encephalomyelitis in New Jersey pheasant in 1945 and 1946. J. A. V. E. A. 112: 140–146, 1948.

102. Davis, W. A. A study of birds and mosquitoes as hosts for eastern equine encephalomyelitis. Am. J. Hyg. 32: 45, 1940.

103. Ten Broeck, C. Birds as possible carriers of the virus of equine encephalomyelitis. Arch, Path. 25: 759, 1938.

104. Tyzzer, E. E., and Sellards, A. W. The pathology of equine encephalomyelitis in young chickens. Am. J. Hyg. 33: 69, 1941.

105. Hammon, W. McD., and Reeves, W. C. Western equine encephalomyelitis virus in the blood of experimentally inoculated chickens. Jour. Exp. Med. 83: 163, 1946.

106. Hammon, W. McD., Reeves, W. C., and Izumi, E. M. St. Louis encephalitis virus in the blood of experimentally inoculated fowls and mammals. Jour. Exp. Med. 83: 175, 1946.

107. Sulkin, S. E. The recovery of equine encephalomyelitis virus (western type) from chicken mites. Sci., 101: 381, 1945.

108. Smith, M. G., Blattner, R. J., and Heys, F. M. The isolation of the St. Louis encephalitis virus from chicken mites (Dermanyssus gallinae) in nature. Sci., 100: 362, 1944.

109. Hammon, W. McD., Lunday, H. W., Gray, J. A., Evans, F. C., Bang, F., and Izumi, E. M. A large scale serum neutralization survey of certain vertebrates as part of an epidemiological study of encephalitis of the western equine and St. Louis types. Jour. Immunol. 44: 75, 1942.

110. Hammon, W. McD., Tigertt, W. D., Sather, G., and Schenker, H. Isolation of Japanese B. encephalitis virus from naturally infected culex tritaeniorhynchus collected in Japan. Am. J. Hyg. 50: 51–56, 1949.

111. Hammon, W. McD., Reeves, W. C., and Sather, G. E. Japanese B. encephalitis virus in the blood of experimentally inoculated birds. Epidemiological implications. Am. J. Hyg. 53: 249–261, 1951.

112. Burnet, F. M. Human infection with virus of Newcastle disease of fowls. M. J. Austral. 2, 313–314, 1943.

113. Anderson, S. G. A note on 2 laboratory infections with the virus of Newcastle disease in fowls. M. J. Austral. 1:371, 1946.

114. Freymann, M. W., and Bang, F. B. Human conjunctivitis due to Newcastle disease virus in the U. S. Bull. Johns Hopkins Hosp. 84: 409–413, 1949.

115. Ingalls, W. L., and Mahoney, A. Isolation of the virus of Newcastle disease from human beings. A. J. P. H. 39: 730–740, 1949.

116. Hunter, M. C., Keeney, A. H., and Sigel, H. M. Laboratory aspects of an infection with Newcastle disease virus in man. Jour. Inf. Dis. 88: 272–277, 1951.

117 Gustafson, D. P., and Moses, H. E. Isolation of Newcastle disease virus from the eye of a human being. J. A. V. H. A. 118: 1–2, 1951.

118. Nelson, C. B., Pomeroy, B. S., Schall, K., Park, W. E., and Lindeman, R. J. An outbreak of conjunctivitis due to Newcastle disease virus (NDV) occurring in poultry workers. A. J. P. H. 42: 672–678, 1952.

119. Yatom, J. An outbreak of conjunctivitis in man associated with the virus of Newcastle disease. Refuh. Vet. 3: 69–70, 1946, cited by Howitt in reference 105.

120. Thompson, C. H. Newcastle disease infection in man. Mil. Surg. 106: 276–281, 1950.

121. Mitchell, C. A., and Walker, R. V. L. Note on the infection of a person with Newcastle disease virus. Canad. J. Comp. Med. Sept. 226–227, 1951.

122. Moolten, S. E., and Clark, E. Viremia in acute hemolytic anemia and in autohemagglutination—with special reference to the virus of Newcastle disease. A. M. A. Arch. Int. Med. 89: 270–292, 1952.

123. Quinn, R. W., Hanson, R. P., Brown, J. W., and Brandly, C. A. Newcastle disease in man: Results of studies in 5 cases. Jour. Lab. Clin. Med. In press.

124. Wolins, W. Ornithosis (Psittacosis). A review with a report of 8 cases resulting from contact with the domestic pekin duck. Am. J. M. Sci. 216: 551–564, 1948.

125. Meyer, K. F., and Eddie, B. Spontaneous ornithosis (psittacosis) in chickens the cause of a human infection. Proc. Soc. Exp. Biol. Med. 49: 522–525, 1942.

126. Irons, J. C., Sullivan, T. D., and Rowen, J. Outbreak of psittacosis (ornithosis) from working with turkeys or chickens. A. J. P. H. 41: 931–937, 1951.

127. Meyer, K. F. Psittacosis. In Diseases of Poultry. Edited by H. E. Biester and L. H. Schwarte, Iowa State Coll. Press, Ames, 1948.

128. Karrer, H., Meyer, K. F., and Eddie, B. The complement-fixation-inhibition test and its application to the diagnosis of ornithosis in chickens and ducks. I. Principles and technique of the test. Jour. Inf. Dis. 87: 13–36, 1950.

129. Mandel, A. and Jordan, W. S. Ornithosis (psittacosis) in chickens and poultry workers. Am. J. Hyg. 55: 230–238, 1952.

130. Duncan, P. R., Thomas, A. E., and Tobin, J. O'H. Ornithosis: Isolation of the virus from a case. Lancet, Apr. 5, 696–697, 1952.

131. Ward, C. G. and Birge, J. P. Psittacosis (ornithosis) following contact with pheasants. JAMA, 150: 217–219, 1952.

132. Remlinger, P. and Bailly, J. Transmission de la rage a' la Cigogne. Comp. Rend. Soc. Biol., 123: 383, 1936, cited by L. H. Schwarte in Diseases of Poultry (see ref. 111).

133. Emmons, C. W. Personal communication.

134. Skinner, C. E., Emmons, C. W., and Tsuchiya, H. M. Henrici's molds, yeasts and actinomycetes, 2d edition, John Wiley & Sons, Inc. London.

135. Singer, D. E., Freeman, E., Hoffert, W., Keys, J., Mitchell, E. B., and Hardy, A. V. Otitis externa: Bacteriological and mycological studies. Ann. Otol. Rhin. & Laryng. 61: 317–330, 1952.

136. Gordon, Morris A. Veterinary mycology and its public health significance. Auburn Veterinarian, fall issue, 1951.

137. Conant, Norman F. Medical Mycology. In Bacterial and Myotic Infections of Man, edited by R. J. Dubos, J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila. 1948.

138. Manwell, R. D., Coulston, F., Binckley, E. C., and Jones, V. P. Mammalian and Avian Toxoplasma. Jour. Inf. Dis. 76: 1–23, 1945.

139. Molner, J. G., Meyer, K. T., and Raskin, H. A. Leptospiral infections. JAMA, 136: 814, 1948.

Mr. Speaker, Exhibit B, Poultry Inspection and Health Hazards, is as follows:

EXHIBIT B

POULTRY INSPECTION AND HEALTH HAZARDS

This memorandum seeks to present evidence concerning the need for compulsory Federal inspection of poultry for wholesomeness in interstate commerce.

The data contained in this memo forms the highlights and a summation of the findings made by the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, A. F. of L., during more than a year of study. The information is presented in the hope that you will interest yourself in the problem of bringing standards of wholesomeness and sanitation to the mushrooming poultry industry. You, thereby, can help end the flow of diseased and filthy poultry which is currently endangering the consumer and poultry worker.

The Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, A. F. of L., has more than 300,000 members working in the poultry and meat industries. It has, therefore, become acutely aware of the shocking sanitary and health conditions presently existing in some sections of the poultry industry. The Amalgamated has made great strides in ending these practices in many plants, but the scope of its effectiveness is limited. It, therefore, looks to Congress to protect the health of poultry workers and of consumers, as a whole.

LACK OF POULTRY INSPECTION

The poultry industry stands alone among the major producers of food for the Nation in that it is not properly regulated to assure wholesomeness or freedom from disease. Unlike red meat, filthy and diseased poultry can be, and is, sold with immunity. No law exists on a national level to provide for the compulsory inspection of this much-eaten food.

The phenomenal growth of the poultry industry in the past 20 years is responsible to a degree for the existence of this condition. In 1940 143 million broilers were raised commercially. In 1954 1,050,000,000 were raised. During the same period of time the production of turkeys increased from 34 million to 61 million birds.[1] This expansion has caused the poultry and egg industry to become the third largest source of agricultural income in the United States. The national poultry and egg income is estimated at $4.1 billion for 1954, and latest figures show it is still expanding at a rapid rate.

An inspection service for sanitation and wholesomeness is maintained by the Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture. However, inspection is purely voluntary. The processor is under no obligation whatsoever to have his product inspected. If he does seek the inspection, he must pay the full cost of it. In other words, not only can he get by without assuring the public of the wholesomeness of his product, but he is monetarily penalized if he seeks to provide that assurance.

It should be noted that only 21 percent of the poultry in interstate commerce is inspected for wholesomeness and sanitation. In 1953 United States Department of Agriculture veterinary inspectors condemned as unfit almost 2 million (1,843,446) poultry carcasses. This figure does not take into account the many organs and parts condemned when the carcasses in whole or in part were certified as wholesome.[2]

These sad facts do not tell the full story of the inadequateness and ineffectiveness of the permissive inspection by the Production and Marketing Administration. One of the major dangers is that the Production and Marketing Administration often permits the owner of the poultry business or one of his employees to serve as official sanitarian and grader. Here, certainly, is a tremendous conflict of interests, and the interest of the consuming public becomes secondary.

This system does not meet the criterions laid down by Brig. Gen. Wayne O. Kester, Office of the Surgeon General, United States Air Force, who declared:

"An inspection agency, to be acceptable, must comply with four cardinal prerequisites for an adequate inspection system.

"First, the inspectors must be competent and qualified.

"Second, they must have tenure of office, so that no one may put pressure on them in connection with their duties.

"Third, the inspectors' agency or supervisors must be responsible and accountable to the consumer.

"Fourth, the inspector must have no financial interest or connection with anyone in the organization being inspected."

INEFFECTIVENESS OF PMA PROGRAM

Actually, it is little wonder that the Production and Marketing Administration has been ineffective in its inspection, for this service was not intended primarily to safeguard the public health. Instead, it was established to promote the marketing of poultry products.

Many people believe mistakenly that the PMA inspection service was established to provide a form of inspection and regulation paralleling that of the Federal Meat Inspection Act. In reality, the Production and Marketing Administration initially provided only a grading service which was utilized in trading between dealers. At the request of certain processors, this service was extended to include inspection for wholesomeness and sanitation on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

But even when diseased poultry is rejected under the present system, the carcasses are not necessarily condemned. For example, there is the classic case of the 60,000 birds of a Brady, Tex., poultry plant. The Army rejected the turkeys because they had been hit by the 1954 Texas outbreak of ornithosis (psittacosis). But instead of disposing of the carcasses, the processor sold them for civilian consumption. Public health authorities traced them to east coast cities—many of them carrying live ornithosis (psittacosis) virus.

There are even instances in which health officers of cities having rigid poultry inspection programs have excluded poultry that came from plants inspected by the Production and Marketing Administration. For example, Dr. Aaron H. Haskin, Health Officer of Newark, N. J., wrote on December 7, 1954, to Earl W. Jimerson, president of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, A. F. of L.:

"About 1 month ago I excluded from sale in the city of Newark, N. J., the products of a poultry-processing plant which bore a USDA inspection legend. Meat inspectors from this office upon visiting the premises found numerous pertinent violations which had existed for a long time."

LIMITED ACTIVITIES OF UNITED STATES FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

The only Government agency responsible for preventing diseased and filthy poultry from coming to the market place is the United States Food and Drug Administration. Acting under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, that agency has the right to seize any adulterated food, including poultry.

However, the slashes in appropriations the Food and Drug Administration has suffered and the lack of a compulsory ante mortem-post mortem inspection law has made its job impossible.

Thus, when Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri, asked in September 1954 about the United States Food and Drug Administration's ability to police the poultry industry, then-Commissioner C. W. Crawford replied:

"We estimate that there are approximately 1,300 interstate poultry dressing, freezing or canning establishments in the United States. For the past 2 years we have made about 400 poultry establishment inspections each year, of which we estimate that perhaps one-fourth represent reinspection of the same firms. Thus, our program contemplates complete coverage of this industry about once every 3 or 4 years."

His successor, the present Commissioner, George P. Larrick, went even further in an April 21, 1955, letter to Shirley W. Barker, director, Poultry Department, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workers of North America, A. F. of L. Mr. Larrick wrote:

"Your assumption is correct that our average rate of inspection coverage of the poultry

[1] U. S. Department of Agriculture; Agricultural Marketing Service; outlook issue 1955; released October 4, 1955.

[2] Paper prepared and presented by Dr. Joe W. Atkinson, DVM, consultant, U. S. Public Health Service, to the 39th annual meeting of Central Atlantic States Association of Food and Drug Officials, June 5, 1955, Atlanta, Ga.

processing plants amounts to a spot check once every 3 or 4 years. One such inspection of one plant at one time requires on the average 5 or 6 hours of an inspector's time. It is also true, as you suggest, that such a spot check cannot guarantee the wholesomeness or the legality of products prepared at other times. However, lest this be misleading to you we must point out that in many instances reasonable valid conclusions with respect to the probability of diseased or otherwise illegal poultry being shipped from a plant can be drawn from the observation made during an inspection of this type, and conversations with employees.

"* * * Although some lots of cull poultry are recognized as obviously diseased from the external appearance of the carcass, it is our view that not only post mortem but also ante mortem examination is essential to a full program of protection of the consumer from diseased poultry."

In other words, the present and the former head of the United States Food and Drug Administration bluntly state that their organization cannot, under present circumstances, guarantee protection against diseased poultry for the consumer. The present commissioner adds that not only after-slaughter inspection is needed to protect the consumer, but also a before-slaughter inspection. Such a program can only be put into force by new legislation providing the compulsory inspection of poultry.

INDUSTRIAL AND CONSUMER HAZARDS

There are many diseases of poultry transmissible to man which constitute a public health danger.[3] Dr. James Lieberman, DVM, MPH, consultant, Poultry Inspection and Sanitation, Milk and Food Branch, Division of Sanitation, United States Public Health Service, Washington, D. C., stated at the American Veterinary Medical Association, 19th annual meeting, Toronto, July 20–23, 1953:

"Veterinary investigations have concluded that there are over 25 diseases of poultry to which man is also susceptible. Some of these diseases, such as staphylococcosis, streptococcosis, and salmonellosis, cause food poisoning and, hence, constitute a threat to individual and public health. Others, such as psittacosis, Newcastle disease, and erysipelas, must be viewed from an occupational standpoint, since they affect primarily our poultry plant workers."

Only one of these diseases, psittacosis, has resulted in the following officially recorded cases listed by the National Office of Vital Statistics of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

Year:	Deaths	Morbidity (illness)
1940	3	--
1941	1	--
1942	4	23
1943	0	1
1944	2	6
1945	0	27
1946	2	26
1947	1	27
1948	0	32
1949	0	35
1950	0	26
1951	1	25
1952	5	135
1953	4	169
1954	3	445
1955 (Jan. 1, 1955, to July 16 1955)	0	168
Total	26	1,145

[3] Diseases and Public Health Dangers:

1. The Public Health Aspects of Poultry Diseases by W. L. Ingalls, DVM, MSc.

2. Poultry Diseases as Public Health Problems by C. A. Brandly.

3. Isolation of the Virus of Newcastle Disease from Human Beings by W. L. Ingalls, DVM, and Ann Mahoney.

These figures, however, do not tell the full story of lost man-hours, illnesses and deaths. The National Office of Vital Statistics lists no deaths and only 32 cases of illness due to psittacosis in 1948, but Dr. J. B. Irons, Director of Laboratories of the Texas State Department of Health, has reported 3 deaths and 22 cases occurring among turkey plant workers in Giddings, Tex., alone during that year. This situation emphasizes that public health authorities are not fully aware of the annual frequency of these diseases.

The tremendous impact of more sanitary methods and control of diseases in poultry processing plants is well illustrated by W. Vic Pringle of the Rockingham Marketing Cooperative, Inc., Broadway, Va. Speaking before the Outlook Workshop of the Institute of American Poultry Industries, Kansas City, Mo., in 1955, he said:

"One firm I know saved $12,000 last year in compensation insurance, by controlling infections and skin rashes, thanks mainly to a better sanitation program throughout all parts of its plants. It is also a known fact that cleanup labor and supplies can be materially reduced when plants are constantly maintained in a sanitary manner versus the occasional thorough cleanup, with a hit-and-miss job most of the time. The preventive maintenance principle applies in any field."

As for the hazards to the consumer, while it is true that most of the disease organisms are killed by thorough cooking to allow diseased birds to be sold is somewhat like condoning the cooking of garbage for human consumption. Edible from a medical standpoint, but certainly not desirable.

Let us look at an affidavit taken from an employee working on poultry processing without ante mortem-post mortem inspection:

"My job was to pull feathers and those who were on the job with me and I were the first ones to handle the chickens after they had passed through the scalding process and roughing machine. When the chickens reached me most of the feathers were off the bodies and I could see the skin of the birds very clearly. It was quite often that thousands of chickens would pass on the line with sores on their bodies. Thousands of them would have large swellings as large as a chicken egg on their bodies. These swellings were filled with a yellowish pus and the odor was very strong."

Or as a worker in another plant has said:

"I work on many different jobs on the line. During this time I saw lots of chickens with lumps on them and some were full of sores. Sometimes when the lumps were cut off or they would burst, they smelled awful bad. All of these chickens went right through with the other chickens for shipment."

Or as another employee states in an affidavit:

"When a lot of chickens were returned to our plant because the customer would not take them because they were not the quality he wanted, these chickens were cut up in pieces and frozen and shipped to another customer. Many times these chickens were in not very good condition when they came back to the plant."

These affidavits, taken from workers employed by national concerns who sell their products under reputable name brands, certainly bear out the statement "somewhat like cooking garbage." There is, however, a very real danger with present methods of cooking poultry—broiling and baking at low temperatures—that it might not be thoroughly cooked. This would make real hazards of many diseases, such as salmonellosis, tuberculosis, streptococcosis, brucellosis, staphylococcosis, and others. Food infections caused by poultry constitute a major public-health problem. This is illustrated by the findings of the United States Public Health Service showing that 1 out of 4 food poisoning cases studied were the result of poultry or poultry products.

Dr. Joe W. Atkinson, DVM, consultant, Poultry Inspection and Sanitation, Milk, Food, and Shellfish Sanitation Program, Division of Sanitary Engineering Services, Bureau of State Services, Public Health Service, stated at the 38th annual meeting, Central Atlantic States Association of Food and Drug Officials, May 5, 1954, Baltimore, Md.:

"In 1948, a study of 8,832 cases of foodborne disease, as reported by the States, indicated that 2,492 (or 28.2 percent) were attributed to poultry or poultry dishes. Relatively many cases so reported each year since 1948 have similarly been attributed to poultry and poultry products. These figures indicate the relative importance of poultry among sources of food-borne disease.

"Research indicates that poultry constitutes one of the important reservoirs of disease organisms affecting man. Such diseases may be transmitted to man, either during the preparation of poultry for marketing, or through the consumption of poultry products."

A 1954 United States Public Health Report summarizing "disease outbreaks" for the previous year reveals the following:

"In one-third of the (Salmonellosis) outbreaks, chicken or turkey was found to be the vehicle of infection. Considering the frequency with which these fowl are found with Salmonella infections, this cannot be considered an unusual finding."

FOREIGN RESISTANCE TO UNITED STATES POULTRY

In 1907 when the Federal Meat Inspection Act was passed, the sale of poultry was largely a matter of selling surplus birds from a farm flock. The numbers sold were so insignificant, no records were kept. In most cases the prospective purchaser saw the bird alive, and was thereby assured that it was not visibly sick or emaciated. The processing was largely done at home where, if the fowl did not appear to be healthy or wholesome, it was thrown away.

Historically, the American people have risen to protest against unclean, unsafe practices by any food industry. In fact, the peoples of the world have sought to protect themselves against the sale of diseased or unclean foodstuffs.

The occurrences surrounding the passage of the Federal Meat Inspection Act in 1907 are indicative of this statement. When Upton Sinclair wrote The Jungle exposing the filth and diseases which were hazards to both workmen and the consuming public the legislative bodies of this country took appropriate action to correct this situation. Today more than 80 percent of all red meats sold are processed under Federal meat inspection surveillance.

A contributing fact to the all-out support of the Federal Meat Inspection Act was also the embargo prior to 1907 by foreign lands against the meat products of this country. The Federal Meat Inspection Act covering movement of red meats in interstate and foreign commerce corrected this condition and met the standards demanded by the American public as well as the peoples of foreign lands. Some such appropriate action by the Congress of the United States is now needed to correct similar practices and similar hazards in the poultry processing industry.

In a recent report to the poultry industry, Mr. William D. Termohlen, former chief of the Production and Marketing Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, stated that the United States had been unable to develop markets for the export of

poultry products into Europe because of embargoes.[4] Mr. Termohlen wrote:

"The British importers' enthusiasm was in contrast to lack of interest by the National Farmers Union representatives and an attitude of caution on the part of British veterinarians who indicated they felt United States imports would in time cause poultry disease outbreaks among their flocks. * * *

"Since the United States is not reported free of Newcastle (disease) by the Paris organization (International Epizootic Organization), no encouragement by United Kingdom officials toward the importation of fresh or frozen poultry meat was forthcoming."

Government officials of other countries feel that in the absence of adequate controls by the United States, imports from this country present hazards to their consumers and poultry industry which they are not willing to permit. In the face of a shortage of food in foreign lands, it appears that the poultry industry of the United States presently is confronted by the same dilemma faced by the red-meat industry in 1907.

PROTEST BY PUBLIC HEALTH AND CONSUMER GROUPS

Many organizations, medical men, health officers, and persons in important positions have expressed interest and alarm over the present situation in the poultry industry. A notable number of them have indicated their willingness to stand up and be counted as soon as a program which would result in correction is offered to protect the worker and the consumer alike.

At conference after conference of public health officers and veterinarians the lack of compulsory inspection in the poultry industry has been a subject of serious discussion and suggestions have been made to correct this condition.

On June 5, 1955, for example, the Central Atlantic States Association of Food and Drug Officials, meeting in Atlanta, Ga., resolved unanimously:

"Whereas all meat that enters into interstate commerce may, under Federal regulations, emanate only from federally inspected slaughterhouses; and

"Whereas poultry that enters into interstate commerce need not be processed in federally inspected processing plants; and

"Whereas uniformity in the inspection of poultry for wholesomeness is most desirable and essential for the welfare of the consumer: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Central Atlantic States Association urges that the Federal Government take the necessary measures to require that all poultry entering interstate commerce be inspected for wholesomeness by duly authorized representatives of a Federal agency."

The fourth annual conference of Public Health Veterinarians of the American Public Health Association, meeting in St. Louis on October 30, 1950, received from its committee on poultry inspection and sanitation a report which includes the following:

"The committee further felt that all poultry entering into interstate commerce, if killed, should be federally inspected. They (sic) felt that if there is a need for the interstate inspections of 'red meats,' there should be a Federal law requiring the interstate inspection of 'poultry meats' and they recommend that this conference go on record as recommending such congressional action as would be needed."

The 91st annual meeting of the American Veterinary Medical Association, meeting in Seattle, Wash., August 23 to 26, 1954, resolved that:

"The American Veterinary Medical Association recommends that the Poultry Inspection Service be transferred and combined with the Federal Meat Inspection Service where adequate veterinary supervision can be provided to conduct an acceptable inspection program."

This transfer would automatically bring about compulsory ante mortem-post mortem inspection for wholesomeness and inspection for sanitation of all poultry processing plants.

Not only public-health officials and veterinarians have viewed this situation with alarm. The Hoover Commission's Task Force on Federal Medical Service reported in February 1955:

"Federal inspection of meat contrasts in form as well as in cost with its inspection of poultry. Whereas about four-fifths of the Nation's meat is slaughtered and packed under compulsory meat inspection, Federal poultry inspection not only is voluntary but also is financed by fees from users of the service and covers less than one-fifth of the Nation's commercial poultry supply.

"The poultry industry has doubled in size since 1940 to become the third largest source of gross farm income. Diseases common to poultry and man—especially the salmonella infections—are almost as significant in number and severity as diseases common to animal and man. Poultry or poultry dishes cause about 1 out of 4 cases of food-borne disease. Environmental sanitation and handling in poultry packing plants is, in many instances, deplorable.

"Both the United States Livestock Sanitary Association and the Conference of State and Territorial Health Officers have recommended that State and local governments strengthen their poultry inspection and sanitation programs. But, as yet, only a few States have compulsory poultry inspection. Especially, in view of the recent growth of the poultry industry, we do not believe we can expect the States alone to provide the needed controls."

LEGISLATIVE SUGGESTIONS

The legal propriety of an effective Federal inspection in the poultry processing industry is well established. In fact, under existing Federal enactments, jurisdiction over the industry has long been asserted by the Food and Drug Administration of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Poultry Branch of the Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture.

The products of the poultry processing industry prepared for, or while in interstate commerce or at any time thereafter are subject to the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, which is administered by the Food and Drug Administration. In this connection, section 304A of that act provides the authority under which the Food and Drug Administration is empowered to seize adulterated food products. Definitions of adulteration in section 402 are broad indeed and provide an ample frame of legislative authority for the promulgation of codes prescribing standards of wholesomeness of poultry and poultry products. It should likewise be noted that the same Federal statute provides the legislative concepts concerning investigations necessary to conduct an effective inspection program.

It is here suggested that the establishment of an effective program of inspection for wholesomeness in the poultry processing industry would not necessitate the establishment of a new Federal agency, nor would it establish any new era of Federal jurisdiction.

Recognizing the inadequacy of current Federal inspection programs, the Public Health Service of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has prepared and promulgated a poultry ordinance, providing standards of sanitation requirements and is now in the process of preparing and promulgating a proposed poultry ordinance, providing standards of ante mortem and post mortem inspections. Such ordinances, when adopted by States, counties and municipalities, provide a vital uniformity in sanitation and wholesomeness regulations in the poultry processing industry throughout the United States. It should be borne in mind that if the essence of such ordinances and codes were to be enacted as Federal legislation to be enforced by the Food and Drug Administration, there would thus be established a valuable uniformity in regulations promoting the public health throughout the United States in all parts of the industry operating in interstate or intrastate commerce.

Significantly, adoption of such Federal legislation could not interfere with the operation of local poultry ordinances in view of the specific Federal jurisdictional definitions contained in section 304 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

In addition to the Food and Drug Administration, jurisdiction over the poultry processing industry has been exercised by the United States Department of Agriculture under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 1087; 7 U. S. C. 1621 et seq.). That law provides for inspection and grading programs for poultry and poultry products. Programs, however, are permissive and are financed by the payment of fees by the members of the industry. The various regulations are promulgated by the poultry branch of the Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture. In general, three separate programs are administered by the USDA under the 1946 act. They provide inspection for wholesomeness, grading for quality and inspection for plant sanitation. Under the programs, different labels are provided which signify that the cooperating industry member has complied with the standards established in the regulations. The programs are generally comparable to those covering red meat except that, as above stated, they are permissive and are performed on a fee basis.

Those who have been actively concerned with the establishment of an adequate Federal poultry inspection program have considered the advisability of the compulsory application of the voluntary regulations promulgated by the Production and Marketing Administration. It is of interest to note that Herman I. Miller, Acting Director of the Poultry Division of the Agricultural Marketing Service of the USDA, in a letter dated August 9, 1954, stated as follows:

"The responsibility for regulating the interstate shipment of adulterated, unwholesome and misbranded products is vested in the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

It has also been suggested that the problems herein considered can be adequately dealt with by the Bureau of Animal Industry in the Agricultural Research Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture if appropriate legislation is enacted. This bureau now administers the regulations governing meat inspection authorized under the Meat Inspection Act as amended and extended (34 Stat. 1260; 21 U. S. C. 71; 21 U. S. C., sub. III, 71). Of course, the regulations governing meat inspection contained in the code of Federal regulations (Title 9, Animals and Animal Products) are thorough and all-embracing. However, in this connection, it should be noted that such unit inspection, governing poultry and poultry products, could be inaugurated only after appropriate legislation amending the Meat Inspection Act (see above) as well as the Imported Meat Act (46 Stat. 689).

This analysis of present laws and regulations indicates the existence of legal precedent for three separate methods of dealing with the problem of Federal poultry inspection. Various considerations to be developed during the course of legislative hearings will, of course, dictate which of the alternate methods should be pursued in effectuating an adequate inspection program in the poultry processing industry, which will most ef-

[4] Poultry and Eggs Weekly, Saturday, April 16, 1955.

fectively promote adequate public health standards. In any event, it is significant to note that the promulgation and effectuation of an adequate Federal inspection program in the industry does not require any extension of existing Federal jurisdiction, nor will it necessitate experimentation with unknown or untried operational procedures.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KRUEGER, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered was granted to:

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin, for 15 minutes on Wednesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and to include certain articles.

Mr. BENTLEY (at the request of Mr. HOSMER).

Mr. LOVRE and to include a specch by Hon. RALPH HARVEY, of Indiana.

Mr. VURSELL in 2 instances.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio and to include a telegram.

Mr. DAVIDSON (at the request of Mr. MULTER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHMORE and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. WICKERSHAM.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3195. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Rhode Island to the town of North Kingstown, R. I.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 3316. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 3388. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the port of Port Townsend, Wash.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 3768. An act to amend section 158 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, so as to include the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare among the executive departments there listed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 3843. An act to adjust the application of section 322 of the so-called Economy Act of 1932 to premises leased for Government purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 3866. An act to facilitate the making of lease-purchase agreements by the Administrator of General Services under the Public Buildings Act of 1949, as amended, and by the Postmaster General under the Post Office Department Property Act of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7247. An act relating to recognition of gain or loss in certain railroad reorganizations and to amend section 108 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H. R. 7471. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., a municipal corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Florida;

H. R. 7896. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land in the city of Hogansville, Ga., to the city of Hogansville;

H. R. 8102. An act to provide for the disposition of moneys arising from deductions made from carriers on account of the loss of or damage to military or naval material in transit, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8404. An act to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former prisoner-of-war camp, near Douglas, Conserve County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8693. An act to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, in relation to the refund of reenlistment bonuses;

H. R. 8922. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services;

H. R. 9377. An act to provide for the sale to the Eagle Rock Young Men's Christian Association of certain real property located in Los Angeles County, Calif.;

H. R. 9824. An act to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict;

H. R. 10417. An act to amend the Federal Register Act, as amended, so as to provide for the effectiveness and notice to the public of proclamations, orders, regulations, and other documents in a period following an attack or threatened attack upon the continental United States; and

H. R. 10899. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 415. An act for the relief of Ernest B. Sanders; and

S. 2984. An act for the relief of Col. John A. O'Keefe.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 19, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1973. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the annual report of the United States Soldiers' Home for the fiscal year 1955, and the report of annual inspection, 1955, of the Home by the Inspector General of the Army, pursuant to the act of Congress, approved March 3, 1883; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1974. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to increase the retired annuities of the civilian members of the teaching staffs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1975. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 544 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the bonds of United States marshals"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1976. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 23, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a letter report on Oregon Slough, Oreg., submitted in response to a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, adopted January 20, 1948, requesting a review of reports on Oregon Slough (Columbia River), Oreg., with respect to improving the unimproved portion of Oregon Slough to provide for a through channel; and a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted April 13, 1948, requesting a review of reports on Oregon Slough (North Portland Harbor), Oreg., with regard to extension of present and proposed channel improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

1977. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1978. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1979. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 14, 1956, the following bill was reported on June 15, 1956:

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1644. An act to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2362). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 1956, the following bill was reported on June 15, 1956:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 11742. A bill to extend and

amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2363). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted June 18, 1956*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 483. Resolution appointing a committee to investigate and report on certain matters; without amendment (Rept. No. 2364). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 542. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 11544, a bill to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2365). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1961. An act to provide for the conveyance of part of Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Colchester, Vt., to the State of Vermont, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2366). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. S. 3723. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey certain land in the county of Alameda, Calif., and to accept other land in exchange therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 2367). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3386. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt," approved July 28, 1955; with amendment (Rept. No. 2368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. S. 3214. An act to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under leases entered into for the provision of commercial recreational facilities at the Clark Hill Reservoir; without amendment (Rept. No. 2369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 225. Concurrent resolution to commemorate the quadricentennial anniversary of the establishment of the first settlement in Florida; without amendment (Rept. No. 2370). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 11010. A bill creating the Muscatine Bride Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2371). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7290. A bill to authorize female Reserve officers of the Army or Air Force appointed as nurses or women medical specialists to be members of the Army National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States, as appropriate; with amendment (Rept. No. 2372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9081. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army or his designee to convey a 2.915 acre tract of land situated about 6 miles south of the city of San Antonio, in Bexar County, Tex., to the State of Texas; with amendment (Rept. No. 2373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9506. A bill to provide for the conveyance of La Puntilla Military Reservation, San Juan, P. R., to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; with amendment (Rept. No. 2374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9699. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Oregon of the land and improvements known as the Clackamas National Guard target range, at Clackamas, Oreg., to be used for National Guard purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 10075. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the town of Bald Knob., Ark.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 10363. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Vero Beach, Fla.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2377). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 10479. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain land to the county of Galveston, Tex.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2378), Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 11520. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain property situated in the State of Maine to the town of Castine, Maine; without amendment (Rept. No. 2379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 11708. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. House Joint Resolution 451. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study and investigation of Indian education in the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2381). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 8047. A bill granting authority to the Secretary of the Army to renew the license of the Ira D. MacLachlan Post No. 3, the American Legion, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to use a certain parcel of land in Fort Brady Reservation; with amendment (Rept. No. 2382). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 9631. A bill to ratify and confirm the sale of certain real property of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 9578. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the reversionary interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Colorado; with amendment (Rept. No. 2384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 11798. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 11799. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 11800. A bill to amend the Meat Inspection Act (34 Stat. 1260, as amended) and the Tariff Act of 1930 (46 Stat. 689, sec. 306) to require compulsory inspection for wholesomeness of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 11801. A bill to validate overpayments of pay and allowances made to certain officers of the Army, Navy, Naval Reserve, and Air Force, while undergoing training at civilian hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11802. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, as amended, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits until July 1, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 11803. A bill to exempt certain shipments of farm produce from the tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 11804. A bill to encourage the development, marketing, and distribution of domestic fishery resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Commitee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 11805. A bill to enable Indian tribes to deprive members who neglect or abandon children of the right to any per capita payments due the minor from the tribe, and for other purposes; to the Commitee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 11806. A bill to establish on public lands of the United States a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of areas within this System by existing Federal agencies and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 11807. A bill to authorize negotiations with respect to a compact to provide for a definition or relocation of the common boundary between Arizona and California and for the appointment by the President of a Federal representative to the compact negotiations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 11808. A bill to authorize negotiations with respect to a compact to provide for a definition or relocation of the common boundary between Arizona and California

and for the appointment by the President of a Federal representative to the compact negotiations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 11809. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 11810. A bill to amend section 3231, title 18, United States Code to reaffirm the jurisdiction of State courts to enforce State statutes prohibiting subversive activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 11811. A bill to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment and underemployment in depressed industrial and rural areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 11812. A bill to authorize and direct the transfer of certain Federal property to the Government of American Samoa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 11813. A bill to reoffer for sale the Government-owned rubber producing facility at Louisville, Ky., known as Plancor No. 1207; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 11814. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif., area in order to insure the existence of an adequate water supply for naval installations and defense production plants in such area," approved October 11, 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 648. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate must concur in the making of any treaty by the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. Res. 543. Resolution extending the felicitations of the House of Representatives to the city of Orange, N. J., on the celebration of its sesquicentennial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 544. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held by the Committee on the Judiciary on civil rights; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. Res. 545. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate and study labor racketeering and related activities within labor unions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. Res. 546. Resolution providing for additional copies of House Document No. 234, 84th Congress, 1st session; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. Res. 547. Resolution authorizing the printing of the staff report entitled "State Taxation of Interstate Trucking and the Reciprocity Problem" as a House document, and providing for additional copies thereof; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 11815. A bill for the relief of Heskel Salman Shina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 11816. A bill for the relief of Chieko Shinohara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 11817. A bill for the relief of Jonas Beno Linker, Mrs. Estera Idesa Linker, and their minor child, Perla Ita Linker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 11818. A bill for the relief of Evelyne J. Norris, nee Guerin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 11819. A bill for the relief of Nicholas P. Alessi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 11820. A bill for the relief of Sumiko Nakamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 11821. A bill for the relief of Esterlee Hutzler Weinhoeppel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 11822. A bill for the relief of Tom R. Hickman and Nannie Conley and husband, Jack Conley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 11823. A bill for the relief of Hans Hirth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 11824. A bill for the relief of Rutilio Mendoza-Trejo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 11825. A bill for the relief of Richard L. Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 11826. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain surplus real property in Seattle, Wash., for educational use in conformity with section 203 (k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 11827. A bill for the relief of Yoe Chul Koo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 11828. A bill for the relief of Huriko Ishiyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R.11829. A bill for the relief of Sofia Kavadias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 11830. A bill for the relief of George Nakamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1141. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of 23 retired railroad workers of Renovo, Pa., urging passage of H. R. 9065 increasing benefits for retired railroad employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1142. By the SPEAKER: Petition of J. R. Lewis and others, Chicotah, Okla., requesting passage of H. R. 446 or H. R. 7981, pertaining to a national old-age pension; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1143. Also, petition of the secretary, Lithuanian American Council, Inc., Racine, Wis., relative to going on record as expressing gratitude to our Government for its steadfast adherence to those American principles which do not recognize the forcible annexation of any free nation and free peoples; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1144. Also, petition of the national commander, American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa., urging passage of H. R. 175; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1145. Also, petition of Dabi D. Pastor, Iloilo, Philippine Islands, urging enactment of a pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Better Watch Our Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for years, the government of Russia brutally oppressed its people. Its government was a blot upon civilization.

After a group of its leaders revolted, which we falsely assumed gave the people at least a degree of freedom, we in 1933 again recognized Russia as a nation, our own Senator Vandenberg casting the only dissenting vote. How right he was in his distrust of those who controlled that country has been proven by time and subsequent experience.

While we sent the "Polar Bears" to Siberia in World War I and were allied with Russia against the Kaiser, and subsequently, in World War II, were allied with Russia against Hitler, we now know that Russia was fighting for her own advancement rather than for a common purpose.

Whatever may be the belief and the purpose of Russia's people, those who control her have accepted and relied upon the belief that "there is no God, that religion is a fraud, that ministers and priests are hypocrites."

Since the end of World War II, Russia may accurately be characterized as the enemy of the rest of the world. She seeks world domination.

Through aid given during World War II and subsequently, Russia and communism have spread over much of the world's area—this in spite of the fact that we have spent billions to prevent it.

Are we now about to fall into another trap, just because Stalin—now dead and incapable of retaliation—and his atheistic, immoral, oppressive practices have been denounced by his former asssociates?

Holding out to us what some think is the olive branch of peace, the new regime has invited our Air Force Chief, General Twining, to Moscow.

The President has given his consent, but yesterday from his sickbed in Walter Reed Hospital, said that other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would not now accept a similar invitation.

Common courtesy would require us after Twining's visit—certainly after a visit by other top military men—to issue a return invitation for the Communists to visit us.

We are still spending billions to hold our so-called allies in line against the spread of communism. They are watching us.

Just what will happen to their already extremely weak support of our world position if they see our top military men breaking bread, drinking toasts with the Communist leaders?

It is all very well to hold out the hand of friendship to an enemy, but I never would permit one to get behind me.

If forced to meet one, I would like to first search him for his shoulder-holster gun, the knife in his bootleg, first sip the drink he proffered so I might be sure it was not poisoned.

Most assuredly I would expect a friend who lived in fear of communism to look upon my social visit to those who are oppressing him with not a little misgiving.

Sometimes we are judged by our associates. The nations we hope will resist communism may be confused when they see us acting "buddylike" with Russian rulers, their enemies.

Foreign Aid and the Taxpayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert the following statement which gives the results of some calculations I have made in an effort to relate the foreign-aid bill to my own district.

In reaching a decision as to whether or not to go along with the administration on their request for $4.9 billion in funds for foreign aid, I found it of considerable interest to apply this figure to my district. I felt it important to bring my constituents' attention to the amounts which are actually coming from their pocketbooks without their being given an actual opportunity to vote on the measure. As their Representative in Congress, I am very much aware of the fact that they are heavily burdened with tax and that I should extend my efforts wherever possible to ease that load.

Since coming to Congress I have fought consistently for cuts in foreign aid and this year for the first time voted for the bill after the cuts I worked for in committee were made. While I certainly do not base my decision to fight for cuts entirely on the basis of per capita cost to the taxpayer, I do feel it is of great importance.

In applying the 1956 foreign-aid figure to my State, I find that Michigan's share amounts to $277,340,000. My Eighth District, with a population of 333,277, would carry a portion of this request amounting to $14,504,882.

In my district, there were 104,995 voters who cast a ballot in the congressional election in 1954. It is surprising to realize that their share of the proposed $4.9 billion would amount to $138.14 each.

I believe the following figures on the 6 counties and 6 largest cities in the Eighth District are worthy of our study:

	Population	Share of 1956 foreign aid
Clinton County	31,195	$1,358,966.00
Gratiot County	33,429	1,453,261.60
Ionia County	38,158	1,658,493.20
Montcalm County	31,013	1,350,645.80
Saginaw County	153,515	6,683,894.00
Shiawassee County	45,967	1,999,621.40
8th district	333,277	14,504,882.00

Applying the same figures to our six largest cities:

City	Population	Share of 1956 foreign aid
Ionia	6,412	$278,626.85
Alma	8,341	361,861.74
Greenville	6,668	290,388.85
Owosso	15,948	696,968.74
St. Johns	4,954	215,803.80
Saginaw	92,918	4,043,755.87

Value of Research and Extension Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Benson, and all of his department heads each year come before our Appropriations Subcommittee of seven members with their request for funds for the Department of Agriculture for the coming year. This year, after lengthy hearings and careful evaluation of their requests, we appropriated about $800 million for the regular activities of the Department.

Today, I want to discuss the importance of the Research and Extension Service, and the great benefits it brings to agriculture.

As an illustration, our scientists are doing a tremendous job in protecting farm crops from the ravishes of insects by developing chemicals, and by many other means that help to protect the farmers' crops from insects and plant pests.

Not withstanding the constant fight made against insects and plant pests, the annual loss runs about $3½ billion.

Were it not for the constant fight we make to destroy or hold back these insects, the damage would run many times the above amount, and they would multiply to the point where they would almost destroy the agricultural production of this country. So you see, the $12 million annually we spend on this phase of research is paying the farmer, and the economy of our Nation tremendous dividends.

The purpose of one type of research in cooperation with the State departments of agriculture, the extension service, and the State experiment stations is to increase farm production.

One illustration, of the many that could be made, of the benefits of this research can be illustrated by referring to the development of hybrid corn, which development at the cost of only a few million dollars has increased the farmers' production of corn by 25 percent, and has increased their income on corn alone by over $750 million a year.

BRUCELLOSIS

The work of our scientists in the United States Department here cooperating with the State departments of agriculture and the extension service toward the eradication of brucellosis, is another outstanding example of the benefit of research with which every county agent and most farmers are familiar. It is estimated that the total loss to livestock farmers since 1930 to the present time has been over $2 billion. Our committee and the Congress in 1954 increased appropriations to $15 million a year up to 1956, and in this session of the Congress increased it to $20 million a year for another 2-year period.

This stepped-up program is bringing results. In 1930, 11 percent of the cattle was infected. Through the work of the United States Department of Agriculture, State experiment stations, county agents, and progressive farmers, infection has been reduced to 2½ percent, and with the additional funds to employ additional veterinarians, our purpose is to reduce it to the lowest possible minimum.

NEW USES FOR FARM PRODUCTS

Tremendous benefits have been brought to the farmers through the work of the research scientists in finding new markets and new uses for farm products.

A good illustration of the benefits of this work can be found in soybean production, and markets.

Since 1935, our total production of soybeans has increased from 49,000,000 bushels to 372,000,000 bushels this year, and has become one of the most profitable farm crops—yielding the farmers about $900,000,000 annually.

Since 1935, research scientists, by cross-breeding of soybean plants, developed new varieties with greater resistance to plant disease—all producing higher yields. On an average, these varieties now yield 20 percent more oil, and 10 percent more beans than the varieties they have replaced. There is a great demand for soybean oil at home and abroad, and for soybean meal, which demand has caused the price to rise from $2 a bushel at harvest time to over $3. At this time, when we have so much surplus wheat, corn, and other products, I would like to point out that this huge crop of soybeans is selling far above any support prices, and we are not plagued with any surpluses.

NEW USES FOR SOYBEANS

In addition to its great use for livestock feed, soybeans today provide 70 percent of all vegetable oils used in margarine and 54 percent of all vegetable shortenings.

Research has also opened an outlet for 221,000,000 pounds of soybean oil annually for use as drying oil products. Many new industrial products have been developed including: acids, special resins, and plasticizers made from soybeans. In plastics alone, the potential market for soybean oil is estimated at 200,000,000 pounds annually.

Industrial uses of both soybean oil and soybeans cover a long list from linoleums and tile, to glues and plastics.

In the field of printing inks and paper, ever-increasing amounts of soybean oil are being used, as well as in the making of such things as shotgun shells. A great field is open for the use of soybean products in the manufacturing of textile sizing, and automobile tire-cord sizing. These are only a few new uses of soybeans.

As a result of the continued work of research scientists, markets in industry are steadily being extended, which help to keep the demand for the farmers' soybeans strong in our domesic and export markets.

From July last year to February this year, 55 million bushels of soybeans were exported—40 percent more than a year before.

Out of the total production of soybeans last year, Illinois led all of the 48 States, with 77 million bushels.

POULTRY RESEARCH

Let me discuss briefly the value of research as applied to the poultry business.

You will recall not many years past, poultry, both chicken and turkey, was a luxury generally reserved for the Sunday dinner. Today, chicken and turkey are served daily in hundreds of thousands of restaurants and have become one of the leading meat menus throughout the country. Research scientists, by cross-breeding, have developed the broad-breasted turkey, a better meat-type chicken, and greater production in the number of eggs per hen. Through research has come better feed nutrition, producing heavier broilers in less time, on less feed—both a saving to the farmers. We have seen the broiler business expand from 43 million broilers in 1935 to over 1 billion broilers today. Better type birds are produced in shorter time with less feed, which has brought a great saving and more profit to the farmers.

Egg production per hen has been increased from 122 in 1935 to an average of 184 eggs per hen this year. The 200-eggs-a-year hen is becoming more common on the farms, and the research scientists have set their goal for a 240-eggs-a-year hen in the near future.

The poultry business, which was a fringe sideline for the farmers 20 years ago, has grown into a $3,450,000,000-a-year business—over 10 percent of the total gross national farm income today.

Mr. Speaker, may I close by saying that for the past 2 years we have substantially increased appropriations for Research and Extension Service. We feel that these appropriations in the hands of the research scientists in the Department of Agriculture, cooperating with the States' departments of agriculture, and the States' experiment stations are bringing vastly greater benefits to the farmers, generally, than any other like amounts we have appropriated for agriculture.

Mr. Dulles and the New York Democratic Delegation—The $64,000 Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, under date of March 15, 1956, a letter was sent in the name of the members of the New York State Democratic delegation to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles requesting that he meet with the signatories to that letter to discuss the then critical situation in the Middle East. This request was made because each of us felt that the interests of our combined constituencies, numbering over 8 million people, demanded that we speak directly to the Secretary on this subject of vital world concern.

Replies to our letter were sent out first on March 19 and then again on March 26, not from the Secretary, but, rather, from the Honorable Robert C. Hill, Assistant Secretary. The latter of those two letters informed us that "the Secretary of State regrets that he will be unable to meet with the Democratic members of the New York delegation in the immediate future. The reasons assigned for his inability to meet with us was that the Secretary was leaving for the White Sulphur Springs meeting of the Canadian-Mexican-United States heads of government, a meeting, which, if memory serves me correctly, lasted all of 3 days. The letter of March 26, 1956, ended with the suggestion that we meet with lower echelon officials of the State Department. Mr. Hill was immediately informed both by telephone, and by a letter of confirmation, that the members of the delegation desired to see the Secretary personally.

It is now the 18th day of June, Mr. Speaker, and we have not yet seen the Secretary of State. In our humble opinion, the situation in the Middle East has not as yet been solved, and there are many questions to be answered. We protest the patent discourtesy that has been shown us by the Secretary of State. He has agreed to see but three of our group and is adamant in his refusal to see the entire delegation. For some reason, certainly unknown to us, the Secretary feels that he can more easily ward off the opinions and interrogatories of 3 of our number rather than those of the delegation.

Mr. Dulles has taken a position with regard to the Middle East, one with which, to say the very least, we are not in complete agreement. If he is so sure of the course that he has charted, he should have no fear of discussing his views with the elected representatives of over 8 million people, for these representatives feel that their ideas and opinions are worthy of consideration. As the Secretary well knows, we of the New York Democratic delegation have taken an active interest in the Middle East situation and we are fairly conversant with the problems that exist. We seek merely the opportunity for a face-to-face discussion of this matter with Mr. Dulles. The result of such a meeting can be but twofold: one, the Secretary will be able to persuade us that his program and decisions on policy are in the best interests of our Nation and of the cause of world peace; and, two, that we will be able to bring to light information which will persuade the Secretary that there is merit to our position and that reconsideration of our present policies is called for.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the New York Democratic delegation have repeatedly issued joint statements on this proposed meeting. We have indicated that we would like an explanation, in detail, why arms are shipped to Saudi Arabia and Iraq by the United States, and why Israel is not accorded equal treatment. This is of great concern to us, especially with regard to Saudi Arabia, a country which Mr. Dulles, in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee earlier this year, included among those in the Middle East having a background of "centuries of animosities" toward the Jews. We would also like to know why our allies have been given an "all clear" by the State Department on their shipment of arms to Israel while at the same time Mr. Dulles forbids American arms shipments to that country. Finally, Mr. Speaker, we would like to know why our representatives in the United Nations acceded to the demands of the Arab States and of the Soviet Union on the resolution offered in that body by Great Britain.

These are some of the questions that require answers. Mr. Dulles is duty bound to inform us and the entire world of his intentions and his position. At the very least, whether we agree or disagree with his views, whether national policy toward the Middle East remains as it is or is reconsidered and reevaluated, the facts will be out in the open for all to see and for everyone to discuss, so that through the process of assimilated, collective wisdom, the proper, the moral, the decent, and the just solution may be chosen and followed. Only then can a decision be reached which will aid the cause of world peace and which will sell the story of the greatness of the democratic way of life. It is shameful for Mr. Dulles to be silent, for his silence, when added to his refusal to see the members of the New York Democratic delegation, can only lead to a concern for his motives and his courage.

Mr. Speaker, I am but 1 of the 16 Congressmen who has expressed this desire to meet with Mr. Dulles. I have set forth the story of what we seek and the shabby treatment that we have received at the Secretary's hands, because over 350,000 people who reside in the 20th

Congressional District of New York, which I have the honor to represent, are vitally interested in the situation in the Middle East; they are entitled to know the position that I, as their representative, have taken.

The Fine Record of REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk briefly about REA legislation in which the farmers in my district, and the Nation, have a special interest.

First, may I say at the opening of this session, many farmers being served with REA light and power were fearful that the REA recommendations of the Hoover Report to the Congress might have the support of this body, and the present administration.

Happily, and for the good of REA and the Nation, Ancher Nelsen, then Administrator of REA, after making a close study of the recommendations strongly opposed the proposal and pointed out why it was ill-advised, unworkable, and would, in fact, destroy REA in its future service to the Nation.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson and President Eisenhower agreed with Administrator Nelsen in his opposition. The Congress also is so strongly opposed to the Hoover report on REA, that, in my judgment, if called upon to vote, would defeat it by an overwhelming majority.

REA OFFICIALS MEET IN WASHINGTON

Officials of all the 27 REA cooperatives of Illinois came to Washington and held a dinner meeting here last March 26, which was attended by most Members of Congress from Illinois, for the purpose of expressing their opposition to the adoption of the Hoover report.

Attending that meeting from my district were: Mr. Joseph H. Heimann, manager of Clinton County Electric Co-op, of Breese, Ill.; Mr. H. G. Downey, manager, Tri-County Electric, Mount Vernon, Ill.; Mr. Elmo A. Cates, manager, Clay Electric Co-op, Flora, Ill.; Mr. O. J. Chaney, manager, Wayne-White Electric Co-op, Fairfield, Ill.; Mr. V. C. Kallal, manager, Southwestern Electric Co-op, Greenville, Ill.; Mr. Damon Williams, manager, Newton, Ill., and with these managers were one or more directors of each of these cooperatives.

Mr. Speaker, at that meeting the Members of Congress present from Illinois expressed their opposition, and, at that time, both Senator DIRKSEN and I expressed our opposition to the recommendations of the report, and told the officers of REA, in our judgment, "they need not worry because the Congress, which brought REA into being, and had nurtured its growth through the years, was so proud of the great work it had accomplished that they need not have any fear that we will permit its present organization to be handicapped, or changed in any way that would mar its fine record."

Mr. Speaker, may I say now, in my judgment, in view of the fine record of service this organization has made that no administration or Congress in the future will ever change, to any appreciable extent, the present organization setup of REA, which has proven its worth—not only to the farmers but to the entire economy of the Nation.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THIS YEAR

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, the officials of REA and all departments of Agriculture came before our committee in request for funds some weeks ago. We approved loan funds in the amount of $214 million for next year for REA, and $100 million for REA telephone loans. I have supported all the loan funds for the continued expansion and extension of REA in every session of the Congress for the past 14 years, which totals about $3 billion, including the amounts we appropriated in this session of the Congress.

All of these loan funds are being paid back by the members of the REA cooperatives, with interest, and I know of no big business in the Nation that has a finer record of business management than does the REA, which has been managed in the field, at the grassroots of every community, by progressive farmers who have given freely of their time in the interest of their communities and the Nation.

When I came to Congress, the REA organization was about 8 years old, and about 47 percent of the farmers had been reached with its service. Today, about 95 percent of the farmers of Illinois and the entire Nation are receiving light and power. Of all the billions of dollars I have helped to appropriate for various departments of Government for the past 14 years, none of it, in my judgment, has done so much to aid the farmers, to lift the drudgery from farm work, and from farm women, and build up the economic welfare of the country as has the money we have loaned to REA cooperatives.

Let me tell you how promptly they have met and paid their obligations, using Illinois as an illustration:

Up to January 1, 1956, the 27 cooperatives in Illinois have borrowed from the Government $84,510,000 upon which they have met the due date on every payment, and have paid back, to date $18,167,359. In addition to paying interest on the amount loaned, of $8,950,834. In fact, they are now $5,147,854 ahead of schedule on their loan payments.

In my congressional district, the five REA cooperatives at the close of 1955 had met every due date interest payment and have paid $6,600,000 on the principal, and have made advance payments on principal, before due date, in the amount of $2,400,000. I submit this is a fine record.

The record of REA throughout the United States is almost on a par with Illinois. At the present time, nationwide, the REA cooperatives, after paying back to the Government all of the payments as they came due with interest, have to their credit advance payments, before due, of over $80 million. About 700 of the 900 cooperatives have made such advance payments to the Government.

NELSEN MAKES FINE RECORD

Early in 1953, Ancher Nelsen, who helped to start REA in Minnesota, was appointed national Administrator of REA. During his tenure of office, he has brought to REA's management his practical experience plus executive ability in adopting sound business policies which accelerated its expansion. The results are that today the REA, through its cooperatives, has reached its greatest output of electric energy to the people served, and, most important, it should not be overlooked that the farmers are buying this power on a national average today of 2.8 cents per kilowatt-hour—which is the cheapest rate they have ever had.

The day that Administrator Ancher Nelsen came into office in 1953, there were backlog applications that had not been approved, or processed, totaling $220 million. By expediting the processing of these applications, and getting the power to the farmers the backlog has been reduced to about $90 million—which is the lowest backlog since 1947.

REA TELEPHONES

While the REA telephone organization is in its infancy, compared with REA light and power, rapid progress is being made in the development of REA telephone cooperatives.

The following figures will indicate the progress being made:

Fiscal year ended—	Number of loans to telephone co-op's	Amount of loans for the period
June 30, 1951	96	$38,000,000
June 30, 1952	53	42,000,000
June 30, 1953	103	43,000,000
First full fiscal year of Nelsen administration ended:		
June 30, 1954	150	74,000,000
June 30, 1955	147	53,000,000
June 30, 1956	[1] 200	[1] 80,000,000

[1] Estimated.

Mr. Speaker, these facts not only pay a tribute to the great benefits the REA has brought to the farmers and the economy of our Nation, but also pay a high tribute to the thousands of progressive farmers who have given freely of their time and ability as directors and officials of the 900 cooperatives in our country. They can depend upon us Members of Congress to continue to safeguard the interest of REA.

A Telegram to Drew Pearson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my

remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I insert therein copy of a telegram which I sent to Drew Pearson, columnist, last Saturday morning, June 16. The telegram is self-explanatory:

JUNE 16, 1956.

DREW PEARSON,
Washington, D. C.:

Was amazed to read in your column in this (Saturday June 16) morning's Washington Post your statement I had said President Eisenhower's operation was "the last straw," and that he should not be a candidate for reelection. Story completely incorrect and untrue, as I have never made any such statement, either publicly or privately. Instead, during the past week, I have expressed in public addresses, press releases, and radio reports, my confidence President Eisenhower will soon fully recover from his operation and will be a candidate for reelection. Furthermore, as a duly elected Delegate at Large from Ohio to the coming Republican Convention I shall cast my vote for Mr. Eisenhower's renomination. As a fellow newspaperman I regret your failure to check story with me before publication. Will appreciate correction of report as promptly as possible.

CLARENCE J. BROWN,
Member of Congress.

The Importance of the Civil Air Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me at the Civil Air Patrol congressional dinner recently:

This week the big news splashed in headlines across the country has been the squabble between the Air Force and the Army. Each service has clashed with the other over budgets and appropriations. Army has charged Air Force with demanding more and more from our defense appropriations, and Air Force counters that Army is attacking the established national policy of air-atomic power as our prime deterrent to aggression. Navy, too, has entered the picture through its demands for a larger role in our strategic airpower.

This inner-service bickering is a sorry situation and will benefit no one, unless perhaps, the Kremlin. No one blames our Nation's people for their keen interest in such a vital affair, for on the shoulders of our fine services rests the responsibility for safeguarding America's freedom. We in Oklahoma like our rivalry to be friendly, like the rivalry between Oklahoma University and Maryland, Texas, or Notre Dame. I think that the basic concept of air warfare and that of ground warfare clearly indicates the utilization of each force and the scope of their activities. We must recognize that in this air age, our Nation's prime salvation lies in airpower. I would call for an end to this arguing, this assassination of morale by charge and countercharge, because all branches are essential. Each branch feels it is the most important. The CAP is important, the Air Force is important. However we must not underestimate the value of the Army, Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard. They are most essential. The national situation is such that it requires the maximum coordinated efforts of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, Coast Guard, and CAP working as a team. I wish to pay tribute to Secretaries Brucker, Thomas, Quarles, Generals Pate, Spaatz, Agee, and Vice Admiral Richmond for the good work they have done. I feel they can work together.

While the conflict between these services has drawn the focus of the news mediums, there is another, a continuing tragic event taking place within the United States. It is something every bit as dramatic as the daily headlines and if allowed to continue, its ultimate effects will be devastating. You in Civil Air Patrol know all about it. As a matter of fact, everyone does. I am referring to a creeping paralysis which is slowly but surely crippling our military and commercial air potential. This paralysis is the lack of interest shown in aviation and other technical fields by our young people today.

Why then aren't the citizens of this great Nation alarmed at the situation? Are they developing an apathy toward the air age and its problems? Nothing would please the Soviet more than an indifferent attitude on our part toward airpower. Of course, the people I should be talking to about this situation are not here. You are gathered here tonight because you are sincere devotees of airpower and recognize what must be done if we are to survive. And, you are doing it. Of course, I mean educating the young people of our great Nation to this, the air age.

The fact that you undertake this great crusade as volunteers is the marvelous part of your program. Your time and your efforts given so freely to the young members of CAP is truly patriotic—a splendid display of devotion to freedom.

In Russia today, there exists a youth aviation education program quite similar to that of the Civil Air Patrol except for two important facts. Theirs is mandatory. We have freedom. Practically every school in the major cities of Russia includes this program as a part of their curriculum. No volunteers there. In addition, the Soviet makes flight training available to its youth at little or no cost. The result is very clear and alarming to thinking Americans. The U. S. S. R. is far outdistancing us in the number of graduate engineers, technicians, and student pilots. I've been there.

We are told that by 1958 Russia will meet and surpass our Air Force in terms of numbers of aircraft. The race is on for an intercontinental ballistic missile. At this time, there is no indication as to exactly which side will win that race, but in both the aircraft and missile fields we are taking strides to insure an outcome favorable to the United States.

While all of this is taking place, Russia is winning the personnel war, having a lopsided advantage over this country. And let me assure you that the final winner of this race will have all the odds in his favor in any future war. Where, then, does the United States stand in this silent race for survival? All we know is that, in a general sort of a way, we are far behind. Almost all that is being done to maintain any interest in aviation among young people today is being done by CAP and the Active Reserve. While there may be arguments churning up over various phases of Armed Forces activities, there may be no cause for argument over the fact that we must do more to interest the teen-ager in the advantages of a career in aviation.

There was, and not too long ago, a time when a youngster could go to the local airport, walk up to an airplane—touch it and see what it was like, and if he had a dollar saved up he could get the pilot to take him for a ride over his town. Saturdays and Sundays used to find local airports well populated with greasy-faced kids—working on aircraft engines, re-covering wings, and doing the other things necessary to the maintenance of small airplanes. This was their hobby and while they worked at it, they also learned. Most of those lads answered the call when World War II came and served admirably in the war theaters of Europe and the South Pacific. In other words, when the emergency struck, we had a pool of qualified young people who were ready, with a minimum of training, to maintain and fly our planes. We had the advantage of time, too. We were able to train hundreds of thousands of other young men in this relatively new business of flying.

In any future war, we will not be so fortunate. Time will be our enemy rather than our ally. Those who will fly our fighters and bombers will have had previous training, so any victory will be contingent upon having a ready reservoir of trained personnel.

But suppose we do not have a next war to worry about? Why, then, should we bother to develop aviation among our young people? One reason is because the aviation industry is a growing thing. The operation of airlines demands control-tower operators, ramp attendants, stewardesses, weather technicians, mechanics, and hundreds of types of highly specialized personnel. Industry, too, is learning to depend heavily upon the private airplane. Thousands of companies, both large and small, now have their own planes which play a large part in the daily transaction of their business. This trend, too, is demanding an ever-increasing supply of aviation-minded people to fill its needs. It is not enough for us to sit here tonight nodding our heads in agreement that something must be done about the problem. I am very much aware that on the shoulders of CAP rests this staggering burden—this task of motivating our youth, and I say that if any volunteer organization ever earned a "well done," it is the Civil Air Patrol. Your mission is never completed. Your mission grows because the air age plays an increasingly important part in our daily lives through both the commercial and the military airplane.

Even more perplexing is the siphoning off by industry of highly trained technicians from the Armed Forces. Quite literally, the aircraft industry today competes directly with the Air Force, offering attractive salaries and benefits to qualified personnel which no branch of the military can match. This competition will continue until we are able to increase the number of scientists, engineers, and designers available each year at the close of the college term to take responsible positions in industry. When this goal is met, then and only then will our Armed Forces be free from the unhappy position of being in competition with industry. For, as the situation now exists, it is nothing but a vicious circle. Industry draws personnel from the military to produce equipment for the military which is then shorthanded due to a loss of personnel. Besides the work which you members of CAP do in your various assignments let me urge you also to be missionaries. Certainly you contact many young people whose minds are not yet made up about careers which they wish to follow. Here then is an opportunity for you to help in this vital effort. Talk to them—try to make them see the need for more specialized personnel. And, if you are unable to reach them with this appeal, point out the lucrative advantage of such careers, for today specially trained individuals can practically

"write their own ticket" as the old cliché goes.

Teen-agers are responsive to leadership. As a result of your efforts to train and orient them in aviation, these young people will grow to understand the importance of both technology and airpower. Never for one moment doubt the value of the work you are doing for these young Americans. The spirit with which you tackle this tremendous task is the same spirit which inspired George Washington at Valley Forge and Gen. Anthony McAuliffe at Bastogne when he responded to the German's surrender demands with the now-famous word "Nuts." This is Americanism at its best.

In this dedicated organization you are dealing with a power more tremendous, more potent than the greatest nuclear device which has been or ever will be perfected—you are directing and developing youth power which today stands as the monumental hope for a bright tomorrow.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am proud of the Civil Air Patrol. I am proud of each and every one of you for your unselfish devotion in helping this great country. You are serving America nobly in your continuing efforts to keep our Nation first in aviation.

The spirit of Civil Air Patrol also represents the finest quality of Americanism.

Textile Mills Curtail Due to Japanese Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, the textile industry of this country continues to plead for relief from the unfair competition of Japanese fabrics made at an average wage rate of 13½ cents per hour.

When Congress passed H. R. 1, in July 1955, and the GATT agreements were announced in August, American textile executives declared it would soon be impossible for them to operate at a profit if this country was to be flooded with cheaply made foreign textiles. These complaints did not seem to impress the present administration, since both President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles consistently refused to approve quota limitations on low priced Japanese textiles. Consequently, the importation of these goods is increasing by leaps and bounds, and thus, seriously damaging our entire textile industry. Undisputed evidence of this unfair competition is contained in a recent statement of William F. Sullivan, secretary of the Northern Textile Association. Mr. Sullivan says that imports of cotton clothes from Japan during the first quarter of 1956 "have increased 183 percent over the corresponding quarter a year ago." There are many similar instances of like injury. As a result of this unjust discrimination our domestic textile manufacturers and laborers are suffering badly and soon will suffer much more unless the Government changes its policy and gives a reasonable amount of protection to this vital industry. The President has authority to stop this influx of foreign textiles, made by cheap labor, simply by setting up quota limitations under the provisions of section 22 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act.

Cotton mills throughout the country are curtailing because of cutthroat Japanese goods. J. P. Stevens & Co., one of the largest manufacturers in the business, last month cut its gingham and broadcloth production from a 6-day to a 5-day week; Reigen Textile Mills, Ware Shoals, S. C., recently laid off 82 workers because it was forced to cut back its production of pillow cases; Kendall Mills, in May, cut its broadcloth and poplin production from a 6-day to a 5-day week; Consolidated Textile Co. announced on June 7 from New York that it was shutting down 2 plants—1 in New England and 1 in the South—because of Japanese competition. On June 5, Senator FREDERICK G. PAYNE, Republican, of Maine, wrote President Eisenhower that the administration's refusal to protect the American textile industry from foreign textile imports may defeat the administration's national trade policy. Senator PAYNE urged the President to take prompt action due to the distress in our domestic textile industry.

Not only has production been cut back but huge expansion programs have also been postponed or abandoned. Approximately 1 year ago Col. Elliot W. Springs, president of the Springs Cotton Mills in South Carolina, announced a $10 million expansion program. But under prevailing conditions in the textile industry there will be no expansion by this company, and on the contrary 12,000 persons presently employed by the Springs Mills are now working only 5 days a week, whereas they formerly worked 6 days.

The following news report of an interview with Colonel Springs gives a vivid picture of present conditions in the American textile industry:

JAPANESE THROAT CUTTING BLAMED: SPRINGS CURTAILS WORK, POSTPONES HUGE EXPANSION

COLUMBIA, June 6.—Postponement of a $10 million expansion program at Springs Mills, Chester, and curtailment from a 6-day to a 5-day week in all Springs Mills because of Japanese throat cutting, was announced today by Col. Elliot W. Springs, president of the mills.

The Springs Mills, heretofore, have opened steadily on a 6-day basis and the reduction to a 5-day week, already in effect, amounts actually to a 12-hour per week pay loss to employees because the sixth day carried time and a half wages. More than 12,000 persons are employed by Springs Mills.

The Springs mills are the largest makers of sheeting in the world. The Springs chain is composed of seven mills with 740,000 spindles. There are only about 19 million spindles in the country. The company is now busy covering up 55,000 spindles in the retrenchment program.

The expansion program which has postponed was for $10 million.

Colonel Springs' reasons are outlined in the text of the following letter to W. E. Wrenn, president of the Chester Chamber of Commerce.

"I wrote you on February 24th that, due to Japanese competition, we had to change our balance and this gave us a surplus of yarn. Therefore, we either had to curtaill our production or install additional looms. We don't like to curtail."

WOULD ENLARGE

"After your chamber offered us every cooperation to put the looms in Chester, I wrote you that I would consider enlarging the Eureka plant if I could get permission from the Seaboard to encroach on their property; that I would consider enlarging Springsteen if something could be done about city taxes, and Gayle if something were done about Japanese throat cutting.

"Since that time, the Japanese situation, instead of improving, has deteriorated considerably. They are gaining on us every day. We gave them new machinery as reparations for Pearl Harbor, and the CCC sells them the same cotton I buy at 10 cents a pound less. We have always been able to meet competition without tears, but, we can't lick the State Department, the Secretary of Agriculture, GATT, OTC and the 64 billion dollar give-away-program while Congress twists our arm.

"Therefore, we have been forced to revise our plans and, instead of expanding, we are going to have to curtail. It is with regret that I tell you reluctantly the Springs Cotton Mills' operations will be reduced indefinitely, and that we will have to postpone our plans for installing additional looms. By 'indefinitely,' I mean until my customers find out that all that is yellow is not gold, or the public decides our textile industry is not part of foreign aid. If this meets with the approval of the people of Chester, I suggest they write President Eisenhower and tell him how much they love Secretary Dulles."

Address of Hon. Ralph Harvey, of Indiana, at Muncie, Ind., Saturday, June 16, 1956, at the State Convention of AMVETS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address delivered on June 16, 1956, at the State Convention of AMVETS, in Muncie, Ind., by my colleague and good friend, the able Representative from the 10th District of Indiana, the Honorable RALPH HARVEY:

It is a real pleasure to be here today. Organizations such as yours, I believe, are more widely admired than some realize.

As war veterans in civilian life, you are properly concerned with the welfare of veterans and their kin; but AMVETS, to their credit, have demonstrated an alert interest in all they share with others—the progress of the home community, the prosperity of State and Nation, and profoundly, the peace of the world.

I am sure I speak for more than one in congratulating you upon the scope of your

sympathies, the division of your interests. By word and deed you have made evident the resolve that while veterans are not to be forgotten, a just regard of their fellow Americans shall be maintained. The goals you seek are intelligently conceived to be helpful to some without being hurtful to others.

In considering current veterans' legislation, I should like to read a letter that came to my desk a few days ago. It omits mention of veterans and their programs, but it pointedly touches upon some of the many public problems confronting us all, veterans included.

This letter, whose author might have been your wife or mine, came in response to a public opinion questionnaire. It says:

"DEAR MR. HARVEY: At risk of seeming completely negative, I must vote 'no' to proposals which will spend more money. We must stop somewhere, and I fail to see any benefits received from all the wild spending we have done. Foreign aid? The time should be run out now. Roads and highways? Go a little safer and more slowly on the ones we have. Arms? Yes; but use some sensible spending.

"As for NATO, I believe Congress should assume the duties that NATO wants. I guess I am a contrary female (gentlemen, at this point it is obvious the writer couldn't be your wife or mine) but I am tired of working and taking home less than three-fourths of my pay. Can't we increase the personal exemptions of taxpayers? Thank you. I respect your efforts and service very much. Under Eisenhower, at least we have peace."

The lady, bless her, feels as many do. But I repeat that word "feels" with emphasis, because she is dealing with large orders—foreign aid, highways, NATO, and guided missiles. The real point at issue, as I see it, is not how we feel; it's the more soul-searching challenge of what we know, and if knowing, what we can do about it.

Let's start in again at the beginning and try to think the letter through aloud.

The writer would have us vote "no" on proposals which involve the spending of more money. Assuredly it will be a happy day when we privately or publicly can have what we want, and all we want, for nothing. More realistically it can be said that the cost of government to our people is pretty faithfully reflected by the demands of the people.

I am reasonably certain the writer would not choose to deny herself or her neighbors the protection of a policeman, a fireman, or a building inspector. They are but a few of the necessary public servants whose tools and wages must be provided through the collection of local taxes.

Our writer, it may be assumed, would not ask Indiana schoolteachers to go payless, nor would she leave streets and roads to become impassable, our penal and benevolent institutions to rot away. Their maintenance and improvement represent but a part of the day-to-day functions of State government.

Finally, I am prone to believe that the writer, despite an understandable desire to retain more of her pay, would not subscribe to the proposition that we substantially cut down our Army, Navy, and Air Force. Yet the implementing of these and all they entail by way of national security accounts for the spending of 70 cents of every dollar collected in Federal taxes.

Our correspondent, to be fair, has in mind proposals of new spending, including those she enumerated, so let us strive to take an unbiased view of them.

There shall be no foreign aid, none at all. A few days ago I voted against foreign aid, as did many of my House colleagues, both Democratic and Republican. But I voted, as did most others, in protest to the amount and direction of foreign aid, not to its existence. I could never vote against every dollar of United States foreign aid so long as there remains loose in this world a conspiracy to destroy the very freedoms for which you men fought. And whatever the Russian threat to the future of this country and its principles, I could not in good conscience join those who contend that the way for us to deal with the rest of the world is to withdraw from it. Our withdrawal—unless I misread the doctrines of international communism—would set free in many parts of the earth such a frankenstein of terror, treason, and murder as to wipe out the last trace of mankind's yearning for liberty, decency, and justice.

The letter suggests a passive solution of our highway problems. Just let them multiply. Make all land-bound vehicles travel more slowly; take it easy and our existing roads will suffice. Speed, we must admit, is often a killer, but speed in the movement of food to hungry cities, steel to waiting factories, and to most of us a thousand and one necessities of present-day living—for them, speed can be essential. Our error, it seems more likely, has been that of producing and affording more cars than can be safely accommodated on public thoroughfares, and the remedy for more cars and more trucks is surely more roads. We can debate the number of roads, the type of roads, and the cost of the use of them, but we can scarcely hope to outlaw the manufacture of motor-driven vehicles and put our people back into the safer transportation age of the horse and buggy.

The letter, you will recall, urged sensible spending on arms, commonsense investment in our military might. I certainly am for that, and so are you. There is one hitch. Who, even among the expert, can tell us what constitutes sensible spending for guns, ships, bombers, and rockets? I know of no single authority, and because he, too, cannot be sure of the answer, the President of the United States is a modest and sometimes worried Commander in Chief. Sensible spending by all means, but I can tell the lady in behalf of all officials in Washington: If ahead of us are unbroken years of peace, then we are wasting tax moneys; if war in all its atomic fury should come tomorrow, then the few who survive in this vast land can vouch that we spent too little.

The writer would have Congress assume the duties of NATO. I believe Congress has only the constitutional authority to help govern the American people. It can't legislate for the British, the French, the Scandinavians, or the West Germans. NATO, of course, as some judge the United Nations, may be futile, a waste of our time and substance. Here again, however, I am sure that all in Congress, commended by the President, would vote yet tonight to withdraw from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, if only we could be assured on two counts:

One, that Russia has no ambitions to rule any but the Russian people, and two, that a Russian pledge can be honored under any circumstances. You may be sure I am not here to preach on communism, but I pray we may all be spared from the day on which those responsible for America's survival are charmed into inertia by the sweetness of the Soviet smile.

The letter's last question deserves an answer: Can't we increase the personal exemptions of taxpayers? Why not? If Congress so votes, it is done. The President might veto such a measure, but even then if taxpayers insist, Congress will oblige. But into the bargain must go some other considerations: An unbalanced budget, deficit spending, the hiking of other taxes, or further increases in the public debt. A personal tax exemption increase of $100 means a Treasury loss of some $2 billion. Vote-seeking candidates may make it sound simple and justified, but those who take their responsibilities more seriously know that tax cutting now is the sure path to more headaches tomorrow, headaches that would multiply for all taxpayers if the present high level of prosperity should slip.

Let us, to conclude with the letter, be honest in advising the writer that she is not a contrary female. It is more pleasant to regard her for what she surely is, a good and worthwhile citizen. She has expressed her opinions and if they should crystalize into the conviction of many citizens, then our Government is such that her wishes will prevail. Whatever faults beset Washington, indifference to the will of the American voter is not one of them.

One week ago yesterday, as many of you know, veterans' legislation began to loom large in the closing days of the 84th Congress. While a few veterans' benefit bills had been passed into law earlier, and attention was divided among many others, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs took unprecedented action. It voted out H. R. 7886, and the significance of the omnibus bill is becoming apparent. Its fate in Washington is left to your conjecture.

In its main provisions, H. R. 7886, now awaiting the disposition of the House Committee on Rules, calls for the following:

1. The American Legion's plan for $105 in monthly pension to all needy veterans at the age of 65.

2. The disabled American veterans' plan to increase payments for service-connected disabilities by 10 to 15 percent.

3. An increase in Spanish War widows' pensions to $75 a month.

4. An increase in the basic pension rate for widows of both World Wars and of Korea to $75 a month.

5. A Veterans of Foreign Wars proposal for a 20-percent pension premium for those who served overseas.

6. An amendment to give World War II and Korea widows the more liberal compensation now provided widows of World War I veterans.

7. An increase in veterans' burial allowance from $150 to $200.

The estimated first-year cost of the legislation would be $1,400,000,000. In succeeding years, it would rise rapidly.

The proposal, as pending, is subject now to public debate. I trust that you, both as veterans and taxpayers, will make your voice heard in the controversy at hand.

Before concluding, I wish to offer this assurance to veterans and their loved ones: During my time in Congress, it has become unmistakably clear to me that the American people mean to stand by those who have defended them in time of war. They are as one in their belief that the survivors of those lost in battle, as well as those who are themselves disabled in service, should be generously provided for; that those who leave the security of home and livelihood to answer the call of duty shall be afforded every opportunity to readjust to civilian life, retain their job rights and seniority, and receive material assistance in obtaining for themselves and their dependents an education, a business, or a home. They want no man or woman who marched under the colors to be left in his or her declining years destitute, demoralized, discarded. They are not merely prepared to pay their part of the terrible cost of war when it is upon us, but through the years that follow, they want the Nation's defenders to share and share fully in the Nation's progress and prosperity. Their lasting gratitude to those who sacrifice most is the finest guaranty of our future—a guaranty that to Americans young and old, their country, and its flag are worth fighting for.

Thank you.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 19, 1956

Rev. Theodore Henry Palmquist, D. D., minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, in whose mind the past and the future meet on this very day, in this very place, we offer our thanks for all who have served their day well and, therefore, the future well. May we never lightly esteem what they obtained at a great price.

Deliver us from the foolishness of impatience, the dictatorship of the nonessential, and the emptiness of the hurried life. Help us always to differ without becoming difficult; to have convictions without becoming dogmatic.

Open our eyes to the evils among us that we so often condemn in others; the failures of genuine democracy in our personal attitude and social institutions; a dangerous pride—"If, drunk with sight of power, we loose wild tongues that have not Thee in awe."

Make us pioneers of a better world, mankind organized for peaceful progress, not for mutual slaughter. And if the way is long—and it will be long—keep our faith strong as was the faith of our fathers.

Bless our homes and our loved ones. Bless the President of the United States of America. May he continue on the road to physical recovery. Come down now by a secret passage and through a private door and enter each life here with wisdom and courage. We ask it all in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 18, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1146. An act to further amend section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, relating to fees of agents, attorneys, and representatives;

S. 2202. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an additional contract with the Yuma County Water Users' Association with respect to payment of construction charges on the valley division, Yuma reclamation project, Arizona, and for other purposes;

S. 3265. An act to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for filing vessel utilization and performance reports by operators of vessels in the foreign commerce of the United States;

S. 3581. An act to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service;

S. 3778. An act to amend the act for the protection of walruses; and

S. 3857. An act to clarify section 1103 (d) of title XI (Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 2512. An act to amend the act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving in such forces; and

S. 3076. An act to provide for a continuing survey and special studies of sickness and disability in the United States, and for periodic reports of the results thereof, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1614. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids," title 21, United States Code, section 321c; and

S. 3149. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to permit air carriers to grant free or reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4652. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain property to the Panama Canal Company, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5147. An act to change the distribution of Coast and Geodetic Survey charts;

H. R. 5712. An act to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Pueblos of Zia and Jemez, a part of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant and a small area of public domain adjacent thereto;

H. R. 5838. An act to provide that payments be made to certain members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians as reimbursement for damages suffered as the result of the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range;

H. R. 6025. An act to amend the shipping laws, to prohibit the operation in the coastwise trade of vessels rebuilt outside the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6245. An act to authorize the Panama Canal Company to convey to the Department of State an improved site in Colon, Republic of Panama;

H. R. 6501. An act to amend the act of July 17, 1914, to permit the disposal of certain reserve mineral deposits under the mining laws of the United States;

H. R. 6850. An act to create an academic advisory board for the United States Merchant Marine Academy;

H. R. 7811. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions relative to the registration of architects and professional engineers, and the regulation of their practice;

H. R. 9137. An act to waive section 142, of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the United States District Court for the western district of North Carolina holding court at Bryson City, N. C.;

H. R. 9500. An act to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1957;

H. R. 9742. An act to provide for the protection of the Okefenokee National Refuge, Georgia, against damage from fire and drought;

H. R. 9828. An act to transfer 600 acres of public domain to the Kanosh Band of Indians, Utah;

H. R. 9974. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the cutting of timber, the manufacture and sale of lumber, and the preservation of the forests on the Menominee Indian Reservation in the State of Wisconsin," approved March 28, 1908, as amended;

H. R. 10504. An act to allow a homesteader settling on unsurveyed public land in Alaska to make single final proof prior to survey of the lands;

H. R. 10535. An act to include the present area of Zion National Monument within Zion National Park, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10946. An act to provide for the disposition of surplus personal property to the Territorial government of Alaska until December 31, 1958;

H. R. 10949. An act to amend section 633 of title 28, United States Code, prescribing fees of United States commissioners;

H. R. 10964. An act to provide for municipal use of storage water in Benbrook Dam, Tex.;

H. R. 11010. An act creating the Muscatine Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill.;

H. R. 11027. An act to amend title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for experimental operation and testing of vessels owned by the United States;

H. R. 11127. An act to clarify the law relating to the grant of certain public lands to the States for school purposes;

H. R. 11402. An act to extend the existing application of the Temporary Promotion Act of 1941, as amended, to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11499. An act to amend the Texas City Disaster Claims Act;

H. R. 11522. An act to implement section 25 (b) of the Organic Act of Guam by carrying out the recommendations of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11558. An act to relinquish any right, title, and interest which the United States may have in and to certain land located in Forrest County, Miss., in order to clear the title to such land; and

H. R. 11611. An act to provide for the establishment of the Pea Ridge National Military Park, in the State of Arkansas.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 1410. An act for the relief of Giovanna Scano;

H. R. 2709. An act for the relief of the estate of Rene Weil;

H. R. 3373. An act for the relief of Mrs. Zella K. Thissell;

H. R. 5453. An act for the relief of the estate of Robert Bradford Bickerstaff;

H. R. 6143. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Codes of 1939 and 1954, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6742. An act for the relief of Rumiko Fujiki Kirkpatrick;

H. R. 6955. An act for the relief of Inna Hokker Grade;

H. R. 7373. An act for the relief of Eugene G. Aretz;

H. R. 8041. An act for the relief of Clyde R. Stevens;

H. R. 8867. An act for the relief of the estate of F. M. Bryson;

H. R. 9285. An act to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, so as to extend for 2 additional years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury;

H. R. 11205. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Roy Cowan and others arising by reason of the flooding of land in the vicinity of Lake Alice, N. Dak.; and

H. J. Res. 609. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 4652. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain property to the Panama Canal Company, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5147. An act to change the distribution of Coast and Geodetic Survey charts;

H. R. 6025. An act to amend the shipping laws, to prohibit the operation in the coastwise trade of vessels rebuilt outside the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6245. An act to authorize the Panama Canal Company to convey to the Department of State an improved site in Colon, Republic of Panama;

H. R. 6850. An act to create an academic advisory board for the United States Merchant Marine Academy;

H. R. 7811. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions relative to the registration of architects and professional engineers, and the regulation of their practice;

H. R. 9742. An act to provide for the protection of the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge, Ga., against damage from fire and drought;

H. R. 11027. An act to amend title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for experimental operation and testing of vessels owned by the United States; and

H. R. 11402. An act to extend the existing application of the Temporary Promotion Act of 1941, as amended, to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5712. An act to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Pueblos of Zia and Jemez a part of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant and a small area of public domain adjacent thereto; placed on the calendar.

H. R. 5838. An act to provide that payments be made to certain members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians as reimbursement for damages suffered as the result of the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range;

H. R. 6501. An act to amend the act of July 17, 1914, to permit the disposal of certain reserve mineral deposits under the mining laws of the United States;

H. R. 9828. An act to transfer 600 acres of public domain to the Kanosh Band of Indians, Utah;

H. R. 9974. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the cutting of timber, the manufacture and sale of lumber, and the preservation of the forests on the Menominee Indian Reservation in the State of Wisconsin," approved March 28, 1908, as amended;

H. R. 10504. An act to allow a homesteader settling on unsurveyed public land in Alaska to make single final proof prior to survey of the lands;

H. R. 10535. An act to include the present area of Zion National Monument within Zion National Park, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10946. An act to provide for the disposition of surplus personal property to the Territorial government of Alaska until December 31, 1958;

H. R. 11127. An act to clarify the law relating to the grant of certain public lands to the States for school purposes;

H. R. 11522. An act to implement section 25 (b) of the Organic Act of Guam by carrying out the recommendations of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11558. An act to relinquish any right, title, and interest which the United States may have in and to certain land located in Forrest County, Miss., in order to clear the title to such land; and

H. R. 11611. An act to provide for the establishment of the Pea Ridge National Military Park, in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 9137. An act to waive section 142, of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina holding court at Bryson City, N. C.;

H. R. 10949. An act to amend section 633 of title 28, United States Code, prescribing fees of United States commissioners; and

H. R. 11499. An act to amend the Texas City Disaster Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9500. An act to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1957; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 10964. An act to provide for municipal use of storage water in Benbrook Dam, Tex.;

H. R. 11010. An act creating the Muscatine Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations and the Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Committee on Armed Services were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection with the transaction of the routine morning business be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the executive business, to act on the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and forty-nine postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Willard Frank Libby, of Illinois, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nomination today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT SECURITY TO FILE FINAL REPORT

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Government Security, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the time for that Commission to file its final report (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF CODE, RELATING TO FEES OF UNITED STATES MARSHALS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to fees of United States marshals (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF WATER AND LAND RESOURCES, ARKANSAS-WHITE-RED RIVER BASINS

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the conservation and development of the water and related land resources of the Arkansas-White-Red River Basins (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON LAND AND WATER RESOURCES, NEW ENGLAND-NEW YORK REGION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the land and water resources of the New England-New York region (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1956—RESOLUTION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, protesting against the enactment of House bill 7225, the Social Security Act amendments of 1956, which was ordered to lie on the table.

RESOLUTIONS OF AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by the American Public Power Association, at their 13th annual convention, in Los Angeles, Calif., on April 26, 1956.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION ADOPTED AT 13TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, APRIL 26, 1956, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

RESOLUTION 1

Supporting application of Administrative Procedure Act to Federal power marketing

Whereas the Federal Administrative Procedure Act of 1947 is designed to protect the public from arbitrary conduct of Federal officers and agencies and provides for the right of public notice, public hearings, and court review; and

Whereas the sale of federally generated electric power is exempt from the protection of the Administrative Procedure Act; and

Whereas the Federal Power Commission and the Department of the Interior have in numerous instances made arbitrary decisions from which there has been available no recourse for hearings or court review: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association urges Congress to amend the Administrative Procedure Act so as to make its protective features applicable to the marketing of electricity by the Department of the Interior and the setting of rates and cost allocations by the Federal Power Commission.

RESOLUTION 2

Supporting reimbursement for relocation of utility facilities

Whereas a continuing program of Federal and State highway building makes it necessary to remove and relocate consumer-owned electric system facilities; and

Whereas the costs of moving and changing such facilities have been in the past absorbed by consumer-owned agencies involved; and

Whereas a hardship is often placed upon the consumer-owned agencies in absorbing these costs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association recommends that the Congress enact legislation so that funds are provided to reimburse the consumer-owned electric systems for the expense of relocation of their facilities, when such action is made necessary by the Federal-aid highway building program.

RESOLUTION 3

Supporting integration of Trinity River Division in Central Valley project

Whereas it is an established and fundamental policy of the American Public Power Association to encourage financially feasible multiple-purpose development of water resources by the United States and other public agencies and to make electric power incidental thereto available at the lowest possible cost to the ultimate consumer and by means of public distribution systems; and

Whereas the Central Valley project has been operating since 1944 and includes power producing features at Shasta, Keswick, Folsom, and Nimbus Dams, including an extensive transmission system for wholesale marketing of power, and the Trinity River division has been added to the project and authorized by the Congress in accordance with the act of August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 719), and construction of the authorized works is now underway; and

Whereas the authorizing act requires the Secretary of the Interior to report to the Congress on the possibility of selling the falling water available from the Trinity development to a non-Federal agency; and

Whereas it now appears certain that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., the second largest electric utility in the United States which has a virtual monopoly on the generating and distribution of power in northern and central California, is the only non-Federal agency in a position to buy Trinity falling water, and is the only agency which has made an offer to purchase said falling water; and

Whereas the sale of Trinity falling water to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. would tend to further strengthen that company's monopoly by removing from competition a large block of power which under existing reclamation law would be available for sale to numerous public agencies in the area; and

Whereas, the sale of Trinity falling water to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. would deprive the ultimate consumer of lower power rates in a manner contrary to the policies and principles of this association; and

Whereas the sale of Trinity falling water to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. would have the effect of handing over to a private utility for private gain a natural resource of tremendous value which belongs to all of the people; and

Whereas the addition of Trinity River power output to the Central Valley project will provide a maximum amount of low-cost power for operation of project irrigation pumping plants with attendant benefits to the farmers of the Central Valley: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association, in recognition of its longstanding interest in Federal resources development and the importance of making power available to the ultimate consumer at the lowest possible cost, does hereby respectfully request the Congress of the United States to reject any proposal by the Secretary of the Interior and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for the sale of Trinity falling water; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be requested to direct the Secretary of the Interior to integrate the Trinity power supplies with power now being developed at Shasta Dam and by other features of the Central Valley project to achieve the maximum efficiency of the project power system and direct the Secretary to construct all generation and transmission facilities necessary to make Central Valley project power available in accordance with the well-established and time-proven preference policies under the existing Reclamation Law.

RESOLUTION 4

Endorsing self-financing plans for TVA

Whereas the Congress, through the establishment of the Tennessee Valley Authority, has caused the United States Government to be the source of power supply for the Tennessee Valley service area, including the huge needs of the United States Government itself for large defense power in this area, presently requiring in excess of 50 percent of the entire output of the TVA, with resulting large benefits in the cost of electric power to the Government for such national defense power needs, and has heretofore made annual appropriations for the purpose of providing needed generating and transmission power facilities; and

Whereas, in addition to the huge savings in the United States Government power costs for its national-defense power needs, a return to the United States Government averaging 4 percent has been realized upon such appropriations, which, under an act of Congress, are being repaid by TVA to the Government upon a schedule imposed by the Congress, with said payments made by TVA as of now being ahead of such schedule; and

Whereas the TVA has submitted to the Bureau of the Budget a proposed plan whereby TVA can issue its own revenue bonds for such power generating and transmission needs, not to be a direct Government obligation, but only one of the TVA itself; and

Whereas such proposed self-financing plans for TVA by the means of bonds have been embodied in the so-called Kerr and Davis-Jones bills now being considered by the United States Senate and Congress of the Government; and

Whereas the said Kerr and Davis-Jones bills have had widespread approval throughout the TVA service area, and particularly by the executive board of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, a group 95 percent representative of the 150 municipalities and cooperatives which distribute TVA power in the area; and

Whereas it is of the utmost importance to the power needs of the Tennessee Valley service area that prompt action be had by the Senate and Congress upon the said Kerr and Davis-Jones bills providing self-financing for the TVA: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association, whose officials have testified urging the passage of these bills before the appropriate congressional committees, hereby urges that the Senate and Congress speedily enact the bills providing for self-financing plans of the TVA into law.

RESOLUTION 5

Opposing the weakening of the Holding Company Act

Whereas Senate bill 2643 and House bills 6294 and 7554 have been introduced in the United States Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, to amend the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 to remove automatically from the jurisdiction of the Securities and Exchange Commission under that act (1) atomic reactor companies which produce only the heat in connection with the generation of electricity, and (2) jointly sponsored conventional or atomic power projects which meet certain specified standards; and

Whereas the American Public Power Association has a direct interest in the cost and availability of power produced by privately owned utilities because a sizable proportion of its members purchase such power; and

Whereas the American Public Power Association is concerned about any weakening of Federal regulation of the privately owned electric utility industry that could lead to conditions in the industry inimical to the interests of the small locally owned utilities; and

Whereas Federal regulation under the Holding Company Act has benefited the utility industry, consumers, investors, and general public, and has not hindered the development of conventional or atomic power projects; and

Whereas the American Public Power Association agrees with the Securities and Exchange Commission that, in view of provisions in existing law for exemptions which are in the public interest, S. 2643 and H. R. 6294 propose exemptions which are unnecessary to the growth of the private electric utility industry and the prompt undertaking

of privately financed atomic power development projects; and

Whereas the proposed exemptions would reduce SEC regulation of such matters as securities acquisitions by holding companies, political contributions, and financial soundness of holding-company securities, seriously hamper effective rate regulation by State and Federal agencies, and open the door to the revival of widespread abuses and defeat the purposes of achieving abundant low-cost power, both conventional and nuclear: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association opposes passage of S. 2643 and H. R. 6294 and any legislation proposing similar blanket exemptions to the provisions of the Public Utility Holding Company Act.

RESOLUTION 6

Favoring construction of Fort Randall-Grand Island 230-kilovolt transmission line

Whereas the State of Nebraska, an all public power State, is primarily engaged in agricultural pursuits and has an abundant natural resource in its extensive ground water supply; and

Whereas the full and beneficial development of this natural resource is dependent upon the availability of ample quantities of low cost electric power for pump irrigation purposes; and

Whereas the Missouri River Basin project on the main stem of the Missouri River will soon have available large quantities of secondary power during the summer months, which power will not be available during other months of the year and for which power there is no foreseeable market except at dump rates unless such power is utilized for pump irrigation purposes during said summer months; and

Whereas, the utilization of said secondary or seasonal power for irrigation purposes will result in a twofold benefit—(1) it will conserve and put to beneficial use for agricultural production the abundant supply of ground water in Nebraska now largely unused, and (2) it will provide a ready market at reasonable rates for large blocks of power produced by the Government to help repay the cost of the Missouri Basin project; and

Whereas the Bureau of the Budget has recommended budgetary funds for the construction of a 230-kilovolt transmission line by the Bureau of Reclamation from Fort Randall Power Plant to Grand Island, Nebr., and the President has recommended to the Congress that such line be constructed, thereby making it possible to achieve the aforesaid purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association favors the construction of said transmission line by the Bureau of Reclamation and urges the Congress to authorize such construction.

RESOLUTION 7

Supporting Columbia River Development Corporation

Whereas the rate of Federal power investment in the Pacific Northwest through the appropriations process has not been sufficient to meet the net unsatisfied power demands; and

Whereas the Northwest Public Power Association and other Pacific Northwest groups have prepared a draft of legislation to convert the Bonneville Power Administration into the Columbia River Development Corporation with power to issue electric-revenue bonds; and

Whereas the Northwest Public Power Association has endorsed this proposed legislation subject to refinements in another draft which is now in preparation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association endorses the principle of the provision for issuance of electric revenue bonds in order to meet public utility responsibility for power development in the Pacific Northwest.

RESOLUTION 8

Supporting Federal construction of John Day Dam

Whereas the Pacific Northwest faces a power shortage starting in 1960; and

Whereas the million-kilowatt John Day Dam and navigation locks has been authorized by Congress and is now in the final planning stage preparatory to construction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association endorses the earliest feasible start of Federal construction of the John Day Dam.

RESOLUTION 9

Supporting high Hells Canyon Dam

Whereas the Hells Canyon issue, like the Muscle Shoals struggle of 30 years ago, involves the right of the people to develop their rivers for the greatest good of the general public; and

Whereas the alternative plan of the Idaho Power Co. would develop only about 60 percent of the water-power potential in the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River and would sacrifice virtually all the flood-control benefits; and

Whereas the high Hells Canyon Dam would provide maximum, comprehensive utilization for flood control, river regulation, and power; and

Whereas the Hells Canyon issue involves principles of conservation applicable to many river basins such that a surrender here would set a dangerous precedent for waste of resources; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association reaffirms its endorsement of Federal construction of Hells Canyon Dam.

RESOLUTION 10

Opposing private monopoly electric utility propaganda activities

Whereas the last year has seen consumer-owned electric systems increasingly placed under propaganda attack by the private monopoly electric utility corporations; and

Whereas such intensified propaganda attacks by means of newspaper, magazine, radio, television and other forms of advertising are for the purpose of poisoning the public mind as regards their right, and the feasibility, of owning and operating consumer-owned electric utilities, and thus are contrary to the best public interest, and the right of the public mind to decide such questions upon the basis of the true facts; and

Whereas such private monopoly electric utility propaganda attacks are being carried out and financed by the expenditures of millions of dollars (admittedly totaling over $14 million in the period 1941–52) all extracted from ratepayers as a part of their cost of service from private monopoly electric utilities; and

Whereas such propaganda activities of the private monopoly electric utilities seriously contaminate the public mind, the democratic procedures of government and are a travesty upon the right of access to public means of mass communication and public education; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association urges the Congress (1) to investigate and place upon the public record these propaganda, lobbying and oftentimes purely selfish and political activities of the private monopoly electric utility corporations, (2) to enact legislation that will prohibit the use of money obtained from electric rates charged consumers for the purposes of propaganda and lobbying, and (3) to strengthen the Public Utility Holding Company Act so as to protect ratepayers of such corporations from the use of money paid to them for such purposes.

RESOLUTION 11

Niagara Falls

Whereas Congress is considering various bills to permit increased use of the power potential of Niagara Falls to the extent of 1,300,000 kilowatts; and

Whereas several proposals would turn over this valuable resource to private monopoly, or otherwise would not make adequate provision for insuring for the electric consumers of the area the benefits of low cost power; and

Whereas the area which would be served by the Niagara Falls power now has electric rates which are among the highest in the United States; and

Whereas adequate provisions for development by a public agency, together with marketing of the power under the traditional public and cooperative agency preference conditions, are contained at the present time only in Senate bill 1823 and the companion House bill 5878: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association endorses S. 1823 and H. R. 5878 and urges their enactment by the Congress.

RESOLUTION 12

Opposing fast tax writeoffs for private utilities

Whereas certificates of necessity for rapid amortization for tax purposes of new facilities issued to private power companies have, in effect, resulted in interest-free loans to private monopoly electric corporations exceeding $1,200,000,000 with ultimate benefits to these corporations in excess of $4 billion; and

Whereas these certificates issued under section 124A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1951 and under section 168 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 will result in benefits to the private monopoly electric corporations exceeding all Federal investment in power dams, an investment which will be repaid together with interest to the United States Treasury; and

Whereas the benefits of these certificates under Opinion 264 of the Federal Power Commission adopted in December 1953, and under similar decisions of various State regulatory commissions, flow almost entirely to private utility stockholders; and

Whereas similar and comparable benefits to private power monopolies can result from the liberalized depreciation provisions of section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; and

Whereas the presiding examiner of the Federal Power Commission in a recommended decision filed February 28 in the matters of Amere Gas Utilities Co. and others (Docket No. G–6358) has held relying in part upon aforementioned Opinion No. 264, that utilities may treat the benefits of liberalized depreciation in a similar manner to those resulting from rapid amortization; and

Whereas if this decision is adopted by the Commission and its findings and conclusions are made applicable to electric utilities, private power companies will be able to enjoy benefits from liberalized depreciation such as those they now receive from rapid amortization without either applying for certificates or being limited to a specified percentage of the costs of projects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association:

1. Recommends that the Congress amend the Internal Revenue Act of 1954 to provide that section 167 relating to liberalized depreciation and section 168 relating to accelerated amortization shall not apply to regulated utility monopolies; and

2. Urges the Federal Power Commission to reconsider and reverse Opinion No. 264 relating to treatment of benefits received by electric utilities under certificates of necessity for rapid amortization; and

3. Asks the Federal Power Commission to deny and reverse the recommended decision of the presiding examiner in the matters of Amere Gas Utilities Co. and others (Docket No. G–6358) filed February 28, especially as

the findings and conclusions of said decision might be related to electric utilities; and

4. Urges the Federal Power Commission and all State regulatory commissions having jurisdiction over electric utilities to prescribe procedures to insure that the benefits accruing to private power companies under certificates of necessity for rapid amortization or from the use of liberalized depreciation will be passed on to electric consumers.

RESOLUTION 13

Broadening revenue bond market

Whereas a bill (S. 2290) would authorize national banks to deal in and underwrite certain types of revenue bonds; and

Whereas the passage of such a bill would greatly widen the market for revenue bonds through the participation of national banks in this type of financing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association go on record as favoring passage of such a bill: *Provided*, That the necessary safeguards are included to protect the public interest, and authorizing its general manager to take the necessary action to assist in obtaining such passage.

RESOLUTION 14

Small atomic power reactors

Whereas the American Public Power Association at its annual meeting May 3–5, 1955, adopted a resolution in the interest of the 2,300 publicly owned and 1,000 rural cooperative electric systems in the United States, most of which are relatively small, "urging upon the Atomic Energy Commission the importance of developing low-cost atomic reactors to produce electric power economically for units as small as 5,000 kilowatts"; and

Whereas the Atomic Energy Commission on February 1, 1956, received six proposals from publicly owned and rural cooperative electric systems to build small atomic power plants with Government aid; and

Whereas the prompt construction and operation of these demonstration units is a most important factor in the development of commercially practicable small atomic units for domestic use and especially for use in the nations of the free world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association hereby expresses its appreciation to the Atomic Energy Commission for its recent action in receiving proposals for small demonstration units; and be it further

Resolved, That the association requests the earliest possible favorable action by the Atomic Energy Commission in concluding contracts for the construction and operation of these units.

RESOLUTION 15

Speeding the demonstration power-reactor program

Whereas it is apparent to all that the demonstration full-scale power-reactor program is lagging behind desirable schedules due among other reasons to:

1. The difficulty of forecasting and guaranteeing true costs;

2. The expectation or, even certainty, that the costs of electric generation in the first round of demonstration reactors of all capacities will greatly exceed the cost of power produced from conventional fuels; and

3. The failure so far to secure adequate third party risk insurance at reasonable cost; and

Whereas too great emphasis upon public utilities assuming high risks places an undue burden upon their customers, and the assumption of high risks by the individual manufacturers narrows competition, tending toward monopoly by the few largest manufacturers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association hereby urges the Atomic Energy Commission and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Congress to speed the demonstration power-reactor program and endorses a policy of having the United States Government (1) shoulder a greater part of the risks involved in the construction and operation of reactors in both the large and small power demonstration reactor programs, with full public disclosure of the Federal contribution and tax benefits provided, and (2) itself undertake in the public interest the construction and operation of atomic powerplants of each representative type in both the large and small demonstration reactor programs.

RESOLUTION 16

Importation of residual fuel oil

Whereas many of the member systems of the American Public Power Association use large quantities of residual fuel oil for generating electric power; and

Whereas the cost of generating electric energy in such cases is directly affected by the cost of such fuel; and

Whereas restrictive measures have been proposed in the Office of Defense Mobilization which would severely limit the imports of such fuel, thereby adversely affecting the price and the quantity of fuel oil available: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association opposes any restrictive measures which would limit in any manner the importation of residual fuel oil.

RESOLUTION 17

Endorsing Federal Power Commission regulation of natural gas

Whereas a large number of the member utilities of the American Public Power Association use natural gas as a fuel in their generating stations; and

Whereas the United States Supreme Court has ruled that the Federal Power Commission has jurisdiction, under the Natural Gas Act, to regulate wholesale sales of independent producers and gatherers of gas to interstate pipelines: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association opposes any legislation which would exempt from Federal Power Commission regulation the wholesale sales of natural gas to interstate pipelines by independent producers and gatherers.

RESOLUTION 18

Transfer of power transmission facilities in the Pacific Southwest

Whereas the American Public Power Association consistently has endorsed the maximum amount of local control and home rule; and

Whereas in several States of the Pacific Southwest, State owned and administered power authorities and local publicly owned agencies have been established in order that the public may receive the benefits of low-cost power; and

Whereas in the service areas of some of such State power authorities and publicly owned agencies, the Federal Government owns and operates power transmission facilities which constitute the base on which the load growth of the area must depend; and

Whereas ownership and operation of such transmission facilities by the State power authority and publicly owned agencies would enable more economical operation of the facilities and enable expansion of lines and equipment to meet the growing needs of the area without necessitating appropriations by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association favors transfer of the ownership and operation of Federally owned power transmission facilities to a state power authority or a publicly owned agency in those cases in the Pacific Southwest where such transfer will be in the best interests of the power users served by such facilities, provided: (1) that the preference rights of publicly owned electric utilities and cooperatives in the service area shall not be adversely affected by such transfer; and (2) that the Federal Government shall be paid the full amount of any remaining unamortized construction cost of such facilities.

RESOLUTION 19

Commendation of officers and staff of APPA

Whereas the officers and Board of Directors of the American Public Power Association have during the year provided effective leadership in formulating and carrying out the policies of the association and by their actions have advanced the influence and prestige of the APPA and further ably represented the interests of our respective membership and the electrical consumers whom we represent; and

Whereas General Manager Alex Radin and the staff of the APPA have during the year most efficiently carried forward the program and policies of the association, ably represented its position when called upon, and provided to the membership efficient and helpful services upon its many problems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association expresses its appreciation to the officers of the association, to General Manager Alex Radin and the staff for their valuable leadership and excellent services.

RESOLUTION 20

President William E. Hooper

Whereas William E. Hooper, general manager, City Power, Water & Gas Department, Sheffield, Ala., has served as president of the American Public Power Association for the year 1955–56; and

Whereas President Hooper has worked untiringly in the interests of the association; and

Whereas there have been outstanding achievements of the association during the past year, as indicated by the inauguration of the Atomic Energy Service, the publication of the Public Relations Manual, the sponsorship of the Accounting and Finance Workshop, the continued growth in membership, and the inauguration and expansion of many other services; and

Whereas these achievements are indicative of the wise counsel and excellent leadership displayed by President Hooper: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association expresses its wholehearted appreciation to President Hooper for his great services as president of the association during the year 1955–56.

RESOLUTION 21

Appreciation to convention hosts

Whereas the California Municipal Utilities Association, and particularly the municipal electric utilities of Los Angeles, Pasadena, Burbank, and Glendale, have been hosts to the 13th annual convention of the American Public Power Association; and

Whereas these hosts arranged an excellent and outstanding program of entertainment for convention delegates and their wives; and

Whereas the general arrangements committee, headed by Bradley Cozzens of the Department of Water and Power of Los Angeles, has been exceptionally helpful in handling such arrangements as registration, hospitality, exhibits, inspection trips, transportation, entertainment, publicity, and special events; and

Whereas, the members of the American Public Power Association have thoroughly enjoyed this most gracious hospitality accorded by their hosts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association expresses its wholehearted appreciation to the general arrangements committee, to the municipal electric utilities of

Los Angeles, Pasadena, Burbank, and Glendale, to the entire California Municipal Utilities Association, and to the Los Angeles City Council which gave valued financial assistance, for their hospitality and great assistance in making this one of the most outstanding conventions ever held by the American Public Power Association.

RESOLUTION 22

Alaska waterpower

Whereas the development of Alaska is retarded by electric power shortages and high electric rates; and

Whereas Congress last year enacted legislation authorizing surveys of Alaska waterpower resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association expresses appreciation to Congress for this legislation, and that we support adequate appropriations for these waterpower surveys including the $200,000 recommended in the present Federal budget.

RESOLUTION 23

Condemning attacks on Southwestern Power Administration

Whereas the electrical capacity available through the Southwestern Power Administration has been of great benefit not only to the preference customers but also, to a greater extent, to the private power companies in Missouri, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and adjacent areas; and

Whereas the private power companies have not been satisfied with a major share of those benefits and have conducted a persistent and aggressive campaign to obtain, exclusively for themselves, control of the entire capacity of the SPA system; and

Whereas the private power companies have been aided in their campaign by certain antipublic power policies of the Interior Department and the attempts of some of the Interior Department officials to nullify the preference rights of municipalities and cooperatives; and

Whereas every avenue and subterfuge has been used to gain this end, even to the extent of trying to force certain power cooperatives to allow their preference rights to be used to permit the sale of a large block of capacity (all that was left unsold) to the private power companies; and

Whereas the latest attack has centered around an attempt to increase rates to the preference customers through the device of reallocation of construction costs; and

Whereas failure to block these attempts to undermine SPA would result in great damage to the electrical consumers in the area, would severely handicap the preference customers and nullify their legal rights, and would constitute an improper diversion of power, belonging to all the people, to a few private power corporations; and

Whereas various committees of Congress have from time to time delved into parts of this situation and legislation is now pending to delay the rate increases: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association:

1. Commends Congress for being alert to this attempt to convert public projects to the benefit of the stockholders of a few private power corporations;

2. Urges Congress to approve the pending legislation delaying the rate increases; and

3. Recommends that a full-scale investigation of all of the devious ramifications of this situation be conducted to the end of enacting legislation to protect the interests of the public against abuses of this nature.

RESOLUTION 24

Clark Hill power

Whereas for several years the rural electric cooperatives and municipal electric utilities of Georgia have been attempting to obtain a quantity of power from the Clark Hill project constructed on the Savannah River by the Army Corps of Engineers; and

Whereas, by virtue of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, the rural electric cooperatives and municipal electric utilities have a preference in the availability of power from this project; and

Whereas, in the past, the efforts of the preference customers to obtain a fair share of this power have been thwarted on occasions by the policies of the Georgia Power Co., and the Department of the Interior; and

Whereas Attorney General Brownell recently issued an opinion reaffirming the right of the preference customers to a preference in purchasing this power directly from the Federal Government; and

Whereas in the absence of a fair and effective wheeling arrangement with the Georgia Power Co., the Southeastern Power Administration should receive funds to make a study of the feasibility of the construction of Federal transmission lines to serve the preference customers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association expresses its appreciation to Attorney General Brownell for a forthright and equitable opinion with regard to the rights accorded by law to the preference customers; and be it further

Resolved, That this association expresses the hope that wheeling arrangements, in full accord with the law, can soon be consummated between the Department of the Interior, the Georgia Power Co., and the preference customers, to the end that this source of low-cost power can be made available to the preference customers without further delay; and be it further

Resolved, That if suitable wheeling arrangements are not consummated within the very near future, the Congress should appropriate funds to the Southeastern Power Administration so that agency can make a study of the economic feasibility of the construction of Federal transmission lines.

RESOLUTION 25

Marketing of atomic power

Whereas the Atomic Energy Commission has undertaken certain reactor projects for research and development which may produce electric power in connection with its responsibility for nuclear reactor development; and

Whereas the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 contains a provision giving preference to public and cooperative agencies in the marketing of power produced from such facilities; and

Whereas there appears to be little possibility that the privately owned utilities will cooperate with the public agencies and cooperatives in the wheeling of this power to preference customers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Department of the Interior or other appropriate Federal agency be empowered by Congress to provide for the marketing and wheeling of this power to the preference customers involved.

RESOLUTIONS OF CALIFORNIA FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the California Federation of Post Office Clerks, at Fresno, Calif.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF CALIFORNIA FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS, 23D BIENNIAL CONVENTION, MAY 24, 25, 26, 27, 1956, FRESNO, CALIF.

ORDER REGARDING OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT TO BE SET ASIDE

Whereas the Post Office Department in Washington, D. C., issued orders to all regional offices to scrutinize closely the sick leave records and abuse of sick leave; and

Whereas postmasters in different regional areas issued various type questionnaires to employees concerning outside activities; and

Whereas we deem this an invasion of our rights as citizens and free men in a democratic society; and

Whereas we are paid for an 8-hour day and a 40-hour week for working in the post office, and the remainder of each day and each week should be our own time, to do with as we see fit, as long as we violate no laws of the land; and

Whereas the authority to force this indignity upon postal employees stems from the decision in the St. Paul court action regarding such an order in that office; and

Whereas this policy by the department is a far-reaching matter that could and will eventually touch each and every postal and Government employee: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the California Federation of Post Office Clerks, in convention assembled at Fresno May 24–27, do go on record as condemning and protesting this action; and be it further

Resolved, That action be taken to bring this to the attention of the delegates at the national convention in Chicago in August, 1956, and that the national officers be mandated to seek to remedy the situation, either by legislation, or by appeal to a higher court of the St. Paul decision; and be it further

Resolved, That if court action is necessary that such action be carried to the highest court possible in an effort to gain a reversal of the St. Paul decision and that the various locals in the federation be assessed on a prorata basis the cost of appealing said court action; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent immediately to the national officers, so that they may know the stand of this organization at once; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent immediately to each member of the House and Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

PROTESTING "GAG" ORDERS OF THE POSTAL FIELD SERVICE

Whereas employees are restrained from advising with each other—by means of bulletin boards located in locker and swing rooms, without prior censorship by the postal official in charge of the installation, concerning matters which may be held to be controversial by the postal official in charge who is, in many cases, directly and solely responsible for whatever controversy exists; and

Whereas by means of recent changes in the Postal Manual, specifically parts 741 and 744 and all sections pertaining thereto, a studied and calculated attempt has been made to silence employees of the postal field service to prevent them from expressing their dissatisfaction with existing conditions; and

Whereas the provisions of this change have already been enforced in some instances; and

Whereas the existing relations between management and labor in the postal field service are not in the best interests of the postal service: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the California Federation of Post Office Clerks assembled in convention at Fresno, Calif., May 24–27, 1956, does hereby condemn these actions of the Post Office Department as oppressive, unwise and illegal and destructive of a sound modern personnel-management relationship, and calls upon the 84th Congress to support immediate and corrective action toward these inequities, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our national officers, Senators KNOWLAND and KUCHEL, and each of the California Congressmen, Congressman Moss, Subcommittee on Government Information, and that it also be released to the press for publication.

DISSEMINATION OF PROPAGANDA

Whereas the primary function of the Postal Bulletin has always been to transmit official information; and

Whereas the Department now uses the Postal Bulletin as a medium to disseminate propaganda; and

Whereas the Department publishes and issues free of charge to employees, a magazine titled "Postal Service News"; and

Whereas it is obvious that the aim of the Department is to reduce the deficit, even at the expense of maintaining adequate service: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the California Federation of Post Office Clerks in convention assembled at Fresno, Calif., May 24–27, 1956, go on record urging the omission of Department propaganda from the Postal Bulletin and the suspension of "Postal Service News"; and be it further

Resolved, That the specific cost of this unnecessary publication to the taxpayer be ascertained to determine the exact amount the deficit can be reduced; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Chairmen of the Senate and House Post Office Committees and to the Senators and Representatives from California.

PROTEST TRANSFER OF GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES TO PRIVATE BUSINESS

Whereas the President of the United States has directed the Federal Agencies and Departments to review their commercial and industrial activities to determine which functions can be taken over by private industry; and

Whereas the entire policy is being predicated without regard to increased cost to the taxpayer, national security, the Government's moral obligation to Federal employees and the Government's operation of the Postal Service as established by the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas such directions have affected postal operations by recommending:

(a) Postal remittances, money order, and other finance activities formerly handled in post offices and in other central accounting offices have been transferred to banking institutions:

(b) IBM machines and others are now being used in postal work with the ownership retained by business firms and used in postal activities on a rental basis;

(c) The Post Office Department has contracted much of the postal work to individuals and firms who to all intents and purposes conduct post offices involving money order, registry, COD, insurance, stamp sales and other postal activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the California Federation of Post Office Clerks, in convention assembled at Fresno, Calif., May 24–27, 1956, go on record in opposition to the policy which would deprive postal personnel of the duties pertinent to the operation of the United States Postal Service as now established by the Constitution and the laws of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, This protest be communicated to Members of Congress from the State of California, to the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON, Vice President of the United States, and President of the Senate; the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, majority leader; the Honorable W. F. KNOWLAND, minority leader, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, majority leader; and the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., minority leader, advising them of our protest over this policy of taking away the duties and work of postal personnel and transferring same to private individuals who have not demonstrated their ability to handle such responsibility, nor have pledged their loyalty and devotion to the Federal Government as have the post-office employees of this Nation.

WORKING CONDITIONS

Whereas the present policies of the Post Office Department involve the elimination of seniority as a major factor in promotions; and

Whereas the installation of the Works Performance Standards program has resulted in the establishment of a vicious speedup system which places men in competition with each other in an effort to reach impossible goals; and

Whereas other working conditions with particular reference to hours and tours of duty, assignments, compensatory time and substitute employment to name only a few, are steadily deteriorating; and

Whereas interpretations of Public Law 68, 84th Congress, by the Post Office Department are designed to circumvent and nullify the provisions of section 606 (b) of that act by authorizing or purporting to authorize the employment of substitutes for less than 2 hours on a voluntary basis in direct violation of law; and

Whereas the interpretation by the Post Office Department of section 403 (1) deprives employees of their legal rights to promotions on specified dates, contrary to the stated language of the act; and

Whereas regional and district officers are issuing orders and directives with respect to seniority, sick and annual leave, filling of vacancies and increases in complement which are directly contrary to what we have been assured is the policy of the Post Office Department; and

Whereas as a result of these developments and others too numerous to mention there is a steady and noticeable decline in morale among employees; and

Whereas these conditions have all been brought about by unilateral actions on the part of the Post Office Department without previous consultation with employee representatives on either a local or national scale; and

Whereas employees are restrained, under part 743.222 of the Postal Manual, from advising with each other—by means of bulletin boards located in locker and swing rooms not accessible to the public—concerning matters which may be held to be controversial by a postmaster who is in many cases, directly and solely responsible for whatever controversy exists; and

Whereas by means of recent changes in the Postal Manual, part 744.442, a studied and calculated attempt has been made to silence and gag employees of the field postal service to prevent them from expressing their dissatisfaction with existing conditions; and

Whereas this action is in direct violation of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, better known as the Lloyd-La Follette anti-gag law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the California Federation of Post Office Clerks, in convention assembled at Fresno, Calif., May 24, 25, 26, 27, 1956, does hereby condemn those actions of the Post Office Department as oppressive, unwise and illegal and destructive of a sound modern personnel-management relationship, and call upon the California Congressmen and Senators thereof, to enact legislation which will absolutely require the heads of each department and agency of our Federal Government to cease and desist from practices which in the case of an employer under the National Labor Relations Act would be branded as unfair labor practices; and be it further

Resolved, That we endorse the Rhodes-Johnston bills H. R. 10237; S. 3593 for this purpose and urge each Member of Congress who believes in human dignity and fair play to support this legislation and work for its enactment at the current session of the 84th Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 3704. A bill to authorize the acquisition of the remaining property in square 725 and the property in square 724 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the size of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds (Rept. No. 2263).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1693. A bill for the relief of Robert F. Gross (Rept. No. 2269).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 3042. A bill to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U. S. C., sec. 184), in order to promote the development of phosphate on the public domain (Rept. No. 2272).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1333. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes (Rept. No. 2275).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 3512. A bill to permit desert land entries on disconnected tracts of lands which, in the case of any one entryman, form a compact unit and do not exceed in the aggregate 320 acres (Rept. No. 2271).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 3743. A bill to add certain federally owned land to the Lassen Volcanic National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2264).

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H. R. 6782. A bill to amend section 7 of an act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, approved July 1, 1902, as amended (Rept. No. 2268).

By Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments:

S. 3362. A bill to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2266); and

H. R. 7227. A bill to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the disposal of surplus property for civil defense purposes, to provide that certain Federal surplus property be disposed of to State and local civil defense organizations which are established by or pursuant to State law, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2267).

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

H. R. 10230. An act to amend sections 3526 and 3528 of the Revised Statutes relating to the coinage of subsidiary silver coins and minor coins of the United States (Rept. No. 2270).

By Mr. JENNER (for Mr. GREEN), from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of Senate document No. 117, entitled "A Handbok for Americans."

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Commitee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution approving the relinquishment of the consular jurisdic-

tion of the United States in Morocco (Rept. No. 2274).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment:

H. R. 11356. A bill to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2273).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment:

H. R. 5256. A bill to provide for the redemption by the Post Office Department of certain unsold Federal migratory-bird hunting stamps, and to clarify the requirements with respect to the age of hunters who must possess Federal migratory-bird hunting stamps (Rept. No. 2276).

IMPROVEMENT OF GOVERNMENTAL BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING METHODS AND PROCEDURES (S. REPT. NO. 2265)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am about to submit a report, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it, in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 3897) to improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures, and for other purposes.

This bill was ordered reported unanimously by the Committee on Government Operations on June 7, 1956, after extensive hearings during this session of the Congress. In my opinion, and that of the foremost authorities on financial management, it is the most significant development in the Government's financial structure in a decade or more.

Sponsored by 32 Members of this body, from both sides of the aisle, the bill would place the entire governmental financial structure on an annual accrued expenditures basis. The heart of the bill is contained in section I which provides that the Congress make its appropriations for each fiscal year upon the estimates of expenditures actually to be made or to be accrued during that fiscal year, as opposed to the present complicated procedure whereby the Congress appropriates billions of dollars for a fiscal year which are expended during future fiscal years—and over which the Congress has little or no control once the appropriations are made.

This feature would eliminate or substantially reduce the tremendous carryovers of unexpended balances of appropriations, presently estimated as high as $48 billion, which have plagued the Congress for many years. In addition, I am convinced enactment of this legislation will produce substantial operating economies by placing our financial structure on a more businesslike basis where we know each fiscal year what is required, what is expended, and what we have received for the expenditures made.

To convert appropriations to an annual expenditures basis, the bill provides that the executive agencies shall maintain their budgets on a cost-operating basis and maintain their accounts on an accrual expenditures basis. In no other way can the Congress realistically appropriate on the basis of actual requirements each fiscal year.

To avert any fear or confusion that this legislation will in any way impair the maintenance of the military establishment at the levels that the preservation of our national security dictates, I should like to state that the evidence presented before the Government Operations Committee makes clear that the stating of appropriations on an expenditures basis will not affect the existing statutory authority of the executive departments, including the Department of Defense, to contract for or make commitments for capital expenditures in future fiscal years, provided that the existing requirement that advance approval be obtained from the Appropriations Committees of the Congress is met.

In connection with this very important aspect, I should like to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, June 6, 1956.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Reorganization, Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During the hearings this morning on S. 3897, representatives of the Department of Defense suggested that the language of the proposed section 201 (b) of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, might be clarified by the insertion of the following proviso at the end of the paragraph in lines 6 through 9 of page 2 of S. 3897:

"*Provided,* That nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the authority of the President to submit requests for authorizations to create obligations in advance of appropriations."

The Defense representatives apparently felt that the present language of lines 6 through 9 might possibly be construed as repealing by implication the authority for requesting contract authorizations contained in the present section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921. It is our considered opinion that there is no conflict whatsoever between the language of the new subsection 201 (b) proposed to be added by this bill and the present section 201 of that act, and that the proposed section 201 (b) could not be construed as restricting the authority to request contract authorizations in the present section 201.

Section 2 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, defines the term "appropriation" as used in that act as follows:

"The term 'appropriations' includes, in appropriate context, funds and authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations, or any other authority making funds available for obligation or expenditure."

The use of the words "in appropriate context" contained in that definition makes it clear that the term "appropriation" may mean (1) the appropriation of funds; (2) authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations (commonly referred to as "contract authority"); or both (1) and (2). As the term "appropriation" is used in the present section 201 (d), which under this bill would be section 201 (a) (5), and section 203, it clearly means both appropriation of funds and contract authority. As that term is used in line 6, page 2, of the bill, however, it is used in relation to the determining of amounts of proposed appropriations on an accrued expenditure basis. As the term "appropriation" is used in that context, it can mean only the appropriation of funds. Since the language in lines 6 through 9, page 2 of the bill relates only to the appropriation of funds, it cannot be viewed as conflicting with the authority in the present section 201 to include in the budget proper requests for authorizations to create obligations in advance of appropriations. The appropriation committees of the Congress will thus have the tools to review both the complete programs for which contractual authorizations are requested or have been granted as well as the amount of funds required to meet the expenditures which will accrue in the budget year.

Moreover, it should be noted that the legislative history of this bill already has made it clear that contractual authorizations for long lead-time programs will be required when the appropriations therefor are stated on an annual accrued expenditure basis. This was pointed out in the Hoover Commission Report on Budget and Accounting.

It thus seems very clear to us that the existing authority to include requests for contract authorizations in the budget would not be abrogated by this bill and that the clarifying language suggested by the Department of Defense is unnecessary.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am fully aware that the stating of appropriations on an expenditures basis is, indeed, a revolutionary change in the Government's financial structure. I may advise the Senate that this is proposed by the Senate Committee on Government Operations only after the most thorough deliberation and consideration.

This bill has the unqualified endorsement of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Secretary of the Treasury, as well as the general approval of the Department of Defense, which, I might say, despite the many technical problems involved, has cooperated wholeheartedly with the Senate Government Operations Committee's Subcommittee on Reorganization in the processing of this legislation during the last 90 days. As a matter of fact the Department of Defense has, for many years, been working steadily toward the accomplishment of most of the basic financial improvements which are the objectives of this bill.

In conclusion, I should like to emphasize that this legislation directly implements, verbatim, the recommendations of the second Hoover Commission relating to cost-based budgeting, accrued accounting, and converting appropriations to an expenditures basis. The Hoover Commission gave the greatest significance to the conversion of appropriations to an expenditures basis as essential to improving financial management of the executive branch and restoring control of the purse to the Congress.

In connection with this, the President of the United States, in a special message to the Congress delivered May 10, 1956,

urged early enactment of appropriate legislation to accomplish the Hoover Commission's recommendations in this field. After briefly reviewing certain administrative action already taken by the Bureau of the Budget, the President stated:

The actions being taken by the executive branch to put many of the Commission's proposals into effect will require close coordination with the legislative branch and merit the support which the Congress should and can provide. I urge that the Congress seek the early enactment of appropriate legislative provisions to support the main objectives of the Commission's recommendations.

The provisions of this bill, upon which the Reorganization Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations has been working since early in this session of the 84th Congress, would, as I have previously indicated, directly effectuate the Hoover Commission's recommendations, as the President of the United States requested.

I strongly urge early consideration by the Senate of this vitally important bill. I know of no other legislation which is of greater importance at this crucial time to bringing order to our complicated financial structure and maintaining this Government on its strongest financial foundation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wonder when the distinguished Senator would like to have called up the budget and accounting bill, on which he has just filed a unanimous report. Would he be ready to have the bill considered later in the week?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes; as soon as it is agreeable to the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the bill was reported unanimously.

Mr. KENNEDY. It was reported unanimously by its sponsors on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The leadership also is interested in the depressed-areas bill. I understand the Senator from Massachusetts attended a meeting of the committee this morning, but a quorum of the committee was not present. Is there to be an attempt to have a meeting later this week?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, a meeting will be held to decide on the matter one way or another this week.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assure the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts of the cooperation of the leadership. As soon as the minority leader gives me an answer concerning the bill just reported, the leadership will try to schedule it for consideration on either Wednesday or Thursday, or on Friday if the Senate is in session, or perhaps on Monday if the consideration of the bill will not take a great deal of time.

As soon as the depressed-areas bill is reported, the leadership expects to give it high priority.

I hope the members of the committee will meet and act on the proposed legislation at as early a date as possible. I do not want to have the calendar become crowded in the last days of the session.

Mr. KENNEDY. I appreciate the willingness of the majority leader to schedule quick action on Senate bill 3897, because it embodies, I think, one of the most important recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The leadership is delighted to cooperate with the very able Senator from Massachusetts.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 4081. A bill to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education byeond the high school; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 4082. A bill for the relief of Kasimirs Abarons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON) (by request):

S. 4083. A bill to change the name of the Government locks at Ballard, Wash., to the "Hiram M. Chittenden locks"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 4084. A bill for the relief of Heskel Salman Shina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) (by request):

S. 4085. A bill for the relief of John (Ioannis) Legatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR STATE COMMITTEES ON EDUCATION BEYOND THE HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Nation will soon be facing a very critical situation with regard to our institutions of higher learning—namely, our colleges and universities. It is estimated that within the next 10 years there will be 3 students in our colleges for every 2 who are now there.

So we shall soon be facing some very difficult questions. Where will we get the needed teachers? How can the coming increase in students be handled by the colleges without decreasing their standards?

Closely allied to these problems is the serious shortage of trained college graduates in such fields as science and engineering.

In order that these numerous problems may receive serious and organized attention at all levels of Government and among our private institutions, President Eisenhower, in his special message to Congress of January 12, 1956, announced he would appoint a Committee on Education Beyond the High School.

This has now been done; and the President's Committee has recommended the appropriation of one-time grants to all the States, to encourage the setting up of State committees on education beyond the high school level.

Mr. President, after conferring with the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I introduce, on behalf of the Senator from Alabama and myself, a bill to authorize the appropriation of $800,000, to be available until June 30, 1958, for grants to the States on the basis of their populations, to encourage and assist them in the initial formulation of the State committees to make this study.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be appropriately referred; and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a copy of the bill and a letter to the Speaker of the House from Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Marion B. Folsom, asking for support of this proposal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4081) to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. HILL), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby finds and declares that the impending great increases in enrollment in higher education institutions, the great national need for increased numbers of scientists, engineers, teachers, technicians, nurses, and other trained personnel, the rapid changes in conditions which necessitate additional education for many adults, and the dependence of the national security on the research and advanced preparation provided by educational institutions, combine to make it imperative that immediate stimulus be given to planning and action throughout the Nation which will meet adequately the needs for education beyond the high school.

SEC. 2. (a) To encourage and assist each State to provide for a State committee on education beyond the high school, composed of educators and other interested citizens, to consider educational problems beyond the high school and to make recommendations for appropriate action to be taken by public and private agencies at local, State, regional, and Federal levels, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $800,000. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall be allotted to the States on the basis of their respective populations according to the latest figures certified by the Department of Commerce except that no State's allotment shall be less than $7,500.

(b) The Commissioner of Education shall pay its allotment to each State which, through its governor or other State official designated by the governor, undertakes to accept and use the sums so paid exclusively for the purposes set forth in subsection (a), including the expenses of studies and conferences, and to have its State committee on education beyond the high school make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Commissioner for the use of the President's committee on education beyond the high school. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available until June 30, 1958, and any such sums remaining unpaid to the States or unobligated by them as of that date shall be returned to the Treasury.

SEC. 3. The Commissioner is authorized to accept funds, equipment, personal services, and facilities donated for purposes of this act and to use the same in accordance with such purposes.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this act the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

The letter presented by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, June 11, 1956.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am enclosing for your consideration a draft bill to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school.

The draft bill would authorize the appropriation of $800,000, to be available until June 30, 1958, for grants to the States on the basis of their respective populations, in order to encourage and assist each State to provide for a State committee on education beyond the high school, which committee, through studies and conferences, would consider educational problems beyond the high school and make recommendations for appropriate action to be taken by public and private agencies at local, State, regional, and Federal levels. States would be required, through their governors, to undertake to use grants solely for the purposes of the act and to have their State committees submit reports to the Commissioner of Education for use of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School.

You will recall that the President, in his special message to the Congress on January 12, 1956, expressed his concern about the growing problems in the field of education beyond the high school and indicated that he would appoint a committee to develop proposals in this field, as follows:

Shortages now exist in medicine, teaching, nursing, science, engineering, and in other fields of knowledge which require education beyond the level of the secondary school. Changing times and conditions create new opportunities and challenges. There are now possibilities for older persons, properly trained, to lead more productive and rewarding lives. The tide of increasing school enrollment will soon reach higher educational institutions. Within 10 years we may expect 3 students in our colleges and universities for every 2 who are there now.

Higher education is and must remain the responsibility of the States, localities, and private groups and institutions. But to lay before us all the problems of education beyond high school, and to encourage active and systematic attack on them, I shall appoint a distinguished group of educators and citizens to develop this year, through studies and conferences, proposals in this educational field. Through the leadership and counsel of this group, beneficial results can be expected to flow to education and to the Nation, in the years ahead.

Composition of the committee was announced April 19 and on April 27 it met, organized, and agreed on basic objectives as follows: First, to collect, assemble and disseminate information for the purpose of increasing public awareness of the vast challenge which lies ahead in the field of education beyond the high school; second, to encourage the planning and action which must now be undertaken by institutions and groups of institutions, locally and nationally, publicly and privately, to meet the impending demands upon our educational system; the third, to advise the President as to the proper role of the Federal Government in this field and to recommend appropriate Federal policies and relationships.

In order to provide immediate stimulus to the initiation of widespread planning, studies, and action which should be undertaken now by institutions, States and localities, the committee recommended the provision of one-time grants to the States to encourage and assist each State to establish a State committee on education beyond the high school. These State counterparts to the national committee are essential not only for coordination of study and planning activities in the States but to provide a nationwide mechanism for liaison with the national committee. The instant draft bill is designed to accomplish these objectives.

This Department shares with the Committee on Education Beyond the High School and with the educational leadership of the Nation, the great concern we all have about the necessity of bringing concerted action to bear on the mounting problems which we foresee ahead in this field of education and in meeting our future manpower needs. We are, therefore, in accord with the recommendation of the Committee.

I shall appreciate it if you would refer the draft bill to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

M. B. FOLSOM,
Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BRIDGES (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. MUNDT) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENSION OF LAWS DEALING WITH PROMOTIONS IN THE COAST GUARD—CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF LETTER

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from the further consideration of a letter dated May 18, 1956, from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, addressed to the Vice President, relative to an extension of laws dealing with promotions in the Coast Guard, and that the letter be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF R. JASPER SMITH TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, June 26, 1956, at 10:30 a. m. in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the nomination of R. Jasper Smith, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the Western District of Missouri, vice Charles E. Whittaker, elevated.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and myself, chairman.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Roger G. Connor, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for the district of Alaska, Division No. 1, for the term of 4 years, vice Theodore E. Munson, resigned.

John E. Henry, of Montana, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1962. Mr. Henry is now serving in this post under an appointment which expires September 30, 1956.

Scovel Richardson, of Missouri, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1962. Mr. Richardson is now serving in this post under an appointment which expires September 30, 1956.

Victor R. Hansen, of California, to be Assistant Attorney General, vice Stanley N. Barnes, resigned.

Notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee on or before Saturday, June 23, 1956, any representations or objections in writing they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have an announcement I should like to make for the benefit of the Senate. The unfinished business is H. R. 7763, an act to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, to expedite the final determination of the claims. The Senate expects and hopes to dispose of that bill today, and, in addition, to consider Calendar No. 2175, S. 2572, the Agriculture-Defense Department land exchange bill, as well as Calendar No. 2095, S. 3879, the dealer's day-in-court bill.

Mr. President, we had anticipated taking up the bill to extend the Defense Production Act. The distinguished minority leader had suggested that that bill precede the consideration of certain other proposed legislation. I am informed now that at least two distinguished Members on the minority side of the aisle cannot be in the Senate today, and that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] cannot be here tomorrow. He has an amendment to offer. So, in an attempt to accommodate them, if it is agreeable to the minority leader, we shall postpone consideration of the bill to extend the Defense Production Act until another day.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL RECREATION ASSOCIATION CITATIONS TO PERCIVAL P. BAXTER, ALLEN E. MORRELL, AND THE PORTLAND KIWANIS CLUB

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, one of the State of Maine's best-loved citizens, former Gov. Percival P. Baxter, will be awarded a special certificate of appreciation and letter of citation today from the National Recreation Association in recognition of his long and outstanding leadership in developing the public recreational facilities of Maine.

It pleases me, as I know it does all the people of Maine, to note this honor which has come to Governor Baxter; for no man in Maine's history, and indeed few in all America, have done so much for the recreation and conservation movements as has Governor Baxter.

The Portland, Maine, Kiwanis Club will also be honored today for its long service to the recreation program of that city. On June 7, the National Recreation Association cited Allen E. Morrell, of Brunswick, Maine, for his leadership in the field of recreation in his community.

These honors are indicative, I believe, of the progress which my State has made down through the years in developing one of her greatest resources, the natural beauty and recreational advantages which she offers to her citizens and to thousands of visitors every year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the National Recreation Association's citations to Governor Baxter, Allen Morrell, and the Portland Kiwanis Club.

There being no objection, the citations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL RECREATION ASSOCIATION CITATION TO THE HONORABLE PERCIVAL P. BAXTER OF PORTLAND, MAINE

You have been identified with the public park and recreation movement in America for many years. You, more than most people, have recognized the recreational value of land to the people. Your contributions to public recreation in Portland and in the State of Maine have been outstanding. The people of Maine and the many visitors to your State are grateful to you for the gift of more than 165,000 acres of primeval forest land including beautiful Mount Katahdin. In Portland, Mayor Baxter Woods, the beautiful nature sanctuary, given by you in honor of your father; Baxter Forest, given by you as a municipal forest; the lighting of the scenic parkway, Baxter Boulevard, are just a few among many contributions you have made for the recreational benefit of your fellowman. We send you our heartiest commendation for all you have done for the recreation movement.

NATIONAL RECREATION ASSOCIATION CITATION TO ALLEN E. MORRELL OF BRUNSWICK, MAINE

You have been an effective leader of public thought in the field of recreation in Brunswick for 15 years. First recognizing war-time recreation needs, and later the peace-time needs as well, you were able to interpret these needs to the public in such a way as to secure community understanding and public support together with sound expansion and improvement in recreation organization, facilities, personnel and program. You chaired many committees in the several stages of recreation development. Among these were the Citizen's Committee which secured the purchase of Brunswick's fine recreation building and the Recreation Study Committee which wrote the ordinance creating a legal recreation commission. You were one of the first persons appointed to the new recreation commission and have served as a member of that body for 5 years. For all that you have done and are doing for the cause of recreation, we send you our hearty commendation.

NATIONAL RECREATION ASSOCIATION CITATION TO THE KIWANIS CLUB OF PORTLAND, MAINE

Kiwanis has shown real devotion to the cause of recreation and is making outstanding contributions to the community recreation movement in Portland. It has sponsored the swimming meet of the park and recreation department and a Little League baseball team. As a major special project in the interest of youth, it is assisting in the development of the St. James Street playfield. As the club's long term project in connection with this area, it has carried the responsibility since 1954 for the raising of $100,000 for an outdoor swimming pool, which will eventually be an important feature of this area. For all these civic-minded efforts in the field of recreation we send the Kiwanis Club our hearty commendation.

DROUGHT EMERGENCY IN MISSOURI

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the New York Times yesterday morning, carried an article, "Only 2 Weeks of Water Left in Missouri Town," which emphasizes the drought emergency in Bethany in northwest Missouri, an emergency worthy of the attention and action by the administration.

I ask unanimous consent to have that article printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONLY 2 WEEKS OF WATER LEFT IN MISSOURI TOWN

BETHANY, Mo., June 17—Mayor Raymond K. Wheeler said today that the water supply of this town of 3,000 would last only 2 weeks unless rain brought relief.

People have been asked to limit themselves to a couple of gallons daily. Car-washing, lawn-sprinkling, use of automatic dishwashers and nonessential laundry have been barred. Restaurants will not serve water unless customers demand it.

The mayor said further restrictions would have to be imposed.

Bethany's trouble stems from a drought in northwest Missouri. Mr. Wheeler said the 50-year annual rainfall average was 24 inches but in 1955 the town received only 27 inches and in the past 8 months only 5 inches.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in late April, the seriousness of this situation was called to the attention of the proper people in the Department of Agriculture. The Department was asked to be ready to act in response to a request from the Governor of Missouri, if that became necessary.

On May 14, we wrote the Department of Agriculture forwarding minutes of a meeting held at Bethany, Mo., reporting the then serious condition.

On May 25, Gov. Phil M. Donnelly, of Missouri, wrote President Eisenhower asking for drought disaster designation for 11 northwest Missouri counties under provisions of the applicable public laws.

Subsequently, an inspector from the Department of Agriculture did visit the 11-county area of northwest Missouri for which the Governor had requested drought disaster designation. The report on that visit to Bethany is given in the Bethany (Mo.) Republican-Clipper of June 6, under the heading, "Drought Inspector Passes Hurriedly on 11-County Trip."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that article made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DROUGHT INSPECTOR PASSES HURRIEDLY ON 11-COUNTY TRIP—LEAVES IMPRESSION THAT HE DOES NOT YET CONSIDER AREA IN DIRE PERIL, BUT NO STATEMENT IS MADE

A representative of the United States Department of Agriculture, making an inspection of the 11-county dry area of northwest Missouri, paused last week at Bethany on what apparently was a hurried trip over the territory recommended by the State to receive drought disaster relief.

He talked here with Charles Coon, FHA supervisor, and the FHA county committee which happened to be in session at the moment; with Robert Zulian and Oscar Benson, county agents; and Jack Provin, manager of the ASC office.

All three agencies offered to take the inspector out to show him dry ponds, unproductive pastures, and stunted small grain; and to take him to farms where livestock has had to be sold because the farms have no water or feed. He declined to take that time, which would, of course, add up over 11 counties.

COMES FROM TEXAS

It is understood that the inspector came here from examinations in Colorado and Texas, where the country is brown and relatively treeless. Missouri appears green at any time after coming from those directions. It would have been better had the inspector come from the north or east.

Men to whom the inspector talked here, were left with the impression that he felt this area has not yet reached the position of "dire peril" which, according to some interpretation, makes the drought disaster law applicable. The inspector did not say that, however. He was noncommittal.

About 30 or 40 minutes were spent with Coon and his county committee. The disaster law of 1950 was read and discussed, and the category of "position of peril" seemed to be the interpretive guide.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is significant that this inspector was invited to see the dry ponds, unproductive pastures, stunted small grain, and farms where livestock had to be sold because there was no water or grain, but "he declined to take the time."

On June 7, Mr. Sherman Adams, acting for the President, notified Governor

Donnelly that Missouri's request for emergency drought designation for this area was denied.

On June 12, I telegraphed the President as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 12, 1956.*

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

A telegram from farmers and business men of Gentry County, 1 of 11 Missouri counties for which Governor Donnelly requested emergency drought designation, reads in part as follows:

"Outraged at the action of Department of Agriculture in refusing aid to this stricken area after a very limited check of conditions."

Similar messages are being received from other drought stricken counties. As evidence of this serious condition, 1 town, Bethany, Mo., has only enough water to last 2 more weeks. These farm and business people would deeply appreciate your immediate reconsideration of Governor Donnelly's request for drought designation.

STUART SYMINGTON,
United States Senator.

On June 13, we told the Department of Agriculture of plans for a 13-county meeting to be held at Bethany last Friday noon, June 15, and asked that a representative of the Department be sent to that meeting.

We pointed out that time is of greatest importance in meeting this need, not only for the city of Bethany, which has only a 2-week water supply left, but also for the farm people of that area who have been hauling water for many weeks.

Department officials said "No"; they planned to send a man to Bethany today, Monday, June 18, to attend a State drought meeting and that he will stay in the area as long as necessary to survey the need. Too bad he did not do that 3 weeks ago.

At the meeting last Friday, 180 farm and business people told of the drought problems they face. Representative WILLIAM R. HULL flew out from Washington to attend and then toured the area Friday afternoon and Saturday. We had a transcript made of the meeting and will send it to the Department of Agriculture and the President's office for their information.

Mr. President, we hope the people of the drought-stricken northwest Missouri and of Bethany, in particular, will not have to exhaust all their water supply before their Government takes action to provide the help needed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REQUIREMENTS FOR FREIGHT FORWARDER PERMITS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2063, Senate bill 3365.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3365) to amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to change the requirements for obtaining a freight forwarder permit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by eliminating therefrom subsection (d) in its entirety, and by redesignating subsection (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i) as subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, there is at the desk an amendment to the bill. The amendment was submitted by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], who is not present at this time. I wish to call up that amendment, with the understanding that the chairman of the committee is willing to accept it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is the understanding. May the amendment be stated?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. BRICKER. On behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That subsection (d) of section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Commission shall not deny authority to engage in the whole or any part of the proposed service covered by any application made under this section by a corporation controlled by, or under common control with, a common carrier subject to part I of this act solely on the ground that such service will be in competition with the service subject to this part performed by any other freight forwarder or freight forwarders."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish very briefly to explain the bill. The report is on the desks of Senators.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Is it satisfactory to the chairman to accept the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I wished to explain why we were willing to accept it.

Mr. BRICKER. We might conclude the RECORD on that point.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Six or seven years ago, after months of hearings in which all segments of the transportation industry in the United States testified, Congress made freight forwarders common carriers. Previous to that time, under the Interstate Commerce Act, they were not so classified. However, the growth of the freight forwarding business, and its particular interest for the so-called small shipper, the man who ships in less than carload lots, made it so important that it was felt by the Congress at that time, after lengthy hearings, that freight forwarders should be made common carriers.

At the time the bill provided only that the definition of a common carrier under the Interstate Commerce Act should be applied to a freight forwarder. All the pending bill does is to give the Commission the same right to regulate freight forwarders, and to issue a certificate of necessity to a freight forwarder, if he qualifies, in a manner similar to the procedure when a common carrier qualifies. It was thought that probably the language was not sufficient to protect those who might engage in competition in whole or in part with freight forwarders—in some cases other truckers, railroads, and other modes of transportation.

The amendment suggested by the Senator from Maryland and offered in his behalf by the Senator from Ohio is language which has been agreed upon to clear up that point. Otherwise the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is unanimous with regard to the bill. With this amendment I think the question will be cleared up. Freight forwarders will then be placed in the same position as other common carriers. I think that will do a great deal toward stabilizing our transportation industry. As I say, the growth of the freight forwarding business for the benefit of the small shipper has made it very important in the field of transportation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] for the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I made only a very brief statement, and the further fact that the report on this technical subject is quite brief, I ask unanimous consent to have the report of the committee printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 2040) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE REPORT

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3365) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to change the requirements for obtaining a freight forwarder permit, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and recommend that the bill do pass.

I. PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this bill is to give the Interstate Commerce Commission stronger control over the issuance of permits to engage in the business of freight forwarding than it possesses under existing law.

Section 410 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act provides, so far as here pertinent, that:

"The Commission shall issue a permit to any qualified applicant therefor, authorizing the whole or any part of the service covered by the application, if the Commission finds that the applicant is ready, able, and willing properly to perform the service proposed, and that the proposed service, to the extent authorized by the permit, is or will be consistent with the public interest

and the national transportation policy declared in this act; otherwise such application shall be denied."

The above-quoted language is the exact counterpart of the permit requirements of part II of the act in the cast of contract carriers by motor vehicle and of part III in the case of contract carriers by water. However, it is followed by section 410 (d) which has no counterpart anywhere in the Interstate Commerce Act or any comparable regulatory statute. Section 410 (d) provides:

"The Commission shall not deny authority to engage in the whole or any part of the proposed service covered by any application made under this section solely on the ground that such service will be in competition with the service subject to this part performed by any other freight forwarder or freight forwarders."

Under sections 209 (b) and 309 (g) of the Interstate Commerce Act, which deal with the issuance of permits to contract carriers by motor vehicle, and to contract carriers by water, respectively, the Commission has regularly and frequently denied applications for new or additional operating authority upon the grounds that the service of existing carriers was adequate to meet all reasonable requirements of the shipping public, and that the institution of additional service would result in needless and uneconomic duplication of existing transportation facilities.

However, because of the provisions of section 410 (d) which are quoted above, and which, as stated, are unique in the field of public utility regulation the Commission has construed the present law as precluding the denial of applications for freight forwarder operating authority upon these grounds. The Commission's interpretation of the statute was spelled out in *Lifschultz Fast Freight, Extension-West and Midwest* (265 I. C. C. 428). This decision placed considerable emphasis upon section 410 (d) and held that, in the light of the provisions of that section, applications for freight forwarder permits could not be denied upon the ground that the new or additional service proposed would compete with existing services or would result in wasteful or uneconomic duplication of facilities, in the absence of specific proof that actual impairment of existing services would result or could reasonably be anticipated. This interpretation of the law was sustained by the Supreme Court in Three Hundred and Thirty-eighth United States Reports, page 855.

The burden of proof imposed under the above-cited decision is one which is practically impossible to meet and, as a result of this interpretation which has been placed upon the law, entry into the field of freight forwarding has been virtually unrestricted. Consistently with this interpretation, the Commission apparently has felt that it is compelled to grant nearly all freight forwarder applications which have come before it. The relatively few applications which have been denied have each been distinguished by some unusual consideration peculiar to that particular case. This could result in overcrowding the freight forwarding field beyond the limits of sound economic balance, a fact which has been called to our attention in the Commission's annual reports to Congress in each of the last 4 years.

The bill would harmonize the permit requirements of part IV of the act with the provisions now contained in other parts of the act and would authorize the Commission to exercise broader discretion in determining whether an application for new or additional freight forwarder operating rights should be granted or denied.

II. TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF THE BILL

Testimony in support of the bill was offered on behalf of the freight forwarding industry. The Interstate Commerce Commission has recommended that the bill be enacted, even favoring a more restrictive amendment which would require applicants for freight forwarder operating authority to obtain certificates of public convenience and necessity.

The forwarders who favor enactment of the bill emphasize the fact that successful freight forwarding operations require the availability of a sufficient volume of freight to permit the accumulation and forwarding of truckload or carload quantities with reasonable frequency. This obviously is true, and it follows, as a corollary, that diffusion of the available traffic among too many forwarders would tend to prevent any of them from rendering an efficient and economic service. The testimony indicates that under the liberal policy which the Interstate Commerce Commission has followed in the issuance of freight forwarder permits, such diffusion already has occurred. For example, in 1943 the freight forwarders handled in excess of 5 million tons of freight. Their annual tonnage has declined steadily since then, and in 1954 they handled only 4.2 million tons. During this same period, 29 forwarders have been authorized to institute new operations or to expand their existing services. This strongly indicates that the available tonnage has simply been divided up between more forwarding companies. Not only does this tend to impair the efficiency of existing forwarder service, but it tends to discourage and retard the expansion and development of forwarder service in marginal areas where improved transportation service is most sorely needed. The record makes it clear that a sufficient number of forwarders already are engaged in business to assure that there will be ample competition within this field. Moreover, the bill would not prohibit the Interstate Commerce Commission from granting new or additional freight forwarding rights wherever it might find them to be required in the public interest. The proponents of the bill merely seek the same measure of protection against wasteful and uneconomic competition which is accorded to all other carriers regulated under the act and which is customarily accorded to all regulated utilities.

In the letter dated April 6, 1956, the Commission's Committee on Legislation expressed the following views in support of the bill:

"The effect to be given to section 410 (d) has been considered in a number of Commission proceedings, and, in this connection, one of the requirements necessary to issuance of a freight-forwarder permit under section 410 (c) is a finding 'that the proposed service, to the extent authorized by the permit, is or will be consistent with the public interest and the national transportation policy.' In our administration of part IV of the act, applications for forwarder rights have been granted where the evidence showed, among other things, that shippers desired and would utilize a proposed service. In those cases where it appeared that substantial impairment to the services of existing forwarders might result, the Commission has taken the position that such result would be contrary to the public interest and, upon so finding, has denied applications for new rights. However, due to the difficulty which interested parties in forwarder proceedings have had in adducing evidence to show the probable effects of a proposed service, very few applications for freight-forwarder permits have been denied upon evidence that the granting of such applications might lead to situations resulting in substantial impairment to the services of existing forwarders.

"The act of December 20, 1950 (Public Law 881, 81st Cong.), amended the Interstate Commerce Act by designating freight forwarders as common carriers. The Commission, in its 69th annual report to Congress, recommended (recommendation No. 31) that, since freight forwarders are now classified as common carriers, they be required to secure certificates of public convenience and necessity as a prerequisite to engaging in service as a freight forwarder, the same type of authority required to be obtained by other types of common carriers. As stated in the annual report, the ease with which permits may be obtained, under section 410 (d), could result in overcrowding the freight-forwarding field, with general impairment of forwarder service and harm to the general public. While it appears that the elimination of section 410 (d) is desirable so as to remove the restriction on the Commission's authority to deny applications, we believe that the act should be further amended so as to give effect to the aforementioned annual report recommendation.

"While we are of the opinion that it would be more desirable to amend section 410 as suggested above, we have no objection to the enactment of S. 3365 as introduced."

The Comptroller General of the United States also was asked to comment upon the bill and has advised the committee in a letter dater March 12, 1956, that the bill "if enacted, apparently would not have any direct effect upon the interests of the United States as a shipper or upon the functions of our Office. Accordingly, we have no occasion to object to the enactment of S. 3365."

III. TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION TO THE BILL

The bill was not opposed by the motor-carriers. It was opposed in part by the railroads and it was opposed by representatives of certain shippers and shipper associations. The interest expressed by the latter was twofold: First, that additional competition in the freight forwarding field would be desirable and that enactment of this bill would tend to curtail the freedom of entry into the business of freight forwarding which exists under present law; and, second, that if shipper associations which are now excluded from regulation under section 402 (c) of the act should ever be subjected to regulation, this bill would make it more difficult for them to obtain freight forwarder permits.

In support of this position, they renewed their argument that freight forwarders are essentially shippers, not carriers, and that therefore no restraint should be placed upon the freedom of any person desiring to do so, to enter the freight forwarding business. The fact that freight forwarders are common carriers subject to regulation under the Interstate Commerce Act serves to distinguish them from unregulated shipper associations which have no obligations to the public, and which are not subject to the restraints and burdens of regulation.

Unlike the shippers and shipper associations who testified in opposition to the bill, the freight forwarders neither manufacture, buy, nor sell the goods which they transport, and they have no proprietary interest in those goods. The 1950 amendment to the act (Public Law 881, 81st Cong.) and the report of this committee in connection therewith (Rept. No. 1285, 81st Cong., 2d sess.) make it abundantly clear that freight forwarders are regulated as common carriers. In the circumstances, it appears to the committee only proper that they should be impartially regulated upon the same terms as other carriers subject to the act.

There has been no testimony before this committee to the effect that if the permit requirements for freight forwarders were made the same as those which now apply in the case of contract carriers by motor vehicle or contract carriers by water, which is the purpose of this bill, the Interstate Commerce Commission would or should place any different construction upon section 410 (c) of the act than it has heretofore placed upon sections 209 (b) or 309 (g). Under the latter sections the Commission has not hesitated to authorize new or extended operations where

it appeared that such operations would be consistent with the public interest, taking into account the possible effect of such new operations upon the service of existing carriers.

The contention that shipper associations which are now excluded from regulation might possibly be subjected to regulation at some future date is too speculative to afford a proper basis for consideration of the merits of the bill which is before us. However, as stated above, the committee sees no reason to believe that the Interstate Commerce Commission would hesitate to grant any application for freight forwarder permit where it was shown that the service proposed would be consistent with the public interest.

The railroads who oppose the bill recognize the fact that the extreme liberality with which freight forwarder permits have been issued under existing law has tended to result in unnecessary duplication of transportation facilities, and in uneconomic conditions within the freight forwarding industry. However, they make the point that freight forwarder service is important to the railroads and that no amendment to the act should be approved which would restrict the right of any railroad to establish freight forwarder service through a controlled corporation as is now permitted under existing law.

It appears to the committee that continuation of the present situation in which virtually all applications for freight forwarder operating authority are granted without regard for the economic consequences, should not be perpetuated indefinitely, to the detriment of the freight forwarding industry and of their service to the public.

The present bill would not modify the provisions of existing law under which carriers subject to parts I, II, or III of the act may acquire freight forwarders, nor would it prohibit any carrier subject to parts I, II, or III of the act, through a separate corporation, from establishing a freight forwarder service upon a showing that such service would be consistent with the public interest and with the other standards laid down in section 410 (c) of the act.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In the opinion of the committee sound principles of regulation require that all regulated carriers be accorded equal protection against improvident and wasteful duplication of transportation facilities. This is required in the interest of the public no less than in the interest of the carriers. As an incident of regulation, public utilities assume far-reaching obligations to the public and are subject to many restrictions. As a corollary, they are entitled to reasonable protection against dissipation of their revenues and consequent impairment of their service to the public. In the belief that this bill will afford such protection, the committee recommends that this bill do pass.

Changes in existing law

In compliance with subsection 4 of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets; existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

"THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

"Part IV

"* * * * * *

"SEC. 410. * * *

"(c) The Commission shall issue a permit to any qualified applicant therefor, authorizing the whole or any part of the service covered by the application, if the Commission finds that the applicant is ready, able, and willing properly to perform the service proposed, and that the proposed service, to the extent authorized by the permit, is or will be consistent with the public interest and the national transportation policy declared in this act; otherwise such application shall be denied. * * *.

"[(d) The Commission shall not deny authority to engage in the whole or any part of the proposed service covered by any application made under this section solely on the ground that such service will be in competition with the service subject to this part performed by any other freight forwarder or freight forwarders.]"

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (S. 3365) was passed.

AMENDMENT OF JAPANESE-AMERICAN EVACUATION CLAIMS ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7763) to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, to expedite the final determination of the claims.

INTERCHANGE OF LAND BETWEEN CERTAIN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2175, S. 2572.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2572) to authorize the interchange of land between the Department of Agriculture and military departments of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall not object to the consideration of the bill, but I have a couple of questions which I should like to raise after an explanation of the bill has been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the pending measure was introduced by me at the request of the Department. It authorizes the interchange of national forest lands which are under the Department of Agriculture with military department lands within or adjacent to national forests. This will permit the most efficient use and administration of lands which are needed by, or intermingled with, other lands administered under the jurisdiction of the respective departments.

When the bill was called up the other day, the Republican calendar committee objected to its consideration. As I understand, the opposition was based on the fact that if the bill were passed, Congress would lose its present authority to decide whether transfers of such lands could be made. In order to act upon this proposal, I consulted the Department of Agriculture. An amendment was suggested which may meet the approval of the Republican calendar committee. The amendment which I intend to propose is to insert on page 2, line 3, before the period, a colon, and the following: *"Provided*, That no such interchange of land shall become effective until 45 days (counting only days occurring before any regular or special session of the Congress) after the submission to the Congress by the respective Secretaries of notice of intention to make the interchange."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think that meets the point raised by the Republican calendar committee, which I think was a valid one, to keep control within the Congress, and to assure that due notice would be given.

I think the Senator's amendment would take care of the situation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send my amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 3, before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: *"Provided*, That no such interchange of land shall become effective until 45 days, (counting only days occurring during any regular or special session of the Congress) after the submission to the Congress by the respective Secretaries of notice of intention to make the interchange."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2572) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to national forest lands and the Secretary of a military department with respect to lands under the control of the military department which lie

within or adjacent to the exterior boundaries of a national forest are authorized, subject to any applicable provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to interchange such lands, or any part thereof, without reimbursement or transfer of funds whenever they shall determine that such interchange will facilitate land management and will provide maximum use thereof for authorized purposes: *Provided,* That no such interchange of lands shall become effective until 45 days (counting only days occurring during any regular or special session of the Congress) after the submission to the Congress by the respective Secretaries of notice of intention to make the interchange.

SEC. 2. Any national forest lands which are transferred to a military department in accordance with this act shall be thereafter subject only to the laws applicable to other lands within the military installation or other public works project for which such lands are required and any lands which are transferred to the Department of Agriculture in accordance with this act shall become subject to the laws applicable to lands acquired under the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended.

AMENDMENT OF JAPANESE-AMERICAN EVACUATION CLAIMS ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the parliamentary situation, I assume the Presiding Officer will lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7763) to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determination of the claims, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in 1948 provision was made for handling the claims of Japanese-American citizens who, under the War Powers Act, were evacuated from areas on the Pacific coast, and also in Hawaii and in Alaska. Quite a number of claims were filed as a result of that act, and additional claims were filed when the act was amended from time to time. The Attorney General was given power to compromise claims up to $2,500, and he had to adjudicate them.

The record will show that since 1948 some 24,064 claims had originally been filed, and under the action of the Attorney General, the number has now been reduced to 1,936. But we are in the unhappy position that the remaining claims are in excess of $2,500. They range from $6,800 to more than $100,000, and aggregate $53 million.

The pending bill was considered by the House of Representatives and passed in March. It was then considered by a subcommittee and by the full Judiciary Committee of the Senate. The committee suggests some modifications designed to give the Attorney General jurisdiction to compromise and settle claims involving not exceeding $100,000. Claims in excess of that amount can either be handled by the Court of Claims or be submitted to the Congress.

It is provided that certain other claims shall be considered, including those filed by organizations, and claims which were mailed but not received within the time period set in the original act.

The bill has the concurrence of the Attorney General. It has passed the House, and I hope that with the safeguarding amendments it will be approved by the Senate.

In connection with this statement, not wishing to trespass on the time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

In urging approval of H. R. 7763, a bill to expedite the final determination of the remaining evacuation claims of Americans of Japanese ancestry, may I briefly explain the necessity and urgency for its enactment.

Fourteen years ago, in the spring of 1942, as a matter of military precaution, the Army evacuated without trial or hearing some 110,000 persons of Japanese ancestry, more than two-thirds of whom were citizens by birth while the others were resident aliens denied the privileges of naturalization by our laws, from their west coast homes and associations. None was charged with disloyalty or any criminal act against the United States; indeed, records of all the Federal investigative agencies reveal that there is not a single instance of espionage or sabotage against this country by a resident Japanese, citizens and aliens alike, before, during, and after December 7, 1941.

In this unprecedented mass movement, many lost everything they had; most lost substantially; and all suffered some economic loss, not to mention humiliation and physical hardships and illnesses.

80TH CONGRESS PASSED BASIC LAW

The 80th Congress, 8 years ago, enacted the basic Japanese American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948 authorizing the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims of persons of Japanese ancestry which were a direct consequence of their military eviction.

In the 18-month period allowed to file claims, some 24,000 claims for almost $130 million were filed with the Attorney General. But the adjudicative process proved so slow and cumbersome, as well as costly administratively, that the 82d Congress in 1951 approved a compromise settlement procedure under which the Attorney General was authorized to compromise and settle the smaller claims up to three-fourths the amount of the compensable items, if any, or $2,500, whichever was less.

Under this compromise settlement procedure for smaller claims, a program which threatened to take decades was virtually completed by the end of fiscal year 1954. By that time, some 19,750 claims had been compromised and settled for some $23 million, out of a total originally claimed of some $63,700,000.

Today, in the main only the larger claims remain, almost 2,000 claims for a total claimed amount of more than $53,000,000.

LOGICAL EXTENSION

The proposed legislation is the logical extension of the compromise settlement program for the smaller claims. Unless it is approved, it will take another decade or more to complete this program.

It authorizes the Attorney General to compromise and settle all claims in an amount not to exceed $100,000. This limitation will allow the Attorney General to compromise and settle all but 69 of the remaining claims, and many of these 69 claims with an original claimed amount of over $100,000 will probably be willing to accept the Attorney General's top limit or less if given the opportunity.

If the claimant is not satisfied with the compromise offer of the Attorney General, he may seek a judicial review or determination of his claim, both as to valuation and as to compensable terms, in the Court of Claims. This appeal to judicial review, incidentally, is not a part of existing law. In keeping with traditional American concepts of justice, we believe that such review should be provided in any claims program and, therefore, H. R. 7763 makes such appeals procedure applicable.

If the claim is for more than $100,000, and the claimant is not satisfied with the Attorney General's compromise offer which may or may not be in that limited amount, he has recourse to the Court of Claims.

In this connection, it should be made clear that, as with other litigation before the Court of Claims, the Attorney General and the claimant may agree to any settlement of the claim, subject of course to approval of the Court of Claims. In other words, the amendment offered by the Committee on the Judiciary does not in any way change or alter the right of the Attorney General to settle any claim while it is in litigation if he feels that it is in the interests of the United States to do so.

Moreover, the Court of Claims is not restricted to awarding an amount not in excess of the $100,000 authorized for the Attorney General in the compromise settlement procedure. If any claimant can demonstrate to the Court of Claims that, under the law, he is entitled to more than the $100,000, there is nothing in this legislation to prohibit the court from making such an award. Indeed, in the 2 or 3 claims totaling more than $1 million each, if the claimant can prove his claim to the claimed amount, the court can make an award without regard to any limitation as to total amount.

CLAIMS VALIDATED

In addition to this compromise settlement authority, with a Court of Claims alternative, H. R. 7763 validates three types of claims presently not considered compensable.

Profit and nonprofit corporations, the majority of whose stock or members on December 7, 1941, were persons of Japanese ancestry are declared to be eligible claimants. In the light of common business practices, where corporate entities are recognized as legal personages, we believe that this claims program should take this traditional concept into consideration.

West coast internees who suffered property losses as a consequence of the evacuation, and not of their internment, are also recognized as eligible claimants. In this connection, it should be made clear that other internees, including those of Japanese ancestry residing outside of the evacuated areas, were able to carry on their businesses and to maintain their homes, even though they were interned, because their families and friends were able to carry on their activities in their behalf. This was not true in the case of west coast internees from the evacuated areas since thier families and their friends of Japanese ancestry were subsequently removed and, therefore, not able to continue the operations on behalf of these internees. It is clear that no disloyal person will be compensated, however, because all of the so-called dangerous internees were expatriated or deported to Japan during and after the war and are not in this country at this time.

Finally, some 75 claims totaling some $150,000 which were postmarked prior to the January 3, 1950, deadline but were received after that bar date by the Attorney General in Washington are to be considered as timely filed within the meaning of the act.

Perhaps it should be pointed out that the House Committee on the Judiciary eliminated certain provisions to H. R. 7763 which would have required the Attorney General to be more generous and liberal in his evaluation of certain kinds of losses, such as conservation and management expenses, crop losses, and rental values, in the interests of securing expediting legislation this session. In respect to these items, which constitute a substantial part of many of the remaining claims, it is clear that the Attorney General will continue to evaluate the extent of the losses suffered in terms of his present interpretations and that he will not refuse to consider these items of loss as valid ones.

CHICAGO JAPANESE-AMERICANS

After the evacuation most of the Japanese-Americans resettled in midwestern, southern, and eastern communities outside the western defense command. As a matter of record, more Japanese-Americans resettled in the city of Chicago than in any other community in the Nation and even today the second largest group of Americans of Japanese ancestry continue to reside in Chicago.

These Japanese-Americans have contributed much to Chicago and to the State of Illinois. The Chicago chapter of the Japanese American Citizens League is one of the more active civic organizations in my State.

It is, therefore, from personal experience with these evacuated Japanese Americans who have found new homes, new friends, new opportunities, and new hopes in Illinois that I, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary to which H. R. 7763 was referred, urge my colleagues to approve this vital and meritorious legislation which would help in part to mitigate the wartime property losses suffered by one loyal segment of our population.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be stated.

The amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary were, on page 1, line 8, after the word "award", to insert "in an amount not to exceed $100,000"; and on page 5, line 2, after the word "award", to insert "in an amount not to exceed $100,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to add a word or two to what the Senator from Illinois has stated concerning the bill.

It is quite important, particularly to those of us on the Pacific coast. After the attack on Pearl Harbor many Japanese were taken from their homes. I think it turned out that we made a mistake, but I can understand that the better part of caution was to take action. They were taken to various parts of the country, and located in concentration centers. Many were moved east of the Rocky Mountains. Chicago received a great number of these people, who are still living there.

It developed that no question of sabotage was involved, and there was no disloyalty on the part of these people. I do not know of a single case of disloyalty. They were disrupted. Many of them have returned to the places where they formerly lived. They are hopeful that they can reestablish themselves.

Many of them did not know how to file their claims. They did not have lawyers. In some cases, there was a great deal of damage done to their small homes. Vandalism occurred. Windows were broken, and the land deteriorated.

We have been working 6 or 7 years, trying to get these claims cleared up. The bill is not exactly what we wanted, but it will go a long way to give the Attorney General authority to proceed to clear up the claims.

The bill has a long history. I think I introduced the original bill when I was a member of the Judiciary Committee. Former Senator Cooper, of Kentucky, was also a member of the committee.

I hope we can report to the next Congress, or, at least, before the session next year is concluded, that some success has been achieved in clearing up the remainder of the claims.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the subject, and also a portion of the report of the Judiciary Committee.

There being no objection, the statement and a portion of the committee report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

THE JAPANESE-AMERICAN EVACUATION CLAIMS ACT

Eight years ago, I was a member of the Judiciary Subcommittee with the present Ambassador to India, then Senator John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, when the basic statute which H. R. 7763 seeks to amend was considered. The basic statute is the Japanese American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, which authorizes the Attorney General to adjudicate certain property losses suffered by persons of Japanese ancestry as a direct consequence of their military evacuation in the spring and summer of 1942.

Since there are more Japanese-Americans in my State of Washington than in any other State in the Union except California, and since I have long been acquainted with them and their problems, both before and since World War II, I desire my colleagues in the Senate to understand the purpose of this particular legislation, H. R. 7763.

Major objective

The main provision of this bill proposes to authorize the Attorney General to compromise and settle all of the remaining evacuation claims in an amount not to exceed $100,000. If a claim is for more than that amount, or if the claimant is not satisfied with the compromise offer of the Attorney General, he has the right to appeal to the Court of Claims for a judicial determination of his claim.

It is as simple as that.

Of course, there are other provisions in this bill, but the compromise settlement feature with its Court of Claims alternative is the principal one.

And why is such an expediting provision needed? It is because the adjudicative procedure established by the basic law is so cumbersome, slow, and costly that, unless this amendatory legislation is passed, a decade or more will be required to complete this program at an administrative cost to the Government that may well equal one-half or more of the amount of awards paid to the claimants.

House report for background

In order that Senators may have the benefit of the background for this legislation, I ask that Report No. 1809, of the House Committee on the Judiciary, to accompany H. R. 7763, be included in my statement at this point, beginning on page 3, Purpose, and ending on page 8, after the paragraph on item V, Bill gives claimants election to either accept Attorney General's compromise or to take claim to Court of Claims for settlement.

Hearings held

It should be noted that extensive public hearings were held in California in 1954 and in 1955 with more than 150 witnesses, representing all walks of life, testifying to the need for this expediting legislation. Only one witness wrote in expressing objection to the principle involved.

Items eliminated

The chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Claims introduced H. R. 7763, to include those recommendations which the subcommittee on 2 occasions had felt required legislation. Unfortunately, not because they lacked merit, but because "their inclusion would substantially reopen the entire project and would thereby delay, and not expedite, the final conclusion of this program," the House Judiciary Committee eliminated provisions directing the Attorney General to more liberally and generously evaluate management and conservation expenses, crop losses, and rental values.

At the same time, the House Judiciary Committee made it clear that its actions did not foreclose future consideration of these items by the Attorney General, for it is intended that the Attorney General continue to determine the extent or amount of the losses suffered on the same basis as he has been doing since the inception of the program.

Moreover, the House Judiciary Committee makes it clear that claimants who are not satisfied with either or both the amounts and the compensable items allowed may seek recourse to the Court of Claims for a final determination on judicial grounds.

H. R. 7763, as amended, passed the House unanimously on March 5.

Senate amendment

The Senate Committee on the Judiciary accepted the House-approved bill with but one amendment, and that to limit the authority of the Attorney General to compromise in an amount "not to exceed $100,000."

It is my belief that this Senate amendment is an appropriate one, for the Attorney General should have some limits to his discretion in such matters. On the other hand, I do not believe that this limitation prevents the Attorney General from reaching a settlement on claims over $100,000 and for amounts in excess of $100,000 when that claim is in litigation before the Court of Claims and is agreed to by both the claimant and the court itself, for this is an established principle which this Senate amendment does not impinge upon. Also, it is my opinion that this $100,000 limitation on the Attorney General's power to compromise claims does not prohibit the Court of Claims from making an award in excess of that amount.

In any event, this legislation is needed in order that this program can be completed within a reasonable period so that those who suffered the losses and who filed claims may be the beneficiaries of this legislation of grace while they are still alive.

Noncontroversial bill

This remedial legislation is endorsed by the Japanese American Citizens League, with its 88 chapters in 32 States, as the single most important bill in this session directly and solely involving Americans of Japanese ancestry in this country. It is also approved by the administration and by the Department of Justice. It has the support of all the west coast delegation in Congress on a nonpartisan basis. It is noncontroversial and certainly meritorious in the tradition of democracy's ability to make up for its mistakes.

Too long have our Americans of Japanese ancestry waited for the conclusion of this claims program. It is my hope that this Congress will enact H. R. 7763 to speed the time when what can be done to compensate for some of the property losses of their wartime evacuation will be accomplished. We

can never compensate for what we did to them in the hysteria of war, but we can at least compensate our Japanese-Americans for certain of their real property losses which our Government caused them to suffer.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this legislation is to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act, as amended, to provide methods for the expeditious settlement of the remaining claims. Under the proposed legislation, the Attorney General will be relieved of his obligation to adjudicate the remaining claims and will be empowered instead to dispose of them through compromise settlements.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

In 1948, Congress enacted Public Law 886 (80th Cong.) authorizing the Attorney General to adjudicate and settle the property loss claims of those persons of Japanese ancestry who were evacuated or excluded from the Pacific coast area of the United States, Hawaii, and Alaska during World War II, pursuant to Presidential orders.

The 1948 act called for formal adjudication of the claims. Formal adjudication, however, proved burdensome, at least for the smaller claims, and in 1951 Congress amended the 1948 act, authorizing compromise settlement—as distinguished from formal adjudication—of all claims where the award made would be $2,500 or less. Practically all of the claims amounting to $2,500 or less have been settled.

As of September 23, 1955, there were still 2,077 remaining claims to be settled, totaling $55,051,492.58. They included substantially all of the larger claims which, because of the $2,500 limitation in the present law, cannot be settled through the compromise formula. In order to expedite the remaining claims, Representative PATRICK J. HILLINGS introduced in the 83d Congress H. R. 7435. Hearings were held on that measure and as a result the subcommitte filed a report setting forth 16 specific recommendations. Because the Congress had adjourned, no further action was taken on that measure.

In the 84th Congress H. R. 4673 was introduced, containing those recommendations. A report on that bill was requested from the Department of Justice, which is charged with administering the claims program. While the Department was in favor of the subcommittee's recommendations for informal compromise settlement of all remaining claims, it nonetheless took issue with several of the subcommittee's recommendations. Thereafter the present bill, H. R. 7763 was introduced and it is, in a sense, a compromise measure and is calculated to carry out the present recommendations of the subcommittee and at the same time embody the suggestions made by the Attorney General.

It might be well to note at this point that the committee did not go into the question of whether the Government was either legally or morally responsible for the losses sustained by the evacuated people. That issue, insofar as the committee is concerned, was resolved in 1948 when Congress passed Public Law 886 (80th Cong.) compensating those people for their property losses. The committee's main objective was to consider the provisions of H. R. 7763 in order to determine whether it would provide adequate procedure by which the remaining claims can be expeditiously and properly settled.

BACKGROUND

Early in 1942, the War Department, acting under Presidential order, ordered the exclusion of all persons of Japanese ancestry from the Pacific coast of the continental United States, Alaska, and a portion of Arizona. Most of these people were removed to relocation centers administered by the War Relocation Authority. They were joined later by over 1,000 persons evacuated from Hawaii. For approximately 2½ years these American citizens and their alien parents, more than 100,000 in number, were exiled from their homes.

After January 2, 1945, the majority of them were permitted to return to their homes in the evacuated areas.

The chief military justification for the removal of these people was the war with Japan, the possibility of the existence of a disloyal element in their midst, the critical military situation in the Pacific which increased uneasiness over the possibility of espionage or sabotage, and the lack of time and facilities for individual loyalty screening. The persons evacuated were not individually charged with any crime or with disloyalty and subsequent experience has clearly demonstrated that the vast majority of them were and are good Americans.[1]

The evacuation orders, in many instances, gave the people affected desperately little time in which to settle their affairs. The governmental safeguards which were designed to prevent undue loss were somewhat tardily instituted, were not at once effectively publicized among the evacuees, and were never entirely successful. Merchants disposed of their stocks and businesses at sacrifice prices. Many individuals sold personal possessions for a small portion of their value. A large number had to accept inadequate arrangements for protection and management of property.

Continued exclusion increased the losses. Private homes and buildings in which evacuees stored their property were broken into and vandalized. Persons entrusted with the management of real property mulcted the owners. Tenants failed to pay rent, converted property to their own use, and committed waste. Prohibited from returning to the evacuated areas even temporarily to handle property matters, the evacuees were unable to protect themselves adequately.

In relocation centers the only income opportunities lay in relocation center employment at wage rates of $12 to $19 per month, plus small clothing allowances. As a result many found themselves unable to meet insurance premiums, mortgage, and tax payments, and they therefore lost substantial equities.

PRIOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION AND REASONS THEREFOR

After the end of hostilities of World War II, and in 1948, Congress enacted Public Law 886 (80th Cong.) authorizing the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders. The report of the House Committee on the Judiciary, on this legislation sets forth the reasons for compensating these victims of military necessity in the following language (H. Rept. No. 732, 80th Cong.):

"The committee was impressed with the fact that, despite the hardships visited upon this unfortunate racial group brought about by the then prevailing military necessity, there was recorded during the war not one act of sabotage or espionage attributable to those who were the victims of the forced relocation. Moreover, statistics were produced to indicate that the percentage of enlistments in the Armed Forces of this country by those of Japanese ancestry of eligible age exceeded the nationwide percentage. The valiant exploits of the 442d Regimental Combat Team, composed entirely of Japanese-Americans and the most decorated combat team in the war, are well known. It was further adduced that the Japanese-Americans who were relocated proved themselves to be, almost without exception, loyal to the traditions of this country, and exhibited a commendable discipline throughout the period of their exile. * * *

"The committee considered the argument that the victims of the relocation were no more casualties of the war than were many millions of other Americans who lost their lives or their homes or occupations during the war. However, this argument was not considered tenable, since in the instant case the loss was inflicted upon a special racial group by a voluntary act of the Government without precedent in the history of this country. Not to redress these loyal Americans in some measure for the wrongs inflicted upon them would provide ample material for attacks by the followers of foreign ideologies on the American way of life, and to redress them would be simple justice."

TWENTY-FOUR THOUSAND, ONE HUNDRED AND THREE CLAIMS FILED

In accordance with the provisions of Public Law 886, the Department of Justice established a Japanese Claims Section and invited all evacuees to file their claims. By January 3, 1950, the statutory deadline for filing claims, 24,103 claims were submitted to the Department, totaling $129,996,589.

PROCESSING OF CLAIMS

The processing of claims started slowly. Because of the tremendous size of the program, detailed plans and systematized procedures had to be developed. An office force, including a sufficient number of qualified attorneys, had to be set up. To facilitate matters, the Department of Justice, in addition to its Washington, D. C., office, opened offices in the cities of Los Angeles and San Francisco, Calif.

In the calendar year 1949, 21 claims were adjudicated by the Department. In the calendar year 1950, 211 claims were adjudicated. During this period it became apparent that, because of the formalized procedures required by the Evacuation Claims Act, the processing of claims would be both slow and administratively expensive.

The slowness and high costs caused the Congress and the Department of Justice to seek a more expeditious and less expensive method of handling these claims. As a result, the Department proposed a compromise settlement plan which would authorize the Attorney General, on an informal basis, to compromise and settle the smaller claims for amounts not in excess of $2,500. Congress adopted this proposal by enacting Public Law 116, 82d Congress. (See Congressman RODINO'S H. Rept. 496, 82d Cong., on this legislation.)

Thereafter, the Department of Justice was able to increase its production schedule to more than 1,000 claims per month and by mid-1953 substantially all of the claims which could be compromised under the $2,500 limitation were processed and awards made. Administrative costs per claim were greatly reduced.

PRESENT STATUS OF CLAIM PROCESSING

At the time of the hearings, the committee received the following statistics from the Department of Justice, showing the number

[1] The subcommittee could not fail to be impressed with the fact that, despite the suspicions in which they were held, there was not one recorded act of sabotage or espionage which was attributable to them. Moreover, the percentage of enlistments in the Armed Forces by those of Japanese ancestry exceeded the nationwide percentage. Where the average casualty rate of the American Army was less than 25 percent, the casualty rate of the 442d Regimental Combat Team, composed entirely of Japanese-Americans, was 308 percent. No other group of regimental size during World War II won more than 3 Presidential distinguished unit citations; the 442d Japanese-American regiment won 7.

of claims settled and the amounts awarded from 1948 to 1955:

	Number of claims	Amount claimed	Amount awarded
Compromised	20,211	$69,185,472.41	$24,259,528.05
Adjudicated	688	3,404,503.14	1,421,396.89
Dismissed	1,088	3,810,998.68	
Total	21,987	76,400,974.23	25,680,924.94

It should be noted that the total amount originally claimed, including those dismissed, was $76,400,974.23. The total amount awarded was $25,680,924.94. The Government, therefore, has been settling claims for about one-third of the amount originally claimed.

TWO THOUSAND AND SEVENTY-SEVEN REMAINING CLAIMS

Two thousand and seventy-seven claims remain to be processed, totaling over $55 million. On a dollar basis, they represent substantially all of the larger claims and, under the present law, since they are too large to be compromised, they can only be settled by adjudication.

The breakdown of the remaining claims is as follows:

Category	Number	Amount involved
To $6,800	632	$1,952,908.43
$6,800 to $10,000	222	1,886,310.04
$10,000 to $25,000	654	10,689,524.15
$25,000 to $50,000	334	11,605,553.68
$50,000 to $100,000	164	10,974,454.51
$100,000 and over	71	17,942,741.77
Total	2,077	55,051,492.58

ANALYSIS OF BILL

Item I (p. 1, lines 7 to 10; p. 2, lines 1 to 15; p. 5, lines 10 to 16 of bill as introduced)—Authority to Attorney General to compromise and settle all remaining claims regardless of amount claimed

The most important change sought by this legislation concerns the informal compromise settlement of all claims regardless of amount. It is 14 years now since the evacuation began in 1942. Many of the detailed records and documents existing at that time have either been lost or destroyed. Evacuees were given very short notice within which to evacuate, and they could take to the relocation centers only those articles which they were able to carry. Books and records were of course left behind and since whole communities were moved, there was in many instances inadequate protection for the proper safeguarding of property.

Claimants who are without records and documents must now look to other sources for information. With the passage of time, however, available sources of information lessen. Witnesses, who could testify, have moved and their present addresses are unknown; others have died.

Under the compromise procedure, however, the Government will be able to process the claims on the basis of affidavits of witnesses, available records, State and Federal surveys and data, and other satisfactory information. This is, of course, a realistic approach to a most difficult problem. The Department of Justice has acquired voluminous information in its processing of thousands of claims, and, as a result, there have evolved general patterns of information which can be used as guides in the compromise processing of remaining claims. In addition, while this simplified, informal method will offer advantages to claimants, it will also lower the administrative costs per claim to the Government as well as save the administrative costs of a long-continuing program.

Item II (p. 2, lines 20 to 25; and p. 3, lines 1 to 6 of bill as introduced)—Bill recognizes corporate, partnership, association claims, etc., both profit and nonprofit, the majority of whose stockholders were of Japanese ancestry

Under the present law only a person of Japanese ancestry may be compensated for losses resulting from the evacuation and exclusion. A strict interpretation of the word "person" excludes corporations, partnerships, charitable organizations, church congregations, etc. The Attorney General, in instances where the corporation was owned entirely by the individual members of an evacuated or excluded family (so-called family corporation), has gone behind the corporate entity and treated the claims on a pro rata basis, compensating each member of a family for a portion of the loss. Greater difficulty arises, however, with claims involving corporations, church organizations, cemetery groups, and charitable institutions where not all of the membership are persons of Japanese ancestry. In recommending that these entities be recognized under this act, the subcommittee drew a provision (amendment No. 2, supra) which limits relief to those organizations which were substantially owned by people of Japanese ancestry and which can demonstrate that their losses were caused by the evacuation of the Japanese people from the Pacific coast areas.

Item III (p. 3, lines 7 to 17 of bill as introduced)—Bill recognizes internee claims

Immediately after Pearl Harbor, many Japanese aliens were apprehended by the Federal Bureau of Investigation as alien enemies and were interned for questioning and investigation. Unlike other alien enemies who were interned and whose families remained at home to continue their businesses or to care for their properties, the families and friends of the Japanese internees were forced to evacuate when the general evacuation orders became effective. This resulted in losses to the Japanese interned aliens which were not due to their internment but rather were, in fact, due to the evacuation of their families and to the evacuation of the Japanese community as a group. After the Japanese alien internees were investigated they were usually released and sent to relocation centers.

Section 2 (b) (2) of the present law forbids consideration of claims for damage or loss arising out of action by any Federal agency pursuant to the alien enemy law or the Trading With the Enemy Act, so that a loss resulting from the internment of a Japanese alien cannot be compensated for even though the same loss might have occurred if he had not been interned but had been evacuated under military orders. In addition, in situations where the loss would not have occurred but for the subsequent evacuation of the family of the internee, he personally cannot claim because under section 1 of the act as presently worded the loss was not a consequence of his evacuation or exclusion. This provision of the bill would validate the claims of such a detained or interned person.

Item IV (p. 4, lines 16 to 24 of bill as introduced)—Validation of certain late claims

A minor objective of the instant bill which the committee approves is to have considered as timely filed 75 claims which were postmarked prior to midnight January 3, 1950, the last day for filing claims, but which were not received in Washington until after that date. While technically such claims were not filed on time, the claimants involved no doubt acted under the widespread misconception that anything timely mailed is timely filed. This provision of the bill will validate those claims.

Item V (p. 5, lines 17 to 24; p. 6, lines 1 to 21 of bill as introduced)—Bill gives claimants election to either accept Attorney General's compromise or to take claim to Court of Claims for settlement

The bill permits any claimant who is dissatisfied with the determination of the Attorney General to go to the Court of Claims for an adjudication of his claim. Under its provision, he may elect to proceed immediately before the Court of Claims or to process his claim for informal compromise settlement before the Attorney General. In the further event the Attorney General notifies claimant that he will give no further consideration to the compromise settlement of the claim, the claimant may thereafter and within 90 days seek an adjudication in the Court of Claims. The committee, in approving this provision, feels that claimants should have another forum through which to seek relief when they are dissatisfied with the determinations of the Attorney General. The testimony at the hearings indicated that there would not be more than "5 or 6" claimants prosecuting their claims in the Court of Claims.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF INDIAN EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2195, Senate Joint Resolution 110, directing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study and investigation of Indian education in the United States.

I should like to make this statement, if it is proper to do so now: When the action on Senate Joint Resolution 110 has been concluded, it is planned to take up the auto-dealer's-day-in-court bill, S. 3879. At that time I shall suggest the absence of a quorum, so that all Senators may be on notice of the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate Joint Resolution 110 will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 110) directing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study and investigation of Indian education in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 1, line 6, after the word "the", to strike out "United States" and insert "continental United States and Alaska"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "schools", to strike out "A major share of such study and investigation shall consist of original

educational research, and original inquiry into the interests and desires of Indian and non-Indian citizens in the field of Indian education"; in line 7, after the word "authorized", to strike out "to procure the temporary or intermittent services of experts, consultants, or organizations thereof, in accordance with the provisions of section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810). Such experts or consultants shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them while performing such services" and insert "to enter into contracts in accordance with the provisions of the Johnson-O'Malley Act of June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1458; 25 U. S. C. 452)"; and in line 16, after the word "after", to strike out "the effective date" and insert "funds are made available to carry out the purposes", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), acting through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of Indian education in the continental United States and Alaska, including a study and investigation of (1) the education problems of Indian children from non-English-speaking homes, and (2) the possibility of establishing a more orderly, equitable, and acceptable program for transferring Indian children to public schools.

SEC. 2. The Secretary, in carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, is authorized to enter into contracts in accordance with the provisions of the Johnson-O'Malley Act of June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1458; 25 U. S. C. 452).

SEC. 3. Not later than 2 years after funds are made available to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a complete report of the results of such study and investigation, together with such recommendations as he deems desirable.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in support of the joint resolution, I may say that it was unanimously reported by the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and was unanimously endorsed and ordered to be reported to the Senate by the full committee.

The purpose of the joint resolution is to broaden the functions of the Johnson-O'Malley Act for the education of Indians, particularly Indian children. I feel certain there is no objection to the joint resolution, but if there is I shall be glad to make a statement in explanation of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 110) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 417. An act for the relief of Pearl O. Seilaz;

S. 530. An act for the relief of the Sacred Heart Hospital;

S. 1034. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Donald D. Parrish.

S. 1414. An act for the relief of James Edward Robinson;

S. 2016. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Lawrence F. Kramer;

S. 2152. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer;

S. 2582. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of William E. Stone for disability retirement as a Reserve officer or Army of the United States officer under the provisions of the act of April 3, 1939, as amended;

S. 3472. An act for the relief of Patricia A. Pembroke; and

S. 3945. An act for the relief of Walter C. Jordan and Elton W. Johnson.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following joint resolutions of the House:

H. J. Res. 535. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 566. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following joint resolutions of the House:

H. J. Res. 533. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 534. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 553. Joint resolution waiving certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 554. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 555. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

AUTOMOBILE DEALERS' DAY IN COURT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2095, Senate bill 3879, the so-called automobile-dealers'-day-in-court bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3879) to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States, in order to balance the power now heavily weighted in favor of automobile manufacturers, by enabling franchised automobile dealers to bring suit in the district courts of the United States to recover twofold damages sustained by reason of the failure of automobile manufacturers to act in good faith in complying with the terms of franchises or in terminating or not renewing franchises with their dealers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this is a very important piece of proposed legislation. I think all Senators should be here, if possible, to hear the explanation which will be made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

I ask the cooperation of the attachés of the Senate in notifying all Senators.

I suggest the absence of a quorum; and I announce that the consideration of the bill will not be proceeded with until a quorum has been obtained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	McNamara
Anderson	Holland	Millikin
Beall	Jackson	Murray
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Neuberger
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Clements	Kefauver	Pastore
Cotton	Kennedy	Payne
Dirksen	Knowland	Sparkman
Eastland	Laird	Stennis
Ellender	Long	Thye
Flanders	Magnuson	Watkins
Gore	Martin, Iowa	Wofford
Hayden	McClellan	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH and Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent in order to attend the wedding of his daughter.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JENNER, Mr.

KERR, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. POTTER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). A quorum is present. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, today the Senate is considering what I consider to be one of the most important measures to come before the Senate at this session of Congress. When I say that I am cognizant of the fact that there are a great many interested onlookers in the gallery. They are citizens of the United States who have come to Washington to watch a legislative body perform.

I wish them to know that the roll has been called, that Senators have come into the Chamber, have answered to their names, and that they are aware of the importance of the measure the Senate is considering. They know that the measure has come before the Senate after hearings were held over a period of weeks by a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. They were well attended hearings; they were attended not only by members of the subcommittee and of the committee, but by other Members of the Senate.

Our guests in the gallery today should be aware of the fact that that is why I am making these remarks. All of that preliminary work has been done, and today, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation, of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, I am making the record.

A printed report has been filed by the committee. It has been distributed to every Member of the Senate. I have personally addressed letters to the Members of the Senate to apprise them of the contents of the committee report.

Therefore, the slim attendance on the floor of the Senate today, occasioned by the fact that Members are aware of what the problem is, and have come into the Chamber and registered their attendance and then have gone to other committee meetings, is not at all an indication that the Members of the Senate are not giving close attention to the questions and problems which are presented by the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to say that in all my experience in the Senate, during the 15 years I have been here, I have never known a subcommittee to go into a subject more thoroughly and more completely than the subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming went into the subject now pending before the Senate.

Through its counsel and staff, the subcommittee has made a clear-cut analysis of this great problem that confronts so many people in the United States. I am happy to have been associated in this matter with the Senator from Wyoming, and I am delighted to note the high and consistently fine job he has done to get a clear understanding of this great problem before the American people. I want the people to know that, and I assure the Senator of my continued wholehearted cooperation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from North Dakota, who, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, has been very effective in the presentation of the pending bill.

In order to confirm what he has said, I call attention to the fact that I hold in my hand a file of letters which I have received within the past week from Members of the Senate to whom I had sent the report. In these letters they tell me of their favorable reaction to the report.

There are many students in the gallery today, and I wish them to know that under the procedure which the Senate follows, a printed report must be filed by every committee on every bill it reports. The reports go to the Senators in their offices, where they are examined.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to join the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] in expressing my appreciation for the fine job the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has done in presenting this bill to the Senate. We know of the tireless work which was done by the subcommittee in studying the problem. We also know of the cooperation between the distinguished Senator's subcommittee and the Subcommittee on Automobile Marketing Practices of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The two subcommittees have worked along somewhat parallel lines in hearing evidence. We heard testimony concerning practices in the automobile manufacturing industry from many automobile dealers who have suffered under many of the conditions which the pending bill seeks to correct.

We have also had a wide response to a questionnaire sent out by our committee. It was the widest response which has ever been received, on a voluntary basis, to a questionnaire sent out by a Government agency, and the responses were received from more than 20,000 automobile dealers. The answers to the questionnaire have been made available in detail to the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, in an exchange of information and cooperation between the staffs of the two subcommittees.

It would be hard for me to recall any proposed legislation which has had more careful and considerate study than the bill now pending before the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me add one more comment to what the Senator from Oklahoma has said. This problem is one of interstate commerce. It is only natural, therefore, that the committee of which he is a member, and the subcommittee of which he is chairman should study the problems which affect automobile dealers throughout the country, and that his subcommittee should look into that subject.

There has developed in the United States a situation which is becoming more and more widespread and better and better understood, whereby a comparatively few manufacturers hold a position of power in dealing with small businesses throughout the United States in every State, and because of disproportionate economic power, hold almost complete control over the activities of the small automobile dealers.

This has been revealed in the questionnaires to which the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has just referred. Questionnaires were sent out by the committee to automobile dealers in every State of the Union. The dealers have answered voluntarily and have told us the conditions out of which two bills have issued, the bill which I am about to explain, on the one hand, and the bill which the Senator from Oklahoma and his colleagues on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have reported to the Senate. So the record should be clear that there has been a great backlog of information built up which is known to the manufacturers and known also to the dealers and to other small-business people.

The manufacturers have learned so much from these hearings that they have already taken steps to modify the conditions in many respects about which the automobile dealers have complained. I am happy to have seen that development, and I wish to congratulate the Senator from Oklahoma on the great work he has done in this matter.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As a member of the subcommittee which held hearings on this question, I had the pleasure of being present at some of the hearings, and I wish heartily to congratulate the distinguished acting chairman of the subcommittee upon accomplishing two things in what seemed to be a very confused and almost hopeless problem.

I have been very much impressed with the fact that after the full statements of many dealers had been made, the automobile companies themselves changed their method of doing business, reformed their contracts, and gave more liberal consideration to the dealers on a voluntary basis.

I congratulate the Senator upon arriving at and preparing the provision contained on page 2 of the bill which sets forth the method and the way the contracts between the automobile companies and the dealers shall be carried out. That provision seems to me to be eminently fair to the automobile companies as well as to the dealers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. It was intended to be fair to the manufacturers as well as to the dealers.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think it will bring about a more satisfactory relationship between the two parties, and it will result in the dealers having the protection to which they are entitled. I know it will stabilize the industry all over the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, I desire briefly to explain why the committee, after long

hearings, felt that it was necessary to report this bill and to have it considered by the Senate.

The necessity arose out of the fact that by reason of technological developments during the past 25 to 50 years the old boundaries which separated the people into narrow trading areas have practically disappeared. The airplane, to mention one type of transportation, and the automobile have helped to break down the geographical boundaries of our economic development. So it comes about that very great institutions are the producers of manufactured articles which are sent to every State of the Union.

There has been a steady concentration of economic power in the hands of those who are at the head of the various manufacturing institutions, a concentration which is so great that scarcely a day passes that the country does not receive through the newspapers evidence of what is transpiring. We have evidence upon the floor of the Senate in the bills we pass. The Government has to subsidize the farmers. The Government has to subsidize small business. A few years ago, under the Legislative Reorganization Act, it was provided that special committees should no longer be allowed, and the Committee on Small Business which had existed through many sessions of Congress was by that law abolished. But the demand from the rank and file of the people throughout the United States was such that the very next Congress had to reestablish the Committee on Small Business.

This is a problem which we have not settled, and I believe, Mr. President, that we are presenting to the Senate today a bill which will open the door to the solution of the great problem of the relationship of big business to small business. I have personally been accused of being a foe of big business in itself. I am not. In this bill which we present I think the Judiciary Committee has given evidence that it is not at all antagonistic to big industry as such. We have not proposed here, for example, that any limitation be placed upon any business. We have not proposed that any new penalty be applied to big business. All in the world we have done is to provide that the automobile dealer who regards himself as an independent businessman, who has invested his money in the establishment of his business, shall have his day in court whenever a question arises between the dealer and the manufacturer with respect to the exercise of good faith by the manufacturer in the carrying out of the contract, or the franchise, as it is sometimes called.

Before the hearing was held, in most cases these franchises were year to year franchises, terminable at will. The independent local automobile dealers—there are more than 40,000 of them in the United States—who had invested, upon the average, not less than $100,000, found themselves absolutely unable to defend themselves against the economic power of the huge national industry from which they were obtaining the automobiles they were distributing to the public. They were economically outweighed. An automobile dealer having an investment, even, of $500,000 or $1,000,000 is not in the same class with the manufacturer whose assets are counted sometimes in the billions of dollars. So the small dealer was utterly unable to defend himself when, as he felt, the good faith of the franchise was violated.

Decision after decision was made in the courts, similar to the decision which has been quoted in the report submitted by the committee to the Senate. I read from page 3 of the report a part of the decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit in 1933 in the case of Ford Motor Co. against Kirkmyer Motor Co. This is what the court said:

> While there is a natural impulse to be impatient with a form of contract which places the comparatively helpless dealer at the mercy of the manufacturer, we cannot make contracts for parties or protect them from the provisions of contracts which have been made for themselves.

I call attention to the fact that it was the judgment of the court that the form of contract which was used in that case, to use the language of the court, "places the comparatively helpless dealer at the mercy of the manufacturer."

Similar decisions have been rendered by the courts throughout the country. The result is that in the bill which is being considered by the Senate today the dealer for the first time is given his day in court. The proposed legislation creates a cause of action in the Federal courts where none previously existed.

Yet who can deny that the automobile business is a national business as well as a local business? Who can deny that although the automobiles are made at 1, 2, 3, or 4 different centers, they are transported to every State and to almost every community in the land? There is a combination of small local business and of big national business. It is interstate commerce. Yet up to this hour the independent dealers in the various States have been utterly without any right to go into the Federal courts to defend their rights.

So the bill affirmatively imposes a duty of good faith upon the parties to the franchise. Good faith must be shown in situations in which the manufacturer, under present conditions, by reason of his great economic power, is able to intimidate small dealers. We are not seeking to provide any legislation to punish intimidation of that kind. We are asking for no new criminal law. We are merely asking for a civil review. We are saying to the automobile dealers upon the one hand, and to the manufacturers on the other hand, that disputes over the good faith of these contracts should be settled in the courts established by the Constitution of the United States.

Objection is made to that. The manufacturers seem to feel that Congress should not pass a law opening the doors of the Federal courts to the determination of issues which are clearly within the authority of the Constitution and of Congress. The result of the bill will be, in my judgment, to promote a new era of much better feeling than has ever before existed. I see no ground whatsoever upon which the objection can be raised to the establishment of this new right of self-protection. This is demonstrated by the words of some of the automobile dealers themselves.

I hold in my hand the text of a statement made by Henry Ford II, president of the Ford Motor Co., before the Subcommittee on Automobile Marketing Practices of the United States Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at Washington, D. C., on Monday, March 12, 1956. That is the subcommittee over which the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] presided so ably.

The tenor of the statement is that the motor companies, the big manufacturers, are themselves competent to deal with the matter. I have no challenge at all to make of the intent of the Ford Motor Co. and of Mr. Ford to bring about better relations with the dealers than have existed. But he has made clear in his testimony that while he is against bootlegging, against false registration, and against false and misleading advertising, and is opposed to price packing and other abuses which have crept in, at the same time he lays particular emphasis upon the fact that the company itself can settle disputes which may arise. I shall read from page 18 of the statement which was published by the Ford Motor Co.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I am acquainted with a great many automobile dealers. I have talked with many of them about the problems they are facing. Many of them, in whom I have confidence, feel that they have faced rather harsh and unjust situations at times.

My inquiry is, Why, in drawing the bill, was not the obligation of good faith written into the bill so as to apply to both parties to the contract?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it is. Under the bill, good faith is a matter for the jury to determine, and the manufacturer is perfectly free to introduce any evidence whatsoever with respect to the lack of good faith on the part of the dealer. If there should be such, that would be a defense, without the slightest doubt.

Mr. CURTIS. That does not answer my question. Why should the Senate write a bill which has a specific requirement of good faith on the part of one party to the contract, but not both parties?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the bill does refer to both parties; it could not be otherwise.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the Senator point that out in the bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly. I read from page 2 of the bill, commencing on line 21:

> The term "good faith" shall mean the duty of the automobile manufacturer, its officers, employees, or agents to act in a fair, equitable, and nonarbitrary manner so as to guarantee the dealer freedom from coercion, intimidation, or threats of coercion or intimidation, and in order to preserve and protect all the equities of the automobile dealer which are inherent in the nature of the relationship between the automobile dealer and automobile manufacturer.

Mr. CURTIS. That language deals with the manufacturer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The inherent relationship—the nature of the relationship between the automobile dealer and the automobile manufacturer—necessarily depends upon mutual good faith. There could not possibly be a case decided against a manufacturer in which the manufacturer was suffering from a lack of good faith on the part of the dealer. I want to make that statement just as clear as possible.

Mr. CURTIS. I have the same confidence in our system of courts that the Senator from Wyoming has, but I am still faced with the question as to why the Congress should specifically impose the requirement of good faith on the part of one party to a contract, but not both parties.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator there was no intention of withdrawing from the manufacturer any defense on the ground that the dealer himself had violated good faith. However, I think it is obvious that if a dealer is given the authority, under the bill, to come into court and test the termination of a contract or franchise, the termination of which is in the hands of the manufacturer, it becomes immediately available to the manufacturer to show a lack of good faith on the part of the dealer.

Mr. CURTIS. Does not the law of contract generally require good faith on the part of both parties, without legislation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The point is this: Under franchises which are now in force, the manufacturers have the right to terminate the contracts. We are seeking to preserve the defense of the dealer in a termination which is not made in good faith. If it should appear that the dealer himself had performed some act of bad faith, it would be impossible for him to stay in court for 30 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. I am one of those individuals who thoroughly believe that the vast majority of automobile dealers and other businessmen are not guilty of bad faith, especially intentional bad faith; but I still raise the question as to the propriety of Congress not making the terms apply equally to both sides of a contract.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because the franchises with which we are dealing are not contracts; they are terminable at the will of the manufacturers.

Mr. CURTIS. Did I understand the Senator to say they are not contracts?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; in many cases they are merely a kind of license, because of the distribution of economic power as between the two parties involved. Moreover, the franchises are not presently enforceable. The committee has a whole list of cases in which that question was decided by the courts.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the distinguished Senator from Wyoming yield for another question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. CURTIS. On page 3, line 1, of the bill, there appears the language "all the equities of the automobile dealer." What is included in the term "all the equities"?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. All the equities that arise out of the franchise as written between the parties.

Mr. CURTIS. Would a dealer holding a franchise or a contract who happens to have committed practices which appear to be against the interests of all other dealers, such as supplying bootleg dealers with cars, have equities in his contract or franchise?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is the Senator referring to a person who supplies bootleg cars?

Mr. CURTIS. A holder of a franchise or a contract who is guilty of supplying cars to unauthorized dealers. Would he have equities in his contract with the manufacturer that would be protected by this bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. He certainly would not. He would not dare to go into court.

Mr. CURTIS. He would not have equities?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. He would not dare to go into court, because such an activity on his part would obviously be bad faith.

Mr. CURTIS. Would it be a violation of any law?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would be bad faith, because of the nature of the franchise.

Mr. CURTIS. But what I am getting at is, Suppose the dealer has not violated the law, and perhaps not his contract—I do not know what the contract may provide—but has used his franchise to secure cars from the manufacturer, and has, in turn, disposed of them at cut-rate prices to unauthorized dealers. The question is, Does he have an equity in his franchise that the bill will protect?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would feel that such a person would have no equity at all before the court. Even if he brought suit, the suit could not stand up.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BRICKER. What would be the proof of his bad faith? He would not have violated his franchise or his contract with the dealer, or any law.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was not the situation with which I understood the Senator from Nebraska was dealing.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. That is what I intended.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In such a case, of course, suit could be brought, and the question of bad faith or good faith would be one for the jury to decide.

Mr. BRICKER. There is no question of bad faith when a man does not violate the terms of his contract with the manufacturer, and when he does not violate the law in any way. He is permitted to sell cars in any market he desires, at any price he wants to quote. In fact, the Department of Justice prevented the limitation of territory in the fixation of prices in a dealer's franchise, under the antitrust laws. So he is within the law. He is within the terms of his franchise entirely. It is in that field that the question first arose as to the bootlegging of automobiles. There is no law or term of his contract that he is violating. Yet he is frozen in that right under the bill, as I read it, and is entitled to triple damages if the company tries to stop him from selling cars in such a channel.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say first there is no provision for triple damages in the bill.

Mr. BRICKER. Double damages, then. They are punitive anyway.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But the question of having the case decided in the Federal courts is the paramount question, as the committee has seen it.

Mr. BRICKER. That right applies to any citizen of any State except Michigan, if the companies are located in Michigan.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would not say that.

Mr. BRICKER. A citizen of one State has a right to sue the citizen of another State in a Federal court.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is true, but there should be considered the economic strength of the manufacturer, upon the one hand, and the puny economic power of the dealer, upon the other hand. Under the provisions of the bill, in my opinion, in such a case as that cited the dealer could not go into court and present to a jury a case on which he would be able to obtain a verdict favorable to him.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In my mind there is no question that the committee was of the opinion that there should be good faith on all sides.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. What right does a dealer have in court now?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. He has no rights in the Federal court.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator from Wyoming mean a dealer cannot bring suit in a Federal court?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No.

Mr. CURTIS. Why?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because the franchises have been such that the cases are State cases; and the franchises have been such that the dealer has practically written away his rights in the matter and any case he might have.

Mr. BRICKER. In his franchise, does the dealer waive his constitutional right to bring suit in a Federal court? I should like to see some of those franchises.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me read to the Senator from Ohio what the report says about one of the cases:

> Representative of the thinking of the courts is the decision in *Ford Motor Co.* v. *Kirkmyer Motor Co.* (65 F. 2d 1001 (C. C. A. 4, 1933)), where the court stated:
>
> "While there is a natural impulse to be impatient with a form of contract which places the comparatively helpless dealer at the mercy of the manufacturer, we cannot make contracts for parties or protect them from the provisions of contracts which have been made for themselves. Dealers doubtless accept these one-sided contracts because they think that the right to deal in the product of the manufacturer, even on his terms, is valuable to them; but after they have made such contracts, relying upon the good faith of the manufacturer for the protection which the contracts do not give they cannot, when they get into trouble, expect

the courts to place in the contract the protection which they themselves have failed to insert."

There is case after case of that kind—showing that in the present state of the law, the dealer is absolutely at the mercy of the manufacturer. There are cases in which the franchises are terminable without causes, after the dealers have invested large amounts of capital of their own.

Let me refer to the case of *J. R. Watkins Co.* v. *Rich* (254 Michigan 82, 235 N. W. 845 (1931)):

It being the law that contracts terminable at will are binding on both parties until right of cancelation reserved is exercised by cancelation on the part of one or the other; provided further, that the option to terminate at will must be exercised in good faith.

That case was cited.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WOFFORD in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. At the bottom of page 3, I note that the case of Ford Motor Co. against Kirkmyer was brought in Federal court; and I note that the case of McMaster against Ford Motor Co. was brought in Federal court; and I notice that the case of Bushwick-Decatur Motors, Inc., against Ford was brought in Federal court. That confirms my belief that the Constitution of the United States gives a citizen of one State the right to file suit in a Federal court against a citizen of another State.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course that is correct. But because of the nature of the franchise, the dealer was without remedy.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator from Wyoming mean that the dealer could not bring suit in Federal court?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I do not mean that. But I mean that in the Federal courts the decisions were always against the dealers, because in the contracts they signed they practically waived their rights.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a further question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. BRICKER. Where is the record of the hearings on this bill, so that I may refer to some of those cases?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have before me a part of the record.

Mr. BRICKER. That is the record of the investigation which the Senator from Wyoming conducted, is it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. It is not a record of hearings on this bill, is it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No.

Mr. BRICKER. Was any record made in regard to the provisions of the pending bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not the pending bill. But the committee was of the opinion that the hearings on the investigation were so thorough and went into so many different angles, that those hearings constituted the basis for the bill.

Mr. BRICKER. But there was no hearing in regard to the meaning in equity of the bill, as determined by the nature of the relationship; and there was no hearing on the legality of double damages; and there was no hearing on what the word "commerce" means, as used in the bill; and there was no hearing regarding the definition of the term "automobile dealer," or regarding the rights or obligations of the manufacturer and the dealer. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Most of the subjects the Senator from Ohio has mentioned are already so clearly defined that no hearings upon them would be necessary.

But upon the major question the Senator from Ohio has asked—namely, whether a specific hearing was held upon the provisions of this bill—the answer is "No," because the committee felt it was unnecessary to have a hearing, and because following the hearing in the case of the manufacturers, there was an announcement of a most significant change and an important modification of the dealer relationship which theretofore had been in effect.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield once more?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. BRICKER. Would the Senator from Wyoming be willing to accept to subsection (e), on page 2 of the bill, an amendment to include dealers in the requirement of good faith and in the protection of the equities, and to require obligations on the part of the dealers toward the manufacturers, as well as the obligations of manufacturers toward the dealers?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have conferred with the chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, who introduced in the House a companion bill to this one. He and I agreed that hearings would be held in the House committee. So I would prefer that matters of the kind referred to by the Senator from Ohio await the House committee hearings.

But I have no hesitation in saying that if the pending bill does not make the matter clear, and if the legislative record we are now building does not make it clear, the committee in reporting the bill intended that good faith should be exercised by both parties to the franchise.

Of course I would be very glad to review any amendment which might be suggested. But I give the Senator from Ohio my assurance that hearings will be held by the House committee, and consideration will be given there to such amendments.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President——

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah has risen. Will the Senator from Ohio pardon me if I yield at this time to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BRICKER. That is perfectly all right. I shall recur a little later to the questions I have in mind.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Although I am in favor of the general objectives of the bill, since I have heard the discussion it seems to me that probably the bill should be amended in order to require that good faith be exercised on the part of the dealer, inasmuch as the bill requires that good faith be exercised on the part of the manufacturer. In that way, the bill would only be carrying out what the chairman of the subcommittee has already stated.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course; and I reiterate that statement.

Mr. WATKINS. But if there is objection to the bill on that ground, it seems to me it would be good legislation to make the parties equally responsible, insofar as good faith is concerned.

As I recall, we did not get much opportunity to discuss the bill in the committee. Some of the questions which have been raised today in the course of the debate now in progress have caused me some concern in regard to the drafting of a piece of proposed legislation which may appear to be too one-sided, although in my own mind, I am certain that the dealers do require some protection. I think that, in many instances, the dealers have been the victims of very large companies which have been able to dictate practically any terms they wanted to make the dealers comply with if they wished to represent the companies in the selling of automobiles.

I think Congress ought not to deny equal rights to both sides in a controversy of this kind. I can see, from what has been said in respect to bootleggers, and so forth, that there might be some matters which would require a dealer as well as the manufacturer to act in good faith, and make obligatory upon the dealer compliance with the same kind of provisions we require the manufacturer to obey.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no intention on the part of the committee to deny equal rights to both sides, and make good faith the responsibility of both. As I have said, I feel that the bill accomplishes that purpose. If any amendment were to be drafted, it would require, of course, very careful consideration—as careful consideration as was given to the bill. Therefore, I am hoping, as I said to the Senator from Ohio, that, inasmuch as I think the legislative record we are making with respect to the bill is clear, the actual presentation of such an amendment will await the hearing in the House.

Mr. WATKINS. It seems to me that if what has been indicated is our view there would be no harm in saying so in specific language.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The specific language has not appeared. We want to get the bill passed.

Mr. WATKINS. It may appear later. I think we are under some obligation to see that that objective is accomplished.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from Wyoming is a distinguished lawyer. He

is fully aware that there may be a constitutional question involved in the bill. In the first place, we give a certain property right to the holder of the franchise already in existence, in the nature of double damages, and the right to sue. There may not be an additional property right, because he already has the right to sue if there is not good faith on the part of the manufacturer. But there is no commensurate right given to the manufacturer to go into court because of the violation of the terms of the franchise. He may have rights at common law in connection with the enforcement of his contract. But does the Senator feel that there is any constitutional question raised in giving additional rights to the dealer which are not given to the manufacturer by giving him a day in court on the question of double damages? That is a property right.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It had not occurred to me that there was any constitutional question involved. I believe that the double damages would act as a deterrent against the abuses which we found so innumerable.

We are dealing with a situation which was presented to two committees of this body in great detail. It was shown that the automobile dealer was, in fact and in practice, absolutely at the beck and call of the manufacturer. We had evidence that the contracts, or franchises, as we should call them—because they were not in fact contracts at all—placed the dealer under great pressure and denied him his economic freedom. That this was so has been demonstrated by the great modifications which have been made by the manufacturers since the hearings were held. I have known no case to compare with this one, except the case of the insurance business under the old TNEC investigation in the years before World War II began. In that case the mere exposition of the facts before a congressional hearing had a beneficial result similar to that produced by the recent hearings. But without the day-in-court bill there would be nothing to prevent the manufacturer from restoring, ipsi dixit, the conditions which previously existed.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I agree with the Senator that there have been cases of arbitrary action—perhaps unfair action—on the part of the companies in their dealings with their dealers. Also there have been cases of the raiding of dealers of one company by those of another company. Of course, those are inequities. They represent unfair treatment. But, after all, the manufacturer lives because his agents prosper. I think the record will show that a very small minority of the dealers are complaining about their relationships. I well remember a few years ago, as the Senator undoubtedly remembers, when all sorts of efforts were made by people to get into the automobile-dealer business. They wanted franchises. They did not ask for terms or anything else, because the business was very profitable.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The record is full of abuses. The report of the General Motors Co. itself is an acknowledgment, by reason of the changes which have been made.

I hold in my hand not a statement of the committee but the statement of Mr. Harlowe Curtice, president of General Motors Co., on distribution policies and practices of his company. This was his statement before the Monroney committee, in which he pointed out what has been done.

I read from page 3 of the document, which is dated May 8 and 9, 1956:

> Last November, as you know, we appeared before another Senate subcommittee. The hearing generated a great deal of publicity pertaining to our dealer relations—and specifically to our selling agreement and factory-dealer relationships. The atmosphere was emotional, and charges were made which were not documented or, in our opinion, reasonably established. However, it appeared to me that where there was smoke there must be some fire. How serious the fire I was determined to find out.

With respect to his characterization of the hearings as emotional, I think I can testify to my colleague that there was no emotion upon the part of members of the subcommittee. We were only looking for the facts.

Continuing with Mr. Curtice's statement, he gives particulars with respect to the revised selling agreement, after a conference of the General Motors Dealer Council was held. Mr. Curtice continued:

> Some of the changes and additions to the selling agreement have to do with policy. Others are economic changes, and still others are general. All are to the benefit of the dealer and, we believe, to the ultimate benefit of the consumer.

Then there are some 17 changes listed. Let me read some of them:

> 10. We are increasing the allowance under the General Motors parts obsolescence plan from 2 percent to 4 percent of annual purchases. This will give greater assistance to the dealer in maintaining a parts inventory adequate for the increasing complexity of our cars and the steadily mounting number of them on the road.
>
> * * * * *
>
> 13. Return of purchased parts. The contract has made provision since 1938 for the return of purchased parts within 30 days. We are now increasing the period to 90 days.
>
> * * * * *
>
> 15. Ethical advertising. The revised selling agreement will contain a clause providing for maintenance of a high standard of ethics in advertising.

So it goes, in paragraph after paragraph, showing how the General Motors Corp., as a result of this exposition at a public Senate hearing of the complaints of the dealers, brought about corrections.

Mr. BRICKER. I do not deny that at all. I think much good has been accomplished by it, as was the case 3 years ago as a result of the hearing with respect to the situation in connection with phantom freights.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My point is that unless we nail them down by legislation, the gains will speedily vanish.

Mr. BRICKER. My only thought is that we should not be unfair in the legislation we enact; that we should not treat one party unfairly. I have one more question to ask the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I agree with the Senator; and I do not believe that this is unfair legislation.

Mr. BRICKER. As I understand, the Senator believes that the right of Congress to pass the proposed legislation attaches under the commerce clause of the Constitution. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe the right so attaches.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator believe that under the commerce clause the power goes to the sale of automobiles within a State, locally, to a domestic consumer?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A great authority on the commerce clause, Chief Justice Marshall, in one of his very famous decisions, held that that was so. Chief Justice Marshall has been honored by many conservatives and by some liberals during the years which have elapsed since he was Chief Justice.

Mr. BRICKER. Sometimes I think he has been honored more by the Senator and myself than by the Supreme Court.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to be in the Senator's company. In the famous case of Gibbons against Ogden, Chief Justice Marshall held specifically that the commerce power granted in the Constitution to Congress covers intrastate commerce if it affects interstate commerce.

Mr. BRICKER. If it affects interstate commerce. The question is whether this does.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Under the conditions under which we have been living for the past 20 years, Congress has been passing laws which it would not have attempted to pass 30 or 40 years ago.

Mr. BRICKER. And the Supreme Court has sustained suits which 30 or 40 years ago it would not have sustained, because of the integration of commerce.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. How far does that power go, however?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe the commerce clause covers all commerce which affects the welfare of the people of the United States in the several States.

Mr. BRICKER. There is no question that it covers the terms of a contract in interstate commerce, but whether it covers a sale to the ultimate consumer is the question I have in mind.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The question is whether it affects commerce as a whole. I believe bootlegging, which falls under the question the Senator asked, is clearly within that power.

Mr. BRICKER. Of course, the pending bill would not prevent bootlegging.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; the other bill which was introduced would do that.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the provisions of the pending bill apply to farm tractors? I notice the bill refers to "or other automotive vehicles." Are not tractors automotive vehicles?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I read from the bill:

(a) The term "automobile manufacturer" shall mean any person, partnership, corporation, association, or other form of business enterprise engaged in the manufacturing or assembling of passenger cars, trucks, station wagons, or other automotive vehicles, including any person, partnership, or corporation which acts for such manufacturer or assembler in connection with the distribution of said automotive vehicles.

Mr. AIKEN. My question is, Is a tractor an automotive vehicle?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe a tractor is an automotive vehicle.

Mr. AIKEN. Is a combine or a cotton picker an automotive vehicle?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If it is driven by automotive power; yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Would a power lawn mower be an automotive vehicle?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, I do not think so.

Mr. AIKEN. Why not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because it is not a vehicle.

Mr. AIKEN. Why not? I have seen people riding power lawn mowers. Why is it not an automotive vehicle?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because it is not designed for the purposes we had in mind in drawing the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Is not an automotive vehicle a vehicle propelled by power on which one may ride?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A vehicle, as conceived by the committee, is a vehicle used for the purpose of transportation.

Mr. AIKEN. I have seen people ride from place to place on a power lawn mower.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, I know; but a power lawn mower is not used primarily for that purpose.

Mr. AIKEN. No, not primarily. Primarily it is used for cutting grass, and it is incidentally used for riding.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The primary purpose of the automotive vehicles which is dealt with in the proposed legislation is transportation.

Mr. AIKEN. The bill would cover motorcycles, would it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; I believe it would cover motorcycles.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no further questions. I wanted to know where an automotive vehicle leaves off and something else begins. I was wondering why a farm-equipment dealer should not be protected. It seems to me that farm machinery dealers need protection also. Many of them also sell automobiles.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We dealt solely with the question of vehicles used for transportation, and with a particular kind of business. We did not feel it would be wise to enter into the field of all the items which are manufactured and distributed throughout the country.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. In quickly reading the bill and in quickly inspecting the report of the committee I have been unable to find any clear statement as to whether the proposed legislation, if enacted, would apply to dealer contracts in existence at the time of the passage of the bill. It would seem to me that either the bill or the report should clearly show that fact. I have failed to find it. I therefore ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming what his judgment is in that regard.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My judgment is that it does apply. Section 3 reads:

SEC. 3. An automobile dealer may bring suit against any automobile manufacturer engaged in commerce, in any district court of the United States in the district in which said manufacturer resides, or is found, or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover twofold the damages by him sustained and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee, by reason of the failure of said automobile manufacturer to act in good faith in performing or complying with any of the terms or provisions of the franchise, or in terminating, canceling, or not renewing the franchise with said dealer.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. I note, however, that section 2 reads as follows:

SEC. 2. Any automobile manufacturer engaged in commerce who makes or grants any franchise to an automobile dealer, shall have the duty to act in good faith in all dealings or transactions with such dealer.

That does not say who shall make or who shall grant in the future, but neither does it say who has made or who has granted heretofore. I should think that the sounder interpretation of the present tense, as used in section 2, would require the legislation, if it were not required by other provisions of law, to apply only to contract dealerships made after the date of the enactment of the legislation. I ask the distinguished Senator to reread section 2 and then give me the benefit of his thinking on it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I note the emphasis which the Senator from Florida places upon the use of the present tense. However, I believe it is common practice in law to use the present tense to cover incidents which may happen at any time.

Any automobile manufacturer engaged in commerce—

I am reading section 2—

who makes or grants any franchise to an automobile dealer—

I believe that language is just as effective, in covering a franchise now existing, as though the language said "who has made."

I have been looking over the last clause of the section. Section 2 is the whole sentence, and the last clause of it imposes a duty upon the automobile manufacturer. What is that duty? He shall have the duty to act in good faith in all dealings or transactions with the dealers. That applies to future acts of the manufacturer after the enactment of the bill, and I think it applies under any franchise which may exist.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. Would the language, as the Senator has just interpreted it, vary or alter the provisions of existing contracts or affect existing property rights?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should say that existing contracts are so clearly being altered now that that question is more academic than actual. I have on my desk, as I indicated a moment ago, the testimony of the president of the General Motors Corp. with respect to changes. During the hearings at which the president of the General Motors Corp. appeared he announced from the hearing room an immediate change when he said to the committee that he had just sent a telegram to all General Motors dealers saying that the franchises no longer would be for 1 year only, but for 5 years.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate that information. That, however, amounted to a renewal beyond the period of the then existing contract, and, of course, the right of renewal had always existed and such effect would not operate to take away or change any right existing under the contract.

My anxiety at this point concerns the question of whether the bill, if enacted, will so operate as to existing contracts as to alter or vary their provisions or hurtfully affect existing rights.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I do not think it alters the provisions of the contracts at all, but it imposes upon the manufacturer the duty to act in good faith in conforming with or complying with any of the terms or provisions of the contract.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The distinguished Senator has been very kind in yielding. I want nothing but a fair deal for automobile dealers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure that is the position of the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to ask this question: How long a time after a cause of action accrued would an automobile dealer have to bring suit against the manufacturer?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, there is no specific term mentioned in the bill. It was assumed by the committee that the existing statute of limitations, whatever it was, would apply.

Mr. CURTIS. Which statute of limitations?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The statute effective in the area involved.

Mr. CURTIS. The State statute?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Whatever statute is in effect in the jurisdiction of the court in which the case is brought.

Mr. CURTIS. In that connection, would there be the right to sue for an act heretofore committed by the manufacturer?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, I think not. The bill applies to future acts.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the Senator point out the language which restricts it to future acts?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Section 3 is the section which makes it clear. There is no retroactive language in this bill making it applicable to acts of bad faith which occured in the past. To do that, it would be necessary to write retroactive language.

I wish the Senator to know that in sponsoring this bill, I have done so in the belief that we can promote good rela-

tions between the manufacturers and the dealers, and that it is not necessary to look into the past for violations.

I have repeatedly said, and I should like to reiterate it now, that I personally would be ready to forgive every violation of the antitrust laws which has been committed up to this time, if by so doing we could rewrite the sort of legislation which would establish proper dealings under the antitrust laws.

Mr. CURTIS. I, certainly, hold no particular or special brief for manufacturers. They are usually able to take care of themselves. But I am anxious that the language we use will accomplish what we hope it will accomplish. I was delighted to hear the distinguished Senator say that he had an agreement with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House that public hearings would be held, because I would not want to grant rights to a dealer in respect to acts which were not in the public interest and in the interest of other dealers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have been on my feet much longer than I had anticipated. The time has come for the legislative body of the United States and for the executive branch to come to an understanding of what can be done to preserve small business from being absorbed by concentrated big business, which, under present conditions, operates according to its own will. I do not blame it at all, because Congress is responsible for not having legislated effectively to meet the situation in which we find ourselves.

When the Sherman Antitrust Law was passed in 1890, no one in the Senate or in the House had any conception, at least, any which was expressed in the discussion of the bill, that the time would come when most of the business in interstate commerce would be conducted by a comparatively few corporations chartered by the States, with blanket power to create subsidiary corporations to operate in various ways.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for yielding. Before I submit a favorable report from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on the nominations of 149 postmasters, I desire to say that the Senator from Wyoming has done outstanding work in preparing the pending proposed legislation. It is something which is needed very badly in my State. I hear complaints about the situation every day from the automobile dealers. I believe that if the bill now under consideration shall be passed, it will do a great deal of good.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, I was about to say, in conclusion, that the Department of Justice, realizing the nature of the problem at the beginning of this administration, appointed a special group of lawyers, economists, and professors to study the antitrust laws. The United States Senate and House of Representatives undertook to review that report.

No recommendations were made in the report submitted by the Attorney General's Committee, but the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has brought many suits to enforce the antitrust laws. I have only praise and admiration for Judge Barnes, the recent head of the Antitrust Division. Nevertheless, it is perfectly clear that the problem has not been solved, when one remembers that in the numerous consent decrees which have been obtained we have fallen into the practice of securing consent between the Department of Justice and the defendant as to the nature of the complaint to be made against him before negotiation and agreement are made on the nature of the decree which should be signed.

The bill is not an attempt to solve the whole problem. It is merely an attempt to make it clear that one small thing can be done for the automobile dealers of America, namely, to give them the right to go into court and to enforce good faith between themselves and the manufacturers.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the testimony showed that some of the corporations were, in a manner of speaking, larger than the United States Government itself? They could borrow money more cheaply than could the United States Government. That is a perfectly indefensible situation, in the opinion of the Senator from North Dakota. The automobile-manufacturing corporations are so strong and so powerful that they can borrow money more cheaply than can our own Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the situation which now exists continues to grow—if the concentration of power proceeds further—we may confidently look forward to a time when it will be unnecessary to have any Senators in this Chamber, because the power to regulate commerce will be in the hands of those giant agencies, and not in the hands of Congress.

The large corporations complain about Federal regulation. Yet the record of the hearings on the bill shows that some of the automobile companies want for themselves the right to regulate the automobile dealer. That is a situation which the Government cannot tolerate. If we fail now to give the automobile dealer his day in court, we shall be sacrificing, in my opinion, the day in court of thousands, yes, of tens of thousands, of small-business people throughout the United States.

Congress must keep the door of opportunity open to all. We must not allow to continue a situation in which great accumulations of capital, counted in the billions of dollars, and operating not only on a nationwide basis, but also upon a worldwide basis, are able to overawe the small businessmen and businesswomen whom we represent in our own States.

I hope, Mr. President, that when the debate upon the bill has been finished, we may have a yea-and-nay vote. I ask for the yeas and nays upon the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. Obviously, a large number of Senators has arrived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays when the Senate comes to vote on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the yeas and nays are ordered at this time on the bill itself, and I certainly have no objection to that, does that foreclose the ordering of the yeas and nays on a motion to recommit, should such a motion be made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would not foreclose the ordering of the yeas and nays on a motion to recommit.

The question is, Shall the yeas and nays be ordered on the passage of the bill?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I move to recommit the bill. Before I speak on the motion to recommit, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I should like to place in the RECORD the determination of the court in the case of Gibbons against Ogden. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Wyoming that I was not entirely familiar with the decision when he called it to my attention. It has been several years since I read the decision. The report of the case consists of about 239 pages. I think the law is largely stated in the syllabus of the case. The case involved a situation wherein the State of New York required all vessels which were sailing on the Hudson River at the port of New York and adjacent waters to be licensed by the State of New York. That case came before the Supreme Court on behalf of one who was licensed by the State of New Jersey and who wished to traverse the water. Forfeiture of the vessel was provided for in the New York statutes.

The syllabus of the case states:

The acts of the Legislature of the State of New York, granting to Robert R. Livingston and Robert Fulton, the exclusive navigation of all the waters within the jurisdiction of that State, with boats moved by fire or steam, for a term of years, are repugnant to that clause to the Constitution of the United States, which authorizes Congress to regulate commerce, so far as the said acts prohibits vessels, licensed, according to the laws of the United States, for carrying on the coasting trade, from navigating the said waters by means of fire or steam.

So, that case dealt directly with transportation over navigable waters within the State of New York, and did not apply to any sales in commerce within the State of New York.

As I say, I have not read all the 239 pages of the reported case, but I think the case had to do exclusively with the moving of vessels over the waters of the State of New York, and the case held that vessels which were chartered either by the United States or by another State could not be excluded from moving over those waters.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have not read the case for a long time, either, but my recollection is that the ferryboat involved was operating across the Hudson River between the State of New York and the State of New Jersey.

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And that it was transportation in interstate commerce.

Mr. BRICKER. It was a clear case of that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A clear case. Here we have a similarly clear case, because there are involved operations under a franchise given for the transportation and sale of automobiles from one State to another. I drew the conclusion, from many decisions which have been rendered, and from many acts of Congress which have been enacted in the past 20 years, that the statement of Chief Justice Marshall in that case involving the power of Congress over interstate commerce, in passing the Navigation Act, is such that it applies to all commerce which affects commerce among the States.

Mr. BRICKER. The case of Gibbons against Ogden does not go that far.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then I am thinking of the wrong citation.

Mr. BRICKER. My question was whether or not the power of the Congress, under the interstate and foreign commerce clause, attaches to the sale of a product to the trade after delivery, under the franchise of the dealer. I was getting at the problem of bootleg sales, to which the industry or dealers objected 2 or 3 years ago. That was the reason for the question. The case I have cited does not apply to that situation. I do not know yet whether we have the power to regulate the sale after the delivery.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I still think we do have that power.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from Michigan for yielding to me.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, irrespective of the merits of the bill, the motion to recommit, is made because the Senate is being asked to act upon a bill which will have far-reaching effect. The bill seems tame on the surface. I believe the purpose of the bill is described as giving the dealer a fair day in the court, an objective which we certainly all support.

I wish to point out that no hearings were held directly on this bill. It is true that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] conducted extensive hearings, involving the major automobile companies and dealers, upon the question of antitrust law violations, monopolistic trends and influences, and, to a certain degree, management-dealer relationships. The Senator from Wyoming, during the course of those hearings, frequently suggested that they were exploratory; that there was no legislation before the committee; that the hearings were an effort to lead the manufacturers and the dealers into a relationship of greater harmony.

After hearings were concluded, the subcommittee drafted the pending bill, which was subsequently reported to the Senate. Mind you, Mr. President, representatives of the industry have not testified on the proposed legislation. Dealers have not testified on the proposed legislation. Representatives of the various departments of Government have not testified on the bill presently before the Senate. Nor have consumer or labor groups testified.

I have in my hand a report from the Department of Justice, which was submitted about 2 or 3 days ago, raising some very serious objections to the bill.

In all fairness to the Members of the Senate, it must be remembered that in the debate which has taken place so far many questions have been raised as to whether the bill requires good faith to be observed by both parties to a contract, and, as I recall, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has conceded that there is considerable doubt on that score. The senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] raised a question as to the effect upon present franchises.

We know the folly of endeavoring to write on the floor of the Senate even the simplest piece of legislation. Regardless of what an individual Senator may believe as to whether Federal legislation is needed in order to enforce contracts between manufacturers and dealers in the automobile industry, certainly no Senator will say that the Senate should pass a bill on the expectation that the other body will do a better job, that the other body will hold hearings, or that the other body will correct mistakes which the Senate may make.

Mr. President, this body has a clear responsibility to recommit the bill, so that the Senate committee may hold hearings at which an opportunity will be afforded all interested parties, including representatives of the Department of Justice, representatives of the Federal Trade Commission, representatives of the manufacturing industry, representatives of the dealers and consumers, to testify regarding the provisions of the bill. They should be given their day in court.

Mr. President, I say frankly that if I were an automobile dealer, I would be scared stiff of the bill which now is before the Senate. What does the bill do? In the bill the manufacturer is charged with the duty of protecting the equities of each individual dealer. That does not mean only the legitimate dealer; it means both the franchised dealer and the dealer who sells to bootleggers; it means also the "stimulator" dealer. Such a provision would compel the manufacturer to protect the equities of the very forces which 90 percent of the automobile dealers have condemned.

So, Mr. President, although we may be greatly concerned about the relationships between the manufacturers and the dealers—and I shall be the first to admit that auto manufacturers have sometimes dealt with a very heavy hand—yet it frequently happens that when we endeavor by legislation to solve certain problems, particularly those relating to two parties to a contract, we use a broad and double-edged sword that cuts both ways.

Now we face the question of equities. If a manufacturer can be sued by a dealer for double damages because of a breach of good faith, what is the position of the consumer? Why not extend that right to the limit, and allow a customer to sue a dealer for breach of good faith? Dealers have been known to advertise falsely and to advertise a certain trade-in which, at the time when the deal was consummated, did not materialize.

So, Mr. President, when we deal with the question of good faith, and when we include in the bill a punitive provision for double damages, our great concern should be not necessarily for the manufacturer or for the dealer, but for the public. This bill provides protection for the public. If we are honest about the matter, we should provide in the bill a requirement that all consumers shall be dealt with in good faith.

Mr. President, there are many reasons why the bill should not be passed today.

First, the bill imposes upon the manufacturers of automobile vehicles duties and burdens which are not imposed upon other manufacturers whose products are sold to dealers and compete with automobiles for the consumers' dollar. No justification for giving such treatment to automobile manufacturers, while protecting the manufacturers of other commodities from similar treatment, has been offered. In other words, the bill applies to manufacturers of only one commodity, and discriminates against one industry. Mr. President, what about the manufacturers of farm equipment? What about the manufacturers of refrigerators? What about the manufacturers of television sets and automobile tires? They also operate through dealers.

Historically, the Congress has always endeavored to avoid discriminatory legislation. It has never undertaken to say, "We shall treat this one industry differently from all other industries."

Mr. President, if the proposed protection is needed, let us apply it to all industries in which there are manufacturers and franchised dealers; let us not select only one industry, and hold it up as a bad example.

Of course, as has been stated, no hearings were held on the pending bill; there was no opportunity for representatives of the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, the automobile dealers, and the automobile manufacturers or the consumer to appear before the committee, testify on the bill, and test its language.

As the debate on the bill has progressed today it has been demonstrated that there is great vagueness as to what the bill will do.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WOFFORD in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator from Michigan interpret the bill as applying to franchises already in existence?

Mr. POTTER. That is a question which has not been decided. The distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] raised that question. The author of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], stated, I believe, that the bill would affect present contracts. But that is an area which is still in doubt.

Mr. BRICKER. Of course, if it be true that the bill will apply to franchises already in existence, the bill will clearly be unconstitutional, I think, because the Constitution of the United States prohibits the enactment of an ex post facto law; and this bill would then affect the substantive rights—not the remedial procedure, but the substantive rights—of every automobile dealer in the country who today has a franchise. In other words, the bill would amend his franchise. If that be true, and if the bill gives the automobile dealers that right, the bill would take property from someone else; in this case it might be a contract right in the nature of a property right.

Mr. POTTER. The Senator from Ohio is absolutely correct.

Mr. BRICKER. In other words, two very definite constitutional questions are raised by the bill; and before it is enacted, those questions should be resolved.

Mr. POTTER. In the report by the Department of Justice, reference is made to the fact that there is a constitutional question:

> Finally, this language may raise constitutional problems. The bill in no way limits the time from which damages may run. Thus, for example, dealer-manufacturer contracts presently in force might be held not to protect all the equities of the automobile dealer. Even though the manufacturer complied strictly with the present contract terms, he still could be sued by a dealer the day this bill becomes law, and subjected to punitive damages for past acts not illegal when committed.

Mr. BRICKER. The record shows that it is the intention of the proponents of the bill that it apply to present contracts.

Mr. POTTER. That is my understanding.

Mr. O'MAHONEY Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Ohio has misunderstood the answer which I gave; and I think the Senator from Michigan has also misunderstood it.

Mr. POTTER. I shall be glad to be corrected.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The bill does not apply to any acts which have happened in the past. There could be no such retroactive legislation. We agree to that. The bill deals solely with acts which are committed after the enactment of the bill, with respect to lack of good faith.

Let me say also that the pledges which have already been made by the big manufacturers with respect to the rewriting of the franchises are so clear that the situation which has existed will be utterly different from that which will exist at the time the bill is enacted. Let me state it in another way. The franchises under which the abuses are committed are rapidly going out of existence.

Mr. BRICKER. That is gratifying. Will the Senator from Michigan yield in order that I may ask the Senator from Wyoming one further question to clear up the record?

Mr. POTTER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the double damages feature apply to contracts which are already in existence?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It applies only to acts which take place in the future, after the bill is enacted.

Mr. BRICKER. But under those contracts?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In connection with the termination of an existing contract; yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me in order that I may propound a question to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. POTTER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I dislike to interrupt the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ALLOTT. My question is along the lines of the discussion which has already taken place.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am perfectly willing to answer the question, but I wish to be courteous to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. The Senator from Wyoming is always courteous.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator from Michigan is always polite, so it is all right.

The second paragraph of the report of the committee reads in part as follows:

> This legislation has several purposes. It creates causes of action where none previously existed.

Based upon the answer of the Senator from Wyoming, the effect of this proposed legislation, in the creation of causes of action where none previously existed, would be to rewrite the terms of all existing franchises.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. The old franchises, against which the complaints were made, were terminable at will. So the bill, in authorizing a suit upon termination where good faith has not been exercised, would create a new cause of action. The record was full of cases in which the franchises had been terminated absolutely in the most arbitrary manner possible.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator from Michigan will further yield, I feel that this point ought to be cleared up.

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. The report continues:

> This right to court review will exist irrespective of current franchise provisions to the contrary.

Each of us knows of many abuses which have existed in the past.

But with respect to the answer of the Senator from Wyoming to my inquiry, it seems to me that if the bill does actually create a right, and it applies to existing contracts, in effect it would abrogate the provisions of those contracts and deprive people of property without due process of law. In fact, it would deprive them of the right which they had to contract freely, which right theretofore existed.

I am not unaware of the problems which have existed in this field, but I feel that the question which has been raised must be resolved before the proposed legislation can become effective or good.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator from Colorado that the franchises which we have been discussing are not franchises which are at the present time enforceable; and the courts have said so over and over again. The only thing we are doing in this bill with respect to any of the old franchises, which the companies will not have abolished voluntarily by the time the bill passes, is to outlaw the provision by which the companies have the right to terminate franchises without cause.

Mr. ALLOTT. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the bill does not say that the franchise must be terminated before the dealer can sue. There is no such provision in the bill. So a dealer might have a franchise with respect to which he contended good faith had not been shown, and he might sue. The bill would incorporate in the franchise a term, a condition, and a right, as the report of the committee says, which did not previously exist. If that be true, as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has very well pointed out, I think the bill is probably unconstitutional.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Again I read the concluding language of section 3, which contains the gist of the bill. This is the purpose for which the automobile dealer may sue. I begin in line 15 on page 3:

> By reason of the failure of said automobile manufacturer to act in good faith in performing or complying with any of the terms or provisions of the franchise, or in terminating, canceling, or not renewing the franchise with said dealer.

These are the specific fields in which the hearings clearly showed the abuses, the coercion, and the violation of dealers' rights to have taken place. Let me say to the Senator from Colorado that we are dealing with a situation which was so clearly abusive that the manufacturers have already changed their attitude. The result of the bill will be to nail down, as it were, the gains which have now been made. If the bill is not passed, if we do not give the dealer his day in court, all those abuses can be restored immediately. That is the gist of the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, may I impose once more upon the good Senator from Michigan?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am not unaware of the situation to which the Senator from Wyoming refers. I speak with a background of some years of actual knowledge. But he has answered my question by referring to the last few lines of the

bill. The bill does exactly what I previously stated, when it says:

By reason of the failure of said automobile manufacturer to act in good faith in performing or complying with any of the terms or provisions of the franchise, or in terminating, canceling, or not renewing the franchise with said dealer.

In the first part, in stating it in the alternative, what we have done is actually to incorporate a new right in the original contracts. I hope to make my position clear later, but I wish to say now that, insofar as the bill attempts to write into existing franchises new rights—not merely remedial, but substantive in character—I am inclined to agree with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] that it may be unconstitutional. I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Michigan for having yielded to me and also to the Senator from Wyoming for answering my questions.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the colloquy which has taken place emphasizes the very serious questions raised by the bill, which, on its face—and I know this is the intention of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming—would give a day in court to automobile dealers. However, the plain language of the bill hides some provisions which, I am sure, will return to haunt the very dealers the distinguished Senator seeks to aid.

Before I yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado, I wish to complete my citation of the objections raised to the pending bill. I said, first of all, that it was discriminatory. It provides for punitive action against one part of an industry, and not another part; against one industry, and not against another where the same type of manufacturer-dealer relationship exists.

Secondly, Mr. President, the bill comes before us without hearings having been held on the specific piece of legislation now being considered by the Senate.

The third objection I have to the bill is that it imposes fiduciary duties upon automobile manufacturers with respect to their dealers, without corresponding obligations being imposed on the dealers toward manufacturers or toward the public. There is no justification for legislation which requires manufacturers to act in good faith toward dealers but which does not impose the same obligation upon dealers with respect to manufacturers and the public.

I am not a lawyer, but it is my understanding that the legal interpretation of the term "fiduciary duties" implies a trust. A manufacturer, according to my interpretation of the bill, would be obligated to protect the equities of every individual dealer. What would the equities be as between dealer A and dealer B in one community? For example, in Washington there may be Buick dealer A. What are his equities as compared with those of Buick dealer B at Hyattsville? Perhaps the dealer at Hyattsville is a bootlegger, who has been selling his cars wholesale to be taken to Utah or Colorado or some other locality, and there sold at a $50 profit on each car. Under this bill, dealer A, the legitimate, nonbootleg dealer, could not protect himself against dealer B.

As a matter of fact, the manufacturer, under the terms of the bill, would be required to protect the equities of dealer B, who sells cars in bootleg channels.

Therefore, we would freeze into law every stimulator dealer ever created. Instead of alleviating the evils which have cropped up in the management-dealer-customer relationship in the past years, we would legalize every one of them. We would force companies to protect the equities of bootleg operators under penalty of double damages. The very people the bill seeks to aid would be penalized if the bill were enacted into law.

Of course, the vast majority of the people in the country are not manufacturers. Only a few are automobile manufacturers. There are many automobile dealers. And the automobile consumers or buyers outnumber all the rest.

As a public servant coming from the State of Michigan, I assure the Senators that I am very much interested in automobile consumers. I want more of them. The interest of the consumer is completely ignored in the pending bill. This bill assumes that the interests of the public are the same as the interests of the automobile dealers. There are no grounds for such an assumption. Economic facts and experience contradict it. If the premise of the bill were sound, the public would be entitled to recover double damages from dealers in cases of bad faith by the latter.

Mr. President, as a matter of startling fact, manufacturers would be punished under the bill for the very act of protecting the public. Manufacturers would be subject to double damages for taking steps to protect the consumer against bad-faith actions of their dealers, if such cases were construed to follow section 1 (e) of the bill, the protection of the dealer-equity clause.

Mr. President, reference has been made to the report of the Department of Justice. This report points out many of the serious questions which are raised by the proposed legislation.

I wish to read from the report of the Department of Justice, signed by William P. Rogers, Deputy Attorney General. It is dated June 13, 1956. I shall not read the entire report, but I shall submit it for the RECORD later. In part, the report states:

This bill is special legislation limited solely to the distribution of automobiles. This Department has previously objected to the enactment of legislation limited to single industries. As a general rule we continue to oppose special legislation applying to any one industry.

Beyond that, comment on the bill's extremely broad wording is complicated by the absence of that public discussion and analysis which hearings would likely evoke. Principal questions stem from the construction of section 1 (e)'s definition of "good faith."

Initially, the manufacturer is obliged, under pain of double damages, to "guarantee the dealer freedom from coercion, intimidation, or threats of coercion or intimidation." While we are opposed to the coercion of any dealers including automobile dealers, to accept products for resale, this practice may be at present an unfair method of competition under the Federal Trade Commission Act. By making specific in section 1 (e) by definition of "good faith," the illegality of such a practice only by automobile manufacturers described in section 2, the bill, if enacted, might cause courts to question the illegality of the practice in other industries. Subject to this word of caution, I would not oppose the enactment of a bill to outlaw coercion.

In other words, Mr. President, we select one industry and say that if it indulges in coercion or intimidation or threats of coercion or intimidation, it is subject to double penalty. What about other industries in which there is a manufacturer-dealer relationship? The courts might infer that there would be a question as to the legality of such action.

Quoting further from the report of the Deputy Attorney General:

S. 3879 does more. The manufacturer is made liable for "coercion, intimidation, or threats of" same, not only by himself, but also, for instance, by his distributors—whether or not they are subject to his control. Thus, section 1 (a) defines "manufacturer" to include "any person, partnership, or corporation which acts for such manufacturer or assembler in connection with the distribution of said automotive vehicles."

Section 1 (e), in addition, defines "good faith" broadly to include the manufacturer's duty * * * to guarantee the dealer freedom from coercion," etc. The source from which this "coercion" may come, I emphasize, is no way limited by the bill. Apparently, then, this language obliges the manufacturer, on pain of double damages, to protect his dealer from any "coercion"—regardless of the source.

The bill, Mr. President, presents an interesting situation in connection with the definition of "manufacturer" and "distributor." A distributor is one who acts on the part of the manufacturer, and his actions in his relationship with the dealer can cause the dealer to sue for double damages; but the distributor also has franchises, so he is put in the position of the dealer. In the definition of "dealer" a distributor is also included. Is a dealer in automobiles who owns a franchise fish or fowl? Is he a manufacturer, or is he a dealer? That is another question which this bill raises. The bill would operate in a cloudy area and would be bound to bring on litigation for years. I contend, Mr. President, that the bill would work to the detriment of the very persons whom it seeks to aid.

Mr. President, I have cited only a few of the paragraphs from the Attorney General's report. I ask unanimous consent that the entire report be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ON S. 3879

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
June 13, 1956.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: This is in response to your request for this Department's views on S. 3879 (84th Cong., 2d sess.). That bill was introduced May 18, 1956, referred to the Senate Judiciary Commtitee, and reported out favorably, without hearings, June 4 of this year.

Section 2 of the bill specifies that "any automobile manufacturer engaged in commerce who makes or grants any franchise to an automobile dealer shall have the duty to act in good faith in all dealings or transactions with such dealer."

Supplementing section 2, section 3 provides "an automobile dealer" may sue any manufacturer for double damages, plus cost of suit and attorney's fees, "sustained * * * by reason of the failure of said automobile manufacturer to act in good faith in performing or complying with any of the terms or provisions of the franchise, or in terminating, canceling, or not renewing the franchise with said dealer."

Finally, section 1 (e) defines "good faith" as:

"The duty of the automobile manufacturer, its officers, employees, or agents to act in a fair, equitable, and nonarbitrary manner so as to guarantee the dealer freedom from coercion, intimidation, or threats of coercion or intimidation, and in order to preserve and protect all the equities of the automobile dealer which are inherent in the nature of the relationship between the automobile dealer and automobile manufacturer."

This bill is special legislation limited solely to the distribution of automobiles. This Department has previously objected to the enactment of legislation limited to single industries. As a general rule we continue to oppose special legislation applying to any one industry.

Beyond that, comment on the bill's extremely broad wording is complicated by the absence of that public discussion and analysis which hearings would likely evoke. Principal questions stem from the construction of section 1 (e)'s definition of "good faith."

Initially, the manufacturer is obliged, upon pain of double damages, to "guarantee the dealer freedom from coercion, intimidation, or threats of coercion or intimidation." While we are opposed to the coercion of any dealers, including automobile dealers, to accept products for resale, this practice may be at present an unfair method of competition under the Federal Trade Commission Act. By making specific in section 1 (e) by definition of "good faith" the illegality of such a practice only by automobile manufacturers described in section 2, the bill, if enacted, might cause courts to question the illegality of the practice in other industries. Subject to this word of caution, I would not oppose the enactment of a bill to outlaw coercion. (See, e. g., *International Salt Co.* v. *United States* (332 U. S. 392 (1947)); *Standard Oil of California* v. *United States* (337 U. S. 293 (1949).)

S. 3879 does more. The manufacturer is made liable for "coercion, intimidation, or threats of" same, not only by himself but also, for instance, by his distributors, whether or not they are subject to his control. Thus, bill section 1 (a) defines "manufacturer" to include "any person, partnership, or corporation which acts for such manufacturer or assembler in connection with the distribution of said automotive vehicles." Section 1 (e), in addition, defines "good faith" broadly to include the manufacturer's "duty * * * to guarantee the dealer freedom from coercion," etc. The source from which this "coercion" may come, I emphasize, is no way limited by the bill. Apparently, then, this language obliges the manufacturer, on pain of double damages, to protect his dealer from any "coercion," regardless of the source.

Also specified by section 1 (e) as part of the manufacturer's "good faith" obligation is the duty to "protect all the equities of the automobile dealer" which are inherent within the nature of the relationship between the automobile dealer and the automobile manufacturer. Antitrust difficulties here, too, are immediately apparent. In light of auto-industry history, for example, the term "equities of the dealer" might well include the dealer's right to be free from competition from added franchise dealers. As I understand it, one major auto manufacturer's policy now is to permit appeal to its dealer relations board from any sales manager's decisions which affect "the equities of the dealer." Within this language, appointment of an additional dealer in a dealer's area has consistently been deemed a matter warranting appeal. Appointment of added dealers in an area, however, is but one normal competitive means for securing better distribution. As a result, this language might deprive newcomers of their fair chance to enter the auto-dealer business and in the process seriously restrain distribution of new cars.

Even more broadly, this phrasing could be read to require a manufacturer to guarantee against a dealer's unprofitable operation or depletion of investment. The report, for example, emphasizes throughout this bill's concern for the dealer's franchise investment.[1] After remarking on the "substantial investment of his own personal funds by the dealer in the business," the report, on page 2, states the dealer "becomes in a real sense the economic captive of the manufacturer." Building on this analysis, the report concludes (p. 5):

"The economic facts underlying the relationship between manufacturer and dealer justify the imposition upon the factory of duties of a fiduciary or quasi-judiciary character. * * * Under these circumstances, it seems reasonable that the law should impost upon the dominant party, the manufacturer, duties of a fiduciary character."

Against this background, it seems reasonable to conclude that the committee intended that dealers' equities include some safeguard for dealers' margins of profit or investment. Section 3 would apply this standard to any terminating, canceling, or not renewing of a dealer's franchise.[2] Any failure to renew, it seems clear, might drastically deplete a dealer's investment. Similarly, an increase in auto production might mean harder competition among dealers but a lower return for any one dealer. From this it follows that S. 3879 could oblige a manufacturer, I repeat, on pain of double damages, to gear his production and distribution to preserve each dealer's profitable investment.

Thus building for dealers a sanctuary from the rigors of competition seems at odds with basic principles of antitrust. It could effectively prevent manufacturers from responding with production or price changes to the stimuli of a free market. The result might be artificially to recreate as a permanent condition in the retailing of automobiles post-war shortages and prices still fresh in the minds of many. Completely frustrated would be that public interest in more and better products, as well as rival distribution methods which competition is meant to safeguard.

Finally, this language may raise constitutional problems. The bill no way limits the time from which damages may run. Thus, for example, dealer-manufacturer contracts presently in force might be held not to protect all the equities of the automobile dealer. Even though the manufacturer complied strictly with present contract terms, he still could be sued by a dealer—the day this bill became law—and subjected to punitive damages for past acts not illegal when committed.

For all these reasons, I am unable to recommend enactment of this bill.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Deputy Attorney General.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, as a result of the hearings held by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, focusing public attention upon manufacturer-dealer relationships, the automobile manufacturers made some drastic changes in their management-dealer relationships and the provisions of their contracts, and also in the manner in which dealer grievances are considered. Those changes have recently gone into effect. It would seem to me folly of the first order for us to rush in assuming that legislation is the panacea for all troubles, before we ascertain whether the new policy on the part of manufacturers in their relationships with dealers is working successfully.

I hold no brief for any automobile manufacturers, or for any other manufacturers, who force automobiles, refrigerators, tires, or television sets on the dealers. The contracts between them should be two-way contracts. But this bill has a great deal more pain in it for the dealer than it has for the manufacturer. I hope that the Senate, in its wisdom, rather than to wait for the House committee to hold hearings, rather than to pass the bill and to pass the buck and let the House iron out the bumps, will recommit the bill to the committee. Immediate hearings could be held, and we could be assured of some legislative history on the meaning of the provisions of the bill. Then the bill could be brought before the Senate, according to this body its right to act upon a bill which had been properly considered. I should not like to think that the Senate would pass the buck to the House, saying, "You hold the hearings; you make the corrections; we want to get a bill out." The automobile industry has been suffering some pains in recent months, and I am frank to admit that many of those pains have been self-inflicted. There is an unemployment problem in the State of Michigan at the present time, but legislation of this kind will compound the problem, not only for the dealer, but for the manufacturer and the working population. Mr. President, this bill would do serious injury to the public interest. Therefore, I have moved that it be recommitted.

---

[1] S. Rept. No. 2073, 84th Cong., 2d sess.

[2] Acknowledging the possibility that a manufacturer may fail to renew a dealer contract only on pain of double damages, the report, p. 6, states: "The bill would not permanently bind a manufacturer to his dealer. The dealer in case of nonrenewal has no right to require continuance of the relationship. He merely has a right to damages if the factory failed to act in good faith in refusing to renew the franchise."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce, for the information of the Senate, that on tomorrow we shall consider Calendar No. 2262, House bill 101, relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9, subsections (d) and (e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, which bill has been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular

Affairs; and Calendar Nos. 2263 to 2276, inclusive, being 14 bills reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia; and Calendar Nos. 2277 through 2280, inclusive, being 4 bills reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. These measures have been cleared by the respective policy committees; and I have discussed this schedule with the distinguished minority leader, and he is agreeable to it.

The Health, Education, and Welfare Department appropriation bill is in conference. No conference has yet been held. We are hopeful that there may be a conference on that bill this week, and that the conference report can be brought before the Senate this week.

A conference is being held this afternoon on the Independent Offices appropriation bill. If an agreement is reached, I serve notice that we may take up that report later in the week.

The Public Works bill has passed the Senate. There is scheduled a meeting of the conference committee at 4 o'clock today.

The legislative appropriation bill has passed the Senate, and it may be that the House will accept the Senate amendments without a conference.

As the Senate has previously been informed, we shall take up the Defense Department appropriation bill Thursday, and have general discussion on Thursday and Friday—if Senators care to discuss it Friday—but there will be no votes on the Defense Department appropriation bill until Monday. We hope to conclude, on Monday or Tuesday, consideration of the Defense Department appropriation bill, to be followed by the foreign aid authorization bill.

Hearings are now being held by the Appropriations Committee on the foreign aid appropriation bill, but, of course, no action will be taken on that bill until after the Senate acts on the conference report on the foreign aid authorization bill.

The supplemental appropriation bill has yet to be reported. It cannot be acted upon until the Armed Services Committee acts upon the military public works bill, which it expects to do on next Tuesday.

I make this announcement so that Senators may know of the schedule which has been arranged for the next few days, and make their plans accordingly.

AUTOMOBILE DEALER'S DAY IN COURT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3879) to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States, in order to balance the power now heavily weighted in favor of automobile manufacturers, by enabling franchise automobile dealers to bring suit in the district courts of the United States to recover twofold damages sustained by reason of the failure of automobile manufacturers to act in good faith in complying with the terms of franchises or in terminating or not renewing franchises with their dealers.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit submitted by the distinguished Senator from Michigan. Within a few minutes this body will be called upon to decide whether the protests of the giants of the automobile manufacturing industry—namely, Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler, who manufacture 95 percent of the automobiles on the roads of this country—are going to be free and remain free to dictate, with the power of an absolute monarch, the rules of existence in the No. 1 industry of the United States of America and of the world.

Mr. President, the telegrams have poured out from these giants.

They seem to have such complete and total control of those in the Justice Department that the purpose of that department is always to defend the giants and to let small, competitive, free enterprise take its dictation according to whatever the oracles on the mount deside—according to their own whim and greater profit.

The hearings held by the committee of the Senator from Wyoming and by my own Committee extended over a period of 2 years. Prior to that time hearings had been held by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on other proposed legislation designed to correct many of the cancerous abuses which had grown up under the very eyes of the men who operate and manage the giant automobile factories.

I am becoming a little tired of hearing the Department of Justice take the side of big business.

I thought the purpose of the Antitrust Division was to protect the rabbit from the hunter. But instead, under this administration, and according to the opinion of the very man, Mr. Rogers, who was quoted a few minutes ago by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the purpose of the game laws is to protect the hunter from the rabbit. So we have a peculiar distortion of emphasis, namely, that to provide for a free, competitive economy, we must be careful not to have even a set of Marquis of Queensberry rules—at a time when the three giants control 95 percent of the industry, and when a threat of monopoly exists which threatens 40,000 competitive, locally managed, locally financed, little-business men.

The report from the Department of Justice, signed by the Deputy United States Attorney General in opposition to the bill offered by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, was written by the same gentleman who wrote an opinion on a similar bill that was being considered about 2 years ago by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It was a mild bill allowing the manufacturers to write into their contracts, if they so chose, a prohibition against franchised dealers selling automobiles to dealers who were not franchised. The committee tried to get the thinking of the men on whom the administration seemed to rely as to its attitude toward little business. Let me quote from the opinion of Mr. William P. Rogers under date of July 21, 1954.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to read it all but he concludes with these words—he is the same man on whom the distinguished Senator from Michigan now relies to make a case against the bill offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

In closing, Mr. Rogers said:

> The fact that bootleg sales are so prevalent in the automobile industry may indicate that a large segment of the purchasing public favors a new method of distribution in the automobile industry. If the problem of automobile dealers is to be solved by enactment of the present bill, moreover, the way will be opened for countless appeals to Congress by every industry group with a real or fancied problem produced by intensified competition. The Department of Justice does not believe that the current competitive conditions in the automobile industry present a reasonable justification for tampering with the antitrust laws by granting special preferential exemptions which run counter to the American standard of a free, vigorous economy.
>
> Accordingly, the Department of Justice is opposed to the enactment of the bill.
>
> The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

There was the idea that this was a "fancied problem." There was the idea that perhaps we ought to flush down the drain some 40,000 locally managed small businesses—because to pass any kind of legislation in this field would be abhorrent to those who are supposed to be running the Antitrust Division. The Department of Justice felt that it was necessary to protect the big three; to protect $7⅓ billion of concentrated wealth; never mind the 40,000 little local dealers who are trying to eke out a profit.

Only the other day the very same men who are so much opposed to the bill sent telegrams to their suppliers, including United States Steel and Bethlehem Steel and Pittsburgh Plate Glass, trying to influence the vote of the United States Senate. They said the dealers were making so much profit that to pass legislation now in this field would only multiply the vast "take" they are getting.

Also, they have been trying to raise the same type of hobgoblins which are being raised on the floor today, in an effort to defeat this bill, a bill which provides only that a dealer shall be given his day in court—an opportunity to sue in any Federal court for bad faith performance of a contract on the part of the manufacturer.

The other day in our subcommittee hearings I detailed some 15 or 20 bills which were pending before the House and the Senate. I asked the distinguished witness, the general counsel and vice president of the Ford Motor Co., if he favored any single one of the bills. There was not one that he favored. He did not even favor a bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], who now has moved to recommit the O'Mahoney bill. He was not even in favor of any of the Republican bills. It appears that the giants of the industry plainly do not want any legislation along this line. They are running the show, and they feel that they should continue to run the show.

I remind the Senators that this is not an unusual experience in Government. When we discussed the Federal bank deposit insurance, the big banks were against it, because the legislation gave

to the little banks the same right to guarantee the security of their bank deposits. The lobby in Washington urged Congress to vote to kill the bill, because it would interfere with the great productive free-enterprise system. I am for the great, free, productive-enterprise system. But I remind Senators that it is a competitive system; it is not a system which will work without competition.

Then, when the scandalous stock market situation arose, the Senator from Wyoming and others tried to secure corrective legislation which would insure honesty, decency, and ethical conduct. The Senate and House committees heard testimony to the effect that the Government was tinkering with business and was trying to destroy free enterprise. The same was true of the Holding Company Act. We heard about the scandalous graveyard list, and the same statements were made in an effort to destroy that bill.

Whenever the Government has moved to provide a set of Marquis of Queensberry rules to insure fair play and to prohibit hitting below the belt, it has always been charged with interference with the rights of business to operate.

But whenever the Government has insisted on fair play and fair practices, the very ones who have protested the action of the Government have found that such action has ultimately worked to their advantage—as well as to that of the smaller people which the law sought to protect.

I am becoming a little tired of hearing the Department of Justice, whenever legislation is proposed to help the little people and to help the competitive enterprise in this country survive in the face of an ever-growing tendency toward monopoly and concentration of power, raise the fear of hobgoblins, or contend that the law should be so broad as to include other types of industry. It seems that big business merely wants to have someone else on its team. They want the television, refrigerator, bicycle, motorcycle, and aircraft industries to be included.

Actually, I think the primary industry of this Nation and of the world is important enough to be the subject of legislation in this field. The committees spent many, many months in careful study of the conditions in the automobile industry. But if additional legislation is necessary to cover the farm implement, the television, the radio, or the refrigerator industries, all of which have franchise agreements, let us consider legislating for them later. I do not think Congress knows enough about all those subjects, or can know enough about them, in a single period of 2 years of investigation, to legislate across that whole field.

We are dealing with the No. 1 industry of America and the world. If that is not an important enough industry in which to legislate, I do not know what industry would be.

I regret that all Senators could not have attended the hearings and have learned of the fear that is in hearts of thousands of automobile dealers who were afraid to answer even a questionnaire with their names signed to it. This was because of the intimidation and pressures which have existed throughout the years, and the contract termination clauses which have served as economic death penalties if the dealers dared to incur the ire of the manufacturers.

This bill merely gives the dealer the right to go into court and lodge a suit, not to make the manufacturer prove good-faith performance, but for the dealer to prove the manufacturer's bad-faith performance of existing contracts. Some of the contracts which have existed in the past were the most one-sided contracts ever entered into by any businessman. Usually there is mutuality between the seller and a buyer. Usually if one is an independent retailer he has sources of supply consisting of some 2 to 10 or 20 or 100 manufacturers. This does not obtain, and cannot obtain, in the automotive industry.

Mr. President, the dealer is the captive buyer of a seller who can impose an economic death penalty in 90 days time by terminating the contract. This is regardless of how long the dealer may have been in business, regardless of how many hundreds of thousands of dollars he may have put into his building—at the company's instruction, building at a certain location, under certain specifications and design, and everything else insisted on by the factory. Yet there is, in practically every major contract existing today in the automotive industry, provision for economic loss of life in 90 days.

The bill would simply assure the dealer who signs a contract, one-sided though it may be—and they are still one-sided, and they will perhaps continue to be one-sided, weighted in favor of the factory—that he has a right to go into court and sue for damages for bad faith under the terms of the contract.

We see glistening tears being shed over Ford and General Motors, and over the fact that throughout the United States the individual dealers, who have an investment averaging $118,000, are going to victimize the Ford Motor Co. or General Motors.

Frankly, I think the bill has been well drafted. The basis for its need cannot be questioned even by its enemies and those who would seek to kill it by recommitment. I feel the bill merits action by the Senate, since it was unanimously reported by the subcommittee, and, I am told, unanimously reported by the full Committee on the Judiciary.

Generally, the purpose of most hearings is to determine whether legislation is needed in a particular field. Perhaps some correction of the bill can be made on the floor of the Senate, if the bill has any defects in it. But I cannot see any.

Frankly, I think the little dealers and little-business men are going to learn who their friends are today. They are going to find out whether the United States Senate is in favor of the continuation of little business or whether it is going to go all-out for greater and greater monopolization of our economic spectrum. The question is as simple as that.

Make no mistake, the motion to recommit, which has been submitted in good faith by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, is in fact a motion to kill the bill. We all know that Congress is nearing the end of its session, and we know that agreement to the motion to recommit today will mean the death of the bill and therefore, no legislation on the subject matter in this session.

So as we get near agreement or disagreement to the motion to recommit, which is apparently supported by the minority leader, who says he shall ask for the yeas and nays—and I support him in that request—we shall find out very quickly how we stand on the conflict between little-business interests and big-business interests. We shall find out the answer to that question on a bill which I think is completely equitable. I do not see how anyone in the world can say any American, no matter who he is, shall be denied his day in court, and shall not be given the opportunity to appear before a Federal judge and ask to be recompensed for damages which he has sustained as a result of bad faith on the part of another.

Are we in favor of bad faith in existing contracts?

We are not asked to turn the question over to a bureaucracy. We are not asked to turn the matter over to a board or a commission. We are asked to turn it over to Federal judges, so that a dealer may introduce evidence before the Judge, have him weigh the evidence, and determine whether or not, under the contract signed by the manufacturer and by the dealer, bad faith has been shown to have resulted in losses being sustained by the dealer—whether the losses which were sustained by the dealer were the result of bad faith on the part of the manufacturer.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have been in committee most of the afternoon. I left the committee to hear the address of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. I have been impressed by his arguments. I may say, in all candor, I have been in doubt as to how I should cast my vote on the bill. The Senator's arguments are impressive. I wonder if the Senator would be willing to give me, and perhaps other Senators who may be interested, the benefit of his reaction to the statement I have heard that the enactment of the bill would tend to freeze into permanence, so to speak, some of the bad trade practices of which many dealers complain.

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly think the result would be the reverse of that. I have been involved in an independent study by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Automobile Marketing Practices. Because of that study, because of the activities of the antimonopoly subcommittee, and because we took the trouble to poll 40,000 automobile dealers on whether they thought legislation or Federal studies were needed in the field, we have seen, in recent months, great concessions made by the large automobile manufacturers. I will say this for them: As the situation exists today, they have gone far toward correcting the abuses about which most dealers were complaining. But the No. 1 complaint was

about contracts. The dealers fear the 90-day death sentence. Contracts still carry that clause, making the contracts subject to cancellation in 90 days, at the option of either party. It means that, no matter how much the local dealer's investment is, no matter how many years he may have been in business, no matter how much inventory he may be carrying, no matter how many employees were with his company, no matter whether his entire investment had been dictated by the factory—even down to the location in the block—the manufacturer, for no reason whatsoever, if he so chooses, can cancel out the dealership in 90 days. Such contracts exist still today in the automobile distributing business.

Such contracts will still exist under the bill. The only difference is that a dealer will have an opportunity to go into court and sue for damages. He must prove he sustained those damages as a result of bad faith on the part of the factory in carrying out the one-sided contract the factory had written.

I feel it is perfectly logical that automobile dealers should be given the same rights which practically every other competitive industry has, particularly because of the peculiar situation of having 95 percent of the supply of cars concentrated in the hands of 3 companies. Legislation such as is proposed in the pending bill is needed to provide for some microscopic degree of mutuality between the two contracting parties. Now, it is a case of there being a giant on the one hand, and a gnat on the other. The combined investment of the 40,000 automobile dealers is not an insignificant one. Although the average investment is $118,000, the total investment of the franchised dealers is about $5 billion, and these independent franchised dealers employ about 667,800 persons. We think of the automobile industry as consisting of big manufacturers. Yet they have a total investment of only $7⅓ billion, and they employ about 780,000. So the automobile industry is really divided into two halves. One-half has been the complete and total master of the other half. I have often said they are like the Siamese twins. When one of the Siamese twins, the independent franchised dealers, becomes anemic and withers away, it will not be long before the other twin will likewise die. I am not afraid of what was so blatantly told our committee only last week, practically in these words: if the Congress dared enact legislation in this field, the Ford Motor Co. might decide not to have any independent, franchised dealers. Mr. President, I do not like to have attempts made to bluff the Senate; I do not like threats or attempts to intimidate or coerce either the Senate or the dealers. Yet representatives of the Ford Motor Co. have repeatedly said that they would have to consider changing that company's entire automobile distribution system if we were to provide for equity and fair and decent treatment of the little, independently owned, independently financed automobile dealers.

In that connection, let us consider their present dealership structure. The manufacturers with good dealership structures are doing very well indeed. The automobile manufacturers that today are "on the rocks" or nearly "on the rocks" are those which do not have and cannot obtain satisfactory dealerships. In contrast, the manufacturers who are doing well have a cadre of well-equipped dealers who sell the manufacturers' products. We do not think the other half of the industry should forever be the slaves of the manufacturing half. We do not think the manufacturing half of the industry should be able to call the tune and determine which dealers shall survive and which shall "go under," and be able to pass economic death sentences at their whim or fancy. Do not worry about the bluff that automobile manufacturers will give up the advantages of the dealership system just because Congress writes a minimum amount of good faith and fair play into their relations with dealers.

The manufacturers now have corrected most of the abuses. But how long can we be sure they will remain corrected, especially in a difficult competitive condition in a bad automobile year, such as the present one?

And who caused the over-selling in the automobile market last year? It was not caused by the dealers. Instead, it was caused by the manufacturers—who forced on the market a million more automobiles than the market could absorb, and attempted to stretch the normal customer demand in one year to the size of the demand for 2 or 3 years. As a result, today there is vast unemployment, which has been caused by the desire of the manufacturers to overload the market last year, regardless of what would happen in this year.

Mr. President, the automobile dealers constitute an extremely large and extremely important industry. The investment of the automobile manufacturers in the United States amounts to approximately $7⅓ billion, and they employ approximately 780,000 persons. But the total investment of the franchised dealers is estimated to be nearly $5 billion, and they employ approximately 667,800 persons, or approximately 9.7 percent of total retail employment in the United States. The investment of the 42,000 dealers averages approximately $118,000 each.

Certainly we must be concerned when unethical practices, including "price packing"—adding unjustified charges—phony "blitz" sales, misleading advertising, and so forth, are engaged in. Today such practices are taboo by action of the automobile manufacturing companies. But do you not, Senators, think that a local small-business man with an investment of $200,000 or even $50,000 is entitled to some security beyond the whim or monetary desire of a manufacturer to do thus and so?

The pending bill is a corrective piece of proposed legislation designed to put a Marquis of Queensberry set of rules into effect in a business which really is a cornerstone of our domestic prosperity.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. From the previous remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma, I understood that the automobile manufacturers have an investment amounting to approximately $7.2 billion.

Mr. MONRONEY. They have an investment totaling approximately $7⅓ billion.

Mr. McNAMARA. And I also understood the Senator from Oklahoma to say that the total investment of the dealers is approximately $5 billion.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; $5 billion.

Mr. McNAMARA. Certainly the dealers constitute a very substantial part of the automobile industry.

Mr. MONRONEY. Certainly they do.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note the employment. Approximately 780,000 persons are employed by the automobile manufacturers in the United States, whereas approximately 667,800 persons are employed in the distribution and servicing branches of the industry.

Mr. McNAMARA. In other words, the figures indicate, do they not, that the two branches of this industry are nearly equal in size.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; they are Siamese twins.

Mr. McNAMARA. Does not the Senator from Oklahoma think that in view of that relationship, the industry would be better off without Government intervention? Could not the two branches of the industry conduct themselves in such a manner that the Federal Government would not have to enter into the picture? Have any remedies of that sort been suggested by either party?

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not think the pending bill provides for Government intervention. The bill merely will allow such a dealer to maintain, in court, a suit similar to that which 99.44 percent of all other businessmen in the United States can maintain in court. But because Philadelphia lawyers have written these one-sided contracts, although today a dealer can go into court and can file suit, his suit will be thrown out of court the next day.

This bill would allow damages to be awarded in such a suit if bad faith could be shown. Such a provision would not cause the complaint to be turned over to a board. Instead, the suits would be handled by the district courts of the United States. I do not think that the district courts of the United States are prejudiced, or that the verdicts in the district courts are awarded indiscriminately, or that they will refuse to recognize good faith as a proper defense on the part of a manufacturer to a suit for losses actually sustained.

Mr. McNAMARA. Did the investigation suggest recognition by manufacturers of a dealer organization? If such a dealer organization had recognition, would it be logical for representatives of the manufacturers to sit down at the bargaining table and bargain collectively with representatives of the dealer organization, as is done with representatives of other interested parties in the automobile industry?

Mr. MONRONEY. I may say to my distinguished colleague, who is a great leader of organized labor, that our early investigation showed rather conclusively that the then-existing dealer organizations were established on the basis of the various makes of automobiles, each one having a dealers' council; and they were about as close to being company unions as could be imagined. In other words, whatever the manufacturer wished the local dealers' council or the State dealers' council to decide, was usually decided.

The National Automobile Dealers Association did agitate for, and recommend, and now have had supplied, certain high-level officials to whom appeals may be made; but that arrangement is still made only by the grace of the manufacturers, and not as a matter of right

That is the purpose of the pending bill. We think the dealers have rights which should be recognized, rather than to have them be merely the recipients of the grace or noblesse oblige of the giant automobile manufacturers.

Is it wrong for a free, independent businessman to be able to have and to exercise the rights which usually are guaranteed to everyone else?

Mr. McNAMARA. I certainly agree with the viewpoint of the Senator from Oklahoma. Let me ask whether his answer implies that if there is what is commonly recognized as honest, collective bargaining between these two parties, there would be no need for legislation in this field.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would hardly say it is a field in which collective bargaining would work.

I think the collective opinions of the dealers, as obtained by means of our questionnaire, have been very helpful. We are trying to provide for the restoration of a certain amount of individual free bargaining, whereas today there is no such thing. Today the dealer is a captive buyer of a sole supplier. That is why the dealers constitute such a peculiar and unusual distribution group.

Mr. McNAMARA. Much has been made by the opposition to the bill of the so-called bootlegging dealer. Has not the subcommittee's investigation disclosed that the "bootlegging" situation is largely brought about by forcing too many automobiles on legitimate dealers?

Mr. MONRONEY. The questionnaire showed that the bootlegging situation was caused largely by overproduction, factory pressure, and maldistribution, which means that the oversupply of automobiles to the dealers was the principal cause, in the opinion of the dealers, for the bootleggers. Let me say that we received approximately 20,000 replies to the questionnaire.

Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] was inquiring about collective bargaining by the dealers. I believe they would then run afoul of the antitrust laws. I am inclined to believe that the idea of the Department of Justice is that the dealers would probably be prosecuted for getting together to bargain. Antitrust actions would probably be filed against the small dealers, although the monopolization of 95 percent of the automobile spectrum by three manufacturers does not seem important to the Department at this time—or to the Deputy Attorney General, who has made an adverse report on this bill, and who also made an adverse report some 18 months ago on a very innocuous bill which was then pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. The question which I have—or perhaps a series of questions—relates to the interpretation of the bill, and the judgment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], as well as the judgment of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], on the difficult question in the field of antitrust law.

The question arises in this way: Under the definitions in the bill, section 1, subsection (e), good faith is defined to mean "the duty of the automobile manufacturer, its officers, employees, or agents to act in a fair, equitable, and nonarbitrary manner so as to guarantee the dealer freedom from coercion, intimidation, or threats of coercion or intimidation, and in order to preserve and protect all the equities of the automobile dealer which are inherent in the nature of the relationship between the automobile dealer and automobile manufacturer."

In order to get at my point, I should like to ask the Senator first whether or not, in his judgment, if the manufacturer decided, we will say, without being able to prove any fault on the part of the dealer in a particular town in which there was only one dealer, that he would like to have another dealer in that town, he would, under the provisions of the bill if it should become law, be in violation if he granted to another person a dealership in that town?

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not see how such action would violate good faith in any way. I do not see how installing another dealership in a town would involve bad faith. However, if it so happened that the other dealership was established because of the refusal of dealer A to buy seat covers by the gross, or to buy cowboy and Indian suits, or to contribute a thousand dollars to a presidential political campaign, I should say that a suit based upon a charge of bad faith might lie. That is only my judgment. If a dealer failed to do certain things required in bad faith by the manufacturer, by means of coercion and intimidation—and we have had ample evidence before our committee of such cases—and if the result of the dealer's refusal to cooperate with the factory in the face of the threat of a new agency caused him to suffer damages, he might get into court. I think a Federal judge would hear the evidence on both sides, and rule whether or not the loss was occasioned by bad faith. I think each case would stand on the evidence submitted. I would rather have my distinguished friend, the primary author of the bill, elaborate on that question.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I would very much appreciate having the views of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

In order that I may have in mind the views of the Senator from Oklahoma, I will ask him one further question.

It is my understanding that the Senator's interpretation of the bill is that the mere act of granting another franchise in the same territory, in the absence of affirmative evidence of coercion, intimidation, or threats—as to which, I take it, the burden would be on the dealer—would not constitute a violation of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not read such a construction into the bill at all. If it is a clear case of the manufacturer merely wishing a second dealership, and there is no evidence of intimidation, coercion, or bad faith, I do not believe any violation of the law would be involved.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. This is a question which has been somewhat difficult for me. I should not want the effect of any bill we pass to create exclusiveness in an area in which it is undesirable to have that principle established as valid.

Mr. MONRONEY. The tenor of many manufacturers has been that if Congress dares to enter the field, the heavens will fall, the world will stand still, people will stop buying automobiles, and, above all else, the dealer franchise system of small businesses will have to be dispensed with. It is the fear technique. We heard it frequently when the Holding Company Act and other pieces of legislation were before Congress for consideration.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma one further question, and then I shall be glad to have the views of the Senator from Wyoming.

In section 3 of the bill, toward the end, in the very last phrase, are the words: "by reason of the failure of said automobile manufacturer to act in good faith in performing or complying with any of the terms or provisions of the franchise, or in terminating, canceling, or not renewing the franchise with said dealer."

Is it the Senator's view that it is obligatory on a manufacturer to extend or renew franchises indefinitely under this bill, or would there be a violation of law only if there were affirmative evidence that a manufacturer had refused to renew in the course of a process of coercion, intimidation, or threats of coercion and intimidation?

Mr. MONRONEY. As I read the language—and I should like to have the distinguished primary author of the bill amplify the point—only in the event of nonrenewal, in connection with which bad faith could be proved by the dealer whose franchise was terminated, would any rights accrue, and then only to the extent of provable damages.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. The question is, What is good faith? This colloquy may be helpful in spelling out our intent. I have no wish to complain about the difficulties which I know exist in writing legislation of this sort. An indefinite right of renewal is not one of the equities of an automobile dealer, I take it.

Mr. MONRONEY. By way of amplification of that point, let me say that if the failure to renew was because a zone or district manager had a brother-in-law who was trying to buy that agency and

its physical assets for about half of what they were worth, and if the dealer could prove that—and many dealers came before our committee with such charges—and if the dealer had a proper right to bring such suit, and if he could prove such bad faith, then I believe he should recover. I believe the Senator from New Jersey believes so, also.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I would have great sympathy in such cases. Suppose one were to buy the agency and physical assets for their full value?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would still say that it would be apt to be bad faith unless there were extenuating circumstances showing why the long-term relationship of the dealer should be terminated. I think if there is preference, discrimination, and things of that kind, the court would then decide—and only the court could decide—first, whether there was bad faith, and, second, whether damages were sustained as the result of bad faith. If it were proved in court that the dealer received full value, I believe there would be very little by way of damages that he could collect.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. That, of course, would depend upon whether there was in effect a permanent franchise. In a sense, we are begging the question or chasing ourselves around a circle when we talk about good faith, because good faith is a term of art; it is not a matter of common definition or understanding, as is the case with the term "good morals." I am only trying to arrive at an understanding, not to argue the merits of the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. If we place such cases in the jurisdiction of the Federal district courts, where the term "good faith" is so well recognized—and with the amplification in the bill of the definition, so as to make it apply to the peculiar franchise relationship and the responsibility of a manufacturer to a dealer—I have no fear of our courts in that regard. In other words, if we were placing the jurisdiction in matters of this kind, in a commission or in a board, I would be somewhat concerned. However I feel that anyone should have a right to sue. Perhaps anyone can sue now, but under the peculiar terms of most of the present franchises, a dealer who brings the kind of suit to which we have been referring is thrown out of court almost on the day he comes into court.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Oklahoma and concur fully in what he has said with reference to his confidence in the courts. The point is that we are now writing a law for the courts to apply and to interpret. The purpose of the colloquy is to attempt to define more clearly—at least that is the thought of the Senator from New Jersey in connection with this colloquy—the meaning of the law and the nature of the substantive rights which are being created, for which drastic remedies are being provided.

Therefore I should like to press just a little further the question of the renewal of franchise. Is it necessary that a failure to renew be coupled with intimidation, coercion, or threats of that kind, in order to have a failure to renew create a cause of action under the bill, or would mere failure to renew, without any evidence of coercion or intimidation, or such threats, be sufficient to give rise to a cause of action?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would answer the latter part of the Senator's question first. In my opinion, failure to renew would not, per se, give the dealer a cause of action. There would have to be other circumstances which would indicate bad faith. I would not say that bad faith would be so limited, necessarily, as to include only 2 or 3 things. I believe the court would be capable of observing whether bad faith was the principal reason for the nonrenewal.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I am grateful to the Senator from Oklahoma for his explanation. I would appreciate it very much if the Senator from Wyoming would be good enough to make some observations on this point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe that the colloquy between the two Senators has been very helpful indeed. I could not have asked for better answers to the questions asked by the Senator from New Jersey than the answers which have been given by the Senator from Oklahoma. I would not attempt to improve upon what he has said. He has made it clear that the purpose of the bill is to give the automobile dealer a cause of action in order to protect him from abuses which have been rampant in the industry. That is all.

It is not intended to give a permanent franchise or to separate a cause of action from the integral abuses which are mentioned in the definition of good faith.

During the early part of the day, when we were discussing the bill, I was asked several questions, the answers to which I believe will help the Senator from New Jersey in understanding the intent of the bill.

The question was asked about bad faith on the part of the dealer. We have no objection whatever to good faith being required on the part of the dealer. We are trying to bring about a situation which will prevent the resumption of the abuses which have prevailed in the past and to protect good faith on all sides.

If the Senator from New Jersey will be kind enough to look at the bill, particularly at section 1 (e), about which he was questioning the Senator from Oklahoma, I may say that, in order to make clear that the obligation of good faith lies on the dealer as well as upon the manufacturer, I would be very glad to amend the section in the manner I shall indicate. The Senator may wish to mark it down as I proceed.

Beginning in line 22, on page 2, I would strike out the words "the automobile manufacturer, its" and insert in lieu thereof the words "each party to any franchise and all", so that that part of the sentence would read:

(e) The term "good faith" shall mean the duty of each party to any franchise and all officers employees, or agents to act in a fair, equitable, and nonarbitrary manner so as to guarantee—

In line 25 I would strike the words "the dealer" and insert in lieu thereof the words "such other party", so as to make that part of the sentence read: "guarantee such other party freedom from coercion, intimidation, or threats of coercion or intimidation."

Then in line 1, page 3, I would strike out the words "and in order to preserve and protect" and insert in lieu thereof the words "so as to preserve."

In line 2, page 3, I would strike the first 3 words, "serve and protect" and the last 3 words on line 2, "the automobile dealer" and insert in lieu of the latter "such other party", so as to make that part of the sentence read: "so as to preserve all the equities of such other party which are inherent in the nature of the relationship."

In line 3 I would insert the word "created" between the words "relationship" and "between".

Then I would strike out all of line 4 and insert in lieu thereof the words: "such parties by such franchise."

Subsection 1 (e) would then read:

The term "good faith" shall mean the duty of each party to any franchise and all officers, employees, or agents to act in a fair, equitable, and nonarbitrary manner so as to guarantee such other party freedom from coercion, intimidation, of threat of coercion, or intimidation, so as to preserve all the equities of such other party which are inherent in the nature of the relationship created between such parties by such franchise.

That would be a definition of good faith, and would place the duty upon both parties to the franchise. I would be very happy indeed to offer such an amendment. I would be willing, even, to go so far as to strike out section 2 altogether.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. It is sort of redundant.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because, as the Senator from New Jersey says, it is sort of redundant. But section 3 I would allow to remain as it is, and the rest of the bill as it is.

As I was reading section 1 (e) as I would have amended it, and came to the words "freedom from coercion, intimidation, or threats of coercion or intimidation," it occurred to me that the whole record shows that no small dealer in a little town was ever in a position to apply any threats of coercion or intimidation to any of the manufacturers. That is the reason why we did not write it into the bill in the first place. But, of course, it is necessary to make the provision clear, and I am very willing indeed to offer those amendments, which I hope will be satisfactory to the Senators who have raised the question about the term "good faith."

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Will the Senator read the first four lines on page 2, again, please.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me read the whole of subsection (e) as I am willing to have it read. I shall be glad to offer this amendment which will make it read:

The term "good faith" shall mean the duty of each party to any franchise and all officers, employees, or agents to act in a fair, equitable, and nonarbitrary manner so as to guarantee such other party freedom from

coercion, intimidation, or threats of coercion or intimidation, so as to preserve all the equities of such other party which are inherent in the nature of the relationship created between such parties by such franchise.

We have made a sincere effort to clarify the matter.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Would that involve any other person than an automobile dealer?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No.

Mr. THYE. In other words, the automobile dealer is defined in the bill, and he would not in any sense have his identity lost in this paragraph?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No.

Mr. THYE. The provision would not go beyond that one question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I can understand that the Senator, reading this bill, perhaps for the first time, would be very anxious to be sure that we are acting in good faith, and are not attempting to present a bill which is not in good faith. That is not and never has been the purpose of the Judiciary Committee or its subcommittee. We are acting only for the purpose of establishing good relations between the parties.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. There is one question which I should like to address to the Senator. In his judgment, would a cause of action arise on the part of either party against the other by reason of the amendment, for breach of good faith, which could be enforced by a suit at law?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Bear in mind that franchises, as they now exist, are not enforceable in court. The dealer is a minnow in a sea full of whales. I should not say "full of whales," because there are only a few left. But the dealer has no present way of defending himself, and he has been the victim of abuses which all have acknowledged.

So that there would not be created by reason of this definition, as I see it, any cause of action which would be frivolous or which might constitute coercion.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I had no thought of suggesting that. I was merely trying to find out what consequences the proposed amendment would bring.

I wonder if I may now propound another question to the Senator?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me give the Senator this further answer: It would be a guaranty that the manufacturer could raise a question, when sued, of a lack of good faith on the part of the dealer.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. The Senator anticipates my next question, which is this: Would it, in the Senator's judgment, be desirable, and would he be willing to accept an amendment to section 3 providing that lack of good faith on the part of a dealer would be a defense to the action brought by the dealer against the automobile manufacturer?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am inclined to believe there would be no objection to that, but I wish to consult my lawyer. [Laughter.]

I would accept such an amendment.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRICKER. How would the section read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would inform the distinguished Senators that a little difficulty is being encountered in knowing what is going on.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Presiding Officer that I have been endeavoring to talk to him as well as to the Senator from New Jersey, and I assure him that when this colloquy, which is conducted through him with other Members of the Senate, is completed, I shall restate the proposed amendment in such form that not even the Presiding Officer will be in doubt.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, may I ask that everywhere I have spoken, the words "Mr. President" precede my statement? [Laughter.]

I wonder if the Senator from Wyoming would consent to an amendment to section 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would inform the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that under rule XXII of the Senate the pending motion to recommit has precedence over any amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, no amendment has been offered. Because of my recognition of that rule I have avoided offering any amendment. I am trying to get an agreement among Senators who are endeavoring to perfect a good bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Therefore, an amendment at this time can be considered only by unanimous consent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am aware of the rule, Mr. President, and I have not transgressed it, but I am glad to have received the warning of the Presiding Officer.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield, gladly.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am wondering if it would be possible for the Senator from Wyoming to suggest the nature of the language of an amendment to section 3 which, the parliamentary situation being appropriate, I might be willing to have offered to that section in order to make it clear that lack of good faith would be a defense.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thought from the way in which the Senator offered his suggestion of an amendment it was very clear and very accurate. My counsel has been taking it down, and I am going to see now whether it will be satisfactory to all concerned.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am about to answer the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. ALLOTT. Then I will withhold. I should prefer to wait until the Senator from Wyoming has answered the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from New Jersey has suggested an amendment to section 3 which, in principle, is agreeable to me, and it has been put into legal language.

Mr. BRICKER. Has the Senator read section 3 of the amendment, which I gave him a moment ago?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, I have.

Mr. BRICKER. Would that accomplish what the Senator has in mind?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is directed toward the same end.

Mr. BRICKER. That is what I mean. It has the same purpose which the Senator had in mind.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It has the same purpose which I had in mind, but I should prefer, since I have not had an opportunity to consult with the other members of the committee, to state it in the form in which the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and I have already come to an agreement. I think it will be substantially in agreement with what the Senator first suggested.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator will note that the amendment which I have prepared would limit the damages to actual damages rather than to double damages. Double damages are punitive. I think we must consider that the bill affects interstate commerce, and that there is no reason for punitive damages to be awarded to any party if he recovers actual damages.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am willing to accept such a provision, too.

Mr. BRICKER. I shall be willing to agree to that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Therefore, when the appropriate time comes to submit an amendment, it will be in line 13, page 3, of the bill now before the Senate, and will be to strike out the words "twofold the", and insert in lieu thereof "compensatory", so as to make the phrase read: "shall recover compensatory damages by him sustained."

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I may say to the Senator from Wyoming that this removes one of the very great difficulties I have had with the bill. With the changes suggested, including the reduction of damages so as to provide for the recovery of damages actually sustained, and the cost of the suit, I think the bill is much improved.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is a great pleasure to work with a Senator who is so comprehending and so intelligent. I am very happy indeed.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I blush to hear the compliment of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma will state his parliamentary question.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I understand, the amendment suggested by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary to modify the bill will not be in order until the motion to recommit, on which a yea-and-nay vote has been ordered, has been disposed of. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. What about the mutuality of obligation in section 3, as suggested by the Senator from New Jersey? Is that to be worked out later, or will it be consistent with the language which I submitted to the Senator a moment ago?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is the way in which the Senator from New Jersey and I agreed upon the proposed amendment—I do not believe there is any need for using the word "mutuality."

On page 3, line 18, strike out the period after the word "dealer" and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the words: "*Provided*, That in any such suit the manufacturer shall not be barred from asserting in defense of any such action the failure of the dealer to act in good faith."

May I ask the Senator from New Jersey if that does not meet with his approval?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Could the words "as a defense" be added?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes. I said "in defense of any such action."

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. That states accurately the thought which the Senator and I had during our earlier colloquy.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Is there any doubt whatever in the Senator's mind whether or not the manufacturer would be precluded from a suit by the giving of a special right to the dealer, and not naming the manufacturer in that section?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think there is no danger of that.

Mr. BRICKER. I am not inclined to think there is. I merely wanted to make the record certain.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree with the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. What right, then, does this give to the dealer, especially, which would not be given to the manufacturer?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The only right which the dealer would acquire which is not specifically given to the manufacturer would be the right to bring the suit to challenge the good faith of the manufacturer. The reason for that is that with the very preponderant economic strength possessed by the manufacturer, on the one hand, and the puny strength of the dealer, on the other hand, there is no need to authorize the manufacturer to bring a suit in good faith against a dealer.

Mr. BRICKER. But when the suit is brought, under the wording, then, the manufacturer could raise the question of good faith, as set forth in paragraph 1 of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Absolutely.

Mr. BRICKER. What about section 2? Did the Senator suggest that he would be willing to strike that out?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggested I would be willing to strike it out. It is redundant; it is surplusage.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to raise a question which I believe was touched upon by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and perhaps was touched upon by the Senator from Wyoming himself. It is a question which I believe is very pertinent to the situation.

From what I have been able to learn, one of the great difficulties concerning the bootlegging problem has been that certain dealers who are strategically located have taken large numbers of cars from a particular manufacturer and then have bootlegged the cars, in turn, to other persons throughout the country.

In other words, as I understand, it is impossible for anyone except a dealer to get cars, but authorized dealers have been guilty of the practices which produce bootlegging.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I may interrupt the Senator before he proceeds any further, I want to have this matter nailed down.

In all the hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Antitrust Monopoly, and also, I feel certain, by the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], there has not been a single instance cited in which any manufacturer has terminated the contract of a dealer for bootlegging—not one.

Many a dealer has said to the members of the subcommittee, "If the factory wants to stop bootlegging, the factory can do it."

Mr. ALLOTT. Let us follow this through. I was not able to read the volumes of testimony taken in the two hearings, and I do not suppose very many other Senators have done so.

What I should like to pin down—and I think it is necessary for the protection of dealers throughout the country—is that the original bill provided, at the top of page 3:

> Protect all the equities of the automobile dealer which are inherent in the nature of the relationship between the automobile dealer and automobile manufacturer.

As I understand the proposed amendment, it would read as follows: "so as to preserve all the equities of such other party which are inherent in the nature of the relationship between such parties by such franchise."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. "Created between such parties."

Mr. ALLOTT. Very well; "created between."

What I wish to pin down for the record is that enumerated among the equities is not the right of any dealer to bootleg cars and to make possible the bootlegging practice.

In other words, as the bill was originally written, it occurs to me that when it said, "protect all the equities of the automobile dealer," it was in effect protecting and preserving the rights of the particular few automobile dealers around Detroit who bootleg. Do we all understand for the record that among these equities there is not included the right to perpetuate the practice of bootlegging among dealers?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I cannot follow the Senator's argument at all. The provision which we have written into the bill to preserve equities certainly cannot be interpreted as preserving the right to bootleg cars. What the Senator is saying means only this, in other words: There is a danger, as he sees it, that the bootlegger would be entitled to assert, as an equity against the manufacturer, the right to receive cars which the dealer had been selling at low prices to the bootlegger.

Mr. ALLOTT. No.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is where the bootlegging starts.

Mr. ALLOTT. No. I believe the Senator has forgotten some of the testimony which was given before his committee. I am not saying that this practice is universal, but the car dealers in my State inform me, and have so informed me on numerous occasions, in an attempt to educate me on this subject, that it is the dealers, particularly in the central Detroit area, and within several hundred miles of there, who take large numbers of cars and bootleg them, at $25 or $50 a car, to the rest of the country.

Let us consider a given dealer. Let us suppose he could legitimately handle, through his agency, 200 cars a year, but he handles 500 cars a year, and handles the extra 300 on the basis of bootlegging them at $50 a car. The question I want to propound in this particular instance, so we may all understand what is being done, is this: The right to continue to demand those 300 cars a year and to bootleg them and thus to destroy the legitimate dealer, is not one of that dealer's equities, is it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not think there is a jury in the country that would accept such an interpretation of the law as good faith.

Mr. ALLOTT. It would depend on the contract itself.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the dealer were doing what the Senator has just described, he would find that no lawyer would take his case into court, alleging that the manufacturer had violated good faith.

Mr. ALLOTT. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming, who himself is a lawyer——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator compliments me. I merely struggle along with the English language.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am sure he would find counsel.

I wanted to bring this point out, because it seemed to me that otherwise we might very well be perpetuating a system of bootlegging, which is in itself bad. I realize now the Senator has the same view I have, but I wanted the RECORD to be absolutely clear in this respect.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was going to ask the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from New Jersey, if the language which I have suggested as being willing to accept were offered as an amendment to the bill, it would be satisfactory to them. Then I should like to follow that inquiry with a question addressed to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] as to

whether he would not, in those circumstances, be willing to withdraw his motion to recommit the bill.

Mr. BRICKER. I am sure subsection (e) is entirely satisfactory. I think section 2 is redundant and should be stricken. As to section 3, I think there ought to be complete mutuality of statement, as in subsection (e). I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming a question concerning the right to bring suit in the district court of the United States "in the district in which said manufacturer resides."

There is no question of the right to bring suit if it involves interstate commerce. There is no question of the right of jurisdiction if there is diverse citizenship. Would the bill give a dealer in the State of Michigan, for instance, the right to sue one of the manufacturing companies of Michigan in a district court of Michigan if interstate commerce were not involved? And if that is the case, would the Congress have the power to give such jurisdiction to the Federal courts, which jurisdiction is extremely delimited in the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The language in the bill is "in the district in which said manufacturer resides, or is found, or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy."

I am afraid, speaking frankly to the Senator, that I would have to fall back upon the intention which, I think it is generally agreed, is that the automobile business is so national in scope that it is commerce, and that such a suit might be brought. No doubt many of the dealers within the State where the manufacturer also resides do business outside the boundaries of a State, and come within the definition of "commerce" in its very narrowest sense.

Mr. BRICKER. Of course, if the definition of interstate commerce includes that, then there is no question about it; but if it does not, there is some question in my mind whether or not the Federal courts would have jurisdiction. They have jurisdiction over all the laws of the United States, and the laws of the United States cannot detract from or subtract from the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, as set forth in section 2, article III, of the Constitution; but, it would not be a law of the United States the court would be considering; it would be a contract.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator from Ohio that there have been so many court decisions concerning the definition of "commerce," which word is contained in the bill, that there would be no question about it.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Would the Senator from Michigan, in those circumstances I have mentioned, withdraw his motion?

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I will say to my distinguished friend from Wyoming that because of the fact that much of the bill is proposed to be rewritten on the floor, it would seem to me that the debate which has taken place so far fortifies the need for further study of the bill. I can assure the Senator that, while I am not a lawyer, I have tried to pay as close attention to what has transpired on the floor as possible. Nevertheless, I am sure many Members of the Senate will not be informed as to what is in the bill when they are asked to vote on it.

For that reason, I shall insist upon my motion to recommit.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of my distinguished friend the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. Do I correctly understand that the proposed amendments which have been discussed with the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] are acceptable to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. I wrote them after examining the suggestions which were made by the Senator from Ohio. Apparently they were agreeable to him; and I shall submit those amendments immediately when the parliamentary situation permits me to do so.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I think it is certainly most unsatisfactory to attempt to write legislation on the floor of the Senate. Personally, I would much prefer to have proposed legislation of this character considered by the appropriate committee, and to have the committee hold hearings at which all interested parties could appear and could testify.

Personally, I feel that it is very bad practice to attempt to write legislation on the floor of the Senate. Therefore, I shall vote against the bill, because I still believe that when the vote is taken on the bill, many Members of the Senate will be voting with little, if any, understanding of its provisions.

However, as a result of the debate which has transpired today, and the agreement which has been reached on the proposed amendments, I am prepared to withdraw my motion to recommit the bill, so that the Senator from Wyoming will be able to submit the amendments which have been discussed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am quite willing that that shall be done. However, the parliamentary situation, as I understand it, is such that the Senator from Michigan will have to request unanimous consent that the motion to recommit may be withdrawn.

Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No unanimous-consent request has yet been submitted, but objection by the Senator from South Carolina is heard.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I move that the motion to recommit Senate bill 3879 be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator include within his motion a motion to rescind the order for the yeas and nays?

Mr. POTTER. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not necessary for the Senator from Michigan to obtain unanimous consent to withdraw the motion to recommit?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from Wyoming that it is necessary for the Senator from Michigan to obtain unanimous consent to withdraw the motion to recommit.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to recommit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan to lay on the table the motion to recommit.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator that the last motion takes precedence over the motion to recommit.

The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] to lay on the table his motion to recommit. The motion to lay on the table is not debatable.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KERR. As I understand, the motion of the Senator from Michigan now is to lay on the table his own motion to recommit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. [Putting the question.]

Mr. POTTER'S motion to lay on the table his motion to recommit was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in accordance with the understanding reached with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and other Senators, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, beginning with line 21, it is proposed to strike out all of subsection (e) and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

(e) The term "good faith" shall mean the duty of each party to any franchise, and all officers, employees, or agents to act in a fair, equitable, and nonarbitrary manner so as to guarantee such other party freedom from coercion, intimidation, or threats of coercion or intimidation, so as to preserve all equities of such other party which are inherent in the nature of the relationship created between such parties by such franchise.

It is proposed to strike out all of section 2; and in line 18 on page 3, to strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following: *"Provided,* That in any such

suit the manufacturer shall not be barred from asserting in defense of any such action the failure of the dealer to act in good faith."

It is proposed to change the section number in line 8 on page 3 from "3" to "2"; and in line 13, to strike out the words "twofold the" and insert "compensatory."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration en bloc of the amendments offered by the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH and Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent in order to attend the wedding of his daughter.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 1, as follows:

YEAS—75

Aiken	Gore	McCarthy
Allott	Hayden	McClellan
Anderson	Hennings	McNamara
Barrett	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Beall	Hill	Monroney
Bender	Holland	Mundt
Bricker	Humphrey	Murray
Bridges	Jackson	Neuberger
Byrd	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Payne
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Clements	Kerr	Scott
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Laird	Sparkman
Douglas	Langer	Stennis
Duff	Lehman	Symington
Dworshak	Long	Thye
Eastland	Magnuson	Watkins
Ellender	Malone	Welker
Flanders	Mansfield	Williams
Frear	Martin, Iowa	Wofford
George	Martin, Pa.	Young

NAYS—1

Potter

NOT VOTING—19

Bennett	Fulbright	Purtell
Bible	Goldwater	Robertson
Bush	Green	Russell
Butler	Hruska	Smathers
Capehart	Ives	Wiley
Daniel	Morse	
Ervin	Neely	

So the bill (S. 3879) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States, in order to balance the power now heavily weighted in favor of automobile manufacturers, by enabling franchise automobile dealers to bring suit in the district courts of the United States to recover compensatory damages sustained by reason of the failure of automobile manufacturers to act in good faith in complying with the terms of franchises or in terminating or not renewing franchises with their dealers."

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SALARY ACT OF 1953

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2261, H. R. 10060.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10060) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957—AMENDMENT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, out of order, I send to the desk an amendment to H. R. 10986, the Defense Department appropriation bill, and I should like to take a minute to explain it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New Hampshire may proceed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the amendment which I send to the desk is an amendment to the Defense Department appropriation bill, H. R. 10986, and applies to the Air Force.

The other day, at the meeting of the Committee on Appropriations, an amendment was offered to increase by $1,160,000 the amount provided by the House for the Air Force. That amendment was adopted in committee by a 1-vote margin. The amendment which I have submitted is sponsored by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

This amendment will be offered as a substitute for the committee amendment. It constitutes an increase of $500 million over the amount provided by the House, of which $350 million is for the procurement of new planes, $100 million for research, and the remainder for maintenance, operation, and personnel. Those are the fields in which the Air Force can use funds to a greater degree than in any other fields. We believe the increase suggested will meet the needs which can be foreseen at this time, and at the proper time on Monday next we shall call up the amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Do I correctly understand that the Senator's amendment will, instead of the amount which was voted for yesterday by the committee, increase the House amount by $500 million?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from New Hampshire is a very able and respected political strategist, and I wish to commend him for his effort. If he should come up with $500 million in one day, and if we accept it at the time we vote on the Defense Department appropriation bill, we will greatly increase the figures in that bill. I wonder if the Senator has in mind offering a similar amendment to the foreign-aid bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. No. First, I wish to thank the Senator from Texas for his words of commendation and to say that I feel the same with reference to him. At the moment I have no proposal to offer any amendment to increase appropriations contained in the foreign-aid bill. I shall limit my activities next Monday to this particular amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator. The Senator has always been for defense and adequate preparedness. I hope the Senator will go along with the full committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, no one has greater respect for the Senator from New Hampshire than I have. I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Department Appropriations. Of course, the Senator from New Hampshire has the right and the privilege of offering an amendment, but I assure the Senator that, so far as the Senator from New Mexico is concerned, he will not take the amendment to conference. Indeed, the Senator from New Mexico will take his chances in the United States Senate for adequate American defense.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator. The purpose of the amendment is to present to the Senate an opportunity to consider an amount which represents a more balanced and adequate approach to national defense than presented by the committee amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does this amendment have the approval of the Defense Department and the administration?

Mr. BRIDGES. I cannot say that it has the approval of the Defense Department and the administration. I would say that the administration and the Defense Department have knowledge of its being offered, but I could not say it has their approval, because I cannot act as spokesman for either the Defense Department or the administration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is a very worthy and able spokesman, but if he is going to ask the Senate to increase the appropriation contained in the Defense Department appropriation bill by $500 million over and above the estimate, I should think he would want to know how the proposal will be received by the Defense Department and the administration. The Senator will recall that during a Democratic administration once upon a time we increased funds for the Air Force, and they were impounded. Does the Senator have any assurance that that action will not be repeated this time?

Mr. BRIDGES. I have a belief that if our amendment is adopted in place of the committee amendment it will be more in line with the requirements and the possible use of funds for pointing up our national defense effort and that the administration and the Department will endeavor in good faith to make use of the money. I feel that in arriving at this figure of an additional $500 million, having looked into the items of procurement of airplanes, research, maintenance and operation, and personnel we have chosen items which offer a greater opportunity of realization in improving our national defense.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to congratulate the Senator on improving his position at least $500 million overnight. I wish to congratulate him on getting the administration to go along with that position. I am always reluctant to disagree with my friend in the field of defense, because no one is more concerned with his country's security than is the Senator from New Hampshire. I hope the study he gave this question is indicative of, perhaps, a study over the weekend which may induce him to go along with the committee. At least, I wish to congratulate him on the progress he has made.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, General LeMay is in charge of the Strategic Air Command. He is the one who has been entrusted by the Federal Government in connection with offensive or defensive enterprises. If we had adopted General LeMay's recommendation we would have recommended $3,800,000,000, but the committee, after due consideration of the need of the Nation for national defense, made its recommendations, and I believe that when the Senate meets on Monday, or when we vote on this particular item, the Senate will take care of it in the proper manner.

I know the Senator from Florida was against it, but it just happened that there were some who were also interested in national defense on the Republican side. I believe the Senate will sustain the committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, since the Senator from New Mexico has mentioned the Senator from Florida in this matter, I wish to make it very clear that I was against the amendment in committee. So were 11 other Senators, because, as I recall, the vote was 13 to 12. The vote was bipartisan. I do not think all the patriotism resides either in my good friend the Senator from New Mexico or in any other Senator. I believe I am now the only Member of the Senate who participated in combat with the Air Force in World War I. It was in a very modest way however.

I am greatly interested in the Air Force, but when I looked at the figures I found there was a $2.9 billion carryover of unobligated funds, and a total of around $9 billion of obligated but unexpended funds, all in the same field of furnishing new airplanes.

When I looked at the budget figure it was something over $6 billion, and I felt that there would not be any possibility of expending all the amount allowed by the budget, plus that carried over as unobligated and unexpended funds from the fiscal year 1956. That was my reason for opposing an increase of more than $1 billion for this purpose, which was approved by a vote of 13 to 12 by the Appropriations Committee.

I regret that my good friend from New Mexico saw fit to make some comment as if he thought I was taking an unusual position. I have been supporting the Air Force for a long time, and shall continue to do so. I do not yield to my friend from New Mexico or anyone else in my belief in the necessity of supporting the Air Force. I feel that the proposed amendment, in which I have joined along with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], both of whom are just as good friends of the Air Force and just as good patriots as is the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, is a good amendment, and I do not think this is the occasion for intimate, sharp, unnecessary, and critical remarks on the floor of the Senate, even by my good friend, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not asking the permission of the Senator from Florida to use my own judgment as to what I think should be done for the security of the country.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very sure that that is the case.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I swore, just as did the Senator from Florida, to perform my duties in the Senate as I saw them.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very sure that that is true.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is my purpose to carry on in that way.

Mr. HOLLAND. But the Senator from Florida did not bring the Senator from New Mexico into this discussion. The Senator from New Mexico brought the Senator from Florida into it in a way that the Senator from Florida regarded as unfair, and which he resented, because the Senator from Florida has fought on four fronts as a member of the Air Force, and he has no apology to make to his good friend from New Mexico, or to anyone else, for his interest in the Air Force.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let us have a clear understanding as to that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Florida does not have to apologize to me or to anybody else. I have observed the Senator from Florida on the floor, and I have always respected his judgment. I have not always agreed with it. I have thought that sometimes the Senator from Florida should belong to the other side of the aisle, rather than to this side. Nevertheless, I have respected his judgment, and I do respect his judgment.

In this particular instance, the vote was 13 to 12. That is true. The Senator from Florida, the Senator from Virginia, and the Senator from Louisiana voted against the amendment which has been submitted.

The Senator from Louisiana—I know him; we all know him—not only on this bill, but on every other bill, feels that we are spending too much money. There is no question whatsoever about that.

But irrespective of my respect for the judgment of the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Virginia—and I love them both—I really do—I have my doubts whether their judgment was sound as concerns protection in what might be an emergency. General LeMay told us that Russia was way ahead of us.

I might ask the Senator if he is for the amendment which has been submitted, what made him change his view, if he was not so sure?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from New Mexico had been listening carefully, he would have heard the Senator from New Hampshire say that the Senator from Florida was one of the sponsors of the amendment. The Senator from

Florida joined in offering the amendment because he understands that perhaps it will be acceptable to the majority of the Senate and perhaps it will be acceptable to the executive branch of the Government.

The Senator from Florida is one of those who saw this occasion rise during the last administration, when Senators and Representatives alike voted an increase for the Air Force, but the Chief Executive saw fit not to accept it and did not use it. The Senator from Florida knows that that is a possibility this time, the same as it was before. He is trying to bring some understanding into the matter.

Again, he says he does not see any excuse or any reason available to the Senator from New Mexico to have brought the name of the Senator from Florida into the discussion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I call the attention of the Senator from Florida to the fact that I respect the President of the United States. But the President has one chore to do; he has one function to perform. Congress has another function to perform. I am trying to act in the Senate according to the oath of office which all Senators take.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida is sure of that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not try to legislate according to administrative recommendation. I take my oath to heart. I think that we in the Senate, as also the Members of the House of Representatives, have a responsibility which is far and away different from that of the Executive. That is the only reason why I recommended the amendment which was adopted by the committee. I favored the amendment.

If I had had my way with the committee, I would have favored the whole $3,800,000,000 which General LeMay recommended. He knows what the situation is.

I understand the viewpoints of the departments and of the Budget Bureau. I consider and respect and give consideration to the proposals of the Budget Bureau. But, after all, who is it who defends the country when an emergency comes? It is not the white-collar workers in the Budget Bureau or in the Pentagon. It is not the Secretary or the Assistant Secretary of Defense. When an emergency comes, we depend on the LeMays, the Twinings, the Burkes, and the Taylors. They are the ones on whom we depend.

We were only trying to do what the military wanted to have done. This happened in the committee. If those men had not been afraid to talk in front of the white-collar workers who were listening to them, they would have told us the truth. Even General Twining, speaking about the recommendation made by the Bureau of the Budget, very coyly said that this is an austere budget. What he really wanted to tell us was that it was not enough. But he was working under orders. As a good soldier, he has to obey orders.

I know the practice which is followed. They tell us in private that they want $1 billion, but they do not dare say so before the committee, because somebody is watching and listening to them.

Who will take care of the Nation when a war comes? Will it be the white collar men in the Pentagon? Will it be the Secretary of Defense or the Assistant Secretaries of the Navy, the Army, and the Air Corps? Or will it be the LeMays, the Twinings, the Burkes, and the Taylors?

But we shall take that up next week. If in any way I seemed to be offensive, I assure the Senator from Florida that I did not mean to be.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate that comment. So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he knows perfectly well that the Senator from New Mexico took the position he took in the committee because he believed in it. He stated it frankly; he did not hedge on it.

The Senator from Florida would never have made any statement about the matter at all except that he thought the comments made gratuitously by the Senator from New Mexico about the Senator from Florida were unnecessary and unkind.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I apologize to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I accept the apology.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, to finish the colloquy, a question has been raised by certain able Senators on the floor as to the good faith of the administration and the Department of Defense in carrying out the will of Congress if the $500 million amendment shall be adopted.

I believe the administration will act in good faith.

The only experience I have had in which the Department of Defense did not act in good faith was a few years ago when Mr. Truman was President. Congress appropriated substantial sums for the Air Force, but the funds were impounded by President Truman against the wishes of Congress. They were held in an impounded condition and were not spent.

I do not think that will occur at this time. Certainly so far as my own humble efforts are concerned, any influence or persuasion which I may be able to bring to bear will be to make certain that the administration carries out the intent of Congress.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I was much interested in what the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire said. Perhaps he remembers a speech which the then General Eisenhower made on September 25, 1952, in Baltimore. In that talk he criticized, by implication, the impounding of funds to which the distinguished Senator has referred.

As I remember, last year the Congress decided that it would like to keep Marine volunteers in the service, at a time when the Congress was approving the drafting of boys from the farms and out of the cities, boys who did not want to go into the service in peacetime.

As I remember, after the $42 million had been appropriated to that end, and the Senator from New Hampshire will correct me if I am wrong—President Eisenhower not only impounded those moneys, but let the Secretary of Defense try to use a part of them for his own office.

I believe it is fair to ask if the distinguished Senator knows the amount of production of B–52's this year. It is easy to criticise unobligated funds, and lack of expenditures; but one of the best ways to avoid fiscal problems, incident to our security in this troubled world is to hold back on aircraft production, and in that way obtain unobligated funds. Then, it can be said that we do not need more appropriations because we already have excess money unobligated, and therefore unexpended.

Of all the surprises recently, with respect to this so-called big business administration, the biggest surprise is with relation to the production of B–52's, especially after all this talk about increased production.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say in answer, if the Senator from Texas will yield to me——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to interject to say that the Senator from Texas has not questioned the good faith of anyone. The Senator from Texas does not operate that way. The Senator from Texas asked for information from the Senator from New Hampshire. He wanted to ascertain if his amendment had the approval of the executive branch, the President and the Defense Department. All the Senator from Texas was seeking was information.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire certainly did not intend to put words in the mouth of the Senator from Texas. The Senator from New Hampshire knows the Senator from Texas always acts in good faith, and expects all of us to do the same. But the question was raised, and the Senator from New Hampshire answered it to the best of his knowledge and ability.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The answer of the Senator from New Hampshire was very pleasing. If we get assurance that we shall get an increase of $500 million, maybe over the weekend we shall get the whole $1 billion. It would be reassuring to know that that amount would go to the production of B–52's, which we need.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who raised the question of what was done with respect to the Marines last year, the Senator from New Hampshire is not at the moment familiar with all of the details, but he is going to study the matter, so that when the question comes up on Monday, he will be able to discuss it. Frankly, I do not know the details, but if the administration has withheld or impounded funds, I do not approve of it any more than I did Mr. Truman's impounding of funds. I want to say that, at the least, I am consistent.

Secondly, in answer to the Senator from Missouri, I should like to say that the Senator from New Hampshire thinks, with respect to the special committee of which the Senator is the chairman, that the defense and the security of the United States are the most sacred possessions of the American people, and they should be the most sacred possessions of everybody in the free world.

These possessions should be the greatest hope of everybody in the slave world. For that reason, the Senator from New Hampshire is very happy and glad that the Senator from Missouri is looking into the question, and that he is doing it in such a thorough manner. While the Senator from New Hampshire may not always agree with everything the Senator from Missouri advocates, he is sure that the Senator from Missouri is proceeding with the best interests of his country at heart. I think some good will come from the investigation with regard to the strengthening of the defenses of the country.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my good friend from New Hampshire for his kind remarks. There is no man on the floor of the Senate, on either side of the aisle, who takes more of an interest in the security of the United States, in his mind and heart than does the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

With respect to the amendment regarding the Marines, one of the more unfortunate aspects of that impounding was that the money impounded was the result of a floor amendment, offered to prevent the Marine Corps from being further reduced.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to make my position perfectly clear. No Member of this body has been more interested in the preparedness of this Nation than has the Senator from New Hampshire. He has worked long, faithfully, and diligently to see that the United States had adequate defenses. I did not rise to criticize him, or to question his good faith, or the good faith of anyone. I rose to congratulate and commend him. Anyone who can increase the budget by $500 million overnight, and get men like the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to go along with him on an amendment increasing the budget figure by $500 million in 24 hours excites my admiration. While I hope the Senator will continue his efforts along that line to the point where he finally will get in line with the views of the majority of the committee, I shall not criticize him if he does not go along with those views. I appreciate the concession he has made. While I recognize it as a brilliant strategic move, I do not want the RECORD to indicate that I have any doubt about either the patriotism or the good judgment of my friend from New Hampshire.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I was one who voted against the increase in the military appropriation bill. I believe we can advance too rapidly in the production of B–52's which might be produced or manufactured in a given year. If some of us had yielded to the recommendation that we increase the number of wings of B–36's, we would have today a large inventory of obsolete planes. There was wisdom in opposition to increasing the number of B–36's at the time the increase was advocated on the floor of the Senate.

We know that the B–52 is not the perfect airplane that engineers and designers are hopeful of designing. We know that there will be new planes in the future. We know, however, that the guided missile question is the most important one with which the United States Government is faced, if it is to have an adequate defense, and if it is to keep abreast of developments in some other countries.

I stated in committee that I was going to oppose the amendment to increase the appropriation above the Budget Bureau's recommendation; but I said that if anyone could justify the expenditure of more funds in the research and in the development of guided missiles, he would have my vote. I have searched for a way, during a study of the appropriation, to determine how I could assist in bringing about an expansion of the guided-missile program. If that way can be developed between now and the time we cast our votes on the bill, Senators will find me voting for an increase of $1 billion, if anyone can prove or justify that the $1 billion can be expended to improve our present and future plans for guided missiles.

For that reason, Mr. President, there might be some justification for scrutinizing carefully a proposal to expand appropriations for the purchase of B–52's which will come off the assembly lines this calendar year or in early 1957. If the guided missile ever is perfected so that it will have the ability to strike effectively its objective or target, even the B–52, or any plane conceivably to be built in the near future, will be as a stationary target in the heavens. For that reason, I am studying and endeavoring to determine whether I can assist in the defense of my country by advocating an increase in appropriations in the guided-missile field, because in that direction lies the new development for the defense of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield. In fact, the Senator from Texas had the floor. He yielded to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Minnesota favor the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. THYE. I will say to my distinguished friend from Texas that the amendment was as much of a surprise to me as it was to the majority leader when it was offered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have nothing but the greatest respect for the patriotism of the Senator from Minnesota and for his sound judgment. If the Senator from New Hampshire could improve his position by $500 million overnight, I wonder whether perhaps the Senator from Minnesota might go along with him, and thus we would make some progress.

Mr. THYE. I am still in the process of trying to acquaint myself with all the facts relating to our national defense. I have not been able to attend all the committee hearings I should like to have attended, because we have had to divide our time in the Senate among several assignments. But I believe that the best and the soundest source of information upon which I could rely was, first, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, after they had made a complete study of all facts relating to our national-defense objectives; and, second, the President of the United States, after he had arrived at his objectives for our national defense. So I felt justified in following their recommendations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Minnesota understand that the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President have endorsed this $500 million increase?

Mr. THYE. I do not understand that, because I became acquainted with this matter only when it was brought up on the floor of the Senate, just at the time when the majority leader became acquainted with it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota will yield, I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] whether the $500 million increase he has proposed has the approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I cannot say as to their approval. However, they have knowledge that it has been proposed. I cannot speak for many other persons in this country; I can speak only for myself.

I would say that they have knowledge of the submission of the amendment, but I cannot speak for them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from New Hampshire care to state whether they look with favor or with disfavor upon it?

Mr. BRIDGES. I would say they look with favor upon it, as compared to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I see.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished majority leader that, like the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, I, too, was one of the members of the Appropriations Committee included in the 12 who voted against the proposal to increase by approximately $1 billion the House appropriation for this purpose. I did so primarily because I was impressed by the fact that in preparing to produce aircraft, we must constantly be on the alert against obsolescence. I did so because I realize that new prototype planes are constantly coming off the line, and some are getting ready for actual production. However, I did so with the feeling that someone—perhaps the majority leader himself—might make a motion for a small increase. Of course, the vote was taken on another question, so it was not necessary to make the other motion. But had the other motion been made and had it prevailed, I think perhaps it might have been the majority leader himself who would have suggested the $500 million amount, because inasmuch as not only Members of Congress but even persons in uniform disagree about this item, there is always room for making a compromise.

I have been impressed by the views of those who believe that we should increase the amount of money we make available for this purpose; but I think an increase of $1 billion in the funds made available for continuation of the production of planes which might become obsolescent might be too much. So I am happy that this compromise proposal has been made. In fact, I have been stimulated to the point where I should like to ask permission of the authors of the compromise amendment to join them in sponsoring the amendment, if it is possible for that to be done.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, we shall be happy to have any other Senators join in sponsoring the amendment, which was rather hastily prepared this afternoon. Certainly it would be consistent with the general attitude of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] for him to join in sponsoring the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me say that the Senator from South Dakota also had a rather quick conversion overnight.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have seen my friend, the Senator from South Dakota, have some quick conversions before. He always acts in accordance with the information before him and on the basis of what in his honest judgment is in the best interests of the Nation. I would be the last Member of the Senate ever to question the motives of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

But I wish to observe that this evening the Senator from South Dakota is in a position $500 million better than the one he was in last night. If in the future the Senator from South Dakota is able to improve his position that rapidly, he is to be congratulated. The Senator from Texas hopes that on Monday the Senator from South Dakota will find it possible to go along with the committee.

I do not question the propriety of the Senator from South Dakota in raising his sights by $500 million. Perhaps by Monday he will decide that he can raise his sights to the extent of another $500 million. Who is there to say that after today, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, he will not be able to raise his sights by $1 billion?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I hope the majority leader is not too optimistic that I shall bite off another $500 million chunk by next Monday or Tuesday, because although I think sometimes it is proper for one to change his mind, yet I also have a few mucilaginous qualities which make me reluctant to move too quickly about matters concerning which I am not certain.

However, let me point out that on August 26, 1949, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 9, page 12315, we had a similar controversy on the floor of the Senate. At that time a proposal was made to decrease by $500 million the funds required for a 70-group Air Force. I was 1 of 9 Members of the Senate who were recorded on the yea-and-nay vote as being in support of a 70-group Air Force and in support of an additional $500 million appropriation at that time. All that is to be found in the RECORD. Although later President Truman found it expedient to impound the money and not to spend it, yet I have felt that, throughout, the Air Force was important to our Natoin, although I recognize that it is not always efficient to spend hundreds of millions of dollars on a certain type of plane at a certain time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I recall the vote to which the Senator has referred. I do not raise the question that the Senator from South Dakota is a recent convert or is acting against his best judgment. I commend him for the judgment he is exercising this evening. Neither do I question the judgment he exercised yesterday. I express the hope—perhaps it is optimistic on my part, but when I am dealing with my friend, the Senator from South Dakota, I am always optimistic—that when the Senator from South Dakota reviews the entire matter on Monday next, he will be willing to take off another bite, after the bite of $500 million that he has digested today.

Mr. MUNDT. I reciprocate the optimism of the Senator from Texas, and express the hope that by next week the Senator from Texas will conclude that this $500 million is the optimum figure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That could be.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Texas is not a spend-easy Member of the Senate, and I think that certain measures of economy register as well with him as they do with other Members of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Certainly I have not closed my mind on the subject.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I recognize that, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Texas is very well informed on the appropriations matters that come before this body.

However, Mr. President, I wish to state that, as one member of the Appropriations Committee, I have neither a confession nor an apology to make for the position I took on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not asking any Senator to confess or to apologize, Mr. President. I congratulated my friend, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], for the brilliant strategy he displayed here this afternoon. I have not questioned the motives of any Senator, and I do not want the record by implication or otherwise to indicate that I am calling upon any of my colleagues to confess. They have nothing to confess; the record is an open book.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I merely wish the record to show that because I was busily engaged in discharging my duties as a member of several subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, at hearings which have been held during the past several weeks, I did not attend all the hearings of this subcommittee and did not hear the testimony of all the witnesses, including the Secretary of Defense, the Assistant Secretaries, and the Chiefs of Staff. However, I did hear General LeMay testify for 2 hours. Although there may be in the printed hearings of the Appropriations Committee which were released yesterday something which might justify the contention that if we are gradually losing air supremacy to the Soviets, it may be because the Congress has been derelict in making available the funds with which to procure B–47's or B–52's, yet I wish to point out—I do not know that it is necessary, because I am sure the majority leader is aware of what revelations are made in the printed hearings—that the record shows that $15 billion was appropriated by the Congress for the Air Force to operate and to procure planes during the fiscal year which will end within a couple of weeks.

At this point I should like to read a United Press dispatch dated 5:41 p. m. today, which I took from the bulletin board. The dispatch refers to General LeMay's testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee, wherein he said that because we were gradually losing out on air supremacy, we should have a large increase in the funds made available for planes. The last paragraph of the United Press dispatch is as follows:

> General Twining, testifying at another closed door session of the subcommittee the same day, said the air procurement program is "satisfactory." Twining said that if he got more money, he would put it into bases and personnel, not planes.

If the Senator will further yield, so far as I am concerned, that verifies my reactions after listening to the testimony of the various witnesses before our committee.

Furthermore, I do not think we are justified in creating the impression—and I do not think it is being done deliberately or with any intention of misrepresentation—that if the Congress were to appropriate the $3,800,000,000 which General LeMay thought he should have for the Strategic Air Command, or if we were to double the $15 billion which the Air Force had this year, the next morning we would wake up and find a very brilliant array of B–52's, without bases from which to operate them, and without personnel with which to operate them.

So far as the Senator from Idaho is concerned, he merely wishes to rely upon the testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee, that it is not the lack of funds or the lack of procurement of modern planes that may be responsible for our gradual loss of air supremacy to the Soviets. Adequate funds have been appropriated, and if there is any lack of national defense so far as our Air Force is concerned, it is not because the Congress has been unwilling to make available every dollar which is essential for the operation of our Defense Establishment. The record is clear on that point; and until we can develop personnel and build bases, I think it is idle for us to contend that if we were to appropriate an additional billion, or an additional $5 billion, we could then tell the American people to become complacent, because everything had been done to guarantee that we should not lose air supremacy to the Soviets.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have not criticized the Senator

from Idaho, and I do not criticize any of the Senator's acts. Who am I to pass judgment on the acts of my colleagues? They are all as concerned with the security of their country as is the Senator from Texas. Perhaps some of them have more information about what is necessary to maintain it than has the Senator from Texas.

The Senator from Texas desires to leave no false impression with anyone. General LeMay recommended an expenditure of $3,800,000,000. The committee, after hearing him, decided to recommend an increase of only $1 billion of that $3,800,000,000. The distinguished ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee and the distinguished chairman of the Republican policy committee, after sleeping over it, have come up with an amendment to increase by $500 million the amount voted by the House.

The Senator from Texas rose merely to commend the Senator from New Hampshire on the progress he had made.

I did not intend to stir up a hornet's nest. I did not intend to criticize any of my colleagues.

The Senator from Texas wishes to commend the Senator from New Hampshire for the action he has taken. If he can do as well over the weekend as he has done overnight, we shall not require much time on Monday to pass the bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In 1953 the late Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg warned the Senate that if personnel, skilled people, were cut as planned then, it would make no difference whether or not the Air Force got the planes, because they would not have the personnel with which to operate them properly.

I have remained out of this money discussion, and plan to stay out of it as our subcommittee continues to try to get the truth, without clouding it with discussions about current appropriations.

I regret some of the remarks made by my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. It is always a pleasure to discuss air power with him. He says the B–36 is obsolete. Inasmuch as, with the exception of perhaps one wing of B–52's, the B–36 is the only intercontinental bomber this country has, that might be a harsh term.

The Senator also warns against producing B–52's in excess quantities, because we might find ourselves in the same position with respect to B–52's as we are now with respect to B–36's—in other words, more obsolete planes.

I have seen the latest figures with respect to B–52 production. The Senator need not worry about any overproduction of B–52's. In fact, one of the chief reasons we may be talking about unobligated funds is that it would be ridiculous for the Government to pay for planes until they had been accepted.

I hope also we shall not be misled, from the standpoint of the future, in overemphasizing the guided missile program. The Secretary of Defense is responsible for the statement there will not be any guided missiles for years to come which will take the place of piloted aircraft. I hope we shall not allow ourselves to get into a state of mind which will result in this country finding itself, in the middle 1950's in the same position England and France found themselves with respect to the Nazis in the middle thirties. It was this kind of talk in her Parliament, that resulted in the British being placed in an impossible situation.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. THYE. No one could have a higher regard for any Member of the United States Senate than I have for the distinguished Senator from Missouri. I knew him when he was Secretary of Air. I had great respect for him then, and I have great respect for him now.

I would challenge anyone who might maintain that the B–36 is everything we desire in an air defense unit as of today. We know that we are striving to perfect even the B–52's, and we know that the B–52 is far superior to the B–36.

Therefore I must reiterate my statement that if we had produced a greater number of B–36's in 1953 and 1954 than we did, we would have inventories today which would not be the most desirable in defense equipment.

The B–52 will not be the most desirable plane in years to come. That is a certainty. I asked Secretary of Defense Wilson, in a committee hearing, whether we had the plant facilities and the personnel to step up production if an emergency demanded increased production. I received the assurance that we did have.

I have been inside the plants, and I have asked the same question of the superintendents and the plant managers. If an emergency called for it, and if we needed to step up production to a basis of 24 hours daily production, we could produce more B–52's than we are now manufacturing. That is the important phase of our defense, namely, our ability to expand if the emergency calls for it. However, if the emergency does not call for it, we would not be wise in our action if we were in this calendar year to fill up our depots with equipment which might be in an obsolete state in the next year or so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I will say to my good friend from Minnesota that if we were to follow that line of reasoning to its logical conclusion, we would not buy any B–52's. We are not getting delivery on many of them now.

Mr. THYE. Oh, the Senator knows better than to make that kind of statement. I must say that in all fairness.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. A great deal of work must be done before an airplane is actually built. In the meantime it may well become obsolete. That is due to the inventive genius of our country.

Mr. President, last night we were a billion dollars apart. The Senator from Texas is one who believes in the old saying that a man's judgment is no better than his information.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas wishes to finish his sentence first.

Evidently, the information which has been made available since the committee voted on the matter yesterday has brought some of our friends to the conclusion that wisdom dictates a change of $500 million in their position. The Senator from Texas is pleased with the progress we are making. He expresses the hope that his very good friend from Minnesota will join him. If he does not wish to join the Senator from Texas, at least the Senator from Texas hopes that he will join his friend the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], in voting for a $500 million increase. The judgment of the Senator from Texas is not infallible, of course, and it may be that his friend from New Hampshire has a better figure than he has.

The Senator from Texas has learned over the years to have very great respect for the judgment of the Senator from New Hampshire and for his colleagues on the other side of the aisle. He expresses the hope that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] will join with them, if he cannot join the Senator from Texas. If the Senator from Minnesota cannot go all the way, the Senator from Texas hopes he will go a part of the way, and that perhaps in the days to come we will finally arrive at an area in which we can reach an agreement.

Mr. THYE. A westerner, when he saw a vicious prairie fire sweeping across the plains, would usually start a backfire. That was the safest way for him to protect himself and his property. It may be that the action of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire and his colleagues is by way of a little backfire so as to save the Nation's Treasury.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would not associate myself with any such viewpoint as has been expressed by the Senator from Minnesota. I do not attribute any such motive to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire, so that we may at least be informed of all its implications.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 23, line 17, in lieu of "$6,848,500,000" insert "$6,398,500,000."

On page 26, line 4, in lieu of "$3,780,185,000" insert "$3,770,185,000."

On page 29, strike out lines 14–19, inclusive.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas wishes to conclude his statement at this point by saying that he much prefers the committee's action to the suggested amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

If the Senate, in its wisdom, is unable to go along with the committee's amendment, he certainly hopes that the Senate will go along with the figure proposed by his friend from New Hampshire.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota knows there is no one in the Senate

for whom the Senator from Missouri has more affection and respect than he has for the Senator from Minnesota.

I was not criticizing the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. However, inasmuch as he is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, he is entitled to the information. I suggest that he look up the production record of B–52's for the past 6 months. If he does, he will not worry about any danger of there being too many on hand.

Mr. THYE. I know exactly what the production is, because no one could have sat through the hearings without knowing it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, is the Senator from Minnesota satisfied with that production?

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Minnesota is taking every factor of our defense into consideration. Each must be weighed with the other. All of it must be weighed together.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is the Senator from Minnesota satisfied with that production?

Mr. THYE. The Senator is satisfied with the production; yes. Yes; I am.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator feel that the Defense Department should issue B–52 schedules and then produce only a small fraction of those schedules, and then give a lot of information on missiles to the American people as solace.

Mr. THYE. The Senator is trying to confuse missiles with B–52's.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The American people are being confused about the whole defense picture.

Mr. THYE. The Senator is bringing missiles into a debate on B–52's.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to remind Senators that it is now almost 7 o'clock. We will have a general discussion of the defense appropriation bill on Thursday, and, if necessary, on Friday also. Furthermore, if Senators wish to discuss it on Saturday, we will meet on Saturday also.

We expect to discuss it further on Monday and perhaps also on Tuesday. The Senator from Texas wishes all his friends to have every right to discuss the bill as fully as they wish, and he does not desire to monopolize the conversation. However, it is now 25 minutes to 7 o'clock, and the Senator from Texas has been on his feet for a good time. If it is agreeable, he should like to have the Senate go over until tomorrow.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SALARY ACT OF 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10060) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, as amended.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, to enable the Police Department to eliminate certain administrative difficulties insofar as the pay and work periods are concerned. Prior to the act of 1953, the pay periods and the work periods for the Police force commenced on a Sunday and ended on a Saturday, making it possible for the force to be at greater strength during the peak days of police activitiy—Friday, Saturday, and Sunday—while at the same time allowing the police officers their 2 days off per week on the less active days of the week. The act of 1953, however, went into effect on July 1, 1953, a Wednesday, causing the pay periods to begin on that day and end on a Tuesday. Because of the need for greater police strength at the weekend, it is not feasible to make the police work period coincide with the pay period, and the lack of coincidence tends to create administrative difficulties in the Department and hardship for the officers.

This bill provides for a 4-day transitional pay period, June 27 through June 30, 1956. During this period, the days-off provision in existing law would be suspended, and all members of the force would be on duty. Beginning Sunday, July 1, 1956, the work period and pay period would coincide.

The cost of the bill, resulting from the additional police services during the 4-day transition period, will be approximately $25,000. Current police Department appropriation is sufficient to absorb the cost.

I should like to point out, Mr. President, that a bill which accomplishes the same objectives for the Fire Department was passed in the 83d Congress. The proposed legislation has the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IMPROVEMENT OF GOVERNMENTAL BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 3897.

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3897) to improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the bill was reported by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] from the Committee on Government Operations. I am asking that the bill be made the unfinished business of the Senate. The report will be available tomorrow before the bill is considered by the Senate. I wish to have some unfinished business before the Senate.

The bill deals with the budget and the placing of the annual expenditures on an expenditure basis. The Senator from Texas does not have any further details about the bill at the moment. However, it was reported unanimously by the Committee on Government Operations. The Senator from Texas has discussed the measure with the acting minority leader, with the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], who is the author of the bill, and with the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who is anxious to get action on it. It is my understanding that it carries out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

The report is not available at this time. The hour is late, and we do not plan to discuss the bill tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 20, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 19, 1956:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Willard Frank Libby, of Illinois, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, term of 5 years, expiring June 30, 1961.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 19, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of majesty and mercy, constrain us now by Thy grace to approach Thy throne with a humble spirit and a contrite heart.

May we come in penitence for we have all sinned and fallen short of the glory of God but may we also come with gratitude for Thou art willing to forgive and blot out all our transgressions and remember them no more against us.

Grant that daily our life may be touched with more of the brotherly spirit which will enable us to look at struggling and suffering humanity through the eyes of clarity and consideration, of sympathy and kindness.

Help us so to live and labor that when our day is ended and our work is finished we may leave a legacy of faith and fidelity, of love and loyalty, and receive the blessings and benediction which Thou dost bestow upon the faithful.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amend-

ment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1410. An act for the relief of Giovanna Scano;

H. R. 2709. An act for the relief of the estate of Rene Weil;

H. R. 3373. An act for the relief of Mrs. Zella K. Thissell;

H. R. 5382. An act for the relief of W. R. Zanes & Company of Louisiana, Inc.;

H. R. 5453. An act for the relief of the estate of Robert Bradford Bickerstaff;

H. R. 6742. An act for the relief of Rumiko Fujiki Kirkpatrick;

H. R. 6955. An act for the relief of Inna Hekker Grade;

H. R. 7373. An act for the relief of Eugene G. Aretz;

H. R. 8041. An act for the relief of Clyde R. Stevens;

H. R. 8867. An act for the relief of the estate of F. M. Bryson;

H. R. 9285. An act to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act so as to extend for 2 additional years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury;

H. R. 11205. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Roy Cowan and others arising by reason of the flooding of land in the vicinity of Lake Alice, N. Dak.;

H. J. Res. 591. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 609. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1243. An act for the relief of Kyu Lee;

S. 1798. An act for the relief of Mrs. Charles C. Phillips;

S. 2779. An act for the relief of Evelyn Levenston Harris;

S. 2804. An act for the relief of Dr. Shan Yah Gin;

S. 2833. An act for the relief of Louis Henri Stassart;

S. 2836. An act for the relief of Choh-Yi Ang;

S. 2839. An act for the relief of Rosetta Ittner;

S. 2849. An act for the relief of Janos Schreiner;

S. 2863. An act for the relief of Margaret Emma Lewis, nee Guschmann;

S. 2881. An act to direct the Secretary of Commerce to collect and publish annually statistics as to the number of certain types of textile looms in place and in operation on a State-by-State basis;

S. 3029. An act for the relief of Josephine Langton;

S. 3050. An act for the relief of Annemarie Appelt and her two minor children, Karin Amelia Green and Sylvia Green;

S. 3132. An act to provide for purchase of lands within the Cache National Forest, Utah, to promote prevention of floods and minimization of soil erosion, and for other purposes;

S. 3150. An act for the relief of Sgt. and Mrs. Herbert G. Herman;

S. 3166. An act for the relief of Lucie Toehl;

S. 3180. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of two United States Commissioners for Cumberland Gap National Historical Park;

S. 3215. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to provide for the use of special canceling stamps or postmarking dies in order to encourage registration for voting in general elections;

S. 3221. An act for the relief of Dr. Tscheng-Sui Feng;

S. 3232. An act for the relief of Josef Kranz;

S. 3292. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria (Schandl) Cote;

S. 3380. An act for the relief of Zygmunt Sobota;

S. 3473. An act for the relief of Kurt Johan Paro;

S. 3522. An act for the relief of Theresia Schneider;

S. 3945. An act for the relief of Walter C. Jordan and Elton W. Johnson; and

S. 3982. An act to provide for the maintenance of the production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 906. An act for the relief of William Martin, of Tok Junction, Alaska;

H. R. 1156. An act for the relief of John Jordan;

H. R. 1963. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence M. Augustine;

H. R. 7855. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to extend until June 30, 1956, the period during which disposals of surplus property may be made by negotiations;

H. R. 8634. An act to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in North Carolina to the city of Charlotte, N. C.;

H. J. Res. 592. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 605. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 606. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 611. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 11473. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MR. AND MRS. THOMAS V. COMPTON

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the Clerk of the House:

JUNE 19, 1956.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's office on June 18, 1956, and said to contain a veto message from the President on H. R. 1866, an act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, United States House of Representatives.

MR. AND MRS. THOMAS V. COMPTON—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 427)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 1866, a bill "for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton."

The purpose of this bill is to provide to Mr. and Mrs. Compton the payment of $6,000 as compensation for loss of business and decline in the market value of their business by reason of the relocation of United States Highway 15 at Clarksville, Va.

The relocation of the highway was accomplished incidental to the development and construction of the John H. Kerr Dam and Reservoir project on the Roanoke River. Although the portion of United States Highway No. 15 adjacent to the Compton property has not been physically altered and is usable and accessible from the relocated highway, the severance of the highway by flooding of the reservoir several miles distant has resulted in a diversion of potential traffic and a decline in the use of the roadway. As a consequence there has been some diminution in value of commercial properties adjacent to that portion of the unused highway.

The Compton property consists of 4.7 acres of land with a service station, grocery store, and trailer parking lot. The decrease in traffic led to the loss of business which in turn resulted in an undetermined diminution in the value of the property for commercial use. There is no basis in law for compensating the Comptons and others similarly situated whose property is not taken in whole or in part for public purposes.

Decline as well as increase in property values goes on as an everyday matter, attributable to many factors commonly recognized by property owners. Relocation of highways and streets is necessitated by sundry causes and is one of such factors. The relocation of the segment of highway here involved results from a public work performed by the Federal Government, but this could as well be a claim arising through action of a State, county, municipality, or township, or a sewer or drainage district. In all such cases, compensation is paid for property taken but not for consequential damage to property not taken, such as decline in the value of property due to a change effected in the neighborhood.

To make payments of the kind provided by this bill would, in essence, make the Government the guarantor of the stability of property or business values. This can best be illustrated by instances in which highway relocation projects have resulted not only in the bypassing of individual properties but by the bypassing of entire towns. It becomes quite evident in such situations that the Government cannot indemnify every businessman or property owner in such towns against loss by reason of changes of community pattern. It would be no more reasonable to expect the Government to

do so than it would be to expect those who benefit from such changes to make voluntary payments to the Government in proportion to their gains.

For these reasons, I have withheld my approval from this measure.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1956.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and without objection the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed.

There was no objection.

REPUBLICAN PROSPERITY IS MERELY PROPAGANDA

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to direct our colleagues' attention to the Republican brand of prosperity.

The building industry is the backbone of our economy. Every economist who knows anything about our country will tell you that it will take 10 years of building homes at a minimum annual rate of 1,400,000 family units before the supply of dwellings can catch up with the demand. They will also tell you that when building construction steadily declines we are in for trouble. That is precisely what is happening.

The month of May is usually the month in which we have the greatest number of new housing starts throughout the country. This May, we had new starts, on a seasonally adjusted annual basis of only 1,100,000 as against 1,400,000 in May of last year, a decrease of more than 27 percent.

At the same time we find an increase of those drawing unemployment insurance for the last week of the month of May as against the corresponding period last year.

Bankruptcies for last week were 286 as against 214 a year ago. An increase of 33⅓ percent.

All this indicates that this Republican prosperity we hear so much about is merely propaganda.

CLOSING A LOOPHOLE IN TARIFF ON IMPORTED WATCH MOVEMENTS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a bill, H. R. 11437, I introduced on May 24 designed to close a quite serious loophole in the Tariff Act provisions relating to duties on imported watch movements.

In the fall of 1954 various departments of the Government learned that certain importers and foreign manufacturers of imported watch movements were considering exploiting loopholes in the Tariff Act to avoid the specific $10.75 rate of duty on over 17-jewel watch movements. They proposed to import movements containing 17 or less jewels at a duty rate of $3.75 or lower and after importation upjeweling the movements by adding additional jewels to bring the total jewel count over 17. They would then sell the movements as over 17-jewel movements even though the rate of duty applicable to movements containing over 17 jewels had not been paid. The Treasury Department, which is charged with the administration of the tariff laws, gave this matter careful study and finally concluded in July 1955 that there was a gap in the law. Legislation was then rather hurriedly introduced last July to close this loophole. Although this legislation was favorably reported by the House Ways and Means Committee, there was not time for it to be enacted at the last session of this Congress.

The bill which I have just recently introduced is designed to close this loophole and is submitted as new legislation because the interested agencies in the executive branch felt after having studied the problem for many months that this bill will accomplish the purpose much more clearly and fairly than the bill of last year. This legislation has been drafted by the Treasury Department in consultation with the interested agencies in the executive branch and after discussion with interested parties outside the Government.

The urgent need for legislation to plug this gap in the tariff law has become more and more apparent as time has gone by. New and even more serious upjeweling possibilities have been developed abroad and in this country. They threaten to destroy the tariff rate structure on watches as it relates to jewel count which, of course, is the prime criterion of this section of the law.

Whenever a practice is developed to circumvent the intended application of any law, it should be stopped. However, this case is a particularly important one in view of the implications it has of undermining the entire tariff rate structure on watch movements. The significance of this upjeweling practice is underlined by the President's finding on the recommendation of the Office of Defense Mobilization concerning the defense essentiality of the skills of the jeweled watch industry and the fact that failure to act on the upjeweling question through corrective legislation might more than offset the results of the tariff increase on watches ordered by the President in 1954.

I want to emphasize that the serious threat posed by the continued existence of this loophole is not simply an unfounded fear. Upjeweling is taking place today and recent indications are that it will definitely increase manyfold in the near future if action is not taken now.

Since March 1955 when the first Treasury Department decision on upjeweling was issued, the Treasury Department has had, I understand, a steady stream of requests for rulings on various types of upjeweling propositions. By any standards the number of requests for rulings is very large and indicates the intention of importers and foreign manufacturers of watch movements to utilize this device to the utmost. At the hearings on this question before the House Ways and Means Committee last year a representative of the watch importers stated that if given time they were sure that they could work out a satisfactory solution to this problem without legislation. I understand that the Treasury Department has been in regular touch with the importers on this question since last fall, has had numerous conferences with them, and has discussed various proposals with them seeking to resolve the problem. However, the importers have not been able to suggest any satisfactory proposals. Consequently, this legislation is necessary. It is supported by all of the members of the ODM Advisory Committee on the Watch Industry, namely, the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, Commerce, and Labor.

A very recent action taken by the Swiss watch trust highlights the need for this legislation. The trust has, I understand, just changed its rules of long standing prohibiting the shipment of self-winding devices separately from the movements to which the devices are to be attached and has now specifically sanctioned this practice. This change applies only to movements shipped to the United States and has obviously been made to permit, and encourage one of the most important types of upjeweling, that of increasing the jewel count by the addition of a self-winding device containing jewels. This is just one more clear indication of the intention of the foreign watch manufacturers and the importers to utilize the existing loophole in the tariff law to the greatest extent possible.

I commend your attention to this bill and the identical bill on this subject introduced by my esteemed colleague [Mr. MILLS] and urge that hearings be held on these bills promptly so that this much-needed legislation may be enacted without further delay.

A BILL TO PROTECT THE SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES BY PREVENTING THE EMPLOYMENT BY THE UNITED STATES OF PERSONS DISLOYAL TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include a summary of the provisions of a bill in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which will enable the Federal Government to rid the payrolls of Communists or other disloyal employees whether or not they

are in sensitive positions. This meets the issues raised by the Supreme Court's decision in the Cole case, which held that present law relating to security dismissals was applicable only in cases where employees were in sensitive positions.

It has always been my view that the question of Federal employees' loyalty should be considered separately from matters relating to security suitability. Congress so intended when the security law of 1950 was enacted. I believe there is now general agreement that legislation is desirable in this very important area affecting the security of our country and the rights of our citizens.

Under the provisions of my bill a three-member Loyalty Board appointed by the President would determine whether there is reasonable doubt as to the loyalty of Federal employees and applicants for Federal positions. The bill provides for a review of the Board's decision when any individual believes his rights have been violated.

Through the years the executive branch of the Government has maintained it was not necessary to have legislation—that sufficient authority already existed. The recent decision of the Supreme Court in the Cole case shows that legislation is essential and desirable. Certainly, no one contends that Communists or other disloyal persons should have any right to a position on the Federal payroll.

As early as the 79th Congress, I delivered at executive session hearings a serious situation then existing in the Government, covering the loyalty of Federal employees. A committee report was issued of such deep significance that it called for a Federal employees' loyalty program. This program, however, in my judgment, was not adequate and did not meet my views as expressed in the minority views accompanying the committee report.

These conditions could reoccur unless we are prepared to take immediate action with a continuing program based on law covering Federal employees' loyalty.

While my bill does not repeal Public Law 733, under which the present Federal employees' security system is conducted, it will henceforth apply only to security-suitability cases and not to loyalty.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am including in the RECORD a summary of the provisions of my bill.

A NATIONAL LOTTERY

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to learn that the British House of Commons yesterday passed a lottery bill by a substantial vote. The British lottery plan is designed to induce the people of England to save more money in government bonds. However, whatever the method used, the proposal is to bring more money into the government treasury.

If a conservative country like England can propose and suggest this type of activity, I am sure that its people realize that gambling is not as radical as it would seem to some, nor as immoral as some might believe it to be. Certainly the lottery proposed in England will be government supervised, regulated, controlled, and operated.

I make mention of this particular proposal because of my long-standing interest in my own bill for a national lottery. If we are more liberal-minded than England, and I believe we are, then why the delay in bringing out my national lottery bill?

In recent months, there has been a great deal of discussion regarding the amount of surplus available at the end of this fiscal year. There has been a great deal of talk as to whether to apply the surplus toward reduction of our national debt or toward a tax cut for our people. This problem can very easily be solved if this Congress were to adopt my bill and put into effect a national lottery system. It is my estimate, and a conservative one at that, that if we were to have a national lottery in the United States, $10 billion would be coming into our Government coffers. While we are supposed to be an intelligent and advanced country among the nations of the world, I often wonder whether we are lacking just plain common horse sense. Up until now, we have allowed hypocrisy to stand in the way of the enactment of a national lottery which would mean not only a tax cut for our people, a reduction in our national debt, but also a balanced buget.

I wish to serve notice on the House that I have arranged to have placed on the Speaker's desk for signatures, a motion to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means from further consideration of H. R. 6626, which has been in that committee the required length of time.

I trust and hope that the Members of this House will have the courage to affix their signatures to this petition, which I am sure will meet with the approval of a majority of the American people.

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 483 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Members be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to investigate and report to the House not later than January 3, 1957, with respect to the following matters:

(1) The extent and nature of expenditures made by all candidates for the House of Representatives in connection with their campaign for nomination and election to such office.

(2) The amounts subscribed, contributed, or expended, and the value of services rendered, and facilities made available (including personal services, use of advertising space, radio and television time, office space, moving-picture films, and automobile and other transportation facilities) by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any convention or election held in 1956 to which a candidate for the House of Representatives is to be nominated or elected.

(3) The use of any other means or influence (including the promise or use of patronage) for the purpose of aiding or influencing the nomination or election of any such candidates.

(4) The amounts, if any, raised, contributed, and expended by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, including any political committee thereof, in connection with any such election, and the amounts received by any political committee from any corporation, labor union, individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, or partnership.

(5) the violations, if any, of the following statutes of the United States:

(a) The Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

(b) The act of August 2, 1939, as amended, relating to pernicious political activities, commonly referred to as the Hatch Act.

(c) The provisions of section 304, Public Law 101, 80th Congress, chapter 120, 1st session, referred to as the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947.

(d) Any statute or legislative act of the United States or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or reelection to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes would affect the qualification of a Member of the House of Representatives within the meaning of article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.

(6) Such other matters relating to the election of Members of the House of Representatives in 1956, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which in its opinion will aid the House of Representatives in enacting remedial legislation, or in deciding contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the House of Representatives.

(7) The committee is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable. Upon complaint being made to the committee under oath, by any person, candidate, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution, it would be the duty of said committee to investigate, the committee shall investigate such charges as fully as though it were acting upon its own motion, unless, after a hearing upon such complaint, the committee shall find that the allegations in such complaint are immaterial or untrue. All hearings before the committee, and before any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall be public, and all orders and decisions of the committee, and of any such subcommittee shall be public.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such public hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the 84th Congress, to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

(8) The committee is authorized and directed to report promptly any and all violations of any Federal or State statutes in connection with the matters and things mentioned herein to the Attorney General of the United States in order that he may take such official action as may be proper.

(9) Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties prescribed by law.

That said committee is authorized and directed to file interim reports whenever in the judgment of the majority of the committee, or of a subcommittee conducting portions of said investigation, the public interest will be best served by the filing of said interim reports, and in no event shall the final report of said committee be filed later than January 3, 1957, as hereinabove provided.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual and customary resolution which is adopted in every election year for Members of Congress to investigate election expenditures.

Mr. MARTIN. If the gentleman will yield, it is no different from any of the other resolutions?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am informed there is no difference between this resolution and all the other resolutions.

I thank the Speaker for his cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, evidently there are no requests for time to speak on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

CAMP KOOCH-I-CHING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5690) for the relief of Camp Kooch-i-ching.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 4132 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 11), and section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 883), the motorboat *Kooch-I-Ching II*, which is owned and operated by Camp Kooch-i-ching, a camp for boys on Rainy Lake, International Falls, Minn., under the identification number 36D675, shall not be precluded from being documented under the laws of the United States, nor from engaging in the coastwise trade of the United States, by reason of having been built outside the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 1, strike out all of line 1 and the words "been built outside the United States" on line 2, and insert the following: "the transportation of personnel and guests of Camp Kooch-i-ching located on Rainy Lake, International Falls, Minn., in the coastal and intercoastal waters, in which the boat is not now permitted to operate by reason of having been built outside the United States."

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, whch is now at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BONNER to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 2, after the word "of", at the end of the line, insert the word "merchandise" and a comma.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFERRING CERTAIN LAND TO RICHARD M. TINNEY AND JOHN T. O'CONNOR, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10204) authorizing the Commandant of the Coast Guard to transfer certain land to Richard M. Tinney and John T. O'Connor, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon consideration of $5,000, the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transfer all rights and title to a certain tract of land, known as lot No. 14, in block 190, city of Galveston, Tex., to Richard M. Tinney and John T. O'Connor, Jr.

With the following committee amendments:

On lines 3 and 4 of the bill, delete the words "Commandant of the United States Coast Guard" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Administrator of General Services."

In the title of the bill, delete the words "Commandant of the Coast Guard" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Administrator of General Services."

On line 3 of the bill, delete the word "$5,000" and in lieu thereof insert the words "fair market value of the property as determined by the Administrator, General Services."

On line 8, after the word "Junior", delete the period and insert the words "; *Provided*, That the named grantees take necessary steps to consummate the transfer authorized herein within a period of 90 days after passage of this act."

Add the following new section:

"SEC. 2. Effective upon consummation of the transfer authorized herein, the United States hereby waives all claims against the named grantees arising out of their prior use and occupancy of such property."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the Administrator of General Services to transfer certain land to Richard M. Tinney and John T. O'Connor, Jr."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Con. Res. 246) granting status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress approves the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 403; 68 Stat. 1044):

A-6827809, Ai, Kuo-Yen or Kuo-Yen Thomas Ai.
A-6916280, Ai, Josephine Yueh-Li Mao.
A-7383344, Avella, Eva Maria (nee Ruttkay).
A-6059371, Banaszkiewicz, Leszek Romuald.
A-7444647, Benedikt, Erwin.
A-8036432, Berkovits, Ervin.
0300-402795, Bloks, Peteris.
A-9748478, Bok, Leung Koon.
A-8079746, Braun, Naftali.
T-2760124, Chai, Sum.
A-5770643, Chan, Sik Hung or Howe Chan or Henry Sighung Chan.
A-8955072, Chang, Ching Shan.
A-6084090, Chang, Fu-Kuei.
0300-471516, Chang, Chang-Chwan.
A-8875962, Chang, Ho Shing.
A-6967248, Chang, Mary Mei-Li.
0300-322153, Chang (nee Joi).
A-7355370, Chang, Phillip Wei-Li, also known as Chang Wei-Li.
A-7292164, Chang, Silas Hsien-Ta.
A-6959863, Chang, Carol Fang.
A-6848012, Chang, Wen-Han.
T-359293, Chao, Howard Hao Sheng.
A-62518161.
0300-471322, Charbani, Chaoul Ibrahim or Saul Charbani.
A-4825480, Chen, Chow Sun.
A-6084186, Yi-Hsien, Chow.
A-7782851, Chen, Chung Peng.
A-356977, Chen, Hsu-Tu.
A-7389479, Chen, Hue-Chen.
A-10066139, Chen, Katherine Chih-Mei.
T-301887, Chen, Leo Hsiao-Lin, formerly Chen Hsiao-Lin.
T-301886, Chen, Helena H. (nee Hsun Hsin Cheng).
T-301888, Chen, Carlson.
T-301889, Chen, Kiki Nelson, formerly Kee Chen.
A-6967327, Chen, Lydia Pi Lin.
V-753648, Chen, Mary or Sister Mary Anunciata Chen.
0300-4675050, Chen, Shueng Ching Chang.
A-7292410, Chen, Victor Anchao.
0300-419633, Chen, Vung Yueh.
A-7056595, Chen, Lia Shen.
A-9678204, Cheng, Ah Tooi.
A-6973688, Ch'eng, Kuang Chin.
V-1242064, Cheng, Mary Molan.
E-057486, Cheng, Sun Tong.
A-6084123, Cheo, Ying Chang, also known as Vincent Y. C. Cheo.
A-9559741, Cheong, Tsang.
A-7295490, Chia, Teh-Tsao.
A-6522853, Chiang, Chin Long.
A-6522854, Chiang, Fu Chen.
A-4919939, Chiang, Pei-Run.
A-7583971, Chiang, Lena.
A-6992023, Chi-Lung, Li or Sister Mary Claudia.
0300-93183, Ching, Tung Jui.
A-1161839, Chiu, Churchill Too-Ming.
A-7445196, Chiu, Shiao-Yuen (Victoria Maria Chiu).
A-6849825, Cho, Frank Fu-La.
A-9245145, Chong, Ah Sung.
A-7860200, Chou, Albert Sze-Ching.
V-885173, Chow, Hee Yar Wong.

1600–106555, Chow, Some Foot.
1600–106556, Chow, Some How.
1600–106557, Chow, Some Kid.
A–9073827, Choy, Soo.
A–6709314, Chu, Bark-Ho.
A–6877770, Chu, Chih-Cheng.
A–6967268, Chu, Herbert Yuan-Sing, formerly Yuan-Shing Chu.
A–8057137, Chu, Tsu Hsi.
A–7243064, Chu, Yueh Chang.
A–9568331, Chu, Yung Shing.
0300–436371, Dai, Chan.
A–7480686, Dembitzer, Abraham.
A–6980355, Djang, Jane Chu, also known as Chang Chu.
A–8258348, Fang, Ta-Chuan.
A–7095389, Fang, Tao Yao.
A–9684299, Fat, Ho, also known as No Kong Hon.
0300–469308, Fatt, Chin, also known as Ching Fott, also known as Cham Fatt.
A–6650785, Fong, Tsung Butt.
A–8198637, Gluck, Andor.
A–7819648, Gluck, Aron.
0300–463505, Gluck, Hela.
A–10141603, Gratzer, Rozina.
A–7830718, Ha, Chen Chun.
T–300009, Han, Andrew I-Chih.
A–6855624, Han, Rebecca Chih Lan.
A–8153566, Hartman, Dora Meisels.
A–5153507, Henry, Wei (Mun-Hee).
A–7632418–T, Ho, Lok Shang.
A–6704241, Ho, Thomas C. K., also known as Chi-Kao Ho.
A–6847752, Ho, Lucy Chao (nee Lucy Wan-Chen Chao).
0300–457392, Hong, Than Sien.
A–8915816, Hong, Yung Shing.
A–6849397, Hsiao, Chi-Mei.
A–6027123, Hsiao, Feng.
T–2699670, Hsiao, Kuang Hao.
A–8876992, Hsiao, Samuel Chi,, also known as Wang-yuan Hsiao.
A–8876994, Hsiao, May Lee, also known as Elsie Marie Hsiao.
A–8876995, Hsiao, Victor, also known as Chi-sheng Hsiao.
A–8876993, Hsiao, Christopher, also known as Chi-min Hsiao.
A–7389362, Hsieh, Hua-Kuang.
A–6967604, Hsieh, James Ke Ming.
A–7389467, Hsieh, Po Yuen.
0300–182009, Hsieh, Tsu Hsi.
A–0944164, Hsu, Chih Kien.
A–8979938, Hsu, Han-Kuang.
A–6848375, Hsu, Kwan.
A–7805868, Hsu, Robert Ying Hwang.
A–6033147, Hsu, Tony Tatung.
1103–13015, Ting, Rosalind Yi Ming.
A–8982869, Hsueh, Wei Yuan.
A–8982868, I-Chieh, Mai Yin.
A–8982873, Hsueh, Mary Andy.
A–8982872, Hsueh, Angy.
A–8982871, Tsueh, Army.
A–8982870, Hsueh, Antung.
0300–344285, Hu, Mabel Liang.
A–7731146, Hu, Yung Chun.
A–10076472, Huang, Chamber.
0300–362053, Huang, Dorothy Hsiu Ting.
A–7948396, Huang, Paul.
A–8957076, Huang, Margaret Jean.
A–6196024, Hui, You.
A–8093871, Huskel, Joseph Haim.
A–8980010, Hwang, Ching Yun.
A–8980011, Hwang, Ella Koh-Chang Li.
A–8980012, Hwang, Chien Sheng.
A–6669707, Hang (Wong), Joseph Ru-Yu.
A–8951034, Hwang, Beth Han-Chen Liu.
A–8951033, Hwang, Betty Shao-Chen.
E–47222, Ivanov, Victor Michael.
E–47223, Ivanov, Zenaida Alexandrovna.
A–7841161, Jean Andrew Foh Chung.
A–7985645, Jeng, Chorng-Shiaw, also known as Douglas Chorng-Shiaw Jeng.
E–118862, Kalebota, Oliver.
A–7290189, Kalish, Edith.
A–6848587, Kao, Wen Shui.
A–7952708, Kaufman, Samuel.
A–7120687, Kaye, Show-Wei (Alan).
A–7356383, Kendi, Zekiye.
A–7356384, Kendi, Linda Chahoud.
A–6985805, Kiang, Sheng Piao.
V–305645, Zee, Lin Chen, also known as Mimi Kiang.
A–6694224, King, Lucia Joan Wou.
A–7081614, King, Memee Hien-Kouen.
0200–102936, King, Lung Chang.
A–7790652, King, Yun Ching Mao.
A–7790649, King, Josephine Schweng.
0200–130574, King, David Da-Wei.
A–6849450, Kuh, Ernest Shiu-Jen.
A–10015956, Kuzura, Hans.
A–5394024, Lam, Tam.
A–7365686, Lan, Yu Hu or Lucy Yu Hu Lan.
0300–454039, Leban, Ivan Stanislaus, also known as John S. Leban.
A–7274351, Lee, Chwan-Chang Nai-Kuan.
A–7389484, Lee, Ding Wong.
A–6049385, Lee, Mov.
0300–457461, Lee, Tsung-Dao.
A–6967640, Lee, Jeannette Chin.
A–6872458, Lee, Yung Chia.
A–8982880, Leung, Tak So, alias Catherine Tak So Leung.
A–6703452, Li, Hui-Sen or Victoria Hui-Sen Li.
A–6958557, Li Louis Hsiao-Chao.
A–7202735, Liang, Hou Jan.
A–7205485, Liang, Kang Shun.
A–7399259, Liang, Rio (Shui-Oi) Lin.
A–6442562, Liang, Siu Seu Kei.
0300–470029, Lien, Ho.
E–083509, Lillimagi, Leonardo.
E–083510, Krup, Arne, also known as Arne Lillimagi.
A–6847733, Lin, Hung Chang.
A–6567581, Lin, Anchen Wang.
A–6967590, Lin, Lan Ying.
A–7354778, Lin, Lucy Kwen-Yuan.
A–6843380, Lin, Mary Elizabeth, formerly Mary Elizabeth (Betty) Young of Yang Wei-Tsung.
A–6552714, Lin, or Po-Chen.
A–8153629, Lin, Hsi-Chuan (nee Chen, Hsi-Chuan).
A–7295496, Lin, Samuel Paochi, formerly Lin Pao-Hsi.
A–7078166, Liu, Elizabeth Hwai-Ying.
A–8982882, Liu, Hannah Man-Hwa.
A–6847864, Liu, Hsiao-Chuan.
A–7850968, Liu, Jeannette Che-Chien.
0300–314881, Liu, Norah Tang, also known as Shiu Ming Tang.
A–8995041, Liu, Philip Sze-Yung.
A–7456051, Liu, Theresa Hui.
0300–399845, Liubicich, Ivan.
A–9128943, Lo, Yen.
A–7387939, Loeffler, Olga nee Weisz.
V–754182, Loh, James Mei-Huang.
0300–382462, Lou, Tai Yeong Shiue.
0300–468623, Lou, Whei Ling.
0300–468622, Lou, Whei Ping.
A–7857768, Lowe, Diana Ming-Duh.
A–7808104, Lowy, Bertha.
A–8955198, Lu, Ponzy.
A–8955199, Lu, Kai Roh, also known as Cary Lu.
A–6958639, Lui, Chum Lau.
A–6983525, Maday, Maria.
A–8150145, Maday, Zsolt Bela Gaspar.
1308–8483, Maday, Katalin (Kathy) Maria Erzsebet.
A–9550839, Manka, Jan.
A–8995042, May, Chu Tom Chung.
A–6962962, Meng, Ching-Hwa.
1300–134705, Miao, Pei Chi.
A–6848595, Nee, David Shou-I.
0300–369097, Ogorek, Leib.
A–743639, Ogorek, Cily (nee Meyerovich).
A–7282130, Pao, Huei-Yuan (John).
A–7444657, Pejsa, Lubomir Oscar, also known as Larry Pejsa.
A–9759315, Perme, Milan.
A–8853556, Peros, Venci.
A–9576034, Piow, Jan.
A–7367940, Poon, Wai Ha or Mrs. Henry Louis.
V–1184123, Popoff, Leo.
V–1184124, Popoff, Alla.
T–1495443, Popoff, Marina.
T–1495444, Popoff, Andrei.
A–9665946, Porubov, Roman Deevich.
0300–305335, Posner, Pola.
A–7828309, Quo, Diana Shu.
A–7828310, Quo, Edward.
A–7365708, Rabinovici, Benjamin.
A–7988114, Roth, Miklos.
A–7988111, Roth, Geza.
E–8381, Rubin, Maximilian.
A–7223159, Rubinstein, Adolph.
A–9519927, Sak, Fung, or Fung Sik.
E–058296, Sang, Chan.
E–084407, Sawicki, Jerzy Grzegorz.
A–7243000, Scheiner, Herbert.
0300–466312, Sha, Tseng Lu.
A–7865359, Shang, Ching-Ting.
A–7350585, Shao, Lillian Chang.
A–7350586, Shao, Eugene.
A–7350587, Shao, Betty.
A–7350588, Shao, Jane.
A–7350589, Shao, Stella Lou.
A–7350590, Shao, Susie.
A–7350592, Shao, Connie.
A–8995044, Shee, Wong.
A–8245890, Shen, Chen Tung.
1600–107942, Shen Yung Chung.
0300–457390, Shoo, Koo Ah.
A–7118648, Sih, Kwang Chi.
A–7395232, Soong, Kwan Hua.
V–469348, Sun, Arnold Yiu Fang, formerly Sun Yiu Fang.
A–7456028, Sun, Betty Chia-Hui.
A–6851441, Sun, Ho Sheng.
A–7463623, Sun, Sung Huang.
A–7248491, Sung, Albert Yun-Hua.
A–6848633, Sung, Neng-Lun.
A–7416448, Sung, Rodney Lu Dai.
A–6704103, Swen, En-Lien or Ruby En-Lien Swen.
A–7821882, Szu-Tu, Anthony Yen-Sheng.
0300–408601, Tai, Chao Yao, also known as Clement Leo Tai.
0030–408602, Tai, Chu Ching Hsin, also known as Clare Chu Tai.
E–058041, Tai, Chew Jee.
A–10065565, Tawil, Clement Ibrahim.
A–7174723, Teng, Hsi Ching.
A–5753754, Toa, Chan Sze.
A–5182572, Tom, Wallace, also known as Tam Kam Cheung.
T–2080412, Tong, Long-Sun.
A–8173633, Tsai, Bruce Kuo-Hai.
A–6973686, Tsai, Stephen Wei Tun.
A–6153407, Tso, Piao Frank.
A–7282962, Tung, Agatha Feng-Mei.
A–7457555, Vassos, Christos Antonios.
A–8190484, Vernitsky, Nadezda, formerly Nadezda Leithammel (nee Kepper).
E–085343, Wadhsmuth, Leonard or Leonhard.
A–9623511, Wah, Chin.
A–8878066, Wah, Chu Kwong, also known as Kwong Wah Chu.
A–7284218, Wang, Allan Tsong Kao.
A–5369089, Wang, David Kehsin.
A–6463163, Wang, Jimmy Peng-Lin.
0300–472021, Wang, Jinq Bor or Jinq Bor Tang.
0300–469273, Tang, Fan Kuo.
0300–469702, Tang, Ping Chien.
A–4374750, Weber, Estera P.
T–1496395, Wong, Chung Dong.
1300–84918, Wong, Lee Yung.
0300–387779, Wong, Yung.
A–9798854, Wong, Yun Ching.
T–2809651, Woo, Lin Siang.
A–7297883, Wu, Joseph.
A–7073634, Wu, Tao-Yuan.
A–6259104, Wu, Yuan-Li.
0204/5969, Yang, Chen-Ping.
A–7418233, Yao, John Chun-Yu.
A–10135697, Yao Mary Soo-Wah.
T–1746758, Yao, Sin Ping.
V–1438199, Yeh, Tsun-kai.
A–7274654, Lih, Chia Moun, also known as Manette Chia-Moun Yih.
A–7424859, Ying, Chieh-Liang.
A–8870545, Yu, Edwin.
A–7462148, Yu, Eileen Hsiu-Yung (nee Wu).
A–7202749, Yuen, You Liang.
E–086499, Yurman, Alberto or Alberto Jurman.
0300–17305, Zaveckas, Adomas, also known as Adomas Plecuakas Zaveckas.
A–6325061, Altenbrun, Juliane.

A-6325059, Andre, Maia.
A-8172278, Bandera, Vittorio Giovani.
A-8830712, Bronevsky, Sergiu Aristotel.
A-9825253, Bussanich, Antonio, also known as Anthony Bussanich.
A-7415211, Chai, Chiuling.
0400-46784, Chan, Chow Shun.
0300-226262, Chan, Gat Chong, also known as Johnny Chan.
0300-279131, Chan, Raymond Loi-Ming.
0300-460911, Chan, Anita Wu.
0300-360856, Chan, Roger Chi-Yit.
A-9633955, Chan, Sow.
1300-113468, Chang, Betty Low, also known as Foon Ngan Low.
A-7389486, Chang, Yunshan Katherine, formerly Yunshan Shih.
A6623720, Chao, Tzu-Chow.
A-7439036, Chao, Frank Yin-Tzu.
A-7439037, Chao, Himmy Min-Tzu.
A-7439038, Chao, Gene Jao-Tzu.
A-10141625, Chen, Chunjen Constant.
A-10141624, Chen, Eva Yi-Fu Chien.
A-10141635, Chen, Yung Ming.
A-10141623, Chen, Yung Kang.
A-9769854, Chen, Mai Kong.
A-6851419, Chiang, Alpha Chung-I.
A-7354784, Chiang, Emily.
A-7143990, Chiang, Robert Sish-Hauan.
A_6967664, Chiang, Ruby Ju-Pi.
V-754381, Chiang, Tung Ming.
A-7389360, Chian, Kun Li.
0300-394851, Chin, May, also known as Kong Moy Chin.
A-6967643, Ching, Amy.
A-6858243, Ching, George Pao Kang, also known as Pao Kang Ching.
E-084353, Chong, Chung.
A-7436768, Chou, Chang Fong.
0300-347788, Chow, Ting-Chuan.
0300-460088, Chow, Fengling Ou.
0300-460090, Chow, Ninota Stephen.
A-6071279, Choy, Kee.
A-10135617, Choy, Som or Seng Tsai.
T-2064297, Chu, Helen Yu Li Chao.
A-8153740, Chu, Janet Yun.
T-1408515, Chu, Mabel Chen-Mi.
A-7274381, Chu, Wen-Chi (Diana).
E-082668, Cnesich, Antonio.
E-118711, Dai, Leong Kam.
A-7243251, Diminich, Milan.
E-057950, Doo, Sze Wod.
E-086370, Eckstein, Ervine.
0300-444834, Eng, Hu, also known as Chin Inn.
A-8055364, Fajncajg, Chaja.
A-7865110, Fajncajg, David.
A-8055371, Fajncajg, Icchok.
A-9731873, Fat, Kan Chung.
0300-414355, Fat, Tsung.
A-8916443, Fatt, Cheng.
A-7802066, Fisers, Karlis Hermanis.
A-7913545, Fishman, Chaim.
A-9782527, Fong, Cheng.
E-086609, Fong, Mon or Fong Mon or Feng Ming.
A-8826832, Fook, Ng.
A-1762198, Fook, Wong Ah.
0300-475315, Four, Lum.
A-7424925, Frey, Andrew, also known as Andras Frey.
A-7424926, Frey, Clara, also known as Klara Frey (nee Rudas).
A-7480684, Fried, David.
A-10067763, Fried, Livia.
0300-313392, Friedman, Miklos.
0300-313393, Friedman, Edith (nee Weisz).
0300-314455, Frosh, Magda.
T-1496401, Fu, John E. Kai-Cheng, formerly Yuh Sen Fu.
A-8211344, Fu, Frances Hsing-Chao (nee Lee).
A-6851290, Fung, Shui Ching.
A-7223143, Gluck, Abraham.
A-7228321, Gunfeld, Rose (nee Schwartz).
A-7197486, Gyongy, Imre.
A-7197487, Gyongy, Alice.
A-7366218, Gyongy, Adrienne Gloria.
0300-471519, Hing, Ting.
A-6083399, Hin-Cheung, Hoh or David H. C. Hoh.
A-9646320, Hong, Lai.
A-10135618, Hroncich, Antonio.
T-1499144, Hsieh, Chia Chi, now known as Kate Hsieh.
A-7915690, Hsieh Ching-Kien, also known as Ching Chien Hsieh or C. K. Hsieh.
A-7396905, Hsiung, Chi Hwa.
A-6461174, Hsu, Chia Pi.
T-359254, Hsu, Pao Li.
A-6967601, Hsu, Yun Kung.
A-7882617, Huang, Jean Cho-Wu.
A-6848579, Huang, Jwo-Shauo.
A-7415301, Huang, Kee Chang.
A-6589910, Huang, Robert Kih-Hua.
V-605862, Huang, Stella Wong.
0300-460541, Huang, Yung-Chih.
A-7286963, Hwa, Chuan Shi or Francis Chuan-Shi Hwa.
V-57435, Hwang, Chen Hon.
A-7355248, Hwang, Yeu Puu.
A-4808163, Ivin, Sime Kuzman.
A-9764686, Jea, Foo.
A-6730662, Jeng, Wu Young, also known as Nelson J. Wu.
A-6542228, Karaulnik, Matus.
A-6542229, Karaulnik, Chana.
A-6542230, Karaulnik, Gloria Golda.
A-9948140, Kerkez, Bogdan Milo.
0500-48784, Ki, John Toke-Jen.
0300-356308, King, Wang Ying, also known as Ying King Wang.
A9907380, Kloo, Francois.
A-10187248, Kokins, Edward or Eduards Kokins.
A-7868139, Kong, King Tong or Tom King.
A-7247542, Kung, Son Sung or Robert Son Sung Kung.
A-7267071, Chia, Mei Yun or May Mei Yun Chia.
E-094491, Kwai, Chan.
A-9709002, Kwai, Chang, also known as Chang Kwai Tsang.
A-7296134, Kwoh-I, Ai or Daniel Kuo Yi Ai.
A-7945953, Kwok, Clifford.
0300-336774, Kwok, Donald Chi Ping or Donald Kwok.
0301-21061, Kwok, Dennis Chu-Ming.
A-6967572, Kwok, Chin-San, also known as Rosalind Chin-San Kwok, Chow.
A-6848555, Kwong, Shue-Shan.
0300-392478, Lam, Yat Fong, also known as Lam Fong.
A-7897517, Lebovitz, Miklos.
A-6589922, Lee, Kung Ching.
A-7118661, Lee, Feng Chih Han.
A-9798519, Lee, Wen Kan.
A-7391013, Lederfajn, Abram.
A-7454543, Lerner, Isadore.
A-7991023, Lerner, Maria.
A-7991024, Lerner, Estera.
A-8037900, Ley, Hsiao-Min.
A-3073395, Li, Hui Lin.
0400-51309, Li, Chi Ying Hsu.
0400-55967, Li, June Sing Ju.
A3640930, Liang, Hung.
0300-390885, Hung, Elsie, also known as Elsie Yabsieh Lee Liang.
0300-366350, Liang, Lone.
0300-344286, Liang, Suying.
A-7354764, Liang, Teresa Ai-Ling, also known as Carolina Ai-Ling Liang.
A-10060061, Liao, Lettice Ho.
A-10060122, Liao, Darwin Harry.
A-7362899, Ling, Sui-Lin.
A-7388007, Lieu, Aloysius.
A-6620896, Lin, Yin Po.
E-057315, Ling, Woo Zai.
A-4974265, Liu, Haosun.
A-5551670, Liu, Baogee.
A-7039102, Liu, Sze Swui.
A-6737213, Liu, Shih Jan.
V-885354, Liu, Chang Chih.
A-8105197, Lo, Hui Ch'uan or Howell Charles Lowe.
A-6848026, Lo, William Hui-Wen.
A-8091311, Loy, Wan.
A-6702200, Lu, Go.
0300-315394, Lum, How.
A-8198523, Ma, Gertrude, formerly Yun Chu Ma.
E-057985, Ming, Tong.
A-9518302, Moo, Wo Yee.
A-9541791, Ng, Ho.
E-057393, Ng, Shiu.
0300-398092, Nin, Leung.
A-9533426, On, Mark Tai.
A-8956479, Palango, Viktor, also known as Viktor Palovnikov.
A-8956481, Palango, Agnes (nee Walker or Valker).
0300-475079, Pao, Fah Lin.
0300-452721, Peras, Mario.
A-10135780, Picinich, Lorenzo Antonio, also known as Lawrence Picinich.
A-9541787, Pin, Lo.
A-7807631, Puhk, Heino.
0800-111738, Riszner, Rosa Ida (nee Schoepflin).
A-7393981, Rubin, Bernard.
0300-329210, Rubin, Ilona.
0300-376025, Rubin, Bluma.
A-7952698, Schapiro, Ely.
A-6967725, Sheng-Wu, Wang.
A-6967723, Shuen-Shan, Wang.
A-6848671, Shuen, Shih Chieh, now known as Anthony Shuen.
E-086380, Sing, How.
A-6848686, Soo, Shao Lee.
A-7821538, Dan, Gung-Tai, also known as Hermia Gung Tai Dan Soo.
A-7374695, Soong, Constance Yu-Ru (nee Sun).
A-8057789, Sow, Sin.
A-8234000, Sun, Emily I-Chu.
A-9948306, Suurhans, Rudolf.
0300-410182, Tai, Chan.
1600-91347, Tcheng-Tchao, Chen or Tcheng Tchao Chen.
A-6613770, Tchou, Pao-Hui, also known as Howard Pao-Hui Tchou.
A-6695454, Tiao, Hui-Li.
0300-468233, Tiao Pei-Yun.
A-6851458, Tien, Ping King.
A-7389359, Tien, Nancy Nai-Ying Chen.
0300-469050, To, Cheng Sze.
0300-459049, Chin, Ham Po.
A-3397292, Tom, Won Shee.
A-8198643, Treitel, Leopold.
A-6976657, Tsai Dora Yung-Chen (nee Yung-Chen Chu), also known as Yung-Chan Tse.
A-7399263, Tsao, Carson Kuo-Hsiang.
A-6849436, Tsao-Hwa, Kuo, also known as Edward T. H. Kuo.
A-7383370, Tse, Stephen Yung-Nien.
A-10142001, Tsing, Di-Tsin.
A-8091385, Tso, Feng Ah or Feng Ah Chu or Fah Voong Ah.
0300-323918, Vorhand Victor, also known as Hersch Vorhand.
0300-323919, Vorhand, Niesel.
0300-323919, Vorhand, Berta.
0300-472736, Walinska, Wanda.
A-7269686, Wallach, Chnaier.
A-6849389, Wang, Ben Chang.
A-6851543, Wang, Chen I.
A-6848029, Wang Chih-Chung.
A-10141552, Wang, Fang Wen.
A-6967633, Wang, Lillian Lin-Yen.
A-6967592, Wang, Marian Mei-Yen.
0300-471923, Wang, Men Chun.
0300-472924, Wang, Helen, also known as Hwei-Chen Helen Wang.
V-889926, Wang, Ming Kang.
A-6054040 Wang, Tso.
A-7223132, Weiss, Gerszon, formerly Weisz.
A-7444697, Wen, Bertha Yoen-Ngai.
A-10141627, Wen, Robert Kuo-Liang.
A-9766046, Wong, Chen.
A-10075791, Wong, Pao Hsiang.
A-10135746, Wu, Bosco Ting Lin, also known as Nicholas Wu.
A-8982881, Wu, Nan Hwa or Nancy Wu.
A-7903455, Wu, Nancy Yung-Chun.
A-7903454, Wu, Percy Liang-Yu.
A-10055011, Wu, Sophie Ann.
A-6967290, Yang, Hanford Han Foo.
A-7962614, Yang, Ih Cheo.
A-7830615, Yang, Julie Chi Sun.
A-6952369, Yang, Ling.
A-6263746, Yang, Ching-Sing Miao.
0300-468795, Yen, Hsin Yung.
0400-57735, Yip, Loretta Yuen Fong Hsu.
E-057257, You, Liu.

A-7476314, Yu Moses Lee Kung.
V-754236, Yu, Cornelia.
A-8917908, Yu, Margaret.
A-6990735, Yuan, Robert Hsun Piao.
A-7383311, Yuan, Si-Chen.
T-2946897, Yuan, Jen-Chi Lu.
A-8217598, Yuen, Wai Lum or Ywai Lam Yuen, now known as William Yuen.
A-8065228, Yu-Seng, Hsia or H. Chu-Bao Shaw or Harrison Hsia.
A-8979849, Zielka, Siegfried.
A-8190221, Zivkovic, Bogdan Dusan.
E-082248, Zywko, Peter.
A-8845060, Ang, Huan Chun (Edith) (nee Kwoh).
0300-471573, Berzins, Laimonis.
A-7859850, Blonder, Josef.
A-6084180, Chang, Shu-Tsing (Street).
A-7060821, Chao, Pius Kuang-Wen.
A-7805871, Chen, Billy Deh-Bin.
A-7277348, Chen, Chung Cheng.
A-8125688, Chen, James Wen-Po.
A-7927821, Chen, Daisy Parker.
A-8015358, Chen, Ross, also known as Kong-Chie Chen.
0300-463699, Cheng, Chang-Chun.
1300-136558, Cheng, Sung Yuan.
V-885352, Chin, Fong-Von.
T-358275, Chiu, Yung Chuan.
A-7243149, Deutsch, Laszlo (Leslie).
A-7243148, Deutsch, Rosalia Olga.
E-057844, Gow, Won Kun, also known as Won Sing.
A-6940545, Ho, Stanley Siang-Lin.
A-6881737, Hsi, Ching Seng.
A-6986514, Hsi, Kathy C.
A-7860201, Hsi, Helen Yu-Ching.
T-358271, Hsin, Ling Hsien.
A-7865335, Hsu, Chao Yung.
A-6967274, Hsueh, Rosemary Sun King.
A-10135565, Johanson, Elmo.
A-7374669, Kai-Li-Diao, Elizabeth.
A-4473105, Karlic, Sime Ivan, also known as Sam Karlich.
A-7854781, Kee, Lau Cheong.
A-7865355, Keh, (Edward) Shou Shreu.
A-7865356, Keh, Martha Mei Sing (nee Chen).
A-6845062, Keng-Kwan, Chuan Mary, now Edwards.
A-1003584, King, Wei Hsien.
A-1617804, King, Yao Ying Sze.
A-10074297, King, Richard Lien Chao.
A-7897518, Koo, Chia Tsung.
A-7282999, Ku, Chia Cheng.
A-7526796, Kwok, Jean Gee Hing (Gee Hing Kwok).
A-7376935, Lee, Chiu Tseng.
V-1183770, Lee, James H.
V-1183775, Lee, Laura.
A-6848553, Lee (Seward), Say Wah.
A-6848708, Lee (Simone), Shi Wen (nee Yoh).
A-6847779, Lee, Vivian Yang (nee Yang Pao Chiu).
A-7118694, Li, Huon.
A-7118680, Li, Wei-Shan.
A-7450486, Liim, Villi.
A-6991765, Ling, Wilfred Chen-Sun.
A-8873894, Lis, Stanislaw.
A-7857694, Lowe, Joseph Dzenhsi.
A-8951035, Lowe, Madge Lee (Ting-Yu Lee).
A-8951036, Lowe, Benny Tsin-Yuan.
A-10073387, Lu, Yen Shen.
A-10073386, Lu, Yen Chi.
A-7118690, Mao, Tchen-Lien, also known as Lucy T. L. Mao.
0300-359383, Marciniewicz, Czeslaw.
A-7853070, Nissan, Anwar Yacoub.
A-7419931, Pao, Yee.
1300-106845, Profaca, Vincenzo.
1300-108948, Profaca, Maria.
1300-110382, Profaca, Diana.
1300-110383, Profaca, Luciana.
A-7299349, Sah, Chih-Tang.
A-7830664, Shen, Tsuh-Ming, also known as James Tsuh-Ming Shen.
A-7962545, Sing, Wong Wing.
A-7463307, So-Yuk, Lew Chao.
A-7362938, Sun, David Chen-Hwa.
A-6781264, Sung, Wong Yang.
A-9208465, Tabulov, Ante Truta.
1300-136085, Ting, Chiew Heer.
0501-20280, Tseng, Chin Kuan.
A-7391680, Tung, Shiu Hang.
A-7285811, Wang, Chi-Wu.
A-7491837, Wang, Hsueh Jeh.
A-7491838, Wang, Hwei Chen Lu.
A-6843445, Yang, Ping-Shiang, also known as James Yang.
A-6967760, Wei, Ling.
A-7202733, Wei, Alice Jun
A-10053722, Wei, Lilly Kay.
A-7292439, Wei, Young.
A-7118695, Lee, Young Ho.
A-7297990, Weidenmiller, Helen Carla, also known as Helena Carla Stembera.
A-7244892, Weingarten, Arthur.
A-6886896, Willinger, Rosalia.
A-8916442, Wong, Tsa Chung.
A-8082677, Wu, Fa Hsiang, also known as Frazer Wu.
A-8956275, Wu, Chin Chung Yu.
A-8956276, Wu, Lan Sing.
A-8956277, Wu, Fu Sing.
A-7123419, Yen, Chih-Min.
A-8015340, Yin, Ken Hu.
A-8259445, Yin, Yee Fang Kwan.
A-8015342, Shen En, also known as John Yin.
0400-59703, Yin, Chen Shu, also known as Philip Yin.
A-7296133, Yu, Arthur Jun-Shen.
A-7436727, Zee, Frank Wei Min.
A-9759314, Zuber, Novak.
0300-406963, Duck, Chow.
0300-459682, Pao, Li Ah, also known as Pao, Lee Ah.
0300-423722, Tim, Tam or Tim, Harold Tam.
0300-456055, Liang, Chen Fou.
E-086835, Sung, Lam Kim.
T-1892794, Wong, Ding.
A-7247308, Farkas, Adam.
A-9673450, Ken, Lo Lien or Seng, Lo Lien.
E-086119, Kao, Hai Chuen.
A-9732049, Potman, Axel.
0200/121276, Tong, Kun.
A-9825413, Yu, Pang.
0300-471507, Ching, Wong Ping.
A-6703360, Li, Tsung Ming.
A-7350836, Li, Mary Loh.
E-096788, Nam, Chan.
0300-461417, Seng, Choy.
A-7486941, Lau, Wing Gong.
T-1496495, Tan, Shu-Tsun.
T-1496494, Tan, Jeon E. Chang.
A-6849829, Yu, Yi Yuan, also known as Yu, Rutherford Berkeley.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 21, strike out the number "A-62518161" and substitute in lieu thereof the number "A-6251861."

On page 3, line 12, strike out the number "0300-4675050" and substitute in lieu thereof the number "0300-467050."

On page 3, line 22, strike out the number "A-9559741" and substitute in lieu thereof the number "A-9579541."

On page 7, strike out all of line 16, as follows "A-7841161, Jean Andrew Foh Chung."

On page 9, line 15, strike out the name "Paochi" and insert in lieu thereof the name "Paoshi."

On page 11, line 2, strike out the name "Piow" and insert in lieu thereof the name "Piew."

On page 15, line 17, strike out the name "Himmy" and insert in lieu thereof the name "Jimmy."

On page 16, line 5, after the name "Chin" strike out the name "May," and insert in lieu thereof the name "Moy."

On page 19, line 13, after the name "John", strike out the name "Tohe-Jen." and insert in lieu thereof the name "Tche-Jen."

On page 23, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following: "A-6041694, Tang, Chang Jun."

On page 27, line 1, strike out the number "A-7355781" and insert in lieu thereof the number "A-7354781."

On page 30, at the end of the concurrent resolution, add the following names:

A-6699880, Chen, Lien Ching.
0300-464139, Strklja, Yerko Grgas.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEARL O. SEILAZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 417) for the relief of Pearl O. Seilaz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 765-770), are hereby waived in favor of Pearl O. Seilaz, of Miami, Fla., for compensation for disability allegedly caused by her employment as an employee in the Office of the Price Administrator, Miami, Fla., during the period 1943 to 1947, and her claim is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if she files such claim with the Department of Labor (Bureau of Employees' Compensation) not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act. No benefits other than hospital and medical expenses actually incurred shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SACRED HEART HOSPITAL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 530) for the relief of the Sacred Heart Hospital.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Sacred Heart Hospital, Havre, Mont., the sum of $5,686.12. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the Sacred Heart Hospital against the United States for hospitalization, treatment, and other services rendered to certain Indians, 92 of whom were enrolled Indians from the Rocky Boy's Reservation and the Fort Belknap Agency: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. DONALD D. PARRISH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1034) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Donald D. Parrish.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Donald D. Parrish, of Lansing, Mich., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all their claims against the United States arising out of injuries sustained by Mrs. Donald D. Parrish on April 1, 1952, when she was a passenger in a United States Air Force staff car which was involved in an accident with a commercial bus near Florence, Italy: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES EDWARD ROBINSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1414) for the relief of James Edward Robinson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James Edward Robinson, of St. Louis, Mo., the sum of $1,000. Such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the said James Edward Robinson against the United States for compensation for the injury he sustained to his right hand on February 15, 1954, while performing the duties assigned to him as an inmate of the United States Penitentiary, Terre Haute, Ind., and which necessitated the amputation at the distal joints of the index and middle fingers of his right hand: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROVEMENT ON PUBLIC LANDS IN THE RAPID VALLEY UNIT, SOUTH DAKOTA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1622) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to pay, out of any moneys available for construction of the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, to the following-named persons the amounts set forth opposite their names for the purposes there specified, the parcel numbers in each case referring to tracts of public lands of the United States within the boundaries of the said Rapid Valley unit:

(a) The Synod of the Presbyterian Church of South Dakota, a South Dakota corporation, a sum of not more than $18,383 as reimbursable for the removal of its improvements constituting a church camp on parcel numbered 10, and the necessary relocation thereof;

(b) The Pactola Methodist Assembly Park Association, Rapid City, S. Dak., the sum of not more than $14,880 for its improvements on parcel numbered 13 constituting a church camp owned by said association: *Provided*, That in order to assist in the relocation of said camp the Secretary may also sell at appraised values or, in lieu of making the payment above provided for, may exchange and sell at appraised values improvements on other lands of the United States acquired or administered by him in connection with the Rapid Valley unit;

(c) Pactola School District No. 5, the sum of not more than $1,449.79 as reimbursement for the actual cost of moving its school buildings from parcel numbered 22 and relocating them on a site outside the area required for the construction, operation, or maintenance of the Rapid Valley unit;

(d) Hilda M. Coone, a widow, the sum not more than $2,000 for a summer home owned by her on parcel numbered 25; and

(e) Berry Marvel O'Harra and Cecile Matrux O'Harra, husband and wife, Wayne G. O'Harra and Mary Bland O'Harra, husband and wife, and Mariam Pollock, a widow, the sum of not more than $2,200 for a summer home owned by them on parcel numbered 18.

Said payments, and the ratification hereby of other like payments which have heretofore been made to N. M. Bratton and Mrs. N. M. Bratton, his wife ($2,000 for a summer home owned by them on parcel numbered 23) and to L. E. Reemsta and Hanna Reemsta, his wife ($2,000 for a summer home owned by them on parcel numbered 24), shall constitute a full and complete settlement of any claims which the said parties may have or assert against the United States with respect to their use or occupancy of the tracts in question, their improvements thereon, or the disposition of such improvements or their removal therefrom but shall not constitute an admission by the United States of the legitimacy of any such claim: *Provided*, That no part of any amount provided for in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and any such payment, delivery, or receipt shall, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding, be unlawful. Any person paying, delivering, or receiving such excess amount shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined in a sum of not more than $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "of the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota,".

Page 2, line 5, strike out "$18,383 as reimbursable", and insert in lieu thereof "$16,382 as reimbursement."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "thereof", insert "on other lands."

Page 2, line 10, strike out "13", and insert in lieu thereof "30."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAWRENCE F. KRAMER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2016) for the relief of Lawrence F. Kramer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Lawrence F. Kramer, of 354 East 42d Street, Paterson, N. J., in the manner hereinafter provided by this act.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act, the said Lawrence F. Kramer (hereinafter referred to as "the claimant") shall establish to the satisfaction of the Court of Claims the following: (1) That the claimant furnished the United States with information in 1935 regarding a fraudulent conspiracy, collusive bidding, and bribery in connection with certain sand and stone supply contracts, awarded or to have been awarded by the Works Progress Administration, in New Jersey; and (2) that the claimant collaborated with and assisted United States investigators and furnished them with leads which made more possible the Government's success in criminal prosecution No. 8516b, United States District Court, District of New Jersey (1938), and civil action No. 1956 which was filed on January 5, 1942, United States District Court, District of New Jersey, and in which the United States entered an appearance on March 11, 1944, and which was settled by way of compromise to the pecuniary benefit of the United States on March 4, 1952.

SEC. 3. The Court of Claims shall accept as a basis for determining the services referred to in section 2 hereof the following: (1) all papers (or duly authenticated copies thereof), including transcripts of court proceedings, depositions, records, pleadings, orders, and exhibits filed in the criminal and civil causes referred to in section 2 hereof; and (2) the findings of fact and conclusions of law and opinion of the court in *United States ex rel. Bayarsky* v. *Brooks, et al.* (110 F. Supp. 175).

SEC. 4. Upon determination by the Court of Claims that the claimant has complied with section 2 hereof, the claimant shall be deemed to have instituted a qui tam action and to be legally and equitably entitled to a judgment as hereinafter provided under the appropriate provisions of the False Claims Act which were in force at the time claimant's cause of action thereunder arose, namely, sections 3490 to 3494, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C., 1940 edition, secs. 231–235). In computing the amount of such judgment, the provisions of section 3493 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C., 1940 edition, sec. 234), entitling the claimant to one-half of the costs and the recovery which was obtained by the Government in civil action No. 1956, United States District Court, District of New Jersey, shall not apply but, instead, the claimant shall be entitled to recover only 30 percent of the amount recovered in the said civil action No. 1956, exclusive of the usual costs and expenses, by the United States on March 4, 1952.

SEC. 5. Suit under this act shall be instituted within 6 months after enactment hereof, and the judgment by the Court of Claims shall be final, and shall not be subject to review. Payment of such judgment shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has juris-

diction as provided by law, and shall constitute full and complete settlement of all claims or demands of any nature whatsoever arising out of the litigation referred to in this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF SUSIE LEE SPENCER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2152) for the relief of Susie Lee Spencer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Susie Lee Spencer, of Spartanburg, S. C., the sum of $7,500, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the death of the said Susie Lee Spencer sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Navy locomotive at the Norfolk naval shipyard, Norfolk, Va., on December 11, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM E. STONE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2582) for the relief of William E. Stone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations, or any other limitation upon the jurisdiction of such court, to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of William E. Stone arising out of the failure of the War Department to retire him or to certify him for retirement as an Army of the United States or Reserve officer under the provisions of the act of April 3, 1939, as amended. In its consideration of such claim, the court shall determine whether or not said William E. Stone should have been retired for physical disability as an officer of the Army Air Corps. Should the court decide that the said William E. Stone should have been so retired, judgment shall be rendered in an amount equal to the amount the said William E. Stone would have received had he been so retired: *Provided*, That the passage and approval of this legislation shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the Government of the United States.

Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 4 months after the date of the enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeal from, and payment of, any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which the Court of Claims has jurisdiction as now provided by law.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATRICIA A. PEMBROKE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3472) for the relief of Patricia A. Pembroke.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act for the relief of Patricia A. Pembroke," approved August 28, 1954 (68 Stat. A231), is amended by inserting, in the proviso of such act, after the words "prior to the enactment of this act", the words "except hospital and medical expenses."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTHONY J. VARCA, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1403) for the relief of Anthony J. Varca, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Anthony J. Varca, Jr., of Brooklyn, N. Y., is hereby relieved of all liability to refund the sum of $1,057.69 to the United States because of alleged erroneous hiring at the maximum step-ingrade whereas interdepartmental regulations seem to dictate the minimum step-ingrade while he was employed by Military Sea Transportation Service, Atlantic Area, Department of the Navy, during the period July 18, 1952, to May 27, 1954.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, insert:

"In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount of such overpayment. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Anthony J. Varca, Jr., a sum equal to the aggregate of any amounts which may have been paid by him, or withheld from amounts due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the claim of the United States for the refund of such overpayment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL H. SARVIS, SR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3062) for the relief of Paul H. Sarvis, Sr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul H. Sarvis, Sr., of Sylacauga, Ala., the sum of $1,431. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of Paul H. Sarvis, Sr., against the United States for the failure of the United States to pay the agreed purchase price under a purchase agreement entered into pursuant to the 1952 hay and pasture seed price-support program for 5,000 pounds of certified Kentucky 31 fescue seed which it received from Paul H. Sarvis, Sr., on or about June 21, 1953; and Paul H. Sarvis, Sr., shall not be liable for any transportation, loading, or warehouse storage charges which may have accrued on or after such date with respect to such 5,000 pounds of seed: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ONIE HACK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3987) for the relief of Onie Hack.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Onie Hack, Mount Clemens, Mich., the sum of $336. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Onie Hack against the United States for payment of wages due him on account of services performed in 1951 as an employee of the Inland Waterways Corporation. Payment of such wages was denied the said Onie Hack because of the fact that, on August 23, 1951, he was involved in a work stoppage on the steamer *Illinois* (a vessel owned by such Corporation) which allegedly constituted a strike against the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$336" and insert "$352.48."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Z. A. HARDEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4336) for the relief of Z. A. Hardee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Z. A. Hardee, Enfield, N. C., the sum of $3,973.45, plus interest on $1,569.26 from March 15, 1947, on $1,662.37 from March 15, 1948, on $479.62 from March 15, 1949, and on $262.20 from March 15, 1950, compounded annually at the rate of 6 percent per annum to the date of payment hereunder. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Z. A. Hardee against the United

States for refund of certain income-tax overpayments made by him on June 28, 1950, for the years 1945 through 1948. The claim of the said Z. A. Hardee for such refund was rejected on the ground that it was filed 2 days after the expiration of the statutory period for filing such claims, despite the fact that his failure to file within such period was solely the result of erroneous information furnished him by officials of the Bureau of Internal Revenue: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, lines 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, strike the language of lines 6, 7, 8, 9, through "hereunder" in line 10, and insert in lieu thereof "sum of $3,973.45, plus interest on $1,569.26 from March 15, 1946, on $1,662.37 from March 15, 1947, on $479.62 from March 15, 1948, and on $262.20 from March 15, 1949, at the rate of 6 percent per annum to the date of payment hereunder."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCOTT BERRY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7738) for the relief of Scott Berry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Scott Berry, of Huntington, W. Va., the sum of $481.84. Such sum represents the amount of the judgment and costs which the said Scott Berry has been required to pay, arising out of an automobile accident near Huntington, W. Va., on March 25, 1954, in which a truck being operated by him on official business of the United States Post Office Department was struck by a privately owned vehicle: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAUL LEHMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9106) for the relief of Saul Lehman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Saul Lehman, New York, N. Y., the sum of $2,500 as reimbursement for the amount advanced by him to the Treasurer of the United States to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out the first section of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide that a gold medal be coined and presented to Dr. Jonas E. Salk in honor of his achievements in the field of medicine," approved August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 589; Public Law 297, 84th Cong.), which authorized an appropriation of $2,500 for the purpose of coining a gold medal in honor of Dr. Jonas E. Salk: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and that same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTER C. JORDAN AND ELTON W. JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10281) for the relief of Walter C. Jordan and Elton W. Johnson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 3945) be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Walter C. Jordan, of Pryor, Okla., the sum of $303 and to Elton W. Johnson, of Chelsea, Okla., the sum of $67, which amounts represent the estimated costs of replacement of 2 abstracts of title and duplicates of 2 mortgagee's title insurance policies, belonging to the above-named individuals and which abstracts and original policies were destroyed when the mailbag in which they were being dispatched by the Postal Transportation Service slid under the wheels of the train at Pryor, Okla., on or about May 3, 1954: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider, and a similar House bill, H. R. 10281, were laid on the table.

GEORGE T. MOORE AND CARL D. BERRY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10818) for the relief of George T. Moore and Carl D. Berry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That George T. Moore, of Glencoe, Ill., an employee of the Department of Commerce, is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $3,051, representing payments of a per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence paid to him for the period from December 21, 1953, through November 30, 1954, as a result of administrative error, in connection with service rendered to the Government as consultant and as expert in Washington, D. C. In the audit and settlement of accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for the amounts for which liability is relieved by this act.

SEC. 2. Carl D. Berry, of Winnetka, Ill., an employee of the Department of Commerce, is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $1,423.66, $1,127.25 of which represents payments of a per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence for the period from March 9, 1955, through July 31, 1955, and $296.41 represents payments for travel incurred between Washington, D. C., and Winnetka, Ill., which payments were made as the result of administrative error, in connection with service rendered to the Government as consultant and as expert in Washington, D. C. In the audit and settlement of accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, lines 5 and 6, strike the words "In excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLIE GARDENER FORD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10587) for the relief of Charlie Gardener Ford.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary. The provisions of this bill were added to the bill H. R. 10010, which passed the House on June 11, 1956.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CYRUS B. FOLLMER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11207) for the relief of Cyrus B. Follmer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Cyrus B. Follmer, the sum of $4,737. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of any and all claims against the United States for compensation for reasonable and necessary personal property lost while in the course of his duties as clerk in the American Embassy at Berlin, Germany, in 1941, as a result of

war or conditions resulting from war: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

M. SGT. HAROLD LEROY ALLEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11530) for the relief of M. Sgt. Harold LeRoy Allen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to M. Sgt. Harold LeRoy Allen, RA36978744, the sum of $672.25 in full settlement of his claim for costs of hospitalization and medical expenses incurred by him as a result of an operation performed on his dependent child, Kathleen Loraine Allen, at a Canadian hospital in June 1954, while he was stationed at the First Arctic Test Detachment, United States Army, Fort Churchill, Canada, as follows: to Drs. T. E. Holland and George A. Waugh, 632 Medical Arts Building, Winnipeg, Canada, the sum of $200; to the Associated Anaesthetists of Winnipeg, Winnipeg General Hospital, Winnipeg, Canada, the sum of $36; and to the Department of Veterans Affairs, Canada, the sum of $436.25: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARTMANN H. PAULY

The Clerk called House Resolution 520.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 4507) entitled "A bill for the relief of Hartmann H. Pauly," together with all accompanying papers, notwithstanding the statute of limitations, be referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House of Representatives, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

SEC. 2. The United States Court of Claims, in connection with its consideration of the case referred by section 1 of this resolution, shall admit in evidence and consider as evidence such documents and affidavits as are submitted by either party.

The House resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AHMET HALDUN KOCA TASKIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 245) for the relief of Ahmet Haldun Koca Taskin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ahmet Haldun Koca Taskin may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if otherwise eligible under that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment.

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ahmet Haldun Koca Taskin may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That nothing in this section of this act shall be construed to waive the provisions of section 315 of the Immigration and Nationality Act as they apply to the said Ahmet Haldun Koca Taskin.

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ursula Jadwiga Milarski Goodman may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

"SEC. 3. The exemptions provided for in this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Ahmet Haldun Koca Taskin and Ursula Jadwiga Milarski Goodman."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PINGFONG NGO CHUNG AND PEARL WAH CHUNG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1375) for the relief of Pingfong Ngo Chung and Pearl Wah Chung.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pingfong Ngo Chung and Pearl Wah Chung shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the Unied States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pingfong Ngo Chung, Pearl Wah Chung, Dorothy May Ackermann, Dr. Mahmood Sajjadi, and Wan Ngo Lim shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of certain aliens."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERESA LUCIA CILLI, GUISEPPE CORRADO CILLI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1814) for the relief of Teresa Lucia Cilli and Guiseppe Corrado Cilli.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Teresa Lucia Cilli and Guiseppe Corrado Cilli, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Sfc. Joseph C. Smith, a citizen of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after line 8, insert:

"SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Manda Pauline Petricevic, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Paul G. Schuldt, citizens of the United States.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Teresa Lucia Cilli and Guiseppe Corrado Cilli."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOINI MARGARETA HEINO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9020) for the relief of Toini Margareta Heino.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Toini Margareta Heino may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the words "may be", insert "issued a visa and."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "have" and insert "had."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 2842.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Toini Margareta Heino may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer as an amendment to the Senate bill the provisions of H. R. 9020 as amended, and as just passed by the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Toini Margareta Heino may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided*, That this shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings whereby the bill, H. R. 9020, was passed were vacated and the bill laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 636 for the relief of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kanokichi Kumasaki, Myra Wishnetzky Dromi, Wong Ma Chee, Suye Uchida, Mrs. Takayo Uota, Lum Shee Seid, Koriku Kato, Mrs. Liu Cha Thung Tsai (alias Mary Lau), Mrs. Doris Kelly, Sansho Yamagata, Kouko Mikami Yamagata, Ubachi Iino, Shima Saito Iino, and Mrs. Tatsu Kakimoto shall be held to be classifiable as nonquota returning residents under the provisions of section 101 (a) (27) (B) of that act.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Roberta Enriquez Macaspac, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. Bart T. Macaspac and Mrs. Macaspac, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Anna Poulos, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Peter M. Poulos, citizens of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Kanokichi Kumasaki."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "Ubachi" and insert "Uhachi."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING CERTAIN SUBSECTIONS OF SECTION 212 (a) OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 637 to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppe Staropoli and Rosario Pecoraro may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 2. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Miss Betti O. Bollman, the fiance of Sgt. Edward J. Dorpinghaus, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Betti O. Bollmann is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Edward J. Dorpinghaus and that she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, other than the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the said act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Betti O. Bollmann, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Betti O. Bollmann, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Betti O. Bollmann as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

SEC. 3. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Susanne Ingebord Bernhard, the fiance of David B. Warren, a citizen of the United States, and her minor children, David and Helen Bernhard, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Susanne Ingebord Bernhard is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said David B. Warren and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, except that the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the said act shall not be applicable in the case of the said Susanne Ingebord Bernhard. In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Susanne Ingebord Bernhard and her minor children, David and Helen Bernhard, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Susanne Ingebord Bernhard and her minor children, David and Helen Bernhard, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record their lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

SEC. 4. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Edith Ilse Hausmann, the fiance of John A. Ferrick, Jr., a citizen of the United States, and her minor child, John, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Edith Ilse Hausmann is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said John A. Ferrick, Jr., and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, except that the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the said act shall not be applicable in the case of the said Edith Ilse Hausmann. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Edith Ilse Hausmann and son, John, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Edith Ilse Hausmann and son, John, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Edith Ilse Hausmann and son, John, as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Patricia Stone and Inez Lenzi Erickson may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (17) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Enrique Zaragosa-Bermejo may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 7. The exemptions provided for in this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FACILITATING THE ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN FIANCES OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 638, to facilitate the admission into

the United States of certain fiances of United States citizens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Shizuko Hamaoka, the fiance of Leo E. Minnis, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Shizuko Hamaoka is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Leo E. Minnis and that she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Shizuko Hamaoka, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Shizuko Hamaoka, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Shizuko Hamaoka as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

SEC. 2. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sumiko Takae, the Japanese fiance of John Stafford, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of three months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Sumiko Takae is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said John Stafford and that she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Sumiko Takae, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Sumiko Takae, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Sumiko Takae as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

SEC. 3. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chung Pang Ja, the Korean fiance of Private First Class Ronald M. Smith, a citizen of the United States serving in the Armed Forces, and her minor child, Chung Soun Ai, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Chung Pang Ja is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Ronald M. Smith and that she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Chung Pang Ja and her minor child, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Chung Pang Ja and her minor child, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record their lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

SEC. 4. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Fusako Tone, the fiance of Staff Sgt. Robert C. Record, Jr., a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Fusako Tone is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Staff Sgt. Robert C. Record, Jr., and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Fusako Tone, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Fusako Tone, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Fusako Tone as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

SEC. 5. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Reiko Kurachi, the fiance of Robert A. Jubenville, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Reiko Kurachi is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Robert A. Jubenville and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Reiko Kurachi, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Reiko Kurachi, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Reiko Kurachi as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

SEC. 6. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Noriko Shimizu, the fiance of Fred T. Nakagawa, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Noriko Shimizu is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Fred T. Nakagawa and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Noriko Shimizu, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Noriko Shimizu, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Noriko Shimizu as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

SEC. 7. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mieko Furukubo, the fiance of James A. Trailer, a citizen of the United States, and her minor child, Jimmy Furukubo, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Mieko Furukubo is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said James A. Trailer and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Mieko Furukubo and Jimmy Furukubo, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Mieko Furukubo and Jimmy Furukubo, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Mieko Furukubo and Jimmy Furukubo as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

SEC. 8. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Miss Mieko Kii, the fiance of Ray R. Ody, a citizen of the United States, and her minor child, Grace, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Mieko Kii is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Ray R. Ody and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Mieko Kii, and her daughter, Grace, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Mieko Kii, and her daughter, Grace, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Mieko Kii, and her daughter, Grace, as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

SEC. 9. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ryoko Nakayama, the fiance of Robert B. Tate, a citizen of the United States, and her minor child, Kaiichi, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Ryoko Nakayama is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Robert B. Tate and that they are found otherwise admissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Ryoko Nakayama and the minor child, Kaiichi, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Ryoko Nakayama and her minor child, Kaiichi, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Ryoko Nakayama and her minor child, Kaiichi, as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

SEC. 10. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mutsuko Shinohara, the fiance of Monroe R. Schaffer, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Mutsuko Shinohara is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said

Monroe R. Schaffer and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Mutsuko Shinohara, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Mutsuko Shinohara, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Mutsuko Shinohara as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

SEC. 11. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Joh Pyung Nam, the fiance of Samuel H. Millen, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Joh Pyung Nam is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Samuel H. Millen and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Joh Pyung Nam, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Joh Pyung Nam, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Joh Pyung Nam as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendments:

Beginning on page 3, line 8, strike out all of section 3 and section 4, ending at the end of page 4.

On page 5, line 1, strike out "Sec. 5." and substitute "Sec. 3."

On page 5, line 3, after the words "United States", insert "and her child, Kiyomi Kurachi."

On page 5, line 3, after the words "eligible for", strike out "a."

On page 5, line 4, strike out the word "visa" and substitute "visas."

On page 5, line 4, after the word "as", strike out "a."

On page 5, line 4, strike out the word "visitor" and substitute "visitors."

On page 5, line 8, strike out the words "she is" and substitute "they are."

On page 5, line 12, strike out the word "she" and substitute "and her child, Kiyomi Kurachi, they."

On page 5, line 17, after the name "Reiko Kurachi", insert "and her child, Kiyomi Kurachi."

On page 5, line 20, after the name "Kurachi", insert "and her child, Kiyomi Kurachi."

On page 5, line 20, after the words "payment by", strike out "her" and substitute "them."

On page 5, line 21, strike out the word "fee." and substitute "fees."

On page 5, line 22, renumber section 6 to read "Sec. 4."

On page 6, line 19, renumber section 7 to read "Sec. 5."

On page 7, line 17, renumber section 8 to read "Sec. 6."

On page 8, line 14, renumber section 9 to read "Sec. 7."

On page 9, line 12, renumber section 10 to read "Sec. 8."

Beginning on page 10, strike out all of section 11 through the end of the joint resolution on page 11.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT M. DECKARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1986) for the relief of Robert M. Deckard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert M. Deckard, of San Bernardino, Calif., the sum of $1,700.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert M. Deckard against the United States arising by reason of the loss of personal property sustained by him in a fire which totally destroyed the quarters occupied by him at the FEAMCOM Air Base, Japan: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,700.50" and insert "$1,650.50."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED FOUNDATION CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6765) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of the United Foundation Corporation of Union, N. J.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims, notwithstanding any prior determination by such court on a motion for summary judgment, or any other provision or rule of law to the contrary, to hear de novo, determine, and render judgment upon all claims of the United Foundation Corporation of Union, N. J., against the United States, arising out of contract numbered W-49-080-eng-668 entered into between the said corporation and the United States on September 30, 1948, and such claims shall be considered as if they had arisen subsequent to the enactment of the act entitled "An act to permit review of decisions of the heads of departments, or their representatives or boards, involving questions arising under Government contracts", approved May 11, 1954 (41 U. S. C., secs. 321 and 322).

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claims may be instituted at any time within 90 days after the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEDER STRAND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5155) for the relief of Peder Strand.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That Peder Strand, who is unable to satisfy the physical presence requirements of section 316 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act because he is serving as captain of a Panamanian tanker, may be naturalized by taking the oaths prescribed by section 337 of such act before any court referred to in section 310 of such act or before any diplomatic or consular official abroad, prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Peder Strand shall be held to meet the requirements for physical presence set forth in section 316 (a) (1) of that act and may be permitted to file his petition for naturalization in accordance with the requirements of section 334 of that act: *Provided*, That such petition is filed not later than 1 year following the date of the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 639) for the relief of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jaffa Kam, Shaoul I. Khedouri, Suzette Khedouri, Franklin Khedouri, Francis Khedouri, Sister Philomena Vella, Hen Min Lee, and Lim Khin Thong shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this section of this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ann Yellin, Andrew W. Garfield, Edward V. DeFreitas, Olga Rubin Donn Bornes, David Harden, and Lynda Harden shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Altha A. Barry and Eleanor Bertoni shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees: *Provided*, That suitable and proper bonds or undertakings, approved by the Attorney

General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 4. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds which may have issued in the cases of Rosa Alaton Eskenazi and Dimitrios Kondoleon. From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said Rosa Alaton Eskenazi and Dimitrios Kondoleon shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

SEC. 5. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bonds which may have issued in the case of Cesar Grana. From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said Cesar Grana shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued: *Provided,* That nothing in this section of this act shall be construed to waive the provisions of section 315 of the Immigration and Nationality Act as they apply to the said Cesar Grana.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. J. Res. 533) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 7 over to and including line 2 on page 2.

Page 2, line 3, strike out "3" and insert "2."

Page 2, line 8, strike out "4" and insert "3."

Page 2, line 14, strike out "5" and insert "4."

Page 2, line 19, strike out "6" and insert "5."

Page 2, line 24, strike out "7" and insert "6."

Page 3, strike out lines 4 to 8, inclusive.

Page 3, line 9, strike out "9" and insert "7."

Page 3, line 14, strike out "10" and insert "8."

Page 3, line 19, strike out "11" and insert "9."

Page 3, line 24, strike out "12" and insert "10."

Page 4, line 3, strike out "13" and insert "11."

Page 4, strike out lines 8 to 12, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. J. Res. 534) to waive certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "Mrs. Hanum Nigogoshian."

Page 3, after line 21, insert:

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Hanum Nigogoshian may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. J. Res. 535) for the relief of certain aliens, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out "Ezra Chitayat, Violet Chitayat, Georgette Chitayat, Linda Chitayat."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. J. Res. 553) waiving certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 9 to 16, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 3. That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Emma Green shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee."

Page 3, line 2, after "(9)", insert "and (10)."

Page 3, line 6, strike out "this exemption" and insert "these exemptions."

Page 3, line 6, strike out "a ground" and insert "grounds."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution waiving certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. J. Res. 554) for the relief of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, lines 22 and 23, strike out "Bernardo Regino."

Page 3, after line 15, insert:

"SEC. 5. That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Bernardo Regino. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Bernardo Regino shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. J. Res. 555) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens with the Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 2 over to and including line 13 on page 2.

Page 2, line 14, strike out "SEC. 2."

Page 2, line 19, strike out "3" and insert: "2".

Page 2, line 22, strike out "4" and insert: "3".

Page 3, line 3, strike out "5" and insert: "4".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. J. Res. 566) to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, strike out all after line 5 over to and including line 3 on page 3 and insert:

"SEC. 4. That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (28) (C) (iv) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gertrud Koch may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That her marriage to her United States citizen fiance, Frank J. Kleczewski, shall occur not later than 6 months following the date of the enactment of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISAPPROVAL OF SALE OF PLANCOR NO. 1207

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 524) to disapprove the sale of the alcohol butadiene manufacturing facility at Louisville, Ky., Plancor No. 1207, as recommended by the Rubber Facilities Disposal Commission; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I as unanimous consent that general debate on the resolution be fixed at not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Resolution 524, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives does not favor the sale of the alcohol butadiene manufacturing facility at Louisville, Ky., Plancor No. 1207.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a resolution introduced in accordance with the statute governing the disposal of rubber plants in the United States. This alcohol butadiene manufacturing facility at Louisville, Ky., is the last of the plants to be disposed of. When the Commission made arrangements for its disposal, two bids were received. One was accepted by the Commission. However, the Attorney General did not consider the sale in the best interests of the promotion of the alcohol butadiene program.

In addition to the disapproval of the Attorney General the Comptroller General ruled that even if no objection had been raised through the medium of this resolution, the unsuccessful bidder could challenge the sale of the plant to the successful bidder, because the latter would have a cloudy title if he took possession of the plant.

In view of this situation, the resolution was adopted disapproving the sale. The committee felt it had no alternative in view of the opinions of the Attorney General and of the Comptroller General, but to disapprove the sale.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] has made a clear explanation of the situation faced by the Committee on Armed Services. We had a full and complete hearing on the matter, and it was the almost unanimous judgment of our committee that the matter should be handled in precisely the fashion we propose here today. Therefore, I hope that this resolution will be adopted without any difficulty.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What will happen to this plant if the resolution is adopted?

Mr. ARENDS. We shall have a meeting of the Committee on Armed Services tomorrow at which time we shall extend the life of the Commission for another year, to give them an opportunity to get a good and a clear bid on this plant.

Mr. GROSS. Is the plant presently in operation?

Mr. ARENDS. Yes, under a lease that will expire within 2 years.

Mr. VINSON. In answer to the gentleman from Iowa, and in addition to what the gentleman from Illinois has said, we will have to change the criteria by which we propose to ask for bids, because under the criteria established now we would be confronted with the identical situation, if we called for future bids, as we are now. So when the committee reports back to the House a bill to extend the life of the Commission, the criteria that will be set up for the Commission to use in considering bids will be somewhat different from what they are today.

Mr. ARENDS. And will meet with the Attorney General's approval.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman anticipates the sale of this plant within the next year?

Mr. ARENDS. That is right, subject, of course, to the existing lease.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May I ask the chairman of the committee this question: Does this resolution get rid of the sale here?

Mr. VINSON. This disapproving resolution does disapprove of the sale, but we want to give the Commission by new legislation, which we will bring in in a day or two, a different method of seeking to dispose of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It has the gentleman's personal support?

Mr. VINSON. I hope it has the support of the gentleman from Michigan, too.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I follow the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. I am glad the gentleman does.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I see the committee report refers to a lease expiring on April 24, 1958.

Mr. VINSON. Everybody who buys has to buy subject to that provision. Whatever sale is made has to be made subject to the lease that is outstanding.

Mr. SCOTT. Do I understand that the committee is considering the manner in which the property may be disposed of for sale, subject to this lease?

Mr. VINSON. I hope to report such a bill tomorrow, and call it up just as soon as it may be programed—to get a new method of disposing of this plant.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives does not favor the sale of the alcohol butadiene manufacturing facility at Louisville, Ky., Plancor No. 1207.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House, with the recommendation that it be agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the resolution (H. Res. 524) disapproving the sale of the alcohol butadiene manufacturing facility at Louisville, Ky., Plancor No. 1207, had directed him to report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that it be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, have until midnight tonight in which to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

TARIFF REDUCTIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the fourth round of multilateral tariff reductions was announced recently. The tariff on numerous items was reduced another 15 percent.

Our total tariff protection has now been cut approximately 80 percent in the past 22 years.

This should be the last of the multilateral knife-wielding conferences; and I believe that it is the last.

There is just so much in any given economic program, such as the trade agreements program. Then it runs dry. This program has reached that point. In fact it has in various segments gone beyond that point.

Much of the tariff-slashing was carried out in a reckless manner in past conferences. State Department representatives who were far removed from the home scene and who in any case had little or no sympathy with the American producer and his problems of competition, wielded the knife.

The doctrine which animated them was that the reduction of a tariff rate was of itself a good deed. Therefore, they eagerly fell to with wild-eyed enthusiasm and economic irresponsibility.

Today some of our industries are paying for this orgy. Many more will pay in the future. Once the anesthesia of wartime and military prosperity wears off there will be anguish.

In the meantime the State Department zealots are trying to nail down the fruits of their labors of the past 20 years by taking from Congress the power of putting its own will into effect.

They have sought to get the United States into an international trade organization where the State Department and not Congress would be the spokesman for the United States. Thereafter it would make little difference if sentiment in this country did change. The State Department need not listen to the election results.

Such freebootery and effrontery are wearing thin as the State Department will learn if it has not already sensed the fact.

The time is here when we need a substitute for the 22-year-old program. The fourth round Geneva conference should mark the last gasp of the program dedicated to a periodic general massacre of tariff rates.

The extension of our trade agreements act by the 1st session of the 84th Congress, which was made over my protest that we should first know what was proposed in the new Japanese treaty, has been a real eye opener to Members of Congress.

In this connection I want to call attention to a recent statement of Mr. Joseph L. Miller, of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers, which gives us more idea of how our economy is being affected by what the Congress has already done in the field of trade relations. Mr. Miller says—and I quote:

United States imports of cotton cloths and apparel from Japan have continued to increase at an alarming rate during the first quarter of 1956. Imports of cotton cloths, excluding velveteens, are now at the annual rate of 244 million square yards—which is an increase of almost 700 percent over total imports from Japan during 1953.

The imports of certain specific fabrics, predominantly those with high labor content, have increased in an even more drastic fashion during the past 3 years. Imports of cotton velveteens from Japan reached the staggering total of almost 6 million square yards during 1955—an increase of close to 2,000 percent over 1953. During the month of March alone, imports of Japanese ginghams totaled 16 million square yards—almost three times as much gingham as was imported during the entire year of 1954. The current annual rate of gingham importations based on first quarter shipments to the United States is 121 million square yards—an increase of 1,876 percent over 1954.

During the month of March, shipments of 500,000 yards of voiles and lawns marked the beginning of what may become an avalanche of importations of these fabrics—made by fine combed mills in the United States, many of which are located in New England.

In addition to cotton cloths, United States imports of finished sheets and pillowcases from Japan increased from 791,000 units in 1953 to almost 12 million units during 1955—an increase of 1,382 percent.

Just as fantastic have been imports of cotton wearing apparel, the bulk of which are cotton blouses and shirts, which jumped from a combined total of $1,315,200 during both 1953 and 1954 to an annual rate of $44,055,600 during 1956—an increase of more than 3,000 percent.

Examples of why imports from Japan are increasing at these astonishing rates is found by comparing the prices of some domestic and Japanese cotton fabrics. Japanese ginghams are selling in New York, duty paid, at 33¼ cents per yard, while it costs American mills 37½ cents per yard to make the same fabric. Japanese broadcloth sells in New York, duty paid, at 26 cents per yard which is 4 cents below the cost of production in many American mills.

The invasion of the cotton textile market is only the start of what can be expected from Japan in the near future. Equipped with modern machinery and average hourly earning of approximately 15 cents, the Japanese textile industry will soon be ready to export synthetic textile fabrics, as well as woolens and worsteds, at prices so far below the cost of manufacturing these fabrics in domestic mills that American producers will be completely unable to compete.

JOSEPH L. MILLER,
The National Association of Cotton Manufacturers.
WASHINGTON.

The proposal contained in H. R. 5550 to provide United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, which means a back door entrance to GATT, is just one more instance of threatening our economy and can result only in the trade destruction of many of our small American producers, who manufacture for home consumption, and not for export trade.

If we approve OTC and enter the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, Congress will advocate its constitutional powers to regulate commerce and tariffs, and American citizens will lose a basic constitutional right.

Already the original American Constitution has been seriously weakened, first, by executive use of power; second, by congressional administration of power; and, third, by order of the Supreme Court, which enters into it by means of the Constitution.

This is not a question of high tariffs or low tariffs. It is a constitutional principle which we, as Members of the Congress, cannot and must not surrender.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered was granted to:

Mr. EDMONDSON, for 60 minutes, on Thursday, June 21.

Mr. HESELTON, for 20 minutes, on next Tuesday.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. METCALF and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in three instances.

Mr. REUSS in two instances.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHEEHAN.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON and to include a broadcast she made over station WHK, Cleveland, Ohio, on June 16, 1956.

Mr. MADDEN and to include a speech by Mr. DONDERO made on Memorial Day at Gettysburg.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1243. An act for the relief of Kyu Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1798. An act for the relief of Mrs. Charles C. Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2779. An act for the relief of Evelyn Levenston Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2804. An act for the relief of Dr. Shan Yah Gin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2833. An act for the relief of Louis Henri Stassart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2836. An act for the relief of Choh-Yi Ang; to the Committee on the Juidiciary.

S. 2839. An act for the relief of Rosetta Ittner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2849. An act for the relief of Janos Schreiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2863. An act for the relief of Margaret Emma Lewis, nee Guschmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2881. An act to direct the Secretary of Commerce to collect and publish annually statistics as to the number of certain types

of textile looms in place and in operation on a State-by-State basis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3029. An act for the relief of Josephine Langton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3050. An act for the relief of Annemarie Appelt and her two minor children, Karin Amelia Green and Sylvia Green; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3132. An act to provide for purchase of lands within the Cache National Forest, Utah, to promote prevention of floods and minimization of soil erosion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3150. An act for the relief of Sgt. and Mrs. Herbert G. Herman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3166. An act for the relief of Lucie Toehl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3180. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of two United States Commissioners for Cumberland Gap National Historical Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3215. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to provide for the use of special canceling stamps or postmarking dies in order to encourage registration for voting in general elections; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3221. An act for the relief of Dr. Tscheng-Sui Feng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3232. An act for the relief of Josef Kranz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3292. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria (Schandl) Cote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3380. An act for the relief of Zygmunt Sobota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3473. An act for the relief of Kurt Johan Paro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3522. An act for the relief of Theresia Schneider; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3982. An act to provide for the maintenance of the production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1410. An act for the relief of Giovanna Scano;

H. R. 2709. An act for the relief of the estate of Rene Weil;

H. R. 3373. An act for the relief of Mrs. Zella K. Thissell;

H. R. 5453. An act for the relief of the estate of Robert Bradford Bickerstaff;

H. R. 6143. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Codes of 1939 and 1954, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6742. An act for the relief of Rumiko Fujiki Kirkpatrick;

H. R. 6955. An act for the relief of Inna Hekker Grade;

H. R. 7373. An act for the relief of Eugene G. Aretz;

H. R. 8041. An act for the relief of Clyde R. Stevens;

H. R. 8867. An act for the relief of the estate of F. M. Bryson.

H. R. 9285. An act to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, so as to extend for two additional years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury.

H. R. 11205. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Roy Cowan and others arising by reason of the flooding of land in the vicinity of Lake Alice, N. Dak.; and

H. J. Res. 609. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7247. An act relating to recognition of gain or loss in certain railroad reorganizations and to amend section 108 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H. R. 7471. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., a municipal corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Florida;

H. R. 7896. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land in the city of Hogansville, Ga., to the city of Hogansville;

H. R. 8102. An act to provide for the disposition of moneys arising from deductions made from carriers on account of the loss of or damage to military or naval material in transit, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8404. An act to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former prisoner of war camp, near Douglas, Converse County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8693. An act to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, in relation to the refund of reenlistment bonuses;

H. R. 8922. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services;

H. R. 9377. An act to provide for the sale to the Eagle Rock Young Men's Christian Association of certain real property located in Los Angeles County, Calif.;

H. R. 9824. An act to establish an education assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict;

H. R. 10417. An act to amend the Federal Register Act, as amended, so as to provide for the effectiveness and notice to the public of proclamations, orders, regulations, and other documents in a period following an attack or threatened attack upon the continental United States; and

H. R. 10899. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 20, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1980. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation in the amount of $125,000 for the fiscal year 1956 for the House of Representatives and a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws, in the amount of $2,683,396, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay indefinite interest and costs and to cover increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency (H. Doc. No. 426); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1981. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to fees of United States marshals"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1982. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to clarify the application of navigation rules for the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1983. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a comprehensive report on the land and water resources of the New England-New York region, prepared by the New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee; to the Committee on Public Works.

1984. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a comprehensive report on the conservation and development of the water and related land resources of the Arkansas-White-Red River Basins, prepared by the Arkansas-White-Red River Basins Inter-Agency Committee; to the Committee on Public Works.

1985. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting the report of the Attorney General on the administration of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 for the year ending May 1956, pursuant to the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3674. An act to amend section 1343, of title 18, United States Code, relating to fraud by wire, radio or television; without amendment (Rept. No. 2385). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11636. A bill to amend chapter 3, of title 18, United States Code, relating to animals, birds, and fish; without amendment (Rept. No. 2386). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MACDONALD: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7536. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to require that certain vessels carrying passengers for hire be fitted with radiotelephone installations; with amendment (Rept. No. 2387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOGGS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 11619. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 11714. A bill to extend for 3 years the existing authority of the Secretary of the Treasury in respect of transfers of distilled spirits for purposes deemed neces-

sary to meet the requirements of the national defense; without amendment (Rept. No. 2389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Nineteenth intermediate report pertaining to the administration of the nickel plant at Nicaro, Cuba; (Rept. No. 2390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 7943. A bill to change the name of the Government Locks at Ballard, Wash., to the "Hiram M. Chittenden Locks"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2391). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee of Conference. H. R. 9739. A bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2396). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8967. A bill for the relief of Paul Levitt; with amendment (Rept. No. 2392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1245. An act for the relief of Agnes V. Walsh, the estate of Margaret T. Denehy, and David Walsh; without amendment (Rept. No. 2393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2352. An act for the relief of Maj. Luther C. Cox; without amendment (Rept. No. 2394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2690. An act for the relief of William G. Jackson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 11831. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 11832. A bill to provide for the designation of holidays for the officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia for pay and leave purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 11833. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 11834. A bill to allow a charitable deduction for certain bequests; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDAY (by request):

H. R. 11835. A bill to meet the requirements of national military defense, civil defense, and city and metropolitan civilian governments, by providing large-scale topographic maps of the cities and metropolitan areas of the United States, of 50,000 and over population; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 11836. A bill to provide that World War II veterans whose national service life insurance has lapsed may obtain new insurance without medical examination; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 11837. A bill to amend the Hatch Act to permit all officers and employees of the Government to exercise the full responsibility of citizenship and to take an active part in the political life of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 11838. A bill to encourage private United States investment in foreign countries by reducing the incidence of double taxation on taxpayers with more than 80 percent of their gross income from sources without the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 11839. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to undertake continuing studies of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides upon fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses of those invaluable natural resources following spraying, and to provide basic data on the various chemical controls so that forests, croplands, and marshes can be sprayed with minimum losses of fish and wildlife; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 11840. A bill to allow a charitable deduction for certain bequests; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 11841. A bill to protect the security of the United States by preventing the employment by the United States of persons found to be disloyal to the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 11842. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954 to provide that counterpart funds used by a committee of Congress overseas shall be charged against the amount available to such committee from the contingent fund of the Senate or the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 11843. A bill to prohibit the transmission in the mails of certain devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:

H. R. 11844. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the construction of a bridge and road across the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 11845. A bill to amend section 16 of the Clayton Act to provide for the payment of costs of the suit and attorneys' fees to private parties who proceed to enforce the antitrust laws in the public interest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11846. A bill to amend section 3 of the Clayton Act to free those in commerce from restraints of trade and to allow small-business men freedom of choice in the conduct of their respective businesses as independent enterprises; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 11847. A bill to limit and regulate the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 254. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Reports Nos. 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, and 2244, current session; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. Res. 548. Resolution providing for the printing of certain proceedings in the House Committee on Armed Services; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Res. 549. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document, and additional copies, the manuscript entitled "The Powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States"; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 11848. A bill for the relief of Karl L. Larson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 11849. A bill for the relief of Gee Yueng Chong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11850. A bill for the relief of Yeh Yueh Chie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 11851. A bill for the relief of D. S. and Elizabeth Laney; to the Committee on the Judicary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 11852. A bill for the relief of Joseph Tawil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 11853. A bill for the relief of Bernhard Elmers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 11854. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Jane Stevens, administratrix of the estate of Pvt. Robert E. Stevens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 11855. A bill for the relief of Guiseppina Coppola (also known as Guiseppa Coppola); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11856. A bill for the relief of Ralph Miranda and his wife Maria Miranda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 11857. A bill for the relief of Manuel Stephan Derahian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 11858. A bill for the relief of Ingeborg Bildii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 11859. A bill for the relief of Ioakim Lyras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 649. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 650. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 651. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1146. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of the City Council of the City of Providence, R. I., urging the Congress of the United States to provide by legislation an annual inspection of weirs, dams, and barriers to prevent flooding of rural and industrial areas throughout the country; to the Committee on Public Works.

1147. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Ernest B. Steen and others, Trinity Lutheran

Church, Madison, Wis., urging passage of H. R. 7922, to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to passengers on aircraft in flight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1148. Also, petition of Frank A. Hourihan, Chicago, Ill., relative to making a complaint against Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, for the manner in which he handled a redress of grievance relating to Frank A. Hourihan of Chicago, Ill., petition No. 209, dated April 21, 1955; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1149. Also, petition of the city clerk, Niagara Falls, N. Y., relative to reaffirming the previous actions of the city council in advocating that all power development at Niagara Falls be undertaken by privately owned and operated power companies, etc.; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Proposed Amendments to the Clayton Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I introduced H. R. 8395 in which I proposed certain amendments to sections 3 and 4 of the Clayton Act. Hearings were held before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

I am now introducing two new and separate bills which I believe would obviate certain objections that were raised to the original measure.

The first of these bills proposes to amend section 3 of the Clayton Act in order to strengthen it to insure free competition and efficient antitrust enforcement.

Investigations which have been made by the Select Committee on Small Business of the House, as well as by the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, have disclosed widespread denial of freedom of choice in trade by many large suppliers which has resulted in the suppression of competition and the creation of conditions favoring the growth of monopolies.

This new bill makes no substantial change in section 3 of the Clayton Act except that "services or facilities" are added which is further enlarged by making illegal, not only those acts which prevent a lessee or purchaser from using or dealing in merchandise of the lessor or seller but also makes it unlawful to make any threat to prevent or hinder the lessee or purchaser from dealing in the commodities and goods of a competitor of the lessor or seller, or to take or withhold any action in retaliation of such lessee or purchaser dealing in the commodities, including services and facilities of a competitor, when the effect may be to prevent or to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce.

This bill is designed to make illegal any conduct which prevents a dealer exercising his freedom of choice in respect to the goods he may wish to handle or display and is designed to prevent the suppression of competition through indirect means.

I feel that it is essential to write this provision into statutory law in order to implement the Supreme Court's interpretation of section 3 in the Standard Oil of California case, because that decision has been under attack by the advocates of monopoly who are the natural antagonists and opponents of all antitrust legislation.

During the hearings held on April 19, 1956, by the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, Judge Stanley N. Barnes, Assistant Attorney General, in charge of the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice, in testifying in regard to H. R. 8395, said:

On the one hand, some portions of H. R. 8395 this Department supports. I approve, for example, making explicit Clayton Act, section 3, coverage of service or facilities. Restraints on services or facilities have been held to transgress the Sherman Act. And exclusive dealing arrangements involving services or facilities have been struck down, not only under Sherman Act, section 1, but also under Federal Trade Commission Act, section 5. But present Clayton Act, section 3, coverage is of goods, wares, merchandise, machinery, supplies, or other commodities, and hence probably does not include services. In any event, no reason appears why coverage of services and facilities should not be made explicit.

Thus, we have the unequivocal statement of the head of the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice in which he approves the inclusion of services and facilities in section 3 of the Clayton Act.

I, therefore, submit that this new bill is eminently desirable in order to strengthen that section of the Clayton Act.

Atomic Power and the Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in the June 21, 1956, issue of the Public Utilities Fortnightly magazine, published by the Public Utility Reports, Inc., Baltimore, Md., there appears the following article in which I discuss atomic power and its effect on the coal industry:

ATOMIC POWER AND THE COAL INDUSTRY
(By the Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT)

A new era of robust prosperity lies ahead for the United States coal industry. Our rapidly developing atoms-for-peace program is today one of America's largest coal-consuming industries, using approximately 20,200,000 tons a year for its own heat and power requirements. And this vast atomic program already is expanding faster than United States coal production.

At present our atomic experimental plants are using 1 car of coal every 80 seconds, night and day, the year around. Experts in the Atomic Energy Commission estimate this demand likely will double over the next 5 years. Instead of replacing coal as a basic energy source, atomic power promises to test the entire coal industry, over the next decade, in its ability to keep abreast of the still unmeasured demands of atomic experiment and development.

From studies presented before the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I have the honor to be a member, I am convinced that we face, not the displacement of coal by the new A-power program, but rather the question, "Can coal keep up with the call to be made upon it over the next 50 years?"

Electric-generating capacity installed in the United States today measures 116 million kilowatts. By 1970 our demand will be 320 million kilowatts; and by 1980, 600 million. Only 18 percent—less than one-fifth—of our power today is supplied by hydro energy. With America's need for electric power expanding so fast, the ultimate problem is not which fuel may be crowded out of the market, but rather, what new energy sources may be developed to help carry the load?

Nothing could be farther from the fact than the suggestion that atomic energy eventually might close down our mines. The truth is that by 1980 (only 25 years forward) our atomic power production will be, at best, about 175 million kilowatts, against about 425 million kilowatts from fossil fuels. With our power requirements multiplied by 5 by 1980, today's conventional fuels in various forms still will supply approximately 71 percent, and atomic plants only about 29 percent of our total energy. Even after allowance for increased efficiency in coal consumption at steam plants, our coal requirements for power alone by 1980 would call for 5 tons for every 1 consumed today for electric power.

Neither shall we fear exhaustion of our fossil fuels. The Interior Department assures us that our potential supply of these fuels * * * is literally beyond the realm of accurate estimate * * * our resources are so vast as to apparently insure an adequate supply for any reasonable foreseeable period of time. Some official estimates say we have plenty of these fuels in reserve for at least a thousand years.

Recent history attests the ever-increasing efficiency of coal as our basic energy source. The Federal Power Commission tells us that in 1926 we required 3 pounds of coal to produce 1 kilowatt-hour of electricity. Today, less than 1 pound of coal produces the same energy for the transmission system—and engineers already are designing new boilers to give us 1 kilowatt-hour of electricity for only six-tenths of a pound of coal. When the productive energy obtained from a pound of coal thus can be multiplied by 5 over a period of only 30 years it is utterly unrealistic to harbor fears that the industry may be pushed out of the fuel market.

It is likely, too, that we cannot long continue to consume natural gas at our present prodigious rate. As these naturally

limited supplies tend toward exhaustion, the replacement demand will fall first on coal. The Atomic Energy Commission calculates that by 2000 A. D. only about 1 percent of our electricity will come from oil and natural gas fuels—as against approximately 50 percent from those fuels today.

Production of gas and liquid fuels from coal also is progressing in giant strides. This new form of coal fuel is not yet competitive with direct-consumption coal, but easily could become so over the next 2 decades. The Atomic Energy Commission estimates that by 2000 A. D. as much as 76 percent of our electricity might come from such converted coal fuels. This is a fourth compelling reason why coal faces a future of sustained prosperity.

A second argument heard occasionally against atomic electric power programs is that, with Government investing heavily in every A-power project, the way is being paved for the eventual nationalization of the entire electric industry.

This argument neglects utterly the fact that private investments in A-power projects in the United States at the end of 1956 will total more than $175 million. Are these people investing in eventual state socialism?

We must not forget that until 1954, when the new Atomic Energy Act became effective, A-power remained a complete, airtight Government monopoly. Not only was it illegal for private enterprise to experiment in atomic research save under rigid Government tutelage; all atom research and development were under almost crippling security protection, which forbade even the theoretical discussion of scientific probabilities in normal public speaking and writing. During those 14 years (1941–54) atomic energy was a total state secret. It was as if the first automobile had been impounded by the Government, and no private experiment or development permitted until about 1905.

The problem of protecting our A-power defense systems still remains. That area of nuclear development necessarily must continue a stoutly protected Government monopoly, at least until international control treaties may be perfected. Meanwhile, the AEC has made great progress since 1954 in releasing research data not related basically to defense programs. This has been accomplished through the Eisenhower concept of active partnership between Government and industry, as outlined in the 1954 act.

Today there are 15 electric power plants under construction, in design, or proposed in pending AEC contracts, all for completion during the next 5 years. These plants will cost in excess of $1.5 billion, of which private enterprise will pay approximately half. Surely it is untenable to suggest that such companies as Commonwealth Edison, Pacific Gas & Electric, Duquesne Light & Power, Yankee Atomic Electric Co., Detroit Edison, General Electric, and North American Aviation are parties to a gigantic conspiracy to socialize the electric power industry.

To my mind, this type of planning on the part of our large cooperating companies refutes conclusively all arguments that Government participation in the nuclear energy program imperils private development of A-power electricity. To provide effective legal safeguards against such a takeover by Government, Congress in the 1954 act specifically and categorically forbade the AEC to engage in "the sale or distribution of energy for commercial use" save where such energy became available as a byproduct of Government research and development programs.

Through all human history timorous philosophical fears have argued against progress. The railroad was resisted in the first half of the 19th century because it might run over the farmers' cattle, sheep, and horses. In every generation there has emerged a small fringe of sabotage against mechanical and scientific equipment—even to the resistance offered by our own horse breeders early in the present century against development of the automobile; or the more recent campaign against the dial telephone, on the ground that it surely would displace and impoverish all manual operators.

Yet, in every case, the new industry came on, only to broaden the productive base of the entire economy, provide more jobs, bigger payrolls, more leisure for all. We know today, for example, that without the automatic dial phone there would not be available in the entire country enough capable telephone centrals to handle our present volume of local traffic.

Similarly, nuclear power is here to stay. It will not make us poorer, but richer. So long as the Government must continue to spend large sums every year in development of the atomic defense program, it is logical and sound to carry on the collateral studies for peacetime applications of the same power. The cost of these peace studies is relatively small, yet they promise to contribute magnificently to national development clear across the economic horizon. Indeed, they already have yielded vast benefits in medicine, agriculture, food preservation, electronics, and heat machines. Should all these fabulous byproducts of the defense program be neglected merely because they entail a degree of partnership and cooperation between Government and private enterprise?

Secondly, there are large areas of the earth which have no conventional fuels. Atomic power is the only hope of those regions for industrial progress. We have much to gain from industrial progress among the sandal-and-loincloth peoples of Asia, Africa, and Oceania.

England already is pressing her nuclear-power program under forced draft, chiefly because her coal resources are vanishing rapidly.

Russia is fully abreast of America and England in A-power technology. Shall we stand by to see communism take the lead in peacetime application of the atom?

Third, many areas of the United States are far removed from today's conventional fuels. Smaller unit package reactors, now well along in development, promise adequate power for those areas long before A-power electricity becomes truly competitive in our great industrial areas closer to fuel deposits.

True, A-power electricity today is perhaps 10 times more costly than power from conventional fuels, but this cost is coming down every month. At some point in the future A-power electricity must become competitive in our great metropolitan markets. Meanwhile, however, our power demands are increasing much faster than our generating capacity.

Government has a definite place in the development of new industries and new energy resources through all the experimental phases, for the entire national economy benefits from such progress. But our Government's support of scientific research and development in aviation during World War I did not entail nationalization or socialization of the aviation industry after 1918. Nor did Federal aid to wireless research in the early years of this century entail socialization of the radio and electronics industries.

Free enterprise has its own great strengths and values. Government research in new fields of technology, as a function of national defense, does not weaken or destroy the ultimate values of freedom.

Perhaps the most convincing answer to the charge that the atom may bankrupt our coal industry has been given by the National Coal Association. This organization, which represents most of the bituminous-coal tonnage produced in 26 States, certainly has as great a stake in the Nation's energy program as any individual company or other association.

The following two paragraphs are from a resolution adopted by the National Coal Association and submitted formally to the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

"I. In the progression of humanity, in furthering world trade, in advancing the cause of peace, and in maintaining the world leadership of the United States, there is a need to continue Government sponsorship of the development of nuclear energy. To this end, the National Coal Association recognizes the need for the Government to support the national laboratories and to carry out the basic as well as applied research in the field of atomic energy.

"II. Future development of economically feasible nuclear power is necessary to provide power for underdeveloped areas of the world, to assist nations which have power shortages, and to protect the future of the United States in the power field. The National Coal Association therefore recognizes the need for the Government to continue the power demonstration program to optimize the conditions under which atomic power is generated."

Tom Pickett, executive vice president of the National Coal Association, came before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and stated unequivocally that the coal industry has no fear about the development of the atom for peacetime uses. He submitted his own studies showing that the Nation will need at least twice as much coal by 1980 as was produced in 1955. Mr. Pickett, like other coal industry spokesmen from whom we have heard, asks only that cost figures and other unclassified information pertaining to the reactor program be made public.

Speaking for myself, I can assure the American people that we of the Congressional Joint Committee will not permit the peacetime application of atomic power to undermine in any way our private enterprise system. I intend to make certain that—as implicit in the new atomic energy law—there shall be no permanent subsidies once the research and development stage is past.

We will do whatever is possible to bring about competitive nuclear power to the benefit of all the people of the world, but there will be no subsidization beyond the research area.

My one intent is to support the program to the extent necessary for the betterment of mankind. If in the process of carrying out this program any Federal official or other participant attempts to advance the cause of state socialism in the electric power industry, I shall vigorously oppose such action, and shall, without hesitation, make my suspicions known to the American people.

Public Opinion Survey—11th Illinois Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, each of the 6 years that I have been in Congress I have conducted a public-opinion survey among my constituents. This year I mailed out 46,500 questionnaires, making an equal distribution into every single precinct in the 11th Congressional District in an effort to obtain the views of a representative cross section of the people whom I represent. To date, 6,976

questionnaires have been tabulated, which is a return of 15 percent.

Five of the questions on this year's questionnaire have been repeated in a similarly worded fashion in each year's survey since 1953. A comparison of these results over the 4 years is interesting in establishing either a constancy or a changing trend in the thinking of the people of the 11th Illinois District.

The results of the 1956 survey are as follows:

	Yes	Percent	No	Percent	No answer	Percent
1. Are you in favor of the United States continuing as a member of the United Nations?	5,107	73.2	1,671	24.0	198	2.8
2. Do you favor the proposed $4.9 billion foreign-aid bill?	1,556	22.3	5,053	72.4	367	5.3
3. Do you approve of the Republican foreign policy in general?	4,344	62.3	2,064	29.6	568	8.1
4. Do you approve of the Eisenhower administration to date?	5,328	76.4	1,122	16.1	526	7.5
5. Are you in favor of a basic pension plan for veterans of World War I?	4,096	58.7	2,312	33.1	568	8.2
6. Do you favor Federal aid to education?	4,359	62.5	2,378	34.1	239	3.4
7. Do you favor H. R. 627, which proposes the establishment of a bipartisan civil rights commission and the creation of a civil rights division in the Department of Justice?	3,542	50.8	2,068	29.6	1,366	19.6
8. Do you favor continuation of the Federal Government's low-rent public housing program, which in H. R. 10157 provides for 50,000 public housing units in each of the next 3 years?	3,383	48.5	3,286	47.1	307	4.4
9. Do you favor postal rate increases to help cut down the present postal deficit?	4,570	65.5	2,172	31.1	234	3.4
10. Do you favor the discharge of Government employees who invoke the 5th amendment in order not to disclose Communist connections?	6,301	90.3	521	7.5	154	2.2
11. Are you in favor of a constitutional amendment which would set a percentage limit on the amount of income tax the Federal Government could levy against individuals in peacetime?	5,003	71.7	1,631	23.4	342	4.9
12. Do you approve of permitting labor unions to use membership dues for political purposes?	681	9.8	6,134	87.9	161	2.3
13. Do you favor retention of the principles of the national origins quota system which has been in effect since 1920, and which regulates immigration so as to maintain the historic population pattern of the United States?	5,274	75.6	1,188	17.0	514	7.4
14. Do you approve of President Eisenhower's and Secretary Benson's farm program for flexible price supports and a soil-bank program?	4,872	69.9	1,537	22.0	567	8.1
15. If there is a surplus due to greater Federal income than Federal expenses this year, should it be used to: (A) reduce taxes, or (B) reduce the national debt?	(A) 3,094	44.4	(B) 3,636	52.1	246	3.5

The comparison for repeated questions in 1953, 1954, 1955, and 1956 is shown below:

	Percentages										
	1956			1955			1954			1953 [1]	
	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	No
Are you in favor of the United States continuing as a member of the United Nations?	73.2	24.0	2.8	69.5	28.3	2.2	67.0	29.9	3.1	64.1	35.9
Do you favor further arms and military aid for foreign nations? [2]				44.9	49.8	5.3	45.7	46.4	7.9	44.7	55.3
Do you favor continued economic aid (Point 4 program) to foreign nations for development of backward areas? [2]				50.0	46.0	4.0	54.4	38.8	6.8	43.3	56.7
Do you favor the proposed $4.9 billion foreign aid bill? [3]	22.3	72.4	5.3								
Do you approve of the Republican foreign policy in general?	62.3	29.6	8.1	56.9	30.3	12.8	52.9	36.6	10.5	78.5	21.5
Do you approve of the Eisenhower administration to date?	76.4	16.1	7.5	65.3	23.9	10.8	58.0	25.9	16.1	84.2	15.8

[1] It is to be noted that in the 1953 questionnaire, the "no answers" were not included in the percentage breakdown.

[2] In the 1953, 1954, and 1955 questionnaires, the foreign aid subject was broken down into separate questions, that is, arms and military aid, and economic aid.

[3] In 1956, all foreign aid was treated as one question.

Speech Delivered by Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, Before the 1956 Wisconsin Democratic Party Convention at Superior, Wis., Saturday Evening, June 16, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech given by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, at the 1956 Wisconsin Democratic Party Convention at Superior, on June 16.

I am in full accord with the views expressed by the distinguished Senator and the delegates at the convention enthusiastically received the speech. On the basis of the vote in the Wisconsin Democratic primary this April, Wisconsin's 26 votes at the National Democratic Convention are pledged to Senator KEFAUVER for the Presidency. I found the Wisconsin delegates unified in their support of Senator KEFAUVER and determined to fight for him at the coming convention.

The Senator's speech follows:

Wisconsin is at the heart of what may well be the principal battleground between the Democratic and Republican parties in 1956. If anything is true in our politics it is that the Republican Party must win the support of the great agricultural heartland of America in order to win national elections.

The Democratic prescription for victory, on the other hand, calls for us to win here in these important farming States. We will win if we have a platform which deals forthrightly with the issues. We will win if we have the will to win and truly represent the spirit of progress which has characterized the Democratic Party in the past, and will in the future.

There may be some who believe that we can win on a negative basis. They count on President Eisenhower not running again. They count on the support of farmers because of the failures of Secretary Benson either to understand the gravity of the farm problem or to do anything substantial to help the farmers retrieve a fair share of the Nation's income. In my judgment this is not enough. We must take a positive and affirmative position and we must win on our own merits and not on Republican failures.

I do not know whether President Eisenhower will consider himself able to run for another term of office or not. I hope that for his sake and the Nation's sake that he soon will be well enough to exert the actual leadership that the Nation and the world so greatly need. Whether or not he is again a candidate will depend on questions beyond any man's control, and whatever his final decision is I do not intend to question it. This I know, however, that we Democrats are inviting defeat if in our thinking, our planning, and our strategy, we are not ready to run—and run to win—against the strongest ticket the Republicans can put up.

As individuals and as a party we must rise to meet the great challenges of our time.

Of overriding importance, of course, is the absolute necessity of reaching peaceful solutions to the questions and anxieties which plague the world. Here is where failure of Republican leadership has counted most against us. We must be ready to substitute diplomacy for threats. Without the loss of a single value, or a single iota of power, we can make much greater use of simple and firm courtesy in our international relations. We lose prestige and respect when we brush off too quickly proposals from other nations, including the Soviet. In dealing with the neutral nations, we can rewin much of the friendship and respect which we have so painfully lost by using the methods of peace and diplomacy.

We must return to our traditional position of sympathy and aid to all people who desire freedom and self-government and are capable of exercising it. In giving aid we can

offer it not as bait or bribe, but as a means of strengthening free nations so as to keep them free. As Dr. Sukarno, of Indonesia, pointed out in Washington the other day, gifts alone will not win us the friendship of the world—we must also have respect.

Most of all, we must once again learn to assess our strengths and our weaknesses with honest realism. We can once again use truth and nothing but the truth as a means and a method of discussing foreign problems with both our own people and the world.

Finally, we share with most of the peoples of the world a belief in a Supreme Being. This is a point of similarity between us and one that we even share with many of the peoples of the Soviet—who long for the days when they, too, may worship their God. We must not forget this.

We must push forward to that day which will come, since it must come, when no super bombs will be dropped in either anger or anguish.

This is the greatest challenge of our time and we must meet it with resolution and courage, with imagination and with daring. We must place its solution above party and partisanship. We must move toward this solution as an undivided people whose only cause and only purpose is rightness and justice.

Our next great challenge is to prepare our economy for the era of peace. Even with our economy booming in many areas because of the tremendous outpouring of billions of dollars in the defense effort, there are many inequalities. Any recession resulting from a slowing down of this effort would immediately show the distress in many of our farm areas in its stark reality. Industries dependent on the farmer, small-town businesses, churches, and institutions of many kinds in the rural areas are suffering.

We can have a farm program which will reverse the downward trend of farm prices. We can have a farm program which will seek to give the farmer a fair income without building up surpluses. We can have a farm program which will effectively liquidate the farm surpluses we already have to the national advantage. And we can have a farm program which will give a fair break to the small farmer with limited land and limited capital. I have outlined such a program, and you have shown, by the votes which I appreciate so much that you approve of it.

Congress tried to improve the farm program, but our effort was vetoed. Under threat of a veto we tried again but the result bears no resemblance to a real farm program.

Today, despite near record employment for the Nation as a whole, there is serious unemployment in many so-called soft areas. Many of these areas fall in this category precisely because the farmers have lost so much of their purchasing power, and more than that, have lost confidence that they ever will have much more purchasing power under a Republican administration. If we can reverse this fact and this state of mind, it will do as much as anything to relieve the unemployment which exists here and in many other States of this region.

But what has the Republican administration done about it? A generation ago when anybody in a family got sick, mother was likely to turn up with the bottle of castor oil. Today when anything about our economy seems to need fixing, the Republicans have one remedy. They turn on the hard-money policy. At the very outset of the administration the new hard-money policy pushed us into a recession. I hope that some of the businessmen and industrialists who are now so loud in their praises of this administration will remember that. A few months ago they turned the hard-money policy on again. They raised the rate at which banks themselves borrow money. Then all the rates went up all along the line. The administration has seen to it from the start that farmers would have to pay more for the money they need. Now it costs more to finance a house. It costs more to own an automobile or a television set—or anything bought on time.

According to the Federal Reserve Board this was deflationary. Yet inflation occurs when there is more money than there are products to buy with it, and eager purchasers bid prices upward. No such situation exists with us. Prices of many things, as every housewife knows, are high—often too high—but this has not come from a lack of production. Currently we can make more automobiles and radios and automatic washers and shoes than the market can absorb. Yet the hard-money policy being pursued by the administration makes it more costly to buy them. Demand slows down and workers are laid off. And eventual cost to the consumer goes even higher because of higher financing charges. I doubt if even the bankers benefit from a hard-money policy under such conditions as those which exist at present. Perhaps there is a contest between Secretary Benson and the Federal Reserve Board as to which can be more stubborn. How else can it be explained?

These are not the most difficult problems we have to solve at home. With sound thinking, with good will, with the determination to give the farmer, the worker, the consumer an even break they can be solved promptly. The great challenge to our economy will come when we prepare to keep business booming under peacetime conditions.

So far the Republicans have taken not a step to prepare our economy for peace. Perhaps that is why they work for peace in such a haphazard way.

We can have peace in the world. And we can keep our national income up, employment high, and enrich the lives of us all at the same time.

The future offers the greatest hope that has ever lain before the eyes of mankind.

We can begin again to control and develop our rivers and all the vast resources of our national heritage.

We can bring our school system, which each year becomes more and more inadequate, up to adequate standards. Not long ago in Florida I talked to the mayor of a relatively small town in the central part of the State. He told me that his community needed a new schoolroom every 3 days. All over America our towns and cities are growing and stretching out. The Federal Government can and must help the schools to meet these increasing needs. And the need is not just for schoolrooms and equipment, we must have better paid teachers to help our children get the better education which will fit them for the complex world of tomorrow.

We ought to be moving into the peacetime uses of atomic energy with more decision and purpose. This energy added to mankind's own, plus the many other sources available to us, will open up unimagined areas of speed and power. In order to provide the leadership needed, Government itself must build reactors.

Housing is our largest industry. Yet we have failed to adequately meet the needs both of the industry and the consumer. Here, above all, we need imaginative research and planning. We know the advantage of slum clearance in building better cities and better citizens. We must press forward with low-cost public housing and veteran's housing. Particularly now, when the cost of housing and of rentals have mounted so high, do we need to press forward on this front.

Great cities all over the United States are dying from an inward rot and we must encourage our cities to undertake plans for redevelopment of rotten areas.

We can, and we should, make it simpler and cheaper to buy decent housing—or to rent it. And it seems to me that we have done less research on how to build good housing at more reasonable costs than we should have.

If we strike out purposefully and eagerly and with hope, I know that this country can live in a peaceful world, in a world in which people find it easy to communicate with each other and trade with each other, and still have a bustling economy at home.

As a party we must give the leadership and the drive to get this done.

Finally, in addition to preparing for peace and securing peace, we need to keep America the kind of nation we will want to live in in peace. We want to keep America a nation which appreciates the fact that ideas are important, that the Constitution and Bill of Rights are not only pillars of strength here at home but are also recognized as symbols of American freedom around the world. We must not abuse them.

Recently the Supreme Court once again has moved in to correct a situation which was beginning to intolerably affect our basic liberties. In its decision that security measures had no place in relationship to persons in nonsensitive jobs the Supreme Court took a long step toward forcing the administration to improve a security program which had become intolerable because of its mistakes and its inhumanity—and, as the Supreme Court now declares, its legality in part.

We must have security in sensitive places. Yet in obtaining it we must never forget those basic rights and liberties which the Constitution grants us all and which are the most precious things for which we fight. By screening everyone in the United States we might turn up 1 or 2 "bad eggs," but it wouldn't be worth it, for in the process we would have destroyed that which we seek to protect—our freedom. All those of us who truly believe in our great Constitution will applaud and uphold the Court. What we must regret, however, is that the leadership in these matters must come from the Court because leadership does not come from the White House.

We need an administration that is sensitive to the Constitution—an administration that knows it and believes in it, all of it.

So let us move forward confidently to peaceful solutions in the world, to a vibrant economy in a peaceful United States. And in doing so let us determine to keep our rights and those of others intact, and even in a crowded and a complex world to keep our humanity.

As Democrats, let us speak to America with the authentic voice of America. With God's help, let us keep our aims and purposes as high as they can go—as high as the stars in the heavens above us.

Thank you.

A Bill To Strengthen the Clayton Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, section 4 of the Clayton Act permits any person who shall be injured in his business or property by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws to sue and recover "threefold the damages by him sustained, and the cost of suit, including

a reasonable attorney's fee." The provision has been in effect for a long time and may be found in Thirty-eighth United States Statutes at Large, page 731, and is codified as Fifteenth United States Code, section 15.

Section 16 of the Clayton Act provides for equitable relief and the granting of an injunction to prevent threatened loss or damage by a violation of the antitrust laws. Yet, strange as it might seem, there appears to be an unexplained omission in this section, because it is silent as to the granting of a reasonable attorney's fee when equitable relief is given a complainant.

It should be particularly noted that when an action at law for treble damages is brought, and even if it should be concluded successfully for the plaintiff, the unfair competition, or the violation of antitrust laws, is not necessarily stopped thereby, but often continues unabated. However, in a proceeding for injunctive and equitable relief, under the antitrust laws, brought by virtue of the provisions contained in section 16 of the Clayton Act, permanent relief is afforded and fair competition and compliance with the provisions of the antitrust laws is automatically restored. Both the public interest and the complainant's advantage are better served by this than by the mere award of monetary damages even if trebled.

Unfortunately, however, and I submit, unfairly, in an action for equitable relief, the complainant not only does not recover any damages but may be obliged to bear the cost of litigation as well as the expense of paying the attorney's fee. Therefore, under the present law, there is a great incentive for the plaintiff to seek recovery of treble damages, rather than pray for permanent equitable relief and the compliance by the defendant with the provisions of the antitrust laws.

It is because of this obvious unfairness and omission in the provisions of the Clayton Act that impells me to introduce a bill to amend section 16, and thereby put the complainant who seeks a permanent cessation of violations of positive statutory law by the defendant, on par and equality with the plaintiff who brings an action at law for treble damages, and thereby award such complainant when successful his cost of the suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

The Federal courts have repeatedly held that the rights of persons damaged by violations of the antitrust laws to sue the defendants guilty of such violations were also for the purpose of multiplying the agencies which would help enforce these important statutes, and therefore make them more effective—*Maltz* v. *Sax* (134 F. 2d 2). They are said to be designed to supply an auxiliary force of private investigators to supplement the Department of Justice in law enforcement—*Weinberg* v. *Sinclair Refining Company* (48 F. Supp. 203)—and to aid in achieving the broad social objectives of the act—*Fanchon & Marco* v. *Paramount Pictures* (100 F. Supp. 84).

Some time ago, when I introduced H. R. 8395, it was provided, among other things, that a successful plaintiff in an equitable proceeding may recover the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee. In this connection I should like to quote the testimony of Judge Stanley N. Barnes, Assistant Attorney in charge of the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice. In his testimony before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives Judge Barnes stated:

> I likewise support H. R. 8395's effort to permit a successful private antitrust plaintiff's recovery of costs not only where he seeks damages but also solely equitable relief. I think that this is consonant with well-recognized principles, that a prevailing party litigant should be entitled to his costs under present section 4 of the Clayton Act, any person injured may recover treble damages and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee. Section 16, however, enables private antitrust plaintiffs to seek injunctive relief, but does not include a provision authorizing the recovery of costs. Where a private litigant does not sue under section 4 as well as 16, no rational basis appears for denying recovery of costs. In either case he should recover costs including a reasonable attorney's fee.

I submit and advocate the enactment of this bill into law in order to strengthen the Clayton Act and thereby aid small business. For, after all, small business is the backbone of the Nation's economy and the maintenance of the growth and survival of small enterprises are vital to the country's strength and welfare.

Study Asked on Effects of Insecticides, Herbicides, and Fungicides on Fish and Wildlife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to undertake continuing studies of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides upon fish and wildlife.

I did so in an attempt to prevent the loss of these invaluable natural resources following spraying.

Last year, 65 million acres, just a little over one-sixth of the cropland of the United States, were sprayed. Even so, crop losses on untreated areas were estimated at $7.5 billion. Over 3.4 million acres of forest were sprayed last year and more will be sprayed this year. A total of 3 billion pounds of formulated pesticides were applied in the United States last year. The cost of applying this quantity of pesticides amounted to $256 million.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration estimates that 31 million acres of land were sprayed by airplane in 1954 and that 541,000 hours were flown by the more than 6,000 airplanes devoted to this job.

What are garden sprays and airplane spraying of forests and farmlands doing to our fish and wildlife resources? Sportsmen, conservationists, foresters, and farmers are equally concerned over the tremendous increase in spraying to eliminate insects, weeds, diseases, and other pests. Each succeeding year finds more acreage being sprayed and better and more efficient pesticides being used. More reports are made each year of fish and wildlife being killed by this spraying.

Everyone appreciates the need for minimizing the damage to forests and agricultural crops. Both are vitally needed. All of us must also be concerned about the potentially destructive effects of these pesticides and herbicides on fish and wildlife.

Despite the enormous good that is wrought by chemical controls, they must be considered in the category of mixed blessings. Being poisons they can be harmful to birds, mammals, and fish. Considerable damage to valuable fish and wildlife resources has occurred unnecessarily because the application was made without sufficient knowledge of accepted procedures or without full regard to the consequences. The toxicity of many pesticides to man, bird, mammal, or fish simply is not known. For others, it is known that they are toxic to the animals and plants required as food.

A multibillion dollar recreation and commercial fishery industry of interest to at least 40 million Americans is involved. All reasonable precautions must be taken to safeguard their interests. Research on the effects of pesticides and herbicides to fish and wildlife has not kept pace with the development of these powerful controls and the increased spraying of our crops, forests, and marshes.

The appropriation authorized by this bill will be sufficient to obtain the data necessary to protect our valuable fish and wildlife resources while at the same time allowing the proper treatment for forest and agricultural areas.

We Must Not Forget the Enslaved Peoples of the Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD the text of my broadcast over station WHK, Cleveland, on June 16, 1956, on the subject of the Soviet enslavement of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia:

BROADCAST BY HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON, REPRESENTATIVE (REPUBLICAN) 22D DISTRICT, OHIO, ON STATION WHK, CLEVELAND, JUNE 16, 1956

We Americans are deeply grateful for the freedoms that are ours. They have cost us blood and sorrow, which give us a certain understanding of the anguish of those who have lost their freedom. We remember the sadness in the hearts of all who have so suffered. We know that in the past decade alone more than 700 million people have fallen under the despotism of the Soviet Union. We have not forgotten that even

more than 10 years ago Soviet armies enslaved the people of the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

All this week Americans of Baltic descent and their friends have been holding memorial services that mark the Soviet occupation of June 1940, and the mass deportations that started the following year. Tonight in Cleveland many of our fellow citizens are gathered in St. George's Hall to observe those sad chapters in the history of civilization.

Since there is much talk these days of changed attitudes in the Soviet Union, we Americans must take note of those who remain in the enslaved lands. Let me say to all who think Moscow has changed its strategy, read the speech by First Party Secretary Khrushchev before the 20th Party Congress of the Soviet Union. Our Department of State released copies of the speech last week.

Read how cruel Stalin was in deporting Russian people from their home areas. But does Khrushchev have a single word of regret for the mass deportations of men, women and children from Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia? No; not once in his 6-hour address.

The new collective leaders of Soviet Russia say that Stalin was bad, but Lenin was good. But the people in St. George's Hall tonight know that in 1920 and 1921 it was Lenin himself who renounced the Soviet rights to the Baltic States. But in spite of that they were taken over. Do the collective leaders plan to return those lands to the people who have lived there for centuries?

The Soviets say they have stopped the reign of terror in the enslaved lands. But still the people of Baltic descent cannot get their parents, brothers, or sisters out of enslavement, for the Communists will permit no one to leave.

What can we in America do—so many miles away from the Baltic—to be of help to those brave people? Let me read a portion from one of their underground appeals to the free world:

"We wonder whether the world knows about our sufferings, and our difficult and heroic struggle for the right and freedom of mankind to democratic ideals which the leaders of Western democracies have proclaimed."

We must tell them that we do know and we hear their appeals—just as they tell us that they hear our voices speaking out in anger. We must give them the encouragement to continue their battle against seemingly impossible odds. For they have to know that we are still determined that the Baltic States will some day return to their rightful owners. If we ever forsake these fighters for freedom, we will destroy their last thread of hope.

Tomorrow our fellow Clevelanders will attend mass in St. George's Church in memory of those who are still enslaved. We all join in their pleas for the deliverance of their loved ones. Let us also urge them to include in their service a prayer for the continued strength of America and for the never wavering determination to spread the principles of freedom throughout the world.

Civil Rights—Cleveland, Ohio, Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the press of the Nation reported a most remarkable and almost unbelievable incident which occurred in Cleveland, Ohio, a place which is noted as the seat of some of the most ardent agitation for so-called civil rights. According to these reports, a judge of one of the Cleveland courts issued an exile order, under which one of his court employees was required to place a Negro woman and her minor children on a train or a bus and send them back from Ohio to Alabama.

Section 2 of article IV of the United States Constitution reads:

> The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

It is an unquestioned constitutional right of every citizen to live anywhere in the United States where he or she may desire to live.

According to the newspaper stories, this Negro woman protested tearfully that she and her children desired to live in Ohio and did not want to live in Alabama. Over this tearful protest and in violation of a clear constitutional right, they were not only ordered back to Alabama; they were sent back to Alabama.

Undoubtedly this is a violation of civil rights, but I have not heard of the Federal Bureau of Investigation being placed on the case.

Undoubtedly this is a violation of civil rights, but I have not heard of any protest from Ohio or elsewhere on the part of those who work themselves into a frenzy of protest whenever any violation of so-called civil rights is reported south of the Mason-Dixon line.

Is there a double standard of conduct on the question of civil rights? Does the fact that the act is committed in Cleveland, Ohio, convert into a laudable and praiseworthy act something which would be denounced and excoriated if committed in the South?

It may well be that this Cleveland judge feels that he has as much right to ignore the Constitution of the United States as the Supreme Court has, and that he is following established precedent in doing so.

Although this order of banishment has not created any furor, or even a ripple of protest, in the North and East, it has attracted some notice in the South. The Metropolitan Herald, of Atlanta, Ga., carried an editorial in its June 13 issue calling attention to this unconstitutional deportation order. I insert the editorial from the Metropolitan Herald herewith as a part of my remarks:

CIVIL RIGHTS—CLEVELAND, OHIO, STYLE

In America a man can choose to live where ever he pleases. There are no passports required for crossing State lines as is true in Europe where many small countries, each with their borders guarded, prevent free travel.

The right to live and work where one pleases is as much a part of civil rights as is the right to mix and mingle, regardless of race, color, or creed, as is being advocated on a Nationwide basis today.

These being facts of life, it is rather incongruous to read where a jobless Negress was, under a court order, placed on a bus with her eight minor children and told to leave Cleveland and go back to her native Livingston, Ala.

We can understand why this woman could be denied public relief from the State of Ohio because she had not been a legal resident for a year, but we can't help but chuckle when a judge in a State which would force integration on the South under a civil rights belief, deports a resident of another State and orders her to catch the bus and get going. She had broken no law apparently, although the article telling of her plight did have some funny angles. It seems her children ranged in age from an 11-day-old infant to a 17-year-old girl. However the dispatch said, "Mrs. Winston and her husband separated 5 years ago. She came to Cleveland 4 years ago because she could not earn a living in Alabama."

A later dispatch said, "A Negro woman and her eight dependent children who were forced to leave Cleveland, Ohio, because they were not eligible for State relief there, returned home today. The husband met his family when they arrived by train from Cleveland."

Maybe the civil rights belief in the North is like the gooney bird, which can't see where it is going and don't give a hoot.

Presentation of Congressional Franklin Medal to the Pennsylvania State University, June 16, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to present the Congressional Franklin Medal to the Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa., during the alumni institute June 16, 1956, in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin.

The address I delivered in connection with the presentation of the Congressional Franklin Medal follows:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, ON THE OCCASION OF THE PRESENTATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL FRANKLIN MEDAL TO PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY PARK, PA., DURING THE ALUMNI INSTITUTE JUNE 16, 1956, IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 250TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

It is a special privilege to speak to you today about Benjamin Franklin and to bring you a message of deep appreciation from the Congress of the United States.

When the plan was made originally to honor the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin the committee thought of only a small celebration.

They expected to limit it to an exchange of ideas among the societies and institutions of which Franklin was once a member or which he founded or helped.

But such is the stature of the man that the original and limited plan soon developed into a great outpouring of voluntary cooperation in 51 countries of the world.

Franklin's spirit and philosophy were never more alive and vital than it proved to be in this year—2½ centuries after he was born.

Nearly a thousand organizations, with hundreds of thousands of members, seized upon this opportunity to do one of the

things Benjamin Franklin believed was necessary to help bring enduring peace to the world.

They will cooperate, all during the year 1956, in a free and voluntary communication of ideas to help improve international understanding.

Each group plans its own program in its own country, in its own way.

Ideas are exchanged through addresses, papers, books, and broadcasts through the generous cooperation of many thousand publishers and broadcasters.

Already the Franklin Institute, which organized this plan, estimates that upward of 500 million people have been reached in the 51 cooperating countries.

This is the kind of plan that Franklin himself once developed for the young United States.

He was elected to membership in 28 of the most famous learned societies of his day—in England, France, Scotland, Holland, Russia, Germany, Italy, Spain, and America.

Through the transactions of these societies and the free press he helped so much to develop, he took part in the exchange of ideas which helped our young country to grow in the technological world we know today.

Twenty-one of these famous old societies that helped Benjamin Franklin are still in existence and cooperating in the current program.

They have been joined by many others in South America, Asia, and Europe in this modern exchange of ideas.

Franklin believed that it was necessary for the peoples of all countries to communicate with each other—in addition to their governments.

He thought that in this way, mankind could hasten the day when peace and understanding would replace wars and threats of war.

The Congress of the United States thought of this objective when they met to consider the most fitting tribute they could pay to Benjamin Franklin on the 250th anniversary of his birth.

They felt, as they believe Franklin would have felt, that honor should be paid to those groups which did so much to help make his success in this field possible.

The Franklin commemorative medal for distinguished service was designed for this purpose.

On it appears these words of Franklin's: "Wise and good men are the strength of a nation." The complete quotation adds the words: "Far more than riches or arms."

Someday, the world will come to recognize the truth of that statement.

The position of a country in the council of nations will be determined not by its material wealth or power of its armaments alone, but even more by the contributions of its great men and women to the welfare and progress of all mankind.

Benjamin Franklin believed this more than 200 years ago.

He knew and said that the road would be long and difficult.

But he never lost faith in the belief that "wise and good men" would be recognized as the "strength of a nation far more than riches or arms."

And that this day would be speeded by the free and open communications between the peoples of all countries.

The United States honors that philosophy in the creation of the Franklin medal.

Dean Stevenson Fletcher, of your university, in a delightful paper read at the Franklin Institute, listed Benjamin Franklin as one of the great leaders of Pennsylvania agriculture.

Dean Fletcher did not accord him this honor because of any great success he had made on his Chester County farm, where he was mostly an absentee owner.

But he did include Franklin because of his great services in helping to found and promote the idea of agricultural education for the young farmers of America.

Benjamin Franklin was one of the early members in founding the Philadelphia society for promoting agriculture.

He was a tireless advocate, as you know, of practical education as opposed to the more limited and ornamental education of his time.

In pursuit of this objective, he helped to found the University of Pennsylvania and brought into it, for the first time in America, the teaching of scientific and technical subjects.

He wrote the Rules Respecting a Medical Education and Degree, which were adopted by the college of physicians for the training of young doctors.

He assisted in developing Franklin and Marshall College at Lancaster as a school especially for young Germans.

So it was only to be expected that he would lend his influence and ability to the development of a school for students of agriculture.

Actually, the first farmers' high school was not opened until after Franklin's death, but the idea of its beginning may be traced directly back to Poor Richard.

This Farmers' High School filled such an obvious and important need that it grew into your great university of today.

The Congress of the United States is especially proud that the institutions which Benjamin Franklin helped to start have been developed in succeeding years far beyond his fondest expectations.

That is why this Franklin medal is presented not only to honor Benjamin Franklin but also to honor the many wise and good men of your institution who have made the reality greater than the founder's dream.

Perhaps a true measure of greatness is to build so well that the foundations will carry forward into the future without danger of weakness.

Benjamin Franklin built that way.

It is part of the measure of the man that he helped to found our first scientific and technical education, our first medical college, our first school for young people speaking another language, and our first agricultural school—all of which have come to greater service than even he could have dreamed.

It is a very special privilege for me today, Dr. Eisenhower, to present you this medal in the name of the Congress of the United States, in memory of Benjamin Franklin, and to honor also the many wise and good men of Pennsylvania State University who have built and are building so well upon the foundations he laid.

Counterpart Control Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to make certain improvements in the congressional budgetary procedure with respect to the use of local currency counterpart by committees in official work abroad. I would like briefly to explain the purposes of this bill and the improvements it proposes.

At the present time, local currency set aside under the provisions of our aid programs abroad is available, in limited amounts, for the use of the United States Government. Congressional committees engaged in official business in these countries are authorized to use these counterpart funds to defray their local expenses. This is a sound procedure, which results in savings to the American taxpayer. My bill in no way changes or limits this procedure.

However, the funds that are used in this way by committees are not subject to the regular budgeting and accounting procedures by which the Congress controls the expenditures of its committees. The appropriate committees—in the case of this House, the Rules and the Administration Committees—go through a careful and conscientious procedure each year in recommending authorization and appropriation of funds for committee use. I believe I speak for all Members in saying that our respect for the judgment of these committees is so great that we rarely question their decisions in passing on their recommendations. By this procedure the activities of committees are controlled and supervised by the Congress.

These facts are, of course, well known. What is not so well known is that, by exclusion of counterpart funds from this budgetary process, we have in fact reduced the process, in many cases, to a nullity. Any committee which travels abroad and uses counterpart funds is in fact operating on an entirely different budget than the one approved—operating on a budget which has not been fully examined, authorized, or appropriated. Let us take the case of a committee which brings in a budget for $60,000 for the year, itemized to justify the various expenditures that make it up. This is examined by two committees of the House, approved by the entire body—and then made meaningless when the committee proceeds to spend $100,000, by using an additional $40,000 of counterpart.

Now I know that there has been a great deal of public comment and newspaper rumor about the use or misuse of counterpart funds by congressional committees. But it seems to me that such criticism and the facts that may or may not underlie it are a secondary consideration here. What is really at stake is this: Is this House to control its own affairs by the careful and prudent procedures it has created, or are those procedures and the labors of the committees that carry them out to be rendered meaningless by leaving a substantial part of the funds actually used outside the budgetary control system?

I do not think I am overstating the case. The figures show clearly just how meaningless the budgetary process becomes.

Just in the 3 months following the close of Congress last year, 151 Members of the Congress had begun or were preparing for official trips abroad. Of 14 House committees planning to travel, 8 were authorized to visit countries where counterpart funds were available. In fiscal 1955, I am told, $135,000 in counterpart was spent by such committees. In fiscal 1954, $157,000 was spent. Although I have not been able to ascertain the figures, it is reasonable to suppose

that the eight committees traveling abroad last fall spent a comparable amount. In other words, committees authorized to spent $1.05 million by this House, probably spent well over another $100,000. Let me repeat, I am not objecting; that was a hundred thousand saved for the American taxpayer. But what sense does a budgeting procedure make when, after the budget is carefully drawn up for $1,050,000, these committees can and do spend another $100,000 to $150,000? Over a fourth of the Members of the Congress, half or more of its committees, travel abroad yearly in pursuit of congressional business, spending several millions of dollars of funds allocated to them by the Congress. In an operation of such magnitude, should we not maintain some control and accountability, by the means Congress has created for that very purpose?

It seems to me that there should be no controversy about this proposal. If elimination of this budgetary loophole were difficult or cumbersome; or if we were in any way handicapping the committees of Congress in pursuing their activities; or if we were in any way discouraging the economical and desirable practice of utilizing counterpart funds—if any of these things were so, I would hesitate to suggest a change. But, in fact, there is no such problem. All that is necessary is to require that committees include all their proposed activities and expenditures in their budgets, so that the supervising budgetary committees and the Congress may scrutinize and pass on all of the expenditures that, in fact, they propose to make whether from contingent fund or counterpart. This can be accomplished very simply by requiring that counterpart funds, when used, be used in lieu of and under the same limitations and conditions as contingent fund appropriations. In other words, use of counterpart should be charged against a committee's contingent fund balance and accounted for in precisely the same manner as though it were drawn from the contingent fund. That is all my bill proposes.

The purpose of this bill is simply to restore to Congress what it intended to have, what it should have, and what it presently does not have: control over its own operations by means of control of its budget. Because it does so, I believe this bill is sound and noncontroversial.

But I should like to touch on one more aspect of this matter which, I believe, is a further recommendation of my bill. We all know that in the past few months there has been a great deal of newspaper comment on the use of counterpart funds and a lot of rumor and speculation about its misuse. There are rumors of committees traveling abroad without authorization, solely by unauthorized use of counterpart. There are stories of extravagant use of counterpart funds, sometimes for personal expenditures. I do not pretend to know the facts or lack of facts on which these stories are based. But I am sure we have all been disturbed by them because of the reflections they cast on the dignity of this body. I think all of us would like to see them put an end to, once and for all.

But stories like these flourish best in a situation of ignorance, where the facts are not known. It is precisely because the facts about counterpart funds, escaping from the proper budgetary control of this House, are not known that rumor can circulate. I do not think any of us is willing to dignify malicious rumor by argument. But the best answer—and an answer suitable to the situation—is provided by this bill. When counterpart funds are accounted for within the regular budgetary procedure of the Congress, there is no longer any of the mystery on which rumor flourishes. So, I say, a second reason for enacting this measure is to free Members of the Congress from the necessity to answer such allegations—and to make it impossible for allegations any longer to flourish. Newspapers discussing this subject have referred to "arrogance," have commented on the "secrecy" of these funds and have talked about "freeloaders." The best answer to these charges, I submit, is this bill.

Health Service Is a Basic Right of All the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, one of the major responsibilities of Congress today is to take an increasing interest in the human factors as well as the economic aspects of American life.

For this reason, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to a new study which has just been published, dealing with the general health situation of the American people. And surely national health is a foremost human factor which deserves the consideration of Congress today.

Only recently off the presses, the study entitled "Health Service Is a Basic Right of All the People" is one of the most competent which I have noted in this field in recent years. It brings together the latest facts on the state of the people's health and the facilities available to keep us well. This study was done under sponsorship of the Public Affairs Institute, Washington, D. C. The institute is a nonpartisan, nonprofit research organization.

It is especially significant, I think, that the words in the title of this new study are the same words used as the guiding premise for the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation.

It is equally significant that this institute, which seeks to promote wide public knowledge and appreciation of currently important problems, chose to deal with the topic of America's health needs at this time.

Dewey Anderson, Doctor of Philosophy, director of the institute, drew on the findings of a large number of research specialists in compiling the data used in this publication.

My colleagues will be especially interested, I know, in the general approach to one aspect of the national health situation. In the foreword to his publication, Dr. Anderson wrote:

> The author holds the view that all the professional health services should be licensed strictly by the State and each should be policed by its own professional organization to insure the satisfactory and ethical performance of its tasks. That this is the surest way to protect the public from unprofessional conduct. The author is not frightened by charges and countercharges leveled by one group of practitioners at another. For he has given considerable time to the objective study of the merits of such attacks, and seeks in his summaries, handicapped as they are by necessary limitation of wordage, to present reasoned conclusions. The final judgment naturally rests with the reader.

I would certainly say to my colleagues here today that this is a most concise and fair-minded way to begin such an exhaustive summary study by a man who has been trained in the social sciences and has had long experience in examining data and writing his findings in this and related fields.

The purpose of this new booklet, I should point out, is "to present in condensed form for ready reading and reference the main points made by the President's Commission" in its recent 5-volume survey of the health needs of the Nation, according to Dr. Anderson.

In a review of this new survey, Glenn E. Long writes in Healthways magazine that—

> From all that is presented in the booklet, it is obvious that the national health level is not as high as it should be. It is equally obvious that there are not enough doctors in the recognized branches of healing, and not enough hospitals and other facilities to provide the required care to maintain national health at a maximum level.

That is one reviewer's summary, but I encourage my colleagues to read for themselves the facts as summarized in this new Public Affairs Institute booklet so that they may draw their own conclusions.

Considering it true that a shortage of doctors exists to provide maximum national health, I think it is especially noteworthy that Dr. Anderson included in his study a review of the Doctor of Chiropractic as an integral part of America's health personnel.

It is the intention of the author to treat the various professions separately in order to more fully cover the contribution of each to the Nation's health. One of these has now appeared as The Present Day Doctor of Chiropractic. Here we have a penetrating, unbiased study of a comparatively new arrival on the American health scene.

Dr. L. M. Rogers, executive secretary of the National Chiropractic Association, says "there is no doubt that this current study is providing a fine, factual basis for constructive nationwide discussion of our profession and its progress."

Science Sidelights comments that "since every profession is built upon a body of knowledge which has developed over a period of years, Dr. Anderson correctly appraises chiropractic in the light of certain concepts which are regarded as well accepted by the public at large."

And, in one phase of the study on chiropractic, Dr. Anderson says:

From a handful of patients somewhat more than half a century ago who came to D. D. Palmer (chiropractic's discoverer), and got relief, those being cared for by today's chiropractors number many millions. And every year the number swells as chiropractors become more proficient and as their satisfied and healthy patients spread the word. Here is the best and final test of an emerging profession seriously serving the public.

Here, I believe, lies an important fact. In an era when there is a shortage of doctors and of health facilities, we find the fastest growing branch of the healing profession. In its 60-year history, chiropractic has grown to become the second largest branch of the healing arts with over 25,000 doctors now licensed to practice this important healing profession, dedicated to public health and welfare.

The importance of Dr. Anderson's study is seen in this opinion from Science Sidelights that—

Since this is the first time that an independent and unbiased study of the chiropractic profession has been published, the author's findings are of great interest not only to chiropractors but to the public at large.

The author himself writes:

In these modern days of our high-speed, nerve exhausting living, chiropractic is fast becoming an indispensable element in helping people maintain good health.

And he says:

Add to the foregoing the fact that the doctor of chiropractic is striving to build his profession, to meet his social responsibilities, to take his place as a leader in the community.

Insofar as America's national health is concerned, it is vitally important that more and more people turn to the art and science of healing so that we may, as a Nation, cope with the increasing problems and responsibilities, in this area of human living.

Therefore it is of interest that Dr. Anderson concludes his special study on chiropractic by saying that "the profession itself is so ardent about its future that nothing can stop doctors of chiropractic from being devoted public servants and becoming better ones with the passage of time."

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to these studies of Dr. Anderson because I believe they both contribute much to the knowledge that is needed in America today so that we may better meet and solve our problems of human living for the benefit and betterment of all our citizens.

A New Defeat in the Mediterranean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was an unpleasant day for the Western World, for the West has suffered a new defeat in the Mediterranean.

Yesterday, Mr. Dmitri T. Shepilov, the Foreign Minister of the U. S. S. R., was in Cairo to join with the Egyptian Government in celebrating a national holiday—Evacuation Day—marking the end of Britain's 74-year control of the Suez Canal Zone.

All British troops are now out of Egypt. This fact in itself would not be ominous to the free world if we had any assurance that those who were taking control of that base were solidly on the side of democracy and were succeeding the British in the maintenance of a base dedicated and devoted to the support of Western freedom. However, the presence of the Foreign Minister of the U. S. S. R. makes it clear that the change in military command at the Suez is not a consolidation of Western power. On the contrary, Mr. Shepilov is not the only Russian export in the vicinity of the Suez at this moment. There are Communist submarines and Communist warships and Communist jet planes sent there by the Czechoslovakian Government as a result of its arms deal with Prime Minister Nasser of Egypt.

We must ask whether our own Ambassador to Egypt, Mr. Henry Byroade, will stand with the Foreign Minister of the U. S. S. R. in celebration of this retreat for Western prestige and power in the Mediterranean. For if anyone merits the credit—a dubious word under the circumstances—it is Mr. Byroade, who as our Ambassador to Egypt and previously as our Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, supported by the campaign to organize the evacuation of the British from the Canal Zone and the transfer of that base to Egyptian authority. It was Mr. Byroade who insisted that we must do everything possible to facilitate the departure of the British, and that we must do nothing to request any quid pro quo from the Egyptian Government. It was his bland assumption that if we were to help the Egyptians in the achievement of this long-sought goal, an achievement which they considered so crucial for their sovereignty and independence, the Egyptian Government would automatically and gratefully adhere to the West and remain our firm and fast friend.

The record shows, Mr. Speaker, that others did not share Mr. Byroade's naivete. I quote from a column which appeared in the New York Times on July 18, 1954, written by Mr. Hanson Baldwin. He predicted:

The basic strategic fact about the impending withdrawal of British power is that it will create another vacuum of power in an area—the Middle East—already distinguished for its lack of power.

He continued:

It is clear, therefore, that the impending withdrawal is an undesirable military expedient undertaken partly because of the decline of British power, partly in the hopes of political and psychological gains in the Arab world. The last named is likely to be an evanescent hope; retreat, particularly under pressure, does not breed respect but more pressure.

Events of the last few months have shown that Mr. Byroade miscalculated in Egypt as he did elsewhere in the Middle East. Egypt has given no sign of friendship for the West. It has organized a coalition of Arab countries in an effort to breakdown Western influence and to frustrate the efforts of our Government to establish a defense system to secure the region against the threat of Communist subversion and imperialism.

One is moved to ask, Mr. Speaker, how many more such diplomatic defeats we shall suffer in the Near East until we come to appreciate the fundamental principle that democracy will not be able to organize the defense of freedom in the Near East if it continues to capitulate to the pressures and intrigue of rulers who have no interest in democracy and who are concerned primarily with the search for power.

Summary of the Major Provisions of the Rees Bill To Prevent Employment of Disloyal Persons by the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the bill I have introduced today establishes a top-level, independent, three-member Loyalty Review Board responsible for determining the loyalty of Government employees and applicants for Government service. Members will be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than two members can be of one political party. The President will designate the Chairman. Terms of members will be 6 years, on a staggered basis to assure continuity of policy and administration. Members may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance. The salary of each member will be equal to that of assistant secretaries of executive departments, except the Chairman will receive $1,000 more. Membership on the Board will be a full-time job, with no outside employment permitted. Board headquarters will be in Washington, but the Board will have subordinate boards as needed for its work.

The Rees bill provides a comprehensive and effective procedure for investigation and development of information with respect to loyalty of present or prospective Government employees. Maximum use will be made of existing investigative facilities.

After the bill becomes effective, no person can be appointed in a Government Department until his absolute loyalty has been determined under these procedures—except in case of urgent necessity for a new appointment, certified by the agency head concerned and approved by the Board, where prompt investigation will be made after appointment. Any agency head may initiate the loyalty procedure on evidence of disloyalty of an employee of his agency.

The Civil Service Commission will conduct a preliminary investigation of every applicant being considered for appointment, using all pertinent sources of in-

formation, including files of the FBI, military intelligence units, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, local law enforcement agencies, other Government investigative and intelligence agencies, and employment and school records.

If the Commission finds no derogatory information relating to loyalty, it will so advise the department. That closes the loyalty procedure. Of course, if there is any other question of suitability for employment the Commission will take proper action.

If the Civil Service Commission finds indication that any employee or applicant for employment is of questionable loyalty, it will immediately terminate its investigation, refer the matter to the FBI for a full field loyalty investigation, and notify the department concerned. The FBI will report the results of its investigation to the Loyalty Review Board. The President may, in the national interest, require an FBI investigation without a preliminary investigation by the Commission and, in his discretion, notify the department concerned.

On receipt of notice from the Commission or the President of a full field loyalty investigation of any employee, the head of the department concerned may, in his discretion and if national security requires, suspend the employee pending final determination of his loyalty. Any suspended employee restored to duty because of a final determination that he is not disloyal will receive compensation for the period of suspension at the rate provided for the position from which suspended, less any earnings in other employment during such period.

The Loyalty Review Board will refer each FBI report to a subordinate board for review and preliminary findings on the evidence. A unanimous finding that there is no question of loyalty will become the decision of the full Board, which will notify the agency concerned that in its judgment there is no reasonable doubt of loyalty. If the favorable finding is not unanimous, the full Board will review it and, if in agreement, will take the same action.

If the finding of the subordinate board is adverse, or if the full Board agrees with a minority adverse opinion of the subordinate board, the person concerned will be notified in writing and may appeal to the Board within 15 days.

The Board may, if in its judgment justice requires, disclose its sources of information, but any finding and statement to the person involved will be held confidential by the Board.

Upon appeal the Board will consider any additional evidence submitted in writing or at a hearing and make a final decision, with immediate notice to the appellant and the agency head concerned.

If there is no appeal from an adverse decision, or if the decision on appeal is adverse to the appellant, the Board will certify to the agency that the loyalty of the individual is doubtful after allowing him 30 days to file a complaint with the appropriate United States court, with copies to the Board and the agency head. The court then will have exclusive jurisdiction to dismiss the complaint or to set aside the Board's decision if satisfied that it is arbitrary, capricious, or otherwise contrary to law. The court may order suspension of any employee during the consideration of his complaint if the Board shows that continuance on duty might be dangerous to the United States. No employee or applicant who files a timely complaint with the court will be discharged or rejected for disloyalty until his complaint is decided by the court.

If there is no complaint to the courts and the Board certifies that there is reasonable doubt of the loyalty of any employee or applicant, or if the court dismisses the complaint, the employee will be discharged or the applicant will be rejected, as the case may be.

The Loyalty Review Board will make rules and regulations to carry out its functions and publish them in the Federal Register. All statements before the Board by an appellant must be under oath. The appellant will have the right to be represented by legal counsel, to produce evidence and witnesses, and to furnish competent affidavits or other written statements. No decision of the Board will be made except with the concurrence of at least three members, and the Board must maintain a permanent record of each member's vote.

The Loyalty Review Board and its subordinate boards may subpena witnesses and books, records, and documents as deemed necessary, and may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses. Witnesses will be paid fees and mileage as paid to witnesses in United States district courts.

In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena the Board may invoke the aid of the appropriate United States court. Failure to obey a court order may be punished as contempt, under penalty of a $1,000 fine or 1 year imprisonment, or both.

The Rees bill sets forth basic standards for use by the Board in determining the need for removal of an employee or refusal of employment. These include evidence of sabotage, espionage, association with spies or saboteurs, treason or sedition—or advocacy thereof—advocacy of revolution or altering the form of Government by force or violence, disclosure of government by force or violence, disclosure of confidential or nonpublic documents or information under circumstances which may indicate disloyalty, performing or acting to serve foreign interests in preference to those of the United States, membership or association with any person, group, or party known to the Loyalty Review Board or designated by the Attorney General as Communist, totalitarian, or subversive, or as advocating force or violence to deny rights under our Constitution or to alter our form of government by unconstitutional means. The Attorney General is required to publish a list of any such group, party, organization, or combination of persons and upon request will furnish the Board his reasons.

The Board will report to the President and to the Congress each year on the performance of its responsibilities under this legislation.

Every agency will submit to the Board the name and fingerprints of any employee not already submitted.

The functions, records, and personnel information of the present Loyalty Review Board in the Civil Service Commission—called the Old Board—are transferred to the Loyalty Review Board created by the bill. This legislation in general will replace Public Law 298, 82d Congress, authorizing certain preliminary investigations by the Civil Service Commission, except for pending cases. All inconsistent laws or regulations are repealed or rescinded to the extent of any inconsistency with this legislation.

The Rees bill also closes a gap in existing laws by spelling out in affirmative language a prohibition against any person holding or accepting, Government employment or payment for any Government service if he, first, knows, or has been notified in writing of a determination by an appropriate authority, that he is of doubtful loyalty; second, engages in any activity which, under any law or Executive order, reflects adversely on his loyalty; or, third, belongs to or is sympathetically associated with any group, party, organization, or movement in which membership reflects adversely on the loyalty of members to the United States.

Violation of this prohibition will be a criminal offense, under penalty of $10,000 fine or 5 years imprisonment, or both.

Any Government officer or employee who knowingly appoints or pays, or refuses to discharge, any person found disloyal by the Loyalty Review Board or otherwise prohibited by this bill from Government employment or pay will be subject to dismissal from his office or position and a $2,000 fine or 2 years imprisonment, or both.

The bill does not apply to the President or Vice President of the United States or to Presidential appointees by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President may exempt certain specified persons as he deems necessary in the national interest.

The provisions of the bill relating to the Loyalty Review Board will become effective 60 days after not less than 3 members of the Board are in office. The other provisions will be effective upon enactment.

Hon. George A. Dondero, of Michigan, Speaks at Gettysburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Michigan, was honored by being selected to make the annual Memorial Day speech at Gettysburg May 30.

Mr. DONDERO is recognized throughout the Nation as one of the outstanding

authorities on Civil War history and Abraham Lincoln.

I am hereby submitting his magnificent address which he delivered on that day:

MEMORIAL DAY AT GETTYSBURG 1956

(Address of the Honorable GEORGE A. DONDERO, Member of Congress, 18th Michigan District, U. S. Military Cemetery, Gettysburg, Pa., May 30, 1956)

This is Memorial Day. It is a day of memories.

Americans everywhere around the world gather reverently, as we do here at Gettysburg today, to honor the Nation's dead. Their dust remains an inspiration to their countrymen.

Because of their sacrifice, on the Capitol Building at Washington—kissed by the sun of day and watched by the stars at night—waves the unconquered flag of your land and mine.

The struggle for freedom never ends. It was purchased with blood. It must be preserved by devotion. So Memorial Day is a day of honor, a day of remembrance, a day of reckoning, a day of accounting and above all a day of high resolve. We resolve anew today "that these dead shall not have died in vain" and with the help of God, who has never forsaken this favored land, we shall maintain our high resolve through future generations.

If the time should ever come when we no longer remember what brave men and women, living and dead, have done for us, in that day our Republic will no longer deserve preservation.

No one can stand on the battlefield of Gettysburg, on this spot, on this day and in this hour of history without a deep sense of humility. Here was fought one of the greatest and most significant battles of all time. Here were spoken, from a page and a half of ordinary ruled paper, the lines of an address that has never been surpassed on American soil. To me it has always seemed a near miracle that a man with President Lincoln's limited education, whose invitation to come here to make a few appropriate remarks was an afterthought, and whose educational opportunities were so meager, could produce such a gem of English literature as the Gettysburg Address. Many years ago I asked Robert Lincoln, the President's son, the extent of his father's education, and he replied: "Father did not have anything to start with and hardly went to school at all." Lincoln's lines not only gave mankind the essence of the meaning of the struggle then being waged but also serve in this hour and for all ages as a prayer of deliverance for all people.

Abraham Lincoln the man, Gettysburg the place, and the soldier dead were the occasion for the ceremony on November 19, 1863. These combined to create for the free world an eternal light in man's unending struggle for the happiness God intended him to possess. Here at Gettysburg representative government ceased to be an experiment of 4 score and 7 years. The battle and the speech gave it the stature of perpetuity. Today, 4 score and 13 years later, Lincoln's question, "whether this Nation or any nation conceived in liberty can long endure," has again been tested in the crucible of war and answered affirmatively, at least for our day.

The circumstances dedicating this burial ground take on a shining luster and a sublime grandeur from the complete absence in the spirit of Lincoln's address of any note of hostility. It is weighted with the tragedy of the event and the whole war. It broods over the hero dead as though on both sides they had fought for the clarification of a great ideal and perished to realize it.

Great utterances have been delivered in many places down through the centuries. This one had the singular gift of expressing the basic meaning of the United States, in the noblest language, at a moment of deep national bereavement, by an American President forever stamped as typical, and whose entire lifework is summed up in these compactly beautiful sentences of that short oration. Never in the history of literature was so much said, so wisely, in so few words.

We know now that the address was not written on the back of an envelope, nor was it the inspiration of the moment. We know it represented the deepest soul searching of a profound and thoughtful President putting into 3 minutes of the spoken word what he had been thinking about for many years. The longer he lived the greater was his faith in the freedom of man and the stronger his conviction that it must be preserved.

What we have in the Gettysburg Address is deep thinking expressed in simple language. Its infinite compassion, its dedication, and its hope that "this Nation under God shall not perish from the earth" place it with the most sublime literature of the Hebrew prophets.

Whatever part of this Republic might be destroyed in a physical sense, its spiritual foundations, with these words, remain imperishable.

The real headline or top attraction of the Gettysburg dedication 93 years ago was not Abraham Lincoln at all but perhaps the greatest of the great orators of that day. He was a former Member of Congress, former president of Harvard College, former Minister to Great Britain, former Secretary of State, former Governor of Massachusetts, and former United States Senator—the matchless Edward Everett. Yet the purest and most perfect prose was spoken not by the most educated American of his time who had attended temples of learning on two continents but by a most uncommon commoner from Illinois whose hands knew the feel of an ax handle and who hardly went to school at all. Yet the few appropriate remarks he was invited to deliver here stand forever as the symbol of our American philosophy of government.

There is still another circumstance equally challenging that holds us here today in this reverent hour of recollection and memorial.

"The world," said Lincoln with the humility of the lonely and the great, "will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here." Now 93 years after we find the Gettysburg Address as well as "what they did here" as much the living tradition of our country as the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. Indeed I venture to suggest that we have to turn to the Bible and to our books of prayer to find words better remembered, more frequently quoted or vested with such moving spiritual force.

It was because of what was done here and precisely because of what was said here that we gather today to add our homage to the generations that before ours paid their tribute as will the generations that are to come after. Where we now stand is holy ground, a shrine as durable as man's love of freedom and as precious as his willingness to sacrifice life to maintain it.

We are rightly humble before the presence that watches over these sacred acres, and we should take as much as we can of inspiration from these surroundings for the tasks destiny has thrust upon us in an age where again freedom and slavery face each other in a world divided.

It may be that another American will in the decades to come add to the luster Abraham Lincoln gave to the American dream. It may be that another American taking his fire from the eternal light brought forth here will help mankind of a future day march to its hour of victory over the enemies of liberty. Perhaps we had less than 2 short years ago an approach to the Lincoln tenets of faith in the words of President Eisenhower, who stated on July 7, 1954, "I will not be a party to any treaty that makes anybody a slave."

Freedom has its life in the hearts, the actions, and in the spirit of men. This we know as we meet today in commemoration and communion; a weapon touched by the finger of God was forged here by Abraham Lincoln, a weapon of the soul and of the heart that cannot be vanquished by any force so long as man lives.

We have been obliged to forge some dreadful weapons to preserve our heritage. But no weapon we have yet forged is as enduring, no weapon is as strong, no weapon so grips our inmost conscience as that weapon of the mind that Lincoln tossed to men, like a torch, on the field of Gettysburg in 1863.

Foreign Aid and Our Friends Abroad—Address by Hon. Clement J. Zablocki, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege last week to be present at the State convention of the Democratic Party of Wisconsin when my distinguished colleague, the Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, presented a memorable address on United States foreign policy. An audience of some 2,000 gave it undivided attention to a brilliant examination of the strength and weaknesses of our present foreign policy, particularly with reference to our foreign aid programs. This statement by a Member of Congress, whose devotion and diligence has won the deep respect of his fellow members of the Foreign Affairs Committee and of this House generally, deserves an even wider audience. For this reason, I am glad to be able to insert the complete text below:

ADDRESS OF HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, OF WISCONSIN, AT THE WISCONSIN STATE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION, SUPERIOR, WIS., JUNE 16, 1956

I am pleased to have this opportunity of reporting to you on the subject of our foreign policy.

Specifically, I want to address myself to that rather unpopular topic known as foreign aid. Our foreign-assistance programs have been under a particularly serious attack for a number of months, and they will be a campaign issue. It is incumbent upon us, therefore, to acquaint ourselves thoroughly with this subject.

It is a matter of record that never in the history of mankind did any single nation extend as much aid and assistance to others as did the United States during the past decade. The generosity and the far-sightedness of our people find no parallel in history. We have spent billions of dollars to help our friends abroad, even though we had to shoulder the burden of tremendously high taxes to do it.

As of the first of this year, we have spent a total of $53 billion on foreign grants and credits: $26 billion between the end of World War II and the outbreak of the Korean conflict, and $27 billion since the beginning of the Korean war. Of this amount, $42 billion

consisted of outright grants, and $11 billion of loans. As you know, Western Europe was the primary beneficiary of our assistance, receiving about $34 billion in grants and credits. The remaining $19 billion were distributed all over the world.

The figures which I have just mentioned are staggering. It is no wonder, then, that many of our people are questioning the need for any further sacrifice on our part, and calling for an end to all forms of foreign aid. They do this in the belief that we can cut off our assistance to our friends abroad without any adverse effect on our own Nation—and in the hope that the termination of foreign aid will enable us to reduce our tax burden at home.

I personally believe that neither of the two expectations can be fulfilled, and I shall briefly outline the reasons for my convictions.

In the first place, let me say that I shall not attempt to justify our past foreign-aid programs. They are already a matter of history. Their value has been well established. We have spent the $53 billion on projects considered necessary for the reconstruction of the economies of our allies, for the creation of a collective defense against communism, and for the establishment of a sound basis for lasting world peace.

These were not only noble—but at the same time very practical goals. I am certain that if we had not pursued our past policies, many of the free nations would have been unable to withstand Communist advances. Without our aid, the borders of the Communist-dominated territories would not be in Eastern Europe, but would probably reach today to the very shores of the Atlantic Ocean.

What concerns us today, however, is how shall we conduct ourselves with respect to our friends abroad in the years to come. Shall we continue our foreign-aid programs? If so, which programs would be best suited to further our own national interest, and at the same time meet with the wholehearted support of our people?

Let me digress here for a moment to stress the importance of a public acceptance and support of our foreign programs and policies. If we are divided on this subject at home, our action in the international field loses much of its effectiveness. Our assistance becomes as bitter as gall to its recipients when they read that some Americans refer to their countries as "ratholes," to their people as "worthless, backward savages," and to the aid itself as charity extended against the donors' will. I am certain that we would feel the same way if we were in their position.

We can be proud indeed that the American people on the whole have actively supported our foreign-aid programs in the past. The Democrats have established an enviable record for themselves in this regard. As you well know, we have supported the United States foreign policy without indulging in partisan considerations—even though during the last 4 years all-out support became quite a chore.

Just this week, all three of the Democratic Congressmen from Wisconsin again voted in favor of the President's request for an extension of the mutual-security program—while only 1 of the 7 Republican Representatives from our State stood up and backed his President.

The Democrats in Congress have consistently given President Eisenhower more support on issues vital to the welfare of our country, than did the members of his own party. On the Mutual Security Act of 1956, 163—or 76 percent of the Democrats—supported the foreign policy of the United States, while only 112—or 62 percent of the Republicans—backed the bill. Even among the Republicans who voted for the bill, many did so only because they wanted to get through the forthcoming election on President Eisenhower's coattails—but they will be among the first to leave him as soon as the election is over.

For this reason, I do not see much sense in a man running for the President of the United States when he cannot even command the loyalty of his own party members when the chips are down. I think that it would be much healthier if the Republicans were honest with the people, and picked for their candidate a man who professes their own ideals. In that way, the people would know the programs and policies they are voting for, and there would be no need for the Democrats to bail the administration out whenever it gets into trouble. I believe that the legislative record of the 84th Congress would have been a sorry sight indeed if the American people had given the President a Republican Congress that he campaigned for in 1954.

Regardless of whom the Republicans pick for their candidate, however, I am confident that we shall not face this situation in the years to come because the American people, come November, will elect a Democratic president and Democratic majorities in both Houses of Congress.

The first point we ought to bear in mind as we look to the future is that extensive foreign aid, of the kind which we granted in the last decade, is a thing of the past. The staggering job of post-war reconstruction is virtually completed. Foreign aid today has come to represent only a small fraction of our Federal budget—and two-thirds of it is military in nature.

During the last couple of years, we have spent about $4 billion annually on foreign assistance. If we subtract the portion which went to military preparedness, and for defense support, we find that nonmilitary aid to our allies has been running at the rate of about one-fourth billion dollars to one-half billion dollars a year. This is the figure we should bear in mind when we speak of foreign aid today.

Personally, I believe that we ought to classify foreign military assistance together with our own defense expenditures. There are ample reasons for this. Everybody knows very well that today no single nation can stand alone very long, and try to match the Communist military might bolstered by forced conscription and requisitioned resources from the captive nations. Such a course would prove economically unfeasible in the long run.

Our strength against the Communists rests today on the foundations of the collective security arrangements which have been established together with other independent, self-governing nations. A wing of jet bombers stationed in England, in France, in Turkey or in Greece, means as much to our own security against a common menace as if it were based in Wisconsin. Consequently, the $36 billion which we have put aside this year for our own Defense Establishment, and the $2 or $3 billion that Congress may appropriate for the mutual security program, are actually being devoted to the same purpose: the security of the United States and—in a larger sense—of the entire free world.

There is, however, one difference; each dollar that is spent through the mutual security program produces 4 to 10 times as much defense as a dollar actually expended for a like purpose in the United States. In other words, our country would have to spend an additional $12 or more billions a year at home in order to obtain as much security as we are getting for $2 or $3 billion through the mutual security program.

You can see, therefore, that if we discontinue our military cooperation and assistance to our allies, we will have to spend proportionately much more for our own defense budget—and we will either have to increase our taxes to do it, or cut corners on such vital domestic programs as highway construction, hospital building, veterans benefits, social security increases and the like.

Furthermore, by departing from the framework of the collective security arrangements which we have constructed with such great effort, we would have to increase our own Armed Forces and be prepared to send more of our boys overseas when necessary—an eventuality which, I am certain, does not appeal to anyone of us.

In the long run we cannot hope to save by eliminating the mutual security program. On the contrary, such action can prove uneconomical and expensive both in terms of dollars and in terms of national security.

We come, then, to the second portion of our foreign-aid program: the $1¼ to $1½ billion spent annually for technical and economic assistance to the other free nations. This assistance consists of outright grants, of loans, of gifts (or sales below world prices) of our surpluses, and of the expense of sending American technicians and specialists to foreign countries for the purpose of aiding them in raising their standard of living.

The question before us is: Can we eliminate this annual expenditure without any bad effects on our national economy and well-being?

The answer to this question is almost as clear as the answer to the issue of foreign military assistance. Before we come to it, however, let us look at a few facts.

Very few people seem to realize to what extent our American security, prosperity, employment, and standard of living depend on our friendly relations with the rest of the world. Last year, the United States exported almost $20 billion worth of goods and services, exclusive of military aid. This tremendous export trade means jobs for our workers, and profits for our industries.

Can this trade continue unless we remain on good terms with the rest of the free nations and unless they have the income with which to buy our goods? The answer should be self-evident. And we should also remember that increased purchasing power abroad can only come through an increase in the standard of living of those peoples. As a result, whatever we do to aid our friends in their own efforts to improve their standard of living will ultimately increase their ability and willingness to trade with us.

Let us look next at the other side of our foreign trade—our imports. Did you know, for instance, that of the 184 materials needed for the production of automobiles and other motor vehicles, some 50 items are being imported from abroad? Did you know that the production of a simple telephone requires 48 imports? Or that we must have imported metals to produce light bulbs, television and radio tubes?

And you, ladies, did you know that the essential ingredients of various beauty creams and lipsticks must be imported from abroad?

We depend on foreign sources for a great portion of our copper, zinc, lead, tungsten, and other needs. In addition, over 90 percent of our domestic consumption of manganese ore, long-fiber asbestos, nickel, strategic mica, chromite, tin, tantalum, and industrial diamonds comes from abroad.

The list of items which are vital to our high standard of living—and whose production depends on imports from foreign lands—is extremely long. What is perhaps more important is the fact that, with a growing population and with an ever-increasing standard of living, we are going to become even more dependent on foreign sources for strategic materials and other commodities than we are today.

Now it is only commonsense to stay on good terms with the people on whom you depend for something—and that you help them when they require your assistance to produce the goods which you need. These

commonsense principles are observed by every businessman in our country. They apply with even greater force in the realm of our foreign affairs. This fact ought to be clearly understood by every one of us—but unfortunately it is not. It is our job, therefore, to go out and talk sense to the people, to show them in concrete terms how much our foreign programs mean to our own welfare and security—and that, by cutting them off, we will be—so to speak—cutting off our nose to spite our face.

I am afraid that I have taken a little more time than I intended to on this subject. However, the pressures against all forms of international cooperation and assistance have been growing each day. This came about, I believe, in the first place, as a result of the misinformation spread around by some of our public officials and certain newspapers, and, secondly, because too little has been done to stimulate and promote public understanding of these issues.

I am confident that if we bring the facts to the people—and show them what is at stake—the reaction will be entirely different. We Americans are known world over as practical, sensible people. Our countrymen will act without hesitation in our own best interest—but it is our job to help push aside the cobwebs of misunderstanding, of prejudice, of emotionalism, and of partisanship, which at times obscure the exact nature and location of our national self-interest.

Before concluding, I want to say a few words about the foreign policy of the present administration.

In general, the Eisenhower administration has tried to follow the policies and programs initiated under the previous Democratic administrations—but its efforts have been feeble and often confused. The only truly new proposal that the present administration can claim is the "open sky" plan of disarmament inspection—which, by the way, was reportedly introduced against the advice of some of the President's counselors, and even today does not have the wholehearted support of some people in the Pentagon.

Even though President Eisenhower has tried to follow the collective security and economic aid programs established before he took office, the foreign policy of the United States has suffered tremendously under his leadership. This happened because the present administration has failed to follow a consistent, straightforward course in world affairs. There have been so many contradictory, confusing, and completely unintelligible statements made on this subject by the President and his assistant, that today nobody seems to know where we stand, and where we are going.

Let me illustrate this inconsistency and bungling of the administration for you with a few examples:

In 1952, the Republicans condemned President Truman's action in assigning the 7th Fleet to guard Formosa, by claiming that the former administration was holding Chiang Kai-shek back from invading and recapturing the China mainland. In following up on these statements, the President, in his first state of the Union message, made a great ado about "unleashing" Chiang Kai-shek and his army of the Chinese Nationalists. I would venture to say that, following that announcement, the whole world—and particularly Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek—expected to see the Nationalists, with our help, driving the Communists from the China mainland.

But what really happened? After this initial grand gesture, the President not only told Chiang Kai-shek to sit tight on Formosa, but even went a step further and insisted on the turning over to the Communists of some of the off-shore islands. This completely confused everyone concerned. The people, particularly in Southeast Asia and the Far East, no longer knew where we stood, or what the United States would do next.

There are many similar examples. The Democrats were criticized, for instance, for the containment policy which was intended to stop any further Communist expansion. This was not good enough for the Republicans. The Communists had to be driven back, and the captive countries liberated. Many persons took the Republican spokesmen at their word.

But the grand pledges, as it turned out, were directed only with an eye on the political ballot box at home—not at the realities of the world situation. No sooner did the administration take office, than the hedges and contradictions began. Instead of containment, we saw retreat and compromise in Korea, and in the China Sea, and in Indochina. Communist domination and influence began to spread. And thousands of refugees and escapees who crossed the Iron Curtain at the risk of their very lives—believing that the United States and the free world were waiting for them with open arms—soon discovered to their great disillusionment that prolonged, aimless existence in a displaced persons' camp was not too much better than the suffering to which they were accustomed under Communist rule.

These things are a matter of record. And so are the confused efforts of the present administration, on the one hand to arm the free world against the Communist threat, and, on the other hand, to enter into the "friendly spirit of coexistence," engendered at the Geneva conference.

To mention another contradiction—just last week the President, in his press conference, took time out to tell the American people that neutrality is a sound position for the nations—particularly in the Middle East and Asia—which have but recently won their independence. The President argued on behalf of neutrality for those countries, pointing out that the United States followed a neutral path during the first 100 years of our national existence. He added that the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, would have something more to say on this subject.

Mr. Dulles did have something to say—but what he said contradicted the position taken by his Commander in Chief. Speaking at Ames, Iowa, only 3 days after the President's press conference, the Secretary of State insisted that, and I quote him, "except under very exceptional circumstances," neutrality is "an immoral and shortsighted conception."

How could any two statements be more contradictory? How can the American people know what the administration's policies are when our President says one thing, and the members of his Cabinet something entirely different? How can the free peoples of the world—whose friendship and cooperation are important to us—know where we stand, and what the United States is going to do, when our foreign policy is as full of contradictions and uncertainties as it has been during the last 4 years? How can we attempt to lead them when, from all appearances, our own Government does not know where it is going?

These considerations are not trivial, because they cut to the very core of our security, and of our future. Is it any wonder that the NATO military structure is crumbling, and that the SEATO alliance is dragging its feet? If the spirit of Geneva—that precocious offspring of the Eisenhower foreign policy—has really opened a new era in East-West relations, why should the nations of the free world devote their meager resources to expensive armaments, when they can use that wealth to improve the standard of living of their peoples? If the United States is content to trade with the Communists, and if the world outlook is really as rosy as our administration would have us believe that it is, then why is Mr. Dulles asking our friends abroad to sacrifice and to build stronger defense? And why, in view of these things, should they listen to him?

I fully realize the dangers inherent in any attempt to make specific recommendations on the subject of our foreign policy because, even as members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, my colleagues and I receive very little information about the true state of world affairs from the White House. The recommendations which I venture to make are based on my personal observations during several study missions, and on the information gleaned during my 8 years of service with the Foreign Affairs Committee. I hope that they may merit your consideration.

In the first place, I would suggest that we face facts squarely and put the cost of our collective security where it belongs, together with our overall defense and preparedness expenditures. As long as our long-range security planning relies to a large extent on the combined resources of our allies, we ought to stop deceiving ourselves by passing off the cost of military international cooperation as a charitable donation for the benefit of some foreign country.

Secondly, I would suggest that, as far as nonmilitary assistance is concerned, we make it perfectly clear that we shall cooperate with the free nations as a matter of policy—rather than on emergency basis—to an extent consistent with our capabilities and our national interest. The Foreign Affairs Committee included a declaration to this effect in the 1956 mutual security bill, and the House approved it. I believe that it should become the cornerstone of our foreign policy, consistent with our present role in world affairs.

Thirdly, in extending nonmilitary assistance, we should return to the spirit of the original point 4 program, outlined under the Truman administration. In this respect, we ought to aid the underdeveloped nations—within the limits of our capabilities—in their own plans and efforts to develop their resources in a manner consistent with their own cultural and economic frameworks. We should stop trying to rebuild the world in our image, which tendency has become all too apparent in the last few years under the impact of the grand visions of some of our overzealous planners.

Fourthly, we must not condition our cooperation with other countries on their unqualified acceptance of permanent dependence on the United States—both in terms of military and of economic ties. We should not try to make independent countries into satellites of the United States. They will grow much faster, and will become truer friends, if we help them to achieve real independence—rather than if we try to buy them thereby turning them into our mercenaries.

Finally, elaborating on the above point, I would suggest that we face the facts of life in the relationships which must exist between truly independent nations: that we do not become outraged whenever anyone dares to criticize us, or threaten to sever our ties with any nation which chooses to make an independent decision without receiving prior approval from Washington. As any parent knows, family ties become much stronger, and much more meaningful, when proper respect is shown for any grownup member's right to his or her own opinion. We should adopt more of this kind of thinking in the area of our foreign relations. We should deal with our sister nations—whether they be small or large—on an adult basis. We must recognize their equality and their right to their own opinion.

We are a Nation of free men and women, and we prize our liberty and our independence. Let us allow others to enjoy their blessings, without begrudging them the exercise of their sovereignty. It is only in this manner, if we follow the advice of the founding fathers of our own country, that we hope to remain friends with the free peoples of the world and work together for lasting and just peace in the world.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father in changing, troubled days, we pray for conceptions big enough and spirits strong enough to match the epic time in which we live and serve—in this age on ages telling. With our minds startled by the swift march of world-shaking events, we bow at this wayside altar of prayer. Hidden fires are flaming forth consuming the old habitations of men. We hear voices that challenge all that has been counted fixed and final and sure. Nations and men in chains are stirring with hopes that savage repression cannot kill. For social systems which have sentenced the masses to grinding poverty, for industrial theories which hold human life more cheap than merchandise, may the ax be at the root of the rotted tree—as in all the turmoil of our times Thou are sifting out the souls of men beneath Thy judgment seat. Make us eager partners of Thy eternal purpose for all Thy children when under every sky men shall stand side by side in equal worth and unfettered freedom, all toiling and all reaping, with gratitude to Thee, the source of their blessings and the Father of all mankind. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 19, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, June 20, 1956, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 872) for the relief of Sam Bergesen.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Annual Report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 20, 1956.*

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems submitted to me through its chairman, covering its operations from July 1 to December 31, 1955, and describing, in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 20, 1956.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, should the Senate be in session on June 26, 27, 28, and 29, I ask unanimous consent to be absent in order to attend the Republican State convention in my home State of Indiana, where I am a candidate for renomination to the United States Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, the Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Committee on Armed Services, and the Business and Commerce Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection with the transaction of the routine morning business be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE NORTHERN SYNOD, EVANGELICAL AND REFORMED CHURCH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Northern Synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church recently adopted two resolutions at the annual synod meeting. The first urges the elimination of discriminatory provisions in our immigration and naturalization laws, and the second urges the expansion of our technical assistance programs, particularly through the United Nations.

I support both of these objectives wholeheartedly and ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolutions be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTHERN SYNOD,
EVANGELICAL AND REFORMED CHURCH,
June 14, 1956.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Congressional Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: At our annual synod meeting held April 24–26 our committee for Christian social action presented the following resolutions which were unanimously adopted:

"A. That the synod affirm the obligation which rests upon the United States to eliminate from its immigration and naturalization laws all provisions which discriminate against persons on the basis of race; to provide for a more equitable quota basis and a more flexible use of quotas so that more worthy persons may enter this country from lands whose quotas are presently exhausted; and to provide for a system of fair hearings and appeals covering unjust deportation orders or refusa' of visas.

"B. That the synod urge the International Cooperation Administration, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, and the Members of Congress representing its constituency to support and expand our support of technical assistance, particularly through the channels of the United Nations, and to allot adequate sums to give such programs effectiveness and stability."

We are sure that you are in agreement with the objectives of these two resolutions and request that you do what you can to secure favorable action on them.

Sincerely yours,

H. REIFSCHNEIDER,
President.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. R. 6029. A bill for the relief of Robert D. Grier (individually, and as executor of the estate of Katie C. Grier) and Jane Grier Hawthorne (Rept. No. 2277).

By Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. Res. 285. Resolution arranging for exhaustive studies to be made regarding foreign assistance by the United States Government (Rept. No. 2278).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 4086. A bill to determine the rights and interests of the Navajo Tribe, Hopi Tribe, and individual Indians to the area set aside by the Executive order of December 6, 1882, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 4087. A bill for the relief of Verdi Adam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 4088. A bill to provide additional visas for certain aliens of Greek ethnic origin residing in Greece; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 4089. A bill to amend Public Law 298, 84th Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 4090. A bill for the relief of Kalman Novak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL (by request):

S. 4091. A bill for the relief of Kyonghi Hong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 4092. A bill to provide for the appointment of an Assistant Secretary of State for International Cultural Relations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 4093. A bill for the relief of Sally Ann Probert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 4094. A bill amending the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, relative to reductions in certain Federal income and excess profits taxes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

PRINTING OF REVISION OF HOUSE DOCUMENT 210, ENTITLED "HOW OUR LAWS ARE MADE"

Mr. KENNEDY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 293), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the revision of the document entitled "How Our Laws Are Made" (H. Doc. No. 210, 83d Cong.), by Charles J. Zinn, law revision counsel of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, be printed as a Senate document, and that 15,000 additional copies of such document be printed for the use of the Members of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL VISAS FOR CERTAIN ALIENS OF GREEK ETHNIC ORIGIN

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am sure that every Member of the Senate numbers among his friends, as I do, hundreds of Greek-Americans who are such fine citizens of our Nation.

I am certain, also, that every Member of the Senate has watched with interest and admiration the fine work of the Order of AHEPA and the AHEPA Refugee Relief Committee.

In the State of Indiana, as in all other States, AHEPA continues its work with great vigor, but feels the need of some assistance from the Congress in furthering its valiant efforts.

I have been working with these fine folk to formulate legislation which would be helpful to their program. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which these fine people assure me will accomplish their worthy purpose.

The bill proposes to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 by providing that from any special nonquota immigrant visas allotted to aliens under section 4 (a) of such act which remain unissued on January 1, 1957, there shall be made available for issuance to aliens of Greek ethnic origin residing in Greece—whether or not refugees within the meaning of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953—the following: First, not more than 4,000 shall be available to aliens residing in Greece who served in the military forces of such country during World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict; second, not more than 2,000 shall be available to aliens residing in Greece who are the parents, brothers, sisters, sons, or daughters of citizens of the United States; and third, not more than 500 shall be available to eligible orphans residing in Greece who are under 14 years of age.

The visas authorized to be issued under the provisions of the bill may be issued until December 31, 1957.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4088) to provide additional visas for certain aliens of Greek ethnic origin residing in Greece, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENT OF AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, and ask that it be appropriately referred. The bill has been prepared in an effort to put into effect the recommendations of Dr. J. L. Morrill, the distinguished president of the University of Minnesota, who was employed by the Department of State to review the exchange programs. I introduce the bill to call it to the attention of the Senate. I do not expect to press for its present enactment; but I hope Senators will give it their attention and in that way perhaps an appropriate bill may be developed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4092) to provide for the appointment of an Assistant Secretary of State for International Cultural Relations, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT, RELATING TO EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY—AMENDMENT

Mr. CAPEHART submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 11) to amend the Robinson-Patman Act with reference to equality of opportunity, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CHAVEZ submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill H. R. 10986 making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely:

On page 47, after line 16, insert:

"SEC. 634. During the fiscal year 1957 there is hereby authorized to be transferred to the Air Force Industrial Fund not to exceed $40 million from the Navy Industrial Fund and not to exceed $110 million from the Army Industrial Fund."

On page 47, after line 16, insert:

"SEC. 635. Appropriations available to the Department of Defense for major procurement of aircraft and missiles shall be available for expenses of development."

Mr. CHAVEZ also submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 10986, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

COMPULSORY INSPECTION OF POULTRY AND POULTRY PRODUCTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] may be added as an additional cosponsor to the bill (S. 3588) to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products, introduced by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], for himself and other Senators, on April 11, 1956.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Address entitled "Our Heritage of Freedom," delivered by him at the baccalaureate service, Montana State University, Missoula, Mont., on June 3, 1956.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Address delivered by Senator PURTELL placing in nomination Senator BUSH, and excerpts from keynote address by Leonard W. Hall, at the Connecticut Republican State Convention on June 19, 1956.

THE PREFERENCE CLAUSE IN FEDERAL POWER LEGISLATION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Watertown Times, of Watertown, N. Y., has published a series of three excellent articles written by its Washington corre-

spondent, Alan Emory, on the history of the preference clause in Federal power legislation and its importance to the Niagara power bill now pending before the House Committee on Public Works.

I ask unanimous consent that these three articles be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times of June 7, 1956]

PREFERENCE CLAUSE LONG AT CENTER OF DISPUTE ON POWER—PROVIDES PRIORITY IN SALE OF POWER TO PUBLICLY OWNED NONPROFIT GROUPS

(Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN'S Niagara power bill was fought in the Senate almost entirely on the issue of the preference clause. The history of that provision, what it means, what it does, the arguments for and against it and its particular position in the Niagara power battle are discussed in a series of three articles starting today.)

(By Alan S. Emory)

I

WASHINGTON, June 7.—The most controversial word in the whole public-private power dispute is "preference."

The preference clause was at the heart of the Senate debate on Niagara power. That single provision of Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN'S bill to let the State of New York build a huge hydroelectric plant at Niagara Falls aroused the heated opposition of the other State Senator, IRVING M. IVES.

Senator LEHMAN is a Democrat, Senator IVES a Republican, yet it was under a Republican, President Theodore Roosevelt, that the preference clause got its first real impetus.

It has been reinforced at least 13 times in congressional statutes since then.

Senator LEHMAN'S bill specifies that the New York State Power Authority, in selling Niagara energy, shall give equal preference to counties and municipalities, including their agencies or instrumentalities, New York agencies and departments, rural electric cooperatives not organized for profit and Federal defense units.

Proponents of the preference clause argue that the first crack at buying power from publicly developed projects should go to publicly owned nonprofit organizations, like local governments. Opponents argue that such arrangements constitute discrimination against customers of private utility companies who are more numerous.

According to a Library of Congress study this year by Wallace R. Vawter and Barbara Jibrin, prepared at the request of Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, Oregon, "there has been a continuous and consistent provision by the Congress that public agencies should have preference in the purchase of surplus power from Federal projects."

The latest expression of this policy, now 50-plus years old, came in the 1954 atomic energy law, when Congress directed that the byproduct heat and energy from atomic installations should be sold under preference provisions.

"Here, even with incidental power and in a wholly new field of energy development, the Congress has insisted on a preference clause," the study reported.

Public ownership and operation of waterpower sites along rivers existed long before the United States was established and can be traced to New Hampshire in the 1630's. There was a public preference in the disposition of surplus reclamation water back in 1877.

Twenty-six years later, President Theodore Roosevelt vetoed the Muscle Shoals, Ala., dam bill and in his message called for a survey aimed at a new power policy to "best conserve the public interest."

On April 16, 1906, the policy took form in the Reclamation Act, which authorized the Federal Government to lease surplus power with preference to municipal customers. This, the Library of Congress report said, gave evidence of "intention that the power benefits should be widespread, rather than monopolized by a private corporation."

Following this act Presidents Roosevelt and William Howard Taft vetoed a succession of bills authorizing private companies to build hydroprojects on the Tennessee, Rainey, James, White, and Coosa Rivers.

Since then the preference clause has had a long legislative history, but Congress has generally followed the principle of selling power at the generating site, or bus bar, to the first customer to show up.

A sustained attack on the preference clause coincided with the entry into office of the Eisenhower administration. Public power advocates decried the administration's "partnership" policy, which, they claimed, led to the denial of proper public benefits from natural resources projects. The main target of their attack, Douglas McKay, has resigned the Interior Secretariat and is now a candidate for the Senate from Oregon.

Between 1906 and 1956 the preference clause had this history:

The Raker Act, 1913, granted the city of San Francisco authority to use national park land in the Sierra Nevada to store water and develop power, but the water and energy could be sold only to a municipality, municipal water district, or irrigation district. The courts upheld this law.

The Federal Power Act, 1920, set up the Federal Power Commission, classed power as a natural resource owned by the public, and ordered the FPC to give preference to State and municipal applications for hydro licenses on navigable waters.

The Boulder Canyon project law of 1928 repeated this theory.

The Tennessee Valley Authority law of 1933 said surplus power should be distributed with preference to "States, counties, municipalities, and cooperative organizations of citizens or farmers not organized or doing business for profit * * *."

The Rural Electrification Act of 1936 included the preference principle in regard to loans.

The Bonneville Power Act, 1937, required the agency running the project to give public bodies and cooperatives first chance to buy project energy and stated Congress' policy that public bodies should always get such preference. Here Congress added a provision for withdrawing power committed to private companies by contract if the preference customers should eventually develop greater needs. Senator LEHMAN'S Niagara bill has this provision in it.

The Fort Peck Act, 1938, duplicated the Bonneville provisions.

The Flood Control Acts of 1938, 1944, and 1945 insisted that preference in the sale of public-project power go to public bodies and cooperatives.

An amendment to the reclamation law, 1939, authorized power contracts for periods of up to 40 years at rates approved by the Interior Department, but preference for public agencies was repeated.

The Water Conservation and Utilization Act, 1940, repeated the preference clause.

The atomic-energy law, 1954, specified that the Atomic Energy Commission "shall give preference and priority to public bodies and cooperatives or to privately owned utilities providing electric utility services to higher-cost areas not being served by public bodies or cooperatives." License applications from public or cooperative bodies "shall be given preferred consideration," the law said.

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times of June 8, 1956]

PREFERENCE CLAUSE SOFT-PEDALED, MORE OR LESS, UNDER IKE—SEATON MAY LOOK MORE KINDLY UPON ITS ENFORCEMENT THAN DID MCKAY

(This is the second of three articles on the preference clause.)

(By Alan S. Emory)

II

WASHINGTON, June 8.—The controversial preference clause has been more or less soft-pedaled over the years the Eisenhower administration has been in power.

Former Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay was of the opinion that it ought to be revised. His successor, Fred A. Seaton, comes from Nebraska, a public power State, and may look more kindly on its enforcement.

Yet, as far back as August 18, 1953, the Interior Department made a policy statement that all Federal natural resource facilities would be operated for the benefit of the general public and particularly of domestic and rural consumers and the Department will give preference and priority to public bodies and cooperatives.

The difference with preceding Democratic administrations was the declaration that the Department would not try to dispose of publicly developed power directly to consumers except under existing contracts.

In 1954 the Southwest Power Administration said that after preference customers used the power allocated under present contracts, plus a small upward revision, they would have to find other sources for additional power needs.

The Interior Department set up marketing criteria making the sale of power from Federal projects a local responsibility.

One big fight centered on a contract with the Georgia Power Co. for the sale of power from the Clark Hill Dam in South Carolina.

The company was to transmit and sell the power to preference customers, taking for itself only a transmission, or wheeling fee. Public-power advocates objected to a plan under which the company could contract for the entire project output at the bus bar and the elimination of direct negotiations between preference customers.

After a congressional investigation of Interior Department policies began under Representative EARL CHUDOFF, Democrat, Pennsylvania, there came to light a memorandum by Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., on the Clark Hill contract. Mr. Brownell said that if preference customers wanted a more direct sale than the agreement provided they were entitled to it and should be allowed a reasonable time to provide the means for taking and delivering the power to their clients.

Aside from wheeling, the private companies may serve preference customers through displacement or substitution. Under this plan, the company finds it more economical to use all the project power itself and serves the preference customer through steam plants located closer to the customer.

Close to 85 percent of all the electric power produced in the country now flows from private plants. However, preference customers have been purchasing an increasing proportion of power generated by Federal projects.

The Library of Congress study prepared this year for Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, Oregon, on the preference clause shows that preference customers were now buying 54 percent of the output. Back in fiscal 1951 they purchased only 35 percent from the Interior Department.

The study showed that the Bureau of Reclamation was selling 64 percent of its power to preference customers, compared with 52 percent 2 years ago, whereas private companies and industry were getting 26 percent, compared with 43 percent 2 years ago.

But the Bonneville Power Administration is selling 29 percent to preference customers, compared with 31 percent 2 years ago, while private companies and industry have upped their take from 63 to 65 percent. In the TVA area the preference customer allotment has dipped from 46 percent to 32, the industrial allotment from 22 percent to 14.

Opponents of the preference clause fear it is an opening wedge to nationalization of the power industry, but their rivals profess an equal objection to nationalization.

Private power forces argue that the preference clause is socialistic. Public-power forces reply that it simply insures to the people the benefits of what already belongs to them.

One reason the two are at such odds over the preference clause is that preference customers normally do not own transmission lines and must, therefore, rely on private companies to deliver their power. Without the preference clause, they say, they would have no guaranty of obtaining the electricity at reasonable rates.

The Lehman bill would probably not have included the preference clause if the Federal Power Commission had ever put such a provision into one of its licenses. But the FPC never has, and is, for the near future, anyway, unlikely to.

There is no preference in the marketing of St. Lawrence River energy.

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times of June 9, 1956]

PREFERENCE CLAUSE IS SEEN HOLDING UP NIAGARA POWER BILL—WOULD HAVE LITTLE DIFFICULTY PASSING WITHOUT IT, IS BELIEF

(This is the last of three articles on the preference clause.)

(By Alan S. Emory)

III

WASHINGTON, June 9.—Without the preference clause, most Washington observers agree, Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN'S Niagara power bill would have little difficulty winning congressional approval.

But the bill does have that bitterly contested provision, and the Senator won a signal victory when it was included in the measure as it passed the Senate, 48–39. No effort was made to knock it out, even by opponents of preference.

The New York State Power Authority Act states only that rural and domestic consumers of electricity in the State should get first call on State-produced power. If 95 percent of these consumers were represented by private companies, then those companies would get a priority on buying 95 percent of State-produced power.

As a matter of fact, private companies serve about 95 percent of the State's electricity consumers. But they still object to a power purchase priority's being given to public agencies and rural cooperatives, even though combined they could only consume a maximum of 10 percent of Niagara or St. Lawrence power now.

The preference features of the Lehman bill, which give the priority to municipalities and rural co-ops, amount to a clarification of New York law and are not necessarily in conflict with it.

Chairman Robert Moses of the New York State Power Authority admits that an argument of such a conflict is a possibility, but he does not support the validity of that argument.

He says the Lehman bill's preference clause "can be retained."

Mr. Moses would like to see the Lehman bill preference changed—he says the change would make it more workable—by adding language "making it entirely clear that the preference customers to whom power must be sold are those within the area of reasonable economic benefit. This will avoid any requirement to carry power to distant areas at uneconomical transmission costs and through areas closer to the source of power."

The purpose of the declaration seems to be to shut New York City out of the field of preference customers.

But at no point does Mr. Moses object to the heart of the Lehman preference clause, which is the same one carried down through the years in congressional legislation on public-powers projects.

One of the severest attacks on the preference clause was launched by the Hoover Commission and its task force on water resources. The attack drew from dissenting Commissioner Chet Holifield this comment:

"It is curious how insistent the Commission is on following the private utility line in the face of congressional policies which have decreed in no less than 14 basic statutes since 1906 by the Commission's own count, that public agencies should have preference in purchasing power from Federal agencies."

The preference expressed in the 1954 Atomic Energy Act, he said, "does not set up a preference class of consumers of electricity with resulting discrimination against other consumers who must buy their electricity from private utilities which make profits and pay taxes."

Nothing in either Federal or State law clearly bars the preference clause from a New York power license. Under Thomas E. Dewey the State administration's policy was dead against preference in the traditional congressional sense.

Yet, while he was Governor, the State power authority told the FPC it could accept in its St. Lawrence license—and, therefore, presumably in a Niagara license—any conditions the FPC laid down. Mr. Dewey advanced this idea in 1951 himself.

Now that Averell Harriman is the State's chief executive, State administration policy finds no conflict between the Federal and State ideas on preference. Mr. Harriman is four-square behind the Lehman Niagara bill.

Proponents of the preference clause claim it will provide a "yardstick" for measuring all electric rates, with a resulting drop of high power costs to consumers served by competing private companies.

In 17 out of 23 areas where municipal utility systems' rates can be measured against neighboring private-company service in New York State, according to the 1954 FPC report, the public power rates were lower, based on charges for 100 kilowatt-hours.

IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the Senate for about 4 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Arizona was going to make a similar request. The Senator from Arizona will gladly listen to the remarks of the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for approximately 4 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have taken note of the fact that the Senate Judiciary Committee has reported H. R. 6888, a bill to provide for the admission, above quota, of a number of sheepherders and to eliminate the quota mortgaging resulting from previous special bills for the admission of sheepherders into the United States.

Mr. President, I think that my views on immigration legislation and policy are fairly well known. My opposition to our present immigration laws and policies is deep and unremitting. I shall not cease to fight, with all the efforts of which I am capable, until the McCarran-Walter Act is converted into a just and humane law, giving opportunity, under fair but strict overall quota limits, to all people, regardless of national origin, race, or creed, to be admitted into the United States on their individual merits, qualifications, and need—and the need of the United States.

It strikes me as surpassingly strange that every 2 years we are confronted with a proposition to admit more sheepherders above quota limits, but we never get an opportunity to vote on basic legislation to revise our quota system so that these special sheepherder bills will not be necessary.

In past years, Mr. President, I have voted for these special sheepherder bills because I have felt that it was good for the United States to have these additional and undeniably useful workers come in, even though this permission was granted to only one group, for the benefit of only one industry. But the time has come, Mr. President, for the Congress to face the issue frankly and to admit that the McCarran-Walter Act is a cruel, unreasonable, and repressive law, and that action must be taken to change it substantially. I do not expect to continue to vote for special bills for sheepherders, while capmakers, watchmakers, carpenters, doctors, scientists, and metal workers—to name at random just a few types of workers—continue to be barred from the United States by the operation of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Some of the very sponsors of these sheepherder bills are the most vociferous in defending the national origins quota system. Let them admit that these special sheepherder bills violate the so-called principle of the national origins quota system. Let them admit that the national origins quota system is a shame and a scandal upon the fair name of the United States.

The other day the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], former chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee, who was himself a strong supporter of the last sheepherders bill the Senate passed, declared that this sheepherders bill could not be accepted as constituting an immigration program for 1956. If any immigration legislation is to be passed, it should be substantial immigration legislation which will grant relief to the sheep-raising industry, to other industries, and to mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, uncles, and friends of aliens who want to come to the United States but who are now barred because of the quota system and the other restrictions in the McCarran-Walter Act.

Let me call attention again to S. 1206, the bill which I and 12 other Senators have introduced in this Congress, which would revise our immigration and citizenship laws in a constructive and positive manner, and remove those discriminatory features which plague us today.

There are also pending before the Senate four bills introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], representing the recommendations of the administration. I do not think that these bills go far enough. I am glad, however, to recognize them as constituting, for the most part, steps in the right direction.

The President of the United States has recommended the enactment of substantial immigration legislation at this session. The majority leader of the Senate has urged that substantial immigration legislation be enacted at this session. There is no partisanship involved. No party stands to win selfish credit from the enactment of immigration legislation, but both parties will deservedly be blamed if no substantial immigration legislation is enacted at this session of Congress. And what is much more important, America will be the loser.

Suitable immigration legislation should be, and must be, enacted by this Congress. I hope that the Senate Judiciary Committee will yet consider and report my bill, S. 1206. If the committee does not see fit to recommend S. 1206, I hope it will recommend substantial portions of it. I would even be glad to see the committee recommend the administration's four bills, although those bills do not go far enough, as I have said, and in some particulars at least, represent a backward movement. I shall be glad to take my chances of seeking amendment to those bills on the floor.

I hope that the Judiciary Committee will shortly move to show as much consideration for human beings as it has shown for sheep.

CURRENT EVENTS IN THE FIELD OF PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE POWER

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed at this time for not to exceed 4 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Arizona is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I called the attention of my colleagues to some very interesting current events in the field of public versus private power. I say these events were very interesting because they were of considerable significance to me, and I assume them to be of equal interest to the Members of this body, particularly to those who have been carrying the torch for public power in all of its ramifications.

I took the occasion to recite the results of 2 recent elections, 1 in the State of Oregon and 1 in the State of Washington, in which people at the grassroots, after having experienced public power, voted overwhelmingly to solve their public power problems—and I assure you they were serious problems—by selling their public power systems to private enterprise.

The election in the State of Oregon which I mentioned was the vote of members of the Sandy Electric Cooperative, with headquarters at Sandy, Oreg., to sell their system to the Portland General Electric Co. The vote by the members was 571 to 99 in favor of the sale. The Sandy Electric Cooperative had been operating at a loss, and had reached the end of its rope. Its rates had been about one-third higher than the rates of the Portland General Electric Co., which serves similar customers in neighboring areas. By this time the Sandy Electric Cooperatives customers are enjoying what is believed to be better service, at a saving of some 33⅓ percent, at the hands of that much-maligned monster, private power. At least, the people most directly affected are not afraid of that big, bad wolf.

The second instance was a similar election held recently in Stevens County, Wash. The people who were the patrons of the Stevens County Public Utility District voted 5,008 to 2,019 to sell the district's facilities to the Washington Water Power Co., another big, bad wolf of public power fiction.

Again, in this instance, the people had experienced not only a taste but a bellyful. They were not voting on an ideological abstraction. They had lived through years of public power, had been on the receiving end, and were in a position to know from experience its merits and demerits. If public power, as has so often been claimed, is the bonanza from whence all blessings flow, the fact had escaped their attention.

Now the people of Stevens County, Wash., too, are benefiting from lower electric rates and from tax dollars generated simultaneously from a privately owned electric company.

After describing these current events, I proceeded to document a comparison of electric rates for farm service, as received by another private electric utility company, the Idaho Power Co., with those of all REA systems operating in the State of Idaho; also a similar comparison of Idaho Power Co. farm service rates with those of REA-financed systems in the State of Tennessee.

Suffice it to say at this point that the four REA distributors in Idaho which purchase power from Bonneville Power Administration received for the year 1953 an average price per kilowatt-hour 32.7 percent higher than the average price per kilowatt-hour for electric service supplied to farm customers by Idaho Power Co. for the same year. The five REA distributors in Idaho which purchase their power requirements from privately owned, taxpaying electric companies and from the United States Bureau of Reclamation received an average price per kilowatt-hour, for the year 1953, which is 54.4 percent higher than the average price for farm electric service received by Idaho Power Co.

These disparities occurred in spite of the fact that the private electric company, Idaho Power, paid 33.32 percent of its gross revenues for taxes of all kinds in 1953.

Having spread these facts upon the RECORD, I was interested in the reaction a few days later by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. On May 18, 1956, he arose to decry those facts, not to dispute them. He used his privilege in an attempt to divert attention from the facts, with a plea to "look behind the statistics."

That is an intriguing exercise, Mr. President, if, in fact, it can be done. Being of a curious turn of mind, I am perfectly willing—in fact, I invite the Senator—not only to look behind the facts, but also to look under them and look around them, and even through them; but he cannot overlook them.

The further intriguing thing to me about the Senator's dissertation is that he had not a single, blessed thing to say about the current events in the public-power field described above. Perhaps he followed his own advice in the other instance, and, having taken a look behind the statistics of the two free elections among people who have experienced a full dosage of public power, decided there was no merit in further talk about them.

I submit to the Senator from Oregon that the votes by American citizens, those in Oregon being among his own constituents, are a far more potent commentary upon the subject at hand than anything he or I may say.

In the process of looking behind the statistics, the Senator from Oregon tries to gloss over the facts, by describing my data as "selective and partial." He said:

> That the co-ops selected for comparison serve some of the most rugged and sparsely populated sections of the West, where construction costs are high and operating conditions difficult, when compared with Idaho Power's more compact service area.

I can assure the Senator from Oregon there was nothing selective or partial about the data. The comparisons included all REA units in the entire State of Idaho, broadly scattered throughout the State, with varying degrees of operating conditions, and not unlike the farm areas served by the private company which has a record of farm electrification which embraces a near 100 percent saturation, and not only including irrigated farms, but extending throughout vast expanses of upland ranch areas, up the gullies, and along the creeks.

He says the co-ops came into existence in the first place because the private company did not want to add these areas to its system, out of belief they would be unprofitable. A sweeping generalization such as that might mislead the uninformed, but is ludicrous to the extreme to those who have even only a slight acquaintance with Idaho geography. Some of the REAs which the Senator from Oregon suggests should, in all conscience, have been rendered unnecessary by Idaho Power Co. service to their areas years ago are 400 miles away from the company's service area.

Let me make it clear that nothing I say or have said is intended to disparage the value of electric service, from whatever source, to an isolated area. Many, many REAs across the Nation, as well as in Idaho, are serving a splendid purpose. Without them, many of our people would not have the modern advantages of electric aids to living and to agriculture. Perhaps the REA rates are justifiably higher than those of private companies, and their service still a bargain to the people.

My objection is to the all-too-common practice of clothing public power, whatever its situation, with all righteousness,

and the accompanying failure to give credit for accomplishment to private enterprise when that credit is due.

Getting back to the voice of the people in these matters of public versus private power, the junior Senator from Oregon should be reminded that his disclaimers will not stand up against the experience and the votes of the people themselves in several areas, some in his own State of Oregon, where the Idaho Power Co. renders electric service. If this company's record of service and rates require a look behind the statistics, why have the members of four REAs in that area taken the same course of action recently followed by the people of Stevens County, Wash., and of the Sandy, Oreg., rural community?

The citizens of Jordon Valley, Oreg., whom the junior Senator from Oregon represents, pioneered the path some years back, when they voted overwhelmingly to sell their REA system lock, stock, and barrel, to the Idaho Power Co., after an unsatisfactory public-power experience. Since that vote, they have enjoyed better service, lower rates, and wider extension of farm service.

The REA at Juntura, Oreg., also in a part of the Senator's bailiwick, made a like decision. Later, the REA unit headquartered at Vale, Oreg., where there are real, live voters in the Senator's jurisdiction, followed suit, after several years of operation. In Long Valley, Idaho, REA members reached a similar decision for the same reasons.

Is not this the voice of the people?—not people who deal in theories but people who have had the experience of unfulfilled expectations which abound in the myth of public power being always beneficent, always a cure-all, always doing public good and, incidentally, in opposition to the terrible ogre of private enterprise.

EVELYN COLE, MONTANA'S CONTEMPORARY WESTERN ARTIST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, recently I was presented by one of our Senate pages—Jack Upshaw, of Chinook, Mont.—with an original oil painting.

The artist responsible for the fine piece of art work is Miss Evelyn Cole, also of Chinook. In my estimation, Miss Cole is one of the outstanding contemporary western artists, and a worthy successor to Charles M. Russell, the greatest American frontier artist.

The creative brushes of the Russells, Remingtons, and the Coles have preserved for us on canvas a vanishing era—the era of the settler, the cowboy, and the Indian on the western frontier.

The painting is a landscape scene of north-central Montana, near the Bearpaw Mountains, set within an outline of the Treasure State. The foreground of the painting depicts a band of Nez Perce Indians led by the great Chief Joseph.

Miss Cole is a native Montanan. Her art deals largely with history and landscapes associated with central Montana. A number of her paintings are on display in museums and libraries in Montana. At present, Miss Cole's art is not known as well as it should be beyond the limits of Montana; but I am sure that national recognition will be forthcoming in the near future, because Evelyn Cole's art is fine in detail, pleasing in color, and presents true and accurate portrayal of the West.

Miss Cole's painting hangs in a prominent place in my office, and I welcome all admirers of western art who may care to inspect it to come in and see a real masterpiece.

BUTTE AND MONTANA CELEBRATE A BIRTHDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Butte and Montana Celebrate a Birthday," published in the Montana Standard of May 27, 1956. I believe this editorial is worthy of the consideration of all Members of the Senate, because it outlines in some detail the growth of these two fine entities, first, the city of Butte, the most picturesque city in the United States, with the finest people, and Montana, the Treasure State, also with the finest people in the Union.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUTTE AND MONTANA CELEBRATE A BIRTHDAY

The city of Butte and the State of Montana are both 92 years old.

But the fact is cities and States do not grow old; they grow young until they die.

And both Butte and Montana are still growing young.

Ninety-two years ago last week the legislation which made Montana a Territory, separating it from Idaho Territory, was passed in Congress and signed by President A. Lincoln.

And at about the same time a couple of prospectors, G. O. Humphrey and William Allison, panned sufficient gold along Silver Bow Creek to establish a gold camp and attract other prospectors here. Within 2 years the population had reached 500.

Since then Montana and Butte have had their ups and downs, but they have continued to grow.

New mining developments and extension of old ones bring assurance that the population of Butte will increase materially within the next few years. Similarly, these developments have given the mining camp a new lease on longevity. The end isn't in sight.

Economists and scientists concluded in recent years that Montana's varied assortment of natural resources have only been scratched, thus giving the State a new lease on the future.

Although Montana's extensive deposits of minerals are irreplaceable once they have been removed from the ground, the supply as the years have passed has constantly grown larger and larger.

It has been similar with Montana's other natural resources.

New discoveries in scientific methods, irrigation, and new machinery have constantly increased Montana's agricultural productive capacity.

Montana's attractiveness as a tourist haven are only beginning to be realized. The tourist business has grown up within the memory of our young people from almost nothing to third rank in the State's income producing resources.

The State's population has been steadily increasing with the trend of the movement of people away from the crowded East to the wide open spaces of the West.

One resource which has scarcely begun to be developed is Montana's vast supply of water, a large amount of which is stored naturally in the form of snow in the mountains during the winter and seeps away gradually during the summer in clear, cool mountain streams.

Another resource which has only been scratched is that of petroleum.

In both of these categories there is room for tremendous growth, thus making the State of Montana younger even though it is growing older in years chronologically.

The migrations of people constantly westward across the United States is merely one of the signs that the areas from which they are coming are actually growing old, both chronologically and in resources.

In another field, Montana has a great opportunity to achieve still more youthfulness. This is in the manufacturing field. The trend here again is in our favor. The trend is to move the factory closer and closer to the source of raw materials needed for fabrication.

In the past, Montana has existed chiefly as a source of raw materials. Processing adds greatly to the value of a raw product. There is no reason why Montana can't grasp this advantage. It has most of the necessary ingredients.

So, here's a salute to Butte and Montana on their twin birthdays.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I notice the blushing modesty of the Senator from Montana when he says that Butte is the finest city in the country, and that the people of Montana are the finest people in the country. Does not the Senator from Montana think he should sprinkle a little modesty on such glowing statements?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that I was being unduly modest because of my sensitive feeling for other Senators. However, I could have gone to extremes and really told the truth about Montana, the Treasure State, which, of course, words are not sufficient to express.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is always excellent to find people with such a charitable opinion of themselves.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Especially when it is the truth.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON PROPOSALS TO AMEND ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary, I announce that tomorrow at 10 o'clock, in room 318 of the Senate Office Building, hearings will be opened upon H. R. 11, S. 11, and several other bills dealing with the amendment of the Robinson-Patman Act.

The committee has received communications from at least 60 different persons who desire to express opinions with respect to this issue. It is one of the most important questions confronting the Nation. It is a part of the same problem which the Senate had under discussion yesterday when the bill giving automobile dealers their day in court was passed by a vote of 76 to 1.

The problem of violations of the Robinson-Patman Act affects all sorts of small business. Drugstores in many

localities are very much affected. Small grocers are very much interested. Small jobbers in the gasoline and oil business, filling stations, small refiners, and big refiners, are all interested.

Recently I received a letter from the Governor of my State in which he expressed great concern over the gasoline wars which have been opened in Wyoming. The same situation has developed in other States. The big refiners cut prices, and the small filling station and the small refiner cannot compete. There have been instances of big companies moving into a local community, spending large sums of money on the construction of luxurious filling stations, offering their commodities at a lower rate, and driving the small, independent dealers out of business.

The issue we are facing is whether the local independent businessman is seeing the end of his day as a part of the economic system of America, and is being succeeded by the national operator, who is in a position to write the whole law for himself.

It will be the endeavor of the subcommittee, as I stated to Governor Simpson in response to his letter to me, to make arrangements for the full presentation of the problem by representatives of independent filling stations, independent jobbers, small refiners, and big refiners. I hope to be able to lay on the table the entire story of the devices by which local independent enterprise is losing its economic freedom.

One of the bills, S. 11, was introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The commitee is also about to open hearings on the meat industry. The Senator from Tennessee will preside at the opening session, which will be held tomorrow. The bills which are involved are not only S. 11, introduced by the Senator from Tennessee, but also H. R. 1840, introduced by Representative BYRON G. ROGERS of Colorado, and S. 780, which was introduced by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I am pleased to learn that hearings are to be conducted upon this important issue. I very much hope that the committee will report S. 11, or a bill which will accomplish the same purpose, some time during the next few weeks, because Congress will not be in session much longer. I am a cosponsor, along with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], of S. 11.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am aware of that fact.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Wyoming is familiar with the problems involved. It seems to me that the price discriminations which are adversely affecting small business are very serious. Unless Congress acts to afford some element of protection to small business which does not now exist, we shall see very many more business failures and bankruptcies than are necessary.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct. I believe it will be possible to report proposed legislation which will, at least, be of some assistance in the situation which is developing.

The problem affects the entire economy. The struggle is now reaching its most critical point. I refer to the struggle between small independent enterprise in local communities and the great national, concentrated companies which operate throughout the United States, and sometimes throughout the world. We are losing the power to regulate commerce in the public welfare, and shall continue to lose it unless legislation of this kind, well drafted and properly conceived, is enacted.

IMPROVEMENT OF GOVERNMENTAL BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3897) to improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in my opinion, the pending bill, if enacted, will bring about the most important reforms and improvements in the Government's financial structure in a decade or more.

Cosponsored by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], who is a great authority on the subject and has done a tremendous amount of work in this field of legislation, and by 30 other distinguished Members of the Senate from each side of the aisle, S. 3897 was reported unanimously by the Committee on Government Operations on June 7.

It has the unqualified endorsement of the major financial departments of the Government, including the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Comptroller General of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury, each of whom submitted testimony before the Subcommittee on Reorganization which held the hearings upon this matter.

The bill implements directly the recommendations of the Second Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—the Second Hoover Commission—relating to budgeting and accounting.

The task force on budgeting and accounting was headed by Mr. J. Harold Stewart, of Boston, to whom the subcommittee is strongly indebted.

The bill would enact into law the recommendations made by the President of the United States to the Congress in his special message delivered May 10, 1956, when he urged early enactment of appropriate legislation in this field.

As I pointed out on yesterday when I filed the committee's report, this proposed legislation would place the entire governmental structure on an accrued annual expenditures basis, thus improving the financial management within the executive agencies, and immeasurably strengthening the control of the Congress over the purse strings.

As the Senate probably knows, more than $25 million of Government expenditures in 1956 are being made from funds appropriated in previous years. It seems to me, therefore, that the pending measure, if enacted, would bring about a radical and important reform in governmental accounting.

The bill provides that the executive agencies shall determine their budgets on a cost basis and shall maintain their accounts on an accrual expenditures basis to provide the foundation for the stating of appropriations by the Congress on an annual accrued expenditures basis, which is the heart of fiscal control.

In other words, upon the enactment of this bill, the Congress would make its appropriations for each fiscal year upon the estimates of expenditures actually to be made or to be accrued during that fiscal year, as opposed to the present appropriations procedure whereby appropriations are made upon an obligation basis which at times extends over several fiscal years in the future.

I am fully aware that this is a revolutionary change in our fiscal processes which could not be effectuated overnight, but which in all probability would be implemented gradually with the least disturbance within the executive agencies. Nor do I believe—nor was there any evidence in the hearings—that it would have any adverse effect upon the Government's financial operations.

To the contrary, there is every indication that substantial operating economies will accrue to the Government from the establishment of more business-like budgeting, accounting, and appropriations procedures. I strongly urge favorable action upon this bill.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire, who has attended every hearing on the bill and whose fine assistance was extremely important in bringing about action on the bill in committee and having it reported to the Senate.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his kind expressions. My purpose in rising is to make sure the record shows that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the chairman of the subcommittee which considered the proposed legislation, handled it in his characteristic, able fashion. He gave it his constant attention. Hearings were held with great care. Testimony from the Comptroller General of the United States, from the Bureau of the Budget, and from departments involved, including the Department of Defense, was taken and carefully sifted and screened.

As a minority member of the subcommittee, I should like to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished Senator from Masachusetts for his able,

careful, and painstaking handling of this important measure, and other measures to implement the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, to express my confidence in the subcommittee and the staff and also to assure the Senate that the measure has been carefully screened. We are all in hearty accord in urging the Senate to pass the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator, very much. I also wish to express regret that the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], who played such a major role in preparing this measure, is unable to be present because of a death in his family. In talking with him yesterday he expressed his great interest in the measure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to express my commendation of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] for his nonpartisan approach to this matter and for the comments he has made regarding the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. The Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] is a coauthor of the measure. He expressed the hope that it would not be brought before the Senate during his absence, which was made necessary by a death in his family, but that did not fit in with the wishes of some other Senators.

I appreciate the contribution of both the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Maine, and I also wish to commend my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join in the comments made by the Senator from New Hampshire. As has been stated, the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] is unavoidably absent because of a death in his family. He is vitally interested in the measure and has asked me to convey to the Senate the great importance he attaches to this measure in connection with the operations of the Federal Government.

I wish to join, also, in commending the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who has done such good work on the bill. I also wish to commend the entire committee and those who have worked together, on both sides of the aisle, in bringing the measure before the Senate.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to state that too often, I think, we overlook the importance of the work and the responsibilities which are assumed by subcommittees of the various standing committees. In this particular instance, as my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and other Members realize, the chairman of the Government Operations Committee is carrying a very heavy workload; and were it not for Senators, like the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who are willing to cooperate and willing to take the chairmanship of subcommittees and actually do the heavy work in developing and processing proposed legislation of this character, our committees would bog down.

I am personally indebted to the Senator from Massachusetts and to those who served with him on both sides of the aisle for the splendid job which has been done on this bill. It is an important measure. We can make substantial progress in getting ready for action on important and needed legislation only as our subcommittees take responsibility and do the job as thoroughly and efficiently as it has been done in this instance. The chairman of the full committee is thoroughly appreciative of the labors of the members of the subcommittee.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

In considering appropriations for the armed services, we noticed a great number of obligated but unexpended balances which have been carried over for years. This bill will prevent such a situation from arising. It will give far greater authority to the Appropriations Committee each year, and it will be necessary for the committee to decide each year how much shall be appropriated to prevent the tremendous carryovers. So, Mr. President, it seems to me that this measure offers a hope of substantial savings, and also far greater control by the executive branch and by the Appropriations Committees of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 3897) was passed.

Mr. BYRD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following the passage of the Kennedy-Payne bill, Senate bill 3897, there be printed in the RECORD a statement by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

KENNEDY-PAYNE BILL

I am a patron on this bill because it is expressly a step in the direction of two objectives which I believe to be urgently needed in the Federal fiscal system:

1. Annual review of Congress of all major appropriations for expenditure in the coming fiscal year; and

2. Reduction in unexpended balances carried over from prior appropriations which now are available for years with ineffective legislative control over the annual rate of expenditure from them.

We must keep constantly before us the fact that there is a wide difference between annual appropriations and annual expenditures.

It is annual expenditures—not appropriations—measured by annual revenue which result in annual deficits or surpluses.

To demonstrate the difference between annual appropriations and annual expenditures, I shall summarize the record for the past 10 years.

In 1948 we appropriated $39 billion and spent $34 billion.

In 1949 we appropriated $41 billion and spent $40 billion.

In 1950 we appropriated $50 billion and spent $45 billion.

In 1951 we appropriated $84 billion and spent $45 billion.

In 1952 we appropriated $93 billion and spent $66 billion.

In 1953 we appropriated $80 billion and spent $74 billion.

In 1954 we appropriated $63 billion and spent $68 billion.

In 1955 we appropriated $57 billion and spent $65 billion.

In 1956 we appropriated $62 billion and it is estimated that we shall spend $64 billion.

In 1957 the President has requested appropriations totaling $66 billion and the Budget Bureau has estimated that we shall spend $66 billion.

The accumulation of unexpended balances in appropriations over the years in excess of expenditures, after deducting lapses, now totals $74.6 billion. If we should appropriate in this session of Congress the full amount requested by the President for fiscal year 1957, beginning July 1, we would enter the new fiscal year with appropriations and other authorizations for expenditure totaling $140.9 billion.

Of the $66 billion in new appropriations requested by the President for fiscal year 1957, only $42.7 billion is for actual expenditure during the year. This means that of the appropriations we are making at this time, assuming the budget requests, $23.3 billion would be for expenditure in some subsequent year. Under the legislative appropriation practices, expenditure from this $23.3 billion balance would be subject to very little annual review by Congress in subsequent years.

This huge balance has been built up under a policy of financing tremendous long-lead time projects in advance by appropriating the full amount of the cost at the time of their inception. After the original appropriation, in practice, very little legislative control is exercised over annual expenditures from multiyear appropriations.

Under this bill the President's budget ultimately would be submitted on an annual accrued-cost basis, and appropriations would be made each year to finance the annual cost of contracts entered into pursuant to statutory authority.

I do not contend that this legislation would accomplish all which is desirable for the recapture of congressional control over the annual rate of expenditure of Federal funds. But it would be a step in the general direction of more meaningful appropriation action. It would provide a more practicable control over annual expenditures. It would produce a more tangible relationship with revenue requirements for a given year. It would develop a clearer disclosure of Federal activities on an annual basis. And it would establish Federal operations on a more businesslike basis not only for purposes of revenue and appropriations but also for more effective accounting and auditing.

I hope the bill will pass as a progressive reorganization in Federal fiscal procedures,

methods, and techniques which may result in more efficient government at reduced cost to taxpayers.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2262, House Bill 101.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 101) relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9, subsections (d) and (e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY OF COLUMBIA HISTORICAL SOCIETY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending bill be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2263, Senate bill 3663.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3663) to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this bill comes to the floor of the Senate with the unanimous vote of the District of Columbia Committee. The explanation is brief. I make it for the purpose of the Record.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for the exemption from taxation of the real estate described as lot 79, in square 115, in the District of Columbia, owned by the Columbia Historical Society so long as the same is owned and occupied by the Columbia Historical Society and its member organizations and is not used for commercial purposes.

The Columbia Historical Society is the historical society of and for the Nation's Capital, as well as the District of Columbia. It was founded and incorporated in 1894, and is a nonprofit cultural, educational, philanthropic, and historical society.

The loss of revenue from annual real estate taxes on this property, under present valuation, amounts to $2,876.28.

I urge the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3663) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the real estate described as lot 79, in square No. 115, situated in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, owned by the Columbia Historical Society, is hereby exempt from all taxation so long as the same is owned and occupied by the Columbia Historical Society and its member organizations and is not used for commercial purposes, subject to the provisions of sections 2, 3, and 5 of the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1091; D. C. Code, secs. 47–801b, 47–801c, and 47–801e).

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE OVER POTOMAC RIVER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2264, Senate bill 3838.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3838) to provide for the maintenance and operation of the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River from Jones Point, Va., to Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, by way of a brief explanation, the bill also comes to the Senate by unanimous vote of the District of Columbia Committee.

The purpose of this bill is to provide that the bridge authorized to be constructed over the Potomac River from Jones Point, Va., to Maryland, shall be maintained and operated by and at the expense of the States of Maryland and Virginia, and the District of Columbia, in accordance with such arrangements as are agreed to by such States and the District of Columbia.

The act of August 30, 1954—Public Law 704, 83d Congress—authorized and directed the Secretary of the Interior to construct, maintain, and operate a six-lane bridge over the Potomac River, from a point at or near Jones Point, Va., across a certain portion of the District of Columbia, to a point in Maryland, together with bridge approaches on property owned by the United States in the State of Virginia.

The President, at the time of his approval of the above act, issued a statement that it improperly vests responsibilities in the Department of the Interior, which is not a construction agency, and that such responsibilities should be placed in the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, or the Corps of Engineers of the Army.

Public Law 534, 84th Congress, approved May 22, 1956, amended the act of August 30, 1954, to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to construct a six-lane bridge at the site hereinbefore mentioned.

I urge passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3838) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the bridge authorized to be constructed by title II of the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1954, shall be maintained and operated by and at the expense of the States of Maryland and Virginia and the District of Columbia in accordance with such arrangements as shall be agreed upon by such States and the District of Columbia.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of House bill 101.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 101) relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9, subsections (d) and (e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I call the attention of the Senator from New Mexico to the request I have just made, and ask him to explain the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this bill is made necessary because of changes made in the reclamation law by the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. Under reclamation authorizations, the Department of the Interior got itself in the situation where irrigation districts could not be assured of renewal of the so-called 9 (e) or utility irrigation contracts after 40 years. In doing so, we found it was necessary to say that the Secretary of the Interior could renew so-called 9 (e) contracts or convert them to 9 (d) contracts. When it comes to renewals, he can work out with the contracting organizations a procedure to go ahead on a basis which will be satisfactory to them and protect the interests of the Government. He can include in the long-term contracts provisions which take care of circumstances such as assurances of a share of whatever water is available or to change the terms and amounts in view of construction costs.

The Bureau of Reclamation has asked for the bill, and the Bureau of the Budget has approved it. The bill was passed by the House after full consideration. The Senate committee also considered it thoroughly and we think the bill is satisfactory.

I may say to the Senator from California that most of these so-called 9 (e) contracts are in the State of California. The irrigation districts there would like to have this bill, I am informed, and there has been no objection to it from any source. The purpose of the bill is to extend to the 9 (e) contract districts the same conditions as under the standard provisions of the reclamation law. I think it is a desirable bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no

amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 101) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY OF THE GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC., IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2265, House bill 8493.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8493) to exempt from taxation certain property of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this bill also comes to the Senate with the unanimous vote of the District of Columbia Committee.

The purpose of this bill is to exempt from taxation certain property of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in the District of Columbia, so long as such property is not used for commercial purposes, and is subject to the provisions of the act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District.

I urge the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 8493) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RETIREMENT OF PUBLIC-SCHOOL TEACHERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2266, House bill 10768.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10768) to amend section 5 of the act of August 7, 1946, entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief explanation of the bill. I want to say that it, too, was unanimously reported by the District of Columbia Committee.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for increased annuities for all teachers and school officers who are now retired or may retire prior to December 31, 1957. The bill is designed to parallel the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended—Public Law 369, 84th Congress amended that act to provide increases to annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act. The amount of the increase is set forth on a percentage basis and would depend upon the commencing date of the annuity. Since the increases provided by H. R. 10768 would apply only to a group of persons who may have retired prior to December 31, 1957, the annual disbursements for such increases would be on a gradually declining basis by reason of mortality of annuitants.

The present value of all such future disbursements, as of July 1, 1956, is estimated as $2,619,100. The first year's cost would be approximately $252,800. The bill would permit retired teachers to waive all or any part of their annuity to which they are entitled, in the same manner as persons retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

I urge the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 10768) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN HIGHWAY-RAILROAD GRADE SEPARATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2267, S. 2704.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2704) to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction of certain highway-railroad grade separations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senate is presently considering S. 2704.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the Senator from Oregon propose to offer an amendment to correct a typographical error in spelling?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. I was going to do so in my explanation, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Very well.

Mr. MORSE. First, I want to give an explanation of the bill, and then take up the amendment.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize partial reimbursement of the District of Columbia for its share of the cost of certain highway-railroad grade separations. Assessment of any of the cost against the railroads involved is prohibited.

The project is at a point in the southeast section of the District in the vicinty of East Capitol Street, where the proposed extension of East Capital Street as shown on the highway plan of the District will cross the right-of-way of the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad—operated under lease by the Pennsylvania Railroad—and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

The total cost of the project is estimated at $1,995,000.

I have an amendment to correct a printing error in the bill. The word "Treasury" is misspelled, and the amendment seeks to have the print corrected so the proper spelling will be in the print. I offer that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to say, in defense of the Government Printing Office, that seldom do they make mistakes. When they do, I think we should understand that the factor of human error is bound to creep in, even in such an efficient organization as the Government Printing Office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the committee will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, in line 9, after the word "of", it is proposed to strike out "$634,000" and insert "$665,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of all members of the committee, I urge that the bill be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2704) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in recognition of the fact that the need to bring traffic to and from the Washington-Baltimore Parkway and to handle such traffic requires the construction of certain highway-railroad grade separations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the District of Columbia for credit to the Highway Fund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $665,000, which shall be in addition to any other amounts authorized, appropriated, accruing, or otherwise made available to the District of Columbia under any other provision of law, for the construction and maintenance in the District of Columbia of a highway-railroad grade separation underpass at a point in the southeast section of the District of Columbia in the vicinity of East Capitol Street, where the

proposed extension of East Capitol Street as shown on the highway plan of the District of Columbia will cross the right-of-way of the Philadelphia, Baltimore, & Washington Railroad and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. Such sums as are appropriated shall remain available until expended when specifically provided in the Appropriation Act.

SEC. 2. Appropriations made to carry out the purposes of this act shall be available for construction, maintenance, and expenses incident to construction and maintenance, including planning, design, overhead, and supervision.

SEC. 3. Since the construction of East Capitol Street extended is to provide connections between the District of Columbia and the Federal Highway System, the entire cost of construction and maintenance of the grade-separation structure referred to in the preceding sections of this act shall be borne by the District of Columbia, out of funds authorized to be appropriated by this act and any other funds available to the District, and no contributions to such cost of construction and maintenance shall be required of any railroad whose right-of-way is involved by such structure, except as provided in section 4 of this act.

SEC. 4. The dedication by the railroads to the District of Columbia of the right to use as a public thoroughfare the portion of East Capitol Street extended shall not impair or affect the right of the railroads to use for railroad purposes the portion of its right-of-way so dedicated.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE VILLAGE OF CAREY, OHIO

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2260, House bill 9671; and I call this motion to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9671) to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the village of Carey, Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, this bill was introduced by my colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. The bill was considered by the full committee, and was reported unanimously by it.

The bill has to do with the conveyance by the United States of some land to Carey, Ohio.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have checked the report on the bill, and I see from the report that I can obtain an answer to the only question I had in mind. In short, I find that the transfer involves payment by the city of the fair market value of the property.

Mr. BENDER. I have before me a letter from the Bureau of the Budget which I think will satisfy the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am satisfied, if the committee report is correct. It says that "the village will be required to pay the fair market value of the property at its highest and best use as determined by the Administrator, as of the date of such conveyance."

That is perfectly satisfactory to me, if the United States is to receive the fair market value of the property.

Mr. BENDER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to commend the Senator from Ohio for having taken care of that matter in connection with the bill, because, as he knows, I am the watchdog of the Treasury in connection with getting the fair market value for all property belonging to the United States. Therefore I am perfectly willing to have the bill passed.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 9671) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 2268, House bill 11487.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11487) to amend the act entitled "an act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the RECORD should show the committee's brief explanation of the bill. This bill also comes before the Senate as a result of the unanimous vote of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The purpose of the bill is to reduce the registration fee for small two-wheel trailers; to permit such trailers owned by nonresidents to be operated in the District of Columbia without District registration; to provide a special registration fee for antique motor vehicles, and to authorize the issuance of congressional tags to the Chief Clerk, the Parliamentarian, and the Deputy Sergeant at Arms of the Senate. Comparable officers in the House are issued such tags under existing law.

There is a growing expansion in the automotive field in the small, two-wheel trailer rental service, under which a person may rent a trailer in one jurisdiction, attach it to his private motor vehicle, travel to another jurisdiction, and surrender the trailer to the local branch of the rental service. It may thus happen that a trailer registered in another jurisdiction will terminate a trip in the District. Inasmuch as this type of service is a convenient and practical service for persons moving small quantities of personal property, it is believed that the provision in existing law prohibiting the operation by District residents of trailers registered elsewhere than in the District should be qualified.

I urge that the bill be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Committee on the District of Columbia will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, after line 21, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 4. The first proviso of paragraph (c) of section 3, chapter 6, of title 40 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1951 edition, relating to issuance of congressional tags, is amended by inserting after the phrase "to the elective officers and disbursing clerks of the Senate and the House of Representatives" a comma and the words "the Chief Clerk of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Deputy Sergeant at Arms, Auditor, and Procurement Officer of the Senate."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 245. An act for the relief of Ahmet Haidun Koca Taskin;

S. 1375. An act for the relief of Pingfong Ngo Chung and Pearl Wah Chung;

S. 1622. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes; and

S. 1814. An act for the relief of Teresa Lucia Cilli and Guiseppe Corrado Cilli.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2842) for the relief of Toini Margareta Heino, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 5590. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever, approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Gustaf E. Lambert"; and

H. R. 11473. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its

disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment No. 50, to the bill, and concurred therein, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1403. An act for the relief of Anthony J. Varca, Jr.;

H. R. 1986. An act for the relief of Robert M. Deckard;

H. R. 3062. An act for the relief of Paul H. Sarvis, Sr.;

H. R. 3987. An act for the relief of Onie Hack;

H. R. 4336. An act for the relief of Z. A. Hardee;

H. R. 5155. An act for the relief of Peder Strand;

H. R. 5690. An act for the relief of Camp Kooch-i-ching;

H. R. 6765. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of the United Foundation Corporation of Union, N. J.;

H. R. 7738. An act for the relief of Scott Berry;

H. R. 9106. An act for the relief of Saul Lehman;

H. R. 10818. An act for the relief of George T. Moore and Carl D. Berry;

H. R. 10204. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to transfer certain land to Richard M. Tinney and John T. O'Connor, Jr.;

H. R. 11207. An act for the relief of Cyrus B. Follmer;

H. R. 11530. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Harold LeRoy Allen;

H. J. Res. 636. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 637. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 638. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain finances of United States citizens; and

H. J. Res. 639. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 246) approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 417. An act for the relief of Pearl O. Seilaz;

S. 530. An act for the relief of the Sacred Heart Hospital;

S. 1146. An act to further amend section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, relating to fees of agents, attorneys, and representatives;

S. 1414. An act for the relief of James Edward Robinson;

S. 1749. An act adopting and authorizing the improvement of Rockland Harbor, Maine;

S. 2016. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Lawrence F. Kramer;

S. 2152. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer;

S. 2202. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an additional contract with the Yuma County Water Users' Association with respect to payment of construction charges on the valley division, Yuma reclamation project, Arizona, and for other purposes;

S. 2582. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of William E. Stone for disability retirement as a Reserve officer or Army of the United States officer under the provisions of the act of April 3, 1939, as amended;

S. 3265. An act to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for filing vessel utilization and performance reports by operators of vessels in the foreign commerce of the United States;

S. 3472. An act for the relief of Patricia A. Pembroke;

S.3581. An act to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service;

S. 3778. An act to amend the act for the protection of walruses;

S. 3857. An act to clarify section 1103 (d) of title XI (Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended;

S. 3945. An act for the relief of Walter C. Jordan and Elton W. Johnson;

H. R. 5382. An act for the relief of W. R. Zanes & Co. of Louisiana, Inc.; and

H. J. Res. 591. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

H. R. 1403. An act for the relief of Anthony J. Varca, Jr.;

H. R. 1986. An act for the relief of Robert M. Deckard;

H. R. 3062. An act for the relief of Paul H. Sarvis, Sr.;

H. R. 3987. An act for the relief of Onie Hack;

H. R. 4336. An act for the relief of Z. A. Hardee;

H. R. 5155. An act for the relief of Peder Strand;

H. R. 6765. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of the United Foundation Corporation of Union, N. J.;

H. R. 7738. An act for the relief of Scott Berry;

H. R. 9106. An act for the relief of Saul Lehman;

H. R. 10818. An act for the relief of George T. Moore and Carl D. Berry;

H. R. 11207. An act for the relief of Cyrus B. Follmer;

H. R. 11530. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Harold LeRoy Allen;

H. J. Res. 636. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 637. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 638. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain fiances of United States citizens; and

H. J. Res. 639. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5690. An act for the relief of Camp Kooch-i-ching; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 10204. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to transfer certain land to Richard M. Tinney and John T. O'Connor, Jr.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 246) approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress approves the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 403; 68 Stat. 1044):

A-6827809, Ai, Kuo-Yen or Kuo-Yen Thomas Ai.

A-6916280, Ai, Josephine Yueh-Li Mao.

A-7383344, Avella, Eva Maria (nee Ruttkay).

A-6059371, Banaszkiewicz, Leszek Romuald.

A-7444647, Benedikt, Erwin.

A-8036432, Berkovits, Ervin.

0300-402795, Bloks, Peteris.

A-9748478, Bok, Leung Koon.

A-8079746, Braun, Naftali.

T-2760124, Chai, Sum.

A-5770643, Chan, Sik Hung or Howe Chan or Henry Sighung Chan.

A-8955072, Chang, Ching Shan.

A-6084090, Chang, Fu-Kuei.

0300-471516, Chang, Chang-Chwan.

A-8875962, Chang, Ho Shing.

A-6967248, Chang, Mary Mei-Li.

0300-322153, Chang (nee Joi).

A-7355370, Chang, Phillip Wei-Li, also known as Chang Wei-Li.

A-7292164, Chang, Silas Hsien-Ta.

A-6959863, Chang, Carol Fang.

A-6848012, Chang, Wen-Han.

T-359293, Chao, Howard Hao Sheng.

A-6251861, Chao, Hsien-Gieh Sie.

0300-471322, Charbani, Chaoul Ibrahim or Saul Charbani.

A-4825480, Cheng, Chow Sun.

A-6084186, Yi-Hsien, Chow.

A-7782851, Chen, Chung Peng.

A-356977, Chen, Hsu-Tu.

A-7389479, Chen, Hue-Chen.

A-10066139, Chen, Katherine Chih-Mei.

T-301887, Chen, Leo Hsiao-Lin, formerly Chen Hsiao-Lin.

T-301886, Chen, Helena H. (nee Hsun Hsin Cheng)

T-301888, Chen, Carlson.

T-301889, Chen, Kiki Nelson, formerly Kee Chen.

A-6967327, Chen, Lydia Pi Lin.

V-753648, Chen, Mary or Sister Mary Anunciata Chen.

0300-467050, Chen, Shueng Ching Chang.

A-7292410, Chen, Victor Anchao.

0300-419633, Chen, Vung Yueh.

A-7056595, Chen, Yia Shen.

A-9678204, Cheng, Ah Tooi.

A-6973688, Ch'eng, Kuang Chin.

V-1242064, Cheng, Mary Molan.

E-057486, Cheng, Sun Tong.

A-6084123, Cheo, Ying Chang, also known as Vincent Y. C. Cheo.

A-9579541, Cheong, Tsang.

A-7295490, Chia, Teh-Tsao.

A-6522853, Chiang, Chin Long.

A-6522854, Chiang, Fu Chen.

A-4919939, Chiang, Pei-Run.

A-7583971, Chiang, Lena.

A-6992023, Chi-Lung, Li or Sister Mary Claudia.

0300-93183, Ching, Tung Jui.

A-1161839, Chiu, Churchill Too-Ming.

A-7445196, Chiu, Shiao-Yuen (Victoria Maria Chiu).

A–6849825, Cho, Frank Fu-La.
A–9245145, Chong, Ah Sung.
A–7860200, Chou, Albert Sze-Ching.
V–885173, Chow, Hee Yar Wong.
1600–106555, Chow, Some Foot.
1600–106556, Chow, Some How.
1600–106557, Chow, Some Kid.
A–9073827, Choy, Soo.
A–6709314, Chu, Bark-Ho.
A–6877770, Chu, Chih-Cheng.
A–6967268, Chu, Herbert Yuan-Sing, formerly Yuan-Shing Chu.
A–8057137, Chu, Tsu Hsi.
A–7243064, Chu, Yueh Chang.
A–9568331, Chu, Yung Shing.
0300–436371, Dai, Chan.
A–7480686, Dembitzer, Abraham.
A–6980355, Djang, Jane Chu, also known as Chang Chu.
A–8258348, Fang, Ta-Chuan.
A–7095389, Fang, Tao Yao.
A–9684299, Fat, Ho, also known as No Kong Hon.
0300–469308, Fatt, Chin, also known as Ching Fott, also known as Cham Fatt.
A–6650785, Fong, Tsung Butt.
A–8198637, Gluck, Andor.
A–7819648, Gluck, Aron.
0300–463505, Gluck, Hela.
A–10141603, Gratzer, Rozina.
A–7830718, Ha, Chen Chun.
T–300009, Han, Andrew I-Chih.
A–6855624, Han, Rebecca Chih Lan.
A–8153566, Hartman, Dora Meisels.
A–5153507, Henry, Wei (Mun-Hee).
A–7632418–T, Ho, Lok Shang.
A–6704241, Ho, Thomas C. K., also known as Chi-Kao Ho.
A–6847752, Ho, Lucy Chao (nee Lucy Wan-Chen Chao).
0300–457392, Hong, Than Sien.
A–8915816, Hong, Yung Shing.
A–6849397, Hsiao, Chi-Mei.
A–6027123, Hsiao, Feng.
T–2699670, Hsiao, Kuang Hao.
A–8876992, Hsiao, Samuel Chi, also known as Wang-yuan Hsiao.
A–8876994, Hsiao, May Lee, also known as Elsie Marie Hsiao.
A–8876995, Hsiao, Victor, also known as Chi-sheng Hsiao.
A–8876993, Hsiao, Christopher, also known as Chi-min Hsiao.
A–7389362, Hsieh, Hua-Kuang.
A–6967604, Hsieh, James Ke Ming.
A–7389467, Hsieh, Po Yuen.
0300–182009, Hsieh, Tsu Hsi.
A–0944164, Hsu, Chih Kien.
A–8979938, Hsu, Han-Kuang.
A–6848375, Hsu, Kwan.
A–7805868, Hsu, Robert Ying Hwang.
A–6033147, Hsu, Tony Tatung.
1103–13015, Ting, Rosalind Yi Ming.
A–8982869, Hsueh, Wei Yuan.
A–8982868, I-Chieh, Mai Yin.
A–8982873, Hsueh, Mary Andy.
A–8982872, Hsueh, Angy.
A–8982871, Hsueh, Army.
A–8982870, Hsueh, Antung.
0300–344285, Hu, Mabel Liang.
A–7731146, Hu, Yung Chun.
A–10076472, Huang, Chamber.
0300–362053, Huang, Dorothy Hsiu Ting.
A–7948396, Huang, Paul.
A–8957076, Huang, Margaret Jean.
A–6196024, Hui, You.
A–8093871, Huskel, Joseph Haim.
A–8980010, Hwang, Ching Yun.
A–8980011, Hwang, Ella Koh-Chang Li.
A–8980012, Hwang, Chien Sheng.
A–6669707, Hang (Wong), Joseph Ru-Yu.
A–8951034, Hwang, Beth Han-Chen Liu.
A–8951033, Hwang, Betty Shao-Chen.
E–47222, Ivanov, Victor Michael.
E–47223, Ivanov, Zenaida Alexandrovna.
A–7985645, Jeng, Chorng-Shiaw, also known as Douglas Chorng-Shiaw Jeng.
E–118862, Kalebota, Oliver.
A–7290189, Kalish, Edith.
A–6848587, Kao, Wen Shui.
A–7952708, Kaufman, Samuel.
A–7120687, Kaye, Show-Wei (Alan).
A–7366383, Kendi, Zekiye.
A–7356384, Kendi, Linda Chahoud.
A–6985805, Kiang, Sheng Piao.
V–305645, Zee, Lin Chen, also known as Mimi Kiang.
A–6694224, King, Lucia, Joan Wou.
A–7081614, King, Memee Hien-Kouen.
0200–102836, King, Lung Chang.
A–7790652, King, Yun Ching Mao.
A–7790649, King, Josephine Schweng.
0200–130574, King, David Da-Wei.
A–6849450, Kuh, Ernest Shiu-Jen.
A–10015956, Kuzura, Hans.
A–5394024, Lam, Tam.
A–7365686, Lan, Yu Hu or Lucy Yu Hu Lan.
0300–454039, Leban, Ivan Stanislaus, also known as John S. Leban.
A–7274351, Lee, Chwan-Chang Nai-Kuan.
A–7389484, Lee, Ding Wong.
A–6049385, Lee, Mov.
0300–457461, Lee, Tsung-Dao.
A–6967640, Lee, Jeannette Chin.
A–6872458, Lee, Yung Chia.
A–8982880, Leung, Tak So, alias Catherine Tak So Leung.
A–6703452, Li, Hui-Sen or Victoria Hui-Sen Li.
A–6958557, Li, Louis Hsiao-Chao.
A–7202735, Liang, Hou Jan.
A–7295485, Liang, Kang-Shun.
A–7399259, Liang, Rio (Shui-Oi) Lin.
A–6442562, Liang, Siu Seu Kei.
0300–470029, Lien, Ho.
E–083509, Lillimagi, Leonardo.
E–083510, Krup, Arne, also known as Arne Lillimagi.
A–6847733, Lin, Hung Chang.
A–6567581, Lin, Anchen Wang.
A–6967590, Lin, Lan Ying.
A–7354778, Lin, Lucy Kwen-Yuan.
A–6843380, Lin, Mary Elizabeth, formerly Mary Elizabeth (Betty) Young or Yang Wei-Tsung.
A–6552714, Lin, or Po-Chen.
A–8153629, Lin, Hsi-Chuan (nee Chen, Hsi-Chuan).
A–7295496, Lin, Samuel Paoshi, formely Lin Pao-Hsi.
A–7078166, Liu, Elizabeth Hwai-Ying.
A–8982882, Liu, Hannah Man-Hwa.
A–6847864, Liu, Hsiao-Chuan.
A–7850968, Liu, Jeannette Che-Chien.
0300–314881, Liu, Norah Tang, also known as Shiu Ming Tang.
A–8995041, Liu, Philip Sze-Yung.
A–7456051, Liu, Theresa Hui.
0300–399845, Liubicich, Ivan.
A–9128943, Lo, Yen.
A–7387939, Leoffler, Olga nee Weisz.
V–754182, Loh, James Mei-Huang.
0300–382462, You, Tai Yeong Shiue.
0300–468623, Lou, Whei Ling.
0300–468622, Lou, Whei Ping.
A–7857768, Lowe, Diana Ming-Duh.
A–7808104, Lowy, Bertha.
A–8955198, Lu, Ponzy.
A–8955199, Lu, Kai Roh, also known as Cary Lu.
A–6958639, Lui, Chum Lau.
A–6983525, Maday, Maria.
A–8150145, Maday, Zsolt Bela Gaspar.
1308–8483, Maday, Katalin (Kathy) Maria Erzsebet.
A–9550839, Manka, Jan.
A–8995042, May, Chu Tom Chung.
A–6962962, Meng, Ching-Hwa.
1300–134705, Miao, Pei Chi.
A–6848595, Nee, David Shou-I.
0300–369097, Ogorek, Leib.
A–7436639, Ogorek, Cily (nee Meyerovich).
A–7282130, Pao, Huei-Yuan (John).
A–7444657, Pejsa, Lubomir Oscar, also known as Larry Pejsa.
A–9759315, Perme, Milan.
A–8853556, Peros, Venci.
A–9576034, Piew, Jan.
A–7367940, Poon, Wai Ha or Mrs. Henry Louis.
V–1184123, Popoff, Leo.
V–1184124, Popoff, Alla.
T–1495443, Popoff, Marina.
T–1495444, Popoff, Andrei.
A–9665946, Porubov, Roman Deevich.
0300–305335, Posner, Pola.
A–7828309, Quo, Diana Shu.
A–7828310, Quo, Edward.
A–7365708, Rabinovici, Benjamin.
A–7988114, Roth, Miklos.
A–7988111, Roth, Geza.
E–8381, Rubin, Maximilian.
A–7223159, Rubinstein, Adolph.
A–9519927, Sak, Fung or Fung Sik.
E–058296, Sang, Chan.
E–084407, Sawicki, Jerzy Grzegorz.
A–7243000, Scheiner, Herbert.
0300–466312, Sha, Tseng, Lu.
A–7865359, Shang, Ching-Ting.
A–7350585, Shao, Lillian Chang.
A–7350586, Shao, Eugene.
A–7350587, Shao, Betty.
A–7350588, Shao, Jane.
A–7350589, Shao, Stella Lou.
A–7350590, Shao, Susie.
A–7350592, Shao, Connie.
A–8995044, Shee, Wong.
A–8245890, Shen, Chen Tung.
1600–107942, Shen, Yung Chung.
0300–457390, Shoo, Koo Ah.
A–7118648, Sih, Kwang Chi.
A–7395232, Soong, Kwan Hua.
V–469348, Sun, Arnold Yiu Fang, formerly Sun Yiu Fang.
A–7456028, Sun, Betty Chia-Hui.
A–6851441, Sun, Ho Sheng.
A–7463623, Sun, Sung Huang.
A–7248491, Sung, Albert Yun-Hua.
A–6848633, Sung, Neng-Lun.
A–7416448, Sung, Rodney Lu Dai.
A–6704103, Swen, En-Lienor Ruby En-Lien Swen.
A–7821882, Szu-Tu, Anthony Yen-Sheng.
0300–408601, Tai, Chao Yao, also known as Clement Leo Tai.
0300–408602, Tai, Chu Ching Hsin, also known as Clare Chu Tai.
E–058041, Tai, Chew Jee.
A–10065565, Tawil, Clement Ibrahim.
A–7174723, Teng, Hsi Ching.
A–5753754, Toa, Chan Sze.
A–5182572, Tom, Wallace, also known as Tam Kam Cheung.
T–2080412, Tong, Long-Sun.
A–8173633, Tsai, Bruce Kuo-Hai.
A–6973686, Tsai, Stephen Wei Tun.
A–6153407, Tso, Piao Frank.
A–7282962, Tung, Agatha Feng-Mei.
A–7457555, Vassos, Christos Antonios.
A–8190484, Vernitsky, Nadezda, formerly Nadezda Leithammel (nee Kepper).
E–085343, Wadhsmuth, Leonard or Leonhard.
A–9623511, Wah, Chin.
A–8878066, Wah, Chu Kwong, also known as Kwong Wah Chu.
A–7284218, Wang, Allan Tsong Kao.
A–5369089, Wang, David Kehsin.
A–6463163, Wang, Jimmy Peng-Lin.
0300–472021, Wang, Jinq Bor, or Jinq Bor Tang.
0300–469273, Tang, Fan Kuo.
0300–469702, Tang, Ping Chien.
A–4374750, Weber, Estera P.
T–1496395, Wong, Chung Dong.
1300–84918, Wong, Lee Yung.
0300–387779, Wong, Yung.
A–9798854, Wong, Yung Ching.
T–2809651, Woo, Lin Siang.
A–7297983, Wu, Joseph.
A–7073634, Wu, Tao-Yuan.
A–6259104, Wu, Yuan-Li.
0204/5969, Yang, Chen-Ping.
A–7418233, Yao, John Chun-Yu.
A–10135697, Yao, Mary Soo-Wah.
T–1746758, Yao, Sin Ping.
V–1438199, Yeh, Tsun-kai.
A–7274654, Yih, Chia Moun, also known as Manette Chia-Moun Yih.
A–7424859, Ying, Chieh-Liang.
A–8870545, Yu, Edwin.
A–7462148, Yu, Eileen Hsiu-Yung (nee Wu).

A–7202749, Yuen, You Liang.
E–086499, Yurman, Alberto, or Alberto Jurman.
0300–17305, Zaveckas, Adomas, also known as Adomas Plecuakas Zaveckas.
A–6325061, Altenbrun, Juliane.
A–6325059, Andre, Maia.
A–8172278, Bandera, Vittorio Giovani.
A–8830712, Bronevsky, Sergiu Aristotel.
A–9825253, Bussanich, Antonio, also known as Anthony Bussanich.
A–7415211, Chai, Chiuling.
0400–46784, Chan, Chow Shun.
0300–226262, Chan, Gat Chong, also known as Johnny Chan.
0300–279131, Chan, Raymond Loi-Ming.
0300–460911, Chan, Anita Wu.
0300–360856, Chan, Roger Chi-Yit.
A–9633955, Chan, Sow.
1300–113468, Chang, Betty Low, also known as Foon Ngan Low.
A–7389486, Chang, Yunshan Katherine, formerly Yunshan Shih.
A–6623720, Chao, Tzu-Chow.
A–7439036, Chao, Frank Yin-Tzu.
A–7439037, Chao, Jimmy Min-Tzu.
A–7439038, Chao, Gene Jao-Tzu.
A–10141625, Chen, Chunjen Constant.
A–10141624, Chen, Eva Yi-Fu Chien.
A–10141635, Chen, Yung Ming.
A–10141623, Chen, Yung Kang.
A–9769854, Chen, Mai Kong.
A–6851419, Chiang, Alpha Chung-I.
A–7354784, Chiang, Emily.
A–7143990, Chiang, Robert Sish-Hauan.
A–6967664, Chiang, Ruby Ju-Pi.
V–754381, Chiang, Tung Ming.
A–7389360, Chian, Kun Li.
0300–394851, Chin, Moy, also known as Kong Moy Chin.
A–6967643, Ching, Amy.
A–6858243, Ching, George Pao Kang, also known as Pao Kang Ching.
E–084353, Chong, Chung.
A–7436768, Chou, Chan Fong.
0300–347788, Chow, Ting-Chuan.
0300–460088, Chow, Fengling Ou.
0300–460090, Chow, Ninota Stephen.
A–6071279, Choy, Kee.
A–10135617, Choy, Som or Seng Tsai.
T–2064297, Chu, Helen Yu Li Chao.
A–8153740, Chu, Janet Yun.
T–1408515, Chu, Mabel Chen-Mi.
A–7274381, Chu, Wen-Chi (Diana).
E–082668, Cnesich, Antonio.
E–118711, Dai, Leong Kam.
A–7243251, Diminich, Milan.
E–057950, Doo, Sze, Wod.
E–086370, Eckstein, Ervine.
0300–444834, Eng, Hu, also known as Chin Inn.
A–8055364, Fajncajg, Chaja.
A–7865110, Fajncajg, David.
A–8055371, Fajncajg, Icchok.
A–9731873, Fat, Kan Chung.
0300–414355, Fat, Tsung.
A–8916443, Fatt, Cheng.
A–7802066, Fisers, Karlis Hermanis.
A–7913545, Fishman, Chaim.
A–9782527, Fong, Cheng.
E–086609, Fong, Mon or Fong Mon or Feng Ming.
A–8826832, Fook, Ng.
A–1762198, Fook, Wong Ah.
0300–475315, Four, Lum.
A–7424925, Frey, Andrew, also known as Andras Frey.
A–7424926, Frey, Clara, also known as Klara Frey (nee Rudas).
A–7480684, Fried, David.
A–10067763, Fried, Livia.
0300–313392, Friedman, Miklos.
0300–313393, Friedman, Edith(nee Weisz).
0300–314455, Frosh, Magda.
T–1496401, Fu, John E. Kai-Cheng, formerly Yuh Sen Fu.
A–8211344, Fu, Frances Hsing-Chao (nee Lee).
A–6851290, Fung, Shui Ching.
A–7223143, Gluck, Abraham.
A–7228321, Grunfeld, Rose (nee Schwartz).
A–7197486, Gyongy, Imre.
A–7197487, Gyongy, Alice.
A–7366218, Gyongy, Adrienne Gloria.
0300–471519, Hing, Ting.
A–6083399, Hin-Cheung, Hoh or David H. C. Hoh.
A–9646320, Hong, Lai.
A–10135618, Hroncich, Antonio.
T–1499144, Hsieh, Chia Chi, now known as Kate Hsieh.
A–7915690, Hsieh Ching-Kien, also known as Ching Chien Hsieh or C. K. Hsieh.
A–7396905, Hsiung, Chi Hwa.
A–6461174, Hsu, Chia Pi.
T–359254, Hsu, Pao Li.
A–6967601, Hsu, Yun Kung.
A–7882617, Huang, Jean Cho-Wu.
A–6848579, Huang, Jwo-Shauo.
A–7415301, Huang, Kee Chang.
A–6589910, Huang, Robert Kih-Hua.
V–605862, Huang, Stella Wong.
0300–460541, Huang, Yung-Chih.
A–7286963, Hwa, Chuan Shi or Francis Chuan-Shi Hwa.
V–57435, Hwang, Chen Hon.
A–7355248, Hwang, Yeu Puu.
A–4808163, Ivin, Sime Kuzman.
A–9764686, Jea, Foo.
A–6730662, Jeng, Wu Yung also known as Nelson J. Wu.
A–6542228, Karaulnik, Matus.
A–6542229, Karaulnik, Chana.
A–6542230, Karaulnik, Gloria Golda.
A–9948140, Kerkez, Bogdan Milo.
0500–48784, Ki, John Tche-Jen.
0300–356308, King, Wang Ying, also known as Ying King Wang.
A–9907380, Kloo, Francois.
A–10187248, Kokins, Edward or Eduards Kokins.
A–7868139, Kong, King Tong or Tom King.
A–7247542, Kung, Son Sung or Robert Son Sung Kung.
A–7267071, Chia, Mei Yun or May Mei Yun Chia.
E–094491, Kwai, Chan.
A–9709002, Kwai, Chang, also known as Chang Kwai Tsang.
A–7296134, Kwoh-I, Ai or Daniel Kuo Yi Ai.
A–7945953, Kwok, Clifford.
0300–336774, Kwok, Donald Chi Ping or Donald Kwok.
0301–21061, Kwok, Dennis Chu-Ming.
A–6967572, Kwok, Chin-San, also known as Rosalind Chin-San Kwok Chow.
A–6848555, Kwong, Shue-Shan.
0300–392478, Lam, Yat Fong, also known as Lam Fang.
A–7897517, Lebovitz, Miklos.
A–6589922, Lee Kung Ching.
A–7118661, Lee, Feng Chih Han.
A–9798519, Lee, Wen Kan.
A–7391013, Lederfajn, Abram.
A–7454543, Lerner, Isadore.
A–7991023, Lerner, Maria.
A–7991024, Lerner, Estera.
A–8037900, Ley, Hsiao-Min.
A–3073395, Li, Hui Lin.
0400–51309, Li, Chi Ying Hsu.
0400–55967, Li, June Sing Ju.
A–3640930, Liang, Hung.
0300–390885, Hung, Elsie, also known as Elsie Yahsieh Lee Liang.
0300–366350, Liang, Lone.
0300–344286, Liang, Suying.
A–7354764, Liang, Teresa Ai-Ling, also known as Carolina Ai-Ling Liang.
A–10060061, Liao, Lettice Ho.
A–10060122, Liao, Darwin Harry.
A–7362899, Ling, Sui-Lin.
A–7388007, Lieu, Aloysius.
A–6620896, Lin, Yin Po.
E–057315, Ling, Woo Zai.
A–4974265, Liu, Haosun.
A–5551670, Liu, Baogee.
A–7039102, Liu, Sze Swui.
A–6737213, Liu, Shih Jan.
V–885354, Liu, Chang Chih.
A–8105197, Lo, Hui Ch'uan or Howell Charles Lowe.
A–6848026, Lo, William Hui-Wen.
A–8091311, Loy, Wan.
A–6702200, Lu, Go.
0300–315394, Lum, How.
A–8198523, Ma, Gertrude, formerly Yun Chu Ma.
E–057985, Ming, Tong.
A–9518302, Moo, Wo Yee.
A–9541791, Ng, Ho.
E–057393, Ng, Shiu.
0300–398092, Nin, Leung.
A–9533426, On, Mark Tai.
A–8956479, Palango, Viktor, also known as Viktor Palovnikov.
A–8956481, Palango, Agnes (nee Walker or Valker).
0300–475079, Pao, Fah Lin.
0300–452721, Peras, Mario.
A–10135780, Picinich, Lorenzo Antonio, also known as Lawrence Picinich.
A–9541787, Pin, Lo.
A–7807631, Puhk, Heino.
0800–111738, Riszner, Rosa Ida (nee Schoepflin).
A–7393981, Rubin, Bernard.
0300–329210, Rubin, Ilona.
0300–376025, Rubin, Bluma.
A–7952698, Schapiro, Ely.
A–6967725, Sheng-Wu, Wang.
A–6967723, Shuen-Shan, Wang.
A–6848671, Shuen, Shih Chieh, now known as Anthony Shuen.
E–086380, Sing, How.
A–6848686, Soo, Shao Lee.
A–7821538, Dan, Gung-Tai, also known as Hermia Gung Tai Dan Soo.
A–7374695, Soong, Constance Yu-Ru (nee Sun).
A–8057789, Sow, Sin.
A–8234000, Sun, Emily I-Chu.
A–9948306, Suurhans, Rudolf.
0300–410182, Tai, Chan.
A–6041694, Tang, Chang Jun.
1600–91347, Tcheng-Tchao, Chen or Tcheng Tchao Chen.
A–6613770, Tchou, Pao-Hui, also known as Howard Pao-Hui Tchou.
A–6695454, Tiao, Hui-Li.
0300–468233, Tiao, Pei-Yun.
A–6851458, Tien, Ping King.
A–7389359, Tien, Nancy Nai-Ying Chen.
0300–469050, To, Sheng Sze.
0300–459049, Chin, Ham Po.
A–3397292, Tom, Won Shee.
A–8198643, Treitel, Leopold.
A–6976657, Tsai, Dora Yung-Chen (nee Yung-Chen Chu), also known as Yung-Chan Tse.
A–7399263, Tsao, Carson Kuo-Hsiang.
A–6849436, Tsao-Hwa, Kuo, also known as Edward T. H. Kuo.
A–7383370, Tse, Stephen Yung-Nien.
A–10142001, Tsing, Di-Tsin.
A–8091385, Tso, Feng Ah or Feng Ah Chu or Fah Voong Ah.
0300–323918, Vorhand, Victor, also known as Hersch Vorhand.
0300–323919, Vorhand, Niesel.
0300–323919, Vorhand, Berta.
0300–472736, Walinska, Wanda.
A–7269686, Wallach, Chnaier.
A–6849389, Wang, Ben Chang.
A–6851543, Wang, Chen I.
A–6848029, Wang, Chih-Chung.
A–10141552, Wang, Fang Wen.
A–6967633, Wang, Lillian Lin-Yen.
A–6967592, Wang, Marian Mei-Yen.
0300–471923, Wang, Men Chun.
0300–471924, Wang, Helen, also known as Hwei-Chen Helen Wang.
V–889926, Wang, Ming Kang.
A–6054040, Wang, Tso.
A–7223132, Weiss, Gerszon, formerly Weisz.
A–7444697, Wen, Bertha Yoen-Ngai.
A–10141627, Wen, Robert Kuo-Liang.
A–9766046, Wong, Chen.
A–10075791, Wong, Pao Hsiang.
A–10135746, Wu, Bosco Ting Lin, also known as Nicholas Wu.
A–8982881, Wu, Nan Hwa or Nancy Wu.
A–7903455, Wu, Nancy Yung-Chun.
A–7903454, Wu, Percy Liang-Yu.
A–10015501, Wu, Sophie Ann.
A–6967290, Yang, Hanford Han Foo.
A–7962614, Yang, Ih Cheo.

A–7830615, Yang, Julie Chi Sun.
A–6952369, Yang, Ling.
A–6263746, Yang, Ching-Sing Miao.
0300–468795, Yen, Hsin Yung.
0400–57735, Yip, Loretta Yuen Fong Hsu.
E–057257, You, Liu.
A–7476314, Yu, Moses Lee Kung.
V–754236, Yu, Cornelia.
A–8917908, Yu, Margaret.
A–6990735, Yuan, Robert Hsun Piao.
A–7383311, Yuan, Si-Chen.
T–2946897, Yuan, Jen-Chi Lu.
A–8217598, Yuen, Wai Lum or Ywai Lam Yuen, now known as William Yuen.
A–8065228, Yu-Seng, Hsia or H. Chu-Bao Shaw or Harrison Hsia.
A–8979849, Zielka, Siegfried.
A–8190221, Zivkovic, Bogdan Dusan.
E–082248, Zywko, Peter.
A–8845060, Ang, Huan Chun (Edith) (nee Kwoh).
0300–471573, Berzins, Laimonis.
A–7859850, Blonder, Josef.
A–6084180, Chang, Shu-Tsing (Street).
A–7060821, Chao, Pius Kuang-Wen.
A–7805871, Chen, Billy Deh-Bin.
A–7277348, Chen, Chung Cheng.
A–8125688, Chen, James Wen-Po.
A–7927821, Chen, Daisy Parker.
A–8015358, Chen, Ross, also known as Kong-Chie Chen.
0300–463699, Cheng, Chang-Chun.
1300–136558, Cheng, Sung Yuan.
V–885352, Chin, Fong-Von.
T–358275, Chiu, Yung Chuan.
A–7243149, Deutsch, Laszlo (Leslie).
A–7243148, Deutsch, Rosalia Olga.
E–057844, Gow, Won Kun, also known as Won Sing.
A–6940545, Ho, Stanley Siang-Lin.
A–6881737, Hsi, Ching Seng.
A–6986514, Hsi, Kathy C.
A–7860201, Hsi, Helen Yu-Ching.
T–358271, Hsin, Ling Hsien.
A–7865335, Hsu, Chao Yung.
A–6967274, Hseuh, Rosemary Sun King.
A–10135565, Johanson, Elmo.
A–7374669, Kai-Li-Diao, Elizabeth.
A–4473105, Karlic, Sime Ivan, also known as Sam Karlich.
A–7354781, Kee, Lau Cheong.
A–7865355, Keh, (Edward) Shou Shreu.
A–7865356, Keh, Martha Mei Sing (nee Chen).
A–6845062, Keng-Kwan, Chuan Mary, now Edwards.
A–1003584, King, Wei Hsien.
A–1617804, King, Yao Ying Sze.
A–10074297, King, Richard Lien Chao.
A–7897518, Koo, Chia Tsung.
A–7282999, Ku, Chia Cheng.
A–7526796, Kwok, Jean Gee Hing (Gee Hing Kwok).
A–7376935, Lee, Chiu Tseng.
V–1183770, Lee, James H.
V–1183775, Lee, Laura.
A–6848553, Lee (Seward), Say Wah.
A–6848708, Lee (Simone), Shi Wen (nee Yoh).
A–6847779, Lee, Vivian Yang (nee Yang Pao Chiu).
A–7118694, Li, Huon.
A–7118680, Li, Wei-Shan.
A–7450486, Liim, Villi.
A–6991765, Ling, Wilfred Chen-Sun.
A–8873894, Lis, Stanislaw.
A–7857694, Lowe, Joseph Dzenhsi.
A–8951035, Lowe, Madge Lee (Ting-Yu Lee).
A–8951036, Lowe, Benny Tsin-Yuan.
A–10073387, Lu, Yen Shen.
A–10073386, Lu, Yen Chi.
A–7118690, Mao, Tchen-Lien, also known as Lucy T. L. Mao.
0300–359383, Marciniewicz, Czeslaw.
A–7853070, Nissan, Anwar Yacoub.
A–7419931, Pao, Yee.
1300–106845, Profaca, Vincenzo.
1300–108948, Profaca, Maria.
1300–110382, Profaca, Diana.
1300–110383, Profaca, Luciana.
A–7299349, Sah, Chih-Tang.
A–7830664, Shen, Tsuh-Ming, also known as James Tsuh-Ming Shen.
A–7962545, Sing, Wong Wing.
A–7463307, So-Yuk, Lew Chao.
A–7362938, Sun, David Chen-Hwa.
A–6781264, Sung, Wong Yang.
A–9208465, Tabulov, Ante Truta.
1300–136085, Ting, Chiew Heer.
0501–20280, Tseng, Chin Kuan.
A–7391680, Tung, Shiu Hang.
A–7285811, Wang, Chi-Wu.
A–7491837, Wang, Hsueh Jeh.
A–7491838, Wang, Hwei Chen Lu.
A–6843445, Yang, Ping-Shiang, also known as James Yang.
A–6967760, Wei, Ling.
A–7202733, Wei, Alice Jun.
A–10053722, Wei, Lilly Kay.
A–7292439, Wei, Young.
A–7118695, Lee, Young Ho.
A–7297990, Weidenmiller, Helen Carla, also known as Helena Carla Stembera.
A–7244892, Weingarten, Arthur.
A–6886896, Willinger, Rosalia.
A–8916442, Wong, Tsa Chung.
A–8082677, Wu, Fa Hsiang, also known as Frazer Wu.
A–8956275, Wu, Chin, Chung Yu.
A–8956276, Wu, Lan Sing.
A–8956277, Wu, Fu Sing.
A–7123419, Yen, Chih-Min.
A–8015340, Yin, Ken Hu.
A–8259445, Yin, Yee Fang Kwan.
A–8015342, Shen, En, also known as John Yin.
0400–59703, Yin, Cheng Shu, also known as Philip Yin.
A–7296133, Yu, Arthur Jun-Shen.
A–7436727, Zee, Frank Wei Min.
A–9759314, Zuber, Novak.
0300–406963, Duck, Chow.
0300–459682, Pao, Li Ah, also known as Pao, Lee Ah.
0300–423722, Tim, Tam or Tim, Harold Tam.
0300–456055, Liang, Chen Fou.
E–086835, Sung, Lam Kim.
T–1892794, Wong, Ding.
A–7247308, Farkas, Adam.
A–9673450, Ken, Lo Lien or Seng, Lo Lien.
E–086119, Kao, Hai Chuen.
A–9732049, Potman, Axel.
0200/121276, Tong, Kun.
A–9825413, Yu, Pang.
0300–471507, Ching, Wong Ping.
A–6703360, Li, Tsung Ming.
A–7350836, Li, Mary Loh.
E–096788, Nam, Chan.
0300–461417, Seng, Choy.
A–7486941, Lau, Wing Gong.
T–1496495, Tan, Shu-Tsun.
T–1496494, Tan, Jeon E. Chang.
A–6849829, Yu Yi Yuan, also known as Yu, Rutherford Berkeley.
A–6699880, Chen, Lien Ching.
0300–464139, Strklja, Yerko Grgas.

RAILWAY–HIGHWAY GRADE ELIMINATION STRUCTURES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 2269, Senate bill 2895.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2895) to amend the acts of February 28, 1903, and March 3, 1927, relating to the payment of the cost and expense of constructing railway-highway grade elimination structures in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments on page 2, line 7, after the word "such", where it appears the second time, to strike out "project" and insert "projects"; in line 17, after the word "project", to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That the obligation within this limit of the railroad carrier affected shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subparagraph (b) of section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944;"; on page 4, line 7, after the word "such", to strike out "project" and insert "projects"; and in line 15, after the word "project", to insert *"Provided further,* That the obligation within this limit of the railroad carrier affected shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subparagraph (b) of section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of the second paragraph of section 10 of the act of February 28, 1903 (32 Stat. 918), as amended (sec. 7–1214, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended to read as follows: "The cost and expense of any project for opening any such street or highway within the limits of such railroad company's right-of-way, including the cost of constructing the portion of any viaduct bridge, within said limits, shall be borne and paid as follows:

"(1) The District of Columbia shall apply to the payment of such cost and expense all Federal aid highway-railway grade separation funds available for use by the District of Columbia at the time any such project is programed and all such funds which become available for use on such projects by the District of Columbia during the construction of such project;

"(2) If such Federal aid highway-railway grade separation funds are insufficient to pay the cost and expense of any such project, the portion not so covered shall be paid one-half by the railroad company, its successors and assigns, whose tracks are crossed and one-half by the District of Columbia: *Provided,* That in no case shall the obligation of the railroad company affected exceed 10 percent of the total cost and expense of such project: *Provided further,* That the obligation within this limit of the railroad carrier affected shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subparagraph (b) of section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944;

"(3) After construction, the cost of maintenance shall be wholly borne and paid in the case of highway overpasses by the District of Columbia, and in the case of highway underpasses by the railroad company, its successors and assigns, whose tracks are crossed; and

"(4) The portions of such streets planned or projected as above which lie within a right-of-way belonging to such railroad company shall be dedicated by such company as a public thoroughfare when the portions of such street adjoining such right-of-way have been similarly dedicated or otherwise acquired."

SEC. 2. (a) That section 3 of the act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1353; sec. 7–1215, D. C. Code, 1951 edition) is amended by striking therefrom the word "steam."

(b) So much of section 3 of such act approved March 3, 1927, as reads: *"Provided,* That one-half of the total cost of constructing any viaduct or subway and approaches thereto shall in such case be paid by the railroad company, its successors or assigns, whose tracks are so crossed; and in the event the rights-of-way of two or more railroad companies are so crossed said half cost as herein provided shall be paid by the said railroad

companies, their successors or assigns, in proportion to the widths of their respective land holdings, and all" is amended to read as follows: *"Provided,* That the total cost of constructing any project for such viaduct or subway and approaches thereto shall be borne and paid as follows:

"(1) The District of Columbia shall apply to the payment of the cost of such project all Federal aid highway-railway grade separation funds available for use by the District of Columbia at the time any such project is programed and all such funds which become available for use on such project by the District of Columbia during the contruction of such projects; and

"(2) If such Federal aid highway-railway grade separation funds are insufficient to pay the cost of any such project, the portion not so covered shall be paid one-half by the railroad company, its successors and assigns, whose tracks are crossed and one-half by the District of Columbia: *Provided further,* That in no case shall the obligation of the railroad company affected exceed 10 percent of the total cost of such project: *Provided further,* That the obligation within this limit of the railroad carrier affected shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subparagraph (b) of section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944: *Provided further,* That in the event the rights-of-way of two or more railroad companies are so crossed said half cost as herein provided shall be paid by the said railroad companies, their successors and assigns, in proportion to the widths of their respective landholdings, but the obligations of such companies shall not, in the aggregate, exceed 10 percent of the cost of such project: *Provided further,* That after construction the cost of maintenance shall be wholly borne and paid in the case of highway overpasses by the District of Columbia, and in the case of highway underpasses by the railroad company, its successors and assigns, whose tracks are crossed: *Provided further,* That in the event the rights-of-way of two or more railroad companies are so crossed, the cost of maintenance shall be borne and paid in the case of highway underpasses by the said railroad companies, their successors and assigns, in proportion to the widths of their respective landholdings. All".

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, by way of explanation of the bill, let me say it also has been reported unanimously by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The purpose of the bill is to provide that the District of Columbia shall apply to the payment of the cost and expense of the highway-railway grade separation projects referred to in the acts of February 28, 1903, and March 3, 1927, all Federal-aid, highway-railway grade separation funds available for use by the District on such projects at the time they are programed, and all such funds which become available for use by the District on such projects during the construction of such projects.

In the event that Federal-aid, highway-railway grade separation funds available to the District are insufficient to pay the total cost and expense of such grade separation projects, the total cost and expense of said separation projects not paid with such Federal-aid funds shall be borne and paid one-half by the railroad company whose tracks are crossed and one-half by the District of Columbia, provided that the railroad company's share of such cost shall not in any case exceed 10 percent of the total cost of such projects.

After construction, the cost of maintenance shall be wholly borne in the case of highway overpasses by the District, and in the case of highway underpasses by the railroad company.

This proposed legislation was requested by the Commissioners, as a result of recommendations of the Railway-Highway Division of Costs Committee which was appointed by the Commissioners.

I urge that the bill be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SALARY ACT OF 1935

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 2270, House bill 7380.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7380) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1935, to correct certain inequities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, as amended, so as to provide that the basic annual salary of a private of any class of the fire department shall be increased by $224 while he is assigned to duty as a regular first driver-operator or tillerman of a fire department hose wagon, pumper, aerial ladder truck, rescue squad, or fire department ambulance.

Hearings on the bill indicated that practically all the men affected by this proposed legislation are men who formerly served for many years as hose wagon or truck drivers, and who were reassigned to their present positions in order that younger members could be made available to perform the more arduous duties incident to driving certain fire apparatus. It appears to your committee that no penalty should be attached to reassignment of duties unless a lack of ability or efficiency has been established. Therefore, Mr. President, I urge that the bill be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments of the Committee on the District of Columbia will be stated.

The amendments of the Committee on the District of Columbia were on page 1, after line 9, to strike out:

SEC. 2. Section 201 (b) of such Salary Act of 1953 is amended by (1) striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3), (2) striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", and", and (3) by adding at the end of such section 201 (b) the following new paragraph:

"(5) $420, while he is assigned to duty as acting sergeant."

SEC. 3. Section 202 (f) of such Salary Act of 1953 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In computing service in the grade of inspector for the purpose of determining longevity increases, service in excess of 3 years rendered prior to the effective date of this act in the grade of private, when the individual was assigned to duty as a fire inspector or assistant marine engineer shall be considered service in the grade of inspector.".

SEC. 4. Title II of such Salary Act of 1953 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 203. Not less than fifteen privates of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who have passed all examinations required for promotion to sergeant, shall at all times be assigned to duty as acting sergeants. Privates shall be selected for such assignment in the order in which they are scheduled for promotion to the grade of sergeant."

SEC. 5. Paragraph (2) of section 404 (a) of such Salary Act of 1953 is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", and the first and second provisos of section 4 of such act (D. C. Code, sec. 4–802)."

On page 3, at the beginning of line 5, to change the section number from "6" to "2," and in the same line, after the word "The", to strike out "amendments" and insert "amendment".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONAL DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BILLS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will be kind enough to do so, I shall appreciate it if he will handle the list of 6 or 7 other District of Columbia bills, by asking that they be considered by the Senate in the order in which they appear on the list. The majority leader must be out of the Chamber for a few minutes, to attend another meeting.

If the distinguished Senator from Oregon—who has had such a great interest in all District of Columbia legislation, and who has done more for the District of Columbia than any other Senator I have known since I have served in the Senate, and who plans to handle these measures anyway—will take charge of them, I shall be very much indebted to him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before the Senator from Texas leaves the Chamber, I wish to say that I appreciate very much his comments about my service to the District of Columbia. However, I assure him that this service is shared very much by my colleagues on the committee, particularly by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

Mr. President, to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], I wish to say that I think the record will prove that during his service in the capacity of majority leader, more legislation in behalf of the District of Columbia has been passed under his leadership than at any other time during my more than 11 years of service in the Senate of the United States. As a member of the Committee

on the District of Columbia, and as chairman of its Subcommittee on the Judiciary, I wish to thank the distinguished majority leader for the cooperation we have always received from him when we have had District of Columbia problems to present.

Mr. President, today is almost city council day for the District of Columbia, here in the Senate. As we consider this long list of District of Columbia bills, we are almost sitting as the District of Columbia City Council. So, in the capacity of an alderman, I shall be very glad to carry out the instructions the majority leader has left with me, if that meets with the pleasure of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statements of my generous and kind friend; and I thank him for them.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Texas.

CEMETERY ASSOCIATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2271, Senate bill 2896, to amend the act relating to cemetery associations.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2896) to amend the act relating to cemetery associations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, without regard to the provisions of section 27–114 of the District of Columbia Code—act of March 3, 1901—to license for cemetery purposes any parcel of land in the District of Columbia which does not exceed 1 acre in size and which except for a one-sided frontage of less than 100 feet on a public street or highway, is otherwise completely bounded by land dedicated to cemetery purposes.

While the language of the bill is general, and can apply to any parcel of land, it is at this time intended to take care of a particular situation which has existed for several years. The plot of land immediately concerned was acquired almost 30 years ago by the Washington Hebrew Congregation. It has a frontage of 90 feet on Alabama Avenue SE., approximately 400 feet east of Congress Place. Apart from this public-highway frontage, it is completely surrounded by cemetery lands owned by the Washington Hebrew and Adas Israel Congregations.

In keeping with my duties on the committee, I made a personal inspection, with counsel for the District of Columbia, of this piece of land, so that from my own observation I could pass upon the equities involved in the petition for the passage of this measure. There is no question about the fact that we would do a gross injustice to this congregation if we were to say that this little piece of land, surrounded by a cemetery property and graves on three sides, and by Alabama Avenue on the other side, could not be used for burial purposes. I urge the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2896) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, without regard to the provisions of section 27–114 of the District of Columbia Code (act of March 3, 1901, 31 Stat. 1295, ch. 854, sec. 670), the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to license for cemetery purposes any parcel of land in the District of Columbia which does not exceed 1 acre in size, and which, except for a one-side frontage of less than 100 feet on a public street or highway, is otherwise completely bounded by land dedicated to cemetery purposes.

DELAYED REPORTING OF BIRTHS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2272, House bill 9582.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9582) to provide for the delayed reporting of births within the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to authorize and empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to adopt rules and regulations governing the filing of reports of births and the issuance of delayed birth registration certificates in such cases where certificates of birth have not been recorded pursuant to the act of March 1, 1907. Under that act, a birth must be registered by some person in attendance—a physician or midwife, or in their absence, any person who is actually in attendance of the birth. However, there have been many cases where such reports have not been filed.

Existing law makes no provision for a person whose birth has not been reported to establish his parentage and the date and place of his birth by means of baptismal, school, census, physician's, family, insurance, marriage, military, employment, voting, or other records, or by affidavits of persons having known such person since his birth. As a result, persons born in the District prior to the act of March 1, 1907, may not have had their births reported, and, because of the death or other unavailability of the person in attendance, are unable, under present law, to report the birth and to have such report form the basis for the issuance of a birth certificate by the District of Columbia.

I urge the passage of the bill, for obvious reasons of fairness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 9582) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCORPORATION OF OAK HILL CEMETERY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2273, House bill 10374.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10374) to amend the act to incorporate the Oak Hill Cemetery in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to amend the act approved March 3, 1849, which incorporated the Oak Hill Cemetery, in the District of Columbia, so as to permit the board of managers of the Oak Hill Cemetery Co. to dispose of certain real property now usable only for cemetery purposes.

This cemetery was incorporated under a special act of Congress in 1849, and as is the general custom, it contained a provision in the act making all of its real estate inalienable. A number of years after the cemetery was incorporated, it purchased a parcel of ground across the street from the cemetery on R Street NW., which was used strictly for ancillary purposes such as worksheds and a stable and other activities that would not ordinarily be carried on within the cemetery proper.

Under existing law it would be impossible for the Oak Hill Cemetery to use this parcel for burial grounds as it would be necessary to obtain the consent of all property owners within 200 yards which, under the circumstances, would be unlikely. The cemetery now has an opportunity to sell this parcel of land; however, this proposed legislation is necessary before the sale can be consummated.

I therefore urge passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 10374) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TESTS TO DETERMINE THE PRESENCE OF ALCOHOL IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. MORSE. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2274, Senate bill 313.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 313) to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood, urine, or breath of persons tried in the District of Columbia for certain offenses committed while operating vehicles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That if, as a result of the operation of a vehicle, any person is tried in any court of competent jurisdiction within the District of Columbia for operating such vehicle while under the influence of any intoxicating liquor in violation of section 10 (b) of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, approved March 3, 1925, as amended (D. C. Code, title 40, sec. 609), and in the course of such trial there is received in evidence competent proof to the effect that at the time of such operation—

(a) defendant's blood contained five one-hundredths of 1 percent or less, by weight, of alcohol, or that defendant's urine contained eight one-hundredths of 1 percent or less, by weight, of alcohol, such proof shall be deemed prima facie proof that defendant at such time was not under the influence of any intoxicating liquor;

(b) defendant's blood contained more than five one-hundredths of 1 percent, but less than fifteen one-hundredths of 1 percent, by weight, of alcohol, or defendant's urine contained more than eight one-hundredths of 1 percent, but less than twenty one-hundredths of 1 percent, by weight, of alcohol, such proof shall constitute relevant evidence, but shall not constitute prima facie proof that defendant was or was not at such time under the influence of any intoxicating liquor; and

(c) defendant's blood contained fifteen one-hundredths of 1 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol, or defendant's urine contained twenty one-hundredths of 1 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol, such proof shall constitute prima facie proof that defendant at such time was under the influence of intoxicating liquor.

SEC. 2. (a) CHEMICAL TESTS.—Any person who operates a motor vehicle in the District of Columbia shall be deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test of his blood or urine for the purpose of determining the alcoholic content of his blood or urine: *Provided*, That such test is administered at the direction of a police officer having reasonable grounds to believe such person to have been driving in an intoxicated condition and in accordance with the rules and regulations established by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent. If such person having been placed under arrest and having thereafter been requested to submit to such chemical test refuses to submit to such chemical test the test shall not be given but the Commissioners or their designated agent shall revoke his license or permit to drive and any nonresident operating privilege: *Provided, however*, That the Commissioners or their designated agent shall grant such person an opportunity to be heard but a license, permit, or nonresident operating privilege may, upon the basis of a sworn report of the police officer that he had reasonable grounds to believe such arrested person to have been driving in an intoxicated condition and that said person had refused to submit to such test, be temporarily suspended without notice pending the determination upon any such hearing, which shall be held within 10 days from date of suspension unless an extension of time be requested by such person. If, as a result of such hearing, it be determined such person did not refuse to submit to such a test, his license or permit and any nonresident operating privilege shall forthwith be restored. The provisions of section 13 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended (sec. 40-302, D. C. Code), shall be applicable to revocations under this section.

(b) Upon the request of the person who was tested, the results of such test shall be made available to him.

(c) Only a physician acting at the request of a police officer can withdraw blood for the purpose of determining the alcoholic content therein. This limitation shall not apply to the taking of a urine specimen.

(d) The person tested shall be permitted to have a physician of his own choosing administer a chemical test in addition to the one administered at the direction of the police officer.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood or urine of persons tried in any court of competent jurisdiction within the District of Columbia for operating vehicles while under the influence of intoxicating liquor.

The bill creates two presumptions with respect to tests for alcohol in the blood or urine:

First. If the defendant's blood contains five-hundredths of 1 percent or less, by weight, of alcohol, or if his urine contains eight-hundredths of 1 percent or less, by weight, of alcohol, he shall be presumed not to be under the influence of intoxicating liquor.

Second. If the defendant's blood contains fifteen-hundredths of 1 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol, or if his urine contains twenty-hundredths of 1 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol, he shall be presumed to be under the influence of intoxicating liquor.

This proposed legislation would permit the District to offer in evidence the results of such chemical tests without the necessity of securing the services of an expert witness.

Twenty-two States have adopted chemical-test laws, as will be seen from the report.

Section 2 of the bill is similar to the implied-consent law of the State of New York.

The testimony was, without exception, that if the blood or urine contains the weight of alcohol set forth in the bill, there is no question about the driver being under the influence of alcohol. A laymen might possibly question that statement, but it is very interesting to point out what the witnesses made very clear. There is a body of unquestioned scientific data which bears out the testimony. It seems to be the invariable rule that, no matter how much an individual may drink, no matter for how long a period he may have been a heavy drinker, nevertheless, if his blood contains a certain quantity of alcohol, by weight, he is under the influence of alcohol.

So we are not dealing with the problem which was raised in the discussion in the committee, as to whether or not such a test might be unfair to the so-called heavy drinker, because when the alcohol in the blood or urine reaches a certain weight, no matter how long one had engaged in the drinking of alcohol, he is under the influence of liquor, so far as intoxication is concerned.

The second point I wish to bring out is that this procedure has become pro forma in the District of Columbia courts. There is only one doctor, and he volunteers his services by going to the police court and reciting what he very good naturedly said to us has now become almost a rote with him—a statement to the effect that the test had been given and the blood contained a certain weight of alcohol. He is doing this as a great public service to the District of Columbia, without charge, as did his father before him. As the record will show, he received the high commendation of the District of Columbia Committee for this public service. But it is pro forma. It is not necessary. It ought to be eliminated, and this bill seeks to eliminate it, as has been done in 22 other States.

Lastly, it will be noted that the bill provides for the adoption of a provision relative to so-called implied consent, which is found in the New York law, which has been thoroughly tested in the courts. Briefly, the application of the provision would be as follows:

Assume, for example, that an accident has occurred at Constitution and Delaware Avenues. X runs into Y. Y's car is damaged and Y is injured. The police officers come upon the scene, escort X to precinct headquarters and ask him to take an alcohol test. He refuses, which he has the right to do. He then automatically loses his right to drive a car until such time as a hearing is held, as provided in the bill, to determine whether or not he refused to take the test.

If my hypothetical Mr. X, who has been taken to the precinct station house, refuses to take the test, he loses his right to drive an automobile until the following events occur:

First. A hearing is held, as provided in the bill, which goes into the question as to whether or not he had refused to take the test. If, as the result of the hearing, it is found that he did refuse to take the test, he cannot drive an automobile until his innocence of the charge of driving while intoxicated is established.

Second. If his innocence is established he can drive again. If it is not established, or, in other words, if he is found guilty, automatically, under District law, he loses the right to drive for 6 months anyway.

The members of the committee on the District of Columbia are unanimous in their opinion. We wish to make it perfectly clear that we intend to do what we can to tighten the traffic laws in the District of Columbia so as to try to reduce the number of fatalities and injuries that are occurring on the streets of the District of Columbia. We want drivers to know that we are somewhat intolerant of the growing evidence that there is too much driving in the District of Columbia by people who have taken a cocktail or two, who cannot handle a cocktail or two. Since Congress still

maintains its city council functions—and we ought to get rid of them by passing a District of Columbia home-rule bill—the time has come to get tough with alcoholic drivers.

This section of the bill, which I urged in committee and with regard to which I accepted some amendments, is a section which in my judgment will cause people who go to cocktail parties believing they can handle 3 or 4 cocktails and then demonstrate they cannot handle even 1 cocktail, to think twice before they drive under such circumstances, for they will know they will be found guilty if an accident occurs as a result of their having had too much alcohol, as shown by weight in either their blood or urine. I urge the passage of the bill as a long-needed safety measure in the District of Columbia to protect the innocent from alcoholic drivers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 313) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood or urine of persons tried in the District of Columbia for operating vehicles while under the influence of intoxicating liquor."

CONTROL OF NARCOTICS, BARBITURATES, AND DANGEROUS DRUGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 2275, H. R. 11320.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11320) to effect the control of narcotics, barbiturates, and dangerous drugs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "the", to strike out "Narcotic" and insert "Dangerous Drug"; on page 9, line 22, after the word "or", where it appears the first time, to strike out "hynotic" and insert "hypnotic"; on page 17, line 3, after the word "other", to insert "drug or"; in line 10, after the word "and", where it occurs the first time to insert "(1)"; in line 21, after the word "drugs", to strike out "including barbiturates or amphetamines)"; on page 19, line 23, after the word "to", to insert "Federal and"; at the beginning of line 25, to strike out "or of the United States" and insert "and the laws of the United States applicable within the District of Columbia"; on page 25, line 17, after the word "the", to strike out "provision" and insert "provisions"; on page 34, line 14, after the word "the", to strike out "provitions" and insert "provisions"; on page 35, line 16, after the word "this", to strike out "Act" and insert "section"; on page 36, line 3, after the numeral "(1)", to insert "if committed prior to July 1, 1958; (2)"; and in line 6, after the word "and", to strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I read my prepared statement on the bill I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], in which he discusses the use of the phrase "in the course of his professional practice," which is included in the definition of "practitioner" appearing in title II of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BEALL

A question has been raised over the use of the phrase "in the course of his professional practice," which is included in the definition of "practitioner" appearing in title 2 of the proposed Dangerous Drug Control Act for the District of Columbia. It is thought that such definition might conflict with the use of the term practitioner appearing in section 503 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U. S. C. 353).

The definition of the term "practitioner" in the District bill is as follows:

"The term 'practitioner' means any person duly licensed by appropriate authority and, in conformance with the law, licensed to prescribe dangerous drugs, and to administer and use dangerous drugs in the course of his professional practice."

The term "practitioner" is not defined in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act as such but appears in section 503 defining a prescription drug which reads in part as follows: "shall be dispensed only (1) upon a written prescription of a practitioner licensed by law."

The selection of the definition of the term practitioner in the proposed District bill was deliberate, having in mind the objectives of the legislation which differ fundamentally from those of the Federal act.

The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is designed primarily to regulate and control the introduction and flow in interstate commerce of certain items, including drugs, to insure that the ultimate consumer shall not be harmed or injured by any impure, adulterated, or inherently dangerous substance, or one which has not been properly labeled or branded. Therefore, the Federal act is not directly concerned with individual conduct on the local level of those who handle and use these items which are not adulterated, impure or inherently dangerous, or which have not been misbranded.

To fill the gap between the introduction in interstate commerce of pure and unadulterated drugs, as provided by the Federal act, and the handling and use of such drugs on the local level, over two-thirds of the States have already adopted legislation to police the conduct of those who deal in or use these drugs.

Under the provision of this new Dangerous Drug Control Act for the District of Columbia it is intended that the conduct of those who handle, distribute, and use these dangerous drugs shall be regulated and controlled in order to minimize the chances and opportunities for abuse and misuse. By including the phrase "in the course of his professional practice" in the term "practitioner" the District act does nothing more than recognize and acknowledge the high type of professional conduct which governs the practice of local physicians who dispense and prescribe these drugs. Yet is must be recognized that there are unscrupulous persons who may be tempted to make indiscriminate use of their licensed authority to dispense these drugs to individuals who do not share the bona fide doctor-patient relationship. To strike the phrase "in the course of his professional practice" from the definition of practitioner in the bill would leave the door open to unethical doctors and illicit users.

The phrase itself is not new and can be found in identical usage in our Federal narcotic laws, in the Uniform Drug Act for the District of Columbia and in many of the State acts. With such precedents to follow, and with full understanding the purposes of the Federal act and the proposed new legislation for the District of Columbia, I feel any effort to change or alter the language of the definition of the term "practitioner," as the bill is presently written, would seriously weaken the more important enforcement and regulatory features of the act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to improve existing programs for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic drug addicts, to provide controls over the distribution and use of barbiturates, amphetamines, and other dangerous drugs, and to strengthen present law enforcement procedures to combat the illicit drug traffic in the District of Columbia.

The first title corrects the manifold weaknesses in the present addict law and insures swift and certain commitment of drug addicts who show promise of benefiting from hospital treatment and rehabilitation in the community. Juveniles are specifically included among those subject to the provisions of the bill.

Title II regulates and controls the sale and use of amphetamines, barbiturates, and other dangerous drugs in the District of Columbia. Prescriptions, invoices, records, and inventories would be subject to inspection at all times by both Federal and District officials.

Title III amends the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act to permit arrest without a warrant as in the case of a felony or probable cause that the person to be arrested is violating a provision of the act at the time of his arrest.

The Public Health Service Act is also amended to require the Surgeon General to furnish to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or their designated agent, the name, address, and other pertinent information of any resident drug addict of the District of Columbia who has volunteered for treatment for addiction.

I would supplement my statement by saying that this is a long-overdue act. We held very thorough hearings on the bill. We had the cooperation of the very able chairman of the District Board of Pharmacists. Of course, there were some objections made to some of the procedural phases of the bill at one stage in the hearings, and probably there are still some objections to the bill. It does mean the placing of an additional burden of inspection on the pharmacists of the District.

However, when we weigh that burden against the need of protecting the public

from what is represented to us to be evidence of a constant increase in the drug traffic in the District and an increase in the use of the particular types of drugs we seek to regulate very stringently, there is no question that an inconvenience to druggists must give way to the public good.

I wish to say in behalf of the druggists, without committing any of them, that they cooperated with our committee and that they are entitled to the commendation of the committee and, for that matter, of the people of the District for their willingness at least to accede to the additional supervision which goes along with the provisions of the bill.

I urge its immediate passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time, the bill (H. R. 11320) was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to effect the control of narcotics and dangerous drugs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1937

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2276, H. R. 3693.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3693) to amend title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the purpose of this proposed legislation is to increase the term of the judge of the District of Columbia Tax Court from 4 years to 10 years, and provides retirement for the judge of such court as follows:

First. After having served as a judge of such court for a period or periods aggregating 20 years or more, whether continuously or not;

Second. After having served as a judge of such court for a period or periods aggregating 10 years or more, whether continuously or not, and having attained the age of 70 years; or

Third. After having become permanently disabled from performing his duties, regardless of age or length of service.

The bill was supported by the members of the Tax Bar Association of the District of Columbia and by other bar associations.

In support of the bill I wish to say that they convinced the committee unanimously that we are dealing here with a District tax court which is almost identical in every respect so far as type of case handled, and is identical with respect to procedure followed, with the United States Tax Court.

We are dealing also with a court on the bench of which there is required a man who has had many years of tax experience. Therefore, very frequently, the man appointed to a judgeship in the court is in the declining years of life. We feel, therefore, that such a judge should stand somewhat on a par with Federal Tax Court judges when it comes to retirement benefits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on the District of Columbia was on page 1, line 7, after the word "for", to insert the word "a".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 3, after line 16, to insert:

SEC. 2. The amendment to the first paragraph of section 2 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, set forth in the first section of this act, shall take effect after the expiration of the term of office of the present judge of the District of Columbia Tax Court.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, in line 19, to strike out the word "eflect" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "effect." My amendment is to correct a typographical error in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3693) was read the third time, and passed.

LICENSING OF SECONDHAND DEALERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2289, H. R. 6782.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6782) to amend section 7 of "An act making appropriations to provide for the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to bring up to date the act of July 1, 1902, relating to the licensing of secondhand dealers, by empowering the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to classify and regulate secondhand dealers in the light of modern merchandising methods.

Existing law requires the same procedure for licensing, as a secondhand dealer, of every person dealing in used personal property, regardless of whether such dealing is their primary business or whether such dealing is only incidental to the buying and selling of new personal property.

Existing law also requires every person licensed as a secondhand dealer to pay an annual license fee of $50, without regard to the extent to which such person deals in used personal property.

The bill merely brings up to date an old law of the District, and enables the Commissioners to properly regulate the sale of goods in the District by permitting the Commissioners to classify dealers. It would permit a better and more equitable administration and application of the license act.

I urge the immediate passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. A. 6782) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 20, 1956, pp. 10679–10681, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 9739, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 20, 1956.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64 to the bill (H. R. 9739) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes," and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$75,000" named in said amendment, insert: "$50,000."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the House and Senate actions on various items in the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of House and Senate action on independent offices appropriation bill, 1957

TITLE I—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Item	Appropriations, 1956 [1]	Budget estimates, 1957	Recommended in House bill for 1957	Amount recommended by Senate	Amount agreed to in conference
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	$17,282,500	$17,618,000	$17,282,500	$17,532,500	$17,407,500
Investigations of United States citizens for employment by international organizations	[2] 107,100	574,000	450,000	525,000	487,500
Annuities, Panama Canal construction employees and Lighthouse Service widows	2,240,000	2,024,000	2,024,000	2,024,000	2,024,000
Payment to the civil-service retirement and disability fund	233,000,000	295,000,000	600,000,000	440,438,000	525,000,000
Administrative expenses, Federal employees' life insurance fund	(117,500)	(186,700)	(100,000)	(186,700)	(117,500)
Total, Civil Service Commission	252,629,600	315,216,000	619,756,500	460,519,500	544,919,000
FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION					
Operations	[3] 12,125,000	21,700,000	15,560,000	21,700,000	15,560,000
Federal contributions	12,400,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
Emergency supplies and equipment	32,650,000	64,000,000	42,000,000	64,000,000	47,000,000
Surveys, plans, and research	10,000,000	14,500,000	10,000,000	14,500,000	10,000,000
Salaries and expenses, civil-defense functions of Federal agencies	[4] 1,500,000	6,000,000	1,540,000	6,000,000	4,000,000
Total, Federal Civil Defense Administration	68,675,000	123,200,000	86,100,000	123,200,000	93,560,000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Disaster relief	28,500,000	----------	5,386,030	6,000,000	6,000,000
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	7,323,000	7,850,000	7,800,000	7,828,000	7,828,000
FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	4,900,000	5,250,000	5,200,000	5,250,000	5,225,000
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	4,548,500	5,500,000	5,400,000	5,550,000	5,550,000
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses	33,481,000	34,581,000	34,000,000	34,000,000	34,000,000
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION					
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service	102,280,500	128,598,000	122,694,200	128,084,500	125,000,000
Repair, improvement, and equipment of federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia	26,150,000	44,138,000	42,565,550	42,638,000	42,565,550
Sites and planning, purchase contract and public buildings projects	15,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Payments, public buildings purchase contracts	----------	237,000	237,000	237,000	237,000
Hospital facilities in the District of Columbia (liquidation of contract authorization)	9,700,000	5,300,000	5,300,000	5,300,000	5,300,000
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service	3,395,000	4,028,000	[5] 2,809,400	[5] 2,959,400	[5] 2,884,400
Expenses, general supply fund	[6] 13,625,000	15,344,000	14,270,000	14,770,000	14,770,000
General supply fund	----------	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service	5,997,500	6,977,000	6,818,650	6,893,650	6,893,650
Survey of Government records, records management, and disposal practices	----------	200,000	----------	200,000	----------
Operating expenses, transportation and public utilities service	----------	1,407,000	1,251,100	1,251,100	1,251,100
Refunds under Renegotiation Act	4,000,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Strategic and critical materials	521,500,000	[7]	[5] (3,000,000)	[5] (3,351,000)	[5] (3,175,500)
Abaca fiber program (administrative expenses)	(119,500)	(117,500)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator	----------	395,000	395,000	395,000	395,000
Administrative operations fund	----------	(9,745,300)	(9,278,200)	(9,802,550)	(9,540,375)
Hospital facilities in the District of Columbia	1,610,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Emergency operating expenses	11,865,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
U. S. Post Office and Courthouse, Nome, Alaska	1,100,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Strategic and critical materials (liquidation of contract authorization)	27,400,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Administrative operations	4,410,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Total, General Services Administration	748,033,000	221,624,000	211,340,900	217,728,650	214,296,700
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY					
Office of the Administrator:					
Salaries and expenses	5,398,500	6,450,000	6,000,000	6,450,000	6,225,000
Urban planning grants	2,000,000	2,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000	1,500,000
Statistics on housing demand	----------	175,000	----------	----------	----------
Reserve of planned public works (payment to revolving fund)	3,000,000	12,000,000	6,000,000	9,000,000	7,500,000
Capital grants for slum clearance and urban renewal	50,000,000	50,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000
Total, Office of the Administrator	60,398,500	70,625,000	53,000,000	57,450,000	55,225,000

[1] Includes pay increases and other items in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956.
[2] Unobligated balances continued available.
[3] And transfer of $362,000 from "Emergency supplies and equipment."
[4] And transfer of $40,000 from "Emergency supplies and equipment."
[5] And $1,935,600 from funds derived from proceeds of surplus personal property disposal.
[6] And transfer of $450,000 from "Sites and planning," etc.
[7] Language only.
[8] Limitation and rescission of $199,349,000 of prior year appropriations.

Comparison of House and Senate action on independent offices appropriation bill, 1957—Continued

TITLE I—INDEPENDENT OFFICES—continued

Item	Appropriations, 1956	Budget estimates, 1957	Recommended in House bill for 1957	Amount recommended by Senate	Amount agreed to in conference
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY—continued					
Public Housing Administration:					
Administrative expenses	$9,636,500	$10,700,000	$9,700,000	$10,700,000	$10,500,000
Annual contributions	81,750,000	96,000,000	90,000,000	96,000,000	93,000,000
Total, Public Housing Administration	91,386,500	106,700,000	99,700,000	106,700,000	103,500,000
Total, Housing and Home Finance Agency	151,785,000	177,325,000	152,700,000	164,150,000	158,725,000
INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses		14,000,000	13,900,000	14,879,696	14,879,696
General expenses	11,107,000	[9]	[9]	[9]	
Railroad safety	1,035,000	[9]	[9]	[10] (1,230,178)	(1,230,178)
Locomotive inspection	754,000	[9]	[9]	[10] (849,500)	(849,500)
Total, Interstate Commerce Commission	12,896,000	14,000,000	13,900,000	14,879,696	14,879,696
NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS					
Salaries and expenses	60,135,000	64,700,000	[11] 61,475,000	[12] 63,200,000	[12] 61,887,500
Construction and equipment	12,565,000	15,000,000	13,000,000	15,000,000	14,000,000
Total, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	72,700,000	79,700,000	74,475,000	78,200,000	75,887,500
NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY					
Maintenance and operation of properties	38,400	39,000	37,000	39,000	38,000
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION					
Salaries and expenses	16,000,000	41,300,000	35,915,000	41,300,000	40,000,000
International Geophysical Year	37,000,000				
Total, National Science Foundation	53,000,000	41,300,000	35,915,000	41,300,000	
NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	40,000	75,000		75,000	50,000
RENEGOTIATION BOARD					
Salaries and expenses	4,150,000	3,750,000	3,675,000	3,657,000	3,675,000
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	5,278,000	5,749,000	5,700,000	5,749,000	5,749,000
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM					
Salaries and expenses	[13] 27,216,000	29,050,000	28,442,000	29,050,000	29,050,000
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION					
General operating expenses	167,502,000	164,436,000	162,118,260	163,936,000	163,027,130
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	16,049,600	16,453,000	16,099,600	20,773,800	20,773,800
Inpatient care	[14] 649,790,600	[15] 662,900,000	[15] 662,900,000	[15] 662,900,000	[15] 662,900,000
Outpatient care	85,971,200	82,638,000	82,638,000	82,638,000	82,638,000
Maintenance and operation of supply depots	1,628,000	1,671,000	1,628,000	1,628,000	1,628,000
Compensation and pensions	2,810,000,000	2,907,000,000	2,907,000,000	2,907,000,000	2,907,000,000
Readjustment benefits	812,097,000	775,000,000	775,000,000	775,000,000	775,000,000
Military and naval insurance	4,868,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
National service life insurance	81,300,000	23,200,000	23,200,000	23,200,000	23,200,000
Servicemen's indemnities	40,500,000	26,750,000	26,750,000	26,750,000	26,750,000
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	2,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Hospital and domiciliary facilities	30,000,000	47,000,000	50,935,000	51,635,000	51,635,000
Major alterations, improvements, and repairs	3,900,000	4,447,000	4,447,000	4,533,000	4,533,000
Service-disabled veterans insurance fund	750,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Total, Veterans' Administration	4,706,856,400	4,719,495,000	4,720,715,860	4,727,993,800	4,727,084,930
Total, Title I	6,182,049,900	5,783,704,000	6,010,543,290	5,925,187,646	5,966,517,826

Rescission of prior year appropriations recommended in the bill:	
General Services Administration: Strategic and critical materials	−$199,349,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency: Public facility loans	−1,960,945
Total rescissions	−201,309,945

[9] Consolidated in above amount.
[10] Earmarked in bill.
[11] And not to exceed $600,000 of prior year funds continued available.
[12] And not to exceed $1,500,000 of prior year funds continued available.
[13] And $1,226,000 of prior year funds continued available.
[14] And in addition, $7,229,600 from reimbursements.
[15] And in addition, $7,216,900 from reimbursements.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

[Limitations on amounts of corporate funds to be expended]

Corporation or agency	Authorizations, 1956 [1]	Budget estimates, 1957	Recommended in House bill for 1957	Amount recommended by Senate	Amount agreed to in conference
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	$978,400	$1,095,000	$978,400	$1,095,000	$1,036,700
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	985,000	596,000	532,000	596,000	596,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency:					
College housing loans	706,300	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
Public facility loans	159,500	475,000	318,000	418,000	368,000
Public facility loans (RFC Liquidation Act)	40,000				
Revolving fund (liquidating programs)	2,788,000	2,310,000	2,000,000	2,310,000	2,165,000
Federal National Mortgage Association	3,950,000	4,000,000	3,700,000	3,850,000	3,775,000
Federal Housing Administration	6,692,500	7,150,000	6,900,000	6,900,000	6,900,000
Public Housing Administration	[2] (11,966,500)	[2] (12,800,000)	[2] (11,550,000)	[2] (12,800,000)	[2] (12,475,000)
Total, administrative expenses	16,299,700	16,726,000	15,528,400	16,269,000	15,940,700

[1] Includes pay increases in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956.
[2] Amount includes funds appropriated in title I and available from "Revolving fund (liquidating programs)." Duplication eliminated in totals.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until tomorrow at noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2277, S. 2429.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2429) to amend section 212 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize research and experimental work with vessels, vessel propulsion and equipment, port facilities, planning, and operation, and cargo handling on ships and at ports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the bill, which received the unanimous approval of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, authorizes research and experimental work on vessels, port facilities, and cargo handling.

Without taking the time of the Senate, I should merely like to say that the bill would give specific authority to the Maritime Administration, in collaboration with public and private interests concerned, to carry on research activities in the fields of ship design, propulsion, and equipment; of improvement of port facilities; and of all phases of passenger and cargo handling. In effect, the bill would authorize studies looking to reducing the time spent by vessels in port.

There is some obsolescence in the way cargoes are now handled by our merchant marine, and the bill would allow the Maritime Board and Administration to make the proper studies with a view to bringing about more efficient cargo handling.

It so happens that the average running ship in the American merchant marine spends 60 percent of its time in port, and 40 percent of its time at sea.

It is hoped that as a result of the studies there will be more efficient loading and unloading, better propulsion and equipment, and new designs which are necessary in order to keep our merchant marine modern.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2429) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 212 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 1122), is amended by inserting at the end of subsection (c) two new paragraphs, to read as follows:

"In collaboration with public and private interests concerned, and in the interest of improved efficiency and economy, to conduct research and experiments, developmental, trial, and demonstration work with vessels, propelling machinery, cargo-handling and other vessel equipment, improvements, and facilities, and to prepare plans and designs for new and improved vessels, machinery, equipment, and facilities;

"In collaboration with public and private interests concerned, and in the interest of improved efficiency and economy in the transfer of cargo and passengers between vessels and shore-transportation faciilties in ports, to conduct research and experiments, to develop plans and designs, procedures, and equipment for the improvement of wharves, docks, piers, warehouses, and other port facilities used in the movement and handling of cargo, passengers, and other commerce in ports in connection with water transportation."

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on Senate bill 2429 be printed at the conclusion of the passage of that bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

This bill would give broad authority to the Maritime Administration to conduct experimental work and research on all phases of vessel design, construction and propulsion, as well as covering projects for modernization of cargo-handling equipment, docking facilities, etc. As the Maritime Administrator so well explained at the hearings on the bill, such research as this may afford many answers to the problems now facing the American merchant marine.

When I was in Europe last summer, attending the Atoms for Peace Conference, I could not help but note the progress that had been made there in modernizing docks and dock facilities. We must keep abreast of that overseas development and, if possible, exceed it, and I believe that the pending bill offers ample opportunity to do both.

FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION IN THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2278, H. R. 5790.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5790) relating to the application in the Territory of Hawaii of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the report on the bill, which was reported unanimously from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

There being no objection, the report (No. 2257) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5790) to amend the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Act, as amended, and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act, as amended, having considered the same, report favorable thereon and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of the bill is to modify the provisions of the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Act and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act as they relate to the Territory of Hawaii, so as to place Hawaii on a parity with the several States in the distribution of Federal-aid funds under the formula and matching fund requirement as expressed in existing law, which, at present, does not apply to the Territories and possessions of the United States.

Section 8 (a) of the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Act of September 2, 1937 (50 Stat. 917; 16 U. S. C., 1952 edition, sec. 669a) and section 12 of the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act of August 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 431; 16 U. S. C. 1952 edition, sec. 777a) each provide that the Territory of Hawaii receive a fixed annual amount "not to exceed $25,000.00" to accomplish the purposes expressed in the legislation. The present bill modifies such provisions and removes Hawaii from the "fixed" sums and places it on a parity with the several States.

Allocations to the several States are based upon a formula designed to give each State its equitable portion of Federal aid based upon its area and the number of hunters or fisherman purchasing licenses. The funds are allocated on the basis of one-half in the ratio which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States, and one-half in the ratio which the number of paid license holders of each State bears to the total number of paid license holders of all the States. The funds are derived from the excise tax imposed on sporting arms and ammunition. In order that a State can become eligible for grants-in-aid, it must provide at least 25 percent of the funds needed for individual projects.

Hawaii, during the past 10 years, has made great strides in the wildlife and fish-restoration fields. In the former, it has established 14 public shooting areas, containing about 243,000 acres of land and conducted wildlife surveys and investigations gathering data urgently needed for management use. In the latter, it has conducted a study of the fresh-water goby and is conducting research on the ultimate restoration on the one valuable off-shore-reef fisheries, which have been severely overfished. Thus, placing Hawaii on a parity with the several States in the distribution of these grants-in-aid funds will enable it to undertake additional projects that are badly needed. Such equality of treatment will also result in imposing upon the Territory stricter matching requirements than now apply to it. Accordingly, this committee recommends that the bill do pass.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection 4 of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported are shown as follows (new matter is printed in italics, matter proposed to be omitted is in brackets, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

"FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION ACT OF SEPTEMBER 2, 1937 (50 STAT. 917)

"SEC. 2. * * * the term 'State fish and game department' shall be construed to mean and include any department or division of department of another name, or commission, or official or officials, of a State empowered under its laws to exercise the functions ordinarily exercized by a State fish and game department[.]*; and the term 'State' shall be construed to mean and include the several States and the Territory of Hawaii.*

"SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cooperate with the Alaska Game Commission, [the Division of Game and Fish of the Board of Commissioners of Agriculture and Forestry of Hawaii,] the Commissioner of Agriculture and Commerce

of Puerto Rico and the Governor of the Virgin Islands, in the conduct of wildlife-restoration projects, as defined in section 669a of this title, upon such terms and conditions as he shall deem fair, just, and equitable, and is authorized to apportion to said [Territories,] *Territory of Alaska,* Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, out of money available for apportionment under sections 669–669j of this title, such sums as he shall determine, not exceeding $75,000 for Alaska, [not exceeding $25,000 for Hawaii,] and not exceeding $10,000 each for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, in any one year, which apportionments, when made, shall be deducted before making the apportionments to the States provided for by said sections; but the Secretary shall in no event require any of said cooperating agencies to pay an amount which will exceed 25 per centum of the cost of any project. Any unexpended or unobligated balance of any apportionment made pursuant to this section shall be available for expenditure in the [Territories] *Territory of Alaska,* Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, as the case may be, in the succeeding year, on any approved project, and if unexpended or unobligated at the end of such year is authorized to be made available for expenditure by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out the provisions of the Migratory-Bird Conservation Act.

"FEDERAL AID IN FISH RESTORATION ACT OF AUGUST 9, 1950 (64 STAT. 431; 16 U. S. C., 1952 ED., SEC. 777A)

"SEC. 2. * * * the term "State fish and game department" shall be construed to mean and include any department or division of department of another name, or commission, or official or officials, of a State empowered under its laws to exercise the functions ordinarily exercised by a State fish and game department [.]*; and the term "State" shall be construed to mean and include the several States and the Territory of Hawaii.*

"SEC. 12. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cooperate with the Alaska Game Commission, [the Division of Game and Fish of the Board of Commissioners of Agriculture and Forestry of Hawaii,] the Commissioner of Agriculture and Commerce of Puerto Rico, and the Governor of the Virgin Islands, in the conduct of fish restoration and management projects, as defined in section 2 of this act, upon such terms and conditions as he shall deem fair, just, and equitable, and is authorized to apportion to said [Territories] *Territory of Alaska,* Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, out of money available for apportionment under this act, such sums as he shall determine, not exceeding $75,000 for Alaska, [not exceeding $25,000 for Hawaii,] and not exceeding $10,000 each for Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, in any one year, which apportionments, when made, shall be deducted before making the apportionments to the States provided for by this act; but the Secretary shall in no event require any of said cooperating agencies to pay an amount which will exceed 25 percent of the cost of any project. Any unexpended or unobligated balance of any apportionment made, pursuant to this section shall be available for expenditure in the [Territories] *Territory of Alaska,* Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, as the case may be, in the succeeding year, on any approved project, and if unexpended or unobligated at the end of the year is authorized to be made available for expenditure by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying on the research program of the Fish and Wildlife Service in respect to fish of material value for sport recreation."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, all the bill does is to modify the provisions of the Federal Aid To Wildlife Restoration Act so as to have it apply to Hawaii. The act does not now apply to Hawaii. The bill was passed by the House, and was reported unanimously by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 5790) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION OF PROTOTYPE CARGO SHIP AND CONVERSION OF LIBERTY SHIP

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2280, S. 3821.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3821) to authorize the construction of 2 prototype ships, and the conversion of 1 Liberty ship, by the Maritime Administration Department of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "test", to strike out "two prototype merchant ships, one of the 'Freedom' class and one" and insert "one prototype merchant ship", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, to construct, outfit, and test one prototype merchant ship of the "Clipper" class, as designed by the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, and to convert, outfit, and test one reserve fleet Liberty ship. Such construction and conversion outfitting and testing shall be subject to the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this bill, which again received unanimous approval of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, is an authorization measure. It allows the construction of one prototype ship of a new type, and also the conversion of our present mothball fleet of Liberty ships. The Maritime Administration has some plans with respect to this matter. The Administration would construct the ships or do the experimental work in conjunction with shipyards and private operators. That would result, we hope, in a new type of ship, which the administration wants to have called the Freedom class—vessels of 8,770 deadweight tons. We hope it will be the type of ship which can replace the Liberty ships, which are now reaching obsolescence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3821) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize the construction of one prototype ship and the conversion of one Liberty ship, by the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce."

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a statement I have prepared on Senate bill 3821 printed at the conclusion of the passage of that bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

This bill would authorize the Maritime Administration to construct and operate a prototype merchant ship of the clipper class and to convert another Liberty ship of the reserve fleet to a more modern type of propulsion machinery. I think both projects are entirely worthy of all the support that can be given them. We have more than 1,000 Liberty ships on hand which are too slow to be economical and which are really suitable for use only in an extreme emergency. If we can step up the speed by one of the new types of powerplants, it will make them intensely more valuable both to our peacetime and wartime economy; and in my opinion, be one of the best returns for our money than can be received.

With regard to the prototype clipper ship, I think the Maritime Administration is to be congratulated on its farsightedness in designing this ship, which not only can be of great assistance to the American merchant marine but also will afford, ready at hand, an austerity type of ship for mass construction, in which our naval authorities already have expressed the deepest interest.

CONSTRUCTION OF NUCLEAR-POWERED PROTOTYPE MERCHANT SHIPS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2279, S. 2523; and I call my motion to the attention of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2523) to amend section 212 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the construction of a nuclear-powered prototype merchant ship for operation in foreign commerce of the United States, to authorize research and experimental work with vessels, port facilities, planning, and operating and cargo handling on ships and at ports, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had gone through the following committee procedure:

On July 23, 1955, the bill had been reported without amendment from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign

Commerce; on July 30, 1955, it had been reported from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That (a) in order to demonstrate to the peoples of the world the great peaceful use and potential of atomic energy and the humanitarian and industrial applications of such energy, the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to construct an atomic energy propulsion facility, consisting of one or more reactors and auxiliary equipment, and to install such facility and equipment in a merchant vessel to be converted or constructed, and operated by the Secretary of Commerce for accomplishing the purposes of this act.

(b) On completion of such vessel, the Secretary of Commerce shall make suitable arrangements for such licenses as are required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and, in consultation with the Atomic Energy Commission, for the display on such vessel, insofar as practicable, of the peaceful uses of atomic energy and for the training of qualified personnel. The Secretary of Commerce shall make such regulations and prescribe such fees as he deems necessary for the display of goods and wares of United States manufacture or origin. Such vessel may be equipped and utilized to generate electricity from atomic energy and, under such terms, rates, or conditions as the Secretary of Commerce may prescribe, may be utilized (1) to supply for demonstration or emergency purposes such electrical energy to the electric utility system of any port in which such vessel is a visitor, and (2) to transport cargo.

(c) No charge shall be made to any person visiting such vessel in the normal course of viewing the vessel or its exhibits while the vessel is operated by the Government.

(d) The itinerary of such vessel shall be determined by the Secretary of Commerce on direction of the President and, to the maximum extent consistent with the common defense and security and the health and safety of the public, the vessel and its contents shall be made freely accessible to public view.

(e) The name of such vessel shall be the U. S. S. *Atomic Enterprise*.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of developing the economic uses of nuclear transportation power in peaceful pursuits of domestic and foreign commerce, the Atomic Energy Commission, with the assistance of the Maritime Administration, is authorized to develop and construct an atomic energy propulsion facility and auxiliary equipment for adaptation to a surface vessel of such characteristics and design as will make it usable in the American merchant marine fleet. The Maritime Administration, with the assistance of the Atomic Energy Commission, is authorized to construct such vessel. Upon completion of such vessel, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to arrange for its operation or charter in such manner as circumstances and the public interest then warrant.

SEC. 3. Except as otherwise determined by the Atomic Energy Commission, the development, construction and installation of the reactor propulsion facilities and auxiliary facilities herein authorized shall be so conducted as not to impair substantially the prosecution of other atomic energy research and development or construction projects of the Atomic Energy Commission.

SEC. 4. The Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, are authorized to utilize such funds as may be presently available to them to accomplish the purposes of this act, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

And to amend the title, so as to read: "A bill to authorize appropriations for the development, construction, and operation of two atomic energy propulsion facilities, and for other purposes."

On May 10, 1956, it was rereferred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and on June 18, 1956, was reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with the following additional amendment:

To strike out all of the amendment of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and insert, in lieu thereof, the following:

"That section 212 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 1122), is amended by inserting at the end of subsection (c) two new paragraphs to read as follows:

" 'That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, for the construction, outfitting, and preparation for operation, including training of qualified personnel, of a nuclear-powered prototype merchant ship capable of providing shipping services on routes essential for maintaining the flow of the foreign commerce of the United States. The Maritime Administration in carrying on activities and functions under this paragraph, may collaborate with and employ persons, firms, and corporations on a contract or fee basis for the performance of special services deemed necessary by the Administration in carrying on such activities and functions, and may, for the same purposes, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce and where appropriate the Atomic Energy Commission, avail itself of the use of licenses, information, services, facilities, offices, and employees of any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency of the Government, including any field service thereof;

" 'In collaboration with public and private interests concerned, and in the interest of improved efficiency and economy in the transfer of cargo and passengers between vessels and shore transportation facilities in ports, to conduct research and experiments, to develop plans and designs, procedures, and equipment for the improvement of wharves, docks, piers, warehouses, and other port facilities used in the movement and handling of cargo, passengers, and other commerce in ports in connection with water transportation;'."

And to amend the title, so as to read: "A bill to amend section 212 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the construction of a nuclear-powered prototype merchant ship for operation in foreign commerce of the United States, to authorize research and experimental work with vessels, port facilities, planning, and operating and cargo handling on ships and at ports, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield at this point?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The effect of the recommendation which has just been read is to strike out all except the original provisions of the bill which the Senator from Washington introduced, and which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] and I joined in sponsoring. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It may be that some amendments to the language reported by the committee will be proposed. If the committee amendment is adopted, will amendments to it then be in order; or must such amendments be submitted and acted on prior to adoption of the committee amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I hope the procedure followed will not prohibit the offering of amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, are in order before a vote is taken on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not believe any amendment has been reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee has reported an amendment in the nature of a complete substitute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a similar bill, House bill 6243, is before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I shall ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 6243; that that bill be considered by the Senate; that all after the enacting clause of House bill 6243 be stricken out, and that there be inserted in lieu thereof, the text of Senate bill 2523. In other words, by that means we shall agree to the text of Senate bill 2523.

The Senate bill authorizes the Department of Commerce and the Maritime Administration to proceed with the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship. The bill relating to the so-called peace ship is still before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. That is the situation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. All I am trying to ascertain is the language to which we are addressing ourselves at this moment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The language of the Senate bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand the provisions of the bill. But three separate reports have been made on Senate bill 2523, and we are confronted with three separate texts. I wish to know which one is before the Senate at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will attempt to state the parliamentary situation:

The bill was reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce without amendment. The bill was then referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy then reported an amendment in the nature of a complete substitute for the bill.

The bill was then referred back to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and that committee reported a complete substitute for the amendment in the nature of a substitute which had been reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—which had the effect of restoring the original language of the bill.

The parliamentary situation is that the first vote will occur on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

If that motion be rejected, the vote will then occur on the amendment reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on page 5 of the bill the Senator from Iowa will see in italics the language reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think I know what the Senator from Iowa is trying to do, and I think he is completely correct. He wishes to be sure that if the Senate adopts the language of the original bill as a committee substitute, he will not be barred from offering amendments to it. If that is not the procedure, I should like to ask unanimous consent that we consider the bill as originally reported to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state that if any amendments are to be submitted to the amendment reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, they must be submitted and acted on before adoption of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. ANDERSON. But I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that nothing reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment in the nature of a complete substitute has been reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. ANDERSON. It has been reported by the committee headed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been reported twice by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the intervening period the bill was reported once by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. In each case an amendment in the nature of a complete substitute was reported. The Chair has before him the report by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The parliamentary situation is that the first vote will be taken on the question of agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, for the bill as originally reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am willing to accept the ruling of the Chair. But the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy does not have any bill before the Senate. The Joint Committee joined in an effort to send the bill back to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

All I am trying to do is to request unanimous consent that the language now in the bill, namely, from line 20, on page 5, through to the end of page 7, shall be regarded as original text, and be open to any amendment which may be offered by any Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would it not clear up the legislative situation—if the suggestion may be made in keeping with the desires of the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Washington, and the Senator from Iowa—to have the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, laid on the table. That would leave us with the bill reported the second time by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. At that point, we could enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to consider that language as the original text of the bill; and then the Senator from Iowa could offer any amendments he might wish to offer.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished chairman of the committee that in connection with any amendments I may wish to discuss, I have only one thought, namely, I am not opposed to the general principle of the bill as finally reported by the committee, except I have a very deep feeling that the nuclear elements in the ship should be constructed and built under the supervision of the Atomic Energy Commission, which is equipped to perform that function. I wish to speak to those matters at the proper time.

I do not think the Atomic Energy Commission has anything to do with building a ship; that is not its business. The Maritime Administration is the shipbuilding organization. My sole interest is to see whether we can provide that only the nuclear elements—such as the nuclear powerplant—which are specialized, and are strictly dependent upon atomic energy, shall be handled under the responsibility of the Atomic Energy Commission, which shall either build or shall supervise the construction of that particular phase of the operation. That is my sole interest in this matter. I am not opposing the Senator's bill or its principle.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to say to the Senator from Iowa that the testimony before the committee, as received from both the Maritime Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission, was to the effect that the nuclear elements of the nuclear-propelled ship would be supervised by the Atomic Energy Commission.

In drafting the bill we were very careful to protect the rights of the Atomic Energy Commission to license or give out information, or in granting the Maritime Administration access to its files. The bill gives the Commission complete control and supervision in such matters. All the testimony on behalf of the Secretary of Commerce, and also the testimony by Admiral Strauss, himself, was that preliminary negotiations have already taken place between the Maritime Administration, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Atomic Energy Commission, and they have perfected a plan whereby they will work together.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That still does not reach what I believe to be fundamental in connection with this matter. There is a tendency on the part of every department of government to try to get into the atomic field. We can, if we permit it, dilute the technicians and experts in that field to such an extent as to be of disservice to the development of atomic energy.

The Atomic Energy Commission has the setup, the equipment, the proper organization, the know-how, and the experience; and I hope we shall be realistic about this matter.

So far as I am concerned, I think the Maritime Administration should build the ship and should draw up its design. But the responsibility for the nuclear powerplant should be vested in the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not so familiar with the matter as is the Senator from Iowa. But my understanding is that the Maritime Administration could not possibly build the powerplant; that would have to be done under the supervision of the Atomic Energy Commission; and then, under license from the Atomic Energy Commission, it could be turned over to the Maritime Administration, to be installed in the hull of the ship.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I think the Senator is entirely correct about that. However, in view of the form in which the bill is drafted, I think that 1 or 2 amendments are necessary in order to correct the authorization set forth in the bill. Therefore, I believe that the bill should be corrected by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in such fashion as may be needed in order to conform to the desires of the Atomic Energy Commission regarding this matter. I think it essential that the powerplant be constructed by the Atomic Energy Commission. Thereafter, the licensing authority provided in the bill will take care of the operation of installing the powerplant in the hull of the ship.

In my judgment, the authorization contained in the bill should be drawn in such a way as to make a division between the authorization for construction of the ship and the authorization for construction of its powerplant.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have no objection to having that done. The only reason the bill is before the Senate in its present form is that the Atomic Energy Commission, through its Chairman, Admiral Strauss, and other members of the Commission, approved this language, and said the Atomic Energy Commission would do the preliminary work under the liaison which now exists between the Department of Commerce and the Atomic Energy Commission; and the Commission unanimously approved the bill. So I have no objection to an amendment of the character suggested.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. All that is necessary is a technical amendment to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to take its proper share of the appropriation, in order to do what we intend it shall do.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the Senator submit his amendment?

Mr. BRICKER. I think the Senator from New Mexico or the Senator from Iowa has such an amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have some language which I think will take care of the situation, but I should like to submit it to the Senator from Washington so that there may be agreement. I do not want the Atomic Energy Commission to get into shipbuilding, any more than I want the State Department to start building battleships.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the Senator. However, this language was approved by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I arrived too late to join with the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in connection with Senate bill 2429 and Senate bill 3821, as well as the bill under discussion. These are bills upon which the Appropriations Committee and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have been working for the past 2 or 3 years. I am glad to see that action is being taken upon them. I hope the Senator from Washington and other Senators can reach a proper agreement with respect to the atomic energy ship. That is a very important prototype ship.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am only trying to clear up the legislative history, so that perhaps we shall not have to worry quite so much about the amendments.

I invite the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the fact that in the accompanying report the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce recommends that the United States give No. 1 priority to the construction of a ship using the *Nautilus*-type reactor and having the characteristics outlined by Under Secretary of Commerce Rothschild, namely, that it be a vessel of 16,000 tons displacement, with a speed of 18 knots, and so forth.

The *Nautilus*-type reactor is not a commercially attractive type of reactor. If priority is to be given to that type, a vessel will be built which will have no real practical application in developing nuclear-powered merchant ships.

In that connection, I invite attention to the fact that in November the Maritime Administration invited proposals for the design, manufacture, installation, and test of a 20,000 shaft horsepower nuclear reactor and associated machinery for a 36,000-ton deadweight merchant tanker, for operation by June 30, 1959. It has since been explained that the estimated construction time for this type, after the date of the contract, would be between 36 and 40 months. Therefore the actual date would be somewhere near June 30, 1959. Invitations to bid on the project were sent to 25 companies. Last March the Maritime Administration announced that it had received fixed price bids from four firms for this project, namely, Babcock & Wilcox Co., Foster-Wheeler Corp., General Electric Co., and Ingalls Shipbuilding Co.

If it is to be a tanker rather than a dry cargo ship, the tonnage is 36,000, rather than 16,000 tons, and the estimated date of completion is about a year later than in the case of the demonstration plant.

I say we cannot do the two things simultaneously without additional authority. The language of the bill seems completely to override what the Maritime Administration has done, and to set aside the bids it has received. It is proposed to say, "We will not go ahead with what has been more or less agreed upon, and upon which the Maritime Administration is progressing."

I hope there may be some legislative declaration on the floor that the Maritime Administration is to proceed with the ship which is now under construction, of 36,000 dry tons, and an additional ship, if that is our desire. I think there should be some clarification at that point before we go further.

I shall be glad to deal with other questions if the chairman so desires. I invite attention to the following language in the report:

> The question therefore presents itself—should this be the exhibition-type proposed by the President, on a dry cargo vessel or an oil tanker?
>
> We would choose one of the latter two types because, first, the psychological effect on the people of the world would be as pronounced as it would be in the case of the exhibition ship, which relatively few people of other countries would ever see.

When reference is made to one of these types, is it to the first ship, or to a dry cargo vessel? From reading the report I cannot find out what is contemplated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Maritime Administration representatives testified that they desired to proceed with a merchant-type ship, and that they had also had some negotiations or discussions regarding a tanker-type ship. All parties concerned, including the Director of the Budget, Admiral Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the reactor expert, Dr. Davis, agreed that they wanted this authorization to proceed with a merchant-type ship.

Mr. ANDERSON. And not the tanker?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not the tanker.

Mr. ANDERSON. A merchant-type ship would not necessarily have a *Nautilus*-type reactor. A completely different design has been asked for. The report states that is should be a *Nautilus*-type reactor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is a year's difference in the construction time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Perhaps there is a year's difference, but I think probably it would be more accurate to say that the difference is 3 or 4 months. If the *Nautilus*-type reactor is desired, then it will not be a merchant-type ship which is contemplated. The chairman of the committee has just stated that it was a merchant-type ship that was wanted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not so well informed as is the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who is chairman of the very important Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. However, the testimony of the Maritime Administration, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Atomic Energy Commission itself was to the effect that whatever the type of reactor to be used, this authorization would allow them to continue the talks and planning which had been proceeding for the past few months.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should appreciate the attention of the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Iowa. Is it the understanding of the chairman of the committee that if this bill is passed the Atomic Energy Commission will be fully empowered to select the type of powerplant to put into this vessel, the type which it thinks would be most desirable under all the circumstances?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not only should the Commission have such authority, but I think it would be very unwise to proceed with any type of merchant ship unless the Commission had such authority, because the Commission would know what type of reactor to use.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. That was the intention of the committee, and there was no dissent from that point of view. That is the reason why I think the amendments which the Senator from Iowa mentioned a moment ago, and which I fully support, should be made. The authorization should be contained in this bill. To that end, I have submitted to the chairman of the committee certain amendments which I think would carry out the intent.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will allow me, I think I can clear up this question.

The suggested amendments are:

On page 6, line 4, after the words "Maritime Administration", to insert "and the Atomic Energy Commission."

On page 6, line 10, after the words "the Maritime Administration", to insert "and the Atomic Energy Commission."

On page 6, line 14, after the word "by", to strike out "the Administration" and insert "such agencies."

On page 6, line 15, after the word "functions", to insert a period, strike out the word "and" and insert "The Administration."

In line 25, after the word "ports", to insert "the Maritime Administration is authorized."

Mr. BRICKER. Those amendments would clear up the situation, except that I think the title should be amended to show that this is not an amendment of the Merchant Marine Act, but in the nature of an original bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent that the title be so amended.

Mr. BRICKER. In the last paragraph, provision should be made for an amendment to the title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title will be amended after the passage of the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I point out to the chairman of the committee that this matter caused much discussion in the joint committee. The question is, Who is responsible for trying to design a ship? The decision is that the Maritime Administration shall have responsibility for designing the ship. I quite agree with the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Ohio that the Maritime Administration should perform that function. The Atomic Energy Commission ought to deal with the powerplant. But the difficulty heretofore has been that the Maritime Commission wanted to build a merchant-type ship, and the Atomic Energy Commission did not approve proceeding with the construction of a second nuclear-propelled ship.

I suggest that if the language of the bill remains as it is, there might be a question as to who would build the ship—who would force it down the other fellow's throat. The two proposals are diametrically opposed.

Mr. BRICKER. The bill determines that fact. The bill provides for the building of a merchant ship.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. The bill provides that the Atomic Energy Commission shall fit into the ship a powerplant. It will have to be a powerplant which will fit within the dimensions of the ship. The two functions are separated. The Maritime Administration has no business building an atomic reactor, and the Atomic Energy Commission has no business building a ship. The determination of the type of ship to be built is already made in the bill itself. That question is solved. There is no difference of opinion as to what kind of ship shall be built.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe this discussion is very useful. The Senator from Ohio and I are not apart in this matter. It so happens that after a year and a half of steady pleading with the Atomic Energy Commission, the only proposal the Commission has to make is for the building of a floating playhouse.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is not provided in the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. It may not be provided in the bill——

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is out, so far as the bill is concerned.

Mr. ANDERSON. It may be out so far as the bill is concerned, but it is not out of the minds of the Atomic Energy Commission. I have pleaded with the Atomic Energy Commission to submit a recommendation which is something other than a recommendation for the building of a floating playhouse. They have declined to do so. It must be that the playhouse idea is still in their minds. I should like to have the Commission make a proposal which will not be for a vessel which will end up as a playhouse. I believe it would be a mistake to leave this possibility open. The Maritime Commission should have responsibility for designing the ship, and the Atomic Energy Commission the responsibility for the design and the construction of the reactor. If that were clearly provided, I would have no objection.

Mr. BRICKER. That is exactly what this bill would do.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is what I thought the bill would do.

Mr. BRICKER. The bill provides:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission, such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, for the construction, outfitting, and preparation for operation, including training of qualified personnel, of a nuclear-powered prototype merchant ship capable of providing shipping services on routes essential for maintaining the flow of the foreign commerce of the United States. The Maritime Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission, in carrying on activities and functions under this paragraph, may collaborate with and employ persons, firms, and corporations—

And so forth. Therefore, I say the type of ship is determined by the bill. It is to be a merchant ship. It is to be a "nuclear-powered prototype merchant ship capable of providing shipping services on routes essential to maintaining the flow of the foreign commerce of the United States."

The reactor, of course, would depend on the proportions of the ship.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Admiral Strauss testified that he wanted to proceed with it, and that it was a worthwhile undertaking.

Mr. BRICKER. The controversy over the showboat is not before us. It constitutes no objection to the pending bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was not discussed at all.

Mr. BRICKER. No.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe the statement made by the Senator from Ohio and the statement made by the Senator from Washington are extremely helpful in setting forth clearly the legislative intent. I agree with the statements as to the legislative intent. If the amendment is so drawn as to clearly carry out that legislative intent, I have no objection. On the contrary, I believe we will be making real progress.

I agree with what the Senator from Ohio has stated as to what the purpose is to be. Because of his position on the committee and because of the position of the able chairman of the committee, I believe what has been said here establishes sufficient legislative history for me. If the amendments do not go beyond that, I have no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point the testimony of the chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee when he appeared before the committee on behalf of the bill.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS, CHAIRMAN, ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. STRAUSS. We appreciate the opportunity to testify before your committee today to present the Atomic Energy Commission's position concerning the application and development of nuclear power for the propulsion of merchant vessels. I would first like to express the Commission's views on what we conceive to be an appropriate merchant-ship program after which I will discuss the particular bills before your committee in the light of our views as to the appropriate program.

We feel that it is highly desirable to proceed as rapidly as possible to construct a vessel to demonstrate peaceful nuclear surface propulsion. Such a vessel will afford the United States the opportunity to demonstrate convincingly and appealingly the practical application of atomic power to propel a surface ship and make clear our intention to pursue with vigor the peaceful applications of atomic energy to nuclear surface propulsion.

The President in a letter to Representative JAMES T. PATTERSON, of Connecticut, last July stated the desirability of such a vessel, if you will permit me, I would like to quote from that letter:

"The world, by and large, now looks at atomic science as a destructive force, and of primary importance only to two great world centers—Washington and Moscow. We for our part simply must demonstrate convincingly to the world, in as many ways as we can, and to as many people as we can, that we are utilizing atomic science to improve the lot of man. Our pursuits in this field are in fact paving the way to the betterment of human welfare everywhere.

"The atoms-for-peace ship would dramatize these efforts all over the world. It would help generate a moral force to turn atomic energy more and more into peaceful uses and away from destructive channels. I conceive of it as an important step in our progress toward peace."

In his 1957 budget message the President reiterated his interest in a ship to demonstrate peaceful nuclear surface propulsion, stating that "work on this ship should go forward as rapidly as possible."

As you may know, other countries are believed to have undertaken programs to adapt nuclear energy to the propulsion of surface ships.

The CHAIRMAN. I might just interrupt right there. I have that clipping. And, I also have a clipping which I brought from home from the Seattle Times of February—in February in which the Russians announced an atomic icebreaker.

Mr. STRAUSS. I do refer to that later. This statement was prepared after we had that information but before the other——

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. All right.

Mr. STRAUSS. While these programs, to our knowledge, may not have yet progressed to the construction phase, the intention of a number of countries is clear and certainly in the not too distant future such countries will employ this energy source to propel their surface vessels. Of some significance are announcements from the Soviet Union of its plans for the construction of an icebreaker which will employ a nuclear propulsion plant.

The Atomic Energy Commission and the Maritime Administration are in a position to proceed immediately with the construction of a ship to demonstrate peaceful nuclear surface propulsion. The urgency of earliest possible completion of such a ship requires the utilization of a proven reactor system presently capable of rapid assembly. In light of this, we feel that the optimum solution is a powerplant based on the reactor system similar to that installed in the *Nautilus*. The estimated completion of this project is 27 to 30 months from the time Congressional authorization is received. If action is taken during the present session of Congress, the United States could launch a nuclear powered vessel early in 1959. We believe we can obtain from industry fixed price proposals for the major portion of the reactor work.

And, since that sentence was dictated, we have, as a matter of fact, assurances, and we will later produce it, if you require it.

General agreement has been reached between the Atomic Enregy Commission and the Maritime Administration with respect to the areas of responsibility to be assumed by each agency. The Commission would assume responsibility for and direct the development, design, and construction of the nuclear power source. The Maritime Administration would be responsible for converting or constructing and operating the surface vessel. This would be the same type of arrangement that the Commission has worked out with the Department of Defense in regard to certain propulsion units of joint interest. Such an arrangement avoids duplication of facilities and competition for the already scarce technical personnel between agencies of the Federal Government.

Looking beyond the ship proposed by the President, the Commission is firmly convinced that further effort should be made toward developing competitive commercial propulsion. While the ship we have been discussing will not provide competitive propulsion, it will add measurably to our know-how and skills and thus create a base from which to undertake construction of ships of more advanced design. Further, it will provide opportunity for training and equipping a greater segment of our industry for the future, thereby hastening our progress on advanced vessels. The Commission believes that the initiation of construction of a second nuclear-powered merchant ship should be predicated upon the ability to take a significant technological step and should not prejudice the prompt building of the ship that we need to complete at the earliest possible date. We would envisage a period of study during which time full advantage would be taken of all available research and development. These studies would be followed by a period of development of the most promising approaches and aimed at the availability of a significantly improved propulsion system both from a technical and economic standpoint at an early date.

At the present time the AEC and Maritime Administration are undertaking the joint support of feasibility and design studies for this purpose. We are prepared to continue to work closely together to provide to the merchant marine the most advanced nuclear propulsion system our technology can produce for this application.

In light of the Commission's position that I have just attempted to set forth, I would like to comment on two of the bills being considered by your committee. The Commission is in favor of S. 2523 as reported out by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and referred to your committee several weeks ago. This bill, we believe, fulfills the Nation's need at this time to progress with the application and development of atomic energy for the propulsion of surface vessels. This bill properly spells out the responsibilities of the AEC and Maritime Administration for the two projects to be authorized.

We understand that S. 2523, as originally introduced, and H. R. 6243, were not intended to apply to the project requested by the President for the expeditious construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship in order to demonstrate peaceful nuclear surface propulsion. We agree with what appears to be the basic objectives of these bills—accelerating the development of practical and economical power for merchant ships.

We believe, however, that a significantly improved reactor system will evolve most quickly as a result of a carefully planned well-integrated development program extending over a period of several years. The demonstration ship, on the other hand, is essentially an adaptation of proven technology with primary emphasis upon immediate construction. In our minds, therefore, the two programs do not compete nor in fact should one adversely affect or impede the other. If you do not authorize us to proceed with the demonstration vessel, the United States may have to concede to some other nation the first achievement of peaceful nuclear power for merchant ships.

H. R. 6243 would appear to place responsibility for development of a nuclear propulsion unit in the Maritime Administration. The Commission feels that development work on this nuclear propulsion unit should be performed under the supervision of the AEC to minimize competition with and assure proper coordination with other nuclear research and development being performed by the Commission, and in particular other nuclear propulsion development. For this reason, the Commission feels that the delineation of responsibilities in S. 2523, as reported out by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is preferable to that contained in H. R. 6243.

We assume that the provision in H. R. 6243 which would authorize the Maritime Administration to "avail itself of the use of licenses, information, services, facilities, offices, and employees" of any other Federal agency is not intended to affect the licensing authority of the Commission, or its discretion in providing assistance requested by the Maritime Administration in the light of the overall requirements of the Commission's programs. If our assumption is incorrect, we believe that the provision should be amended to make it entirely clear that the Commission's authority in these respects is unaffected by the provision.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that S. 2523, as reported out by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, is in accord with the program of the President.

Mr. STRAUSS. That, Mr. Chairman, is the end of the prepared statement.

We would like to attempt to answer any questions that may arise in your mind.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, No. 1: I am sure that I speak for at least myself as author of the bill, that there was no intent to affect the licensing authority of the Commission. If we need further language in the bill to spell that out much more clearly, why, we will be glad to accept it and put it in.

Now, Admiral, of course, there is before us only the bill, the House and the Senate bill, which merely in itself authorizes the construction of a nuclear powered prototype merchant ship for operation in foreign commerce.

The matter of how the ship would be used or the two ships in this particular case, would be a matter of policy that Congress would have to determine itself. I guess you would agree with me that if we do authorize this, that then the ship, or the two ships, could be used in any way that it was determined.

And I presume you further agree with the committee that regardless of this controversy over whether we should have a so-called peace ship of that term, or as spelled out in S. 2523, that we ought to go ahead regardless, and then determine what we are going to do.

Mr. STRAUSS. I most emphatically agree with that, Mr. Chairman.

It seems to me that since the first ship, the most expeditious job cannot be completed from 27 to 30 months, which is over 2 years in any case, that to attempt to spell out now the precise method in which it is going to be used would be premature. And the main purpose that I have in coming before you is to get a nuclear propelled surface ship of merchant type built as quickly as possible, and before anybody else can do it.

That is the thing in a nutshell.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has had several discussions, as well as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and I think the only difference of opinion arises as to which one we should go ahead with first.

I think that the majority of opinion was that we should go ahead with the merchant ship, the commercial merchant ship, first. But I think we must agree regardless of that controversey that we have got to go ahead anyway with the beginning ship.

Mr. STRAUSS. I was hoping you would agree.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. And that can be evolved as we proceed. Because I would think that the beginning, regardless of how the ship would be used for joint or the two purposes, the basic thing has to be constructed, regardless of that.

Mr. STRAUSS. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, through their chairman, also have this statement in their summary. And I might ask your comment on this. And I quote from Senator ANDERSON's statement to the committee here:

"It would appear on the basis of technical information furnished us to date that our first step should be to design and construct a nuclear-powered oil tanker."

They specify the type of merchant ship in this particular case. Has the Commission any comments to make on that?

Mr. STRAUSS. I would say this, Mr. Chairman: that any complication in this construction beyond that which has been recommended by the Maritime Administration for haul, and the Commission for propulsion machinery, will operate to delay the completion of the job.

Since this will not be an economic operation in any case——

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I must agree with you there.

I do not care whether it be a tanker or merchant ship or this other so-called type of ship, that in the beginning it is an experiment to prove that we might make it economic.

But the first ship could not be economical.

Mr. STRAUSS. The only requirement that I would put on it, were I sitting as a Member of the Senate or House, would be: it should be the kind of vessel which can be the most rapidly produced to operate successfully.

I hope that will be the stipulation.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. I see.

Of course, it may be as they move along that Congress may decide that this could be a specific type of ship as you move along. But we have got to get going.

Well, I have no further questions. I think you have cleared up the fact that both the Commission and the Maritime Administration have been doing a great deal of preliminary work on this.

Mr. STRAUSS. Yes, sir. Secretary Rothschild is here, and he will speak for his own agency.

I would like to express thanks to you for permitting me to go on as the first witness.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you venture a guess on the cost of a merchant ship?

Mr. STRAUSS. We have some overall estimates, Mr. Chairman.

Since it has been a matter of months that I have reviewed them, I would like to refresh my memory by calling on, with your permission, Dr. Davis, who is here and whom I have identified as the Director of the Reactor Division.

What is the figure for the reactor and propulsion machinery, Dr. Davis?

Dr. DAVIS. Well, the estimate that we had and used last year was $21 million for the propulsion plant and $3,500,000 for the core, which represents the first batch of fuel which would go into such a ship.

And the Maritime Administration has also estimated the cost of the ship into which this would go. So our total estimate is on the order of $37 million for the propulsion plant and for the ship.

The CHAIRMAN. Thirty-seven million dollars?

Dr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. There are several members of the committee who might want to ask some questions as to whether on this controversy you should have a peace ship or a merchant ship. But I do not think the

Atomic Energy Commission should be burdened with that.

That is a matter of policy, I think, that Congress should determine.

Mr. STRAUSS. Further, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me a matter which could very well be determined if it were controversial at a later date without running the risk of arresting this development so that we would run the risk of Congress adjourning without this authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Now, in that case, let me ask this: if this bill was passed before Congress adjourned, then you would proceed with the Maritime Administration on the basic construction. Then Congress, if it should, say, come January or April make a definite determination on what should be done on this matter—they may make it in the report on this bill—which I would hope they would—but that would not seriously hamper the situation even if we did, say, 6 months from now say, "Well, we want this ship, say, to be a tanker." Use that example.

Mr. STRAUSS. It would not affect us in the Atomic Energy Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. It might affect the design.

Mr. STRAUSS. I will have to ask you to direct that specific question to Mr. Rothschild as to whether it would handicap him on that.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. STRAUSS. I could say emphatically that we would go ahead with the reactor and with the propulsion machinery at once under those circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. And that there could be, as you move along, a change toward the ultimate use of the ship?

Mr. STRAUSS. That is right, assuming no change in shaft horsepower and other physical requirements.

The CHAIRMAN. Which would be technical matters that the Maritime technicians and engineers would have to work out?

Mr. STRAUSS. That I cannot answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Well, thank you, Admiral Strauss. We appreciate your coming here.

I have no further questions.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, may we have the proposed amendments read again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendments, as follows:

That section 212 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 1122), is amended by inserting at the end of subsection (c) two new paragraphs to read as follows:

"That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission, such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, for the construction, outfitting, and preparation for operation, including training of qualified personnel, of a nuclear-powered prototype merchant ship capable of providing shipping services on routes essential for maintaining the flow of the foreign commerce of the United States. The Maritime Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission, in carrying on activities and functions under this paragraph, may collaborate with and employ persons, firms, and corporations on a contract or fee basis for the performance of special services deemed necessary by such agencies in carrying on such activities and functions. The administration may, for the same purposes, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce and where appropriate the Atomic Energy Commission, avail itself of the use of licenses, information, services, facilities, offices, and employees of any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency of the Government, including any field service thereof.

"In collaboration with public and private interests concerned, and in the interest of improved efficiency and economy in the transfer of cargo and passengers between vessels and shore transportation facilities in ports, the Maritime Administration is authorized to conduct research and experiments, to develop plans and designs, procedures, and equipment for the improvement of wharves, docks, piers, warehouses, and other port facilities used in the movement and handling of cargo, passengers, and other commerce in ports in connection with water transportation."

Mr. ANDERSON. I make the same observation I made a while ago, that these are the original amendments which were proposed to the bill by the Atomic Energy Commission more than a year ago. I suggest to the Senator that, if he will read the language of the amendments, he will see that it is the same language that came to our committee more than a year ago.

Mr. BRICKER. The situation this year is different. The provisions this year will limit the ship to a prototype merchant ship. The question as to what type of ship it is to be is determined by the bill. There is no question about what kind of ship it is to be.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say, in support of what the Senator from Ohio has stated, and I hope in reassurance to the Senator from New Mexico, that I do not believe there is any question about the ship now. The ship to be built is to be a merchant ship; the bill specifically so limits it. The Atomic Energy Commission will have the responsibility of building the powerplant, not for building the ship, or influencing the design of the ship, except that there may be certain collaboration and cooperation in determining how the plant is to fit into a particular hull.

I may say that I am not very strongly in favor of a bill of this kind; but I will go along with it. I think it is well to get an atomic powered ship on the ocean. I believe, however, that we would gain tremendously, comparatively speaking, by putting a so-called showboat, or whatever the Senator from New Mexico may call it, type of ship on the ocean as an exhibit ship and send it around the world, instead of building merely a merchant transport hull-type of ship. However, a so-called showboat is not in good favor, apparently, and I will not press that point at this moment. I merely say that I am less enthusiastic for the merchant type of ship.

Furthermore, Mr. President, let us not delude ourselves that this will be a competitively and economically sound ship when it comes into operation. We should not attempt to delude anyone about that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is not expected to be.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I say that so that the record will be clear. Therefore, if we are going to build and put on the ocean a ship which is unsound from a competitive and economic standpoint, we ought to build one which will be able to demonstrate many phases of atomic energy.

I am pointing that out so that there will be no question about it, and because I prefer the other type ship. However, I will go along with the proposal, because I believe it to be important to get a ship of this type into operation.

Mr. ANDERSON. The statement made by the former chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], is extremely helpful, as I believe are also the observations of the able Senator from Ohio and the able Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. They are all very helpful. With those statements in the RECORD, I do not believe I will have any objection to the language which is proposed by way of amendment to the bill.

The Senator from Washington a moment ago suggested there was a House bill pending and that the bill pending before the Senate would go to conference with the House. Is that correct? Does the Senator know whether the language of the House bill is identical with the language of the Senate bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No, I do not. I have the House bill here, I may say to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask that question because if the language is not identical, and if the two bills will be in conference, there is a possibility of being absolutely sure about the final language.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The language in the House bill is not exactly the same, but it is very specific that the ship is to be a merchant type of ship.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator from New Mexico propose that we substitute in the House bill the language contained in the Senate bill as perfected?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I do. In that way, there would be a conference on the bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In other words, we would substitute the language of the Senate bill for that of the House bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. In that way the bill would go to conference.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. I believe the difficulties could be ironed out in that way.

Mr. ANDERSON. Otherwise, if the two bills were identical, there would be nothing for a committee of conference to consider.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They are not identical.

Mr. ANDERSON. When the bill went to conference, there could be a discussion of whether the *Nautilus* type of reaction should be used, for example—and that type of reactor obviously does not contribute to the art at all—or whether it would be possible by substitute language to provide that another type of reactor should be used.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So far as I am concerned, I would be willing that that be done.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am merely trying to make legislative history in the event the conferees desired to deal with this question. In other words, does not the Senator believe that the conferees would be free to deal with the matter?

Mr. MAGNUSON. They would be free to deal with it; yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. On that basis, I have no objection to the amendments which have been proposed. I am anxious, as I say, as is the Senator from Ohio, to have some sort of bill enacted. On that basis, and with the statements made by the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Iowa, I suggest that the amendments be adopted and that the bill be quickly passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wish to say again, in order to make the legislative history clear, that on June 6 the committee received a statement from the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, in which he pointed out the Commission's position concerning the development of nuclear power for the propulsion of a merchant vessel. He makes it clear that that is what they were talking about. They, of course, would like to proceed with the other ship about which we have been speaking, but it is not provided for in this bill and is another matter.

Mr. ANDERSON. I assume that is what the committee referred to on page 4 of its report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think the amendments are satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of H. R. 6243, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill, that all after the enacting clause of the House be stricken and the language of the Senate bill, as amended, be substituted therefor, and that following the passage of the House bill the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, is the motion to strike out all the language of the House bill after the enacting clause, and to substitute the language of the Senate bill as amended?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6243) authorizing the construction of nuclear-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that all after the enacting clause be stricken, and that the language of the Senate bill, as amended, be substituted therefor.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6243) was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to amend section 212 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the construction of a nuclear-powered prototype merchant ship for operation in foreign commerce of the United States, to authorize research and experimental work with vessels, port facilities, planning, and operating and cargo handling on ships and at ports, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate bill will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed after the passage of House bill 6243, a statement I have prepared on the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

As a stanch supporter of the American merchant marine, I have been interested in the possibilities of an atomic-powered merchant ship from the earliest suggestions of the feasibility of such a vessel. With Senator SALTONSTALL I cosponsored S. 2005, to build a nuclear-powered merchant ship. I also was strongly in support of the President's proposed nuclear demonstration ship which was designed to show to the peoples of other countries the interest of this country in the development of nuclear power for peaceful purposes.

However, the committee, in its wisdom, has considered the necessities of the shipping industry to be such that they have reported out the bill favoring construction first of a nuclear-powered merchant ship for use in the foreign commerce of the United States. Having been a vigorous proponent of an adequate merchant marine and realizing the need for upgrading our shipping to the greatest possible extent to meet the ever-increasing foreign competition, I must lend my heartiest support to the proposals for immediate construction of this atomic merchant ship.

During the next 10 years, the shipping interests of the Nation must replace almost 100 percent their present commercial fleet. If we can develop enough experience and know-how in the field of atomic propulsion of vessels, it is entirely possible that our merchant ship replacements may take advantage of this newest and most extraordinary form of energy and once again step out to the forefront of the shipping nations of the world.

TRANSMISSION TO UNITED NATIONS OF INFORMATION CONCERNING THE TERRITORIES OF ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the United Nations Charter, chapter XI, article 73, provides:

Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international peace and security established by the present charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories, and to this end—

And then follow subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e).

I ask unanimous consent that article 73 in its entirety be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, article 73 of the United Nations Charter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPTER XI

DECLARATION REGARDING NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES

Article 73

Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international peace and security established by the present charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories, and, to this end:

(a) to insure, with due respect for the culture of the peoples concerned, their political, economic, social, and educational advancement, their just treatment, and their protection against abuses;

(b) to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement;

(c) to further international peace and security;

(d) to promote constructive measures of development, to encourage research, and to cooperate with one another and, when and where appropriate, with specialized international bodies with a view to the practical achievement of the social, economic, and scientific purposes set forth in this article; and

(e) to transmit regularly to the Secretary-General for information purposes, subject to such limitation as security and constitutional considerations may require, statistical and other information of a technical nature relating to economic, social, and educational conditions in the territories for which they are respectively responsible other than those territories to which chapters XII and XIII apply.

Mr. President, I was quite surprised to learn that since the year 1946 the Government of the United States has been filing reports to the United Nations relative to the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and I sought some additional information from the State Department. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a list of the various types of dependencies and territories for which the several nations belonging to the United Nations presently file reports. It is dated June 11, 1956.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Australia: Papua.

Belgium: Belgian Congo.

France: French Equatorial Africa, French Somaliland, Comoro, Madagascar, French West Africa. Morocco, Tunis, last reported on in 1954.

Netherlands: Netherlands New Guinea.

New Zealand: Tokelau Islands, Cook Islands, Niue Island.

United Kingdom: Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, British Somaliland, Bechuanaland, Kenya, Uganda, Zanzibar, Basutoland, Swaziland, Mauritius, Seychelles, Gambia,

Gold Coast, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Cyprus, Gibraltar, Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, Jamaica, Leeward Islands, Trinidad and Tobago, Windward Islands, Brunei, Federation of Malaya, Hong Kong, North Borneo, Sarawak, Singapore, Fiji, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, New Hebrides (condominium with France), Pitcairn Island, Solomon Islands, Aden colony and protectorate, Falkland Islands, St. Helena.

United States: Alaska, American Samoa, Guam, Hawaii, Virgin Islands of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, yesterday I addressed a letter to the Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles, which reads as follows:

JUNE 19, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I have written to Assistant Secretary of State Francis O. Wilcox.

Frankly, I was greatly shocked to learn that the United States since 1946 has been transmitting information under article 73 (e) for the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii. I hope that steps will be taken to correct this situation as these two organized Territories have elected their own legislatures and both have adopted constitutions in anticipation to being admitted as full members of the Union as the 49th and 50th States.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

Mr. President, the letter which I wrote Mr. Francis Wilcox, also under date of June 19, 1956, reads as follows:

JUNE 19, 1956.

Hon. FRANCIS O. WILCOX,
Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANCIS: Your letter of June 11 has been received, and I wish to thank you for sending me the information.

I would certainly see no objection to the United States filing a report under article 73 (e) relating to American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

I most strenuously do object to this Government having filed such reports for the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, both of which are destined to become States of the American Union. Both have adopted State constitutions and are awaiting admission as the 49th and 50th States.

I am taking the liberty of forwarding a copy of this letter to Secretary Dulles.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

Mr. President, I should like to add that, as every Member of the Senate knows, and as Members of the House know, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii elect delegates to the Congress of the United States who sit in the House of Representatives. So, Mr. President, I hope that prompt action will be taken to get the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska out of the category into which they have apparently been placed.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Have there been any reports from the State Department setting forth why the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii were included in the first place? If so, on what assumption did they make such reports?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am awaiting a full and complete report. The preliminary information I had when the matter came up in 1946 was that it had been determined that it might encourage some of the other nations to file reports if we included Hawaii and Alaska. I do not agree with that decision, needless to say.

Mr. BRICKER. I join the Senator from California in his attitude in the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The Chair would like to inform the Senator from California that he has requested replacement in the chair so that he might comment on what the distinguished Senator from California has just said, because the cause of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii has been one of my major interests for a long time. The Chair wishes to thank the Senator from California for the additional argument he has made for their admission into the Union. The Chair has been impressed every time he has gone North with the way in which we deny Alaska self-government. The Yukon Territory of Canada has only about 10 percent of the population of Alaska, and yet that territory is allowed a voting representative in the House of Commons of Canada, while our Delegate from Alaska is still denied the right to vote.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Presiding Officer.

SIMPLIFICATION OF ACCOUNTING METHODS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2287, Senate bill 3362.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3362) to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with amendments.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this bill was reported unanimously from the Subcommittee on Reorganization and by the Government Operations Committee. It would put into effect one of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Under present law, unexpended balances of appropriations with limited fiscal-year availability, lapse, or cease to be available to the agencies to which they are provided at the end of two full fiscal years following the fiscal year or years for which appropriated. At that time such balances are transferred to a consolidated Treasury Department appropriation account known as "Payment of certified claims."

This bill authorizes agencies of the Government to pay undisputed bills chargeable in precisely the same manner as are bills payable from currently available appropriations. It is anticipated that enactment of the bill will result eventually in direct savings of approximately $600,000 annually. Savings will also be effected by the agencies concerned, and there will be a far more accurate idea of the exact amount to be appropriated to the Treasury Department each year instead of, as at present, all balances being charged to the Treasury Department rather than to the agencies involved.

As I have said, the bill has been reported unanimously, and I hope it will be passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be stated.

The amendments of the Committee on Government Operations were on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to strike out "except as otherwise provided by law"; at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "of" and insert "for"; in line 8, after the word "the", to strike out "activity" and insert "agency or subdivision thereof"; on page 2, line 8, after the word "derived", to insert a colon and "*Provided,* That when it is determined necessary by the head of the agency concerned that a portion of the remaining balance withdrawn is required to liquidate obligations and reflect adjustments, such portion of the remaining balance may be restored to the appropriate account established pursuant to this act: *Provided further,* That the head of the agency concerned shall make a report with respect to each such restoration to the Chairmen of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, to the Comptroller General of the United States, and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget"; on page 3, line 7, after the word "account", to insert "as of the close of the fiscal year"; in line 10, after the word "appropriations", to strike out "as of the close of the fiscal year"; in line 22, after the word "withdrawals", to strike out "required" and insert "made"; in line 23, after the word "to", to strike out "subsection (a)" and insert "subsections (a) and (b)"; on page 4, line 20, after the word "each", where it appears the second time, to strike out "activity responsible for the liquidation of the obligations chargeable to such accounts" and insert "agency concerned"; on page 5, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "shall" and insert "may"; on page 6, line 23, after the word "the", to strike out "activity" and insert "agency or subdivision thereof"; on page 7, line 6, after the word "been", to strike out "fulfilled or will not be undertaken or continued" and insert "fulfilled"; on page 8, after line 6, to insert:

(f) Any provisions (except those contained in appropriation acts for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957) permitting an appropriation to remain available for expenditure for any period beyond that for which it is available for obligation, but this subsection shall not be effective until June 30, 1957.

In line 13, after the word "Columbia", to insert "or to the appropriations disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives"; and after line 15, to insert:

SEC. 9. The inclusion in appropriation acts of provisions excepting any appropriation or appropriations from the operation of the

provisions of this act and fixing the period for which such appropriation or appropriations shall remain available for expenditure is hereby authorized.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That (a) the account for each appropriation available for obligation for a definite period of time shall, upon the expiration of such period, be closed as follows:

(1) The obligated balance shall be transferred to an appropriation account of the agency or subdivision thereof responsible for the liquidation of the obligations, in which account shall be merged the amounts so transferred from all appropriation accounts for the same general purposes; and

(2) The remaining balance shall be withdrawn and, if the appropriation was derived in whole or in part from the general fund, shall revert to such fund, but if the appropriation was derived solely from a special or trust fund, shall revert, unless otherwise provided by law, to the fund from which derived: *Provided*, That when it is determined necessary by the head of the agency concerned that a portion of the remaining balance withdrawn is required to liquidate obligations and reflect adjustments, such portion of the remaining balance may be restored to the appropriate account established pursuant to this act: *Provided further*, That the head of the agency concerned shall make a report with respect to each such restoration to the chairmen of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, to the Comptroller General of the United States, and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(b) The transfers and withdrawals required by subsection (a) of this section shall be made—

(1) not later than September 30 of the fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year in which the period of availability for obligation expires, in the case of an appropriation available both for obligation and disbursement, on or after the date of approval of this act; or

(2) not later than September 30 of the fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year in which this act is approved, in the case of an appropriation which, on the date of approval of this act, is available only for disbursement.

(c) For the purposes of this act, the obligated balance of an appropriation account as of the close of the fiscal year shall be the amount of unliquidated obligations applicable to such appropriation less the amount collectible as repayments to the appropriations as reported pursuant to section 1311 (b) of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 830; 31 U. S. C. 200 (b)). Collections authorized to be credited to an appropriation but not received until after the close of the fiscal year in which such appropriation expires for obligation shall, unless otherwise authorized by law, be credited to the appropriation account into which the obligated balance has been or will be transferred, pursuant to subsection (a) (1), except that collections made by the General Accounting Office for other Government agencies may be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(d) The transfers and withdrawals made pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be accounted for and reported as of the fiscal year in which the appropriations concerned expire for obligation, except that such transfers of appropriations described in subsection (b) (2) of this section shall be accounted for and reported as of the fiscal year in which this act is approved.

SEC. 2. Each appropriation account established pursuant to this act shall be accounted for as one fund and shall be available without fiscal year limitation for payment of obligations chargeable against any of the appropriations from which such account was derived. Subject to regulations to be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, payment of such obligations may be made without prior action by the General Accounting Office, but nothing contained in this act shall be construed to relieve the Comptroller General of the United States of his duty to render decisions upon requests made pursuant to law or to abridge the existing authority of the General Accounting Office to settle and adjust claims, demands, and accounts.

SEC. 3. (a) Appropriation accounts established pursuant to this act shall be reviewed periodically but at least once each fiscal year, by each agency concerned. If the undisbursed balance in any account exceeds the obligated balance pertaining thereto, the amount of the excess shall be withdrawn in the manner provided by section 1 (a) (2) of this act; but if the obligated balance exceeds the undisbursed balance, the amount of the excess may be transferred to such account from the appropriation currently available for the same general purposes. A review shall be made as of the close of each fiscal year and the transfers or withdrawals required by this section accomplished not later than September 30 of the following fiscal year, but the transactions shall be accounted for and reported as of the close of the fiscal year to which such review pertains. A review made as of any other date for which transfers or withdrawals are accomplished after September 30 in any fiscal year shall be accounted for and reported as transactions of the fiscal year in which accomplished.

(b) Whenever a payment chargeable to an appropriation account established pursuant to this act would exceed the undisbursed balance of such account, the amount of the definciency may be transferred to such account from the appropriation currently available for the same general purposes. Where such deficiency is caused by the failure to collect repayments to appropriations merged with the appropriation account established pursuant to this act, the amount of the deficiency may be returned to such current appropriation if the repayments are subsequently collected during the same fiscal year.

(c) In connection with his audit responsibilities, the Comptroller General of the United States shall report to the head of the agency concerned, to the Secretary of the Treasury, and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, respecting operations under this act, including an appraisal of the unliquidated obligations under the appropriation accounts established by this act. Within 30 days after receipt of such report, the agency concerned shall accomplish any actions required by subsection (a) of this section which such report shows to be necessary.

SEC. 4. During the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which this act becomes effective, and under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, the undisbursed balance of the appropriation account for payment of certified claims established pursuant to section 2 of the act of July 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 407; 31 U. S. C. 712b), shall be closed in the manner provided in section 1 (a) of this act.

SEC. 5. The obligated balances of appropriations made available for the obligation for definite periods of time under discontinued appropriation heads may be merged in the appropriation accounts provided for by section 1 hereof, or in 1 or more other accounts to be established pursuant to this act for discontinued appropriations of the agency or subdivision thereof currently responsible for the liquidation of the obligations.

SEC. 6. The unobligated balances of appropriations which are not limited to a definite period of time shall be withdrawn in the manner provided in section 1 (a) (2) of this act whenever the head of the agency concerned shall determine that the purpose for which the appropriation was made has been fulfilled; or, in any event, whenever disbursements have not been made against the appropriation for 2 full consecutive fiscal years: *Provided*, That amounts of appropriations not limited to a definite period of time which are withdrawn pursuant to this section or were heretofore withdrawn from the appropriation account by administrative action may be restored to the applicable appropriation account for the payment of obligations and for the settlement of accounts.

SEC. 7. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(a) The proviso under the heading "Payment of certified claims" in the act of April 25, 1945 (59 Stat. 90; 31 U. S. C. 690);

(b) Section 2 of the act of July 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 407; 31 U. S. C. 712b), but the repeal of this section shall not be effective until June 30, 1957;

(c) The paragraph under the heading "Payment of certified claims" in the act of June 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 358; 31 U. S. C. 712c);

(d) Section 5 of the act of March 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 418; 31 U. S. C. 713a); and

(e) Section 3691 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 715).

(f) Any provisions (except those contained in appropriation acts for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957) permitting an appropriation to remain available for expenditure for any period beyond that for which it is available for obligation, but this subsection shall not be effective until June 30, 1957.

SEC. 8. The provisions of this act shall not apply to the appropriations for the District of Columbia or to the appropriations disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 9. The inclusion in appropriation acts of provisions excepting any appropriation or appropriations from the operation of the provisions of this act and fixing the period for which such appropriation or appropriations shall remain available for expenditure is hereby authorized.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9593) to simplify accounting, to facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the Committee on Government Operations is discharged from the further consideration of the bill referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 9593.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9593) to simplify accounting, to facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move that all after the enacting clause of the House bill be stricken, and that the Senate bill, as amended, be substituted for the language of the House bill, and that following the passage of the House bill the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 9593) was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate bill 3362 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. KENNEDY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD, following the passage of House bill 9593, a brief explanation of the differences between that bill and Senate bill 3362.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPARISON OF H. R. 9593, AS APPROVED BY THE HOUSE, WITH S. 3362

Section 1 of S. 3362 provides for the transfer and merger in no-year accounts of all obligated balances of appropriations which are made for a definite period of time (1 year for obligation and 3 years for liquidation of obligations) immediately after the close of the first year.

H. R. 9593 postpones the transfer of the obligation balances until the end of the second year after expiration of the obligation period, i. e., at the end of the third year or expiration of the appropriation for expenditure purposes.

Section 1 (a) (2) and (3) of S. 3362 provides alternate authority to restore amounts withdrawn as unobligated or to effect transfers from current appropriations for supplying funds to balance the liquidated accounts, effect adjustments, and to pay outstanding obligations.

H. R. 9593 provides that funds necessary for these purposes will be limited to, and supplied from, amounts withdrawn as unobligated. Balances restored to liquidated obligations and to effect adjustments are required to be reported to the Bureau of the Budget prior to restoration.

The Senate bill is silent as to when the report must be made but requires report to the Appropriations Committees, Bureau of the Budget, and to the Comptroller General of the United States.

Both bills eliminate the requirement that all bills chargeable to lapsed appropriations must be submitted to the General Accounting Office before payment.

Both bills permit the agencies to pay prior year obligations in the same manner as current bills.

Both bills contemplate that expenditures on account of prior year obligations will be charged against the agency actually incurring the obligation rather than charging the Treasury Department as is done at the present time.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 2288, H. R. 7227.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7227) to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the disposal of surplus property for civil defense purposes, to provide that certain Federal surplus property be disposed of to State and local civil defense organizations which are established by or pursuant to State law, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That subsection 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U. S. C. 484 (j)), is amended to read as follows:

"(j) (1) Under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Administrator is authorized in his discretion to donate without cost (except for costs of care and handling) for use in any State for purposes of education, public health, or civil defense, or for research for any such purpose, any equipment, materials, books or other supplies (including those capitalized in a working capital or similar fund) under the control of any executive agency which shall have been determined to be surplus property and which shall have been determined under paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of this subsection to be usable and necessary for any such purpose. In determining whether property is to be donated under this subsection, no distinction shall be made between property capitalized in a working-capital fund established under section 405 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, or any similar fund, and any other property. No such property shall be transferred for use within any State except to the State agency designated under State law for the purpose of distributing in conformity with the provisions of this subsection, all property allocated under this subsection for use within such State.

"(2) In the case of surplus property under the control of the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense shall determine whether such property is usable and necessary for educational activities which are of special interest to the armed services, such as maritime academies or military, naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard preparatory schools. If such Secretary shall determine that such property is usable and necessary for such purposes, he shall allocate it for transfer by the Administrator to the appropriate State agency for distribution to such educational activities. If he shall determine that such property is not usable and necessary for such purposes, it may be disposed of in accordance with paragraph (3) or paragraph (4) of this subsection.

"(3) Determination whether such surplus property (except surplus property allocated in conformity with par. (2) of this subsection) is usable and necessary for purposes of education or public health, or for research for any such purpose, in any State shall be made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who shall allocate such property on the basis of needs and utilization for transfer by the Administrator to such State agency for distribution to (A) tax-supported medical institutions, hospitals, clinics, health centers, school systems, schools, colleges, and universities, and (B) other nonprofit medical institutions, hospitals, clinics, health centers, schools, colleges, and universities which are exempt from taxation under section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. No such property shall be transferred to any State agency until the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has received, from such State agency, a certification that such property is usable and needed for educational or public-health purposes in the State, and until the Secretary has determined that such State agency has conformed to minimum standards of operation prescribed by the Secretary for the disposal of surplus property.

"(4) Determination whether such surplus property (except surplus property allocated in conformity with paragraph (2) of this subsection) is usable and necessary for civil-defense purposes, including research, in any State shall be made by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, who shall allocate such property on the basis of need and utilization for transfer by the Administrator of General Services to such State agency for distribution to civil-defense organizations of such State, or political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof, which are established pursuant to State law. No such property shall be transferred until the Federal Civil Defense Administrator has received from such State agency a certification that such property is usable and needed for civil-defense purposes in the State, and until the Federal Civil Defense Administrator has determined that such State agency has conformed to minimum standards of operation prescribed by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator for the disposal of surplus property. The provisions of sections 201 (b), 401 (c), 401 (e), and 405 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, shall apply to the performance by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator of his responsibilities under this section.

"(5) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Federal Civil Defense Administrator may impose reasonable terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions upon the use of any single item of personal property donated under paragraph (3) or paragraph (4), respectively, of this subsection which has an acquisition cost of $2,500 or more.

"(6) The term 'State', as used in this subsection, includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Territories and possessions of the United States."

SEC. 2. (a) Clause (C) of paragraph (2) of subsection 203 (k) of such act is amended by striking out the word "or" at the end thereof.

(b) Clause (D) of paragraph (2) of such subsection is amended by striking out the comma at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or."

(c) Paragraph (2) of such subsection is amended by inserting, immediately after clause (D) thereof, as amended by this section, the following new clause:

"(E) the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, in the case of property transferred pursuant to this act to civil-defense organizations of the States or political subdivisions or instrumentalities thereof which are established by or pursuant to State law,".

SEC. 3. Subsection 203 (n) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(n) For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of subsections (j) and (k), the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, and the head of any Federal agency designated by either such officer, are authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with State surplus property distribution agencies designated in conformity with paragraph (1) of subsection (j). Such cooperative agreements may provide for utilization by such Federal agency, without payment or reimbursement, of the property, facilities, personnel, and services of the State agency in carrying out any such program, and for making available to such State agency, without payment or reimbursement, property, facilities, personnel, or services of such Federal agency in connection with such utilization."

SEC. 4. Subsection (h) of section 507 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, as added by clause (3) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the acceptance and

maintenance of Presidential libraries, and for other purposes," approved August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 697), is redesignated as subsection (i) of such section.

SEC. 5. (a) Except as provided by subsection (b), the amendments made by this act shall become effective on the first day of the first month beginning after the date of enactment of this act.

(b) In the case of any State which on the date of enactment of this act has not designated a single State agency for the purpose of distributing surplus property pursuant to subsection 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, transfers of such property may be made by the Administrator of General Services under such subsection, as amended by this act, to the State agency heretofore designated in such State to distribute property in conformity with such subsection for purposes of education and public health to the extent that such agency is authorized under State law to receive and distribute any class of property transferred pursuant to such subsection, or in the absence of any such agency or in the absence of authority of such agency to receive and distribute any such class of property, to any State agency or official authorized under State law to receive and distribute such property, until 90 calendar days have passed after the close of the first regular session of the legislature of such State beginning after the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill, as amended, is to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the donation of Government-owned surplus personal property to civil-defense organizations of the States and political subdivisions thereof which have been established by or pursuant to State law. This will mean that the civil-defense organizations will share as donees of surplus property with health and education departments in the various States. The bill has been highly recommended by Governor Peterson of the civil-defense organization. The committee held hearings on the bill, and reported it unanimously. There is no objection to it. The bill has the support of the Bureau of the Budget and all other agencies of the Government. I hope the Senate will pass the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 7227) was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the disposal of surplus property for civil-defense purposes, and for other purposes."

PAYMENT FOR CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS IN RAPID VALLEY UNIT, SOUTH DAKOTA, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1622) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes, which were on page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out "of the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota,"; on page 2, line 5, strike out "$18,383 as reimbursable" and insert "$16,382 as reimbursement"; on page 2, line 7, after "thereof" insert "on other lands", and on page 2, line 10, strike out "13" and insert "30."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on June 19, the House of Representatives passed S. 1622, with certain corrective or clarifying amendments recommended by the Department of the Interior. I have conferred with members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and with the sponsor of the bill (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). All are agreeable to accepting the House amendments.

I, therefore, move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, 1957

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move that at the conclusion of today's business of the Senate H. R. 10986, an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, be made the pending order of business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 2106. An act to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets or midshipmen at the Military, Naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard Academies, or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10060. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, as amended;

H. J. Res. 533. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 534. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 535. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 553. Joint resolution waiving certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 554. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 555. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 566. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

THE NEED FOR LIBERALIZING THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM BY ADDING CERTAIN BENEFITS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment which will shortly be offered to provide benefits to insured Americans at the age of 50 for total disabilities which will be relatively permanent in nature. Such a provision was in the House bill which passed that body last year by a vote of 372 to 31. This feature, along with others, was, however, eliminated by the Senate Finance Committee, although there were three of us, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and myself, all members of the Democratic Party, who voted for it.

1. THE PROBLEM OF DISABILITY

First, let us make no mistake about the seriousness of the problems created by those who are totally and in large part permanently disabled. The total number of those so disabled has been estimated in 1954 at 5.3 million, or 3.3 percent of the population. This includes mental as well as physical cases—see Social Security Bulletin, June 1955, pages 20–21. A quarter of a million of this total were believed to be under 14 years of age or about one-half of 1 percent of the total number in this age group. About 2.9 million were suffering from long-term disability in the 14- to 64-year age group. Since there were about 100 million persons in this very group, this was equivalent to a long-term disability rate of 2.9 percent. For those over 64, the long-term disability rate was much higher, namely, approximately 16 percent, with the estimated total number of the disabled amounting to about 2,150,000.

Two other overall figures are important. The total number of the long-term disabled who were in institutions was estimated at 1.2 million—Social Security Bulletin, June 1955, pages 20–21. This includes mental patients. While there are no definite statistics on the numbers in this subgroup, nevertheless, since there are 750,000 hospital beds for the mentally sick, and since these are overtaxed, it can safely be assumed that the mentally ill furnish the large majority of the 1.2 million who are hospitalized with long-term disabilities.

The Social Security Administration estimates that of the total number suffering from long-term disability about 2.2 million would otherwise be in the labor force. This is a loss of a little over 3 percent of the total labor supply. It should be noted that all these people are unable to work and that their loss of earning power will either continue throughout their life or for long periods of time. During this entire period they will be unable to earn and except in rare instances cannot support themselves, let alone aid in the support of others.

But not only are they unable to earn current income; their expenses are commonly heavier than those who are able to work, for they require special medical attention, appliances, medicine, and in many cases hospital care.

All this rapidly eats up savings and makes the disabled person dependent upon others. Whole families are dragged down by the crippling accidents and diseases which swell the numbers of the disabled.

We all know individual cases of families where literal havoc has been created by those misfortunes. They are vivid in our memories as individual cases. We sometimes forget, however, how widespread is this destruction and how great is the total human and economic loss. The mass figures which I have given may therefore indicate the dimensions of this very real national calamity and strengthen our desire to do something effective about it.

2. ATTEMPTS TO MEET IT

The proposal for benefits to those gravely disabled is no sudden innovation. In 1938 the advisory committee to the Senate and to the Social Security Administration, of which I was then a member, recommended the ultimate adoption of benefits for so-called total and apparently permanent disability although there was some disagreement as to when such a system should be instituted. In 1941 the Social Security Board recommended that it be adopted. In 1948, the second advisory committee, after a long study of the problem, voted 15 to 2 in favor of such a system. In 1949 the House of Representatives passed a revision of the Social Security Act which provided for benefits for total disability without any restriction as to age. This provision was eliminated by the Senate Finance Committee, just as the committee has done this year to a more limited proposal.

What we did instead, in 1950, was to provide public assistance on a Federal-State matching basis for those who, though less than 65 were, according to the advice of responsible medical opinion and administrative determination, permanently and totally disabled. There are today approximately 247,000 persons who are receiving such assistance, plus 104,000 blind who have been granted corresponding assistance from the very beginning of the Social Security Act.

3. THE WEAKNESSES OF THE ASSISTANCE SYSTEM

There are, however, many critical weaknesses in this assistance system. In the first place there are seven States which have not accepted the Federal-State matching system, and which therefore are not making such payments. These States are Arizona, California, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Nevada, and Texas—see testimony of Secretary Folsom, hearings, page 1263, and other material. I should also add the Territory of Alaska. One-fifth of the population of the country lives in those States, and is therefore outside the scope of such protection. Furthermore, in many of the States which do grant aid to the disabled, the program is so restrictive that an individual must be virtually helpless to qualify. Secondly, in order to get such assistance the disabled in the remaining States must be subjected to a means test. This, in most cases, is very rigorous. In the majority of States they must first have used up virtually all of their liquid assets. Then, if they own their own home, reversionary rights are taken by the State in such assets. Children and close relatives are directly responsible for the maintenance of their parents, and assistance is not given if the younger generation has any ability to shoulder the load.

These restrictions are probably necessary in any system of public assistance. But they should be frankly recognized for what they are. They mean that the disabled, like the aged, must in most cases be virtually destitute and stripped of all resources before they can qualify for assistance. In addition to all the pain and sacrifice which the disabled must undergo, they must also be ground down close to the bloodless pulp of destitution and forced to sacrifice virtually all savings and assets before they can receive aid.

In fact, this so-called assistance is, indeed, much like the old-fashioned relief. It is more liberally financed and more certain than the old-time relief. But it is still humiliating and relatively inadequate. It is humiliating because the disabled man or woman has to fill out forms pleading not only poverty, but virtual destitution. Then the personal affairs and financial standing of the applicant are subjected to a detailed probing which is embarrassing to all, and still further humiliating to most. And then even if assistance is granted, it is in the barest amounts which will just enable the disabled person to exist. The ingenuity of budgetary experts and of social workers are all harnessed in this cause. Supervision over the expenditures which the disabled and aged can make is lodged with the case workers who have a large degree of disciplinary power over the recipients if the distribution of their expenditures differs appreciably from those that have been recommended. It is small wonder that the disabled do not like this system, which they feel erodes their self-respect.

That the relief is still relatively inadequate is seen by the fact that the average monthly payment for the disabled, for the country as a whole, amounted to only $56.43 in February of this year. About $8 of this was in the form of medical care paid for by the welfare authorities. This meant that the average monthly cash assistance amounted to only around $48 a month. This was about the equivalent of $24 in 1939, since the cost of living has almost doubled since that time. There were moreover eight States in June of last year where the combined cash and medical benefits amounted to less than $40 a month and, of course, a still larger number whose cash benefits were less than this amount.

The hardships of total and long-continued disability are in fact even more severe than those of old age, for the aged customarily accumulate more reserves, and a considerable percentage of them retain at least some ability to earn. The totally disabled, on the other hand, tend to use up their reserves through their long-continued inability to earn and in trying to meet the costs of the medical treatment and care which they must undergo.

4. THE NEED FOR INSURANCE

Disabilities of so grave and serious a nature are precisely the type for which insurance is the most effective protection. Only a relatively small percentage of the population are hit by them; but those who are, are struck with terrific force. There are few individuals who can save up enough to protect themselves if the dread accident or disease should come, for such misfortune will not wait until the victim has accumulated an adequate nest egg. The worker may be struck down in early manhood, before he has accumulated any reserve, or when his family is growing up and his resources are strained to and beyond the limit to care for them. And even if all men were to save for this contingency, in the vast majority of cases it would not be needed, for the great majority escape; and these could have spent their money for more urgent and, to them, more necessary purposes.

Insurance is designed to meet this very situation and to furnish pooled protection against losses, the total of which can be roughly approximated, but the specific incidence of which cannot be foreseen.

It is better for the many to make small payments, and hence to decrease their incomes slightly, than for a small minority to suffer heavy and crushing losses. What could not be borne by the few whom grave misfortune visits can easily be supported by the many, all of whom are endangered, even though the vast majority ultimately escape. In addition, because of insurance, all will worry less because one fear will be reduced or removed. People will sleep better at night, and will be happier and more productive by day.

This is the fundamental justification of life, fire, accident, and marine insurance. It is better for each of a thousand homeowners to pay $15 a year in premiums for $15,000 of insurance on their homes, than for the one householder whose home does burn to suffer the full loss of $15,000.

This is exactly the case with crippling disability. Individual and voluntary disability insurance is an excellent thing. Those who sell and manage it are performing useful service. But we cannot depend solely, and probably not even primarily, upon it. In the first place, the immediate needs of a family are so pressing that well-meaning and even prudent individuals will tend to let this contingency rest in the background of their consciousness, and trust to their good fortune to bring them through. Just as the average soldier going into battle does not expect to be killed or seriously wounded, so does the average worker believe that he will go through life relatively unscathed.

Those who are already sick, and who believe that they will become sicker, and those who are afflicted with one or more

ills of the flesh, will want to insure against the greater blows which they believe or fear may fall upon them. The insurance companies naturally try to protect themselves against this tendency by very stringent health requirements, so as to cut down their losses. This in itself shuts out from protection a large portion of those who need assistance the most.

Even with all these precautions, however, there is an adverse selection of risks, so that the insurance companies in self-protection have to raise their rates in order to provide for their heavier loss ratio. This makes it harder for those in moderately good health who do want to protect themselves to pay the cost of such insurance, and hence tends to deter them from taking it out. If all were to share the burden of financial support, the average cost to the insured would be markedly lower. General coverage is, therefore, highly desirable.

Bringing those almost completely disabled for long periods of time under the Social Security System will be far better than to depend solely on either disability assistance or voluntary insurance.

Such protection will be at once more adequate and more self-respecting protection than that which old-age assistance can give. Under the insurance system, for which half of the cost has been paid by the covered workers and the other half by their employers, the disability benefits are paid as a right, not as a gratuity. There is no humiliating means test. Once it is determined that the covered worker is so seriously disabled as to be unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity, then at age 50, and subject to conditions which will be stated later, he becomes eligible for benefit, without regard to whether he is destitute. As we shall see, certain rather rigid requirements are imposed to check fraud and malingering, but these tests do not deal with whether the insured is poverty-stricken. The aim is, instead, to give the disabled person aid before he is destitute, so that he and his family may be spared this worry and hardship.

The benefits which are to be given are also on the average more generous than the aid given under disability assistance. This is shown by the following table:

Average previous monthly earnings	Workers' monthly disability benefits [1]	Percent benefits of earnings
$100	$55.00	55
$150	68.50	46
$200	78.50	39
$250	88.50	35
$300	98.50	33
$350	108.50	31

[1] There are of course some disabled workers living in States with high assistance payments, but whose previous wages were low, who would get more under disability assistance than disability insurance. But these would be very much in the minority. In these cases, as in old age, both insurance benefits and assistance could be given.

The average benefit which will be paid will be between $75 and $80, or $20 more than the average assistance payment, including medical benefits.

It should be realized that, although the disabled worker who is over 50 receives the same benefit as he individually would be entitled to after 65 years under old-age insurance, he is not entitled to added benefits for a wife or other dependents. No dependency benefit is attached to this proposal.

We are, in fact, trying to do for long-term disability in 1956 what we did for old age in 1935 and for premature death in 1939, namely, to replace assistance by insurance. In 1935, we designed old-age insurance as the method by which old-age assistance was ultimately to be supplanted or greatly reduced. While in the early years of the Social Security System, the number of those receiving old-age assistance was much greater than those receiving insurance benefits, because eligibility had not then been acquired by those in the insurance system, this has been reversed in recent years, as more and more acquired eligibility. Today 4½ millions are receiving old-age insurance benefits, as compared with the 2½ million receiving old-age assistance.

With the broadened coverage of the Social Security Act, which now includes approximately 90 percent of the gainfully employed, this disparity will be still further increased. This is all to the good. The American people have decided that they want self-respecting insurance, rather than public relief. The attempts which were recently made by the United States Chamber of Commerce and others to abandon the insurance principle throughout the Social Security System, and to rely, instead, solely upon assistance, have now been given up, for when they were exposed to the light of day, they collapsed, and they have now gone where the woodbine twineth.

It is the same with disability. Self-respecting insurance is better than humiliating relief; and I feel confident that American workers are willing to pay their share of the extra cost. This has been estimated on a level-premium basis by Robert J. Myers, the actuary for the Social Security Board, at .42 of 1 percent. I think I should add that Mr. Myers' cost estimates have been found to be substantially accurate up to date. To the degree that they have erred, it has been on the conservative side, with an overstatement of probable costs.

5. THE OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED

The objections to insurance against disability which were advanced in the hearings, and which have been raised in public discussion, seem to be approximately four in number: It is objected, first, that the medical determination of eligibility would be very difficult, and that an undue and improper strain would be placed upon doctors and would lead to abuses; second, that the payment of total disability benefits would lead to widespread malingering, because of the desire of the beneficiaries to obtain the security of the disability payments, rather than face the uncertainties of the competitive world; third, that the payment of these benefits would retard the medical and vocational rehabilitation of the disabled, which, it is urged, is more important than their cash compensation; fourth, that it would cost too much.

Let us consider each of these objections in turn. Perhaps the best answer to the first objection is that the determination of disability is already being made in many hundreds of thousands of cases, and is being conducted with substantial satisfaction. Veterans, railway workers, those in Federal employ, under State and local government retirement plans, and those in the employ of large numbers of private companies are already eligible for benefits for long-term disability.

The following are receiving long-term disability benefits from Government administered systems:

1. Veterans (with 70 percent or more disability):	
World War I	41,000
Korean war	18,000
World War II	128,000
Regular Establishment	10,000
2. Railroad retirement	85,000
3. Federal civil service	57,000
4. Federal noncontributing	81,000
5. State and local government retirement plans	45,000
Total	465,000

As Mr. Nelson H. Cruikshank, director of department of social security, AFL–CIO, has cogently observed:

> Persons who say that the Government cannot administer a disability program apparently shut their eyes to the fact that it is administering a number of such programs.

Nearly half a million are receiving disability benefits from publicly administered funds. In addition, many thousands are being paid under private plans, while workmen's compensation for industrial accidents creates a large additional caseload.

In addition to those receiving benefits for virtually total disability, large numbers have been examined, and their cases considered, under the disability freeze which Congress enacted in 1954. By this provision, those who were adjudged, because of physical or mental impairment, to be unable to engage in gainful activity which could be expected to result either in death or in a long-continued and indefinite term of disability, had their old-age-benefit rights continued as of the date of their disability. The fact that they had not been able to be covered during the period of disability, and hence did not make contributions to the fund during that time, was not allowed to count against them, so far as receiving old-age benefits at age 65 was concerned.

To carry out this provision, it was necessary to devise a procedure for determining such long-term disability. The administration was put in the hands of State authorities, generally the boards of vocational rehabilitation, which passed on the reports made to them by members of the medical profession and with ultimate appeal to the Social Security Administration and presumably to the courts.

According to the most recent reports which I have seen, the claims of approximately 105,000 persons for such a "freeze" have been processed. Approximately 65,000 have been granted and about 40,000 rejected. It is thus apparent that the claimants have not ridden roughshod over the administrative agencies. These have indeed shown marked restraint in certifying persons to be entitled to such a freeze.

The most interesting thing about this illustration is that the definition of what is long-term disability and the procedure for determining it is the same under the George amendment to this bill, upon which we shall shortly vote, as it is under the freeze provisions of the 1954 act which I have just described. Since all this has worked efficiently under the "freeze," why could it not work efficiently under the George amendment.

I have studied very carefully the objections which the representatives of the various medical societies have made against the payment of benefits for so-called long-term disabilities. Apparently they boil down to this: There is said to be a subjective as well as an objective factor in disability. Some men may consciously or unconsciously decide to give up the struggle. They will either develop psychosomatic ailments which will apparently disable them or will feign them. They will claim or honestly believe themselves to be afflicted with ailments which are essentially nondiagnosable. Headaches, backaches, and so forth, are frequently of this nature. Cases of rheumatism and arthritis, when traced to their roots, are often similarly caused.

It is, therefore, argued that essentially all these cases are nondiagnosable. Under these circumstances, many claim that doctors would be under great pressure to certify applicants as being more or less totally and permanently disabled, even though, in fact, they might not be. For, it is argued, if doctors acquire a reputation of being tough, they will lose patients who will, instead, flock to the doctors who hand out certificates of disability with a flowing and uncritical hand.

I have, apparently, a higher opinion of the medical profession than many of its official representatives. I believe that the overwhelming majority of the doctors of the country are scrupulously honest in their diagnosis. I do not believe them to be venal, and I will defend their characters and their professional integrity against the implications which have been leveled against them by some of their official spokesmen. Of course, there are probably a few black sheep and some weaklings in their profession, as in all others. But I believe they will be detected rather quickly and their findings will be properly discounted.

This brings us to a basic misunderstanding or misrepresentation of what the role of the physician will be in the administrative process. The representatives of the American Medical Association seem to assume that the doctors will be the men who determine whether or not a claimant is to receive benefits. But this is not the case.

What the doctors will do is to furnish medical information to a State board, which then makes the determination both on the medical and other information. This State board, under the freeze, now consists typically of another doctor and a lay member. In this way the doctors are made consultants rather than State functionaries, and at the same time are largely freed from the pressure to which their spokesmen persist in claiming that they would be subjected.

The definition of a compensable case is quite clear and concise. As has been stated, it is identical with that used for the disability freeze, namely:

> The term "disability" means inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or to be of long continued and indefinite duration.

Under this provision in the "freeze" determination of disability, a number of commonsense rulings and precedents have been established which will be of great help in making similar determinations for disability benefits. The administrative machinery on the State level has already been set up and is operating. The trail, in short, has been blazed and the way laid out. We have accumulated the experience and the know-how which should enable the benefits to be efficiently administered.

It should also be clearly understood that in addition to the rather precise tests of disability which are set up, four further requisites for eligibility are prescribed—all of which must be satisfied: first, the individual must have had 1½ years of coverage under social security out of the last 3 years; second, he must have had 5 years of coverage in the last 10 years; third, there must have been coverage for half of the time since 1950, or alternatively for 10 years; and finally, fourth, the disability must have been in existence for at least 6 years before monthly benefits will be payable.

All these qualifications, when added to the fact that only those who are 50 years and over are eligible, constitute a very tough set of conditions. While complications are introduced by carrying over the "freeze" provisions for the determination of the disability benefit, these are not unduly serious. They are explained in a technical statement appended to my remarks. In short, while there will still be problems, they can be solved. If we are ever to be ready to handle disability benefits, we now are. And the circumstances under which the George amendment will be carried out could not be more favorable.

Perhaps it should be added for those who believe in decentralized and State rather than Federal administration, that this is precisely what is provided for under the George amendment. The determination and administration will be in the hands of State authorities, with the Social Security Administration merely setting general standards and acting as upper reviewing and appeals body.

In the hearings there are about 10 pages of fine print discussing in great detail the administrative procedures which are followed in determining disability under the "freeze" provision. It is presumed that these procedures will be followed if the George amendment is adopted. A careful study of them will, I believe, show that the criticisms advanced by a great many people against disability benefits are not well founded.

The second and third objections to providing disability benefits, namely, that they will greatly stimulate malingering and impede the rehabilitation of the disabled, are really two phases of the same set of feared dangers and hence may properly be considered together.

What so many of the doctors seem to be afraid of is that once the disabled are in receipt of benefits they may become reconciled to the idea that they are disabled and hence will not strive to rehabilitate themselves either physically or occupationally. It will be easier, it is said, to keep on drawing benefits and to stay out of the stream of productive activity.

It is undeniable that there is something to this objection. But the question is whether it should be controlling. Many of us have carefully considered this question for many years—I have thought about it for 20 years—and have come to the conclusion that this tendency can be largely checked under the George amendment.

For example, the disabled man or woman will not be neglected and will still be checked and aided once he is in receipt of benefits. Unlike the case of old-age benefits, his right to disability benefits is not an absolute one. If the disabled person seems to be neglecting opportunities for improvement, he can be admonished and if he persists, his situation can be reassessed.

A second variation of this fundamental fear of subjective and often unconscious malingering is the argument that disability benefits will impede rehabilitation. Rehabilitation, it is urged, is the all-important goal and to get men and women restored to self-respect and self-support we should not keep them in a dependent position through the payment of benefits.

I yield to no one in my enthusiasm for rehabilitation. I have watched wounded men being rehabilitated in military hospitals, and I am happy to have played a part, although a very minor one, in the improvement and expansion of these services under the Truman administration. I rejoice in the further progress which has been made since then. I believe that in Miss Mary Switzer, who is heading up the rehabilitation work in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we have a truly magnificent public servant. I shall support the rehabilitation program with my full strength.

But it is a great mistake to believe that the benefit system set up by the George amendment is in any real sense antagonistic to, or a substitute for, rehabilitation. On the contrary, it not only supplements, but actually strengthens, the rehabilitation work.

Let us be clear about a very essential fact. Rehabilitation by itself is indeed a very imperfect way of caring for the disabled. For there is competent medical opinion that probably not much more than 25 percent of those above 50 years who are so severely disabled can be restored to self-support. This is a considerable percentage to be sure and every effort should be made to realize it. But, we may ask, what about the other three-quarters? Are they and their families to be crushed into abject poverty? No sane and humane person would agree to that.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very much interested in the Senator's remarks on this subject. He and I served together for many years on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and we had before us many questions dealing with rehabilitation.

I am sure the Senator from Illinois will recall that at the hearings a great deal of testimony was given to the effect that there is today a backlog of more than 2 million cases of physically handicapped people in this country, and that the number is increasing at the rate of 250,000 a year. On the other hand, we are rehabilitating, or seeking to rehabilitate, only 50 or 60 thousand a year. As the Senator will surely recall, there was a great deal of testimony from the head of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and from important members of his staff, to the effect that for every dollar the United States spends in rehabilitating people, $5 is returned to the United States, through making a person self-supporting again, able to bear his share of the burden, and to pay taxes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from New York is entirely correct. He is quite right about the importance of rehabilitation. However, the point I was trying to make is that even if we were to do as good a job as we could, probably in three-quarters of the cases over the age of 50 rehabilitation would not be effective. Therefore we must have some method of taking care of people who cannot be rehabilitated.

Mr. LEHMAN. I fully understand what the distinguished Senator from Illinois is pointing out, and I am in complete agreement with him. But I have been disturbed and distressed for a long time because the very people who are opposing the George amendment or an amendment similar to the George amendment are the ones who have constantly, consistently, and vigorously opposed the Government's taking any adequate steps whatsoever to rehabilitate the physically handicapped. Even this very year a wholly inadequate amount of money has been appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe the Senator from New York is correct. When we try to do one thing, we are told that we should do the other; when we try to do the other, we are told that we should do the first.

Mr. LEHMAN. Personally—and I am sure I speak for the other members of the committee—I very much regret that the distinguished Senator from Illinois is no longer a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on which he served so devotedly and so effectively. My only consolation is that he is being replaced by a very excellent man, too, the present occupant of the chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New York. I, too, in many ways regret the transfer.

The objectors, moreover, seem to ignore the fact that under the George amendment the disabled man is required to avail himself of the services of the State rehabilitation agencies upon penalty of losing his benefits. Thus, the scope and importance of rehabilitation work would be greatly increased rather than decreased by the adoption of the George amendment and a powerful enforcing device would be imposed to prevent rehabilitation from being shirked. This is a big improvement over the 1950 provision for disability benefits which was passed by the House and rejected by the Senate Finance Committee. For that bill had no such provision in it and the payment of benefits was almost completely divorced from rehabilitation. I can well remember urging some of the sponsors of the 1950 bill to include such a requirement, as well as my strong feelings of doubt over its absence.

But as I have said, this lack has now been removed and the inclusion of this requirement should remove all legitimate grounds for opposition. Sometimes it seems to me that the opponents ignore the changes that have been made in the draft and do not realize that rehabilitation can be required as a condition of receiving benefits.

To make the transition into gainful employment much easier, it is provided that the benefits will continue in effect during the first year of substantial gainful activity. In this way, everything the disabled man earns during this trial period will be so much added income instead of merely reducing his insurance benefit. In this way, an added inducement is given to disabled men and women to rehabilitate themselves and then, as they acquire more confidence and ability during the initial year, they will be able to strike out for themselves and become completely self-supporting.

Finally, as the American Medical Association itself has pointed out in another connection, the payment of disability benefits should actually make rehabilitation more possible and effective. The fact seems to have been lost sight of that the house of delegates of the AMA approved in December of 1955, only 6 months ago, a report of a special committee on medical relations in workmen's compensation. I hold this report in my hand and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in its entirety at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of Senator DOUGLAS' remarks.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let me read some salient paragraphs of the report:

> The physician's interest involves recognition that the amount and method of indemnification have a direct and important bearing on an effective rehabilitation regime. While overgenerous indemnity can dull the will for rehabilitation, inadequate indemnity requirements can destroy an employer's incentive to support rehabilitation by providing him with an easier or cheaper alternative. More important, inadequate indemnity can lower patient morale, or force return to gainful employment in advance of clear-cut medical indications.

I should like to call especial attention to this last sentence, that an inadequate indemnity can lower patient morale. This point is developed at length in subsequent paragraphs of this same report.

Now, I think this is good commonsense, and I commend our friends in the American Medical Association for it. But I cannot understand how the American Medical Association can endorse adequate benefits as an aid to the rehabilitation of the industrially disabled, and yet simultaneously condemn in an unmeasured and unrestrained manner the payment of similar benefits for the long-term disabled as an entire group. This is certainly not understandable from the standpoint either of logic or of medical reasoning. The American Medical Association in this respect is indeed like the character in Stephen Leacock's story who mounted his horse and rode off in all directions. I can only conclude that the attitude of the leaders of the American Medical Association, on this as on so many other questions of social policy is largely shaped by their political and social prejudices and likings. These doctors say they are opposed to state medicine, but many of them seem to want to create a medical state. Thus, a leading candidate for the presidency of the American Medical Association, without having personally examined any of the men in question, has solemnly announced that the President, after a critical heart attack and a major operation, is in better physical condition than any of his various Democratic rivals. It is about time that the rank and file of the profession expressed their disapproval both of politics in medicine and medicine in politics.

The fourth objection to the George amendment is that it will cost too much. As I have pointed out, the actuary for the Social Security Administration, Robert J. Myers, has made an intermediate estimate of cost which is between the high and low estimates. On a level premium basis through time, this average was set at forty-two one hundredths of 1 percent of the covered payroll. In the beginning, the cost would be much less than this. Mr. Myers estimates that in the first year, approximately 250,000 persons would draw disability benefits totaling a little over $200 million at an average cost of about one-sixth of 1 percent of the covered payroll. This number would probably increase in 25 years to a total of around 1 million persons and a payroll cost of around $900 million, or about two-thirds of 1 percent of the covered earnings.

But the surplus accumulated during the earlier years, on a forty-two one hundredths of 1 percent contribution plus accumulated interest, would probably be sufficient according to Dr. Myers to meet the costs into the foreseeable future—it should be noted that this is an intermediate cost estimate based on the assumption of high-level employment.

To provide an assessment of one-half of 1 percent of payroll, distributed equally between employer and employee should, therefore, provide a safety factor of nearly one-tenth of 1 percent or one-fifth of the basic estimates.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana, who has played such a magnificent part in this whole fight.

Mr. LONG. The Senator was very gracious in permitting me to look at an advance copy of his remarks, which I appreciate very much. I completely agree with the Senator's position. The speech he is making is one of the best speeches that has ever been made on the subject of disability insurance.

I completely agree with him that spreading the risk with small payments, which everyone can afford, is the way to take care of disability. It is certainly far better than the public welfare approach, which requires that the person applying for relief be needy, that he have no means of getting other assistance, or that his relations cannot help him, or similar situations.

The idea of preserving a person's pride and self-respect, by having him pay for the insurance which he receives in payments, appeals to me.

We can say, of course, that the man who receives the smallest percentage return with regard to the amount he pays in is the person in the upper brackets. For example, a man who makes as much as $4,200 or more a year will receive in disability payments only about 31 percent of his earnings, whereas a person who earns $100 a month receives about 55 percent of his earnings.

I believe that when it is worked out, it will be found that a person would be paying about 75 cents a month to insure himself against disability, and that his employer would be paying 75 cents a month also.

When such a man lost his job because of disability he would be in a position to draw, starting at age 50, a total of approximately $19,000, to carry him from the time he was 50 years of age until he was 65.

That is certainly a large amount of assistance for a person to receive in the event he is disabled, to offset the terrific hardship which his disability in all probability would entail. It is a rather high payment, and I am sure that almost every workman in the country would be willing to pay such a small amount for that kind of protection.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. It comes to about $10 a year. I regard that as a good investment. The Senator from Louisiana the other day made his case on the floor of the Senate. He made it very succinctly in a few sentences. He made the very best brief statement of the issue that I have ever heard. If people will only realize what is involved here, they will cease to make many of their objections.

I may say that this is not only insurance, but it is social insurance. In social insurance it is possible to introduce a principle which it is not possible to introduce in private insurance, namely, some sharing of the benefits and some of the allocation of the costs.

Social security is good for everyone in most circumstances. Its broader effect is to give a greater proportionate benefit to those who are most in need, on the Christian principle of "Share ye with one another your burdens."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that, as the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Louisiana have pointed out, unless we adopt a plan of disability insurance such as is provided in the George amendment, the only alternative is that a great number of the men who are permanently and totally disabled will necessarily become objects of charity?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. There is no alternative that I can think of, except using up one's private resources.

Mr. LEHMAN. In many cases there are no private resources to draw on, because those private resources usually have already been consumed and the families are poor and are unable to take care of the person. As I see it, the only alternative is for the person to become an object of charity.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. One thing which I do not understand is why some people who appreciate the need of this type of insurance oppose it so vigorously. I have in mind the American Medical Association. It was only a year ago that spokesmen for the American Medical Association came before the committee and asked us to pass a bill giving them a tax deduction to assist them in insuring themselves against disability.

In other words, the doctor recognizes that if he should go blind, for instance, he could not continue his practice as a doctor. So they came before the committee and asked for a tax deduction. Most doctors are in a relatively high income-tax bracket. If we had adopted that proposal, it would have meant that Uncle Sam was picking up about 50 percent of the check. That is what it would have amounted to.

Under such a proposal the cost of disability insurance for doctors would have been about the same cost to the doctors as it would have been if they had placed themselves under social security because the social-security program costs only about half as much as it would cost to take out similar insurance with a private company. The working man wants what the doctors want. If it is good enough for the doctors, it should be good enough for the workingmen.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They want to be taken care of under the social-security system.

Mr. LONG. That is correct. The doctors constitute the only large remaining group of professional people who are opposed to social security. The lawyers asked to be taken under this system.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is in the case of young lawyers.

Mr. LONG. Yes. But they learned what it was all about. In the great city of Cleveland, the lawyers started to wake up to what the social-security system was all about. Some of them came before us at the time the American Bar Association was against the social-security system.

They had a discussion group. Two men debated in favor of social security and two men debated against it. After the debate was concluded before the whole group of attorneys, they proceeded to take a vote of all the attorneys present as to whether they were for or against lawyers being covered by social security. Every lawyer present, including those who had conducted the debate, voted in favor of social security. They were convinced, after they had studied the subject, that it was the best type of insurance for the cost that could be devised.

The only group of professional people who will be left out, after we pass this bill, will be the doctors and the chiropractors. I understand the chiropractors want to be considered in the same category with doctors, and I can understand why. It somewhat dignifies them to be in the same category with doctors. Those are the only professional groups of any consequence that will not be covered by social security after we pass this bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, there are some members of the medical profession who do wish to be included.

Mr. LONG. I would be willing to leave out the doctors, so long as a majority of them do not want to be under Social Security. If they do not want it, that is alright with me. But I do not see why the doctors should send a representative from every medical association in the United States to testify against letting the workingman purchase that which the workingman wants to buy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is referring to disability insurance, is he not?

Mr. LONG. Yes. They do not want the working man to have what is good for the doctors. If they do not want it, they can be left out. But I do not see why they should oppose letting the workingman have something for which he is willing to pay.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am greatly disappointed that they are opposing it, and I hope Members of the Senate will not be overpowered by their opposition. It is true that the American Medical Association had a powerful influence in the 1952 elections, though I do not think it was as great as was claimed by them. They claim credit for defeating several Members of the Senate.

Mr. LONG. I believe the proposal is, in a sense, a subsidy for the medical profession, because, if we consider the disabling diseases, it will be found that the top one in the list is heart disease with hardening of the arteries. Anyone who has that disease needs a doctor. How can such a person pay the doctor? He cannot work. He would be able to pay his doctor bill if he had disability assistance.

I believe arthritis is next on the list. If a man has arthritis, he needs a doctor.

Cancer of the blood tops the list of the various kinds of cancer. A person with such a disease needs a doctor.

Polio is one of the top disablers. People suffering from that disease need doctors. They have to have doctors to look after them from day to day. The income realized from social security disability insurance would pay the doctor bill.

One of these days, the medical association will wake up to the fact that when payments are made for these various disabling diseases, the doctor will be one of the persons sharing in the check.

Why they have not figured that out up to this time, I cannot understand.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am not at all surprised, because I have seen a similar attitude taken in many other activities affecting the health of the people.

The American Medical Association is opposing social security on the ground that the people could and should be rehabilitated. But as governor of a great State for many years, and as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate, I do not recall any occasion whatsoever when the American Medical Association tried to use its influence to obtain appropriations sufficient to advance the cause of rehabilitation. They just have not done that. I have the greatest admiration for most medical practitioners. Individual doctors frequently make tremendous sacrifices. I am not referring to them but to the American Medical Association. The officers and governing body of the American Medical Association have opposed social security as they have opposed so many other things which are necessary to the welfare of the people, and to which the people are entitled.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think one of the tragedies of modern life in America has been the fact that doctors who are so generous and kind in their individual treatment of patients have allowed themselves to be governed by an inner clique of physicians to the well-to-do who do not have a great deal of personal contact with the problems of poor people, and who are largely the articulate members of the various medical societies. As a result, they have opposed in all too many cases measures which would really help the health and welfare of the American people. I think it has been a tragedy that they have adopted such an attitude.

Mr. President, I have said that the assistance will be ample to meet the costs.

Our critics, however, claim that this would not be enough and say that the tendency toward malingering and the way in which the disability rate rose under private plans during the great depression of the thirties is clear indication that the costs might be double Myers' intermediate estimate.

Here it should be noted, however, that real efforts will be made to root out and discourage malingering and that the experience of the thirties is no guide. For then, there was no unemployment insurance and men who were out of work and deprived of income were at once adversely affected from a physical and mental standpoint and, at the same time, came to look upon the receipt of private disability benefits as a way out of their tragic situation.

Our people are now better protected than they were during the great depression. Because of unemployment insurance, their income does not stop when their job ceases. This relieves the temptation to use disability benefits as protection against unemployment, while it also lessens the danger of psychosomatic sickness.

Probably a major reason for the difficulties of private companies with disability insurance was the problem of writing into contracts language which would cover all possible cases of disability. However, this problem does not arise with respect to this legislation, because the determination as to disability is an administrative one. Experience with the disability freeze indicates that the determination of disability can be tough but fair.

Dr. Myers' estimates are conservative because he assumes that the average earnings per covered worker will continue to be the same as in 1954. This is a proper assumption for an actuary to make.

At the same time, we know it has not been true in the past and that there is little likelihood that it will be true in the future. Weekly earnings are, instead, nearly twice what they were in 1945, and between 3 and 4 times what they were in 1935, when the Social Security Act was launched. Even if the price level were to remain constant, the increase in per capita productivity and, hence in average money earnings, will in all likelihood send up the total amounts taken into the system by not far from 2 percent a year. Since benefits paid out under these conditions do not increase as rapidly as total contributions, a large further margin of safety is built into the system. Due to the fact that while benefits are 55 percent of average earnings up to $110 a month, they are only 20 percent of earnings above that figure.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator has outlined what the cost of this program would be.

Mr. DOUGLAS. According to Dr. Myers' estimate, forty-two one-hundredths of 1 percent of covered payroll on a level premium basis.

Mr. LONG. When the program goes into full effect for those who are disabled, after they have achieved eligibility over some period of time, there will be some increase in the cost of the program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is right.

Mr. LONG. But from that point forward, there is no reason to believe that the cost of the program will increase.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is right.

Mr. LONG. Because there will not be an increase of disabled persons, on a percentage basis.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Therefore, when we shall have assumed the normal case burden of disabled persons, the number could not be expected to increase, as would be the case with the aged.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The percentage will not increase relative to the working population.

Mr. LONG. The percentage of persons disabled will not increase, as would be the case with the aged, because it is expected that persons will live longer and longer. For that reason, there will be an increasing number of people over the age of 65. However, that situation does not apply to disabled persons, and there is no reason to believe, after the normal caseload is reached, that there will be an increase percentagewise in the number of disabled.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is right.

We should not be afraid, therefore, of financing the benefits by an additional tax of one-quarter of 1 percent upon employers and employees alike on earnings up to $350 a month or $4,200 a year, and three-eighths of 1 percent upon similar earnings of the self-employed. If added contributions are needed, labor at least would be ready to foot its share of the bill. For the A. F. of L. and the CIO, at their first joint convention, adopted a resolution pledging themselves as follows:

> We continue also our full support of the increased contribution rate necessary to keep social security soundly financed when these increased benefits are provided.

With this, the last objection to providing disability benefits should disappear.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire resolution be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there is still another factor. The introduction of insurance benefits for disabilities of persons over the age of 50 will not immediately decrease by very much assistance or welfare payments for those handicapped, because it will take time to build up eligibility. However, as the system comes to cover more and more people, it should reduce the assistance payments. Those assistance payments are paid for entirely by the taxpayers, partly by the taxpayers of the Federal Government, and partly by taxpayers of the State governments. So that what would otherwise be a tax burden would be reduced in some degree by the substitution of the insurance benefits for the assistance payments, and the insurance benefits would be jointly contributed by employer and employee on a self-respecting basis for the purchase of insurance and not for a charitable handout.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. Persons in the upper income brackets should welcome the program, because they make the major tax payments. Some of the general revenues into which go payments for income, corporation, and inheritance taxes all help to pay for the cost of welfare payments. That being the case, they could expect to have some relief, insofar as concerns the taxes they pay on corporate and personal income.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that all those persons who would be covered under the George amendment at age 50,

rather than at age 65, have been members of the system of social-security insurance?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; that is true.

Mr. LEHMAN. Some of them have been members of the system for a great many years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. In order to meet the eligibility requirements under the George amendment, persons must have had a large amount of prior employent under the system—at least 5 years of covered employment.

Mr. LEHMAN. What I cannot understand is the argument which has been raised that the proposal to pay disability insurance at a certain age is something entirely new, that it is something that is socialistic. As a matter of fact, many insurance companies pay disability insurance at certain ages, even though the insured persons may be younger than 65 years of age. Under the policies of some insurance companies, they pay disability insurance at any age. There is nothing new or socialistic about the proposal in any way. It is a system which has been recognized by insurance companies as far back as I can recall.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is simply a better method of protecting against great risks than the method which the majority of the people can obtain for themselves.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I say in conclusion that the time is ripe for us to take the next forward step in social security, and to insure against severe, crippling, and long-continued disability for those over 50.

This will be an investment in self-respect. It will not cost much—probably less than one-half of 1 percent of payroll.

Those who object to it are, in the main, those who have opposed each previous step in social security. The fact that their past fears have been proved to be largely groundless should prevent our being frightened by their present claims.

I regret that the administration has seen fit to oppose this proposal.

I regret that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for whom personally I always entertain a high opinion, should have seen fit to appear on the last day of the hearings and to make a very vigorous statement in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I would imagine that if the administration were to succeed in defeating the proposal, assuming the same administration should continue in power for a while longer, the same proposal may be sent down in an administration bill. The administration witnesses testified in such a way that they left the door open so that they could make their own proposal later on, after they had succeeded in defeating the proposal made in a previous Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That may be the politics of the administration, but it is not the politics of the Senator from Illinois. If the administration were to come forward with a proposal to help mankind, I would support it even if it originated with the administration. And I think it is poor policy to oppose a proposal simply because it comes from the Democrats.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Illinois has had outstanding experience to qualify on the subject he is discussing. That is why I am particularly happy to have him as a member of the Finance Committee, which handles social-security matters. However, the Senator from Illinois was not a member of the committee at the time hearings were held on the bill.

I think if the Senator will review the statement of Secretary Hobby last year, when she was Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, he will find that she urged that we ought to think about the subject, study it, and mull over it a while, notwithstanding the fact that the subject has been studied for almost 20 years.

The Senator will further find that Secretary Folsom's testimony this time was that we should study the matter, see what experience will yield, and eventually they might consent to doing something like this, although he himself was a member of the very group which studied the matter in 1948. He had 8 years to think about it, after that very group made its recommendation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Louisiana has brought to mind some memories of my own, because I was a member of the group set up by the United States Senate and the Social Security Administration in 1938 to study the social-security law. Of course, I was not a Member of this body at that time. Mr. Folsom was a member of the same group with me. I liked him. I still like him very much, as a matter of fact. We held meeting after meeting. We decided to recommend benefits and insurance for survivors; and we debated the question of disability benefits. I do not remember whether he was for them or against them. I know I was for them, although I had great desire to tie them up with rehabilitation and to prevent malingering. This subject has been studied by official bodies for at least 18 years. Secretary Folsom was a member of the 1938 committee, and he was a member of the 1948 committee. In 1948, I was engaged in some other matters—in trying to get elected to this body. So I was not a member of that group. But certainly there has been ample time to study it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator from Illinois was not a member of the 1948 committee, perhaps he would not know about this matter. But my information is that in the 1948 committee, out of a 17-man group, 15 members recommended that the time was ripe, and that disability insurance should then be proceeded with. Mr. Folsom and one other member at that time said it should be thought about and studied longer—although he had been studying it for at least 10 years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from Illinois remember the name of the other member of the committee who took that position?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it was Albert Linton, then president, and now chairman of the board, I believe, of the Provident Mutual Insurance Co.

Mr. LONG. That is correct. And back in 1948, Mr. Folsom wanted to study the matter further. However, these needy persons will be dead long before the study is completed, if we proceed at the rate Mr. Folsom and others like him have suggested.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to say that although I think Mr. Folsom is wrong on this matter, I have known him for almost 30 years, and he is a high-minded person and a rather socially minded person. But he is extremely cautious. If we had to depend on him, I believe that no new steps would be taken during the life of any of us. He will administer very well the programs which have been decided on, but he is never found launching out into bold new programs.

Mr. LONG. The chances are that if we had had to proceed on the basis Mr. Folsom prefers, we never would have had any program such as this one.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I wish to commend the senior Senator from Illinois for his remarkably fine work in the field of social security. As the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has said, the record of the Senator from Illinois in this matter is one of years of study and of great understanding in this area of important social-welfare legislation.

I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Illinois to the fact that although Mr. Folsom, for whom I, too, have respect and admiration——

Mr. DOUGLAS. And he is a great improvement over his predecessor in the Office of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, there is no doubt of that. But although Mr. Folsom was engaged in studying and studying, in postgraduate course after postgraduate course, I think one must recognize that Mr. Folsom was not really one of the mainsprings or one of the big wheels in the Republican organization, as such. Mr. Folsom represents the study side of the administration. But the Republican Party never did study this matter. Instead, the Republican Party opposed it, and just said, "No," from the very beginning.

So, really, it is quite a concession from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that he even would say publicly that he is studying these things.

Mr. Folsom is an enlightened man; and I was delighted when he became Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. But everyone knows that any program that a department submits to Congress has to be the President's program, and is worked out through the Bureau of the Budget and the White House

organization, with its special assistants and advisers in and out of Government; and Mr. Folsom is doing what the President's program calls for. The President's program in regard to social security is to study, but to oppose lowering to age 62 the eligibility for benefits for women; to study disability; but not to do very much about rehabilitation.

I wish to concur in what my colleagues have said here in regard to rehabilitation. I am interested in this matter, and my record will bear out what I am saying. I have spoken several times in the Senate in advocating the appropriation of funds for rehabilitation work and rehabilitation facilities, and in favoring that one of our public-health laws be amended so as to provide funds for rehabilitation facilities.

One of the best rehabilitation centers in America is located at the Mayo Foundation at the University of Minnesota Medical School. Dr. Kottke is in charge of it, and is associated there with Dr. Frank Krusen, one of the outstanding rehabilitation experts in the country. I have the greatest respect for these two gentlemen. They are friends of mine, and I admire them.

But let me make it crystal clear that—as has been stated here—I have not witnessed any militant effort on the part of the administration or on the part of the medical profession to fortify the rehabilitation programs with the facilities and authorizations and appropriations which are required for this program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Minnesota is quite correct.

Let me say that a good part of Mr. Folsom's niceness can be attributed, I think, to the fact that he grew up in Georgia, and therefore presumably came from Democratic parentage, and thus had a good start in life, and has been traveling for some time on the accumulated moral energy furnished to him by the Democratic Party. However, his basic decency has suffered some erosion from contaminating contact with the present administration. I suggest that on this issue he "get his batteries recharged."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. When it is stated that the Republican Party is opposing this program, attention should be called to the fact that the time element is involved, inasmuch as the Republican Party is not only opposing the program now, but has been opposing it for a great number of years. Not only has the Republican Party for a long time been opposing the proposal to make adequate provisions for those who are disabled, but the majority of the Republican Party has also been fighting proposals to increase the welfare payments to the needy, the blind, and the aged.

The Republican administration has been fighting the proposal to lower the retirement age for women. The administration has been fighting that proposal bitterly, and has been using every device it could to defeat it.

However, I am confident that if the bill is passed, the President will sign it; and then, when he runs for reelection, he will say it is one of the great accomplishments of his administration. I am as sure of that as I am certain that I am now standing on this floor.

I recall that when, 2 years ago, we reduced the excise taxes, the Eisenhower administration resisted that reduction, and did everything it could to prevent it and defeat it. However, Congress passed the bill, notwithstanding the administration's opposition; and then the President signed the bill. That was the only tax reduction made during the Eisenhower administration—out of the entire $7 billion of tax reduction—that did the average workingman any good whatever. But after Congress insisted that that reduction be made, the President began to attempt to take credit for making it.

Since then, whenever we have said that the billions of dollars of tax reduction made under the Republican administration did not help workingmen of the country, some Republican Senator has immediately jumped to his feet and has referred to this excise-tax reduction that the Congress insisted upon, over the opposition of the administration; Republican Senators have said that it was proper for the President to take credit for that reduction in excise taxes, because the President signed the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois recalls very well that situation. He proposed the cut in the tax on household appliances. That proposal was bitterly opposed by the administration but there was a little break in the otherwise solid front on the other side of the aisle, and we succeeded in having that bill passed and enacted into law. But then, when the Senator ran for reelection, he found that in the literature the opposition party distributed, the opposition party claimed credit for itself—for the Republicans—for that reduction in the excise tax on household appliances.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Illinois will recall that when the bill was passed, there was colloquy between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Minnesota; and even though the bill was then referred to by the Secretary of the Treasury as "fiscal irresponsibility," at that time both of us said—just as the Senator from Louisiana has stated now—that "Now that the bill has been passed, we can be sure that the Republicans will claim it as their own, will pull it to their bosom, will hug it and love it, and will say, 'This is ours.' "

Mr. President, that is exactly what happened—even though prior to that time the attitude of the Republican candidate for the Presidency and the attitude of the Republican Party was consistently one of opposition to everything related to social security; and their position regarding it was entirely one of adverse comment and negative statement and negative approach. They said it was collectivism and socialism and that it would wreck the private insurance companies and would undermine the moral fiber of the people.

But then, all at once—when the program did work, and when it was found that the funds were adequate, and that the program was solvent, and that the benefits were proving to be of help to both individuals and insurance companies, and the national economy—the Republican leadership began to say, "Yes, this is a fine program, something we have been working for for years."

Mr. President, that situation reminds me of a man who refused to acknowledge his parentage of a little boy, and simply had nothing to do with the boy for his first 6 years. Then the boy went to school, and did very well, and then went to high school, where he continued to do very well as a student; and also did very well as an athlete, and made the football team and made the basketball team; and became valedictorian of his class, won a scholarship, and went to college, where he also did very well, made the college football team and made the basketball team, and made "All American," and graduated from college with honors. Then, all at once, out of the catacombs came his father, then on old man, and—although for more than 20 years he had denied being the father of the young man—suddenly said, for the first time, "That's my boy," and pointed to him with pride.

That is what the administration has done in this case. For 20 years the administration opposed this program and used every means at its command to thwart it. But during those 20 years we worked hard and made great sacrifices for the program, and the political bodies of those who fought for it have been piled high, so to speak. But now, all of a sudden, after 20 years of constant opposition to the program, the Republicans step forward—handsome, well dressed, looking affluent——

Mr. DOUGLAS. In fact, they are affluent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, indeed, Mr. President; they are very affluent. [Laughter.] And now the Republicans say—for the first time—"This is a fine program, and it is sound and solvent"—except when something new is tried.

I think it fair to say that if, during all the years which have passed since the early days, it had been necessary to rely upon the Republicans, insofar as determining the shape of the world was concerned, today we would not have round globes to show the shape of the world; but, instead, it would still be said that the world was flat. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say, in reply to the comments of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Minnesota about the reversal of the position of Republicans on social security, that I think we all remember very well the trip which the then Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower made to Texas in 1949, when he was entertained by a great many wealthy Texas oilmen. Upon one occasion he made the statement that if anyone wanted social security he should go to jail.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I believe the statement was that if anyone wanted security he should go to jail. However, I believe that statement was generally interpreted

as referring to the social security type of program. It was widely hailed by many vigorous opponents of social security and public welfare as a great statement of principle.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. I now have a copy of the New York Times article of December 9, 1949, which quotes him as saying, "If all that Americans want is security, they can go to prison. They'll have enough to eat, a bed, and a roof over their heads." Perhaps he should have added, "Or go into the Army."

At the time I felt that that statement was not worthy of the general. Of course, that position has since been reversed. I regret to find the administration opposing the extension of this same principle to the field of disability.

Mr. President, I have only a sentence left to complete my speech.

I may be quite naive, but I simply cannot believe that the spokesmen for the administration really want to shut the gates of mercy on mankind. I hope that this discussion and that which is to follow may serve to change their opinion, and that we may adopt the George amendment by a resounding vote when it comes up.

The matters heretofore referred to are as follows:

ELIGIBILITY FOR DISABILITY

To be eligible for the "freeze" of benefits because of disability the person has to meet two requirements with respect to coverage:

1. He must have 20 quarters of coverage out of the last 40 quarters (5 years out of 10) ending with the quarter in which disability began.

2. He must have 6 quarters of coverage out of the last 13 quarters (1½ years out of 3¼) ending with the quarter in which disability began.

Since the freeze is retroactive, a person whose disability began (as early as the fourth quarter of 1941) 5 years after the effective date of the act (1937) is eligible if he met the two requirements. For example: Mr. A worked in covered employment throughout the years 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940, and 1941. He is found to have become disabled in December 1941. He meets both requirements as to coverage and is therefore eligible for the freeze of benefits at the level of December 1941.

Mr. B worked in covered employment throughout 1937, 1938, 1940, and 1941. Throughout 1942 and 1943 he was either ill or working in employment that was not covered. He worked again in covered employment throughout 1944, but became disabled at the end of 1944. He had 20 quarters of coverage out of the previous 40, but had only 5 quarters of coverage out of the last 13, and therefore would not be eligible for the disability freeze.

Mr. C worked in covered employment throughout 1940 and 1941. He then had a heart attack which kept him out of work during 1942 and 1943. He recovered sufficiently to return to work throughout 1944 and 1945, but then suffered another heart attack and has not since been able to work. He would have 8 out of the last 13 quarters of coverage, but only 16 out of the last 40, and would therefore not be eligible for the disability freeze.

The same rules would apply at any period. These early examples were used to show how far back the freeze goes.

The requirements for eligibility for disability payments under the House bill are the same as for the present freeze with two additions:

1. Payments do not begin until age 50.

2. The beneficiary must be fully insured.

In both the freeze and the payment plans a 6-month waiting period is required.

Fully insured status may be acquired by having 40 quarters (10 years) of coverage or by having one quarter of coverage for each two quarters elapsing after 1950 or after the quarter in which the individual became 21 years of age, in other words coverage for half of the time. (The quarters of coverage may be acquired either before or after 1950.) Fully insured status can also be acquired by being covered in every quarter elapsing after 1954. In all cases a minimum of six quarters of coverage is required for an individual to be fully insured. Any person who is fully insured at the time he is determined to be eligible for the disability freeze has his fully insured status frozen, and at age 50 he would be eligible for disability payments.

Until 1961, any person who met the 20 quarters (5 years) of coverage requirement for disability payments or the freeze would automatically meet the fully insured requirement of coverage for half the time elapsing after 1950. Therefore all persons currently under the freeze (with an exception noted below) would be eligible for payments at age 50.

For example: Mr. D incurs a disability in December 1960, after working 5 years in covered employment. He meets the requirements for the freeze and he is fully insured because he was covered for 5 of the 10 years elapsing after 1950. He would therefore be eligible for disability payments at age 50.

Beginning with 1961, and until 1971, one additional quarter of coverage for each two quarters of elapsed time would be required in order to be fully insured. Beginning with 1971, 10 years of coverage would be required in order to be fully insured.

For example: Mr. E becomes disabled in 1966, after 6 years of covered employment. He would be eligible for the freeze, which would preserve his benefits until he was age 65, but he would not be eligible for disability payments at age 50 because he was not fully insured—he had only 6 years of coverage but needed 7½ to be fully insured (one-half of the 15 years elapsing after 1950). By 1971, and thereafter, he would need 10 years of coverage.

In the case of younger people, the requirement of coverage for one-half of the time elapsing after they became 21 years of age would apply. Thus, any person who acquired 5 years of coverage and became disabled before he was 31 years of age would be fully insured and eligible for payments at age 50. For example: Mr. F becomes disabled in 1980, at the age of 30, after working in covered employment throughout 1957–59. He is eligible for the freeze and is fully insured, having been covered for more than half of the time elapsing after he became 21. He would be eligible for disability payments at age 50.

However, if the disability did not occur until he was 41, he would need 10 years of coverage (one-half of the 20 years elapsing after he was 21) in order to be fully insured.

NOTE.—There is one small group of people under the freeze who would not automatically qualify for payments. The act defines blindness and makes this a disability for purposes of the freeze. However, to receive disability payments a blind person must demonstrate inability to engage in substantial gainful employment as must all others.

In 1950 and in 1954 amendments were adopted to the Social Security Act which substantially expanded coverage. Those people taken in under the amendments of 1950 become eligible for the disability freeze, and subsequently for payments, if they became disabled during the last quarter of 1955—that is the earliest date at which they could have acquired 5 years of coverage. For those taken in under the amendments of 1954, the earliest date at which they could become eligible is the last quarter of 1959.

The total number of workers in covered employment for selected years follows:

1940	35,393,000
1941	40,976,000
1946	48,845,000
1950	48,283,000
1951 (due to amendments of 1950)	53,100,000
1952	59,600,000
1953	61,000,000
1954	60,000,000
1956 (estimated) (due to amendments of 1954)	69,000,000

MEDICAL RELATIONS IN WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION: A GUIDE FOR THE EVALUATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A PROGRESSIVE PROGRAM BY THE MEDICAL PROFESSION

(Adoption by house of delegates, December 1955)

FOREWORD

Since its inception the Council on Industrial Health has maintained an active interest in workmen's compensation. In recent years a series of studies has made it clear that there is widespread dissatisfaction with current policies, programs and procedures. Those studies with special emphasis on medical aspects strongly suggest that present-day laws have not kept pace with advances in professional skill, technical knowledge and with substantial alterations in the political and socio-economic milieu. Official actions by the house of delegates of the American Medical Association, requests for assistance from State medical societies, and information developed through the council's own investigations have demonstrated a need for a guide by which physicians, individually and as organizations, can reassess their proper role in this important sphere of medical service.

In formulating these guides, thoughtful consideration has been given to the views of recognized authorities and to representatives of many agencies whose interests are closely identified with workmen's compensation. Of special value was the session on workmen's compensation at the 15th Annual Congress on Industrial Health in January 1955. At that time statements on the essentials and goals of a modern program were presented by spokesmen for labor, industry, law, medicine, and administrative bodies. The Council on Industrial Health acknowledges with sincere appreciation assistance and encouragement received from these sources.

The preparation of this report has been the work of the Council's Committee on Workmen's Compensation and Rehabilitation made up of the following members: Drs. Henry H. Kessler, chairman, Newark, N. J.; Lloyd E. Hamlin, Chicago; Rutherford T. Johnstone, Los Angeles; E. S. Jones, Hammond, Ind.; and O. A. Sander, Milwaukee. Special thanks are due to Earl D. Cheit, St. Louis; Bernard Hirsh, law department, Chicago; James J. Reid, Columbia, S. C.; and Herman M. Somers, Haverford, Pa.; consultants who participated actively in the various stages of investigation and preparation.

THE MEDICAL PROFESSION'S INTEREST IN WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

The workmen's compensation program in the United States was adopted primarily to meet certain needs of employees or their survivors resulting from disability or death of an employee arising out of and in the course of employment. In general, the program sought to remedy inadequacies stemming from common law and employers' liability statutes by providing laws based upon the principle of insured liability without regard to fault on the part of either employee or employer. Of primary concern was the provision of cash payments to replace a portion of wages lost by disabled employees. Little or no consideration was given to the

provision of medical care for occupational disabilities. Under the Federal, State, and Territorial laws enacted between 1911 and 1948, the major emphasis of the various systems and their administration has continued to be on monetary satisfaction of liability, with insufficient attention given to the rehabilitation of the occupationally disabled.

Substantial progress has been made in the extension of medical care, the application of improved clinical techniques and other aspects of the rehabilitation process, including vocational training and selective placement of the disabled in kinds of work suited to physical and emotional capacity. It is a matter of great and growing concern that a considerable gap exists between potential services to the occupationally disabled and what is actually available to them.

In any event, many physicians have been deterred from widespread and active participation in workmen's compensation affairs. They are largely unaware of the significance of medical and economic policies under these laws and the undesirable and often harmful effects of existing systems. Whatever the causes the attitude has been short-sighted and unwise to the end that not only workmen's compensation laws but other similar laws in related fields of social security are and have been formulated largely without medical consultation or any clear identification of medicine's primary interest. The predominance which economic considerations have come to occupy in both the professional and administrative aspects of workmen's compensation is a natural consequence. These same considerations have led to a concentration of professional services and responsibility in a few and not always the best hands. The Council's studies and others call attention to the need for critical appraisal of medicine's past record of performance and its present opportunities for the implementation of new and creative concepts (1).

The Council on Industrial Health is convinced through its consideration of the findings in this report that physicians have a duty and responsibility, both as members of professional organizations and as citizens in an industrial society, to improve the lot of the occupationally disabled. The several recommendations contained herein are presented with that purpose in mind.

GOALS OF WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

The basic goals of workmen's compensation today are:

1. Rehabilitation of the occupationally disabled;

2. Assured, prompt and adequate indemnity for the occupationally disabled or their survivors;

3. Minimal cost to employers and society commensurate with the above provisions.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THESE GOALS

The essential elements in the implementation of these goals from the medical point of view are described in the following sections of this report. Actually, sustained cooperative effort by all individuals and groups concerned with the welfare of the occupationally disabled are essential to success.

REHABILITATION OF THE OCCUPATIONALLY DISABLED

Rehabilitation implies the effective use of all disciplines and skills dedicated to the conquest of disability. Aside from great benefit to the disabled, their families and to society, current experience has amply demonstrated that the provision of rehabilitation services results in substantial savings in both medical and indemnity costs, just as the development of medical care provisions has resulted in savings in indemnity payments.

The establishment of workable rehabilitation programs calls for specific statutory provision; planned and improved cooperation from the medical profession; and intelligent, forceful administrative supervision.

1. Statutory provision. Periodically, workmen's compensation legislation and rulings come up for review. To implement a proper rehabilitation program the medical profession should seek adoption of statutory provisions that recognize these points:

(a) Rehabilitation of the occupationally disabled is the intent and responsibility of the compensation system and the legal right of the employee.

(b) The disabled employee is entitled to all services, appliances and supplies required by the nature of his disability or the process of his recovery and that will promote his restoration to or his continuance in employment. Services include medical, surgical, dental, hospital, and nursing attendance and treatment, as well as the training necessary to rehabilitation. Appliances and supplies include medicines; medical, surgical and dental supplies; crutches; artificial members; and apparatus. Services, appliances and supplies are to be paid for by the employer under the supervision of competent professionals responsible to the administrative agency.

(c) In the absence of stipulated agreements, professional fees should approximate those that would be charged the employee as a private patient for similar services.

(d) Disabled employees should have the right to accept physicians' services provided by employers, or to select another attending physician from a register of all other physicians in the community willing and qualified to perform the essential services (2).

(e) Vocational counseling, training, transitional employment and placement services require prompt analysis of problems, efficient screening, and referral and follow-up techniques to assure proper training and results. Effective supervision of these services in public or private facilities requires prompt reporting of occupational disabilities to the administrative agency.

(f) When necessary administrative procedures for such a system of rehabilitation of the occupationally disabled do not exist, or when adequate facilities are not readily available, steps should be taken to provide them.

2. Planned cooperation from the medical profession: Successful operation of a workmen's compensation system depends increasingly upon the medical profession. Although the administrative agency has the ultimate responsibility by law, medical care is the core of the system and physicians play a major role.

Every year hundreds of thousands of the occupationally disabled depend upon physicians for care and guidance from the beginning of disability until they return to gainful employment and even beyond. Physicians are also responsible indirectly for the payment of a substantial portion of their patients' income during disability. Compensation payments amounting to many millions of dollars annually are based upon reports and, in disputed cases, upon testimony provided by physicians.

The medical profession in each workmen's compensation jurisdiction can best fulfill its responsibilities by providing a broadly representative committee to advise the administrative agency on medical policies and practices and to assist in the operation of the systems in the following ways (2):

(a) The committee should prepare and submit at stated intervals to the administrative agency appropriate information for its use in establishing a register of physicians who are willing and competent to accept calls for services to the occupationally disabled. Regulations governing enrollment on the physicians' register should be established by the administrative agency after consultation with the medical advisory committee.

(b) It should mediate, if possible, complaints that a physician has neglected or refused to furnish reasonably necessary reports in accordance with general orders of the administrative agency.

(c) It should mediate, if possible, complaints of unreasonable interference with matters properly within the discretion and control of the attending physician.

(d) It should mediate, if possible, differences that may arise relative to remuneration.

(e) Claims of violation of medical ethics should be reviewed and relevant facts referred to the appropriate agency.

(f) Complaints should be heard about the competency of those serving on the physicians' register and recommendations made to the administrative agency concerning the removal of names therefrom, if complaints are justified.

If the advisory committee is unable to function promptly, the administrative agency should take appropriate action within the powers vested in it by law.

The medical profession should join with the administrative agency in sponsoring educational programs for all concerned on clinical and administrative problems in the compensation system. Other joint activities should include the development of proper medical report forms, desirable legislation to improve the workmen's compensation system and its administration, and handbooks for physicians.

3. Role of individual physician: The primary obligation of the individual physician is to see that his patient is restored as nearly as possible to the economic and personal effectiveness which he possessed before he was disabled. This requires not only competent and impartial medical care but also that the physician use or recommend the use of other technical skills and resources available, whether in the community or not.

Physicians who wish to receive calls for service to the occupationally disabled should be prepared to assume duties and obligations which are not encountered in private practice. The best interests of the disabled patient will be served in the following ways:

(a) Concise, accurate information and reports descriptive of the disability should be furnished promptly and to the same extent to the patient or his dependents, the employer, the workmen's compensation insurance carrier and the administrative agency.

(b) Testimony should be given before the administrative agency upon reasonable notice. The physician's testimony must adhere to reasonable scientific deductions regarding the injury, disease, or possible sequelae to the end that every deserving claim receives just consideration.

(c) Consultation should be requested in case of serious illness, especially in doubtful or difficult conditions, and agreement given for consultation with mutually acceptable physicians when requested by one of the interested parties. Effective rehabilitation goes beyond accurate diagnosis and expert treatment. Although the attending physician should remain in charge, he must embrace the modern concept of teamwork in the rehabilitation process. Physicians should not only cooperate with each other but also collaborate with the whole team of paramedical workers to assure maximum rehabilitation.

(d) Determination should be made by scientific methods and upon the basis of objective measurable factors of the permanent anatomic or functional impairment of a specific member or of his patient as a whole as compared to normal. From the medical standpoint, permanent anatomic or functional impairments cannot vary because of geographic locations or circumstances under which they were incurred. Therefore, the physician should determine the percentage of permanent impairment without regard to age, sex, occupation or real, presumed or potential wage loss. The application of these and all other factors provided by law to the

percentage of permanent impairment established by the physician is the responsibility of the administrative agency in determining the indemnity award. In general, physicians are no more qualified by experience or training to evaluate such factors than any other disinterested individual.

4. Administrative supervision: Rehabilitation of the occupationally disabled requires a competent administrative agency with full statutory authority and responsibility.

The administrative agency must have more than adjudication and appeals functions; it must have an affirmative duty to see that the intent of the law is carried out. It may delegate functions, but it cannot abdicate responsibility. Proper discharge of this trust requires adequate resources in terms of qualified, permanent, professional personnel and proper facilities.

Duties should include supervision of the rehabilitation process and indemnity payments for permanent disability during and following the maximum rehabilitation of the disabled employee.

To assist in the administration of the law, the agency should seek the advice and active cooperation of appropriate professional, private and public organizations.

The administrative agency should have a medical director, approved by the medical profession, and a qualified vocational counselor. As staff officers, they should be in charge of the administration of appropriate provisions related to the rehabilitation of the occupationally disabled and should participate in such policymaking deliberations of the agency. They should have the full support of their superiors and constantly strive to provide leadership and promote effective professional relations in their fields through the maintenance of approved professional standards and practices.

INDEMNITY

The physician's interest involves recognition that the amount and method of indemnification have a direct and important bearing on an effective rehabilitation regime. While overgenerous indemnity can dull the will for rehabilitation, inadequate indemnity requirements can destroy an employer's incentive to support rehabilitation by providing him with an easier or cheaper alternative. More important, inadequate indemnity can lower patient morale or force return to gainful employment in advance of clear-cut medical indications.

In view of these relationships, it is consistent for the medical profession to support methods of indemnification which contribute to, rather than obstruct, rehabilitation procedures. Certain factors merit consideration:

1. Inadequate cash indemnity encourages "lump-summing" of payments, which tends to interfere with rehabilitation motivations. The practice should, therefore, be limited to instances where dependable evidence supports the contention that such a payment would contribute to the overall rehabilitation of the employee. Problems of paying for legal, medical, and other services should not influence the determination of whether a lump sum should be allowed.

2. Workmen's compensation is not a relief program. It is the proper intent of the program that a disabled employee and his family should not suffer a serious reduction in normal living standards during the rehabilitation period. This requires that the benefit level be maintained at an adequate percentage of usual wage and include reasonable personal expenses incurred by the employee in the course of the rehabilitation process.

3. Effective rehabilitation can drastically reduce the number of permanently disabled employees which now constitutes the heaviest burden on workmen's compensation systems. Physicians interested in a rehabilitation program acceptable to permanently disabled employees recognize that attempts to relate indemnity payments solely to loss of earnings is impractical and unscientific. While it is not the purpose of workmen's compensation to indemnify all individual consequences of a disability, such as pain, suffering, and humiliation, the employee's right to personal effectiveness is not confined to employment or a limited period of time. Personal motivation to maximum rehabilitation can be hindered by complete deprivation of indemnity for permanent anatomic or functional impairment, whether it be a member or an organ of the body. Therefore, indemnity for permanent disability should be related to the employee's permanent impairment of earning capacity—in effect the anatomic and functional handicap incurred in working for a given employer. Maximum rehabilitation should be encouraged, and to this end the award for permanent disability should be based upon the effect of such a handicap on the earning capacity of the average employee so as not to penalize a disabled employee for exercising individual initiative.

4. The administrative agency should have continuing jurisdiction of these cases and indemnity payments should be subject to review whenever evidence is clear that the original evaluation of permanent impairment of earning capacity was in error.

5. Various methods of compensating employees with preexisting permanent impairments have been devised. Most commonly the impairments must involve loss of a member that, combined with a subsequent injury, results in permanent total disability. In these cases liability is apportioned generally between the employer at the time of subsequent injury and a State fund established for this purpose. In recent years increasing consideration has been given to cases where the preexisting condition is an organic disease that, combined with a subsequent injury, results in increased or total permanent disability. While the medical complexities alone of this problem are apparent, intensive study is currently being given to the equitable resolution of the whole problem when:

(a) Further decrease in earning capacity or death of these employees can be clearly established on the basis of responsible scientific knowledge to be casually related to their employment; and

(b) Such casual relationship cannot be so established.

CONCLUSION

The Council on Industrial Health wishes to emphasize again the importance of participation by physicians, individually and collectively, in a critical appraisal of medicine's past performance and its present opportunities for the implementation of new and creative concepts in workmen's compensation. Requests for additional information and assistance should be addressed to the Council on Industrial Health, American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago 10, Ill.

REFERENCES

1. Operating Principles for a Modern Workmen's Compensation System (Bull. Am. Coll. Surgeons 40:57, January-February 1955). Medical Relations Under Workmen's Compensation in Illinois, Monmouth, Ill. Illinois State Medical Society, Committee on Industrial Health, 1953.

2. Physicians and the Workmen's Compensation Act, Wisconsin (M. J. 54: 77, January 1955; Agreement on Panel Practice (ibid. 54: 84) January 1955).

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL—PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The Senate now has before it for action a measure that is of greater and more immediate significance to millions of Americans than any other that may be acted upon by this Congress—the proposed amendments to the Social Security Act. The most important of the amendments that will be considered would provide for the payment of benefits to persons at the age of 50 who become totally and permanently disabled and would reduce the retirement age for women from age 65 to age 62.

These provisions, which were the key features of the bill (H. R. 7225) passed by the House last year by a very large majority, were deleted by the conservative majority in the Senate Finance Committee. We deeply appreciate the effort led by members of this same committee to restore these provisions on the floor of the Senate. It is now up to the Members of the Senate as a whole to demonstrate their concern for the welfare of disabled workers, older workers and their wives and of workingwomen who suffer discrimination in the search for employment because of their age, by voting to restore these vital provisions to the Senate bill. This is the most important, and perhaps the only, opportunity that Senators will have this year to record themselves for or against a step toward the fulfillment of the modest hopes and most pressing needs of this deserving group of citizens. Millions of Americans will be watching the outcome with keen personal interest.

We strongly urge each Member of the Senate to record himself on the human side of this issue by voting to restore the disability benefit feature and the reduced retirement age for women to the bill that is now before that body.

We continue also our full support of the increased contribution rate necessary to keep social security soundly financed when these increased benefits are provided.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

During the delivery of Mr. DOUGLAS' speech,

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield, so that I may request consideration and confirmation of some Republican postmaster nominations?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly. I would ask that the proceedings in connection with the executive session be printed in the RECORD following the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois may yield to me, in order that I may request that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the postmaster nominations on the Executive Calendar; and with the understanding that the proceedings in that connection shall be printed in the RECORD following the remarks of the Senator from Illinois; and with the further understanding that he will not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

David A. Hamil, of Colorado, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, vice Ancher Nelsen, resigned; and

Glen A. Boger, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration.

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William G. Juergens, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Illinois, vice Fred L. Wham, retired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmations of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, out of order, I introduce and send to the desk a bill to amend Public Law 285 of the 84th Congress, H. R. 6382 of last year. The purpose of the new bill is to correct legislation heretofore enacted by the Congress by amending it so as to carry out the actual intent of the Congress last year. I ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4094) amending the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, relative to reductions in certain Federal income and excess profits taxes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Members of the Senate will recall that we passed legislation amending the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee was aware of the fact that if tax benefits are added to the benefits under the bill as written, it would be possible for some large corporate claimants to receive more in total benefits than was actually lost abroad. At the same time some of the smaller claimants would not receive anywhere near the amount of money they lost in foreign countries. To correct this patently unfair and unsought-for effect, the Senate committee adopted an amendment which I introduced. The Senate saw fit to accept the amendment and it went with the bill to conference.

During our meetings the conference committee, of which I was a member, was informed by representatives of the Internal Revenue Service that the Senate's interpretation of the bill as it related to existing tax law was inaccurate. We were told that in fact it would not be possible for large corporate claimants to receive an amount larger than their actual loss by virtue of the operations of our tax laws. On the strength of those representations by the Internal Revenue Service, the conference committee agreed to drop the Senate amendment.

It is now unmistakably clear that the conference committee on H. R. 6382 was misinformed by an official of the Internal Revenue Service. I am sure it was not intentionally misinformed, but there was some misunderstanding or some erroneous information. I am certain that the erroneous information was provided us unwittingly and that it was not the intent of the Department to mislead the Congress. The Department now seems to agree, however, that the information given to the conference committee was in error.

On February 25, 1956, I wrote to Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey outlining the situation and asking for his help in considering appropriate remedial legislation. I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Secretary be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 25, 1956.

The Honorable GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY HUMPHREY: During the first session of the 84th Congress we enacted into law a bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949. That bill is now Public Law 285.

While the bill was under consideration by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee I became interested in certain problems created by the fact that the total amount of claims will greatly exceed the amount of money available to pay them. It would seem, in particular, that claimants against the Ungarian Fund will receive compensation of less than 10 percent of their losses. As now written, however, the law fails to distinguish between the claimant who still bears the full burden of his loss and the claimant who may have cut his loss through a tax deduction by up to 92 percent. It was also called to my attention that as the law is now written some large corporate claimants may, if their net compensation under Public Law 285 is added to their tax benefits, receive more in benefits than they actually lost.

In the light of the foregoing I proposed an amendment which was adopted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and was passed by the Senate. It was, however, eliminated in conference. While a number of objections to the amendment were considered, I must say, in all candor, that an important factor in the rejection of my amendment was certain incorrect information supplied to the conference committee by the Internal Revenue Service. I am sure that this error was made inadvertently and resulted from the great pressure under which all of us were working during the closing days of the session.

When the conference report was adopted by the Senate, I announced that I expected to raise this question again at the second session and it is my full intention to do so. I still feel that a claims compensation program which pays compensation of less than 10 percent is hardly worth its name. Such a program is particularly objectionable if it closes its eyes to the fact that some claimants may have written off their losses while others have not.

I am not oblivious to the fact that my amendment raises certain administrative problems for your Department. I believe, however, that these problems can easily be minimized or entirely eliminated without affecting the basic purpose of the proposal. I think, therefore, that it would be helpful that my office consult with an official of your Department for the purpose of preparing appropriate language to carry out that objective. I would like to ask you, therefore, to designate such an official, who could meet with my counsel, Mr. Thomas L. Hughes, for the purpose of preparing the amendment.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is with great pleasure that I inform the Senate that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey and the officials of the Treasury Department have responded to this set of events in a spirit of complete cooperation. Following that letter, a series of staff conferences have taken place which resulted in the Department furnishing me with a memorandum explaining the tax provisions which govern the bill passed by us. That memorandum fully agrees with my own understanding of the law as I expressed it to the Senate and to the conference committee last year. It proves the information given the conference committee by the Internal Revenue Service to be incorrect.

As a result of the cooperation by Treasury officials, a bill has been prepared which is readily acceptable to both the Treasury Department officials and to me. It is the bill which I have just sent to the desk. It would cure the defect which the Senate tried to correct last year and which the House of Representatives undoubtedly would wish to have corrected had we been furnished with accurate information in the conference committee.

I am pleased that a mutually agreeable approach has been reached on this matter, and I urge the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to take speedy action on this bill so that it may be enacted into law during the current session.

PROGRESS OF CONFERENCE ON FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that I have been informed that the conferees have reached an agreement on the Federal-aid highway bill. I should like Senators to be on notice that there is a possibility that the conference report may be submitted to the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I do not wish to misinform Senators as to the status of the road bill. We have agreed in principle in conference on every item. However, a meeting is scheduled for tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock to discuss certain language in the bill in which every member of the conference committee is interested. I am pretty sure that the conferees will be able to report tomorrow.

DEFINITION AND STANDARD OF IDENTITY OF CERTAIN DRY MILK SOLIDS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1614) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids", title 21, United States Code, section 321c, which were on page 1, line 3, strike out "numbered"; on page 1, line 7, strike out "for" and insert "that for"; and on page 2, strike out lines 6 and 7, and insert:

The term "milk" when used herein means sweet milk of cows.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House. Let me explain that the House amendments are technical and clerical. They are a matter of drafting. They make no substantive change whatever in the bill. The purpose of the amendments is clarification.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. Is this a House bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; it is a Senate bill. The bill was passed by the Senate, and the House accepted the Senate bill, but the drafting clerk of the House used different language. The amendments are clarifying, and are not substantive in nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S SCIENCE ATTACHÉ PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have recently had occasion to comment on the Senate floor about the deterioration of the State Department's science attaché program. In the May 1956, issue of Geological Newsletter, issued by the American Geological Institute, an editorial was devoted to this subject.

The American Geological Institute is also, of course, greatly interested in the State Department's corps of mineral attachés. Critics have recently pointed out too, Mr. President, that in this field as well the distribution of the attachés is very sparse and bears very little relationship to our dependence on foreign mineral resources.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Geological Newsletter appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES RECALLS SCIENCE AIDS

To be commended is President Eisenhower's move to establish on April 3 a National Committee for the Development of Scientists and Engineers. A group of outstanding Americans have been appointed to serve on this Committee. The National Foundation is to provide the President's Committee with staff services under the direction of Robert L. Clark as Executive Secretary. The Committee is charged with the task of stimulating greater educational efforts in the training of scientists and engineers to meet the ever-increasing demands of the modern era and to encourage a better understanding of science and technology by the general public.

To be condemned is the extreme shortsightedness of the President's United States Department of State for its policy with regard to science attachés. In mid-1952 the State Department had the impressive total of 10 science attachés in foreign service scattered sparsely among its many embassies and consulates. By January 1956 all science attachés had been recalled, so that at the present time the United States overseas arm has its scientific head in the sand. Furthermore, indications are that no effort is planned to remedy the situation. To make matters still worse, many of our top scientists feel that international travel restrictions imposed by the United States are curbing our advancement of science and technology.

The State Department is equally deficient in another area—that of mineral attachés. Despite the fact that our prosperity and future security are contingent upon vital supplies of minerals, such as oil, manganese, chrome, and many others, our policymakers continue to shape our future course abroad without the benefit of observation and interpretation by staff career men with mining and petroleum backgrounds. We have only five mineral attachés abroad today. It cannot be disputed that mineral endowment is a major factor in the destiny of any nation and that our highly industrialized economy would languish without the flow of ores and minerals from many sectors of the globe. Is it unrealistic to propose a well-trained corps of mineral specialists as foreign-service career officers to provide continuing mineral surveillance abroad for the United States, which in 1952 imported nearly $2 billion in mineral raw materials?

The apathy of our United States Department of State toward science is a matter of grave concern. The tremendous surge of the Soviets in the education of scientists and technologists has been much publicized. One prominent American scientist has pointed out the real danger of a Russian scientist surplus that can be exported to spread a scientific intelligence network throughout the world. The growing number of Russian scientists and technologists cannot be denied and we can ill afford to speculate disparagingly concerning their scientific abilities.

It could be that the State Department lacks confidence in its own abilities to delineate programs for and the staffing of worldwide corps of scientific and mineral attachés. Many scientists would hasten to agree. The State Department could scarcely do better than to seek the recommendations of scientists themselves. The National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, in its independent position, detached from government and political pressures, is able to call on the best scientific resources of our Nation to address these vital problems.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I present the editorial in the hope that the State Department will read the RECORD, because the program of scientific attachés has practically come to a dead stop. The number involved today is so few that for all practical purposes there is no program. It seems to me that at a time when there is serious concern in our Nation about the technical and scientific training of large numbers of scientists and technicians in the Soviet Union, it might be very well for our State Department to give friendly consideration to the advice and counsel of distinguished editors, publishers, and scientists.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

THE ILO FORCED LABOR ISSUE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of Senators an editorial which appeared in this morning's New York Times. I shall not ask to have it reprinted.

I also invite attention to a news story which has appeared in the American press in the past 2 days, from Geneva, Switzerland. The news story and editorial relate to the ILO conference which is taking place there, and the unbelievable spectacle the representatives of our country are affording, when, instead of spearheading the efforts to outlaw forced labor, they are advocating halfhearted measures.

Mr. President, those of us who have been concerned about the administration's foot-dragging on the ILO forced labor issue can now take cold comfort that our fears seem to have been well founded. The New York Times this morning contains a dispatch from Geneva pointing out the Soviet Government is taking the lead at the ILO conference to promote a convention that will "outlaw forced labor in all its forms and anywhere."

I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET RUSE SEEN ON FORCED LABOR—DELEGATES TO I. L. O. PARLEY NOTE MOSCOW MANEUVERS TO EMBARRASS THE WEST

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

GENEVA, June 18—The Soviet Union has tried to grab the ball from the Western Governments and trade unions on the forced labor issue in the International Labor Organization.

The essentially simple Soviet tactics were revealed today in a committee of the international labor conference in which the long process of working out a convention to outlaw forced labor is geting under way.

One delegate said the Soviet delegates clearly intended to try to get such extreme amendments into the draft convention that hardly any non-Communist Government could ratify it. If they succeed, they will be able to earn credit throughout the world by being in favor of the convention while the main western governments oppose it.

If they fail, they easily can oppose the convention as being inadequate, not going far enough and being a mere screen to hide the bad practices of the colonial and capitalist nations.

BROAD PROHIBITION URGED

Today, for instance, Amazasp Arutiunian, Soviet Government delegate, urged the committee to insert in the preamble to the main operative article of the convention that forced labor should be outlawed "in all its forms and anywhere."

He introduced these words as an amendment to an amendment of the workers' group, that would put into the preamble a reference to human rights and the United Nations Charter—an amendment to which no one objected.

The Russian language of the amendment would clearly outlaw prison labor, which in many countries is regarded as a progressive penal practice.

The effect was that the Soviet delegates spent the afternoon as the champions of a really sweeping abolition of forced labor while western government, employer and labor spokesmen argued for limiting the scope of the convention to what could be expected to be adopted in practice.

Neither this nor any other Soviet amendment was adopted. However, on one vote the Soviet delegates lacked only one vote of a majority and succeeded in splitting, and embarrassing, the workers' group which previously had adopted a group position against the Soviet proposals.

UNITED STATES PLAN MAKES LITTLE GAIN

The United States Government delegation does not seem to be making much progress in its effort to have the organization adopt a convention with alternative operative clauses so that the United States could ratify it without raising a constitutional issue on the use of treaty powers to establish labor standards within the United States.

The United States Government delegation has proposed language that would enable a country to get credit for having ratified the convention if it agreed only to prevent the movement into international trade of goods made with forced labor.

The texts submitted by the United States Government delegation have not been debated in full committee. However, it is clear that the worker delegations, including those from the United States, do not think the United States Government plan goes far enough toward outlawing forced labor. Even the Australian Government, which also has a problem of federal-state division of authority, regards the United States Government delegation's position as essentially an evasion of the issue.

The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions announced today it was challenging the credentials of the workers' delegates sent from Spain and Rumania. J. H. Oldenbroek, secretary general of the confederation, said at a news conference that neither delegation had been chosen truly by workers. In both cases they really represent Governments, he said.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This dispatch says that the effect yesterday "was that the Soviet delegates spent the afternoon as the champions of a really sweeping abolition of forced labor while western government, employer and labor spokesmen argued for limiting the scope of the convention to what could be expected to be adopted in practice."

The article goes on to say:

The United States Government delegation does not seem to be making much progress in its effort to have the organization adopt a convention with alternative operative clauses so that the United States could ratify it without raising a constitutional issue on the use of treaty powers to establish labor standards within the United States * * * it is clear that the worker delegations, including those from the United States, do not think the United States Government plan goes far enough toward outlawing forced labor. Even the Australian Government, which also has a problem of Federal-State division of authority, regards the United States Government delegations' position as essentially an evasion of the issue.

I agree, Mr. President, that the official American position is an evasion of the issue. I felt so last January when I introduced my resolution calling for the administration to take the lead in adopting a convention aimed at effectively outlawing forced labor. I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate Labor Committee, now that hearings have been concluded on this resolution, will still see fit to adopt Senate Resolution 248, already favorably recommended by the appropriate subcommittee. Even at this late date we still have an opportunity to indicate to the world that the United States Senate does not support the pettifogging position of the State Department.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to associate myself with the Senator's remarks. It is very disturbing to me that in the year 1956 my Government should not be taking an unequivocal stand on the question of slave labor, not only with respect to the convention the Senator from Minnesota has referred to, but in respect also to aid to certain foreign nations into which American taxpayers' dollars are going, when we know that slave labor exists in those States. For instance, Mr. President, we are pouring money into Saudi Arabia when we know that human beings are sold on a slave market in that country.

I believe it is about time our Government started to keep faith with our professed ideals. The State Deraptment, however, is walking out on our ideals when it comes to slave labor. It is about time for America to stand up and be counted among the nations of the world and in the councils of the world on the question of slave labor, but instead the State Department ducks the issue.

I hope the American people will keep in mind that we have a "ducking" State Department, and that it is about time the Secretary of State be "ducked" and "dumped," because of his failure to keep faith with the ideal of America on this great human issue.

I agree with the Senator from Minnesota that it is a disgrace. When we say that, in my opinion, we have uttered the most devastating criticism that can be made against the State Department. It is acting in a disgraceful fashion on this great issue of human values.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oregon. He has studied the ILO charter, and he is familiar with the workings of the ILO, and he knows the provisions of the ILO constitution. He knows that it contains a separate article regarding our type of constitutional structure and Federal-State relationship as they relate to conventions of the type now being proposed by the ILO conference.

There is no treaty problem involved. There is no constitutional problem involved. The only problem involved is a recalcitrant attitude, and the attitude of halfhearted measures and halfhearted words which are being indulged in by representatives of our Government.

I can surely sympathize with our labor representatives at ILO, when they realize that the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organization voted its unequivocal opposition to forced labor and has asked for an international convention to declare it illegal and to outlaw it.

We, the great champion of democracy in the world, stand literally paralyzed by legalism, which no one seems to understand, including the lawyers in the State Department. Even a nonlawyer like myself is able to answer the arguments of the lawyers in the State Department. When that happens, I suggest that their case must be rather poor.

FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a very fine editorial published in the Dalles Optimist of June 7, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STORAGE RESERVOIRS THE ULTIMATE ANSWER

The other night at the city council meeting, Councilman John H. Skirving introduced a resolution calling for strengthening by the United States Army engineers of the Dalles dike, "in the most vigorous language possible." The resolution was ordered adopted by the council.

There is nothing that so sharpens the recognition of the peril that exists from year to year for the communities which are adjacent to the Columbia River as a flood such as the one which has been descending this great river of the West this year.

Little damage has resulted here this year from the high water, though the city and county will have some costs to pay for sandbagging and pumping of seepage water. Heavy damages have resulted, however, on the lower river.

If we didn't experience a flood such as the one this year from time to time, however our people would soon forget all the hazards of floods, and when another 1894, or even a 1948, came along, it would be too late.

What is needed and needed at once is either a better dike here or a bypass route through the city along the waterfront which will serve the double purpose of dike and freeway for movement of through traffic.

Years away is the full control of the river brought about primarily by storage dams on the headwaters. Political considerations, and opposition by fishermen, private power interests, and others all enter into such a

public program on a vast scale, and it is unlikely this control plan will ever be adopted in its entirety.

In Portland this week Gen. L. H. Foote, North Pacific division engineer, made some interesting comments. Here are some of his views:

Floods aren't necessary. They can be controlled within reason. The flood of 1956 would have ranked next to the flood of 1948 if existing reservoirs along the United States portion of the Columbia and its tributaries had not been used to reduce the peak flow.

The crest was cut about 2 feet. Without Grand Coulee and other dams, the crest would have exceeded the 28.2-foot level at which Smith Lake broke suddenly through the S. P. & S. Railway fill on Memorial Day, 1948, smashing the city of Vanport. It would have been the third worst flood in the history of the river.

The Columbia crested at Vancouver, Wash., at high noon, June 13, 1948, at 30.2 feet (29.9 at Portland). Had all the present resources of the river, including existing reservoir capacity at Grand Coulee, been used in 1948, the crest could have been held down 1¾ to 2 feet.

Peak flow of the Columbia at The Dalles in 1948 was 1,010,000 cubic feet per second on May 31. This peak outpouring of snow and rain water has been exceeded only once in history, June 7, 1894, when 1,240,000 cubic feet per second flowed past The Dalles, raising the river at Portland to 33 feet. (No data was kept on Vancouver at that time.)

The 1894 flood, highest crest—although not the greatest runoff—in history, could have been cut down by 2 feet by full use of all the 4,900,000 acre-feet of storage now available on the river, General Foote points out.

The engineers could pull the teeth of Old Man River almost completely. They have a plan for dams to provide 20,900,000 acre-feet of storage which could cut the flow of the river in a flood of 1894 proportions down to 800,000 cubic feet per second at The Dalles. That would cut the crest at Vancouver by 7.7 feet.

The worst flood in history could be cut down to dike size—about 25 feet—if all the dams proposed were constructed to the heights proposed.

Would it be worth the cost? The cost of the program has not been estimated, but General Foote estimates a flood of 1894 proportions under present conditions would approximate $300 million damage on the lower Columbia River.

To achieve practical flood control would require construction of the following dams:

The high dam at Hells Canyon, 2,600,000 acre-feet; Payette River, increased by 300,000; John Day, 1,400,000; Priest Rapids, 2,100,000; Libby Dam, 3,900,000; Glacier View, 1,800,000, and increase of 3,900,000 acre-feet of storage at Grand Coulee by installation of new gates would operate under high pressure, and by upriver storage from new dams.

These projects, together with 4,690,000 acre-feet of storage usable at existing dams, would provide 20,890,000 acre-feet of usable storage for flood control.

Opposition to the proposed full flood control program, however, will cut the available storage in half, according to the present outlook, General Foote estimates.

Mr. MORSE. The editorial deals with the very serious flood problem in my State. I have just returned from a few days' visit in my State, during the course of which I made an inspection of certain areas along the Columbia River in Oregon which have suffered devastating floods.

They constitute further proof of the contention of the two Senators from Oregon for some time in the past, namely, that such floods can be prevented. I wish to stress that fact. When we are talking about adequate flood control, Mr. President, we are talking about a great waste in America which can be prevented; we are talking about saving the taxpayers of the country great economic wealth which is now going down the river and out to sea in the form of valuable topsoil; we are talking about saving millions of dollars in personal and real property. We are also talking about priceless human values.

The editorial which I have asked to have printed in the RECORD points out very clearly that flood damage is avoidable if we in our time take the necessary steps to control the streams by adequate dams.

The editorial comments on one of the greatest of flood-control projects, the Hells Canyon project, which would involve 2,600,000 acre-feet of flood control. I wish to stress that point. We are talking about preventing for the sake of our generation and of future generations all the damage which otherwise would be suffered because of a failure to save Hells Canyon Dam—if we should fail to save it—with its 2,600,000 acre-feet of flood control.

As I looked at the flooded areas during the past week, and as I sat on Monday night in Portland and looked at a film depicting the great catastrophe the people of my State in the flooded area had suffered this spring, as well as a few days ago again when the Columbia River went on a rampage, I found myself asking this question: "Why cannot all see it?"

This problem is of such a nature that, I am satisfied, if the American people could sit down before a showing of the film I saw on Monday night—a terrible film in the sense of depicting the frightful suffering caused when that river goes on a rampage—they would ask the Senate, "What are you waiting for? Why don't you appropriate the funds necessary to build these projects, from the standpoint of saving human values?"

As we note the sorrow on the faces of our fellow citizens who have just seen all they possess washed away down the river, we ask ourselves the question, "What is our moral obligation to these fellow citizens, when we know that the appropriation of funds to build the necessary dams will prevent such sorrow being visited upon them and upon other citizens in the future?"

Anyone in my position naturally finds himself in a very difficult posture in this regard, because as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations I have been spending a great deal of time with my colleagues on that committee marking up the so-called foreign-aid bill. I am in favor of foreign aid. I shall continue to give the benefit of the doubt and all the presumptions to the President of the United States in his requests for foreign aid. I agreed in committee that our whole foreign-aid program should be subjected to an early study, and I therefore voted for the resolution which calls for a study and a reappraisal of the entire program.

In the meantime, I am willing to grant the benefit of all the presumptions and all the doubts to the President of the United States on the question of foreign aid, because I realize that we will win the fight for freedom in the days ahead on the economic front, or we will not win it at all. Therefore, we as a free people will have to export economic freedom to foreign lands, so that the people who are willing to stand with us can enjoy political freedom.

However, as a Senator, I am put in a very difficult position, for when I go back home and talk to constituents who have been subjected to the terrible sufferings and losses caused by a rampaging river, they ask me why Congress cannot provide an appropriation to stop this loss in our own country, since it does not seem to be too difficult to get from Congress appropriations of millions of dollars with which to develop great reclamation projects, flood-control projects, and other economic projects for people in far-away lands. Our own people, Mr. President, are not able to get from the Congress appropriations adequate for such purposes. We are living in a time when selfish private utility interests seem to have too much political power in this country to permit the people's interest to be protected in the Congress of the United States by providing appropriations necessary for great flood-control dams.

I offer Hells Canyon as exhibit A in support of my argument. The test soon will be made, Mr. President, as to whether this Congress places the flood-control interests of the American people first, or the selfish profit dollars of the Idaho Power Co. first. It is as simple as that.

I know I may tell the administration what the verdict of the people of my State will be, because I know that the people of Oregon, by an overwhelming majority, expect this Congress to pass a Hells Canyon Dam bill and to follow it with the appropriations necessary to start the great flood-control project on the Snake River, a project which will provide 2,600,000 acre-feet of flood control for the people of the Pacific Northwest. It is a project which the Army Engineer reports have said consistently would greatly help reduce flood dangers on the Snake and the Columbia—not eliminate them, because there are other projects.

Senators will find me continuing to support those projects, not only in the Pacific Northwest, but in any other State where the Army Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation can submit reports, as they have on the projects to which I refer, and which show that from an engineering standpoint the building of a flood-control dam will help to reduce or eliminate entirely the damage from future floods.

It is easy to translate one of these issues into an issue of morality, but I do so because, in my judgment, this is also a moral issue. It is an economic issue; it is an engineering issue; it is also a moral issue.

Having seen what I looked at during the last weekend with respect to flood damages on the Columbia this year, I have come back to the Senate to start what I believe will be a very historic debate in the history of the Senate, a

debate over the moral issue as to whether the Congress is willing to put the rights of the American people for protection from the damages of ravaging floods at least on a plane equal to the consideration being shown to the people of foreign lands, into whose countries we are pouring millions of the American taxpayers' dollars for the development of flood control and reclamation projects.

Mr. President, if we can pour money into Egypt to the tune of $56 million or $57 million, according to the latest figures I have seen, let me say that we had better spend it in the United States also, or else be ready for the political verdict of the American people on the heads of those who do not face up to the great moral issue of adequate flood control for the American people.

RESPONSE OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair) laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read and ordered to lie on the table:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 19, 1956.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am deeply touched by and will always treasure Senate Resolution 280, adopted by the Senate on June 11, which conveys a most considerate and solicitous message of good wishes for my speedy recovery. For this extraordinarily kind act, I hope you will convey to every Member of the Senate my heartfelt thanks and appreciation.

With warm regard,
Sincerely,
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 20, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 417. An act for the relief of Pearl O. Seilaz;

S. 530. An act for the relief of the Sacred Heart Hospital;

S. 1146. An act to further amend section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act relating to fees of agents, attorneys, and representatives;

S. 1414. An act for the relief of James Edward Robinson;

S. 1749. An act adopting and authorizing the improvement of Rockland Harbor, Maine;

S. 2016. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Lawrence F. Kramer;

S. 2152. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer;

S. 2202. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an additional contract with the Yuma County Water Users' Association with respect to payment of construction charges on the Valley division, Yuma reclamation project, Arizona, and for other purposes;

S. 2582. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of William E. Stone for disability retirement as a Reserve officer or Army of the United States officer under the provisions of the act of April 3, 1939, as amended;

S. 3265. An act to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for filing vessel utilization and performance reports by operators of vessels in the foreign commerce of the United States;

S. 3472. An act for the relief of Patricia A. Pembroke;

S. 3581. An act to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service;

S. 3778. An act to amend the act for the protection of walruses;

S. 3857. An act to clarify section 1103 (d) of title XI (Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; and

S. 3945. An act for the relief of Walter C. Jordan and Elton W. Johnson.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the agreement heretofore entered, the Chair lays before the Senate the bill (H. R. 10986), which will be the unfinished business, and which the clerk will state by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, June 21, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 20, 1956:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law and regulation:

I. FOR APPOINTMENT

To be senior surgeons

Herbert A. Hudgins
Stanley J. Sarnoff

To be senior dental surgeon

Seymour J. Kreshover

To be senior sanitarian

Robert Johnston

To be senior assistant nurse officers

Dorothy L. Connors
Margaret M. Sweeney

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 20, 1956:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Joseph E. Martin, Boaz.
Luther Palmer Bean, Clanton.
Winston S. Morris, Elkmont.

ALASKA

Michael Shepard, Anchorage.

ARIZONA

William F. Cole, Maricopa.
Sarah L. Smith, Randolph.
Ethelyn L. Pettijohn, Stanfield.

ARKANSAS

Boyd B. Hammer, Bradley.
John E. Hunt, Marianna.
Willis E. Varvil, Quitman.

CALIFORNIA

Hazel L. Krueger, Acton.
Sam R. Haley, Associated.
Windol M. Martin, Bellflower.
Frank S. Spires, Berkeley.
Laura J. Pawlus, Bridgeville.
Leonard A. Mannee, Colusa.
Virginia N. Tharp, Esparto.
James E. Orr, Lancaster.
Donald Burleson, Mendocino.
Charles F. Linck, Jr., Ontario.
Raymond C. Durant, Redondo Beach.
Warren H. Williams, San Rafael.
Major R. Rix, South Pasadena.

COLORADO

Fred C. Brewer, Loveland.
Willard W. Wieck, Salida.
Calvin C. Haarhues, Wiggins.

CONNECTICUT

Richard J. Brereton, Wilton.

GEORGIA

William C. Chambers, Jr., Fort Gaines.
Samuel H. Henderson, Gray.
Carlos M. Sisson, Hapeville.

HAWAII

Joe R. Ferreira, Hanamaulu.

ILLINOIS

Roland W. Schultz, Downers Grove.
Robert G. Wheeler, Mills Shoals.
Robert G. Root, Versailles.

INDIANA

Albert T. Morris, Eaton.
Billy L. Kruse, Elberfeld.
Wayne W. Sloan, Marengo.
Marjorie L. Van Dyke, Pimento.
Maurice C. Griffith, Pleasant Lake.

IOWA

Joe R. Gordon, Arlington.
Myrtle L. Lane, Colesburg.
Ray H. Aten, Humeston.
Charles R. Kremenak, Newell.

KANSAS

Warren L. Hartley, Belle Plaine.
James J. Hiner, Belvue.
Myrtle M. McNeive, Emmett.
Layne B. Lairmore, Newton.
Mayetta B. Decker, Oskaloosa.
Bertha I. Elniff, Randall.
Jack R. Houston, Seneca.
Merle E. Popplewell, South Haven.
Ralph R. Johnson, Vermillion.
Leroy E. Blocker, Wetmore.

LOUISIANA

Ollie H. Dosher, Kilbourne.
Claude Rogers, Saline.
William H. Prejean, Westlake.

MAINE

Elsie M. Decker, Darkharbor.
Pauline C. Nason, Poland.
Robert F. Belgrade, South Gardiner.

MARYLAND

Richard W. Dawson, Mayo.
Edward F. Boston, Princess Ann.
Hugh H. Hassell, Rockville.
Rayola M. Moore, White Marsh.

MASSACHUSETTS

Ernest A. Paradis, Dodgeville.
Arthur K. Tolman, Gilbertville.
Larz D. Neilson, North Wilmington.

MINNESOTA

Homer D. Little, Appleton.
Loren J. Schendel, St. Michael.
Adelbert O. Ames, Springfield.
Chauncey B. Erwin, Winona.

MISSISSIPPI

Allie Mack Coker, Brookhaven.
Wiley Lee Williamson, Collins.
Jake R. Van Devender, Gholson.
James B. Johnston, Shubuta.
Carl H. Parker, Sumrall.
Minnie L. Logan, Tinsley.

MISSOURI

Robert E. Hock, Fort Leonard Wood.
Wilma M. Henneke, Leslie.
Davis L. Owen, Moberly.
Joseph A. Wallenburn, Otterville.
James W. Buzzard, Seneca.

MONTANA

Stephen Sams, Joliet.
George W. Duffy, Whitefish.

NEBRASKA

Bernard A. Boots, Ashby.
Earnest A. Moxham, Chester.
Dale B. Morrill, Creighton.
Lowell L. Saunders, Dixon.
Albert W. Watsek, Humboldt.
Leonard E. Peterson, Kennard.

NEVADA

Walter J. Bitton, Imlay.
Garner Andersen, Overton.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Samuel A. Towle, Hampton.

NEW JERSEY

Harry H. Pedersen, Jr., Absecon.
George W. Douglass, Cape May Court House.
Howard F. Koons, Perth Amboy.

NEW YORK

Florence M. Drankhan, Boston.
Bernice M. Murphy, Cattaragus.
Doris M. Robinson, Comstock.
Raymond V. Seaman, Gilbertsville.
Paul W. Christenson, Gowanda.
David O. Rourke, Madrid.
Percy Pembleton, Monroe.
William R. Costello, Red House.
Ruth H. Dexter, Wampsville.

NORTH CAROLINA

Walter L. York, High Point.
Ruth E. Parrish, Summerfield.
Marvin W. Thomas, Trenton.

NORTH DAKOTA

Harold W. Bachman, Streeter.

OHIO

Glenn M. Price, Gahanna.
Ann M. Collins, Hooven.
Janice B. Hilborn, Tiro.
Richard G. Graham, Wapakoneta.
Owen F. Hartsock, Waynesville.
Stephen M. Snouffer, Worthington.

OKLAHOMA

R. C. Chastain, Clayton.

OREGON

Richard M. Bowman, Falls City.

PENNSYLVANIA

Robert W. Newton, Blandburg.
Norman C. Mackrell, Conoquenessing.
Adrian E. Kibler, Hastings.
Mary E. Yost, Loganville.
Norbert C. McDermott, McKees Rocks.
Drue L. Eyer, Nescopeck.
Melvin S. Raudabaugh, New Kingstown.
Alfred E. Ingram, Norwood.
Robert D. Esbenshade, Paradise.
Millard L. Kroh, Seven Valleys.
C. Lyman Sturgis, Uniontown.
Frank A. Bialas, Wilmore.
Jack S. Karchner, Woodland.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Samuel A. Elliott, Windy Hill Beach.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Clifford N. Nelson, Toronto.

TENNESSEE

Josiah A. DeMarcus, Norris.

TEXAS

Dewey E. Waggoner, Sundown.
Thomas J. Pippin, Van.
Henry M. Durham, Woodville.

UTAH

Garnel E. Larsen, Hyrum.
Lydia Johnson, Marysvalle.
Gordon A. Wood, Monticello.

VIRGINIA

Willoughby P. Taylor, Ashland.
Charles N. Wysor, Honaker.
Charles William Brown, Narrows.
Raymond N. Kinder, Rural Retreat.

WASHINGTON

Edna B. Gibson, Eastsound.

WISCONSIN

Boyd D. Wilson, Benton.
Walter L. Paepke, Burlington.
Elden F. Keller, Cochrane.
Lawrence W. Paul, Fox Lake.
Lydia I. Sievert, Greenvalley.
Neal E. Jones, Wausau.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in this moment of prayer, may we come nearer unto Thee than we have ever known and may our human wills be made one with Thine in a bond of unity that can never be broken.

Grant that we may also be more firmly and closely united with one another in our plans and purposes to achieve for all mankind the blessings of a freer and fuller life.

Inspire us to search and struggle earnestly for that blessed day of universal peace when the tyrannies which oppress and the terrors which affright the soul of man shall be dethroned and destroyed and supplanted by the spirit of truth and righteousness.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 15, 1956:

H. R. 2216. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1948 (ch. 511, 62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force;

H. R. 4229. An act to provide running mates for certain staff corps officers in the naval service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4437. An act relating to withholding for State employee retirement system purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard and the Air National Guard;

H. R. 4569. An act to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes;

H. R. 4704. An act to provide for the examination preliminary to promotion of officers of the naval service;

H. R. 8477. An act to amend title II of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, by providing flexibility in the distribution of women officers in the grades of commander and lieutenant commander, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8490. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Bonham, Tex.;

H. R. 8674. An act to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.; and

H. R. 9358. An act to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue a deed to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for certain land heretofore conveyed to such city, removing the conditions and reservations made a part of such prior conveyance.

On June 18, 1956:

H. R. 3255. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to preserve in certain cases the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees whose positions are placed in lower grades by virtue of reclassification actions under such act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8123. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.;

H. R. 8225. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Pipestone National Monument in the State of Minnesota; and

H. R. 9822. An act to provide for the establishment of a trout hatchery on the Davidson River in the Pisgah National Forest in North Carolina.

On June 19, 1956:

H. R. 2840. An act to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas;

H. R. 4363. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the State of New Mexico;

H. R. 5237. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ella Madden and Clarence E. Madden; and

H. R. 6274. An act to provide that no fee shall be charged a veteran discharged under honorable conditions for furnishing him or his next of kin or legal representative a copy of a certificate showing his service in the Armed Forces.

On June 20, 1956:

H. R. 692. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for Peace";

H. R. 1484. An act for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen.

H. R. 5079. An act for the relief of Tom Wong (Foo Tai Nam);

H. R. 5516. An act to amend title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide that service as an Army field clerk, or as a field clerk, Quartermaster Corps, shall be counted for purposes of retirement under title III of that act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Shenekji;

H. R. 7913. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to effect the exchange of properties between the United States and the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo.;

H. R. 10721. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10899. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10060. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7763. An act to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determination of the claims, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2572. An act to authorize the interchange of lands between the Department of Agriculture and military departments of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes;

S. 3363. An act for the relief of Miroslav Slovak;

S. 3365. An act to amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to change the requirements for obtaining a freight forwarder permit;

S. 3879. An act to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States, in order to balance the power now heavily weighted in favor of automobile manufacturers, by enabling franchise automobile dealers to bring suit in the district courts of the United States to recover compensatory damages sustained by reason of the failure of automobile manufacturers to act in good faith in complying with the terms of franchises or in terminating or not renewing franchises with their dealers; and

S. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study and investigation of Indian education in the United States.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2396)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 9, 11, 13, 15, 23, 28, 33, 43, 49, 56, and 72.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 26, 27, 30, 39, 40, 41, 42, 45, 52, 53, 55, 59, 60, 61, 62, 65, 66, 69 and 75, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$17,407,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$487,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$525,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$117,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$47,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$125,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$120,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,884,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,175,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,540,375"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"No part of any money appropriated by this or any other Act for any agency of the executive branch of the Government shall be used during the current fiscal year for the purchase within the continental limits of the United States of any typewriting machines except in accordance with regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$93,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$61,887,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$38,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$40,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,125"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "twenty-eight"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$163,027,130"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ", of which $17,640,042 shall be available for such expenses as are necessary for the loan guaranty program"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ", of which $2,000,000 shall be used for the major alteration, rehabilitation, and modernization for the continued operation of the hospital at McKinney, Texas, and $1,500,000 shall be available for technical services for replacement of the general medical and surgical hospital at Nashville, Tennessee"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,036,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$46,950; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$368,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,165,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,775,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,475,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 50 and 64.

ALBERT THOMAS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
C. W. VURSELL,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
LISTER HILL,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
W. F. KNOWLAND,
per J. P. G.
JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY,
CHARLES POTTER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Civil Service Commission

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2—Salaries and expenses: Authorize $12,000 for consultant services instead of $10,000 as proposed by the House and $29,000 as proposed by the Senate; and appropriate $17,407,500 for salaries and expenses instead of $17,282,500 as proposed by the House and $17,532,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Restores House language relating to compensation or expenses of members of boards of examiners.

Amendment No. 4: Deletes House language relating to employees who allocate or reallocate supervisory positions in the classified civil service as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5—Investigations of United States citizens for employment by international organizations: Appropriates $487,500 instead of $450,000 as proposed by the House and $525,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6—Payment to civil-service retirement and disability fund: Appropriates $525,000,000 instead of $600,000,000 as proposed by the House and $440,438,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Authorizes $117,500 for administrative expenses of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $186,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Civil Defense Administration

Amendments Nos. 8 and 9—Operations: Authorize $6,000 for the purchase of newspapers, periodicals, and teletype news services instead of $5,000 as proposed by the House and $10,000 as proposed by the Senate; and appropriate $15,560,000 as proposed by the House instead of $21,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10—Emergency supplies and equipment: Appropriates $47,000,000 instead of $42,000,000 as proposed by the House and $64,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11—Surveys, plans, and research: Appropriates $10,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $14,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12—Salaries and expenses, Civil defense functions of Federal agencies: Appropriates $4,000,000 instead of $1,540,000 as proposed by the House and $6,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Restores House language relating to the construction or lease of warehouse space.

Funds Appropriated to the President

Disaster Relief

Amendments Nos. 14 and 15: Appropriate $6,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,386,030 as proposed by the House; and delete Senate language limiting the amount of expenditures in any one State.

Federal Communications Commission

Amendment No. 16—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $7,828,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,800,000 as proposed by the House.

Federal Power Commission

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $5,225,000 instead of $5,200,000 as proposed by the House and $5,250,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize $325,000 for investigations relating to Federal river development projects as proposed by the Senate instead of $200,000 as proposed by the House.

Federal Trade Commission

Amendments Nos. 19, 20 and 21—Salaries and expenses: Authorize $237,000 for expenses of travel as proposed by the Senate instead of $227,000 as proposed by the House; appropriate $5,550,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,400,000 as proposed by the House; and delete House language relating to a statistical analysis of the consumer's dollar as proposed by the Senate.

General Services Administration

Amendment No. 22—Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service: Appropriates $125,000,000 instead of $122,694,200 as proposed by the House and $128,084,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23—Repair, improvement, and equipment of federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia: Appropriates $42,565,550 as proposed by the House instead of $42,638,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 24 and 25—Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service: Authorize $120,000 for expenses of travel instead of $81,000 as proposed by the House and $160,000 as proposed by the Senate; and appropriate $2,884,400 instead of $2,809,400 as proposed by the House and $2,959,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26—Expenses, general supply fund: Appropriates $14,770,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $14,270,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 27—Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service: Appropriates $6,893,650 as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,818,650 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28—Survey of Government records, records management, and disposal practices: Deletes Senate language to appropriate $200,000.

Amendments Nos. 29 and 30—Strategic and critical materials: Authorize $3,175,500 for operating expenses instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $3,351,000 as proposed by the Senate; and insert a comma as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31—Administrative operations fund: Authorizes $9,540,375 instead of $9,278,200 as proposed by the House and $9,802,550 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32: Strikes out House language relating to the purchase of type-

writers but inserts language requiring that they be purchased in accordance with regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended. The deletion of the typewriter price restriction language is not intended to alter the present prohibition against purchases of typewriting machines by agencies in the executive branch of the Government unless the General Services Administration certifies that suitable typewriting machines are not available from excess.

Amendment No. 33: Restores House language authorizing 10 positions in grade GS-16 and one position in grade GS-18 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Office of the Administrator

Amendment No. 34—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $6,225,000 instead of $6,000,000 as proposed by the House and $6,450,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35—Urban planning grants: Appropriates $1,500,000 instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36—Reserve of planned public works (payment to revolving fund): Appropriates $7,500,000 instead of $6,000,000 as proposed by the House and $9,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Public Housing Administration

Amendment No. 37—Administrative expenses: Appropriates $10,500,000 instead of $9,700,000 as proposed by the House and $10,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38—Annual contributions: Appropriates $93,000,000 instead of $90,000,000 as proposed by the House and $96,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Interstate Commerce Commission

Amendments Nos. 39, 40, 41, 42 and 43—Salaries and expenses: Authorize the purchase of 60 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 45 as proposed by the House; insert language as proposed by the Senate authorizing not to exceed $1,085,000 for expenses of travel; appropriate $14,879,696 for the Interstate Commerce Commission as proposed by the Senate instead of $13,900,000 as proposed by the House; authorize not less than $1,230,178 for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety activities and not less than $849,500 for expenses necessary to carry out locomotive inspection activities as proposed by the Senate instead of not less than $1,939,000 for railroad safety and locomotive inspection activities as proposed by the House; and strike out language proposed by the Senate earmarking $187,088 for twenty-two inspectors for the Bureau of Motor Carriers. In deleting language proposed by the Senate earmarking funds for motor carrier inspectors, the conferees intend that the additional funds provided shall be used for such safety inspectors as intended in the language.

National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics

Amendments Nos. 44 and 45—Salaries and expenses: Provide $63,387,500 instead of $62,075,000 as proposed by the House and $64,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46—Construction and equipment: Appropriates $14,000,000 instead of $13,000,000 as proposed by the House and $15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

National Capital Housing Authority

Amendment No. 47—Maintenance and operation of properties: Appropriates $38,000 instead of $37,000 as proposed by the House and $39,000 as proposed by the Senate.

National Science Foundation

Amendments Nos. 48 and 49—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $40,000,000 instead of $35,915,000 as proposed by the House and $41,300,000 as proposed by the Senate; and restore House language earmarking $9,500,000 for the supplementary training of high-school science and mathematics teachers. The amount appropriated includes $3,500,000 proposed for a radio astronomy facility.

National Security Training Commission

Amendment No. 50—Salaries and expenses: Reported in disagreement. The conferees are agreed that the amount provided for this agency in fiscal year 1957 should be to close out its activities during the fiscal year.

Securities and Exchange Commission

Amendments Nos. 51, 52 and 53—Salaries and expenses: Authorize $1,125 for the purchase of newspapers instead of $750 as proposed by the House and $1,500 as proposed by the Senate; authorize purchase of one passenger motor vehicle as proposed by the Senate; and appropriate $5,749,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,700,000 as proposed by the House.

Selective Service System

Amendments Nos. 54, 55 and 56—Salaries and expenses: Authorize purchase of 28 motor vehicles for replacement only instead of 19 as proposed by the House and 38 as proposed by the Senate; appropriate $29,050,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $28,442,000 as proposed by the House; and restore House language earmarking $20,586,050 for activities of local boards.

Veterans' Administration

Amendments Nos. 57, 58 and 59—General operating expenses: Appropriate $163,027,130 instead of $162,118,260 as proposed by the House and $163,936,000 as proposed by the Senate; insert language earmarking $17,640,042 for the loan guaranty program proposed by the House; and authorize 22 persons in public relations work as proposed by the Senate instead of 20 persons as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 60 and 61—Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses: Appropriate $20,773,800 as proposed by the Senate instead of $16,099,600 as proposed by the House; and earmark $10,000,000 for medical research as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 62, 63, and 65—Hospital and domiciliary facilities: Appropriate $51,635,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $50,935,000 as proposed by the House. The appropriation, in addition to the budget program, includes $1,500,000 for the major alteration and rehabilitation of the hospital at McKinney, Tex., for permanent use; $2,000,000 for replacement of the hospital at Nashville, Tenn.; and chapel facilities for the hospitals at Northampton, Mass., Wilkes-Barre, Pa., and Brooklyn, N. Y., as proposed by the House; and $700,000 for a therapeutic exercise clinic for the hospital at Battle Creek, Mich., as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64—Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 66—Major alterations, improvements, and repairs: Appropriates $4,533,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,447,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

Federal Home Loan Bank Board

Amendments Nos. 67 and 68—Authorize $1,036,700 for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board instead of $978,400 as proposed by the House and $1,095,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize $46,950 for expenses of travel instead of $42,400 as proposed by the House and $51,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 69—Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation: Authorizes $596,000 for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $532,000 as proposed by the House.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Amendment No. 70—Office of the Administrator, public facility loans: Authorizes $368,000 for administrative expenses instead of $318,000 as proposed by the House and $418,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 71 and 72—Office of the Administrator, revolving fund (liquidating programs): Authorize $2,165,000 for administrative expenses instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,310,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize $7,900,000 for nonadministrative expenses as proposed by the House instead of $8,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 73—Federal National Mortgage Association: Authorizes $3,775,000 for administrative expenses instead of $3,700,000 as proposed by the House and $3,850,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 74 and 75—Public Housing Administration: Authorize $12,475,000 for administrative expenses instead of $11,550,000 as proposed by the House and $12,800,000 as proposed by the Senate; and insert language authorizing purchase of uniforms and allowances therefor as proposed by the Senate.

ALBERT THOMAS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
C. W. VURSELL,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, with regard to this conference report which we are about to adopt, I should like to express the grateful appreciation of the vast number of war veterans in Brooklyn, N. Y., to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas, and the managers on the part of the House for having included in this conference report funds for a new chapel facility at the Fort Hamilton Veterans' Administration hospital in Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. THOMAS. As the gentleman from New York knows, there is $435,000 included in this bill for 3 chapels, and the one in Brooklyn is 1 of them.

I recall several years ago when a former Member of this House, Donald L. O'Toole, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] were instrumental in getting the Fort Hamilton veterans' hospital. They have been active ever since in procuring the chapel facility. So we think the headache is over with now.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gracious and distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 50: Page 24, line 20, insert:

"NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the National Security Training

Commission, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of $50 per diem; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; $75,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$75,000" named in said amendment, insert "$50,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 64: Page 32, line 9, insert ": *Provided*, That the construction of the hospital at the Wade Park site is to furnish not less than 800 general, medical, and surgical beds."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 11473) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"SENATE"

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Salaries of Senators, mileage of the President of the Senate and of Senators, expense allowance of the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, and salary and expense allowance of the Vice President"

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"For compensation of Senators, $12,166,240."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"For mileage of the President of the Senate and of Senators, $51,000."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"For expense allowance of the majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate, $2,000 each, in all, $4,000."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"For the compensation of the Vice President of the United States, $35,070."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"For expense allowance of the Vice President, $10,000."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Salaries, officers and employees

"For compensation of officers, employees, clerks to Senators, and others as authorized by law, as follows."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Office of the Vice President

"For clerical assistance to the Vice President, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him in multiples of $5 per month, $86,925."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Chaplain

"Chaplain of the Senate, $5,000."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Office of the Secretary

"For office of the Secretary, $572,915: *Provided*, That effective July 1, 1956, the compensation of the chief clerk and parliamentarian of the Senate shall be $15,500 gross per annum each in lieu of $8,820 basic per annum each; and the basic annual compensation of the following positions shall be: legislative clerk $7,620 in lieu of $7,260; journal clerk $7,620 in lieu of $7,260; assistant parliamentarian $7,620 in lieu of $7,260; keeper of stationery $6,060 in lieu of $5,580; librarian $6,060 in lieu of $5,580; superintendent document room $6,060 in lieu of $5,580; secretary to parliamentarian $3,240 in lieu of $3,000; assistant journal clerk $3,240 in lieu of $3,060; assistant bill clerk $3,240 in lieu of $3,000; assistant executive clerk $3,240 in lieu of $3,000; and custodian of records $3,240 in lieu of $3,000."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Committee employees

"For professional and clerical assistance to standing committees, and the Select Committee on Small Business, $2,030,650."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Conference committees"

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"For clerical assistance to the conference of the majority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, $40,000."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"For clerical assistance to the conference of the minority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, $40,000."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators

"For administrative and clerical assistants and messenger service for Senators, $9,604,000."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper

"For office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, $1,755,770: *Provided*, That effective July 1, 1956, the basic annual compensation of the following positions shall be: secretary $2,760 in lieu of $2,520; clerk $2,880 in lieu of secretary $2,460; chief telephone operator $3,180 in lieu of $3,000; three assistant chief telephone operators at $2,580 each in lieu of $2,460 each; 26 pages at $1,800 each in lieu of 24 pages at $1,800 each; 79 privates, police force, at $2,160 each in lieu of 75 privates, police force, at $2,160 each; postmaster $6,060 in lieu of $5,580; chief clerk, post office $2,760 in lieu of $2,660; 30 mail carriers at $2,100 each in lieu of 28 mail carriers at $2,100 each; superintendent, periodical press gallery at $4,740 in lieu of $4,320; clerk-stenographer, service department at $2,160 in lieu of clerk-typist at $1,920; chief machine operator at $2,880 in lieu of $2,760; foreman of duplicating department at $3,180 in lieu of $2,880; two offset press operators at $2,580 each and 1 offset press operator at $2,340 in lieu of 3 offset press operators at $2,340 each; 2 messengers at pass door at $2,400 each; superintendent of mails at $2,400; superintendent press photographers gallery at $4,020; night supervisor, service department at $2,700; senior addressograph operator at $2,400 and 5 addressograph operators at $2,160 each in lieu of 4 addressograph operators at $2,160 each; 7 messengers at $1,740 each in lieu of 6 messengers at $1,740 each; 5 inserting machine operators at $1,980 each; 2 photostat operators at $2,400 each in lieu of 1 photostat operator at $2,400; 4 laborers at $1,620 each in lieu of 3 laborers at $1,620 each; auditor $2,220; administrative assistant $7,320; director, recording studio, $7,020; director of photography $5,100; chief sound engineer $4,080; laboratory supervisor $4,020; cameraman $3,600; film and radio recording engineer $3,120; shipping and stock clerk $1,800; traffic manager $2,520; production assistant $3,420; editor and printer $3,000; administrative officer $3,780; and projectionist, film inspector $2,280."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Offices of the Secretaries for the majority and the minority

"For the offices of the Secretary for the majority and the Secretary for the minority, $94,950: *Provided*, That effective July 1, 1956, the gross compensation of the Secretary for the Majority and the Secretary for the Minority shall be $15,500 per annum each; and the basic annual compensation of the assistant secretary for the majority and the assistant secretary for the minority shall be $6,300 each in lieu of $5,580 each."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Offices of the majority and minority whips

"For 2 clerical assistants, 1 for the majority whip and 1 for the minority whip, at not to exceed $5,580 basic per annum each, $20,045."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"In all $14,250,255, and the agency contribution for Federal Employees Group Life Insurance authorized to be paid from this appropriation by Public Law 598, 83d Congress, shall be paid without regard to the above limitations."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Contingent expenses of the Senate"

Page 1, after line, insert:

"Legislative reorganization: For salaries and expenses, legislative reorganization, including the objects specified in Public Law 663, 79th Congress, $100,000."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Senate policy committees: For salaries and expenses of the Majority Policy Committee and the Minority Policy Committee, $105,000 for each such committee; in all $210,000."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Joint Committee on the Economic Report: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, $135,560."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, including the objects specified in Public Law 20, 80th Congress, including $825 for expenses of compiling and preparing year end Joint Committee reports, which sum, or any part thereof, may be paid as additional compensation to any employee of the United States, $222,775."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Joint Committee on Printing: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Printing, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the committee, $59,085; for expenses of compiling, preparing, and indexing the Congressional Directory, $1,600; and for compiling, preparing, and indexing material for the biographical directory, $2,500, said sum, or any part thereof, in the discretion of the chairman or vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, may be paid as additional compensation to any employee of the United States; in all, $63,185."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Committee on Rules and Administration: For reimbursement to General Services Administration for space furnished the United States Senate, $27,515; and for expenses of compiling, preparing, and indexing material for the Senate Manual, $2,050, said sum, or any part thereof, in the discretion of the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, may be paid as additional

compensation to any employee of the United States; in all, $29,565."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Vice President's automobile: For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the Vice President, $8,785."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Automobile for the President pro tempore: For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the President pro tempore of the Senate, $8,785."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Automobiles for majority and minority leaders: For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of 2 automobiles, 1 for the majority leader of the Senate, and 1 for the minority leader of the Senate, $17,570."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Reporting Senate proceedings: For reporting the debates and proceedings of the Senate, payable in equal monthly installments, $170,250."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Furniture: For services and materials in cleaning and repairing furniture, and for the purchase of Furniture, $31,190: *Provided*, That the furniture purchased is not available from other agencies of the Government."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Inquiries and investigatitons: For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate or conducted pursuant to section 134 (a) of Public Law 601, 79th Congress, including $400,000 for the Committee on Appropriatitons, to be available also for the purposes mentioned in Senate Resolution numbered 193, agreed to October 14, 1943, and Public Law 20, 80th Congress, $2,000,000."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Folding documents: For the employment of personnel for folding speeches and pamphlets at a gross rate of not exceeding $1.61 per hour per person, notwithstanding any other provision of law, $29,000."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Senate restaurants: For repairs, improvements, equipment, and supplies for Senate kitchens and restaurants, Capitol Building and Senate Office Building, including personal and other services, to be expended under the supervision of the Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate, $55,000."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Motor vehicles: For maintaining, exchanging, and equipping motor vehicles for carrying the mails and for official use of the offices of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, $16,560."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Miscellaneous items: For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, $1,370,000."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Postage stamps: For Office of the Secretary, $650; Office of Sergeant at Arms, $225; Offices of the Secretaries for the Majority and the Minority, $100; and for airmail and special-delivery stamps for Senators and the President of the Senate, as authorized by law, $38,800, in all, $39,775, and the maximum allowance per capita for airmail and special-delivery stamps of $300 is increased to $400 for the fiscal year 1957, and thereafter."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Stationery: For stationery for Senators and for the President of the Senate, including $12,900 for stationery for committees and officers of the Senate, $187,500."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Communications: For an amount for communications which may be expended interchangeably for payment, in accordance with such limitations and restrictions as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration, of charges on official telegrams and long-distance telephone calls made by or on behalf of Senators or the President of the Senate, such telephone calls to be in addition to those authorized by the provisions of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 392; 2 U. S. C. 46c, 46d, 46e), as amended, and the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949 (63 Stat. 77; 2 U. S. C. 46d–1), $14,550."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Administrative provisions"

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, each Senator may fix the basic compensation of one employee in his office at a rate of not to exceed $8,040 per annum in addition to other positions authorized by law."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"The Sergeant at Arms hereafter is authorized and directed to secure suitable office space in post office or other Federal buildings in the State of each Senator for the use of such Senator and in the city to be designated by him: *Provided*, That in the event suitable space is not available in such buildings and a Senator leases or rents office space elsewhere, the Sergeant at Arms is authorized to approve for payment, from the contingent fund of the Senate, vouchers covering bona fide statements of rentals due in an amount not exceeding $1,200 per annum for each Senator."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"The Sergeant at Arms of the Senate hereafter is authorized and directed to approve for payment from the contingent fund of the Senate to each Senator an amount not to exceed $150 quarterly, upon certification of each such Senator, for official office expenses incurred in his State: *Provided*, That in the case of the death of any Senator the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration may certify for each deceased Senator for any portion of such quarterly allowances already obligated but not certified to at the time of such Senator's death, and for an amount at the same quarterly rate which may be reasonably needed for the purpose of closing such deceased Senator's State office, for payment to the person or persons designated as entitled to such payment by said chairman."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Effective July 1, 1956, the paragraph relating to official long-distance telephone calls to and from Washington, D. C., under the heading 'Contingent Expenses of the Senate' in Public Law 479, 79th Congress (2 U. S. C. 46c), as amended, is amended by striking out the word 'ninety' and inserting in lieu thereof 'one hundred and twenty' and by striking out the words 'four hundred and fifty' and inserting in lieu thereof 'six hundred'."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"The Secretary of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms hereafter are authorized and directed to protect the funds of their respective offices by purchasing insurance in an amount necessary to protect said funds against loss. Premiums on such insurance shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Salaries or wages paid out of the foregoing items under 'Contingent Expenses of the Senate' shall be computed at basic rates, plus increased and additional compensation, as authorized and provided by law."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"No part of the foregoing appropriations made under the heading 'Contingent Expenses of the Senate' hereafter may be expended for per diem and subsistence expenses (as defined in the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended) at rates in excess of $12 per day; except that (1) higher rates may be established by the Committee on Rules and Administration for travel beyond the limits of the continental United States, and (2) in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, reimbursement for such expenses may be made on an actual expense basis of not to exceed $25 per day in the case of travel within the continental limits of the United States."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Compensation for stenographic assistance of committees paid out of the foregoing items under 'Contingent Expenses of the Senate' hereafter shall be computed at such rates and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration, notwithstanding, and without regard to any other provision of law."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"The contingent fund of the Senate is hereafter made available for reimbursement for mileage, at the rate of 10 cents per mile, for one round trip in each fiscal year by the nearest route usually traveled between Washington, D. C., and a Senator's residence in his home State, to not to exceed two employees in each Senator's office, such reimbursement to be made upon vouchers approved by the Senator and containing a certification by him that such travel was performed in line of official duty."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Unless otherwise specifically authorized by law, no part of any appropriation disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate shall be available for payment of compensation to any person holding any position, for any period for which such person received compensation for holding any other position, the compensation for which is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate."

Page 8, line 9, strike out "$82,495" and insert "$83,095."

Page 9, line 19, after "incumbents" insert "and that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are directed to pay the deputy chief detailed under the authority of this paragraph the same salary as that paid in fiscal year 1956 plus $600 and such increases in basic compensation as may be subsequently provided by law so long as this position is held by the present incumbent."

Page 10, after line 4, insert:

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

"For an amount to enable the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures to carry out the duties imposed upon it by section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 726), to remain available during the existence of the committee, $22,500, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate."

Page 13, line 14, strike out "$282,600" and insert "$932,600."

Page 13, line 14, after "$282,600" insert ", of which $650,000 shall be available for construction of a combined sanitary-storm water sewer extending from the Additional Senate Office Building to the existing sewer crossing Constitution Avenue just west of New Jersey Avenue NW."

Page 13, after line 14, insert:

"Subway transportation, Capitol and Senate Office Buildings: For maintenance, repairs, and rebuilding of the subway transportation system connecting the Senate Office Building with the Capitol, including personal and other services, $6,600."

Page 13, after line 14, insert:

"Senate Office Building: For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, including furniture, furnishings, and equipment, and for labor and material incident thereto, and repairs thereof; for purchase of waterproof wearing apparel and for personal and other services; including five female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms at $1,800 each, for the care and operation of the Senate Office Building; to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol; in all, $1,248,600."

Page 13, after line 14, insert:

"Additional office building for the United States Senate

"Construction and equipment of additional Senate Office Building: To enable the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, to continue to provide for the construction and equipment of a fireproof office building for the use of the United States Senate, in accordance with the provisions of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948 (62 Stat. 1029), $5,250,000: *Provided,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be obligated or expended for construction of the rear center wing of said building, from the ground floor up, provided for under the building plans heretofore approved by such Commission."

Page 16, line 18, strike out "$5,300,000" and insert "$5,310,593."

Page 17, line 13, strike out "$1,475,000" and insert "$1,487,100."

Page 20, after line 25, insert:

"The paragraph in the Legislative Appropriation Act 1954 (67 Stat. 330), establishing the Government Printing Office Revolving Fund is hereby amended by striking out the words '(except buildings and land)', where they occur, and inserting in lieu thereof 'and building appurtenances (except building structures and land)'.

Page 20, after line 25, insert:

"The Public Printer is authorized to provide for the improvement of electrical facilities and extension of air conditioning as necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Government Printing Office. The operation shall be financed from the revolving fund in accordance with provisions of law (44 U. S. C. 63; 63 Stat. 301, Aug. 1, 1955)."

Page 22, strike out all after line 4 over to and including line 12 on page 25 and insert:

"SEC. 105. (a) There is hereby established a House Recording Studio and a Senate Recording Studio.

"(b) The House Recording Studio shall assist Members of the House of Representatives in making disk, film, and tape recordings, and in performing such other functions and duties in connection with the making of such recordings as may be necessary. The Senate Recording Studio shall assist Members of the Senate and committees of the Senate in making disk, film, and tape recordings, and in performing such other functions and duties in connection with the making of such recordings as may be necessary. The House Recording Studio shall be for the exclusive use of Members of the House of Representatives (including the Delegates and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico); the Senate Recording Studio shall be for the exclusive use of Members of the Senate, the Vice President, and committees of the Senate.

"(c) The House Recording Studio shall be operated by the Clerk of the House of Representatives under the direction and control of a committee which is hereby created (hereinafter referred to as the committee) composed of three Members of the House. Two members of the committee shall be from the majority party and one member shall be from the minority party, to be appointed by the Speaker. The committee is authorized to issue such rules and regulations relating to operation of the House Recording Studio as it may deem necessary.

"The Senate Recording Studio shall be operated by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate under the direction and control of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate. The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to issue such rules and regulations relating to operation of the Senate Recording Studio as it may deem necessary.

"(d) The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall, subject to the approval of the committee, set the price of making disk, film, and tape recordings, and collect all moneys owed the House Recording Studio. The Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate shall set the price of making disk, film, and tape recordings and all moneys owed the Senate Recording Studio shall be collected by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate.

"(e) No moneys shall be expended or obligated for the House Recording Studio except as shall be pursuant to such regulations as the committee may approve. No moneys shall be expended or obligated by the Director of the Senate Recording Studio until approval therefor has been obtained from the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate.

"(f) The Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized, subject to the approval of the committee, to appoint and fix the compensation of a Director of the House Recording Studio and such other employees as are deemed necessary to the operation of the House Recording Studio.

"(g) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States, a revolving fund within the contingent fund of the House of Representatives for the House Recording Studio for the purposes of administering the duties of that studio. There is also established in the Treasury of the United States, a revolving fund within the contingent fund of the Senate for the Senate Recording Studio for the purposes of administering the duties of that studio.

"(h) All moneys received by the House Recording Studio from Members of the House of Representatives for disk, film, or tape recordings, or from any other source, shall be deposited by the Clerk of the House of Representatives in the revolving fund established for the House Recording Studio by the preceding paragraph; moneys in such fund shall be available for disbursement therefrom by the Clerk of the House of Representatives for the care, maintenance, operation, and other expenses of the studio upon vouchers signed and approved in such manner as the committee shall prescribe. All moneys received by the Senate Recording Studio for disk, film, or tape recordings or from any other source, shall be deposited in the revolving fund established for the Senate Recording Studio by the preceding paragraph; moneys in such fund shall be available for disbursement therefrom upon vouchers signed and approved by the Sergeant at Arms for the care, maintenance, operation, and other expenses of the Senate Recording Studio.

"(i) (1) As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this act but no later than September 30, 1956, the equity of the Joint Senate and House Recording Facility Revolving Fund shall be distributed equally to the Senate and House of Representatives on the basis of an audit to be made by the General Accounting Office.

"(2) The Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall, subject to the approval of the committees mentioned in subsection (c) hereof, determine the assignment of existing studio facilities to the Senate and the House of Representatives, and also the existing equipment, materials, and supplies to be transferred to the respective studios. The evaluation of equipment, materials, and supplies transferred to each studio shall be on the basis of market value. Any other equipment, materials, and supplies determined to be obsolete or not needed for the operation of the respective studios shall be disposed of to the best interest of the Government and the proceeds thereof deposited in the Joint Senate and House Recording Facility Revolving Fund.

"(3) Accounts receivable, which on the effective date of liquidation, are due from Members and committees of the Senate shall be transferred to the Senate Studio, and those due from Members and committees of the House of Representatives shall be transferred to the House Studio.

"(4) A sufficient reserve shall be set aside from the Joint Senate and House Recording Facility Revolving Fund to liquidate any outstanding accounts payable.

"(5) After appropriate adjustments for the value of assets assigned or transferred to the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, the balance in the Joint Senate and House Recording Facility Revolving Fund shall be distributed equally to the Senate and House of Representatives for deposit to the respective revolving funds authorized by this section.

"(j) Pending acquisition of the stock, supplies, materials, and equipment necessary to properly equip both studios, the present services and facilities shall be made available to both studios in order that each studio may carry out its duty.

"(k) No person shall be an officer or employee of the House or Senate Recording Studio while he is engaged in any other business, profession, occupation, or employment which involves the performance of duties which are similar to those which would be performed by him as such an officer or employee of such studio unless approved in writing by the committee in the case of the House Recording Studio and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration in the case of the Senate Recording Studio.

"(l) The Joint Recording Facility positions and salaries established pursuant to the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1948, and all subsequent acts are hereby abolished.

"(m) Effective with the completion of the transfer provided for by subsection (i) hereof the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution establishing in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund within the contingent fund of the House of Representatives,' approved August 7, 1953 (2 U. S. C., sec. 123), is repealed.

"(n) The Director of the House Recording Studio shall give bond to the Clerk of the House of Representatives with one or more sureties in the penal sum of $20,000, with condition for the faithful performance of his duties and the preservation and security of all property in his care. The Director of the Senate Recording Studio shall give bond to the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate with one or more sureties in the penal sum of $20,000, with condition for the faithful performance of his duties and the preservation and security of all property in his care.

"(o) Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section are hereby authorized to be appropriated."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point on the Record and include a table and comments regarding it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 11473, making appropriations for the legislative establishment for the fiscal year 1957, passed the House on May 29, 1956, carrying appropriations in the total amount of $89,376,450. Following a custom of many years' standing, the bill at that time did not include appropriations for Senate items, but did pro-

vide for the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office and other miscellaneous activities identified with the legislative branch.

The bill was reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations on June 14 with increases recommended in the total amount of $28,427,608, making a total in the bill of $117,804,058. The increase is, except for approximately $23,000, entirely applicable to the Senate items. The bill passed the Senate on June 18 without any change in the total appropriations recommended by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The bill, as now agreed to, appropriates $117,804,058, which amount is $4,692,875 under the budget estimates.

In view of the discussion at the time the bill passed the Senate, I would like to insert at this time a table indicating a comparison between certain allowances made to Members of the Senate and Members of the House.

Compensation and allowances, Members of Congress

Item	Members of the House	Members of the Senate	Changes proposed for Senators in 1957 legislative bill
Compensation	$22,500	$22,500	
Mileage	1 round trip each regular session (20 cents per mile).	1 round trip each regular session (20 cents per mile).	
Stationery allowance	$1,200 a year	$1,800 a year	
Stamps (airmail and special delivery)	$200 a year	$300 a year	$400 a year.
Telephone (long distance)	3,000 minutes a year		
To and from Washington		Not to exceed 1,080 calls a year, involving not to exceed 5,400 minutes a year.	Not to exceed 1,440 calls a year, involving not to exceed 7,200 minutes a year.
Originating and terminating outside Washington plus additional for calls to and from Washington.		Not to exceed $1,200 allowance a year	
Telegrams	20,000 words a year, of which not to exceed 2,000 may be overseas cables.	No specified limit, except as provided by Rules and Administration Committee. Allowances are based on population and Western Union rates (details not available).	
Office space rental (home State)	$900 a year (not to exceed)	$900 a year (not to exceed)	$1,200 a year (not to exceed).
Office expenses (home State)	$150 quarterly (not to exceed)	$150 quarterly (not to exceed)	
Trip home by office employees		One round trip a year, at 10 cents per mile, for not to exceed 2 employees.	
Clerk hire allowance	$17,500 "basic" a year	On basis of State Population. Basic amounts not presently available.	
Maximum number of clerks	Not to exceed 8	No legal limit	
Maximum salaries of clerks	One at not to exceed $7,000 "basic" ($12,131 a year).	One at maximum rate of classification act (presently, $14,800); 1 at basic of $8,460 (gross of $14,301); others at not to exceed $5,100 basic (gross of $9,292).	In addition, 1 at $8,040 basic (gross of $13,677).

NOTE.—Item under Senate contingent fund, "Communications," provides up to $150 a year for each Senator for telephone or telegrams under certain conditions the details of which are not clear.

I realize that there is considerable sentiment on the part of many House Members to bring certain of these allowances more in line than they are at present.

The amendments just agreed to provide for, among other things, the dissolution of the Joint Recording Facility and the creation of separate facilities for the House and Senate. There seems to be a preponderance of opinion on both sides of the Capitol that better service and satisfaction will result from this change.

Finally, in connection with the Government Printing Office provision is made for broadening the use of the Government Printing Office revolving fund in order that certain repairs and improvements can be made in the physical plant.

NARCOTIC CONTROL ACT OF 1956

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 11619) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and for other purposes, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Narcotic Control Act of 1956."

SEC. 2. Unlawful acquisition, etc., of marihuana.

Subsection (a) of section 4744 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (unlawful acquisition of marihuana) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Persons in general: It shall be unlawful for any person who is a transferee required to pay the transfer tax imposed by section 4741 (a)—

"(1) to acquire or otherwise obtain any marihuana without having paid such tax, or

"(2) to transport or conceal, or in any manner facilitate the transportation or concealment of, any marihuana so acquired or obtained.

Proof that any person shall have had in his possession any marihuana and shall have failed, after reasonable notice and demand by the Secretary or his delegate, to produce the order form required by section 4742 to be retained by him shall be presumptive evidence of guilt under this subsection and of liability for the tax imposed by section 4741 (a)."

SEC. 3. Unlawful transportation of marihuana.

Subsection (b) of section 4755 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (unlawful transportation of marihuana) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Transportation: Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, it shall be unlawful for any person to send, ship, carry, transport, or deliver any marihuana within any Territory, the District of Columbia, or any insular possession of the United States, or from any State, Territory, the District of Columbia, or any insular possession of the United States into any other State, Territory, the District of Columbia, or insular possession of the United States. Nothing contained in this subsection shall apply—

"(1) to any person who shall have registered and paid the special tax as required by sections 4751 to 4753, inclusive;

"(2) to any common carrier engaged in transporting marihuana;

"(3) to any employee acting within the scope of his employment for any person who shall have registered and paid the special tax as required by sections 4751 to 4753, inclusive, or to any contract carrier or other agent acting within the scope of his agency for such registered person;

"(4) to any person who shall deliver marihuana which has been prescribed or dispensed by a physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner registered under section 4753 and employed to prescribe for the particular patient receiving such marihuana;

"(5) to any person carrying marihuana which has been obtained by the person from a registered dealer in pursuance of a written prescription referred to in section 4742 (b) (2), issued for legitimate medical uses by a physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner registered under section 4753, if the bottle or other container in which such marihuana is carried bears the name and registry number of the druggist, serial number of prescription, name and address of the patient, and name, address, and registry number of the person issuing such prescription;

"(6) to any person carrying marihuana which has been obtained by the person as a patient from a registered physician, dentist, or other practitioner in the course of his professional practice if such marihuana is dispensed to the patient for legitimate medical purposes; or

"(7) to any United States, State, county, municipal, District, Territorial, or insular officer or official acting within the scope of his official duties."

SEC. 4. Violations of narcotic drug and marihuana laws.

Section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (violations of laws relating to narcotic drugs and marihuana) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7237. Violation of laws relating to narcotic drugs and to marihuana.

"(a) Where no specific penalty is otherwise provided: Whoever commits an offense,

or conspires to commit an offense, described in part I or part II of subchapter A of chapter 39 for which no specific penalty is otherwise provided, shall be imprisoned not less than 2 or more than 10 years and, in addition, may be fined not more than $20,000. For a second offense, the offender shall be imprisoned not less than 5 or more than 20 years and, in addition, may be fined not more than $20,000. For a third or subsequent offense, the offender shall be imprisoned not less than 10 or more than 40 years and, in addition, may be fined not more than $20,000.

"(b) Sale or other transfer without written order: Whoever commits an offense, or conspires to commit an offense, described in section 4705 (a) or section 4742 (a) shall be imprisoned not less than 5 or more than 20 years and, in addition, may be fined not more than $20,000. For a second or subsequent offense, the offender shall be imprisoned not less than 10 or more than 40 years and, in addition, may be fined not more than $20,000. If the offender attained the age of 18 before the offense and—

"(1) the offense consisted of the sale, barter, exchange, giving away, or transfer of any narcotic drug or marihuana to a person who had not attained the age of 18 at the time of such offense, or

"(2) the offense consisted of a conspiracy to commit an offense described in paragraph (1),

the offender shall be imprisoned not less than 10 or more than 40 years and, in addition, may be fined not more than $20,000.

"(c) Conviction of second or subsequent offense:

"(1) Prior offenses counted: For purposes of subsections (a), (b), and (d) of this section, subsections (c) and (h) of section 2 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended (21 U. S. C., sec. 174), and the act of July 11, 1941, as amended (21 U. S. C., sec. 184a), an offender shall be considered a second or subsequent offender, as the case may be, if he previously has been convicted of any offense the penalty for which was provided in subsection (a) or (b) of this section or in—

"(A) subsection (c) or (h) of section 2 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act (21 U. S. C., sec. 174);

"(B) the act of July 11, 1941 (21 U. S. C., sec. 184a);

"(C) section 9 of the act of December 17, 1914 (38 Stat. 789);

"(D) section 1 of the act of May 26, 1922 (42 Stat. 596);

"(E) section 12 of the Marihuana Tax Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 556); or

"(F) section 2557 (b) (1) or 2596 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

For purposes of determining prior offenses under the preceding sentence, a reference to any subsection, section, or act providing a penalty for an offense shall be considered as a reference to such subsection, section, or act as in effect (as originally enacted or as amended, as the case may be) with respect to the offense for which the offender previously has been convicted.

"(2) Procedure. After conviction (but before pronouncement of sentence) of any offense the penalty for which is provided in subsection (a) or (b) of this section, subsection (c) or (h) of section 2 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended, or such act of July 11, 1941, as amended, the court shall be advised by the United States attorney whether the conviction is the offender's first or a subsequent offense. If it is not a first offense, the United States attorney shall file an information setting forth the prior convictions. The offender shall have the opportunity in open court to affirm or deny that he is identical with the person previously convicted. If he denies the identity, sentence shall be postponed for such time as to permit a trial before a jury on the sole issue of the offender's identity with the person previously convicted. If the offender is found by the jury to be the person previously convicted, or if he acknowledges that he is such person, he shall be sentenced as prescribed in subsection (a) or (b) of this section, subsection (c) or (h) of such section 2, or such act of July 11, 1941, as amended, as the case may be.

"(d) No suspension of sentence; no probation; etc. Upon conviction—

"(1) of any offense the penalty for which is provided in subsection (b) of this section, subsection (c) or (h) of section 2 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended, or such act of July 11, 1941, as amended, or

"(2) of any offense the penalty for which is provided in subsection (a) of this section, if it is the offender's second or subsequent offense,

the imposition or execution of sentence shall not be suspended, probation shall not be granted, section 4202 of title 18 of the United States Code shall not apply, and the act of July 15, 1932 (47 Stat. 696; D. C. Code 24–201 and following), as amended, shall not apply.

"(e) Use of Communications Facilities:

"(1) Penalties: Whoever uses any communication facility in committing or in causing or facilitating the commission of, or in attempting to commit, any act or acts constituting an offense or a conspiracy to commit an offense the penalty for which is provided in—

"(A) subsection (a) or (b) of this section,

"(B) subsection (c) or (h) of section 2 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act (21 U. S. C., sec. 174), or

"(C) the act of July 11, 1941 (21 U. S. C., sec. 184a),

shall be imprisoned not less than 2 nor more than 5 years and, in addition, may be fined not more than $5,000. Each separate use of a communication facility shall be a separate offense under this paragraph.

"(2) Communication facility defined: For purposes of this subsection, the term 'communication facility' means any and all public and private instrumentalities used or useful in the transmission of writings, signs, signals, pictures, and sounds of all kinds by mail, telephone, wire, radio, or other means of communication.

"(f) Unlawful disclosure of information on returns and order forms: Any person who shall disclose the information contained in the statements or returns required under section 4732 (b) or 4754 (a), in the duplicate order forms required under section 4705 (e), or in the order forms or copies thereof referred to in section 4742 (d), except—

"(1) as expressly provided in section 4773,

"(2) for the purpose of enforcing any law of the United States relating to narcotic drugs or marihuana, or

"(3) for the purpose of enforcing any law of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, or any insular possession of the United States, or ordinance of any organized municipality therein, regulating the sale, prescribing, dispensing, dealing in, or distribution of narcotic drugs or marihuana.

shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years or both."

SEC. 5. Immunity of witnesses; appeal from order to suppress evidence or return property.

(a) In General: Subchapter E of chapter 76 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to judicial proceedings) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 7494. Special provisions relating to narcotic drugs and marihuana

"(a) Immunity of witnesses: Whenever in the judgment of a United States attorney the testimony of any witness, or the production of books, papers, or other evidence by any witness, in any case or proceeding before any grand jury or court of the United States involving any violation of—

"(1) any provision of part I or part II of subchapter A of chapter 39 the penalty for which is provided in subsection (a) or (b) of section 7237,

"(2) subsection (c) or (h) of section 2 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended (21 U. S. C., sec. 174), or

"(3) the act of July 11, 1941, as amended (21 U. S. C., sec. 184a),

is necessary to the public interest, he, upon the approval of the Attorney General, shall make application to the court that the witness shall be instructed to testify or produce evidence subject to the provisions of this subsection, and upon order of the court such witness shall not be excused from testifying or from producing books, papers, or other evidence on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture. But no such witness shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, nor shall testimony so compelled be used as evidence in any criminal proceeding (except prosecution described in the next sentence) against him in any court. No witness shall be exempt under this subsection from prosecution for perjury or contempt committed while giving testimony or producing evidence under compulsion as provided in this subsection.

"(b) Appeal from order to suppress evidence or return property: In addition to any other right to appeal the United States shall have the right to appeal from an order granting a motion for the return of seized property and to suppress evidence made before the trial of a person charged with a violation of—

"(1) any provision of part I or part II of subchapter A of chapter 39 the penalty for which is provided in subsection (a) or (b) of section 7237,

"(2) subsection (c) or (h) of section 2 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended (21 U. S. C., sec. 174), or

"(3) the act of July 11, 1941, as amended (21 U. S. C., sec. 184a).

This subsection shall not apply with respect to any such motion unless the United States attorney shall certify, to the judge granting such motion, that the appeal is not taken for purposes of delay. Any appeal under this subsection shall be taken within 30 days after the date the order was entered and shall be diligently prosecuted."

(b) Amendment of table of sections: The table of sections for subchapter E of chapter 76 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 7494. Special provisions relating to narcotic drugs and marihuana."

SEC. 6. Discovery of liability; enforcement.

(a) In general: Subchapter A of chapter 78 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (discovery of liability and enforcement of title) is amended by renumbering section 7607 as section 7608 and by inserting after section 7606 the following new section:

"SEC. 7607. Special provisions relating to narcotic drugs and marihuana.

"(a) Powers of Bureau of Narcotics: The Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, Assistant to the Commissioner, and agents, of the Bureau of Narcotics of the Department of the Treasury may—

"(1) carry firearms, execute and serve search warrants and arrest warrants, and serve subpenas and summonses issued under the authority of the United States, and

"(2) make arrests without warrant for violations of any law of the United States relat-

ing to narcotic drugs (as defined in section 4731) or marihuana (as defined in section 4761) where the violation is committed in the presence of the person making the arrest or where such person has reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing such violation.

"(b) Issuance of search warrants: In any case involving a violation of any provision of part I or part II of subchapter A of chapter 39 the penalty for which is provided in subsection (a) or (b) of section 7237, a violation of subsection (c) or (h) of section 2 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended (21 U. S. C., sec. 174), or a violation of the act of July 11, 1941, as amended (21 U. S. C., sec. 184a)—

"(1) a search warrant may be served at any time of the day or night if the judge or the United States Commissioner issuing the warrant is satisfied that there is probable cause to believe that the grounds for the application exist, and

"(2) a search warrant may be directed to any officer of the Metropolitan Police of the District of Columbia authorized to enforce or assist in enforcing a violation of any of such provisions."

(b) Amendment of table of sections: The table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 78 is amended by striking out.

"Sec. 7607. Cross references."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"Sec. 7607. Special provisions relating to narcotic drugs and marihuana.

"Sec. 7608. Cross references."

SEC. 7. Importation, etc., of Narcotic Drugs.

Section 2 (c) of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 21, sec. 174), is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Whoever fraudulently or knowingly imports or brings any narcotic drug into the United States or any territory under its control or jurisdiction, contrary to law, or receives, conceals, buys, sells, or in any manner facilitates the transportation, concealment, or sale of any such narcotic drug after being imported or brought in, knowing the same to have been imported or brought into the United States contrary to law, or conspires to commit any of such acts in violation of the laws of the United States, shall be imprisoned not less than 5 or more than 20 years and, in addition, may be fined not more than $20,000. For a second or subsequent offense (as determined under section 7237 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954), the offender shall be imprisoned not less than 10 or more than 40 years and, in addition, may be fined not more than $20,000.

"Whenever on trial for a violation of this subsection the defendant is shown to have or to have had possession of the narcotic drug, such possession shall be deemed sufficient evidence to authorize conviction unless the defendant explains the possession to the satisfaction of the jury.

"For provision relating to sentencing, probation, etc., see section 7237 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."

SEC. 8. Smuggling of marihuana.

Section 2 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whoever, knowingly, with intent to defraud the United States, imports or brings into the United States marihuana contrary to law, or smuggles or clandestinely introduces into the United States marihuana which should have been invoiced, or receives, conceals, buys, sells, or in any manner facilitates the transportation, concealment, or sale of such marihuana after being imported or brought in, knowing the same to have been imported or brought into the United States contrary to law, or whoever conspires to do any of the foregoing acts, shall be imprisoned not less than 5 or more than 20 years and, in addition, may be fined not more than $20,000. For a second or subsequent offense (as determined under section 7237 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954), the offenders shall be imprisoned for not less than 10 or more than 40 years and, in addition, may be fined not more than $20,000.

"Whenever on trial for a violation of this subsection, the defendant is shown to have or to have had the marihuana in his possession, such possession shall be deemed sufficient evidence to authorize conviction unless the defendant explains his possession to the satisfaction of the jury.

"As used in this subsection, the term 'marihuana' has the meaning given to such term by section 4761 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"For provision relating to sentencing, probation, etc., see section 7237 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."

SEC. 9. Unlawful possession of narcotic drugs and marihuana on vessels.

(a) In general: Subsection (a) of the first section of the act of July 11, 1941 (21 U. S. C., sec. 184a), is amended by striking out "fined not more than $5,000 or be imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both," and inserting in lieu thereof "imprisoned not less than 5 or more than 20 years and, in addition, may be fined not more than $20,000. For a second or subsequent offense (as determined under section 7237 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954), the offender shall be imprisoned not less than 10 or more than 40 years and, in addition, may be fined not more than $20,000. For provision relating to sentencing, probation, etc., see section 7237 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."

(b) Correction of reference: Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out "chapter 23 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended," and inserting in lieu thereof "subchapter A of chapter 39 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."

SEC. 10. Territorial extent of law.

Section 4774 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (territorial extent of certain laws relating to narcotic drugs and marihuana) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "On and after the effective date of the Narcotic Control Act of 1956, the provisions referred to in the preceding sentence shall not apply to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico unless the Legislative Assembly of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico expressly consents thereto in the manner prescribed in the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for the enactment of a law."

SEC. 11. Effective date.

The amendments made by this act shall take effect on the day following the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 11619 embodies the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Narcotics of the Committee on Ways and Means. This subcommittee conducted hearings in various cities throughout the country and reviewed all problems relating to narcotic addiction as well as the abuse of barbiturates and amphetamines.

At this point I would like to commend very highly the excellent work of the Subcommittee on Narcotics under the chairmanship of Hon. HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana. This is the most complete review of the illicit traffic in drugs which has ever been conducted by the Committee on Ways and Means. The subcommittee worked very diligently; and, in my opinion, the recommendations which are embodied in H. R. 11619 will greatly strengthen the efforts of Federal enforcement officials and Federal judges in combating the illicit traffic in narcotics and marihuana.

Hon. HALE BOGGS, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Narcotics, introduced H. R. 11619 carrying out the recommendations of his subcommittee. Hon. HOWARD BAKER, of Tennessee, introduced an identical bill, H. R. 11620. The subcommittee decided against recommending that barbiturates and amphetamines be subjected to regulatory taxation and penalties similar to those applicable to narcotics and marihuana. The subcommittee recommended that barbiturates and amphetamines be subjected to more stringent Federal control by the device of registration of persons dealing in these drugs. This, of course, would have to be undertaken through the power of the Federal Government to regulate interstate commerce.

Mr. BOGGS, as chairman of the subcommittee, and Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES, of Wisconsin, as a member of the subcommittee, introduced identical bills carrying out these recommendations, which bills were referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is my hope that that committee will act favorably on these bills.

NARCOTIC CONTROL ACT OF 1956

Section 1 of H. R. 11619 states that the act may be cited as the "Narcotic Control Act of 1956."

VENUE IN MARIHUANA CASES

The Bureau of Narcotics has encountered difficulty in prosecuting persons who have been apprehended violating the marihuana laws due to the fact that venue lies in the jurisdiction where the marihuana is acquired or obtained without having paid the required tax. Section 2 of the bill provides that it will be an offense to transport or conceal marihuana and therefore will provide venue in the jurisdiction where violators are apprehended.

UNLAWFUL TRANSPORTATION OF MARIHUANA

Section 3 of the bill broadens the application of section 4755 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make it unlawful for any person to send, carry, or otherwise transport marihuana. At the present time section 4755 is applicable only to persons who shall not have paid the special tax and registered pursuant to law. Exceptions from the amended provisions would be provided for certain persons and their employees such as registrants.

PENALTIES

Under present law the penalties contained in the Internal Revenue Code provide for a minimum mandatory sentence

of 2 years for a first offender with a permissive maximum up to 5 years. A second offender is subject to a minimum mandatory sentence of 5 years with a permissive sentence up to 10 years. A third and subsequent offender is subject to a minimum mandatory sentence of 10 years with a permissive maximum up to 20 years. No distinction is made in present law as between a possessor and a trafficker. Present law also provides a mandatory fine for all offenses of up to $2,000. In the case of first offenders, probation and suspension of sentence is permitted. This is not true in the case of second and subsequent offenders.

The bill, in section 4, provides for increased penalties for violations of the narcotic and marihuana laws. In the case of possessors, the same minimum mandatory sentences would be applied under the bill as in present law. The bill raises the permissive maximum sentences from 5 to 10 years in the case of a first offender, 10 to 20 years in the case of a second offender, and 20 to 40 years in the case of a third and subsequent offender. The bill also provides for a discretionary fine for all offenses of up to $20,000.

A distinction would be made between the possessors and traffickers. Traffickers would be subject to a minimum mandatory sentence of 5 years and a permissive maximum sentence of up to 20 years. Second and subsequent offenders would be subject to a minimum mandatory sentence of 10 years with a permissive maximum sentence of up to 40 years. An adult who sells or otherwise furnishes a minor (a person under the age of 18) marihuana or narcotics, would be subject to a minimum mandatory sentence of 10 years with a permissive maximum sentence up to 40 years.

Probation, suspension of sentence, and parole would be permitted only in the case of a first offender possessor.

The bill would make the Federal law applicable to the District of Columbia in lieu of the present indeterminate sentences.

The bill adds a new provision to the Internal Revenue Code, making it an offense for any person to use any communication facility in committing a violation of the narcotic and marihuana laws. Such violations would be subject to a minimum mandatory sentence of 2 years with a permissive maximum sentence of up to 5 years. In addition, a discretionary fine of up to $5,000 could be imposed.

Section 4 of the bill also amends present provisions relating to the unlawful disclosure of information on returns and order forms by Federal Government personnel. At the present time these offenses are subject to the schedule of penalties which are provided for other narcotic and marihuana violations.

The bill would amend these penalties to provide that such an offender would be subject to imprisonment of not more than 5 years, a mandatory fine of not more than $2,000, or both.

As a practical matter, it is inconceivable that such a violator would be retained in the Federal service; therefore, there would appear to be no reason to have a schedule of penalties based on the number of offenses committed.

IMMUNITY OF WITNESSES AND APPEAL FROM AN ORDER TO SUPPRESS EVIDENCE OR RETURN PROPERTY

Section 5 of the bill would add a new provision to the Internal Revenue Code providing that a United States attorney who feels that the testimony and other evidence of a witness is necessary in the public interest may, upon the approval of the Attorney General, apply to the court, requesting that the witness be instructed to testify or produce evidence. If a court order is granted to this effect, the witness cannot be excused on the grounds that such testimony or evidence may tend to incriminate him. Such a witness would be provided with immunity from prosecution based on such testimony or evidence as he may give under compulsion.

At the present time there is a divergence in the courts in the granting of motion to return seized property and to suppress evidence, and the Government cannot appeal from such an order. The bill would give the Government the right to appeal.

ENFORCEMENT

The bill would specify that personnel of the Bureau of Narcotics may carry firearms, execute and serve search warrants and arrest warrants, and serve subpenas and summonses issued under the authority of the United States.

Where violations of the narcotic or marihuana laws are committed in the presence of Bureau personnel or where such personnel has reasonable grounds to believe that a person to be arrested has committed or is committing such violations, the Bureau personnel would be permitted to make arrests without a warrant.

The bill also provides in section 6 that a search warrant may be served at any time of the day or night if the judge or Commissioner issuing the warrant is satisfied that there is probable cause to believe that the grounds for the application exist. This eliminates the present stringent rule of positiveness in the affidavit which now requires evidence that the narcotic drugs sought to be taken under the warrant are in the premises to be searched.

Metropolitan police officers of the District of Columbia would be permitted to receive and execute search warrants issued pursuant to the general laws of the United States. As the present time these officers are not considered to be civil officers of the United States.

IMPORTATION, ETC., OF NARCOTIC DRUGS

Section 7 would provide the same penalties as are provided in section 4 for traffickers for violations of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act. At the present time violations of this act call for the same penalties as now provided for violations of the Internal Revenue laws relating to narcotics and marihuana.

SMUGGLING OF MARIHUANA

At the present time smuggling of marihuana is punished under the general smuggling laws of the United States. Section 8 of the bill would amend the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act so as to provide a specific penalty for the smuggling of marihuana. The penalties would be the same as are provided in section 4 for traffickers.

UNLAWFUL POSSESSION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS AND MARIHUANA ON VESSELS

At the present time unlawful possession of narcotic drugs and marihuana on vessels is punished by a fine of not more than $5,000, imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both. The bill would amend these penalties so as to provide the same penalties as contained in section 4 for traffickers.

TERRITORIAL EXTENT OF THE LAW

Section 10 of the bill amends section 4774 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to clarify the territorial extent of the provisions referred to in section 4774 so that on and after the effective date of H. R. 11619 these provisions would not be applicable to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico unless the Legislative Assembly of the Commonwealth expressly consents thereto in the manner prescribed in the constitution of the Commonwealth for the enactment of a law.

EFFECTIVE DATE

H. R. 11619 would be effective on the day following the date of enactment.

Mr. Speaker, as long as we have one drug addict in the United States, we will have a very serious social problem. I believe that enactment of H. R. 11619 will be very instrumental in combating the illicit traffic in narcotics and marihuana and will be a big step toward the day which we all hope for when we will be able to completely eliminate this blight from our society.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 11619 incorporates the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Narcotics of the Committee on Ways and Means. The subcommittee held 15 days of public hearings in Washington, D. C.; Lexington, Ky.; New York City, N. Y.; San Francisco, Calif.; Seattle, Wash.; and Chicago, Ill. In its investigation and study, the subcommittee received the complete cooperation of the Departments of the Treasury, Defense, Justice, and Health, Education, and Welfare. The staff of the Bureau of Narcotics was particularly helpful to the subcommittee in its work.

The various technical provisions of the bill before us have already been explained in considerable detail. In general, the bill provides more severe penalties for violations; authorizes Federal enforcement officials to perform certain functions necessary to the apprehension of violators; improves the venue provisions of the present marihuana law; and makes available to Federal enforcement officials certain enforcement procedure not presently available.

This bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means. It has as its objective the eradication of one of the most serious social problems con-

fronting the American people today—the illicit trafficking in narcotic drugs and marihuana and their illegal uses.

This evil commerce in narcotic drugs and marihuana has devasted the lives of thousands of addicts and has deprived the affected communities and the nation of what otherwise would have been the addict's useful contribution to society. The existence of drug addiction has been described as a "social malignancy" because of the manner in which this dread affliction breeds its own furtherance and destroys those who fall victims of its compulsion.

A current estimate by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics of the number of persons addicted to drugs in the United States indicates there about 60,000 addicts, or an incidence of about 1 for each 3,000 population. It has been estimated that the high cost of illicit drugs requires that an addict spends from $50 to $100 per week to maintain his addiction. The average addict spends approximately $10 a day for narcotics and with an estimated 60,000 addicts in this country, approximately $600,000 is spent daily and $219 million annually for drugs obtained through illicit sources.

Mr. Speaker, the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means were represented on the narcotics subcommittee by my distinguished colleagues, Representative BYRNES of Wisconsin, Representative SADLAK of Connecticut, and Representative BAKER of Tennessee. I believe that the House should know that each of these minority Members has introduced legislation designed to implement the recommendations of the subcommittee. Again, I would like to emphasize that the pending bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for the able explanation of the provisions of the bill under consideration in this distinguished body today, H. R. 11619. It has been the chairman's leadership in the committee that has made such an important contribution to the development of this legislation designed to eradicate the illicit trafficking in the narcotics and marihuana.

In the closing days of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, Chairman COOPER appointed a Subcommittee on Narcotics on which it has been my privilege to serve as chairman. My colleagues on the subcommittee were the Honorable FRANK M. KARSTEN; EUGENE J. MCCARTHY; FRANK IKARD; JOHN W. BYRNES, of Wisconsin; ANTONI N. SADLAK; and HOWARD H. BAKER.

The principal purpose of the subcommittee was to determine the effect of Public Law 255 of the 82d Congress on the illicit traffic in narcotics. The subcommittee also obtained information and testimony on the barbiturate and amphetamine problem to determine the need for subjecting barbiturates and amphetamines to a type of control similar to that now applicable to narcotics.

The subcommittee in its work conducted 15 days of public hearings in Washington, D. C.; Lexington, Ky.; New York, N. Y.; San Francisco, Calif.; Seattle, Wash.; and Chicago, Ill. In addition, the subcommittee met several times in executive session to carefully consider the results of its investigation and to formulate its recommendations to the Committee on Ways and Means. The legislation before the House is the result of that subcommittee's work and the efforts of the full Committee on Ways and Means. My subcommittee colleagues, the Honorable JOHN BYRNES of Wisconsin, and the Honorable HOWARD H. BAKER, of Tennessee, have also sponsored legislation dealing with the narcotic and marihuana problem. Mr. BYRNES' bill was H. R. 11107, Mr. BAKER'S bills were H. R. 11155 and H. R. 11620.

During the public hearings conducted by the subcommittee, testimony was received from 108 witnesses including Federal, State, and local officials, medical and pharmaceutical groups, civic organizations, and interested individuals. In addition, a considerable amount of pertinent information was submitted to the committee for the record which has been carefully studied by the Subcommittee on Narcotics.

In the case of narcotics and marihuana the testimony pertained to the scope and operation of present law with its related effects on addiction, recidivism, probation, and suspension of sentence. A study was made of the trends in addiction with particular reference to the age of addicts. Trends in violations and sentences for a period of time before and after the enactment of Public Law 255 of the 82d Congress were also studied. It will be recalled that Public Law 255 for the first time imposed minimum mandatory sentences for narcotic violators. The subcommittee also considered recommendations as to the use of wiretapping in narcotic cases, cooperation by the Federal, State, and local narcotic officials, and other related views concerned with the narcotic problem. The printed record of the activity of the Subcommittee on Narcotics is set forth in the hearings of 1,633 pages and a subcommittee report of 33 pages.

The legislative record of the Subcommittee on Narcotics is represented by H. R. 11619. I am confident that with favorable consideration by the Congress of this legislation, the accomplishment record of the subcommittee will reflect a substantial curtailment in the illicit trafficking in narcotics and marihuana.

During the course of the hearings about the country, I believe the subcommittee membership was particularly impressed by three principal points. These are: First, the terrible nature of drug addiction, its destructive consequences on the individual, and its pestilential effect upon society; second, the difficulty encountered by enforcement officials under present law in effectively bringing about the apprehension of narcotic violators and obtaining their conviction in the courts; and, third, the fact that in judicial districts where the judges have a record of imposing severe sentences for narcotic violations, the traffic has either disappeared or is waning, and in judicial districts where leniency with respect to narcotic violators is the pattern in the courts, the illicit traffic is flourishing.

H. R. 11619 is designed to cope with these three impressions that were derived by the subcommittee during its study of this subject. Drug addiction is not a disease, but is a symptom of a mental or psychiatric disorder. Convincing testimony was presented to the Subcommittee on Narcotics that the most effective way of eliminating addiction was through the eradication of the illicit trafficking in drugs. By eliminating this unlawful traffic, we will be drying up the source of supply available to present addicts and will be greatly diminishing the likelihood of the creation of new addicts.

To accomplish the end of removing the illicit traffic from our midst, it was concluded by the Subcommittee on Narcotics, and by the Committee on Ways and Means, that improvements in present law relating to enforcement were necessary. Accordingly, H. R. 11619 will provide for, first, authorization for more effective searches and seizures in narcotic cases; second, authority for Federal agents to carry firearms, to execute and serve warrants, and to make arrests without warrants for narcotic violations under certain circumstances; third, a statutory method to grant immunity to witnesses in cases involving a violation of the narcotic or marihuana laws; fourth, the United States to have the right of appeal from certain court orders granting a defendant a motion to suppress evidence or to return seized property; and fifth, the strengthening of the applicable venue provisions so that venue in marihuana cases would lie within the jurisdiction in which a trafficker was apprehended as well as in the jurisdiction of acquisition.

Effective steps to eliminate the unlawful drug traffic requires not only vigorous enforcement but also the imposition of severe punishment by the courts. Prior to the enactment of the so-called Boggs Act in the 82d Congress, the average narcotics sentence was 18 months. At the present time the average narcotics sentence is 43 months. While the imposition of heavier sentences has done much to reduce the existence of repeat narcotic law offenders, there is a growing occurrence of hoodlums being recruited as drug traffickers. This arises from the fact that many courts have granted probation or suspended sentences in the case of drug violators with no record of previous drug convictions. H. R. 11619 would correct this problem by denying the trafficker the opportunity for probation, suspension of sentence, or parole.

With respect to the trafficker, the minimum mandatory sentences would be increased from 2 years to 5 years for the first offense, and not less than 10 years for a second or subsequent offense. Maximum sentences would be increased to 20 years and 40 years, respectively, for first offenses, and for second and subsequent offenses.

The increased penalties that are set forth in H. R. 11619, as described by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, are fully warranted by the reprehensible nature of the crime of abetting drug addiction by engaging in the illicit narcotic and marihuana traffic. In the past, the problems encountered by Federal enforcement officials in the fulfillment of their responsibilities have been aggravated by the early return of violators to the drug traffic. These Federal enforcement officials have found that by the time a gang of drug violators was apprehended, the case processed through the courts, and violators sentenced, a previous gang that had gone through the same procedure was out of prison and had returned to the illicit drug traffic.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the Congress act as promptly as possible to enact legislation that will aid in the enforcement of our narcotic and marihuana laws, and that will severely punish those individuals who are determined to be violators of these laws. H. R. 11619 would accomplish these objectives. It is for that reason that I support the enactment of this important legislation and urge my esteemed colleagues in the House to join me in this purpose.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Narcotics of the Committee on Ways and Means, I would like to express my appreciation to the many public officials and private citizens who cooperated with the subcommittee in its work. These people have selflessly lent their time and energies to the successful completion of the subcommittee's assigned task. I would particularly like to express my personal gratitude to the Commissioner of Narcotics, the Honorable H. J. Anslinger. Also deserving of special appreciation is Mr. Henry J. Giordano, who served the subcommittee as chief investigator, and who came to us on loan from the Bureau of Narcotics. Mr. Giordano worked in an extremely effective manner with the subcommittee in all phases of its work.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the House has just passed by unanimous consent a very comprehensive narcotics bill. This bill had been reported unanimously by the Ways and Means Committee by a vote of 25 to nothing. In my opinion, and in the opinion of the subcommittee which worked on this legislation for about 6 months, it is the most comprehensive approach to this problem that we have ever brought before this body, and I should like the opportunity to thank the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] for the splendid cooperation we have had, also the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], ranking minority member, and the members; also Mr. Anslinger, Commissioner of Narcotics, and all the other people and staff members who have cooperated to make this legislation possible.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON THE BILL

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the bill at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, passage of H. R. 11619 will provide heavier penalties for dope peddlers, and for persons in possession of narcotics. Such legislation has been long needed in our country.

There are about 60,000 dope addicts in our Nation today. These unfortunate persons have been led into a practice that can only be described as living death. Many of them are young and face shattered lives and early death because of the nefarious activities of "pushers" or dope peddlers.

This bill has firmed up the policies on imprisonment of these purveyors of narcotics. We have upped the mandatory minimum and extended the permissive maximums for first offenders. I do not think the degree of offense should be of major consideration in this type of traffic. The first offense may have cost the useful lives of hundreds of our citizens. Stiff penalties for any traffic in narcotics would be an effective means of curtailing the number of persons willing to risk capture to engage in this degrading crime.

I voted for the House bill as a step in the right direction. The Senate bill goes much further. I wonder if we in the House have taken maximum advantage of the opportunity to stamp out dope traffic by making the penalties so severe that criminally minded persons would shun it? The saving of thousands of lives every year would be worth millions to the Nation, in addition to being one of the most humane actions that Congress could take.

An illustration of the effective curtailment of the dope racket is the city of Seattle, part of which is in my congressional district. Two Federal judges in that city, Judges Bowen and Lindberg, have taken firm stands against narcotics violators and have issued stiff sentences to convicted peddlers. The drug traffic is considered one of the most profitable of crimes, but the penalties inflicted in Seattle have succeeded in making the business unattractive to the criminal element, and narcotics authorities agree that it is one of the cleanest port cities in the United States as far as dope peddling is concerned. They credit these two judges with keeping the traffic down to a furtive minimum.

One factor in the apprehension of narcotics violators on which we in the House have not fulfilled our duty is the necessity for telephone surveillance. This is called wiretapping in the vernacular and has been bruited around as a nasty word. By use of the telephone tap, narcotics agents can trace the activities of the behind-the-scenes "big boy" who directs the activities of his underlings from the safety and obscurity of a telephone.

We in the House kept this provision out of our bill because it was opposed in the Senate committee. I believe the public has faith in the Narcotics Bureau, and would like to see them have every weapon at their command to haul in these big shots who are masterminding this terrible, killing, depraved traffic in human destinies. Without peddlers there would be no addicts. I believe we have the obligation to carry this legislation further, if not in this session, early in the next, to include the telephone tap. The Bureau of Narcotics has stated that this device would be one of the greatest deterrents to dope peddling that could be employed.

TRANSFER OF DISTILLED SPIRITS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 11714) to extend for 3 years the existing authority of the Secretary of the Treasury in respect of transfers of distilled spirits for purposes deemed necessary to meet the requirements of the national defense, which was reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5217 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out "July 11, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 11, 1959."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, section 5217 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 now authorizes the transfer of distilled spirits between various types of producing plants and warehousing facilities when the Secretary of the Treasury deems it necessary in the interest of national defense. The section also permits the Secretary to temporarily waive the application of any of the internal revenue laws relating to distilled spirits, except those imposing the tax, in order to meet the requirements of national defense. However, the authority contained in section 5217 expires on July 11, 1956.

H. R. 11714 would extend the authority to make emergency transfers and to waive application of the internal revenue laws relating to distilled spirits until July 11, 1959.

While the authority to waive application of the internal revenue laws relating to distilled spirits is not now being used, the need for it might arise on short notice. The authority to make transfers between producing plants and warehousing facilities is being used to great advantage at the present time. There-

fore, it is desirable to extend the application of section 5217 for 3 years.

The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means and I urge its approval by the House.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 11714 extends for 3 years the existing authority of the Secretary of the Treasury in respect to transfers of distilled spirits for purposes deemed necessary to meet the requirements of the national defense.

Under present law, this authority expires on July 11 of this year. For this reason, it is necessary that the Congress act expeditiously in order that the pending bill may become law before that date. This bill has the approval of the Department of the Treasury and was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

MAJ. WALTER REED ET AL.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 5590, an act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Gustaf E. Lambert, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 2, line 5, after "filed", insert "with the Veterans' Administration."

Page 2, line 6, after "act", insert "and payment of any such benefits shall be made by the Veterans' Administration."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 430)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, submitted to me through its Chairman, covering its operations from July 1 to December 31, 1955, and describing, in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 20, 1956.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Annual Report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 20, 1956.*

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, last week I obtained a special order to address the House for 30 minutes today, which I would like to have vacated and I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on next Wednesday, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

NARCOTICS

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my word of pleasure at the passage of the narcotics bill H. R. 11619, introduced by my distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS]. It is many years since I first became aware of the terrible menace of narcotics addiction—many years since I started doing the little one person can do in such a vast sea of crime. Long ago I realized that unless the penalties for the illegal sale of drugs, especially to minors, were made much more severe there would be no surcease. These infamous people do not commit just a single murder, they are responsible for a form of mass murder directed most of all against women and young people. May I take this moment to thank my eminent colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] for his fine courage in bringing this bill to the floor. By its unanimous vote the membership of this House has shown its determination to do its full share in destroying this menace.

In earlier days the laws of Ohio were lenient and peddlers came in from other States in such numbers that the Federal Bureau had to double and treble its agents in our State. However, Ohio stiffened her narcotic laws and since then these ghouls have been less troublesome. It will be a wonderful day for America when we have cleaned out this menace.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight tonight to file an intermediate report, and any member to file minority or accompanying views, and that if such minority or accompanying views are filed today they shall be printed with the majority report; otherwise the majority report shall be printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume that the additional views and the majority views will all be printed together?

Mr. McCORMACK. As I have said in my unanimous consent request, if the minority views are filed in time with the Public Printer, they will be incorporated in one report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 73]

Adair	Durham	Prouty
Barrett	Eberharter	Richards
Bass, Tenn.	Gamble	Sadlak
Bell	Hoffman, Ill.	St. George
Blatnik	Kelley, Pa.	Saylor
Brooks, La.	King, Calif.	Shelley
Brooks, Tex.	Krueger	Sieminski
Carlyle	Lane	Taylor
Carnahan	Long	Thompson, La.
Chatham	McConnell	Thornberry
Chudoff	Morrison	Vursell
Cretella	Nelson	Wickersham
Davidson	O'Hara, Minn.	Wilson, Calif.
Diggs	Patman	Wolcott
Dodd	Patterson	Zelenko
Dowdy	Powell	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and eighty-two Members are present, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FARM LOAN PROGRAMS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 542 and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11544) to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, former member of the Committee on Rules; and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 542 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 11544, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers.

The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate.

H. R. 11544 authorizes the refinancing of existing indebtedness of eligible farmers on family-size farms if the borrowers are unable to meet the terms and conditions of their outstanding indebtedness and are unable to refinance through any other lending agency. The FHA is authorized to accept second mortgages for direct loans for this purpose, but not for insured loans.

Provision is also made, for the first time, to allow the FHA to make loans for real estate and development and operating expenses to part-time farmers, providing that they have depended on agriculture for a living for at least 1 year of the most recent 10 and are conducting a substantial farm operation at the time they make application for loans.

New authorization is added to make loans to bona fide farmers who are owners and operators of smaller than family-size units. The bill permits the use of normal market value as the basis for these loans instead of valuation on the basis of earning capacity. However, the loans may not be made to persons without agricultural background, or for the acquisition of a part-time farm.

Another provision increases from $7,000 to $9,000 the maximum amount of an initial loan for operating purposes and increases from $10,000 to $15,000 the total indebtedness for such loans that borrowers may have outstanding at one time.

A further provision increases the annual authorization for insured loans from $100 million to $125 million. However, the aggregate of refinancing loans authorized to be insured in any one year will be $50 million out of the $125 million ceiling proposed.

The authority to make economic-emergency loans under Public Law 727 of the 83d Congress is extended for 2 years from June 30, 1957, to June 30, 1959, and increases the aggregate amount to be made out of the revolving fund for such emergency loans from $15 million to $65 million. The repayment period of regular operative loans to farmers in disaster areas is extended by the number of years the area has been classified as a disaster area.

These are the major provisions of the bill. Section 3 of the bills contains general provisions to extend the authority of the FHA in adjusting and compromising claims, writing off or releasing claims and grants authority to appoint additional county committees where necessary.

Mr. Speaker, on my request to speak out of order:

Mr. Speaker, we have before us in the Rules Committee today the so-called school construction bill. That bill will be voted out tonight by a majority vote of the Rules Committee. It will doubtless be called up for consideration in a few days. It has been before the Rules Committee for some months. It was before the Education and Labor for something like a year, I believe, before it could be reported out. From that it may be observed that the bill is of a highly controversial nature.

It has been examined with great care by the Rules Committee as it was by the Committee on Education and Labor. The purpose of my remarks this morning is to express the hope that in the interval before that bill comes up for consideration on the flood Members who are really interested in the merits of the legislation will take occasion to glance at the bill and see what it is all about, because, in the press accounts, you have not had the real facts about the bill and what it does in the way of expenditures. I know there is a lot of controversy about the segregation question and the so-called silly Powell amendment, but I do not want to discuss that. I want to discuss the bill itself and just one or two features of it.

The first title of the bill provides for an appropriation of a billion six hundred million dollars for a 4-year program of aid to public schools. The billion six hundred million dollars is the figure that has been spoken of and what I thought, and what I imagine most Members of the House think, is the figure that is going to be expended. But when you get through examining this bill you will find there are three titles and the aggregate amount involved is $8,350,000,000 for aid in the construction of school buildings.

I pass over section 1 because if you are going to have a school construction program, it seems to me that title I is about as good as you are going to be able to get. The gentlemen on my left know that the President's proposal was one for aid where needed. But title I does not give aid where needed; it gives aid indiscriminately all over the country. I have no comment to make about title I, however. If you are going to have this kind of a bill, which I do not believe in and to which I am opposed, but if you are going to have it, that is about as good as you are going to be able to do.

Then there is title II, which involves $750 million of further aid in financing these projects.

Then there is title III, which is the one I want to call your attention to merely for the purpose of expressing the hope that Members who are serious about this thing and Members who are thinking something about the Treasury and about orderly, intelligible legislation, will examine that with some care. I am going to aid you in that task by pointing to the page and section numbers which show the things I have in mind and which demonstrate how utterly ill considered title III is.

Title III undertakes to set up a system to aid the States in financing their proportion of the amounts to be given for this worthy cause. Section 311, page 23, states:

Federal advances may be made pursuant to this title only with respect to obligations issued in the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1960, in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed $6 billion.

Now, what that does is this: That sets up a situation where the Federal Government is going to undertake to assist in financing $6 billion worth of obligations of the States in case the States cannot sell the bonds, and the Federal Government will undertake year after year to put up one-half of the money to, what they call, "service" those bonds, and to "service" the bonds they intend and say that the service figure shall include not only the interest on the bonds but the amortization figure on the bonds. That means that the Federal Government is to put up one-half of $6 billion to take care of the Government's share of paying the amortization of these bonds plus one-half of the interest, so that they can clean up the principal and interest. So that at the minimum you are going to spend, in addition to the $1.6 billion, $3 billion plus interest.

Now, what I want to particularly call your attention to is the draftsmanship of that title relating to the $6 billion. You will find on page 24 under "Administrative Provisions" section 313 (a) this very remarkable piece of legislation, and I hope the Members of the House will listen carefully. I will read it slowly, because I want you to understand it, and I am sure you want to understand it, at least those who are in any wise interested in the merits of the situation. It reads as follows:

The Commissioner—

That is, the Commissioner of Education—

in addition to other powers conferred by this act, shall have power to agree to modifications of agreements made under this title and to pay, compromise, waive, or release any

right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however arising or acquired under this title—

That is a type of legislation that I do not think I have observed in my experience here, where the administrator under an act involving this much money is entitled to give it away. And, there has been a lot of talk about it in the Committee on Rules. But, you cannot get away from the positive language of the bill, and that is the reason I read it with such care, in order that you may be advised on the subject.

Now, then, that does not end it. There is another little joker down there at the bottom of that paragraph. I will read it, and then I am through. Section (b) following that says this:

Financial transactions of the Commissioner in making advances pursuant to this title—

That is, the financial transactions; everything about financing—

and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government.

In other words, the effect of that is to repeal the office of the Comptroller General so far as this bill is concerned.

Now, gentlemen, if that is what you want to do, it is up to you.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman, with one exception, has stated the situation just about correctly. I would like to say to him that he is in error in his thinking, if he thinks that the Government under title 3 would be obligated for $3 billion or $6 billion. It is true that that $6 billion item is in there; but I offered to the Committee on Rules yesterday, when I faced them, an amendment that would strike out the $6 billion and insert in lieu thereof the actual Government obligation.

A preceding section of title 3 says that the Government shall assume one-half of the carrying charges of this indebtedness during the construction period. That is the 4-year period that we are talking about. The going interest rate the Government would have to pay for money is 2½ percent. Two and a half percent of $6 billion is $150 million.

I offered an amendment to strike out the $6 billion, which is the overall size of the construction program and to substitute therefor the exact Government obligation of $150 million. I am still willing, when the bill comes to the floor—and I am personally pledging myself to do so—to offer that amendment.

I am also offering an amendment, to answer the gentleman's objection, to strike out the section on page 24 that would take away from the Comptroller General and vest in the Commissioner of Education the authority to audit the handling of this money. I believe the gentleman will admit that I made that proposal to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] was very fair about the whole thing and freely admitted these defects in the bill, and I do not know what other defects there may be in it. But the gentleman is going to offer an amendment as an individual Member of the House. I called his attention to the matter 3 months ago when this bill was before the Committee on Rules and he then agreed that the bill ought to be amended. I suggested that his committee should take the matter up and offer a committee amendment. I asked the question yesterday, and the gentleman advised me that his committee has taken no action on it. Whatever the amount may be that is authorized, I do not know what the gentleman will offer in place of the $6 billion; but the servicing of this $6 billion debt includes not only the interest, but the amortization and it is so stated in the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman is correct in saying that he made this objection back in February when I first appeared before the Committee on Rules. I promised him that I would prepare the necessary amendments and submit them to the Committee on Rules. But they quit considering the school construction bill at that point and I never had the opportunity to get back before the Committee on Rules to find out whether the amendments were satisfactory.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman misapprehends the function of the Committee on Rules. We have nothing to do with amendments. It was just a friendly suggestion to help correct errors in this bill. That is the function of the Committee on Labor and the Committee on Labor has not offered any amendment up to now.

Mr. BAILEY. As a member of the committee I propose to offer the amendment on the floor.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say this; the latest figures that I have from the Department of Education are to the effect that the pupil load per teacher in the United States 20 years ago was 32-and-a-fraction per teacher. Today the figure is 26-and-a-fraction pupils per teacher, a smaller load today than it was 20 years ago, on an average all over the Nation. The only schools that are congested are those in what we call impacted areas and we have legislation on the books to take care of those. So, I advise the Members of this House to get the latest figures on the pupil load per teacher and not to accept these statements that there is a crowded condition in the public schools all over the United States.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, we have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit while the House is in session during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 516 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11040) to advance the scientific and professional research and development programs of the Departments of Defense, the Interior, and Commerce, to improve the management and administration of certain departmental activities, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and yield myself such times as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 11040, an amendment of the Classification Act. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], the ranking member of that committee, are present. As far as I know, there is no opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. I think the legislation involved here is long overdue and that it is essential that it be passed forthwith if we are to retain our leading position in technological development of our armed services.

I serve on a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee that has recently visited most of the airplane plants, and we were told of the shortage of engineers, physicists, and scientific people who are so necessary in the development of these newer instruments of war.

The Federal Government has always lagged behind private industry in paying adequate salaries to people in this category. It was less than 10 years ago that the ceiling of $10,000 for Federal

pay was broken. We have never been realistic in adopting legislation that would recognize the necessity for an adequate number of people in these higher brackets to operate the agencies of Government that have to do with the new weapons of war and with atomic energy.

Our scientific people, who must sit opposite the highly paid technicians and skilled people in private industry, find themselves at a disadvantage. As we develop these people within Government, they are siphoned off into private industry because they cannot afford to work for the salaries we give them. The few that have remained are devoted people who have stayed on because in most cases they have earned and have a certain interest in Government due to their retirement privileges.

I think this committee is to be congratulated in bringing out this proposed legislation. I congratulate the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], and the other members of the committee on so doing. I trust the rule will be adopted forthwith and that the bill will be put on its way so that we can keep the Government in the forefront in this important field so essential to our national defense.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to yield any time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11040) to advance the scientific and professional research and development programs of the Departments of Defense, the Interior, and Commerce, to improve the management and administration of certain departmental activities, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11040, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 13 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill represents a major change in the allocation and numbers of scientific and technical positions and positions in the highest three grades under the Classification Act. It will have a direct effect on all departments and agencies, but more specifically it will affect the Departments of Defense, Commerce, and Interior, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

It has become necessary, because of the increasing need for emphasis on research and development and the critical shortage of scientists and technicians to reappraise and bring up to date the law governing the number and allocation of scientific and technical positions. These positions are provided for under Public Law 313 of the 80th Congress.

At the present time there are 45 of these positions in the Department of Defense and 10 in the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

There will be an increase of 230 technical and scientific positions for the Department of Defense, 50 for the National Security Agency, 50 for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and the establishment of 35 such positions in the Department of Commerce and 10 in the Department of the Interior. These positions are all keyed to our national defense.

Those in the Department of Commerce will be allocated as follows: 23 to the Bureau of Standards, 2 to the Weather Bureau, 3 to the Maritime Administration, 2 to the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and 5 to the Civil Aeronautics Authority. In the Department of the Interior they will be allocated as follows: 5 to the Geological Survey and 5 to the Bureau of Mines.

These agencies, charged with vital responsibility for developing and maintaining a strong and effective national defense, are facing serious handicaps due to the lack of sufficient higher-salaried positions to attract and keep the necessary engineers, scientists, technicians, and administrators to carry out their programs with dispatch and effectiveness. This condition is especially evident in the fields of research and development. Requirements for the development of missiles and test vehicles for the expanded guided missile programs, for new nuclear applications, for many new types of combat and support aircraft, and for experimental ships of many classes have created pressing needs for the highest caliber technical and executive leadership.

It should be noted that there are two other groups of scientific positions that have been allocated under Appropriation Act riders. These are 60 positions in the Public Health Service—Public Law 195, 84th Congress—and 5 positions in the Department of Agriculture—Public Law 496, 80th Congress.

The second feature of this bill is the allocation to the Department of Defense of its own group of 285 positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the Classification Act in a manner similar to that already established for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the General Accounting Office. The net effect with respect to the Department of Defense will be that they will have an increase of 95 positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 and an increase of 201 positions in the technical and scientific categories, which includes 50 specifically earmarked for the National Security Agency.

The net effect of this bill, as far as the GS–16, 17, and 18 positions that are allocated by the Civil Service Commission are concerned, is that at the present time there are approximately 22 out of the fixed total of 1,200 available for distribution to the departments and agencies other than Defense. If this bill is approved, there will be some 290 positions available.

The Civil Service Commissioners will continue to allocate the positions for the top three grades in the Classification Act except for the Department of Defense, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the General Accounting Office, and the Library of Congress.

If this legislation is approved, we will then have the following pattern throughout the Government, taking into consideration positions in the three top grades of the Classification Act and positions allocated under Public Law 313:

Classification Act positions of grades 16, 17, and 18

Under allocation by Civil Service Commission	1,200
Department of Defense	285
Federal Bureau of Investigation	37
General Accounting Office	25
Library of Congress	29
Various agencies by special legislation	25
Total	1,601

Scientific and technical positions allocated under Public Law 313

Department of Defense	275
National Security Agency	50
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	60
Department of Commerce	35
Department of the Interior	10
Total	430

Scientific and professional positions allocated under appropriation riders

Public Health Service	60
Department of Agriculture	6
Total	65

Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize to the House that this is an urgent matter. I hope it will be acted upon promptly by the Congress in order that we can have a more effective and efficient top-level working force dealing with these important Government matters, particularly in research and development.

Our committee held very extensive hearings. Among those testifying were the following:

Hon. Reuben R. Robertson, Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Henry A. DuFlon, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Manpower, Personnel, and Reserve.

Mr. Leon L. Wheeless, Director of Civilian Personnel, Policy Division, Department of Defense.

Lt. Gen. Ralph J. Canine, Director, National Security Agency.

Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Director, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Dr. John F. Victory, executive secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Mr. Paul G. Dembling, legal adviser, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Mr. Robert J. Lacklen, personnel officer, National Committee for Aeronautics.

Mr. Carlton W. Hayward, Director, Office of Personnel Management, Department of Commerce.

Dr. A. V. Astin, Director, National Bureau of Standards.

Dr. Francis W. Reichelderfer, Chief, Weather Bureau.

Mr. Otis Beasley, Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior.

Mr. Thomas Miller, Acting Director, Bureau of Mines.

Dr. Thomas B. Nolan, Director, Geological Survey.

Hon. Philip Young, Chairman, Civil Service Commission.

Hon. George M. Moore, Civil Service Commissioner.

Our hearings fully documented the use that would be made of the technical and scientific positions. They include such positions as the following:

(A) Director of Guided Missiles, Office of Secretary of Defense;

(B) Chief, Guided Missile Development, Redstone Arsenal, Department of Army;

(C) Chief Nuclear Physicist, Bureau of Ships, Department of Navy; and

(D) Director, Rocket Engine Test Laboratory, Department of the Air Force.

With respect to the National Security Agency, most of us know what a very important part that Agency plays in our whole national defense setup. We received testimony from Lt. Gen. Ralph J. Canine, Director of the National Security Agency in executive session, and the committee was so impressed with the need for adequately compensating people who have devoted a lifetime to this very important area, that at the request of General Canine we increased the amount from the original submission of 35 to 50 of these positions.

We hope this action will settle, not only for the present, but for some time to come, the issues that have been raised with respect to the supergrades, or grades 16, 17, and 18. Appropriation riders and other provisions of special legislation have given certain employees or certain positions salaries or grades above that which their positions warrant. They have not considered these special grants in relation to all other similar positions throughout the Federal Government.

The Civil Service Commission will have approximately 270 additional supergrade positions to allocate. They have over 500 requests for the allocations of these positions. The Commission, in their testimony before the committee, estimated that about 50 percent of the requests would probably not be justified, so this indicates that, at the present time, if this legislation is approved, we would be providing positions adequately to treat all employees fairly and equitably.

The committee has included a reporting procedure in this bill which will enable the Congress to more clearly determine the manner in which these higher grade positions are being used. As far as the scientific and technical positions are concerned, we were provided with a detailed report from the Department of Defense identifying and describing the positions presently being occupied under Public Law 313, and those which it proposed to put under that authority. It is indeed an impressive document, not only indicating the important responsibilities of many of these scientists, but indicating as well that our country is doing an extensive amount of research and development directed toward our national defense.

The estimated cost of this legislation in increased payroll is $1,534,250 for the Department of Defense, $464,280 for the National Security Agency, $100,000 for the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, $21,200 for the Department of Interior, $151,380 for the Department of Commerce and, if all 236 positions are utilized by the Civil Service Commission, $644,000 for other departments and agencies, making a total estimated increase of $2,915,110 in annual payroll costs.

To sum up, may I say this—that this legislation presents a major readjustment of the positions in the Federal Government carrying salaries ranging between $10,000 and $15,000, both those paid under the Classification Act and those paid as scientific and technical positions under the authority of Public Law 313, 80th Congress.

In addition, the bill sets aside a specific allocation of 285 positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 for the Department of Defense in the same manner as we have previously provided them for the General Accounting Office and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This action makes available for departments and agencies outside of the Department of Defense 269 positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 which are presently allocated to the Department of Defense by the Civil Service Commission.

SALARY RANGES, SUPERGRADES

GS–16: $12,900 to $13,760.
GS–17: $13,975 to $14,620.
GS–18: $14,800.

Mr. Chairman, I may say that the committee was unanimous in reporting this bill. It is a very important bill and I believe it is essential to our national defense. All of us are fully aware of the acute shortage of scientists, technicians, and engineers. You can read Sunday's New York Times and you will see page after page of advertisements for all kinds of engineers and scientists.

In a statement recently released by the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. entitled "Are We Losing the Race With Russia," the critical shortage of scientists and engineers is shown. Let me read it to you:

It's the trend—shown in the chart—that is alarming.

Over the last 5 years we have turned out only 142,000 engineers, compared to an estimated 216,000 in Russia. In 1955 our output was around 23,000 compared to their 63,000. Over the next 5 years our projected output is 153,000, against at least 400,000 in Russia. There will be an additional 150,000 or more in the satellites and Red China.

In another publication recently released by the same publishing company entitled "How Critical Is It?" appears the following statement:

According to the best available information, from estimates by the Engineers' Joint Council and the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, the minimum need for engineers from graduating classes is 40,000 each year for the next 10 years. Last year we graduated only 23,000 engineers, just about enough to cover replacement needs without allowing for any expansion of the number of active engineers. Projections made by the United States Office of Education indicate that we shall probably not have a class of 40,000—the current annual requirement—until 1963.

According to Dr. Howard Meyerhoff, Executive Director of the Scientific Manpower Commission, there is now a shortage of about 20,000 scientists. Last year the number of doctoral degrees in the natural sciences, almost a prerequisite for research work, was only 5,000. Dr. Meyerhoff estimates that the shortage of scientists will rise another 30,000 by 1960.

We need more scientists and engineers in our defense setup. The provisions of this bill are certainly justified. Since there is no opposition to the bill on the part of the committee I hope it may be passed unanimously.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of my committee. I think this bill is very timely and one that should be passed by the House because I think it will strengthen the scientific research of our Government a great deal. It will mean a lot to us in keeping pace with the rest of the world in that regard.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for 285 additional supergrade positions and 375 scientific and professional positions. The passage of this legislation is of vital importance to the research and development programs concerned with the defense efforts of the Government.

The committee held 3 days of hearings and 2 executive sessions on the provisions of this bill. The deputy and assistant secretaries of the departments and the heads of the agencies concerned presented factual testimony and fully answered all questions in justification of the allocation of these top-salaried positions. Their allocations were considered in groups and by individual positions. It is believed that without exception each one of these top-salaried positions will be fully utilized in the carrying out of the activities necessary to the expanded and ever-increasing technological requirements of our defense efforts and other essential Government operations.

It want to make it clear that the positions authorized by this bill are of two types. The supergrade positions, with salaries ranging from $11,900 to $14,800, are to be utilized for top executive and administrative employees. The scientific and professional positions are to be utilized in the employment of engineers, physicists, and other technicians engaged in research and development activities. The salaries of this last group range from $10,000 to $15,000.

All positions authorized by this bill are subject to a complete review and evaluation by the Civil Service Commission. The Department of Defense is authorized to select the positions which will be recommended for both the supergrade and scientific and professional allocation. This allocation must, however, be approved by the Civil Service Commission before it can become effective. The

scientific and professional positions in the other agencies are subject to the same approval.

In addition to this control by the Civil Service Commission, the bill provides for reporting requirements, in which the departments and agencies concerned must report annually on the number of such positions in existence as well as those established during the year. This report must furnish the names of the occupants, the salary they are receiving, and a complete listing of their qualifications for such positions. The agencies must also furnish such other information pertaining to these positions as the Congress may require.

There has been considerable debate in this Congress regarding the allocation of supergrade and other top-salaried positions through special legislation or riders on appropriation bills. The committee, in reporting this bill, believes that with the additional positions authorized, there will be no further justification for any department or agency to request special treatment outside of the Classification Act.

The supergrade positions were created in 1949, with authority for 400. With the enactment of this bill, there will be some 1,600 such positions. This is an increase of over 400 percent. At the same time, overall employment in the Federal Government has materially decreased.

The scientific and professional positions were created in the 80th Congress, at which time I was chairman of the committee. The legislation at that time authorized 45 fully justified positions in the Department of Defense. With the enactment of bill H. R. 11040, there will be 495 such positions in the Federal Government. This represents an increase of over 1,100 percent. I firmly believe that these increases, even though large, are fully justified and that the requirements for specially trained and qualified top-civilian personnel in the Federal Government have increased, especially during the last 3 years and will continue to do so.

In detail, this bill provides for 285 supergrade positions and 230 new scientific and professional positions for the Department of Defense, 50 scientific and professional positions for the National Security Agency, 50 for the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, 10 for the Department of Interior, and 35 for the Department of Commerce. The action in regard to the 285 supergrade positions for the Department of Defense will release 269 such positions to the Civil Service Commission where they will be available for allocation to the other departments and agencies.

The Civil Service Commission has advised the committee that it has over 500 requests for these positions. They have indicated, however, that their experience has shown that only approximately 50 percent of the requests for supergrade positions can be justified. The 269 positions provided for by this bill should, therefore, take care of all justifiable requests for this type of position, including the 10 positions for the General Services Administration which were authorized by the House in a rider on the Independent Offices Appropriation Act and the 6 positions for the Immigration and Naturalization Service which were authorized in the State, Justice, and Judiciary Appropriations Act.

The allocations provided for by this bill entirely satisfy all requests for these top-level positions made to the committee by the departments and agencies of the executive branch. Each one of these allocations has been fully justified. There was no opposition in the committee to recommending favorable action on the provisions of the bill. I strongly recommend that the House give favorable consideration to its provisions and pass it without delay.

As a result, there are 660 high-salaried jobs; 285 are supergrade, all to Department of Defense; 375 are scientific and professor positions.

There are now 1,341 supergrades, 120 scientific, for a total of 1,461.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, we have listened to testimony concerning the problems involved in scientific research and development as they have been presented to the Committee on the Armed Services by the various branches of the armed services, especially by the personnel who were engaged in scientific research and development, as they applied to the Armed Forces. May I point out to the gentleman that many, many years ago there was founded the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics. I believe that was started in 1915, long before there were many airplanes used for military purposes. This illustrates how important it is to start early. All during the years the group of individuals on that committee have done a wonderful work, even back in 1915 when flying was new and novel and carried on by stunt fliers. Their wonderful work resulted in the development of practically all of the scientific contributions to the aeronautical field. This is important. The spark-plug in this endeavor was John Victory, who is still the executive secretary of NACA. So I want to congratulate the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], also the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] the able chairman of the committee, with whom the gentleman from Kansas has worked cooperatively, and I should like to join in expressing the hope that this bill will be passed unanimously.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, who is a distinguished member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Kansas. I want to commend him for his statement concerning this bill and say that I think most of the positions authorized are justified. Moreover, this is the orderly procedure for creating and allocating such positions. I have contended, as has the gentleman from Kansas, against riders upon appropriation bills creating supergrade jobs in the Government.

I do want to say, however, that I have always contended that the Government cannot compete with private employers, who operate on cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts in the matter of securing scientific and professional employees.

Let me also join with the chairman of our committee [Mr. MURRAY], in expressing the hope that we will not again in the near future be confronted with a similar request.

I want to reemphasize that the Government can never compete for personnel with those who hold cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. I repeat that this is the orderly procedure for providing supergrade jobs, and the bill also provides certain safeguards whereby in the future supergrade jobs must be justified by the various departments and agencies. That is a good feature of this bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I agree with the gentleman and I appreciate his contribution in respect to this proposed legislation.

One more thing, and that is this: I want to emphasize that this proposed legislation is the result of full and complete hearings on this question. I also want to reiterate, if I may, the thing that the gentleman from Iowa has just stated. We hope this legislation will prevent agencies from coming in and getting their supergrades approved in appropriation bills without having had hearings on the question of necessity for such positions.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. I realize that there is no particular glamor attached to it; no particular appropriation for any particular section of the country. But, I still feel very sincerely and very strongly that this is one of the most important pieces of legislation that we could enact in this session.

I am going to confine my remarks to one of the Government installations which will receive additional supergrade employees if this bill is passed, namely, the Ames Laboratory of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics which happens to be situated in my district. I work very closely with these people. I have found that their work is most important to the national defense. Ames Laboratory is developing basic research data which will result in the airplanes and guided missiles our armed services will be flying 10 to 15 years from now. The lag time between research and development, and actual manufacture is so terrific that we must, if we are going to win this cold war, be far ahead insofar as research is concerned. The Ames Laboratory represents an investment of $64 million of the taxpayers' money, but at the same time this great, terrific investment is not adequately manned with scientific personnel due to the fact that wages are just simply not high enough. During the fiscal year 1955 Ames Laboratory was only able to recruit 33 scientists in grades GS–5 to 7, principally because the salary offered by private industry

was too much higher. A comparison shows that Ames Laboratory could offer $3,410 for a GS–5 position and $4,205 for a GS–7. At the same time the aircraft industry was offering salaries for the equivalent of a GS–5 job of $4,860 and a salary of $5,940 for the equivalent of a GS–7 position. Not only was the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics unable to compete with the aeronautics industry on a salary basis, but they were required to offer less than State, county, and city governments were offering.

Unfortunately, this bill will not take care of the need for recruitment of new scientific personnel at the bottom of the ladder. The gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] and I are presently preparing a bill which would meet this very, very great need.

Though I wish the bill could go further, I am nevertheless supporting it because it does take care of the need for retaining our especially skilled and experienced scientific personnel at the top of the pay scale.

Mr. Chairman, let me give you an example of what has happened at the top of the ladder at Ames Laboratory. A GS–15 getting $12,150 has been offered 3 positions from private industry, 1 at $16,000 plus a $2,500 bonus, 1 at $16,000, and another at $15,000. A GS–15 at $11,880 has been offered a full professorship at four permanent universities throughout the country. He still stayed on at Ames Laboratory at a far lesser salary.

I have similar communications from the Atomic Energy Commission indicating that their need is as great and as acute as that of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

At the atomic bomb test last year at Yucca Flats in Nevada, I talked with many a scientist who could go into private industry and draw anywhere from $25,000 to probably as high as $50,000 per year. And yet they were living there, in the desert, under extremely adverse conditions, working for far less than $15,000.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making a very important and a very true statement. I can say from my own knowledge of the scientific personnel problem in the Atomic Energy Commission that while a great many of these people are staying on, there are a great many of them who are going into private industry at greatly increased salaries, sometimes double as much as they are getting and sometimes treble what they are receiving from the Government.

Within the last 2 years we have even had on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the experience of losing 3 or 4 of our valuable staff members who were in the $10,000 to $11,000 range and who have been hired at up to as high as $20,000 by private industry.

This draining away from the Government into private industry is going on all the time, and if something is not done to preserve the integrity of the caliber of the personnel in our Government functions, the more qualified, and perhaps the more adventurous type will go into private industry. And unfortunately we may have left the less qualified people in the Government.

I just want to say that I am in favor of this bill. I think it is a good bill. I know there is one problem it will not solve, and that is the inadequate supply of scientists and I hope legislation will be offered to cover that matter.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, his remarks are certainly valuable. That brings me to this point. How long can we expect our scientific and technical personnel to derive the full measure of their pay from a patriotic sense of accomplishment? I feel we should pay them what they are worth, just as private industry is paying them.

In the other body there is great debate presently going on concerning appropriations for the Air Force. Personally I favor a strong Air Force and will vote for it. I favor a strong national defense in every respect. This bill is an attempt not to provide airplanes today but to provide the brains which will develop the airplanes and the guided missiles which will be flying 10 years from now when the B–52 of today is obsolete.

This is an important bill. We have in our hands the ability to go ahead and win this cold war by providing the brains to do it, or we have in our hands the decision to remain behind and allow our potential opponents to go ahead of us.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], a member of the committee.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, this bill is vitally necessary and highly desirable. It is my own conviction that what good it does is not sufficient, but to do less would be highly disastrous.

We are asking scientists and technicians now to stay on as a patriotic duty. Many of them are doing that and continuing in their missions and projects, but some of them are finding that their families are suffering, that they are not securing the benefits that they should and, consequently, they have been forced to accept better offers in private industry. But even those who are staying should not be penalized because of their patriotic devotion to their duty.

Therefore, this bill should not only be passed unanimously, as I hope it will be, but it ought to be the forerunner of a study of just exactly what the needs of our various defense agencies are for scientists both in quantity and those who are experts in their field.

We all recognize that even some of the finest jet planes we have on order that are not yet delivered will be obsolete in a very few years and able to serve only as interim weapons as the guided missile program advances.

We know that the whole safety of the United States and the free nations allied with us may hinge on certain scientific or technological advances. If we do fail to provide ourselves with the means of keeping our leadership in the fields of science and research we fail in our fundamental job of protecting the United States and the people thereof.

Mr. Chairman, I believe and hope the Members agree that this bill should be passed unanimously, and that we should further examine the needs and proper desires of the agencies for more individuals to help us in this terrible job of defending ourselves against the Communist conspiracy.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) subsections (a) and (b) of the first section of the act of August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 715; Public Law 313, 80th Cong.), as amended, are amended to read as follows: "(a) the Secretary of Defense is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than 275 positions in the Department of Defense and not more than 50 positions in the National Security Agency, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions, relating to the national defense, military and naval medicine, and any and all other activities of the Department of Defense and the National Security Agency, as the case may be, which require the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel.

"(b) The Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for, in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, not to exceed 60 positions in the professional and scientific service, each such position being established in order to enable the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to secure and retain the services of specially qualified personnel necessary in the discharge of the duty of the Committee to supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of flight with a view to their practical solution.

"(c) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not to exceed 10 positions of a professional or scientific nature in the Department of the Interior, each such position being established in order to enable the Department of the Interior to effectuate those research and development functions and activities of such Department which require the services of specially qualified professional or scientific personnel.

"(d) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not to exceed 35 positions of a professional or scientic nature in the Department of Commerce, each such position being established in order to enable the Department of Commerce to effectuate those research and development functions and activities of such Department which require the services of specially qualified professional or scientific personnel."

(b) Nothing contained in the amendment made to such act of August 1, 1947, by subsection (a) of this section shall affect any position existing under authority of subsection (a) of the first section of such act of August 1, 1947, as in effect immediately prior to the effective date of such amendment, the compensation attached to any such position, and any incumbent thereof, his appointment thereto, and his right to receive the compensation attached thereto, until appropriate action is taken under authority of subsection (a) of such first section of such act of August 1, 1947, as contained in the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Subsection (c) of the first section of such act of August 1, 1947, as amended, is hereby redesignated subsection (e) of such first section.

(d) Section 3 of such act of August 1, 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) Each officer, with respect to positions established by him under this act, shall submit to the Congress, not later than February 1 of each year, a report which sets forth—

"(1) the number of such positions so established or in existence during the immediately preceding calendar year,

"(2) the name, rate of compensation, and description of the qualifications of each incumbent of each such position, together with the position title and a statement of the functions, duties, and responsibilities performed by each such incumbent, except that nothing contained in this section shall require the resubmission of information required under this paragraph which has been reported pursuant to this section and which remains unchanged, and

"(3) such other information as he deems appropriate.

"(b) In any instance in which any officer so required to submit such report may consider full public disclosure of any or all of the above-specified items to be detrimental to the national security or the public interest, such officer is authorized—

"(1) to omit in his annual report those items with respect to which full public disclosure is considered by him to be detrimental to the national security or the public interest,

"(2) to inform the Congress of such omission, and

"(3) at the request of any congressional committee to which such report is referred, to present information concerning such items in executive sessions of such committee."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments to section 1 and without objection the amendments will be reported and considered en bloc.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

On page 4, line 20, immediately before the period insert "or which may be required by the Congress or a committee thereof."

Line 23, strike out "consider" and insert "find."

Page 5, line 1, strike out "or the public interest."

Line 4, strike out "considered" and insert "found."

Lines 5 and 6, strike out "or the public interest."

Line 9, insert "all."

Lines 10 and 11, strike out "in executive sessions of such committee."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRUMPACKER: On page 2, line 13, after "exceed", strike out "sixty" and insert "one hundred."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee is still considering section 1. We have not yet passed on to section 2 of the bill.

The point of order is overruled and the gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered would increase the number of high salaried scientific positions authorized for the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics from the 60 provided by the committee bill to 100.

There has been a great deal of discussion in recent months not only in this body but elsewhere as to the relative state of our aeronautical technology and science and that of our potential enemies.

The National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics is the body on whose shoulders rests the ultimate responsibility of winning this technological race. Unquestionably whether we have better aircraft than our enemies depends upon the skill and ability of this group of scientists. Oftentimes their activities and their work is largely overlooked. The activities of the Defense Department, particularly of the services in testing and demonstrating the end weapons which have been made possible by NACA research, receives a great deal more attention and publicity than the activities of these scientists, who generally work, without any publicity at all, in their laboratories in the less glamorous field of pure aeronautic science. Before they have made the scientific breakthroughs, the scientists in the Defense Department and the engineers in the various aircraft manufacturing companies cannot and do not produce the weapons that for the present and forseeable future are essential to our survival as a nation.

NACA must lead the way, and if they are not effective and efficient in doing so we will ultimately lose this technological race. Because of the fact that their activities are not so well known, they oftentimes tend to be overlooked. I realize it will be argued that a greater number of these high-salaried scientific positions was not asked for by these agencies. My answer to that is first, that all such requests by directors of such agencies must clear through other agencies of the Government, such as the Bureau of the Budget. Frequently the desires of a particular agency get strained down in being channeled through the various Government channels on their way to Congress.

This is the first time in 7 years that this Congress has seen fit to deal directly with this question of the creation of adequate financial incentives for these highly trained scientific personnel. During that 7 years the workload in all of these defense agencies, particularly the workload of the NACA, has multiplied many times. From all present indications, it will continue to increase in the future. So, while 60 may be adequate for today—and as to that I am not in a position to argue with the committee—I do feel that if 60 is the number we need today, in all probability we will need more in the near future. Undoubtedly we will need more before the Congress gets around to acting on this subject matter again.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the Director of the NACA appeared before our committee and asked for only 60? Now, have any of these gentlemen indicated to you that they wanted more than the committee gave to them? We are simply complying with the request of these gentlemen in that regard.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. None of those people have come to me and indicated any dissatisfaction with the request, but for the reasons I have stated and the slowness of Congress to deal with these situations as they develop, and the fact that these responsible officials have to channel their requests through other agencies, who almost invariably cut down the requests, I do not think that is an adequate answer to the needs, not only the present but the future needs of this agency.

I would like to say that all this measure does is authorize the positions. If the agency does not need the positions at the present time, they will not have to fill them, but if they do need them in the future, this would permit them to fill the positions without going through the long and sometimes tedious process of trying to gain congressional approval.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CRUMPACKER was granted 1 additional minute.)

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do feel that the need in this particular field of pure scientific research is so great that we should not handicap this agency in any way, or tie strings about them that may block their possible expansion in the future.

After all, if all these posts were filled at the maximum figure permissible, it would cost the Government just an additional $200,000 a year. As against the billions of dollars we are spending on research it seems to me that this is a very small amount indeed, a very small investment to make in the future security of this country.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

(On request of Mr. HARVEY (and by unanimous consent), Mr. CRUMPACKER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. I was very favorably impressed with the reasoning back of the gentleman's amendment. I would like to ask him, because I know he has given a great deal of study to this problem, whether there will be competent and specially trained people to fill these positions, if authorized? It is one thing to have a position available; it is another

to have people with adequate skills and training to fill it.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I may say that they will certainly not be easy to fill. However, if this legislation would induce just a few of the highly skilled personnel who have left these special agencies in recent months to accept higher paying jobs in private industry, to return to the Government service it would have served a very worthwhile purpose. Certainly there is a great shortage of highly skilled scientific personnel. They cannot be just picked up overnight. Certainly over a period of years the personnel would become available; and, as suggested previously, I think this legislation may induce some of those who have left the Government service in recent years to possibly return to it and thus fill the vacancies. It should also induce many now in the Government service to remain and not accept offers from private industry.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, our committee in this bill has given the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics the number of scientific and technical jobs they asked for.

I have known Dr. Dryden, who is director of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and Mr. Victory, who is the executive secretary, for several years. Our committee has wholeheartedly cooperated with these gentlemen insofar as the jurisdiction of our committee is concerned. We gave them first the ten technical and scientific jobs that they asked for the first time. Dr. Dryden and Mr. Victory appeared before our committee in connection with this bill. Here is the printed testimony of these gentlemen before our committee. They asked us to increase the number of these excepted positions from 10 to 60 with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] says he has not been contacted by Dr. Dryden or by Mr. Victory or any other official of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics about this matter. Surely these gentlemen in charge know what they want, and we have given them what they asked for. Certainly they must have a sufficient number of technically skilled and qualified engineers, technicians, and scientists to do this important work.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. There was no contention made before our committee that the Bureau of the Budget had denied the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics a request for additional employees. Will the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Why, certainly.

Mr. GROSS. Has the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee had any word from Dr. Dryden or anyone else from the National Advisory Committee, since our hearings were held, asserting that the 60 extra pay jobs were insufficient?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I have not received any such information. They have been very fair whenever they appeared before our committee and we have never turned down any request from them about legislation. I know they are highly satisfied and well pleased with the action of our committee which gave them the 60 scientific and technical positions they wanted.

Mr. GROSS. If there are supergrade spaces unfilled under the control of the Civil Service, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics could go to the Commission and get additional berths if they could justify the need.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Yes, in these supergrades. They only asked for an increase from 10 to 60 in these scientific positions and we gave them exactly what they wanted. I do not see where the gentleman from Indiana has presented anything to the contrary.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Can the gentleman promise me that the Congress will deal with this subject again in less than 7 years if the need arises?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The gentleman can rest assured that if Dr. Dryden and Dr. Victory, officials in charge of the Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, come before our committee with a request, we will give them every cooperation. We have never turned them down. We are not experts in their field and we have to rely upon their judgment. We did so in this case and I appeal to you to vote down the pending amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care to inject myself into this controversy between the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member other than to say that in my opinion, the gentleman from Indiana has a very good point. The reason I take that view is because of an experience I had in 1945.

When the shooting war in Europe ended, a number of members of the Committee on Military Affairs went to France to look into the displaced persons problem and other problems. The gentleman now presiding as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole accompanied us at that time.

One of the things that I remember so very well, and I am sure every Member who was there remembers very well, was Nordhausen, one of the horror camps where the Germans executed thousands of innocent victims that were captured at that time. In going there we had to fly over a very high mountain, and as we looked down to the landscape below we saw that a railroad went into the side of a mountain and came out at the other end of it. Later we found that Hitler had an underground operation for the development and use of V2 bombs. No one knew anything about this until the Americans got into that underground area where the railroad was. He had extrusion presses there where these bombs were developed and built in great numbers. As a matter of fact, they shot many of these bombs from Amsterdam into London where they struck a large church and damaged an extensive area of that city. If Hitler had had one more month, just one month, it was our conviction then that England would have fallen and we would have been left alone to fight that war to its bitter and tragic end.

I mention that experience to demonstrate that the argument presented by the gentleman from Indiana has a great deal of merit. Why not leave the door open slightly so that if the scientists feel that they should have more scientific help they will be able to get it promptly? That experience taught me that sometimes we have to look a little further ahead than we can see at the time we make a particular decision. This may be a little beside the argument here, but I do think the gentleman's contention has great merit. That experience impressed me and it impressed every Member present. Thank God we got there in time and licked the enemy, otherwise Hitler might have taken away our major ally.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize what our chairman, Mr. MURRAY, has said with respect to this proposed amendment. That is, that Dr. Dryden and other officials of this organization appeared before the committee asking for 60 of these new positions, which we gave them. We took care of all of the requests of agencies that appeared before our committee.

Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment ought to be rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, a member of our committee. He is one who has studied this legislation very carefully.

Mr. GROSS. If we adopt this amendment we would be setting a precedent of saying to the various departments and agencies when they ask for an increase in personnel, if they say they want 100, give them 200 in anticipation that they may need 200. That is a very poor way to legislate, and I believe the gentleman from Kansas will agree with me.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I agree with the gentleman. One of our difficulties is to keep these matters from getting out of control. Here is a case where we were extremely careful to see that our defense was not injured in any way, and the witnesses were so convincing with respect to their requests that they were granted in toto; every one of them. Now, when we come to the floor of the House and offer an amendment to almost double it, it is out of order, in my opinion, and ought to be rejected.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Does not the gentleman realize that our defense has been injured in the last months and the last years during which the restriction set up in 1949 was in effect and before the committee and the Congress got around to dealing with it?

Mr. REES of Kansas. With respect to this particular agency, Congress did approve 10 supergrades more at that time than had been granted any other agency.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Back in 1949?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. And a great deal of harm has been done to that agency because of the personnel that was lost to private industry, because they could not pay comparable salaries.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So far as I know, this is the first time a request was made to this committee for the relief that is being granted under this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (69 Stat. 179; 5 U. S. C., sec. 1105), is amended—

(1) by striking out in subsection (b) of such section 505 "subsections (c), (d), and (e)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f)" and

(2) by adding at the end of such section 505 the following new subsection:

"(f) The Secretary of Defense is authorized, in accordance with the standards and procedures of this act, to place a total of two hundred and eighty-five positions in the Department of Defense in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by subsection (b)."

SEC. 3. (a) The United States Civil Service Commission, the Librarian of Congress, the Comptroller General of the United States, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, and the Secretary of Defense, respectively, with respect to those positions within the purview of subsection (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively, of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the appropriate authority, with respect to those positions under jurisdiction of such authority which are allocated to or placed in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (including such positions as allocated or placed on a temporary or present incumbency basis), under any provision of law (including any reorganization plan) other than the above-specified subsections, which is in effect on or after the date of enactment of this subsection, shall submit, so long as such provision of law or reorganization plan remains in effect, to the Congress, not later than February 1 of each year, a report which sets forth—

(1) the total number of such positions allocated to or placed in all of such grades during the immediately preceding calendar year, the total number of such positions allocated to or placed in each of such grades during such immediately preceding calendar year, and the total number of such positions in existence during such immediately preceding calendar year and the grades to or in which such total number of positions in existing are allocated or placed.

(2) the name, rate of compensation, and description of the qualifications of each incumbent of each such position, together with the position title and a statement of the duties and responsibilities performed by each such incumbent,

(3) the position or positions in or outside the Federal Government held by each such incumbent, and his rate or rates of compensation, during the 5-year period immediately preceding the date of appointment of each such incumbent to such position, and

(4) Such other information as the Commission, officer, or other appropriate authority submitting such report may deem appropriate.

Nothing contained in this subsection shall require the resubmission of any information required under paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection which has been reported pursuant to this subsection and which remains unchanged.

(b) In any instance in which the Commission, officer, or other appropriate authority so required to submit such report may consider full public disclosure of any or all of the above-specified items to be detrimental to the national security or the public interest, such Commission, officer, or authority is authorized—

(1) to omit in such annual report those items with respect to which full public disclosure is considered to be detrimental to the national security or the public interest,

(2) to inform the Congress of such omission, and

(3) at the request of any congressional committee to which such report is referred, to present information concerning such items in executive sessions of such committee.

(c) Subsection (b) of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (69 Stat. 179; 5 U. S. C., sec. 1105), is amended by striking out "The United States Civil Service Commission shall report annually to the Congress the total number of positions established under this subsection for grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule and the total number of positions so established for each such grade.".

SEC. 4. (a) The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(1) That part of the paragraph under the heading "Federal Prison System" and under the subheading "salaries and expenses, bureau of prisons" contained in title II (the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1956) of the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 273; Public Law 133, 84th Congress; 5 U. S. C., sec. 298a), which reads as follows: ": *Provided further*, That the Attorney General hereafter is authorized, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, to place three positions in grade GS–16 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949"; and

(2) Section 633 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 320; Public Law 157, 84th Congress; 5 U. S. C., sec. 171d–2).

(b) Positions in grade 16, 17, or 18, as the case may be, of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, under any provision of law repealed by subsection (a) of this section, shall remain, on and after such effective date, in their respective grades, until other action is taken under the provisions of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 as in effect on and after such effective date.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments, and without objection they will be considered en bloc.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

Page 7, line 17, immediately before the period insert "or which may be required by the Congress or a committee thereof."

Page 7, line 24, strike out "consider" and insert in lieu thereof "find."

Page 8, line 2, strike out "or the public interest."

Page 8, line 5, strike out "considered" and insert in lieu thereof "found."

Page 8, lines 6 and 7, strike out "or the public interest."

Page 8, line 10, after "present", insert "all."

Page 8, lines 11 and 12, strike out "in executive sessions of such committee."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, we have read in the newspapers today and yesterday and the day before of a visit made to Egypt by the Soviet foreign minister who recently succeeded Molotov, and we find in the news items the offer of the Soviet Union early this year to help finance a $1.2 billion project for harnessing the waters of the Nile, the Aswan Dam. We find that apparently conversations are taking place between Premier Nasser of Egypt and the Soviet foreign minister in relation to that matter as well as other assistance from the Soviet Union. We have read of Soviet offers of the same nature to other countries, and that raises in my mind a question as to what the policy of our country should be. Are we going to rush in, after the Soviets have made some kind of an offer, and make a bigger offer? Or are we going to call the turn somewhere along the line with reference to some of these large commitments?

The attitude and the action of the Soviet Union presents a serious question that our Government and all Americans must consider because, after they have made an offer and we have gone in and made a larger offer, they can then gracefully withdraw and say to the country who is to be the beneficiary, "See? We got America to do it for you." And then they get the benefit of it both ways. And in some cases we do not even receive the minimum feeling of gratitude.

There is a question whether the Soviet Union can go through with its commitments, but in any event, since such offers are made, the evidence seems to be that our country rushes in and raises the ante and offers more. Repeating the result is that the Soviets are thus permitted to back out gracefully but they are enabled to say to the people of, say, Egypt, or other countries, "See? We got you the offer from the United States. It is our action that has gotten you American aid and increased aid. It is we who are your best friends."

Since an offer came from the Soviet Union and the United States then comes in and increases the offer of aid, the whole benefit, it seems to me, redounds to the Soviet Union. No matter how it works out, we lose.

I have been a strong advocate of point 4 assistance. But I do not like this situation where the Soviet Union is moving in and then we come in after them with an offer of more aid, greater assistance,

larger loans; then they move out and receive the benefit of the appreciation of the beneficiary, while we get no benefit.

It seems to me that somewhere along the line, particularly in the case of large countries—of course, in the case of a small country, the Soviet could probably go ahead with their commitment—but in the case of a large country, or in the case of a large commitment such as that of the Aswan Dam, our officials should say, "All right, Soviet Union, we have been helping, we have been rendering assistance, we have assisted Egypt in the sum of so many tens of millions of dollars; if you want to come into this field, we are glad to see you do it." Then the issue would be put up to Nasser, because he knows in his own mind that the probabilities are that the Soviets cannot carry out their commitment.

It is getting to be humiliating for us to read of these events. I do not say that the administration does not have it in mind.

My remarks are not to be misconstrued. They are my own personal remarks as an American and in my individual capacity as a Member of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am not talking as a Democratic Member, but as an American. I think my few remarks here today pretty much represent the views of the great majority, if not all, of my colleagues, without regard to political affiliation.

It is embarrassing to have the situation in which this great Nation of ours is placed. When we give assistance, at least there ought to be a minimum amount of gratitude for it. We are doing it in our own national interest, but it is also in their national interest.

As I view the situation in Egypt, Mr. Nasser is confronted with a very acute economic question. His playing with the Soviet Union does not deceive me or my colleagues. No matter how strong he might become militarily as a result of Communist aid in that field, his basic problem is an economic one. I think in his own mind he realizes he cannot rely on the Soviet Union, because even if they did give aid they would exact from him attributes of the sovereignty of his own country in addition to other exactions.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What the gentleman is saying is that too many countries are playing both ends against the middle; that is, they are playing the United States off against Russia and Russia off against the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. That in plain language is a fair statement and represents my state of mind.

Mr. GROSS. I would hope, then, with that commendable statement from the gentleman, that when the foreign handout authorization bill comes back from the Senate with a greatly increased amount of money, the gentleman will join some of us in sending it to conference with insistence upon the figures in the House bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. My remarks are addressed to those who are administering our foreign aid, asking them to realize that there has to be a reappraisal in the light of the policy of foreign aid and in the light of our rushing in to give greater aid and greater benefits, with the result that the Soviet Union gets the full credit in those countries and all we find is an anti-American atmosphere.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I should like to congratulate the majority leader on what I think is a splendid analysis of the situation. I hope he will not object to my reminding him that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] and I have had resolutions introduced for some time to permit a reappraisal of our foreign-aid program. I mention this merely in the hope that the gentleman may see fit in his power and kindness to get those resolutions out for consideration.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am aware of those resolutions. If any action is taken toward the establishment of a commission, not to investigate but to survey our foreign commitments and actions in relation to mutual assistance, because I am sure no one would want an investigation, but rather a survey, I favor its being done on the legislative level rather than by a commission in the executive department. That is no reflection on the executive department. However, in a sense, such a commission would be investigating the very branch of Government that brought it into existence.

My voice is raised not as majority leader but as a Member of the House simply to show concern about the unfortunate position of our great country, that does not want one inch of land from another country. We are being placed in this position by the maneuverings of the representatives of the Soviet Union. Then our representatives try to outbid them. The Soviet Union is then permitted to retire gracefully without any commitment and say, "See what we have done for you? We forced the Americans to do it."

To me, that is humiliating and calls for some kind of clear thinking and affirmative action on our part by which we at least call the bluff of the Soviet Union.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, with respect to H. R. 11040, it is not news to anyone that the United States no longer has the tremendous lead that it once enjoyed in military strength, airpower, and international prestige. Other nations of the world have challenged our position and as they offered the challenge, have themselves begun energetically to work at the task of assuming a prominent role in world leadership.

Nor is it any secret that our Government is facing grave difficulties in obtaining the necessary key scientific personnel to keep pace with the requirements of modern-day warfare.

Our committee hearings on this legislation disclosed that inability to attract and retain competent top-level scientific professional, technical, and administrative personnel is one of the most pressing problems faced by the Department of Defense, the National Security Agency, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Private industry has found the necessity for such top-level personnel, and private industry is prepared to pay substantially higher wages than is the Government, under existing legislation.

Witnesses before our committee pointed out that although it is possible to keep key personnel when the wage differential may be 50 percent, that those people who are in key positions with the Government are devoted to their work and hesitate to change, when the monetary difference between what industry is paying and what Government is paying is not too great. But, tell a man with a growing family who wants to own his home and have a better car that he can go into private industry at 2 or 3 times the salary that he is receiving from Government and it takes a unique type of loyalty to keep him there.

And that is just what our departments of Government have discovered to be the case. The condition is particularly evident in the field of research and development. These programs have increased in size. They have grown more complex, and the demands are far more urgent. This bill is designed to help those departments of Government to attract and retain the talent which is necessary for the programs. They are not able presently to attract and retain these talents because of the shortage of higher level positions. This legislation would increase from 45 to 275 the number of scientific and professional positions in the Department of Defense under Public Law 313 as amended, provide 56 positions for use by the National Security Agency, increase from 10 to 60 the number of such positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics under Public Law 313, as amended, and authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish and fix the compensation for not to exceed 10 such positions in the Department of the Interior, and finally to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to establish and fix the compensation for not to exceed 35 such positions in the Department of Commerce, making a maximum total of 375 such positions. These positions would pay not less than $10,000 or more than $15,000 as provided in Public Law 313, as amended.

I would like to point out here very emphatically that these are positions in the classified Civil Service, and that the salaries thereof as well as the qualifications of proposed appointees will be subject to prior approval by the United States Civil Service Commission.

Now, in addition to those positions, one other section of the bill provides that the

Secretary of Defense may place 285 positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 in lieu of 236 such positions now allocated to that Department by the Civil Service Commission. The difference between 236 and 285 is a net increase of 49 such positions. This is done by adding a subsection F to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949. The 236 positions thereby released will return to the Civil Service Commission and be available for allocation to other departments and agencies of Government in accordance with section 505 of the Classification Act.

One further change is made with regard to section 505 by the enactment of this bill, as follows: Under section 505, as previously established, allocation of these so-called supergrades has been left exclusively to the Civil Service Commissioners in accordance with their determination of the needs. By the enactment of this legislation, Congress is saying that of the supergrades authorized 285 of them will be for the exclusive use of the Department of Defense.

The bill provides for a detailed system of reporting so that the Congress may maintain very close watch over the use of the scientific and professional positions. This is done two places in the bill—one on page 4, section 3, of the act of August 1, 1947, as amended, and again on page 6, where a new section of law is being enacted with regard to the reporting of supergrades by those agencies to whom they are assigned by the Civil Service Commission and by this act.

Insofar as the individual positions are concerned which are being filled by this act, each of them were detailed to us in the hearings, and in the opinion of our committee were fully justified. The day has come when, unless our strategic branches of Government can recruit and retain its key professional, scientific, and top executive career personnel, it cannot keep pace in this battle of wits, in this struggle for ideals, and in the campaign for military strength in which it is engaged in this day of democracies versus communism.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11040) to advance the scientific and professional research and development programs of the Departments of Defense, the Interior, and Commerce, to improve the management and administration of certain departmental activities, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 516, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is there a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

CREDIT FACILITIES TO FARMERS AND AMENDING BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11544) to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11544, with Mr. MACHROWICZ in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, the bill the committee brings to you today is an extension of the powers of the Farmers Home Administration in several different respects. In the first place, I should mention that this extends the period for emergency loans from June 30, 1957, to June 30, 1959, and it increases the authorization for such emergency or disaster loans from $15 million to $65 million—an increase of $50 million for the next 3-year period. It is perfectly true that the new period of extension does not start until 1957, but the present money is used up. The Department has advised us on several occasions that we should proceed expeditiously to provide additional authorization. The other body has made provision in the form of a separate bill. We have included that provision in this general bill.

Along with this extension of time and in the amount of money that we have brought to the House, there are several changes in the scope of the activities. We have for the first time made provision for loans to part-time farmers. It has become more and more apparent every month that a large portion of the farmers of America simply cannot make a living on the farm. More than one-third of all the farmers in America today find that they secure a major portion of their income off the farm. By that I mean a very large share of the people who till the soil in America find it necessary to supplement the income they get from their farm by work performed off the farm. That may mean they are engaged in a business of some kind or it may mean, and ofttimes does mean, that they are employed in industry in some adjoining community. But, in any event it means that the farms simply are not paying enough to make it possible for farm families to rear their families on the farms. In the past, the Farmers Home Administration has been restricted in its loans so that it could make no loan to any farmer unless he received the major portion of his income from the farm operation.

That automatically eliminated about one-third of the farmers of America, and generally eliminated those with the smallest income. We have felt that we should not open the door by inviting people who are now employed in industry or in business in town to go into the country and become part-time farmers, and thereby further aggravate the situation. But we found that such a large portion of the people who live on the farm have been depending on a job to pay their living that it makes it impossible under present regulations to finance their operations. The farmer who may have let us say 15 or 20 or 50 acres somewhere out in the country, where he might have made a livelihood in the past, but who now has a position in town is ineligible for a FHA loan at this time, even though he still lives on the same farm. So we say in this bill that if a man during the past 10 years has in any one of those years depended on the operation of his farm for his livelihood, even though today he is making a large share of his living working in town, we will be able to make him an operative loan to carry on his farming operation. We will be able to make him a loan for improving his equipment, his housing, and other activities that are related to his farming activities; but we cannot make him a loan under this bill to carry on a grocery business in town; but we will make him a loan to carry on his farming activities and take as security those farmlands, farm tools, housing, and other facilities that he uses in connection with his farming activities.

We then provide in this bill for a refinancing of existing farmers who are on farms of not more than family size, if the farmers are presently unable to meet the payments and conditions of their outstanding indebtedness and are unable to refinance their debts with commercial banks. But we specifically provide that this can only be done when the creditors of such a farmer are, if necessary, williing to so scale down the total indebtedness that the man, when refi-

nanced, will have security for the loan. In other words, we are saying that we are not going to refinance a man and still leave him owing more than his assets. If we did that sort of thing, all we would be doing would be bailing out the creditors. We would not be helping that man at all. But we are saying to those creditors, if a farmer is in such desperate condition because of a drought, crop failures, or low prices; if he is in such desperate condition that there is no way possible of being able to pay off his creditors, you get together, and if you will let the Farmers Home Administration take over the assets, take the liens, and scale down the debts, then we will let you step out, and we will carry the farmer. We think that is sound procedure. We think it is absolutely necessary procedure in a great many of the disaster areas.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield, certainly.

Mr. COOLEY. We have heard a lot of talk about the small farmers. I just want to suggest to the gentleman that it might be well for him to emphasize the fact that this agency deals only with small farmers, and that the provisions we are now presenting will be beneficial to the small farmers of America.

Mr. POAGE. Our chairman is exactly correct, as he always is. This agency, the Farmers Home Administration, deals only with what we call small farmers; the small family-size farmer, the farmer who cannot get commercial credit.

I know there are always questions asked about what is a family-sized farm. Let me answer it for you as best I can. A family-sized farm is a farm of whatever size is necessary to most efficiently use the labor and equipment of the family on the farm. That may well be vastly different in different sections of the country, depending on the type of agriculture, and it may be different for different farmers in the same neighborhood.

If the family group is capable of operating a farm of 50 acres with the employment of a minimum of outside labor, 50 acres is a family-sized farm for that family.

But maybe that family is growing tobacco, maybe they cannot efficiently handle more than 5 acres of tobacco or 2 acres without employing a large amount of outside labor. In such case 2 acres would be the family-sized farm for that family.

On the other hand, maybe a family is out in Colorado, where possibly the only way of making a living through farming is the operation of livestock. They may require two sections of land there or even more. Whatever it takes to efficiently use the resources of that family is what we consider a family-size farm.

We attempt in this bill to say that the United States Government is going to assist these families in continuing to stay on the farm. We say that "You have gone through hard times, you are still going through hard times, so it may be necessary to extend the period of your pay-out"; so we provide in this bill that there is an extension of the period.

The present law provides that none of these loans can be extended beyond 7 years, and I feel that that was probably a sound provision. I do not think that it is fair to any farmer or other individual to give him credit over a lifetime without any possibility of ever paying it out. So we provided a limit of 7 years. But in this bill we have said that if the farmer lived in a disaster area which has been certified by the Secretary of Agriculture as a disaster area, and if he has a sound reason for not having met his payments; if, in other words, in the eyes of the Secretary of Agriculture he is a meritorious case and is in a disaster area, the Secretary can extend his loans by the same number of years that he has been in the disaster area. In other words, if he has had only 1 year of disaster, then he may have an 8-year period; or if he has lived in a disaster area—and I know of some who have lived 5 long years, then he may add 5 to that time and he may have a 12-year payout.

We have also added in this bill to the amount that can be loaned. We have increased from $7,000 to $9,000 the maximum amount of original loans for operating purposes, and we have increased from $10,000 to $15,000 the indebtedness that the borrowers can owe at any one time.

Remember, the limits in the present law were based on values of about the year 1947. At that time $7,000 would buy a whole lot more equipment, would support a much larger operation than $9,000 will today. So we are actually squeezing down rather than extending the size of the operations these people can carry on. But we have said that we are not going to try to hold strictly to the 1947 purchasing power of the dollar.

I believe there is about one more thing in this bill that is deserving of attention. I hope you will understand it. We have provided here for the settlement of certain uncollectible debts. Our record in regard to the collection of these debts has been very excellent, far better than almost anyone would dare predict that it might possibly be. We have charged off less than 1 percent. But of course we have had 5 years of terrible searing drought in large parts of this country. We have had 3 years of terrifically low prices in this country and obviously some people are not able to pay out. Some of these loans were made purely upon the crop, but no crop was grown. Sometimes we took a mortgage on household chattels, the dishes, the wash pot, the cooking stove, and that sort of thing.

The Attorney General came before us and told us that it cost an average of $150 to collect one of these debts. He will not take them, I am told, unless they amount to $200. We felt it was ridiculous to spend that amount of money in an effort to collect a lesser amount, so we have authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise and to write off indebtedness of less than $150 where he certifies there is no possibility of collection and there is a meritorious reason for releasing the debtor. We think that is sound. It is true that the former limit was only $10, but the Government has been losing money in trying to collect something that we could not collect. Such efforts have accomplished nothing except to cost the taxpayers money. We believe this is the businesslike procedure and is what every big business in the United States does.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that covers the major aspects of this bill. I want to point out that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE] has probably a better knowledge of all of the details of this matter of credit than almost any member of our committee and I know he will cover any details I have omitted.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture dealing with agricultural credit, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has given you a good explanation of this bill. I would like to point out that this subcommittee had before it two major pieces of legislation relative to agricultural credit in this session. One has already been reported to the House and passed by the House. That bill dealt with establishing the legislative basis upon which units of the Farm Credit Administration could retire from their capital structure the capital subscribed in to them by the Federal Government. In that legislation we did not change the lending authority particularly of those units, but simply provided for a basis of retiring their capital.

In the bill which is before the Committee today we are changing substantially the lending authority of the Farmers Home Administration. These two substantial portions of the extension of authority have already been touched upon by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and they deal primarily with authorizing the lending to part-time farmers, both in the area of the refinancing of existing indebtedness and also in the area of operating loans.

In this bill there is new authorization because existing legislation does not permit the Farmers Home Administration to function in this particular field.

The second major provision of this bill deals with an authorization to the Farmers Home Administration to refinance the debt structure of a farmer when the debt is not related to that of refinancing any other function like the acquiring of additional land or the improving of buildings or something of that nature, which functions are already authorized in existing legislation.

I would like to point out to you that under the leadership of the chairman of this subcommittee we have dealt with approximately 25 bills presented to the committee by various Members of the House. We have tried to take from all of these bills that were presented to and referred to the subcommittee some of those provisions and bring them together in the bill before you today.

Now, in considering these various measures set forth in these various bills we have not gone the full limit, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has indicated, that was set forth in the bills as introduced. We have attempted to

put up some limitations, you might say, which we think, and are quite certain, will be helpful to the Farmers Home Administration in administering the provisions of the bill. We have not gone the full limit of some of the extensions of authority which were contained in some of those bills. But, out of this consideration we do believe we have before you today a bill which will meet the needs of many farm people. We do feel that in this field of part-time farm operators there is a need for lending for agricultural purposes. We have tried to hedge the eligibility of those farmers so that we are dealing with bona fide farm people. We have tried to make sure that we are dealing with folk who know how to operate a farm, and we are certain that we have laid down provisions which will mean that the ability of these farmers and the farm unit itself will be such that they can constructively be served, and we also believe that these limitations we have laid down will permit sound loans to be made and that the Government's interest in these loans is fully protected.

I would like to touch for a moment on this field of refinancing existing indebtedness. I think it might be said that this closes perhaps the one remaining gap in the whole field of agricultural credit and authorizes the Farmers Home Administration to deal with about every conceivable credit problem which might exist at the farm level. It is about the only field in which they have not had authorization previous to this time. They have existing authority under title I of this act to assist a farmer in rounding out an economic unit, acquiring more land, or improving buildings and to refinance outstanding indebtedness which might exist in relation to that operation if it seemed a constructive thing to do. However, they have not had authority up to this time to loan for the direct purpose of refinancing existing indebtedness without incorporating into that lending some additional feature like new land or improvement of buildings. This legislation closes that gap and will permit the Farmers Home Administration to make, on a long-term basis, loans which have for their primary purpose the consolidation of indebtedness in instances where the indebtedness structure is such that consolidation is constructive in the more efficient management of the farm operation.

That, to me, is a major step, and I want to emphasize it, because it will do what a number of Members indicated they felt should be done in this field of agricultural credit. The bill extends the lending base and an authorization for lending over and above what is permissible under the law in relation to land-bank loans which can, of course, be used for refinancing indebtedness and taking as security a real-estate mortgage.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I am very happy to see on page 2 of the report some mention made of long-term loans to orchardists. As we all know, when trees are planted, it takes about 8 years for them to produce. I wonder if the gentleman could comment on the wording on page 2 of the report.

Mr. McINTIRE. I would be very happy to, because the committee had this matter under consideration since interest had been expressed by Members of the House by bills introduced relative to the problem in areas where disasters had occurred, and this relates particularly to orchard loans, that in lending for the reestablishment of their orchards the time of repayment was not designed on the ability to repay from the reestablished portions of the orchard. Administratively I believe the Farmers Home Administration has been extending this repayment period for perhaps up to the second crop and from that time on payments would be required. It was the opinion of the committee that authority rested in existing legislation to extend the repayment period. So we placed in this report the section to which the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] referred, on page 2. It says:

> Consequently, if the purpose of the loan is to reestablish an orchard destroyed by the disaster and repayment is to be expected solely from the production of the orchard, the first repayment installment should be deferred until the income is expected from the reestablished orchard.

I am sure that it was the intent in our committee that this type of loan shall have established a repayment schedule which will fit the ability of that orchard to repay the loan rather than to have it short of the repayment ability of the reestablished orchard.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to state a situation and get the gentleman's views on it, knowing he is an expert in this field.

In my area we have had considerable drought over a period of years. By reason of irrigation, many farmers have done reasonably well; but the impact of a drought over so long a period of time on the dry-land farmer has been considerable on the farmer, the bank, and on the hardware dealer, the implement dealer, and others.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Some of my banker friends in certain areas feel, and I agree with them, that the FHA has not gone far enough in refinancing people who have been put in such desperate straits by the prolonged drought. The FHA apparently has been afraid that it would be accused of bailing out the banks and officials of the FHA seem to think that that would be unpopular. I think that sort of thing might be overdone; but the bank is an important institution in a community and it is not improper to help a farmer just because the banker and merchant are likewise helped.

My question is this: Under this bill, H. R. 11544, can the administrators of FHA do a better job in helping coordinate a man's indebtedness, helping him to meet his banking obligations and his obligations to other creditors and getting himself in a position where he can work himself out of the dilemma in which he finds himself by reason of abnormal weather conditions or other conditions which have militated against him for a period of years?

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I think I can answer that very frankly and say that in my opinion this will accomplish that objective. There are, of course, various disaster-type loans, but we shall not go into all of the criteria relative to those. But this proposed legislation will permit the Farmers Home Administration to go in and refinance outstanding indebtedness, either on a direct-loan basis or an insured-loan basis and permit a consolidation of indebtedness, taking as collateral security a real-estate or personal-property mortgage, whichever seems to be wise.

I think the answer is that this will do an effective job in that field. They have not had the authority up to this time.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that this legislation will fulfill, in part, the administration's objective of effectively developing our rural resources, particularly in areas of small family-size farms, by providing a better agriculture credit base.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE] has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to take any of the time of the committee, but I do wish to direct a question to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], who has rendered such an excellent public service in connection with this bill.

I have listened with great interest to what he has had to say and also to the remarks of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE] who has given us such an enlightening statement.

The gentleman from Texas will recall that in 1937, when the Bankhead-Jones Act was adopted, I was a member of the legal staff of the Department of Agriculture and took a great deal of interest in the problems covered by this legislation.

I remember sitting in the gallery the afternoon that the beloved Will Bankhead came into the well for one of his infrequent speeches to plead for the passage of that bill. I recall the contribution that was made by the gentleman from Texas, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], as well as the other senior members of the Committee on Agriculture on that occasion and subsequently.

We know that some mistakes were made in the early days of the Farm Security Administration in administering the act. I have been happy to see the improvements that have enabled us to profit by the experience of that agency.

One of the things that has distressed me however has been the loss of a sort

of crusading spirit, that sense of serving the people who need help at the hands of their Federal Government. But it was true of the Extension Service that at one stage its spirit seemed to lag. It was history repeating itself as economic problems tended to diminish. I would like to ask if the gentleman agrees that while we might not require a crusading spirit there must be something of the sense of idealism in human service if this program is to be made the vital program for the benefit of the Nation that it ought to be.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I think the gentleman's statement should cause me to point out to the House that not only did he take an interest in this program when he sat in the gallery in 1937 but he has taken a deep and very helpful interest in the Farmers Home program ever since he has been a Member of this House, and that has been a good many years. He has been one of the most helpful Members in trying to maintain that spirit of which he speaks.

The committee had in mind exactly the thing the gentleman is suggesting when we wrote this bill. We recognized, as I tried to point out a while ago, that one-third of the farmers of America are presently cut off from the benefits of the Farmers Home Administration because they are dependent upon outside sources of income for their livelihood. We recognize that there has been a change in agriculture, and that if we are to continue this program as one of service to the less wealthy groups of farmers we have to make some change in our program. We have tried to make it in this bill.

I believe you will observe that every change in this bill is intended to make the legislation of greater service to more of the small family-sized farms of America than it has been in the past. I think the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE] put his finger on it when he said we were closing up a number of the gaps that had heretofore existed. We see an evil and we try to correct it. We see another evil and we try to correct it. We have tried in this bill to close many of those gaps in the needed credit structure for the family-sized farms.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I appreciate very much what the gentleman has said in response to my question. I also appreciate what he said about me. I hope he will leave those remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I commend the gentleman from Arkansas for bringing out in such a clear way the point that in the last few years some of the heart has gone out of the FHA and because of that agriculture has suffered. I am not discounting, of course, the good work that has been done. I hope the passage of this bill and these remarks on the floor of the House today will tend to invigorate the administrators of this program, causing them to make a more aggressive approach to the problem. Regardless of this act, it will not succeed unless there is a disposition down in the Department and out in the field to do the job of helping worthy people who are in need.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I appreciate that very much. I think these are wholesome signs we have of a bipartisan legislative effort to encourage it.

I remember back in the old days when this program was being carried on to help family-sized farms there was a little school out in a rural section that had only 20 pupils. The teacher asked, "Who is the President of the United States?" Nobody answered. She said, "Doesn't anybody know the name of our President?" Finally one little fellow held up his hand and said, "Miss Myrtle, I don't know the name of our President, but Mr. Hanna is our Farm Security Supervisor." It was his tie to the Federal Government.

We all know, Mr. Chairman, of the threat to the family-sized farm. There are many evidences of concern over this trend and this bill embodies constructive ideas to arrest it. The Appropriations Subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has also assumed leadership in the movement, particularly in stressing the value of supervision of certain activities where this type of credit is supplied. Such supervision is not resented; it is welcomed, and is the key to the success of the program.

Another indication of interest is in the discussions in the Banking and Currency Committee pertaining to the problems of underemployment in certain rural areas. The problem of low incomes in these areas must be attacked on many fronts. I am glad that this particular piece of legislation is being advanced today as one method of dealing with a major problem.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 18 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, on March 8, 1956, I introduced in the House as did Congressmen HOPE, HOEVEN, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, H. CARL ANDERSEN, and perhaps others, H. R. 9843, a bill which would provide for expanding farm credit through the Farmers home Administration.

Since this program was originally set up under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act under title I and title II, the bill I introduced, H. R. 9843, was a bill to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes.

When the Committee on Agriculture considered this legislation, we held extensive hearings and the Department of Agriculture testified in detail as to the changes they wished to have made through H. R. 9843.

In order to bring to the House a bill that would include the changes that were made by the committee, a new bill was introduced which bears the name of our chairman [Mr. COOLEY] and is H. R. 11544.

The committee report was presented to the House on June 4, 1956.

While the changes are considerable, and the legal matter rather complex, the changes are not as full and complete as I had hoped we could make them, nor do they satisfy the Department in all the changes proposed in this legislation. In many cases they do not go far enough nor do they provide the FHA with the flexibility of operations especially necessary in drought or flood areas, or where other calamities have occurred.

I feel certain H. R. 9843 would have been better agricultural legislation but bow to the will of the majority of our subcommittee which handled this matter, and since the Committee on Agriculture reported the bill out unanimously, I support the measure and hope in the end the other body will make some additional changes which our committee seemed reluctant to make.

In discussing this matter I call the attention of the House to four suggestions made by President Eisenhower early in the 84th Congress.

In his message of April 27, 1955, he suggested:

First. That FHA be given authority to make loans to part-time farmers. This is being done in the bill I introduced and is also a part of H. R. 11544 that we are now considering. My own feeling is, and was, that this should have been considered and passed by the Congress during the early part of last year.

The second request made by the President in early 1955 was that money in addition to the regular budget be provided for extensive research—soil conservation, farm loans, and related services. This legislation, of course, would have required an appropriation, but no action was considered and nothing was done.

The third thing the President suggested in the message to the Congress in April 1955 was that funds should be provided for pilot programs to be conducted to secure information to aid the low-income group or type of farm. Here considerable data should be collected before outlining a definite program for such projects. We need this information, and here again this program should have been on its way over a year ago.

Finally, the fourth suggestion made by the President in his message to the Congress in 1955 was the authorization of $30 million for the Farmers Home Administration to be used in the operation of disaster programs throughout the entire United States, whether it was from a flood on the east coast, hail or cyclones in the Mississippi-Missouri Valley, or from freezes destroying fruit in the fruit areas. In other words, a general appropriation for disaster use in farm communities.

The major changes in H. R. 11544 are given on page 2 of our committee report, and I quote:

MAJOR PROVISIONS

(1) Authorizes the refinancing of existing indebtedness of eligible farmers on farms of not more than family size if the borrowers are presently unable to meet the terms and conditions of their outstanding indebtedness and are unable to refinance such debts with commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies, or other responsible credit sources

at rates and terms which they could reasonably be expected to fulfill. The bill authorizes FHA to accept a second mortgage for direct loans for this purpose, but not for insured loans.

(2) Authorizes FHA to make loans, for the first time, to part-time farmers. Loans authorized include those for real-estate improvement and development and loans for operating expenses. To be eligible, a borrower would have to be a bona fide farmer who has depended on agriculture for his livelihood for at least 1 year out of the most recent 10 and who is conducting a substantial farming operation at the time the loan is made. Such loans may also be made for refinancing but not for the acquisition of such a farm unit.

(3) The bill extends from June 30, 1957, to June 30, 1959, the authority to make economic-emergency loans under Public Law 727, 83d Congress, and increases from 15 to 65 million dollars the amount of money from the loan revolving fund which may be used for such loans.

(4) Increases from $7,000 to $9,000 the maximum amount of an initial loan for operating purposes and from $10,000 to $15,000 the total indebtedness for such loans a borrower may have outstanding at any one time.

(5) Authorizes the Secretary to extend the repayment period of regular operative loans to farmers in disaster areas by the number of years the area has been classified as a disaster area.

The report explains fully in the analysis of the bill the changes in section (1) real-estate loans; section (2) operating loans; section (3) general provisions; and section (4) economic emergency loans. Since these are given in detail in the report, I will not take the time of the House to discuss the analysis.

A great Secretary of Agriculture, William M. Jardine, Secretary of Agriculture from 1925 to 1929, said, and I quote:

> Could a farmer of the Pharaoh's time have been suddenly reincarnated and set down in our grandfathers' wheat fields, he could have picked up the grain cradle and could have gone to work with a familiar tool at a familiar job. And then, within the space of 20 years, the methods of crop production underwent greater changes than they had in the previous 5,000 years. At one stride, we covered ground where 50 centuries had left almost no mark.

True as the above quotation is—a statement made in the late twenties—should a statement of the same purport be made today, in this era of technological and scientific advancement, it would be more unusual and striking.

Assistant Secretary Earl Butz of the Department of Agriculture says that agriculture has made more progress since 1855, in the last 100 years, than in all recorded history. So, using a clock as an indicator, more would have been accomplished in the progress of agriculture the last 15 minutes than was accomplished in the previous 11 hours and 45 minutes.

Now carrying this allegory to our farmers, they would be turning out more products in 15 minutes, at the present time, than they would turn out in 11 hours and 45 minutes prior to 1855.

It seems to me that much of our legislative program for our farmers is still operating in the Dark Ages.

Since the late 1920's, the average cost of modern farm equipment for an individual farm has changed from an average of $10,000 to $40,000. It took four times as much to provide the equipment for a farm in 1955 than it did in 1930, yet we hesitate to liberalize our agricultural financial legislation to meet modern production progress.

In early colonial days in the United States, 85 percent of our population lived on the farm and were kept busy producing food for the population. Today 12 to 15 percent of our population live on producing farms and we have a 4 to 6 percent surplus of farm products classed as overproduction or surpluses.

How has such a tremendous production come about? Undoubtedly much of it is due to the fact that each farmer has, ready to use, 33 horsepower in the form of electrical equipment, tractors, or other power farming equipment. Compare this to the twenties when each farmer had 5.3 horsepower or to the 1870's when he had 1.6.

When farm tractors became equipped with built-in power takeoffs, this opened an entirely new type of farm equipment, such as cornpickers, balers, combines, sprayers, and so forth. When tractors became equipped with rubber tires, another great change in the course of agricultural production was instituted. The horse as a farm work animal was ready for extinction. The numbers decreased in 1924 from 23,285,000 to a little over 7 million by 1950.

With tractors equipped from the factory with power lifts, power takeoff, and rubber tires it was only a step further to the use of rear-engine tractor tool bar implements. The revolution of farm equipment had been completed and the number of tractors increased from 920,000 in 1930 to more than 4 million by 1950.

An agricultural statistician has stated that with the advent of the tractor the production of farmers in America in 1944 was enough greater than the average of 1930–39 to feed an additional 50 million people.

In 1930—USDA figures—man-hours to produce an acre of wheat were 5.77. In 1949, in the Great Plains area, man-hours had been reduced to 1.82 hours per acre.

In 1930, in the Corn Belt area, hours per acre to produce a corn crop were 6.9. In 1949, the State of Iowa average was 3.88.

The 1925–29 average to produce an acre of cotton was 9.6 hours. In 1949, in the Texas high plains, 6.5 hours.

Let us take a look at what has been going on in legislation during the same time that we have been making such revolutionary progress in production. The basic Agricultural Act, which specifies that the basic crops are cotton, wheat, corn, rice, tobacco, and peanuts, was passed in 1938, about the same time that agricultural types of farm equipment came into common use. And during World War II, with 20 percent less help on the average farm, the output of American agriculture was able to increase its production over 35 percent.

As we increased our production during the war, and continued to produce at a high rate in the years immediately following the war, we found ourselves with not only an outmoded basic Agricultural Act on our hands, but basic crops filling up all available storage space at a cost of over $1 million a day.

With the present understanding of our farm production and its possibilities, it is time, and indeed it is past time, that this Congress should take a look at our agricultural legislation, and it seems to me that we should immediately move toward a nonpartisan study designed to recodify present agriculture legislation and recommend a new type and kind of farm program that will bring into control and direction, not only basic crops as provided in the 1938 act, but bring into a complete, united, and integrated agricultural program all of our food and fiber production.

We should devise a program that will give direction to the progress new research and technological improvements are daily making in the field of scientific farming.

Such a program should strive to eliminate surpluses by finding and encouraging new uses for old crops so that surpluses will no longer plague our most basic industry.

And while doing this, we should not delay the promotion of our soil bank program in which we should not only provide for acreage reserve but a type and kind of conservation reserve to control and develop, conserve, and preserve the topsoil for the benefit of generations yet to come.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman and compliment him on the statement he is making. I wanted to make this observation particularly with regard to part-time farmers, because it has come to be a great factor in modern agriculture. In my own State in particular, I notice a report by the Indiana Business Review, earlier this year, in which it is said that 42 percent of the farmers of Indiana had substantial off-farm employment. This indicates that the farmer of 20 or 30 years ago who was a full-time family farmer, is not today. Many of these people are working in the nearby factories, and also carrying on their farm activities at the same time. In many instances they are just as good repayment risks as those who are full-time farmers. I think the recognition given to this development in agriculture is a commendable one, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HILL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, as one of the number of Members who introduced somewhat similar measures I am today, of course, very much in support of the bill before us. I congratulate our subcommittee on the fine work it has done on this report, and its chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], also the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE], for his effective work. I think he is an expert on farm credit matters.

The purpose of this bill is to liberalize farm credit. If this act is accepted and

passed I am convinced that it will be an unmitigated blessing to our farmers. It is a measure which in principle has been supported by our President, by our Department of Agriculture, and by our Secretary of Agriculture, who said in a recent speech:

When disaster strikes agricultural credit is urgently needed. If there is real distress farmers often cannot meet the standards of commercial credit; collateral is insufficient, terms needed for repayment are too long, and administrative costs are too great. It is in the interest of these farmers and the Nation's interest to help them get onto their feet. These farmers are good credit risks. I want to emphasize that, they are good credit risks, if the lender can afford to wait. Our Farmers' Home loan organization advanced many substantial loans to farmers who could not meet the standards of commercial credit, but their record of 9 years of operation is a 93-percent payout.

The major provisions to liberalize the farm credit law are as follows:

First. For the first time to give these ownership loans to all eligible applicants.

Second. To extend credit to part-time farmers.

Third. It would increase the funds authorized from $100 million to $125 million.

Fourth. It would authorize loans solely for refinancing where farmers are not able to get refinancing through private agencies.

Fifth. It would increase from seven to nine million dollars the maximum amount of initial loans and from ten to fifteen million dollars the total outstanding indebtedness.

Sixth. It would permit the Secretary to extend the repayment period to farmers in disaster areas. That is needed very much at the present time.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Utah was one of those who originally introduced companion bills to those of mine which had to do with these subjects and out of which has grown this proposed legislation. The gentleman exhibited his interest at that time. He has just mentioned the question of extending the term of repayment. While I am in agreement with the bulk of what is in this bill—I think it will do a lot of good—I feel personally very much disappointed that the extensions do not apply nationwide, may I say to the gentleman.

In other words, John Jones who just the other day in my community had 10 inches of rain dumped upon him and lost part or all of his crop, because he is not in a designated disaster area there is no way under this bill by which he can get an extension because that particular area does not come under the provisions of exceptions as outlined in the bill.

I cite local conditions in my district in Minnesota, but the same thing would apply to a farmer anywhere in the United States if his farm did not happen to be located in a so-called disaster area. I hate to think, and I believe the gentleman will agree, that we in the Congress would write general farm credit legislation and say in it that one of the important benefits would not be available to a farmer—regardless of his individual circumstances—unless he happened to have his farm located in a general disaster area.

As I have said many times before, I do not like sectionalism in national legislation. I want to see all farmers treated alike regardless of the section of our great land in which they live. That is the fundamental principle of our Republic and it should guide us in all legislation.

Personally, I do not believe that it is possible for us, in the brief interval we have for the consideration of such far-reaching legislation, to delineate either areas of need or areas of eligibility for benefits. That being the case, it is much to be preferred that the Congress make desirable benefits available on a general basis and leave something to the discretion of the administrative agencies in the way of determining who can be helped by our action. The county committees, the county supervisors, and the entire staff of the Farmers Home Administration are in a far better position to make such determinations than is the Congress.

The excellent repayment record of the Farmers Home Administration loan program, as the gentleman so well knows, is the best possible evidence of the integrity of the entire operation. I believe action by the Congress in making these extensions available on a national basis is fully justified in light of past experience. I do not believe any unnecessary extensions would be granted, and I believe the results would be beneficial to everyone concerned.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, agriculture, in spite of somewhat low prices and declining farm income of the last few years, basically is in a relatively sound condition. For example, the present market value of total farm assets is nearly $163 billion. This is only $3 billion less than the total of all farm assets in the peak year of 1955. Compared with total farm assets of $163 billion, total debt obligations of all farms is only 11 percent of the total assets, about $18 billion.

Also, only 3 out of every 10 farmers have mortgage debt obligations, and over one-half of all farms mortgaged are mortgaged for less than 30 percent of their market value. In 1955, according to the administrative office of the Federal court system, only 336 bankruptcies for the last 5 years have comprised less than 1 percent of the annual number of such proceedings. I believe these facts indicate the basically sound financial position of American agriculture.

However, certain storm warning signals are beginning to appear which make it prudent for us to consider legislation at this time to help good farmers who cannot obtain credit from private or cooperative sources. In 1955, farm owners borrowed $2.4 billion on farm mortgage security. This was 26 percent more than in 1954, and represented 19,000 more mortgages than were made in that year, also. Farmers in 1955 borrowed $483 million from the Federal land bank system and their 1,100 local farm loan associations. This was an increase of 59 percent in the amount of such loans over 1954. Also, $338 million of this money loaned in 1955 was new money borrowed—a 50-percent increase.

During the first 10 months of 1955, 498 production credit associations lent their farmer members some $1.1 billion. As you know, these associations lend funds obtained from investors in obligations held by the Federal intermediate credit banks.

You can see, therefore, that even those farmers who have adequate collateral and satisfactory credit ratings are beginning to borrow in increasing amounts and at an increased rate. The Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture, on the other hand, has had the difficult responsibility of extending credit to good farmers who for various reasons simply cannot meet the standards set by commercial credit institutions, including the local loan and production credit associations I just referred to. The cost-price squeeze that farmers have been experiencing since 1951 has had the greatest effect upon farmers who find themselves in this unenviable position. But as Secretary Benson said in his address of last October 15, before the National Association of Mutual Credit Companies at St. Louis, Mo.:

When disaster strikes in agriculture, credit is urgently needed. If there is real distress, farmers often cannot meet the standards of commercial credit. Collateral is insufficient, terms needed for repayment are too long, and administrative costs are too great. It is in the interest of these farmers—and the Nation's interest—to help them get onto their feet. These farmers are good credit risks if the lender can afford to wait. Our Farmers Home Administration makes substantial loans to farmers who cannot meet the standards of commercial credit. Their records of 9 years of operation show 93 percent of the principal repaid.

So you see, FHA borrowers, as they are called, in general are good farmers and they are good credit risks, provided they are given adequate repayment conditions commensurate with their ability to repay. But many FHA borrowers throughout the country are having extreme difficulty meeting their present obligations. Many other would-be FHA borrowers, especially among the younger farmers, are not going to stay in agriculture unless they can obtain FHA loans on more liberal terms than the Farmers Home Administration has authority to make at the present time. With these farmers in particular experiencing a great intensive negative effect due to the cost-price squeeze, it is essential that the terms of FHA loans be more readily adapted to meet their needs. Especially is this true in drought disaster areas such as those which were designated last year and those this year in Utah.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 11544 would extend the lending authority of the Farmers Home Administration with respect to real estate or farm ownership loans made under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and title II relating to production and subsistence loans of the same act, as amended.

With real estate values on the rise since mid-1954, it is becoming more difficult for the owners and operators of

small full- and part-time family farms to obtain credit to enlarge their farms through land purchases. In this respect, it should be noted that land prices have advanced more since 1947–49 than most other groups of commodities. The latest USDA reports indicate that as of November 1, 1955, values increased 2 to 4 percent in 31 States during the preceding 4 months' period alone. Likewise, with the costs of building materials, and so forth, on the increase, many of these farmers cannot build and maintain suitable family living quarters and other farm buildings which are necessary to a happy and successful farm operation.

The basic provisions of the bill are as follows:

First. Section 1 (a) would make farm ownership loans for improvements, including housing and other farm buildings, to all eligible applicants rather than just existing borrowers who obtained loans initially for the purpose of acquiring, repairing or improving family-size farms.

Second. Section 1 makes farm ownership loans to farm owners of not larger than efficient family-type farms, who receive a substantial portion of their incomes from farming. Heretofore, loans under title I have been limited to veterans, farm tenants, laborers, sharecroppers and others who obtain the major part of their income from farming operations.

Third. Section 1 would authorize such loans for the repair and improvement on those farms which at present are less than family-type units which constitute the residence of the owner-operator, if the income from outside sources, plus income from the farm, will warrant the making of such loans. Heretofore, farm ownership loans were limited to full-time family-type farms of sufficient size "to constitute an efficient family-type farm-management unit."

Fourth. Section 1 (d) establishes as the maximum amount of a farm ownership loan the fair and reasonable value based on the normal market value of those farms constituting less than family-type units. For a unit that is less than a full-time farming operation, factors other than the earning capacity of the farm generally influence its value.

Loans on full-time family-type farms continue to be based on the earning capacity of the farm. Loans will still be limited to not to exceed the fair and reasonable value of the farm less any prior lien indebtedness.

Section 1 (e) would also authorize the Farmers Home Administration to increase from $100 million to $125 million the aggregate amount of mortgages on farm-ownership loans which may be secured in any 1 fiscal year. Section 1 (h) would authorize the Farmers Home Administration to make and insure loans solely for refinancing existing indebtedness of farm owners of farms not larger than family size, who qualify for farm-ownership loans—housing and other farm buildings as well as real estate—under the expanded authority of section 1 of the bill. This subsection authorizes the appropriation of $50 million of the $125 million ceiling for this purpose.

This bill also amends title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, as follows:

First, section 2 changes the title of title II of the act from "Production and Subsistence Loans" to "Operating Loans."

Second, it amends section 21 (a) so as to limit operating loans for the purchase of livestock, seed, feed, fertilizer, farm equipment, supplies, and so forth, to farmers and stockmen who are citizens of the United States and who are:

(a) Operators of full-time family-type farms.

(b) Operators of part-time family-type units who during 1 or more of the last 10 years depended upon farm income for their livelihood, and who are conducting substantial farming operations if the farm unit is of sufficient size to produce income, which together with the income from other sources, will enable them to meet living and operating expenses and the amounts due on their lands.

This change is designed to provide credit to low-income and part-time farms and in that respect to implement the rural-development program now being developed in 50 pilot counties throughout the country.

Third, section 21 (b) of the present act would be amended to provide for a limit of $15,000 on the total outstanding principal indebtedness including accrued interest, taxes, and so forth, of operating loan borrowers. Initial loans may be made also in an amount not to exceed $9,000.

H. R. 11544 will, in my opinion, provide more liberalized and badly needed credit for farmers who cannot obtain such credit from private lending institutions for various reasons. Mr. Chairman, merely because many of our farmers cannot obtain credit from private lending institutions does not mean they are not good credit risks.

This is borne out by a March 29 reply I received from Mr. Robert B. McLeaish, Administrator, Farmers Home Administration, to a letter of mine written March 26. The purpose of my letter was to obtain answers to certain questions concerning the extent of FHA activities in Utah, and the repayment record of Utah FHA borrowers. The letter enumerates the questions and provides the answers in concise form, as follows:

1. What percentage of Utah farmers are getting their credit from the Farmers Home Administration?

We have been unable to secure statistics which would accurately represent the percentage of Utah farmers who are getting their real estate and farm operating loan credit from the Farmers Home Administration. In the past, when this question has arisen, we used as a basis the percentage of outstanding farm indebtedness owed to the Farmers Home Administration as compared to all principal lenders. We believe this would be a fair method of appraising the participation of Utah farmers in the loan programs of the Farmers Home Administration.

(a) Real estate loans: As of January 1, 1955, the Farmers Home Administration held 7.2 percent of the entire farm mortgage debt outstanding. This percentage includes, as a part of the Farmers Home Administration-held indebtedness, the insured farm ownership loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, even though funds for these loans are actually advanced by private lenders. The percentage of farm mortgage debt held by the Farmers Home Administration, calculated on the basis of insured loans being held by other lenders, was 6.7 percent on January 1, 1955.

(b) Farm operating and subsistence loans: On July 1, 1955, the Farmers Home Administration held 11.9 percent of the total operating loan indebtedness of Utah farmers. This percentage is based on the total indebtedness of principal lenders in the operating loan field, not including loans held by individuals, dealers, merchants, finance corporations, marketing agencies, similar lenders.

2. What has been the rate of repayment by Utah FHA borrowers?

As of March 31, 1955, borrowers owing farm ownership loan balances under title I of the act had paid 95 percent of the cumulative amount that had fallen due on their loans. As of June 30, 1955, borrowers who had received production and subsistence loans from the inception of the program had paid an average of 94 percent of the principal amount that had fallen due on their loans. The percentages for both of these programs are averages as of the particular dates for all borrowers, taking into account prepayments by some borrowers as well as delinquencies of others.

3. What percentage of delinquency has existed in the last few years?

The following table shows the percentage of delinquency of the borrowers owing balances at the dates indicated for the two loan programs:

Percentage of dollar delinquency

	United States total	*Utah*
Farm ownership loans:		
Mar. 31, 1952	5	10
Mar. 31, 1953	5	11
Mar. 31, 1954	5	12
Mar. 31, 1955	5	11
Production and subsistence loans:		
June 30, 1952	26	20
June 30, 1953	25	23
June 30, 1954	26	22
June 30, 1955	27	23

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Credit of the Agriculture Committee held extensive hearings on this bill. Its members labored long and hard to put together a workable bill comprising suggestions from many sources. Likewise, the full committee gave considerable attention to the bill. I urge its speedy passage by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute just to say that I want to congratulate the subcommittee on the bill that has been prepared and presented here today and to say that in my opinion the bill will be very beneficial to our small farmers. The bill was unanimously reported by the House Committee on Agriculture, it has the support of the Department of Agriculture, and I hope it will pass without opposition.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I attended the hearings held on this legislation before the House Agriculture Committee. I feel that this legislation is very beneficial to the small family-type farmers of our country and also to the young veterans who are just beginning their farming operations.

This bill, in part, should help in the credit situation. When the Wisconsin bankers made their annual trip to Washington, one of the members told me and other Congressmen that unless something was done to relieve the credit situation, the banks in his county would have to start foreclosure proceedings. These young farmers are doing a fine job, but unless the Government can take over the loans of some of these deserving young men, the banks will have to close them out. I am hoping that some of these fine young men will be able to refinance their farms through the Federal Government and thus continue farming.

I want to compliment our distinguished chairman, Congressman HAROLD COOLEY, and our vice chairman, Congressman BOB POAGE, for the wonderful job they have done in acting so promptly in this emergency.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON].

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, I, too, am vitally interested in this legislation and I think this will be of great help to the small farmers. I want to compliment the subcommittee that handled this legislation for doing a very good job.

I would like at this time to ask a member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE] a question. We had a very serious freeze out in the Milton-Freewater area last year in which nearly all of the orchards of that area were destroyed. From 90 to 100 percent of the trees were killed and those farmers are in a bad way in that frozen area. What they need is credit and that they be allowed to defer repayments on their loans until the orchards get back into production. Now, will this legislation do that for the farmers in that Milton-Freewater area?

Mr. MCINTIRE. In reply to the gentleman's question, may I say I believe it will. I also want to say that the subcommittee had before it the bill which the gentleman from Oregon introduced relative to this problem. We placed in the report accompanying this bill, on page 2, a provision entitled "Loans to Orchardists." If I may I should like to quote the following from that report as follows:

> Consequently, if the purpose of the loan is to reestablish an orchard destroyed by the disaster and repayment is to be expected solely from the production of the orchard, the first repayment installment should be deferred until income is expected from the reestablished orchard.

I believe it is the committee's intent, and this should be placed on record as far as the committee is concerned, that these loans should be made with a repayment schedule adjusted to repayment ability of the reestablished orchard.

I think that covers the point which the gentleman had in mind in the bill which he presented.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. It is my recollection that when the representatives of the Department appeared before the subcommittee we asked them if they did not have this authority and they readily agreed that they did have the authority, and we felt then that there was no use writing new authority in there. But, we told them to use the authority that they admitted they had.

Mr. COON. This then will establish the policy that they can use that authority and defer repayment until the orchards are put back into production.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(a) The following sections of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, are further amended as follows:

Section 1 (a) is amended by striking from the second sentence thereof the words "to assist borrowers under this title in making the" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "or insured for" and by striking the word "their" preceding the words "farming operations."

(b) Section 1 (b) is amended by inserting after the word "only" in the first sentence the words "farm owners," by striking the words "(including owners of inadequate or underimproved farm units)," and by inserting in lieu of the words "the major portion" the words "a substantial portion."

(c) Section 1 (c) is amended to read as follows: "No loan shall be made, or mortgage insured, unless the farm is a family-type unit of such size as the Secretary determines to be sufficient to enable the family to carry on successful farming of a type which the Secretary deems can be carried on successfully in the locality in which the farm is situated: *Provided, however*, That—

"(1) loans may be made to veterans or mortgages insured for veterans, as defined in section 1 (b) (2) hereof, who have pensionable disabilities, with respect to farm units of sufficient size to meet the farming capabilities of such veterans and afford them income which, together with their pensions, will enable them to meet living and operating expenses and the amounts to become due on their loans; and

"(2) loans may be made or mortgages insured to owner-operators who are bona fide farmers who have during one or more of the last 10 years depended on farm income for their livelihood, and who are conducting substantial farming operations on units which are less than family-type units, to repair or improve such farm units, and to refinance indebtedness of the owner incurred for agricultural purposes, if such farms are of sufficient size to produce income which, together with income from other sources, will enable them to meet living and operating expenses and the amounts to become due on their loan."

(d) The second sentence of section 2 (b) is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and inserting a comma and the following: "except that, for loans under either part of the proviso in section 1 (c) of this title, the certification shall be based on the normal market value of the farm."

(e) Section 12 (b) is amended by striking the figures "$100,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "$125,000,000."

(f) Section 12 (c) is amended by striking item (5) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a new item (5) reading as follows:

"(5) The principal obligation (plus the amount of the prior lien, if any, and fees and charges chargeable under subsection (d) of this section) shall not exceed 90 percent of the value of the farm as certified by the county committee pursuant to section 2 (b);"

(g) Section 12 (e) is amended by striking from the last sentence of item (2) the words "to carry out the provisions of this title, relating to mortgage insurance" and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "of the Farmers Home Administration and may be transferred annually to that administrative expense account and become merged therewith".

(h) The following new section 17 is added:

"SEC. 17. Until June 30, 1959, the purposes for which loans may be made or insured under this title shall include the advance of funds for refinancing secured or unsecured indebtedness of eligible farmers on farms of not more than family size who are presently unable to meet the terms and conditions of their outstanding indebtedness and are unable to refinance such debts with commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies, or other responsible credit sources at rates and terms which they could reasonably be expected to fulfill. No such loans shall be made to an applicant whose total indebtedness is in excess of the amount certified by the county committee to be the value of the real estate, less any prior lien indebtedness not to be refinanced, and the reasonable value of the applicant's livestock and farm equipment, unless the aggregate of the outstanding indebtedness shall be adjusted so as to be within such values. The total amount of loans insured in any one fiscal year under this section shall not exceed $50,000,000."

SEC. 2. Title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, is further amended by striking the words "Production and Subsistence Loans" in the title and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Operating Loans", and by the amendment of section 21 to read as follows:

"SEC. 21. (a) The Secretary may make loans to farmers and stockmen who are operators of family-type farms and who are citizens of the United States for the purchase of livestock, seed, feed, fertilizer, farm equipment, supplies, and other farm needs, the cost of reorganizing the farming enterprise or changing farming practices to accomplish more diversified or more profitable farming operations, the refinancing of existing indebtedness, and for family subsistence: *Provided, however*, That loans may be made to operators who are bona fide farmers who have during one or more of the last 10 years depended upon farm income for their livelihood and who are conducting substantial farming operations on units who are less than family-type units, if the units are of sufficient size to produce income which, together with income from other sources, including pensions in the case of disabled veterans, will enable them to meet living and operating expenses and the amounts due on their loans.

"(b) No loan shall be made under this section for the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program. No initial loan to any one borrower under this section shall exceed $8,000 and no further loan may be made under this section to a borrower so long as the total amount outstanding under this section, including accrued interest, taxes, and other obligations properly chargeable to the account of the borrower, exceeds $15,000.

"(c) The terms of loans under this section, including any renewal or extension of any such loan except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, shall not exceed 7 years from the date the original loan was made.

"(d) No person who has failed to liquidate his indebtedness under this section for 7 consecutive years shall be eligible for loans hereunder: *Provided, however*, That in justifiable cases, in areas designated under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1855), for agricultural assistance or where the Secretary has made loans under

Public Law 38, 81st Congress, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1148a), or under Public Law 727, 83d Congress, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1141a–1), where the Secretary finds that the inability of a borrower to repay his indebtedness under this section within 7 years is due to natural causes beyond the control of the borrower, the Secretary may extend or renew such loans to be repayable in not to exceed a number of additional years equal to the number of years the area has been designated for such emergency assistance or loans. The Secretary may make additional loans to such persons, if necessary, during the same number of additional years."

SEC. 3. Except insofar as they affect title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, the following sections of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, are further amended as follows:

(a) Section 41 (g) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Compromise, adjust, or reduce claims and adjust and modify the terms of mortgages, leases, contracts, and agreements entered into or administered by the Farmers Home Administration under any of its programs, as circumstances may require: *Provided, however,* That—

"(1) compromise, adjustment, or reduction of claims of $15,000 or more must be effected by reference to the Secretary of the Treasury or to the Attorney General pursuant to the provisions of section 3469 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 194);

"(2) compromise, adjustment, or reduction of claims shall be based on a reasonable determination by the Secretary of the debtor's ability to pay and the value of the security and with or without the payment of any consideration at the time of such adjustment or reduction;

"(3) releases from personal liability may also be made with or without the payment of any consideration at the time of adjustment of claims against—

"(A) borrowers who have transferred the security property to other approved applicants under agreements assuming the outstanding secured indebtedness; and

"(B) borrowers who have transferred their farms to other approved applicants under agreements assuming that portion of their outstanding indebtedness against the farm which is equal to the value of the farm at the time of the transfer, and borrowers whose farms have been acquired by the Secretary, in cases where the county committees certify and the Secretary determines that the borrowers have cooperated in good faith with the Secretary, have farmed in a workmanlike manner, used due diligence to maintain the security against loss, and otherwise fulfilled the covenants incident to their loans, to the best of their abilities;

"(4) no compromise, adjustment, or reduction of claims shall be made upon terms more favorable than recommended by the appropriate county committee established pursuant to section 42 of this act; and

"(5) any claim which has been due and payable for 5 years or more, and where the debtor has no assets from which the claim could be collected and has no apparent future debt-payment ability, or is deceased and has left no estate, or has been absent from his last known address for a period of at least 5 years, has no known assets, and his whereabouts cannot be ascertained without undue expense, may be charged off or released by the Secretary upon a report and favorable recommendation of the employee of the Administration having charge of the claim: *Provided, however,* That claims involving a principal balance of $150 or less may be charged off or released whenever it appears to the Secretary that further collection efforts would be ineffectual or likely to prove uneconomical."

(b) The first sentence of section 42 (a) is amended by inserting, after the word "county" where it first appears, the words "or area within a county", and after the word "county" where it later appears in said sentence, the words "or area."

(c) Section 43 (d) is amended by striking the words "as family-size farms."

(d) Section 51 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 51. The Secretary is authorized and empowered to make advances to preserve and protect the security for, or the lien or priority of the lien securing, any loan or other indebtedness owing to, insured by or acquired by the Secretary under any programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration; to bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or other sale or otherwise acquire property pledged, mortgaged, conveyed, attached, or levied upon to secure the payment of any such indebtedness; to accept title to any property so purchased or acquired; to operate for a period not in excess of 1 year from the date of acquisition, or lease such property for such period as may be deemed necessary to protect the investment therein; to sell or grant rights-of-way or easements over such property; and to sell or otherwise dispose of such property in a manner consistent with the provisions of section 43 of this act. Any advances or expenditures under this section with respect to any insured loan or insured mortgage shall be paid out of the mortgage insurance fund."

SEC. 4. Section 1 of the act of August 31, 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 999; 69 Stat. 223), is further amended by striking the figures "1957" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "1959" and by striking the figures "$15,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$65,000,000."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 22, strike out "the prior lien, if any, and" and insert "any."

Page 5, line 21, strike out "who" and insert "which."

Page 6, line 6, strike out "$8,000" and insert "$9,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on January 23, 1956, I introduced two bills, H. R. 8653 and H. R. 8654, to liberalize and extend farm credit operations of the Farmers Home Administration under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

In simple terms, these bills proposed two things. H. R. 8653, in recognition of the decline in net farm income in recent years, proposed to extend to a total of 10 years the repayment period on production and subsistence loans which is by present law limited to a total of 7 years.

H. R. 8654, in recognition of the same conditions together with a sharp rise in farm mortgage debt and tightening of credit in rural areas, proposed a new title V to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act authorizing direct and insured refinancing loans—including farm mortgages.

In considering the bill before us, I believe that it meets in large measure the intent of my bill, H. R. 8654. I am happy to see this done because there is throughout the Nation a very pressing need for this type of farm credit. I recall that when the House Committee on Agriculture held hearings this spring on my bills there was considerable interest in this proposal and I am most pleased with the action of the committee in accepting the basic principles of H. R. 8654.

However, I am personally quite disappointed with the failure to act favorably on my proposal to extend the repayment period on production and subsistence loans. Anyone familiar with agriculture knows that as a general rule those borrowers who have found it necessary to turn to the Farmers' Home Administration for production and subsistence loans were at the time they did so in a tight or even precarious credit situation. They had to be, to even be eligible for the loan; otherwise, credit would have been available from other sources.

Throughout my almost 18 years in the Congress I have always tried to consider objectively the problems of all farmers, regardless of whether they lived in the North, East, South, or West. I have fought just as vigorously for the beneficial programs farmers in the South wanted and needed as I did for those of immediate benefit to the farmers in my Seventh District of Minnesota. I do not subscribe to sectionalism or favoritism in farm legislation, or any other national legislation for that matter.

Now, however, we have a bill before us which proposes to make available time extensions on production and subsistence loans only to those farmers in the disaster areas. In other words, if a drought-stricken farmer lost his crop, or part of it, one year and his area was included in a designated disaster area, he would be eligible for a 1-year extension. However, if an average farmer in any other part of the country found that due to the general decline in net farm income he was in an equally serious credit situation, he would not be accorded equal consideration under the bill before us.

The bill before us is generally good and has as its purpose the relief of credit stringencies which have mainly developed because of the decline in net farm income. However, the proposed amendment to subsections (c) and (d) of section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act does not go far enough. By limiting its beneficial effects to farmers in the areas adversely affected by natural disasters, it ignores the problems of farmers in other areas who in many instances are equally in need of its benefits due to adverse economic conditions. In the final analysis, the whole purpose of the bill before us is economic in nature and I personally believe it would be a mistake to limit one of its principal benefits to sectional groups. A credit problem is just as important to a farmer regardless of its cause or its inception.

Let me further illustrate the inadequacy, and I may say unfairness, of the bill before us in this particular regard. As has previously been said, this credit extension feature will be of great value to farmers in the flood areas of the East and the drought areas of the West and Southwest. I note from the remarks of the gentleman from Oregon that some special recognition has been given in the committee report to the coastal areas damaged by freezes in the orchards. All of this is fine and it has my full and unqualified support; but it simply does not go far enough in my personal opinion.

In the area surrounding my farm in Minnesota, some of my neighboring farmers have had 10 inches of rain in the last few days. Some of them are no doubt now filing claims under their crop insurance. This year they have been flooded out; last year they were dried out. However, the little areas sometimes involving only a few sections of land have not been included in the disaster areas mentioned in the proviso in this bill and as a result they will not be eligible for the benefits of this extension.

I want to make that point clear for the benefit of the committee. There will be no help under this bill as now written for farmers in those isolated communities whose crops are damaged or destroyed by rail, flood, or drought because they are not in an officially recognized disaster area. As a general rule, the disaster designations cover certain counties. Someone has to make the decision as to which counties shall be included and which shall not. The line has to be drawn somewhere, and after it has been drawn by administrative edict the farmers on one side of that line will be eligible for the extension of their loans while those on the other will not. That in my opinion is sectional and therefore objectionable in national legislation of this nature.

By the very laws mentioned in the proviso in the bill before us we have recognized the special needs of the disaster areas and have made provision to meet them. Let us not make the very serious mistake of limiting the benefits of this otherwise very desirable legislation to those particular geographical areas.

One final point. In considering the liberalization of these so-called production and subsistence loans, please keep in mind that it is still discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture, and through him with the Farmers' Home Administration, to approve or deny requests or applications for such extensions. We are merely saying by law that they may be extended to 7 years under existing law, or to a total of 10 years if my proposal is adopted. This is especially important to many of our young veterans who started farming since World War II or Korea and have not built up sufficient reserves or equity to see them through present difficulties. By authorizing extensions to a total of 10 years we would not by any manner or means be jeopardizing the best interests of the Federal Government as a lending agency. As a matter of fact, from my discussions with employees, officials, and county committees of the Farmers' Home Administration, we might even improve the possibility of collections on some outstanding loans if the agency had the authority to extend some of these loans a year or so instead of throwing them into the delinquent column.

I had earnestly hoped that the Committee on Agriculture would recognize the need for this amendment and I so advised the committee when I appeared before it this spring to testify in support of my bills.

I feel constrained to offer an amendment to correct this inadequacy but will refrain from doing so in order not to jeopardize passage of what is otherwise a most desirable bill. It is late in the session and I would not want to endanger passage by creating a controversy here today.

However, I do hope the other body will take cognizance of the problem and correct the deficiency when the bill comes before them. That is why I am calling the matter to the committee's attention here today.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the other body considers this particular point when the bill is taken up. The balance of the bill is good and its provisions are necessary. If the other body takes appropriate action, I hope the House Committee on Agriculture will give the amendment the consideration it deserves.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE] or the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] several questions which I feel will be asked of me on my return to my district.

Under the bill we are making loans and taking care of the small part-time farmer by financing him to continue his operations. I have had a number of letters from farm operators in my district complaining about the part-time farmer, that he is causing some of the trouble of the regular full-time farmer. If we are financing the part-time farmer here, are we developing additional competition against the full-time farmer who depends entirely upon farming as his occupation for his income?

I am asking this simply for information that we may pass on to those who may have some objection to it.

Mr. POAGE. We cannot develop competition since we are not making any purchase loans under this provision. Therefore, we cannot bring new people into the picture. We limit these loans to farmers who have in the past depended upon agriculture for their livelihood. Consequently we are not financing the man who is simply going out from industry or business and setting himself up as a farmer. We are making loans only to continue the farming operations of those who have heretofore been engaged in farming and have been dependent upon farming for their livelihood. We think that is a reasonable limitation.

Mr. BOW. Do I correctly understand that anyone who in the last 10 years has had 1 year in which he received the greater portion of his income from farming is eligible, so that we are over a period of 10 years picking up someone and financing him to go back into farming?

Mr. POAGE. That is true, provided he meets a large number of other requirements, such as that the loan can be made or the mortgage insured only to owner-operators who are at the time bona fide operators and who are conducting substantial farming operations. By that, of course, we mean those who are doing a substantial amount of marketing.

Mr. BOW. Who makes the determination as to that?

Mr. POAGE. The Department of Agriculture makes it. Of course, that in effect means the local committee will make it.

Mr. BOW. The local committee will do that?

Mr. POAGE. Yes. We make all those limitations in addition to the fact that the borrower has to have within the past 10 years been dependent upon agriculture for his livelihood.

Mr. BOW. Let us assume we have a man back from Korea who has gone into farming. He, of course, has not been there for 10 years. Is he eligible for this loan if he is in trouble?

Mr. POAGE. Provided that for at least 1 year he has depended on that farm for his livelihood. If he just comes back from Korea today and has a job with the General Tire & Rubber Co. and is drawing $400 a month in salary, and buys a residence at the edge of town and puts in a dozen tomato plants, he does not qualify.

Mr. BOW. I am talking about the men we have had come back from Korea during the past 3 years who have gone into farming and are caught in this squeeze. Are they eligible for this, even if they have not been there for 10 years?

Mr. POAGE. I thought we were quite liberal in the definition of a man who had been a farmer in that we required him only to show in addition to that fact, the further fact that he is a bona fide operator at the present time and that his operations are substantial; that is, that he depends upon them for some appreciable part of his income. Then we require that he show that sometime during the past 10 years he was dependent for his livelihood on those operations. We did not say that it was sufficient to show that he received even the major part of his livelihood from the farm, but during one of those years he must have been dependent upon farming operations for his income.

Mr. BOW. The great Committee on Agriculture of the House has studied this, and they do not feel that by the adoption of this legislation we are creating any additional burden on the regular full-time farmer?

Mr. POAGE. We do not think so. We were much disturbed and fearful about that possibility, just as the gentleman from Ohio is, but we think we have so limited the new credit that we will not create new competition. We are simply trying to keep those people farming who have tried to make farming their major activity, and we are giving no aid or comfort to those who are trying to push into the farming field on a part-time basis.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to ask the gentleman from Texas another question. I notice on page 3 of the bill, the section beginning on line 22, reads as follows:

> (5) The principal obligation (plus the amount of any fees and charges chargeable under subsection (d) of this section) shall not exceed 90 percent of the value of the farm as certified by the county committee pursuant to section 2 (b).

Does that contemplate that loans up to 90 percent of the value of the farm, as

certified by the county committee, may be granted?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, that is what it means. Direct loans are made for 100 percent. This means if they are insured loans, they cannot exceed 90 percent.

Mr. JONAS. That is not 90 percent of the fair value of the farm, but 90 percent of the value certified by a committee. Does the committee undertake to determine the fair value of the farm?

Mr. POAGE. That committee is limited on what it can certify on the basis of the agricultural value. As you will find in existing law, the committee is limited in making its appraisal to what we call the agricultural value, and that means the reasonable anticipated income that can be made from the farm.

Mr. JONAS. But, it would not involve then a loan of 90 percent of the market value of the farm.

Mr. POAGE. Not necessarily. It might, however. It might exceed or it might be less. We have found in times of inflated values that ordinarily your agricultural value is somewhat less than your market value because people will pay a speculative price for land. Of course, in times of deflation you sometimes will find the reverse taking place. At the present time, I think, it clearly means it would not go as high as your market value.

Mr. JONAS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Are there any further amendments? If not, under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MACHROWICZ, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11544) to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Tenant Act, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 542, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM TO ALLEVIATE CONDITIONS OF EXCESSIVE UNEMPLOYMENT IN ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas.

My original bill, H. R. 7857, on this same subject was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House because of a tax-raising provision which is not in this new bill, and extensive hearings were conducted and concluded by the Senate Labor and Education Committee, both in Washington and in some of the areas including my district. The hearings were taken place in Wilkes-Barre, where the problem sought to be relieved by the bill exists. The need for this type of legislation, was conclusively established by the hearings. Many constructive suggestions for the improvement of the bill were also received. As a result of the hearings, therefore, the desirability of certain changes in the original bill became apparent, and this amendment in the nature of a substitute was drafted to meet those needs and suggestions.

Under this bill which was originally called the depressed areas bill, it now will be entitled "The Area Redevelopment Act." It will establish programs not only to help relieve chronic unemployment in areas of excessive underemployment. The purpose of the bill, of course, is to help all these areas help themselves.

The bill provides for closer cooperation by Government agencies and private industry in the effort to work out a real solution to this problem.

As it became apparent that the problem is not one of mere unemployment, but also underemployment, we have brought these two factors together in the amended bill by authorizing the Administrator to denominate and assist industrial redevelopment areas and rural redevelopment areas as well. Definitions of these areas are now more clearly spelled out and expanded.

Uses of the loans to be made upon recommendation of the local committees have been enlarged to include those things—land, buildings, and machinery—found to be necessary for the communities to do the job of relieving unemployment and underemployment.

Local financial participation is required.

Assistance to public facilities has been retained in the amended bill both by loans and grants. The loan funds have been set up on a revolving basis.

Additional safeguards have been included in the revised bill to prevent migration of industry or transfer of work by a borrower from one area to another which would have the effect of merely shifting unemployment from one section of the country to another.

Retraining subsistence payments have been authorized in place of extended unemployment compensation.

The problems of areas of chronic unemployment and underemployment are still very much present. Current labor statistics show little, if any, real change in employment in these areas from that existing 1 year ago. Efforts of these areas, unsuccessful in large part, to solve their own problems were graphically exhibited to the Senate Labor Subcommittee, and representatives from the areas vividly described the need for legislation of this type to bring a real solution to their problems. The recent layoffs in the auto and farm machinery manufacturing industries will substantially aggravate the problems, as many of the individuals affected had originally migrated into these more prosperous industrial areas and now must return to their homes in economically plagued areas.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to help these needy areas pull themselves up by a little more than their own bootstraps. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, despite the lateness of the session, that Congress will recognize the need and will find that this revised bill is a constructive way to help these areas and will take favorable action on this legislation.

The following is a digest of bill H. R. 11715:

1. PURPOSE

To provide assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in areas needing redevelopment to enable them to expand and adjust their productive activity to alleviate excessive unemployment and underemployment within such areas by providing new employment opportunities and developing and expanding existing facilities and resources without reducing employment in other areas of the United States.

2. ORGANIZATION

1. Creates Area Redevelopment Administration with Administrator.

2. Creates Advisory Committees—meet twice a year—to assist Administrator.

(a) Government Advisory Committee consisting of heads of major Federal bureaus.

(b) National Public Advisory Committee consisting of heads of business, labor and agriculture.

3. DEPRESSED AREAS DEFINED

(a) Industrial redevelopment areas are defined as "those within the United States in which Administrator determines that there has existed excessive unemployment for an extended period of time."

Areas shall be so designated where unemployment is:

1. Not less than 12 percent for 12-month period.

2. Not less than 8 percent for 15 months of 18 month period.

3. Not less than 6 percent for 8 months in each of 2 years.

(b) Rural redevelopment areas are defined as "those rural areas within United States (not exceeding at any one time 15 counties in any State or 300 counties in United States) in which he determines that there exist the largest number and percentage of low income farm families, and a condition of substantial and prolonged underemployment."

4. LOCAL COMMITTEES

Once a redevelopment area is determined, local redevelopment committee is appointed by Administrator consisting of at least 7 residents of area. Local committee to represent: management, labor, commercial, industrial development, and agricultural groups. Submit plans for alleviating unemployment and underemployment.

Administrator may appoint Regional Committee on same basis as above within areas to represent two or more redevelopment areas.

Funds for local committees: Not more than $1,500,000 available to Administrator, to aid regional and local committees for administrative-expenses only salaries, and traveling expenses excluded.

5. LOANS

(a) May make loans to assist in financing (1) purchase or development of land for industrial usage; (2) construction, rehabilitation, or alteration of industrial plants or other manufacturing, commercial, or processing facilities; (3) purchase of machinery or equipment.

Need established by findings showing:

1. Construction of facility reasonably calculated to alleviate unemployment or underemployment.

2. Funds for construction not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

3. Amount of loan plus private funds available are adequate to insure completion.

4. Borrower will not transfer business operations to such plant so as to effect a reduction in employment in any other area within the United States.

5. Facility constructed will provide more than temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment.

(b) No loan shall be in excess of 75 percent of aggregate cost nor longer than 40 years.

(c) Administrator shall require not less than 10 percent or more than 25 percent of aggregate cost to be supplied by (1) States and subdivisions thereof; or (2) local interests. Federal lien has first status. Financial condition of area to determine amount of local contribution to cost.

(d) Loan shall be conditioned upon contract provision effective during life loan prohibiting borrower from transferring or relocating business operations to redevelopment area so as to cause unemployment elsewhere.

(e) "Borrower" includes successors in interest, lessees, subcontractors, or persons or firms under common control.

(f) One hundred million dollars authorized for making industrial redevelopment loans. Revolving fund created. Fifty million dollars appropriated for rural redevelopment loans (with limitation of $2,500,000 any one State). Revolving fund created.

6. ASSISTANCE TO PUBLIC FACILITIES

1. Loans for public facilities:

(a) Upon application of any State or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, private or public organization, Administrator is authorized to make loans to assist in financing purchase or development of land for public-facility usage, construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities in redevelopment areas.

Need established by findings of:

(1) Project provides more than temporary alleviation of unemployment and will tend to improve opportunities in areas for successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities.

(2) Funds requested are not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

(3) Amount of loan plus amount of funds from State or local or private sources are adequate to insure completion.

(b) No loan shall be in excess of 75 percent of aggregate costs, or for longer than 40 years.

(c) Administrator shall require not less than 10 percent or more than 25 percent of aggregate cost to be supplied by (1) State or political subdivision, or (2) a loan. Financial condition of areas to determine amount of local contribution to cost. Federal lien has first position.

(d) One hundred million dollars appropriated for public facility loans. Revolving fund created.

2. Grants for public facilities:

(a) Administrator shall conduct continuing studies of needs and probable costs in redevelopment areas for needed land acquisition for public facility usage and for construction, alterations, expansion, or improvement of useful public facilities. Receive proposals from States, Indian tribes, etc., showing costs and contributions to be made to proposal and Administrator may make grants where he finds:

(1) Proposal will provide more than temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment and proposal will tend to improve opportunities of area for establishment or expansion of industrial plants and facilities.

(2) Local groups contribute to cost of project proportionate to ability to contribute.

(3) Project will fill a pressing need of area and little probability project could otherwise be undertaken. Grant, with other funds available, will not exceed amount needed to insure completion.

(b) Administrator provides supervision to prevent waste of Federal funds.

(c) Appropriations authorized not to exceed $50 million annually for making grants.

7. FUNDS FOR INDUSTRIAL PLANTS AND PUBLIC FACILITIES

Administrator with approval of President issues notes and obligations not exceeding $250 million. Secretary of the Treasury may purchase and sell such notes.

8. ESTABLISHMENT OF REVOLVING FUNDS

Creates revolving funds for industrial and rural redevelopment loans and public facility loans. (See separate loan sections for amounts.)

9. PROCUREMENT BY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

(a) Each Department of the Federal Government engaged in procurement of supplies shall—

1. Use best efforts to award negotiated procurements to contractors in redevelopment areas.

2. Where deemed appropriate set aside portions of procurements for negotiation with firms in redevelopment areas.

3. Provide bid matching procurements means.

4. Assure that firms in redevelopment areas are bidders on list and get notices.

5. In event of tie bids, all other things being equal, award contract to firm in redevelopment area.

6. Encourage prime contractors to award subcontracts to firms in redevelopment areas.

7. Cooperate with other departments and agencies of Federal Government to achieve objectives set forth.

(b) Administrator shall furnish all departments and agencies of Federal Government with list of areas designated as redevelopment areas and with list of services and supplies available in each of such areas.

10. INFORMATION

Administrator shall aid redevelopment areas by furnishing assistance, technical information, market research, advice, etc., obtainable from Federal Government agencies. Administrator shall also supply Federal procurement agencies with names and addresses of redevelopment area firms desirous of obtaining contracts from United States Government.

11. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Administration authorized to provide technical assistance to redevelopment areas. Includes studies of need, potentials, etc., and may be provided by use of staff of Administrator or by contract with individuals or institutions locally.

12. POWERS OF ADMINISTRATION

1. Hold hearings, take testimony.

2. Request from Federal agencies, information, suggestions, statistics.

3. Sell, assign, rent, improve, etc., any properties or security for collecting loans and otherwise pursue to final collection all loans made under act.

13. VOCATIONAL TRAINING

(a) Secretary of Labor shall:

1. Provide suitable training for unemployed persons in such areas in need of training, retraining, or reemployment or vocational education.

2. Cooperate with existing retraining facilities of Federal and State Governments by contract on reimbursable basis or make contracts with private institutions.

14. RETRAINING SUBSISTENCE PAYMENTS

(a) Secretary of Labor shall:

1. Enter into agreements with States whereby the States as agent of the Federal Government make weekly retraining payments to unemployed individuals not entitled to unemployment compensation (exhaustions or not insured) certified by Secretary of Labor.

2. Make retraining payments to such individuals for not more than 13 weeks in amounts equal to average unemployment compensation payments payable in State making payments.

15. ANNUAL REPORT

Administrator shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report to Congress.

16. APPROPRIATIONS

Authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out provisions of the act.

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'Area Redevelopment Act.'

"FINDINGS OF FACT

"SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the maintenance of the national economy at a high level of prosperity and employment is vital to the best interests of the United States and that the present existence of excessive unemployment or underdevelopment in certain areas of the Nation is jeopardizing the health, standard of living, and general welfare of the Nation. It is therefore the purpose of this act to provide assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in areas needing redevelopment to enable them to expand and adjust their productive activity to alleviate excessive unemployment or underemployment within such areas by providing new employment opportunities and developing and expanding existing facilities and resources without reducing employment in other areas of the United States.

"AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 3. In order to carry out the purposes of this act, there is hereby established, within the executive branch of the Government, an Area Redevelopment Administration. Such Administration shall be under the direction and control of an Administrator (hereinafter referred to as 'the Administrator') who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall be compensated at the rate of $ per annum.

"ADVISORY COMMITTEES

"SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Government Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment which shall be composed of the following members: The Administrator, as Chairman, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, the Administrator of General Services, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Such committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof, shall from time to time make recommendations to the Administrator relative to the carrying out of his duties under this act, and the Administrator shall, in carrying out such duties, consult with such committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof. Such committee shall hold meetings at the call of the chairman, and such meetings shall be held at least twice during each calendar year.

"(b) The Administrator shall appoint a National Public Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment which shall consist of 12 members and which shall be composed of representatives of labor, management, agriculture, and the public in general. From the members appointed to such committee the Administrator shall designate a chairman. Such committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof, shall from time to time make recommendations to the Administrator relative to the carrying out of his duties under this act. Such committee shall hold not less than two meetings during each calendar year.

"(c) The Administrator is authorized from time to time to call together and confer with representatives of the various parties in interest from any industry in which employment has dropped substantially over an extended period of years and which in consequence has been a primary source of high levels of unemployment in several areas designated by the Administrator as redevelopment areas. Conferences convened under authority of this subsection shall consider with and recommend to the Administrator plans and programs with special reference to any such industry to carry out the purposes of this act.

"REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

"SEC. 5. (a) The Administrator shall designate as 'industrial redevelopment areas' those industrial areas within the United States in which he determines that there has existed excessive unemployment for an extended period of time. Any such industrial area in which there has existed unemployment of not less than (1) 12 percent of the labor force for the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which an application or recommendation for assistance is made under this act, (2) 8 percent of the labor force during at least 15 months of the 18-month period immediately preceding such date, or (3) 6 percent of the labor force during at least 8 months in each of the 2 years immediately preceding such date, shall be designated an 'industrial redevelopment area.'

"(b) In addition to those areas designated under subsection (a), the Administrator shall designate as 'rural redevelopment areas' those rural areas within the United States (not exceeding at any 1 time 15 counties in any 1 State or 300 counties in the United States) in which he determines that there exist the largest number and percentage of low-income farm families, and a condition of substantial and prolonged underemployment. In making the designations under this subsection, the Administrator shall consider among other relevant factors the number of low-income farm families in the various rural areas of the United States, the proportion that such low-income families are to the total farm families of each of such areas, the relationship of the income levels of the farm families in each such area to the general levels of income in the same area, the current and prospective employment opportunities in each such area, and the availability of farm manpower in each such area for supplemental employment.

"(c) In making the determinations provided for in this section, the Administrator shall be guided, but not conclusively governed, by pertinent studies made, and information and data collected or compiled, by (1) departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, (2) State and local governments, (3) universities and land-grant colleges, and (4) private organizations.

"(d) Upon the request of the Administrator, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of the Bureau of the Census are respectively authorized to conduct such special studies, obtain such information, and compile and furnish to the Administrator such data as the Administrator may deem necessary or proper to enable him to make the determinations provided for in this section.

"LOCAL AND REGIONAL COMMITTEES

"SEC. 6. (a) The Administrator, upon determining that any area is a redevelopment area, shall appoint a local redevelopment committee (hereinafter referred to as a 'local committee'), to be composed of not less than seven residents of such area who, as nearly as possible, are representative of labor, management, commercial, industrial development, and agricultural groups, and of the residents generally of such area. Each local committee shall prepare plans and cost estimates, to the extent deemed desirable by it, for (1) the development of the resources of, and processing and marketing facilities in, the area which such committee represents, (2) the construction, rehabilitation, and alteration of industrial plants or other industrial and commercial facilities in such area, and (3) the purchase of machinery or equipment for use in such area, with a view to attracting new industries thereto and otherwise to stimulate economic activity therein. Each local committee shall enlist the support of local residents and private and public lending agencies in financing the carrying out of such plans. The Administrator shall, at the request of any local committee, make available to such committee such professional, technical, and other experts as may be necessary to enable such local committee properly to discharge its functions under this act.

"(b) The Administrator may establish regional committees to represent two or more redevelopment areas when he finds that the establishment of such committees will facilitate the carrying out of the purposes of this act. The members of the regional committees shall be appointed by the Administrator on the same basis as are members of local committees, and such regional committees shall cooperate with, and, to the extent possible, coordinate the activities of, the local committees within the regions represented by such regional committees.

"(c) Of the sums appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act, not to exceed $1,500,000 shall be available to the Administrator for the purpose of assisting the local or regional committees established under this section to defray their administrative expenses, but no part thereof shall be available for the purpose of paying salaries or traveling expenses of the members of such committees.

"LOANS

"SEC. 7. (a) Upon the recommendation of any local committee, the Administrator is authorized to make loans to assist in financing the purchase or development of land for industrial usage within the redevelopment area represented by such committee, and the construction, rehabilitation, or alteration of industrial plants, or other manufacturing, commercial, or processing facilities, and the purchase of machinery or equipment for use, in such area, if he finds that—

"(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought is reasonably calculated to alleviate unemployment or underemployment within the redevelopment area wherein it is, or will be, located;

"(2) the funds requested for such project are not otherwise available on reasonable terms;

"(3) the amount of the loan plus the amount of private funds available for such project are adequate to insure the completion thereof;

"(4) the borrower will not cause a transferral to, or relocation in, any plant or facility, the construction, rehabilitation, or alteration of which is assisted under this section, of business operations otherwise conducted by such borrower so as to effect a reduction in employment in any other area within the United States; and

"(5) the construction, rehabilitation, or alteration, of any such plant or facility will provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment.

"(b) No loan under this section shall be for an amount in excess of 75 percent of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made. The maturity date of any such loan shall be not later than 40 years after the date such loan was made.

"(c) In making any loan under this section, the Administrator shall require that not less than 10 percent, or more than 25 percent, of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made shall be supplied (1) by the State (including any agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision thereof) within which such project is to be located, or (2) by one or more community or area organizations, or persons, firms, or corporations within the redevlopment area in which such project is to be located, as equity capital, or as a loan repayable only after the financial assistance provided under this section has been repaid in full, and, if such loan is secured, its security shall be subordinate to the lien or liens securing the financial assistance provided under this section. In determining the amount of participation required under this subsection with respect to any particular project, the Administrator shall give consideration to the financial condition of the State or local government, and to the per capita income of the residence of the redevelopment area, within which such project is to be located.

"(d) In making any loan under this section with respect to the construction, rehabilitation, or alteration of any plan or facility, the Administrator shall include in the loan agreement a provision that during the life of the loan the borrower shall not cause a transferral to, or relocation in, such plant or facility of business operations otherwise conducted by such borrower so as to effect a reduction in employment in any other area within the United States. Such loan agreement shall further authorize the Administrator, in the event of a violation of the foregoing provision, to declare the unpaid balance of any such loan immediately due and payable, and, in default of payment, to proceed forthwith to enforce such loan agreement and the security thereon.

"(e) As used in this section, the term 'borrower' includes any successor in interest to the borrower, or any agent, lessee or operating subcontractor thereof, or any person, firm, or corporation which directly or indirectly controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with, the borrower by reason of voting stock interest, common officers, directors or stockholders, voting trusts, or by any other direct or indirect means.

"LOANS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

"SEC. 8. (a) Upon the application of any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or private or public organization or association representing any development area or part thereof, the Administrator is authorized to make loans to assist in financing the purchase or development of land for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or im-

provement of public facilities within any redevelopment area, if he finds that—

"(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment in the redevelopment area wherein such project is, or will be, located, and will tend to improve the opportunities in such area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;

"(2) the funds requested for such project are not otherwise available on reasonable terms; and

"(3) the amount of the loan plus the amount of public funds from State or local sources or private funds or both, available for such project are adequate to insure the completion thereof.

"(b) No loan under this section shall be for an amount in excess of 75 percent of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made. The maturity date of any such loan shall be not later than 40 years after the date such loan is made.

"(c) In making any loan under this section, the Administrator shall require that not less than 10 percent, nor more than 25 percent, of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made shall be supplied (1) by the State (including any political subdivision thereof) within which such project is to be located as equity capital, or as a loan repayable only after the financial assistance provided under this section has been repaid in full, and, if such loan is secured, its security shall be subordinate to the lien or liens securing the financial assistance provided under this section. In determining the amount of participation required under this subsection with respect to any particular project, the Administrator shall give consideration to the financial condition of the State or local government, and to the per capita income of the residents of the redevelopment area, within which such project is to be located.

"GRANTS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

"SEC. 9. (a) The Administrator shall conduct continuing studies of needs in the various redevelopment areas throughout the United States for, and the probable cost of, land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of useful public facilities within such areas, and may receive proposals from any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or private or public organization or association representing any redevelopment area, or part thereof, relating to land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within any such area. Any such proposal shall contain plans showing the project proposed to be undertaken, the cost thereof, and the contributions proposed to be made to such cost by the entity making the proposal. The Administrator, in consultation with such entity, is authorized to modify all or any part of such proposal.

"(b) The Administrator, pursuant to a proposal received by him under this section, or on his own initiative, may make grants to any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or private or public organization or association representing any redevelopment area, or part thereof, for land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within a redevelopment area, if he finds that—

"(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment in the redevelopment area wherein such project is, or will be, located, and will tend to improve the opportunities in such area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;

"(2) the entity requesting the grant proposes to contribute to the cost of the project for which such grant is requested in proportion to its ability so to contribute; and

"(3) the project for which a grant is requested will fulfill a pressing need of the area, or part thereof, in which it is, or will be, located, and there is little probability that such project can be undertaken without the assistance of a grant under this section. The amount of any grant under this section for any such project shall not exceed the difference between the funds which can be practicably obtained from other sources (including a loan under section 8 of this act) for such project, and the amount which is necessary to insure the completion thereof.

"(c) The Administrator shall by regulations provide for the supervision of the carrying out of projects with respect to which grants are made under this section so as to insure that Federal funds are not wasted or dissipated.

"(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $50 million annually for the purpose of making grants under this section.

"FUNDS FOR LOANS

"SEC. 10. To obtain funds for loans under this act the Administrator may, with the approval of the President, issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not to exceed $250 million. Such notes or other obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations issued under this section and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such Act are extended to include any purchases of such notes and other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated in every respect as public debt transactions of the United States.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF REVOLVING FUNDS

"SEC. 11. Of the funds raised under section 10 of this act, not more than (1) $100 million shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans for projects within industrial redevelopment areas; (2) $50 million shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans for projects within rural redevelopment areas, but the principal amount of loans from such fund which are outstanding at any one time within any one State shall not exceed $2,500,000; and (3) $100 million shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans for public facilities. Receipts arising from the repayment of any such loans shall be deposited in the fund from which such loan was made and shall be utilized for the purpose for which such fund was established.

"PROCUREMENT BY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

"SEC. 12. (a) Each department, agency, or other instrumentality of the Federal Government engaged in the procurement of any supplies or services for use by or on behalf of the United States shall—

"(1) use its best efforts to award negotiated procurement contracts to contractors located within redevelopment areas to the extent procurement objectives will permit;

"(2) where deemed appropriate, set aside portions of procurements for negotiations exclusively with firms located in redevelopment areas, if a substantial proportion of production on such negotiated contracts will be performed within redevelopment areas and if such firms will contract for such portions of the procurement at such prices;

"(3) where deemed appropriate and consistent with procurement objectives, after the expiration of the period during which bids for any procurement are permitted to be submitted and if the lowest of such bids was submitted by a firm in an area other than a redevelopment area, negotiate with firms in redevelopment areas with a view to ascertaining whether any such firm will furnish the services or supplies with respect to which bids were theretofore submitted for an amount equal to, or less than, the amount of the lowest bid theretofore submitted for the furnishing of such services or supplies, and if any such firm can be found, award the contract for the furnishing of such services or supplies to such firm;

"(4) assure that firms in redevelopment areas which are on appropriate bidders' lists will be given the opportunity to submit bids or proposals on all procurements for which they are qualified and on which small business joint-determinations have not been made, but whenever the number of firms on a bidders' list is exclusive, there shall be included a representative number of firms from redevelopment areas;

"(5) in the event of tie bids on offers on any procurement, award the contract to the firm located in a redevelopment area, other things being equal;

"(6) encourage prime contractors to award subcontracts to firms in redevelopment areas; and

"(7) cooperate with other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government in achieving the objectives set out in this subsection.

"(b) The Administrator shall furnish all departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government with a list of areas which he has designated as redevelopment areas under this act, together with a list of the services and supplies which are most abundantly available in each of such areas.

"INFORMATION

"SEC. 13. The Administrator shall aid depressed areas by furnishing to interested individuals, communities, industries, and enterprises within such areas any assistance, technical information, market research, or other forms of assistance, information, or advice which are obtainable from the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government and which would be useful in alleviating conditions of excessive unemployment or underemployment within such areas. The Administrator shall furnish the procurement divisions of the various departments, agencies, and other instrumentalities of the Federal Government with a list containing the names and addresses of business firms which are located in redevelopment areas and which are desirous of obtaining Government contracts for the

furnishing of supplies or services, and designating the supplies and services such firms are engaged in providing.

"TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 14. In carrying out his duties under this act, the Administrator is authorized to provide technical assistance to areas which he has designated as redevelopment areas under this act. Such assistance shall include studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of such areas. Such assistance may be provided by the Administrator through members of his staff or through the employment of private individuals or institutions under contracts entered into for such purpose.

"POWERS OF ADMINISTRATOR

"SEC. 15. In performing his duties under this act, the Administrator is authorized to—

"(1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as he may deem advisable;

"(2) request directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics needed to carry out the purposes of this act; and each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Administrator;

"(3) under regulations prescribed by him, assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of loans made under this act, and collect or compromise all obligations assigned to him in connection with the payment of such loans until such time as such obligation may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

"(4) deal with, complete, renovate, improve, modernize, insure, rent, or sell for cash or credit, upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any real or personal property conveyed to, or otherwise acquired by, him in connection with the payment of loans made under this act;

"(5) pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or other administrative action, prior to reference to the Attorney General, all claims against third parties assigned to him in connection with loans made under this act, and the power to convey and to execute in the name of the Administrator deeds of conveyance, deeds of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real or personal property or any interest therein acquired by the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this act may be exercised by the Administrator or by any officer or agent appointed by him for that purpose;

"(6) in addition to any powers, functions, privileges, and immunities otherwise vested in him, take any and all actions, including the procurement of the services of attorneys by contract, determined by him to be necessary or desirable in making, servicing, compromising, modifying, liquidating, or otherwise administratively dealing with or realizing on loans made under this act; and

"(7) establish such rules, regulations, and procedures as he may deem appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this act.

"'VOCATIONAL TRAINING

"SEC. 16. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall—

"(1) prescribe and provide suitable training for unemployed individuals residing in redevelopment areas who are in need of training, retraining, or reemployment or vocational education;

"(2) enter into agreements with other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, and with agencies maintained by joint Federal and State contributions whereby the existing facilities of such departments, agencies, and instrumentalities may be utilized, on a reimbursable basis, in carrying out the purposes of this section; and

"(3) by agreement or contract with public or private institutions or establishments, provide for such additional training facilities as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this section.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor shall cooperate with existing Federal, State, and local agencies and officials in charge of existing programs relating to training, retraining, and reemployment and vocational education for the purpose of coordinating his activities with those of such agencies and officials.

"RETRAINING SUBSISTENCE PAYMENTS

"SEC. 17. The Secretary of Labor shall, on behalf of the United States, enter into agreements with States in which redevelopment areas are located under which the Secretary shall make payments to such States for the purpose of enabling such States, as agents of the United States, to make weekly retraining payments to unemployed individuals residing within such redevelopment areas who are not entitled to unemployment compensation (either because their unemployment compensation benefits have been exhausted or because they were not insured for such compensation) and who have been certified by the Secretary of Labor to be undergoing training for a new job. Such payments shall be made for a period not exceeding 13 weeks, and the amounts of such payments shall be equal to the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment payable in the State making such payments.

"ANNUAL REPORT

"SEC. 18. The Administrator shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report to the Congress of his operations under this act for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. Such report shall be printed, and shall be transmitted to the Congress not later than January 3 of the year following the fiscal year with respect to which such report is made. Such report shall show, among other things, the number and size of Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies and services placed with business firms located in redevelopment areas, and the amount and duration of employment resulting therefrom.

"APPROPRIATION

"SEC. 19. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

INCREASE IN SALARIES OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 14, I introduced a bill (H. R. 11790) to increase the salaries of those Federal employees who are paid in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. I believe that there is ample justification for such a measure at this time.

There are two chief reasons for proposing an increase in these salaries. First, each previous increase was delayed after the real need for it had developed; and, secondly, the pay of employees in all grades has not advanced at the rate or in the proportion to which salaries and wages have gone ahead outside the Government service.

The adverse economic situation in which employees under the Classification Act find themselves may be summarized as follows:

First. The gross average weekly earnings of production workers in manufacturing industries increased from $23.86 in 1939 to $78.39 in April 1956. This was an increase of 228.5 percent. This was double the rate of increase for grade GS–1. In the same period, the Consumer Price Index rose 94.7 percent from August 1939 to April 1956. Thus the advance in gross average weekly earnings for factory workers was 69 percent greater than the increase in consumer prices.

If Classification Act salaries on a weekly basis in the first three grades had been raised in the same proportion as the earnings of factory workers, the situation would have been as follows:

Grade	Actual rate		Proportionate to increase in factory earnings
	1939	1956	
GS–1	$24.23	$51.73	$79.61
GS–2	27.69	56.92	90.98
GS–3	31.15	61.06	102.35

It may be objected to that so-called white-collar and blue-collar pay rates are not comparable, but that is a fallacy to which only those who attempt to justify low pay rates will subscribe. Of course, they differ to the extent their jobs differ, but the economic bases for wage-rate determinations are no different than those for fixing salaries.

The one significant difference between the two groups is the lack of unionization in the white-collar group. This is why the earnings of the factory worker have increased at a more rapid rate and more substantially than those of the white-collar group. About 15 million workers are employed in clerical, professional, and technical positions, excluding the managerial category. It is reliably estimated that 2,750,000 are union members, or about 18 percent of the estimated white-collar potential. In contrast is the degree of unionization among production workers—the blue-collar group. Well over 50 percent of the union potential in the blue-collar category have been organized.

Second. This disparity between the increase in earnings of the factory worker and the officeworker is further pointed up by these figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics showing the percentage increase in the median wage or salary income of experienced male em-

ployees in the following occupational groups:

Major occupation group:	Percent increase, 1939–54
Professional, technical	171.1
Clerical and kindred workers	162.8
Sales workers	199.4
Craftsmen, foreman, and kindred workers	224.4
Service workers, except private household	238.3
Laborers, except mine	250.4

Third. Another measurement of the trend of clerical and professional earnings is the index of weekly earnings for this group prepared monthly by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. This index indicates that clerical and professional earnings increased 150.9 percent from August 1939 to February 1956. In 1953 BLS calculated the increase in average salaries of classification act salaries, general schedule, to have been 92.2 percent. Last year's raise would bring this figure up to 106.6 percent. On the basis of the Federal Reserve index, the increase in the earnings of all clerical and professional employees was 21 percent above that for Federal white-collar workers. This shows that Federal employees lagged behind even the relatively poor position which white-collar workers in the entire labor force had attained during and since World War II.

Fourth. The economic disadvantage of employees in the upper grades of the general schedule of the classification act is confirmed both by the Federal Reserve index and a comparison provided by the BLS, both of which have already been analyzed. This disadvantage is further confirmed by the Consumer Price Index. These employees have lagged behind advancing prices ever since classification act pay schedules received their first revision 11 years ago. This disparity has from time to time been emphasized until at present it has reached a point which will make it doubly difficult to hold in the Federal Civil Service persons whom it can ill-afford to lose.

This is indicated in a comparison of existing salaries with those which are needed to preserve the economic position of these employees in 1939. The comparison follows:

Grade	Current salary	Salary needed to maintain 1939 buying power
GS–5	$3,670	$3,895
GS–7	4,525	5,063
GS–9	5,440	6,232
GS–11	6,390	7,400
GS–13	8,990	10,906
GS–15	11,610	15,580

The marked disparity between current salaries and the amount of pay needed to main their former economic position is apparent. It has come about by the fact that each time salaries were raised the amount fell short of the sum needed to retrieve lost purchasing power. Thus there has been a cumulative loss which has never been restored even to an appreciable extent in the upper grades.

I think one of the most significant aspects of the bill is that it takes into consideraiton the numerous across-the-board increases that have been passed by Congress. You will note that the bill proposes proportionately smaller increases in the lower brackets. The purpose of this is to bring about proper adjustments in the salary levels so that they will be more in line with the responsibilities of the respective grades.

The following schedule shows the effects of the bill:

Proposed Classification Act salary rates based on a graduated percentage formula [1]

Grade	Present entrance salary rate	Amount of increase	New entrance salary rate	Percent of increase
1	$2,690	$195.75	$2,885.75	7.3
2	2,960	243.00	3,203.00	8.2
3	3,175	280.63	3,455.63	8.8
4	3,415	322.63	3,737.63	9.4
5	3,670	367.25	4,037.25	10.0
6	4,080	439.00	4,519.00	10.8
7	4,525	516.88	5,041.88	11.4
8	4,970	594.75	5,564.75	12.0
9	5,440	677.00	6,117.00	12.4
10	5,915	760.13	6,675.13	12.9
11	6,390	843.25	7,233.25	13.2
12	7,570	1,049.75	8,619.75	13.9
13	8,990	1,298.25	10,288.25	14.4
14	10,320	1,590.20	11,910.20	15.4
15	11,610	2,054.60	13,664.60	17.7
16	12,900	2,519.00	15,419.00	19.5
17	13,975	2,906.00	16,881.00	20.8
18	14,800	3,203.00	18,003.00	21.6

[1] 6½ percent of that part of existing salary which is not in excess of $2,500, plus 17½ percent of that part which is in excess of $2,500 but not in excess of $10,000 plus 36 percent of that part which is in excess of $10,000.

Source: Based on salary rates in Public Law 94, 84th Cong.

On the basis of this evidence, the rates provided in H. R. 11790 are well within reason and quite realistic.

AMENDING CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION ON TREATYMAKING POWER

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 648, proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate must concur in the making of a treaty by the President.

This is a simple amendment and should have the prompt action of the House before the present session adjourns.

Treaties, Mr. Speaker, should be ratified by a plain majority of both the House and Senate instead of by a two-thirds majority of the Senate alone. Why should there be a different rule of procedure in the matter of treaty ratification than applies to every other piece of Federal legislation? As I see it, the exception that exists today is illogical.

For what good reason should it require a majority of the House plus a mere majority of the Senate to make war? But two-thirds of the Senate alone to make peace? On what ground should the House be deprived of a voice in the treatymaking process? This body is called upon to implement treaties in the adoption of which it has had no voice. It votes funds needed to put a treaty into operation. It initiates any taxation which this involves. It participates in the passage of any internal legislation required to make a treaty effective.

Mr. Speaker, the requirements of constitutional consistency are certainly no different from the requirements of sound democratic procedures. Are we not the body that most directly represents the people? Are we not much more responsive to public opinion by virtue of the fact that the entire membership must be elected every 2 years? Should we not have an equal say in the vital question of foreign relations, than a body more remote from the popular will, as measured by either a time or a population standard?

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the present practice of treaty ratification places excessive power in the hands of a minority in the other body.

Many Presidents have deplored the existing constitutional provision. At one time John Hay, when Secretary of State, referred to the present constitutional provision as an "irreparable mistake." He said that under the Constitution as now written this "puts it into the power of one-third plus one of the Senate to meet with a categorical veto any treaty negotiated by the President, even though it may have the approval of nine-tenths of the people of the Nation."

It is important to remember this fact as we consider the overall question of treaty ratification under the Constitution.

In the Constitutional Convention, history records there were many who thought the two-thirds provision wholly objectionable. Wilson, of Pennsylvania, pointed out that it would place it "in the power of a minority to control the will of a majority." And he urged that a simple majority be required and that the House of Representatives also join in the power of approval, because as treaties are to have the operation of laws, they ought to have the sanction of laws also. This was wise counsel.

Why then was the present provision adopted? Chiefly it seems to me because the framers of the Constitution had an idea that the other body would be small and it would act as a consulting body. Some members of the Constitutional Convention contended that only the other body could safely be trusted with the power of approval because of the necessity for preserving secrecy in the consideration of treaties.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the arguments which finally prevailed in the Constitutional Convention are not valid today. Ninety-six Members of the other body cannot and do not act as a special council. The ratification of treaties are arrived at openly and under the glare of public debate.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the House of Representatives should respond to this suggestion and approve House Joint Resolution 648 overwhelmingly. It would

give this body a participating voice in foreign policy of which it has been unjustly, unwisely, and inconsistently deprived. Certainly it should meet with presidential approval because Presidents for years have been concerned about the veto power of treaties possessed by one-third plus one of the other body.

There is another reason and that is that the President in any case always needs the positive help of the House in carrying out his foreign policy. Presently this body is deprived of its rightful place in the ratification of treaties, yet it participates in all phases of internal legislation that supports a treaty or that may be required by a treaty.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that there may be prompt action by the House on my resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a copy of my amendment, which follows:

House Joint Resolution 648

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate must concur in the making of any treaty by the President

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of Congress, to make treaties, provided that a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives present, and a majority of the Senators present, concur in such treaty.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

THE VETERAN AND HIS FUTURE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I take great satisfaction in what I am about to say. For I am speaking of an important group which now enjoys the accusation of being a pressure group.

Personally, I have absolutely no objection to bankers being for bankers, or manufacturers for manufacturers, or Frenchmen for Frenchmen.

But I am a little bothered when persons seeking their betterment in a period of neglect are called a pressure group.

I am bothered when veterans and disabled veterans especially, are given the heave-ho because legislation that affects their very self-respect, their living, their day-to-day existence, excites their own interest and their own quite normal reaction.

It seems that the way for veterans not to be a pressure group is to forget their role in society and the service they gave to our country.

If they must have some civic interest, some participatory feeling in the Government for whose survival they gave a part of their body or mind, or proved themselves willing to give life itself, then they are asked to forget their status as servicemen and as veterans.

It is because of things like this that I am a little tired of hearing the Disabled American Veterans and other veterans' groups called by names that are intended to impugn their motives. I am tired of hearing veterans' organizations called promoters of privileged legislation.

I want the needs of veterans considered on the basis of merit under a concept of government that seeks to "form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessing of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

For me, the disabled veteran is not to be treated like some nondescript mendicant once removed from the poorhouse.

For me, the veteran has earned, at the very least, the Nation's respect, its consideration, in some instances a tangible type of gratitude which should be expressed not merely in language, but in material terms tailored to the Nation's capacity and the needs and requirements of the cases in point.

Veterans' legislation is being confronted by an increasing wall of opposition.

If you examine this opposition you find that some of it is objective, some of it is philosophically prejudiced, and much of it is downright hostile.

The luster of heroism has worn off.

We are more than a decade removed from World War II. World War I is cataloged in the memory of some with the French and Indian Wars and, I suppose, the War of the Roses. Some, no doubt, already are asking: World War I? When was that?

If there are those who cannot remember the war, then how are they to be expected to remember its heroes, the rank and file who did the bloody, dirty work of battle?

All the blood, the anguish, the suffering of Korea seem now to have been allocated a small space somewhere in the history of foreign policy. To some it still is a police action.

We are in that phase of remembrance where—

The tumult and the shouting dies;
The Captains and the Kings depart;
Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,
An humble and a contrite heart

The essence of this new wall of opposition gets its fullest and its most potent expression in the more or less recently released Report of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions.

It may be that some of its findings have merit but I have thus far been unable to find many that do. I find myself hostile to its hostility even if—here and there—a sound policy could be assumed to be enunciated. The report is called, Findings and Recommendations—Veterans' Benefits in the United States and is directed to the President by the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions. A 25-page summary of the 415-page report begins like a slap in the veteran's face.

It puts its whole case in one sentence this way:

Military service in time of war or peace—

I am quoting—

should be treated as discharging an obligation of citizenship and not of itself as a basis for future Government benefits.

With the first hammer blow the veteran is put on the defensive.

The cruel presumption of so hostile an approach seems to be that he joined the military service whether in war or in peace, in order to get future Government benefits.

I do not recall anybody handing out copies of the prospective GI bill of rights at the recruiting station—or promising pensions. I can remember the line: "There's a war on, brother—and you're in it."

The report recommends that—

Special veterans' benefits should be provided only for the significant requirements of veterans that arise directly out of their military service.

It goes on to say that—

The ordinary or non-service-connected needs which veterans have in common with all citizens should be met wherever possible through the general welfare programs under which veterans are covered along with other people. Veterans' non-service-connected benefits should be minimized and gradually eliminated.

Now there you have the basic philosophy of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions.

The key words here are: "minimized" and "gradually eliminated."

The plan is to shunt as many veterans as possible into the mass assembly yard they now call social security.

That means a veteran gets no recognition as a veteran.

Of course, I favor social security and have all of my political life.

It is my position, however, that social security and veterans' pensions are two wholly disparate, dissimilar, and basically unrelated areas of legislation.

Joining them together is legislatively unrealistic and conducive to a confusion of meanings.

To put veterans' pensions within the category of social security is to ignore the significance of the word "veteran."

The sponsors of this idea would herd the veteran with a nameless mass.

The purpose of the proposed recommendations is to deprive him of his veteran status in the context of future legislation and in any event to reduce and to gradually eliminate whatever now exists.

Let me put in here that I have the highest respect for the Chairman of the Commission—Omar N. Bradley—as a soldier and indeed, for its members. I do find it difficult to call this report a document on veterans' benefits. I find it rather a document against veterans' benefits.

Notwithstanding my opposition to the general tone of the report, I shall study it carefully for any desirable legislation that may be predicated on some of its findings. For example, I not only refuse

to quarrel with one of the Commission's recommendations, but even wholeheartedly endorse it. That is the recommendation which reads:

Service-connected benefits should be accorded the highest priority among the special programs for veterans. Service-connected compensation and related benefits should be liberal, even generous.

Of course, to have said anything less than that about service-connected disabilities would have wrecked the report in toto. Nevertheless, I am grateful that the President's Commission saw fit to make its statement so vigorous and so pronounced and so unequivocal. Nor can I find ground to quarrel with the recommendations, for instance that—

The Government in general, and especially the Veterans' Administration, should develop and maintain a rounded research program so that basic comparative information on the economic and social conditions of veterans and non-veterans will always be available to the President, and to the Congress, and to the public.

Of course, decisions should be predicated upon information, upon knowledge and upon facts.

But may I add that decisions should also be based upon something deeply significant in the appraisal of the veteran's situation. That deeply significant factor may be compressed in the simple but meaningful phrase: Moral obligation.

If we lose sight of that principle, we set in motion a chain of conduct, legislative and executive and possibly judicial, which may very well undermine the heart of democratic government. The veteran is someone who has done a very special service and in proportion to the quality and the sacrifice of that service he should be recognized. To fail to so recognize him is to renege on a moral obligation. Moreover, maybe they know, but I am sure I do not know, just what is the narrow sense in which the term "service connected" is used. There are disabilities due to war service which may not show up for a decade or even more, and even when they do show up there may be no conclusive, no positive, no absolute evidence for attributing them to war. Yet in ever so many instances these disabilities are indeed due to war service and that fact may very well be safely inferred. A whole range of nervous ailments have their roots in the turmoil and the distress of combat and even noncombat service under the strain of overall violence. Men may live with these ailments for a lifetime and remain permanently handicapped under them. Yet they will not manifest any obvious signs of disorder calling for such drastic attention as would bring the cases within the purview of the Veterans' Administration. What I say is not critical of the Veterans' Administration.

Moral obligation is a precious phrase.

And moral obligation, I like to think, invests much of the pending current veterans' legislation in the Congress.

There is, for example, the bill—it has passed the House—that calls for the simplification and codification into a single act of all laws governing payment of compensation for service-connected disability or death. Another bill that also passed the House revises and simplifies laws providing for benefit payments to survivors of servicemen and veterans. Still another bill provides for medical care of dependents of members of the Armed Forces. These bills have not yet become law. They are pending in the Senate. But there is Public Law 490 which increases the pay of 6-month trainees under the Reserve Act from $50 to $78 per month. Another bill not yet law extends to June 30, 1956, free postal privileges for members of the Armed Forces in specified areas abroad. The Congress passed Public Law 497 which increases the pay of medical and dental officers in the armed services and the Public Health Service. The House passed—and action is pending in the Senate—on a bill providing educational assistance to children of certain veterans who died in World War II or Korea. Still another bill in the early stages of passage redefines the eligibility requirement of widows for pension or compensation. The object is to make the eligibility uniform for widows of veterans of World War I and II and Korea. The House has under consideration a bill that would increase by $600 the income limitations applicable to the widow or child of a deceased veteran for pension purposes during the year in which death occurs. There is also pending the bill which permits pension payments to veterans hospitalized with tuberculosis less than 6 months.

The legislation I have discussed covers only the second session of the 84th Congress. But as you can see moral obligation is not a precept lost on the Congress of the United States. And I am certain that any proposed recommendations that aim to blind the Congress or the country to its sense of moral obligation are destined for failure.

Veterans have a fight on their hands and they are not given to retreat. They are fighting for the right to place the veteran status of veterans in its true focus. They are fighting to check the antagonists of veterans' programs who seek to win their aims by first placing the veterans of the United States in an unfavorable light in public opinion. We must not let them be humbled, belittled, offended, or put in the position of being ashamed to ask for the respect and the recognition due America's veterans. They are the men and women who have taken years out of their lives, lost possible promotion in private life, profits and income, men and women who have sacrificed a part of their health and well-being for the survival of this country and the free world. It is up to veterans to fight back—and hard—at the concept that would paint the war veterans as a mendicant group standing, hat in hand, outside the halls of Congress begging for a handout.

Let us take heart in the fact there is strength in numbers and greater strength in the justice and rightness of the cause of veterans. It is true that veterans' expenditures are now at the rate of $4.5 billion a year. But I have been talking about putting the veteran situation in focus. And I find that the President has been asking for $4.9 billion in foreign aid. Now, one may be for or against foreign aid. But regardless of one's stand on that issue, I incline to the view that whether there is rice in Burma, however important this may be, is secondary to my consideration, as a Congressman for the status of the veteran. It is the veteran who made it possible for us to consider Burma and Afghanistan, and Ceylon, and Pakistan in our foreign-aid program or to have any foreign-aid program at all.

My faith rests deep in the United States and this Nation, I am confident, will not let its veterans down.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SAYLOR (at the request of Mr. GAVIN), for 2 days, on account of illness.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. TUMULTY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACHROWICZ and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FASCELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JACKSON (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM and to include an address by the Honorable FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, on Flag Day.

Mr. WESTLAND and to include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. KEOGH and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADDONIZIO.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. ROOSEVELT) and include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2572. An act to authorize the interchange of lands between the Department of Agriculture and military departments of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3363. An act for the relief of Miroslav Slovak; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3365. An act to amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to change the requirements for obtaining a freight-forwarder permit; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3879. An act to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States in order to balance the power now heavily weighted in favor of automobile manufacturers by enabling franchise automobile dealers to bring suit in the district courts of the United States to recover compensatory damages sustained by reason of the failure of automobile manufacturers to act in good faith in complying with the terms of franchises or in terminating or not renewing franchises with their dealers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2106. An act to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets or midshipmen at the Military, Naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard Academies, or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5382. An act for the relief of W. R. Zanes & Company of Louisiana, Inc.;

H. R. 10060. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, as amended;

H. J. Res. 533. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 534. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 535. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 553. Joint resolution waiving certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 554. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 555. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission in the United States of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 566. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 591. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 417. An act for the relief of Pearl O. Seilaz;

S. 530. An act for the relief of the Sacred Heart Hospital;

S. 1146. An act to further amend section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, relating to fees of agents, attorneys, and representatives;

S. 1414. An act for the relief of James Edward Robinson;

S. 1749. An act adopting and authorizing the improvement of Rockland Harbor, Maine;

S. 2016. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Lawrence F. Kramer;

S. 2152. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer;

S. 2202. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an additional contract with the Yuma County Water Users' Association with respect to payment of construction charges on the valley division, Yuma reclamation project, Arizona, and for other purposes;

S. 2582. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of William E. Stone for disability retirement as a Reserve officer or Army of the United States officer under the provisions of the act of April 3, 1939, as amended;

S. 3265. An act to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for filing vessel utilization and performance reports by operators of vessels in the foreign commerce of the United States;

S. 3472. An act for the relief of Patricia A. Pembroke;

S. 3581. On act to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service;

S. 3778. An act to amend the act for the protection of walruses;

S. 3857. An act to clarify section 1103 (d) of title XI (Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; and

S. 3945. An act for the relief of Walter C. Jordan and Elton W. Johnson.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1410. An act for the relief of Giovanna Scano;

H. R. 2709. An act for the relief of the estate of Rene Weil;

H. R. 3373. An act for the relief of Mrs. Zella K. Thissell;

H. R. 5382. An act for the relief of W. R. Zanes and Company of Louisiana, Inc.;

H. R. 5453. An act for the relief of the estate of Robert Bradford Bickerstaff;

H. R. 6143. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Codes of 1939 and 1954, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6742. An act for the relief of Rumiko Fujiki Kirkpatrick;

H. R. 6955. An act for the relief of Inna Hekker Grade;

H. R. 7373. An act for the relief of Eugene G. Aretz;

H. R. 8041. An act for the relief of Clyde R. Stevens;

H. R. 8867. An act for the relief of the estate of F. M. Bryson;

H. R. 9285. An act to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, so as to extend for 2 additional years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury;

H. R. 11205. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Roy Cowan and others arising by reason of the flooding of land in the vicinity of Lake Alice, N. Dak.;

H. J. Res. 591. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 609. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 21, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1986. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report and findings on the McMillan Delta project, Pecos River Basin, N. Mex., pursuant to the provisions of section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 429); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1987. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with the Hot Springs National Park Physical Medicine Center, Inc., which when executed by the Director of the National Park Service, will authorize the concessioner to operate the physical medicine center and to obtain hot waters therefor, in Hot Springs National Park, Ark., for a period of 20 years from January 1, 1953, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1988. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Government Security, relative to presenting a draft of proposed legislation which requests the Congress to extend the time for filing the final report of the Commission from December 31, 1956, as presently fixed by Public Law 304, 84th Congress, to June 30, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1989. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting additional information relative to the case of Jacob Passic, A-4371303, involving suspension of deportation, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1990. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting additional information relative to the case of Urania Antippas, A-6334252, (0300-173918), involving suspension of deportation, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1991. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1992. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1993. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to surrender and convey to the city of New York certain rights of access in and to Marshall, John, and Little Streets adjacent to the New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N. Y., and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2397. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R.

8000. A bill to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight; with amendment (Rept. No. 2399). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 10683. A bill to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended, so as to provide punishment for fraudulent acceptance of benefits thereunder; without amendment (Rept. No. 2400). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. S. 3307. An act to amend section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to authorize jurisdiction in the Federal courts in certain reemployment cases; wihout amendment (Rept. No. 2401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4296. A bill to provide that certain professors at West Point shall not be deprived of certain retirement benefits; without amendment (Rept. No. 2402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6729. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Navy shall appoint certain former members of the Navy and Marine Corps to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, as may be appropriate, and thereafter transfer such members to the appropriate retired list; with amendment (Rept. No. 2403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9246. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 by authorizing payments to survivors of former members for unused leave credit; with amendment (Rept. No. 2404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9892. A bill to amend the provisions of the Revised Statutes relating to physical examinations preliminary to promotion of officers of the naval service; with amendment (Rept. No. 2405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNICK: Committee on Public Works. S. 2210. An act to modify the project for the St. Marys River, Mich., South Canal, in order to repeal the authorization for the alteration of the International Bridge as part of such project, and to authorize the Secretary of the Army to accomplish such alteration; without amendment (Rept. No. 2406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 11740. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit; without amendment (Rept. No. 2407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Twentieth intermediate report on the Al Sarena case. (Rept. No. 2408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 10720. A bill for the relief of Dorothy E. Green and Thelma L. Alley; without amendment (Rept. No. 2398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 11860. A bill to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment and underemployment in depressed industrial and rural areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 11861. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 11862. A bill relating to the retirement of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force, and the relief payable to their widows, children, and orphans; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 11863. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the donation and other disposal of property to State welfare agencies and nonprofit welfare institutions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 11864. A bill relating to the computation of the retirement income credit in the case of joint income-tax returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. R. 11865. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to provide for studies of the social and economic effects of automation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 11866. A bill relating to the reporting for income-tax purposes of dues and fees received by nonprofit service corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 11867. A bill to facilitate the administration and development of the Whitman National Monument, in the State of Washington, by authorizing the acquisition of additional land for the monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 11868. A bill to exempt certain vehicles used for religious purposes from Federal excise tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 11869. A bill to provide that any United States passport hereafter issued to a citizen shall not show his place of birth or contain any other information which would indicate whether he is a citizen by birth or by naturalization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 11870. A bill to amend paragraphs 1773 and 1774 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit free importation of certain religious articles by additional organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee (by request):

H. R. 11871. A bill to provide a uniform premium pay system for Federal employees engaged in inspectional services, to authorize a uniform system of fees and charges for such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 11872. A bill to amend section 270 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 11873. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act so as to eliminate delay in the start of projects; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 11874. A bill authorizing a comprehensive project for control and progressive eradication of salt-marsh and other injurious mosquitoes in the coastal area of southwest Louisiana; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 11875. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 11876. A bill to determine the rights and interests of the Navaho Tribe, Hopi Tribe, and individual Indians to the area set aside by Executive order of December 6, 1882, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 11877. A bill to amend the act of April 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 44, 25 U. S. C. 631 et seq.) so as to permit the Navaho Indian Tribe to lease tribal lands for residential and other purposes for a term of not to exceed 99 years; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 11878. A bill to extend the date upon which the Rubber Disposal Commission will terminate; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 11879. A bill to provide for the reconveyance of all mineral interests in lands acquired by the United States for certain reservoir projects to former owners thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. J. Res. 652. Joint resolution to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall accept that real property in New York, N. Y., known as the General Grant Monument and that it shall become the General Grant National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. Con. Res. 255. Concurrent resolution authorizing the President of the United States to designate the month of February of each year as American History Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. Res. 550. Resolution creating a Special Committee on Foreign Aid Programs; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 11880. A bill for the relief of Pietro Rosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 11881. A bill for the relief of Vito Leggio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 11882. A bill for the relief of Maria Schager; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 11883. A bill for the relief of Jose Vargas-Mercado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 11884. A bill for the relief of Artemio N. Jangaon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 11885. A bill for the relief of Rajendra Paul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:
H. R. 11886. A bill for the relief of Mary Carmelita Ottolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:
H. R. 11887. A bill for the relief of the estate of Leatha Horn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1150. By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of Mark J. Hanna, Pasadena, Calif., and 19 others residents of that area urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

1151. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition of 26 citizens of Athens County, Ohio, addressed to our Senator and Representatives in Congress, urging passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1152. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Chosuke Ie, chairman, Committee for Expediting Settlement of Okinawan Land Problem, Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan, relative to resolutions passed by the Japanese House of Representatives and the Legislature of the Ryukyus on the restoration of Japanese administrative authority over Okinawa and on the Okinawan land requisitioned for military purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1153. Also, petition of the executive director, National Society of Professional Engineers, Washington, D. C., urging enactment of appropriate legislation in the public interest on revisions in navigational clearances requirements for highways and railroad bridges; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Ghost Writers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, in this day and time it seems to be commonplace to use ghost writers, but it seems rather unusual for two people to use the same ghost writer. In the Appendix of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 22, is an article allegedly written by Mr. Clyde T. Ellis, of the Rural Electric Cooperative Association. In the same issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is an article allegedly written by Mr. Claude R. Wickard, former Secretary of Agriculture.

The article signed by Mr. Ellis is 6 paragraphs in length. The last 4 paragraphs are identical, word for word, with the last 4 paragraphs of the article by Mr. Wickard.

These paragraphs warn that there are "certain interests who would like to eliminate entirely the REA cooperatives." The next sentence in these identical paragraphs mentions the Hoover report apparently attempting to convey the idea that the Hoover report recommends elimination of REA. Of course, this is not true and was evidently recognized as such by the writer since he did not say the Hoover report would destroy REA but merely tried to convey that thought by inference.

The Hoover Commission recommended that the Rural Electrification Administration be reorganized on a self-supporting basis—interest and fees should be sufficient to cover the cost of money and administrative expenses—that it secure its financing from private sources, and that as reorganized, it be made subject to the Government Corporation Control Act.

Many of the people in my district seem to agree that this is a good idea.

From this point the articles went on to make a plea for public-power development. Could it be that the public-power advocates are so hard up for support for their cause, even when not forthrightly presented, that they have to steal each others material without crediting the real writer?

Thailand Celebrates 24th Anniversary of National Day, June 24

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to send greetings to the people of Thailand, His Majesty Phumiphon Adundet, and His Excellency Pote Sarasin, Ambassador of Thailand, on the occasion of the celebration of the 24th anniversary of National Day, June 24, 1956.

Thailand enjoys the proud distinction of being the only nation in Southeast Asia, and one of the few on the Continent of Asia, which has been independent throughout its history. Although from the beginning of her history Thailand had been governed by a progressive monarchy, the people threw off the yoke of absolutism on June 24, 1932, and proclaimed a constitutional monarchy with the hopes that the new government might better meet the needs of the times.

She has known an area of unprecedented development, without regard to her internal and external security. The leaders of the nation have as their primary aim the development of the resources of the country in order to attain a better standard of living for the benefit of all its people. The Thai people along with the rest of the free world know that a free and prosperous people is communism's most formidable foe. Every well-founded and happy home is a fortress against tyranny, while poverty and wretchedness are its breeding ground.

It is Thai policy to maintain friendly relations with other nations. In amplification of this policy she has taken her place with the free nations in United Nations sessions, and has benefited greatly from membership. Thailand has maintained the best of friendly relations with the United States. It has welcomed American assistance in improving its economic well-being and keeping its political freedom.

Thailand's strategic position, its tradition as a free nation in Southeast Asia, and its opposition to communism give the country an important place in international affairs. It is an example and inspiration to other countries in the region who are engaged in the conflict with totalitarian aggression. As a bulwark against communism, the influence of the Thai may be beyond measure.

Again I salute Thailand and pray for continued mutual loyalty and respect between our countries and a continued strong purpose toward our peaceful aims.

Vice Admiral Francis C. Denebrink, USN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, after a long and honorable career in the United States Navy, Vice Adm. Francis C. Denebrink, USN, is retiring to inactive service.

At the beginning of World War I in 1917, Admiral Denebrink received his commission as a youthful ensign in the Navy. His service has spanned two world wars and the Korean conflict, and reached its zenith upon his promotion to the grade of vice admiral in 1952. He was one of the capable officers chosen to attend the Naval War College course in naval warfare. His excellent war service was recognized when he had conferred upon him the coveted Legion of Merit.

During the last years of his active service, Admiral Denebrink has been the able Commandant of the Military Sea Transportation Service, the organization that has done such a splendid job in transporting our Armed Forces across the seas of the world.

Upon his retirement from active service and upon his birthday, which he will celebrate tomorrow, Admiral Denebrink is to be congratulated by his many friends in the armed services and in civilian life. It is their sincere hope that he will have many years during which he may enjoy the fruits of his excellent service.

Address of Hon. William A. Purtell, of Connecticut, Nominating Hon. Prescott Bush, of Connecticut, and Excerpts From Keynote Address by Leonard W. Hall at the Connecticut Republican State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, today, in Hartford, Conn., the Republican State Convention is being held; and this morning it was the pleasure of our colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] to place in nomination the name of a distinguished Member of this body, the senior Senator from Connecticut, PRESCOTT BUSH. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks by Senator PURTELL, as he placed the nomination before the convention, and also excerpts from the keynote address delivered by Leonard W. Hall.

There being no objection, the address and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOMINATING SPEECH OF UNITED STATES SENATOR WILLIAM A. PURTELL, CONNECTICUT REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION, BUSHNELL MEMORIAL, HARTFORD, CONN., JUNE 19, 1956

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen of the convention, fellow Republicans all; it is indeed an honor to be given the opportunity of addressing this convention. It is a signal honor to be privileged to present to you for the highest office to which this convention can nominate a colleague and a friend.

Four years ago in like conventions, two candidates were honored by selection for the United States Senate. I shall be forever grateful to my party and to the convention delegates who selected me as one of those candidates. I shall be eternally grateful to the citizens of Connecticut for having elected me to the Senate of the United States. We were most fortunate as a party and as a people in the selection and election of another Republican candidate for the United States Senate—the man whose name it is my privilege to place in nomination here today.

A nominating speech should embody certain basic elements. It should present, and in concise form, a clear picture of the candidate, his qualifications and his record. Now, just what do we seek in a candidate? Prime considerations are integrity, purposeful action, balance and dedication to the service of the people and to the principles and policies of the Republican Party. Certainly we have seen those most important qualities displayed and demonstrated time and time again by the man it is my honor to nominate.

There is little that I can add to your knowledge of him. You know him, you respect him, you have great admiration for him as have his colleagues in the Senate, the members of the Cabinet and as has that inspired and dedicated leader—Dwight David Eisenhower.

For the sake of the record, let me review a bit. While his birthplace was Ohio, if years of residence in, and service to a State are to be counted, and, of course, they count, then he is more native than many born here. When a choice could be made as to where he would reside he unhesitatingly selected Fairfield County in the great State of Connecticut, not only as a place to live, but as a place to raise his fine family and as a place to work for and with his fellow man. For the past 32 years he has been not only a resident of Greenwich but a most active participant in the affairs of his community and his State, and yes, his party. His is a 32-year impressive record indeed.

He has a fine educational background which includes a bachelor of arts degree from Yale, the alma mater which has honored him with election to its board of trustees continuously since 1944. He is a veteran of World War I, having enlisted in the Connecticut National Guard as a private even before he was graduated from Yale. Before the war ended, he had won the bars of a captaincy in the field artillery—an accomplishment I speak of with great appreciation from my rank as a late but not lamented corporal in the A. E. F.

From college and the war he entered business in the realm of finance and attained a position of eminence that would have been impossible had he not possessed in substantial measure the fundamental attributes of pronounced ability, broad knowledge, integrity, and sound judgment.

Of him, too, it can be said that his private life has been as admirable as his public career has been illustrious. An exemplary father and husband he has been justly blessed with a devoted, charming, and capable wife, 5 fine children, and 9 wonderful grandchildren. He has been and is an active and prominent layman in his church, and in his home community of Greenwich he well deserves his place in the forefront of civic leadership.

Outstanding and commendable are all of these achievements, but that part of his life which I wish to emphasize here is his Republicanism and his lifelong devotion to the Republican Party and the ideals, principles, and policies for which it stands. In particular, I want to dwell briefly on his role in the United States Senate for it is there as a fellow Senator that I have seen him in action, and it is there in the Chamber of that body and in its committees that I have watched him reach a high level of respect, admiration, and recognition from his colleagues.

In the Senate of the United States he has worked tirelessly and unremittingly in behalf of our State and its local communities. He played a leading part in marshaling the forces of the Federal Government to aid our flood-stricken people. He was the leader in guiding through the Senate a program of flood insurance and flood protection. He played a major part in fighting for highway legislation beneficial not only to our State but to the Nation, both in economic growth and defense needs.

His interest in and concern for flood and other protections had been demonstrated long before the terrible disasters of last year. In 1954 it was the Bush Act—Public Law 71—which resulted in the hurricane study. He took the lead in steering this piece of legislation through the Congress. His work in the field of urban redevelopment needs no repetition here, nor does his support of a liberal housing program. He has displayed a deep interest in human needs and in the welfare of the people, not only of Connecticut, but of the country as a whole.

These are some of the reasons, but indeed not all, why I am happy to break precedent, if precedent breaking it is, to make this nominating speech here today at this convention of the Republican Party.

And I remember another convention, a convention which I and many of you attended in Chicago in 1952. You all recall, and I shall never forget, how ardently was espoused the cause of the man we selected at that convention. We chose not only the standard bearer of our party but, as he has since so ably demonstrated, we chose the standard bearer of this country and the free world. We selected and the people of this Nation overwhelmingly elected one of the great Americans—one who will in our history be recorded as one of the greatest of all Americans—our President—Dwight David Eisenhower.

Our party then in 1952 offered not only a great leader but a promise of a successful transition from war to peace. And that promise has been kept. The maiming and dying of American boys in Korea has been stopped. Economic stability has been restored in our own lives. Integrity and decency in Government now prevail. And added to all this, in the past 4 years we have seen real accomplishments in the area of human rights for all of our people. We have not given lip service to equal human rights. We have acted to make them a reality.

These were the promises made by the Republican Party. These were our goals. These too were the aspirations of the American people. They have been fulfilled. Yes, fulfilled under the administration, direction and inspiration of our President—Dwight Eisenhower.

These great achievements, and they have been great, have been accomplished because of the support and cooperation of other men as dedicated as he to the principles and policies he and they espouse, to the cause for which we have all fought shoulder to shoulder in and since 1952.

Under our system of government, wisely divided as it is into the executive, legislative, and judicial branches, President Eisenhower could have done but little without legislators who believed in, worked for and fought for the program which he advanced for the good of America and the world.

One of these stalwart legislators who fought courageously, vigorously, and effectively for the program of President Eisenhower is my colleague and my friend—the senior Senator from the sovereign State of Connecticut. To him no job has been too big, no task too small in the service of our people. He indeed has kept faith with the people who elected him to serve them, this State and this Nation in the United States Senate.

Above and beyond all these important considerations is his deep loyalty to, his unswerving faith in, his untiring support of and his personal friendship with our great leader Dwight David Eisenhower whose administration is a blessing to every man, woman, and child in this Nation and in the free world.

Mr. Chairman and delegates, it is now my privilege to place in nomination to succeed himself to the office of United States Senator the name of my colleague and my friend, the senior Senator from Connecticut—PRESCOTT BUSH, of Greenwich.

EXCERPTS FROM KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY LEONARD W. HALL AT CONNECTICUT REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION, BUSHNELL MEMORIAL, HARTFORD, CONN., JUNE 19, 1956

It is an inspiring thing to appear before this convention and witness the energy, spirit, and enthusiasm of the Republican Party of Connecticut.

For many years it has been almost literally true that as Connecticut goes, so goes the Union.

This year you face a challenge: You can make a clean sweep. You already have two fine Republican Senators of whom every resident of Connecticut can be proud. BILL PURTELL and PRES BUSH. This year you can return PRES BUSH to the Senate along with your fine Republican Congressmen, HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Jr., ALBERT W. CRETELLA, JAMES T. PATTERSON, ALBERT P. MORANO, ANTONI N. SADLAK, and to take the first district back from the Democrats.

With a fine young war veteran and business leader like Ed May scheduled to run for Congress on the Republican ticket in the first district, now you have a chance—a real fighting chance—to help give Ike what he needs to do his job, a Republican Congress.

This convention has met for the purpose, among others, of renominating PRES BUSH for Senator and TONI SADLAK for Congress man at Large. They both are a credit to the Republican Party, to the State of Connecticut, and to the Congress of the United States.

Senator BUSH has shown himself to be a worthy colleague of Senator PURTELL. PRES is a man of outstanding courage and integrity. His work for hurricane and flood relief, in and out of Congress, has made him a national figure. A recognized fiscal expert and a man of broad business experience, he showed his character and courage by voting against the natural-gas bill. His yeoman work for roads and public housing further marks him a true progressive who commands the respect of his colleagues and the affection of the people of Connecticut, without regard to party. And he has supported President Eisenhower's foreign policy 100 percent.

Connecticut did a great thing for America when it sent men like BUSH, PURTELL, and SADLAK to Congress. And this year Connecticut can do it again—if we all work hard as a team.

This year's primaries showed that the voters in the larger cities and industrial areas are turning to the Republican Party. That is why the First Congressional District gives us a real opportunity to make it a clean sweep in Connecticut. You can carry it for Eisenhower and the Republican Party, if we all work together, work hard, and fight hard for victory.

* * * * *

Fortunately, this year, as in 1952, the Republican candidates have a strong appeal to the large group of independent voters. The independents not only support the warmhearted, level-headed policies of the Eisenhower administration but they now realize that only a Republican Congress can be counted on to put those policies into effect.

This independent vote has decided the outcome of every Connecticut State election in the last generation. They are disgusted with the campaign promises that sought a Democrat Congress to support Ike in 1954, only to see that Congress turn and throttle the President's legislative program. They are bored with partisan politicking and annoyed with the Democrat campaign of misrepresentation and exaggeration.

* * * * *

We must all remember to tell the people, over and over again, that our message to America in 1956 rests on principles of government and respect for people. We stand on our record, and what a record it is.

Peace, prosperity, progress, coupled with principles of decency, honesty, and integrity in Government and above all concern for people in their homes, their rights, and their lives.

It is this record that is changing the political climate of the United States. These are the issues of the campaign and the Democrats can't meet them. So they are back at their old tricks of exaggeration, misrepresentation, fear and smear, doom and gloom.

The primaries are over and they have shown the country the internal weaknesses, the inconsistencies, the bickering, and squabbles that beset the Democrat Party.

No Republican need say any more about Mr. Stevenson than what has already been said by his own colleague, Senator KEFAUVER.

The Democrat primaries revealed an apathetic indifference to the principal contenders. First Senator KEFAUVER was ahead, then Governor Stevenson was ahead. But I would say that their efforts have failed to rouse any real enthusiasm within their own party.

* * * * *

The Democrats have tried—almost frantically at times—to find a real issue against the Republican Party and they have failed. They started with the gloom and doom predictions of another general depression. That fizzled and they tried Dixon-Yates, and giveaways, the hydrogen bomb, and a dozen others. They even tried to drag the newspapermen in with their silly charge of a one-party press.

But the fact is that the Democrats can't find any issue to stand up against the Eisenhower Republican record which has brought peace, prosperity, and progress to this great land of ours.

The Democrats are so short of issues that the other day Mr. Stevenson complained that the Republican prosperity was based only on money.

* * * * *

The overriding issue in this country today is peace, and the voters in my opinion will decide that President Eisenhower is best qualified to continue to lead us toward that goal.

President Eisenhower has given us not only peace but an unprecedented prosperity with that peace. This is something the Democrats could never do.

I believe the coming election will be decided on that simple issue which every American can understand.

* * * * *

It's up to us to work, to organize, and to bring out the biggest possible vote next November, because a big vote is an Eisenhower vote and a Republican vote and a vote for peace, prosperity, and progress.

Above all, it's up to us to work together as a team and to leave the feuding to the Democrats who today are bickering and squabbling over which of them will have the honor of taking a shellacking from Ike and Dick this November.

The Democrat Party is so disorganized and split that they called a meeting in Chicago last week to name a keynoter for their convention but could not get together on one name.

Yes; we can win. We must win. And we will win—but only if we organize, work, and fight—between now and election day.

And here in Connecticut you have the privilege and the duty to put your State at the head of the national parade, by sending PRES BUSH back to the Senate, by sending six Republican Congressmen to the House, and by giving President Eisenhower and DICK NIXON a resounding vote of confidence.

The Freedom Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself wholeheartedly with the Freedom Crusade to effect the release of the Americans in captivity in Red China. Of the 13 who have been in confinement, 2 were released June 15, but they are still in Shanghai and our State Department has no further information on them.

The Freedom Crusade is a nationwide letter-writing campaign to Chairman Mao Tse-tung, head of Red China's government, politely petitioning the release of all the Americans still held prisoners by the Chinese Reds. This crusade has been launched by the Very Reverend Harold W. Rigney, SVD, a Divine Word missionary whose 10-year prison sentence in Red China was cut down to 4 years and 2 months by prayer, publicity, and letter writing. I am sure all Americans will respond willingly and generously to Father Rigney's plea in behalf of these prisoners. It is so little for each American to do, and every letter will be a powerful instrument in bringing these Americans back home.

I respectfully urge the membership to enlist the participation of their constituents in this noble crusade. All Americans must have a feeling of anger and sorrow when they think of their fellow Americans suffering prison life in Red China, and all should be willing to cooperate in the Freedom Crusade which can be productive of so much good.

Encouraging Foreign Investment Through Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, June 19, 1956, I introduced H. R. 11838, a bill to encourage private United States investments in foreign countries by reducing the incidence of double taxation on taxpayers with more than 80 percent of their gross income from sources without the United States. I most strongly urge my colleagues to give this legislation their full support.

Our best insurance against a communistic world is to bolster the economies of our allies in foreign countries. A healthy economy and a high standard of living are rarely breeding grounds for communism. During the past decade the United States has been relying mainly on the foreign-aid programs to help the underdeveloped areas of the world to improve their economic conditions.

It is doubtful that we can continue to afford these costly foreign-aid programs. Our people are coming to the realization that private enterprise must gradually take over the burden of developing the economies of these countries. Competitive, free enterprise, which has developed the United States to its present high economic level, is the best exportable product the United States possesses.

However, in order to encourage the American investor to undertake the development of foreign natural resources, industries, and markets for United States goods, the investor must be placed on a competitive level with the investors from other capital exporting countries.

Under the present United States income-tax laws, the American investor in foreign countries is at a disadvantage with his competitors. The removal of

some of the tax obstacles would encourage him to take the risk of sending capital funds abroad, even in the face of exchange fluctuations, nationalistic tendencies, and the ever-present communistic influences.

One of the obstacles which causes an American investor to pay a combined foreign and United States tax in excess of the tax payable on the same investment made in the United States is the so-called per country limitation in the Internal Revenue Code.

The United States investor abroad cannot obtain in undeveloped foreign countries sufficient capital to develop and expand operations and must look to the United States capital market for funds. The fixed charges on these funds must be paid in United States dollars. Hence, the investor has found it necessary to invest in several countries; so that in the event the exchange and economic conditions in one country deteriorate then the fixed charges on the borrowings for the whole operation may be met with revenues from the other countries.

This diversity of investment in several countries is the same approach used by the United States in giving aid to several countries at the same time in its fight against communism. In this manner, if the aid to one country is ineffectual, the complete program will not be destroyed.

The per country limitation of the code does not recognize the business necessity of diversification and requires earnings and income taxes to be segregated by countries rather than allowing the taxpayer to consider the income and taxes from all countries as a single business unit. The total foreign income taxes paid are an expense of the entire operation and the fact that in some countries the tax rate is low and in others it is high should not prevent the use of the full foreign income taxes paid as an offset to the United States income tax.

The allocation of income and taxes by countries required by the per-country limitation often results in a combined foreign and United States tax rate in excess of the present 52-percent tax rate on United States income.

The original and basic intent of the foreign tax credit provisions of the code was to avoid double taxation of foreign income. These provisions have been of real value and without them a United States company could not possibly operate in a foreign country.

The removal of the overall limitation in the Revenue Act of 1954 should have been an impetus to the investor with United States source income to invest abroad, since it enabled him to use foreign income taxes as an offset to the tax on United States income. However, the removal of the overall limitation did not afford any tax relief to the investor who derives practically all of his income from sources without the United States. Such an investor does not have sufficient United States income against which foreign taxes could be applied. This investor must still bear the inequities brought about by the application of the per-country limitation.

In order to remove these inequities entirely and thus give full impetus to investment abroad, the per-country limitation on the use of foreign tax credits should be removed from the code completely. Though this would be reasonable and in the public interest, the Congress may not consider it feasible to take this action at the present time.

However, the per-country limitation should at least be made inapplicable to the taxpayer whose gross income qualifies as foreign source income under the provisions of subchapter N, part I, of the code. Such qualified taxpayers are the true foreign investors. With the assurance that their combined taxes will not exceed the United States tax rate, these are the organizations which will send capital funds abroad to further expand and develop industry and markets for United States goods.

House Resolution 541

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, June 14, 1956, I introduced House Resolution 541 which calls for disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1956. This proposes a separation of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation from the Federal Home Loan Bank System. The proposed plan is undesirable in principle and deficient in technical draftsmanship and should be rejected. The affected agencies have never publicly proposed such a plan, nor has it the endorsement of any of the leaders of the savings and loan business which it affects.

Contrary to the explicit grounds for reorganization as defined in the Reorganization Act of 1949, Reorganization Plan No. 2 does not reduce the number of agencies, does not eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort, does not group or coordinate, or promote economy, or promote the better execution of laws, or increase efficiency.

The primary purpose of reorganization plans and the primary objective of the Hoover Commission was to promote economy. This proposed plan does the opposite. Where there is now a single board and a single agency, it would create two boards and two agencies. The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board now use the same personnel for legal work, personnel work, publicity work, and so forth. The plan would require the establishment of separate departments to handle each of these functions.

Even the President's accompanying statement admits that it will not promote efficiency or economy by the following language:

> There will be a modest increase in the overall operating expenses of the Corporation and of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board which are financed from the receipts of assessments, fees, premiums and investment income of the Corporation and of the Board, not from ordinary Government appropriations.

In addition to these general objections about which more will be said later, there are certain technical inadequacies of great importance and which make the entire plan either illegal or contrary to all previous congressional intent. One blaring deficiency is that no term of office is provided for the trustees. In the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, it specifically prohibits increasing the term of office beyond that provided by law for such office, and in no event in excess of 4 years. Secondly, there is no requirement or provision in the reorganization plan that requires bipartisan appointment of the trustees. This gross omission would mean that the board of trustees of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation could consist of three members of the same party.

Reorganization Plan No. 2 is in the opposite direction from the President's own declared intentions of reducing the number of independent agencies. Last year administration spokesmen opposed the establishment of an independent Federal Home Loan Bank Board, making the following statement:

> The administration believes that new independent agencies reporting to the President should be created only upon the showing of clear and compelling reasons for such action and of persuasive advantages to be derived from it. In signing the Housing Amendments of 1955, President Eisenhower stated: "I also have serious objections to the provisions of the bill which would create still another independent agency in the executive branch by detaching the Home Loan Bank Board, including the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, from the Housing and Home Finance Agency."

Yet less than a year later the President is asking for the establishment of another new agency.

The administration cites the Hoover Commission report as one of the justifications for the proposed reorganization plan. There is a big difference between the Hoover Commission recommendation and this plan. The Commission report simply recommends that—

> No person be permitted to serve as a member of the Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation at the same time.

The reorganization plan, however, goes far beyond the personnel of the respective boards and requires the establishment of a separate agency and a separation of all personnel, records, and so forth. Ironically, the President's plan is not even consistent with the brief recommendation of the Commission. Under Reorganization Plan No. 2, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board Chairman would serve as a member of both the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and thus would be in violation of the Hoover Commission recommendation that no person serve on both the boards.

More significantly, the plan is directly opposite of the recommendation of the Hoover Commission task force on lending agencies which made a thorough

study of the operation of both the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. The task force report on lending agencies concluded its discussion of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation with this statement:

> Except for the general recommendation on management presented earlier in this report, the task force has no recommendation to offer with respect to the organization of this mutual insurance trust.

As a matter of fact, the task force specifically approved present organizational structure of the Board and Insurance Corporation with the statement on page 38:

> This appears to be a natural grouping of functions which requires no change.

Thus, the experts after careful study of this field, recommended the continuation of the organization as Congress has established it.

Conclusive evidence that the objective of the plan is, to say the least, on shaky ground, is borne out by the fact that the task force on lending agencies of the first Hoover Commission in 1949 recommended that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation be placed under the Federal Reserve Board. This recommendation is directly contrary to one of the basic arguments for separating the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board; namely, because "the FDIC is an independent agency." As noted above, Reorganization Plan No. 2 is not a Hoover Commission recommendation and, in fact, violates the recommendations of both task forces and the overall Hoover Commission report. In addition to these inconsistencies, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board have both, in the past, been recorded as opposed to the separation of the Insurance Corporation and the Board.

One of the most singular sections of the reorganization plan is section 3 (b), which in straight, simple language says that the Corporation and all the matters under the jurisdiction of the board of trustees shall be subject to the "direction and control of the President of the United States." To my knowledge, there is no precedent for this provision, and the question that comes to mind is what is the purpose and intent of this unusual provision? The Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 dealing with housing agencies contained no such provision. Under present law, the Insurance Corporation reports to Congress, and Reorganization Plan No. 2 would appear to be an effort to bypass the Congress and have the agency solely and completely subservient to the President.

In reviewing the general effects of the plan the following points should be considered: First, it would increase the number of effective agencies by making two out of the one now existing; second, it would create duplication of reports, regulations, and so forth, both by the Government and the individual associations; third, it would add an additional group of high-salary-bracket employees to the operating expenses of the Insurance Corporation; fourth, the expenses of the Insurance Corporation are borne by the individual institutions, yet they were not consulted on this measure to increase these expenses; fifth, the law required that all Federal institutions, in effect, would still be controlled by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, since they have the sole power to charter new member institutions; sixth, as a practical matter, the Insurance Corporation and the Board have always worked closely in supervising, regulating, and chartering institutions. In fact, the Insurance Corporation's regulations are sometimes used as a means of strengthening the operations of all savings and loan associations.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join in support of House Resolution 541.

Our Heritage of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on June 3 I had the privilege and honor of delivering the address at the baccalaureate service at Montana State University, Missoula, Mont. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR HERITAGE OF FREEDOM

Twenty-three years ago I sat, by the grace and benefaction of the university faculty, where you graduates are sitting today.

I thought then, as you must think now, that one of the few burdens of this pleasant week which marks the milestone of 4 years of accomplishment was that I had to be subjected to the remarks of some oldster who had been selected by some process which interested me very little to give the baccalaureate service. It seemed clear to me then that while I was very little interested in what he had to say, I was quite aware that he had very little idea, if any at all, of what I really thought about anything.

But I remember well that I suffered him in silence, and I hope only that you will do the same for me. There are some significant differences, however, between my situation then and your situation now.

For one thing, I had reached the age of 30 before I managed to earn my degree. Unless my judgment is failing, I suspect most of you have some years to go before you will reach that ripe old age.

For another thing, when this university conferred the degree of bachelor of arts on me, the United States was still in the depths of a depression and jobs were few. Today, from what I know and read in the help-wanted columns, most of you won't need to worry about finding jobs.

But probably the most significant difference in the situation of the college graduate today and the graduate of 20 years ago flows from the changed situation of the United States in the world. The fact that the United States in two decades has moved from a position of chosen isolationism to a position of unsought world leadership has a most profound effect on every person in this Nation.

In the early 1930's the United States had not recognized Russia; the high tariff policies of the 1920's were strangling our international trade; we were not a member of the League of Nations and had not even accepted the statute of the World Court.

The events taking place in Europe, such as the rise of Hitler, seemed of small importance. The activities of the Japanese in Manchuria were not of particular concern. My classes at this university in the fields of Far Eastern and Latin American history were not characterized by overenrollment. The Foreign Service of the United States numbered less than 700 in 1930, and the total number of employees in the Department of State was less than 5,000. Communism was a movement that didn't seem to be of particular concern to most Americans. It was not viewed as an international conspiracy threatening our freedom. Indeed, the Communist candidate for President of the United States polled more than 100,000 votes in 1932 and some 80,000 votes in 1936.

I cite these facts so we may contrast them with the present. Today we not only recognize the Soviet Union in the legal, diplomatic sense, but we recognize her in the physical sense as the leading protagonist of international communism which poses the greatest threat of our time to individual man's freedom. We today recognize internal, as well as international, communism as an abiding enemy of free people.

Since 1934 our international trade barriers have been gradually liberalized under the terms of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. And we have not only joined the United Nations, we take pride in the leadership we took in establishing the U. N. and its peripheral specialized agencies in the fields of health, agriculture, aviation, education, and labor. We have joined the International Court of Justice, have accepted its jurisdiction, and have abided by its judgments.

Our lack of concern with world events in the 1930's has been replaced by household familiarity with geographic areas such as Formosa, Indonesia, Indochina, Pakistan, and India. Our children literally call world statesmen by their first names. We accept as fact the proposition that events in faraway places may be of vital concern to individual Americans. We show this concern today by a Foreign Service some 4 times as large as in 1930, by a State Department which now numbers its employees at over 10,000, and by the fact that in 1955 no less than 32,000 civilian Americans were employed overseas.

These things have a direct impact on you graduating students. The status of the United States as a great power and its bastion position as defender and protagonist of freedom increases the demand for the skills you possess or will acquire.

For the foreseeable future there will be a heavy demand for men and women with foreign language ability. It daily becomes more important that more Americans than ever before learn not only the common languages of Spanish, French, Portuguese, and Italian, but the more unusual languages such as Russian, Chinese, Japanese, and the dialects and tongues of south Asia and Africa.

Combined with language ability, there is a growing need for men and women with special skills. South America, by way of example, is headed for a tremendous industrial and transportation revolution during the next decade and there will be heavy demands for help in American know-how. How many diesel engineers can General Motors send to South America who will have a working knowledge of Spanish? How many television technicians know Portuguese? How many of Montana's mining engineers understand why

some Latin American states have nationalized their mineral resources?

Doctors, lawyers, teachers, psychologists, nutritionists, agronomists, mining engineers—there is scarcely a skill or profession for which there is not an international demand waiting to be satisfied. To the extent that worldwide needs for knowledge can be met by qualified Americans, we can expect to influence peoples. And I might add—to the extent the United States does not stand ready to help millions of people in neutralist states, there will be indoctrinated Communists ready to help them move toward a totalitarian life.

Now I know there are among you some who may ask why we should concern ourselves with the needs of other peoples. Why should I talk of trying to influence foreigners?

The main reason for our concern results from the fact that any diminution in the area of individual freedom, whether it results from fascism, communism, other forms of totalitarianism, or from the failure of dependent peoples to grow toward independence, threatens freedom in the United States. Undoubtedly, there are still among us some who view our relations with other nations as activities we could better do without, or in any event, matters about which only experts should be concerned. Too many of us, however, have seen wars that have taken a heavy toll of American lives, and that have disrupted our peaceful growth at home, to be indifferent to this interrelationship. We know that we cannot banish the problems of international relations by closing our eyes to them. We know we cannot—by voting Republican or Democrat—vote our international problems out of existence.

One observer put the matter clearly and trenchantly recently when he remarked, and I quote, "Every value that you and I cherish as free people, the things for which men have died on the battlefields of the world, all of the things that are woven together in the rich heritage that we call America, all of those values are in jeopardy because they cannot be preserved in a little vacuum called America. They must be preserved in the world in which powerful forces are at work threatening these basic values that we believe in."

The freedom we know will either expand and live, or be curtailed and die. Freedom is not a static thing which can be preserved in America and allowed to die elsewhere. What happens to the aspirations for liberty of the student in Indonesia will eventually effect the freedom of the men and women who walk the campus here in Missoula. I believe this thought was best expressed in a different time and a different age and in a smaller world. It was true then but it is much more true now. Let me read to you the famous words of John Donne, the 17th century poet and minister. They are taken from one of his sermons:

"No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main; if a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the lesse, as well as if a promontorie were, as well as if a mannor of thy friends or of thine owne were; any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankinde; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

There are among us, of course, a few who search for a quick way to preserve freedom. They hope for the immediate creation of world government, for example, or to attain complete and universal disarmament overnight. I do not belittle the great efforts and devoted dedication of people who urge such projects as these—even though they may well be visionary. The point I make is that there is no quick, no cheap, and no easy way to attain a Utopia in which men and nations may live in peace and freedom.

A few days ago I read a newspaper dispatch from Denver which discussed a fad that is sweeping some parts of the country. It seems that there are drugstores which sell what is known as a happy pill. These pills are advertised as being able to restore peace of mind. But the Colorado State Medical Society has cautioned that none of these drugs is curative of anything. They are only palliatives.

I want to emphasize that there is no happy pill that this Nation can take which will get rid of our international ailments—that will guarantee peace. We may as well realize that the one certain prediction that we can make for the future of our international relations is that we are in for a prolonged period of difficulty and there is no palliative for that condition.

In contrast to those who seek the happy pill treatment for international tension, there are those who believe that the way to relieve international tension is to encourage it to erupt into violence. Some even suggest preventive war. Fortunately, the number of advocates of this course is small and since the development of hydrogen or thermonuclear weapons it has become even smaller.

The difference then, between the world you graduates face and the world my generation encountered 20 years ago is that the United States is now a part of the world. We could not isolate ourselves if we wanted to.

Yet as a part of the world—and probably the most important part—we cannot singlehandedly mold the world to our own image. But we can influence the direction in which the world moves by the quality of our character as a government, and as a people.

It is important that we do our level best to influence the direction the world moves because we are at the crossroads of a fundamental conflict. Superficially we often think of this conflict as one which involves the United States on one side, and the Soviet Union on the other. But the issue is more crucial. It stems from the basic antithesis between freedom and totalitarianism. Relations between the Soviet Union and the United States are only the surface evidence of the basic conflict. The basic question underlying this conflict is whether the state exists to serve the individual, or the individual exists to serve the state. If on the one hand the individual is to find his aspirations for spiritual, political, and economic growth always hemmed in by the demands of an omnipotent state, individual freedom will constantly be curtailed and eventually it will die. If on the other hand the state exists to provide a framework within which the individual may grow, we may expect the gradual expansion of the area of man's freedom.

The origin of the cleavage is not new, although it has been a long time in becoming apparent. Over a hundred years ago Alexis de Tocqueville foresaw the conflict and made a remarkable prediction. In his words: "To achieve its objective, America relies on personal interest, and gives full reign to the strength and reason of the individual. Russia centers all authority of society in a single man. The principal instrument of the former is freedom, of the latter slavery. Their points of departure are different, they follow different paths. Nonetheless, each of them seems intended through some secret design of providence to hold in its hands the destinies of half the world."

Here then are the two fundamental alternatives which face mankind. Although the United States may be able to accommodate itself to such international tensions as grow out of boundary disputes or trade disagreements without a significant curtailment of individual freedom in the United States, it is by no means certain that a further expansion of totalitarian communism would not have a direct and immediate impact on the future of freedom in this country. As I suggested earlier, freedom cannot be preserved in a vacuum.

This is not to say that the ideological clash must lead ultimately to war. But it does seem clear to me that this conflict holds a greater threat to the peace and security of the United States than any other foreign-policy issue which we face. Indeed, the most profound foreign-policy issues of our time revolve around the ideological clash of communism and freedom. Just as the destiny of this Nation during the past century was determined by our management of our domestic resources, our destiny in this century will be determined by the way we manage our external relations.

Ultimately, it seems to me, there are only three possible outcomes to this struggle between freedom and communism. First, there could be military conflict which would relieve the present tension by the drastic treatment of destroying life as we know it.

Second, there may eventually be a stalemate in which the conflicting systems may live in fear and in the sullen acceptance of each other's presence on the earth. This would be a solution in the pattern of the great religious conflicts of the middle ages. I personally doubt, however, that the conflict between communism and freedom will end in a stalemate of that kind.

The third alternative seems to me to be the most likely. There may in time be world evolution which will result ultimately in survival of the system that is most fit to the temper of mankind.

In suggesting this possible outcome to the struggle you may think me guilty of begging the question, and I am afraid that is the case. I do not know at this point whether in the long run man will choose to move more in the direction of totalitarianism or freedom. It is my personal belief that the future of mankind lies in freedom. But you ladies and gentlemen know as well as I how perverse a creature man sometimes is. Although we have made our choice in this country, there are still great uncommitted areas of the world where men have little awareness of the fundamentals of freedom. For them there can as yet be no clear choice based on adequate understanding of the alternatives.

We are now, of course, coexisting with Soviet communism. But neither communism nor democracy are static concepts. One or the other will ultimately prevail not necessarily by force of arms, but more likely, in my opinion, by force of spirit.

This is the first graduating class to which I could ever state my belief that a world war in your lifetime may be avoided. I make this statement not because of things that have been done by Democrats or Republicans, or because nations have learned to handle their international relations on a rational basis. I make this statement because of things that have been done by educated men. The men of science from many nations have, in their pursuit of knowledge, uncovered the means by which man may light the fires of atomic destruction. This capacity which at one time was a threat may now have become a benefit in disguise because any nation which might start a world conflagration may now reasonably expect to bring about its own destruction.

The realization of the world's great powers during the past year that another war would be likely to destroy all life has imposed the "peace of mutual terror" of which Sir Winston Churchill has spoken.

The Geneva Conference, called at the suggestion of Senator WALTER GEORGE, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, may have had its failures, but it did, in my opinion, crystallize the unspoken and unwritten understanding of the United States and the Soviet Union that neither of them can start a war, nor permit a situation between other powers

to deteriorate to the point where a great war threatens.

The significance of this situation, if my judgment be correct, is not that we should abandon our readiness to meet force with force should that prove necessary. The important point is that the conflict between totalitarianism and freedom will be decided by force of spirit rather than by force of arms.

This, I suggest, is a hopeful situation, because it is in this realm of spirit where I believe the United States has before it the greatest opportunity to lead. Our greatest opportunities to advance the concept of human liberty in the next decade are to be found in the moral, political, and economic fields and not in the military realm.

The future of human liberty as a concept for man to live by is being decided in two areas of the world. It is being decided in the United States where action will speak louder than words. It is being decided in those areas of the world in the vicinity of the Equator which have newly achieved their national independence or are now in the process of achieving it.

It would require another speech for me to consider the ways in which our conduct within the United States influences our relations with the rest of the world. I suggest, however, that what we do at home is far more important than what we say. The influence of this Nation on the world is determined by what we are in fact, not by what we think or say we are.

The future of individual freedom is also being decided in that part of the newly independent world which stretches more than half way around the globe from Indonesia to Morocco. This area of the earth has for generations known western civilization not so much as a clarion of liberty but as a source of exploitation. The western economic system which was known to the peoples of Asia was not the private enterprise we know in the United States characterized by respect for the rights of labor and a sense of responsibility to the community. Rather, Asia knew a capitalism of Charles Dickens' England, which, as a Justice of the Supreme Court has remarked, ran on a sweatshop basis, exploiting labor. It knew a capitalism that took great dividends out of a nation and in which a 25-percent return a year on capital was not uncommon.

The United States has been extremely active in the newly independent, underdeveloped areas of the world in recent years in attempting to show these areas that capitalism does not mean exploitation. We have spent more effort in these nations than all the rest of the free world and the Communist world put together. But I am not sure, despite our prodigious efforts, that all we have been doing is good. We must not make the mistake of believing that, because an operation is big, it is good. We have, I believe, placed undue stress on building defensive miltary umbrellas, oftentimes overlooking the concerns of the indigenous peoples who are immersed in problems of day-to-day survival. We have tended to give our economic assistance with principal emphasis on the idea that the recipient nations had to aline themselves in virtually every way with our own policies. Why help these nations move toward a better life unless they are willing to "stand up and be counted" has often been the contention.

The total impact of this kind of approach is that despite our bounty, we appear to many Asians as having a foreign policy focused on fear and arrogance. Any man who is fearful or arrogant is on the defensive, whether he knows it or not. Neither posture is fitting for a creative America.

Much of the world is not concerned with whether the United States opposes communism. We may as well realize that fact. Exhortations to others to share our opposition to communism have more often than not fallen on deaf ears. These people are not so much interested in what we are against, as in what we are for. They are not as much concerned with how much money we will put into a program designed primarily to assuage our own concern, as they are in sharing a partnership relationship with them as they struggle to improve the general lot of their lives.

What we should seek to create in our relations with the underdeveloped areas of the world is independence, not dependence. If we operate on the concept that the independent nations must either be with us or against us, we will in fact be creating satellites, not independent states, and a satellite has no strength of its own. If we condition assistance to these areas on the basis that they must be with us in opposition to something, we are in effect trying to buy mercenaries. Any state that can be bought is, in my opinion, not worth buying.

As long as we operate a foreign-aid program based on such a theory we are buying trouble. We will be buying tension as between ourselves and the states who hope for partnership instead of submission.

Our dealings with these new nations call for calm and caution on our part. We are not going to understand them and they will certainly not understand us if we view their future with pessimism and let our dealings with them be guided by passion.

I have suggested that there are two areas in which the future of man's freedom is being decided—in the United States by what we are, and in the uncommitted, underdeveloped areas of the world. The United States as a Nation and as a people exercises a tremendous influence in this battle for free men because the fundamentals of our Christian religion and our democratic form of government have always emphasized the importance of the individual.

Our religious attitude toward the individual is expressed by Christ's remark that not one sparrow should fall to the ground but that your Father would know. The Christian religion constantly emphasizes the importance of the individual.

Our form of government as well as our religion is also based on the ultimate importance of the individual. The Declaration of Independence states the "self-evident" truth that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their powers from the consent of the governed."

In other words, government and religion in the United States have promoted the growth of the individual in freedom and in spirit.

One of our great contemporary authors has written: "Nothing was ever created by two men. There are no good collaborations, whether in music, in art, in poetry, in mathematics, in philosophy. Once the miracle of creation has taken place, the group can build and extend it, but the group never invents anything. The preciousness lies in the lonely mind of man." But individual freedom is in danger from the attack of totalitarianism. The writer continues: "And now the forces marshaled around the concept of the group have declared a war of extermination on that preciousness, the mind of man. By disparagement, by starvation, by repressions, forced direction, and the stunning hammerblows of conditioning, the free roving mind is being pursued, roped, blunted, drugged."

The preciousness of our religion and our government lies in their ability to preserve and to promote the capability of every individual to make his unique contribution to the progress of mankind.

None of us can know the contribution he may make toward man's progress. Some may develop new ideas; others will improve on our physical surroundings; some will influence the lives of their companions; others will pass their heritage on to children capable of greater contributions than their parents. We each have the capacity to leave the world a better place than it was before us.

You may have heard the story of the rich and favored King who asked a wise Athenian whether he considered the King lucky. The answer was quick. "How can I tell. You aren't dead yet."

And this is, I suppose, a characteristic of the contributions we may make. Their total impact may not be known until we have passed on.

Man as an individual has laboriously struggled upward. He understands things today he did not understand last year or the year before. He has moved ahead step by step. He can continue this progress when his spirit and mind can operate in freedom. His growth will be stunted if his freedom is impaired.

It is for this reason that it is so important that we as individuals and as a nation shape our destiny toward protecting and promoting freedom within and without this Nation.

You young men and women gathered here today to take an important step in life are the product of a free people. You are here to carry on the heritage man has built. You are each fitting yourselves to make your unique contributions to man's progress so that he may live and grow in peace and in freedom.

The Flag: Our Heritage, Our Stay, Our Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 14, our colleague, the Honorable FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, had the honor of being the speaker at the Flag Day exercises on the Capitol steps, sponsored by the Department of the Potomac Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic. I have always been disturbed because I feel that the flag is a part of our heritage which we take too much for granted. Because it is always with us, we are all too prone to be passive about its value and meaning. Flag Day too often becomes just another day. Because Congressman SCHWENGEL has taken more than the ordinary interest in the Flag Day exercises both years that he has been here, and because his remarks can be an inspiration to the rest of us, I ask that his address be printed in the RECORD and commend it to every patriotic American:

THE FLAG: OUR HERITAGE, OUR STAY, AND OUR HOPE

This day, Flag Day, is consecrated to the glorious symbol of our United States. We have hailed it in love and devotion as Old Glory; we have sung its praise as the Star-Spangled Banner; we have cheered its colors, red, white, and blue; we have marched to the tune of The Stars and Stripes Forever. If the flag were only sentiment—if the flag

were only cloth, and colors, and a pattern—we should soon weary of the sentiment, and tire of looking at the cloth, always striped and starred, always red, and white, and blue. But the flag is more than we see. Its heritage must be understood, for it is more real than cloth, deeper than sentiment, more filled with light and life than any color could make it, more meaningful than any pattern. The schoolbooks and legends tell a hundred stories about how the pattern came to be, and what the colors symbolize. For the most part, many of these stories are fanciful, or, at best, of doubtful authenticity, but each story, even those drawn of fancy, add their bit to the pattern of American life and thought, and to the heritage that goes to build up the flag itself. Betsy Ross may not have taken up paper, and snipped it with her scissors to show George Washington how a five-pointed star could be made simply, but in thousands of kindergartens, and in the minds and hearts of millions of children growing up today, that story lives. Barbara Fritchie may not have waved her flag out of the window as Stonewall Jackson marched his Confederate troops through Frederick, Md., but that brave picture is a part of what we all see as we look at the flag today, and the story of courage and patriotic devotion, told in Whittier's ringing words, is a part of what we hear as the flag snaps in the wind. But do not think these legends live only in imagination and feeling. That would be soft and foolish sentiment. They may not be factual, but they do carry a deeper truth of symbolism. The simple story of Betsy Ross lingers in my mind as meaning that the highest authority in this land will consent to be taught by the most humble citizen, especially when that humble citizen has the knowledge that is available to all. It means that in our country pride and power must give way before reasoning and practical good sense. This is a characteristic that separated our young American Republic from the tired monarchies of Europe, where peasant and nobleman lived forever and unchangeably apart from each other. The story of Barbara Fritchie, romantically decorated as it may be, is the story of a courage that lived then and lives today in the hearts of American men, and women, and children. For one fictitious heroine so dramatically daring and so generously spared, there have been thousands and millions who have risked their lives with equal daring and stubbornness for the flag and for the Nation symbolized by its striped and starry folds. Let Betsy stand for each poor seamstress or laborer whose thought and work and spirit have gone into the building of this country. Let Barbara stand for the unconquerable soul of America, that stands up in each of us and is expressed year after year in different terms, by men and women, by soldiers and civilians, from Nathan Hale's beautiful phrase, "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country," to General McAuliffe's brief defiance, "Nuts." This sense, this equality, this energy, this courage, live in our true stories as much as in our legends, in our own lives, and in the lives of our ancestors as much as in our imaginations. The colors and patterns of the flag are the colors and patterns of our national heritage.

In our flag, as in our country, there is unity in variety. The stripes represent the Union of the Thirteen Original Colonies. The stars represent the Union of the present 48 States. But by their very existence in the flag, the stripes and the stars symbolize the fact that each Colony, each State, continues its existence as an individual entity, not merged in subjection to the absolute authority of a central government, but holding up its head in the federation of equal States just as the individual citizen in the Republic holds up his head as an equal among his fellow citizens. From the beginnings of our country until the present day, we have acknowledged one master, and only one. George Washington reminded us of this master in his Thanksgiving Proclamation of October 3, 1789, when he said that it is the duty of all nations to acknowledge the providence of Almighty God, to obey His will, to be grateful for His benefits, and humbly to implore His protection and favor. We, the people of the United States, expressed his idea when in 1954, we added the words "Under God" to the pledge of allegiance. When I look up to the flag, I see it as raised up in the sight of God, invoking His blessing upon our land and our people, and submitting all our actions to His will.

For liberty we and our ancestors have worked and prayed and fought. Our soil is rich with the blood of those who died for liberty, and the soil of our spirit, our heritage of honor, is abundantly rich with the memory of their sacrifice. Looking into the stars and stripes of the flag, at once united and separate, connected and independent, I think how our liberty is dependent upon our union. I remember the bold pun attributed to Benjamin Franklin:

We must all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately."

I think of how Daniel Webster built up his reply to Hayne to the ringing climax:

"Liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

All this, our heritage of glorious words and brave deeds, is built into this wonderful banner we call our flag. As we look into the flag we see the independence of our Nation from all others, the independence of each State from all others, and the independence of each citizen from all others. But at the same moment, and in the same flag, we see that intimate union of equals in which the welfare of one is the welfare of all, and the welfare of all is the welfare of each one. Back in the time of World War II, the American poet Charles Malam expressed this thought simply and tellingly in his poem, Freedom, when he said:

"Freedom, wherein we shelter us together
Against the rage of time and prowling man,
Is as a house which in the angry weather
Looks out through storm to the horizon's span.
Whatever warmth and comfort there we know
Our labor and our heartbreak made it so."

This spirit of togetherness, this teamwork, this brotherhood, is what we must work for today to perfect. We have had too many jealousies: State against State, section against section, man against man. Let us look upon the flag today in the spirit of Daniel Webster's great saying: "One country, one Constitution, and one destiny." Let us build upon this heritage of the past a firm loyalty for the present. Let us keep our constitutional system of checks and balances—our Executive operating with skill and energy, our Legislature studying carefully and acting boldly, our judiciary true to the Constitution and the laws—all three independent of one another, but all three ultimately responsive to the considered and determinedly expressed will of the people.

As I look at the light thrown back from the flag, thus raised into the heavens, I remember how, James A. Garfield, out of his lifetime devotion to the Bible, and out of the tumult and stress of a terrible moment of history, rose to heights of eloquence. A crowd in New York, gathering on receipt of the news of the assassination of President Abraham Lincoln, was swelling and milling ominously, obviously on the verge of becoming a riotous mob, when Garfield, then a young Ohio Congressman, stepped out on the balcony of the customhouse. His commanding presence brought silence. The organ tones of his famous voice carried to the farthest reaches of the crowd as he said in that dramatic setting:

"Fellow citizens, clouds and darkness are around Him; His pavilion is dark waters and thick clouds; justice and judgment are the establishment of His throne; mercy and truth shall go before His face. God reigns and the Government at Washington still lives."

These were the words for that occasion, having a more than magical effect in calming the turbulent multitude, and changing an aimless terror to a constructive and faith-filled grief. But they were words for all time. As Garfield picked them up out of the age-old faith of Israel, and the eloquent language of the Old Testament, I take them now, charged with all the meaning in American history of their use by Garfield on that great and sorrowful occasion. They are the words of today, as of a century ago. "God reigns and the Government at Washington still lives." There is a sense in which the center of the United States is, for me, in Iowa, as for you it may be in New Mexico, or for you, in Maine. "The axis of the earth," said Emerson, "sticks out visibly through the center of each and every town or city." But for you, and for you, and for me, the center of the United States is, in a very real sense, right here in Washington—right here in the Capitol Building—right here in the flag that waves day and night overhead. Here is the center of Government, here is the place where the representatives of the people of the United States meet to carry out the will of those people, and at once rule and serve them, under the folds of this symbolic flag. A mile off, there, is the White House—and across the street, in that direction, the Supreme Court Building. Here we are, all three, joined in a partnership to rule and to serve under this flag.

But as the past leads into the present, and our heritage from the past is our possession of the present, so the present must be our preparation for the future. No one and nothing stands still. If we do not advance, we must slide back. Neither in our country as it is today, nor in our flag, the symbol of that country, can we see perfection as now present. What we see in flag and country is something better and brighter than perfection itself, for perfection would be a State from which our only possible progression would be downward. In these Stars and Stripes we must see hope itself—the hope that the growth our country has shown in the past, growth in courage, in selflessness, in devotion to the right, will continue and increase. The hope that we shall take and keep our rightful place as leaders for all the world—the hope that we in our time will more fully understand and practice the great admonitions of our forefathers so that the spirit of truth and freedom in the hearts of good people everywhere will know "the power of the United States is a menace to no nation or people. It will never be used in aggression or for the aggrandizement of any selfish interest of our own. It springs out of freedom and is for the service of freedom" (Woodrow Wilson, 1918).

The hope that all the nations of the world will know that what Woodrow Wilson once said, "A patriotic American is a man who is not niggardly and selfish in the things that he enjoys that make for human liberty and the rights of man. He wants to share them with the whole world, and he is never so proud of the great flag under which he lives as when it comes to mean to other people as well as to himself a symbol of hope and liberty. Liberty does not consist—in mere general declarations of the rights of men. It consists in the translation of those declarations into definite action."

Then let us not ever deceive ourselves into seeing our own advantage in another's loss, or our loss is his gain. In the spirit of cooperation and partnership there is a clue

to an undreamed-of future of peace and happiness and prosperity for all the world. The helpfulness that drives forward toward accomplishment for the good of neighbor and for the good of all, without thought of the individual or national self, is the spirit than can win the world in a far happier sense than any totalitarian political or military conquest.

This is the present, from which still we may build a future such as was envisoned by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, when, in those dark days in which the war clouds of the Civil War were gathering, he looked upon the organ-like disposal of cannon in the Springfield Arsenal, and dreamed his dream of universal peace:

"Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need of arsenals or forts:
The warrior's name would be name abhorred.
And every nation, that should lift again
Its hand against a brother, on its forehead
Would wear forevermore the curse of Cain.
Down the dark future, through long generations,
The echoing sounds grow fainter and then cease;
And like a bell, with solemn, sweet vibrations,
I hear once more the voice of Christ say, "Peace."
Peace, and no longer from its brazen portals
The blast of war's great organ shakes the skies.
But beautiful as songs of the immortals,
The holy melodies of love arise."

Let us then forever remember the rich heritage of fundamental truths that have come out of the past to point the way of a higher civilization and a better life and let us follow the admonition of Abraham Lincoln when he said on that memorable occasion at Gettysburg, "Let us dedicate ourselves to the unfinished task," being ever mindful of the important place we play in this terribly challenging time in our history.

An ancient seer once said that no doctrine, faith, or knowledge is of value to man except as it bears fruit in action. Let us then never be guilty of unconcern for and about the greatest government ever given to man and always do our part as a patriotic American in such a way that God will continue to bless America, and thus will our flag forever wave over the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Change Needed in the Administration's Near East Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, during the mutual security bill debate I raised the question why the United States foreign policy was aggressively friendly toward Tito, an enemy, while almost hostile toward our friend Israel. Developments in the Near East during the past few weeks confirm my judgment.

The Russian Foreign Minister has been making a triumphant tour of Arab countries, ready to fill the vacuum brought about by the British withdrawal from the Suez base; the parade of Communist weapons in Cairo was a frightening spectacle; and Arab leaders, Colonel Nasser, of Egypt, and the new Premier of Jordan, have made new, open, and belligerent threats against Israel. Meanwhile, that little democracy still cannot persuade the Department of State to let her have the jets she needs to defend herself from the Communist planes now in Egypt. The administration continues in a state of paralyzed neutralism—utterly inconsistent with the responsibilities of leadership in the worldwide defense of freedom. There should be a change in the administration's unrealistic policy.

Speech of Hon. A. L. Miller, of Nebraska, at 16th Annual Meeting of Institute of Food Technologists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following speech I made at the 16th annual meeting of the Institute of Food Technologists at St. Louis, Mo., June 11, 1956:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I feel honored to have the pleasure of appearing before this distinguished group of experts who deal with the problems of food chemistry and allied subjects. You are rendering a service to the public. As a physician and surgeon I was rendering a service to the public. It is not unlike serving in Congress where you also try to be of service to your constituents. As a physician people came to me seeking relief from pain or a physical condition—as a Member of Congress people either want something from government or they want to get government out of their hair. It's a service either way.

I pay my respects to you men and women who have made such a marvelous contribution to society through your efforts to improve the processing, the packaging and the handling of food. I have reviewed the program of your 16th annual meeting. It bears evidence that science marches on to unlock doors of the scientific tomorrow. The answers we find should bring additional blessings to mankind.

We who approach three-score years in life have seen in our lifetime more advancement in science, in technology and in the art of living than have any other equivalent period of history in this world. You and I have seen the coming of the automobile, the telephone, the radio, television, and a thousand and one gadgets that make life a little easier, and that give us more time to do the things we want to do in life. We have grown from the horse and buggy period to the jet-propelled plane that travels faster than the speed of sound. Guided missiles are on the trestle board which will travel 16,000 miles an hour and 300,000 feet in the air. The atomic-powered submarine the *Nautilus* is a reality. It is quite possible the ships of tomorrow may all be powered by atomic energy.

The medicine of today is far advanced over that day when I received my sheepskin to practice medicine and surgery in 1918. Many diseases have been conquered. It is estimated that 70 percent of the prescriptions being filled over the drugstore counter today were not thought of 15 years ago. I doubt if the next 40 years will witness the many changes that have taken place in our lifetime.

One of the significant changes in the last two decades has been that of the scientific improvements in the dynamic and rapidly growing business of food technology. You scientists in your meeting today have been dealing in research which has opened up new frontiers. You have helped to create new industries, new and better jobs, and more and better things for a growing America.

I believe the American standard of living is greatly benefited because of the new things that research has been able to accomplish.

Research is a process that involves basically no more than asking questions of nature and seeking the answers. What new promise will come tomorrow is still a secret to many of the chemists living today. There will always be unexplored horizons waiting for someone to unlock the mysterious door to future progress, and it takes a pioneering spirit, a never-give-up attitude to discover those horizons and open those formidable doors.

There is no question but what chemicals are needed in the preparation, preservation and use of food. Much progress has been made through research in the field of nutrition and other practical applications of chemicals, and the American public can take pride in the manner in which our scientists and industry have handled these delicate problems.

I was privileged to be a member of a Select Committee, known as the Delaney Group Committee, established in 1950. We held 59 public hearings in 1950, 1951, and 1952, and heard 217 witnesses who presented their views; witnesses from the American Public Health Association, New York Academy of Medicine, National Research Council, United States Public Health Service, United States Food and Drug Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, American Cancer Society, Grocery Manufacturers of America, National Canners Association, National Agricultural Chemicals Association, Manufacturing Chemists' Association, American Plant Food Council, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Cooperative League of the U. S. A., American Home Economics Association, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Grange, National Farmers Union, and others.

The select committee had this to say about food chemicals:

"The number of chemicals entering the food supply of the Nation has increased tremendously in the last decade. Chemical substances are being introduced into the production, processing, storage, packaging, and distribution of food at an ever-increasing rate. There is hardly a food sold in the market today which has not had some chemicals used on or in it at some stage in its production, processing, packaging, transportation, or storage. These foods include those eaten by every family, ranging from staples like bread to such luxury items as the maraschino cherry. Some eminent pharmacologists, toxicologists, physiologists, and nutritionists expressed the fear that many of the chemicals being added to food today have not been tested sufficiently to establish their nontoxicity and suitability for use in food. These scientists are not so much concerned with the acutely toxic compounds, whose harmfulness can readily be detected, as with those chemicals which may produce harmful effects only after being ingested for months or perhaps for years."

In the 84th Congress, several bills have been introduced that deal with chemicals in foods, the so-called food additives. Most of them attempt to regulate through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the quantitative and qualitative application of these additives. I know that unwise and excessive regulations, coupled with unwise and excessive administration, can do harm to any industry. We ought to create a favorable climate, taxwise as well as healthwise, if we are to promote the best interest of our cause. American industry must be encouraged to produce more and better goods. They ought to be produced at continually lowering prices because technical progress has shown the way. All legislation dealing with the question of chemicals in food should point the way to better living conditions. If the standard of living is lowered, we are going in the wrong direction.

It is recognized that present law does not provide adequate safeguards to guarantee a food supply absolutely free of injury to the public health. The consuming public requires more protection.

While industry has done a good job, we all know that in a tough economic world there is always someone ready to cut corners. That is why the public needs protection from those who might be less scrupulous than the large majority of the food and chemical industry.

Chemicals, antibiotics, and other things that made food better are essential to many manufactured items. The proper use of chemicals and other methods of handling, preparing, and storing food has reduced the cost of food and has kept it at a higher quality. Your technology group should have a great influence in shaping future legislation.

It is my opinion that the horizons of tomorrow will show still further progress for the food and chemical industry. The scientists are uncovering the secrets of nature and helping us weave a new fabric of life that will be even more pleasant than the one we enjoy today.

The interest in food and drug administration is countrywide. It is a subject that needs careful handling. We should not make the public hysterical. We should have composure and an objective view if we are to approach the problem in the interest of the public.

We should be sure that any new chemical is safe before permitting its application to the public food supply and that it will benefit the consumer. Now, by "benefit to the consumer" I do not believe this should be confined solely to a showing of functional value. We must recognize that foods with taste appeal, eye appeal, or sales appeal in many instances benefit the consumer just as they benefit the manufacturer and the dealer, to say nothing of the "ad man." It should be the responsibility of industry to thoroughly pretest the food additive before it is made available to the consumer.

We should never have a law which might permit untested chemicals to be introduced into food, but as the law now stands, they can be introduced into food, and the burden rests with enforcement agencies to determine whether or not they are injurious to the public health.

The bill that I have introduced, while covering all phases of chemicals in food, does set up a panel or council which is advisory and may be used by the Food and Drug Administration or by industry when a dispute on a chemical arises. A panel will be selected from the members of the Academy of Science. Let me emphasize that they are merely advisory. If industry is not satisfied it may then appeal to the courts who would then make an adjudication between the opposing parties. In the meantime the new chemical could not be introduced into the food until the final decision is made. The bill requires prompt action and eliminates long delays.

There is a great need to fill the gap which seems to exist in the present law which permits untested and inadequately tested chemicals to enter the food supply. This country is fortunate that we have a high-class group of gentlemen dealing with chemicals and food problems, and so the problems are less frequent than might be supposed.

The number of bills that have been introduced which deal with this subject indicate the desirability of such legislation, and the varied approaches emphasize that there is no universal agreement on the method for dealing with the problem.

It is a technical subject. It deals with technical, scientific problems for which there are no ready or easy answers. It is also a delicate problem, because, in considering in this legislation the desirability of a mechanism for the protection of the public health, we must not lose sight of the overriding principle that free enterprise must be encouraged in its constant research for a better, a more attractive, a more abundant, and a safer food supply for the American public.

The bill I introduced in this Congress defines new food additives as "any substance or treatment used, directly or indirectly, in or on food for the purpose of affecting the appearance, flavor, texture, or storage property of such food, or for the purpose of otherwise altering the quality or property of such food, which is not recognized among experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of food, to be safe for use under the conditions of such use or intended use."

In other words, this definition confers jurisdiction in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to apply the procedural sanctions of this bill to any substance or treatment used in or on food if, in the quantity and manner of use, the substance is not recognized as safe by qualified scientists.

There are many food additives now in use that are safe and are recognized as safe. There are many food additives now in use about which we have little scientific knowledge, but which have been used without any laboratory or practical evidence of hazard to the public health. It is my feeling that legislation requiring exhaustive laboratory analysis, pretesting and reporting of the old, recognized, safe additives would serve no useful purpose and would be unduly burdensome upon both industry and Government. They should come under the so-called grandfather clause provision. If, however, evidence—scientific evidence—should be developed in the laboratory or otherwise that an additive in use presents a reasonable probability of injury to health, the industry marketing that additive should be made to examine and reexamine its data and subject this additive to the scrutiny of the Department under this law.

Most of the bills that have been introduced on this subject agree, at least in principle, with this statement of the objectives of such legislation and with the jurisdiction which should be conferred upon the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as its enforcement agency. The bills all quite uniformly agree that any industry proposing to market a substance that comes within the definition of a "new food additive" should submit a report of the scientific pretesting that has gone into development of the substance to the Department. The bills also are in material agreement on what the report should contain, and they all agree that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare should have certain power over the use of chemicals and other added substances in our food supply.

The significant division in thinking appears in the procedures that are to be established. Here again, however, we all agree that the public health is paramount, and we all agree that the magnificent progress of American industry must not be blocked by an unwise delegation of power to a Government agency. The procedures established by these bills all have this purpose in mind.

We are dealing here with a problem that is primarily scientific, and secondarily legal. The problem of "what is safe for public health purposes" is essentially one within the knowledge of scientists who are qualified by training and experience to evaluate safety factors.

I believe the primary responsibility for evaluating the safety of new food additives should fall upon an advisory committee, composed of scientists. Any industry proposing to market a new food additive, after submitting its report of pretesting to the Secretary, may request that an advisory committee be appointed to examine the report of pretesting, and, after completing its examination, to submit recommendations to the Secretary. It does give the applicant and the Secretary the benefit of the knowledge and the impartiality of a board of experts. Their independent and impartial knowledge can act as a brake upon any inclination that might appear on the part of the Secretary to exercise arbitrary and unreasonable control over industry. It can also serve as an arbiter between industry and the Department if sharp differences develop. The committee can be requested and consulted by the Secretary, just as it can by the applicant industry.

The advisory committee device has proved itself well in another facet of the food field since the enactment of Public Law 518 of the 83d Congress. That law, of course, deals with the use of pesticide chemicals, or the Miller bill. It established advisory committees to make recommendations to the Secretary on pesticide chemical tolerances. I have followed the same framework in writing the advisory committee into new food legislation.

To those who fear the use of the advisory committee and suggest that it would become a tool in the hands of a capricious Department, may I say that on the only occasion when an advisory committee has been consulted under Public Law 518, the Committee's recommendations were contrary to the opinion of the Secretary, but the Secretary subsequently followed the recommendations of the committee.

The Secretary is given authority to write regulations that will define the use of a new food additive. If the applicant, or any party adversely affected wishes to protest the regulations, he may file objections thereto and proceed to public hearing in the Department. The Secretary will then proceed to issue an order pursuant to the findings at the hearing, and the applicant's recourse is to the circuit court of appeals.

Again, let me say I am honored to appear before this distinguished group. I trust that in your deliberation you will give some thought to not only the new legislation but the type of legislation that will be best suited to a growing, dynamic America—the type of legislation that will best protect the health of America and provide the incentive for continued research in food technology.

Your land, America, is a dynamic, growing Nation. Many of the good things of life that we enjoy come about because devoted men and women of science have worked hard and long to make our land a better place to live. We have grown from the Thirteen Original Colonies with 3 million people to 48 States with 167 million people. You are a part of this parade of progress and I am sure you will continue to make scientific contributions that will be in the interests of future generations.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thy Kindly Light, with the encircling gloom about us, lead Thou us on.

We grope forward with uncertain steps, in a time tingling with tension and dark with fears.

Help us to trust the faithful stars above us and the glow on the far horizon, where the gates of dawn await the day of brotherhood.

May the poisoning evils which blight the earth not devastate our inner life, subduing us to its low standards, confusing us by its chaos, or crushing our faith under its tragedy.

Help us to face the piercing truth of the question—

Why build these cities glorious,
If man unbuilded goes,
In vain we build the world, unless
The builder also grows?

Growing in moral and spiritual stature, grant us honesty in dealing with our own besetting sins, humility in confessing them, and resolution in overcoming them. Grant us Thy grace to walk circumspectly, not as foolish, but as wise, redeeming the time because the days are evil.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 20, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2771) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Fourth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 11040. An act to advance the scientific and professional research and development programs of the Departments of Defense, the Interior, and Commerce, to improve the management and administration of certain departmental activities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11544. An act to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11619. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 11714. An act to extend for 3 years the existing authority of the Secretary of the Treasury in respect of transfers of distilled spirits for purposes deemed necessary to meet the requirements of the national defense.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1034. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Donald D. Parrish; and

H. R. 9739. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 11040. An act to advance the scientific and professional research and development programs of the Departments of Defense, the Interior, and Commerce, to improve the management and administration of certain departmental activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 11544. An act to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 11619. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

H. R. 11714. An act to extend for 3 years the existing authority of the Secretary of the Treasury in respect of transfers of distilled spirits for purposes deemed necessary to meet the requirements of the national defense; to the Committee on Finance.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees and a special committee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Committee on Armed Services;

The Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare;

The Veterans Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare;

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary;

The Special Committee on Lobbying Activities;

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations; and

The Reorganization Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection with the transaction of the routine morning business be limited to 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for action on the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Glen L. Strange, to be postmaster at Tonkawa, Okla., vice H. J. Barclay, retired;

James F. Houser, Jr., to be postmaster at Newkirk, Okla., vice E. C. Lucas; and

Gene L. Taylor, to be postmaster at Wann, Okla., vice D. M. Bailey, resigned.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Kenneth S. Harrison for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the United States Coast Guard Reserve;

Edward J. Worrel, Jr., and sundry other persons, for appointment in the United States Coast Guard; and

Joseph P. Lushene, and sundry other persons for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

T. A. M. Craven, of Virginia, to be a member of the Federal Communicatcns Commission, vice Edward Mount Webster.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Garrison Norton, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nomination of Maj. Gen. Lewis Blaine Hershey, Director of Selective Service, to be lieutenant general, United States Army. I also report the nominations of 2 major generals in the Marine Corps to be assigned special commands in the rank of lieutenant general, as well as the names of 2 lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps to be placed on the retired list. I ask that these nominations be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be placed on the Executive

Calendar, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The nominations are as follows:

Maj. Gen. Lewis Blaine Hershey, United States Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, with the rank of lieutenant general; and

Maj. Gen. Ray A. Robinson, and Maj. Gen. Merrill B. Twining, United States Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President, with the rank of lieutenant general; and

Lt. Gen. Alfred H. Noble, and Lt. Gen. William O. Brice, United States Marine Corps, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the grade of lieutenant general.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in addition to the above, I report favorably 5,217 nominations in grades below flag and general officer rank involving appointment, promotion, and transfer in the Regular Army, temporary and permanent appointment and promotion in the Navy and Marine Corps, and appointment and promotion in the Regular Air Force. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Glenn A. Boger, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATON

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of David A. Hamil, of Colorado, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William G. Juergens, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nominations today confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Are we in the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS OF OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, covering overobligations of certain appropriations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

ANNUAL REPORT OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration, for the year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTS WITH BUSINESS FIRMS FOR WORK IN THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military prime contracts with business firms for work in the United States, for the period July 1, 1955, through April 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN ACCESS RIGHTS TO CITY OF NEW YORK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to surrender and convey to the city of New York certain rights of access in and to Marshall, John, and Little Streets, adjacent to the New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N. Y., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CLARIFICATION OF NAVIGATION RULES FOR GREAT LAKES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify the application of navigation rules for the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of Jacob Passic and Urania Antippas from reports relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on February 1, 1956, and March 15, 1956, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of Yao Kui Chu and Francesco Iurman from reports submitted to the Senate on July 25, 1955, and January 16, 1956, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of their immigration status (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A telegram, in the nature of a petition, from the Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles County, Calif., signed by James S. Allison, chief clerk, relating to old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted at a mass meeting of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians, at Detroit, Mich., relating to communism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petitions of Mrs. J. A. Taylor, Mrs. Stella M. Fowler, Mrs. E. K. Rehker, Gertrude Farrell, and Mrs. Maude Sutter, all of Bloomington, Ill., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 923) to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the American Veterans of World War II and Korea, AMVETS, Department of Ohio, favoring the enactment of House bill 11357, relating to a program of scholarships for students in science and education at institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the National Society of Professional Engineers, at Atlantic City, N. J., relating to navigational clearance requirements for highway and railroad bridges; to the Committee on Public Works.

The petition of Mrs. W. R. Manley, of Valyermo, Calif., relating to the reduction in age limit for women eligible for retirement benefits under the Social Security Act; ordered to lie on the table.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND CONTROL OF WATER RUNOFF—RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I present a resolution which was adopted by the officers and members of the Brown County Kansas Farm Bureau, the Brown Soil Conservation District, the Walnut Creek Watershed District No. 1, and the Brown County Agricultural Council in regard to the proposed amendments to Public Law No. 566.

This program of soil conservation and the control of water runoff at its source is one program that is of real value to our area and I urge that the committee give favorable consideration to these suggestions.

I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIAWATHA, KANS., *June 6, 1956.*

We, officers and members of the Brown County Kansas Farm Bureau, the Brown County Soil Conservation District, the Walnut Creek Watershed District No. 1, and the Brown County Agricultural Council in a common meeting called to consider provisions of the proposed amendments to Public Law 566 passed by the House of Representatives and now referred to a subcommittee on agriculture of the United States Senate.

After due consideration respectfully submit to the honorable members of the subcommittee the following observations and recommendations:

Whereas, when, in compliance with the laws of Congress and the laws and regulations of the different States, the land owner and/or operator has taken all the required measures of construction of waterways, terraces, diversion ditches, building of farm ponds, seeding of waterways, and such other measures as may be required as a condition precedent to consideration of any project contemplated by Public Law 566 and any amendments thereto, the land owner and/or operator has completed all land and water management measures in which he is individually concerned therefore, all thereto are designed solely for the benefit of the general public and should be paid for out of the public treasury. Such measures as mentioned immediately above shall include procurement of all easements and construction cost of all such complementary structures as may be deemed necessary by the engineers of the Soil Conservation Service to make permanent and effective the soil and water conservation operations previously performed on the land and the major flood prevention and water retarding structures recommended by the Soil Conservation Service, in putting into effect the provisions of Public Law 566 as to be amended.

And whereas the watershed plan of development of soil and water conservation and flood prevention as contemplated under Public Law 566 is as much a matter of public interest as are larger dams constructed on main streams and rivers and perform much the same function, we submit to the honorable members of the subcommittee that all provisions applicable to the one are equally applicable to the other whether large or small, projects having the same functions should receive like treatment.

We further submit that the engineers in the Soil Conservation Service are fully capable of laying out and supervising any projects authorized under Public Law 566 and we object to any provision requiring their findings to be submitted to any other body of engineers as being unjustly derogatory of the Soil Conservation Service and a waste of time and effort.

It was stated at this meeting by members of the board of directors of the Walnut Creek Watershed District No. 1, organized under Public Law 566, that unless the recommendations enumerated above are included in the proposed amendment to the act, Walnut Creek Watershed cannot be developed under the law.

NATHAN K. BABCOCK,
Chairman, Brown County Soil Conservation District.
GLEN D. BYER,
President, Walnut Creek Watershed District No. 1.
ROBERT D. KORTHANKE,
Chairman, Brown County Agricultural Council.
JAMES W. PATTON,
President, Brown County Kansas Farm Bureau.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT COMMITTEES IN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have long been deeply interested in assuring the closest cooperation between the management of the vast United States Post Office Department and the great numbers of its employees throughout the Nation.

I was pleased, therefore, to receive the text of a resolution, which was adopted at the convention of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor, urging the establishment of labor-management committees in the Department, so as to assure the best possible working relations.

I believe this resolution will be of interest to my colleagues on the Senate Post Office Committee. I present the resolution, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 47—INTRODUCED BY DELEGATE KENNETH SLIPPER, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS, PIONEER BRANCH NO. 2

Whereas it is the general practice in private industry to have committees representing labor and management meet on a friendly basis to iron out their difficulties; and

Whereas our National Government has insisted on the establishment of such labor-management committees; yet the Post Office Department has failed to organize such committees: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates to the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor in convention assembled in the city of Oshkosh, Wis., August 15 through 18, 1955, go on record as favoring the establishment of labor-management committees in the Post Office Department, and instruct the officers of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor to use their best efforts to assist in bringing about such legislation.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES—LETTER FROM WISCONSIN STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present a letter which I have received from the secretary-treasurer of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor, George W. Hall.

He has urged that, as of the first pay period after March 1 of this year, the faithful postal workers of the United States be given across-the-board salary increases.

I believe the judgment of the Federation merits the earnest consideration of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN STATE
FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Milwaukee, Wis., June 18, 1956.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Letter carriers and all postal employees have been receiving adjustments in salaries, long after the outside industries have advanced. The recent increase fell far short of their actual needs.

Because of the inequities we are requesting that you use your good office to assist in the support and passage of bill Nos. S. 3846 and H. R. 11116, which are companion bills. These bills provide for a $600 cross-the-board increase, and 30 cents per hour for substitutes.

The effective date of the bill is the first day of the first pay period following March 1, 1956.

Appreciating your assistance, I am,
Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. HALL,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I know my colleagues are deeply interested, as I am, in assuring a fair and sound program for the faithful members—present and past—of the Reserve forces of the United States and of the National Guard.

I present an important resolution which was adopted at the most recent annual convention of the Reserve Officers Association, Department of Wisconsin, urging the enactment of clarifying legislation in the interest of genuine equalization of benefits, as compared with that accorded to officers of the regular service.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 sought to achieve equalization of benefits as to retirement accorded Reserve and National Guard officers as compared with officers of the Regular Service; and

Whereas the Comptroller General of the United States has interpreted and ruled in effect that there is not an equalization of benefits under the act; and

Whereas there is pending before the 84th session of Congress two bills designed to bring about the enactment of legislation so clear in wording that misconstruction, ambiguity, and evasion thereof will not be possible; said bills being Senate 1643 and H. R. 6408 stating as follows:

"SEC. 8. Paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

" 'The retired pay of any officer of the Armed Forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, heretofore or hereafter retired under any provision of law, shall, unless such officer is entitled to retired pay of a higher grade, be 75 percent of the active duty pay of his rank and length of service.' "

Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Department of Wisconsin, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, in convention assembled at Appleton, Wis., this 5th day of May 1956, that the Department of Wisconsin approves of and urges the passage of Senate bill 1643 and H. R. 6408 pending before the 84th Congress, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of the Wisconsin Department to all members of the Senate and House Armed Services Committee, Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, and Lt. Col. Floyd Oles, USAR, secretary, Reserve Equalization Committee and Wisconsin Senators and Congressmen.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 9828. A bill to transfer 600 acres of public domain to the Kanosh Band of Indians, Utah (Rept. No. 2279).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 3665. A bill to allow a homesteader settling on unsurveyed public land in Alaska to make single final proof prior to survey of the lands (Rept. No. 2280).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H. R. 5657. A bill to allow the use of certain property in Volusia County, Fla., for civil-defense purposes without payment of compensation to the United States (Rept. No. 2282); and

H. R. 8552. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the town of Chincoteague, Va., permanent easements on certain lands for the purpose of taking subterranean water (Rept. No. 2281).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

S. 976. A bill to provide for the release of the right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract or parcel of land conditionally granted by it to the city of Montgomery, W. Va. (Rept. No. 2283); and

S. 3404. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army or his designee to convey an 11¼ acre tract of land situated in the vicinity of Williamsburg, Va., to the State of Virginia (Rept. No. 2284).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

S. 3998. A bill to provide for the development of the Federal fish hatchery, known as the Holden trout hatchery, at Pittsford, Vt. (Rept. No. 2285).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

HELLS CANYON DAM—ADDITIONAL TIME TO SUBMIT REPORT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on June 19, 1956, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I reported favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1333) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes. At that time unanimous consent was given to file the report on June 22, 1956. I now ask unanimous consent that the time for filing the report may be extended until Tuesday, June 26, 1956, together with any separate or dissenting views submitted by members of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 4095. A bill to authorize the construction of a reactor at Hanford, Wash., to produce special nuclear material and power, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. JACKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 4096. A bill to establish recreational use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to make a comprehensive study of national forest recreational use needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 4097. A bill to make it a crime to transport any person in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of committing rape upon such person, or to travel in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of committing rape upon any person; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 4098. A bill for the relief of Za Lee Moh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 4099. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. for the construction of a dam on the North Branch of the Potomac River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 4100. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps commemorating the 250th anniversary of the founding of the city of Albuquerque, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 4101. A bill to provide for the disposition of certain property of the United States heretofore conveyed to the housing authority of the city of Seattle, State of Washington; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 4102. A bill to authorize negotiations with respect to a compact to provide for a definition or relocation of the common boundary between Arizona and California, and for the appointment by the President of a Federal representative to the compact negotiations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 4103. A bill for the relief of Cornelis Vander Hoek;

S. 4104. A bill to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners, and for other purposes;

S. 4105. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to fees of United States marshals; and

S. 4106. A bill to amend section 544 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the bonds of United States marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution to extend the time for filing the final report of the Commission on Government Security to June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

FURTHER EXTENSION OF TIME FOR STUDY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 294) which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 154, 84th Congress, agreed to February 20, 1956 (authorizing a study of the administration of the Government employees security program), is amended by striking out "July 31, 1956" whenever it appears in such resolution and inserting in lieu thereof "January 31, 1957."

CONSTRUCTION OF A REACTOR AT HANFORD, WASH.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the construction of a dual-purpose reactor at Hanford, Wash.

The type of reactor proposed in this bill is unique. We hear much, Mr. President, about the value of atomic energy for both peacetime and wartime use. The dual-purpose reactor, however, is not designed to meet just one of these needs. The dual-purpose reactor combines—in one instrument—both the sword and the plowshare.

In plutonium, the dual-purpose reactor produces a material vital to our military program. Exploration of plutonium's peacetime potential has barely begun. In power, the dual-purpose reactor produces a material increasingly critical to our economic progress. The reactor proposed in my bill will produce over 200,000 kilowatts of electricity. This output can now be utilized entirely within the atomic energy works at Hanford. The drain which Hanford creates on Northwest power supplies will be correspondingly lessened. In addition, this reactor will produce isotopes for use in research, medical, and industrial applications.

By its nature, Hanford is a most appropriate location for the first dual-purpose reactor in this country. Not only can Hanford now utilize its products, but Hanford is uniquely equipped to build and operate this instrument. Costs would be greatly increased if the auxiliary services now available at Hanford had to be provided at some other site. Among the services now ready for use in this connection at Hanford are fuel fabrication and chemical processing operations, shops, warehouses, and laboratories.

Mr. President, the construction of a dual-purpose reactor at Hanford will permit revolutionary advances in our reactor technology. We know that the dual-purpose reactor is technically feasible. There is reason to believe that it is economically feasible. The only way, however, that we can perfect this reactor as a double-edged weapon for war or peace is to build one. Clearly, we can learn much from the dual-purpose reactor authorized in this bill. While we learn, we will gain material benefits in both power and plutonium.

This project, Mr. President, offers a great opportunity to capitalize on the technical advances and development at Hanford over the past decade. It provides a great opportunity to push forward the boundaries of our knowledge in the atomic field. Favorable action on this bill will mark a milestone in our progress toward the best possible use of the gifts of the nuclear age.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4095) to authorize the construction of a reactor at Hanford, Wash., to produce special nuclear material and power, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JACKSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

A PROGRAM TO PROMOTE AND ENCOURAGE RECREATIONAL USE OF NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for reference to the appropriate committee, a bill to establish recreational use of the national forests of this country as a policy of Congress. My bill would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to make a comprehensive 1-year study of national forest recreational use needs.

Original construction and provision of facilities in our national parks and forests have long since become inadequate to the vastly increased attendance in all recreational areas throughout this country by vacationers and other visitors. In the case of our national park system, this expanded use has been recognized by a major program to improve park facilities—the widely known Mission 66. The bill which I am introducing simply carries this principle over to the national forests whose facilities are equally in need of repair and expansion. Both parks and forests are essential, Mr. President.

The need for such a program for forest areas is vital. In recent years the national forests have been visited by nearly 2½ times as many people as have the national parks. For example, in 1955 it was estimated that the national forests were visited by more than 45,700,000 people, while approximately 18,800,000 people entered national parks. In my own State of Oregon, visitors to national forests in 1955 outnumbered national park visitors by 10 to 1. In that year there were 3,221,000 visitors in Oregon's national forests compared with 343,839 visitors to the Crater Lake National Park in Oregon. Campsite facilities have consequently become overcrowded and often have fallen into disrepair. These facts alone prove the necessity for an overall program of improvement for national forests.

SCENIC MAJESTY ABOUNDS IN NATIONAL FORESTS

I might mention that some time ago a related bill, of which I was a cosponsor, was introduced by my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. That bill, S. 3742, calls for a public policy to reserve areas in our great natural forested lands for public uses, including recreation. That bill would protect such great beauty spots as the Beaver Marsh area on the upper McKenzie River where only recently the voters of the city of Eugene, Oreg., rejected a plan to destroy the natural grandeur by constructing a small power installation.

An additional bill, S. 3980, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] on June 4, 1956, for himself and his colleague the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], has recognized the same important problem as my bill does. The bill of the Senators from Montana authorizes a maximum of $7½ million annually to be spent for the improvement of recreation areas. My bill, in directing the Secretary of Agriculture to present to Congress within 1 year a comprehensive plan for national-forest improvement, will facilitate the expenditure of any money which might be appropriated under the excellent bill of Senators MURRAY and MANSFIELD.

The month of June is being observed as National Recreation Month to commemorate the 50th anniversary celebration of the National Recreation Association, an organization which, since 1906, has provided leadership in developing better recreation for the American people. Because of the role which the national forests have played in our Nation's recreational pattern, it is especially fitting at this time that we consider the future possibilities which the forests offer in enhancing recreational opportunities.

LEGISLATION WOULD ENCOURAGE NATIONAL FOREST RECREATION

The bill which I am introducing today provides for a survey and plan for the proper development of necessary facilities in our national-forest system, including such areas as might in the future be preserved for conservation and outdoor recreation.

I ask unanimous consent that along with the text of the bill there be printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the attendance records over a period of years in national parks and national forests.

Furthermore, Mr. President, let me add that I am introducing the bill for myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and table will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4096) to establish recreational use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to make a comprehensive study of national forest recreational use needs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in recognition of the fact that the national forests constitute an invaluable asset in the recreational life of the people of the United States, providing actual and potential recreational possibilities of great importance to the national economy; that use of such forests for recreational purposes, including picnicking, camping, skiing, swimming, hunting, fishing, hiking and mountain climbing is rapidly increasing, reaching an all-time high of 45.5 million visits in 1955; that visits to improved recreational areas within the national forests have almost tripled since the 1930's when most of such areas were planned and their facilities constructed in connection with Civilian Conservation Corps projects; that many of such facilities are now reaching the age where heavy maintenance and even replacement are becoming necessary; that many popular recreational areas are now regularly overcrowded and an extensive program of construction of new facilities to accommodate present use is necessary; that the continuing increase in our population emphasizes the growing need for increasing the national forest recreational opportunities with new facilities; that the national forests comprise the largest area of productive habitat for public fishing and hunting grounds in the country; and that funds available to the Department of Agriculture for providing the necessary maintenance, replacement, and construction of national forest recreational areas and facilities and for wildlife habitat management are not adequate to meet present and future needs; it is declared to be the policy of the Congress that public use of the national forests for purposes of recreation is a beneficial and proper use of such forests and that development and maintenance of areas and facilities for such public use, including maximum safety, sanitation, and wildlife habitat values, is a proper function of the Federal Government.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to initiate and carry out a comprehensive study of the personnel, funds, and other requirements necessary to develop within 5 years an adequate program for recreational use and wildlife habitat on the national forests and to provide the proper services and facilities to carry out the program. The Secretary shall within 1 year report to the Congress the results of the comprehensive study and his program recommendations including funds and any legislation necessary to permit implementation of the recommendations, such report and recommendations specifically to include provisions for (a) the development, maintenance, and operation of areas and facilities needed for public recreational use, (b) coordinating wildlife management with other resource uses and development and maintenance of wildlife habitat, and (c) adequate safety, sanitation, and health measures and facilities.

The table presented by Mr. NEUBERGER is as follows:

UNITED STATES

	Attendance	
	National Park	National Forest
1950	13,918,872	27,368,000
1951	15,079,165	29,950,000
1952	17,142,658	33,007,000
1953	17,372,080	35,403,000
1954	17,968,596	40,304,000
1955	18,829,541	45,713,000

OREGON

	Attendance	
	National Park	National Forest
1950	310,796	1,778,000
1951	289,286	1,907,000
1952	312,677	2,275,000
1953	332,835	2,413,000
1954	370,554	2,803,000
1955	343,839	3,221,000

ESTABLISHMENT OF BOUNDARY BETWEEN CALIFORNIA AND ARIZONA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the people of Arizona and the people of California find themselves in a friendly dispute with respect to what constitutes the accurate and legal boundary between those two States. I am very glad the State governments of both Arizona and California have agreed the question should be amicably settled to the satisfaction of the people of the two States.

So, on behalf of myself, my able colleague, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the two able and distinguished Senators from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN and Mr. GOLDWATER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the approval by Congress of a compact to be entered into between the two States, and under which the President of the United States shall appoint an independent representative, so that the ends of justice may be fully met with respect to the problem of what constitutes the boundary between Arizona and California.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4102) to authorize negotiations with respect to a compact to provide for a definition or relocation of the common boundary between Arizona and California, and for the appointment by the President of a Federal representative to the compact negotiations, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I submit two amendments which I intend to propose to H. R. 11356, the Mutual Security Act of 1956. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be printed and lie on the table.

The first of these amendments, if adopted, would make military assistance funds a part of the regular Defense Department budget. For use beginning in fiscal year 1957, there would be authorized the same amount as recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee; namely, $2,525,000,000. For subsequent years, there would be a continuing authorization of such sums as may be necessary.

Every witness on military assistance has told us that this program is an integral part of our own defense effort. It seems to me, therefore, that it should be handled in the same manner as funds for our own Armed Forces. This amendment would make that possible. It would emphasize the concept that military assistance is a part of our national defense. It would remove the inaccurate label of "foreign aid" from this part of our defense program.

The second amendment I am submitting, Mr. President, has to do with economic assistance. Instead of the $243 million authorized by the committee bill for these purposes, my amendment would set up two loan funds. One of these would be a $2 billion line of credit in the Export-Import Bank available over a 3-year period for good, hard dollar loans to underdeveloped countries. The second would be a fund of $500 million available to the International Cooperation Administration for soft loans which might be repayable in foreign currencies.

This amendment, if adopted, would put all of our foreign economic development assistance on a businesslike loan basis. Such a program not only makes more sense to the American people; I am convinced it will also make more sense to our friends abroad. The sums of money are large, but they would be used over a period of years, and they would be paid back to the United States Treasury.

It is significant that the much-talked-about Soviet economic offensive is on an all-loan basis. I believe one reason for this is that the Soviets recognize that loans are more acceptable than grants to proud, independent peoples. By putting our own program on an all-loan basis, my amendment would, in my judgment, substantially increase its effectiveness.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendments, together with a series of editorials and an article dealing with my proposals may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments, editorials and article will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments are as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. CAPEHART to the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, viz: On page 27, in line 11, strike out "paragraphs" and insert "paragraph."

Strike out all beginning in line 12 on page 27 through line 9 on page 28 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense to carry out the purposes of this chapter not to exceed $2,525,000,000 for use beginning in the fiscal year 1957 to remain available until expended, and thereafter there are authorized to be appropriated annually to remain available until expended such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter."

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. CAPEHART to the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, viz: On pages 30 and 31, strike out all of section 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 6. Title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to development assistance, is further amended by adding the following new sections:

" 'SEC. 203. (a) There is hereby established in the Export-Import Bank of Washington an International Development Fund of $2 billion which shall be extended as a line of credit to the countries and non-self-governing territories of the Near East (including Greece and Turkey), Africa, Asia, and Latin America and to Spain for projects designed to promote the economic development of such countries and non-self-governing territories.' "

On pages 30 and 31, strike out all of section 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Credits established under authority of this section shall be extended on such terms and conditions of repayment as may be determined by the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems and with the Secretary of State: *Provided*, That all such credits shall be repayable in United States dollars.

"(c) Credits extended under authority of this section shall not be considered in determining whether the Export-Import Bank of Washington has outstanding at any one time loans and guaranties to the extent of the limitation imposed by section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 526), as amended.

"(d) To carry out the purposes of this section, the Export-Import Bank of Washington is authorized to issue from time to time for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury its notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations to the extent of $2 billion in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 526), as amended, but without regard to the limitation imposed by such section on the aggregate amount of such obligations which may be outstanding at any one time.

"(e) No credits shall be extended under authority of this section after June 30, 1959, but this subsection shall not be construed as preventing the Export-Import Bank of Washington from exercising, subsequent to that date, such functions as may be necessary for the carrying out of credit agreements entered into prior to that date.

"SEC. 204. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the International Cooperation Administration not to exceed $500 million which shall be available for loans to the countries and non-self-governing territories of the Near East (including Greece and Turkey), Africa, Asia, and Latin America and to Spain for projects designated to promote the economic development of such countries and non-self-governing territories.

"(b) Loans may be made under authority of this section under such terms and conditions of repayment, including repayment in foreign currency, as the Secretary of State may prescribe.

"(c) Amounts received in repayment of principal and interest on any loan made under this section shall be held by the Treasury to be used for such purposes, including further loans, as may be authorized from time to time by Congress."

The editorials and article presented by Mr. CAPEHART are as follows:

[From the New Albany (Ind.) Tribune of May 4, 1956]

CAPEHART PLAN TO AID

Senator CAPEHART has come forward with a proposal for putting foreign aid on a business plan of administration.

Instead of administering military aid through civil agencies he would commit such aid to military authorities for proper and effective distribution and application.

Economic aid he proposes to administer through the World Bank, an institution largely financed by America and equipped with facilities, understanding, and experience for transactions with or among nations. The aid would be made accessible in 3-year credits repayable in the currency of the nations aided.

It is an unfortunate but well-known and much-discussed fact that American foreign aid has been misunderstood abroad and often in places at home and that, in its actual appreciation, there has been great waste and disappointment in material results and that considerable ill will has been engendered among foreign nations aided.

Business methods are of common understanding all over the world and the responses of honorable nations to them are fairly standard.

America's lavish gratuities—$55 billion since 1945—in form of so-called aid have no comparable precedents in international relations. They hardly translate themselves into common understanding or an acceptable standard of response.

That condition of fact is partly attributable to the offering of aid at the outset under the Marshall plan to Russia among others and to an apparent understanding by America to nurse all nations, irresponsible of ideology and potential enmity, back to economic health. That understanding has now come to be considered an American duty and obligation to the world.

Such a conception is as fantastic as it seems to be firmly set. America, with 160 million of people and a relatively small segment of the earth, can help the other 2 billion people and the large rest of the earth. Some she can help those who help themselves enough to defend their freedom. But all she can do is to give some help. To help the most possible, all help she gives must be wisely administered and effectively used.

French Premier Mollet is not alone in his misunderstanding and complaint of aid. He suggests that American aid (American taxpayers' money) be delivered to the United Nations for administration in order to avoid possible interference by the United States in the use or mode of use of aid by recipients.

Statesmen of India complain that American aid is accompanied by some expectation of moral or other obligation on the part of the donees or some sympathy for American policies and the common cause.

The French Premier does not at all grasp the American taxpayers' point of view. The American taxpayer admits no grandiose sense of obligation to keep the world or to commit himself to some other sovereignty to do so. To give his aid to the United Nations, of which Russia is a member, in order to create a defense against Russia does not strike too favorably his sense of wisdom or his feelings.

A great deal can be said for Senator CAPEHART's plan which may reach into fields of conviction in which he has no intention to plow. It is enough that he has proposed a plan of practical businesslike merit which will effect the real purposes which aid is intended to serve or which the taxpayers desire that they serve.

His plan neither increases or decreases the extent of the aid to be given. It neither extends nor shortens the time in which America may commit itself to finance foreign aid. It coerces no nation to accept aid. It withdraws from Americans no power to exercise their will in creating aid.

It creates a circulating economic fund which is not exhausted by the first beneficiaries, but passes to others as it is replaced by the first. It will accommodate at any time and times all the billions Americans may deem desirable and possible to contribute to it.

The plan may have some flaws, but hardly any that cannot be ground out in the drafting and amending mill of Congress.

It undoubtedly will find opposition. It is the common expression that business in Washington is not businesslike and cannot be made so. We are not so certain. The income tax seems quite sternly businesslike at times. However, it is true that businessmen in Congress are constantly attempting to upset bureaucratic apple carts, protocol of authority, and fixed habits of thinking and acting.

The keen edge of the Capehart plan does cut through a lot of adipoise and some proud flesh in its surgery—and it is surgery.

But unless some cogent reasons are advanced against it, it should retain all the appearances of remedial surgery which might well restore health, vigor, and efficiency to the organs of foreign aid.

[From the Indianapolis News of May 1, 1956]

CAPEHART HAS THE RIGHT IDEA

The current Washington wave to "convert" our overseas defensive undertakings from military to economic needs some sober second thoughts.

It may be the Soviet Union's idea of throwing us off balance.

Moscow talks about reducing its armed forces. Yet the United Nations Economic Survey of Europe for 1955 discloses there was at least a 12 percent rise in Soviet military expenditures last year. In the Soviet Union there is a continuing shift toward heavy industry and armaments.

Does this look like the North Atlantic Alliance ought to become a countinghouse instead of concentrating on armaments?

We believe Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is right in opposing such a conversion.

We believe House Foreign Affairs Chairman JAMES P. RICHARDS also is right. He says that, pending some explanation from the administration where it is going with economic aid plans, he favors treating the foreign aid bill as an interim measure.

The proposed total of $4,900,000,000 could and should be vastly reduced by eliminating not only the long-range provision, but also by confining our aid to proved friends.

Our foreign aid program needs revamping, all right, but not in the direction that some of our spenders would go.

What the United Nations needs to do is to take its overseas assistance out of the hands of the foreign politicians, instead of giving them more of it to manipulate.

Indiana Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART has introduced legislation which makes more sense than anything we have heard recently on the subject.

Senator CAPEHART urges that the bulk of foreign aid—that for military purposes—be turned over for disbursement to military agencies, instead of being spent, as presently, by civilians.

He is right in stating that "the sole purpose of these expenditures is to bolster the defenses of the United States and its allies. This can best be done by the military."

Such economic expenditures as are needed should be in the form of loans, not grants. And they should be handled by the Export-Import Bank.

Senator CAPEHART's bill would put military expenditures in the hands of the military and economic aid in the hands of businessmen—on a business basis—as he explains.

That idea has so much logic that it may be hard for some Washington do-gooders to understand. But the American people understand that kind of language. They should make themselves heard.

[From the Indianapolis Star]

A SENSIBLE PLAN

Ten years of bitter experience with foreign aid and its failures seem to indicate that if Congress had listened to Senator HOMER CAPEHART in 1946, when the Marshall plan was proposed, Americans would be $65 billion richer and our allies would be in a sounder economic and military position than they are today.

In 1946, Senator CAPEHART proposed an alternative to the Marshall plan to give away money. He would have placed all foreign aid on a loan basis. Loans would have been made, not to governments but to individual businesses, industries, or agricultural programs. It all would have been handled by a sort of international RFC, using repayments of loans as a revolving fund to make new loans. All loans would have been made only if the possibility of repayment was there. Some repayments to the United States would have been made in strategic materials, much of which is now going to the Soviet Union from our allies, incidentally.

Today, Senator CAPEHART again proposes a similar substitute for foreign aid. He suggests that all military aid to other nations be handled directly by the Defense Department. He proposes that all giveaway aid be stopped. And he suggests that loans to foreign countries be handled by the Export-Import Bank, which requires that all purchases of goods with such loans be made in the United States.

The Capehart substitute is far more sensible than continuance of the present giveaway program. It takes the United States State Department out of both military giving and economic aid and puts both in the hands of experts competent to handle them. It would save American taxpayers about $4 billion a year. It would end American political interference, with foreign aid funds, in the internal affairs of our allies.

The Star believes the present foreign-aid program should be abolished. We recognize that it is in America's interest to help other people help themselves. But we believe that such aid should be put on a businesslike basis. Repayment should be expected. And money should be loaned only when there is a good possibility of a return. Under such circumstances the waste, the boondoggling, the foolish mistakes in judgment in foreign aid would be ended. This would help both the United States and our allies, because only worthwhile enterprises would be given assistance.

If the foreign-aid program is not to be completely abolished, as it should be, Senator CAPEHART's plan provides an excellent way to wind up the present program and get back to a businesslike handling of the American taxpayers' money. We suggest that all carryover funds for foreign aid, about $8 billion in unspent funds, be turned over in part to the military services and in part to the Export-Import Bank to carry out the Senator's plan. And we suggest that no new appropriation for foreign aid be made at all this year.

[From the Indianapolis News of May 7, 1956]

READER PRAISES CAPEHART PLAN FOR CHANNELING FOREIGN AID FUNDS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEWS:

Senator CAPEHART does have the right idea with his bill that would put our foreign-aid money into the proper hands. His plan to put military expenditures in the hands of the military and economic aid in the hands of businessmen—on a business basis of loans, not grants—is a must. It is hard to understand why this was not done long ago.

The United States cannot buy its friends and, I am sorry to say, much of our foreign aid has been watered on the leaves of these countries and has dripped into the hands of foreign politicians, with little water reaching the roots.

When I was in Korea it became obvious that even though Americans will be recorded as having the most humane armed forces in the history of mankind, we did and are still doing a poor job of winning friends. We step on many toes.

The only real, sound progress we have made has been through our missionary programs. Those people have done more to win friends and influence nations than all of our diplomats, politicians and money combined. The missionary is working at the grass-roots level, selling the very product that made America great, while our foreign-aid people try to buy our friends. The foreign-aid folks are going around with their feet off the ground and their heads up in the clouds.

No, I'm not trying to say Uncle Sam should move directly into the missionary field, but I do feel that Senator CAPEHART's bill is a step which could encourage this grass-roots feeling. It seems a shame that there is not

a missionary phase connected with our overseas forces, especially since we have troops the world over.

If we would back up all of our missionary people and correlate their programs with the military and businessmen we would actually win the ground on which we now stand. We have a much better product to sell than do the Reds with their communism, but we're not selling it.

Our freedoms made America great, and unless we keep our enterprise free, our worship free, and share it with the rest of the world, we cannot last. The United States belongs to the rest of the world the same as Indiana belongs to Ohio. This is no time to compromise with the principles that built our Nation. We must revive them and put them into use.

I will work untiringly in behalf of such a program. Will you?

THOMAS R. WARD.

AURORA.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 21, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1034) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Donald D. Parrish.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. JENNER:

Address entitled "A Constitutional Congress Can End World Government," delivered by him at Los Angeles, Calif., on June 7, 1956.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article entitled "How a Senator Promotes His State's Hotel Industry," written by him and published in the Hotel Gazette of June 9, 1956.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF RICHARD E. ROBINSON TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, June 28, 1956, at 11:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Richard E. Robinson, of Nebraska, to be United States district judge for the district of Nebraska, vice James A. Donohoe, deceased.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and myself, chairman.

CARE OF MENTALLY ILL OF ALASKA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6376) to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill in Alaska, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JACKSON. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. GOLDWATER conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROTEST AGAINST ICC SERVICE ORDER LIMITING RAIL CARS USE FROM GREAT LAKES PORTS—EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, an issue of the gravest importance to us of the Great Lakes States has arisen in connection with Service Order No. 914, issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission. This incredible and indefensible order limits to merely 2 days the free time on railroads delivering export cargo to ocean carriers at lake ports. By contrast a 6-day free-time period is authorized at all ocean and gulf ports under ICC Service Order 912.

There is no excuse whatsoever for this discrimination against Great Lakes ports. I respectfully urge reconsideration on the part of the Commission.

I may say that I have received telegrams from cities all along the lakes, as well as messages from distinguished representatives of the Great Lakes Harbors Association, including the Honorable Harry Brockel, municipal port director of Milwaukee, expressing sentiments similar to those which I am citing now.

Yesterday afternoon in Kenosha, Wis., I delivered an address spelling out the case against Service Order No. 914. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from my Kenosha address be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE KENOSHA KIWANIS CLUB, JUNE 20, 1956

SENATOR WILEY PLEDGES CONTINUED EFFORT FOR WISCONSIN PROSPERITY; PROTESTS ICC ORDER STIFLING GREAT LAKES RAILROAD TRAFFIC; URGES IMMEDIATE REVISION IN DISCRIMINATORY ORDER

I should like to talk to you, my friends, today about the problem of prosperity for our country, and, in particular, for our own State.

In considering this issue, a great many phases immediately come to mind.

America's booming production

In the first place, we are, as you know, still producing goods and services at a total figure of around $400 billion per year.

In the second place, the national income of our people is running at the almost third of a trillion dollars mark—$330 billion.

Unemployment spotty, but irritating

Sixty-four million Americans are employed.

In our own State, the picture is far from 100 percent bright, however. Some 19,000 jobless in Wisconsin have had to draw unemployment compensation.

When unemployment occurs, even if it is just spotty and relatively small in total (as compared with the rest of the Nation), the effect, as you know, on a specific city can be very severe.

To the unemployed man himself, to his wife and children, it is small comfort to know that the rest of our country may be prosperous.

And to the local shopkeeper or auto dealer or other merchant who finds that unemployment has cut down on purchases, even a relatively small jobless figure can prove serious.

And so, my aim, as I know the aim of all thinking Wisconsinites, is to try to make sure that we have reduced unemployment to an absolute minimum.

Our aim in Kenosha

You and I know of problems which have been experienced right here in the Kenosha area.

We know that a great deal more can be and should be done to help even out employment here and to keep raising the level of employment, the level of purchasing power, the level of income of this fine, forward-moving community.

You and I know, too, that the greatest source of Kenosha's progress and prosperity will continue to be Kenosha itself—through your own efforts, your own ingenuity and cooperation.

But whatever help you need can and should be given.

Of course, it has been a pleasure for me to cooperate toward gerater prosperity with a great many fine civic-minded groups here in Kenosha and throughout our State. My aim has been to help to attract more local industry, and to help expand the industry that is presently in the area.

I pledge my continued efforts along this line.

Speeding connecting channels

One of the ways by which I am, of course, doing so, is by speeding action on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway connecting channels.

You are all familiar with the fact that the first $5 million of appropriations for these connecting channels, west of Lake Erie, is now successfully approaching the concluding stages of congressional enactment.

These connecting channels are, of course, absolutely essential for prosperity of the upper lake area. Without the connecting channels being deepened and improved, we would not have a complete 2,300-mile, 27-foot waterway. With the channels, we will fulfill the ocean-coast goal which has been our Wisconsin dream for more than 3 decades.

But speed of construction is absolutely essential.

The main seaway navigation works will open in the spring of 1959. (Just a few weeks ago, I dedicated Eisenhower lock at Massena—on which excellent progress is being made.)

But the connecting channels will not, according to present engineering plans, be ready until 1962. So we've got to cut down this 3-year time difference—this serious time lag to the greatest possible extent. We want 27-foot traffic all the way and we want it at the earliest possible date.

My protest against unfair ICC order

Now there are more battles to be fought in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway.

One such phase of the battle is a new phase in which I have been engaged for the past 48 hours.

Urgent word came to me that the Interstate Commerce Commission had, under Service Order 914, effective last Thursday,

prohibited railroads serving Great Lakes ports from allowing free time in excess of merely 2 days on rail cars delivering export cargo to ocean carriers.

This order is to me absolutely indefensible. I accordingly sent a message of immediate protest to the ICC, urging its immediate reconsideration.

Let us analyze precisely the background of the order:

Under ICC Service Order 912, a period of 6 days—I repeat—6 days was allowed for free time on rail cars at every United States ocean port on all 3 seacoasts.

Why, then, the discrimination against the lake area? Don't the people on the ICC realize that the Great Lakes route, even in its present modest status, involves immensely significant commerce with the world, commerce which requires adequate interchange time—from rail to water?

I say that the ports on the Great Lakes are absolutely entitled to equal consideration with the competing gateways from the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts.

ICC—an independent body

Now, let me make it quite clear, my friends, that no one realizes more definitely than I that the Interstate Commerce Commission is an independent, quasi-judicial organization, which is entitled to come to its own judgment, as it sees fit.

It is not and must not be subservient to the legislative branch or to the executive branch.

ICC has set a prejudicial precedent

But the ICC has a responsibility of serving all United States transportation, not just a few powerful eastern railroads which tend to exert a very strong influence. The ICC has the responsibility of observing, not ignoring the facts. And there is no good reason under the sun why the ICC should not immediately reconsider its utterly absurd order—which sets, I point out, a very bad precedent insofar as future rail-to-ocean traffic from the Midwest is concerned.

I point out to you, my friends, that the railroad lines serving the west bank Lake Michigan ports of Milwaukee, Chicago, and Green Bay in April voluntarily revised their tariffs. They did so so as to provide for 7 days free time on railroad cars, carrying export freight for delivery to ocean vessels.

Prior to this time, for many years, all lake ports had been on a domestic basis of demurrage, with only 2 days free time allowed to interchange rail cars with ocean carriers.

Western railroads had voluntarily revised their tariffs to provide for 6 days free time, so as to conform to Service Order 912 of the ICC, providing for 6 days free time to conserve railroad equipment.

Rail diehards may be trying to stifle seaway

I point out to you this striking fact: On June 5, the 8 eastern railroads whose lines parallel the Great Lakes petitioned the ICC to suspend the tariffs published by the western rail lines, providing for 6 days free time at Lake Michigan ports.

I point out to you, my friends, the hard fact that these were the very same eastern railroads which unfortunately—by and large—opposed enactment of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

And it is even more regrettable that, although the main seaway battle has long been won by us—the Wiley seaway law having been signed in May 1954—apparently there may be some diehards in these railroads who are still trying to stifle St. Lawrence seaway traffic, even in its infancy.

My warning to eastern railroad influences

I want to issue a word of stern warning to eastern railroad sources, which may be trying to use their influence—in any possible way—to curb our Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway traffic.

I want to warn them that they are due for as bad a beating on this issue as they took on the St. Lawrence Seaway itself.

And it is not going to take us a fraction nearly as long as it took us the last time—to beat the opposition.

Now, what does this newest phase of the battle signify? It signifies that we of the upper Midwest still have a terrific job before us—to try to educate the rest of the Nation. Some folks elsewhere don't seem to realize that the entire economy of the Great Lakes, heart land of our country, is being revolutionized by the seaway.

They don't seem to realize that even before the seaway comes into fruition, in the spring of 1959, the Great Lakes area represents an inland empire which matches, and in many respects, surpasses anything which any other region of our country has to offer.

I don't intend to permit our Great Lakes area to be treated as a stepchild or as an orphan child. I don't intend to allow the eastern trunk line railroads or any other railroads to minimize on the slightest—our Great Lakes prosperity.

Many fine railroaders want teamwork

I want to assure tnis audience that I know that there are a great many thinking folks associated with the railroads, at both the management and labor end, who have long since buried the hatchet—in a friendly, peaceful way—on the seaway fight.

As a matter of fact, all during the seaway struggle, their hearts were not really in the battle against us.

They wanted to cooperate with us of the Midwest although they were pulled along by a few powerful eastern railroads. The thinking railroaders knew that Great Lakes prosperity means railroad prosperity. It means the ability of all competing transportation channels to expand.

There is more than enough room for a booming waterway and for a booming rail transportation network which feeds the waterway.

Meanwhile all America is expanding; 4,100,000 babies were born last year—representing in themselves a vast new market for America.

We of the Midwest desire no quarrel with the railroads, and certainly no quarrel with the railroad brotherhoods. I have always had a warm admiration for the railroad brotherhoods, they are as staunch, as honest, as hard-working, and respectable a real American group as there is anywhere in our Nation—in any walk of life.

The only quarrel that we have is with a relative minority of men—in powerful positions in eastern railroads, who may be determined to fight a last-ditch—delaying-type fight against us—against the Midwest on America's fourth ocean coast.

But the narrowminded diehards are not going to succeed.

I pledge my all-out efforts to assure victory for America's inland empire..

Conclusion

These, then, are but a few of the phases of the prosperity story for Wisconsin.

I want to invite every member of this audience to be in contact with me in Washington on all ways and means by which I can further help assure complete prosperity for our State.

It has been a pleasure to be with you today, and I hope that I will have another opportunity in the not too distant future.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC SIGNS AGREEMENT FOR NUCLEAR GENERATOR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, while I was in my State I was pleased to note among the news stories of inter-American cooperation the encouraging word with regard to a new forward step of technical advance in the hemisphere.

From Baltimore came word from the Glenn L. Martin Co. of its signature with the Government of the Dominican Republic of a contract for the construction of a nuclear-powered, electrical generating system.

I am sure that the carrying out of this contract will mark a most important, yes, a most historic landmark in the history of the forward surge of the peoples of the New World—their surge to an ever higher standard of living.

I know that there is profound satisfaction in this step, and I congratulate the government and the people of the Dominican Republic in this effort, the first such contract, I believe, to be signed by a Latin-American state.

I send to the desk the text of an article which appeared in last week's Wall Street Journal concerning the new generator.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLENN L. MARTIN GETS DOMINICAN REPUBLIC NUCLEAR GENERATOR ORDER

BALTIMORE.—The Government of the Dominican Republic has contracted with the Glenn L. Martin Co. for construction of a nuclear-powered, electrical generating system to meet the growing requirements of the island, according to a statement of Martin.

The contract is contingent on a bilateral agreement between the United States and the Dominican Republic before becoming effective. The proposed reactor would increase the present electrical generating capacity of the Dominican Republic to 57,000 kilowatts from 45,000.

The basic operating principle of the Martin industrial atomic reactor is a pressurized water system. Water is pumped at high pressure in a closed system (primary loop) passage through the reactor where it absorbs the heat generated by the slightly enriched uranium contained in the core. The superheated water then passes to a steam generator where it gives up its heat to a secondary system. The cooled primary loop water is then pumped back to the reactor to continue the cycle.

The secondary loop is in general a conventional steam electric power system. The dry, saturated steam supplied by the heat exchanger is expanded through high efficiency turbines which run the electric generator.

VOLUME OF AIRLINE BUSINESS AT THE WASHINGTON AIRPORT

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the people of the District of Columbia and surrounding areas, including Prince Georges and Montgomery Counties, in Maryland, have of late indicated deep concern regarding the inadequacy of the National Airport at Washington, D. C.

In the June 18 issue of Life magazine there appears a chart and statistics indicating the tremendous volume of business done by the commercial airlines at the city of Washington, in comparison with the volume of business done at Los Angeles, Dallas, Chicago, Atlanta, and New York. From the statistics it appears that the city of Washington has 427 arrivals daily, every 24 hours; the city of New York has only 272; Chicago has

400, or 27 less than the city of Washington; Dallas has 203; Los Angeles has 230; and Atlanta has 148.

In the case of departures, Washington has 408; Dallas has 204; Chicago has 400; New York has 282; Atlanta has 149; and Los Angeles has 226.

I ask unanimous consent that the chart giving those statistics be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Los Angeles: 230 arrivals, 226 departures, 12,666 passengers, 75,400 pounds of mail, 411,899 pounds of baggage, 53,216 pounds of freight.

Dallas: 203 arrivals, 204 departures, 6,809 passengers, 19,200 pounds of mail, 214,100 pounds of baggage, 90,800 pounds of freight.

Chicago: 400 arrivals, 400 departures, 27,338 passengers, 76,129 pounds of mail, 715,840 pounds of baggage, 158,254 pounds of freight.

Atlanta: 148 arrivals, 149 departures, 9,958 passengers, 13,000 pounds of mail, 226,000 pounds of baggage, 8,430 pounds of freight.

Washington, D. C.: 427 arrivals, 408 departures, 22,635 passengers, 19,207 pounds of mail, 375,000 pounds of baggage, 41,967 pounds of freight.

New York: 272 arrivals, 282 departures, 18,125 passengers, 33,866 pounds of mail, 456,118 pounds of baggage, 31,274 pounds of freight.

ADDRESS BY JOHN L. LEWIS AT DEDICATION OF 10 MEMORIAL HOSPITALS ESTABLISHED BY THE UNITED MINE WORKERS

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the United Mine Workers of America, through the instrumentality of their welfare fund, have built 10 magnificent modern hospitals in West Virginia, Virginia, and Kentucky, to furnish medical care and healing services for the afflicted members of that great organization.

These hospitals were all dedicated in a notable ceremony held in Beckley, W. Va., on the 2d day of this month. On that occasion, the president of the United Mine Workers, the renowned John L. Lewis, delivered an inspiring address, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY JOHN L. LEWIS AT THE DEDICATION OF THE 10 MEMORIAL HOSPITALS, JUNE 2, 1956

At these exercises today there are a large number of honored guests representing industry, finance, the social sciences, the medical sciences, and others, including the Governor of the great State of West Virginia, and the Members of Congress from the States of West Virginia, Kentucky, and Virginia.

In this connection I have this telegram to read from the Honorable James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor, quoting: "My best wishes attend the dedication of the 10 new United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund Hospitals today. The establishment of these much needed hospitals in West Virginia, Kentucky, and Virginia is but another chapter in the UMW's long history of dedicated service to its members and to the communities in which they live. Sincere regards to you and to those attending today's ceremonies." Signed: James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor of the United States.

Because of the vicissitudes of the weather, and the comfort of those in attendance, our program will be curtailed to some degree and certain of the ceremonials omitted. My own remarks will necessarily be brief. These 10 hospitals being dedicated today have been made possible through the United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund. That fund made certain grants-in-aid to the Memorial Hospital Association for the erection and the maintenance of these hospitals, which in every sense of the word become community hospitals. In an area of our country where improved hospital facilities were perhaps needed more than in any other similar area the United Mine Workers of America and the associated coal operators of the country, have made possible the welfare fund through joint negotiation in their industry contracts. It was perhaps 6 years of time between the conception of the fund, the negotiation of the fund, the stabilization of the fund, and its recognition by the public at large, as being a beneficial institution.

The major accomplishments of the fund have necessarily occurred in the last 6 years, since 1950. The fund officially has been in effect for the last 10 years, since May 1946.

We have present here today one of the public representatives who gave great assistance to the mineworkers of the country at a time when the Government of the United States was in doubt whether or not to permit the establishment of this fund. I refer to Mr. Arthur J. Altmeyer, who for many years administered the Federal Social Security program, and who with our own distinguished Miss Roche served on the Interdepartmental Committee of the Government which set up the Social Security System of the United States.

The mineworkers of the country owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Arthur Altmeyer, for the service he rendered in recommending to his Government that the Government execute a contract with the United Mine Workers of America which for the first time in the history of this agonized industry gave some consideration to the human element, and the right of men and their families to live, while they rendered service in the hazardous coal industry.

The establishment of this principle in the major coal industry formed a great incentive for other industries to set up similar devices for the protection of their manpower and the well-being of their employees. And recently, a Senate committee reported that the United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund had beneficiaries to the amount of almost 1 percent of the total population of the United States, and that in the United States some 70 million persons were more or less beneficiaries of the various funds set up in other industries.

Security, safety of person, the health and well-being of loved ones, are the motivating factors behind this great surge of sentiment which has crystallized into this organization whose record is public as to its accomplishments.

A Senate committee recently investigated exhaustively and almost to the point of exhaustion, the United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund, and in recent hearings before the Senate committee found that it was virtuous, sound, meritorious, and, hold your breath, honestly run.

I do not know that my associate trustees feel any more honest since that verdict was rendered than they did before, and I doubt if they can find any way to act more honestly. But in any event it is nice to have a certificate of character, and we have got one.

But, the services of this fund, the services of these hospitals, for the abatement of the illnesses and the agonies of those who are afflicted and distressed, can only be maintained as long as the men in this industry, on both sides of the question, investment, management, and labor, recognize the joint obligation of all of us to care for those who meet misfortune while serving in this industry.

I think today that there is a wider recognition of that virtue; and a more clearcut and well-defined acceptance of responsibility and desire to cooperate than in any time past that I can remember in the history of our industry. The great industrial leaders of the coal industry, I feel, recognize fully the contribution to the better health and welfare of the mining population that is coming through the systematic administering of this fund which created these hospitals, and they may take satisfaction and pride in their accomplishments.

Our industry during the last 6 years has been living in rather a new era of peace when conflict was abated and when men on both sides of the industry in immediate positions of leadership were free to apply themselves to the major project of making this industry successful and making it possible to operate under our system of free enterprise, and today our Nation boasts the most efficient, the most productive, coalmining industry in any country of the civilized world. Coal mined in greater quantity, of better quality, at a lower cost per ton than that of any civilized nation.

The efficiencies brought into the industry in recent years are responsible for the present modest price of the product at the mine heads of the country in contrast again to the conditions which exist in other mining countries. It is due to the genius of the managers of our industry, of its engineering and technical talent, and to the productivity of the American miners. It is necessary for all of us to do what we can to perpetuate that relationship and use our energy and our talent and our minds to go forward constructively in the economic and social sense rather than engage in the dissipation of that energy through internal economic warfare.

I am proud to testify to the success that has come jointly to all of those interested in the industry during the period which I mentioned. But, great achievement brings increased responsibility. And let me say to the mine workers of this country, be alert that you retain and keep for yourselves and your family that which you have achieved. Today is today and tomorrow is tomorrow, and each morrow brings its new problems and its new responsibilities. And let me charge each and every one of you that only your union can maintain this hospital in its present status and only your union can retain your welfare fund. So, protect your union and live up to your contract, and discharge your obligations under that contract, so that the operators of this country in the mines, in the various States, may have reliance upon your word, and your honor, and your good intent to live up to that obligation which you take when you make your contract.

If there are young men among us who are hasty and impulsive, and who have yet failed to achieve and acquire the wisdom that will come to them, I hope, in later years let the elders of this organization advise them and counsel them and hold them to accountability in your local unions for their wrongful actions.

The great scheme of these hospitals came after a long time in the industry. It took many, many years for the industry to achieve a position where it could underwrite and finance an erection of this character. These are memorial hospitals in memory of those men who died without hospitals, and without proper medical attention, in the hills and in the hamlets that infest this mountain country where men lived their lives and their families became destitute because there was no provision for them, when they were ground up in the wheels of the mining industry and cast aside because they were no longer competent to earn a living or to produce a ton of coal.

So these hospitals are in memory of those who suffered and died before us that we might today be more privileged and be more comfortable and be better treated, and live longer and fulfill more of the destiny of a human being.

So care for them, you men, and care for them you men who are on the operating side of the industry and let there be no return to the conditions that prevailed here in West Virginia as well as elsewhere not too long ago.

These everlasting hills which now echo the sound of my voice have been scenes of violence in the past, where the civil laws were perverted and where the rule of the lawless was permitted and encouraged by those who would stand in the way of the progress of labor. That day has gone; let it not come back.

And the price of not letting it come back is the cooperation of the investment side of the industry through its managers and the cooperation of the labor side through the union. And when I say cooperate, I mean cooperate with your contracts and your union rules.

I am sorry, there are additional things that I might say to you on this occasion, some of them historical and some of them dealing with the present, but consideration for the comfort of all requires me to terminate these proceedings very shortly.

I am now going to call for the unveiling of the several plaques which will be presented to the 10 hospitals.

Will the following representatives of the several hospitals come forward to the platform as I read their names:

From the Harlan Memorial Hospital, Mr. Robert L. Black, hospital administrator; Dr. David McLean Greeley, chief of clinical services.

From the Hazard Memorial Hospital, Mr. Larry C. Rigsby, hospital administrator; Dr. Clifford A. Best, chief of clinical services.

From the Whitesburg Memorial Hospital, Mr. Joseph J. Doney, hospital administrator; Dr. J. Huston Westover, chief of clinical services.

From the Middlesboro Memorial Hospital, Mr. Edwin L. King, hospital administrator; Dr. Warren H. Diessner, chief of clinical services.

From the Wise Memorial Hospital, Mr. Waldo R. McNutt, hospital administrator; Dr. Gerald N. Rein, chief of clinical services.

From the Williamson Memorial Medical Center, Mr. William B. Esson, hospital administrator; Dr. Gordon M. Meade, chief of clinical services.

From the McDowell Memorial Hospital, Mr. Charles D. Jenkins, hospital administrator; Dr. Cordell H. Williams, chief of clinical services.

From the Man Memorial Hospital, Mr. Andrew M. Gould, hospital administrator; Dr. Paul A. Keeney, chief of clinical services.

From the Pikeville Memorial Hospital, Mr. Harland W. Layer, hospital administrator; Dr. Charles N. Christensen, acting chief of clinical services.

From the Beckley Memorial Hospital, Mr. Steve J. Soltis, hospital administrator; Dr. Theodore S. Wilder, chief of clinical services.

Gentlemen, I am authorized by the board of trustees of the United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund, and the officers of the Memorial Hospital Association to present to each of you a ceremonial and dedication plaque for your institution, on this day, under these circumstances, and under these auspices.

I might say how intensely appreciative the trustees of the welfare fund are, and the executives of the Memorial Hospital Association, for the remarkable efficiency of your several services in setting up these 10 hospitals as a going concern, now operating, fulfilling their mission in the communities where they are located. I cannot say how much we appreciate the time, the service, the profound knowledge, the spirit of self-sacrifice which has animated all of you in encountering and disposing of the manifold and multitude of details essential to the opening of these great units.

We are appreciative of the task of the architects, of the builders, of the technical staff, the managerial staff and we dedicate these hospitals on this day entrusting to you and your successors in office all of the responsibility that goes with that presentation and with that dedication.

I can only say that I am sure that it will be in the hearts and the minds of the trustees always, that the spiritual motto that might be emblazoned above the portals of our institutions, be: "Let no soul in extremis be turned from these doors." Thank you all. Success and my compliments. I wish to shake hands with each one of you.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE DEPUTY SPEAKER OF PAKISTAN

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present to the Senate a distinguished visitor from Pakistan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Virginia may proceed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, it is my high honor and coveted privilege to present to the Senate at this time the Deputy Speaker of the Parliament and the leader of the Christian group of a new republic, the Republic of Pakistan.

On yesterday, a copy of the Constitution of Pakistan was delivered to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In this troubled period, when we welcome the friendship of those who share our views regarding the democratic manner of life and who share our love of personal freedom, I can say without fear of contradiction that we have no better friends than the 90 million people of Pakistan.

Today, we have with us one of the leaders of that nation, a man high in his government, a man who is the leader of the Christian group in Pakistan.

On behalf of the Democratic membership of the Senate, we welcome him, Mr. President. I only regret that our calendar schedule is such that we cannot invite him to speak here. We shall have little opportunity for the Members of the Senate to meet him personally; but at this time I take great pleasure in presenting to the Senate the Honorable Cecil E. Gibbon, of Pakistan. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, speaking on behalf of the Senators who sit on this side of the aisle, I wish to join in the remarks of the junior Senator from Virginia in welcoming our distinguished visitor from Pakistan.

As has been pointed out, our Nation has a close and friendly relationship with his great new Republic. It has been my privilege to be in his country on several occasions. I am very happy, on behalf, I know, of the entire membership of the Senate, to join in welcoming him here today. [Applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to point out that our distinguished guest also presented a copy of the Constitution of Pakistan to the presiding officer of the Senate, and that copy is available in the formal office of the Vice President, for Members of the Senate to observe.

In that connection, the Chair would like to point out, too, that the man who was primarily the author of the Constitution of Pakistan, and who did most of the work on it, is our distinguished visitor today. [Prolonged applause.]

ALLEGED USE BY THE ARMY OF LIVE DOMESTIC ANIMALS AS TARGETS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the RECORD a letter which I have just addressed to the Secretary of Defense to determine the truth or falsehood of reports that troops at Fort Sam Houston are gaining so-called battlefield experience by shooting at live domestic animals with high-powered rifles. I also ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the RECORD a dispatch from the Oregonian of June 16, by Harold Hughes, staff reporter, describing this alleged incident, and also to include a most effective and cogent letter addressed to the Portland Oregonian on June 16, 1956, by one of my constituents, Mr. Floyd Hand, of Milwaukie, Oreg.

Mr. President, the account of this alleged shocking episode at Fort Sam Houston appeared originally in the Portland Oregonian of June 16. It is both hard and disturbing for me to believe that the Army would use live domestic animals as targets for its riflemen. Could this possibly occur in our civilized country? If it has occurred, those responsible should be eternally ashamed of themselves—and, furthermore, they should be immediately disciplined. I think the Secretary of the Army should give the Congress full information on this episode as soon as possible.

There being no objection, the letters and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
June 20, 1956.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the issue of the Portland Oregonian for June 16, 1956, appears an interview with an Army doctor, Capt. Carolyn Taylor. In the course of that interview, telling of some of her experiences at Fort Sam Houston, appears the following passage:

"In order to give the doctors battlefield experience, the Army shot goats with high-powered rifles at Fort Houston. 'And we had to rush out, pick them up and carry them back to a first-aid station and treat their wounds,' she said, still able to give with a magic smile."

This article in the Oregonian, the paper of largest circulation in my State, is by a reliable staff reporter, Mr. Harold Hughes.

I should like to know if the United States Army is so callous and so cruel that it is experimenting with high-powered rifles on tethered, live, domestic animals. It is both difficult and disturbing for me to believe that such an episode could possibly take place.

If it did occur, those who ordered it should be eternally ashamed of themselves. Furthermore, they should be disciplined at once by their superiors. I urge you to undertake an immediate investigation to ascertain the

truth of this report of events at Fort Sam Houston, concerning the use of live domestic animals for battlefield experience with high-powered rifles.

May I hear from you as soon as possible?

Very sincerely yours,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

[From the Portland Oregonian of June 16, 1956]

CAPT. CAROLYN TAYLOR, PRETTY ARMY DOCTOR, LEAVES FOR PARIS FOR OVERSEAS HOSPITAL DUTY

(By Harold Hughes)

From a clinical standpoint, Carolyn Taylor is formed and figured like a serious candidate for a Miss America title, a condition that is much easier to diagnose than the reasons behind her having become a doctor in internal medicine and a captain in the United States Army.

The tall, 28-year-old Dr. Taylor has wanted to be a doctor since she was 3 years old, she explained before leaving her mother's home at 3315 Northeast 41st Avenue for a trip to Paris and an assignment in an Army general hospital somewhere in Europe.

"I wanted to travel and see more of the world, so I joined the Army last year," Dr. Taylor said after explaining she has already made one globe-circling trip "on my own hook."

SHE DOES NOT LIKE ODDS

She has completed studies for her American board of internal medicine examinations and needs only 2 years of practice to qualify for the top test in the medical profession.

"They're passing about 50 percent of those who try, odds I don't like," she explained.

Dr. Taylor, who is unmarried despite having had professional training in heart problems, expects to specialize in cardiac medicine when she enters private practice, either in Portland or San Francisco, after her Army hitch.

"Cardiac is the biggest killer—you don't have to worry about business," she laughed. And when she smiles or laughs it is enough to cause a dead man to jump out of bed.

MARCHING KEEPS HER BUSY

Dr. Taylor recently enlivened a Fort Knox, Ky., ward of 35 enlisted men, all of whom swore they were ill.

"They got used to a woman doctor—after a couple of weeks," was her unbelievable statement after her first tour of Army medical duty.

Dr. Taylor took her Army basic training with 400 males at Fort Sam Houston, near San Antonio, Tex. It is possible that not since the battle of the Alamo have so many soldiers in the area felt the need of medical attention of the internal variety. But they got no help from the vivacious captain.

"I was too busy marching, trying to keep in step, which is a problem when you are wearing a skirt. It was really sad."

It apparently has not occurred to the Government that an Army skirt is not made for marching. Dr. Taylor made a libelous remark about the designer of her uniform.

"All of the men were marching boom, boom in step and I was four steps behind going click, click, click, all because of a tight skirt," she explained after noting that she has long legs (she's 5 feet 10) and should have been able to keep in step.

In order to give the doctors battlefield experience, the Army shot goats with high-powered rifles at Fort Houston.

"And we had to rush out, pick them up and carry them back to a first-aid station and treat their wounds," she said, still able to give with a magic smile.

"The medical basic used to be much stiffer, but they lost too many doctors with coronaries," she declared.

Dr. Taylor, who recently stumped the experts on the TV show, What's My Line, is something of a brain herself. She entered the University of Oregon at the age of 15.

Dr. Taylor was born in San Francisco and moved to Portland with her mother, Mrs. Ellen Gatton, "about the time I entered the university."

During her med-school days and when not struggling with anatomy, Carolyn rode at the Columbia Hunt Club. She also went to Sun Valley twice to learn to ski.

"But I am still a risk on a slope," she added.

Dr. Taylor is the first doctor in her family. She's also one of the few female doctors in the United States Army, which has only been taking female physicians since about 1951, she believes.

Dr. Taylor reported that she's not currently engaged and was properly vague about any romance interests. But after her European tour of duty, she plans to settle down, maybe marry some doctor.

"That way I could continue to practice off and on while the children are young."

The doctor plans to have maybe three children.

"It's a nice lucky number."

MILWAUKIE, OREG., *June 16, 1956.*

To the EDITOR OF THE OREGONIAN:

In a feature article in the June 16 Oregonian, staff writer Harold Hughes describes the field training of Army medical officers. In telling of the experiences of Dr. Carolyn Taylor, he said, "In order to give the doctors battlefield experience, the Army shot goats with high-powered rifles at Fort Houston." Miss Taylor is quoted, "* * * and we had to rush out, pick them up and carry them back to a first-aid station and treat their wounds."

I must protest such callous treatment of innocent animals. I can't see what possible training benefit either in moving litter cases or in administering battlefield first-aid can be realized by such practice. The Army and its apologists will claim that this slaughter is essential in order that medics receive proper training in saving human lives.

This is the same argument they used when goats, pigs, chickens, and other animals were used in atomic radiation exposure tests. I accepted the argument then because I felt that there was justification. Scientific data were gained that could be used in developing treatments for atomic bomb injuries.

But to shoot goats with rifles serves no constructive purpose and to deliberately wound them is an even greater example of inhumanity. Certainly a wounded animal is not going to react like an injured human. If it has any mobility left it is not going to lie supinely on a stretcher while being transported to a first-aid station. What kind of beneficial training can be realized from field dressing of wounded creatures that is applicable to the patching up of human beings?

If the Army feels that it is necessary to impress neophyte medics with the fact that battlefields are strewn with blood and guts, I suggest that they get several truckloads of offal from the nearest slaughterhouse and broadcast it on the training course. That should give the necessary touch of realism and would permit the goats to perform their normal functions of giving mohair and milk in the service of man.

Sincerely,

FLOYD HAND.

AMERICAN FARM EXPORTS AND IMPORTS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have compiled some extremely interesting figures showing the comparison between American farm exports and American imports of those products normally in competition with our own products.

It should be noted that the figures, which I presently will place in the RECORD, do not include in the list of imports rubber, coffee, tea, and spices which are not competitive with American products.

These figures were compiled for the 9-month period from July 1955–March 1956.

They show that exports for that period totaled $1,780,754,000. Imports of competitive products totaled $483,653,000, a difference of $1,297,101,000.

However, in that respect there is included in the imports a little more than $200 million worth of wool. We in the United States produce only about one-third of our wool needs. So if we deduct some $200 million of imports of wool from the $483 million of imports, we have only about $283 million worth of imports, as against $1,780,754,000 in exports.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table showing the figures for individual products, and the total.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Farm exports and imports, July 1955–March 1956, 9 months only

Product	Exports	Imports in competition with American farm products
Dairy:		
1. Cheese	$8,685,000	$20,626,000
2. Milk, evaporated	17,815,000	----------
3. Milk, dry	17,838,000	----------
4. Nonfat	18,145,000	----------
Beef and veal	10,854,000	26,875,000
Tallow	77,404,000	[1] 7,239,000
Pork	$13,270,000	$78,008,000
Lard	58,601,000	----------
Grains:		
Wheat	298,222,000	[2] 7,513,000
Flour	66,663,000	----------
Barley	70,772,000	----------
Corn	131,735,000	----------
Sorghums	61,981,000	----------
Eggs: Shell	17,388,000	0
Soybeans	140,563,000	0
Oils:		
Soybean	38,660,000	[3] 53,066,000
Cotton seed	69,478,000	----------
Tobacco	318,244,000	58,115,000
Wool:		
United States only produces ⅓ of its needs	----------	112,832,000
Wool duty 17 cents per pound on 40 to 44 pounds, and 25 cents per pound over 44 (free in bond)	----------	94,692,000
Rice	62,804,000	0
Cotton	217,431,000	24,687,000
Fruits, canned	31,039,000	0
Beans, dried	9,323,000	----------
Peas, dried	3,174,000	0
Vegetables, canned	15,181,000	0
Potatoes	5,484,000	0
Total	1,780,754,000	483,653,000

[1] Cattle. [2] Feeds. [3] Oils and waxes.

NOTE.—Most of our farm imports such as rubber, coffee, tea, spices, are not in competition with American farm products.

COMMENCEMENT DAY ADDRESS BY HON. HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Tuesday, June 5, former President Herbert Hoover made a notable address at the dedication of the Herbert Hoover High School in San Francisco, Calif. The entire address, with his kindly advice to the younger generation, is worth our careful reading, but I am

asking that it be printed in the RECORD because in the middle of the address he calls attention to a very serious situation in this country today. I quote from a part of the address:

Our country is running into a famine of trained scientists and engineers. Ten years ago our universities and technical colleges graduated about 50,000 men and women into these professions. This year they will probably turn out less than 30,000. The country needs a minimum of 50,000 each year. Communist Russia claims that she graduates 85,000 into these professions annually.

There are many explanations for this national failure.

Recently, Adm. Lewis Strauss, of the Atomic Energy Commission, also called attention to this critically serious situation.

Through the National Science Foundation we have been trying to assist in developing scholarships and other kinds of aid for promising young scientists. We must have them if we are to meet the competition of Russia. This is a responsibility which I want to call to the attention of all my colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Hoover's address be printed in the body of the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HERBERT HOOVER AT THE DEDICATION OF THE HERBERT HOOVER JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, SAN FRANCISCO, JUNE 5, 1956

No greater nor more affectionate honor can be conferred on an American than to have a public school named after him. I deeply appreciate the honor and affection that go with your action. Some people have to endow a school to get their name on it. But this is a great gift. And I doubly value your honor because while often a transient I have for 60 years bragged about San Francisco as my hometown.

My steps in education came through the public schools and a great university which was then also free. Without those generous services from my country I could never have attained a profession. And I can prove my faith in the American public school system for my two sons also trod that path in making their way to success in life.

After all these years, I have a lingering affection to my devoted teachers. And the friendships made in school have been stanch over the years. To these institutions of free men, and their able and devoted teachers, I owe an unrepayable debt.

As I here am speaking to both the elders and students, I will take on the elders first.

I do not need to say that we elders have a great responsibility for the education of all the children of America. And this magnificent building is proof that the elders in San Francisco assume these responsibilities.

It is a further monument to the devotion of California and the State educational authorities.

OUR POSSIBLE NATIONAL FAMINE IN TRAINED SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS

I would like to speak for a few moments to the elders upon a critical problem in education with which our whole Nation's public schools could help.

Our country is running into a famine of trained scientists and engineers. Ten years ago our universities and technical colleges graduated about 50,000 men and women into these professions. This year they will probably turn out less than 30,000. The country needs a minimum of 50,000 each year. Communist Russia claims that she graduates 85,000 into these professions annually.

There are many explanations for this national failure. Many of our higher institutions complain that they are not able to secure adequately trained youngsters from the public schools. To meet the entrance requirements of our universities and technical institutions, students must have a basic training in mathematics and elementary physical sciences. Adm. Hyman Rickover, who is in a position to know, states that in 1950 only 4 percent of our high schools teach physics, 7 percent chemistry, and 13 percent geometry. They do a little better in algebra, but that figure is only 27 percent.

There are other causes of our national failure and the blame does not all rest upon our public schools. I realize that our high schools must graduate over 1,200,000 youngsters every year; that they must look at the needs of the whole 1,200,000 more than preparation for only the 50,000 scientists and engineers. I realize the difficulty of the public schools in securing teachers in science. I realize also that the cost of training in these professions in our universities and colleges has risen above the resources of many parents and many youngsters. Not every youngster wishes, or is adapted, to enter these professions. But it is a pity that those who are adapted, any of them, find their public schools have failed in their preparation.

To finish this scolding, I say at once that none of this assault is directed to this school. But somebody must be a public scold.

I suggest that unless somebody attends to this job, many of the wheels in the United States will someday stop going around.

To the youngsters I, as an engineer, would suggest that there are no professions of greater satisfactions. The engineer has the fascination of watching a figment of imagination emerge into a plan on paper. Then it moves to realization in cement, in metal, or energy. Then it brings new jobs and better homes. And I might add that on the average it is the highest paid profession in the country—and there are today five bids to a job for every graduate.

THE YOUNGSTERS

I can turn from scolding elders to a much more cheerful subject. That is, the chattering, fun-loving, ambitious youngsters in this school. Even to look at them is a relief from thinking about national problems.

And I can say something to youngsters which perhaps they will appreciate more in a few years.

Somebody will tell you of the failures of our Government—and it is often justified. No government is perfect because human beings are not perfect. But I may remind such persons that despite many disheartening things, under our American system of government we have given more opportunities to every boy and girl than any other government on earth.

Somebody will tell you that the older generations have made a mess of things which must be reformed. I have often agreed with that idea. But you should remember that it was the older generations who built all these schools, these libraries, these playing fields, these homes, these farms, these factories, these stores, these radios, and orchestras, with all these ways of earning a living and enjoying life. Someday all these elders are going to die. Someday you will inherit all these things and the jobs of managing them. And do not forget, it was the older generation who gave you the greatest heritage that can come to man—national independence and personal liberty.

Someday you will be the older generation. As the new older generation, you can undertake to reform our national ways—and they will need it.

And finally I would like to assure you that you need have no fears of your future.

Do not think it is a cold, hard world you are going into. You will find a kindliness and helpfulness from your elders as you venture into your callings in life. Your elders want you to succeed.

From the astonishing advances in science and technology, you will enter into a world of constantly new frontiers, new opportunities, and new adventures, besides managing your inheritance.

Many of you will become great leaders, great artists, great baseball players and, I hope, great engineers. But more important than becoming great is the everyday toil and the satisfaction of carrying on our American way of life.

And again I express my gratitude for your affectionate honor.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRANSIT SITUATION

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I should like to report briefly to the Senate on the latest developments in the District of Columbia transit situation.

The conference committee on S. 3073, of which committee I am chairman, met on May 28 and requested the District Commissioners to meet with any private groups in an effort to work out a firm proposal which would be acceptable to the Commissioners.

Several groups subsequently made proposals to the Commissioners and lengthy discussions followed.

Today, I am in receipt of a report signed by Robert E. McLaughlin, president of the Board of Commissioners, in which he presents a lengthy and detailed discussion of their activities.

This is not the time or place to go into this report, but in essence, the Commissioners have received no proposal that is acceptable to them.

I am encouraged, however, by the number of private groups that have presented proposals, and I am hopeful that one of them—or some new group—may yet be able to reach a satisfactory agreement with the Commissioners.

I understand that all members of the conference committee now have copies of this report. It is my thought that, after they have had an opportunity to study it, the committee should meet again, probably next week.

I should like to say that I am impressed by the way the Commissioners have tackled this problem, and what appears to be their strong desire to find a private operator for the transit system if it is at all possible. I know they must have the best interests of the Washington public and the District government in mind.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that two editorials from the Washington Post and Times Herald on the transit matter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 20, 1956]

HOLD FAST TO REGULATION

The District Commissioners are under strong pressure to work out a deal with one or another of the groups seeking to take over the Capital Transit Co. Congress has

demonstrated an unmistakable coolness toward the creation of a public transit authority here. Likewise, the community appears to favor private transit operation if satisfactory arrangements can be made. In short, the tide is running powerfully toward continuation of the CTC under new management.

The Commissioners are under pressure from another source. Less than 2 months remain of the year that Congress gave them to work out a solution of the city's transit problem. On August 14 the franchise of the Capital Transit Co. will expire, and Washington will be in difficult straits unless some means of transporting more than 250,000 patrons daily has been devised. In this kind of situation the Commissioners are not free to await an ideal setup. They must send their recommendations to Capitol Hill without delay, and Congress must act fast to avert an emergency.

While recognizing these facts, however, it is also well to remember that the decision about to be made may vitally affect the welfare of the Capital City and its inhabitants for many years to come. In the long run the action of the Commissioners will be judged by the kind of transit system that results from it and not merely by the avoidance of an emergency 2 months hence. To our way of thinking, therefore, it is more important to adhere to sound principles than to make a quick deal that the community would forever thereafter regret.

Fortunately, the Commissioners are well aware of the pitfalls in some of the policies that are being urged upon them. They appear to be adamant, for example, in their resistance to the proposal of the National City Lines, Inc., which has a conditional contract to buy Capital Transit, that the company be relieved from its obligation to finance the cost of repaving the streets when the streetcar tracks are removed. Nor are the Commissioners willing to concede that National City earnings should be 10 percent of gross operating revenue after all expenses, taxes, license fees, and interest have been paid. Similarly they have resisted the suggestions of the Fox-Chalk group that the company's rate base and a right to earn a 6½ percent return on that investment be written into the law.

The first requisite, in our opinion, is that the new transit system shall be adequately regulated in the public interest. Any agreement or deal which left the public unprotected might prove to be a frightful boomerang. Congress, no less than the Commissioners, must be on guard against a letdown of regulatory standards, for what is done here will have repercussions throughout the country. Congressmen will not want to get themselves into the position of compromising on so important an issue.

The only safe course, therefore, is to cling to sound regulatory principles, and the Commissioners are to be commended for adhering to that course. We think that a well-managed private transit company can operate successfully here with strict regulation if the Public Utilities Commission speeds up its operations. If no private firm is willing to assume the risks of operating under standard regulation, it would be better to face the problems of public operation immediately than to leave regulation in the hands of Congress or the utility itself. The first obligation of the Commissioners is to see that the public interest is protected in regard to future ratemaking as well as continuation of transit service.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 21, 1956]

LET D. C. DO IT

The effort to write legislation that would put a new private transit operator into business in Washington before next August 14 appears to have broken down. The District Commissioners made herculean efforts to carry out the wishes of the House-Senate conferees in this regard, but they have not been able to come up with any agreement that could be promptly translated into a new transit franchise. The stubborn facts that stand out are that the National City Lines has signed a conditional contract to buy the assets of the Capital Transit Co. and that the proposition the NCL has made to the Commissioners is wholly unacceptable. No other potential successor to Capital Transit can be given a charter while Congress is still in session unless this deal should be quickly abandoned and satisfactory terms could be worked out.

In these circumstances Congress has the alternative of accepting the Capital Transit-NCL deal, against the advice of the Commissioners, or of giving the Commissioners authority to work out a solution after Congress has adjourned. To our way of thinking, the first alternative would be disastrous. It would inflict heavy losses upon the community by relieving the successor company of the obligation to repave the streets after streetcar tracks are removed. It would make a shambles of transit regulation. It is unthinkable that Congress should impose such penalties upon the city for the sake of keeping transit operation in private hands.

If Congress gives the Commissioners authority to work out a solution, there is a strong probability that they will be able to come to agreement with the Chalk-Fox group, the McDonald group, or some other potential private operator. Under the Senate bill, the Commissioners could grant such operator a franchise which could later be confirmed by specific congressional action. The Commissioners' recommendations to the conferees are said to take this approach, and we do not see how responsible officials who give first thought to the welfare of the community can reject such an appeal.

Of course it will be necessary, if Congress follows this line of thinking, to authorize the Commissioners, as a last-ditch safeguard to take by eminent domain whatever part of Capital Transit's assets may be needed to continue a satisfactory transit system here. Otherwise the city might be left without mass transportation once more with no means of doing anything about it. Congress is reluctant to take this step, but it is certainly less objectionable than any other course now open to it. If all efforts to secure good transit service through private operators break down, public operation becomes an unavoidable obligation. The time has come to face this fact and let the District authorities work out the best solution possible.

DISCRIMINATION IN HOUSING

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, one of the problems which has concerned many citizens of my State and other States has been that of discrimination in housing.

From time to time, I have brought this matter to the attention of the Honorable Albert M. Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and he has written me a letter outlining in considerable detail the steps taken to achieve the objective of assuring to all Americans, regardless of race, creed, or color, equal rights and equal opportunities under the housing programs administered by that agency.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Cole's letter printed in the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. PRESCOTT BUSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUSH: This is in response to your letter of March 15 to Bill Painter requesting comments on letters you have received from Mrs. Frances Levenson, executive director of the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing, and from Mr. Hyman Haves, of the same organization.

Mrs. Levenson's assertions that racial segregation continues in housing built under the Federal housing programs and that the Federal Government is actually supporting the spread of segregation are, of course, familiar to me. We have had various meetings with the National Committee Against Discrimination and other organizations concerned with the elimination of racial discrimination. I am in complete sympathy with this objective. I have expressed many times my deep conviction that all Americans, regardless of race, creed, or color, should have equal rights and equal opportunities. As Housing Administrator, the prime objective of my efforts is the realization of a good home in a decent neighborhood for all Americans.

Our efforts in this direction have been vigorous, continuing, and, I believe, productive. In 1954, I conducted a conference on housing for minority groups—the first of its kind—at which representatives of industry finance, government, churches, and minority organizations exchanged their views and proposals, in an atmosphere of full freedom of expression. In speeches, conferences, interviews, and the day-to-day conduct of business, the Commissioners of HHFA's constituent administrations and I have worked to arouse leaders of the private building and financing industry to their obligations and their opportunities in the minority group market. In July 1954, for example, the FHA Commissioner notified the National Association of Home Builders of his intention to reinforce FHA support of housing for minorities (with special emphasis on the development of demonstration open occupancy projects in suitable key areas), and outlined his specific plans for doing so. In March 1955, he gave his operating personnel an emphatic directive on the subject, and has followed it up.

I want to emphasize that the leaders of the building and lending industries, with whom we are in constant contact in the course of day-to-day operations, have reacted cooperatively and energetically to our continuous emphasis on housing for minority group families, and they are giving special and substantial effort to its production. The National Association of Home Builders has established national and regional committees to stimulate its membership to provide minority group housing, and has distributed a "minority housing kit" with a packaged program and agenda for local meetings. The Mortgage Bankers Association has taken similar action, and FHA personnel have assisted both associations in these undertakings and have contributed to their trade publications. I am convinced that the efforts of these leaders on a national scale are being reflected locally in an increasingly substantial volume of production of housing for these families.

Through January 1956, the Voluntary Home Mortgage Credit program had placed a total of 12,000 loans. Of these loans, nearly 1,800 were for housing units specifically available to members of minority groups. The extent to which the remaining 10,200 were for minority housing is unknown. In

view of the newness of this program these figures are outstanding.

The Public Housing Administration's policy is that programs must reflect equitable provision for eligible families of all races determined on the approximate volume and urgency of their respective needs, and that additional public housing for white families will not be assisted in communities which are found to be neglecting the needs of their racial minorities. Under the Housing Act of 1954, the small program authorized was based entirely upon the needs of families displaced by slum clearance and other governmental action. In allocating the units authorized by the 1955 amendments to localities, priority was administratively established for cities with relocation needs and cities needing the housing to provide a greater degree of racial equity in the housing supply for low income families. In all public housing first preference for occupancy goes to families displaced from slum housing. Since racial minorities constitute a high proportion of slum dwellers, these circumstances orient the low-rent program significantly to serve their needs. While the selection of tenants and assignment of dwelling units are primarily matters for local determination, local housing authorities are encouraged to admit tenants without regard to racial considerations. In 1953 PHA published a bulletin on the subject for the guidance of interested local authorities.

The Urban Renewal Administration has strengthened the requirements it imposes on local public agencies for relocating displaced slum families in decent housing. These agencies are required to maintain family relocation services to find housing for the displaced families, but many families relocate themselves without using the service. So far as possible such families have been traced in order to make certain that they are housed in standard units. During the last 2 years new procedures have reduced the percentage of families which cannot be traced from 25 percent of total families moved from project sites (March 1954) to 15 percent (September 1955). Furthermore, the agencies are now required not only to trace the families but to inspect accommodations procured by them, to classify the units as standard or substandard, and, in the case of the substandard ones, to continue their referral service to the families and make every effort to get them into decent housing. More than half of the 4,700 units of housing for relocation for which private financing has been authorized under section 221 of the National Housing Act are intended for minority group occupancy.

All contracts and instruments for sale or lease of land cleared under the urban renewal program prohibit the execution of instruments restricting the sale, lease, or occupancy of the land upon the basis of race.

As I understand their position, the National Committee Against Discrimination would have the Federal Government set up, as a condition to all types of Federal assistance in housing, a rigid agreement that the recipients of this aid agree to eliminate racial segregation and to require integration. For a number of reasons, I do not believe that so drastic a step is possible or desirable at this time.

In the FHA program, which is designed to stimulate privately built and privately financed housing, such a requirement would be extremely difficult to enforce. To the extent that it were possible to put teeth into such a requirement I am convinced that the result, in many parts of the country, would be a sharp cutback in the rate of housing production, and of our capacity to meet the housing needs of all the people. Such drastic action would set us back in the accomplishment of our goal of decent housing for all and produce a severe impact upon our economy as well.

In the case of public-housing projects, which are locally planned and controlled, a federally imposed requirement for racial integration would certainly result in the rejection of this form of Federal aid by many communities where the need for low-rent housing, especially for minority group families, is most pressing.

All of the programs administered by this agency rely basically upon private and local initiative and place heavy reliance upon local responsibility in meeting housing needs. The role of the Federal Government in the housing programs is to assist, to stimulate, to lead, and sometimes to prod, but never to dictate or coerce, and never to stifle the proper exercise of private and local responsibility. This is as it should be, not only because housing needs and problems are peculiarly local but also because undue Federal intervention is incompatible with our ideas of political and economic freedom.

I am sure I do not need to remind you that the problems of racial discrimination are also peculiarly local. In addition, they are complex and deeply rooted in local traditions, institutions, and emotions. Here, as in other facets of the housing problem, I believe we should rely heavily on local responsibility and local wisdom to work out solutions, with appropriate assistance, stimulation, and leadership from the Federal Government.

These principles have guided the vigorous steps against racial discrimination in housing which we have taken during the past 3 years. I believe we have made significant progress. However, we are by no means satisfied. Much more must be done, as circumstances develop and opportunities can be seized, by the Federal Government, by local government, by private groups, and individual citizens. I assure you that we are continually assessing our own efforts and seeking to find new and better ways of discharging Federal responsibility for the elimination of racial discrimination in housing.

Because the President expressed so well at a recent press conference the policy we are trying to follow in the Housing Agency, I should like to quote some of his words about the current process of school integration: "So, let us remember that there are people who are ready to approach this thing with moderation, but with a determination to make progress that the Supreme Court asked for. If ever there was a time when we must be patient without being complacent, when we must be understanding of other people's deep emotions, as well as our own, this is it. Extremists on neither side are going to help this situation, and we can only believe that the good sense, the commonsense, of Americans will bring this thing along, and the length of time I am not even going to talk about."

I appreciate very much the opportunity you have given me to comment on this very important question. The letters from Mrs. Levenson and Mr. Haves are returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

AL COLE, *Administrator.*

AGREEMENT BY COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE ON FEDERAL HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the conferees on the highway bill have today concluded their labors. In that connection I have issued a statement, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

The conference agreement on the biggest highway construction program ever to be undertaken by the American people represents a great improvement over the bill passed by the Senate. This is especially noticeable in its apportionment of funds for the national system of interstate and defense highways and in its recognition of the problems involved in integrating toll roads, bridges, and tunnels into the system.

A major victory was won by acceptance of the principle that no State should receive less, nor more, than the Federal Government's 90-percent share of the cost of completing the Interstate System within that State's borders. At the end of the 13-year construction period, under the agreement, each State will have its portion of the Interstate System completed and will have received from the Federal Government 90 percent of the cost.

One effect of the decision to use the Senate bill's apportionment formula for the first 3 years, and the House bill's cost basis for the remaining 10 may be to delay construction in some States during the early years of the 13-year program. To offset this, the conference accepted my amendment which provides, in effect, that a State may use funds of its own on additional interstate projects in the years when the Senate formula is operative, and be reimbursed for the Federal Government's 90-percent share of the cost of such projects from its apportionments in later years.

Although the conference agreement deletes the House bill's declaration of intent to reimburse States which already have built acceptable highways, free or toll, on Interstate System routes, it paves the way for such reimbursement in later years by providing a study to obtain essential information now lacking. Moreover, it provides for the use of Federal-aid funds on approaches to toll projects, clarifying and expanding existing law.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that it is the plan of the leadership to program for consideration tomorrow Calendar No. 2259, H. R. 9852, to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950. The expiration date on that legislation is June 30.

We had planned to program that bill earlier in the week, but it was necessary for some of our colleagues to be out of town, to attend State conventions and for other purposes, and we have held that bill over in an attempt to accommodate them. In accommodating them we may now inconvenience other Senators. However, we have the Defense Department appropriation bill set for consideration, and then the foreign aid authorization bill and the foreign aid appropriation bill must come along. We hope to finish those by June 30. Therefore, if we are to have H. R. 9852, the Defense Production Act, acted on, it is necessary for us to consider it tomorrow or at the earliest possible date.

I should like to inform the Senate also that from here on it will probably be necessary to hold Friday, and, perhaps, some Saturday sessions.

We do not expect the Senate to be in session on July 4, which falls on a Wednesday, but we do expect to hold sessions on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday, and on Saturday, if necessary, to dispose of the program ahead of us.

I should also like to have the Senate be on notice that the leadership has cleared for consideration on tomorrow, in addition to Calendar No. 2259, H. R. 9852, the Defense Production Act, the following measures:

Calendar No. 2220, S. 2654, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.;

Calendar No. 2253, S. 3467, to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States;

Calendar No. 2293, S. 3512, to permit desert land entries on disconnected tracts of land which in the case of any one entryman form a compact unit and do not exceed in the aggregate 320 acres;

Calendar No. 2294, S. 3042, to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, in order to promote the development of phosphate in the public domain; and

Calendar No. 2299, H. R. 5256, to provide for the redemption by the Post Office Department of certain unsold Federal migratory-bird hunting stamps.

In addition, we hope to have for early consideration by the Senate the conference report on the road bill. I wish to congratulate the group of conferees who have completed the conference report on that bill for doing a very fine job in a very thorough manner.

The conferees on the public works appropriation bill may be ready to report. Any Member interested in either of those bills should be on notice that the conference reports on them may be called up tomorrow, in the event the House shall have acted; if not, then at the earliest possible date.

Now that the month of July is close upon us, I hope every Senator will make plans to be available in the Senate for a full week.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I did not quite understand the Senator's conclusion with reference to the defense-production bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I stated that the leadership planned to proceed to the consideration of that bill tomorrow, and I hope we can dispose of it tomorrow. Its consideration was postponed in order to accommodate some of our colleagues, It may inconvenience some other colleagues to have the bill considered tomorrow, but we had very little choice in the matter.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, has morning business been closed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business has not been closed.

NEW USES FOR FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, again I should like to invite the attention of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to the fact that I hope, as do 6 million American farmers, that the committee will hold hearings and report favorably on the bill introduced by me, together with thirty-odd other Senators, to establish laboratories and pilot plants to find new uses for farm products. I again urge the committee to hold hearings on the bill. In my opinion, we should do something worth while, something that would be permanent, for the American farmers before the end of the second session of this Congress.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1957

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10986), an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Millikin
Allott	Gore	Monroney
Anderson	Hayden	Morse
Barrett	Hennings	Mundt
Beall	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bender	Hill	Neely
Bricker	Holland	Neuberger
Bridges	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Bush	Humphrey	Pastore
Butler	Jackson	Payne
Byrd	Jenner	Potter
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Schoeppel
Clements	Knowland	Scott
Cotton	Kuchel	Smathers
Curtis	Laird	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Lehman	Sparkman
Duff	Long	Stennis
Dworshak	Magnuson	Symington
Eastland	Malone	Thye
Ellender	Mansfield	Watkins
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Frear	McCarthy	Wofford
Fulbright	McClellan	Young
George	McNamara	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). A quorum is present.

BANK MERGERS IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of a letter which was sent to me under date of May 28, 1956, by the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, transmitting a statement with respect to the merger of certain banks in the State of New York which he requested me to have printed in the record of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

It would appear, according to the testimony of Mr. CELLER given several days ago, that the bank authorities of the State of New York had denied permission to State banks to merge. Another merger, however, was accomplished a short time later between one of the banks against which the State banking department had ruled and a national bank, thus taking that merger out of the jurisdiction of the State banking authorities.

The facts, as developed by Representative CELLER are of such great importance that I think Mr. CELLER'S letter should be printed in the body of the RECORD and referred to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, which is presently interested in the matter.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the letter and also the text of the statement by Representative CELLER.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, *May 28, 1956.*

Hon. JOSEPH O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Antitrust Subcommittee,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOE: Enclosed please find the history of a very bad situation in New York, where the Comptroller of the Currency Gidney deliberately flouted the policy of the State superintendent of banks, Mr. George Mooney, and paid no heed to competitive banking situations.

I would indeed appreciate it if you would make this letter and the enclosed factual background a part of the hearings on H. R. 9424.

Thanking you and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MANNY.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND REGARDING MERGER OF SECOND NATIONAL BANK OF COOPERSTOWN INTO NATIONAL COMMERCIAL BANK AND TRUST COMPANY OF ALBANY

Late last fall the Banking Department of New York State was approached by the State Bank of Albany for its reaction to their intention to merge with the Second National Bank of Cooperstown. Cooperstown is a small town, not far from Albany. At that time, there were in Cooperstown two national banks of about the same size, the First National Bank and the Second National Bank.

The New York Banking Department, after determining that conditions in Cooperstown were very similar to those in Auburn, N. Y., where a proposed merged had recently been disapproved, alerted the State Bank of Albany people to the fact that approval of their proposed merger might not be forthcoming.

The New York State Banking Department felt indeed that this merger would be contrary to the principles of the Celler-Kefauver-O'Mahoney Act, amendatory of section 7 of the Clayton Act.

Mr. Mooney, New York State superintendent of banks had appeared before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Monopoly while I was presiding and unequivocally stated that he would approve no mergers if the effect might be a substantial lessening of competition in a given area. We called this principle that was to guide him the "Auburn" principle because he first followed it in the proposed Auburn case.

With respect to the prior situation in Auburn, the Auburn Trust Co. had been acquired by the Marine Midland Corp., which wished to merge into its Syracuse unit, the Marine Midland Company of Central New York.

There was also in Auburn the National Bank of Auburn which was about the same size as the Auburn Trust Co. Superintendent Mooney took the position that the proposed merger in Auburn would place the remaining independent bank, a national bank by the way, at a competitive disadvantage.

Although it would compete on even terms with Auburn Trust Co., it would not be expected to do so if the trust company became part of the much larger Marine Midland Trust Company of Central New York.

After the above factual situation was outlined to representatives of the State Bank of Albany, they were told that Superintendent Mooney, following the Auburn principle, was disposed to disapprove the plan to merge the Second National Bank of Cooperstown into the State Bank of Albany. When this decision was made known to the directors of the State Bank of Albany, they withdrew their informal request for approval of the merger.

However, at this time the State Bank of Albany pointed out to the department that it was fearful that its competitor in Albany, the National Commercial Bank, would attempt to merge the Second National Bank of Cooperstown.

When these fears were expressed to the superintendent, he informed the State bank people that he had conferred with the Comptroller of the Currency Gidney on merger problems generally at the time of his disapproval of the proposed Auburn merger as outlined above. The banking department was told by the comptroller at that time that he agreed with the policy set by it in the Auburn decision.

When this was outlined to the State bank people, the department assured them that it would immediately protest to the comptroller of the currency any attempt by the National Commercial Bank to merge the Second National Bank of Cooperstown, and it felt sure, based on its prior conversations, that its protests would be given due weight.

Shortly thereafter the State bank people again approached the department to tell it that it was reported that the National Commercial Bank of Albany had applied to the comptroller of the currency for permission to merge the Second National Bank of Cooperstown.

Superintendent Mooney immediately arranged for a conference with the Comptroller of the Currency Gidney, so that his objections to the proposed merger might be set forth.

At the conference with the comptroller, Mr. Mooney pointed out that the National Commercial Bank of Albany sought to do exactly what the State Bank of Albany had been discouraged from doing.

He expressed the strong conviction that the comptroller should deny the application for the same reasons that Mr. Mooney himself had discouraged the earlier application.

Approval of the application, he said, was undesirable because of the substantial lessening of competition which would inevitably result in Cooperstown. In addition, approval of the merger, Mr. Mooney added, would also result in a second merger or the liquidation of the remaining bank, namely the First National Bank at Cooperstown.

At this point both Mr. Gidney and his assistant, Mr. Jennings, stated that they had never gone along with the banking department on its thinking in the Auburn situation.

This was absolute repudiation of the so-called Auburn principle, but also was a denial of a solemn assurance that Mr. Gidney gave to the House Antitrust Subcommittee.

He stated before the committee that he would not approve any national bank merger where the effect might be to substantially lessen competition. Messrs. Gidney and Jenkins stated that it would be difficult for them to deny a merger merely because it might place another independent bank in an inferior competitive position.

They stated that there had been too many such instances all over the country for the comptroller to take such a position at this late date. Mr. Jennings was frank to say that had he been in the superintendent's place he would have approved the Auburn and Cooperstown mergers.

At the close of the conference Mr. Gidney stated he appreciated the position of the superintendent and would give the problem more thought. Approximately 1 week later the following letter was received from the Comptroller of the Currency:

"We have given very careful consideration to the facts presented by you during our conversation of April 6, 1956, with respect to the proposed merger of the National Commercial Bank & Trust Co., Albany, N. Y., with the Second National Bank, Cooperstown, N. Y. We have every desire to cooperate with you, and we are most reluctant to take any action which does not meet with your agreement. However, the facts as they exist, and as we evaluate them, do not permit us to refuse to approve the proposed merger which meets all the requirements of the Federal statutes. Both from a legal and moral standpoint, we cannot act arbitrarily or capriciously in making such decisions, and as we are not aware of any sound reasons to deny this merger application, we are required to give it our approval."

Effective as of the close of business May 18, 1956, the Second National Bank of Cooperstown was merged into the National Commercial Bank of Albany.

This was all consummated with the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency and thereafter the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation likewise rubber-stamped the approval.

Attached you will also find a draft of an agreement entered into by what is known as an Interagency Committee, which is composed of representatives of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Reserve Board.

The National Association of Supervisors of State Banks is composed of the 48 State banking supervisors, plus the banking supervisor of Puerto Rico, Alaska, and Hawaii.

Over a year ago, this interagency committee agreed to set up liaison between the Federal and State supervisory agencies, so that there could be proper coordination between Federal and State banking authorities. It was agreed that there would be set up definite standards for guidance to the end that there would not be any undue concentration of banking facilities resulting from mergers. One whole year had elapsed and the Federal agencies aforesaid have taken no action.

The enclosed is a draft of a letter dated early in April 1956 which was sent to representatives of the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Comptroller of the Currency.

It clearly indicates dereliction and refusal on the part of these agencies to cooperate with the State banking supervisors.

Now comes Comptroller of the Currency Gidney and, in common parlance, literally thumbs his nose at the New York State banking superintendent and does exactly what the New York State superintendent refused to do because of serious competitive implications.

It is almost fantastic. The moral of this situation is that we cannot trust the Comptroller of the Currency to do the needful in the face of the present merger movement.

The Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Reserve Board have appealed to your committee that the matter of mergers should be left entirely to them.

The above is a case history of what would happen if these entities were given the sole authority.

The above is also the best evidence I can submit to demonstrate the necessity for giving the Department of Justice the responsibility for enforcement.

"DEAR ———. At the recent meeting of the executive committee of this association in Washington there was a great deal of discussion of pending merger legislation in Congress and of the merger problem generally. As it had been our understanding that the Interagency Committee was to attempt to agree on a joint approach to merger applications and legislative proposals, we were disappointed to learn from our representative on that committee that this objective had not been reached.

"The executive committee has instructed me to seek from each of the Federal supervisory agencies a statement of the policies which guide it in considering such merger proposals as come within its province. We should also be interested in learning whether an analysis has been made of the types of mergers which have been approved or disapproved over the past 5 or 10 years. What percentage were motivated for instance, by aging board and management, desire to acquire another institution because of good executive material, an effort to meet competition caused by mergers of rival institutions, or salvage operations where merger was the alternative to involuntary liquidation, etc.? We would also like to learn your views as to when and under what circumstances you feel that mergers might merit disapproval because they raise serious questions of concentration.

"It seems to us that loss of control over mergers can only be avoided by the Federal and State bank supervisory agencies if we present a united front, and, by exchange of ideas on policies, and data on practices, reach a common ground upon which we can present a sound, well-thought out program, satisfactory to Congress and the general public.

"My associates and I await your early reply so that our own deliberations may be guided accordingly.

"Sincerely,

"———— ————,

"Chairman, Executive Committee."

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY JAPANESE TRADE UNION LEADERS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in the diplomatic gallery, as guests of the Senate today, are a number of trade union leaders from Japan. They are visiting the United States on a productivity tour and plan to visit various places in our country. They are firm believers in establishing closer trade relations between the United States and Japan.

It is a privilege to have them visit the Senate today. I shall ask them to stand so that the Members of the Senate may greet them.

The distinguished visitors rose from their places in the gallery and were greeted with applause, Senators rising.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege. I wish to report on an incident which took place in my office yesterday and which, I believe, is of great significance to the Senate and the entire country.

Yesterday, in the morning, three men barged into my office, brushed my secretary—my receptionist—aside, and said they wished to inspect a certain part of my office. They at first showed no credentials. They showed their credentials only when she insisted on seeing them. One of those men, as I shall again report later, was a member of the Capitol Police. Two of these men came from the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

This morning the New York Times carried a page-one story of the incident. The press services and many newspapers carried a similar story based on the account in the Times. The New York Times story, which I am about to read, and which received such prominence in this morning's edition of the Times, is a fairly accurate report, within the limits of the resources for accuracy available to the reporter.

Mr. President, I do not know who tipped off the Times to the story, I certainly did not. But somebody must have given him the story. I shall read now the article which appeared on page one of the Times this morning. The headline reads: "Agents Hunt A 'Bug' in LEHMAN'S Office." The article, which is dated Washington, June 20, reads:

Two men with badges walked into Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN'S office today and scrutinized his refrigerator closet.

Security being what it is, no one can be certain what they were looking for, but circumstantial evidence suggests they suspected a "bug," an electrical or electronic device used for long-range eavesdropping.

The Senator's closet is adjacent to a Senate hearing room where hypersecret Defense Department information is being submitted to an Armed Services Subcommittee investigating the Nation's aerial preparedness for war.

The subcommittee revealed yesterday that security police were guarding the air around the room against potential devices for eavesdropping.

The agents' job, according to the subcommittee, is to insure that no remotely controlled clandestine transmitters are put into operation during a conference.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, who conducts the hearings, said that though the check was merely a routine precautionary measure, similar procedure had never been used before in Senate hearings.

The Defense Department refused today to describe its techniques for fighting any long-range snooper. Radio monitoring and visual inspection are vaguely alluded to, but more precise information is secret.

The guessing in Senator LEHMAN'S office today was that it had been subjected to the visual inspection technique. Miss Mildred Akins, one of the New York Democrat's secretaries, said she was startled to notice a Capitol policeman and two men in civilian clothes prowling resolutely through private quarters of the office.

"I said, 'Nobody comes in our office unless I see a badge or something,'" she reported. The policeman, she said, muttered something about security and a hearing next door. The other two men flashed badges.

Thereupon, she said, they sought out the closet where the staff keeps a small refrigerator and scanned it professionally. They left without further explanation.

Normally congressional hearing rooms are checked for eavesdropping devices before sessions in which secret information is to be divulged. The continuous check with radio monitoring devices, however, is thought to be an innovation. It is operated by the security office of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Miss Akins said that the two men who checked Senator LEHMAN'S office today seemed satisfied that nothing sinister was secreted there and left after simply looking.

The Capitol office buildings, however, rank among the worst security nightmares of Washington for the Defense Department. There is no restraint or check on the public. Crackpots appear in high percentage to plead all manner of causes and the corridors are usually thronged with mobs of tourists.

The police force, which in theory guards it, is a special group recruited from men seeking minor political patronage and bears little resemblance to any other police force in the Nation. It is utterly political and has no connection with the professional Washington city force.

I shall not read the rest of the article. I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the remainder of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In hearings last year a private detective specializing in wiretapping told a House committee that new eavesdropping devices being developed would enable a snooper to stand outside a building and "bug" any hearing room.

This, he testified, could be done electronically.

The Defense Department's reference to "radio monitoring" as an "antibug" device presumably means that the Department is now equipped to detect such snoopers.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I believe that neither the incident nor the inspection of my office reflected on me personally. That, however, is not the question, Mr. President. What happened yesterday, in my opinion, was inexcusable, outrageous, and highly dangerous; and I protest against it with all the force at my command. I believe that the incident which happened yesterday affects the dignity and the independence of the Senate of the United States.

Yesterday, as I have said, three men barged into my office. One was a member of the Capitol Police force. The other two men were from the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Neither of those two Departments or agents have any power whatsoever except those granted them by the Congress of the United States. When they came, they immediately busied themselves with their paraphernalia in that portion of my office in which, as Miss Akins has said, the office refrigerator is located, and which, I may add, is used as a storeroom and working space for my two office messengers.

Mr. President, as I recall, I have occupied that office ever since I came to the Senate, 7 years ago, and no question has ever been raised regarding the security of the office or regarding anything connected with security in my office.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, before yielding, I should like to complete my statement, if I may.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. LEHMAN. Then I shall be very glad, indeed, to yield.

Mr. President, these men did not even show their credentials, except upon the insistent demand of Miss Akins, one of my secretaries; and then they merely flashed their credentials, and neither explained nor justified their conduct.

Mr. President, the men never communicated with me. They never asked my permission to inspect my office; and Mr. President, that failure to communicate with me or to obtain my permission is in spite of the fact that I was either in my office or on the floor of the Senate or in committee meeting, constantly available to anybody, from about 9 o'clock in the morning until after 6 o'clock in the evening; and, Mr. President, I have been available in my office or in the Capitol throughout each day for many, many days prior to yesterday.

In the article which appeared on page 1 of the New York Times it is written that security officers and snoopers invaded my office to detect whether it was the source of a security leak. Mr. President, I insist on knowing who directed that inspection. Was the inspection special in character, or was it of a routine nature? If special in character, I demand to know who on my staff was under suspicion. If routine, I demand to know who had the authority to order the inspection. Did the Armed Services Committee or any member of the Armed Services Committee order the inspection? Did the Defense Department order it? Did the Capitol Police order it? If the inspection was merely routine, as is now claimed, why should a newspaper be informed of it and be given the right to publish an article from which damaging inferences may be drawn.

Mr. President, I think my colleagues know me well enough for me to say that no one has a greater desire than I have to protect the security of our country and to keep information which has been developed from possible enemy scrutiny.

Let me say here that I have been deeply shocked at leaks which have occurred in or from Senate committees in the case of vital matters affecting the security of our country, and I have also sometimes been shocked at what has been said on the floor of the Senate.

So, Mr. President, I say to you that if those officers who demanded the right, in my absence, to inspect my offices, had communicated with me, I would not only have given them permission, but I would have cooperated in every possible way in the inspection of my office premises or in any other manner that was desirable.

Mr. President, I believe that every Member of this body has as great a devotion to his country as does any other Member or any official of the Federal Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me for a moment? I must soon leave the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope that my friend, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], will understand.

First, Mr. President, I wish to say that when the Senator from New York notified me, this morning, of this action, I was amazed; I was shocked; I could not conceive that such outrageous treatment could be accorded any Member of the Senate.

It is my view, Mr. President, that every Member of this body will frown upon the action which took place on yesterday.

The majority leader immediately called for a full and complete report from the Capitol Police as to what part they played in this action. The majority leader wishes to assure the Senator from New York that as soon as the report is available, the majority leader, in cooperation, I trust, with the minority leader, will take such action as may be indicated.

I think the Senator from New York has presented to the Senate evidence of what I consider to be typical, bureaucratic, flatfoot stupidity. I think the Senator from New York is deserving of an apology, and the Senate of the United States is deserving of an apology, not only from one of its own employees, but from the great Defense Department of the Nation, if the facts as related by the Senator from New York and as published in the New York Times are confirmed.

On behalf of the Senate, I express my utter disgust at the action taken, my deep regret that any employee of the Senate would participate, my utter horror that the Defense Department of the Nation would permit its agents to be ransacking Senators' offices. If they can inspect the refrigerator in the office of the Senator from New York on yesterday, who knows but what on tomorrow they will be inspecting the desk of the minority leader or the majority leader or the chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. President, I hope that every Member of this body will denounce in the strongest possible terms the ill-advised action which took place on yesterday; and I appreciate the Senator's bringing it to our attention.

I apologize for interrupting him; but I have an engagement at 1 o'clock which I must keep, and I did not want this opportunity to pass without expressing myself as forcibly and as deeply as I could.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Texas, the eminent majority leader, for his remarks, which are greatly appreciated.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator from New York for only several moments?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me say that my regret is that a young man from New Mexico, working for the United States Senate, should dare to do that. I am happy that he was not an appointee of mine. But on behalf of the people of New Mexico, whom I know well—people of both political parties—I apologize to the Senator from New York, and I want to take my part in denouncing such an action.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me? I have to leave for a meeting which I must attend.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from New York, with all due respect to his problem, inasmuch as he has brought my name into this matter, I must ask him to yield to me.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri, after yielding to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Let me say to my distinguished friend that I associate myself completely with the comments made by the distinguished majority leader. Either someone moved into the Senator's office with some premeditated design to do something, or those who entered exercised the utmost stupidity and poor judgment in following that course of conduct.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Washington very much, indeed.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Missouri, chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The first the Senator from Missouri knew of this incident was when I read an article in the New York Times this morning. The article reads, in part:

> Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat of Missouri, who conducts the hearings, said that though the check was merely a routine precautionary measure, similar procedure had never been used before in Senate hearings.

I had never discussed the incident with anyone from the New York Times or any other newspaper. The first I knew about it was when I read the article in question this morning.

However, inasmuch as what appeared to be involved was new procedure on the part of the Department of Defense, on May 17, when it was noticed by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself that these men were not in the room, the next day we had a colloquy on the subject. One of the men involved was one of the individuals who entered the office of the distinguished junior Senator from New York. I read from the record:

> Senator SYMINGTON. Will you come forward a minute, please? Which one of you is in charge?
>
> Mr. MORGAN. I am, sir.
>
> Senator SYMINGTON. What is your name?
>
> Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Morgan, sir.
>
> Senator SYMINGTON. And whom do you represent?
>
> Mr. MORGAN. I am from OSD Security Office.
>
> Senator SYMINGTON. Yesterday when I went into the washroom while the briefing was going on, well after 5 o'clock, there was nobody there. Why was that?
>
> SECURITY CHECK OF HEARING ROOM
>
> Mr. MORGAN. Sir, we do not always stay for the full period. We run through our procedure 2 or 3 times and then sometimes leave.
>
> Senator SYMINGTON. What hours do you observe?
>
> Mr. MORGAN. Well, for instance here instead of quitting while you people are all here we will stay with you.
>
> Senator SYMINGTON. What time did you leave yesterday?
>
> Mr. MORGAN. 4:15.
>
> Senator SYMINGTON. And what time did you leave the day before?
>
> Mr. MORGAN. I don't believe there was anything Monday.
>
> Senator SYMINGTON. Then the last time before that what time did you leave?
>
> Mr. MORGAN. Six o'clock, I believe it was Friday night.
>
> Senator SYMINGTON. I noticed it and some people mentioned it to me.
>
> Are we to understand this is a periodic test, or a constant test?
>
> Mr. MORGAN. Well, we figure that if anybody was going to get anything out by that late period, they would have started a transmission out of there by then.
>
> Senator SYMINGTON. Don't you think if anybody was really interested in bugging the room of a hearing like this, that they would know when you came in and when you left?
>
> Mr. MORGAN. I was told yesterday, sir, that the meeting was about over and that you were going to vote at that time so I figured the hearing itself was over.

The man speaking on May 17 is a member of the Department of Defense. Continuing to read from the record:

> Senator SYMINGTON. We are not asking you this in any criticism. I have heard a good many briefings in this building, on far more secret things than we are discussing. We have never had this routine before to the best of my knowledge. We periodically check the committee rooms if I remember a statement made by the chairman of the full committee.
>
> As we do with all other witnesses, will you raise your hand and be sworn, please?
>
> Do you swear that you will give the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth to this Senate Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Senate Armed Services Committee, so help you God?
>
> Mr. MORGAN. I do, sir.
>
> Senator SYMINGTON. Will you give us details as to whom you report and what your instructions were when you came over here and what we are to expect in the future?
>
> Mr. HAMILTON. You can supply that for the record.
>
> Mr. MORGAN. At a later date?
>
> Senator SYMINGTON. At a later date.
>
> Mr. MORGAN. All right, sir.
>
> (The requested information is as follows:)
>
> "I, Clark A. Morgan, a representative of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Security Office, make the following statement for the record in compliance with a request of May 17, 1956, by the chairman of the subcommittee.
>
> "The standard operating procedure of this Office normally consists of a visual inspection and radio monitoring of an area immediately prior to a conference to insure that no clandestine listening devices are in operation within the area. Spot monitoring is also conducted during a conference to insure that no remotely controlled clandestine transmitters are put into operation during a conference.
>
> "The procedures used during the present closed hearings of this subcommittee consist of the above-listed standard operating

procedure or 1 of the 3 variations listed below:

"(1) If a closed session immediately follows an open hearing, time does not permit a complete visual inspection of the area and only the radio-monitoring phase is conducted.

"(2) Radio monitoring is conducted for approximately 3 hours if the monitoring is conducted from an area immediately adjacent to the conference room, and if the departure of the monitoring team would create no undue disturbance or attract attention.

"(3) If the monitoring is conducted from the conference room itself, the monitoring team remains until the session is concluded to prevent interruption to the hearing by the packing of monitoring equipment and departure of the monitoring team.

"In the future the procedure in covering the subcommittee will follow the above-listed standard operating procedure, or 1 of the 3 variations, unless otherwise directed."

Apparently this testimony, taken in executive session on May 17 and subsequently printed, was the basis for the article, because I had not discussed this matter with any reporter.

As soon as I read the article I called for the policeman involved and talked with him. The junior Senator from New York later called me. The subcommittee thereupon held an open hearing this morning, and took the sworn testimony of the policeman and the two members of the Department of Defense referred to.

The men involved are representatives of the Security Office of the Office of the Secretary of Defense. He stated in the testimony this morning that he did this work at the request of "legislative liaison."

Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, which knew absolutely nothing about the episode of yesterday, and which already had discussed the operations of these gentlemen, I express our apologies to the Senator from New York for the inconvenience caused to him.

The testimony is not entirely clear about what occurred. It would appear the incident is merely another example of overeager bureaucracy.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri. I was very confident that he would not in any way sanction a procedure of this kind.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. We held an open hearing this morning. If agreeable to my friend from New York, I should like to place in the RECORD tomorrow, or after it is typed, the testimony given by the two gentlemen and the policeman who entered his office yesterday.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should be very grateful to the Senator if he would do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the chairman of the subcommittee, has expressed apologies on his own behalf and on behalf of the subcommittee. He has our complete authority in expressing such apology. I join with him in doing so.

I think this incident resulted from the eagerness of two rather young gentlemen to do their duty as fully as they could. As was stated by the Senator from Missouri, the evidence given in public session will show that there was some part of the wallpaper or wall covering which was torn. They wanted to see where the hole led. They first asked the Capitol Police officer to go into the ladies' restroom. They found that the ventilator did not connect with the ladies' restroom, but did connect with the room next door. They stated that they did not know whose room it was, but, led by the officer, they asked the secretary of the Senator from New York if they could see what was in the room. She said she would see if anyone was in there. They then entered. They saw where the ventilator was. They stuffed some paper into the hole and left.

They should have asked the Senator's permission before they entered his office. They did ask the police officer to ask the lady who was in charge, and then they went in. They did not know, they stated, whose office it was. They did not know what the room was. All they knew was that this ventilator connected with it.

As a member of the subcommittee, I join in the sentiments expressed by the chairman, and I do so as emphatically as I can. I regret very much that the Senator from New York has been the victim of an utterly unjustified intrusion. We hope he will forget it, and try to think that the incident never occurred, because it certainly was not aimed at him or anyone in his office. Because there was a torn piece of paper over a hole which opened into a ventilator, these individuals, in their eagerness to be as thorough as possible, wondered if there was any connection between the hearing taking place in the next room and the tearing of a piece of paper from the ventilator.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the distinguished Senator from New York, will permit, I would change the word "apology" to "regret." The subcommittee has no authority whatever over these people. The subcommittee would like to express its very deep regret to the distinguished Senator from New York. It is not an apology. In my opinion, the apology should come from the Department of Defense.

Mr. LEHMAN. I agree with the Senator from Missouri very definitely.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. As a member of the subcommittee I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and to say that I regret very much that this incident occurred. I am sure I speak for all members of the subcommittee when I say there is no Member of the Senate who is more anxious to protect the United States against disclosure of security information than is the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to say, as minority leader, that I, too, regret that this incident happened. I am not a member of the subcommittee. However, judging by the article in the New York Times and from the statements which have been made on the floor of the Senate, it is apparent to me that if the agents had come to any one of the 96 Senators and had said they were trying to protect the security of the country, every one of the Senators would have been glad to cooperate with them.

They very poorly performed their duties, indeed, in going into the office of the Senator from New York without any prior knowledge being given to the Senator from New York.

I hope no similar incident ever arises again in the history of the Senate with respect to any Member on either side of the aisle. The Senator from New York is quite within his rights and quite properly has brought the matter to the attention of the Senate. I am sure the men who were performing their duty thought they were acting in the interest of the security of the country, because there have been occasions, as I am sure the Senator knows, even in American Embassies abroad when electronic devices have been planted by which information was picked up. In this instance the men involved were apparently trying to make certain that there was no such leakage of information possible. However, the procedures were all wrong, and they should not be countenanced. I join with the other expressions by other Members of the Senate in this regard.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am grateful to the Senator from California.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, this is a regrettable incident. I merely wish to ask one question. Did the men ask someone on the Senator's staff if they could come into his office?

Mr. LEHMAN. They asked no one to my knowledge who had authority to grant such permission.

Mr. CAPEHART. But they did ask someone on the Senator's staff; is that correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; they just came in, and they were in.

Mr. CAPEHART. Was someone from the Senator's staff present when they came in?

Mr. LEHMAN. My receptionist was there; yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. She happened to be there at the time?

Mr. LEHMAN. She was there in line of duty. That is her place in the office. I happened to be out of the office at the time.

Mr. CAPEHART. But they spoke to the Senator's receptionist and asked her if they could do what they did?

Mr. LEHMAN. No, according to her, they just walked past her. She tried to stop them, and they flashed their badges. They said they had authority to do it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Did they ask her whether they could enter the room?

Mr. LEHMAN. They did not ask her.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think this is a regrettable incident. It is certainly very regrettable. It was probably due to their enthusiasm. As I understand, the two men from the Defense Department did go in with the policeman.

Mr. SYMINGTON. They did.

Mr. CAPEHART. He escorted them into the room?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to say to the Senator from Indiana that the first I heard of this incident was when I returned to my office after being on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think it is regrettable.

Mr. LEHMAN. I returned to the office at 5 o'clock. I immediately called up the Sergeant at Arms, Mr. Joseph C. Duke, and insisted that he make an investigation of this whole matter.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the Senator from New York was 100 percent right. It is a regrettable incident.

Mr. LEHMAN. I will not take up very much more time of the Senate. I have only one or two more comments to make. Every Member of the Senate—and I wish to emphasize this, Mr. President—has as great devotion to his country and its security as has the Secretary of Defense. Every Member of the Senate is just as loyal as the Secretary of Defense. Every Member of the Senate, I know, would exert every effort to protect the security of the country.

There can be no excuse, however, for the assumption of authority by the Capitol Police or by the office of the Secretary of Defense in the manner demonstrated by this intrusion. We ought to know, if we do not know already, that the members of the Capitol Police are, in almost all cases, political appointees. The Defense Department, of course, is a bureau of the administrative branch of the Government. I cannot believe that the Senate would abdicate its independence to any bureau of the administrative branch of the Government, whether it be the Defense Department or any other department.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I regret that I was in attendance at a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and missed the beginning of the Senator's discussion of this incident. Was it the Senator's understanding that the young Capitol Police officer who escorted the men into the Senator's office, was acting out of order?

Mr. LEHMAN. I did not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. ANDERSON. Was the Capitol Police officer doing something that he should not have done?

Mr. LEHMAN. The three men came into my office and simply barged in and sought to examine a part of my office. That particular part of my office houses my office refrigerator and certain other paraphernalia used by my clerical staff and my two messengers.

Mr. ANDERSON. The young man in question, a member of the Capitol Police force, is my patronage appointee, with the name of Gilbert Encinias. As I understand—and I hope the Senator will correct me if I am wrong—he escorted the men into the Senator's office for the purpose of finding out whether a flue, which leads from the hearing room into the Senator's room, was communicating voices. Is that the information of the Senator from New York?

Mr. LEHMAN. I have no idea what the name of the young man is, or specifically what he and the others were looking for.

Mr. ANDERSON. His name is Gilbert Encinias.

Mr. LEHMAN. I did not know whether he came from New Mexico or from New York. However, 1 of the 3 men was a member of the Capitol Police force, and he came to my office with 2 men who were later identified, according to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommiteee on Armed Services, as men who came from the Office of the Secretary of Defense. I have no idea what they were looking for. Perhaps they were looking for something sinister. I do not know.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator knows, I am sure, that they were not looking for anything sinister. What they do is this: If secret information is being given out in a room during a hearing, there has always been a responsibility to check adjoining rooms to see whether voices carry through partitions or flues. I have talked with the Sergeant at Arms, Mr. Duke, and he tells me that that is a perfectly routine examination, which goes on in the office of any Senator. I have also talked with the chief of the Capitol Police, and asked him how his man got into the matter, and the captain said it was because the man had been detailed with instructions to accompany the two men to see that they did what they always do.

Mr. LEHMAN. I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that I have occupied the same suite of offices for 7 years, and 1 room is adjacent to the hearing room, room 457. There is no doubt that many hearings have been held in the hearing room, and I have no doubt that in some cases some testimony of a confidential nature has been given. The particular hearing held yesterday was a continuation of the hearing which had been held in the same room for several days.

I wish to point out—and I cannot emphasize this too strongly—that I am just as much devoted to the protection of security in the Senate and elsewhere as is anyone else, whether it be the Secretary of Defense or any other official. What I am objecting to, however, is that this inspection was made without communication whatsoever with the Senator involved—I being that Senator—of course, without his permission, and without a request for cooperation, which would have been given with great pleasure and with great enthusiasm. But this incident occurred yesterday while I was absent, and there was no consultation, no permission asked, no authorization requested of the Senator who occupied those quarters.

I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that he is perfectly correct. If there is a ventilator or an opening between two rooms which should be protected, all that was necessary, if it was possible to hear—and I do not know whether it was or was not—was to put up a piece of cardboard, a blanket, a sheet, or a cover of some kind between the two rooms, and no sound could have come through.

But I cannot believe that we in the Senate are going to abdicate our independence to the wishes and to the rules of the Department of Defense or any other department in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say to the Senator that when I became a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the first time there was a meeting in my office at which secret and confidential information was to be revealed to me by members of the joint committee or of the staff, I requested the AEC to check my office to see if there were microphones anywhere in it. I did not regard that as an invasion of my rights. I was only trying to make sure that secret information was not made available to those unauthorized to have it.

I think if such a suggestion had been made to the Senator from New York, he would have been the first to agree and to insist that security precautions be observed.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from New Mexico knows that to be so. But for someone to come from the Department of Defense and arbitrarily proceed to inspect my office spaces, to inspect them without authorization, I think amounts to violating the right of a Senator. I am told—I was not told yesterday, and I do not know whether it is true or not—that this was a routine inspection. If it was a routine inspection such as that to which the Senator has referred in connection with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, why was the news given to the newspapers? Why was it that one newspaper carried the story, which, inevitably, contained inferences of a serious and possibly damaging nature?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the Senator knows the answer to that, does he not?

Mr. LEHMAN. No, I do not.

Mr. ANDERSON. As the group went into the office, permission was requested to go into the Senator's office. I wish to assure the Senator that I have had only a few minutes' conversation on this incident and have not talked to the individuals concerned at all, but I understand that permission was granted to enter the Senator's office. As they left the office there was heated conversation outside the office which newspaper reporters could not help overhearing. The conversation came from members of the Senator's own staff, and not from the officers.

Mr. LEHMAN. To me it is an amazing thing. Of course, if anyone claims to have credentials, no one in an inferior position, such as that of a receptionist, is going to deny the right to inspect. But that does not change this situation.

Mr. President, there can be no excuse for the assumption of authority by the Capitol Police or by the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The members of the Capitol Police are in almost all cases political appointees. The Defense Department is a part of the executive branch of the Government. I do not believe that we in the Senate are ready today or ever will be ready to abdicate our independence to any department or bureau of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. President, we have come a far distance down the road. We have built a thick and almost suffocating atmosphere which today pervades the Halls of the United States Congress and the Senate Office Building, and which permits such an incident as I have described to take place. It is unconscionable, to my mind, that the Defense Department should engage in completely unauthorized acts in the Senate Office Building. If leakage is suspected, they should solicit the cooperation of the Senators who have adjoining offices—if that is the form of leakage suspected—and not act as if they suspect the Senators and their staffs too.

In my judgment, Mr. President, we have gone too far in this business of the invasion of privacy to detect breaches of so-called security. Everyone is suspected these days, and when everyone is suspected, there is no such thing as real security.

Mr. President, I believe this is an intolerable situation, in which each man walks constantly on the precipice of infamy from which he can be pushed by any careless snooper, by any irresponsible order issued by any irresponsible and overzealous security officials.

Mr. President, I ask the Secretary of Defense for justification and for an explanation of this incident. I ask that this insult to the United States Senate—for so I view it—be wiped out and that steps be immediately taken so that similar incidents cannot again occur.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wish to say, along with the other Members of the Senate who have participated in this discussion, that every Member of this body knows the devoted loyalty, patriotism, and dedication of the Senator from New York. We regard his loyalty, patriotism, and dedication as unsurpassed in the Nation.

I think it is exceedingly regrettable that this incident has occurred. There are constitutional protections regarding search and seizure in civil life. A search requires a writ. In public life it is at least desirable to have notification, particularly when Members of the Senate serve on committees to which confidential information is given. Apparently, they trust us sufficiently, if we are in the room, to hear what they have to say.

It appears to me that if they would take the time to make an advance request of the Senator, or of his administrative assistant, who in turn could communicate with the Senator, there would be complete and wholehearted compliance and cooperation.

Very frankly, in my opinion, the Capitol Police have difficult tasks to perform in connection with the Senate. I think they do good work, despite some of the criticisms which are leveled against them at times.

Also, I feel certain that the Capitol Police officer, as did the Senator's receptionist, stood in some awe and respect of the officials of the Department of Defense, who had credentials as investigators. On occasion, such officials call at our offices for the purpose of inquiring about personnel matters relating to Federal appointments. I may say that the average employee in a Senator's office, as is true of the average citizen, sometimes stands in fear, and always in awe, of a Federal officer who is empowered with investigatory or inspection authority. I think all of us should remember that. People sometimes are prone to become panicky at the sight of an officer who seems to be quite officious and determined to proceed forthwith to complete his assignment.

If I may make one suggestion, it is that the rooms be investigated. The sooner that can be done, the better. I should like to know how many telephones are being tapped. I do not know that they are, but I keep hearing that they are. I should like to know whether any of the walls are "bugged," so to speak. I think it would be a good idea to have the whole building gone over; in fact, I recommend it, because from time to time important conferences are in progress. Furthermore, sometimes there are things being said which are not so important, but which I do not care to have other persons hear. I am sure others feel as I do about that.

The process of unrestrained snooping is not within the dignity of Congress or of the Government. I certainly am not accusing the Department of Defense of snooping. I think their motives in this instance were correct and proper, but their action was improper; their methodology was improper. I am sure that the officer concerned in this instance feels as regretful about what happened as does anyone else. But he felt he had an assignment, and, as in the case of a military command, he was going to carry it through.

I think the sooner the procedure is clarified, the better off we shall be. I feel certain that every Senator would like it to be known that he can be relied upon, if called upon, to give cooperation. I am certain, however, that every committee room in the Capitol has work in progress from time to time which requires the most careful inspection and scrutiny. Therefore, as the Senator from New Mexico has said, the inspection should be routine, but routine with Senators having knowledge of what is going on, as the Senator from New York has asked.

If I understand correctly the complaint of the Senator from New York—and it is a justifiable complaint, in my opinion—it is not so much what was done that concerns him, as it is the manner in which it was done. It is a fact that he, a United States Senator, and one of the most distinguished citizens of his country, was not informed of what was about to happen, was not asked to cooperate, and was told nothing. Finding his name flashed across the front page of a great newspaper, he has a right to become disturbed, because such statements, even in a reliable newspaper, always leave some lingering doubts. There is hardly any retraction which can erase such a record, because people in public life are controversial figures. I think it is unfortunate that this has happened.

The affection, the esteem, and the respect of the colleagues of the junior Senator from New York will be like a mighty fortress for him in this particular instance, because no Member of the Senate could be more loyal to his country, even to the point of laying down his life for it than the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I appreciate sincerely the very generous comments made by the junior Senator from Minnesota about me. There is no question that every possible means must be used to insure security in the hearings which are being held. I wish there could be more security in the debates in the Senate than actually occurs. I wish there could be greater security in every other way. It seems to me that such security should be provided by the Senate itself. I do not think there should be set up in the various committees little teams of snoopers and little teams of investigators from the Department of Defense, a department which has no connection whatsoever with the committees of the Senate. I do not believe each committee separately should decide whether it wants to have snoopers going around and inspecting persons for their loyalty and considering such related factors. I think it would be perfectly proper—and I wish we could have more of it—to have made a real security check of the rooms of the Senate, especially in connection with some of the deliberations which take place in the hearings. But that security check should be made by the Senate itself when the question of security is under consideration. The same is true also of the House.

But I do not think it is necessary to bring into the picture the Department of Defense, which is in no way whatsoever connected with the legislative branch, and over which we have no control and no influence. I think its activities are something entirely different.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is unnecessary for Senators to express their confidence in the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. I myself have never known a nobler man in public life than the junior Senator from New York, whose life has clearly been devoted to the best interests of the people of the United States.

All of us not only regret but are indignant about what happened. But we know that it will not hurt the Senator from New York, because his life and reputation are so firmly established that they are beyond attack by anyone.

I think the Senator from New York has proposed a very interesting idea. I

should like to make now a formal suggestion to the Committee on Rules and Administration; namely, that the committee engage experts in electronic devices to inspect all hearing rooms and all adjoining rooms to determine whether security and privacy exist.

I suggest also that inspection be made of the offices of all Senators—every office—to ascertain whether there are any hidden recording devices and whether the telephone wires of Senators are being tapped. I suggest that following such an inspection a report be made to the Senate. I further suggest that the membership of the subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration which would conduct the investigation be composed of Senators from both parties.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very appreciative of the remarks of the Senator from Illinois. I hope I have made it clear that I am not at all worried about this matter from a personal standpoint. I think my record demonstrates very clearly what I have stood for and fought for. I have no fear of any article of this sort, so far as its affecting my own life is concerned. But I have a very great concern about what is happening in connection with many matters relating to security.

As the Senator from Illinois knows, all my adult life I have been heart and soul against wire tapping. I do not know whether my wires are tapped. They may be. I would not be surprised if they were, although I have absolutely no proof of it. I have been against the use of all other subtle devices which are used to entangle people unfairly and unjustly and to deprive them of their civil rights and liberties. I am steadfastly opposed to the use of wire tapping and similar devices. I think that is the important point.

When men come into a Senator's office and brush aside his receptionist, a person who has no authority whatsoever, and who neither gave nor withheld permission because she felt that she could not do so as merely a receptionist—when such a group comes into a Senator's office and preempts the right to make an inspection without consultation with the Senator, I think it is simply one example of what may happen if we are not careful.

I do not think anybody is going to try to inspect the premises of the Senator from New Mexico, or the Senator from Illinois, or the Senator from New York. I do not know whether other things may be done, but we know they have been done frequently in other countries. We know they could be done here. That is why, although I do not have the slightest concern in the world about the effect of the article in the New York Times on my own personal fortunes, nor have I any fear at all of the effect of the incident itself, I felt that I could not possibly remain silent under the circumstances which I have recounted, because, in my opinion, they are serious circumstances. I think they are circumstances fraught with great dangers to the future of this body, which we all agree is the greatest legislative body in the world. It has maintained its independence. The minute we surrender our independence, then I think we are through, and I think the country is through.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair). Has the Senator from New York yielded the floor?

Mr. LEHMAN. No, I have not.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President——

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in my anxiety to keep the record straight with respect to what happened yesterday in the subcommittee, I did not express, as I should have, my deep respect and affection for the distinguished Senator from New York. In the years I have been in the Senate, I have always felt he was one of the most outstanding and patriotic Americans who have ever graced this body and I am especially sorry this unfortunate incident occurred in connection with a subcommittee on which I serve.

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield now to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. When the Senator from New York refers to the possibility that somebody could be worried to see this happening in his office, I may say to him that, so far as I am concerned, if anybody in the country could have the slightest doubt about the patriotism and loyalty of the able Senator from New York, that person would be in a pretty bad way, indeed, because we have all watched the Senator from New York over a long period of years. So far as I am concerned, nothing could happen that would in the slightest concern me on that subject. I will always recognize his loyalty and patriotism under any circumstances.

Secondly, I should like to say I think the Senator from New York has brought to the attention of the Senate something that is important to us, and that is that if an examination is made in any Senator's office, it ought to me made only with the approval of the Senator concerned. I join him in the statement he has made in that connection.

I should like to say, however, that the use of recording devices and machinery of that nature is not unique. The Senator from New York may remember that when there was a change in the Cabinet some years ago, more than 1,000 pounds of recording equipment were taken from that Cabinet member's office and another 800 pounds from his dining room, all of which had been used to obtain records of conversations between him and Members of the House and Senate, without knowledge of such Members.

I think the Senator from New York may have inadvertently served the country very well in the misfortune that has happened to him. It may result in our being able to say that none of these things shall be allowed to take place without approval of the Senator, if there is going to be an examination. I agree with the Senator completely that we must not have it done in any other fashion. To the extent that the personal approval of the Senator is not obtained, it ought not to be allowed.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that I had not known of the incident which he related with reference to the 1,000 pounds of material which was taken from the office of a Cabinet member. It was a Cabinet member, was it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, a member of the Cabinet.

Mr. LEHMAN. Who listened in on conversations?

Mr. ANDERSON. He had some push-buttons under his desk. As one would participate in a conversation with him, he would push buttons, so that the person who was talking would have his voice recorded a little more clearly. Later, pounds and pounds and pounds of recording equipment were removed from the Cabinet member's office. I once had luncheon in that Cabinet member's office. He asked me a great many questions. He asked me about the political chances of my predecessor in the Senate, Carl Hatch, who is now a Federal judge. He asked me questions concerning political complications if my colleague ran for office. These conversations were carefully winnowed, and the three or four words that "Carl Hatch was going to have a hard run" were handed around, and certain persons were told, "Look what this man thinks about you."

I think that there ought to be warning signals like buzzers or beepers, when recorders are used on telephones. If a conversation is being recorded, the person on the other end of the line should be notified.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator has made a very interesting statement. I have no knowledge of the former Cabinet officer to whom he has referred, but regardless of who he was, I certainly condemn the procedure wholeheartedly. The mere fact that the Senator from New Mexico has related something that happened some years ago shows the danger of this thing. How can anybody sanction or approve that sort of procedure?

The Senator from New Mexico has stated that perhaps the junior Senator from New York has inadvertently done a service to the country by bringing up this matter. I want him to know that I did not do it inadvertently. I did it with complete knowledge of what I was doing, and in the hope that I was rendering a service to the country by bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate and the country. It was not done inadvertently. It was done deliberately, and it was done with all the force at my command.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me say to the Senator I had intended to try to remove the word "inadvertent" from my remarks, because it was not what I intended to say. I was trying to say, or I started to say, that the Senator from New York, in calling attention to one thing, had brought out the necessity of making sure that there was a rule which would prevent any one doing this sort of thing, without going first to the Senator himself. That is what I meant by what I said.

I also think that if somebody can come into a Senator's office for the purpose of checking it to see if voices travel through a flue, they might come in for other

purposes. Therefore, I do not think they should come in without prior approval and watchfulness of the Senator himself. I am deeply sorry they came in under the circumstance related by the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President——

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Anyone who wears the Distinguished Service Medal should not have his patriotism questioned. Anyone who has served the Senate, his State, and the country as long as has the Senator from New York cannot have his honesty questioned. I share the resentment of the Senator from New York over the act that was performed.

I expressed a similar resentment on the floor of the Senate not many weeks ago against the president of the Americans for Democratic Action, who paid money for information obtained fraudulently from Paul Hughes, and which proved to be lies, against a Member of the United States Senate.

I hope the distinguished Senator from New York will include in his expressions of resentment Joseph L. Rauh, president of Americans for Democratic Action, for his uncalled for, sneaking attack on a Member of the United States Senate by means exactly the same as those over which the Senator from New York expresses resentment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say to the Senator from Arizona that I am not in any way familiar with the incident to which he has referred. But I can make the general statement, categorically, and without qualification, that I would resent the use of any kind of listening device in order to obtain political advantage, whether in the case of a member of the ADA or a member of the Republican Party or a member of the Democratic Party. I am opposed to all of it, and I always have been, and I always will be, because I think it is iniquitous and bad. I hope the Senate will not lend itself to that in any way, at any time, or under any circumstances.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to hear the Senator from New York express himself in that way, because, knowing him as I do, I thought he was not aware of the facts concerning Mr. Rauh, the president of the ADA. I know that if the Senator from New York will study the documents I placed in the RECORD regarding the Paul Hughes case, he will include in his resentment the president of the ADA.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have been a lifelong liberal.

Mr. LEHMAN. Who has been a lifelong liberal, Mr. President?

Mr. CAPEHART. I have been a lifelong liberal. That is why I feel as I do, and why I desire to make the statement I shall make.

First, let me say that I feel that a Senator's office and everything that happens within it is public business. I cannot conceive that anything which may happen in a Senator's office—whether correspondence or anything else of any nature—does not belong to the public. Personally, I do not think that anything in a Senator's office should be protected against anything except thievery.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to complete my statement, please, Mr. President.

I think a Senator's office is public property, and is used for public business. I cannot conceive that a single piece of correspondence either coming into or going out of a Senator's office does not belong to the public. I think we are conducting the public business.

The Senate makes its own rules. The Senate appointed the policeman. If I correctly understand the situation, a Senate policeman, and two other persons, went to the receptionist of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and said they wanted to look at one office. If a Capitol policeman asked to be allowed to look at any of the rooms in a Senator's office, I do not think a single member of any Senator's staff in Washington would have said anything except, "Of course come on in." Under those circumstances, I do not think a single staff member would have said anything except, "Certainly come on in," because the business we are conducting is the public business. We are not here on private business. At least, that is my view of the matter.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. CAPEHART. I ask the Senator from New Mexico to wait a moment, please.

Mr. President, so far as I personally am concerned, the police can walk into my office and can read every piece of mail there—every piece of mail I have received or every piece of mail I have written. They can come there whenever they wish to. What is so secret about a Senator's office?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Just this, Mr. President——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from New Mexico to wait a moment, please I have not yielded.

Mr. President, what is so secret about a Senator's office? What are we afraid of? We are engaged on the public business. We are the servants of the public. Particularly, when a policeman the Senate has appointed is engaged in checking into matters, I do not know why we should make such a fuss about something of this nature honestly I do not, Mr. President.

Now I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. LEHMAN. No, Mr. President; the Senator from Indiana cannot yield. I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to answer the question. Of course a Senator's business is public business. But would the Senator from Indiana want anyone in Washington or any policeman or any administrative assistant from any other office to go into his office and attend to the public business he undertakes to perform for Indiana? Would he?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not understand the question. Will the Senator from New Mexico repeat it?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Would the Senator from Indiana want my administrative assistant to investigate the Senator's files in connection with the public business in which he is engaged?

Mr. CAPEHART. I have no objection at all, if such a request is made of my receptionist, saying, "I should like to come into your office." I do not think I would particularly want him to go through the files, but it is public business.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No one is more interested in the public business than I am; and in connection with the public business, I keep closely in touch with the people of my State, and they are entitled to service.

But any policeman from the Pentagon, badge or no badge, had better not come into my office and do what was done in the office of the Senator from New York.

Mr. CAPEHART. If a Capitol policeman came to the Senator's receptionist and said he would like to have a look at the physical properties in room so-and-so, I imagine the receptionist would say, "Certainly; come in and take a good look."

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Indiana does not know my receptionist. [Laughter.] Ordinarly she would throw such a person out on his ear.

Mr. CAPEHART. Perhaps that is true in the Senator's office.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. But in my office, we are such great liberals, and believe in the public trust, that we would say, "Of course; come take a look."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; but I do not trust any Tom, Dick, or Harry, in spite of his badges. That is the only difference between the Senator from Indiana and myself.

The point I am trying to make is this: Of course all of us are interested in the public business. For instance, today or tomorrow we are going to submit the conference report on the big road bill, which is public business. But would the Senator from Indiana say that because it is public business, any Tom, Dick, or Harry could go to the Committee on Public Works and rifle the files?

Mr. CAPEHART. I said that I am opposed to thievery, and certainly I am opposed to thievery.

But I am looking at the matter from the broad, liberal standpoint that what we do here is the public business, because I am a great liberal, and I always have been; and I think the members of the public are entitled to know what is going on within our offices.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, unfortunately I have to leave the Chamber to attend a meeting of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. So I am afraid I shall have to yield the floor.

But before doing so, I wish to say one word to the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. President, I am 78 years old, and I have learned many things. I have always proceeded on the theory that we

live to learn. Today I have learned something for the first time—at least, I have heard the claim made, and it is something of great interest to me; for the first time I have heard anyone describe the distinguished Senator from Indiana as a great liberal. [Laughter.] But then, of course, the Senator from Indiana has a fine sense of humor.

Mr. President, I wish to make it very clear that the Senator from Indiana is perfectly correct in saying that a Senator's business is the business of the Nation, and that a Senator has no right to keep anything from the people he represents or from the people of the Nation as a whole. I have proceeded on that theory. My files have been wide open to anyone who had authority or who had a reason for asking me for my opinion or about my attitude or my stand on any public question.

I think I can make that statement without fear of contradiction. But it is one thing to give permission to question, to investigate, and to study to people who have authority, but it is quite a different thing to give it to people who have no authority. No one can tell me that the Department of Defense, which is a department of the executive branch of the Government, has the right to come to the Senate of the United States and demand anything.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall yield when I am through.

They may be asked to do it, but I have been told by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee that these men were not asked to do it. They certainly have no right to do it; and if the Senate is ever willing to state that they have the right to do it, I believe we shall lose our independence to a very considerable extent.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know whether they had the right or not, but they did go to the Capitol Police, who represent the Senate, whose members are appointed by the Senate, and they asked that a member of the Capitol Police go with them. He went with them. They asked a representative of the United States Senate to go with them.

The Senator says that if a thing like that can happen, he is afraid that we shall lose our liberties. I say that I am afraid of it when I hear talk, as I have heard today from Senators, to the effect that we ought to adopt regulations which would prohibit anyone from doing such things. It is then that I would become fearful.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am already late for my appointment; but let me say to my friend from Indiana that I do not believe that in establishing the Capitol Police force we intended to invest its members with any such authority. Reluctantly, we must confess, the Capitol force is a purely political organization. It is a patronage organization, to which both the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from New York have made appointments, possibly on a political basis. I do not think that any of us believes that we should give to the Capitol Police the untrammeled right to investigate our offices without specific authorization from the Senate in each case or in all cases.

When I ask for the appointment of a man to the Capitol Police force, to preserve order here and protect the property and personnel of the Capitol and its appurtances, I do not believe that I am recommending a person who will have delegated to him powers which must belong to the Senate itself. I do not think the officers of the Capitol Police would want such powers, except under carefully circumscribed conditions, and by specific authorization of the Senate or the Senator in each case.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I stated a moment ago that I thought the incident was regrettable. I think it would have been better if the individuals involved had spoken to the Senator. But the point is that they did approach one of his employees. They were accompanied by a member of the Capital Police force. Members of that force are appointed by the United States Senate. They are responsible to the Senate, and to the Senate only.

There was a room in which mutilation of the wall had taken place——

Mr. LEHMAN. What is that?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mutilation of the wall——

Mr. LEHMAN. No.

Mr. CAPEHART. Not in the Senator's office, but in the other office.

Mr. LEHMAN. No. The Senator must not say that. Whatever was in that room had been there for 7 years.

Mr. CAPEHART. I mean in the committee room.

Mr. LEHMAN. In the committee room, too. It has been there for much more than 7 years. I have been a Senator for 7 years.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not mean the Senator's office. I did not say it was the Senator's office. I said it was the committee room. The wall was mutilated; and those who were making the investigation had every right in the world to find out whether it was mutilated on the other side. Unfortunately, the other side happened to be in the office of the Senator from New York. No one knew but that someone might have planted a bomb there. We do not want to see police officers sitting around waiting to find out, under those circumstances, whether someone is trying to do physical harm to a United States Senator, or to members of the committee which meets there.

Mr. President, I think we are making a mountain out of a molehill. My best judgment is that we have been playing politics against the Defense Department of the United States. The so-called liberals who have been discussing the subject knew that they were playing politics with the situation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in order not to play politics with the Defense Department, I hope the Senator from Indiana will remain in the Chamber this afternoon and help the committee, in connection with the Defense Department appropriation bill, to see that the Defense Department is given what it needs.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

PANAMA CANAL IMPROVEMENTS: TERMINAL LAKE THIRD LOCKS PLAN APPROVED IN PRINCIPLE BY GOV. GLEN E. EDGERTON, JANUARY 17, 1944

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, in a brief address to the Senate on June 4, 1956, I quoted a number of informal statements on Isthmian Canal problems by eminent engineers and others with Panama Canal experience.

Recently, the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Hon. George H. Roderick, of Michigan, transmitted to me—following my inquiry—a declassified official 1944 preliminary report to the Secretary of War by Gov. Glen E. Edgerton of the Panama Canal (1940–1944) concerning the elimination of the Pedro Miguel locks in connection with the 1939 third-locks project. The proposal discussed in this report has been appropriately designated as the Terminal Lake third locks plan.

This plan, it should be noted, was developed in the Panama Canal organization from operating experience in World War II, 1941 to 1943, and before the advent of the atomic bomb. Because of its inherent logic and obvious navigational advantages, it received prompt attention by Canal Zone officials and won widespread technical support, including that of the Secretary of the Navy.

In his 1944 report, which was likewise prepared before the advent of the atomic bomb in 1945, Governor Edgerton evaluated the advantages and disadvantages of the plan from the engineering viewpoint and presented information of the highest importance to the Congress, and the Nation. To aid in its examination, I have prepared a brief summary of the main points of the report, which is commended for careful study by all concerned with the gravely important problem of the Panama Canal, especially cognizant committees of the Congress.

Though portions of Governor Edgerton's 1944 report may no longer pertain, its main evaluations still apply with even greater force. Thus, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD, my summary of its highlights and my discussions of this matter, and immediately following my complete remarks I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the report be printed.

There being no objection, the summary, discussion, and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT POINTS IN GOV. GLEN E. EDGERTON'S REPORT ON ELIMINATION OF PEDRO MIGUEL LOCKS, JANUARY 17, 1944

The most significant points in Governor Edgerton's report are his:

1. Statement that "the wisdom of the adoption of the high-level plan in the original construction of the canal is completely established" (par. 71).

2. Disclosure of the origin of the Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan in the Panama Canal organization in 1943 and its support by the Secretary of the Navy (pars. 1, 2, and 7).

3. Listing of key documents on the formulation of the plan and its submission to higher authority (pars. 1–6).

4. Admission of the navigational hazards in the Pacific sector of the third-locks project as originally laid out (par. 19) and of naval opposition to its completion in the form as first planned (par. 2).

5. Approval in principle of the Terminal Lake third locks plan (pars. 24–88) and recommendation to the Secretary of War for its thorough investigation (par. 136).

6. Estimates of costs (1944) for completion of the Terminal Lake third locks project varying from $210 millon to $360 million (par. 94). (Compare these with present-day estimates for the sea-level project, between five and ten billion dollars.)

7. Recognition of the operational superiority of a lake-lock type canal over one at sea level (pars. 71 and 74).

8. Assertion that, notwithstanding the superior operational convenience of a lake-lock type canal, the arguments for a sea-level canal are based on the relative vulnerability of the lake-lock type and a sea-level type to damage by enemy attack (par. 72). As already pointed out this statement was made before the advent of the atomic bomb.

9. Warning that sea-level advocates would "oppose unjustifiably any expensive change in the present plans on the grounds that it would defer the time when the conversion of the existing canal to a sea-level waterway might otherwise be authorized" (par. 70).

By way of further explanation, it should be noted that the 1939 Third Locks project was suspended in May 1942. Some $75 million was expended, mainly on excavation of lock sites at Gatun and Miraflores. No excavation was undertaken at Pedro Miguel.

The final report on the Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan contemplated by Governor Edgerton was never submitted, as his program was superseded by the Isthmian Canal Studies under Public Law 280, 79th Congress. The 1947 report of these studies, because of the impact of the atomic bomb, appears to have been directed toward securing authorization of the 1947 sea-level project chiefly on the alleged basis of security from atomic attack.

Developments in thermonuclear weapons since 1947, in the opinion of competent, independent experts, have changed the entire canal picture from the defense standpoint by rendering the type of canal as essentially irrelevant. Whatever force these considerations may have had in 1946 and 1947, when the sea-level project report was prepared, has been wholly dissipated because of the tremendous advances in destructive powers of thermonuclear weapons—not to mention even greater advances in the future.

These facts restore the canal problem to securing adequate capacity and maximum operational convenience at least cost. For these purposes, the 1944 engineering evaluation of operational problems of the Panama Canal assume the highest character.

All of this, I may say, adds up to indicate the absolute importance for prompt action by the Congress to provide for the creation of an Interoceanic Canals Commission to study the entire canals problem as provided for in S. 766 and H. R. 3335, 84th Congress.

REPORT ON PROPOSALS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF PEDRO MIGUEL LOCKS OF THE PANAMA CANAL

SYNOPSIS

Modification of the authorized project for a third set of locks in the Panama Canal by 1 of 5 plans which contemplate the abandonment of all locks, existing and proposed, at Pedro Miguel and the provision of 3-lift flights (or equivalent 2-lift flights) at Miraflores, has been suggested in order to obtain the operational advantages of an anchorage area at the Pacific end of Gaillard Cut and other benefits.

The plans are schematic and cannot be appraised with accuracy in the present stage of their investigation. The relative advantages and disadvantages are described and explained in this report. The major advantages are economic and are evaluated in the report at from about $600,000 to $1,070,000 per year. The additional costs of the several plans would range from $30 million to $180 million, and the additional time required for construction from 1½ to 3 years. Intangible factors of both war and peace are explained and discussed briefly.

One of the plans merits comprehensive investigation. Its feasibility is doubtful because of unfavorable foundation conditions. None of the other plans appears to be justifiable, but final conclusions in that respect, also, should be deferred until investigations in progress have been completed.

I. AUTHORITY, REFERENCES, AND SCOPE

Authority

1. This report is submitted in response to a letter from the Adjutant General, United States Army, September 18, 1943 (AG–381 [7 Sept. 1943] OB–S–E), to the Commanding General, Caribbean Defense Command, on the subject, Plan For the Improvement of the Panama Canal, transmitting copies of a letter of September 7, 1943, and its enclosures, from the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of War, requesting study of the subject in order that the practicability and advisability of such a program might be discussed jointly and the President advised in the premises.

References

2. In addition to the two letters identified above, the references include the enclosures to the letter of the Secretary of the Navy which consist of copies of the following, listed in chronological order:

(a) Memorandum, February 25, 1943, to the Marine Superintendent of the Panama Canal, by the captain of the port, Balboa, on the subject, Panama Canal—Improvement of Operating Conditions and Increasing Capacity, with three enclosures.

(b) Memorandum, March 25, 1943, to the Marine Superintendent, by the captain of the port, Balboa, on the subject, Panama Canal—Proposed Plan for Improvement—Marine Features.

(c) Memorandum, March 26, 1943, to the Governor of the Panama Canal, by Mr. R. S. Randolph, consulting engineer, on the subject, Panama Canal—Proposed Improvement of Operating Conditions and Increasing Capacity.

(d) Memorandum, April 25, 1943, to the Marine Superintendent, by the captain of the port, Balboa, on the subject Panama Canal—Marine Features of the Sea Level and Lock Types Compared.

(e) Mimeographed copy of the Marine Operating Problems of the Panama Canal and the Solution, a lecture before the Panama section of the American Society of Civil Engineers, by Commander Miles P. DuVal, United States Navy, captain of the port, Balboa, of the Panama Canal, May 25, 1943.

(f) Letter of June 17, 1943, from the Commandant, 15th Naval District, to the vice Chief of Naval Operations on the subject Panama Canal—Proposed Naval Plans for Its Immediate Improvement. A copy of the reference, Com. 15ND, file H. C. 1423 (01) of June 9, 1943, was not included with the copy of this letter.

(g) Endorsement 1, June 24, 1943, from the Vice Chief of Naval Operations to the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

(h) Endorsement 2, undated, from the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks to the Vice Chief of Naval Operations.

(i) Endorsement 3, July 15, 1943, from the Vice Chief of Naval Operations, to the Secretary of the Navy.

(j) Fourth endorsement, August 2, 1943, from Commander in Chief, United States Fleet and Chief of Naval Operations to the Secretary of the Navy.

3. The basic letter for purposes of this discussion is reference (f) in which the Commandant, 15th Naval District, urged immediate endorsement by the Navy Department of the general plan proposed in the enclosures to his letter. The enclosures to the basic letter, except reference (e), are copies of intraoffice communications of the Panama Canal for the consideration of the official addressed in each case. They are not in all cases well suited to consideration by others and should not be regarded as affording, by themselves, a satisfactory basis for final conclusions concerning the subjects presented.

4. Copies of these papers were furnished the Commandant, 15th Naval District, informally, as a matter of information on a subject of interest to him. The physical aspects of the general plan have been described orally during the course of occasional inspections of the locks and lock sites by the Commandant and visiting naval officials, but prior to the receipt of the references, no suggestion was made to this office that the Commandant desired to discuss the merits of the proposal or to make recommendations concerning its adoption. It is regrettable that in transmitting copies of these references from this office to the Commandant no mention was made of their incomplete and tentative nature. A number of errors in reference (f) might have been avoided if a caution of that kind had been given in time. However, the papers themselves, except reference (d), recognize the need for more information than they contain and their closing paragraphs include, appropriately, recommendations for further investigation.

5. Reference (h) suggests two additional plans and reference (j) contains brief pertinent comment and valuable suggestions in reference to additioal data needed for the consideration of the subject.

6. In general, the references present an objective rather than a plan. They suggest schematic arrangements of locks, dams, and channels, but the evident purpose is to develop the best plan for accomplishing the objective, which is an anchorage basin above the locks at the Pacific end of the canal.

Scope of this report

7. The proposals under consideration are those presented by the captain of the port, Balboa, in reference (a) and amplified in references (b), (d), and (h). The essential purpose of the proposals is to modify the existing canal and the third locks project so as to eliminate the locks, existing and proposed, in the vicinity of Pedro Miguel and to create a basin at Gatun Lake level between the southern end of Gaillard Cut and the locks at Miraflores.

8. It should not be supposed that this conception is new or that it has not previously been appraised. On the contrary, the basic features of the plan, i. e., the concentration of the Pacific locks at Miraflores and the creation of an anchorage basin above the locks, are identical with those of the plan proposed in 1906 by Mr. William Gorig and in 1908 by Major William L. Sibert. The same plan was again suggested in 1909 by a board of consulting engineers headed by Mr. Frederic P. Stearns. Both Major Sibert and the Stearns Board listed economy of construction and operation as one of the reasons for proposing the consolidation of the Pacific locks, but both reports laid the greater stress on the value of the resulting

Miraflores anchorage basin to navigation, with particular reference to overcoming the effects of fogs in the cut on the capacity of the canal. Reasons for the rejection of the plan at that time were given by General Goethals, in his paper on the Panama Canal in Transactions of the International Engineering Congress, 1915, as: "* * * the extent and character of the foundations which were the poorest under any of the structures on the Isthmus, the great depth to rock for part of the structures which imposed too great pressures, and the question of water supply; economy in the use of water resulted from the separation of the locks at Pedro Miguel and Miraflores."

9. However, since the present proposals are based on operating experiences and since the suspension of work on the third-locks project provides time for their careful reconsideration, investigation of the several plans was begun shortly after the receipt of the required copy of reference (a) by this office in March 1943. It is the purpose of this report to summarize the results to date of these investigations, which are not yet completed.

II. THE CANAL AND THE PROPOSED CHANGES

Existing features of the canal

10. In the interests of clarity, it is desired to outline the principal features of the canal, as they are now and as planned in the third locks project, to which reference must be made in the discussion of proposed changes. Plate I is a general map of the Canal Zone.

11. The canal is approximately 50 statute miles in length from deep water in the Caribbean Sea, usually referred to as the Atlantic end, to deep water in the Gulf of Panama, referred to as the Pacific end. From the Atlantic to the Pacific the general direction of the canal channel is southeast, but the Atlantic end and distances in that direction are referred to as north. Correspondingly, the banks and lateral distances are designated as east or west.

12. Proceeding from the Atlantic end, the canal channel is at sea level to Gatun, a distance of 7 miles. Two flights of locks of 3 lifts each (6 locks in all) at Gatun give access to Gatun Lake, the normal surface level of which is considered to be at elevation 85 (feet above sea level). Gatun Lake is created by Gatun Dam, an earth dam about 8,200 feet in length, extending across the valley of the Chagres River to the westward from Gatun locks and on both sides of the spillway, which was constructed in a natural hill near the center of the dam. The spillway is a gravity section concrete structure, with its crest at elevation 69. Above the crest of the spillway are 14 regulating gates, each 45 feet long and 19 feet high, with a discharge capacity of about 13,000 cubic feet per second with the lake at elevation 87. Gatun Lake has a superficial area of 163 square miles. It serves as a regulating basin for the tributary streams, affords about 800 acres of anchorage area for vessels of all sizes in the vicinity of Gatun locks, and provides a channel 1,000 feet wide, with greater widths at bends, and over 45 feet in depth to the vicinity of Barbacoas Island, about 15.5 miles from Gatun Locks. From Barbacoas Island to Camboa, near the northerly end of Gaillard Cut, about 7.5 miles, the channel is 500 feet or more in width and 45 feet in depth at normal lake level.

13. Gaillard Cut is an artificial extension of Gatun Lake through the Continental Divide, and the cut may be considered for present purposes as extending from Chagres River crossing, just south of Camboa, to Pedro Miguel locks, a distance of nearly 9 miles. In the cut the channels are of much more restricted widths than elsewhere in Gatun Lake, and the alinement includes more bends, but none as sharp as some in the Gatun Lake channel. The minimum bottom width of the channel in the cut is 300 feet, and the minimum depth, with Gatun Lake at elevation 85, its normal level, is 45 feet. The channels are somewhat wider at most of the bends and other critical places, so that for a considerable portion of the length of the cut widths greater than 300 feet prevail.

14. At Pedro Miguel there are 2 locks (2 flights, each of single lift) which give access from Gatun Lake to Miraflores Lake, the normal surface level of which is considered to be at elevation 54 (feet above mean sea level). The superficial area of Miraflores Lake is about 1.5 square miles. It serves to regulate the tributary streams but provides very limited anchorage for vessels. The spillway for Miraflores Lake, which is located to the eastward of Miraflores locks, has its crest at elevation 38.67 and 8 gates similar to those of the Gatun spillway.

15. From Pedro Miguel Locks the canal channel extends through Miraflores Lake 1 mile to Miraflores locks, which consist of 2 flights of 2 lifts each (4 locks). The lower (southern) locks at Miraflores are subject to a variation of some 10 feet in either direction from normal, depending upon the state of the tide, which has an extreme range of about 20 feet in the channel below the locks. From Miraflores locks to the Pacific entrance, 6 miles, the channel is at sea level.

Features of the third locks project

16. The principal purposes of the third locks project are to increase the capacity of the canal in respect to the size and number of vessels that may be accommodated and to decrease the probability of interruption of traffic by enemy action. The former is to be attained by the construction of locks of increased dimensions, viz, 1,200 feet long, 140 feet wide, and with a minimum depth of water of 45 feet, compared with 1,000 feet, 110 feet, and 40 feet, respectively, in the dimensions of the existing locks. The greater dimensions of the proposed locks will permit the passage of larger vessels, and the additional flight of locks to be provided throughout will increase the number of vessels that can transit the canal in a given period, since vessels can be dispatched through the channels at shorter intervals than through the locks. The probability of damage is to be decreased by certain features of the design, which it is unnecessary to describe here, and by locating the new locks at a distance from the existing locks beyond the probable pattern of bombs directed at the latter and beyond the most destructive effects of even larger explosions in the immediate vicinity of the existing locks.

17. At Gatun the third locks project contemplates locks in a single flight of three lifts, located approximately one-half mile to the eastward of the existing locks. The connecting channels to the new locks will be easy and direct.

18. At Pedro Miguel and at Miraflores the project contemplates location of the new locks about a quarter of a mile to the westward of the existing locks and in corresponding flights, a single lock opposite Pedro Miguel and a single flight of two lifts opposite Miraflores. Plate II shows the Pacific locks and channels of the third locks project and their relation to the existing locks and channels.

19. Topographical features and the requirements of reasonable economy in excavation necessitate a sharp bend in the north approach channel to the New Pedro Miguel lock and an easier bend at the intersection with the present channel. The angle, 46° 17′, of the sharper bend is greater than that of any of the bends in the present channel, except in Gatun Lake, where there are 5 bends with angles from 48° 17′ to 67° 12′. As to compensatory measures, the channel at this bend is to be 55 feet deep and 900 feet wide, which greatly exceed the channel depth and width in any part of Gaillard Cut. Another bend will be required between the Pedro Miguel and Miraflores locks of this project. This bend is located in Miraflores Lake, where maneuvering space is available.

20. A surge reservoir approximately 70 acres in area at Gatun Lake level is provided for in the third locks project. This reservoir is designed to prevent any increase, on account of the new lock, in the magnitude of the surges presently created in Gaillard Cut by operation of the existing locks at Pedro Miguel. With small additional expense the surge reservoir could be connected for use to dampen also the surges created by the existing locks.

Status of work on the third lock project

21. The initial construction program, which provided for the completion of the third locks project as early as practiable, was modified in compliance with instructions of the Secretary of War, in May 1942, to meet requirements of the national war program, and construction work has been suspended in respect to features which would require substantial amounts of materials needed for war purposes or would require much shipping capacity. In the modified program, the excavation required for the Gatun locks and for the Miraflores locks has been virtually completed. No excavation for the Pedro Miguel lock has been made and none is contemplated until the present program is changed. Construction of all locks has been deferred. Work on the sea-level approach channels at Gatun and Miraflores is being carried on with low priority. The relocation of utilities and other facilities required by the project has been practically completed. The plants for the production of concrete aggregates for all locks have been completed at Camboa and on the west side of the canal near Miraflores. Nearly all work done on this project could be utilized to advantage in any of the plans proposed in the references.

Plans suggested for further investigation

22. The plans suggested in the references are designated below by letters and brief descriptive titles. All plans, of course, include, in addition to the features stated, the removal of the existing Pedro Miguel locks and corresponding modifications in the third locks project.

A. Transform present Miraflores locks into three lifts by increasing the heights of present structures, adding a lower chamber at the south end of each flight and provide a three-lift flight at the new Miraflores site of the third locks project.

B. Transform present Miraflores locks into three lifts by adding an upper chamber at the north end of each flight and provide a three-lift flight at the new Miraflores site of the third locks project.

C. Abandon present Miraflores locks and construct 2 flights of 3 lifts each at the new Miraflores site of the third locks project.

D. Transform present Miraflores locks to 2-lift flights covering the full range from sea level to summit level and provide a 3-lift flight at the new Miraflores site of the third locks project.

E. Construct 2 3-lift flights at the new Miraflores site and subsequently a single flight of 3 lifts at the site of the existing Miraflores locks.

Plan A is shown on plate III, plan B on plate IV, and plan C on plate V.

23. Plans A, B, and C are those recommended for investigation in references (a) and (b), except that plan C as considered in this report has been modified by substituting 1 flight of large locks for the 2 flights of smaller locks suggested in the references. Subsequently, the captain of the port, Balboa, has recommended the abandonment of plan B on account of the reduction it requires in the area of the proposed anchorage. Plans D and E are those suggested by the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in reference (h). All the plans are essen-

tially the same in respect to their effects on important adjacent facilities, such as the towns of Pedro Miguel and Red Tank, the Panama Railroad, highways, and utilities, in the area that would be submerged in Miraflores Lake at the higher elevation proposed.

III. ADVANTAGES OF THE GENERAL PLAN PROPOSED

Statement of the advantages

24. Since all the plans suggested are merely different methods of attaining the primary objective, a basin of adequate size for anchorage and other purposes at the south end of Gaillard Cut, it is in order to consider the benefits to be derived if that were accomplished. The advantages stated in paragraph 39 of reference (a) and in paragraph 5 of reference (b) are restated below in a more logical order and with changes in form to consolidate the list by combining items of similar nature and to eliminate most of the overlapping and duplication, which appear in the references as a consequence of stating the results anticipated and the feature by which they would be accomplished as separate advantages. Two advantages suggested since the submission of the references are added to this list, but they are of little importance.

(1) Provides an anchorage area at Gatun Lake level at the south end of Gaillard Cut;

(2) Eliminates the channel bends in the approach channels to Pedro Miguel locks of the third locks project;

(3) Reduces or eliminates surges in Gaillard Cut;

(4) Reduces the annual operating costs of Pacific locks;

(5) Reduces the time required for a vessel to transit the canal in an amount depending upon characteristics of the vessel;

(6) Increases the convenience and safety of passing vessels through the canal.

(7) Removes strong reasons presented for sea-level canal;

(8) Increases the storage capacity of Catun Lake;

(9) Increases the watershed tributary to to Gatun Lake;

(10) Affords opportunity for development of hydroelectric power at Miraflores;

(11) Eliminates silting at Pedro Miguel locks;

(12) Permits abandonment of Paraiso mooring station;

(13) Increases the spillway capacity of Gatun Lake;

(14) Permits saving in railroad operation in the event of the abandonment of Pedro Miguel as a main station;

(15) Eliminates surge waves in Miraflores Lake;

(16) Reduces channel maintenance operations;

(17) Permits better distribution of Dredging Division equipment in the event of slides.

In the following paragraphs of this section the nature and extent of the advantages listed above are explained and discussed sufficiently to give a general conception of their importance for comparison with disadvantages treated in the same manner in later sections.

Provides an anchorage area at Gatun Lake level at the south end of Gaillard Cut

25. The anchorage area at the south end of Gaillard Cut is the principal feature of the general plan proposed, and many of the advantages suggested in the references pertain to the use of the anchorage.

26. One of its main purposes is to lessen the effects of fog upon the capacity of the canal. Fogs of such density as to preclude navigation of the cut occur frequently during the rainy season from May to December. At such times, the lockage of vessels northbound at Pedro Miguel is impracticable because they cannot proceed immediately into the cut, and there are at present no adequate berthing or anchorage facilities above the locks. Fog rarely covers the locks so as to interfere with their operation, and if berthing space on anchorage were available above the locks, ships could be locked up and held until the fog cleared in the cut, when they could be dispatched at close intervals. After the fog lifted, the anchorage could be cleared of vessels in readiness to receive southbound vessels. Meanwhile, northbound lockages could be continued as required, and if the anchorage space were sufficient and the fog did not persist too long, the capacity of the canal for the day as limited by the speed of lockage would remain unaffected by the fog. In the references, 10 minutes apart is the interval suggested for the dispatch of vessels through the cut which may be compared with intervals of about 55 minutes between lockages at each flight of locks. Of course, the delay to the first ship caused by the fog could not be lessened, but the following ships detained in the basin would experience successively shorter delays on that account.

27. Fogs may occur at any time, but they usually occur sometime between 9 p. m. and 8 a. m. They are rare in the dry season from January through April. During the rainy season, from May to December, they are intermittent and irregular, but not infrequent, and in the worst months, usually October and November, from 10 to 20 foggy nights may occure in a month. At Pedro Miguel locks, fogs are infrequent, even in the rainy season, and at Miraflores rarer still.

28. Largely because it has not yet been found necessary or desirable to operate the canal regularly at night between 11 p. m. and 7 a. m. (except during overhaul periods, in the dry season) detailed data on the density and duration of fogs in the cut are fragmentary. Good observations have been made for periods of a few weeks at a time, but complete continuous records over periods of years are not available. The data available are sufficient to show that dense fogs during which navigation of the cut would have to be suspended, although sometimes lasting 12 hours or more, usually begin late at night and disappear soon after sunrise. On the average they apparently last less than 8 hours of the nights on which they occur.

29. The theoretical capacity required in the anchorage would, therefore, be about one-third the maximum daily capacity of the Pacific locks, which may, with reasonable assumptions, be taken as about 60 ships for the existing canal and about 110 ships after the third flight of locks has been added. To compensate for the effects of fog as completely as possible by this means, an anchorage for 37 ships might be required. Incidently, traffic reaching 110 ships on occasional peak days would correspond to a probable annual traffic of more than 20,000 vessels, which is not anticipated until the year 2055. Plate VI shows previous and present traffic predictions.

30. All the plans provide an anchorage of approximately the indicated capacity, except plan B, in which the capacity is reduced about 15 percent below that of the anchorage provided in the other plans. That reduction should not be regarded as very serious out in view of the approximate method used in estimating the maximum capacity needed, the remoteness of the time when the full 24-hour capacity of the locks may be required frequently, the possibilities of enlarging the anchorage area by dredging if and when required, and especially the limitation of the capacity of the locks imposed by overhaul requirements, which cannot be affected materially by the anchorage basin.

31. The existing locks require extensive overhaul at intervals of about 4 years. On account of the large amounts of bituminous enamel to be applied and of the need for prosecuting the work as rapidly as possible, both of which would be interfered with by rain, the overhauls are carried out during the dry season. A considerable additional force of mechanics and other workers has to be obtained, housed and cared for temporarily for this work, and it has been found most desirable to overhaul all of the Pacific locks in one dry season and all of the Atlantic locks during the second dry season following, so that the locks at one end of the Canal or the other are under overhaul every second dry season. During most of the overhaul period, one flight of locks cannot be used and the capacity of the other flight of the existing locks may be reduced from 15 to 30 percent by the necessity of using only the sidewall culverts, instead of both sidewall and centerwall culverts, for filling and emptying the locks. As a result, the maximum capacity is reduced for a period of 2 or 3 months during the overhaul to about 24 lockages, or 30 to 36 ships per day, and with the additional third locks the capacity would be about 80 ships. In the dry season of the year, fogs are so infrequent that their effects upon Canal traffic are slight. When they do occur, the anchorage area could be used to advantage and would increase the capacity of the Canal for the day.

32. Since the ruling capacity of the existing locks, which is established by the requirements of overhauling the locks, occurs in the dry season, the minimum capacity of the Canal is not materially affected by fogs. The same will be true after the addition of a third set of locks.

33. With the third set of locks in operation, their combined capacity will be about 1 ship every 13 minutes. If, as previously indicated, the interval at which ships may be dispatched through the cut is 10 minutes, the capacity of the locks will be 75 percent of the capacity of the cut for one-way traffic, which is required as a safety measure for vessels of large size or other very unfavorable characteristics. It is practicable to provide mooring facilities for a limited number of vessels above the present and proposed locks at Pedro Miguel and so to obtain some of the advantages of the proposed anchorage at nominal cost.

34. This discussion suggests that anchorage for a large number of vessels is of less importance than widening the cut to permit two-way traffic for all vessels. It is practicable to widen Gaillard Cut at a cost which has been estimated tentatively at about $70 million, for a minimum width of 500 feet. The wider channel would be beneficial in reducing surges, decreasing the probability of accident in the cut, avoiding delays to individual vessels, simplifying dispatching, and would offer other advantages similar or comparable to those of the anchorage.

35. It is apparent that some of the advantages of the anchorage basin suggested in the reference depend upon the operation of the locks 24 hours daily. There are practical advantages in the 16-hour operation which has been the rule since the opening of the canal 29 years ago. The cost of 16-hour operation is much less than that of 24-hour operation. The night hours in which operation is suspended can be utilized when necessary for running repairs and similar work that cannot well be carried on when the lock machinery is actually in use. With regular operation for 16 hours, it is possible to compensate for time lost in any extraordinary circumstances and to take care of exceptional peak traffic by overtime operation extending into the third shift. At such times, the anchorage might be very useful in reducing the effects of fog as previously indicated. However, after the addition of the third flight the capacity of the locks will be so large in comparison with the traffic in prospect that regular 24-hour operation during the rainy season in which fog occurs will not be necessary for many years to come. If the ultimate growth of traffic taxes the capacity of the 3 flights of locks, the limitation on the lockage capacity which is established during the overhaul period

may be expected to necessitate the provision of additional locks before 24-hour operation in the rainy season would be required.

36. The prospect that technical means may soon be developed to permit the safe navigation of the cut in fog, especially if the channel should be widened to 500 feet or more, is not considered to be sufficiently definite to warrant more than mention.

37. The proposed anchorage offers very desirable operational advantages and would permit reduction in delays up to 8 hours in individual cases, which a moderate proportion of the transiting vessels might otherwise encounter from time to time. It does not appear, however, that the ruling capacity or the useful life of the canal would be materially affected, as suggested in the references.

38. Other advantages are attributed in the references to the anchorage, but they are of relatively slight importance or doubtful validity and may be considered as included under item 6, explained in paragraphs 56–69.

Eliminates the channel bends in the approach channels to Pedro Miguel locks of the third locks project

39. There are 3 bends in these approach channels, 1 in the south approach and 2 in the north approach. The bend in the south approach with an angle of 37° 20′ is in Miraflores Lake where the maneuvering space is sufficient to make this bend unobjectionable, or at least not seriously objectionable. The two bends in the north approach are in a more restricted channel and their elimination would be an advantage. The sharper of the two bends, 46° 17′, is about 3,000 feet to the northward of the lock. To reduce the difficulty of making this turn, the channel width has been established at 900 feet, which is believed to be sufficient for the largest vessels that could pass through the proposed locks to make the turn without serious difficulty. The depth of the approach channel has been established 10 feet greater than the depth of the existing channels in Gaillard Cut, which will decrease the difficulty of handling large vessels in the sharper bend as well as in the straight reaches of the channel. The increased width and depth will reduce the "suction" effects that would be experienced with large vessels in channels of smaller dimensions.

40. The other bend occurs at the intersection of this approach channel and the existing channel of the canal, about 9,000 feet northward from both the existing and the proposed Pedro Miguel locks. The angle at this bend is 28° 59′ and the width of the proposed channel is 500 feet. Careful study has been given to the possibility of dangerous currents near the intersection of the two channels, which might be induced by surges in either or both of the channels. Hydraulic model tests show that such currents will not be serious. The surge reservoir of the third locks project will reduce the surges that might otherwise result from the operation of the new Pedro Miguel lock and can also be connected at small expense and used to reduce those created by the existing locks.

41. Large vessels require tugs to assist them in the smaller channels of Gaillard Cut and that assistance would continue also in the new channel, to reduce or avoid difficulties that might otherwise be experienced in navigating these two bends. Notwithstanding the precautions taken in the design of the project, the two bends decrease the speed with which large vessels can navigate the channel and tend to increase the probability of accident. The possible effects of the bends and the benefit that would be derived from their elimination are difficult to evaluate accurately. The records of accidents probably afford the best basis for appraisal of the advantage of eliminating bends in the channel, and a special analysis has been made of the records of grounding in Gaillard Cut to determine any relationship that may be disclosed between the angles of the bends and the groundings that have occurred in their vicinity.

42. There are nine bends with angles from 7° 37′ to 29° 59′ in the cut. In the following table, the bends are designated by name and arranged in the order of the size of the angles. The total number of groundings near the bend, the number attributed entirely to the bend, the number attributed in part to the bend, and the percentage of the total number of groundings that were attributed at least partly to the bend, are shown. With due allowance for the haphazard occurrence of accidents, the total groundings attributed in some measure to a particular bend would be expected to reflect its relative hazard, even if the total number of groundings in the vicinity did not.

Name of bend	Angle	Groundings				
		Total	Entirely due to bend	Partly due to bend	Total due to bend	Percent due to bend
	° ′					
Bas Obispo	29 59	17	6	4	10	59
Cunette (La Pita)	29 25	15	10	2	12	80
Lirio	22 14	20	12	2	14	70
Santa Cruz	21 58	8	2	1	3	37
Culebra	17 43	26	10	6	16	62
Paraiso	14 36	17	2	3	5	29
Cartagena	10 28	11	3	4	7	64
Las Cascadas	9 9	15	4	4	8	53
Empire	7 37	15	10	2	12	80
Total		144	59	28	87	[1] 60

[1] Average.

Of the 9 bends, the sharpest stand tied with 1 other for third place in total number of accidents, fifth in the number attributed entirely to the bend, tied with 2 others for second in the number attributed partly to the bend, and fifth in the total number of groundings attributed wholly or in part to the bend. The smallest bend of the 9 stands tied with 2 others for fifth place in total groundings, is tied with 2 others for second in those attributed entirely to the bend, tied with 2 others for sixth in those partly attributed to the bend and tied with 1 other for third in the total number attributable to the bend.

43. These and other similar comparisons which can be made are interpreted not as showing that large bends are no more objectionable than small ones, but merely that the angle of the bend and the accidents likely to occur in it do not show a pronounced relationship in the statistical analysis of 144 cases. Statistically, the most dangerous of the bends is Culebra with an angle which is a little more than half that of Bas Obispo and more than double that of Empire. The channel width is only 350 feet at Culebra and it is the sharpest of the 3 bends in which the channel width is 350 feet or less at the bend. Comparisons of the same kind, based on channel widths at the bends, are as patternless as those in the table above.

44. In the bend in the north approach to the proposed Pedro Miguel lock, the channel width is 900 feet, compared with 650 feet at Bas Obispo, 520 feet at Cunette, and 350 feet at Culebra. The depth is 10 feet greater than the depth in Gaillard Cut. Practical limitations do not permit an increase in the 900-foot width even if it were considered to be badly needed, but the remainder of the approach channel could be widened to a width of 500 feet throughout at a cost of about $9 million.

45. The sharpest bend in the Suez Canal is 48° 08′; the channel width at the water level is 512 feet, but only 256 feet at the bottom. The depth is about 2 feet less than that of Gaillard Cut. The banks of the channel in the Suez Canal are generally sandy and consequently grounding is less serious than in the Panama Canal where the banks are generally of rock.

46. There appears little room for doubt that experienced pilots would be able to navigate the bends in the widened approach channel to the Pedro Miguel lock without much, if any, greater danger or difficulty than that now experienced in the narrow channel at the Culebra bend.

47. Ships using the approach channel would avoid the Paraiso and Cartagena bends of the present channel.

Reduces or eliminates surges in Gaillard Cut

48. An increase in the usable water-storage capacity of Gatun Lake would result from any reduction in the size of the surges, which may occur in Gaillard Cut as a result of drawing water for lockages. These surge waves alternately lower and raise the surface elevation at Pedro Miguel and in the cut. They decrease the range in which it would otherwise be practicable to manipulate the lake level without decreasing the navigable depths of the channel in the cut insupportably on the one hand, or risking the flooding of the machinery chambers of the Pedro Miguel locks on the other hand. The creation of any considerable surge basin at the south end of Gaillard Cut would decrease the range of the surges, and a basin of the size proposed in the general plan would reduce the surge to insignificant proportions. It is also practicable to avoid the surges to a very large extent by regulating the time and the rate at which water is drawn for lockage, but not without affecting the rate at which vessels may be locked through. Under certain conditions the surges may be as much as 1.5 feet above or below the mean level of the lake, and their elimination would permit the effective use of about 150,000 acre-feet of the storage capacity of Gatun Lake which it is not now practicable to use. This additional storage is not a necessity for navigation under present conditions, since the completion of Madden Lake. It may be needed, however, in the distant future under conditions of high traffic density and low runoff from the watersheds of the two lakes.

49. The use of the additional storage would be of considerable immediate value as a means of increasing hydroelectric power production during the dry season. The economic value of this power storage has not yet been estimated accurately, nor have the costs of providing equivalent storage by other means been determined.

50. The requirements of water for lockages and the maintenance of navigable depths in the channel in Gatun Lake conflict in principle with the use of this storage for power development. With the future growth of traffic, the portion of the storage which it may be permissible to use for power purposes will decline. This conflict does not exist in respect to storage above and tributary to Gatun Lake, as in Madden Lake. Consequently, the storage of greatest continuing value for power and navigation purposes is

supplementary storage above the level of Gatun Lake, and preferably above Madden Lake, so that the regulated flow could be utilized also for power development at Madden Dam, where the head is nearly twice that at Gatun.

51. In addition to the desirable effects upon the limiting lake levels that the elimination of surges would produce, it would be beneficial in the reduction of currents in the cut unfavorable to navigation. As shown in paragraph 60 the damage from all accidents to vessels in the canal has been relatively small. The intangible advantages of decreasing the difficulty and the danger of navigation are in the reduction of the strain on the pilots and in the possibility that a more serious accident than has ever occurred might happen and close the channel in whole or in part for a considerable period at a critical time. The probability of such an accident can be estimated only from past experience, which indicates that the probability is not great. The consequences in time of war, however, might be of almost any magnitude, and an improvement that would decrease the probability of accident merits consideration, even though its value is not susceptible of accurate appraisal.

Reduces the annual operating cost of the Pacific locks

52. This is a definite economic advantage inherent in any plan for concentrating the locks at a single location. The probable magnitude of the economic benefit varies among the several plans. The normal operating cost of the existing locks at Pedro Miguel and Miraflores, including prorated costs of the overhauls, is approximately $1,150,000 per year. The corresponding costs after the completion of the third locks are estimated at $1,460,000. Substantially similar plans of operation would be applicable to plans A or B, and the annual operating cost is estimated at $940,000. The operating costs of plan C would be in the neighborhood of $700,000 per year, and of plans D or E, $1 million per year.

Reduces the time required for a vessel to transit the canal

53. A reduction in the total time required for a vessel to transit the canal would result from the elimination of the Pedro Miguel locks and the avoidance of the delay incurred in approaching those locks, attaching the lines of the towing locomotives, and departing from the locks after lockage. The saving in time that might be expected is stated in reference (a) as about 1 hour. That estimate indicates the general magnitude of the saving of time on this account, although the actual savings of time would vary considerably with the characteristics of individual vessels and the circumstances of each transit. The average would probably be closer to one-half hour.

54. The elimination of such delays is of tangible value to each vessel and the total economic value of the improvement would increase in proportion to the total traffic. Estimating liberally the average value of the saving in time at $75 per vessel, the economic benefit would range from $470,000 annually, for the year of highest traffic to date, to about $1,500,000, for the traffic to be anticipated in the year 2055.

55. Theoretically, it should be possible to recover a large part of such savings to commercial vessels by increasing the canal tolls and so to obtain an increase in the revenues of the canal enterprises. Practically, however, it has not been possible to establish the tolls as high as the operating expense of the canal and a fair return on the capital investment require. It is therefore problematical what proportion, if any, of the economic benefit of reducing the time of transit of commercial vessels might accrue to the United States. In normal times, vessels operated by or for the account of the United States constitute less than 7 percent of the total traffic, and the direct benefit to the Government of a reduction in the time of transit would be correspondingly small. About 60 percent of the traffic in normal times is comprised of vessels of foreign countries, and the remainder of commercial vessels flying the American flag.

Increases the convenience and safety of passing vessels through the canal

56. This benefit, as it is stated above, combines a number of advantages of similar general nature stated separately in the references. The convenience of passing vessels is intended to cover the simplification of dispatching traffic, the reduction of mental and physical strain on pilots, the decrease in the need for assistance by tugs, and general benefits of like nature, which the anchorage basin and the elimination of the separate Pedro Miguel locks would afford. These advantages are real but generally intangible, so that it is difficult to appraise them, but they should not be disregarded on that account. Their importance increases with increases in the volume of traffic and so will be somewhat greater in future years than in the past. As a whole, advantages of this kind should not be regarded as of controlling importance in view of the success attained in operating the canal for nearly 30 years without them.

57. The more important advantages are those which increase the safety of transiting vessels. To a large extent, but by no means completely, advantages of this nature are included in other advantages that are stated more particularly elsewhere in this report. The improvement of navigation in the cut by the reduction of the surges, and the general desirability of avoiding bends, especially in narrow channels, have already been explained.

58. Another contributory cause of accidents exists at the approaches to the locks, and the elimination of the separate locks at Pedro Miguel may be expected to reduce the accidents experienced in approaching and departing from locks by about one-third, or possibly a little more, since the northerly approach to both the existing Pedro Miguel locks and that of the third locks project may be regarded as more difficult than the other approaches to locks. The data in paragraph 16 of reference (a) suggest that the probability of accident in approaching or leaving the Pedro Miguel locks is 10 percent greater than at Gatun and 60 percent greater than at Miraflores.

59. A study has been made of the records of the accidents that have occurred in the channels of the canal since it has been in operation, excluding accidents in the terminal harbors. Plate VII shows graphically some of the results of this study.

60. The records are not complete in all respects, but they are sufficient to show the general nature and magnitude of the problem of accidents. The following figures are taken from the report of the study:

Total number of accidents (excluding accidents in terminal harbors)	708
Average number of accidents per year	25
Total number of transits of the canal	130,350
Average number of transits per accident	184
Number of accidents per thousand transits	5.4

The records give estimates of the damage in 505 of the 708 accidents. In the remainder, the damage was possibly not in every case insignificant, but in serious accidents an investigation by the board of local inspectors is necessary to fix the responsibility. The investigation may be omitted when a vessel concerned is unwilling to be delayed sufficiently to permit the investigation to be made. In general, it may be assumed that the damage was very small and may be ignored in those cases in which no estimate of the damage has been made. The following data are summarized from the records of 505 accidents in which estimates of damage were made:

Total estimated damage	$1,078,000
Average damage per accident	2,100
Average damage actually estimated per year	38,500
Average damage per year for all accidents, calculated at average damage for 505	54,000

61. The records of accidents have also been analyzed in respect to the type or cause of accidents, with the following results which are pertinent to this consideration:

Type of accident	Number of accidents	Percent of total	Average damage per accident
Striking lock wall	312	44	$820
Grounding	184	26	3,500
Collision	62	9	3,600
All other	150	21	300
Total	708	100	

62. It should be recognized, of course, that a number of the extensions of these estimates are subject to question, that losses of time to vessels are not included in the damage estimates, and consequently, that the figures given are not highly accurate. However, they furnish good evidence that the problem of accidents is not a major one. It is significant also that the accident rate shows a distinct downward trend.

63. It may be seen from plate VII that the most recent 5-year average of damage to vessels entering or leaving Pedro Miguel locks amounts to about 30 cents per vessel transiting the canal.

64. Naval vessels are mentioned separately here because of the special concern for their safety, which under certain circumstances may be of another order of importance than economic value, and because in the references mention is made of the special importance to naval vessels of the improvements suggested. In general, it appears that the advantages of the proposed plan would accrue to naval vessels in about the same measure as to vessels of other types. The essential difference is that the certainty, time and safety of the transit of the canal by naval vessels in war may be of much greater importance than for merchant vessels at any time, and scarcely practicable of evaluation by any standard or method. Considerations of that kind have constituted the justification for the separation of the locks of the third locks project from the existing locks and from each other. The separation decreases the probability of the complete closure of the canal, as a result of bombing and some other kinds of attack, quite sufficiently, it is believed, to warrant the expense of the necessary approach channels to the new locks and the other disadvantages they entail. Except for this requirement, the alinement of those channels could readily have been adjusted to meet practically any standards desired. The location of the new locks in a single three-lift flight at the new Miraflores site was considered in the design of the third locks project. That plan offered substantial savings in cost and straight approach channels. The separation of the locks of the third flight, as they appear in the third locks project, was decided upon to decrease the probability of closure of the canal through enemy action.

65. If all three of the proposed locks were located in a single flight they would offer a single target in which all of the locks would lie within the probable pattern of bombs directed at the middle lock and within the destructive area of a large explosion in that lock. The series of three locks would

conform well to the normal pattern of torpedo bombing or other low-level attack by planes following the center line of the locks.

66. In addition to separating the three locks of the flight, advantage was taken of the existence of Miraflores Lake further to decrease the probability of the complete closure of the canal through damage to the Pacific locks. The connecting channel between the Pedro Miguel and the Miraflores locks of the third flight was projected through Miraflores Lake instead of directly between the locks and to the westward of the lake. In this arrangement, a vessel after passing through one of the 3 lower flights can be routed through any of the 3 locks at Pedro Miguel. Complete closure of the canal by damage to these locks would require damage to all of the upper locks or to at least 1 lock in each of the 3 lower flights, a combination much less probable than damage to any 3 locks in different flights, which would close the canal if the locks were continuous in each flight. The results of the destruction of the gates of an upper lock would also be much less serious and extensive with the locks separated in flight than if the locks of each flight were together. Miraflores Lake, with its separate spillway, should protect the lower locks from damage by the overflow from above.

67. One other observation in respect to the use of the anchorage basin in war time to reduce delay on account of fog, seems appropriate. Mitigation of the effects of fog would require the concentration in the anchorage basin of the vessels locked through to the upper level during the fog period and their detention until the fog lifted, usually after daylight. This would be a disposition very vulnerable to attack by aircraft and unfavorable in respect to any damage, such as the destruction of lock or spillway gates, which might rapidly lower the level of Gatun Lake. Under circumstances in which either of these possibilities was conceived to exist, war vessels, at least, would probably not be exposed to such risks for the sake of time to be saved in transiting the canal.

68. These considerations are real but not susceptible of evaluation with accuracy. Their merits are matters of judgment and there is room for considerable difference of opinion concerning them, but the third locks project is safer in respect to damage by enemy attack than any of the other plans.

69. In paragraphs 59–61 it is shown that the probability of damage by accidents in normal times and the magnitude of the total damage experienced are relatively small.

Removes strong reasons presented for sea-level canal

70. This item has been restated here only because it has been advanced, in reference (a), as one of the advantages of the proposed plan. It is believed that any change, however beneficial, in the high level canal, would have little influence on either the uninformed or the well-informed advocates of a sea-level canal. It is possible that advocates of a sea-level canal would oppose unjustifiably any expensive change in present plans on the grounds that it would defer the time when the conversion of the existing canal to a sea-level waterway might otherwise be authorized. Some opposition of that kind was in evidence when the legislation to authorize the third locks project was under consideration, but the opposition subsided when it was pointed out that a third set of locks would be a practical necessity in lowering the levels of Gatun Lake without prolonged interruption of traffic.

71. Although the wisdom of the adoption of the high-level plan in the original construction of the canal is completely established, there remain advocates of the eventual substitution of a sea-level canal who can hardly be dismissed as uninformed or incompetent. The main arguments for a canal at sea level are not in the superiority of its navigational features. On the contrary, the provision of channels as safe and easy to navigate as those of the existing canal would involve heavy costs, while narrow and crooked channels would be slower, more difficult, and more dangerous for ships to pass through, than the channels and locks of the canal as they exist today.

72. The arguments for a sea-level canal are based upon the relative vulnerability of the lock canal and a sea-level canal to damage by enemy attack. In that respect a sea-level canal is superior to a high-level lock canal, although at this location a sea-level canal would involve dams, for the regulation and diversion of tributary streams, and probably tidal locks, which could be damaged or destroyed by bombing. The principal advantages of the sea-level canal would be that its structures would be more difficult to destroy or damage seriously and that the results of such damage would be less grave and far-reaching than like damage to the structures of a high-level lock canal. Destruction of the locks or dams of the high-level canal, resulting in the loss of water from the summit lake, would prevent resumption of traffic until repairs could be made and the lake refilled thereafter. To fill Gatun Lake, if it were entirely empty, might require a year or more under unfavorable conditions.

73. The use of the locks of a sea-level canal for lockage would probably not be required for the transit of vessels at favorable daily stages of tide, and the locks being of low head could be readily repaired, by improvised arrangements if necessary, after damage of any kind, more quickly than high-lift locks. Upon the completion of repairs, traffic could be resumed without delay to await restoration of lake levels. The diversion dams of a sea-level canal, although not invulnerable, would be must less vulnerable than locks. The existing dams at Pedro Miguel and Miraflores, for example, are hardly considered as elements of weakness at all, nor are the dams that would be required to raise the elevation of Miraflores Lake to elevation 85. Gatun Dam has been regarded as involving more definite danger, because of its greater size. Any substantial channel permitting water to flow through the dam would probably result in the disintegration of a large section of the earth and rock fill, and the consequent loss of a large part of the water of the lake, before remedial measures could be taken effectively. The large cross section of the Gatun Dam and the difficulty and improbability of creating a continuous breach through it by bombing greatly decrease the hazards, and the same would be true of the principal diversion dams of a sea-level canal.

74. A sea-level canal would have a greater proportion of its length in relatively narrow channels than the present canal, and would be correspondingly more liable to interruption through the sinking of vessels, by either enemy action or accident. However, the minimum channel widths heretofore considered in the discussion of the possibilities of a sea-level canal have been 500 feet, compared with 300 feet in Gaillard Cut, and the former would be less likely to be closed completely by a sunken vessel.

75. These brief comments, and in fact all of the data available, are insufficient to dispose of many important questions pertinent to this subject. They point, however, to the conclusion that the plans under consideration in this report would have little effect upon either the merits or the discussion of the sea-level canal.

Increases the storage capacity of Gatun Lake

76. The increase in the storage capacity of Gatun Lake by the inclusion of the proposed basin is estimated roughly as about 2 percent. This increase of some 10,000 acre-feet in the useful storage capacity is a tangible advantage, but it is relatively small in magnitude and is dwarfed by the increase in useful storage capacity to be obtained by the reduction of the surges, designated (3) in paragraph 24 and described in paragraphs 48–51.

Increases the watershed tributary to Gatun Lake

77. The increase in the area of the watershed of Gatun Lake by the inclusion of 37.4 square miles now tributary to Miraflores Lake amounts to about 2.8 percent, and is slightly greater than the proportionate increase in the storage capacity of the lake. In view of the high yield of the Gatun Lake watershed compared with the storage available, the increase in the watershed area is of little practical consequence.

Affords opportunity for development of hydroelectric power at Miraflores

78. The same total head exists at Pedro Miguel and at Miraflores that would be available if the Pacific locks were concentrated at the latter location, but the division of the total head into two separate parts would increase the cost of utilizing it for the development of hydroelectric power. Since the entire head is now available at Gatun, where the powerhouse, with provision for the future expansion of its generating capacity, has already been provided and is connected to the Pacific side through the transmission lines of the Canal Zone power system the only advantage to be derived from the development of power at the Pacific locks would be in the dispersion of the powerplants.

Eliminates silting at Pedro Miguel locks

79. This is an advantage that would accrue from the execution of any of the plans proposed. The magnitude of the benefit is small.

Permits abandonment of Paraiso mooring station

80. This advantage would also accrue from any of the plans, but it is considered to be insignificant.

Increases the spillway capacity of Gatun Lake

81. Additional spillway capacity would be a substantial benefit to Gatun Lake in that with ample spillway capacity to take care of unexpected floods near the end of the rainy season, it would be permissible to raise the lake to a somewhat higher level than would otherwise be possible without incurring risk of flooding the machinery of the locks in an unusual flood.

82. The elimination of the Pedro Miguel locks would eliminate the necessity for the spillway at Miraflores, since Miraflores Lake at the higher level could be regulated with Gatun Lake and by the same means. As stated above, additional spillway capacity for Gatun Lake is desirable and should eventually be provided, whether at Miraflores or elsewhere. Miraflores is not a desirable location for the additional spillway, since its discharge would enter the sea level channel a short distance below the Miraflores locks. When the present Miraflores spillway is in operation objectionable currents are created in the navigable channel and the cost of its maintenance is increased somewhat by such currents. These effects would be aggravated greatly by the use of a spillway at Miraflores for the regulation of Gatun Lake.

83. The need for additional spillway capacity has not yet been regarded as sufficiently urgent to warrant detailed study of the problem, which is independent of the plans under consideration, except that they provide a location at Miraflores not otherwise available, and a spillway of the desired capacity could be constructed as a feature of these plans at less cost, no doubt, than in any other way. It is probable that the most desirable location for additional spillway capacity would be found at one of the low

points on the northern rim of Gatun Lake, where the discharge would follow natural watercourses to the Caribbean Sea.

84. In any event the benefit of the additional spillway capacity contemplated by the proposed plans is of the same nature as the addition to the usable storage by the reduction of surges and is much smaller in magnitude.

Permits saving in railroad operation in the event of the abandonment of Pedro Miguel as a main station

85. Pedro Miguel station is unfavorably located for a main stop, because it is on a grade and at the end of a curve. The abandonment of this station would probably be possible, depending upon the detailed plans developed for the replacement of facilities which would have to be removed or abandoned to permit the enlargement of Miraflores Lake. It appears that the additional expense of operating the longer line of the railroad likely to be required in its relocation to conform to the higher lake level would be greater than the saving that might result from the abandonment of the Pedro Miguel stop. In the present stage of these investigations it is impossible to determine whether or not advantage could be realized on this account.

Eliminates surge waves in Miraflores Lake

86. Surges of measurable magnitude in Miraflores Lake may occur as a result of operation of the locks at either end of the lake or the Miraflores spillway. These surges are of little practical importance.

Reduces channel maintenance operations

87. The greater depths and width which would be established in the channel in Miraflores Lake would decrease the cost of maintaining the channel, which is approximately 1 mile in length. Less frequent use of Miraflores spillway, to be expected if Miraflores Lake were subject to normal regulation by the Gatum spillway, might decrease somewhat the amount of dredging in the channel below the present Miraflores locks. The magnitude and value of these influences would be small.

Permits better distribution of dredging division equipment in event of slides

88. In the operation of dredging equipment and other floating plant of the canal, the proposed anchorage basin would be a convenience of the same order as in the navigation of the canal channel by transiting vessels. The benefit would be of increased importance in the event of serious slides in Gaillard Cut. Slides are decreasing progressively in size and frequency and little advantage on this account would be obtained from the anchorage basin.

IV. DISADVANTAGES OF THE GENERAL PLAN PROPOSED

89. The brief review which has been given of the prospective benefits offered by the plans suggested, although incomplete and in some instances lacking even the reasonably precise data which it may be possible to obtain inexpensively in the course of further investigation, is sufficient to show that the overall benefits would be substantial and that physical factors are not unfavorable to the essential features of the general plan. The disadvantages common in considerable measure to all of these plans are found principally in the time and expense that would be required for their execution and the possibilities of damage by enemy action.

90. The necessity for the relocation of the towns of Pedro Miguel and Red Tank, sections of the Panama Railroad, highways, electric-power lines, water lines, and for miscellaneous other replacements and remedial works, is not discussed as a separate disadvantage, because this feature is evaluated satisfactorily by the rough estimates of the costs amounting to $14 million, which are included in the probable cost suggested for each plan.

Time required for completion

91. More time would be required to carry out any of those plans than to complete the third locks project. The importance of this disadvantage depends principally upon the international situation at the time construction at full rate is resumed on the project. When construction work began on the third locks project, July 1, 1940, it was expected that the larger locks would be required for the use of large naval vessels which would be ready to transit the canal before the new locks could possibly be completed. It was therefore of great urgency that the project be constructed in the shortest possible time, and the construction program was established to accomplish that purpose, at the expense of considerable savings offered by a somewhat longer period of construction. This program was subsequently modified to meet other requirements of the war, so that construction work is now virtually suspended. If the resumption of construction work should be postponed until after the war, it may then be a matter of small import whether or not the largest naval vessels are unable to transit the canal for a few years longer. In those circumstances, an extension of the time required for the completion of the project would not be a very serious disadvantage. The requirements of commercial shipping, as far as they can be foreseen, do not demand the completion of the new locks within the next 10 years. The importance of time is therefore largely for appraisal in the light of circumstances anticipated at the time construction is to be resumed.

92. The completion of the adopted third locks project is estimated to require about 5 years after the resumption of work, for construction at the most economical rate of progress and without shortage of men and materials. These are the conditions to be expected after the war. Under such conditions, the time required could probably be reduced about 1 year with some increase in cost, if it were determined to be desirable to incur it. Completion of the project in less than 4 years would hardly be practicable, even with easy markets for the equipment, material, and personnel required.

93. Estimates of the time required for the other plans, comparable in accuracy to the estimates for the third locks project, have not yet been made, but the following approximations appear to be close enough for present purposes.

(a) The single flight of three lifts proposed in plans A, B, and D at the site of the new Miraflores locks could be constructed in approximately the same time as that required for the completion of the third locks project. The transformation of the present Miraflores locks, if practicable, would probably require 2 years longer under favorable conditions. The work on the existing locks themselves could not be undertaken until the new flight was completed and in operation, although preparatory work and work on features other than the locks, such as the dams and spillway, could be carried on in the meantime. Consequently, the total time required for the execution of any one of these three plans would be in the neighborhood of 7 years. It would be practicable to shorten the construction period to 6 years at an increase in cost. Incidentally, while the reconstruction of the existing Miraflores locks was in progress there would be only the new flight available for use. Any accident which would render one of its locks inoperable would close the canal to traffic until the damage was repaired. For a large part of the construction period, it would be impossible to restore either of the old flights at Miraflores to operating condition, which is the action relied upon in case of such an accident when only one flight is in service during overhaul under existing conditions.

(b) The two triple flights of plan C at the new Miraflores site could be constructed in 6½ years at an economical rate and in 5½ years at additional cost. The construction of the additional flight at the site of the existing Miraflores locks, as proposed in plan E, would add about 1½ years to the construction period for plan C. These plans avoid the disadvantages of having only one flight available for an extended period during construction.

(c) The estimates are summarized as follows:

Time required to complete the several plans

	At the maximum rate	At the economical rate
	Years	*Years*
Third locks project	4	5
Plan A	6	7
Plan B	6	7
Plan C	5½	6½
Plan D	6	7
Plan E	7	8

Expense

94. Detailed estimates are available only of the costs of completing the Third Locks project. Consequently, there is as yet no entirely satisfactory basis for comparisons of its cost with those of the other plans, nor of the probable costs of the different plans with each other. Plan B, if it is practicable, is regarded as the cheapest of the five plans suggested in the references, and attention has been devoted chiefly to this plan in the investigations that have been made to date. A tentative general design and estimate of cost have been made for plan B, but the validity of the estimates depends upon the adequacy of the design to compensate the unfavorable foundation conditions. Consequently, the figures for plan B should be taken as about the minimum costs likely to be incurred in constructing it, and the probably costs of the other plans given below should be regarded only as rough appraisals for the purpose of general comparison of the cost features of the different plans.

Plans:	*Probable cost to complete*
Third locks project (Pacific side)	$180,000,000
Plan A	290,000,000
Plan B	[1] 210,000,000
Plan C	280,000,000
Plan D	290,000,000
Plan E	[1] 360,000,000

[1] Probable cost if tentative general designs are sufficient to overcome unfavorable foundation conditions.

Damage by enemy action

95. The design of the third locks project was influenced basically by the purpose of making it as difficult as possible for an enemy to inflict serious damage, and of lessening the consequences of damage if it occurred. It was considered especially desirable to decrease the probability of closure of the canal for a long period of time. Unusual features are included in the design of the locks and appurtenant structures of the project to make them resistant to damage by bombing and to facilitate their repair after damage. These features would, of course, be included with equal effectiveness in the similar structures of any of the plans under consideration. However, the same purpose governed the locations selected for the locks of the project, and the locations suggested in all the other plans serve that purpose less effectively. The separation of the locks in flight would be sacrificed in all the other plans. One of them, plan C, would also give up the separation of corresponding locks in the different flights; the other plans would not.

96. The interchangeability of use between the Pedro Miguel locks and the Miraflores flights of locks afforded by the existing canal and by the third locks project, and the resulting decrease in the probability of complete closure of the canal by damage to locks, has previously been referred to. Any one of the Pedro Miguel locks may be used by any vessel (except one too large for the existing locks) which transits 1 of the 2-lift flights at Miraflores. Experience has demonstrated the operational advantage of this flexibility, and the lack of it in 3-lift flights increases the probability of the closure of all routes through the locks as a consequence of simultaneous damage to 3 or more. It is probably sufficient merely to state this relative disadvantage. Its importance, either in normal times or in war, can be judged only generally, like many of the other considerations mentioned in this report.

V. PARTICULAR DISADVANTAGES OF THE DIFFERENT PLANS

Plan A

97. This plan would require the construction of three lifts of the third locks at the new Miraflores site and the construction of 2 3-lift flights at the existing Miraflores locks by raising them to the required height and adding a third chamber at the south end of each flight. The transformation of the four existing locks at Miraflores to meet the requirements of this plan would amount almost to complete reconstruction. The dams and the spillway at Miraflores would be raised correspondingly, and the existing Pedro Miguel locks would be removed.

98. In addition to the disadvantages common to all the plans, a rather extensive modification of the channel to the south of the present locks would be necessary; and the unfavorable effects of currents in the south approach to the locks caused by the Cardenas River would be aggravated by the decrease in the distance between the mouth of the river and the entrance to the locks.

99. The practicability of the plan depends upon the possibilities of raising the lock walls, sills, gates, and machinery of the existing locks some 35 feet and of building the additional locks required. The foundations on which the existing locks rest may be sufficient to meet these greater requirements, but the walls themselves are not, and raising the existing locks would closely approach in difficulty and cost the building of new structures. The economies that it might be possible to realize would be chiefly in the use of the present gates and machinery, which would be of doubtful wisdom on account of their age and their probable condition after removal from their settings. Core borings are being made to develop the foundation conditions that would be encountered in constructing locks at the south end of the existing Miraflores locks. While these borings have not progressed sufficiently to support definite conclusions, the information presently available is favorable. The construction of the 3-lift flight at the Miraflores site appears to be practicable, and a large part of the excavation completed for the 2-lift flight could be used for the 3 lifts.

100. In the execution of the plan it would be necessary first to complete the new Miraflores three-lift flight of locks, with the emergency dam and gate sill at the upper and omitted temporarily so that ships could pass through that lock at the present level of Miraflores Lake. The existing dams at Miraflores could be raised and the relocation of towns and facilities required by the higher level of Miraflores Lake could be made at any time. The reconstruction of the existing locks could not be undertaken until the locks at the new Miraflores site were ready for traffic. After they were open, the reconstruction of the old locks would begin. During the reconstruction, a channel to bypass the Pedro Miguel locks would be completed, except for the removal of a final plug, and Miraflores spillway, if incorporated in the final plan, would be rebuilt to the new elevation. In the meantime, traffic would continue through Pedro Miguel locks but would be diverted through the new Miraflores locks, with lockage through the two lower lifts only. Necessary regulation of Miraflores Lake would have to be accomplished by use of the culverts of the new locks.

101. Upon completion of the reconstruction, Miraflores Lake would be raised to the elevation of Gatun Lake, the bypass channel at Pedro Miguel would be opened, and traffic would be diverted to it and to the reconstructed Miraflores locks. The emergency dam of the new flight would then be constructed and the Pedro Miguel locks would be removed.

102. Traffic would have been suspended for the time required to raise the lake and to remove the plug in the bypass channel at Pedro Miguel. With preparations that could be made in advance, the suspension of traffic would be for only a few days.

103. Throughout the period required for the reconstruction of the existing Miraflores locks, probably 2 years at least, there would be only 1 flight of locks available for use and any accident which rendered any of the new locks inoperable would close the canal to traffic until repairs were effected.

Plan B

104. This plan is similar to plan A, except that the two additional locks chambers to be provided at the Miraflores locks would be added at the north, instead of the south, end of the present locks, and raising the latter would be unnecessary. The encroachment upon the proposed anchorage basin by the new upper locks has been mentioned previously. It appears to be an objection of insufficient importance to warrant the rejection of this plan solely on that account.

105. Sixty-four borings with a total length of 6,300 feet have been made recently in further investigation of the foundations for the 2 proposed upper locks. The investigations show the underlying material at the site to be predominantly a clay-shale of the so-called Cucaracha formation, the weakness of which is well known because of the large slides it has produced in Gaillard Cut. The site is traversed by 2 faults, 1 with an intrusion of basalt and the other of volcanic ash. Because of the weakness of the Cucaracha shale in shear, the heterogeneous nature, and low modulus of elasticity of this material, and the presence of the basaltic intrusion across the site, large and unequal settlement may be expected in the high walls required in the proposed new upper chambers. Tentative designs for the walls have been developed but further investigation which is underway will be required before final conclusions can be reached concerning the feasibility of constructing serviceable lock structures at this site.

106. Since this plan would involve no change in the location of the south entrance to these locks, the effects of the Cardenas River would not be aggravated. Other advantages and disadvantages, except cost, would be about the same as plan A. If the unfavorable foundation conditions can be overcome this plan appears to be the best of those suggested.

Plan C

107. This plan would require the construction of 2 new flights of 3 lifts each at the new Miraflores site, the construction of a dam in place of the existing Miraflores locks, and the reconstruction of the Miraflores spillway. The removal of the existing locks at Pedro Miguel is required as in the other plans suggested.

108. The objectionable effects of the Cardenas River on the canal channel would be reduced by its removal in this plan to the southern approach to the new Miraflores site.

109. Since this plan provides only two flights of locks on the Pacific side, the capacity of the canal as measured in lockages would remain as it is at present, instead of being increased 50 percent in normal times and 100 percent during overhaul, as in all of the other plans under consideration. The capacity of the canal measured in vessels would be somewhat higher than these figures indicate because of the increase in the number of locks of large size and the consequent increase in the number of tandem lockages that it would be possible to make. The capacity of the Pacific locks of the canal would be much less than that of the Atlantic locks and would constitute the limiting factor in respect to capacity, which, however, would be sufficient for the immediate requirements and those in prospect for the next two or three decades. When the growth of traffic required, an additional flight of locks could be provided and the plan would then be identical with plan E.

110. The principal objection to this plan, aside from those of time and cost, is in the sacrifice of the principle of dispersion adopted as a safeguard against vital damage by enemy action. With eventual development into plan E, as indicated above, the same dispersion of the several flights of locks would be obtained as in the other plans suggested. The advantage of separation of the locks of each flight would, of course, be lost in this plan, as in all the other plans suggested.

Plan D

111. This plan is similar to plans A and B in its general arrangement, but it provides for the transformation of the existing Miraflores locks into two lifts of sufficient height to meet the requirements of the higher level of Miraflores Lake. Unfavorable features of plan A in the extension of the south entrance toward the mouth of the Cardenas River and the encroachment on the anchorage area by plan B, are avoided in this plan.

112. It retains, however, the other unfavorable features of plan A and introduces additional ones of considerable magnitude in requiring higher-lift locks. They increase the volume of water required for each lockage and increase the difficulty of providing for the close control of a vessel in the locks throughout the greater range of the lift. This is a very important matter in respect to large vessels. Furthermore, the greater range of the lift of each lock would prevent the transit of certain aircraft carriers, whose flight decks exceed the width of the present lock chambers that the existing locks can accommodate.

113. The additional storage made available by the proposed basin is sufficient to compensate for the greater water requirements of the deeper locks of this plan, but if held for that purpose the other benefits of the increased storage would largely be lost. Studies made in connection with the design of the third locks project indicate that the necessary control of a vessel throughout the range of the lift in such a lock can be obtained by special installations, which have been devised, but they are somewhat complicated, expensive, and are untested by actual experience. The inability of aircraft carriers to transit these locks would be less objectionable when the wider locks of the third flight are available, but it is undesirable to rely only on the latter to permit the passage of such vessels.

114. In connection with the third locks project, consideration was given to the advantages and disadvantages of a two-lift flight of locks for the full range from sea level to lake level at Gatun and it was concluded that the three-lift flight was better. The maximum total lift at Miraflores would be higher than at Gatun on account of the greater tidal range on the Pacific side, and the conclusions reached in respect to the Gatun locks would apply with greater force

at Miraflores. Those conclusions would have to be reexamined with great care before the adoption of locks of higher lift at Miraflores, or elsewhere on the Panama Canal, could be recommended.

Plan E

115. This plan is identical with plan C as it might be expected to develop with the growth of traffic beyond the capacity of two flights of locks.

VI. DISCUSSION

116. In section III, paragraphs 24–88, attempt has been made to outline the available information on which it is necessary to rely in evaluating at this time the advantages of the proposal under consideration, which are listed in paragraph 24. In order to make that list comprehensive of all the advantages suggested in the references, a number of advantages that are regarded as inconsequential and others of insufficient importance to affect materially the comparison of the advantages and disadvantages of the proposal, are included.

Tangible values

117. The most important advantage, from the economic viewpoint at least, is the reduction in the annual operating cost of the Pacific locks. In plan A or B the ultimate prospective saving would amount to $520,000 per year.

118. Probably the next most important advantage is the increase in the total usable storage in Gatun Lake as a result of the reduction of the surges in the cut and the addition of Miraflores Lake at the summit level. Together, they would increase the usable storage by about 160,000 acre-feet, which has an immediate value for power purposes in the neighborhood of $40,000 per year. The ultimate value of this storage may be higher, when it is required for lockages, but that time is remote and the value could be determined only after detailed study of other possibilities that may be better for both power and navigation. It has previously been pointed out that a similar result can be accomplished by either widening or deepening the cut sufficiently to reduce the surges or to permit lower levels in Gatun Lake, and that storage at a higher level than Gatun Lake is more valuable.

119. The reduction of the time of transit by eliminating the delays in approaching and departing from Pedro Miguel locks, which would be avoided in the three-lift flights proposed, would have a large theoretical value, on the order of $470,000 per year in the near future and increasing through the years with the growth of traffic. It has been pointed out that it is impracticable to recover a substantial part of this saving for the Government.

120. Similar circumstances in respect to the recovery of the value apply to the saving of time of vessels by the use of the anchorage basin to reduce delay on account of fogs. With the great capacity of the locks after the addition of the third set, even if 24-hour operation of the locks were instituted (for which there seems to be little necessity), time could be saved by the use of the anchorage only occasionally and to relatively few vessels. The total saving, even if recoverable, would not be large. It has also been shown that the anchorage basin has no dependable value in deferring the construction of additional locks. The prospective need for them is so remote that in any event little current value could be assigned to the ultimate postponement of their construction.

121. The elimination of bends in the third locks channel and the other benefits in the convenience and safety of navigation that have been suggested are difficult to evaluate, but in view of past experience of accidental damage for which the United States was responsible of less than $20,000 per year and total economic loss on the same account averaging about $54,000 annually, $40,000 would be a liberal estimate of the average annual value of all recoverable benefits that might be expected on this account for many years in the future.

122. The other advantages that have been suggested are small or of doubtful dependability and have insignificant tangible benefits.

123. This brief summary indicates that the economic value of the significant advantages of the modification of the Panama Canal and the third locks project to conform to one of the plans suggested might be represented liberally by an estimate of $600,000 per year for the economic values which might accrue to the United States, or $1,070,000 for all economic values, including those not practically recoverable.

124. Obviously, these rough estimates are not entirely conclusive. They can be refined considerably by research similar to that which has been undertaken in the analysis of accidents to vessels, referred to in paragraphs 59–61, but there is little prospect that the whole import of the estimates would be altered. The present estimates are sufficient to show that on an economic basis, the value of the prospective advantages would not approach the additional costs of any of the plans suggested, except, possibly, plan B. The cost of plan B would exceed that of the third locks project by $30 million, if the tentative designs are acceptable, and without allowance for additional interest during construction on account of the larger capital investment and the longer construction period. The comparison of the additional capital investment and the recoverable benefits is not very favorable to the plan, but the disparity is not great and further investigation is warranted. The disparity between the economic benefit and the additional costs of the other plans, ranging from $100 million to $180 million, is sufficient to warrant their rejection on economic grounds, unless intangible considerations of high importance would justify further study.

Intangible values

125. Intangible features are more difficult to appraise, of course. The weight to be given them is a matter of judgment, rather than calculation. Most of the advantages that affect the peacetime operation of the canal are susceptible of reduction to some economic basis, as shown by the preceding discussion. The peacetime benefits for which no bases for economic appraisal at all can be found may be regarded as conveniences which it might be desirable to have but for which there is not sufficient need to warrant the expenditure of millions of dollars nor the risk of extraordinary engineering expedients. In this category are a number of the advantages suggested in the references as pertaining to the proposed plan, such as "simplifies problem of dispatching transit traffic," "in case of slides will enable grouping of ships for rapid passage through slide area," "will reduce unnecessary wear on piloting personnel" which were not listed separately in paragraph 24, but have been included generally under item (6) of the list of advantages.

126. Still more difficult to appraise are the intangibles of wartime operation. All the efforts on peacetime operation would be retained in war, but their relative importance would be greatly changed. Economic features would then become less significant and dependability would become paramount. The time of war vessels may be so valuable that the saving of even 30 minutes per transit would be of high importance in special circumstances. Even the time of merchant vessels may then assume a value hardly measurable in money. These factors illustrate the enhancement of some of the advantages of the proposal that might occur in war. They, and others like them, offset in some measure the disadvantages of the proposed plan, which, except for cost, are chiefly intangibles of wartime operation.

127. The first of these disadvantages is that of time of completion. The third locks project can be completed in 4 years, at least 1½ years sooner than any of the other plans. If the larger locks may be needed in this war, no doubt the project should be adhered to without substantial modification. At this time, it seems improbable that work on the project will be resumed during the war, and consequently, assuming that a substantial period of peace will follow, this relative disadvantage of the other plans may be ignored.

128. The advantage of the separation of the locks in flight as a safeguard against complete closure of the canal has been pointed out. It affords some protection, but less, it is believed, than the separation of the flights, which is retained in all the suggested plans, except plan C.

129. In wartime the great advantages of the reduction in the cost of operating the locks and of the increased storage in Gatun Lake disappear or diminish in importance. The advantage of the anchorage basin would probably be lost to war vessels during any time in which an attack on the canal was a reasonable possibility, because they would be unwilling to use it.

130. Despite the relatively small magnitude of the hazard of accident in the cut, it would assume greater importance in war. Only recently an important war vessel struck the bank near Cunetto (La Pita) and encountered delay for repairs from an accident that might have been avoided in a wider and straighter channel. While it is generally recognized that the superior power and maneuverability of war vessels reduces their liability to accident in the cut, this accident furnishes current evidence, if any were needed, of the desirability of a better channel. The evidence available on the subject indicates that in channels of the dimensions of those in Gaillard Cut, the width of the channel is of greater importance than the angles of the bends in reducing the probability of accident. But even so, this incident emphasizes the disadvantage of bends such as those in the third locks approach channel and suggests the desirability not only of widening that channel, but also of widening Gaillard Cut to 500 feet, although the justification for either would have to rest chiefly on the intangibles of wartime needs because of the low economic loss shown by the records of accidents. With the wider channels, the minimum time of transit by war vessels could be reduced considerably, in emergencies at least, and the probability of blocking the channel by the sinking of a vessel would be diminished substantially.

131. The consideration of factors which owe their importance chiefly to war conditions should take into account the probabilities of war. None of the improvements under consideration in this report is likely to be of use in this war. It is probable that war exhaustion alone warrants the expectation that many years will elapse before the facilities of the Panama Canal will again be required for war activities. This prospect diminishes the effects of all war factors, but both the premises and the extent of their influence are uncertain matters. For present purposes, it seems necessary to discount the considerations which suggest that a long period of peace can be counted on to follow termination of present hostilities.

132. In reference (d), which is devoted to the relative merits of a high-level lock canal and a sea-level canal, it is recommended that the former be accepted as the best canal for the Isthmus of Panama. The brief discussion on paragraphs 70–75 is believed to show that the comparison is not materially involved in the present subject. The completion of the third locks project would have about the same weight in the consideration

of proposals for a sea-level as the completion of any of the other improvements proposed. It should be noted that practically all of the arguments that have ever been advanced in support of a sea-level canal are based upon the intangibles of war needs, without consideration of economics or cost. The superiority of the high-level canal envisaged in reference (d) is based largely upon assumptions that excessive costs would preclude the provision of a channel adequate for safe and rapid transit. If reliability in war could be considered of such transcendental importance as completely to override economic considerations, it may be that more detailed study than any yet made should be given to the possibilities of a sea-level canal, or of a lock canal at a lower level than the present canal, with water storage in separate reservoirs so that the loss of the contents of Gatun Lake could not insure the suspension of traffic for many months. It is feasible to construct a sea-level canal with channels of any desired dimensions. The costs are not well established, but they would be high.

133. So far as such intangible war benefits are concerned, the third locks project can be completed in the shortest time and is superior to the other plans in respect to the probability of closure of the canal by enemy attack, but the other plans are superior in their contribution to the convenience, speed, and safety with which individual vessels may transit the canal in war, as well as in peace. Wherever the balance may rest in this comparison, it does not seem sufficient to warrant additional expense on the order of $100 million or more.

Summary

134. Plan B appears to be the only modification suggested which might be adopted with reasonable justification, if the foundation difficulties do not prove insuperable. The investigation of this plan is continuing. Full-scale loading tests on similar foundation material in place is being undertaken and results of the test will give data upon which judgment of the acceptability of the foundations may be founded. These tests will require 3 or 4 months. When the results are available, it is intended to have all the available information concerning the foundations for the locks proposed in plan B reviewed by a special board of consulting engineers and to obtain their individual and collective opinions of the practicability of the foundations and of the plans devised to overcome the unfavorable conditions.

135. In the meantime, the other factors of importance which have been referred to in this report will be developed and analyzed further to determine more precisely the values which should be accorded them. Wartime aspects of the plans will be discussed with members of the local joint board and also with other officials of the War and Navy Departments as opportunities occur.

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

136. It is concluded that thorough investigation should be made of the plan, designated plan B in this report, providing for the modification of the existing canal and third locks project to locate all three of the additional larger locks at the new Miraflores site, to add a third lock at the north end of each of the existing Miraflores flights, to construct the appurtenant, replacement and remedial works necessary for raising the level of Miraflores Lake to that of Gatun Lake, and to abandon and remove the existing Pedro Miguel locks.

137. The other plans referred to in this report, including widening Gaillard Cut, should also be studied further to the extent that it may be possible to do so without substantial cost, but expenditures of considerable magnitude should not be incurred on that account, at least until the investigation of plan B has been completed.

138. If the need should arise for the earliest practicable completion of additional locks, the third locks project should be completed without major modification.

Recommendations

139. It is recommended:

(a) That no steps be taken to obtain approval of any change in the existing canal or the present authorized project before the foundation investigations now in progress are completed.

(b) That after completion of those investigations and others which it may be practicable to make in the meantime, a further report on this subject be submitted for final consideration.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, day before yesterday, June 19, I had occasion to meet with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] in the Senate Chamber. I understood him to say that there was a possibility of an agreement being reached to increase by $500 million the Defense Department appropriation bill for the purpose of providing more airplanes for our defense.

I did not understand at the time that the proposal was to be made by way of an amendment to be sponsored only by some of us on the Senate Appropriations Committee who had opposed the billion-dollar-plus proposal offered by the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. I discovered last night after reading the RECORD that I was named as cosponsor of the amendment.

I took the position before the committee that I was not in favor of the billion-dollar-plus increase. However, I stated to Senator BRIDGES that if, as I understood, an agreement was reached on both sides to increase the amount by $500 million, I would not urge objection to that. But I find that there is considerable agitation to increase the sum to the original amount requested before the committee.

I expect to vote against not only the billion-and-some-odd-dollars' increase, but also against the $500 million proposal should a controversy arise. I was willing to go along with the $500 million if it meant harmony among the members of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be stricken from the amendment. I discussed the matter with the Senator from New Hampshire, and I am confident that there was a clear misunderstanding between us. I am sure he acted in good faith and it is not my purpose to cast any reflection on him at all for having placed my name as a cosponsor of this amendment.

The amendment I refer to is labeled 6–19–56–A and it is intended "to be proposed by Mr. BRIDGES (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. MUNDT)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF PRESIDENTIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORT POLICY AND ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in April 1955 there was made public a report entitled "Revisions of Federal Transportation Policy," prepared by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Transport Policy and Organizations, commonly known as the Cabinet Committee report on transportation. The membership of this committee consisted of the Secretary of Commerce as chairman, the Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. Participating ad hoc members were the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

This report might just as well have been written by the Association of American Railroads because it generally reflects the point of view of the railroads and seeks to advance their interests at the expense of our motor carriers and water carriers.

This charge is serious, but a very grave issue is at stake, and I think it is of utmost importance that my colleagues in the Senate have the facts at hand in connection with any proposed legislation to implement the report which might come before the Senate for consideration.

According to the report, because of the development of highway, air, pipeline, and water carriers, generally with Government aid, the restrictive legislation that was passed when the railroads had a virtual monopoly, is outmoded.

Further dislocations resulting from intense competition, so states the report, at present accompanied by restraining legislation, are unduly oppressive on common carriers, the backbone of the transportation system. The shipper, and in turn the public, pay heavily in increased transportation costs for these dislocations, the Cabinet Committee tells us.

Further, the Cabinet Committee, proceeding from the premise that the transportation system operates under conditions of pervasive competition, concluded that reappraisal and adjustment is necessary in regulatory policies in order to insure a strong system of common carriage for public use and national defense.

I should point out that many of the common carriers do not appreciate the efforts of the Cabinet Committee on their behalf. The railroads are the only group of common carriers that have supported most features of the report. Motor and water carriers almost universally reject the recommendations of the report.

Mr. President, a great deal of time might be consumed in discussing the numerous valid objections to the pro-

posals contained in the Cabinet Committee report. However, at this time, I shall not attempt to explore all of these objections, but instead shall confine my discussion to what I believe are a few major areas in which the report makes proposals contrary to the public interest. These are the proposed changes in the national transportation policy and various revisions in the ratemaking provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act.

PROPOSED CHANGES OF EXISTING NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY

The present declaration of policy set forth in the Interstate Commerce Act provides for "fair and impartial regulations of all modes of transportation so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each without unfair or destructive competitive practices."

The Cabinet Committee would seize upon a pet expression of the huckster in describing the type of competition that it envisages. It calls it "dynamic competition."

That is a very catchy phrase, Mr. President, until we start to analyze the report in terms of the meaning of the semantics used by the committee.

Thus, the report would change the national policy "to provide for and develop under the free-enterprise system of dynamic competition, a national transportation industry." Further, the new policy would "encourage and promote full competition between modes of transportation."

During the months ahead my colleagues may expect to hear the term "dynamic competition" used as another of this administration's ever-growing catalog of slogans. Many of us may not understand fully the meaning of "dynamic competition" but I suspect that it has one meaning for the railroads and another and less desirable meaning for motor and water carriers.

Thus, by the subtle injection of glittering generalities the Cabinet Committee report would substitute for the present prohibition against unfair or destructive competitive practices in the present national transportation policy, a new scheme which allegedly would allow common carriers greater freedom to realize advantages in competitive pricing of their services by "increased reliance on competitive forces in ratemaking."

In order to effectuate this proposed system of "dynamic competition" a number of changes are proposed in the ratemaking provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE RATEMAKING PROVISIONS IN THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Under the existing law the Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized to set precise rates, that is, the exact price for a transportation service. Under the Cabinet Committee report however, the ICC would be deprived of its authority to establish precise rates. Instead, the Commission would be limited to establishing just and reasonable minimum rates or just and reasonable maximum rates. In the broad area between these two extremes, carriers would be left free to determine their rates for themselves. This sounds fine in theory but let us test its practical application.

The important point I wish to stress is that if we adopt the report of the Cabinet Committee we shall be reversing a long history of ratemaking, whereby the railroads and other carriers petition the Interstate Commerce Commission for rates, and if they do not like the rates which are fixed, they have the right to appeal. In essence, under the proposal of the Cabinet Committee, the railroads would be relatively free to fix their rates, and if the Government should not like them, the Government could appeal. That is unsound from every standpoint from which we look at it, and it is particularly unsound, in my judgment, from the standpoint of the Government, because, after all, the burden of proof should be upon the carrier and not placed upon the Government. The Government should not, figuratively speaking, have to go hat in hand before judicial tribunals and seek to set aside rates fixed by the carriers. On the contrary, the carriers should go before such tribunals and ask for a change in a ruling of the Interstate Commerce Commission if, on the merits, they are entitled to a change.

OUT-OF-POCKET COSTS

According to the Committee's report, minimum rates would be lawful as long as they are not lower than the out-of-pocket costs incurred in rendering the transportation service. As you know, out-of-pocket costs are those that are directly attributable to the handling of the traffic transported; or, to put it another way, costs that would not be incurred if the traffic were not moved. Fixed costs, on the other hand, are those which largely remain constant whether the facility is used slightly or to maximum capacity. Therefore, when the committee would have us apply the out-of-pocket cost test in determining just and reasonable minimum rates, it in effect proposes a windfall for the transportation agency whose operations are characterized by a favorable out-of-pocket cost situation.

Which transportation is so favored? The answer is obvious—the railroad industry is so favored.

If this out-of-pocket formula were applied, the railroads would almost always be in a position to cut their rates to a level lower than their competitors could find profitable. At the same time they could blandly assure the Interstate Commerce Commission that the rates were legal, because they would at least cover out-of-pocket costs.

By way of contrast, the motor-carrier industry is characterized by high out-of-pocket costs and low fixed costs. Thus, under the Cabinet Committee proposals the rules of the game would be set so as to almost always assure the railroads of an opportunity to eliminate their competitors by destructive competition. The ICC would be helpless to interfere so long as the railroads could show that the rates were no lower than the out-of-pocket costs.

If ever a proposed piece of legislation had potentialities for the elimination of competition and the fostering of monopoly transportation, the Cabinet Committee proposal for minimum rates serves as an outstanding example.

It takes no great imagination to foresee the ultimate result under a program of this type. Once the railroads, through their permissible minimum rates based on out-of-pocket costs, have eliminated the competition having relatively high out-of-pocket costs, they can then revert to the standard practice of monopolists and increase rates to the permissible maximum allowed by the law.

Let us not be misled, however, by the concept of maximum rates permitted by law. Under the Cabinet Committee proposal, the lowest maximum rate that could be maintained by the ICC would be a rate based on "fully distributed costs" of rendering the service, which means out-of-pocket costs attributable to the traffic plus its proper share of the overhead costs exclusive of losses in rendering other services. The highest maximum rate is practically without limit, because the Committee set no definitive standards for determining the upper limit of maximum rates.

Those of my colleagues who come from areas in which small communities are served by rail carriers without adequate competition from other modes of transportation can well imagine what will happen to freight rates for those communities under the Cabinet Committee ratemaking proposals.

Mr. President, the other day a very interesting statement was placed in the hearings of a subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on H. R. 6141, which incorporates the Cabinet Committee recommendations. The statement was submitted by a resident of Fargo, N. Dak. I take the liberty of quoting from his statement, which is the practical transportation man's evaluation of the workings of the Cabinet Committee proposals:

> It is now proposed to have some dynamic competition. I would like to tell you how this will work for small business.
>
> The railroads will have as a floor their out-of-pocket costs which are lower than motor-carrier costs for all but the lower minimum weights and shorter distances.
>
> To the extent that rail rates gravitate to out-of-pocket costs, the question arises as to who is going to pay the constant cost, the profit and the passenger deficit. We are under no illusions, for we will pay for it on all of our traffic, because it is all noncompetitive.
>
> The railroads will not reduce rates just for the fun of it. They will reduce rates to meet the competition of water transportation, the competition of private truck fleets or threatened diversion to private truck or the competition of the common motor carrier. Even the common motor carrier presents a serious threat, by the nature of their costs, only on short hauls for lighter loads and in areas where balanced traffic loads exist.
>
> The small city or the agricultural State has none of these competitive factors. We have no waterways, private truck fleets are a rarity confined to limited types of business, and common-carrier trucks present no serious competition because of the long one-way hauls involved.
>
> The intention of H. R. 6141 is to introduce a more vigorous competitive atmosphere than already exists. The evils of the present, so far as we are concerned, are to be magnified, and the powers of the Commission to curb the disintegration of the rate structure are to be removed except as to rates which gravitate below directly ascertainable or out-of-pocket costs.

Mr. President, I urge a careful study of the observations made by the witness from Fargo, N. Dak., because they are completely sound as to what will happen if the report of the Cabinet Committee is adopted by Congress.

Sound ratemaking regulatory policy demands that the ICC retain its present authority to establish precise rates as well as minimum and maximum rates. I might add that the Commission has exercised its power to prescribe precise rates very sparingly.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE RULE OF RATEMAKING

As a corollary to the changes advocated in the minimum and maximum rate provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act, the Cabinet Committee proposes a change in the so-called rule of ratemaking provided in the act. At present the rule requires that the Commission, in the exercise of its power to prescribe just and reasonable rates, must take into account the effect of rates on the movement of traffic and the need of carriers for revenues sufficient to render adequate and efficient service. Under this provision of the law, the ICC has on occasion restrained carriers from cutting rates which do not meet these standards. The Cabinet Committee proposes that the rule of ratemaking be changed to forbid the Commission, when it reviews proposed competitive rates of one form of transportation, to consider, first, the effect of such rates on the traffic of any other mode of transportation; second, the relation of such rates to the rates of any other mode of transportation; or third, whether such rates are lower than necessary to meet the competition.

These three negative provisions proposed by the Cabinet Committee have been termed the three "shall nots." The enactment of the three "shall nots" would insure that the railroads could take advantage of their favorable out-of-pocket cost position under present minimum rate standards of the law.

It is significant, Mr. President, that in recent testimony before a subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee a railroad witness indicated that his principals have for the time being abandoned their demands for enactment of the other recommendations of the Cabinet Committee report and will settle for the enactment of the three "shall nots." I might add, Mr. President, that if this change in the law were made, the railroads would receive the lion's share of the benefits that would accrue to them if other provisions of H. R. 6141 which are designed to produce "increased reliance of competitive forces in ratemaking" were enacted.

Another change proposed by the Cabinet Committee would alter the power of the ICC to suspend and investigate proposed rates of doubtful legality in order to determine their lawfulness. At the present the maximum suspension period is 7 months. Under the Cabinet Committee report it would be 3 months. Such suspensions would be restricted to that of "a special and unusual remedy."

The Commission's experience over the years has shown that 7 months is about the minimum period required to investigate properly such suspended rates. Under the proposed changes the burden of proof would shift from a proponent carrier to a complaining carrier. It seems fairly obvious that a small motor carrier asking for the suspension of the rates of a large railroad would find it almost impossible to bear the burden of proof that the rates were unlawful. We are all aware of the practical disabilities of a small transportation company in this respect.

That is why I am stressing in this speech the importance of keeping the burden of proof exactly where it is today under the law. I again emphasize that we had better always look into the procedures which are proposed in the various pieces of proposed legislation, in order to ascertain what the gimmicks are. This procedural change is one of the dangerous gimmicks of the Cabinet Committee's report. The procedural change with respect to burden of proof is one of the windfalls which would be given to the railroads. It is a procedural windfall which would place the railroads in a very favorable position in any future litigation involving ratemaking.

Mr. President, we had better take a long, hard, careful look at the procedural changes suggested when it comes to the question of the burden of proof, because if the procedure which is proposed by the Cabinet Committee should be adopted, very unfair discrimination would be practiced against the small carriers of America to the advantage of the great railroads.

Mr. President, I stress the point that it seems fairly obvious that a small motor carrier asking for the suspension of the rates of a large railroad would, as I said before, find it impossible to bear the burden of proof that the rates were unlawful. All of us are aware of the practical disabilities of a small transportation company in this respect.

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE LONG-AND-SHORT-HAUL CLAUSE OF THE ICC

The administration's proposal on this item figuratively pokes a stick into a hornet's nest. The long-and-short-haul clause of the act has had a stormy career. Efforts to weaken it will only engender further controversy. The present law requires that the rail or water common carriers subject to ICC regulation obtain prior approval of the Commission before charging more than the aggregate of the intermediate rates or before charging more for shorter than for longer hauls over the same line or route in the same direction. The proposal would allow these carriers to violate these principles if it could be shown that the making of such rate was necessary to meet actual competition and the rate charged is not less than a reasonable minimum rate; that is, not less than the out-of-pocket costs of handling the traffic.

Therefore, I emphasize in this speech, as chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, that the small-business men of America had better be on guard in respect to the procedural changes proposed by the Cabinet Committee's report, because, in my judgment, the proposal is not in the interest of the small-business men of America. As chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I intend to do everything I can to forewarn small business of the dangerous potentialities of the Cabinet Committee's report, known as the Weeks Report.

Such a change in the law would allow railroads to pinpoint their competition and make rates low enough to defeat that competition. Mr. President, if this change were made in the law, I believe I am safe in predicting that in only a few months water carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act would be destroyed by the resulting railroad competition. Some of the motor carriers might survive longer. Generally, however, the motor carrier industry as we know it today would be reduced to but a comparatively unimportant mode of transportation.

INCENTIVE RATES

A proposal of the Cabinet Committee that is particularly suited to the administration's program is that which would make lawful, incentive rates on large volume traffic movements.

It is another example of playing into the hands of the big boys. It is another example of big business favoritism at the expense of small business. Watch out for the procedural gimmicks in the proposal, because the procedures will do damage to the small-business men.

Under this proposal the large shipper would receive reduced rates on large volumes of traffic. The small-business man would not be able to compete with the large shipper under such an arrangement.

There are other proposed changes in the regulatory pattern suggested in the Cabinet Committee report, many of which are as unfair and unsound as those I have just mentioned, but I consider the items I have just discussed as those which comprise the most serious threats to adequate transportation regulation contained in the report.

Before closing, I should call attention to an amazing provision of H. R. 6141, and S. 1920, the companion bill.

This is section 25 of these bills which provides:

> Outstanding effective orders prescribing minimum, maximum, or maximum-and-minimum rates, fares, or charges, or issued under section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, prior to its amendment by this act, shall not have any force and effect with respect to rates, fares, or charges filed 180 days after the enactment hereof.

Under this section, all outstanding orders of the ICC apparently would automatically expire upon the publication and filing of such rates as the carrier might choose to establish to supplant those required by existing orders. My colleagues from the South and West may recall the struggle of many years' duration to rid those areas of a discriminatory basic freight rate structure. After years of hearings by the ICC and action by the Supreme Court, the South and West obtained a class rate system of freight rates on the same level as

that given to the formerly favored official territory.

In my opinion, the passage of section 25 would allow the rail carriers, if they chose—and we can be very certain they would so choose—to substitute a completely different system, one that might increase the discriminations formerly contained in the regionalized class rate structures.

Mr. President, so far as I can ascertain at the present time, it does not appear likely that the legislative proposals to implement the Cabinet Committee report will reach the floor of the Senate for action, but if they should, I urge my colleagues to give these proposals serious study. They constitute a threat to our motor and water carriers and to the shipping public, who, after all, must pay the excessive bills presented by monopolists in any field of economic endeavor.

Mr. President, lest it should be attempted, in the closing days or hours of this session, to have the Senate pass this proposed bill, I think it is very important that we give notice that it must be subjected to considerable debate. All the complex procedural changes recommended ought to be brought under the scrutiny of careful debate and analysis on the floor of the Senate, before we run the risk of imposing on the small-business men of America, and upon the motor and water transportation carriers of America, this railroad bill. In essence, I respectfully submit, it is a bill which is loaded with unfair discrimination in favor of the railroads and against the legitimate competitive interests of the motor and water carriers of America.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. YI-PING KIANG, MEMBER OF FORMOSA LEGISLATURE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we have been privileged to welcome a number of visitors from foreign lands. The world has grown so small that what yesterday were considered distant lands are today in our own neighborhood.

We have heard of Formosa. It has been called Taiwan. Today we have with us one of the legislators from Taiwan, Hon. Yi-Ping Kiang. I ask that he stand and be welcomed by Members of the Senate.

[The visitor rose and was greeted with hearty applause, Senators rising.]

SENATOR FROM KENTUCKY—APPOINTMENT AND WITHDRAWAL OF APPOINTMENT OF JOSEPH J. LEARY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate two communications received from the Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Honorable Albert Benjamin Chandler, Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, which will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Frankfort, June 18, 1956.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, I, Albert Benjamin Chandler, the Governor of said Commonwealth, do hereby appoint Joseph J. Leary a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of Senator Alben W. Barkley, is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency, our Gov. A. B. Chandler, and our seal hereto affixed at Frankfort, Ky., this 18th day of June, in the year of our Lord 1956.

ALBERT BENJAMIN CHANDLER,
Governor.

By the Governor:

THELMA L. STOVALL,
Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a telegram signed by Gov. A. B. Chandler, which will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

FRANKFORT, KY., *June 21, 1956.*

Hon. FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary of the Senate, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Please return certificate of appointment on Joseph J. Leary, who has declined to serve. We are sending papers on Hon. Robert Humphreys.

GOV. A. B. CHANDLER.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit an order and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That in view of the declination of Joseph J. Leary of the appointment by the Governor of Kentucky as Senator from that State to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the late Senator Alben W. Barkley, the certificate of appointment of Mr. Leary be returned by the Secretary of the Senate to the Governor, in compliance with his request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the order?

There being no objection, the order was considered and agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate appropriations subcommittee charged with the consideration of H. R. 10986, I have the privilege to present to the Senate a summary of the major provisions of this bill and an explanation of the various amendments recommended by the committee.

Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations of the Senate Appropriations Committee worked earnestly and diligently for many weeks in receiving and considering testimony on the largest and, we believe, the most important single appropriation to come before this body.

To indicate even partially how large the pending bill is, let me say that in round figures it provides approximately $35 billion, which is more than the cost of Government for all the other departments, including the independent offices. That will give my colleagues an idea of how vast the bill is.

This year, perhaps more than at any time in recent years, there has been a virtual avalanche of conflicting advice and opinions on national defense policies and programs. Millions of words have been written in the Nation's newspapers and magazines, and spoken over the Nation's radio and television networks, about the numerous and varied aspects of our national defense program. Various committees of the Congress have held, or are still holding, hearings on particular problem areas in the defense program, and great quantities of testimony have been produced.

Conflicting views have been presented, not only by civilian enthusiasts of a particular branch of the armed services or a particular military theory or concept, but also by eminently qualified professional military men and by present or former officials of the Department of Defense. Confronted by this tremendous volume of information and conflicting views, the committee has had to delve deeply into many of the major issues involved in the national defense program, and carefully to separate fact from opinion in arriving at its conclusions as to what is required for the national security.

At this time last year, when the Defense Department appropriations for fiscal year 1956 were before the Senate, there was considerable hope that some progress would be achieved in working out, with the U. S. S. R., ways and means for easing international tension. We were then just about to enter into new negotiations with that nation in a sincere effort to find a road to a just and durable peace.

Unfortunately, these hopes have not been fulfilled. Although the U. S. S. R. has recently announced a further reduction of 1,200,000 men in her armed forces, there is ample evidence that in the type of military power that constitutes the real threat to our national security, the Russians have made no reduction; but, in fact, have made very considerable increases. Among informed persons, there is now general agreement that the U. S. S. R. is making rapid progress in science and technology and in the development and production of modern armaments, particularly jet-powered aircraft, including long-range bombers, guided missiles, and nuclear weapons. What new surprises will be unveiled to the Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force during his impending visit to the U. S. S. R., we do not know; but it is clear that the Russians are bending every effort to catch up and, if possible, to overtake us in the development of modern military forces.

Although very real changes appear to be going on in the U. S. S. R., there is as yet no evidence that these changes bode well for the free world. Most important, at the present time there is no indication that the U. S. S. R. seriously intends to negotiate for a workable system of disarmament or arms reduction. Under these circumstances, the United States has no choice but to maintain for an indefinite period of time in the future a large Military Establishment of growing combat effectiveness.

While there is general agreement as to the need for a large Military Establishment, the question remains, how large should it be, and what should be its composition? This is not a question which can easily be answered by laymen. In fact, it is a matter upon which even professional military men cannot agree; so it is not surprising that there are some differences of viewpoint among the members of the committee.

Mr. President, I wish to say right here and now, and in the most emphatic manner at my command, that every member of the committee is deeply concerned with the problem of providing adequate security for our country. I do not wish in any way, shape, or form to leave the impression that the members of the committee who voted against certain of our recommendations for increases over the amounts voted by the House are any less concerned with providing adequate national defense than are those who voted for them. Every one of the distinguished Senators who serve with me on the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations is sincerely determined to provide the military forces required for the Nation's defense.

The determination of what is an adequate defense at any particular time and in any particular situation is a very complicated process. Not only must we consider strictly military matters, but we must also consider all the other factors which bear on the problem. We must consider the financial needs of other Government programs, such as foreign aid, atomic energy, the farm programs, education, highways, and so forth. We must also consider the tax burden our citizens must bear and the inflationary dangers of continual budget deficits. All of us recognize that the threat to our security is likely to continue for many years in the future, and that the financial burdens of defense will be with us for many years to come. In weighing all these diverse factors, which must be taken into consideration in answering the question of what is adequate defense under any particular set of circumstances, there is a great deal of room for honest differences of judgment.

The majority of the committee is of the opinion that the defense budget requested by the administration, including the amendments of April 9, which were substantially included in the House version of the bill, leans too far in the direction of austerity. Because there is so much uncertainty as to our military position relative to that of the U. S. S. R., particularly in the 1959–60 period, the majority of the committee believes that we should lean over backward to assure that during the coming fiscal year a lack of funds will not be a limiting factor on the further development of our most critical military programs. Admittedly, this is a matter of judgment; but the majority of the committee feels that, all things considered, some additional insurance is warranted, in view of the uncertainties surrounding our future military capabilities, as compared with those of the U. S. S. R.

The bill as reported to the Senate by the committee provides a total of $34,983,734,000 — $1,348,668,000 more than the amount voted by the House, $835,884,000 more than the amount requested by the President, and $3,090,500,374 more than the amount appropriated for these purposes to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1956.

I am trying to give the figures so that every Member of the Senate will understand what is being done when the time comes for the passage of the bill. I am trying to analyze the reasons for the action of the majority of the committee.

Under this bill, the Army will continue at about its present level, ending the fiscal year with 19 divisions, 10 regiments, and 140 antiaircraft battalions. The Navy will increase somewhat the number of active ships to 988, including 409 warships. The Marine Corps will continue to maintain its 3 divisions and 3 air wings at a high state of combat readiness. They are always ready. That is one branch of the Defense Department which is always prepared for action.

The Air Force will complete its buildup to 137 wings, including 126 combat wings.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a table showing a summary of military forces planned for June 30, 1957, as compared with the forces planned for June 30, 1956, and the actual forces on hand on June 30 and December 31, 1955.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of military forces

	June 30, 1955	Actual, Dec. 31, 1955	June 30, 1956	June 30, 1957
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY				
Divisions	20	20	18	19
Regiments/RCTs	12	12	10	10
Antiaircraft battalions	122	126	133	140
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY				
Active ships, total	1,030	984	982	988
Major combatant	402	403	404	409
Other active ships	628	581	578	579
Marine divisions	3	3	3	3
Marine aircraft wings	3	3	3	3
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE				
Wings, total	121	127	131	137
Combat	108	114	118	126
Troop carrier	13	13	13	11

Mr. CHAVEZ. These forces will provide a growing retaliatory capability, not only in the Air Force, but in the other services as well. They will provide an increasingly effective continental defense system, comprising an outer zone early warning radar network, stretching across the top of the North American Continent and extending in both oceans across the seaward approaches to the United States, and an inner zone system of radars, ground electronics environment and weapons for the protection of our cities, industrial centers, and military installations. Included also are the essential tactical forces, required both for general war and limited war, as well as the naval forces needed to protect the sea lines of communication with our allies and our forces overseas.

The organization, equipping, and training of these forces will increasingly reflect the integration of new weapons and the adoption of new tactics and techniques required for effective defense in the nuclear age.

The bill as amended by the committee provides for a total military personnel strength of a little over 2,870,000 men, for the end of fiscal year 1957—1,045,000 for the Army, 678,000 for the Navy, 206,000 for the Marine Corps, and 941,000 for the Air Force. The strength figure for the Air Force is 4,900 greater than that provided in the House bill. I will discuss this increase in greater detail later in my statement.

Overall, the bill provides a relatively small increase of about 50,000 over the total military personnel strength of $2,820,000 estimated for June 30, 1956. The Air Force, which is still building toward the 137-wing goal, is provided an increase of about 25,000 for the coming fiscal year, the Navy an increase of about 15,000, and the Marine Corps and Army an increase of 5,000 each. The increases in the Army and Navy will take care of certain new activities recently assigned to those services.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a summary of military personnel strengths as of the end of fiscal years 1955, 1956, and 1957.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Military personnel strengths

	Actual end strength, June 30, 1955	Estimated end strength, June 30, 1956	Planned end strength, June 30, 1957
Department of Defense, total	2,934,556	2,820,024	2,870,158
Army	1,108,745	1,040,250	1,045,300
Navy	660,695	662,774	678,223
Marine Corps	205,170	201,000	205,735
Air Force	959,946	916,000	940,900

Mr. CHAVEZ. The military services have made good progress in the past few years in improving the utilization of their manpower. With continued progress in this area the numbers of military personnel provided for fiscal year 1957 should be adequate to man properly the forces planned for that period.

For the Reserve forces funds are provided in the bill, as amended by the committee, for a total of approximately 1,117,000 men to be engaged in regular paid drills by the end of fiscal year 1957.

Those are the Reserves and the National Guard, separate and apart from the military personnel belonging to the Department of Defense. The Reserves are growing by leaps and bounds. Those are the home troops in every State, whom all the neighbors know and respect.

This is an increase of almost 150,000 men in drill pay status during fiscal year 1957. Most of the increase will be in the Army Reserve component. The committee has provided funds for a total of 425,000 reservists in drill pay status at the end of fiscal year 1957 in the Army National Guard as compared with the 408,100 provided in the House bill. The reasons for this increase will be explained later.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a table showing the increase in the number of reservists in drill pay status from the end of fiscal year 1955 to the end of fiscal year 1957.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reserve personnel in drill pay status

	Actual end strength June 30, 1955	Estimated end strength June 30, 1956	Planned end strength June 30, 1957
Department of Defense, total	826,196	967,419	1,116,684
Department of the Army	521,378	622,155	723,600
Army National Guard	358,241	407,100	425,000
Army Reserve	163,137	215,055	298,600
Department of the Navy	191,998	210,299	225,419
Naval Reserve	149,142	159,691	165,359
Marine Corps Reserve	42,856	50,608	60,060
Department of the Air Force	112,820	134,965	167,665
Air National Guard	61,306	63,280	67,980
Air Force Reserve	51,514	71,685	99,685

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Defense Department's fiscal year 1957 programs provide for a continued increase in the combat effectiveness of the Reserve Forces. The facilities and equipment of the Reserve components are being steadily modernized and expanded. A substantial number of jet aircraft will be provided the flying elements of the Reserve Forces in fiscal year 1957. Training programs are being improved and general combat readiness raised. Reservists, who for various reasons may not be available for prompt entry on active duty in the event of war or national emergency will be screened out of the Ready Reserves.

Elements of the Air National Guard are now participating with Regular units of the Air Defense Command of the Air Force in the maintenance of the 24-hour aircraft alert. A growing number of Army National Guard antiaircraft battalions are also actively participating in the peacetime continental defense system. The weapons and equipment of these battalions are located on site and are kept in instant readiness by caretaker crews of civilian personnel who are also members of the Army National Guard so that in an emergency they can go into action in a very short time.

Mr. President, I now would like to review the principal provisions of the bill, but before doing so I would like to discuss a matter which affects several of the Army and Air Force appropriations, and that is deutschemark support of our forces in Germany.

Senators will recall that under section 727 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act of 1955 agencies of the Department were authorized to accept real property, the use of real property, services, and other commodities from foreign countries for the use of the United States in accordance with mutual-defense agreements or occupational arrangements, and to use same for the support of United States forces in such areas without specific appropriations therefor.

Basically, this permitted the Department of Defense agencies to accept deutschemark support for our occupation forces in Germany without charge to appropriations. The Department of Defense fiscal year 1955 budget was originally submitted on a gross dollar basis; that is, the dollar value of the deutschemark support expected to be received by our forces in Germany was included in the appropriations requests. By enacting section 727, the Congress was enabled to delete $355 million from the Defense Department budget for that fiscal year.

In other words, the arrangement for the use of the deutschemark permitted us to reduce the budget for that year by $355 million.

Last year the Defense Department budget was again submitted on a gross-dollar basis. The Congress continued the authority originally contained in section 727 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act of 1955 as section 626 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act of 1956. This again enabled the Congress to delete from the Defense Department 1956 budget the sum of $296 million, the deutschemark equivalent included in that budget.

This year we are confronted with a different situation. Prior to the entry of the Federal Republic of Germany into NATO, agreement was reached between the Allied Powers and Germany on specific levels of deutschemark support to be provided during the first year after Germany's entry into NATO. This period expired on May 5, 1956. At the time the fiscal year 1957 budget was submitted to the Congress, there was no agreement between the Allied Powers and Germany as to the nature and extent of deutschemark support that would be provided by Germany after May 5, 1956. Because of the uncertainty as to the nature and extent of deutschemark support that might be available to the Department of Defense agencies in fiscal year 1957, the Defense Department budget for that fiscal year was again submitted on a gross basis pending agreement with Germany on continued support. A total of $276,319,000 was included in lieu of continued deutschemark support for our forces in Germany.

At the time the Defense Department appropriation bill for fiscal year 1957 was before the House, the question of additional support to be provided by the Federal Republic of Germany remained unresolved. The House Appropriations Committee, however, recommended the deletion of the $276,319,000 in lieu of deutschemark support and stated in its report:

> While it is understood that negotiations for the extension of these arrangements into the ensuing fiscal year are now pending, the committee is assuming that the arrangements will be extended in substantially the present form.

But they were not.

Subsequently, an interim arrangement was worked out with the Federal Republic of Germany whereby that country agreed to continue to provide support for United States forces through June 30, 1956, with settlement of the obligations incurred during this period dependent upon the outcome of the deutschemark support negotiations.

On June 7, 1956, agreement was reached with the Federal Republic of Germany under which the United States will be provided goods and services amounting to 650 million deutschemarks, or the equivalent of $154,761,900 for the 1-year period May 6, 1956, to May 5, 1957, inclusive. On a prorata basis, the Department of Defense estimates that the equivalent of $41 million of this amount will be allocated to cover deutschemark obligations incurred under the interim arrangements for the period May 6 to June 30, 1956. This would leave the equivalent of $113,761,900 in deutschemark support for fiscal year 1957 if the agreement is not extended beyond May 5, 1957. This compares with the fiscal year 1957 budget estimate of $261,757,200 in deutschemark support for the maintenance of United States forces in Germany, leaving a deficit, if no further deutschemark support is forthcoming, of $147,995,300. The Department of Defense has requested restoration of this $147,995,300.

Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the House Committee on Appropriations and the two Houses of Congress, taking their work seriously, of necessity hope that arrangements will be made by the State Department and by the Defense Department under which the German Government will accept its fair share of deutschemark support, so that the American people will not be burdened too heavily.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of the letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense—Comptroller—to the chairman, Department of Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, dated June 11, 1956, which provides further details on this matter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 11, 1956.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Department of Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During my testimony before your committee on the fiscal year 1957 budget request for the Department of Defense, I stated:

"Prior to the entry of the Federal Republic of Germany into NATO, agreement was reached between the Allied Powers and Germany on specific levels of deutschemark

support to be provided during the first year after Germany's entry into NATO. This period expires on May 5, 1956. Although there have been discussions with the Federal Republic of Germany on this matter, no agreement has yet been reached concerning the nature and extent of support that will be provided by Germany after May 5, 1956. A small amount of deutschemark support will continue to be received from the Berlin Magistrat regardless of the progress of negotiations with the Federal Republic of Germany since such support can be expected to continue so long as that city remains under four-power occupation.

"The committee will recall that our budget for fiscal year 1956 was submitted on a 'gross' dollar basis last year, and that $296 million was properly deleted from our budget when the authority contained in section 626 was continued for the Department of Defense. Because of Bureau of the Budget instructions, and the current uncertainty as to the nature and extent of deutschemark support that will be available, our budget for fiscal year 1957 is again submitted on a 'gross' dollar basis, pending agreement on continued support. We will keep this committee advised of the progress of negotiations and hope to be able to provide definite figures prior to final action by the committee on this bill."

Based on the above, the following amounts were included in the fiscal year 1957 budget requests in lieu of continued deutschemark support:

Army:	
Military personnel	$4, 926, 000
Maintenance and operations	224, 018, 000
Total, Army	228, 944, 000
Air Force:	
Military personnel	1, 560, 000
Maintenance and operations	45, 815, 000
Total, Air Force	47, 375, 000
Total, Department of Defense	276, 319, 000

The amount of additional support to be provided by the Federal Republic of Germany remained unresolved while the bill was under consideration by the House of Representatives. The House committee, however, recommended the reduction of the $276,319,000 and stated in its report:

"While it is understood that negotiations for the extension of these arrangements into the ensuing fiscal year are now pending, the committee is assuming that the arrangements will be extended in substantially the present form."

Because agreement could not be reached prior to May 5, 1956, the expiration date of the existing agreement, on the nature and extent of continued deutschemark support to be provided to United States forces by the Federal Republic of Germany, interim arrangements were worked out under which the Federal Republic of Germany agreed to continue to provide support for United States forces through June 30, 1956, with settlement of the obligations incurred during this period dependent upon the outcome of the deutschemark-support negotiations.

On June 7, 1956, agreement was reached that the Federal Republic of Germany will provide United States forces with goods and services amounting to 650 million deutschemarks (equivalent to $154,761,900) for the 1-year period May 6, 1956 to May 5, 1957, inclusive. On a pro rata basis, it is anticipated that the equivalent of $41 million of this amount will be allocated to cover deutschemark obligations incurred under the interim arrangements for the period May 6 to June 30, 1956. This would provide the equivalent of $113,761,900 in deutschemark support for maintenance of United States forces in Germany in fiscal year 1957 through May 5, 1957.

It is not possible at this time to estimate what support the United States will receive from the Federal Republic of Germany after May 5, 1957, toward meeting the costs of maintaining United States forces in Germany. The nature and extent of continued support for the United States forces will depend in large part on the progress made by Germany in building up its own forces.

The fiscal year 1957 budget estimate of $276,319,000 in lieu of deutschemark support provided $261,757,200 for maintenance of United States forces in Germany and $14,561,800 for maintenance of United States forces in Berlin. It is anticipated that adequate deutschemark support will be provided by the Berlin magistrat, but, as stated above, only $113,761,900 can be considered definitely available in fiscal year 1957 in the Federal Republic of Germany, or $147,995,300 less than the budget estimate. On this basis, the amounts required for restoration to fund the military personnel and maintenance and operation appropriations of the Army and the Air Force through June 30, 1957, without taking into consideration the possible provision of continued support by the Federal Republic of Germany after May 5, 1957, are as follows:

	Army		Air Force	
	Military personnel	Maintenance and operations	Military personnel	Operation and maintenance
President's budget request	$3, 585, 000, 000	$3, 192, 000, 000	$3, 727, 000, 000	$3, 786, 000, 000
House action	3, 566, 704, 000	2, 954, 581, 000	3, 718, 440, 000	3, 684, 185, 000
Restoration requested May 17, 1956		12, 476, 000	7, 000, 000	56, 000, 000
Total requested of Senate, May 17, 1956	3, 566, 704, 000	2, 967, 057, 000	3, 725, 440, 000	3, 740, 185, 000
Additional funds required for fiscal year 1957 because of deficiency in deutschemark support	773, 400	121, 495, 770	245, 000	25, 481, 130
Revised total request to Senate	3, 567, 477, 400	3, 088, 552, 770	3, 725, 685, 000	3, 765, 666, 130

However, since the United States may receive continued deutschemark support from Germany after May 5, 1957, it might be the desire of the Congress not to finance by dollar appropriation at this time the costs of maintaining our forces in Germany during the period May 5 to June 30, 1957. On a pro rata basis, this would amount to $41 million, as shown in the attachment to this letter. On this basis, the amounts which would be required for restoration in the maintenance and operations appropriations of the Army and the Air Force are as follows:

	Maintenance and operations, Army	Operation and maintenance, Air Force
President's budget request	$3, 192, 000, 000	$3, 786, 000, 000
House action	2, 954, 581, 000	3, 684, 185, 000
Restoration requested, May 17, 1956	12, 476, 000	56, 000, 000
Total requested of Senate, May 17, 1956	2, 967, 057, 000	3, 740, 185, 000
Additional funds required through May 5, 1957, because of deficiency in deutschemark support	88, 369, 170	18, 626, 130
Revised total request to Senate	3, 055, 426, 170	3, 758, 811, 130

If it is the desire of the Congress to choose the latter course, it should be understood that in the absence of an adequate level of continued deutschemark support after May 5, 1957, additional dollar appropriations of up to $41 million would be required to bring the Military Personnel and Maintenance and Operations appropriations of the Army and the Air Force into line with the amounts currently approved by the House, plus the amounts currently required to offset the deficiency in deutschemark support.

Sincerely yours,

W. J. McNEIL.

Relation of requested restoration to amounts reduced from fiscal year 1957 budget in anticipation of continued availability of $276,319,000 deutschemark support

	Army			Air Force			
	Total	Military personnel	Maintenance and operations	Total	Military personnel	Operation and maintenance	Grand total
Reduction by House	$228, 944, 000	$4, 926, 000	$224, 018, 000	$47, 375, 000	$1, 560, 000	$45, 815, 000	$276, 319, 000
Less deutschemark support, Berlin Magistrat	12, 741, 530		12, 741, 530	1, 820, 270		1, 820, 270	14, 561, 800
Equals estimate for forces in Germany	216, 202, 470	4, 926, 000	211, 276, 470	45, 554, 730	1, 560, 000	43, 994, 730	261, 757, 200
Less deutschemark support available in fiscal year 1957 for forces in Germany	93, 933, 300	4, 152, 600	89, 780, 700	19, 828, 600	1, 315, 000	18, 513, 600	113, 761, 900
Equals additional funds required for fiscal year 1957	122, 269, 170	773, 400	121, 495, 770	25, 726, 130	245, 000	25, 481, 130	147, 995, 300
Less requirements for May 6 to June 30, 1957	33, 900, 000	773, 400	33, 126, 600	7, 100, 000	245, 000	6, 855, 000	41, 000, 000
Equals dollar restoration required through May 5, 1957	88, 369, 170		88, 369, 170	18, 626, 130		18, 626, 130	106, 995, 300

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the committee is of the belief that a more satisfactory arrangement should be made with the Federal Republic of Germany so that the cost of supporting our troops in Germany would be more equitably divided. For this reason, the Department of Defense request for restoration of funds to cover the deficiencies in deutschemark support was not allowed at this time. However, the committee wishes it understood that the reduction in funds shall in no wise interfere with planned troop strengths and facilities in Germany. I believe it only fair to caution the Senate that we may be forced to provide additional funds for this purpose at a later date in the event that more satisfactory arrangements cannot be achieved.

Mr. President, I should now like to return to the principal provisions of the bill as recommended by the committee.

For the Office of the Secretary of Defense there is provided a total of $14,950,000. This is the same sum recommended in the House bill and requested in the President's budget.

For interservice activities, the committee recommends $643,875,000. This is the same amount recommended in the House bill, but is $13.5 million less than the amount requested in the President's budget. The Department of Defense had also requested the reapportionment of $100 million for reserve tools and facilities. This was denied by the House because of the $200 million made available for this purpose in previous years only $15 million will finally remain allocated to the services. Furthermore, the Department of Defense has changed its policy in this regard and such tools will now be included in current production programs.

The Department of Defense has not requested restoration of any of these funds, and none are recommended by the committee.

For the Department of the Army, the committee recommends a total of $7,545,787,000. This is $48,205,000 more than the amount recommended in the House bill, but $215,638,000 less than the budget estimate. However, excluding the deletion of $228,944,000 in lieu of deutschemark support, the amount recommended by the committee is actually $13,306,000 in excess of the budget estimate.

The sum of $3,566,704,000 is provided for military personnel, the same amount as recommended in the House bill, but $18,296,000 below the budget estimate; $4,926,000 of this difference represents dollars in lieu of deutschemark support, $8,370,000 reflects savings in subsistence, and $5 million a reduction in travel. Aside from the deutschemark deficiencies, none of these reductions will affect the Army's ability to adequately support its planned June 30, 1957, personnel strength of 1,045,300 men, including the increased requirements in support of the Reserve Forces Act, and the distant early warning line.

The sum of $2,967,057,000 is provided for maintenance and operation. This is $12,476,000 more than the amount recommended in the House bill, but $224,943,000 below the budget estimate; $224,018,000 of the difference represents dollars in lieu of deutschemark support. Except for a reduction of $925,000 made by the House—the cost of tuition for 24 officers in civilian law schools—the committee recommends restoration of the funds deleted by the House from this appropriation, namely, $12,476,000. The committee believes the restoration of these funds is justified to assist the Department of the Army in meeting certain unanticipated expenses, such as increases in wage rates for foreign national employees of the Department and increases in railroad freight rates authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission. These increases were not known at the time the budget was prepared and were, therefore, not included.

The sum of $60 million is provided for military construction for Army Reserve forces. This is $20 million more than the amount recommended in the House bill and included in the budget estimate. The additional $20 million recommended by the committee is for National Guard military construction—$16 million for armory construction and $4 million for nonarmory construction. Testimony adduced before the committee revealed that these additional amounts are required if the National Guard military construction program is to proceed in an expeditious manner. The difficulties experienced with this construction program in past years have been largely removed and there is every reason to believe that these additional funds can be properly utilized during the coming fiscal year. This recommendation is related to the committee's recommendation for an increase in Army National Guard strength during the coming fiscal year.

The committee recommends for the Army National Guard a total of $321,492,000—$15,492,000 more than the amount recommended in the House bill and included in the budget estimate. Of this increase, $11,162,000 is to provide for an additional 16,900 Army National Guard men on drill pay status during fiscal year 1957, raising the total end strength to 425,000 as compared with a budgeted end strength of 408,100 men. The budgeted strength for end fiscal year 1957 is only 1,000 greater than the estimated strength on June 30, 1956. The committee feels the Army National Guard should be encouraged to continue its growth in consonance with the intent of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. An increase of only 1,000 during fiscal year 1957 is entirely unrealistic.

Testimony before the committee clearly revealed that on a conservative basis the guard could readily attain an end fiscal year 1957 strength of 425,000.

The committee also recommends an additional $4 million to enable the Army National Guard to increase the number of technicians by 552, and to provide for the equalization of the Army National Guard technician pay-grade structure. If this is not done, the additional cost of reclassification will have to be absorbed through reduction in pay or by no new authorized employment. The committee also recommends the appropriation of $330,000 to assure National Guard teams the opportunity of attending national rifle matches during fiscal year 1957.

I think every Senator is familiar with the national rifle matches which take place every year, and which have taken place annually for many years.

The sum of $215 million is recommended for the Army Reserve, the same amount recommended in the House bill, but $8 million less than the budget estimate. A major portion of this reduction is to reflect more realistic estimates of the number of men who might be expected to enter the 6-month training program authorized under the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. This reduction should in no wise slow down this important program. The funds recommended will provide for a total of 298,600 Army reservists on drill-pay status for the end of fiscal year 1957 compared with an estimated 215,055 on June 30, 1956, an increase of almost 85,000. The Department of the Army has not requested restoration of the funds deleted by the House, and none is recommended by the committee.

The sum of $410 million is recommended for Army research and development. This is the same amount as that recommended in the House bill and included in the budget estimate. This sum is $77 million more than the amount appropriated for this purpose for fiscal year 1956. It should enable the Army to carry on a vigorous and farsighted research and development program, particularly in the guided-missile and electronics fields.

The committee received information to the effect that this is one area in which the United States may be backward, and in which some military men feel that Soviet Russia may be ahead of us.

There is an urgent need for the Army to develop and introduce into the forces the new and modern weapons required to insure a highly mobile force with the utmost capability and fire power.

For the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, the committee recommends a total of $534,000—$237,000 more than the amount recommended in the House bill and $109,000 greater than the budget estimate. This board is responsible for encouraging rifle practice, particularly among those citizens not ordinarily reached in the Army training programs. For example, high-school boys are taught to shoot a .22 caliber rifle or a .30-caliber rifle.

It is the opinion of the committee that rifle practice aids national preparedness by providing able-bodied citizens training in the use of small arms. It was testified before the committee that funds were not available for the purchase of .22-caliber ammunition for the younger age group and for travel of civilian teams to national rifle matches and small-arms firing schools. The Department of the Army requested restoration of $128,000 for travel and the committee recommends the appropriation of this amount. In addition, the committee recommends the appropriation of $109,000 for the purchase of .22 caliber ammunition, and also approval of section 633 of the general provisions of this bill which authorizes transfer of other types of ammunition to the board, without reimbursement.

The sum of $5 million is recommended for the Alaska communication system, the same amount recommended in the House bill and included in the budget estimate.

No new funds were requested for Army procurement and production for fiscal year 1957 since ample funds are available from prior year appropriations. It is estimated that the Army will carry over into fiscal year 1957 a total of $2,113,000,000 in this appropriation. That is the backlog. This will adequately support the Army's obligational program of $1,386,000,000 planned for fiscal year 1957. A large proportion of these funds will be devoted to the procurement of guided missiles, aircraft, and other modern weapons.

The committee recommends for the Department of the Navy a shade less than $10 billion—$9,999,997,000. This is $463,000 more than the amount recommended in the House bill but $47,603,000 less than the budget estimate.

For naval petroleum reserves, the committee recommends $1,183,000—$500,000 more than the amount recommended in the House bill but $29,000 less than the budget estimate. The House deleted from the budget request $529,000 for the proposed exploration and drilling on San Nicholas Island, Calif., as there appears to be no authority or justification for this project. However, no funds were requested by the Navy for the maintenance, protection, and conservation of the Government's oil-shale plant at Rifle, Colo. The committee supports the House deletion of $529,000 for exploration and drilling but recommends the inclusion of $500,000 for the oil-shale plant at Rifle, Colo.

For servicewide operations the committee recommends $102,435,000—$37,000 less than the amount recommended in the House bill, and $73,000 less than the budget estimate. The Navy had included in this appropriation request funds for furnishing six sets of flag officers' quarters. The number of quarters was subsequently reduced to 3, and $36,000 was deleted by the House. Since the remaining 3 sets of quarters have not as yet been approved by the Congress, the committee recommends a further reduction of $37,000 from the bill for furnishing and maintenance of these quarters, on the grounds that they are not likely to be available for occupancy during the coming fiscal year.

That reference is to the quarters which are to be built on the Naval Observatory grounds off Massachusetts Avenue. Money was requested for furniture and equipment, when, as a matter of fact, the housing will not be completed during this year.

For all other Department of the Navy appropriations, the committee recommends the same amounts recommended in the House bill.

The sum of $2,478,316,000 is provided for Navy military personnel. This should enable the Navy to support a military personnel strength for June 30, 1957, of 678,223.

The sum of $647,100,000 is provided for Marine Corps military personnel. This will provide the Marine Corps with a personnel strength of 205,735 for June 30, 1957.

For aircraft and related procurement in the Navy, $1,732,900,000 is recommended, the same amount recommended in the House bill and included in the budget estimate. These funds will provide for the procurement of almost 1,500 new aircraft for the Navy and Marine Corps. This quantity, when combined with aircraft procured with prior year funds, will result in deliveries of approximately 2,000 aircraft per year through calendar year 1958. The funds recommended will enable the Navy to begin production engineering and procurement of long lead-time components and materials for two new models of aircraft in advance of their actual production. Additional funds will have to be provided in the 1958 budget to procure sufficient quantities of these particular models to permit accelerated test and evaluation. This procedure of concurrent design and production engineering should speed up the flow of modern aircraft to the Navy, and yet avoid cost by premature production orders.

For shipbuilding and conversion, the committee recommends a total of $1,479,700,000—the same amount recommended in the House bill and included in the budget estimate. This will finance the Navy's 1957 shipbuilding program, consisting of 23 ship, including a sixth *Forrestal* carrier, 12 destroyers and frigate guided-missile ships, 1 nuclear-powered guided-missile cruiser, and 6 nuclear-powered submarines, plus 4,629 tons of landing craft. It also includes the conversion and modernization of 22 ships, including 4 attack aircraft carriers, 5 guided-missile light cruisers, 1 amphibious assault ship, 1 attack transport, 1 seaplane tender, 6 radar picket escort vessels, and 4 ocean radar-station ships, together with about 16,000 tons of service and other small craft. The program also includes funds to commence design and advanced procurement of a powerplant for a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier.

The committee recommends a total of $95 million for Naval Reserve personnel and $26,800,000 for Marine Corps Reserve personnel. This will provide the Naval Reserve with a total of 165,359 men in drill-pay status and the Marine Corps Reserve with a total of 60,060 by June 30, 1957. This is an increase of a little over 5,000 in the Naval Reserve and almost 10,000 in the Marine Corps Reserve during fiscal year 1957.

The committee recommends $492 million for Navy research and development, a reduction of $1 million from the budget estimate, but an increase of more than $60 million over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1956. There is a difference of only $1 million as between the budget estimate and the recommendation.

The reduction of $1 million reflects an effort to force the Navy to screen out questionable projects in the so-called military-science program. The funds provided should enable the Navy to carry forward a vigorous program of research and development, particularly in the aircraft and guided missile fields.

I shall not discuss in detail the remaining Department of the Navy appropriations, except to say that the funds recommended by the committee should be fully adequate to carry forward the Navy program as presented to the Congress.

Mr. President, before I discuss the committee's recommendations for the Department of the Air Force, I should like to touch briefly on the committee action with regard to several other matters.

With respect to section 612: Scrap and salvage, the committee recommends an increase of $22,500,000 in the limitation on funds expended for the preparation for sale and salvage of scrap and surplus materials, raising the amount from $31 million to $53,500,000. These funds are generated from receipts from the sale of scrap, salvage, and surplus materials. Receipts from the sale of surplus are included for the first time. It is the objective of the proposed section 612 to establish a single all-inclusive fund to finance the Department of Defense disposal program which heretofore had been financed from several sources. This increase in the limitation will permit the Department of Defense to put greater emphasis on the program for getting rid of old scrap, salvage, and surplus materials, thereby freeing warehouse space for other more useful purposes.

What the section actually does in practice is to provide that all the funds now being used for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps—for all agencies of the Department of Defense—shall be at the disposal of one particular agency, in a revolving fund, which will handle the whole matter. We believe it can be done better in that way, and that it will save the Government some money.

With respect to the Air Force industrial fund, the committee recommends the following provision:

> During the fiscal year 1957 there is hereby authorized to be transferred to the Air Force industrial fund not to exceed $40 million from the Navy industrial fund and not to exceed $110 million from the Army industrial fund.

The committee deleted language provided by the House which would rescind these amounts from the respective accounts of the Army and Navy. The effect of this amendment would be to authorize the transfer of funds from the Army and Navy industrial funds to the Air Force industrial fund so as to enable the Air Force to place the Military Air Transport Service and eight major aircraft overhaul installations under industrial funding. The funds provided constitute the amount needed to finance the recoverable costs of work in process until the Air Force industrial fund can be reimbursed by the customer agencies. Various groups and commissions, including the Hoover Commission, which have studied Defense Department operations, have strongly urged the application of the industrial fund principle to these types of activities.

The committee feels the advantages to be gained by placing these activities under industrial funding are so great that no obstacles should be placed in the way of the early accomplishment of this objective.

In making this recommended change, however, the committee wishes to make it clear that the Department of Defense should, in the future, utilize the services of commercial transportation to the fullest extent possible when it is more economical; and that in evaluating relative costs of transportation the Department should recognize the element of time saved as an important factor.

The committee recommends the inclusion of the following new section—section 635, expense of development—requested by the Department of Defense:

Appropriations available to the Department of Defense for major procurement of aircraft and missiles shall be available for expenses of development.

The procurement appropriations of the military departments have for several years provided funds for financing development of items being procured and produced, although the language of these appropriations does not specifically cover such expenses. The expenditures for development being made from procurement appropriations are generally associated with the missiles program. In the interest of avoiding any delays in the program, because of technicalities, the foregoing amendment is recommended.

The proposal would involve no change from past and present practice concerning the use of the funds from the procurement appropriations for the development aspects associated with the procurement and production of missiles. The purpose would be to support present practices of using procurement funds for those portions of development which are inseparable from the production phase in the procurement of weapons.

With respect to the disposal of commercial activities, the committee has taken no action to restore section 638 of the 1956 act, which was identical to section 633 of this bill, as reported to the House.

This would have permitted committee action, either approving or disapproving, the disposal or transfer, by contract or otherwise, of work that for a period of 3 years or more has been performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense. However, the committee directs the Department of Defense to maintain all such facilities and activities within the Department, unless such disposal or transfer is economically justified, and unless no increased costs result. The Department of Defense is directed to report periodically to this committee on actions taken regarding such disposal or transfer.

The committee recommends for the Department of the Air Force a total of $16,779,125,000—$1,300,000,000 more than the amount provided by the House version of the bill, and $1,112,625,000 more than the budget request.

These particular recommendations were the subject of considerable discussion in the committee. The majority view is that the Air Force program should be further accelerated, especially the buildup of the strategic long-range air forces. In order to receive firsthand information on this matter, the committee invited Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, the commanding general of the Strategic Air Command, to appear before it. General LeMay made it very clear, in his testimony before the committee, that he did not consider the Air Force budget presented to the Congress fully adequate to the Nation's needs as he saw them.

It was the opinion of the majority of the committee, at least, that General LeMay, because he is in command of the Strategic Air Force is in a better position to tell the Congress and the country what is actually needed in order adequately to protect and safeguard the general welfare and defense of the United States than is anyone else of whom we know.

It was brought out in the hearings that the Air Force's fiscal year 1957 budget request contained about $5 billion for SAC. The SAC forces proposed by General LeMay to the committee would according to his estimate, cost about $8 billion per year, $3 billion more than is contained in the fiscal year 1957 budget. Yet these are not the forces General LeMay thinks we require in order to maintain our air supremacy over the U. S. S. R. in 1960; rather they are the forces he believes we can attain without resorting to what he calls extraordinary measures.

General LeMay told the committee:

The principal requirements for support of this force are, first, a portion of the force must be maintained on a continuous combat alert. This means more people on a proved experience level and special facilities designed for this function. Simpler, more rugged bombs will also be necessary. Second, the force must be dispersed to the extent that managerial efficiency will permit. This means more bases. Third, the security of the force requires a communications and control system, both rapid and foolproof. This system must tie all elements of the Strategic Air Command, the Continental Air Defense Command, and the highest national authorities into one common net. Fourth, the maximum number of nonstrategic Air Command military air bases and civil airfields must be made compatible with Strategic Air Command aircraft for emergency use. Every airfield we develop under the minimum standards for Strategic Air Command use increases our flexibility and complicates the Soviet task. Fifth, research and development must be urgently pressed on the successor to the B–52, on missiles and on other aids which will enhance our ability to penetrate enemy defenses. We must have a modernized force in being to meet each new threat as it develops.

In brief, General LeMay says he needs more modern aircraft, more bases, more highly trained people, and more research and development.

The committee recognizes that more money alone will not provide all that General LeMay requires; but to the extent that it would help in maintaining our air superiority over the U. S. S. R., it should be provided. The committee recognizes that since 1945, the greatest single deterrent to war has been the strength of the United States Air Force, together with its possession of nuclear weapons. If we are to believe the experts, today the United States is in danger of falling behind in the development and production of the means to deliver this "greatest single deterrent."

The amendments totaling $1 billion 160 million which have been added to the Air Force portion of this bill are the committee's answer to this threat. That is the answer of the committee, and I think it is the answer that the American people would give to this threat.

We do not hold that this additional sum will prevent war any more than the lack of it will bring on a conflict. But we do believe that we dare not, we must not gamble on the security of our way of life, on the very existence of our Nation by hamstringing the production of our most effective weapons. This committee, this Congress, cannot produce B–52 bombers and modern fighters. Nor can it do the research necessary to produce the weapons of the future to counterbalance those being produced by other nations. But we can provide the funds necessary to do this, and we can alert the people of this Nation to the dangers of falling behind in production, in research, in development, of those weapons and those systems without which we might well become a second-rate airpower.

There may be those who would wish to muddy our thinking by referring to the single-weapon fallacy. Let me say right now that I am not one who believes that through airpower alone we can remain invincible. Our Army, our Navy, and our Marine Corps are an integral part of our defense team. We could never win a war or hope to keep the peace without them.

Nor am I one who is forgetful of the tremendous costs of this preparedness. How much better it would be if we could reduce our Armed Forces to a real peacetime basis, refrain from spending these billions upon billions for armament, and instead pour our energies entirely into making this country, this world, a better place in which to live.

But we must constantly remember that this expense is small when balanced against the frightful costs of war—not only in money, but in the men, women, and children who might well be obliterated, vaporized, in the conflict—and in the exhaustion of our natural resources, and our moral fiber, so precious if we are to continue to develop this great Nation.

And so the majority of our committee has recommended the addition of $1,160,000,000 to this bill, divided into 5 appropriation titles: $800 million for aircraft; $200 million for base construction; $100 million for research and development; $40 million for operation and maintenance; and $20 million for personnel.

I shall speak of each of these briefly in turn as I come to them.

Specifically, the committee recommends, for aircraft and related procurement, a total of $6,848,500,000—$800 million more than the amount recommended in both the House bill and the budget estimate. These additional funds are to be used primarily for increasing the production of heavy bombers for the Strategic Air Command. At the same time, should it be deemed advisable, part of these funds may be used to increase the production of fighter aircraft for the continental defense.

For procurement other than aircraft, the committee recommends $1,177,000,000—$77 million more than recommended in the House bill but the same

amount contained in the budget estimate. In restoring the $77 million deleted by the House, the committee took cognizance of Air Force testimony to the effect that these funds were required to finance certain additional budgetary requirements which were not included in the budget submission. These requirements were for the acceleration of the air defense missile program, increases in support equipment for missile programs, modification and alinement of training equipment with recent changes in aircraft programs, additional equipment, equipment for the western extension of the distant early warning line, and increased equipment costs for SAGE, and the DEW line. These requirements the Air Force estimates will far exceed the $77 million restored by the committee.

Ask the average member of the American public if he would like to have that much insurance for the protection of his country. We are willing to rest our case on that basis.

For research and development, the committee recommends $710 million—$100 million more than the amount recommended in the House bill and contained in the budget estimate. Sufficient evidence was adduced in testimony before the committee to indicate that additional funds could very profitably be used in the research and development program of the Air Force.

Although Air Force Secretary Quarles indicated that he considered the Air Force budget request for research and development "an austere but satisfactory level, requiring further very careful study," General Twining made it clear that he felt the Air Force could profitably use additional funds in that area. What does "an austere but satisfactory level" mean? It means a tightening. It means a squeezing of the pocketbook. In these days when our Government gives $4 billion for foreign aid, some persons whimper about $100 million being appropriated for research and development for the protection of the country.

General Callahan, the Air Force Assistant for Programing, also stated:

> In my judgment, we could usefully obligate on the order of $150 million to $200 million more during fiscal year 1957 in research and development.

The $100 million proposed for research and development is recommended because the high priority projects such as ballistic missiles and atom power aircraft are using such a large part of the research dollars available to the Air Force that many other important worthwhile projects are being squeezed out of the program or inadequately financed, thereby reducing our technical leadership in many areas.

For operations and maintenance, the committee recommends a total of $3,780,185,000, an increase of $96 million over the amount recommended in the House bill, but $5,815,000 less than the budget estimate. As in the case of the Army, the Air Force budget estimate for operations and maintenance contained $45,815,000 in lieu of deutschemark support. Excluding this item, the committee recommendation actually adds $40 million to the budget estimate. This $40 million has been added to the bill to support the increased operational and force buildup. In addition the committee recommends restoration of $56 million deleted by the House, as requested by the Air Force. This will permit the Air Force to support approved activities and force buildup which are essential to meet approved program objectives.

Specifically, the $56 million will provide $30 million for aviation fuel and oil, $6 million for logistic support, $15 million for operational support, $4 million for training support, and $1 million for servicewide support.

For military personnel, the committee recommends a total of $3,745,440,000, which is $27 million more than the amount recommended in the House bill, and $18,440,000 more than the budget estimate. Excluding $1,560,000 included in the budget estimate in lieu of deutschemark support, the committee recommendations actually add $20 million to the budget estimate.

The Air Force testified that restoration of $7 million is necessary in order to reassign and deploy military personnel on a permanent change of station basis in order to accomplish the required manning of the additional six wings and support units planned for activation during the fiscal year 1957. The increase of $20 million is provided for additional personnel needed to implement an augmented Air Force.

The committee also recommends language similar to that contained in Senate Document 127 be included in the bill. This would permit the utilization of $57,853,000 of the 1957 appropriation to pay obligations incurred under this head in fiscal 1956. It was testified that the additional sum is required to cover unanticipated increases in certain personnel costs associated with a larger number of reenlistments than previously estimated. Unless additional funds are supplied, increased costs cannot be met without reducing the planned level of personnel.

The committee recommends a total of $59,300,000 for Air Force Reserve personnel and $258,700,000 for the Air National Guard. These are the same amounts recommended in the House bill and included in the budget estimates. These funds will provide for a total of 67,980 men in drill pay status in the Air National Guard and 99,685 in the Air Force Reserve.

The committee recommends an appropriation at this time of $200 million for "Military construction, Air Force," in order to provide, at the earliest possible time, needed funds for the construction of bases required for the proper operation of the larger aircraft. Total military construction requests for fiscal year 1957 for the Air Force amount to $1,228,000,000 and have not yet been acted upon by the Congress. In recommending an immediate appropriation of $200 million, the committee is acting on the assumption that a like amount will be deducted from the appropriation request for military construction in the supplemental appropriation bill, 1957. The net effect of this action is to make construction funds available to the Air Force earlier than would otherwise be possible, to be utilized in accordance with the recommendations contained in the justification already submitted to our committee and to the House Appropriations Committee.

We wished to give them that much lead time, and probably when the appropriations for construction are made in the supplemental appropriation bill, this amount will be deducted from the total appropriated for the Air Force for that purpose.

It will permit the Air Force to proceed immediately with construction for the dispersal of the SAC forces, the construction needed for the ballistic missiles program and for certain classified projects which are of great importance to the United States. Making these funds available now will permit contracting at an early date and start on the projects this fall and avoid a delay in these projects until next spring, which would be the case if the Air Force was required to wait for the passage of the regular public-works appropriations bill.

Mr. President, the committee, in recommending appropriations of this great magnitude, almost $35 billion, excluding—except for $200 million—funds for military construction, fully recognizes the financial burden imposed on the American people. But the Congress has a responsibility, not only to guard the public purse, but also to guard the Nation's security.

The cost of national defense is unavoidably increasing, primarily because of the increasing costs of new weapons. Practically every new item of equipment procured for our military forces costs considerably more, sometimes 2 or 3 times more than the item it replaces. Yet it is only by developing, producing, and integrating these new weapons into our military forces as rapidly as feasible that we can continue to assure our national security in an increasingly dangerous world.

Clearly, under these circumstances, greater economy and efficiency in the management of the Defense Establishment is an absolute necessity. Numerous examples of duplication have been forcibly brought to the attention of the committee. In some cases, the committee believes this duplication borders on unconscionable waste of the country's resources, not only in materials, but in land resources, manpower, and money.

The committee recognizes that in limited areas of research and development, certain parallel research efforts will unavoidably be necessary for the sake of rapid progress. The committee is also aware that healthy competition among the services is desirable. But the committee expresses deep concern over duplication of functions and facilities among the services which tend to reduce the overall effectiveness of our military effort.

The committee is well aware that the Congress cannot legislate departmental economy. It is also aware that this Nation cannot expect a balanced economy unless and until officials charged with the responsibility for these vast spending programs make a renewed effort to curtail nonessential expenditures.

Within the Department of Defense, unification of the armed services must

be made a fact, and the joint use of existing facilities where feasible must be made mandatory. Construction of new facilities should be initiated only when existing facilities are fully utilized.

Mr. President, the bill which is now before the Senate provides the funds necessary to support the size and kind of forces needed to assure the peace and security of the United States in the years to come.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, first I wish to commend the Senator from New Mexico for his excellent description of the action taken by the committee. As one who listened to most of the testimony and studied the evidence submitted to the committee, I would say that his statement covers very clearly the action of the committee.

It is my understanding that the committee was unanimous, with the exception of several items concerning the Air Force. I should like to bring out that fact, if I may, at the present time, so as to develop what the issues are as between the majority and the minority of the committee. The differences all relate to the Air Force.

In the committee the distinguished Senator from New Mexico offered an amendment which would have increased the budget estimates on certain aircraft items, to wit, aircraft and procurement, research and development, operation and maintenance, personnel, and military construction, by a total of $1,160 million.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The total consists of the sums of $800 million, $200 million, $100 million, $40 million, and $20 million.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. There is $200 million for an advance on construction.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That amendment was adopted in committee by a vote of 13 to 12. Afterward, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, submitted an amendment on the floor of the Senate, of which I and several other Senators are sponsors, which would reduce the amounts proposed to be appropriated by the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico, as follows:

Aircraft and related procurement. The amount recommended by the Senator from New Mexico is $800 million additional. The amount provided by the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire is $350 million. There is a difference of $450 million.

For research and development, the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico provides an increase of $100 million over the estimate of the Budget Bureau, and the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire carries the same figure.

For operation and maintenance, the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico provides $40 million, and the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire provides $30 million. So there is a difference of $10 million there.

For personnel, the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico provides $20 million, and the Bridges amendment provides $20 million. The amounts are the same.

For military construction, the Senator from New Mexico would provide $200 million now, while the Senator from New Hampshire would strike out the amendment and allow it to come up in the regular construction bill.

So that, boiled down, the committee was unanimous except as to the three items, namely, aircraft and related procurement, where there is a difference of $450 million; operation and maintenance, where there is a difference of $10 million; and the question of whether any military construction money shall be included in this bill or whether it shall be considered in a later bill.

Does the Senator from New Mexico agree with me that the issues, as we see them, concern those three items?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Unless some individual Member of the Senate has an amendment which he wishes to offer, there is no other difference of opinion?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. The only differences are between the $800 million in my amendment and the $350 million in the Bridges amendment, the difference of $10 million with reference to operation and maintenance, and the difference of $200 million in construction.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator, and I appreciate his statement this afternoon, to which I have listened with attention, following him as he finished reading his pages, because of the details involved.

I hope to have a few remarks of my own to make on the general subject, either tomorrow or on Monday. But I wish to commend the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts, and I wish to assure the Senate that the members of the Committee on Appropriations, both the subcommittee and the full committee, on both sides of the so-called political line, were at all times most cooperative. I do not believe any politics was involved, whatsoever.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am sure the Senator is correct. There was simply a difference of opinion as to whether we should try to advance the time for building a greater number of aircraft.

Mr. CHAVEZ. One redeeming feature, as I think my good friend from Massachusetts will agree with me, is that a supplemental bill will carry the construction items. When military construction is dealt with in the supplemental bill, I would be willing to go along with the Senator from Massachusetts in deducting this amount from that bill. The only reason why I think it is necessary now is to gain a little time during the construction season.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator from New Mexico that the Air Force needs the full amount of construction money covered by the estimate. That amount, if my memory is correct, is $1,228,000,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. What difference would it make if we granted this much extra time during the construction months? In a few months it will be getting cold in many places.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We should also make sure that we know what projects are authorized and on what projects we are going to allow money to be spent, rather than to put $200 million into construction now, even though it may have been authorized in the past.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think it would be a good principle if we handled all these items in one bill, because they can cover a multitude of sins by the time the supplemental bill is taken up. It is usually said that the projects were not ready at the time of the regular appropriation bill. I think it would be a good, sound principle to put them in the regular bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from New Mexico has had much experience in these matters. I again commend him for his thoughtful statement and for the courtesy and patience with which he conducted the hearings during the past few weeks.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

DISPERSION OF DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Government of the United States maintains a sound policy of dispersion with respect to defense industries. I think, in part, that policy, perhaps, ought to be constantly subject to review, but it has been carefully arrived at and, from time to time, has been amended. The people of the United States believe in the wisdom of a sound policy of dispersion of defense industries.

Mr. President, tomorrow the Senate will debate H. R. 9852 which provides for certain amendments to the Defense Production Act of 1950. I very much regret that an amendment has been submitted by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] which, if adopted, would write into the defense production bill a statement with respect to the congressional policy of dispersion, a statement, which, in my judgment, has not been carefully considered, and which would create confusion. It completely avoids inclusion of many of the carefully drawn criteria which the Office of Defense Mobilization has prepared in the present dispersal order. Indeed, Mr. President, the Department of Defense, speaking through the Department of the Air Force, has registered its objection to the so-called geographic dispersal amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah.

In connection with tomorrow's debate I wish the Members of the Senate to have readily available to them a copy of the present Federal order with respect to dispersal. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Defense Mobilization Order No. 1–19, issued by the Office of Defense Mobilization and signed by Arthur S. Flemming, Director, be printed in full in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the order was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION—DEFENSE MOBILIZATION ORDER I–19

Subject: Dispersion and Protective Construction—Policy, Criteria, Responsibilities.

By virtue of the authority vested in me pursuant to the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; Reorganization Plan No. 3, effective June 12, 1953; and the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; the following policy, criteria, and assignment of responsibilities for dispersion and protective construction are promulgated:

1. Policy: It is the policy of the United States to encourage and, when appropriate, to require that new facilities and major expansions of existing facilities important to national security be located, insofar as practicable, so as to reduce the risk of damage in the event of attack; and to encourage and, when appropriate, require the incorporation of protective construction features in new and existing facilities to provide resistance to weapons effects suitable to the locations of said facilities.

2. Criteria:

(a) The distance of a facility from the probable area of destruction is the controlling factor in reducing the risk of attack damage to such facility. In determining the appropriate distance consideration will be given to all relevant factors, including:

(1) The most likely objects or targets of enemy attack, such as certain military, industrial, population, and governmental concentrations.

(2) The size of such targets.

(3) The destructive power of a large yield weapon or weapons suitable to the particular target.

(4) The gradation of pressures and thermal radiation at various distances from an assumed point of detonation.

(5) The characteristics of the proposed facility, including underground and built-in protective construction features, with respect to its resistance to nuclear, chemical, and unconventional weapons.

(6) The degree of damage which a facility could sustain and still remain operable.

(7) The ground environment or natural barriers which might provide added protection to the facility.

(8) The economic, operational, and administrative requirements in carrying out the function for which the facility is to be provided.

b. While no single distance standard and no single set of protective construction specifications against nuclear, chemical, and unconventional weapons are feasible for all situations, the above factors will be applied so as to achieve the most protection practicable for a specific situation.

3. Responsibilities:

(a) All departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Federal Government are responsible for adherence to the policy and criteria herein set forth with respect to programs under their control. Without limitation, specific reference is made to the following:

(1) All agencies: (a) Programs for minimizing the vulnerability of the mobilization base (DMO–I–4, paragraph 17); (b) consideration of dispersed location and protective construction in the review of application for tax amortization (DMO–III–1, paragraphs 4 and 5; DMO–VI–4); (c) application of dispersion standards to facilities of the executive branch, in accordance with policy and standards issued by Director, Office of Defense Mobilization.

(2) Department of Defense: Programs for maximum use of dispersed plants, and development of standards for strategic locations and physical security. (DMO–I–12, par. 2 (g) (h) and (o).)

(3) Department of the Interior: Programs for continuity of production of certain assigned industries. (DMO–I–13, par. 2 (j).)

(4) Department of Agriculture: Programs for operation of vital food facilities. (DMO–I–9, par. 2 (h).)

(5) Department of Commerce: Programs for dispersion and continuity of production. (DMO–I–8, par. 2 (g) and (h).)

(6) Federal Civil Defense Administration: Development and coordination of plans and programs for the reduction of urban vulnerability. (DMO–I–18.)

(b) The Department of Commerce (Office of Area Development) is responsible for providing guidance and assistance to departments and agencies of the Federal Government, to industry, public and private persons and organizations including local dispersion committees, in the application of the policy and criteria contained herein.

(1) By agreement between the Department of Defense and the Department of Commerce, Department of Defense will provide guidance on certain industrial and other nonmilitary projects in which it has a direct and special interest.

(2) The Department of Commerce may make similar arrangements with other departments and agencies to provide guidance on projects in which they have a direct and special interest, provided that reasonable safeguards to assure consistency and uniformity in the application of the policy and standards are maintained.

(3) The Department of Defense is responsible for the application of this policy to military projects without consultation with the Department of Commerce, but with due regard to the location of other vital facilities and plans for reduction of urban vulnerability as developed by the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

(c) The Federal Civil Defense Administration, responsible for the development and coordination of plans and programs for the reduction of urban vulnerability, is responsible for integrating at the metropolitan target zone level dispersion actions with all other measures which can make urban areas less attractive targets. It is also responsible for promulgating construction standards and specifications for the protection of persons and property from nuclear and unconventional weapons effects. The Department of Commerce and all others concerned will be governed by such standards in rendering the guidance and assistance described in paragraph b, above.

4. Decisions: This order supersedes the dispersion policy statement of August 10, 1951.

5. This order is effective immediately.

OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, *Director.*

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I very much hope the Members of the Senate will study that order and then contrast it with the language contained in House bill 9852 which will be before the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that section 4 of House bill 9852 be printed in the RECORD at this point in my marks.

There being no objection, section 4 of House bill 9852 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 4. Section 2 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"In order to insure productive capacity in the event of such an attack on the United States, it is the policy of the Congress to promote the geographical dispersal of the industrial facilities of the United States in the interest of the national defense, and to discourage the concentration of such productive facilities within limited geographical areas which are vulnerable to attack by an enemy of the United States. In the construction of any Government-owned industrial facilities, in the rendition of any Government financial assistance for the construction, expansion, or improvement of any industrial facilities, and in the procurement of goods and services, under this or any other act, each department and agency of the Executive Branch shall apply, under the coordination of the Office of Defense Mobilization, when practicable and consistent with existing law and the desirablity for maintaining a sound economy, the principle of the geographical dispersal of such facilities in the interest of national defense. Nothing contained in this paragraph shall preclude the use of existing industrial facilities.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, tomorrow I shall object to the provision of the House bill with respect to dispersion. I shall do so because the provision is not well considered and because it does not spell out the entire criteria which was spelled out by the Government of the United States in its order. If it is the wish and desire of Congress to pass judgment on a sound dispersal policy, then I commend the present order of the Office of Defense Mobilization to their attention.

FREE OR REDUCED RATE FOR AIR TRANSPORTATION OF MINISTERS OF RELIGION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3149) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to permit air carriers to grant free or reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That subsection (b) of section 403 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following sentence: "Any air carrier or foreign air carrier, under such terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe, may grant reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion, except that such a carrier may not grant such reduced-rate transportation during any period with respect to which it receives any compensation, determined under section 406 of this act, which is payable by the Board pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 10 of 1953."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit air carriers and foreign air carriers, subject to certain conditions, to grant reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House of Representatives, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, and Mr. PAYNE conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that, in accordance with the order previously entered, the Senate now stand adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, June 22, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 21, 1956:

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF LOCOMOTIVE INSPECTION

Howard H. Shannon, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Director of Locomotive Inspection, vice James H. Friend, resigning.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Richard E. Robinson, of Nebraska, to be United States district judge for the district of Nebraska, vice James A. Donohoe, deceased.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Prof. Thomas Dodson Stamps, O8560, United States Military Academy, for appointment as Dean of the Academic Board of the United States Military Academy, under the provisions of an act of Congress adopted June 26, 1946 (Public Law 449, 79th Cong.).

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. Frederic Joseph Brown, O16761, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Thomas Morgan Watlington, O16780, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Leander LaChance Doan, O16839, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Frederick Sink, O16907, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Willis Small Matthews, O16932, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Gerald Edward Galloway, O16043, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. William Clyde Baker, Jr., O16371, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Clerin Rodney Smith, O16388, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Bertram Arthur Holtzworth, O16804, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Herbert John Vander Heide, O17754, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Weldon Dunn, O18157, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Phillips Daley, O18358, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Theodore William Parker, O18369, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Orlando Collette Troxel, Jr., O18487, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Rush Blodget Lincoln, Jr., O18656, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Floyd Allan Hansen, O18767, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Alexander McNair Willing, O38619, United States Army.

Col. James Harvey Cash 2d, O38628, United States Army.

Col. Charles Coburn Smith, Jr., O18434, United States Army.

Col. John Joseph Davis, O18530, United States Army.

Col. Curtis James Herrick, O18538, United States Army.

Col. Richard Steinbach, O18560, United States Army.

Col. John Edward Leary, O18607, United States Army.

Col. Hal Cushman Pattison, O29683, United States Army.

Col. John Henry Weber, O18680, United States Army.

Col. Kenneth Frederick Zitzman, O18694, United States Army.

Col. Frank Hamilton Britton, O18703, United States Army.

Col. Edwin Simpson Hartshorn, Jr., O18716, United States Army.

Col. Stephen Michael Melinik, O18754, United States Army.

Col. Charles Salvatore D'Orsa, O18866, United States Army.

Col. Loris Ray Cochran, O18889, United States Army.

Col. Lawrence Joseph Lincoln, O18968, United States Army.

Col. John Gardner Shinkle, O18979, United States Army.

Col. Chester Arthur Dahlen, O19020, United States Army.

Col. George Warren White, O19079, United States Army.

Col. Edgar Collins Doleman, O19131, United States Army.

Col. Charles Francis Tank, O19350, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert George MacDonnell, O19361, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Stanley Robert Larsen, O22094, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be colonels

Adams, Robert H., O19474.
Alexander, David C., Jr., O39901.
Allen, Chester F., O30060.
Amoroso, Leonard, O30076.
Andersen, Hal P., O39920.
Anderson, Chester H., O30096.
Anderson, Townsend C., O30195.
Andrae, Herbert H., O19546.
Andrews, Charles L., O19363.
Armstrong, Donald K., O18578.
Bahr, Robert C., O19470.
Baker, Elverson E., O30183.
Baker, Robert G., O19427.
Baker, Samuel E., O42395.
Barber, Keith H., O39606.
Barry, George W., O39916.
Beauchamp, Edwin LeP., O51444.
Beck, Vancel R., O30233.
Bender, Thomas W., O30162.
Bergmann, John A., O42300.
Berkowitz, Charles J., O39854.
Betts, Austin W., O19373.
Bilbo, Theodore G., Jr., O19477.
Billings, William H., O30098.
Blair, Robert K., O51526.
Blankenship, Francis R., O42330.
Blaser, Eugene V., O42364.
Blencoe, Guy M., O30245.
Bochnowski, Joseph S., O51498.
Bollero, Angelo D., O39853.
Bolton, Cecil H., O39870.
Booth, James W., O26382.
Bowers, Mervin C., O42319.
Boyd, Lawrence L., O30180.
Boyd, Marzelle F., O39921.
Breckenridge, James D. C., O39897.
Brittain, Courtland F., O42341.
Brogan, William T., O30194.
Brookhart, Harold C., O19562.
Brown, Charles E., O19552.
Brown, Harry E., Jr., O39900.
Brown, Percival S., O19487.
Brown, Staunton L., O19356.
Brown, Travis T., O19574.
Browning, Harold W., O19545.
Brownlee, Laurance H., O17583.
Brubaker, Elbridge L., O51445.
Bruce, Burton B., O19360.
Bucher, John C., O51494.
Bunker, William B., O19402.
Buser, Oscar C., O42246.
Bush, Howard C., O30205.
Butler, James J., O30068.
Campbell, William M., O42337.
Cantey, James, O30019.
Carson, Eugene J., O51446.
Caufield, Frank J., O19515.
Caughron, James W., O51513.
Chandler, Fitzhugh H., O42328.
Chapman, Rubert D., O42367.
Chatfield, Miles B., O19404.
Cheston, D. Murray, 3d O19507.
Claps, Luigi F., O39855.
Clark, Harold F., O30040.
Clem, Rhoman E., O51457.
Clinebell, Glenn L., O30109.
Coffman, George W., Jr., O42293.
Coleman, James C., Jr., O30053.
Cook, Dave J., O30051.
Cook, Fredric C., O19484.
Corey, Harold L., O56814.
Coward, Raymond, O51495.
Cowles, Harper B., O51515.
Cox, Weldon W., O51453.
Craig, William H., O19526.
Crane, George E., O42377.
Cromwell, Jack O., O42346.
Culbertson, Eual W., O42263.
Culley, Frank J., O30117.
Cunin, Kenneth A., O19481.
Cunningham, William A., 3d, O19579.
Curtin, Edwin P., O30231.
Daehler, Raymond E., O42304.
Dale, John R., O39857.
Dame, Hartley F., O51487.
Darrah, John W., Jr., O19473.
Darrah, Raymond W., O30029.
Davall, Harold C., O19425.
Davin, John H., O42253.
Davis, Kermit LeV., O19386.
Day, John F., Jr., O51502.
Deagle, Edwin A., O30237.
Decker, Nelson I., O30105.
DeGuire, Merlin L., O19446.
DeJarnette, James T. O42344.
DeMarr, James D., O42273.
Devaney, Carl N., O38770.
Dorsey, Robert E., O30100.
Dow, Donald G., O42389.
Eales, John I. H., O38751.
Echols, Leonard E., O42265.
Edson, Hallett D., O19541.
Edwards, William H., O42267.
Elliott, Charles B., Jr., O19490.
Evans, Albert B., O30215.
Feindel, William B., Jr., O30177.
Fell, Charles F., O19368.
Fellenz, Lloyd E., O19485.
Field, Winston L., O39869.
Fillmore, Robert H., O30254.
Fincher, Joe LeR., O30145.
Finn, John W., O30257.
Foote, Thomas C., O19488.

Forbes, Merwin B., O30097.
Foster, James E., O30256.
Franklin, John F., Jr., O19476.
Franklin, John M., O39864.
Frick, John E., O42303.
Fuller, William H. G., O19190.
Gambrill, Robert E., O39716.
Georges, Michael P., O42242.
Gerhart, George H., O19569.
Gifford, Gerald K., O51539.
Gilman, Seymour I., O19377.
Glen, George R., O30049.
Gooch, Stacy W., O19455.
Goodhand, Oscar G., O51511.
Goodloe, Mason F., O30161.
Gould, Karl T., O19544.
Grenelle, Edwin W., O38757.
Grenier, William T., O30167.
Guimond, Joseph A., O26379.
Hamilton, J. Arthur, O42294.
Hammonds, Vernon, O51486.
Harkins, Basil A., O51015.
Harper, James E., Jr., O42404.
Harrelson, Elmer H., O42350.
Harton, Thomas G., O42385.
Hatfield, Ralph H., O39755.
Hattox James G., O30253.
Haycraft, Kenneth C., O29704.
Hayden, Robert H., O42356.
Hayes, Thomas H., O19556.
Hein, Neil F., O51467.
Henderson, William P., O51483.
Hess, Buie, O42379.
Heyne, Daniel H., O19493.
Higgins, Roger E., O39867.
Hillyard, Harry L., O19524.
Himes, Donald S., O30224.
Himes, William J., O19365.
Hines, Clifford C., O42289.
Hoehne, Ervin D. K., O39878.
Hoff, Stuart S., O38766.
Hoffman, Theodore F., O19403.
Holly, Leo V., O42420.
Hood, Lund F., O39892.
Horton, Russell H., O30125.
Howard, Claude M., O19464.
Howell, William C., Jr., O30085.
Hubbard, Harry J., O19459.
Huneycutt, Robert E., O29946.
Hunt, Lewis A., O39889.
Hurst, Richard M., O30191.
Jablonsky, Harvey J., O19390.
Jackson, William F., O51529.
James, George W., O30146.
Jeffery, Arthur B., O30201.
Jenna, Russell W., O19564.
Johnson, Charles E., 3d, O19534.
Johnson, Leonard M., O42329.
Johnson, William G., O38756.
Johnston, Dana W., Jr., O19506.
Jones, Thornton E., O30214.
Kabrich, Charles E., O39856.
Kelleher, Gerald C., O38750.
Kenerick, Kenneth R., O19452.
Kent, Frederick T., Jr., O30172.
Kern, Truman H., O42309.
Kern, William B., O19566.
Keyes, Lewis H., O38765.
Killian, Joseph O., O19370.
Knowlton, Stewart H., O30159.
Kuster, John F., O42419.
Kyser, Robert C., O19535.
Lambert, Joe C., O30033.
Lane, Danna L., O51520.
Lardin, Harry E., O19494.
Larner, Thomas M., O30223.
Lawlor, John D., O19536.
Lee, John K., Jr., O30136.
Leigh, Beverly M., Jr., O39917.
Levin, Maurice, O39912.
Lewis, Donald L., O30119.
Limoncelli, Donald D., O42375.
Lipscomb, Thomas H., O19371.
Long, Homer E., O30176.
Longacre, Terrance M., O30047.
Lucke, Emil A., O42331.
Luke, Regis W., O39859.
Lynn, Clark, Jr., O19456.
MacDonnell, Robert G., O19361.
Mack, Daniel D., Jr., O30015.
MacLeod, John W., O41919.
MacWillie, Donald MacG., O30152.
Maddox, Edward R., O30036.
Maiorano, Pasquale P., O42316.
Manlove, Almon W., O19413.
Markley, Harrison M., O38752.
Martin, Lewis T., O30188.
Martin, Ronald LeV., O19428.
Mathewson, David A., Jr., O38753.
McBride, Robert J., O30216.
McCrary, Thomas A., O19570.
McDonald, William J., O30169.
McElroy, Arvine W., O30093.
McGovern, John P., O42391.
McGowan, Glenn J., O42353.
McKee, Richard L., O19453.
McLennan, Donald G., O19475.
McPheron, Donald A., O19555.
McRell, Donald W., O29606.
Meetze, Adam W., O30087.
Mennie, Merle L., O39880.
Merritt, Anthony G., O42255.
Messner, Arthur E., O30181.
Metcalf, James F., O42288.
Miller, Arles H., O42287.
Miller, Eugene E., O30156.
Miller, James R., O51472.
Miller, Lee C., O19438.
Miller, Leland V., O30235.
Miller, Robert B., O19366.
Minot, Charles A., O42335.
Mize, Willard W., O30204.
Moffett, Clewis C., O39909.
Moore, Elmore P., O51460.
Moore, Lowrey R., O29941.
Moorman, Frank W., O19444.
Moorman, Richard R., O19394.
Mossman, Albert P., O19469.
Mouk, Robert McF., O42368.
Mullen, Carroll C., O51456.
Mullen, William J., Jr., O19586.
Murphy, William J., O30222.
Murray, Roy A., O42366.
Neel, John S., O51493.
Neilson, Henry, O19588.
Nelson, Herbert L., O30232.
Newman, Erman M., O30173.
Nida, Glenn E., O30140.
Nooncaster, Clifton F., O30061.
Northam, William F., O19547.
Norton, George E., Jr., O42262.
Norvell, Frank C., O19471.
Nutt, James D., O30164.
O'Connell, Edward M., O19563.
O'Neil, Larry J., O38761.
O'Neil, Thomas A., O19583.
O'Neill, John T., O30166.
Orsino, Guy A., O30168.
Osborne, Eric R., O42299.
Osborne, Hugh P., O30151.
Painter, Brookman R., O38754.
Parnelle, Samuel W., Jr., O29501.
Parry, Robert C., O39908.
Pearson, Harold J., O42418.
Peca, Peter S., O19392.
Penaat, Edward F., O29598.
Perez, Gines, O30126.
Petty, Travis L., O19439.
Phillips, Stanley W., O42407.
Piram, Joseph S., O19411.
Pitzer, John M., O26378.
Pochyla, Benjamin H., O30103.
Pond, Leon O., O42412.
Preston, Walter J., Jr., O42388.
Pritchard, William J., O42258.
Ranney, Daniel A., O39863.
Rasor, Sam J., O38769.
Rathbone, John V., Jr., O42424.
Rathje, Theodore A., O42311.
Ray, Claude E., O51430.
Reed, Albert L., O42380.
Rehmann, Edward L., O30027.
Reifsnyder, Harold R., O39881.
Revie, Charles R., O19369.
Richardson, Joseph M., O42269.
Ridlehuber, Walter R., O39902.
Rinker, Cornelius J., O30129.
Rinque, Donald P., O39874.
Roelofs, Thomas B., O38764.
Rogers, Thomas DeF., O19351.
Routh, David B., O19437.
Rusteberg, Edwin, O19542.
Ryan, Charles F., O30213.
Sabine, John S., O39860.
Saenz, Ralph, O38762.
Sames, Harry B., O42167.
Sanders, Donald A., O51489.
Sanders, Horace L., O19445.
Sandin, Ramon A., O39884.
Schepp, David G., O42382.
Seaman, Jonathan O., O19385.
Seitz, John A., O30137.
Seymour, Willard R., O38772.
Shaw, Millard, O42313.
Shaw, Walter A., O42343.
Shoemaker, John J., O30133.
Simenson, Clifford G., O19511.
Smith, Dana E., O38759.
Smith, Joseph V., O30030.
Smith, Lynn D., O29741.
Smith, Merwin H., O42349.
Smith, Stilson H., Jr., O19480.
Smith, William A., O30079.
Smoller, John F., O19416.
Snee, James W., O19516.
Sonneman, Otto F., Jr., O42280.
Spillman, William R., O42345.
Spinney, Russell G., O30054.
Spivy, Berton E., Jr., O19479.
Stanley, Charles A., O30118.
Stanley, John B., O19549.
Stark, Henry J., O51448.
Stein, John F., O51538.
Stevens, John DuV., O19414.
Stewart, Marion G., Jr., O30244.
Stiebel, Henry M., O30198.
Street, Frank L., O30055.
Surratt, Joe F., O19461.
Swartz, Robert N., O39903.
Sylvester, Robert W., O51473.
Tank, Charles F., O19350.
Tate, Ferdinand J., O19359.
Taylor, Glenn R., O42387.
Tennant, Richard S., O51474.
Thomas, Evert S., Jr., O30107.
Thrift, Richard B., O39849.
Trail, Harry E., O30206.
Tribe, Merrill LeR., O42374.
Troth, James R., O42270.
True, Gerald F., O38773.
Turner, John R., O39899.
Tyson, Robert N., O19594.
Usera, Vincent, O39883.
Vail, Bruce H., O51533.
VanDine, William H., O30032.
Villere, Lewis G., O42520.
Vining, Osmyn A., O42398.
Voehl, Wilford E. H., O19382.
Volckmann, Russell W., O19537.
Walitschek, Kurt L., O42241.
Walsh, James E., O19372.
Walsh, Louis A., Jr., O19567.
Walt, Ivan O., O42286.
Ward, Nathaniel P., 3d, O19553.
Warren, Robert B., O19380.
Waugh, William H., Jr., O19587.
Webb, Robert L., O30207.
Weber, Richard E., Jr., O19421.
Wehrle, Awtry P., O51017.
Wellendorf, Leonard E., O29538.
White, Charles H., Jr., O19407.
White, Edward L., O39885.
Whitson, Ray W., O30056.
Williams, John A., O42257.
Williams, Urquhart P., O19391.
Williamson, Carl E., O30178.
Willoughby, William H., O30108.
Wingo, Charles A., O51451.
Winn, James R., O19491.
Wobbeking, Bernard, O42417.
Wolfe, Yale H., O19415.
Wood, Charles H., O19498.
Wood, Thomas E., O19483.
Worthy, Clair M., O39911.
Wrightson, Samuel H., O39879.
Yancey, Thomas R., O42256.
Yanka, Donald E., O30252.
Yarbrough, Samuel K., Jr., O19460.
Yost, Harvey J., O42277.
Young, Charlie L., O51455.
Young, Stanley A., O51479.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, without specification of

branch, arm, or service, in the grades specified:

To be major

Gorn, John W., O22200.

To be captain

Moore, James E., O69992.

To be first lieutenant

Caskey, John T., Jr., O70298.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Congress), section 201, title II, Public Law 365, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress, Public Law 759, 80th Congress, and Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress, and Public Law 294, 84th Congress:

To be captain

Smith, Milton J., MC.

To be first lieutenants

Biagi, Joseph A., JAGC, O985441.
Bond, John L., Jr., MC, O2276785.
Haight, Robert P., Jr., MC.
Holm, Ruth W., ANC N804384.
Howell, Sharon O., ANC, N805668.
Ivey, Paul E., DC, O2270664.
Lakes, Cecil T., JAGC, O2203778.
McNab, James F., MSC, O1314936.
Mullins, Harold A., DC, O2283492.
Murphy, Eugene J., JAGC, O2266939.
Westerfield, Frank M., MC, O1880743.

To be second lieutenants

Metcalf, Virginia A., AMSC, M2996.
Terry, Frances M., ANC, N901871.
Vollmer, Dorothy A., AMSC, M3020.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 201, title II, Public Law 365, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress, subject to completion of internship:

Ball, James J.
Browder, James A.
Gangarosa, Eugene J., O2275558.
Hartvigsen, Robert E.
Johnson, Louis A., O1873898.
Kirkland, Benjamin B., Jr., O2205460.
Miller, Robert E., O2275401.
Moyer, Donald G., O2275579.
Muir, Mark D.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Dental Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 201, title II, Public Law 365, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress, upon receipt of doctor of dental surgery degree:

Kern, Thomas F., O2283105.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be first lieutenant

Rolya, William I., O1913301.

To be second lieutenants

Chittenden, Richard E., AO2234480.
Greenwalt, James P., O4030908.
Lizardo, Alex R., O4010417.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Beaulieu, John A.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Billups, William H., Jr.
Boll, Albert F.
Budinich, Thomas M., Jr.
Cei, Peter G., Jr.
Ferguson, Lewis L.
Fiorentino, William J.
Garrett, James W.
Hartman, Robert W.
Jones, Dale F.
Kane, Eugene R.
Moores, Jack M.
Owens, Ronald E.
Quinlan, Richard J.
Sams, Marion W., Jr.
Tuttle, Donald C.
Welch, Larry L.
Zavadil, Jerome J., Jr.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Harry D. Felt, United States Navy, to be Vice Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy with the rank of admiral.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of section 413 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, Vice Adm. Harry D. Felt, United States Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him to have the grade, rank, pay and allowances of admiral while so serving.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of section 413 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, the following named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate them to have the grade, rank, pay and allowances of vice admiral while so serving:

Vice Adm. Thomas S. Combs, United States Navy.

Rear Adm. William V. Davis, Jr., United States Navy.

Vice Adm. Matthias B. Gardner, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

Vice Adm. Stuart S. Murray, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 21, 1956:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Glenn A. Boger, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, term expiring March 31, 1962.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

David A. Hamil, of Colorado, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, term of 10 years.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

William G. Juergens, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Illinois.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, who art our refuge and redemption, and whose truth is our light and hope, may we now worship Thee with eager minds and earnest hearts, gratefully acknowledging Thy goodness and our dependence upon Thee.

Emancipate us from all fears and anxieties and inspire us with a greater faith in Thy immeasurable love which always sustains us and Thy unfathomable care which always surrounds us.

We rejoice that when we are discouraged and disturbed in spirit we may bring our burdens and sorrows unto Thee and carry away a song and receive a new joy which defies despair.

Show us how we may cultivate a more vital and healing sympathy for struggling humanity, a nobler skill in doing good, and a finer art of insight and understanding for all who are baffled and perplexed by life's untoward happenings and vicissitudes.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 101. An act relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9, subsections (d) and (e), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939;

H. R. 5790. An act relating to the application in the Territory of Hawaii of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act;

H. R. 6782. An act to amend section 7 of "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 8493. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the General Federation of Womens Clubs, Inc., in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 9582. An act to provide for the delayed reporting of births within the District of Columbia;

H. R. 9671. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the village of Carey, Ohio;

H. R. 10374. An act to amend the act to incorporate the Oak Hill Cemetery, in the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 10768. An act to amend section 5 of the act of August 7, 1946, entitled "An act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia," as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3693. An act to amend title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended;

H. R. 6243. An act authorizing the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7227. An act to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the disposal of surplus property for civil defense purposes, to provide that certain Federal surplus property be disposed of to State and local civil defense organizations which are established by or pursuant to State law, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7380. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 to correct certain inequities;

H. R. 9593. An act to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11320. An act to effect the control of narcotics, barbiturates, and dangerous drugs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 11487. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 313. An act to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood or urine of persons tried in the District of Columbia for operating vehicles while under the influence of intoxicating liquor;

S. 2429. An act to amend section 212 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize research and experimental work with vessels, vessel propulsion and equipment, port facilities, planning, and operation and cargo handling on ships and at ports;

S. 2704. An act to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction of certain highway-railroad grade separations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 2895. An act to amend the acts of February 28, 1903, and March 3, 1927, relating to the payment of the cost and expense of constructing railway-highway grade elimination structures in the District of Columbia;

S. 2896. An act to amend the act relating to cemetery associations;

S. 3663. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia;

S. 3821. An act to authorize the construction of one prototype ship, and the conversion of one Liberty ship, by the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce;

S. 3838. An act to provide for the maintenance and operation of the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River from Jones Point, Va., to Maryland; and

S. 3897. An act to improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1614. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry-milk solids; title 21, United States Code, section 321c"; and

S. 1622. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9739) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes."

The message further announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 50 to the above-entitled bill.

FOURTH NATIONAL JAMBOREE, BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2771) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Fourth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to lend to the Boy Scouts of America, a corporation created under the act of June 15, 1916, for the use and accommodation of the approximately 50,000 Scouts and officials who are to attend the Fourth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America to be held as a part of the national program "Onward for God and My Country" during the period beginning in June 1957, and ending in July 1957, at Valley Forge, Pa., such tents, cots, blankets, commissary equipment, flags, refrigerators, and other equipment and services as may be necessary or useful to the extent that items are in stock and available and their issue will not jeopardize the national-defense program.

(b) Such equipment is authorized to be delivered at such time prior to the holding of such jamboree, and to be returned at such time after the close of such jamboree, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense and the National Council, Boy Scouts of America. No expense shall be incurred by the United States Government for the delivery, return, rehabilitation, or replacement of such equipment.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, before delivering such property, shall take from the Boy Scouts of America a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of such property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend at this point in the RECORD my remarks explaining the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of S. 2771 is to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Fourth National Jamboree to be held at Valley Forge, Pa., during June to July 1957.

This bill will authorize the Secretary to lend tents, cots, blankets, flags, and commissary equipment as may be necessary or useful to the Boy Scouts.

Now, this will all be at no expense to the Government, and the Boy Scouts must furnish a good and sufficient bond to insure the return, rehabilitation and replacement of all equipment loaned.

There is ample precedence for this legislation. Prior to World War II it was customary for the Government to assist the Boy Scouts in connection with their annual jamboree by lending the necessary equipment needed at the site of the encampment. This custom was revived following World War II, and the acts of October 5, 1949, and May 26, 1952, authorized the loan of military property to the Boy Scouts for use during the Second and Third National Jamborees.

The Department of Defense favors enactment of the bill, and the Bureau of the Budget interposes no objection.

1957 WORLD JAMBOREE OF BOY SCOUTS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2772) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in England in 1957; and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to lend to the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, for the use and accommodation of the approximately 1,500 Scouts and officials who are to attend the World Jamboree, Boy Scouts, to be held in England in July and August 1957, such tents, cots, blankets, commissary equipment, flags, refrigerators, and other equipment and services as may be necessary or useful to the extent that items are in stock and available and their issue will not jeopardize the national-defense program.

(b) Such equipment is authorized to be delivered at such time prior to the holding of such jamboree, and to be returned at such time after the close of such jamboree, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense and the National Council, Boy Scouts of America. No expense shall be incurred by the United States Government for the delivery, return, rehabilitation, or replacement of such equipment.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, before delivering such property, shall take from the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, good and sufficient bond for the safe return of such property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to provide, without expense to the United States Government, transportation from the United States and return on a vessel of the Military Sea Transportation Service for (1) those Boy Scouts and Scouters certified by the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, as representing the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, at the jamboree referred to in the first section of this act, and (2) the equipment and property of such Boy Scouts and Scouters and the property loaned to the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to this act to the extent that such transportation will not interfere with the requirements of military operations.

(b) Before furnishing any transportation under this section, the Secretary of Defense shall take from the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, a good and sufficient bond for the reimbursement to the United States by the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, of the actual costs of transportation furnished under this section.

SEC. 3. Amounts paid to the United States to reimburse it for expenses incurred under the first section and for the actual costs of transportation furnished under section 2 shall be credited to the current applicable appropriations or funds to which such expenses and costs were charged and shall be available for the same purposes as such appropriations or funds.

SEC. 4. Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State, no fee shall be collected for the application for a passport by, or the issuance of a passport to, any Boy Scout or Scouter who is certified by the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, as representing the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, at the jamboree referred to in the first section of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, place a comma after the word "Scouts" and insert the word "Scouters."

On page 2, line 24, delete the word "and", place a comma after the word "Scouts", and insert the words "and officials" after the word "Scouters."

On page 3, line 3, delete the word "and", following the word "Scouts", place a comma after the word "Scouts", and after the word "Scouters", insert the words "and officials."

On page 3, line 23, place a comma after the word "Scout", and on page 3, line 24, delete the word "or" and insert after the word "Scouter" the words "or official."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend at this point in the RECORD my remarks explaining the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of S. 2772 is to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend to the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, certain equipment, such as tents, cots, blankets, flags, and commissary equipment as may be necessary, and to the extent that such items are in stock and available, for use of approximately 1,500 Scouts, Scouters, and officials who are to attend the World Jamboree to be held in England in July and August 1957.

Now, there is no expense to the Government for the loan of this equipment. The bill provides that the Boy Scouts will give the Government a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of the property in good order and condition.

The Secretary of Defense is also authorized to provide transportation for these Scouts, Scouters, and officials on a vessel of the Military Sea Transportation Service. The bill provides that the Boy Scouts of America will reimburse the Government for the expense of this transportation and will also furnish a bond to insure the reimbursement to the Government.

Another provision of the bill provides that no fees shall be collected for the application for a passport for any Boy Scout, Scouter, or official who is certified by the National Council, Boy Scouts of America.

There is a precedent for this legislation, in that the Congress enacted similar legislation by the act of August 14, 1947, which conferred similar authority for the loan of equipment and furnishing of transportation in connection with the World Jamboree held in France in 1947.

The committee wished to make certain that Scouters and officials were included in the provisions of the bill in all respects. Consequently, four minor amendments were adopted. These are all clarifying in nature.

The Department of Defense favors enactment of this bill, and the Bureau of the Budget interposes no objection.

IMPROVEMENTS IN THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of a measure which I introduced today which would affect the Office of the Vice Presidency. For over a year I have been researching this subject and have had innumerable conferences with the executive branch on this important proposal. Many conferences were held with all persons who might be affected by this proposed legislation. I received invaluable research assistance from Ernest Grunebaum, a senior at Dartmouth College in New Hampshire.

Despite the fact that the role played by the Vice President has changed dramatically within the past two decades, no improving legislation has accompanied this change. For example, in spite of the fact that the Vice President must entertain high dignitaries from foreign countries he must use a private club or restaurant. The holder of the second highest office in our land has no official home.

The Vice President's present staff allowance is pitiful. His employees are overworked and underpaid. He receives a pathetically small amount for travel allowance, yet he must be constantly on the road in this Nation's interests.

My bill would, in essence, improve the tools of the Vice President by giving him an official home, increase his expense and traveling allowances, as well as provide additional funds for administrative, clerical, and research assistants. The bill would insure better working quarters for the Vice President. At present he has a small, tired-looking office on the top floor of the Senate Office Building.

It is up to Congress to modernize and streamline the tools with which the Vice President of the United States must work.

A COMMEMORATIVE STAMP FOR COAL MINERS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, we in this country owe a great debt to a very important group of persons in our economy. I am referring to the Nation's coal miners of both past years and the present.

Coal is and has always been the primary source of energy which has played an important part in the industrial and economic growth of the United States. Coal is a vital link in the process of converting raw material at its source into many thousands of finished products ranging from tiny objects to great ships and structures. And coal has played an important part in transporting these commodities to their point of consumption. Thus, it is not an overstatement to say that one of the underlying pillars on which the economy was built is coal. And it is equally proper to say that coal has played an essential part in national defense.

This important ingredient has been buried deep in the earth, and until it was made available aboveground and at the site of factories and other users it was of no usefulness. Men had to go into the mines and remove coal. Thus was created one of the most hazardous of all peacetime occupations, and, by the same token, a heritage of particularly brave men.

Mr. Speaker, I think it high time that we extend some token of official recognition to the Nation's coal miners. Accordingly, I propose that there be executed a special postage stamp honoring all the men who have gone into the mines to dig our coal. It is fitting and proper that we give these men our vote of appreciation in this manner for the great service they have performed on behalf of the Nation.

Therefore, I earnestly commend this proposal to the Postmaster General for his sympathetic consideration, and I urge my distinguished colleagues and persons everywhere to give it their wholehearted support.

BUSINESS SEES BIGGEST YEAR YET

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on the floor of the House we had a 1-minute dissertation by my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], and the theme song of his blues was the disaster facing our economy and boils down to just one thing—that my friend is so anxious to win a presidential election that he would march down the highways singing the blues until everyone started his chant.

Such stuff and nonsense. I enclose as part of my remarks an editorial from the Denver Post of June 18, 1956, by the Associated Press, and I especially call

this article to the attention of my disheartened, discouraged, and depressed friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER]:

BUSINESS SEES BIGGEST YEAR YET

WASHINGTON, June 18.—This will be the Nation's biggest business year and the boom ought to carry over into 1957, according to the chief economist of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Dr. Emerson P. Schmidt made this prediction after weighing fresh reports from 15 industry sources. The individual forecasts also were made public Saturday at the chamber's midyear business symposium.

Schmidt said his prediction of prosperity would stand even if President Eisenhower decides not to run for reelection because of his latest illness.

There would be an initial shock if Eisenhower should withdraw, Schmidt said, but fundamental elements of strength in the economy soon would reassure businessmen.

Executives of 14 trade associations, and a banker whose personal forecast did not side with the majority's optimism, gave their views to reporters.

Most panelists were confident the boom this year would top 1955 and that the second half of 1956 would top the first 6 months.

AN AMENDMENT TO THE WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1945

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, last year I introduced a very worthwhile bill, which, when compared with much of the legislation considered by Congress, may be adjudged to be of little import. I speak of H. R. 7733, which would, if enacted, provide for several needed changes in section 17 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended—title 50, United States Code, appendix 2016. Inasmuch as this bill involves the rights of certain United States citizens, however, even though the number affected is relatively small, my feeling is that this bill is quite important, and I, therefore, have taken the floor at this time to acquaint you with its provisions.

During the Japanese occupation of the Philippine Islands, the Japanese military authorities sequestered bank accounts and other credits in the Philippines owned by American individuals and business enterprises. Postwar decisions of the Philippine courts held that compliance with Japanese sequestration orders on the part of debtors resulted in the discharge of their obligations. As a result, American citizens and firms whose credits were sequestered were without the means of recouping their losses.

As a result, section 17 was placed in the War Claims Act of 1948. This section provides compensation from the war-claims fund for American individuals and businesses suffering sequestration losses. Section 17, as amended, provides that in cases of the death of an individual entitled to benefits, payments shall be made to the surviving spouse, children or parents of the decedent in a specified order of priority.

In H. R. 7733, I have added two categories of eligible heirs under section 17 of the War Claims Act, as follows:

(1) brothers and sisters (in equal shares) if there is no widow, husband, child, or parent; and

(2) the next of kin (in equal shares), under the laws of the State in which the deceased was domiciled at the time of his death, if there is no widow, husband, child, parent, brother, or sister.

Authority for the payment of claims is provided in subsection (d) of section 6 of the War Claims Act. Subsection (d) of section 6, the prisoner of war section of the act, provides for the payment to the following survivors of deceased persons in the order named as follows:

(1) widow or husband if there is no child or children of the deceased;

(2) widow or husband and child or children of the deceased, one-half to the widow or husband and the other half to the child or children of the deceased in equal shares;

(3) child or children of the deceased (in equal shares) if there is no widow or husband; and

(4) parents (in equal shares) if there is no widow, husband, or child.

Subsection (c) of section 17 states that in those cases where the death of any eligible individual has occurred, the payment of such claim shall be made to the individual specified, and in the order provided in subsection (d) of section 6. My reason for referring to the subsections which state the order of priority of the individuals eligible for payment of claims is to point out that my bill, H. R. 7733, would not add to the categories of survivors eligible under subsection (d) of section 6 of the act. The amendment which I have proposed strikes out any reference to the prisoners of war section and sets up a separate category of eligible survivors under section 17. The addition of these two classes of persons, therefore, applies only to the sequestered funds cases, but, at the same time, it retains the order of eligible survivors as provided by the other sections of the War Claims Act.

The opinion of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission notwithstanding, the sequestration of funds section can be distinguished from the other sections of the act in that payments provided in the sequestration cases are based on actual deprivation of properties by the Japanese Government, whereas other sections of the act are in effect gratuities or bounties paid by this Government to compensate those American civilians and military personnel who were prisoners of war and internees of the enemy during the war. I, therefore, feel strongly that the United States Government should make payment to any living survivor, or survivors, of deceased individuals whose properties were sequestered by the Japanese. That brothers and sisters and other next of kin should be ineligible to receive the amount of these monetary benefits is, in my opinion, unfair and unjust and is certainly not in accordance with the general law of descents and distributions operative in most, if not all, of the States in this country. The United States has an impelling obligation, it seems to me, to pay any next of kin that may be found in any of these cases the full amount of the properties taken from American citizens.

The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission has taken a completely unwarranted and unjustified position on this bill. In their report to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Commission states a total of six objections to the passage of this legislation. After a careful study, I have concluded the Commission's objections are neither sound nor can they be substantiated by the facts. The reasons given by the Commission in their adverse recommendation are as follows:

1. The bill is discriminatory in that it would extend benefits to 2 additional classes of survivors under section 17 of the act, but does not extend such benefits under other sections of the act;

2. The difficulties which would be encountered in proving the next of kin relationship to a deceased person and the time consumed in documenting the proof of such relationship would far outweigh the benefits which would be derived;

3. Enactment of this legislation would establish a dangerous precedent not only with respect to other sections of the War Claims Act but, as well, to other legislation providing gratuity compensation;

4. The proposal to extend the filing date under section 17 to 1 year after the enactment date of the bill would, in effect, discriminate against those persons who have been informed by the Government, volunteer agencies, such as veterans service organizations, and other media, that the deadline for filing claims would expire on August 31, 1955;

5. There is no basis on which the Commission could estimate the number of claims which would be filed should this bill be enacted; consequently no estimate of its cost can be furnished; and

6. Qualified personnel presently assigned to processing section 17 claims would be required longer than the completion date of such claims, thus affecting the eventual assignment of such personnel to other claims programs authorized under Public Law 285, 84th Congress, and impeding the ability of the Commission in meeting the production schedules set forth in its budget justifications.

The Commission's report concluded its reasoning with the statement that they had placed considerable emphasis on completion of its programs within the statutory deadlines and the imposition of this new proposal would tend to extensively prolong its functions in these matters.

Mr. Speaker, in all due respect to the members of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, I am confident you will agree that the reasons set forth by them for rendering their adverse report on this bill are most unusual. With your permission, I will proceed to show you one by one just how unusual their objections are.

The Commission's view that the sequestered funds claims are in the nature of gratuities is not borne out by the legislative history of section 17 of the War Claims Act of 1948. Section 17, as opposed to the other sections of the act, deals with actual moneys and other credits of American citizens which were expropriated by Japan from banks and other financial institutions during World War II. I agree with the Commission that the other sections of the act which provide payments of claims to prisoners

of war and civilian internees are not vested rights, but are in the nature of gratuities, and are thus similar to other laws providing gratuities, such as laws appertaining to veterans. That claims under the sequestered funds cases are not vested rights, however, is a surprising theory. My recollection of the law of contracts is that if A unlawfully expropriates a sum of money or other property from B, B has a cause of action against A and has a vested right in the money or property which was unlawfully expropriated.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, all the moneys in the war claims fund were transferred from the Alien Property Custodian of the United States, which moneys were received from vested German and Japanese assets. Payments of claims under the War Claims Act of 1948, including the sequestration cases, have been made wholly from the war claims fund. Since we obtained these moneys from the German and Japanese Governments, this Government, in effect, is acting as the agent and administrator for our World War II enemy governments in reimbursing American citizens and their heirs for the damages which they incurred during wartime. It is, therefore, logical to state that the United States Government, in reality, stands in the place of the Japanese Government in making payments to American citizens and their heirs under the sequestered funds cases. Inasmuch as the United States is, in effect, acting for the Japanese Government, and since the Japanese were guilty of unlawfully expropriating money or other property from our own citizens, the United States would be placed in a position of unlawfully expropriating these moneys from its own citizens unless the heirs in the order of priority specified under my bill are compensated in the amount of the losses incurred by their deceased relatives.

The Commission's objection that a dangerous precedent would be established not only with respect to other sections of the War Claims Act as well as other legislation providing gratuity compensation is readily disposed of with the brief statement that the sequestered funds cases are not in any sense of the word payments in the nature of gratuities or bounties. Inasmuch as section 17 cannot properly be considered as in the nature of gratuity compensation, the enactment of H. R. 7733 could in no way establish any dangerous precedent.

I was particularly surprised at that part of the Commission's report which stated that "the difficulties which would be encountered in proving the next of kin relationship to a deceased person and the time consumed in documenting the proof of such a relationship would far outweigh the benefits which would be derived." In an apparent attempt to justify this statement, the Commission in the following sentence stated that "of approximately 300 claims considered to date under section 17 by the Commission, there were no cases involving a next of kin and only 2 cases involved brothers and sisters." Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that if Congress had been concerned with the difficulties of administration of claims under the War Claims Act, they would have never enacted this bill in 1948. Neither can I understand the Commission's view in regard to the time that would be consumed in documenting the proof of relationship, which would, according to the Commission, far outweigh the benefits which would be derived. H. R. 7733 sets a 1-year limitation for the filing of claims but grants the Commission 2 years following enactment to wind up its affairs. It would seem to me 2 years should be ample time for the Commission to obtain the necessary documentary proof of relationship from applicants.

The Commission, in its report, stated that of approximately 300 claims considered under section 17, there were no cases involving next of kin and only 2 cases involving a brother and sister, which indicates only a limited number of claims would be filed under H. R. 7733. Therefore, contrary to the Commission's sixth objection, with proper administration of personnel, they could reduce the number of employees processing claims under section 17, thus freeing many employees for assignments under other claim programs.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I am startled by the light consideration given by the Commission to those survivors who would benefit by this bill. Neither we nor the members of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission should lose sight of the fact that the beneficiaries under this bill are brothers and sisters, and other next of kin, of deceased individuals, both military and civilian, who were in the Philippines on that dark day when the Japanese Government invaded and assumed control of the islands. Many of the individuals whose funds were sequestered lost their lives during the war. My considered opinion is that this Government should make every effort to make whole any living survivors of these deceased persons.

With respect to the Commission's fourth objection to this bill, which is that the extension of "the filing date to 1 year after the enactment date of the bill would discriminate against those persons who have been informed by the Government, volunteer organizations, such as veterans service organizations, and other mediums, that the deadline for filing claims would expire August 31, 1955," I fail altogether to understand how any discrimination could possibly result. I am confident that our veterans service organizations and other volunteer agencies would be most happy for the Congress to make every possible effort to make payments on these cases to any living survivor.

The Commission expresses concern, as noted in their fifth reason for giving an unfavorable report, that the cost of the bill is uncertain because there is no basis for estimating the number of claims. This is essentially a good statement. Even so, it is strongly indicated by the Commission's own admission that the number of claims which would be filed under this amendment would be negligible. This is borne out by their statement that of the 300 section 17 claims processed to date, there have been no claims filed by next of kin and only two by brothers and sisters. Therefore, I think we can properly assume the number of claims filed, and therefore, the cost of this bill would be exceedingly small.

I have already covered sufficiently the Commission's sixth objection which was that this legislation, if enacted, would impede the ability of the Commission in meeting the production schedule in that qualified personnel assigned to section 17 claims would have to be maintained longer than the anticipated completion date, thus affecting the assignment of such personnel to other claims programs. However, I should like to point out that the Commission's statement that they have placed considerable emphasis on completion of its programs within the statutory deadline and enactment of H. R. 7733 would tend to extensively prolong its functions in these matters, while commendatory, overlooks the fact that the Congress and not the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission has the prerogative to extend or not extend the War Claims Act and, if the Congress sees fit to extend said act, it is the responsibility of the Commission to execute and administer this and other proposals.

Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy the other agencies and departments requested to submit a report on this bill had no recommendations to make with the exception of the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau agreed with the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission's surprising theory that inequitable precedents might be established by adding this class of survivors as beneficiaries under section 17 provisions of the War Claims Act. The Bureau of the Budget, in effect, echoed the objection of the Commission in this regard, which I think has been amply disposed of in my previous discussion. On the other hand, the Departments of Justice, State, and Treasury reported only that, since they had no information in regard to the proposed legislation and since the subject of the bill was primarily the concern of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, they had no comments to make with respect to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission has the money to pay beneficiaries under H. R. 7733 from presently appropriated amounts in the war claims fund. A responsible official of the Commission has told me that, as of March 31, 1956, they had a balance available in the war claims fund of $10,398,600.08. In addition, the Commission estimates that $5,740,000 will be returned to the war claims fund after all pending claims have been paid in full. If the Commission's estimates are sound, this would leave a balance in the war claims fund of $16,138,600.08 after all claims are paid.

On March 31, 1956, the Commission had received claims under section 17 from individuals and banks amounting to $17,861,453. However, only $1,424,696.12 of this amount has been allowed and paid. The Commission had received 2,025 claims under this section, of which 157 have been disallowed. They had paid in full 1,152 claims under $500 and the first payment had been made to 226 claimants who were entitled to payments

exceeding $500. They had processed 1,535 claims and had 490 claims not processed under this section.

The Commission as of March 31 had set aside in the claims-payment account $568,620.35 as a reserve for further payments under subsection (d). Therefore, with the amount already paid, $1,424,696.12, plus the reserve for other payments of $568,620.35, the Commission anticipated on March 31 a total payment under section 17 of only $1,993,316.47.

Mr. Speaker, it is, therefore, obvious the Commission will, after payment of all claims under the War Claims Act as now written, have more than sufficient moneys for the payment in full of all claims and will also have ample funds to pay the additional classes of persons H. R. 7733 renders eligible.

To add to the classes of survivors made eligible under section 17, as I propose, would not be inconsistent with past actions taken by Congress in liberalizing the definition of persons considered to be eligible to participate in the war-claims program. Public Law 744, 83d Congress, eliminated the word "dependent" from sections 5 (d), 6 (c), 6 (d) (4) (A), (B), (C), and (D) and also added a new paragraph (4) to section 5 (d) making parents eligible to claim detention benefits as survivors in the absence of a surviving husband or child.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission will have sufficient moneys to pay additional claims that would be authorized under this bill, and since it is obligatory, in my opinion, for the United States Government to make every possible effort to make whole, insofar as this can be done when the death of a loved one is involved, those survivors of deceased individuals who were deprived of their properties by Japan in World War II, I strongly urge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and later the House of Representatives and the Senate to approve this legislation prior to adjournment.

In the words of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Mr. Speaker, "the benefits which would be derived are small." Nevertheless, a principle is involved in this matter and that principle is a large principle—it involves the property rights of United States citizens. The Congress in 1948 saw fit to pay claims on these bank accounts and credits sequestered by Japan, but we did not go far enough at that time.

Mr. Speaker, let it not ever be said that we have not completed a task set before us. My sincere feeling is that we will be denying property rights unless we go two steps further, as is provided for in this bill, and make eligible brothers and sisters and other next of kin of those deceased persons whose moneys were expropriated by an enemy government.

COMMITTEE TO REPRESENT CONGRESS AT CEREMONIES IN CONNECTION WITH THE UNVEILING OF THE STATUE OF COMMODORE JOHN BARRY AT WEXFORD, IRELAND

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 244, Rept. No. 2409), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby created a joint committee, to be composed of 6 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House and 6 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, to represent the Congress at the ceremonies in connection with the unveiling of the statue of Commodore John Barry to be presented by the President to Ireland on behalf of the people of the United States at Wexford, Ireland, on September 16, 1956. The members of the joint committee shall select a chairman from among their number.

The expenses of the joint committee incurred in carrying out the purposes of this resolution, not to exceed $25,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers authorized by such joint committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 244.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read House Concurrent Resolution 244.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on September 16, 1956, the statue of Commodore John Barry, heretofore authorized by law to be presented by the President of the United States to Ireland on behalf of the people of the United States, will be unveiled at Wexford, Ireland.

The pending resolution would create a joint committee to be composed of 6 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House and 6 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, to represent the Congress of the United States at the unveiling ceremonies.

I am sure that every Member of this body knows that Commodore Barry, the naval hero of the American Revolution, had the distinction of receiving United States Naval Commission No. 1 from George Washington. In 1776, commanding the *Lexington*, he captured the first naval vessel taken by an American man-of-war. During the course of the Revolution, when requested by the enemy to desert to their forces, he stood firm with his adopted country and refused 20,000 guineas and the command of a British ship. He brought 70,000 milled Spanish dollars, despite a pursuing enemy fleet, from Havana into a depleted Continental treasury. In 1783, he fired the Navy's last shot of the Revolution.

From 1794 until his death in 1803, Barry was Senior Commodore of the United States Navy.

Commodore Barry was born in County Wexford on the southeast coast of Ireland in 1745 and is buried in St. Mary's Churchyard, in Philadelphia.

It is fitting and proper that the Congress of the United States be represented at the ceremonies in connection with the unveiling of this statue near Commodore John Barry's birthplace in County Wexford, Ireland. I am confident that this resolution will be adopted by unanimous consent of every Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday is District day. The following bills will be in order:

H. R. 11002, Pawnbrokers' Act.

S. 1275, police protection, institutions outside of the District of Columbia.

S. 3295, extending daylight saving.

H. R. 9641, exempting from taxation property of the Columbia Historical Society.

For the remainder of the week the program is as follows:

On Tuesday, H. R. 7886, increase veterans' compensation; and should a roll-call vote be demanded in connection with final passage, it will take place not earlier than Wednesday, Thursday, or later. There will be no votes on Tuesday because of the primaries.

Mr. MARTIN. Where is the primary on Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Indiana, North Dakota, and a second primary in South Carolina, I understand.

Mr. MARTIN. We do not give delay consideration for second primaries, do we?

Mr. McCORMACK. There are two others, anyway. There is Indiana, for instance.

Mr. MARTIN. I think they have already had their primary in Indiana.

Mr. McCORMACK. And North Dakota. That is my information.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is the Democratic State convention on Tues-

day in Indiana, and the Republican State convention comes on Friday. I wonder if we will have equal protection on Friday.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Indiana can be assured, so far as I am concerned, that there is always equal treatment. That means equal protection. I might say that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has already discussed the Friday meeting of the Republican convention in Indiana.

After the veterans' bill we will take up H. R. 7535, Federal aid for school construction.

There are three conference reports that probably will be in order: the public-works appropriation bill, the Federal interstate highway bill, and the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill. In relation to the latter, I have conferred with the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], who told me this morning that he would like to have that bill come up on Wednesday. It does not necessarily follow that it will come up on that day, but that particular conference report will not be brought up before Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on District day, we will have the bill for the extension of daylight-saving time for the District. There are some Members who are interested in that. There are 3 or 4 other bills that I assume will be taken up on District day, if reported this morning.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the information given by my friend. I was waiting for a report from the committee. I had hoped I would have it by this time, but the committee is meeting and at this moment I cannot give the information on the specific bills that will be brought up. But I shall see that that information is inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, the gentleman realizes that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] is contemplating at the moment calling up the postal bill, probably on Wednesday or Thursday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have had no official notice of it. I have had an informal discussion.

Mr. MARTIN. That is all I had, an informal discussion.

Mr. McCORMACK. All I can say is that I cannot program the bill for next week. Of course, any Member of the Committee on Rules can bring the rule up. I would expect that a Member of the Committee on Rules would confer with the leadership as to when it could be programed by the leader. In the light of this program, including the veterans' pension bill and the school construction bill, for next week, with some conference reports, it will be a rather heavy schedule. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] calls it up, he will be doing it on his own responsibility.

I might also call attention to the fact that in the 83d Congress, a similar bill was reported out of the Republican-controlled committee in February of 1954. The House adjourned in August, but the bill was never brought up by the Republican leadership. That is a bill that the Republican leadership favored. The Democratic leadership, speaking at least for myself——

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, of course, if we are going to get into politics about this——

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no politics in this.

Mr. MARTIN. The school construction bill has been in the Committee on Rules for 4 months, without any action having been taken upon it.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no politics. This is a statement of historical fact. The bill was reported out in February of 1954, in the second session of the last Congress, but was not brought up. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] is going to call up the bill, he is going to do so on his own responsibility; and I think he ought to be on the floor and let the Members know.

The Democratic leadership, as far as I am concerned, is opposed to the increase in first-class mail from 3 cents to 4 cents. It is rather strange that the Republican leadership, which did not bring up the bill when they were in control, opposes the program of the Democratic leadership now. The bill can be brought up, but I think we ought to know.

Mr. MARTIN. The bill can be brought up under the rules. The gentleman is not conceding anything when he says that. The gentleman is just playing pure politics when he talks about letting the people know.

Mr. McCORMACK. Everything is politics, but why did not the gentleman bring it up in the 83d Congress?

Mr. MARTIN. There may have been conditions.

Mr. McCORMACK. What were they?

Mr. MARTIN. We probably knew we did not have the votes at that time. I think that is as good an answer as any.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wonder if that was dictatorship on the gentleman's part then.

Mr. MARTIN. When is the gentleman going to program the civil-rights bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. That bill will be programed promptly when the rule is reported.

Mr. MARTIN. Will that bill be brought up ahead of the postal bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] is on the floor and if he says he intends to call it up, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] will program it, if it is agreeable to him, the week after next. If he is going to call it up next week, he has got to do it on his own responsibility. This is the first time that has ever been done when the leadership is willing to program a bill.

Mr. MARTIN. When is the Congress going to adjourn?

Mr. McCORMACK. What does the gentleman think?

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman is in charge of programing; he should know best.

Mr. McCORMACK. What does the gentleman think? The gentleman last January said June the 15th. I could not see it before July 15. I think my guess was more accurate than his.

Mr. MARTIN. We are not interested in guessing.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman's minute has long since expired.

The SPEAKER. The Chair always allows a little relaxation when the two gentlemen from Massachusetts get into conversation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] ought to assume his responsibility and tell the House frankly what he is going to do.

Mr. MARTIN. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] will not duck any of his responsibility, and he will give the House full consideration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] expired some time ago.

TEMPORARY INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 11740) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is there to be an explanation of this bill?

Mr. COOPER. I would be glad to give the gentleman an explanation. All it does is allow an increase of half what was allowed last time.

Mr. GROSS. Half of $6 billion?

Mr. COOPER. That is right, and on a temporary basis.

Mr. GROSS. This increases the debt limit to what?

Mr. COOPER. Two hundred and seventy-eight billion dollars, for 1 year only. Previously the increase was $6 billion.

Mr. GROSS. That took it to $281 billion; is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. That is correct. This is for half of it for 1 year. The bill was unanimously reported by the committee.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker, but before I do let the RECORD show that I am opposed to this or any other increase in the Federal debt limitation.

This increase would not be necessary had a realistic approach been taken to the foreign hand-out program. With $6½ to $7 billion already in the pipeline there was no necessity for authorizing a single dollar of new money during the coming fiscal year for the benefit of foreign governments. It is plain for everyone to see that the nearly $5 billion

sought by the administration for so-called foreign aid is well above the increase in the debt limitation as here requested.

Mr. MULTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is it not appropriate to comment in connection with this bill that this represents a failure by the administration to keep its promise to balance the budget without any increase in the debt limitation?

Mr. COOPER. Of course, the gentleman may draw that inference.

Mr. MULTER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, during the period beginning on July 1, 1956, and ending on June 30, 1957, the public debt limit set forth in the first sentence of section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, shall be temporarily increased by $3 billion.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 11740 would continue a temporary increase in the ceiling on the debt limit for another year. The permanent statutory ceiling on the public debt is $275 billion. Last year and the year before, Congress at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury enacted legislation increasing temporarily this ceiling by $6 billion. The Secretary of the Treasury in an appearance before our committee has again requested a 1-year temporary increase in the debt limit, but this time he has requested a $3 billion instead of a $6 billion increase. H. R. 11740 carries out the request of the Secretary and provides that a public debt limit of $278 billion is to apply for the period from July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1957. This bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

While I am concerned about the necessity for continuing a temporary increase in the public-debt limit, I am glad to note that the request this year is for a $3 billion increase which is one-half of the increase found necessary in the two previous fiscal years.

The Secretary of the Treasury's request for a smaller temporary increase in the debt limit this year results from a budgetary surplus and from the fact that corporate tax payments, under the law, now in effect are gradually being spread more evenly over the year, making it unnecessary to borrow as heavily, as in the past, in the fore part of the fiscal year. I might point out that the budgetary surplus referred to results not so much from the level of expenditures, which are higher than estimated by the Treasury Department in January of this year, as from larger receipts from the continuing high level of business activity than the Treasury Department had originally estimated.

As I pointed out to the House last year when we were considering this subject, it is the Congress itself which has the final say-so in the amount of money which the Government is authorized to spend, and once expenditures have been authorized and commitments have been made, it is the obligation of the Congress to protect the fiscal integrity of the Government. For this reason and because the Treasury needs a minimum balance of cash in order to provide some flexibility in fiscal operations, I urge that the bill be passed.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that the Congress act promptly and favorably upon the pending bill to provide a temporary increase of $3 billion in the statutory debt ceiling. I introduced an identical bill, H. R. 11741.

The present permanent debt limit is $275 billion. Because of seasonal fluctuations in receipts, it is anticipated that the debt during the coming fiscal year will exceed this amount temporarily and I wish to emphasize that word "temporarily." It is important to understand that this temporary increase in no way suggests that the overall public debt is being increased. In fact, the Secretary of the Treasury informed the Committee on Ways and Means that he expected the public debt at the close of this fiscal year to be in the neighborhood of $273 billion, a substantial reduction from the total at the end of last year.

It should be noted that the temporary increase is limited in this bill to $3 billion while a $6 billion increase has been authorized in recent years. This sharp cutback in the amount of the temporary increase furnishes dramatic evidence of the magnificent accomplishments of this administration in putting the fiscal affairs of the Nation in order. Moreover, Secretary Humphrey declared to our committee that the present fiscal program of the administration calls for applying the anticipated surplus this fiscal year to debt reduction. He went on to express his hope "that this year we are setting a precedent which may be faithfully followed year after year, and that we will so handle our financial affairs that we can make each year a modest payment in reduction of our huge indebtedness as a matter of standard practice." In this plan for the future, I concur heartily.

The Republican Party is determined to maintain fiscal soundness and to insure the integrity of our money. In so doing, the American people will be able to depend upon the value of the dollar and face the future with confidence. Thus, we will continue our present prosperity and establish a firm foundation for more jobs, greater production, and an ever-higher standard of living in the future.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AID FOREVER?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, with $50 billion already spent for global foreign aid since World War II, and with billions more in process of being voted, there is very little agreement, in Government or out, as to why we are doing it.

That shocking fact stands out starkly in the record of the current congressional debate on this issue.

It is attested by the sincere but seemingly ineffectual suggestions that a reappraisal and reevaluation of the entire program is in order.

It is reflected in the vague and confused thinking of the American people themselves.

Small wonder that even many of the nations which are beneficiaries of our largess are dubious as to our motives or our sanity, and are becoming increasingly frank in saying so.

So far as I am concerned, this incredible situation is itself sufficient reason for my votes against foreign aid.

But we seem to be victims of a national obsession—of a compulsive urge to scatter our wealth and resources around the globe.

The prospect is that Congress may wind up approving even more than the $3.6 billion of new foreign aid already voted by this House.

Therefore, I feel obligated to speak more fully, and with utter frankness, on some aspects of this issue.

I wonder how many members of this House would be willing to pass the hat in their congressional districts to buy Comrade Tito more American jet planes, or additional miles of modern highways, or to help him balance his country's budget.

For my part, no thanks.

Not after the news reports of the enthusiastic, vodka-drinking, prodigal son welcome this Yugoslav commie received in Moscow where he swore, by whatever it is he regards as good and holy, that he and his Kremlin comrades would never again be parted.

Not when the jet-fighter planes our Government has already given him could, easily enough, be used to repeat his courageous shooting up of an unarmed American transport plane, which killed five of our airmen.

And I am equally unwilling to send the tax collector, armed with the power of the Federal Government, into my congressional district—or yours—to extract money for Tito by force.

Speaking of commies, I do not believe the Communists are really philanthro-

pists—not even the home-grown American breed of comrades.

Yet here is an official organ of the Communist Party line, the January 1956 issue of the magazine Political Activity, plugging vigorously for "a policy of large-scale economic aid, without strings, to the so-called underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America."

And, this propaganda blurb continues:

Let our country—

They mean, believe it or not, the United States—

compete with the Soviet Union on a peaceful basis to see who can extend the most economic assistance to such areas as Egypt, Burma, and India.

Amazing, is it not?

Or is it, in view of Lenin's prophetic boast that the conquest and destruction of America would be achieved by our walking, or being pushed, into the booby-trap of bankruptcy?

Of course I am not even remotely implying that everyone who favors foreign aid is a Communist.

But under this party directive it is obvious that every American Communist must be an all-out advocate of unlimited spending of American wealth and resources on economic assistance to other countries — government-to-government aid which, by the way, inevitably promotes socialism within the recipient countries.

No wonder a majority of the members of the Second Hoover Commission warned last year, "Surely, after almost 10 years, the time has come to apply some brakes to this overseas spending program."

I am 100 percent in favor of the proposed congressional reappraisal and reevaluation of foreign aid on the chance that it would help apply the brakes.

But I would have a lot more faith that it would really happen, that it would really amount to something, if this were done before, rather than after, new billions of foreign-aid funds are voted.

There is not the slightest excuse for postponing this review of the basic premises of foreign aid. And there is no reason why we cannot delay voting more money for a few months. There is an estimated unexpended balance of $6.8 billion of foreign-aid funds, enough to keep the program going for at least 2 years.

I am fairly sure that if we vote the money first the zeal for a genuine reappraisal and reevaluation will quickly and noticeably wane.

Congress was asked to give the administration authority, in this year's foreign-aid bill "to make commitments up to 10 years in length to assist less developed countries on long-term projects important to their development."

That unprecedented request does not sound like applying the brakes.

I am glad the Committee on Foreign Affairs and this House have turned down the proposal.

But, I ask you to take a look at the substitute provision the House inserted in the bill as a compromise.

It declares that, as long as the Communist threat persists—and the way things are going that could be for quite a spell—it will "be the policy of the United States to continue to make available to free nations and peoples upon request assistance of such nature and in such amounts as the United States is able to provide compatible with its own stability, strength, and other obligations, and as may be needed and effectively used by such free nations and peoples."

Quite a compromise, is it not?

Something like a prospective tenant who refuses to sign a year's lease but offers, instead, to agree to rent the property permanently, just as long as he is able to pay the rent.

I decline to have any part in that kind of a mortgage on America.

I did not believe that it was possible to top the blank-check commitment I have just described.

But I was wrong.

The other day I read—the rules of this House prevent my identifying the source—the statement that—

The recipients of our aid should know that we would share a portion of our abundance, whether or not there was a Soviet Union.

So, apparently, communism may come and go, but foreign aid, like Tennyson's brook, "goes on forever."

The American taxpayer today is coming to know less and less about what his Government is doing with more and more of his money.

This is particularly true with respect to money spent for foreign aid.

One of the reasons is so-called security restrictions.

I want to be entirely fair and reasonable about this matter. I know there are necessary military secrets. No doubt there is some information regarding military assistance to specific countries which cannot properly be discussed on the floor of Congress and thereby disclosed to the world.

However, one serious consequence of these restrictions is that Members of Congress other than those on committees directly involved can secure this classified information on only a limited and individual basis.

They are prevented from using the information as the background for congressional discussion of either the amounts or the policies involved.

This may be a necessary evil—but it is still an evil.

Moreover, I am firmly convinced that, with the power to classify and restrict such information vested in the executive agencies, there are grave potentialities of abuse.

I see no valid reason, for example, why the proposed allocations of nonmilitary, economic aid for fiscal year 1957 to Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Bolivia, and Guatemala should be classified.

The practical, and exceedingly dangerous, consequence of these restrictions is that undoubtedly many Members of Congress actually vote for unspecified, unlisted allocations of taxpayers' moneys to foreign countries without any knowledge of the specific amount that country is to receive, or the alleged reasons therefor.

This evil is compounded by the fact that the current foreign-aid bill confers authority upon the executive department to switch appropriated funds between countries and areas of the globe.

Back in 1949 the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg, although a stanch supporter of foreign aid, said that a proposal to grant similar authority to the executive branch in effect called for "the virtual creation of a total worldwide warlord power." At that time the proposal was indignantly turned down by Congress.

But that very power has gradually and stealthily come to the executive agencies as a byproduct of the evolution of this foreign-aid Frankenstein and through the piecemeal acquiescence of Congress.

During recent debate on the foreign-aid bill, I heard the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. RICHARDS] say:

Here you find the greatest flexibility power ever given to any President of the United States. He can move funds all over the place, from one side of the world to the other, to meet any emergency.

I do not detract one iota from my very great respect for the present President of the United States when I say that I am unwilling to bestow this power upon any President.

My unwillingness is all the greater because, in exercising the authority "to move funds all over the place," the President must rely upon the opinions, decisions, and recommendations of numerous paper-shuffling bureaucrats far down the line in the executive agencies, many of whom, so far as the Congress, the American people, and the President himself are concerned, are completely anonymous and faceless.

American generosity under the foreign-aid program has become utterly profligate.

What is worse, the purposes this generosity is supposed to serve, the ends it is supposed to accomplish, have become increasingly vague, ill defined, lacking in sharp focus, and even contradictory, as the years have passed.

As I said at the outset, after 10 years and $50 billion of expenditures, there is little agreement as to why we are doing it.

There is no agreement as to whether the motive is generosity or strict self-interest.

There is no agreement as to whether the purpose is "to share our abundance" with the less fortunate on a sort of permanent worldwide WPA basis—which has nothing to do with the Soviet threat—or whether the sole justification for aid to other countries is the protection of the United States against a clear and present danger.

There is no agreement as to the basis of eligibility for our assistance. In consequence, today, we are helping those countries in formal military alliance with us; those who are avowed neutralists, like India and Egypt; and even self-proclaimed friends of the Kremlin, like Yugoslavia.

There is sharp disagreement as to the relative emphasis, and billions, to be given military assistance and economic aid.

Perhaps most serious of all, there are those who argue that our assistance is no substitute for a nation's determination to help itself, but nevertheless continue to vote for aid to the very countries in which such determination is admittedly lacking.

Thus we find this strange statement in the House Foreign Affairs Committee report on foreign aid:

> The committee believes that our support of NATO should continue. The nations of Western Europe are prosperous, however, and in some cases appear to be relaxing their defense efforts. The United States cannot hope to overcome a lack of zeal on the part of any nation by supplying it with equipment. The future of NATO will be determined to a larger degree by what the nations of Europe do with their own resources than by the assistance rendered by the United States.

How can we hope to bring our foreign-aid program into sharp and effective focus; how can we expect results anywhere commensurate with our spending, how can we justify a continuation of our largess, until these contradictions and confusions are resolved?

One of the generalities offered as an objective of our foreign-aid programs is that of assisting nations and peoples to gain, or maintain, their independence.

Yet there are mounting evidences of bitter ill will toward us within many of the nations we are seeking to help.

I think one of the reasons for this ironical and frustrating situation is that we have failed to recognize all that is involved in the concept of independence.

A man or a nation, rendered the slave of another by virtue of force, cruelty or deceit obviously is not independent. That is precisely the threat posed by international communism.

But it is equally true that a man or nation made habitually reliant upon the aid and assistance of another is, to the extent of that reliance, also something less than independent.

That is the threat to national independence which we actually, or seemingly, pose to the very nations we seek to help.

And that threat is magnified when we necessarily impose conditions upon our aid and when we actually, or seemingly, intrude in the internal life and affairs of the beneficiary nations—as we inevitably do.

I have heard it said on this floor, certainly not without some basis in fact, that we Americans—who make it a prison offense to buy elections in our own country—have deliberately influenced the outcome of elections in other countries by the timing of our assistance. The effect obviously is to give aid to a particular political party or regime in those countries. Certainly this is a violation of national independence.

Needless to add, the use of American aid and equipment by beneficiary governments to combat colonial uprisings has been a further grievous source of hostility toward us.

Clearly then, generosity—even on a profligate scale—is no open sesame to friendship and mutual good will and cooperation between nations.

The last words of a great American who was twice elected President of the United States were, "I have tried so hard to do what is right."

Despite honest differences of judgment, despite the failings of human nature, despite the genuine difficulties of knowing what is right, despite the cynicism of those who profess to believe only the worst about their public servants, I am sure very few of those in positions of responsibility in Government are devoid of the earnest desire to do what is right.

That desire is particularly acute in the face of so vast, complex, and crucial an issue as the one here under discussion.

I do not want to oppose merely for the sake of opposing. Neither do I intend to be jockeyed into the position of accepting and supporting a packaged foreign-aid program involving immense, innumerable, interchangeable—and virtually permanent—lump-sum expenditures of American wealth around the globe.

I have said that I am 100 percent in favor of the proposed congressional reappraisal and reevaluation of foreign aid.

To be of real value, I believe such a reappraisal and reevalution must place primary emphasis on the defense, security, and welfare of the United States.

I believe it must underscore the urgency of providing Members of Congress full access to all facts as to specific proposals of foreign aid to specific nations.

I believe it must stress the necessity of maximum utilization, by other nations, of their own resources of self-help and of the means of assistance available from American private enterprise and capital and sound trade relations.

I believe it must recognize the indispensable factor of the will to self-help on the part of other nations in solving the problems of mutual security.

Finally, I believe it must recognize the importance of pointing all programs of foreign aid to the goal of reduction and termination as rapidly as possible.

This, it seems to me, would constitute a genuine reappraisal and reevaluation.

Perhaps if we will humbly renounce the virtually omniscient and Godlike role we have assumed under the guise of global foreign aid, we shall find less pretentious but far more effective means of serving, not only the interests of America, but the divine purpose of promoting peace, justice, and human freedom throughout this troubled world.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. JOHANSEN, for 45 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. MULTER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRD.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 9739. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1034. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Donald D. Parrish.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 313. An act to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood or unrine of persons tried in the District of Columbia for operating vehicles while under the influence of intoxicating liquor; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2429. An act to amend section 212 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize research and experimental work with vessels, vessel propulsion and equipment, port facilities, planning, and operation and cargo handling on ships and at ports; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2704. An act to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction of certain highway-railroad grade separations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2895. An act to amend the acts of February 28, 1903, and March 3, 1927, relating to the payment of the cost and expense of constructing railway-highway grade elimination structures in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2896. An act to amend the act relating to cemetery association; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 3663. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 3821. An act to authorize the construction of one prototype ship, and the conversion of one Liberty ship, by the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 3838. An act to provide for the maintenance and operation of the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River from Jones Point, Va., to Maryland; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 3897. An act to improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 25, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1994. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting 73 reports received from the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force covering 83 violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1 "Administrative Control of Appropriations within the Department of Defense," pursuant to section 3679 (i) (2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1995. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the Fifth Annual Report of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, together with pertinent recommendations for civil defense in our future national security structure, pursuant to section 406 of Public Law 920, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1996. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting the monthly report on military prime contracts with business firms for work in the United States for the period from July 1, 1955, through April 30, 1956, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 268, 84th Congress, which amended section 211 of the Small Business Act of 1953; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1997. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting additional information relative to the case of Yao Kui Chu, A–10065559, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1998. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting additional information relative to the case of Francesco Iurman, A–10035781, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1999. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 24, 1956, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of Root River at Rushford, Minn. This report is submitted in interim response to the authority contained in an item of the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937, for a preliminary examination and survey of Root River, Fillmore, Mower, Olmsted, Winona, and Houston Counties, Minn. (H. Doc. No. 431); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

2000. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 25, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Waimea Beach and Hanapepe Bay, Island of Kauai, T. H., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 432); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

2001. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 22, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of Freeport Harbor, Tex. This report is submitted in response to a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on September 27, 1951, requesting a review of reports on Freeport Harbor, Tex., and a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on March 30, 1955, requesting a review of reports on Brazos River, mouth of Freeport, Tex. (H. Doc. No. 433); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

2002. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 24, 1956, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a survey of Licking River, vicinity of Covington and Newport, Ky. This report is submitted in response to a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted March 16, 1954, authorizing submission of an interim report on Licking River, vicinity of Covington and Newport, Ky., under the general authority of the resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 24, 1953, requesting a review of reports on Licking River, Ky., with respect to improvement and maintenance of a navigation channel in the lower reach of the river. This report covers maintenance only (H. Doc. No. 434); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

2003. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 1, 1956, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a survey of the upper Wabash River Basin, of Indiana. This report is submitted in partial response to a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, adopted May 9, 1949, requesting a review of reports on the Wabash River and tributaries, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. It is submitted also in complete response to a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted May 23, 1946, requesting a review of the recommendations contained in House Document 100, 73d Congress, 1st session, relative to flood protection at or near Logansport, Ind. (H. Doc. No. 435); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

2004. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 24, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Toledo Harbor, Ohio. This report is submitted in response to a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on April 21, 1953, authorizing the preparation of a survey report on Toledo Harbor, Ohio (H. Doc. No. 436); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

2005. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 26, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on waterway from the Escambia River to the Alabama River, Fla. and Ala., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Concurrent Resolution 244. Concurrent resolution to provide for a joint committee of the Congress to represent the Congress at the unveiling of the Commodore John Barry Memorial at Wexford, Ireland, on September 16, 1956; without amendment (Rept. No. 2409). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KILGORE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 1542. An act to authorize an allowance for civilian officers and employees of the Government who are notaries public; without amendment (Rept. No. 2410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 10523. A bill to conform the appointment and compensation of the chief legal officer of the Post Office Department to the method of appointment and rate of compensation provided for comparable positions, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2182. An act for the relief of the city of Elkins, W. Va.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 11888. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery at the Birch Coulee battlefield site in Renville County, Minn.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 11889. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 11890. A bill to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 11891. A bill to amend section 2 of Public Law 385, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 11892. A bill to amend section 2 of Public Law 385, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 11893. A bill to provide special tax treatment for certain taxpayers who changed from the retirement to the straight-line method of computing depreciation with respect to certain kinds of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 11894. A bill to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 11895. A bill to authorize the interchange of lands between the Department of Agriculture and military departments of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 11896. A bill to provide that 66⅔ percent of money rentals received by the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force from leasing for agricultural or grazing purposes lands located within school districts shall be paid to such school districts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 11897. A bill to provide for an official residence for the Vice President of the United States, to increase certain allowances of and provide more adequate office space

for such official, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. Res. 551. Resolution to establish a select committee to conduct a study and evaluation of the foreign aid mutual security programs; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 11898. A bill for the relief of Judith Wollner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 11899. A bill for the relief of Arie Cornelis DeVos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11900. A bill for the relief of Gaetano DiChiara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 11901. A bill for the relief of Anna Bertuzzi Boselli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 11902. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bronislawa Marini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 11903. A bill for the relief of Lum Shen Ng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 11904. A bill for the relief of Harry D. Naum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

1154. Mr. BUSH presented a petition of 64 residents of Lycoming County, Pa., urging early enactment of H. R. 7886, the veterans' security bill, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

How a Senator Promotes His State's Hotel Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently it was my privilege to prepare for the Hotel Gazette an article entitled "How a Senator Promotes His State's Hotel Industry." As printed in that distinguished magazine, the article was accompanied by a picture of President Eisenhower and his brothers on a visit to Wisconsin's famed North Woods, where they caught a number of large pike and muskellunge. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW A SENATOR PROMOTES HIS STATE'S HOTEL INDUSTRY

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, senior Senator from Wisconsin)

What are the usual duties of the average United States Senator?

If you were to ask Mr. Ordinary American that question, he would probably answer, "A Senator's duties are basically legislative—to work on bills and laws in the State's and his Nation's interest."

That answer is absolutely sound.

But in addition to the legislative challenge, as such, there are dozens of other duties performed by the average Senator. These duties include: Keeping the home folks informed of major issues affecting them, and helping on many constituents' problems with Government agencies in the public interest. An example of the latter work would be assisting on a veteran's claim with the Veterans' Administration, helping on a farmer's problem with the Department of Agriculture, and so forth.

All in all, a Senator must basically fulfill the broad needs of his entire State.

Inevitably, serving the interests of one's State also means helping to boost the industries of the State.

And, since so many of the 48 States now rely heavily upon the tourist industry for major income, it is perfectly natural that a United States Senator should interest himself in focusing national attention on his State's tourist attractions.

As Wisconsin's senior Senator, representing as I do a State where tourism is perhaps our second greatest industry, I am vitally interested in the well-being of the Badger Hotel and related industries.

I am pleased, therefore, to report to the readers of Hotel Gazette regarding my efforts along this line.

I do so because I think that other Senators and Representatives may be in a position to help their own hotel industry. Thereby, they will help America's sound leisure-time activity, its sound pursuit of happiness.

TIPS ON SPOTLIGHTING A STATE

Let me therefore list some of the ways by which I have helped throw the friendly national spotlight on Wisconsin tourism:

1. Each year, on the Senate floor, I have issued an open invitation to Senators and Representatives to come and visit wonderful Wisconsin.

In hot humid Washington in June, July, and August, Congress wends its weary way toward adjournment, handling hundreds upon hundreds of bills. And, so at that time, I have said to my colleagues, "Come and relax in the 56,000 square miles of superb vacation land, which is Wisconsin. Enjoy the unexcelled fishing and hunting of my State."

I have said, in effect, "for months, we legislators have been fighting one another. Now, let's get wise and go out and relax. Let's fight—on the fishing line—one of Wisconsin's famed muskies. Let's enjoy the thrill of the best outdoor sports in the Nation."

My comments as published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have been reprinted in tens of thousands of copies.

The prints have been forwarded to all the resorts of my State, and thereafter to their guests and clients for other States.

2. Pictures have played a very important role in this publicity. I use pictures of Wisconsin's tourist attractions in my weekly newsletter, which is distributed not only to the newspapers of my State, but to other press men all over the country. Included are pictures of Wisconsin fishing, boating, swimming, hunting, and just plain outdoor relaxing—pictures which adorn my office too, and which prominently feature articles which I have prepared from time to time.

3. When word came that President Eisenhower might not vacation in Colorado this year, I wrote to him and issued a press release which "broke" in the national wire services, urging him to come back to Wisconsin. Ike responded most graciously with assurance that he would certainly bear Wisconsin in mind when he picks his vacation spot.

4. On the occasion of the holding of important national conventions in Milwaukee or Madison, or elsewhere, I have spotlighted these functions by remarks in the Senate. I have warmly welcomed the convention delegates from the 48 States. I have pointed out that I know they will enjoy our splendid hotels and restaurants.

This has helped, I believe, to encourage other conventions to meet in Wisconsin. My readers know how crucial national convention business is to a State.

5. A great boost to Wisconsin hotels has been provided by the wonderful Milwaukee Braves which have broken all National League attendance records.

"Come on and watch baseball's greatest team," I've said to the Nation, before personally heading for opening day and other games at Milwaukee County's greatest stadium.

6. In visiting abroad, and meeting with prominent foreign leaders, I have not hesitated to mention in interviews with foreign correspondents this fact: While I enjoy visiting foreign parts, I have unhesitatingly invited the distinguished leaders of those countries to come to the United States and visit wonderful Wisconsin.

These, then, are a few of the phases of my pro-Badger tourist activities.

All this has, of course, required close liaison with the Wisconsin State Convention Department, the Wisconsin State Hotel Association, the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, with various county and regional resort groups, and a wide variety of other folks, designed constantly to boost Wisconsin tourism.

I have done this not simply to serve the Wisconsin hotel industry, of course, but that vast variety of other groups in our society which benefit from tourist dollars, from the gasoline station on the highway to the cheese stand, the roadside restaurant, the fishing lodge, outdoor guides, and everyone else who benefits from tourist income.

In conclusion, I certainly like Wisconsin hotels. They are clean, efficient, well run, friendly. They pride themselves on the traditional high quality of their personal service.

I won't ever let them down. I'll do all that I can to constantly build them up. They are worthy of all my devoted efforts because they are a mainstay of the economy of Wisconsin.

Anniversary of the Proclamation of the Republic of Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, in observance of the celebration of the second anniversary of the government of President Ngo Dinh Diem, of Vietnam, on

July 7, 1956, and because Congress will not be in session on the occasion of the celebration of the first anniversary of the proclamation of the Republic of Vietnam, October 26, 1956, I wish to take this opportunity to extend sincere felicitations and best wishes to President Ngo Dinh Diem.

Under the leadership of a dedicated man, President Ngo Dinh Diem, the people of Vietnam shook themselves loose from both the shackles of colonialism and the tentacles of communism. By the referendum of October 23, 1955, the majority of the Vietnamese people clearly manifested their desire to get away from all forms of corruption of the past. In the October 26 election of the Chief of State of Vietnam, Premier Ngo Dinh Diem, and the subsequent proclamation of the republic, for the first time in modern history, the people of Vietnam had an opportunity to vote in a national election. The elected leader of the Vietnamese people is a man whose patriotism, courage, and honesty are renown the world over.

Political independence can only be complete where economic independence is also genuine. The National Government of Vietnam has been fighting a valiant struggle against the exigencies of forces which have served to disrupt and dislocate the economy. Possessing considerable potentialities for a country whose development is still in its beginnings, Vietnam devotes most of its resources to economic reconstruction.

That President Ngo Dinh Diem is unwilling merely to give orders without seeing for himself the progress being made in the national reconstruction policy he has followed since coming to office is evidenced by his frequent tours throughout the Provinces.

The press and information service of the Embassy of Vietnam in the United States reports in its volume 2, No. 1, edition:

These Provinces are almost entirely agricultural and their population of nearly 1 million is almost completely made up of farmers. As a result, President Ngo's visit has emphasized the importance of the government's agricultural policy and the value of gifts of all kinds made by the government to the farmers of the area.

Under the leadership of President Ngo dinh Diem, the government has as its main objective the well-being of the people, without political or religious discrimination:

We are only beginning. Thanks to the help of friendly countries, especially the United States, we can see our way to achieving our aim of raising the standard of living and contributing to the happiness of every member of the rural community as much as possible.

An address given by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Vu van Mau, to the ministerial conference of the Colombo plan at Singapore further underscored the economic problems facing the nation:

Our economic troubles, resulting from 8 years of war, are still cause for concern: factors include the dwindling of the production potential, a chronic trade deficit, the unaccustomed obstruction of channels of distribution to the detriment of production. * * * Immense mining and forest resources, essential for our growing industries, have been taken from our control, we hope, at least, temporarily. Deprived of the coalfields of Hongay and Dong Trieu, we, and the whole free world, find ourselves without any important source of thermal energy and at the same time robbed of a considerable reserve of exportable materials. * * * The reestablishment of these * * * will necessitate considerable investment and cannot be achieved without difficulty and delay.

The development of a strong public administration, the raising of the economic level of a nation, are difficult tasks. The free world must cooperate wholeheartedly in achievement of the common goal which is to build a free and strong Vietnam. The president of Vietnam and the National Government are working toward peace and social progress—silently, steadily, without fanfare. In this struggle for national survival, a survival necessary to the whole Far East, Vietnam asks the understanding of its allies, and believes that "From this understanding we will draw the strength necessary to achieve a purpose which is more than just."

The Vietnamese people are very grateful for the generous help given by the United States and France and also for the aid given within the framework of the Colombo plan, by Britain, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand. They appreciate this aid fully in that it is making it possible for them to conquer communism by combating poverty.

As one who deeply believes in freedom, democracy, and the importance of achieving a better understanding among all nations, I want to take this opportunity to wish President Ngo Dinh Diem and the people of Vietnam every success which they so richly deserve.

West Virginia To Supply Coal to West Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 22, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement in the press that one of West Germany's biggest steel companies has completed negotiations for the purchase of 3 million to 4 million tons of coal from producers in West Virginia, to be delivered in 1956, is indeed heartening news. There, however, is a disheartening side to the report, and that concerns the critical shortage of railroad freight cars. The shortage has been continuous since the end of World War II.

I should like to point up the irony in the problem of the boxcar shortage. During the recent foreign-aid hearings before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member, testimony was presented to the effect that India obtained some $18.5 million in railroad rolling stock during the fiscal year 1955—much of which was purchased in the United States. I thereupon directed attention to the serious shortage of freight cars that exists in the coalfields of West Virginia, as well as in other States. Accordingly, I asked that this contribution on the part of the United States be translated into units. In response to my request, the following information was supplied for the record:

Under operational agreement No. 17, Railway Rehabilitation, the United States committed a total of $38.5 million to India during fiscal years 1954 and 1955.

The above funds were to provide the following: 100 type WG broad gage locomotives (steam); 4,365 broad-gage freight wagons; and 4,365 meter-gage freight wagons.

Country of source	Item	Value
United States	50 WG locomotives	$8,940,650
Do	1,650 MC cars	7,080,299
Do	1,650 O cars	5,846,546
	Total	21,867,495
Japan	25 WG locomotives	2,038,750
United Kingdom	do	2,036,750
Do	2,215 MC car bodies	6,176,115
Do	1,715 O car bodies	
Austria	1,000 O car bodies	1,942,000
Japan	2,715 MC wheel and axles.	2,533,910
Do	2,715 O wheel and axles.	
France	500 MC car bodies	750,000
	Total	15,477,525
	Grand total	37,345,020

In my opinion, the comment which I made during the hearings is apropos. It follows:

Mr. BYRD. I am quite sure that the American people, who haven't been too well pleased with the treatment that we Americans get from the Indians, as voiced by Mr. Nehru himself, are not happy and will continue not to be happy when we supply the Indians with implements of equipment that we ourselves are doing without.

The following article, which appeared in the June 20 issue of the Wall Street Journal, reports the arrangements that have been made for the supply of coal by West Virginia to West Germany:

WEST GERMAN STEEL PRODUCER GOES TO WEST VIRGINIA FOR COAL SUPPLY—BUYS 3 MILLION TO 4 MILLION TONS, TAKES OPTIONS ON LIKE AMOUNT FOR 1957

NEW YORK.—An executive of one of West Germany's biggest steel companies has completed negotiations for the purchase of 3 to 4 million tons of American coal to be delivered in 1956.

Dr. F. W. Siebert, director of the Phoenix-Rheinrohr A. G., which describes itself as West Germany's second biggest producer of steel ingots and Western Europe's biggest maker of pipes, said he had arranged for the purchase of this quantity of coal from "a number of wholesalers and producing companies in West Virginia."

Dr. Siebert also disclosed he'd also made arrangements on options for a similar quantity of coal to be delivered next year. He said he believed the United States would remain a "permanent" supplier of coal to West Germany, despite the fact that American coal landed in his country is currently about $10 a ton more costly than other supplies.

Neither British, German, nor any other coal-producing nations of Western Europe can meet West Germany's soaring need for coal, he said. He estimated Western Europe's purchases of American coal this year

would amount to some 42 million tons, compared with approximately 27 million tons in 1955.

According to the latest statistics of the United States Bureau of Mines, the United States in the first 2 months of 1956 had exported close to 1½ million tons of coal to West Germany, compared with less than 400,000 tons in the corresponding 1955 period.

But the Bonn Republic isn't the only foreign customer beating a broader path to America's coal counter; Italy, the Netherlands, Japan, and Argentina are all showing substantial increases in their purchases of coal from the United States, according to the Bureau of Mines. Total United States coal exports, over 90 percent of them bituminous, amounted to 8,735,657 tons in the first 2 months of this year. They were 4,907,638 tons a year earlier.

The president of the biggest commercial coal producing company in the United States, George H. Love of the Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co. told the company's annual meeting in April he expected United States coal exports this year to "reach or slightly exceed" 500 million tons, compared with 470 million tons in 1955. The company, which has properties in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Kentucky, recently began a $20 million project aimed at opening up a new mine and processing plant near Moundsville, W. Va.

Coal exports, along with increased demand for coal on the part of chemical producers and atomic-energy plants, are credited with much of the improvement in coal industry fortunes in recent months. It's been a sharp turnabout, too. Pittsburgh Consolidation, for example, showed first quarter earnings of 51 cents a share after its 3-for-1 stock split, compared with 37 cents a share on present stock in the first quarter of 1955. The West Kentucky Coal Co. in the same period reported earnings of 57 cents a share compared with 19 cents a year earlier.

Shipping companies operating tramp steamers and railroads moving the coal to United States ports are also participating handsomely in coal's recovery. Overseas coal movements have proved an important prop under tramp shipping rates, pushed so high of late that coal producers in combination with several railroads and the United Mine Workers of America are currently organizing a $50 million corporation solely for the transportation of coal overseas. Railroad companies such as the Chesapeake & Ohio, Norfolk & Western and Virginian railway credit coal clients for much of the 20 percent or more improvement in profits in the early months of 1956, compared with the like 1955 months.

A Constitutional Congress Can End World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks made by me on June 7 at a meeting of For America in Los Angeles.

These remarks point out that NATO also has, from the beginning, had political, economic, and propaganda authority sufficient for any activities in these fields, and that it is developing a system of governmental agencies for dealing with these powers on a supranational basis.

The remarks further point out that neither the executive branch nor the judicial branch can reverse the drift to a one-world government. Congress can reverse the drift if supporters of national sovereignty will turn their attention to the congressional contests and nominate and elect constitutionalists, in both parties, so they can tip the balance in Congress back to nationalism by the same methods by which Harry Hopkins and Sidney Hillman tipped the balance in doubtful areas to collectivist internationalism.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CONSTITUTIONAL CONGRESS CAN END WORLD GOVERNMENT

You have been hearing expert testimony on the fantastic taxes you are paying your Government today. I will try to show you something of what you are getting for your money.

Let me take, as an example, one of Mr. Acheson's most curious achievements, NATO.

I mentioned, at the New York meeting of For America, that the North Atlantic Treaty area includes not only Britain, France, Benelux, and the other Western European Powers, but the African territories of the member nations, their airplanes and their ships at sea. I received a doubting letter from someone in California, who asked if I hadn't made a mistake. Wasn't NATO, he said, limited to the nations of Western Europe?

I quoted from the North Atlantic Treaty, and added, "The NATO area also includes the Atlantic Ocean, Canada, and the United States. San Francisco is as much NATO territory as Paris."

Why do our people have this propaganda picture of NATO as something limited to Western Europe, instead of a vast empire stretching from Alaska to the borders of Iran? Perhaps someone planned it that way.

Another evidence of NATO's importance is its financial resources. A report in the New York Times of April 22, from the North Atlantic Council, datelined Norfolk, Va., stated that the NATO nations had spent $316 billion on defense in the past 7 years.

Of that amount, the United States spent $252 billion, or about 5 times as much as the other 13 nations combined. It is true that part of our expenditures were for the Pacific area, but it is also true that most of the NATO members have Pacific territories. We also make nonmilitary contributions to help support the budgets of member nations.

You may wonder why American defense expenditures are included in the NATO figures. Just remember that NATO is a holding company which silently directs the defense programs of member nations as Sam Insull's holding companies used to direct your local light and power companies.

THE NATO GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE

NATO does not stop with pious statements of intention. It has governmental organs to put its intentions into effect. Someone planned it that way.

NATO has a secretary-general and other officials, and a permanent international civil service. This purely executive operation is nowhere subject to any limits on its powers.

NATO has organs for budgeting, purchasing, letting of international contracts, accounting, auditing, and inspection. Like Topsy, these agencies just "growed" but how they "growed."

The NATO Council of Foreign and Other Ministers is the top policymaking layer. Their permanent deputies come next. The Joint Chiefs of each member nation form a third supervising layer, and a military executive committee in Washington is a fourth layer, all above the military commander who sits in splendor at the headquarters called SHAPE.

These powerful but almost invisible agencies give political guidance and strategic directions to the commander of the NATO forces.

NATO has its own armed forces in being. This is the crucial test of sovereignty. Its forces are made up of parts of the armed forces of the West European member states assigned to it, and the components of our army stationed in Western Europe.

Whoever is guiding the evolution of NATO has been careful to avoid anything which would arouse American suspicions. The commanders of NATO forces have always been Americans—Generals Eisenhower, Ridgway, Gruenther. But the military commander is low man on the totem pole of the policymaking hierarchy in NATO.

Now it is perfectly clear, if you read the record, that these military contingents from the member nations form one integrated NATO armed force.

It is the duty of the Supreme Commander to see that they are integrated. Great care has been used to avoid visible signs of this integration. Uniforms are different. Titles are different. All the unimportant things are different. Some members of our armed forces sincerely believe the national contingents are still legally and militarily independent, but I see no grounds for any such illusion. This hope is part, I believe, of the natural tendency of professional military men to believe our powerful Military Establishment is unchanged, if the only change is in the fine print of a legal document.

NATO'S POLITICAL-ECONOMIC POWERS

From the beginning, NATO has had political, economic, and social as well as military responsibilities. Article 2 of the treaty proclaims the intention of the signers to promote conditions of "stability and well-being." Words like "stability and well-being," in present-day legislative drafting, are designed to cover the waterfront. The Ismay report on the first 5 years of NATO, says, and I quote, "Peace is not merely the absence of war. Its maintenance requires continuous cooperation by governments in the economic, social, and cultural as well as in the military field." Article 2 is, in fact, merely a restatement of articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter.

NATO's aim is to unite all the member states into one community. What will be left of the American experiment, when we have been integrated with the political system of France, the economic system of Turkey, the social system of Italy? I do not know, but someone knows.

I cannot understand the present hullabaloo over giving NATO economic and political responsibilities. Certainly Mr. Dulles, Prime Minister Mollet, Foreign Minister Lester Pearson, and the other ministers of NATO nations know what was in the treaty and is now in full operation. The three wise men who were assigned to present a program for enlarging the role of NATO may be needed to prepare public opinion, but not to provide any new powers.

Military responsibilities are in themselves both economic and political controls.

Armies consist of men, supplies, weapons, and the command and staff structure. Supplies and weapons are economic problems. Command and strategy are political. NATO moved early to authorize its bureaucratic agencies to oversee the production of weapons and supplies, and the financial operations involved in defense production by member nations.

The significant area of economic and political control is the planning of expenditures yet to come. Here the key word is "coordinated."

In the mushroom growth of the governmental network all over the world today, the coordinators have all the fun. If any of you are ambitious to get a place in one of these hierarchies, get a job as a coordinator. Then everybody will be working for your nod of approval, and their fate will be in your hands.

NATO puts what its members should do, in the form of recommendations to member governments. But what recommendations NATO has made to the American Government I do not know. They are classified. You have to be a high official in the executive branch before you can be told. Members of Congress, the press, and the people lack the necessary intelligence or discretion or something. The facts on NATO must be kept from them.

At this point let me remind you that there is nowhere in the North Atlantic Treaty system any provision for keeping Communists out of either its governing councils or its permanent international staff.

We know the high proportion of Communist voters in France and Italy. We know that, in Britain and Canada, communism is strong, as it is in our country. How much vital military information is channeled to the Communists by the NATO machinery? I do not know, but I consider it the neatest espionage setup the Communists have yet devised, not excluding the agreement which put a Soviet national at the key point in U. N. through which military reports are funneled. You remember how all General MacArthur's military reports on the Korean war were sent to a U. N. official from the U. S. S. R. How many such reports our busy bureaucrats are sending to NATO links in the Communist net, we cannot know. Judging from the information we obtained under oath on the so-called international civil service of the United Nations, I fear the worst.

IS NATO REPLACING NATIONAL MILITARY FORCES?

We have one test case of how NATO planning works. That is in the mystifying developments in the rearming of West Germany.

Somewhere in the maze of NATO it has been decided that West Germany may enlist her manpower, put her men in uniform, and train them. But the West German Government may not do certain other things. It may not have a military general staff. It may not have atomic weapons, chemical weapons, or the most modern planes.

Germany is the front line for the defense of all Western Europe. Who gains from a system which makes the German troops a mere armed horde, without its own general staff and without modern weapons of war?

Suppose we should face the threat of a war with the Soviet Union, and Germany wants to fight with us, but the other West European countries go neutralist? German troops will be bound hand and foot. Someone planned it that way.

I am troubled about another question. I wonder if this amputation of the essential organs of military power, in the case of Germany, is the pilot model for all national armies in the future? Are we moving, by deliberate plan, to the day when no nation will have a general staff, or atomic weapons, or airpower?

NATO has a curious interest in civil defense. Now some of you are worried about the constitutional dangers implicit in civil defense. These doubts were intensified in Washington, when our executive branch held a dress rehearsal for dispersal after an imaginary atomic-bomb attack, and the President proclaimed martial law. Apparently it was a mistake in signals. The connection between atomic attack or even rumor of atomic attack, and martial law here at home, was not supposed to be brought out so clearly.

So far NATO has operated with a velvet quiet. But it is getting too large and too important for secrecy. So what is the alternative? NATO is stepping up its machinery for saturating our minds with propaganda, through the printed word, motion pictures, radio, student tours, and all the other devices for political brainwashing.

HOW NATO ERODES OUR CONSTITUTION

Constitutionally NATO is not responsible to the people of the member nations. Only the executive branch has any influence on the policies of NATO. Only the executive branch is permitted to learn what NATO decides. The growth of NATO is a continuation, in another form, of the mushroom growth of the executive power, far beyond the point where it can be influenced by Congress, the courts, the press, or the people.

But note this: Under the American Constitution, when the people wanted to change their Government policies, they voted the administration out of power, and out it went. Today our elected officials, and their advisers, are wedged tightly between an internationalist bureaucracy above them and an independent self-guiding bureaucracy below them. The officials in the front windows may be changed by a national election, but they can make almost no change in our policies.

I have given you the simplest, most unemotional and undramatic presentation I could make of the information about NATO, from its own published reports.

NATO is part of a system of regional pacts which includes SEATO, and the Organization of the American States, that strange new agency, which has locked the Pan American Union firmly into the United Nations, where we of the Americas can now act only with approval of Soviet Russia in the Security Council.

Do you like this silent relentless drive to world government?

Do you think global executive supremacy is superior to American constitutional freedom?

Do you think the clever men who planned this devious political straitjacket should be trusted with making American policies, in the life and death struggle with the Communist elite?

CONGRESS ALONE CAN DEMOLISH WORLD GOVERNMENT

You ask what you can do, to help destroy this superstructure which cages us in.

There is no slightest hope that anyone in the executive branch can cast off the chains that bind us. The weaving of the net was too cleverly done.

You know well that our Supreme Court will not do it.

The only power that can restore constitutional liberty is the Congress. On February 11, I said "We must put none but constitutionalists on guard in Congress." But people say, "What do you mean. How can we do that?"

Isn't it pitiful that Americans do not know how to get a Congress that represents them?

Let me give you a short-cut method of electing a constitutionalist Congress. Study how the leftwingers have year after year elected their leftwing, collectivist, internationalist spokesmen in Congress!

The collectivists understand something we have forgotten. The political contest to win the executive branch is entirely different from the contest for control of Congress. The executive branch operates as a unit. It is a Roosevelt administration, or a Truman administration, or an Eisenhower administration. The fight at election time is for large blocs of votes in key States, to win or lose all, for 4 years.

Congress is entirely different. Nearly 50 percent of the Members of both Houses speak for the party out of power. The problem is to tip the balance in Congress. A few districts mean victory. Every congressional district, every Senatorial contest, in large or small States, is critical. It may be the battle which wins the war.

COLLECTIVISTS HAVE A GRAND STRATEGY TO WIN CONGRESS

The collectivists have carefully planned the strategy and tactics for congressional elections. Sidney Hillman taught them, many years ago, to fight for the marginal districts, to win where the other party's margin was small.

The collectivists see the congressional campaign as a chessboard on which is clearly marked the margin of victory, and the record of opposing candidates, in every congressional district in the United States.

The objective of their strategy is to help collectivists to defeat constitutionalists. They work in both parties, because they know the constitutional struggle is far more fundamental than the contest between parties.

The collectivists have perfected three techniques.

First, they build a vigorous organization in every district, to ring doorbells. It is directed by their national agencies, but appears to work through local people.

Second, they build up a nationwide propaganda to indoctrinate people with the leftwing policies which their candidates will be supporting.

Third, they mount an intensive campaign, backed by all their resources of money, propaganda, and organization, to destroy the leadership candidates on the conservative side, and to elect outstanding candidates on their side.

For many years the collectivists have worked together brilliantly, along all three roads, regardless of party, to elect men to Congress who will serve their purpose, and to pass a political death sentence against those who oppose communism, socialism, big spending, or internationalism. The attack on the 80th Congress, which exposed wartime communism, was their most blatant, but not their only, victory.

CONSTITUTIONALISTS CAN BEGIN TO FIGHT FOR CONGRESS

The constitutionalists have no comparable organization to help American nationalists in their districts, to create a tide of opinion in favor of constitutionalism, or to strengthen the leadership on their own side in both Houses, and defeat the leaders on the other side. They have never tried to tip the balance in Congress to the conservative side.

For decades, the voters who revere the Constitution have sulked in their tents like Achilles, while collectivists were out ringing doorbells, keeping up a continuous barrage of collectivist ideas in the press, over the air, and in a thousand papers and magazines, and sending their best teams to drive from public life the leaders of constitutionalism in Congress.

For decades conservative voters have watched the balance of power in Congress being pushed toward the left, a little more every year, and done nothing. Then they wonder why Members of Congress who were elected by the leftwingers vote for foreign aid and big spending.

Jim Farley had a saying which we ought to heed. He kept repeating, "In politics, you can't beat something with nothing."

It is now June. Congressional elections are 5 months away. For all of those 5 months the collectivist political machine will be in high gear, working in and through both parties, to destroy the remnants of American constitutionalism. What will you be doing?

If you wish, you can do something. Now is the moment. You can take your eyes off Washington, and ring doorbells in your own district. You can ask for America to compile a list of the hard core of leadership on the left and try to defeat it. Also a list of

the hard core of leadership on the American side, and reinforce it. You can study how the collectivists spread their slogans and symbols and then tell the story of our Constitution as it affects the fight today.

You may not win a majority in Congress on the first try, but you can begin to tip the balance your way. In each succeeding Congress you can do a little more. In a few short years you can have a constitutionalist Congress. Then your Congress can cut down big spending and demobilize the bureaucratic elite.

Or, if you wish, you can do nothing.

Let me end with this. While you do nothing, the mesh of world government is being woven tighter and tighter, in the U. N., in NATO, in SEATO, in UNESCO.

It is moving to control your money, your foreign policies, your armies, and the minds of your little children.

The collectivists are watching. They will know the moment when they dare spring the trap.

Once they spring the trap, my friends, I promise you, you will be helpless to do anything, because you will have had it.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 22, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mankind, as together we pause at this shrine of devotion our fathers built, grant us, we pray Thee, the steadying vision of Thy eternal goodness. We give Thee thanks for the high souls of the yesterdays which are our cloud of witnesses today, and who still urge us on to deathless goals. Join us to "that company of souls supreme, the conscripts of the mighty dream."

In a day when all we value most seems so often to be at the mercy of what we value least, so direct Thy servants who here serve the Republic that the best which is expected of them and of which their dedicated faculties are capable may be brought to bear, without fear or favor, upon the confused issues of this critical day. Grant us, with resolution striving for a peace built on justice and decency and on the respect for the rights of nations great and small, such courage and patience in defending these high principles, despite any disheartenment, that the children of coming generations shall rise up and call us blessed. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 21, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2772) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in England in 1957, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 11740) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 244) to provide for a joint committee of the Congress to represent the Congress at the unveiling of the Commodore John Barry Memorial at Wexford, Ireland, on September 16, 1956, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 11740) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 244) to provide for a joint committee of the Congress to represent the Congress at the unveiling of the Commodore John Barry Memorial at Wexford, Ireland, on September 16, 1956, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby created a joint committee to be composed of 6 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House and 6 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, to represent the Congress at the ceremonies in connection with the unveiling of the statue of Commodore John Barry to be presented by the President to Ireland on behalf of the people of the United States at Wexford, Ireland, on September 16, 1956. The members of the joint committee shall select a chairman from among their number.

The expenses of the joint committee incurred in carrying out the purposes of this resolution, not to exceed $25,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers authorized by such joint committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

OBJECTION TO COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY MEETING TODAY DURING THE SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to enter objection to the Judiciary Committee sitting this afternoon during the session of the Senate. I simply wish to enter my objection.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection with the transaction of the routine morning business be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and take up nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

James Cunningham Sargent, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, vice Clarence H. Adams.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of T. A. M. Craven, of Virginia, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Garrison Norton, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Lewis Blaine Hershey, United States Army, to be a lieutenant general.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the

nominations in the Marine Corps be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps will be considered en bloc and, without objection, they are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Coast Guard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I make the same request in regard to the nominations in the United States Coast Guard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast Guard will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed en bloc.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I make the same request with reference to the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I make the same request with reference to the nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE VICE PRESIDENT'S DESK

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read routine nominations in the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy and Marine Corps, which had been placed on the Vice President's desk without being printed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I make the same request concerning these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection the nominations will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF JUNE 21, 1950, RELATING TO APPOINTMENT OF BOARDS OF MEDICAL OFFICERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 21, 1950, relating to the appointment of boards of medical officers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF LIGNITE RESEARCH LABORATORY, GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Lignite Research Laboratory, Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the calendar year 1955; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

A letter from the Secretary, National Trust for Historic Preservation, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that trust, for the calendar year 1955 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUTHORIZATION FOR JUDICIAL CONFERENCE TO PROMULGATE MINIMUM STANDARDS OF QUALIFICATIONS FOR PROBATION OFFICERS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Judicial Conference of the United States to promulgate minimum standards of qualifications for probation officers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Todrys Wallach from a report transmitted to the Senate on January 16, 1956, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1941, RELATING TO EMERGENCY FLOOD CONTROL WORK

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood control work (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to permit recipients of aid to the aged to earn $50 a month, which amount shall not be taken into consideration in computing aid to such recipients; to the Committee of Finance.

A resolution adopted by the convention of the District of Columbia Bankers Association, at Hot Springs, Va., relating to the location of Federal agencies outside the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the national board, Young Women's Christian Association, of New York, N. Y., signed by Mrs. F. Beardsley Foster, Jr., vice president, relating to the administration of funds for economic aid and technical assistance sections of the mutual security program; ordered to lie on the table.

OVERTIME PAY—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today I received a letter from George W. Hall, secretary-treasurer of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor, enclosing copy of Resolution No. 24, which was recently adopted at the last convention of that federation. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, and also be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it is established in industry to set overtime rates for weekend work schedules over and above the standard straight time rate; and

Whereas postal employees are a loyal conscientious part of the American laboring class of people, striving to gain favorable conditions to their interest and welfare; and

Whereas postal employees are frequently required to work weekends and holidays throughout the year: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates to the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor in convention assembled in the city of Oshkosh, Wis., August 15 through 18, 1955, go on record as favoring legislation to grant compensatory overtime rates commensurate with industry for weekends and holidays; and be it further

Resolved, That the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor go on record as being ready and willing to support any and all legislative objectives adopted by the Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor.

RESOLUTIONS OF OAKDALE COOPERATIVE ELECTRICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received this morning from Roy McCaskey, manager of the Oakdale, Wis., Cooperative Electrical Association, an important series of resolutions which were adopted by the 21st annual meeting of that organization.

I believe these resolutions from a grassroots REA will be of deep interest to my colleagues.

I particularly commend to the attention of the Senate the expression with regard to the full utilization of our great REA system in connection with the Nation's progress in nuclear development.

This has been an objective in which I personally have long been deeply interested.

I also invite attention to the important comments in opposition to Commission proposals which would endanger the future of REA.

I present the resolutions, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD, and thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION No. 1

DAIRY MARKETING

Whereas Wisconsin farmers have had their income sharply reduced on dairy products; and

Whereas profits of the 2 leading sales distributors of dairy products have increased by one-third during this period, and profits of the third largest company have increased 50 percent in the past year; and

Whereas agricultural economists have estimated that 95 percent of the investment in facilities of the dairy industry has been made by farmers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we endorse the program for a national dairy sales cooperative to carry the 45 percent of dairy products now handled at one stage by cooperatives into national markets and to enable producing dairymen to retain more of the retail price; and be it further

Resolved, That we commend the efforts to assist dairy farmers in achieving this objective so vigorously being pushed by the Wisconsin Association of Cooperatives.

RESOLUTION No. 2

OPPOSITION TO HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS ON REA

Whereas a Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report has recently organized an intensive public drive for the indiscriminate adoption of all recommendations of the Hoover Commission without regard to their individual merit; and the private utilities have seized upon this opportunity to kill REA by disguising the attack under a high-pressure glamorized propaganda program to blanket all Hoover recommendations, covering multifarious and unrelated subjects, under an all-or-none and the bad-with-the-good principle; and

Whereas the United States Government has in fact made a profit on REA loans to cooperatives; and

Whereas the Hoover Commission has recommended the abolition of REA and the establishment of a corporation to loan money to the rural electric cooperatives at interest rates in excess of twice the rate now paid, thereby destroying the original sound partnership between Government and rural people to improve and make rural life bearable on a private enterprise basis of repayment of loans with interest more than sufficient to cover the Government's cost: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge that REA be continued as presently constituted, with adequate administrative and loan funds, and that all bills designed to alter the REA Act in line with the Hoover Commission recommendations be defeated.

RESOLUTION No. 3

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION ON WATERWAYS USER CHARGES

Whereas recommendation No. 8 on water resources and power adopted by the Hoover Commission urges that Congress authorize a user charge on inland waterways; and

Whereas such a policy would end our historical national policy of encouraging maximum commerce by toll-free use of waterways; and

Whereas many industries such as Dairyland Power Cooperative developed their operations in the good faith that our traditional national policy on waterways would be continued to sustain the feasibility of locating steam-generating facilities strategically to take full advantage of the most advantageous use of these waterways; and

Whereas preliminary estimates included in the task-force report of a user charge would amount to 95 cents per ton of additional transportation cost to haul coal up the Mississippi to our steam-generating facilities and due to our rapid expansion would soon add $1 million per year to the production costs of Dairyland Power Cooperative resulting in unnecessary substantial increases in rural electric rates; and

Whereas any increase in costs to Dairyland Power Cooperative will result in greater costs to our company and then to the farmers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we go on record in opposition to the adoption by the Congress of this recommendation and urge the continuation of the Nation's historic policy of encouraging maximum through toll-free use of our waterways.

RESOLUTION No. 4

ATOMIC ENERGY FOR COOPERATIVES

Whereas the intention of Congress as expressed in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 for achieving rapid development of the use of the atom for producing electric power has not been substantially effectuated, and most progress thus far achieved has resulted primarily from taxpayer subsidy of cost; and

Whereas Congress is now considering legislation authorizing and directing the Atomic Energy Commission to construct six large demonstration atomic powerplants with these projects to be located as steps in a continuing program to equalize and stabilize power-supply costs at the lowest possible levels, with adequate consideration for public and cooperative electric systems; and

Whereas this legislation, introduced by Senator ALBERT GORE, makes clear the intent of Congress that such Federal atomic power program shall be undertaken as one of the major objectives of Government policy and provides for establishment of an electric power liaison committee within a Division of Civilian Power Application with particular emphasis on coordination of its activities with other Federal agencies having responsibilities in the power field: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of Oakdale Cooperative Electrical 21st annual meeting of the cooperative, do hereby go on record in support of Senator GORE'S proposed legislation; be it further

Resolved, That we favor REA being prepared to implement this legislation by the addition of nuclear power specialists on its staff to work in liaison with AEC and other Federal agencies to assist the most rapid development of atomic energy for rural application; and be it further

Resolved, That we favor full cooperation by officials of the electric cooperative program with REA and AEC in preparation for that time when it might be considered feasible for experimental application on our systems; be it further

Resolved, That we extend our full congratulations to one of our own members of WEC, the Rural Cooperative Power Association of Elk River, Minn., for its pioneering work in this field and join with this member cooperative in urging expeditious AEC approval of the installation of an experimental reactor, approval for which Rural Power has made formal application; be it further

Resolved, That if Rural Power's application is approved we pledge our support to extend our full cooperation and wish them every success.

RESOLUTION No. 5

HELLS CANYON AND NIAGARA

Be it resolved, That we, the members at this 21st annual meeting of Oakdale Cooperative Electrical Association, reassert positions taken at previous annual meetings in favor of Federal development of the Snake River with a high dam at Hells Canyon; and be it further

Resolved, That we endorse the Lehman-Davidson bills for development of Niagara Falls and further urge passage in the form reported out of committee giving preference to rural electric cooperatives and municipal electric utilities.

RESOLUTION No. 6

CONTINUED SUPPORT

Be it further resolved, That we recommend to our Congress and the President that they give as enthusiastic and generous support to the Farmers Electric Cooperatives as was the policy of the Federal Government in the early years of the REA when the first cooperative lines were built.

Respectfully submitted.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE,
WILLIAM RASMUSSEN,
MERLE REMINGTON.
WALTER VEHERS.

Dated June 8, 1956.

CONTROL AND DISTRIBUTION OF WATER—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Nebraska Stock Growers Association met in their 67th annual convention in North Platte, Nebr., on June 14 to 16. Among the subjects which they discussed was S. 863, pertaining to the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water, with the objective of making same subject to the laws of the State in which it is located.

On this very important subject, a resolution was duly adopted by the convention. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, together with a similar resolution on the same subject as adopted by the Republican Valley Conservation Association on June 6, 1956.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON WATER RESOURCES BY NEBRASKA STOCK GROWERS ASSOCIATION

Whereas our national and local economy, both agricultural and industrial, is closely geared to the efficient management and use of our total water supply, both surface and subterranean; and

Whereas our area is devoid of many of the wealth-producing natural resources that other areas are blessed with, but is rich in water; and

Whereas central bureaucracy is attempting to completely dominate development and usage of our water without regard to our State and local needs both current and for our future potential; and

Whereas the stock growers of Nebraska believe that any increased Federal control of our water resources would be detrimental to our agriculture and industry and that

this Federal control would be in violation of States rights: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association strongly oppose any attempt to increase the Federal control of our water resources and also strongly endorse any legislature or program which tends to retain State control of these water resources; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to our Nebraska Senators, Congressmen; to the Secretary of the Interior, Fred Seaton; and to Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson; to Senator BARRETT, of Wyoming; to the Attorney General of the United States, Herbert Brownell; and all others who might be connected with this problem.

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE REPUBLICAN VALLEY CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION, MCCOOK, NEBR., JUNE 6, 1956

Be it resolved, That the association favors support of national legislation now pending in Congress upholding the rights of the States for regulation and control of waters within the respective boundaries; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this association send copies of this resolution to our Representatives in Congress, the Honorable Governor Victor Anderson, Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton, Commissioner of Reclamation Wilbur Dexheimer, Director of Fish and Wildlife Service John Farley, and the National Chamber of Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment:

S. 1384. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall return certain mineral interests in land acquired by him for flood-control purposes, to the former owners of such land (Rept. No. 2286).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

S. 4011. A bill to amend section 650 of title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," relating to the Coast Guard Supply Fund (Rept. No. 2293);

H. R. 4652. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain property to the Panama Canal Company, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2294);

H. R. 5147. A bill to change the distribution of Coast and Geodetic Survey charts (Rept. No. 2295);

H. R. 6245. A bill to authorize the Panama Canal Company to convey to the Department of State an improved site in Colon, Republic of Panama (Rept. No. 2296); and

H. R. 6850. A bill to create an academic advisory board for the United States Merchant Marine Academy (Rept. No. 2297).

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments:

S. 2643. A bill to promote the common defense and the general welfare of the people of the United States by encouraging maximum development of low-cost electric energy from all sources of power, including atomic energy, coal, oil, natural gas, and water, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2287); and the bill was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

H. R. 9952. A bill to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty (Rept. No. 2288).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment:

S. 3903. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2290).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 3820. A bill to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation (Rept. No. 2289).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments:

S. 2634. A bill relating to the transportation of mail by highway post office service, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2291).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

H. R. 10766. A bill to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II (Rept. No. 2292).

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I report favorably an original bill, to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 2298) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 4112) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, reported by Mr. ANDERSON, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, was received, read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 4107. A bill for the relief of Lloyd Lindbo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 4108. A bill for the relief of John Leary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 4109. A bill to provide for the sale of lands in reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army for cottage site development and use; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MALONE (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. DWORSHAK):

S. 4110. A bill to establish in the Department of the Interior a Bureau of Coal Mine Safety; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 4111. A bill for the relief of Henry Holland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 4112. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he reported the above bill from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PURTELL (for Mr. POTTER):

S. 4113. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 3 of the Securities Act of 1933, to provide that responsible officers or other persons shall be liable in damages on account of untrue statements or material omissions in statements or documents filed under such subsection as a condition of exemption; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

APPOINTMENT OF HEADS OF REGIONAL AND DISTRICT OFFICES OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—RECOMMITTAL OF BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 579, the bill (S. 63) to provide for the appointment of the heads of regional and district offices of the Post Office Department by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, be taken from the calendar and recommitted to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STUDIES OF FOREIGN AID—REFERENCE OF RESOLUTION TO COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 2301, the resolution (S. Res. 285) arranging for exhaustive studies to be made regarding foreign assistance by the United States Government, be taken from the calendar, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF WAR HAZARDS COMPENSATION ACT — CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF LETTER

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by letter dated June 1, 1956, addressed to the President of the Senate, the Secretary of the Army forwarded a proposed draft of legislation to amend and make permanent several temporary statutes providing certain benefits for civilian employees of the Department of Defense subject to war-risk hazards. The communication was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

In previous years legislation on this subject has been originated by the Committee on Banking and Currency, in 1953; the Committee on the Judiciary, in 1954; and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in 1955.

In the House, such legislation uniformly has originated in the Committee on the Judiciary.

The proposed legislation does not pertain to insurance, but rather to outright relief payments somewhat in the nature of the claims bills against the Government which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

This matter has been discussed with the Parliamentarian and the staff on the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and it is agreed that the message is within the cognizance of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from the further consideration of the letter of the Secretary of the Army dated June 1, 1956, addressed to the President of the Senate, and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INTERIM REPORT OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 131)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 601, 83d Congress, to establish a Commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton, I submit an interim report of that Commission. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from address delivered by him to the National Association of Plumbing Contractors, at Milwaukee, Wis., on June 12, 1956.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KENNEDY, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on June 14, 1956, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] was awarded an honorary degree by his alma mater, Harvard University.

I know that the Senator's colleagues will be pleased by the citation which accompanied this award. It reads as follows:

Brave officer, able Senator, son of Harvard; loyal to party, he remains steadfast to principles.

As a part of the exercises of that day, Senator KENNEDY delivered an address. This address did not receive the national attention it should have, and it was only by an accident, that it happened to come into my hands.

This speech is the most eloquent defense of politics and politicians that it has ever been my pleasure to read. Those of us who belong to this honorable profession understand only too well that we have many critics. I suspect that all of us from time to time are inclined to feel that while some of this criticism may be deserved, much of it is based on a woeful lack of understanding and of knowledge of how the legislative process works.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts has made an eloquent plea for a better understanding of the politician by the group which criticizes him most—the intellectuals and college professors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this address of the junior Senator from Massachusetts be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a pleasure to join with my fellow alumni in this pilgrimage to the second home of our youth.

Prince Bismarck once remarked that one-third of the students of German universities broke down from overwork; another third broke down from dissipation; and the other third ruled Germany. As I look about this campus today, I would hesitate to predict which third attends reunions (although I have some suspicion) but, I am confident I am looking at rulers of America in the sense that all active, informed citizens rule.

I can think of nothing more reassuring for all of us than to come again to this institution whose whole purpose is dedicated to the advancement of knowledge and the dissemination of truth.

I belong to a profession where the emphasis is somewhat different. Our political parties, our politicians are interested, of necessity, in winning popular support—a majority; and only indirectly truth is the object of our controversy. From this polemic of contending factions, the general public is expected to make a discriminating judgment. As the problems have become more complex, as our role as a chief defender of Western civilization has become enlarged, the responsibility of the electorate as a court of last resort has become almost too great. The people desperately seek objectivity and a university such as this fulfills that function.

And the political profession needs to have its temperature lowered in the cooling waters of the scholastic pool. We need both the technical judgment and the disinterested viewpoint of the scholar, to prevent us from becoming imprisoned by our own slogans.

Therefore, it is regrettable that the gap between the intellectual and the politician seems to be growing. Instead of synthesis, clash and discord now characterize the relations between the two groups much of the time. Authors, scholars, and intellectuals can praise every aspect of American society but the political. My desk is flooded with books, articles, and pamphlets criticizing Congress. But, rarely if ever, have I seen any intellectual bestow praise on either the political profession or any political body for its accomplishments, its ability, or its integrity—much less for its intelligence. To many universities and scholars we reap nothing but censure, investigators and perpetrators of what has been called the swinish cult of anti-intellectualism.

James Russell Lowell's satiric attack more than 100 years ago on Caleb Cushing, a celebrated Attorney General and Member of Congress, sets the tone, "Gineral C is a dreffle smart man, he's ben on all sides that give places or pelt but consistency still wuz a part of his plan—he's ben true to one party, that is himself."

But in fairness, the way of the intellectual is not altogether serene; in fact, so great has become popular suspicion that a recent survey of American intellectuals by a national magazine elicited from one of our foremost literary figures the guarded response, "I ain't no intellectual."

Both sides in this battle, it seems to me, are motivated by largely unfounded feelings of distrust. The politician, whose authority rests upon the mandate of the popular will, is resentful of the scholar who can, with dexterity, slip from position to position without dragging the anchor of public opinion. It was this skill that caused Lord Melbourne to say of the youthful historian Macauley that he wished he was as sure of anything as Macauley was of everything. The intellectual, on the other hand, finds it difficult to accept the differences between the laboratory and the legislature. In the former, the goal is truth, pure and simple, without regard to changing currents of public opinion; in the latter, compromises and majorities and procedural customs and rights affect the ultimate decision as to what is right or just or good. And even when they realize this difference, most intellectuals consider their chief functions that of the critic—and politicians are sensitive to critics—(possibly because we have so many of them). "Many intellectuals," Sidney Hook has said, "would rather die than agree with the majority, even on the rare occasions when the majority is right."

It seems to me that the time has come for intellectuals and politicians alike to put aside those horrible weapons of modern internecine warfare, the barbed thrust, the acid pen, and, most sinister of all, the rhetorical blast. Let us not emphasize all on which we differ but all we have in common. Let us consider not what we fear separately but what we share together.

First, I would ask both groups to recall that the American politician of today and the American intellectual of today are descended from a common ancestry. Our Nation's first great politicians were also among the Nation's first great writers and scholars. The founders of the American Constitution were also the founders of American scholarship. The works of Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton, Franklin, Paine, and John Adams—to name but a few—influenced the literature of the world as well as its geography. Books were their tools, not their enemies. Locke, Milton, Sydney, Montesquieu, Coke, and Bolingbroke were among those widely read in political circles and frequently quoted in political pamphlets. Our political leaders traded in the free commerce of ideas with lasting results both here and abroad.

In those golden years, our political leaders moved from one field to another with amazing versatility and vitality. Jefferson and Franklin still throw long shadows over many fields of learning. A contemporary described Jefferson, "A gentleman of 32, who could calculate an eclipse, survey an estate, tie an artery, plan an edifice, try a cause, break a horse, dance a minuet, and play the violin."

Daniel Webster could throw thunderbolts at Hayne on the Senate floor and then stroll a few steps down the corridor and dominate the Supreme Court as the foremost lawyer of his time. John Quincy Adams, after being summarily dismissed from the Senate for a notable display of independence, could become Boylston professor rhetoric and oratory at Harvard and then become a great Secretary of State. (Those were the happy days when Harvard professors had no difficulty getting Senate confirmation.)

The versatility also existed on the frontier. In an obituary of Missouri's first Senator, Thomas Hart Benton, the man whose tavern brawl with Jackson in Tennessee caused him to flee the State, said, "With a readiness that was often surprising, he could quote from a Roman law or a Greek philosopher, from Virgil's Georgics, the Arabian Nights, Herodotus, or Sancho Panza, from the Sacred Carpets, the German reformers or Adam Smith; from Fénelon or Hudibras, from the financial reports of Necca or the doings of the Council of Trent, from the debates on the adoption of the Constitution or intrigues of the kitchen cabinet or from some forgotten speech of a deceased Member of Congress."

This link between the American scholar and the American politician remained for more than a century. Just 100 years ago in the presidential campaign of 1956, the Republicans sent three brilliant orators around the campaign circuit: William Cullen Bryant, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, and Ralph Waldo Emerson. Those were the carefree days when the eggheads were all Republicans.

I would hope that both groups, recalling their common heritage, might once again forge a link between the intellectual and political professions. I know that scholars may prefer the mysteries of pure scholarship or the delights of abstract discourse. But, "Would you have counted him a friend of ancient Greece," as George William Curtis asked a century ago during the Kansas-Nebraska controversy, "who quietly discussed patriotism on that Greek summer day through whose hopeless and immortal hours Leonidas and his 300 stood at Thermopylae for liberty? Was John Milton to conjugate Greek verbs in his library or talk of the liberty of the ancient Shunamites when the liberty of Englishmen was imperiled?" No, the duty of the scholar, particularly in a republic such as ours, is to contribute his objective views and his sense of liberty to the affairs of his State and Nation.

Secondly, I would remind both groups that the American politician and the American intellectual operate within a common framework—a framework we call liberty. Freedom of expression is not divisible into political expression and intellectual expression. The lock on the door of the legislature, the Parliament, or the assembly hall—by order of the King, the Commissar, or the Fuehrer—has historically been followed or preceded by a lock on the door of the university, the library, or the print shop. And if the first blow for freedom in any subjugated land is struck by a political leader, the second is struck by a book, a newspaper, or a pamphlet.

Unfortunately, in more recent times, politicians and intellectuals have quarreled bitterly, too bitterly in some cases, over how each group has met the modern challenge to freedom both at home and abroad. Politicians have questioned the discernment with which intellectuals have reacted to the siren call of the extreme left; and intellectuals have tended to accuse politicians of not always being aware, especially here at home, of the toxic effects of freedom restrained.

While differences in judgment where freedom is endangered are perhaps inevitable, there should, nevertheless, be more basic agreement on fundamentals. In this field we should be natural allies, working more closely together for the common cause against the common enemy.

Third and finally, I would stress the great potential gain for both groups resulting from increased political cooperation.

The American intellectual and scholar today must decide, as Goethe put it, whether he is to be an anvil—or a hammer. Today, for many, the stage of the anvil, at least in its formal phases, is complete. The question he faces is whether he is to be a hammer—whether he is to give to the world in which he was reared and educated the broadest possible benefits of his learning. As one who is familiar with the political world, I can testify that we need it.

For example: The password for all legislation, promoted by either party, is progress. But how do we tell what is progress and what is retreat? Those of us who may be too close to the issue, or too politically or emotionally involved in it, look for the objective word of the scholar. Indeed, the operation of our political life is such that we may not even be debating the real issues.

In foreign affairs, for example, the parties dispute over which is best fitted to implement the long-accepted policies of collective security and Soviet containment. But perhaps these policies are no longer adequate, perhaps these goals are no longer meaningful—the debate goes on nevertheless, for neither party is in a position to undertake the reappraisal necessary, particularly if the solutions presented are more complex to, and less popular with, the electorate.

Or take our agricultural program, for another example. Republicans and Democrats debate long over whether flexible or rigid price supports should be in effect. But this may not be the real issue at all—and in fact I am convinced that it is not, that neither program offers any long-range solution to our many real farm problems. The scholars and the universities might reexamine this whole area and come up with some real answers—the political parties and their conventions rarely will.

Other examples could be given indefinitely—where do we draw the line between free trade and protection, when does taxation become prohibitive, what is the most effective use we can make of our present nuclear potential? The intellectuals who can draw upon their rational disinterested approach and their fund of learning to help reshape our political life can make a tremendous contribution to their society while gaining new respect for their own group.

I do not say that our political and public life should be turned over to experts who ignore public opinion. Nor would I adopt from the Belgian constitution of 1893 the provision giving 3 votes instead of 1 to college graduates; or give Harvard a seat in the Congress as William and Mary was once represented in the Virginia House of Burgesses.

But, I would urge that our political parties and our universities recognize the need for greater cooperation and understanding between politicians and intellectuals. We do not need scholars or politicians like Lord John Russell, of whom Queen Victoria remarked, he would be a better man if he knew a third subject—but he was interested in nothing but the constitution of 1688 and himself. What we need are men who can ride easily over broad fields of knowledge and recognize the mutual dependence of our two worlds.

"Don't teach my boy poetry," an English mother recently wrote the Provost of Harrow. "Don't teach my boy poetry; he is going to stand for Parliament." Well, perhaps she was right—but if more politicians knew poetry, and more poets knew politics, I am convinced the world would be a little better place in which to live on this commencement day of 1956.

ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD the address delivered by the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, before the 41st annual convention of Kiwanis International, in the civic auditorium in San Francisco, Calif., on Thursday, June 21, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN FOSTER DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE THE 41ST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL, CIVIC AUDITORIUM, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 1956

I

Your organization has, as its purpose, to develop internationally "intelligent, aggressive, and serviceable citizenship." Therefore, you must, I know, be deeply interested in the contest now going on between freedom and despotism.

It is, of course, nothing new that despotism and freedom should be combating each other. That has been going on since the dawn of history. But today that contest has the magnitude and intensity which are characteristic of our time.

The forces of despotism are more highly organized than ever before. Already they control one-third of the entire human race and they openly proclaim their ambition to extend their system throughout the world.

So far, their gains have come through the use of violence, or the threat of violence. During the Stalin era, 15 nations, in whole or in large part, were forcibly subjected to Soviet Communist dominion. But the free nations became aroused to the danger. They built up their deterrent power and joined in measures of collective defense. It was no longer possible for Soviet communism to pick up nations one by one.

So the Soviet rulers now say that they will renounce the use of violence. But they say that they still expect their system to win its way in the world because it is so good that all will want it.

II

We welcome and shall encourage these developments. But it would be foolhardy to assume that danger is past and that we can abandon the mutual security policies which have frustrated the old Soviet tactics. The Soviet rulers retain capabilities which enable them quickly to revert to their old policies of violence and attempted coercion, and they would surely be tempted to do so if ever the free nations abandoned their policy of standing together. For violence is the classic and natural tactic of Soviet communism as taught not merely by Stalin, but by Lenin.

Soviet industries are working at top speed to develop ever more potent atomic and nuclear weapons. Their nuclear experiments are being multiplied. They work unceasingly to increase the means for the delivery of new weapons by means of bombers, intercontinental rockets, and submarines.

They are also developing new techniques of indirect aggression. They are, for example, striving to introduce their agents into other countries—persons who are technicians but also part of the political apparatus of international communism. And they try to ensnare needy countries with economic lures. Thus they prepare the possibility of subverting other governments, irrespective of the will, or even knowledge, of the peoples concerned.

It is therefore vital that the free nations should maintain their guard and their peace insurance policies, including in our case the mutual-security program now pending in Congress.

At the same time we confidently take up the challenge of the Soviet Communists, to compare our systems.

III

First of all we ask: If communism is so good that, as its leaders say, others will freely accept it on its merits, why not give the first chance to those who know it best? The Russian people have now had 39 years within which to appraise the merits of the Soviet Communist system. The peoples of Eastern Europe have had a decade or more to appraise that system. If communism can win on its merits, under conditions of genuine freedom of choice, why do not its proponents demonstrate that where communism now prevails?

The Soviet rulers last July at the summit pledged themselves to let the German people have free elections. Seventeen million of those Germans know communism at firsthand and most of the others have had eyewitness reports. Why does the Soviet Government now say, as it said at Geneva last November and still repeats, that it will not permit the promised free elections because it fears the German people would turn away from the so-called social gains that the Communist regime has imposed on East Germany?

Are not the free peoples entitled to presume that there is something basically wrong about a system that has never been accepted voluntarily by any people and that the Soviet rulers are unwilling to submit to the verdict of the peoples who know it best?

IV

Let us, however, not reason solely on the basis of this presumption, however reasonable. Let us look more closely at the Soviet system.

Of course, dictatorship seems to offer some short-range advantages. It permits of opportunism. It makes possible a flexibility of action which is denied to democratically based governments. Despots can go in one direction one day and then in another direction the next day without need to explain or to justify their zigs and zags. They are not bound by parliamentary directives or budgets. They can channel the education of their people in accordance with the dictates of expediency and they can compel persons of their choice to perform governmental tasks at home and abroad. Also, Communist dictatorships, being atheistic and materialistic, can and do treat human labor as a commodity to be used for the glorification of the state.

Through such powers dictators can do some things that cannot be done by governments which derive their powers from the consent of the governed.

Many of the despotic societies of the past have created notable monuments—pyramids, coliseums, palaces, and temples—built by slave labor to glorify kings and potentates who personified the state. The Soviet state has comparable achievements to its credit. By the ruthless use of forced labor, the dictators have created modern monuments in the form of industrial plants, power developments, and the like. They have subjected their economy to a forced and unbalanced growth, and, with the help of natural resources and a temperate climate, attained a rapid rate of industrialization and a rapid increase of technical training.

All of this is featured in the Soviet Communist propaganda.

However, there is another side of the picture.

V

I shall not attempt here to catalog all of the many evils of Soviet Communist despotism. I do wish, however, to call attention to the revelations recently made by Mr. Khrushchev, the present head of the Soviet Communist Party, in his initially secret speech before the 20th Party Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. It is the most damning indictment of despotism ever made by a despot. It should of itself be sufficient to make all free peoples shun that type of despotism as they would shun a plague.

Khrushchev, understandably, tried to keep his speech secret. He said: "We cannot let this matter get out of the party, especially not to the press. * * * We should not give ammunition to the enemy; we should not wash our dirty linen before their eyes."

Mr. Khrushchev's address has now become known. It should be read and studied throughout the world.

What did Mr. Khrushchev say? He said that the man who for many years headed the Soviet Communist Party and Soviet state, who was portrayed as a demigod and whose writings were treated as authoritative by international communism the world over, was, as regards doctrine, a "deviationist"; was as head of state so blind to the dangers to his nation as to be almost a traitor; and was as a man so brutal and sadistic in character as to rival one of the most evil of the Roman emperors, Caligula. Furthermore—and this is the main point—Mr. Khrushchev exposes the inability of the Soviet Communist system to liquidate its own evil leadership, because it was the evil leader who had the supreme power to liquidate others.

VI

Let me give you a few of the highlights of Khrushchev's long speech.

Mr. Khrushchev, after recalling some of Stalin's writings, says, "This is, of course, a clear deviation from Marxism-Leninism, a clear debasing and belittling of the role of the party."

Mr. Khrushchev says that prior to Hitler's attack on Russia Stalin was amply warned, but that "Despite these particularly grave warnings the necessary steps were not taken to prepare the country properly for defense and to prevent it from being caught unawares."

Mr. Khrushchev says that the fear of Stalin was such that those who had the business of gathering and assessing information did so with trepidation lest what they reported would anger Stalin and jeopardize their own lives. He says:

"Because the leadership was conditioned against such information, such data was dispatched with fear and assessed with reservation."

He alleges that Stalin, to satisfy his sadistic lusts, constantly invoked torture to procure false confessions which were then made the basis of judicial murder. He directed long tortures and habitually himself called the investigative judge, gave him instructions, advised him on which investigative methods should be used; these methods were simple—beat, beat, and once again, beat. Mr. Khrushchev recites incident after incident of the application of these tortures.

VII

Mr. Khrushchev's speech portrays a loathsome scene. The speech cannot be read without horror and revulsion. But we must not stop at that instinctive, emotional reaction. We must go on to ask the basic question: "Why was not this situation unmasked during Stalin's life?" Or, indeed, not until 3 years after Stalin died?

Mr. Khrushchev attempts to give the reason. He points to Beria as Stalin's principal agent for torture and murder, and says:

"The question arises why Beria, who had liquidated tens of thousands of party and Soviet workers, was not unmasked during Stalin's life. He was not unmasked earlier because he had utilized very skillfully Stalin's weaknesses; feeding him with suspicions, he assisted Stalin in everything and acted with his support."

In short, the Soviet Communist system provides no safeguards against even such extreme abuses as those that Mr. Khrushchev recounts. There are no checks and balances. The system is, as even Lenin said, one of unlimited power, based on force and not on law. It operates in the dark. It provides no dependable method of changing the ruler. When there is misrule, only death or violence can assure the end of that misrule, and even that is no assurance, for Beria, whom Khrushchev calls even worse than Stalin, would probably have succeeded Stalin had not Beria been violently liquidated in the post-Stalin contest for power.

The principal political figures in Russia today were all intimates of Stalin and knew full well what was going on. Khrushchev and Bulganin were Stalin's close collaborators and indeed the beneficiaries of his purges within the party. And today they must admit that once their system is fastened upon a country there are no means to prevent the grossest abuses.

VIII

Also, it is to be observed that while the Soviet Communist leaders now privately discuss Stalin's crimes and seek publicly to disassociate themselves from Stalin, and while they show some signs of hoping to avoid a repetition of his misrule, not even this much gain is registered by the Chinese Communist Party, which seeks to extend its system in Asia. Its leaders have been the most dedicated imitators of Stalin. Mao Tze-tung, writing of Stalin after his death, said: "We rallied around him, ceaselessly asked his advice, and constantly drew ideological strength from his works." The Chinese Communist representative to the 20th party congress in Moscow, where Mr. Khrushchev's address was made, applauded the firmness and invincibility of the Soviet Communist Party created by Lenin and reared by Stalin.

The Chinese Communists have, indeed, sought to outdo Stalin in brutality. And while the Soviet successors to Stalin at least profess to have renounced the use of force in international affairs, the Chinese Communists still refuse this. We have been, and are, patiently trying to get them to make a meaningful renunciation of force, particularly in the Taiwan (Formosa) area, but so far without success.

IX

Thus, we see revealed the system which Messrs. Bulganin and Khrushchev say they hope the free peoples of the world will voluntarily accept. It is a system which again proves Lord Acton's dictum that "Power tends to corrupt; absolute power corrupts absolutely." It is a system of inevitable abuses which provides no dependable means for the correction of those abuses.

As against that system stands the system of the free societies, where government rests on the knowledge and consent of the governed, and is changed when the governed so desire. The Soviet Communists' principal indictment of these societies is that they are reactionary, status quo societies. But what is the record?

It is the good custom of the free societies to indulge in self-criticism and to expose their deficiencies. But, occasionally, it is profitable to pause and take stock of the immense changes for good that are accomplished by representative governments. This is the more necessary because peaceful change rarely attracts as much attention as change that is wrought by violence.

So, let us look at the peaceful evolution which has occurred within our American society since 1917 when the revolutionary Bolsheviks took over in Russia.

Our free society derives its principal momentum from its religious character. We believe in the spiritual nature of man, and in the human dignity which results from the fact that man has his origin and destiny in God.

Such beliefs provide a constant and powerful compulsion toward peaceful change toward a better world.

Within the period of years of which I speak, the specific changes have been immense.

Women have been relieved of the many disabilities that were for centuries their lot, and have now gained a political, economic, and social status totally different from that of 40 years ago.

Race discrimination, while not yet wholly eliminated, is rapidly diminishing. The present bears no resemblance to the conditions of 40 years ago.

There has been growing protection of health. Infant mortality has been reduced by 75 percent. Many dread diseases are being eradicated.

Science is performing miracles. It was free-world scientists who first cracked the atom and opened up vast new possibilities of advancement in economic and medical fields. These possibilities are being spread throughout the world by international agreements, and we look forward to the early formation of an international atomic energy agency, pursuant to President Eisenhower's atoms for peace proposal to the United Nations.

National productivity has about tripled in 40 years.

Working men and women are living a good life. They have higher wages, shorter hours, greater job security, and retirement plans. Wages are up and hours of labor down. In 1916 the average factory wage, in 1955 dollars, was about $32 for a 49-hour week. Today it is about $76 for a 41-hour week. The spread between the average wage of factory workers and of executives is less in the United States than in the Soviet Union.

Not only have living standards risen sharply during the last 40 years, but the lower income groups have gained relatively the most.

During recent years the income, before taxes, of the upper fifth of our families increased by 33 percent, while the income of the lowest fifth increased by 125 percent. Furthermore, income taxes and inheritance taxes, almost negligible 40 years ago, now take largely from the upper income groups for the general welfare. This further increases the relatively greater share of the lower income groups.

Property ownership, limited in 1917, is today widely diffused. Over 8 million individuals own shares of American business companies. Over 22 million families now own their homes, compared to 7 million 40 years ago.

Educational facilities are greatly expanded even in terms of higher education. Today 37 percent of young people between the ages of 18 and 21 are enrolled in educational institutions as against 8 percent in 1920.

All these, and many more advances, have come about under our free society.

In the international field, a vast change also has come about. Much progress has been made toward developing conditions of collective security. This is the enlightened way. Mature societies fight crime with a collective police system, fight fire with a collective fire department, and fight disease with public-health services. This same principle of collective effort is now emerging internationally. The free nations have been its sponsors, both in terms of the United Nations, and in terms of collective security treaties. The United States now has such treaties with 42 other nations. These developments apply the great moral principle that "we are every one members, one of another."

Similarly, the principle of human dignity has been applied to the colonial problem. During a period when international communism was forcibly extending its dominion over more than 650 million alien people, and destroying or truncating the independence of some 15 nations, free nations were according independence to 17 nations with aggregate populations of around 650 million. Thus we have the most dramatic contrast between the dynamic liberalism of free societies and the brutal reactionism of those who glorify physical power.

So, whether we look at the domestic scene or at the international scene, we see the immense and benign changes wrought by the processes of freedom.

x

But we dare not be complacent and feel that our past automatically assures our future. It is essential that the dynamic and liberalizing influence of freedom should constantly be made apparent, not only by word but by deed.

In any contest with despotism, the free societies are under certain seeming disadvantages. They expose their deficiencies, whereas despotisms habitually hide their deficiencies. Thus, free societies often appear worse than they are and despotic societies for a time may appear better than they are.

It is not often that despotism can be publicly unmasked, as by the publication of Mr. Khrushchev's speech. To overcome this ability of despotism to mask itself, the free societies must make clear, so that none can doubt, their own constant dedication to liberal principles of peaceful change.

It is not enough to prove that despotism is bad. It is equally necessary to go on, and on, proving that freedom is good.

Unless the free peoples do that, despotism will gain, if only because peoples in need, such as those of the newly developing countries, can readily be tempted by what seems a prospect of rapid economic change which is the specialty of the Soviet rulers.

That is the great mission to which the free nations are dedicated. If we can continue to show freedom as a dynamic liberalizing force, then we need not fear the results of the peaceful competition which the Soviet rulers profess to offer. More than that, we can hope that the forces now at work within the Soviet Union, and within the captive countries will require that those who rule shall increasingly conform to principles of freedom. This means that they shall increasingly recognize the dignity of the human individual, shall increasingly satisfy the aspirations of the people, and shall increasingly be themselves subject to peaceful change by the will of the governed. Thus will come about the beginning of a worldwide era of true liberalism.

That possibility is now clearly visible for the first time in many years. That possibility should spur us on to increased effort. Now we can be confident that it may be possible for our generation to share in building the kind of a world which we will be proud to bequeath to our children.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I commend the address delivered by the Secretary of State to the attention of all Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. In it Mr. Dulles very clearly points out the vast differences between the world outside the Iron Curtain—the free world—and the system of totalitarianism which is represented by the Communist powers. He compares the advances which have taken place under our free system in the period of time from the rise of communism in the Soviet Union in 1917.

The Secretary of State also, Mr. President, made a very realistic appraisal of the recent downgrading of Stalin by Khrushchev before the Supreme Soviet.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think the Secretary of State very clearly pointed out the difference in the past 25 years between the action of the free world and the several nations constituting it in having given freedom to over 600 million people who had a colonial status, and the opposite trend in the Soviet Communist world, where the freedom of 15 nations which were once independent, also representing about 600 million people, was lost.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. DOUGLAS HOUGTHON, MEMBER, HOUSE OF COMMONS, GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is a great honor and a high privilege to have the opportunity to present to the Senate at this time a distinguished member of the British House of Commons. He is here looking into some of our legislative processes. He is at the present time occupying the seat of the President pro tempore. It gives me much pleasure to introduce to the Senate the Honorable Douglas Hougthon, a member of the House of Commons, Great Britain.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

MERGING SCENIC AREAS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial appearing in the Salt Lake Tribune for June 19, 1956, in support of a bill which I introduced, S. 3106, which would merge the Zion National Monument with its contiguous neighbor, Zion National Park, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The bill has been reported favorably by the subcommittee to the full Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and an identical bill has already passed the House. S. 3106 is supported by the Department of the Interior and the people of Utah, particularly those in southern Utah, and they are anxious that it be passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Utah?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MERGING SCENIC AREAS

Mission 66, the 10-year national park development program to be climaxed in 1966, the golden anniversary of the National Park Service, contemplates merging Zion National Park and Zion National Monument which adjoin in southern Utah.

Aside from some psychological and administrative differences, national parks and national monuments are generally the same. National parks are traditionally created by Congress and monuments by Executive order, but use of the latter method is declining.

When Zion National Monument, northwest of the park, was created in 1937, plans were announced for a development program to make its red cliffs and grass-bottomed canyons available for public enjoyment. As has been the case in so many national monuments in this region, hardly anything has been done, however, and Zion Monument is reached only by a rough unimproved dirt road from the little town of Virgin.

In keeping with the aims of the Mission 66 program, Utah's Senator BENNETT is sponsoring a bill in Congress to merge Zion Monument with Zion National Park. The two areas are already administered by the superintendent of Zion Park but consolidation would eliminate some budgetary and bookkeeping problems, simplify administration, and clear up misunderstanding. Consolidation might also result in building roads and otherwise developing the monument. This is important since Zion Park is overcrowded in summer, and opening of adjoining scenic areas is needed to relieve the pressure.

Inside the monument is the Hurricane Fault, containing a bold, jagged escarpment, and the 8 Kolob Canyons with walls from 1,500 to 2,500 feet high. Streams flow in several; the La Verkin Creek tributary of the Virgin River is the most easterly one.

Senator BENNETT says he has been assured by George D. Clyde of the Utah Water and Power Board that no projects would be adversely affected by the merger. If this is true, we see no reason why the monument should not be added to the park. We wonder why Cedar Breaks National Monument is not also included and why Grand Canyon National Monument is not incorporated in Grand Canyon National Park. The tendency in the future likely will be to make all sizable national monuments national parks, eliminating confusion and controversy over their status.

ARE PRIVATE POWER COMPANIES FOREIGN OWNED?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, many times during the discussions that develop between advocates of public power and private power, the charge is made by the public-power group that private companies are foreign owned. By this, they mean to infer that a private-power concern, whether it be in Arizona, or in California, or in Idaho, or

in any other State in the Union, is owned—lock, stock, and barrel—by a mysterious group of people who, by some quirk of circumstances, live some place in an area bounded on the south by Philadelphia and on the north by Hartford, Conn., with the eastern boundary being the Atlantic Ocean, and the western boundary some indefinite line not many miles inland. This charge has been leveled against private-power companies in my own State; and during the course of the hearings on Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton, a similar charge was hurled against a power company in Idaho. Having a suspicion that this charge was not any more accurate than that hurled at the companies in my State, I asked that company to give me a breakdown, if it could, of its stockholders by areas. I have received from the Idaho Power Co. an answer in the form of correspondence which took place between the president of that company and a distinguished member of this body, the senior Senator from Tennessee; and I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IDAHO POWER CO.,
Boise, Idaho, June 12, 1956.

The Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It has just come to my attention that during the course of the June 5, 1956, hearing before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on the nomination of Fred A. Seaton as Secretary of Interior there was some discussion regarding the ownership and control of Idaho Power Co. and there was inserted in the record of that hearing a list of the 10 top stockholders as of some unstated date. The inference drawn from that list was that Idaho Power is owned, controlled, and directed from some point remote from its service area.

The list of the 10 largest stockholders mentioned was taken, I am sure, from our 1952 annual report to the Federal Power Commission, because it coincides exactly with a similar list used by Senator KEFAUVER in January and February of 1954.

Because I am certain you would wish to be accurate in your public references to the ownership of our company, I am enclosing my exchange of letters with Senator KEFAUVER under dates of January 15, February 12, and February 25, all in 1954, which I think demonstrates that Idaho Power is not owned or dominated from the outside but, in every sense of the word, is a local institution with a widespread ownership interest.

I am sending a copy of this letter and the attachments to Secretary Seaton, Senators Dworshak and Welker, and those other Senators present at the hearing, in order that they, too, may have before them the complete facts in the event this question is again discussed.

With kindest regards, I am,

Cordially,

T. E. ROACH,
President.

P. S.—As of today, 71 percent of our employees are shareowners.

IDAHO POWER CO.,
Boise, Idaho, January 15, 1954.

The Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: There has just come to my attention the release dated January 5, 1954, embodying your remarks prepared for delivery before the International Platform Association meeting in Washington, D. C., on January 4, 1954, entitled "Public Versus Private Power." On page 4 of that release the second paragraph reads as follows, the words in brackets being mine:

"Secretary McKay tried to justify his position by talking about letting the local people do the job. By local people, [he obviously meant the Idaho Power Co., a New England concern, headquartered in Maine, having few, if any, stockholders west of the Hudson River.]"

I am confident that you would not knowingly, or with malice, be guilty of a misstatement of ascertainable facts, and assume, therefore, that your research assistant or some other source is responsible for the completely inaccurate statement regarding the geographic location of the majority of the share owners of our company.

For your information, the geographic distribution of our share owners as of October 31, 1953, is as follows:

	Percent
11 Western States	59.48
6 New England States	15.23
5 Mid-Atlantic States	10.41
12 North Central States	11.43
8 South Central States	1.96
6 Southeastern States	1.14
Outside United States	.35
	100.00

Of particular significance in connection with the bracketed portion of your statement above is the fact that "40 percent of our share owners actually reside in the States of Idaho and Oregon and the majority of them are likewise customers of the company." Moreover, 55 percent of our employees are also share owners.

The corporate voting power of Idaho shareowners alone is almost double that of shareowners residing in any other State, attesting to the comparative size of the investment made in Idaho Power Co. by people of Idaho.

Furthermore, another readily ascertainable fact from the files of the Federal Power Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission in Washington, D. C., is that our headquarters are in Boise, Idaho, that all of our directors are substantial and responsible Idaho and Oregon business, professional and agricultural men, and that all of the company's officers are residents of its service area.

It is a fact that we are incorporated in the State of Maine, an event which took place at the time the company was organized in 1916, because that State was then considered to have corporation laws which afforded the greatest protection to investors and shareowners. We, of course, must conform in addition to the corporation requirements of the States in which we operate, Idaho, Oregon, and Nevada, a fact that must be well known to you.

To change our corporate domicile would cost approximately $300,000, and our shareowners have been unable to satisfy themselves that there is any sound reason for incurring that needless expense. The question of corporate domicile has not heretofore been raised by anyone having an ownership, a regulatory, or a customer relations interest in our company. It has been seized upon by certain public power proponents who have attempted to attach to it some sinister influence or intent for the purpose of creating prejudice against the company.

I believe sincerely in the right of free speech and freedom of opinion, and I fully respect your viewpoint with regard to public and private power, although I disagree with that viewpoint. At the same time I am sure you will agree with me that the approximately 11,000 shareowners who have voluntarily invested some of their savings in the equity securities of Idaho Power Co. are entitled to expect, as a matter of right and fairness, that your references to them should be accurate. Certainly, the least they should have from you is a public correction of your statement.

Yours very truly,

T. E. ROACH,
President.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
February 12, 1954.

Mr. T. E. ROACH,
President, Idaho Power Co.,
Boise, Idaho.

DEAR MR. ROACH: I am sorry for the delay in answering your letter of January 15 in which you object to a statement that I made in a speech before the International Platform Association meeting in Washington.

The quotation which you attributed to me is not quite accurate. The paragraph to which you object appears on page 5 of the enclosed mimeographed text of my talk and you will note that in referring to the Idaho Power Co., your company is identified as "having few controlling stockholders west of the Hudson River" rather than "having few if any stockholders west of the Hudson River" as you have stated in your letter.

I appreciate your letter, which apparently was distributed rather widely, giving what you refer to as a "geographic distribution of shareholders." However, I do not believe that a "geographic distribution of shareholders" sheds any light on the point that I was making. My question has to do with the ownership of controlling voting stock. According to the records of the Federal Power Commission, which I had at hand at the time I delivered the speech, the first 10 holders of Idaho Power Co. stock are as follows:

Steere & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
Etna Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.
Baer-Stearns Co., New York, N. Y.
Cotton & Co., Boston, Mass.
Eastman Dillon & Co., New York, N. Y.
Hallgarten & Co., New York, N. Y.
John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., New York, N. Y.
Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., Milwaukee, Wis.
Olen & Co., Chicago, Ill.
New England Mutual Life Insurance Co., Boston, Mass.

If you are still of the opinion that I misstated any facts concerning the Idaho Power Co., I will be glad to receive from you a full listing of the voting shares and number of shares held by each shareholder, together with the location of the shareholders, which is after all the real point at issue.

Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER.

IDAHO POWER CO.,
Boise, Idaho, February 25, 1954.

The Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: Thank you for your letter of February 12 received here during my absence from Boise on a trip from which I returned today.

Whether your statement in a speech to the International Platform Association meeting in Washington, D. C., on January 4 referred to Idaho Power Co. as "a New England concern, headquartered in Maine, having few if any stockholders west of the Hudson River," as previously reported, or as "a New England concern, headquartered in Maine, having few controlling stockholders west of the Hudson River," the implication remains that Idaho Power Co. ownership is predominantly eastern.

The latter statement in quotation marks, which you say is the correct quotation from your speech, still implies that Idaho Power Co. does have a small controlling group of eastern stockholders, which is definitely not the case regardless of geographic location. Our largest shareowner represents an ownership of about 2 percent of the total in terms of corporate voting power. As a

consequence, there is no small group of controlling shareowners of Idaho Power Co. On the contrary, the ownership is widely distributed, as I demonstrated in my letter of January 15. I further pointed out in that letter that the corporate voting power of Idaho shareowners alone is almost double that of share owners residing in any other State.

Approximately 81.87 percent of our preferred shares and 33.61 percent of our common shares are held by residents living outside of the mid-Atlantic and New England States. Because each preferred share ($100 par value) is entitled to 5 votes in contrast to 1 vote for each common share ($20 par value), these shareholdings represent majority ownership and control. The shareownership in the Pacific Coast and Intermountain States alone represents over 42 percent of the voting power.

It is true that several eastern educational institutions and a good many old-line, prominent life insurance companies with headquarters in the East have thought sufficiently well of our company and of our section of the country to invest some of their endowment funds and policyholders' premium payments in the equity securities of our company, which accounts for much of the ownership interest in that part of the country. This fact we feel to be a real tribute to the high regard in which our company is held, rather than a basis for criticism.

So far as the life insurance companies are concerned, I think a point of greater interest is the fact that the number of Idaho policyholders in those life insurance companies having investments in the securities of Idaho Power Co. total approximately 138,000. Therefore, about one-fourth of the citizens of our State have an indirect ownership interest in our company, in addition to the large number having a direct ownership.

The list of the first 10 holders of Idaho Power Co. stock, to which you refer in your letter, does not coincide with the current record of ownership in our office. Your list is that taken, I am sure, from our 1952 report to the Federal Power Commission and is the list which has been widely circulated by certain public power proponents in the West and represented by them as being the controlling owners of company securities.

It so happens that the investment firms listed in your letter as among the first 10 holders of Idaho Power Co. stock were members of the underwriting group which was the successful bidder for the public offering at competitive bidding, under the supervision of the Federal Power Commission, of 225,000 shares of our common stock in October 1952. These firms held that stock in their names during a period of approximately 2 weeks while they were distributing it at retail to investors all over the United States. Their very temporary ownership was reported to the Federal Power Commission in our 1952 annual report, but their ownership ceased with the public distribution.

The ownership listings of Steere & Co., Philadelphia; Catton & Co., Boston; and Olen & Co., Chicago, represent the small holdings of hundreds of individual trust accounts administered under the common-trust laws of the States of Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Illinois through the agency of accredited trust companies and trust departments of banks at the election of the particular owners. The ownership names here listed are merely convenient corporate nominees established for that express purpose. This is a long-established procedure for the administration of investments of individual and common trust accounts, with which I am sure you are acquainted.

In summary, therefore, the investment firms listed in your letter of February 12 were (1) merely transitory underwriting owners; (2) life insurance companies which represent thousands of policyholders whose premium funds are being invested for the policyholders' benefit, and (3) trust account nominees who are the convenient administrative custodians for hundreds of individual owners. In no instance is there reflected in any of these groups the concentration of control which is implied in your letter.

Incidentally, I am sure a check on your part of the investment holdings of the life insurance companies of the country would reveal that their assets include very substantial investments in Government bonds, as well as in various public and municipal utility revenue bonds. I assume you would not look upon such ownership of those securities as inimical to the best interests of the Federal Government or of the public agencies involved, or would feel that it would in any way change the local character of such agencies. Rather, I think you would feel that the willingness of the insurance companies to place such a substantial proportion of their funds in those investments was to be commended. I can see no contrary distinction in our case.

Our service area in Idaho and eastern Oregon, as you may know, is a very sparsely populated section of the country. While we would be most happy to be able to raise within our own area boundaries all of the very large sums of investment capital constantly required in a business of our magnitude, it should be apparent to any informed individual that such an achievement is not possible. We must, of necessity, therefore, go outside of the area for some of our capital in exactly the same manner as Seattle City Light, Tacoma City Light, or any of the Washington State public utility districts must go outside their areas for part of their capital funds. I think you might find it of considerable interest to learn where the large percentage of the revenue bonds of the agencies just mentioned are held, and through what investment channels those bonds are normally marketed. I am sure you would find the vast majority of them held in the East.

Under the regulations of the Federal Power Commission, we are obligated to make public offerings of security issues at competitive bidding, subject to the approval of that agency, and are not free to choose the avenues through which our securities are offered.

You must know that I am not free to supply you with a listing of the shares held by each shareholder, nor do I think it should be necessary to do so as a matter of proof of the truthfulness of my statements with respect to ownership. We are a responsible, completely regulated public utility, with a record of 40 years of faithful public service, a fact fully attested by the people whom we have been privileged to serve over these years, and on the basis of our record are entitled to have our statements with respect to ownership accepted as accurate and truthful.

I have made a sincere endeavor to cover completely the questions raised in your letter of February 12, and hope that with this additional evidence of the inaccuracy of your implication with respect to our ownership you will make the correction I requested on behalf of our shareowners in my letter of January 15.

Yours very truly,

T. E. ROACH,
President.

IMPORTANCE OF LIBERALIZATION OF THE McCARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION ACT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as my colleagues know, for several years—in fact, ever since its enactment in 1952—I have worked against the present immigration law which is commonly known as the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

On Wednesday of this week—June 20—I spoke in reference to a bill which would permit admission into the United States, under special preference, of a group of 350 sheepherders. At that time I said:

The time has come for the Congress to face the issue frankly and admit that the McCarran-Walter Act is a cruel, unreasonable, and oppressive law, and that action must be taken to change it substantially. I do not expect to continue to vote for special bills for sheepherders, while watchmakers, needleworkers, carpenters, doctors, scientists, metalworkers, and other useful workers continue to be barred from the United States by the operation of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Mr. President, this morning the Washington Post and Times Herald contained an editorial which I wish to read into the RECORD. The editorial, which is entitled "Sheep and Goats," reads as follows:

SHEEP AND GOATS

After all the exhortations from the White House and all the speeches in Congress on the need for liberalization of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, the Senate Judiciary Committee has labored and brought forth a mere baby lamb. It has reported H. R. 6888, a bill to provide for the admission, above quota, of some 350 sheepherders and to eliminate the quota mortgaging which resulted from the long series of previous special bills regularly sponsored by the late Senator McCarran for the admission of sheepherders into the United States. This would be funny if it weren't tragic. It leaves in full effect all the pitiless and pointless rigidities of the McCarran-Walter Act. Senator LEHMAN was quite warranted in expressing the bitter hope that "the Judiciary Committee will shortly move to show as much consideration for human beings as they have shown for sheep."

The bill reported by the Judiciary Committee not only fails to embrace any part of the sweeping reform of immigration policy sought by Senator LEHMAN and any of the moderate liberalization recommended by the President and sponsored by Senator WATKINS; it fails to embrace even the limited revision endorsed by Representative WALTER. Senator WATKINS observed the other day that this sheepherders bill cannot now be accepted as constituting an immigration program for 1956. He is quite right. We suggest that he move to amend it on the Senate floor by adding to it at least those changes which President Eisenhower has said are necessary in the name of humanity.

Mr. President, today we have no reasonable or fair or humane immigration law. Men and women of great worth and who would be of great service to our country are excluded because of race, religion, or national origin. Until we do away with the national origins quota system, we shall not have a reasonable, fair, humane, and workable immigration law. I wish to say that I shall continue with all my strength to fight for such a law so long as I am in the Senate, or outside the Senate if I do not return to this body for another term.

APPEAL FOR IMMEDIATE FUNDS FOR KEWAUNEE HARBOR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues and, in particular, to the attention of the Corps of Engineers, a most important matter affecting my State. I

refer to further improvement of Kewaunee Harbor.

Folks not familiar with the upper Midwest may not realize the full significance of this vital car-ferry port. Kewaunee represents, tonnagewise, Wisconsin's third largest port on Lake Michigan. The harbor, by its very nature, is large enough to handle any amount of traffic. But it becomes absolutely essential to extend the present Federal project so as to handle this increased traffic. An additional fleet will be using the harbor before the end of the year. So it is imperative that present facilities be expanded. This is not only a long-range matter; this is a situation of urgent emergency significance.

Under date of May 24, the Senate Public Works Committee wisely adopted a resolution requesting the Chief of Engineers to review the present status of Kewaunee Harbor by studying the report which had been published as House Document No. 43 of the 72d Congress, 1st session. Regrettably, the action of the Public Works Committee came at a date too late to have funds included in the public works appropriation bill, which now has been reported from the Senate-House conference committee, and which is thus in its concluding stages.

I want publicly to urge, therefore, that the Corps of Engineers give its sympathetic attention to the possibility of allocating funds for this purpose out of existing revenues, to the extent that there may prove to be funds to meet this problem head-on. Therefore I publicly make this request of our able friend, Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works.

I know that my colleagues from the great State of Michigan join with me in making this appeal, because this harbor—located on the western shore of Lake Michigan at the mouth of the Kewaunee River—is of the utmost importance to our neighbor State, as it is to us, and, indeed, to many other States of the Union. Car-ferry steamers ply throughout the year between Kewaunee port and Frankfort and Ludington, Mich.

The existing project for Kewaunee Harbor—providing for breakwater construction, pier alteration and construction, and dredging of an entrance channel and turning basin—is about 70 percent complete. The additional work, which is so urgently necessary, is essential for further deepening of the channel and extension of the interior basin.

By way of indicating the urgent necessity for the project, I send to the desk a telegram which I received today from the Honorable J. J. Reinke, mayor of the city of Kewaunee. I have moreover received a telegram from Fred J. Peterson, of the Kewaunee Engineering Corp., along the same line. I append to Mayor Reinke's telegram a letter which had come from Mr. Don W. Jirtle, chairman of the harbor commission.

Finally, as an indication of the broad, grassroots position on which this request is based, I append the text of an earlier letter which I had received from the mayor and the common council, in behalf of this project. I ask unanimous consent that all of these communications be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

I look forward to an early report from General Itschner, to whom I am conveying the text of these remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEWAUNEE, WIS., *June 21, 1956.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Senate public works resolution for Kewaunee Harbor survey highly valuable but emergency and business needs of this vital car-ferry port require immediate allocation of funds for early survey by Corps of Engineers. Present needs equally important to Michigan lake cities emergency allocation of funds should be favored by Senators POTTER and MCNAMARA. Special conference in this city of Chesapeake & Ohio, Ann Arbor, Green Bay & Western, and other marine interests last evening wish you will secure necessary funds for immediate survey as desired by General Itschner. Because of high necessity will you please advise if money can be made immediately available?

Mayor J. J. REINKE,
City of Kewaunee, Wis.

KEWAUNEE, WIS., *June 15, 1956.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Our harbor commission and our mayor and council of the city of Kewaunee, have under consideration Senator MCCARTHY'S review resolution of our harbor as enacted by the Senate Public Works Committee May 24, and now with the Corps of Engineers to process.

As you know, General Itschner's position is necessarily that action is dependent on the Senate appropriation subcommittee making money available if quick action is desired.

You know the high importance of the Kewaunee Harbor and the car-ferry service which is valuable and necessary to shippers and people of 40 States, as contrasted to the local municipality. Car-ferry service in our harbor has long needed an enlargement of our turning basin and the extension of a channel up to and through an existing bridge. A present emergency exists because, in addition to the car-ferry operation, the Kewaunee Engineering Co. plans for immediate construction of a storage tank farm for petroleum products brought in by water, imperatively needs both the turning basin enlargement and the channel extension.

We ask you to assist in this present need with the Senate subcommittee to authorize the necessary amount for immediate survey, and with General Itschner that he will take immediate action. The cost of survey is slight, even as compared to value, or conversely, of damage to shippers in many States.

We trust we may have your cooperation, and shall supply any additional information you need. And, as you know, Wisconsin car-ferry ports are part of the use of similar ports in Michigan, which is of interest to Senator POTTER who is a member of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

Very truly yours,

DON W. JIRTLE,
Chairman, Harbor Commission.

KEWAUNEE, WIS., *March 12, 1956.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The mayor and common council of the city of Kewaunee asks your help to determine whether there is a possibility of obtaining Federal aid for the dredging of the north basin of Kewaunee Harbor.

Most of the north basin shoreline is now occupied by the depot and docks of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army. Adjoining the Corps of Engineers, area is occupied by the Kewaunee Engineering Corp. and the Kewaunee, Green Bay & Western Railroad.

It is understood that the Kewaunee Engineering Corp. has plans pending for building, repairing, loading, and unloading freight ships, and the need for greater channel depth and a turning basing there is urgent.

Very truly yours,

C. F. Temby, Mayor; Elizabeth M. Kuehl, Clerk; J. P. Stangel, Alderman; B. Albrecht, Alderman; William A. Murphy, Alderman; Robert F. McKay, Alderman; John H. Jerabek, Alderman; Sylvester P. Monty, Alderman; Thomas Kelliher, Alderman; W. J. Wessely, Alderman.

A TRIBUTE TO OUR SWEDISH PEOPLE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, this weekend a large portion of the population of my State of Minnesota will participate in an annual celebration known as Svenskarnas Dag, or Swede's Day. This is a great occasion in our State and is a tradition brought to our country by the more than 1 million Swedish immigrants who have come to our shores since 1638, the year when the first handful of Swedish colonists landed in Delaware.

The Scandinavian Peninsula is located much farther north in latitude than the United States. In June the days lengthen until that part of the world is able to enjoy almost continuous daylight. Each year in Sweden this is observed by a great celebration known as Midsummer Eve.

It is only fitting that our Swedish immigrants and their descendants should continue this fine custom with a similar celebration on Sunday, June 24. On many occasions down through the years I have been privileged to attend the Minneapolis celebration of Svenskarnas Dag. Since coming to the Senate it has been most difficult to leave during the pressing last days of the session to participate in this fine celebration, and again this year I shall be unable to attend the festival. This I regret, inasmuch as these occasions have always served as an inspiration and as a powerful reminder of our American heritage.

It is not difficult to understand why our Nation is great when we think of the unusual qualities a person had to have to leave the securities of home, family, and job for all the uncertainties of the New World. Whether we are first-generation or tenth-generation Americans, we can be extremely proud of our forefathers and the splendid heritage they have created for you and for me. If heredity has any influence whatsoever in determining our characteristics, then there can be no cause for wonder at America's greatness.

The Swedish peoples, like every other nationality, have made great contribu-

tions to this American heritage. Although few in number in the early history of our country, many of Swedish descent distinguished themselves during the American Revolution and during the first critical years of the Republic. One was John Hanson, a signer of the Declaration of Independence and for a time President of the Confederation. Another was John Morton, a member of the Pennsylvania delegation which approved the Declaration. Although Sweden did not actively participate in the American Revolutionary War, more than 70 Swedish officers volunteered to fight for our cause, and in 1783 Sweden became the first nation, not participating in the war, to recognize the United States as a free, equal, and independent country.

The history of Minnesota has been closely tied to the Swedish immigration to this country. Although the first Swedish immigrants came to Minnesota only a little over 100 years ago, 1 in every 4 persons in our State can trace their national origin to Sweden. These Swedish immigrants and their descendants have helped to build Minnesota from a wilderness into a rich agricultural and manufacturing region. The Swedes have made their mark in all walks of life. They can be found in every profession; in government, as mayors, State legislators, Members of Congress, and governors; in the factories of the Twin Cities and in the iron mines of northeastern Minnesota; they can be found in business; teaching in our high schools and colleges; and tilling the rich, black Minnesota earth as successful farmers.

Again this year, in Minnesota, we salute the spirit of friendship between the peoples of Sweden and the United States. This spirit originated before the Revolution and has continued without interruption through the generations which have come and gone to this date. During all these years we have experienced a feeling of kinship, resulting from our common love for peace, freedom, independence, and a truly democratic way of life. Basic to this fine relationship has been a dedication to God and religious principles by the people of both our countries.

I am proud of the Swedes of Minnesota and of their century of fine contributions to our way of life.

As we approach the celebration of Svenskarnas Dag, I think it is, indeed, fitting and proper that we pay tribute to the Swedish immigrants for the role they have played in developing the great American heritage, and to all those people living today in this country who proudly claim Swedish descent for their contribution in keeping America great.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

CONTROL OF NARCOTIC DRUGS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on May 31, last, the Senate passed Senate bill 3760, a bill to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other related purposes.

Last Wednesday the House of Representatives passed a similar bill, House bill 11619, which is now on the calendar as order of business No. 2303.

In order to get this measure to conference it is necessary to substitute the language of the Senate bill for the language of the House bill.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 11619.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11619) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause in House bill 11619 and substitute therefor the language of Senate bill 3760.

The amendment was agreed to, as follows:

That this act may be cited as the "Narcotic Control Act of 1956."

TITLE I

SEC. 101. Part I of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after chapter 67 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 68—NARCOTICS

"Sec.
"1401. Definitions.
"1402. Heroin—penalities.
"1403. Sale of heroin to juveniles—penalties.
"1404. Smuggling of marihuana—penalties.
"1405. Second or subsequent offenses—procedure.
"1406. Surrender of heroin—procedure.
"1407. Use of communications facilities—penalties.
"1408. Additional authority for the Bureau of Narcotics and Bureau of Customs.
"1409. Motion to suppress—appeal by the United States.
"1410. Issuance of search warrants—procedure.
"1411. Border crossings—narcotic addicts and violators.

"§ 1401. Definitions

"As used in this chapter—

"The term 'heroin' shall mean any substance identified chemically as diacetylmorphine or any salt thereof.

"The term 'marihuana' shall have the meaning given such term in section 4761 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"The term 'United States' shall include the District of Columbia, the Territory of Alaska, the Territory of Hawaii, the insular possessions of the United States, the Trust Territory of the Pacific, and the Canal Zone.

"The term 'person' shall include any partnership, association, company, corporation, or one or more individuals.

"§ 1402. Heroin—penalties

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whoever knowingly imports or otherwise brings any heroin into the United States, or causes any such heroin to be imported or otherwise brought into the United States, or receives, conceals, buys, sells, or in any manner facilitates the transportation, concealment, or sale of any such heroin after being imported or brought in, knowing the same to have been imported or brought in contrary to law, or conspires to commit any such act or acts shall, except as provided in section 1403 of this chapter, be fined not more than $3,000 and imprisoned not less than 5 nor more than 10 years. For a second offense, the offender shall be fined not more than $5,000 and imprisoned not less than 10 nor more than 30 years. For a third or subsequent offense the offender shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned for life, except that the offender shall suffer death if the jury in its discretion shall so direct.

"Whenever on trial for a violation of this section, the defendant is shown to have or to have had the heroin in his possession, such possession shall be deemed sufficient evidence to authorize conviction unless the defendant explains his possession to the satisfaction of the jury.

"§ 1403. Sale of heroin to juveniles—penalties

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whoever knowingly sells, gives away, furnishes, or dispenses, facilitates the sale, giving, furnishing, or dispensing, or conspires to sell, give away, furnish, or dispense any heroin unlawfully imported or otherwise brought into the United States, to any person who has not attained the age of 18 years, shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned for life, or for not less than 10 years, except that the offender shall suffer death if the jury in its discretion shall so direct.

"Whenever on trial for a violation of this section, the defendant is shown to have had heroin in his possession, such possession shall be sufficient proof that the heroin was unlawfully imported or otherwise brought into the United States unless the defendant explains his possession to the satisfaction of the jury.

"§ 1404. Smuggling of marihuana—penalties

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whoever, knowingly, with intent to defraud the United States, imports or brings into the United States any marihuana contrary to law, or smuggles or clandestinely introduces into the United States any marihuana which should have been invoiced, or receives, conceals, buys, sells, or in any manner facilitates the transportation, concealment, or sale of such marihuana after importation, knowing the same to have been imported or brought into the United States contrary to law, or whoever conspires to do any of the foregoing acts, shall be fined not more than $3,000 and imprisoned not less than 5 nor more than 10 years. For a second offense, the offender shall be fined not more than $5,000 and imprisoned not less than 10 nor more than 20 years. For a third or subsequent offense the offender shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned for life.

"Whenever on trial for a violation of this section, the defendant is shown to have or to have had the marihuana in his possession, such possession shall be deemed sufficient evidence to authorize conviction unless the defendant explains his possession to the satisfaction of the jury.

"§ 1405. Second or subsequent offenders—procedure

"(a) Upon conviction of any of the offenses defined in section 1402 or 1403 hereof, or upon a second or subsequent conviction of the offense defined in section 1404 hereof, execution of sentence shall not be suspended, and the provisions of section 4202 of title 18 of the United States Code shall not apply, and in the District of Columbia the provisions of the act of July 15, 1932 (47 Stat. 697, D. C. Code 24–201 and the following), as amended, shall not apply.

"(b) For the purpose of this chapter, an offense shall be considered a second or subsequent offense, as the case may be, if the offender previously has been convicted of any of the offenses defined in section 1402, 1403, or 1404 hereof, or if he has been

convicted of any other Federal offense involving the unlawful importation, transportation, purchase, dispensing, distributing, sale, or concealment of heroin or marihuana or of conspiracy to commit any such act or acts. After conviction, but prior to pronouncement of sentence, the court shall be advised by the United States attorney whether the offense is a first or a subsequent offense. If it is not a first offense, the United States attorney shall file an information setting forth any prior convictions. The offender shall have the opportunity in open court to affirm or deny that he is identical with the person previously convicted. If he denies such identity, sentence shall be postponed for such time as to permit a trial before a jury on the sole issue of the offender's identity with the person previously convicted. If the offender is found by the jury to be the person previously convicted, or if he acknowledges that he is such person, he shall be sentenced as prescribed in this chapter.

"§ 1406. Surrender of heroin—procedure

"(a) Any heroin lawfully possessed prior to the effective date of this act shall be surrendered to the Secretary of the Treasury, or his designated representative, within 120 days after the effective date of the act, and each person making such surrender shall be fairly and justly compensated therefor, The Secretary of the Treasury, or his designated representative, shall formulate regulations for such procedure. All quantities of heroin not surrendered in accordance with this section and the regulations promulgated thereunder by the Secretary of the Treasury, or his designated representative, shall by him be declared contraband, seized, and forfeited to the United States without compensation. All quantities of heroin received pursuant to the provisions of this section, or otherwise, shall be disposed of in the manner provided in section 4733 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, except that no heroin shall be distributed or used for other than scientific research purposes approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, or his designated representative.

"(b) Any heroin or marihuana introduced into the United States in violation of section 1402, 1403, or 1404 hereof shall be summarily forfeited to the United States without the necessity of insituting forfeiture proceedings of any character. All quantities of heroin so forefeited shall be disposed of in the same manner as provided in subsection (a) hereof, and all quantities of marihuana so forfeited shall be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of section 4745 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"§ 1407. Use of communications facilities—penalties

"(a) Each use of any telephone, mail, or any other public or private communication facility in the commission or in causing or facilitating the commission, or in attempting to commit any act or acts constituting a violation of or a conspiracy to violate section 1402 or 1403 hereof, or section 2 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, or any provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the penalty for which is provided in section 7237 (a) of such code, as amended, shall be considered a separate offense punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 and imprisonment for not less than 2 nor more than 5 years.

"(b) As used in this section, the term 'communication facility' means any and all instrumentalities used or useful in the transmission of writings, signs, signals, pictures, and sounds of all kinds by wire or radio or other like communication between points of origin and reception of such transmission.

"§ 1408. Additional authority for the Bureau of Narcotics and Bureau of Customs

"The Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, Assistant to the Commissioner and agents of the Bureau of Narcotics and Bureau of Customs may carry firearms, execute and serve search warrants and arrest warrants at any time of the day or night, serve subpenas and summonses issued under the authority of the United States, and make arrests without warrant for violations of any law of the United States relating to narcotic drugs (as defined in the first section of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act (21 U. S. C. 171)) or marihuana (as defined in section 4761 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) where the violation is committed in the presence of the person making the arrest or where such person has reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing such violation.

"§ 1409. Motion to suppress—appeal by the United States

"In addition to any other right to appeal, the United States shall have the right to appeal from an order granting a motion to suppress evidence or return seized property made prior to the trial of a person charged with a violation of sections 1402, 1403, or 1404 hereof or section 2 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, or of any of the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the penalty for which is provided in section 7237 (a) of such Code, as amended: *Provided*, That the United States attorney shall certify to the judge granting such motion, that the appeal is not taken for purposes of delay and that the prosecution is unable to go forward without the evidence suppressed. Any such appeal shall be taken within 30 days after the decision or order has been entered and shall be diligently prosecuted.

"§ 1410. Issuance of search warrants, procedure

"Notwithstanding the provisions of rule 41 (c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, in any case involving a violation of sections 1402, 1403, or 1404 hereof, or section 2 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, or any of the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the penalty for which is provided in section 7237 (a) of such code, as amended, (1) a search warrant may be served at any time of the day or night if the judge or the commissioner issuing the warrant is satisfied that there is probable cause to believe that the grounds for the application exist; and (2) a search warrant may be directed to any officer of the Metropolitan Police of the District of Columbia authorized to enforce or assist in enforcing a violation of any of such sections.

"§ 1411. Border crossings—narcotic addicts and violators

"(a) In order further to give effect to the obligations of the United States pursuant to the Hague Convention of 1912, proclaimed as a treaty on March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. 1912), and the limitation convention of 1931, proclaimed as a treaty on July 10, 1933 (48 Stat. 1571), and in order to facilitate more effective control of the international traffic in narcotic drugs, and to prevent the spread of drug addiction, no citizen of the United States who is addicted to or uses narcotic drugs, as defined in section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended (except a person using such narcotic drugs as a result of sickness or accident or injury and to whom such narcotic drugs is being furnished, prescribed, or administered in good faith by a duly licensed physician in attendance upon such person, in the course of his professional practice) or who has been convicted of a violation of any of the narcotic or marihuana laws of the United States, or of any State thereof, the penalty for which is imprisonment for more than 1 year, shall depart from or enter into or attempt to depart from or enter into the United States, unless such person registers, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, with a customs official, agent, or employee at a point of entry or a border customs station. Unless otherwise prohibited by law or Federal regulation such customs official, agent, or employee shall issue a certificate to any such person departing from the United States; and such person shall, upon returning to the United States, surrender such certificate to the customs official, agent, or employee present at the port of entry or border customs station.

"(b) Whoever violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished for each such violation by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not less than 1 nor more than 3 years, or both."

SEC. 102. The analysis of part 1 of title 18 of the United States Code, immediately preceding chapter 1 of such title, is amended by adding

"68. Narcotics"

after

"67. Military and Navy."

TITLE II

SEC. 201. (a) Section 212 (a) (23) of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended to read as follows:

"(23) Any alien who has been convicted of a violation of, or a conspiracy to violate any law or regulation relating to the illicit possession of, or traffic in narcotic drugs, or who has been convicted of a violation of, or a conspiracy to violate any law or regulation governing or controlling the taxing, manufacture, production, compounding, transportation, sale, exchange, dispensing, giving away, importation, exportation, or the possession for the purpose of the manufacture, production, compounding, transportation, sale, exchange, dispensing, giving away, importation, or exportation of opium, coca leaves, heroin, marihuana, or any salt derivative or preparation of opium or coca leaves, or isonipecaine or any addiction-forming or addiction-sustaining opiate; or any alien who the consular officer or immigration officers know or have reason to believe is or has been an illicit trafficker in any of the aforementioned drugs."

(b) Section 241 (a) (11) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(11) is, or hereafter at any time after entry has been a narcotic drug addict, or who at any time has been convicted of a violation of, or a conspiracy to violate any law or regulation relating to the illicit possession of or traffic in narcotic drugs, or who has been convicted of a violation of, or a conspiracy to violate any law or regulation governing or controlling the taxing, manufacture, production, compounding, transportation, sale, exchange, dispensing, giving away, importation, exportation, or the possession for the purpose of the manufacture, production, compounding, transportation, sale, exchange, dispensing, giving away, importation, or exportation of opium, coca leaves, heroin, marihuana, any salt derivative or preparation of opium or coca leaves or isonipecaine or any addiction-forming or addiction-sustaining opiate."

(c) Section 241 (b) of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following additional new sentence: "The provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any alien who is charged with being deportable from the United States under section 241 (a) (11) of this act."

SEC. 202. Section 8 of the act entitled "An act to create in the Treasury Department the Bureau of Narcotics, and for other purposes",

approved June 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 587), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall cooperate with the several States in the suppression of the abuse of narcotic drugs in their respective jurisdictions, and to that end he is authorized (1) to cooperate in the drafting of such legislation as may be needed, if any, to effect the end named, (2) to arrange for the exchange of information concerning the use and abuse of narcotic drugs in said States and for cooperation in the institution and prosecution of cases in the courts of the United States and before the licensing boards and courts of the several States, (3) to conduct narcotic training programs, as an integral part of narcotic law enforcement for the training of such local and State narcotic enforcement personnel as may be arranged with the respective local and States agencies, and (4) to maintain in the Bureau of Narcotics a 'Division of Statistics and Records' to accept, catalog, file, and otherwise utilize narcotic information and statistics, including complete records on drug addicts and other narcotic law offenders which may be received from Federal, State, and local agencies, and make such information available for Federal, State, and local law-enforcement purposes. Any law to the contrary notwithstanding, Federal agencies of the United States shall make available to the Bureau of Narcotics the names, identification, and any other pertinent information which may be specified by the Secretary of the Treasury, or his designated representative, of all persons who are known by them to be drug addicts or convicted violators of any of the narcotic laws of the United States, or any State thereof. The Commissioner of Narcotics shall request and encourage all heads of State and local agencies to make such information available to the Bureau of Narcotics.

"(b) As used in this section, the term 'Federal agencies' shall include (1) the executive departments, (2) the Departments of the Army, Navy, and the Air Force, (3) the independent establishments and agenices in the executive branch, including corporations wholly owned by the United States, and (4) the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

"The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to make such regulations as may be necessary to carry this section into effect."

SEC. 203. Section 4744 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Persons in general: It shall be unlawful for any person who is a transferee required to pay the transfer tax imposed by section 4741 (a) to acquire or otherwise obtain any marihuana without having paid such tax, or to receive, conceal, buy, sell, or in any manner facilitate the transportation, concealment, or sale of any such marihuana, knowing the same to have been acquired contrary to law, or to conspire to commit any of such acts in violation of the laws of the United States; and proof that any person shall have had in his possession any marihuana and shall have failed, after reasonable notice and demand by the Secretary or his delegate, to produce the order form required by section 4742 to be retained by him shall be presumptive evidence of guilt under this section and of liability for the tax imposed by section 4741 (a)."

SEC. 204. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remaining provisions of this act, or the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask that the title be amended in accordance with the title of Senate bill 3760.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other related purposes."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. BUTLER conferees on the part of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

SHORTAGE OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my purpose today to talk about the great need of scientists and engineers in this country and to indicate how that need is related to our defense needs, and also to compare the differences between the greatly expanding Soviet scientific-engineer curve, and the declining American scientific-engineer curve.

I sincerely hope that Secretary of Defense, Charles E. Wilson, will not refer to my statements as "phony" as he did on yesterday with reference to congressional demands to appropriate more money for more B–52's. Secretary Wilson has a facility for making statements "off the cuff" which will not stand up under close scrutiny. There is nothing phony about trying to make our country secure. There is nothing phony in recognizing that the testimony before the congressional committees by Generals LeMay and Twining, as well as Secretary Quarles, is directly contrary to what Mr. Wilson has to say about the B–52's or the air strength of the United States vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, and the development of our missile program. There was nothing phony about the unanimous action of the Congress last year in restoring $40 million to keep the Marine Corps at its then present strength. There was something phony about the attempt of the Department of Defense to take unto itself the greater portion of this $40 million and to use it for other activities in the Armed Services not so designated by Congress. Thanks to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and his Appropriations Committee, this attempt on the part of Mr. Wilson to divert these funds for the use of the services other than the Marine Corps was stymied.

I understand, Mr. President, that the Pentagon, perhaps through the orders of Secretary Wilson, will issue an order that all uniform personnel while on duty in the metropolitan Washington area will be put into civilian clothes on the first of July 1956. If this order has been issued, or is to be issued, is the idea behind it to try to play down the role of the military in our Government and the extremely large number in evidence in this Capital. I think that it would be a mistake to issue an order of this kind because I think in a Government such as ours, we should have a daily reminder of the influence of the military in our Government.

Mr. President, on several occasions I have made reference to the critical shortage of scientists and engineers that we face in the United States. Today I wish to pursue further this general topic and attempt to construct a picture of the grave situation that exists today.

As never before in our history this Nation's security rests in the hands of its scientists and engineers in the technological front lines of scientific progress. Nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, intercontinental guided missiles, supersonic jet planes, radar warning nets, these are the complex instruments upon which depends our ability to preserve peace and to resist aggression if it should come. To develop these instruments and to improve them we need men and women of the highest caliber in both theoretical and applied mathematics, physics, chemistry, and related fields. We have today a drastic, almost catastrophic shortage of these essentials personnel and there is no immediate relief in sight.

The United States requires 30,000 to 35,000 new engineers annually; the new production burdens of the cold war require another 3,000 to 4,000 a year. But in 1954 accredited United States schools graduated only 22,000 engineers. At the same time, the Soviet Union graduated more than 53,000. In addition, Russia is graduating far more men in the subprofessional fields of engineering, in the "technical areas that are so vital in a technological age." The Russians who produced only about 9,500 engineers in 1928 are now graduating engineers at a rate two and one-half times greater than the United States.

According to Ramsey D. Potts, Jr., in the May 1955 issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science:

> While the United States has been turning out far more university graduates, the Soviets, between 1928 and 1953, have graduated 150,000 more engineers than the United States. In 1928 the Soviets had some 26 institutions offering engineering training. Today there are approximately 175 schools offering training in engineering exclusively. Their enrollment numbers about 30,000 students. By comparison, some 210 United States colleges offer engineering courses with an enrollment of about 194,000 students. * * * Since 1951 the Soviets have been graduating at least 1,200 to 1,400 aeronautical engineers per year. In 1954 the United States graduated 645 aeronautical engineers. The quality of Soviet instruction is very high by United States standards: the students get considerably more education in the general sciences and especially in mathematics.

The general education program in America is far superior to the Soviet's

but we are beginning to fail in this one area.

The critical nature of the American shortage of engineers and scientists has been voiced by the top men in education, science, and government. Last year, Allen Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, speaking before the Alumni Federation of Columbia University, said that in the decade from 1950 to 1960, the Soviet Union would graduate 1,200,000 scientists and engineers, compared to 900,000 in the United States. And he warned that unless something was done at once, Soviet scientific manpower might well outnumber ours in many key areas.

In December of last year Dr. Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, said that this country's need of trained scientists was becoming more and more critical. Dr. Waterman stated that the fault lies at all levels of American education, especially in the secondary schools, which, he declared, are not turning out graduates competent to profit by scientific education in colleges.

Secretary of State Dulles had voiced his alarm on this topic, as seen from a foreign affairs point of view. He believes that this country with an economy two-thirds greater than the Soviet Union's will be able and willing to provide much more economic assistance than the Communists in years to come. However, he is worried about the Soviet Union's ability to raise and disperse an army of technical advisers all over Asia and Africa. The Soviet Union does not have a surplus of capital or goods, but it is becoming evident that there soon will be a surplus of excellent technicians trained in the sciences and engineering, and, of course, well trained in the art of political subversion. Unless the current trend in the United States is changed, this Government will not be able to compete with the Soviet offers of technical aid.

One of the latest warnings comes from former Senator William Benton, of Connecticut, who made an intensive study of Soviet education and propaganda last year, making it clear that the Soviet educational system is geared to win the cold war. According to Senator Benton, the Soviet Union is producing a surplus of engineers and technicians who will be assigned to carry out technical assistance in every uncommitted country in the world. He made many interesting and disturbing statements in his recent interview with Washington correspondent, Marquis Childs. The Senator's recommendations should be kept in mind by all of us who have not had the opportunity to see the Soviet educational system at first hand.

Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, has warned on occasion that in the decade 1950–60 the Soviet Union is expected to graduate far greater numbers in the sciences and engineering than the United States.

President Eisenhower sent Congress a report in late January warning that the United States has an inadequate supply of scientists, particularly in the research field.

Atomic Energy Commissioner Willard F. Libby told a recent Engineers and Architects Day celebration here in Washington that today's scientific manpower shortage was fearsome and awful.

Perhaps the finest summation of the situation which confronts the Nation is a report on engineering and scientific manpower in the United States, Western Europe, and Soviet Russia, issued in March by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. In the preface, subcommittee chairman, the Honorable MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, stated:

> It should be no secret that the United States is in desperate danger of falling behind the Soviet world in a critical field of competition, the life-and-death field of competition in the education and training of adequate numbers of scientists, engineers, and techicians. But although it is not a secret, the facts have not sunk into the public mind.
>
> Many warnings have been issued, many speeches have been made. They have been reported. But they have not sunk into the mind of the administration and the Congress, even when the warnings came from eminent administration sources. I suggest that the time has come for strenuous measures, for action by the Government, by business corporations, and universities, for what might be called a crash program to increase swiftly and steadily the number of adequately trained American scientists and engineers.

I recommend that all members of Congress give serious consideration to this report which is, in my estimation, the most complete and factual study that has been published on the scientist and engineer shortage.

These statements and figures do not paint a very pleasant picture, particularly at a time when our strength depends greatly on technological advancement. We must meet the situation head on, admit the inadequacies of the past and work to meet this shortage.

The shortage is due to a number of factors. Prior to the Korean war we had an overabundance of scientists and engineers. But the Korean conflict and the boom in electronics, nuclear energy, and guided missiles transformed the picture. The industrial ratio of engineers to factory workers, which stood at 1 to 250 in 1900, increase to 1 to 60 in 1950 and is rising with every new automation process. In some industries today the ratio is as high as 1 engineer for every 10 employees.

The source of one of the major problems is at the high-school level. There is a sharp decline in interest in the sciences among high-school students. Figures issued by the United States Office of Education show that proportionately fewer students now take courses in chemistry, physics, science, and mathematics than ever before. Half the high schools in the country do not even offer chemistry today.

Training in the sciences and higher mathematics should begin no later than the junior year in high school. But in the last 50 years, the proportion of high-school students studying algebra has dropped from 50 percent to 20 percent, physics from 20 percent to 4 percent. A basic curriculum in the sciences in high school is necessary as a background for college work. There are technological schools which are not filled because they lack properly qualified applicants.

The decline in student interest in science has been attributed by some to a soft educational policy, which has turned students away from the hard scientific subjects and into easy courses in social studies and vocational education.

Some people argue that teaching science at the high-school level is of little value, that the real basis in science is to be found in college. This may or may not be true, but we must not forget that it is in the high school where the interest in science and mathematics is developed, and this can only be done by exposing the students to this field in the high-school curriculum.

There is an immense problem of getting teachers adequately trained in the sciences and mathematics. Many schools are unable to compete with the salaries offered by the Government and private industry. The shortage of competent people in the sciences is severe and even more so with those needed in the teaching field. To give new life to our science program, there must be a change at the high school level.

Another problem which takes its toll of potential scientists and engineers is of a financial nature. Many students who have great potential in the fields of science and engineering do not have enough funds to continue their education beyond high school. It is costly to attend these schools, as any parent who has a son or daughter in college will testify to.

Another factor which enters the picture is the Selective Service program. The draft takes away many potential engineers and scientists. Many young men who could be providing a great service to private industry or the Federal Government are now filling a routine position in one of the branches of the service, where their capabilities are not being fully utilized.

A portion of the unattractiveness of the scientific or engineering careers can be blamed partly on the desire of students to avoid the kind of personal tragedies that befall scientists when they run afoul of the security program.

This shortage has brought a mad scramble by United States companies for engineers and scientists. Teams of recruiters are swarming over every campus, wining, dining, and tempting seniors with beginning salaries of an average of $7,200 to $7,500 per year according to Engineering Societies Personnel Service, Inc. Some companies are reported to have tried to hire entire graduating classes.

The Washington Post and Times Herald recently carried a feature story of a young senior engineering student at the University of Maryland. His services were being sought by 15 companies after his graduation this spring. This dilemma is not uncommon today on the campuses of our schools of higher education.

Thus we have a brief picture of the critical situation we now face. There is no immediate solution, it will have to be a long-term proposition. We are fighting for first place in this technological

race and we must not lose. The program for training and employing scientists and engineers needs a complete adjustment from top to bottom.

The first thing which must be done is to give some new life to our science and mathematics programs in the high schools. There must be a new incentive instilled in our young people to seek careers in science and engineering.

Every responsible educational agency at the Federal and State level and even the small school boards should take a long hard look at the present high school standards and see what can be done to raise them.

The interest of those students who have a natural inclination toward the sciences should be kindled as early as possible. The raising of standards would be one step, but it is also necessary to have competent teachers of science. Education spokesmen say that untold numbers of students get their first distaste for scientific courses from incompetent teachers who show little aptitude or understanding for their subjects. With better salaries and more adequate facilities, the proper kind of natural science teaching could be brought back into the curricula. We cannot do this by scrapping laboratories, refusing to install new equipment or by assigning science and mathematics classes to anyone who might happen to have a free period.

One proposal which might counteract the indifference at the college level was discussed editorially by Benjamin Fine, columnist for the New York Times. The proposal suggests the creation of a Reserve Officers Training Corps in the fields of engineering and science. At present many campuses in the Nation support these corps in the various branches of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. According to Mr. Fine, the Pentagon has under consideration an extension of these programs, to include ROTC units devoted to engineering and science students. Under such a plan, the military officials would provide financial support to qualified students in the technical fields. This program seems to have considerable merit.

It has also been suggested that a science academy be set up, comparable to our military academies. Promising students would enter the science academy on a competitive basis. Upon completion of the course the graduates would be required to work a minimum number of years for the Federal Government in one of its research programs or in connection with a federally sponsored program in private industry.

An expanded Federal scholarship program would do much to increase our supply of scientists and engineers. Financing college and graduate study is one of the major obstacles to aspiring scientists and engineers.

It is my understanding that the Federal Government's present role in promoting the education of potential scientists and engineers is generally limited to the National Science Foundation. The Foundation was created by Congress, as an agency of the executive branch, to fill the recognized need for a focal point within Government for the development of a national science policy and the support and encouragement of basic research in science.

The Foundation's fellowship system is the most direct measure by which it augments the Nation's scientific manpower resources. By awarding of fellowships for predoctoral study also, the Foundation offers to an average of 600 selected students a year the opportunity to undertake at institutions of their choosing, the advanced training necessary for a career in research.

The foundation is also requesting funds to embark on a program of supplementary training for high-school science and mathematics teachers. Under this new program a grant awarded to a teacher will enable him to obtain further education in the field of science, in which he is interested. These refresher courses would be for approximately 1 year. The House considered this program so important that they increased the amount requested by $5,650,000 above the budget estimate.

This program is a proven success, but the Federal Government's role needs to be greatly expanded to meet the shortage we are facing. The number of scholarships should be increased and funds should not be limited to predoctoral and graduate work. Direct assistance to students studying in the sciences and mathematics below the graduate level is necessary in order to increase the number of capable scientists and engineers.

A nationwide testing program in our high schools would be a start in seeking out the potential student applicants for scholarships to study science and engineering in college or at graduate schools.

There needs to be a reexamination of our selective-service program. A more realistic attitude must be taken. Scientific and engineering students are being drafted before they have completed their studies. This is particularly true of students preparing to do graduate work or those who are in the midst of the course and then they are called into the service. Graduate study is becoming more essential with each technological advance in the world of science. Allowances should be made for these students. They will be of much more value to the Nation in the laboratories than they will in an office or behind a gun.

A feeling of personal security must be returned to scientific work. The present security system has induced an unattractiveness in scientific careers that has turned young men and women into other fields.

Beyond the general shortage of scientists and engineers there is an ever-increasing differential between the number who seek a career in the service of the Federal Government and private industry. We are faced with a situation similar to that which we have in the armed services. We want our Army, Navy, and Air Force to be made up of career men instead of short-term draftees in order to promote efficiency and strength.

Private industry is beginning to outstrip the Government service in salaries and benefits in most cases. Private industry is offering engineers and physical scientists with bachelor of science degrees on the average $50 per month more than the starting salary offered them by the Government. There is generally the same difference between salaries offered graduates with master's degrees. Most firms pay part or all of the moving expense incurred by their new professional employees, a practice which the United States civil service cannot follow under existing policies. Fringe benefits in the Government service are no longer the attraction that they originally were. In addition, there is much more personal security in the service of private industry.

The Federal Government needs increasing numbers of capable scientists and engineers to keep ahead in this worldwide technological race. The United States Government has superior research facilities and equipment. With all of this, is the Federal Government going to have to employ second- and third-rate people to work in our laboratories and installations? I sincerely hope not, but if we do not enact a constructive program that is exactly what we will be doing.

We have a problem which must be studied and approached from every angle, Federal, State, county, and the local school districts. The lot of scientists and engineers cannot be improved merely by setting up a vast scholarship program; there also must be an interest created in our high schools. There must be competent instructors. They need better salaries and equipment. Science and engineering graduates must have personal security in addition to financial well-being. All of these things must go together to meet this shortage of scientists and engineers.

I have discussed the shortage of scientists and engineers that faces this Nation of ours at some length. I think the problem is clear enough for all to realize the seriousness of the situation.

There are a number of things which need to be done, but what are we doing about it? At the moment, very little at the Federal level. There are a number of broad and limited scholarship programs in the form of legislation pending before Congress, but no action has been taken.

We need an immediate source of incentive to increase our supply of scientists, engineers, and young people who are interested in pursuing these careers. Many of the proposals we are familiar with would take time to get into operation. We have many fine private scholarship programs for college students. The Ford Foundation, last year, embarked upon the largest college scholarship program of its kind in our history, with initial grants of $20 million from the Ford Foundation and $500,000 from the Carnegie Corp. Other corporations and foundations are planning to contribute. The first year there will be approximately 350 awards. The number of awards will increase, according to the announced plan.

In the United States many of our young men and women would like to go on to college, but do not, largely because of the lack of financial means. In the Soviet Union this would be of no concern for they select the most able youth

and send them to college at no expense. These young people have no choice in the matter, but the number of Russian graduates in the sciences far outnumbers those in America today. This approach is contrary to our way of life.

In the entire scholarship and fellowship program in the United States the undergraduate student has probably benefited the least. There has been a tendency to concentrate on grants in the field of graduate study.

The Federal Government has available today the means of instituting such a scholarship program for the undergraduate in our colleges and universities. We must remember that the step from high school to college is often the most difficult one to make.

The means available to the Federal Government to which I referred is the National Science Foundation. Under Public Law 507, 81st Congress, "The Foundation is authorized to award, within the limits of funds made available specifically for such purpose pursuant to section 16, scholarships and graduate fellowships for scientific study or scientific work in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, or other sciences at accredited nonprofit American or nonprofit foreign institutions of higher education, selected by the recipient for such aid, for stated period of time."

The Foundation, as I have said, makes available scholarships for graduate work and plans refresher courses for qualified high school mathematics and science teachers. Since the organization of the Foundation, in 1950, a scholarship program for the undergraduate college students has not been sponsored. The major limitation on the expansion of its program to include undergraduates has been the amount of funds appropriated each year.

I have written to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, asking that additional funds be appropriated for the National Science Foundation, specifically for a Federal undergraduate scholarship program in fiscal year 1957. I ask that this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have given a good deal of thought and consideration in the past year to the shortage of scientists and engineers which plagues American leaders in education, industry, and government. In the decade from 1950 to 1960 the Soviet Union will graduate 1,200,000 scientists and engineers, compared to 900,000 in the United States, according to official estimates. This is only a small sampling of the voluminous material available indicating the seriousness of the crisis we face.

Considerable interest has been aroused in both Houses of Congress, but to date the Federal Government has done little to help relieve the situation. As you know, there are a number of bills pending before Congress which would set up general and limited scholarship programs, in addition to various other proposals to relieve the critical situation in future years. The necessity to increase the supply of engineers and scientists in this country is immediate.

Private foundations and scholarship programs have greatly expanded in recent years, but I feel that it is the duty of the Federal Government to take the lead in meeting this crisis. Only the Federal Government has the resources and prestige to produce the new emphasis on the training of qualified young people in the engineering and scientific fields.

In meeting this crisis action must be taken at all levels, Federal, State, county, and district. The Federal Government has available an agency with the necessary authority to put into operation an expanded scholarship program to help relieve the shortage. I refer to the National Science Foundation, which you sponsored, as authorized by the 81st Congress. The foundation offers scholarships, within the limits of funds made available for scientific study or scientific work, both here in America and abroad. Since the beginning of the program, foundation scholarships and fellowships have been limited to graduate work and specialized courses. The foundation has not offered scholarships to undergraduates in our colleges, largely because of fund limitations, according to information at my disposal.

If we are to increase the number of students in the fields of science, it will have to start in undergraduate work. It is a big step from high school into college, and many of our capable young people do not make it because of their inability to finance a higher education. A Federal scholarship program for undergraduate students in the sciences and engineering would be a major effort in meeting the crisis.

I am taking the liberty of recommending to the Appropriations Committee that the funds for the National Science Foundation under H. R. 9739, which the subcommittee is now considering, be increased by $20 million, designating this additional money for a Federal scholarship program for undergraduate students. This is the most immediate way of helping to meet the crisis, and we are using an agency which has the authority and facilities to put such a program into operation with little delay. Even if this amount is allowed, it must be borne in mind that it will mark a beginning, not an end, to fulfilling our national needs.

I ask that this proposal be given consideration at the time appropriations for the National Science Foundation are before the subcommittee.

Thanking you for the opportunity to express my views on this matter, I remain,

Sincerely yours.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as the independent offices appropriation bill passed the House, it contained an appropriation of $35,915,000 for the operation of the National Science Foundation in fiscal year 1957. My recommendations would have increased this appropriation to $55,915,000, designating that the additional $20 million be made available for undergraduate scholarships as authorized. While my suggestion was not adopted, I am delighted that the conferees of the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House did increase the amount for the National Science Foundation by $4,085,000 to a total of $40 million over the amount passed by the House. It is my hope that out of these funds—still $1,300,000 below the Budget request—that consideration will be given to the proposal I advanced.

This proposal utilizes an authority and an agency which already exists. It will not be necessary to set up a new scholarship program for scientists and engineers. The extent and necessity of such a program can be regulated by appropriation. If ever there should be an oversupply of technicians, scientists, and engineers, this program could be curtailed with little effort. The shortage of engineers and scientists is distressing, but what is being done about it?

In the words of Rear Adm. H. G. Rickover, Chief of the Atomic Energy Commission's Naval Reactor Branch, the critical question is: How can we provide the trained men and women needed to maintain the momentum of our rapidly expanding technical civilization? The most immediate answer to this question is the National Science Foundation, an agency of the Federal Government. However, we must keep in mind that this would be a beginning—not an end—to fulfilling our national needs.

Mr. President, a great deal of credit is due Admiral Rickover for alerting the Nation to the serious nature of the shortage of scientists and engineers. The admiral, in his spare moments, and there are very few of those, has traveled throughout the country trying to bring home the seriousness of this problem.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I recommend a five-point program to meet the shortage of scientists and engineers, a program of immediate and long-range effort. It is a cooperative program, but the Federal Government must take the lead through the National Science Foundation.

First. An expanded Federal scholarship program for college and graduate students in the natural sciences and engineering under the National Science Foundation. In order to insure an adequate number of trained personnel in the service of the Federal Government in highly technical and skilled fields, I suggest that the Government, under a scholarship program, select a number of high-school students each year who have shown special scientific interests and capabilities and underwrite their education. In return these students could be required to put in a period of service after graduation which would be in some way beneficial to our national security, in the military or in industry.

Second. Reemphasis on science and mathematics instruction in the high schools of the Nation. This must be a cooperative move between the local school districts and the State departments of education.

Third. A Federal grant-in-aid program to the States for science and mathematics teachers in the high school somewhat similar to existing Federal aid for certain agricultural and vocational training in the secondary schools.

Fourth. A revised Selective Service program, making allowances for students and graduates pursuing a career in the sciences and engineering.

Fifth. An improved public relations and security program for scientists, engineers and technical personnel.

The Federal Government must take the lead in meeting this crisis; nothing else will do. Only the Federal Government has the resources and prestige to produce the new emphasis on the train-

ing of qualified young people in the engineering and scientific fields.

I want to say that in order to keep ahead in the worldwide race of technological advancement, the United States will need a vast and continuing supply of first-rate scientists and engineers. Today we are facing a severe shortage. The proposals that I have made will, in my estimation, help to contribute to and insure American stability and supremacy in the sciences, which will be so necessary in the years to come.

Mr. President, I ask that an editorial, entitled "Where Soviet Gains Are Greatest," from the Great Falls Tribune, Great Falls, Mont., be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE SOVIET GAINS ARE GREATEST

There has been so much discussion in recent months about alleged Russian superiority in developing guided missiles that a more important factor in the contest between Soviet and American science has been obscured. This concerns Russia's long-range program for attaining scientific leadership throughout the world.

It has long been recognized that the foundation of America's tremendous strength rests on our superior production capacity, which in turn rests on the high level of skills and "know-how" of the American populace.

But in the field of science Russia, by concentrated attention and heavy subsidy, has made astonishing progress in the last few years. This progress has brought a warning from Dr. John Turkevich, a Princeton chemistry professor and leading student of the Soviet Union. According to Turkevich, an iron curtain around the Russian scientific community was lifted with the passing of Stalin. Scientists, elevated to a new position of importance and esteem, were permitted freer traffic in science and technology was stepped up in Russian schools.

Results are already apparent. Turkevich says the Russians have made rapid strides in virtually all fields of scientific endeavor.

The most significant gains have been in education. Soviet output of scientists and engineers now surpasses that in the United States, and many young Russians are starting scientific careers as early as age 7. Science occupies 30 percent of the primary curriculum in Russia, 46 percent in secondary schools. And the Russian child studies 6 days a week instead of 5.

Dr. Turkevich feels that Soviet science represents "a tremendous potential for scientific and technological progress," and that Russia obviously is making "a conscious, well-planned attempt to assume the scientific leadership of the world."

What is scientific leadership worth in this day and age? It is much more than a matter of prestige. An immense new technological era has been opened in the past decade, an era in which a nation ranking at the top in scientific endeavor occupies an unusually advantageous position with respect to military, industrial and economic potential.

While we in America are concentrating on our more immediate scientific developments, we need also a better coordinated national science program—and soon.

During the delivery of Mr. MANSFIELD's speech,

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, has the Senator from Montana had occasion to note how many generals, colonels, majors, and other officers have been appointed to executive positions in the administration?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will say to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that the Senator from Montana has looked into that matter and he is appalled at the large number of retired generals and colonels in the administration and others who are working in the United Nations, and who receive tax-exempt salaries in addition to their retirement pay.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. And the ordinary person who comes into contact with these men is not aware of the fact that they are or have been in the military service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I should like, first, to compliment the distinguished junior Senator from Montana for his fine statement regarding the need for scientists and engineers. We are living in an age when the future security of our country is more and more dependent upon scientific achievement. Unless we can continue to expand along the lines suggested by the Senator from Montana, we are going to be in serious trouble. The Senator has made an excellent contribution today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Washington for his kind words. I am sure he will agree with me that there is nothing "phony" about the suggestion that a shortage of scientists and engineers exists in our country at this time.

Mr. JACKSON. I am glad the distinguished Senator mentioned the word "phony." It seems to be a word of considerable significance as the result of comments made by the Secretary of Defense yesterday. As I understand, he implied that the $1,100,000,000 increase in funds for the Air Force voted by 13 members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, both Republicans and Democrats, was a "phony."

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. I should like to ask the Senator this question: Is it not a fact that the Republican members of the Appropriations Committee, headed by the distinguished ranking Member on the Republican side of the aisle, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], have asked for a half-a-billion-dollar increase?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from New Hampshire is only half a phony. [Laughter.]

Mr. JACKSON. Does not the junior Senator from Montana think that all members of the Appropriations Committee, Republicans and Democrats alike——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator from New Mexico read the names of the Senators, in addition to the Senator from New Hampshire, advocating the smaller amount?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. MANSFIELD. A Republican.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Mr. MANSFIELD. A Republican.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And the fine lady from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

Mr. MANSFIELD. A Republican.

Mr. JACKSON. I think there is almost unanimous agreement in the Appropriations Committee that there should be some increase for the Air Force. But, according to Mr. Wilson's statement, any increase is a "phony."

I should like to ask the Senator from Montana if Mr. Wilson has not placed his own associates in the position of being "phonies." For instance, the Secretary of the Air Force asked for $18,881,000,000 with which to conduct the operations of the Air Force. This sum is $2,363,000,000 more than was suggested to the Senate Appropriations Committee by Mr. Wilson.

So, Secretary Quarles, to follow the statement just made by the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico, is twice a phony, because he asked for twice the increase approved by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is not Secretary Quarles charged with the direct responsibility of determining the needs of the Air Force year by year?

Mr. JACKSON. He is; and the top professional soldier in the Air Force, General Twining, asked for $19,392,000,000 for the Air Force.

I think it is pertinent at this point to call the attention of the Senate to the distinguished airpower record of the Secretary of Defense. On May 19, 1953, the Secretary of Defense told a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations:

It [the Russian air force] is much more a defensive air force and not an offensive air force. A defensive air force would be more fighters and interceptors, and an offensive air force would be more bombers and long-range fighters. That ought to give the American people some encouragement.

That was on May 19, 1953. On February 1, 1954, Secretary Wilson told the House Appropriations Committee:

My analysis would indicate that the Russians have been much more afraid of us than we are of them, and their buildup has been a defensive buildup.

Then after the May Day 1954, Moscow fly-by of a prototype Bison, which is a long-range Russian bomber comparable to the United States B–52, the Secretary of Defense said at a press conference on May 4, 1954, that the Russians were "about 3 years" behind the United States in jet bombers.

After the May Day, 1955, fly-by, and on May 24, 1955, the Secretary of Defense, at a press conference, said:

I think it would be a fair assumption that the Russian Air Force is shifting its emphasis to a long-range strategic bomber force. We have known for some time that they [the Russians] were striving to increase their production of these types of aircraft. These are facts which are not new to the Defense Department.

Secretary Wilson made that statement after a long series of previous statements, year by year, in which he said that the Russians were interested only in a defensive build-up and were not building long-range bombers.

This is Secretary Wilson's record of miscalculations with respect to the B–52.

He made two miscalculations in 1 year, starting on May 24, 1955. On that date, asked at a press conference if the Moscow fly-bys would cause him to ask Congress for more funds, Secretary Wilson replied:

I don't think so.

But in June 1955—the following month—Secretary Wilson asked for approximately one-quarter of a billion dollars for B–52 production speed-up.

On March 6, 1956—this year—asked at a press conference how a decision to step up B–52 production would affect appropriation requests, Secretary Wilson replied:

You wouldn't have to do anything about it, in my opinion.

In the following month, in April of this year, Secretary Wilson asked for approximately one-quarter of a billion dollars for B–52 production speed-up. I might add, parenthetically that that was a week prior to the time the Armed Forces Subcommittee started its investigation of airpower.

Here we have the record of the Secretary of Defense on the subject of airpower. In my humble judgment—and I said this more than 3 years ago—he should no longer serve as Secretary of Defense.

His latest comment has demonstrated his ability to keep his foot in his mouth most of the time. The rest of the time he is trying desperately to take his foot out of his mouth.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad the Senator from Washington has placed the statements of Secretary Wilson in the RECORD for all to see. I now yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the defense establishment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So far as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations is concerned, he is willing to accept the designation of phony so long as it will protect the American people in their national security.

The difficulty of the Secretary of Defense is that he forgets he is not running General Motors but is working for the public. He cannot get over the idea that notwithstanding his success with General Motors, as a public servant he is behaving as a child. Every time he holds a conference, his limbs become so limber that, as the proverbial saying goes, he puts his foot in his mouth. He certainly has done so on this particular occasion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is getting to be a habit.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is a habit.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I rise to speak on a subject which is not a partisan matter. It involves the future security of every American.

Since the 25th of February, when the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and the authority on military matters in this body, established the Senate Subcommittee on the Air Force, I have tried to refrain from comment on the current controversy with respect to adequate defense.

This morning, however, in the press of the Nation, the Secretary of Defense has made statements attacking other members of his own organization, taking issue with their sworn testimony, ridiculing their statements made under oath as a result of requests from the Senate to be given the truth.

Far more important than that, however, is Mr. Wilson's deliberate attack on the Senate itself.

Apparently this Cabinet officer does not understand our form of government, especially that part which embraces the division of power in our Constitution, and which gives Congress the right to decide what funds are necessary for the creation and maintenance of the Armed Forces.

A full-page headline in the press this morning states:

Wilson sees no more funds needed for B–52 program but White House support of defense boost is hinted.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Missouri is not interested in possible disagreement between the White House and the man to whom the President has entrusted our defenses. But he is interested in the second heading, which states:

Secretary says drive in Senate for bigger Air Force is a phony.

And he is also interested in the third heading, which states:

KNOWLAND calls GOP bid for $500 million increase more acceptable to administration than Democratic move for $960 million.

Mr. President, ever since Mr. Wilson took office his opinion of the Senate has never been a secret. In his first year, 1953, after disagreeing with one of the Nation's great soldiers of World War II, Wilson remarked, in effort to ridicule this soldier at an open convention: "You talk like a Senator."

I have spent a little time on what Mr. Wilson thinks of the Senate. I will not spend any time on what the Senate thinks of Mr. Wilson.

In the press this morning, however, statements are made which the Senator from Missouri does not intend to let go unchallenged.

The Secretary of Defense is quoted as saying yesterday:

The Russian Bison bomber is vastly inferior to the United States B–52 intercontinental jet bomber.

Mr. Wilson is also quoted as saying:

There is a popular impression that the B–52 and the Russian Bison are equal. It is not so. The B–52 is greatly superior to the Bison, in the altitude it can fly, and the distance it can fly, without refueling.

Mr. Wilson also said:

General LeMay acted as if he didn't know what our plans are. He didn't know that we had gone up from 17 to 20 per month.

In making these statements, Mr. Wilson not only ridicules General LeMay; he tells the American people that his—LeMay's—sworn testimony is false.

I now read the sworn testimony of the world's greatest authority on strategic airpower, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, as he was questioned by the committee's very able counsel, Mr. Fowler Hamilton:

Mr. HAMILTON. What different kinds of long-range bombers, General, do we now have in operation?

General LEMAY. B–36's; B–52's.

Mr. HAMILTON. Which, if either of these, is becoming obsolete?

General LEMAY. The B–36.

Mr. HAMILTON. Directing your attention to the Russian situation, what different kinds of long-range bombers do the Russians now have and which, if any, of these is becoming obsolete?

General LEMAY. The Soviets now have the Bear, which is a turboprop aircraft; the Bison, which is a jet-powered aircraft comparable to our B–52. These are new aircraft and neither is obsolete.

Mr. HAMILTON. General, is it not a fact that the quality of Russia's modern long-range bombers, the Bear and the Bison that you have mentioned, is comparable to that of our own aircraft of the same type, that is to say, our B–52?

General LEMAY. If our estimates as to the performance characteristics of the Bison are accurate, then it is comparable to our B–52. The Bear, while a long-range bomber, is a turboprop-powered aircraft, and therefore its performance is greater in range but less in speed and in altitude than that of the B–52.

The Congress, the American people, will decide whether to believe the statements, based on his experience, of Mr. Wilson—or the statements, based on his experience, of General LeMay.

When Mr. Wilson says the B–52 is far superior in altitude and distance, he is also making statements directly contrary to oher sworn testimony of other high-ranking officers in the Department of Defense.

The press also reports Mr. Wilson also observed yesterday that the Russians do not have tanker planes to refuel the Bison in flight.

He has no more knowledge of that than anyone else. What he does know, or what he should know, is that whereas this country has almost no modern tankers for refueling, the Bear, the new Russian turboprop long-range bomber, has an estimated range greater than the B–52, and is an ideal plane to be used as a tanker.

We have testimony the Russians are working on another form of tanker for refueling—which may be inferior to ours, and may be superior.

The LeMay testimony was given the Senate Subcommittee on the Air Force under oath, in executive session, on April 30.

Mr. Wilson says, "General LeMay acted as if he didn't know what our plans are." He, Wilson, then talked about production being raised first from 13 per month to 17 per month, then to 20 per month—and the idea is thereby generated that this was comparable to production now going on.

But not too long ago a responsible newspaper had an editorial entitled, "Only 17 per Month." The editorial urged that production be raised to 45.

Later, this same paper had an editorial which was, in effect, an apology; because they had found out actual production was only four a month.

This morning, a responsible columnist makes the following statement:

Between January 1 and June 9 (of this year) the Air Force took delivery of only eight B–52's.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed a reply of the Secretary of the Air Force to the distinguished Senator

from Georgia [Mr. PURSELL], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, to the latter's request for knowledge as to what could be done with $1½ billion more appropriations from the Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the request of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Air Force has given consideration to the purposes to which funds in the amount of approximately $1.5 billion could be applied if such funds were added to the fiscal year 1957 budget request then pending before the Congress. As would be expected, we have found that there have been developments and changes in several of the budget areas since our fiscal year 1957 budget was prepared which suggest further specific needs, as outlined below.

ACCELERATION OF B–52 PRODUCTION PROGRAM

It will be recalled that last year the production rate of the B–52 program was stepped up substantially. A review of production experience to date in the principal airframe, engine, and equipment contractors has indicated the feasibility, with only minor additions to existing facilities, of further acceleration of B–52 production. This acceleration would make it possible to place a greater number of B–52 aircraft under contract and to produce by (date) some 80 more than would would be delivered under the existing schedule. We propose to adopt this new schedule and increase our total purchase through fiscal year 1957, deferring decision as to whether additional B–52 aircraft will be purchased in fiscal year 1958. To finance the additional aircraft in the fiscal year 1957 program would require an additional estimated $230 million in aircraft procurement, including spares and an additional $18.5 million in facilities for aircraft and related equipment production.

B–52 BASE DISPERSAL

This step-up in the rate of production of B–52 aircraft makes it highly desirable to accelerate our program for dispersal bases for such aircraft. A detailed study of this situation indicates that we should start in fiscal year 1957 the preparation of 4 or 5 additional dispersal bases beyond those previously planned. These are presently existing bases requiring additional construction to make them suitable for B–52 aircraft. To accelerate B–52 base dispersal to this extent would make it necessary that these bases be added to the Military Construction Authorization Act for 1957 and that additional funds in the amount of $60 million be added to the Air Force military public works appropriation.

DISTANT EARLY WARNING LINE—WESTWARD EXTENSION

A recent restudy of the westward extension of the distant early warning line indicated the desirability of a change to a better and more economical plan under which land stations along the Aleutian chain would be substituted for a portion of the picket ships which, under the previous plan, the Navy would have funded in fiscal year 1958. This has the effect of placing a new requirement on the Air Force for $68 million for construction of the land stations. Since this westward extension of the distant early warning line is a vital part of our warning system, the Air Force proposes that this westward extension be undertaken without delay and that, to this end, additional military public works in the amount of $68 million be authorized and appropriated.

The above new programs which we now recommend for additional support in the fiscal year 1957 budget total $376.5 million. Sums in the above amounts and for these specific purposes have been submitted by the President to the Congress as a supplement to the budget which was before the committee at the time the request to which we are now responding was made. Aside from contingencies in our ballistic missile program which we are not in a position to estimate at this time, it is felt that the Air Force fiscal year 1957 budget supplemented as above is adequate to meet the essential needs of the Air Force in this budget period. Without implying a request for funds beyond those included in the Air Force fiscal year 1957 budget as supplemented, the Air Force would recommend that if the Congress decides to appropriate funds beyond this they be appropriated to a new Air Force account, with the provision that withdrawal of funds from such account and transfer to other Air Force accounts must be for specific purposes and must have the approval of the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The availability of such an account would make it possible to meet contingencies in fiscal year 1957, such as any deficiency in ballistic missile program funds. To the extent that contingencies do not arise that would justify the withdrawal and use of these funds, the balance in this account at the end of the fiscal year would become available as a prepayment against the budgetary requirements of the Air Force for fiscal year 1958.

Sincerely,

DONALD A. QUARLES.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in my years in Government, this reply is about the most extraordinary letter I have seen. It was first classified, but, upon the Senator from Georgia protesting it was declassified.

The Senator from Georgia asked the Air Force "to give consideration to the purposes to which funds in the amount of $1½ billion could be applied if such funds were awarded to the fiscal year 1957 request" then pending before the Congress.

The reply states the Air Force will recommend additional support, in the 1957 budget, of $376½ million.

Instead of thereupon stating what the Air Force could do with the remaining $1.124 billion, the request of the Senator from Georgia, the Air Force suggests:

If the Congress decides to appropriate funds beyond this, they be appropriated to a new Air Force account with the provision that withdrawal of funds from such an account and transfer to either Air Force accounts must be for specific reasons.

And note this:

Must have the approval of the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

The significance of this Pentagon policy is further illustrated by Mr. Wilson's comments yesterday in reply to a request of what he would do in case $1.160 billion approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee was given him; or the $500 million recommended by another authority on military matters of the Senate, the senior Senator from New Hampshire, ranking Republican, and member of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

This is what Mr. Wilson said yesterday, in reply to these bipartisan suggestions for an increase in funds:

What do you do when someone forces money upon you? I cross bridges when I come to them. I'll wait and see if I need it. At the moment, I don't think I'll need it.

Now I direct attention to the testimony of another four-star general, Gen. Earle Partridge, head of both the Continental Air Command and the Air Defense Command, the man entrusted with the responsibility of defending the United States against attack.

In sworn testimony on April 30, General Partridge told the Senate:

They also brought out and are producing in large numbers a heavy bomber comparable to our B–52. This is the Bison.

At this point testimony was censored by the Department of Defense.

The testimony then continues:

I should like to invite your attention to the 4 large intake ducts which indicate they have 4 large very powerful engines. In other words they are doing with 4 engines what we are doing with 8 in the B–52.

The other aircraft for which we have no counterpart is the Bear. This is a turboprop bomber of extremely long range. The Soviet now have [deletion by Department of Defense censor] of these in operational units, and the reason it is built is to get not only the high altitude and the high speed but to get the extreme range which the Soviet feel they need for a two way attack on this country unrefuelled.

Why does not the Secretary of Defense, in his off-the-cuff ramblings, tell the American people also that the other new long-range Russian bomber, the Bear, has a longer range than either the Russian Bison or the United States B–52?

Mr. President, Mr. Wilson is the man who only 3 years ago took more than $7 billion out of our national defense without even obtaining an opinion from the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

It was at this time the late General Vandenberg said the reductions in personnel made then would mean that planes could not be properly operated.

Mr. President, here is a story which illustrates what happens as a result of the heavy cuts in maintenance and operation put through by this administration. Some weeks ago, when in Omaha, I asked General LeMay to give me an illustration of how these cuts had damaged the Air Force.

The general replied:

One of my best men was preparing for take-off when the ejector seat on his plane went off. He was thrown 40 feet in the air, came down on the concrete. The next morning he died, leaving behind a young wife and 2 children.

General LeMay said:

I wanted to see the ejector pin, so I told them to get me the crew chief. They brought in a 19-year-old boy. I asked him whether or not be had inspected the ejector pin, and he assured me that he had. I tried to get it. They could not find it. I had magnets applied to the field to find it, but it could not be found. So I called the boy back. Then he broke down and admitted he had not inspected the pin.

I asked General LeMay at that point, "What did you do with the boy?" He replied, "I could have court-martialed

him and ruined his life, but he was only 19 years old. He had no right to be crew chief at 19. So I told him he had already cost the life of a fine officer. 'Go forth and be a better airman'."

Those who are saying what the Senate is trying to do for the defenses of the country is phony might consider that story. Similar stories are coming in from over the world.

Is there one Senator who does not believe that since the Congress has the right to draft boys off the farms and from civilian life, it has the duty likewise to see to it that these men have the best equipment and best training possible, so they in turn may have the best chance to return alive to their families, after their tour of duty is over?

Mr. President, the Secretary of Defense did not stop here in his criticism of yesterday. The press states:

8. He (Mr. Wilson) dislikes to quarrel with Dr. James Killian, who expressed a belief that the Department should spend more money on basic research ($100 million more for that purpose is contemplated in the opposition Senators' planning), but Wilson feels that the Defense Department should concern itself with "objective research." If the country wishes to spend money on wholly basic research it should vote money for that purpose, he insists, and not have it concealed in a defense appropriation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield? I have to leave the Chamber in a moment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire, who is a great authority on air power.

Mr. BRIDGES. I merely wish to say that I read with amazement and shock the statement of the Secretary of Defense, as published in the newspapers this morning, in which he describes the efforts of Members of the Senate as "phony." I feel there is an honest difference of opinion between Senators, but I believe all of them are attempting sincerely to fulfill the objective of providing the ultimate security for America. I consider the statement by the Secretary of Defense, in terming those efforts of Senators as "phony," to be an unwarranted slur upon Senators; and I wish to be registered as emphatically saying so on this floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his wise and logical position on this as on other matters of great interest to the security of our country.

Only last Wednesday, this scientist, President Killian, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, called attention to our shortcomings in the field of research and development.

Mr. Wilson now takes on Dr. Killion, also.

Yesterday, Mr. Wilson said:

If the country wishes to spend money on wholly basic research, it should vote money for that purpose and not have it concealed in a defense appropriation.

Mr. President, this is not new thinking on the part of Mr. Wilson. Back in 1954, Mr. Wilson said:

If we want to go ahead and have pure research, let us let somebody subsidize it. Let us not put the burden of it on the Defense Department. I am not much interested, as a military project, in why potatoes turn brown when they are fried.

Senator MAYBANK.—

Our late, beloved colleague—

Did they have such a project as that?

Secretary WILSON. That is an apt way to describe it.

Senator MAYBANK. I have to differ with you.

Senator HILL. Mr. Wilson, why not give us a real or true illustration, not about potatoes, but something you did not approve of.

Secretary WILSON. We were pushing the atomic airplane. You could consider that was in the area of pure research.

This opinion, with the resultant action, from one who literally had been on the job only a few weeks, resulted in serious delay to a program whose priority is now exceeded only by that on ballistic missiles.

Mr. President, I have gone into some detail today, because this member of the President's Cabinet, in these trying times, in his latest comments about the Senate, not only has attacked the Senate's intelligence, but also has actually attacked the rights of this body under the Constitution of the United States.

I believe a majority of the Congress and the American people will agree that the usefulness of this Cabinet officer has come to an end.

Over the years he has bewildered the people with his varied contrary statements—statements not supported by the sworn testimony of many of his highest ranking officers.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. The distinguished Senator from Missouri has called the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Secretary of Defense has insulted the Senate by asserting that the claim of some Senators, which is based upon the testimony of military men, that we need more money for the Air Force, is a phony or fraudulent claim. The Secretary of Defense not only insults the Senate, but he also insults the American people. According to the dispatch which appeared this morning in the Washington Post, the Secretary of Defense also said that—

The people of our country want to make sure we have a strong defense. But when it comes to paying off, they take a different slant.

I should like to state to the Senator from Missouri that I resent the insult to the Members of the Senate and the military officers who happen to disagree with the Secretary of Defense. I likewise resent the gratuitous and unfounded insult to the American people. From my observation, the American people are not only giving their sons to the defense of their country, but they are also giving their dollars; and since I came to Washington 2 years ago I have not heard any American citizen other than the Secretary of Defense complain about any appropriation for defense purposes.

As a result of my service on the Senate Armed Services Committee and on the Special Subcommittee on the Air Force, I have come to the deliberate conclusion that the Secretary of Defense is much more concerned about the security of dollars than he is about the security of our Nation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the great Senator from North Carolina, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Mr. President, as has just been pointed out, the statements made by the Secretary of Defense have seriously impaired much of the morale in our Defense Department all over the world.

The Commander in Chief would be the first to say there is nothing more important to any military establishment than morale.

When General Eisenhower was Chief of Staff of the Army, he testified before the Congress:

We have asked for these things because from our point of view these are what we would like to have; these are what we think we need; we will defend these same estimates in the Senate, but it is the responsibility of the Congress under the Constitution, to determine what portion of the national economy can be assigned to the national defense, and that is the responsibility that the Constitution places upon the Congress.

If the President is informed of these latest attacks by Mr. Wilson on other members of the Department of Defense and on the Congress, and still allows him to remain on the job, then it will be obvious that Mr. Eisenhower no longer believes in 1956 what General Eisenhower told the Congress in 1945.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President——

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I yield with pleasure to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

First, let me congratulate him upon his very excellent statement, and particularly upon giving us the benefit of the statements made by the then General Eisenhower, as to what is our constitutional——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair state that a Senator who has the floor can yield only for a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri may yield to the Senator from Florida without losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Senator from Missouri had yielded, but the Chair is ruling that a Senator who has the floor can yield only for a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have made a unanimous-consent request. If objection is made, I shall be glad to abide by it.

Mr. SMATHERS. I shall be happy to ask a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to having the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Florida for other than a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall not object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will not object.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No, Mr. President; I shall not object. I only say——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have the regular order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection. The Senator from Florida may proceed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Massachusetts, and I wish to repeat my expression of thanks to the very able Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] for, in effect, defending the integrity of all the Members who sit in this great body.

I am sure all of us recognize that, as the Senator from Missouri has so well pointed out, we do have a responsibility to look into these matters of national defense and to determine whether we do or do not have a sufficient national defense. Our duty is to the general public, just as is that of Secretary Wilson.

I certainly agree with the Senator from Missouri that it is time the President called on the Secretary of Defense to apologize to the American people, because, as the Senator from North Carolina has so well pointed out, there is no evidence that the people of the United States are unwilling to pay for the defense which they think they need in order to preserve their great institutions and in order to preserve their lives.

For him to infer this morning that they may want a defense but that they are unwilling to pay for it is an insult to the American people, and the time has come for the President of the United States to call upon Secretary Wilson to apologize to them. Once again he evidences his great ability to put both feet in his mouth at the same time. The Secretary of Defense can make more errors than Mickey Mantle can make hits. I do not know when we have had anyone in the Government of the United States who has managed more often to insult not only those with whom he must work within his own Department, but Members of Congress as well. He acts as though he knew more about this particular problem than such well-qualified men as General LeMay and other outstanding American patriots who have spent their lives in this particular field, and who testify just the opposite of what the Secretary is trying to tell the American public.

I congratulate the Senator from Missouri. Let me say that so far as I am concerned, I am one of those who highly resent the statement made by the Secretary of Defense this morning.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator. If we analyze the statements made by Mr. Wilson as reported in the various newspapers of the United States, it will be seen that what he is doing is challenging the sworn statements of those subordinates on whom he must rely for morale in case this country gets into trouble. The testimony under oath of Generals LeMay and Partridge is at direct variance with what the Secretary said yesterday at Quantico. As I stated in my prepared statement, I believe that the usefulness of Mr. Wilson as Secretary of Defense has come to an end.

I thank the Senator from Florida for his typically kind, gracious, and very thoughtful remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am very pleased that no Member of the Senate on either side of the aisle has sought to justify the statement made by the Secretary of Defense yesterday. I think the statement which the Secretary made was repugnant to all patriotic Americans, regardless of party. I think it ill behooves a Cabinet officer in an administration which is now asking the Senate to restore in excess of $700 million to the foreign-aid bill to brand the efforts of Senators as "phony" when they offer $500 million additional for America's own defense system.

Like every other Senator, I regret the statement of the Secretary of Defense. I think it is unfortunate, and to be deplored.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his remarks. The senior Senator from Texas has fought for his country. He has been decorated for gallantry in action, and he has every right therefore, as an American who has seen that type and character of action, to express his opinion with respect to the comments made by the Secretary of Defense during the past 24 hours.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like very briefly to discuss the defense appropriation bill now pending before us. The committee was unanimous on all items submitted by the Army, the Navy, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The only items of disagreement related to the Air Force. There by a vote of 13–12, the committee voted to add to the budget request $1,160 million. After the bill was reported, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the senior minority member of the committee, planned to offer an amendment to the committee, amendment which will increase the budget request by $500 million instead of $1,160 million.

In several respects these amendments are similar. Both increase the research and development by $100 million. Both increase the personnel appropriation by $20 million. The committee amendment increases the operation and maintenance by $40 million; the Senator from New Hampshire by $30 million, a difference of $10 million. The Bridges amendment omits the construction of bases in the amount of $200 million. The difference becomes a difference of timing rather than dollars. The military construction bill has not yet been authorized and money for it cannot be appropriated until it is authorized. The work on the authorization will be completed and submitted to the Senate next week. We, who joined with the Senator from New Hampshire, believe that if we are going to have a separate military construction bill, the appropriation should all be included in that bill and not separated into two bills.

The amount of time lost will be so negligible that it is much wiser to keep the two bills completely separate and know what the new authorizations and extension of old authorizations may be.

The big difference comes in aircraft procurement. The original estimate, including the supplementary request, amounted to $6,048,500,000. The majority of the committee would raise this by $800 million. The Bridges amendment would raise this by $350 million, or a difference of $450 million.

A study of the testimony will indicate that the production of B–52 bombers, the newest, latest bomber, is going upward at an accelerated rate and will build up the planned number of wings more rapidly than was originally contemplated. Whether more money appropriated can further accelerate this rate or whether it will just result in placing further orders ahead, is a decision that the Air Force will have to make. There can be an acceleration also of tactical aircraft and jet tankers.

Secretary Quarles has testified that they have sufficient money at the present time for aircraft procurement. Certainly an additional $350 million may give them additional flexibility, but more than that amount will be difficult for them to plan to use advisedly now.

General LeMay, the leader of the Strategic Air Command, and General Partridge, the overall commander of Continental Defense, want as much for their commands as they believe they can use. LeMay has testified he could use $3 billion additional a year for the SAC for the next 4 years. Partridge has testified he could use $6 billion between 1950 and 1965 for continental defense.

This gives us some indication of what would be involved if all requests were filled in full. The economic life of this country cannot bear such a burden except in wartime when everything is concentrated on the winning of the war.

At the same time Generals Twining, LeMay, and Partridge have unanimously testified that they place their priorities as follows:

First. Personnel—trained personnel.

Second. Air bases for dispersal purposes.

Third. Research—this is inserted by General Twining.

Fourth. Aircraft production.

First. We have made an effort in this Congress through the military dependent and medical benefits bill, reenlistment bonuses, and other bills to induce trained personnel to stay in the Armed Forces. Possibly a pay raise for those meeting certain technical requirements will have to come in the next Congress. We are all cognizant that we must do more to keep trained personnel in the Armed Forces if we are to operate the highly technical equipment we now have in the air, on the sea, and on the ground.

Second. Construction of military bases. As we get more planes we must have more places on the ground to put them, and if there is danger of a sudden and unexpected attack, we should have as wide a dispersal as possible. Naturally the bigger the planes, the longer and heavier the runways must be. Consequently I intend to support the full amount requested for air bases.

Third. There is no dispute that we must stimulate our research and development of new instruments as fast as we efficiently can. Some competition, but

not duplication, by the services is extremely helpful. Our research must be efficient and imaginative, because we must have the best quality of airplanes, and, as early as possible, guided and ballistics missiles in our defense inventory. There is no question about that and no disagreement.

Fourth. Production of airplanes, as I have stated, must proceed. Guided missiles and ballistic missiles are still far from being in the quantity production to supplant in any way the need for the present strategic bombers and tactical fighters. On the other hand, a plane becomes obsolete almost overnight. The B–52's were on the drawing boards back in 1944–45. They are in regular production now. As they increase in numbers the B–36's become more obsolete. Certainly we want to use the B–36's until we have enough B–52's to take their place. We have a fine inventory of B–47's, although we do not hear much about these planes in the discussions of this subject. They, too, will become obsolete in due course. But in all the discussion concerning the B–52's we must not overlook the fact that the B–47 is an exceedingly fine strategic bomber, and with the bases we have around the world, the B–47 is a mighty important deterrent factor. So we must have the best quality planes in the greatest possible numbers consistent with the building up of a peacetime force, and ever watchful of obsolescence due to new inventions.

But airplanes and air bases are of no value unless we have the trained personnel to operate them; and as one who has listened to much testimony on this subject in the past 6 months, I know how important it is to keep our ablest young men in the Armed Forces. Certainly we have been fortunate over the years in the quality of men who have desired to make the military a career. Certainly we must do everything in our power to maintain that desire among our young men who are coming along today.

We were very fortunate indeed during World War II in having the experience of men like General Marshall and General Eisenhower and Admiral King and Admiral Nimitz, and other great military leaders. Certainly we should stimulate the interest of the young people who are looking toward a career in the Armed Forces.

Mr. President, I shall not today go into a discussion of airpower. As a member of the Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee on Air Power, I expect to discuss that subject more fully when that committee makes its report sometime soon. As a member of the Armed Services Committee and as the senior member on the minority side of the Military Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I have tried to ask myself, in reaching my decision, this question: "Will what we do make more certain that we have sufficient armed strength so that no nation will dare to attack us because of our ability to retaliate in a totally destructive way?" Only by maintaining our Armed Forces in such a manner can we maintain the security of our country. If we try to match numbers with our most powerful possible enemy, we may well defeat ourselves in the process.

Dr. Killian, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, told our committee the other day in an open hearing that he believes there have been greater advances in destructive armament since the Korean war than there had been in many years previous. This, he said, called for a constant reappraisal of our military situation in types of armament and in missions. I agree with him so heartily that I would like to quote his testimony before the Air Force Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee on June 20:

> I conclude with the mention of one factor which to my mind today is of overriding importance: that is to do those things now within our grasp and means to achieve a maximum degree of readiness. This is as of today more important than any discussion of budgets or number of bomber wings or trying to match or exceed Soviet plane production or R. and D. policies. Are we deploying what we have and can get in the immediate months ahead to give maximum deterrence and to insure maximum protection of our striking power? Simply adding more and more planes does not necessarily give us optimum strength. Of first priority is a balanced, integrated combination of offensive-defensive power designed to meet our military requirements and not to duplicate that of the Russians.

Mr. President, I have quoted that statement in full because I believe it to be the best description I have seen of the problem which confronts Congress and the President.

Our military strength must be determined by our political and economic decisions. The unanimous action of Congress last year, in giving the President discretion as to whether to use our troops in the defense of Formosa, has done much, in my opinion, to prevent an attack on Formosa. We have the experience of the Monroe Doctrine over the 19th century. If we had had more troops in Korea in 1950, would there ever have been an attack? To the deterrent buildup of the strength of our Armed Forces, we have added a visible deterrent through our willingness to support NATO with Armed Forces in Europe, with the armies of various countries throughout the world, whom we hope will be our friends. In these ways, as well as building up our armed strength, we create a visible deterrent to any nation attacking us in a worldwide effort or starting a periphery war.

Mr. President, in considering the size of the military budget, we must give thought to these factors as vitally important in determining what we must do, not only in armament and military personnel, but in all the factors that lead to greater security and world peace.

Mr. President, my principal reason for the statement which I have just made, and the reason for my opposition to the $1.160 billion increase which has been proposed, is simply this: Is the security of the United States—its fully adequate security against any type of attack from any quarter by any aggressor—to be determined simply by the wholesale addition to this or any other defense budget of an additional billion or 5 billion or 10 billion dollars? For my own part, Mr. President, I doubt it—I doubt it seriously.

The President has long since made it clear that our great defense and security objective should be the building up of our strength in such a balanced, flexible, and up-to-the-minute way as to deter completely any aggressor that may plan attack upon us.

Whose judgment and experience are better than those of President Eisenhower? He believes that neither the short-war concept of defense nor the one-weapon strategy which some have proposed will serve this Nation's best interests. To rely upon a single weapon, to place our dependence upon a single service, or to play a deadly numbers game in an armament production race with the Soviet Union would be foolish and extraordinarily dangerous, far more than our economy could bear, and certain to leave us weaker rather than stronger in the long run.

The principle of measured might, a policy of balanced forces, a flexible strategic concept to meet, at a moment's notice and over the long pull, either a small war or a total one—these, I believe, to be absolutely vital to this Nation's security.

It is for these reasons that, while I am prepared to support some increases in the budget originally proposed, I am quite unwilling to support the committee amendment as now offered to us. I do not believe it represents the best appropriation of defense funds in 1957.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, anticipating that something of the nature of that which has developed at the present time would develop, I requested of the Library of Congress, some weeks ago, a brief in regard to the authority of the President concerning the Armed Forces of the United States. I hold in my hand a brief prepared in the Library of Congress which sets forth in detail the authority of the President and which also deals with the question before the Senate at the present time concerning Secretary of Defense Wilson and what he has had to say. Anyone reading this brief will, I think, clearly see that the Congress of the United States holds the authority and power to make appropriations and to decide the strength of our Armed Forces and what are the necessary appropriations in each instance for each Department, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps. In connection with prior appropriations for the Marine Corps the matter was brought to my attention. The Department did not carry out the wishes of the Congress of the United States with respect to using the money provided for the Marine Corps.

The brief is interesting reading, Mr. President, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, because it gives answers to many of the questions which will arise in the future so long as we have at the head of the Department of Defense a man such as Mr. Wilson who is willing to criticize the Congress of the United States for doing what it thinks is right and having it done in a certain manner.

Mr. President, I should like to commend highly the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] for his excellent remarks of this morning regarding Defense Secretary Wilson and his chronic foot-in-mouth-disease ailment.

I wish to call to the attention of the Senate some profit figures on General Motors Corp. covering the past 4 years of operation, or that period representing approximately the same time since Mr. Wilson left the services of that corporation.

In the past 4 years General Motors, of which Mr. Wilson was president, increased its annual profits from $588,721,000 in 1952 to $1,189,477,000 in 1955.

This represents an increase in 1955 of 202 percent profit over its 1952 profits.

Apparently Mr. Wilson has not been missed too sorely by General Motors since becoming Secretary of Defense, because that company certainly has not "gone to the dogs"—a subject on which Mr. Wilson is also somewhat of an expert.

I wish to assure the country at this time that should Secretary Wilson resign, as has been suggested here today, that once again he shall not be missed too sorely.

Mr. President, I renew my request to have the brief prepared by the Library of Congress printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the brief was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION

Because of the fact that Congress has usually relied on more specific clauses of the Constitution when it has undertaken to pass laws affecting the Armed Forces, or to limit powers which the President might otherwise exercise as Commander in Chief, we must search for relevant principles in decisions and debates arising under those other clauses. The materials on this point are less voluminous than those relating to the scope of the President's authority as Commander in Chief in cases where there is no statute authorizing or prohibiting a particular course of action.

The principal controversies which have arisen concerning the respective powers of Congress and the President in this area have related to (1) the exercise of the power of command; (2) the use of the Armed Forces at home and abroad; (3) the exercise of belligerent rights; (4) the reconstruction of governments in the seceded states; and (5) civilian controls in time of war or emergency.

EXERCISE OF POWER OF COMMAND

A right to determine how the power of command shall be exercised is claimed by virtue of Article I, section 8, clause 14, which empowers Congress to "make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces." The principle by which this power is to be reconciled with the commander in chief clause can be easily stated. In *Swain* v. *United States* ((1893) 28 Ct. Cls. 173, 221, affirmed 165 U. S. 553), it was formulated in the following terms:

"The significant fact in our military system that the President is always the Commander in Chief. Congress may increase the Army, or reduce the Army, or abolish it altogether; but so long as we have a military force Congress cannot take away from the President the supreme command. It is true that the Constitution has conferred upon Congress the exclusive power 'to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces;' but the two powers are distinct; neither can trench upon the other; the President cannot, under the disguise of military orders, evade the legislative regulations by which he in common with the Army must be governed; and Congress cannot in the disguise of 'rule for the Government' of the Army impair the authority of the President as Commander in Chief."

Such generalizations are, however, of little help in defining the powers of the Commander in Chief which Congress may not impair. A classic debate on this question was precipitated by the Act of March 2, 1867, making appropriations for the support of the Army, 14 Stat. 485. Section 2 of that act provided that:

"All orders and instructions relating to military operations issued by the President or Secretary of War shall be issued through the General of the Army, and, in case of his inability, through the next in rank. The General of the Army shall not be removed, suspended, or relieved from command, or assigned to duty elsewhere than at said headquarters, except at his own request, without the previous approval of the Senate; and any orders or instructions relating to military operations issued contrary to the requirements of this section shall be null and void; and any officer who shall issue orders or instructions contrary to the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor in office; and any officer of the Army who shall transmit, convey, or obey any orders or instructions so issued contrary to the provisions of this section, knowing that such order were so issued, shall be liable to imprisonment for not less than 2 or more than 20 years, upon conviction thereof in any court of competent jurisdiction."

The validity of this section was vigorously challenged in the Senate. Reverdy Johnson of Maryland declared (Congressional Globe, 39th Congress, 2d session, 1851 (1867)):

"It seems to me perfectly obvious that that section is in direct conflict with the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution, in express terms, not content with placing the entire executive power of the nation in the executive department of the Government and in the President of the United States as the head of that department, provides that he shall be the Commander in Chief of the Army. And this section says, although in the absence of such a provision General Grant would be under the control of the President as the constitutional Commander in Chief, his station shall be here though that commander may think it should be elsewhere. And it goes on further and says that no orders shall be issued of a military character except in accordance with the provisions of this bill; and proposes to punish any officer of the Government who may dare in the fact of Congress to obey a military order coming from the constitutional Commander in Chief."

Senator Buckalew of Pennsylvania joined in the attack, saying (id. at 1853):

"What powers, then, are conferred upon the President of the United States when the Constitution declares that he shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy? Why, sir, there is one power under this head which no man can deny or doubt; and that is the power of giving orders to his inferiors in military rank. The most especial characteristic of a commander in chief is that he shall issue his orders to his subordinates and that they shall be bound to obey them. To be sure our President must issue his orders according to law; he cannot command his inferior officers to do acts which are illegal; but so long as he complies with the laws his orders are to be obeyed, being given in his capacity as Commander in Chief, charged with the execution of the law."

On the other hand, Senators Fessenden, of Maine, and Edmunds, of Vermont, defended the right of Congress to impose this requirement. Fessenden reasoned as follows (id. at 1851–1852):

"While the Constitution fixes the rank of the President of the United States as a military and naval officer, it keeps within the control of the people of the United States, represented in Congress, the power to raise armies and to create a navy and the power to pass rules and regulations for the government of the land and naval forces. That power is reserved in the hands of the people, to be exercised through the Congress of the United States. Now, sir, I hold that, although the President is Commander in Chief as a matter of military rank, yet what armies shall be raised, where they shall go, where they shall be disbanded, what they shall do, and what all their officers shall do, are matters to be regulated by the sovereign power; and that sovereign power is to be exercised precisely as sovereign power is exercised in any case. The commander in chief of the army of Russia, I take it, would be subject to the power of the Emperor. The Commander in Chief of the Army of the United States is subject to the power of the people, to be exercised by Congress; and I deny that because his military rank is fixed as Commander in Chief by the Constitution the people may not through their Congress pass all such rules and regulations with regard to the exercise of military power as they see fit, and devolve that power upon any military officer. They cannot, perhaps, authorize an officer to command the Commander in Chief, but they can direct any officer what to do. That I hold very distinctly is the power of the people; and gentlemen mistake when they suppose that because the President as a matter of military rank is head of the Army it is out of the power of Congress to say what that head of the Army shall do, or shall not do.

* * * * *

"We can just as well control the President as Commander in Chief as we can control any one of his subordinates."

Edmunds asked, "What is 'government of the land and naval forces' * * * if it be not to provide the methods and limitations by which and under which the Army shall be moved and operated and controlled?" (id. at 1854). He went on to say:

"Another clause, to be sure, provides that the President of the United States shall be the Commander in Chief. Is he to be the Commander in Chief against this Government which the Constitution declares Congress shall provide, or is he to be the Commander in Chief under it and according to its authority and its asserted force and regulation?

"Now, what does this bill propose to do? It proposes to declare that the method of operating the Army shall be a particular one; that is, that the orders which the Commander in Chief shall give shall be given through a particular channel and shall operate in a particular way. There is no provision that he shall not give an order. It does not undertake to hedge in his authority a particle as to what he shall order, or in what way, other than that when he operates upon the Army and says it shall go here or stay there, he shall operate upon it in the regular method through a particular subordinate. Is not that government? Is not that executing merely a government of the Army? If it is not, then this language which as I say, is as comprehensive as it is possible for language to be, has no meaning at all. If we are not governing the Army of the United States in providing the methods by which it shall be operated and moved, what are we doing?"

While protesting that in certain cases this bill virtually deprived him of his constitutional function as Commander in Chief, Johnson nevertheless signed this bill since a failure to do so would have defeated necessary appropriations (Congressional Globe, 40th Cong., 1st sess. 5 (1867)). One of the charges in the bill of impeachment against

him was that this law had been ignored (Congressional Globe, 40th Cong., 2d sess. 1648 (1868)). Johnson denied the charge. Inasmuch as his impeachment trial was ended after he had been acquitted of three other charges, this issue was never resolved. The law itself was repealed in the first year of Grant's administration (16 Stat. 319 (1870)).

A somewhat similar provision was inserted in the act of June 28, 1940, concerning expansion of defense facilities—Fifty-fourth United States Statutes at Large, page 681. Section 14 of that law stipulated that:

"Notwithstanding the provision of any other law, no military or naval weapon, ship, boat, aircraft, munitions, supplies, or equipment, to which the United States has title, in whole or in part, or which have been contracted for, shall hereafter be transferred, exchanged, sold, or otherwise disposed of in any manner whatsoever unless the Chief of Naval Operations in the case of naval material, and the Chief of Staff of the Army, in the case of military material, shall first certify that such material is not essential to the defense of the United States."

This section had been added on the floor of the Senate (86 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 8828 (1940)), without any discussion of its constitutionality. In his opinion approving the delivery of destroyers to Great Britain in exchange for naval and air bases, the Attorney General suggested a doubt about its validity (39 Op. Atty. Gen., 484, 490 (1940)). He wrote:

"Thus to prohibit action by the constitutionally created Commander in Chief except upon authorization of a statutory officer subordinate in rank is of questionable constitutionality. However, since the statute requires certification only of matter as to which you would wish, irrespective of the statute, to be satisfied, and as the legislative history of the section indicates that no arbitrary restriction is intended, it seems unnecessary to raise the question of constitutionality which such a provision would otherwise invite."

Another unsettled question is whether Congress can restrict the President's authority to dismiss members of the Armed Forces. By the act of July 13, 1866, Fourteenth United States Statutes at Large, page 92, dismissal of an officer in time of peace was forbidden except "in pursuance of the sentence of a court-martial to that effect, or in commutation thereof." A similar provision is now found in title 50, United States Code, page 739. In *Wallace* v. *United States* ((1922) 257 U. S. 541, 545), the Supreme Court observed that the validity of this act (and others) had been the subject of doubt and discussion and had never been directly passed on by that Court. It was not settled in that case.

Theodore Roosevelt's dismissal of three companies of soldiers in November 1906, for alleged misconduct in Brownsville, Tex., touched off a heated debate in the Senate as to the extent of the President's authority over the Armed Forces. He justified the dismissal as having been ordered "in the exercise of my constitutional power, and in pursuance of what, after full consideration, I found to be my constitutional duty as Commander in Chief of the United States Army" (41 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 549 (1906)). Several Senators charged that the dismissal was illegal because made in contravention of the Articles of War enacted by Congress. Senator Foraker, of Ohio, for example, insisted (id. at 568) that:

The Congress has power to prescribe by law what rules and regulations shall govern the Army as to its organization, as to the size of the Army, its maximum, its minimum, as to the number of the infantry regiments, the number of cavalry regiments, the number of artillery regiments, and the number of batteries, and the number of men in each of these units of organization; and how, Mr. President, particularly, men shall be enlisted and men shall be discharged from the Army, the terms and conditions upon which they shall be enlisted, the rights that shall accrue to them on account of their service—long service, faithful service—whether or not they shall be recognized by the Government and be rewarded by the Government. All that rests with Congress as a part of that power. As a part of that power it is competent for the Congress of the United States to provide that no man shall be summarily discharged from the Army after he has been regularly enlisted except upon certain terms and conditions; that no man in the Army shall be found guilty of any offense with which he may be charged except after he has had an opportunity to appear before a tribunal where he can present his defense, where he can be represented in person and be represented by attorney, if he wants to be, or by someone else to speak for him; where he can confront his accusers and cross-examine their witnesses."

Henry Cabot Lodge defended the President in the following argument (id. at 685):

"When the framers of the Constitution made the President Commander in Chief it vested in him all the powers inherent in that office, which was one well understood, and the powers of which were thoroughly apprehended and appreciated by the men who framed the Constitution, and over whom Washington presided, who had been the Commander in Chief of the forces of the United States.

* * * * *

"When we came to our Revolution we adopted the military laws of England. They were those that our officers had been accustomed to in the old French War, and in all military organizations; and our modern articles of war, which were embodied in the statutes soon after the adoption of the Constitution, the principal revision being, I think, in 1806, preserved still the characteristics of the military law which we took over from England.

* * * * *

"In England * * * the power of summary dismissal—that is, of terminating the enlistment—is absolute today, and as Clode, the authority I have quoted, says, it may be extended to an entire regiment, and no reasons need be given for the action beyond that of the good of the service.

"Now, Mr. President, has that power of summary dismissal, unquestionably inherent in the Commander in Chief as originally established, been taken from him by any regulation or law of Congress? If it has not been specifically taken from him then he still possesses, as he does all other powers inherent in the office of Commander in Chief of which he has not been deprived or in which he has not been limited by law."

Thus he did not deny that the President's power could be limited by law. The burden of his argument was that the President had inherent authority as Commander in Chief to dismiss these companies in the absence of a statute forbidding it, and that the Articles of War, properly interpreted, had not deprived him of this power.

USE OF ARMED FORCES AT HOME

A variety of measures enacted in the early days under the Constitution reflect the view that it was for Congress to define the conditions under which the President might use the Armed Forces. By the act of May 2, 1792, 1 Stat. 264, superseded by the act of February 28, 1795, 1 Stat. 424, the President was authorized to call forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions under stated conditions. One requirement was that before dispatching the militia, he should issue a proclamation commanding the insurgents to disperse, and retire peaceably to their respective abodes. In 1807 this was extended to empower the President to employ the land or naval forces of the United States for the purpose of suppressing insurrection or executing the laws "having first observed all the prerequisites of the law in that respect" (2 Stat. 443).

The declaration of war against Great Britain in 1812 contained a clause to the effect that "the President of the United States is hereby authorized to use the whole land and naval force of the United States to carry the same into effect" (2 Stat. 755). Similar clauses are to be found in subsequent declarations of war. The declarations of war against Japan and Germany in 1941 "Authorized and directed [the President] to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war" (55 Stat. 795–796).

Further evidence of the limited scope of the authority then asserted under the Commander in Chief clause is found in Jefferson's first annual message to Congress. Referring to the depredations of Tripoli against our commerce, he stated that he had taken defensive measures to protect that commerce but that he was "unauthorized by the Constitution, without the sanction of Congress, to go beyond the line of defense." I Richardson, Messages and Papers of the President 326, 327 (1897). By the act of February 6, 1802 (2 Stat. 130), Congress made it lawful for the President "to instruct the commanders of the respective public vessels * * * to subdue, seize, and make prize of all vessels * * * belonging to the Bey of Tripoli * * * and also to cause to be done all such other acts of precaution or hostility as the state of war will justify, and may, in his opinion, require."

An entirely different interpretation of his powers as Commander in Chief was put forward by Millard Fillmore in 1851. As a result of difficulties encountered in enforcing the fugitive slave law, he asked Congress to modify the proclamation requirements of the acts of 1795 and 1807 on the ground that "Such a proclamation * * * would often defeat the whole object by giving such notice to persons intended to be arrested that they would be enabled to fly or secrete themselves."

He questioned the power of Congress to make this provision applicable to use of the Army or Navy in these words (V Richardson, op. cit., supra, 104–105):

"The Constitution declares that 'the President shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed,' and that 'he shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States,' and that 'Congress shall have power to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions.' From which it appears that the Army and Navy are by the Constitution placed under the control of the Executive; and probably no legislation of Congress could add to or diminish the power thus given but by increasing or diminishing or abolishing altogether the Army and Navy. * * *

"Congress, not probably adverting to the difference between the militia and the Regular Army, by the act of March 3, 1807, authorized the President to use the land and naval forces of the United States for the same purposes for which he might call forth the militia, and subject to the same proclamation. But the power of the President under the Constitution, as Commander of the Army and Navy, is general, and his duty to see the laws faithfully executed is general and positive; and the act of 1807 ought not to be construed as evincing any disposition in Congress to limit or restrain this constitutional authority. For greater certainty, however, it may be well that Congress should modify or explain this act in regard to its provisions for the employment of the Army

and Navy of the United States, as well as that in regard to calling forth the militia."

Congress ignored the suggestion that the act of 1807 be amended for greater certainty. During the Civil War, it reasserted its authority over the use of the Armed Forces by the act of February 25, 1865, 13 Stat. 437. Section 1 of this act, which is carried forward in 18 U. S. C. 592, made it unlawful to use troops "at the place where any general or special election is held in any State * * * unless it shall be necessary to repel the armed enemies of the United States, or to keep the peace at the polls." The proponents made it clear that the measure was aimed at action taken pursuant to orders of the President. (CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 38th Congress, 1st sess., Appendix 55–71 (1864)). Senator Howard, of Michigan, who led the opposition to the bill, conceded that Congress had constitutional power to deal with this problem. He said (id. at 86):

"I admit that, if Congress were so unwise, it might, by a statute, direct the Commander in Chief of the armies not to employ the troops of the United States within any given place, whether that place be within a mile of a poll or elsewhere, because I hold that the warmaking, war conducting power, in all its varying forms and phases, is lodged in Congress, and that they have a right, if they choose to do so, at all times to direct the movements of the Army; to declare what expeditions shall be sent out and for what purpose; to declare where the Army shall march, where the Navy shall operate, and to do anything and everything in reference to the management of the Army and the Navy in the conduct of a war. This is within their power under the Constitution. I yield that point. If Congress were so unwise as to undertake, by special legislation, to strip the Commander in Chief of the Army of the United States of the implied authority which belongs to him as such, they have an undoubted right to do so, leaving him only his rank of Commander in Chief."

As a result of further dissatisfaction with the use of troops in domestic affairs, Congress passed another law in 1878, 20 Stat. 152, now 10 U. S. C. 15, which provided that:

"It shall not be lawful to employ any part of the Army of the United States, as a posse comitatus, or otherwise, for the purpose of executing the laws, except in such cases and under such circumstances as such employment of said force may be expressly authorized by the Constitution or by act of Congress; and any person willfully violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction thereof shall be punished by fine not exceeding $10,000 or imprisonment not exceeding 2 years or by both such fine and imprisonment."

The debates on this measure found some Members supporting the view that Congress cannot interfere with the President's power as Commander in Chief to use the Army as he sees fit. Representative Gardner, of Virginia, argued that (7 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 3852 (1878)):

"Congress is empowered by the Constitution to 'raise and support armies,' but is nowhere authorized or empowered to command them. It may 'make rules for the government of the land and naval forces,' but it cannot direct when or where they may be used. 'It may declare war,' but the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, directs its management.

"And section 4 of article 4, which provides that 'the United States' shall protect the States from domestic violence or from invasion, etc., clothed the Executive with the power to use the Army to carry out this constitutional requirement. Nor can Congress render this right of protection due the States and this power of the Executive to enforce it nugatory by refusing to legislate that it may be done or by any legislation prohibiting it."

In the same view, Representative Lapham, of New York, declared that: "If I were the President of the United States, and such a law as this were placed before me, and I were called upon to exercise the military authority in order to preserve the Government, I would disregard such an act as an infraction of the Constitution." Id. at 3849. On the other hand Tucker, of Virginia, maintained "that the President would have no right to use the Army or Navy of the United States unless under authority of some act of Congress. That has been settled by statutory precedents ever since the act of 1795." Id. at 3851.

Since its passage the validity of this act has never been directly challenged. In 1890, Attorney General Miller reserved judgment as to its constitutionality but advised the President that he had authority to use troops in the case under consideration by virtue of another statute (19 Op. Atty. Gen. 570 (1890)). From time to time other Attorneys General have either advised that because of this section troops could not be used for law enforcement in stated circumstances (17 id. 71 (1881); 21 id. (1894)); or have found authority for their use in other laws (16 id. 162 (1878); 17 id. 242 (1881); 17 id. 333 (1882); 19 id.).

USE OF ARMED FORCES ABROAD

In 1912 the Senate defeated a proposed rider to the Army appropriation bill to prevent the use of the Army outside the United States, except in case of emergency when Congress was not in session. However, Elihu Root, who opposed the rider, acknowledged that "doubtless Congress could by law forbid the troops being sent out of the country" (48 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10929 (1912)).

A similar attempt to insert a provision in a naval appropriation bill to prevent the use of funds to maintain forces in Nicaragua was defeated in 1928. Senator Borah, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, opposed the rider on grounds of policy. In response to questions concerning the constitutional powers of the President, he had this to say (69 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 6754, 6759 (1928)):

"Prior to 1903, so far as I know, no President ever assumed to use our troops in foreign countries in aggressive action without the authority of Congress. I agree perfectly with those Senators who feel that the power of the President ought to be defined and restrained. I will support any proposition which will bring the President to the Congress of the United States for the purpose of getting authority to use the troops in foreign countries whenever we use troops for any kind of aggressive action.

* * * * *

"The President has the power, under the Constitution, to employ troops for the purpose of protecting lives and property of American citizens in a foreign country. We could not, in my judgment, take that power away from him, because it is granted by the Constitution.

* * * * *

"If the Congress does not see fit to create an army, the President has no army to command. If the Congress does not see fit to create a navy, the President has no navy to command, because there is no navy in existence. But once an army and a navy are in existence he is the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy. Whatever relates to command, whatever is incorporated in the idea of command, belongs to the President, and you cannot take it away from the President. It is given to him by the Constitution."

Congress did impose restrictions on the use of the Armed Forces abroad by the act of August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 858), which authorized the President to call National Guard, Reserve, and retired personnel into active service, and the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885). These measures prohibited the employment of certain personnel "beyond the limits of the Western Hemisphere excepting in the Territories and possessions of the United States, including the Philippine Islands."

One of the most significant aspects of the debates on this provision was the uncertainty expressed by several of its proponents as to whether it would be binding on the President. Senator Ashurst supported it on the ground that the President "would be inclined to respect an expression of this sort by the Congress, incorporating into the bill certainly the legislative wish and hope, the expression of our opinion, that drafted troops should not be sent to Europe to participate in the wars of Europe; but such an expression is not legally binding on the Executive" (86 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10896 (1940)). Senator WILEY agreed that (id. at 10896–10897):

"Under our form of government, the Executive is given constitutional powers with which the Legislature cannot interfere. We claim as a Legislature that we have constitutional powers with which the Executive cannot interfere. We have had example after example of the Executive power in the use of the Army.

* * * * *

"What if, in the opinion of the Commander in Chief, it should be thought advisable to shift some troops from Hawaii to China? This amendment would have no effect. Under his constitutional authority he could do so. So I say to the country that if we adopt this amendment it is simply an expression of opinion. It is simply saying that we do not want the Executive to do what he may legally do."

However, Senator Clark, of Missouri, defended the legal authority of Congress to impose the limitations. He had this to say (id. at 10899):

"Why is the provision any more a limitation or restriction upon the power of the President to command the Army as Commander in Chief, than a provision that a man may enlist for 3 years, or that he may be inducted for 1 year? Congress has the right to impose any limitation it may see fit to insert upon the character of service or the tenure of service, or anything else, as to the Army which they are furnishing the President. I cannot see any legal ground whatever, although I have very high respect for the legal opinions or the opinions of any sort of the Senator from Arizona, for the contention that it is a violation of the President's constitutional functions as Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy to insert a limitation upon the character of service of men when Congress is raising an army, any more so than when raising any army it says that the men shall be enlisted for 3 years, or, as we say in this very bill, that they shall be inducted into the service for 1 year. It is a limitation of precisely the same sort when we say that the men who are inducted into the service shall serve only in the United States, or in this hemisphere, or in any other place which the Congress sees fit to prescribe."

In the Universal Military Training and Service Act (65 Stat. 78, 50 U. S. C. App. 454 (a)), Congress prohibited the sending of inductees outside the United States, to Territories and possessions, until they had had at least 4 months' training. To reinforce this limitation, it barred the use of appropriated funds to transport or maintain personnel in violation of it.

At other times, instead of positively forbidding the use of armed forces for particular purposes, Congress has simply stated that the enactment of specific laws shall not be deemed to authorize such use. Provisions

of this nature were inserted in the Lend-Lease Act (55 Stat. 32, 22 U. S. C. 412 (d)), and the United Nations Participation Act (59 Stat. 621, 22 U. S. C. 287d). They neither add to nor subtract from the powers of the President. They may, however, be a reflection of the division of opinion in Congress concerning the scope of its own power.

After a prolonged debate in 1951 on a resolution to approve the furnishing of United States forces under the North Atlantic Treaty, the Senate adopted an amendment which expressed "the sense of Congress that, in the interest of sound constitutional processes, and of national unity, congressional approval should be obtained of any policy requiring the assignment of American troops abroad when such assignment is in implementation of article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 97, pt. 3, p. 3294). In offering this amendment, Senator MCCLELLAN insisted that (id. at 2974):

"The power of Congress to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces includes, in my opinion, the power of the Congress to determine what disposition and assignment shall be made of the land and naval forces of the United States in the implementation of a treaty that provides for an international army. If there were not these restrictions and provisions in the Constitution of the United States, the Commander in Chief, with unlimited power of control, could any day, at his will and by his command, set himself up as the military dictator of this Nation. The Founding Fathers who wrote the Constitution never intended that the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces should be, or should be placed in a position to become, a military ruler and dictator of a free people."

Like opinions were voiced by other Members. Senator Taft, for example, urged his colleagues to "declare clearly our conviction that the Congress has the constitutional power to restrain action on the part of the President" (id. at 3273). Opponents of the amendment defended in general terms the right of the President to use troops without consulting Congress. A few denied the authority of Congress to legislate on the subject. Senator McMahon argued that "We cannot by legislation attempt to direct the movements of the Armed Forces" (id. at 3044). Senator HUMPHREY termed the amendment "an intrusion" on the legal responsibility of the President as Commander in Chief (id. at 3098). But in spite of these objections, the McClellan amendment was approved by a vote of 49 to 43 (id. at 3096).

BELLIGERENT RIGHTS

When a bill for confiscation of rebel property was pending, in 1862, some lawmakers opposed it as an invasion of the powers of the Commander in Chief. Senator Browning, of Illinois, took the position (Congressional Globe, 37th Cong., 2d sess., 2919 (1862)) that:

"It is not true that Congress may assume and exercise all the active war powers in the actual prosecution of war. The Constitution invests it with no such prerogative. * * * I deny that the right exists, in any case, to pass in judgment upon what is properly called a military necessity. It may become a military necessity when an Army, with its munitions and supplies, has been transported across a stream, to destroy the bridge that bore them safely over, and leave only the deep and rapid river in the rear. It may be a military necessity to preserve the bridge, that the means of safe retreat may be at hand if adverse fortune should require it.

* * * * *

"When the Constitution made the President 'Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States,' it clothed him with all the incidental powers necessary to a full, faithful, and efficient performance of the duties of that high office; and to decide what are military necessities, and to devise and execute the requisite measures to meet them, is one of these incidents. It is not a legislative but an Executive function, and Congress has nothing to do with it. Congress can raise and support but cannot command armies. That duty the Constitution has devolved upon the President. It has made him Commander in Chief, and therefore Congress cannot be. Nor can Congress control him in the command of the Army, for, if it can, then he is not Commander in Chief, and the assertion of the Constitution to that effect is a falsehood. And whenever Congress assumes the control of the Army in the field it usurps the powers of a coordinate department of the Government, destroys the checks and balances provided for the safety of the people, and subverts the Constitution."

To which Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, responded (id. at 2964):

"The President, it is said, as Commander in Chief, may seize, confiscate, and liberate under the rights of war; but Congress cannot direct these things to be done. Pray, sir, where is the limitation upon Congress? Read the text of the Constitution, and you will find its powers vast as all the requirements of war. There is nothing which may be done anywhere under the rights of war, which may not be done by Congress. I do not mean to question the powers of the President in his sphere, or of any military commander within his department. But I claim for Congress all that belongs to any Government in the exercise of the rights of war. And when I speak of Congress, let it be understood that I mean an act of Congress, passed according to the requirements of the Constitution by both Houses and approved by the President. It seems strange to claim for the President alone, in the exercise of his single will, war powers which are denied to the President in association with Congress. Surely, if he can wield these powers alone, he can wield them in association with Congress; nor will their efficacy be impaired when it is known that they proceed from this associate will, rather than from his single will alone. The Government of the United States appears most completely in an act of Congress. Therefore war is declared, armies are raised, rules concerning captures are made, and all articles of war regulating the conduct of war are established by act of Congress. It is by act of Congress that the war powers are all put in motion. When once in motion the President must execute them. But he is only the instrument of Congress, under the Constitution of the United States.

"It is true the President is Commander in Chief; but it is for Congress to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution his powers; so that, according to the very words of the Constitution, his powers depend upon Congress, which may limit or enlarge them at its own pleasure. Thus, whether you regard Congress or regard the President, you will find that Congress is the arbiter and regulator of the war powers."

Apparently the constitutional objections to this measure were not widely entertained. After a compromise version of the bill was enacted (12 Stat. 589 (1862)), a number of cases arising under it were carried to the Supreme Court, but its validity was never tested. See, e. g., Mrs. Alexander's Cotton ((1864) 2 Wall. 404).

RECONSTRUCTION IN SECEDED STATES

One of the most important instances in which Congress successfully asserted its authority in opposition to the President was in the reconstruction of governments in the Southern States after the Civil War. Before the war ended, Lincoln, invoking his powers as Commander in Chief, took the first steps toward restoring loyal governments in these States. By a proclamation issued December 8, 1863, he granted amnesty to all citizens, with certain exceptions, who would take an oath to support the Constitution, as well as all acts of Congress and proclamations of the President relating to slaves, and declared that whenever 10 percent of the voters should take that oath and reestablish a State government, republican in form and consistent with that oath, the government would be recognized as the true government of the State and would receive the protection guaranteed to the States (13 Stat. 737).

Congress did not acquiesce in this plan. It passed a bill providing that the President should appoint a provisional governor to exercise the powers of civil government in each of the rebellious States, until a State government should be recognized with the assent of Congress, and specifying the steps to be taken in order to obtain such recognition. This measure was presented to Lincoln shortly before the end of the session, and he killed it by a pocket veto. Thereupon, he issued another proclamation stating that while he was "unprepared by a formal approval of this bill, to be inflexibly committed to any single plan of restoration; and * * * also unprepared to declare that the free State constitutions and governments already adopted and installed in Arkansas and Louisiana * * * (should) be set aside and held for nought, * * * or to declare a constitutional competency in Congress to abolish slavery in States," he was "fully satisfied with the system for restoration contained in the bill as one very proper plan for the loyal people of any State choosing to adopt it" (13 Stat. 744).

After Lincoln's death, Johnson issued a series of proclamations appointing provisional governors for eight of the seceded States and prescribing the procedure for setting up new governments in those States (13 Stat. 760, 761, 764, 765, 767, 769, 771).

When Congress convened in December 1865, it appointed a Joint Committee on Reconstruction which brought in a report challenging the position of the President. The majority expressed the opinion (id. at VIII, XX) that:

"As Commander in Chief of a victorious army, it was his duty, under the law of nations and the Army regulations, to restore order, to preserve property, and to protect the people against violence from any quarter until provision should be made by law for their Government. He might, as President, assemble Congress and submit the whole matter to the law-making power; or he might continue military supervision and control until Congress should assemble on its regular appointed day. Selecting the latter alternative, he proceeded, by virtue of his power as Commander in Chief, to appoint provisional governors over the revolted States. These were regularly commissioned, and their compensation was paid, as the Secretary of War states, "from the appropriation for Army exigencies, because the duties performed by the parties were regarded as of a temporary character, ancillary to the withdrawal of military force, the disbandment of armies, and the reduction of military expenditure, by provisional organizations for the protection of civil rights, the preservation of peace, and to take the place of armed force in the respective States." It cannot, we think, be contended that these governors possessed, or could exercise, any but military authority. They had no power to organize civil governments, nor to exercise any authority except that which inhered in their own persons under their commissions. Neither had the President, as Commander in Chief, any other than military power. But he was in exclusive possession of the military authority. It was for him to decide how far he would exercise it, how far he would relax it, when and on what terms he would withdraw it. He might properly permit the people to assemble, and to initiate local governments, and to execute such local laws as they might choose to frame not inconsistent with, nor

in opposition to, the laws of the United States. * * * But it was not for him to decide upon the nature or effect of any system of government which the people of these States might see fit to adopt. This power is lodged by the Constitution in the Congress of the United States, that branch of the Government in which is vested the authority to fix the political relations of the States to the Union, whose duty it is to guarantee to each State a republican form of government, and to protect each and all of them against foreign or domestic violence, and against each other. We cannot, therefore, regard the various acts of the President in relation to the formation of local governments in the insurrectionary States, and the conditions imposed by him upon their action, in any other light than as intimations to the people that, as Commander in Chief of the Army, he would consent to withdraw military rule just in proportion as they should, by their acts, manifest a disposition to preserve order among themselves, establish governments denoting loyalty to the Union, and exhibit a settled determination to return to their allegiance, leaving with the law-making power to fix the terms of their final restoration to all their rights and privileges as States of the Union.

* * * * *

"These rebellious enemies were conquered by the people of the United States, acting through all the coordinate branches of the Government, and not by the executive department alone. The authority to restore rebels to political power in the Federal Government can be exercised only with the concurrence of all the departments in which political power is vested; and hence the several proclamations of the President to the people of the Confederate States cannot be considered as extending beyond the purposes declared, and can only be regarded as provisional permission by the Commander in Chief of the Army to do certain acts, the effect and validity whereof is to be determined by the constitutional government, and not solely by the executive power."

The minority report did not deal with the legality of the measures adopted by the President (id. at pt. 2, p. 12).

At the next session, Congress passed over the President's veto "An act to provide for the more efficient government of the rebel States" (14 Stat. 428). It provided that these States should be divided into five military districts, each under the command of an officer of general rank. It also prescribed the steps to be taken by the people of each State to obtain readmission to the Union. One requirement for readmission was the ratification of the 14th amendment. As the several States complied with these conditions, Congress passed laws readmitting them to representation in Congress (15 Stat. 72, 73 (1868); 16 Stat. 62, 80 (1870)).

The right of Congress to assume responsibility for reconstruction was upheld by the Supreme Court in *Texas* v. *White* ((1868) 7 Wall. 700, 729). That was a bill by Texas to enjoin payment of United States bonds owned by the State which had been negotiated by the rebel government. In sustaining the right of the provisional government to bring the suit, the Supreme Court made the following comment on the respective roles of Congress and the President in setting up lawful governments in these States:

"Whether the action then taken was, in all respects, warranted by the Constitution, it is not now necessary to determine. The power exercised by the President was supposed, doubtless, to be derived from his constitutional functions, as Commander in Chief; and, so long as the war continued, it cannot be denied that he might institute temporary government within insurgent districts, occupied by the national forces, or take measures, in any State, for the restoration of State government faithful to the Union, employing, however, in such efforts, only such means and agents as were authorized by constitutional laws.

"But, the power to carry into effect the clause of guaranty is primarily a legislative power, and resides in Congress. 'Under the fourth article of the Constitution, it rests with Congress to decide what government is the established one in the State, before it can determine whether it is republican or not.'

"This is the language of the late Chief Justice, speaking for the Court, in a case from Rhode Island (*Luther* v. *Borden*, 7 Howard, 42), arising from the organization of opposing governments in that State. And, we think that the principle sanctioned by it may be applied, with even more propriety, to the case of a State deprived of all rightful government, by revolutionary violence; though necessarily limited to cases where the rightful government is thus subverted, or in imminent danger of being overthrown by an opposing government, set up by force within the State.

"The action of the President must, therefore, be considered as provisional, and, in that light, it seems to have been regarded by Congress."

CIVILIAN CONTROLS IN TIME OF WAR OR EMERGENCY

In his famous message of September 7, 1942, President Roosevelt laid claim to a power as Commander in Chief to disregard an explicit provision of the Emergency Price Control Act. He coupled a demand for the repeal of this section with the warning that (88 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 7053–7054 (1942)):

"I ask the Congress to take this action by the 1st of October. Inaction on your part by that date will leave me with an inescapable responsibility to the people of this country to see to it that the war effort is no longer imperiled by threat of economic chaos.

"In the event that the Congress should fail to act, and act adequately, I shall accept the responsibility, and I will act.

"At the same time that farm prices are stabilized, wages can and will be stabilized, also. This I will do.

"The President has the powers, under the Constitution and under congressional acts, to take measures necessary to avert a disaster which would interfere with the winning of the war.

"I have given the most thoughtful consideration to meeting this issue without further reference to the Congress. I have determined, however, on this vital matter to consult with the Congress.

* * * * *

"I cannot tell what powers may have to be exercised in order to win this war.

"The American people can be sure that I will use my powers with a full sense of my responsibility to the Constitution and to my country. The American people can also be sure that I shall not hesitate to use every power vested in me to accomplish the defeat of our enemies in any part of the world where our own safety demands such defeat.

"When the war is won, the powers under which I act automatically revert to the people—to whom they belong."

Taking sharp exception to this claim of power, Congress refused to pass the legislation sought by the President. Senator La-Follette repudiated "without equivocation the extraordinary doctrine enunciated in the message of the Chief Executive. * * * He does not have legislative power under the Constitution of the United States or under any statute which this Congress has passed" (id. at 7586). In the House of Representatives, Whittington, of Mississippi, declared that "It is for Congress to pass laws; it is for the President to enforce laws; if in war, when vast powers are essential in the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, any statute should be suspended, it is for Congress to provide for such suspensions. The exercise or usurpation of the authority to suspend by the President smacks of dictatorship and is contrary to the democratic concept; moreover, it is wholly unnecessary in the prosecution of the war" (id. at 7343). These were typical of the views expressed by many Members. However, some Members supported the position taken by the President. In spite of the explicit prohibition of the Emergency Price Control Act, a few argued that he had the necessary authority under other acts. Senator Barkley came close to endorsing the President's claim on constitutional grounds when he said that "The people of the United States have never yet denied their President, the Commander in Chief of their Army and Navy, support in the exercise of whatever powers he may have in the conduct of a war, and I recall no case in which the Supreme Court has not sustained such powers" (id. at 7558). Representative MCCORMACK suggested on the floor of the House that if the bill were passed with an amendment opposed by the President, "The bill will be vetoed and the President, as Commander in Chief, will act, as he should, by Executive order" (id. at 7383).

At first both Houses approved amendments strongly opposed by the administration. These were modified to some extent before the bill was finally passed, but the measure sent to the President fell far short of what he had asked. Nevertheless he signed the bill (56 Stat. 765).

That the President as Commander in Chief cannot seize the property of private citizens in time of emergency, contrary to an act of Congress, is the teaching of the early case of *Little* v. *Barreme* ((1804) 2 Cr. 170) and the recent decision in *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co.* v. *Sawyer* ((1952) 343 U. S. 579). The former involved the validity of the seizure of the *Flying Fish*, a vessel bound from a French port. Congress had authorized seizure, in stated circumstances, of vessels bound to a French port. The President had gone beyond this and issued instructions for a seizure of vessels bound either to or from a French port. The Supreme Court held that these instructions were unauthorized and did not "legalize an act which, without those instructions would have been a plain trespass." Chief Justice Marshall wrote:

"It is by no means clear that the President of the United States, whose high duty it is to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and who is Commander in Chief of the armies and navies of the United States, might not, without any special authority for that purpose, in the then existing state of things, have empowered the officers commanding the armed vessels of the United States, to seize and send into port for adjudication, American vessels which were forfeited by being engaged in this illicit commerce. But when it is observed that the general clause of the first section of the act, which declares that such vessels may be seized, and may be prosecuted in any district or circuit court, which shall be holden within or for the district where the seizure shall be made, obviously contemplates a seizure within the United States; and that the fifth section gives a special authority to seize on the high seas, and limits that authority to the seizure of vessels bound, or sailing to, a French port, the legislature seems to have prescribed that the manner in which this law shall be carried into execution was to exclude a seizure of any vessel not bound to a French port."

In the steel seizure case, the Court denied the authority of the President to seize private property in time of emergency to prevent interruption of the production of supplies for the Armed Forces. The opinion of the Court written by Mr. Justice Black seemed to say that the President has no

power of seizure without affirmative authority from Congress. That also appeared to be the view of Mr. Justice Douglas. Justices Frankfurter, Jackson, Clark, and Burton put great emphasis upon the refusal of Congress to insert a seizure provision in the Taft-Hartley Act. Mr. Justice Jackson examined at length the claim of justification under the Commander in Chief clause. He said:

"The clause on which the Government next relies is that 'The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States * * *.' These cryptic words have given rise to some of the most persistent controversies in our constitutional history. Of course, they imply something more than an empty title. But just what authority goes with the name has plagued Presidential advisers who would not waive or narrow it by nonassertion yet cannot say where it begins or ends. It undoubtedly puts the Nation's Armed Forces under Presidential command. Hence, this loose appellation is sometimes advanced as support for any Presidential action, internal or external, involving use of force, the idea being that it vests power to do anything, anywhere, that can be done with an army or navy.

* * * * *

"The Constitution expressly places in Congress power 'to raise and [support] armies' and 'to [provide] and [maintain] a Navy.' (Words in brackets supplied.) This certainly lays upon Congress primary responsibility for supplying the Armed Forces. Congress alone controls the raising of revenues and their appropriation and may determine in what manner and by what means they shall be spent for military and naval procurement. I suppose no one would doubt that Congress can take over war supply as a Government enterprise. On the other hand, if Congress sees fit to rely on free private enterprise collectively bargaining with free labor for support and maintenance of our Armed Forces, can the Executive, because of lawful disagreements incidental to that process, seize the facility for operation upon Government-imposed terms?

"There are indications that the Constitution did not contemplate that the title Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy will constitute him also Commander in Chief of the country, its industries, and its inhabitants. He has no monopoly of war powers, whatever they are. While Congress cannot deprive the President of the command of the Army and Navy, only Congress can provide him an Army or Navy to command. It is also empowered to make rules for the 'Government and regulation of land and naval forces,' by which it may to some unknown extent impinge upon even command functions.

"That military powers of the Commander in Chief were not to supersede representative government of internal affairs seems obvious from the Constitution and from elementary American history. Time out of mind, and even now in many parts of the world, a military commander can seize private housing to shelter his troops. Not so, however, in the United States, for the third amendment says, 'No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.' Thus, even in wartime, his seizure of needed military housing must be authorized by Congress. It also was expressly left to Congress to 'provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions.' Such a limitation on the command power, written at a time when the militia rather than a standing army was contemplated as the military weapon of the Republic, underscores the Constitution's policy that Congress, not the Executive, should control utilization of the war power as an instrument of domestic policy. Congress, fulfilling that function, has authorized the President to use the Army to enforce certain civil rights. On the other hand, Congress has forbidden him to use the Army for the purpose of executing general laws except when expressly authorized by the Constitution or by act of Congress.

"While broad claims under this rubric often have been made, advice to the President in specific matters usually has carried overtones that powers, even under this head, are measured by the command functions usual to the topmost officer of the Army and Navy. Even then, heed has been taken of any efforts of Congress to negative his authority.

* * * * *

"His command power is not such an absolute as might be implied from that office in a militaristic system but is subject to limitations consistent with a constitutional Republic whose law and policymaking branch is a representative Congress. The purpose of lodging dual titles in one man was to insure that the civilian would control the military, not to enable the military to subordinate the Presidential Office."

Thus all of the Justices who constituted the majority asserted the supremacy of Congress. The point of difference among them was whether the President had any power of seizure if Congress had not disapproved that course.

These two cases, in combination with *Texas* v. *White*, supra, lend strong support to the view that any powers the President may have as Commander in Chief over civilians in the United States is subordinate to the legislative powers of Congress under various clauses of article I, section 8. From the very beginning, Congress has asserted the right to determine the circumstances under which the Armed Forces may be used at home and abroad. In a few instances it has also undertaken to prescribe the methods by which the power of command shall be exercised. However, the boundary between its authority and that of the President over the Armed Forces has never been authoritatively charted.

EMPLOYEE SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this Congress has been vitally concerned with the employee security program being conducted by the Government.

Early in 1955 the Senate approved the establishment of a Special Subcommittee to Investigate the Employee Security Program being administered by the Government.

This subcommittee, of which I am chairman, has been probing into the various operations of the security program and pertinent relative matters for over a year. The report of this committee is in the final stages of assembly.

Some Members of the Senate have been concerned with the possibility that our employee security program has been inadequate.

Other Members have felt that the program has been conducted too harshly, with concentration of security efforts on the wrong types of employees. Still other Members believe the program needs strengthening on one end and relaxing on the other.

Certainly a great majority of the Senate has not been satisfied with the conduct of the security program, otherwise the investigation would not have been authorized.

More recently a flurry of editorial comment and statements from Members of Congress have arisen as a result of the Cole case decision, with which I know all Senators are familiar.

As a result of these comments and other factors, public cognizance of the security program has reached a new tempo. Some members have introduced or talked about introducing legislation to deal with phases of the security problem and perhaps the entire security matter.

Mr. President, why I speak to you here today on this subject is of great importance to the Senate. As I said before, the report of my subcommittee's conclusions and recommendations resulting from its study and investigation of the Government's employee security program is nearly completed and will be ready for delivery to the Members of the Senate in the immediate future.

The findings of my subcommittee are very extensive and deal with most of the security problems which are now receiving the attention of Members of Congress.

I believe this report will be most helpful to all of us to aid in guiding our actions toward the accomplishment which we all want—a nonpartisan effective security program which will keep subversives and disloyal employees out of Government and at the same time will protect our loyal employees.

I therefore suggest and recommend that the Senate withhold action on any security legislation until the Members shall have had the opportunity to receive the benefit of information contained in my subcommittee's report.

No Member of the Senate is more interested than I am in the enactment of a strong and fair security program. But I believe we would err to take any legislative steps until we have first studied the report which will be in the hands of Senators in the immediate future.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to say that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina held some very extensive hearings and, as a member of that subcommittee, I appreciate the fine way in which he conducted them.

I think I gathered from the Senator's statement that the subcommittee report will soon be ready for printing. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Would it be possible for the minority Member to see and analyze the report before it is ready for distribution to the full committee for approval?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should think so.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like very much to have time to analyze it. I participated in the hearings and know it is voluminous. I concur in the suggestion of the Senator that no action should be taken until the committee report is approved by the full committee and available for distribution. I think it will contain some valuable suggestions. Since we are dealing with the protection and security of our Nation, careful analysis is demanded by all.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I shall take it up immediately.

Mr. President, I should like to commend the Senator from Kansas for the work he did on the subcommittee. I was glad to hear him make the remarks he has made. The hearings were handled from a nonpartisan standpoint, for the good of the United States and for the good of the employees of the Government. We were endeavoring to do nothing that would injure the security of the Nation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2259, H. R. 9852, to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9852) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself, I submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement which I ask to have read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed agreement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, during the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9852) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, and as hereinafter indicated, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided, however*, That it shall be in order for the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. BUSH, to make a motion to lay on the table the committee amendment inserting section 4 on pages 3 and 4, upon which there shall be a limitation of not exceeding 2 hours' debate, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. BUSH and the majority leader, respectively: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I may say, in brief explanation of the proposed agreement, that it is immaterial to the minority leader or the majority leader to have a unanimous-consent agreement, but it is my understanding that those who are directly interested in House bill 9852 have met and talked about such an agreement. The proposed agreement is similar to other agreements the Senate has entered into. It is my information that it is acceptable to both opponents and proponents of certain amendments to be offered, and to those in charge of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PAYMENT FOR IMPROVEMENTS ON LANDS IN RAPID VALLEY UNIT, SOUTH DAKOTA—MOTION TO RECONSIDER—REQUEST FOR RETURN OF SENATE BILL 1622

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to enter a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate on yesterday agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1622) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be entered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, is that a unanimous consent request?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think that is a privileged matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a privileged matter.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUSH. Has the Senate not just entered into a unanimous consent agreement that requires us to proceed with the consideration of the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is a privileged matter, the Chair is advised.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I make the further motion that the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return the message of the Senate announcing its agreement to the amendments of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the House will be requested to return the bill, and the motion to reconsider will be entered.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9852) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2——

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. I should like to ask the Chair what the parliamentary situation is with respect to the desire on the part of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] to move to table one of the committee amendments. Is it in order for the Senator from Connecticut to proceed in that fashion at any time he desires to make such a motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the logical time to make that motion to lay on the table is when the committee amendment, which is section 4, is reached.

Mr. BUSH. I now serve notice that when section 4 becomes the pending question, I shall then move to table; and under the unanimous-consent agreement, I understand an hour is allowed to each side on that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Banking and Currency Committee held hearings on S. 3407, a bill to provide a 2-year extension for the Defense Production Act. This bill met with general approval by the committee, subject to a few amendments. The House passed H. R. 9852, a bill also providing a 2-year extension, also with amendments, and this bill was referred to the committee.

The Banking and Currency Committee has reported out H. R. 9852, and recommends favorable action on this bill.

As reported, H. R. 9852 provides for a 2-year extension of the act, to June 30, 1958, along with a 2-year extension of the title III contracting authority, to June 30, 1965. The bill also contains, first, a declaration of policy supporting the principle of geographical dispersal; second, a requirement that the Secretary of Commerce make a special investigation and study of nickel; third, an amendment emphasizing the President's authority and duty to take action for the benefit of civilian users of any commodity in seriously short supply as a result

of military requirements; and fourth, a technical amendment designed to simplify payment of the expenses of the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

The bill, as reported, does not include the provision adopted by the House requiring members of the executive reserve to file statements of their financial interests at the time of their appointment.

The committee's review of the defense program and the defense supporting industrial program left no doubt that continuance of the powers in the Defense Production Act are necessary. I shall, therefore, not attempt to elaborate on this aspect of the matter.

The committee report lists the powers now contained in the Defense Production Act, principally the priority and allocation authority in title I, and the financial authority conferred in title III for the purpose of expanding productive capacity and supply. Although these powers are not now being used extensively, they are essential at the moment to maintain the present state of mobilization readiness; and, in addition, the existence of these authorities places the Government in a position to take the initial steps in the event of an emergency.

The bill does not contain any authority for controls over prices, wages, rents, or credit. These standby powers were not recommended or proposed by the administration witnesses. It is recognized that such controls would be needed in the event of full mobilization or war, but there was no indication of any present need for such authority.

The two principal amendments proposed by the committee related to dispersal and allocations in the civilian market.

The dispersal amendment would express congressional approval of, and support for, the existing agency policy of encouraging geographical dispersal of new Government-assisted industrial facilities, first, when practical; second, when consistent with existing law, and third, when consistent with the desirability of maintaining a sound economy. The amendment does not prevent or restrict the use of existing plants; it does not apply to plants which do not get assistance of some sort from the Government; and it does not make the policy of geographical dispersal the only, or in some cases even the principal, element to be considered in locating a new Government-assisted plant.

A sound economy must be maintained. All the factors which properly go into the location of any industrial plant must be considered—access to raw materials, transportation, power, water, labor, markets, and so on. The amendment would not eliminate consideration of these other factors.

All the Government agencies concerned endorse and support the principle of geographical dispersal. All, except the Air Force, support an amendment expressing congressional approval and support of the policy. And even the Air Force, in opposing the amendment on the ground that it might be confusing, supports the principle of geographical dispersal, and states that the amendment is entirely consistent in its intent with existing Department of Defense policy.

If we consider the possibilities which lie before us, we can see why the Congress should, and must, accept responsibility for the dispersal program.

Our defense plans must take into account the possibility of an attack by an aggressor, an attack which may include a Pearl Harbor or a number of Pearl Harbors. If this occurs, we must be prepared to retaliate immediately, using weapons in being at the time of such an attack. Equally important, we must be prepared to wage a continuing all-out war, which may not be of short duration. This second stage will require a strong, productive industry, capable of producing the needed weapons of war and capable of supplying everything needed to maintain the military and civilian population.

The Nation's ability to carry on this second stage depends to a large extent on how much of its productive capacity has been wiped out in the first attack. This is where geographical dispersal of industrial facilities is vital.

The principle of geographical dispersal does not depend on the argument that one spot in the United States is safer than another spot. Perhaps an argument can be made for this in some cases, although usually such an argument is not conclusive. The principle of geographical dispersal is much simpler and much clearer than any argument over the merits of one location as compared with the merits of another location.

The principle of geographical dispersal is merely another way of saying, "Don't put all your eggs in one basket."

If all the Nation's supply of a vital material or a vital piece of equipment comes from 1 plant or from plants in 1 small area, we might be deprived of our supply of that material or equipment by 1 bomb. But if we obtain the material or equipment from 5 or 10 widely separated sources, we are much better prepared to carry on the second stage of defense.

We should also bear in mind—and I think this is extremely important—that if we should achieve a sound degree of dispersal of our industry, it would reduce the danger of an attack. If the target is less attractive, if a single bomb or a few bombs could not accomplish so much damage to the defense effort, the temptation to attack the country would be reduced. Incidentally, this would reduce the danger to the areas which now, because of the concentration of industries, are the most attractive targets. This thought should be borne in mind by those who might wish to oppose the amendment.

I particularly invite this point to the attention of the distinguished Senators from the New England States, because, as our defense productivity is now set up, it makes New England an especially attractive target in case there should be trouble.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Arkansas consider that this amendment, requiring dispersal among regions, would preclude dispersal of industry within a region, such as New England?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The amendment does not require anything of so rigid a nature. It requires consideration of the element of the risk of destruction of our vital production and supplies. I may say that I used the term "New England" rather broadly. I doubt that in the great State of Vermont there is such a concentration as would necessarily be involved. But I do know of areas around the great cities of Boston and Hartford which I think create a very tempting target in case of difficulty.

Mr. AIKEN. In the committee amendment is there anything to preclude the establishment of new industries in, let us say, the States of northern New England—Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont—without having them considered as being in a strategic target area?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think so. As I have previously said, the amendment seeks to draw attention, particularly the attention of the Defense Department, to this question, and to give congressional approval to a policy which already is being followed to some extent. That policy would be to give serious consideration, in connection with the construction of new plants, to the vulnerability to attack of certain industries having significance in our national defense. I do not think the amendment necessarily precludes the building of new plants in any area, depending upon a number of factors which I have just mentioned, namely, raw materials, transportation, and all the other elements.

Mr. AIKEN. And perhaps the policy would encourage the location of a plant among the hills, where it might have much more protection than if located at a greater distance from a strategic center, but located in open prairie land?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Most certainly that could be considered.

Mr. AIKEN. And would the location as it relates to the direction of the prevailing winds have a bearing on the dispersal program?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly. The question of fallout is a very material one; and the recent developments regarding the seriousness of fallout constitute one of the major reasons for the further and, I think, favorable consideration by the Congress of this amendment. Fallout is now a much more serious problem, we know, than it was 5 years ago.

Mr. AIKEN. Bearing in mind the protection afforded by the hills and the northern winds in New England, would not the Senator from Arkansas say they constitute one of the factors which might well be favorably considered in connection with the establishment of defense plants?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would not say the contrary at all. In referring to New England, of course, let me say that all of us know about the great concentration of defense plants, particularly in communities near the coasts of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts. Of course, I can understand the concern of the people of those communi-

ties about any change in the status quo. Nevertheless, this is an extremely important matter affecting our national security.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Mr. President, this might be a proper place for me to insert in the RECORD a letter which came too late to be inserted in the hearings. The letter is from Mr. Val Peterson, Administrator of the Civil Defense Administration, and is dated May 16. I call especial attention to the next to the last paragraph of the letter; and I now read a part of it:

We therefore urge that the committee favorably consider the proposed amendment by Senator BENNETT to S. 3407, and we recommend that the Congress enact the measure into law.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
Battle Creek, Mich., May 16, 1956.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to the request of Mr. Matthew Hale, of the committee staff, for a report from the Federal Civil Defense Administration on the merits of S. 3407, a bill "to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes," and the amendment to the bill intended to be proposed by Senator BENNETT, dated April 23, 1956.

S. 3407 would further amend section 717 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the provisions of the act until June 30, 1958. Section 2 would amend section 303 to extend the provisions thereof, which relate to the purchase, or commitments to purchase, of critical or strategic metals, minerals, or other materials, until June 30, 1965.

As S. 3407 relates to the extension of the expiration dates of sections 303 and 717 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, the Federal Civil Defense Administration would interpose no objection to the proposed extensions.

The amendment to S. 3407, proposed by Senator BENNETT, would further amend the declaration of policy contained in section 2 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, to state that it is the policy of the Congress to promote the geographical dispersal of the industrial facilities of the United States, and to discourage concentration of productive facilities within limited geographical areas vulnerable to attack. Further, the amendment also provides that in the construction of Government-owned industrial facilities, and the extension of governmental financial assistance for the construction, expansion, or improvement of industrial facilities, or in the procurement of goods or services under the Defense Production Act or any other act, each department or agency of the executive branch shall apply, to the greatest practicable extent, consistent with existing law, the principle of geographical dispersion of such facilities in the interest of national defense. The Office of Defense Mobilization would be charged with the coordination of the proposed program. Nothing in the program would preclude the use of existing industrial facilities.

The Federal Civil Defense Administration, under Defense Mobilization Order I–18, issued January 11, 1956, is charged with the responsibility for the development and coordination of plans and programs for the reduction of urban vulnerability, including coordination at the metropolitan target-zone level of dispersion, urban redevelopment, highway, and other programs and measures capable of making a contribution to the reduction of urban vulnerability.

Accordingly, the Federal Civil Defense Administration holds the view that statutory amendments designed to encourage the reduction of vulnerability of metropolitan target zones from enemy attack through industrial dispersal of the nature contained in the proposed amendment to S. 3407 are in the national interest. We, therefore, urge that the committee favorably consider the proposed amendment by Senator BENNETT to S. 3407, and we recommend that the Congress enact the measure into law.

In view of the urgent nature of the committee request for a report by this Administration on the measure, the usual Bureau of the Budget clearance has not been obtained. Should revision of the report be necessary upon receipt of the Bureau's comments, the revised report will be forwarded promptly to the committee.

Sincerely,

VAL PETERSON.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I believe I heard the Senator from Arkansas say that there were some who objected to any change in the status quo. May I ask the Senator if any change in the current Office of Defense Mobilization order on dispersal is contemplated by the so-called Bennett amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I understand, the effect of the amendment would be to carry out the policy and to give it added emphasis. As I stated in the earlier part of my remarks, the Defense Department, even including the Air Force, is to some degree, at least, carrying out this policy. I certainly believe it is entirely proper for the Congress to state its own views as to this policy. This question has been before Congress several times. I think it is proper for us to emphasize the importance of this policy if we are interested in our own national security. As I understand, the present attitude of the Office of Defense Mobilization is favorable to dispersal.

Mr. KUCHEL. I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that, as I understand, the present order of the Office of Defense Mobilization with respect to dispersal has been in effect since the first of the year. No one has quarreled with it. I believe it is being enforced by all branches of the Defense Department, and I further believe that the Department of the Air Force, in objecting to the language in the bill known as the so-called Bennett amendment, speaks not alone for the Air Force, but for all branches of the Defense Department.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator is incorrect. The Nelson report on this subject stated that the policy of dispersal was not being pursued with the proper enthusiasm.

Mr. KUCHEL. Can the Senator indicate where it is not being pursued with the proper enthusiasm?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will wait, in a few moments I shall quote from the Nelson report. I shall reach it after about two more pages.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Apropos of a question raised earlier by the Senator from Vermont, I think one additional factor is that this provision would give a congressional blank check to possible future executive action, with respect to which I think there is some grave doubt, as a matter of public policy. I think it is doubtful if the Congress should grant such authority.

There were examples in my own State of California of which I think the Senate should be advised, and which I think are pertinent to the discussion on the floor today.

Some time ago, and prior to the latest order by the Office of Defense Mobilization, there had been a very definite move to prevent a subcontractor from going into the city of San Diego, Calif., from the city of Fresno, in connection with an aircraft industry located in Los Angeles. It so happens that the distance from Fresno to San Diego is 315 miles. This is greater than the distance from Washington to Cleveland, which is 306 miles; it is greater than the distance from Dallas to Tulsa, which is 236 miles; the distance from New York to Washington, which is 205 miles, passing through a number of States enroute; the distance from Washington to Pittsburgh, which is 192 miles; the distance from Cleveland to Detroit, which is 90 miles; and the distance from New York to Philadelphia, which is 83 miles. I think it becomes pertinent as to what type of decision might be made on a pure mileage basis, considering the distance from an existing industrial complex.

Certainly before Congress gives a blank-check endorsement to the amendment which has been proposed to the Senate, I think this question should be thoroughly explored and debated; and I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is not the first time the subject has beeen explored by the Senate. This is the third time it has been under consideration, and it has been thoroughly discussed.

I cannot take the responsibility, nor can the Congress, for what may or may not be the arbitrary or erroneous decision of the Director of Defense Mobilization with regard to Fresno. We are stating a policy, which I think is perfectly reasonable and clear. We cannot in any case guarantee that someone in the executive department who administers the law will not be arbitrary and make a foolish decision under the policy, if the policy itself is sound and proper. I think the Senator himself might take a little responsibility for decisions in the executive department. The fact that a certain decision was made in the case mentioned, for which the Senator thinks there is no reason, does not mean that the principle is bad. It only means that someone misinterpreted the policy. Not knowing any more facts than the Senator has mentioned, it seems to me that 300 miles is sufficient dispersal in that case, unless there may have been other factors related to Fresno. I do not know

any more about the facts than what the Senator has stated.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Did the Senator from Connecticut correctly understand the Senator from Arkansas to say that this amendment would not change the status quo?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not entirely. I said that those who did not wish to change the status quo are for the Bush motion and opposed to the committee amendments. As I understand, it would give congressional approval and emphasis to a policy which is being followed, at least to some degree, in the Pentagon. The Nelson committee says that it needs reinforcement. The endorsement of Congress should stiffen the backs of the administrators in applying the policy of dispersal. While the policy exists, the administrators are very easily dissuaded from applying it in many individual cases. I suppose that may be because of the very conscientious representations which Senators make before the bureaus when they are considering questions of dispersal. I wish to read what the Nelson committee says on the subject.

Mr. PURTELL. Is it the Senator's intention, before he concludes, to indicate in what way the status quo would be changed?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would be changed by reason of reinforcement of the determination of the executive department to apply a principle which I think is sound. In that sense the status quo would be changed.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Is that on the assumption that the policy is not being administered today?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. There was criticism to the effect that the policy was not being applied as vigorously as it should be.

We had a demonstration last year of what terrible disruption to our economy even a hurricane can cause in the State of Connecticut. We do not need an atomic bomb to give an illustration. We saw pictures of great rubber plants, chemical plants, and other plants falling into rivers. Terrible destruction occurred in one small State where there was an unduly high degree of concentration of defense plants. We were warned then that we were exposing ourselves to unnecessary risks by continuing to pile up one factory after another in the Naugatuck Valley and other valleys of Connecticut.

Mr. PURTELL. Is the Senator acquainted with the testimony given before his committee by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] referring to the question of whether or not these policies were being administered? I read from page 2 of the hearings. The Senator from Utah said:

> For some time now we have had a national policy of industrial dispersal. Considering the problems inherent in any such program, not the least of which has been public apathy, I think it has gone pretty well.

That would indicate to the Senator from Connecticut that the Senator from Utah felt that those policies were being followed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He did not feel it strongly enough to deter him from offering an amendment. The Senator from Utah is the author of the amendment in the bill. The Senator from Utah can speak for himself. He is in the Chamber, and will speak in a moment. I do not think it is proper for me to interpret his thoughts on the subject.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it possible that this amendment would activate the status quo?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would give force to a policy which I think most reasonable people agree is a good policy, although there may be a difference of opinion as to how it is being applied.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Arkansas. Is it the understanding of the Senator that if the dispersal amendment to section 4 of the bill should be adopted, that amendment would expire on June 30, 1958, or on June 30, 1965?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would expire on June 30, 1958.

Mr. PASTORE. 1958?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. Am I to understand that there is nothing contained in the amendment which precludes the use of existing industrial facilities?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. There is no intention to destroy or to change the use of existing facilities. The amendment would apply to new plants, and to extensions or new constructions built with Government assistance.

Mr. PASTORE. If there is no intention to affect existing facilities, and if in truth the act would expire on June 30, 1958, wherein would the national security be promoted by going so far as to say, in section 4, "in the procurement of goods and services"? Why is that phrase used? In the procurement of goods and services, what is expected to happen in the next 2 years which will jeopardize the national security unless there is dispersal, and unless it is recognized that it shall not apply to existing facilities? I believe there is an inconsistency there which is very serious one.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I suggest that the Senator read the whole sentence:

> In the construction of any Government-owned——

Mr. PASTORE. That means the performance of a future act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The sentence reads:

> In the construction of any Government-owned industrial facilities, in the rendition of any Government financial assistance for the construction, expansion, or improvement of any industrial facilities, and in the procurement of goods and services, under this or any other act, each department and agency of the executive branch shall apply—

In other words, in the process of procurement that assistance is given. It is necessary to read the remainder of the sentence.

Mr. PASTORE. I have already read the whole paragraph.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I continue to read:

> Each department and agency of the executive branch shall apply, under the coordination of the Office of Defense Mobilization, when practicable and consistent with existing law and the desirability for maintaining a sound economy, the principle of the geographical dispersal of such facilities in the interest of national defense.

Suppose, for the purpose of illustration, that the Government needs for its Defense Establishment a vital commodity or goods, and that that commodity or those goods are located in only one place. If a new plant is to be built, I would say that under the provision "in the procurement of goods and services," it would mean that the new plant would have to be built in a different place.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know whether the Senator from Rhode Island has concluded his questions.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to ask another question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I cannot follow the Senator in his reasoning that that language adds any peculiar meaning to the act.

Mr. PASTORE. In reading the amendment, I gained the impression that the last sentence in the amendment, which starts on page 4, line 5, was inserted to reassure those who might think that existing facilities were included or intended to be affected. The only concern of those of us who are interested in existing facilities would be in the case of procurement. Yet procurement has been thrown into the catch-all of the dispersal plan. I am convinced that there is an obvious inconsistency here. In other words, the provision regarding procurement on page 3, line 23, vitiates the spirit and meaning and intent of the last sentence of the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not understand that to be so at all.

Mr. PASTORE. I hope that is not the meaning, but that is what it says.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the Senator from Arkansas realize that the opponents of the amendment are using up his time to make their arguments?

Mr. PASTORE. Oh, I have an hour on the bill, and I am perfectly willing to yield any part of it to the distinguished Senator from Utah. We have a great deal of time this afternoon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe we will have sufficient time. My speech is not very long, although I have gone only half-way through it.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Inasmuch as the Senator has quoted from the language of the committee amendment known as the Bennett dispersal amendment, I should

like to point out that that amendment is not confined in its present language to defense procurement. That is not so by any means. That is one of the reasons I object so strenuously to the amendment. As the Senator has just read the amendment, it provides:

In the construction of any Government-owned industrial facilities, in the rendition of any Government financial assistance for the construction, expansion, or improvement of any industrial facilities, and in the procurement of goods and services—

That applies to GSA or any other agency, and to any goods or services—

under this or any other act, each department and agency of the executive branch shall apply, under the coordination of the Office of Defense Mobilization, when practicable and consistent with existing law and the desirability for maintaining a sound economy, the principle of the geographical dispersal of such facilities in the interest of national defense.

That is such all-inclusive language as, in my opinion, to include anything the Government might wish to purchase.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The whole subject of dispersal is significant only when applied to materials or plants which have relation to our defense. If a candy factory were involved, for example, the idea would not apply at all. The question of dispersal would not arise at all. It would arise only in connection with such geographical dispersal as is inherent in the question of defense. It refers to factories or procurement which have to do with defense. It is not a vital commodity if it has no significance to defense.

Mr. BUSH. But that language is in the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It will not apply in the case mentioned by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. The provision does not refer exclusively to commodities vital to defense.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Can the Senator give us an example of the fear in his mind? What is bothering him?

Mr. BUSH. What bothers me is that the language is so broad that it can be used to apply to the procurement of any kind of goods and for any purpose for which the Government buys the goods. It could apply to office furniture or anything else.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator also express distrust in the judgment of the executive branch of the Government in the application of the law?

Mr. BUSH. No; I do not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As the Senator from California seemed to do a moment ago? Does he not believe the Government will use a reasonable interpretation of the language?

Mr. BUSH. That is not what I distrust. I distrust the Members of this particular Congress and of the next Congress, and of the one after that, who will use this amendment as a club with which to beat departments and agencies over the head. That is what I fear.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator does not have much confidence in his colleagues.

Mr. BUSH. Not when it comes to this kind of business. I have a great deal of confidence in them in connection with many things, but not when it comes to a question such as this.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why does not the Senator have confidence in them in this particular field?

Mr. BUSH. Because I know what they will do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What will they do?

Mr. BUSH. They will use it as a club with which to hit the Defense Department and GSA and other agencies over the head, and say to them, "This is what the law says. You must buy a certain article in Utah or in Arkansas."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am delighted to have the Senator say that. I wish he would cite one example of what he has in mind, so that my constituents would appreciate how well they are represented in Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HRUSKA in the chair). The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Another factor which must be considered in connection with the dispersal amendment is the recent development in weapons, in their delivery and in their destructive power. The committee report quotes from the statement by Admiral Strauss of the appalling effects of an H-bomb, both the immediate blast and heat effects and the widespread fallout effects. Earlier defensive concepts are obsolete. Widespread dispersal is the only answer.

The problem has been the subject of serious concern to the executive branch. ODM early in 1955 requested a committee, the so-called Nelson committee, headed by Gen. Otto L. Nelson, Jr., vice president of the New York Life Insurance Co., to review an earlier report on the subject of civil defense which had been made in 1952. The Nelson committee's report was submitted in October of 1955. In this report the committee stressed the importance of industrial dispersion and reduction of urban vulnerability and urged that renewed emphasis be given to these programs. The Nelson committee's recommendation on the subject of industrial dispersion is particularly important:

Leadership in the field of industrial dispersion is essentially a Federal responsibility. The work of the Office of Defense Mobilization in analyzing key industries to uncover undue concentration in any one locality and to induce a spreading out geographically should be continued with the goal that within the next 10 years a reasonable minimum and properly balanced portion of our total national production with the necessary accessory facilities therefor be established outside of metropolitan target zones. Thirty percent has been suggested but this standard obviously needs testing, and any standard will probably require frequent modification with the passage of time. In these programs, emphasis should be placed on the location of new facilities in order to accomplish the goals.

If it should be said that the present dispersal policies and programs of the agencies are sufficient to insure the Nation's security, I urge the Senate to consider this statement by the Nelson committee:

It had been hoped that the National Security Resources Board and its successor, the Office of Defense Mobilization, would gain better acceptance and would be more adequately recognized as striving to carry out effectively a most important function in the field of nonmilitary defense planning and preparations. The declining attention in terms of personnel, funds, and key-man interest in the problems of industrial dispersion, reduction of urban vulnerability, and postattack rehabilitation is particularly disheartening. In the face of the development of weapons of more and more destructive power, this work would seem to be of increasingly greater importance, complexity, and difficulty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of members of the Nelson committee.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1955 REVIEW COMMITTEE OF THE REPORT OF PROJECT EAST RIVER

Gen. Otto L. Nelson, Jr., chairman, vice president in charge of housing, New York Life Insurance Co., New York, N. Y.

Dr. Lloyd V. Berkner, president, Associated Universities, Inc., New York, N. Y.

Mr. Horatio Bond, chief engineer, National Fire Protection Association, Boston, Mass.

Mr. Percy Bugbee, General Manager, National Fire Protection Association, Boston, Mass.

Dr. Richard M. Emberson, assistant to the president, Associated Universities, Inc., New York, N. Y.

Dr. Leland J. Haworth, director, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, Long Island, N. Y.

Dr. Albert Gordon Hill, professor of physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

Mrs. Katherine G. Howard, Boston, Mass.

Mr. Burnham Kelly, associate professor of city planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

Dr. J. B. H. Kuper, chairman instrumentation and health physics, Brookhaven, National Laboratory, Upton, Long Island, N. Y.

Hon. Joseph E. McLean, commissioner of conservation and economic development, State of New Jersey, Trenton, N. J.

Mrs. Marlene D. Morrisey, administrative assistant to the Librarian of Congress, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Elihu Root, Jr., New York, N. Y.

Mr. Stephen F. Voorhees, Voorhees, Walker, Smith & Smith, New York, N. Y.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the National Planning Association has also considered the need for nonmilitary defense measures and in May of 1955 issued a statement by a special policy committee on nonmilitary defense planning which also urged major efforts in the field of industrial dispersal. This report concluded that:

Knowledge of the threat and effective nonmilitary defense measures against the threat can save millions of lives, can limit damage to resources, can minimize postattack confusion, can contribute to more rapid restoration of critical community in industrial resources, and can assure and speed victory.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of the members of the special policy committee signing the statements in which this position is taken.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMBERS OF THE SPECIAL POLICY COMMITTEE ON NONMILITARY DEFENSE PLANNING SIGNING THE STATEMENT

H. Christian Sonne, chairman, president, South Ridge Corp.

Melvin Anshen, professor of industrial administration, Carnegie Institute of Technology.

Cole A. Armstrong, customer equipment engineer, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Gerhard D. Bleicken, secretary, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Harry A. Bullis, chairman of the board, General Mills, Inc.

David F. Cavers, office of the associate dean, Harvard University Law School.

Walker L. Cisler, president, the Detroit Edison Co.

Charles Fairman Nagel, professor of constitutional law, Washington University.

Clinton S. Golden, executive director, Trade Union Program, Harvard University.

Luther H. Gulick, city administrator of the City of New York.

A. J. Hays, international president, International Association of Machinists.

Joseph D. Keenan, international secretary, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL.

Murray D. Lincoln, president, Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance Co.

Shaw Livermore, Rockefeller Brothers Office, New York City.

J. Murray Mitchell, Washington, D. C.

Otto L. Nelson, president, New York Life Insurance Co.

Robert Oliver, assistant to the president, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Ethan Allen Peyser, Peyser, Cartano, Botzer & Chapman.

James T. Phillips, vice president, New York Life Insurance Co.

Sumner T. Pike, chairman, Maine Public Utilities Commission.

Ramsay D. Potts, Jr., president, Independent Military Air Transport Association.

John H. Redmond, assistant production manager, Koppers Co., Inc.

H. Gifford Till, director, Industrial and Agricultural Research and Development Department, Missouri-Kansas-Texas Lines.

Ralph J. Watkins, director of research, Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.

Frank P. Zeidler, mayor, city of Milwaukee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I hope as all Members of the Senate hope, that no A-bombs or H-bombs fall on the United States. I hope that the defense program and the dispersal program will accomplish their most effective result—preventing any attack on the United States.

But we cannot sweep the H–bomb under the rug and forget it. We must shoulder part of the responsibility for this vital program.

The second substantive amendment is made in section 701 (c) of the act. This amendment would require the President to exercise such controls under the act as he may deem necessary to make available for firms in the normal channels of distribution a fair share of the available civilian supply, if the share allocated to the military is so great as to cause a significant dislocation of the normal distribution in the civilian market. Due consideration is to be given to the needs of new concerns, individual hardships and the needs of smaller concerns.

The amendment provides ample leeway and discretion to the President. He is not required to act unless he finds that to do so would alleviate the hardship without having an unfavorable effect on the civilian economy as a whole. The President may allocate all of the available civilian supply, if the requirements of section 101 (b) are met; he may exercise end-use controls or conservation measures; he may require set-asides for segments of industry or small businesses; he may impose inventory restrictions; or he may devise other forms of allocation or priority measures to suit the need. The form of controls to be exercised is entirely within his discretion. He is not required to take any action which is not practicable.

This amendment was adopted because it was felt that the Government owes a duty to civilian users of a material to take all practicable steps to assure fair distribution, when the mandatory fulfillment of defense requirements leaves only a hopelessly inadequate supply for civilian users.

This amendment would apply to any material. The particular situation which led to its adoption was the distressing nickel situation. Defense requirements, including the stockpile, now take a very large share of the supply. The balance is parceled out among civilian users under an informal arrangement between the Commerce Department and nickel producers and suppliers, more or less on the basis of the old NPA allocation orders which were repealed in 1953.

In one breath the Commerce Department says that it is not controlling the distribution of nickel in the civilian market; that private enterprise is preferable to Government controls; and that it has no responsibility for the present difficulties. In the next breath the Commerce Department refers to its agreement with the producers and suppliers; it explains its elaborate inspections of the books of the producers and suppliers; it tells of the corrections of inequities it has accomplished by calling them to the attention of the producers and suppliers; and it assures the public that the present system is fair and equitable and orderly.

The committee did not find the present voluntary allocation agreement satisfactory. Nickel is apparently sold regularly at three different prices. A so-called market price of around 65 or 70 cents a pound, a premium price of about $1.25 and a grey market price in the neighborhood of $2.50 to $3 a pound. The platers and other users of nickel get only about 20 or 25 percent of their base-period receipts at the so-called market price. If they can afford it, they supplement this inadequate supply with $1.25 or $3 nickel. The difficulties of carrying on a legitimate business under these conditions are obvious. No wonder small firms are being forced to the wall, while the big firms and the integrated firms which can absorb these high prices get all the nickel they want and take over the small firms' business in the process.

The ODM is trying to cure this situation by increasing the supply of nickel. They have been trying to do this under the financial assistance provision of title III of the act for 5 or 6 years. The supply has increased but most of the increase goes to defense requirements and even at that the supplies intended for the stockpile are constantly being diverted to industry. There is no indication of immediate relief for the small businesses which are suffering so severely.

This situation is the result of the allocations of nickel to defense programs. The Government cannot wash its hands of responsibility.

And I think the Government's responsibility cannot be met by an informal voluntary allocation agreement, run on the basis of informal agreements with nickel producers and suppliers, of which the public is only now becoming aware, under which the nickel consumers are dependent upon the whim of their suppliers, and with no recourse to written regulations, formal procedures, rules or regulations. As Dr. Flemming said: "If we are going to have controls, they should be formal controls so that everyone knows the rules of the game."

The amendment relating to the payment of the expenses of the Joint Committee on Defense Production is entirely technical. It is acceptable to the disbursing officers of the Senate and the House. Its only purpose is to simplify paperwork and to do away with unnecessary obligation of funds.

In view of the expiration of the Defense Production Act on June 30, 1956, I urge that H. R. 9852 be acted upon promptly and favorably by the Senate.

Mr. President, before I take my seat, there is a technical change which I am afraid I might overlook, and which I ask unanimous consent to make in the bill.

On page 3, line 2, the study and report are required to be made by July 15, 1956. It was expected that the bill would have been enacted sooner than this. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the date be changed to August 15, 1956, because there would not be time enough in which to submit a report by July 15, 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas?

The Chair hears none, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to know if the Senator has given any thought to dispersal to areas which can support it or to areas where there is a large amount of unemployment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is not the purpose of the bill. There are other pieces of proposed legislation which are devoted to that purpose.

I do not think that what the Senator from Kansas has referred to is a consideration. Certainly it was not one of the motives in the adoption of this particular amendment. However, commonsense tells us that the labor supply is an important factor. I think it is a matter which, with the location of any plant, regardless of its effect upon the vulnerability of our Defense Establishment, should receive proper consideration.

Mr. CARLSON. I notice in the report that one of the considerations to be given is "when consistent with the desirability of maintaining a sound economy." Of course, unemployment areas affect the general economy of the Nation. I assume that that might have something to do with the situation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would say that the Government is free, within a reasonable contemplation of the matter, to take into consideration all factors which may relate to a sound economy.

We do not say, and I certainly do not intend to say, that the economy shall be distorted or crippled in any way in order to secure dispersion. On the other hand, we do not wish to concentrate everything in a particular area merely because that is where the industry has been in the past. There is a certain amount of inertia in these matters which might prevent the dispersal of all or a substantial part of a vital industry.

Mr. CARLSON. Is it not reasonable to assume that in a program of the dispersal of defense industries and other industries in which the Federal Government makes great investments or makes special provisions, such as amortization, the entire economy should be considered, including the unemployment factor and all other factors?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What I meant to say in my first remark was that we were not seeking to relieve distressed areas by dispersal. Commonsense tells us that when we examine into a situation and have the responsibility of deciding whether a new plant shall be located in an area where there is a great scarcity of labor, and there is great difficulty in securing labor, but there is another area where all the necessary factors are present, of course those situations must be taken into consideration.

I still do not believe the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] was seeking to relieve unemployment. There are other bills, including one before the Committee on Banking and Currency and one before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which seek to attack that problem directly. I do not consider that this amendment was primarily drawn for that purpose, although I recognize that sensible men in examining the economy would certainly take into consideration whether there was an ample labor supply, whether there was a tight supply in the labor market, and whether that condition had existed for a long time.

Mr. CARLSON. Could the Senator from Arkansas advise me if rapid amortization or additional rapid amortization for defense industries to locate in unemployment areas was a factor which was given consideration?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it is a factor in rapid amortization. That is the situation under existing law. It is my information that that is sometimes considered.

Mr. CARLSON. At one time additional rapid amortization was offered as an incentive in unemployment areas. I simply wondered if the Senator from Arkansas could advise me if that situation still prevailed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know; I cannot answer the Senator positively on that point. That is not a matter within the jurisdiction of our committee.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I believe it is now in order that I move the adoption of the committee amendments.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut will state it.

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator's motion apply to the amendment on page 2 of the bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is at the top of page 2 where the executive reserve requirement is omitted. Is that what the Senator from Connecticut refers to?

Mr. BUSH. Does the language which is stricken constitute the amendment to which the Senator from Arkansas refers?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I am referring to all the committee amendments.

Mr. BUSH. Is the Senator's motion to consider all the amendments en bloc or to vote on them en bloc?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That would be perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. BUSH. I would object strongly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would the Senator object to that?

Mr. BUSH. I certainly would.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then, if it is in order to do so, we shall have to consider the amendments one at a time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let us consider the first committee amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The first committee amendment is at the top of page 2.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is a section which is stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair may state that it would be in order to ask for the adoption of all committee amendments except section 4.

Mr. BUSH. I would not object to that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Very well. I ask unanimous consent that all the committee amendments except section 4, on page 3, line 10, be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out:

"SEC. 3. Subsection (e) of section 710 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'No such person shall become a member of the executive reserve unless he has complied, to the extent applicable, with the same requirements as apply with respect to persons appointed under subsection (b) of this section; this sentence shall not be construed as requiring any member of the executive reserve to file a statement of changes in interests in conformity with the last sentence of paragraph (6) of subsection (b).'"

On page 2, line 12, to renumber the section.

On page 4, after line 6, to insert:

"SEC. 5. Subsection (c) of section 701 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out 'in the civilian market, he shall do so in such a manner as' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'and finds that such action will result in a significant dislocation of the normal distribution of such material in the civilian market, to such a degree as to cause appreciable hardship, he shall, whenever he finds that such action will alleviate such hardship without having an unfavorable effect on the civilian economy as a whole, exercise such controls under this act as he may deem necessary.'"

And, on page 4, after line 17, to insert:

"SEC. Effective July 1, 1956, section 712 (e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(e) The expenses of the committee under this section, which shall not exceed $65,000 in any fiscal year, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.'"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The remaining committee amendment will now be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, after line 9, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 4. Section 2 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"In order to insure productive capacity in the event of such an attack on the United States, it is the policy of the Congress to promote the geographical dispersal of the industrial facilities of the United States in the interest of the national defense, and to discourage the concentration of such productive facilities within limited geographical areas which are vulnerable to attack by an enemy of the United States. In the construction of any Government-owned industrial facilities, in the rendition of any Government financial assistance for the construction, expansion, or improvement of any industrial facilities, and in the procurement of goods and services, under this or any other act, each department and agency of the executive branch shall apply, under the coordination of the Office of Defense Mobilization, when practicable and consistent with existing law and the desirability for maintaining a sound economy, the principle of the geographical dispersal of such facilities in the interest of national defense. Nothing contained in this paragraph shall preclude the use of existing industrial facilities.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, under the special provision of the unanimous-consent agreement, I now move to lay on the table the amendment on page 3, line 10.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Under the rules of the Senate, a motion to table is not debatable. But under the peculiar unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered into with respect to the motion of the Senator from Connecticut, the motion to table is open to debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; and 1 hour of debate has been allotted to each side.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield myself, first, 15 minutes.

I am opposed to the Bennett amendment, which is now before the Senate, and which relates to geographical dispersal, because I consider it to be a dagger thrust at the heart of my own State and region, and of every other industrial area from the east coast to the west coast of the Nation. I am opposed to it for many reasons, which are more fully set forth in the committee report on the bill, but especially for these reasons:

First, should the amendment creep into the law, pork-barrel pressures

would be exerted upon Federal officials to use Government procurement, tax favors, loans, and other forms of financial assistance as a means of developing some States to the detriment of other States.

Second, the resulting social and economic dislocations would seriously weaken the national security, instead of strengthening it, as the amendment would pretend to do.

Third, under the guise of promoting the national security by reinforcing existing law and policy, the amendment seems to make new law and to change future policy by requiring the application of "geographical dispersal" to all industries, whether defense or nondefense, and to all Government purchases of all goods and services, whether or not they are essential for security reasons. In a colloquy with the Senator from Arkansas, I have pointed that out specifically in connection with the amendment.

In an age of rapid development of long-range guided missiles having atomic warheads, every wise precaution should be taken against undue concentration of industries which are, in fact, essential to the national security. I wish to make it very clear that I am not in any way opposed to proper dispersal. I strongly favor the dispersal policy of the Department of Defense, as it appears in the hearings on the bill. Much dispersal of essential industries has, in fact, taken place during and since World War II.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I am very much interested in the argument which is being developed by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. The proposed amendment which appears on page 3 of the bill is so broad and general that, in my belief, it includes all industry, not only industry connected with the development of national security.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Rhode Island is absolutely correct.

Mr. PASTORE. The reason I say that is that if the Senator will contrast the language of section 4—and I hope the Senator from Utah will address his argument to this point, because, in my opinion, it is very important—with the directive which is now in existence, he will see that it says—and I read now from the directive, not from the language of the amendment:

> It is the policy of the United States to encourage and, when appropriate, to require that new facilities and major expansions of existing facilities important to the national defense—

There is no such language in the amendment. In other words, the directive is aimed exclusively at industries which are important to the national security. There is no such language in the amendment. In other words, under the bill, it would be hard to imagine that any industry would not be entitled to fast amortization, because the language is not directed alone to industries important to the national security. I think the point ought to be clarified, because that is the fault I find with the amendment on page 3. It is too broad, and includes almost everything and anything.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is absolutely correct. That is the trouble with the amendment. It is all-inclusive. It is not directed to defense plants, but is directed to every kind of Government procurement. I am glad the Senator has lent emphasis to that point.

Mr. President, I was speaking of the fact that communities in the interior were no more safe from air attack than were cities on the seacoast.

It is far from clear, however, that dispersal of industries over widely separated areas is the soundest way of protecting ourselves against intercontinental missiles or other forms of air attack.

Already, communities in the interior of the Nation are no safer from air attack than communities on or near the coasts.

Salt Lake City is no more immune from such attack by our present potential enemy than San Francisco or Syracuse.

In a few years, it may become apparent that the best protection of our industrial mobilization base lies in tunneling into mountainsides for factory sites, or putting them underground.

I am no expert on these matters. Few Senators are. And the Department best qualified to advise us, the Department of Defense, has said that the proposed amendment is not only unnecessary, but may cause harm by creating confusion.

Incidentally, I wish to reiterate my observation about the confusion which it may cause, since I think Members of Congress are apt to use it as a weapon to make many demands on the Department of Defense, and interfere with the proper conduct of its business, as well as that of other departments.

The advice of the Department which bears the heaviest responsibility for an effective national defense and for protecting the national security was disregarded by our committee, which devoted shockingly little time and attention to so serious a matter.

Although the amendment may have the most far-reaching and harmful effects upon the Nation's industrial mobilization base, essential to the effectiveness of all our Armed Forces, no expert military witnesses were heard. Nor was any consultation sought with committees of the Senate possessing more detailed information, much of a highly classified nature, bearing on the problem.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Were there any hearings before the committee on this particular amendment, where not only the testimony of the defense witnesses was heard, but also the testimony from industrial managers and others who have also contributed their part to the building of the Nation's defense and economy?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad the Senator from California raises that question. I do not think there was a single witness of that kind called before the committee, and I object very strongly to that procedure. I am glad the Senator has brought out that point.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not true that the committee called everybody the Senator from Connecticut asked the committee to hear?

Mr. BUSH. I beg the Senator's pardon?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did not the committee hear everybody the Senator from Connecticut or anyone else asked to be heard? Did the committee refuse to hear anyone the Senator from Connecticut requested the committee to hear?

Mr. BUSH. I do not recall that the committee refused any request of mine. I simply observe that the hearings were very scanty, and little attention was given to the matter, and when the vote was taken only 6 members of the 15 members of the committee voted on the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the hearings were scanty, the Senator from Connecticut has some responsibility for it. He is on the committee. The other members of the committee were satisfied with the testimony as it stood. If the Senator from Connecticut thought the testimony was not sufficient, or that there was any merit in his position, why did he not propose testimony? We were perfectly willing to receive anything the Senator from Connecticut cared to offer. I do not believe he should be complaining about the scantiness of the hearings. We would have heard 50 witnesses if he cared to offer them. We never refused to let anybody who wished to testify do so. We had the benefit of the Nelson committee, on which some of the most outstanding men of this country serve. For that reason, and for other reasons, we thought we had adequate justification for the amendment. I do not think the Senator from Connecticut is in a position to complain that the committee rushed through the consideration of the bill and did not adequately consider it. We gave it all the consideration the Senator from Connecticut wanted us to give to it.

Mr. BUSH. I do not recall that the committee did or did not give it all the consideration I wanted the committee to give to it. I simply assert that the hearings were very brief and very few witnesses were called, and there was not any attempt to get representatives of industrial management before the committee. Frankly, I think the fact is that very few persons realized what a very serious effect the proposal would have. It is possible that I myself did not so realize until after the subcommittee suddenly adopted this amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will yield further, I think this is a very serious statement. First, I should like to say that Mr. Flemming, Mr. Weeks, and Mr. Peterson gave their evidence.

Mr. BUSH. I know they did.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then the Senator has mentioned the lack of testimony by representatives of industry. I do not wish to read the entire list again. I thought the Senator from Connecticut was familiar with the facts. I never

dreamed he would say that no consideration was given to the bill. The policy committee which I mentioned, and which made such a strong recommendation for it, had on it such persons as Mr. Walker L. Cisler, president of the Detroit Edison Co.; Mr. James T. Phillips, vice president of the New York Life Insurance Co.; Mr. Sumner T. Pike, chairman of the Maine Public Utilities Commission; Mr. H. Gifford Till, director, Industrial and Agricultural Research and Development Department, Missouri-Kansas-Texas Lines; Mr. Ralph J. Watkins, director of research, Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. There were many others.

Mr. BUSH. Did those witnesses appear to testify on the amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The names I read are those of some of the persons who composed the committee of the National Planning Association that made the report from which I read, very strongly recommending the proposal.

Mr. BUSH. I asked the Senator if those witnesses testified. I remind the Senator that my statement was that no expert military witnesses were heard. Will the Senator state who was called that was an expert military witness?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Flemming, Mr. Weeks, and Mr. Peterson.

Mr. BUSH. I beg to disagree with the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I happen to be one who does not think that military experts know everything. In fact, I think their knowledge is very limited on anything but military matters. The point I want to make is that the Senator from Connecticut is a prominent and influential member of the Banking and Currency Committee. He was free to ask the chairman to invite anybody he wished to have invited. Now, what happened? He had no witnesses there. I submit, if he felt they were necessary, he had every right to ask for them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not a fact that, so far as the hearings were concerned, the hearings were called on Senate bill 3407, 84th Congress, 2d session, which is a bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes, and that does not contain the Bennett amendment? So far as concerns notice to the public, to the people scattered over the 48 States of the Union, they thought it was a bare extension of the Defense Production Act. The Bennett amendment proposes new language, and the people did not have full notice as to its far-reaching consequences.

I think no one will disagree, in generality, as to the importance of dispersion, as recommended in the general policy announced by the distinguished persons whose names were mentioned by the Senator. But there is involved the entire problem of production. If we were to disperse our industries and, as a result, lose our production at a time when we are complaining that we need more missiles, more airplanes, more tanks, and more of the other articles of defense, we might actually jeopardize the defense of the Nation by carrying out the dispersal to such an extent as to prevent us from obtaining—at the time when they are desperately needed—the necessary instruments of defense. I think that point has been ignored.

If the far-reaching consequences of the Bennett amendment had been generally known, I think that witnesses from practically all 48 of the States of the Union would have asked to be heard.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from California for his observation on that point, and I think he is correct.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HRUSKA in the chair). The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I was saying that no consultation was sought with committees of the Senate possessing more detailed information, much of a highly classified nature, bearing on the problem.

Instead, the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization held brief hearings on 2 days only, and devoted much of the time to subjects other than this amendment.

Not all members of the subcommittee attended. As a result, when the matter came before the full Committee on Banking and Currency, few of its members had heard the testimony. And when the vote was taken, only six members of our 15-man committee were recorded in favor, some of them by proxy.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Connecticut that all legislative proposals reported to the Senate are reported by the vote of a full committee, with all it members present? Is not the pattern by means of which this amendment was reported to the Senate the same as that by which almost all proposed legislation comes to the floor of the Senate?

Mr. BUSH. I would say that is not the case in connection with so important a matter. Only six members of the committee were recorded as being in favor of the amendment, and I think that is an unusual situation in connection with such a very important matter as this is.

Mr. BENNETT. Was a quorum present in the committee?

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator from Utah mean when the vote was taken?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. Presumably so, or else the amendment would not be before the Senate now. Of course some of the votes in the committee may have been recorded by proxy.

Mr. BENNETT. So the amendment has come to the floor of the Senate in an entirely legal way, has it not?

Mr. BUSH. Oh, yes; I do not question that at all. I merely say that the matter was handled by the committee in much too casual a fashion, for a matter of such far-reaching import. From my own observations, I do not think the members of the Banking and Currency Committee realized the implications of the amendment. After studying the matter further, during the past few days, I realize now, even more than I did when I voted on the amendment, what some of its far-reaching effects may be.

Dispersal without the most careful consideration of all the factors involved, and on a case-by-case basis, may do far more harm than good.

Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, has expressed support of the amendment, in principle. But he carefully qualified his support by mentioning many other factors which must be considered in addition to geographical dispersal.

He summed up his position by saying:

> If we permit the objective of dispersal to undermine our effectively functioning urban economy, then in terms of our total strength we have not accomplished anything. Probably we have weakened ourselves.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me at this point?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. In the amendment is there anything which would preclude consideration of the other factors to which reference has been made?

Mr. BUSH. I cannot say "yes" or "no," in reply. But I very much fear there is. For instance, no mention is made of other factors; the entire emphasis of the amendment is on geographical dispersal, regardless of the effect on production.

Mr. BENNETT. Does not the Senator from Connecticut consider that the phrase "consistent with existing law and the desirability for maintaining a sound economy" provides adequate protection?

Mr. BUSH. That is so vague a phrase that I do not think it constitutes adequate protection by any means. If we wish to spell out what some of the necessities are in connection with maintaining a sound economy, we would come back——

Mr. BENNETT. Does not the Senator from Connecticut think that if all those terms were to be spelled out, we would arrive at a list so long and a set of specifications so rigid as to make the interpretation rather difficult?

Mr. BUSH. No. I say to the Senator from Utah that is exactly how the dispersal policy has been executed by the Defense Department. It has a list of all kinds of factors which have to be taken into account.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on that point will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. If it were necessary to nail down legislatively the order of the Defense Department, which has been tried and tested and found to be true, then why would it not have been wiser to have included as section 4 the language of the order itself, if it were the purpose to say from a congressional standpoint and a congressional view what the policy of the United States is. But the fact is——

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me, so that I may reply?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have not finished.

I suggest that the fact is that under the guise of adopting in principle a dispersal program, the committee have actually proposed language, the legal consequences of which are unforeseeable now.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me now, so that I may make an observation, in reply?

Mr. BUSH. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BENNETT. Of course, the language of the directive is subject to change by executive decision at any time. If we were to attempt to write similar language in the proposed legislation, we would fix it definiteley in the policy of Congress, which is not subject to change at any time.

Mr. BUSH. That is one of the chief objections we have.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield at this point?

Mr. BENNETT. I wish to finish my comment.

So I would say that the general language of the bill, which is a statement of the attitude and policy of the Congress, backs up the specific language of the directive, and still leaves the executive department free to change its specifications as times change.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on that point will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course, the exact opposite is true, because the substance of language which has legislative meaning cannot be changed by means of administrative rules and procedures. In this case we would be adopting as a matter of law language which could not be enlarged by administrative rules and regulations. In this case we would be saying—and I refer now to the language appearing on page 3, in line 21, where the statement is made in plain English which no one can misinterpret—

In the rendition of any Government financial assistance—

And surely that means any Government financial assistance at all—

for the construction, expansion, or improvement of any industrial facilities—

How could the language which is used be interpreted otherwise than as I have indicated?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island finish the sentence?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, I will—

and in the procurement of goods and services, under this or any other act—

Mr. BENNETT. Very well; I ask the Senator please to finish the sentence.

Mr. PASTORE. Certainly—

each department and agency of the executive branch shall apply, under the coordination of the Office of Defense Mobilization, when practicable—

Mr. BENNETT. Now the Senator from Rhode Island is getting to the important part.

Mr. PASTORE. I am right at it now—

and consistent with existing law—

Which cannot be changed by administrative rules or regulations—

and the desirability for maintaining a sound economy—

Which might mean anything in anybody's country—

the principle of the geographical dispersal of such facilities in the interest of national defense.

Mr. BENNETT. Very well. May I reply?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I trust that the Senator from Utah will be as generous with his time as I am with mine.

Mr. PASTORE. I will yield time to the Senator from Utah from my time, in order to permit him to answer the question.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it seems to me that we come to the key of the sentence when we reach the word "practicable." These provisions are not mandatory, without any opportunity to exercise good judgment. The words "practicable and consistent with existing law and the desirability for maintaining a sound economy" I think are sufficiently broad to make it possible for this system to operate without becoming an absolute mandate.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield for one further observation?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President——

Mr. BUSH. I yield first to the Senator from Rhode Island, and then I shall yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. PASTORE. That is precisely the point the junior Senator from Rhode Island is making. Once we enact legislation, anything which is subsequently done must be consistent with the law. If anyone believes that rules or regulations can be used to water down the law, I submit that such a course is inconsistent with sound legal principles, and that it ought not be followed.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator would wipe out the word "practicable" and he would wipe out the phrase "and the desirability for maintaining a sound economy," leaving only the phrase "consistent with existing law."

Mr. PASTORE. We could give any Government assistance to any industry, or any industrial facility, unless there was dispersal.

Mr. BENNETT. We could not have any dispersal unless it was practicable, consistent with existing law, and in the interest of national defense.

Mr. PASTORE. Now we have gone from homicide to murder.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional 10 minutes of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I will take 5 minutes more. I yield to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, one of the best arguments against writing this dispersal amendment into the pending legislation has been made by the distinguished author of the amendment, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. The distinguished Senator from Utah has suggested that he wanted something less in this bill than the careful and painstaking approach which has been made by the executive branch of the Government. He indicated that from time to time the present dispersal order of the Government of the United States is subjected to changes which are necessary and advisable. Yet the Senator from Utah suggests that he wants to rivet into the law a dispersal policy which is neither consonant with the present dispersal order of the Government, nor does it recognize that changes have been necessary in order to pefect it to its present position. I believe the Senator from Utah has made an excellent argument in favor of defeating the dispersal amendment.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from California.

Will the Chair advise me how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. BUSH. I will proceed from the point where I was interrupted some time ago.

The whole drive of the amendment is to focus attention primarily, indeed almost exclusively, on geographical dispersal, and the effect might well be to undermine the present structure of our economy upon which must depend our military strength.

The committee report disclaims such intention, but the language of the amendment speaks for itself. It speaks of geographical dispersal as if it were the be-all and end-all. Nowhere is there mention of the many other factors which must be considered, such as cost, availability of materials, power, skilled labor supply, ability to deliver promptly and so forth.

It is true that the committee sought to lessen opposition by modifying the original language through insertion of the phrase, "when practicable and consistent with existing law and the desirability for maintaining a sound economy." Such a phrase, however, is vague and almost meaningless when compared with the detailed specifications of the present Air Force policy on industrial production readiness. And it would lead to intolerable pressures, difficult to resist, for changes in that well-considered policy, and would thwart sound adaptions to new circumstances arising from the development of new weapons.

I urge my fellow Senators to be alert to the evils which could flow from the amendment, however well-intentioned may be its sponsors.

Let us lock fast the Pandora's box of evils which this amendment proposes to open.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my individual views in the committee's report on the bill be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, Mr. BUSH's individual views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF MR. BUSH

While I favor a reasonable extension of the present provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, I strongly oppose the "geographical dispersal" amendment added to the bill by a vote of only 6 members of our 15-man committee.

I oppose the proposed amendment because—

1. It greatly overemphasizes the importance of dispersal of industry as a measure of national security.

2. It creates a grave danger that decision-making Federal officials would be exposed to heavy political pressures in procurement and in location of industrial facilities.

3. Instead of strengthening the national defense, it could seriously weaken our mobilization base by forcing dislocations in the industrial and social structures.

DISPERSAL ONLY ONE FACTOR

In an age of rapid development of guided missiles with atomic warheads, no one conscious of the national security would deny that geographical dispersal is a factor which should be taken into consideration. But it is only one factor, and in many cases by no means the most important. An industrial establishment at the South Pole would undoubtedly satisfy the aim of locating plants at a desirably safe distance from the striking base of our present potential enemy. By the same token, if we were to locate all new industrial facilities solely in United States territories in the Pacific and Caribbean, we would come close to achieving maximum geographic dispersal on soil under United States control, considering the industrial development already existing on the mainland. But it is apparent that such action would not best contribute to the efficient economic mobilization of United States resources.

OTHER FACTORS

Other factors that come readily to mind in the economic evaluation of plant location are as follows:

1. Convenient availability of production materials.
2. Adequacy and productivity of labor.
3. Availability of adequate industrial fuel.
4. Sufficiency of transportation facilities.
5. Proximity to markets.
6. Adequacy of distribution facilities.
7. Dependability of power and water.
8. Acceptability of living conditions, including adequacy and cost of housing and community facilities (stores, schools, places of worship, hospitals, water and sewer systems, power and fuel, cultural and recreational facilities).
9. Availability of adequate sites.
10. Favorability of construction costs.
11. Acceptability of climate.
12. Ready accessibility to servicing, repair, and replacement facilities for machinery, components, and parts.
13. Attractiveness of tax structure.
14. Acceptability of State and local laws and regulations.
15. Overall economy and efficiency of operation.
16. Ability to meet deadlines for timely delivery of end products at specified places.
17. In the case of a defense plant, proximity to supply of capable employees who become available for defense work as production for civilian use dwindles during a national emergency.

In time of national emergency the best production with the least possible amount of money is called for, in view of the tremendous costs necessarily heaped upon the American taxpayer during such an emergency, and the need for obtaining the optimum return from the use of each dollar in order to protect the solvency of the Nation and dampen tendencies toward inflation.

As noted by one of our senatorial colleagues experienced in industrial operation, there are some 40 to 50 different considerations a private firm bears in mind in deciding upon a location for its activities.

In large measure, these have determined the present pattern of industrial location. In the absence of any dispersal requirement, industrial facilities in World War II sprang up in many sections of the Nation. Their location was not dictated solely by dispersal considerations, even when constructed by the Federal Government itself. Since the end of the war factors apart from national defense considerations have prompted continuation of the trend to decentralize industry into small communities.

Even the Federal official chiefly relied upon by the proponents of the amendment has testified:

"I have taken this position consistently: That dispersal as an objective cannot be the only objective that can be taken into consideration. I have stressed a great many times my own feeling that one of the objectives we have to keep in mind in this country at all times is an effective functioning urban economy." (See testimony of Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, given to Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of U. S. Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on April 23, 1956, relative to S. 3407, hearings, p. 12.)

Yet the amendment would amend the basic declaration of policy of the Defense Production Act of 1950 by referring only to the policy of geographic dispersal of industrial facilities. While it closes with the condescending note that it is not to "preclude the use of existing industrial facilities," it contains no positive declaration of purpose to encourage the use of existing industrial facilities. By contrast, the current Department of Defense Directive No. 5220.5, dated November 17, 1955, affirmatively requires:

"Every effort will be made to require the use of existing facilities before new facilities are constructed."

The directive expressly recognizes that use of existing facilities is required in order to avoid the excessive cost and resulting social dislocation attendant upon their abandonment.

BROAD SCOPE OF AMENDMENT

Nor does the amendment limit its application to defense plants. It expressly mandates all departments and agencies in the executive branch to apply the principle of geographic dispersal in the following cases:

1. Construction of any Government-owned industrial facility;

2. Aid through Government financial assistance to the construction, expansion, or improvement of any industrial facility; and

3. Procurement of goods and services; whether these actions are taken under the Defense Production Act of 1950 or any other act.

These pervasive directives are included with a purported congressional declaration of policy to promote geographical dispersal of industrial facilities of the United States and to discourage their concentration in limited geographical areas vulnerable to enemy attack.

The amendment would become a new section to the present well-rounded declaration of policy in the Defense Production Act of 1950. As now stated, that policy notes that our mobilization effort continues to require diversion of certain materials and facilities from civilian use to military and related purposes. It further states that this requires development of preparedness programs and expansion of productive capacity and supply beyond levels needed to meet civilian demand. It asserts such development and expansion is needed to reduce the time required for full mobilization in event of attack.

It will be noted that this language is all hinged to our mobilization effort. The amendment introduces the seemingly parallel and equal goal of geographical dispersal of industrial facilities in the United States.

It ignores the fact that many other considerations must be weighed in arriving at the important decision as to the best geographical grouping of the United States industrial complex in the interest of national defense. This grouping should serve the purpose of providing a readily expandable and efficient base for economic mobilization at a minimum cost.

SIMILAR AMENDMENT REJECTED IN 1951

One of our former colleagues described a similar, but less virulent proposed amendment offered unsuccessfully in 1951 to this same statute, as a pork-barrel amendment. The undignified attempt to wrap the barrel in the bunting of national security failed to disguise its true nature. Even the sponsor of this present dispersal amendment joined with 55 of his colleagues in defeating the earlier amendment in 1951 by a vote of 56 to 25, with 2 absentees recording the fact that they would also have voted against the amendment had they been present.

The amendment thus defeated by a better than 2-to-1 vote was less obnoxious than the dispersal amendment in the present bill, because it was not mandatory and it considered the factors of availability of labor and natural resources as well as vulnerability to attack. Moreover, it made no pretense of using the Federal Government's vast and important procurement powers as a means of compelling dispersal.

The arguments used in successfully defeating that proposed amendment are fully as applicable to the present dispersal amendment, in some cases to an even greater degree. These arguments may be summarized as follows:

1. Would remove industry from areas in which a speedy stepup in defense production is possible when civilian-use production slackens.

2. Increases costs to Federal Government (causes decline in tax proceeds due to larger depreciation allowances; compels Government as purchaser of end product to pay higher purchase price; requires Federal financial aid to provide new housing, schools, hospitals, water and sewer systems, and general community facilities).

3. Slows production due to difficulty of attracting capable labor and management to new areas lacking acceptable living conditions.

4. The present industrial location pattern is shaped by overall efficiency and economy, not by fortuity.

5. Forced dispersal interferes with pattern of successful production of best product in shortest time at least expense.

6. If suitable or efficient, areas of our Nation favored by a dispersal requirement would develop an industrial economy anyway.

7. Stagnates existing industrial areas, depriving them of increased efficiency and economy possible through expansion there.

8. Wastes and depreciates value of housing and community facilities readily available in such areas.

9. Leads to wasteful use of Federal funds.

10. Foreshadows Federal measures to freeze labor to jobs in order to make feasible continued operation of forcibly dispersed plants.

11. Opens the door to political pressure in the location of new industrial facilities, using Federal tax funds as an incentive or a blackjack, as required.

12. Places dictatorial power in the hands of nonelected Federal officials, enabling them to favor certain regions over others by using a test not necessarily in the best interest of national defense.

13. The amendment is an unwarranted interference with the balanced judgment of both Government and industry officials in deciding the best location for industrial facilities in the interest of national defense.

14. The initiative of small business working in a free-enterprise system itself leads to dispersal of industry.

15. The amendment embodies a wasteful proposal demanding costly construction of schools, streets, and other community facilities in the vicinity of the new plant sites.

SIMILAR PROVISION ALSO DEFEATED IN 1944

In 1944, a similar effort opposed as forcing an unnatural and uneconomic dispersal of industry also was defeated in the United States Senate. Thus, the present dispersal amendment is not a new idea, but a rehash of earlier proposals twice defeated by this same body.

CHANGES IN ATTACK TECHNIQUES DECREASE VALUE OF DISPERSAL

In successfully opposing the amendment proposed in 1951, the present minority leader noted the swiftly changing pattern of acceptable security measures. Decisions made in the light of obsolete or obsolescent security patterns would result in an unwise location of new and immobile industrial facilities. He noted that accompanying the development of the nature and destructive power of weapons, areas formerly deemed safe from attack became more vulnerable than those deemed subject to attack. Prior to the development of airpower, seaboard areas of the United States were more exposed to enemy attacks than were its inland areas. The coming of airpower abruptly changed this pattern. Inviting attention to this fact in 1951, the distinguished senior Senator from California, Mr. KNOWLAND, stated:

"Today a State in the middle of the country, may be closer, across the polar ice cap, to the threat of Soviet aggression than is a coastal State. By what standards are we to measure the likelihood that a given area would be subject to air attack?"

A mere glance at a map to ascertain great circle distances rudely shakes the idea of increased safety from attack as one leaves the seacoast of the United States. A reorientation of our perspective regarding distances in the United States is called for. From the eye of an observer seated in Moscow, U. S. S. R., Seattle is only 538 miles further than New York City. Chicago is a mere 309 miles more distant from Moscow than New York. Even Los Angeles is only 1,338 miles farther than New York.

Absolute distances airline on the great circle route from Moscow to various United States cities are as follows in order of increasing distance:

City:	*Miles*
New York	4,665
Washington	4,858
Chicago	4,974
Seattle	5,203
Miami	5,731
New Orleans	5,820
San Francisco	5,871
Los Angeles	6,003

Other places in the U. S. S. R. are even closer to some of these cities. Our usual conception of the United States as being over 3,000 miles across from the Atlantic to the Pacific is faulty in great circle distance terms viewed from locations in the U. S. S. R. Taken alone, therefore, dispersal is far less a potential safety factor than it might otherwise seem.

INCREASE IN DESTRUCTIVE POTENTIAL OF WEAPONS DECREASES VALUE OF DISPERSAL

The recent geometrical increase in destructive capacity of weapons and the increase in ability to direct them to a given target at more and more lengthy distances from the launching site tends to make dispersal per se of even less value as a defensive measure. Considering both the increase in destructive capacity of weapons and the ability to hurl them accurately over extremely long distances, it is safe to assume that the value of dispersal as a protective measure will decrease accordingly.

Emphasizing the obsolescence of recent dispersal policy, Dr. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, testified that it had become necessary to abandon the so-called mileage standard whereby a line having a 10-mile radius was drawn around an area of industrialized concentration and installations beyond the 10-mile perimeter were deemed safe from a dispersal standpoint. He stated it was abandoned because it was found to be not practical or feasible. Consequently, industrial facilities located in accordance with such dispersal policy no longer met present dispersal standards. Dr. Flemming concluded that in his opinion the best that could be done under present conditions is to consider each industrial facility on a case-by-case basis, weigh all the factors and arrive at the best possible decision. (Hearings on Defense Production Act Amendments of 1956, p. 14.)

AMENDMENT EITHER UNWISE OR REDUNDANT

But Dr. Flemming noted that ODM is presently following that policy and that "Senator BENNETT'S amendment would not change that one iota." In other words, whatever benefits may be derivable from a dispersal policy, they will not be increased by the present amendment. This leads to the inquiry: Why is the amendment advisable, if it does not add to the power the executive branch already claims to be exercising?

It is claimed it will constitute a confirmation by the Congress of an existing Executive policy. But either the amendment will grant new power by legislation or the existing Executive policy lacks a statutory basis. In the latter event, the present policy is invalid as an unlawful assumption of legislative power, for the Constitution places all legislative power in the Congress. On the other hand, an amendment purporting to give the executive branch authority it already possesses is redundant and unnecessary.

As successor to the National Security Resources Board, ODM already has fallen heir to that phase of its duty described in the currently effective National Security Act of 1947 as—

"The strategic relocation of industries, services, Government, and economic activities, the continuous operation of which is essential to the Nation's security."

But this is limited in effect to defense-related activities. It is not nearly as broad in scope as the present dispersal amendment.

In addition to ODM and the Department of Defense, the Department of the Air Force has a current policy on industrial production readiness that includes dispersal as one among many other factors. (See hearings on Defense Production Act Amendments of 1956, pp. 15–19.)

Both Department of the Air Force and the Department of Defense policies modify application of the dispersal policy by considering such other factors as cost, social dislocation, production delay, use of existing plants before constructing new plants, and timely delivery. The directives caution that the urgency of dispersal should always be weighted against the urgency of the requirement for timely delivery of the vital product involved.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OPPOSES AMENDMENT

It is interesting to note that in his April 30, 1956, letter to Chairman FULBRIGHT, of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Secretary of the Air Force Quarles states that the Department of the Air Force, on behalf of the Department of Defense, does not favor enactment of the present amendment. He explains the Department's position as follows:

"Proper application of the dispersal policy is an extremely complex matter and requires sound judgment and careful consideration of many factors. Each case has its own peculiar circumstances, and, therefore, there is no established pattern or formula which gives proper weight to each factor involved. Consequently, it is important that the departments be allowed to exercise their judgment to the fullest extent within the broad policy as already established in existing Executive directives. Particularly in this regard, it is noted that section 2 of S. 2879 would require that "in the procurement of goods and services under any provision of law, the Department of Defense * * * shall apply to the greatest practicable extent the principle of the geographical dispersal of such facilities in the interest of national defense." This provision would require that consideration be given to a broad general principle not always consistent with other procurement objectives. While S. 2879 is entirely consistent in its intent, with existing Department of Defense policy, the very fact that it exists could give rise to question as to its interpretation in individual cases and, in that sense, be confusing. It is therefore felt that the purpose of S. 2879 is clearly recognized and being accomplished under existing directives, and that the enactment of this bill is undesirable."

OTHER REASONS FOR OPPOSITION

Among recorded opposition to the amendment may be noted the following:

The New England Council, Walter Raleigh, executive vice president:

"Established areas present advantages which cannot be overlooked in providing adequate qualitative and quantitative defense production such as a skilled labor force, experienced administrative personnel, research and scientific facilities, as well as completed facilities of all kinds" (hearings, p. 127).

The New England Governor's Conference, Hon. Dennis J. Roberts, Governor of Rhode Island:

"Location of industry away from sources of raw materials and labor and efficient production will only increase cost and reduce effectiveness of the defense effort" (hearings, p. 127).

New England Governor's Textile Committee, Dr. Seymour E. Harris, chairman:

"Similar proposals made in Truman administration but quickly abandoned—vulnerability one consideration but proximity to markets, materials, transportation, housing, and especially skilled labor very important. Unwise to double or treble costs and cut output in order to be ready for uncertain attack of uncertain time" (hearings, p. 128).

Connecticut Development Commission, Robert P. Lee, chairman:

"Amendment * * * would seriously interfere with normal growth and the creation of job opportunities in practically every well-established industrial area in the country and would be a serious threat to the economy of the entire Northeast. In our opinion Office of Defense Mobilization is presently equipped with sufficient restrictive authority to protect the best interest and safety of the entire country and this proposed amendment is neither necessary nor desirable" (hearings, p. 127).

ODM DISPERSAL POLICY MORE LIMITED

Present ODM policy on dispersal limits it to facilities important to national security. It also recognizes the advantages of ground environment or natural barriers as factors contributing to security of a given facility and thus achieving the benefits claimed for dispersal. But the present amendment's sponsor indicates he expects it to require dispersal among several States rather than on any intrastate basis.

Courts will not interpret a statute as being meaningless; hence they will be inclined to find a grant of new dispersal policy power in this amendment—leading to an overemphasis on dispersal.

The amendment is impaled on the horns of this dilemma: It is either unnecessary and redundant or it grants new and unwise dispersal authority to the executive branch.

CONCLUSION

It must constantly be borne in mind that the purpose of industrial facilities is to pro-

duce end products efficiently and economically as needed—not to remain in absolute safety. This prime reason for the existence of industrial facilities must be considered in weighing the value of safety from attack as a factor in their location. The latter is only one among many factors in measuring the value of a given plant site, and not the most important factor.

In World War II, Germany believed dispersion of its vital industries would amply protect them against any bombing attacks then anticipated. Yet by 1944 bombing raids by the Allied forces destroyed a large segment of Germany's surface industry and also crippled the transportation system, cutting deeply into the effective production of the remaining plants not physically damaged. Too little and too late Germany turned to construction of underground industrial facilities. At the end of hostilities, she had placed underground only 16.6 million square feet of a program calling for 99.5 million square feet of underground construction. This experience should serve as a warning lest we be lulled into a false sense of security concerning the absolute value of dispersion.

Constant care must be exercised in order that dispersed industry may not become displaced industry.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to my distinguished colleague [Mr. PURTELL].

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the motion to table the so-called Bennett amendment.

It is my belief that the adoption of such an amendment as the proposed amendment, section 4, could and, in all probability, would ultimately lead to extreme confusion and disorder in the administration of the act by the executive agencies which are charged with the responsibility for carrying out its purposes.

After carefully reading the record of the testimony presented during the hearings held by the committee, I am unable to find any evidence whatsoever as to the necessity of such a proposed amendment. On the other hand, there is evidence in the record to support my contention that the addition of this amendment to the act would be undesirable since the interpretation of this new language could, in the light of the existing dispersal policy, be highly confusing.

When the author of this amendment appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee in support of his amendment, he stated:

> The amendment would not require existing facilities to be dispersed. It would require all executive agencies and departments to apply, to the greatest practicable extent, the principle of dispersion in locating all new industrial facilities in which the Government renders financial assistance.

If the effect of this proposal is not to disturb existing defense facilities as far as dispersal is concerned, then there would not appear to be any logical reason for adopting this amendment, since present dispersal policy is quite clear with regard to the construction of any new facilities necessary for our national defense.

If the purpose of this amendment is merely to reiterate, as we are led to believe, the existing policy of placement of defense facilities, why then does it spell out geographical dispersal only and fail to enumerate the many other factors that are now considered in the locating of new defense construction? The only logical answer that I can give is that the plain import of this proposal is to place paramount importance upon the term "geographical dispersal" to the detriment of all other factors which should and have been taken into consideration in the past.

There is sufficient legislation now to carry out this vital program. So testified the Secretary of Commerce, whose Department bears the major responsibility for operations under the act affecting the greater portion of American industry. When questioned by the committee regarding his position on the amendment, Secretary Weeks stated:

> I think, Senator, that we probably have legislation on the books sufficient to do the job, if it can be done—the job of dispersion. * * * With all due regard for Sena- BENNETT'S amendment, I do not think it would help us to get along on the road very much faster than we are.
>
> This amendment, I would repeat, I do not think would do much that we are not doing now. * * * But I cannot see that this amendment is necessary or does anything that we are not trying to do today.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PURTELL. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the Senator seen the letter which Secretary Weeks wrote to the chairman of the committee, in which he said:

> In view of present practices of the executive branch, a congressional statement of the importance of dispersal would be helpful in securing public cooperation.

Mr. PURTELL. From what page is the Senator quoting? I have quoted from the testimony given before the committee by Secretary Weeks.

Mr. BENNETT. I am quoting from page 115 of the official record of hearings before the committee.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator indicate the portion of the letter from which he is quoting?

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps the Senator would like to read the whole paragraph, which begins with the words "Although this Department is of the opinion." It is a short paragraph.

Mr. PURTELL. It has been called to my attention—and I assume the Senator would like to have it called to his attention also—that the testimony of the Secretary of Commerce from which I am reading followed the receipt of the letter. Therefore, I would say that the information I am giving, contained in his testimony, was his latest pronouncement on the subject.

Mr. BENNETT. In other words, when he was sitting in his office calmly writing a letter to the committee, he took a certain position, but when he came before the committee, under questioning from the very able Senator from the same area in New England, he changed his mind? Is that what the Senator means?

Mr. PURTELL. I do not agree with the Senator from Utah at all.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PURTELL. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Secretary Weeks in his letter did not endorse the language of section 4 of the bill. I hope the Senator from Utah is not trying to create the impression that he did endorse it. He said he endorsed the principle of Congress reiterating, in legislative form, what the order said. He did not endorse the language of the amendment. We are finding fault with that language. That is not what the order says.

Mr. PURTELL. I quote from the letter which the Senator has called to my attention:

> Although this Department is of the opinion that it would be unnecessary to provide guidance on the subject of dispersal and carrying out the Defense Production Act in view of present practices of the executive branch, a congressional statement of the importance of dispersal would be helpful in securing public cooperation.

That is entirely different—and I am sure the Senator will agree with me—from an endorsement of the proposed amendment. That is the letter the Senator asked me to read.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PURTELL. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BENNETT. It seems to me that the objective of the proposed amendment is exactly the objective suggested by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. PURTELL. I beg to differ with the Senator from Utah. As a matter of fact, the Senator well knows that his proposal is not the language used in the directive of the ODM.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PURTELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not a fact that that letter was the Secretary's comment he was requested to make on the amendment of the Senator from Utah? Was not that letter in response to a request for his comments?

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct. I appreciate the observations of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no confusion about that.

Mr. PURTELL. What he was doing was talking about the Director of the ODM, not the language of the proposed amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The first paragraph of the letter says what it was. There is no doubt about it. It was an endorsement of the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. PURTELL. The Senator knows that is not exactly so. When the Secretary of Commerce appeared before the committee, he made the statement I read, and I believe that at that meeting the Senator from Utah was present.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In order to clarify the matter, let me say, if the Senator will permit me to do so, that the first paragraph specifically refers to the amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Utah, and that is the amendment now in question. I refer to the first paragraph of the letter on page 115 of the hearings. That letter is dated April 20. The Secretary of Commerce was directly commenting on the Senator's amendment.

Mr. PURTELL. I do not believe he was commenting on the amendment

when he said what I said he said after the letter had been written.

The views of the Department of the Air Force lend further support to the rejection of the Bennett amendment. In his report to the committee, Secretary Quarles wrote:

Proper application of the dispersal policy is an extremely complex matter and requires sound judgment and careful consideration of many factors. Each case has its own peculiar circumstances and, therefore, there is no established pattern or formula which gives proper weight to each factor involved. Consequently, it is important that the departments be allowed to exercise their judgment to the fullest extent within the broad policy as already established in existing executive directives. Particularly in this regard, it is noted that section 2 of S. 2879 would require that "in the procurement of goods and services under any provision of law, the Department of Defense * * * shall apply to the greatest practicable extent the principle of the geographical dispersal of such facilities in the interest of national defense." This provision would require that consideration be given to a broad general principle not always consistent with other procurement objectives. While S. 2879 is entirely consistent in its intent, with existing Department of Defense policy, the very fact that it exists could give rise to question as to its interpretation in individual cases and, in that sense, be confusing. It is therefore, felt that the purpose of S. 2879 is clearly recognized and being accomplished under existing directives, and that the enactment of this bill is undesirable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. PURTELL. May I have 2 more minutes?

Mr. BUSH. I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Connecticut.

Mr. PURTELL. On page 4 of the committee report it is stated:

It is the considered view of the committee that the amendment will bring public support to the agencies dispersal program, and thereby contribute to the national security.

The principle of geographical dispersal is vital to our national security. Congress should not shirk responsibility for this policy. The committee urges that Congress give its full support to the agencies working on this program, through the enactment of this amendment.

If this is what the amendment is to accomplish, namely a reaffirmation of an existing dispersal program, why is it necessary at all to insert entirely new language in the act when a statement in the report itself would be more than sufficient. If there is concern over the existing dispersal program, then I believe that the Secretary of Commerce offered a very good suggestion when he said:

I would think that if the committee wanted, in its report on the bill or otherwise, to instruct ODM and the Commerce Department to give an exhaustive look at what we are accomplishing and how we are proceeding and make recommendations, if there are any, that would come from such a study, that would be highly desirable.

There does not appear to be any clear-cut reason for the approval of this amendment and I urge the Senate to reject it.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will my colleague the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to table.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I shall be very brief.

Ever since the enactment of the National Security Act of 1947 and the Defense Production Act of 1950, the Government of the United States has been interested in a sound policy of dispersal of defense industries. All the people of the United States agree that a sound policy of dispersal should prevail with respect to the awarding by our Government of defense industrial contracts.

Again and again, as new information has come to the executive agencies of the Federal Government, the dispersal policy has been modernized and kept up to date.

Last January a very carefully considered dispersal order was adopted by the Office of Defense Mobilization, to take the place of one which had been in effect prior thereto. One paragraph of the order which is now in effect reads as follows:

1. Policy: It is the policy of the United States to encourage and, when appropriate, to require that new facilities and major expansions of existing facilities important to national security be located, insofar as practicable, so as to reduce the risk of damage in the event of attack; and to encourage and, when appropriate, require the incorporation of protective construction features in new and existing facilities to provide resistance to weapons effects suitable to the locations of said facilities.

Then the order carefully enumerates the criteria according to which the Department of Defense and, indeed, all the departments of the Government of the United States, shall conduct themselves with respect to the awarding of contracts in the defense field.

Where does the Department of Defense stand on the suggestion that the Bennett amendment be written into law? I call the attention of the Senator from Arkansas to the fact that the Department of Defense is opposed to the amendment. I ask unanimous consent that a letter written by the Department of the Air Force on the 30th of April 1956, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, April 30, 1956.

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your recent request to the Secretary of Defense for a report on S. 2879, 84th Congress, a bill "to promote the dispersal of industrial facilities in the interest of national defense." The Department of the Air Force has been assigned the responsibility for expressing the views of the Department of Defense.

Section 1 of S. 2879 declares that it is the policy of the Congress to promote geographical dispersal of industrial facilities in the interest of national defense, and to discourage the concentration of such production facilities in areas which are vulnerable to attack. Sections 2 and 3 of the bill prescribe a course of conduct intended to carry out that policy.

The Department of the Air Force on behalf of the Department of Defense, while in agreement with the general objective of the bill, does not favor its enactment for the following reasons:

The Department of Defense policy with respect to industrial dispersal is outlined in Department of Defense Directive No. 5220.5 dated November 17, 1955. The criteria outlined in this directive that are to be considered in seeking a solution to the problem of dispersal are (1) that dispersal will be the key factor in selection of additional sources for an item for which there are multiple sources; (2) dispersal will be one of the prime considerations in the location of new facility construction particularly when furnished at Government expense or with Federal aid to construction although this may not necessarily apply to those new facilities which constitute a desirable, but relatively minor, adjunct to existing defense facilities; (3) that all facilities will be maintained in use as required, and every effort will be made to require the use of existing facilities before new facilities are constructed; (4) that the urgency of dispersal should always be weighed against the urgency of the request for timely delivery of the vital products involved; and (5) that consistent with the preceding, the objective shall be to avoid the tendency toward overconcentration of critical defense facilities in target areas.

The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization by virtue of the authority vested in him, issued on January 11, 1956, Defense Mobilization Order I–19, subject: "Dispersion and Protective Construction—Policy, Criteria, Responsibilities." This order indicates that:

"It is the policy of the United States to encourage and, when appropriate, to require that new facilities and major expansions of existing facilities important to national security be located, insofar as practicable, so as to reduce the risk of damage in the event of attack; and to encourage and, when appropriate, require the incorporation of protective construction features in new and existing facilities to provide resistance to weapons effects suitable to the locations of said facilities."

Proper application of the dispersal policy is an extremely complex matter and requires sound judgment and careful consideration of many factors. Each case has its own peculiar circumstances, and therefore, there is no established pattern or formula which gives proper weight to each factor involved. Consequently, it is important that the departments be allowed to exercise their judgment to the fullest extent within the broad policy as already established in existing Executive directives. Particularly in this regard, it is noted that section 2 or S. 2879 would require that "in the procurement of goods and services under any provision of law, the Department of Defense * * * shall apply to the greatest practicable extent the principle of the geographical dispersal of such facilities in the interest of national defense." This provision would require that consideration be given to a broad general principle not always consistent with other procurement objectives. While S. 2879 is entirely consistent in its intent, with existing Department of Defense policy, the very fact that it exists could give rise to question as to its interpretation in individual cases and, in that sense, be confusing. It is therefore felt that the purpose of S. 2879 is clearly recognized and being accomplished under existing directives, and that the enactment of this bill is undesirable.

Insofar as the budgetary effect on the Department of Defense is concerned, section 3 of S. 2879 would appear to negate any adverse effect thereon.

This report has been coordinated within the Department of Defense in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD A. QUARLES.

Mr. KUCHEL. I quote a portion of the letter:

The Department of the Air Force, on behalf of the Department of Defense, while in agreement with the general objective of the bill, does not favor its enactment for the following reasons:

I wish to say to my good friend from Arkansas that as I listened to his comments with respect to the Nelson report, I heard nothing which would indicate that the present Government policy of dispersal is being ineptly applied or is not being properly applied in the field in which it operates.

Mr. President, much has been said during the course of this debate by my able colleague from California, my able colleagues from Connecticut, and my able colleague from Rhode Island with respect to the ill-considered language of the so-called Bennett amendment. I have the greatest respect for the Senator from Utah. I know of no finer man in this body than is the author of the amendment, but the fact remains that the amendment is ill-considered. For the first time we hear such phrases as "limited geographic areas" and "geographic dispersion." Who is going to sit in judgment as to what those phrases mean if Congress adopts the Bennett amendment and writes it into the law?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I fully concur in the Senator's statement, but if he will go a bit further, he will find the following language in the amendment:

In the construction of any Government-owned industrial facilities, in the rendition of any Government financial assistance for the construction, expansion, or improvement of any industrial facilities, and in the procurement of goods and services.

Does not the Senator believe that language is broad enough to affect a small-business man or a small supplier who may, in turn, be called upon to supply larger industries, whether it be for defense or otherwise?

Mr. KUCHEL. My colleague is 100 percent correct. There is no limitation upon the words which have been used in this particular amendment. So far as the specific point to which my colleague has alluded, unquestionably any interpretation of the language used would make this amendment apply to just such a situation as my able colleague from California has indicated. That is so, Mr. President, it seems to me, as to every sentence in the amendment. It is wide open. It does not apply merely to the defense of our country. It utilizes new words and phrases rather than those which have been carefully drafted and perfected and which for the past several years have formed the basis of a sound policy of dispersal for our country.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. First, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from California, of the Senators from Connecticut, and of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Is it not true that this proposal is not new? I believe that in 1951 it was brought up, and as early as 1944 similar amendments were considered by the Senate, but each time the Senate, in its wisdom, saw fit to reject such an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from Michigan is completely correct in his recollection of the history. Similar proposals have been dealt with in prior sessions of the Congress.

Mr. POTTER. Is it not true that if it were the intention of the authors of the amendment to keep in effect present dispersal policies they would have included other factors which are now a part of our Government policy? If we intend to put all the emphasis on geographic location, chaos might develop in the national economy and our whole industrial structure. Irrespective of whoever might be in the executive branch of the Government, there would be pressure, for political considerations, to move industrial plants.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is exactly correct, and he has underlined one of the important points to be made in this contest.

Mr. President, I wish to say a further word. It has been suggested by those who sponsor the amendment that interpretation would be difficult if it spelled out all the criteria.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has again expired.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, of course, interpretation is difficult in a difficult problem such as this, but the Government of the United States has proceeded in a sound fashion with respect to dispersal, and it has a lengthy list of criteria which all Federal agencies are required to follow. Why, Mr. President, throw it all out the window and adopt the very loose language which appears in the amendment which is now before the Senate?

I hope the motion of my able colleague from Connecticut will prevail and that once again the Senate will reject an attempt to write something into the law which is not in the best interest of the people and of the Government of the United States.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time remains on each side with reference to this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). There are 9 minutes remaining of the time of the Senator from Connecticut, and the opposition has used no time whatever.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, during the debate, in the time provided by the supporters of the motion to lay on the table, I think most of the case has been made. I have prepared a speech which would require about 20 minutes to deliver. Included in it are several exhibits which I should like to have printed in the RECORD. In order to bring this matter to a head I wish to make a short statement with reference to the speech, put the speech into the RECORD without reading it, and call for a quorum, after which we may have a vote on the subject, the yeas and nays having been ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator complete his oral statement in whatever time he wishes to use, put his prepared statement into the RECORD, and then if both sides yield back all their remaining time, we can have a quorum call without the time being charged to either side.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I have prepared be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, together with certain exhibits which fit properly into the remarks. That having been done, I am prepared to agree that all time in opposition to the motion be yielded back.

There being no objection, the speech and exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR BENNETT ON INDUSTRIAL DISPERSAL

Since I am the author of the disputed amendment on industrial dispersal which is in the Defense Production Act, I feel it would be appropriate to speak briefly concerning that amendment, especially in view of its importance to national security and the misapprehensions which have arisen with regard to it. First of all, I wish to acknowledge the fine support this amendment has received from the committee chairman and other members of the majority and minority. This matter of industrial dispersal deserves that sort of bipartisan support.

If it were not for the "awful arithmetic" of nuclear weapons and the fact of a shrunken world—a world which will grow even smaller—there would be little reason to advocate the geographical dispersal of this Nation's industrial facilities. However, two objectives seem paramount with regard to our national security. First, this Nation must possess retaliatory power of tremendous proportions to use in the event of an attack. Second, this Nation must have the capacity to survive and rise from the ashes of an atomic attack—if one comes. Fortunately, in our preparations for both retaliation and recuperation we may also deter the enemy from attacking. As one of our military leaders has said, "We believe, however, that our primary objective is to convince the enemy that he should not attack, and if we can deter the enemy from attacking, we have achieved a 100-percent air defense."

One of the best ways we have to insure the survival of this Nation in the event of

an attack is the dispersal of our critical facilities. Dispersal is still sound nonmilitary defense. To argue that dispersal is obsolete is to adopt an attitude of "eat, drink, and be merry for tomorrow we die." Dispersal is not absolute security; nothing is today. But dispersal does offer another means by which we can take added precautions which may save lives and facilities if an attack comes. I have little sympathy for the argument that because 30 million people might be killed in atomic attack that to worry about saving 10 million is foolish. This is saying that because absolute security is unattainable, relative security is of little value. We must do all we can. We must not adopt an attitude of hopelessness.

I should like now to direct the attention of this body to some of the facts concerning the present concentration of industry in the United States.

One study indicates two H-bombs could destroy one-third of our steelmaking capacity and 10 H-bombs could destroy three-fourths of our steel industry. Bomb placements on 5 cities: Pittsburgh, Chicago, Youngstown, Cleveland, and Detroit, would destroy 50 percent of our steel industry. Five additional bombs would bring the total to nearly 75 percent. Two-thirds of the ingotmaking capacity of the United States is concentrated in eight districts.

Not only are plants vulnerable but so are the workers who live in proximity to the plants. I have a chart showing the concentration of industrial workers in nine different types of industries which my colleagues may wish to view. I insert in my remarks a table prepared by the Defense Department showing this same concentration of skilled workers. It is noteworthy with regard to many of those industries that workers comprising over 50 percent of the United States total live in only 17 areas. Many of these areas would be overlapped by H-bomb fallouts. Forty-five percent of the Nation's people and industry are within range of submarine-launched missiles, according to Project East River.

I insert in my remarks excerpts from the testimony by Gen. Omar Bradley and Gen. Carl Spaatz before the Senate Subcommittee on the Air Force. In this testimony General Spaatz points up the fact that the initial attack by the Russians need not come by airpower alone. The Soviets have over 400 submarines with which they can approach our coastlines. The submarines could lob guided missiles with atomic warheads. The general reminded us of the pitiable position we were once in with regard to a mere 50 German subs. Under questioning by the junior Senator from Washington, General Spaatz regarded the 500-mile missile—not the future ICBM—when launched from subs as capable of crippling our Nation's industry and as posing a serious threat to our existence. If not used in the initial attack, Soviet submarines, in the view of General Partridge, would pose a "great threat to us, because some 30 percent of the profitable targets in the United States lie within 150 miles of the shores." The general says if the Soviets put just 50 bombs on target, 40 percent of our population and 50 percent of our key facilities, and 60 percent of our industry could be destroyed. He says further that such an attack would be "catastrophic."

I insert in my remarks excerpts from the testimony of General Partridge before the Senate Armed Services Committee on May 25, 1956. Again General Partridge stresses that certainly some Soviet bombers would get through, and that those areas containing 58 percent of our population and 75 percent of our industry, along with the SAC bases and AEC installations would be considered prime targets. He stresses, too, that the Soviets would strive for surprise.

Another example of our vulnerability is the chemical processing industry. Eight H-bombs could destroy plants employing 20 percent of all employees in chemical processing industries, more than 40 percent of our petroleum refining capacity, and 46 percent of our chemistry plants, and 52 percent of the Nation's skilled workers who produce instruments. In the Great Lakes region, for example, are to be found 47 percent of our electrical machinery manufacturing and 40 percent of our nonelectrical machinery production. Only four H-bombs would be required to take out nearly half of our petroleum processing industry.

Examples could be multiplied ad infinitum. I have brought these few to the attention of the Senate to indicate the problem we face. Of course, we can react to this challenge in various ways. We can do nothing. We can convulse our Nation by the uprooting of existing industry. Or we can concentrate on dispersing new facilities over a period of time. No one seriously entertains the idea of moving existing industry. No one can seriously advocate doing nothing. We have wisely chosen a middle course aimed at new facilities. I emphasize at this point that the provision in this bill does not relate to existing industry. It does state, however, that in the construction of new facilities in which the Government renders financial assistance, geographical dispersal shall be one of the factors to be taken into consideration. This seems to me to be a minimum effort to achieve dispersal. It is realistic yet effective. Of course, Government cannot tell industry where it can build, but the Goverenment can refuse financial assistance unless a dispersed site is selected from among several suggested alternatives. The taxpayer at least ought to have the assurance that his money is not being spent to increase our already dangerous vulnerability.

One estimate has been made indicating that if we channeled 78 percent of the normal private investment for the next 10 years into dispersed areas we'd have as much dispersed capacity as we had total capacity in 1950.

Some have said we already have an industrial dispersal program. That is true. But the man who manages that program, Dr. Flemming, feels very strongly that the program would be strengthened if Congress were to declare itself on the matter. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point remarks by Dr. Flemming before the House Committee on Government Operations.

The Administrator of our Federal civil-defense program, Val Peterson, feels the same way about Congress asserting itself with regard to dispersal. In a statement before that same committee Mr. Peterson said, "In the era of intercontinental ballistic missiles, when our potential tactical warning time will be drastically shortened, dispersal appears the most effective preattack defense measure." I ask unanimous consent to insert the context of that remark at this point in the RECORD.

By way of underlining the need for congressional support of dispersal, I should like to draw the Senate's attention to excerpts from a press conference held by the former Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Talbott, to defend his proposal to disperse our future aircraft plants. I ask unanimous consent to have that excerpt inserted in my remarks.

The press asked Secretary Talbott if Congress backed him up in his policy of dispersal. All Mr. Talbott could say was that the President, Dr. Flemming, and Secretary Wilson were for it. He was asked if Congress had ever endorsed dispersal. He said Congress had discussed it. Finally, an aide said Congress had given tacit concurrence to dispersal.

On a question of this type there should be no doubt in anyone's mind as to where Congress stands. No Secretary of the Air Force should again feel that we aren't with him, or that there is an absence of approval by Congress of something so vital to our national security.

I do not think it redundant for Congress to speak out when so much is at stake. This provision may not change the mechanics of this program but it will certainly give it emphasis and support and strengthen the hands of those who administer it.

I insert editorials from the Atlanta Constitution, Des Moines Register, and the Tampa Times in favor of dispersal. I also insert an article from the Harvard Business Review entitled "Industry Must Prepare for Atomic Attack." Also a statement by the Federation of American Scientists, representing 2,000 scientists favoring this dispersal provision in the pending bill.

I want to emphasize again that this amendment, agreed to by the committee, does not make dispersal the sole factor in locating plants. A company seeking to locate a new plant site will obviously take into consideration many other factors. For instance, the firm would probably look for a favorable local tax structure, but surely Congress does not need to write that into the bill. As the mechanics of this program operate, the same firm would be advised (assuming there was no need for an exception) that if Government aid was to be given it should locate in a dispersed site. Site suggestions are usually made by our Federal officials. The company is free then to test several prospective sites against all the other criteria which are important to a new facility.

It seems to me there is a real distinction between Congress asserting itself with regard to dispersal as a criterion and having Congress say, "No plants will be located where there is no water or electricity." Our businessmen and Federal officials are wise enough to see that distinction.

Some have said that if this provision stays in the bill it means dispersal will run rampant. I am sure that will not be the case; but our progress has been slight and, if anything, we have erred on the side of timidity with regard to the location of critical facilities. The 1955 review of Project East River concluded that our progress had been "disappointing." In what I consider an understatement, that review also said: "It is fair to state that the political and economic obstacles to any such program were underestimated by project East River."

The review committee, composed of distinguished citizens, called for more Federal leadership and for the Federal Government to set an example in new Federal construction. We need to set that example both by a declaration of policy and in connection with Federal construction.

I insert a copy of a letter sent to the heads of all Federal agencies and departments with regard to new construction, urging dispersal, wherever possible, of new Federal facilities. The provision in this bill covers this facet of dispersal, too. I see no reason why Congress, which appropriates the money for new Federal buildings and construction, should not concern itself with where those facilities are to be located, especially if they are critical in nature.

Our program of utilizing tax amortizations to effect dispersal has helped; but since there is a decline in our possibilities for dispersal through that means, we must utilize such things as our procurement program to aid in dispersing facilities.

I insert a table showing the disposition of certificates of necessity for the calendar year 1953. This table indicates that of 3,770 applications, 3,111 were for less than $1 million and, therefore, dispersal did not apply. Of the remainder, laying aside ODM norms, only 210 met dispersal criteria involving $1.6 million out of over $5 million in original applications. Only about 4.9 percent of the total cases were told to disperse or else.

Mention has been made that dispersal did not help Germany in World War II. It is

true, they encountered difficulty after dispersing certain facilities. But if Germany had followed a system of multiple sources of supply for critical items, she would have been much stronger. Over 50 percent of her antifriction bearings were produced in Schweinfurt. After successful Allied bombings of Schweinfurt, according to our strategic bombing survey, Germany's interdependent industry was nearly paralyzed.

Multiple source of supply is the key to real dispersal. It is a realistic, yet effective, way of achieving dispersion. It can be attained by guiding our new facilities into areas which are dispersed. Surely Congress will want to join with the Executive in implementing a program of this type. This program of dispersal may spell survival for millions of Americans in the event of attack. As I have said before, I can see no reason for Congress to remain silent with so much at stake. I urge the Senate to support this provision and to oppose any efforts to delete it from the bill.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (SUPPLY AND LOGISTICS), MOBILIZATION PLANNING AND STATISTICS DIVISION, INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES PROTECTION BRANCH

Concentration of essential defense industries in United States metropolitan areas based on employment in 1953

Type of manufacture	Percent of United States total in—		
	Top 17 areas	Top 35 areas	57 areas
Chemicals	41.9	48.9	53.8
Petroleum and coal products	49.1	57.9	61.9
Rubber products	29.0	55.8	67.2
Primary metals	54.8	63.2	72.3
Fabricated metals	54.6	64.1	72.7
Machinery (except electrical)	42.6	56.2	66.9
Electrical machinery	58.1	69.6	73.2
Transportation equipment	54.2	68.9	80.0
Instruments	47.8	72.4	76.8
Total essential defense industry	50.0	62.6	71.3
United States urban population	47.8	57.5	64.9

Source: Employment reported in County Business Patterns, 1953, published by U. S. Department of Commerce and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

AREAS INCLUDED IN EMPLOYMENT DATA

In terms of industrial (manufacturing) employment in March 1953, the 16 top-ranking metropolitan areas were: New York-northeast New Jersey; Chicago, Ill.: Detroit, Mich.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Cleveland, Ohio; St. Louis, Mo.; Boston, Mass.; Buffalo, N. Y.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Baltimore, Md.; Hartford-New Britain, Conn.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Youngstown, Ohio; San Francisco-Oakland, Calif.

NOTE.—Because it is the seat of government, Washington, D. C., is considered as important as any of the above cities, and the attached statistics include it in the top 17 areas.)

The next 18 areas are: Indianapolis, Ind.; Akron, Ohio; Rochester, N. Y.; Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.; Dayton, Ohio; Kansas City, Mo.-Kans.; Flint, Mich.; Bridgeport, Conn.; Toledo, Ohio; Canton, Ohio; Providence, R. I.; Columbus, Ohio; Houston, Tex.; Albany-Schenectady-Troy, N. Y.; Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, Pa.; Syracuse, N. Y.; Wichita, Kans.; Seattle, Wash.

The following 22 areas are included: Louisville, Ky.; Springfield-Holyoke, Mass.; South Bend, Ind.; San Diego, Calif.; Birmingham, Ala.; Davenport, Iowa, and Rock Island-Moline, Ill.; Waterbury, Conn.; Dallas, Tex.; Evansville, Ind.; Wheeling, W. Va.; and Steubenville, Ohio; Erie, Pa.; Rockford, Ill.; Grand Rapids, Mich.; Fort Worth, Tex.; Loraine-Elyria, Ohio; Fort Wayne, Ind.; Peoria, Ill.; Worcester, Mass.; Trenton, N. J.; New Haven, Conn.; New Orleans, La.; Atlanta, Ga.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE AIR FORCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

(Pp. 27, 41, 57)

General BRADLEY. Not unless we can protect our industry while we are so doing. I don't think that we are going to fight the whole war with what we have in being. I hope that we can protect our industry and our country to the point where we can continue to produce. So I would hestitate to say we had to win the war with the forces in being on D-day, but we might lose it if we did not protect ourselves to the point where we could continue to produce.

* * * * *

General SPAATZ. I would assume he could. I think he can; yes. Now we come to another problem. You are talking now about Russian airpower vis-a-vis our airpower. But the attack, the initial attack by the Russians, if they make it, is not confined to airpower. They have over 400 submarines, and quite obviously they are not going to attack us until they are ready to attack, and then make a surprise attack. Those submarines at such time will be equipped with guided missiles. If they turn those 400 submarines loose in the 2 oceans and approach our coastlines, and start lobbing those guided missiles with atomic warheads around, that is another serious threat which we must be prepared to meet. Everyone remembers back in the early days of World War II the pitiable position of our military strength in meeting the 30 or 45 German submarines hovering off our coast at that time. If you multiply that by a factor of 10 or more and add atomic guided missiles, you will see that becomes quite a problem.

* * * * *

Senator JACKSON. Assume the 500-mile ballistic missile, as you pointed out, isn't it a fact that you could reach a substantial part of the industrial heartland of the United States from our coasts, the three coasts?

General SPAATZ. Yes; the most important part.

Senator JACKSON. The most important part?

General SPAATZ. The most important part, I would say.

Senator JACKSON. Of the United States industrial complex?

General SPAATZ. Yes, sir.

Senator JACKSON. Insofar as our warmaking or defense-making potential is concerned?

General SPAATZ. Yes; insofar as our existence as a nation is concerned.

STATEMENT OF GENERAL PARTRIDGE BEFORE THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE, MAY 25, 1956

In evaluating the Soviet threat we feel that the Soviets, if they attack at all, would launch a very large-scale air attack against this country and that they would do their best to achieve surprise.

* * * * *

If unopposed, we believe that a large percentage of the bombers launched by the Soviets could reach their targets in the United States.

* * * * *

We believe that the Soviets would attack not only the large metropolitan areas that contain the bulk of our population and industry, but that they would also attack the bases from which we mount our retaliatory strikes.

* * * * *

Fifty-five percent of the population of the country and about 75 percent of its industry are concentrated in 170 metropolitan areas. I believe these areas, plus the Strategic Air Command's bases and the Atomic Energy Commission's facilities, would be considered prime targets by the Russians.

* * * * *

If the Russians successfully attacked the 50 most important metropolitan area targets in the complex you have described, how much of our population and industry would this bring under fire? About 40 percent of the population and about 60 percent of the industry of the country.

OUTLINE OF TESTIMONY OF ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, DIRECTOR, BEFORE THE MILITARY OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

(Pp. 10, 11, 22, 23)

We also believe, however, that attention must be given to steps that would help to insure the fact that a portion of our mobilization base would be available following an attack on this country for use in connection with survival and rehabilitation activities, as well as for the production of those few essential military end items that would be required during the first phase following an attack and to resume production on other items as soon as possible in order to prepare for the second phase. This is why we issued Defense Mobilization Order I–19 to take the place of a dispersal policy that had been in effect since 1951.

* * * * *

Except under very unusual circumstances, we will not grant fast tax writeoffs unless the facility is located in conformity with the advice of the Department of Commerce. The Defense Department is applying the policy to military projects and to industrial facilities to which it has a special interest.

* * * * *

Personally, I feel, however, that programs that are now being carried forward in this area and programs that may be inaugurated in this area do not rest on as sound a foundation as should be the case: (1) There is a tendency on the part of some citizens to ignore the problems in this area in the hope that it will never be necessary to face them. (2) On the other hand, there is a tendency on the part of others to regard the problems as being of such magnitude as to defy solution. (3) It is clear that a widespread acceptance of either point of view could lead to a situation where we would be giving up one of our most effective deterrents to war. I have had the feeling, and still have the feeling, that in order to make the maximum possible progress in this area, the legislative branch and the executive branch should unite in expressing their convictions relative to the absolute necessity of facing these problems in a realistic manner, and also in expressing their joint judgment relative to the broad framework of policies within which the solution to these problems should be worked out.

1. I have the feeling that this objective could be realized if, for example, there should be established a joint Legislative-Executive Commission to which such an assignment would be made.

2. It would be my hope that such a Commission could develop an agreed-upon statement of policies to be followed in this area which would be approved by the Members of both Houses of Congress and by the President.

3. Such a statement would provide the foundation on which the executive branch and the legislative branch could develop programs which would be received with the consideration that should be accorded them by the citizens of this country because these citizens would know that they had the endorsement not only of the executive branch but also of the elected representatives of the people.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE AIR FORCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

(Pp. 239, 264)

A Soviet submarine attack would, however, pose a great threat to us after the initial attack, because some 30 percent of the profitable targets in the United States lie within 150 miles of the shores.

* * * * *

You may think that 170 targets is a very small number, but let's look at the concentration of resources in those target areas. If we assume that the Russians could push home an attack of only—that would put just 50 bombs on the target, and that the bombs were placed properly, and were of the proper size, we would destroy or at least bring under fire about 40 percent of the population, 50 percent of the key facilities, and 60 percent of the industry of the United States, total.

* * * * *

If all 170 targets were successfully attacked some 55–58 percent of the population and 75 percent of the industry would be brought under fire, with disastrous results. I am sure you all agree that such an attack (deletion by Department of Defense censor) in this country would be catastrophic.

General PARTRIDGE. (Deletion by Department of Defense censor.) In a few years. Our capability is growing all the time. As a matter of doctrine, we believe that the best defense is a good offense, and we believe that our primary mission in the Air Defense Command is to defend the bases from which the Strategic Air Command is going to operate (deletion by Department of Defense censor). We believe also that we have to provide a reasonable, an equitable protection for the key facilities, the population centers, and our industry.

* * * * *

We believe, however, that our primary objective is to convince the enemy that he should not attack, and if we can deter the enemy from attacking we have achieved a 100-percent air defense.

STATEMENT FOR THE MILITARY OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, VAL PETERSON, ADMINISTRATOR

In this connection I repeat there are only two essential principles with any validity against nuclear weapons: Distance and shielding.

As far as distance is concerned we have two ways of using distance: Evacuation, both strategic and tactical, which I have mentioned briefly in connection with the survival plan studies, and dispersal. In talking of dispersal I do not mean transplanting existing industry to areas that may now be less vulnerable, but simply that in the future expansions of industry be placed so as to reduce our vulnerability. I am convinced that recent enormous advances in communications and transportation make possible such dispersal without sacrifice of productive strength.

In the era of intercontinental ballistic missiles, when our potential tactical warning time will be drastically shortened, dispersal appears the most effective pre-attack defense measure.

MINUTES OF PRESS BRIEFING HELD BY THE HONORABLE HAROLD E. TALBOTT, SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 1955, THE PENTAGON, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Participant: The Honorable Roger Lewis, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Materiel).

The PRESS. Mr. Secretary, Congress has never given any endorsement to this dispersal policy, have they?

Secretary TALBOTT. They have discussed it, that is all.

The PRESS. Ho do you feel? Do you feel you've got pretty good backing in Congress if there is going to be any argument about this?

Secretary TALBOTT. I have talked to—the President knows all about this dispersal and is for it and so is Dr. Flemming, and so is Secretary Wilson. They all have endorsed the policy of dispersal.

Mr. MCCONE. If I could inject a thought there, Mr. Secretary. Congress through the years has appropriated funds for the activation of any number of plants which would follow a pattern of dispersal such as Wichita and Tulsa and Marietta.

[From the Atlanta Constitution of April 30, 1956]

INDUSTRIAL DISPERSAL IS A "MUST" FOR DEFENSE

A recent extensive study of United States civil defense by a group of leading citizens came up with the conclusion that the present program is worse than no program at all.

While this is a probable exaggeration, there is no reason to rejoice over the progress that has been made in preparing this country for a possible atomic attack. Needless to say, this lack of preparation is inviting needless casualties should such an attack occur.

One of the failures, according to the study, is the slowness in industrial dispersal. Otto L. Nelson, Jr., head of the group, told a House Government Operations Subcommittee that the Soviets might never attack if they knew as much as 30 percent of United States industry would survive the first bombs.

A major goal, he emphasized, should be to "obtain a balanced 30 percent of our gross national production outside the metropolitan target zones." This would just about equal all Soviet production, he said, and would deter war.

Standby plants and a decentralization of industry into lesser concentrations is a must in any civil defense program. Such plans have been made, but the slowness in putting them into effect is proving a major hazard to national security.

[From the Des Moines Register of May 2, 1956]

DISPERSAL OF VITAL INDUSTRIES

A new battle over the location of defense plants is underway in Congress. It grows out of the expiration of the present Defense Production Act and the request for its extension for another 2 years.

Since development of the atomic bomb and long-range bombers, there has never been any sound argument raised against the case for greater dispersal of vital defense plants. Industry agrees that it is needed. Labor agrees that it is needed. The military agrees that it is a must. And Congress put its stamp of approval on the dispersal policy when it passed the Defense Production Act now in operation.

Heretofore the Government has relied mainly upon persuasion trying to influence the location of plants built with Government assistance. But persuasion has not always been enough.

Local community interests, business interests, and political pressures have operated at times to balk some dispersal plans.

Thus, when Defense Mobilizer Arthur S. Flemming indorsed a proposed amendment that would strengthen the Government's hand in compelling wider dispersal of vital industries, he ran into vigorous opposition from several New England Senators.

The heavily industrialized centers stand to gain little from dispersal. They fear they may lose some of what they have.

Strongest support for the strengthening amendment came from representatives of the Rocky Mountain States which have little industry.

In both instances the Senators were judging a measure, intended to be in the best interests of the Nation as a whole, strictly from the selfish interests of their local communities.

That conflict of interest is very likely to prevent the granting of stronger powers to the Government to compel dispersal, but it is at the same time the best argument that can be made in behalf of its adoption.

[From the Tampa Times, April 30, 1956]

INDUSTRIAL DISPERSAL POLICY URGED BY SENATOR

Important and immediate planning is necessary if the United States is to be able to withstand the initial blows of an atomic attack and maintain its industrial output at a high level.

With this point in mind, Senator BENNETT of Utah has offered a valuable amendment to the Defense Production Act. It would require all executive agencies and departments to apply the principle of dispersal in locating all new industrial facilities in which the Government renders financial assistance. The key word in the last sentence is "new." Senator BENNETT'S proposal would not force removal of existing industries from their present sites, but it would discourage further concentration of the Nation's industrial production power in single target sectors.

Naturally, representatives of the established industrial centers—such as the New England States—are opposed to the amendment. They want nothing to inhibit the growth of the already giant plants in their areas. Yet, in taking this attitude, they are placing the Nation in an extremely precarious position.

Here is the danger as Senator BENNETT sees it:

"Sixty percent of America's industrial production lies in a 'heartland' running from Illinois to lower New England. With the fall-out problem what it is, this entire area could be blanketed by destruction.

"Forty-five percent of the Nation's industry is within range of submarine-launched missiles."

It should be noted here that the Russian Navy has the largest underwater armada in the world. Its submarine fleet is reported at 400, with a production rate of new submarines set at 85 per year. Since the Russians have little coastal area to protect and no shipping lanes to guard, the submarine fleet is clearly an attack force.

Senator BENNETT further observes that 77 percent of the Nation's total coke capacity, 82 percent of its iron capacity, and 73 percent of its ingot capacity is contained within 10 districts. One H-bomb exploded near the center of each district would severely damage these vital fuel capacities.

The Senator estimates that only two H-bombs would be needed to cut the United States steelmaking capacity by one-third; 4 of these weapons could destroy more than 40 of the petroleum refining centers and saturation nuclear bombing of the Great Lakes region could drastically cripple electrical and nonelectrical machinery production.

These figures demonstrate rather frighteningly the vulnerability of United States industry to an enemy attack. Less than a dozen well-placed H-bombs could have a decisive effect in crippling United States industry. Since the industrial might of a nation is its basic source of strength in war today, a loss of this magnitude could spell the difference between victory and defeat.

Senator BENNETT recognizes that it would be impractical to attempt any mass dispersal, but his argument that current targets should not be made larger makes good sense. He simply suggests, for instance, that if an electrical machinery plant in the Great Lakes region is considering enlarging its output by constructing new facilities, the new facili-

ties should be erected completely out of the present area.

The advantages of dispersal should be apparent to United States industry and many already are looking to other areas to establish branch operations. The Air Corps has adopted a policy similar to that proposed by Senator BENNETT, but the importance of even this policy would be greatly highlighted if Congress added its weight to such a program.

In this regard, Senator BENNETT has said, "While it is true that the Executive has a program of industrial dispersal, I believe Congress should share in this program by affirmatively stating its policy with regard to industrial dispersal. Our failure to do so in the past has, in my opinion, reduced the effectiveness of the Executive's efforts in this regard."

Certainly, congressional endorsement of the dispersal policy would increase its significance and impress upon both industry and the Executive the necessity of adopting this program. It is hoped that other Congressmen see the wisdom of Senator BENNETT's proposal and give it their wholehearted support.

INDUSTRY MUST PREPARE FOR ATOMIC ATTACK

(By Marshall K. Wood)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This article has been written by Mr. Wood while studying at the Harvard Graduate School of Public Administration under a Rockefeller public service award, on leave of absence from his position as Chief of the Mobilization Planning Branch, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics). The views expressed are his own, and do not necessarily reflect the policy of the Department of Defense.)

This Nation faces a military threat unique in its history: An avowedly hostile nation, the Soviet Union, with the present capability to attack and destroy our major centers of population and industry. We do not have the power to prevent such an attack, but only to blunt it somewhat and perhaps to deter it with the threat of retaliation in kind. The effectiveness of even the retaliatory threat is in question, since the bases from which retaliatory strikes would be launched are themselves vulnerable to a sneak attack; they might be crippled before they could get into operation. A measure of short-run protection may be achieved by improved air defense and by the construction of more and better dispersed bases for our retaliatory forces.

An even greater threat is on the horizon: The development of intercontinental ballistic missiles with hydrogen warheads which would travel so fast that neither adequate warning nor effective interception appears possible. The possession of such weapons would give a ruthless aggressor a tremendous advantage. The only defenses against these weapons appear to be the creation of a mobile retaliatory force, which could maintain the threat of retaliation in kind despite a sneak attack; and industrial dispersal, to increase the probability that a sufficient, balanced industrial capability would remain after attack to support continued effective combat operations while meeting minimum needs of the surviving population.

Fortunately, it is probably feasible to create such defenses within the 5 to 10 years that may remain before substantial quantities of intercontinental ballistic missiles are produced. Business and industrial leaders have a special stake in these problems—not only for the sake of their own survival and their interest as citizens and taxpayers, but because a major part of the possible remedial action is in their hands.

CHALLENGE TO INDUSTRY

If these defenses are to be created, businessmen must, in collaboration with the Federal Government, take major responsibility for better dispersal and relocation of industries essential to national survival and retaliation after atomic attack; for planning the use of existing dispersed small plants to meet military and vital civilian needs in the event of destruction of major metropolitan areas; and for the assembly of industrial data and development of procedures for rapid preattack and postattack assessment of damage, postattack reprograming, and production control.

The element of initiative is vital. Management's role cannot be considered a passive one; "going along" with Government leadership is not enough. For reasons which will appear later, much of the job can be done only by industry.

Here are the main propositions I shall discuss:

We must face up to the very real possibility that the best military measures we can take may not be an effective deterrent to Soviet attack.

A successful attack against our 50 largest metropolitan areas would devastate over 60 percent of total manufacturing production, and over 70 percent of production of the critical hard goods industry. Actually the effect on production would be even more severe because of imbalances and bottlenecks, at least as our industrial pattern now exists.

There are many things we can do, both in the short and the long run, to increase our capability to survive and fight after atomic attack. Fundamentally there are two jobs to be done:

1. We must set up administrative machinery which would permit us to make the best possible use of the human and material resources remaining after attack.

2. We must seek a geographical redistribution of our resources, with particular emphasis on achieving such a balance of industry in dispersed areas as will most nearly correspond to our postattack requirements.

These tasks are equally urgent and should be done in parallel; to this end there are a number of new techniques and concepts that will be helpful.

MILITARY THREAT

A great deal is being written about the era of "atomic plenty," and the "nuclear stalemate" which is thought to have arrived with it. President Eisenhower says that there is no longer any alternative to peace; and this can hardly be questioned from the United States standpoint. It takes two to make peace, however, and Mr. Molotov now holds, or purports to hold, a different view: he says that nuclear war would destroy the United States, but not the Soviet Union. This may be only propaganda, but we can hardly afford to dismiss it as such without a hard look at the question of whether approximate equality in nuclear weapons will, in fact, necessarily produce a stalemate.

Atomic plenty

We have been told officially that nuclear weapons have achieved virtually conventional status in all our armed services. Senator SYMINGTON, former Secretary of the Air Force and now a member of the Armed Services Committee, said in a Senate speech last summer that there was no longer any shortage of nuclear material, and that it was then possible to manufacture both H-bombs and A-bombs inexpensively and in great volume.

But as President Eisenhower recently pointed out, even if the United States maintains its lead in numbers of atomic weapons, it will be of little significance after the Soviet Union has enough to serve its purposes. "If you get enough of a particular type of weapon," he remarked at a news conference, "I doubt that it is particularly important to have a lot more."

What about the capability to deliver atomic bombs to targets a quarter of the way around the world? The United States is said to have more than 1,000 6-engine B–47 medium jet bombers, which presumably can reach almost any point in the Soviet Union from advanced bases in Alaska, Greenland, England, Spain, North Africa, the Middle East, Okinawa, or Japan; or, with aerial refueling, from bases in the continental United States. In addition, we are now building a smaller fleet of 8-engine B–52 heavy jet bombers which presumably can reach most parts of the Soviet Union from bases in the United States without refueling (to replace our B–36's, which are soon going to be obsolescent).

We also have a number of strategic fighter wings, which will be equipped to carry atomic bombs. In all, the Strategic Air Command (SAC) portion of the 137-wing Air Force will comprise 54 wings, of 30 to 75 aircraft each. We can likewise count on a growing number of Navy carrier air groups designed to carry atomic bombs.

The Soviets are building T–39's, comparable in size, shape, and presumably in performance to our B–47's. And at the 1954 May Day celebration they flew a new heavy bomber, the T–37, comparable in size to our B–52 but having only 4 jet engines instead of 8. Some observers concluded that the T–37 must have engines of twice the power of any yet designed in the United States; if this is a correct deduction, it would certainly have substantially better range and performance. Most observers agree, however, that the backbone of the Soviet strategic air force is still the TU–4, a copy of our B–29, of which they are thought to have more than 1,000. These planes are probably capable of attacking most parts of the United States on one-way missions only, but the Soviets probably would not hesitate to send them on one-way missions if it served their purpose.

Air defense penetrable

To get the bombs to the target, the bombers have to break through the air defense forces. About 3 years ago, General Vandenberg, then Chief of Staff of the Air Force, said that in his judgment at least 70 percent of any enemy bomber force attacking the United States would get through to its targets. Despite improvements in the air defense system, General Twining, the present Air Force Chief of Staff, reaffirmed about a year ago that at least 70 percent would probably still get through. A leading air defense scientist has recently stated that it would be possible to build an air defense system which would knock down 50 percent of an attacking force if a great deal more money were spent on it than is presently contemplated.

Concerning the Soviet Union air defense capability, General Twining in his testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee in February 1954 said:

"The Soviets have continued their great effort to build up an air defense system. They have completed replacement of piston fighters with jet fighters and are continuing to make improvements in their jet fighters. There has been a rapid expansion of the early-warning, ground-controlled intercept radar coverage with improved modern equipment. Of major importance has been the integration of the satellite air forces into an efficient organizational structure for the over-all Soviet bloc air defense system."

But in their case, as in ours, the defense is penetrable. As General Twining went on to say:

"By employing the principle of mass saturation of the enemy's defenses, utilization of cloud cover, altitude and hours of darkness, the present striking force can penetrate the enmey's defenses with acceptable losses."

Admiral Straus, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, said that one H-bomb could destroy any metropolitan area. Nearly half the population of the United States

lives in 100 metropolitan areas; over 60 percent of the industrial capacity of the United States is located in 50 metropolitan areas. Probably the distribution of population and industry in the Soviet Union is not far different, although the proportion of both population and industry in large cities may be somewhat smaller. But even if air defense capability were improved to the point where 50 percent of the attacking bombers were shot down, only a few hundred aircraft—small fraction of those available—would be needed to destroy half of either the United States or the Soviet Union.

It is clear that each of the two nations now has the capability of largely destroying the other.

No atomic stalemate

Does this make an atomic stalemate? The United States clearly will not initiate a preventive war against the Soviet Union; no matter how desirable that might be from the standpoint of cold military logic, it would be constitutionally, politically, and morally impossible for us to do so. It seems equally clear that the rulers of the Soviet Union would not attack the United States if they expected that the Soviet Union would be annihilated as a result—at least, not unless their situation were so desperate that general chaos seemed attractive to them. (It is conceivable that such a situation might sometime arise, but it seems hardly likely in the near future.) But would a Soviet attack on the United States necessarily lead to Soviet annihilation if the initial Soviet attack were directed primarily against SAC bases instead of cities?

The key to this question is whether or not we could expect to get enough warning of attack to get our SAC aircraft loaded with atomic bombs and into the air before the Soviet aircraft reached their bases. This is the major risk that the Soviets would have to weigh in contemplating an attack on the United States. Our advance bases overseas could not expect, considering their locations, to get more than a few minutes' to an hour's warning, which is hardly likely to be enough to get the planes loaded and into the air, if there should happen to be planes on the bases at the time. By contrast, the SAC bases in the United States might have up to several hours' warning; this should be sufficient to get all serviceable planes into the air, but might not be sufficient to get them loaded with bombs. And the planes operating from bases in this country would have a limited capability if their advance overseas bases had been destroyed.

The number of SAC bases has not, of course, been publicly disclosed; but it is apparent, from the fact that most of the wings are doubled up, two on a single base, that there are fewer home bases than wings. Including the advanced bases overseas, there can hardly be more than 100 bases in all, and perhaps considerably less. If the Soviet air force could destroy these bases in an initial attack, the Soviet Union might largely escape damage from a retaliatory strike by the United States. On the basis of the available information, it is hard to escape the conclusion that the Soviets may now have the capability to make a decisive sneak attack, and might retain it even in the face of considerably increased American air defense capability.

Certainly, on the strength of official public statements from Washington about our air defense, the Soviet rulers have adequate grounds for thinking they have such a capability; and the thing that matters most is not whether they have it, but whether they think they have it.

If the Soviets should attack us, they would of course try first to destroy our SAC bases. To that extent, the major portion of the initial military effort would be directed against purely military targets—which would be something of a paradox in an age characterized by weapons of almost inconceivable destructiveness.

At the same time, any striking power beyond that needed to destroy the SAC bases would probably be directed at those areas vital for our continuing retaliatory power: the large cities with civilian airports (from which the SAC bombers that got into the air before the attack could operate), and the major port cities (from which we could supply or reinforce NATO forces in Europe). Or these might be the targets of an immediate second wave of aircraft. Also, the destruction of coastal cities could be accomplished by detonation of bombs concealed in tramp steamers or by missiles launched from submarines, as well as by bombs dropped from aircraft. Although such missiles would probably not be very accurate, they would not have to be more accurate than the World War II V–2's, considering the radius of destruction of the hydrogen warhead, in order to have a good probability of destroying a metropolitan area.

Thus, this situation seems very far from a stalemate, but is rather one in which a very great, and possibly decisive, advantage would be gained by the nation that made the first atomic strike.

Retaliatory power

What actions can we take to mitigate this intolerable threat? The distant early warning line, soon to be constructed along the Arctic shore of Canada and Alaska, together with the airborne and shipborne extensions, may when completed provide a good chance that we would get enough warning of an attack to permit SAC to get its planes loaded and on their way for at least one retaliatory strike before its bases could be destroyed. This might or might not act as an adequate deterrent. And there are admittedly many gaps in the radar screen where an enemy force might slip through undetected. To provide reasonable assurance of a continuing combat capability, it would certainly be necessary to build additional dispersed SAC bases, and to improve the kill percentage of the fighter and anti-aircraft missile defense forces.

Against intercontinental ballistic missiles, however, neither effective warnings nor defense appears possible. Even an equal or greater ability on our part to retaliate in kind would not necessarily be an adequate deterrent, since our missile launching sites might be destroyed in a sneak attack, leaving us little chance of retaliation because of the shortness or absence of a warning period.

Moreover, the Soviets would have a further advantage because of the relative ease with which they could locate our missile launching sites, in comparison with the difficulty which we would have in locating theirs. To maintain an effective counterthreat we would need retaliatory forces which were continuously moving in an unpredictable course. Such forces, if they could be created, would be invulnerable to attack by ballistic missiles, whose aiming point is fixed prior to the moment of launching. The Navy is now developing sea-based and ship-serviced jet bombers which might provide such a force. Even better, if feasible, would be the development of long-range missiles launched from ships or submarines.

The fact remains that there is a substantial chance that the best military measures we can take may not be an effective deterrent to Soviet attack. If they are not, and an atomic attack is made, would we then surrender and accept Communist domination? Or is it possible that we could and would, even assuming mutual destruction of a major part of both United States and Soviet human and material resources, still put up a fight for the maintenance of a free society in the world?

There are many things we can do, both in the short and the long run, to increase our capability to survive and fight even after atomic attack. If we resolutely face the problem, we may be able to accomplish these actions in time. And if we do, the knowledge that we are prepared to continue to fight even after a crippling initial strike may serve as a substantial additional deterrent to attack.

CONSEQUENCES OF ATTACK

What effects would the probable Soviet weapons have in an attack on the United States?

The last United States H-bomb has been variously reported to have a yield of from 8 to 17 megatons. (A megaton is an energy release equivalent to that produced by 1 million tons of TNT.) Val Peterson, Federal Civil Defense Administrator, has mentioned the probability of H-bombs of 40, 50, or 60 megatons.

Weapon effects

The blast and thermal radiation effects of the H-bomb are presumably similar to those of the A-bomb, though, of course, greater because of the difference in yield. The fallout effect poses a distinct, additional hazard.

The handbook, the Effects of Atomic Weapons, prepared by the Atomic Energy Commission and published in 1950, provides basic figures on the blast and thermal radiation effects of A-bombs and gives formulas for extrapolating for weapons of different yield, which presumably can be applied to H-bombs. As for the hazard to personnel from radioactive fallout, that was carefully described in the recent public announcement of the AEC:

"Blast: The effects of blast are summarized in exhibit I for weapons of 20 and 50 megatons. It will be seen that a 150-percent increase in yield produces only about a 36-percent increase in radius of destruction. The radius of destruction increases approximately as the cube root of the increase of yield.

"Thermal radiation: The tremendous heat radiated from A-bombs is a comparatively negligible cause of damage to structures, in view of the fact that blast damage extends to a greater distance. (The radiated heat may be a major cause of casualties to people caught without shelter, however.) But the intensity of radiation does not decrease with distance as rapidly as does blast pressure. Thus it seems probable that the heat radiated by an H-bomb, with its greater yield, would start fires at greater distances than those at which structures would be destroyed or severely damaged by blast. This would be especially true when the air is clear, dry, and free from dust and smoke. The effects of thermal radiation on structures can be greatly reduced by painting them a light color, or otherwise increasing their reflectivity. Also, the Army Chemical Corps has reported that artificial smokescreens could be used to absorb some of the radiation.

"Fallout hazard: Following the March 1954 test at Bikini, fallout of lethal intensity was deposited in a cigar-shaped area extending downwind from the explosion about 140 miles, and as much as 20 miles wide. Fallout of lower intensity, possibly lethal in some cases, extended about 220 miles downwind, and about 20 miles crosswind and upwind, for a total of about 7,000 square miles of contaminated area.

"Reasonably adequate protection from fallout may be obtained, however, by taking cover in an ordinary basement, or digging a trench, and remaining undercover for several days (or perhaps a week in the most heavily contaminated areas). Even an ordinary house would provide some shelter, especially one of brick or masonry. Since the fallout does not normally start to come down for an hour or so after the explosion, it should be possible for most persons who escaped injury from the blast and thermal effects to take cover effectively sheltering them from fallout injury.

"A much more effective program of public education and much more widespread con-

struction of shelters, both in homes and in industrial facilities and public buildings, seems essential to minimize casualties from fallout. If such actions are taken, fallout need not be a major source of casualties, though it would almost certainly result in paralyzing normal economic activity for a period of weeks, at least, over very wide areas."

Cumulative damage

Now, what about the cumulative damage to our human and material resources?

Exhibit II (chart not printed) shows the percentages of our total population and total industry which were located in metropolitan areas, in order of size, at the time of the last census.

Counting one bomb to a metropolitan area, and assuming no warning, we see that an enemy could destroy 30 percent of our population with 15 H-bombs and 43 percent with 50.

If everyone in our 50 largest metropolitan areas were killed, our population would be reduced to about the level of 1916. However, there is a good chance that a considerable portion of the urban population could be evacuated, so that the loss need not be this high.

Manufacturing production is much more highly concentrated than population, and hard goods production is more highly concentrated than manufacturing as a whole. Over 30 percent of our total industrial production comes from 5 metropolitan areas; 15 metropolitan areas produce 45 percent of all manufactured goods and 52 percent of hard goods; 50 metropolitan areas produce 62 percent of our total manufacturing output and 72 percent of our hard goods output.

However, our industrial production has been growing much more rapidly than our population, so that despite the greater concentration, loss of 50 metropolitan areas would still leave us with undamaged plants which are now producing goods equal to our total production in 1934, as contrasted with a population equal to that of 1916. Of course, as our industry is now distributed, it is likely that much of the undamaged capacity would be immobilized because of dependence upon particular critical materials or components produced largely or exclusively in the large metropolitan areas. But this is a situation we can rectify.

Industrial bottlenecks

What could we do in an emergency with the portion of our resources which might be left after an attack? The overall situation need not be hopeless if we prepare for it.

The big problem, of course, is that the portion of our resources which remain undamaged would be very badly balanced in terms of the relative capacity of different industries required to produce the kinds of things we would need in order to survive and continue fighting.

This problem is illustrated in exhibit III (chart, not printed), which shows the distribution of total production in the 50 largest metropolitan areas for the instruments, electrical machinery, fabricated metal products, chemicals, and (for contrast) the textile industry groups. The instrument industry is the most highly concentrated of any major industry group (defined as the two-digit level of the standard industrial classification), with 52 percent of United States production in 3 cities, 69 percent in 10 cities, and 80 percent in 25 cities. The textile industry group is the least concentrated. Unfortunately, the industries we would need most for survival and retaliation in a post-attack period are rather highly concentrated.

A further breakdown by products is shown in exhibit IV. Note that if an aggressor selected targets primarily on the basis of damage he could do to production of specific items, it would be possible, for example, to wipe out 54 percent of rubber production by destroying the 10 largest metropolitan areas for that particular type of production; while if the 10 largest areas for all types of production were selected as targets, 29 percent of rubber production would be included in the attack. Although an attack aimed at the largest cities in terms of all types of production would also serve to cripple a roughly corresponding amount of the production of many specific items, it might be feasible for an aggressor to pinpoint his attack on some of the more critical items with even greater effectiveness. (All these production figures are from the last Census of Manufacturers in 1947; the new 1954 figures are not yet available, but soon will be.)

By comparing such data for individual industries and products with the requirements, industry by industry, to support the most vital military and civilian needs after attack, it should be possible to determine the particular industries and products which are most likely to become bottlenecks. (These are not likely to be the same as under conditions of all-out production for a general war without domestic bomb damage. Thus, there would be much heavier requirements for repair and reconstruction of damaged facilities, both military and civilian, and probably much lighter demand for some military products, such as infantry weapons and ammunition.) Such analyses would provide a realistic basis for advance preparations.

MAKING PLANS

We can take a number of steps to improve our short-run capability to survive an atomic attack and continue effective combat operations. We need to do the following:

1. Develop procedures for estimating the overall effect which various different kinds of possible attacks would have on our industrial production capability.

2. Formulate new strategic plans, approximately consistent with potential post-attack industrial production capabilities, and translate these plans into production requirements for specific products.

3. Undertake detailed mobilization production planning with individual plants in order to insure that the specific items we would need can be produced up to the limit of the overall post-attack production capability.

4. Devise methods for rapid post-attack assessment of actual damage, and for determining quickly the size and character of the military program which available resources would permit us to undertake.

5. Think through and blueprint in advance the kind of industrial production control techniques which we would need to get the undamaged portions of the economy working again quickly after an attack.

Estimating damage

The only feasible method of preattack damage estimation, and the easiest and quickest method of post-attack damage assessment, is to have data on the characteristics and location of resources collected in advance and plotted in accordance with some kind of common geographic reference system for the surface of the United States—such as the Universal Transverse Mercator grid, a rectangular coordinate system which is already used by the military services for other purposes. Then a specified attack pattern (anticipated or actual) can be plotted on the same system, and the specific damage can be computed.

The application of such a system of damage assessment is perhaps best illustrated for manufacturing industries, although it is equally applicable to other resources:

There are about 280,000 manufacturing establishments in the United States, but about 80 percent of their total output is produced by the 10 percent of the companies which have over 100 employees. It would be a fairly strightforward matter to determine the coordinates of each of these 28,000 plants in accordance with the standard grid system, working from the manufacturing location address given on the Census of Manufactures schedules. Census data on production and employment could then be associated with these coordinates.

If an attack pattern were specified in terms of the coordinates of the points at which the bombs were dropped, the distance of each plant from each bomb could then be calculated by simple arithmetic. The approximate extent of damage to each plant could then be derived from the computed distance to the nearest bomb and from the energy yield of the bomb. The data on production and employment could then be summarized by specific industry and product, by class of damage. If all the necessary data were prepared in advance and maintained on magnetic tape accessible to a large-scale electronic computer such as the Univac, the entire computation for one attack pattern could be performed in a few hours.

More detailed information is needed as to the type of construction of plants (including the reflectivity of building exteriors), since this may make a considerable difference in the extent of damage to plants at the outer edge of the blast area. Ideally, such data on all industrial plants with over 100 employees should be collected and introduced into the damage assessment procedure. In the absence of such data, however, it should still be possible to get useful results by assuming that each plant conforms to the average type of construction in the industry group in which it is classified.

The fact that census data apply only to current production of particular products rather than to capability (for more of the same products or for different products) means that more precise information is also needed from industry as to how much of what it could produce when operating to meet an all-out emergency.

It should be feasible for plant managers to estimate the total capacity of a plant expressed as its maximum potential employment. Capacity for particular products could be expressed in physical units, such as number or weight, where the product classes were relatively homogeneous, or in terms of value where the product classes are more heterogeneous. The relation of capacity for individual product classes to total capacity could be roughly measured by the ratio of employment needed for each product to the maximum potential employment at the plant when operating at capacity. (The technique of estimating capacity in terms of maximum potential employment was used with fair success by the Bureau of Labor Statistics during the Korean war.)

New mobilization plan

Assuming that a workable procedure for damage assessment is available, then the next step is to develop a realistic military mobilization plan, consistent with the probable postattack availability of resources.

Previous mobilization plans have generally been based on the assumption of a rapid expansion of the military forces and the supporting industrial production over a period of years after the start of a war. In fact, the requirements derived from these plans often exceeded the estimated total national industrial production capacity, even without taking any bomb damage into account.

Thus it was found necessary 3 years ago to reverse the usual planning process, and start with ODM estimates of total national production capacity and minimum civilian needs and try to fit the military planning within the ODM estimates of the capacity available for military production remaining after meeting minimum civilian needs. This process was a move in the right direction, but still it did not allow for any loss of production capacity from bomb damage, since at that time there did not yet exist

any substantial capability to inflict bomb damage on the United States.

It now seems essential to develop a new mobilization plan consistent with estimates of the industrial capacity likely to be available for military production in the light of (a) probable loss of capacity through bomb damage and (b) minimum civilian requirements for food, shelter, and essential reconstruction of transportation, communications, and other vital facilities. Such estimates should be based on consideration of a variety of alternative possible patterns of attack, and the estimates of capacity remaining after each attack should be weighted according to subjective estimates of the relative probability of each attack pattern.

The resulting estimates of capacity available for military production could be expressed at this stage as total production capacity in the hard goods industries, as was done 3 years ago in developing the last set of mobilization production schedules. Then military mobilization plans should be developed which would not require more hard goods production than could be produced by the estimated capacity likely to remain after attack. Production requirements for specific items could be developed from those plans, which would serve as the basis for revised mobilization production planning with industry.

It is clear that the total postattack hard-goods capacity could not all be used effectively to produce the particular products needed. As a result, the military mobilization plans developed by this procedure would call for more production of many products than would be actually feasible. Therefore, to get maximum production of the needed items, a principal objective of mobilization production planning with industry should be to insure that the capacity for the desired individual products is as nearly as possible equal to the total hard-goods capacity.

Detailed plant schedules

For a number of years the military services have been making war-production plans with industry, under what is called the production-allocation program. Under this program, representatives of the military services approach a potential contractor with their desired wartime production schedule for a particular item. Through mutual discussion, this schedule is modified to fit the capabilities of the plant, and an agreed tentative mobilization schedule is developed. Planning under this program is now concentrated on about 1,000 hard-to-produce, long-lead-time military equipment items and their major components. About 25,000 plants are participating in the program in some degree. At present, this program does not reflect probable bomb damage, either in the development of requirements or in the selection of plants; but the basic procedures can be adapted to the new situation.

In developing individual plant schedules for the production of potentially critical items, either military or civilian, primary consideration should, of course, be given to plants which are not located near any major metropolitan area or near any other likely target such as a SAC base. After allowing for what was shown in the preceding exhibits, there remains a considerable part of total United States manufacturing capacity which is relatively invulnerable to attack because of its widely dispersed locations. To make sure we find all there is, it seems desirable to make a systematic canvass of the plants reporting in the new 1954 Census of Manufactures, and to plan with these dispersed plants to the maximum feasible extent.

For many critical items, however, there will be no way of getting along without using some of the more vulnerable plants. A substantial part of the total postattack production capability will derive from plants which are in more or less vulnerable locations, and which might be destroyed but are lucky enough to escape. There are many possible attack patterns, and we cannot tell in advance which one would be used. Neither, in fact, can the attacker himself, for many of the possible variations will result from chance factors in the effectiveness of the defense forces. The particular planes which happen to get shot down will have a considerable influence on the final pattern of bomb damage, as will random errors of bombing by the planes which get through.

Thus, although all the plants in the large metropolitan areas, and some in other areas, are potentially subject to attack, there is still an appreciable chance that any particular plant will escape damage. Planning for this event is, therefore, the next step.

Figuring chance of loss

At the same time that we count on making some use of vulnerable plants, we must be reasonably sure that we do not plan on getting more production from them than would be realistic in view of the proportion likely to escape damage. We may do this by assigning a chance-of-loss index to each vulnerable plant, adding its full capacity into our planned production schedules for each item, and then discounting the totals for each item by the average chance-of-loss index for all the plants at which it is scheduled to be produced.

The index for a given plant in a vulnerable location would depend on (a) the chance that the metropolitan area in which it is located will be successfully attacked and (b) the probable extent of damage to the plant if the metropolitan area is successfully attacked.

The chance of attack for any metropolitan area is in turn the product of the chance that an attack will be attempted and the chance that an attack, if attemped, will be able to penetrate our air defense forces. (The same principles would apply to a nonmetropolitan target area, such as a SAC base.)

It seems likely that an aggressor would decide to attack those areas where the damage he could inflict would be highest in relation to the cost in terms of probable losses to our defense forces. Among the measures which he might use in estimating the value to him of destroying different metropolitan areas are population, employment, and manufacturing production, either in total, for broad groups such as hard goods, or in particular critical industries such as chemicals, petroleum, primary metals, aircraft instruments, and so on; or he might also elect to concentrate on utilities like electric power, transportation, and port facilities. In any event, most of the measures of importance which an attacker would be likely to pick are highly correlated in the large metropolitan areas. This is illustrated by exhibit V, which shows the 10 largest metropolitan areas of the United States in order of rank according to a number of different criteria.

One could assign weights to these and perhaps other criteria, representing subjective judgments as to the enemy's evaluation of their relative importance, and compute the overall target value of each city compared with other cities. The ratio of a city's target value to the corresponding estimated costs of making a successful attack on that city would yield a measure of the likelihood of attack. Such ratios could then be converted into rough probabilities in accordance with estimates of the size of the total force which the enemy could devote to an attack.

In physical terms, the extent of damage to a plant in a metropolitan area which is successfully attacked depends primarily on its physical vulnerability and on its location, in reference to the probable aiming point, bombing error, and bomb yield. Once this is estimated (assuming we have some of the more precise information that is needed), the loss in production can probably best be measured as the quantity of products that would have been turned out during the time required to construct an equivalent new plant. This factor can then be combined with the chance-of-attack figure to make a composite chance-of-loss index for that plant.

My proposal is that such an index of the chance of loss of wartime production be prepared for each important plant which is a potential producer of critical items, either military or civilian, or an important component thereof. This index should be the point of departure for all subsequent mobilization planning actions affecting individual plants as such.

These chance-of-loss indexes will provide a measure of the extent to which we need to hedge schedules with plans for additional sources in different metropolitan areas. Each tentative mobilization production schedule for a vulnerable plant should be discounted by the plant's chance-of-loss index; and enough additional schedules negotiated with other plants in different metropolitan areas (other plants in the same area might be destroyed by the same bomb), so that the total of all tentative mobilization production schedules, after discounting by the chance-of-loss indexes of the respective plants, will equal the total desired production schedule. To illustrate:

Suppose that only 20 precent of the desired wartime production of a particular item can be produced in facilities in adequately dispersed locations. Suppose that the remaining 80 percent can be produced in 2 plants, 50 percent in 1 plant which has a 50 percent chance of loss, and 30 percent in another plant which has a 60 percent chance of loss. Then the expected value of the wartime production in these 3 plants is 57 percent of the desired wartime production. [20%+ (50%×50%)+(30%×40%)=57%.]

We should then make provision for additional sources for the remaining 43 percent of the desired wartime production. We might get this 43 percent by adding a source for 50 percent of the requirement in a plant which has a 50 percent chance of loss, plus another source for 60 percent of the requirement in a plant which has a 70 percent chance of loss. [(50%×50%)+(60%×30%)=43%.]

Of course, considering the rather rough estimates on which the chance-of-loss indexes would have to be based, approximate rather than precise balancing of requirements and discounted production schedules is all that is needed.

The schedules just described should all be considered primary production schedules, since the expected value of the wartime production from these schedules just equals requirements. This will give us a 50–50 chance that we would be able to meet our requirements if the attack pattern is in accordance with our expectations. But we may not be satisfied with a 50–50 chance. Also the actual attack pattern might vary considerably from our expectations. If this happened, we might very well end up with proportionately too much capacity for some items, and no capacity at all for others.

To maintain maximum flexibility we should also develop for each facility additional alternate production schedules for different items. These schedules would substitute for any primary schedules for products not needed because damage was less than expected in other plants.

It is clear that the kind of mobilization planning here proposed will put a greater burden on both industry and Government than has previously been required. This burden will fall most heavily on industrial management, since the program is and probably must continue a voluntary one. This is as it should be, for there can be no substitute for local centers of knowledge and know-how

if industry is to get off to a fast start following an attack.

PLACING CONTRACTS

For a considerable period after the start of any war the principal sources for most major military items would inevitably be the plants which were producing the items on D-day.

Clearly it is of prime importance to get production sources of military equipment into nonvulnerable areas to the maximum extent feasible. This should always be kept in mind in placing procurement contracts. If placing current procurement contracts in dispersed locations results in substantial increases in cost, the combat capability which this added cost would buy in terms of probable postattack production in the critical period of a war must be weighed against the combat capability it would buy if devoted to increasing D-day stocks of equipment. (The strategic situation increases the premium on combat forces already in being and thus of reserve stocks of equipment and supplies on hand to support those forces.)

There undoubtedly will be some cases where unique capacity for particular items is concentrated in certain areas and current production could be expected in other areas only at prohibitive cost. But such exceptional conditions should not be used as a rationalization for general inaction. Much can certainly be done at little or no added cost to produce military items for current needs in less vulnerable locations.

Harnessing small plants

Although many plants in nonvulnerable locations do not have adequate equipment to produce any major military equipment item, they do have facilities to produce significant subassemblies or components of many kinds of equipment. There may also be many cases in which a group of small plants, in the same or nearby communities, could collectively produce all or nearly all of some major item of equipment.

In most cases it probably would be necessary to add some specialized production equipment to that already available in these small plants. And it would almost certainly be necessary for the large plants to provide additional management skills in the fields of engineering, production scheduling control, and perhaps others. One of the principal aims of mobilization planning must be to develop means of utilizing the potential of these small plants with minimum delay.

I propose that each company awarded a current contract for a major item of military equipment produced in a vulnerable location be made responsible, as a condition of the contract, for preparing a plan for rapidly resuming production of the item at an alternate location or locations in case the primary producing facility is destroyed by enemy attack. While there should be no limitations on the ingenuity of the responsible companies in devising methods for rapid resumption of production after attack, use of the facilities of such small plants in nearby communities seems likely to be a promising method.

If any needed additional specialized production equipment cannot be provided by the prime contractor, it might be purchased by the Government and held in the machine tool reserve earmarked for the particular purpose. The prime contractor would of course be responsible for providing safe storage of duplicate blueprints, and perhaps duplicate jigs, dies, and fixtures, if necessary, as well as for providing needed general engineering and management supervision and production control.

Transferring military production

There are several other possible methods of securing a greater probability of continued production of military equipment after an attack. One is to reverse the tendency to produce vital military items in vulnerable locations and civilian items in dispersed locations. For example:

A large corporation producing military radar equipment in a large metropolitan area has recently built new plants to produce television sets in well-dispersed locations. It would be highly desirable to transfer production of the radar equipment to the dispersed plants, and produce the television sets in the metropolitan plants.

There would undoubtedly be problems in making such a move; for instance, the labor supply at the dispersed plants is probably not as highly skilled or as diversified as in the metropolitan areas. On the other hand, the move would bring the television production nearer the market. Over a period of time, it should be possible to make many such shifts with minimum cost or economic dislocation.

There may be other cases, such as that of the aircraft industry perhaps, where nearly all the existing facilities which could produce the military item are now producing military equipment. But even in such cases it should be possible to attain a significantly greater degree of flexibility and insurance against complete loss of capacity to produce a vital item by negotiating mutual-assistance and cross-licensing agreements between existing companies with plants in different metropolitan areas, so that if either should be destroyed, the other could undertake production of the item normally produced by the destroyed plant.

The fact remains—and we may as well face it—that in many cases what are desirable moves from the mobilization standpoint would be wasteful in an economic sense, at least in the short run, if no attack comes. But if an attack does come, they might save the day.

EFFECTING DISPERSAL

Measures to maximize our ability to use effectively the industrial resources which remain after an attack, such as those which have just been described, might prove the margin between survival and subjugation, if we should be attacked within the next few years; and they will be of continuing importance in the long run. But over a longer period of 5 to 10 years, it will be of primary importance to increase the proportion of our total resources which is so located as to be relatively invulnerable to attack. Within this period much can be accomplished if proper inducements are provided to channel normal economic growth into dispersed areas.

Guiding future growth

In this process we should seek to promote the development of dispersed industrial capacity appropriately balanced to meet probable postattack needs. On the other hand, we should seek to induce concentration in the existing metropolitan areas of the consumer goods industries which we could do without, if need be, in wartime. If we do this successfully, we will greatly reduce the risk of atomic war, as well as increase our capacity to survive it; for an attack is less likely if it is clear that an initial sneak attack would probably not be decisive.

President Eisenhower said in his 1955 economic report to the Congress that he expects the gross national product of the United States to grow to over $500 billion in the next 10 years. This implies an average annual growth rate of about 3.5 percent (as contrasted with historical growth rates of 2.6 percent for the quarter century since 1929, including the depression, and 5.1 percent for the 15-year period 1938–53). The average rate of gross private investment for the 9 years since the end of World War II has been 15 percent of the gross national product. This has been accompanied by an average annual growth rate for the same period of 2.8 percent. It seems reasonable to assume that the projected annual growth rate of 3.5 percent will require an annual rate of investment of at least 15 percent of the gross national product. This would mean that total investment for the period would come to about $640 billion (at 1954 price levels).

A recent study by the Stanford Research Institute, made for the Federal Civil Defense Administration (FCDA), estimates that the total replacement value of housing, industrial, and commercial facilities in the 70 metropolitan areas which FCDA has classed as critical targets was about $500 billion in 1950. Thus if 78 percent of the normal private investment over the next 10 years were channeled into dispersed areas, we could have, in 10 years, as much dispersed industrial capacity as we had total capacity in 1950. (Actually, we probably could do much better, since we would need to replace, in dispersed areas, only a part of that which is now located in the 70 critical target areas; much of the latter is capacity in consumer goods industries and services which we could dispense with in an emergency.)

Present policy inadequate

It has been the policy of the Federal Government to encourage industrial dispersion since 1951, when President Truman announced the National Industrial Dispersion Policy. The principal means for accomplishing it was to offer accelerated tax amortization for privately financed new industrial facilities if they were located in dispersed areas and if they were in industries for which a deficit in wartime production capacity was anticipated. "Expansion goals" for creation of additional industrial capacity are announced from time to time by the Office of Defense Mobilization (ODM), based largely on the full war mobilization requirements whose development was described earlier.

This policy has been only moderately successful. Although a tremendous expansion of industrial facilities was undertaken during the Korean war, because of the pressure for quick production, which was usually attained most readily by expansion of existing facilities, it was found necessary to waive dispersal criteria in a large proportion of the cases.

Since the end of the Korean war, there has been a more strenuous and fairly effective effort to enforce conformance with dispersal criteria as a condition of granting accelerated tax amortization. However, the dispersal criteria used—10 miles from a concentrated area—is geared to A-bombs, not H-bombs. (Under present conditions, probably no location should be considered dispersed which is within 30 miles of an FCDA critical target area or other prime target, such as a SAC base.) Further, the industries covered by the expansion goals are those in which deficits in capacity were anticipated in the event of a nonatomic global war rather than an atomic war.

A careful study should be undertaken, using the procedures previously described in this article, to determine what mix of industries would be needed to support military and essential civilian production for general atomic war within the capacity of facilities likely to remain after atomic attack. Then the difference between the mix that is needed and what we have got should be established as expansion goals. These expansion goals should be continuously revised upward, of course, as the total amount of industry in dispersed areas increases.

Recently the policy of granting preference to plants in dispersed locations has been reaffirmed in Defense Mobilization Order VII–7 and Department of Defense Directive 3005.6. In the recent hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of ODM, indicated that establishment of new dispersal criteria, appropriate to H-bomb attack, was under consideration.

New incentives proposed

Accelerated tax amortization can undoubtedly be an important incentive to fulfilling

these expansion goals. It is doubtful, however, if it alone will ever be adequate to insure that the major part of the gross private investment is channeled into dispersed areas.

Further, as earlier pointed out, there is a need for some relocation of existing industries, part of which should take the form of shifts between existing facilities, with critical defense industries moving into existing buildings in dispersed areas, and consumer goods industries now in dispersed areas moving into vacant buildings in metropolitan areas. (It might be feasible, for instance, for some of the highly concentrated instrument industry to move from metropolitan areas into idle New England textile plants.) But on such moves accelerated tax amortization would not help at all.

A possible approach would be to provide continuing tax incentives for plants in dispersed areas which produced particular vital products, as defined by expansion goals. This would not only provide added inducement to the construction of new facilities, but would promote the conversion of existing facilities and the relocation of existing operations.

For this purpose, a graded series of degrees of dispersal would be needed, since the incentive should not be continued to the point at which new target areas would be created, yet should not be discontinued abruptly when an area reaches some critical size. Perhaps the degree of dispersal could be measured by the total population within a radius of 30 miles of the plant in question, and a percentage reduction of corporate income tax allowed, depending on the degree of dispersion. Here is a possible scale:

Reduction of corporate income tax

Population within 30-mile radius of plant:	*Percent*
Under 10,000	10
10,000–20,000	9
20,000–30,000	8
30,000–40,000	7
40,000–50,000	6
50,000–60,000	5
60,000–70,000	4
70,000–80,000	3
80,000–90,000	2
90,000–100,000	1
Over 100,000	0

(There were 151 standard metropolitan areas with a population over 100,000 in 1950, and probably a slightly larger number of areas with a population of over 100,000 within a 30-mile radius.)

There are many obvious objections to such a scheme, among which are the fact that it would require multiplant corporations to set up accounts which would permit attribution of income to individual plants. But some such scheme seems necessary to reduce the chance of national annihilation in the era of intercontinental ballistic missiles. The time is barely enough, at best.

CONCLUSION

National survival in the second atomic decade is likely to depend on greatly increased awareness by business leaders of the terrible threat which faces us, and on their willingness to act to reduce the threat. The principal means of action needed is in their hands—the construction of new industrial capacity for strategic products in dispersed areas. If the bulk of all private investment is channeled into dispersed areas, we can probably deter a nuclear holocaust, or survive it if it comes.

Much added insurance can be provided by new techniques of industrial mobilization planning which explicitly recognize the probable losses of capacity that would result from enemy atomic attack. Government must determine the needed action, and must provide appropriate inducements to facilitate action by industry. Industry must support the necessary Government action, and must be prepared to collaborate in mobilization planning and in providing necessary data to permit effective planning.

The action which is needed, on the part of Government or industry, will cost time, effort, and money. This is part of the premium on our survival insurance for the second atomic decade.

EXHIBIT I.—*Approximate maximum distance in miles from H-bomb for specified types of damage from blast*

Type of damage	Size of bomb	
	20 megatons	50 megatons
	Miles	*Miles*
Virtually complete destruction of all buildings	5	7
Severe damage, all buildings collapsed or liable to collapse	11	15
Severe damage to homes	15	21
Moderate damage, all buildings unusable until repaired	16	22
Severe secondary fire damage probable from short circuits, overturned stoves, etc	19	26
Light damage, mostly plaster and window breakage	80	109

Source: Estimated from data on Hiroshima-Nagasaki experience and extrapolation formulas contained in The Effects of Atomic Weapons, prepared by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of National Defense (Washington, Combat Forces Press, August 1950).

EXHIBIT IV.—*Percentage of production in metropolitan areas by major industry groups*

Industry group	10 metropolitan areas		50 metropolitan areas
	Largest 10 for all industries	Largest 10 for each industry	
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Food and kindred products	34	35	55
Tobacco manufactures	13	22	24
Textile mill products	18	27	33
Apparel	66	69	79
Lumber and wood products	7	12	17
Furniture and fixtures	33	37	54
Paper and allied products	26	28	42
Printing and publishing	57	58	75
Chemicals and allied products	41	45	63
Petroleum and coal products	47	50	61
Rubber products	29	54	66
Leather and leather products	38	43	48
Stone, clay, and glass products	26	28	45
Primary metal industries	44	51	73
Fabricated metal products	46	46	73
Machinery (except electrical)	35	39	67
Electrical machinery	52	55	79
Transportation equipment	51	56	75
Instruments and related products	48	69	82
Miscellaneous manufactures	47	56	76
Total manufacturing	40		62

Source: Census of Manufactures: 1947; value added by manufacture.

EXHIBIT V.—*Rank of 10 largest United States metropolitan areas according to selected criteria*

Selected criteria	New York	Chicago	Los Angeles	Philadelphia	Detroit	Boston	San Francisco	Pittsburgh	St. Louis	Cleveland
Population	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Total employment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	11
Manufacturing employment	1	2	5	4	3	7	10	6	9	8
Production value:										
Total for all industries	1	2	5	4	3	8	10	6	9	7
Hard goods	3	1	7	6	2	12	14	4	9	5
Chemicals and allied products	1	2	8	3	6	11	9	18	5	7
Petroleum and coal	1	2	4	3	9	13	8	7	6	11
Primary metals	5	2	15	9	4	30	17	1	11	6
Fabricated metal products	2	1	6	4	3	8	10	7	9	5
Machinery (except electrical)	2	1	8	6	3	11	23	10	16	4
Electrical machinery	2	1	12	3	18	5	24	4	9	6
Transportation equipment	3	5	2	7	1	16	12	13	8	6
Instruments	1	3	7	4	21	6	24	8	19	12

Source: Population figures from United States Census of Population: 1950; employment figures, County and City Data Book: 1950; production figures, Census of Manufactures: 1947 ("Value Added by Manufacture").

STATEMENT ON AMENDMENT TO H. R. 9852 TO PROMOTE DISPERSAL BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS

The Federation of American Scientists (FAS) is wholeheartedly in favor of a proposal now under Senate consideration, that "it is the policy of the Congress to promote the geographical dispersal of the industrial facilities of the United States." The proposal was made by Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican, of Utah, in the form of an amendment to the bill (H. R. 9852) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950. This amendment was approved by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, on June 14.

A year ago the FAS warned in a published letter to President Eisenhower that the Nation's defense program was out of balance because dispersal of target cities is not proceeding fast enough. In its letter of May 13, 1955, the FAS pointed out that the United States is spending many billions each year on military weapons but hardly a cent on dispersal, which is one defense measure that has a chance of lasting effectiveness. Conventional military arms, on the other hand, become out-of-date in a short time and must be replaced by new ones at great expense.

"Dispersal is a means of saving lives and protecting our capacity for defense if war should come," the letter argued. "It also makes enemy attack less effective and therefore less likely, giving us time to work out peaceful solutions to our international problems."

Economic forces in the United States are already causing some dispersal, but not enough in proportion to the need. The longer we delay in launching an adequate program, the more drastic it will have to be to meet the danger of intercontinental missiles. In fact, dispersal may well be the only defense against such missiles.

While the executive department already has a praiseworthy policy in favor of dispersal, the Federation believes that this vitally important matter has not received the public support it deserves and which action by the Congress should help to achieve.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1956.

Hon. HARVEY V. HIGLEY,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HIGLEY: By letter dated April 21, 1954, I transmitted to you the President's

expressed desire that new Federal buildings not be constructed in critical target areas unless there was need for an exception. That letter was accompanied with a statement of guidance making the industrial dispersion standards applicable in the acquisition of facilities for the executive branch, and providing the basis for exceptions when needed.

On January 9, 1956, I issued Defense Mobilization Order I–19 setting forth a revised dispersion policy and criteria for applying it. This revision was necessitated by technological advances in weapons developments and practical considerations encountered in the administration of the previous policy and standards established in 1951. The policy and criteria contained in DMO–I–19 are applicable to all new facilities important to national security without distinction between Government and private facilities. Accordingly, the policy and criteria contained in DMO–I–19 supersedes the dispersion standards contained in my letter of April 21, 1954.

In applying this policy to the locations of new Federal facilities, attention is invited to paragraph 3 (b) of DMO–I–19, which provides that departments and agencies will receive guidance on appropriate locations from the Department of Commerce. Such guidance will be consistent with plans of the Federal Civil Defense Administration for reduction of urban vulnerability. Attention is also invited to paragraph 2 (a) (8) of DMO–I–19 which provides that one of the factors to be considered in the selection of a location is—

"(8) The economic, operational, and administrative requirements in carrying out the functions for which the facility is to be provided."

This factor is, in effect, the basis for exceptions when needed. Experience has indicated that there is need for some further guidance in determining when an exception is justified.

The head of the agency concerned is responsible for determining whether the nature of the activity for which a new Federal facility is to be used will permit the use of a dispersed location. No one is in a better position to make such determination than the head of the agency responsible for both the day-to-day operations and the continuity of the agency's essential functions in the event of attack. In making the determination, it should be kept in mind that the intent of the policy is to make us, as a nation, less vulnerable to weapons of mass destruction. Exceptions are to be avoided insofar as practicable. On the other hand, it is not the intent of this policy that new facilities be located on the basis of security considerations only; it is not intended that we make ourselves so secure as to be ineffective in our day-to-day operations. The head of the agency concerned must balance the requirements for efficient peacetime operations against the need for postattack operational capability. This calls for a conscientious appraisal of all factors involved.

I am sure that in making a determination as to whether an exception is justified you will satisfy yourself that the practical considerations on which you base your decision are both factual and compelling. If you find it necessary to locate closer to the heart of a target than is desirable for security purposes, locations which offer the most protection by reason of ground environment should be explored, suitable protective construction features should be included, and a statement of the factual basis for the exception filed with the Office of Defense Mobilization, in order that the President may be kept informed of progress in the application of this policy.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director.

Statistics on certificates of necessity for the year 1953

	Number	Estimated value (in thousands)	Number	Percent of dollars
1. Cases eligible for certification	3,770	$5,022,996		
2. Cases to which dispersion criteria did not apply:				
(a) Less than $1,000,000	3,111	648,466	82.5 percent of item 1	12.9 percent.
(b) Location not fixed, or less than $5,000,000 and less than $50 expansion.	384	2,212,674	10.2 percent of item 1	44.0 percent.
3. Cases to which dispersion criteria were applicable.	275	2,161,856	7.3 percent of item 1	43.1 percent.
4. Cases in which proposed sites not dispersal.	210	1,643,599	76.4 percent of item 3	76.0 percent of item 3.
5. Cases influenced to change location	5	70,886	1.8 percent of item 3	3.3 percent of item 3.
6. Cases denied for refusal to meet standards and inability to justify a waiver.	6	33,414	2.2 percent of item 3	1.6 percent of item 3.
7. Exception granted in cases applicable to dispersal criteria.	54	413,957	19.6 percent of item 3	19.1 percent.
8. Of exception, grantees indicating they may undertake protective construction:				
1. Applicants for protective construction, 5.				
2. Certificates for protective construction granted, 3 for $602,393.				
3. Applications for protective construction denied, 2.				

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, we are prepared to yield back all the remaining time in opposition to the motion.

Mr. BUSH. I shall be glad to yield back all the remaining time of the proponents of the motion, with the understanding that the Senator from Utah yield back all the time remaining to his side.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Arkansas to yield a minute or two to me.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I withhold my suggestion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield a minute or two to the senior Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it looks like the difference between the haves and the have nots. The amendment does not contemplate removing anything which the haves now have. They did not have much to begin with.

Mr. President, I join with my colleague in his prepared statement. Although I have not seen it, I know his views are sound and that he has plenty of good reasons why this amendment should be made a part of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I expected to hear from California. I cannot quite understand the combination of California and New England in trying to stop some of the defense industries from being located in some of the other States. It seems to me the situation should be such that the Communists could not find our defense industries concentrated in more or less restricted areas. They should be spread over the United States for the good of the United States.

The Government has now spent many billions of dollars for the construction of defense plants. Those plants should not be scattered around as a matter of politics, but they should be located where they will be the least vulnerable and will help the United States in its vital defense program.

I urge all Senators to vote against the motion to table.

I came in late; I think that is the correct procedure.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. I think this is the only time within my memory when a motion to lay on the table could be debated.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I realize that this discussion could go on and on, and that my offer to bring the question to a head could be lost. Senators have already spoken at some length. I shall restrain my desire to comment on what they have said in their turn.

I renew my suggestion that all time be yielded back and that the Senate proceed to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are the Senators in control of the time ready to yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. BUSH. If my friend, the Senator from Arkansas, will be indulgent with me, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. We will yield back the remainder of the time on this side if the Senator from Connecticut will yield back the remainder of his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Both sides having yielded back the remainder of their time, the question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] to lay on the table the amendment on page 3, line 10.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. HOLLAND. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Carlson	Ervin
Allott	Case, S. Dak.	Flanders
Anderson	Chavez	Frear
Barrett	Cotton	Fullbright
Bender	Curtis	George
Bennett	Dirksen	Goldwater
Bush	Dworshak	Gore
Butler	Ellender	Hayden

Hickenlooper	Magnuson	Saltonstall
Hill	Malone	Schoeppel
Holland	Mansfield	Scott
Hruska	Martin, Pa.	Smathers
Jackson	McCarthy	Smith, Maine
Jenner	McClellan	Smith, N. J.
Johnson, Tex.	Millikin	Sparkman
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Stennis
Kennedy	Mundt	Symington
Kerr	Murray	Thye
Knowland	Neuberger	Watkins
Kuchel	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Laird	Pastore	Williams
Langer	Payne	Wofford
Lehman	Potter	
Long	Purtell	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oklahoma, [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Connecticut to lay on the table section 4, the committee amendment. A vote in the affirmative is in support of the motion of the Senator from Connecticut. A vote in the negative is a vote to retain section 4.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment.

All time having been yielded back, the yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I understood the statement of the Chair, if a Senator favors dispersal, his vote should be "nay." If he is against dispersal——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a point of order. That is not a parliamentary inquiry; that is joining debate again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If a Senator votes in the affirmative, he votes for the motion of the Senator from Connecticut to lay on the table section 4. If a Senator votes in the negative, he, in effect, votes against the motion of the Senator from Connecticut, leaving section 4, the committee amendment, for consideration.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay," and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], are absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

Also, on this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—20

Bender	Knowland	Pastore
Bush	Kuchel	Potter
Butler	Lehman	Purtell
Flanders	Magnuson	Saltonstall
Jackson	Martin, Pa.	Smith, N. J.
Jenner	Morse	Williams
Kennedy	Neuberger	

NAYS—50

Aiken	Goldwater	Millikin
Allott	Gore	Mundt
Anderson	Hayden	Murray
Barrett	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Hill	Payne
Carlson	Holland	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Hruska	Scott
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Cotton	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Kerr	Sparkman
Dirksen	Laird	Stennis
Dworshak	Langer	Symington
Ellender	Long	Thye
Ervin	Malone	Watkins
Frear	Mansfield	Wiley
Fulbright	McCarthy	Wofford
George	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—25

Beall	Douglas	McNamara
Bible	Duff	Monroney
Bricker	Eastland	Neely
Bridges	Green	Robertson
Byrd	Hennings	Russell
Capehart	Humphrey	Welker
Case, N. J.	Ives	Young
Clements	Kefauver	
Daniel	Martin, Iowa	

So the motion to lay on the table was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. I have an amendment which I should like to offer to the committee amendment. My amendment is in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment. Is my amendment in order now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order.

Mr. KUCHEL. Then, Mr. President, I send my amendment to the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from California to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 3, beginning in line 13, it is proposed to strike out all through line 6, on page 4, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

> The Congress hereby declares that the policy, criteria, and responsibilities set forth in Defense Mobilization Order I–19, dated January 11, 1956, furnish an adequate and desirable program with respect to dispersion and protective construction of new facilities and major expansions of existing facilities important to national security.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the subject before the Senate is one of prime importance. Because of the last yea-and-nay vote, I most respectfully urge Members of the Senate to adopt the amendment I have offered as the best means of expressing its approval of a sound policy of dispersion with respect to defense contracts. My amendment would incorporate by reference the present dispersal policy, carefully written and adhered to by the Government of

the United States, as initiated by the Office of Defense Mobilization last January.

A series of dispersal orders has been issued by the Federal Government. We need a sound policy of dispersal in the United States. What constitutes a sound policy of dispersal? Obviously, geographical effect is important, but there are other factors. One important factor would be, What is the situation with respect to each area of the country with regard to available employment? Another would be, If a defense industry is now located in a particular State, should it be taken away and located in another part of the country, to the economic detriment of the original State?

The Office of Defense Mobilization says that the effect on the economy of an area engaged in defense industry is important. Of course, it is important. The question of a sound policy of dispersal must include the effect which it has upon the economy of the country at large, and upon the economy of the various segments of our country which now, happily or unhappily, are engaged in defense production. I sincerely suggest to Senators that the language which is written into the pending bill, and which attempts to lay down a policy of dispersal, is not well considered so far as the verbiage that is used is concerned.

Yesterday I introduced into the RECORD the text of the present order of the Office of Defense Mobilization on dispersal. It appears at page 10778 of the RECORD.

I also introduced into the RECORD the verbiage of section 4 of the pending bill, which attempts to write a policy of dispersal. I commend to Members of the Senate a reading of those two documents. Senators will find on page 10778 a very carefully written policy which now guides the Government of the United States with respect to dispersal. Let me read from it:

1. Policy: It is the policy of the United States to encourage and, when appropriate, to require that new facilities and major expansions of existing facilities important to national security be located, insofar as practicable, so as to reduce the risk of damage in the event of attack; and to encourage and, when appropriate, require the incorporation of protective construction features in new and existing facilities to provide resistance to weapons effects suitable to the locations of said facilities.

2. Criteria:

(a) The distance of a facility from the probable area of destruction is the controlling factor in reducing the risk of attack damage to such facility. In determining the appropriate distance consideration will be given to all relevant factors, including:

(1) The most likely objects or targets of enemy attack, such as certain military, industrial, population, and governmental concentrations.

(2) The size of such targets.

(3) The destructive power of a large yield weapon or weapons suitable to the particular target.

(4) The gradation of pressures and thermal radiation at various distances from an assumed point of detonation.

(5) The characteristics of the proposed facility, including underground and built-in protective construction features, with respect to its resistance to nuclear, chemical, and unconventional weapons.

(6) The degree of damage which a facility could sustain and still remain operable.

(7) The ground environment or natural barriers which might provide added protection to the facility.

(8) The economic, operational, and administrative requirements in carrying out the function for which the facility is to be provided.

(b) While no single distance standard and no single set of protective construction specifications against nuclear, chemical, and unconventional weapons are feasible for all situations, the above factors will be applied so as to achieve the most protection practicable for a specific situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield myself 5 more minutes.

Those are the careful, discriminating standards and criteria which have been established in the Executive order. I submit that if the Senate is ready to approve a policy of dispersal in the interest of all the people of the United States, we should accept those standards, rather than the alternative which is before us in the pending bill.

The Department of Defense, speaking through the Department of the Air Force, opposes the language of the bill as it now stands. I ask the Senators to read it. It consists of a series of criteria for the guidance of the executive branch of the Government. It says, in general terms:

In order to insure productive capacity in the event of such an attack on the United States, it is the policy of the Congress to promote the geographical dispersal of the industrial facilities of the United States in the interest of the national defense, and to discourage the concentration of such productive facilities within limited geographical areas which are vulnerable to attack by an enemy of the United States.

I call this language particularly to the attention of Senators:

In the construction of any Government-owned industrial facilities, in the rendition of any Government financial assistance for the construction, expansion, or improvement of any industrial facilities, and in the procurement of goods and services, under this or any other act, each department and agency of the executive branch shall apply—

That is mandatory—

under the coordination of the Office of Defense Mobilization, when practicable and consistent with existing law and the desirability for maintaining a sound economy, the principle of the geographical dispersal of such facilities in the interest of national defense. Nothing contained in this paragraph shall preclude the use of existing industrial facilities.

The Department of the Air Force, speaking for the Department of Defense, says it cannot work under this amendment. It says there will be such a multiplicity of questions as to what is to apply, and how it is to apply, that the administration of the act will be bogged down in endless redtape.

If the time has come for Congress to say, "We embrace a sound policy of dispersal," then the adoption of the amendment which I have offered is the way in which to do it.

My amendment refers to the carefully worded order issued by the Office of Defense Mobilization on the subject of dispersal, and, by referring to it, approves it.

I very strongly urge that in a matter of this extreme importance, language which has been tested by all the agencies should be adopted, instead of throwing it all overboard and substituting language which is susceptible of the widest kind of interpretation, such as the language in the bill as it is now written.

I ask Senators to vote in favor of the amendment I have offered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. I have 2 or 3 comments to make. The Senator from California is seeking to write into law regulations which now exist in the Office of Defense Mobilization. There is nothing wrong with the regulations, except that they are regulations of an administering body and are, very properly, subject to change as conditions change.

The Senator from California fails to make a distinction between administrative regulations and policy. Congress is charged with creating policy as guidance for administrative agencies.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe it would be a great mistake for us to write in the greatest detail the criteria of an order. Not only in this instance, but in other instances, under our system of Government, we make a distinction. We create the broad policy—and it is properly broad in this particular matter.

The Bennett amendment is intentionally broad. It is broad in order to allow some leeway for the development of policy in accordance with conditions as they arise.

I have one other thought on the subject. The statement has been made that the Bennett amendment contains no restrictions whatever. In two different places the amendment specifically says "in the interest of national defense."

It is not a wide open application of policies of dispersal, unless it relates to national defense. At the moment I cannot think of any plants which would not be concerned with national defense. But perhaps there are some. If there are, this amendment would not apply where such plants have no relation to national defense.

I submit, in the first instance, that the language is not wide open without any proper limitations. I also say again that the amendment offered by the Senator from California was not submitted to the committee. It has not been considered by the committee or by the Defense Establishment or by anyone else. It would be very unwise and very bad practice to accept the amendment without the study that should be made of it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. The objective which I seek is the incorporation in the bill of the present Executive order under which the agencies of the Department of Defense conduct their business.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite right. I believe the order was drawn in January. There is nothing wrong with the order, so far as I know. However, it is very bad practice to write into law an order that is drawn up for application at a particular moment.

The criteria have been changed as the conditions in nuclear warfare and in other methods of warfare have changed. That was proper. If the Senator will compare the criteria to which he refers with those that existed 2 or 3 years ago, he will find a very substantial difference, and properly so. I have no objection to the regulations as regulations, but I do object to incorporating them into law. That would be an exceptionally bad practice for the Senate to adopt.

Mr. KUCHEL. However, it seems to me it would be tragic to use the language which the Senator has written into the bill, in which the word "shall" is used in connection with geographical dispersal. It is mandatory. Geographical dispersal is made the basic reason for awarding any type of defense contract.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I remind the Senator that most of the laws which have been passed by Congress are mandatory. That is characteristic of law.

The committee amendment provides "when practicable and consistent with existing law and the desirability for maintaining a sound economy, the principle of the geographical dispersal of such facilities in the interest of national defense," and so forth.

I do not know what further restrictions can be applied. Of course, it is mandatory, and it is very properly mandatory. I submit the amendment is properly drawn and is a very proper amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from California. I urge Senators to support his amendment as being an amendment far preferable to the one which was under discussion earlier today, which had been offered in committee by the Senator from Utah, and which is now contained in the bill as a committee amendment.

I had intended to offer a perfecting amendment, but have concluded to defer to the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

However, in the hope that my suggested amendment might be of help in conference in connection with this particular question, I now ask unanimous consent that my explanation of my suggested perfecting amendment and a copy of the amendment as it would read be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and amendment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

EXPLANATION OF PERFECTING AMENDMENT

This amendment will recognize geographical dispersal of essential defense industry as one among several criteria to be applied in determining the location of new industrial facilities of that nature, in cases where construction of such facilities is to be aided by Federal guaranty or direct loan.

By listing the major factors to be considered, including dispersal, the amendment places the importance of dispersal in proper perspective, instead of overemphasizing its importance, as I fear the committee amendment would do. My amendment brings the situation more in line with existing policies of the executive branch by considering dispersal as one among many other important items in deciding upon location of new industrial facilities essential to national security. My amendment also follows the pattern of the National Security Act of 1947 by limiting its application to industrial facilities essential to national security. As rewritten by the Congress as recently as 1954 by the act of September 3, 1954, the pertinent portions of section 103 of the National Security Act of 1947 provide as follows:

"It shall be the function of the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization, including—

* * * * *

"(6) The strategic relocation of industries, services, Government, and economic activities, the continuous operation of which is essential to the Nation's security" (50 U. S. C., Supp. III, sec. 404).

This is existing law.

The committee amendment, on the other hand, would apply the test of geographical dispersal to (1) all procurement of goods and services by the Federal Government, (2) all Government financial assistance for construction, expansion, or improvement of any industrial facilities, and (3) construction of all Government-owned facilities. In my opinion this is far too broad in scope. My perfecting amendment would limit the application of the dispersal principle to reasonable bounds.

For convenience of reference, a copy of the committee amendment as modified by my perfecting amendment follows, showing additions by italic and deletions by brackets:

"In order to insure productive capacity in the event of such an attack on the United States, it is the policy of the Congress to [promote] *have due consideration given, among other factors, to* the geographical dispersal of the industrial facilities of the United States in the interest of the national defense, *in instances where the continuous operation of such facilities is essential to the Nation's security.* [and to discourage the concentration of such productive facilities within limited geographical areas which are vulnerable to attack by an enemy of the United States.] In the construction of any Government-owned industrial facilities, *the continuous operation of which is essential to the Nation's security, and* in the rendition of Government financial assistance *by way of direct loan or guaranty* for the construction, expansion, or improvement of any such industrial facilities [, and in the procurement of goods and services, under this or any other act], each department and agency of the executive branch [shall apply], under the coordination of the Office of Defense Mobilization, when practicable and consistent with existing law and the desirability for maintaining a sound economy, *shall give due consideration to the following factors, among others:*

"(a) achievent of geographical dispersal;

"(b) convenient availability of production materials;

"(c) adequacy and productivity of labor;

"(d) proximity to supply of capable labor available for defense work as production for civilian use dwindles during a national emergency;

"(e) availability of adequate industrial fuel;

"(f) sufficiency of transportation facilities;

"(g) proximately to markets for end products;

"(h) adequacy of distribution facilities;

"(i) dependable availability of power and water;

"(j) acceptability of living conditions, including adequacy and reasonableness of cost to users of housing and community facilities;

"(k) availability of adequate sites;

"(l) favorability of construction cost of facilities and appurtenant housing and community facilities;

"(m) acceptability of climate;

"(n) accessibility to servicing, repair and replacement facilities for machinery, components and parts;

"(o) ability to meet deadlines for timely delivery of end products at specified places;

"(p) overall economy and efficiency of operation;

"(q) acceptability of tax structure; and

"(r) effect of pertinent State and local laws and regulations.

[the principle of the geographical dispersal of such facilities in the interest of national defense.] *Every effort will be made to require the use of existing facilities in lieu of constructing new industrial facilities of the type described above in this section.* [Nothing contained in this paragraph shall preclude the use of existing industrial facilities.]"

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield back the time on this side.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, is there any time allotted on the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 30 minutes time to each side.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly. The Senate has voted on the motion to table, and I hope that some Senators who were not here during the debate on the motion to table are present at this time.

In the first place, Mr. President, the committee amendment is very far reaching and is new to legislation in the way it is being presented. For the first time it draws a criterion in law for a geographical dispersal, and then it goes to such an extent as to provide:

In the construction of any Government-owned industrial facilities, in the rendition of any governmental financial assistance.

I believe those words are sufficiently broad to prohibit small business loans to an existing manufacturing plant in an area which might be deemed by some executive to be an area subject to atomic attack or any other enemy attack. It might prohibit such a plant receiving a loan to produce parts which might be supplied to a larger manufacturer.

Reading further, Mr. President—

In the rendition of any Government financial assistance for the construction, expansion, or improvement of any industrial facilities, and in the procurement of goods and services, under this or any other act.

And so forth. It not only relates to defense production, such as planes or tanks or guns, but I believe it is so broad that it would apply to general manufacture in the United States.

Mr. President, I say, most respectfully, that in the event the amendment is made a part of the bill, I hope the question will go to conference, and that the conferees will give it attention, because although I know it is not the intent of the authors of the proposal, I think we have here the makings of a corporate state whereby the central government will move in and to a degree control industry. Up to this time, under the system we have followed we have built this Nation from a small colony of 3 million population on the Atlantic seaboard to a great Nation of 165 million, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and have made it the most productive Nation the world has ever known, with the largest force of workers ever employed in our Nation's history; but now, Mr. President, it is proposed that management be transferred to Government. We are legislating not for this administration or for the one which may follow it. We may be setting a precedent for a long time to come.

This bill, without this amendment, passed the House of Representatives on May 31. This amendment, so far as the general public knew, was not the matter under consideration when the committee met. The meetings were called for consideration of the extension of the Defense Production Act. From one end of this country to the other, Mr. President, I believe the people have not had adequate notice. I believe that had they known an amendment of this far-reaching character would be under consideration, they would have asked to be heard in each of the 48 States of the Union.

I respectfully say, again, Mr. President, that I think we are driving an opening wedge to transfer private management, which, under our free enterprise system, has built this Nation and built each of our 48 States, into the hands of the Federal Government, and we may find some subordinate official laying down criteria and saying that the Congress of the United States has given him a blank check.

I hope the legislative history of this measure will be such that it will not be possible to put the stamp of approval upon that kind of thing, because, otherwise, what we do will rise to plague us in years to come, and it may very well be, as in the case of Italy under Mussolini, that vast powers will be exercised by the Federal Government. Then it will be said, "If you move the plants, you must be able to move the labor, because the plants without labor will not be effective."

There would be a chain reaction going far beyond anything which the authors of the bill or any Senator who voted on the motion to table ever recognized as even a possibility.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from California upon his remarkable speech. I think he has put his finger on an element which has not been brought out previously in the debate. I certainly wish to concur in the sentiments which he has expressed. I think the amendment represents a danger which we did not consider in the committee at all and which has not been heretofore considered on the floor in connection with this issue. I hope Senators will give consideration to the dangers referred to by the Senator from California which, as he so ably points out, are inherent in the pending measure.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I wish to make the observation that we are extending the Defense Production Act for 2 years, and there will be ample opportunity 2 years from now to review the situation, if experience proves that it is so frightening as the speech of the Senator from California would indicate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to say 1 or 2 things by way of commenting on the speech of the Senator from California.

The present administration is trying to follow, in many respects, the same policy as that which is set forth in the bill. The Air Force is the only segment of the administration that has shown any disagreement with this amendment. It says it agrees with the policy, but it objects to the inclusion of this particular provision in the bill. But the Secretary of Commerce, Dr. Flemming of ODM, and Mr. Val Peterson of the Civil Defense Administration have recorded themselves in favor of the pending amendment.

It seems rather strange that no one in the present administration has been conscious of this great danger to our private enterprise system which has been indicated by the Senator from California. Or are we to believe that the Senator from California has lost all confidence in this administration and is not willing to trust it with the administration of this program?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I happen to believe in a government of laws, and not of men, regardless of the administration that may be in power. We in the Congress are a coordinate branch of the Government and a coequal branch of the Government. We have an obligation not even inadvertently to surrender any power to the Federal Government which may be used 5 or 10 or 20 years from now to destroy or to modify greatly what I think has been our great productive capacity growing out of our economic system.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think the Senator from California misunderstands the amendment completely. This amendment does not apply at all except in those instances where a company is seeking assistance from the Government.

In view of the enormous contributions of the Federal Government to the State of California, I think the Senator should not be too fearful of a program in which the Federal Government participates. Airplane plants, aluminum plants, and other plants in the State of California, built by the Federal Government, have been a great addition to the economy, not only of California, but of the whole Nation. I do not think there is anything inherently bad about that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not speaking today as a Senator from California, but as a Senator of the United States.

I did not understand that the amendment was for the purpose of distributing industrial plants around the Nation; I thought the purpose was to promote the national defense.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has had his say. I was about to say that it amazes me, inasmuch as the Senator from California has shown an interest in the defense of the country, and in building up the defense, that because this particular aspect might affect specific localities, he is unwilling to recognize the main objective; namely, that this provision relates to the national defense. The objective and the incentive for the proposed legislation and the Bennett amendment are quite clear.

This amendment follows the recommendations of the administration. The three persons whom I have mentioned—Mr. Peterson, the Administrator of Civil Defense; Secretary of Commerce Weeks; and Mr. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and also the Nelson committee, which was appointed by ODM for the specific purpose of examining into this policy—all recommend that for the defense of the country, in case of an atomic attack, the dispersal policy is fundamental and essential.

It is true that such a policy will have local effects. All our policies have local effects when they are applied. But the objective of the bill and of the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah is to increase the national defense. They are designed to be in the interest of the national defense.

To put it very simply, as I stated in my opening remarks, the purpose of the bill is to carry out the principle of not putting all our eggs in one basket. If all our airplane production, or a very large part of it, is to be in a small area outside Los Angeles, that area will be a very inviting target in case of war. If an enemy should succeed in dropping one bomb accurately on that area, the Nation's aircraft production would be paralyzed.

The bill does not provide for the moving of any established plants. It is really very modest in its objectives. It merely provides that in the building of new plants, if the builders seek to obtain assistance from the Government, the Government shall consider the principle of dispersion and shall seek in the interest of national defense, to disperse the plants, so that all of them, or a very substantial number of them, will not be located in a place which is subject to destruction by a single raid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The proposal is a very modest one. It writes into the law policies which the administration is already seeking to carry out, but which the Nelson committee and officials of the administration have said is moving too slowly, because

not sufficient attention is being paid to it. The administration, therefore, has agreed that Congress should accept and adopt this policy by writing it into the law, in order to strengthen the administration's application of the program.

I think it is very strange, indeed, that the Senator from California should build up mythical bugaboos to the effect that the intention is to turn the Nation into a corporate state, because this is a very modest provision in the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, since it appears that we are now all talking for the record and are making the legislative history to be read by those who are charged with the responsibility of administering the act, I shall comment briefly in connection with this legislative history.

First, I congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for having included this amendment in the bill. It is very clear that the amendment applies only to those operations and functions of the Government which are owned and operated or are supported or financed by the Federal Government. It will have no impact upon the private industry of this country.

I am glad the Senate voted on the amendment relating to the present dispersal criteria, and that the legislative history shows that the Senate emphatically rejected those criteria when they were presented in amendment form. I think the Senate rejected them in part because of the very valid and persuasive argument advanced by the Senator from Arkansas. I think they were rejected in part also because they are not sufficiently effective to do the job. Had the dispersal criteria which the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] sought to have included in the law by amendment been sufficiently effective, the committee would never have had to submit this committee amendment now before us for approval.

The committee submitted its amendment because there was something lacking in the law, and the administrative criteria, namely, a sufficient recognition of the importance of geography in those criteria. I feel certain the committee found it necessary to make this new amendment because of these inadequate criteria. It is now a mandate of the Senate, however, to place more emphasis on geography in dispersal of defense industries. It is now a legislative recital of the determination of Congress and the appropriation bodies of Congress that geography be recognized as one of the great methods by which defense industries which are defensible can be established. We do not want them concentrated in a few choice target areas.

I am glad the Senate has had its yea-and-nay votes on these matters. I am glad we have had this discussion. I do not think we need to fear, despite the arguments envisioned by my good friend from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], that the adoption of the amendment will certainly bring about a great governmental movement of people from coastal areas to the interior of the Nation. Nevertheless, we have a right to hope that it will stop the continuing drain of young people from the middle part of America to the coastal areas.

California, the East, and other areas of the Nation are heavily populated with the sons and daughters of rural America, who were forced to leave their home States to secure employment in defense industries—a fact which up to now the Department of Defense has pretty well ignored. I repeat, the word is "ignored." The Middle West has been pretty well ignored in the locating of defense fabricating plants. The defense plants are supported by all the taxpayers, not merely the taxpayers of the coastal States which now have a plethora of defense industries.

The committee and the Senate have acted wisely in solidifying in the law the determination of Congress, at long last, to have the dispersals made throughout the country, so that the plants can be defended without undue added expense under the national defense program, and so that there will be some element of equity from the standpoint of placing tax-supported industries in various tax-paying areas of the Nation.

I hope those who will evaluate and administer this law will, from a reading of the RECORD, note well the fact that the present criteria were rejected when they were brought before us in amendment form. They were inadequate to do the job. We have a right to expect better performance in the future under this new law.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on the committee amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time on both sides yielded back?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will yield back the remainder of my time if the Senator from California will yield back his remaining time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. On the committee amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Chair repeat his decision?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not announce the result.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Allott	Hill	Murray
Anderson	Hruska	Neuberger
Barrett	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Bender	Jenner	Payne
Bennett	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Bush	Johnston, S. C.	Purtell
Carlson	Kerr	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Knowland	Scott
Chavez	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Laird	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Langer	Sparkman
Ellender	Lehman	Stennis
Ervin	Long	Symington
Flanders	Malone	Thye
Frear	Mansfield	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
George	McCarthy	Williams
Goldwater	McClellan	Wofford
Gore	Millikin	
Hayden	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning on page 3, in line 10, and ending on page 4 in line 6.

On this question, all time has been used.

The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay" and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea," and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] would each vote "yea."

Also on this vote the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would vote "nay."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

Also, on this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

I further announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 13, as follows:

YEAS—48

Aiken	Gore	Morse
Allott	Hayden	Mundt
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Murray
Barrett	Hill	Neuberger
Bennett	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Payne
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kerr	Scott
Cotton	Laird	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Langer	Sparkman
Ellender	Long	Stennis
Ervin	Malone	Symington
Frear	Mansfield	Thye
Fulbright	McCarthy	Watkins
George	McClellan	Wiley
Goldwater	Millikin	Wofford

NAYS—13

Bender	Knowland	Purtell
Bush	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	Lehman	Williams
Jackson	Martin, Pa.	
Jenner	Potter	

NOT VOTING—34

Beall	Douglas	McNamara
Bible	Duff	Monroney
Bricker	Eastland	Neely
Bridges	Green	Pastore
Butler	Hennings	Robertson
Byrd	Holland	Russell
Capehart	Humphrey	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Ives	Smathers
Clements	Kefauver	Welker
Curtis	Kennedy	Young
Daniel	Magnuson	
Dirksen	Martin, Iowa	

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time, with the understanding that the other side will do likewise.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have 10 minutes on the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senate for accepting the committee amendment to section 701 (c). This was an amendment which I proposed in committee.

In my judgment, this amendment is the minimum action the Congress should take to provide some assistance to the small concerns in the country which are suffering from the heavy demands imposed by meeting our defense requirements.

I thank the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] for the cooperation and assistance he gave me in connection with this amendment. After committee discussion of the principle of the amendment, which was approved by the committee, the Senator from Utah and I worked out, with the assistance of legal counsel of the staff, the wording of the amendment.

I have received many requests for assistance from small firms which are unable to get materials in order to stay in business. Small contractors cannot bid on jobs because they cannot get certain types of steel—it is all going to the producers' subsidiaries. Small barge builders cannot get the kind of steel they need to provide cheap barge transportation—it is all going to the big companies, which find it easy to get both rapid tax amortization and the needed steel.

In the field of nickel, the same story is told again and again. Only 3 weeks ago the Small Business Committee held hearings on the subject of nickel. We heard platers and plating suppliers tell of their hardships. Their supplies have been reduced to a quarter of their supply in 1949 or 1950, and even at that they never can count on more than a month's supply. They do not know how their allocation is computed, or how it compares with their competitor's. All they know is that each month they are told how much they can have for the next month. They can go out and buy more nickel—at two or three times the so-called market price, but their business does not allow for this kind of a margin. The big companies can afford it, and they are putting in their own plating equipment and integrating still further.

And what does the Government, which has caused this situation, do about it? The only hope the Government can offer is to wait 3 or 4 years until the latest expansion program announced May 17, 1956, gets going. In the meantime the ODM is diverting nickel from the defense stockpile. This is helpful to industry; I hope it is not toying with the national security.

Beyond this, the ODM and the Commerce Department can only agree on confusing the situation hopelessly.

On one hand, they state they are exercising no controls, on the theory, expressed by Dr. Flemming when the NPA orders controlling nickel were revoked, that "competition in a free market is a major factor in the maintenance of a strong and dynamic economy." Again and again Dr. Flemming and Secretary Weeks reiterate that there are no Government controls. And equally frequently they repeat that the present distribution is fair and equitable.

But when I heard the testimony of Mr. Mueller, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and Mr. McCoy of the Commerce Department, and Mr. Wingate of the International Nickel Co., I had a very different impression.

Instead of there being no Government controls, I concluded there is now an informal voluntary agreement between Commerce, the International Nickel Co. and the few other minor producers, and the distributors of nickel to platers and other small users of nickel. Mr. McCoy's testimony on page 232 of the small business hearings made it clear that International Nickel agreed to carry on under the same arrangements as NPA had used. Mr. Wingate on pages 291 and 292 left no doubt that the other producers cooperated fully in this system. Mr. Hershman's testimony on page 235 and Mr. Wingate's testimony on page 296 made it clear that the suppliers to the plating industry shared in this arrangement. They have to, of course; if they did not cooperate, Inco would cut off their supplies.

What happens is that Inco assigns a quota to each of its customers. They start with the customers' orders in 1948–1950. Then Inco makes all kinds of adjustments—on the basis of Inco's estimate of the customers' needs, and the future prospects of the customer and so on, as described at length at pages 292–299 of the small business hearings.

Each customer is then required to say just how much he got from any supplier other than Inco. This is deducted from his allocation. This applies to the Government nickel from NICARO, as much as to any other.

Part of the original agreement was that the Commerce Department would be permitted to look at the books of the producers and suppliers to see whether the agreement was being carried out.

Listen to this quotation from the Commerce Department's report on nickel, issued in December 1955:

Question. What steps are taken by the Government to assure equitable distribution of nickel?

Answer. BDSA personnel conduct a monthly audit of nickel distributed by nickel producers in order to make sure that some nickel consumers do not get more than their fair share. This is done by BDSA personnel matching up the order boards of nickel producers in order to insure that consumers do not place duplicate orders with different suppliers. In addition, the order boards of the nickel plating suppliers are audited periodically. The most recent audit was conducted during September of this year. In this way any inequities can be corrected quickly.

Dr. Flemming thinks nickel is being distributed in the civilian market without Government controls—page 376. He calls what the Government does maintaining liaison. Perhaps he considers this Inco-run Government-assisted system "competition in a free market."

I cannot agree. I think even the best-run cartels in Europe must envy the situation into which the Government has placed the International Nickel Co., backing its control over the market, and lending its sanction and approval to this system.

I do not blame International Nickel for this situation. On the contrary, it seems to me that it is Secretary Weeks and Dr. Flemming who are primarily responsible, and they may well have not appreciated what they were doing.

Dr. Flemming may not appreciate how thorough is this Government control or Government support of Inco control. I suspect he does not. If he had appreciated it, he would not have said:

Formal control over the distribution of nickel in the civilian economy would bring a great many liabilities in its wake. Informal controls would create even more serious liabilities. If we are going to have controls, they should be formal controls, so that everyone knows the rules of the game" (p. 375).

Mr. Mueller of the Commerce Department, on the other hand, presumably knew what was going on, though even he does not seem to appreciate the result of the Government's actions. His view of this private voluntary agreement, sponsored and supervised by the Government, was shown by the following colloquy:

Mr. ODOM. So that you could say as between International Nickel Co. controlling that industry and the Government controlling the industry, you would rest it in the hands of International Nickel Co.; is that your testimony?

Mr. MUELLER. Well, as a matter of fact, that is the way it has been done, to a large extent.

Mr. ODOM. And you think that is the best procedure?

Mr. MUELLER. I think it is far preferable to the Government doing it.

This is not free competitive private enterprise. This is not a free market. This is not freedom from Government controls.

This is not freedom from governmental control. Every plater in the country knows that he is not engaging in a free enterprise industry. He knows he is being subjected to the monopolistic control of the International Nickel Co., which, in turn, has the cooperation and assistance of, and in a very real sense, the approval of its practice by the United States Government.

If the nickel situation is so bad that such a system is necessary, I am convinced it should be run in an open, public way by Government orders, printed in the Federal Register, so that all who are affected can know what is being done, with formal procedures established for protests and appeals, and with definite lawful penalties for violations.

Mr. President, the little fellow does not have a chance against the exercise of discretion by the International Nickel Co. He takes the nickel it allows him, and he likes it, or he can go broke as a result of raising protests which may get him into difficulty when it comes to getting future supplies.

I think Dr. Flemming and Secretary Weeks can now take measures to assist the consumers of nickel, even under the present statute. In the first place, there are many forms of allocation short of control over the general distribution in the civilian market which they could now exercise regardless of the limitations imposed by section 101 (b) of the act. Furthermore, even Dr. Flemming agrees that the facts support a finding under section 101 (b) warranting the exercise of control over the general distribution of nickel in the civilian market—Defense Production Act hearings, pages 37–38.

The amendment is desirable, in my view, to make it clear that the President has a duty, when the needs of defense bring about a situation like the nickel situation today, to review the situation carefully, and to look into all the many forms of control which he might exercise, and then to take whatever action will best remedy the situation.

This amendment is no iron maiden. It does not handcuff the President and compel him to take needless or harmful action. The provision is loaded with escape clauses. I realize that the Congress cannot specify just what form of relief would be best in a complicated and changing situation. Even if we could devise the best system in the world for today's situation, tomorrow's problem would be different and would call for a different solution.

What the amendment does is to make it clear that the President should not wash his hands of responsibility for a situation created by the needs of defense.

What the Senate has done this afternoon, in my judgment, is to give long-overdue assistance to small-business men, particularly those in the plating industry, so far as the nickel business is concerned. Under the amendment, the President has the clear authority and, in my judgment, the charge of duty to come to the assistance of these small-business men when the facts make it perfectly clear that they are entitled to relief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do both sides yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a statement which I prepared on H. R. 9852.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA

The time is most opportune to give new impetus to a well-considered policy of industrial dispersion which will not disrupt or dislocate our existing industrial installations.

It is appropriate first that we assess a policy of industrial dispersion as another addition to our arsenal of military weapons. Senators have heard many speeches and much testimony before their committees in recent weeks on the relative merits of certain items of military hardware over others. Such discussion is aimed at bringing our Military Establishment to the highest peak of striking power possible.

A policy of industrial dispersion should, in my opinion, be discussed in the same light. Industrial dispersion is a sound investment for our defense dollar.

The potential of aggressor nations' destructive power increases daily. I need not detail the destruction with which we would be threatened in case of attack by an enemy.

The importance of dispersion has increased as man has devised weapons of war with ever greater destructive power. Unnecessary concentration of our industrial facilities is a neglect of a vital part of our defense program.

Industrial dispersion is, of course, not the complete solution to our problems of vulnerability but it is an integral part of any modern mobilization program. As such, it should be so recognized by a declaration of policy by Congress such as is proposed.

It is also appropriate that the Senate make such a declaration of policy at a time when our economy is at a high peak of prosperity. The vigor of our industrial community is at an alltime high. Plant modernization and expansion is proceeding at an unprecedented peacetime pace and there is little sign of a slackening.

Thus, a vigorous program of industrial dispersion can be initiated without disruption or dislocation of existing industrial installations.

The McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., in its eighth annual survey of industry, estimated recently that American industry will spend $39 billion for plant modernization and expansion this year. That is a 30-percent increase over 1955.

Most of the large increases in capacity this year are in the field of manufacturing—with just under $14 billion worth of capital spending scheduled for this year. Further, the manufacturing industry plans $13.2 billion worth of capital spending in 1957. McGraw-Hill reports that around $11 billion for plant and expansion already has been earmarked by manufacturers for 1958 and a like amount in 1959.

These figures show that the yield of an industrial dispersion program would be high. Despite the urgency of need for industrial dispersion, there is a practical limit to how much our industrial capacity can be dispersed within a given period. At this time, when our manufacturing community is extremely active in increasing capacity, that limit is comparatively high.

This is well attuned to the current problems and potentialities of our dispersion program. It would require those executive agencies concerned to apply the principles of dispersion in considering location of all new industrial facilities in which the Government renders financial assistance. It recognizes the undesirability of disrupting the great industrial complexes which are the backbone of our economy. But, at the same time, it declares that Federal funds will not be used in establishment of new industrial

installations to increase the vulnerability of established facilities.

This program, therefore, would do much to increase the protection of our established industrial capacity as well as to provide whatever measure of protection possible for new installations. In short, it would guard against making any target area any more critical than at present.

Techniques of industrial dispersion are well developed. The Departments of Defense and Commerce, the Office of Civil Defense, and the Office of Defense Mobilization have established dispersal criteria and methods of applying them to specific areas.

Industrial dispersion is no longer a yardstick matter. Taking into consideration the awesome destruction which can be wrought by nuclear weapons and the complications of fallout patterns, there can be established no scale of dispersion readily applicable to every situation.

Nevertheless, mobilization planners, on a case-by-case basis, have devised a technology of dispersion geared to the requirements for the maximum of practical protection.

A national policy of industrial dispersion was declared in August 1951. The first standards of proper spacing of industrial facilities soon became obsolete. But modernized dispersion criteria have become a major consideration for any company expanding its capacity through new plant construction.

Any additional encouragement Congress can provide this program would, Mr. President, increase the effectiveness of our industrial community in its potential role as a bulwark of our defense against attack. I urge that H. R. 9852, as reported by the committee, be passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], because he did a great deal of work on the amendment, and I think he deserves much credit.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas. Not in the spirit of reciprocity, but out of the depths of my heart, I say that the entire Senate is indebted to the Senator from Arkansas for the leadership he gave. This is a good bill, and the fact that it is a good bill is due in no small measure to the leadership of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have yielded back my time, Mr. President.

Mr. PURTELL. We yield back our time, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 9852) was read the third time, and passed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE CITY OF CHEYENNE, WYO.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2220, Senate bill 2654.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2654) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which has been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this bill is one of several which were objected to upon the last call of the calendar. This bill and the one to which I shall refer later were objected to by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who has since withdrawn his objection. The bill is noncontroversial.

Some 20 years ago the city of Cheyenne conveyed more than 600 acres to the Government for a Veterans' Administration center in that city. The bill transfers back to the city 90.2 acres for which the Veterans' Administration has no longer any need.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the mayor of Cheyenne, in which he says that 1,100 boys play ball in a field which is a part of the 90 acres the city is asking to have restored.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the superintendent of schools of Cheyenne, Wyo., in connection with the location on the tract of a possible second senior high school.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHEYENNE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Cheyenne, Wyo., June 6, 1956.

Hon. FRANK A. BARRETT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: I am sure that you are aware of our interest in the land by the Veterans Hospital, east of Cheyenne. We have watched with interest the legislation to return this land to the city and have been in close touch with the present city officials. We have their verbal assurance that we will be given some land from the 400-plus acres that has been included in the first bill. This land would be used for an athletic stadium.

You are aware also that we were especially anxious to secure part of the additional 90 acres for the location of a possible second senior high school. This land is ideally located for such purposes. I am sure that you know the number of possible sites for a building of the type necessary is quite limited.

The city officials have been quite cooperative, and we feel certain that should this additional land be returned to the city of Cheyenne, we would have no difficulty securing the site from them.

We are aware of your interest in our schools and will certainly appreciate anything you can do to aid us and the city in securing this property.

Respectfully yours,

SAM CLARK.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be stated.

The amendments of the Committee on Government Operations were, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert a comma and "subject to the provisions of section 2 (a) of this Act", and on page 2, after line 5, to insert:

SEC. 2. The deed of conveyance (1) shall provide that the tract of land authorized to be conveyed shall be used by the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for such purposes as will not in the judgment of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or his designate interfere with the operation of the Veterans' Administration Center, Cheyenne, Wyo.; (2) may contain such additional terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as may be determined by the Administrator of General Services to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States; and (3) shall provide that title to such tract shall revert to the United States upon the violation by the grantee of any such term, condition, reservation, or restriction.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to the provisions of section 2 (a) of this act, the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately ninety and two-tenths acres of land, together with any improvements thereon, which were formerly a part of the tract of land comprising the Veterans' Administration Center, Cheyenne, Wyo., and declared surplus to the needs of the Veterans' Administration, the exact description of which shall be determined by the Administrator of General Services.

SEC. 2. The deed of conveyance (1) shall provide that the tract of land authorized to be conveyed shall be used by the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for such purposes as will not in the judgment of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or his designate interfere with the operation of the Veterans' Administration Center, Cheyenne, Wyo.; (2) may contain such additional terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as may be determined by the Administrator of General Services to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States; and (3) shall provide that title to such tract shall revert to the United States upon the violation by the grantee of any such term, condition, reservation, or restriction.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until next Monday at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOWARD SHARP BENNION

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it is one of the tributes of the American way of life that a man may rise from humble circumstances—through events and challenges—to a position of greatness, worth, and spiritual well-being in our land. Such a man is inspirational to all of us, and in recounting something of the story of his life we are again reminded of the value of America and of the American spirit, while recognizing the worth of a citizen of whom we are proud.

Such a man is Howard Sharp Bennion, better known in the electrical utilities industry as "the Colonel."

In the fall of 1889, Howard Bennion was born—the third of nine children—to a couple then living in the little community of Vernon, Utah, a settlement that today numbers still no more than a hundred persons. Through the urging of the late great Utah Senator—Reed Smoot—the worth of this young man was recognized and the Republican Senator assisted him in procuring appointment to West Point's well-known United States Military Academy. Four years later Howard Bennion graduated—top man in his class.

In his military career, in the business career that followed, and in his lifelong devotion to his religion, Howard Bennion has lived a life of service. He is now a patriarch in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints—the Mormon Church. He has achieved fame and reputation in the electrical utilities field, to which—after 30 years of service as its spokesman—he recently announced his retirement. He has served long as vice president and managing director of the Edison Electric Institute, and the people of his native State are justifiably proud of Colonel Bennion and his great record of outstanding service.

Colonel Bennion's career and achievement is reviewed in a recent account in the New York Times, and I ask unanimous consent that that statement be made a part of my remarks. I am sure that many of my colleagues here will read with pleasure and profit this story of a great American.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PATRIARCH LEAVES UTILITY FIELD AFTER 30 YEARS AS ITS SPOKESMAN—COL. HOWARD SHARP BENNION RETIRING TO SALT LAKE CITY AND MORMON WORK

ATLANTIC CITY, June 5.—The Nation's electric utilities honored here today their spokesman for the past 30 years.

Col. Howard Sharp Bennion, a patriarch of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormon) stepped down officially as vice president and managing director of the Edison Electric Institute. This brought to a close a career that has been one-third military and two-thirds industrial leadership and has remained throughout 100 percent devoted to his church.

The industry, recognizing this leadership, presented itself a 30-by-40-inch portrait of The Colonel painted for EEI by the artist, Thomas A. Stephens.

In his 30 years service Colonel Bennion has seen the industry's production multiply eight times to last year's record output of 545 billion kilowatt hours.

The outstanding characteristic of the man is his gentleness. Quiet, soft-spoken, almost shy, The Colonel, as he is known to utility leaders, was born in Vernon, Utah, on September 7, 1889, the third of nine children. Of Welsh, English and Scotch ancestry, Colonel Bennion's forebears were among the Mormon pioneers.

RELIGION AND DANCING

His early education was interspersed with farm chores. He admits today that he was not much interested in such work, preferring reading, games and the religious activities that even today occupy much of his time.

"Families would take turns giving a dance in their homes," he recalled. "There would be one, possibly two, fiddlers. Neighbors would drive over by team and the dance would last all night. Small children would be put to bed. A supply of good food would more than meet the needs and after a hearty breakfast at sunrise the teams would be hitched up and the party would disperse."

For 40 years he has worn high-laced shoes, souvenirs of a pulled tendon at a dance in Washington.

ALWAYS A STAR

The late Senator Reed Smoot, Republican of Utah, urged young Bennion to take an appointment to the United States Military Academy at West Point, which he entered in March, 1908. He was top man in his class (1912) and achieved a scholastic rating that ranks him with Gens. Robert E. Lee and Douglas MacArthur.

The Howitzer for 1912, West Point's yearbook, said:

"Some men are born bright, others achieve brightness, and still others have brightness thrust upon them. Bennion suffers all three and, in consequence, has always been a star [West Point designation for those in the upper 2 or 3 percent of their class]. And, yet, how quiet and unassuming is the man from the sagebrush of Utah."

When he left the Point, he enrolled in the School of Army Engineers, from which he was graduated, again at the top of his class, in 1915. Lieutenant Bennion served 6 months in Texas during the Mexican border troubles, then was transferred to the Philippine Islands, where he headed a military survey of Luzon.

With America's entry into World War I, he became commanding officer of the 1st Battalion, 2d Engineers, and took that unit to France in 1917. At the age of 28 he was selected to organize the new Army Camouflage Service. In that capacity he wrote three manuals, many of whose principles are still basic Army doctrine.

For this service he received the Distinguished Service Medal. Later he was honored by France with membership in the Legion of Honor for rehabilitation work.

ASSIGNED TO FPC

Postwar service with the Engineers at Washington slowly headed him to the world of electric utilities. Shortly after his marriage to Marian Norros Cannon in 1920, Colonel Bennion was assigned by the War Department to duty with the then new Federal Power Commission, a group with which he has had continuous dealings ever since.

On leave of absence in 1926 he became director of engineering for National Electric Light Association, predecessor of the Edison Electric Institute.

In that post he set the standards for his later job with EEI: "The efficiency of our association," he wrote, "depends on a widespread interchange of ideas and information. * * * We are like sentries on outpost and frequently must decide whether there is time to call up the main body to attack the question at issue or whether we ourselves must engage it with the limited force at hand."

This has been pretty much the way Colonel Bennion has governed policies of EEI over the years.

He resigned from the Army later in 1926. When the NELA was dissolved in 1933, he continued with the new EEI, and in 1939 he was elected vice president and managing director.

The 17 years that followed have seen the electric utilities pace the Nation's economy, pacing it and fulfilling its needs even during the unprecedented demands of wartime. During World War II, Colonel Bennion was approached many times with offers to return to high military posts, but he cast his lot with guidance of the war efforts of the utilities.

After the war, he helped lead the industry in battle against so-called socialized power. He also helped to make EEI a clearinghouse for nuclear-power information.

Today this quiet man embarks on a new career in which one of his top worries will be how to keep off excess weight.

"Over the years," he explains, "I've had no trouble keeping at 178 pounds because I've worked it off. Now I'm not sure what will happen."

Mrs. Bennion and the colonel leave for a trip through Western Europe and Greece and Israel ("Just to see them," he said) and then back to Salt Lake City where they will both keep active in their church work.

The official tribute read yesterday by Louis V. Sutton, president of the Carolina Power & Light Co., summed up the industry's attitude:

"No industry has ever been better served by an individual than the electric utility industry has been by Col. Howard Sharp Bennion. He has been our leader, our monitor, our good and useful servant. His vast abilities have won our admiration and our gratitude."

CONVEYANCE OF TRIBAL LANDS OF THE WIND RIVER RESERVATION, WYO., TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2253, Senate bill 3467.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3467) to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, like the bill which was passed a few moments ago, this bill was objected to on the last call of the calendar by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in order that he might have an opportunity to examine it. He has examined it and has withdrawn his objection.

The purpose of the bill is to enable the Arapahoe and Shoshone Indians of Wyoming to transfer 388.23 acres to the Government of the United States, the Bureau of Reclamation, for the purpose of constructing a reservoir. The bill is approved by the Department of the Interior and is unanimously reported by the committee.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, it is necessary to pass this bill if this project is to be constructed at an eary date. Is that not correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment will be stated.

The amendment of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation are authorized to convey to the United States the tribes' interests in the 388.23 acres of land that are described in section 2 of the act, subject to a reservation to the tribes of all minerals, including oil and gas, and mineral rights, which may be exercised only in a manner that does not interfere with the construction and operation of the dam site and reservoir of Anchor Dam, a part of the Owl Creek unit, Missouri River Basin project in Hot Springs County, near Thermopolis, Wyo. If the tribes fail to agree to such conveyance within 30 days after the date of this act, the Secretary is directed to acquire such land by eminent domain. The consideration payable to the tribes pursuant to eminent domain proceedings, if such should be necessary, shall be paid out of funds appropriated for the Missouri River Basin project and shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit and for the use of the respective tribes in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 19, 1947 (61 Stat. 102), as amended.

SEC. 2. The lands that are referred to in section 1 of this act are: Lots 1 and 2, section 13, northwest quarter, north half southwest quarter, west half northeast quarter, and northwest quarter southeast quarter, section 24, township 8 north, range 1 west, Wind River meridian, Wyoming, containing 388.23 acres.

SEC. 3. In the event of the failure or abandonment of the Anchor Dam feature of the Owl Creek unit the interest in the land acquired pursuant to this act shall be reconveyed by the Secretary of the Interior to the tribes and the title shall be held in the same manner it was held before such acquisition: *Provided*, That the sum of the award in the eminent domain proceedings, if any, paid by the United States shall be returned by the tribes.

SEC. 4. If the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes make the conveyance authorized by the first sentence of section 1 of this act, no part of the construction costs of the Owl Creek unit shall be allocated to the irrigable lands of the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes of the Wind River Reservation or against the tribes, and the portion of such construction costs that would be so allocated except for this act shall be nonreimbursable. The irrigable lands of the tribes shall be entitled to their pro rata share of the water storage and regulation benefits accruing from the construction and operation of the Owl Creek unit upon payment by the tribes, under appropriate contract, of their pro rata share of the annual operation and maintenance costs of the Owl Creek unit.

SEC. 5. The members of the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes shall have the right to fish on the lake created by Anchor Dam, without a State license, but the Indians shall be subject to all other provisions of applicable conservation laws and regulations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DESERT LAND ENTRIES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2293, Senate bill 3512.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3512) to permit desert land entries on disconnected tracts of lands which, in the case of any one entryman, form a compact unit and do not exceed in the aggregate 320 acres.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, this bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It was favorably reported upon by the Secretary of the Interior and by the Bureau of the Budget. It simply provides that disconnected tracts of land in a compact body may be settled under the act of 1877. There is no objection to the bill recorded by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act of March 3, 1877, entitled "An act to provide for the sale of desert lands in certain States and Territories," as amended (43 U. S. C. 321), is further amended by the deletion at the end of that section of the following words ": *Provided*, That no person shall be permitted to enter more than one tract of land and not to exceed 320 acres which shall be in compact form" and the addition of the following: "Except as provided in section 3 of the act of June 16, 1955 (69 Stat. 138), as amended, no person may make more than one entry under this act. However, in that entry one or more tracts may be included, and the tracts so entered need not be contiguous. The aggregate acreage of desert land which may be entered by any one person under this section shall not exceed 320 acres, and all the tracts entered by one person must form together a compact unit, as determined by rules and regulations to be issued by the Secretary of the Interior."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the act of June 16, 1955 (69 Stat. 138), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Any person who, prior to June 16, 1955, made a valid desert-land entry on lands subject to such act of June 22, 1910, or of July 17, 1914, may, if otherwise qualified, make one additional entry, as a personal privilege, not assignable, upon one or more tracts of desert land subject to the provisions of such acts, as hereby amended, and section 7 of the act entitled 'An act to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration, to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range, and for other purposes', approved June 28, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 1269, 1272; 43 U. S. C. 315f). The additional land entered by any person pursuant to this section shall not, together with his original entry, exceed 320 acres, and all the tracts included within the additional entry authorized by this section shall form together a compact unit, as determined by rules and regulations to be issued by the Secretary of the Interior. Additional entries authorized by this section shall be subject to all the requirements of the desert-land law."

DEVELOPMENT OF PHOSPHATE ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2294, S. 3042.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3042) to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U. S. C., sec. 184), in order to promote the development of phosphate on the public domain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act, which contains a limitation that not more than 5,120 acres of land on the public domain and containing phosphate deposits may be leased in any one State to any one individual or corporation.

There is a total limitation of 10,240 acres, but the limitation of 5,120 acres of land in any one State renders it uneconomical to establish and operate plants to process the phosphate deposits.

So the bill was drafted and was submitted to Congress by the Department of the Interior. It was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am chairman, and I introduced the bill at the request of the Department of the Interior. Full hearings were held in the House, and the Senate committee had access to those hearings.

I understand there is no objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of section 27 of the act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U. S. C., sec. 184), is amended by the deletion of the words "exceeding in the aggregate 5,120 acres in any one State, and."

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, June 25, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 22, 1956:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

T. A. M. Craven, of Virginia, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1956.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Garrison Norton, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Kenneth S. Harrison, for promotion to permanent rank of rear admiral in the United States Coast Guard Reserve.

The following-named persons to rank indicated:

To be commanders

Edward J. Worrell, Jr.*
Charles W. Miller

To be lieutenant commanders

Stanley L. Smith
John A. Weber
William H. Campbell

To be chief warrant officers, W–2

Carl D. Strange	Frederick D. Mann
Donat Cotnoir	James W. Berry
Bampton L. Jones	James I. Pledger, Jr.
Eugene Newsome	William F. Brock
Wayne W. Fish	Dolly Fulcher
Peter P. Zilkan	Merle S. Wilson
Alvin R. Rutz	Finis L. McClanahan
Elbert S. Hendrix	Robert F. Konrad
Raymond C. Buday	Cornelius A. Johnson
Edward C. Zachowski	Palmer F. Guarente
Boyd M. Smith	Philip J. Crawley
Kenneth M. Lumsden	Frederick M. Rummel
Elmer L. Alban	Joseph A. DelTorto
George D. Miller, Jr.	Raymond R. Thiele
Earl H. McDonald	Charter D. Edwards
Robert L. Roberts	Harry H. Stimpson, Jr.
James B. Hunnings	Edison Jones
Wilbur T. Hutchinson	Beverly E. Locke
Charles J. Albanese	Claude W. Jenkins
William R. Bentler	

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following persons for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be captains

Joseph P. Lushene
Walter J. Chovan

To be ensigns

John A. Alexander	Verle B. Miller
Lawrence H. Anderson	Kerry F. Pitts
William D. Barnum	Joel P. Porcher
Dale V. Bedenkop	James K. Richards
Ogden Beeman	Joseph M. Rodgers
Robert B. Bowman	Paul L. Schock
Bernard L. Gabrielsen	James R. Schwartz
Richard H. Garnett, Jr.	Thomas E. Simkin
Richard G. Hajec	C. Eugene Skinner
K. William Jeffers	Matthew J. Stahl
Alveric B. Kegerreis	Victory V. Tilley, Jr.,
James E. Long	effective June 18,
Bernard W. McCray, Jr.	1956.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility, designated by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Lewis Blaine Hershey, O6530, United States Army, to be lieutenant general.

The nominations of Peter A. Abbruzzese and 1,435 other officers for promotion in the Regular Army, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on June 5, 1956, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Peter A. Abbruzzese, which occurs on page 9546 and ending with the name of William R. Wynd, which is shown on page 9551.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations of Charlotte Gage Butterfield and 438 other officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on June 6, 1956, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Charlotte Gage Butterfield, which appears on page 9653 and ending with the name of Jack Allison Morris, which occurs on page 9655.

The nominations of Daniel B. Dockstader and 349 other officers for reappointment or appointment in the Regular Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on June 18, 1956, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Daniel B. Dockstader, which is shown on page 10497 and ending with the name of George E. Woods, which occurs on page 10498.

IN THE NAVY

The nominations of Paul A. Weber, Jr., and 1,788 other officers for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on June 6, 1956, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Paul A. Weber, Jr., which is shown on page 9655, and ending with the name of Lester D. Widick, Jr., which occurs on page 9659.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general while serving under the provisions of section 415 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Maj. Gen. Ray A. Robinson, USMC.
Maj. Gen. Merrill B. Twining, USMC.

The following-named officers, when retired, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general:

Lt. Gen. Alfred H. Noble, USMC.
Lt. Gen. William O. Brice, USMC.

The nominations of Daniel C. Pollock and 1,197 other officers for appointment in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on June 13, 1956, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Daniel C. Pollock, appearing on page 9189, and ending with the name of Charles P. Williams, on page 9192.

POSTMASTERS

OKLAHOMA

James F. Houser, Jr., Newkirk.
Gene L. Taylor, Wann.
Glen L. Strange, Tonkawa.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address By Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, to the National Association of Plumbing Contractors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 22, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during my recent tour throughout Wisconsin, I was pleased to address a splendid organization which is a pillar of the United States construction industry. I refer to the National Association of Plumbing Contractors.

I was glad to refer, in the course of my remarks, to the importance of labor management teamwork in realizing the highest possible goal for United States construction.

It was a pleasure to praise one of the outstanding leaders of this industry, another man with deep roots in my own State, the able president of the Plumbing Contractors, Mr. Peter T. Schoeman. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from my address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY SAYS UNITED STATES GOLDEN AGE IS HERE—URGES UPGRADING OF AMERICA'S HOMES TO CREATE INFINITELY BROADER MARKET

(Excerpts from address by Senator WILEY to the National Association of Plumbing Contractors convention at Milwaukee on Tuesday, June 12, 1956)

I am delighted to attend your outstanding convention—the greatest in history.

It is a particular pleasure for me to add my personal word of gratification that you have honored America's vacation land, Wisconsin, by meeting here in this great convention city.

I hope that you have been enjoying the opportunity to see all you can of this great port city, and that you will be seeing more of the Badger State, as well.

ENJOYING LIFE'S GOOD THINGS

Why? Because to do so is to enjoy more of the good things of life—wholesome leisure in pleasant, attractive surroundings. And that is precisely my theme to you this morning: America's enjoying more of life's good things.

This great country of ours has entered upon its true golden age—an age where Mr. and Mrs. Average Man are going to enjoy a better home, broader comforts, more stable security than they have ever known before.

Of course, no one can foresee through the veil of the future. A grim cloud can appear on our national horizon—such as that cast by the illness of our great President. But with God's help, all will be well.

My theme is that the motto of America can well be "Future unlimited" if we but choose to make it so, if we but use our God-given ingenuity and understanding, if there be genuine and continuing labor-management teamwork in fact and in spirit.

TRIBUTE TO BUILDING LABOR

I am delighted that among our honored guests is, of course, the distinguished president of the plumbers' union, Mr. Peter T. Schoeman, a former Milwaukeean, as you know.

Pete Schoeman is truly representative of the highest type of leader of American organized labor. We are proud of him and of other leading representatives of the officers and rank and file of the building trades. They constitute a traditional cornerstone of the labor movement. They are builders in every sense of the word—literally and figuratively—skilled builders side by side with the skilled building and repairing contractors in this vast audience.

It is you who are—day in and day out—truly building, you who are contributing to almost every structure that extends below the surface and silhouettes against the prairies or the villages or the skylines of our Nation.

CONSTRUCTION—KEYSTONE IN ECONOMY

The building industry, as you well know, has become an ever more important keystone in our expanding American economy.

"As the construction industry goes, so goes America." Not only home construction but also as home repair and home improvement go—as factory repair and improvement and expansion go, so goes America.

Our whole vast economy, with its $400 billion total of goods and services, pulsates with the beat—the tempo—of the huge construction industry.

MODERNIZE 12 MONTHS A YEAR

The month of August, as you know, is designated Plumbing, Heating, and Cooling Month.

But I would like—as you would like—August to be just the start of a year-long forward surge of modernized plumbing, heating and cooling for our country.

This is the challenge confronting us.

The building of new homes, improvement of older houses, the needed expansion of industry, the construction of nonresidential buildings such as churches, schools, office buildings; hospitals, playgrounds, hotels, motels, restaurants: All of this is a tremendous opportunity, a new and bigger market for your sales and service.

SIZABLE ESTIMATES FOR 1956

It means more jobs, more pay envelopes, more expansion of companies, a greater income for more people.

As you know, there were about 1.3 million houses built last year. It is expected there will be slightly less, but still, perhaps, a million two hundred thousand houses erected in 1956.

I'd like to see that total topped. It can be topped, if we pursue the right governmental and private policies.

As for improvement on homes, the estimated goals range between $10 billion and $12 billion in total value annually.

The potential for new commercial and other nonresidential construction ranges up to $15 billion.

These amount to a significant proportion of our whole economy.

CHANGING THE FACE OF AMERICA

Residential construction has, of course, long been our No. 1 interest.

The pattern of America has almost been revolutionized by the new type of suburban living. Whole new developments—whole new shopping centers—whole new towns, have almost completely changed the face of many countrysides.

But even in the center of cities, as you know, modernization programs have been changing the face of America.

For homemakers, modernization means better living in many ways:

1. Extra space by finishing off basements and attics, enclosing porches, and utilizing other unused areas.

2. More efficient and more comfortable heating and cooling systems.

3. Remodeling for improved beauty and greater livability.

THE BEST HOUSED PEOPLE ON EARTH

We are all rightly proud of the trend. We're proud of the free enterprise system which has shot up the percentage of individual home ownership to more than 55 percent, making ours the best housed people on earth.

SHOCKING CONDITIONS FACING SOME HOMEMAKERS

Unhappily, however, it is necessary to point out some disturbing conditions in American homemaking.

Of more than 50 million homes in our great country almost 10 million are in slum areas; more than 20 million are in need of repair and improvements.

According to a recent survey, about 40 percent of homeowners actually spend nothing—I repeat, nothing—on home maintenance and improvements.

To illustrate, I cite these familiar statistics: 13 million homes have no bathtubs or showers; 7 million have no kitchen sinks; 7 million have no running water.

This is the challenge:

Of course, a considerable proportion of these statistics are represented in some depressed areas. Fortunately, these areas are relatively few in number; fortunately, we are making progress in revitalizing them.

But we Americans, however, proud of our past accomplishments, rightly proud, I may say—we are, nevertheless, realistic, and we are not going to just rest on our laurels. We are going to roll up our sleeves and go to work—harder than ever before.

We Americans are never 100 percent satisfied. We are a restless, dynamic people. We are constantly seeking new horizons, new and higher goals. This is our natural talent—our natural genius—improve, improve, improve.

SUPERSALESMANSHIP NEEDED

To attain our goals for peak home improvement is going to require a tremendous selling job. This does not mean, of course, high-pressure salesmanship.

Instead, it requires bringing the facts of the situation and the knowledge of opportunity to American homemakers.

If we succeed, the effect will be better living for all our American families.

Our objective, of course, is to raise the American standard of living to a higher plateau—even though our standard is presently the highest in the world of any major power.

ENTERPRISE NEEDED FOR ALL TO BENEFIT

To achieve our goal will require a renewed display of imaginative and enterprising work, public relations, and service, such as you yourselves have demonstrated.

The result, however, will be for the benefit of everybody.

1. For every plumber and plumbing contractor in the country:

2. For the suppliers, manufacturers, retailers, distributors, the transporters, and others;

3. For home owners;

4. For industry and manufacturers; and

5. For the overall economic well-being of our great country.

Fortunately, your United States Congress is helping.

NEW HOUSING LEGISLATION

As you are aware, the Senate recently passed the Housing Act amendments for 1956. This is an important step toward providing homes for more people. The principal features of this extension of the Housing Act are:

1. Extend home improvements and repair loans until September 30, 1959.

2. Increase the loan maximum from $2,500 to $3,500.

3. Extend the repayment period from 3 years to 5 years.

4. Increase FHA mortgage insurance authority by about $1 billion.

5. Gives more favorable terms to provide housing for elderly persons.

6. Provide for slum clearance and urban renewal. Increasing authorization from $200 million to $250 million for 1956.

7. One year extension of FHA home loan program. (I had personally introduced a bill for longer extension of this splendid program, but I'll settle temporarily for 1-year extension.)

These important features need to be brought to the homemakers of the Nation.

The bill, of course, now goes before the House of Representatives to be acted upon. If enacted—and it should be—this will be a boon to our economy.

AVOID EXTREMES OF INFLATION AND DEFLATION

Inevitably, when one discusses the construction topic, we come full face with the issue of our national credit policy. As we are all aware, America has faced a twin problem at opposite extremes—how to avoid the evil of inflation, on the one hand, and how to avoid the evil of deflation, on the other hand.

Fortunately, the value of the dollar has been relatively stabilized following years of depreciation.

Now, however, a great many of us are inclined to feel that the antiinflation brakes may have been put on too hard on our economy, by the Federal Reserve Board. There is at present too much of a credit pinch—too much of a deflationary tendency.

No thinking person wants overly loose credit, wild speculative credit. None of us wants to see the average American get so deeply into debt that he became hopelessly swamped with bills, bills, bills.

We want sound credit. But we want ample credit.

I personally am inclined to feel that a liberalization of credit is in order. At the same time, we must maintain constant caution to prevent the sort of loose practices which can lead to default on personal or company debts.

SMALL-BUSINESS CREDIT PROBLEM

The credit problem of many small-business men has, as you know, become particularly acute. Many a small man simply cannot get sufficient bank or other credit at attractive terms.

Yet, all America, of course, is or should be aware of the indispensable contributions of our 14 million small-business concerns—particularly those in the construction industry.

A symbol of our free enterprise system, the small-business men is basic not only to the economic well being, but to the stability of our Nation.

In view of his importance, it is imperative that we provide the "economic climate" in which the small-business man may prosper and expand his operation.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSION

Wisely, the President has recently appointed a seven-man Commission for the purpose of keeping in touch with the problems of small business.

The primary responsibility of the Commission is to recommend both administrative action and new legislation to resolve problems faced by small business.

The main factors to be considered by the Commission include the following:

Loans and defense contract assistance provided by the Small Business Administration;

Antitrust enforcement by the Justice Department;

Various managerial and technical aids available from the Commerce Department;

Efforts by the Office of Defense Mobilization to strengthen the productive potential of small firms in our defense program, and helping small business in the housing field.

These are sound objectives.

ANTIMONOPOLY ACTION IN CONGRESS

One continuing threat to the future of small business is monopoly and monopolistic practices. More and more, small business is being faced with competition from chains, merged corporations and big business in general.

As you may know, I am a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Currently, we are examining proposals for protecting the small-business man.

Many people feel that the recent increase in corporate mergers may jeopardize somewhat the freedom with which the small-business man may operate. So, our monopoly subcommittee is considering, among other matters, the problem of mergers, as well as diverse monopolistic practices as they affect the free economy of our Nation.

Our objective, of course, is to determine legislative action which is necessary to provide a fair competitive climate for the small-business man.

PROGRAM FOR 1956

Meanwhile, our large job—our overall job—is to blueprint a program that will pave the way for full speed ahead progress. The objectives of this program are to:

1. Provide and preserve a fair competitive environment for the small-business man.

2. Continue to assist the small-business man with access to financing, technical guidance, and other aids.

3. Continue the VA home and FHA loan programs to provide better homes for more Americans.

4. Make a thorough study of reserve material—to avert shutdowns due to shortage of building materials.

5. Assist in "selling" the "Better Living for More Americans" theme to all America.

6. Provide more adequate homes for our elder citizens.

7. Meet the needs of business and industry expansion—relative to erection of more factories, machine shops, service buildings, and other construction.

8. Enact tax relief for small-businessmen. I recently joined in cosponsoring such a bill.

9. Provide ample credit to enable businesses to operate at maximum efficiency.

10. Expand the program of nonresidential buildings, churches, schools, and other construction.

The new Federal-State highway law will be a tremendous boost. It will involve $37 billion in road work over a 13-year period. And this, in turn, should mean a vast amount of new buildings alongside the roads as well.

SPOTTY UNEMPLOYMENT IN UNITED STATES

I said, at the outset, that we have entered into a "golden age." I firmly believe this.

But I am a realist, not a Pollyanna. I do not wear rose-colored glasses.

We all know that there are trouble spots here and there.

In the State of Wisconsin, we have hit a few bumps in the road, particularly in auto-producing centers and in areas where farm implements are manufactured, as well as in some other places.

Coming as you do from the 48 States, you know that here and there, some of your own State's industries have had to cut back, and there is unemployment and shrinking of purchasing power.

Meanwhile, our American productivity is so enormous—our mass producing of washing machines, air conditioners, dryers, and all the other vast variety of appliances is constantly growing to such an extent that, inevitably, we must open up whole new markets, if we are to absorb the productivity.

I think we can do so. In fact, we must do so.

MORE MIDDLE CLASS AMERICANS

Fortunately, the record of the past few years shows that more and more Americans are graduating upward into the middle class. That means more people who want better home heating and who want air conditioning and other essential features of comfortable living.

The so-called lower income brackets are shrinking in percentage of the total population. And the percentage of our people who are in what we call the middle class is increasing.

But if ever there was a country which is truly "classless", it is ours.

That does not mean that there cannot be a wide difference of income, because obviously there is.

But it does mean that ours is a ladder-of-success society. A man of humblest origin can rise from his shirtsleeves and can accumulate considerable means by his own hard work.

It is my task as a legislator to keep our society this way. I want to keep it expanding, dynamic, rather than to see it become frigid, frozen—with people unable to climb up the ladder of success.

To do so, we must, of course, have a sound tax system, a sound credit policy, sound labor-management teamwork.

And we must have a government which gives overall encouragement to you and your associates in serving America's expanding needs.

CONCLUSION

It has been a great pleasure to be with you today. I hope that when you return to your States you will carry with you the most pleasant memories of this convention. And I hope that the day will not be long distant when you will return to the Badger State.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 25, 1956

(Legislative day of Friday, June 22, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace and love, Thou searcher of men's hearts, help us in this opening moment of a new week's council concerning the future of the Nation and of the world to draw near unto Thee, in tranquillity, in humility, in sincerity. It is at Thy word that man goeth forth unto his work and to his labor, until the evening. Keep within the grasp of Thy firm hand the threads of each day's words and deeds, that we may not mar the fair design of what Thou wouldst do for us and through us. In times of turmoil may we find Thy peace, and for its tasks yet set before us grant Thy empowering.

Possess us with Thy passion for purity and peace. Purge our besetting sins by Thy cleansing fire, that for this troubled day we may be the faithful servants of Thy redeeming will for all mankind. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 22, 1956, was dispensed with.

SENATOR FROM KENTUCKY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I send to the desk the certificate of appointment of the Honorable ROBERT HUMPHREYS to serve as a Member of the Senate from Kentucky. The certificate is signed by the Honorable Albert Benjamin Chandler, Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The certificate will be read.

The certificate of appointment was read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Frankfort, June 21, 1956.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, I, Albert Benjamin Chandler, the Governor of said Commonwealth, do hereby appoint ROBERT HUMPHREYS a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of Senator Alben W. Barkley, is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His excellency our Governor, A. B. Chandler, and our seal hereto affixed at Frankfort, Ky., this 21st day of June, in the year of our Lord 1956.

ALBERT BENJAMIN CHANDLER,
Governor.

By the Governor:

THELMA L. STOVALL,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-designate will present himself at the desk, the oath of office will be administered to him.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Kentucky, escorted by Mr. CLEMENTS, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President, and was subscribed by him.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT, GLACIER NATIONAL PARK, MONT.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession con-

tract in Glacier National Park, Mont., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the proposals and recommendations of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions

"Whereas the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions established on January 14, 1955, under Executive Order 10588, submitted its report, including findings and recommendations to the President of the United States on April 23, 1956; and

"Whereas many of the recommendations contained in this report, commonly called the Bradley report, would drastically alter the general philosophy behind veterans' benefits in the United States as it has evolved over a long period of years and substitute a set of sociological principles wholly unrelated to the peculiarities of the veterans' problems: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the President and the Congress of the United States to take no action based on said report that would result in derogation of veterans' benefits; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the clerk of the senate to the President of the United States and to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress.

"Senate, June 14, 1956, adopted.

"RICHARD I. FURBUSH,
"President.
"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk."

A resolution adopted by the 36th annual convention of the Wisconsin Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., Green Lake, Wis., relating to deepening of the connecting channels of the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A paper, in the nature of a petition, from the Croatian Catholic Union of the United States of America, Gary, Ind., relating to the enslavement of the Croatian people; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTION OF POSTAL TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION, DENVER, COLO.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the National Postal Transport Association of Denver, Colo., relating to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL POSTAL TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION, DENVER, COLO., BRANCH, JUNE 11, 1956

Whereas Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, and Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, have worked long and hard for our benefit by their sponsoring of S. 2875, S. 3593, and other beneficial legislation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Denver branch, National Postal Transport Association, hereby commends and thanks them for their efforts in our behalf; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators JOHNSTON and LANGER as a token of our appreciation and regard.

RESOLUTION OF BALTIC COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian descent, held at Washington, D. C., together with a joint statement of Baltic diplomatic representatives relating to the anniversary of the beginning of mass deportation in the Baltic States by the Soviet Union.

There being no objection, the resolution and joint statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BALTIC COMMITTEE OF WASHINGTON, D. C.,
Washington, D. C. June 10, 1956.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to submit the following resolution unanimously adopted by citizens and residents of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian descent, assembled this day at Pierce Hall, Washington, D. C., to commemorate the first mass deportations of citizens from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, perpetrated by the Government of the Soviet Union on June 14, 1941, and to raise our voice in protest against the continuous violation of fundamental human rights, and enslavement of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union:

"Whereas the Soviet Union has arbitrarily occupied and established Communist regimes in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and continues to enslave the people of these democratic republics; and

"Whereas June 14, 1941, marks the beginning of Soviet mass deportations of citizens from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to slave labor into the subarctic tundra, Siberia, and the steppes of Kazakhstan, and that such deportations still are continuing; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has refused to recognize the incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union and is steadfastly continuing recognition of their lawful diplomatic representatives in this country; and

"Whereas the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain on February 1, 1956, in their Washington Declaration stated that 'Millions of people of different blood, religions and traditions have been forcibly incorporated within the Soviet Union' and that '* * * we shall help ourselves and others to peace, freedom and social progress maintaining human rights where they are already secure, defending them when they are in peril and peacefully restoring them where they have temporarily been lost'; Be it

"Resolved, That we, here assembled in prayerful mourning for the victims of Soviet aggression and genocide in the Baltic countries, vigorously protest against the continuous practice of genocide and enslavement of the Baltic peoples by the Soviet Union; and be it further

"Resolved, That we respectfully request the Government of the United States to initiate action by the United Nations with the aim of achieving the withdrawal of Soviet occupation forces from the Baltic States and complete restoration of their sovereignties; and be it finally

"Resolved, That we express our sincerest gratitude to the people, the Congress, and the Government of the United States for their resolute support and encouragement of the Baltic nations' struggle for regaining their liberty, and that we pledge our unequivocal support to America's leadership in the fateful fight of the free world against totalitarian Communist aggression."

Faithfully yours,

Dr. D. KRIVICKAS,
Chairman.

JOINT STATEMENT BY THE BALTIC DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATIVES IN CONNECTION WITH THE COMMEMORATION OF THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BEGINNING OF MASS DEPORTATIONS IN THE BALTIC STATES BY THE SOVIET UNION, PIERCE HALL, WASHINGTON, D. C., JUNE 10, 1956

On the eve of World War II, the Baltic States became victims of the Soviet aspiration for world domination. Soviet leaders opened the gates of aggression in Europe by the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, signed on August 23, 1939. By this pact, the Soviet Union secured a free hand in eastern Poland, Latvia, and Estonia, and later, on September 28, 1939, by means of an additional protocol, also Lithuania was included in the Soviet Communist sphere of influence of the Soviet Union. The enslavement of the Baltic States was undertaken notwithstanding the Soviet's most solemn declarations and treaty obligations to respect the territorial integrity and political independence of the Baltic countries and not to interfere with their domestic affairs. All that followed—the forced conclusion of mutual assistance pacts between the Soviet Union and the Baltic States, military occupation, formation of puppet governments, farcical elections—is now a well-established fact.

The occupation and incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union was only the prelude to the whole campaign of territorial acquisitions on the part of the Soviet Union in Europe and Asia.

"Millions of people of different blood, religions, and traditions have been forcibly incorporated within the Soviet Union, and many millions more have, in fact, although not always in form, been absorbed into the Soviet Communist bloc. In Europe alone, some 100 million people, in what were once 10 independent nations, are compelled, against their will, to work for the glorification and aggrandizement of the Soviet Communist state.

"The Communist rulers have expressed, in numerous documents and manifestos, their purpose to extend the practice of communism, by every possible means, until it encompasses the world. To this end they have used military and political force in the past. They continue to seek the same goals, and they have now added economic inducements to their other methods of penetration.

"It would be illusory to hope that in their foreign policies, political and economic, the Soviet rulers would reflect a concern for the rights of other peoples which they do not show toward the men and women they already rule." (Joint declaration made by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom in Washington on February 1, 1956.)

The same goal of world domination and expansion was recently reiterated at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

"The Communist Party of the Soviet Union follows Lenin's thesis that 'all nations will realize socialism, this is inevitable, but not all of them in the same way.'"

To this Khrushchev added:

"These (bourgeois) politicians do not dare to declare that capitalism will perish in the new world war, if they will wage it, but they are already forced to admit publicly that the socialist camp is invincible.

"It is true," said Khrushchev in his report to the 20th Congress, "that we recognize the necessity to transform in a revolutionary way the capitalist society into the socialist society. * * * It does not at all follow from the fact that we stand for peaceful coexistence and economic competition with capitalism, that the struggle against bourgeous

ideology, against the survival of capitalism in the minds of men can be relaxed."

Soviet imperialism in Europe and Asia has been imposed with greatest ruthlessness, and it has been accompanied with an appalling amount of human misery.

Today we are commemorating the mass deportations which began in our countries in June 1941 and which still continue under one form or another. In those tragic days of June more than 100,000 Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians were deported to remote areas of the Arctic and Siberia. Since then our people have been deprived of the most elementary human rights and have been exposed to torture and starvation in forced labor camps. On the testimony of hundreds of eyewitnesses, the Select Committee To Investigate the Incorporation of the Baltic States Into the U. S. S. R. of the House of Representatives of the United States in 1954 established the following:

"The U. S. S. R. has been and is now engaged in a ruthless program of sovietization in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, employing the well known Communist tactics of arrest and detention without cause, torture chambers, mass deportations to slave labor camps, population transfer, and wide-scale political murders."

After a detailed analysis of the facts, the committee concluded:

"The evidence is overwhelming and conclusive that Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were forcibly occupied and illegally annexed by the U. S. S. R. Any claims by the U. S. S. R. that the elections conducted by them in July 1940 were free and voluntary and that the resolutions adopted by the representing parliaments petitioning for recognition as a Soviet Republic were legal, are false and without foundation in fact." (Third Interim Report, 1954, p. 8.)

The Baltic nations, like the other Soviet subjugated nations behind the Iron Curtain are firmly convinced that as ramparts of western civilization they will not be abandoned by the free world. Therefore, we highly appreciate the Joint Declaration of the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom made in Washington on February 1, 1956, setting forth their attitude toward the struggle between the western and Communist worlds, wherein they expressed the hope of all the captive nations as follows:

"We (of the West) shall help ourselves and others to peace, freedom and social progress, maintaining human rights where they are already secure, defending them when they are in peril and peacefully restoring them where they have temporarily been lost."

At this solemn commemoration, together with millions of other Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians throughout the world, we mourn those compatriots who have fallen victim to the Communist conspiracy and those who are still struggling for their lives in the remote reaches of the Arctic and Siberia, or in their own lands—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

We must again state that our goal has been and will always remain the reestablishment of the complete independence and full sovereignty of our nations, and we have faith that with the help of God, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania will achieve that freedom and independence.

RESOLUTION OF THE NORTHWEST REGION, ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, the midyear conference of the northwest region of the Zionist Organization of America was held in Milwaukee, Wis., on June 3.

I ask unanimous consent that a resolution dealing with the Near East which was adopted at this conference be printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The northwest region, Zionist Organization of America, representing 20 Zionist districts in Minnesota, Wisconsin, North and South Dakota, assembled in midyear conference at the Hotel Schroeder in Milwaukee, Wis., on Sunday, June 3, 1956, adopted the following resolution:

"We deplore the refusal of the Department of State to accede to Israel's request for defensive weapons and we deem such refusal to be inimical to the best interests of the United States and the free world.

"We commend the efforts of the United Nations Secretary General in reducing tensions in the border area of Palestine by securing observance of the armistice agreements. However, so long as the flow of Communist arms to Egypt continues unabated, notwithstanding Soviet assurances of peaceful intent, an attack upon Israel by the power hungry dictator of Egypt and his allies cannot be ruled out.

"The recent debate in the United Nations provides further proof of the arrogant and belligerent attitude of the Arab nations toward a 'mutually acceptable' solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

"We call upon the President and the Secretary of State to act promptly and courageously with reference to the Middle East by furnishing Israel with the American arms it needs for legitimate self-defense. Defensive arms in the hands of the State of Israel will be a potent deterrent to aggression and will thus contribute to peace and stability in that area."

CHANGES IN POSTAL MANUAL—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Minneapolis and St. Paul Joint Council of Postal Employees concerning changes in the Postal Manual, part 741, be printed at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANGES IN THE POSTAL MANUAL, PART 741

Whereas recent changes in the Postal Manual have been issued to force upon postal workers punitive restrictions which will humiliate and degrade all members of employee unions; and

Whereas a few examples will show that these changes could be designed to weaken and destroy postal unions which are the only groups dedicated to the improvement of service to the public; and

Whereas the first sentence of 741.4 is redundant as it is covered completely by libel laws which apply to all citizens of our country; and

Whereas the second sentence of 741.4 establishes rigid censorship which violates every concept of American democracy; and

Whereas the third sentence of 741.4 is an example of picayunish tactics invoked to demean the position of the postal worker; and

Whereas the first sentence of 741.5 needlessly and callously revokes a policy which has existed since 1912; and

Whereas no valid reason for these changes has been given by any official of the Postal Department; not one official has contended that these changes would reduce the deficit or improve the service to the public: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Minneapolis and St. Paul Joint Council of Postal Employees urges that these orders be rescinded and that a copy of this resolution be sent to each Senator from Minnesota and to each Representative from the Minneapolis-St. Paul area.

THOMAS NOLIN,
President.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the first conference of State governors for the protection in the public interest, of the natural resources of the United States (Rept. No. 2299).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2272. A bill for the relief of Evangelos Demetre Kargiotis (Rept. No. 2305);

S. 2644. A bill for the relief of Hasan Muhammad Tiro (Rept. No. 2306);

S. 2761. A bill for the relief of Fethi Hepcakici (Rept. No. 2307);

S. 2803. A bill for the relief of Max Mazak Terian and his wife, Maria Terian (Rept. No. 2308);

S. 2826. A bill for the relief of Doctor Ching-Lin Hsia and wife, Wai Tsung Hsia (Rept. No. 2309);

S. 2846. A bill for the relief of Don-chean Chu (Rept. No. 2310);

S. 2904. A bill for the relief of Rosalind Chang (Rept. No. 2311);

S. 2955. A bill for the relief of Anna Justine Cakste (Rept. No. 2312);

S. 2958. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Hollas (Rept. No. 2313);

S. 3016. A bill for the relief of Mayland Township, Carpio, N. Dak. (Rept. No. 2314);

S. 3059. A bill for the relief of No Kum Sok (also known as Kenneth No) (Rept. No. 2315);

S. 3171. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Riva Kagan (Rept. No. 2316);

S. 3194. A bill for the relief of Henry Lappeman (Rept. No. 2317);

S. 3196. A bill for the relief of Helen Mar Stanger (Rept. No. 2318);

S. 3206. A bill for the relief of Saveria Velona Gangemi (Rept. No. 2319);

S. 3209. A bill for the relief of Paul Edward Horn (Rept. No. 2320);

S. 3217. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Thomas L. Davidson (Rept. No. 2321);

S. 3218. A bill for the relief of Joaquin Flores-Munoz (Rept. No. 2322);

S. 3253. A bill for the relief of Chiyoko Tominaga Beckmann (Rept. No. 2323);

S. 3255. A bill for the relief of Amin Habib Nabhan (Rept. No. 2324);

S. 3276. A bill for the relief of Jan Hovorka (Rept. No. 2325);

H. R. 877. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Amoresano and her children (Rept. No. 2336);

H. R. 3960. A bill for the relief of Maria del Carmen Gago Santana (Rept. No. 2338);

H. R. 4031. A bill to consider residence in American Samoa or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands by certain employees of the governments thereof, and their dependents, as residence in the United States for naturalization purposes (Rept. No. 2337);

H. R. 4141. A bill for the relief of Vivencia Fernando Raymundo, Bienvenida Raymundo, Lolita Raymundo, Agnes Raymundo, Henry Raymundo, and Fred Raymundo (Rept. No. 2339);

H. R. 4851. A bill for the relief of the Kelmoor Fox & Fur Farm, Inc. (Rept. No. 2340);

H. R. 5041. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Dows Thyberg (Rept. No. 2341);

H. R. 5635. A bill for the relief of Dr. Wolodymyr Fedyniak and others (Rept. No. 2342); and

H. R. 11499. A bill to amend the Texas City Disaster Claims Act (Rept. No. 2343).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1847. A bill for the relief of Alecos Markos Karavasilis and his wife, Steliani Karavasilis (Rept. No. 2326);

S. 2022. A bill for the relief of Arnold Rosenthal (Rept. No. 2327);

S. 2882. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Geraldine Elaine Sim (Rept. No. 2328);

S. 3583. A bill for the relief of Mathilde Gombard-Liatzky (Rept. No. 2329);

S. 3650. A bill for the relief of the town of Freeport, Maine (Rept. No. 2330);

H. R. 1761. A bill to relieve certain veterans who relied on an erroneous interpretation of the law from liability to repay a portion of the subsistence allowances which they received under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Rept. No. 2344);

H. R. 1876. A bill for the relief of Martin M. Sorensen (Rept. No. 2345);

H. R. 9371. A bill for the relief of John R. Henry (Rept. No. 2346); and

H. Con. Res. 221. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens (Rept. No. 2301).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1328. A bill for the relief of Doreen Tsung-tao Chen (Rept. No. 2331);

S. 2760. A bill for the relief of Yee Chung Fong Ming, Yee Chung Nom Ming, and Gee Shee Ming (Rept. No. 2332);

S. 2916. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alberta Bernard (Rept. No. 2333);

S. 3012. A bill for the relief of Richard Rhen-Yang Lin and his wife Julia Lam Lin and their minor child Richard Rhen-Yang Lin, Jr. (Rept. No. 2334);

S. 3030. A bill for the relief of Costantinos F. Agoris (Rept. No. 2335);

H. R. 6190. A bill for the relief of Ens. Charles A. Binswanger (Rept. No. 2347);

H. J. Res. 456. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens (Rept. No. 2303);

H. J. Res. 616. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2304); and

H. Con. Res. 228. Concurrent resolution approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens (Rept. No. 2302).

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1087. A bill to authorize aftercare payments by the Youth Division of the United States Board of Parole (Rept. No. 2300).

By Mr. DANIEL, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 2891. A bill to amend section 709 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the use by certain businesses of the initials "U. S." in the business or firm name or pictures of the Capitol Building and other public buildings of the United States in their advertising, and to increase the penalties for violation of such section (Rept. No. 2351).

By Mr. DANIEL, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 2017. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the misuse by collecting agencies of names, emblems, and insignia to indicate Federal agency (Rept. No. 2350).

OPPOSITION TO SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS (S. REPT. NO. 2349)

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 296), opposing the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)):

A-5163473, Henriksen, Charles Emil.
E-092802, Petrolekas, Christos Ioannis.
A-9836943, Van Thoai, Nguyen.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS (S. REPT. NO. 2348)

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 84), favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation pursuant to the provisions of section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 214; 8 U. S. C. 1254 (c)):

A-4402414, Feigenbaum, Lena.
A-1368567, Guszcza, Konstanty.
A-5540879, Johnson, William.
A-2436831, Schwartz, Albert.
A-1328350, Amado, Joseph Barbosa.
A-2550952, Baum, Louis.
A-3065105, Cinque, Luigi.
A-5448287, Donaldson, John Kelly.
A-2623371, Ekstrom, Gustav Fritz.
A-3576941, Gabartus, Joseph.
A-1418512, Gaines, Raymond Verand.
A-5981807, Gerber, Pauline.
A-4180130, Hernandez, Narciso.
A-3483987, Kolek, Frank.
A-1534631, Martenuk, Wasil.
A-1087241, Mendez-Perez, Feliciano.
A-1258280, Mendez-de la Rosa, Anastacio.
A-5069154, Monteiro, Anthony.
A-8281823, Morrison, John William.
A-5167345, Murphy, Donald K.
A-1297962, Okerstrom, Olof Edwin.
A-5038080, Palen, Adolph.
A-5407196, Rubenstein, Benjamin.
A-8478270, Russo, Esteban.
A-2331492, Schwed, John.
A-5919577, Sikorski, Adolph.
A-8678037, Stamatopulos, Andreas Vasilios.
A-2784150, Tamayo, Maria Salazar de
A-5574722, Zaks, Aber.
1300-134264, Castillo, Pedro Contreras.
A-5991679, Chomsker, Mones.
A-4722856, Garcia, Eliseo Vasquez.
A-5237203, Mascitti, Luigi.
A-3065941, Ruzycki, Walter Stanley.
A-5880176, Aguayo-Renteria, Felipe.
A-5543950, Abeson, Louis.
A-5163391, Briller, Clara Sadie.
A-4241143, Ceddia, Angelo.
A-5190234, Duffy, Dorothy B.
A-5294327, Fellmeth, Martin.
E-057893, Frumpkin, Paul.
A-5242017, Golbin, Margaret.
A-4177923, Gonzales, Louis.
A-2710779, Gutierrez-Galaviz, Miguel.
A-4192990, Kaganski, Chaim.
A-6824870, Kaplan, Morris.
A-4924358, Kryshtall, Alexander.
A-5781163, Laro, Francisco.
A-2513344, Lashuk, Maxime.
A-3084067, Lysyak, Lucas.
A-5624182, Marcus, Benjamin.
A-7142118, Melicharek, John.
A-4732368, Molina, Salvadora Ozuna.
A-4338054, Molina, Saturnino Paderes.
A-8846106, Race, Thomas Frank.
A-5772133, Radmilo, John.
A-4385372, Ramirez-Davalos, Dario.
0300-460796, Reisler, Betty.
A-4098680, Rodriguez-Borjas, Manuel.
A-3445360, Rubicz, Stefan.
A-10035249, Sedor, Walter Richard.
A-4683291, Shadletsky, Esther.
A-2935218, Silverman, George James.
A-5998756, Spector, Maurice.
A-5808720, Springer, James.
A-5758104, Tuxen, Jean Charles.
A-5767334, Wong, Man Jaw.
A-1802172, Zahran, Abraham John.
A-3807772, Zych, Walter Joseph.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 4114. A bill for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 4115. A bill for the relief of Chan Wing Cheung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 4116. A bill to increase the membership of the Senate Office Building Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION—SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The following original concurrent resolution was reported by Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to above concurrent resolution, reported by Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were submitted or reported and referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

ADVANCEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Mr. ANDERSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 295), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the principles which underlie scientific progress are universal in their application; and

Whereas history reveals that all nations benefit from the cross-fertilization of ideas among the scientists of all nations; and

Whereas the great progress of the United States in atomic energy and many other scientific fields has been furthered by the work of scientists of other nations; and

Whereas the excessive isolation of basic scientific research behind rigid national walls breeds suspicion and may tend to divert a disproportionate part of the scientific effort to destructive rather than constructive effort; and

Whereas greater communication and contact and common effort among the leading scientists of the world will produce more intensive progress in such fields as medicine, nuclear energy, weather control, and the solution of the mysteries of outer space which will be of lasting benefit to all mankind; and

Whereas the present year, being the International Geophysical Year in which all nations are cooperating in meteorological research, provides a fitting occasion for the advancement of international scientific cooperation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President of the United States explore with other nations, through such channels as he finds appropriate—

1. The means of conferring on an outstanding scientist in each of the major scientific fields, selected annually on the basis of contribution to the good of mankind, regardless of nationality, an honorary world passport;

2. The means of creating a World Laboratory to serve as a center of advanced scientific research and to supplement and facilitate national efforts in this connection; and

3. The means of giving additional encouragement to the travel and exchange of scientists throughout the world and the exchange of scientific information.

SEC. 2. On the basis of such exploration, the President shall make suitable recommendations to the Congress.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 296. Resolution opposing the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to the above resolution, reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees."

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SMATHERS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the able and to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Address on foreign policy delivered by former Senator William Benton before the Union League Club of Chicago on June 14, 1956.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Address delivered by National Commander J. Addington Wagner, of the American Legion, before the graduates of the 57th session of the FBI National Academy, at Washington, D. C., on June 8, 1956.

Address delivered by George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, before the graduates of the 57th session of the FBI National Academy, at Washington, D. C., on June 8, 1956.

By Mr. THYE:

Address delivered by John Cowles, president, Minneapolis Star and Tribune Co., before Minnesota State Bar Association, on June 22, 1956.

By Mr. LANGER:

GTA Daily Radio Roundup concerning REA.

By Mr. BEALL:

Telegram received by him from S. Vannort Chapman, secretary of the Maryland Bar Association, transmitting resolution recommending immediate action on the nomination of Simon E. Sobeloff to be associate judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

Article entitled "Bolivar Blazed the Trail," written by Bob Considine, and published in the New York Journal-American of June 20, 1956.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Article entitled "Foreign Service a Growing Force," written by Gould Lincoln, and published in the Washington Evening Star of June 24, 1956.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Article entitled "Israel's Meaning," written by Joseph Alsop, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of June 20, 1956.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Editorial on the use of compulsory union dues for political purposes, written by W. P. Stuart, and published in the Prescott (Ariz.) Evening Courier.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Editorial entitled "Neater Polling Places Might Get More Voters," published in the Saturday Evening Post of July 17, 1954.

Article entitled "What This County Needs: A National Physical Fitness Commission," written by Dr. H. Harrison Clarke, of Eugene, Oreg.

Article entitled "CIO Plays Vital Role in Oregon and Nation," written by Mrs. Emsie Howard, and published in the June 15, 1956, issue of the Oregon Labor Press.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota:

Columns on the Presidency by Mr. James Reston, which will appear hereafter in the RECORD.

RETIRED PAY OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE—RETURN OF ENROLLED BILL TO THE SENATE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent that it may be given immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the concurrent resolution for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 83), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States is requested to return to the Senate, the enrolled bill (S. 3581) to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service. If and when said bill is returned by the President, the action of the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in signing said bill shall be deemed rescinded; and the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of said bill, to make the following corrections: On page 1 and in the table following line 7 strike out "January 20, 1918" and insert "June 20, 1918."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 83) was considered and agreed to.

USE OF UNION DUES FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on June 8, in South Bend, Ind., Mr. Paul Butler, who as Democrat national chairman, is doing the Republicans so much good that I hope the Democrats keep him forever, displayed another example of his total disregard of the truth when he said that Mr. George Hinkle, Indiana State labor commissioner, and I were opposed to any political action on the part of unions. Neither Mr. Hinkle nor I have ever made such a statement. What we have been saying—and, by the way, it has never been denied by anyone, including Mr. Butler—has been that it is morally wrong for a union to use compulsory dues money for political purposes. That is the sole issue. It is an issue on which Mr. Butler might well express himself, for such activity has gone on in his home town in Studebaker Local, No. 5, UAW–CIO. If he doubts this, let him visit the local and examine their books for the 3 months ended December 31, 1954, and the year 1954, and for the same periods of 1955. Then he might continue his perusal of those interesting documents by looking at their general fund statement of income and expenses for the 3 months ended March 31 of this year. He will have no difficulty doing that, as I was able to obtain photographs of the documents I mention. He would discover that those statements alone show a transfer to the PAC of $3,773.88. That money came out of the general fund of the union local. It did not come out of any funds described in the statement as being voluntary. What I would like to hear Mr. Butler say is that he, too, is against the use of compulsory dues money for political purposes.

Mr. President, enough about Mr. Butler. Now I should like to direct a few short remarks to the courage of Mr. George Hinkle, who is the State labor commissioner of Indiana. Mr. Hinkle is a courageous man. He is standing up and resisting the pressures being put on him by the CIO in that State, and is administering his office in a fair and impartial manner. I have great respect for any person who will resist any group whose obvious desire is to have government operated the way they want it operated, regardless of whether or not the rights of minorities are thereby infringed.

To complete the record, I ask unanimous consent that a column written by Mr. Holmes Alexander, which appeared in the Indianapolis Star of Saturday, June 9, entitled "Hinkle Puts Up Fight for Individual Rights," be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, along with a statement made by Mr. Hinkle on the occasion of the false statements made by the chairman of the Democrat Party and his copartner on the stand, Mr. Dallas Sells, Indiana CIO chief.

There being no objection, the column and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis Star of June 9, 1956]

HINKLE PUTS UP FIGHT FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—George F. Hinkle, UAW–CIO, Local 5, Indianapolis, is the fourth person to be State labor commissioner during the administration of Gov. George Craig, of Indiana. One of Hinkle's predecessors died in office; two others resigned under pressure. Today the young and thoughtful George Hinkle, 37, a former mechanic in the Studebaker plant, a World War II veteran and lately administrative assistant to the mayor of South Bend, is finding out how the pressure feels on his own skin. He made a speech against political use of union dues, and the labor bosses are trying to get him out of there.

This is what a man in the labor movement gets these days for voicing minority opinions. Hinkle is used to it. When he first signed up as a union member some 15 years ago, he found things going on that he didn't like. He did something about it by going in for union politics. He was elected to the

executive board and to the bargaining committee. Then one day he got up and opposed something called a citizenship fund whereby a sum of 10 cents a member a month was applied to politics—in other words, about $65,000 a month made available to Democratic Party candidates.

"The union bosses and their stooges yelled 'Commie! Commie!' at me," says Hinkle. "Then in April when I made my speech on the same subject before the State chamber of commerce, the same bosses and stooges called me a right-wing, labor-hating reactionary."

Hinkle told me he was in Washington to talk with his Congressman, SHEPPARD (STAINLESS STEEL) CRUMPACKER, of South Bend, about same union welfare legislation now pending on Capitol Hill. "The young commissioner, in his blue flannel suit and Ike button, was also concerned about what's going to happen to some of the minority religious sects (President Eisenhower's forebears in Pennsylvania were members) whose church rules forbid them to contribute to secular organizations like the CIO–UAW union shops. A group of Amish from Lancaster County, Pa., recently called on AFL–CIO President George Meany and asked to be exempt from union dues. They offered to contribute the amount of the dues to charity. Hinkle has also been visited by small delegations of minority religionists who work in the General Motors Allison aircraft engine plant at Indianapolis. In 1955 this plant voted for a union shop; now men with over 15 years' seniority are up against the hard choice of quitting the job or violating their religious creeds and customs. It was something like this that brought the Pilgrims and others to America.

"There's nothing under State law that I can do to help them," Hinkle told me.

Meanwhile the Indiana CIO has demanded his head on a sacrificial slab. One of the union publications, the Lampmaker, calls him a phony, and CIO State President Sells says the commissioner is brainwashing the unsuspecting Hoosier public. In the horrendous speech which kicked off the controversy Hinkle traced the American labor movement from Sam Gompers through the confessed Communist Lee Pressman down to the "intellectual radical" Walter Reuther. Hinkle came out against the right-to-work laws, endorsed the principle of union shops, and then soared into this passage:

"Now, what about individual rights and freedoms? Today, there are millions of union members in this country who are being forced to contribute to the campaign funds of political candidates—candidates whom these very same union members are opposed to at the polls. These candidates are the choice of—and are many times owned by—unscrupulous labor leaders."

Hinkle knows whereof he speaks because he is speaking from personal experience. He is one of the 43 percent of union members who voted Republican in 1952. He saw Governor Craig forced by the violence of the strike at New Castle to call out the National Guard to protect public safety and private property. He noted that in the neighboring State of Pennsylvania another kind of governor put the strikers on unemployment compensation with taxpayers' money. He saw that in a third State, Michigan, the CIO pays two-thirds of the Democratic campaign funds. He heard David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, pledge $500,000 to political campaigning this year. Hinkle has been a dues-paying union member all his adult life, and he is certain in his own mind that the big wheels of the labor movement are off the track of the working man's welfare and are rolling toward dictatorial control of the Democratic Party. It takes nerve to say the things that Hinkle is saying. This kind of talk cost columnist Victor Riesel his eyesight. Hinkle's answer to that is a near-quotation from Sam Gompers:

"If we want to keep America as the land of the free, we have to make sure it is also the home of the brave."

STATEMENT OF GEORGE F. HINKLE, COMMISSIONER OF LABOR, INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

JUNE 14, 1956.

Democrat National Chairman Paul M. Butler and State CIO President Dallas Sells are resorting to untruths and distortions in an effort to defend their position on the use of union dues for political purposes. In speeches to the United Auto Workers at their 20th anniversary in South Bend, Ind., last Friday, June 8, 1956, both Mr. Butler and Mr. Sells accused Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, and me of being opposed to any political action on the part of unions. I attended the affair and heard both gentlemen make the statements as I sat in the audience.

At no time have I or Senator GOLDWATER ever said or implied that we are opposed to political activity on the part of unions as long as the money used for such activity was raised and solicited on a voluntary and noncompulsory basis. Compulsory union dues money being used for the support of political candidates is the issue.

The question in point is this, do Mr. Butler and Mr. Sells believe that it is right or wrong to use compulsory union dues in the support of political candidates? I have yet to hear Mr. Butler, Mr. Sells, or any labor union political boss deny the use of union dues money for politics, and I have yet to hear any one of them say whether or not they think it is right or wrong.

I am of the opinion that Mr. Sells and Mr. Butler are not giving fair and honest representation to the CIO and the Democrat Party when they avoid this issue with distortions and untruths, because I know that many union members and many members of the Democrat Party are opposed to the use of union dues for political purposes. I ask them to face the issue squarely and let the members of their respective organizations know where they stand on the issue.

SIX-MONTHS VOLUNTARY TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, last year the National Reserve Act of 1955, which called for a 6 months voluntary training program, was passed by the Congress. Great hopes were held out that this program would be a success, and would provide our Armed Forces with the manpower pool it must have in order to maintain a dominant position in the area of military force. Reports to date have not been encouraging as to the results of this program. In spite of an intensive, well-directed, and expensive publicity program directed at the youth of this country, the figures indicate that it is not attracting a sufficient number of young men. This is not a healthy situation for any of the components of our armed services, but it is particularly unhealthy for the Air Force, which is the pivotal point around which our military strategy must be constructed in the future. The Air Force cannot in 6 months, train a boy to be a technician. It takes closer to 3 years. Men, not machines, are the problem of the Air Force today. The testimony of such an outstanding general as Curtis LeMay indicates the growing concern of the Air Force over its personnel situation. At the time of the passage of this act, I felt that inadequate attention had been given to the technical training needs of the Air Force, and I express that concern again today. The whole subject has been eloquently described by Edmund F. Hogan, Reserve affairs editor of the Air Force magazine. I ask unanimous consent that his article entitled "How the 6 Months' Deal Hurts Force in Being," be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW THE 6-MONTHS "DEAL" HURTS "FORCE IN BEING"

(By Edmund F. Hogan)

Last month a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, chaired by Representative OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana, convened to hear a report on the progress of the National Reserve Act of 1955. Carter L. Burgess, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, headed a distinguished group of witnesses.

The heart of the National Reserve Act is a plan whereby young men may elect 6 months of active-duty training, followed by 7½ years of service in the Reserve. It is designed principally for the Army and, in the beginning, neither the Navy nor the Air Force wanted any part of it. The Navy has now capitulated, leaving the Air Force as the only holdout.

The Air Force is holding out for the very good reason that it needs large numbers of highly skilled technicians to maintain an effective force in being. You simply cannot train a technician in 6 months. The time factor is closer to 3 years and so the Air Force requires 4-year enlistment periods.

This is why there should be concern that so much effort is being expended toward turning out millions of weekend warriors. It also explains why the Air Force has been reluctant to avail itself of the 6-months trainee. And, regardless of whether the Air Force accepts the plan or not, the fact that the other services are using it threatens to have an adverse effect on the Air Force.

When the program started last fall the Army hoped to attract some 90,000 6-months trainees by the end of this month. But the program lagged so badly that Mr. Burgess and the Army decided that a nationwide publicity campaign should call attention to the 6-months deal.

Whether the 6-months program is directly connected with the recent drop in Air Force enlistments cannot be proven at the moment. Air Force recruiting dipped by 3,000 in March and by more than 5,000 in April.

In terms of annual recruiting achievements, however, these figures are not as bad as they seem at first glance. The present lag is as much the result of a shortage of AF training money as for any reason. Given sufficient funds for facilities and staff, the Air Force could accept many more recruits each month than is now possible.

And the current 8,000-man lag in recruiting is hardly the true picture. For, despite the heavy opposition created by Mr. Burgess, the Air Force recruiting curve is up on technically skilled, prior-service men; on raw recruits with higher I. Q.'s; and even on the number of very low I. Q. recruits the Air Force is required to accept, who pass the minimum intelligence test for the services.

Over the long pull, Air Force probably can continue to meet its annual quotas. Time, of course, alone will tell. There is immediate opposition ahead, however. For Mr. Burgess told the Brooks subcommittee that the "upsurge in enlistments which occurred during March just after midterm of the school year should repeat itself, with perhaps more force, at the end of the school year in June." If he is correct, the Air Force can look ahead to a further drop in 4-year enlistments.

This matter of technicians is of grave concern to the Air Force, particularly to the commander of Strategic Air Command, Gen. Curtis LeMay. At the very time the drums were being beaten across the Nation to encourage 6-months enlistments in the Army, General LeMay was telling the Symington subcommittee that a shortage of skilled technicians is already impairing his combat capability.

To assure that no healthy, young American would overlook the advantages to him of the 6-months program, the Department of Defense recently sponsored Military Reserve Week. It was launched with a Presidential proclamation. Thirty-three State governors followed suit. Radio and television gave abundantly of expensive network time. Brochures by the thousands urged young men to "End draft worries. Join the new 6-months training program."

This program, our youths were assured, would permit them to plan their military service "with the least interference" to their personal lives. They were told that the 6 months of training would be given at the Army camp nearest their homes; that after 6 months "you are free to live your life"; that once back home and in an Army Reserve unit their only obligation for 7½ years would be a 2-hour weekly training assembly and 2 weeks of field training each year.

This, according to one brochure, is the best insurance for America's future. Not the kind of force in being which the country needs, but a vast Reserve composed of men who have had 6 months of basic training. That, as our old soldiers are wont to say, isn't time enough for a man's bunk tag to stop swinging.

A keynote speaker for Military Reserve Week recalled Lord Nelson's warning that "5 minutes may make the difference between victory and defeat." "Today," said the speaker, "this warning should be edited to read, 'the first 5 minutes may make the difference.'"

This may well be true. If it is, a 6-months program cannot possibly be the answer. The answer must be the force in being—the Air Defense Command fighters on 5-minute runway alert—SAC atomic bombers ready to head for targets on 5 minutes' notice.

Six-months trainees may have been useful in the days of the square infantry division, but not in an age when airpower in being is the acknowledged cornerstone of our defense structure. Any military program that will reduce its effectiveness courts disaster.

The 6-months program is dear to the heart of Mr. Burgess. He is pledged to its success, and has never relaxed the pressure to swing the Air Force into line.

Mr. Burgess is clever and persistent as his barrage of 6-months-trainee propaganda will testify. But we hope the Air Force may never have to bend the knee.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE SENATE AT CONCLUSION OF THE MORNING HOUR

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning hour I may be recognized, to address the Senate for 12 minutes on the subject of foreign policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

PREVIEW OF MOTION PICTURE "WOODROW WILSON: SPOKESMAN FOR TOMORROW"

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Thursday, June 28, there will be presented in the Coolidge Auditorium of the Library of Congress, at 8:30 p. m., a preview of the documentary motion picture entitled "Woodrow Wilson: Spokesman for Tomorrow."

This motion picture is made entirely of film and other documents of President Wilson's time. The main emphasis in the film is on Wilson's activities as President in search of world peace at the Paris Peace Conference, following World War I, in his effort to enlist popular support for the League of Nations.

This motion picture has been produced by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, for showing by Government and private agencies in this and foreign countries during this year, commemorating the 100th anniversary of Wilson's birth.

The picture runs for about 27 minutes, and will be preceded by an address by Governor McKeldin, of Maryland; and a short introduction by Mr. August Heckscher, president of the Foundation.

As a member and vice chairman of the official Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission, I have been requested to announce that Members of the Senate, including members of their families, will be most welcome at the preview; and I am happy to extend a cordial invitation to all of them.

PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS AND THE BALTIMORE FRIENDSHIP INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, as a supplement to my remarks of June 14, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD three editorials published in recent editions of the Baltimore newspapers, and which deal with the problem of New York to Miami air service, now pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore News-Post of June 21, 1956]

SHABBY SERVICE

The cold facts on just how fantastically inadequate is the airline service through Friendship Airport were given the Civil Aeronautics Board yesterday in briefs filed by four Baltimore-Maryland groups.

At the same time the Baltimore interests tackled the hitherto fruitless task of convincing Federal officials that Baltimore is not a bad air city—that a great air passenger and freight potential is bottled up by lack of flights at Friendship.

One brief was presented by the city of Baltimore and the Association of Commerce; another by the Greater Baltimore Committee and the State Aviation Commission. They urge CAB to certify Pan American World Airways for the East Coast-Florida route and to recognize Friendship as a Baltimore-Washington regional terminal.

The Greater Baltimore Aviation Commission groups charged flatly that "Baltimore is being discriminated against by Eastern and National lines (which now fly the route) in favor of the more lucrative Washington and New York passenger traffic."

BACK UP THE CHARGE

They backed up the charge with striking facts, including:

National Airlines provide Baltimore with only one flight southbound a day which terminates in Miami. It is with a 2-engine plane and makes 8 stops en route.

This flight takes 8 hours and 40 minutes, in contrast to DC–7B nonstop flight between New York and Miami requiring 3 hours and 30 minutes and from Washington in 3 hours.

Eastern Air Lines has only one flight southbound from Baltimore, terminating at Jacksonville, requiring 5 hours and 8 minutes with 4 intermediate stops. Northbound service originates in Miami and gets to Baltimore in 9 hours and 25 minutes after 8 intermediate stops.

The brief brings out that as a result of service "really tantamount to no service at all" the 2 carriers transported only 1 Baltimore-Miami passenger per 1,000 of population, compared to an average of 43 per 1,000 from New York, Philadelphia and Washington.

By contrast, as of last year, Boston had 6 daily southbound flights, using Constellations and DC–6's; New York had 49, of which 29 were nonstop to Florida; Philadelphia had 10, half of them nonstop, and Washington 17, of which 11 were nonstop, according to the City of Baltimore Association of Commerce brief.

ALL CARGO SERVICE UNHEARD OF

Of 98 schedules utilizing modern 4-engine planes, none served Baltimore and Baltimore all-cargo service was unheard of, the brief added.

Concerning all of which the Greater Baltimore Aviation Commission group remarked: "It is academic that without service there cannot be any traffic."

That flights generate air traffic is proved by an increase of 50 percent in Boston-Miami traffic when a single nonstop flight was added, and in National's increase of 67 percent on the New York-Tampa route with addition of only one nonstop coach flight.

More strikingly, when service from Philadelphia to Miami was increased substantially in capacity and quality, Eastern Air Lines passenger traffic increased nearly 6 times, from 1952 through 1954.

The above brief remarks:

"Baltimore will show an even more phenomenal increase in Miami traffic if given proper service."

SERVICE LACK HURTS BUSINESS

No, Baltimore is not a bad air city.

Its big business community, its large number of citizens who vacation in the South, its diversity of manufacture of small articles, a large proportion of which are sold in the South and Latin America and are suitable for shipment by air, give the city a vast air potential. But lack of flights from Friendship prevent these facts from being demonstrated to the world.

The CAB will be giving Baltimore the shabbiest of treatment, ignoring the needs of the Nation's sixth largest city, if it refuses to act favorably in the Pan American case.

[From the Baltimore Morning Sun of June 22, 1956]

CASE FOR PAN AM

The arguments in favor of allowing Pan American Airways to fly from New York to Florida by way of Friendship Airport are so strong, so clear, and so evident to most Baltimoreans that there is no point in rehearsing them here. They have been well put in the briefs submitted to the Civil Aeronautics Board by the city, the Baltimore Association of Commerce, the Greater Baltimore Committee, and the State Aviation Commission. All that remains here is to urge them on the CAB, by whose examiner the original Pan American application was rejected in April.

Two airlines now have the monopoly of the rich and crowded New York-Florida route. The examiner proposed to let in a third, which would operate out of Washington. It has been admitted and confirmed that Washington's airport is dangerously overcrowded already. To add another service through Na-

tional Airport would add to the congestion and hence to the danger.

The new briefs merit consideration not only for these and other reasons, but because they are filed, not merely by an interested airline, but by four bodies unconnected with commercial aviation. None of the four parties has a special interest in anything but getting better airline service and making better use of the facilities at Friendship. Under such pleading as this, it behooves the CAB to think again about a decision of great moment to the whole Baltimore-Washington area.

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun of June 22, 1956]

MORE THAN LOCAL

For Baltimore, the most important point about the application of Pan American World Airways for permission to operate a direct service from New York to Miami using Friendship Airport to serve both Baltimore and Washington is that this proposal would give the city an adequate air schedule to the South.

Let no one think, however, that this is a purely local case. It involves national issues and it involves the interests of other cities. New York City, for instance, has just filed a brief with the Civil Aeronautics Board supporting Pan American's bid. The document, presented by New York's equivalent of our city solicitor, stresses the fact that the Nation's largest city needs much more extensive service to Miami than it is now getting from Eastern and National Airlines. It says that Delta, which the CAB examiner recommended for the route in preference to Pan American, can't provide the service promptly, and that no other line is in position to provide it except Pan American. This is because Pan American has the planes already in service and the pilots and equipment to man and service them. During the summer Pan American employs large numbers of planes on the North Atlantic routes to Europe. In the winter, when travel to Florida is heavy, it can easily transfer its equipment to the southern route. Because of this situation, New York wishes Pan American to get CAB approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

FOREIGN POLICY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business having been closed, under the order previously entered, the Chair now recognizes for 12 minutes the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

I. INTRODUCTORY

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, before leaving for a well-earned vacation on May 27, Secretary of State Dulles stated that he welcomed a "pretty thorough airing" of foreign policy during the fall election campaign. He added that he hoped the discussion would prove "constructive."

All of us can agree that foreign policy should have our earnest consideration; but is it not a good idea to give it a thorough airing under the calmer conditions of the Senate floor, instead of waiting for the heat of a presidential campaign to do so? Feeling a deep sense of the Senate's responsibility in this field, I am proposing to address this body in a series of brief speeches, giving the point of view of one Senator with regard to the pressing and difficult problems which face us in the field of foreign affairs. It is my plan to ask for unanimous consent to make these brief talks immediately after the end of the morning hour, on dates which I shall specify in advance. No one of them will be over 15 minutes in length, and most of them will be shorter.

I will not presume to lay down a definite foreign policy as being the only right course of action. I would hope to make tentative suggestions as to policy; but I am particularly anxious to bring into consideration all the important factors which, it seems to me, should guide the Senate, the Congress, and the administration in the formation of specific policy.

This first talk is addressed to the general situation. It asks and suggests answers to certain fundamental questions.

What is the basis for our foreign policy? That basis is national self-interest.

How can we define national self-interest? This lies in so directing our words and our acts that we may help to organize a world in which freedom, justice, and peace prevail, and which is thus the kind of a world we would bequeath to our children and grandchildren. This is the basic statement of our national interest, and everything else is subsidiary.

Is this opposed to a general benevolence in world affairs? It is opposed to it as the guiding principle, although our self-interest, defined as above, will in general lead to humanly helpful relationships with the nations of the earth and their peoples. The place to exercise benevolence per se, which perhaps is best called charity, is in the case of severe disasters, such as earthquakes, famine, and pestilence. But even this, though pursued for humanitarian reasons, will automatically fall within the framework of self-interest.

What is the function of armed strength in the support of our self-interest? Since power for its own sake is no part of our ultimate purpose, armed strength is to be used for defense only. What this decision involves will be discussed later in more detail. At this point let it only be said that two great leaders of a former generation have expressed principles which we should be following today. It was President Theodore Roosevelt who said, "Speak softly and carry a big stick." This wise advice we have honored more in the breach than in the observance. The admonition to "speak softly" should be heeded alike in the State Department, in the press, and on the floors of the two Houses of Congress.

The other aphorism was set forth by that great master of the philosophy of strategy, Admiral Mahan, who said many years ago, "The purpose of military power is to provide time for moral ideas to take root." Here again, from high authority, we are directed toward a wise use of military power.

Because of their importance in our foreign policy, it is important to define benevolence, charity, and cooperation. This I plan to do in the fifth of these talks.

Through what sentiments shall we work to attain our self-interest? Not through inspiring fear of our own strength or by fearing the strength of an opponent. Even fear of atomic warfare is not to be used aggressively. It is, however, an irreplaceable deterrent. However strongly the horrors of such warfare urge us on to constructive effort, we ourselves cannot succumb to fear because, although it properly urges us to action, it does not lend itself to the formation of effective policy.

Not through expectations of gaining allies by bribery, because economic benefits which are to be paid for by support of our policies will demand an ever higher price as time goes on, and will gain acceptance only of a shallow sort for selfish reasons. If we seek to purchase support in this way, we open ourselves to the dangers of having to enter into spirited bidding with our Soviet friends. Other nations will join or oppose as they learn who can offer the most and the best on the lowest terms. Let us not get into any auction of our economic assistance.

Should our emphasis be on relations with governments or with peoples?

We must cultivate both. The relations with people are the more important, and we are in danger of neglecting them. In these days and in many parts of the world, dependence on governments is an insecure basis for policy. Governments come and go. Those which were friendly to us become uncertain or even hostile. Those which seem to be hostile through some change, by election or otherwise, show the possibilities of friendship. Governments are overturned, but the people remain. The basis for our relationship with the peoples of the earth should be assistance toward a higher standard of living, better food, clothing, shelter, health, and education—all based on self-help.

Are we concerned with supporting liberty for the people of the earth?

We are, and this is a most difficult problem. How can we show our desire for supporting freedom and not be guilty in some instances of turning masses of people over to a savage anarchy? In all cases we can and must support in the councils of the nations a rapid education of the peoples of the earth toward self-government.

Does this interest extend to the people behind the Iron Curtain whether citizens of the Soviet Union or of the enslaved nationalities?

We can and must maintain the most effective opposition possible to the policies of that government which outrage the dignity of the individual man, train him to be used as an unthinking tool in the service of Soviet imperialism, and deny him and his brothers in the satellite nations the privileges of free men. On this question we cannot compromise. We cannot abandon our purpose of bringing freedom to these people by the most effective means possible. We are stewards for the free world and the world which is to become free. We cannot abandon our responsibilities.

What is the most neglected element in our foreign policy?

To my mind as I observe that policy in action, we have failed most definitely in trying to find out what the other peoples of the earth are thinking about, what

their desires are, what their prejudices are, and what their possibilities are. Again, as said earlier, we must direct our policies more strongly toward people than in the past, while not neglecting the relations with governments.

These considerations lead to the development of long-range policy. It is important that the administrative and legislative branches of the Government and the people as a whole see the new situations now presented to us as an opportunity which we must seize. It is now possible to develop long-range policy which will not be upset and reversed by every incident and accident of the relationships between the free world and the world behind the Iron Curtain. Now is the time for a thoroughgoing but not "agonizing" reappraisal. It is a time to redirect and determine our policies so that they will follow the principles that human experience through the ages has shown to be successful in building satisfactory human relations.

I hope to offer the second of this series of talks at the next session of the Senate. It will deal with the highly controversial questions involved in the rearming of Germany.

CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL FACILITIES FOR VARIOUS GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, about a year ago I served on a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services which recommended an authorization for a new building for the Central Intelligence Agency, at an authorized cost of $46 million. I was partly instrumental in convincing some of the other members of that committee, as well as the Appropriations Committee, of the need for such a building. Even though the figure seemed a little high, I thought it was justified. I was influenced partly by the fact that thereby the Federal Government would be enabled to vacate some of the temporary buildings on or near Constitution Avenue.

I agreed to that figure also in part because of special storage requirements for this particular agency.

There is also provision for an authorization of $8,500,000 to extend the approaches of the George Washington Memorial Highway if the building in question is to be located in Langley, Va. I thought that appropriation would serve a double purpose. It would facilitate extension of the memorial highway as early as possible, and it would also serve the proposed building.

I shall not give the figures as to the number of employees which this Agency has accumulated since it was created in 1947, because of certain security considerations involved in the number of employees. But to me the number was shocking, and it was shocking to many others who heard the proof.

In the face of those facts, I am further shocked and somewhat chagrined to learn that the CIA is asking for an additional $10 million for the construction of this building, over and above the $46 million already authorized.

The press has already dubbed the proprosed building as a "little Pentagon." I was not in sympathy with that designation when it was coined, but later I concluded that the press was perhaps as nearly right as I was, even though I had more of the facts than the press had.

I feel a certain sense of responsibility in this connection, toward the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, as well as to the members of the Appropriations Committee, because of representations which I made to them last year. Unless the facts have materially changed, I shall certainly vigorously oppose an increase of $10 million for this building. The only justification given for this item is that building costs have gone up 5.72 percent within the past 12 months. However, the increase in the request for appropriations is 21.7 percent.

Without going into this subject further at this time, or making an extended argument, I announce that I shall certainly look into the question further, and I expect to oppose the proposal. I strongly favor the construction of ornamental buildings on Constitution Avenue, Capitol Hill, or other similar areas of the Federal Government. Such structures should not be built primarily with the idea of trying to save a dollar, because when we ornament the Hill, it is an ornament to the entire Nation.

However, the proposed construction is away from the Hill, away from the immediate seat of government. I consider the proposed expenditure to be lavish. I think it illustrates the point that at some time the Congress must call a halt on lavish expenditures for public buildings. Otherwise we may make ourselves the laughing stock of those who know the facts.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I know what the Senator from Mississippi is talking about. The construction of every building of this type must be approved by the Committee on Public Works.

I have found, through representations which have been made before the Committee on Public Works, that every agency of the Federal Government located within the District of Columbia has the bright idea that Congress will approve the selection of an area which suits the esthetic ideas of the personnel of the particular agency.

The CIA is not the only agency involved. There is before the Committee on Public Works for approval a great scheme of the Geological Survey. Notwithstanding the fact that there is plenty of Federal property within the District that is vacant, the Geological Survey wants to go elsewhere, not for the purpose of more efficiency, but to suit the ideas of the personnel within the agency.

I think every Member who is listening to me now is familiar with the area of the Bureau of Standards, on Connecticut Avenue. There is no better location in the District of Columbia. Nevertheless, the Bureau wants to give it up and move to a new location, where it can have more lawns, more of this, and more of that.

The Committee on Public Works is asking all the agencies to furnish it with a list of the vacant property which they now have in the District of Columbia. I know it is the feeling of the Congress, and, I think, it is the desire of the people of the United States that all the temporary buildings on the Mall, on Constitution Avenue, and elsewhere, should be eliminated. Would the Congress be justified in buying property for the Geological Survey or for the Bureau of Standards or for the CIA so long as it has property which it already owns? I do not think the Congress would be justified in spending millions of dollars for new real estate.

Let me give the Senate another example. The property across from the White House, at 17th Street, is occupied, I believe, by the Court of Claims. Do the Senators know who owns that property? It, and also the parking lot next to it, is owned by Uncle Sam. Someone is making money by having a parking lot there. Apparently all the members of the court wish to have a building in the country, with the exception of Judge Marvin Jones. Would we be justified in abandoning that property? For what would it be used? If we should abandon it we would have to justify before our constituents and the American people why we did that and then appropriate millions of dollars to buy land on the outskirts of the District of Columbia.

The District of Columbia is not represented in the Senate or in the House of Representatives. The responsibility for the welfare of the District of Columbia is in the Congress of the United States. Do we not have a responsibility, even from an economic standpoint, to consider these things before we take hasty action?

So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, before the CIA and other Government agencies receive any more money from the Committee on Public Works they will have to make a better showing than they have made up to this moment.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to take action on the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Frederick Blake Payne, of New York, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Regional Organizations.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William B. Herlands, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Cunningham Sargent, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement. I expect to be absent from the Senate the latter part of this week and during next week. It is hoped by the leadership that the Senate will be able to conclude action on the defense appropriation bill today and proceed to the consideration of the mutual security authorization bill. We shall, of course, consider any conference reports which may be available, and it may be that some conference reports will need to be considered tomorrow.

At the conclusion of the consideration of the mutual aid authorization bill it is planned to consider the debt limit bill, the old age and survivors insurance bill, and the military public works bill. Of course it is necessary to pass the mutual aid authorization bill before the mutual aid appropriation bill is considered. We shall also consider the Frying Pan project bill and the Hells Canyon project bill, together with any conference reports on appropriation bills which may be available from time to time.

We also expect to schedule for consideration Calendar 2313, S. 3903, the Trade Development Assistance Act.

I make this announcement, Mr. President, so that Members of the Senate may know of the possibility of various bills I have listed being considered this week or next week.

The Democratic policy committee will have a meeting on Wednesday of this week and will attempt to clear other bills which have been reported to the Senate and are on the calendar. As soon as the policy committee has taken action I shall inform the Senate of its decision.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to add to the list of bills which I previously enumerated Calendar No. 2315, H. R. 10766, to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the majority leader and the minority leader while I make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, with the exception of three which are, respectively, on page 23, line 17; page 26, line 4, and page 29, lines 14 to 19, inclusive, that the bill as thus amended be considered as the original text for the purpose of further amendment, and that any point of order against the committee amendments be reserved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the request is not an unusual one, but for the exceptions incorporated in it. I presume that there may be some advantage in this type of procedure. I cannot conceive of any Senator changing his views because of a procedural matter. Therefore, to preserve harmony, and in order that we may expedite consideration of the bill, I shall not object to the request, provided the same request, based on individual amendments, is made without exception to all appropriation bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered.

The amendments of the Committee on Appropriations agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the heading "Title III—Department of the Army—Maintenance and Operations," on page 8, line 5, after the word "Government", to strike out "$2,954,581,000" and insert $2,967,057,000."

Under the subhead "Military Construction, Army Reserve Forces," on page 8, at the beginning of line 22, to strike out "$40,000,000" and insert "$60,000,000."

Under the subhead "Army National Guard," on page 10, line 10, after the word "aircraft", to strike out $306,000,000" and insert "$321,492,000."

Under the subhead "National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army," on page 11, line 5, after the word "Board", to strike out "$297,000" and insert "$534,000."

On page 11, after line 17, to strike out:

"REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION

"Army industrial fund

"The amount available in the Army Industrial Fund is hereby reduced by $110,000,000, such sum to be covered into the Treasury immediately upon approval of this act."

Under the heading "Title IV—Department of the Navy—Servicewide Operations," on page 22, line 6, after the word "salaries", to strike out "$102,472,000" and insert "$102,435,000."

Under the subhead "Naval Petroleum Reserves," on page 22, line 10, after the word "law", to strike out "$683,000" and insert "$1,183,000."

Under the subhead "Reductions in Appropriations," on page 22, line 24, after the word "Fund", to strike out "$52,000,000" and insert "$12,000,000."

Under the subhead "Procurement Other Than Aircraft," on page 23, at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "$1,100,000,000" and insert "$1,177,000,000."

Under the subhead "Research and Development," on page 24, line 5, after the word "law", to strike out "$610,000,000" and insert "$710,000,000."

Under the subhead "Military Personnel," on page 27, line 18, after the word "enlistment", to strike out "$3,718,440,000" and insert "$3,745,440,000, of which not to exceed "$57,853,000 may be transferred to the appropriation, 'Military personnel, 1956'."

Under the heading "Title VI—General Provisions," on page 37, line 17, after the word "than", to strike out "$31,000,000" and insert "$53,500,000."

On page 47, after line 16, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 634. During the fiscal year 1957 there is hereby authorized to be transferred to the Air Force Industrial Fund not to exceed $40 million from the Navy Industrial Fund and not to exceed $110 million from the Army Industrial Fund."

On page 47, after line 21, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 635. Appropriations available to the Department of Defense for major procurement of aircraft and missiles shall be available for expenses of development."

On page 48, line 1, to change the section number from "634" to "636."

REFUGEES, ESCAPEES, AND EXPELLEES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement and ask that the clerk may read it. My eyes are not in shape to read the statement myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read the statement of the Senator from North Dakota.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate problems connected with the emigration of refugees, escapees, and expellees, I want to call the attention of the Members of this body to the statement released to the press on June 12, 1956, by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles on the subject of refugees, and at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Dulles' statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REALLOCATION OF VISA ALLOTMENTS IN REFUGEE RELIEF ACT

I wish to call to your attention an action which the refugee relief program was required to take last week, and which points up in a forceful but unfortunate way the merit of the President's repeated requests that there be a reallocation of visa allotments contained in the Refugee Relief Act.

We were compelled to announce that, effective midnight last night, no more applications for visas could be accepted for Iron Curtain escapees residing in the NATO countries of continental Europe, plus Sweden, Turkey, and Iran—but not including Germany and Austria. Ten thousand visas were authorized for this group of escapees. About 6,000 have been issued. We now have in

process over 10,000 escapee applicants for the remaining 4,000 visas. At the same time, we have thousands more visas authorized for Iron Curtain escapees residing in Germany and Austria than we have escapee applicants in those two countries.

One of the President's proposals was to reallocate visas from places where they are not needed to places where they are needed. Over a month ago, I also testified before a Senate subcommittee urging congressional action to amend the Refugee Relief Act. The present situation confirms that need.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I remind the Senate that the enactment of some refugee relief legislation was one of the very first things President Eisenhower asked the Congress to do and his interest in and very grave concern over this matter is a continuing one even to this day, as there is no doubt in my mind that Mr. Dulles, in his June 12 statement, was merely expressing the President's views.

It is common knowledge that the President of the United States, in asking Congress to pass some refugee relief bill, had several very good reasons and that his first and foremost reason was a humanitarian one. Also that he believed it would strengthen our foreign policy, and increase our prestige abroad. It would be irrefutable evidence to the other countries of the free world that the United States was willing to shoulder her fair share of this burden and it was hoped that it would serve as an example to the other countries to do likewise, that they too, would open their doors to certain numbers of these unfortunate, homeless people.

However, the legislation which was finally passed, Public Law 203, 83d Congress, approved by the President on August 7, 1953, must have been a great disappointment to him, as when humanitarian legislation is enacted there should not be incorporated therein all the obstacles the human mind is capable of devising to defeat the very benefits granted by such legislation. In other words, Mr. President, something is not given with one hand and immediately taken away with the other. But that is exactly what was done by Public Law 203. I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee at that time, and I assure the Senate that we could not get a more liberal bill reported favorably. Many times we were in executive session at midnight in an effort to report any sort of refugee bill.

So. Mr. President, we start with the premise that Public Law 203 is a very difficult piece of refugee legislation, which under its provisions, the Department of State is charged with administering. The Department of State, in turn, had its problems, not the least of which was having to start from scratch. The American consular offices overseas were entirely unable to cope with the handling of large numbers of visa applications. The Department had to employ and train new personnel, engage office space in the various capitols of the world, and at the same time struggle to keep its budget within reasonable limits.

It is now admitted by everybody working with this act, the Department of State officials included, that the refugee relief program was at least a year and a half late in getting under way and it is my considered opinion that such delay was due to inexperience and perhaps in some instances, bad judgment, but I have found no evidence to support the charge that such delay was deliberate or intentional. So much for the background. Now let us see what has transpired since the operation of the act has at long last gotten going.

Among other things, Public Law 203 provides that visas may be issued to 209,000 immigrants who meet the very strict definition of "refugee," "escapee," and "expellee." Also they must meet other rigid requirements. The cut-off date of the act is December 31, 1956.

Mr. President, the Department of State publishes weekly statistical reports, showing the number of visas issued as of a given date. Early in 1955, it became apparent that little more than half the 209,000 visas would be issued before the expiration date, although many times this number of refugees, escapees, and expellees had been sitting in camps for more than 5 years and were registered with American consuls all over the world.

President Eisenhower took cognizance of this situation, and on May 27, 1955, sent a message to Congress setting forth a number of ways in which he believed the act should be liberalized, if it was to accomplish the purpose for which it was intended. Thereupon, a number of bills were introduced in the Senate embodying the suggested changes. The subcommittee went into action, hearings were held, and reports written, but up to the present time we have not been successful in having any of these bills reported favorably by the subcommittee. Again, it is not due to the lack of effort.

President Eisenhower considered the refugee problem of sufficient importance to mention it again in his state of the Union message to Congress in January of this year. What more could any President do?

Mr. President, I want to dwell for a minute on the incongruous position of the United States Government as concerns the escapees, if this act is actually allowed to expire as scheduled on December 31, 1956. The Government is spending millions of dollars through such instrumentalities as Radio Free Europe. United States Information Agency, which includes Voice of America, United States escapee program—which provides interim aid—and many, many others. All these expenditures have but one objective, namely, to persuade, entice, induce, cajole, and lure the Communist slaves to throw off their shackles and escape from behind the Iron Curtain countries. We tell them, through every medium of communication at our disposal, to risk everything, even their lives, if necessary, to escape, come to the free West, see how people there live, and make new lives for themselves, with unlimited opportunities, and that we will help them.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I understood, the Senate was operating under the 2-minute rule with respect to the limitation of speeches during the morning hour. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota asked unanimous consent to place certain matters in the RECORD, but he did not ask unanimous consent to have the clerk read for 20 minutes.

I make the point of order that since the Senate is operating in the morning hour, with a limitation of 2 minutes on speeches, the limitation would apply as much to the clerk who is reading the Senator's statement as it would to the Senator himself. Therefore, since the Senator from North Dakota did not ask unanimous consent that his statement be read for 15 or 20 minutes, I object to the continuation of the reading of the statement.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Virginia is quite correct. I did not know that the Senate was operating under the 2-minute rule and that the time granted to me under the rule had expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announced before the statement of the Senator from North Dakota was read that the Senate was operating under the 2-minute rule, but no objection was raised at that time to the reading of the Senator's statement.

What is the pleasure of the Senate? Does the Senator from Virginia object to the continuation of the reading of the statement of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will continue to read.

The legislative clerk resumed the reading of Mr. LANGER'S statement, as follows:

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let us assume that these people succumb to our enticements and risk everything to escape to the free West. Then what are we to do with them? Certainly we cannot give them a visa because the Refugee Relief Act has expired and in almost all cases the country of their origin has a heavily oversubscribed quota—some countries are oversubscribed for the next 10 years. So the only alternative is for them to continue to live in refugee camps and if you have ever seen such a camp, then you know it is not a very desirable abode, but there is something else they can do and that is defect—go back behind the Iron Curtain and tell the Communists how they were received and deceived by the so-called free West. So far, only a small number have defected, those who became discouraged and disillusioned by the long delay and endless redtape in trying to get a visa. The Communists, you know, are not asleep. They are continually trying to induce the escapees to return, promising them a full pardon for having escaped, houses and jobs. If these escapees, beginning to realize the futility of spending more years in a camp, returned by the thousands as they are sure to do, then the United States from a propaganda standpoint, will most certainly be discredited—in fact, we will be a great deal worse off than we were before we initiated this program—we will have miserably failed.

Now our promise to take a certain number of these refugees did set an

example to other countries of the world, just as the President of the United States hoped it would. These countries opened their doors to large numbers of refugees, many more than the United States and are to this day continuing to admit them. Many hundreds of thousands of refugees have gone to Australia, Canada, and almost all of the South American countries. This was in reliance on the promise of the United States to do likewise and now we are about to default—to break our promise. What must other countries think of us?

Mr. President, if this act is not extended and we continue to invite these people to escape, through all the mediums of communication available to us, we are guilty of misleading them—badly misleading them—of knowingly encouraging them to exchange bad conditions for worse conditions, and I want to go on record as protesting against this unfairness—this cruelty. Then when thousands of these human beings understandably become disgusted and defect—what a blow this will be to our foreign policy.

And now, Mr. President, let us consider briefly the orphan phase of this program. Under Public Law 203, 4,000 orphan visas may be issued on a worldwide basis, and at one time, it appeared that perhaps all of these visas would not be used. However, I have recently been told that the entire 4,000 orphan visas will be exhausted before December 31 of this year and that the American people are simply clamoring for more orphans to adopt. In my State of North Dakota, approximately 150 applications for orphans have been filed, and at last report only 2 have actually come in to North Dakota.

Mr. President, certainly from the standpoint of their youth, flexibility and lack of ties to any other cultures, these little children will make most desirable citizens. Nobody could object to them on the ground of being a security risk, nobody could raise the objection that they are displacing some American workingman from his house or his job. So why are we so reluctant to increase this number?

In view of the anguish being experienced by many United States citizens who want to adopt children and find them in such short supply over here, we would be doing a good thing for our own people and for the orphans if we increased this 4,000 to 10,000 or even more. As a member of the subcommittee on juvenile delinquency, we found by holding hearings, that some of our reputable citizens go into the black market and actually spend thousands of dollars to buy a child. Of course, this is a most reprehensible practice and one not to be condoned, but it just shows to what lengths people will go when they want to adopt a child.

Public Law 203, expires in less than 6 months for all practical purposes, although the cut-off date is technically December 31, 1956. I am told by Department of State officials that any application received after July of this year, or the very latest August of this year, will have little or no chance of being acted upon because, on an average, it takes 5 months to process an application. Now according to the statistical report from the Department of State dated June 1, 1956, it is shown that as of that date only 112,938 visas have been issued. This means that 96,062 visas remain to be issued during the next 6 months and I submit, Mr. President, that this is a physical impossibility. It is estimated that between 35 to 40 thousand visas will be unused—that is—lost to these unfortunate homeless people.

Mr. President, to me this would be nothing less than a tragedy and it need not happen. There are several bills pending in my subcommittee which would save the situation. As I see it, the immediate need is to pass legislation to extend the life of the act and for the reallocation of these unused visas. I recently introduced a bill, S. 3876, which would accomplish both of these objectives. Hearings have been concluded on this bill and a confidential subcommittee report written and I might also add, that this bill has the unqualified endorsement of the Department of State. It only remains to have it reported favorably by the subcommittee, and I sincerely hope we will do this in time.

PENSION PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk another statement which I ask unanimous consent to have read, because of my own inability at present to read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The statement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in January of this year, I introduced a bill, S. 2978, which if enacted, would increase the income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents. This bill, was in due course, properly referred to the Senate Committee on Finance and the committee, as a routine matter, requested a report from the Veterans' Administration. This report has now been received and a copy forwarded to me and at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I am enclosing for your information a copy of a report received from the Veterans' Administration relative to your bill S. 2978, "To increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents."

Respectfully,
ELIZABETH B. SPRINGER,
Chief Clerk.

JUNE 8, 1956.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Further reference is made to your letter requesting a report by the Veterans' Administration relative to S. 2978, 84th Congress, "A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents."

The bill proposes to increase existing income limitations governing the payment of pension for non-service-connected disability to certain veterans and of pension for non-service-connected death to certain widows and children.

Under existing law (pt. III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended), veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict period are eligible, subject to specified requirements, to pension for permanent total non-service-connected disability. The pension rates are $66.15 per month, or $78.75 if the veteran has received the basic rate for a continuous period of 10 years or reaches the age of 65. A rate of $135.45 per month is authorized in the case of an otherwise eligible veteran who is, on account of age or physical or mental disability, helpless or blind or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid or attendance of another person. Payment cannot be made if the veteran's annual income exceeds $1,400 if he is unmarried, or $2,700 if married or with minor children. Section 1 of S. 2978 would raise the $1,400 income limitation to $3,000 and the existing $2,700 limitation to $4,000.

In connection with this proposal, your committee will undoubtedly desire to consider the basic purpose of this disability pension. It was intended primarily to afford a modest allowance to seriously disabled veterans who are in limited financial circumstances but whose condition is not the outgrowth of their war service. It was not intended to provide full support. The veteran who receives $66.15 monthly pension ($793.80 yearly), if subject to the $1,400 income limitation, may receive an aggregate yearly income (including pension) of $2,193.80. The aggregate of $2,193.80 would be increased to $3,793.80 if S. 2978 is enacted into law. If he is subject to the $2,700 limitation, he currently can receive as much as $3,493.80 annually. The aggregate of $3,493.80 would be increased to $4,793.80 if the bill is enacted. If paid the higher rates of $78.75 or $135.45 per month, the veteran's potential aggregate income would be proportionately greater.

Section 2 of the bill is concerned with the annual income limitations which qualify eligibility of widows and children of deceased veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict period, for non-service-connected death pension provided by the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1281), as amended and extended. The current monthly death pension rates are widow with no child, $50.40; widow with 1 child, $63; with $7.56 for each additional child; no widow but 1 child, $27.30; no widow but 2 children, $40.95, equally divided; no widow but 3 children, $54.60, equally divided; with $7.56 for each additional child, total equally divided. Section 2 of S. 2978 would raise the annual income limitations governing the payment of this pension from $1,400 to $3,000 in the case of a widow without children or in the case of a child, and from $2,700 to $4,000 in the case of a widow with a child or children.

As in the case of disability pension, it has been the consistent policy of the Congress to restrict the benefits of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended, to widows and children in limited financial circumstances, the theory of the legislation being to provide some measure of support to those primary dependents who survive the veteran and who are in need. Under the present law, an eligible widow with no child receives $50.40 monthly pension or $604.80 annually, which when combined with the permissible $1,400 income would aggregate $2,004.80 annually. The aggregate of $2,004.80 would be increased to $3,604.80 if S. 2978 is enacted into law. A widow with 1 child receives $63 monthly pension or $756 annually, which when combined

with the permissible $2,700 income would aggregate $3,456 annually. The aggregate of $3,456 would be increased to $4,756 in the event S. 2978 is enacted. In other cases the possible income would vary according to the rate of pension and income limitation applicable thereto.

Section 3 of S. 2978 states that the bill shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month following its enactment. It provides that no pension shall be paid to any person whose eligibility for pension is established solely by virtue of the bill for any period prior to the effective date thereof. It is assumed in this connection that it is intended that the bill apply to pending and future applications for benefits and would not require an administrative review, without application, of cases previously disallowed.

When the disability pension with which this bill is concerned was established by law (Veterans Regulation No. 1, March 31, 1933), income limitations were provided of $1,000 applicable to an unmarried veteran, and $2,500 to a married veteran or a veteran with a minor child or children. The act of June 28, 1934, which created the death pension benefit under consideration, provided that it would not be applicable to any person during any year following a year for which such person was not entitled to exemption from the payment of a Federal income tax. By the act of July 19, 1939 (53 Stat. 1068), that limitation was replaced by the income limitations or $1,000 in the case of a widow without child, or a child, and $2,500 in the case of a widow with a child or children. The mentioned $1,000 and $2,500 limitations applicable to both disability and death pension were increased to $1,400 and $2,700 by sections 1 and 2, respectively, of the act of May 23, 1952 (66 Stat. 91). For the information of the committee, it is noted that for the purposes of the foregoing limitations, annual income is determined in accordance with Veterans' Administration Regulation 1228, a copy of which was furnished your committee with the Veterans' Administration's report on S. 1213, 84th Congress, under date of October 5, 1955.

It appears from the legislative history of the bill (H. R. 4387, 82d Cong.), which became the act of May 23, 1952, supra, that the increases granted in the income limitations at that time were predicated on the increased cost of living. In this connection, it is noted that the Consumer Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, for May 1952, was 113 points and for April 1956, 114.9 points (1947–49=100 points), an increase of roughly 1⅔ percent.

With respect to the following estimates of cost of the bill, if enacted, the latest available income data and marital status data published by the Bureau of the Census have been utilized. In estimating the cost of the bills, it has been assumed that the income level of veterans and dependents of deceased veterans is the same as that for the general population of comparable age and sex and that there will be no significant change in income levels from that indicated by the latest available data.

Subject to the foregoing assumptions, it is estimated that S. 2978, if enacted, would affect approximately 378,800 cases during the first year at an additional cost for that year of approximately $309,262,000. Of these, it is estimated that section 1 of the bill would affect 334,000 veterans' cases at a cost of $284,119,000, and section 2 would affect 44,800 deceased veterans' cases at a cost of $25,143,000. In accordance with paragraph 7, Bureau of the Budget Circular A–19, dated June 14, 1954, it is estimated that the annual cost of S. 2978 will increase by approximately 16 to 19 percent each year, over the preceding year in the 4 succeeding years. In view of the intangible factors involved, the foregoing estimate may not be considered as firm, but as the best practicable estimate of the cost of the bill.

In view of the fact that the income limitations were liberalized in 1952, and the cost of living has increased less than 2 percent since that time, I do not believe that the bill merits favorable consideration.

Advice was received from the Bureau of the Budget with respect to a similar report on a similar bill (H. R. 644, 84th Cong.) to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, that there would be no objection by that Office to the submission of the report to the committee, and that for the reasons set forth in the report the Bureau recommends against favorable consideration of the bill.

Sincerely yours,

H. V. HIGLEY,
Administrator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, while I am not surprised that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to use his own words, "does not believe that the bill merits favorable consideration," I am surprised at the circuitous reasoning route he took to reach this profound conclusion. The Administrator opposes the increase in income limitations on the basis that since Congress gave an increase in incomes in 1952, and since the cost of living has increased very little since 1952 to 1956, less than 2 percent, to be exact, that further liberalization of income limitations would not be justified.

Why 1952, why not go back to 1933? My reply to that assertion is this—if Congress was guilty of an injustice in 1952, which we were, must we perpetuate it to the end of time? My contention is that when these income limitations were raised in 1952, such increases were not realistic then and today they are absurd.

Mr. President, in case someone may be wondering what is this "income limitation" which I consider so all-important, I want to explain briefly what is meant by these terms and how it works to the disadvantage of veterans. Under certain existing laws pertaining to veterans who have been rated nonservice-connected, there is a provision that, although such a veteran may be otherwise eligible to receive a pension, he may have the required service, he may have an honorable discharge, together with all the other elements of entitlement, yet if his annual income exceeds a certain amount, he may not be awarded a pension. This stipulation is written in the law, and it cannot be bypassed. The same holds true for dependents of such veterans, and believe me, Mr. President, this "annual income" takes in just about everything.

Mr. President, the basis for the present income limitation on World War I veterans dates back to 1933. At that time, during the depression, Congress imposed, by Public Law 2—March 20, 1933—an income limitation of $1,000 for veterans without dependents and $2,500 for veterans with dependents. This was increased by Public Law 356—May 23, 1952—to $1,400 and $2,700, respectively. In other words, in the last 23 years we have raised this income limitations exactly $400 for single veterans and $200 for veterans with dependents. This is also true for veterans' dependents. And now let us see how the cost of living has gone up since 1933:

Changes in selected consumer food prices, 1933–56

Item	Unit	1933	February 1956	Percentage increases
		Cents	*Cents*	
Butter	1 pound	27.8	70.8	154.7
Cheese, American	do	23.9	57.0	138.5
Eggs, fresh	1 dozen	28.8	59.2	105.6
Milk, fresh	1 quart	10.4	22.2	113.5
Flour, wheat	5 pounds	19.5	53.0	171.8
Bread	1 pound	7.1	17.6	147.9
Potatoes	10 pounds	23.0	54.8	138.3
Coffee	1 pound	26.4	96.2	264.4
Chuck roast	do	16.0	45.0	181.3

The foods I have mentioned—and they are the very cheapest grades—are necessary staples which every family must buy and consume if they are to maintain any standard of health. I am not arguing for this increase in income limitations so veterans can buy filet mignon, champagne, and caviar, but only that they may be able to buy the barest necessities.

Mr. President, what would S. 2978 do that would be so ruinous to the country and would clean out the Treasury? It would raise the income limitation in the case of single veterans from the present $1,400 to $3,000, and for veterans with dependents from the present $2,700 to $4,000. The same would apply to dependents of veterans. This bill is based on the belief that the old income limitation is outmoded and unrealistic in terms of present living costs and concepts of a minimum decent standard of living of the American people. I am very sure that Congress never intended that the veterans' standard of living should be lower than that of the nonveteran. If the argument of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs holds water, that the income limitation upon veterans' pensions should vary directly with the cost of living, then the amounts mentioned in my bill, S. 2978, are too low. They should be at least $3,100 and $5,000 respectively. How did the Administrator arrive at the conclusion that S. 2978 "does not merit favorable consideration"?

The figures I have just quoted concerning the cost of foodstuffs are from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and prove, beyond any doubt, that the cost of living from 1933 to 1956 increased 107.8 percent. The income limitation has practically stood still. These figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics must have been available to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, just as they were available to me; and from where I sit, Mr. President, I am not able to say with certainty whether he chose to ignore them or whether not taking them into account was an oversight.

SECURITY CHECKING OF OFFICE OF SENATOR LEHMAN

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on last Thursday, June 21, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] discussed on the floor a matter

concerning the security checking of a part of his office space by representatives of the Department of Defense.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the sworn testimony of the two Department of Defense representatives and the Capitol policeman involved, which was given before the Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Committee on Armed Services.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEHMAN MATTER

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE AIR FORCE
OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D. C., June 21, 1956.

The subcommittee (consisting of Senators SYMINGTON, JACKSON, ERVIN, SALTONSTALL, and DUFF) met, pursuant to call, at 11:10 a. m., in room 212, Senate Office Building, Senator STUART SYMINGTON (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators SYMINGTON (presiding) SALTONSTALL, and DUFF.

Also present: Mr. Fowler Hamilton, counsel; Ramsay D. Potts, associate counsel; Fred B. Rhodes, legal consultant to Senator SALTONSTALL; Edward C. Welsh, assistant to Senator SYMINGTON; and Wallace L. Engle, staff member.

Mansfield T. Sprague, general counsel, Department of Defense.

Senator SYMINGTON. We will take up a matter that has come up as the result of an article in the press this morning.

Will a member of the staff find the policeman, the one who was involved in this?

This article, at this point, I submit for the record.

(The article above referred to in its entirety is as follows:)

"[From the New York Times, of June 21, 1956]

"AGENTS HUNT A 'TAP' IN LEHMAN'S OFFICE

"WASHINGTON, June 20.—Two men with badges walked into Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN'S office today and scrutinized his refrigerator closet.

"Security being what it is, no one can be certain what they were looking for, but circumstantial evidence suggests they suspected a 'bug,' an electrical or electronic device used for long-range eavesdropping.

"The Senator's closet is adjacent to a Senate hearing room where hypersecret Defense Department information is being submitted to an Armed Services Subcommittee investigating the Nation's aerial preparedness for war.

"The subcommittee revealed yesterday that security police were guarding the air around the room against potential devices for eavesdropping.

"The agents' job, according to the subcommittee, is to insure that 'no remotely controlled clandestine, transmitters are put into operation during a conference.'

"Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat of Missouri, who conducts the hearings, said that though the check was merely a routine precautionary measure, a similar procedure had never been used before in Senate hearings.

"The Defense Department refused today to describe its techniques for fighting any long-range snooper. 'Radio monitoring' and 'visual inspection' are vaguely alluded to, but more precise information is secret.

"Secretary is startled

"The guessing Senator LEHMAN'S office today was that it had been subjected to the 'visual inspection' technique. Mrs. Mildred Akins, one of the New York Democrat's secretaries, said she was startled to notice a Capitol policeman and two men in civilian clothes prowling resolutely through private quarters of the office.

"'I said, "Nobody comes in our office unless I see a badge or something,"' she reported. The policeman, she said, muttered something about 'security' and 'a hearing next door.' The other two men flashed badges.

"Thereupon, she said, they sought out the closet where the staff keeps a small refrigerator and scanned it professionally. They left without further explanation.

"Normally congressional hearing rooms are checked for eavesdropping devices before sessions in which secret information is to be divulged. The continuous check with radio monitoring devices, however, is thought to be an innovation. It is operated by the security office of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

"Mrs. Akins said that the two men who checked Senator LEHMAN'S office today seemed satisfied that nothing sinister was secreted there and left after simply looking.

"Security 'nightmares'

"The Capitol Office Building, however, ranks among the worst security nightmares of Washington for the Defense Department. There is no restraint or check on the public. Crackpots appear in high percentage to plead all manner of causes and the corridors are usually thronged with mobs of tourists.

"The police force, which in theory guards it, is a special group recruited from men seeking minor political patronage and bears little resemblance to any other police force in the Nation. It is utterly political and has no connection with the professional Washington City force.

"In hearings last year, a private detective specializing in wiretapping told a House committee that new eavesdropping devices being developed would enable a snooper to stand outside a building and 'bug' any hearing room.

"This, he testified, could be done electronically.

"The Defense Department's reference to 'radio monitoring' as an 'antibug' device presumably means that the Department is now equipped to detect such snoopers."

Senator SYMINGTON. Is Mr. Morgan here?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Are you the headman of these two?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you raise your right hand? Do you solemnly swear the information you give this committee is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MORGAN. I do, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. What is this all about?

TESTIMONY OF CLARKE A. MORGAN, OSD SECURITY

Mr. MORGAN. It is very little, sir. Yesterday I noticed a ventilator which had insulation torn aside in it, and I wanted to see what was on the other side of it, and therefore, I asked the policeman—I thought it led to the ladies latrine, which is right next door, but it wasn't. It was behind in the next office, a little long room, and I asked the policeman if he would go along with me, and I went in and looked at it.

Senator SYMINGTON. Is the ventilation not connected with the ladies room?

Mr. MORGAN. No.

Senator SYMINGTON. Did you go into the ladies room first?

Mr. MORGAN. First I checked there and then around in the next office.

Senator SYMINGTON. And then what did you do?

Mr. MORGAN. I just walked out. I saw what it was, that it had been torn aside, so I went around on the other side, I saw no listening devices, went and plugged up the hole from our side.

Senator SYMINGTON. And is that all that happened?

Mr. MORGAN. That's all.

Senator SYMINGTON. Where is the other man who was with you? Will you give your full name?

Mr. MORGAN. Clarke A. Morgan.

Senator SYMINGTON. And to whom do you report?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Gould, of Security Division of OSD.

Mr. HAMILTON. What is his full name?

Mr. MORGAN. George J. Gould.

Senator SYMINGTON. Raise your right hand please. What is your name?

Mr. BOGDANOWICZ. Bernard Bogdanowicz.

Senator SYMINGTON. Do you solemnly swear all the information you give this subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Mr. BOGDANOWICZ. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Were you on this joint journey yesterday, too?

TESTIMONY OF BERNARD S. BOGDANOWICZ, OSD SECURITY

Mr. BOGDANOWICZ. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. And will you tell what happened?

Mr. BOGDANOWICZ. Mr. Morgan noted that the ventilator had insulation which was visibly disturbed, so he checked the adjacent ladies room, after it was noted that it was empty. The police guard knocked on the door and checked to make certain. Then we went——

Senator SYMINGTON. What did you do?

Mr. BOGDANOWICZ. After a police guard checked the adjacent ladies' room to make certain there was nobody in it, we went to see if the ventilator was from the ladies' room. It wasn't. It was in an adjacent office which belonged to Senator LEHMAN, so we asked the guard for assistance.

He asked the secretary if it were permissible for us to go back there, and she seemed perfectly willing. She went to check to see if there was anything that we shouldn't see. She came back and assisted us——

Senator SYMINGTON. Say that again, will you?

Mr. BOGDANOWICZ. It's in a room adjacent to room 457 where our hearings are. It happens to be Senator LEHMAN'S suite of offices.

We sought the assistance of a police guard. He went in and asked the secretary if we could go look at the room. She said "yes," and she checked to see if there was anybody in the room.

Senator SYMINGTON. Is that all she did?

Mr. BOGDANOWICZ. Right. She went to the room, she checked to see if there was anybody there. She came back out and walked into the room with us. We looked at the ventilator and we walked back out.

Senator SYMINGTON. And that's all there is to it?

Mr. BOGDANOWICZ. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. And you all report to whom?

Mr. BOGDANOWICZ. Mr. George J. Gould, Security Services Division of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Senator SYMINGTON. Who told you to come to the committee?

Mr. MORGAN. That was done through, I believe, legislative liaison to Mr. Gould, who told us personally.

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Sprague, did you know anything about this?

Mr. SPRAGUE. No, sir.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Taylor of legislation liaison sometimes calls me, but usually it comes through Mr. Gould.

Senator SYMINGTON. Over in the Pentagon?

Mr. MORGAN. That's right.

Senator SYMINGTON. What did they tell you to do when you came over here?

Mr. MORGAN. Security coverage of the hearing.

Senator SYMINGTON. And our testimony is that as soon as you went in the office, the woman was glad to have you look the office over?

Mr. MORGAN. She did not seem to have any trouble. She walked back. She made some comment about she had a crackpot in there at one time, and she was leery about letting people in, so I showed her my badge and went in. She made no comment at all.

That was after we were in there that she said she was leery of people coming in, so I showed her my badge, and she seemed very contented.

Senator SYMINGTON. The policeman's story and your story don't jibe the way he gave it to me this morning. We are trying to find him. Do you know where he is?

Mr. ENGLE. No, sir; I don't. He has been sent for.

Senator SYMINGTON. He said the woman ran in the back and shut the door.

Mr. MORGAN. Within this office, the office that you walk into from the hall, there was a little partition, glass-paneled partition to another office back of that. Now, how long that office is, I don't remember whether it runs to the left or not. Anyway, there was another door to this little long room, the one that we were interested in.

Senator SYMINGTON. What happened when you first went in the office? What did you say? Who went in first?

Mr. MORGAN. I believe the policeman went in first.

Senator SYMINGTON. Did you go in with him when he went in first?

Mr. BOGDANOWICZ. We went to the outer office, sir, and he inquired, or asked the stenographer, if we could go back in and check a ventilator.

Senator SYMINGTON. And what did she say?

Mr. BOGDANOWICZ. She said she would go to the room and check and see if anybody was there, and she came out and escorted us into the room, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. That was all the conversation there was?

Mr. BOGDANOWICZ. Except the fact she mentioned having had an individual in there which at one time she didn't want, something like that. That was all, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Did you find the officer?

Mr. POTTS. I have him out here, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you bring him in? Will you come up here, please, and sit next to this gentleman. Will you raise your right hand and be sworn, please?

Do you solemnly swear the information you give this subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Officer ENCINIAS. I do, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. What is your full name?

TESTIMONY OF OFFICER GILBERT J. ENCINIAS

Officer ENCINIAS. My name is Gilbert J.—last name is E-n-c-i-n-i-a-s.

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you tell us what happened yesterday?

Officer ENCINIAS. I was standing in room 457. I was assigned to take care of that committee there, and the two security officers came to me and asked me if I knew where that vent led. I didn't know where it led. I thought it might lead from the ladies' lounge.

I went to Senator LEHMAN's office. I stopped at the desk. I asked the girl if she would do me a favor. The girl said, "I would do it for you if it did not mean leaving the room."

I said, "No. What it is, I have to go into the ladies lounge, and I'd like somebody to go in there and check if anybody is in there."

She said she could not leave the room, so I left. I knocked on the door and I yelled a couple of times. There was nobody in there, so we walked in there and there were no vent in there. Then I suggested that it probably went into Senator LEHMAN's office. I wasn't sure. So I went in there, into Senator LEHMAN's office. I stood at the desk.

The two gentlemen, the two security officers were right by me. I asked the girl if it was possible for us to check that vent in the back room. She jumped up. She went to shut the door on us, and I explained to her again——

Senator SYMINGTON. I think when I saw you this morning you said "slammed the door on you."

Officer ENCINIAS. Yes, sir, she slammed the door and she said, "Nobody comes in here." And I explained again to her that these were security officers. The man had identification. She asked the man for identification and he pulled out his billfold, and then she let him in. They went into the back room and she had a conversation with this gentleman right here that I think—I couldn't hear very well—I think she said about 2 weeks ago somebody tried to come into the files. She let him in and talked to him, and then we went out.

A few minutes elapsed, and she came to me while I was standing at the door, and she said that they were stuffing paper in the vent. I explained again to her why they were stuffing paper over there, and she kept on talking and I reported to some other officers there, I don't know who it was, and they were asking me different questions about the men there at the door. I said.

"Next time, man, I will ask Senator SYMINGTON if he could give us permission."

And she took that as an insult. I did not mean it as an insult. I meant it with every courtesy I could, that I would ask the Senator next time to give me permission for what I had done. That is all there was to it, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Morgan, you have already testified to whom you report in the Department of Defense, isn't that correct?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Senator SALTONSTALL, have you any comments?

Senator SALTONSTALL. No, I have no comments.

Senator SYMINGTON. Senator DUFF?

Senator DUFF. None.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I have this comment, Mr. Chairman. Listening to this evidence, I should say that these men had done their best to carry out their responsibility to the Security Officer in the Pentagon to whom they report, and certainly there is no connection between the Senators who comprise the subcommittee and this duty of theirs.

We have asked them to make sure that our hearings held in executive session are debugged.

Senator SYMINGTON. When did we do that, Senator?

Senator SALTONSTALL. We didn't ask them. We found that they were here in executive session to make sure that our sessions were debugged. We did not ask them to do it, that is correct. They were here to do it, and they were carrying out their responsibilities.

Certainly, there is no responsibility on your part, and it seems to me that they were carrying out their duties, and that the officer of the law was carrying out his duty, and I should say that the incident had been much magnified, and very unfortunately magnified.

Senator SYMINGTON. The Chair would like, in case there is any real or implied relationship to the subcommittee's work in this testimony, to express his apologies to Senator LEHMAN for any inconvenience it might have caused him or his staff. Would the Senator care to join with me in that.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I would be very happy to. I would say as far as I am concerned that we would be glad to, happy to apologize.

Senator DUFF. I would like to do so also, and I would like to say from what I have heard, I don't think there was any conceivable intention of reflection on Senator LEHMAN.

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir. I might state that I didn't even know it was his office at the time.

Mr. SPRAGUE. Mr. Chairman, if you think it would be advisable, and I do, I would be glad to see to it that a letter of apology to Senator LEHMAN is issued from the Department of Defense. But I do feel on the basis of what the gentlemen have said, that they were just trying to carry out their normal duties.

Senator SYMINGTON. I would appreciate that. Senator LEHMAN called me this morning and told me that, based on the story, he intended to talk about it on the floor—if you got in touch with him as soon as convenient, it might be constructive, so he will understand the nature of what these men were trying to do, and the position of the Department of Defense.

Mr. SPRAGUE. I will do that, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you, gentlemen. We will now go into executive session.

THE UNITED NATIONS IN THE MAINSTREAM OF HISTORY

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, I have followed with great interest, from his schooldays, the entire career of Hon. Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State. Mr. Wilcox is a native Iowan, and all Iowa is proud, indeed, of him and his outstanding record.

On April 27, 1956, Mr. Wilcox delivered a speech, entitled "The United Nations in the Mainstream of History," before the American Association of International Law. In this speech he analyzed some of the main developments in the United Nations during the past decade, and the major problems we shall have to face as we look ahead.

Because of the importance of Mr. Wilcox's discussion, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS IN THE MAINSTREAM OF HISTORY

(Address by the Honorable Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State, before the American Society of International Law, Sheraton-Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C., Friday, April 27, 1956)

As a member of the fraternity of international law, I am honored to appear before you tonight as the society celebrates its 50th anniversary. We have been colleagues for a long time. It may sometimes seem to you, as it does to me, that we in government tend to lose touch with the wellsprings of scholarship and speculations that are indispensable to intellectual vigor. The scholar, for his part, may sometimes get too far away from the harsh realities of political action. August Comte, I am told, practiced the policy of cerebral hygiene—he didn't read any books except his own. This kind of sterility of thought must be avoided at all costs and I hope the day never comes when we in the government read only our own memoranda.

Both the public service and the learned professions can profit from increased contact between our two worlds. Organizations such as the American Society of International Law can and should provide a helpful bridge in this connection.

In wondering how to use this opportunity tonight, I thought it might be beneficial to step back from the immediate and the obvious, and look upon the United Nations from an historical point of view.

How can we sum up its first decade? How should we evaluate the trends that have set in? What are the main problems that lie ahead?

THE HISTORICAL BASIS OF THE U. N.

First of all, we should abandon the notion, sometimes held, that in 1945 the United Nations sprang into being from nowhere, like Minerva from the brow of Zeus. The analogy, rather, should be the Phoenix arising from its own ashes. For while many felt it wise in 1945 to avoid dwelling on antecedents, those who labored to create the United Nations would have had an extremely difficult time without the precedents of the League of Nations to guide them.

Indeed, the ancestry of the United Nations reaches back to such historic landmarks as the rise of the nation-state, the evolution of constitutional government, the beginnings of modern economic patterns, and the development of international jurisprudence from the time of Grotius and Vittoria.

From these early roots the process which Secretary Dulles has called "the institutionalizing of peace" has slowly taken form, culminating in our age in the creation of the United Nations.

We can criticize history, but we can never rewrite it, despite the best efforts of both Stalin and his ungrateful proteges. When the United Nations came into being, men and nations had reached a certain point in their development. It was at this point, and this point only, that the United Nations could be constructed.

By no means all men realized that we had reached that historic watershed. There were those, as there still are, who out of conviction or prejudice denied the possibility of true international cooperation. Much past history was available to support their pessimism.

Others went well beyond that point. Optimistic about man's innate virtue, they sought—and still seek—utopian solutions.

In the main, the United Nations Charter represents a consensus—if not of men, at least of governments. The document itself is a remarkable compromise in the name of political reality. However, it has provided a satisfactory framework within which the organism has been able to live, to experiment, and to grow. That no nation, however dissatisfied, has withdrawn its membership bespeaks both the intrinsic value of the organization and increasingly articulate world public opinion. One can only conclude that it has been in the interest of member states to participate. This in itself is a major tribute to the architects who by and large confined themselves within the bounds of political interests and possibilities. The organization has had to function in a world of fundamental changes and its responses to those changes show that it has a strong survival factor.

THE FIRST DECADE—TWO OVERRIDING FACTS

What are the great changes in the first decade of the organization's life? Two facts of paramount importance stand out.

First of all, after military victory in World War II was assured, the Soviet Union resumed its doctrinal hostility to the noncommunist world, and above all to the United States—the symbol of all that stands between it and world domination.

To say this is to describe how the hopeful notion of universal collective security has had to be transformed, at least for this age, into quite a different pattern of coalitions and alliances. It describes the growth and the competition of two great powers; one determined to subvert free societies, the other equally determined to preserve from assault and subversion the values of Western civilization and the practice of freedom under law. This fact has dimmed the United Nation's bright promise of cooperation and peace-enforcement. For once the cold war began in earnest, the United Nations had to adapt itself to an intensely competitive, often hostile, and flagrantly "undiplomatic" world of tensions among the great powers. If it had not been able to do so, it would have expired.

A second momentous development has marked the postwar decade. For the first time in modern history the scene of political and social action has significantly shifted from the European West to the great cradle of civilization lying athwart the equator, stretching from North Africa to the Islands of Melanesia. This half of the world, which seemed to slumber through the great revolutions of the West, is rising from the remains of its mighty past.

In one apocalyptic moment, as history tells time, this ancient world has erupted like some long-forgotten volcano. Today, 11 years after the war, 14 nations containing 600,000,000 people have achieved political independence and become members of the United Nations. Hundreds of millions of their neighbors are moving toward a new political status, either quickly or slowly. They, too, lay claim to the status and the opportunities of the West, demanding an equal share of both.

Those members of the United Nations who share similar backgrounds or similar problems in relation to colonialism and economic development command a parliamentary strength today which few dreamed of in 1945. This balance was strengthened by the admission of 16 more states to membership last fall. What they ask, in short, is freedom from poverty, freedom from control, and freedom from inequality. In the United Nations this takes on concrete shape in the repudiation of a passing age of Western colonialism, in expectations of economic help toward industrialization, and in demands for recognition of their claims for racial, social, and cultural equality. Together, these ambitions represent a dynamic emotional force that has swept the subcontinents of the Eastern Hemisphere.

The collision in the United Nations between these two currents, one running between the free world and international communism, the other between Europe and its old imperial holdings, has served to mould the United Nations to the shape of the world it represents. It may have set discouraging limits to the organization. But it has also opened new possibilities for utilizing the United Nations to keep within peaceful bounds these sweeping tides and currents. The foremost task facing both the policymaker and the scholar is to determine how best these forces can be turned to good and constructive use, in pursuance of our goals of peace with justice.

THE FIRST DECADE—OTHER PROBLEMS

But it is only too easy to forget that, if there had been no cold war, and if the colonial revolution had not broken out with such energy, there would still be a formidable array of international problems. Finding solutions for some of these problems has sorely taxed human ingenuity.

If nationalism is a vital force in Asia, it is no less so in the rest of the world. Disputes arise between nations over questions of trade, or territory, or simply prestige. Effective machinery is necessary to direct such disputes into peaceful channels. It is likewise necessary for conflicts that arise out of efforts to change the established order. One reason why it is so hard to speak of law as a governing principle of the United Nations is that, like the league, its most pressing problems arise from the desire of nations, not to see their legal rights enforced, but to change the law itself.

The clash and interplay of conflicting claims and competing systems and cultures has had a transforming effect on the concept of multilateral relations that prevailed in 1945.

For one thing, nations have tended to draw together in the United Nations in voting blocs on the basis of their special interests, and their estimate of the parliamentary power situation. Those who placed a high premium on traditions of political and civil liberties have united for defense against world communism. Those who shared a definable corner of the globe tended to find community in regional alliances. Those who administered dependent territories tended to unite on the principle of noninterference in colonial affairs. The non-Communist but anti-colonial nations have banded together to create parliamentary strength out of individual weakness. In this situation, the Communist bloc has worked, as might be expected, to take advantage of these divisions of interest in the free world.

The unreliability of the Security Council, given its unworkable premise of great-power unity, has placed a premium on the Assembly. New voting patterns, involving shifting groups of states, have come to characterize the Assembly. It was there that the Asian, African, and Latin-American nations found new ways to exert their influence. It was there that we ourselves turned in 1950 to unfreeze the organization's potential for collective defense against aggression, in the face of the deadlock in the Security Council. And it is there that the great powers have had to present and defend their policies before the rest of the world.

In this setting, the United Nations has tended to become less and less of a tribunal where abstract justice could be meted out, and where, when the chips were down, the great powers would together enforce the peace. At the same time, it has also tended to become less of a tight coalition of pro-Western nations. Instead, it has been revealed for what it really was all along—a sort of log-cabin community house where the entire neighborhood friends and strangers, rich and poor, law-abiding and law-breaking—are all present.

Their mood indoors is not appreciably different from what it is outdoors, but one great purpose is shared in common by most members: to settle differences peacefully, arguing national policy on a give-and-take basis, negotiating agreements under public pressure, and, if one member gets unruly, trying as best they can to deal with him.

The ground rules are primitive, but those that work are indispensable to world order. The dreams of a future model community under law do not die, nor should they. But just as law is a product of the community, so the community must follow from a consensus, however modest, as to the common goals and purposes of the individual members. The development of this community and the broadening of its underlying consensus is the greatest long-term task facing us today.

HOW THE U. N. HAS DEVELOPED—ADAPTATION TO REALITY

We have so far depicted the United Nations in broad terms. What has happened to it in the face of changing conditions? The combination of pressures on the organization have led it to adapt in a number of significant ways. None of these has been formally ratified by amendment of the charter. In some cases there was no suitable charter provision to change. But in the main, these were adaptations designed to permit the machinery to function without having to rewrite the charter.

Chief Justice Marshall once said of our Constitution that "it was intended to endure for ages to come, and, consequently, to be adapted to the various crises of human affairs." Throughout our history the process of constitutional growth has gone on unceasingly. Specifically, the Constitution has grown in four ways: through formal amendments, through interpretation by the Courts, through custom and usage, and through

basic legislation passed by Congress. With remarkably little textual change the Constitution has been kept a living document.

In somewhat the same fashion the Charter has proven flexible enough to meet new situations not foreseen 10 years ago. Despite the fears of some, these are not changes in the powers of the organization as a whole in relation to its member states. The United Nations legal powers are no less and no greater than what was agreed to at San Francisco, although they have been in some respects clarified. The purposes and goals have not changed either. Indeed the changes I refer to have brought these goals closer to fruition by avoiding futility, and refusing to accept impotence.

These informal evolutions fall into four categories.

In the first place, some provisions of the charter early became obsolete and unworkable. Much of charter VII dealing with Security Council enforcement had to be put aside so long as the great-power unanimity it presupposed was impossible to achieve. Similarly, article 106 on interim enforcement measures called for great-power unanimity, and similarly it became unworkable in a setting where one of the powers itself constituted the chief threat to the peace.

In the second place, new interpretations were found for existing charter provisions. The practice of absention prevented total paralysis of the Security Council, on occasions where an outright veto could be sidestepped. The Secretary-General's role has come to be interpreted quite liberally, opening the way to new possibilities in the peaceful settlement of disputes. A new set of activities in the colonial field has grown out of interpretations of article 73 regarding responsibilities with respect to non-self-governing territories, a development which we must help to keep constructive and balanced. And, as I have indicated, the General Assembly has largely replaced the Security Council as the principal forum for consideration of political issues, including many arising from the colonial revolt against the West.

In the third place, international agreements have been developed to fill out gaps in the charter. I have in mind such important treaties as the Atlantic Pact, the SEATO agreement, and other regional and collective defense pacts based on articles 51–54.

These pacts, I am aware, have sometimes been criticized on the ground that they run counter to the spirit—if not the letter—of the charter. Actually, they are based on the obvious fact that the enforcement procedures outlined in the charter were denied vitality by the Soviet Union.

Finally, the major organs of the United Nations have used their authority to create subsidiary organs, such as the Interim Committee and the various ECOSOC regional commissions, to assist the parent organs in performing their proper functions.

It is clear that if the United Nations is to develop without charter amendments, we must strike a balance between the extreme positions of loose and strict construction. The idea that the charter is so flexible that it can be changed at will merely by interpretation, may be dangerous not only for the member states but also for the United Nations. For obviously, a member that supports a broad interpretation on one occasion might find the precedent very much against its interests on another occasion. And a General Assembly that might seek to enlarge unduly the area of its power by narrow voting margins would probably find its influence weakened in a relatively short time.

THE FUTURE OF THE U. N.: SOME CENTRAL ISSUES

When the member nations come to reexamine the powers, functions and structure of the United Nations in connection with the proposed charter review conference, these developments all constitute vital background. Nothing could be more futile than to scrutinize the charter in a political vacuum, in the vain hope that improvements in language alone will somehow transform the behavior, the interests, or the motivation of nations. But it would be equally irresponsible, in my judgment, to assume that no real improvements are possible.

This is a uniquely propitious time to be taking a hard look at international organizations, and at the role the United States should play in them. For we appear to be living through one of those electric periods when the whole apparatus of history seems to hesitate, shift gears, and move ahead on a new and different track.

Certainly the program of the Soviet Union has shown startling signs of alteration, if not of policy, then of strategy and tactics. We must not be deluded into a false set of assumptions about its continuing purpose. But the tactical shift of the Soviets should not be minimized. It is a major political development, and it has already had an important impact in the United Nations. Indeed, its effects confront us everywhere with new and challenging problems. Their solution will call for the most imaginative balance between the continuing need for military defenses, and the growing possibility that economic, social, and cultural weapons may be decisive factors in an era of competitive coexistence.

We still have some distance to go to prepare ourselves to act effectively in the long pull ahead. Indeed, the comments made at the first meeting of this society, in 1907, by its President, Elihu Root, are still discouragingly timely:

"The education of public opinion, which should lead the sovereign people in each country to understand the definite limitations upon national rights and the full scope and responsibility of national duties, has only just begun."

What do we seek when we look ahead to the next 10 years? Our world has changed drastically over the last 10; have we reason to believe the process will stop?

My own crystal ball is no better than yours. But it is possible to project ahead some of the fundamental issues, with confidence that whatever else happens to these problems, they will not disappear.

THE PROBLEM OF DOMESTIC JURISDICTION

The most profound issue involving the United Nations has to do with the scope of its authority in relation to member states. Around this central question revolves the whole galaxy of controversial problems involving supranational powers, domestic jurisdiction, the veto, human rights, the development of world law, and many others. We can see the two extreme poles of this argument—world government at one end, relatively complete national freedom of action at the other. But, like all extremes, these are misleading and impractical.

We can equip ourselves to deal intelligently with this problem only if we clarify our own thinking as to the nature and authority of the United Nations.

There is no more persistently recurrent—and unjustified criticism of the U. N. than that it threatens the sovereignty of the United States. This is a good illustration of how mischievous a little misinformation can be. The misinformation in this case is that the U. N. allegedly has the power to make treaties automatically binding on the member nations. This, of course, is just not so. The United Nations or its specialized agencies can, if its members wish, freely draft and recommend conventions or treaties. However, none of these can ever be binding on any nation until that nation has given consent through its normal constitutional processes. In our case, this means approval by two-thirds of the United States Senate.

The member states of the U. N. are sovereign. They have agreed to collaborate in certain fields in their common interest. If they wish to use the U. N. as a forum for reaching international agreement on a variety of matters, there is, of course, nothing in the charter to prevent them from doing so. But there is nothing to prevent those same countries from reaching agreement on the same matters outside the U. N. The point is that it is the states which make this decision, not the organization, and it is, as it always has been, up to the individual state to enter into a treaty or not.

In considering the matter of jurisdiction and the United Nations, we would do well to keep emotions from obscuring the facts.

COLLECTIVE SECURITY UNDER THE CHARTER

Another central issue is the matter of collective defense against aggression. There has been abundant evidence that the original premises of universal collective security were unattainable in today's world, in the sense that nations would not commit themselves in advance to fight any aggression, any time, anywhere. If the great powers were the antagonists, this seemed to be particularly true.

When great power unanimity proved unrealistic, the United States took the lead in devising alternative methods of developing collective defense under the charter. This took two forms. When it was seen that the Security Council was able to act in the Korean aggression only because of the absence of the Soviets, we sponsored the uniting-for-peace resolution, strengthening the Assembly's capacity to respond to similar emergencies. Also, we have played a leading part in organizing regional defense pacts and mutual security arrangements, the possible need for which had already been anticipated by the charter.

Some people have complained that our Government has been suffering from a case of "pactitis." We should all recall, however, that soon after the end of World War II the Soviet Union, which alone of the great powers had not disarmed, began to employ military threats and pressure to expand its influence and territories. The urgency of the formation of collective defense pacts was obvious. Behind these bastions nations have been able to put their political and economic houses in order, and develop their own defenses. These pacts, along with the uniting-for-peace program, have been the answer to the Soviet Union's abuse of the veto. They have provided free world security inside the charter but outside the veto.

Today, as the world political situation changes, the United States and other nations are exploring the possibilities of giving greater effect to the potentialities of NATO, for example, in the nonmilitary field, without losing sight of its primary role as a bulwark against aggression. We must now go on to encourage and support other aspects of cooperation inside and outside the U. N. This leads to a third great issue relating to the U. N.; the technical and economic fields.

U. N. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

It is important to remember that the charter did not specifically create any of the specialized agencies or the now flourishing technical-assistance program. It merely authorized and approved their establishment. In my mind, their growth and vitality constitutes one of the most remarkable developments in the last 10 years. They reflect a high degree of successful international cooperation.

The United States has from the beginning given the strongest support to this aspect of the U. N. system. It is clearly in our national interest, and it constitutes a powerful force for peace and international understanding. The Soviet Union, after years of indifference or downright hostility, now seems prepared to play a more active role in this work. If this participation is genuine,

it is welcome. This is a field in which we do not hesitate to compete with the Soviet Union.

In carrying on its social and economic programs the U. N. and its specialized agencies must be guided by two cardinal principles. In the first place, in their natural enthusiasm to get results, they should be very careful not to alienate public opinion by invading the domestic jurisdiction of their member states. This engenders adverse criticism and loss of valuable support, out of which only harm can come to the organizations and their objectives. There is plenty to do within the limits of their present authority, and it can be done most effectively if the agreed metes and bounds are respected.

In the second place, the U. N. should not attempt to do more than it reasonably can. Progress in the social and economic fields is painfully slow, and there is much to do. Yet I believe that modest programs well conceived and effectively administered, will take the U. N. further toward its goal than more grandiose programs that exceed the organization's present capabilities. We must recognize that the U. N. will lose ground, and may indeed suffer incalculable damage, if it tries to move too far too fast.

OTHER BASIC ISSUES

I have dealt with only three of the issues that must be thought through in the years to come. Other problems will persist and other vistas of opportunity will open up. There is, for example, the issue of colonialism, and the possibilities inherent in the U. N. for resolving colonial disputes and establishing nonviolent patterns of change. There is also the important field of pacific settlement and international adjudication.

In this connection I might say just a word about Secretary General Hammarskjold's mission to the Middle East. It is, of course, too early to predict the final outcome of his efforts. Up to this point he has made a valuable contribution in easing tensions in the area and avoiding the possible outbreak of war. He may well lay the groundwork for a more lasting peace. His role illustrates once more the fact that there are many resources for peace within the charter—including the techniques of direct and quiet diplomacy—which have not yet been fully tapped.

In evaluating the political work of the United Nations let us remember one hard fact. Many important and difficult international problems are solved outside the organization. But the really tough ones, the well-nigh insoluble ones, come to the United Nations. It is, in a way, the court of last appeal.

UNITED STATES RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations is, as I have emphasized, a voluntary partnership of nations which have subscribed to a set of common purposes and principles. In trying to look into the future of this organization we cannot speak for other nations. We can, however, speak for ourselves.

Last fall 16 new members were admitted to the United Nations. Other qualified states are waiting and the membership list may soon exceed the 80 mark. It is our view that this trend toward approximate universality will add new vitality and strength to the organization.

There are, of course, a few prophets of gloom who have been predicting that the United States will lose its role of leadership in the United Nations. I have no fear of such a development. In the General Assembly the democratic process has worked remarkably well. The small countries, on nearly all important issues, have rallied to the cause of the free world.

Thus far whatever leadership we have exercised has stemmed largely from the logic of our position and our ability to persuade other nations of the rightness of our cause. We intend to continue to rely on these principles. And if the time should ever come when we are consistently outvoted in the General Assembly then we had better begin to reexamine our basic policies.

As we move into the second decade let us keep firmly in mind the fundamental principles which underlie our participation in the United Nations.

First. We intend to live up to the purposes and principles of the charter. We shall refrain from the use of force and we shall do our utmost to settle our disputes by peaceful means. If other nations will do the same there can be established that mutual confidence which is the indispensable ingredient of permanent peace.

Second. We shall continue to foster and encourage the concept of collective security so that those nations which wish to remain free may stand together in protective unity under the charter against the threat of aggression.

Third. We shall earnestly pursue our quest, within the framework of the United Nations, to bring about adequately safeguarded disarmament. This is the most complex and the most urgent of all world problems.

Fourth. We shall continue to cooperate with other countries in our mutual efforts to attain the social and economic goals of the charter. To this end our Government can be counted on to continue our strong financial support to the United Nations technical-assistance program and the work of the specialized agencies.

May I tarry on this point for just a moment. There are suggestions from a few critics to the effect that the United States should limit its participation in, or even withdraw from, certain of the specialized agencies. One argument is that increasing Soviet and Communist satellite activity in these agencies is a threat to free-world interests. This seems to me to be an additional reason, if any were needed, why we should continue in, and even increase our support for, the specialized agencies.

Actually, if we were to withdraw from enterprises of this kind every time we encountered a serious obstacle or an unpleasant situation, we would perforce be compelled to desert almost every international activity of any consequence in which we participate. And it is extremely difficult for me to understand how we can wage peace successfully by running away from all the battlefields.

Fifth. We shall do what we can to encourage through the United Nations the development of international law. Unfortunately this is a period of history in which certain nations ignore moral principles and break rules of law when it suits their convenience. That is precisely the reason we should put renewed effort into the great search for that consensus of world opinion which will make permanent peace the unwritten law of relations among the nations.

While I said earlier that the United Nations did not materialize out of nowhere like Minerva, I recall now that Minerva was, among other things, the patron of peace. It now seems possible that we have an opportunity to wage the sort of diplomacy we ought to excel at—the diplomacy of peace.

Such a peace, if it should persist, will not be a static one. It will have to be maintained in a world of conflicts, of passions, and of change. In the background will still lurk the terrible possibility of nuclear war. The hostility of world communism will be long sustained. The working out of far-reaching transformations in the formerly colonial areas, and in economically underdeveloped regions, will be slow and precarious.

But in the sort of world we are working in and toward—a world of peaceful change—the United Nations can continue to grow and flourish as a patron of peace, striving always to create community out of discord, and law out of community.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBERTSON obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Virginia to yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that he will not lose the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the concern which I shall express today as to the adequacy of funds which have been provided and which are to be provided for our Air Force and the action which I shall advocate have roots going back to the fall of 1955, when I attended a meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in Helsinki.

Talking at that meeting with representatives of the forty-odd nations which belong to that organization, devoted to the preservation of world peace and increasing understanding among nations, I was disturbed by two things: First, the lack of friendliness exhibited by members of parliaments of some of the countries which had received generous shares of the more than $50 billion of foreign aid we have provided since the end of World War II; and second, indications that allies on whom we were counting to stand beside us in any future world conflict were taking seriously Soviet assurances of peaceful intentions, and evidently were planning to reduce their own defense efforts.

At Helsinki, I learned nothing that led me to believe that there had been any major change in the Communistic cold war offensive. While speaking long and loud on the subject of peaceful coexistence, delegates from behind the Iron Curtain were doing all in their power to drive a wedge between the free nations and the so-called neutral nations of the Orient over admitting Red China both to the Interparliamentary Union and United Nations; and in sowing seeds of discord for the French and the British, by denouncing all programs of colonialism, while themselves exercising the most vicious type of colonialism the world has ever seen, in East Germany and what are commonly referred to as the satellite countries. I knew that Communists in France, acting on orders from Moscow, had wrecked French participation in EDC, which in turn had delayed German membership in NATO;

and that the Communists in North Africa were forcing the French to materially reduce their support of NATO, in order to combat a troublesome type of guerilla warfare in North Africa. In other words, when the NATO program for manpower, mechanized equipment, fighter planes, and airfields capable of handling jet planes was from 2 to 3 years behind the anticipated schedule, it became very apparent to me from the many contacts I made at Helsinki that our prestige in the world had deteriorated, and that it was vital for us to reappraise our own defense establishment in the light of those developments.

It was with a sense of shock, therefore, that immediately after my return to Washington, I was confronted by newspaper headlines stating that the administration's estimates for defense spending in the 1956 fiscal year, which already had been pared once after January 1955, were expected to be cut another billion dollars.

Although no individual official was quoted in these new stories, the similarity of the accounts in various papers made it evident that this was not merely some reporter's pipe dream, but that facts had been "leaked" from high sources.

The New York Times, for example, in a front-page story in the September 7, 1955, issue, written by William R. Conklin, under a Washington dateline, quoted "a Defense Department spokesman" as saying:

No top limit on defense expense has been set either by George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, or by Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense. However, by reworking our estimates and revising certain programs that will not impair national defense, we are working toward the $33 billion goal.

Explaining the significance of this figure, the reporter said the $33 billion figure mentioned on September 6 was an even billion dollars less than an estimate given by the Defense Department 2 weeks earlier. He said the January 1955 estimate for 1956 fiscal year spending included a Department of Defense estimate of $35,750 million, but that budget experts in the Department had reviewed the items, and said later that the services probably would not spend more than $34 billion in the fiscal year 1956.

Two weeks before this article was written, the reporter quoted the armed services as saying they had identified potential savings of $1,750 million, which would permit them to reach the reduced goal of $34 billion, but a further review in the last few weeks had resulted in $33 billion being set as a likely goal.

The Times story also said:

Secretary Wilson conferred last Thursday with Mr. Quarles and Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Air Force Chief of Staff, at Mr. Wilson's vacation retreat in northern Michigan.

It was reported at the Pentagon today that Mr. Wilson had directed a thorough overhauling of budget estimates by all the armed services. His budget exercise calls for backtracking along previous 1956 estimates to see where cuts can be made. Concurrently, the services are working on estimates for the fiscal year 1957 with the present goal of $33 billion in mind.

Pentagon officials expect the Air Force to meet the brunt of any cuts, with the Army and Navy making up the $1 billion total. In 1955 the Air Force spent about $16,600 million. This included almost $7 billion for aircraft and related items.

For 1956 the Air Force plans to spend about $5 billion on such procurement. This amount is expected to suffer the heaviest cut.

When Secretary Wilson testified before our Appropriations Committee, last week, I asked him about the stories of a billion-dollar cut in the Air Force which had been published in the New York Times, the Washington Post, and, I assume, all other metropolitan newspapers of the Nation; and he replied that he had never heard of the story.

From the official record of the hearings, I quote the following questions and answers on that subject:

Senator ROBERTSON. Who makes the decision as to whether we will slow down on foreign military aid for some nations that give evidence of perhaps running out on us at a critical time?

Who makes that decision? Do we just go ahead and keep pouring it in, and saying, "We will hope everything is going to work out all right?"

Secretary WILSON. We are getting organized all of the time to use better judgment, and we use the best we have. If it is a highly important matter, we finally get up to the President. Or, the State Department, and ourselves would talk it over and say, "Here is one that looks like it is getting sour and we had better slow down on this one."

Senator ROBERTSON. That is considered?

Secretary WILSON. Surely.

Senator ROBERTSON. There is just one other question that I had. I have been listening to your concern about keeping our allies armed, but last August I read a piece attributed to a high source in the administration that we were going to cut our own Air Force a billion dollars. I had just gotten back from Helsinki, and I had heard many evidences of unfriendly attitudes from those that we thought ought to be our friends. I heard many expressions that the summit Conference in Geneva had eliminated the possibility of war.

Then I read that somebody in the administration was going to cut our own Air Force $1 billion.

Do you know who sent up that trial balloon?

Secretary WILSON. No, sir.

Senator ROBERTSON. You remember that, do you?

Secretary WILSON. I do not remember, because there are so many that go up and I am so troubled by it that I finally paid no attention to any of it and I try to go about the business.

Senator ROBERTSON. It was widely published, and they do not generally pick that up from some low subordinate, I do not think, that is so vital a matter as cutting our Air Force $1 billion.

And here is where he sidestepped the issue:

Secretary WILSON. The current rumor is that it is going to be increased $1 billion; is it not that?

Senator ROBERTSON. I hope it is; I took it up promptly with the President and they said, "Please do not give that letter out, the President has not authorized that statement," and, in about 4 days, Mr. Hagerty flew out to Denver and the President issued a statement that they were not going to cut the Air Force $1 billion.

But, I am convinced that it was being considered by somebody or it would not have been published. Then, after you set up the budget estimate, you took another look, and sent up an additional $500 million, and I thought that was fine, but still too little.

Secretary WILSON. I can tell you this: As far as I was concerned, and I would know it, there was never any intention to cut the Air Force $1 billion. Who started the business and the rumors and the statements, I do not know.

That is the exact quotation from his testimony before our committee.

Mr. President, is it not astounding to hear a Secretary of Defense say that he knew absolutely nothing about a discussion which was on the front page of all metropolitan newspapers about cutting the Air Force a billion dollars, with a view, of course, to balancing the budget, and perhaps proposing a tax cut in an election year—a statement which finally was set at rest by a statement issued by Secretary Wilson's second in command, in behalf of the Pentagon,

But we should be getting more or less accustomed to astounding statements made by our distinguished Secretary of Defense, as witness the one he made at Quantico the day following his testimony before our committee just quoted above. That statement is headlined in the Washington Post of the 22d, "Wilson Brands Plans To Up AF Fund Phony." Then the United Press story says that—

Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson declared tonight that Senate efforts to increase the Air Force's budget by $1.16 billion are "phony."

And the news item added:

He said he felt the "same way" about Republican attempts to compromise on an extra $500 million.

In other words, they are "phony" too. But he did not stop at calling everybody in the Senate who thought there should be more Air Force money appropriated "phonies"; he even saw fit to hang that tag on millions of patriotic Americans when he gratuitously insulted them in this manner:

The people of our country want to make sure we have a strong defense but when it comes to paying off they take a different slant.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I read the statement about the people and their reaction to taxes. So far as national defense and national security are concerned, there has not been any complaint from the American taxpayers or the American people. No Senator has received a single communication objecting to sufficient funds for national security.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I fully endorse the statement of the chairman of our subcommittee which handled this bill. We have received no protest whatsoever from the taxpayers about an adequate defense program.

Of course, every sensible taxpayer wants to see the country get its money's worth for funds spent on our own defense, as on our program of foreign aid, and is fully justified in criticizing all evidence of waste and inefficiency. But Wilson's broadside against them that they ask for a strong defense but are not willing to pay for it will not soon be forgotten.

What did Secretary Wilson mean when he called those who advocate a strong national defense phonies? "Phony" is a slang word described by the dictionary as meaning "not straight or genuine, counterfeit, fake." When Secretary Wilson solemnly denied before our committee that he had ever heard of any proposal last September to cut the Air Force by a billion dollars I did not call him "not straight or genuine, counterfeit, or fake." I did not even intimate that I did not think he was telling the truth. I was merely forced to the conclusion that our distinguished Secretary of Defense had been operating in a vacuum, suspended, as Thomas Carlyle would say, between two worlds—the one dead, the other not yet born. When he went down to Quantico the next day, if he had just called the Democrats in the Senate who did not agree with his defense budget phonies, I could have shrugged that off as being a political attack of a rather low order. But what possible political advantage could the Secretary hope to gain by thus questioning the sincerity of the members of his own party who have introduced an amendment to add $500 million to the Air Force appropriation and all other Republican Members of the Senate who plan to support it. This comment on the ability of the Secretary of Defense to decide for the American people vital questions of military policy and national defense becomes necessary. Before I conclude my remarks I shall cite specific testimony of Secretary Wilson on what our military needs are and compare it with specific testimony given by our top military experts. Then, of course, I shall pose the question of whose leadership in so vital a matter we should follow.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is true, is it not, that in the spring of 1953 the Secretary of Defense took more than $7 billion from the national security budget without requesting an opinion from the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Mr. ROBERTSON. He impounded the money after Congress had appropriated and indicated a policy of building up our Defense Establishment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator know that the decision to put all the officers in Washington in mufti was made without discussion with the Secretary of the Army?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I did not know, but when I heard of it I could not believe that the Secretary of Defense had discussed it with any sensible man.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In his testimony before the subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee this morning the Secretary of the Army stated that he did not know the order was about to be issued until he saw it in the press. It was not discussed with him.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I first learned of it when I was on the Shenandoah River in the valley of Virginia, where I was doing a little quiet fishing and trying to get away from these troublesome things. A lieutenant commander in the Reserves had read the morning newspapers. He asked, "Do you know what Secretary Wison has done?" I replied, "No, I do not know what Secretary Wilson has done."

He said, "He has said to the thousands of soldiers, sailors, and marines in Washington, 'You cannot wear your uniforms in Washington.' "

He said, "I have never written a letter to a newspaper in my life, but I cannot take that." We want to persuade the boys to enter the service. We want them to be proud of the uniform. We want them to fight bravely. But the Secretary says, "Do not go around Washington looking like soldiers, sailors, or marines. When you come to Washington, you must invest in civilian attire."

I said, "As soon as that gets back to the President, I think the order will be reversed."

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Secretary of Defense took $7 billion plus from the Defense budget in 1953, without consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He is merely running true to form, is he not, when he states, in 1956, without consulting the Secretaries, that officers on duty in Washington must not wear their uniforms. Is not that a logical conclusion?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The junior Senator from Virginia could not question the soundness of that logical conclusion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that while possibly the Senator from Missouri, the Senator from Virginia, and the Senator from Massachusetts might not agree with the original order, immediately thereafter, on the suggestion of the President, when he saw that possibly the Secretary had been a little hasty, the judgment of the Secretary was corrected?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I fully agree with my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts that the Nation is fortunate to have as Commander in Chief over the Secretary of Defense so grand a man as President Eisenhower.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. This is a matter about which some of us are beginning to have concern. Apparently the President is being advised by a man who will not listen to his military advisers. The man who advises the President declines to listen to military advice. Apparently the President is being led around by the advice of such a man.

The Secretary did make one wise decision. When he was named Secretary of Defense he did offer to give up his General Motors stock, because it would have been against the law to hold it. But when he moved out as president of General Motors Corp., the stock doubled in value during the following 2 years.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As I stated, this is not an issue between Secretary Wilson and myself. The fact that he called us "phonies" has no bearing on the merits of this question. I tried to indicate my position as early as last September. I started a drive to keep our Air Force from being cut. I started a drive to have an Air Force second to none, because the testimony is that a second rate Air Force is national suicide. That is what we are headed for under the present program. Whether we are "phonies" or not does not matter. We are acting on our best convictions as to the interests of the Nation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That was the entire philosophy behind the efforts of the committee—not whether Mr. Wilson thought we were "phonies," or whether he thought we were good men or not. Under our oath of office, we felt that the important thing was national security. Secretaries of Defense come and go. I hope the present one will remain in office at least until November, because I am pretty sure that on future occasions he will discuss bird dogs and "phonies."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, since I dictated the paragraph I have just read Secretary Wilson has issued a kind of combination alibi and apology, saying he was misunderstood by the reporters and that he intended to apply the word "phony" to the reporter's question and not to maneuvers in the Senate.

That statement, published in Saturday afternoon papers, came, however, not only after Mr. Wilson's comment had been denounced here in the Senate by Members on both sides of the aisle, but also after it had been discussed by the President and his aides.

And it is significant that the Saturday morning papers still were quoting the Secretary of Defense as saying, when given an opportunity to retract his remark, that if he had thought more about it he probably wouldn't have used the word, but he added: "it's all right."

Therefore, I shall not retract my comment, which I have given to the press, because it seems evident that Mr. Wilson's real feelings were indicated not only by his use of the word "phony" in an unguarded moment, but also by his sneering statement that he would like to see the people who vote for expenditures vote for taxes to produce the money and stand up and be counted.

Returning for the moment to the newspaper story of last September about a billion-dollar Air Force cut the reporter said that although the Air Force was continuing its buildup, the $5 billion estimate for 1956 procurement, already $2 billion less than had been spent in fiscal 1955 "is a tempting target for reduction-minded officials."

These statements, Mr. President, at a time when I had been made acutely conscious of the Soviet threat and felt that a strategic air force which the Russians must respect was the chief deterrent to another war, alarmed me to such an extent that I immediately wrote a personal letter to the President.

In that letter I told him I had just returned from the Interparliamentary Union meeting in Helsinki, where our delegation had succeeded in preventing admission of Red China, which would have made a farce of an organization

intended to advance democratic institutions, but that China might still gain admission at a later meeting.

I said the largest delegation at the meeting was the Soviet Union group, and that apparently most of the other delegates had accepted at face value their assurances of peaceful intentions, although one Austrian delegate was bold enough to ask how, if the Russians were as peaceful as they claimed to be, they could explain their continuing occupation of a part of Finland, where they had installed long-range guns capable of destroying the city of Helsinki.

In the letter which I wrote to the President of the United States in September 1955, I said:

> The primary purpose of this letter is to convey to you my impression that the representatives of some 40 nations at Helsinki are so weary of the cold war and its incident expense that they intend to cut their military appropriations as rapidly as possible, saying that it is unthinkable that anbody in this atomic age would start another world war. I agree that it would be unthinkable if we continue to have air superiority, at least in quality if not in numbers, and therefore, I am a bit disturbed over news items to the effect that you are now planning to reduce actual expenditures for the buildup for our Air Force by more than a billion dollars below what even just a few months ago you thought was absolutely necessary.
>
> With respect to NATO you, of course, know that the original proposal was for France to furnish 20 divisions. Later that was cut to 10. Of the 10 promised only 6 were finally furnished and they were not fully equipped. And then 3 of the 6 that were fully equipped and were fully trained were withdrawn by France from NATO for use in Morocco. If that action should be followed, and it is not too unlikely that it will be, by other members of NATO by the end of next year, NATO will be nothing much more than a paper organization because the German divisions will still not be in being and Germany might follow the example of other nations and decline to furnish them.
>
> While, of course, I am not unmindful of the more favorable atmosphere for peace generated at the Geneva Conference, I applaud the statement you made at the meeting of the American Bar Association in Philadelphia, which I was privileged to read in full in Oslo, to the effect that tangible evidences of the Russian will for peace had not been received. At Helsinki the Russian delegation and also those of their satellite countries were very friendly with our delegation and those of the other democracies but that, of course, was only in line with the new approach.
>
> In my opinion, it is entirely too early to assume that the Russians will withdraw from East Germany, that they will in any way release their stranglehold on the satellite countries, or that they will agree to any bona fide inspection of armaments. Therefore, the real deterrent to another war is our Air Force; and for that reason I feel that we would be taking an unnecessary risk, regardless of how desirable a cut in expenditures and a reduction in taxes may be, to seriously delay at this time the proposed expansion of our Air Force.

My letter was acknowledged by a member of the White House staff in the absence of the President, who was in Colorado, and the reply contained a copy of a Department of Defense press release, dated a day later than my letter. This release said there was "no factual basis" for news stories that "drastic cuts will be made in currently approved defense programs in order to reduce fiscal year 1956 expenditures."

The statement, quoting Acting Secretary of Defense Reuben B. Robertson, Jr., said that although the President's January budget message had indicated that if the defense program were carried out in full it would result in expenditures of $35,750 million, it was indicated at the time and in later testimony by witnesses before congressional committees that "all the detailed projections could not possibly develop exactly on schedule and that for some of them expenditures would fall somewhat below the preliminary estimates. Actual expenditures were then estimated at around $34 billion."

Mr. President, that is from Mr. Wilson's Department, sent out by Mr. Reuben B. Robertson, Jr., Acting Secretary. Mr. Wilson said he did not know anything about it and had never heard of it.

The press release statement went on to say that revised estimates, taking into account specific actions taken by the Congress on the President's request, some of which would increase expenditures and some of which would decrease them, now added up to $35 billion but that overall expenditures for the year "are still expected to be approximately $34 billion, as originally estimated."

Mr. President, I also received an excerpt from a letter sent to other Members of Congress who apparently had inquired about the reported billion dollar cut and in this the White House said there had been no change in objectives for defense and there would be no reduction in forces programed. It said the fact that the current estimate was still approximately $34 billion, rather than the $33 billion mentioned in the news stories, was "a good indication that we are not contemplating cutting back our forces or reducing military readiness."

The letter also promised continued emphasis would be placed "on acceleration of production of high priority items such as the B–52 bombers."

Mr. President, I have no way of knowing whether that September 1955 talk of another billion-dollar cut in defense spending, to be applied mostly to the Air Force, was a trial balloon sent up by someone in the Defense Department who wanted it done and shot down by higher authority when the reaction became evident, or whether there was some misunderstanding between a number of competent news reporters and an authorized briefing officer.

At any rate, I was reassured at the time by the promise that the reported cut to the $33 billion level in 1956 would not be made.

I had some renewed concern last January when the President's budget estimate for fiscal 1957 proposed only $33.7 billion for defense, including $15.7 billion for the Air Force as compared with the $16.6 billion it spent in 1955, and I was glad when the President submitted a supplemental estimate of $419 million of which $376 million was for the Air Force.

In recent months, however, I have had growing concern as to the adequacy of our Air Force as an effective deterrent to another war in the light of increasingly ominous information about advances in Soviet air power.

For the reasons I have indicated I had a conviction when our Senate Appropriations Committee began its hearings on the defense-appropriations bill for 1957 that greater emphasis needed to be placed on our Air Force, and that conviction was reinforced by the testimony we received.

I also entered those hearings with a feeling that the amount approved by the House for Air Force activities was not adequate and that even the slightly larger amount proposed in the administration's budget was too little and what we heard from Defense Department witnesses confirmed that impression.

Some of the facts and figures given to the committee in executive session are classified material and cannot be quoted here, but I want to call attention to some passages in the published hearings which are not secret and which illustrate my point.

One question which concerned me greatly was how our military strength on land, sea, and air compares with that of the Soviets, both now and in potential for the immediate future.

In his opening statement Secretary of Defense Wilson said that although the Soviets have many more divisions of ground forces than we have, our defense needs are different, and our present program provides adequate forces for our needs (p. 7).

This difference of strength was not dismissed so lightly, however, by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, the Army Chief of Staff, when he took the stand, and after he had made, in his opening statement, the presentation expected of him as administration representative, and began to answer questions we put to him, this fine officer's optimism appeared even more limited.

General Taylor said:

> Ground forces constitute the predominant element of the Communist military strength. As is well known, the Soviet land forces are the most powerful in the world today. Since 1950 they have equipped their army with a complete family of modern weapons and equipment and continue to maintain it in an excellent state of combat readiness (p. 77).

He said weapons of World War II vintage have virtually been replaced by a new arsenal, and that training, including atomic-warfare training, is first class, and added:

> Known dispositions indicate that the Soviet Army is ready to undertake a major war with little warning. * * * The combined Communist armies present a formidable threat and outnumber Allied forces of the free world by a considerable margin (p. 78).

Then, by way of reassurance, General Taylor told us that the United States and its allies have the capability, if they have the will, of producing ground forces able to counter those of the enemy—page 78.

Under questioning by our subcommittee chairman, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, General Taylor said he was referring to the willingness of our allies to expend the effort and make the sacrifices necessary to attain the level of readiness of which he spoke, and when I questioned him further on that point, he agreed that since he had submitted his

estimate of essential needs of our Army, NATO has become weaker, because of withdrawal of French units from Europe, and there have been discouraging developments involving relations of Yugoslavia, Turkey, and Greece.

He said there are many things we do not know in detail about Russian equipment; that our Allied Forces are uneven as to capability and that he could not generalize in evaluating our strength as compared to that of the Soviets, even though man for man and weapon for weapon he believed the American Army division is the best in the world—pages 95–96.

Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker, at this same stage of our hearings, said there was no doubt as to the numerical superiority of the Red armies—page 85. He said we have the ability to meet on better than even terms as to weapons and men anything on the other side but significantly added:

> There is one additional concern I should voice, one that General Taylor and I share. We must develop the Reserve. The Reserve is not just a second line. It is part of the line. Under the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 we have to develop it from voluntary enlistments, and we have to get 1,350,000 by 1960 to balance our forces. We cannot afford to depend upon the Regular Establishment and the Active Army to do the whole job (p. 97).

Asked if failure to get the Reserve now planned by 1960 would leave us deficient in our ground strength, Secretary Brucker replied:

> It certainly would by 1960 unless we get it. We might as well be frank. We are depending on it (p. 97).

I asked General Taylor whether anything specific had happened since last October when he submitted an estimate of $10.2 billion as required for the essential needs of the Army to lead him to believe we need less Army now than we needed then and he replied frankly: "No, sir."

He confirmed that when the administration budget was made up his request was cut $800 million and that the House had cut another $264 million, so that the bill came to the Senate with $1,063,843,000 less for the Army than General Taylor thought last October was essential. Then I asked him:

> If you had the sole say-so, what would you do under the statistics I cited? Your original request has been cut $1,063,843,000, and you are unable to point out to us that the situation from a military standpoint is better, including the negotiations for a dependable worldwide disarmament which is dimmer now than then—and it is possible that some of our allied support that existed in the fall of last year has to some extent deteriorated. What would you do if you were sitting here passing on what the economy can stand, and then on what is needed to preserve our lives, which are worth more than money to everybody, I assume. What would you do?

General Taylor, who knows from bitter personal experience what it means to face Communist forces in the field, replied frankly:

> As Chief of Staff, I would adhere to my previous recommendation.

To be sure there was no misunderstanding, I asked again if, as Chief of Staff, when his recommendation had been cut more than a billion dollars he would put it back. He said:

> Yes, sir (p. 99).

So, Mr. President, I believe there is a solid basis for my feeling that we cannot rely primarily on our ground forces to deter the Soviets from launching an attack on us any time the Kremlin leaders feel it is to their advantage to do so.

Now, what about seapower?

There is no question that the United States now has the most powerful Navy in the world, but in World War I and particularly in World War II we found that the greatest surface fleets were highly vulnerable to mass submarine attacks; and while we have continued to work on defensive measures, it seems apparent that the development of underwater craft has advanced at a comparable pace, as is illustrated by our atomic-powered *Nautilus* with its almost unlimited cruising range.

In the prepared statement which he submitted to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, Admiral Burke, the Chief of Naval Operations, had this to say about the Soviet threat:

> The United States is not alone in recognizing the importance of seapower. The Soviet Union is aware of the attack potential afforded by use of the seas and the transportation problem the free world faces in the event of war. She has been engaged in a huge naval building program since World War II.
>
> The New Soviet Navy is powerful. It is designed to isolate the United States from our overseas bases and allies. It is designed to prevent our naval forces and supply ships from reaching European and Asiatic waters. It is designed to prevent vital raw materials from reaching our industry from overseas sources.
>
> In any war—regardless of length—regardless of weapons used—the Soviets will endeavor to isolate and destroy our forces deployed overseas. They will pinpoint and try to destroy our overseas bases and our overseas stockpiles. If the Soviets can prevent our Navy and our supply ships from reaching their overseas terminals—they can overrun Europe, Asia, and the Middle East, as they see fit.
>
> German submarines almost severed our sea communications with Europe in World War II. The Soviets' underseas force right now—consists of over 400 submarines. That is about seven times the strength with which the Germans entered World War II.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The statement by the Chief of Naval Operations, a statement already made by the Secretary of the Navy, that "The Soviets' underseas force right now consists of over 400 submarines" was made many months ago. If the number was more than 400 at that time, the chances are that it is considerably greater now.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Undubtedly; and very likely the number now is more than 7 times as great as the submarine force with which Germany, in World War II, almost wrecked us. Furthermore, the Soviet submarine is probably a much better type of craft.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it not true also that the production of Russian submarines is many times greater than the production of submarines in the free world?

Mr. ROBERTSON. There is no question about that.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Therefore the already great difference between the number of submarines which the Soviets have as compared with the number we have is rapidly becoming even greater, is it not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. This is what Admiral Burke testified:

> Their submarine building program is still accelerating.

They are his exact words. He testified further:

> New snorkel-equipped units have the latest technological advances, including long endurance, higher submerged speed and improved weapons, detection, and communications gear. They can operate thousands of miles from their home bases and are capable of sustained operations off the coasts of the United States (p. 129).

Mr. President, in the light of that testimony I believe it also is evident that, whether or not we are ahead of Russia in development of nuclear-powered craft, the Soviets have in being an offensive underseas force which makes it unlikely that they would regard our Navy as an adequate deterrent to keep them from attacking us if they chose to do so.

But if our ground and sea forces, regardless of their defensive value to us, are discounted as effective instruments to prevent the start of another war, that leaves only air power. And what did we find out about that in our hearings?

Gen. Curtis LeMay, commander in chief of the Strategic Air Command, told us that if war were to start tomorrow, we would unquestionably be the victor, but he followed that statement quickly with sobering qualifications. He said there were two reasons for our current superiority: First, failure of the Soviet leaders to recognize the true value of strategic air power immediately after World War II; second, realization by our own national and military leaders of the potential of an atomically armed Air Force and their timely action to insure its full development—page 1222.

General LeMay said we concluded in 1954 an extensive study of Strategic Air Command requirements through 1965, but the results of that study had to be discarded in 1955 after the Soviets gave us a glimpse of their actual progress in developing a strategic air force. He continued:

> We have since received a series of new estimates, each more pessimistic than its predecessor, all of which emphasized one point. The Soviets now have a distinct appreciation for the decisive nature of the long-range air weapon and they developed this appreciation early enough to be able to display today substantial and unexpected progress in the building of a strategic air arm. * * *
>
> If one takes the new estimates of projected Soviet capability at face value and measures them against our current programs, only one conclusion can be drawn.

Who is better equipped to draw that one conclusion than General LeMay? I quote verbatim the conclusion he draws:

> The supremacy which we enjoy today is on the wane. By 1959 the Soviets will have the superior strategic air force. (P. 1223.)

In our executive committee session there was discussion of the latest estimates of our needs for B–52 and B–47 bombers, involving figures which cannot be publicized, and General LeMay told us the figures he had mentioned as requirements actually could not be obtained. He said:

It is too late now. We have delayed too long.

Even if the planes could be produced, he said, we would be unable to man and support the force properly. His recommendation, therefore, even though it involved increasing funds for the Strategic Air Force next year from $5 billion to $8 billion, and continuing at that rate for 4 years, still did not represent the kind of program we ought to have to fully meet the Soviet threat, but merely the best we could hope to do in the situation in which we find ourselves.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is true, is it not, that in 1953 General Vandenberg predicted, if there were further cuts in personnel, it would make no difference whether or not planes were obtained because the skilled personnel would not be available to operate those planes?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is exactly what General LeMay said. He said it is too late now. We are late getting the planes, but we do not have the trained men to handle them, and we do not have the dispersal fields. General Vandenberg was absolutely correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. But this administration, instead of trying to raise the level of skilled personnel, states that because we do not have the personnel, we do not need the planes or the bases. Is not that, in effect, a correct statement?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. The committee discussed the subject quite fully with General LeMay. I asked, "If you broke down the $3,800,000,000 into so much for personnel, so much for bases, and so much for miscellaneous items, could you get delivery, could you get the men, and could you fulfill the program?"

He said, "Absolutely, we could."

Mr. SYMINGTON. Instead of raising the number of the lowest of the 3 basic components of airpower to the magnitude of the other 2, is not, this administration consistently lowering the 2 higher components to the level of the lowest?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think that is true, and I believe it has been a very dangerous miscalculation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Could there be any other reason for this policy except the belief that money is the most important characteristic of our defense program?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I would have to admit, without saying what was the most important characteristic, that the recommendations of a very able and fine Secretary of the Treasury undoubtedly have had some bearing on the program.

Proceeding with the testimony of General LeMay, in response to a question I asked him, he said:

In response to questions I asked, General LeMay said:

The force that we require now, based on the latest intelligence estimate of the Russians' force is larger than we can possibly produce between now and when it will be necessary. We just cannot do it unless we go into all-out emergency measures.

So, I have submitted a force that I think we can produce in that time and the cost for that force alone, Strategic Air Command, is about $8 billion a year. I think it is well within the resources of the country to do that. I think it is well within the ability of the country to do it, without going to emergency measures. Whether it will be enough or not I do not know.

Listen to this, Mr. President:

Our calculations are that it will not be enough—

That is, the $8 billion.

I am here today in support of the proposal of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to add $1,160,000,000. That is less than one-third of what General LeMay recommended, and he said, according to his present calculations, that if the amount he recommended were continued for 4 years, it would not be enough.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The approved committee recommendation now in the bill is $1,160,000,000. Is not that practically only one-third of the recommendation made by General LeMay?

Mr. ROBERTSON. He recommended $3,800,000,000. That is correct. He also said, as I have just quoted, that if that amount were provided for 4 years, which, in his calculation would be about as much as could be provided at this time, it would not be sufficient.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to the Senator from Virginia, for whose opinion I have a great deal of respect, that General LeMay was testifying as head of the Strategic Air Command. He was speaking of his command alone. He was asking for $3 billion a year for the next 4 years for his command alone. As I recall his testimony, he did not profess to talk about ballistic missiles or guided missiles or new aircraft which may be developed. That is security information, and we cannot discuss it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct, but I shall point out later in my statement that the forces under the Chief of Staff, who was thinking of missiles and fighter planes and new planes, have already been subjected to a cut of $3 billion. I am going to point that out.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. All I want to suggest is that these figures of General LeMay did not include other funds which may be required for other purposes, but includes merely what he wanted for his Strategic Air Command, for which he is entitled to ask funds.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct; and it looks like a lot of money. What we are proposing is a third of what he asked, and which he said was not enough.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Is not it the official view of the Air Force as expressed by Mr. Quarles, and in one area with which General LeMay is involved, that for a long time we shall have to depend on "man bombs"? Ballistic missiles, intercontinental and intermediate which are in initial stages of development, will help to supplement our air atomic devices, and in years ahead may substantially supplant "man bombs," but that is a long way ahead.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The junior Senator from Virginia has heard so much testimony, classified and unclassified, and what has been said about guided missiles is classified, so that he is afraid to say anything more than this, and I am sure this may legitimately be said publicly: "We do not have it now; we do not know when we will get it."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I wanted to say to the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia that what I have just said has been uttered publicly by Mr. Quarles and by General LeMay.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The distinguished Senator from Washington is one of our best experts on classified material, because he has served on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, where nearly everything is classified. The Senator must be fearful of waking up in the night and saying something he ought not to say. The Senator from Washington has served on the subcommittee of which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is chairman, and I am sure he has heard the facts, because the subcommittee's duty was to learn the facts. Therefore, I am sure that when the Senator from Washington states that what he has said can be publicly said, he is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] mentioned the fact that the amount of money requested by General LeMay is three times the amount contained in the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico. As I read the testimony that in the included provision for $1,160,000,000, is a great deal of money which does not go to the Strategic Air Command. There is provided $100 million for research and development; $200 million for bases; $40 million for operation and maintenance.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The total amount included money for research, also.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think I said $100 million for research and development. The actual difference is much greater than only one-third.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What I meant was the total difference between the approximately $3 billion and the $1,160,000,000.

Mr. SYMINGTON. There was an additional $450 million for aircraft procurement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And $20 million for personnel.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to quote again from what General LeMay said, because nobody can question his qualifications on the subject of strategic air power.

General LeMay reminded us that we have the only strategic capability in the NATO organization, and must carry the full load of that type of defense.

I told General LeMay I realized that if we got into war we would need all the defensive services, Army, Navy, and Air Force, but that I wanted his opinion on what would be the greatest deterrent to the Russians to keep them from starting a war.

He replied: "Nuclear offensive airpower."

General LeMay said that, looking at the national defense picture for the next 15 years, we can see a number of enemy strengths of various types we may have to face, but the only threat which can destroy the United States and our allies is the Soviet capability to deliver a surprise, massive nuclear air attack. Then he said:

I know of only one thing which will make us capable of meeting the threat of an all-out nuclear attack as well as lesser threats and that is the clear possession by the United States of an effective strategic nuclear air offensive force in being. Its size and effectiveness must meet the enemy threat or we invite miscalculations on his part which could lead to our own defeat. There are no adjectives which can adequately describe the destruction and desolation which would result from a war in 1960. We must have a force strong enough in size, so deployed and in such a condition of readiness to guarantee to him that the inevitable consequence of any attack they might launch will be devastation of his own homeland. Should they be so foolhardy as to miscalculate our capability, this force must be capable of insuring the emergence of the United States as the superior power (p. 1225).

In addition to the need for the Strategic Air Force as a deterrent to war, General LeMay said all military men will agree that no military task can be undertaken in these modern days until a nation has air superiority and has won the airpower battle. It is necessary, therefore, to put into the hands of the military the weapons to win the airpower battle before any other military task is undertaken—page 1250.

Mr. President, in contrast with that strong plea for added airpower, what did our committee learn about the budget figures on which the bill passed by the House was based?

When the Chief of Staff for the Air Force, Gen. Nathan F. Twining, was before us I asked him how the Air Force budget submitted to the Congress last January compared with the figure he had submitted for the Air Force last October, and he replied there was a difference of more than $3 billion. The Air Force in October said it needed $20,480 million, and the President 3 months later recommended that they be given $16,518 million. Later the Defense Department found out some things it did not know before about our needs, and recommended $376 million as a supplemental appropriation, but that still left a difference of more than $3 billion between the request and the budget figures—page 162.

Later, testimony brought out that the Air Force Advisory Committee on budget matters had done some paring which resulted in a final figure of $19,392 million, which still was $2,874 million more than the budget recommendation; and explanations were offered as to how some of the difference was to be made up by adjustment of reorder leadtime, and some by revision of procurement estimates to which the Air Force had agreed, and some by changes in actual procurement plans.

After those adjustments had been made, however, there remained a difference of $500 million, which General Twining and Maj. Gen. Frank A. Bogart, the Air Force budget director, defined simply as an "arbitrary reduction." General Bogart said:

We just absorb that. We don't know quite how (p. 1276).

So, Mr. President, at the end of our hearings the Appropriations Committee was faced with uncontroverted evidence that our airpower is deteriorating, relative to that of the Soviets, at a rate which will leave us in second place by 1960; that a program increased by $3 billion a year, as recommended by General LeMay, to use our full productive capability, would still not fully meet our estimated requirements to retain superiority; and that the even smaller program officially recommended by the Chief of Staff of the Air Force had been placed under the handicap of an arbitrary cut of $500 million, which those who must carry on the program have not figured out how to absorb.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not true that notwithstanding that General Twining—who is now in Russia, to find out how advanced Russian airpower is, in comparison to our airpower—stated that he was willing to go along with the budget recommendations of the Defense Department, yet he thought the program was austere?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What does the Senator from Virginia think General Twining meant by his use of the word "austere"?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think he meant that not only did he not have as much as he had requested or as much as he thought he would need, but that he was like a man who had been underfed: he was still alive, but was not feeling good about it; in other words, he had been trained down until he was too thin. That indicates General Twining's attitude, after he had requested appropriations amounting to $3 billion more than the Air Force received in the end.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Not only did General Twining request that amount of money; but the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Quarles, a distinguished scientist in his own right, asked for $2,363,000,000 more than Secretary Wilson allowed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. Every time anyone looked at the appropriation, it was reduced.

Mr. President, that was the basis on which a majority of our committee voted to increase the Air Force funds $1,300,000,000 over the amount allowed by the House, and $1,112 million over the Budget estimate.

But, Mr. President, since the Secretary of Defense has said our proposed increase in funds for the Air Force is a "phony," and that our concern about the comparative quality as well as quantity of the Russian Air Force is not soundly based, I want to point to additional testimony which emphasizes and reinforces the information given to our Appropriations Committee.

During the same period when we were conducting our hearings, the Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Senate Armed Services Committee was holding hearings focused on the question: "Are the present and planned strengths of the United States Air Force adequate to preserve the peace through the deterrence of aggression?" That was the topic and the theme on which the testimony was taken.

The witnesses at the hearing were not men who had made their reputations by supervising the production and sale of automobiles. They were the past and present commanders of our Armed Forces, who learned by personal experience in Africa, in Europe, over the Pacific, and in Korea the practical difficulties of modern scientific warfare; and they were men whose business it has been to study Soviet actions and to plan the details of the course we must follow if the Communists make a future move against us.

One of those witnesses was Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, General Eisenhower's Chief of Staff during World War II; Ambassador to the Soviet Union from 1946 to 1949; and, after that, Director for 3 years of the Central Intelligence Agency, which has the mission of keeping us informed as to developments in potentially hostile nations.

General Smith, who appeared under subpena, naturally was discreet as to what he told the committee; but he made clear his belief that we seriously underestimated the ability of the Soviet Union for scientific development and industrial production. He said we knew they had a few top-level scientists, but thought there was a shortage of technically trained people and of those with practical ability. We found that we were wrong as to their ability to take training rapidly. We also failed to make proper allowance for the advantage of a monolithic system of government which can meet defense and heavy industrial needs by ignoring public opinion and allowing light industry to go short.

They can ignore the wishes of the man in the street—

General Smith said.

If he wants to buy another suit of clothes or a cooking pot, he can go short, if it is necessary, for them to concentrate on heavy industry (p. 10–11).

General Smith agreed, in answer to a question, that since the end of World

War II, the Soviets have been able to break our monopoly of atomic weapons, atomic and hydrogen, fission and fusion, and said we would be justified in assuming that they have been concentrating on a delivery system for those weapons—page 13. In that concentration, as he pointed out, they have had the advantage of ignoring civilian desires or demands, and concentrating on this one task of overtaking our strength in the air.

Another witness heard by the Armed Forces Subcommittee was Gen. Carl Spaatz, former Chief of Staff of the Air Force, who retired in 1948, after a distinguished career which included service as Chief Air Adviser to General Eisenhower in North Africa, and Commander in Chief of Strategic Air Forces in Europe in 1944, and against Japan in 1945.

General Spaatz said:

The Air Force in being at this very moment I would say, in my opinion, is adequate to meet any threat that the Russians might put against us from the air. As of today. But remembering also that the money we spend today will determine what we have 4 or 5 or 6 years from now (p. 52).

Asked, then, whether at the rate of present spending, and based on our present budget, we will continue to have an Air Force that can carry out the assigned mission, General Spaatz replied:

I do not believe so. In the first place, the Russians have improved their air position both with atomic weapons and by increasing the range and performance of the aircraft, closing a gap that existed before. And in the second place, I am not sure that we are anticipating what the situation will be 4 or 5 years from now by spending enough money in certain fields (p. 52–54).

General Spaatz then mentioned airbases for dispersion, funds for more research, and greater production of ultra-long-range aircraft as areas in which more spending would be profitable; and these are the same objectives our Appropriations Committee had in mind in voting for an increase of $1.1 billion.

The next witness questioned by the Armed Services Subcommittee was General LeMay, commander in chief of the Strategic Air Command. Asked for his views about the best defense against atomic air attack, he said—and he was testifying under oath—that all responsible airmen agree it is impossible to provide an airtight defense against a well-coordniated and properly executed atomic bombing attack, and that some of the planes are bound to get through and hit their targets. Therefore, General LeMay said:

The primary defensive force is the ability to strike back with sufficient effectiveness to provide a deterrent force.

And he quoted the statement of Winston Churchill that—

The primary deterrents to aggression remain the nuclear weapon and the ability of the highly organized and trained United States Strategic Air Command to use it (p. 101–102).

That statement was echoed this month, by the way, but with a different and rather alarming emphasis, by the present Prime Minister of England, Anthony Eden, who asked why the countries of western Europe should continue to spend $12 billion a year on defense, in accord with a 100-division plan laid out in 1952, when the real barrier to Soviet aggression now is the hydrogen-bomb power of the United States.

When others see no adequate deterrent force except what our Air Force can provide, and are unwilling even to try to supply such a force, can we afford to neglect our own defense?

General LeMay told the Armed Forces Subcommittee, as he told our Appropriations Subcommittee, that Russian offensive airpower has increased more rapidly than had been expected when our Strategic Air Force program was established in 1953; but that we have made no consequential changes in our plan, and, therefore, our strength in relation to the Soviet strength is decreasing; and unless there are changes, it will continue to decrease through the 1958–60 period.

Mr. President, Secretary Wilson has said we are unduly alarmed about Soviet progress, and that their Bison bombers are not in a class with our B–52's. That is his opinion. On just what evidence it is based, I do not know. But I want to call particular attention to the testimony of General LeMay as to the quality of Russian airplanes.

General LeMay was the man who introduced the formation pattern bombing used during World War II, and personally led many missions. He also headed the Research and Development staff of the Air Force, before taking command of the Strategic Air Force. We do know, therefore, something about the basis on which he would evaluate a Russian airplane and compare it with one of ours.

When he was asked what kinds of long-range bombers the Russians now have, General LeMay said:

The Soviets now have the Bear, which is a turboprop aircraft; the Bison, which is a jetpowered aircraft comparable to our B–52. These are new aircraft, and neither is obsolete (p. 104).

Then he was asked whether the quality of these bombers was comparable with our own aircraft, including the B–52. He replied:

If our estimates as to the performance characteristics of the Bison are accurate, then it is comparable to our B–52. The Bear, while a long-range bomber, is a turboprop-powered aircraft, and, therefore, its performance is greater in range, but less in speed and altitude, than that of the B–52 (p. 104).

Asked about production rates, General LeMay said:

If our estimate of Soviet production is accurate, then they are producing Bears and Bisons at a combined rate substantially higher than we are producing B–52's.

Mr. President, I pause here to say that everyone knows that the Russians have more of them, to begin with, than we have B–52's.

General LeMay said also that the Soviets now have more Bear and Bison bombers in inventory than we have B–52's; that they are producing their long-range bombers at a substantially higher rate than we now are, we do not now plan to increase the rate of production of B–52's to a point where it will equal the Russian production and assuming no change in our present plans and programs, they will have a substantially larger force of this type of airplane than we will in the 1958–60 period—page 104.

As to striking power, General LeMay said it would be foolhardy to assume the Russians would not provide weapons, bases, refueling capacity, maintenance capacity, training and professional personnel to support their numerical superiority of aircraft and therefore, he said:

I can only conclude then that they will have a greater striking power than we will have in the time period under our present plans and programs.

When he was asked if he thought there should be an increase in the number of B–52's planned for the Strategic Air Command, General LeMay said:

Yes; I believe that we should maintain the deterrent position that we have had over the past 10 years. I think this means an increase in the planned number of B–52's.

He added that more bases also would be needed because our building of bases has lagged behind production of airplanes and has resulted in shortage of bases and crowding of units—page 105.

When the commander in chief of our Strategic Air Command was asked if it was within the competence of the United States to step up B–52 production between now and 1960 enough to prevent Russia from having an undue preponderance he said that it was possible; that we have factories which could do the job—page 227.

But in discussing our needs General LeMay also said that we do not have the proper ratio of jet tankers to jet bombers to develop our full intercontinental strike capability, that if we get more B–52's we will have a still greater need for jet tankers and that a satisfactory tanker ratio for the 1958–60 period can be obtained only "if prompt action were taken now"—page 107.

That statement ought to be weighted alongside the statement of the Secretary of Defense that the Russian long-range bombers are not so formidable because they lack tankers for refueling.

Then the Armed Services Subcommittee heard from Gen. Earle E. Partridge, commander in chief of the forces on which we rely for our continental defense, and who said his comments on the threat we face were based on general estimates on which all intelligence agencies agree, and which are prepared for the National Security Council.

General Partridge said it was estimated that today the Russians have the capability of sending hundreds of bombers against us of which a number, deleted for security reasons in the printed hearings, would arrive within our defenses, and that this capability would be measurably increased by 1959.

This witness too called the Bison bomber comparable to our B–52 and pointed out that it apparently does with four jet engines what our craft does with eight. He said we have no counterpart to the Bear, which does not have as high altitude or speed as the B–52, but has extremely long range to permit a

two-way attack on this country without requiring refueling—page 238.

Summarizing, General Partridge said he believed it must be assumed from the data he and others had given—

> That the Soviets have the capability for air attack on the United States using large numbers of modern bombers, and that they have a sufficient number of weapons to destroy the key targets of this country unless those targets are well defended (p. 240).

He said also that if the Russians put just 50 bombs of the proper kind on target they could destroy or at least bring under fire 40 percent of our population, 50 percent of our key facilities, and 60 percent of the industry of the United States—page 239.

When asked if we have planes with capabilities to provide the defense which he felt was needed against such attacks, General Partridge said:

> I am not satisfied with what we have at this time (p. 283).

I invite attention also, Mr. President, to the testimony before this committee of Lt. Gen. Donald L. Putt, the Air Force's Chief of Staff for Development, who said the technological lead of our Air Force over the Soviets' has become "progressively more expensive and decreasingly strong." He continued:

> If we are to maintain the required qualitative deterrent Air Force in-being, we must always stay ahead through the development of tomorrow's weapons yesterday.

General Putt said:

> We could lose the next showdown if proper emphasis is not being placd on tomorrow's weapons today; further, dollars spent for less than the best Air Force, as measured against requirements, is a total waste. In fact, it is a national suicide (p. 537).

Yet all the experts who appeared before the committee testified to the effect that under our present program we shall wind up in 1960 with the second-best Air Force. This, according to the witness whose testimony I have just quoted, would be national suicide.

General Putt said Russian research progress is at a more rapid rate than ours is today and they are threatening to overtake us. He said this progress added to our research requirements but that we did not provide as much in additional funds as he felt was required to do the necessary job—page 555. Then—and I direct particular attention to this—General Putt said in reply to questions that of the funds appropriated by the Congress for research and development in 1956, a sum of $30 million was withheld from the Air Force by the Bureau of the Budget on recommendation of the Department of Defense—page 556.

He said also that in comparison with $129 million asked for research and development to meet Killian report requirements, only $52.5 million was provided in fiscal 1956 by the Department of Defense, and of this $30 million had to be used for non-Killian items which were to have been paid for by the money which was impounded.

Later General Putt confirmed published reports that the Russians have a passenger plane with engines apparently producing 19,000 pounds of thrust compared with the 10,500 produced by our B–52 engines and said:

> I think had we had enough money to carry it on, we would have developed bigger engines sooner than we have (p. 569).

He added that what concerned him more than the fact that the Russians have bigger engines than we have is the demonstration by these engines of their ability to overcome complex and difficult problems—pages 569 to 570.

Finally, Mr. President, I refer briefly to the testimony of former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Research and Development, Trevor Gardner, who said that our tendency during the last 3 years has been to avoid making the kinds of decisions that would assure our staying ahead of the Russians in weapons research and development—page 334 of transcript.

Mr. Gardner said the Air Force repeatedly stated in detail to the civilian managers of the Department of Defense the Air Force programs and amounts of money needed to develop new engines, fuels, and other matters suggested by the Russian competition but they had been unable to break through the flat ceiling of guidelines, which he described as blank instructions from the Secretary of Defense, dictating the total amount of money which could be spent, regardless of projects involved—page 335.

He said that after learning of the Bison and other aircraft developed by the Russians and the implications of their advanced technology in powerplants and radar "we attempted to make a response by asking for a larger budget and we were told that we must make do with the amount of funds that were available under an austere budget"—page 341.

This witness said that "unless we recognize the power of the Russian threat by increasing our bomber forces and our defensive system and our research and development on missiles, we are being extremely foolhardy"—page 360.

Mr. President, I have presented only a few scattered excerpts from the large volume of testimony before two committees indicating the vital importance of our maintaining a first-class rather than a second-class Air Force as a deterrent against an atomic attack.

Our situation today reminds me, in some respects, of that many years ago, when Gen. Billy Mitchell tried to convince Army and Navy leaders of the importance of airpower. Instead of being recognized as a prophet, he was court-martialed. I hope none of those who have been bold enough to give us their honest opinion in these hearings will meet a similar fate. We know today that Billy Mitchell was right, but we lost valuable time during which we might have become better prepared for World War II.

Today there are many who, while recognizing the airplane as a new weapon of modern warfare, still believe that wars will continue to be won or lost by conventional older weapons, and that therefore any program of defense expansion must involve proportional expansion of all convention weapons and branches of the service.

I do not challenge the theory that all weapons will be needed and used. But the point which must be stressed is that there can be no winner in the next war; and it is far more important to try to prevent it than to plan to win it after it starts.

I cannot see how any civilian, much less a military expert, can claim that a large land army, a large navy, or a large combination of both can be as effective as a deterrent of future aggression as a large strategic air force capable of inflicting such great damage that no nation will want to incur that risk.

It is for this reason I am supporting the increased appropriation for our Air Force, and I accept the challenge of Secretary of Defense Wilson to tell the taxpayers what I am doing and why I am doing it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the presentation of the able junior Senator from Virginia. I must admit that there is much he said with which I am wholly in agreement.

I am not in agreement with those who suggest that we have a second-rate Air Force today, or that we might have a second-rate Air Force in the future.

I wish to ask the Senator from Virginia if, during the hearings and during the executive sessions of the committee, emphasis was placed, in the testimony given before the committee, upon the need for attention to the question of the personnel of the Air Force, the retention of fringe benefits, and the increase of specialist pay, so as to avoid the result which is indicated by the table on page 901 of the printed hearings, which shows that during the past fiscal year we lost 1,713 E–7 airmen, and gained only 192.

Mr. ROBERTSON. All those matters were considered and discussed. General LeMay said:

> It would injure the morale of my whole outfit if, in order to compete with skilled industry, I should put one sergeant's pay twice as high as another sergeant's pay. I cannot do that. It is unnecessary. But if you will give us fringe benefits, better housing, and better assurance of a sane program, we can hold the necessary men we need over a period of years.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Were those suggestions made specifically?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The suggestions were made specifically, and we had assurance of the Armed Services Committee that they would take care of legislation on the subject of fringe benefits. We cannot write fringe benefits into an appropriation bill. That would be legislation. We do have an item for new housing, for more personnel, and for education, and things for which we can properly appropriate, but we would have to change the law before we could provide so-called fringe benefits. Proposed legislation on that subject is now under consideration by the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. GOLDWATER. And that committee has made a definite recommendation; has it not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not think the committee has reported the bill, but I know the Defense Department has made specific recommendations concerning the legislation it wants for the armed services. The committee has the matter under consideration, and hopes to report a bill to the Senate before adjournment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I ask these questions, Mr. President, because, while I am in agreement with the Senator from Virginia that in certain categories of airplanes we certainly should have a faster production of planes, I think we are completely overlooking the nub of the whole problem when we seem to neglect the very source of the trouble, which is the low rate of enlistments not only in the Air Force, but in all our forces.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I can assure the Senator that that is only a part of the problem. The big part of the problem is that we do not have enough B–52's. When we get them, we have got to have more personnel and certain types of programs and plans to hold the technical men in the service. That will be by means of better living conditions and fringe benefits. The Air Force will need enough men to do the job.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong the discussion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to clear up the personnel angle. The first report which General LeMay made was on personnel, for the reason that when a B–52 is acquired a different kind of technical personnel is needed than that which is necessary for some other kind of aircraft. It is like a mechanic working on an old jalopy and one working on a high-powered car.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree with the Senator. I wish to comment further on the need of additional personnel. I am not in complete disagreement with the Senator from Virginia. The Senator from Virginia remembers that we have a fleet of more than a thousand B–47's. The B–47 is not an obsolete airplane. Our trouble is that we do not have a sufficient number of crews.

We spend approximately $684,000 for training a lead pilot, and then we lose him to industry. If it takes a little more pay, if it takes a little more fringe benefits, let us give them. I believe that is the best investment we can make. I imagine a colonel who will command a B–52 will probably have three-quarters of a million dollars spent on his training. If we listen to a discussion based on numbers of planes only, the people of the country may become unduly alarmed. We must remember several things about the Russian Air Force. Their experience in World War II was based almost entirely on tactical support of ground forces. The Russians flew very few strategic missions and only one over 200 miles. We performed hundreds of thousands of missions before we perfected our bombing patterns. The Russians, from every indication we can get, have not been able to duplicate our strategic bombing efforts. We have the finest trained crews in the world in SAC.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We are told that the Russians have superiority in every category except the B–47. If we pay attention to what the top experts say, we can still lick them; but 4 years from now, if we do not speed up, we will have a second-class air force. During the course of my speech I have quoted technical witnesses who are well informed on the subject, not the kind of people who say an American can whip his weight in wildcats. That is a lot of tommyrot.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I could not more agree with the Senator. The point I am trying to make is that the morale of the Air Force is affected when responsible Senators say that our crews are inferior to the Russian crews.

Mr. ROBERTSON. They are the best in the world.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am saying that we should pay attention to the enlisted men and officers of all grades, from second lieutenants up to lieutenant colonels, and let us worry about a housing program here and there, about hospitalization, and other fringe benefits. I should like to see the Senator devote an hour and a half to talking about the personnel of the Air Force rather than to the subject of equipment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I can give my distinguished colleague a little encouragement, because I am told that next year we are going to step up these expenditures.

Mr. GOLDWATER. This situation has not developed in the past year or 2 years or 3 years; it has been developing ever since World War II.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, with the indulgence of the Senator from Arizona, let me say I am glad he has made his statement. I am very sure there is one vote the committee will have on the $20 million increase for personnel. It makes me most happy.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator tell me whether $20 million is sufficient?

Mr. CHAVEZ. According to the best information we have, $20 million is probably not sufficient, but——

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is sufficient for a one-third step-up.

Mr. GOLDWATER. All I am trying to point out is that so far I have not heard enough stress placed on personnel.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think if the Senator had read my first statement he would know that I devoted several pages to nothing but personnel. When we talk about personnel, there is no question that the Senator from Arizona is correct, but an increase in personnel cannot be taken care of merely by fringe benefits in order to induce men to remain in the service. Corporals, sergeants, second lieutenants, and first lieutenants are extremely essential, and we should take care of them, but I have not heard anyone complain about another shortage, which is in the higher echelon. A national magazine, less than 3 or 4 weeks ago, contained a statement regarding the many admirals and generals who are now working in private enterprise.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not think that enters into this discussion at all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. JACKSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should like to yield to my colleague from Massachusetts, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize what the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], has said, as well as what has been said by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. Every man in uniform and every civilian in the Air Force believes that the personnel situation can be helped by fringe benefits and in various other ways, but perhaps more by creating a new group of technicians.

I should like to take exception to one statement which the Senator from Virginia has made. General LeMay and many other generals, and also many civilian officials, have testified that today we have the best Air Force in the world. No one has said that it would be the second best Air Force in the world 2, 3, or 4 years from now. What they have said is that they are worried about whether it will be such a deterrent as to prevent an attack upon us. That is the principal issue; and the problem will be solved, as others have said, by personnel rather than by planes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Let us realize the difference between putting specific words in General LeMay's mouth and what he actually said. He said that on the present basis Russia was gaining superiority; and that if we continue on the present basis, then 4 years from now Russia would have superior airpower. If that does not forecast that we will be second best, it might mean that we will be third best. Certainly we will not be first.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We can never engage in a numbers race with Russia. What we must do is to keep up the quality of our planes and of our research.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I agree with the Senator's statement, because Russia has twice as many planes as we have. She outnumbers us in every respect except as to B–47's.

I wish to finish my remarks with this thought. We have the best potential in the world in our American youth. They must be trained. They must be adequately equipped. We need not match Russia in numbers, but there are certain fundamentals with which we must be concerned. I think it was with that in mind that General LeMay and the other persons I have quoted considered all the factors which must be kept in mind. They admit that we cannot even try to catch up with Russia on the ground; that is out of reason. Similarly, we may not be able to keep up with Russia in the building of submarines; that is not in the plans, and certainly it is not in the present budget.

But we do not have to think, when it comes to the realm of flying a bomber 3,000, 4,000, or 5,000 miles, and dropping bombs, that we are second to anybody.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator from Virginia as to that.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Much has been said about the United States not having a better personnel program. I could not agree more with anything than with what has been said on that subject by my distinguished colleagues this afternoon. I think the record should be made clear, however, so that every Senator will realize the exact situation. The truth is that the committee which is investigating airpower has asked for recommendations for improvements in the personnel program. We have not received those recommendations from the Department of Defense. Therefore, it is rather difficult for Senators to be called upon to improve the personnel program when we do not have the recommendations from the Department.

We should not have to ask the Department of Defense for recommendations; they should have been submitted by the Department on the Department's own volition.

What all this boils down to is dollars. There is no substitute for money when it comes to getting a stronger Air Force. If we are to have more planes, we must have the supporting resources of personnel, bases, research, and development. That all costs money. It is not possible to concentrate on the training of personnel in order to fly the planes, but not ask for money.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Everyone must agree with that statement.

In the case of the Army, if we are to have more military bases overseas, it will be necessary to have more ground troops to guard the bases. That all adds up to more money.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If I may, I should like to have the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts. I had to leave the floor temporarily. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Virginia based upon some of the observations which he made in response to questions I understand were asked by the Senator from Massachusetts.

It is true, is it not, that in 1948 it was said we could not match the Communists man for man on the ground.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely; and all the witnesses testificd to that effect.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In 1952 it was agreed, was it not, that we could not afford to match Russia submarine for submarine?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That has not been so completely agreed to, but it has been tacitly understood. Of course, we have made no effort to do so.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Inasmuch as Russia now has hundreds more submarines—many more times the number than we have—regardless of the reasons for this situation, the decision has been made; has it not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Indubitably.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Recently, the Department of Defense, and I believe even higher authority, stated that the United States could not afford to match the Communists plane for plane.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct; but the statement was that it was not necessary.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Neither are we matching Russia scientist for scientist or engineer for engineer in our training programs. Is not that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. All the testimony is that Russia is moving ahead of us in the matter of trained scientists. They are training twice as many as we train. Russia provides attractive rewards for scientists. All Russia's schools are channeling scientists into the production effort.

I have placed in the RECORD the speech made by former Senator Benton, in which he sets forth how Russia is moving ahead of us in those fields. He said that if we are worried about being bombed, we had better give some thought as to how to win a war without firing a shot.

Mr. SYMINGTON. With the exception of our carrier force and our medium bomber force, the latter becoming rapidly less and less effective because of the deterioration of our base structure around the world, which my colleague from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] will develop in more detail, it now appears that there is little in which we can afford to match Russia. Is not that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. General LeMay wanted to match Russia's Bison with our B–52. But he said it is now too late. We cannot do it except by going onto a full, all-out basis. He said that even if we provided $3,800,000,000 for 8 years, we would not actually match the Soviet Union, but that with our superior technique and skill we could deter them from seeking a fight.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Since I have had the honor of being in the Senate, many Senators have taken the floor in opposition to military appropriations on the ground there already was a large amount of unexpended funds. I hope we can give the Senate, before this debate is over, the truth about our aircraft production. But if any Senator is interested in resisting appropriations for more money, the best way to do that would be to think up ways to further reduce aircraft production. Is not that true? Would they not in that way have a good argument for less money, because of greater unexpended funds?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That would be the easiest way to impound money.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The record of unexpended funds and the record of aircraft production are tied together. I ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia if he will tell us anything he can, of an unclassified nature, as to whether this administration is even approximating its own schedule of B–52 production.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I hope I am not disclosing any classified information, but I must say that we are not approaching even the administration's schedule on actual deliveries.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would most respectfully say that that is not a strictly accurate statement. There has been a defect in the plane which is now being cured. It cannot be stated on the floor—at least I will not state on the floor—the numbers of planes or the production schedule of the planes. All I can say is that I believe—and I have every reason to believe—that the production of B–52's is going forward on schedule, and that by next January, when Congress returns and we can ask more questions, the program will be on schedule.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not deny that it will be on schedule by next January; I simply say that my impression is that the production of B–52's is behind schedule today. I could state the number which have been delivered between January and June, but I do not want to speak out of turn.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator from Virginia know the name of the aircraft company which makes the B–52?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is the Boeing Aircraft Co. Does the Senator know that before a B–52 can leave the Boeing plant, and fly away, it must be taken by truck or trailer across a main highway, U. S. Highway 99?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have heard something to that effect, yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Therefore, thousands of persons have the opportunity to see every B–52 which is built. Does the Senator know that?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I asume the Russians know all the details about matters which I have heard in the greatest confidence, but which I myself cannot disclose.

Mr. SYMINGTON. But the fact is, is it not, that every B–52 which leaves the Boeing plant, before it reaches the field from which it will fiy, must be escorted slowly, by a trailer or tractor, across one of the main highways of the United States, on which highway there are no security restrictions of any kind whatsoever?

Mr. ROBERTSON. As the planes leave the factory, anyone can see them move across the ground.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

I disagree with the Senator from Massachusetts. There is a published figure in excess of 500 as the number which we hope to obtain. There is no secret about that number. However, we do not have even a small percentage of that total, even if we include every plane being held up because of defects.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JACKSON obtained the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Missouri was out of the Chamber when I had a colloquy with the Senator from Virginia. The junior Senator from Virginia and I are not in complete accord on most of these matters. But what constantly frightens me in these annual discussions about airpower and the United States position in airpower is that our Air Force is referred to as a second-class or a second-rate air force. I maintain, as a member of that Air Force, that that is not so.

I think this type of discussion is very healthy, indeed, if it aids to keep up the rate of production and to assure adequate personnel. But I do not like to have the position taken on the floor, particularly by my distinguished friend from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], that the United States today has a second-rate air force.

I think we can maintain or even increase our rate of production.

The Air Force is not engaged in a numbers racket. However, in the Air Force we have a kind of numbers game with personnel. We simply are not attracting young men to the Air Force; or, having obtained them, we are not keeping them. That, to me, is the problem. It is not a new problem; it was in existence when the distinguished Senator from Missouri became head of the Air Force, and at the end of World War II. Through Democratic and Republican administrations alike, it seems to me, we have failed to recognize that service in the Armed Forces today is a profession on an equal basis with the profession of a lawyer or doctor or merchant, and that the compensation provided should be sufficient to make a career in the Armed Forces attractive. That question started the whole argument.

Before I take my seat, I again say, Let us not leave in the minds of the American people the inference that we do not have a good Air Force today. I think such an impression would hurt the morale of the personnel of the Air Force.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I enjoyed the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Arizona. But when he says I stated we had a second-rate Air Force, he is putting words in my mouth.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I shall take them back out of the mouth of the Senator, but such words are coming out of the mouths of other Senators on this floor, and they should not be.

Mr. SYMINGTON. We have had sworn testimony from many commanders in the military service that if the present policies of this administration continue, we can only end up with a second-rate Air Force at some date in the not too distant future. Some day current policies will have to be changed, or else we will have a second-rate Air Force. I refer my friend from Arizona to the sworn testimony of General LeMay, General Partridge, and many others, that unless we change the policies of this administration—which policies are the reason for the debate this afternoon—we shall have a second-rate Air Force. Then we shall add our second-rate Air Force to our quantitatively second-rate Army, and to our second-rate underseas Navy. The policies of this administration are policies which are going to make us, very shortly, second rate in the air. The sworn testimony before the subcommittee proves that statement.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I hope we can keep this debate on a high level, that we can keep politics out of it, and that we can stress to the American people the need for the expenditure of these funds. This is not a new problem. Our military leaders still do not recognize that the Air Force is the pivotal point around which we should build our whole military strategy. I blame that attitude partly on Congress, partly on the administration, and partly on the old school tie, when we have a new school.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The junior Senator from Missouri was authorized by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to start an investigation of air power last February. Since that time, I believe it is correct to say I have not in any way referred to this question of money. Each year the question of air power becomes more secondary to the question of money. For once, I hope we can get before the American people the fact that an additional $1 billion or an additional half billion dollars is not the most important consideration, because if the American people learn the truth with respect to United States air power as against that of the Soviet Union, the question of money will automatically be taken care of.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I could not agree with the Senator from Missouri more completely. In conclusion, I merely wish to say I should not like to have the young men who are standing on alerts at airstrips at the distant early warning lines, and I should not like to have bombing crews on 24-hour alerts, hear coming from us the assertion that we have a second-rate air force today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to add one statement to that which I made to the Senator from Missouri. I had made certain notes, and I have had them gone over for security reasons. I wanted to make certain I would not break security regulations. In relation to the B–52, we have one wing in service. Additional wings will be added in 1957. If the 1957 budget is carried out as drafted, we shall have 500 B–52's. Presumably there will be new orders for B–52's in the 1958 budget, but the decision as to how many has not yet been made. That is the statement I have had gone over for security reasons.

Mr. SYMINGTON. When will we have 500 B–52's?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. By October 1958.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I hope the Senator from Washington will yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. JACKSON. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to call a statement made by General LeMay to the attention of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. To what page of the hearings is the Senator referring?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Page 1222 of the hearings, last paragraph. General LeMay said:

> If one takes the new estimates of projected Soviet capability at face value and measures them against our current programs only one conclusion can be drawn. The supremacy which we enjoy today is on the wane. By 1959 the Soviets will have the superior strategic air force. I have yet to see our intelligent people overestimate his capability. The new estimates demanded new studies of our force requirements. Our new studies conclude that no less than ——— B–52's and B–47's supported by ——— jet tankers are required to meet the new Soviet threat in 1960.

That is the justification for the recommendation of the committee that the Air Force be given the extra money.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not want to prolong this discussion, because I know the distinguished Senator from Washington is anxious to proceed with his remarks, but I am in complete accord with what the Senator from New Mexico has said, and I am in complete accord with the statement of General LeMay, as read by the Senator. Certainly, in the field of their economy, the Russians are showing rapid strides. It is an amazing thing to see the Communist nation slowly taking on capitalist methods, such as incentive pay, leasing of farms, and private ownership, while we in this country embrace more and more of the Socialist economic ideas. If that continues, then we might have a second-rate Air Force in the future. If this policy goes on in this country for too long, we might become the great slave nation and Russia might become the great free republic of the world.

I agree with the Senator and with General LeMay that we must review our methods.

My whole remarks have been directed to the point that we should not criticize our Air Force as being second rate, because today it is the best. I will go along with everything the Senator has said about the future. I will go along with the suggestion that there should be a nonpartisan effort to appraise the situation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It should be an American effort, and not a partisan effort.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has risen on the floor of the Senate to announce, presumably with pleasure, that the production of B–52's will be some 500 by October 1958.

The American people have the right to know that that quantity is nothing as compared to which the commanding general of the Strategic Air Force believes is necessary for the security of the United States. It is only a small fraction of what he believes is the necessary quantity. In addition, the number of B–52's being delivered to the Air Force, regardless of the reasons, is nothing like the planned schedule for yesterday or today; and tomorrow is always another story.

The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has now stated that the number of planes for the Air Force, by October 1958, will be nothing as compared to what General LeMay believes is essential.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am not responsible for the last statement made

by the Senator from Missouri. I merely stated what the number of bombers would be by that date. I did not say whether the commanding general said that number was adequate or inadequate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I should like to ask my good friend from Massachusetts why he states the figure as one he thinks will solve the problem, if the figure he has given out is small compared to what General LeMay says is needed? In addition, the number of B–52's we shall have by October 1958, will be nothing like the 500 the Senator has referred to, if we can take as precedent the number we have today as compared with what it was stated the Air Force would have last January.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I simply gave the number as a factual number. I did not give it as a bad or good or indifferent figure. I simply stated it out as the fact.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If I may respectfully say so, it is not a fact; it is the opinion of the Department of Defense, not a fact.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would be happy if the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts would give the number of B–52's which have been delivered. It would solve a lot of our problems in this discussion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. From the information I have, that figure is a security figure which we cannot reveal, and I shall not reveal it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The distinguished Senator knows that every B–52 which is produced has to be taken by tractor across Highway No. 99. There are no security regulations in effect on that highway. Thousands of people each day see each B–52 built. Is the reason the Senator from Massachusetts does not give the figure because he is proud of it, or ashamed of it?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. For neither reason. It is because on my notes there is a red pencil mark through that line, inasmuch as I have been asked, for security reasons, not to give out the information.

Mr. SYMINGTON. On what note?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. On my personal notes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Not to give out what figure for security reasons?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The figure of the number of planes being produced by the factory.

I know where the Boeing factory is, just as do the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Washington. I have been there.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Why does the Senator from Massachusetts think it is proper for the people of the State of Washington to know what is the production of B–52's, but not proper for the rest of the country to know what is that production?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They may or may not know what the production is. If other Senators wish to give out that figure, they may do so; but I do not wish to reveal the figure when the Department of Defense has asked me, for security reasons, not to do so.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator from Massachusetts know there is no security whatever as regards the number of B–52's produced at the Boeing plant? If that is correct, does the Senator from Massachusetts believe it is proper for the American people not to be informed?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Presumably the factories must continue to be located where they are at this time.

I may say semifacetiously that a few days ago the Senator from Washington and I voted against the dispersal bill; but perhaps in this case there should be dispersal, so the people could not know the number of planes coming from the plants.

Speaking seriously, I merely say that to the best of my ability I shall see to it that I do not state on this floor information which I have been advised should not, for securty reasons, be stated publicly; and I am sure that the Senator from Missouri does not want such information to be stated publicly either.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the figure of 13 a month—which means nothing as against actual production—and the figure of 17 a month—and the figure of 20 a month—did not originate with me. Those figures are "planted" figures periodically coming from the Department of Defense, in effort to place in the minds of the American people the idea that 13, 17, or 20 B–52's would shortly be produced per month. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, for 8 weeks the Special Air Force Subcommittee has received testimony on the requirements of a modern air force. That testimony has centered on four major elements, which taken together, determine air force effectiveness, namely, planes, personnel, bases, and research and development.

I am happy to see that the Appropriations Committee has proposed additional funds for each of these four elements. The performance of our Air Force is proportional to the availability of modern aircraft, manned by trained personnel, with properly dispersed and guarded bases, backed up by adequate research and development.

I do not believe this is the occasion for lengthy remarks on my part. My views are well known to the Senate. I wish to comment briefly on the recommended increase in Air Force spending.

Mr. President, the funds we vote this week will not augment the air power we now have. Our strength of the moment results from decisions made several years ago. What we are now deciding is the kind of Air Force we shall have 3 years hence.

Today, we have the best Air Force in the world. But, Mr. President, unless we expand current programs, our strategic striking power will soon be inferior to Russia's. On June 11, General LeMay told the Appropriations Committee:

> The supremacy which we enjoy today is on the wane. By 1959 the Soviets will have the superior strategic air force.

This testimony stands uncontradicted and uncontested. Mr. President, it is now in our hands to maintain our supremacy in air power or to lose it to the Soviet Union.

I am pleased to see that a major portion of the recommended increase would go for additional B–52 bombers.

The argument has been made that the extra funds proposed in this bill cannot be spent this year. This argument is based on the premise that our productive plant cannot promptly absorb the increase. In my opinion, this contention is utterly unsound. The record is clear that our B–52 production can readily be doubled. The Boeing plant at Seattle is not operating any one of its three shifts at full capacity; and the same situation prevails at its Wichita plant. With the step-up in goals that these additional funds will permit, production schedules can be adjusted rapidly with a minimum effort.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. JACKSON. I am very happy to yield to the junior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Within the limits of security, I wonder whether the Senator from Washington can answer this question: If, under the present program, we are to have 500 B–52's in 1958, according to the figures submitted to the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] what additional number shall we have if we accept the $1,200,000,000 figure; and does the Senator from Washington know the basis of the statement about 500 B–52's, as made by the senior Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield, I believe I can answer that question.

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In the figure of $1,160,000,000, referred to by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] there is $800 million for airplanes. That would be roughly equivalent to 100 B–52's.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; I will say that one B–52 costs approximately $8 million.

Mr. SYMINGTON. With spares.

Mr. JACKSON. Does that figure include spares?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. So in one case, 100 B–52's would be added, and in the other case, 50 B–52's would be added; is that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. In one case there would be $800 million, which would be equivalent to 100 B–52 planes. In the revision, that figure has been reduced from $800 million to $350 million.

Mr. KENNEDY. That represent 35 B–52's, does it?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. The senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]

said that in 1958 we would have 500 B–52's.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That will depend upon the rate of production. Actually, in this bill, a certain amount of money is included for more B–52's, on the basis of appropriating $1,600,000,000, if $800 million of that amount is for the procurement of aircraft.

When the planes would be obtained would depend upon the schedule.

The number of B–52's which would be obtained with $800 million would total 100. When we would obtain them would depend upon the rate of production.

Mr. KENNEDY. I should like to ask one more question of the Senator from Washington. It has been suggested that next year the administration will request more funds for the production or procurement of airplanes. Will there be any advantage in postponing the request for additional funds? Would there be such an advantage because of the possibility of the production of newer types or the possibility of advances which might be made between the present time and a year from now?

Mr. JACKSON. I am glad the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts has asked that question. I shall discuss that matter in a moment, in connection with my prepared remarks. At this time let me say that we do not have a replacement for the B–52; that is the uncontested testimony of General Putt, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. KENNEDY. In other words, the question, then, is simply whether an additional number of B–52's of the same type will be available a year sooner than they would be if the money were made available next year? Is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. I cannot state the exact time; but the question is how rapidly are we going to obtain them.

Mr. KENNEDY. But all other things being equal, the question is whether this year or next year we shall provide funds for additional planes of the same type; is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will my colleague repeat his question? I had difficulty hearing him.

Mr. KENNEDY. My question was this: If it is assumed that we would simply spend more money next year for aircraft—and Secretary Quarles has suggested that that would be the case—will such money, if spent next year, be spent for a later version of the B–52 or for the version now available?

The Senator from Washington has said that the money spent next year would be spent for the same type of plane. Then I asked him whether it is a fact that we would receive the B–52's sooner if we spent the money this year, rather than next year; and he was about to answer that question.

Mr. JACKSON. I shall go into that question in a moment.

The usual argument made about not turning out too many planes of a certain type is that a new type is coming along, and we do not want to have a great number of obsolete aircraft on hand. However, in connection with the B–52, the point is that we do not have such a plane coming along. Until we get the IBM or the ICBM, this is the one means of delivering a retaliatory atomic attack by air from the United States or from the North American Continent. It is the only intercontinental means we have in the jet-propulsion field. We now have the B–36, but the B–36 cannot carry out its mission much longer, in view of the growing air defenses of the Soviet Union.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question, which he may or may not be able to answer?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. In view of the problems in Iceland and other places, would it be possible for the United States to deliver an atomic bomb from any of our bases overseas without prior consultation with the governments involved.

Mr. JACKSON. I prefer not to go into that subject. I may say, in general, that there might be problems. It is not the most reliable means of defense, so far as we are concerned.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he leaves the discussion of the B–52?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I show the Senator a picture of the B–52 plant, with which I am sure he is familiar. It shows a B–52 coming out of the Boeing plant, with thousands of people around it. It is a correct statement, is it not, that the only way this B–52 can leave the plant is to cross United States Highway No. 99?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct. It must cross United States Highway No. 99, which runs through the city of Seattle.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Calling the Senator's attention to this picture, is the Senator familiar with the site?

Mr. JACKSON. The junior Senator from Washington has passed the plant many times. Everyone in the area knows the situation. Anyone traveling up and down United States Highway No. 99 is familiar with the situation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Therefore thousands of people on the highway and thousands of people in the plant, if they are interested in the number of B–52's being produced in this country—in which a possible enemy would be exceedingly interested—could find it out without any difficulty whatsoever, could they not?

Mr. JACKSON. I think we might clarify the subject. I believe that members of the Press Gallery are aware of the fact that General LeMay gave production figures, at least from the first of January, for each month up through April. Those figures were approved for release by the Department of Defense censor, so I think there is no question about security at this point so far as the Department of Defense is concerned, inasmuch as the Department approved the release of the production figures with respect to B–52's from January on. I would rather not disclose those figures now, because I do not have the published testimony before me.

Mr. SYMINGTON. To the best of the Senator's knowledge these pictures are correct, are they not?

Mr. JACKSON. There is no question about it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Therefore there is no problem of any kind from the standpoint of Soviet interest in knowing how many B–52's are produced in this country.

Mr. JACKSON. Apparently the Department of Defense came to that conclusion when it released the production figures given by General LeMay in open session.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I had not intended to ask the Senator a question. I was listening with very great interest to the colloquy between the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Missouri. But since the opportunity is made available to me, let me ask the Senator a question which is also addressed to the Senator from Missouri. Has the Senator received any explanation whatever, in any committee of which he is a member, or any suggestion as to what the United States should do with respect to expanding its Air Force, now that the former editor of Pravda, who was promoted to take the place of Mr. Molotov as Foreign Minister, has just completed a tour of Egypt, which resulted not only in an agreement with Soviet Russia to furnish Egypt with arms, but in a totalitarian election in Egypt by which Colonel Nasser, now Premier, has been elected President, with no opposition party being permitted to exist?

In the face of this and other evidences of the activity of Soviet Russia, through the new regime; in the fact of 18 months conversations which a representative of our State Department has held in Geneva, without results, looking to the release of American citizens who are falsely and illegally held prisoner by Communist China, has the Senator heard any suggestion emanating from the administration—or, should I say, the Department of Defense—as to what should be done in connection with the question of the preservation and expansion of American airpower?

How can we be so utterly complacent about what we can do in the future, in the face of the news coming over the radio and television day after day about the growing acuteness of the situation in the Middle East, where Soviet Russia is promoting a policy directly antagonistic to that which our State Department and the regents at the White House pretend they want the United States to follow?

Mr. JACKSON. The Defense Department has a program. The Defense Department proposes to postpone the build-up of airpower. I should like to read into the RECORD at this point the testimony of the Secretary of the Air Force, Donald Quarles, before the Senate Appropriations Committee on May 11, 1956:

> If we are to continue to support an Air Force program of this magnitude there is no escape from a substantially larger budget in fiscal year 1958 than the one we are submitting this year.

General Twining, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, before the Senate Appropriations Committee on the same day, said:

> The budget is really going up considerably next year—a greatly increased budget.

General Twining, on February 21, 1956, before the Senate Armed Services Committee, said:

The program I have outlined and the budget for fiscal year 1957 is austere. It meets only our most essential needs on a minimum basis. To keep this minimum program going and to reach and support 137 wings will require an increased budget in 1958. On this basis, I urge support of this year's program.

Charles E. Wilson, at a press conference on December 20, 1955, said:

Quite a few of the economies that we have been able to achieve are what are often referred to as "one-shot savings." In other words, you can't do the same every year. We are about through that stage of it, just like we are about through being able to carry out the program from money previously appropriated. We are getting closer to where the appropriations are going to have to be substantially in line with estimated expenditures so that we can keep the thing going. Maybe that will have to go up a little bit.

Since he made that statement he had to concede, a week before we started the airpower investigation, that he needed a quarter of a billion dollars more money.

There is a program, but the program is to postpone the procurement of the long-range intercontinental jet bombers, which remain the foundation of our atomic retaliatory air striking force. I do not believe we can afford to postpone a program so vital to the security of our country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me to say a few words, with the understanding that he will not lose the floor, let me say that in 1951 and 1952 the United States Senate, by yea and nay votes of more than 70 to 0, passed military appropriation bills which were designed to insure that the United States would possess the greatest airpower in the world. The purpose of the committee which recommended those appropriations, and the purpose of the Senate, which unanimously approved them, was to be certain that no power on earth should exceed the United States in air strength. Many of the Senators whose voices I have heard on the floor today defending the cuts of the administration voted with the unanimous Senate at that time. The conclusion was clear. We wanted to be certain that no other nation on earth should exceed the United States in airpower. But in 1953 appropriations were cut back.

I wish to be fair. During Democratic administration, because of the same false reasoning, appropriations made by the Congress for building up airpower were cut back when they should not have been cut back. The same error was made then that is being made now. But in those days there was no question that American airpower was the greatest in the world. Now we know that that is not the case. The Chief of the Air Force, General Twining, has been permitted to go to Moscow to witness the air show put on by the Soviet Union.

No one in his right mind thinks that General Twining will secure from Mr. Khrushchev, and the other men who now hold power in Soviet Russia, any suggestion of disarmament. The object of the air show is to intimidate the United States.

Mr. JACKSON. And its allies.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The object of the air show is to show Egypt, the Middle East, and Asia that Soviet Russia has the airpower which will dominate the world. I wonder how much effect this demonstration has had upon the recent decisions of the commanders of the NATO forces in Europe to resign, and I wonder, of course, why General Gruenther has resigned as the chief of all the military forces of NATO. When we see these things with our very eyes and hear these reports with our own ears, how is it possible that Members of the Senate, in this presidential election year of 1956, should give more attention to pleas of postponement and plans for balancing the budget than to the protection of the United States?

Mr. JACKSON. Would the Senator agree that the invitation which we and our allies received is part of a Soviet attempt to demonstrate to our allies and to our friends around the world, and to neutral nations, that the industrial supremacy of the United States may be shifting toward the Soviet Union?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct, of course. They are seeking to intimidate the free peoples of the world and to show them that they need depend no longer upon the United States. I hope the Senate itself and the entire Congress will refuse to follow the pusillanimous doctrine suggested by the Department of Defense. My concern about it is that within a year we shall be defending our shores in a hot war, not a cold war.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not a fact that in the long history of airpower we have never found ourselves in a position where we had too many planes at any one time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. Unless it was at the conclusion of hostilities, at the end of World War II. We then made the mistake of disarming, when we should have continued to maintain our Air Force.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I remember very well when, as an excuse for our failure to ratify the treaty of the League of Nations, the Republican leaders upon this floor, with the aid of some Democrats, fought against it, and then the Harding administration, in order to demonstrate that it was for peace, agreed to sink the American Navy. And it was sunk. Instead of having the second largest Navy in the world, we ended up with a Navy smaller than even that of Japan. We paid the price for that at Pearl Harbor. It is beyond my understanding now any Member of Congress, no matter what his party, should continue to fight against a guaranty that the United States of America shall remain before the whole world as the greatest power in the air. To be the greatest power in the air, we must have not only planes, but guided missiles and long-range bombers. We know that representatives of Soviet Russia in this country are even now seeking to return to Russia certain Russian citizens who sought to escape communism by coming to the United States. Spokesmen in the Russian Embassy in Washington have tried to intimidate and have succeeded in intimidating some and sending them back to Russia, and Members of the Senate, in the face of such facts, say, "Oh, we can let it go until next year or the year after that."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for having made a very excellent statement. He served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Armed Services of the Senate Appropriations Committee for many years.

He speaks from great personal knowledge, and he knows the dangers inherent in any kind of penny-pinching program when we deal with this all-important area of national security. I compliment the Senator for a very excellent contribution.

Mr. President, it is argued further that, being preoccupied with the production rates of B–52's, we have ignored the effectiveness of the medium range B–47 bomber operating from overseas bases. The capabilities of the B–47 are not in question. But the B–47, without overseas bases, cannot substitute for the B–52. And the truth is that our overseas bases are becoming less and less reliable to support our air-atomic power. From Iceland to Okinawa, key strategic bases are now under political attack.

For example, in Iceland, we are dangerously close to being evicted. North Africa is in tumult: Five United States airbases in Morocco have been in doubtful status since Morocco won her sovereignty. The airbase in Libya is under strong anti-Western pressures. Key bases are now up for renewal in the agitated Middle East.

Of course, we hope that we will not be denied the use of these important overseas bases. However, we and our B–47's could be excluded from these bases overnight, and we could not, overnight, get the intercontinental planes to operate without them.

Another unsound argument is being made. We are told that it is foolish to spend more money for B–52's, because the B–52 will soon be replaced by a new and better plane. But, Mr. President, the fact is that no replacement is in sight.

At a hearing of the Special Air Force Subcommittee on May 17, General Putt was asked:

What are you doing for a replacement for the B–52?

In released testimony General Putt replied:

We have only some research and development projects at this time.

When asked:

The B–58 is not to be a replacement for the B–52, is it?

General Putt answered:

No.

According to the sworn testimony of General LeMay, even when we get the ICBM and related missiles in quantity, the long-range manned bomber will be in the picture for a long time. The IRBM and ICBM, when available in operational numbers, will first supplement, and later partially replace, our manned bomber force. But until we have these ballistic missiles in quantity, we have to rely almost wholly on the B–52.

There is no planned successor to the B–52.

No weapon is obsolete so long as it serves as a deterrent. Nothing we have in sight will make the B–52 obsolete.

The Soviets may make the B–52 obsolete, in the sense that it becomes out-of-date relative to their weapons. That would be the situation if Moscow either develops the IRBM or the ICBM in quantity or if it produces before we do a more advanced long-range bomber than the B–52.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I noticed the Senator's remarks about the B–52. Many times the failure to obtain B–52's is explained away by emphasis on B–47 production. The latter is the one class of airplane, namely, the medium bomber, in which the Russians are not up to free world production.

I observe a headline in this afternoon's newspaper, which reads: "Oust United States Parties, Win Iceland Vote."

Will not this base development, if it continues throughout the world, much reduce the importance of the B–47 to our national security?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is absolutely correct. The foundation of our air atomic retaliatory striking power today, until we have enough B–52's, is our reliance upon the B–47; and the capability of the B–47 to perform that mission is dependent upon bases overseas.

Mr. SYMINGTON. And on refueling.

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct. If we lose our bases overseas the B–47 will not be able to carry out its mission, because we do not have the tankers necessary to permit refueling of B–47's.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am very glad the Senator has raised the tanker situation, normally overshadowed by B–52 discussion. Is it not true that we are at least as short in the number of tankers necessary for B–47 operation as we are in B–52's?

Mr. JACKSON. According to the public testimony, we are further behind on the tankers than we are on bombers at this time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If we lose overseas bases—and it would seem, according to the newspaper this afternoon, we may lose the important base in Iceland, then the B–47, in order to be an intercontinental bomber must have tankers; and we do not have sufficient numbers. Is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator has stated the situation correctly, as I understand it.

(At this point Mr. JACKSON yielded to Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, who submitted a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, which, with the ensuing colloquy, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. JACKSON'S speech.)

Mr. JACKSON. But Mr. President, if the Kremlin does achieve this sort of success, then we are going to need all the more B–52's. Under these conditions the larger our fleet of B–52's, the better off we will be—the more B–52's we had on hand, the greater would be our chance still to deter Moscow, or if deterrence fails, to retaliate with some effectiveness.

It should be clear that there is no reason for holding back on production of more B–52's on grounds that there is a better plane on the horizon.

There is nothing new about the arguments against a step-up in spending for the B–52. The Pentagon politicians have made the same arguments ever since some of us advocated a B–52 speed-up over a year ago.

However, the Pentagon politicians have reversed themselves twice. Back in May 1955, even after the Moscow fly-by, Secretary Wilson told a press conference he thought no more B–52 funds were needed. But in June, less than a month later, he asked for about one quarter billion more for B–52's.

In March of this year Secretary Wilson told another press conference he thought no new funds for B–52's were needed. But in April he changed his tune again and asked for about one quarter billion more.

This is why I cannot be surprised at the attitude of Secretary Wilson toward the increase recommended by the Appropriations Committee. It fits the pattern of error which has marked his approach to our military requirements.

I am glad that both the committee amendment and the substitute of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] provide added money for Air Force research and development.

This country has already surrendered the lead to Moscow in quantity of airpower. It is the unanimous verdict of professional military men that the Russians are now closing the gap in quality. In the words of General Twining: "The Soviets are narrowing our margin of superiority. They have long since passed us in quantity and they are making remarkable strides in quality."

The Kremlin achieves this result in part because it concentrates talent and money on research and development. Russian leaders know the best route to the most powerful air force in the world.

And what has been our policy? We have imposed a fixed dollar ceiling on Air Force research and development. Projects have been deferred for lack of funds. Urgent work has been stretched out. Breakthroughs have been dropped that should have been followed up.

Before our special Air Force Subcommittee on May 17, General Putt listed 11 research and development items which have suffered from inadequate funds. His testimony has been released, and here, in brief, are the 11 items:

First. Work on a nuclear propulsion system for aircraft has been slowed.

Second. Initiation of a new tactical bomber, and work on strategic bombers, has been delayed.

Third. Vitally important work in the field of reliable electronics has been deferred, with serious implications for B–52 performance and for jamming and counterelectronic measures.

Fourth. Work, almost across the board, in the field of missiles could have progressed faster with more funds.

Fifth. Projects in research aircraft which would make aerodynamic exploration have been held up.

Sixth. The earth satellite program has been retarded because of too little money.

Seventh. Funds are deficient for radar development to improve our air-defense system, particularly against long-range ballistic missiles.

Eighth. Good prospects in the field of propulsion will go unexplored, unless more funds are forthcoming.

Ninth. Important technical studies that would influence future programs have been brought almost to a standstill.

Tenth. Funds for producing prototypes of aircraft are so limited that only one prototype is produced for each type of aircraft required. General Putt pointed out that the intelligent thing to do is to produce more than one prototype, so that in case one prototype fails, less time is lost.

Eleventh. Research in high-energy fuels shows great promise of substantially increasing the range of existing aircraft, but this research is hampered by insufficient resources.

This recital by General Putt is most disturbing. Unless we give greater emphasis and more money to our research and development effort, we are bound to lose the critical races for the discovery of advanced weapons. And in the nuclear age, Mr. President, even minor inventions in nuclear weapons can spell the difference between defeat and survival.

Mr. President, our defense program could make good use of more money than it will get this year. It is the testimony of the administration itself that the defense budget will be substantially increased in 1958. Even Secretary Wilson said so. On May 11, General Twining informed the Senate Appropriations Committee, "the budget is really going up considerably next year—a greatly increased budget."

It is hard to see how anyone can fail to vote for the additional funds recommended by the Appropriations Committee, as a step in the right direction.

General LeMay told the Appropriations Committee this month that with programs now in effect "by 1958–59, somewhere in there, the Russians will have as many bombers as we have," and they will have "twice as many of the heavy bombers as we have."

General LeMay has asked for an additional $3.8 billion to expand current programs. As it stands, the increase recommended by the Appropriations Committee is only about one-third of what General LeMay believes we need.

If any Senator is reconciled to the United States having the second best Air Force in the world, then I suggest that he vote against the committee's proposal. But if the Senate wants the United States to continue to have the best Air Force, then I urge that we support the committee's recommendation.

Mr. President, I recently attempted to summarize my thinking on American defense policy in an article published in the New York Times magazine section of May 20, 1956, entitled "Toward a Superior 'Force in Being.'"

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWARD A SUPERIOR "FORCE IN BEING"

(By HENRY M. JACKSON)

WASHINGTON.—For the second year in a row, the 84th Congress is challenging a defense budget approved and submitted by the first five-star general ever to reach the White House. While the budget has been questioned primarily by Democrats, the ironic nature of the debate is compounded by the unusual reluctance of their Republican colleagues to come to the President's defense.

In the public view, the defense controversy appears to rest largely on questions of dollars and cents. It is certainly true that budgetary issues play a central role. In a wider sense, however, the debate concerns the basic form that our Defense Establishment shall take in a period which does not find us at war, and certainly does not find us at peace as we once knew it.

In essence, the question is whether we can be content to rely on our defense potential, or whether we must resolve to acquire the "force in being" adequate to protect our security. "Force in being," as I understand the phrase, describes the actual military strength available to us for immediate use—as opposed to the latent resources on which we can draw tomorrow, the next day, or sometime in the future.

Of the several factors which combine to produce this debate, two are of special importance. The first is a growing awareness, in Congress and elsewhere, of the threatening achievements of the Soviets in the development and production of new weapons. In light of recent history, Khrushchev's latest forecast of Russian progress in the missile field cannot be discounted. The record is clear that similar Soviet predictions on the A-bomb and H-bomb were promptly confirmed in fact. Disturbing knowledge of Russian accomplishments led some of us in Congress to demand, many months ago, that our air-atomic program (including missiles) be drastically revised.

It is apparent now that this same knowledge has created some uneasiness in the executive branch. Just 3 months after submitting his original budget, the President last month asked Congress for an extra half-billion dollars in defense funds—almost half of which is slated for additional production of B-52 bombers. It is likely that further increases in defense spending will result from the current study of the Air Force by a special Senate Armed Services subcommittee.

The second factor affecting the budget controversy is the realization—as yet dim in some quarters—that a workday, routine approach to matters of defense simply does not fit the strategic patterns of the hydrogen era.

The fact is that we will never again in total war be permitted to mobilize armed strength as we did after December 7, 1941. The precious gifts of time and space, which once permitted the construction of a vast military machine after hostilities had begun, are gone forever.

In 1941, space was our shield—protecting us from the direct onslaught of the Axis Powers. Until the war's end, despite the conquest of Europe and Southeast Asia by our enemies, the continental United States lay untouched. Time was on our side too. The dogged stand of our allies, notably in Europe, gave us precious months to harness our industrial machine to the manufacture of tanks, guns, and planes.

In terms of security, what do space and time hold for us today? Can we once again afford to lose every battle but the last? It is not inconceivable, in my opinion, that today if we lose the first battle, we may lose the war. Our buffers of the past have disappeared.

Time is gone because the United States is now one of the two great military powers of the world. If total war should break out, our involvement would be instantaneous. As a practical matter, the speed with which we entered such a war would be a critical factor in determining our success. For we now confront a power which possesses, like ourselves, potent nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them. A frontal assault on the United States could inflict a measure of destruction in hours which the weapons of World War II could achieve only in years.

Space as an advantage in security planning has been eliminated by air-atomic weapons, present and planned, which virtually equate the distance between Moscow and New York with the distance between Moscow and London.

No longer have we the leeway to develop new weapons in the environment of war. If, for example, the United States and Russia both achieve and produce the intercontinental ballistic missile, but Russia alone develops a counterweapon of defense, our security would be in mortal jeopardy. As Dr. John von Neuman, distinguished recipient of the Enrico Fermi scientific award, has said, "Today there is every reason to fear that even minor inventions and feints in the field of nuclear weapons can be decisive in less time than would be required to devise specific countermeasures."

In my opinion, the increasing awareness of this wholly new set of strategic considerations lies wholly at the heart of the present defense controversy. The United States now requires what is for her a revolutionary defense philosophy, and is going through the growing pains of getting it. In essence, such a philosophy is based on the principle that the United States must have on hand, ready for use, the weapons and delivery systems essential to ultimate survival in an all-out war. It follows that we must discover, develop, and produce in peacetime the crucial weapons which, if first obtained by a hostile power, could turn the military balance of power against us. And we must keep on producing them. As one becomes obsolescent, its replacement must be ready.

"Force in being" is a cold, military phrase, but no three words could more aptly summarize the demands of the new defense philosophy. Ideas in men's minds, plans on drawing boards, weapons in process on assembly lines, will not contribute to our military might if we are once again cursed with total war. Money spent next year for planes to fly 3 years hence will not help us much if such a war should come tomorrow.

Nor is it safe or realistic to assume that such a war cannot come. I do not know of any expert on Soviet Russia who is willing to state that recent changes in Russian policy mean an abandonment of the basic aim of communism—ultimate world domination. Soviet leaders stand ready to use every weapon at their command, military, political, or economic, to achieve this goal. Our hope that Russia will shun nuclear war now rests on the "balance of terror." Fear of crushing reprisal continues to deter the Soviets from sudden attack.

But if at any time the margin between their force in being and ours is sufficient to justify the plunge; if the gains ever seemed worth the costs, we cannot count on them to resist the temptation. Moreover, smaller nations, steered by reckless leaders, could quite possibly involve both Russia and the United States against the better judgment of both.

The force in being concept has radical implications for our entire defense setup. They concern manpower problems, facilities, and weapons production in each of the three services. With particular reference to missiles and air-atomic strength, a number of these factors are receiving special emphasis in the current defense debate.

Our most advanced weapons must at all times be ahead of or equal to those in Russian hands. Because the long-range B-52 bomber is today our most advanced means of deterring or damaging the enemy, the size of our B-52 fleet is now a central issue. (The Russians at present far outproduce us with their comparable "Bison" bomber.) Also involved in the debate is the effectiveness of present efforts to develop and produce a radically advanced type of long-range bomber to supplant the B-52. Because ballistic missiles are likely soon to supplement—and later partially replace—our manned bomber force, the momentum with which the ballistic missile program is progressing is also a controversial question.

To maintain superiority in advanced weapons, stress must be placed on research and development work throughout our Military Establishment. Only through broad research effort, both basic and applied, can we win the critical race for the discovery and development of advanced weapons systems. The adequacy of our "R and D" work is thus also a major point at issue.

The problem in the research and development field is one of emphasis as well as money. It is certainly true that appropriations for this work must be geared to the expanding requirements of technological progress. The more complex the scientific problem, the more costly its solution. At the same time, however, the success of our research and development work also depends on the energy with which this effort is pushed in certain critical areas.

There comes a time when some unexpected discovery of the highest importance results in a scientific "breakthrough"—opening new vistas and inviting broad exploration into untouched fields of knowledge. To recognize and exploit vital "breakthroughs," with heavy applications of men and money, requires the finest organizational teamwork and the highest administrative skill.

The concept of superior "force in being" calls, in addition, for production techniques which match the effectiveness of our scientific effort. Once our scientists have devised an important, perhaps crucial, weapon, we cannot hesitate to produce it in such numbers as to create a genuine deterrent. The United States has always prided itself on its ability to move new concepts from the drawing boards to mass production in record time. In 20th-century jargon, this period from blueprint to completed product is known as "lead time." By halving our lead time on the production of heavy jet bombers, the Russians tossed another issue into the defense debate.

We will never be able to maintain a superior "force in being" as long as dynamic weapons are stalled on production lines by overcautious and archaic administrative methods. Discussing our production failures, Admiral Rickover points out that the "money we try to save by checking and counterchecking, by being too careful not to make mistakes, is frequently offset by the lengthening of our lead time." In the long run, such economy can be both false and fatal, for the margin by which we lead the Russians in placing advanced weapons in mass production may also be our margin of survival.

This thesis is slowly gaining recognition. The Air Force, for example, recently announced a new method of selecting contractors which, while safeguarding the competitive principle, succeeded in reducing by many months the period from development directive to signed contract. The importance of dedicated administrators who thrive on cutting redtape cannot be overemphasized.

The demands of the new philosophy of defense presents a formidable challenge for a free society. The vigorous national effort required to achieve a superior force in being has never been asked of our people in peacetime.

The Soviet military buildup has proceeded unhampered by the obligations of a democratic government. While we devote our productive capacity to supporting a high standard of living for all our people, the Russian masses have to take what they can get—after the priorities of military production have been met.

Nor does the Kremlin face the necessity of competing with private industry for technical and scientific skills. It does not go to any Congress for funds to support a weapons program. For a totalitarian state, building a war machine in time of peace is accepted practice. On a scale that was minute compared to the Soviets today, Hitler, too, created a great aggressive force in peacetime.

But militarism of any sort runs counter to basic democratic beliefs. Short of war—when the issue of self-preservation is dramatized—the American people are not readily persuaded to marshal their talents and resources for a full-scale military effort.

Yet the wide implications of our changed strategic position cannot safely be ignored. I am convinced that our people will gladly make whatever sacrifices are required once they become aware of the problem which confronts us. But the general support and understanding which is vital to the success of a new defense program can be created only through frank reporting to the people by their elected and appointed officials.

Even Congress itself cannot discharge its duties unless it hears the best available professional opinion. Senators and Representatives need to know not only the opinions on defense that are accepted and embodied in a Presidential budget; they must also have those views which are rejected, know why they were rejected or why a compromise was reached. Congress cannot judge the wisdom on proposed programs unless it hears the conflicting viewpoints they claim to resolve. Our professional military leadership, in other words, should be permitted to speak its mind to properly constituted committees of Congress—free from restraints and fear of recrimination.

Likewise, the people themselves must learn the main alternatives of defense planning. They cannot be deeply persuaded of the necessity for a great effort if they do not debate the possibilities and decide for themselves.

In the past few months much progress has been made toward a freer discussion of our defense posture relative to that of the Soviet Union. Some officials have shown commendable courage in speaking their minds on current shortcomings. Many people, once reluctant to speak frankly, are now speaking out—and with authority. The current Air Force study is sharpening important issues. The public press, radio, and television are dramatizing many of our problems.

Once our citizens are given an honest appraisal of the requirements, I believe we will develop a defense program that we can live with—and by.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] said there were some figures on B–52 production which he would like to give, but did not feel he could do so. Last April, before the Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Committee on Armed Services, General LeMay, in testimony now released by the Department of Defense, in reply to questioning by our very able counsel, Mr. Fowler Hamilton, made the following statements with respect to B–52 production:

Mr. HAMILTON. How many B–52's were produced up to January 1, 1956?

General LEMAY. We consider B–52's have completed production when they have completed shop assembly. Up to January 1, 1956, 57 B–52's had completed shop assembly.

Mr. HAMILTON. How many were accepted by the Air Force?

General LEMAY. Forty-one.

Mr. HAMILTON. How many were produced in February 1956?

General LEMAY. Six had completed shop assembly.

Mr. HAMILTON. How many were accepted by the Air Force?

General LEMAY. Two.

Mr. HAMILTON. How many were produced in March 1956?

General LEMAY. Six.

Mr. HAMILTON. How many were accepted by the Air Force?

General LEMAY. None.

Mr. HAMILTON. How many were produced in April?

General LEMAY. Five.

Mr. HAMILTON. How many were accepted by the Air Force?

General LEMAY. None. Most of the B–52's produced and not accepted in February, March, and April have not been accepted because of a component failure for which we now have a solution.

Mr. HAMILTON. Is it not true that every time a B–52 replaces either a B–36 or a B–47 it makes for a more effective strategic air force?

General LEMAY. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will permit a comment, the junior Senator from Washington would like to say that he understands that if planes are not accepted, the Air Force does not have to pay for them. Is that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

During the delivery of Mr. JACKSON'S speech,

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington may yield to me, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and then propose a unanimous-consent request on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit a proposed unanimous-consent request, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Tuesday, June 26, 1956, at the hour of 1:30 p. m., during the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10986, the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1957, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1½ hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control of the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal. (June 25, 1956.)

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. May I ask the distinguished majority leader if the latter provision means that the extra time to be allotted would come from the time on the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But there is no particular amount of time allotted on the bill itself, is there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes; each side is allotted 1½ hours on the bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I do not intend to object, but am I to understand that the Senate will remain in session as late as necessary this evening? I have a matter which I wish to discuss.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I told the distinguished Senator from New York earlier today, that will be done. The Senator certainly will be protected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 3295. An act to amend the act of April 28, 1953, relating to daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia; and

S. 3663. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3693) to amend title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 7227. An act to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Serv-

ices Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the disposal of surplus property for civil-defense purposes, to provide that certain Federal surplus property be disposed of to State and local civil defense organizations which are established by or pursuant to State law, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8634. An act to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in North Carolina to the city of Charlotte, N. C.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6243) authorizing the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BONNER, Mr. ROBESON of Virginia, Mr. TUMULTY, Mr. TOLLEFSON, and Mr. ALLEN of California were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7380) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 to correct certain inequities; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi, and Mr. BROYHILL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9052) to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. RAINS, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GAMBLE, and Mr. TALLE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9852) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. RAINS, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GAMBLE, and Mr. TALLE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11320) to effect the control of narcotics, barbiturates, and dangerous drugs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. MILLER of Nebraska were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11619) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOPER, Mr. MILLS, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, and Mr. SADLAK were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 256) correcting the enrollment of H. R. 6782, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1614. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids", title 21, United States Code, section 321c;

S. 2771. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Fourth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes;

H. R. 101. An act relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9, subsections (d) and (e), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939;

H. R. 5590. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause of means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Gustaf E. Lambert;

H. R. 5790. An act relating to the application in the Territory of Hawaii of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act;

H. R. 8493. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 9582. An act to provide for the delayed reporting of births within the District of Columbia;

H. R. 9671. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States in the village of Carey, Ohio;

H. R. 10374. An act to amend the act to incorporate the Oak Hill Cemetery, in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 10768. An act to amend section 5 of the act of August 7, 1946, entitled "An Act for the Retirement of Public School Teachers in the District of Columbia," as amended; and

H. R. 11473. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 25, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1614. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids," title 21, United States Code, section 321c; and

S. 2771. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the fourth national jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am not posing this afternon as an armchair strategist. I serve on the subcommittee which recommended the appropriation of this money, and I regret that because I was busily engaged first on the farm bill, and later on the public works appropriation bill, I was unable to attend as many of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Armed Services of the Appropriations Committee as I desired.

Mr. President, I personally do not know what it may be best to do in the way of appropriating specific sums for defense purposes for the simple reason that I do not have the facts at hand which the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President have. Because they have these facts—as far as I know—they are the only individuals so equipped, I believe that we must, by all means, rely on what they tell us is necessary.

I realize that if we should be forced to engage in another war, it will be necessary for us to have the best of everything—the best Army, the best Navy, and the best Air Force. I believe I can illustrate my point by a story. I recall reading that during the Civil War it was necessary for the Confederate Army to obtain more recruits; quite a number of the Confederate soldiers had been killed, and the ranks were growing very thin. Someone thought of a method by which more recruits could be obtained: In various States, officers serving in the Confederate Army were told to do some recruiting—to make talks to the younger men, and to get them to enlist in the Confederate Army. In South Carolina, a young major volunteered to make speeches, in the attempt to get as many recruits as possible. Every time he began to speak, he would tell his audience, "Why should we fear those Yankees? We can beat them with cornstalks." And in each case he ended his speech with the same statement: "Why should we fear them? We can beat them with cornstalks." Recruits flocked to the Confederate cause—sparked, no doubt, by the man's eloquence.

Of course, all of us know what the result was.

After the Civil War was over, the same major decided to run for Congress. He proceeded to make speeches on behalf of his candidacy. He would make riproaring speeches among the citizens of his district. One day, an old fellow in the back row called out, "Look here, Major: You ain't fit to be a Congressman. I thought you told us during the war that we could beat those Yankees with cornstalks."

The major scratched his head a while, and then said: Yes, I did say that. But the devil of it was that those Yankees wouldn't fight with cornstalks." [Laughter]

Mr. President, I am not expert in the matter of what weapons the Russians might use against us should hostilities

break out. I frankly do not know what weapons we should have available. But Mr. President, I am a firm believer in our Joint Chiefs of Staff. They are men of experience. They should know what we need, and the budget they helped formulate represents their judgment. The budget we are now discussing was not made overnight. It has been worked upon since last July by all the services—the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. I am quite satisfied that none of the services is allowed in the budget the full amount it originally requested. Instead, each of the services is allowed, in the budget, somewhat less than the amount it requested.

In making up the budget, those in charge of it had to weigh all the proposals made by representatives of the various branches of the armed services.

I am satisfied that General LeMay made a good case when he presented his budget to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to read into the RECORD what General LeMay said, at the hearings, regarding how these budgets are made:

General LEMAY. We make up our portion of the budget out at the command, stating our requirements to carry out the mission assigned and then send that in.

The "mission assigned" is designated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. From the evidence they have, they assume that an enemy potentiality will be "X," and in order to counter that strength each branch of the services make an appraisal of their need. Those figures representing the needs of the Air Force, the Navy, and the Army as their shares of the military budget are presented to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I read further from the testimony, at the hearings, of General LeMay:

From time to time we make recommendations as to size of the force we should have based on what we think the enemy capability will be and our own position at that time. Those are two different things. We prepare a budget for the new program that we are told to do; but we go beyond that and recommend the proper size force that we think is necessary to carry out our assigned task.

Senator ELLENDER. Now, does the present budget for 1957 as originally submitted provide for all of the money that you asked for?

General LEMAY. You understand that I submit my budget and I never see it again until it gets through the Congress.

Senator ELLENDER. You are familiar with what is being asked, are you not? You are now, I presume, acquainted with the amount of money that we are asked to appropriate and that part which should be given to your command?

General LEMAY. No, I am not.

Now I read the testimony which was taken a moment later:

Senator ELLENDER. I am sorry I was not here to listen to all your testimony. I had to be with another committee. But judging from your testimony it would seem to me that much more money than has been budgeted is being requested by you.

General LEMAY. That is correct. I turn in my recommendations to the Department of the Air Force as to what I think should be done.

It is the responsibility of the Air Force and the Department of Defense to weigh those decisions and come up with a program. Then, as a good soldier, I must support the program and try to get the job done the way my superiors want it done. I do that. I have been talking about my personal recommendations in the past; what I personally think is necessary.

Mr. President, I should like to point out that General LeMay's recommendations fall in the same category as the recommendations made by General Ridgway several years ago. Senators will recall that General Ridgway came before the committee, and stated that by all means we should increase the appropriation for the Army to provide a force of 1,200,000 men. However, the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended an Army force considerably below that figure. In fact, I have the figure before me; and it shows the Army wound up with 1,082,000 men, instead of 1,200,000, as requested by General Ridgway. In other words, the individual recommendations of one military leader must yield to the overall recommendations of our Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. President, as I have said, these budgets are made by the departments a year in advance. Once they are presented to the committee and defended before the committee by representatives of the Government agencies, the members of the committee take over and must use their own judgment.

In the case of the information which has been developed recently, I believe that no doubt it will be reflected in the preparation of the budget for the next fiscal year—that is, for fiscal year 1958.

I shall show in a few minutes, the amount of money budgeted for the Air Force was determined at least in part on what our production capability is; in other words, the recommended budget for the Air Force represents the number of aircraft our facilities can produce, and the Air Force can sustain during the 1957 fiscal year. I refer not only to B–52's and the Strategic Air Command, but to the entire Air Force, including the Tactical Air Command.

As I have said, Mr. President, I was unable to attend all the hearings on the defense appropriation bill. I have read most of the printed hearings. Except for the personal testimony given by General LeMay, I have not been able to find in the course of the lengthy hearings conducted by the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee any testimony which would lead me to believe that either the $1,160,000,000 additional, as proposed by the Appropriations Committee, or the more modest additional amount of $500 million, as proposed by the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire, for himself and other Senators, is necessary, justified, or justifiable. The Department of Defense will end the current fiscal year with an unobligated balance of almost $12.6 billion. The Air Force will have almost $5.5 billion in unobligated funds.

Mr. President, for some time now, particularly since I have been a member of the Subcommittee on Armed Services, of the Appropriations Committee—I have been expressing concern about the huge carryovers of unobligated balances.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I wish to say that I agree completely with the Senator from Louisiana. I think we have a right to complain about the huge unused and uncommitted balances.

I note that the Senator from Louisiana has already stated for the record the uncommitted and unused balance for the Air Force as a whole. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana recalls that a separate item—the principal item in which we are now interested is assigned for aircraft procurement. I have noted that $2.9 billion is the amount of the uncommitted, unobligated funds to be carried over for that purpose, and that in excess of $9 billion, although committed for that purpose, is unexpended—meaning that there is a $12 billion carryover into the next fiscal year, from former appropriations. The Senator from Louisiana recalls those figures, does he not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, I do.

Mr. HOLLAND. Considering that immense amount of carryover, and considering, further, that the current budget includes in excess of $6 billion for aircraft procurement, making a total of more than $18 billion for that one objective, does not the Senator from Louisiana think that the Air Force would have more funds than could possibly be spent in the approaching fiscal year 1957 if only the budgeted amount were appropriated as new funds?

Mr. ELLENDER. I think there is no doubt that the Air Force will have sufficient funds. As I pointed out a while ago, when General LeMay testified before the subcommittee, he said that in presenting his figures he tried his best to outline a plan to meet the mission which was given him by the Chiefs of Staff. The Joint Chiefs have all the facts before them. They also have from General LeMay what he thinks ought to be done. It seems to me that the decision should be left to them as to how many B–52's or B–47's we should have. I believe the Joint Chiefs of Staff should make that decision.

I shall read from the testimony of General Twining in a few moments. He places the requests for planes in category 4. He calls attention to the fact that we are short of technical personnel. He even places housing and fringe benefits for officers ahead of airplane production. He places the need for more bases ahead of airplane procurement. As the Senator knows, he put research and development ahead of airplane production. In the amendment which is being proposed, the arm-chair strategists say, "We want you to spend $800 million for B–52's, whether you need them or not, and whether you have the trained personnel to man them or not."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Am I to understand that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is taking the position—which apparently is becoming rather foolish in the eyes of some—that General Twining,

the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the other military experts know more than we do about this subject?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. It is my honest opinion that a great many persons are prone to accept the Kremlin's boasts—statements which come out of Moscow and which are pure propaganda—as "The real McCoy." They forget that Moscow is trying to bleed us white. Moscow is trying to make us spend ourselves into bankruptcy. As I pointed out at the hearings, if we continue to spend $35 billion to $40 billion a year to prepare ourselves for the next 10 years, we shall lose our way of life. We cannot long support such expenditures and still preserve our way of life.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator has noted that General LeMay, who is one of our great flying heroes and one of our great strategists in the Air Force, has asked, not the paltry billion dollars which is recommended here as an increase, but an increase of $3.8 billion, not for airplane procurement in general, but for airplane procurement for the needs of our Strategic Air Command alone.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true. As I pointed out a while ago, I am satisfied that the Navy has asked for a great deal more than it will get, and I am sure the Army has also done so. I am sure the Tactical Air Command asked for more.

The top military experts—our Joint Chiefs of Staff—know the facts. They receive intelligence from the CIA, from the Navy, the Army, and various other sources which we do not have. I have faith that those men know what they are talking about.

As my good friend from Missouri stated a moment ago, 5 or 6 B–52 airplanes were produced in April, 4 or 5 in February, and so forth. They were turned down. Why? Because they had "bugs" in them. Would Senators want us to continue to build such planes unless they were perfected? That was one of the reasons for the delay. A B–52 cannot be built overnight. The Senator knows that we spent hundreds of millions of dollars in perfecting the B–36. Where is it now? It is obsolete. The B–52 succeeded it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The distinguished Senator feels, as I likewise feel, that when the responsible head of the Air Force and the Chiefs of Staff tell us that there are personnel needs which they must place first, or the planes will not do them any good because they will be without trained men to operate them and service them; that housing facilities come close to top priority, because satisfied men are required for long periods of time in the service; and that research and experimentation are required, because "bugs" have been found in even our most up-to-date planes, such a request, coming from such a source, should be heeded by Members of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question about it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator. I commend him for his speech. I agree that Members of the Senate, with the multifarious duties they have to perform, cannot possibly have the grasp and understanding of this subject which is possessed by those good men who have now come to the top of the pile so far as their profession is concerned. Of course they want to make good. They come to the Congress with the burden on their consciences as to what to recommend to place our Nation in the most secure position. I agree with the distinguished Senator that we would be foolish indeed if we were to pay no attention to their recommendations.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Because of the huge sum asked by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I have taken the position that they now have control of the purse strings of our country. We in the Congress have lost control over defense appropriations.

Of the billions of dollars we appropriate each year to operate our whole Government, 90 percent is for future protection and to pay for past wars, including the interest on our huge debt.

As the record will show, I have posed many times this question to Mr. Wilson: What weight do the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the President, and others give to the impact which such expenditures may have on our own economy? Of course, they must give weight to that factor. Otherwise, what is the use of our having a large Army, a large Navy, and a large Air Force, if the net result is to bring to our shores a new and destructive "ism"—a form of dictatorship?

As I shall show in a moment, the representatives of our Department of Defense are satisfied with the budget as presented to Congress. I shall show, by a letter from the Department of Defense, that the SAC budget suggested by General LeMay was not substantially changed prior to submitting the total military budget to Congress, except possibly as it may have been affected by an arbitrary cut of $500 million, imposed at the recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—our top military leadership.

I come back to the proposition that each year there have been unobligated balances in the armed services, and each year they have grown steadily. On July 1, 1954, the carryover from the year before was $15,706,808,000. Those were funds that were not even obligated.

The Defense Department started the fiscal year 1956 with an unobligated balance of $12,815,170,000. At the beginning of the fiscal year 1957 it will have unobligated balances available of $12,593,914,000. All these appropriations are global; they can be channeled in almost any way the Department of Defense sees fit. Some of this money could be used to procure additional B–52's. No new appropriation is required for that purpose.

If the increase which has been suggested is voted, and additional appropriations are made, the result will be merely to increase the unobligated balances by just that much more.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a schedule from the Department of Defense indicating the unobligated balances for each year during the period beginning January 1, 1949.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

Department of Defense: Obligations and obligational availability of current general appropriations, summary by service (excluding working, revolving, and special funds and expired general appropriations and authorizations), fiscal year 1950–57

[Thousands of dollars]

	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force	OSD and interservice activities
FISCAL YEAR 1950—ACTUAL [1]					
Unobligated balance July 1, 1949	872,313	71,390	567,648	233,275	
Plus:					
New obligational availability fiscal year 1950	13,169,339	4,233,508	4,073,017	4,671,364	191,450
Direct congressional appropriations	(13,041,902)	(4,405,144)	(4,328,383)	[2] (4,116,925)	(191,450)
Cash to liquidate prior contract authority	(−1,809,529)	(−220,000)	(−789,529)	[3] (−800,000)	
New unfinanced contract authority	(1,936,966)	(48,364)	[4] (534,163)	[5] (1,354,439)	
Administrative adjustment of contract authority	−99,081		[6] −99,081		
Reimbursements	186,436	33,675	74,228	78,535	
Transfers (net)	−22,982	[7] −30,350	−26,247	16,615	17,000
Equals total available for obligation fiscal year 1950	14,106,029	4,308,224	4,589,565	4,999,789	208,450
Deduct obligations incurred fiscal year 1950	13,163,453	4,066,577	4,159,910	4,729,083	207,883
Equals unobligated balance June 30, 1950	942,576	241,647	429,656	270,706	567
Expired as of June 30, 1950	(137,962)	(124,165)	(3,825)	(9,405)	(567)
Available in fiscal year 1951	(804,614)	(117,482)	(425,831)	(261,301)	

See footnotes at end of table.

Department of Defense: Obligations and obligational availability of current general appropriations, summary by service (excluding working, revolving and special funds and expired general appropriations and authorizations), fiscal year 1950–57—Continued

[Thousands of dollars]

	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force	OSD and interservice activities
FISCAL YEAR 1951—ACTUAL					
Unobligated balance July 1, 1950	804,614	117,482	425,831	261,301	
Plus:					
New obligational availability fiscal year 1951	48,038,560	19,360,143	12,337,975	15,895,975	444,467
Direct congressional appropriations	(48,086,926)	(19,270,030)	(12,319,074)	[2] (15,813,522)	(684,300)
Cash to liquidate prior contract authority	(−2,317,600)		(−767,600)	(−1,550,000)	
New unfinanced contract authority	(2,269,233)		[4] (700,293)	[5] (1,568,940)	
Distribution of OSD emergency fund		(90,113)	(86,207)	(63,513)	(−239,833)
Adjustment of unfinanced contract authority	−20,560		[3] −20,560		
Reimbursements	654,212	138,211	290,822	224,714	465
Transfers (net)	−1,886	2,958	−2,862	−1,982	
Equals total available for obligation fiscal year 1951	49,474,939	19,618,795	13,031,204	16,380,008	444,932
Deduct obligations incurred fiscal year 1951	45,772,330	17,658,609	12,443,623	15,264,406	405,692
Equals:					
Unobligated balance June 30, 1951	3,702,609	1,960,186	587,581	1,115,602	39,240
Expired as of June 30, 1951	(251,732)	(65,407)	(88,980)	(58,105)	(39,240)
Available in fiscal year 1952	(3,450,879)	(1,894,779)	(498,602)	(1,057,497)	
FISCAL YEAR 1952—ACTUAL					
Unobligated balance, July 1, 1951	3,450,879	1,894,779	498,602	1,057,497	
Plus:					
New obligational availability, fiscal year 1952	59,986,264	21,639,719	15,648,422	22,265,123	433,000
Direct congressional appropriations	(61,411,104)	(21,648,032)	(16,291,087)	(22,948,985)	(523,000)
Cash to liquidate prior contract authority	(−1,424,840)	(−48,364)	(−666,476)	(−710,000)	
Transfer to offset pay deficiency		[9] (13,342)			[9] (−13,342)
Distribution of OSD emergency fund		(26,709)	(23,811)	(26,138)	(−76,658)
Reimbursements	837,391	36,912	508,157	292,237	85
Transfers (net)	37,765	−513	[10] 38,719	−441	[10]
Equals total available for obligation, fiscal year 1952	64,312,298	23,570,897	16,693,900	23,614,416	433,085
Deduct obligations incurred, fiscal year 1952	56,867,342	20,902,622	15,482,198	20,111,958	370,564
Equals:					
Unobligated balance, June 30, 1952	7,444,956	2,668,275	1,211,702	3,502,458	62,521
Expired as of June 30, 1952	(359,946)	(69,683)	(121,525)	(106,218)	(62,521)
Available in fiscal year 1953	(7,085,010)	(2,598,592)	(1,090,177)	(3,396,240)	
FISCAL YEAR 1953—ACTUAL					
Unobligated balance, July 1, 1952	7,085,010	2,598,592	1,090,177	3,396,240	
Plus:					
New obligational availability, fiscal year 1953	46,971,036	13,537,510	12,532,758	20,345,983	554,785
Direct congressional appropriations	(49,198,317)	(13,124,410)	(13,205,745)	(22,318,362)	(549,800)
Cash to liquidate prior contract authority	(−2,307,681)		(−577,302)	(−1,730,379)	
Transfer to offset pay deficiency	(80,400)	(400,400)	(−96,000)	(−250,000)	(26,000)
Distribution of OSD emergency fund		(12,700)	(315)	(8,000)	(−21,015)
Reimbursements	1,941,886	1,200,777	429,720	311,389	
Transfers (net)	−49,643	−48,933	−568	−142	
Equals total available for obligation, fiscal year 1953	55,948,287	17,287,946	14,052,086	24,053,470	554,785
Deduct obligations incurred, fiscal year 1953	45,734,793	14,194,587	12,256,645	18,747,624	535,936
Equals:					
Unobligated balance, June 30, 1953	10,213,494	3,093,359	1,795,441	5,305,846	18,849
Expired as of June 30, 1953	(821,755)	(268,091)	(489,049)	(46,009)	(18,607)
Available in fiscal year 1954	(9,391,739)	(2,825,268)	(1,306,392)	(5,259,837)	(242)
FISCAL YEAR 1954—ACTUAL					
Unobligated balance July 1, 1953	[11] 9,369,099	[11] 2,802,629	1,306,392	5,259,837	242
Plus:					
New obligational availability fiscal year 1954	34,473,599	12,938,992	9,333,356	11,410,496	790,755
Direct congressional appropriations	(34,554,042)	(12,937,406)	(9,438,310)	(11,408,776)	(769,550)
Treasury restore warrant	(11)	(11)			
Cash to liquidate prior contract authority	(−80,454)		(−80,454)		
Transfers in lieu of supplemental appropriations			(−24,500)		(24,500)
Distribution of OSD emergency fund		(1,575)		(1,720)	(−3,295)
Reimbursements	2,507,433	1,652,302	402,808	452,323	
Transfers (net)	−18,969	−172,010	161,162	−8,121	
Equals total available for obligation fiscal year 1954	46,331,163	17,221,913	11,203,718	17,114,535	790,997
Deduct obligations incurred fiscal year 1954	27,956,827	9,517,784	8,258,236	9,752,374	428,432
Equals:					
Unobligated balance June 30, 1954	18,374,336	7,704,129	2,945,482	7,362,162	362,564
Expired as of June 30, 1954	(2,667,528)	(1,464,377)	(620,435)	(320,152)	(262,564)
Available in fiscal year 1955	(15,706,808)	(6,239,752)	(2,325,046)	(7,042,010)	(100,000)
FISCAL YEAR 1955—ACTUAL (SF–133 BASIS)					
Unobligated balance July 1, 1954	15,706,808	6,239,752	2,325,046	7,042,010	100,000
Plus:					
New obligational authority fiscal year 1955	29,104,475	7,092,081	9,730,936	11,715,763	565,696
Direct congressional appropriations	(29,617,073)	(7,619,570)	(9,810,824)	(11,557,930)	(628,750)
Cash to liquidate prior contract authority	(−34,000)		(−34,000)		
Congressional transfers	(21,402)	(−27,489)	(−45,888)	(157,833)	(−63,055)
Congressional recissions	(−500,000)	(−500,000)			
Reimbursements	2,583,214	1,739,735	417,792	425,618	69
Equals total available for obligation fiscal year 1955	47,394,498	15,071,568	12,473,774	19,183,391	665,765
Deduct:					
Obligations incurred in fiscal year 1955	34,172,618	10,627,788	7,616,755	15,323,861	604,213
Balances expiring on June 30, 1955	406,710	130,559	228,949	20,633	26,569
Equals unobligated balance available in fiscal year 1956	12,815,170	4,313,220	4,628,070	3,838,897	34,983

See footnotes at end of table.

Department of Defense: Obligations and obligational availability of current general appropriations, summary by service (excluding working, revolving and special funds and expired general appropriations and authorizations), fiscal year 1950–57—Continued

[Thousands of dollars]

	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force	OSD and interservice activities
FISCAL YEAR 1956—ESTIMATED					
Plus:					
New obligational authority fiscal year 1956	33,026,146	7,084,153	9,620,517	15,653,431	668,046
Direct congressional appropriations	(33,081,603)	(7,329,953)	(9,578,960)	(15,479,054)	(702,208)
Cash to liquidate prior contract authority	(−28,000)		(−28,000)		
Congressional transfers	(−18,885)	(−245,800)	(78,129)	(174,376)	(−34,162)
Congressional rescissions	(−8,572)		(−8,572)		
Anticipated reimbursements	5,109,369	1,391,933	684,285	3,033,151	
Fiscal year 1955 MDAP common item orders	(3,728,545)	(758,871)	(257,485)	(2,712,189)	
Fiscal year 1956 MDAP common item orders	(417,200)	(335,000)	(31,700)	(50,500)	
All other	(963,624)	(298,062)	(395,100)	(270,462)	
Equals total available for obligation fiscal year 1956	50,950,685	12,789,306	14,932,871	22,525,479	703,029
Deduct:					
Obligations incurred in fiscal year 1956	38,114,472	9,579,485	10,936,505	17,034,206	564,276
Balances expiring on June 30, 1956	242,300	65,691	127,409	18,000	31,200
Equals:					
Unobligated balances available in fiscal year 1957:					
Appropriations and reimbursements earned	9,634,172	2,521,743	3,670,932	3,333,944	107,553
Anticipated reimbursements from MDAP fund reservations outstanding as of June 30, 1956, to be earned:					
In fiscal year 1957	1,078,165	375,000	60,665	642,500	
After fiscal year 1957	1,881,577	247,387	137,360	1,496,830	
Total unobligated balance available in 1957	12,593,914	3,144,130	3,868,957	5,473,274	107,553
FISCAL YEAR 1957—ESTIMATED					
Plus:					
New obligational authority, fiscal year 1957	[13] 36,133,164	7,954,425	10,406,464	16,894,500	677,775
Direct congressional appropriations	(35,189,300)	(7,761,425)	(10,212,600)	(16,537,500)	(677,775)
Proposed for later transmission	(200,000)				
Congressional transfers	(785,000)	(193,000)	(235,000)	(357,000)	
Congressional rescissions	(−41,136)		(−41,136)		
Anticipated reimbursements	973,949	449,200	258,037	266,712	
Fiscal year 1957 MDAP common item orders [12]					
All other	(973,949)	(449,200)	(258,037)	(266,712)	
Equals total available for obligation, fiscal year 1957	[13] 49,701,027	11,547,755	14,533,458	22,634,486	785,328
Deduct:					
Obligations incurred in fiscal year 1957	[13] 39,870,804	10,321,625	10,883,139	17,680,712	785,328
Balances expiring on June 30, 1957	14,238		14,238		
Equals:					
Unobligated balances available in fiscal year 1958:					
Appropriations and reimbursements earned	7,934,408	978,743	3,498,721	3,456,944	
Anticipated reimbursements from MDAP fund reservations outstanding as of June 30, 1957, to be earned after fiscal year 1957	1,881,577	247,387	137,360	1,496,830	
Total unobligated balance available in fiscal year 1958	9,815,985	1,226,130	3,636,081	4,953,774	

[1] For purpose of continuity, fiscal year 1950 amounts include the appropriation "Alaska Communication System, operation and maintenance," which was reclassified from civil function to military function during fiscal year 1951 (Public Law 843).

[2] Fiscal year 1950 excludes and fiscal year 1951 includes $22,461,000 cash carried over to fiscal year 1951 from fiscal year 1950 reserve ("Research and development, Air Force").

[3] Excludes $75 million appropriation for payment of obligations incurred prior to June 30, 1946, against the appropriation "Air Corps, Army 1942–46." This amount does not represent cash to liquidate prior contract authority ("Construction of aircraft and related procurement, Air Force").

[4] Fiscal year 1950 excludes and fiscal year 1951 includes $124,797,000 contract authority carried over to fiscal year 1951 from fiscal year 1950 reserve ("Construction of aircraft and related procurement, Navy").

[5] Fiscal year 1950 excludes and fiscal year 1951 includes $726,151,000 contract authority carried over to fiscal year 1951 from fiscal year 1950 reserve ("Construction of aircraft and related procurement, Air Force").

[6] Administrative adjustments in contract authority, as follows:

Construction of ships	−$18,873,000
Ordnance for new construction	+5,000,000
IRNV:	
Armor, armament, and ammunition	−6,500,000
Construction of machinery	−78,708,000
Total	−99,081,000

[7] Excludes $42 million transfer representing extended availability of "Transportation Service, Army, 1949" which is included in "New obligational authority, fiscal year 1950."

[8] Represents rescission of $31,460,000 contract authority made by Public Law 759 ("Ordnance for new construction, Navy") and administrative increase of $10,900,000 contract authority ("IRNV—Construction and machinery, Navy").

[9] Transfer to "Military personnel, Army, 1952," which was not actually made until fiscal year 1953.

[10] Excludes $6.1 million transfer from "Contingencies, DOD" to "Navy petroleum reserve No. 4, Alaska," which is included in new obligational authority fiscal year 1952.

[11] Differs from ending balance fiscal year 1953 due to reclassification of "Civilian relief in Korea" from a military function to a civilian function.

[12] Excludes reimbursements that may be anticipated later from fiscal year 1957 MDAP common item orders.

[13] Includes $200 million not distributed by service.

Source: Standard Form 133.

NOTE.—Amounts do not necessarily add to totals due to rounding.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I bow to no other Member of the Senate in our efforts to be certain that our country is well protected. But in making these appropriations we must remember that we also owe an obligation to the taxpayers of the country. If we continue to increase appropriations—without what I consider to be justification—and make taxes so burdensome as to destroy initiative, we shall not need the armed services. Our way of life will be destroyed as efficiently as if the Russian air force sowed atomic destruction on our land. The testimony given before both the House and Senate committees clearly indicates that the 1957 request was based on the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and was personally approved by the President, who certainly possesses an unequalled competence to evaluate the requirements of our security.

I should like to call the attention of the Members of the Senate, Mr. President, to the information contained on pages 1275 to 1277 of the hearings, excerpts from which I shall read in a few moments. It is clearly established there that the budget requests submitted by the President to the Congress, after review by the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget, provide all but $500 million of the funds originally requested by the Department of the Air Force.

We have all had sufficient experience in these matters to know that any original staff estimates are certainly not the minimum amount actually required. The $500 million reduction represents differences of opinion between the various field air staffs and reviewing authorities, consisting of $400 million for operation and maintenance—which involves no new airplanes—and $100 million for military construction, which has nothing to do with B–52 procurement.

We had before us in the hearings men in charge of the budget, who helped to prepare the budget, and who had the facts upon which the budget was based. In the hearings, at page 1276, there is a letter from General Bogart, Director of Budget, Department of the Air Force, dated June 11, 1956, indicating the manner and method in which the original

amount asked by the Air Force was reduced.

It will be noted, as I said a while ago, that the amount of the cut does not in any manner affect the number of airplanes which are to be constructed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I noticed that the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Louisiana were complaining about the money not being spent, and about certain airplanes which seem to have "bugs" in them, and therefore, they do not wish to spend the money. Does not that bring to our attention the fact that we should try to find out what we should have and use some of the money to protect the people of the United States?

Mr. ELLENDER. I anticipated the Senator's question, and I have before me a document which has to do with research and development, tests, and evaluation programs of the Department of Defense, which states that a total of $5.2 billion will be available in fiscal year 1957 for these purposes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is money which they have. When are they going to spend it?

Mr. ELLENDER. They are spending it now. For specific research and development items for the Army, the request is $410 million. For activities in support of research and development, $89.4 million. We did not cut out any of that, and they did not ask for any more than that.

For the Navy, $493 million was requested. We allowed that amount.

For Navy activities supporting research and development of facilities to make these newly designed implements of war, we provided $134.2 million.

The Air Force, for research and development, asked for and obtained $610 million.

For Air Force activities supporting research and development, $383 million, and for Air Force development, test and evaluation items—to test the new planes and various other items for our defense—the amount was $1,731,000,000. We allowed those amounts, too.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is that money to be spent in the future?

Mr. ELLENDER. In this fiscal year.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. How much has been spent in 1956 for research and development?

Mr. ELLENDER. In 1956 we spent $3,769,000,000. In 1955 we spent $3,391,000,000 and in 1957 it is proposed to spend $5,194,000,000, which includes, as I said, development tests and evaluation procedures for all three of the armed services, together with the activities connected therewith.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In the past year how much did the committee recommend for appropriation for research and development?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have just given the figures to the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Did they spend all of it?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know how much, if any, of those amounts was left over—that is, how much represents unobligated balances. The problem of unobligated balances is of fairly recent origin. The Senator will recall that during the 80th Congress, our method of appropriating money was changed. Prior to that time, the departments were given the right to contract, and then after the contract was entered into and the work was completed, they came to us for appropriations to pay for the work performed under the contract. That method was changed in the 80th Congress, and as a result of the change we have to appropriate in advance all the money necessary to purchase new implements, new ships, new missiles, airplanes, and so forth. I presume that change accounts to a great extent for these unobligated funds. But the point I was trying to make a while ago was that these unobligated funds are, of course, in addition to those which have been obligated, amounting to billions of dollars. I have shown that in the statement which I have just had placed in the RECORD.

Since the Department of Defense is asking for more than it can possibly obligate in fiscal year 1957, if it needs any additional money to build B–52's, it can easily find money to pay for them by tapping some of the funds not yet obligated. But any such program must be determined in the light of the capability of our factories to produce. General LeMay asked for an accelerated program, but I doubt that we have the capacity to build the number of planes for which he is asking, unless we build more factories. That would entail millions of dollors more, as the Senator knows.

Personally, I am willing to trust the judgment of our Joint Chiefs of Staff. As was pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Florida, they are dedicated men. They have at hand facts which we do not have. They prepare and assign missions for the various services, and the various services are asked to meet them.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The committee is recommending this year a very substantial increase for research and development, is it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They have awakened, then, to the fact that they have not been doing their duty in that field.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would not say that. I wish I could state some of the facts that are secret, and the Senator could well understand the delay. But I do not wish to divulge any military secrets. I will state that I have faith in those dedicated men. They should certainly know what they are doing, and I am willing to trust them.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They certainly realize at this time that they need more for research and development than they have been using in the past.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true. That has been the case with the budget for airplanes and various other implements of war. We are bound to expect changes from time to time.

Here is another which was pointed out to us during the hearings. If we were to give to General LeMay all he asks we might throw the missions of the Air Force and the other services out of balance—we would affect what the Navy might need or what the Army might require. We cannot depend entirely on superiority in strategic air bombing to win a war. We must depend on all the military services. Before the budget is made, the Air Force must consult with the Army and the Navy in order to dovetail all this work. If the Air Force budget is out of balance we may have so many airplanes that we cannot man them, and they will be on the ground like ducks for the enemy. The Department of Defense recommended to Congress what I would call a more or less balanced program. I was very much impressed with its presentation.

It is my belief that in the light of what General Twining may present when he returns from Moscow, we will be materially assisted in preparing the budget for fiscal year 1958.

Going back to the amount which was asked for by the Air Force, I stated a moment ago that of that entire amount, including money requested by General LeMay and by all others in the Air Force, a cut of only $500 million was imposed by the Joint Chiefs. I return to the proposition that if that sum is necessary, it can be obtained by the Armed Services from prior-year appropriations as yet unobligated. I read from the hearings:

Senator SALTONSTALL. I hold up my hands on that one because it is my understanding that all but $500 million of that $2.8 billion was really found in that $16.5 billion plus what this—

We were then discussing the entire amount which was originally asked by the Air Force for its 1957 budget.

General BOGART. I think, sir, the point is that all but $500 million of that cut is identified against such things as reorder lead time, the financing adjustment. In other words, it either has no effect on program or is against program changes which were agreed. In other words, what it amounts to is that of that total cut $500 million was arbitrary and we just absorb that. We don't know quite how. The other points we do have specified ways to absorb and it is for a specific reason.

The letter from General Bogart to which I referred earlier and which explains how this sum, the difference between what the Congress was asked to provide and what the Air Staff asked for, was well spelled out. The letter was addressed to the chairman, and reads:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
HEADQUARTERS, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE,
Washington, D. C., June 11, 1956.

CHAIRMAN,
Department of Defense Subcommittee,
Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The following information is submitted in response to Senator SALTONSTALL'S request for a breakdown of the differences between the $19.392 billion Air Staff submission for the fiscal year 1957 budget and the $16.8945 billion currently in the budget before the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The total decrease between the $19.392 billion Air Staff estimate and the $16.518

billion included in the President's budget was $2.874 billion. Of this amount—

(a) Approximately $1.560 billion was identified against reorder lead-time adjustments, financial adjustments (anticipated recoupments), price changes, and other factors not involving program modification.

(b) Approximately $650 million was identified against program changes—primarily revised procurement estimates—which were recommended or agreed by the Air Force.

In other words, according to General Bogart, those two items, which aggregate more than $2 billion, did not in any manner adversely affect the program which the Air Force presented to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

(c) About $157 million, including $123 million in the "Aircraft and related procurement" appropriation, represents the net of a number of changes, both plus and minus, in many individual item programs. It is most difficult, in retrospect, to determine to what extent each of these individual changes stemmed from funding reductions. For the most part, I believe that these reductions were the type of staff adjustments which normally result from the detailed reviews and constitute the net of many minor disallowances, pricing forecasts, obligational capability judgments, and minor policy determinations. It is fair to state, I believe, that on balance there is no substantial adverse effect on the Air Force program by these reductions.

That is the information we received from General Bogart.

(d) About $500 million were arbitrary reductions; that is, those based upon differences in judgment between the Air Staff and the review authorities. These reductions, to which I had previously referred, included $404.9 million in "Operation and maintenance" and $100 million in "Military construction." These were reductions not related to specific program changes or any of those factors which normally lead to adjustment during the review process.

Mr. President, we have the whole story in that letter. I do not think there is any doubt that the program which was originally presented by General LeMay, based upon the mission to be performed by him, has been fulfilled almost 100 percent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would correct the Senator to this extent, if I may.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish the Senator would do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The $19.8 billion to which the Senator refers was the decision of the Air Force Advisory Committee, composed of their staff; it was not the decision of General LeMay. General LeMay, I think, submitted a somewhat higher figure for the SAC.

Mr. ELLENDER. But it was included in the prior amount submitted. Am I not correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may state that there was some question as to who constituted the Air Force Budget Advisory Committee, so I requested their names and positions. The committee is composed of the following officers: Maj. Gen. Daniel F. Callahan, Maj. Gen. Kenneth P. Bergquist, Maj. Gen. Kenneth B. Hobson, Maj. Gen. Thomas P. Gerrity, Maj. Gen. William S. Stone, Col. W. L. Rogers, Maj. Gen. Frank A. Bogart, and Maj. Gen. William E. Hall.

I have not read the titles of these officers, so, with the permission of the Senator from Louisiana, I ask unanimous consent that the complete list of the Air Force Budget Advisory Committee and their positions be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR FORCE BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Maj. Gen. Daniel F. Callahan, Assistant for Programing, Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations.

Maj. Gen. Kenneth P. Bergquist, Director of Operations, Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations.

Maj. Gen. Kenneth B. Hobson, Director of Manpower and Organization, Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations.

Maj. Gen. Thomas P. Gerrity, Assistant for Production Programing, Deputy Chief of Staff, Materiel.

Maj. Gen. William S. Stone, Director of Personnel Planning, Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel.

Col. W. L. Rogers, Assistant for Development Programing, Deputy Chief of Staff, Development.

Maj. Gen. Frank A. Bogart, Director of Budget, Deputy Chief of Staff, Controller.

Maj. Gen. William E. Hall. Assistant Chief of Staff for Reserve Forces, Office of the Chief of Staff, USAF.

Advisory: Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management) or his designated representative, Lyle S. Garlock.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Air Force Budget Advisory Committee were members of the Air Force in uniform, who were holding very responsible positions in the Air Force, and certainly ought to have known its overall requirements.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to call this passage, in particular, to the attention of the Senate—Senator SALTONSTALL was still addressing General Twining:

Now, as Chief of Staff, I trust it is a fair question to ask you if this committee determined to increase the budget allowance over and above the estimates of the Secretary of Defense and the President this year, say $500 million, where would you believe that could be best spent? If we decided to increase it by $1 billion, where, as Chief of Staff, would you decide that could be best spent?

In other words, what is your highest priority today in your opinion as Chief of Staff of the Air Force?

General TWINING. I think first, including the present supplemental, that our aircraft program is satisfactory.

That was General Twining's answer. I continue:

If I had the money, I would put it on air bases and do something to keep those people in the service, like better housing, and things like that. I consider the aircraft program satisfactory.

At first, according to his testimony in the hearings, General Twining said that he would stress experienced trained personnel, then airbases, but that aircraft production was satisfactory. A few minutes later he corrected this by stating he would place research and development ahead of aircraft production. I am certain my good friend from Massachusetts will agree that there is enough in the budget, according to the witnesses who appeared before us, to handle all the research the military deems necessary during the coming fiscal year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think, to be absolutely accurate, General Twining stated as his third priority that he believed he could use from $150 million to $200 million more for research.

Mr. ELLENDER. But he did not express dissatisfaction with the amount the committee provided. He said that in the event the amount were increased and the money were made available, he could spend it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. But he did not complain about the amount which we were providing.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. He did not complain about the budget; on the contrary, he said it was satisfactory.

In presenting the budget, General LeMay had this to say in his presentation before the committee:

It was apparent that the procurement of such a force within this time period was very improbable, but of more concern was the likelihood that even if we were provided such a force we would be unable to man and support it properly. In other words, we could not absorb it without emergency procedures. Consequently, we have been focusing our attention on the force structure which we and industry can support, which the Air Force and the Nation can produce and absorb without emergency measures and which will give us the greatest deterrent capability practical for the time period.

(Discussion off the record.)

That was General LeMay talking about the budget which he submitted to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is true that General LeMay made a personal plea for what he thought should be done. Let me read from page 1250 of the hearings:

I think you will find that all military men will agree that no military task can be undertaken in these modern days until you have air superiority—until you have won the airpower battle. No military task can be undertaken until that is accomplished. Therefore, we should buy first things first and put into the hands of the military the weapons that will win this airpower battle. It is going to be of very short duration. If you win it, then you can go on and do whatever else is necessary and have plenty of time to build those forces and build them up. If you lose it, those other forces will do you no good if you have them.

In other words, Mr. President, it is his belief that only SAC can win the war, should it come.

He is sold on that idea. He thinks that if SAC is properly equipped, we can end a war shortly after it begins. He is very much impressed with that. I am not disagreeing with him, because I do not know, but I do say that the Joint Chiefs disagreed with him, and I am willing to accept their judgment.

General LeMay made his budget estimate; he took into consideration the task which had been set before him, and stated that task could be accomplished in accord with the capability of our Nation to produce and absorb

without emergency measures, without having to build extra plants which would cost hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Louisiana will admit, will he not, that General LeMay is the head of the Strategic Air Command?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So General LeMay is a military officer charged with the defense of the country and the security of the country. In this particular instance General LeMay, as the head of Strategic Air Command, has the responsibility of trying to do everything he can for the security of the country and for the national defense.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question about that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is no question about that.

Mr. ELLENDER. General Taylor is charged with the same thing, and Admiral Burke is charged with the same thing.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So is General Partridge.

Mr. ELLENDER. So is General Partridge, and so are all of them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that General LeMay recommended, for his own Strategic Air Command functions, $3,800,000,000?

Mr. ELLENDER. Three billion eight hundred million dollars represented his original budget.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say to my good friend that what General LeMay said was in agreement with General Twining's testimony as to how the extra appropriation was to be spent, and it was not all to be for airplanes. He put airplanes in the third category.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly. He wanted manpower.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. That is the problem, not airplanes. That is why, as I shall point out in a few moments, I am opposed to the provisions of the bill which provide $800 million for aircraft procurement and——

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me assure the Senator from Louisiana that no one has greater respect for his intellectual integrity than I have.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know the Senator from Louisiana is opposed to that proposal; but, after General LeMay gave his testimony, and as brought out by the Senator from Louisiana when he read the report, the committee, at the instance of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], instead of allowing $3,800,000,000 thought that production could be kept up by providing $1,160,000,000, or one-third of what General LeMay asked for. Is not that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. I beg to differ on that point, because General LeMay stated, as I understood him, that if there was an increase in the production of B–52's, emergency measures would have to be taken. It would mean a broadening of our plant structure, the erection of more plants, and other expensive expanions. That is the way I understood it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am sure the Senator understood it that way.

In this morning's press, and even in the afternoon or the early editions of the afternoon press, we have seen published statements from General Twining, who also testified, and who called the budget estimates austere. That means tight, or not enough. Anyone who has a simple understanding of the word "austerity" knows that is exactly what it means—not enough. General Twining made that statement. The morning press and the afternoon press tell us what type of airplanes or aircraft he was shown in Soviet Russia.

I do not care a thing about what Secretary Wilson thinks of the Senator from Louisiana or myself——

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not, either.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The only justification for the increase is that we are taking seriously the idea of national security and defense.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am taking it very seriously. I was convinced by the testimony I heard, and the testimony I read, that we are now providing all that it is within our capability to produce, and which the Joint Chiefs of Staff feel is necessary. I would not be at all surprised if, by the time the year is ended, the B–52 became obsolete, just as the B–36 did.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But for the moment the B–52 is the best we have.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have never opposed requests for any amount which could economically be used for research and development. The Senator knows that to be so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is true. The committee reduced the recommendation of General LeMay for research and development from $200 million to $100 million. The Senator knows that. Now, if we do not take seriously this situation of national security and defense, then every cent requested should be refused. But, if we do take this question seriously, we should not look at the dollars and cents alone, because the chairman of the subcommittee is convinced that the American people are more interested in national security and defense than they are in the dollars and cents involved.

Has the Senator from Louisiana heard from one of his constituents, or from one of my constituents, or from anyone anywhere in the country, that this is too much for national security?

Mr. ELLENDER. When I explain to them that Congress has already provided so much money that the funds appropriated could not even be obligated—and this year the Defense Department is ending up with over $12 billion that could not even be obligated—I am sure they will agree with me that we should not appropriate another billion dollars. That is my answer to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand that.

Mr. ELLENDER. In the same vein, General LeMay took this position and said this in answer to the question of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and I quote the Senator from New Mexico:

> May I interrupt at this point? That is what we can build. Is that what we should build or should we have some more?
>
> General LEMAY. We could build more, but it does no good to build just airplanes unless you have bases, people, and support to adequately operate them and take care of them.

That is the situation.

As I shall point out, of the $1 billion being requested, $800 billion is to build new airplanes, for which General LeMay says we shall not have a sufficient number of people to operate.

Now, going back to the amendment itself, let us look at the various appropriations involved in the suggested increase of $1,160,000,000—which, by the way, is in the bill at present. We have $200 million recommended for military construction. The only explanation offered by the committee for this is the following which I quote from the committee report:

> The committee recommends an appropriation at this time of $200 million for "Military construction, Air Force," in order to provide needed funds for bases so as to make larger aircraft operational. Total military construction requests for 1957 for the Air Force amount to $1,228,000,000, and have not yet been acted upon by the Congress. In recommending an immediate appropriation of $200 million the committee acts on the assumption that a like amount will be deducted from the appropriation request for military construction in the supplemental appropriation bill, 1957.

I ask my colleagues, why should we now provide the $200 million appropriation when we have not as yet passed on the authorization? Even if we should vote for the $200 million, a start could not be made until the military public works bill is passed by the Senate. I say we are getting ahead of ourselves. We ought to wait until the military public works bill comes before us, and then put in a supplemental appropriation bill not only the $200 million which is requested, but any amount necessary and which may be justified by the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I frankly do not understand what would be gained by appropriating the $200 million at this time. The total $1,228,000,000 for Air Force construction is expected to be before the appropriations committee for action within the next week or 2. The funds involved cannot be used prior to the beginning of the new fiscal year. At most, therefore, we might make these funds available a few days earlier than would otherwise be the case if we followed orderly procedures and considered all military public works at one time.

Next, it is recommended that money for "Operation and maintenance" be increased by $40 million over the amount requested. The only explanation offered by the committee is that—

> An additional $40 million has been added to the bill to support the increased operational and force buildup.

We have no evidence to enable us to determine whether that amount is sufficient or whether it is too large or too small.

In this connection, we may recall that the amount requested in the budget for this appropriation item was approximately $400 million less than the amount originally recommended by the air staff. As the House Appropriations Committee pointed out, however, even this amount involved an increase of more than $608 million, or 19.2 percent, over the amount available in 1956. Since there is little indication that the level of Air Force activity in 1957 is to be some 20 percent above that of the current year, the amounts requested in the budget should certainly be adequate without the further increase of $40 million recommended by the committee.

Mr. President, all afternoon we have heard debate about the bases we have built in Iceland and the bases we have built in North Africa, and it has been stated that they are in danger of being lost. Yet General LeMay and others have recommended that many more be built throughout the world.

It seems to me that before we undertake a building program of that kind, we should evaluate the present situation. As I have previously stated, we have many bases in north Africa. I visited all of them. We also have bases in Japan and in Formosa, and we are building some in Spain. I believe that before we consider constructing more bases of this sort, we should determine the extent to which we can save the ones we have there now, because such bases cost large sums of money. As I recall, the amount spent for these bases alone was almost $3 billion. So, Mr. President, before we undertake to build more overseas bases, we certainly should look into the feasibility of trying to make our present bases more secure, of having our bases built on property which we can rest assured will continue to be available for our use.

Next, Mr. President, $20 million is recommended for "Military personnel." Again, the committee report merely states:

> The increase of $20 million is provided for additional personnel needed to implement an augmented Air Force.

Apparently, Mr. President, this implies that the number of Air Force military personnel is to be increased by some 4,900 from the 963,000 requested in the budget and recommended by the Air Force itself. This is particularly confusing, since the various Air Force witnesses testified that their problem was to get and to retain experienced technical personnel, rather than to increase the total numbers involved. Furthermore, this strength of 936,000 was recommended by the Air Force itself, as against an approved manpower ceiling of 975,000, and undoubtedly represents the best judgment of the Air Force as to the numbers of men it needs and can obtain next year.

Mr. President, General LeMay, as well as General Twining and other witnesses, assigned top priority to the funds necessary in order to obtain good technicians, men who can take care of the aircraft and can fly them. They say the way to do that is to increase pay scales; undoubtedly some of the three-billion-and-some-odd-thousand dollars which General LeMay recommends is to be used for that purpose, and also to provide more fringe benefits, and so forth.

I return to the point that General Twining listed the construction of aircraft as fourth in priority; and General LeMay classified it as third. The rest of the money requested was for research and development, for better housing and better pay, so as to retain the needed technical personnel.

Next, Mr. President, an increase of $100 million is recommended by the committee for Research and Development, over the amount requested for 1957. Again, only a generalized statement is offered to explain this increase, namely:

> The added funds are provided in order to expedite the research and development program of the Air Force.

Of course, research and development should be given high priority. However, there is a definite limit to the amount of profitable research which can be carried on. The President's budget request for $610 million for Air Force research and development is $40 million more than the amount available in 1956. Furthermore, the emergency fund of the Secretary of Defense contains $135 million which can be transferred to the military departments for research and development; it is reasonable to assume that the Air Force would receive from this source substantial amounts to augment the $610 million requested directly for the Air Force.

Mr. President, I note that the committee has recommended in section 635 language which would make the appropriations which are available for major procurement of aircraft and missiles also available to cover the expenses of development. This will certainly add measurably to the funds available for research and development, without the additional $100 million proposed by the committee.

Finally, Mr. President, the committee has recommended adding $800 million for aircraft and related procurement, over the $6,048,500,000 requested for this purpose in the budget. The committee report states:

> These additional funds are to be used primarily for increasing the production of heavy bombers for the Strategic Air Command. At the same time, should it be deemed advisable, part of these added appropriations are available for increased production of fighter aircraft for the continental defense.

Mr. President, I do not consider myself qualified to discuss in any detail the question of whether we should continue procuring more and more aircraft of types which may be partially obsolescent by the time they are delivered or which may be superseded by guided missiles; or the question of whether the Air Force could, in fact, actually absorb such additional aircraft. Again, I simply refer to page 1278 of the printed hearings, where General Twining responded to the questions ably put to him by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] concerning the priorities he would assign if the committee determined to increase the budget allowance over the estimates presented to the Congress. General Twining replied without qualification as follows:

> I think, first, including the present supplemental, that our aircraft program is satisfactory. If I had the money—

And, Mr. President, let me say here that all the armed services want more money; we cannot find any of them that could not spend more money somewhere—

> I would put it on airbases and do something to keep these people in the service, like better housing and things like that. I consider the aircraft program is satisfactory.

Mr. President, in view of the above-mentioned facts, I do not believe that the committee's recommendations to increase the Air Force appropriations above the amounts requested in the budget can be justified. On the same basis, there is no particular justification for the amendment to increase the amount by $500 million. The only virtue I can find in the latter proposal is that it is less than the amount the committee has recommended.

Mr. President, that concludes my presentation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation and explanation entitled "Activities Supporting the Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation Program in the Department of Defense," to which I referred earlier in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTIVITIES SUPPORTING THE RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION PROGRAM IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The introduction of improved weapons and military equipment into the combat and combat support forces of the Army, Navy and Air Force is a complicated process covering many different, although related, activities which must be completed before a new weapon or item of military equipment can be considered as fully developed in a military sense. From a military standpoint, a new item cannot be considered as fully developed until it is capable of performing an assigned combat mission, and has been assigned for operational use by the combat or combat support forces. The lines between research, development, and procurement cannot be drawn precisely, particularly in areas of rapidly advancing technology. For purposes of budgetary presentation, a narrowly construed definition has been used for research and development, which does not give the full measure of our research, development, test, and evaluation effort. Thus, while the fiscal year 1957 budget requests a total of over $1.6 billion for the category specifically identified as research and development, it can reasonably be estimated from currently available data that the funds for research and development plus funds for activities directly supporting the research, development, test and evaluation program aggregate about $5.2 billion for fiscal year 1957. This may be compared with an estimated $3.4 billion in fiscal year 1955 and $3.8 billion in fiscal year 1956 for the same purposes. The estimates of funds programed for research, development, test, and evaluation in fiscal

year 1955, fiscal year 1956, and fiscal year 1957 are derived as follows:

1. New obligational authority, research and development appropriations:

[Millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1957
Army	$366.3	$421.3	$410
Navy	434.4	474.2	493
Air Force	420.4	598.0	610
Emergency fund	(1)	(1)	[2] 135
Total	1,221.1	1,493.5	1,648

[1] Transfers included in Army, Navy, and Air Force figures.
[2] Includes $50 million transfer authority.

2. Supporting activities directly related to research and development: Certain of the requirements in direct support of the research and development program are not included in the research and development appropriations, but are included in other appropriations which provide the same general type of support for all military programs. These include military construction, industrial facilities financed under procurement appropriations and the pay and allowances of military personnel. On the basis of detailed program data, the amounts in these appropriations that are directly related to the activities financed under the research and development appropriations are estimated as follows:

[Millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1957
(a) Military construction:			
Army	1.9	8.0	43.1
Navy	9.7	63.0	55.9
Air Force	109.3	98.5	224.9
Subtotal	120.9	169.5	323.9
(b) Industrial facilities:			
Army			
Navy			34.5
Air Force	45.2	88.1	52.7
Subtotal	45.2	88.1	87.2
(c) Military personnel:			
Army	35.9	40.7	46.3
Navy	41.5	43.4	43.8
Air Force	100.8	103.8	106.2
Subtotal	178.2	187.9	196.3
(d) Department of Defense total:			
Military construction	120.9	169.5	323.9
Industrial facilities	45.2	88.1	87.2
Military personnel	178.2	187.9	196.3
Total	344.3	445.5	607.4
Army	37.8	48.7	89.4
Navy	51.2	106.4	134.2
Air Force	255.3	290.4	383.8

3. Items under development, test, and evaluation: Many of the programs for developing new weapons and military equipment have, as the result of previous years research efforts, reached a stage where it is necessary to procure preliminary production items in limited quantities for test and evaluation as to:

(a) The soundness of the engineering design;

(b) The feasibility of the production design; and

(c) The operational suitability of weapons or equipment from a military standpoint, prior to standardization for operational use and large scale production for issue or inventory.

Major engineering changes and improvements must be made in new developments, provisionally accepted for limited production and use, to satisfy the need for achieving early operational capabilities with the most modern weapons attainable in support of national security policy. All procurement items which have been standardized or otherwise approved for service use within the military departments have been excluded from the following estimates. Procurement items which are not standardized, to the extent they can be identified at this time, are considered as being under development and are estimated as follows:

[Millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1957
(a) Aircraft:			
Army			
Navy	60.4	10.9	305.8
Air Force	755.3	152.4	216.1
Subtotal	815.7	163.3	521.9
(b) Guided missiles:			
Army	168.7	83.0	453.0
Navy	70.0	104.3	146.5
Air Force	418.4	810.9	1,266.2
Subtotal	657.1	998.2	1,865.7
(c) Ships:			
Army			
Navy	41.7	177.6	153.6
Air Force			
Subtotal	41.7	177.6	153.6
(d) Other:			
Army	39.7	165.2	100.0
Navy	26.0	33.1	48.9
Air Force	246.2	292.7	249.1
Subtotal	311.9	491.0	398.0
(e) Department of Defense total:			
Aircraft	815.7	163.3	521.9
Guided missiles	657.1	998.2	1,865.7
Ships	41.7	177.6	153.6
Other	311.9	491.0	398.0
Total	1,826.4	1,830:1	2,939.2
Army	208.4	248.2	553.0
Navy	198.1	325.9	654.8
Air Force	1,419.9	1,256.0	1,731.4

4. Summary: The identifiable amounts programed in the fiscal year 1957 budget for research and development, and in support of the research, development, test, and evaluation program can be summarized as follows:

[Millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1957
(a) Army:			
Research and development	366.3	421.3	410.0
Activities supporting research and development	37.8	48.7	89.4
Development, test, and evaluation items	208.4	248.2	553.0
Subtotal	612.5	718.2	1,052.4
(b) Navy:			
Research and development	434.4	474.2	493.0
Activities supporting research and development	51.2	106.4	134.2
Development, test, and evaluation items	198.1	325.9	654.8
Subtotal	683.7	906.5	1,282.0
(c) Air Force:			
Research and development	420.4	598.0	610.0
Activities supporting research and development	255.3	290.4	383.8
Development, test, and evaluation items	1,419.9	1,256.0	1,731.4
Subtotal	2,095.6	2,144.4	2,725.2
(d) Interservice (emergency fund)			135.0
(e) Department of Defense total:			
Research and development	1,221.1	1,493.5	1,648.0
Activities supporting research and development	344.3	445.5	607.4
Development, test, and evaluation items	1,826.4	1,830.1	2,939.2
Total	3,391.8	3,769.1	5,194.6
Army	612.5	718.2	1,052.4
Navy	683.7	906.5	1,282.0
Air Force	2,095.6	2,144.4	2,725.2
Interservice (emergency fund)			135.0

5. Items not estimated: In addition to the above program items which could be identified from data presently available, there are other activities of the Department of Defense and the three military departments which provide significant support to the research and development programs, but which have not been included because the amounts applicable to the research and development program cannot be readily identified. These items include, but are not limited to, the following:

(a) Departmental administrative costs.

(b) The regular operating and maintenance cost of military ships, aircraft, and troop units used in conducting tests.

(c) The pay and allowances of military personnel attached to regular military units used in conducting tests other than specific operational evaluation organizations.

(d) Costs which are part of production contracts required for the further development of standardized items which must be adapted to other uses or improved in performance.

(e) The regular military costs, associated with operational and training units, required in the process of phasing out obsolete weapons and phasing in improved weapons, such as the changeover from propeller driven aircraft to turbojet aircraft.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a brief statement?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. First, let me commend the Senator from Louisiana upon the care with which he has built up his argument, for his faithful attendance upon the committee's hearings, and for his knowledge of the subject.

The Senator from Louisiana has made a statement about the proposed increase in the amount of $500 million. As one who advocated that amendment, let me say that I agree with the Senator from Louisiana that the budget as a whole is carefully worked out, and is the budget of the administration.

In the Department of Defense, particularly in the Air Force, there are a number of persons who say that additional funds can reasonably be spent for research. There is ample testimony on that point.

Then there is the question of funds for maintenance and operation. The funds available for that purpose may run short during the year. So there is some justification for the appropriation for that purpose of an additional amount of $30 million.

In the case of personnel, we wish to build up the strength of our technical personnel; all of us agree on that point.

So the issue resolves itself to the procurement of aircraft and whether the procurement of more aircraft should be provided for in this year's budget.

According to my view of the matter, although in that case the budget itself will provide for procurement of the aircraft the Air Force says it needs and says it can get along with, even though General LeMay and General Partridge feel they could use more—and probably they could use more—yet General Twining and Secretary Quarles say they are satisfied.

It is an austere budget, and the funds available for aircraft production must be figured very closely. Therefore, if we appropriate an additional $350 million, there will be a certain degree of flexibility which will allow the Air Force a little more leeway in building B–52's, if that is the thing to do, or in building aircraft of other types, if that is the thing to do. At any rate, such an additional appropriation will give the Air Force a little more flexibility from the present very austere budget, from a banking point of view, in paying for aircraft procurement. In my view, that is the argument in favor of making an increase of $500 million, instead of an increase of $1,162,000,000, as recommended by a majority of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the President of the United States and the Joint Chiefs of Staff present us with a new budget estimate for such an additional amount—and let me say that I assume that when General Twining returns from Russia, he will have a great deal to say—then it may be necessary to increase the budget. But I do not see the necessity for increasing the budget at this time, in view of the fact—as I have pointed out—that even with amounts recommended by the military, there will be more than $12 billion of unobligated funds at the end of the next fiscal year.

The only thing an increase in the budget would achieve, may I say to my good friend from Massachusetts, would be further to increase the amounts of unobligated year-end balances. The Senator knows that I have constantly taken the position that the armed services should not come before us and ask for more money than they can spend. As I have pointed out on many occasions, the fact that they have so much money to spend leads to the purchase of a great many supplies that are far beyond the capacity of our armed services to use.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator speaks about the unobligated balances. About $2½ billion of the unobligated balance is in the 1957 budget. In other words, in round figures, they are asking for $36.8 billion, and they are adding $2.5 billion, which makes a total of $38.8 billion, in round figures.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but if we add to that amount the unobligated balances from the previous year we will end the year for which we are appropriating money, as I pointed out, with almost $12 billion unobligated. Nine billion dollars of it is actual cash on hand, so to speak, and the remainder is to be earned from the sale of hardware through MDAP.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. When the figure goes below $10 billion of unobligated balances in the entire Department of Defense, we get down to a position which is estimated to be about as low as it should get. In other words, that figure represents the bank balance. How much they can go below $10 billion is a question which has not been determined.

Mr. ELLENDER. Secretary Wilson stated to us last year that he intended to continue whittling away at the figure until he got it down to $5 billion or $6 billion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think that is a little low.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure that an amount of that size would be far more than the amount really necessary to carry as unobligated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think he now estimates that $8 billion or $9 billion would be the appropriate figure, rather than $5 billion or $6 billion.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9852) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. FREAR, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. BUSH conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9052) to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. FREAR, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. BUSH conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, legislation authorizing Federal aid for school construction has been pending before the Senate and the Congress since the first days of 1955. We have had 2 sets of proposals from the administration—1 impossible and 1 just inadequate. Other legislative formulations have also been pending on the same subject both in the House and the Senate.

I am myself deeply committed to the general proposition of Federal aid for school construction. I believe in it with all my heart and I am, indeed, a cosponsor of a legislative formulation introduced last year by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, which has jurisdiction over legislation on this subject.

Last year that committee, of which I am proud to be a member, held extensive hearings on all the legislative proposals on this matter that were before us. The Education and Labor Committee of the House has even more recently held extensive hearings on the same subject. The House committee has reported a bill, and the Rules Committee has granted a rule. Consideration of this legislation in the House is scheduled to begin this week.

It has taken 2 years to move this legislation to even this point of consideration. We here all know—although I doubt whether the general public knows—why this legislation has moved so slowly and hesitantly, despite the fact that it is "must" legislation, so labeled by the President of the United States and the majority leadership of both the House and the Senate.

The reason for the delay and hesitation on legislation for Federal aid for school construction, despite the great need and the overwhelming public support for it, has been the fear in both the House and Senate of confronting an antisegregation amendment.

The fear has been commonly expressed that if such an amendment is offered, it will set off an explosive debate and a filibuster in the Senate, and will interfere with the rest of the legislative program in the Senate. I am afraid that there may have been other and less worthy motives involved, too.

Mr. President, I favor an antisegregation amendment quite as much as I favor the basic legislation itself—and I have been a supporter of Federal aid for education and have fought for it ever since I became a Member of the Senate and for many years before that.

As soon as the question was raised last year I announced that I would support an antisegregation amendment and that I would, in fact, submit one and do my best to insure that such an amendment comes to a vote in the Senate.

On numerous occasions since then I have said the same thing, on the floor of the Senate, to the press and in public speeches. I gave my pledge that I would submit such an amendment, would support it, and fight for it.

That is my intention still and, indeed, my determination, as we face the prospect and the necessity of considering and debating school aid legislation in the days and weeks ahead.

But at this point, Mr. President, I feel that it is desirable to let the Senate know exactly what is in my mind—speaking only for myself—when I refer to an antisegregation amendment. Many different versions of such an amendment, representing radically different approaches and even radically different concepts, have been suggested during the past 2 years. Indeed, there has been a progressive evolution of thinking in regard to this amendment on my part and on the part of others to whom this subject has been of primary concern.

These developments in approach and concept have followed, in a general way, the developing pattern of compliance with and resistance to the Supreme Court decision and decree in the school segregation cases.

This pattern has now taken definite shape, in its broad outlines, although changes in detail are occurring in different parts of the country almost every day.

The amendment which I have worked out is designed to meet the situation as it has actually developed, and as it is expected to continue to develop in the months ahead. I do not claim perfection of language for my amendment. But I do submit it as my contribution to our thinking on this crucial subject.

It is my impression that the public generally and even the Senate has a mistaken impression of what most of us mean today—and certainly of what I mean—in referring to an antisegration amendment. The general impression is that we mean an amendment to the school aid bill that would undertake to force desegration or at the least, compliance with the Supreme Court decision and decree.

Mr. President, deeply as I desire to see total desegregation come about without a moment's needless delay, I doubt whether the school-aid bill is an appropriate vehicle to enforce this purpose. Nor do I believe it would be possible to draft an amendment to the school-aid bill which would of itself achieve this result. It would be like trying to stop a rampaging bull elephant with a bean-shooter.

No, Mr. President, I do not propose, in this measure, that we try to prohibit segregation or enforce the decision of the Supreme Court.

That has been shown to be far too complex and immeasurably difficult a matter to be handled so casually and simply.

What I propose, Mr. President, is simply to restrain the Federal Government from aiding and abetting segregation and from helping to deepen the segregation pattern which so many States are trying in such a herculean manner to eradicate.

I propose, Mr. President—and I shall go into some further detail in a moment—a legislative formula which will permit the Federal Government to aid those States which are making these efforts, in some cases against stubborn local defiance, and those localities which are making such efforts, in some cases against the opposition of the State administrations. My purpose, in essence, is to see to it that the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government should not work in opposition to the mandate of the Constitution and the direction being charted by the Supreme Court and being followed by the lower courts in bringing about compliance with the basic law of the land.

I propose a law-and-order amendment, not to enforce law and order, and observance of the Constitution, but to prevent the Federal Government from being an accomplice in the violation of law and order and of the Constitution.

Strongly as I feel on the subject, I shall not even begin to undertake, in the course of these remarks today, to make the arguments for the Constitution, for the Supreme Court decision, for the observance of law and order, for desegregation and against the present practices in certain States and localities in maintaining segregated schools and defying the law of the land. These I will make at another time.

My purpose today is to set forth my concept of what an appropriate antisegregation amendment should be, rather than to give the reasons why my amendment should be adopted. I will leave the major arguments for its adoption to that day when I offer and call up my amendment.

I know that among the opponents of such an amendment are people of good will who are fundamentally committed to the cause of law and order and the Constitution, who recognize and accept the decision of the Supreme Court in the school segregation cases and even some who are strongly opposed on both moral and legal grounds to the practice of segregation.

Their opposition is mainly directed toward the offering of an antisegregation amendment. They feel that such an amendment threatens the legislative prospects of the school-aid bill itself. They fear a filibuster in the Senate. They fear finally that such an amendment will be supported by the opponents of any school-aid legislation in order to induce a filibuster and stop the school-aid bill.

Mr. President, I do not think anyone can accuse me of being less than wholehearted in my support of school-aid legislation. I doubt whether any member of the Senate has supported the cause of Federal aid to education more consistently, and more strongly, than I. I agree as to the high importance of this legislation, for the sake of our children and for the sake of the Nation.

But, Mr. President, I feel that the cause of law and order represents an even higher principle. I believe, moreover, that it is morally reprehensible for the Federal Government, in its efforts to improve the level of education by building more school facilities to aid and abet the defiance of law and order, and to help educate more children in the illegal practice of segregation.

Mr. President, I do not fear a filibuster. I am not sure a filibuster will develop. I think we are going to have a very high level, if somewhat prolonged, debate on this subject when this bill reaches the floor of the Senate, after which I hope we shall be able to proceed to a vote.

I have formulated an amendment which is, in my judgment, the height of reasonableness, containing what I feel to be the minimal requirements—and they are very mild ones indeed—governing the payment by the Federal Government to the States and localities of school-construction money which is raised by the taxation of all the people, regardless of race, color, or creed.

The State of New York and its people pay about 20 percent of the taxes which will be devoted to this program of Federal grants to the 48 States. The people of my State will not willingly pay such taxes if their money is to be used to deepen a segregation pattern that is both violative of the Constitution and repugnant to their sense of moral values.

As I have said, I do not fear a filibuster on this amendment. I think the Senate can force a vote on this legislation, if there is the will to do so. And I believe there is the will to do so, both in the Senate and in the country at large.

Mr. President, the lower courts are handling the matter of compliance with the Supreme Court decision and decree in the letter and spirit of that decision and that decree. It will admittedly be a long and drawn-out process to bring about completely the end of segregation in the schools. Scores of different legal devices have been improvised and still more are undoubtedly going to be improvised in efforts to evade and avoid compliance.

A jungle of laws and executive orders has already sprung up in some of the Southern States designed actively to prevent, evade, and even penalize compliance. On the other hand, some States are doing nothing but watching and waiting, letting their localities do what they will about desegregation. Still other State administrations are moving actively to desegregate their schools. And some of these are meeting strong opposition on the part of some localities.

Perhaps it would be desirable to enact comprehensive legislation to supplement the efforts of the Court in enforcing the law and in meeting the varied and variable situations which have arisen and will yet arise. Obviously, the situation is very complex and changes from day to day, and any legislation to implement and enforce the pertinent prohibition of the 14th amendment would have to be most carefully drawn and carefully considered.

I do not have such a bill in mind even in its general outlines, although I think it would be good idea. I want to emphasize that the amendment I am talking about today has no such intent and purpose. And until such comprehensive legislation is drafted and enacted, the courts must continue to bear their present burden of responsibility for effectuating the intent of the Constitution.

The President of the United States, and the executive branch, also have a major responsibility in this regard. It is the President's duty to enforce the laws of the United States. Thus far there has been no move by the President to discharge this responsibility and perform this duty, in regard to the Constitution and its prohibition against segregated schools.

It has been suggested that the President might very properly take into consideration, in disbursing the moneys we expect to vote for school construction, his sworn duty to support the Constitution and enforce the laws of the land. But I have seen no indication, despite repeated representations made to him on this score, that he intends to discharge his responsibility and duty in this connection.

It must be conceded that it would be very difficult for the President or his commissioner of education to determine, with regard to every school district in the land, whether each one is, in fact, proceeding in good faith and with deliberate speed to undertake the process of desegregation, in accordance with the constitutional and Supreme Court mandate. It must be conceded that this would require a vast investigative, adjudicative and administrative machinery to gather the facts, assess them and act on the basis of them, in awarding the grants to be provided under the Federal aid legislation.

I think my amendment would avoid this difficulty. It would provide a guide and a standard for the President and the commissioner of education and would make it unnecessary for the executive branch to duplicate the work of the courts in this regard.

It is to be remembered—and emphasized—that the whole school aid program is an emergency program. It is a 2-year program, a one-shot program. Once the money authorized is expended in the form of grants, the program will be finished. Except under the very special circumstances of clear violation of the terms of the agreements to be entered into between the Federal Government and the States, there will be no way of recapturing the money granted.

So, Mr. President, it is vital that the conditions for receiving the money in the first place be clearly stipulated. And the school-aid legislation we will be considering already sets forth many such conditions and requirements, all of which are to be included, in the case of each State, in a State plan, which is to be subject to the approval of the Federal Commissioner of Education.

My amendment, Mr. President, very simply includes among the conditions and requirements to be set forth in the State plan by the designated State agency which is to handle the program in each State, a certification that the money granted will be used in projects in conformity with the Constitution and the applicable decisions of the Supreme Court prohibiting discrimination based on race and color.

This requirement does not go beyond the Supreme Court decision, thus involving only a certification of what the Court defined as good faith efforts, with deliberate speed, to desegregate, in regard to the schools to be built or improved with the funds authorized by this legislation.

My amendment does not propose judgment or the assessment of past policies or practices in regard to segregation, but only those designed for application to the schools which would be improved or built with the Federal funds now proposed to be paid to the States and the local school districts.

If the designated State agency could not or would not make such a certification, the funds which would otherwise be allocated to that State would be held in escrow until such a certification could be and was made.

To meet the case of States where some localities are proceeding in good faith to desegregate and some are refusing or are resisting, my amendment provides that the designated State agency can enter a certification for those localities which are moving in good faith, with the appropriate speed, in a lawful direction, and which can receive an appropriate grant. In such cases, the remaining money that would otherwise be allocated to defiant school districts in that State would be kept in escrow until the proper certification can be made for those districts, too.

The third and final provision in my amendment is designed to meet the situation where the State agency refuses or is unwilling or unable to make the required certification for any school district in the State, but where there are individual school districts which are themselves willing and able to make such a certification. In these cases, the school districts in question could submit a certification directly to the Federal Government, together with a fulfillment of other requirements of the law, and if they submit a plan which is otherwise acceptable, they will be eligible to receive proportionate grants. In such a case the remainder of the money for that State would be held in escrow until the State agency is ready and willing to submit a certification and a plan.

Mr. President, that is all there is to my amendment. It is simple. It is narrowed to its absolute essentials. It is mild. It is not punitive, repressive, onerous or coercive. I believe it should be acceptable to the overwhelming majority of the Southern States, as well as to the North.

I hope my amendment will be carefully scrutinized and discussed by my colleagues. I hope that if they have constructive suggestions as to either language or terminology, they will make such suggestions to me, in anticipation of the time when this measure will come before us in the Senate.

This amendment is drafted in relation to S. 5, the bill introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and a number of cosponsors, including myself. It may be that the House bill or some entirely different version will be before us when we finally take up, for debate and vote, this subject matter. If so, at that time, my amendment will be modified accordingly, in form, although not in principle or in substance, and also in consideration of any constructive suggestions which may be made between now and then.

I wish to emphasize again that the argument over whether it is desirable to offer an amendment on this subject at all is academic. I give notice now, as I have so frequently in the past, that I am going to offer this amendment, or a modified version thereof, if I am here when the basic legislation is called up for consideration.

I continue to reserve for future decision, depending upon parliamentary and strategic considerations, the question of whether I will offer this amendment in the Labor Committee, of which I am a member, or on the floor when the bill is called up.

I want to make sure that this amendment comes to a vote. It is a simple amendment and all who wish to do so may study it between now and when this bill comes before us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment about which I have been talking, in its tentative form as to language, be printed in the record at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, appropriately referred, and printed; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 5, after line 2, insert the following as paragraph (3) and renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly:

"Contain a certification that all school facilities intended to be provided in whole or in part thereunder will be used in conformity with the Constitution of the United States and the applicable decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States relating to discriminations based upon race or color. In the event that the State agency is unable to include as part of the State plan such a certification with respect to every local school agency within its jurisdiction applying for a project under the provisions of this act, within the time limit prescribed by the Commissioner for the submission of such plans, then only the projects of the State and such local school agencies as to which such certification is made shall be considered as part of any State plan. In the event that the State agency does not include any certification as part of the State plan within the time limit prescribed by the Commissioner for the submission of such plans, the Commissioner is authorized, with regard to any local school agency, within such State, which is able to submit such certification on its own behalf, and is otherwise qualified to receive payments under this act, upon application and appropriate certification, to regard such local school agency as a State agency and the separate local school agency plans as State plans, subject otherwise to the pertinent requirements of this section and such other requirements as the Commissioner, by regulation, may prescribe. Upon approval of such local school agency plans, allotments in such amounts as the Commissioner may determine as being fair proportionate shares of the amount that would otherwise be allotted to the State whereof the local school district is a part shall be made to such local school agency under the formulae prescribed in section 4 of this act, so far as may be applicable. In the event that any State fails to qualify, under the terms of this paragraph, for such payments in whole or in part, to which it would otherwise be entitled under the provisions of this

act, the sum or sums which would otherwise have been paid to the State shall be retained in a special fund in the Treasury, until such time as the disqualified State on its own behalf or on behalf of the disqualified local school agencies within the State is able to make the certification required by this paragraph, unless or until Congress shall otherwise dispose."

On page 8, line 2, insert after the word "thereof" the following: "or any separable part thereof as provided in paragraph (3) of subsection 5 (a)."

On page 8, line 4, insert after the word "thereof" the following: "or part thereof as provided in paragraph (3) of subsection 5 (a)."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, I congratulate the Senator from New York upon his devotion to the principle of nondiscrimination in American life, his assistance, and his ingenuity. For what it is worth, I may say that it is my intention to support the amendment offered by the Senator from New York when it is offered.

There is one question, however, I should like to ask about the technical details of the amendment which the Senator is proposing. Suppose a State certifies that it is following the decisions of the Supreme Court in this matter—decisions which, as we all know, do not require immediate desegregation, but merely progress toward desegregation—but, in fact, the State is not doing so. What powers, if any, would the Federal agency concerned—presumably the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—have in such a case?

Mr. LEHMAN. I should say it would have exactly the same powers which it now has in many similar situations in other fields. Before a State can receive financial aid for relief, for medical care, for rehabilitation, or for aid to the crippled and the blind, and similar programs, it must submit a plan to the Federal Government, as is proposed by my amendment.

The Federal Government will study the plan carefully and will either approve or disapprove it. If it approves the plan, it does so, of course, with the understanding that the plan will be carried out loyally, honestly, and fairly by the State which has entered into an agreement with the Federal Government. If the State does not carry out the plan—and this has happened in the past—the Federal Government can decide that the provisions of the agreement have not been carried out or have not been observed by the State, and can merely cut off all aid. That practice has been followed in a great many instances, as I feel certain my distinguished colleague from Illinois knows. During the time I was Governor of my State, there were some cases in which the Federal Government questioned whether the plan which had been mutually agreed to by the Federal Government and the State for Federal aid and assistance had been properly and adequately carried out.

In some instances, it was found that the plan had not been carried out by the State of New York. In that situation, steps were taken promptly to remedy the condition. But if the State had not taken such steps, the Federal Government would have been completely within its right to have cut off—and it would have had the power to do so—the Federal aid which had been agreed to in accordance with the legislation and under a plan which had been mutually approved by the State and the Federal Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New York. I suppose it is true that in the vast majority of cases the States which did not intend to abide by the decisions of the Supreme Court would not agree to certification, and therefore, in a sense, would deny themselves the Federal aid. Is not that true?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think that is absolutely true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So the amendment which the Senator from New York has submitted is in a sense self-enforcing.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is self-enforcing, except that if there is a certification, either from the State or the school districts, which is not carried out, the Federal Government can clamp down and refuse to provide assistance.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. Then, I should say, it is partially self-enforcing.

Mr. LEHMAN. My amendment seems to me to be a very simple one. It has three parts. In the first class, as I have briefly outlined the amendment, are the States which simply will not make any certification at all. In such instances, of course, the Federal Government will not make payments to those States under any legislation which is passed by Congress. But the States will not for all time forfeit such assistance. The money will be held in escrow for the States, and will be paid to them when it has been established that they are abiding by the law of the land.

The second class is composed of the States—and there are a number of them—in which some districts have complied while other districts have refused to comply. In that event, a State can simply certify to the Federal Government the districts which have complied with the law, and those districts will receive the money. The other districts will not be for all time deprived of their money. Their money simply will be placed in escrow.

Finally, there may be States which will refuse to do anything about making certification. Yet within the boundaries of that State there may be districts which feel that they will want to desegregate and that they are entitled to the Federal aid. In those cases, the individual districts concerned can make certification to the Federal Government, which will recognize them and make payments to them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New York.

FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC "REPORT ON BLACKLISTING: RADIO-TELEVISION"

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the papers today are filled with news reports and comments on a rather amazing release which has come out under the imprimatur of the Fund for the Republic. This release is in the nature of a report which has been under study for some time by a grant from the Fund for the Republic, and the report is in the nature of an attack on America's radio, television, and motion-picture industries, and also against the Congress of the United States, some of its committees, and, strangely enough, against some individual American businessmen. The attack is directed against these various targets because this report of the Fund for the Republic alleges they have been engaging in what the Fund terms "blacklisting" activities against Communists and Communist sympathizers and associates in the entertainment and advertising business.

It appears that the Fund for the Republic is rapidly endeavoring to deserve the designation of being the ugly duckling hatched from an egg laid by the Ford Foundation.

I think it is exceedingly regretful that the name of Henry Ford, a great American, and of the Ford Motor Co., a great American motorcar institution and the producer of a great automobile, and of Henry Ford II should be linked to the Fund for the Republic by virtue of the fact that its funds came from the Ford Foundation.

I can think of nothing more American than the rise of the Ford Motor Co. in our American life, or the contribution made by Henry Ford and his distinguished sons in carrying on this great private automobile company, which recently became a publicly owned automobile company by virtue of its stock being available on the stock exchange. But it is extraordinarily disquieting to realize that funds which have been accumulated through that private-enterprise system are being employed by the Fund for the Republic, a creature of the Ford Foundation, to discredit those who are engaged in trying to free Americans from the danger of the Communist menace.

So I am disturbed no end when I read that still another effort is being made today by the Fund for the Republic to give aid and comfort to the Communists both in this country and abroad.

I was impressed, however, by the splendid reporting job done by Frederick Woltman, whose reputation needs no enhancement by the present speaker, because he is recognized as one of the Nation's great reporters. Mr. Woltman, writing for the Scripps-Howard chain, has a commentary in today's Washington News, and I presume in all the other Scripps-Howard papers, relating to this report coming over the wires today from the Fund for the Republic.

He points out, in three succinct paragraphs, some of the deficiencies engaged in by the fund's report.

The first reason, as he states, is:

It can only throw confusion on a major problem of the industry which already has been straightening itself out.

He refers to the radio, television, and motion-picture industry.

That is, what to do with the actors, writers, and directors who are Communist backers or who have aided the communist cause in the past without clearing their records?

Certainly Mr. Woltman is right when he says that the fund's strange report today does add confusion to a very difficult problem.

I am happy to report, in that connection, that the radio, television, and motion-picture industry has been making very important strides in the field of cleaning up its own house. They have taken salutary action to rid the entertainment world of Communist agents. They deserve the commendation of all patriotic Americans for their efforts.

Well over 15 years ago, in the House of Representatives, I was a member of the House Committee on Un-American activities, which at that time was conducting hearings in California. I went to California on one trip with the committee in conjunction with hearings which the committee was holding. We had a great many so-called Hollywood people before our committee at that time. The American Motion Picture Producers Association was vitally interested in the problem. The American Motion Picture Producers Association was not only interested, but helpful, in correcting a situation which was at that time subjecting the American people to a whole field of pictures and programs in which the actors, actresses, and script writers, frequently were Communists, and in which Communist-slanted lines were frequently found in the productions themselves.

Actually, it was because of the concern that the Hollywood producers showed for this problem, and their desire to do something about it, that what came to be known as the Mundt-Nixon bill was born. I remember the conference in my office in which Mr. Eric Johnston, who then, as now, was president of the American Motion Pictures Producers' Association, discussed with me the problems the producers had in Hollywood when it was disclosed that one of their actors or actresses or playwrights or script writers was an agent of communism. They still could not take any direct or summary corrective action, because those who were summarily fired were able to collect damages against producers who fired them. He pointed out that if it were possible, some way or other, to have appointed a board or commission which had the power to determine what a Communist was in this country, it would then be easy for Hollywood, television companies, radio stations, advertising agencies, and anybody employing entertainment talent in America to include in the contract an abrogation clause which would make it possible to abrogate a contract once it was established that a contracting party was a Communist.

It was out of that discussion, and with the splendid cooperation of Eric Johnston, that I prepared the first draft of what ultimately became known as the Mundt-Nixon bill, a bill which passed the House and, I am happy to say, passed the Senate, and which is to be found in the legislation of the land as the first 17 sections of the Internal Security Act, which is the law of the land, despite the unsuccessful veto of President Truman.

So I recognize that many Hollywood producers have tried to clean communism out of Hollywood as best they could. To a lesser degree, but to a substantial degree, the radio and television industry has been trying to do something constructive about this problem. The industry has taken out of radio studios and from television screens some notorious Communist agents, supervisors, and propagandists. It has been helped in that effort by the work of the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Internal Security Committee of the Senate, the FBI, the American Legion, by its publication of The Firing Line, which has made available to the American public the names and positions of Communists in the entertainment world, by Counterattack which has done the same thing, and which brought the problem to a focal point, by its publication of Red Channels, a book listing the names of subversives in the entertainment business.

It is disquieting and disillusioning, therefore, when the Fund for the Republic now levels the guns of its vast tax-exempt funds against the efforts to keep Communists out of the entertainment world.

The second point Mr. Woltman makes is as follows:

> By the use of loaded expressions throughout and the selection and grouping of some facts and the omission of more salient facts, it gives a distorted and often false picture.

Certainly an organization which claims to be objective, such as the Fund for the Republic, should sue Mr. Woltman for libel if his accusations are false. I think it becomes clear from the report by the Fund for the Republic that the accusations made by Mr. Woltman are on the side of gentleness and tenderness rather than on the side of exaggeration.

Mr. Woltman's third statement is:

> Because its author, John Cogley, rubberstamps the basic philosophy of the fund's president, Robert M. Hutchins, the entire slant of the report runs counter to the mainstream of American thought today.

In my opinion, candidly and honestly, I am sure that Mr. Woltman is right when he says the mainstream of American thought today is against communism at home as well as abroad. I think it is equally proper and equally accurate to say that today the mainstream of American thought is opposed to the employment of Communists in the entertainment world.

Mr. Woltman makes some other rather interesting observations in the course of his article which is published in today's issues of the Scripps-Howard newspapers. He points out, for example, that a series of "falsifications by omission," as he calls them, occur throughout the report by the Fund for the Republic; that apparently the whole objection of the Fund for the Republic to these blacklisting techniques stems from the fact that throughout its report it refers to the "political affiliations" of organizations or to the "past political associations" of individuals, and refers to "political blacklistings," and refers to "highly controversial political views."

Mr. President, I am sure not one Member of the Senate believes that Communist activity is political activity, or that the American Communist Party is a political party. Even the Supreme Court—yes, even the present Supreme Court—has held that communism is a conspiracy, not a political party, not entitled to be considered as a political party, and not subjected, by virtue of its own existence, to the laws and regulations which govern political parties in America.

Under the Mundt-Nixon Act, we provided under special legislation that the Communist Party must report the source of its funds and how it spends them, and must publish its propaganda under the imprimatur of the Communist Party. But in this case, it has to do that as a result of the passage of the Internal Security Act, not because it was felt that the Communist Party is a political party.

But now we find that the $127,000 grant from the Fund for the Republic is used to misguide and mislead Americans, by referring to Communist activity as "political activity," and by referring to the Communist Party as a "political party," and by referring to the attempt of decent Americans to rid the entertainment world of communism as an attempt to blacklist people because of their "political affiliations" or "past political associations" or "highly controversial political views."

Mr. President, for the enlightenment of the Congress and the country, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the entire article, written so commendably by Frederick Woltman, and published today in the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT TREATS REDS LIGHTLY

(By Frederick Woltman)

NEW YORK, June 25.—The entire radio-TV industry took a shellacking today in the Fund for the Republic's first real test on the issue of communism. That is its report on blacklisting, radio-television.

While in nowise pro-Communist, the report cannot help but bring joy and comfort to the Communists.

CONCLUSION

A careful reading of the 287-page report, issued by the controversial $15 million fund created by the Ford Foundation, leaves these conclusions:

It can only throw confusion on a major problem of the industry which already has been straightening itself out. That is, what to do with the actors, writers, and directors who are Communist backers or who have aided the Communist cause in the past without clearing their records.

By the use of loaded expressions throughout and the selection and grouping of some facts and the omission of more salient facts, it gives a distorted and often false picture.

Because its author, John Cogley, rubberstamps the basic philosophy of the fund's president, Robert M. Hutchins, the entire slant of the report runs counter to the mainstream of American thought today.

For Mr. Hutchins accepts the Communist Party as a legitimate political party, not a criminal conspiracy. He has said he would not hesitate to hire a present-day party member to work for the fund if qualified.

So why should the billion-dollar radio-TV industry?

Consequently, so far as the report's concerned, communism is a minor issue.

IMPRESSION

The reader's overall impression is that of a ruthless, industrywide blacklisting operation. And its principal victims are liberals, Progressives, leftwingers, New Dealers, innocent dupes, and just plain, outspoken, independent thinkers.

Nothing could be further from the truth, according to a survey this writer made last August.

There have been injustices and stupidities in the past. But radio-TV's main concern was to avoid pushing into the living rooms of the American public people who had established records of helping the cause of communism, particularly after the outbreak of the Korean war. This, the report virtually ignores.

SAMPLE

Here is a sample of falsification-by-omission that runs through it:

The report tells of a leftwing commentator forced off the air by outside pressure. It permits him to describe himself as an Eisenhower Republican, formerly a Roosevelt Democrat.

The leftwing commentator was Johannes Steel, one of radio's chief pro-Soviet propagandists of the 1940's. This writer in 1946 described him as an all-out defender of Stalin's policies, with a special bent for Soviet worship. Mr. Steel never objected. And evidently the Fund's researchers didn't care.

"There is little evidence of Communist activity in the radio-TV field," says the report. Nor is there any evidence whatsoever in the report itself that the Cogley staff ever made a study of this question.

To dodge the main issue, whether the industry is obliged to ignore Communist records, the report resorts to a tricky device. Throughout, it talks about political affiliations, past political associations, political blacklistings, highly controversial political views.

QUESTIONNAIRE

In April 1955, in fact, the Cogley staff blanketed the industry with a questionnaire that went to the broadcasting networks, packagers, advertising agencies, sponsors, and talent agenices. The first question was: "Does your organization hold that certain political criteria should be met?"

This could only obscure the issue. Actually, no question of political views or political activities was involved. The question was Communist activities.

Release of the Cogley report today disclosed as incredible policy that the Fund for the Republic has adopted. In all of its project reports on communism and civil liberties, the Fund disclaims any responsibility for what they say.

It vouches for the integrity of the authors and for the importance of their studies. But for the record, the Fund announced that it does not take responsibility for their selection of facts or for the accuracy of their statements.

REFERENCES

This unusual policy was brought to this writer's attention. The Cogley report makes two references to this writer, both false.

A chapter called Clearance builds up the picture of a ring of clearance men who give affidavits to get suspected TV and radio artists off the hook. It lists George Sokolsky, the columnist; Victor Riesel, the labor columnist who was recently blinded by an acid-throwing thug, and this writer.

As described, the alleged practice has all the aspects of a racket. "These chief clearance men," says the report, "are often the same persons who make the damning indictment and have the power to wound and the power to heal the wound."

This writer has never given any such affidavit.

The Fund's sole authority is an unnamed public-relations expert who is quoted at length, contrary to the Fund's own firm stand against the unnamed informer.

FEATURE

In a second reference, the report states that an advertising agency executive arranged for this reporter to write a commendatory feature story about Radio Comedian Henry Morgan when the latter was in a jam in 1952.

This, too, is entirely false. This reporter wrote a piece about a radio actors' union meeting in which Mr. Morgan blasted the Reds. It was a legitimate news story. There was no arrangement, which, of course, implies some side consideration other than news value.

A telegram was sent promptly to Mr. Hutchins, asking the name of the unknown public-relations expert, in view of your well-known antipathy to nameless informers; and also for the basis of the other assertions.

Mr. Hutchins' reply quoted the Fund's disavowal of responsibility for the accuracy of any statements in the Cogley report.

"Your questions should have been directed to Mr. Cogley," the Fund's president said. "I shall be glad to transmit them to him when he returns to New York on Monday."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to point out another serious deficiency in the Fund for the Republic report, as it is carried by the wire services today, and as it appears in the Washington Post under a staff reporter article written by Warren Unna. In listing the various things included in this amazing document published today by the use of certain Americans' tax-exempt money, camouflaged into the Fund for the Republic, Mr. Unna says that a part of the Fund's attack is directed against a man by the name of Laurence A. Johnson, a Syracuse, N. Y., grocery-chain owner. It points out that the Fund for the Republic attacks Mr. Laurence A. Johnson, of Syracuse, N. Y., because he "takes action when a controversial person does appear" on the radio or on television; that Mr. Johnson "not only lends credence to the economic argument for blacklisting," but that, "generally speaking, he is the argument."

Mr. President, I can throw a little light on that matter, because I have had a long line or series of correspondence exchanges with Mr. Johnson. I first heard of him when I was addressing an annual membership meeting of the Syracuse Chamber of Commerce. In the course of my remarks, I had something to say about Communist activities in the United States and about the necessity that people in private life make certain that they do nothing to support Communist causes or Communist projects or Communist agents. During the open-forum discussion which followed my remarks, someone in the audience rose and asked, "What do you think of Mr. Johnson, of our city?"

I replied, "I do not know him. What am I supposed to think of him? Who is he? What has he done?"

Then I was told about this unique entrepreneur, Mr. Laurence A. Johnson, who began as a grocer, and who, in true American style, expanded his operations to 2 stores, and then to 3 stores, and finally became a grocery-chain owner and operator. However, the unique thing about Mr. Johnson is that a number of years ago he decided that none of the money spent in his stores, by his customers, would be used to build or extend the Communist apparatus in America. So he advertised in the newspapers and by means of placards placed in his stores that, to the best of his ability, he would not spend any of his money to buy food products publicized or propagandized by Communists or their agents; that whenever he heard or learned of some television show or radio broadcast or motion picture or some other advertising medium or some advertising agency which was utilizing Communist talent in urging the public to eat a certain product or to drink a certain product or to chew a certain product or to mix a certain product, he would immediately discontinue handling that particular product or brand of merchandise, and would not publicize it through the medium of his stores or by putting it on the counters in his stores; that he would not urge his particular customers to buy it; that, instead, that he would tell the people of Syracuse, N. Y., that to the best of his ability to determine such things, he would sell in his stores only the products which were made, publicized, and advertised by good Americans; that no other products would be sold in his stores.

That took some courage, Mr. President, because many advertising agencies have permitted a good many Communist sympathizers to creep into their talent positions and into other areas of publicity. But Mr. Johnson is a courageous American who believes that patriotism, like charity, begins at home. He believes also that, as a good American to whom the country has been good as he has expanded his activities, he has the obligation of doing what he can decently and rightfully to help discourage Communists from getting jobs in advertising agencies and to help discourage the use of Communist actors and Communist actresses on television and radio programs, as part of the advertising process in America.

To his satisfaction, and perhaps to his surprise, his stores gained customers, instead of losing them, and expanded to such extent that he has become a very important element in the grocery business of northern New York, and has become a very impressive and successful merchant in his own right.

So, Mr. President, the Ford Foundation is correct when it says that Mr. Laurence Johnson "not only lends credence to the economic argument for blacklisting" but that, "generally speaking, he is the argument," because he continues to point out that Americans should refuse to purchase products advertised by Communists. Instead of attacking him for that, however, the Ford Fund for the Republic should have praised him for it.

Mr. President, you and I could do the same if we refused, as good Americans still have the right to do, to buy automobiles advertised by Communist agencies, or refused to buy a particular kind of hardware or aluminum or brass product publicized by subversives, and simply used our own good American discretion to refuse to purchase items whose producers are so insensible to the dangers of the time that they do not pay any attention as to whether they employ Communists or good Americans among the advertising agencies and the talent which

make presentations of their product to the public.

So, Mr. President, I take a moment to salute Mr. Laurence A. Johnson. I hope his trade continues to grow. I hope it continues to expand. I hope other Americans will follow his example by refusing to sell and refusing to buy and refusing to publicize products which are publicized on the radio and television by people who are un-American, who use, to undermine the American program, the money they receive.

Mr. President, the report issued by the Fund for the Republic makes another grievous error: It seeks to defend the 10 Hollywood writers—the so-called "Hollywood 10"—who went to the Federal penitentiary because of their Communist affiliations. It proposes to defend them on the basis that none of the 159 motion pictures with which they were associated contained any important Communist propaganda.

Mr. President, I do not know what the estate of Henry Ford is giving money to the Fund for the Republic for, to spend in studying 159 old motion pictures. But they have a perfect right to do that; and if they find that there is no notorious propaganda of the Communists in those motion pictures, all well and good. But so what? They miss the point. The "Hollywood Ten" had their pockets lined with the money of Americans, by being employed in the production or the writing of the 159 motion pictures. They had their incomes expanded. They were given the wherewithall and the means and the dollars with which they could join Communist organizations and support Communist causes and employ Communist agents and help undermine freedom in America. It is not enough merely to say, "This Communist, in selling this particular automobile, did not try to sell a part of the Communist line." If, in selling the particular automobile, he received a good fee from some particular advertising employer, and used that money to help the Communist Party in New York secure agents with which to penetrate the Government and carry secrets off to Moscow to undermine our defense, that is an important danger for good Americans to try to eliminate.

It is a strange line that the Fund for the Republic asks us to buy by trying to dodge the whole issue on the theory that there is nothing particularly or notoriously bad in scripts performed by the "Hollywood Ten" in these 159 films.

I have always been curious to know how certain propaganda agencies obtained tax exemption, and certain others do not. I know that the Bureau of Internal Revenue has a difficult decision to make many times. Sometimes they seem to reject a request for tax exemption with respect to organizations which people might feel are engaged in purely educational, noncontroversial, nonpolitical activities. At other times they grant tax exemptions to organizations which some people accuse of engaging in such activities.

In an endeavor to obtain a little information I wrote a letter today to Mr. Russell C. Harrington, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in Washington, D. C., asking for the Bureau's reaction as to the tax-exempt status of the Fund for the Republic, in lieu of its notoriously consistent record of propaganda.

Whether or not the Fund for the Republic is entitled to tax exemption, I do not know, but I assume that the tax exemption screen through which it passes should be subject to the old American axiom that "what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander."

I know of certain organizations which were refused a tax-exempt status. I do not know whether the Fund for the Republic is at present being screened or scrutinized by the Bureau. If it is not, I think it should be, and I think a decision should be forthcoming. I think we should have a pretty clear-cut set of consistent standards to apply to organizations, because if the type of propaganda and the type of controversial activity engaged in by the Fund for the Republic is to be considered acceptable for a tax-exempt status, we are opening the door for the formation of a great many such organizations.

Consider the case of Mr. Johnson, of Syracuse, N. Y., for example. He is a taxpayer. I assume that if the Fund for the Republic enjoys the tax-exempt privilege to criticize him, to attack him, and to discourage customers from coming to his doors, so as to reduce the size of his economic activity, Mr. Johnson should have the right to organize a "Johnson fund" to defend himself, a "Johnson fund for freedom of entrepreneuring," prehaps—a Johnson fund with which to answer charges made by the tax-exempt Funds for the Republic.

I shall be curious to know what Mr. Harrington reports. I hope he will report promptly. I believe he has a difficult problem to resolve, but it should be resolved without delay, because this is a curious situation in which we find ourselves. Taxpayers are attacked by tax-exempt fund organizations. Obviously such taxpayers cannot defend themselves if they must spend tax dollars; but if they are free to charge off such expenses, as the Fund for the Republic uses tax-exempt money in such activities, then we have a different situation.

Good Americans are not without recourse, even under this situation. Millions of Americans want their children to see television shows and hear radio programs conducted by good Americans. Millions of Americans would like to see the motion picture industry complete its job—because it is still unfinished business— of cleaning the Reds out of Hollywood. There are millions of Americans who would like to realize that the children in their homes are not being subjected to Communist propaganda, and that the nickels, quarters, and half dollars which they pass through motion picture ticket windows will not be used further to finance Communist agents and Communist projects.

So I salute this afternoon the American Legion, which has done a grand and courageous job of exposing Communist operatives in the entertainment industry. Every week or two it publishes a periodical called the Firing Line. For the RECORD, let it be said that this publication is prepared and distributed by the national Americanism commission of the American Legion, post office box 1055, Indianapolis, Ind., and that any good American can subscribe to it. Any good American, for $3 a year, can subscribe to this publication and have it delivered to his home, or to a high-school library, or to any good American program committee of a women's club, a Legion post, or Rotary Club, a Sunday school class, or a chamber of commerce which is desirous of acquainting its neighbors with what is going on in the entertainment world. The subscription price is $3 a year. I quote from the American Legion Firing Line, issue of November 1, 1955. It points out that the American Legion, at its 37th annual national convention, held in Miami, Fla., last year, adopted a resolution which said in part:

Whereas certain moving picture theaters, legitimate stage, radio, and television industries continue to employ members of the entertainment field who have never disavowed their association with Communist organizations;

* * * * *

Therefore be it resolved by the American Legion in the 37th annual national convention assembled in Miami, Fla., October 10–13 1955, That the American Legion instruct the Americanism commission to continue its drive to rid the field of entertainment of all Red propaganda and those who support it, and to do its utmost to inform the American public that records of those in the entertainment field who have aided and abetted subversion are available in the various congressional hearings which may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents in Washington, D. C.; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion urge the American public to refuse to support at the box office these entertainers who have never made a clean break from their communistic associations; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion urge American business firms to provide in their contracts with such persons or with their employment agency that such contracts may be terminated when evidence is discovered of this continuing affiliation with such organization.

It discourages Americans from purchasing products either made by Communists or publicized or advertised by Communists. In this issue, in compliance with the convention mandate, are listed the names of those who were found to be Communists, Communist agents, or Communist dupes who were trying to foist their wares on the American people.

I ask unanimous consent to have the list, as it appears in the November 1, 1955, issue of the American Legion publication the Firing Line printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In compliance with this Convention Mandate, the National Americanism Commission has prepared and consolidated the following list of some individuals in the entertainment industry who have been identified as members of the Communist Party before the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

Albert, Sam (musician): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A and B).

Alexander, Harmon (Hy) (radio writer): Identified by Paul Marion, 1952 (A); Owen Vinson, 1952 (A); Carin Kinzel, 1953 (B); Silvia Richards, 1953 (B); and Dwight Hauser, 1953 (B).

Allen, Louis (Allan, Lewis) (playwright): Identified by Silvia Richards, 1953 (B); Leopold Atlas, 1953 (B); and Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B).

Altman, Mischa (musician): Identified by David Raksin, 1951 (A).

Ames, Robert (craft worker): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Amster, Lou (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Urcel Daniel, 1952 (A).

Babb, Sonora (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A) and George Bassman, 1952 (A).

Backus, Georgia (Mrs. Hy Alexander) (actress): Identified by Paul Marion, 1952, (A); Owen Vinson, 1952 (A); Carin Kinzel, 1953 (B); Robert Rossen, 1953 (B); Dwight Hauser, 1953 (B); Silvia Richards, 1953 (B); Roy Erwin, 1953 (B).

Barrie, Lee (singer): Identified by Owen Vinson, 1952 (A).

Barzman, Ben (writer): Identified by Leo Townsend, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Charles Daggett, 1952 (A); Stanley Roberts, 1952 (A); Roy Huggins, 1952 (A); George Glass, 1952 (A); Robert Rossen, 1953 (B); and Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B).

Barzman, Sol (writer): Identified by David A. Lang, 1953 (B); and Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B).

Beard, Cecil (cartoonist): Identified by Charlotte Darling Adams, 1953 (B).

Becker, Leon (musician): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Bein, Albert (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Bela, Nicholas (writer): Identified by Leo Townsend, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Eve Ettinger, 1951 (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Sol Shor, 1953 (B); and Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B).

Bengal, Ben (writer): Identified by Leo Townsend, 1951 (A) and Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B).

Bennett, Seymour (writer): Identified by David A. Lang, 1953 (B).

Bercovici, Leonardo (writer): Identified by Richard Collins, 1951 (A) and Edward Dmytryk, 1951 (A).

Berry, John (Jack) (director): Identified by Edward Dmytryk, 1951 (A); Frank Tuttle, 1951 (A); Stanley Roberts, 1952 (A); and Bernard Schoenfeld, 1952 (A).

Bessie, Alvah (writer): Identified by Edward Dmytryk, 1951 (A); Frank Tuttle, 1951 (A); Leo Townsend, 1951 (A); William Blowitz, 1951 (A); Isobel Lennart, 1952 (A); and Robert Rossen, 1953 (B); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Leopold Atlas, 1953 (B).

Biberman, Edward (artist): Identified by Meta Reis Rosenberg, 1951 (A); Frank Tuttle, 1951 (A); Stanley Roberts, 1952 (A); Bernyce Fleury, 1951 (B); Zachary Schwartz, 1953 (B); Harold Hecht, 1953 (B); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); and Charlotte Darling Adams, 1953 (B).

Biberman, Herbert (director): Identified by Meta Reis Rosenberg, 1951 (A); Edward Dmytryk, 1951 (A); Budd Schulberg, 1951 (A); Frank Tuttle, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); David Raksin, 1951 (A); Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A); Isobel Lennart, 1952 (A); Stanley Roberts, 1952 (A); Bernard Schoenfeld, 1952 (A); Leopold Atlas, 1953 (B); Roland W. Kibbee, 1953 (B); Danny Dare, 1953 (B); Harold Hecht, 1953 (B); Gertrude Purcell, 1953 (B); and Sol Shor, 1953 (B).

Blache, Herbert (actor): Identified by Richard Collins, 1951 (A).

Blankfort, Henry (writer): Identified by Edward Dmytryk, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Isobel Lennart, 1952 (A); Robert Rossen, 1953 (B); Carin Kinzel, 1953 (B); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Dwight Hauser, 1953 (B).

Boretz, Allen (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A) and David A. Lang, 1953 (B).

Brand, Phoebe (Mrs. Morris Carnovsky) (actress): Identified by Leo Townsend, 1951 (A); Eliz Kazan, 1952 (A); Clifford Odets, 1952 (A); and Lee J. Cobb, 1953 (B).

Bright, John (writer): Identified by Richard Collins, 1951 (A); Frank Tuttle, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A); Budd Schulberg, 1951 (A); Robert Rossen, 1953 (B); Harold Hecht, 1953 (B); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); and Roland W. Kibbee, 1953 (B).

Buchman, Harold (writer): Identified by Leo Townsend, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A); Anne Ray Frank, 1951 (A); Robert Rossen, 1953 (B); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B); Roland W. Kibbee, 1953 (B).

Buchman, Sidney (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Burke, Libby (dancer): (Investigation identifying Libby Burke as a member of the Communist Party has not been made public); (B).

Burns, Georgia (actress): Identified by Harold Hecht, 1953 (B).

Burns, Jessie (studio reader): Identified by Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A); Isobel Lennart, 1952 (A); and Danny Dare, 1953 (B); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Burnstein, Russell William (studio engineer): Identified by Babbette Lang, 1953 (B).

Burton, Val (writer): Identified by David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Roy Huggins, 1952 (A).

Butler, Hugo (writer): Identified by Frank Tuttle, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Stanley Roberts, 1952 (A); Bernard Schoenfeld, 1952 (A); Robert Rossen, 1953 (B); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); and Sol Shor, 1953 (B).

Butler. Jean (Mrs. Hugo Butler) (writer): Identified by Stanley Roberts, 1952 (A).

Carlisle, Harry (writer): Identified by Budd Schulberg, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A); and Roy Huggins, 1952 (A); Roy Erwin, 1953 (B); and Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B).

Carnovsky, Morris (actor): Marc Lawrence, 1951 (A); Leo Townsend, 1951 (A); Charles Daggett, 1952 (A); Elia Kazan, 1952 (A); Larry Parks, 1951 (B); Lee J. Cobb, 1951 (B).

Chamberlin, Howland (actor): Investigation identifying Mr. Chamberlin as a member of the Communist Party has not been made public, (A); Anne Kinney, 1952 (B).

Chapman, Tom (studio reader): Identified by Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A); Sol Shor, 1953 (B); and Leopold Atlas, 1953 (B).

Chodorov, Edward (producer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Jerome Robbins, 1953 (B); and Silvia Richards, 1953 (B).

Chodorov, Jerome (writer): Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Clark, Maurice (writer): Identified by Robert Rossen, 1953 (B); Bart Lytton, 1953 (B); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Sol Shor, 1953 (B).

Cole, Lester (writer): Identified by Richard Collins, 1951 (A); Meta Reis Rosenberg, 1951 (A); Marc Lawrence, 1951 (A); Edward Dmytryk, 1951 (A); Budd Schulberg, 1951 (A); Frank Tuttle, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); William Blowitz, 1951 (A); Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A); Melvin Levy, 1952 (A); Isobel Lennart, 1952 (A); Robert Rossen, 1953 (B); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Sol Shor, 1953 (B); and Leopold Atlas, 1953 (B).

Comingore, Dorothy (actress): Identified by Max Silver, 1952 (A); and David A. Lang, 1953 (B).

Cooper, Bert (member, radio group, Communist Party): Identified by Roy Erwin, 1953 (B).

Corey, George (writer): Identified by Edward Dmytryk, 1951 (A).

Corey, Jeff (actor): Identified by Marc Lawrence, 1951 (A); Paul Marion, 1952 (A); and Lee J. Cobb, 1953 (B).

Curtis, Paul (writer): Identified by David A. Lang, 1953 (B).

D'Ambarey, Leona (studio secretary): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

DaSilva, Howard (actor): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Dassin, Julius (Jules) (director): Identified by Edward Dmytryk, 1951 (A); and Frank Tuttle, 1951 (A).

Dimsdale, Howard (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); and Silvia Richards, 1953 (B).

Donath, Ludwig (actor): Identified by Lee J. Cobb, 1953 (B).

Drdlik, Frank (set designer): Identified by Charlotte Darling Adams, 1953 (B).

Dreher, Carl (technician): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

D'Usseau, Arnaud (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Stanley Roberts, 1952 (A).

Eastman, Philip Day (artist and writer): Identified by Bernyce Polifka Fleury, 1953 (B).

Elisku, Edward (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951, (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); and Sol Shor, 1953 (B).

Ellis, Dave (radio actor and writer): Identified by Owen Vinson, 1952 (A).

Endfield, Cyril (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A) and Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B); David A. Lang, 1953 (B).

Endore, Guy (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Roy Huggins, 1952 (A); Robert Rossen, 1953 (B); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Leopold Atlas, (B), 1953; and Babbette Lang, 1953 (B).

Faragoh, Francis (writer): Identified by Meta Reis Rosenberg, 1951 (A); Edward Dmytryk, 1951 (A); and Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Farmer, Mary Virginia (actress): Identified by Mildred Ashe, 1951 (A) and Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Fiske, Dick (movie studio): Identified by Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A).

Foreman, Carl (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Melvin Levy, 1952 (A); Stanley Roberts, 1952 (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Sol Shor, 1953 (B); and Babbette Lang, 1953 (B).

Fuller, Lester (writer): Identified by Eve Ettinger, 1951 (A); Leopold Atlas, 1953 (B); Robert Rossen, 1953 (B).

Geer, Will (actor): Identified by Harold Ashe, 1951 (A).

Gilbert, Ed (set designer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); and Charlotte Darling Adams, 1953 (B).

Gilbert, Jody (actress): Identified by Harvey Narcisenfeld, 1952 (B).

Gold, Lee (writer): Identified by Silvia Richards, 1953 (B).

Goldman, Harold (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Gordon, Donald (assistant editor, studio story department): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); and Charlotte Darling Adams, 1953 (B).

Gordon, Michael (director): Identified by Edward Dmytryk, 1951 (A); Frank Tuttle, 1951 (A); and Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Gorney, Jay (song writer): Identified by Leo Townsend, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Charles Daggett, 1952 (A); George Glass, 1952 (A).

Gough, Lloyd (actor): Identified by Stanley Roberts, 1952 (A); Paul Marion, 1952 (A); Larry Parks, 1951 (B); and Jerome Robbins, 1953 (B).

Graff, Fred (actor): Investigation identifying Mr. Graff as a member of the Communist Party has not been made public (A).

Grant, Carl (in theater branch of Communist Party): Identified by Anne Kinney, 1953 (B).

Grant, Morton (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); William Blowitz, 1951 (A); Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A); Robert Rossen, 1953 (B); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Sol Shor, 1953 (B); and Leopold Atlas, 1953 (B).

Grennard, Elliot (writer): Identified by David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Roy Huggins, 1952 (A).

Gruen, Margaret (Peggy) (writer): Identified by Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A); and Paul Marion, 1952 (A).

Hammer, Alvin (real name: Irving Dratler): Identified by Paul Marion, 1952 (A) (actor).

Hammett, Dashiell (writer): Idenitfied by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Harper, Annette (actress): Identified by Paul Marion, 1952 (A); Owen Vinson, 1952 (A); Carin Kinzell, 1953 (B); and Dwight Hauser, 1953 (B).

Harris, Lou (publicity man): Identified by Harold Ashe, 1951 (A); Mildred Ashe, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A); Robert Rossen, 1953 (B); and Roland W. Kibbee, 1953 (B).

Hellgren, George (studio employee): Identified by Sol Shor, 1953 (B).

Hellman, Lillian (playwright): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Henry, Milton (president, Hollywood Studio Branch, Communist Party): Identified in Communist Party publication introduced into the records during testimony of Anne Kinney, 1952 (B).

Hentschel, Irving Paul (crafts worker): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Hilberman, David (motion-picture layout artist): Identified by Eugene Fleury, 1951 (A); and Charlotte Darling Adams, 1953 (B); Bernyce Fleury, 1951 (A).

Hobart, Rose (actress): Identified by Lee J. Cobb, 1953 (B).

Hopkins, Pauline (radio writer): Identified by Paul Marion, 1952 (A); Silvia Richards, 1953 (B); Roy Erwin, 1953 (B); and Carin Kinzel, 1953 (B).

Hovey, Tamara (writer): Identified by Silvia Richards, 1953 (B).

Howard, Maurice (business agent, Screen Cartoonist Guild): Identified by Charlotte Darling Adams, 1953 (B).

Howe, Ann (former executive secretary of Contemporary Theatre): Identified by Anne Kinney, 1952 (B).

Hubley, John (cartoonist): Identified by Charlotte Darling Adams, 1953 (B).

Huebsch, Edward (writer): Identified by Frank Tuttle, 1951 (A); Leo Townsend, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Melvin Levy, 1952 (A); Stanley Roberts, 1952 (A); Bernard Schoenfeld, 1952 (A); and David A. Lang, 1953 (B).

Hunter, Ian McLellan (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Ivens, Joris (documentary films): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

James, Daniel Lewis (writer): Identified by Leo Townsend, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B); Bart Lytton, 1953 (B); and Robert Rossen, 1953 (B).

James, Lilith (Mrs. Dan James) (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Roy Huggins, 1952 (A); Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B); Bart Lytton, 1953 (B); and Robert Rossen, 1953 (B).

Jarrico, Paul (writer): Identified by Richard Collins, 1951 (A); Meta Reis Rosenberg, 1951 (A); Budd Schulberg, 1951 (A); Leo Townsend, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); David Raksin, 1951 (A); Charles Daggett, 1952 (A); Isobel Lennart, 1952 (A); Ann Ray Frank, 1951 (A); Paul Marion, 1952 (A); Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Max Benoff, 1953 (B); and Robert Rossen, 1953 (B).

Kahn, Gordon (writer): Identified by Richard Collins, 1951 (A); Meta Reis Rosenber, 1951 (A); Marc Lawrence, 1951 (A); Edward Dmytryk, 1951 (A); Budd Schulberg, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Charles Daggett, 1952 (A); Isobel Lennart, 1952 (A); Stanley Roberts (A); George Glass, 1952 (A); Anne Ray Frank, 1951 (A); Harold Hecht, 1953 (B); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Max Benoff, 1953 (B); Leopold Atlas, 1953 (B).

Kaplan, Sol (musician and composer): Investigation identifying Mr. Kaplan as a member of the Communist Party has not been made public (B).

Killian, Victor (actor): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); and Larry Parks, 1951 (B); Lee J. Cobb, 1953 (B).

Klein, Phil (member of Cartoonist Group, Communist Party): Identified by Charlotte Darling Adams, 1953 (B).

Klowden, Nina (radio actress): Identified by Paul Marion, 1952 (A); Owen Vinson, 1952 (A); Dwight Hauser, 1953 (B); Ray Erwin, 1953 (B); Carin Kinzel, 1953 (B).

Koenig, Lester (associate producer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); and Sol Shor, 1953 (B).

Kraber, Tony (actor): Identified by Elia Kazan, 1952 (A); Clifford Odets, 1952 (A).

Kraft, Hyman Solomon (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Kromberger, Joe (studio electrician): Identified by Charlotte Darling Adams, 1953 (B).

Lagerfin, Pauline (writer): Identified by David A. Lang, 1953 (B).

Lampbell, Millard (writer): Identified by David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Silvia Richards, 1953 (B).

Lardner, Ring, Jr. (writer): Identified by Richard Collins, 1951 (A); Budd Schulberg, 1951 (A); Frank Tuttle, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Charles Daggett, 1952 (A); George Glass, 1952 (A); Anne Ray Frank, 1951 (A); Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Max Benoff, 1953 (B); Sol Shor, 1953 (B); Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B).

Lawson, John Howard (writer): Identified by Richard Collins, 1951 (A); Meta Reis Rosenberg, 1951 (A); Edward Dymtryk, 1951 (A); Budd Schulberg, 1951 (A); Frank Tuttle, 1951 (A); Anne Ray Frank, 1951 (A); Harold Ashe, 1951 (A); Leo Townsend, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); William Blowitz, 1951 (A); Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A); David Raksin, 1951 (A); Isobel Lennart, 1952 (A); Stanley Roberts, 1952 (A); Bernard Schoenfeld, 1952 (A); Danny Dare, 1953 (B); Harold Hecht, 1953 (B); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Max Benoff, 1953 (B); Sol Shor, 1953 (B); Leopold Atlas, 1953 (B); Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B); Larry Parks, 1951 (B); Roland W. Kibbee, 1953 (B); Lee J. Cobb, 1953 (B); Bart Lytton, 1953 (B); Robert Rossen, 1953 (B).

Lazarus, Simon M. (owner of Independent Productions Corp.): Investigation identifying Mr. Lazarus as a member of the Communist Party has not been made public (B).

Lees, Robert (writer): Identified by Sterling Hayden, 1951 (A); Frank Tuttle, 1951 (A); Leo Townsend, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Stanley Roberts, 1952 (A); Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A); Roy Huggins, 1952 (A).

Leonard, Charles (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Babbette Lang, 1953 (B).

Lerner, Tillie (writer): Identified by Budd Schulberg, 1951 (A).

Leverett, Lewis (actor): Identified by Elia Kazan, 1952 (A); Clifford Odets, 1952 (A).

Levitt, Alfred (studio reader and writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Melvin Levy, 1952 (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Sol Shor, 1953 (B); Leopold Atlas, 1953 (B).

Lewitzky, Bella (dancer): Identified by Anne Kinney, 1952 (B). (Mrs. Newell Reynolds).

Lieberman, Irwin (writer): Identified by Stanley Roberts, 1952 (A).

Lindeman, Mitchell (director): Identified by Paul Marion, 1952 (A); Owen Vinson, 1952 (A).

Losey, Joseph (director): Identified by Leo Townsend, 1951 (A).

Lyon, Peter (radio writer, New York): Identified by Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B); and Lee J. Cobb, 1953 (B).

Maddow, Ben (screen writer): Identified by Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B).

Maltz, Albert (writer): Identified by Richard Collins, 1951 (A); Meta Reis Rosenberg, 1951 (A); Edward Dmytryk, 1951 (A); Frank Tuttle, 1951 (A); Anne Ray Frank, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Isobel Lennart, 1952 (A); Bernard Schoenfeld, 1952 (A); Harold Hecht, 1953 (B); Max Benoff, 1953 (B); Leopold Atlas, 1953 (B); and Babbette Lang, 1953 (B).

Manoff, Arnold (writer): Identified by Edward Dmytryk, 1951 (A); Mildred Ashe, 1951 (A); Leo Townsend, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Silvia Richards, 1953 (B); Sol Shor, 1953 (B); Leopold Atlas, 1953 (B); and Lee J. Cobb, 1953 (B).

Martin, Henriette (Henrietta) (writer): Identifie by David A. Long, 1953 (B), and Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B).

Matthews, Allen (actor): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); and Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A).

McElroy, Walter (writer): Identified by Mildred Ashe, 1951 (A).

McGrew, John (cartoon animator): Identified by Eugene Fleury, 1951 (A).

McVey, Paul (radio actor): Identified by Dwight Hauser, 1953 (B); Roy Erwin, 1953 (B); and Carin Kinzel, 1953 (B).

Meyers, Henry (writer): Identified by Leo Townsend, 1951 (A); Charles Daggett, 1952 (A); George Glass, 1952 (A); Bernard Schoenfeld, 1952 (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Sol Shor, 1953 (B); and Robert Rossen, 1953 (B).

Miller, John (actor): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Miller, Paula (Mrs. Lee Strasberg) (actress): Identified by Elit Kazan, 1952 (A).

Mindlin, Eunice (secretary, member Communist Party writer's group, Hollywood): Identified by David A. Lang, 1953 (B); and Babbette Lang, 1953 (B).

Mischel, Josef (TV story writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Sol Shor, 1953 (B); and Robert Rossen, 1953 (B).

Moore, Sam (writer): Identified by Edward Dmytryk, 1951 (A); Paul Marion, 1952 (A); Owen Vinson, 1952 (A); Silvia Richards, 1953 (B); Dwight Hauser, 1953 (B); Roy Erwin, 1953 (B); Carin Kinzel, 1953 (B); and Robert Rossen, 1953 (B).

Morley, Karen (actress): Identified by Sterling Hayden, 1951 (A); Marc Lawrence, 1951 (A); Leo Townsend, 1951 (A); Charles Daggett, 1952 (A); Stanley Roberts, 1952 (A); Paul Marion, 1952, (A); Roy Erwin 1953 (B); Larry Parks, 1953 (B).

Moss, Carelton (writer): Identified by Meta Reis Rosenberg, 1951 (A).

Mullen, Mrs. Virginia (actress): Investigation identifying Mrs. Mullen as a Communist Party member has not been made public (B).

Murray, Donald (actor): Identified by Anne Kinney, 1952 (B).

Offner, Mortimer (TV work, ex-screen writer): Identified by Leo Townsend, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A); Melvin Levy, 1952 (A).

Oliver, William E. (drama critic): Identified by Alice Bennett, 1952 (B) and Urcel Daniel, 1952 (B).

Ornitz, Samual (writer): Identified by Richard Collins, 1951 (A); Meta Reis Rosenberg, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A); David A. Lang, 1953, (B); Roland W. Kibbee, 1953 (B); and Babbette Lang, 1953 (B).

Page, Charles (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Morris Appelman, 1952 (B).

Parker, Dorothy (Mrs. Alan Campbell) (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Pearson, Rose (member, Federal theater unit of Communist Party, New York): Identified by Harold Hecht, 1953 (B).

Peck, Trudy (member, Federal theater unit of Communist Party, New York): Identified by Harold Hecht, 1953 (B).

Perlin, Paul (studio worker): Identified by Max Silver, 1952 (A) and Charlotte Darling Adams, 1953 (B).

Peterson, Henry (studio carpenter): Identified by Charlotte Darling Adams, 1953 (B).

Peterson, Hjalmar (studio carpenter): Identified by Charlotte Darling Adams, 1953 (B).

Pettus, Ken (radio writer): Identified by Owen Vinson, 1952 (A).

Polin, Ben (photographer): Identified by Paul Marion, 1952 (A) and Roy Erwin, 1953 (B).

Polonsky, Abraham Lincoln (director-writer): Identified by Richard Collins, 1951 (A); Sterling Hayden, 1951 (A); Meta Reis Rosenberg, 1951 (A); Leo Townsend, 1951 (B); Charles Daggett, 1952 (A); Stanley Roberts, 1952 (A); and Leopold Atlas, 1953 (B).

Pomerance, Mortimer William (Screen Writers' Guild, former executive secretary): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Berneyce Fleury, 1951 (A) and Eugene Fleury, 1951 (A); Charlotte Darling Adams, 1953 (B); Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B); Robert Rossen, 1953 (B).

Rapf, Maurice (writer): Identified by David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Sol Shor, 1953 (B); Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B); Roland W. Kibbee, 1953 (B); Robert Rossen, 1953 (B); Leo Townsend, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); and Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A).

Revere, Ann (actress): Identified by Larry Parks, 1951 (B) and Lee J. Cobb, 1953 (B).

Reynolds, Bella Lewitzky (dancer): See Bela Lewitzky.

Richards, Robert L. (writer): Identified by Roy Huggins, 1952 (A); Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B).

Rinaldo, Fred (writer): Identified by Frank Tuttle, 1951 (A); Leo Townsend, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A); Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B); and Robert Rossen, 1953 (B).

River, W. L. (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Roberts, Bob (producer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); and David A. Lang, 1953 (B).

Roberts, Marguerite (Mrs. John Sanford) (writer): Identified by Leroy Herndon, Jr., 1953 (B); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Leopold Atlas, 1953 (B); Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B); Robert Rossen, 1953 (B); and Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Robinson, Jack (radio writer): Identified by Paul Marion, 1952 (A); Owen Vinson, 1952 (A); and Roy Erwin, 1953 (B).

Robinson, Mary (radio writer): Identified by Paul Marion, 1952 (A); Owen Vinson, 1952 (A); and Roy Edwin, 1953 (B).

Rolfe, Ed (writer): Identified by Silvia Richards, 1953 (B).

Ronka, Wayne (musician): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Rosenfeld, Paul (attorney for Music Corporation of America): Identified by Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B).

Rousseau, Louise (writer): Identified by David A. Lang, 1953 (B).

Ruskin, Shimen (actor): Identified by Lee J. Cobb, 1953 (B).

Sabinson, Lee (Broadway producer): Identified by Eve Ettinger, 1951 (A); and Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Sage, Frances (actress): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Salemson, Harold (in charge of press department, Douglas Fairbanks, New York office): Identified by Sol Shor, 1953 (B).

Salt, Waldo (writer): Identified by Richard Collins, 1951 (A); Meta Reis Rosenberg, 1951 (A); Budd Schulberg, 1951 (A); Frank Tuttle, 1951 (A); Leo Townsend, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); David Raksin, 1951 (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Sol Shor, 1953 (B); Roland W. Kibbee, 1953 (B); Robert Rossen, 1953 (B).

Scofield, Louis (actor, writer): Identified by Owen Vinson, 1952 (A).

Scott, Adrian (producer): Identified by Edward Dmytryk, 1951 (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); and Robert Rossen, 1953 (B).

Shapiro, Art (radio writer or publicist): Identified by Paul Marian, 1952 (A).

Shapiro, Victor (publicist): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); George Bassman, 1952 (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Leopold Atlas, 1952 (B); and Robert Rossen, 1953 (B).

Shaw, Robert (writer): Identified by Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B).

Ship, Reuben (radio and screen writer): Identified by Paul Marion, 1952 (A); Owen Vinson, 1952 (A); Carin Kinzel, 1953 (B); Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B).

Shore, Wilma (Mrs. Lou Solomon) (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Roy Huggins, 1952 (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B).

Shore, Viola Brothers (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Babbette Lang, 1953 (B).

Sklar, George (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Isobel Lennart, 1952 (A); Roy Huggins, 1952 (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B).

Sloan, Robert (member, Federal theater unit of Communist Party, New York): Identified by Harold Hecht, 1953 (B).

Smith, Art (actor): Identified by Elia Kazan, 1952 (A); and Clifford Odets, 1952 (A).

Smith, Ralph (set designer): Identified by Harold Ashe, 1951 (A).

Solomon, Lou (Louis) (writer): Identified by David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B); and Robert Rossen, 1953 (B).

Sondergaard, Gale (actress): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A); Bernard Schoenfeld, 1952 (A); Larry Parks, 1951 (B); and Lee J. Cobb, 1953 (B).

Spencer, Ray (writer): Identified by Danny Dare, 1953 (B).

Stander, Lione (actor): Identified by Marc Lawrence, 1951 (A); Harold Ashe, 1951 (A); Mildred Ashe, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Stanford, John (writer): Identified by David A. Lang, 1953 (B).

Stevenson, Philip Edward (writer): Identified by Roy Huggins, 1952 (A); Leopold Atlas, 1953 (B); and Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B).

Stewart, Donald Ogden (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Stone, Eugene R. (radio writer): Identified by Paul Marion, 1952 (A); Owen Vinson, 1952 (A).

Strawn, Arthur (writer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); and Leopold Atlas, 1953 (B).

Sullivan, Elliott (actor): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Lee J. Cobb, 1953 (B); and Jerome Robbins, 1953 (B).

Taffel, Bess (writer): Identified by Leo Townsend, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); and Leopold Atlas, 1953 (B).

Tarloff, Frank (writer): Identified by David A. Lang, 1953 (B) and Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B).

Terkel, Louis (actor): Identified by Owen Vinson, 1952 (A).

Trabusis, Paul (writer): Identified by David A. Lang, 1953 (B).

Traube, Shepard (theater director and producer): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A).

Tree, Dorothy (Mrs. Michael Uris) (actress): Larry Parks, 1953 (B) and Lee J. Cobb, 1953 (B).

Trivers, Paul (writer): Identified by Edward Dmytryk, 1951 (A); Frank Tuttle, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Stanley Roberts, 1952 (A); Bernard Schoenfeld, 1952 (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Sol Shor, 1953 (B); and Roland Kibbee, 1953 (B).

Trumbo, Dalton, (writer): Iidentified by Martin Berkeley 1951 (A); Anne Ray Frank, 1951 (A); Frank Tuttle, 1951 (A); Charles Daggett, 1952 (A); Stanley Roberts, 1952 (A); Bernard Schoenfeld, 1952 (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Max Benoff, 1953 (B); Leopold Atlas, 1953 (B); and Robert Rossen, 1953 (B).

Tyne, George (actor): Identified by Lee J. Cobb, 1953 (B). (Also known as Buddy Yarus.)

Uerkvitz, Herta (studio research department): Identified by Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); and Elizabeth Wilson, 1951 (A).

Uris, Dorothy Tree (Mrs. Michel Uris) (actress): Identified by Meta Reis Rosenberg, 1951 (A); Frank Tuttle, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Stanley Roberts, 1952 (A); and Bernard Schoenfeld, 1952 (A).

Uris, Michael (writer): Identified by Meta Reis Rosenberg, 1951 (A); Edward Dmytryk, 1951 (A); Frank Tuttle, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Stanley Roberts, 1952 (A); Bernard Schoenfeld, 1952 (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Sol Shor, 1953 (B); and Robert Rossen, 1953 (B).

Vorhaus, Bernard (director): Identified by Edward Dmytryk, 1951 (A); Frank Tuttle, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Stanley Roberts, 1952, (A); Bernard Schoenfeld, 1952 (A); Sol Shor, 1953 (B); and Robert Rossen, 1953 (B).

Wachsman, Robert (publicist): Identified by Charles Daggett, 1952 (B).

Wagner, Esther Jerry (radio announcer): Identified by Babbette Lang, 1953 (B).

Waldman, Herman (Aka David Wolf) (radio actor): Identified by Paul Marion, 1952 (A); Owen Vinson, 1952 (A); and Roy Erwin, 1953 (B).

Waxman, Stanley, (radio actor): Identified by Paul Marion, 1952 (A); and Owen Vinson, 1952 (A).

Weber, John (agent): Identified by Leo Townsend, 1951 (A); and Martin Berkeley 1951 (A).

Wexley, John (writer): Identified by Edwark Dmytryk, 1951 (A); Leo Townsend, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B); Bart Lytton, 1953 (B); and Robert Rossen, 1953 (B).

Whitney, Lynn (actress): Identified by Paul Marion, 1952 (A); Owen Vinson, 1952 (A); Dwight Hauser, 1953 (B); and Roy Erwin, 1953 (B); Carin Kinzel, 1953 (B).

Wilenchick, Clement (artist and actor): Investigation identifying Mr. Wilenchick as a member of the Communist Party has not been made public (B).

Willner, Geore (writers' agent): Identified by Meta Reis Rosenberg, 1951 (A); Martin Berkeley, 1951 (A); Melvin Levy, 1952 (A); Isobel Lennart, 1952 (A); Silvia Richards, 1953 (B); Leopold Atlas, 1953 (B); and Babbette Lang, 1953 (B).

Wilson, Michael (writer): Identified by Bernard Schoenfeld, 1952 (A); David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Sol Shor, 1953 (B); and Babbette Lang, 1953 (B).

Wolff, William (radio writer): Identified by Paul Marion, 1952 (A); and Owen Vinson, 1952 (A).

Young, Ned (actor and writer): Investigation identifying Mr. Young as a member of the Communist Party has not been made public (B).

Zimet, Julian (writer): Identified by David A. Lang, 1953 (B); Pauline S. Townsend, 1953 (B).

Key: (A) Report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for the year 1952. (B) Report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for the year 1953.

Mr. MUNDT. I also salute the Veterans of Foreign Wars for their courageous job in this field and their effort to persuade individual Americans to do something about Communists—not merely to write a letter to their Senator or Representative saying, "I am against communism"; not merely to deliver a

speech about it somewhere; certainly not to form vigilante committees, because we do not want those. However, Americans can individually decline to buy what Communists publicize. They can decline to attend plays which Communists write or in which they participate. They can decline to support motion-picture producers who support Communists. They can refuse to buy what Communists produce. They can carry their trade elsewhere and support good Americans.

I do not believe that is blacklisting any more than it is blacklisting for the British to display signs reading "Buy British." That is publicizing things in which they believe. I do not believe it is blacklisting any more than it is blacklisting on the part of South Dakota farmers who carry on their automobiles signs reading "Watch your curves; buy beef." That is good advice for ladies who must watch their avoirdupois. It is not blacklisting lobsters. It is simply publicizing beef.

I am glad that some Americans are beginning to assume individual responsibility. This is something in which we must engage as individuals by an appropriate American type of activity. Certainly nothing is more American than the proposition that a man who has a dollar has the right to spend it where he wants to spend it and to decline to spend his dollar with those he happens to dislike.

I salute also the All-American Conference To Combat Communism, which is an affiliation of 51 great American organizations which unite on one particular point of view, and that is that they are opposed to communism. They publish a periodical called Freedom's Facts Against Communism. This is also available to anyone who wishes to subscribe to it. It also costs $3 a year. Subscriptions may be sent to 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C. The publication is issued about every 2 weeks. The article in the issue which I have before me, for January 1956, was sponsored by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, a member of the All-American Conference To Combat Communism.

I salute Catholic organizations such as the League of Decency, which pretty well wiped nauseating sex from American films. Having done that, they are doing something about Communists. They are apprising their people as to some of the Communist films, and some of the producers in Hollywood who slip in a Communist film now and then, or who employ Communist actors and try to give them a mantle of respectability by putting them in films with some good Americans. They say, "We will not go to see films put out by such producers, regardless of whether or not any particular one is communistic. We will patronize those who have seen the light. We are proudly American, and proudly anti-Communist. We will patronize only other good Americans."

While passing out the orchids, Mr. President, I wish to present a few to the Daughters of the American Revolution who, certainly, have been valiant in this fight for many years, who have had the courage to name names, and who have refused to purchase products from big American companies who permit the advertising agencies they employ to utilize Communist talent in the business of promoting advertising programs.

More Americans should do that, Mr. President. If they would, they could clean this thing up.

Mr. President, I salute the Elks organization, which so frequently, in its monthly magazine, publishes anti-Communist articles, so proudly displays the emblem of America, and recognizes the dangers of communism to our freedom of thought.

I salute Counterattack. This publication costs a little more than most of us can afford—$24 a year. It is published weekly in New York City by former agents of the FBI, and has the courage to name names.

Mr. President, it is interesting that the publication of names so seldom, if ever, brings about a suit for libel. It is said, "Here is a man who is a Communist and who is appearing in a play," or "Here is a man who is a Communist and who is employed by certain advertising agencies on television."

What a wonderful chance for a libel suit. Why do they not sue the Firing Line or Counterattack? One of their fair-haired boys made that mistake once. The story has been recounted on this floor, and I shall not go into the details again, but Alger Hiss went to the Federal penitentiary because he made the mistake of suing for libel. When it got to the point where he had to put up or shut up, he could not put up. So, he was shut in, instead—shut in a cell in one of our Federal penitentiaries.

So these fakers whose names appear in the lists published by Counterattack, the Firing Line, and other publications, may make a lot of noise, but they do not go to court, because if they were to lose the suit it is a pretty clear-cut indication that they have been properly labeled as Communists, and they might lose their lush advertising contracts as talented individuals who somehow or other lack the convictions of Americanism to make proper citizens.

Mr. President, I salute the Scripps-Howard newspapers. They have kept the flag flying. I salute them for keeping Freddy Woltman's shoulder to the wheel. He did a grand job for the New York World-Telegram. He demonstrated a national reputation and capacity to ferret out this underground conspiracy known as communism. I am glad Scripps-Howard keeps him at the job.

I also salute, Mr. President, the Hearst newspapers and its great newspapers which have never pulled down the flag. I salute the Chicago Tribune, which has never been afraid to call a spade a spade in this battle for America.

I salute the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Internal Security Committee of the Senate, and the FBI for their continuing and continuous job of bringing to the attention of Americans those individuals within our midst who would employ the dollars they get from honest Americans to support Communist activities and to destroy the whole framework of our freedom.

I hope that individual Americans everywhere will reexamine their consciences and ask themselves, "What can I do individually to strike a blow for freedom? What can I do to make sure that none of the money I spend goes to help support a Communist agency or a Communist cause, either by directly going into the box office of a theater offering a Communist play, or indirectly to the manufacturers of products which in turn are publicized on television or on radio by Communists?"

Mr. President, if we could only activate the wholesome conscience and the innate resistance of 25 percent of the good Americans of this country and awaken them to their responsibility and opportunity in this field, we could break up very quickly the Communist movement in America, because we would take from it the source of some of its great income which enables it to operate as effectively as it has against our body politic.

This is a challenge which each individual American must accept or reject for himself, Mr. President. Acting as an individual, every citizen who has the necessary convictions and courage can become a towering force in the battle against Godless communism despite the disparaging criticisms of the Fund for the Republic. Every American can refuse to patronize or purchase a Communist play or a Communist product. He can refuse to purchase a product advertised on radio and television by a Communist employed by some advertising agency or some projection studio. He can write the manufacturer of that product and tell him why he will no longer purchase its products. He can express himself to his friends and neighbors. He can become a worker in the vineyard of freedom and a fighter in the battle against communism without ever joining a committee or an organization of any kind. Once Americans alert themselves to the dangers of communism to the point where they activate themselves to do something to weaken and curtail it, we shall be well along on our road to victory over this malicious and malignant conspiracy of evil.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1956—AMENDMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to H. R. 7225, to amend the Social Security Act. My amendment would correct what I believe is an unintended inequity in the bill as reported out by the Finance Committee. The bill provides for Federal matching for medical payments under the various public-assistance programs, up to $8 per month for each adult and $4 for each child. The purpose of this provision of the bill, which I heartily support, is to encourage the States to broaden their medical programs for the recipients of public assistance. However, a number of States have already set up medical-care programs which average more than $8 per month for each individual, using Federal matching funds available to them for cash payments, as they are permitted to do under the present law. The

bill separates medical payments from cash payments and limits Federal matching to one-half of $8. It would thus force States to curtail their medical-care programs to the $8 limit, and to give larger cash payments in order to receive the maximum Federal matching.

My amendment would permit all States to continue to use matching funds available for cash payments for medical-care programs if they wished to do so, and to take advantage of the new medical-care provisions of the bill without having to curtail their existing programs. I hope this amendment will be accepted so that existing programs may continue.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed and that it lie at the desk so that other Senators, some of whom have already expressed an interest in the amendment, may have the opportunity to cosponsor it if they desire to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS BY CULTURAL AND ATHLETIC EXCHANGES AND PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL FAIRS AND FESTIVALS

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, many of us have been deeply disturbed by the timidity, hesitancy and cowardice exhibited by certain agencies in failing to implement the clear words of the President and Vice President of the United States. We have heard a good deal lately about the importance of "people to people" contacts, a wider exchange of persons, taking advantage of any breach in the Iron Curtain, and utilizing every opportunity to demonstrate our free way of life.

On the congressional side there have been heartening endorsements of these general principles. These endorsements have taken concrete form. One among many examples is the passage by the Senate in March of S. 3116, a bill to strengthen international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals.

I have been delighted to learn that this bill has just been favorably reported to the House by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I am hopeful for early House approval.

Mr. President, at the same time such encouraging things are happening in Congress, the executive agencies are not only unimaginative but cowardly. The recent behavior of the United States Information Agency in withdrawing sponsorship from one of the most important cultural exhibits ever planned for use abroad is symptomatic of this discouraging, unimaginative approach. This particular incident has been a source of considerable disappointment and bitterness among groups who have been trying to cooperate with the administration in the development of a bold new cultural program abroad. This reaction is apparent in the news articles covering the announcement of the USIA's withdrawal from sponsoring the art exhibit.

Two such articles are typical. One of them by Anthony Lewis appeared in the New York Times on June 20, 1956, and another appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on June 22, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 20, 1956]

RED ISSUE BLOCKS EUROPE ART TOUR—UNITED STATES INFORMATION UNIT FEARS 10 PAINTERS IN SHOW MAY BE CALLED PRO-COMMUNIST—ACTION CALLED A FIASCO—ASSISTING MUSEUMS REFUSE TO USE A POLITICAL CRITERION—SEE UNITED STATES CULTURE HURT

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON, June 20.—The United States Information Agency is withdrawing from sponsorship of what had been planned as one of the most important exhibits of American paintings ever sent abroad.

It has done so because of a fear that some of the artists included in the show may be accused of pro-Communist leanings.

This is the third flurry within the USIA in recent months over "subversive art," and it is regarded as the most significant. A number of leading American art institutions had cooperated in getting up this show, and had considered it an ambitious step in international cultural exchange.

The reaction now among these art groups is one of bitterness and disappointment. They call the affair a fiasco and say it will end by damaging the cultural standing of the United States abroad.

The projected show was to have included major works of 100 American artists of the 20th century. To get the pictures together, the information agency had called on the American Federation of Arts, a nonprofit organization with headquarters in New York.

PAINTINGS

The federation's choice of artists was made by John I. H. Bauer, curator of the Whitney Museum in New York, and by Dwight Kirsch of the Des Moines, Iowa, Art Center. Paintings were borrowed from museums, galleries and private collectors over the country. More than half the works have been brought to New York, ready for the European tour.

Then, some weeks ago, a USIA representative informed the federation that about 10 of the artists on the list were "unacceptable" for political reasons. The phrase "social hazards" was used.

Rejecting any political tests for its artists, the federation's 42 trustees voted unanimously on May 23 not to participate in the show if any paintings were barred by the Government.

The federation told the Information Agency it did not want to know the names of the 10 suspected artists, because it did not want to participate in circulating any possibly libelous charges against them.

The federation cited a resolution by its trustees in October 1954 that art "should be judged on its merits as a work of art and not by the political or social views of the artist." It also mentioned a statement made that same month by President Eisenhower, which said in part:

"Freedom of the arts is a basic freedom, one of the pillars of liberty in our land * * *. Our people must have unimpaired opportunity to see, to understand, to profit from our artists' work * * *.

"But, my friends, how different it is in tyranny. When artists are made the slaves and the tools of the state, when artists become the chief propagandists of a cause, progress is arrested and creation and genius are destroyed."

WIDE RANGE OF ARTISTS

Painters selected for the show ranged from such sometime realists as John Sloan, George Bellows, Thomas Hart Benton, Grant Wood, Ivan Albright, and Reginald Marsh to such expressionists as Max Weber, John Marin, Yasuo Kuniyoshi, and Ben Shahn and numerous examples of the surrealist and abstract. (This list was chosen at random from 100 painters and has no relation to charges of procommunism.)

The Information Agency has not finally rejected the show or canceled its sponsorship. But it has made clear that it feels it cannot go ahead unless some kind of political test for the artists is accepted. Efforts are under way to arrange a private sponsor.

The federation has planned many shows for the USIA in the last few years and has never run into difficulty on anything but contemporary American works. The two major previous episodes involving Communist charges were these:

The USIA canceled plans to send to Australia an exhibit called "Sport in Art," which had been sent around the country by the magazine Sports Illustrated. The Agency dropped out because some group called the Dallas County Patriotic Council had made political charges against some of the artists when the show went to Dallas, Tex.

The Agency raised objections to an art collection from American university and college galleries that was going overseas because it included a picture by Pablo Picasso. The artist is a member of the French Communist Party. This tangle was eventually ironed out.

The Agency declined to comment today on the reasons for its stand on the art matters. But it is known that fear of congressional criticism has played an important part.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 22, 1956]

USIA QUITS FOURTH OVERSEA SHOW

The United States Information Agency apparently is withdrawing from the sponsorship overseas of a major American art exhibit because some of the represented artists are unacceptable for political reasons.

When questioned about the report, USIA Director Theodore C. Streibert offered a terse "No comment."

USIA apparently is pulling out of the long-planned project because 10 of the 100 artists may be accused of pro-Communist tendencies.

It marks the fourth time in recent months that USIA or the State Department has become involved in an imbroglio of this nature. USIA canceled plans to send to Australia an exhibit called Sport in Art after a group called the Dallas (Tex.) County Patriotic Council made political charges against some of the artists.

USIA objected to an art collection from American colleges going abroad on the grounds it included a picture by Pablo Picasso, a member of the French Communist Party.

A State Department-sponsored tour of Southeast Asia by Toscanini's former NBC Symphony of the Air was canceled, mainly because 4 fiddlers in the 101-man orchestra allegedly had pro-Communist sympathies.

The most recent incident concerns the planned exhibition of the 20th century American art. USIA had asked the American Federation of Arts, a nonprofit organization, to get the pictures together.

Among the noted art experts assigned to select the pictures was John Walker, chief curator of the National Gallery of Art. The pictures were borrowed from art institutions all over the country and more than half

are already in New York City, ready for the planned European tour.

Recently a USIA representative told the federation that 10 of the artists were unacceptable for political reasons. On May 23 the federation's 42 trustees voted unanimously not to participate in the exhibit if the artists were to be subjected to such political tests.

The federation told USIA it did not want to know the names of the 10 suspected painters. It cited a resolution adopted by its trustees in October 1954, that art "should be judged on its merits as a work of art and not by the political or social views of the artist."

Among the painters whose work was chosen for the exhibit are George Bellows, John Sloan, Grant Wood, Thomas Hart Denton, Reginald Marsh, Ivan Albright, Max Weber, John Marin, Ben Shahn, and Yasuo Kuniyoshi.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, the editorial comments on this withdrawal have been as courageous as the USIA has been timid. An editorial in the New York Times of June 20, 1956, described the USIA decision as "spineless." An editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 23, 1956, described the USIA action as something itself which "does serious damage to American prestige abroad." I ask unanimous consent that these two editorials be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 20, 1956]

PEOPLE TO PEOPLE

With President Eisenhower's expressed hope for furtherance of "people-to-people contacts * * * to create understanding" among the civilized nations of the world there can be no serious disagreement. The public and private exchange programs under which foreigners come to this country and establish direct and personal communication with Americans, and vice versa, constitute one of the most effective of all methods of building up mutual comprehension and goodwill.

The President's support of these programs makes all the more puzzling the fact that the State Department asked this year for actually less money than last year for educational exchanges. It requested $22 million last year for the educational program and $20 million this year. Considering the importance of the program and the moral weight the President rightly ascribes to it, this is a paltry figure, especially when compared with a sum 7 times as great for the governmental exchange of technicians under a different program and also compared with an appropriation of more than $100 million for propaganda of dubious effectiveness put out by the United States Information Agency. While everybody from the President down seems to believe that educational exchange is wonderful, the Agency under which it is administered is treated something like a stepchild in the State Department, with no top-ranking departmental official showing really vital interest in it.

But this is not the only puzzling feature about the working out of "people-to-people contacts" with governmental encouragement. What could be more important in this area of activity than contact with foreigners along cultural lines—through the theater, music, art, and the like? Yet it almost seems that every time an effort is made to establish such serious contact some spineless official in Washington becomes frightened by the Communist bugaboo and the enterprise is called off, to the great detriment of American prestige abroad.

The Symphony of the Air, with a record behind it as one of the best American propaganda agencies ever sent to the Far East, lost a scheduled trip to the Middle East presumably for this reason, if it can be called a reason. An exhibition of American sporting pictures, to be sent to Australia, was withdrawn on the complaint of a small group of fanatics that some of the artists had un-American associations. One of the finest plays on Broadway will not be sent to the International Theater Festival this year because someone in Washington cannot understand that real art appeals to people, even though it may offend a diplomat or two.

We are glad the President plans to have a conference in Washington to encourage "people-to-people contacts," and we hope some of the Government officials who have done so much in their official capacity to alienate these contacts will be invited.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 23, 1956]

CONTROVERSIAL ARTISTS

The United States Information Agency seems determined to represent the United States as a country in which art is judged in terms of its propaganda value and artists are rated in accordance with their political orthodoxy. This is an untrue picture of the United States. It is also a picture which does serious damage to American prestige abroad. It is, essentially, the very picture of America which Soviet propagandists have tried to paint.

The USIA appears to be withdrawing its sponsorship of a show which was to have included major works of 100 contemporary American artists selected by the American Federation of Arts, a nonprofit organization embracing many of the leading American art institutions. The show was regarded as an important effort toward international cultural understanding and recognition of the United States as a land hospitable to the arts. The USIA now threatens to withdraw its sponsorship because 10 of the artists in the show were considered "unacceptable" for political reasons and because the federation's 42 trustees voted unanimously not to participate in the show if any paintings were barred by the Government.

Artists are, by nature, nonconformists. They would not be artists if they did not see things differently from ordinary men. To judge their work on the basis of the conventionality of their private lives and their political opinions would be to select, inevitably, the commonplace instead of the original; it would end in choosing illustrators, instead of artists. The trustees of the American Federation of Arts are quite right in saying that art "should be judged on its merits as a work of art and not by the political or social views of the artist." And they aptly quote President Eisenhower's observation:

"Freedom of the arts is a basic freedom, one of the pillars of liberty in our land. * * * But, my friends, how different it is in tyranny. When artists are made the slaves and the tools of the state, when artists become the chief propagandists of a cause, progress is arrested and creation and genius are destroyed."

Behind the USIA's timorousness lies a fear that Congress would deny funds to the Agency if it sponsored work by controversial artists. We are inclined to think that this libels Congress. In any case, it is a shabby rationalization. USIA is false to its own trust when it uses funds for the misrepresentation of America abroad.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I am sure that most thoughtful Members of Congress are disappointed by the action of the USIA in this instance, and I am hopeful that one of these days timidity will be replaced with boldness, not only in words but in deeds as well.

One of the things which might bolster the confidence of the USIA as well as assure congressional support and cooperation with the information program would be the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 161, a resolution which I introduced on April 11, 1956, which would carry out the recommendations of the United States Advisory Committee on Information by creating a Joint Committee on Information.

This joint committee would be empowered to study the extent and effectiveness of all United States international information programs, study the techniques, special characteristics, and extent of all types of Communist propaganda including methods used to penetrate information media of the free world with such propaganda, inquire into the extent to which scientific research and development in the field of mass communications have progressed in the United States and the degree to which such scientific advances are utilized by the United States international information programs, and provide a continuous, cooperative relationship between Congress and the United States international information programs.

Mr. President, the recent appointment of Mr. Shepilov, the editor of Pravda, as the new Soviet Foreign Minister should provide us with ample additional warning, if we need any, of what we are up against in the struggle for the minds of men all over the world, when ideas become bullets and words become bombs.

This new Soviet move should awaken us more than ever to the urgent necessity for a more concentrated and effective effort to keep the world informed of the real spirit of American democracy. Adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 161 should help in this endeavor. In addition to reassuring our friends abroad, the adoption of this resolution apparently might even serve to reassure the USIA and encourage them, on occasion, to be brave, or at least to be stalwart.

In reference to the action of the USIA, I should like to comment about one instance which is referred to by the New York Times, a case in which the USIA turned down an exhibit. It canceled a plan to send to Australia an exhibit called "Sport in Art," which had been sent all around this country by the magazine called Sports Illustrated. I believe the Sports Illustrated, if I am not mistaken, is published by the publishers of Time, Life, and Fortune. It is a splendid magazine.

I read from the Times article:

The Agency dropped out because some group called the Dallas County Patriotic Council had made political charges against some of the artists when the show went to Dallas, Tex.

The Agency raised objections to an art collection from American university and college galleries that was going overseas because it included a picture by Pablo Picasso. The artist is a member of the French Communist Party. This tangle was eventually ironed out.

The Agency declined to comment today on the reasons for its stand on the art matters. But it is known that fear of congressional criticism has played an important part.

I might say that if the people of the United States can be subjected to a sort of roving tour of art in the field of sports activities, such as that which was sponsored by Sports Illustrated, I should imagine that the people of Australia might have sufficient moral fiber to endure the same kind of exhibition.

I want to know why the USIA does not follow the mandate of the President. Or are we to assume that the President makes speeches merely to please some persons, and that the Government he is supposed to preside over and administer pays no attention to the attitudes and expressions of philosophy by the President of the United States?

I remind the Senate that the President said that freedom of the arts is a basic freedom; it is one of the pillars of liberty in our land. I suggest that in the light of what we have heard, we might contemplate that expression of philosophy by the President.

The recent withdrawal of Sports Illustrated by the USIA, according to the New York Times article and all other press reports, is due to the fact that the USIA is withdrawing from the sponsorship of what had been planned as one of the most important exhibitions of American painting ever to have been sent abroad.

I read from Mr. Anthony Lewis' article in the New York Times of June 20, 1956:

It has done so because of a fear that some of the artists included in the show may be accused of pro-Communist leanings.

This is the third flurry within the USIA in recent months over "subversive art," and it is regarded as the most significant. A number of leading American art institutions had cooperated in getting up this show, and had considered it an ambitious step in international cultural exchange.

The reaction now among these art groups is one of bitterness and disappointment. Call the affair a "fiasco" and say it will end by damaging the cultural standing of the United States abroad.

The projected show was to have included major works of 100 American artists of the 20th century. To get the pictures together, the Information Agency had called on the American Federation of Arts, a nonprofit organization with headquarters in New York.

I hope the officers of the USIA will study the situation carefully. I noted while I was home during the past weekend that the Minneapolis Morning Tribune had published a blistering editorial relating to this subject matter, and had called to the attention of its readers the fact that the USIA had bowed down to social and political pressures and had demonstrated anything else but integrity and courage in this particular matter. That is all the more reason, it seems to me, why we need in Congress a joint committee on information programs.

The New York Times editorial to which I referred earlier contains one statement which I think is rather apropos, and which I shall read:

Yet it almost seems that every time an effort is made to establish such serious contact some spineless official in Washington becomes frightened by the Communist bugaboo and the enterprise is called off, to the great detriment of American prestige abroad.

The Symphony of the Air, with a record behind it as one of the best American propaganda agencies ever sent to the Far East, lost a scheduled trip to the Middle East presumably for this reason, if it can be called a reason.

It is interesting to note that Symphony of the Air went to the Far East, where the problems are serious; but that when it was scheduled to go to the Middle East, some objection was raised, and this symphonic orchestra, which has been the delight of millions of people, had its program called off.

Mr. President, if that is the kind of attitude which is going to prevail in this country, what is the United States doing in an international convention on the possible uses of atomic energy? Why did the President permit General Twining to go to the Soviet Union? What will happen in this country if some Soviet doctor discovers a new cure for a disease? Are we supposed to die because a Communist discovers a cure?

What will happen if General Twining learns of some new development in Soviet planes? Are we supposed to say that we would rather lose a war than to benefit by an advancement in Soviet engineering which might be incorporated in our own planes?

Mr. President, we can become so blind that we can throw ourselves over the precipice of disaster. There is such a thing as common enlightenment and horse sense.

I observe that the majority leader has come to the floor. A statement which he made was quoted recently in a magazine article. It more or less underscores what I am trying to say. I can only paraphrase it. He said something to the effect that his beloved father had once told him that "Some people are awfully smart, but they haven't got any sense."

Sometimes one can be awfully smart, but simply not have any judgment. I think what America needs now is some very good judgment.

I think we had better be deciding whether we are going to stand in mortal fear of a little Communist activity, or are going to demonstrate that we have strength, faith, and courage, and are going to put our best foot forward. We should be proud of American art, culture, and industry; and this United States Senator wants to say now that he is for challenging the Soviet Union in every conceivable area of life, by using every talent at our command to do it. There is no room for timidity, for fear, for floundering, for the kind of administrative ambivalence which seems to be plaguing the Government. We are coming in no longer on a slow freight; we are even missing the train.

I am of the opinion we had better make up our minds that we are in a war for keeps. This is a world series having only one game. Either we will win the first game, or we will not be in the series at all. One of the things we must do to win in this great world series competition between the Soviet Union and the free world is to get out in front and stay there.

We are being outmaneuvered in the Middle East while the American people are being deluded into believing everything is fine and dandy. Day after day, in area after area of the world, we are being outmaneuvered and outcounted through the propaganda of the Soviet Union.

The United States is a great country, which is proud of its merchandizing and proud of its advertising; it points with pride to its skill in communications. But for some reason we seem to have become paralyzed when it comes to international competition.

I hope the suggestion made with reference to the United States Information Agency at the time the appropriation bill was under consideration will be followed up. I think the whole program needs to be examined. I have had some feelings in the past that we were making progress, but when some Senators stand on the floor and undertake to say that the USIA may be doing something which appears to be a little to the left of Grant or McKinley, then the USIA stands like it has been stunned and immobilized.

I suggest that it should be a little more interested in pursuing a program which will be designed through the cooperation of the best minds in this country, and by persons of talent and resourcefulness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, June 26, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 25, legislative day of June 22, 1956.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

James Cunningham Sargent, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1961.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 25, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, may we now come unto Thee in a truly prayerful spirit, humbly acknowledging how much we need Thee and also confidently realizing that Thou art able and willing to supply all our needs.

Grant that in the midst of the miseries and mysteries, the confusions and changes of life, we may have the patience

and perseverance to wait for new and further revelations of Thy love and care.

We pray that the democracy, which we are seeking to establish, may be more magnanimous and unselfish in its feelings and purposes and more extensive in its fellowship and influence.

Inspire us with a faith and courage to break down all the barriers which prevent any of the nations and members of the human family from possessing and enjoying the blessings of freedom and peace.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 14, 1956, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2654. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.;

S. 3042. An act to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U. S. C., sec. 184), in order to promote the development of phosphate on the public domain;

S. 3467. An act to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States; and

S. 3512. An act to permit desert land entries on disconnected tracts of lands which, in the case of any one entryman, form a compact unit and do not exceed in the aggregate 320 cases.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9852. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 11619. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. BUTLER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3149) entitled "An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to permit air carriers to grant free or reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, and Mr. PAYNE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6376) entitled "An act to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. GOLDWATER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate requests the House to return to the Senate the message announcing its agreement to the amendments to S. 1622, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States, numbered 56–17.

EXTENDING DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9852) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, PATMAN, RAINS, WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, and TALLE.

AMENDING THE EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9052) to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, PATMAN, RAINS, WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, and TALLE.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY, CERTAIN AGENCIES OF DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF THE ARMY, 1957

Mr. CANNON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES, 1957

Mr. FERNANDEZ, on behalf of Mr. FOGARTY, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 9720) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

CONTROL OF NARCOTIC DRUGS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 11619) to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other related purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. COOPER, Mr. MILLS, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, and Mr. SADLAK.

TERMINATION OF RUBBER DISPOSAL COMMISSION

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 11878) to extend the date upon which the Rubber Disposal Commission will terminate.

I have cleared this with the leadership on both sides and with the members of the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 of Public Law 336, 84th Congress, approved August 9, 1955; of Public Law 19, 84th Congress, approved March 31, 1955; section 20 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953; and section 3 of Public Law 433 of the 84th Congress, the Commission established by the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 shall not cease to exist until July 1, 1957.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORARY MEMBERSHIPS IN DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today addressed a letter to Mr. Paul Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, urging the Democratic National Committee to offer honorary memberships in the Democratic National Committee to Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson and Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson for their repeated and invaluable contributions to the cause.

THE PRESIDENT CAN BE WRONG

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, no one can question the loyalty to the President of John S. Knight, editor and publisher of the Chicago Daily News, and other great American newspapers. Mr. Knight, it will be recalled, was a most potent factor in swinging the presidential nomination to General Eisenhower at the 1952 Republican Convention in Chicago.

After General Eisenhower's election he has remained one of the President's more dependable counsellors. When the country was perhaps only days away from another world war it was Mr. Knight's bold and dissenting editorial that, in the opinion of many, brought about a reshaping of policies and averted a war that might have destroyed our civilization. I am sure that as events shaped, and we were spared the destruction of another war, the President was thankful to his friend who had not remainded silent when he was in disagreement.

On Saturday last appeared in the Chicago Daily News another editorial by Mr. Knight expressing disagreement with the President on another matter. The House will be interested, I think, in this excerpt from the editorial:

> The question should not be resolved by voting blindly for the President's recommendations. The President can be wrong, and I think he is wrong in this instance.

Mr. Speaker, the judgment of no man is infallible in everything. The wisest and most virtuous of men need the protection against unwise actions and decisions that is afforded by the presence around them of real friends who dare to speak even when in disagreement. Democratic government can function with full efficiency only when there is a minimum of rubber stamping.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the RECORD of June 19 fails to show action taken by the House in concurring in Senate amendments to House Joint Resolution 555, to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD of June 19 be corrected to show the action of the House in concurring in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

POSTAL RATE INCREASE BILL

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader when he intends to bring up the postal rate increase bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Illinois is a member of the Rules Committee. Under the rule after the lapse of 7 legislative days any member of the Rules Committee may call up the rule in a preferential manner. Is it the intention of the gentleman to do so?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am going to assume that responsibility.

Mr. McCORMACK. Under those circumstances the gentleman from Massachusetts will state that he conferred informally with the gentleman from Illinois and told him he would bring it up at some future time. Is that correct?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. What day does the gentleman from Illinois have in mind?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. If it is agreeable to the majority leader, next Monday, July 2.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Illinois having assumed his responsibility as a member of the Rules Committee and making that request, next Monday is agreeable to me. As a matter of fact, for the record, the gentleman from Illinois called to see me with the chairman on the Post Office and Civil Service last Friday and made the inquiry. It was a very pleasant conversation. Is that right?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Next Monday is agreeable and I shall program it accordingly.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF A HEROIC AMERICAN LADY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Emma Gatewood, a resident of Gallipolis, Ohio, in our congressional district, won for herself national fame a few months ago. In spite of the fact that she was 67 years old and a great-grandmother, she hiked by herself 2,050 miles over a rugged mountainous course. She hiked the rough and rugged Appalachian Trail from Fort Oglethorpe, Ga., to the summit of mile-high Mount Katahdin in wild and rugged northeastern Maine.

In performing this great undertaking, she wore out seven pairs of shoes. She carried only a blanket and a small supply of rations. She reached this wild and rugged goal after walking for 146 days. She averaged 17 miles a day and lost 24 pounds of weight. Her accomplishment brought forth many comments from mountain people. One old and experienced Maine woodsman said of her, "We have got to hand it to her. It takes guts, pioneer guts, to do that kind of a job."

Mrs. Gatewood read about the trail 3 years ago—how well marked it was, that there were shelters at the end of a day's hike—but she found most of the shelters had been blown down or burned. Much of the time she slept on benches, tables, and on the ground. On bitter cold nights she would heat stones to sleep on.

In places the trail was little more than a path. There were sand and gravel washouts, weeds and brush up to her neck. But she would not quit. She inched her way over great ledges of shelf rock made slick with sleet, waded across 30-foot-wide mountain streams, whacked with her cane at dense underbrush. She is not afraid of forest animals, although a rattlesnake struck, but just got her dungarees.

Mrs. Gatewood is the only woman who ever accomplished this feat. At the top of Mount Katahdin she signed the register and sang America the Beautiful. In her own words, she was—

> Just walking the trail for pleasure,
> For the love of out of doors.
> For the lovely works our Maker
> Displays on forest floors.

In an editorial, the Boston Post stated that Mrs. Emma Gatewood, of Ohio, demonstrated that the hardihood of pioneer women survives today.

The Millinocket (Maine) Chamber of Commerce presented her with a framed picture of Mount Katahdin when she was its guest. She was also awarded a trophy and life membership in the National Hikers and Campers Association.

Mrs. Gatewood is a relative of O. O. McIntyre, famed New York columnist, whose syndicated columns covering the United States helped make the city of Gallipolis, Ohio, famous.

By this wonderful performance, Mrs. Emma Gatewood has achieved for herself a place with the heroes of the country.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have permission to sit during general debate in the House on Wednesday and Thursday of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND IN NORTH CAROLINA TO THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE, N. C.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8634) to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in North Carolina to the city of Charlotte, N. C., with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "(62 Stat. 770. 350)" and insert "(62 Stat. 350)."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7227) to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the disposal of surplus property for civil defense purposes, to provide that certain Federal surplus property be disposed of to State and local civil-defense organizations which are established by or pursuant to State law, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That subsection 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U. S. C. 484 (j)) is amended to read as follows:

"'(j) (1) Under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Administrator is authorized in his discretion to donate without cost (except for costs of care and handling) for use in any State for purposes of education, public health, or civil defense, or for research for any such purpose, any equipment, materials, books, or other supplies (including those capitalized in a working capital or similar funds) under the control of any executive agency which shall have been determined to be surplus property and which shall have been determined under paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of this subsection to be usable and necessary for any such purpose. In determining whether property is to be donated under this subsection, no distinction shall be made between property capitalized in a working-capital fund established under section 405 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, or any similar fund, and any other property. No such property shall be transferred for use within any State except to the State agency designated under State law for the purpose of distributing, in conformity with the provisions of this subsection, all property allocated under this subsection for use within such State.

"'(2) In the case of surplus property under the control of the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense shall determine whether such property is usable and necessary for educational activities which are of special interest to the armed services, such as maritime academies or military, naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard preparatory schools. If such Secretary shall determine that such property is usable and necessary for such purposes, he shall allocate it for transfer by the Administrator to the appropriate State agency for distribution to such educational activities. If he shall determine that such property is not usable and necessary for such purposes, it may be disposed of in accordance with paragraph (3) or paragraph (4) of this subsection.

"'(3) Determination whether such surplus property (except surplus property allocated in conformity with paragraph (2) of this subsection) is usable and necessary for purposes of education or public health, or for research for any such purpose, in any State shall be made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who shall allocate such property on the basis of needs and utilization for transfer by the Administrator to such State agency for distribution to (A) tax-supported medical institutions, hospitals, clinics, health centers, school systems, schools, colleges, and univertities, and (B) other nonprofit medical institutions, hospitals, clinics, health centers, schools, colleges, and universities which are exempt from taxation under section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. No such property shall be transferred to any State agency until the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has received, from such State agency, a certification that such property is usable and needed for educational or public health purposes in the State, and until the Secretary has determined that such State agency has conformed to minimum standards of operation prescribed by the Secretary for the disposal of surplus property.

"'(4) Determination whether such surplus property (except surplus property allocated in conformity with paragraph (2) of this subsection) is usable and necessary for civil defense purposes, including research, in any State shall be made by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, who shall allocate such property on the basis of need and utilization for transfer by the Administrator of General Services to such State agency for distribution to civil defense organizations of such State, or political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof, which are established pursuant to State law. No such property shall be transferred until the Federal Civil Defense Administrator has received from such State agency a certification that such property is usable and needed for civil defense purposes in the State, and until the Federal Civil Defense Administrator has determined that such State agency has conformed to minimum standards of operation prescribed by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator for the disposal of surplus property. The provisions of sections 201 (b), 401 (c), 401 (e), and 405 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, shall apply to the performance by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator of his responsibilities under this section.

"'(5) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Federal Civil Defense Administrator may impose reasonable terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions upon the use of any single item of personal property donated under paragraph (3) or paragraph (4), respectively, of this subsection which has an acquisition cost of $2,500 or more.

"'(6) The term "State", as used in this subsection, includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Territories and possessions of the United States.'

"SEC. 2. (a) Clause (C) of paragraph (2) of subsection 203 (k) of such act is amended by striking out the word 'or' at the end thereof.

"(b) Clause (D) of paragraph (2) of such subsection is amended by striking out the comma at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word 'or'.

"(c) Paragraph (2) of such subsection is amended by inserting, immediately after clause (D) thereof, as amended by this section, the following new clause:

"'(E) the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, in the case of property transferred pursuant to this act to civil defense organizations of the States or political subdivisions or instrumentalities thereof which are established by or pursuant to State law,'.

"SEC. 3. Subsection 203 (n) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'(n) For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of subsections (j) and (k), the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, and the head of any Federal agency designated by either such officer, are authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with State surplus property distribution agencies designated in conformity with paragraph (1) of subsection (j). Such cooperative agreements may provide for utilization by such Federal agency, without payment or reimbursement, of the property, facilities, personnel, and services of the State agency in carrying out any such program, and for making available to such State agency, without payment or reimbursement, property, facilities, personnel, or services of such Federal agency in connection with such utilization.'

"SEC. 4. Subsection (h) of section 507 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, as added by clause (3) of the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to provide for the acceptance and maintenance of Presidential libraries, and for other purposes,' approved August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 697), is redesignated as subsection (i) of such section.

"SEC. 5. (a) Except as provided by subsection (b), the amendments made by this act shall become effective on the first day of the first month beginning after the date of enactment of this act.

"(b) In the case of any State which on the date of enactment of this act has not designated a single State agency for the purpose of distributing surplus property pursuant to subsection 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, transfers of such property may be made by the Administrator of General Services under such subsection, as amended by this act, to the State agency heretofore designated in such State to distribute property in conformity with such subsection for purposes of education and public health to the extent that such agency is authorized under

State law to receive and distribute any class of property transferred pursuant to such subsection, or in the absence of any such agency or in the absence of authority of such agency to receive and distribute any such class of property, to any State agency or official authorized under State law to receive and distribute such property, until 90 calender days have passed after the close of the first regular session of the legislature of such State begining after the date of enactment of this act."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the disposal of surplus property for civil defense purposes, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I find that H. R. 7227, as amended, is an acceptable bill. It permits the donation of surplus property to such meritorious causes as schools, health institutions, and civilian defense. No one of these recipients would have an overriding priority for the property. The Administrator of GSA has the authority to establish needed regulations covering the entire program and the Secretaries of Defense; Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Federal Civil Defense Administrator each has his responsibility to designate surplus property useful and needed for his particular activity. The property shall be allocated within a State by a single State agency which can and should be satisfied that the entire program is properly coordinated and that no recipient or group of recipients receives more property than is useful and necessary.

I have had some concern that the donation of property to State civil defense agencies might become a huge stockpiling program with the property remaining idle for long periods of time and thus suffering deterioration and obsolescence. I am assured, however, by those who administer the program that this point will be carefully watched and that a careful selection of property of peculiar value to the civil-defense program will be made.

All executive agencies involved in the administration of the program believe that this is a workable bill though each admits that care is necessary in the development of operating procedures and regulations.

DISTRICT DAY

The SPEAKER. This is District day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

REGULATING AND LICENSING PAWNBROKERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 11002) to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 74]

Adair	Gamble	Multer
Addonizio	Garmatz	Nelson
Anfuso	Green, Pa.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Barrett	Griffiths	O'Hara, Minn.
Bass, N. H.	Gubser	O'Neill
Bass, Tenn.	Hays, Ark.	Osmers
Bentley	Healey	Patman
Bolton, Frances P.	Hinshaw	Philbin
	Hoffman, Ill.	Powell
Brownson	Holt	Preston
Broyhill	Holtzman	Prouty
Byrne, Pa.	Jackson	Radwan
Canfield	Jones, N. C.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Carlyle	Kean	Rodino
Chatham	Kelley, Pa.	Sadlak
Chudoff	Kelly, N. Y.	Saylor
Cooley	King, Calif.	Scherer
Corbett	King, Pa.	Scudder
Coudert	Klein	Shelley
Cretella	Kluczynski	Sieminski
Davidson	Knutson	Springer
Davis, Wis.	Laird	Taylor
Dawson, Ill.	Lane	Thompson, La.
Deane	Lankford	Thompson, Mich.
Denton	McCarthy	
Diggs	McCulloch	Thomson, Wyo.
Dodd	McMillan	Thornberry
Dollinger	McVey	Tuck
Donohue	Madden	Van Pelt
Dorn, S. C.	Merrow	Wainwright
Eberharter	Miller, Calif.	Wickersham
Engle	Miller, N. Y.	Wolcott
Fino	Morano	Younger
Flood	Morgan	Zelenko
Fulton	Moss	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 328 Members have answered to their names; a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMITY BETWEEN THE HOUSE AND SENATE

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement to the House.

There has always existed complete comity between the Senate and the House of Representatives. The rules of the House provide that no Member of the House shall criticize a Senator on the floor of the House. It has been called to the attention of the Chair that in recent days editorials highly critical of Members of the other body have been placed in the RECORD. That is a violation of the rules. As far as the present occupant of the Chair is concerned, he is not going to tolerate it any more.

CONSTRUCTION OF NUCLEAR-POWERED MERCHANT SHIP

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6243) authorizing the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BONNER, ROBESON of Virginia, TUMULTY, TOLLEFSON, and ALLEN of California.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 10660

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 10660.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REGULATING AND LICENSING PAWNBROKERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that the bill (H. R. 11002) may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. That, as used in this act—

(a). The term "person" means an individual, firm, voluntary association, joint-stock company, incorporated society, or corporation.

(b) The term "District" means the District of Columbia.

(c) The term "Commissioners" means the Commissioners of the District or the agent or agents designated by them to perform any function vested in the Commissioners by this act: *Provided*, That for the purposes of subsection (e) of section 7 no such agent shall, by way of appeal, review his own action, decision, or ruling.

(d) The term "pawnbroker" means any person who shall in any manner lend or advance money or other things for profit on the pledge and possession of personal property or other valuable thing, other than securities or written or printed evidences of indebtedness or who deals in the purchasing of personal property or other valuable thing on condition of selling the same back again at a stipulated price.

LICENSES REQUIRED OF PAWNBROKERS

SEC. 2. (a) No person shall engage in business as a pawnbroker except as authorized in this act and without first obtaining a license from the Commissioners as hereinafter provided.

(b) No person, other than a licensee under this act, shall display any sign or other device in or about any business premises, or in any advertising manner, which in any manner resembles the emblem or sign commonly used by pawnbrokers nor display any sign which is calculated to deceive, nor use the word "pawnbroker" in or about any business premises or in any advertising manner, nor shall any such person hold himself out to the public to be a pawnbroker either by advertising, soliciting, signs, or otherwise.

APPOINTMENT OF ATTORNEY AND APPLICATION FOR LICENSES

SEC. 3. (a) No license shall be issued to any person unless and until such person shall, in writing and in the form prescribed by the Commissioners, appoint the Commissioners as his true and lawful attorney upon whom all judicial and other process or legal notice directed to such person may be served. A copy of any such process or notice so served upon the Commissioners shall be forthwith sent by registered mail by the plaintiff or his attorney to the defendant at his residence or his place of business.

(b) Each application for a license under this act shall be in writing, under oath or affirmation, to the Commissioners in such form as they may prescribe. Such application shall contain (1) in the case of an individual, his name and the address of his residence and place of business, (2) in the case of a firm or voluntary association, the name and address of every member thereof and the address of the place where such business is to be conducted, (3) in the case of a joint-stock company, incorporated society, or corporation, the names and addresses of the officers and directors thereof and the address of the place where such business is to be conducted, and (4) such additional information as the Commissioners may prescribe.

(c) Each applicant shall prove to the satisfaction of the Commissioners that he has available, for use in the business of making loans authorized by this act at the location specified in his application, cash capital of at least $20,000.

(d) Upon the filing of any such application the applicant shall pay to the Commissioners the sum of $50 as a fee for investigating the application, which sum shall be retained by the District whether such application is approved or disapproved.

BOND PROVISIONS

SEC. 4. (a) Each applicant shall file with his application a bond running to the District in the sum of $5,000 with two or more sufficient sureties, whose liability as such securities shall not exceed the said sum in the aggregate; except that the execution of any such bond by a fidelity or surety company authorized by the laws of the United States to transact business in the District shall be equivalent to the execution thereof by two sureties, but such company, if excepted to, shall justify in the manner required by law of fidelity and surety companies. Such bond shall be approved by the Commissioners and conditioned upon the compliance by the applicant with all the provisions of this title and all rules and regulations lawfully made pursuant thereto. Any person injured by the noncompliance with any such provision, rule, or regulation by any licensee under this act may maintain a suit in his own name in any court of competent jurisdiction and recover on the bond such damages as shall be adjudged by such court together with costs of such suit. Recovery upon any such bond shall not preclude recovery against such licensee for any liability in excess of the amount recovered upon the bond, and such recovery shall not be held to extinguish any remedy under other law.

(b) The bond or bonds which the licensee is required to file hereunder shall be renewed and refiled annually at the time of making payment of the annual license fee. If the Commissioners shall find that any such bond has for any reason become insecure or exhausted, an additional bond in the sum of not more than $5,000 shall be filed by the licensee within 10 days after written demand therefor by the Commissioners.

ISSUANCE OF LICENSE

SEC. 5. (a) If the Commissioners approve the bond filed by the applicant and the form of the application, and find after investigation (1) that the financial responsibility, experience, character, and general fitness of such applicant, and of the members thereof if the applicant is a firm or voluntary association, and of the officers and directors thereof if the applicant is a joint-stock company, incorporated society, or corporation are such as to command the confidence of the community and to warrant the belief that the business of the applicant will be operated honestly, fairly, and efficiently in accordance with the purposes of this act; (2) that permitting such applicant to engage in such business will promote the convenience and advantage of the community; and (3) that the applicant has available for use in such business at the location specified in the application cash capital of at least $20,000, the Commissioners shall, upon payment by the applicant of a license fee of $500, issue to the applicant a license to make such loans in accordance with the provisions of this act as the location specified in such application; except that if any such license is issued after the 30th day of April of any year the fee for such license shall be $250. If the Commissioners do not so find after investigation they shall notify the applicant thereof and return the bond filed with the application. Within 60 days from the date of filing the application for license, accompanied by the investigation fee and bond required by this act, the Commissioners shall either issue or refuse to issue such license, but no applicant shall be denied a license until after a due hearing by the Commissioners, at which the applicant shall have a reasonable opportunity to be heard and to produce evidence in support of his application. If the application be denied the Commissioners shall within 20 days thereafter prepare a written decision and findings with respect thereto containing a summary of the evidence and the reasons supporting the denial and forthwith serve upon the applicant a copy thereof.

(b) Each license issued under this act shall state fully the name of the licensee and the place at which the business is to be conducted under such license. Such license shall be kept conspicuously posted in such place of business. No such license shall be transferable or assignable. Not more than one place of business shall be maintained under the same license, but the Commissioners may issue more than one license to the same licensee upon compliance for each such license with all the provisions of this title applicable to the original issuance of licenses. Whenever a licensee shall desire to change his place of business to another location within the District he shall immediately give written notice thereof to the Commissioners. Upon receipt of such notice the Commissioners shall attach to the license a statement of the change of location and the date thereof, which shall be authority for the operation of such business under such license at the new location.

(c) No licensee shall transact such business or make any loan provided for by this act under any other name or at any other place of business than that named in the license.

REVOCATION, SUSPENSION, AND RENEWAL OF LICENSES

SEC. 6. (a) Each license shall remain in full force and effect until the first day of November following the date of issuance unless sooner surrendered by the licensee or suspended or revoked as hereinafter provided. Application for license for the following year may be made by any licensee within 20 days prior to the first day of November. If the Commissioners are satisfied that no fact or condition than exists which clearly would warrant the Commissioners in refusing to issue a license on an original application the Commissioners are authorized to issue license for the year commencing on the first day of November following the date of such application, upon payment of license fee of $250.

(b) The Commissioners shall, upon 10 days' notice to the licensee stating that they contemplate the revocation or suspension of his license, and, in general, the grounds therefor, revoke or suspend such license, after reasonable opportunity has been afforded to the licensee to be heard, if the Commissioners find (1) that the licensee has failed to maintain in effect the bond or bonds required under this act or (2) that the licensee has either knowingly or without the exercise of due care to prevent the same, violated any provision of this act or has failed to comply with any rule or regulation lawfully made pursuant thereto, or (3) that any fact or condition then exists which clearly would warrant the Commissioners in refusing to issue a license on an original application. If the license be revoked or suspended the Commissioners shall, within 20 days thereafter, prepare a written decision and findings with respect thereto containing a summary of the evidence and the reasons supporting the revocation or suspension and forthwith serve upon the licensee a copy thereof.

(c) The Commissioners may revoke or suspend only the particular license with respect to which there are grounds for revocation or suspension; but if the Commissioners find that such grounds for revocation or suspension apply or extend to more than one license issued to any person under this act, they shall revoke or suspend all the licenses affected thereby.

(d) The licensee may at any time surrender any license issued to him under this Act upon filing written notice to that effect with the Commissioners.

(e) No revocation, suspension, or surrender of any such license shall impair or affect the obligation of any preexisting lawful contract between the licensee and any borrower, or any bond given by such licensee.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 7. (a) The provisions of this act shall be enforced by the Commissioners, who are authorized to make such rules and regulations in addition hereto and not inconsistent herewith, as may be necessary for the enforcement of this act. The Commissioners shall make such examination and investigations of the affairs, business, office, and records of every licensee, and such further examinations or investigations as they shall deem necessary for the purpose of discovering violations of this act or of securing information necessary for its proper enforcement. For the purpose of making such examinations or investigations the Commissioners and their duly designated representatives shall have authority to require by subpena the production of books, papers, and records and the attendance, and examination under oath, of all persons whomsoever whose testimony they may require relative to the loans or business of any such licensee, and shall have free access to the accounts, papers, records, files, safes, vaults, offices, and places of business used in connection with any business conducted under any license issued in accordance with this act. In the event of contumacy or refusal to obey any such subpena or requirement under this section, the Commissioners may make application to the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia for an order requiring obedience thereto. Thereupon the court, with or without notice and hearing, as it in its discretion may decide, shall make such order as is proper and may punish as a contempt any failure to comply with such order in accordance with the provisions of subsection (c), section 5, of the act of April 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 193, ch. 207; sec. 11–756 (c), D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(b) Each licensee shall annually on or before the 15th day of March file with the Commissioners a report giving such information as the Commissioners may require,

relevant to the business and operations during the preceding calendar year, of each licensed place of business conducted by such licensee in the District. Such report shall be made under oath and in the form prescribed by the Commissioners. The Commissioners shall make and publish annually an analysis and recapitulation of such reports.

(c) Each licensee shall keep and use in his business and shall preserve for at least 3 years after making the final entry on any loan recorded therein, such books, accounts, records, or card systems as will enable the Commissioners to determine whether such licensee is complying with the provisions of this act and with the rules and regulations made pursuant thereto.

(d) The Commissioners are authorized to appoint such assistants, clerks, or other employees as may be required for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

(e) Any person aggrieved by any action, decision, or ruling of the Commissioners under this act may, within 20 days thereafter, of within 20 days after the service upon such person of any written decision and findings required by this act, appeal to the Commissioners for a review thereof. Upon any such review, the Commissioners may affirm, set aside, or modify such action, decision, or ruling. In any such case the Commissioners shall, within 10 days thereafter, prepare a written decision and findings with respect thereto, containing a summary of the evidence and the reasons supporting the affirmance, setting aside, or modification, and forthwith serve upon the aggrieved person a copy thereof.

ADVERTISING

SEC. 8. (a) No licensee or other person, firm, voluntary association, joint stock company, incorporated society, or corporation shall advertise, print, display, publish, distribute, or broadcast, or cause or permit to be advertised, printed, displayed, published, distributed, or broadcast, in any manner whatsoever, any statement or representation with regard to the rates, terms, or conditions for lending of money, credit, goods, or things in action in the amount or of the value of $1,000 or less, which is false, misleading, or deceptive, or, in the case of a licensee, which refers to the supervision of such business by the District of Columbia, or any department or official thereof. The Commissioners may order any licensee to desist from any conduct which they shall find to be a violation of the foregoing provisions.

(b) The Commissioners may require that rates of charge, if stated by a licensee, be stated fully and clearly in such manner as they may deem necessary to prevent misunderstanding thereof by prospective borrowers.

SEC. 9. (a) The Commissioners shall investigate from time to time the economic conditions and other factors relating to and affecting the business of making pawnbroker loans under this act, and shall ascertain all pertinent facts necessary to determine what maximum rate of interest should be permitted. Upon the basis of such ascertained facts, the Commissioners shall determine and fix by regulation or order a maximum rate of interest in connection with such loans which will induce efficiently managed commercial capital to be invested in such business in sufficient amounts to make available adequate credit facilities to individuals seeking such loans at reasonable rates of interest, and which will afford those engaged in such business a fair and reasonable return upon the assets. The Commissioners may from time to time, upon the basis of changed conditions or facts, redetermine and refix any such maximum rate of interest, but, before determining or redetermining any such maximum rate, the Commissioners shall give reasonable notice of their intention to consider doing so to all licensees and a reasonable opportunity to be heard and introduce evidence with respect thereto and such notice shall also be published once each week for 2 consecutive weeks in 1 or more of the daily newspapers published in the District. Any such changed maximum rate of interest shall not affect preexisting loan contracts lawfully entered into between any licensee and any borrower. Until such time as a different rate is fixed by the Commissioners in accordance with the authorization contained in this section, every licensed pawnbroker may contract for and receive on any loan of money, not exceeding 2 percent per month, or fraction thereof, upon any loan not exceeding the sum of $200, or more than 1 percent per month or fraction thereof, upon any loan exceeding $200 and not exceeding $1,000, and 8 percent per annum on any loan in excess of $1,000, under a penalty of $100 for each such offense: *Provided*, That pawnbrokers may ask, demand, and receive a minimum charge in lieu of interest of 50 cents.

(b) The borrower may pay all or any part of any loan made pursuant to this act at any time before the date of maturity thereof, but any such payment may first be applied by the licensee to all interest unpaid up to the date of such payment.

SEC. 10. (a) No person, except as authorized by this act, shall directly or indirectly, by any device, subterfuge, or pretense whatsoever, ask, demand, charge, contract for, or receive, or participate, as agent, broker, procurer, intermediary, or volunteer, or in any other capacity, in asking, demanding charging, contracting for, or receiving any interest, discount, fee, charge, or other consideration which in the aggregate is greater than the interest which is permitted by section 1178, 1179, or 1180 of such act approved March 3, 1901, as amended, upon any loan or application for loan in the amount or of the value of $1,000, or less, whether or not such loan is made.

(b) No person engaged in the business regulated by this act shall pay, directly or indirectly, to any person, any money, service, or thing of value for the doing of any of the acts prohibited in the subsection (a) of this section: *Provided*, That this subsection shall apply only to acts done or performed with reference to loan transactions or applications for loans in sums of $1,000 or less, or in inducing or seeking to induce any person to borrow in sums of $1,000 or less.

(c) No instrument evidencing a loan made within the District in violation of the provisions of this act shall be valid or enforceable in the District by the lender or by any other holder thereof who acquired the same with actual knowledge that said loan was made in violation of the provisions of this act or with knowledge of such facts that his action in taking such instrument amounted to bad faith.

(d) Any loan made by any person not licensed under this act for which there has been charged, contracted for, or received a greater rate of interest, discount, or consideration than the interest which is permitted by section 1178, 1179, or 1180 of the act approved March 3, 1901, as amended, and any loan made by a licensee under this act for which there has been charged, contracted for, or received a greater rate of interest, discount, or consideration than licensees are permitted to charge, contract for, or receive under this act is hereby declared to be against the public policy of the District. No such loan made outside the District shall be enforced in the District and every person in anywise participating therein in the District shall be subject to the provisions of this act, except that the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to small loans legally made in any State under and in accordance with the provisions of a duly enacted pawnbroker law.

SEC. 11. (a) Every pawnbroker shall keep a book in which shall be fairly written, at the time of each loan, an accurate account and description of the goods, article, or thing pawned or pledged, the amount of money loaned thereon, the time of pledging the same, the rate of interest to be paid on such loan, and the name and residence of the person pawning or pledging the said goods, article, or thing, together with a particular description of such person, including complexion, color of eyes and hair, and his or her height and general appearances.

(b) The said book shall at all reasonable times be open to the inspection of the Commissioners.

(c) Except as to any judicial or other official of the District, having a right thereto in his official capacity, it shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the District to divulge or make known in any manner the contents of such book.

SEC. 12. Every pawnbroker shall, at the time of each loan, deliver to the person pawning or pledging any goods, article, or thing a memorandum or note, signed by him, containing the substance of the entry required to be made in his or her book by the last preceding section, excepting as to the description of the person and no charge shall be made or received by any pawnbroker for any such entry, memorandum, or note.

SEC. 13. No pawnbroker shall sell any pawn or pledge until the same shall have remained 1 year in his possession, unless by consent in writing by the pawner; and all such sales shall be made at public auction and not otherwise, and shall be made or conducted only by an auctioneer licensed by the District of Columbia.

SEC. 14. Notice of every such sale shall be published for at least 6 days previous thereto, in one or more of the daily newspapers of general circulation printed in the District of Columbia, and such notice shall specify the time and place at which such sale is to take place, the name of the auctioneer by whom the same is to be conducted, and a description of the article to be sold, and in addition thereto the pawnbroker shall mail to the pawner a copy of such notice and shall obtain from the postmaster or his authorized agent a certificate showing such mailing, issued pursuant to the act approved January 13, 1931 (U. S. C., title 39, sec. 260a), and regulations made thereunder. Such certificates shall be deemed to be part of the records of the business of the pawnbroker required by this title to be kept.

SEC. 15. The surplus money, if any, arising from any such sale, after deducting the amount of the loan, the interest then due on the same, and the expenses of the advertisement and sale, shall be paid over by the pawnbroker to the person who would be entitled to redeem the pledge in case no such sale had taken place.

PENALTIES

SEC. 16. (a) Any individual or any member, officer, director, agent, or employee of any firm, voluntary association, joint-stock company, incorporated society, or corporation who shall violate or participate in the violation of any of the provisions of this act shall be punished by a fine of not more than $300 or by imprisonment for not more than 90 days.

(b) Any contract of loan in the making or collection of which any act shall have been done which constitutes a violation of any of the provisions of this title shall be void and the lender shall have no right to collect or receive any principal, interest, or charges whatsoever on account thereof. Any person pledging any goods, article, or other thing as security for a loan which is void shall be entitled to the return of such goods, article, or thing without being required to pay any principal, interest, or other charge on account of such void loan.

SEC. 17. The Commissioners are authorized to make and enforce such rules and regulations as they deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 18. Nothing in this act shall apply to any person, firm, joint-stock company, incorporated society, credit union, or corporation doing business in the District of Columbia under the supervision of the Federal Reserve System, or the Comptroller of the Currency, or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or the Home Loan Bank Board, or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or to loans made by them.

REPEAL

SEC. 19. The act entitled "An act to regulate the business of loaning money on security of any kind by persons, firms, and corporations other than national banks, licensed bankers, trust companies, savings banks, building and loan associations, and real-estate brokers, in the District of Columbia," approved February 4, 1913, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEPARABILTY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 20. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF ACT

SEC. 21. This act shall take effect at the expiration of 60 days after the date of its approval.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 8, strike "oher" and insert "other."

On page 2, line 20, strike word "manner" after "Advertising" and insert "matter."

On page 2, line 24, strike word "manner" after "advertising" and insert "matter."

On page 16, line 15, strike word "very" and insert "every."

On page 16, line 18, strike word "small" and insert in lieu thereof "a"; strike "s" from the word "loans."

Page 20, line 9, after the word "amended" insert "insofar as the same applies to the business of lending money on the security of the pledge and possession of tangible personal property."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in explanation of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, section 1 of the bill contains definitions of terms used in the bill.

Section 2 prohibits engaging in business as a pawnbroker without first obtaining a license from the Commissioners. It further prohibits the use of the word "pawnbroker" or the display of any symbol commonly used by pawnbrokers by any unlicensed business.

Section 3 sets forth qualifications for license, including the requirement that applicants have available for use in the business of making loans cash capital of at least $20,000.

Section 4 requires applicants to file a bond running to the District in the sum of $5,000 conditioned upon the compliance by the applicant with provisions of the act and all rules and regulations made pursuant thereto. It authorizes any person injured by noncompliance with law or regulation by a licensee to maintain suit in his own name and recover on the bond such damages as shall be adjudged.

Section 5 provides that after investigation and after satisfying the Commissioners of his qualifications the license shall be issued to the applicant and that the annual license fee shall be $500.

Section 6 provides for the revocation, suspension, and renewal of licenses.

Section 7 imposes upon the Commissioners the duty of enforcing the act; authorizes the Commissioners to investigate the business and records of licensees and authorizes the Commissioners to require by subpena the production of books, papers, and records, and the attendance, and examination under oath, of all persons whose testimony they may require relative to loans or business of licensees.

Section 8 prohibits false or misleading advertising respecting the pawnbroker business.

Section 9 is the interest section. It directs the District Commissioners to investigate from time to time the economic conditions and other factors relating to the business of making pawnbroker loans; to ascertain pertinent facts necessary to determine what maximum rate of interest may be permitted upon the basis of such ascertained facts and to fix by regulation the maximum rate of interest on pawnbroker loans which will induce efficiently managed commercial capital to be invested in such business in sufficient amounts to make available adequate facilities to individuals seking such loans at reasonable rates of interest and which will afford those engaged in such business a fair and reasonable return upon the assets.

Pending the determination of such rates by the Commissioners, the bill authorizes the pawnbrokers to charge not exceeding 2 percent per month, or fraction thereof, upon any loan not exceeding $200, or more than 1 percent per month, or fraction thereof, upon any loan exceeding $200 and not exceeding $1,000, and 8 percent per annum—the maximum statutory rate now in effect—on any loan in excess of $1,000.

Section 10 prohibits the charging of interest in excess of the existing statutory rate of 6 percent per annum, or 8 percent per annum upon an instrument in writing, by any person except a licensee under the act and declares invalid any instrument evidencing a loan made in the District in violation of the provisions of the bill.

Section 11 requires every pawnbroker to record in a book at the time of each loan an accurate account and description of the goods pawned, the amount of money loaned thereon, the time of pledging the same, and the rate of interest to be paid on such loan, the name and residence of the person pawning such goods together with a description of such persons; requires that the book at all reasonable times be open to the inspection of the Commissioners, and prohibits disclosure by any officer of the District of entries in such book to any person other than an official having a right thereto in his official capacity.

Section 12 requires every pawnbroker at the time of each loan to deliver to any person pawning any goods a memorandum signed by him containing the substance of the entry required to be made by him in this book.

Section 13 prohibits any pawnbroker from selling any pawned article until the same has remained 1 year in his possession, unless with the consent of the pawner. It also provides that all sales shall be made at public auction and shall be made or conducted by licensed auctioneers.

Section 14 requires that notice of every such sale be published at least 6 days prior thereto in one or more daily newspapers printed in the District, such notice to specify the time and place where such sale is to take place, the name of the auctioneer and a description of the article to be sold. In addition the pawnbroker is required to mail to the pawner a copy of such notice.

Section 15 provides that the surplus money, if any, arising from any such sale, after deducting the interest then due and the expenses of advertising any such sale, shall be paid over by the pawnbroker to the person who would be entitled to redeem the pledge in case no such sale had taken place.

Section 16 provides penalties for violation of the act of a fine of not more than $300 or imprisonment for not more than 90 days; declares that any contract of loan from which any act shall have been done which constitutes a violation of the bill shall be void and that the lender shall have no right to collect or receive any principal or charges whatsoever on account thereof.

Section 17 authorizes the Commissioners to make and enforce such regulations as they deem necessary to carry out the purposes of the act.

Section 18 exempts from application of the act, firms, stock companies, and credit unions doing business in the District of Columbia under the supervision of the Federal Reserve System, Comptroller of the Currency, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or to loans made by them.

Section 19 repeals the act of February 4, 1913, as amended, insofar as the same applies to the business of lending money on the security of pledge and possession of tangible personal property.

Section 20 provides if any provision of the act be held invalid the remainder of the act shall not be affected thereby.

Section 21 provides that the act shall take effect at the expiration of 60 days after the date of its approval.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer several amendments to the bill and ask that they may be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. HARRIS:

On page 2, section 1, line 13, paragraph (d), of this bill, replace the period with a comma and add the following: "and shall include all pawnbrokers referred to in SEC. 4–148, SEC. 4–149 and SEC. 4–150 of the D. C. Code of 1951."

On page 17, line 7, after the word "Commissioners", add the following:

"It shall be the duty of every pawnbroker, and of every person in his employ, to admit to his premises during business hours any member of the Metropolitan Police Force of the District of Columbia as aforesaid to examine any pledge or pawn book or other record on the premises, as well as the articles pledged, purchased, or received, and to search for and take possession of any article known by him to be missing or known or believed by him to have been stolen, without the formality of the writ of search warrant or any other process, which search or seizure is hereby authorized."

On page 17, after line 12, insert a new paragraph (d), to read as follows:

"Every pawnbroker shall, every day, except Sunday, before the hour of eleven o'clock in the forenoon, deliver to the Chief of Police, or his representative, on forms to be prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, a legible and correct transcript from the book or books provided for in section 11 (a), showing an accurate and complete description of every article or thing received by him, in pawn or pledge, and giving all numbers, marks, monograms, trademarks, manufacturers' names and other marks of identification appearing on the same, on the business day next preceding, together with the numbers of the pawn ticket issued therefore, the amount of the loan thereon, and the name, residence and physical description of the person pawning or pledging the said goods, article or thing."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I may say of the amendments that the police department of the District of Columbia have suggested and indicated that it would be highly desirable to have them added to this bill.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. The amendment was never considered by the committee. I assume it is a clarification intended to help the police in their dealings with pawnbrokers.

Mr. HARRIS. Some of them were. I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], a member of the committee to explain further.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Is this any different from the amendments here?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is the entire bill all about? Is this a bill to increase the number of pawnbrokers, or what are we dealing with here?

Mr. HARRIS. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa that this is a revision of present law with reference to pawnbroker operations. Presently there is the requirement to have a license for pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia. But other provisions of the law are considered to be unfair to those who are trying to do a legitimate business. Others who are endeavoring to operate are going to the edges or the fringe of the District and establishing operations. The people in the District are going outside to engage in this business.

This bill sets up standards by which the Commissioners shall regulate the operation of the business within the District of Columbia, and there are certain requirements. The bill provides that each one who proposes to operate must meet these requirements. There are also strict rules and regulations with which they must comply in order to afford protection to the people of the District of Columbia, giving the Commissioners of the District of Columbia the responsibility of administering the act and the police department having full authority to make such investigations and to make such inspections of the records as may be necessary.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SENATE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Senate:

JUNE 22, 1956.

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the message announcing its agreement to the amendments to S. 1622, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the Senate will be granted.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO DESIGNATE EMPLOYEES OF THE DISTRICT TO PROTECT LIFE AND PROPERTY

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I may say that I am pinch-hitting for our distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia [Mr. MCMILLAN], who is in South Carolina at the present time. He has requested that I call up these bills for him.

Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (S. 1275) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate employees of the District to protect life and property in and on the buildings and grounds of any institution located upon property outside of the District of Columbia acquired by the United States for District sanitoriums, hospitals, training schools, and other institutions, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may designate any employee of the District to protect life and property in and on the buildings and grounds of any institution upon land outside the District acquired by the United States for the District of Columbia for the establishment or operation thereon of any sanitorium, hospital, training schools, correctional institution, reformatory, workhouse, or jail. Whenever any employee is so designated he is hereby authorized and empowered (1) to arrest under a warrant within the buildings and grounds of any such institution any person accused of having committed within any such buildings or grounds any offense against the laws of the United States, or against any rule or regulation prescribed pursuant to this act; (2) to arrest without a warrant any person committing any such offense within such buildings or grounds, in his presence; or (3) to arrest without warrant within such buildings or grounds, any person who he has reasonable grounds to believe has committed a felony in such buildings or grounds.

(b) Any individual having the power to arrest as provided in subsection (a) of this section may carry firearms or other weapons as the Commissioner may direct or by regulation may prescribe.

SEC. 2. The Commissioners may make and amend such rules and regulations as they deem necessary for the protection of life and property in or on the buildings and grounds of any such institution.

SEC. 3. Any person who knowingly and willfully violates any rule or regulation prescribed under this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 6 months or both.

SEC. 4. The officer on duty in command of those employees designated by the Commissioners as provided in section 1 of this act may accept deposit of collateral from any person charged with the violation of any rule or regulation prescribed under this act, for appearance in court or before the appropriate United States commissioner; and such collateral shall be deposited with the United States commissioner sitting in the district where the offense has been committed.

SEC. 5. The Commissioners may enter into agreements with any of the States, or any political subdivision thereof, where any such institution mentioned in section 1 of this act is located, for such governmental services as the Commissioners shall deem necessary to the efficient and proper government of such institution, and they may, from time to time, agree to modifications in any such agreement: *Provided*, That where the charge for any such service is established by the laws of the State within whose territorial limits such institution is situated, the Commissioners may not pay for such service an amount in excess of the charge so established. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the making of payment for services under any such agreement.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I offer two amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 2, before the period add the following proviso: ": *Provided*, That such employee shall be bonded for the faithful discharge of such duties, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall fix the penalty of any such bond."

On page 2, line 16, immediately after the word "weapons", insert the following: "and shall wear such uniform with such identification badge."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I understand the amendments just proposed have been discussed with our colleagues on the other side and are agreeable to them.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, these amendments have not been discussed with those on this side.

Mr. HARRIS. I was advised that the amendments had been taken up with members of the committee on the gentleman's side of the aisle and were agreed to.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. I can only answer for myself. However, I shall not object.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. The gentleman did discuss these amendments with me and I wholeheartedly agreed with him.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill just passed is to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate employees of the District as special policemen to protect life and property in and on buildings and grounds of any institution located upon property outside of the District of Columbia, acquired by the United States for District sanatoriums, hospitals, training schools, and other institutions.

For some time there have been incidents of vandalism, thefts, trespassing, and assaults at several of the institutions operated by the District on land outside of the District of Columbia. The persons in charge of the institutions have to call the State or county police or the Federal Bureau of Investigation to make the necessary arrests. The State and county police are not authorized to go into some of the institutions and the local office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is not open at night. There is no police protection when it is most needed.

Title to the several tracts of land on which these institutions are located has been taken in the United States pursuant to specific acts of Congress. Congress has made appropriations for the building of the institutions and their maintenance each year and has given the District authority to administer and operate them.

In the past there has been considerable difficulty in arranging for confinement, board, and lodging for persons arrested on the grounds or buildings of such institutions prior to taking them before a committing magistrate. To solve this and other problems, section 5 of the bill authorizes the Commissioners to enter into agreements with any of the States or any political subdivision thereof for the confinement, board, and lodging of any person who has been arrested under the provisions of section 1 of the bill, until he can be brought before the proper committing magistrate or to the United States commissioner of the district where the offense occurred, to "be arrested and imprisoned, or bailed as the case may be for trial before such court of the United States as by law has cognizance of the offense"—United States Code, 1952 edition, title 18, chapter 203, section 3041.

COLUMBIA HISTORICAL SOCIETY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 3663) to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the real estate described as lot 79, in square numbered 115, situated in the city of Washington, D. C., owned by the Columbia Historical Society, is hereby exempt from all taxation so long as the same is owned and occupied by the Columbia Historical Society and its member organizations and is not used for commercial purposes, subject to the provisions of sections 2, 3, and 5 of the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1091; D. C. Code, secs. 47–801b, 47–801c, and 47–801e).

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide for the exemption from taxation the real estate described as lot 79, in square 115, in the District of Columbia owned by the Columbia Historical Society so long as the same is owned and occupied by the Columbia Historical Society and its member organizations and is not used for commercial purposes. The exemption would be subject to the provisions of sections 2, 3, and 5 of the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942.

The Columbia Historical Society is the historical society of and for the Nation's Capital, as well as the District of Columbia. It was founded and incorporated in 1894, and is a nonprofit cultural, educational, philanthropic, and historical society for "the collection, preservation, and diffusion of knowledge respecting the history and topography of the District of Columbia."

Such exemptions have been granted in past Congresses to other nonprofit organizations. The loss of revenue from annual real estate taxes on this property, under present valuation, amounts to $2,876.28.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 3295) to amend the act of April 28, 1953, relating to daylight saving time in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to permit the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District," approved April 28, 1953 (D. C. Code, sec. 28–2804), is hereby amended by striking out the words "last Sunday of September" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "last Sunday of October."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend the act which permits the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District of Columbia each year—approved April 28, 1953, District of Columbia Code, section 28–2804. Under existing law the Commissioners may establish daylight saving time in the District of Columbia for the period beginning not earlier than the last Sunday in April and ending not later than the last Sunday in September. S. 3295 would permit the Commissioners to extend daylight saving time to the last Sunday in October.

The committee has been advised that this proposed extension is necessary in order to bring the District of Columbia in line with a number of large cities in the northeastern and midwestern sections of the United States, and would eliminate confusion as to transportation, radio, and television schedules and programs.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. This is an extension of daylight saving time for an additional 30 days, is it not?

Mr. HARRIS. It gives authority to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to extend daylight saving time within the District of Columbia for one additional month.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I hope I am not out of order if I say that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] still is opposed to this extension of daylight saving time.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to confirm just what the gentleman has said. Our colleague from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] has very definitely expressed his feelings about this question to me to be conveyed to the committee, the Congress and the entire country.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I, too, join the gentleman from Minnesota in opposition to this measure. I am doing it at the urgent request of the West Virginia State Farm Bureau. They are opposed to this type

of legislation, and I want to register my opposition to the passage of this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the spokesman for the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], the necessity for extension of daylight-saving time until the last of October.

Mr. HARRIS. There is a request being made that the extension of daylight-saving time for the District of Columbia conform to other jurisdictions in the New England and eastern seaboard States. It seems that about a year or 2 years ago some of the New England States extended daylight-saving time from the last Sunday in September to the last Sunday in October. I am not sure that the adoption of this kind of legislation by some could be considered as corrective legislation, but nevertheless, as time went on other jurisdictions throughout the entire area have increased daylight-saving time from this period to the last Sunday in October.

Mr. GROSS. What is the real reason? Why are we extending this time other than to keep up with the Joneses in New York and Philadelphia? Just why?

Mr. HARRIS. I was just explaining it was to conform with the other jurisdictions in the New England and eastern seaboard States. Now, after the other States from here clear on up the seaboard to the New England States, and Chicago and St. Louis, had extended daylight-saving time for an additional month, the transportation industry, that is, the railroads, the aviation industry, the commercial airlines, the communications industries, radio and television, the local board of trade here in the District, the school board of the District of Columbia, and the businessmen of the District of Columbia came to us and asked that daylight-saving time for the District of Columbia conform to the other jurisdictions in this extension.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman realize and do not the school officials of the District of Columbia realize that on an overcast, stormy morning there will be schoolchildren who will be going to school in semidarkness by the last of October? Is there no regard for the safety of these youngsters?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say to my distinguished friend that we held 2 days of hearings on this bill, and among the witnesses heard were the Chairman of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of Schools of the District of Columbia. Both witnesses urged the adoption of this bill extending the time and said that it was in the interest of the schoolchildren of the District of Columbia. We questioned them very carefully on that subject.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman dispute the fact that there would be children going to school in the dark, on cloudy or rainy mornings, during October?

Mr. HARRIS. I am merely reporting to the gentleman what the testimony was of these particular people who appeared as witnesses urging adoption of this proposed legislation.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad the gentleman mentioned hearings. Where are the hearings on this bill?

Mr. HARRIS. We can get a copy of the transcript of the hearings immediately.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; but the committee did not have hearings printed, and if it so important that daylight time be extended, why not printed hearings, so that some of the rest of us may find out who is responsible for this extension and their reasons. Did any of the golfing fraternity come in and testify for this bill? I have always called this and believe it to be the golfer's special. Did any of the golfing fraternity come in and testify?

Mr. HARRIS. No. I hope the gentleman does not wish to question my explanation of this. I am giving the gentleman information. I am merely trying to give the gentleman factual information. So far as I know, no one from the golfing industry or the field of golfing appeared or expressed any interest in the matter one way or the other.

Mr. GROSS. What is the merit of this proposal? I have not yet gotten an answer to my question. What is the merit of this bill to extend daylight saving time to the end of October other than the fact that certain people in the District want to keep up with the Joneses somewhere else?

Mr. HARRIS. I could not explain to the gentleman from Iowa. I believe it was the State of Massachusetts that first extended the time. After that other jurisdictions extended the time. The merit of it is that this affects the transportation industry; railroad and airline schedules get all messed up, as well as television and radio schedules. So they want to conform to the time in New York, Chicago, St. Louis, and other centers where these matters originate.

Mr. GROSS. If this is such a good thing, why not extend it for the entire year, put it on a 12-months' basis?

Mr. HARRIS. I am not in a position to answer that, because I would not be for that.

Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman is in favor of extending it through October, I take it?

Mr. HARRIS. No; I am not sure that I am.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts if he can shed any light on this.

Mr. HESELTON. I should like simply to ask a question, if I may, at this point, of the gentleman handling the legislation, because I stepped in just as the gentleman was asking a question. Do I understand that there were 2 days of hearings on this measure?

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HESELTON. And do I understand there were no witnesses representing the District who appeared against the measure?

Mr. HARRIS. There were no witnesses at all who appeared against the measure.

Mr. HESELTON. That is all.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The gentleman says that he wants some light shed on this matter. That is the reason why we extended the time up in Massachusetts, because we want more light.

Mr. GROSS. I am not surprised, because they do need more light on some things up in Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, this silly manhandling of the clock is being continued for the benefit of the golfers, radio and television operators, among others, who seem to be able to make life as complicated as possible for the rest of us. I hope all of the Members appreciate the fact that they are losing an hour in the morning when they could be getting some good sleep under cooler conditions, because of this monstrosity.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does not the gentleman think if they tried to impose this all over the United States some of the Members of Congress might take a different view toward voting for this bill?

Mr. GROSS. And especially so if they had to get out of bed at night to answer telephone calls from constituents who failed to recognize the fact that there was a time differential due to some misguided individuals who are trying to cheat the sun. I heartily agree with the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Also the people who have farms and work as they do back home would not stand for any such thing as this.

Mr. GROSS. Not at all.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If they had young children and had to put them to bed when it was still light, they would not vote for it.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is exactly right. Why do you not go ahead and try to do a real good job of trying to beat the clock and the sun and put this thing on a year-round basis. Why not set the clocks back an hour each afternoon and add still another hour of daylight? That would provide even more enlightenment for the people of Massachusetts.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I think I am the only one from Minnesota on this side of the aisle that is present today. May I say also, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, that I voted against this in the committee the other morning when it was up for consideration.

Because of my very dear friendship for my colleague from Minnesota, JOE O'HARA, I want to express on behalf of him and myself our opposition to this bill, and hope it acts as a proxy for him, because I know he would dearly love to be here to cast a "no" vote.

Mr. HARRIS. My colleague from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] called me and requested that certain information be obtained for the record. We made every possible effort to obtain all the information he requested, and it was put in the record of the proceedings when the hearings were held.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. My question directed to the gentleman is that I do not quite understand what is the basic reason for extending daylight saving time another month. I was brought up in this part of the world. I went to school in this part of the world. When you pass the 1st of October you are going into the fall and winter, and the days are different. I have yet to understand the logic of extending this. I do not like it very much as it is. I think if you had it all year around it would be all right, but to move it up when you have the railroads running on one schedule, the cities on another, the people on the farms of Virginia on one time and the people in the District on another, causes complications. But you add other complications as soon as you go into the fall months. What reasons were advanced to justify Congress in taking this step and extending it beyond the normal time of the summer months and carrying it into the fall?

Mr. HARRIS. As I have already explained, some year and a half ago, maybe longer, the State of Massachusetts, according to the hearings, extended daylight saving time in that jurisdiction for this additional month. In time all the New England States extended it. The Legislature of the State of New York extended it for the State of New York. Then the State of Pennsylvania adopted it. Maryland and other States along the eastern seaboard did the same, as did Chicago and St. Louis. As the gentleman knows, those are the heavy originating centers for transportation by railroad, by airplane; and of course television and radio programs.

Mr. PHILLIPS. So you think it desirable to extend the confusion for another month?

Mr. HARRIS. I think it minimizes the confusion. We can conform to the jurisdiction of these States. In many of these jurisdictions they had this a year ago. The people of the District of Columbia who came and testified said that because of the hour's difference that month with the immediate jurisdiction to the north and all through the New England and New York area it created a very difficult situation here in the District of Columbia, particularly because of the situation I have mentioned regarding transportation and communication.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I do not quite understand the reference to transportation, because when I go down to the railroads the trains run on a different time than the District of Columbia time, so I have to ask, "Do you mean by my watch?" And they say, "No, we mean an hour different from your watch." So I do not see how you are doing anything but extending the confusion for another month in the District of Columbia. If I take the plane to fly, I think the planes fly on daylight-saving time.

Mr. HARRIS. Representatives of these industries came before the committee and in their testimony were very insistent that this change be made to conform.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Who were they?

Mr. HARRIS. The railway industry and the commercial airline industry, as well as the radio and television industry.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Well, I cannot understand that.

Mr. HARRIS. I do want to say this. The gentleman knows my record in the House in the past shows that I have never been enthusiastic about daylight-saving time. I was one of many who opposed it even when it was adopted, giving the Commissioners the authority to invoke daylight-saving time from the last Sunday in April to the last Sunday in September. But, since that is the law and since this Congress adopted it as a policy and since this is merely an extension of 1 month to conform to other jurisdictions which vitally affect this jurisdiction, and since this matter of conforming is in the interest of the local people, I think it should be approved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the Federal judiciary bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] may extend his remarks in the RECORD on the pending bill at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, the necessity for this bill arises from conditions existing last year when daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia ended on the last Sunday of September while other large communities in the country, particularly in the East and parts of the Midwest continued on daylight-saving time to the last Sunday of October. The resulting confusion and annoyance were obvious to everyone directly concerned.

It is significant that during the 2 days of hearings by the committee no one from the District opposed the bill while there was unanimous support from all who took the opportunity of testifying.

Had it not been for the technical difficulties existing in 1953, when Congress gave the Board of Commissioners of the District the authority to establish daylight-saving time each year, there can be no doubt but that Congress would have extended that authority at least through October of each year. Since we are this afternoon using time to act as a city council for the District, there is no sound reason why the bill should not be passed. Sometime Congress may turn over such municipal functions to a municipal agency and devote the time, energy and expense involved to other matters more clearly in the interest of the Nation as a whole.

However, I must concede that some of the events of this past year have not increased that possibility in the immediate future and that some of the advocates of home rule for the Distict have not contributed significantly of late to that cause. Some soul searching, particularly by a few who have paid lipservice to that objective, seems to be in order.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some question raised about the purpose of this legislation. We know that daylight-saving time originated in wartime. As a result of that, the industrial workers got to the point where they liked it. They like that extra hour of light after they get off from work. So, as a result of the demand of the industrial workers in the great industrial centers here in the East, in Chicago, and in other industrial centers, the legislative authorities involved, in response to that demand have continued the daylight-saving time principle. As evidenced by the bill before us, for many areas in the East, in Chicago and St. Louis that principle is extended for an extra month. That is the simple why and wherefore of it. The men and women working in industry want that extra hour. This particular bill, as has been so ably explained by the gentleman from Arkansas, is simply a matter of giving the Commissioners the authority to extend the time to conform to the major centers of communication in the eastern part of the United States. This bill does not automatically extend it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. So the gentleman is saying that a comparatively small minority of the population of this country forces the rest of us to conform to this daylight-saving time business; is that correct?

Mr. HYDE. A large enough segment of the population in the major centers of the population in the East are the ones who are insisting upon this.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Is not the nub of the matter this, that even though we, who come from Midwestern districts, would naturally prefer to have Washington time only 1 hour ahead of our time at home

rather than 2 hours ahead, the fact is that without this resolution, all of the Eastern seaboard from the Potomac north, except the District of Columbia, will be on one time during October and the city of Washington will be on another. In view of the fact that Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and the rest of those States, plus the New England area, will be on daylight-saving time, is it not less disrupting, more convenient, and more sensible that the District of Columbia, which has most of its business and transportation connections with those cities and areas, have the same time also? It is just that simple; is it not? Not the merits or demerits of daylight-saving time; but convenience for Washington and neighboring States and cities.

Mr. HYDE. That is the way it seemed to the majority of the committee.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 1, line 8, by adding "And is further amended by adding a proviso at such section reading: *'Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall be suspended during such time as Congress is in session'."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have always thought that this daylight savings was one of the most asinine proposals that has ever been made. I know that down in my country we have a lot of people who work in industry, and during these summer days they decide they would like to go to work 1 hour earlier and so they go to work an hour earlier and they quit an hour earlier, and they do not disturb the time and convenience of anyone.

I know the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] had no intention of doing it, but I could not follow as he was trying to explain about the railroads. The railroads still use standard time, or at least some of them do. We have that confusion when we are trying to catch a train, and that is one thing that I am opposed to about this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I regret if the gentleman misunderstood what I said, and I am not sure that he did. I was not saying that I was trying to explain that myself. I was telling you what the railroad industry told us during the committee hearings.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. But if they are using standard time all the time, it will lessen the confusion by extending it another month?

Mr. HARRIS. They made it very definite that it had a great bearing on their schedules.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think that is wrong, because they use standard time all throughout the year. If you are going to have this crazy time, let us have it all over the entire country. I guarantee that if you do, you will hear enough from your constituents that you will vote it out in the District of Columbia.

These people working in industry can go to work any time they want to. They can do it without disturbing people who want to live a normal, ordinary life. This difference in time between the district I represent and the District of Columbia is confusing. I leave my office at 5 o'clock and I get a call at 5:30 at my home, and the fellow says, "I cannot understand what you are doing home at this time of day. It is only the middle of the afternoon." He says, "I do not understand it."

And I do not like this thing of getting up in the middle of the night to answer the telephone. It is just confusion all the way through. If you will adopt this little amendment, let us just keep Congress on standard time, and I think everybody will get along very well and we will avoid a lot of confusion.

Of course I am opposed to the entire bill, but at least we can improve it by adopting this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Of course I would have enjoyed having the gentleman's amendment about 3 years ago, if he had offered it then.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I offered a similar amendment at that time, but unfortunately I do not think some of the Members understood it and they defeated it.

Mr. HARRIS. The purpose of my taking this time is to try to get some information about the gentleman's amendment. Do I understand that the gentleman would amend the present Daylight Saving Act whereby there would be no daylight saving in the District of Columbia during the time that Congress is in session?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. That would be retroactive of present law; that is, it would extend this limitation back to May when daylight time goes into effect clear through September or October?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Of course it could not go into effect until the bill is passed. So we could not make it retroactive. It would be from here on out.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman does not mean that his amendment would apply only to the month of October?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Oh, no. It would apply any time that daylight saving would be put into effect. It would not be put into effect when the Congress was in session.

Mr. HARRIS. I wanted to get that clear. This would kill daylight-saving time for the District of Columbia until the Congress adjourns, which is always about July or August.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Maybe it would have a tendency to get Congress adjourned a little earlier. I would be in favor of that.

Mr. HARRIS. Well, we might pick up a few votes on it.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. I do not think the gentleman from Missouri is taking into consideration a call for a special session.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That would be included also.

Mr. HARRIS. I think this would create a much worse situation than we have. As much as I regret to oppose my good friend, I must ask for the defeat of the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 27, noes 49.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present, and I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The Chair will count.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present and object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I now object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has counted three times and failed to find a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 199, nays 120, answered "present" 1, not voting 112, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—199

Abernethy	Clark	Halleck
Albert	Cole	Harden
Alger	Cramer	Hardy
Allen, Calif.	Crumpacker	Harris
Arends	Curtis, Mass.	Harvey
Ashley	Curtis, Mo.	Hays, Ohio
Aspinall	Dawson, Ill.	Hayworth
Auchincloss	Dawson, Utah	Hébert
Avery	Deane	Herlong
Ayres	Delaney	Heselton
Baldwin	Derounian	Hiestand
Bates	Devereux	Hillings
Beamer	Dingell	Hinshaw
Becker	Dondero	Holland
Belcher	Donovan	Holmes
Bennett, Mich.	Dorn, N. Y.	Holt
Blatnik	Doyle	Hope
Boggs	Edmondson	Horan
Boland	Engle	Hosmer
Bolling	Fallon	Hull
Bolton, Oliver P.	Feighan	Hyde
	Fenton	Ikard
Bosch	Fernandez	James
Bowler	Fisher	Jarman
Boyle	Flood	Jenkins
Bray	Flynt	Johnson, Calif.
Brown, Ga.	Forand	Jonas
Broyhill	Ford	Judd
Bush	Frelinghuysen	Karsten
Byrd	Friedel	Kearney
Byrnes, Wis.	Gathings	Kearns
Carlyle	Gavin	Keating
Carnahan	Gordon	Kilburn
Carrigg	Gray	Kilday
Cederberg	Green, Oreg.	Kilgore
Celler	Gwinn	King, Calif.
Chase	Hagen	Kirwan
Church	Hale	Knox

Lanham	Ostertag	Sullivan
Latham	Patterson	Taber
Lesinski	Pelly	Teague, Calif.
Lipscomb	Perkins	Teague, Tex.
McConnell	Poage	Thompson, N. J.
McCormack	Polk	Thompson, Tex.
McDonough	Priest	Tollefson
McDowell	Prouty	Trimble
McGregor	Rabaut	Tumulty
McIntire	Ray	Udall
Macdonald	Reece, Tenn.	Utt
Mack, Ill.	Reuss	Vanik
Mack, Wash.	Rhodes, Pa.	Van Zandt
Magnuson	Riehlman	Walter
Mahon	Rivers	Watts
Mailliard	Robsion, Ky.	Westland
Martin	Rogers, Colo.	Wharton
Matthews	Rogers, Fla.	Widnall
Meader	Rogers, Mass.	Wigglesworth
Metcalf	Roosevelt	Williams, N. J.
Miller, Calif.	Sadlak	Williams, N. Y.
Mills	St. George	Wilson, Ind.
Minshall	Seely-Brown	Wolverton
Mollohan	Selden	Wright
Moss	Sheehan	Yates
Mumma	Siler	Young
Murray, Ill.	Simpson, Ill.	Younger
Nicholson	Smith, Miss.	Zablocki
O'Brien, Ill.	Springer	

NAYS—120

Abbitt	Elliott	O'Konski
Alexander	Ellsworth	Passman
Allen, Ill.	Fjare	Pfost
Andersen, H. Carl	Forrester	Phillips
	Fountain	Pilcher
Andresen, August H.	Frazier	Poff
	Gary	Rains
Andrews	Gentry	Reed, N. Y.
Ashmore	George	Rees, Kans.
Bailey	Grant	Richards
Barden	Gross	Riley
Baumhart	Gubser	Roberts
Bell	Haley	Robeson, Va.
Bennett, Fla.	Harrison, Nebr.	Rogers, Tex.
Berry	Harrison, Va.	Rutherford
Betts	Henderson	Schenck
Blitch	Hess	Schwengel
Bonner	Hill	Scrivner
Bow	Hoeven	Sheppard
Boykin	Hoffman, Mich.	Short
Brooks, La.	Huddleston	Shuford
Brown, Ohio	Jennings	Sikes
Budge	Jensen	Sisk
Burdick	Johansen	Smith, Kans.
Burleson	Johnson, Wis.	Smith, Wis.
Burnside	Jones, Ala.	Staggers
Cannon	Jones, Mo.	Steed
Chelf	Krueger	Talle
Chenoweth	Landrum	Thomas
Chiperfield	LeCompte	Velde
Clevenger	Long	Vinson
Colmer	Lovre	Vorys
Coon	Marshall	Vursell
Cooper	Mason	Weaver
Cunningham	Miller, Md.	Whitten
Dague	Miller, Nebr.	Wier
Davis, Ga.	Murray, Tenn.	Williams, Miss.
Dies	Natcher	Willis
Dixon	Norblad	Winstead
Dolliver	Norrell	Withrow
Dowdy	O'Hara, Ill.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Evins

NOT VOTING—112

Adair	Dollinger	Kluczynski
Addonizio	Donohue	Knutson
Anfuso	Dorn, S. C.	Laird
Baker	Durham	Lane
Barrett	Eberharter	Lankford
Bass, N. H.	Fascell	McCarthy
Bass, Tenn.	Fino	McCulloch
Bentley	Fogarty	McMillan
Bolton, Frances P.	Fulton	McVey
	Gamble	Machrowicz
Brooks, Tex.	Garmatz	Madden
Brownson	Green, Pa.	Merrow
Buckley	Gregory	Miller, N. Y.
Byrne, Pa.	Griffiths	Morano
Canfield	Hand	Morgan
Chatham	Hays, Ark.	Morrison
Christopher	Healey	Moulder
Chudoff	Hoffman, Ill.	Multer
Cooley	Holifield	Nelson
Corbett	Holtzman	O'Brien, N. Y.
Coudert	Jackson	O'Hara, Minn.
Cretella	Jones, N. C.	O'Neill
Davidson	Kean	Osmers
Davis, Tenn.	Kee	Patman
Davis, Wis.	Kelley, Pa.	Philbin
Dempsey	Kelly, N. Y.	Pillion
Denton	Keogh	Powell
Diggs	King, Pa.	Preston
Dodd	Klein	Price
Quigley	Shelley	Thomson, Wyo.
Radwan	Sieminski	Thornberry
Rhodes, Ariz.	Simpson, Pa.	Tuck
Rodino	Smith, Va.	Van Pelt
Rooney	Spence	Wainwright
Saylor	Taylor	Wickersham
Scherer	Thompson, La.	Wilson, Calif.
Scott	Thompson, Mich.	Wolcott
Scudder		Zelenko

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Hand.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Chudoff with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Cretella.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Fulton.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mrs. Knutson with Mr. Jackson.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Wilson of California.
Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Mr. O'Neil with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Price with Miss Thompson of Michigan.
Mr. Dodd with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Thomson of Wyoming.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Wainwright.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Morano.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Pillion.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Scott.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.
Mr. Davidson with Mr. Scudder.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Powell with Mr. McVey.

Mr. FOUNTAIN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ELLSWORTH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, 1903

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 256.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 6782) to amend section 7 of "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the following correction:

In section 3 of the bill strike out "year."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING TITLE IX OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1937

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3693) to amend title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, after "'for" insert "a."

Page 3, after line 16, insert:

"SEC. 2. The amendment to the first paragraph of section 2 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, set forth in the first section of this act, shall take effect after the expiration of the term of office of the present judge of the District of Columbia Tax Court."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SALARY ACT OF 1953

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7380) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 to correct certain inequities, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]? [After a pause.] The Chairs hear none and, without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi, and Mr. BROYHILL.

CONTROL OF NARCOTICS, BARBITURATES, AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 11320) to effect the control of narcotics, barbiturates, and dangerous drugs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? [After a pause.] The Chairs hear none, and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the business of the District of Columbia for today.

HON. ROBERT O. SWAIN

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, last Monday evening it was the privilege of Congressman and Mrs. George Fallon, Mrs. McGregor, and myself and 50 or 60 others to attend a very beautiful dinner at which time recognition was given to the untiring efforts of an individual who is a great American, who puts in tireless hours in behalf of his fellow men. I am referring to one who is known to most all of this Congress, Robert O. Swain.

Robert O. Swain is executive director of International Road Federation, a position he has held since shortly after the federation was founded in 1948. He has been the instrument of creating much good will abroad for the United States and the business interests he represents. In the same capacity, Mr. Swain has contributed to the welfare and economy of many countries, particularly in those of the underdeveloped areas of the world.

As a testimony to this, the French Foreign Minister, M. Christian Pineau and Mme. Pineau, took time out of their very brief and crowded schedule on their visit to Washington recently to spend an evening with Bob, as we know him, and Bob's friends.

In recognition of Mr. Swain's contributions to the development of highways and highway transportation, Mr. Pineau decorated him with the French Legion of Honor and recalled how the two of them had cooperated during the period Mr. Pineau served as a Minister of Public Works of France. The ceremony took place at a dinner given by International Road Federation in honor of the Foreign Minister of France at the Mayflower Hotel, June 19.

Mr. Swain is a graduate of Denison University and Harvard University. Formerly with the United States State Department, Mr. Swain has a rich background in transportation economics and engineering. He participated in transportation programs carried out under the Marshall plan and was technical adviser to the Philippine Rehabilitation program and the Greek-Turkish aid program. He started his career with the Texas Highway Department and subsequently was associated with the United States Bureau of Public Roads. During World War II he was an officer in the United States Corps of Engineers.

It is not unusual for Mr. Swain to visit Europe three times a year, tour the Western Hemisphere countries, and attend several meetings as well in various places around the globe in the interst of highway and highway transportation development. He and Mrs. Swain live at 3556 North Valley Street, Arlington. They have three children, the oldest, Anne, is a student at Stevens College.

The International Road Federation has offices in Washington, London and Paris and affiliated national good roads associations in some 60 countries around the world. Supported by industry and businessmen, the federation and its affiliates encourage the development of highways and highway transportation in the belief that good roads are essential to economic and social development. The federation is a transport consultant to United Nations and a cooperating agency of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation and the Organization of American States.

I am sure Bob's friends join me in extending congratulations and best wishes and assure him that it is our belief that he is worthy and entitled to this honor. We all wish to express to the French Foreign Minister, M. Christian Pineau and Mme. Pineau, our sincere thanks in recognizing deeds accompanied by our very good friend, Robert O. Swain.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow or the day after we are all going to have to face the test of voting on an election-year veterans' pension bill. I have had a lot of mail on this legislation—all of it urging my support. I wonder, however, if the average veteran knows just what the passage of this bill would mean to him and his children.

When it comes to veterans' legislation, Congress has a tendency to overlook such matters as cost. In the case of veterans disabled from wounds or diseases suffered in our country's defense this attitude is understandable. It is understandable, also, when dealing with legislation to establish benefits for the widows, children, and other dependents of men who have paid the supreme sacrifice. To these, the Nation owes a debt it can never fully repay.

We are now spending $2.6 billion a year for compensation and pensions for veterans or their dependents. The most of these funds are going to those with service-connected disabilities. The legislation we are asked to support would in the first year of operation result in an additional expenditure of $1.3 billion.

Of this amount, more than 60 percent would go to veterans with no service-connected disability. The cumulative cost of this bill by the year 2000 would be $148 billion—of which $129 billion would have been spent on pensions for men with no service-connected disabilities. In addition, this legislation creates serious inequities. It is inconceivable that we should approve this bill which would grant $105 per month to a nondisabled, 90-day service veteran at the age of 65 while the same legislation grants only $100 per month to a veteran who is 50 percent disabled from war wounds received in combat.

The legislation before us makes needed adjustments in the compensation and benefits of veterans and dependents in this category. If the scope of the legislation stopped there, I would be happy to support it. Unfortunately, it does not. We are being asked to vote for what in the long run will be the costliest bill ever to come before Congress. And we are being asked to support this legislation on the grounds that it will help the veteran.

The most expensive feature of the legislation is that section which in effect grants veterans at the age of 65 a pension for life. Now I am as concerned as any Member of Congress with the needs of some of our elderly citizens. As a former member of the Utah Welfare Commission I have had a firsthand acquaintance with those needs and methods we are taking at a Federal and State level to meet them. In our abundant society, a person in want through no fault of his own is a charge against our society. Want is not restricted to the veteran.

A vote for this pension legislation is a vote against every person in need who is not benefited. For this bill would forever dedicate a large proportion of this Government's income for the benefit of a single segment of our society. We have all been under pressure to support this bill because—and I quote—"it will help our veterans." This is not true. The average veteran today is not a person who happened to serve 90 days stateside in an Army camp 29 years ago. The average veteran today is a man with a family, with a home and a mortgage, who is confronted annually with a tremendous tax bill. Are we going to pass election-year legislation that will preclude our ever lowering this tax bill that is so oppressive? That is what this legislation will do.

America's veterans fought to preserve a principle. They fought to preserve our classless society—a society that has brought us an abundance unequaled in history. They did not fight to set themselves up as a special class of American citizens who because of their service to the Nation can—simply because of that service—demand special treatment.

Many of the letters I have received on this legislation make mention of our foreign-aid appropriation. There is only one relationship between foreign aid and veterans' pensions. I voted for foreign aid, after it was reduced by the House, because I believe that this expenditure of funds is necessary to preserve the peace and prevent this Nation from again experiencing the tragedy of war with its aftermath of wounded, widows, and orphans.

We now have a wonderful veterans' program. This program, however, needs improving. Many of our veterans' hospitals need repairs. Some need replacing. Let us more adequately take care of the program we now have. Let us

not launch a new and expanded pension program that will saddle us all—veteran and nonveteran alike—with financial obligations we cannot meet.

SIXTH ANNUAL NATIONAL CATHOLIC YOUTH WEEK

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to remind my colleagues in the House that 7 million Catholic youth from all over the United States will observe the sixth annual National Catholic Youth Week this year, from October 28 through November 4. Youth week is sponsored by the National Council of Catholic Youth under the aegis of Msgr. Joseph E. Schieder, the director of the Catholic Youth in the United States. The theme of this year's celebration is Trust in Youth.

President Eisenhower, and many Governors and mayors throughout the country have issued special messages marking the event.

Youth Week is one of the largest single youth activities in this country and includes participation of hundreds of schools, colleges and universities, and many local and national youth groups—as well as millions of working youth. All over the United States and in military installations overseas, Youth Week is celebrated with a diversified program of events: TV and radio programs, religious exercises, lectures and concerts, jamborees, parades, award dinners, athletic events, and social affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the week is a great tribute to the future citizens of the country, spotlighting as it does their purposefulness, talents, and level-headedness. All over the country our young people will be made better, stronger, and happier, by seeing that their qualities and capacity for good are realized; by being made to feel that the country and the world are depending on them to build us a future of honor, justice, and peace. In these times when so much undue emphasis is placed on the problem of juvenile delinquency, Youth Week offers assurance to the people of the United States that the future of the country is secure. Its theme "Trust in Youth" should be edifying and inspiring to both youth and adults alike.

IGNACE JAN PADEREWSKI

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, June 30, 1956, marks the 15th anniversary of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski, world renowned composer and pianist. He became the first Premier of the Polish Republic in 1919 after the people of that country asserted their independence. Their action was taken according to the principle of national self-determination embodied in the famous 14 points of that great Democratic President, Woodrow Wilson.

Since 1956 is also the 100th anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson, it is entirely fitting and proper that these two great patriots be jointly honored on the 15th anniversary of the death of a man who, like Wilson, believed in the democratic form of government—Ignace Jan Paderewski.

This great Polish composer, statesman and patriot was born in the year 1860 in Poland in the province of Podolia, then occupied by Russia. He was raised on his father's farm where his musical talent was discovered, and where he received his early instruction in music. His father had been imprisoned in Siberia. At the age of 12, Ignace went to Warsaw to live. There, in addition to furthering his musical education, he also became dedicated to the freedom of his country.

Even as he was gaining world acclaim as an artist and a composer, the freedom of his country became more important to him than his career. After an immensely successful tour of various European cities, he made his first American appearance at a recital in New York City in 1891. In 1902, his opera "Manru" was produced by the Metropolitan Opera Co. During the First World War, he gave hundreds of concerts to aid Polish war sufferers.

Through his close friend Col. E. M. House, Paderewski met President Wilson in whom he found a friend most sympathetic to the Polish cause. Their long association and consultations resulted in the independence of Poland.

Paderewski gave up his musical career in 1919 and returned to Poland, becoming the first Premier of the Polish Republic. When Poland lost her independence again at the start of the Second World War, he refused to play concerts in public. In 1940, he became President of the exiled Parliament. He died on June 30, 1941, in the city of New York.

THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a concurrent resolution which states the following:

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States is the highest court in the Federal judicial system; and

Whereas the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court are entitled to be held in the greatest respect by the people of the United States; and

Whereas it is of paramount importance that the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court conduct themselves in accordance with the strictest standards of impartiality and objectivity, free from partisan political activity or bias: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that no person should become a candidate for election to any Federal office while serving as the Chief Justice of the United States, or as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, or at any time within 2 years after the date of his resignation or retirement from such service; and that it is also the sense of Congress that the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court should be guided in their political activities and attitudes toward political affairs by standards at least as strict as those established for officers and employees of the executive branch of the Federal Government in section 9 (a) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended (5 U. S. C., sec. 1181 (a)), known as the Hatch Act.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that should this resolution pass it will not have, of course, the effect of law, but will merely serve, I think, as a deterrent to any thought on the part of the Justices of the Supreme Court to seek political office while they are serving on the Supreme Court, or at any time within 2 years after the date of a particular Justice's resignation or retirement from the Supreme Court.

I am sure that all of us realize that the highest court of the land should be objective in its decisions. To insure justice and objective decisions, we have set the salary of the Chief Justice at $35,500 a year, and the Associate Justices receive $35,000 a year. As we know, the members of the Court hold office during good behavior, and may retire after 10 years on the Court at age 70 with full pay. There is thus a guaranty of security which should render it unnecessary for any member of the Court to worry about his future.

Mr. Speaker, I can remember through the years when various members of the Court have talked like political candidates. There are at the present time one or more members of the Court who have been mentioned prominently as possibilities for running for the Presidency of the United States. I do not know that any member of the Supreme Court has the ambition. I do know, however, that it is a dangerous thing if, while serving actively on the Court, a member harbors such an ambition. I believe we should arouse a sentiment in this country that would make it impossible for a Justice of the Supreme Court to run for any office in the land, whether that Justice be a Republican or a Democrat. No matter how high the motives of any individual Justice, I do not like to see him placed in a position of temptation. Certainly Justices who must be in a position to render objective opinions should not challenge the motives of my resolution.

I should like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the members of the Supreme Court are human beings and the history of the decisions of the Court will record, I think, that their decisions are after all those of human beings, and these decisions are subject to changes as vacancies on the Court are filled. In 1869 the Supreme Court was increased to nine Justices. Before President Grant could fill the vacancies, the then seven-man

Court ruled that paper money was not legal tender in payment of debts. President Grant added the new Justices and that decision was overturned and paper money was accepted as legal tender. That example shows how changes in the Court can change decisions and it also emphasizes that those decisions are human. A more recent example, of course, is the Supreme Court's decision on segregation. We all remember, sir, that for 60 years the separate but equal doctrine was the law of the land. Who can tell but that some day in the not-too-distant future a change in the composition of the Court may affect a change in that decision? What I am emphasizing again, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the members of the Supreme Court are, after all, human beings, and I want by means of this resolution to remove from them any thought of ever running for political office while they are serving on the Supreme Court bench or within 2 years after their retirement.

I certainly hope the appropriate committee of the House will give this resolution an immediate hearing.

NET INCOME OF SELF-EMPLOYED FARMERS

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill, H. R. 11909, which will be of great benefit to farmers seeking the protection of the social security system.

Under existing law a self-employed farmer who computes his income on the cash receipts and disbursements method may deem 50 percent of his gross income from farming to be his net earnings from self-employment attributable to farming, provided such gross income is not more than $1,800. If the gross income from farming is more than $1,800 and the net earnings from self-employment as computed under the provisions of section 210 (a) of the Social Security Act are less than $900, such net earnings, at his option, may be deemed to be $900. For this purpose, "gross income" is the excess of gross receipts from farming over the cost or other basis of property which was purchased and sold in carrying on such trade or business, adjusted in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs (1) through (7)—to the extent applicable—of section 211 (a) of the act.

My bill changes the optional method of computing net earnings from farm self-employment, and extends the option to self-employed farmers who report income on the accrual method and to members of farm partnerships. Under the bill a farmer whose gross income from farming operations is not more than $1,200, may, at his option, deem such gross income to be his net earnings from self-employment; and if his gross income from farming is more than $1,200 and his net earnings from self-employment from farming operations—computed under the provisions of section 211 (a) without regard to the optional method of computing net earnings from self-employment—are less than $1,200, he may, at his option, deem his net earnings from self-employment to be $1,200.

In the case of a member of a farm partnership whose distributive share of the gross income of the partnership—after the gross income of the partnership has been reduced by the sum of all payments made by the partnership to members thereof which constitute guaranteed payments within the meaning of section 707 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—is not more than $1,200, the partner may, at his option, deem such distributive share of the gross income of the partnership to be his distributive share of income described in section 702 (a) (9) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 derived from the partnership, and may use such figure in computing his net earnings from self-employment. If the partner's distributive share of the gross income of a farm partnership, computed as provided in the preceding sentence, is more than $1,200 and his distributive share—whether or not distributed—of income described in section 702 (a) (9) of such code derived from such farm partnership—computed under section 211 (a) of the act without regard to the optional method provided in that section for computing net earnings from self-employment—is less than $1,200, the distributive share of income described in section 702 (a) (9) of such code derived from such farm partnership may, at his option, be deemed to be $1,200 for purposes of computing his net earnings from self-employment.

My bill further amends section 211 (a) of the act to provide, for purposes of computing net earnings from self-employment under the optional method, that in any case in which the income is computed under an accrual method, the term "gross income" means gross income from the trade or business carried on by the individual or by the partnership, adjusted in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs (1) through (7) of section 211 (a) of the act. The amendment further provides that for purposes of determining whether an individual—including a member of a partnership—has gross income from farming operations of not more than $1,200 or has gross income from such operations of $1,200 or more, such individual shall aggregate his gross income derived from all farming activities carried on by him as a sole proprietor any payment which he receives from a farm partnership of which he is a member and which is a guaranteed payment within the meaning of section 707 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and his distributive share of the gross income of each farm partnership of which he is a member—computed in accordance with the provisions of section 211 (a) of the act as amended by section 105 (a) of the bill.

The provisions of my bill apply with respect to taxable years ending after 1956.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time granted me today be vacated and that I may have the same order for tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SAYLOR (at the request of Mr. GAVIN) for balance of the week, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HESELTON, on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week, for 20 minutes on each day.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HILLINGS (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTERSON in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACK of Washington and include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 101. An act relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9, subsections (d) and (e), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939;

H. R. 5590. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Gustaf E. Lambert;

H. R. 5790. An act relating to the application in the Territory of Hawaii of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act;

H. R. 8493. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 9582. An act to provide for the delayed reporting of births within the District of Columbia;

H. R. 9671. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States in the village of Carey, Ohio;

H. R. 10374. An act to amend the act to incorporate the Oak Hill Cemetery, in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 10768. An act to amend section 5 of the Act of August 7, 1946, entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," as amended; and

H. R. 11473. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1614. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids," title 21, United States Code, section 321c;

S. 2771. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Fourth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2654. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 3042. An act to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U. S. C., sec. 184), in order to promote the development of phosphate on the public domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3467. An act to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3512. An act to permit desert land entries on disconnected tracts of lands which, in the case of any one entryman, form a compact unit and do not exceed in the aggregate 320 acres; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 21, 1956:

H. R. 2106. An act to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets or midshipmen at the Military, Naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard Academies, or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10060. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, as amended;

H. J. Res. 533. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 534. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 535. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 553. Joint resolution waiving certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 554. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 555. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 566. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

On June 22, 1956:

H. R. 9739. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 26, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2006. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of June 21, 1950, relating to the appointment of boards of medical officers"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2007. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2008. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

2009. A letter from the secretary, National Trust for Historic Preservation, transmitting a report by the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States for the calendar year 1955, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 408, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2010. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to, the Lignite Research Laboratory, Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the calendar year 1955, pursuant to the act of March 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 85); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2011. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with the Lake McDonald Boat Co., which, when executed by the superintendent, Glacier National Park, Mont., will authorize it to provide boat transportation and rental service on Lake McDonald and St. Mary Lake in Glacier National Park for a period of from 2 to 5 years from January 1, 1957, depending on the facilities installed by the concessioner, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2012. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Judicial Conference of the United States to promulgate minimum standards of qualifications for probation officers"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2013. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting additional information relative to the case of Todrys Wallach, A-7988112, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2014. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the United States Army, dated April 30, 1956, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of Minnesota River at Mankato and North Mankato, Minn. This report is submitted in partial response to the authority contained in the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, for a preliminary examination and survey of Minnesota River, Minn. (H. Doc. No. 437); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

2015. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood-control work"; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON: Committee of conference. H. R. 11319. A bill making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2413). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee of conference. H. R. 9720. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2414). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ALEXANDER: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 4938. A bill relating to contracts for the conduct of contract postal stations; with amendment (Rept. No. 2416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10263. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, entitled "Copyrights," with respect to certain fees; without amendment

(Rept. No. 2417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 9065. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 781. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" to provide for a statute of limitations with respect to civil actions; with amendment (Rept. No. 2419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6870. A bill to amend the Federal Probation Act to make it applicable to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2420). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALEXANDER: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 1871. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to reimburse the Post Office Department for the transmission of official Government-mail matter", approved August 15, 1953 (67 Stat. 614), and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee on Public Works. S. 3866. An act to facilitate the making of lease-purchase agreements by the Administrator of General Services under the Public Buildings Act of 1949, as amended, and by the Postmaster General under the Post Office Department Property Act of 1954, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CARNAHAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 178. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation to provide for certain costs of United States participation in the International Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs; without amendment (Rept. No. 2423). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 2913. An act to extend for 2 years the Advisory Committee on Weather Control; without amendment (Rept. No. 2424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 898. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by them, in the furnishing of transportation of property; with amendment (Rept. No. 2425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 7130. A bill to provide that lock and dam No. 17 on the Black Warrior River, Ala., shall hereafter be known and designated as the John Hollis Bankhead Lock and Dam; without amendment (Rept. No. 2426). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6403. A bill to amend title 18, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," of the United States Code, to provide a criminal sanction for the embezzlement or theft of the property of Indian tribal organizations; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2427). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6805. A bill to prohibit in any lawsuit or action for damages the use and admission as evidence of investigations by the military departments of aircraft accidents conducted in the interest of air safety; with amendment (Rept. No. 2428). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. S. 2712. An act to authorize the charging of tolls for transit over the Manette Bridge in Bremerton, Wash.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2429). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 3527. An act authorizing the State Highway Commission of the State of Maine to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada; without amendment (Rept. No. 2430). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DEMPSEY: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H. R. 11926. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, to permit the negotiation of commercial leases at atomic energy communities and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 554. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7535, a bill to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms; without amendment (Rept. No. 2432). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11743. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 11878. A bill to extend the date upon which the Rubber Disposal Commission will terminate; without amendment (Rept. No. 2434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 3295. An act to amend the act of April 28, 1953, relating to daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2435). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FALLON: Committee of conference. H. R. 10660. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2436). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 3663. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 11905. A bill to amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, with respect to donation of food commodities to Foreign relief agencies; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 11906. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 11907. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to fees of United States marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11908. A bill to amend section 544 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the bonds of United States marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 11909. A bill relating to the computation of self-employment income by farm operators; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 11910. A bill to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under leases entered into for the provision of commercial recreation facilities at the Lake Greeson Reservoir, Narrows Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 11911. A bill to authorize negotiations with respect to a compact to provide for a definition or relocation of the common boundary between Arizona and California, and for the appointment by the President of a Federal representative to the compact negotiations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 11912. A bill to provide for off-street parking facilities for employees of United States post offices situated in congested areas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 11913. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a) to provide for payment of the burial allowance in certain cases where funeral expenses are met in whole or in part by a burial association; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 11914. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the Little River from Little Creek Landing to its entrance to the Delaware Bay, for navigation and flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McDOWELL (by request):

H. R. 11915. A bill to amend section 1 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 11916. A bill to provide for a display pasture for the bison herd on the Montana National Bison Range in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 11917. A bill to provide for the tax treatment for certain taxpayers who changed from the retirement to the straight-line method of computing depreciation with respect to certain kinds of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 11918. A bill to provide for the transfer to the Yorktown Battlefield Area, Colonial National Historical Park, Va., certain howitzers surrendered by the British at Yorktown, to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 11919. A bill providing for price reporting and research with respect to forest products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 11920. A bill relating to the computation of the retirement-income credit and certain other items where joint income-tax

returns are filed by husband and wife; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 11921. A bill to provide that persons discharged from the Armed Forces who are proffered discharges other than honorable may reject such discharges and receive a court martial, or if not court martialed, shall be given honorable discharges; to provide for correction of records in the case of certain persons not given honorable discharges in the past; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 11922. A bill to amend the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act of the District of Columbia of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 11923. A bill to provide for the conferring of an award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 11924. A bill to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 11925. A bill to provide that in determining the amount of retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay payable to any enlisted man, all service shall be counted which would have been counted for the same purposes if he were a commissioned officer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 11926. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, to permit the negotiation of commercial leases at atomic energy communities, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 11927. A bill to provide coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance system, as self-employed individuals, for certain employees of States and political subdivisions who are not covered under such system by State agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H. R. 11928. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of May 19, 1947 (ch. 80, 61 Stat. 102), as amended, for the purpose of extending the time in which payments are to be made to members of the Shoshone Tribe and the Arapahoe Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PROUTY:

H. R. 11929. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility in the State of Vermont; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 653. Joint resolution to extend the time for the submission of the final report of the Commission on Government Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. J. Res. 654. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Expanded College Educational Facilities and Programs in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 655. Joint resolution to extend the time for the submission of the final report of the Commission on Government Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. J. Res. 656. Joint resolution to change the name of Bedloe's Island in New York Harbor to Welcome Island; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. J. Res. 657. Joint resolution approving the relinquishment of the consular jurisdiction of the United States in Morocco; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. Con. Res. 257. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to political activities on the part of the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. Res. 552. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 627, a bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 553. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 10765, a bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the proposals and recommendations of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 11930. A bill for the relief of Antonia Salazar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 11931. A bill for the relief of Robert D. Miller, of Juneau, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11932. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands in Alaska to Martha L. Starns as administratrix of the estate of Laurence Starns, deceased; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 11933. A bill for the relief of Christos Petropoulus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 11934. A bill for the relief of Antonio Segade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 11935. A bill for the relief of the Franklin Institute of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H. R. 11936. A bill for the relief of Rifke Besser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11937. A bill for the relief of Nachum Pfeifenmacher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11938. A bill for the relief of Deloris Alice Seaton Reid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 11939. A bill for the relief of Daniels Fomenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11940. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Miriam Tsai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 11941. A bill to provide for the quitclaiming of the title of the United States to the real property known as the Barcelona Lighthouse Site, Portland, N. Y.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 11942. A bill for the relief of Carl J. Warneke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. R. 11943. A bill for the relief of Ryoichi Izawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 11944. A bill for the relief of Augusto Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 11945. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Sandoval-Flores; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11946. A bill for the relief of Desmond Bryan Boylan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1155. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Miss Jewel Estep, of Star Route, Ozark, Mo., and other citizens of that community, urging the passage of H. R. 7922 and H. R. 8000, which would prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to persons on aircraft in flight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1156. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted at the 36th annual convention of the Wisconsin Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., held at Green Lake, on June 15–17, 1956, in support of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the deepening of Great Lakes connecting channels and urging Federal appropriation to implement this work; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1157. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Carl Romanik, State legislation chairman, Wisconsin Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to commending the President, and the Congress and the Wisconsin delegation for their accomplishment in the recent adoption of authorizing legislation for deepening of the connecting channels of the Great Lakes, in order to extend channels of St. Lawrence Seaway depth throughout the Great Lakes system, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1158. Also, petition of E. J. Wohlgemuth and others, St. Louis, Mo., expressing interest in the bill H. R. 9065, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1159. Also, petition of J. Kasselmann and others, St. Louis, Mo., expressing interest in the bill H. R. 9065, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1160. Also, petition of Mrs. L. Swinehart, Washington, D. C., relative to "ignorance of the law is no excuse," etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1161. Also, petition of the president, District of Columbia Bankers Association, Washington, D. C., relative to stating that the association exert every effort within its power to help secure the establishment of an orderly procedure for relocation of Federal agencies, etc.; to the Committee on Public Works.

1162. Also, petition of the assistant city clerk, Los Angeles, Calif., requesting the enactment of such legislation as is necessary to permit recipients of aid to the aged to earn $50 a month, which amount shall not be taken into consideration in computing aid to such recipients; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Status of Forces Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, in an extension of remarks made in debate on the amendment I offered to the Mutual Security Act of 1956, my colleague from Minnesota said that for us to insist on full sovereignty over every American soldier off duty wherever he is would require us to withdraw United States troops from all foreign bases, that it would mean abandoning the world to the Kremlin. He said the adoption of the Bow amendment would force us to give up the whole program of world security and withdraw from all our foreign bases; that at one stroke the Kremlin would have won. This is a good example of the scare argument which proponents of the status of forces agreements advance as a last resort.

There has never been any proof offered that this would be true. In hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee no country was named as having demanded the right to prosecute our servicemen as a condition for permitting them to help defend that country. Granting Iceland exclusive criminal jurisdiction over our troops has not prevented a demand that we leave. If our troops are permitted to stay it will not be because they can try our men in their courts. It will be because the money we pour into Iceland through manning the air base there accounts for about 20 percent of the gross income of that country.

Tied in with the scare argument is a bit of smear technique. There is the covert suggestion that anyone who now seeks to recover constitutional rights for our servicemen is in league with Russia. The smear has often been substituted for argument by advocates of a cause when not sure of their position. I do not think it will receive credence in this instance. There are too many loyal, forthright, patriotic Americans who are demanding that the status of forces agreements be changed. The agreements contain provisions and the procedure for seeking modification. I presume even the molders of the agreements thought these might be needed and used. "Such agreements are often revised," a court in Japan observed in an opinion last month in a case in which an American officer was a defendant.

This Japanese court, in the same opinion, also said:

> It is a well-established rule of international law that an armed force stationed in a foreign country in accordance with a treaty, is not subject to civil or criminal jurisdiction of the receiving state.

The same persons who seek to scare and smear will also sneer at that statement. They will say that a similar declaration by Chief Justice Marshall in 1811, the opinions of our Supreme Court in two later decisions, our position taken in the Supreme Court of Canada in 1943, the declaration of this rule of international law in the Uniform Manual of Courts-Martial, are all wrong. In order to ignore authority to the contrary they announce dogmatically that such a rule did not exist and seek to quell remonstrance with this scare, smear, and sneer logic. Our internationally minded statesmen stubbornly refuse to make an effort to improve the position in which they forced our servicemen. They refuse to use the provisions of the agreement which make revision possible.

The President's Plan for Medical Insurance for Federal Employees Is a Flagrant Act of Favoritism Toward Big Insurance Companies and Tends Toward Monopoly in the Health Insurance Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on May 29, 1956, I commented on a report of a Federal interagency committee relating to the health services to Federal employees. I said at that time that the report showed that although adequate employee health services are available in many Federal establishments, inadequate services or no service at all are available to a substantial number of employees. It is believed that some heads of agencies neither fully realize the value of such health programs nor realize the extent to which they exist in private employment.

Recently, the administration has recommended to the Congress a very limited proposal to help provide for a part of major medical expenses for the employees as an amendment to the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954. It is my belief that this proposal is entirely inadequate. What is needed, I believe, is legislation which would provide basic protection against routine medical expenses. In such a plan, the costs should be borne equally by the Federal Government and by the employees. Medical, surgical, and hospital care should be provided with a payroll deduction for the employee portion of the cost. In addition, the use of nonprofit medical service plans, where they are available, should be encouraged.

In this connection I would like to take this occasion to point out that the policy resolution adopted at the AFL–CIO merger convention relating to Federal employees called for a—

> Hospital and medical insurance program for Federal employees with employee representation in administration of plan and Federal Government to underwrite at least 50 percent of the total cost, and with administrative principles consistent with those approved by the AFL–CIO for administration of health and welfare funds negotiated with employers in private industry.

I would like to say that my reasons for opposing the administration's medical insurance plan are as follows:

First. The proposal is a flagrant act of favoritism toward private commercial insurance carriers and tends toward monopoly in the health insurance field.

Second. The major medical expense plan proposed by the administration discriminates against the lower paid Federal employees. The great majority of Federal employees receive less than $5,000 per year. Many of these employees have no basic health services and many others have only the very minimum coverage.

Third. Few if any of these low-income employees would receive any return from such a major medical insurance plan as the administration proposes because they cannot afford the expense of medical, surgical, and hospital care to the extent of the deductibles proposed: namely, $100 medical, $250 surgical, and $500 hospital for each individual.

Fourth. The medical insurance plan put forward by the present administration does not encourage preventive medical care which is so desirable. Rather, it discourages such care by providing for large deductions of charges as mentioned previously. The provision that benefits start only after other insurance or services are fully met is discriminatory and it discourages comprehensive basic health care and penalizes those who are already providing themselves with comprehensive medical care.

Fifth. The administration plan, even after the large deductibles, provides only partial indemnity for medical and hospital expenses of exceptional or severe illness.

Sixth. The coverage provided in the administration plan for retired employees is even more limited in that they are required to pay the first $200 of medical care and are given no reimbursement for hospitalization.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I believe this proposal for major medical insurance put forward by the administration puts the cart before the horse or, as someone said the other day, it finishes the roof before the foundations have even been laid.

On the other hand, if a program such as I propose is adopted, namely, 50-percent participation by the Federal Government plus payroll deduction for the employee's share of the cost for basic medical, surgical, and hospital care, the cost of a major medical program to supplement the basic program would be drastically reduced.

No layman can estimate the cost of the President's program because it is so entwined with the reserves in the life-insurance program.

Let me make myself perfectly clear. I am not opposed to a major medical-insurance program but it is quite clear that a basic health program of the type I propose should come first.

I believe that my position parallels that of the representatives of the Blue Cross hospital service plan, the Blue Shield medical service plan, Group Health Association, the International Association of Machinists AFL–CIO, and perhaps other organizations.

For these reasons, I am introducing a bill to provide the kind of basic program which I feel should be enacted into law before the administration program is adopted by the Congress.

This legislation, I might add, was largely developed by the International Association of Machinists AFL–CIO and I want to commend William H. Ryan, president and legislative representative of district No. 44, International Association of Machinists AFL–CIO, for his leadership in this matter.

Antarctic Airstrip Named for Oregon Serviceman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am having printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tribute to an Oregon boy who was killed in the Antarctic while serving with the United States Navy on Operation Deepfreeze. The Navy has seen fit to name an airstrip for this lad who gave his life in the service of his country.

Max R. Kiel Airstrip in Little America V commemorates a Joseph, Oreg., Navy man who was killed in the Antarctic while participating in Operation Deepfreeze last March 5.

A Seabee driver second class, Kiel was killed when the 35-ton tractor he was driving crashed into a snow crevasse about 110 miles from Little America V.

He was the son of Mrs. Roma Irene Kiel, Box 32, Joseph, Oreg. Kiel was a member of a tractor train carrying drums of fuel oil and gasoline to a point 250 miles from Little America.

The airstrip was named for Kiel on March 10 and appropriate ceremonies were held.

It seems fitting to me that this Oregon serviceman should be honored for sacrificing his life while helping our country to conquer the vast unknown that characterizes this area of the world.

To me, Max Kiel is a hero just as are those who died in battle, for he, too, was participating in a battle—a battle against the elements of that land of the unknown.

Although I did not know Max personally, I have heard many fine reports about his character and devotion to duty. Mrs. Kiel, the State of Oregon, and the Nation can be proud of this boy.

Pan American Airline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a proven fact that New England needs another airline to service its expanding economy, vital defense plants, and travelers. The airline best qualified to provide this service is Pan American. As I have shown in previous remarks, Pan American cannot only provide the quickest and most thorough service, but it can also provide the safest.

Pan American has a brilliant safety history. Its accident record is excellent. I would like to show the reasons for this fine performance.

In the first place, only the most modern planes are used. Pan American aircraft are equipped with all the latest safety devices which enable them to fly under any conditions anywhere in the world. Its equipment is the most comfortable and the safest available in passenger service today.

But fine equipment alone is not enough. Pan American takes many more precautions. To make triply sure, each plane and each piece of equipment is tested thoroughly at all altitudes, in all conditions, and at all times of the year before it carries one passenger or one piece of freight. And before each flight, highly trained mechanics and technicians give each plane a microscopic going-over. Every grease spot and scratch is serviced before the plane taxies on the runway. If there seems to be the slightest fault anywhere in the craft, it is replaced by one fresh off the production line or completely repaired until perfectly sound.

Further precautions are made because Pan American realizes that there is a human element which is very important in every flight. All Pan American personnel, from the pilot to the desk clerk, are thoroughly trained. They must undergo frequent rigid physical tests to determine their reactions to all conditions. Eyesight and reflexes must be perfect. Before flying a Pan American plane all personnel must have had long hours of experience in the air so that each piece of machinery is completely familiar, every airport recognizable, and every rattle can be fixed in a jiffy.

To provide still another check Pan American has a special training program to teach a pilot how to react to emergencies. He must undergo, in practice, every type of possible accident so that he will know exactly what to do in case trouble develops on a real flight. He is trained to fly over and land on land and sea and is taught how to make his passengers feel totally comfortable and safe at all times. Hostesses are similarly trained to make each flight pleasant as well as free from danger, and all the latest conveniences are available for comfort.

As I have shown in previous remarks, this safe service is essential to New England's economic future. Latin America's raw materials and markets are vital to our growing defense industries. I have also shown how needed expanded service is to vacationers and tourists. I have not, however, mentioned the great diplomatic services which such a Pan American traffic would provide the Nation.

By linking the whole east coast with Europe, Asia, and Latin America, Pan American would keep America much better informed on recent developments. Political, business, and industrial representatives from all nations could reach our shores much more quickly with the service Pan American would like to provide. Similarly, our representatives could be sent all over the world quickly, directly, and safely with such a service. Militarily, such a traffic could also be used as a basis for future troop movements and as a training medium for maintenance crews in the event of a world conflict. In this shadowy world of suspicion, where quick developments can have far-reaching consequences, the service Pan American offers would be a tremendous diplomatic and military advantage against the Communist bloc.

So in concluding, Mr. Speaker, I hope the Civil Aeronautics Board will pay the closest attention to Pan American's requests to provide the vital service which New England and the entire Nation needs so urgently. Such service is essential for economic, travel, diplomatic, and military reasons. Pan American can provide it in the safest and most thorough way.

Washington State Lawyers Want Social Security Coverage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Washington State Bar Association recently took a post-card poll of its members on whether lawyers favored being included under the Social Security Act coverage.

This poll of Washington attorneys revealed that the lawyers of the State of Washington favor almost 2 to 1 being included under social-security coverage even on a compulsory basis.

Here are the results of the post-card vote among lawyers on social security in Washington State as reported by the Washington State Bar News, official organ of the bar association:

1. Do you favor coverage of self-employed lawyers within the Social Security Act on a voluntary basis? Yes, 1,667; no, 206; 149 not voting.

2. Do you favor coverage of self-employed lawyers within the Social Security Act on a

compulsory basis? Yes, 911; no, 855; 315 not voting.

3. Do you favor complete exclusion of self-employed lawyers from the Social Security Act? Yes, 167; no, 1,432; 482 not voting.

4. If your answers above to questions 1 and 2 show that you favor voluntary coverage but oppose compulsory coverage, what is your choice if voluntary coverage is not obtainable? In that event do you favor: Compulsory coverage, 1,141; complete exclusion, 542; 398 not voting.

It is hoped that the United States Senate soon will pass the social-security bill which the House of Representatives passed almost 13 months ago. This bill provides social-security coverage for lawyers and for dentists.

Status-of-Forces Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues in discussing the status-of-forces agreements seek to infer that those who desire a modification of the agreements are trying to save our servicemen from all punishment for any wrong they may commit.

At the same time we have comparisons of sentences being offered to show that servicemen are not punished as severely in foreign courts as they are by courts-martial. Apparently those who fear our men might escape punishment are also torn by the fear they may be punished too much.

The men who are presently serving sentences in prisons abroad as a result of this easy justice of foreign courts know what they would have preferred. They almost unanimously told our colleagues who visited them that they would have preferred to have been tried by court-martial, by their compatriots. Whatever the sentence, they felt they would have received the advantages of our system of justice and the protection of our Constitution. They would have had a fair trial by American standards, not measured by the deceptive standards set up in article VII of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement, or by the vagaries of foreign justice.

This claim that penalties are easy in a foreign court is not supported by the case of one of our servicemen in Italy which has just been revealed. He was found guilty of robbery without intent to steal and sentenced to 2 years' imprisonment with a fine of 30,000 lire. It is scarcely necessary to point out that a crime defined with such contradiction on its face does not exist in our jurisprudence. This conviction is difficult to justify even in Italy since there was testimony indicating that the soldier had only recovered from a young woman money which he had previously given to her.

The defenders of the status agreements who point to sentences in foreign courts as justification for the abandonment of our servicemen's rights belong to that cult which presumes all of the accused are guilty. A mitigated sentence is little solace to the victim of questionable justice.

Results of 1956 Questionnaire

REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, following my custom of previous years, I recently sent an opinion questionnaire to the Democrat and Republican voters who reside in the 25th Congressional District in order to obtain their views on some of the important issues facing our country.

Thousands of replies have been received in response to my questions. So many replies have been received that it is an impossible task to answer each individually. A large number of people added comments to the questionnaire which has increased the value of the poll as a gauge of public opinion.

Mr. Speaker, we who serve the American people have an obligation to seek out the views of those whom we represent. I am pleased and gratified at the response of those public-spirited citizens who have written to me and I wish to take this opportunity to thank each of them.

The following is the compilation of answers:

1. Are you satisfied with the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy? Yes, 72 percent. No, 18 percent. No opinion, 10 percent.

2. Should the United States send arms to Israel? Yes, 17 percent. No, 67 percent. No opinion, 16 percent.

3. Are the United States immigration laws too severe? Yes, 16 percent. No, 69 percent. No opinion, 15 percent.

4. Should the Federal gasoline tax be increased to provide more adequate highways? Yes, 42 percent. No, 48 percent. No opinion, 10 percent.

5. Do you believe existing Federal laws provide adequate old-age benefits for our senior citizens? Yes, 43 percent. No, 43 percent. No opinion, 14 percent.

6. Should the Federal Government encourage private industry to provide workers with a guaranteed annual wage? Yes, 32 percent. No, 53 percent. No opinion, 15 percent.

7. Should the Federal Government spend money to help the individual States build more schools? Yes, 58 percent. No, 33 percent. No opinion, 9 percent.

8. Local authorities have primary responsibility for control of smog. Should the Federal Government assume a more active role to help solve the smog problem? Yes, 56 percent. No, 36 percent. No opinion, 8 percent.

9. The Federal Government has eliminated segregation in the armed services and in the District of Columbia. It has also supported racial integration in the public schools. Do you believe these measures are sufficient? Yes, 64 percent. No, 19 percent. No opinion, 17 percent.

10. In your opinion, whose legislative policies would be best, if serving as President of the United States? Eisenhower, 88 percent. Kefauver, 4 percent. Stevenson, 8 percent.

New England and Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the people of New England are intensely interested in the forthcoming decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board to allow expanded and improved air passenger service between our region, Florida and Latin America.

We of New England, Mr. Speaker, really need such expanded service. The airway between the Northeast and Florida is officially deemed to be the heaviest traveled in the world. Between Boston and Miami, however, it is served by only one carrier; between New York and Miami by two. On the Washington-Chicago line the public has a choice of five carriers—all of them prosperous.

The people of Southern New England have been particularly hurt by the inadequacy of fair carrier schedules from there to Miami and Latin America. Furthermore, restrictions on operations within the area and in other areas on the east coast have hampered them.

To meet these needs, two airlines are now seeking to provide direct service from Boston to Miami. They are Northeast and Pan American Airlines, both of which enjoy the support of many distinguished men here from both sides of the aisle.

I am particularly interested in Pan American's application. It proposes to link its European and Latin American operations with the Northeast by providing one-plane, one-carrier service along our east coast to and from cities in Florida and Latin America.

Such a service by Pan American offers tremendous advantages to our people. In the first place, Pan American is acknowledged to be the only applicant which could begin frequent schedules immediately upon authorization by the Civil Aeronautics. Furthermore, the most modern passenger aircraft should be used. Also, Pan American proposes a unique all-cargo service. Under their plan Boston and New York would serve as our gateways for passenger and cargo service to Miami and all Latin America.

This would benefit New England enterprise tremendously. As the Nation's oldest industrial region, New England has closer historical and economic ties with Latin America than does any other region. Our industries, particularly the great number serving the national defense, urgently need Latin American raw materials to manufacture their products. Furthermore, our neighbors to the South provide us with tremendous and rapidly growing markets for our finished goods.

This applies particularly to the people of my district, whose well-being deeply concerns me. A great many people in the Naugatuck Valley are employed in industries which rely almost completely upon Latin American materials. Many of these people make products for defense. As the economies of New Eng-

land, especially of my district, and Latin America become more and more closely interrelated, such service as Pan American Airlines offers becomes tremendously important.

Such an expanded service would also facilitate vacation travel between the two areas. Many people from Florida and foreign cities beyond like to spend some of the summer in New England. We look forward to seeing them, just as we look forward to visiting them in the winter months. Many of us know from firsthand experience the difficulty of getting a plane reservation at the peak of the vacation season.

If Pan American is authorized to start passenger and cargo service to and from Latin America and Florida and New England, all these problems will be solved. It would mark the beginning of a new era for United States airline transportation within the Western Hemisphere. Not only would it supply one-carrier, one-plane flights from New England to Latin America, but it would provide through service from both areas to European ports of call. There would be no more long and irksome delays and transfers.

So in closing, Mr. Speaker, I hope that Pan American Airlines will get the chance to provide their excellent services. They would be a boon to the whole to eastern and South America, and to New England in particular.

Polish Workers' Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the spontaneous uprising of Polish workers in the city of Poznan on the eve of the 15th anniversary of the death of the great Polish patriot, Ignace Jan Paderewski, is an inspiring example of the courage and determination of the Polish people to regain their birthright of freedom.

Eyewitness reports from western observers attending the industrial fair in Poznan confirmed the heroic demonstrations protesting working conditions, lack of food, and poor living standards. The revolting Polish workers attacked Communist headquarters and government buildings and clashed with tanks and troops, according to these reports.

The Polish uprising comes 3 years after the revolt of German workers in East Berlin and again shows the willingness of these patriots to lay down their lives for freedom. It is dramatic proof that the people behind the Iron Curtain have not succumbed to the evil forces of totalitarianism and tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, by their courage and daring, these Polish patriots have again shown the world that the spirit of freedom never dies in the hearts and minds of the Polish people. As so many times in their history, the Poles have once more proved that the spark of human freedom can never be extinguished. They have given hope to the world that the day will come when that spark will burst into a flame and Poland will again take its place in the front ranks of the free nations of the world.

Status of Forces Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to call to the attention of the House a letter to the editor of the Evening Sun, of Baltimore, Md., which was published on June 22, 1956, as follows:

TREATY QUESTIONS

To the EDITOR OF THE EVENING SUN:

SIR: Your June 14 editorial in defense of the status-of-forces treaties suggests a number of questions.

Suppose, for illustrative example, that two Americans, stationed in a foreign country with which one of these treaties is in force, are on an off-duty basis. Suppose that they drink too much liquor, get into an argument with a native of that foreign country, and kill him in the course of a resulting fight.

Suppose that one of them is in the American diplomatic service and is in that foreign country because he went there of his own free choice and prefers to be stationed there rather than at home. Suppose that the other is in the American military service and was sent to that foreign country against his will as a result of being drafted into the Army. Suppose that he would much prefer to be back in the United States defending his country on his native soil.

Would both these American partners in the same crime have exactly the same status? Would the courts of that foreign country have exactly the same primary jurisdiction over both of them, and have it for exactly the same reasons, and be able to exercise it in exactly the same ways?

Have these status-of-forces agreements been negotiated for the United States by persons in the American diplomatic services? If so, have the agreements conformed to the old Army rule to the effect that the cooks should be required to eat the same food they serve up to the soldiers?

Your June 14 editorial indicates that these status-of-forces agreements have been worked out on some sort of discriminatory basis, whereby the United States gives some foreign countries relatively much more primary jurisdiction over Americans than it gives to others.

Can you tell us who decided upon these discriminations between various countries to which we are bound by agreements? And can you tell us the criteria upon which these discriminations are based?

Any factual information you may choose to give in response to these questions will be appreciated by the undersigned. And possibly also by other Evening Sun readers who, like myself, have not had opportunities to analyze the status-of-forces agreements, and whose information about them has been derived from arguments for or against made by partisan advocates or opponents.

JOHN J. IAGO.

Baltimore, June 15.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—All our correspondent's questions apparently revolve around two points: Why shouldn't servicemen be treated in exactly the same manner as members of diplomatic missions? Why shouldn't the various agreements with different countries on jurisdiction over servicemen be uniform?

(The relative handful of diplomatic mission members make their case a highly special one, which has traditionally been dealt with by the device of diplomatic immunity. The hundreds of thousands of servicemen stationed abroad obviously present a wholly different problem. To insist that the two problems should be dealt with in precisely the same fashion seems to us to ignore the quantitative difference as well as the differing functions of the two groups.

(The lack of uniformity in agreements with various countries was designed to provide exactly the protection which the opponents of the arrangements are so worried about. Foreign countries are granted primary jurisdiction over American servicemen only to the extent that we are convinced the foreign legal and penal system will not work an undue hardship on delinquent American servicemen.)

This letter poses several questions to which every Member of the House should give serious thought. Even the State Department could not answer the questions completely without considerable embarrassment. It is not surprising that the editor of the Sun failed in his note to justify this discrimination between diplomatic and military personnel.

The different functions exercised by diplomats and the Armed Forces do not extend to either group when off duty. A diplomat can operate a motor vehicle as recklessly as a serviceman. If he should commit a serious crime such as homicide on his own time as it were, his diplomatic connections do not make the crime more palatable to foreign nationals than a life offense by a serviceman.

"Quantitative difference" is a fancy way of saying there are fewer persons in diplomatic service than in military service. Is this a valid reason for relieving the smaller group of any responsibility to foreign courts, but subjecting the larger number to all the vagaries of foreign justice?

There is no great lack of uniformity in our agreements which surrender criminal jurisdiction over our servicemen to foreign countries. The NATO Status of Forces Agreement covers 14 countries, the agreement with Japan is practically identical, other Executive agreements which surrender jurisdiction do so in similar terms. The real lack of uniformity is in the laws of the various countries. This subjects our men to different forms of justice and varying degrees of punishment for the same offense in different countries.

The editor is sadly misinformed if he believes that "Foreign countries are granted primary jurisdiction over American servicemen only to the extent that we are convinced the foreign legal and penal system will not work an undue hardship on delinquent American servicemen." The facts are that the State Department and the Defense Department had made no effort to inform themselves concerning foreign laws or penal conditions before these agreements were made. The Defense Department for example did not complete a study of the

laws of Japan until 2 years after the agreement went into effect and after 49 or more of our men had been tried and imprisoned there.

Through belated studies of foreign laws, ordered by the Senate, the Judge Advocate General of the Army has found that it is impossible for an accused to receive a fair trial by our standards in any foreign court, if you consider that the accused automatically loses certain rights granted by our Constitution, such as a presumption of innocence, burden of proof on the prosecution to establish guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, protection against self-incrimination and against use of involuntary confessions.

Congress has now provided counsel for the accused because the Defense Departmen admitted that this was necessary in order to try to protect United States personnel against the disadvantages of these agreements. Such counsel, however, cannot restore to an accused the constitutional rights which he loses through these agreements. Neither can counsel protect the accused who prosecutes an appeal against the tendency of foreign appellate courts to punish him for so doing by increasing the penalty imposed.

It is regrettable that editors who seek to mold public opinion or to advise their readers as to issues of the day do not always secure all the available facts before taking their persuasive pens in hand.

The Administration's Medicinal Insurance Plan for Federal Employees is a Makeshift and Ramshackled Affair, According to John Cramer of the Washington Daily News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to point out that a policy resolution adopted at the AFL–CIO merger convention relating to Federal employees called for a—

Hospital and medical insurance program for Federal employees with employee representation in administration of plan and Federal Government to underwrite at least 50 percent of the total cost, and with administrative principles consistent with those approved by the AFL–CIO for administration of health and welfare funds negotiated with employers in private industry.

In support of the administration's medical insurance plan for Federal employees the Civil Service Commission claims, among other things, that most Federal employees carry basic hospital and surgical insurance to take care of the first need. The Civil Service Commission also maintains that those Federal employees who do not have such insurance can get it at the local level for a modest cost. In August 1954, however, Nelson Rockefeller testified in favor of a radically different plan which would have provided basic coverage just as does a bill I have introduced, H. R. 12005, to provide for Government contribution toward personal health service benefits for civilian employees in the Federal service. Mr. Rockefeller said at that time that:

I think the interesting factor is that here with families having incomes between $2,000 and $4,000 only 51 percent have some coverage, and that is the group in which the bulk of the Government employees are. We can consider they are typical of the United States average that only about 51 percent of the Federal employees in this wage group would have any hospitalization insurance and that is the most common area for them to take coverage in.

In a statement I submitted to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives on June 29, 1956, in support of my bill, I said, in part:

If a program such as I propose in a bill, H. R. 12005, I introduced on June 27, 1956, is adopted, namely, 50-percent participation by the Federal Government plus payroll deduction for the employees' share of the cost for basic medical, surgical, and hospital care, the cost of a major medical program to supplement the basic program would be drastically reduced. * * * Let me make myself perfectly clear. I am not opposed to a major medical-insurance program, but it is quite clear, or so it seems to me and to others, that a basic health program of the type put forth in my H. R. 12005 must come first. I believe that my position roughly parallels that of the representatives of the Blue Cross hospital service plan, the Blue Shield medical service plan, Group Health Association, the International Association of Machinists, AFL–CIO, and perhaps other organizations who have testified, or will testify, before your committee on the administration's 1956 plan for medical insurance.

I was very interested, Mr. Speaker, to read in the Washington Daily News of July 2 a really excellent article by John Cramer, one of the outstanding reporters in the Nation's Capital, entitled, "Why Free Medical Insurance Plan Is Opposed."

Mr. Cramer writes that:

On the surface, the administration's major medical proposal is pretty, indeed. It would protect employees against most expenses of catastrophic-type illness or injury. And it carries the alluring tag: This is free. It will cost you nothing. Search beneath the surface, however, and you'll find the plan a ramshackled affair—and, above all, a makeshift affair.

It was painfully assembled over many months after the administration found it too difficult to keep its original 1954 promise of a basic health-hospital insurance plan for Federal employees—as distinct from major medical.

Because the President publicly was committed to a health program of some sort, his aids had to come up with something.

What the President's aids came up with should, and must, be painstakingly examined. So far, it looks like a goldbrick. John Cramer has carefully examined it in his article of July 2, an article so important that I include it here for the information of my colleagues.

WHY FREE MEDICAL INSURANCE PLAN IS OPPOSED

(By John Cramer)

This is for the many Federal employees who can't understand why there should be opposition to the administration plan to grant free major medical insurance to United States workers and their families.

Here is why:

The plan would hurt many employees—and actually increase their out-of-pocket medical expenses.

It very possibly would hurt as many as it would help.

It especially would hurt thousands of married women who now provide health insurance for their families.

It clearly would discriminate against organizations such as Blue Cross, offering prepaid hospital services, and Blue Shield, offering prepaid surgical services.

On the surface, the administration's major medical proposal is pretty, indeed. It would protect employees against most expenses of catastrophic-type illness or injury. And it carries the alluring tag: "This is free. It will cost you nothing."

MAKESHIFT

Search beneath the surface, however, and you'll find the plan a ramshackle affair—and, above all, a makeshift affair.

It was painfully assembled over many months after the administration found it too difficult to keep its original 1954 promise of a basic health-hospital insurance plan for Federal employees—as distinct from major medical.

Because the President publicly was committed to a health program of some sort, his aides had to come up with something.

So they came up with major medical.

But let's look beneath the surface. Let's look first at what the plan would do to organizations such as Blue Cross and Blue Shield.

There are two basic types of health-hospital protection. They compete against each other.

1. The insurance company or indemnity-type offers specific dollar amounts for specific illnesses, injuries, or periods of hospitalizations.

2. The service type Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans deal only indirectly in dollars. Instead, they offer prepaid days of hospitalization, or prepaid surgical services.

The administration proposal would discriminate against Blue Cross and Blue Shield because:

They would be frozen completely out of the Federal employee major medical field—even though they already operate to a large extent in that area and plan to expand into it further. Under the administration proposal, major medical protection would be handled exclusively by insurance companies, and by Federal employee unions with their own insurance-type plans.

Blue Cross and Blue Shield not only would be frozen out of major medical. They actually would be forced to trim back the protection plans they now offer—in order to mesh them into the insurance company-controlled major medical program.

Under the administration plan, employees and the dependents would be protected against 75 percent of all major medical expenses after the first $500 of hospital expense, first $250 of surgical expense, and first $100 to $200 of medical-care expense (depending on the employee's income).

BEYOND

Blue Cross and Blue Shield offer plans whose benefits usually go well beyond these dollar limits.

And about half of all Federal employees—here and elsewhere—have Blue Cross and Blue Shield coverage.

Once the administration major medical proposal went into effect, however, Blue Cross and Blue Shield say they would be forced to repackage and downgrade their own basic-coverage plans for United States workers.

Blue Cross would offer hospital protection only up to the $500 limit in the major medi-

cal plan. Blue Shield would offer surgical and medical-care protection only up to the $200 and $100–$200 limits.

And, as a result, many employees would find themselves with less real protection than they now have.

Instead of near 100 percent protection against certain brackets of health cost, they would have only the 75-percent protection of the major medical plan.

In recent testimony before a House committee, Washington's Dr. Donald Stubbs, speaking for Blue Shield plans, cited an actual case to illustrate how the administration plan would increase out-of-pocket medical expenses for many employees.

FILES

His case came from the files of Medical Science of the District of Columbia, of which he's president of trustees.

It involves a male employee who had both Blue Cross (group hospitalization) and Blue Shield (medical service) coverage.

He incurred $1,301 in hospital expenses and $500 in surgeon's fee—a total of $1,801, which Blue Cross-Blue Shield paid in full.

But had the major medical plan been in effect, and had this same employee been covered by downgraded Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans (up to $500 hospital protection and $250 surgical) the situation would have been far different.

His downgraded Blue Cross-Blue Shield coverage would have paid $750.

His major medical coverage would have paid three-fourths of the remainder—$788.

And the employee himself would have had to pay $363, all out-of-pocket loss, traceable policy to the major medical plan.

Here are three other cases which illustrate how the major medical plan would hurt many employees—cases from the files of Group Hospitalization.

BILL

Case 1: Involved an employee who incurred a $542.85 hospital bill, and $500 surgical bill, a total of $1,042.85 of which Blue Cross and Blue Shield paid all but $6.10. Had the administration plan been in effect, his downgraded Blue Cross-Blue Shield coverage would have paid the first $750, major medical would have paid 75 percent of the remaining $292.85, and the employee would have wound up paying $73.46.

And the employee's out-of-pocket loss, as a result of major medical, would have been $73.62.

Case 2: Involved an employee with Blue Cross coverage only who incurred a bill (hospitalization plus $39 for pathology) of which Blue Cross paid all but $39.30. Had the administration plan been in effect, downgraded Blue Cross coverage would have paid $500, major medical would have paid 75 percent of the remainder—and the employee would have paid $447.64.

In this case, the employee's out-of-pocket loss would have been $408.34.

Case 3: Involved an employee with Blue Cross and Blue Shield coverage who incurred hospital bills for $946.23, and a surgeon's fee for $500 which is coverage paid in full. Had the administration plan been in effect, his downgraded Blue Cross-Blue Shield coverage would have paid $750, major medical would have paid 75 percent of the rest, and the employee would have paid $236.56—all of it out-of-pocket loss.

HOW

Here is how the administration plan would hurt married women in Government.

Thousands of these women now are enrolled in Blue Cross or Blue Shield plans which provide the only medical protection for their families. In many cases, the woman is the one who buys the protection because group coverage is not available to her husband.

If the major medical plan went into effect, her Blue Cross-Blue Shield coverage would be downgraded to major medical levels like that of other employees.

But that's only part of the story.

Under the administration plan, families of married women would not be covered by major-medical protection unless the husband was physically or mentally unable to work.

Thus, the married woman would lose much of the coverage she now has—and be barred from the extra coverage extended other employees.

Let Us Keep Up the Crusade for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, wherever American citizens are in peril through no fault of their own it is the duty of our Government to rescue them.

I ask, what has our Secretary of State done to cause the release by Red China of the 13 Americans held prisoners these many years?

Their release was promised by Red China last September 1955. They are businessmen and Protestant and Catholic missionaries. It is high time our Government did something about them.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in Heaven and in the earth and in the hearts of men, hallowed be Thy name: Give us, we beseech Thee, that lowly and humble heart, emptied of presumptuous pride, which is the only shrine where any altar pleasing to Thee can be raised. May our own spirits be quarries out of which stones for the new temple of humanity may be fashioned.

May those who here serve the public weal be wise interpreters of the signs of the times, the brave spokesmen of Thy will and of Thy truth which sets men free from ancient wrongs. Reveal unto us the means Thou wouldst have us use to establish justice and peace among men in all the earth. Make our America, we pray, more and more the hope of all who suffer and the dread of all aggressors who would enslave the human spirit. We ask in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 25, 1956, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations;

The Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Committee on Armed Services; and

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection with the transaction of the routine morning business be limited to 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of May 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Chairman, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Commission, for the year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MEMORIAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the memorial of Thomas H. Feeley, Jr., of Los Angeles, Calif., remonstrating against the sale of pornography by Army PX stores, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 3828. A bill to clarify the law relating to the grant of certain public lands to the States for school purposes (Rept. No. 2365);

H. R. 8452. A bill to authorize and direct the conveyance of certain tracts of land in the State of Mississippi to Richard C. French, Lewis M. French, and Ruth French Hershey (Rept. No. 2366);

H. R. 10535. A bill to include the present area of Zion National Monument within

Zion National Park, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2367);

H. R. 11558. A bill to relinquish any right, title, and interest which the United States may have in and to certain land located in Forrest County, Miss., in order to clear the title to such land (Rept. No. 2368); and

S. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to change the name of Bedloe's Island in New York Harbor to Liberty Island (Rept. No. 2356).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 3773. A bill to provide for an extension of the time during which annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims located under the provisions of the act of August 11, 1955, may be made, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2362).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 7426. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 249 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, as amended, and to authorize the issuance of certain highway revenue bonds by the Territory of Hawaii (Rept. No. 2354);

H. R. 8385. A bill to transfer certain responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior to the Public Housing Commissioner and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2352);

H. R. 9768. A bill relating to general obligation bonds of the Territory of Hawaii amending Public Laws 640 and 643 of the 83d Congress (68 Stat. 782, ch. 889 and 68 Stat. 785, ch. 892), and ratifying certain provisions of Act 273, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, which authorizes issuance of public improvement bonds for schools in the city and county of Honolulu and the county of Hawaii (Rept. No. 2353); and

H. R. 9769. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue general obligation bonds (Rept. No. 2355).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 3397. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of May 19, 1947 (ch. 80, 61 Stat. 102), as amended, for the purpose of extending the time in which payments are to be made to members of the Shoshone Tribe and the Arapahoe Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2369).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

H. R. 7811. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions relative to the registration of architects and professional engineers, and the regulation of their practice (Rept. No. 2357); and

H. R. 11027. A bill to amend title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for experimental operation and testing of vessels owned by the United States (Rept. No. 2358).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. R. 2267. A bill for the relief of Morton J. Krakow (Rept. No. 2359);

H. R. 5522. A bill for the relief of Florida State Hospital (Rept. No. 2360); and

H. R. 5526. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kathryn M. Baker (Rept. No. 2361).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

H. R. 9893. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2364).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment:

S. 3592. A bill to provide in certain additional cases for the granting of the status of regular substitute in the postal field service (Rept. No. 2363).

HELLS CANYON DAM—INDIVIDUAL AND MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 2275)

Pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement entered into on June 21, 1956, Mr. MURRAY submitted the individual and minority views to accompany Rept. No. 2275, on the bill (S. 1333) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR STUDY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SECURITY PROGRAM (S. REPT NO. 2370)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I submit a unanimous report of that committee on the resolution (S. Res. 294) extending further the time for a study of the Government employees security program. The resolution would extend the life of a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service without asking for any additional funds. I ask that the resolution be immediately referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, rather than to have it lie over under the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 4117. A bill to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 4118. A bill for the relief of Petronella Elisabeth Deimbeck Major; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 4119. A bill to clarify the application of navigation rules for the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters, and for other purposes; and

S. 4120. A bill to amend section 5 of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 to authorize the sale of goods and services by any department or independent establishment to the owner of an aircraft or his agent in an emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. IVES:

S. 4121. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 4122. A bill for the relief of Josefine Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 4123. A bill to renew and extend the term of patent No. 1,917,634 for 5 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota:

S. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 11th World Health Assembly in the United States in 1958; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution to provide for the relocation of the Ferry County, State of Washington, highway by the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Public Works.

RESOLUTION

The following resolution was submitted and referred as indicated:

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. Res. 297. Resolution extending the time for making report and providing additional funds for the Special Committee on the Senate Reception Room; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

SENIOR CITIZENS OPPORTUNITY AND SECURITY ACT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to initiate a program of action through which America's older citizens may enjoy more fully the fruits of the lengthened life-expectancy that our magnificent advances in health and economic well-being have made possible.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, a joint statement by the Senator from Massachusetts and myself explaining the provisions of the bill, its objectives, and the need for its enactment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4117) to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The joint statement presented by Mr. HILL is as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATORS HILL AND KENNEDY

The bill, entitled "The Senior Citizens Opportunity and Security Act," authorizes a total of $154½ million for a 6-year program. The funds are to be granted on a matching basis to States, local communities, and nonprofit organizations and institutions to finance action projects aimed at helping older people in one or more of the following ways: to secure employment and self-employment through the aid of loans and other financial assistance, to enjoy adequate retirement income, to live in decent homes, to

obtain proper medical care, to share in voluntary hospital insurance protection, to receive rehabilitation service of various kinds and vocational retraining, and to benefit from increased research and training of personnel in fields important to older citizens.

The 6-year program envisaged by the bill centers upon the development and expansion of pilot, or demonstration, projects conducted by States, local communities, and private nonprofit organizations for the benefit of our older people.

Although science has prolonged the average life in America to an age never before attained in the Nation's history, our society has yet to take adequate measures to render that longer life truly livable.

Because of inadequacies in existing laws or because of circumstances over which our older people have little or no control, millions of our finest citizens as they grow older are being deprived of the opportunity for normal, self-reliant, happy lives, for satisfactory standards of living and suitable homes, for their rightful place in the life of the community.

Today we are wasting resources of incalculable value: the accumulated knowledge, the mature wisdom, the seasoned experience, the skilled capacities, the proven productivity of a great and growing number of our people—our senior citizens. At the very time when America's success in the contest with communism demands the fullest utilization of the talents and productive capacities of all our people, millions of our most able, most experienced and most dependable workers are being foreclosed from participation, even on a part-time basis, in the Nation's labor force. Our population is aging and employment of older persons is sharply declining. Yet we have done little to make sure that our most highly trained, skilled, and valuable older workers have an opportunity to keep their talents at work in their own and their country's behalf.

A number of constructive pilot and demonstration projects are already underway in several States and cities, and many more will begin with passage of the bill.

We propose a threefold program: First, action on a scale large enough to be meaningful. Second, continuing study and analysis, not of theories but of real, vital programs voluntarily participated in by large numbers of our senior citizens. Third, a national conference to be held while experimental projects are underway as a forerunner of further action.

Most communities are not today equipped to meet the leisure-time needs of older retired residents, or to rehabilitate, retrain and restore to activity and productiveness older people who do not wish and cannot afford complete withdrawal from active economic and social participation. No pragram which omits any aspects of the problem of the aging can hope to offer an overall approach toward solution. America's concern is with human dignity and human worth, yet today with respect to our senior citizens we are far from living up to the best of which we are capable. We cannot afford to continue this costly waste, either from the standpoint of the national interest or from that of the individual American.

CLARIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF NAVIGATION RULES FOR THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of the Treasury I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to clarify the application of navigation rules for the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a section-by-section analysis of the proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the section-by-section analysis of the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4119) to clarify the application of navigation rules for the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

Section 1: This section would clarify the applicability of the rules for preventing collisions on the Great Lakes and connecting and tributary waters by making the rules specifically applicable to all vessels navigating upon such waters when within the jurisdiction of the United States.

This would be accomplished by amending obsolete phraseology and bringing the applicability provisions of the Great Lakes rules into conformity with the applicability provisions of rules governing harbors, rivers, and inland waters of the United States other than the Great Lakes.

The original enactment providing rules for preventing collisions was the act of April 19, 1864 (ch. 69, 13 Stat. 58). That act made the rules applicable on all waters, to be followed by vessels of the Navy and the mercantile marine of the United States. That applicability was continued in section 4233 of the Revised Statutes of the United States in 1878. Since that time, exceptions to section 4233 have been enacted into law and there are now four different sets of rules governing the prevention of collisions.

The first set of rules is found in the international rules which are applicable to public and private vessels of the United States upon the high seas and certain connecting waters. These rules are contained in the act of October 11, 1951 (ch. 495, 65 Stat. 406; 33 U. S. C. 143 et seq.).

The second set is found in the Great Lakes rules which are applicable to all public and private vessels of the United States navigating upon the Great Lakes and their connecting waters. These rules are contained in the act of February 8, 1895 (ch. 64, 28 Stat. 645; 33 U. S. C. 241 et seq.).

The third set is found in the western rivers rules which are applicable to all vessels upon parts of certain western rivers. These rules are based on section 4233 of the Revised Statutes, which was revised by the act of May 21, 1948 (ch. 328, 62 Stat. 249; 33 U. S. C. 301 et seq.).

The fourth set is found in the inland rules which are applicable to all vessels upon the rivers, harbors, and other inland waters of the United States (except the Great Lakes and connecting waters and parts of certain western rivers). These rules are contained in the act of June 7, 1897, as amended (ch. 4, 30 Stat. 96; 33 U. S. C. 154 et seq.).

It is clear that, at the time of the enactment of the Revised Statutes in 1878, section 4233, the forerunner of all the various rules, was directed specifically to vessels of the United States. However, at the same time, section 4401 of the Revised Statutes provided that all coastwise seagoing vessels and all vessels navigating the Great Lakes should be subject to the navigation laws of the United States, when navigating within the jurisdiction thereof (46 U. S. C. 364). Since 1878, revision of the rules have made the Inland Rules and Western Rivers Rules specifically applicable to all vessels, thus obviating the necessity of invoking the provisions of Revised Statutes 4401 in connection with foreign vessels in those waters. Section 1 of the proposed bill would do the same thing to the applicability language of the Great Lakes Rules and will specifically declare that they are special rules duly made by local authority, in the sense of rule 30 of the International Rules (act of October 11, 1951, supra; 33 U. S. C. 147b). The addition of the phrase "when within the territorial waters of the United States" has been added to make it clear that the legislation is intended to cover only waters within the jurisdiction of the United States and that United States vessels when within the Canadian territorial waters will be subject to the navigation laws of that country. Present language is ambiguous in that regard.

SEC. 2. This section would amend the provisions relating to the penalty for violating the Great Lakes Rules. The present penalty section was contained in the act of February 8, 1895 (ch. 64, 28 Stat. 649; 33 U. S. C. 244) and provided for a fine of $200, which could be assessed against the vessel for a violation of the act. Although that statute, as amended, authorizes the Commandant of the Coast Guard (authority transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury by Reorganization Plan 26, 1950) to establish other regulations which "shall have the force of law" (33 U. S. C. 243), there is no specific penalty for violating those regulations. Furthermore, a penalty provision applicable to the pilot, engineer, mate, or master of vessels, although it was originally contained in section 4413 of the Revised Statutes (46 U. S. C. 381) and is included in the Inland Rules (33 Stat. 158) and the Western River Rules (33 Stat. 354) is not presently included in the Great Lakes Rules. In order to facilitate the enforcement of the rules and authorized regulations, it is desirable that such a penalty provision be added. The change of the penalty now contained in the statute from $200 to $500 will bring the penalty provisions into conformity with the penalty provisions of the Western Rivers Rules, revised by the act of May 21, 1948 (ch. 328, 62 Stat. 250; 33 U. S. C. 354, 355).

Section 3: This section would repeal sections 4412 and 4413 of the Revised Statutes, as amended. These two sections have been specifically repealed only as far as the Inland rules are concerned (June 7, 1897, ch. 4, 30 Stat. 103; 46 U. S. C. 381). However, they were also repealed by implication as far as the United States vessels subject to the Great Lakes rules were concerned by the acts of February 8, 1895 (ch. 64, 28 Stat. 650) and February 19, 1895 (ch. 102, 28 Stat. 672). They were further repealed by implication as to the western rivers by the act of May 21, 1948 (62 Stat. 250; 33 U. S. C. 353, 354). The two sections may now be applicable to foreign vessels on the Great Lakes; however, this applicability has been questioned. The proposed amendment of 33 U. S. C. 241 will bring foreign vessels on the Great Lakes within that section. It follows that after such amendment the application of sections 4412 and 4413 of the Revised Statutes will have been completely superseded with respect to the Great Lakes. Section 3 would specifically repeal sections 4412 and 4413 for the Great Lakes and western rivers.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 5 OF AIR COMMERCE ACT OF 1926, RELATING TO SALE OF CERTAIN SERVICES TO OWNER OF AN AIRCRAFT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of the Air Force, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 5 of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 to authorize the sale

of goods and services by any department or independent establishment to the owner of an aircraft or his agent in an emergency, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4120) to amend section 5 of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 to authorize the sale of goods and services by any department or independent establishment to the owner of an aircraft or his agent in an emergency, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ELEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, in 1958 the World Health Organization will celebrate its 11th anniversary. Those of us who have been interested in WHO during its first decade of life are especially eager that this anniversary be marked in an appropriate manner. After many consultations with organizations and doctors who are intimately in touch with WHO activities, it has occurred to us that the most appropriate gesture to the World Health Organization would be an invitation by our Government to hold the 1958 World Health Assembly in the United States.

This Assembly would provide an excellent opportunity for the ministers and directors of health from WHO's 88 member countries, to view American health and medical methods, as well as an opportunity to focus American public attention on the economic and social program of the United Nations.

Because the cost of holding such an assembly in the United States would exceed the amount provided in WHO's budget for holding the assembly at Geneva, Switzerland, the WHO headquarters, an additional sum of $400,000 has seemed sufficient.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am happy to submit a joint resolution today in conjunction with Representative JUDD, of Minnesota, who is submitting a companion resolution in the other House, to implement these objectives. This joint resolution would authorize an appropriation to enable the United States to extend the invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 11th World Health Assembly in the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the 11th World Health Assembly is scheduled to be held in 1958; and

Whereas the year 1958 is considered particularly appropriate for holding the assembly in the United States since that year will mark the decennial anniversary of the entry into force of the constitution of the World Health Organization, which was originally drawn up and signed in New York City; and

Whereas the assembly and related functions will provide outstanding opportunities for the ministers and directors of health of the World Health Organization's 88 member countries to view American health and medical methods in practice, and to make and renew friendships among American health and medical leaders; and

Whereas the assembly will focus public attention in the United States on the important work of the World Health Organization as an integral part of the economic and social program of the United Nations and as a constructive work contributing to better international appreciation and world peace; and

Whereas American health and medical groups and certain urban organizations have suggested arrangements to make the World Health Assembly in the United States a particularly useful professional occasion through related seminars, field trips, and social activities; and

Whereas the cost of holding an Assembly in the United States would exceed the amount provided in the budget of the World Health Organization for holding an Assembly in Geneva, Switzerland, the headquarters of the organization: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That there is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $400,000 for the purpose of defraying the expenses incident to organizing and holding the Eleventh World Health Assembly in the United States. Funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall be available for advance contribution to the World Health Organization for additional costs incurred by the organization in holding the 11th World Health Assembly outside the organization's headquarters at Geneva, Switzerland; and shall be available for expenses incurred by the Department of State, on behalf of the United States as host government, including personal services without regard to civil-service and classification laws; employment of aliens; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the Travel Expense Act of 1949; rent of quarters by contract or otherwise; and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I introduced the joint resolution, and earnestly hope that we may still have time to act upon it favorably during the present session of Congress. I ask that the joint resolution be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 183) authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 11th World Health Assembly in the United States in 1958, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL AID FOR MARSHAL TITO—AMENDMENT

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this morning conducted a hearing with regard to the proposed $65 million of additional aid for Tito and Yugoslavia.

Mr. President, I do not agree with the position taken by the administration or the Secretary of the Treasury that we should provide additional aid to support that Communist government. My feeling is that if Tito can walk the streets of Moscow treading on rosebuds, enjoying the plaudits of the Communist multitude, then it is no longer necessary that we squeeze the resources out of our hard-pressed taxpayers to give him arms to protect himself from his old and new friends. Apparently his friendship with the Soviet Union has been reestablished, and I see no need of our continuing to pile additional millions of dollars of foreign aid to be sent to Yugoslavia in addition to what we have already given that country. It seems to me it would be just as well to tell Tito that we agree with him, that his danger of being overrun by Russia has subsided.

It was thought that if he went to Moscow he might be boiled in oil. He now finds that he can go there and be completely safe and be greeted as an old friend and welcomed back into the fold.

I have always questioned whether it was wise for us to demonstrate a greater interest in defending another country than that country would take in saving itself. It seems to me that Tito should pay for the arms we send to Yugoslavia, just as Egypt agreed to pay for the arms supplied to her by Russia. It might be a good idea to sell him all the spare parts he wants for the equipment he has, but I see no reason to give anything to him.

Mr. President, I send forward an amendment to the bill (H. R. 11356), the foreign-aid bill, and ask that it be printed and lie on the desk awaiting the day when the foreign-aid bill comes before the Senate for consideration. I offer the amendment on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I suggest that we appropriate no more for foreign aid this year than we appropriated last year. My recollection is that the administration requested $4,700,000,000, and I suggest that we appropriate no more than we appropriated for the foreign-aid program last year, which was $2,765,875,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

ECONOMIC WELFARE OF INDIANS LIVING ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 2632) to direct the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the economic welfare of Indians living on Indian reservations in the United States, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Senate bill 2632 was considered at an executive session of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee yesterday, and it was the unanimous opinion of the committee that the predominant subject matter of the proposed legislation lies within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I was therefore instructed by my committee to make this unanimous-consent request for its referral to that committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

Commencement Day address delivered by him at the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, at Philadelphia, Pa., on June 7, 1956.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce for the information of the Senate—and I call the attention of the distinguished minority leader to this announcement—that Calendar No. 2311, H. R. 9952, which provides for a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty, has been cleared for action on the floor. My staff has communicated with the minority policy committee. I should like to give notice that it is likely that bill, which has already been cleared by the minority policy committee, will be sandwiched in some time during this week or the early part of next week.

The Senate will not be in session on Wednesday, July 4. The majority leader will be out of the city the latter part of this week and next week, but his friends, the minority leader and the assistant majority leader, are going to assume some of the majority leader's duties. The Senate will be in session on Monday and Tuesday and Thursday and Friday of next week. It will take the day off only on July Fourth.

CONSTRUCTION OF NUCLEAR-POWERED MERCHANT SHIP

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its dsagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6243) authorizing the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on June 20, 1956, the Senate passed H. R. 6243, authorizing the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy, and for other purposes, with amendments.

The House disagreed to the Senate amendments and has requested a conference.

I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. DUFF conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for action on the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Ninety-four postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AND EUROPEAN REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frederick Blake Payne, of New York, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Regional Organizations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William B. Herlands, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations today confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 256, and I ask that it be stated for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be read for information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 256) was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 6782), to amend section 7 of "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the following correction:

In section 3 of the bill strike out "year."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, section 3 of the act reads:

SEC. 3. The first section of this act shall take effect on November next year after the approval of this act.

The concurrent resolution simply strikes out the word "year," which was erroneosuly included in the section.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 256) was considered and agreed to.

COST OF HIGH DAM IN HELLS CANYON

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on May 29 I inserted in the body of the RECORD a table which showed the cost to each State if the Federal Government built the high dam in Hells Canyon of the Snake River. On May 31 the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] voiced objection to this table, basing his objection on the grounds that the Bonneville project has been ahead of schedule in its paybacks to the Federal Government. The junior Senator from Oregon completely misses the main point of my contentions in this matter when he expresses the belief that merely because a Federal power project pays itself out more Federal moneys should be expended on the development of public power. I maintain that when private money is available and willing, it is a waste of the taxpayers' money to build the same project with public funds. Mr. President, we have many uses for public money, not the least of which are the balancing of the budget and the reduction of the deficit; so I must again voice my objection to doing with Federal money that which private money is not only willing to do but is doing.

In this respect I have in my hands Bulletin No. 153, dated June 25, 1956, of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce entitled "Federal Spending Facts" which carries a short discussion of the Hells Canyon project and another breakdown on the cost to each State if the Federal Government undertakes this work.

I ask unanimous consent that the bulletin be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the bulletin was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SPENDING FACTS—POLITICS IN HELLS CANYON AND WHAT IT MAY COST AMERICAN TAXPAYERS

The majority leadership in Congress seems determined to put through a bill which would add a totally unnecessary burden of one-half billion dollars on American taxpayers. The first official move in this direction was made last week by the Senate Interior Committee when it favorably reported S. 1333. This bill, introduced by Senator MORSE, of Oregon, authorizes construction of a Federal hydroelectric project at Hells Canyon in the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon. A similar bill, H. R. 4719, introduced by Representative PFOST, of

Idaho, will be voted on by the House Interior Committee June 26.

Federal construction of this project is unnecessary for the simple reason that the power potential of the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River is already in process of development with private financing. On August 4, 1955, the Federal Power Commission, acting in accordance with its responsibility under the Federal Water Power Act of 1920, issued a license to the Idaho Power Co. to construct three hydro projects in the Snake River. Three months later construction workers and equipment were at the site of the first dam to be built and work on it has now been under way over 7 months.

If the Federal Hells Canyon project should be authorized and started, however, the private development would, for practical purposes, have to be stopped. Moreover, the millions of dollars spent and the work done to date would be wasted because the Federal project would be located at a different site than the first dam under the company's plan. There is the probability, too, that the taxpayers would have to bear this loss since the company is proceeding under a duly authorized Federal license.

Since a move is on, nevertheless, to authorize the Federal project, the obvious question is, why? In considering the question, account should be taken of these facts from proceedings of the Federal Power Commission on the matter:

1. The decision of the FPC in granting the license to Idaho Power Co. was no hurried action. It was made after lengthy hearings and study and after opponents, as well as proponents, of private development of Hells Canyon had been given ample opportunity to be heard.

2. There is very little difference in the power-producing capacity of the company's three dams and the proposed single Federal dam. The dependable capacity of the former will be 767,000 kilowatts as compared to 785,000 kilowatts for the Federal dam. The Federal project, however, would cost a quarter billion dollars more than the 3-dam project.

3. The FPC found that other benefits, such as flood control, navigation and recreation, "could be effectuated to about the same extent under either the private or Federal plan of development." The Commission noted, however, that under private development these benefits "will be realized without expense to the United States."

4. The Commission concluded that the private company's 3-dam project "is best adapted to a comprehensive plan" for developing the Snake River in the Hells Canyon area. It also stated its judgment that "the United States itself should not undertake the development of the water resources of the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River."

THE POLITICAL ANGLES IN THE HELLS CANYON BILLS

It is clear from the findings of the FPC that the power needs of the Pacific Northwest will be served sooner and just as well by the company's plan as by the proposed Federal project. The main difference is that the Federal project requires involuntary financing by all taxpayers while the private project is being financed by investors. A second difference is that the private project will help finance the Government to the tune of almost $10 million a year in taxes.

What, then, is the reason for the present effort to substitute the Federal project for private development at Hells Canyon? The only apparent logical reason is that its supporters believe it will serve a political purpose. Here are some of the political angles in connection with it:

1. The 2 bills being actively considered in the Senate and the House were introduced by 2 Members of Congress who have campaigned in the past and continue to campaign on the basis of putting through a Federal Hells Canyon bill.

2. The granting of the license to the Idaho Power Co. has been termed by some administration opponents as a "giveaway" by the administration; and this charge is being made in spite of the fact that it was a unanimous decision by a bipartisan commission. Nevertheless, some politicians seem to think political hay can be made from the charge, not taking into account, of course, the fact that they open themselves to the charge of taking away money from taxpayers of all the States for an unnecessary purpose.

3. The Federal Hells Canyon project was included in Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON'S 13-point program "from the heart" which he announced last November as the legislative objectives of his party in 1956.

4. Representative CHENOWETH, Republican of Colorado, who has previously opposed the Federal project informed the press June 11 that he had made a deal with House Speaker RAYBURN to get the Hells Canyon bill out of the House Interior Committee of which he is a member. By his agreeing to vote for the bill, or abstain from voting, the deadlock in the committee would be broken. In return for this action, he said, Speaker RAYBURN agreed to use his influence to get the $156 million Fryingpan-Arkansas bill cleared for House action. This Colorado project, incidentally, was also included in Senator JOHNSON'S 13-point program.

WHAT THE FEDERAL PROJECT WOULD COST EACH STATE

So that taxpayers of each of the States can see how much money will be taken unnecessarily out of their States to finance the Federal Hells Canyon project if it is approved by Congress, the table below allocates its cost to the States on the basis of their respective shares of the present Federal tax burden. The $508.3 million total cost consists of $356.8 million for project construction, $22 million for interest during construction, and $129.5 million for transmission facilities:

	Percent of Federal tax burden borne by the States	Cost of project to the States
Alabama	0.91	$4,625,530
Arizona	.42	2,134,860
Arkansas	.46	2,338,180
California	9.29	47,221,070
Colorado	1.14	5,794,620
Connecticut	1.88	9,556,040
Delaware	.52	2,643,160
Florida	1.62	8,234,460
Georgia	1.34	6,811,220
Idaho	.25	1,270,750
Illinois	7.59	38,579,970
Indiana	2.41	12,250,030
Iowa	1.26	6,404,580
Kansas	.98	4,981,340
Kentucky	.99	5,032,170
Louisiana	1.10	5,591,300
Maine	.37	1,880,710
Maryland	2.19	11,131,770
Massachusetts	3.24	16,468,920
Michigan	5.66	28,769,780
Minnesota	1.70	8,641,100
Mississippi	.45	2,287,350
Missouri	2.47	12,555,010
Montana	.30	1,524,900
Nebraska	.74	3,761,420
Nevada	.17	864,110
New Hampshire	.27	1,372,410
New Jersey	3.71	18,857,930
New Mexico	.30	1,524,900
New York	14.95	75,990,850
North Carolina	1.41	7,167,030
North Dakota	.19	965,770
Ohio	6.26	31,819,580
Oklahoma	1.02	5,184,660
Oregon	.93	4,727,190
Pennsylvania	7.12	36,190,960
Rhode Island	.52	2,643,160
South Carolina	.62	3,151,460
South Dakota	.23	1,169,090
Tennessee	1.17	5,947,110
Texas	4.22	21,450,260
Utah	.33	1,677,390
Vermont	.15	762,450
Virginia	1.49	$7,573,670
Washington	1.60	8,132,800
West Virginia	.66	3,354,780
Wisconsin	2.00	10,166,000
Wyoming	.15	762,450
District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, etc	1.25	6,353,750
Total	100.00	[1] 508,300,000

[1] Estimate as submitted by a representative of the Department of the Interior to the Senate Interior Committee during its hearings on the bill.

APOLOGY TO SENATOR LEHMAN

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on June 20, an incident occurred in which two security officers from the Department of Defense and a member of the Capitol Police Force inspected a part of my office in the Senate Office Building without notice or consultation with me and, of course, without obtaining my prior permission. The account of the visit of these officers was carried widely in the press.

The following day, on June 21, I reported the incident to the Senate in some detail, and pointed out the potential danger in permitting unauthorized inspection of congressional premises by administrative agencies of the executive branch of the Government.

In the long debate which ensued, many Senators, including the majority and minority leaders and the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Committee on Armed Services, expressed regret and concern over the incident.

In the meantime, the Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Senate Armed Services Committee, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], held a hearing at which testimony was taken concerning the incident. At the hearing, Mr. Mansfield D. Sprague, general counsel of the Department of Defense, advised the committee that a letter of apology to me would be issued from the Department of Defense. A full transcript of the hearing by the subcommittee was introduced into the record yesterday by its distinguished chairman.

This morning, General Counsel Mansfield D. Sprague visited me in my office and personally handed to me a letter of apology from the Department of Defense, and expressed the personal regret of the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the letter of apology from the Department of Defense be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., June 26, 1956.

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: I am writing you concerning the incident which occurred in a portion of your office on June 20. I am doing so because I have been attending the

hearings of the Subcommittee on the Air Force to the Senate Armed Services Committee as the representative of the Department of Defense and was present at the session of the committee on June 21 at which testimony was taken concerning the unfortunate debugging incident.

The first I knew of the matter was at that hearing and I would like to call your attention to what I said which appears on page 15 of the record:

"Mr. SPRAGUE. Mr. Chairman, if you think it would be advisable, and I do, I would be glad to see to it that a letter of apology to Senator LEHMAN is issued from the Department of Defense. But I do feel on the basis of what the gentlemen have said, that they were just trying to carry out their normal duties."

Thereafter, Senator SYMINGTON suggested that I might call on you personally. I did so, but I was very sorry to find that you were on the floor of the Senate. I thereupon requested your secretary to convey to you the apology which I had intended to make personally.

Today I have read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 21 pertaining to this incident and the report of the proceedings before the Symington subcommittee of June 21 at which the two security officers and the Senate policeman testified.

First of all let me say that while the record does not reflect it, I have the personal assurance of the two security officers that they at no time discussed the matter with a representative of any newspaper. I have no idea how it received the initial publicity in the New York Times.

Secondly, I agree fully with the statements which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD referred to wherein it is indicated that all three of the men should have obtained your permission to investigate a portion of your office. It is most unfortunate that this did not occur to them, perhaps because they were acting through a Senate police officer or because permission was requested of your receptionist, which appears to have been granted, according to their testimony.

Thirdly, the fact that it was a portion of your office that was investigated is no reflection whatsoever on you, sir, but was solely a coincidence based on its proximity to the room in which the hearings were being held in which a portion of the wall adjoining your office had been under repair.

The presence of the Department of Defense security officers at the hearings of the Symington committee has been for the sole purpose of protecting not only the witnesses, but the members of the staff, and, in fact, the committee itself and the security of the United States. Their zealousness in the performance of their duty resulted in the invasion of your privacy, for which I apologize on behalf of the Department of Defense. I explained the occurrence to Secretary Wilson and my intention to write such a letter as this to you and I would like you to know that in his absence he wanted me to express his personal regret that the incident occurred in the manner in which it did.

Respectfully,

MANSFIELD D. SPRAGUE.

BIRTHDAY GREETINGS TO SENATOR KNOWLAND, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I think the distinguished majority leader will be interested to know that today is the anniversary of the birth of the distinguished minority leader of the Senate, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND. I wish to take this opportunity to say that I am sure all of us wish him many happy returns of the day and many years of success and happiness.

Senator KNOWLAND, a very able man, has furnished the Republican Members of the Senate with able and courageous leadership at all times since I have been in the Senate, and has earned the respect, I am sure, of all Senators on both sides of the aisle.

Therefore, Mr. President, on this occasion I am happy to call attention to the fact that today is his birthday anniversary, and to wish him happiness and success in the future.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I apologize for my ignorance, and I envy the Senator from Connecticut. If I had been possessed of the knowledge he has just indicated he is possessed of, I would have taken great pleasure in making the announcement myself.

I wish to associate myself with everything the very able Senator from Connecticut has said about the distinguished minority leader. There is no Member of the Senate to whom I am more devoted or for whom I have greater respect.

Always honorable, always diligent, ever conscious of the problems of his Nation and of the world, he leads the minority with courage and with conviction. In the 20 years I have served in Washington, I do not believe I have ever observed a session which has been freer of envy, jealousy, or acrimony than the session of the Senate this year. Although I like to feel that in part I have been responsible for that situation, I do not think anyone is more entitled to receive the plaudits of the country and the Senate than is the distinguished minority leader.

This morning, when the prayer was concluded, the minority leader handed me a copy of the calendar, on which he had written a statement on the part of the minority policy committee in regard to every measure on the calendar. At this session we have passed literally hundreds of bills; but we have never taken up one bill without the knowledge and, I believe, without the consent of the minority leader. By working closely together and by understanding each other's problems, we have been able to accomplish much which otherwise would simply not have been accomplished.

The minority leader is one of the youngest grandfathers I know, and one of the finest minority leaders.

It is my wish that he will have many more happy birthdays, and that he will forever remain the minority leader. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader; and I wish to say to him that if I have been remiss in not observing the amenities, it is due to ignorance on my part. Possibly it would have been better if, in advance, I had called the attention of the majority leader to the fact that today is Senator KNOWLAND's birthday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No, Mr. President; it has been quite appropriate for the Senator from Connecticut to have done what he has just done. I did not mean to indicate any criticism of him; I simply meant to congratulate him.

Mr. BUSH. Certainly we are very appreciative of the wonderful spirit of the Senator from Texas, Mr. President.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I desire to associate myself with everything my distinguished colleagues have just said regarding the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. All of us—even all of us on this side of the aisle—are very proud of Senator KNOWLAND. After all, in addition to being the minority leader, he is a Democratic nominee, as well as a Republican nominee. Therefore, not all of the credit should be given to the Republicans, because the Democrats of California also have nominated him.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in wishing for the distinguished minority leader many more successful and happy years. Certainly he is a wonderful leader. Although I am on the Democratic side of the aisle, and come from the State of South Carolina, I wish to state that those who read the speech I made before the Democratic convention will see that there I said that although many persons in South Carolina think that one who is called a Republican has horns, yet certainly the distinguished minority leader is an extremely fine man. I am very glad, indeed, to join in extending to him congratulations and very best wishes.

REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE SENATE AT CONCLUSION OF THE MORNING HOUR

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning hour, or not later than 1:10 p. m., I may be recognized to address the Senate for 15 minutes on the subject of Germany and NATO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREYS of Kentucky in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the request of the Senator from Vermont is a rather unusual one. The Senator from Vermont made a similar request on yesterday.

Personally, I do not like to object to such requests; but I wonder whether the Senator from Vermont would mind waiting until the morning hour has been concluded. If we begin to establish priorities for recognition for 10 minutes, 12 minutes, 14 minutes, and so forth, at 1:30 or subsequent hours, we shall get into difficulties. The distinguished minority leader and I have worked out a program for today, following the morning hour; and if the Senator from Vermont will add his name to the list, that will take care of the situation.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I expect to make a series of eight short talks which, to my mind, represent my duty and a contribution which I can make to this body. I am willing to withdraw the request I have made, and later to request

recognition by the Presiding Officer or President pro tempore.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from Vermont will withdraw his request, Mr. President, then as soon as the morning hour is concluded, the unfinished business will be laid before the Senate; and I have asked that the name of the Senator from Vermont be included in the list at the desk, and I am sure he will be recognized.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator from Texas.

FEDERAL PERSONNEL LEGISLATION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, when I was a small boy of 9 or 10, my folks took me to a nearby amusement park. Among the main attractions was the "fun house." Inside the "fun house" was a distortion mirror.

If a person faced the distortion mirror from the left it made him appear slender; from the right it made him look fat; in the center, from close up, he resembled a pygmy; from a little distance he appeared to be a giant; and at intermediate points he became a jumbled combination—partly tall, partly short, some of him fat, and the rest of him thin.

Nothing reminds me quite so much of that distortion mirror as the administration's action on Federal personnel legislation.

Let me be specific: Such legislation when sponsored by the administration is good, but such legislation under another label is bad; administration proposals always bear a low-cost figure and a high value, whereas congressional proposals have a high cost and a low value—or so says the administration.

My colleagues will recall the history of the fight waged by Congress to obtain a wage increase for Federal employees. During the closing days of the 83d Congress a bill providing for an increase of approximately 5 percent was approved and sent to the President, by whom it was vetoed on September 7, 1954, after Congress had adjourned and gone home.

Four months later—on January 11, 1955, to be exact—the administration advised Congress that on the basis of a "comprehensive study" it could recommend an increase of 5 percent in the pay of postal employees and a somewhat lesser amount for other Federal employees.

Mr. President, is it not strange that a 5-percent increase should be vetoed, and an increase of the same amount recommended, all in the space of 4 short months? Was the first bill vetoed because the increase originated in Congress, and not downtown? Or did the administration recommend an increase only after it reviewed the 1954 election returns?

Early in the first session of the present Congress, a bill providing for a pay increase of somewhat more than 8 percent was passed, and sent to the President. It, too, was vetoed.

A third bill was quickly passed by Congress. It, like the bill that had been vetoed by the President, provided for somewhat more than an 8 percent pay increase. This bill, however, unlike the two former bills, was not vetoed, but was signed, thereby bringing to an end a long-drawn-out fight on the part of Congress to accord Federal employees a merited increase in pay.

What is there about an 8 percent pay increase that makes it unjustified one week, and justified only a few weeks later? Is it that the administration has a rule "Do it our way and as we say, or not at all?"

Is it not strange that throughout the long fight to obtain a decent pay increase for Federal employees, the administration protested over and over on the basis of cost, but that since enactment of the bill, their spokesmen have shouted from the housetops, telling employee groups of their generosity in giving them an increase. It should be noted, however, that the administration's self-proclaimed generosity to Federal employees has become more and more pronounced as the magic month of November draws nearer. I wonder whether there could be a connection. Or is it that at this late date the administration has honestly come to realize that Federal employees were actually entitled to an increase all along, and that the administration was wrong in its prolonged opposition to an increase?

Mr. President, we now see the telltale shadows of history repeating itself, this time in regard to retirement legislation.

A few short weeks ago the administration opposed a major overhaul of the civil service retirement system. Instead, the administration was wedded to the proposition of coordinating the civil service retirement system and the social security program—coordination without major improvement in the retirement benefits of Federal employees.

The administration plan would have cost the Government some two hundred million dollars a year, and would eventually have called for an employee contribution of 7½ percent. Yes, the administration could stand a two hundred million-plus expense for a bill of its own design, and Federal employees could afford a contribution of 7½ percent of their pay for a plan designed for them—a plan that by their unanimous testimony they did not seek and did not desire.

But, only a few weeks later when testifying before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the administration changed its tune.

The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission stated:

> The Civil Service Commission holds the view that if the Government is to obtain an improved and favorable competitive position in the recruiting and retaining of qualified employees and wishes to regain its former position of leadership in the field of progressive retirement legislation, the present 6-percent rate of employee deductions should be considered a maximum rate, which should not be increased. The Commission accordingly recommends that as a matter of policy 6 percent of salary be considered the maximum rate of employee contributions to the civil service retirement system.

Mind you, this recommendation followed by only a few weeks the hearings on the Senate side, at which time the Commission recommended a plan calling for a 7½-percent deduction. Also the Commission proposed modifications in the Senate-approved retirement bill that would reduce the Government's cost to $165 million a year. This followed by only a few weeks their support of the administration bill that would have cost many millions of dollars more.

The real point of all this is that it seems unmistakably clear that the administration will pay a price to secure something it desires and, moreover, will exact a toll from Federal employees for the same purpose. However, it is not so charitable when it comes to enactment of legislation which does not bear the administration's label. It is a case of "Papa knows best."

In commenting on the provision of the Senate-approved bill which would provide a more favorable factor for the computation of retirement benefits, the Commission stated:

> We do not find this proposal objectionable in principle. Nor do we find the benefit it produces would be excessive when compared with benefits provided other officers and employees. The Commission does believe that the cost involved in this provision must be carefully considered.

In other words, there is no objection as to principle. Neither is there objection on the basis that the benefits are excessive. Yet there is objection because of the cost.

Mr. President, I could not in good conscience object to a proposal that is sound in principle and which does not provide excessive benefits purely on the grounds that it will cost some money.

Are we to deny Federal employees fair treatment because it will cost some money to give them fair treatment? Are we to allow the career service to decay and wither because it will cost money to keep it in proper repair? Are we to be satisfied with a second-class public service because it will cost a few extra dollars to provide an efficient and effective first-class public service? I do not believe we will subscribe to such a short-sighted policy.

On the Senate side, the administration spoke fervently in support of its coordination plan because—

> Only through coordination can adequate survivorship benefits be provided. S. 2875 is inadequate in this respect.

But what happened on the House side? It seems unbelievable, but the administration completely reversed itself by opposing the survivorship benefits of S. 2875, not because they were inadequate, as claimed by the administration representatives when they testified on the Senate side, but because they had suddenly and without change become excessive.

I am convinced that it is the purpose of the administration to confuse and befuddle the issues, which are extremely complex at best, in order to scuttle S. 2875.

However, let me make one thing clear. S. 2875 is a good bill. It is a progressive bill. It is a desirable and greatly needed bill. It is the most important piece of employee legislation of recent decades. Its enactment would do more to improve

and strengthen the career service than any other measure considered by Congress since the turn of the century. Therefore, I do not propose to accept a diluted and emasculated substitute that falls short of the goal. If a proper and adequate measure cannot be enacted into law under the present administration during this session, I am confident of eventual success. Just as in the case of the pay bills, justice and right will eventually prevail in regard to retirement legislation.

PORTRAITS OF OUTSTANDING SENATORS TO BE PLACED IN SENATE RECEPTION ROOM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a Senate resolution sponsored by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and myself.

According to the provisions of Senate Resolution 145, the selection of 5 outstanding Senators whose portraits are to be placed in the Senate reception room was to be made over a period of 10 years, 1 being selected every 2 years.

Upon reflection, the members of our committee unanimously decided that it would be more satisfactory if the five Senators whose portraits are to be placed in the Senate reception room should all be chosen at once. Therefore, the purpose of the resolution which I am submitting is to amend the original resolution so as to provide that the 5 Senators be chosen by May of next year, although we hope the date will be 2 or 3 months earlier.

The resolution also provides that the amount to be appropriated for the committee shall be increased from $5,000 to $10,000, although the committee does not expect that that amount will be expended. However, it will take care of contingencies, particularly clerical help. The select committee feels that this procedure is far more effective. It has the approval of the majority leader and the minority leader, who were the sponsors of the original resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 297), submitted by Mr. KENNEDY for himself and other Senators, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 145, 84th Congress, agreed to on August 2, 1955, authorizing the placing of paintings in the 5 unfilled spaces in the Senate reception room, is amended as follows—

(1) strike out all of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. The committee shall report to the Senate not later than May 1, 1957, its selections of persons whose paintings shall be placed in the Senate reception room."; and

(2) strike out in section 4 "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREYS of Kentucky in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and other Senators, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the amendments of the Senator from New Hampshire are to certain committee amendments. The committee amendments have not yet been called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Under the heading "Title V—Department of the Air Force—Aircraft and Related Procurement," on page 23, at the beginning of line 17, it is proposed to strike out "$6,048,500,000" and insert "$6,848,500,000"; on page 26, line 4, under the heading "Operation and Maintenance," to strike out "$3,684,185,000" and insert "$3,780,185,000"; and on page 29, after line 13, to insert lines 14 to 19, inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and other Senators to the committee amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 23, line 17, in lieu of "$6,848,500,000", it is proposed to insert "$6,398,500,000."

On page 26, line 4, in lieu of "$3,780,185,000", it is proposed to insert "$3,770,185,000."

On page 29, it is proposed to strike out lines 14 to 19 inclusive.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the pending question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from New Hampshire to certain committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. At 1:30 o'clock p. m., the time limitation will begin to operate, and there will be 45 minutes to each side on the amendments of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that it was the intention of the Senator from New Hampshire to ask that his amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not have the information.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Maine have the information?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in order that Senators may be on notice, at 1:30 p. m. the time limitation will begin to operate in connection with the amendments of the Senator from New Hampshire, and there will be 45 minutes to each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FLANDERS obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont cares to yield to me for that purpose, I shall be glad to suggest the absence of a quorum; or, if he prefers, he may proceed without it.

Mr. FLANDERS. I think it might be just as well if I were to proceed without a quorum call. The majority leader and I have had experience with quorum calls.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Very well.

FOREIGN POLICY

II. GERMANY AND NATO

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, this second of the series of brief speeches makes a drastic proposal. It is that Chancellor Adenauer be encouraged to negotiate with the Soviet Government for the reuniting of East and West Germany, in return for a united Germany which agrees to be unarmed and neutral, but is otherwise free.

The initial negotiations must be made with the Soviet Government, not with its puppet, East Germany. Warrant for this is to be found in the statement by Molotov, who, at the second high-level conference, after flying to Moscow to consult with the present government, made it plain that East Germany would not be released except on terms which preserved its puppet, Communist government. The Soviet holds the power and the responsibility not the puppet government.

It may seem strange that I am making such a suggestion so soon after the visit of the Chancellor, in the course of which rearmament and reunion were both reaffirmed. I shall endeavor to show that the two are practically incompatible. Germany and we must recognize this fact of life. The choice between the two must be put up to the Soviet Government. This can be done with some hope of a useful decision, as I will endeavor to show later.

First, let me recount a bit of history. About 2 years ago it had become clear to me that our endeavor to rearm Germany was an ill-conceived, expensive, and fruitless undertaking. Why this should be so is now becoming quite obvious. It was our own idea. It does not fit into the aspirations of the German people. It does arouse the fears of our allies.

The deepest desire of the German people is to have their west and east reunited in peace and freedom. Rearmament does not serve this aspiration but blocks it. Why did we ever believe that the Soviet Government could be persuaded to release East Germany to a rearmed Western Germany? The proposal has only to be stated and it becomes

evidently preposterous. Russia fears a rearmed enemy, and nothing we can say or do will remove that fear so long as we are pressing rearmament. The only way reunification could be effected under our program would be by a victorious war—World War III. Were we ever, are we now, prepared for that solution?

The only rational explanation of our policy does us little credit from the moral standpoint. It is that we gave lip service to the German aspiration for unity, while urging for other reasons a rearmament which made unity impossible. It is true that rearmament was conceived to be in support of larger ends, the resistance to Soviet aggression and the defense of freedom in Western Europe. These are worthy ends and we must never cease to work for them, but their attainment received no useful support from the keystone of our policy—a revival of German military might.

These matters were clearing up in my own mind and led to the thought that we might usefully revise and expand our policy. As suggested at the beginning, why not encourage Chancellor Adenauer to negotiate with the Kremlin for the reunification of East Germany with a West Germany which is unarmed and neutral, but otherwise free? Were negotiations successful, a great and populous area would be recovered from behind the Curtain, the German people would attain a substantial measure of their aspirations, the understandable fears of the Russians would be relieved, and the West would be protected by a neutral zone extending through Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, from the North Sea to within 50 miles of the Adriatic.

But would that neutral zone be a strength or a weakness for the defense of Western Europe? Would it not bring the vast Russian armies unopposed to the banks of the Rhine? Thinking, as we are so prone to do, in terms of World War II, it would be a serious weakness. But world war III—which God and man forbid—will be an atomic war. As I shall endeavor to show in a later talk of this series, the battlefront will not be a line drawn across the earth's surface but a stratum of the upper air—atmosphere, stratosphere, ionosphere, extrasphere—what have you. We are living in a new world and thinking in an old one.

With these thoughts in mind on September 20, 1954, I went up into a hidden valley where is located the village capital of my remote State, and in a public speech suggested the usefulness of an unarmed, neutral, reunited Germany, negotiated for by the Chancellor of that newly freed country.

Some slight notice of that speech appeared in American newspapers—about as much as experience had led me to expect. What was completely unexpected was the notice taken of my words in Germany itself. I had unexpectedly touched upon a fear deep in German hearts—a fear generated by the sad experience of two successive generations led to disaster by German general staffs, serving masters crazed by the lure of power. These correspondents had had enough of this. They wanted no more.

Following this evidence of German misgivings, I communicated with high officials of the State Department. I found our rearmament policy so firmly entrenched that it could not be reconsidered. My efforts there ceased with my prediction that the policy of German rearmament would disintegrate everything it touched. This prophecy has been measurably fulfilled.

My next step was to mention the matter to others high in the administration. Here, too, I found a monolithic support for rearmament. While still believing it to be fruitless and dangerous, I was not prepared to oppose my own Republican administration at a time when I was almost alone in my point of view. Being sure that events have so moved as to bring more support to the idea, I have no hesitation in speaking out again at this time.

What has been said relates to German interests and German sentiment. There are also serious problems with our allies, particularly the French.

When the French Assembly unwisely voted down the proposals for a European Defense Community, the situation became impossible. EDC, as it was called, would have permitted German, French, and other soldiers to have served in an allied army, under allied commanders and an allied general staff. This would have allayed the fears of both the German and French peoples. Yet the French turned it down.

For they are fearful. When I was in Paris last summer, a high-placed public figure said to me, "We are in favor of German reunification, but not too soon." Both as to reunification and rearmament I had a similar unofficial report from one of our own embassy staff who had been on a tour of the country.

Since the events just mentioned, there have been other evidences of the inherent weakness of the rearmament policy. The Chancellor visited Russia and returned with promises that German war prisoners would be returned. A few were. He made no headway on reunification. He was negotiating from weakness, for he had nothing with which to bargain. He could get no assurance of reunion, or of a thoroughgoing repatriation. With our assent he can have disarmament as a strong bargaining point.

More recently an important election went against him and a part of the political coalition on which he depended has defected. The structure of revived military power was built on sand, and the foundations are crumbling.

Meanwhile at the first Geneva conference in July, 1955, the Soviet rulers became convinced of the truth that we had no military designs on them. This has permitted a change of policy on their part from threats to wooings. Furthermore, the French have become so heavily engaged in North Africa that they are virtually evacuating their military defense at home.

NATO thus is weakened. General Gruenther is resigning. Lord Ismay's hope for a political and economic function for NATO comes to be about all that is left, and it is given strong support by the French Premier.

Are we sure that the strength we can draw from German rearmament continues to exist? We need to reexamine this question in view of the obvious shift of tactics and strategy towards atomic warfare.

On the other hand, can we have assurance that Germany will remain neutral? There is an old belief that a "power vacuum" will inevitably be filled. But Germany is not a power vacuum. It is a reservoir of commercial power and the interests of its people center on industrial and commercial activity, freed from military taxation. So much for internal interests. Externally, the Soviet and the Western Powers must and will spring into action if either side begins military aggression. The atomic stalemate must be extended to cover a Russian invasion, as will be suggested in my next talk.

Finally, our confidence in Adenauer is justified; but neither he nor we who are gathered in this Chamber are immortal. In years not now too far ahead, what a prize would be that rearmed Germany, open to Communist subversion.

Let us, therefore, in this area forego the hope of military aid as being illusory. Let us reach rather for another value, that inherent in a new area released from behind the Curtain and serving as part of a protective barrier against military ground attack.

This is indeed a drastic proposal. It requires that the Soviet withdraw completely from East Germany as we withdraw from the West. It requires that we put into effect the lessons learned from the debacle of the Korean truce. The Curtain must first be dropped and thrown aside. Mr. President, I repeat: The Curtain must first be dropped and thrown aside. Complete communication between East and West Germany must be established. Soviet forces and equipment must be moved out in step with our own evacuation. The terms of union must then be left to the freely elected representatives of East and West Germany.

Will the Soviet Government ever agree to this loss of population, territory, and productive capacity? This cannot be known until the proposal is made. A refusal would be a refusal to make an important advance toward peace and freedom. Can that Government afford to refuse, with the eyes of the world keenly searching for a willingness to act for peace as well as to talk about it?

In fact, a careful reading of Molotov's report on his return from Moscow would seem to indicate that the Soviet Government has so committed itself that it would find difficulty in refusing.

Should the Soviet Government, by refusal, show plainly that its policy is focused on power, not peace, then we resume our policies of power and look elsewhere for the means of directing power toward peace.

But, first, let this opportunity be put to the test.

STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS BY CULTURAL AND ATHLETIC EXCHANGES AND PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL FAIRS AND FESTIVALS

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, yesterday I brought to the

attention of the Senate a disservice which I believe the United States Information Agency has done to our prestige abroad by retreating from its sponsorship of an exhibit of American painting overseas. I commented that this was one of several such instances of what I believed to be an unfortunate retreat and a very unwise action on the part of the USIA.

An editorial entitled "USIA Stumbles Again" was published in the Minneapolis Tribune of June 23, 1956. I call the editorial to the attention of my colleagues, because it goes right to the point. It says, in part:

The USIA evidently has decided not to sponsor what would have been one of the most significant exhibits of American painting ever sent overseas. Reason: USIA fears some artists represented might be attacked for pro-Communist leanings.

At USIA's request, the American Federation of Arts had lined up major works of a hundred American artists of this century from galleries, museums, and private collections across the country.

Then USIA declared 10 of the artists unacceptable for political reasons. AFA trustees rejected censorship, voting unanimously not to participate in the project if any paintings were barred.

Last month USIA canceled plans to send a painting exhibit called Sport in Art to the Olympic Games in Australia after a Dallas patriotic council charged that four of the artists represented had once belonged to Communist fronts.

A month earlier USIA had canceled a fall tour of India and the Middle East by the Symphony of the Air, implying that some players had dubious political loyalties. The orchestra had made a highly successful tour in Asia in 1955 under USIA's sponsorship.

This was the same orchestra which only recently was told it was unacceptable. The editorial continues:

In the latest fiasco, the arts federation did well to remind USIA of a 1954 statement by one Dwight D. Eisenhower on the subject, in which the President said:

"Freedom of the arts is a basic freedom, one of the pillars of liberty in our land. * * * When artists are made the slaves and the tools of the state, when artists become the chief propagandists of a cause, progress is arrested and creation and genius are destroyed."

Mr. President, I think this is a matter of serious import, and I am hopeful that before long the USIA will reconsider the matter, exhibit some courage, and come to an honorable decision worthy of "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USIA STUMBLES AGAIN

Comes now the United States Information Agency with one more demonstration that the silly season is still with us and that overzealous Americans can harm their country's prestige more than Communist propaganda.

USIA evidently has decided not to sponsor what would have been one of the most significant exhibits of American painting ever sent overseas. Reason? USIA fears some artists represented might be attacked for pro-Communist leanings.

At USIA's request, the American Federation of Arts had lined up major works of a hundred American artists of this century from galleries, museums, and private collections across the country.

Then USIA declared 10 of the artists unacceptable for political reasons. AFA trustees rejected censorship, voting unanimously not to participate in the project if any paintings were barred.

If the show finally gets abroad at all it will evidently have to be under private sponsorship.

Last month USIA canceled plans to send a painting exhibit called Sport in Art to the Olympic Games in Australia after a Dallas patriotic council charged that four of the artists represented had once belonged to Communist fronts.

A month earlier, USIA had canceled a fall tour of India and the Middle East by the Symphony of the Air, implying that some players had dubious political loyalties. The orchestra had made a highly successful tour in Asia in 1955, under USIA sponsorship.

In the latest fiasco, the arts federation did well to remind USIA of a 1954 statement by one Dwight D. Eisenhower on the subject, in which the President said:

"Freedom of the arts is a basic freedom, one of the pillars of liberty in our land. * * * When artists are made the slaves and the tools of the state, when artists become the chief propagandists of a cause, progress is arrested and creation and genius are destroyed."

THE REMARKABLE CAREER OF CARROLL BINDER

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I have already had occasion to mention on the Senate floor the remarkable career of Carroll Binder, who died on May 1, shortly after paying a visit to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington. Mr. Binder was the editor of the editorial page of the Minneapolis Tribune at the time of his death.

Among the many things he wrote, for which he will be widely remembered, is his statement of personal faith, contributed in 1952 to Edward R. Murrow's "This I Believe." I can think of no statement by Mr. Binder which sums up his own career better than these words. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OF PERSONAL FAITH AND FALLING TILES

(By Carroll Binder)

"We are all at the mercy of a falling tile," Julius Caesar reminds us in Thornton Wilder's Ides of March. None of us knows at what hour something we love may suffer some terrible blow by a force we can neither anticipate nor control.

Fifty-five years of living, much of the time in trouble centers of a highly troubled era, have not taught me how to avoid being hit by falling tiles. I have sustained some very severe blows. My mother died when I was 3 years old. My first-born son, a gifted and idealistic youth, was killed in the war. While I was still cherishing the hope that he might be alive, circumstances beyond my control made it impossible for me to continue work into which I had poured my heart's blood for 20 years.

I speak of such things here in the hope of helping others to believe with me that there are resources within one's grasp which enable one to sustain such blows without being crushed or embittered by them.

I believe the best hope of standing up to falling tiles is through developing a sustaining philosophy and state of mind all through life. I have seen all sorts of people sustain all sorts of blows in all sorts of circumstances by all sorts of faiths, so I believe anyone can find a faith that will serve his needs if he persists in the quest.

One of the best ways I know of fortifying oneself to withstand the vicissitudes of this insecure and unpredictable era is to school oneself to require relatively little in the way of material possessions, physical satisfactions or the praise of others. The less one requires of such things the better situated one is to stand up to changes of fortune.

I am singularly rich in friendships. Friends of all ages have contributed enormously to my happiness and helped me greatly in times of need. I learned one of the great secrets of friendship early in life—to regard each person with whom one associates as an end in himself, not a means to one's ends. That entails trying to help those with whom one comes in contact to find fulfillment in their own way while seeking one's own fulfillment in one's own way.

Another ethical principle that has stood me in good stead is: Know thyself. I try to acquaint myself realistically with my possibilities and limitations. I try to suit my aspirations to goals within my probable capacity to attain. I may have missed some undiscovered possibilities for growth but I have spared myself much by not shooting for stars it clearly was not given me to attain.

I have seen much inhumanity, cheating, corruption, sordidness, and selfishness but I have not become cynical. I have seen too much that is decent, kind, and noble in men to lose faith in the possibility for a far finer existence than yet has been achieved. I believe the quest for a better life is the most satisfying pursuit of men and nations.

I love life but I am not worried about death. I do not feel that I have lost my son and a host of others dear to me by death. I believe with William Penn that "they that love beyond the world cannot be separated by it. Death is but crossing the world, as friends do the seas; they live in one another still." Death, I believe, teaches us the things of deathlessness.

MARKERS IN NATIONAL CEMETERIES TO HONOR MEMORY OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREYS of Kentucky in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2512) to amend the act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving in such forces, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the act entitled "An act to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of members of the Armed Forces missing in action," approved August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 880), is amended by adding after the word "action", the words "or who died or were killed while serving in such forces, and whose remains have not been identified, have been

buried at sea, or have been determined to be nonrecoverable."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has considered the amendment and reports favorably thereon. I therefore move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for himself and other Senators to the committee amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CANCELLATION OF VISIT BY PRIME MINISTER NEHRU

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the cancellation of the visit of Prime Minister Nehru to our country is a shocking setback to our international relations. Mr. Nehru is the leader of the largest community of free people in the world. It is extremely important to all of us that India remain a free country, directing its own destiny, independent of foreign domination.

Mr. Nehru was coming here to attempt to overcome some of the misunderstanding which has troubled our relations in the past. It is tragic that the administration has seen fit to cancel this visit, while at the same time announcing that the President will be flown to Panama 2 weeks later. These circumstances, together with the glowingly optimistic bulletins about the President's health can be interpreted as a deliberate snub by reasonable people.

Speaking for myself at least, and I believe for many of my colleagues, I sincerely hope that Prime Minister Nehru does not take offense at this treatment. We have the greatest respect for the Indian people and Nehru. We believe they are making a valiant and successful effort to remain free and to create a workable and stable democratic society.

I believe the American people desire to be helpful to the people of India; that they have a sincere and deep interest in the success of their struggle for a better life; and that they sincerely regret that the leader of the Indian people is not coming to confer with our President.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1275) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate employees of the District to protect life and property in and on the buildings and grounds of any institution located upon property outside of the District of Columbia acquired by the United States for District sanitariums, hospitals, training schools, and other institutions, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7641) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 11002. An act to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 11878. An act to extend the date upon which the Rubber Disposal Commission will terminate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 3295. An act to amend the act of April 28, 1953, relating to daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia;

S. 3663. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3693. An act to amend title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended;

H. R. 7227. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the disposal of surplus property for civil-defense purposes, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8634. An act to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in North Carolina to the city of Charlotte, N. C.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 11002. An act to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 11878. An act to extend the date upon which the Rubber Disposal Commission will terminate; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 26, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 3295. An act to amend the act of April 28, 1953, relating to daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia; and

S. 3663. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia.

ADMINISTRATION'S POLICIES IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the events of the last few days in Egypt represent a serious set-back for the free world and a sobering disclosure of the futility of the administration's policies in the Middle East.

The British have withdrawn their troops from Suez. The base has been occupied by Egyptian forces. These forces have been recently equipped by Communist nations with modern implements for mechanized warfare.

The new foreign minister of the Soviet Union, Dmitri T. Shepilov, who engineered the Communist bloc arms deal with Egypt, has attended the 3-day celebration of these developments. He has used this visit as an occasion to renew his country's assurances of friendship and support, while attacking Western colonialism and oil monopolies, and otherwise fishing in whatever other troubled waters he could find. He has naturally ignored Soviet colonialism and oil monopolies.

In the meantime, the Cairo radio is reported to be parroting the Communist line on various foreign policy questions; and Premier Nasser, in what was described as an emotionally charged speech in the news story in the New York Times last week, has repeated thinly-veiled threats directed at the nation of Israel, urging that Egypt be strengthened "to restore to the people of Palestine their rights of freedom and existence."

Our own Government at the same time persists in its refusal to sell to Israel the arms she must have if she is to maintain the balance of strength in that area; and all of these developments seem to promise a realization of the prediction of Mr. Hanson Baldwin, made nearly 2 years ago, that with Egypt in sole control at Suez:

> The Egyptian-Arab friction, already at fever point, may even burst the bounds of the past.

The presence of Foreign Minister Shepilov clearly shows what force is determined to fill the vacuum of power created by the withdrawal of the British troops. The actions and statements of the Egyptian premier make all too clear Egypt's hostile intent toward Israel and indifference to the peace of the Middle

East. To the degree that our Government, under what I believe to be the misguided urging of American Ambassador Henry A. Byroade, has helped to bring about this weakening of the free world's power and strengthening of those who avow agressive intentions in the Middle East, it must share in the responsibility and blame for these ominous developments.

We recall the rather precise threats by the Egyptian Minister of National Guidance, Saleh Selim, 2 years ago, who said:

As for the problem of Palestine, it will not be solved except by force. This force will not be attained before the Suez Canal is freed. The Egyptian Army cannot fight while the British Army stands between it and its bases.

In the light of the removal of the British Army and the renewal of these threats by Premier Nasser, is it not time for our Government to review its policy in the Middle East and reverse its previous refusal to allow Israel to purchase necessary defensive arms in this country? Is it not also time to work out some blueprint for the future of our policy in that area which promises no more celebrations graced by the presence of the Russian foreign minister? Must we not more urgently and effectively press for a peaceful stabilization of the national boundaries, based on a recognition of the permanence of Israel, and for the economic upbuilding of the countries in the Middle East? Supporting fully the efforts of the United Nations, should we not likewise assist in mobilizing the free world both to maintain the peace of the Middle East and to block the attempted expansion of Soviet imperialism? It is high time, in my judgment, to end the blindness and futility that seem to have directed our Government's policy in more recent years.

It also seems important to me that we learn from the events of recent days that the basic objectives of the Soviet Union, despite all of their propaganda efforts to make it appear otherwise, are unchanged.

I ask unanimous consent to have printedn in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Visitor in Cairo," which was published in the New York Times on Monday, June 18, 1956. The editorial comments upon the cynical and dangerous game being played by Soviet diplomacy in that area of the world.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VISITOR IN CAIRO

Making his first appearance on the international stage outside the Soviet Union since his recent appointment, Foreign Minister Dmitri T. Shepilov is now in Cairo, where he has been received as an honored guest. The welcome now being shown him is no doubt motivated in large part by his role almost a year ago in laying the groundwork for Egypt's receipt of modern arms from Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Shepilov's remarks last Saturday on arriving in Cairo should help mightily to dispel any illusions that Soviet foreign policy objectives have changed. It would be difficult to find a more cynical statement by a modern statesman, or one more inspired by the desire to increase rancor among states.

The Soviet Foreign Minister poses in Cairo as the envoy of a "country that has totally repudiated colonial expansion." Yet the Soviet Union is today the largest colonial empire in the world, imprisoning among other subject peoples over 20 million persons of Moslem origin in Central Asia and the Caucasus. It might be in point to ask Mr. Shepilov when and where the Soviet Union repudiated Mr. Molotov's official communication of November 26, 1940, to the German Government—the statement which declares that "the area south of Batum and Baku in the general direction of the Persian Gulf, must be, recognized as the center of the aspirations of the Soviet Union." Could there be a cruder statement of plans for "colonial expansion"?

Mr. Shepilov assured his Egyptian hosts his country "has no place for oil monopolies or any other kind of imperialist monopoly that sucks the vitality of less developed nations." But where is there a more complete oil monopoly than in Moslem Azerbaijan, whose petroleum has been ruthlessly taken for Moscow's benefit for over a third of a century? What better example of sucking the vitality of a less developed nation is there today than in Soviet Kazakhstan, whose native Moslem population is today being drowned in a flood of Slav migrants from the West?

These and other misstatements in Mr. Shepilov's speech were not accidental of course. He and his Moscow colleagues hope to exploit the tensions of the Middle East for their own benefit. When he speaks of "oil monopolies" he intends the Arab peoples to be inflamed against the Western oil companies which have invested vast sums to discover and develop Middle Eastern oil resources and which take their profits only after paying the Governments of these countries enormous sums each year for the oil they produce.

Already now it is clear that Moscow is playing a cynical and dangerous game in the Middle East. The Arab-Israeli dispute, the oil question, anticolonial feeling, all these are instruments it hopes to play upon to breed ill will and to heighten Soviet influence. That the Soviet policy could bring war to this sensitive area is also a matter about which Moscow shows little concern.

Whether the Middle Eastern countries will succumb to Mr. Shepilov's honeyed words and the armament presents he has the power to distribute remains to be seen. The real test of the present leaders of the Arab States is here. These leaders have but to look at the plight of the subject Moslem peoples of the Soviet Union to understand their own fate if they ignore the real goals of present Soviet policy. Meanwhile we of the West are being given a valuable object lesson. Soviet policy in the Mideast just doesn't bear out Moscow's assertions that it wants to lessen international tension and bring peace to this troubled world.

NATURAL GAS INDUSTRY'S OWN STATISTICS SHOW PHILLIPS DECISION DID NOT STIFLE "EXPLORATION"

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the proponents of the Harris-Fulbright bill to exempt the producers of natural gas from regulation repeatedly argued that, unless the bill were passed, exploration for natural gas would cease and probably no gas would be available for sale. The theme that supply is more important than price was played again and again, and the level of proved gas reserves was cited as evidence that the Phillips decision was resulting in a decrease in exploration for natural gas. For example, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] stated on the floor of the Senate on January 17 of this year:

The handwriting has already begun to appear on the wall. During the first 11 months of last year—the figures for December are not yet available—oil-well completions in America increased 8 percent. Gas-well completions, however, dropped 8.6 percent. If this trend continues, and I am convinced it will as long as utility controls are applied at the wellhead, the natural-gas consumer may soon find himself in the same situation as the lady who was pricing hamburger at her neighborhood market. When the butcher told her it was 69 cents a pound, the lady complained bitterly.

"Why, down the street," she said, "I can get it for 39 cents a pound."

"Then, why don't you buy it there?" the butcher asked.

"Oh, they're out of hamburger," the lady said.

"Well, that's different," said the butcher. "When we're out, our price is only 15 cents."

The same sort of situation could easily develop in the gas industry. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 17, 1956, pp. 563–564.)

On January 16, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], referring to the contention of a diminishing supply of natural gas for interstate sales, said:

Is this all an idle fear? Am I seeing ghosts under the bed? Better look at the statistics to see what has happened in just one year of this uncertainty.

In 1955, the year just closed, the number of new oil wells completed showed an increase of 7 percent over 1954. The number of new gas wells showed a decrease of 9.7 percent.

Each year, during the period from 1945 through 1953, the unregulated gas producers have added new reserves averaging twice the current production of that year. But the new reserves added in 1954 barely exceeded current production—for the first time in recent history. What greater warning could the Congress have of the ultimate effect of the Phillips decision? (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 16, 1956, p. 458.)

Mr. President, at the time, I assured my distinguished colleagues that these were indeed idle fears; that the proponents were, in fact, "seeing ghosts under the bed." I was supported in this contention by Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, who, after the debate on the natural gas bill was ended, told the Joint Committtee on the Economic Report on February 17, 1956, that in 1955 "the oil industry turned in another record performance in new drilling"—hearings, page 547.

It should not be necessary to say again that, in exploratory drilling, almost invariably one drills for oil, and finds either gas or oil.

I now have further evidence from the natural gas industry itself to show that I was correct in asserting that the Phillips decision had not and would not stifle the growth of gas reserves, as so frequently alleged. The annual estimate of natural gas reserves is now available for the year 1955. I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the annual estimate of natural gas reserves for the years 1945–55 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Annual estimates of natural gas reserves (natural gas added during year)

[Trillion cubic feet]

Year	Extensions and revisions	New discoveries	Total added [1]	Net production	Estimated proved reserves at end of year	Net increase
1945	------	------	------	------	147.8	------
1946	------	------	17.7	4.9	160.6	12.8
1947	7.6	3.4	11.0	5.6	165.9	5.4
1948	9.8	4.1	13.9	6.0	173.9	7.9
1949	8.1	4.6	12.7	6.2	180.4	6.5
1950	9.2	2.9	12.1	6.9	185.6	5.2
1951	13.0	3.0	16.2	8.0	193.8	8.2
1952	8.9	5.4	14.5	8.6	199.7	5.9
1953	13.4	7.1	20.9	9.2	211.4	11.7
1954	4.6	5.0	9.7	9.4	211.7	.3
1955	16.3	5.7	22.0	10.1	223.7	12.0

[1] Includes relatively small "change in underground storage." In 1953, the method of classifying this item was changed and resulted in an increase for that year of 0.5 trillion cubic feet.

NOTE.—Totals sometimes do not agree because of rounding. Comparable figures are not available for 1945 and 1946.

Source: Proved Reserves of Crude Oil, Natural Gas Liquids, and Natural Gas, Dec. 31, 1955. Published jointly by the American Gas Association and the American Petroleum Institute, 1956, p. 21.

1955 BEST YEAR IN INDUSTRY HISTORY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Thus, from the industry's own figures, it is clear that in 1955, the first full year following the Phillips decision, there was the greatest addition to natural gas reserves in the industry's history—22 trillion cubic feet.

Gas Facts, the industry's authoritative compilation of gas statistics, says that—

additions to natural gas reserves may be the result of (1) discoveries of new fields, estimates for which are generally conservative for the first year; (2) new discoveries in old fields; (3) extensions and revisions of estimates for existing fields on the basis of additional drilling or field data; and (4) extensions and revisions because of changed operating conditions or abandonment pressures in existing fields.

Under the column in my table headed "Extensions and Revisions" are included the third and fourth, and under the heading "New Discoveries" are included the first and second.

There is no further breakdown of the figures, nor is any detailed information as to the components of these figures available. They are compiled by an industry committee, from figures submitted anonymously by the companies through regional committees. What figures are submitted, and even whether they are submitted at all, is a matter of company policy. There is no check on these estimates by any other agency, either private or governmental, nor does the final industry committee do anything but compile the figures submitted to it. Furthermore, I am informed that no working papers are kept, but that they are destroyed when the compilation is complete.

NEED FOR BETTER INFORMATION

It seems to me that, in this very important matter of our reserves of natural gas, it would be highly desirable to have some check by the Geological Survey or the Bureau of Mines or the Federal Power Commission upon the estimates. It would also be highly desirable to have some more detailed breakdown of the figures, so that we might know more precisely how they are arrived at, and what they mean. We can see that there have been great fluctuations in the extensions and revisions of natural gas reserves in the last few years, while new discoveries have increased rather steadily, along with drillings. We have no way of knowing whether the fluctuations in extensions and revisions—which became so marked after 1950—have resulted from technical factors or from an industry desire to buttress the arguments for exemption legislation.

Congress should not be asked to act upon exemption legislation, and the Federal Power Commission should not try to pass upon just and reasonable rates of natural gas producers in the dark. Neither should they act with blinders on which permit the lawmakers and the Commission to see only the facts or interpretations of facts which the affected special interests choose to disclose. Especially when arguments about "falling reserves" and "disappearing incentives" are made in support of exemption or loose regulation, the full facts about gas reserves should be determined and reported by some public or independent body with no ax to grind. This is why I have for many months been urging the Federal Power Commission to secure this information, as I reported in a brief speech in the Senate on June 11, 1956.

PHILLIPS DECISION HAD NO HARMFUL EFFECT ON EXPLORATION

At this time, however, even from the industry's own sources, it is clear that the Phillips decision and the subsequent efforts by the Federal Power Commission to institute some regulation over producers have had no adverse effect upon exploration for natural gas. Any effect of regulation as a deterrent to exploration would show up only in the figures for well drillings and new discoveries. It could not be reflected in revisions of existing reserves, if they are honest estimates, for these are merely changes in estimates, based on fuller knowledge. New discoveries do roughly reflect the extent of drilling activity for oil and gas.

Looking at the detailed figures recently released, we see there was some decrease in the volume of new discoveries from 1953 to 1954. However, 1953 was the biggest year for which we have figures in terms of new discoveries of natural gas. At least in part, this was a result of the rush to exploit offshore oil deposits which resulted in a substantial increase in proved reserves. It is possible, too, that the estimates of new discoveries in 1953 were less conservative than usual, which might account in part for the unusually low extensions and revisions in 1954.

At any rate, although there was a drop in new discoveries during 1954, it was the third best year for which we have the figures. Furthermore, since drilling and exploration are planned in advance and the Phillips decision was not issued until mid-1954, it is difficult to see how the decision could have had much effect upon new discoveries for 1954.

If the Phillips decision and the Federal Power Commission's hesitant efforts to carry it out were to have any effect, it should have come during 1955, not during 1954. But what happened in 1955? New discoveries increased substantially to a level exceeded only by the exceptional year of 1953. If there were any justification for the proponents of exemption arguing that the Phillips decision affected reserves adversely during 1954, I would have much greater justification for holding that regulation effected a substantial increase in reserves during 1955, and, therefore, we should have more of it.

Actually, of course, neither argument is valid. Drilling, as I have said many times before, is primarily for oil; the discovery of gas is incidental to it. Drilling for oil will continue as long as it is profitable, and all the evidence continues to show that the oil business is still fabulously profitable. Whatever direct drilling for natural gas takes place, including developmental drilling, is also dependent upon profitability, not upon court decisions. The proponents of exemption have yet to produce any evidence that the production and sale of natural gas is not a highly profitable industry.

As I said before, the fluctuations in reserves have not taken place in new discoveries, but in extensions and revisions in the estimates of already discovered reserves. The only explanations I can find for the fluctuations in extensions and revisions are, first, that they are due to technical factors which are certainly unrelated to regulation; second, that there was some holding back by the industry in revising the estimates at the end of 1954, perhaps to bolster the case for exemption legislation; or, third, some combination of both. These fluctuations clearly do not in any way support the claim that regulation is inhibiting exploration.

Although reserve figures for 1956 will not be available until sometime next year, the industry does make available weekly figures on drilling. In the issue of June 4, 1956, the Oil and Gas Journal compares drillings from January 1, 1956, through May 26, 1956, with the period January 1, 1955, through May 28, 1955. The total number of wildcat wells drilled during the 1956 period was 5,016 as compared with 4,663 for the like period in 1955. This represents an increase this year of about 8 percent. Producing gas wells completed this year totaled 161 as compared with 148 in 1955, an increase of 9 percent. Thus we see that exploration is continuing at an accelerated pace, even after the veto of the Harris-Fulbright bill.

OIL INDUSTRY FIGURES DEMOLISH ITS OWN ARGUMENTS

In conclusion, therefore, the natural gas industry's reserve figures for 1955 demolish the argument of the proponents of exemption legislation that exemption is necessary or exploration will stop. It always was a specious argument. Gas Facts has pointed out that the important fact is that the annual increase in proved reserves should exceed the total production for that year; if it does so, then our natural gas reserves are continuing in good shape. Even in 1954, this was the case, and in 1955, the total increase in proved reserves was the greatest in history—22 trillion cubic feet.

Now that the argument about falling reserves has been conclusively destroyed, there is no reason left to enact exemption legislation except that reason which was always the real one—to provide a gigantic bonanza or giveaway to the producers of natural gas, at the expense of consumers.

Mr. President, I now desire to discuss another matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

THIRTY-FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ILLINOIS FARM BUREAU FARM MANAGEMENT SERVICE, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have before me the 1955 annual report of the Illinois Farm Bureau Farm Management Service. This report is the 31st annual report and covers the returns from the books which farmers themselves keep of their expenses and income. I shall introduce into the RECORD certain tables I have prepared from the information which is contained in the report and I would introduce the entire report except that it is exceedingly voluminous and would take several pages in the RECORD.

1955 INCOME FIGURES ARE ALARMING

This 1955 report was prepared at the University of Illinois, department of agricultural economics, College of Agriculture, in cooperation with 88 county farm bureaus in Illinois. The facts and figures which are contained in this year's report of 1955 farm records are alarming. They are especially alarming when it is recalled that the farmers who participate in this program, as a group, are probably the most prosperous farmers in the State of Illinois. They keep accurate records. They run their farms as a business. By various methods they calculate their expenses and their returns from labor, interest, capital livestock, feed, seeds and crops, taxes, and all the other items which proper business management and accounting deem essential and appropriate.

Further, Mr. President, it should be recalled that Illinois contains some of the richest land in America, if not in the world. The information which I shall put in the RECORD is taken from the accounts of farms in northern Illinois, which is probably the richest part of the State. Thus, the figures I shall give, Mr. President, are from the farms in the richest farm area in the country, that is, the Corn Belt, in the richest land in the State of Illinois, and from the best farms and the most prosperous farmers on what is probably the best farmland in America. Therefore, these figures are not selected from the poorest farms or from the marginal farmers, but are from those who really make an effort to farm efficiently, who have had training in keeping accurate farm records, and from farmers who run their farms as well as modern scientific agriculture and business procedures allow.

I say the figures are alarming. I ask unanimous consent that there be placed in the RECORD at this point, a table showing the 1955 net management returns per farm and per acre for 947 northern Illinois farms in the Farm Bureau Farm Management Service for 1955.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*947 northern Illinois farms in the Farm Bureau Farm Management Service, 1955*

Type of farm	Size of farm (acres)	Number of farms	1955 net management returns	
			Per farm	Per acre
Poultry farms	Under 180	33	−$1,326	−$10.12
Do	180 to 259	20	−1,280	−5.74
Dairy-hog farms	Under 180	21	−4,049	−24.69
Do	180 to 259	17	−3,638	−19.15
Beef cattle	Under 180	81	−4,673	−30.53
Do	180 to 259	120	−5,566	−24.84
Do	260 to 339	99	−6,182	−20.67
Do	340 to 499	91	−7,037	−17.42
Do	500 plus	47	−7,517	−11.86
	Soil rating 76 to 100:			
Hog farms	Under 180	77	−4,050	−26.83
Do	180 to 259	78	−3,893	−17.85
Do	260 to 339	47	−5,350	−18.07
Do	340 to 499	31	−5,231	−12.92
Do	500 plus	10	−8,198	−14.18
	Soil rating 56 to 75:			
Do	Under 180	47	−3,589	−25.28
Do	180 to 259	45	−4,104	−18.08
Do	260 to 339	31	−4,990	−16.91
Do	340 to 499	39	−4,479	−10.97
Do	500 plus	13	−9,391	−14.39
Total		947		

1955 LOSSES WERE LARGE

Mr. DOUGLAS. These figures show that beef-cattle farms in this group lost from $4,673 to $7,517 per farm in 1955, depending on the size of the farm. It will be noted that it was not only the smaller farms—those under 180 acres—which lost money in 1955, but also the farms of 500 acres and above which lost money in 1955.

The hog farmers were even harder hit. Depending upon the size of their farms and the soil ratings of their farms, as a group they lost from $3,589 per farm to as much as $9,391 per farm in 1955.

I hope that Members of the Senate, Secretary Benson, President Eisenhower, and the press and public in general will take note of these figures, whose accuracy is virtually unchallengable, and which were prepared on a factual and academic basis by highly competent people with no political ax to grind.

Now, Mr. President, I should like to introduce a second table, table II, which gives the net management returns for 1955 per farm and per acre for 808 northern Illinois farms which are predominately mixed livestock, dairy, and grain farms.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE II.—*808 northern Illinois farms in the Farm Bureau Farm Management Service, 1955*

Type of farm	Size of farm (acres)	Number of farms	1955 net management returns	
			Per farm	Per acre
Mixed livestock	Under 180	41	−$2,776	−$19.02
Do	180 to 259	68	−4,147	−19.02
Do	260 to 339	46	−4,430	−14.96
Dairy farms	Under 180:			
	Soil rating 56 to 75	51	−2,957	−21.27
	Soil rating 76 to 100	34	−2,007	−14.44
Do	180 to 259:			
	Soil rating 56 to 75	36	−3,106	−14.51
	Soil rating 76 to 100	16	−3,799	−16.52
Do	260 to 399	25	−3,665	−12.64
Do	340 to 499	19	−4,725	−11.64
Grain farms	Soil rating 76 to 100:			
Do	Under 180	48	−1,161	−7.90
Do	180 to 259	83	−724	−3.19
Do	260 to 339	70	−771	−2.58
Do	340 to 499	103	+1,386	+3.36
Do	500 plus	63	+2,923	+4.52
Do	Soil rating 56 to 75:			
Do	Under 180	16	−2,625	−17.62
Do	180 to 259	20	−1,220	−5.43
Do	260 to 339	20	−2,485	−8.17
Do	340 to 499	32	+318	+.76
Do	500 plus	17	+2,859	+4.34
Total		808		

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mixed livestock farms lost from $2,776 to $4,430 in 1955. Dairy farms lost from $2,007 to $4,725 per farm in 1955. The grain farms below 340 acres in size lost from $724 per farm to $2,625 per farm in 1955. Only those grain farms above 340 acres in size showed any profit whatsoever, and their profits on the average were from $318 to $2,923 in 1955. Thus, of all the types of farms in northern Illinois—some 1,755 which participated in the Farm Bureau Farm Management Service in 1955—only a group of 215 farms classified as grain farms which

were 340 acres in size or above, showed any net management returns for 1955. Meanwhile the remaining groups, which included some 1,540 farms, and which included all the mixed livestock, dairy, poultry, dairy-hog, beef cattle, and hog farms of all sizes, plus all the grain farm groups below 340 acres, showed losses for 1955—and these losses ranged as high as an average of $9,391 per farm for some classifications.

1955 LOSSES GREATEST IN PERIOD 1951–55

I now wish to introduce one more table—table III. This table compares the net management returns for 398 farms of 180 to 259 acres in size for 1955 with the returns for the years 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954. Further, the farms are broken down by type of farm—grain, hog, dairy, and beef cattle.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE III.—*Net management returns, northern Illinois farms, 180 to 259 acres in size, 1951–55*

	Grain farms		Hog farms		Dairy farms		Beef cattle farms	
	Number	Net management returns	Number	Net management returns	Number	Net management returns	Number	Net management returns
1951	118	$6,119	169	$5,128	40	$4,364	68	$5,582
1952	105	1,667	157	168	47	710	92	−1,764
1953	112	1,054	125	3,562	61	243	121	−436
1954	112	2,314	145	3,458	48	−224	103	+3,320
1955	103	−821	123	−3,970	52	−3,319	120	−5,563

Mr. DOUGLAS. These figures show that 103 grain farms lost an average of $921 in 1955, that 123 hog farms in the group lost an average of $3,970 in 1955, that 52 dairy farms lost an average of $3,319 in 1955, and that 120 beef-cattle farms lost an average of $5,566 in 1955.

These figures show that the grain farmers had made as much as $6,119 per farm in 1951, that the hog farmers had made $5,128 in 1951, that the dairy farmers had made $4,364 in 1951, and that the beef-cattle farmers had made $5,582 in 1951. Only the beef-cattle farms in 1952 and 1953, of these farms, had previously lost money in this period, and only the dairy farms in 1954 had previously lost money in the period 1951–55. All the other groups had received profits which varied from year to year in this 5-year period.

NOT ONLY THE MARGINAL FARMERS WERE IN TROUBLE

Mr. President, some people have glossed over the difficulties of the farmers in very recent times. The Department of Agriculture, at times, seems almost heartless in its administration of the agricultural laws to help farmers. But this situation is serious and it appears to have become more serious in 1955 than at any previous time in recent history.

The figures I have introduced show that it is not only the marginal farmers, and not only the farmers on relatively small farms, who are in serious difficulties. These figures show that some of the best farms in the country, run by some of our most efficient farmers, on the best land in the Corn Belt, which is the richest land in the world, have been in grave financial difficulties this past year.

I hope these figures will be useful. I hope Secretary of Agriculture Benson will look at them and have second thoughts about his sliding-scale programs, which have meant lower prices and greater production year after year.

I hope the President, when he is able to do so, will look at these figures and recall his pledges in 1952 when, as a candidate, he promised to support the 90-percent program without any if's, and's, or but's.

Our farmers are in real trouble. Too many of them have already gone through the wringer. We have tried, here in Congress, to do something about that, only to have our efforts vetoed by the President. But let him take note of this situation which affects not only the marginal farmer but the whole farming industry. We should do our best to preserve farming as a way of life in America, and if we continue with the sliding-scale program, there may soon be almost no profitable farms in America.

METHOD OF CALCULATION

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be inserted in the RECORD a short memorandum giving certain details on the method by which these figures I have given on the net management returns for 1955 were calculated by the Illinois Farm Bureau farm management service. I think it will be seen that the computation of labor costs and the return on land and on capital are very conservatively calculated.

For example, hired labor was computed at its actual cost and the labor rate for the operator and his family in 1955 was computed at $200 per month for the 8 northeastern counties of the State—those counties near Chicago—and at $185 per month for the remaining counties in northern Illinois. These certainly are not excessive charges.

The land value, on which a 4 percent interest rate was figured as a cost, was based on a price given to the soil rating assigned to the land. Under the soil-rating index, which was established by the University of Illinois' department of agronomy, land with a productivity rating of 90—100 is the best land—was valued at $300 per acre as of 1950. When one considers that this land would sell at prices of $500 to $600 per acre, one can see that the capital charges on land are not excessive and may, in fact, be quite conservative.

The capital charge on buildings of 5 percent was based not on their replacement value, but on their remaining undepreciated value. As many buildings are older buildings they are shown at a relatively low value on the depreciation schedule.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CALCULATION OF NET MANAGEMENT RETURNS IN THE ILLINOIS FARM BUREAU FARM MANAGEMENT SERVICE REPORT FOR 1955

The figures for net management returns in the Illinois Farm Bureau farm management service report, are arrived at by subtracting the total farm returns from the total farm costs or inputs.

A. The dollar inputs per farm include the following items:

1. Soil fertility: This item includes the cost of the annual application of fertilizer plus the depreciation of applied limestone and rock phosphate.
2. Buildings and fences.
3. Machinery and equipment.
4. Labor: Hired labor is computed at its actual cost. In addition, there is a labor rate for unpaid operator labor and his family which is computed at $200 per month in the 8 northeastern counties of the State, $170 per month for counties in the southern one-third of the State, and $185 per month for the remaining counties in the State.
5. Taxes: This item includes the actual real-estate taxes paid and the farm share of the personal property taxes.
6. Seed and crop expense.
7. Livestock and miscellaneous expense.
8. Capital charge: This charge is at 4 percent for land and at 5 percent for machinery, buildings, soil fertility, breeding stock, and inventory as of January 1, 1955.

The land value is based on a price given to the soil rating which has been assigned to the land. The soil rating is an index from 5 to 100 (100 is the best land) which indicates a given soil's ability to grow crops. The index was established by the Department of Agronomy, University of Illinois. Under the index, bare land with a productivity rating of 90, for example, was valued at $300 per acre as of 1950. An adjustment factor of 1.23 has been used for increased prices since that time. Given the $500-$600 prices paid for the best farmland in Illinois, this index is a conservative one. The interest charge is 4 percent because of the long-term rate of loans for farmland.

Buildings have a 5-percent interest charge placed on the remaining undepreciated value. In many cases, these are older buildings constructed when costs were low and they are shown at a relatively low value on the depreciation schedule.

Machinery and soil fertility have a 5-percent interest charge on their remaining undepreciated value as of January 1, 1955. The schedules, in most cases, are the same schedules used in reporting income tax.

Inventories as of January 1 are rated at approximately the market value and a 5-percent interest charge is placed on that value.

Total farm inputs: This includes the total nonfeed inputs (items 1–8 above) and the total feed inputs.

B. The dollar returns per farm were calculated by adding the following items:

1. Miscellaneous returns.
2. Feed and grain returns.
3. All livestock returns.

C. Net management returns represent the difference between total farm inputs and total farm returns.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without having the time charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, with that understanding, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the Federal-aid road bill or that the time for its consideration be not charged to either side under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 26, 1956, pp. 10984–10997, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the authorizations agreed upon by the conferees represent a good compromise between the bills adopted by the two respective Houses. We think it is a good bill, a much better bill than the one passed by either House.

Briefly, the conference agreement provides for a total additional amount of $24.825 billion for the Interstate System over a 13-year period—fiscal years 1957 through 1969—and an additional amount of $1.85 billion for fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959, for the primary, secondary, and urban systems.

Under the present law the authorizations are $700 million annually for the regular systems and $175 million annually for the Interstate System.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a comparative list showing the authorization amounts as passed by the House and as passed by the Senate, and as agreed upon in conference, and tables showing the apportionments to States under the conference agreement.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal-aid systems—Authorizations in H. R. 10660

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal years	House bill	Senate bill	Conference agreement
1957 (already apportioned)	700	700	
1957 (additional)	25	200	125
1958	750	900	850
1959	775	900	875
1960		900	
1961		900	
Total (additional)	1,550	3,800	1,850

System allocations—Additional amount

HOUSE BILL

[Millions of dollars]

	Primary system	Secondary system	Urban system	Total
1957	11.25	7.50	6.25	25
1958	337.50	225.00	187.50	750
1959	348.75	232.50	193.75	775
Total	697.50	465.00	387.50	1,550

System allocations—Additional amount—Continued

SENATE BILL

[Millions of dollars]

	Primary system	Secondary system	Urban system	Total
1957	90	60	50	200
1958	400	300	200	900
1959	400	300	200	900
1960	400	300	200	900
1961	400	300	200	900
Total	1,690	1,260	850	3,800

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

1957	56.25	37.50	31.25	125
1958	382.50	255.00	212.50	850
1959	393.75	262.50	218.75	875
Total	832.50	555.00	462.50	1,850

Interstate System—Authorizations

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal years	House bill	Senate bill	Conference agreement
1957 [1]	1,025	1,000	1,000
1958	1,700	1,750	1,700
1959	2,000	2,000	2,000
1960	2,200	2,000	2,200
1961	2,200	2,000	2,200
1962	2,200	2,000	2,200
1963	2,200	2,000	2,200
1964	2,300	2,000	2,200
1965	2,300	2,000	2,200
1966	2,200	2,000	2,200
1967	2,000	2,000	2,200
1968	1,500	2,000	1,500
1969	1,000	2,000	1,025
Total	24,825	24,750	24,825

[1] Does not include $175 million authorized and already apportioned for fiscal year 1957.

Federally built roads on or to federally owned or controlled lands

[Millions of dollars]

Types	House bill (1958–59)	Senate bill (1958–61)	Conference agreement (1958–59)
Forest highways	25	33.75	30
Forest roads and trails	27	27	27
Park roads and trails	16	18	16
Parkways	16	16	16
Indian roads	10	12.5	12
Public lands	1	[1] 2	[2] 2
Total for each fiscal year	95	82	103
Total for period	190	330	208

[1] Authorization for 1957–62.
[2] Authorization for 1957, 1958, 1959.

Apportionment of funds, existing law

[Millions]

State	1954 act					State	1954 act				
	Primary ($315)	Secondary ($210)	Urban ($175)	Interstate ($175)	Total ($875)		Primary ($315)	Secondary ($210)	Urban ($175)	Interstate ($175)	Total ($875)
Alabama	$6.7	$5.2	$2.3	$3.5	$17.7	Maryland	$2.8	$1.7	$2.9	$2.0	$9.4
Arizona	4.7	3.2	.7	2.0	10.6	Massachusetts	4.0	1.5	7.2	3.7	16.4
Arkansas	5.3	4.2	1.0	2.5	13.0	Michigan	9.9	6.0	8.1	6.2	30.2
California	14.5	7.5	15.4	9.8	47.2	Minnesota	8.3	5.9	2.8	4.0	21.0
Colorado	5.7	3.8	1.5	2.3	13.3	Mississippi	5.6	4.7	1.0	2.8	14.1
Connecticut	2.0	1.0	3.4	1.7	8.1	Missouri	9.2	6.2	4.3	4.7	24.4
Delaware	1.6	1.0	.4	1.1	4.1	Montana	6.3	4.3	.4	2.4	13.8
Florida	5.1	3.4	3.1	2.9	14.5	Nebraska	6.1	4.3	1.0	2.4	13.4
Georgia	7.8	6.0	2.5	4.1	20.4	Nevada	4.1	2.7	.2	1.8	8.8
Idaho	3.9	2.7	.3	1.7	8.6	New Hampshire	1.6	1.0	.5	1.1	4.2
Illinois	12.2	6.6	12.1	8.1	39.0	New Jersey	4.1	1.4	7.6	3.8	16.9
Indiana	7.5	5.2	4.2	4.2	21.1	New Mexico	5.1	3.5	.6	2.1	11.3
Iowa	7.6	5.6	2.1	3.5	18.8	New York	14.9	6.0	23.2	12.2	56.3
Kansas	7.6	5.4	1.6	3.2	17.8	North Carolina	7.9	6.7	2.2	4.4	21.2
Kentucky	5.9	4.9	1.8	3.2	15.8	North Dakota	4.6	3.4	.3	1.9	10.2
Louisiana	4.9	3.6	2.5	2.8	13.8	Ohio	11.0	6.7	10.0	7.4	35.1
Maine	2.7	1.9	.7	1.4	6.7	Oklahoma	6.8	4.9	1.9	3.1	16.7

Apportionment of funds, existing law—Continued

[Millions]

State	1954 act					State	1954 act				
	Primary ($315)	Secondary ($210)	Urban ($175)	Interstate ($175)	Total ($875)		Primary ($315)	Secondary ($210)	Urban ($175)	Interstate ($175)	Total ($875)
Oregon	5.4	3.8	1.4	2.3	12.9	Virginia	6.0	4.7	2.7	3.5	16.9
Pennsylvania	12.4	7.4	13.1	9.2	42.1	Washington	5.2	3.5	2.6	2.8	14.1
Rhode Island	1.6	1.0	1.2	1.1	4.9	West Virginia	3.5	3.0	1.1	2.1	9.7
South Carolina	4.3	3.6	1.2	2.3	11.4	Wisconsin	7.5	5.2	3.4	3.9	20.0
South Dakota	5.0	3.6	.3	2.0	10.9	Wyoming	3.9	2.7	.2	1.7	8.5
Tennessee	6.9	5.3	2.5	3.7	18.4	Hawaii	1.6	1.0	.6		3.2
Texas	20.6	13.8	8.3	9.9	52.6	District of Columbia	1.6	1.0	1.5	1.1	5.2
Utah	3.6	2.4	.7	1.7	8.4	Puerto Rico	1.6	1.7	1.5		4.8
Vermont	1.6	1.0	.3	1.1	4.0						

Table of approximate apportionments of Federal-aid highway funds under H. R. 10660 for fiscal years 1957–59, inclusive

FISCAL YEAR 1957 (ADDITIONAL)

[Millions of dollars]

State	Primary highway system ($56.3)	Secondary or feeder roads ($37.5)	Urban highways ($31.2)	Subtotal ($125.0)	Interstate system ($1,000.0)	Total ($1,125.0)	State	Primary highway system ($56.3)	Secondary or feeder roads ($37.5)	Urban highways ($31.2)	Subtotal ($125.0)	Interstate system ($1,000.0)	Total ($1,125.0)
Alabama	1.2	0.9	0.4	2.5	20.3	22.8	New Hampshire	.3	.2	.1	.6	6.3	6.9
Arizona	.8	.6	.1	1.5	11.5	13.0	New Jersey	.8	.3	1.4	2.5	21.9	24.4
Arkansas	.9	.8	.2	1.9	14.5	16.4	New Mexico	.9	.6	.1	1.6	12.1	13.7
California	2.6	1.3	2.8	6.7	57.0	63.7	New York	2.7	1.1	4.2	8.0	70.9	78.9
Colorado	1.0	.7	.3	2.0	13.7	15.7	North Carolina	1.4	1.2	.4	3.0	25.5	28.5
Connecticut	.4	.2	.6	1.2	9.6	10.8	North Dakota	.8	.6	.1	1.5	11.1	12.6
Delaware	.3	.2	.1	.6	6.3	6.9	Ohio	2.0	1.2	1.8	5.0	42.8	47.8
Florida	.9	.6	.6	2.1	17.0	19.1	Oklahoma	1.2	.8	.3	2.3	17.9	20.2
Georgia	1.4	1.0	.4	2.8	23.3	26.1	Oregon	.9	.7	.2	1.8	13.6	15.4
Idaho	.7	.5	.1	1.3	10.1	11.4	Pennsylvania	2.3	1.4	2.4	6.1	53.6	59.7
Illinois	2.2	1.2	2.2	5.6	47.1	52.7	Rhode Island	.3	.2	.2	.7	6.3	7.0
Indiana	1.3	.9	.7	2.9	24.3	27.2	South Carolina	.8	.6	.2	1.6	13.4	15.0
Iowa	1.4	1.0	.4	2.8	20.4	23.2	South Dakota	.8	.6	.1	1.5	11.6	13.1
Kansas	1.3	.9	.3	2.5	18.1	20.6	Tennessee	1.2	.9	.4	2.5	21.4	23.9
Kentucky	1.0	.9	.3	2.2	18.8	21.0	Texas	3.6	2.4	1.5	7.5	57.5	65.0
Louisiana	.9	.6	.5	2.0	16.5	18.5	Utah	.6	.4	.1	1.1	9.7	10.8
Maine	.5	.3	.1	.9	8.0	8.9	Vermont	.3	.2	(1)	.5	6.3	6.8
Maryland	.5	.3	.5	1.3	12.0	13.3	Virginia	1.1	.8	.5	2.4	20.2	22.6
Massachusetts	.7	.3	1.3	2.3	21.3	23.6	Washington	.9	.6	.5	2.0	16.1	18.1
Michigan	1.8	1.1	1.5	4.4	36.0	40.4	West Virginia	.6	.5	.2	1.3	11.9	13.2
Minnesota	1.5	1.0	.5	3.0	22.5	25.5	Wisconsin	1.3	.9	.6	2.8	22.8	25.6
Mississippi	1.0	.8	.2	2.0	15.9	17.9	Wyoming	.7	.5	(1)	1.2	10.4	11.6
Missouri	1.6	1.1	.8	3.5	27.1	30.6	Hawaii	.3	.2	.1	.6		.6
Montana	1.1	.8	.1	2.0	14.4	16.4	District of Columbia	.3	.2	.3	.8	6.3	7.1
Nebraska	1.1	.8	.2	2.1	14.3	16.4	Puerto Rico	.3	.3	.3	.9		.9
Nevada	.7	.5	(1)	1.2	10.4	11.6	Alaska	1.1	.8	(1)	1.9		1.9

[1] States with apportionments less than $50,000: Nevada $24,000, Vermont $48,000, Wyoming $34,000, and Alaska $10,000.

Table of approximate apportionments of Federal-aid highway funds under H. R. 10660 for fiscal years 1957–59, inclusive

FISCAL YEAR 1958

[Millions of dollars]

State	Primary highway system ($382.5)	Secondary or feeder roads ($255.0)	Urban highways ($212.5)	Subtotal ($850.0)	Interstate system ($1,700.0)	Total ($2,550.0)	State	Primary highway system ($382.5)	Secondary or feeder roads ($255.0)	Urban highways ($212.5)	Subtotal ($850.0)	Interstate system ($1,700.0)	Total ($2,550.0)
Alabama	8.0	6.2	2.8	17.0	34.5	51.5	New Hampshire	1.9	1.3	.6	3.8	10.6	14.4
Arizona	5.6	3.8	.8	10.2	19.5	29.7	New Jersey	5.1	1.7	9.4	16.2	37.2	53.4
Arkansas	6.3	5.1	1.2	12.6	24.7	37.3	New Mexico	6.1	4.2	.7	11.0	20.6	31.6
California	17.7	9.0	19.0	45.7	96.9	142.6	New York	18.3	7.3	28.6	54.2	120.5	174.7
Colorado	7.0	4.6	1.8	13.4	23.2	36.6	North Carolina	9.5	8.2	2.8	20.5	43.3	63.8
Connecticut	2.5	1.3	4.1	7.9	16.4	24.3	North Dakota	5.4	3.9	.4	9.7	18.8	28.5
Delaware	1.9	1.3	.4	3.6	10.6	14.2	Ohio	13.5	8.2	12.4	34.1	72.8	106.9
Florida	6.2	4.0	3.8	14.0	28.9	42.9	Oklahoma	8.1	5.8	2.3	16.2	30.4	46.6
Georgia	9.3	7.2	3.1	19.6	39.6	59.2	Oregon	6.4	4.5	1.7	12.6	23.1	35.7
Idaho	4.6	3.3	.4	8.3	17.2	25.5	Pennsylvania	15.6	9.3	16.2	41.1	91.1	132.2
Illinois	14.9	8.1	15.0	38.0	80.2	118.2	Rhode Island	1.9	1.3	1.5	4.7	10.6	15.3
Indiana	9.0	6.2	5.1	20.3	41.4	61.7	South Carolina	5.1	4.2	1.5	10.8	22.9	33.7
Iowa	9.1	6.7	2.5	18.3	34.7	53.0	South Dakota	5.7	4.1	.4	10.2	19.7	29.9
Kansas	9.0	6.3	2.0	17.3	30.9	48.2	Tennessee	8.3	6.5	3.1	17.9	36.4	54.3
Kentucky	7.1	5.9	2.2	15.2	31.9	47.1	Texas	24.6	16.5	10.2	51.3	97.7	149.0
Louisiana	6.0	4.4	3.1	13.5	28.1	41.6	Utah	4.3	2.9	.9	8.1	16.6	24.7
Maine	3.2	2.3	.9	6.4	13.7	20.1	Vermont	1.9	1.3	.3	3.5	10.6	14.1
Maryland	3.5	2.1	3.6	9.2	20.4	29.6	Virginia	7.4	5.7	3.3	16.4	34.4	50.8
Massachusetts	5.0	1.9	8.9	15.8	36.3	52.1	Washington	6.4	4.2	3.2	13.8	27.3	41.1
Michigan	12.0	7.3	10.0	29.3	61.1	90.4	West Virginia	4.2	3.7	1.4	9.3	20.3	29.6
Minnesota	9.8	6.9	3.5	20.2	38.3	58.5	Wisconsin	9.0	6.3	4.2	19.5	38.7	58.2
Mississippi	6.7	5.6	1.2	13.5	27.0	40.5	Wyoming	4.8	3.2	.2	8.2	17.7	25.9
Missouri	11.0	7.4	5.3	23.7	46.0	69.7	Hawaii	1.9	1.3	.7	3.9		3.9
Montana	7.7	5.3	.5	13.5	24.4	37.9	District of Columbia	1.9	1.3	1.9	5.1	10.6	15.7
Nebraska	7.5	5.3	1.3	14.1	24.4	38.5	Puerto Rico	2.0	2.1	1.8	5.9		5.9
Nevada	4.8	3.2	.2	8.2	17.8	26.0	Alaska	7.8	5.3	.1	13.2		13.2

Table of approximate apportionments of Federal-aid highway funds under H. R. 10660 for fiscal years 1957–59, inclusive

FISCAL YEAR 1959

[Millions of dollars]

State	Primary highway system ($393.7)	Secondary or feeder roads ($262.5)	Urban highways ($218.8)	Subtotal ($875.0)	Interstate system ($2,000.0)	Total ($2,875.0)	State	Primary highway system ($393.7)	Secondary or feeder roads ($262.5)	Urban highways ($218.8)	Subtotal ($875.0)	Interstate system ($2,000.0)	Total ($2,875.0)
Alabama	8.2	6.4	2.9	17.5	40.6	58.1	New Hampshire	2.0	1.3	.7	4.0	12.5	16.5
Arizona	5.7	3.9	.9	10.5	22.9	33.4	New Jersey	5.2	1.8	9.6	16.6	43.8	60.4
Arkansas	6.5	5.3	1.2	13.0	29.1	42.1	New Mexico	6.2	4.3	.7	11.2	24.3	35.5
California	18.2	9.3	19.6	47.1	114.1	161.2	New York	18.9	7.6	29.4	55.9	141.8	197.7
Colorado	7.2	4.8	1.8	13.8	27.3	41.1	North Carolina	9.8	8.4	2.8	21.0	51.0	72.0
Connecticut	2.6	1.3	4.3	8.2	19.3	27.5	North Dakota	5.6	4.0	.4	10.0	22.2	32.2
Delaware	2.0	1.3	.5	3.8	12.5	16.3	Ohio	13.8	8.4	12.7	34.9	85.6	120.5
Florida	6.3	4.1	4.0	14.4	34.0	48.4	Oklahoma	8.3	6.0	2.4	16.7	35.8	52.5
Georgia	9.6	7.4	3.2	20.2	46.6	66.8	Oregon	6.6	4.6	1.8	13.0	27.2	40.2
Idaho	4.8	3.4	.4	8.6	20.2	28.8	Pennsylvania	16.0	9.5	16.7	42.2	107.2	149.4
Illinois	15.3	8.3	15.4	39.0	94.3	133.3	Rhode Island	2.0	1.3	1.6	4.9	12.5	17.4
Indiana	9.3	6.4	5.3	21.0	48.6	69.6	South Carolina	5.2	4.4	1.5	11.1	26 9	38.0
Iowa	9.4	6.9	2.6	18.9	40.8	59.7	South Dakota	5.9	4.2	.4	10.5	23.2	33.7
Kansas	9.3	6.5	2.1	17.9	36.3	54.2	Tennessee	8.5	6.7	3.2	18.4	42.8	61.2
Kentucky	7.3	6.1	2.3	15.7	37.5	53.2	Texas	25.3	17.0	10.6	52.9	114.9	167.8
Louisiana	6.2	4.5	3.2	13.9	33.0	46.9	Utah	4.5	3.0	.9	8.4	19.5	27.9
Maine	3.3	2.3	.9	6.5	16.1	22.6	Vermont	2.0	1.3	.3	3.6	12.5	16.1
Maryland	3.6	2.2	3.7	9.5	24.0	33.5	Virginia	7.6	5.9	3.4	16.9	40.5	57.4
Massachusetts	5.2	1.9	9.2	16.3	42.7	59.0	Washington	6.5	4.4	3.3	14.2	32.1	46.3
Michigan	12.3	7.5	10.2	30.0	71.9	101.9	West Virginia	4.3	3.8	1.4	9.5	23.8	33.3
Minnesota	10.1	7.1	3.6	20.8	45.1	65.9	Wisconsin	9.2	6.4	4.3	19.9	45.5	65.4
Mississippi	6.9	5.8	1.2	13.9	31.7	45.6	Wyoming	4.9	3.4	.2	8.5	20.8	29.3
Missouri	11.3	7.6	5.4	24.3	54.2	78.5	Hawaii	2.0	1.3	.7	4.0	----------	4.0
Montana	7.9	5.5	.5	13.9	28.7	42.6	District of Columbia	2.0	1.3	1.9	5.2	12.5	17.7
Nebraska	7.8	5.5	1.3	14.6	28.7	43.3	Puerto Rico	2.1	2.2	1.9	6.2	----------	6.2
Nevada	5.0	3.3	.2	8.5	20.9	29.4	Alaska	8.0	5.4	.1	13.5	----------	13.5

Table of approximate apportionments of Federal-aid highway funds under H. R. 10660 for fiscal years 1957–59, inclusive

SUMMARY, FISCAL YEARS 1957 TO 1959, INCLUSIVE

[Millions of dollars]

State	Primary highway system ($832.5)	Secondary or feeder roads ($555.0)	Urban highways ($462.5)	Subtotal ($1,850.0)	Interstate system ($4,700.0)	Total ($6,550.0)	State	Primary highway system ($832.5)	Secondary or feeder roads ($555.0)	Urban highways ($462.5)	Subtotal ($1,850.0)	Interstate system ($4,700.0)	Total ($6,550.0)
Alabama	17.4	13.5	6.1	37.0	95.4	132.4	New Hampshire	4.2	2.8	1.4	8.4	29.4	37.8
Arizona	12.1	8.3	1.8	22.2	53.9	76.1	New Jersey	11.1	3.8	20.4	35.3	102.9	138.2
Arkansas	13.7	11.2	2.6	27.5	68.3	95.8	New Mexico	13.2	9.1	1.5	23.8	57.0	80.8
California	38.5	19.6	41.4	99.5	268.0	367.5	New York	39.9	16.0	62.2	118.1	333.2	451.3
Colorado	15.2	10.1	3.9	29.2	64.2	93.4	North Carolina	20.7	17.8	6.0	44.5	119.8	164.3
Connecticut	5.5	2.8	9.0	17.3	45.3	62.6	North Dakota	11.8	8.5	.9	21.2	52.1	73.3
Delaware	4.2	2.8	1.0	8.0	29.4	37.4	Ohio	29.3	17.8	26.9	74.0	201.2	275.2
Florida	13.4	8.7	8.4	30.5	79.9	110.4	Oklahoma	17.6	12.6	5.0	35.2	84.1	119.3
Georgia	20.3	15.6	6.7	42.6	109.5	152.1	Oregon	13.9	9.8	3.7	27.4	63.9	91.3
Idaho	10.1	7.2	.9	18.2	47.5	65.7	Pennsylvania	33.9	20.2	35.3	89.4	251.9	341.3
Illinois	32.4	17.6	32.6	82.6	221.6	304.2	Rhode Island	4.2	2.8	3.3	10.3	29.4	39.7
Indiana	19.6	13.5	11.1	44.2	114.3	158.5	South Carolina	11.1	9.2	3.2	23.5	63.2	86.7
Iowa	19.9	14.6	5.5	40.0	95.9	135.9	South Dakota	12.4	8.9	.9	22.2	54.5	76.7
Kansas	19.6	13.7	4.4	37.7	85.3	123.0	Tennessee	18.0	14.1	6.7	38.8	100.6	139.4
Kentucky	15.4	12.9	4.8	33.1	88.2	121.3	Texas	53.5	35.9	22.3	111.7	270.1	381.8
Louisiana	13.1	9.5	6.8	29.4	77.6	107.0	Utah	9.4	6.3	1.9	17.6	45.8	63.4
Maine	7.0	4.9	1.9	13.8	37.8	51.6	Vermont	4.2	2.8	.6	7.6	29.4	37.0
Maryland	7.6	4.6	7.8	20.0	56.4	76.4	Virginia	16.1	12.4	7.2	35.7	95.1	130.8
Massachusetts	10.9	4.1	19.4	34.4	100.3	134.9	Washington	13.8	9.2	7.0	30.0	75.5	105.5
Michigan	26.1	15.9	21.7	63.7	169.0	232.7	West Virginia	9.1	8.0	3.0	20.1	56.0	76.1
Minnesota	21.4	15.0	7.6	44.0	105.9	149.9	Wisconsin	19.5	13.6	9.1	42.2	107.0	149.2
Mississippi	14.6	12.2	2.6	29.4	74.6	104.0	Wyoming	10.4	7.1	.4	17.9	48.9	66.8
Missouri	23.9	16.1	11.5	51.5	127.3	178.8	Hawaii	4.2	2.8	1.5	8.5	----------	8.5
Montana	16.7	11.6	1.1	29.4	67.5	96.9	District of Columbia	4.2	2.8	4.1	11.1	29.4	40.5
Nebraska	16.4	11.6	2.8	30.8	67.4	98.2	Puerto Rico	4.4	4.6	4.0	13.0	----------	13.0
Nevada	10.5	7.0	.4	17.9	49.1	67.0	Alaska	16.9	11.5	.2	28.6	----------	28.6

Apportionment of interstate funds for 1960 to 1969, inclusive, to be apportioned among the several States in the ratio which the revised estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in each State bears to the sum of the revised estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in all of the States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it should be noted that the authorizations for the regular systems as agreed upon by the conferees covers an additional amount for fiscal year 1957, and funds for the fiscal years 1958 and 1959. The Senate bill carried the authorizations through 2 additional years. It is contemplated that the existing practice of considering a highway bill for these categories of roads every 2 years will be continued.

Allocation of these funds to the primary, secondary, and urban systems on the historic percentage ratio of 45, 30, and 25 percent, will be continued. The conference agreement includes authorization for transfer of funds of not to exceed 20 percent between these systems, which will provide the flexibility needed in certain States to meet the varying conditions.

Funds for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, roads and trails in national parks, parkways, Indian roads, and roads through public lands, were included in about the same amounts as approved by the Senate. The conference agreement provides that these funds shall be available for contract authorization not earlier than 1 year preceding the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized.

The bill provides for participation by the Territory of Alaska in the Federal-aid highway program, the same as Hawaii and Puerto Rico, except that only one-third of the area of Alaska will be used as the area factor in the formula now in effect for apportionment purposes, and the Territory will contribute not less than 10 percent of the Federal funds apportioned to it for any fiscal year. The bill also provides for transfer of all highway functions and personnel from other Federal agencies to the Department of Commerce, which will administer the program in Alaska.

The name for the National System of Interstate Highways was changed to the "National System of Interstate and Defense Highways." The conference agreement expresses the intent of Congress to complete the Interstate System

as presently designated over a 13-year period as nearly as practicable, and to bring the entire system in all the States to simultaneous completion.

The total amount authorized for the 13-year period for the Interstate System is $24,825,000,000, about the same as was included in both the Senate and House bills. The sums authorized for the first 3 years, fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959, will be apportioned to the States in the manner now provided by existing law, one-half on population, and one-half on population, area, and mileage of rural delivery routes and star routes.

For the remaining 10 years of the program, the funds will be apportioned to the States in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in each State bears to the estimated total cost of completing the Interstate System in all the States. The language of the bill makes it clear that the estimates of cost on which the apportionments are to be based shall be subject to review and approval by the Congress, prior to making the apportionments. Thus over the 13-year period no State should receive aggregate apportionments which are greater than the cost of completing the Interstate System within that State.

The Federal share of projects on the Interstate System is to be 90 percent of the total cost of such projects, with an increase in the Federal share in States having public lands as now provided in existing law, but not above 95 percent of the total cost of the project. The funds will be available for expenditure for 2 years after the close of the fiscal year for which authorized. Any amount apportioned to the States and unexpended at the end of the period shall lapse, and be immediately available for reapportionment among the other States.

The conferees agreed on language that would permit a State which has obligated all funds apportioned to it and proceeds to construct projects on the Interstate System without the aid of Federal funds, to be reimbursed from later apportionments for the Federal share of such projects. Such projects must conform to the necessary standards, the plans and specifications must be approved by the Secretary of Commerce, and the remaining usual requirements of Federal-aid projects must be complied with. This procedure will permit States which receive smaller apportionments during the first 3 years of the program to go ahead with their highway work and later receive reimbursement for the Federal share of the cost of such work.

The conferees adopted the Senate language on the maximum weight and width limitations, which are 18,000 pounds on a single axle, 32,000 pounds on a tandem axle, and an overall gross weight of 73,280 pounds, and a width of 96 inches, or the maximum corresponding weights or widths permitted for vehicles using the public highways of any particular State on July 1, 1956, whichever is greater. This does not affect any vehicle that could lawfully operate within a State on July 1, 1956.

The Senate bill included authorization for an increase of 2,500 miles in the Interstate System. The conferees agreed on an increase in such mileage of 1,000 miles, with a provision that the cost of completing any mileage designated from the additional 1,000 miles would be excluded from the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System on which the apportionment to the States is made. This means that by reason of this additional 1,000 miles, no additional cost has been added to the 40,000-mile program on which the tax provisions of title II of the bill are based.

The conference agreement includes provisions for Federal acquisition of rights-of-way for the Interstate System, when requested to do so by a State, and authorizes advancement of funds for this purpose, and also authorizes advances to the States to pay for construction as the work proceeds.

The conferees agreed to the House language providing for reimbursement to the States for utility relocation costs which they have paid for under their own laws or practices. The limitation of no more than 2 percent of the sums apportioned to any State for any fiscal year was deleted by the conferees.

The conferees adopted the provisions of the House bill authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to include as a part of the Interstate System any toll road, bridge, or tunnel, heretofore or hereafter constructed, which meets the standards established for such system and is located on a route designated as a part of the system. The use of Federal funds for expenditure on projects approaching toll roads on the Interstate System was agreed to.

The conference agreement authorizes a study by the Secretary of Commerce and a report thereon relative to reimbursement to States for any toll or free highways on the Interstate System which have been constructed during a specified period and to required standards.

The conference agreement includes the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act as included in the Senate bill, with the further provision for cooperation between the Secretary of Labor and the State highway departments. The provisions in the Senate bill providing for an appeal and judicial review were deleted from the bill.

The conference agreement authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to make a full and complete investigation and study of highway safety, and requires him to submit a report with recommendations to Congress.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I am sure the Senator recalls the discussion in the conference committee with respect to the addition of 1,000 miles to the Interstate System.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do.

Mr. GORE. It was the consensus and understanding of the conferees, as I recall, that if a State which had received a portion of the 1,000-mile additional designation wished to improve it and to delay improving an existing section of the Interstate System, it would have the latitude and privilege so to do. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. What the Senator has stated is what I understand happened in arriving at an agreement in the conference.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What the Senator from Tennessee has stated and what the chairman has agreed to, is my understanding also.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is so far as the extra mileage is concerned.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. That is, the cost of the original 40,000 miles is determined by the total estimated costs on which the apportionment is based under the language of the bill, but the amount allocated to a State may be expended upon any part of the 40,000 miles which may be designated in a State.

Mr. GORE. Does not the Senator recall, also, that the estimated cost of completing the 40,000-mile system to which the Senator has just referred comes into play under section 108 (d) and does not affect the apportionment for the first 3 years of the program?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That certainly is correct. In fact, it could not, because the estimate of cost will not be submitted to the Congress at that time.

Mr. GORE. In fact, the apportionment under the first 3 years will be made, irrespective of the interstate mileage, new or old, within a State, and the State will, upon the approval of the Bureau of Public Roads, be free to use its apportionment for any part of the system.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to add a word or two, if the chairman will indulge me.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have served on many conference committees, both as a Member of the House and as a Member of the Senate, and I have never served on a conference committee which was confronted with problems which seemed at times to be so nearly irreconcilable as was the case with some of the questions before the conference committee on the roads bill. It was because of the good spirit and cooperation of the conferees on both sides and the skillful and patient handling of the conference by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the chairman of the conference, that this very notable result was achieved.

Sometimes during the conference the suggestion was made that perhaps it would be better to report an amendment in disagreement, but every member of the conference desired to get the job done, and as a result the conferees are able today to present to the Congress and to the country a completed report, signed by every member of the conference committee, which establishes the interstate system on a basis that looks toward its completion within 13 years. A remarkable job has been done on the part of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and, of course, I really should name all the conferees, excluding myself, because everyone made a contribution to the outstanding result.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator from South Dakota will permit me at this point, I have been attending conferences for many, many years, and I may say that there has not been a piece of legislation presented which is more important to the American people than is the road bill. I should like to say that I received the cooperation of Senators on both sides of the aisle and the cooperation of Representatives on both sides of the aisle of the House. Among the conferees was the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and I received just as fine cooperation from them as I received from the conferees on this side of the aisle. I want to make that statement of appreciation.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I should like to say that the road bill is the biggest undertaking the United States has ever attempted, outside of a war. It has been possible to get the bill through because of the patience of the Senator from New Mexico, our chairman, and the patience of the Members of the House, because there were great differences of opinion between the Members of the House and the Members of the Senate. But we have now a workable bill. As the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who has done so much work with reference to roads, has said, the task will be completed within a 13-year period. When it is completed, the United States will have the finest system of roads of any nation in all history.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will promptly adopt the conference report.

I may also say, Mr. President, that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and myself are on both conference committees, the conference on title I and the conference on title II. The same fine spirit was exhibited with reference to title II as with reference to title I.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico one question. Before I do so, however, I wish to express my own appreciation of the fact that the conference committee was able to retain an item of $30 million for forest highways. I think that will be of great benefit to all the States in the West.

The question which occurs to me is with reference to the increase in the interstate mileage. The point I have specifically in mind is this: Assume that an interstate highway traverses a good part of the country, approximately 1,800 miles. Would a State have the privilege of disregarding work on a part of that great interstate highway and transfer the work to some other highway in the State which it was desired to have designated on another Interstate System?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish the chairman of the subcommittee who held the hearings would answer the Senator's question.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Wyoming, understands, I am sure, that we reached a compromise with the other body on this particular item. In reaching the compromise it was discussed around the table, and I believe it is fair to say that it was agreed that in the event a State received a new designation of interstate mileage from the 1,000-mile addition to the system, and wished to improve that new designation in substitution for the improvement of some segment of the existing Interstate System which was reasonably adequate for present needs, the State would be privileged to do so, provided it received the approval of the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. BARRETT. Would the State be in position to take a relatively small mileage, such as 10 or 20 miles, out of an existing interstate highway system and transfer it to another road which was not on an interstate system?

Mr. GORE. No.

Mr. BARRETT. Would the new stretch of road have to be designated as a part of a complete Interstate System?

Mr. GORE. It would have to be designated as a part of the Interstate System. I believe it is fair to say that it was also agreed that the additional mileage to be designated from the 1,000 miles of overall addition must contribute to and be a part of an integrated interstate highway system. In other words, it was not the intent to permit the Bureau of Public Roads to designate 10 miles of a road which would not connect with another segment of the Interstate System. In the bill we are looking toward the goal of an integrated Interstate Highway System of 41,000 miles.

Mr. BARRETT. To be specific, assume that a State should want to have a designation from one city to another, consisting of about 400 miles. Would it be possible for that State to take 25 or 50 miles from an existing Interstate System and transfer it to the new system, without having the whole 400 miles designated as a part of the Interstate System?

Mr. GORE. I do not think it was ever contemplated or even discussed that a State would have a right in and of itself to change a designation or to reduce the present designation in any way. I was referring only to the latitude of a State to improve a new segment and to defer the improvement of an existing segment which is reasonably adequate to serve the needs.

I have in mind a segment of the Interstate System in my State, a segment which has just been resurfaced, in a rather sparsely populated section. It may not be adequate for the needs of 1975, but it may be reasonably adequate for the needs of the next 5 or 8 years.

If the State received an additional designation of 5 miles for a circumferential route at Memphis, Tenn., which was more acutely needed, then the State would have the latitude, provided it secured the approval of the Bureau of Public Roads to apply the funds to the improvement of the 5 additional miles more acutely needed, and to defer the improvement of the 10 miles of the newly improved section of the existing Interstate System.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator. In that case, the 5 miles would be designated as a part of the Interstate Highway System.

Mr. GORE. It must be an integral part of the Interstate System.

Mr. BARRETT. The question I had in mind was this: Assume the State wanted to designate a new stretch of road of about 400 or 500 miles as a part of the Interstate System, but was able to transfer only as much as 25 or 50 miles. Could the State have the entire 400 miles designated as a part of the Interstate System, with a transfer of only a relatively small mileage?

Mr. GORE. The Senator understands, I feel certain, that no State highway department or State government can designate an Interstate System.

Mr. BARRETT. I understand that.

Mr. GORE. That designation must come from the Department of Commerce. Any State can apply for an addition to the Interstate System within its borders. The application for an additional designation is subject, however, to the decision and action of the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. BARRETT. I understand that. As I understand what the Senator from Tennessee has said, the only transfer permissible under the conference report is of such mileage——

Mr. GORE. I do not believe any transfer is involved in the conference report.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I thought if I might make a statement, the situation might be clarified.

Mr. BARRETT. I should be delighted to have the Senator from Oklahoma express his views.

Mr. KERR. Under the bill, the Bureau of Public Roads and the Department of Defense are the agencies having the authority to make the designation of the additional thousand miles over and above the 40,000 miles.

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. The bill gives them a mandate to determine what roads shall be included in the thousand-mile designation.

But should an additional amount of mileage in the Senator's State be designated as a part of the Interstate System, it would not change the estimate of the cost of completion of what would be a part of the interstate system during the period of authorization provided in the bill.

However, if the Wyoming State Highway Department wanted to improve a newly designated section of the Interstate System, and if the Federal Bureau of Public Roads agreed to it, the newly designated section could be approved and the improvement made. But in so doing, some other part of the Interstate System previously designated would not then be taken care of, because the funds apportioned to the Senator's State, and to each State, would be in accordance with the estimate of the cost to complete that part of the Interstate System in the Senator's State which was not completed under the apportionments of the first 3

years, but which is a part of 40,000 miles of interstate roads now designated.

Mr. BARRETT. To that extent, the designation would be tantamount to a transfer.

Mr. KERR. It would amount to a transfer. It would mean that the State would have a certain amount of money which would not be increased by reason of the increase in the State's mileage, but which could be used on this or other mileage if the State so desired and the Bureau of Public Roads agreed.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I believe the regular committees of the two Houses have done good work and that the committee of conference has brought forth a good bill, so far as the roads features are concerned. However, I wish to state for the RECORD that I do not agree with the taxing features of the bill.

It is my judgment that the highway users are already paying more than enough taxes for all the roads which the Federal Government expects to assist in building and for all the roads authorized by the proposed legislation.

To state the figures roughly, I believe it will be found that about $1 billion a year is being paid in gasoline taxes at this time. Another billion dollars is being paid annually in taxes on new automobiles. Another $500 million is being paid in taxes on parts, accessories, diesel fuel, and various other highway items. This makes a total of more than $2,500,000,000 a year at present rates of taxation.

No one is proposing that the Federal Government at any time in the foreseeable future should spend as much as $2,500,000,000 to aid highway construction, even when the bill shall have been passed. Therefore, it is my judgment that the highway users are already paying enough in taxes for the building of highways. Even if the argument were to be made that the highway users should balance the budget, the Federal Government is predicting for this year a $2 billion surplus; indeed, some persons predict that there will be a $3 billion surplus.

Therefore, it appears to me that all that was needed was a bill to authorize expanded Federal aid for highway construction purposes, particularly in the Interstate System. That is what the Senate originally passed in the Gore bill. I voted for that bill because it provided the answer to our problem.

I should be glad to vote for a highway bill, but it is my judgment that the taxing features, in the last analysis, will mean nothing more or less than that we shall be shifting the burden to the highway users, in order to afford tax relief for persons who are better able to pay.

I make this statement because I understand that within a year proposals will be made for tax reductions, in view of the fact that there will be a Government surplus. I would anticipate that the tax reductions may come in the form of income-tax reductions. Therefore, in the last analysis, much of the reduction in the income taxes will be financed by additional taxes on highway users. There are many persons who will be paying additional taxes on gasoline, but who do not earn enough to cause them to pay the income tax.

For that reason, although I appreciate the good work of the Senators who serve on the Committee on Public Works, and the good work of the committee of conference, I must express my judgment that the passage of the conference bill will result in an unnecessary increase in taxes. Therefore, I desire to state for the RECORD that I shall be compelled to vote against the conference report because I disagree with the provisions relating to taxes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared respecting the conference report.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

The Congress has now approved the biggest highway construction program ever to be undertaken by the American people.

This means that better, safer roads for Connecticut will be built, and better, safer roads throughout the Nation which we can use in traveling for pleasure or business.

For the first time, the Federal Government will make posssible the construction of a national system of highways—interstate and defense highways linking all the principal cities of the United States.

As one of the conferees on the bill, I fought for the principle that no State should receive less, nor more, than the Federal Government's 90-percent share of the cost of constructing the interstate highways within the State's borders.

I'm happy to report that the bill just enacted accepts that principle. This means that Connecticut, under present estimates, and over the 13-year construction period, will receive almost $600 million in Federal funds for building these modern, divided-lane highways which we so urgently need for reasons of traffic safety, economic development, and defense.

This is more than twice as much as the Senate bill, to which I was strongly opposed, proposed to give us.

Other provisions of the bill will also help us in Connecticut—in the development of our toll roads and bridges, and in the repair and replacement of flood-damaged highways and bridges on the Federal-aid systems.

It's a good highway program—good for Connecticut and good for the Nation.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in addition to having my statement printed in the RECORD, I should like to pay tribute to my colleagues on the conference committee, both on the Democratic and the Republican sides of the aisle in the Senate. They have labored very hard with a very difficult situation. I especially wish to pay tribute to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and my very dear friend the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], who has contributed tremendously—indeed, all of them have contributed tremendously—to the success of this enterprise. I am glad we have a bill which, over the next 13 years, is designed to give our country an Interstate System of highways which is so sorely needed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I compliment the members of the conference committee and all concerned who have worked on this final draft of the bill. I think it is a vast improvement over the original legislation on the subject. I think certainly it is a workable bill which can be used with good effect in improving our entire Federal-Aid Highway System, and particularly the construction of the Interstate System.

I have some questions relative to the Interstate System, and particularly relative to subsection (d) of section 108, which I should like to address to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico or the distinguished Senator from Tennessee or the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, whoever may be the proper one to state for the RECORD what will happen at the end of the first 3 years, when the construction period which will be based on the Senate formula of apportionment for the Interstate System will be completed—when, in short, we shall go to a cost basis for the remainder of the program, so as to complete, under the program, the entire Interstate System in all the States within the period of 13 years. I shall be very happy to address my questions to whichever of the distinguished Senators will reply.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I shall be glad to reply. I wish first to be sure I understand the question of the distinguished Senator from Florida. As I understand the question, the Senator wants to know how the authorization for the 10 years, beginning with the 4th of the 13 years authorized, will be arrived at for the individual States.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct. I note from the conference report—and if I am mistaken I ask that the distinguished Senator correct me—that for the first 3 years of the 13 years, the basis of distribution of funds among the States for the construction of the Interstate System is identical with that which was in the Senate bill. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. That is correct, and the apportionment in the Senate bill, as the Senator knows, is identical with that which was enacted in the 1954 highway bill. So that for the first 3 fiscal years subsequent to this date—that is the year beginning on July 1 of 1956, designated as fiscal 1957, and fiscal 1958, and fiscal 1959—the apportionment of the interstate funds will be on the basis of the formula in the existing law.

Prior to the expiration of that time, the Bureau of Public Roads will conduct a survey in conjunction with the highway departments of each of the States, for the purpose of determining the cost of completing the Interstate System of 40,000 miles, as now comprised, but giving effect to what the spending of the funds apportioned for these first 3 fiscal years will amount to.

Mr. HOLLAND. If I understand the situation, then, for the first 3 fiscal years, 1957, 1958, and 1959, apportionment among the States will be on the basis prescribed by the Senate bill.

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is with reference to the last 10 years that I am particularly interested, and the apportioning for that period is covered, as I understand, by subsection (d) of section 108.

Mr. KERR. As I explained, the Bureau of Public Roads is directed to make

a survey of the cost of completing the 40,000-mile Interstate System as now authorized, and is designated as the agency to give effect to the completion of the expenditure of the funds apportioned the first 3 years. When that survey is made, the Bureau of Roads, or the Secretary of Commerce, will submit the estimates of cost to the Congress, and the Congress will approve, not the apportionment, but the cost, as estimated by the Department of Commerce through its Bureau of Roads.

The apportionment for the 10 years of this period beyond 1957, 1958, and 1959 will be on the basis of the need of each individual State as it relates to the total cost of the completion of the 40,000 miles in all of the States for each of the fiscal years thereafter. So that, for instance, if a State should get 60 percent of the total cost of completing its part of the presently designated Interstate System in the first 3 years, it would have 40 percent remaining. It would be the intention of the act that the State should get an amount, proportionate to that received by the other States, in 10 years thereafter instead of the shorter period.

By the same token, if a State got less than three-thirteenths of the cost of completing its part of the Interstate System during the first part of the period, then after the 3 fiscal years, on the basis of its greater proportionate cost, it would receive proportionally a greater amount each year than what ordinarily would be apportioned to it in the 10-year period.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

I should like to proceed a little further with my questions, if I may. As I read subsection (d) of section 108, it provides clearly that after the first 3 years the apportionment among the several States shall be on the basis of estimated cost. So that even if the Congress should not agree on the estimates which would be collected and reported to it by the Bureau of Public Roads, the basis of apportionment which would prevail in those first 3 years would not automatically be carried over and on into the last 10 years. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. The basis of apportionment as presently provided terminates after the first 3 fiscal years. The basis of apportionment thereafter is the need, but the estimated cost of meeting the need is to be submitted to the Congress and approved by the Congress.

Mr. HOLLAND. The bill as reported from the conference committee makes it completely clear that it is the basis of estimated cost among the States which will prevail after the first 3 years in the apportionment for the last 10 years of the program.

Mr. KERR. That is, giving implementation to the apportionment after the first 3 years for the amount that may not have been completely used up.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then, the only thing that will be left for Congress to do would be to approve the——

Mr. KERR. Estimates of cost submitted by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. HOLLAND. Estimates of cost which, presumably, after checking by the Secretary of Commerce, will be on an approximately uniform basis among the several States.

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask one more question, if I may. Will the Senator state for the RECORD just what would occur if, after the first 3 years' apportionment had been made, and if, after the estimates of cost had been collected by the Secretary of Commerce and reported to Congress, Congress took no action upon the estimates of cost? Just what would be the effect upon this program?

Mr. KERR. I cannot conceive of such a situation arising. As I understand the law, it will be the duty of the Congress to approve the estimate of cost as submitted by the Department of Commerce, or, upon hearings of its own, determine what amendments should be made, because, under the bill, the function of the Congress is to continue the authority to approve the estimates of cost. The basis of apportionment is fixed in the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. I am particularly concerned with this feature because, as I understand now, if the Congress fails to carry out its duty to approve the estimate of cost, either that reported by the Secretary of Commerce, or its own figures as developed by it, then the program will be stymied. It will come to a halt. Funds will continue to accumulate, because the taxes will continue to be collected, but until Congress takes affirmative action in fixing or approving the estimate of cost, the program cannot move ahead. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. I wish to address these remarks to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. I have stated the opinion that it will be necessary for the Congress either to approve the estimate of cost as submitted by the Secretary of Commerce, after he has received it from the Bureau of Roads, or amend it and state the correct estimate of cost for each State and all the States.

Mr. GORE. I believe that is correct. The estimates of cost cannot be used as a basis for apportionment until they are approved by both Houses of Congress by concurrent resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. But a continuation of apportionment on the basis which prevails during the first 3 years may not continue automatically in succeeding years, even though Congress fails to act. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Florida is entirely correct on that point.

Mr. GORE. For those 3 years the apportionment is made according to present law, and will not be affected by the cost estimates or the approval or lack of approval thereof.

Mr. KERR. Under this bill that method of apportionment terminates with those 3 years.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. And the new method of apportionment becomes self-executing, under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Oklahoma. Is it now their statement that the purpose of the conference report is to make sure that the 40,000-mile system is completed in each and all of the States——

Mr. KERR. Within 13 years.

Mr. HOLLAND. Within 13 years.

Mr. KERR. Unless a State under the authorization for an additional thousand miles should choose to use a part of its apportionment and have it approved by the Bureau of Roads, in the case of the newly designated mileage it received. It would then thereby automatically be deprived of that much money in connection with the rest of its Interstate System, as I presently designated.

Mr. HOLLAND. In other words, the added 1,000 miles which is to be distributed hereafter and become a part of the Interstate System, does not have equality of treatment with the 40,000 miles, in having the estimate for its completed construction included in the compilation of estimates which the Secretary of Commerce is required to make. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Florida is correct; but it is the hope of the junior Senator from Tennessee that that error will be corrected the next time a road bill is before the Congress.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I congratulate the two Senators, and I also congratulate particularly my friend, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the chairman of the committee, on this generally constructive accomplishment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a brief question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to yield to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. WOFFORD]; but first I ask his indulgence so that I may yield briefly to another member of the committee. Therefore, Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the chairman of the committee.

My question is asked only in order to make the RECORD clear.

In section 115, subsection (a), entitled "Application of Davis-Bacon Act," we find the following:

> The Secretary of Commerce shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on the initial construction work—

And so forth. My question is this: Do the words "on the initial construction work" describe the character of employment for the laborers and mechanics?

Mr. CHAVEZ. At the initial construction place only. That provision does not apply to a place 60 miles away which might furnish some material for the initial construction.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The provision applies to the construction, not to the materials; is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; not to materials.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the conference report, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WOFFORD. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from New Mexico. My question relates to section 115, providing for payment of the prevailing wage. I should like to know what the conference committee's real meaning was in connection with the portion of subsection (a) of section 115, which states that—

All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on the initial construction work performed on highway projects on the Interstate System authorized under section 108 of this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the act of August 30, 1935, known as the Davis-Bacon Act.

I should like to know the meaning of the words "immediate locality." Is their application limited to the city, the county, the section, the district, or the State in which the prevailing wage is to be determined? Just what is meant?

Mr. GORE. I am sure the Senator from South Carolina realizes that this particular section was not before the conference committee, because it was approved in identical language in both the Senate version of the bill and the House version of the bill.

In reference to the meaning of the language concerning the prevailing wages, I suggest that the Senator from South Carolina inquire of the Department of Labor and consider the experience throughout the country and of the Department of Labor in the application of the prevailing-wage provisions of law. I believe the definition is rather clearly known in practice.

Mr. WOFFORD. Yes; that is my very point. In South Carolina we have had too much experience with that very plan. When the H-bomb plant in Aiken, S. C., was built, the Secretary of Labor, although acting under the Davis-Bacon Act, paid those who were working in the State of South Carolina the wages prevailing in Atlanta, Ga., 300 miles away. That procedure disrupted the entire economic schedule in that section of the State.

I also call attention to the fact that this section of the conference report does not say it shall be the prevailing rate as determined in that locality. Instead, the words used are "shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing", and so forth. It does not say how much higher the wages can be. That is the point I am discussing. In short, just what does that language mean?

Mr. GORE. The conferees did not undertake to define that, because both the Senate and the House had acted on that matter, and the conferees were powerless to deal with that subject.

Mr. WOFFORD. Yes.

Mr. GORE. I should say that the amendment offered by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] was in conference; and the conferees strengthened the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota. I should like to yield now to the Senator from South Dakota, so that he can point out how the conferees strengthened the amendment, and how that amendment places additional requirements on the Secretary of Labor in the performance of this duty.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I think this amendment is germane to the question raised by the Senator from South Carolina. I invite attention to paragraph (b) of section 115, as it appears on page 13 of the conference report:

(b) Consultation with State highway departments; predetermination of rates: In carrying out the duties of the foregoing subsection, the Secretary of Labor shall consult with the highway department of the State in which a project on the Interstate System is to be performed.

The following is a clause which was added by the conferees:

After giving due regard to the information thus obtained, he shall make a predetermination of the minimum wages to be paid laborers and mechanics—

And so forth. In other words, the conferees placed upon the Secretary of Labor the responsibility for giving due regard to the information obtained from the highway department of the State concerned.

Mr. WOFFORD. In that connection let me ask this question: Who is to determine what "due regard" means? What protection are we to have in South Carolina, after one man says he has consulted with our highway department and has given "due regard" to the information he has received from that department? He then goes off to Atlanta to fix the prevailing wage. What protection have we?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The junior Senator from South Dakota invites the attention of the Senator from South Carolina to the language of the report, in which it is pointed out that—

It is recognized that there must be the utmost cooperation between the several State highway departments and the Secretary of Labor in order to carry out the intent of the provisions of section 115 (b).

We inserted the following language to clarify the intent:

It is emphasized that when the Secretary consults with these State agencies, such agencies should furnish the desired information as fully and promptly as possible.

Further, we say:

It is believed that cooperation in good faith between State and Federal officials in this matter will insure satisfactory results.

So, to the extent to which the conferees found it possible, they nailed the provision down, so as to insure that there would be good faith between the Secretary of Labor and the State highway departments.

Mr. WOFFORD. As a matter of fact, we have no actual protection, have we, other than the good faith of the Secretary of Labor, who may change tomorrow? That is all we have, is it not?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the yeas and nays having been ordered, the question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an explanation of title II of House bill 10660.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

EXPLANATION OF TITLE II OF H. R. 10660

The Senate adopted 25 amendments to the House bill. Of these, all but 7 are technical or conforming amendments.

Of the seven, Senate amendment No. 19, with conforming amendments 2, 3, and 14, related to the increased 1-cent tax on gasoline, diesel fuel and special motor fuels. Under these amendments the additional increase in tax of 1 cent applied only to such fuels when used in a highway vehicle which was registered or required to be registered under the laws of a State or foreign country (or in the case of a vehicle owned by the United States which is used on the highway). The House conferees agreed to this amendment.

I was sorry we were unable to get the House conferees to agree to another part of these amendments which was offered by the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and which was also sponsored by Senator MAGNUSON of Washington. This amendment would have permitted a refund of the 1-cent increase in the fuel taxes for use in registered vehicles to the extent that the vehicles were used off the highway. The House conferees were adamant in rejecting this amendment and it was vigorously opposed by the Treasury because of the difficulty of determining when a highway vehicle was used on and off the highway.

The House conferees agreed to that part of Senate amendment No. 3, which limits the 1-cent increase in the case of special motor fuels to fuel used in a motor vehicle which is a registered highway vehicle. This conforms to the treatment applied to gasoline and diesel fuel.

The House conferees also agreed to the Senate amendments requiring the nonhighway user to file a claim for refund directly with the Internal Revenue Service in a manner similar to that now provided in the case of gasoline purchased for use on a farm for farming purposes. However, in order to make the procedure conform more nearly with that provided for farmers, your conferees accepted a House amendment to

require the refund claims to be filed on an annual basis. Under the original Senate version provision was made for the filing of quarterly refund claims where the claim covered at least 100,000 gallons of such fuels.

We had considerable difficulty over the special use tax on heavy trucks and buses. The House bill provided a tax rate of $1.50 per year for each 1,000 pounds of taxable gross weight in excess of 26,000 pounds. The Senate amendment increased the tax rate to $2.50 but applied the tax to that part of the excess weight over 26,000 pounds. The House conferees refused to compromise on this amendment and we were forced to recede and to accept the House provision.

Senate amendment No. 10 struck out the exemption granted under the House bill to local transit systems from the use tax on heavy trucks and buses. Senate amendment No. 16 also struck out the exemption in the House bill from the increased 1-cent tax on gasoline, diesel fuel, and special motor fuels where such fuel was used in the operation of local transportation systems. The House conferees refused to accept these Senate amendments and we were forced to recede on such amendments.

The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment No. 22, which placed a limitation on apportionments to be made under the interstate system. This amendment was designed to give assurance that no deficit would develop in the highway trust fund and that the Federal aid highway program would be financed on a pay-as-you-build basis.

The House conferees also agreed to Senate amendment No. 13, which provides that the increased floor stock taxes would not be required to be paid until such time after September 30, 1956, as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulation prescribe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State Convention.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays, 1, as follows:

YEAS—89

Aiken	Chavez	George
Allott	Clements	Goldwater
Anderson	Cotton	Gore
Barrett	Curtis	Green
Beall	Daniel	Hayden
Bennett	Dirksen	Hennings
Bible	Douglas	Hickenlooper
Bricker	Duff	Hill
Bridges	Dworshak	Holland
Bush	Eastland	Hruska
Butler	Ellender	Humphrey,
Byrd	Ervin	Minn.
Carlson	Flanders	Humphreys,
Case, N. J.	Frear	Ky.
Case, S. Dak.	Fulbright	Ives
Jackson	McCarthy	Saltonstall
Johnson, Tex.	McClellan	Schoeppel
Johnston, S. C.	McNamara	Scott
Kefauver	Millikin	Smathers
Kennedy	Monroney	Smith, Maine
Kerr	Morse	Smith, N. J.
Knowland	Mundt	Sparkman
Kuchel	Murray	Stennis
Laird	Neuberger	Symington
Langer	O'Mahoney	Thye
Lehman	Pastore	Watkins
Magnuson	Payne	Welker
Malone	Potter	Williams
Mansfield	Purtell	Wofford
Martin, Iowa	Robertson	
Martin, Pa.	Russell	

NAYS—1

Long

NOT VOTING—6

Bender	Jenner	Wiley
Capehart	Neely	Young

So the report was agreed to.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY DR. NORIGE PINAR, MEMBER OF TURKISH PARLIAMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield a minute to the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, there is present in the Chamber a distinguished guest. She is Dr. Norige Pinar, a member of the Turkish Parliament. She is in the United States attending an international conference on earthquakes. Dr. Pinar is a geologist and an expert on earthquakes. I am sure all the Members of the Senate are happy to welcome her. [Prolonged applause, Senators rising.]

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understanad, the pending question is on the amendments offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], for himself and other Senators, as to which there is a unanimous-consent agreement to vote en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And the vote, then, will come on the amendments offered by the Senator from New Hampshire to certain committee amendments. A "yea" vote will be in favor of the three proposals of the Bridges amendment at one time. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have the yeas and nays on the Bridges amendments?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I understand, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire, the author of the amendments, will have 45 minutes in favor of the amendments, and the time in opposition to the amendments will be controlled by the majority leader. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that I do not contemplate that we shall use all our time on this side of the aisle. I do not know how much time the Senator from New Hampshire plans to use of his 45 minutes, but I should like to have every Member of the Senate to be on notice that when the Senator from New Hampshire, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], or any other Senator on the other side of the aisle, and 1 or 2 Senators on this side of the aisle, have concluded, we shall have a yea-and-nay vote. I think the yeas and nays will be within an hour and a half from now, and possibly a good deal earlier.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the statement of the Senator from Texas is accurate. It is my intention to take only a part of the time allotted. But it will also depend upon Senators on the other side of the aisle. If Senators on the other side indulge in a long argument, we may wish to reply.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in order that we may have a clear picture of the Bridges amendments and the committee amendments, I should like to make a brief statement.

The committee will have no objection to rejection of the amendment on page 29, lines 14 to 19, inclusive, which is the military construction item. I should like to withdraw it because of the action taken by the Armed Services Committee this morning in reporting the military construction bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. In answer to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, I understand he accepts the last of my amendments, namely, the one on page 29, to strike out lines 14 to 19, inclusive, containing an item of $200 million for military construction for the Air Force. So, in effect, by accepting the last line of my amendment, he thereby narrows the amount between the committee amendment and my amendment by $200 million.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if that is done by unanimous consent, or however the Senator proposes to have it done, should we not have the same consent so that the Senator from New Hampshire can modify his amendments by striking out the final amendment? Otherwise, we will be taking action on something the Senate has already done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico has withdrawn the committee amendment. Thus, the amendment striking out lines 14 to 19, on page 29, would automatically be withdrawn.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I simply wanted to clarify the parliamentary situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to withdrawing the committee amendment? The Chair hears none. The committee amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield me a minute or two?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to the fact that the item of $200 million for construction has been withdrawn. The committee amendment increases the appropriation for the item "Aircraft and related procurement" by $800 million. The Senator's amendment would reduce it to $350 million.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. For "Research and development," my amendment as adopted by the committee provides an increase of $100 million, and the Senator's amendment provides an increase of $100 million.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So, there is no difference there. For "Operation and maintenance," my amendment which the committee adopted provides an increase of $40 million, and the Senator's amendment provides $30 million.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Which will make a difference of $10 million.

For "Personnel," my amendment as adopted by the committee provides an increase of $20 million, and the Senator's amendment also provides an increase of $20 million.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So there is no difference except the $450 million for "Aircraft procurement," and for "Maintenance and operation," $10 million.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is correct. In view of the withdrawal of the committee amendment, which eliminates my last amendment, the question now before the Senate is whether the committee amendments which have been reduced from $1,160,000,000 to $960 million, shall be adopted, or the amendments of the Senator from New Hampshire, providing for $500 million.

Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I think the issue is clear to the Members of the Senate. The Appropriations Committee, acting in good faith, increased the appropriation in the amount of $1,160,000,000, by specific amendments. Of this amount $800 million is for aircraft and related procurement, which is found on line 17, on page 23. The sum of $100 million is for research and development, found on line 5, page 24. The sum of $40 million is for operation and maintenance, found on line 4, page 26. The amount of $20 million is for personnel, found on lines 18 and 19, page 27; also the amount of $200 million for construction, which has just been eliminated from the bill.

The amendments which we are offering provide for $500 million in total. Instead of $800 million for aircraft and aircraft procurement, it provides for $350 million. It is the same as the committee bill in the $100 million item for research and development, and provides $30 million for operation and maintenance, and $20 million for personnel.

Frankly, as the Senate well knows, that is a compromise figure arrived at, after the Senate committee voted, by resurveying the needs of the Department and the ability to use the funds.

It seems to be a reasonable conclusion after considered judgment that the Department of the Air Force could and would proceed in good faith and good conscience to use this amount of funds. The issue is clear. Much has been said about it during the past few days. It has been intensified by personalities. The issue is so well known I do not think there is any need for me or for anyone else to take a great deal of time to go into it extensively. For that reason, I conclude my remarks, and I now yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire because I believe it will give the Air Force a little more flexibility, but not too much more money. If we give the Air Force too much money, we shall simply be advancing their program with respect to weapons which may become obsolescent or obsolete, in view of the new weapons which are constantly coming into use.

The question we must ask ourselves is, Will what we do make it more certain that we will have sufficient armed strength so that no nation will dare to attack us because of our ability to retaliate in a totally destructive way? Only by maintaining our Armed Services in such a manner can we maintain the security of our country. If we try to match numbers with our most powerful possible enemy, we may well defeat ourselves in the process. That is the question we must ask ourselves.

President Eisenhower, whose whole life has been spent in the Armed Forces, has answered the question by giving Congress his administrative budget. The question is, Shall we increase the amount of funds for aircraft procurement beyond what the President asked for in the administrative budget this year?

Mr. Quarles, the Secretary of the Air Force, and General Twining have said, and have made it clear, that they have sufficient funds to meet the present needs of the Air Force, as they see them, in order to provide the United States with the best possible Air Force this year, and to build it up, as Mr. Quarles said, in open testimony this morning, in 1958, 1959, and 1960.

In my opinion, the Air Force can use a little more money in order to make its aircraft procurement a little more flexible. That is something which Congress must decide. If we provide the Air Force with too much money or too large a fund this year, then what they may be able to do is to buy or to place on order planes for the advancement of their program, not into 1958, but possibly into 1959 and 1960.

But if we wait and do not give them too much money now, then next year they can take another look at the picture and see what research and development have been done with respect to aircraft in that time.

Mr. Quarles in his testimony in the form of a prepared statement this morning, stated in conclusion as follows:

> By what standard shall the adequacy of the Air Force program be judged? I think we should set as our standard the ability to perform the Air Force mission. Primarily, that mission is to prevent war by convincing any potential aggressor that the consequences of aggression against us would be unacceptable to him. In my opinion, the ability of the Air Force, together with other free world forces, to do this is solidly sufficient today, and our fiscal year 1957 program is designed to keep it that way.

So the program is designed to keep the Air Force that way, and to build it up to what may be proper in 1958, 1959, and 1960.

For these reasons, I support the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If I have time remaining, I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has referred to some testimony given this morning by the Secretary of the Air Force. I believe testimony of commanders in the Air Force, to which he did not refer, will show opposition to statements made by Secretary Quarles.

I believe that picking up the Secretary's testimony as given this morning, before the witness had even finished his testimony, and before he had been fully questioned, does not, in my opinion, give the Senate an accurate or fair presentation of the matter in question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I resent that statement completely. What I read from, I may say to my friend from Missouri, was the finished prepared statement of Secretary of the Air Force Quarles. What I read was the testimony of Secretary Quarles before the Committee on Appropriations.

Whatever the questions may have been, and whatever evidence may have been given, I do not believe for one minute that Mr. Quarles was telling us a falsehood or was making any statement he did not believe to be true.

I resent the Senator's statement very much, because I would not give false testimony to the Senate. I hope I would be the last man to do that.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes for the purpose of concluding the colloquy.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Missouri regrets the Senator from Massachusetts feels he was being criticized personally.

I said the Senator from Massachusetts read from a statement given by Mr. Quarles this morning prior to the time Mr. Quarles was to be interrogated. In

my opinion, the statement made by Mr. Quarles, which was referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts, did not conform to testimony previously given the subcommittee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Missouri for what he has said.

I agree that Mr. Quarles testified this morning in answer, I think, to questions asked by the Senator from Missouri or the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], that General Twining agreed with the Secretary, that the Deputy Chief of Staff, General White, agreed with the Secretary, but that some of the generals in the field, such as General LeMay, General Putt, and General Partridge, did not agree with him. With that statement, I agree with the Senator from Missouri. It is true that the testimony of certain officers does not agree with that of the Secretary. But I say that the words of Mr. Quarles, as the administrative head of the Air Force, and of General Twining, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are words of weight, even though the words of the other officers be given weight.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Again, I say that testimony of the Secretary of the Air Force, in my opinion, was not in accordance with General Twining's testimony before the committee; nor was it in accordance with some testimony of General White.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. The Senator from Massachusetts is not only the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, but he is one of the senior or ranking members of the Committee on Appropriations, and of the subcommittee dealing with military appropriations.

Not only is Senator SALTONSTALL a student of military questions, but he has been a student of military history throughout the years. I have every confidence in the statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts when he referred to the testimony given by the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Quarles, this morning.

I have been present at many of the sessions of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations. I am not a member of the Committee on Armed Services. Therefore, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, because he is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations and also is the ranking member of the legislative military committee, the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. President, a case has not been made which would justify any vast increase in military appropriations, based on the testimony which has been given to Senators at the sessions of the Committee on Appropriations. It is true that some of the officers in the field have advocated a larger sum of money; but the Joint Chiefs of Staff have not.

There is no greater military expert than President Eisenhower himself. The budget recommendations which have come to Congress have had the full and complete support of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson.

I think the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts were an accurate statement of the facts. If anyone wishes to question that statement of facts, I am willing to debate the question with him.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield to no Member of the Senate in my determination to support for the United States the most powerful and the most effective Air Force in the world. I do not agree with those who say our Air Force at present is second class or will ever become second class.

I am opposing the amendment adopted by the Appropriations Committee, adding another billion dollars to the Air Force appropriation, for the simple reason that there are ample funds unexpended for aircraft procurement.

This additional appropriation is opposed by the President. It has not been requested by the armed services, nor has it been requested by any member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I have never known the military to be bashful in asking for appropriations.

The facts are these:

At the end of the current fiscal year, next Saturday, the Air Force will have unexpended, in old appropriations, an amount totaling $13,600 million for aircraft procurement. The new appropriation requested for the fiscal year beginning July 1 for aircraft procurement totals $5,800 million. Therefore, if the appropriations requested are approved, plus the unexpended balances, the Air Force will have available for the year beginning July 1, 1956, $19,400 million for aircraft procurement.

According to the best estimates I have been able to secure, during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1956, the Air Force will spend $6,400 million for procurement of aircraft. This will leave an unexpended balance, at the end of the coming fiscal year, of $13 billion. To add another billion dollars to appropriations in this bill for this purpose would simply mean increasing balances in carryover appropriations, which cannot possibly be spent in the foreseeable future. It would not, in my judgment, bring a single additional aircraft off the production line next year or the year after next.

As of July 1, 1956, there will remain unobligated nearly $4,600 million for aircraft and related procurement. To increase these huge unexpended balances would merely increase funds available to spending agencies for expenditure in subsequent years, with virtually no control by either the Appropriations Committees or by Congress. Extravagance inevitably is the result of unnecessary appropriated balances.

The figures I have just given are for aircraft procurement alone. As a whole, the Department of the Air Force will enter the new fiscal year, which will start next Sunday, with unexpended balances totaling $20.1 billion. Assuming the President's request for new appropriations totaling $15.4 billion will be granted, the Air Force will go into the new fiscal year with funds available totaling $35.5 billion. Best estimates of expenditures to be made during the year indicate they will total $17.3 billion, leaving a balance at the end of the year of $18.3 billion. Additional appropriations would only increase this balance.

As for the Department of Defense as a whole—Army, Navy, and Air Force—it will start the new year, next Sunday, with unexpended balances in old appropriations totaling $42.2 billion. Assuming there will be granted $35 billion in new appropriations as requested by the President, the Defense Department will have available for expenditure funds totaling more than $77 billion. It is estimated that expenditures in the coming year will total $36.7 billion, leaving unexpended balances a year from now totaling more than $40 billion. Additional appropriations would only increase this balance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there can be no doubt that every Member of the Senate is interested in the question of national defense. If there is any issue before the American people that should be dealt with on a nonpartisan basis, without regard to any political party, it is the security of this country and the protection of the freedoms of the American people and the preservation of our way of life. All of us have a common interest in this problem.

In the course of my duties, Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I have strictly sought to follow a nonpartisan course. I have never thought of any party in any question I have ever asked a witness that has been before the committee. No party line has ever prompted or directed my vote on any matter, either in committee or on the floor of the United States Senate. I shall continue to follow that course, whether the President of the United States may be a Republican or a Democrat.

Mr. President, there have been times when my patience has been sorely tried by the attitude of the present Secretary of Defense in his appearances before the Committee on Armed Services. Had he been a member of my own political party, I would have felt free—indeed, I would have felt compelled—to have expressed my resentment of his attitude. Because, Mr. President, I feared someone might think politics had dictated my remarks, I have held my peace, and I have exercised my forbearance and such patience as I have. But, Mr. President, the recent actions and statements of the Secretary of Defense have caused patience to cease to be a virtue. I say it more in sorrow than in anger. I say it is dangerout, at this time in the life of our Nation,

to have a man so completely inept and unequipped for this responsible position occupy the office of the Secretary of Defense.

The present Secretary of Defense has treated the Congress with disdain—yea, at times almost with contempt. He seems to be of the opinion that the matter of national defense is one that shall be dictated solely by the Secretary of Defense, without regard to law—indeed, without regard to the fundamental charter of American liberties, our Constitution. His vanity and his arrogance in his committee appearances have been excelled only by his lack of understanding of the genius of American government and our system of government and division of powers.

It is unfortunate that we do not require a short course in the American Constitution for those who are to occupy such positions, in order that they might learn that among the powers and responsibilities of the Congress is that of providing for the common defense, of raising and supporting armies, of providing and maintaining a Navy, of providing rules and regulations for the guidance of our armed services, and laws for the government of the militia when it is called into the Federal service.

Just to give an illustration of some of the things that have transpired in committee, on one occasion the present Secretary of Defense roundly denounced the committee for having incorporated in a bill a recommendation of the President's Commission on Military Service, which was discussed fully with his representative, the Assistant Secretary of Defense, when he appeared before the committee. I sought with complete patience to explain to the Secretary of Defense that the President's Committee had reported it to the President and to the Congress, requesting its recommendation; that it had been explained to the Assistant Secretary of Defense whom the Secretary of Defense had sent before the committee to discuss the proposed legislation; and that at least part of the responsibility rested with the Department of Defense. But the Secretary of Defense continued to blame the committee and the Congress.

He has sought to intimidate the officers of the armed services from fully expressing their opinions to, and advising with, the Congress of the United States on the all-important matter of national defense, by stating something to the effect—I do not have the newspaper clipping before me—"Let's see who the next is to stick up his head and make a statement that does not conform to the policy that I, Charles E. Wilson, have laid down."

These officers deserve better at the hands of the Secretary of Defense than such threats as that and such attempts to gag them. I pay tribute to the courage and the patriotism of some of the officers of the armed services who, despite the club that hangs over their heads, have had the temerity—from the standpoint of the Secretary of Defense—and the courage and the patriotism, from my standpoint, to come forward and advise with the Congress of the United States as to what steps we should take to defend our country.

The Secretary of Defense has on occasion reduced the size of the Armed Forces. Of course, men of understanding and knowledge may disagree as to how much we may safely reduce the size of our Armed Forces. But it has been amusing to me that almost every time the Secretary of Defense has announced a reduction in the Air Force or in the firepower of several regiments of infantry or Marines, he has requested three additional Assistant Secretaries of Defense or Assistant Secretaries of various divisions of the Department of Defense, apparently doing so on the theory that he would repair the damage done to our national defense, and would intimidate those who might destroy us, by increasing the number of Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Defense from a total of 17, when he came into office, to a total of 33, if the last reorganization plan to be submitted happens to be approved.

I disagree, Mr. President, with the order of the Secretary of Defense forbidding the wearing of the uniform by the men in the armed services who are on duty here in Washington. Of course, such an order might be understandable, because the present Secretary of Defense happens to be one who has never worn the uniform of his country. But I would not be critical of him on that score, for in time of war it is necessary to have men at work in the shipyards and in the industrial plants; and many of those who were physically qualified to serve in the Armed Forces during World War I or World War II did serve their country while in the industrial plants or in the shipyards.

But, Mr. President, those who wear the uniform of the armed services are entitled to have a Secretary of Defense who has some understanding of the importance of increasing the pride of the men in the armed services in the uniform of their organizations, instead of one who says to them, "Take off your uniform," as if it were some indicium or badge which reflected upon them. I get scant comfort from the fact that it is said that such an order was issued at one time during a Democratic administration. Of course Democratic administrations have made mistakes. I would feel better, however, if, instead of emulating such mistakes, those now serving in positions of authority would emulate some of the constructive parts of the programs of Democratic administrations.

Mr. President, now I turn to the pending amendments. It seems to be rather generally agreed that the air arm of our national defense should be strengthened and increased. There is a question as to how much the increase should be. We are told by all that there is no lessening of the danger from the Soviets. Indeed, Kipling's well-known poem about the Russian bear shows that he should be watched more carefully when he wears his present mask than we would watch him if he showed the teeth of Josef Stalin.

I have before me statements made within the past 24 hours by General Gruenther, in a speech to an organization in the East. He said:

> There has never been any more danger than there is today.

We are told that by all those who have studied, and are in a position to understand, the nature of the Soviet Government and the motivations of the men who direct that government. In the report of the Foreign Relations Committee on the Mutual Security Act of 1956, we find these words, written after the committee heard the testimony of the many witnesses who appeared before it:

> So far as our own military programs are concerned, however, the important point is that Soviet military capabilities have not been significantly weakened. Military programs must be concerned with military realities. They can not be tailored to fit a facade of smiles and sweet talk.

So, Mr. President, inasmuch as all the witnesses told us that the danger today is as great as it has ever been, the only question which can enter the minds of those who serve their country is how much national defense we need to have and what steps the Congress should take and what steps we who serve in this body should take, under our oath and under our constitutional responsibilities to assure the security of these United States.

Mr. President, what has maintained peace on earth in this uneasy period that we call the cold war? What has protected the freedoms of all peoples since the Russian Government revealed its true nature in 1946 and 1947? What has been guarding the American way of life during a time when great areas and vast numbers of people have been falling into the orbit and under the direction of the rulers in the Kremlin? Mr. President, the greatest single factor in maintaining the peace and preserving this Nation—and I challenge anyone to deny it successfully—has been the Strategic Air Command of the United States. The knowledge that we had bombers capable of delivering the atomic bomb anywhere on the face of the earth has maintained the peace. It has been the greatest single factor in preserving the free world and preventing war and preventing all peoples everywhere from coming under the domination of the Communists.

Mr. President, I do not believe it is humanly possible, and I know it is not financially possible at the rates of pay received by our men in the Armed Services, for us to build up a military machine on the ground that the Russians would fear.

I do not wish here to get into a discussion of our foreign-aid program, which this year is increased by $2 billion over that of last year; but I will say that in my judgment no plan or program which has been designed or will be before the Congress can substitute for the strongest strategic Air Force on earth in protecting the American people and the people of the rest of the free world in the days that are to come.

Mr. President, the nations associated with us in all the various agreements we have signed to combine all the strength of the free world, in my opinion look to

the United States Air Force before they even look to their own divisions, for the defense of the rest of the free world and for their own defense. Mr. President, no one can convince me to the contrary. I do not wish to be invidious by referring to any particular nation; but I will say that even though Italy, for instance, might expect to have three divisions equipped by means of the foreign aid we give, those in charge of the Italian Government would not feel so happy about those three divisions, and would not depend upon them, if in their minds there was any doubt regarding the striking power of the United States Air Force. That is the one instrument to which all the free world looks for its defense.

We are confronted with a number of arguments as to why the proposed increase should not be granted. We are told that there is a large carryover of funds. I freely agree that there is a large carryover of funds. In my opinion they should be expended more rapidly. But I cannot direct the executive branch of the Government. I can, under my oath, live up to my responsibility to afford the sinews to the executive department to build an Air Force which is adequate, by providing the appropriations necessary for that purpose.

We are told that there is a great carryover, and therefore we should not increase the appropriation. With the full knowledge of the carryover, the administration came to us within the past few months, offering a supplemental estimate, and asking us to increase the appropriation by $400 million. Senators who complain about the carryover, when the Congress undertakes to exercise its constitutional functions, have said nothing about the fact that the carryover was increased by the request of the administration for an additional $400 million within the past few months.

It is a question of what is necessary. The administration said it was in error in its original estimate, in the amount of $400 million. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], by his amendment, says that the amendment was in error in its original estimate by $900 million. The Senate committee says that, in its opinion, the administration was in error in its estimates by a minimum of $1,200,000,000. All those figures include the $400 million by which the administration admitted it was in error. May God forbid that General LeMay is absolutely correct in his estimate that they needed $4,200,000,000.

I try to pay attention to dollars in government. I do not think I have earned a reputation as a spendthrift or wastrel in the appropriation of public funds. Those who have worked with me in the Appropriations Committee know how often I ask, "Can we not take a little off here, or can we not take a little off there?" But when I deal with the security of America, I want to see planes first, and then consider the cost in dollars. The security of this country and of all we love cannot be valued in dollars, but I do not believe that the American people are going to cry out against paying for a reasonable insurance policy that will not only assure that we shall not be destroyed, but that we shall be spared the horrors of war.

In the last analysis, what we seek to do is to have a striking force so formidable that it will prevent a war. If we have war, not only our economy, but our civilization, will be destroyed. The only way to prevent a war is to maintain our leadership in the field of long-range bombers and hydrogen bombs to such a degree that not even a madman will think of attacking us.

If we occupy a secondary position in respect to airpower, it will perhaps not be necessary for an enemy to attack us. If our Air Force is secondary, particularly in the field of long-range bombers, we shall see this country, that country, and the other country falling off from their alliances with this country and going over to the Communists. We shall wind up an easy victim, perhaps without even being able to fight, because if we did we would be destroyed, and there would be nothing but ruins where our wonderful civilization now flourishes.

Every nation of the free world looks to the United States Air Force for its defense. Do the French depend on their divisions which we are arming and equipping? They take the 300,000 troops which we have armed and trained away from a position facing the Russians in Europe and use them to run down 30,000 rebels in Algeria. Would they do so if they felt that the motherland of France was about to be overrun? They say, "We can do this with impunity because America has the greatest striking force ever seen in her long-range bombers."

The most remarkable argument that has been made on this floor is that if we make B–52's too fast, they will become obsolete, and we shall have nothing but obsolete weapons on our hands. We have had experience in that field. We have a plane which is now passing into obsolescence, namely, the B–36. Those planes were tremendously expensive. As I recall, they cost $6 million apiece. We have a great many of them. But they served their purpose, because the shadow of that B–36 in the skies is what kept the Russians behind the Iron Curtain. It is the best money we ever spent, even though they are now obsolete. We cannot build an airplane which is not obsolescent, because before the first one is completed, a new and better one is going on the drawing board. God forbid that the Russians should have better ones on the drawing board than we have. We cannot match them in numbers, but we have tried to stay ahead of them in quality. I pray that we will not let the number become so great that they will feel that they can take over the earth with impunity.

It is said that the Air Force is extravagant and wasteful. It is; but must we abolish it because the executives of that department have not been able to eliminate all the waste? It seems to me that would be the height of folly.

The B–52's will become obsolete. If we were satisfied with getting them at the rate of four a month, as indicated by the evidence, I would vote against this amendment. I shall not gamble the security of this country on the basis of any such tenuous program.

It is said that we have not the personnel with which to operate these planes, when we are getting four a month. I have before me an unclassified letter from the Secretary of the Air Force to the committee stating:

> I have recently approved the disposal of the first 26 B–36's.

They are being junked. They have served their purpose. There are 26 of the best trained crews of airmen the world has ever seen, ready to take over the B–52's, if we provide the money and the Department of Defense will spend it to give us a first class Air Force, instead of having to rely on the old B–36's.

The letter further states:

> I have under consideration the disposal of an additional 48 B–36's during the first quarter of fiscal year 1957.

That is 16 a month which will be retired. The crews will be standing by, ready to man the B–52's. We should give the Air Force the best planes that can possibly be manufactured in this country.

I am not satisfied with the small number of planes we are getting. We were told last year, when the Russians unveiled the Bison at the Moscow air show, that this program would be stepped up to 17 or 20 a month, but we are still limping along on 4 a month. I think we should at least double that number. I would be much better satisfied if I thought we were getting as many as it has been estimated the Russians are producing.

We were told by the Air Force—and no man will challenge this statement—that this budget was very austere, and that it would be necessary greatly to increase it next year. What experience have we had in that field? In 1953, the Air Force budget was cut back $5 billion, which had to be added to the 1955 appropriation bill, but we lost money in the process, because of the starting and stopping, starting and stopping of production. The committee amendment would give us a level program, and I venture to say would save the American taxpayer money in the long run.

We were told that this was an unusually austere budget. I will not go into the political implications of the statement that it will be necessary greatly to increase the appropriation next year. That was the testimony of the Secretary of the Air Force, and of General Twinning.

Let us not shirk our responsibility as Members of Congress to provide for the defense of this country and to maintain and support our Army, Navy, and Air Force in the strength that is adequate for the protection of the American people.

Mr. President, I, for one, believe that the committee amendment is an exceedingly modest one. If I were directing the defense of this Nation, I would provide more money, even it it were necessary to take it from other items in the budget, because I know how important this is.

Mr. President, after the committee has seriously considered this subject and by a nonpartisan vote has made its recommendation to the Senate and has placed

this very minimum amount in the bill, I hope the Members of the Senate will reject the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], although, of course, it is better than what we have in the bill without the committee amendment. Let us give the entire amount to the Air Force. That is still one-third of what General LeMay said he thought was necessary to meet his responsibility in preventing war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. With reference to the last statement made by the Senator from Georgia, I understood him to say that the amount was one-third less than what General LeMay had recommended.

Mr. RUSSELL. It was actually one-fourth.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. That is what we had cut it down by already. Does not the Senator from Georgia agree with me that the only justification for the committee amendment is national security, not dollars and cents?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, all we seek to do is provide what we believe is the very minimum that is necessary to avoid the tragic consequences of atomic war and to defend this country in case a madman should unleash on the world the dread forces of hydrogen energy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from California. Then I shall be happy to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment, offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], on behalf of himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment which has been recommended to the Senate by the committee by a vote of 13 to 12.

I do not wish to commence my remarks without paying tribute to the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. It was my privilege before becoming a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations to serve under his chairmanship on the Committee on Armed Services.

Certainly there is no man in the Senate who over the years has been more devoted to the interest of the national defense of our country than has the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia. In all the deliberations through which I sat, both as a member of that committee and as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, he always approached the question of national defense as an American, not as a partisan.

However, there are some facts of which I believe the Senate should be mindful and from which it should not be diverted by what was an ill-considered response by the Secretary of Defense at a press conference.

The first basic fact we should consider is that the budget, which was presented to Congress under the constitutional responsibility of the President of the United States, went through the normal budgetary processes, including studies by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, consideration by the National Security Council, and consideration by the President of the United States.

Men may honestly differ, and they do honestly differ on great public questions. Under our constitutional form of government that is as it should be. However, there is one thing about President Eisenhower, and that is that from the very conception of his term as President he has made it clear that he is a firm believer in our constitutional system, and that he recognizes that Congress, under the Constitution, is a great coordinate, coequal branch of the Government, not subordinate to the executive branch. As President of the United States, he does have a serious responsibility in making recommendations, and he makes them according to his best lights and in accordance with studies made by responsible officials of the Government.

We have generally believed that in our Government the military arm should be subordinate to the civilian arm. That is one of the admirable concepts of our Constitution. Certainly it is entirely proper and fitting that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who are in turn supported by the field commanders, should make their recommendations; but the final responsibility rests in the civilian heads of the Government. Of course, we are not trespassing on a foreign field, because, as the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has properly pointed out, we have the constitutional responsibility in this regard to support the Army and Navy and—although the Constitution was adopted before the advent of the airplane—the Air Force. Nevertheless, if we are to have orderly procedures, whether it be in national defense or in any other aspect of our Government, we must look for guidance to the responsible heads of the agencies involved.

Certainly the Joint Chiefs of Staff are the highest responsible agency, so far as the military arm itself is concerned, under the civilian executives of our Government. They have, I submit, a broader understanding of the total national-defense needs of the Nation than does any field commander. It is entirely logical that a man who is in command of ground forces in Europe, for example, should be closer to that particular picture and that perhaps his views should be somewhat influenced by the situation in that area of the world. Likewise a commander who has an assignment in Asia may give greater emphasis to the situation in that area of the world. A man who is in charge of the Strategic Air Command, as is our great General LeMay, for whom we have the highest respect, may give undue emphasis, although perhaps entirely proper emphasis, to the Air Force.

I submit, however, that President Eisenhower, who perhaps more than any other living American, and certainly as much as any other living American, knows the horrors of war, and who led American forces and Allied forces in World War II, would not knowingly recommend to Congress anything which would adversely affect the security of the American people for our survival as a part of the free world of free men.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The President has taken an oath of office to support the Constitution. He has had more personal experience in leading men in a mighty and successful effort to destroy a great totalitarian power than has any other living American. When the facts are presented to him, he goes over them with great care, and very seriously considers all the recommendations which are made. He does not have a closed mind. Instead of being critical—and I do not believe the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] meant to be critical because the administration had come forward with an additional recommendation for funds——

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; I commended that action.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That in itself, I believe, shows that the whole question of defense is under constant review. But, as one who from the time he became a Member of the Senate has been interested in this subject, I submit that we should have an Air Force which is second to none.

The distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] was Secretary of the Air Force, when, on my return from one of my trips to Europe, I told him that I wanted to do everything possible to strengthen the Air Force, and that I wished to be prepared as a Republican to support every request the Secretary or the administration might make in that behalf, because I felt it was vital to the interests of our country.

I commend the Senator from Missouri for the great interest he has taken in our national defense. But I think there can be reasonable and honest differences of opinion. There are in the budget recommendations of the President of the United States, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the National Security Council. In their judgment they believe the amount requested is adequate to protect the vital intersts of our country. Of course, we have the right to say that they ought to have a billion dollars more or that they ought to have $4 billion more, or that they ought to have $500 million more, or that we think the estimates of the Budget Bureau represented an adequate amount. But I believe the weight of the evidence sustains the position of the President, so far as his normal budgetary requests are concerned. I believe there is room for differences of opinion. I should be quite willing to lean over a little further, over and beyond that judgment, if necessary.

I am, for that reason, supporting the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, but I wish to say to the Senate that in face of the figures presented by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and in the face of the evidence, I believe the amendment

offered by the Senator from New Hampshire goes as far as it is advisable for us to go.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished minority leader very much for his remarks concerning my interest in airpower. I will never forget, back in 1946, when the Senator from California returned from a trip around the world and visited with the Air Force, his statement that he would always be interested in the United States having the finest Air Force in the world.

This budget is not approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Chief of Staff recommended $19.3 billion to the Secretary of the Air Force, who cut it some $511 million. It was then cut over $2 billion more in the Offices of the Secretary of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. Therefore, this budget is nearly $3 billion less for the Air Force than the amount recommended by its Chief of Staff.

Of course, as the distinguished minority leader well knows, when the word goes down, "This is it," all the Chiefs, separately representing their services before the Congress, support the budget on instructions from higher authority.

I do not question the system. I simply state the facts.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Missouri has served in a high capacity in a civilian office of the Government and has rendered distinguished service in this body. In my judgment, it is not a question of the Army alone, the Navy alone, the Air Force alone; it is more than the three of them in combination, far more than the atomic program, important as that may be. It also relates to the overall of the national solvency and the national economy.

The reason why I am a great believer in our system of government, as I know all the other Members of this body are, is that no one person lays down the line which any official of the executive arm of the Government must follow. The very fact that generals have come before the Senator's committee, as they have come before other committees, and have expressed their honest judgment, has shown that no one has attempted to intimidate or coerce them. They have been neither intimidated nor coerced. I believe Congress is entitled to information in order to perform its constitutional responsibility.

With reference to whether we are going to be able adequately to prepare this year or next year or 10 or 20 years in the future, I agree with the Senator from Georgia that the Soviet rulers may be far more dangerous to the people of the world when they smile than when they frown.

So, Mr. President, the question is, Can we preserve a solvent Federal Government, a sound national economy, during this period of time? We must weigh the requests made by the various services in arriving at a satisfactory answer to that question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield back the remainder of my time, provided the Senator from New Hampshire will do likewise; that I may then suggest the absence of a quorum; and that, at the conclusion of the quorum call, the Senate may vote on the Bridges amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for order, so that the clerk may hear the responses of the Members of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD, prior to the yea-and-nay vote, a statement by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENDER

I favor the proposal to increase the appropriation for our Air Forces by $500 million. In my judgment, this is a realistic figure which will achieve a goal of assuring America of the world's best Air Force. All of us are agreed that we cannot afford the second best. We recognize that, in this field, research, development and the retention of skilled personnel are of equal importance with construction of large numbers of planes. I believe that we must devote our attention at once to perfecting the best Air Force rather than the largest Air Force. In this field quality is sometimes more important that quantity. We want both. I believe that this appropriation will assure them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I understand, the question is on agreeing to the Bridges amendments to certain committee amendments. Senators desiring to vote for the Bridges amendments will vote "yea," and those opposing it will vote "nay." Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

All time having been yielded back, and the yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State Convention, and his pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has been announced previously.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—42

Aiken	Curtis	Martin, Iowa
Allott	Dirksen	Martin, Pa.
Barrett	Duff	Millikin
Beall	Dworshak	Mundt
Bennett	Flanders	Payne
Bricker	Goldwater	Potter
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Bush	Holland	Saltonstall
Butler	Hruska	Schoeppel
Byrd	Ives	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Case, N. J.	Kuchel	Thye
Case, S. Dak.	Langer	Watkins
Cotton	Long	Williams

NAYS—47

Anderson	Humphrey, Minn.	McNamara
Bible	Humphreys, Ky.	Monroney
Chavez	Jackson	Morse
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Neuberger
Douglas	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Kennedy	Pastore
Ellender	Kerr	Robertson
Ervin	Laird	Russell
Frear	Lehman	Scott
Fulbright	Magnuson	Sparkman
George	Malone	Stennis
Gore	Mansfield	Symington
Green	McCarthy	Welker
Hayden	McClellan	Wofford
Hennings		
Hill		

NOT VOTING—7

Bender	Neely	Young
Capehart	Smathers	
Jenner	Wiley	

So, Mr. BRIDGES' amendments to certain committee amendments were rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment on page 23, line 7, which will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. Under the heading "Aircraft and Related Procurement," on page 23, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "$6,048,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,848,500,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment which has just been stated.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if it is agreeable to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and to the opposition, and if no Senator desires to speak, while so many Senators are present, we can yield back the time and proceed with the yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to speak on the pending amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator desire to speak in opposition to the committee amendment?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, I desire to speak in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. How much time does the Senator from Florida desire?

Mr. HOLLAND. I think 10 minutes will be sufficient.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I realize that this is a highly debatable question, and for that reason I think each Senator should have the right and the opportunity to state for the RECORD the reasons which animate his vote. I voted adversely to the committee amendment in the committee, where the amendment prevailed by the vote of 13 to 12 of the 25 members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. No other standing committee of the Senate has a comparable number of members, so the very vote within the committee itself indicates how thoroughly controversial is this amendment.

Mr. President, that does not mean there is any bitterness in connection with it, or that there is any desire on the part of any Senator, I am sure, to question either the motives or the high patriotism of any other Senator; but it indicates how close a division there is in the Senate as to the wisdom of the amendments, which propose to add more than $1 billion to the budget estimate, $800 million of which would be added to the appropriation for the procurement of aircraft.

Mr. President, no one would speak more gladly and more fully than I about the very high patriotism and the distinguished service of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and yet I think that perhaps one of the clearest illustrations of how differences of opinion may arise was shown in the matter which the Senator from Georgia argued in some detail during his most able and most patriotic argument.

As I understood the Senator from Georgia, he deplored the fact that only four B–52's a month were being accepted for delivery at this time, and he wanted that figure sharply increased. Of course, all Senators who have read the record know there has been some delay in acceptance because of some gadgets, in connection with the plane, which had to be replaced. They know also we are moving rapidly toward a rate of delivery of 20 of those big bombers a month. So that the question is, How can we speed up that rate of production, that rate of delivery of B–52's?

Much as I respect the judgment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, I do not think we can step up the rate of delivery by merely providing more money to be spent by the Air Force, when it clearly appears from an inspection of the budget that the Air Force is not suffering from lack of money at all, but, to the contrary, will have at the end of this fiscal year a large amount of unexpended funds, and even a large amount of unobligated funds, for use in the acquisition of aircraft.

The figures as they are shown by the latest report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures are substantially these: In uncommitted and unobligated appropriations there is nearly $3 billion for the acquisition of aircraft. In addition, for this objective, a little more than $9 billion are committed but not expended. They will be expended during the year which is ahead of us, and for some time thereafter, but such great sums cannot be expended overnight, or in any one month, or in a brief period of time. So the figures before our committee showed with complete clarity that more than $12 billion of carryover are in the hands of the Air Force for the acquisition of aircraft.

So, to my mind—and each of us has the responsibility of having an opinion upon this matter—if we are trying to get aircraft delivered more speedily, it is not the answer to say we will pour out more money, because the money is there in great amounts, unexpended, and much of it unobligated. No Senator recognizing that fact can say with too great a conviction that he is speeding up the delivery of B–52 bombers merely by adding to the appropriation which the Bureau of the Budget and the Chiefs of Staff say can be spent judiciously in the year that lies ahead.

Mr. President, the next point I wish to make is this: When we appropriate funds which are not going to be expended—and no Senator thinks the whole $12 billion carryover can be expended in this year, much less the $6 billion-plus in the budget, bringing the total to more than $18 billion, for the acquisition of aircraft—and thus build up backlogs, we are doing two things: First, we are bringing, or tending to bring, our budget out of balance, as a matter of paper balance. Next, from my point of view, we are encouraging a more careless attitude rather than a more careful one in the expenditure of Federal funds, in that we provide for an agency more funds than it requests for a specific purpose, although it already has on hand vast amounts for that purpose. In this instance the agency has told us that it cannot possibly use for the next year more than the $6 billion-plus now in its budget. In effect, we approve the policy the agency has been following, namely, not to spend all the funds we have been appropriating to it for a purpose, which is no more vital today than it was last month, although it is definitely a vital national-defense purpose. Mr. President, I do not think it is sound finance, and I do not think it is good government, merely just as a gesture, to pour more money onto the pile of funds already available to any agency of the Government, no matter how important its purpose—and this agency has one of the most vital purposes—when the funds thus poured out are to be added to funds which the agency already has on hand but which it has not been able to commit. We simply add to the confusion by piling more money and more money and more money onto the funds already available to an agency which does not now need more money, but which tells us that, first, it needs more personnel and better and larger amounts of housing and more bases and various other things, before it needs more aircraft or the procurement of aircraft more quickly than they are now coming off the assembly lines.

Mr. President, I do not question either the motives or the high patriotism of any other Member of the Senate; but I claim the right to reach my own conclusion, based upon the careful reading of the record and a careful inspection of the financial picture. Therefore, I say I do not believe that the proposal of the committe represents sound government; I do not believe it is the best way to run the country; and, above all, I do not believe it is the way to get the best results from one of the defense agencies which all of us know is new and is manned in large degree by young men, who are excellent flyers, wonderful performers, and fine Americans, but who have shown rather clearly a need for more experience in administraiton and in the executive handling of large funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield 4 more minutes to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 4 additional minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 4 additional minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. President, I do not believe we serve best the Air Force when we give it more funds than it needs and more funds than it can spend; and neither do I think we serve our country well when we do that.

My final point is that if anything is clear from the many reports of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and from the many reports of the CIA, and from the many reports we have received from various other sources, including the incautious utterances of the Soviet leaders themselves, it is that one of the things the Soviets are trying to do is to make us spend ourselves white. I wonder whether it is only a coincidence that while we are debating and voting, the chief of our Air Force is in Moscow. I wonder whether it is only a coincidence that on yesterday or the day before the Soviet leaders showed him an airplane—he did not see it fly—and said to him, "This is our latest bomber, and it is faster than your B–52, because it can crack the sound barrier, and the B–52 cannot."

In short, Mr. President, are we playing into the hands of the Soviet leaders and the policy they are following in the cold war if we allow our judgment to be affected by unsubstantiated claims, and if we allow ourselves to become so excited as to consider making—on the theory that it is necessary for us to do so—an addition of $1 billion to the budget estimate, $800,000,000 of which will be added to the $18 billion already available for the procurement of aircraft during the next fiscal year, when those who know best about the matter say it is not necessary to do so.

Mr. President, other Senators may vote as they wish, of course. I love the Air Force, and I think my colleagues know the reason why I do. I shall not discuss that at this time. But I state here and now that although other Senators may vote for the proposed increase, insofar as I am concerned, it will be wrong for us to do so. Instead, I think it is no crime for us to try to balance the budget, particularly when a large item such as this is not in compliance with the requests of those who should know a great deal more about these matters than we do.

Mr. President, as I take my seat, I wish to say that I yield to no one in my interest in the Air Force and in the national defense of our country, but there is a group in whom I place great confidence as regards knowledge of the equipment and the funds needed for the Air Force and for our national defense. That group, composed of our most capable and experienced military leaders, tell us stoutheartedly that $6 billion is all the Air Force needs, and that that amount will more than enable the Air Force to take care of its problems. I do not believe our love of our country and of the Air Force should replace the experience, the knowledge, and the conviction in the minds of those who advise us, and whose very standing in the future will be dependent upon how successful they are in estimating the needs of the country and in giving us their advice. I think they are well equipped properly to advise us about this problem, and we should not ignore their judgment. Let it be remembered that in the past they have been amply generous in their requests, as is evidenced by the fact that year after year the Air Force has had to carry forward very large amounts of funds unexpended and very large amounts of funds unobligated, as is now the case.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I make four brief points.

First, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have not approved this budget. Yesterday and today there has been indication the Joint Chiefs approved it. That is not right.

Second, I have gone over these much discussed figures. Although contracts may not be actually let, what one wants in good business is good programing. If the Senate votes today for this proposed increase, it will enable the Air Force to carry out that programing which is in line with good business practice.

Third, what we are talking about today may well be theoretical; because last year the President impounded the money Congress appropriated to maintain the strength of the Marines at the level the Congress felt they should be maintained. The President could well impound the funds now being proposed in this amendment. In fact, only last week the Secretary of Defense himself said he would "take a look" at these funds and decide whether he needed them.

Fourth, in my opinion the vote about to be taken is not merely a vote for an appropriation of some $1 billion. Rather, it is a vote as to whether the United States wants to have an Air Force superior to the Communist air force, or whether the United States is willing to have the Communists surpass us in airpower.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if we were to try to take care of the national defense of the United States with dollars and cents, the argument of my good friend, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] would be a correct one. However, we cannot evaluate our national security or national defense with dollars and cents. Only today the headlines in the local press tell us what General Twining, the Chief of Staff of our Air Force, has seen in Moscow. Should we be concerned, or should we not? It is true that aircraft alone will not do the job. The statement made by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] clearly presents the case. The question before us is not one of dollars and cents, rather it is one of the security of the American people.

Therefore, Mr. President, what are we arguing about?

We have agreed to eliminate the $200 million for military construction which is contained in the pending bill.

By direct action, the Senate rejected the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Therefore, the only question remaining before the Senate is on agreeing to or rejecting the committee's recommendations—made by it in good faith—that an additional $800 millon be appropriated for the procurement of aircraft and related procurement, and $40 million for "Operation and maintenance."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. May I have 1 more minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, there is no controversy about research and development, because the Bridges amendment would have provided an additional $100 million over the House figure, so there is no difference there.

There is a difference with respect to operation and maintenance. The bill contains an increase of $40 million for that purpose. The Bridges amendment, which was defeated, provided for a $30 million increase. For personnel, the amounts are the same—$20 million. So all we are concerned about is a difference of $460 million.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield back the remainder of my time, on condition that the other side do likewise, with the understanding that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that when the quorum is obtained, or the order for the quorum call is rescinded, the Senate may proceed to vote.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire, speaking for the minority, acquiesces in that request, and yields back the remainder of his time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 23, line 17. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered. All time has been exhausted or yielded back. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], who is now ill. If present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the calling of the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State convention, and his pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has been announced previously.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea" and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—48

Anderson	Humphrey, Minn.	McNamara
Bible	Humphreys, Ky.	Monroney
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Morse
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Neuberger
Daniel	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kennedy	Pastore
Eastland	Kerr	Robertson
Ervin	Laird	Russell
Frear	Lehman	Scott
Fulbright	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
George	Malone	Sparkman
Gore	Mansfield	Stennis
Green	McCarthy	Symington
Hayden	McClellan	Welker
Hennings		Wofford
Hill		

NAYS—40

Aiken	Dirksen	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Duff	Millikin
Barrett	Dworshak	Mundt
Beall	Flanders	Payne
Bennett	Goldwater	Potter
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Bridges	Holland	Saltonstall
Bush	Hruska	Schoeppel
Butler	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Knowland	Thye
Carlson	Kuchel	Watkins
Case, N. J.	Langer	Williams
Cotton	Long	
Curtis	Martin, Iowa	

NOT VOTING—8

Bender	Jenner	Wiley
Capehart	Neely	Young
Ellender	Smathers	

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was under the subhead "Operation and Maintenance," on page 26, line 4, to strike out "$3,684,185,000" and insert "$3,780,185,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back my time on the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I had intended to offer 1 or 2 amendments to the naval part of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have order? We cannot hear what the Senator from New Hampshire is saying.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator will suspend until the Senate is in order.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have one or two amendments which I had intended to offer to the naval part of the bill. However, in discussions with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and with the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I have been informed that they would like to keep the bill in the form in which it now is, and that there would be objection to my amendments. I should like to inquire of the Senators whether I have correctly stated the situation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire, and I am inclined to be rather sympathetic with the position taken by the Senator from New Hampshire. However, we have had very little information given us on the subject which the Senator from New Hampshire has in mind. Inasmuch as the Senate will soon consider a bill dealing directly with that subject, I wish the Senator would not press his amendment at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator from New Mexico. The Navy accepted the House version of the appropriation bill. The Senate made only two very minor changes in it. No hearings were held on the subject, because there was no difference of opinion between the Navy and the House. Therefore, I hope the Senator will come forward when the supplemental bill is under consideration, because we will have an opportunity to hold hearings on the supplemental bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think it would be better if the Senator from New Hampshire would do that.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the wishes of the ranking members of the subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Is all time for debate on the bill yielded back?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time on the bill, on condition that the acting minority leader will do likewise.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President may we have the yeas and nays on the final passage of the bill?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is: Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State Convention.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senators from Wisconsin (Mr. WILEY and Mr. MCCARTHY) would each vote "yea".

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—88

Aiken	George	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Goldwater	McClellan
Anderson	Gore	McNamara
Barrett	Green	Millikin
Beall	Hayden	Monroney
Bennett	Hennings	Morse
Bible	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	Murray
Bridges	Holland	Neuberger
Bush	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Butler	Humphrey, Minn.	Pastore
Byrd	Humphreys, Ky.	Payne
Carlson	Jackson	Potter
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kefauver	Russell
Clements	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Cotton	Kerr	Schoeppel
Curtis	Knowland	Scott
Daniel	Kuchel	Smathers
Dirksen	Laird	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Lehman	Sparkman
Dworshak	Long	Stennis
Eastland	Magnuson	Symington
Ellender	Malone	Thye
Ervin	Mansfield	Watkins
Flanders	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Frear	McCarthy	Williams
Fulbright	Neely	Wofford

NOT VOTING—8

Bender	Jenner	Wiley
Capehart	McCarthy	Young
Ives	Neely	

So the bill (H. R. 10986) was passed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HILL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. FLANDERS conferees on the part of the Senate.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2296, H. R. 11356.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill,

which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, although the mutual-security authorization bill has been made the unfinished business, it may become necessary to ask the Senate to lay it aside temporarily in order that we may consider the Military Public Works authorization bill tomorrow, provided prompt action may be had on that bill. There will be discussion on the Mutual Security authorization bill tomorrow, and it is hoped that perhaps a vote may be had on it either late Thursday or, at the latest, on Friday.

THE AMERICAN LEGION AND HELLS CANYON DAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to include in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of letters which show that the American Legion does not endorse the misleading advertisements against the Hells Canyon project which have been placed by private utility companies in the American Legion magazine, along with other periodicals. These are the advertisements which misstate the cost figures of the project and, by obscuring the fact that the project will fully pay for itself with interest, seek to give a wholly false impression of its tax consequences.

There had been brought to my attention, by Legion members, a letter from the publisher of the American Legion magazine to commanders of Legion posts, asking them to display this anti-Hells Canyon advertisement on post bulletin boards. I wrote to Mr. J. Addington Wagner, national commander of the American Legion, to inquire whether such display on post bulletin boards, of privately financed political advertising, on a highly controversial issue of vital importance to the State I help to represent in the Senate, represented Legion policy.

As I wrote to Mr. Wagner, I wish to make it clear that I am in no way criticizing the American Legion magazine—or any other periodical—for the contents of this or any other advertisement. We want no censorship in this respect. I only questioned the manner in which this particular advertisement had apparently been sponsored by the American Legion magazine for presentation on the bulletin board of Legion posts throughout the land. This is a very different situation, Mr. President, from merely printing and publishing a paid advertisement.

National Commander Wagner very promptly and very courteously replied to my questions. He wrote that the publisher's action "does not represent the policy of the American Legion"; that "the American Legion has never taken a position with respect to Hells Canyon project or the overall issue of private power versus public power"; and the Legion's publications commission and the publisher of the Legion magazine would be advised accordingly.

I am grateful to the national commander for his statement of Legion policy in this respect, Mr. President, and I believe the information will be of interest to legionnaires in Oregon and elsewhere throughout the country, who may have wondered about the placing of this advertising on Legion post bulletin boards.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, to have printed in the RECORD my letter of June 7, 1956, to the national commander of the American Legion; the letter of the publisher of the American Legion magazine to post commanders, National Commander Wagner's answer to me, dated June 18, 1956, and my reply to him.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
June 7, 1956.

Mr. J. ADDINGTON WAGNER,
National Commander, the American Legion, care of Washington Office, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WAGNER: A commander of one of the posts of our organization has sent me a copy of a form letter which is apparently being sent to post commanders throughout the Nation by Mr. James F. O'Neil, publisher of the American Legion magazine. This letter enclosed a large reproduction of an advertisement in the American Legion magazine, paid for by a group of private electric utility companies, which opposes Federal construction of the Hells Canyon project on the Snake River—a project of vital importance to the people of Oregon, whom I represent in the United States Senate.

In transmitting the reproduction of this advertisement to post commanders, Mr. O'Neil writes:

"We are happy to have these companies explain their functions to our vitally interested American Legion audience through a schedule of advertising messages in our American Legion magazine.

"The attached reprint is typical of this informative ad series. If it fits into your schedule of operations, we would appreciate the display of the reprint upon your bulletin board as an additional service to our advertisers in reminding you and post members of how these companies are providing power today, and how they are preparing for America's future."

As you undoubtedly know, the subject matter of the advertising message which Mr. O'Neil asks to have displayed on Legion post bulletin boards is not only of vast economic significance to the Pacific Northwest but is also the central political controversy in our region.

As a member of the American Legion, I have always taken for granted that our organization of veterans is impartial in economic and political controversies of this kind. I also understand that technically, the American Legion magazine is not published by the Legion itself, but in its behalf by an independent legal entity. Let me emphasize that I suggest no censorship of the magazine or the advertising it may carry; but whatever may be the dissociation of the magazine from the Legion can certainly not be said of Legion post bulletin boards.

I wonder, therefore, whether you would be so kind as to confirm my understanding on the following questions:

1. What is the relationship between the American Legion and the American Legion magazine?

2. Does advertising in the Legion magazine customarily carry with it display of the ad on post bulletin boards?

In other words, do commercial advertisers obtain this additional display along with their space in the magazine, or is Mr. O'Neil's suggestion that this particular political advertising be so displayed an unusual instance?

3. Has the American Legion ever taken a position with respect to Federal construction of the Hells Canyon project, currently before the United States Senate in a bill sponsored by 30 Senators?

4. Is the use of Legion post bulletin boards for the dissemination of private utility advertising opposing Hells Canyon consistent with Legion policy toward legislative controversies of this kind?

5. Does the American Legion endorse or does it reject Mr. O'Neil's suggestion that such advertising be displayed on post bulletin boards?

I am sure you will appreciate my concern, as a lifelong resident of the region affected and as an Oregon Legionnaire, about the role of our organization in a legislative matter of this kind; and I would appreciate your early attention and reply to the questions which are raised by Mr. O'Neil's letter to post commanders.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

THE AMERICAN LEGION MAGAZINE,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR COMMANDER: Electrical power facilities in the United States today are extremely important in our Nation's tremendous production system, and in the daily lives of all of us.

America's independent electric light and power companies are playing a major role in producing and distributing electrical energy, and we are happy to have these companies explain their functions to our vitally interested American Legion audience through a schedule of advertising messages in our American Legion magazine.

The attached reprint is typical of this informative ad series. If it fits into your schedule of operations, we would appreciate the display of the reprint upon your bulletin board as an additional service to our advertiser in reminding you and post members of how these companies are providing power today, and how they are preparing for America's future.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. O'NEIL,
Publisher.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1956.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: In response to your communication concerning the distribution of material by James F. O'Neil, publisher of the American Legion Magazine, to post commanders, I wish to state at the outset that the action does not represent the policy of the American Legion.

In this instance, as in others, the American Legion Magazine was providing a service to an advertiser. That was the only intention of the publisher in transmitting a reprint of one of the ads for possible display on the post bulletin board.

As you know, posts have autonomous powers as it relates to such matters; and while some post bulletin boards are used for general display material, others follow very restrictive policies. As regards to your specific questions:

1. The American Legion Magazine is not a separate entity but is operated within the framework of the American Legion, under the aegis of a publications commission of 21 members who are appointed by the national commander with the approval of the national executive committee.

2. Advertising in the American Legion Magazine does not customarily carry with it display of an advertisement on post bulletin boards, except in such instances as the advertiser makes a special request. There

have been several such instances in the past where there has been distribution of advertising copy as was done in the case of the electric utility company's advertisement. In every case it was by request, with the advertiser paying the costs of the reprint, the stuffing and the mailing, with all lists being protected.

3. The American Legion has never taken a position with respect to the Hells Canyon project or the overall issue of private power versus public power. Certainly there never has been any editorial support in the American Legion Magazine for the opponents of public power.

4. Posts have full control as to the use of their bulletin boards.

5. It would be up to the individual post to make its decision as to the display of any material.

I will advise the publications commission and the publisher of the American Legion Magazine, Mr. O'Neil, to make sure that in the distribution of advertising copy for material to posts, the position of the American Legion is completely stated and that no inferences can be drawn to indicate endorsement of any advertising copy unless it is in support of an American Legion mandate.

Sincerely yours,

J. ADDINGTON WAGNER.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
June 25, 1956.

Mr. J. ADDINGTON WAGNER,
National Commander,
The American Legion,
1608 K Street NW.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WAGNER: Thank you very much for your prompt and courteous reply to my letter of June 7. I am glad to learn from you that Mr. O'Neil's request to Legion post commanders to display the anti-Hells Canyon advertisement on post bulletin boards does not represent the policy of the American Legion, and that Mr. O'Neill will be so advised.

I know you appreciate the importance of the Hells Canyon issue in the State I help to represent in the Senate and that I am, therefore, concerned that there be no misunderstanding of the American Legion's position in this respect. I am grateful to you for setting the record straight.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

PRESERVATION OF THE WILDERNESS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial published in the Eugene Register-Guard of June 18, 1956, setting forth cogent and sound reasons for approval of the national wilderness preservation bill, sponsored by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and a considerable number of other Senators, among whom I am proud to be included.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW WILDERNESS PRESERVATION BILL

We note with approval that the long-awaited "wilderness bill" has been introduced into the Senate. The bill, calling for a national wilderness preservation system, was introduced by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, with the backing of Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER of Oregon, SMITH of Maine, LEHMAN of New York, DOUGLAS of Illinois, KUCHEL of California, MUNDT of South Dakota, LAIRD of West Virginia, and DUFF of Pennsylvania.

The bill does not set up a new land administering agency. The National Park Service will continue to administer the parks and monuments, the Forest Service will continue to administer its wilderness and wild areas, the Bureau of Indian Affairs will keep its functions, etc. A new agency, however, would be created under terms of the bill. It would be called the National Wilderness Preservation Council. Its duties would include the filing of maps and official papers regarding the system, the study of proposals for changes in the system, the serving as a clearinghouse for information, the surveying of wilderness needs and conditions, the gathering of information, including maps, and consultation with old-line agencies on wilderness matters.

The Council would have 15 members— the chairman and ranking minority members of House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees, the directors of the Park Service, Forest Service, Indian Bureau, and Fish and Wildlife Service, the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and six citizens serving staggered 6-year terms. The Smithsonian secretary would be chairman.

Offhand and tentatively we question the membership of the four Congressmen on the Council. We wonder if legislators should be on such a board. We don't exactly oppose the idea. Nor do we endorse it. But we wonder.

The bill does not call for wholesale reform of the present nonunified wilderness systems, but it would work to keep the wilderness areas we have. It would give the force of statute to the executive regulations that have established some of them. The areas to be included would be approximately those now designated as wildernesses. The only "reform" element in the bill is a provision that would prohibit mining. Presumably this would bar oil and gas extraction from wildlife refuges—a pretty hot issue in conservation circles.

Oregon areas spelled out in the bill are wilderness and wild areas at Gearhart Mountain, Kalmiopsis, Mount Hood, Eagle Cap, Mountain Lakes, and Strawberry Mountain; Crater Lake National Park, and the portion of the Mount Jefferson wild area within the Warm Springs Indian Reservation. Another paragraph of the bill permits inclusion of the Three Sisters area and that part of the Mount Jefferson area that is not within the Indian reservation.

And once again we point out that more than a year has passed since hearings were conducted on the boundaries of the Three Sisters wilderness area. The latest information we have is that representatives of the Department of Agriculture (which supervises the Forest Service) will be in the Northwest this summer to look at the region themselves before they stick their necks out and make a decision that is bound to please nobody.

Another point should be made. Because Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER are cosponsors of this bill, some of our friends and neighbors are likely to be, automatically, against it. This would be silly. The bill has nothing to do with partisan politics, and its sponsorship is bipartisan. Witness the sponsoring names of SMITH, DUFF, KUCHEL, and MUNDT.

We don't see this bill as the be-all and end-all of conservation. There will always be the need for review and adjustment, and those things are provided for in the bill. The wilderness system, no matter what Congress does to it, will always be under fire from those who see in the forest nothing but board-feet and kilowatts. And conservationists of the string-saving type will always scream bloody murder every time somebody wants to adjust a wilderness boundary. But we do see the bill as a step toward making raids on the wilderness more difficult. And it will give us a chance to get information and to tailor the wilderness system to the needs of a growing population. Those two reasons are enough to justify the passage, this year, of this long-awaited measure.

ATTAINMENT OF SUBSIDY-FREE OPERATION BY TRANS WORLD AIRLINES

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on June 14, 1956, in discussing S. 3449, a bill proposing to change the existing formula for subsidies paid to airlines, I incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report prepared by the Department of Commerce showing the amount of increased subsidies which would have been paid to the various subsidized companies had the bill been in effect for the past 5 years.

The report of the Department of Commerce was prepared on the basis of the amount of the subsidy which had been paid to the respective companies under the old law during the same period.

Since that time a director of the Trans World Airlines, Inc., has called my attention to the fact that while his company had been the recipient of subsidies in the past, it had attained as of June 1, 1955, the goal where both its domestic and international systems were now subsidy-free operations and that, therefore, since the company was no longer subsidized it would not be affected in any manner by the enactment of the proposed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the Trans World Airlines letter of June 15, 1956, together with a copy of the citation given to the company by the Postmaster General under date of June 1, 1955, commending them on their attainment of subsidy-free operations, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANS WORLD AIRLINES, INC.,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1956.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I have noticed with interest your discussion on June 14, on the floor of the Senate, of Senate bill 3449, and your statement that Trans World Airlines is one of the four major companies interested in the passage of this measure.

Permit me to call to your attention the fact that Trans World Airlines does not receive subsidy on either its domestic or international operations. Attached is a citation presented to TWA by the Postmaster General in commemoration of this achievement. TWA is the first major international operator to attain this position.

Because we are entirely off of subsidy, the bill would not apply to TWA. Should you have occasion to refer to this matter again in the future, it would be appreciated if you would make this plain.

Sincerely yours,

W. T. HUFF,
Assistant Director, Civic Affairs.

A CITATION TO TRANS WORLD AIRLINES, INC.

Whereas the United States Post Office Department appreciates the services rendered by the United States air transport industry in delivering the mails, and

Whereas it has long been the goal of the United States scheduled airlines to maintain

their service without Federal subsidies, the Post Office Department presents this citation to Trans World Airlines, Inc., on the happy occasion of its completion of 30 years of service and its attainment of a subsidy-free operation over both its domestic and international systems.

ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General.

JUNE 1, 1955.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I give notice to the Senate that the conferees on the District of Columbia appropriations bill have agreed ,and their report has been filed. Action is expected to be taken in the other House shortly.

As soon as action has been completed in the House, the Senate will take up both the District of Columbia appropriations conference report and the public works conference report.

In addition, there may be sandwiched in sometime during the week, when it is possible, Calendar No. 2168, H. R. 10285, and Senate bill 3773.

If it is possible to complete action on the military public works appropriation bill in a short time tomorrow, the bill may be considered after the completion of the morning business. So far as I know, there is very little controversy about that bill.

But there may be some yea-and-nay votes on the mutual security authorization bill both tomorrow and on Thursday, and I should like all Senators to be on notice of that fact.

It may be that the Senate will meet early and stay late, because if action on the very important mutual security bill can be concluded on Thursday, it is possible that the minority leader will agree with the majority leader to have the Senate go over until Monday. So I wish to hold out that prospect as an inducement to all Senators to be present and to expect to vote on the mutual security bill, so that action can be expedited on that important measure.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. Since Monday and Tuesday come immediately before the Fourth of July, does the Senator from Texas expect any yea-and-nay votes on those days?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is possible. I do not know.

Mr. WELKER. Does the Senator from Texas know what bills they might be?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes. This morning I read into the RECORD the list of bills and conference reports which may possibly be considered in the next week or so. If the Senator will refer to the RECORD, he will see the announcement.

Mr. WELKER. I shall read the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I know the bill from the committee of which the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is chairman, the survivors' insurance bill, will be up for consideration. The debt limit bill will likely be considered. It is possible the Fryingpan-Arkansas bill, now on the calendar, will be considered. Calendar No. 2313, Senate bill 3903, amending the Trade Development Assistance Act, will be considered. If the military public works bill is not acted on tomorrow, it will fall in that category.

If the Senator desires any assurance concerning the Hells Canyon bill, I have announced it may be considered sometime during the next week or the following week, but I shall be glad to give him assurance that it will not be considered on either Monday or Tuesday, if that suits his convenience.

Mr. WELKER. I am mindful of the fact that many Senators will be away.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be glad to give the Senator assurance that the Hells Canyon bill will not be brought up by motion on either Monday or Tuesday of next week. I ask the acting minority leader to take notice of that assurance.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Can the Senator give assurance that the Hells Canyon bill will not be taken up on the 5th or 6th of July, following the 4th of July?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; I prefer not to do that now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In other words, there is a possibility that the Hells Canyon bill may be brought up on the 5th or 6th of July?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

SPEECH BY HON. LUIS MUÑOZ MARÍN, GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, a speech delivered on April 7, 1956, by the Honorable Luis Muñoz Marín, Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, at the annual convention of the Associated Harvard Clubs held in Coral Gables, Fla.

It is a thought provoking, able, and timely speech, delivered by one of Latin America's most intelligent minds, and most distinguished sons, I highly recommend its reading by the Members of both Houses of the Congress.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY THE HONORABLE LUIS MUÑOZ MARÍN, GOVERNOR OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO, AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE ASSOCIATED HARVARD CLUBS HELD IN CORAL GABLES, FLA., APRIL 7, 1956.

I am thankful to the Associated Harvard Clubs for this invitation to express my views on the future of inter-American relations and Puerto Rico's contribution to it. It is fitting that we should meet here in Florida. No federated State in the Union so much as Florida realizes the need for understanding between the United States and Latin America. No section of the United States can realize better than Florida what we are trying to do in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Associated State of Puerto Rico, as we call it in Spanish, to further that understanding. We are sharply aware of the stakes involved for the Americas. The United States realizes the ever-increasing need of bringing together the two basic streams of Western civilization which have given the New World such a commanding place in the struggle for freedom and human betterment. Latin Americans also realize it. But neither are quite sure that the other does. It is a most worthy task to correct this misapprehension.

Two variations of a way of life, two manners of a common cultural heritage come into contact in Puerto Rico and have the opportunity of influencing each other for better or for worse. It is the job of all of us to make it be for better, to see that this interaction of cultural forces, while minimizing clashes and frictions, does constantly enrich the social and economic well-being, the standard of values, the mores, and aspirations of the peoples of this hemisphere.

I should like to speak, in the course of this talk, of how we are trying to contribute to that end in Puerto Rico. First, however, it may be appropriate to give you, in a nutshell, the very recent story of our island Commonwealth. Since July 25, 1952, Puerto Rico is a self-governing Commonwealth, associated with the American Union through a voluntary compact. It represents a novel, flexible, imaginative relationship within the American constitutional tradition. As Chief Justice Earl Warren has recently said, on the occasion of the inauguration of the new Commonwealth Supreme Court Building: "In the sense that our American system is not static, in the sense that it is not an end but the means to an end—in the sense that it is an organism intended to grow and expand to meet varying conditions and times in a large country—in the sense that every governmental effort of ours is an experiment—so the new institutions of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico represent an experiment—the newest experiment and perhaps the most notable of American governmental experiments in our lifetimes." It is as well an experiment in nonnationalistic political freedom for a Latin American people. Puerto Rico, we know, is not a republic. Neither is it, under its new status, a United States possession or Territory, nor is it in any way a colony. It is a new kind of state, both in the sense of the United States federal system and in the general sense of a people organized to govern themselves.

The compact, governing the relationship with the Federal Government, is founded on Public Law 600, which the people of Puerto Rico proposed to the United States Congress, providing for the organization of a government by the people of Puerto Rico under a constitution of their own adoption. Public Law 600 stated that the principle of government by consent was thereby fully recognized and that the act was adopted in the nature of a compact. It could not go into effect unless approved by the people of Puerto Rico in a free referendum. The terms of the relationships between Puerto Rico and the United States were determined in the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act—a part of Public Law 600—that is, a part of the compact. The Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act contains, among others, the provisions referring to the common citizenship, free trade, common coinage, a customs union, the Federal judiciary, and the applicability of Federal laws, with the exception of the internal revenue legislation.

Public Law 600 was approved by the Congress almost unanimously. It was overwhelmingly ratified by the people of Puerto Rico at the polls thus starting a complex and highly democratic constitutional process which finally led to the proclamation of the new Commonwealth status on July 25, 1952. On November 3, 1953, the Commonwealth was solemnly recognized as a self-governing political body in a historic resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

What is the meaning of this constitutional process, and of the economic and social effort that runs parallel with it, in terms

of inter-American relations? What contribution to United States policies and United States prestige in this vital area of the world is being thus made? I think the answer to these questions can be better understood if placed within the context of the great problems which the United States is facing in its unavoidable and dramatic responsibility to champion the cause of free government and democratic values in this tense, war-weary world.

The Western World, with the American Union in the leadership, is facing the military challenge of communism. It is facing it by preparedness and vigilance and by a constant and sincere search for agreement on disarmament. But we know that the conflict with Communist totalitarianism is not just an attempt to guarantee survival by military means, or even by disarmament. In a way, the armament race, gigantic and ominous as it is, gives one a feeling of anachronism, that it is a symbol of a world ailing because of its own physical strength and seeking for its cure a great wisdom that constantly eludes it.

Disarmament, if it comes, will not by itself stop the challenge to freedom. It would, however, make it a creative challenge. The struggle would then increasingly shape itself, I believe, as the ideological clash between the attempt to defeat economic poverty by political slavery and the purpose to enhance political and human freedom by economic productivity and social justice.

As it stands today, both struggles are going on, the military and the ideological. Within recent months we have witnessed an intensification of the ideological fight. We have all observed the moves of the Soviet Union into the field of technical assistance and economic aid to the underdeveloped areas, as well as of Russian support for old grievances against Western Powers. In a world still bedeviled by undernourishment, evil housing conditions, scant protection against disease, little economic security, the Soviet thrust is more challenging to the Western World, that believes in fighting these evils through freedom, than a stockpile of hydrogen bombs.

The Soviet Prime Minister has announced Russia's intention of offering technical assistance to Latin America and to find better trade channels for its commerce. One of the top men of the Soviet is about to initiate a tour through Latin America offering manna. No doubt a vigorous offensive shall follow by the Communists and their friends in Latin America to picture the Soviet pattern of life as most enticing to the underdeveloped economies of the Western Hemisphere and to unfold before their eyes a vision of a swift industrial revolution that may bring, in a generation, the abolition of poverty. They will speak of freedom as well as of economic salvation.

They will probably not be believed as to freedom but they need not be, because many of the peoples are living under governments that are not democratic. The peoples are unfree and miserably poor. Even if only half of the Russian picture is accepted, the vision would be one of the unfamiliar surcease of extreme poverty even if under the familiar absence of democratic freedom. All such governments in Latin America claim to be anti-Communist, and there is no reason to believe that they are not. There is, however, no doubt that in practice, in relation to the lives of their own peoples, they are also antidemocratic. The dealings of the United States with such regimes present a most delicate problem. There is no question that the United States must be on friendly official terms with all governments of the hemisphere. But there should be no question either that the United States must assure the peoples of the hemisphere of its genuine concern for their political freedom and human rights. And it is called upon to do this difficult feat while keeping its skirts clear of any suspicion of intervention in the internal affairs of other countries. It is a dilemma. But I believe there are ways for the United States to make a sufficiently clear distinction between its friends who are democrats and anti-Communist and its friends who are only anti-Communists.

In this respect, we should convince ourselves, and so become strongly convincing, that the answer to the Communist challenge lies in the ability of the Western Powers, and especially the United States, to show to the less fortunate countries of the world that a greater transformation can be achieved, at an even faster rate and on sounder economic foundations, without shattering, or ignoring, as the Russians and the Red Chinese have done, the fabric of political and individual liberties—and that the transformation need not be patterned after the capitalist mores that have been successful in the United States.

It is urgent that this answer be ready and available in dealing with Latin America.

Latin America, generally, is still an underdeveloped area; its per capita income is grievously too low; housing is a problem of the first magnitude; it is basically dependent on world trade, and particularly United States trade, for its cash and credits and for the purchase of the essential consumer goods and the capital goods its industrial growth requires. The United States uses in maintaining a high standard of living 53 percent of the natural resources of the free world—with which indispensable contribution it maintains a civilization for 8 percent of the free world's people. This creates a relationship that cannot be considered merely in commercial terms. It cannot be a simple question of payment in money according to market. It would seem that the relationship could be better conceived as one of interdependent peoples working together toward a rough but substantial equality in the minimums of civilized living.

Too great is the disparity between the wealth and industrial might of the United States and the economic insufficiency of Latin America. Even with a great fund of good will it imperils long-range understanding. To bridge that gap in the least possible time, with the most efficient techniques available, with the most effective partnership of governments and peoples is, in my opinion, the task of the inter-American system in this generation.

How to help the powerful emerging stream of Latin American aspirations to a future rooted in economic security and democratic freedom is an acid test of United States statesmanship, of American statesmanship in the widest sense of the word "American" and in the deepest sense of the word "statesmanship."

I think we all would have in mind not only a more productive but a finer social order, where there is more nourishment and more adequate shelter for the body, more of the modest good things of life, more opportunities for a general education stressing the values of our common heritage and the contributions of the individual cultures, as well as the search for scientific knowledge and its technological application—an order evolving into a democratic union of free peoples, where the human spirit, more clearly perhaps than today is served by the economic process.

It is in this connection that the Puerto Rican experience can be clarifying. For it demonstrates a joint political creativeness of the United States and a people of Latin American origin. In the economic, social, and cultural field, it reveals the United States at its undogmatic best: the helping hand guided by the undoctrinaire spirit, so forgetful of its bigness that it fully reveals its greatness. For if the commonwealth idea is a tangible proof of the possibility of original political thinking in the Americas, a dramatic refutation of the Communist claim that the United States position is narrow, colonialistic and reactionary, the social and economic surge in Puerto Rico clearly demonstrates that a people of different historical background can find a way out of their former anguish and despair, in close association with the United States.

We have called this surge Operation Bootstrap, an effort to lead the people out of extreme poverty, if possible; Operation Serenity, not into extreme wealth; and to do this, Operation Commonwealth, in an association with the American Union so close as that of common citizenship. We have been healthily undoctrinaire, with no fixed taboos, no immutable sacred cows, in the use of instruments to achieve a better standard of living, caring only that all instruments used conformed to the democratic process and could be tested periodically by approval of the public will at the polls. The Commonwealth government pioneered in building and operating factories when there was need to do so, because private capital was hesitant to do it. It socialistically established and managed industries, and then capitalistically sold them to private enterprise and used the money in further stimulation of economic development by some more private enterprise. It has pioneered in attracting United States and foreign capital, in stimulating private initiative and investment, to promote prompt and effective industrialization. It has used United States techniques and ideas, adapting and rejecting them with a frank experimental temper. It has engaged in land reform without destroying the basic unit of production and without unfair expropriation. It has launched an educational program for young and adults which consumes nearly one-third of our budget.

A few figures may tell the tale of what the people of Puerto Rico have tried to accomplish in the last 15 years. In 1940, our net income was $230 million. It is today nearly a billion, with a real increase of 107 percent. Production has been doubled and our income per capita is now $435, higher than all of the Latin American countries, with the exception of Venezuela. We had 300,000 students in 1940; now we have more than 600,000 and illiteracy has been reduced from 32 percent to 20 percent in the same period, while an active campaign is under way to wipe out this curse altogether.

As former Ambassador Chester Bowles has written, "More than most Americans, those who live in Puerto Rico share the hopes and heartaches of that two-thirds of mankind who remain ill clad, ill housed and ill fed. Yet nowhere, except perhaps in the agricultural settlements of Israel or in some of the industrial and village projects of India, have there been pioneering efforts at economic development which match in promise the techniques recently evolved in Puerto Rico." And he later adds, "Thus a decade ago Puerto Ricans learned a lesson which should now be a truism: that if a people are to be saved from whatever danger threatens them, whether it be the militant aggression of communism or the social scourge of poverty and disease, they will in the last analysis save themselves through their own indigenous power, pride and responsibility. If outsiders are to be helpful, their help must take the form of friendly and unobstrusive support."

Because the people of our Commonwealth are fired with a vision of what human energies can do to overcome man-created or nature-created misery, we have insisted in making Puerto Rico a training center for technical assistance, a laboratory for visitors from the New World and even Africa and Asia, so that they may see for themselves our unrelenting and peaceful war on colonialism, poverty, disease, ignorance, and hopelessness—carried out in terms of a deep sense of friendship, of brotherhood with the United States. Even before Congress appropriated money for the point 4 program, our Govern-

ment established an office and offered its services and cooperation. We have received over 2,700 visitors and trainees—the vast majority from Latin America, who have acquired firsthand knowledge of how the two great cultures of America can work together in terms of freedom, respect, and economic achievement. We have had of late in Puerto Rico eminent visitors like the wise President of Haiti, Paul Magloire, and that stanch defender of hemispheric solidarity through freedom, President José Figueres of Costa Rica. We have held numerous inter-American conferences, seminars, workshops, and meetings, always aiming at making our island a place where people of good faith from this hemisphere can meet to discuss their common problems and aspirations in an atmosphere of freedom and mutual trust. We are a Latin American country composed of citizens of the United States. But that does not quite express it. It is not only that the citizenship is United States period, and the culture Latin American period. It is more than just the addition of those two concepts. It is an emerging new manner in the Americas, an example, perhaps a still dimly realized preview, of what a grand hemispheric union might look like to our children. In saying this, I am not referring to political institutions. Democratic peoples have to be constantly creative, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the people of it, are naturally by no means pretending to offer a pattern of political union. They believe that their experience may be a stimulant to imaginative search—political, cultural, social, economic. We are seeking serenity through an efficiency placed at the service of understanding.

This is a job in which we want to participate more and more. As we scan the social, economic, and political horizon, as we shape the course of the future generation in terms of a fuller and richer society, conducted with freedom and order, with more education than conspicuous consumption, with more imagination than acquisitiveness, we feel the deep spiritual urge to link our experience and hope to the wider search for hemispheric unity. The dream we dream is a realistic dream. Hard study, cool reasoning, unremitting labor, and unfailing dedication can make it possible.

Let us urgently devise the basic objectives in housing, in health, in education, in economic productivity, in communications, which may be attainable by different areas of the hemisphere, according to their human and material resources. Let us solemnly declare that our essential goal—the goal of all Americans, North and South—is the abolition of extreme poverty, in the areas of misery remaining in regions of the United States and in the altiplano of Bolivia, the plains of Venezuela, the coffee lands of Puerto Rico and Central America, the sierras of Mexico—to wipe out extreme poverty in this hemisphere within the lifetime of children already born. Let us encourage Government and private initiative to share in a good partnership with a view to better distributive justice for all; and let's not be doctrinaire about it. Let us not be doctrinaire either as to socialism or capitalism, but only as to freedom and human dignity. Let us give friendly support to all groups thinking in terms of a greater, truly hemispheric America, not merely Latin, not merely Anglo-Saxon, and not merely temporary while a Russian danger lasts. An America to serve the world.

SENATOR HOLLAND, OF FLORIDA—BIOGRAPHY AND HONORARY DEGREE CITATION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on June 7 the University of Tampa, on the occasion of its 37th commencement, conferred upon my colleague, the very able and distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the honorary degree of Doctor of Humanities, for his leadership and service to our country.

We in Florida are justly proud of his meritorious and outstanding service, not only on behalf of the people of his State, but of the Nation as well. Recognition of this record of public service by the University of Tampa is a well-deserved honor.

At the time of the conferring of the honorary degree, Mr. David E. Smiley, chairman of the board of trustees of the University of Tampa, and publisher of the Tampa Daily Times read a biography of Senator HOLLAND prior to presenting him to Dr. Ellwood C. Nance, president of the university, who conferred the honorary degree on him.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the biography as read by Mr. Smiley, together with the honorary degree citation.

There being no objection, the biography and citation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENTATION OF THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM FLORIDA SPESSARD LINDSEY HOLLAND FOR THE HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF HUMANITIES AT THE ANNUAL COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TAMPA, JUNE 7, 1956, BY DAVID E. SMILEY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Mr. SMILEY. There is a rather ancient joke about the lady who was presented to a senator at a party and said: "Senator, I've heard a great deal about you."

Somewhat absently the Senator replied: "Possibly, but you can't prove it."

Over the years I have heard a great deal about Senator SPESSARD LINDSEY HOLLAND—and I am delighted to say that I've heard many things about him and I can prove them.

The proof of his far-ranging activities is recorded with distinction in many areas of endeavor but nowhere is it recorded with such conviction as in the halls of the United States Senate where he holds the esteem of Democrat and Republican alike.

Senator HOLLAND was born in Bartow, July 10, 1892.

His father, Benjamin, a Georgian and Confederate veteran, came to Florida in 1881; his mother, Fannie Virginia, came to Florida in 1888.

Now what can I prove about the Senator?

I can prove that he was the first president of the student body at the University of Florida where he received his legal training; I can prove that he was an honor student at Emory University.

I can cite a string of honorary scholastic honors he earned during his college years.

I can further prove that despite his success in the academic halls he was no stranger to the world of sports.

The Senator won letters in track, football, basketball, and baseball.

And I suspect that while he must enjoy tremendous personal satisfaction for the many solid contributions he has made to Florida and the Federal Government, he must still take a real secret pride in the fact that once he was offered a contract as a major league pitcher by Connie Mack.

What else can I prove?

The Senator qualified for a Rhodes scholarship but was prevented by the outbreak of World War I from accepting the appointment.

He volunteered for military service. The records will show a gallant period as a soldier in the artillery and as an airman. He asked for transfer to the Air Service and saw action as an observer.

The Senator was honorably discharged as a captain and a holder of the Distinguished Service Cross.

As you see, even by then the Senator has a worthy list of achievements to his credit—but those were only the beginning.

Frankly, in the time I have it is difficult to do justice to the multitude of matters I can prove about Senator Holland.

Upon resigning his commission he resumed the practice of law. In 1920 he was elected county judge and held that office for 8 years.

In 1932 he was elected to the State senate where he served for 8 years and concerned himself with progressive measures to improve the schools, helped raise teachers' pay, authored needed citrus legislation born of personal knowledge; supported old-age assistance bills, and other important legislation.

He was elected Governor in 1940. And though weighted with problems brought by the war, his administration was marked by many accomplishments which helped Florida grow and strengthened the basic structure of State government.

Just to mention a few major ones I cite the improvement of the property tax structure; the gasoline tax amendment; increased grants to the needy aged; creation of a nonpolitical fresh-water fish and game commission; firming up the financial condition of our school systems.

In 1946 he brought his great talents to the United States Senate where in a 10-year period the Senator has carved out a notable reputation both as a spokesman for the South and a man deeply concerned with problems vital to all of the Nation. Another distinction is the fact that he is the only native of Florida to serve in both high offices as Governor and Senator. I know he has given enormous service to his two standing committees, Agriculture, and Appropriations.

I know he is a champion of States rights and successfully led the passage of the tidelands bill. He is an active supporter of antisubversive legislation. His name is linked to many other significant congressional measures.

And with all these activities he still manages to concern himself with educational problems.

And here is something else I know about Senator HOLLAND: As I have enumerated, he has served his county, his State, and his Nation as a public servant for 36 years. And in all of these decades there has never been a breath of scandal about this distinguished Floridian.

That is not all I know about the Senator. I know he is a devoted family man who has managed time for his children; who has a charming wife. I know he likes to hunt and fish. And he believes in going regularly to church.

Yes, Dr. Nance, all these things I know and can prove about this man. And that is why it is my privilege and honor as chairman of the board of trustees, to present to you Senator SPESSARD LINDSEY HOLLAND, a unanimously approved candidate of our trustees for the honorary doctorate of humanities.

UNIVERSITY OF TAMPA,
Tampa, Fla.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TAMPA HONORARY DEGREE CITATION FOR DISTINGUISHED LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE TO OUR COUNTRY TO THE HONORABLE SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, DOCTOR OF HUMANITIES [1]

Senator SPESSARD LINDSEY HOLLAND, because of your distinguished services to our

[1] Presented by Dr. Ellwood C. Nance, president of the University of Tampa on the occasion of the conferring upon Senator HOLLAND the doctor of humanities degree at the 37th commencement ceremonies of the university, June 7, 1956, at which ceremony Senator HOLLAND was the commencement speaker.

country and our State as a teacher, scholar, officer in our Armed Forces, attorney at law, State senator and Governor of Florida, United States Senator, civic, fraternal, and religious leader, and because of your active interest and aggressive leadership in both public and private education, and in many civic, cultural, and veterans' organizations which are devoted to the welfare and security of our State and Nation, I, as president of the University of Tampa, with the enthusiastic and unanimous approval of the trustees of the university, bestow on you the honorary doctorate in the humanities, and with this degree all the rights and privileges appertaining thereto. We are honored to claim you as an honorary alumnus.

E. C. NANCE,
President.

NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce for him the following appointments to the National Memorial Stadium Commission authorized by Public Law 523, 78th Congress, as follows: The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are no other Senators who desire to speak, I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 27, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 26, 1956:

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AND EUROPEAN REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Frederick Blake Payne, of New York, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Regional Organizations.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

William B. Herlands, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art daily seeking to reveal Thy way and Thy will unto us, we pray that we may be delivered from all cold and callous tempers of mind and heart.

Grant that we may now feel the touch of Thy divine spirit, cleansing and transforming our human spirit into the likeness of the Son of God and leading all humanity in the path of truth and righteousness.

Help us to appreciate and understand more clearly that mankind is one family and that without striving for the common good, no race, no country, no individual can attain unto fullness of life and blessedness.

Show us how the nations of the earth may live and labor together in harmony and honor; and may our own beloved country have a great and glorious part in mobilizing those moral and spiritual forces which will banish forever the bitter hatreds, the cruel enmities, the antipathies, the suspicions, the prejudices, and the age-old rancors.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 256. Concurrent resolution correcting the enrollment of H. R. 6782.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution requesting the return of enrolled bill S. 3581 to the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2512. An act to amend the act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving in such forces.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6243) entitled "An act authorizing the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. DUFF to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 9052) entitled "An act to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. FREAR, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. BUSH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 9852) entitled "An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. FREAR, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. BUSH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY AND HIGHWAY REVENUE ACTS OF 1956

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses, and for other purposes; and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2436)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

TITLE I

The managers on the part of the House and the managers on the part of the Senate as to title I of the bill having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I—FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956

"SEC. 101. Short title for title I.

"This title may be cited as the 'Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956'.

"SEC. 102. Federal-aid highways.

"(a) (1) Authorization of appropriations: For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, $125,000,000 in addition to any sums heretofore authorized for such fiscal year; the sum of $850,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958; and the sum of $875,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. The sums herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

"(A) 45 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

"(B) 30 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

"(C) 25 per centum for projects on extensions of these systems within urban areas.

"(2) Apportionments: The sums authorized by this section shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838): *Provided*, That the additional amount herein authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, shall be apportioned immediately upon enactment of this Act.

"(b) Availability for expenditure: Any sums apportioned to any State under this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amounts so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums herein and heretofore apportioned to the State is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for construction, reconstruction, or improvement of specific projects as provided in this title and prior Acts: *Provided further*, That in the case of those sums heretofore, herein, or hereafter apportioned to any State for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of Commerce may, upon the request of any State, discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, specifications, estimates, surveys, contract awards, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects by his receiving and approving a certified statement by the State highway department setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the standards and procedures of such State applicable to projects in this category approved by him: *Provided further*, That such approval shall not be given unless such standards and procedures are in accordance with the objectives set forth in section 1 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950: *And provided further*, That nothing contained in the foregoing provisos shall be construed to relieve any State of its obligation now provided by law relative to maintenance, nor to relieve the Secretary of Commerce of his obligation with respect to the selection of the secondary system or the location of projects thereon, to make a final inspection after construction of each project, and to require an adequate showing of the estimated and actual cost of construction of each project. Any Federal-aid primary, secondary, or urban funds released by the payment of the final voucher or by modification of the formal project agreement shall be credited to the same class of funds, primary, secondary, or urban, previously apportioned to the State and be immediately available for expenditure.

"(c) Transfers of appointments: Not more than 20 per centum of the respective amounts apportioned to a State for any fiscal year from funds made available for expenditure under clause (A), clause (B), or clause (C) of subsection (a) (1) of this section, may be transferred to the apportionment made to such State under any other of such clauses, except that no such apportionment may be increased by more than 20 per centum by reason of transfers to it under this subsection: *Provided*, That such transfer is requested by the State highway department and is approved by the Governor of such State and the Secretary of Commerce as being in the public interest: *Provided further*, That the transfers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1958, and June 30, 1959, shall likewise be permitted on the same basis for funds which may be hereafter authorized to be appropriated for any subsequent fiscal year: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso to paragraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

"SEC. 103. Forest highways and forest development roads and trails.

"(a) Authorization of appropriations: For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act of 1921 (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959; and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of $27,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction: *Provided further*, That hereafter funds available for forest highways and forest development roads and trails shall also be available for adjacent vehicular parking areas and for sanitary, water, and fire control facilities: *And provided further*, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

"(b) Repeal of certain apportionment procedures: The provision of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act of 1921, as amended and supplemented, requiring apportionment of funds authorized for forest development roads and trails among the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico is hereby repealed.

"Sec. 104 Roads and Trails in National Parks, etc.

"(a) National parks, etc.: For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $16,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959.

"(b) Parkways: For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of parkways, authorized by Acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $16,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959.

"(c) Indian reservations and lands: For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

"SEC. 105. Public lands highways.

"For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations the additional sum of $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and the sum of $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959.

"SEC. 106. Special provisions for Federal domain roads, etc.

"Any funds authorized herein for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, Indian roads, and public lands highways shall be available for contract upon apportionment, or a date not earlier than one year preceding the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized if no apportionment is required: *Provided*, That any amount remaining unexpended two years after the close of the fiscal year for which authorized shall lapse. The Secretary of the department charged with the administration of such funds is hereby granted authority to incur obligations, approve projects, and enter into contracts under such authorizations, and his action in doing so shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof, and such funds shall be deemed to have been expended when so obligated. Any funds heretofore, herein, or hereafter authorized for any fiscal year for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, Indian roads, and public lands highways shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums authorized for such fiscal year and previous fiscal years since and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, shall have been obligated. Any of such funds released by payment of final voucher or modification of project authorizations shall be credited to the balance of unobligated authorizations and be immediately available for expenditure.

"Sec. 107. Highways for Alaska.

"(a) Apportionment; matching; selection of systems: The Territory of Alaska shall be entitled to share in funds herein or hereafter authorized for expenditure for projects on the Federal-aid primary and secondary highway systems, and extensions thereof within urban areas, under the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, upon the same terms and conditions as the several States and Hawaii and Puerto Rico, and the Territory of Alaska shall be included in the calculations to determine the basis of apportionment of such funds, except that one-third only of the area of Alaska shall be used in the calculations to determine the area factor in the apportionment of such funds: *Provided*, That the Territory of Alaska shall contribute funds each fiscal year in an amount that shall be not less than 10 per centum of the Federal funds apportioned to it for such fiscal year, such contribution to be deposited in a special account in the Federal Treasury for use in conjunction with the Federal funds apportioned to the Territory. The system or systems of roads on which Federal-aid apportionments to the Territory of Alaska are to be expended shall be determined and agreed upon by the Governor of Alaska, the Territorial Highway Engineer of Alaska, and the Secretary of Commerce, without regard to the limitations contained in section 6 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 212), as amended and supplemented. The Federal funds apportioned to the Territory of Alaska and the funds contributed by such Territory in accordance herewith may be expended by the Secretary of Commerce either directly or in cooperation with the Territorial Board of Road Commissioners of Alaska, and may

be so expended separately or in combination and without regard to the matching provisions of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 212); and both such funds may be expended for the maintenance of roads within the system or systems of roads agreed upon under the same terms and conditions as for the construction of such roads.

"(b) Transfer of functions: Effective not more than ninety days after the approval of this Act, the functions, duties, and authority pertaining to the construction, repair, and maintenance of roads, tramways, ferries, bridges, trails, and other works in Alaska, conferred upon the Department of the Interior and heretofore administered by the Secretary of the Interior under the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 446; 48 U. S. C., sec. 321a and following), are hereby transferred to the Department of Commerce, and thereafter shall be administered by the Secretary of Commerce, or under his direction, by such officer, or officers, as may be designated by him.

"(c) Transfer of personnel, etc.: There are hereby transferred to the Department of Commerce, to be employed and expended in connection with the functions, duties, and authority transferred to said Department by subsection (b) hereof, all personnel employed in connection with any such functions, duties, or authority, and the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds now available, or that hereafter may be made available, for use in connection with such functions, duties, or authority; and the Department of the Interior is directed to turn over to the Secretary of Commerce all equipment, materials, supplies, papers, maps, and documents, or other property (real or personal, and including office equipment and records) used or held in connection with such functions, duties, and authority.

"(d) Effectuation of transfer: The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce shall take such steps as may be necessary or appropriate to effect the transfer from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Commerce of the functions, duties, and authority, and the funds and property, as herein provided for.

"(e) Distribution of functions: The Secretary of Commerce shall have power, by order or regulations, to distribute the functions, duties, and authority hereby transferred, and appropriations pertaining thereto, as he may deem proper to accomplish the economical and effective organization and administration thereof.

"SEC. 108. National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

"(a) Interstate System: It is hereby declared to be essential to the national interest to provide for the early completion of the 'National System of Interstate Highways', as authorized and designated in accordance with section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838). It is the intent of the Congress that the Interstate System be completed as nearly as practicable over a thirteen-year period and that the entire System in all the States be brought to simultaneous completion. Because of its primary importance to the national defense, the name of such system is hereby changed to the 'National System of Interstate and Defense Highways'. Such National System of Interstate and Defense Highways is hereinafter in this Act referred to as the 'Interstate System'.

"(b) Authorization of appropriations: For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, or improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the Interstate System, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, which sum shall be in addition to the authorization heretofore made for that year, the additional sum of $1,700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the additional sum of $2,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the additional sum of $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the additional sum of $1,025,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

"(c) Apportionments for 1957, 1958, and 1959: The additional sums herein authorized for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, June 30, 1958, and June 30, 1959, shall be apportioned among the several States in the following manner: one-half in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 per centum of the money so apportioned; and one-half in the manner now provided by law for the apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system. The additional sum herein authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, shall be apportioned immediately upon enactment of this Act. The additional sums herein authorized for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1958, and June 30, 1959, shall be apportioned on a date not less than six months and not more than twelve months in advance of the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized.

"(d) Apportionments for subsequent years based upon revised estimates of cost: All sums authorized by this section to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1960 through 1969, inclusive, shall be apportioned among the several States in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in each State, as determined and approved in the manner provided in this subsection, bears to the sum of the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in all of the States. Each apportionment herein authorized for the fiscal years 1960 through 1969, inclusive, shall be made on a date as far in advance of the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized as practicable but in no case more than eighteen months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized. As soon as the standards provided for in subsection (1) have been adopted, the Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the State highway departments, shall make a detailed estimate of the cost of completing the Interstate System as then designated, after taking into account all previous apportionments made under this section, based upon such standards and in accordance with rules and regulations adopted by him and applied uniformly to all of the States. The Secretary of Commerce shall transmit such estimate to the Senate and the House of Representatives within ten days subsequent to January 2, 1958. Upon approval of such estimate by the Congress by concurrent resolution, the Secretary of Commerce shall use such approved estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, June 30, 1961, and June 30, 1962. The Secretary of Commerce shall make a revised estimate of the cost of completing the then designated Interstate System, after taking into account all previous apportionments made under this section, in the same manner as stated above, and transmit the same to the Senate and the House of Representatives within ten days subsequent to January 2, 1962. Upon approval of such estimate by the Congress by concurrent resolution, the Secretary of Commerce shall use such approved estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1963, June 30, 1964, June 30, 1965, and June 30, 1966. The Secretary of Commerce shall make a revised estimate of the cost of completing the then designated Interstate System, after taking into account all previous apportionments made under this section, in the same manner as stated above, and transmit the same to the Senate and the House of Representatives within ten days subsequent to January 2, 1966, and annually thereafter through and including January 2, 1968. Upon approval of any such estimate by the Congress by concurrent resolution, the Secretary of Commerce shall use such approved estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal year which begins next following the fiscal year in which such report is transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives. Whenever the Secretary of Commerce, pursuant to this subsection, requests and receives estimates of cost from the State highway departments, he shall furnish copies of such estimates at the same time to the Senate and the House of Representatives.

"(e) Federal share: The Federal share payable on account of any project on the Interstate System provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be increased to 90 per centum of the total cost thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 10 per centum of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 per centum of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area: *Provided*, That such Federal share payable on any project in any State shall not exceed 95 per centum of the total cost of such project.

"(f) Availability for expenditure: Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to be expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State specifically for the Interstate System for such fiscal year and previous fiscal years is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of specific projects under this section.

"(g) Lapse of amounts apportioned: Any amount apportioned to the States under the provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of subsection (f) of this section shall lapse, and shall immediately be reapportioned among the other States in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of this section: *Provided*, That any Interstate System funds released by the payment of the final voucher or by the modification of the formal project agreement shall be credited to the Interstate System funds previously apportioned to the State and be immediately available for expenditure.

"(h) Construction by States in advance of apportionment: In any case in which a State has obligated all funds apportioned to it under this section and proceeds, subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act, to construct (without the aid of Federal funds) any project (including one or more parts of any project) on the Interstate System, as designated at that time, in accordance with all procedures and all requirements applicable to projects financed under the provisions of

this section (except insofar as such procedures and requirements limit a State to the construction of projects with the aid of Federal funds previously apportioned to it), the Secretary of Commerce, upon application by such State and his approval of such application, is authorized, whenever additional funds are apportioned to such State under this section, to pay to such State from such funds the Federal share of the costs of construction of such project: *Provided*, That prior to construction of any such project, the plans and specifications therefor shall have been approved by the Secretary of Commerce in the same manner as other projects on the Interstate System: *Provided further*, That any such project shall conform to the standards adopted under subsection (i). In determining the apportionment for any fiscal year under the provisions of subsection (d) of this section, any such project constructed by a State without the aid of Federal funds shall not be considered completed until an application under the provisions of this subsection with respect to such project has been approved by the Secretary of Commerce.

"(i) Standards: The geometric and construction standards to be adopted for the Interstate System shall be those approved by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with the State highway departments. Such standards shall be adequate to accommodate the types and volumes of traffic forecast for the year 1975. The right-of-way width of the Interstate System shall be adequate to permit construction of projects on the Interstate System up to such standards. The Secretary of Commerce shall apply such standards uniformly throughout the States. Such standards shall be adopted by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with the State highway departments as soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act.

"(j) Maximum weight and width limitation: No funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year by this section shall be apportioned to any State within the boundaries of which the Interstate System may lawfully be used by vehicles with weight in excess of eighteen thousand pounds carried on any one axle, or with a tandem-axle weight in excess of thirty-two thousand pounds, or with an overall gross weight in excess of 73,280 pounds, or with a width in excess of 96 inches, or the corresponding maximum weights or maximum widths permitted for vehicles using the public highways of such State under laws or regulations established by appropriate State authority in effect on July 1, 1956, whichever is the greater. Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State pursuant to the foregoing provisions shall lapse: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein shall be construed to deny apportionment to any State allowing the operation within such State of any vehicles or combinations thereof that could be lawfully operated within such State on July 1, 1956.

"(k) Tests to determine maximum desirable dimensions and weights: The Secretary of Commerce is directed to take all action possible to expedite the conduct of a series of tests now planned or being conducted by the Highway Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences, in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads, the several States, and other persons and organizations, for the purpose of determining the maximum desirable dimensions and weights for vehicles operated on the Federal-aid highway systems, including the Interstate System, and, after the conclusion of such tests, but not later than March 1, 1959, to make recommendations to the Congress with respect to such maximum desirable dimensions and weights.

"(l) Increase in mileage: Section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), relating to the Interstate System, is hereby amended by striking out 'forty thousand', and inserting in lieu thereof 'forty-one thousand': *Provided*, That the cost of completing any mileage designated from the one thousand additional miles authorized by this subsection shall be excluded in making the estimates of cost for completing the Interstate System as provided in subsection (b) of this section.

"SEC. 109. Acquisition of rights-of-way for Interstate System.

"(a) Federal acquisition for States: In any case in which the Secretary of Commerce is requested by any State to acquire any lands or interests in lands (including within the term 'interests in lands', the control of access thereto from adjoining lands) required by such State for right-of-way or other purposes in connection with the prosecution of any project for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any section of the Interstate System, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized, in the name of the United States and prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General, to acquire, enter upon, and take possession of such lands or interests in lands by purchase, donation, condemnation, or otherwise in accordance with the laws of the United States (including the Act of February 26, 1931, 46 Stat. 1421), if—

"(1) the Secretary of Commerce has determined either that such State is unable to acquire necessary lands or interests in lands, or is unable to acquire such lands or interests in lands with sufficient promptness; and

"(2) such State has agreed with the Secretary of Commerce to pay, at such time as may be specified by the Secretary of Commerce, an amount equal to 10 per centum of the costs incurred by the Secretary of Commerce, in acquiring such lands or interests in lands, or such lesser percentage which represents the State's pro rata share of project costs as determined in accordance with section 108 (e) of this title.

"The authority granted by this section shall also apply to lands and interests in lands received as grants of land from the United States and owned or held by railroads or other corporations.

"(b) Costs of acquisition: The costs incurred by the Secretary of Commerce in acquiring any such lands or interests in lands may include the cost of examination and abstract of title, certificate of title, advertising, and any fees incidental to such acquisition. All costs incurred by the Secretary of Commerce in connection with the acquisition of any such lands or interests in lands shall be paid from the funds for construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the Interstate System apportioned to the State upon the request of which such lands or interests in lands are acquired, and any sums paid to the Secretary of Commerce by such State as its share of the costs of acquisition of such lands or interests in lands shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation for Federal-aid highways and shall be credited to the amount apportioned to such State as its apportionment of funds for construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the Interstate System, or shall be deducted from other moneys due the State for reimbursement under section 108 of this title.

"(c) Conveyance of acquired lands to the States: The Secretary of Commerce is further authorized and directed by proper deed, executed in the name of the United States, to convey any such lands or interests in lands acquired in any State under the provisions of this section, except the outside five feet of any such right-of-way in any State which does not provide control of access, to the State highway department of such State or such political subdivisions thereof as its laws may provide, upon such terms and conditions as to such lands or interests in lands as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Commerce and the State highway department or political subdivisions to which the conveyance is to be made. Whenever the State makes provision for control of access satisfactory to the Secretary of Commerce, the outside five feet then shall be conveyed to the State by the Secretary of Commerce, as herein provided.

"(d) Rights-of-way over public lands: Whenever rights-of-way, including control of access, on the Interstate System are required over public lands or reservations of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce may make such arrangements with the agency having jurisdiction over such lands as may be necessary to give the State or other person constructing the projects on such lands adequate rights-of-way and control of access thereto from adjoining lands, and any such agency is hereby directed to cooperate with the Secretary of Commerce in this connection.

"SEC. 110. Availability of funds to acquire rights-of-way and to make advances to the States.

"(a) Advance right-of-way acquisitions: For the purpose of facilitating the acquisition of rights-of-way on any of the Federal-aid highway system, including the Interstate System, in the most expeditious and economical manner, and recognizing that the acquisition of rights-of-way requires lengthy planning and negotiations if it is to be done at a reasonable cost, the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized, upon request of a State highway department, to make available to such State for acquisition of rights-of-way, in anticipation of construction and under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Commerce may prescribe, the funds apportioned to such State for expenditure on any of the Federal-aid highway system, including the Interstate System: *Provided*, That the agreement between the Secretary of Commerce and the State highway department for the reimbursement of the cost of such rights-of-way shall provide for the actual construction of a road on such rights-of-way within a period not exceeding five years following the fiscal year in which such request is made: *Provided further*, That Federal participation in the cost of rights-of-way so acquired shall not exceed the Federal pro rata share applicable to the class of funds from which Federal reimbursement is made.

"(b) Advances to States: Section 6 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 6. If the Secretary of Commerce shall determine that it is necessary for the expeditious completion of projects on any of the Federal-aid highway systems, including the Interstate System, he may advance to any State out of any existing appropriations the Federal share of the cost of construction thereof to enable the State highway department to make prompt payments for acquisition of rights-of-way, and for construction as it progresses. The sums so advanced shall be deposited in a special revolving trust fund, by the State official authorized under the laws of the State to receive Federal-aid highway funds, to be disbursed solely upon vouchers approved by the State highway department for rights-of-way which have been or are being acquired, and for construction which has been actually performed and approved by the Secretary of Commerce. Upon determination by the Secretary of Commerce that any part of the funds advanced to any State under the provisions of this section are no longer required, the amount of the advance which is determined to be in excess of current requirements of the State shall be repaid upon his demand, and such repayments shall be returned to the credit of the appropriation from which the funds were advanced. Any sums advanced and not repaid on demand shall be deducted from sums due the State for the Federal pro rata share of the cost of construction of Federal-aid projects.'

"SEC. 111. Relocation of utility facilities.

"(a) Availability of Federal funds for reimbursement to States: Subject to the conditions contained in this section, whenever a State shall pay for the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of a project on the Federal-aid primary or secondary systems or on the Interstate System, including extensions thereof within urban areas, Federal funds may be used to reimburse the State for such cost in the same proportion as Federal funds are expended on the project: *Provided*, That Federal funds shall not be apportioned to the States under this section when the payment to the utility violates the law of the State or violates a legal contract between the utility and the State.

"(b) Utility defined: For the purposes of this section, the term 'utility' shall include publicly, privately, and cooperatively owned utilities.

"(c) Cost of relocation defined: For the purposes of this section, the term 'cost of relocation' shall include the entire amount paid by such utility properly attributable to such relocation after deducting therefrom any increase in the value of the new facility and any salvage value derived from the old facility.

"SEC. 112. Agreements relating to use of and access to rights-of-way.

"All agreements between the Secretary of Commerce and the State highway department for the construction of projects on the Interstate System shall contain a clause providing that the State will not add any points of access to, or exit from, the project in addition to those approved by the Secretary in the plans for such project, without the prior approval of the Secretary. Such agreements shall also contain a clause providing that the State will not permit automotive service stations or other commercial establishments for serving motor vehicle users to be constructed or located on the rights-of-way of the Interstate System. Such agreements may, however, authorize a State or political subdivision thereof to use the air space above and below the established grade line of the highway pavement for the parking of motor vehicles provided such use does not interfere in any way with the free flow of traffic on the Interstate System.

"SEC. 113. Toll roads, bridges, and tunnels.

"(a) Approval as part of Interstate System: Upon a finding by the Secretary of Commerce that such action will promote the development of an integrated Interstate System, the Secretary is authorized to approve as part of the Interstate System any toll road, bridge, or tunnel, now or hereafter constructed which meets the standards adopted for the improvement of projects located on the Interstate System, whenever such toll road, bridge, or tunnel is located on a route heretofore or hereafter designated as a part of the Interstate System: *Provided*, That no Federal-aid highway funds shall be expended for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any such toll road except to the extent hereafter permitted by law: *Provided further*, That no Federal-aid highway funds shall be expended for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any such toll bridge or tunnel except to the extent now or hereafter permitted by law.

"(b) Approaches having other use: The funds authorized under this title, or under prior acts, shall be available for expenditure on projects approaching any toll road, bridge, or tunnel to a point where such project will have some use irrespective of its use for such toll road, bridge, or tunnel.

"(c) Approaches having no other use: The funds authorized under section 108 (b) of this title, or under prior Acts, shall be available for expenditure on Interstate System projects approaching any toll road on the Interstate System, even though the project has no use other than as an approach to such toll road: *Provided*, That agreement satisfactory to the Secretary of Commerce has been reached with the State prior to approval of any such project (1) that the section of toll road will become free to the public upon the collection of tolls sufficient to liquidate the cost of the toll road or any bonds outstanding at the time constituting a valid lien against said section of toll road covered in the agreement and their maintenance and operation and debt service during the period of toll collections, and (2) that there is one or more reasonably satisfactory alternate free routes available to traffic by which the toll section of the System may be bypassed.

"(d) Effect on certain prior acts: Nothing in this title shall be deemed to repeal the Act approved March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1398), or subsection (g) of section 204 of the National Industrial Recovery Act (48 Stat. 200), and such Acts are hereby amended to include tunnels as well as bridges.

"SEC. 114. Determination of policy with respect to reimbursement for certain highways.

"It is hereby declared to be the intent and policy of the Congress to determine whether or not the Federal Government should equitably reimburse any State for a portion of a highway which is on the Interstate System, whether toll or free, the construction of which has been completed subsequent to August 2, 1947, or which is either in actual use or under construction by contract, for completion, awarded not later than June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That such highway meets the standards required by this title for the Interstate System. The time, method, and amounts of such reimbursement, if any, shall be determined by the Congress following a study which the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to conduct, in cooperation with the State highway departments, and other agencies as may be required, to determine which highways in the Interstate System measure up to the standards required by this title, including all related factors of cost, depreciation, participation of Federal funds, and any other items relevant thereto. A complete report of the results of such study shall be submitted to the Congress within ten days subsequent to January 2, 1958.

"SEC. 115. Prevailing rate of wage.

"(a) Application of Davis-Bacon Act: The Secretary of Commerce shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on the initial construction work performed on highway projects on the Interstate System authorized under section 108 of this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Act of August 30, 1935, known as the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U. S. C., sec. 276–a).

"(b) Consultation with State highway departments; predetermination of rates: In carrying out the duties of the foregoing subsection, the Secretary of Labor shall consult with the highway department of the State in which a project on the Interstate System is to be performed. After giving due regard to the information thus obtained, he shall make a predetermination of the minimum wages to be paid laborers and mechanics in accordance with the provisions of the foregoing subsection which shall be set out in each project advertisement for bids and in each bid proposal form and shall be made a part of the contract covering the project.

"SEC. 116. Declarations of policy with respect to Federal-aid highway program.

"(a) Acceleration of program: It is hereby declared to be in the national interest to accelerate the construction of the Federal-aid highway systems, including the Interstate System, since many of such highways, or portions thereof, are in fact inadequate to meet the needs of local and interstate commerce, the national and the civil defense.

"(b) Completion of Interstate System; progress report on Federal-aid highway program: It is further declared that one of the most important objectives of this Act is the prompt completion of the Interstate System. Insofar as possible in consonance with this objective, existing highways located on an interstate route shall be used to the extent that such use is practicable, suitable, and feasible, it being the intent that local needs, to the extent practicable, suitable, and feasible, shall be given equal consideration with the needs of interstate commerce. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby directed to submit to the Congress not later than February 1, 1959, a report on the progress made in attaining the objectives set forth in this subsection and in subsection (a), together with recommendations.

"(c) Public hearings: Any State highway department which submits plans for a Federal-aid highway project involving the bypassing of, or going through, any city, town, or village, either incorporated or unincorporated, shall certify to the Commissioner of Public Roads that it has had public hearings, or has afforded the opportunity for such hearings, and has considered the economic effects of such a location: *Provided*, That, if such hearings have been held, a copy of the transcript of said hearings shall be submitted to the Commissioner of Public Roads, together with the certification.

"(d) Participation by small business enterprises: It is hereby declared to be in the national interest to encourage and develop the actual and potential capacity of small business and to utilize this important segment of our economy to the fullest practicable extent in construction of the Federal-aid highway systems, including the Interstate System. In order to carry out that intent and encourage full and free competition, the Secretary of Commerce should assist, insofar as feasible, small business enterprises in obtaining contracts in connection with the prosecution of the highway program.

"SEC. 117. Highway safety study.

"The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of determining what action can be taken by the Federal Government to promote the public welfare by increasing highway safety in the United States. In making such investigation and study the Secretary of Commerce shall give consideration to—

"(1) the need for Federal assistance to State and local governments in the enforcement of necessary highway safety and speed requirements and the forms such assistance should take;

"(2) the advisability and practicability of uniform State and local highway safety and speed laws and what steps should be taken by the Federal Government to promote the adoption of such uniform laws;

"(3) possible means of promoting highway safety in the manufacture of the various types of vehicles used on the highways;

"(4) educational programs to promote highway safety;

"(5) the design and physical characteristics of highways; and

"(6) such other matters as it may deem advisable and appropriate.

"The Secretary of Commerce shall report his findings, together with such recommendations as he may deem advisable, to the Congress not later than March 1, 1959. The Secretary of Commerce shall conduct such study and investigation under the general authority contained in section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954; except that the amount expended for the purposes of this section shall not exceed $200,000.

"SEC. 118. Emergency fund.

"Section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 158) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized an emergency fund in the amount of $30,000,000 for expenditure by the Secretary of Commerce, in accordance with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, after receipt of an application therefor from the highway department of any State, in the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges on the Federal-aid highway systems, including the Interstate System, which he shall find have suffered serious damage as the result of disaster over a wide area, such as by floods, hurricanes, tidal waves, earthquakes, severe storms, landslides, or other catastrophes in any part of the United States. The appropriation of such moneys as may be necessary for the establishment of the fund in accordance with the provisions of this section and for its replenishment on an annual basis is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That pending the appropriation of such sum, or its replenishment, the Secretary of Commerce may expend, from existing Federal-aid highway appropriations, such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made: *Provided further*, That no expenditures shall be made hereunder with respect to any such catastrophe in any State unless an emergency has been declared by the Governor of such State and concurred in by the Secretary of Commerce: *Provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any repair or reconstruction project provided for by funds made available under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost thereof: *And provided further*, That the funds herein authorized shall be available for use on any projects programed and approved at any time during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and thereafter, which meet the provisions of this section, including projects which may have been previously approved during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, from any other category of funds under the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented.'

"SEC. 119. Definition of construction.

"The definition of the term 'construction' in section 1 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 is hereby amended by inserting after 'mapping' the following: '(including the establishment of temporary and permanent geodetic markers in accordance with specifications of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in the Department of Commerce)'.

"SEC. 120. Archeological and paleontological salvage.

"Funds authorized by this title to be appropriated, to the extent approved as necessary by the highway department of any State, may be used for archeological and paleontological salvage in that State in compliance with the Act entitled 'An Act for the preservation of American antiquities', approved June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225), and State laws where applicable.

"SEC. 121. Mapping.

"In carrying out the provisions of this title the Secretary of Commerce may, wherever practicable, authorize the use of photogrammetric methods in mapping, and the utilization of commercial enterprise for such services.

"SEC. 122. Relationship of this title to other acts; effective date.

"All provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, together with all Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, not inconsistent with this title, shall remain in full force and effect and be applicable hereto. All Acts or parts of Acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed. This title shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
GEORGE H. FALLON,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
GEORGE A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
ROBERT S. KERR,
ALBERT GORE,
PAT MCNAMARA,
EDWARD MARTIN,
FRANCIS CASE,
PRESCOTT BUSH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

TITLE II

The managers on the part of the House and the managers on the part of the Senate as to title II of the bill having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 8, 17, and 23.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 24, and 25 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: ", and by adding after paragraph (2) the following:

"'In the case of a liquid taxable under this subsection sold for use or used as a fuel in a diesel-powered highway vehicle (A) which (at the time of such sale or use) is not registered, and is not required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or (B) which, in the case of a diesel-powered highway vehicle owned by the United States, is not used on the highway, the tax imposed by paragraph (1) or by paragraph (2) shall be 2 cents a gallon in lieu of 3 cents a gallon. If a liquid on which tax was imposed by paragraph (1) at the rate of 2 cents a gallon by reason of the preceding sentence is used as a fuel in a diesel-powered highway vehicle (A) which (at the time of such use) is registered, or is required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or (B) which, in the case of a diesel-powered highway vehicle owned by the United States, is used on the highway, a tax of 1 cent a gallon shall be imposed under paragraph (2)'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "'In the case of a liquid taxable under this subsection sold for use or used otherwise than as a fuel for the propulsion of a highway vehicle (A) which (at the time of such sale or use) is registered, or is required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or (B) which, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, is used on the highway, the tax imposed by paragraph (1) or by paragraph (2) shall be 2 cents a gallon in lieu of 3 cents a gallon. If a liquid on which tax was imposed by paragraph (1) at the rate of 2 cents a gallon by reason of the preceding sentence is used as a fuel for the propulsion of a highway vehicle (A) which (at the time of such use) is registered, or is required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or (B) which, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, is used on the highway, a tax of 1 cent a gallon shall be imposed under paragraph (2)'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 29, line 13, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "Department or agency" and in lieu thereof insert "agency or instrumentality"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and on page 41, line 2, of the House engrossed bill strike out "6416 (b) (2) (L) (i)" and in lieu thereof insert "6421 (b) (2)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(J) In the case of a liquid in respect of which tax was paid under section 4041 (a) (1) at the rate of 3 cents a gallon, used or resold for use as a fuel in a diesel-powered highway vehicle (i) which (at the time of such use or resale) is not registered, and is not required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or (ii) which, in the case of a diesel-powered highway vehicle owned by the United States, is not used on the highway; except that the amount of any overpayment by reason of this subparagraph shall not exceed an amount computed at the rate of 1 cent a gallon;

"(K) In the case of a liquid in respect of which tax was paid under section 4041 (b) (1) at the rate of 3 cents a gallon, used or resold for use otherwise than as a fuel for the propulsion of a highway vehicle (i) which (at the time of such use or resale) is registered, or is required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or (ii) which, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, is used on the highway; except that the amount of any overpayment by reason of this subparagraph shall not exceed an amount computed at the rate of 1 cent a gallon";

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"'(L) In the case of a liquid in respect of which tax was paid under section 4041 at the rate of 3 cents a gallon, used during any calendar quarter in vehicles while engaged in furnishing scheduled common carrier public passenger land transportation service along regular routes; except that (i) this subparagraph shall apply only if the 60 percent passenger fare revenue test set forth in section 6421 (b) (2) is met with respect to such quarter, and (ii) the amount of such overpayment for such quarter shall be an amount determined by multiplying 1 cent for each gallon of liquid so used by the percentage which such person's tax-exempt passenger fare revenue (as defined in section 6421 (d) (2)) derived from such scheduled service during such quarter was of his total passenger fare revenue (not including the tax

imposed by section 4261, relating to the tax on transportation of persons) derived from such scheduled service during such quarter";

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(c) Payments to ultimate purchasers: Subchapter B of chapter 65 (relating to rules of special application for abatements, credits, and refunds) is amended by renumbering section 6421 as 6422 and by inserting after section 6420 the following new section:

"'SEC. 6421. Gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes or by local transit systems.

"'(a) Nonhighway uses: If gasoline is used otherwise than as a fuel in a highway vehicle (1) which (at the time of such use) is registered, or is required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or (2) which, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, is used on the highway, the Secretary or his delegate shall pay (without interest) to the ultimate purchaser of such gasoline an amount equal to 1 cent for each gallon of gasoline so used.

"'(b) Local transit systems:

"'(1) Allowance: If gasoline is used during any calendar quarter in vehicles while engaged in furnishing scheduled common carrier public passenger land transportation service along regular routes, the Secretary or his delegate shall, subject to the provisions of paragraph (2), pay (without interest) to the ultimate purchaser of such gasoline the amount determined by multiplying—

"'(A) 1 cent for each gallon of gasoline so used, by

"'(B) the percentage which the ultimate purchaser's tax-exempt passenger fare revenue derived from such scheduled service during such quarter was of his total passenger fare revenue (not including the tax imposed by section 4261, relating to the tax on transportation of persons) derived from such scheduled service during such quarter.

"'(2) Limitation: Paragraph (1) shall apply in respect of gasoline used during any calendar quarter only if at least 60 percent of the total passenger fare revenue (not including the tax imposed by section 4261, relating to the tax on transportation of persons) derived during such quarter from scheduled service described in paragraph (1) by the person filing the claim was attributable to tax-exempt passenger fare revenue derived during such quarter by such person from such scheduled service.

"'(c) Time for filing claim; period covered: Not more than one claim may be filed under subsection (a), and not more than one claim may be filed under subsection (b), by any person with respect to gasoline used during the 1-year period ending on June 30 of any year. No claim shall be allowed under this section with respect to any 1-year period unless filed on or before September 30 of the year in which such 1-year period ends.

"'(d) Definitions: For purposes of this section:

"'(1) Gasoline: The term "gasoline" has the meaning given to such term by section 4082 (b).

"'(2) Tax-exempt passenger fare revenue: The term "tax-exempt passenger fair revenue" means revenue attributable to fares which were exempt from the tax imposed by section 4261 by reason of section 4262 (b) (relating to the exemption for commutation travel, etc.).

"'(e) Exempt sales; other payments or refunds available:

"'(1) Exempt sales: No amount shall be paid under this section with respect to any gasoline which the Secretary or his delegate determines was exempt from the tax imposed by section 4081. The amount which (but for this sentence) would be payable under this section with respect to any gasoline shall be reduced by any other amount which the Secretary or his delegate determines is payable under this section, or is refundable under any provision of this title, to any person with respect to such gasoline.

"'(2) Gasoline used on farms: This section shall not apply in respect of gasoline which was (within the meaning of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 6420 (c)) used on a farm for farming purposes.

"'(f) Applicable laws:

"'(1) In general: All provisions of law, including penalties, applicable in respect of the tax imposed by section 4081 shall, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with this section, apply in respect of the payments provided for in this section to the same extent as if such payments constituted refunds of overpayments of the tax so imposed.

"'(2) Examination of books and witnesses: For the purpose of ascertaining the correctness of any claim made under this section, or the correctness of any payment made in respect of any such claim, the Secretary or his delegate shall have the authority granted by paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 7602 (relating to examination of books and witnesses) as if the claimant were the person liable for tax.

"'(g) Regulations: The Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe the conditions, not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, under which payments may be made under this section.

"'(h) Effective date: This section shall apply only with respect to gasoline purchased after June 30, 1956, and before July 1, 1972.

"'(i) Cross references:

"'(1) For reduced rate of tax in case of diesel fuel and special motor fuels used for certain nonhighway purposes, see subsections (a) and (b) of section 4041.

"'(2) For partial refund of tax in case of diesel fuel and special motor fuels used for certain nonhighway purposes, see section 6416 (b) (2) (J) and (K).

"'(3) For partial refund of tax in case of diesel fuel and special motor fuels used by local transit systems, see section 6416 (b) (2) (L).

"'(4) For civil penalty for excessive claims under this section, see section 6675.

"'(5) For fraud penalties, etc., see chapter 75 (section 7201 and following, relating to crimes, other offenses, and forfeitures).'

"(d) Technical amendments:

"(1) Section 6206 (relating to special rules applicable to excessive claims) is amended—

"(A) by striking out 'Section 6420' in the heading and inserting in lieu thereof 'Sections 6420 and 6421';

"(B) by inserting after '6420' in the first sentence thereof 'or 6421'; and

"(C) by inserting after '6420' in the second sentence thereof 'or 6421, as the case may be'.

"(2) Section 6675 (relating to excessive claims for gasoline used on farms) is amended—

"(A) by striking out 'For gasoline used on farms' in the heading and inserting in lieu thereof 'With respect to the use of certain gasoline';

"(B) by inserting after '6420 (relating to gasoline used on farms)' in subsection (a) thereof 'or 6421 (relating to gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes or by local transit systems)'; and

"(C) by inserting after '6420' in subsection (b) thereof 'or 6421, as the case may be,'.

"(3) Section 7210 (relating to failure to obey summons) is amended by inserting after 'sections 6420 (e) (2),' the following: '6421 (f) (2),'.

"(4) Section 7603 (relating to service of summons) and 7604 (relating to enforcement of summons) and the first sentence of section 7605 (relating to time and place of examination) are each amended by inserting after 'section 6420 (e) (2)' wherever it appears a comma and the following: '6421 (f) (2),'. The second sentence of section 7605 is amended by inserting after 'section 6420 (e) (2)' the following: 'or 6421 (f) (2)'.

"(e) Clerical amendments:

"(1) Section 4084 is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 4084. Cross references.

"'(1) For provisions to relieve farmers from excise tax in the case of gasoline used on the farm for farming purposes, see section 6420.

"'(2) For provisions to relieve purchasers of gasoline from excise tax in the case of gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes or by local transit systems, see section 6421.'

"(2) The table of sections for subpart A of part III of subchapter A of chapter 32 is amended by striking out

"'Sec. 4084. Relief of farmers from tax in case of gasoline used on the farm.'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'Sec. 4084. Cross references.'

"(3) The table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 63 is amended by striking out

"'Sec. 6206. Special rules applicable to excessive claims under section 6420.'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'Sec. 6206. Special rules applicable to excessive claims under sections 6420 and 6421.'

"(4) The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 65 is amended by striking out

"'Sec. 6421. Cross references.'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'Sec. 6421. Gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes or by local transit systems.'

"'Sec. 6422. Cross references.'

"(5) Section 6504 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(14) Assessments to recover excessive amounts paid under section 6421 (relating to gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes or by local transit systems) and assessments of civil penalties under section 6675 for excessive claims under section 6421, see section 6206.'

"(6) Section 6511 (f) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(6) For limitations in case of payments under section 6421 (relating to gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes or by local transit systems), see section 6421 (c).'

"(7) Section 6612 (c) is amended by striking out 'and' before '6420' and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', and 6421 (relating to payments in the case of gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes or by local transit systems)'.

"(8) The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 68 is amended by striking out

"'Sec. 6675. Excessive claims for gasoline used on farms.'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'SEC. 6675. Excessive claims with respect to the use of certain gasoline.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "and for certain other purposes"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 39, line 2, of the Senate engrossed

amendments strike out "purposes)" and in lieu thereof insert "purposes or by local transit systems)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 39, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "National System of Interstate Highways" and in lieu thereof insert "Interstate System".

On page 40, line 1, lines 5 and 6, line 9, and lines 19 and 20, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "National System of Interstate Highways" each place it appears and in lieu thereof insert "Interstate System".

On page 41, lines 1 and 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "National System of Interstate Highways" and in lieu thereof insert "Interstate System".

And the Senate agree to the same.

JERE COOPER,
W. D. MILLS,
HALE BOGGS,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
ROBT. S. KERR,
E. D. MILLIKIN,
EDWARD MARTIN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

TITLE I

The managers on the part of the House as to title I of the bill submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees as to title I of the bill and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment, relating to the authorization for the Federal-aid highway program, contained a substitute for the provisions of title I of the bill as it passed the House. The House recedes and agrees to the Senate amendment No. 1 with an amendment containing a substitute for both the language of title I as it passed the House and the language of title I as it passed the Senate. Except for technical, clerical, and conforming changes, the provisions of title I, as proposed under the accompanying conference report, are the same as the provisions of title I as it passed the House, with the following changes:

Section 101. Citation of title I

Section 101 of the House bill provided that title I of the bill might be cited as the "Federal Highway Act of 1956." Section 126 of the Senate amendment provided that title I of the bill might be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956." Under the conference agreement, the citation provided by the Senate amendment is followed.

Section 102. Primary and secondary systems and extensions in urban areas

(a) Amounts authorized: Section 102 (a) (1) of the House bill contained the authorization of appropriations for the primary and secondary systems and extensions thereof in urban areas. This authorization was for an additional $25 million for fiscal 1957 (making a total of $725 million), $750 million for fiscal 1958, and $775 million for fiscal 1959.

Section 101 of the Senate amendment contained the authorization of appropriations for these Federal-aid highways. Under the Senate amendment, the authorization for fiscal 1957 was increased by $200 million (making a total of $900 million), and an authorization of $900 million was provided for each of the 4 fiscal years beginning with fiscal 1958.

Under the conference agreement, the additional authorization for fiscal 1957 is $125 million (making a total of $825 million). In addition, an authorization of $850 million is provided for fiscal 1958 and an authorization of $875 million is provided for fiscal 1959. The conference agreement contains no authorizations for fiscal years beyond fiscal 1959.

(b) Ratio: Under the House bill the funds authorized for each fiscal year were to be available for expenditure for the 3 categories in the ratio which has prevailed for a number of years, namely, 45 percent for the primary system, 30 percent for the secondary system, and 25 percent for the extensions of these systems within urban areas.

The Senate amendment provided that the additional sum authorized for fiscal 1957, and the sums authorized for each of the 4 fiscal years beginning with fiscal 1958, were to be available for expenditure for the 3 categories in accordance with specified dollar amounts. In effect, this would have changed the existing ratio so as to provide 44.4 percent for the primary system, 33.3 percent for the secondary system, and 22.2 percent for extensions within urban areas.

Under the conference agreement, the existing 45–30–25 ratio is retained.

(c) Provisions relating to approval of projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system: The Senate amendment (in sec. 101) contained provisions relating to the approval of projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system which are now set forth in the first section of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954. The House bill did not repeat these provisions, relying instead on the provisions of the 1954 act. The conference agreement follows the Senate amendment in expressly setting forth these provisions.

(d) Declaration with respect to future authorizations: The House bill (in sec. 102 (c)) contained a policy statement that progressive increases for the 3 categories of highways of not less than $25 million per year (covering the total for all 3 categories) should continue through fiscal 1969, and that the relative ratio between the 3 categories should continue during that period of time. The Senate amendment contained no similar policy statements.

The conference agreement does not contain any policy statement with respect to the amount of, or relative ratio for, future authorizations for the 3 categories. It is contemplated that the existing practice of considering authorizing legislation for these 3 categories every 2 years will be continued.

(e) Transfers of apportionments: The House bill (in sec. 102 (d)) authorized the transfer of not to exceed 20 percent of the primary, secondary, or urban funds authorized by section 102 to either of the other categories of funds (primary, secondary, or urban), with the limitation that the total of such transfers did not increase the original apportionment for the category to which transferred by more than 20 percent. Under the House bill, this transfer provision did not apply to funds for the Interstate System.

Section 103 of the Senate amendment contained a similar 20-percent transfer provision, except that it would also have permitted transfer of funds between the Interstate System and the primary and secondary systems and their urban extensions.

The conference agreement follows the House provision and does not apply to funds for the Interstate System. Under this 20-percent transfer provision, flexibility will be provided to meet the varying needs of the States for higher relative amounts with respect to 1 or 2 of the 3 categories.

Section 103. Forest highways and forest development roads and trails

(a) Amounts authorized: Section 103 (a) of the House bill authorized the appropriation (1) for forest highways, $25 million for fiscal 1958 and $25 million for fiscal 1959, and (2) for forest development roads and trails, $27 million for fiscal 1958 and $27 million for fiscal 1959.

Section 106 of the Senate amendment authorized the appropriation (1) for forest highways, $33,750,000 for each of the 4 fiscal years beginning with fiscal 1958, and (2) for forest development roads and trails, $27 million for each of the 4 fiscal years beginning with fiscal 1958.

Under the conference agreement the authorization for each of these 2 categories is limited to the 2 fiscal years 1958 and 1959. The amount authorized for each of these years is (1) $30 million for forest highways, and (2) $27 million for forest development roads and trails.

(b) Availability of funds for parking areas and for sanitary, water, and fire-control facilities: Both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided that hereafter funds available for forest highways and for forest development roads and trails shall also be available for vehicular parking areas. The Senate amendment added the requirement that these vehicular parking areas be "adjacent." In addition, the Senate amendment provided that hereafter such funds should also be available for sanitary, water, and fire-control facilities.

Under the conference agreement, which follows the Senate amendment, these funds will be available for adjacent vehicular parking areas, for sanitary facilities, for water facilities, for fire-control facilities, or for any combination thereof.

(c) Repeal of certain apportionment language: Section 23 (a) of the Federal Highway Act of 1921, as amended and supplemented, provides that funds authorized for forest development roads shall be "apportioned" among the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico according to the relative needs of the various national forests. Section 103 (b) of the House bill repealed this requirement. The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision.

The conference agreement follows the House bill in repealing this apportionment requirement. Since expenditures are made on the basis of relative needs, the apportionment procedure, and the accounting necessary in connection therewith, serve no useful purpose. As a result of such procedure, in the past a large number of allotments were created, too small in amount to be economically converted into road improvements. As a result, the apportionments remained idle over a number of years while accumulating sufficiently to be put to use, or they had to be transferred and consolidated into one larger apportionment. The repeal provided by section 103 (b) of the conference agreement will remedy this situation.

Section 104. Roads and trails in national parks, etc.

(a) Amounts authorized: Section 104 of the House bill authorized the appropriation for each of the 2 fiscal years 1958 and 1959 (1) for park roads and trails, $16 million; (2) for parkways, $16 million; and (3) for Indian roads, $10 million.

Section 107 of the Senate amendment authorized the appropriation for each of the 4 fiscal years beginning with fiscal 1958 (1) for park roads and trails, $18 million; (2)

for parkways, $16 million; and (3) for Indian roads, $12,500,000.

Under the conference agreement the authorizations are limited to the 2 fiscal years 1958 and 1959. The amounts authorized for each of these years for these 3 categories are as follows: (1) For park roads and trails, $16 million; (2) for parkways, $16 million; and (3) for Indian roads, $12 million.

(b) Access roads to mines: Section 107 (a) of the Senate amendment included within the authorization of appropriations for park roads and trails the phrase "and for access roads to mines on public lands." The House bill contained no comparable provision.

In this respect, the conference agreement follows the House bill and does not include authorization of appropriations for access roads to mines on public lands.

Section 105. Public lands highways

Section 105 of the House bill authorized the appropriation of $1 million, for each of the fiscal years 1958 and 1959, for roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations. Section 109 of the Senate amendment authorized the appropriation for this category of $2 million for fiscal 1957 (in addition to the $1 million for fiscal 1957 previously authorized), and of $2 million for each of the 5 fiscal years beginning with fiscal 1958.

Under the conference agreement there is authorized to be appropriated for this category (1) for the fiscal year 1957 an additional $2 million (making a total of $3 million), and (2) for each of the 2 fiscal years 1958 and 1959, $2 million.

Section 106. Special provisions for Federal domain roads, etc.

(a) Provisions relating to contract authorization: Section 106 (a) of the House bill provided that funds authorized for the various categories of Federal domain roads would be available for contract on apportionment, or a date not earlier than 6 months preceding the fiscal year for which authorized if no apportionment is required. Section 110 of the Senate amendment provided that these funds would be available for contract for one year in advance of the year for which authorized.

The conference agreement provides that these funds will be available for contract on apportionment, or a date not earlier than one year preceding the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized if no apportionment is required.

(b) Declaration of intent with respect to future authorizations: The House bill (in sec. 106 (b)) declared it to be the intent of Congress to continue the authorizations for the various categories of Federal domain roads at annual rates not less than those contained in the House bill. The Senate amendment contained no comparable declaration of intent.

The conference agreement omits any declaration of intent with respect to future authorizations for the various categories of Federal domain roads. As in the case of the regular Federal-aid highway authorizations, it is contemplated that authorizations for these categories of highways will be considered every 2 years by the Congress.

Section 107. Highways for Alaska

Section 108 of the Senate amendment provided for participation by Alaska in the apportionments of funds authorized in H. R. 10660, or hereafter authorized, for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and their urban extensions. Provision for such participation has already been made for Hawaii and Puerto Rico. The House bill contained no provision with respect to Alaska.

The conference agreement contains the provisions of the Senate amendment with respect to Alaska. Under these provisions, the inclusion of Alaska in the Federal-aid highway program will be made subject to the following provisions:

(1) Only one-third of the area of Alaska will be used as the area factor in the formula now in effect for purposes of apportionment of funds;

(2) Alaska is to contribute for each fiscal year funds in an amount not less than 10 percent of the Federal funds apportioned to it for that year;

(3) The system or systems of roads on which the apportionments are to be expended are to be determined and agreed upon by the Governor of Alaska, the Territorial highway engineer of Alaska, and the Secretary of Commerce;

(4) The Federal funds and the funds contributed by Alaska may be expended by the Secretary of Commerce either directly or in cooperation with the Territorial Board of Road Commissioners of Alaska, and may be expended separately or in combination and without regard to the matching provisions of the Federal Highway Act of 1921; and

(5) The funds may be expended for both the construction and the maintenance of roads within the systems agreed upon.

These provisions relating to Alaska provide for the transfer of the functions of the Department of the Interior with respect to the construction, repair, and maintenance of roads, tramways, ferries, bridges, trails, and other works in Alaska, to the Department of Commerce. Under the conference agreement, the transfer is to take place on such date as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce, as is not later than 90 days after the approval of the act. With the transfer of functions, there is to be transferred the personnel, funds, and property used or held in connection with those functions. Under the conference agreement the Secretary of Commerce is granted authority to distribute the functions transferred to him under this section and the appropriations which pertain thereto.

Section 108. National system of interstate and defense highways

(a) Interstate System: Section 108 (a) of the House bill changed the name of the Interstate System from the "National System of Interstate Highways" to the "National System of Interstate and Defense Highways"; and further provided that in the bill the system was to be referred to as the "Interstate System." The Senate amendment contained no comparable provisions. The conference agreement follows the House bill in this respect.

Under the conference agreement, it is declared to be the intent of the Congress that the Interstate System be completed as nearly as practicable over a 13-year period and that the entire system in all States be brought to simultaneous completion. The phrase "as nearly as practicable" was included because of the fact it is contemplated that some of the funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal 1969 will not be expended until fiscal 1970 and fiscal 1971. The phrase "that the entire system in all the States be brought into simultaneous completion" was inserted to emphasize the expectation of the Congress that, at the end of the 13-year program, all States will have reached the same relative degree of completion and will be in the final stage of completing their respective portions of the Interstate System.

(b) Amounts authorized for Interstate System: Section 108 (b) of the House bill, and section 102 (a) of the Senate amendment, contained authorizations of appropriations for the Interstate System for the 13-year period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1969. Under the conference agreement, the aggregate amount of the authorizations contained in the bill for this period is the same as in the House bill (namely, $24,825 million). In addition, the authorization for each fiscal year is the same as in the House bill, with the following exceptions: (1) the additional sum authorized to be appropriated for fiscal 1957 has been decreased from $1,025 million to $1 billion, (2) the sum authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 has been decreased from $2,300 million to $2,200 million, (3) the sum authorized to be appropriated for fiscal 1967 has been increased from $2 billion to $2,200 million, and (4) the sum authorized to be appropriated for fiscal 1969 has been increased from $1 billion to $1,025 million. The following table shows the amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Interstate System by the House bill, the Senate amendment, and the conference agreement:

Authorizations

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal years	House bill	Senate amendment	Conference agreement
1957	[1] 1,025	[1] 1,000	[1] 1,000
1958	1,700	1,750	1,700
1959	2,000	2,000	2,000
1960	2,200	2,000	2,200
1961	2,200	2,000	2,200
1962	2,200	2,000	2,200
1963	2,200	2,000	2,200
1964	2,300	2,000	2,200
1965	2,300	2,000	2,200
1966	2,200	2,000	2,200
1967	2,000	2,000	2,200
1968	1,500	2,000	1,500
1969	1,000	2,000	1,025
Total	[1] 24,825	[1] 24,750	[1] 24,825

[1] These amounts are in addition to the $175 million authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1957 by sec. 2 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954.

(c) and (d) formulas for apportionment: Section 108 (c) of the House bill provided that the sums authorized for fiscal 1957 and 1958 were to be apportioned on the basis of the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in each State, as set forth in House Document No. 120 of the 84th Congress. Section 108 (d) of the House bill provided that sums authorized for fiscal 1959 and subsequent years through fiscal 1969 were to be apportioned on the basis of revised estimates of the cost of completing the Interstate System in each State. Section 108 (f) of the House bill provided the method of, and the time for, making these revised estimates and required that they be approved by affirmative resolution of the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives to which referred before being used in making apportionments.

Section 102 (a) of the Senate amendment continued, for the 13-year period, the formula of apportionment contained in section 2 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, namely, (1) one-half in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census (with the proviso that no State is to receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the money so apportioned), and (2) one-half in the manner provided by law for the apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system (that is, one-third on the basis of population, one-third on the basis of area, and one-third on the basis of mileage of rural delivery routes and star routes).

Under the conference agreement, the formula of apportionment contained in the Senate amendment will be followed for the first 3 years (fiscal 1957, 1958, and 1959). For the remaining 10 years of the program, the formula of apportionment contained in the House bill will be followed. That is to say, the funds will be apportioned in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in each State bears to the estimated total cost of completing the Interstate System in all of the States. However, new language has been inserted in the bill to make it clear that the estimates of cost on which the apportionments are to be

based shall be subject to review by the Congress. No apportionment for a fiscal year shall be made until the estimate of costs applicable to the group of fiscal years in which that particular year is included (as set forth in sec. 108 (d)) has been approved by the Senate and House of Representatives by concurrent resolution.

It is to be emphasized that for the first 3 years of the program the existing system of apportionment (as explained above) will be followed. For the remaining 10 years of the program, the formula of apportionment is the cost of completion formula. Over the 13-year period, no State should receive aggregate apportionments which are greater or less than the cost of completing the Interstate System within that State.

Consonant with this objective, the phrase "after taking into account all previous apportionments made under this section" has been inserted to provide the necessary mechanism for transferring from the existing-law formula to the cost formula. Thus, if a State receives more or less than its proportionate share (based on respective estimated costs of completion) of the funds apportioned for the first 3 years, that fact will be taken into account when the estimate of cost is submitted for congressional approval in 1958. It is the intent of the conferees that any adjustment necessary will be spread over all of the remaining 10 years rather than being distributed solely over the 3 fiscal years 1960, 1961, and 1962 covered by the first estimate. Similarly, each time thereafter that a revised estimate of the costs of completion is submitted to the Congress for its approval, there will automatically occur adjustments in the estimate with respect to each State by reason of the fact that, under the newest estimate, the State might have received more, or less, than its proportionate share (based on cost of completion) of the funds theretofore apportioned.

As will be explained below (in connection with sec. 108 (l) of the conference agreement), the estimated costs of completion shall be made without regard to the 1,000 additional miles authorized to be designated by the bill.

(e) Federal share: The conference agreement retains the provision contained in both the House bill and the Senate amendment that the Federal share of projects on the Interstate System is to be 90 percent of the total cost thereof. In States having certain public lands and Indian lands, the Federal share is increased in a manner similar to that provided in existing law for the so-called public-land States, but not above 95 percent of the total cost of the project.

(f) Availability for expenditure: The language of the House bill (sec. 108 (h)) and the conference agreement (sec. 108 (f)) are identical in this respect. The conferees took note of the fact that some States have not yet obligated all of the funds previously apportioned to them under the authorizations contained in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, wherein the matching ratio is 60–40 instead of the more liberal 90–10 ratio provided in the conference agreement. It is intended by the conferees that the Secretary of Commerce will take such steps as may be necessary to insure that each State shall utilize all 60–40 funds apportioned to it before the lapse period and that no State will be permitted to deliberately lapse any of the 60–40 funds in order to substitute therefor the more favorable 90–10 funds and thereby increase the total Federal funds going into any State for the Interstate System.

(g) Lapse of amounts apportioned: The conference agreement retains the provisions of the House bill with respect to lapse of any apportionment which is unexpended at the end of the 2-year period during which such apportionment is available for expenditure. However, new language has been inserted in the conference agreement to provide that when the apportionment of any State or States so lapse, the lapsed amounts shall immediately be reapportioned among the other States in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of section 108 (that is to say, on the basis of the estimates of the cost of completing the Interstate System, as such estimates have been approved by the Congress).

(h) Construction by States in advance of apportionment: As explained above, the retention for 3 years of the formula of apportionment contained in existing law will result in some States receiving less funds for that period than they would have received if the cost of completion formula had become immediately effective. To make it possible for these States to proceed with the construction of projects on the Interstate System, and in general to offer the opportunity to all States to speed up the rate of completion, subsection (h) has been inserted in section 108.

Under this subsection, if a State has obligated all of its section 108 funds, and, after this bill becomes law, proceeds to construct any project (or part of a project) on the Interstate System without the use of Federal funds, then the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to pay to such State, whenever additional funds are apportioned to that State under section 108, the Federal share of the project (as computed under sec. 108 (e) of the conference agreement).

However, no such payment may be made with respect to any project unless all procedures and all requirements applicable to other Interstate System projects have been satisfied with respect to the construction of that project (other than the prior availability of apportioned funds). The conference agreement contains two provisos to make it clear (1) that the plans and specifications for the project must have been approved by the Secretary of Commerce in the same manner as other Interstate System projects, and (2) that the project must conform to the geometric and construction standards adopted under section 108 (i) of the conference agreement. The fact that the matters contained in the two provisos have been expressly set forth does not in any way lessen the provision in the subsection that the project must be constructed in accordance with all procedures and all requirements applicable to other Interstate System projects (other than the prior availability of Federal apportionments). For example, the usual requirements with respect to approval of contract awards, inspection of construction, and subsequent maintenance, and other items, will all apply.

It is to be emphasized that this subsection does not in any way increase the amounts apportioned to any State. It merely provides a method whereby, on full compliance with the subsection, the State may be paid for the completed work out of future apportionments when and if made to that State.

The last sentence of section 108 (h) of the conference agreement is inserted to make sure that no State which proceeds in accordance with the provision will be penalized in computing its apportionments under the cost of completion formula. For purposes of the cost formula, any project (or part of a project) so constructed without Federal funds shall not be considered completed until the State's application has been approved by the Secretary of Commerce for payment out of apportionments which have become available to the State.

(i) Geometric and construction standards: The House bill (in sec. 108 (e)) provided that the Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the State highway departments, was to adopt the geometric standards for the Interstate System. There was no similar provision in the Senate amendment.

Under the conference agreement, the language of the House bill with respect to geometric standards is retained, but the subsection is amended so that it applies to construction standards as well as to geometric standards.

(j) Maximum weight and width limitations: The House bill (sec. 108 (j)) prohibited the apportionment of Interstate System funds to any State where the Interstate System might lawfully be used by vehicles having axle weights in excess of 18,000 pounds on any one axle or 32,000 pounds on a tandem axle, or the maximum corresponding axle weight permitted by laws or regulations of such State in effect on July 1, 1956, whichever is the greater. This limitation would not affect any vehicles that could lawfully operate in the State on July 1, 1956. The House bill contained no maximum limitations on overall weight or on width.

The Senate amendment (sec. 102 (d)), while retaining the substance of the House provision, included a width limitation of 96 inches and an overall gross weight limitation of 73,280 pounds.

The conference agreement (sec. 108 (j)) adopts the language of the Senate amendment. Under the conference agreement, any vehicle that could lawfully operate within a State on July 1, 1956, will not be affected.

(k) Tests to determine maximum desirable dimensions and weights: The House bill (sec. 108 (k)) directed the Secretary of Commerce to expedite a series of tests being planned and conducted for the purpose of determining maximum dimensions and weights for vehicles operated on the Federal-aid highway systems and to submit a report, with recommendations, to the Congress not later than March 1, 1959. The Senate amendment was similar to the House provision except for requiring that the report to Congress be made as promptly as possible. The conference agreement contains the language of the House provision.

(l) Increase in mileage: Under the House bill, no change was made in the 40,000-mile limit applicable to the Interstate System, as provided in section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944. Under section 112 of the Senate amendment, the mileage authorized to be designated would have been increased from 40,000 to 42,500.

Under section 108 (l) of the conference agreement, the limit on the mileage which may be designated on the Interstate System is increased by 1,000 (from 40,000 to 41,000). However, the conference agreement contains a proviso that the cost of completing any mileage from any of the 1,000 newly authorized miles is to be excluded in making the estimates of costs of completion under section 108 (d). The designation of additional mileage in any State will, of course, in no way increase the apportionment to any State during the first 3 years (for which the existing law method of apportionment is in effect). The proviso insures that during the ensuing 10-year program the estimate of cost of completing the Interstate System in each State will be made by estimating that cost for mileage designated from the 40,000 miles provided by law before the enactment of this bill. In making such estimates, the costs of completing mileage designated from the additional 1,000 miles will be excluded. This means that no additional cost has been added, by reason of the additional 1,000 miles, to the 40,000-mile program on which the tax provisions of title II of the bill were based.

Section 109. Acquisition of rights-of-way for Interstate System

Both the House bill (sec. 110) and the Senate amendment (sec. 104) contained a similar provision under which the Secretary of Commerce, at the request of a State, could acquire rights-of-way for the Interstate System, under certain prescribed conditions. Since both accomplished the same purpose and the House bill contained some minor perfecting language, the conference agreement adopts the House provision on the subject.

Section 110. Availability of funds to acquire rights-of-way and to make advances to the States

The House bill (sec. 111) authorized the Secretary of Commerce to make any of the apportioned Federal-aid highway funds, including Interstate System funds, available for advance acquisition of rights-of-way. It also authorized the Secretary of Commerce to advance funds to the States for such purposes. The operation of this provision will undoubtedly save large amounts of funds by permitting the right-of-way to be acquired at the most favorable time, and without the pressures created in rush acquisition procedures. It will also permit more orderly acquisition with a minimum of dislocation and hardship to occupants and businesses located in the path of the right-of-way required. The Senate amendment contained no such provisions, although section 105 of the Senate amendment granted contract authority of not to exceed $100 million for the fiscal year 1956 for right-of-way acquisition. Since the 1956 fiscal year is already virtually over and the 1957 fiscal year funds are to become available immediately upon enactment of the act, the Senate provision is not needed and the conference agreement therefore adopts the House provision.

The House bill (in sec. 111 (b)) also amended section 6 of the 1944 Federal-Aid Highway Act, under which the States could apply for and receive a working fund with which to finance the Federal share of the cost of projects pending the receipt of reimbursement from the Secretary of Commerce. Since the Federal share is increased to 90 percent of project cost in the case of the Interstate System, more States will probably require an advance of funds from the Secretary in order to provide a revolving or working fund with which to pay construction contractors as work progresses or to purchase the needed rights-of-way. The conferees feel that this is a desirable feature but intend that the Secretary of Commerce will establish appropriate procedures to safeguard the advance and to insure that no more funds than are needed are advanced to a State and that at no time will the amount advanced to a State exceed one-fourth of the amount apportioned to such State for the year in which the advance is operative.

Section 111. Relocation of utility facilities

The House bill (sec. 113) and the Senate amendment (sec. 111) contained similar provisions which would have permitted Federal funds to be used to reimburse a State for utility relocation costs which the State had paid for under its own laws or practices. Both the House and Senate provisions would have denied apportionment of Federal funds for this purpose to any State when the payment to the utility violated the law of the State or a legal contract between the utility and the State. The Senate amendment differed from the House bill, however, in that it provided that no more than 2 percent of any sum apportioned to any State for any fiscal year might be expended under the section. The House bill contained no such limitation.

This 2-percent limitation would have resulted in administrative difficulties. It could have caused inequities particularly to small utilities and municipalities and in some instances resulted in failure to fully reimburse States which would otherwise have been reimbursed under the policy which the Bureau of Public Roads has followed of reimbursing States that pay relocation costs. Section 113 of the bill as passed by the House and recommended and accepted by the conferees recognizes the equity of reimbursing utilities for the cost of relocating facilities when required for Federal-aid highway projects. Further, this section makes it clear that it is the intention of the Federal Government to assume its proportionate share of utility relocation costs whenever a State allows such costs.

Under the existing practice of the Bureau of Public Roads, Federal funds may participate in utility relocation costs to the same extent as other construction costs without any percentage limitation based on the State's apportionment.

In adopting the House language, the conference agreement intends that the section will be applicable to the amount paid by the State.

Section 112. Agreements relating to the use of and access to rights-of-way

The House bill (sec. 115) and the Senate amendment (sec. 115) contained similar provisions to insure retention of control of access on the Interstate System and to insure that automotive service stations or other commercial establishments are not constructed or located on the rights-of-way of the Interstate System. The House provision contained language to insure that the users of the Interstate System would receive the benefits of free competition in purchasing supplies and services at or adjacent to highways on the Interstate System, which provision did not appear in the Senate amendment. Section 112 of the conference agreement in general follows the language of the Senate amendment with respect to these agreements rather than the language of the House bill.

The conferees emphasize that these provisions are to be applied to future construction and do not operate to require the cancellation of valid agreements made by State toll-road authorities with service station or other concessionaires occupying toll-road rights-of-way whenever such toll roads may be integrated into the Interstate System under the provisions of section 113 of the conference agreement.

Section 113. Toll roads, bridges, and tunnels

The House bill (sec. 116) contained a provision to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to include as part of the Interstate System any toll road, bridge, or tunnel, now or hereafter constructed, which meets the required standards and forms a logical segment of the Interstate System. It authorized Federal funds to be expended on projects approaching any toll road on the Interstate System under certain prescribed conditions. This provision was intended to clarify the Secretary's authority in such matters. The Senate amendment contained no such provision. The conference report adopts the House language with the modifications described in the following paragraph.

With respect to the language in the House bill which would permit any toll road, bridge, or tunnel to be included in the Interstate System, the conferees have inserted language to require the Secretary of Commerce to find that such action will promote the development of an integrated Interstate System. The requirement in the House provision that such toll road, bridge, or tunnel form a logical segment of the Interstate System has been eliminated and in lieu thereof there is inserted the requirement that such toll road, bridge, or tunnel be located on a route heretofore or hereafter designated as a part of the Interstate System. The conference agreement (in sec. 113 (c)) also contains certain perfecting changes in the provisions relating to eligibility of Federal funds for expenditure on projects approaching toll roads on the Interstate System.

Section 114. Determination of policy with respect to reimbursement for certain highways

The House bill (sec. 109) declared the intent and policy of Congress to equitably reimburse the States for any toll or free highway on the Interstate System which had been constructed during a specified period to the required standards and would require a report to be made to Congress within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1958, in order to provide Congress with the information it would need in determining the time, methods, and amounts of such reimbursement. The House provision also declared the policy and intent of Congress to provide funds necessary to make such reimbursements. The Senate amendment contained no provision on this subject.

The conference agreement contains a modification of the House provision. Under this modified provision, there is a declaration of intent and policy on the part of Congress to determine whether or not the Federal Government should equitably reimburse any State for such construction, rather than to commit the Federal Government in advance of the study to make such reimbursement and to provide funds therefor as provided in the House bill.

Section 115. Prevailing rate of wage

The House bill (in sec. 112) and the Senate amendment (in sec. 118) both required the Secretary of Commerce to take such action as may be necessary to insure that the Davis-Bacon Act is applied to Interstate System projects authorized under title I. Under this provision the wages shall be not less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

The Senate amendment, however, provided (in sec. 119), that in so carrying out the Davis-Bacon Act, the Secretary of Labor shall consult with the highway authority of the State in which the project is located and after giving due regard to the information thus obtained shall make a predetermination of minimum wage rates which shall be set out in each project advertisement for bids and each bid proposal form, and be made a part of the contract covering the project. This latter provision was not contained in the House bill. The conference agreement (in sec. 115 (b)) contains the language of section 119 of the Senate amendment, with certain minor perfecting changes.

It is recognized that there must be the utmost cooperation between the several State highway departments and the Secretary of Labor in order to carry out the intent of the provisions of section 115 (b). It is emphasized that when the Secretary consults with these State agencies, such agencies should furnish the desired information as fully and promptly as possible. In order that the projects occasion no delay because of the determination of prevailing wages, the Secretary should be kept advised well in advance of pending Interstate System projects, with sufficient data and information to make the necessary predetermination of wages promptly and satisfactorily.

The conferees rejected a provision in the Senate amendment (in sec. 124) that would provide for an appeal and judicial review by any aggrieved party, as it was feared that court proceedings might delay prosecution of projects in the Federal-aid highway program, and it was believed that cooperation in good faith between State and Federal officials in this matter will insure satisfactory results.

Section 116. Declarations of policy with respect to Federal-aid highway program

(a) Acceleration of program—completion of Interstate System—and progress report: The House bill (in sec. 114) and the Senate amendment (in sec. 113 (a), (b), and (c)) contained somewhat similar declarations of policy regarding acceleration of the Federal-aid highway program and completion of the Interstate System. The conference agreement substantially follows the language of the Senate amendment with changes in

phraseology. The Secretary of Commerce is directed to submit a report to Congress by February 1, 1959, on the progress made toward attaining the objectives.

(b) Public hearings: The Senate amendment (in sec. 113 (d)) required any State highway department which submits plans for a Federal-aid highway project involving the bypassing of any city, town, village, or community, either incorporated or unincorporated, to certify to the Commissioner of Public Roads that it has had public hearings and considered the economic effects of such location. It would also require a transcript of said hearings to be sent to the Commissioner of Public Roads together with the certification. This provision would continue and broaden existing requirements contained in section 13 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950. Under the House bill, which contained no provision on this subject, the existing requirements of section 13 of the 1950 act would continue without change and be applicable to all Federal-aid and Interstate projects.

The conference agreement (in sec. 116 (c)) contains the language of the Senate amendment after modifying the language so as to make the public hearing requirement also applicable to a Federal-aid highway project "going through" any city, town, or village, either incorporated or unincorporated. The word "community" appearing in the Senate amendment is eliminated in the conference report.

Participation by small business enterprises: The House bill (in sec. 102 (c)) included a policy statement to encourage small business and to assure that a fair proportion of the Federal-aid contracts would be awarded to small-business enterprises. The Senate amendment contained no provision on this matter. The conference agreement (in sec. 116 (b)) adopts language somewhat similar to the House provision, with changes in phraseology to extend the application of the provision to the Interstate System. In adopting this provision, the conferees recognize that the Federal-aid contracts are not awarded by the Federal Government but are awarded by the States on the basis of competitive bids.

Section 117. Highway safety study

The Senate amendment (in sec. 123) authorized and directed the Secretary of Commerce to make a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of determining what action can be taken by the Federal Government to promote public welfare by increasing highway safety, and required him to submit a report, with recommendations, to Congress by June 30, 1957. The House bill contained no such provision.

The conference agreement (in sec. 117) contains the language of the Senate amendment, but adds a provision that such study and investigation shall be conducted under the general authority of section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, and that the amount expended for such purposes shall not exceed $200,000. The conference agreement also changes the reporting date to "not later than March 1, 1959."

Section 118. Emergency fund

The House bill (in sec. 107) amended section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 so as to increase the present $10 million annual emergency fund authorization to $30 million for the repair and reconstruction of highways and bridges on the Federal-aid systems which are damaged as a result of disaster. The funds authorized would be available for use on any projects programed and approved any time during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and thereafter, which meet the provisions of this section. The Senate amendment contained no such provision, although the Senate had previously passed a bill in the present session (S. 2861) which would have increased the emergency relief authorization from $10 million to $30 million. The conference agreement contains the provisions of the House bill in this respect.

Section 119. Definition of construction

The House bill (in sec. 117) broadened the definition of the term "construction" contained in section 1 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to include the cost of the establishment of temporary and permanent goedetic markers in accordance with specifications of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and also the cost of relocation of building tenants and demolition of structures or removal of usable buildings to new sites, including the cost of such sites. The Senate amendment contained no such provision.

The conference agreement adopts that portion of the House provision which relates to temporary and permanent geodetic markers.

Section 120. Archeological and paleontological salvage

The House bill (in sec. 118) provided that any portion of the funds authorized by title I, as deemed necessary by the governor or the duly authorized highway officials of any State, might be used for the purpose of archeological salvage in accordance with the act approved June 8, 1906, and State laws where applicable. The Senate amendment (in sec. 120) contained a similar provision except that it also included paleontological salvage and omitted any requirement for the governor's approval.

The conference agreement contains the language of the Senate amendment except for substituting "highway department" for "highway authority."

Section 121. Mapping

The House bill (in sec. 119) provided that the Secretary of Commerce, in carrying out the provisions of title I, should, to the fullest extent practicable, authorize the use of photogrammetric methods in mapping, and the utilization of commercial enterprise for such service. No such provision was contained in the Senate amendment.

The conference agreement adopts the substance of the House provision but modifies it to make it clear that the Secretary of Commerce would have the authority to administer the provision on a discretionary basis.

Section 122. Relationship of this title to other acts; effective date

The conference agreement provides that all provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, not inconsistent with title I of the bill, shall remain in full force and effect, and that all inconsistent provisions are repealed. It also provides that title I shall take effect on the date of the enactment of the act. This provision consolidates and is similar to the language in section 121 of the House bill and sections 122 and 125 of the Senate amendment.

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
GEORGE H. FALLON,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
GEORGE A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

TITLE II

The managers on the part of the House as to title II of the bill submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees as to title II of the bill and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 2: Section 4041 (a) of the 1954 Code imposes a tax of 2 cents a gallon on any liquid sold for use, or used, as a fuel in a diesel-powered highway vehicle. Under section 202 (a) of the House bill, this tax is increased from 2 cents a gallon to 3 cents a gallon effective July 1, 1956. In general, the effect of Senate amendment No. 2 would be to provide (1) that the 1-cent increase shall apply only if the liquid is used in a vehicle registered, or required to be registered, for highway use (or, in the case of vehicles owned by the United States, used on the highway), and (2) that in no case shall the increase apply with respect to any liquid used as a fuel in a vehicle while such vehicle is not being used on a highway.

The House recedes with an amendment which provides that in the case of a liquid taxable under section 4041 (a) of the 1954 Code sold for use or used as a fuel in a diesel-powered highway vehicle—

(A) which (at the time of such sale or use) is not registered, and is not required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or

(B) which, in the case of a diesel-powered highway vehicle owned by the United States, is not used on the highway,

the tax shall be 2 cents a gallon in lieu of 3 cents a gallon. Under the conference agreement, if a liquid on which tax was imposed after June 30, 1956, at the rate of 2 cents a gallon is used as a fuel in a diesel-powered highway vehicle—

(A) which (at the time of such use) is registered, or is required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or

(B) which, in the case of a diesel-powered highway vehicle owned by the United States, is used on the highway,

a tax of 1 cent a gallon is imposed on such use. Under the conference agreement the 3-cent-a-gallon rate will apply (in the case of use in the specified vehicles) without regard to whether the liquid is used on or off the highway.

Amendment No. 3: Section 4041 (b) of the 1954 Code imposes a tax of 2 cents a gallon on special motor fuel (i. e., benzol, benzene, naphtha, liquefied petroleum gas, and other liquid fuels except gasoline, diesel fuel, kerosene, gas oil, or fuel oil) sold for use, or used, as a fuel for the propulsion of a motor vehicle, motorboat, or airplane. Under section 202 (b) of the House bill this tax is increased effective July 1, 1956, from 2 cents a gallon to 3 cents a gallon in the case of a special motor fuel sold for use, or used, as a fuel for the propulsion of a motor vehicle. Senate amendment No. 3 would provide the same treatment for the use of special motor fuels in a nonregistered vehicle or a vehicle used off a highway as Senate amendment No. 2 would have provided for diesel fuel, and, in addition, would limit the 1-cent increase to fuel used in a motor vehicle which is a "highway vehicle."

The House recedes with an amendment which conforms to the conference agreement with respect to amendment No. 2, and, in addition, conforms to the Senate amendment in limiting the 1-cent increase to fuel used in a motor vehicle which is a highway vehicle.

Amendment No. 4: This is a technical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 5: This is a technical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 6: Section 205 of the bill, as passed by the House and the Senate, provides for an increase in tax from 2 cents a gallon to 3 cents a gallon effective July 1, 1956, in the case of gasoline sold by the producer or importer thereof. Section 4081 (b) of the 1954 Code, as proposed to be amended

by section 205 of the House bill, provided that under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate the tax on gasoline shall be 2 cents a gallon in lieu of 3 cents a gallon in the case of gasoline sold by the producer or importer thereof to any person for use by such person otherwise than as a fuel in a highway vehicle. This provision did not apply to gasoline which (within the meaning of sec. 6420 (c) of the 1954 Code) is sold for use on a farm for farming purposes.

Senate amendment No. 6 strikes out section 4081 (b) of the 1954 Code, as proposed to be amended by the House bill. Senate amendment No. 19, explained below, adds a new provision to the bill as a substitute for the exemption provision of the House bill stricken out by amendment No. 6. In conformity with the conference agreement with respect to Senate amendment No. 19, the House recedes on amendment No. 6.

Amendment No. 7: This is a technical conforming amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 8: Section 206 of the bill adds a new subchapter D to chapter 36 of the 1954 Code to provide a tax on the use of certain highway motor vehicles, effective July 1, 1956. Under the House bill, there would be imposed on the use of any highway motor vehicle which has a taxable gross weight of more than 26,000 pounds a tax at the rate of $1.50 a year for each 1,000 pounds of taxable gross weight or fraction thereof. Under Senate amendment No. 8 the tax would be at the rate of $2.50 a year for each 1,000 pounds of taxable gross weight or fraction thereof in excess of 26,000 pounds of taxable gross weight. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 9: This is a technical amendment relating to payment of the tax on the use of highway motor vehicles owned by the United States. The House recedes with a technical amendment to conform the language to other provisions of the 1954 Code.

Amendment No. 10: This amendment struck out of the House bill a provision that the new tax on the use of highway motor vehicles shall not apply to the use of any bus which is of the transit type (rather than of the intercity type) by a person who (for the period prescribed by the bill) met the 60 percent passenger fare revenue test prescribed by the bill. Under the conference agreement the provision of the House bill is restored with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 11: This is a technical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 12: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 13: This amendment provides that the floor stocks taxes imposed by the bill on articles held on July 1, 1956, shall be paid at such time after September 30, 1956, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate. The amendment does not limit or restrict in any way the provisions of section 6862 of the 1954 Code (relating to jeopardy assessments). There was no corresponding provision in the House bill. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 14: This amendment makes changes with respect to credits or refunds in the case of special motor fuels and provides credits or refunds in the case of diesel fuel. This is in conformity with Senate amendments Nos. 2 and 3. The House recedes with an amendment which conforms to the conference action on amendments Nos. 2 and 3.

Amendment No. 15: Section 6416 (b) (2) (K) of the 1954 Code, as proposed to be amended by section 208 (b) of the House bill, provided in general for a credit or refund to the producer or importer at the rate of 1 cent a gallon if gasoline, in respect of which tax was paid under section 4081 of the 1954 Code at 3 cents a gallon, is used or resold for use otherwise than as a fuel in a highway vehicle. This provision did not apply to gasoline which (within the meaning of sec. 6420 (c) of the 1954 Code) is sold for use on a farm for farming purposes.

Senate amendment No. 15 strikes out section 6416 (b) (2) (K) of the 1954 Code, as proposed to be amended by the House bill. Senate amendment No. 19, explained below, adds a new provision to the bill as a substitute for the refund provisions stricken out of the bill by Senate amendment No. 15. In conformity with the conference agreement with respect to Senate amendment No. 19, the House recedes.

Amendment No. 16: Section 208 (b) of the House bill added a new subparagraph (L) to section 6416 (b) (2) of the 1954 Code. Under the new subparagraph, credit or refund would be allowed in the case of a liquid, in respect of which tax was paid under section 4041 (tax on diesel fuel and special motor fuels) or 4081 (tax on gasoline) at the rate of 3 cents a gallon, used in vehicles while engaged in furnishing scheduled common carrier public passenger land transportation service along regular routes. Credit or refund would be allowed in respect of any liquid used during any calendar quarter only if at least 60 percent of the total passenger fare revenue (not including the tax imposed by sec. 4261, relating to the tax on transportation of persons) derived by the person using the vehicles during such quarter from scheduled service along such regular routes was attributable to fares which were exempt from the tax imposed by section 4261 by reason of section 4262 (b) (relating to the exemption for commutation, travel, etc.). The amount of credit or refund for any calendar quarter would not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount computed at the rate of 1 cent a gallon as the passenger fare revenue derived during such quarter from such fares exempt from tax for such scheduled service bears to the total passenger fare revenue (not including the tax imposed by sec. 4261) derived during such calendar quarter for such scheduled service.

Senate amendment No. 16 struck out this provision of the House bill. Under the conference agreement the substance of this provision is restored to the bill. The part relating to credit or refund of taxes paid under section 4041 of the 1954 Code (relating to diesel fuel and special motor fuels) is covered by section 6416 (b) (2) (L) of the 1954 Code which is restored by the conference action on amendment No. 16. The part relating to gasoline is covered by a new section 6421 (b) added to the 1954 Code by the conference action on Senate amendment No. 19, explained below.

Amendment No. 17: This is a clerical amendment. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 18: This is a technical clarifying amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 19: This amendment would add a new section 6421 to the 1954 Code as a substitute for the provisions of the House bill stricken out by Senate amendments Nos. 6 and 15. In general, the new section 6421 would provide a procedure under which the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate would pay an amount computed at the rate of 1 cent a gallon directly to the ultimate purchaser of gasoline used for nonhighway purposes as provided in the section. The procedure, in general, would be the same as under section 6420 (relating to gasoline used on a farm for farming purposes) except that under the Senate amendment quarterly claims would be permitted where the claim is filed for at least 100,000 gallons of gasoline. Payments under the section would, in general, be made in respect of gasoline which (1) is used otherwise than as a fuel in a highway vehicle which (at the time of such use) is registered, or required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country (or, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, which is used on the highway), or (2) is used as a fuel in any such highway vehicle while such highway vehicle is not being used on a highway. Payments would not be made, or would be appropriately reduced, in the case of gasoline exempt from tax or with respect to which a refund or payment is payable under this or any other provision of the 1954 Code.

The House recedes with an amendment. Under the conference agreement, if gasoline is used otherwise than as a fuel in a highway vehicle (1) which (at the time of such use) is registered, or is required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or (2) which, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, is used on the highway, the Secretary or his delegate shall pay (without interest) to the ultimate purchaser of such gasoline an amount equal to 1 cent for each gallon of gasoline so used. The effect of this provision is to relieve the ultimate purchaser of gasoline from the 1 cent increase in the tax on gasoline imposed by the bill if he uses such gasoline otherwise than as a fuel in a highway vehicle or if he uses such gasoline as a fuel in a highway vehicle which (at the time of the use) is not registered for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, and is not required to be so registered under the laws of any State or foreign country in which it is operated. While there are, of course, variations in State laws with respect to technical registration requirements for motor vehicles for highway use, it should be made clear that the registration requirements of the bill are not intended to relieve the operator of a highway vehicle of the 1 cent increase in the tax on gasoline used as a fuel in a highway vehicle which, for example, is operated on the highway under a dealer's license or permit.

In conformity with the action explained in the preceding paragraph and the action with respect to amendment No. 16, the conference agreement also provides that if gasoline is used during any calendar quarter in vehicles while engaged in furnishing scheduled common carrier public passenger land transportation service along regular routes, the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate shall (subject to the 60-percent passenger fare test explained below) pay (without interest) to the ultimate purchaser of such gasoline the amount determined by multiplying (A) 1 cent for each gallon of gasoline so used, by (B) the percentage which the ultimate purchaser's tax-exempt passenger fare revenue (as defined in the new sec. 6421 (d) (2) of the Code) derived from such scheduled service during such quarter was of his total passenger fare revenue (not including the tax imposed by sec. 4261 of the 1954 Code, relating to the tax on transportation of persons) derived from such scheduled service during such quarter.

Under the conference agreement, the payments may be made in respect of gasoline used during any calendar quarter in transit vehicles only if at least 60 percent of the total passenger fare revenue (not including the tax imposed by sec. 4261 of the 1954 Code, relating to the tax on transportation of persons) derived, during such quarter from scheduled service described in the preceding paragraph, by the person filing the claim was attributable to tax-exempt passenger fare revenue derived during such quarter by such person from such scheduled service.

Under the conference agreement, not more than 1 claim may be filed with respect to

gasoline used otherwise than as a fuel in a highway vehicle, and not more than 1 claim may be filed with respect to gasoline used in transit vehicles, by any person with respect to gasoline used during the 1-year period ending on June 30 of any year. No claim shall be allowed under this section with respect to any 1-year period unless filed on or before September 30 of the year in which such 1-year period ends.

Amendments Nos. 20 and 21: These are technical conforming amendments. The House recedes with conforming amendments.

Amendment No. 22: Section 209 of the bill establishes a highway trust fund. In general, the receipts of the trust fund are equivalent to designated percentages of the specified taxes received after June 30, 1956, and before July 1, 1972, and the amounts in the trust fund are made available (as provided by appropriation acts) for expenditures after June 30, 1956, and before July 1, 1972, which are attributable to Federal-aid highways.

Subsection (g) of section 209 of the House bill provided that nothing in section 209 of the bill shall limit the amount of the apportionments made under any authorization in title I of the bill or in any Act heretofore or hereafter enacted which amends or supplements the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916.

Senate amendment No. 22 strikes out subsection (g) of section 209 of the House bill and inserts in lieu thereof a new subsection (g). This subsection requires the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time, after consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, to estimate the amounts which will be available in the highway trust fund (excluding repayable advances) to defray the expenditures which will be required to be made from such fund. In any case in which the Secretary of the Treasury determines that, after all other expenditures required to be made from the highway trust fund have been defrayed, the amounts which will be available in such fund (excluding repayable advances) will be insufficient to defray the expenditures which will be required as a result of the apportionment to the States of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the National System of Interstate Highways, Senate amendment No. 22 requires him (1) to so advise the Secretary of Commerce, and (2) to further advise the Secretary of Commerce as to the amount which, after all other expenditures required to be made from such fund have been defrayed, will be available in such fund (excluding repayable advances) to defray the expenditures required as a result of apportionment to the States of Federal-aid highway funds for the National System of Interstate Highways for such fiscal year. The Secretary of Commerce is then required to determine the percentage which such amount is of the amount authorized to be appropriated for such fiscal year for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the National System of Interstate Highways and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, is required thereafter to apportion to the States for such fiscal year for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the National System of Interstate Highways (in lieu of the amount which but for the provisions of Senate amendment No. 22 would be so apportioned) the amount obtained by multiplying the amount authorized to be appropriated for such fiscal year by such percentage. Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury determines that there will be available in the highway trust fund (excluding repayable advances) amounts which, after all other expenditures required to be made from such fund have been defrayed, will be available to defray the expenditures required as a result of the apportionment of any Federal-aid highway funds for the National System of Interstate Highways previously withheld from apportionment for any fiscal year, he is required to so advise the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Commerce is then required to apportion to the States such portion of the funds so withheld from apportionment as the Secretary of the Treasury has advised him may be so apportioned without causing expenditures from the highway trust fund for the National System of Interstate Highways to exceed amounts available in such fund (excluding repayable advances) to defray such expenditures. Any funds apportioned pursuant to the provisions of the preceding sentence are to remain available for expenditure until the close of the third fiscal year following that in which apportioned.

The House recedes with amendments to change references to the "National System of Interstate Highways" to references to the "Interstate System". The change in references is necessary to conform with the action of the conferees on title I of the bill (see the explanation above with respect to section 108 (a) of the conference agreement).

Amendment No. 23: This is a clerical amendment. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 24 and 25: These are technical conforming amendments. The House recedes.

JERE COOPER,
W. D. MILLS,
HALE BOGGS,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the agreement reached by the conferees on H. R. 10660, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, provides that the funds authorized for the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959 are to be apportioned to the States as provided in present law and that thereafter funds authorized for the Interstate System are to be apportioned to the States on the basis of costs as approved by the Congress for completing the presently authorized 40,000 mile system.

I submit for the RECORD a tabulation showing the approximate amounts which each State would receive under the conference agreement during the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959 for projects on the primary and secondary highway systems, together with their urban extensions, and the Interstate System:

Table of approximate apportionments of Federal-aid highway funds under H. R. 10660 for fiscal years 1957–59, inclusive

FISCAL YEAR 1957

[Millions of dollars]

State	Primary highway system ($56.3)	Secondary or feeder roads ($37.5)	Urban highways ($31.2)	Subtotal ($125.0)	Interstate system ($1,000.0)	Total ($1,125.0)	State	Primary highway system ($56.3)	Secondary or feeder roads ($37.5)	Urban highways ($31.2)	Subtotal ($125.0)	Interstate system ($1,000.0)	Total ($1,125.0)
Alabama	1.2	0.9	0.4	2.5	20.3	22.8	New Hampshire	.3	.2	.1	.6	6.3	6.9
Arizona	.8	.6	.1	1.5	11.5	13.0	New Jersey	.8	.3	1.4	2.5	21.9	24.4
Arkansas	.9	.8	.2	1.9	14.5	16.4	New Mexico	.9	.6	.1	1.6	12.1	13.7
California	2.6	1.3	2.8	6.7	57.0	63.7	New York	2.7	1.1	4.2	8.0	70.9	78.9
Colorado	1.0	.7	.3	2.0	13.7	15.7	North Carolina	1.4	1.2	.4	3.0	25.5	28.5
Connecticut	.4	.2	.6	1.2	9.6	10.8	North Dakota	.8	.6	.1	1.5	11.1	12.6
Delaware	.3	.2	.1	.6	6.3	6.9	Ohio	2.0	1.2	1.8	5.0	42.8	47.8
Florida	.9	.6	.6	2.1	17.0	19.1	Oklahoma	1.2	.8	.3	2.3	17.9	20.2
Georgia	1.4	1.0	.4	2.8	23.3	26.1	Oregon	.9	.7	.2	1.8	13.6	15.4
Idaho	.7	.5	.1	1.3	10.1	11.4	Pennsylvania	2.3	1.4	2.4	6.1	53.6	59.7
Illinois	2.2	1.2	2.2	5.6	47.1	52.7	Rhode Island	.3	.2	.2	.7	6.3	7.0
Indiana	1.3	.9	.7	2.9	24.3	27.2	South Carolina	.8	.6	.2	1.6	13.4	15.0
Iowa	1.4	1.0	.4	2.8	20.4	23.2	South Dakota	.8	.6	.1	1.5	11.6	13.1
Kansas	1.3	.9	.3	2.5	18.1	20.6	Tennessee	1.2	.9	.4	2.5	21.4	23.9
Kentucky	1.0	.9	.3	2.2	18.8	21.0	Texas	3.6	2.4	1.5	7.5	57.5	65.0
Louisiana	.9	.6	.5	2.0	16.5	18.5	Utah	.6	.4	.1	1.1	9.7	10.8
Maine	.5	.3	.1	.9	8.0	8.9	Vermont	.3	.2	(1)	.5	6.3	6.8
Maryland	.5	.3	.5	1.3	12.0	13.3	Virginia	1.1	.8	.5	2.4	20.2	22.6
Massachusetts	.7	.3	1.3	2.3	21.3	23.6	Washington	.9	.6	.5	2.0	16.1	18.1
Michigan	1.8	1.1	1.5	4.4	36.0	40.4	West Virginia	.6	.5	.2	1.3	11.9	13.2
Minnesota	1.5	1.0	.5	3.0	22.5	25.5	Wisconsin	1.3	.9	.6	2.8	22.8	25.6
Mississippi	1.0	.8	.2	2.0	15.9	17.9	Wyoming	.7	.5	(1)	1.2	10.4	11.6
Missouri	1.6	1.1	.8	3.5	27.1	30.6	Hawaii	.3	.2	.1	.6		.6
Montana	1.1	.8	.1	2.0	14.4	16.4	District of Columbia	.3	.2	.3	.8	6.3	7.1
Nebraska	1.1	.8	.2	2.1	14.3	16.6	Puerto Rico	.3	.3	.3	.9		.9
Nevada	.7	.5	(1)	1.2	10.4	11.4	Alaska	1.1	.8	(1)	1.9		1.9

[1] States with apportionments less than $50,000: Nevada $24,000, Vermont $48,000, Wyoming $34,000, and Alaska $10,000.

Table of approximate apportionments of Federal-aid highway funds under H. R. 10660 for fiscal years 1957–59, inclusive—Continued

FISCAL YEAR 1958

[Millions of dollars]

State	Primary highway system ($382.5)	Secondary or feeder roads ($255.0)	Urban highways ($212.5)	Subtotal ($850.0)	Interstate system ($1,700.0)	Total ($2,550.0)	State	Primary highway system ($382.5)	Secondary or feeder roads ($255.0)	Urban highways ($212.5)	Subtotal ($850.0)	Interstate system ($1,700.0)	Total ($2,550.0)
Alabama	8.0	6.2	2.8	17.0	34.5	51.5	New Hampshire	1.9	1.3	.6	3.8	10.6	14.4
Arizona	5.6	3.8	.8	10.2	19.5	29.7	New Jersey	5.1	1.7	9.4	16.2	37.2	53.4
Arkansas	6.3	5.1	1.2	12.6	24.7	37.3	New Mexico	6.1	4.2	.7	11.0	20.6	31.6
California	17.7	9.0	19.0	45.7	96.9	142.6	New York	18.3	7.3	28.6	54.2	120.5	174.7
Colorado	7.0	4.6	1.8	13.4	23.2	36.6	North Carolina	9.5	8.2	2.8	20.5	43.3	63.8
Connecticut	2.5	1.3	4.1	7.9	16.4	24.3	North Dakota	5.4	3.9	.4	9.7	18.8	28.5
Delaware	1.9	1.3	.4	3.6	10.6	14.2	Ohio	13.5	8.2	12.4	34.1	72.8	106.9
Florida	6.2	4.0	3.8	14.0	28.9	42.9	Oklahoma	8.1	5.8	2.3	16.2	30.4	46.6
Georgia	9.3	7.2	3.1	19.6	39.6	59.2	Oregon	6.4	4.5	1.7	12.6	23.1	35.7
Idaho	4.6	3.3	.4	8.3	17.2	25.5	Pennsylvania	15.6	9.3	16.2	41.1	91.1	132.2
Illinois	14.9	8.1	15.0	38.0	80.2	118.2	Rhode Island	1.9	1.3	1.5	4.7	10.6	15.3
Indiana	9.0	6.2	5.1	20.3	41.4	61.7	South Carolina	5.1	4.2	1.5	10.8	22.9	33.7
Iowa	9.1	6.7	2.5	18.3	34.7	53.0	South Dakota	5.7	4.1	.4	10.2	19.7	29.9
Kansas	9.0	6.3	2.0	17.3	30.9	48.2	Tennessee	8.3	6.5	3.1	17.9	36.4	54.3
Kentucky	7.1	5.9	2.2	15.2	31.9	47.1	Texas	24.6	16.5	10.2	51.3	97.7	149.0
Louisiana	6.0	4.4	3.1	13.5	28.1	41.6	Utah	4.3	2.9	.9	8.1	16.6	24.7
Maine	3.2	2.3	.9	6.4	13.7	20.1	Vermont	1.9	1.3	.3	3.5	10.6	14.1
Maryland	3.5	2.1	3.6	9.2	20.4	29.6	Virginia	7.4	5.7	3.3	16.4	34.4	50.8
Massachusetts	5.0	1.9	8.9	15.8	36.3	52.1	Washington	6.4	4.2	3.2	13.8	27.3	41.1
Michigan	12.0	7.3	10.0	29.3	61.1	90.4	West Virginia	4.2	3.7	1.4	9.3	20.3	29.6
Minnesota	9.8	6.9	3.5	20.2	38.3	58.5	Wisconsin	9.0	6.3	4.2	19.5	38.7	58.2
Mississippi	6.7	5.6	1.2	13.5	27.0	40.5	Wyoming	4.8	3.2	.2	8.2	17.7	25.9
Missouri	11.0	7.4	5.3	23.7	46.0	69.7	Hawaii	1.9	1.3	.7	3.9	----------	3.9
Montana	7.7	5.3	.5	13.5	24.4	37.9	District of Columbia	1.9	1.3	1.9	5.1	10.6	15.7
Nebraska	7.5	5.3	1.3	14.1	24.4	38.5	Puerto Rico	2.0	2.1	1.8	5.9	----------	5.9
Nevada	4.8	3.2	.2	8.2	17.8	26.0	Alaska	7.8	5.3	.1	13.2	----------	13.2

FISCAL YEAR 1959

[Millions of dollars]

State	Primary highway system ($393.7)	Secondary or feeder roads ($262.5)	Urban highways ($218.8)	Subtotal ($875.0)	Interstate system ($2,000.0)	Total ($2,875.0)	State	Primary highway system ($393.7)	Secondary or feeder roads ($262.5)	Urban highways ($218.8)	Subtotal ($875.0)	Interstate system ($2,000.0)	Total ($2,875.0)
Alabama	8.2	6.4	2.9	17.5	40.6	58.1	New Hampshire	2.0	1.3	.7	4.0	12.5	16.5
Arizona	5.7	3.9	.9	10.5	22.9	33.4	New Jersey	5.2	1.8	9.6	16.6	43.8	60.4
Arkansas	6.5	5.3	1.2	13.0	29.1	42.1	New Mexico	6.2	4.3	.7	11.2	24.3	35.5
California	18.2	9.3	19.6	47.1	114.1	161.2	New York	18.9	7.6	29.4	55.9	141.8	197.7
Colorado	7.2	4.8	1.8	13.8	27.3	41.1	North Carolina	9.8	8.4	2.8	21.0	51.0	72.0
Connecticut	2.6	1.3	4.3	8.2	19.3	27.5	North Dakota	5.6	4.0	.4	10.0	22.2	32.2
Delaware	2.0	1.3	.5	3.8	12.5	16.3	Ohio	13.8	8.4	12.7	34.9	85.6	120.5
Florida	6.3	4.1	4.0	14.4	34.0	48.4	Oklahoma	8.3	6.0	2.4	16.7	35.8	52.5
Georgia	9.6	7.4	3.2	20.2	46.6	66.8	Oregon	6.6	4.6	1.8	13.0	27.2	40.2
Idaho	4.8	3.4	.4	8.6	20.2	28.8	Pennsylvania	16.0	9.5	16.7	42.2	107.2	149.4
Illinois	15.3	8.3	15.4	39.0	94.3	133.3	Rhode Island	2.0	1.3	1.6	4.9	12.5	17.4
Indiana	9.3	6.4	5.3	21.0	48.6	69.6	South Carolina	5.2	4.4	1.5	11.1	26.9	38.0
Iowa	9.4	6.9	2.6	18.9	40.8	59.7	South Dakota	5.9	4.2	.4	10.5	23.2	33.7
Kansas	9.3	6.5	2.1	17.9	36.3	54.2	Tennessee	8.5	6.7	3.2	18.4	42.8	61.2
Kentucky	7.3	6.1	2.3	15.7	37.5	53.2	Texas	25.3	17.0	10.6	52.9	114.9	167.8
Louisiana	6.2	4.5	3.2	13.9	33.0	46.9	Utah	4.5	3.0	.9	8.4	19.5	27.9
Maine	3.3	2.3	.9	6.5	16.1	22.6	Vermont	2.0	1.3	.3	3.6	12.5	16.1
Maryland	3.6	2.2	3.7	9.5	24.0	33.5	Virginia	7.6	5.9	3.4	16.9	40.5	57.4
Massachusetts	5.2	1.9	9.2	16.3	42.7	59.0	Washington	6.5	4.4	3.3	14.2	32.1	46.3
Michigan	12.3	7.5	10.2	30.0	71.9	101.9	West Virginia	4.3	3.8	1.4	9.5	23.8	33.3
Minnesota	10.1	7.1	3.6	20.8	45.1	65.9	Wisconsin	9.2	6.4	4.3	19.9	45.5	65.4
Mississippi	6.9	5.8	1.2	13.9	31.7	45.6	Wyoming	4.9	3.4	.2	8.5	20.8	29.3
Missouri	11.3	7.6	5.4	24.3	54.2	78.5	Hawaii	2.0	1.3	.7	4.0	----------	4.0
Montana	7.9	5.5	.5	13.9	28.7	42.6	District of Columbia	2.0	1.3	1.9	5.2	12.5	17.7
Nebraska	7.8	5.5	1.3	14.6	28.7	43.3	Puerto Rico	2.1	2.2	1.9	6.2	----------	6.2
Nevada	5.0	3.3	.2	8.5	20.9	29.4	Alaska	8.0	5.4	.1	13.5	----------	13.5

SUMMARY, FISCAL YEARS 1957 TO 1959, INCLUSIVE

[Millions of dollars]

State	Primary highway system ($832.5)	Secondary or feeder roads ($555.0)	Urban highways ($462.5)	Subtotal ($1,850.0)	Interstate system ($4,700.0)	Total ($6,550.0)	State	Primary highway system ($832.5)	Secondary or feeder roads ($555.0)	Urban highways ($462.5)	Subtotal ($1,850.0)	Interstate system ($4,700.0)	Total ($6,550.0)
Alabama	17.4	13.5	6.1	37.0	95.4	132.4	New Hampshire	4.2	2.8	1.4	8.4	29.4	37.8
Arizona	12.1	8.3	1.8	22.2	53.9	76.1	New Jersey	11.1	3.8	20.4	35.3	102.9	138.2
Arkansas	13.7	11.2	2.6	27.5	68.3	95.8	New Mexico	13.2	9.1	1.5	23.8	57.0	80.8
California	38.5	19.6	41.4	99.5	268.0	367.5	New York	39.9	16.0	62.2	118.1	333.2	451.3
Colorado	15.2	10.1	3.9	29.2	64.2	93.4	North Carolina	20.7	17.8	6.0	44.5	119.8	164.3
Connecticut	5.5	2.8	9.0	17.3	45.3	62.6	North Dakota	11.8	8.5	.9	21.2	52.1	73.3
Delaware	4.2	2.8	1.0	8.0	29.4	37.4	Ohio	29.3	17.8	26.9	74.0	201.2	275.2
Florida	13.4	8.7	8.4	30.5	79.9	110.4	Oklahoma	17.6	12.6	5.0	35.2	84.1	119.3
Georgia	20.3	15.6	6.7	42.6	109.5	152.1	Oregon	13.9	9.8	3.7	27.4	63.9	91.3
Idaho	10.1	7.2	.9	18.2	47.5	65.7	Pennsylvania	33.9	20.2	35.3	89.4	251.9	341.3
Illinois	32.4	17.6	32.6	82.6	221.6	304.2	Rhode Island	4.2	2.8	3.3	10.3	29.4	39.7
Indiana	19.6	13.5	11.1	44.2	114.3	158.5	South Carolina	11.1	9.2	3.2	23.5	63.2	86.7
Iowa	19.9	14.6	5.5	40.0	95.9	135.9	South Dakota	12.4	8.9	.9	22.2	54.5	76.7
Kansas	19.6	13.7	4.4	37.7	85.3	123.0	Tennessee	18.0	14.1	6.7	38.8	100.6	139.4
Kentucky	15.4	12.9	4.8	33.1	88.2	121.3	Texas	53.5	35.9	22.3	111.7	270.1	381.8
Louisiana	13.1	9.5	6.8	29.4	77.6	107.0	Utah	9.4	6.3	1.9	17.6	45.8	63.4
Maine	7.0	4.9	1.9	13.8	37.8	51.6	Vermont	4.2	2.8	.6	7.6	29.4	37.0
Maryland	7.6	4.6	7.8	20.0	56.4	76.4	Virginia	16.1	12.4	7.2	35.7	95.1	130.8
Massachusetts	10.9	4.1	19.4	34.4	100.3	134.7	Washington	13.8	9.2	7.0	30.0	75.5	105.5
Michigan	26.1	15.9	21.7	63.7	169.0	232.7	West Virginia	9.1	8.0	3.0	20.1	56.0	76.1
Minnesota	21.4	15.0	7.6	44.0	105.9	149.9	Wisconsin	19.5	13.6	9.1	42.2	107.0	149.2
Mississippi	14.6	12.2	2.6	29.4	74.6	104.0	Wyoming	10.4	7.1	.4	17.9	48.9	66.8
Missouri	23.9	16.1	11.5	51.5	127.3	178.8	Hawaii	4.2	2.8	1.5	8.5	----------	8.5
Montana	16.7	11.6	1.1	29.4	67.5	96.9	District of Columbia	4.2	2.8	4.1	11.1	29.4	40.5
Nebraska	16.4	11.6	2.8	30.8	67.4	98.2	Puerto Rico	4.4	4.6	4.0	13.0	----------	13.0
Nevada	10.5	7.0	.4	17.9	49.1	67.0	Alaska	16.9	11.5	.2	28.6	----------	28.6

Apportionment of interstate funds for 1960 to 1969, inclusive, to be apportioned among the several States in the ratio which the revised estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in each State bears to the sum of the revised estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in all of the States.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the House-Senate conferees on title II of H. R. 10660, the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, have reached the agreement indicated in the conference report filed with respect to this legislation.

Before undertaking to explain the agreement reached by the House-Senate conferees on title II, I would like to commend the work of the conferees on title I of the legislation. The work of the distinguished chairman of the House Public Works Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY], and the other members of the House Public Works Committee who served as conferees on this legislation will do much to provide safety for the American motorist and an adequate highway system for our Nation's national defense and commercial needs. Although I feel there are some additions that should and must be made to the system, the House conferees on title I have worked long and hard and deserve the commendation of their colleagues in the House for the results of their efforts.

It will be recalled that title II of H. R. 10660 contains the financing provisions of our Federal highway program so that the program can be self-financed on a pay-as-we-build basis.

There were 24 Senate amendments affecting title II of the bill. Of these, the House conferees receded without amendment to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 24, and 25, and agreed to the Senate amendments. The Senate conferees receded without amendment from its amendments Nos. 8, 17, and 23. The House conferees receded, with amendment, to the Senate amendment Nos. 2, 3, 9, 14, 19, 20, 21, and 22. The Senate conferees receded, with amendment, to the Senate amendments Nos. 10 and 16.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to proceed to a discussion of the individual Senate amendments and describe briefly the House version and Senate version and the action of the conferees with respect to these amendments.

Senate amendment No. 2 was the first amendment in title II. It relates to the tax imposed on diesel fuel. Under present law a tax of 2 cents a gallon is imposed on fuel sold for use, or used, in a diesel-powered highway vehicle. The House bill would have increased this tax from 2 cents a gallon to 3 cents a gallon, effective July 1, 1956. The Senate amendment would have continued this increase in tax but provided that it would apply only to diesel fuel used in a vehicle registered, or required to be registered, for use on the highways. The Senate amendment also provided that the increased tax would apply only to diesel fuel actually used while the vehicle was being used on a highway. The House conferees receded, with an amendment. The House conferees accepted the principle of not applying the increased diesel fuel tax to fuel used in a vehicle not registered or required to be registered, but deleted the Senate provision applying the increase tax only to that used on the highways. The conferees were informed by technical experts from the Treasury Department and Internal Revenue Service that the prorating which would be required by this provision of the Senate passed bill would have imposed very difficult administrative problems.

Senate amendment No. 3 relates to the excise tax imposed on special motor fuels, such as benzol, benzene, and naphtha, and low-price gas. Present law imposes a tax of 2 cents a gallon on these special motor fuels sold for use or used to propel a motor vehicle, motorboat, or airplane. The House-passed version of H. R. 10660 would have increased the rate of tax to 3 cents a gallon, effective July 1, 1956, in the case of special motor fuel sold for use or used in a motor vehicle. The Senate amendment to this provision would have made three changes. First, it would have made the additional 1-cent tax applicable only to fuel used in highway vehicles instead of motor vehicles. Second, it would have provided the same treatment for special motor fuels as far as registered and nonregistered vehicles are concerned, as I have described under Senate amendment No. 2 in connection with the diesel-fuel tax. Third, as in the case of the diesel-fuel tax, it would also have made the increased tax apply only to special motor fuels actually used on the highways. The House conferees receded with an amendment to the Senate amendment, which accepts the concept of registration of the vehicle as determining the applicability of the 1-cent increase in tax and applies it to highway vehicles instead of motor vehicles, but which deletes the use test provided in the Senate-passed bill. Thus, the House amendment to the Senate amendment conforms to the conference agreement with respect to amendment No. 2 and, in addition, conforms to the Senate amendment in limiting the 1-cent increase to fuel used in a motor vehicle which is a highway vehicle.

Senate amendments Nos. 4 and 5 are technical amendments, and the House conferees receded.

Senate amendment No. 6 proposed to strike out a House provision providing for sales by a gasoline producer free of the additional 1-cent tax on gasoline. H. R. 10660, as it passed the House, would have provided that under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate the tax on gasoline would be 2 cents a gallon instead of 3 cents a gallon in the case of gasoline sold by a producer or importer for use other than as a fuel in a highway vehicle. To conform the conference agreement with respect to Senate amendment No. 19, which I will describe later in my remarks, the House conferees receded on Senate amendment No. 6.

The House conferees receded on Senate amendment No. 7, which was a technical, conforming amendment.

Senate amendment No. 8 relates to the special use tax on heavy trucks and buses. It will be recalled that under the House bill any highway motor vehicle which has a taxable gross weight of more than 26,000 pounds was taxed at the rate of $1.50 a year for each 1,000 pounds of taxable gross weight or fraction thereof. The Senate amendment would have modified this House provision so that the tax would be at a rate of $2.50 a year for each 1,000 pounds of taxable gross weight—or fraction thereof—in excess of 26,000 pounds. The Senate conferees receded on this amendment. This saved $396 million in revenue for the highway program.

Senate amendment No. 9 provided a technical amendment relating to payment of the tax on the use of highway motor vehicles owned by the United States. The House conferees receded with a technical amendment.

Senate amendment No. 10 deleted a provision contained in the House passed bill to the effect that the new tax on the use of heavy trucks and buses would not apply to the use of buses of the transit type which obtain 60 percent or more of their passenger fare revenue from commutation fares or those for 35 cents or less. Under the conference agreement, the provision of the House bill is restored with a clerical amendment.

Senate amendments Nos. 11 and 12 are technical and clerical, respectively, and the House conferees recedes on each.

Senate amendment No. 13 provides that the floor stock taxes imposed by H. R. 10660 on articles held on July 1, 1956, the effective date of the rate increases provided in the bill are to be paid at such time after September 30, 1956, as the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate may prescribe. There was no fixed date prior to which these taxes would not have to be paid under the corresponding provision in the House bill although one would have been fixed by regulations. The House conferees receded.

Senate amendment No. 14 relates to credits and refunds in the case of the special motor fuels tax and also provides credits or refunds in the case of the diesel fuel tax. The House conferees receded, with an amendment, to conform to the conference action on Senate amendments Nos. 2 and 3.

Senate amendment No. 15 deleted the refund and credit provisions of the House bill provided in connection with the 1-cent-a-gallon increase in the tax on gasoline where the gasoline is used or resold for use otherwise than as a fuel in a highway vehicle. In conformity with the conference agreement with respect to Senate amendment No. 19, which I will explain later, the House conferees receded.

Senate amendment No. 16 deleted the provision in the House bill, relating to credits or refunds allowed in the case of gasoline, diesel fuel, and special motor fuels used in vehicles engaged in furnishing scheduled common-carrier public passenger land transportation service along regular routes. Under the conference agreement, the substance of the House provision is restored to the bill. The part relating to credit or refund of taxes on diesel fuel and special motor

fuels is restored by the conference action on this amendment. The part relating to gasoline is added by the conference action on Senate amendment No. 19.

Senate amendment No. 17 was clerical in nature, and the Senate conferees receded.

Senate amendment No. 18 is a technical, clarifying amendment, and the House conferees receded.

Senate amendment No. 19 added a new section to the 1954 Code as a substitute for the provisions of the House bill deleted by Senate amendments Nos. 6 and 15. Under the new section a procedure would be provided under which the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate would pay an amount computed at the rate of 1 cent a gallon to the ultimate purchaser of gasoline used for nonhighway purposes. The procedure, in general, would be the same as that provided for gasoline used on a farm for farming purposes, except that the Senate provided for quarterly claims instead of annual claims where the claim was for at least 100,000 gallons of gasoline. The House conferees receded, accepting the substance of the Senate amendment which provides for direct refunds instead of sales free of the additional tax and refunds processed up through the producer. However, the provisions in the Senate amendment permitting quarterly returns where the claim was for at least 100,000 gallons was deleted by the conferees with the result that all claims will be made annually. The registration requirement for gasoline, previously explained in connection with diesel fuel, was accepted by the House conferees while the Senate conferees agreed to the omission of the use test.

Senate amendments Nos. 20 and 21 are technical, conforming amendments on which the House conferees recedes.

Senate amendment No. 22 deleted a provision of the House bill providing that nothing in the highway trust fund provision was to be construed as limiting the amount of apportionments made under any authorization in title I of the bill or in any previous or subsequent act which amends or supplements the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916. The Senate amendment requires the Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, to estimate from time to time the amounts which will be available in the highway trust fund—excluding repayable advances—to defray the expenditures which will be required to be made from the trust fund. Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the amounts which will be available in the trust fund—excluding repayable advances—will be insufficient to defray expenditures resulting from apportionments to the States, he is required to so notify the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary of Commerce is then required to reduce the apportionments to the States he otherwise would make by an amount sufficient in size so that no deficit will occur in the trust fund. The Secretary of the Treasury is required to notify the Secretary of Commerce when the trust fund balance will permit the apportionment of funds previously withheld from the States and the funds so withheld will then be made available. The effect of the Senate amendment is to require that tax collections under title II of the bill will be sufficient on a year-to-year basis to offset annual expenditures under title I of the bill. The House conferees receded with a conforming amendment.

Senate amendment No. 23 is a clerical amendment on which the Senate conferees receded.

Senate amendments Nos. 24 and 25 are technical, conforming amendments on which the House conferees receded.

Mr. Speaker, it is my view that House Resolution 10660, providing a modern network of roads and highways in our Nation, is one of the most important bills to come before the Congress in recent years. Approximately $50 billion will be spent by the Federal and State Governments to accomplish this program. Seven hundred and fifty thousand miles of highways and streets will be affected. The fact that this program is self-financing is, in my judgment, one of its most meritorious features. While the American motorist will pay more in highway taxes, he will save even more in operating costs. It is estimated that these increased taxes will cost the average motorist $8.80 a year more than he pays now. However, when the new roads are completed, the cost of driving for the average motorist will be reduced by a penny a mile.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to support the conference report on House Resolution 10660 in the interest of public safety, national defense, and the economic growth of our Nation.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the technical provisions of the conference agreement with regard to title II of H. R. 10660 have already been explained in great detail and at considerable length. I would simply like to emphasize at this time three major aspects of the conference agreement because of their particular importance.

First, the conference agreement restores the provision of the House bill which imposes a tax of $1.50 per thousand pounds of gross weight on use of any highway motor vehicle which has a taxable gross weight of more than 26,000 pounds. I personally had sponsored this amendment which the Committee on Ways and Means had adopted unanimously. The Senate had so amended this provision that its version would have produced about $350 million less than the House provision. Thus, restoration of the House provision in its original form constitutes not only a victory for the average motorist in that it results in heavy trucks paying a fairer share of the costs of this program but also it represents a victory for those who believe that this program should be financed as nearly on a pay-as-you-go method as possible.

Second, the Senate had eliminated the exemption from the increased fuel taxes which the House bill had provided with respect to certain urban transit vehicles. Your conferees succeeded in reinstating this exemption. In view of the fact that many of these transit systems are already in financial difficulties and also that any increased costs must be passed on to the users of these mass transportation facilities, this exemption is fully justified.

Finally, the conferees agreed to a Senate amendment designed to give assurance that no deficit will develop in the highway trust fund. This result is achieved by requiring the Secretary of the Treasury—in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce—from time to time to estimate the balance of the highway trust fund available to meet expenditures required to be made from the fund. Whenever he determines that the fund balance will be insufficient to meet the expenditures required as a result of the apportionment to the States of Federal aid highway funds, he is to advise the Secretary of Commerce as to the amount of the expected deficiency. The Secretary of Commerce is then to reduce the funds available for apportionment to the States with respect to the interstate system so as to forestall the estimated deficiency. This reduction in the apportionments for the interstate system is to be made among the States on a pro rata basis. Subsequently, as the Secretary of the Treasury estimates that highway trust fund balances will become available to meet these apportionments to the States for the interstate highway system, the amounts previously withheld are to be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce to the various States. Because the bill provides for the withholding of apportionments only with respect to the interstate system, this provision will not in any way affect the regular Federal aid highway program. It will, however, give specific and definite assurance that the Federal aid highway program will be paid for on a pay-as-you-build basis. This will give assurance of congressional reconsideration of the highway program at any time in the future that revenues appear to be inadequate to meet the highway program presently planned, since either new revenues will have to be raised at such a time or the expenditure program will have to be curtailed or postponed.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, as one of the managers on the part of the House, I am most happy to bring to the attention of the Congress the report of the conferees on H. R. 10660, which is known as the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is the result of many months of study and hard work by the Ways and Means Committee and the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives and the Finance Committee and Public Works Committee of the Senate. I certainly want to pay my respects to the Ways and

Means Committee and its chairman, Congressman COOPER, as well as the senior minority member, Congressman REED. Also to the Public Works Committee of the House, Chairman BUCKLEY, of the full committee, and especially Congressman GEORGE FALLON, of Maryland, who so ably presided during weeks of hearings as chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, and Congressman DONDERO, the senior minority member of the Public Works Committee. I feel certain, Mr. Speaker, that as time goes on the splendid work that these gentlemen did will become more recognized.

Mr. Speaker, I think this conference report carries forward to a large extent the recommendations of this House when we originally passed H. R. 10660 by Mr. FALLON. This legislation represents a compromise by many units of our economy and those various units have been very helpful in aiding us to submit to you legislation for better highways.

I might say that in my opinion this bill is divided into three categories; the Intrastate System, the Interstate System and title II of the bill which establishes taxes to approximately cover the expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, I will only attempt to discuss the title I section which is the authorization section which comes under the jurisdiction of the Public Works Committee. I am certain a full explanation will be made of title II, the taxing section, by the Ways and Means Committee.

INTRASTATE

The intrastate section covers Federal aid primary, Federal aid secondary, and extension of these systems in urban areas. The same formula of distribution is retained, Mr. Speaker, as was in the 1954 Highway Act which is now known as Public Law 350. Forty-five percent of the total appropriated for the intrastate system is to be used on Federal aid primary system, 30 percent on Federal aid secondary system and 25 percent for projects of these systems within urban areas.

The total amount per year for the intrastate system Federal funds will be $825 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957; $850 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and the sum of $875 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. This means that the intrastate system will have a base increase of $100 million plus the escalator clause of $25 million each year.

FARM-TO-MARKET ROADS

The bill retains the provision that gives permission to the State highway departments and the local authorities to use Federal funds on farm-to-market roads. The specifications covering these roads can be drawn by local county engineers with the approval of the highway department and need only to meet the needs of the local communities. This means that Federal highway funds can be used on farm-to-market roads without rigid adherence to Federal specifications which often in the past, because of the exorbitant cost, has prevented the construction of needed roads in many sections of rural areas.

TRANSFER FUNDS

The legislation, Mr. Speaker, allows a transfer of 20 percent from one segment of the intrastate system to another provided that the transfers are requested by the State highway department and is approved by the Governor of such State and the Secretary of Commerce.

INTENT

The bill declares it to be essential to the national interest to provide for an early completion of the National System of Interstate Highways. It clearly sets forth the intent of the Congress that the Interstate System be completed as early as practical over a 13-year period and that the entire system in all the States be brought to simultaneous completion.

The expenditures, Mr. Speaker, covering the appropriations are set forth on page 13 of the bill and the final date of authorization for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

FORMULA OF DISTRIBUTION—INTERSTATE

The House conferees yielded to the Senate version that the formula of distribution for the Interstate System will be based on the existing law for the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959. For the remaining 10 years of the program, 1959 to 1969, the formula of apportionment contained in the House bill will be followed. This is to say, the funds will be apportioned in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in each State bears to the estimated total cost of completing the Interstate System in all of the States. It is to be emphasized, Mr. Speaker, that the last 10 years of the program the formula of apportionment is the cost of completion formula over the 13-year period based on costs and needs. No State should receive aggregate apportionments which are greater or less than the cost of completing the Interstate System within that State.

FEDERAL SHARE

The conferees have definitely agreed, Mr. Speaker, to retain the provision, both in the House and the Senate, that the Federal share on the Interstate System is to be 90 percent of the total cost.

MAXIMUM WEIGHT AND WIDTH LIMITATIONS

Mr. Speaker, there seemingly has been a great deal of misinformation relative to maximum weight, length, and width limitations as they affect motor vehicles using the highways. In a general statement, any truck that is now lawfully operating on the highways as of July 1, 1956, can continue to operate. When the bill was passed by the House it prohibited the apportionment of Interstate System funds to any State where the Interstate System might lawfully be used by vehicles having axle weights in excess of 18,000 pounds on any one axle or 32,000 pounds on a tandem axle or the maximum corresponding axle weight permitted by laws or regulations of such State in effect on July 1, 1956, whichever is the greater. The conferees further agreed to accept the Senate amendment, while retaining the substance of the House provision, including a width limitation of 96 inches and an overall gross weight limitation of 73,280 pounds. Under the conference agreement any vehicle that could lawfully operate within a State on July 1, 1956, will not be affected.

Mr. Speaker, the bill directed the Secretary of Commerce to expedite a series of tests being planned and conducted for the purpose of determining maximum dimensions and weights for vehicles operated on the Federal aid highway system and to submit a report, with recommendations, to the Congress not later than March 1, 1959. The Senate agreed to the House version.

MAXIMUM MILEAGE

When the bill left the House it carried a 40,000-mile limit applicable to the Interstate System. Under section 108 of the conference agreement, the limit on mileage, which may be designated on the Interstate System, was increased by 1,000 miles, from 40,000 to 41,000. However, the conference agreement maintains a proviso that the cost of completing any mileage from any of the 1,000 newly authorized miles is to be excluded in making the estimate of costs of completion under the section 108 (d). The designation of additional mileage in any State will of course in no way increase the apportionment to the State during the first 3 years, for which the existing low method of apportionment is in effect. The proviso insures that during the ensuing 10-year program the estimate of cost of completing the Interstate System in each State will be made by estimating that cost for mileage designated from the 40,000 miles provided by law before the enactment of this bill. This means that no additional cost has been added, by reason of the additional 1,000 miles, to the 40,000-mile program on which the tax provisions of title II of the bill were based.

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS TO ACQUIRE RIGHTS-OF-WAY

The bill provides that the Secretary of Commerce may make available to the States money for advanced acquisition of rights-of-way. At no time, however, will the amount advanced to a State exceed one-fourth of the amount apportioned to such State for the year in which the advance is operative.

RELOCATION OF UTILITY FACILITIES

Section 113 makes it permissible for Federal funds to be used to reimburse a State for additional relocation costs which the State had paid for under its own laws. Section 113 is the same as the bill as passed by the House. This section has been recommended and accepted by the conferees recognizing the equity of reimbursing utilities for the cost of relocating facilities when required for Federal aid highway projects.

After lengthy discussion the conferees have endeavored that this section makes it clear that it is the intention of the Federal Government to assume its apportionate share of utility relocation costs whenever a State allows such costs. Under the existing practice, Mr. Speaker, of the Bureau of Public Roads, Federal funds may participate in utility relocation costs to the same extent as other construction costs without percentage limitations based on the State's apportionment. This legislation encourages the States to review their contemporary status and take objective action in accordance with such review. Mr. Speaker,

this section will be of great assistance to small utilities, both public and private, especially including the REA, small telephone companies and small villages through which highway systems run and now have storm sewers, water sewage, and lighting utilities which do not bring in the revenue necessary to relocate if compelled to do so by new highway alinement.

POLICY WITH RESPECT TO REIMBURSEMENT FOR CERTAIN HIGHWAYS

The bill establishes a provision which is a declaration of intent and policy on the part of Congress to determine whether or not the Federal Government should equitably reimburse any State for such construction, rather than to commit the Federal Government in advance of the study to make such reimbursement and to provide funds therefor.

PREVAILING RATE OF WAGE

It is recognized that there must be the utmost cooperation between the several State Highway Departments and the Secretary of Labor in order to carry out the intent of provisions of section 115 (b). This section sets forth that the Secretary of Commerce shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on the initial construction work performed on highway projects on the Interstate System authorized in section 108 of this title, shall be paid wages at not less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor. In carrying out the duties of the foregoing subsection, the Secretary of Labor shall consult with the Highway Department of the State in which a project on an Interstate System is to be performed. After giving due regard to the information thus obtained, he shall make a predetermination of the minimum wages to be paid laborers and mechanics in accordance with the provision of the foregoing section which shall be set out in each project advertisement for bids and in each bid proposal form and shall be made a part of the contract covering the project.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that it is the intent of this Congress that this program can be worked satisfactorily for all parties concerned if we have the cooperative effort that the conferees have attempted to specify. This particular section is certainly not intended to hinder the existing economy of any section of our country, nor is it applicable to anyone other than those employed by the contractors or subcontractors on the initial construction work, and it goes no further in its scope than that which is set forth in the law.

PROGRESS REPORT

The Secretary of Commerce is to submit to the Congress not later than February 1, 1959, a report on the program made in attaining the completion of the Interstate System and at that time to submit his recommendations.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

The bill provides that when any State highway department submits plans for a Federal-aid highway project involving the bypassing of, or going through, any city, town, or village, either incorporated or unincorporated, it shall certify to the Commissioner of Public Roads that it has had public hearings, or has afforded the opportunity for such hearings, and has considered the economic effects of such a location.

EMERGENCY FUND

There is established an emergency fund in the amount of $30 million to be used in the repairing or construction of highways and bridges when the Federal-aid highway system which have suffered serious damage as the result of disaster over a wide area.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is not perfect. It will require the cooperative effort of all to achieve the goal that the people of this country want, namely, better roads. I sincerely hope that the conference report will be accepted.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, we are about to vote on and pass a very important piece of legislation. Practically every American citizen, men, women, and children, rich or poor, educated or uneducated, are vitally interested in the new road bill which this House is about to pass. I am quite convinced that this bill will become a law by being approved by this House and the Senate and also by the President.

There are several very significant facts connected with this proposed legislation, which, when taken together, have made it very popular.

First. Every American citizen is interested in and will no doubt directly or indirectly use these new proposed highways.

Second. The roads will be paid for by reason of the provisions of this law, which provisions will apply to all American citizens justly, and to all who use the roads. This will be done through taxation and through other fair methods.

Third. There is so much more travel on the highways of the country than formerly, and the amount of travel is bound to increase because of the increase in the population of the country and because of the increase in production of fast, useful automobiles. People now travel many times more every day than in the past.

Fourth. Practically every business now requires the use of new and more speedy implements of travel and the highways that once were mere mud roads are now concrete boulevards built to carry thousands of tons hundreds of miles in a comparatively short time.

I have watched the progress of this new highway construction program with a great deal of interest. Having been brought up on a farm and in a rural section, I understand exactly what you mean when you say "horse and buggy days." I know how much fuller will be the life of all our people when they get the benefit of this big countrywide road program.

Mr. Speaker, I watched the growth of this program ever since my childhood days when the horse and buggy were our fastest means of transportation. I remember well how the bicycle came into wide use. But now, with the program that will follow the passage of this legislation, there is no question but that the transportation of people and commodities will be increased greatly, and all to the benefit of civilization.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that during the past 30 or 40 years, people who traveled the roads were constantly looking forward to better, safer, and faster means of transportation. I know that that was my feeling and I was constantly wishing for a better day in that respect. I read with interest and approved the articles written by those who were taking the leadership in hastening the day when transportation would be faster, safer, and cheaper. For years, I argued that the national authorities should call together the leaders in the States that were planning for better, safer, and faster means of transportation. I mean the governors and highway engineers. And I was very much pleased when just a short time ago, our President and others encouraged and arranged for a meeting here in Washington of the transportation authorities of the States. They came because they could see that the people were demanding safer and more satisfactory transportation. This included the farmer, the country merchant, the city businessman, and practically everybody who understood the problem.

From these meetings came a movement that had its results in causing the Congressmen of the country to prepare legislation that would give the people of our great country—faster, safer, and better means and methods of transportation.

This was a hard colossal job that the Congress undertook, but the Members of Congress, always feeling a sense of responsibility to do what the people want done, took up the task of drawing legislation that would do two important things—

First. It would provide for the construction of thousands of miles of paved roads in those parts of the United States where they were most needed and would produce the greatest benefits. These should be selected without political preference, but purely on the basis of need and usefulness. These should be selected by men who knew roadbuilding thoroughly and knew where the roads were most needed and would bring the most benefits.

Second. It would provide the method of securing the tremendous sums of money that would be needed to pay for these great nationwide public improvements.

The Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, which has the legislative authority to draw up legislation in cases such as this case of nationwide road building, undertook to draw up this legislation This committee did a very fine job, as long as they applied themselves to deciding where the roads should be built and how they should be built. But when that committee assumed to provide the means and methods of paying for these roads, it found itself encroaching on the legislative rights of

that king of all committees—the Ways and Means Committee. Of course, I am sure that all of you will bear with me when I praise the Ways and Means Committee, for I have been a member of this great committee for about 25 years. I should like very much to make a statement at this point giving a report as to how we expect to pay for these tremendous expenses by taxation on gasoline and on trucks and other heavy vehicles that travel on these roads and in many other ways which I cannot set forth here now.

At any rate, the Public Works Committee confined its activity to planning for the construction of the roads in this great program and gave up the task of providing the finances necessary to the carrying out of this program. The Ways and Means Committee, both Democrats and Republicans, applied themselves most assiduously and brought out a plan of taxation that seems to be fair and sufficient. The plan of the Ways and Means Committee was considered carefully by the Finance Committee of the Senate, and the Senate itself. And the House members of the Ways and Means Committee, sitting as conferees with the Senate members as conferees, agreed on the many important provisions of this bill. Therefore, the report of the conference committee of the Senate and the conference committee of the House is now before the House for consideration.

I feel sure that this House will approve the conference committee's report and the Senate will do likewise, and that the President will then approve this legislation.

Then, Mr. Speaker, when this all shall have been accomplished, we, the Congress of the United States, working together with the Senate and with the President, shall have given to the country what I think is a wonderful piece of work and I hope that future generations will rise up and call us blessed for having given to the country a fine piece of legislation.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the members of the Roads Committee of the House, also the members of the Ways and Means Committee, for the splendid cooperation and the hard work they have put in in order to bring this bill to a successful conclusion.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to concur in the statement just made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and to pay my respects to him. The gentleman has had the patience of Job, has done an excellent job and I congratulate him as well as the members of the Ways and Means Committee on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the conference report now being considered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker. I want to take this opportunity to commend the Senate and House conferees on the highway bill conference report. Their work manifests a tremendous exercise of energy, patience, and compromise.

In view of the fact that the adoption of this legislation at this time is imperative because of the national crisis on our highways, it becomes incumbent upon every Member to withhold any reservations he may have and support the conference report.

It is indeed regrettable that initial allocation among the States for the Interstate System will be under the Senate formula which is based upon area, population, and post road mileage. To allocate construction on any other basis than need is unwise and shortsighted. This may have the effect of unduly delaying needed improvements to the Interstate System and increasing the paralysis that exists in and about large urban areas.

It is also regrettable that the conference report struck out the provision expressing the intent of Congress to reimburse States for toll roads designated as part of the Interstate System. In effect, the omission of this provision penalizes the effort of several progressive States to lift themselves from the highway dilemma by the bold construction of modern up-to-date toll roads.

The elimination of any chance for reimbursement for toll roads has the immediate effect of canceling out any proposed toll highways. Plans in Ohio for a north-south turnpike have been shelved. Instead, plans will be made to establish partial constructions as free highways. If Ohio and other States with turnpike authorities could be reimbursed for toll roads designated as a part of the Interstate System, it would provide a very sorely needed incentive for speedy development of the highway system. Delays will only result in increased costs and piecemeal construction.

The successful development of the Interstate Highway System which America needs will now be the responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Roads and the participating State and local authorities. It is my sincere hope that piecemeal improvements will be completely frowned upon; that plans be carried through for entire units of development. It is my further hope that highway right-of-way plans be developed as rapidly as possible so that needed rights-of-way be acquired as a matter of priority before they become unavailable because of immovable obstructions or before it becomes costly because of local planning which does not anticipate the Interstate Highway System.

It is also my hope that the Federal Bureau of Public Roads will insist upon the wider use of limited access highways and further insist that local subdivisions zone out business activities along the highways which detract from highway use and increase highway hazards.

In the decade ahead the Nation must expect the greatest use of America's highways by the greatest number of automobiles. The increase in highway traffic will not be accompanied by the same proportion of driver integrity. Driving habits must be better developed, and qualifications for motor-vehicle operators' licenses must be increased. The motorist must be made to realize that he does not have an inalienable right to drive a car in any manner upon our highways. He must learn that he has a permit which can be suspended or revoked upon a finding that he does not have the ability, the temperament, or the capacity to drive. This will require rigid enforcement of the traffic laws and a uniform but certain application in the administration of highway justice. This field of jurisprudence is one which must be brought home to every motorist.

My appreciation again to the members of the committee who have worked so hard for this day and for the conferees who spent many hours in negotiation and compromise. The legislation is not perfect, but it provides the basis upon which perfection may be achieved.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the House has just passed, and it is understood that Senate approval will be immediately forthcoming, the greatest public works program in the history of the world, a program estimated at a total cost of $51 billion to improve the highway system of this Nation. From a standpoint of defense as well as the economy of the country, the merits of this legislation will undoubtedly be proven as work progresses and as this 40,000-mile Interstate System is completed within a 15-year period. Nearly 2 years of study and effort has been put in on this bill on the part of the Public Works Committee of the House, and lengthy hearings in the Senate have ensued in addition to the great effort put forth by the Clay Committee in initially studying the matter. Eisenhower's report to Congress on the matter and his request for legislation started the ball rolling this session.

Included in the bill as passed is section 110 providing for advance purchase of rights-of-way which is the same provision as made in a bill which I introduced, H. R. 8829, this provision being accepted on my motion by the Roads Subcommittee unanimously and by the full Public Works Committee thereafter and by the House. This provision was deleted by the Senate but reinstated in conference.

It is estimated that this provision alone, if used properly can save as much as $1,500 million in the overall cost of this gigantic road program.

This is a new provision in highway legislation and permits States to use any Federal matching funds on any of the systems of highways provided for in the bill for purchase of rights-of-way up to the 5 years in advance from construction.

The conference report changes the House version of the road bill principally by using the allocation formula under the present law for a period of 3 years and thereafter providing for the institution of the needs formula which the House felt so essential to guarantee the completion of the entire 40,000-mile system, this system having been increased to 41,000 miles in conference.

This means for the first 3 years under the present formula of allocation that Florida will receive in Federal contributions a total of $110,300,000, of which $79.9 million is for the Interstate System and $30.5 million for the other systems, the latter including $13.4 million for primary, $8.7 million for secondary, and $8.4 million for urban. This provides a substantial increase over fiscal 1956 for Federal participation, 1956 being in the amount of $14,559,885 for all systems in Florida. This further provides that the Interstate System shall be on a 90 percent Federal matching basis as compared to 60 percent under previous law, meaning that a large portion of funds previously spent by the State in matching interstate money on a 40 percent State contribution basis will be available for expenditure for additional State highways.

This overall program assures the completion in the near future of the third bay bridge across Tampa Bay as well as the full 1,173 miles of the Interstate System in Florida within the 15-year construction period, providing for two 4-lane routes into the central west coast area on the Interstate System, one coming south through Ocala and the other southwest through Orlando and Lakeland. It also provides for four-laning of U. S. 1 on the west coast and an east-west highway from Jacksonville to Pensacola. The bill provides that under the needs formula beginning in fiscal 1960 that a report should be made to Congress for approval on the allocation basis on the ratio that the total number of miles and the number of miles within the State of Florida has to the total funds available for that year. This is roughly estimated, it means, at approximately $50 million for all systems in Florida per year starting in 1960 and for a 10-year period.

This bill, in other words, provides for nearly 3 times as much money per year for the first 3 years as under the present road legislation and nearly 4 times as much as for the balance of 10 years per year to complete the Interstate System and for the improvement of other roads. This undoubtedly will be one of the greatest boosts to not only the continued but the accelerated economic growth of Florida.

The 40,000-mile Interstate System connects 90 percent of all cities in America where the population is in excess of 50,000 and 42 of the 48 State capitals, thus providing for the first time a comprehensive network of interstate roads while at the same time providing for the accelerated improvement of the other systems.

I cite Florida as an example as to what this bill will mean to the entire country and I am sure history will show that the judgment of all of us in supporting this measure was well founded. I believe that this will be considered the greatest accomplishment of this session of Congress.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE BILL S. 890

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill S. 890.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO COOPERATE WITH FEDERAL AGENCIES IN THE PREVENTION OF WATERFOWL DEPREDATIONS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7641) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purpose of preventing crop damage by migratory waterfowl, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available to the Secretary of the Interior such wheat, corn, or other grains, acquired through price support operations and certified by the Commodity Credit Corporation to be available for purposes of this act or in such condition through spoilage or deterioration as not to be desirable for human consumption, as the Secretary of the Interior shall requisition pursuant to section 2 hereof. With respect to any grain thus made available, the Commodity Credit Corporation may pay packaging, transporting, handling, and other charges up to the time of delivery to one or more designated locations in each State.

"SEC. 2. Upon a finding by the Secretary of the Interior that any area in the United States is threatened with damage to farmers' crops by migratory waterfowl, whether or not during the open season for such migratory waterfowl, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to requisition from the Commodity Credit Corporation and to make available to Federal, State, or local governmental bodies or officials, or to private organizations or persons, such grains acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation through price-support operations in such quantities and subject to such regulations as the Secretary determines will most effectively lure migratory waterfowl away from crop depredations and at the same time not expose such migratory waterfowl to shooting over areas to which the waterfowl have been lured by such feeding programs.

"SEC. 3. With respect to all grain made available pursuant to section 2, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be reimbursed by the Secretary of the Interior for its expenses in packaging and transporting such grain for purposes of this act.

"SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for its investment in the grain transferred pursuant to this act.

"SEC. 5. No grain shall be made available by the Commodity Credit Corporation under this act after the expiration of 3 years following its enactment."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the request?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, is making the request to take up a Senate bill and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, has this matter been taken up with the gentleman's committee? In other words, I know nothing about what the gentleman is trying to do.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I did not think the bill was important enough to be taken up with Members on both sides of the aisle. It simply provides that some of the surplus grain owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be used to beguile the ducks away from the farmers' fields. The bill passed the House, and the Senate limited it to a period of 3 years.

Mr. MARTIN. It is just extending the time.

Mr. SPENCE. Extending the time. There was no limit on the time in the House bill, and the Senate limited the time to 3 years.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 11926) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, to permit the negotiation of commercial leases at atomic energy communities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I understand this is a unanimous report.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is a unanimous report from the committee; yes.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 161 e. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by striking therefrom the words "section 174;" and substituting in lieu thereof the words: "section 174: *Provided, however*, That in the communities owned by the Commission, the Commission is authorized to grant privileges, leases and permits upon adjusted terms which are fair and reasonable to responsible persons to operate commercial businesses without advertising and

without securing competitive bids, but taking into consideration, in addition to the price, and among other things (1) the quality and type of services required by the residents of the community, (2) the experience of each concession applicant in the community and its surrounding area, (3) the ability of the concession applicant to meet the needs of the community, and (4) the contribution the concession applicant has made or will make to the other activities and general welfare of the community;".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELEVENTH ANNUAL ASSEMBLY, WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to authorize an appropriation of $400,000 to defray the added expenses incident to the holding of the 11th Annual Assembly, World Health Organization, in the United States in 1958.

Several of us from the House have served on American delegations to past assemblies and consequently have had an opportunity to obtain firsthand knowledge of the World Health Organization activities.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Appropriations Committee have recently held hearings and learned in detail of the work of the World Health Organization.

I believe it is a fair statement that the dividends to the United States from our participation in the World Health Organization are more readily appreciated than those derived from our participation in perhaps any other international endeavor.

The World Health Assembly is the annual meeting of the legislative body of the World Health Organization attended by delegations from almost 80 member countries. It generally lasts about 3 weeks. Serving in the delegations are the health leaders of the world, including ministers and directors of health, parliamentary leaders, and persons prominent in the medical and scientific professions of these countries.

A meeting in the United States would have far-reaching effects in affording opportunities for American physicians to meet with their counterparts from abroad, and for these important visitors to observe our own health services at municipal, State, and national levels; to visit our fine teaching and research institutions; and to see United States democratic processes at work.

The resolution is introduced because the World Health Organization some years ago adopted a policy, with United States concurrence, that assemblies would not be held away from the Organization's headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland, unless the inviting government paid the additional expenses, which it is estimated will amount to not more than $400,000. Only two assemblies have been held outside Geneva; the 1949 meeting in Rome and the 1955 meeting in Mexico City.

Mr. Speaker, the United States played a leading role in organizing and developing WHO, one international organization about whose activities I have never heard any complaint or criticism.

An assembly in our country can make great contributions to the knowledge and experience of these leaders in health work throughout the whole world.

There will be great benefits to ourselves from the meeting here. The most effective form of building genuine understanding of our country is to allow people to see us as we are, here in our homeland.

Considering all these advantages, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution will be acted upon favorably. It should be passed at this session of the Congress, so that the invitation can be extended this year, allowing the responsible officials of WHO to prepare their plans for 1958 for submission to the next assembly.

1958 will mark the 10th year of the Organization's existence and will be a very appropriate anniversary on which for the first time to hold the assembly in the United States where WHO was born.

FILING OF REPORTS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file reports on H. R. 11802, H. R. 6997, H. R. 9038, and H. R. 10111.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL LIBERATION STAMP

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced House Joint Resolution 658 to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps to be known as the national liberation stamp.

This resolution has special significance. It marks, in a sense, the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Woodrow Wilson, whose devotion to the political principle of national self-determination inspired all the people of the world and caused the rebirth of many nations which had been submerged for many years by alien occupation and foreign tyranny.

It emphasizes the uninterrupted determination of the American people to support the rights of all nations, large and small, and their hopes that all nations and people of the world will enjoy man's inalienable rights to individual liberty and the basic freedoms which form the foundation for a just and lasting peace.

The intent of this resolution is to encourage the issuance of a special series of postage stamps which will tell the people of the world of the determination of the American people to see the restoration of liberty and freedom to all the captive nations in the Communist colonial empire. In order that there would be no misunderstanding concerning the nations held in colonial bondage by the Russian Communists, they are spelled out in detail.

It is fitting that this series of stamps be called the national liberation stamp. It is a fact of history that all nations held in colonial bondage by one means or another, have sought their national liberation. Today, throughout all of Asia and Africa, nations have recently won their independence or are engaged in the struggle for their national independence. The United States has used its good offices to bring about the national liberation of many of these countries. All the newly independent nations of the world can look with confidence to the United States as a friend, a partner, and if needs be, a defender against those who would steal their hard-won national independence. To the many nations enslaved within the Russian Communist empire, such a series of stamps will serve as an inspiration, as a reassurance that the people of the United States are standing firmly by their time honored moral and political principles so well enunciated in the American Declaration of Independence.

It is my hope that this resolution will be adopted before this session of Congress adjourns. Such action will encourage the Post Office Department to complete a project which they have had under consideration for the past several weeks. Moreover, such action by Congress will give hope to all the people of the world at a time when it appears that the initiative of the West has been submerged by the Russian propaganda campaign of peaceful coexistence. My resolution reads as follows:

House Joint Resolution 658

Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps to be known as the National Liberation Stamp

Whereas the year 1956 marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Woodrow Wilson, who will always be remembered for his devotion to the principle of national self-determination; and

Whereas in our time this principle has immediate application to the vast Communist empire, which includes Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Poland, East Germany, Czechia, Slovakia, Hungary, Albania, Rumania, Bulgaria, North Caucasia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, Tibet, North Vietnam, China, Outer Mongolia, Inner Mongolia, North Korea, and federated Russia; and

Whereas one of the goals of American foreign policy is the restoration of liberty and freedom to captive nations in the Communist Colonial empire; and

Whereas the 1st session of the 84th Congress expressed its opposition to Communist colonialism and imperialism by unanimous adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 149; and

Whereas it is fitting and proper to remind the world and our own people of the state of captivity of these enslaved nations and of the hopes and aspirations of their peoples for self-determination and independent sovereignty: Now therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to prepare for issue on as early a date as practicable during the year 1956 a special series of 3-cent postage stamps to serve as a reminder of the present state of captivity of the nations in the Communist Colonial Empire and of the aspirations of the peoples of such nations for self-determination and independence, such stamps to be in appropriate design and to be known as the National Liberation Stamp.

INCREASING RATES OF, AND LIBERALIZING THE BASIS FOR PAYMENT OF, NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED PENSION AND SERVICE-CONNECTED COMPENSATION

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7886) to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue throughout the day, to be confined to the bill and to be equally divided and controlled by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman think he will need all day for general debate?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. From the requests that have come to me, it would take most of the afternoon.

Mr. MARTIN. Most of the afternoon does not mean necessarily all day.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It is impossible to tell exactly how much time Members will request. There has been a considerable number of requests.

Mr. MARTIN. Immediately upon the termination of general debate is the gentleman going to ask to start reading the bill today?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No more than the first section. There will be no amendments offered today.

Mr. MARTIN. How does that interfere with the program for tomorrow?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I presume we shall begin reading the bill for amendment tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN. I thought the school-construction bill was scheduled for tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] drew a natural deduction from the program announced, but we could not commit the House exactly to the program as I announced it last week. I announced that the school-construction bill would follow disposition of the bill we are about to take up. We were hopeful that it would be disposed of today. On the other hand there was the possibility that the school-construction bill might not be brought up until Thursday, due to the fact that two of the Members involved were abroad. Of course, at that time we did not know whether they would be able to get back in time to be here on Wednesday. I understand they have returned.

So that after the disposition of this bill, that will be the next order of business.

I agree with the gentleman; I should like to have the time for general debate shortened to, perhaps, 3 hours, if that could be agreed upon. Then we could proceed to read the bill under the 5-minute rule and have some part of it disposed of without leaving all of the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule for tomorrow.

Of course, we all appreciate the predicament of the chairman of the committee. If he cannot arrange it that way, we shall cooperate with him. On the other hand, if it is possible for him to get an agreement on limitation of general debate to, say, 3 hours, then we could continue after that in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I may say that members of the committee have already asked for more than 3 hours of time, and I am sure there are other Members of the House who desire to speak on the bill, although they have not yet contacted me.

Mr. MARTIN. What is the difficulty about continuing with reading the bill after general debate has concluded, on the assumption, perhaps, that all of the time that may be requested will not be used?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It is perfectly agreeable to the chairman of the committee to read the bill after concluding general debate.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, after general debate has been disposed of, if it is not too late, we can go right into the reading of the bill for amendments?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is perfectly agreeable to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, one further question. The school construction bill will follow this bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. There are some conference reports that will be brought in tomorrow. There is the conference report on the public works appropriation bill; there is the conference report on the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare for tomorrow. But the next legislative business will be the school construction bill. There might also be a conference report on the water pollution bill. Of course, we are all anxious to dispose of these conference reports as soon as possible.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuing this matter just a little further, I am asking this information for the guidance of Members so that they may be able better to make their own plans.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts understands the purpose of the inquiry.

Mr. MARTIN. We are to take the school construction bill up after several conference reports are disposed of and after the veterans bill has been disposed of. Is the gentleman going to run Friday and Saturday, if necessary, on the school construction bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. However, I want to advise the House frankly that if the school construction bill is disposed of this week and it should happen on a Friday or Saturday there will be no votes taken until the following Monday, because there is a convention of the Republican Party in Indiana and, in accordance with our procedure, which I think is a proper one, I am going to protect all Members of all States who have problems of that kind, either conventions or primaries. I know the gentleman from Massachusetts feels as I do.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I desire to continue the discussion of the school construction bill for just 1 minute. As I understand, today we debate the veterans bill and read it for amendment tomorrow. I think we would have to be rather optimistic if we were to assume that we would get through with it before late tomorrow afternoon. Then we will enter the debate on the school construction bill after the conference reports the gentleman has mentioned; and I understand one or two of them are quite controversial.

Mr. McCORMACK. One at least.

Mr. BARDEN. Then we will take the rest of Thursday afternoon, with no votes on Friday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I mean no roll-call votes. That does not mean votes in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BARDEN. I want to say this to the gentleman, that the school construction bill is quite controversial, pro and con.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts is aware of that fact.

Mr. BARDEN. I am not at all encouraged over disposing of it on a Saturday meeting, because I think the gentleman readily recognizes the difficulty we would be operating under on Saturday.

Mr. McCORMACK. What would the gentleman do if he were leader? We have to protect Members in their conventions and primaries. I know the gentleman from North Carolina is just as strong in thinking that as both gentlemen from Massachusetts. Let us go along. I am making this statement, that the next order of legislative business after the disposition of the pension bill is the school construction bill. I am in that position and I have to adhere to it, with all due respect to my friend.

Mr. BARDEN. I know the gentleman respects me just as I do him. I know that I have it at heart to consider the convenience of the Members as he does. I am not trying to arouse any controversy in that field. However, I do think I have more than just the normal responsibility for this piece of legislation. There is a lot of inquiry made of me requesting some degree of certainty. If the gentleman is not in a position to give that at this time, I will bear with him, and maybe this afternoon or in the morning we can discuss it further. I know the gentleman is cooperative and will cooperate with me, and the gentle-

man knows I will do the same with him. But what I interrupted the gentleman for is just to let the House membership know that at least the situation is not wholly firm at this moment.

Mr. McCORMACK. We will let the gentleman's statement stand without any further comment.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the time will be equally divided between the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the ranking minority member?

The SPEAKER. That is exactly the request the gentleman from Texas made.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentlewoman object to the vote, or what is she doing?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No; I just make the point of order that a quorum is not present. I accept the vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not desire to be sharp with the gentlewoman, but unless she objects to the vote the House is already in the Committee of the Whole, because that is the question the Chair put.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7886, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, during the war I went into France with a group of 1,000 men. Six months later 300 of that thousand had been killed and 500 had been wounded. Now, I am not attempting to inject any emotion in the consideration of a bill for veterans. But I certainly could not live with myself if I did not try to be honest with the men I served with during the war—and to be a part of bringing a bill to the floor of the House which I am convinced in my own mind has no chance of becoming law would not be treating those men right. When we had only a few veterans we could do a lot for them. Today we have approximately 22 million veterans. By 1985, according to the Census Bureau, we will have a population of approximately 221 million people, with 110 million being either veterans, their families, or dependents. For that reason, I believe it is time we take a new look at our whole veterans' program. I think everyone will agree that our basic program must deal with widows, orphans, disabled veterans, and dependent mothers and fathers, and those veterans who cannot take care of themselves. The veteran population is so large that when we try to go beyond that we are asking for trouble and will seriously jeopardize our entire veterans' program. I have tried as hard as I know how to work out some kind of honest, sincere veterans' program that our country can live with and accept, and which will deal fairly with all veterans. Each year veterans' groups come to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with anywhere from 50 to 200 mandates requesting passage by the Congress.

What legislation we pass, they take credit for it. What legislation we do not pass, they blame us for. There is no committee in the Congress that has had the membership turnover of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. In the 81st Congress there were 44 percent new members on the committee. In the 82d Congress, 55 percent. In the 83d and 84th Congresses 57 percent. That turnover should prove that it is not easy to serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

We have a bill before this House, as I said before, that I do not think has a chance of becoming law. As far as I am personally concerned, it is a fraud upon the veterans to lead them to believe that there is a chance of its becoming law. A number of Members of this House have worked with me and tried to get a piece of legislation in shape that we can reasonably expect to become law. Before it is over with you will have a chance to vote for probably two substitutes. I can only speak for the one I prepared. That substitute will give a 10 percent across-the-board increase for every disabled veteran. It will give more of an increase than 10 percent to those veterans who are 100-percent disabled—that rate would be $225—and who do not receive a statutory award. It will give an increase to non-service-connected veterans who require aid and an attendant. Today that non-service-connected veteran who requires aid and an attendant receives $135.45. This substitute will increase that to $150.

This substitute will cost about $170 million. We have considerable assurance that this bill has a chance of becoming law. The bill before the Congress now, in my opinion, has no chance of becoming law; and, as I said, it is a fraud upon the veterans to attempt to pass it.

It is most important that you understand our present veterans' program. We have a very large, tremendous veterans' program today. I am going to spend some time running through this program to show you something of the size and scope of our present program.

Just as an example of the size of our Veterans' Administration program today, the Administration employs 177,000 people. They receive approximately 120 million pieces of mail a year. They maintain records of 230 million veterans and families.

We have a hospital program that provides daily 132,000 beds in 173 different hospitals and 17 domiciliaries.

The Administration of Veterans' Affairs is guardian for 237,000 children and 110,000 adults. Since the end of World War II, veterans and their families have made more than 130 million visits and 70 million telephone calls to the Veterans' Affairs contact offices.

I contend that we have a very fine veterans' program, but we have reached the point where we must decide which way we are going in the future and what we can afford to do in the best interests of the veteran and the Nation generally. In my opinion, every dollar we appropriate to non-service-connected cases, we take away from the service-connected disabled. We are spending 7 percent of the Nation's annual income on the veterans' program.

I want to run through a few charts and try to show you something of what our program is today.

First, from World War II we have 15,377,000 veterans in civilian life. From the Korean conflict we have 4,564,000. From World War I, 3,077,000. From prior wars, 128,000.

Today we have a non-service-connected program that gives a veteran who has had 90 days war service or more, with an honorable discharge, who, if single, has an income limitation of $1,400; and, if married, $2,700, and who is, first, less than 55 years of age, who has a single permanent disability of 60 percent, or 2 or more permanent disabilities, or, second, 1 of which is 40 percent, combined with other disabilities in a total of 70 percent, today can receive $66.15. If he is 60 and has a 50-percent rating, 2 or more disabilities and is unemployable, he can receive $66.15. When he is 65, if he has 10-percent disability and unemployment, he can receive $66.15, or $78.75.

On the pension roll as of April 30 this year we have 582,000 veterans; that is, non-service-connected.

The Veterans' Administration tells us that the present increase is 5,000 per month, and that by the year 1961 there will be one million veterans on the non-service-connected pension rolls.

Let me emphasize that I am not talking about the bill we are considering. I am referring to the existing program.

Last year the total appropriations for compensation of pensions amounted to $2,629,000,000. I want to say right here that there have been a lot of things said about these cost estimates. The national commander of the American Legion in articles in the paper have said that they were fantastic and that there was no basis of fact for them, yet I have been told that the American Legion head sent a private consultant, an actuary expert to check those figures at the Veterans' Administration and found them accurate and took no exception as to the figures or the accuracy and that there was nothing fantastic about them. So far as I know they are very accurate. If anyone has information otherwise I would like him to give it to me. I have questioned VA and they have no protests before them as to the accuracy of their estimates.

For service-connected compensation we expended $1,829,000,000; for disability $1,428,000,000; death $401 million in 1955.

For the non-service-connected there is a total of $800 million; for nonservice disability $537 million; for nonservice death $263 million expended in 1955.

Let us look at the year 2000. If we do not pass another bill, do not change the law as it is today, for the year 2000 the cost of the present program will be $4,768,000,000. I do not know what the economy of our country is going to be in

the year 2000. It may be double its present level; I do not know. I am not going to try to venture a guess. This is just the estimate of what the present compensation and pension programs will cost in the year 2000.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The figure of $4 billion the gentleman is giving us for the year 2000 is the annual cost of the present program at that time.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Yes, the annual cost of the present compensation and pension program at that time.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Does the gentleman have also cumulative figures which show the cost of the present program up to the year 2000? There has been a great deal of publicity about cumulative costs. I wonder if the gentleman has the cumulative volume of cost by the year 2000? I think it would be helpful to have it.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I do not know exactly, but if we figure that it would be half of the cost of the present bill and if the cumulative cost under the present bill is estimated at $148 million, I would assume as a wild guess it would be something over $70 billions.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman would assume, then, in estimating the cumulative cost if the annual rate is $2,600,000,000 and it is going to cost $4 billion at the year 2000, the gentleman thinks the cumulative cost would be something over $70 billion?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That would be a wild guess.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. This next chart shows the cost estimate of H. R. 7886. It was prepared by the Veterans' Administration. Section 1 for increased pensions for World War I, II, and Korean veterans the first year would cost $536,150,000; the fifth year's cost is $936,556,000; and the total cumulative cost by the year 2000 would be $86,267,000,000. Let me emphasize that this is for nonservice pensions alone and is additional cost.

Section 2 which gives the widows of World War II and Korea veterans the same pension rights as widows of World War I. Members should realize that today when a World War I veteran dies his wife if she has an income of less than $1,400 is eligible for pension. If a World War II or a Korean war veteran dies, the veteran must die with a service-connected disability or his widow receives nothing. If there is no service connection she is not entitled to a pension.

To equalize those pension rights would cost $126,335,000 the first year, $218,118,000 the fifth year and $36,481,000,000 total cumulative cost by the year 2000.

Section 3 which increases the pensions for widows of World War I and II veterans and Korean veterans from $50.40 to $75, also some increase for the children, would cost $106,133,000 the first year, $133,549,000 is the fifth year cost, and $6,507,000,000 is the cumulative cost by the year 2000.

Section 4 which increases the pensions of Spanish-American War veteran widows from $67.73 to $75 costs $19,473,000 the first year, the fifth-year cost is $19,500,000 and the year 2000 cumulative cost is $309 million.

So the total in the bill before the House, the total cumulative cost, by the year 2000 is $129,564,000,000. The total first year's cost on all non-service-connected pensions in the bill is $788,385,000, the fifth year cost is $1,307,723,000. The year 2000 cumulative cost is $129,564,000,000 for non-service-connected pensions.

Today our compensation rates run from 10 percent to 100 percent, which is added as Title II to the bill.

TITLE II. SERVICE-CONNECTED COMPENSATION

Title II relates exclusively, as I have already indicated, to compensation for service-connected disability or death for veterans and widows and/or children.

Section 5 increases the basic compensation structure now available to veterans of all wars who are suffering from service-connected disabilities. A veteran totally disabled today receives $181 monthly and this bill would increase the rate to $250, a 38 percent increase over the existing level. Appropriate increases are also granted to lesser disabilities. For example, a veteran 10 percent disabled today receives $17. The bill proposes to increase his rate to $20, or an increase of approximately 17 percent. The position of the administration is indicated by the following quotation from the Veterans' Administration report:

> It would appear that disability and death compensation rates were deemed to be appropriate and adequate by the Congress when it enacted the proposal which became Public Law 695, 83d Congress, on August 28, 1954. In this connection, it is noted that the Consumer Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, for August 1954 was 115 points and for January 1956, 114.6 points (1947–49=100 points), a slight decrease. It is not believed that the increases proposed by the bill, which involve a first year's cost of over $183 million, can be justified under the available facts.

The first-year cost is estimated at $237,197,000. Fifth-year cost of $248,482,000 and a cumulative cost by the year 2000 of $9,280,000,000.

Section 6 increases the statutory award rates from the present level of $47 to $55 monthly. The rate for arrested tuberculosis increases from $67 to $75, and the overall ceiling on compensation is increased from $420 to $450 a month. These rates are for the more severely disabled—men who have lost arms and legs, blindness, suffered deafness and other disabilities which are considered so serious as to warrant a special rate above that provided for a veteran rated totally disabled. The first-year cost is estimated at $11,141,000, rising slightly at the fifth year to $13,979,000 with a cumulative cost of $482 million.

Sections 7, 8, 9, and 10 relate entirely and exclusively to veterans of World War I who are rated under the 1925 schedule of rating disabilities and who hold, in many instances, what are termed protected awards, awards which are under the 1925 schedule but cannot qualify at a liberal rate under the current schedule in use, namely, the one promulgated in 1945. These facts are consistent with the rates provided in sections 5 and 6.

Section 11 provides increases for, as well as liberalizing the basis of, additional compensation to veterans who have dependents. Under the provisions of Public Law 877 of the 80th Congress as amended, a veteran who is 50 percent or more disabled is entitled to additional compensation for his wife, child, or dependent parent. For example, a man rated 100 percent disabled today receives $181 a month. If he has a wife, he would receive $25 additional. If he is rated 50 percent disabled, however, he would receive 50 percent of $25, or $12.50 a month additional. Section 11 removes the 50 percent requirement in the present law and makes veterans with a disability as small as 10 percent eligible for this increased compensation. In addition it increases the basic rates for a wife and no child from $21 to $25 or an increase of approximately 19 percent, with appropriate increases for the other classifications. The position of the administration is set forth in the Veterans' Administration report which states:

> The legislative history of this legislation discloses that the basic reason for authorizing (the benefit) was to assist that group of seriously disabled veterans who are not generally in a position to supplement their compensation payments by other income. It is not believed that such a need for assistance exists in the case of less disabled veterans (rated 10 through 49 percent) to the extent that it would warrant the additional cost to the Government of over $100 million yearly.

Bureau of the Budget recommends against favorable consideration of the bill.

The first-year cost is estimated at $143,308,000, with a slight decrease in the fifth year to $140,029,000, and a cumulative cost in the year 2000 of $4,719,000,000.

Section 12 proposes to increase the rates provided for widows and/or children where veterans' deaths were due to service. The present rate for a childless widow is $87 a month. Section 12 would increase that rate to $125 monthly or an increase of 43 percent with appropriate increases for widows with children and for a child without a mother. The estimated cost in the first year of this section is $82,112,000, rising approximately $5 million at the fifth year to make that year cost $87,510,000, with a cumulative cost at the year 2000 of $3,528,000,000. This section is in direct conflict wtih the provisions of H. R. 7089, the so-called survivors benefits bill which passed the House of Representatives on July 13, 1955, and which has recently been reported by the Senate Finance Committee. This latter legislation seeks to set up an entirely new and comprehensive system of survivor benefits.

Section 13 is the only provision in the bill which is favored by the Veterans' Administration, and it increases the burial allowance from the present $150 to $200, or an increase of 33 percent. The first-year cost is estimated at $5,500,000, rising to $7,750,000 at the fifth year, with a cumulative cost of $638,000,000 by the year 2000.

The total cost for the first year is $1,282,985,000, $1,805,473,000 the fifth year,

with a cumulative cost of $148,211,000,000 by the year 2000. It is interesting to note that the pension costs for the first year are two-thirds of the total first-year cost of the bill. By the fifth year the pension costs triple the cost of service-connected compensation and for the cumulative cost to the year 2000 the pension costs are 6½ times that of the compensation. From the time of the Revolution until the end of 1955 this Government has spent, for all veterans' purposes, approximately $81 billion. This bill proposes it spend, in the next 45 years, only $15 billion less than double that amount. Out of the total cumulative cost of this bill service-connected veterans and their dependents would receive only one-sixth of what veterans and dependents of nonservice-connected cases would receive.

Title IV contains sections 14, 15, 16, and 17. These relate to repealers and amendments. Section 17 provides that this bill, should it be enacted, would take effect on the first day of the second calendar month following enactment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I ask the gentleman, How many of these Spanish-American War widows will be living in the year 2000? The gentleman has increased it to $309 million. It is only $19,473,000 for the first year.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I believe there are 80,000 Spanish-American War widows living today. The cost estimates of VA are based on actuary tables of life expectancy. Of course this group is declining rapidly.

Mr. HOLLAND. You have it from 1956 to 2000.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It is the cumulative cost for Spanish-American War widows.

Mr. HOLLAND. They will not be living in the year 2000.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. This group will decline each year.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. What is the average age of those 80,000 widows today?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I think the Spanish-American War veteran is about 78 and the widow is something less than that, about 76 years.

Projected number of living Spanish-American War veterans,[1] by age group, 1955–75, as of June 30

[Thousands]

Age in years	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
All ages	72	35	13	3	(2)
65 to 69	(2)	------	------	------	------
70 to 74	8	(2)	------	------	------
75 to 79	44	5	(2)	------	------
80 to 84	17	23	3	(2)	------
85 to 89	3	6	8	1	(2)
90 to 94	(2)	1	2	2	(2)
95 and over	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Average age	78.2	82.4	86.6	90.3	------

[1] Service between Apr. 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902.
[2] Less than 500.

Mr. McDONOUGH. It can certainly be presumed that by the year 2,000 many of them are not going to be alive.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I do not think any of them will be living. That is the cumulative cost to the year 2,000.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would not interrupt the gentleman's fine presentation but for one thing. The question of cost is the primary concern before this House and the biggest question mark over this entire matter right now. Like the gentleman, I have been a member of a group that has been seeking to reduce that cost and we are seriously concerned at the cost items given by the Veterans' Administration which have been supplied on this bill. The gentleman a moment ago in response to my question about the cost of this present program by the year 2,000 stated that the $4 billion figure which he supplied was an annual cost figure at that time. He said the present cost is $2,629,000,000 and he estimated that the cumulative cost by the year 2,000 of the present program would be around $70 billion, and the gentleman very frankly admitted that was a wild guess. The gentleman will concede, I hope, if you take $2,600,000,000 and $4 billion and arrive at a rough average figure between those two figures for the 45-year period, you will get a figure of around $3,350,000,000, which is roughly the difference between the $2,629,000,000 and the $4 billion, is that not about right?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That sounds all right to me.

Mr. EDMONDSON. When you multiply $3,250,000,000, average annual cost, by 45, you get a total cumulative cost of the present program of $146,250,000,000 rather than the $70 billion cumulative cost which the chairman supplied a moment ago as an admitted guess on this subject. I only introduce this question to the gentleman for this purpose. I seriously question that you can rely at all upon a 20-year or a 45-year cumulative cost estimate on a program that has such imponderable factors as the level of the national economy, the level of the national income of the people, increasing rates of social security, which would operate to disqualify many veterans being eligible for these pension payments, and many other factors. I think the gentleman will concede that if there has been a 50 percent error in the estimated cumulative cost——

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Surely the gentleman from Oklahoma is not going to expect me in a minute and a half to make a guess and discuss it as an honest guess. These cost estimates have been checked and doublechecked, and if the gentleman has anybody down there to check them and can refute them, I would like to know it. We will give you the name of the company that the Legion hired to check the VA figures, who went away saying they could find nothing wrong with them. I do not know what it would cost some private firm to check the figures, but if the gentleman can get somebody, I think the committee could furnish some funds to get the cost checked. If the gentleman says the present program's cumulative cost is $146 billion and this bill will cost another $148 billion on top of that $146 billion, it seems to me worth checking into.

Veterans in civil life,[1] Apr. 30, 1956

World War II	15,377,000
Korean conflict	[2] 4,564,000
World War I	3,077,000
Prior wars	[3] 128,000
Total	22,291,000

[1] Estimated.
[2] Includes 855,000 who also served in World War II.
[3] Includes Indian wars, Civil War, Spanish-American War, and regular establishment disabled on VA compensation rolls.

Present pension program for World War I, II, and Korean veterans, compared with proposals contained in H. R. 7886 as reported

Existing law	*H. R. 7886 as reported*
Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.	Same.
Service of 90 days or more	Same.
Income limits of $1,400 and $2,700.	Same.
Less than age 55 (single permanent disability of 60 percent or 2 or more permanent disabilities, 1 of which is 40 percent in degree combined with other permanent disabilities to a total of 70 percent and unemployability attributable thereto).	Same.
Age 55 (single permanent disability or combination of permanent disabilities rated 60 percent and unemployability attributable thereto).	Same.
Age 60 (50 percent rating for single or 2 or more permanent disabilities and unemployability attributable thereto).	Same.
Age 65 (10 percent rating for single or 2 or more permanent disabilities and unemployability attributable thereto).	Presumed to be permanently and totally disabled; no unemployability finding required.
Rates:	
Under 65 years of age or on pension rolls less than 10 years, $6615.	$85
65 years of age or on pension rolls 10 years, $78.75.	$105
Including aid and attendance allowance, $135.45.	$150
Credit for overseas service, no provision.	Rates increased 20 percent for overseas service.
World War I, II, and Korean veterans on pension rolls:	
Number on rolls April 30, 1956	582,000
Average monthly increase during calendar year 1955	5,500
Estimated number on rolls fiscal year 1960 [1]	1,000,000

[1] Source: Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I share the gentleman's apprehension about the cost of the present program. As the gentleman

knows, I will be associated with the proposed substitute. It will reduce the cost of this present bill before the House by over $600 million a year. But, at the same time, I feel that these estimates over a cumulative period of time are subject to considerable question and point to the fact in the instance of the cumulative cost under the present program that there is certainly a wide range of difference in the estimate of the gentleman and the estimate which I have arrived at here by another method of calculation.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Now, in today's program for our service-connected compensation cases we have a total of 2,076,026 veterans receiving service-connected compensation today. I am not going to run through all these figures. I believe everybody can see them. The present bill would increase from $17 for 10 percent to $20, and up to 90 percent disability from $163 to $180 and total disability from $181 to $250. I am not going to run through all of those figures and take up the time of the House, but you can see the number of veterans today on the compensation rolls. I am showing these charts merely for the sake of demonstrating that we have a veterans program today that is something to see.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will you put those charts in the RECORD?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I will be glad to.

Cost projection of existing pension and compensation laws [1]

	Actual 1955	Projected					
		1960	1965	1970	1975	1985	2000
Total compensation and pension	$2,629,000,000	$3,227,000,000	$3,601,000,000	$3,549,000,000	$3,724,000,000	$4,940,000,000	$4,768,000,000
Service-connected compensation, subtotal	1,829,000,000	1,887,000,000	1,897,000,000	1,829,000,000	1,753,000,000	1,498,000,000	1,116,000,000
Disability	1,428,000,000	1,434,000,000	1,394,000,000	1,347,000,000	1,295,000,000	1,133,000,000	859,000,000
Death	401,000,000	453,000,000	503,000,000	482,000,000	458,000,000	365,000,000	257,000,000
Non-service-connected pension, subtotal	800,000,000	1,340,000,000	1,704,000,000	1,720,000,000	1,971,000,000	3,442,000,000	3,652,000,000
Disability	537,000,000	1,024,000,000	1,371,000,000	1,387,000,000	1,633,000,000	3,106,000,000	3,416,000,000
Death	263,000,000	316,000,000	333,000,000	353,000,000	338,000,000	336,000,000	236,000,000

[1] Assumptions:
(1) No change in economic conditions affecting demand and eligibility for Veterans' Administration benefits.
(2) No change in benefit rates, eligibility conditions, or program characteristics.
(3) The Armed Forces to maintain a combined strength of about 3,000,000 men through an annual turnover of 700,000 (current rate).
(4) Persons who enter the Armed Forces after Jan. 31, 1955, to be eligible for only peacetime benefits.
(5) After 1960, that 50 percent of all veterans who are 65 or more years old will receive non-service-connected disability pensions.

Source: Bureau of Budget.

Cost estimate of H. R. 7886

	1st year	5th year	Cumulative cost, year 2000
Sec. 1. Increased pensions for World War I, II, and Korean veterans	[1] $536,150,000	[2] $936,556,000	[3] $86,267,000,000
Sec. 2. Giving World War II and Korean widows same pension rights as World War I widows	126,335,000	218,118,000	36,481,000,000
Sec. 3. Widows' pensions (World War I, II, and Korea) increased from $50.40 to $75; proportionate increase for children	106,427,000	133,549,000	6,507,000,000
Sec. 4. Increasing Spanish War widows' pensions from $54.18 or $67.73 to $75	19,473,000	19,500,000	309,000,000
Total for pension	788,385,000	1,307,723,000	129,564,000,000
Sec. 5. Increasing basic rates of compensation 10 percent, $20; 100 percent, $250	237,197,000	248,482,000	9,280,000,000
Sec. 7. Increases World War I basic rates	13,000,000		
Sec. 6. Increasing statutory awards; raises ceiling on compensation from $420 to $450	$11,141,000	$13,979,000	$482,000,000
Sec. 8. Increases World War I statutory awards	544,000		
Sec. 9. Increases World War I nurse allowance	26,000		
Sec. 10. Increases World War I arrested TB award	2,772,000		
Sec. 11. Increases compensation for veterans with dependents	142,308,000	140,029,000	4,719,000,000
Sec. 12. Increases rate for widows from $87 to $125 monthly; also children and parents' rates	82,112,000	87,510,000	3,528,000,000
Total for compensation	489,100,000	490,000,000	18,009,000,000
Sec. 13. Increases burial allowance from $150 to $200	5,500,000	7,750,000	638,000,000
Total cost	1,282,985,000	1,805,473,000	148,211,000,000

[1] $88,706,000 attributable to 20-percent differential for overseas service.
[2] $183,227,000 attributable to 20-percent differential for overseas service.
[3] $22,829 million attributable to 20-percent differential for overseas service.

Compensation rates for service-connected disabilities—existing law versus H. R. 7886

Type of disability	Rates under existing law	Rates under H. R. 7886 as reported	Service-connected veterans on rolls June 30, 1955
Total on rolls			2,076,026
(a) 10-percent disability	$17	$20	837,981
(b) 20-percent disability	33	40	319,095
(c) 30-percent disability	50	60	305,982
(d) 40-percent disability	66	80	163,803
(e) 50-percent disability	91	100	116,225
(f) 60-percent disability	109	120	88,813
(g) 70-percent disability	127	140	42,726
(h) 80-percent disability	145	160	26,458
(i) 90-percent disability	163	180	7,544
(j) Total disability	181	250	110,772
(k) Loss, or loss of use of a creative organ, or 1 foot, or 1 hand, or blindness of 1 eye, rates (a) to (j) increased monthly by	$47	$55	[1] 67,247
Loss, or loss of use of a creative organ, or 1 foot, or 1 hand, or blindness of 1 eye, in addition to requirement for any of rates in (l) to (n), rate increased monthly for each loss or loss of use by	47	55	
(l) Loss, or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or 1 hand and 1 foot, or blind both eyes, or in need of regular aid and attendance, monthly compensation	279	300	3,757

[1] Also included in number shown by degree of disability above.

Compensation rates for service-connected disabilities—existing law versus H. R. 7886—Continued

Type of disability	Rates under existing law	Rates under H. R. 7886 as reported	Service-connected veterans on rolls June 30, 1955
(*m*) Loss, or loss of use of 2 extremities at a level, preventing natural elbow or knee action with prosthesis in place, or suffered blindness in both eyes, rendering him helpless, monthly compensation	$329	$350	$1,953
(*n*) Loss of 2 extremities so near shoulder or hip as to prevent use of prosthetic appliance, or anatomical loss of both eyes, monthly compensation	371	400	335
(*o*) Suffered disability under conditions which would entitle him to 2 or more rates in (*l*) to (*n*), no condition being considered twice, or suffered total deafness in combination with total blindness, monthly compensation	$420	$450	$3,750
(*p*) In event disabled person's service-incurred disabilities exceed requirements for any of rates prescribed, Administrator, in his discretion, may allow next higher rate, or intermediate rate, but in no event in excess of	420	450	2,619
(*q*) Minimum rate for arrested tuberculosis	67	75	44,213

H. R. 7886, non-service-connected pension rates versus disability and death compensation rates

	Rates (dollars)
Non-service-connected pension (at age 65, with 90 days' service, no disability and incomes less than $1,400 and $2,700):	
Stateside service	105
Overseas service	125
Service-connected disability compensation:	
30-percent disability	60
40-percent disability	80
50-percent disability	100
60-percent disability	120
Service-connected death compensation—dependents of deceased veteran:	
Widow	125
1 child—mother also deceased	75
2 children—mother also deceased	100

Program for World War I veterans and their dependents

1. Adjusted compensation (bonus):	
Total cost	$3,873,000,000
Average amount	$937
2. Veterans receiving compensation or pension:	
Service-connected compensation ($17 to $420 per month)	231,500
Non-service-connected pension ($66.15, $78.75, or $135.45)	513,400
Current net average monthly additions to pension rolls	5,000
Estimated number on pension rolls fiscal year 1960	[1] 840,000
3. Dependents receiving compensation or pension:	
Compensation:	
Widows	33,800
Children	4,200
Parents	20,100
Pension:	
Widows	299,000
Children	96,000
Parents	
4. Medical care:	
In VA and private or State hospitals paid by VA	45,000
In VA domiciliaries and State homes [2]	21,000
5. Insurance:	
Term policies in force	21,100
Permanent policies in force	367,700
Receiving disability income of $5.75 per $1,000 of insurance	24,400

[1] Source: Bureau of the Budget.
[2] Number in State homes estimated.

Program for World War I veterans and their dependents—Continued

6. Rehabilitation:	
Total cost of vocational rehabilitation training program	$644,865,000
Number who received training	180,000
7. Burial allowance of $150.	
8. Preference in Federal employment.	

VA expenditures per serviceman in World Wars I and II (adjusted to 1955 dollars [1])

Item	World War I	World War II
Expenditures per serviceman: [2]		
In fiscal year 1955	$250	$130
Cumulative through June 30, 1955	$7,300	$3,100
Through the 1st 15 years of benefits	$1,900	$3,100
World War I bonus	$1,500	
Subtotal	$3,400	
Average length of service (months)	12	30
Average age, June 30, 1955 (years)	61.3	36.2

[1] As measured by the Bureau of Labor Statistics Index of Consumer Prices (1947–49=100).
[2] Estimated average expenditures on behalf of World Wars I and II veterans from appropriated funds.

Now, in the present bill, as I said to begin with, my conscience requires me to direct my efforts toward doing something for service-connected before I even consider non-service-connected cases. Under the present bill a non-service-connected veteran age 65 with 90 days' service, not going overseas, meeting the income limit could receive $105, and yet the veteran who was in combat, who had part of his hand shot off, and who has a 50-percent disability would only get $100. We find that kind of disparity all the way through the bill. That is another reason why I could not support it.

Throughout this campaign to increase the non-service-connected pension, there has been the slogan of the World War I veterans that they were the forgotten men. I want to run through the figures to show what World War I veterans have received.

First, World War I veterans received a bonus which cost $3,873,000,000, which was an average of $937 apiece. There are 231,500 World War I veterans receiving service compensation of somewhere between $17 and $420 a month. There are 513,400 World War I veterans receiving non-service-connected pensions. There are 5,000 a month being added to this figure.

It is estimated that on the pension rolls alone by the year 1960 there will be 840,000. Today the World War I veteran's widow receives much better consideration than the World War II or Korean veteran's widow. According to the Veterans' Administration, the pension they receive was equivalent to about $13,806 insurance policy on the day the legislation was passed.

World War I veterans are receiving the same medical care in the domiciliary, State homes and hospitals as all the other veterans. There are 45,000 World War I veterans in the hospitals, 21,000 in the Veterans' Administration domiciliary and State homes.

Also, during the World War I period, we had a vocational rehabilitation training program which cost $644,885,000. And, of course, they receive a burial allowance of $150, and insurance.

There is one other chart to which I wish to call attention concerning how veterans of World War I and World War II veterans, have been treated. You are being told that the World War I veteran is the forgotten man. Statistics furnished by the VA do not substantiate this. In fiscal year 1955, the average per capita expenditure for World War I veterans was $250; for World War II veterans it was $130. The cumulative figures through June 30, 1955, were $7,300, total per capita expenditure for the World War I veteran, and $3,100 for the World War II veteran.

Of course, it has been many years since World War I was over. There is, of course, a great difference between the number of World War I and World War II veterans.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Do the figures for World War II veterans include schooling and housing provisions passed by the Congress?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. They include the total cost, the total amount of money spent on World War II veterans.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Including the cost of the provisions of the GI bill?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Yes. Of course, you have more World War II veterans that have never received any benefits than you had total World War I veterans.

The next figure, to me, is important. The cumulative cost through the first 15 years of benefits for World War I veterans was $3,400; for World War II veterans, it was $3,100. The average length of service of World War I veterans was 12 months and of World War II veterans

30 months. The average ages are 61 years and 36 years. Viewed on any basis the World War I veteran has shared fully with the World War II veteran.

So far as I can find out, in an honest and sincere effort, that is the situation as far as World War I veterans are concerned. I do not feel they are the forgotten men. There is no question that the programs available for World War II men were certainly greater in number than those available to World War I veterans.

A great deal of the mail which I have received complains that the World War I veteran has not been treated fairly and that the World War II veteran has received a great deal more consideration. It is a fact that the benefits for each of our recent wars are not identical. On the other hand, it is not a fact that World War I veterans have received less consideration from a dollar standpoint than veterans of World War II. There are three primary ways in which the World War I veteran enjoys an advantage over the World War II veteran.

First. Every World War I veteran was paid a bonus which averaged over $900. The total cost of this bonus was $3,873,000,000.

Second. Widows of veterans of World War I may receive a pension upon the death of the veteran, while widows of World War II can receive a pension only if their husband had a service-connected disability at the time of his death. This means that only about 10 percent of World War II widows will be able to qualify for a pension under existing law, while all World War I widows qualify. This pension provision for World War I widows became effective January 1, 1945. Based on the average ages of World War I veterans and widows on the date of enactment, the passage of that legislation by Congress was the equivalent of handing to the World War I veteran a paid up life insurance policy for his widow for $13,806.40.

Third. World War I veterans were granted liberal presumptions of disability following World War I and are protected by a series of protected awards which are favorable to many of those drawing disability compensation.

The same general provisions concerning eligibility for most other benefits, such as insurance, medical and hospital care and burial allowances are available to all war veterans. The veterans of World War II and Korea have received readjustment benefits. It is a fact, however, that there are more veterans of World War II who have never received any readjustment benefit whatever than the total number of World War I veterans. It is a fact also that the average length of service for veterans of World War I was 12 months as compared with 30 months for veterans of World War II.

There are all kinds of inequities in our program today. There are many Members of the House who know I tried to stop the Bradley Commission. The reason I wanted to stop it is because I felt that our committee could work out those inequities and correct a great many of the things that were wrong with the program. I believe those inequities should be taken out of the program.

ABUSES OF THE PRESENT PART III PENSION SYSTEM

First. Pension is now paid to persons in State and Federal prisons. There are numerous cases of murderers, narcotics violators, rapists, and people who have forged Government checks, broken into post offices, or otherwise committed crimes against the Federal Government now drawing the part III pension. Their rate would be increased under H. R. 7886.

Second. There are over 20,000 veterans now in VA domiciliary homes and State soldiers' homes where the Federal Government pays an annual grant, drawing a non-service-connected pension. In the VA domiciliary homes, the Federal Government spends over $100 a month for food, shelter, medical care, and so forth, for the veteran, and then gives him a pension in addition. The veteran who lives outside, with a wife to support, gets only the pension, with no special allowance for dependency. This is not fair.

Third. We are sending about 9,000 non-service-connected pension checks a month to persons in foreign countries. This is about $8 million a year. Most of it goes to noncitizens of the United States or persons who were once citizens and who have given up their American citizenship. Examinations are generally conducted by foreign doctors.

Fourth. The pension system presently in use, based on an income limit, is susceptible to abuse. A veteran can claim his wife for the purpose of using the $2,700 rate for a dependent, yet he is not required to include her income. He may manipulate property and income into his wife's name with practically no control by VA.

Fifth. The sole test of means for a non-service-connected pension is income. We have found numerous cases of veterans who, although they meet the income limit, have very substantial resources. Typical cases are as follows:

World War I veterans (income limits of $1,400 single, $2,700 dependents)

Period of service (months)	Occupation	Amount of pension	Monthly income	Real property	Liquid assets	Other personal assets	Liability	Net worth
16	Retired doctor	$78	$177	----------	$27,000	$1,000	----------	$28,000
14	Retired	78	217	----------	31,289	500	----------	31,789
19	Retired farmer	78	140	$5,200	22,397	1,190	----------	38,787
20	Retired salesman	66	146	16,500	22,448	1,000	$353	39,595
20	Office clerk	66	241	12,000	50,783	2,300	----------	65,088

In these cases, the veteran is considered a needs case for pension purposes regardless of the fact that he has considerable sums of money in the bank.

There are many things about the veterans' program that need to be corrected, and we are trying to correct them. I hope the Members will give serious thought to passing legislation which can become law, and not just pass something for the sake of saying we passed something through this House.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. Is it not a fact that effort was made in the committee to bring a compensation bill similar to what the gentleman's substitute is before the House, without its being tied in with any non-service-connected pension program?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There was an attempt in committee to take up a compensation for service-connected disabled bill before we took up a non-service-connected bill, and that motion was voted down. The bill we proposed to take up was more liberal than is the substitute. The substitute is, from what I can find out, the only thing that has a chance on earth of becoming law. There is not as much in it as I would like to put in it. There are many things I think should go in there. But I could not get any kind of agreement or commitment that had a chance of becoming law if it went further than the substitute goes. I will not make myself a party to misleading veterans and dependents that a bill with tremendous costs will be enacted. I am interested in helping those we can and not in misleading others into believing they will get something that has no possible chance.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. In examining the gentleman's charts, and I ask this for information only, I believe there were some 840,000 World War I veterans on the rolls. That is approximately 1 out of every 5, is that about right? I believe the gentleman said there were 4 million World War veterans.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is right.

Mr. SPRINGER. So 840,000 would be approximately 1 out of every 5 veterans of World War I who are now on the active pension rolls in one way or another.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Actually it is a higher figure than that, because the 4 million was the original figure. There are 3,077,000 living today.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is 1 in 4 instead of 1 in 5.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. The World War II veterans and the Korean veterans number approximately 20 million. What percentage of those men are on the active rolls at the present time?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I have forgotten the figure. There were approximately 1,600,000 on the compensation rolls. There are 58,000 pensioners from World War II and Korea. Of course, their age is not nearly as high as that of the World War I veterans.

Mr. SPRINGER. About 10 or 12 percent are on the rolls in one way or another?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is right.

The point I was trying to make is that we have a veterans' program today that is very good, very comprehensive, and it costs about $4.9 billion a year. The committee staff asked the veterans' groups to send out to their service offices and ask them to send us the names of those whom they thought should be on the non-service-pension rolls. We received about 200 cases from the entire United States. That was all we received from all the veterans' groups. Just who are they or where are they?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the committee staff sent out a questionnaire to all of the posts in the United States?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No, I did not say that. I said we called representatives from the different veterans' groups to the committee room and asked that they contact their service offices and that they give us the names of the people who they thought should be on the pension rolls and were not on there. From them we received about 200 names, somewhere between 150 and 200.

Mr. EDMONDSON. There was no direct inquiry of that type addressed to the individual posts or to the service organizations by the staff?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No, there was not.

THE POSITION OF VETERANS ORGANIZATIONS ON THE LIBERALIZED NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED PENSION (SEC. 1 OF THE BILL)

There is no agreement whatever among veterans organizations as to the merits of on expanded non-service-connected pension system. The Veterans of Foreign Wars and American Legion have advocated some sort of expanded pension system; however, they are in disagreement as to the provisions of the system and VFW insists that the pension program should apply only to World War I veterans, while the American Legion includes veterans of World War II and Korea. The American Legion has testified that they are opposed to the pension bill sponsored by VFW. The Disabled American Veterans, realizing that greatly expanded expenditures for non-service-connected pensions will, in the long run, adversely affect disabled veterans, have opposed expanded non-service-connected pensions on that basis. Their national commander, appearing before the committee, made the following statements:

Our great responsibility and our primary responsibility is to the veterans and their dependents who were disabled as a direct result of wars themselves. * * * If we go into a general pension plan, it is going to have to be taken away from the service-connected disabled veterans or their widows or orphans. * * * If we are to carry out our mandate, which is to protect the service-connected disabled and their dependents, then we cannot endorse general pension legislation. * * * But proposals now before you force us to protest any law which in effect offers greater consideration and benefits to the admittedly non-service-connected veteran.

AMVETS are in opposition to the non-service-connected pension features of the bill. Their national commander testified before the committee as follows:

These studies have embraced many facets: The present system of pension; the wisdom of the pending proposals; the economic justification; the economic possibility; the effect on the country; and the effect on other veterans benefits. Each of these facets considered separately leave the impression that these pension proposals are unwise. Considered together they leave the overpowering conviction that the proposals must be discarded by the Congress as ideas which appear on the surface to be beneficial but which by every yardstick are designed—in the final analysis—to defeat the very thing they purport to espouse.

* * * Its first-year cost almost approaches the entire amount to be expended this year on the Veterans' Administration hospital program. In future years, it would probably exceed the cost of the hospital program. It would be 10 times as much as the appropriation request for fiscal 1957 to remodel old hospitals and build new ones. It would cost more than 5 times as much as the outpatient program for the treatment of service-connected disabilities. Most important, however, it would increase the compensation and pension appropriation for the next fiscal year by approximately 18 percent without a single penny of the increase going to the veteran who receives compensation for service-connected disabilities. Because no other word is sufficient, we submit that such a proposal is preposterous.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has recognized that the bill before the House is highly questionable and made the following statement in the form of a letter to their national officers regarding its chances of passage:

It is difficult, however, for the VFW to be optimistic enough to believe that the omnibus veteran benefit bill identified as H. R. 7886 will win approval, in its present form, from the House, the Senate, and the President. If the bill, by some miracle, should clear both branches of the Congress it is almost certain to meet a Presidential veto.

H. R. 7886, no doubt, will suffer 1 of 2 alternatives. First, the bill will fail to win approval somewhere along the 3 hurdles previously mentioned or, second, it will be substantially amended or emasculated to the point where there will be little left for any of the intended beneficiaries.

Despite the fact that Members of Congress have received quite a few letters as a result of the letter-writing campaign stimulated by the American Legion, it is apparent that there is not agreement among veteran organizations or the rank and file of veterans regarding the non-service-connected features of this bill. There is certainly a great deal of justification for the position of the Disabled American Veterans that the bill does not deal equitably with service-connected and non-service-connected veterans.

The total cumulative cost of this legislation for the year 2000 has been estimated at $148 billion. Of this amount, $86 billion results from the liberalization features of section 1, the section providing non-service-connected liberalization. If this bill is enacted, a veteran at age 65 with no disability and only 90 days service, meeting the income limits, can receive $105 a month if he had stateside service and $125 if he had overseas service. This compares with the rate of $80 a month for a 40 percent disabled veteran, $100 a month for the 50 percent disabled, and $120 for the 60 percent disabled. A veteran must have a rather severe disability to be rated 50 percent or 60 percent disabled. For instance, if a veteran lost his thumb, index finger and middle finger of his right hand, he receives 50 percent, or, under the bill, $120 a month. If he had frozen feet and lost some of his toes and continues to suffer from persistent severe symptoms of both feet, he is rated 50 percent disabled and under the bill would receive $100. A veteran with a collapsed lung receives $100. These amounts for these severely disabled individuals compare with the $105 which the stateside 90-day soldier would receive under the bill simply by attaining age 65 and having no disability whatever.

WHAT CONGRESS HAS DONE THIS SESSION FOR VETERANS

The way that the pension issue has developed and been placed before the Congress has cultivated the belief that Congress is not doing anything for veterans. That is absolutely not true and I want to review very briefly for you several major pieces of legislation which we have already enacted or will enact this session of Congress for veterans and their dependents.

First. H. R. 7089, the survivor benefit bill: The House has passed this bill and sent it to the Senate. The Senate committee has reported it favorably to the Senate and the President has indicated his approval of the legislation. Undoubtedly this bill will become law this session. It provides very substantial increases in death compensation for several hundred thousand widows and dependent children of all wars. The first year's additional cost of this legislation will probably exceed over $400 million. An example of the increases may be found in the basic rate increase for the widow without a dependent who lost her husband from a service-connected cause. This rate has been increased from $87 to $121.

Second. Public Law 7, the first piece of veterans' legislation passed by this Congress, preserved entitlement to education and training for about 1 million veterans who served during the Korean conflict. The total cost of this legislation is estimated at about $400 million in the first 5 years.

Third. The Congress has passed and has sent to the President H. R. 9824, the orphan scholarship bill, which will provide educational assistance to 156,000 orphaned children of veterans of World War I, World War II and Korea where the veteran died from a service-connected cause. This legislation is estimated to cost in excess of $250 million.

Fourth. The Veterans' Affairs Committee, with the cooperation of the Veterans' Administration, the Bureau of the Budget and the White House, has developed a long-range renovation, repair and replacement program involving 50 VA hospitals which will extend over a period of about 8 years and ultimately will cost in excess of about a half billion

dollars. The House Appropriations Committee provided the first installment of this program in the appropriations bill this year in an amount in excess of $50 million.

Fifth. There are numerous other smaller pieces of legislation which have been passed by the House and are now pending in the Senate which will cost considerable amounts of money, such as—

H. R. 10542, the bill which will redefine the term "widow" and cost $5,887,000 in the first year.

H. R. 9841, the bill which will give widows consideration on burial costs for their husbands. Exact estimates of the cost of this legislation are not available.

H. R. 735, a bill which would increase the $10 payment now made to individuals awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor to $100. Exact estimates of the cost of this legislation are not available.

H. R. 4006, which is now Public Law 280, raised rates for Korea veterans in the veterans' farm training program at a cost of about $25 million.

H. R. 9922, which grants pensions to veterans suffering from tuberculosis under certain circumstances. Exact estimates of the cost of this legislation are not available.

The mail which I have been receiving urging passage of pension legislation implies that Congress is doing absolutely nothing for veterans. Regardless of the action which the Congress may ultimately take on the bill before us, we have already enacted this session a very generous, far-reaching and costly program of veterans' legislation.

Taxes and cumulative cost of H. R. 7886 as reported

States and Territories	Individual income tax returns filed	Individual income and employers tax collections[1]	Total internal revenue collections	Cost of $148 billion distributed 1st between total of col. B and (C-B) then each column distributed by State		Col. D (individual cost) divided by number of individual returns (col. A)
				Individual	Other taxes	
	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F
		Thousands	*Thousands*	*Thousands*	*Thousands*	
Alabama	725,908	$270,350	$378,308	$603,599	$241,033	$832
Alaska	[2]					
Arizona	294,134	131,113	167,739	292,730	81,773	995
Arkansas	413,692	121,766	165,901	271,862	98,538	657
California	4,887,393	3,456,777	5,184,128	7,717,802	3,856,585	1,579
Colorado	534,043	509,921	679,509	1,138,479	378,632	2,132
Connecticut	957,833	731,529	1,165,600	1,633,254	969,132	1,705
Delaware	144,356	257,248	779,010	574,347	1,164,916	3,979
Florida	1,136,897	529,431	736,528	1,182,038	462,377	1,040
Georgia	914,382	406,370	648,242	907,285	540,018	992
Hawaii	200,871	92,195	126,340	205,840	76,234	1,025
Idaho	204,435	80,172	108,708	178,997	63,711	876
Illinois	3,783,549	3,135,663	5,440,197	7,000,864	5,145,237	1,850
Indiana	1,558,010	813,443	1,392,666	1,793,814	1,315,534	1,151
Iowa	1,006,880	377,548	534,708	842,936	350,885	837
Kansas	751,375	319,184	485,949	712,629	372,329	948
Kentucky	880,819	294,250	1,342,125	656,960	2,339,547	746
Louisiana	747,379	346,114	547,459	772,754	449,535	1,034
Maine	347,112	111,569	163,374	249,095	115,663	718
Maryland [3]	1,533,958	1,342,004	1,885,606	2,996,236	1,213,678	1,953
Massachusetts	2,018,830	1,195,530	1,791,568	2,669,210	1,330,749	1,322
Michigan	2,599,977	2,340,594	5,672,460	5,225,746	7,438,919	2,010
Minnesota	1,169,722	636,593	1,028,543	1,421,294	875,090	1,215
Mississippi	356,448	107,905	138,671	240,915	68,690	676
Missouri	1,453,254	954,168	1,638,388	2,130,331	1,527,629	1,466
Montana	226,803	90,617	119,953	202,317	65,502	892
Nebraska	515,456	285,529	399,670	637,489	254,838	1,237
Nevada	92,008	63,708	86,831	142,238	51,626	1,546
New Hampshire	224,137	90,342	118,039	201,703	61,838	900
New Jersey	2,272,470	1,267,066	2,016,232	2,828,925	1,672,632	1,245
New Mexico	228,651	90,656	117,744	202,404	60,478	885
New York [3]	6,610,156	6,622,939	12,715,477	14,786,759	13,602,556	2,237
North Carolina	1,142,862	427,560	1,498,115	954,595	2,390,184	835
North Dakota	207,133	53,528	64,107	119,510	23,619	577
Ohio	3,340,069	2,443,280	4,227,591	5,455,009	3,983,757	1,633
Oklahoma	674,579	351,092	644,113	783,868	654,216	1,162
Oregon	598,797	331,503	429,231	740,133	218,193	1,236
Pennsylvania	4,229,668	2,814,694	4,657,505	6,284,250	4,114,374	1,486
Rhode Island	326,836	190,344	274,704	424,973	188,347	1,300
South Carolina	579,910	164,611	242,451	367,520	173,790	634
South Dakota	232,280	60,313	74,560	134,658	31,809	580
Tennessee	928,620	360,412	505,123	804,677	323,090	867
Texas	2,658,636	1,463,527	2,245,297	3,267,556	1,745,425	1,229
Utah	251,418	104,656	153,753	233,661	109,617	929
Vermont	134,234	46,794	64,950	104,475	40,536	778
Virginia	1,140,750	467,344	1,053,921	1,043,419	1,309,626	915
Washington [2]	1,005,152	598,444	846,661	1,336,121	554,184	1,329
West Virginia	579,928	188,391	266,696	420,613	174,828	725
Wisconsin	1,355,702	696,084	1,206,835	1,554,118	1,140,332	1,146
Wyoming	111,257	44,900	57,403	100,246	27,915	901
Total	58,288,769	37,869,770	66,288,692	84,550,254	63,449,746	1,451
Percent		57.12855				

[1] Includes employment taxes since the major portion of such taxes are not reported separately from income tax collections.

[2] Returns filed data for Alaska are included in the Washington figure.

[3] Maryland includes the District of Columbia and New York includes Puerto Rico.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Texas yield to someone on his side at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 7886, merely liberalizes existing law and increases certain veterans' and survivors' benefits. No new principle is involved.

What amounts to veterans' service-connected disability compensation was first authorized by the Congress on August 26, 1776. Our service pension policy, from which the Nation has never materially deviated, dates from March 18, 1818. Since that date, Mr. Chairman, a grateful Nation has diligently cared for him and his widow and orphans, who has answered his country's call.

The immediate purpose of the bill is to relieve the unemployable group of old disabled veterans of War I. The Congress has heretofore enacted such pension legislation for the veterans of all wars down through the war with Spain. Always the express purpose has been to provide for those unable to engage in gainful employment due to the disabilities and handicaps of advanced age, so that they may not be forced upon the local relief agencies.

Of 4 million veterans who returned from War I, only slightly more than 3 million are now living and they are dying off at an ever-increasing rate; but, Mr. Chairman, of that number, 690,000 now receive compensation of pension which means, of course, that the 690,000 will

benefit only by the reasonable increases provided in this bill.

Let us, however, avoid the ridiculous mistake of assuming that all or even a majority of the 2½ million World War I veterans will claim these benefits. In the first place a goodly number will have retired under various retirement plans. Still another large part will have accumulated enough of this world's goods to live independently during old age.

With these, the Congress need not be concerned. It is to the less fortunate veteran that our attention is now drawn.

Frequently we are asked if all aged veterans could not be covered by the Federal social-security system and retired under the old-age and survivors' insurance plan. The answer is an emphatic "No." In the first place, Mr. Chairman, not more than a majority have worked in covered employment. Since social security did not come into being until 1937, it is obvious that the War I veterans could not have sufficient credits for retirement. This bill, therefore, guarantees the needed reserve of which a distinguished Army general has recently spoken.

Then, of course, there is a philosophy to which, I am happy to say, the Congress has never subscribed. This philosophy holds that the old and indigent veterans be thrown back on the States as beneficiaries of public assistance.

Careful research discloses that there can be no desirable substitute for service-pension legislation. Negligence and indifference on the part of the Government has had much to do with the enactment of every service-pension law.

Over the years hundreds of thousands of service-connected disability claims have been rejected because the veteran could not prove his disabilities have been originated in service, because incomplete medical and casualty records, and frequently no records at all, were available. I doubt if there is a single Member of this House whose office files do not contain many cases denied because of no record.

Mindful of the great number of injustices, the Congress at various times has undertaken to deal with the problems of hardships, borderline cases, and missing records, by the enactment of special pension acts to worthy claimants. In recent years it simplified this program by the enactment of a non-service-connected disability law and certain presumptive legislation. The Reorganization Act of 1946, however, prohibits any further special pension legislation, and the non-service-connected disability law did not meet with public approval so it was abolished in 1933. Presumptive legislation is inadequate in that it is restricted, and perhaps reasonably so, to but a very few major disabilities which by their very nature and development must be presumed to be of service origin.

However, notwithstanding the desire of the Congress to bridge the gaps, presumptive legislation has met with vigorous opposition. In 1933 that opposition became so strong that 29,000 presumptive cases, such as tuberculosis, were dropped from the compensation rolls. I am told that many of those dropped finally died as objects of charity. Some were suicides. The most recent attacks upon the presumptive law were made by a Presidential Commission.

Clearly, Mr. Chairman, the only sure method of assuring equal justice for all World War I veterans is the enactment of this bill.

Most, if not all, of my colleagues, I am certain, know of the heroic deeds of Sgt. Alvin C. York in War I. The late Gen. John J. Pershing named Sergeant York the outstanding hero of that war, and I assure you there were many more heroes. Sergeant York was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor; however, a few years ago, he was denied a pension because he could not establish a service-connected disability. During the war, of course, Sergeant York and thousands of others like him were too busy disposing of the enemy to report on sick call or to bother with military records. No doubt many of you in the House can cite similar cases. No, Mr. Chairman, the men who stood knee-deep in mud and water in the trenches during freezing weather did not have that service placed on their records. There was the little matter of making the world safe for democracy.

A committee amendment equalizes all widows pensions at $75 a month with additional allowances for dependent minor children. Truly this is a step, but only a step, in the right direction. Many of the widows, especially the Spanish War group, are very old and unemployable. They now receive from $54.18 to $67.73 a month. The need for this modest increase is so obvious, I think, as to require no further comment on my part.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is making a very fine speech. With parts of it I agree, with parts I do not agree. I had a letter the other day from a disabled veteran who said that under this bill he, having a service-connected disability rated at 50 percent would get only $100, yet a 90-day veteran with no service-connected disability was getting $105 a month. I know the gentleman, like myself, is anxious to take care of disabled veterans, but how can we justify paying the 90-day veteran $105 a month when the World War II veteran is getting only $100?

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I may say to my friend that what I am fighting for today is to take care of the World War I veterans. If the gentleman wants to bring in a bill correcting the discrimination to which he draws attention let him do so and by all means I will help him. If there are inequities I will help iron them out.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. In the gentleman's fight for the World War I veteran, he is not leaving the Committee with the impression this bill only covers the World War I veterans?

Mr. LONG. No, I am not leaving that impression. The gentleman will notice my speech. I am personally more concerned at this time with World War I veterans.

Mr. AYRES. Furthermore, I do not believe the gentleman intends to leave the impression that the bill, H. R. 7886, is a bill for World War I veterans only?

Mr. LONG. I did not say that. My speech speaks for itself.

Another committee amendment increases compensation payments and provides modest additional dependency allowances. These increases are realistic. Over the years there have been small percentage increases designed to help meet the increased cost of living; but there was no attempt to deal with the basic rates which for many years were known to be inadequate. Veterans' compensation is a sound practical proposition. Like workmen's compensation it is a contractual obligation. When young men and women enter the employ of the Armed Forces, whether voluntarily or otherwise, it is understood that the Government, as their employer, will compensate them for disabilities incurred in the line of duty, and, Mr. Chairman, that has been so since enactment of the first veterans' compensation law in 1776. If the Government is obligated by law to provide such compensation, then is not the Government morally obligated to provide adequate compensation? We have the committee report—Report No. 2302—which sets out both the present and the proposed new compensation rates.

We are not going to beat around the bush. This bill will cost money; but it will not cost anything like the amount some claim.

In keeping with their old habits, and before the ink was barely dry on the committee report, antiveteran propagandists about the country started to generate opposition to this bill. For the most part, they fell back on their same old time-worn high-cost propaganda. While the administration was moving heaven and earth to have some of the $1 billion foreign aid cut restored, their propagandists were voicing the high cost of this veterans' bill.

Billions for foreign aid, but not one dime for the veteran.

Why, Mr. Chairman, we don't have to worry about the cost of this bill. The 1,100,000,000 we cut off the foreign aid bill will more than carry this bill for the first year—but let us carefully consider the cost of this bill and the method of estimating the cost.

Now, it is said, the Veterans' Administration has estimated the first year's cost to be something over $1 billion—$1,282,000,000. While I am sure that figure is too high, I am willing to accept it. In fact, for my part, I am willing that this bill shall rise or fall upon that estimate. True to form, the Bureau of the Budget is against the bill. They say it will cost too much. They try to scare the daylights out of us with fantastic cost projections through the year 2000. Listen to this:

One estimate that I have seen assumes that the 3 million living World War I veterans will all be living in the year 2000 and that every one of them will be on the pension rolls. So the age of miracles has not entirely passed. No indeed. Although they will all be 106 years of age, according to the official prognosis, none

of the 3 million will have died. Mr. Chairman, if that prognosis is carried out to its logical conclusion, it means that in the year of 2000 there will be between 500 and 600 million people in the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman, the official actuaries, and estimators are most careful to qualify their estimates and to warn us that they are likely to be off base. Mr. Page of the Veterans' Administration tells us that a long range cost estimate of this nature is subject to considerable question. We know a deviation in any one of these assumptions could have a substantial effect upon the cost of this bill during the coming years. Therefore, this estimate should be used as a very rough estimate only.

Mr. Chairman, it is time, I think, for the Congress to assert itself in no uncertain terms concerning these fantastic statements and forecasts. It has been well said, that a clever man with figures can prove that Hades is an icehouse, and with the same set of figures he can find 6 feet of snow at the Equator.

If the Congress ever starts running its business by such ridiculous charts, we are all likely to end up in a mental institution.

The Bureau of the Budget can always find all the money it wants for an administration project, regardless of the cost. We know that while the many adverse reports on this bill were being prepared, they came up with a 10-year foreign-aid program.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TUMULTY. Has any study been made or any projection been made of how much foreign aid will cost by the year 2000 or aid to Tito by the year 2000?

Mr. LONG. No, but I should say the cost would be in excess of $200 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. LONG. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman for the fight that he has made over the last several years, since he has been in Congress, against this international give-away program that we have been indulging in. I realize that that has no bearing on the merits or demerits, the virtues or the shortcomings of the legislation before us at the moment.

However, I should like to point out for the edification of the House that I requested the Library of Congress some time ago to furnish me certain statistical information comparing the amount of money that we have given away in foreign aid over the last 10 years with the cost of veterans' programs. Amazingly enough I found that we had given away some $51 billion to foreign countries in the last 10 years. The cost of our entire veterans' pension and benefit programs from the Revolutionary War to the present amounted to a little over $93 billion. That means that we have given away to foreign countries in the last 10 years more than half as much as it has cost us to defray all of our veterans' benefit programs from the Revolutionary War to date.

Mr. LONG. I thank the gentleman; that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlemen 5 additional minutes.

Mr. LONG. I repeat: Billions for foreign aid, but not one dime for the veteran.

Now, Mr. Chairman, while the administration is engaged in pulling fantastic figures out of thin air, let us consider some actual and official figures, as they appear in the United States Treasury reports.

First—strange as it may seem—the United States has lavished $200 billion on foreign governments and international agencies in the past 42 years.

Second, the total expenditures for all veterans, from our beginning as a Nation to date, is less than $45 billion.

Thus: $200 billion in 42 years for what we now call foreign aid, and what I call giveaway, and $45 billion for veterans in all our history.

Let us examine the figures on foreign aid in broad detail:

Mr. Chairman, since World War II we have spent in round figures some $65 billion for foreign aid. That amount alone, let us note, would almost bear the entire cost of this bill to the year 2000, using the administration estimate. Now, I want everyone to know that these figures do not include any of the billions handed out to Communist Russia, and other countries, during World War II for lend-lease, and so forth; nor do they include the cost of the Korean conflict which we bought and paid for. But what about unpaid foreign loans?

As of this date, Mr. Chairman, 200 foreign countries, including Communist Russia, owe the United States a total of more than $23 billion. Yet I have only hit the high spots on foreign aid. I do not want to burden you further with figures. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] placed a detailed analysis of foreign spending in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some time ago, and every Member of Congress, who can possibly do so, should read and study that revealing document.

In the face of these dramatic and overwhelming statistics, I ask how any Member of this House who has approved of this outpouring of America's wealth to foreign nations, can now take it upon his conscience to deny to a single veteran or a needy veteran's widow, the bounty of a grateful nation?

Mr. Chairman, it has been a solemn comfort to stand here today and reaffirm my eternal devotion to the glorious traditions of my country. May those traditions live on unspoiled and uninterrupted.

In 1818, they pensioned the heroic veterans of the American Revolution; in 1889 they remembered and pensioned the Civil War veterans. Just 11 years before they had pensioned the heroes of the War of 1812. In 1887 they likewise pensioned the survivors of the Mexican War. Then in 1920 a distinguished Congress, of which our beloved Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], were Members, pensioned the veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion. So, Mr. Chairman, the long and unbroken chain of national tradition in this respect is unblemished and without fault.

Mr. Chairman, I shall never forget Pearl Harbor. I will always remember the dark days of Bataan. Where were the antiveteran propagandists while most of our Navy was lying on the bottom of the Pacific? When 12 million young men—the flower of American youth—marched off to put an end to brutal dictatorship, did we hear so much as a dissenting whisper? I can never forget the distressing times of 1917 and 1918 when a despotic emperor had practically brought Europe to her knees and had boasted that his armies and his submarines would conquer the world and that he would hang President Wilson on the highest tree in Washington. Ah, Mr. Chairman, those were frightful days. World morale was at the lowest ebb. But, in quick response to Europe's frantic pleas, and when the Kaiser was knocking at the gates of Paris, literally thousands of raw recruits were rushed to the front to save the day. More than 4 million of America's youth were called to the colors. They were idolized. We could not do enough for our boys.

I remember the awful influenza epidemic—soldiers dying like flies. I remember that these boys received $30 a month over there while war profiteers at home made billions. I remember them as they were demobilized—in a jobless economy. They did not come home to a GI bill; they did not receive unemployment compensation for 52 weeks; they could not attend college at Government expense, they could not get farm, business, and home loans, and their prewar jobs had not been protected.

Then I remember these boys during the dark days of the great economic depression when they came to Washington, hungry and in rags, to beg a few crumbs at the tables of the mighty, and I shall never forget that they were driven out of the city at the point of the Federal bayonet.

Nor shall I forget, Mr. Chairman, those boys as mature men at a much later time. I remember that although the majority of them were past 50, when World War II came, thousands of them entered the Armed Forces a second time to contribute their experience and shed their blood in winning that war.

But most of all, Mr. Chairman, I shall remember those boys today, when my help is most needed, by voting for this bill and, Mr. Chairman, on the final rollcall I hope there will not be a single nay.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I should like to compliment the gentleman from Louisiana on his fine statement. I think he has been too modest. May I point out to the House that he is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitals of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Last sum-

mer between sessions he did a tremendous amount of work to improve the veterans' hospitals over the country. Because of his efforts and the contribution he has made, I wonder if he would like to tell the House in what amount we are supporting the veterans' hospitals and what portion of our Veterans' Administration budget that accounts for.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, at present our hospital program costs about three-quarters of a billion dollars. We have a number of new hospitals started this year. We have about $50 million for renovation and repair in our hospital program. We have a long-range agreed hospital program that will cost about three-quarters of a billion dollars.

Mr. LONG. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to support H. R. 7886.

It is my understanding the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the United Spanish War Veterans have agreed to a series of amendments that will retain the original intent of H. R. 7886, while at the same time reduce its annual cost from $1,287,000,000 to $679 million. When these amendments are offered, I will support them.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us is nothing unusual. Over a period of years the Congress has been considering legislation designed to provide benefits for the defenders of America in time of war. The only difference between this bill and previous bills is that the House Committee on Veterans Affairs wrapped up in one package a lot of amendments to existing law and sent to the floor of the House this omnibus bill, H. R. 7886.

When this bill was reported by the House Committee on Veterans Affairs, the critics of veterans benefits in general had a field day. They pointed to the annual cost of the legislation forgetting that we have been handing out annually in excess of $4 billion to people abroad, many of whom were on the opposite side of the battlelines when America's veterans were defending our Government and its ideals on farflung battlefronts.

In my opinion, the cost of veterans benefits represents nothing more than an additional cost of war and as long as we wage war, we incur these obligations to the defenders of the Nation.

Many of you know that I have been active in veterans affairs for many, many years. Like the majority of the veterans of the country, I realize that in some instances there may have been benefits received where the recipient should not have received them. In all fairness I think you will agree that in any vast program the human element enters and there are bound to be some mistakes. As lawmakers, we Members of Congress know that such mistakes are bound to occur. Yet, this is no blanket indictment of the program itself but rather an administrative error.

Mr. Chairman, the heart of H. R. 7886 is represented by title 1 and title 2 where the provisions affect non-service-connected and service-connected benefits. Both of these provisions will be fully explained during the course of the debate but I would like to describe the difference between non-service-connected benefits and the benefits paid to service-connected veterans under existing laws.

As an illustration, to be eligible for non-service-connected benefits the veteran must have served in active military or naval service for a period of 90 days or more during World War I and World War II. He must have received an honorable discharge. After meeting these service requirements, the veteran must be rated by the Veterans' Administration as suffering from non-service-connected permanent and total disability not incurred as a result of his own willful misconduct or vicious habits.

After being found permanently and totally disabled and unable to follow a gainful occupation, the veteran is not eligible for a pension if his annual income exceeds $1,400 if unmarried, or $2,700 if married or having dependents. I want to emphasize this non-service-connected benefit can only be paid to a veteran of World War I or World War II if he meets the income limitations.

On the other hand, when a veteran draws benefits based on a service-connected disability he receives what is commonly called compensation and not a pension. It is intended to compensate the veteran for that portion of his income that he is unable to earn because of his service-connected disability. This monthly payment of compensation does not require him to be permanently and totally disabled nor does it require him to meet an income limitation. In other words the service-connected veteran can receive his compensation and earn another income at the same time. That is the difference between service-connected and non-service-connected disability.

Those who are making charges that the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, when advocating liberalization of non-service-connected benefits are forgetting the service-connected veteran of this country in plain words do not know what they are talking about.

It was these two great veteran organizations, together with the Disabled American Veterans, which are responsible for conceiving and helping to steer through Congress the schedule of service-connected benefits now in effect. They have never forgotten their obligation to our disabled veterans. I can truthfully say that a great percentage of the veterans today who are drawing benefits for service-connected disability are members of 1 or more of these 3 major veterans organizations. And let me add, they are active members and helped to formulate the program of veterans' benefits as exemplified by the provisions of H. R. 7886.

It might be of interest to state at this point that slightly over 2 million of the 22 million veterans in this country are entitled to service-connected benefits and an additional 600,000 having met the income limitation are receiving non-service-connected benefits based on total and permanent disability. Believe it or not, included among the 600,000 is the outstanding hero of World War I, Sgt. Alvin York, who a few weeks ago was awarded a non-service-connected pension because of the fact that he is permanently and totally disabled and unable to follow a gainful occupation. There are many heroes like Sgt. Alvin York who have served their country honorably and who have never received a penny in the form of compensation from the Nation. However, in their declining years under the provisions of existing law, if they are permanently and totally disabled and can meet the income limitations, they are entitled to a non-service-connected pension of $66.15 monthly.

Mr. Chairman, I have been speaking about existing laws and I would like to comment now on H. R. 7886. If title I of H. R. 7886 becomes a law to be entitled to a pension of $85 monthly, a veteran of World War I, World War II, and Korea will have to be declared permanently and totally disabled and unable to follow a gainful occupation. However, if he is 65 years or over he is deemed to be permanently and totally disabled. This is the major change in existing law.

Under title II of H. R. 7886, increases in the rates of service-connected compensation are provided, ranging from 10 percent to 15 percent. In addition to the liberalization of benefits to the service-connected and nonservice-connected veteran, the bill provides for increases in basic pension rates for widows and other dependents.

Mr. Chairman, as I said in the beginning of my statement I intended to support H. R. 7886 as it will be amended by the amendments proposed by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the United Spanish War Veterans who through their membership in excess of 5 million veterans and some 27,000 posts scattered throughout the Nation constitute a real voice for the veteran population of this country.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I want to emphasize the sincerity of those who speak for the great veterans organizations who are supporting H. R. 7886. It is my fervent hope that the House of Representatives will accept their amendments to the bill so it may be approved and sent to the Senate without further delay.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman refers to the Dorn amendment, I assume.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows that today men 65 years of age cannot readily get a job.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is true. We had a recent report submitted to the Congress which showed that three-quarters of those men over 65 had incomes of $1,500 and less annually.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not also true that this will take care of the many men who did not ask for service-connected disability earlier because they thought they could get along without it, and now they find they cannot,

and they cannot establish service connection because they cannot get the evidence? It will help out a great many very unhappy disabled men.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think the gentlelady is correct. There are many veterans today who will receive non-service-connected benefits, who have had claims pending for years and years with the Veterans' Administration, attempting to establish service connection and have been unable to do so.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Also there are many who did not want to ask for service-connected disability although they had it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Today they cannot get the evidence. It is easy to say you will help men get compensation, but just try it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. People have died, the records have been destroyed. It will pick up those cases and it will fill a very great need of most deserving men.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think it might be well to add that the average age of the veteran of World War I today is about 62. Here it has been stated that 5,000 veterans of World War I are being added to the non-service-connected pension roll of the Veterans' Administration. We should also say that about 9,000 World War veterans are dying every month.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And World War II veterans are dying very fast.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has consumed 11 minutes.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan.

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to inform the House of the patriotic service of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers in providing 24,500 free recordings for distribution to radio stations and so forth of the song Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag as it was rendered in this Chamber on Flag Day last year by the Air Force Band and the Singing Sergeants, and this year, in a more lengthy arrangement, by the Marine Band and the Inter-Service Choral Group.

This distribution will be made through the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate. Each Congressman will receive 50 records—each Senator 25.

I am today submitting a House concurrent resolution which would authorize accepting without cost to the United States copies of the recording Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. This measure further provides:

> The copies of such recording shall be distributed by each Member of the House of Representatives and each Senator, for use for nonprofit purposes, to radio and television stations located within his constituency, and to such other persons, groups, organizations, and institutions as he deems appropriate for the purpose of providing the widest possible dissemination of this patriotic musical composition.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay tribute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] for instigating the very beautiful services on Flag Day this year and last year. I have never attended a more moving or beautiful service than the one this year marked by his fine speech, the beautiful singing of the Interchoral Group, and the thrilling playing of the military band. They are things to be remembered, and it seems particularly fitting that it should be brought up at this time when we are considering legislation to aid the men who have paid so dearly for their flag.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to pay tribute to the fine chairmanship capabilities of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. Although many of us may disagree at times, and in particular at this time, with programs he may suggest, nevertheless the fairness he shows in his committee, his outstanding leadership, his companionship, and comradeship are appreciated by all of us.

Mr. Chairman, I first became interested in veterans' matters in the year 1919 at the close of the First World War. Although I do not pretend to be an expert on any of these problems, nevertheless I have my responsibility in this legislation and have made studies as time has permitted, concerning the problems presented.

The first obligation of the veterans' organizations, to which I belong, is to the care for the disabled veterans and their dependents, and to the care of the dependent survivors of deceased veterans. If that policy were not followed in this legislation I would, of course, be most hesitant in supporting it. However, because of the failure of the recogoanized veterans' organizations to recommend priority of consideration of veterans' legislation it was necessary for us to report out a bill which was before the committee and then amend that bill so that the equities of the needy veterans and those dependent upon them could be properly considered. It is because of such situations that we have the omnibus bill before us and it is only fair to advise my colleagues at this time that I intend to support what is known as the Dorn proposal, provided it is offered during the consideration of this bill.

The principle that those who defended their community and Nation in time of war or emergency are entitled to special attention was first established in the days of the Plymouth Colony. Those hardy souls of yesterday decreed that anyone who defended the colony against hostile natives should be entitled to assistance from the colony in the event he became unable to provide for himself or for his dependents.

This principle of recognition by the community of those who defended the body politic has prevailed throughout the history of our Nation and has taken a variety of forms over the years—pensions, compensation, hospitalization, preference in land or jobs, and later, benefits like educational aid and job training and home and business loans.

Originally, there was little distinction between pensions and compensation. Payments to veterans were originally termed pensions whether based upon need or upon a service-connected disability. In recent years, a specific distinction has been made between these two terms. Compensation is defined as a payment for a disability having a service connection, while pension payments are for those disabled outside of the service by accident, disease, or old age.

The increasing number of veterans in the country has created some concern. Just 100 years ago, veterans constituted just about 1 percent of the population. Today the veterans constitute nearly 15 percent of the total population. Some thus think that the Nation can no longer afford pensions and that we must confine our rewards to those who suffered some service-connected disability, survivors of the service deceased, or of those who according to some statistics which have come to my attention, in 1890 the national income was $10,701,000,000. The veterans' benefits as of that year were $106 million or 99 one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total national income.

In 1953 the national income was $306 billion. The veterans' benefits at that time were 78 one-hundreds of 1 percent of the total national income for that year.

Here are some other figures. In 1890 the national income as published in Historical Statistics of the United States by the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, was $9,700,000,000. The total expenditure of appropriated funds, in that year, by the Bureau of Pensions, Department of the Interior and the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers was $112,600,000 or 1.2 percent of the national income.

In 1953, the national income according to these statistics was $303,600,000,000 and the total expenditure of appropriated funds by the Veterans' Administration was $4,354,200,000 or 1.43 percent of the national income.

It may be noted that the figure first given as the amount spent in 1890 for veterans' benefits, $106 million, represents the approximate amount expended in that year for compensation and pensions, not taking into consideration the additional benefits which servicemen were entitled to in 1953.

Here is another figure that is more or less enlightening to those who say we cannot afford the cost of this program. The national income in 1900 was $14,550,000,000. The veterans' benefits in toto in 1900 were $141,912,000. The Federal appropriation in 1900 was $429,382,585, or, in other words, one-fourth of the

Federal appropriation in 1900 was spent for veterans' benefits.

The reason I have used the dates of 1890 and 1900, especially the latter, is because of the expiration of similar periods of time corresponding to those periods of time expiring since the ending of the recent war.

I posed this question recently to an old World War I friend, rather used by time and tide, and I liked his answer, which I will translate into parlor English. He said, "We cannot afford wars either—but we have them." As to cold economic measures, we can "afford" it, that is, veteran's benefits. We are spending no more presently percentagewise for pensions and compensation than we did 100 years ago when our veteran population was just barely 1 percent. We have to add our aid-to-schooling and our loan programs to make our present veteran benefits a greater percent of taxes collected than the amount of such benefits of yesterday. I am sure that we are all agreed that both our education and our loan programs are actually paying their own way.

There is also the assertion that only service-connected benefits should be paid because military service is stated by some to be an obligation of citizenship and should not be the basis for future benefits. This makes a more appealing argument than cost alone.

I agree that military service is an obligation of citizenship and that each citizen mentally and physically fit should serve as called. However, not all are called and of those called not all serve. It thus remains that those who are called and who do serve perform a service beyond the normal duties of the usual citizen. This clearly establishes their right to turn to the community in time of dire need as veterans and not as charity patients at the lowest level of bare bones existence. Unless and until we have in fact a universal service of not only men but of money, there will remain a clear and separate category of citizen and that will be composed of those who served his fellow citizens upon call in defense of the citizenship and freedom of all.

There is much confusion concerning the conditions for payment of pensions and the requirements contained in the pending bill. The term "general service pension" has been loosely used to describe the pensions of this bill and of existing law. I am sure that my colleagues know that H. R. 7886 is not a general service pension bill, but rather a reasonable liberalization of the existing part III non-service-connected pension program which applies to veterans of World War I, World War II, and Korea. A general service pension would grant pensions to veterans at some given age so long as they met the minimum service time. Part III pensions, here proposed for liberalization, involve and require age, disability, employability, and income conditions before the veteran can qualify. H. R. 7886 continues all of these conditions with the exception of disability and employability at age 65. A low-income limitation is imposed at all times. No veteran in comfortable circumstances will be able to qualify for this pension except by use of fraud.

It is my judgment that the aging group of World War I veterans will be the last group requiring large-scale pension assistance, and that our expanding economy, with better pension and retirement programs for workers, including social security, will largely eliminate the need for pension assistance to veterans of World War II and Korea. With income limitations attached as a condition of payment, we need have no fear that the cost of the pension program will zoom to fantastic proportions.

Payment of compensation and pensions today requires approximately the same percentage of national tax receipts as it did 100 years ago—4.3 percent. It requires a smaller percentage than that of the thirties when such programs ran about 10 percent of Federal tax receipts. This reduced percentage of our tax receipts, going for compensation and pensions to veterans, is all the more significant when we note that veterans and the survivors of deceased veterans represent about 15 percent of the total population, compared to about 3.8 percent when the proportionate costs were higher.

I hope my colleagues will continue to honor our Nation's traditional policy of a return of consideration for those who have served the Nation in its hour of need. I feel that the modest revisions of this bill can be sustained by our economy, and I am convinced that our growing economy will bring a gradual lessening of the pension needs in the future. This legislation is worthy of our support.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to stress briefly a point which I feel to be of great importance.

I think we all agree that it is not only our duty, but our privilege to provide generous and liberal benefits for veterans who were disabled in the line of duty and for their widows and orphans. Furthermore, I am in full accord with the principle of an adequate assistance program in the matter of veterans loans and for educational benefits.

It seems to me that all of these benefits to which I have referred must be distinguished carefully from non-service-connected pensions. If we go too far in this latter category, our whole veterans benefit program will be threatened. We are involved with a basic consideration. That is, to what extent should an American citizen who served his country in the military service, but who was not injured, be considered as being in a special category apart and separate from other American citizens who for reasons of age, physical disability, or for some other cause did not serve their country in uniform. It is argued that there is an important distinction based upon the financial sacrifices which those in service made. It is asserted that this time spent in the service of his country had a serious detrimental effect on the veteran's future earning power and should entitle him to special privilege and consideration.

A study was made within the last year or two by the Bureau of the Census on this subject. A national sampling was made among veterans of all wars on a nationwide and scientific basis. Seven thousand one hundred veterans were asked this question: "Looking back, how has the time you spent in the Armed Forces and the training, skills, and the experience that you acquired there, affected your employment and progress in civilian life?"

The answers are quite illuminating. They were: First, 14.7 percent answered that they were helped considerably, second, 26.2 percent said that the military service had been of some benefit, third, 50.1 percent said there had not been much effect either way, fourth, 2.7 percent said that the military service was a temporary handicap but that what had been learned helped in later years, fifth, only 6.3 percent said that the military service had been a real handicap or disadvantage which had affected their employment and progress after return to civilian life.

To summarize, 50 percent of the veterans said that the military service had had no substantial effect on their later civilian lives. Approximately 41 percent said that they had actually been benefited by their military experience, and only 9 percent said that they had been handicapped either temporarily or permanently.

I feel that it is of great importance that we provide more adequate benefits for those who were disabled in defending our country. I am convinced that the great majority of our veterans do not feel that any general increase in non-service-connected pensions is desirable or necessary. To make such provision would not only threaten but in all probability would destroy any possibility for the types of compensation increases which have been recommended by all of the veteran's organizations.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I take this occasion to commend the gentleman on a very forthright, persuasive statement. I think in these times when we are in an election year it requires some degree of courage to make such a statement. The gentleman certainly should be commended for the stand he has taken.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have the deepest and the greatest respect and affection for the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas. I do not believe I have a closer or a dearer friend in the House of Representatives. It is not a pleasant thing to take issue with him at any time on any matter.

I do believe, however, that we have a situation before us in the House today in which two extreme positions are being taken, and in that there is the necessity for give and take on either side in order to achieve legislation worthy of this

House and adequate to meet the problems which we are called upon to deal with at this time.

I think one extreme poistion, one which is believed in ardently, firmly, and enthusiastically by its supporters, is the position in support of H. R. 7886 as it was originally presented to the House. H. R. 7886 has many fine features as it was originally presented, and it is capable of being defended eloquently, as was done by the gentleman from Louisiana.

I know my good friend, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, spoke ardently and eloquently for the bill as it was introduced in the committee. I know she believes fervently and with deep sincerity that it is fully justified as it was originally written.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield, he knows I am very much in favor of doing something for our veterans. I cannot speak for anyone else here, but I for one could not possibly have voted for the Foreign Aid bill without doing something for our veterans in this country, the men and the women who make possible foreign aid for other countries.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I did not believe I was misrepresenting the gentlewoman on this point, and I appreciate her confirmation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I state how much I have appreciated working on the committee with the gentleman, and how helpful he was during the time I was chairman. He never failed to respond. I admire his integrity and his ability tremendously.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I appreciate the kind remarks of my colleague.

I think there is another extreme of opinion with regard to this legislation, an extreme believed in no less fervently, and with no less complete honesty, integrity, and conviction, and that is the position which has been taken almost from the start with regard to this legislation by my good friend, the gentleman from Texas. That is the position that we should proceed to enact legislation liberalizing and increasing the payments for service-connected disabled veterans—period.

The gentleman of course has also supported many other fine pieces of legislation regarding medical care, hospitalization, and many other things of great benefit to the veteran population of our country. I do not believe any single individual is a stronger champion of the veterans of this country or a stronger and more sincere believer in his convictions on the subject than my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. He represents a point of view that we should not take action at this time for the non-service-connected veterans, that we should not take action at this time for the widows and the orphans of the non-service-connected veterans who have died. He takes the position apparently, and I hope I am not misrepresenting his position, that before we do anything about these things, we must first of all see that we have an increase for service-connected disabled veterans. That is an honest position and I know he is sincere in taking that position and I know he is conscientious when he argues it and when he offers to this House the Teague substitute proposal, which will be offered before we are through.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I appreciate the words of the gentleman from Oklahoma. Of course, I am disturbed in many more ways than just the ways that the gentleman has mentioned. For example, today we are drafting young men and we send them to Okinawa and Korea and all over the world for 2 years. They come out with peacetime veterans' status and receive no pensions at all. Yet, we take millions of men from World War I and World War II, many with short periods of service, who did not make as much of a contribution and did not go overseas and have not done as much as some who are now eligible for pensions and all benefits that we have now. There are so many phases of our whole veterans' program that need to be straightened out before we pass any such bill as we are considering here today.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman makes a very good point and I would agree with him wholeheartedly that there is need for a reexamination of our present policy with regard to men in the service who served for long periods of time away from their families overseas. The plain fact of the matter is, as the gentleman knows, that some of those men are actually undergoing some of the hazards of war or of near war a this time. I do think that is a problem also that we will have to approach and deal with before we can wash our hands of the veterans' problem in this country. But the subject matter before us is the question of taking care of non-service-connected veterans, particularly of World War I and also of World War II and Korea who are qualified for this pension by reason of age or by reason of total disability.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. Does not the gentleman from Oklahoma think that it might be fair to also say that the gentleman from Texas is somewhat disturbed about the cost of this program? We have had various estimates here ranging anywhere from $77 billion to approximately $300 billion. Do you not think the gentleman in fairness, should say that is one of the objections of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think that is quite accurate. I certainly want to compliment the gentleman from Florida as well as the gentleman from Texas for the attention which they have given in committee, and in the committee report to that particular question.

For my own part, I am convinced that most of the Members of the Congress of the United States are in favor of some increases in rates of compensation and also in pensions for American veterans. I believe that most Members of the Congress are in favor of increases for widows and for children and that the Members are in favor of dealing fairly and equally with the veterans of all wars and with the widows and dependents of all veterans—something that is not being done under existing legislation and something that will not be done under the substitute to be offered by the gentleman from Texas. I believe also that most Members are in favor of some liberalization of existing pension laws to take care of the needy veteran who is permanently and totally disabled either by reason of blindness or other physical or mental disability or advanced age.

I believe in conditions of blindness or conditions of mental or physical disability or at the present time where they are unable to carry on a gainful occupation to make a living for themselves and their family, it is the feeling of this Congress that the veteran should be provided for in some way by his Government. It has always been the feeling of the Congress of the United States that that should be done in previous wars and I, for one, see no reason why is should not be the feeling in this year of 1956.

All of these things are provided for in House Resolution 7886. They are also provided for in the substitute which the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] will offer a little later in the proceedings on this bill. It is, perhaps, unfortunate from the standpoint of some features of this bill that they are so combined. I have heard some Members say that they would vote for a World War I pension provision, if it were alone, but they could not support other features of this bill. I have heard others say they would vote for a provision providing increases for those service-connected cases if they were standing alone, but they would not vote for other parts of this bill.

In the Veterans' Affairs Committee, as the chairman knows, there was a series of prolonged disputes on the question of priority for legislation, with some Members contending that this question of pension liberalization was much more acute from the standpoint of hundreds of thousands of World War veterans than any other question today. There were others who believed there should be no pension law change until the compensation for service-connected cases had been increased. It was this dispute on priority of legislation more than any other factor which led to a substantial amendment of House Resolution 7886 as it was originally introduced by the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Rightly or wrongly, it was the conclusion of some members on the committee, and I think I would safely say a majority of the committee, that the only solution to the roadblock that was present in the committee, a roadblock of priority and its determination, was to combine in one bill the most important provisions for increased pensions and modification laws.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If there was ever any roadblock in the committee I did not know where it was. There were 121 pension and compensation bills. We were attempting to decide which to consider, and it was finally decided by the

will of the committee. The committee voted to consider the nonservice-connected matter ahead of compensation. If there was any roadblock, I do not know where it was.

Mr. EDMONDSON. If the gentleman interpreted my remarks as any criticism of him, it was not so intended, and my subsequent remarks will explain just what I mean.

An important factor in this conclusion about the roadblock in priority was the strong belief that any pension bill would be doomed to legislative death if we gave it priority over needed legislation for service-connected disabled veterans and their dependents. As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I do not want to be in the position of coming to this floor and being compelled to justify that kind of priority against attacks which could be expected on this floor for giving it that kind of priority.

At this point I would like to set the record straight on one point with regard to responsibility for the amendments which were added to H. R. 7886. At least one well-known veterans' publication has charged that the chairman of our committee engineered those amendments in order to defeat H. R. 7886. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], is not a man who is in need of defenders from any quarter. His great war record, second to none among the membership of this House, is ample proof of his ability to fight his own battles, and to fight them well. Nevertheless, I cannot stand by as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, with some knowledge of the amendments in question, without challenging this unwarranted accusation against our chairman. The plain fact is that a majority of the amendments adopted in the committee were offered to the committee by members who are in favor of H. R. 7886 and who were seeking in the committee to help the bill rather than to harm it, and a majority of those amendments, in all fairness to him, were opposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], who is chairman of our committee. I do not believe that "TIGER" TEAGUE had any more to do with engineering the present composition of H. R. 7886 than he had to do with the Battle of the Alamo down in Texas, and I feel sure that he would rather be associated with the latter event.

On the other hand, the chairman of our committee, and many other committee members, during the past week have participated in a series of conferences, seeking some kind of a reasonable compromise to this particular piece of legislation. The principal reason why a compromise was sought is rather self evident. The cost figures which were presented by our chairman, and on which I intend to comment further in a few minutes, were being given very wide publicity throughout the country. The cost figure, when you view the entire bill from section 1 through section 17, as it was reported out of the committee, was an alarming thing to contemplate, and I am sure many Members of Congress shared the feeling of alarm in connection with this overall cost picture; particularly when we were presented with a projection to the year 2000 which appeared to be astronomical in connection with this legislation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I listened with great interest to the gentleman when he spoke a moment ago of certain suggestions that had been made that possibly in one form or another there might be a failure of this legislation to become law. As the gentleman well knows, of course, and we all know, any legislation that is passed here goes to the other body and must be acted upon there, and then if it is to become law it is subject to action by the President. I just want to say to the gentleman that I, speaking for myself only, and firmly convinced that if the original bill were to be enacted by this body, or even the substitute to which the gentleman has referred, I am quite convinced that it never would become law. So I think we ought to take a very good look at something that is realistic and that would do the things that need most to be done yet have a reasonable chance of finally becoming law.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman is certainly entitled to his opinion on that score, and I am quite sure that he will have some influence on whatever decision is made by the gentleman in the White House with regard to this piece of legislation.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I think what the gentleman from Indiana is saying is that if we do not enact a reasonable bill we are then going to lose the features of this bill which would grant increased disability payments for service-connected disability and other good features of this legislation; and if the bill as presented is not amended we are going to wipe out the chances of having any kind of reasonable bill.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am in agreement with the gentleman that we need to have a reasonable bill, but we are not in agreement as to what is a reasonable bill or what the features may be that would provide a reasonable substitute.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I wonder if the gentleman is assuming that there is any possibility of the provision he intends to offer being considered by the other body? I realize that we do not agree on that, but we must remember that our committee has sent 15 bills to the other body and thus far none of them has been considered.

Bills pending in Senate

Bill No.	Subject	Passed House	Senate committee
H. R. 735	Pension—Medal of Honor	June 22, 1955	Finance.
H. R. 1614	Compensation—Statutory awards combined loss of eyes and limb	Jan. 16, 1956	Do.
H. R. 1821	VA checks forwarded to addressees	do	Do.
H. R. 2845	Compensation—Loss of buttocks	May 7, 1956	Do.
H. R. 5055	Cadets and midshipmen—Veterans' benefits	Jan. 17, 1956	Do.
H. R. 7144	Statutory awards—No application	May 7, 1956	Do.
H. R. 8458	Compensation—Eligibility—Spanish War widows	do	Do.
H. R. 9841	Pension—Income limitations	do	Do.
H. R. 9922	Pension—TB—Permanent—total	do	Do.
H. R. 10046	Uniformity in compensation	Apr. 16, 1956	Do.
H. R. 10441	Restriction of insurance application—Soliders' and sailors' civil relief.	May 7, 1956	Labor.
H. R. 10542	Widows' benefits—Eligibility	May 24, 1956	Finance.
H. J. Res. 110	Pension—Moro Province	Aug. 2, 1955	Do.

If they will not pass those, then it is impossible for me to believe that they would even consider what the gentleman is proposing that the House pass today.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman certainly is better informed as to what the Senate will do than I. I would not presume to say what the other body will do or what the President of the United States will do. I think, however, that our primary responsibilities in this House are discharged when we review the problem carefully and do that which we as Members of the House of Representatives think we should do with regard to the problem.

Of course there is speculation as to what will be done in the White House and in the other body, but I would still be interested in knowing if there is any communication from the President of the United States in which he indicates that he will not agree to a reasonable compromise of this bill with regard to non-service-connected pensions for veterans and their widows and their orphans. If the President is prepared to take a stand on that I think it could be most illuminating in connection with this debate and of great interest to all of us here in this House.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I think the gentleman heard the letters I read from the President in committee which pointed out that he felt that all the veterans' problems need to be reviewed and that it should be done in the very near future. I think the President has taken a very firm position in this whole affair.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Am I right when I state that the Veterans' Administration, speaking for the executive department has entered its objection to practically all of the bills that have been before our committee?

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is correct, and I think the gentleman from Texas, when he speaks of opposition from the administration to these

bills, will have no difficulty recalling that is correct; that is, that the administration, speaking through the Administrator or his various representatives, has taken a position against practically every bill in support of the veterans which has been passed in this Congress thus far.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. In view of the fact the matter has been brought up as to just where one of the greatest soldiers we ever had and a gentleman who is respected throughout the world stands on this matter, and I refer to the President of the United States, I have a copy of a letter sent to me which the President sent to the chairman of the committee. I would like to read it with the gentleman's kind permission.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Will the gentleman not wait until his own time?

Mr. AYRES. Time is unlimited for the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Unless the letter relates to the Dorn substitute specifically, I would like to request that he hold it for his own time. If it relates to the Dorn substitute I shall be glad to have the gentleman read it.

Mr. AYRES. It does not mention the Dorn substitute, but it does refer to the essence of the Dorn substitute. I will be glad to read it when I take the floor.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to remind the Members of the House that 2 years ago it was stated the President would veto the so-called pension bill. But the President did not veto that bill. He signed the bill and I am firmly of the conviction that today if the pension bill is passed by itself, the President would sign it. I do not believe for 1 minute he will veto this bill. I have not always agreed with the President, he does not agree with me oftentimes, but I am absolutely sure he will sign this bill. If passed separately, and, of course, with the compensation features, I think he would be more apt to sign it. We have proof of what he did in the past. I do not think we like his message very well. He said he did it reluctantly, but still he signed it and I am sure he will sign this.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Chairman, speaking of the conferences that have taken place in recent days in regard to arriving at some reasonable modification of the bill reported by the committee, may I say that in these conferences there was not only participation on behalf of a large number of the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee but there was also participation and exchange of views and information from the national commanders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and representatives of the national commanders of the Disabled Veterans and of the Spanish-American War Veterans. The proposal which will be offered by the chairman of the subcommittee on compensation and pensions has been given the support, somewhat reluctantly but nonetheless support—and I think you will see evidence in writing of that support before the day is ended—of the commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and of the commander of the American Legion. We have also been assured that a telegram will be received expressing support for the proposal by the commander of the Spanish-American War Veterans. With regard to the section on compensation, we have been told that the figures contained in the compromise proposal are acceptable to the responsible leaders of the Disabled American Veterans. I am aware of the fact that the Disabled American Veterans are possibly a little bit more pleased by the provisions of the bill which will be offered as a substitute by the gentleman from Texas. It is slightly higher on 100 percent disability payments, by $5, than is the substitute proposal. Aside from that 1 difference the increases in the two bills for disabled veterans are substantially the same.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman states that the Disabled American Veterans are for the compensation portion of the bill. Is the gentleman saying they support the Dorn amendment or do not support the Dorn amendment?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am not saying they support the Dorn amendment or that they favor in any way the nonservice-connected pensions. When that matter was discussed they said they were interested only in the features of the amendment with regard to disabled veterans and they would give their opinion on those.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Has the Disabled American Veterans taken a position supporting the Dorn amendment?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would be very much surprised if they were taking a position in favor of nonservice benefits, and I am not aware of any position they have taken in the matter.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. You do not anticipate getting any approval from the AMVETS organization for the Dorn proposal?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Well, I am not prepared to discuss the AMVETS position. Perhaps the gentleman can enlighten us on the subject when his time comes along. But, I have not been in communication with AMVETS regarding this proposal.

Mr. AYRES. All Members of Congress have received a letter stating their position, and according to that letter they would be against the Dorn proposal.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Well, since the Dorn proposal was not finalized until this morning, I am a little amazed to hear that they were able to send a letter to every Member of Congress stating their position. But, if the gentleman says it has been done, I will accept it.

Mr. AYRES. I do not think it was quite as secret as you may believe.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman may remember that 2 years ago the Disabled American Veterans urged the President to sign the so-called pension bill.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentlewoman is possibly correct on that.

At this point I would like for a moment to discuss the principal provisions of the Dorn substitute to bring to your attention some facts regarding the cost estimates of this particular piece of legislation. The proposed amendment is offered as a compromise revision of H. R. 7886. I might say to the membership that there are copies of the Dorn amendment on the committee tables at either side of the House for your examination if you would like to look at it and follow it as I make this explanation of it.

Title I in the Dorn proposal corresponds to Title I in H. R. 7886 in that it deals with nonservice-connected pensions for veterans and for their widows and for their orphans and also with the problem of increases in pensions for Spanish-American War widows.

Title I, section 1, continues the principle which already has been written into law that all war veterans who are permanently and totally disabled to the extent that they cannot follow a substantially gainful occupation shall be entitled to a pension, subject to income limitations, and further provides that a war veteran, age 65, who has income below a certain annual figure—those figures remain at the present level of $1,400 without dependents and $2,700 with one or more dependents—shall be qualified for such pension. The proposal establishes rates for these pensions at $75 or at $90 when the veteran has received the pension for 10 consecutive years or is 65 years of age. Now, that is a change from $66.15 in the case of the $75 figure, and from $78.75 in the case of the $90 figure. It further provides for an increase in the pension for helpless or blind veterans requiring attendants from $135 to $150 per month.

It also provides something for which the Veterans of Foreign Wars have been contending for a long time, that otherwise qualified veterans with 30 days or more of overseas service shall be entitled to a pension increase of 10 percent. Now, that is a reduction of one-half from the differential that was provided in H. R. 7886 originally as it was adopted by the committee. It cuts the cost of that particular aspect of the bill in half.

The VA cost estimate of H. R. 7886, section 1, which has been given great publicity and about which I want to comment further in a minute, was $536,150,000 for the first year of operation, to be graded upwards in succeeding years. The VA has supplied to the Veterans' Affairs Committee the first year's cost estimate for the Dorn amendment of $367,958,000, or a reduction in cost of $168,192,000.

Section 2 provides something that most of us have felt for a long time was

long overdue. It places the World War II and Korean war widows and orphans on an equal pension basis with World War I widows and orphans. The VA estimated the cost of that originally at $126,335,000 in the first year. In view of reductions in the succeeding section of the substitute, they estimate the cost under the Dorn amendment at $92,225,000 or a reduction of $34,110,000 on this item under the Dorn substitute. Section 3 increases the rates of pensions for widows and orphans by 10 percent, adjusted to the nearest dollar. The cost of that was estimated by the VA at $106,427,000 on the original H. R. 7886 amendment adopted by the committee. This reduction provided in this substitute is a very substantial reduction. It cuts the increases which were placed in effect by the committee amendment to almost one-fifth the figure provided in the committee amendment, making the cost of the Dorn amendment as calculated by the VA on this particular section $19,857,000, an overall cut for this particular section of $86,570,000.

Section 4 is the Spanish-American War widows section. Originally, the amendment which was adopted in the committee provided for an increase on this particular point of approximately $15 across the board for Spanish-American War widow pensions. The Dorn amendment reduces that to approximately $10 across the board, reducing the cost from $19,473,000 to $12,983,000, or a cut of $6,491,500.

This adds up to a total reduction of title I sections—on the 4 sections in title I, of $295,363,500. Those are the cuts accomplished thus far in the first 4 sections.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to get a figure that I failed to catch. In title I, section 1, what is the reduced cost?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Title I, section 1, cost as estimated by the VA is $367,958,000, a reduction of $168,192,000 below the original figure.

Moving on to title II, which deals with your service-connected disabled veterans, I might say at this point that I doubt very much if there is more than 1 percentage point difference in the cost of this section in the Dorn substitute and the cost of the section as it is supported by the chairman of this committee. If it is more than 1 percentage point, then I have not correctly understood the substitute which the chairman will offer.

The cuts which were agreed to by the veterans' organizations and supported with reference to this title create the following cost figures today as compared with the cost figures when the bill was first reported.

On section 5 and section 7, which operate together to give you a cost collectively, the VA estimated the original year's cost at $250,197,000 for the 2 sections, which include an increase for all of your disabled across the board, whether 10 percent or totally disabled. Originally those increases ranged, under H. R. 7886, from about 10 percent to about 41 percent. Under the Dorn amendment, the range of both of these 2 sections is from about 5 percent to about 22 percent in the case of the totally and permanently disabled service-connected veteran.

The new cost figure for the 2 sections as supplied by the VA is $152,395,000, a cut on those 2 sections of $97,802,000.

Section 6 increases the rates of compensation for so-called statutory awards by average amounts of less than 10 percent. For example, a veteran with the loss of both hands or both feet is raised from $279 to $300. A veteran with the loss of both legs above the knee or of both arms above the elbow, who has lost the use of his arms or his legs for that reason, is increased from $329 to $350.

The cost figures remain the same on this section because they are not changed in the Dorn substitute and I do not believe they are changed in the substitute which the chairman will offer in the course of the reading of this bill.

Section 8, section 9, and section 10 all relate back to section 6 and the statutory awards. No changes have been made in H. R. 7886 as it was originally reported out of the committee and as it now stands in the substitutes, but the total cost estimated by the Veterans' Administration on this combined group of sections is only $14,483,000 in the first year of operation. The $14,483,000 figure remains at that figure in the substitute.

Section 11 is a section on which there has been a substantial amendment. H. R. 7886 provided in section 11 for a far-reaching change in our disability compensation law. It provided that dependents of veterans who were disabled less than 50 percent, at rates of 20 percent or 30 percent or 10 percent, would qualify for certain dependency payments. It added up to a cost in the first year of $143,308,000. The Dorn substitute provides for an across-the-board increase in dependency payments of 10 percent only for veterans who are 50 percent disabled or more, giving a total cost of $9,199,000 in the first year of operation. This is a cut on this section of $134,109,000.

What does this give in the net? There is one more section also eliminated, I believe, in both the Dorn substitute and in the chairman's substitute. Section 12, which has already been covered by H. R. 7089, passed by this House and favorably reported by the Senate, also is eliminated under the Dorn substitute, and I believe eliminated under the chairman's proposal.

Section 13 would also be eliminated under the Dorn substitute, providing for increases in burial allowances from $150 per funeral to $200 per funeral. That adds up to a reduction of $5,500,000 in the first year on that particular item.

This brings us to a total saving on section 1 through section 4 of the Dorn proposal of $295,362,500 on the first year alone. It adds up to a saving on sections 5 through 13 in title II of $318,023,000. The figure which you have on the synopsis which you may be holding does not include the $5,500,000 for the burial allowance, which also is eliminated under the Dorn substitute.

This gives a total saving over the bill H. R. 7886 as it was reported out by the committee of $613,885,000 in the first year of operation, if we accept the Veterans' Administration figures on costs.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. As far as money is concerned, that reminds me of a wife who, when she sees something and does not buy it, thinks she is saving money. We started out with the bill with $528 million first year's cost. We ended up with a bill that was about $1,282,000,000. What you have done is taken that bill and cut it approximately in half, $681 million. Is that about correct?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think substantially, if you accept the Veterans' Administration cost figures originally, which I am not convinced that we should, that you do have that end result, yes.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Can the gentleman tell us what part of this $613 million goes to nonservice-connected programs?

Mr. EDMONDSON. The nonservice-connected total? The reduction was $295,362,000.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I was not speaking of the reduction. I was speaking about the percentage of the $613 million which goes for nonservice-connected programs? What part of the $613 million goes to nonservice-connected pensions?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Of the reduction? Six hundred and thirteen million dollars is the reduction. The figure that remains is a little bit above $613 million.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. How much do the nonservice-connected pensions cost in the Dorn proposal?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I have given the items already on that to the gentleman. I do not have a total by items on it. But the first item is $367 million. The second item is $92 million. The third item is $19 million. The fourth item is approximately $13 million. So, the gentleman only has to add those figures and he will have the cost on the nonservice-connected programs.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. About $500 million of the total, $681 million, goes to nonservice-connected programs. Is that approximately correct?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think with the increases that would be pretty substantially correct.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. $500 million of the $681 million goes to the nonservice-connected programs.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Approximately. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it true that in both the bill, as reported by the committee, and the Dorn substitute to which the gentleman has been referring, provision is made for a general pension not only for World War I veterans but for veterans of World War II and veterans of the Korean war?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Provision is made for any war veteran who becomes totally and permanently disabled, and in the case of a veteran who reaches the age of 65 and has an income below the figure

of $1,400 a year, if he is without dependents, or $2,700 a year if he has dependents, he would be qualified as a disabled veteran under this provision. Now, if the gentleman wants to call that a general pension, he is entitled to do so. I do not believe he would be technically correct in doing so, but he is entitled to do so.

Mr. HALLECK. I am perfectly willing to be corrected by the gentleman and possibly that is the wrong term. I have just one further question. As we have voted such pensions in years past, have they ever been voted for as many years in advance as we would be doing here in the case of veterans of World War II and the Korean war?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I do not think we have ever waited until we had fought two additional wars before adopting a pension for the veterans of a previous war. This is the first time, I believe, that the United States has ever fought three wars before it provided a pension for the veterans of any one of those three wars. That is the situation we find ourselves in at this time. We see no reason for discriminating against any veteran who reaches the age and has a limited income and limited ability to follow a gainful occupation. We feel, if his income has fallen by reason of not being able to hold down a gainful occupation, he should be provided assistance by the Federal Government.

Now with regard to the Veterans' Administration estimate on cost, I would like for you, just for a moment or two, to consider some figures. Most figures when they are statistics are not very interesting and it is hard to hold attention with them. But, these particular figures, I believe, are interesting when we consider the accuracy of the Veterans' Administration projections of cost for this legislation. They have given us projected costs under the Dorn substitute of $367,958,000. We were interested in knowing just how they arrived at this particular figure. We asked for details as to how many veterans they would include in this pension and how many veterans would be added under the Dorn substitute. The same legislative liaison section which supplied the figures to the staff supplied some figures to me in this connection. They told me they estimated that 228,000 additional veterans, most of them World War I veterans, would be added to the pension rolls as eligibles under this new substitute proposal. Consider just for a moment, Mr. Chairman, the fact that we have here a group that the Veterans' Administration recognizes and points to the existence of, of nearly one-quarter of a million veterans in the United States whose incomes are at the level necessary to qualify for this particular pension. If you have a question as to the need for this proposal, consider this cold statistic of 228,000 who are supporting themselves on less than $1,400 a year, or supporting their families on less than $2,700 a year, at the age of 65. That is the group that they say would be affected by this proposal.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield gladly.

Mr. ELLIOTT. You say that this will add 228,000 veterans to the list who are now 65 years of age.

Mr. EDMONDSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLIOTT. But you retain the income limitations of $1,400 and $2,700 per year.

Mr. EDMONDSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLIOTT. What is the difference between that requirement that your bill sets forth and the requirement that is in effect now? Is it not a matter of 10-percent physical disability?

Mr. EDMONDSON. There is no difference in income limitation. There is a requirement under the present law that actual disability be proved.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Of 10 percent.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Of 10 percent, and unemployability must also be proved. Those are the factors that many veterans find difficulty in establishing in order to qualify for this pension. If a veteran's income has fallen below this figure, and he is 65 or over, he should be given the presumption that he is disabled and unable to earn more money or he would be earning more money to support himself and his family.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The Veterans' Administration's own figures show a total of 567,117 now on the pension roll, most of them at the rate of $66.15, which would be raised to $75 under this bill.

The next largest number in this group of 567,000 are now on the roll at $78.75 and would be raised to $90. If we give an average increase for this group of 567,000 of about $10 a month, or approximately $120 a year, that would be an increase in cost, by simple multiplication, of $68,054,040, for the increase that would be accomplished in your rate increase for people already on the rolls. Remember that figure—$68,054,000. If we assume in the cases of all the 228,000 eligible that all of them will receive $90 a month under this proposal, or $1,080 a year, multiply the 228,000 by $1,080, and we get a total figure of $246,240,000. If you put the $246 million and the $68 million together, you get a total of $314 million. That is on the assumption that each and every one of these veterans who is eligible will apply for a pension and receive it. I think actual experience with these things shows that there is a very large number of veterans made eligible and determined eligible under the law for pensions who would never have come in and qualified for them and would have never received them. But if you take the figures of the Veterans' Administration, the number potentially qualified, and put every one on the rolls at the maximum amount which they could receive under this bill, you still have a total cost of $314 million, which is $53 million less in your first year of operation than the cost of $367 million which the Veterans' Administration's statisticians say would be the first-year cost on this bill.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I wonder if in the computation the gentleman has just made he has included the overseas service or the pensions for blind or helpless veterans referred to in the substitute that the gentleman is discussing?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Those figures, as I understand, are included in the initial computations which were given to us.

Mr. VORYS. On the 228,000 the gentleman has just multiplied by 90. There would be the possibility of a 10-percent increase for overseas service; would there not? So there might be a percentage that would get $150 a month.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think if we gave the additional 10 percent to every veteran who is qualified in these 2 totals we would not get $53 million additional. If the gentleman will look and see the 2 figures, 240 and 68, if we gave 10 percent to each one we would still be far short of $53 million difference.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Has the gentleman given the statisticians of the Veterans' Administration a chance to look at his figures to see whether or not the administration was wrong in its figures?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I have not been able to yet.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman has heard me question them in committee many times as to how accurate they were.

Mr. EDMONDSON. As to these figures, I did not get them until about 20 minutes to 12 today.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. So that the House can be absolutely sure, would the gentleman check his figures over with the Bureau and then report back to the House tomorrow?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I should be very glad to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am not interested in having incorrect figures, as the gentleman knows. And I am sure the gentleman remembers that I have questioned the Veterans' Administration many times as to whether their figures were accurate.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman from Texas has criticized their cost estimates much more enthusiastically than I have.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. But I have never been able to prove them wrong.

Mr. EDMONDSON. If the gentleman will bear with me for just a minute I will cite an instance where they were proven wrong and proven wrong substantially.

In the 82d Congress a bill known as H. R. 3193 was before the Veterans' Affairs Committee. It provided for a substantial increase in the pension rate for World War I and II and for Korean war veterans who were totally disabled, blind, helpless, or who had reached such a scale of helplessness as to need regular aid and attendants. That bill became a public law after a White House veto was overridden by both Houses of Congress, and the law became effective in 1951.

During the hearings on this particular bill, on page 615 of the hearings a representative of the Veterans' Administration made the following statement:

It is estimated that the enactment of H. R. 3193 would affect approximately 400 veterans of World War II, 23,700 veterans of World

War I, and 50 veterans of the Spanish-American War during the first year with an additional cost for that year of approximately $16,700,000.

That was the official testimony of the Veterans' Administration witness before the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

On November 25, 1952, the Veterans' Administration stated that as of October 31, 1952, which was the end of the first year of operation of the pension rates under this law, Public Law 149, the number of veterans who were receiving increased pensions by virtue of the operation of Public Law 149 of the 82d Congress came to a total of 13,440. This represented 10,710 fewer veterans receiving the pension than was estimated by the Veterans' Administration during the hearings on the bill.

Using the same factors of increased pension rates in the Veterans' Administration's computation, the cost for the first year's operation under Public Law 149 of the 82d Congress was $8,709,120, compared with an estimate of $16,700,000 made by the Veterans' Administration at the time of the hearings.

In other words, on this one bill which is within the memory, I think, of many Members of this body, the Veterans' Administraton was in error on estimated cost by in excess of 50 percent; and I say to you that if they could make an error of those proportions in overestimating and overstating the estimated cost on that bill which was passed by the 82d Congress they could certainly be doing the same thing in the present consideration of this legislation for non-service-connected pensions and for increases in disability pensions.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows there are a good many famous cases where the Veterans' Adminstration gave estimates to the Appropriations Committee of their needs for the next year and they were away off. That has happened numerous times.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentlewoman is correct.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. T. J. Collins, assistant director of research, Richard Mandel Research Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York City, was hired, or at least went to the VA and checked their first year's figures.

Mr. EDMONDSON. He had the 228,000 figure?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It is the first-year figure for the bill H. R. 7886, which we are discussing. He came away saying their figures were substantially correct. I think there are a lot of assumptions to be made to arrive at cost, but here is one private organization that has gone down to check the figures in H. R. 7886 and had that to say.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I know Mr. Collins reached the estimate of 228,000 potentially eligible. I was not aware he had reached the other conclusion. I would be very much surprised to see in writing that the gentleman agreed to the conclusion that all 228,000 would go on the rolls in the first year of operation. That is something, I think, the VA has presumed and assumed unfairly with regard to this particular legislation.

Now let me boil it down to the major differences between the Teague substitute or the Ayres substitute. I do not know whether it is the Ayres substitute or the Teague substitute or the Dorn substitute.

Mr. AYRES. I would be very proud to have it as my substitute, but it is the Teague substitute.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to say in connection with the substitute that I think it is good and desirable. I have no criticism to make of what is in the Teague substitute, as I understand it. It is what is not in it that disturbs and leads me to the conclusion it is doing an incomplete job and not measuring up to the problem that we have, which involves a quarter of a million veterans of World War I.

The major differences between the two substitutes can be boiled down to this: Both of them make substantially the same provision for service-connected disability.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TUMULTY. Assuming the Teague substitute is adopted, assuming a veteran to be unemployable and meeting the requirements of this bill, not getting more than $1,400 a year. If the Teague substitute is adopted what happens to that veteran who meets all of the requirements? He does not get $1,400 a year, he has no income, he is over 65 years of age. What does he do?

Mr. EDMONDSON. That is the question that I do not know the answer to. There is no provision made for him outside of local charity that I know of.

Mr. AYRES. He would come under existing law. I think the gentleman should explain that to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TUMULTY. Which law does the gentleman mean—the income-tax law?

Mr. AYRES. I think the gentleman was here this morning when Chairman TEAGUE went all through what the present program is.

Mr. TUMULTY. I saw the charts, but what happens to him?

Mr. AYRES. Seventy-eight dollars would be the maximum to which he would be entitled.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is not maintaining that a man over 65 years with an income below that figure would be automatically qualified under existing law? I hope he is not trying to present that to the House at this time. Unless he proved actual medical disability and unemployability, he would not be entitled to that.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman assumed a man to be in that position.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I did not understand the gentleman to assume medical disability.

Mr. TUMULTY. If this bill passes, the man would get certain benefits. If it did not pass and in place of it the Teague substitute were passed, he would get nothing.

Mr. AYRES. The Teague substitute does not deal with pensions.

Mr. TUMULTY. What happens to the man which this bill itself tends to help? If we do not pass the bill itself and give him a pension, then he gets no pension and has no job. Where does he get the money to live under the other bill?

Mr. AYRES. I do not think a veteran reaching 65 years has any difficulty in proving 10 percent disability.

Mr. TUMULTY. If he cannot prove that what happens to him?

Mr. AYRES. If a man is not disabled he probably would have a job.

Mr. TUMULTY. At 65 years of age?

Mr. AYRES. We have many of them over 65 working and they make more than $1,400 a year.

Mr. TUMULTY. I am speaking of the man who does not make $1,400 a year.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is speaking of the 228,000 as determined by the VA figure who are not able to qualify under existing law, have not been able to qualify under existing law, but who would be taken care of under this bill.

Mr. TUMULTY. If this bill is not passed, what happens to them?

Mr. EDMONDSON. They are forgotten men under existing legislation, so far as I know.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me 5 additional minutes? A great deal of my presentation has been taken up with answering questions, and some have not been friendly questions.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted the additional 5 minutes in order to summarize the difference between the two substitute proposals. Both proposals make a liberal provision for your service-connected disabled and for the dependents of the service-connected disabled. The chairman's proposal does not make provision for a needed increase in non-service-connected pensions. The chairman's proposal does not make provision for non-service-connected veterans who are not provided for under existing law. The chairman's proposal does not make provision for needed increases for Spanish-American War widows, World War II, and Korean widows and orphans. It does not make provision for equal treatment for World War II and Korean widows with the widows of World War I veterans. I think what he has proposed is good, it is commendable, but it falls short of meeting our problem in regard to our veterans, the widows, and the orphans of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I think when this House soberly considers and reviews the soundness of the two substitute proposals that it will be a wise thing and a generous thing to adopt a reasonable compromise which will be offered by the gentleman from South Carolina when we read this bill for amendment.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. To summarize my position as far as the two are concerned, the amendment that the gentleman intends to support costs $681 million the first year; $500 milllion goes to non-service-connected, and $181 million goes to service-connected. My amendment covers only the service-connected, and an increase in the pension from $135.45 to $150 for the seriously disabled pensioners, requiring "aid and attendance," because that is the only possible bill that will go through both Houses and become the law of the land and help the veterans. You might as well send the present bill over to the other body as the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman will concede even with the adoption of this law payment to disabled veterans and dependents will remain substantially higher in total than the non-service-connected.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Yes; that is true. And I think the House should also remember other veterans' legislation we have passed in this Congress. We passed the survivors benefit bill for service-connected veterans that will cost some $300 million to $400 million the first year. We passed Public Law 7 on education that covers more than a million veterans. We have passed an orphan scholarship bill that will cost $250 million and will benefit 156,000 children.

Mr. EDMONDSON. On the other hand, the gentleman will concede that we are now looking forward to a termination next year of very substantial expenses for educational benefits and also the GI housing bill.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. These programs are nearly over, there will be only small savings involved, probably not one-fifth of the first year's cost of the Dorn proposal.

Mr. EDMONDSON. So we will have big savings in those areas that could be devoted to pensions.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. When the gentleman speaks of veterans of 65 being in the poorhouse, I think he should also tell the House that according to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare 80 percent of all World War I veterans will be covered by social security by the middle of this year.

Social security

World War I veterans eligible (percent)	80
World War II veterans eligible (percent)	95
Maximum social-security retirement for single person:	
Per month	$108.50
Per annum	$1,302.00
Maximum social-security retirement for man and wife:	
Per month	$162.80
Per annum	$1,953.60

Year	Total number World War I veterans 65 and over	Number eligible for social security	Average annual social-security benefit
1955	605	443	$785
1960	1,731	1,312	949
1965	2,199	1,715	994
1970	1,582	1,254	1,027
1975	993	741	1,027
1980	423	338	1,027
1985	137	110	1,027
1990	29	24	1,027
1995	3	3	1,027

Ninety-five percent of all World War II veterans are covered by social security and the maximum amount of social security is $108 for a single person. He may receive both social security and a non-service-connected pension. For a married man the figure is $162.50; something like that.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Of course, very few of those veterans will be receiving the maximums which the gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is true.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Would the gentleman agree that the payments that are considered for non-service-connected disabilities are probably going to be paid for by the taxpayer, even if the bill is not enacted, anyway, inasmuch as those individuals will have to be on relief in their local communities; and, therefore, in essence, what we are doing is giving them a more dignified way of getting at least a part of their necessary support from the Government which they served in time of war?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman makes a very fine point.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. The statement was made that these veterans would be able to draw social security. I think it should be brought out that by a recent ruling of the Social Security Board even someone working for the Communist Party is entitled to social security, and certainly the veteran should be entitled to more than that.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I referred previously to amounts we were paying in pensions to persons overseas. I am listing the numbers of nonservice pension checks going to persons in foreign countries.

Number of checks forwarded during August 1956 for non-service-connected pension benefits to dependents of deceased veterans where death was non-service-connected and to non-service-connected living veterans residing in foreign countries

	Deceased veterans	Living veterans
Total	6,360	8,757
Europe	2,730	4,644
Austria	3	2
Azores	3	7
Belgium	45	68
Cyprus	2	5
Denmark	54	90
Finland	13	16
France	147	81
Greece	308	500
Ireland	184	476
Italy	1,166	2,991
Luxembourg	4	13
Malta	4	2
Netherlands	4	8
Norway	93	93
Portugal	8	13
Spain	12	7
Sweden	65	82
Switzerland	7	11
United Kingdom	176	102
West Germany	33	15
Yugoslavia	39	62

Number of checks forwarded during August 1956 for non-service-connected pension benefits to dependents of deceased veterans where death was non-service-connected and to non-service-connected living veterans residing in foreign countries—Con.

	Deceased veterans	Living veterans
Africa	19	18
Algeria		1
Belgian Congo	1	
Cape Verde Islands	3	3
Egypt		2
French Equatorial Africa	2	
Gold Coast	1	
Liberia	2	
Maderia Islands		1
Morocco, Spanish Zone		1
St. Helena and dependencies	1	
Tunisia	2	1
Union of South Africa	7	9
Asia	98	68
British Malaya	1	
China	1	1
Hong Kong, British	39	4
India	3	
Japan	23	9
Jordan	7	9
Korea		1
Lebanon	5	23
Palestine	11	6
Syria	6	11
Turkey	2	4
North America and West Indies	849	906
Bahamas	7	6
British West Indies	9	12
Canada	654	719
Costa Rica	7	11
Cuba	61	43
Dominican Republic	7	2
El Salvador		1
Guatemala	4	1
Haiti	2	
Honduras	1	6
Iceland		1
Mexico	78	102
Nicaragua	7	
Panama	12	2
South America	47	23
Argentina	12	7
Brazil	7	1
Chile	5	5
Colombia	5	3
Equador	1	2
Paraguay	1	
Peru	9	4
Uruguay	2	1
Venezuela	5	
Pacific	2,977	3,098
Australia	18	14
French Oceania	2	1
New Zealand	5	4
Republic of the Philippines	2,952	3,079

The CHAIRMAN. Under the agreement entered into between the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member, each is to control one-half of the time. Up to this time the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has consumed 16 minutes and the gentleman from Texas 2 hours and 29 minutes. Does the gentlewoman from Massachusetts care to yield time now?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I prefer still to wait and yield time later on. However, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, would the lady care to yield time to me, in order to catch up with the chairman of the committee? I am against her position, but I should be glad to take some time now.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree to that at this time.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a rather unusual position today, just as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] who stated that he found himself under rather unusual circumstances.

The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and was chairman of the committee in the 83d Congress. She has been of considerable help to those of us who came to the committee as new members. I have found her to be one of the most generous persons both with her own money and that which goes to veterans, of any person I have ever met. I think she is to be commended on her humanitarianism and her generosity.

On the other hand, I am quite indebted to the American Legion. In the year 1932, the American Legion started what they called a junior league baseball organization throughout the United States. I was not too smart, but I was a fairly good ball player and was taken on an Ohio State team. The Cleveland Indians came down and scouted us, but I was not good enough to make their farm team. But they stirred up enough interest so that Western Reserve University gave me a scholarship. That is how I happened to get to go to college. So indirectly I owe a great deal to the Legion. Four years ago, my daughter received their award, which they give to the eighth-grade graduates throughout the United States. I have admired and respected the work that they do both from a civic point of view and from a patriotic point of view.

But I regret to report to you here today that it disturbs me no end to see the pressure that has been applied by a few leaders within the Legion and a few lobbyists who are hired and controlled by these leaders.

I come from a pretty rough district for a Republican; 50,000 CIO members, nearly 20,000 A. F. of L. members, about 15,000 unaffiliated. And I want to be perfectly honest with you; I do not dare make too many political mistakes or I will not be returned here. Fortunately the members of these organizations are with me.

This is my sixth year. I am for this Teague proposal not because I think it is the political thing to do but because in my heart I know it is the moral thing to take care of the service-connected disabled veterans first.

I did not suffer the trials and tribulations of combat that the chairman of this committee did.

When I was discharged from the Army we stayed in the barracks that night at Camp Atterbury, and I tell you here this afternoon that I was on my knees thanking God that I had been returned with all my faculties to my wife and three kids. I dedicated myself at that time that if the occasion ever presented itself I would do everything within my power to see that those who had left a leg on Iwo Jima or a hand on some far-distant island or had had their blood spilled on the hills they could not climb, were properly cared for.

I do not believe that here this afternoon we should consider this legislation on the basis of what we can afford, because to the man who lost a hand, the man who lost an arm, or the man who lost a leg, that cannot be replaced with any amount of money. We should not consider this on the basis of what we can afford. It should be considered on the basis of what is needed. If we find the need to be there, then it is our responsibility as the elected representatives of the people to see that the money is provided for that need.

Look what we did on the highway bill. We established a need for a new highway program, and no one stood up and said, "Why, yes, we need the highways but we cannot afford them." We had a special tax bill to raise the revenue, because we realized the highways were needed.

If there is need for such legislation as proposed by this Dorn amendment to H. R. 7886, then those of you who admit or feel in your hearts that the need is there should be proposing legislation that will provide the necessary funds to meet that need.

Personally, I take the position that there is need for help for those with service-connected disabilities and that there is no need at this time for pensions for World War II and Korean veterans.

Here I am, who came out of the Army in better physical condition than I have ever been in my life. I wish I could get back in that same condition. I am 25 years away from being eligible for the pension you propose, and I am 4 years older than the average World War II veteran, which is 36. The average age of the Korean veteran is 27. Yet here today we are being asked to vote on legislation providing a pension for a man 25 to 30 years from now. That is not based on need.

I will tell you what it is based on. It is based on the fact that various veterans' organizations need members, and they have made a terrific drive to get those members. When they meet at their national conventions they have to come up with a proposal. They call it a mandate when they come before our committee, that they have been mandated to do this.

You would be amazed at the pressure they can employ through various individuals, but I honestly do not believe that the commander of any post, whether it be the American Legion, DAV, AMVETS, or Veterans of Foreign Wars, controls any vote other than his own. Sometimes I think he has difficulty in telling his wife what to do.

In order to find out the feelings of the rank-and-file veteran, whom we never hear from, for out of the 22 million veterans there are only a little over 4 million who belong to any organization, I went out into my district and held a full day of hearings. I invited veterans of all walks of life to come in and testify. The hearings were announced a week in advance. Any veteran who wanted to come in and state his position had the right to do so.

I want to give you one case in particular, which proves the point that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], and I believe hundreds of other Members of the House, feel should be given consideration first, and that is with regard to the service-connected disabled. Here is a man, a World War I veteran, who lost a leg. He draws approximately $200 a month. That is all he has been drawing in compensation since he lost his leg. Under the law that we are proposing to pass, when that man becomes 65 he is not going to get any added amount of money in the form of a pension. He cannot have both compensation and a pension because his compensation is more than the $1,400. That type of man came before the committee saying, "Why do I not get a little bit extra for having gone 30 years without a leg?"

A young man, a veteran of World War II, came before the committee. He had lost his leg on Iwo Jima. He could hardly walk on crutches because his other leg was also shot up. I would like to read to you his testimony. His name is Harry E. Jenkins. He lives in what you might say is an attic in Akron, because the compensation, he being unemployable, which he receives does not make it possible for him to have a decent home. In fact, for his wife and child and himself, $263 a month is all that boy can ever expect to draw unless we increase his compensation under the Teague proposal. He wanted to get a better house. He made an application for a GI loan. What was he told? They say, "No, you cannot buy a $10,000 home because you do not make $3,400 a year. Furthermore, you would be a pretty bad risk because with that stump you have, your life expectancy is not too good."

When we speak of the inequities that should be corrected, I say to you that those are the boys who should be given consideration first.

The charge has been made here today that under the Dorn proposal we cover all of the various fields that are deserving of attention. It has been my experience that when you try to please everyone, you wind up pleasing no one. That is exactly what you are going to do with this bill. Should the Dorn proposal prevail, we all know it is not going any place in the other body. We all know that the President of the United States is not going to sign it. I have a letter here which he wrote to the chairman of our committee. He sent me a copy of the letter. The letter is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 30, 1956.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate your May 22 letter asking my views on non-service-connected pension bills in light of the executive agencies' adverse reports, which I feel are soundly based, and also the recommendations of the Commission on Veterans' Pensions.

The Commission's report and the background data yet to be released represent a substantial investment of time and effort by outstanding citizens and warrant the thoughtful study of the executive branch, the Congress, organizations of veterans, and the public generally. A detailed review of this material is now in progress in the executive branch, and I will submit specific recommendations to the Congress after these studies are completed.

This comment, however, I should like to make now: I firmly believe in the principle of recognizing the special sacrifices of those who serve in our military forces in time of

war or national emergency. I further believe that our first obligation is to our war-disabled veterans, their widows and orphans. This obligation we should meet generously, and the conclusion that we are not now meeting this obligation in all respects is one of the Commission's many findings that give me serious concern.

I am convinced that all concerned—the public, the Congress, the executive branch—should have full opportunity carefully to evaluate these findings, the voluminous background information now becoming available, and especially the basic principles and priorities involved, before such basic and far-reaching pension legislation as you mention is acted upon.

With kind regard,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Aside from the President's letter, what has been the reaction of many of the other organizations who deal with veterans' affairs? I have here a statement of the VFW which was sent to their national officers and departmental commanders prior to the knowledge that there would be a Dorn substitute. Here is what they said—make no mistake about it, the Dorn substitute is just about half as bad as the original Dorn bill. It does not deal with the people we want to take care of, the service-connected disabled. Their proposal will never be enacted into law.

Here is what they say:

It is difficult, however, for the VFW to be optimistic enough to believe that the omnibus veteran benefit bill identified as H. R. 7886 will win approval, in its present form, from the House, the Senate, and the President. If the bill, by some miracle, should clear both branches of the Congress it is almost certain to meet a Presidential veto.

H. R. 7886, no doubt, will suffer one of two alternatives. First, the bill will fail to win approval somewhere along the three hurdles previously mentioned or, second, it will be substantially amended or emasculated, to the point where there will be little left for any of the intended beneficiaries.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Will the gentleman tell me in what respects, other than the $5 difference on total disability, the Teague substitute is more generous for service-connected disabled than the Dorn substitute?

Mr. AYRES. The Teague proposal stands by itself for service-connected disabled veterans. That is the only type of legislation that you stand a chance of getting into law in this session, in my judgment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman has made the statement that the Dorn substitute does not deal with the veterans that we want to take care of, the service-connected disabled. Will the gentleman correct that?

Mr. AYRES. I will correct it by saying that the Dorn proposal and the provisions contained therein for the service-connected, left in the Dorn proposal as such, would never be enacted into law.

Mr. EDMONDSON. That is a little different from the statement that it does not deal with the service-connected disabled.

Mr. AYRES. Now we also have a letter from the AMVETS. In essence, this is what the letter from the national commander of the AMVETS says:

It is inconceivable that the House of Representatives should be asked to grant $105 per month to a nondisabled, 90-day service veteran at age 65 while in the same breath they grant only $100 to the combat veteran whose war wounds are 50 percent disabling.

In my travels throughout the Nation during the past 6 months, I have discussed this subject with thousands of veterans. I am convinced and can assure you that the rank-and-file veteran is not interested in non-service-connected pension liberalizations but does seek equity for the service-connected disabled.

We are hopeful that a substitute measure to grant compensation increases for the service-connected will be offered when H. R. 7886 is considered by the House of Representatives. In the interest of disabled veterans, we respectfully urge that you lend your support to such a substitute.

I tell you, Mr. Chairman, it is evident that the members of this committee are going to be given an opportunity to vote for a proposal that can become law, that will correct many of the inequities that the service-connected disabled, the boys who lost their arms and legs around the world, suffer.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mrs. CHURCH. Did I understand the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], to say that the Teague amendment does nothing for the widows and orphans? If so, do you think that the present provision for those classes is adequate?

Mr. AYRES. As the chairman of the committee said when he had his charts here—and I assume the gentlewoman was here and saw them.

Mrs. CHURCH. No; I am sorry that I did not hear all of his speech.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The bill that passed the House last year, was reported out of the Senate committee recently, and was scheduled for the Senate floor next week, does a lot for our service-connected widows and orphans.

Mrs. CHURCH. Does it do as much as is provided in the Dorn amendment?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It does considerably more.

Mrs. CHURCH. Does the gentleman feel that he could expect the President to sign such a bill in addition to the bill we are discussing today?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The President has already expressed his approval.

Mrs. CHURCH. If that provision is embodied in the Dorn amendment and is passed by this House, it would nullify any reason for having the other bill passed by the Senate, would it not?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I believe that particular provision for service-connected widows and orphans has been taken out of the Dorn amendment. I do not believe it is covered in the Dorn amendment. I think the service-connected widows and orphans who are covered by H. R. 7089 that we passed last year are not covered at all in the Dorn amendment. That bill is still in the other body.

Mrs. CHURCH. I wonder if the gentleman from Texas would clarify then what he meant by saying that something valuable was contained in the Dorn amendment for the widows and orphans?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The Dorn substitute provided for increases across the board for widows and orphans of World War I, World War II, the Korean war, and the Spanish-American War widows as well.

Mrs. CHURCH. Would that be the equivalent of, or more, or less than the bill now pending in the Senate?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. H. R. 7089, the bill pending over in the Senate has a provision relating to the service-connected widows and orphans which has already been dealt with by the Congress. The other pensioners to whom I have referred are the widows and orphans of non-service-connected pensioners, the non-service-connected veterans.

Mrs. CHURCH. And provision is made in the Dorn substitute for that certainly needy class. I certainly desire such provision for the group so signally affected.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. For that class, yes.

Mr. AYRES. I think the gentlewoman is also aware that all who had 90 days service or more would be covered under that proposal.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman clarify the difference with regard to the service-connected veteran himself between the Dorn substitute and the Teague amendment? I gather that there is more in the Teague amendment for the service-connected disabled veteran.

Mr. AYRES. The only thing in the Teague amendment over and above increasing the compensation payment to those veterans with service-connected disabilities is to increase the amount given to those veterans who are bedridden, who require an attendant.

Mr. KEATING. In the so-called Dorn proposal what is the provision, if any, for the service-connected disabled veteran? Can the gentleman from Ohio or the gentleman from Oklahoma or someone else enlighten me in regard to that?

Mr. AYRES. Under the Dorn proposal as stated in title II, section 5, there are increases in rates of pension of service-connected disabled veterans, 10-percent totally disabled by approximately 10 percent; to some others the increase will be 5 percent; and to the totally disabled 22 percent. There are a few discrepancies, but basically there is not a great deal of difference between what is provided in the Teague bill and what is provided in title II, section 5, of the Dorn proposal.

Mr. KEATING. As to service-connected cases?

Mr. AYRES. As to the service-connected disabled.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. AYRES. I trust that the members of the committee will realize that they have 1 of 2 things to vote for: Either the Dorn proposal which is a little bit of everything for everybody which can

never become law; and what is fair, what is honest, and what is just for the service-connected disabled veterans of our land, the Teague proposal which can become law in this session of Congress.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that the AMVETS letter, the one I have at least, was written on June 21. It was written before the Dorn amendment was even suggested.

Mr. AYRES. I may say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that I talked with them this morning and their position is the same toward getting a bad apple half in two as when they were against the whole thing.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Of course, I do not know with whom the gentleman talked, but some of the AMVETS have informed me they were sorry this letter was sent and made public.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I have a telegram I received this morning reading as follows:

> Have read with approving interest your proposed substitute for H. R. 7886. This measure will provide needed increases in compensation to those who are most deserving of increases, the service-connected disabled and their dependents. Equally important and unlike the measure it is proposed to replace, its cost will not impose an unfair burden upon the taxpayers of this Nation. AMVETS heartily endorse the proposed substitute and urge your continued effort to have it adopted by your colleagues in the House of Representatives.
>
> JOHN R. HOLDEN,
> *National Legislative Director, AMVETS.*

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Ohio that I have great admiration for the veterans' organizations and the work they have done for the disabled and also for their constant effort to keep our country strong. These service organizations are of tremendous value and I know they consider all veteran problems with reason and fairness. On previous occasions they have greatly helped with legislation for the disabled. They have helped the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on many occasions and because of their suggestions quite a volume of sound legislation has been enacted. In the early days after World War I, veterans were not too well organized and particularly this was true regarding the disabled for many of them were still confined to hospitals all over the country. I know, because I visited them and helped them work out their problems. Many who needed to go into hospitals could not get in because of conditions existing at that time. It took organization to work out these difficulties.

Today all types of veterans are organized, and these organzations with their staffs are helping the men get their service connection, helping them with their family problems, and providing this help without pay, without charge, devoting their full time to the service and benefit of the men who served with them.

I am deeply grateful to these service organizations for coming before our Veterans' Committee and giving all of us the benefit of their thinking on all of the constructive and needed provisions of this legislation.

Here in the Congress we have so-called lobbyists come before us for big business, for little business, for the farmers, for the road builders, for everything under the sun so, why should we not have the benefit of the thinking of the veteran organizations, in order to provide fair and just legislation. I have known many of their representatives for years and years, and they are very fine gentlemen. I am personally deeply grateful for all they have done to help us with our work.

Now it is true we have not done what we ought to have done for the disabled veterans. Nobody knows that more than I do. But we have done in many respects all that we could. Although the Bradley report is misleading in many respects it does make some constructive suggestions for some of the disabled. Personally I do not believe the disabled should be placed in a position of constant fear of having their allowances cut. To live in fear surely is not the way of freedom or a democratic grateful Nation. This fear certainly has a negative reaction on the health of the disabled.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay my respects to the veterans' organizations for what they have done for our national defense, for what they have done in the care of the disabled and for what they have done for my colleagues here in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for her splendid work concerning benefits for veterans and their families. If the gentlewoman will permit me, I would like to comment for just a moment. The gentleman who preceded you, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], made the statement that all the support for this bill was coming from the kingpins of veterans' organizations. I would like to read a letter I received from a World War I veteran. To that letter is affixed a home-made petition, just letters pinned together, containing 275 signatures of World War I veterans. I would like to read just one paragraph of that letter. It states:

> We are too young to die, but still too old to obtain employment. Many of us now are becoming disabled where we cannot work full time at our occupations. Many of us are completely out of work, but still we are forgotten. Between now and the day that we expect to go to the polls and cast our votes you can bet that by then we will well know who our buddies are to be elected to various offices.

This is not a kingpin talking. This petition originated in a small town, Anna, Ill., about 5,000 people, where on Sunday a group of veterans banded together and worked up this petition. This is what they have to say. It is not coming from kingpins. I merely take this time to point out that there is great interest on the part of the rank-and-file veterans. I have had more mail on this legislation from individuals than all other legislation combined in this session of the Congress. I thank the gentlewoman for permitting me to explain that this bill is not being pushed by a group of kingpins, but is wanted by those veterans who are in need and who feel, through what they have contributed to the welfare of this country, they are entitled to a small pension when they become needy. And I think they are entitled to it, too. I compliment the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for the great work she has done in supporting this veterans' bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to say to the gentleman that I have not had a single letter against this bill. I have received a great many letters from all parts of the country, and I considered it a compliment to have people feel I am interested in the veteran. I am interested in these great citizens we call veterans who have saved this Nation time after time without considering the cost to them. I have not received a single letter of protest against this bill. Based upon the mail that has poured into my office, I believe the public in general is in sympathy with all this bill will do for the veterans. The public has not made any concentrated protest against this bill. There is no organized or unorganized effort to prevent its enactment. Since I have received no opposition on the part of the public there must be a feeling of justification for this legislation on the part of the American people in general.

From my district, my Commonwealth, and from all over the country, people write to me about every subject under the sun, so there must be an overwhelming belief that this measure in some form should pass. It is a matter of great rejoicing with me, Mr. Chairman, because I think the public is strongly of the opinion that with all that is being given to industry and small business, with all that is being given to the farmers, with all these tremendous amounts that are being given in aid to foreign countries, some of whom are stabbing us in the back, but it is given for a purpose, I know; that certainly something should be done for our own veterans, for those who wore the uniform and fought to maintain and hold fast to all we have here in America and they made their sacrifices without first thinking of cost to them. When there is no fury of war, it is easy to turn away from the cost of war. But when this great country is threatened and challenged in war, no thought is given to the cost in human sacrifice or in material substance. The cost of war does not end when the struggle of the conflict is over, the field of combat calm, and the battle won. The cost of war goes on and on for a grateful nation as long as a veteran remains alive. Let us never forget this fact as a nation even though there are many who selfishly are willing to forget.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York, Judge FINO, coauthor of the original bill, and I

would like to take a minute myself, Mr. Chairman, to state that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported out the bill, so far as I can remember, with only one vote against it, showing how the committee felt regarding the need of some sort of veterans legislation.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I want to say here and now that I am going to support the Dorn amendment to H. R. 7886, which bill I was privileged to cosponsor in this Congress. And I want to say particularly that my cosponsorship of this particular legislation was at the request of the American Legion.

This is the so-called omnibus compensation and pension bill, which I supported in committee, and which was reported out favorably by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs about 2 weeks ago. I have heard a great deal of criticism regarding this bill. Those opposed to this type of legislation have condemned it as a "giveaway program" or "a handout to the veterans," and this kind of talk disturbs me.

I want to make one point crystal clear. If ever there was need for liberalization and humanization of our entire veterans' benefit structure, it is now, when the country is enjoying the greatest prosperity in its history. And yet shamefully we neglect and ignore the desperate plight of our veterans, their widows and children. And what excuse do we offer? We tell them that we cannot afford it. We are telling these veterans, young and old, who sacrificed part of their lives, and the widows of those men who paid the supreme sacrifice, that the cost of this proposal to increase rates for pension and compensation is too great.

Let us take a good look at our World War I veterans who are rapidly becoming old men. It is reliably estimated that they are dying at the rate of 7,500 per month. The survivors are finding it increasingly difficult and almost impossible to compete in the exacting labor market.

How many 65-year-old men do we know who are as well physically as they were at age 25? How many 65-year-old men do not have large doctor bills, hospital expenses, and other miscellaneous expenses caused solely by advancing age or ill health? You can probably count them on your fingers.

Very few, if any, of our veterans have had the thought in mind that this Nation owes them a living. But when conditions do exist, as they do now, it is our duty and obligation to help them, and we cannot and must not evaluate this responsibility in terms of dollars and cents. We have taken care of our veterans in the past and we shall take care of them now.

We oftentimes hear of the age of 65 as the age of retirement. This age, when reached, is one thought of as being the age of unemployability—and believe me, at the rate these veterans are dying, the age of employability is really limited to a selected group of younger and more recent veterans.

In these times of high living costs how many of our veterans' widows can live a normal, self-supporting, and happy life on the pension left them? They may be able to exist, but that they can live comfortably I doubt.

This bill places all widows on the same pension basis and gives them all $75 a month. Is this small amount going to bankrupt our great-grandchildren? But I am willing to go along with the Dorn proposal, which is at least an effort, an attempt in the right direction.

Do your realize how far this small increase will go in supplying the bare necessities which some of these pensioners must have in order to live?

How many of you Members would care to see your own widow and dependents exist on this small handout? However, I am willing to support the Dorn proposal if it is the best we can get out of this House.

The thing that disturbs me most is the objection of some people that the cost of this program, the cost of H. R. 7886, will be tremendous. About 3 weeks ago I did not see many tears in this House, I did not see much hair-pulling when it came to voting on our foreign-aid program, when we were called upon to dole out and give away about $4 billion to our foreign neighbors. Why the terrible concern when it comes to our own people? A large portion of what we have given away, $51 billion since World War II, has been not for military strength, not for economic strength, but for gaining good will. I am sure that a great deal of this aid has been dissipated in attempting to win friends. Examples of the waste of funds to my way of thinking, and as far as I am concerned, can be seen in Yugoslavia, India, and Egypt. All of these countries have clearly shown their pro-Soviet tendencies.

I am sure you know as well as I that these increased benefits are needed. These increased benefits are needed not for extra spending money, these increased benefits are needed not for luxuries, but merely to permit and allow these veterans and their dependents to purchase the bare necessities of life.

The benefits we are providing under this bill are just and fair. Under the Dorn proposal they are less, but at least, as I said before, it is a step in the right direction. In fact, this is a period in the lives of these aging veterans and their widows and dependents when a tribute to their brave sacrifices would be most welcome and appreciated.

We cannot turn down our own veterans and dependents by telling them we cannot afford it. I learned something when I was young, and it has been carried on and on, and I believe everyone knows that charity starts at home. Taking care of our own is but a small tribute for the many sacrifices made by our veterans in the preservation of our American way of life.

There has been talk here this afternoon that if we pass this bill in its present form, if we pass this bill even with the Dorn proposal, it will not pass the Senate, it will not receive Presidential approval.

Let me say this to you gentlemen. We have a responsibility in this House. Our responsibility is to do our job here. What happens outside this Chamber should not reflect on us. I trust and hope that when the Dorn proposal is submitted it will receive the wholehearted support of every Member of this House.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I will try to make my remarks brief. This question has been discussed this evening at great length and in all its ramifications.

I am for H. R. 7886. I voted for it in the committee, I will vote for it in the Committee of the Whole, and I only hope I will have a straight chance to vote for it on the floor of the House.

I realize that I am taking in this discussion a side opposite to that of my chairman, but that does not mean that he is not a dear friend of mine and it does not mean that we will not continue that friendship through the days and the years that no doubt lie ahead.

I am going to offer him now the greatest compliment that, as far as I know, I can give a man. I am going to say that when I go to my chairman and ask a question as to what he thinks about something or what he intends to do about it, he gives me a straight answer to that question and I can go on from there knowing that it will be exactly as he said it would be. That is the highest compliment that I know of to pay a friend.

I have a lot of mail regarding this bill, H. R. 7886. In fact, we have tabulated something over 10,000 requests for its passage and we have 2 letters in opposition—2 to more than 10,000. Now they are not from kingpins or anything like that. They are just from veterans and veterans' wives and veterans' widows all over the United States asking when is this House going to pass H. R. 7886. They come in petitions that long signed with a lead pencil. We have tried to reply to all of them, and I think we have pretty well done that. But we have had to take the telephone directories and go through them because some of these names and some of the addresses are undecipherable and some of the mail which is sent to the veterans comes back because it cannot be delivered. We have done everything we could to reply to every one of them. About half of these 10,000 have come to me from the State of Missouri and the other half has come from all points all over the United States. I know they are genuine.

There is one thing that has disturbed me a little here today when a gentleman assured us that unless we did thus and so, the Senate would not take any action. Now, I do not know if there is any rule to bar me from referring to the Senate—maybe I should not refer to them as the upper body or the other body. Well, anyway, you know whom I am talking about. I wonder since when it has become the rule of this House to check a proposed piece of legislation with the other body to see if they approve of it before we pass it. I wonder whether the people who voted for us and sent us up here to represent them sent us here to check with the other body and to see what they wanted. If we believe in a piece of legislation, let us pass that legislation and then let

the other body and the executive department of this Government do whatever they feel the dictates of their conscience and their greater ability, perhaps, demand that they do. I take no stock in that.

Whom do we seek to help here today? We do not seek in the Dorn amendment to H. R. 7886 to enact a general pension bill. We put limitations in that bill as to how many dollars a pensioner can draw and what his income limitations are. Those income limitations are the same income limitations that are written into the law at the present time. They have not been raised. Do not deceive yourself. The whole thing about this debate and all this discussion that is taking place is over section 1 of H. R. 7886. The so-called Dorn amendment and the substitute that will be offered through our chairman are so nearly identical that it would take an expert to tell the difference with the exception of section 1. There is the difference. Shall we assume that a man who is a veteran and has reached the age of 65 and whose income is less than $1,400 a year, if he has no dependents, and less than $2,700 a year, if he has one or more dependents; is he assumed to be entitled to a pension or is he not?

Now that is the thing we are discussing today. That is what we are spending the whole day about. That is what the final vote in this Committee will determine what you are going to do. These men need help. If they are 65 years old and make less than $1,400 or $2,700, they need help. They are entitled to help. We are not seeking to take away anything from the service-connected pensions. We are offering, in the Dorn substitute, to give him almost exactly the same as the chairman of our committee is offering to give him in his substitute. I am glad of that. I do not want to take anything from a service-connected pensioner or his widow or children. I want to give them a raise. I think the raise that is recommended by the chairman of our committee is reasonable. It is in line. It is almost exactly the same as the Dorn proposal. The difference is in that assumption of disability at age 65, and nothing else. That is tied down under income proposals until it is fair and just, and I hope this House will enact it.

A friend of mine said to me today, "How are you going to justify a vote for that when you go back home to your district?"

I would rather justify a vote for the assumption of disability, with that income limitation, than I would to try to justify a vote I gave the other day for foreign aid, even with enough money taken out of the request for foreign aid, $1.1 billion, to pay the cost of this Dorn substitute, H. R. 7886, for 2 years. I would much rather. In fact, I do not know just how I am going to justify my vote for foreign aid. We have had foreign aid for a long time, and it looks like we may have it for a still longer time. Perhaps it is justified. I do not know. It has never been my privilege to visit Europe or Asia. I have no first-hand information. I have to take the word of other folks in great measure, regarding whether it is justified. But the House voted $35 billion for the military. It voted over $3 billion for foreign aid, and will probably wind up voting for a conference report that will be in excess of $4 billion for foreign aid. We vote for subsidies for almost everything. I cannot go home to my district and stand up and make a speech if I look back and see a World War veteran sitting back there, a man who is in debt, who is without employment, who is without income, 65 years old or older, who could not get any assistance, and I would expect him to get up and ask me how I voted on H. R. 7886. I know how I am going to vote on it.

These two letters that I have in my possession opposing 7886, one of those said, "It is all right to think of the vets, but think of the country first." That gentleman missed the point. If it had not been for the vets, we would not have any country to think about. We had to whip Germany the first time or she would have realized her dream of ruling the world. Since then the sons of those World War I veterans had to cross the Atlantic and whip Germany again under Hitler. If they had failed there is a good chance that the swastika would be flying above the place where the Capitol now stands instead of the Stars and Stripes now floating above this great city, the Capital of the world.

There is no politics in this bill. These veterans are Republicans, they are Democrats; and their fathers and mothers are Republicans and Democrats; and this House is made up of Republicans and Democrats. This is a nonpartisan piece of legislation and I want to ask the Members on both sides of this aisle to stand up and be counted and do not let section 1 of H. R. 7886 be taken out by any substitute, because if you do you have cut the heart out of it.

One Member said on the floor of the House that Spanish-American War widows' pensions would cost a tremendous amount of money, and it was projected to the year 2000. I wonder how ridiculous we can get around here. The average age of the Spanish-American War widow is 68 years. This century has about 44 years to go; 44 added to 68 makes 112. Maybe there is 1 widow in 10,000 who lives to be 112, but there are not going to be any Spanish-American War widows in the year 2000.

Another gentleman spoke about the turnover on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. It is a committee with a tremendous lot of responsibility, a statement in which I think the chairman of the committee will bear me out; but it is also a committee that offers opportunities. I am new on the committee, but if I come back to this House again, which I trust and hope will be the case, I will not ask to be reassigned to some other committee.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I asked the gentleman to yield because the gentleman from Ohio, in speaking in support of the Teague substitute, read a letter of support from the commander of the Amvets. I hold in my hand two telegrams addressed to me just received this afternoon which I would like to read. The first one reads:

> Veterans of Foreign Wars approves revision of H. R. 7886 as proposed by Congressman BRYAN DORN. Amendments by DORN will cut original cost estimates in half but will retain fundamental principles. Bulk of payments will go to widows, orphans, and service-disabled veterans. Urge you support Dorn amendments.
>
> TIMOTHY J. MURPHY,
> *Commander in Chief.*

The second one, also addressed to me, reads as follows:

> Reference H. R. 7886 under consideration today. Pleased to advise American Legion strongly supports substitute proposals of Hon. W. J. BRYAN DORN, which substantially reduce costs and still achieve bill's major objectives. They are product extensive conferences between members of Veterans' Affairs Committee and representatives major veterans' organizations. Respectfully request your support. Regards.
>
> J. ADDINGTON WAGNER,
> *National Commander, the American Legion.*

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I wish to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for reading these telegrams. The Members who were listening will do well to study those amendments.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. A page has just brought me a third telegram as follows:

> Spanish War veterans everywhere are grateful to you for your understanding of the problems facing our widow class. They are unable to exist in decency on the small pension they now receive and unlike other widows are too old to be acceptable even as baby sitters. Age is most important factor in treating with this condition. Urge you implore House to include a pension increase for them in any legislation approved this week. Amount asked is in line with Bradley Commission proposal and would doubtless be acceptable to the President.
>
> WILLIAM J. OTJEN,
> *Chairman for Legislation,*
> *United Spanish War Veterans.*
> HATTIE B. TRAZENFELD,
> *Cochairman, Auxiliary Committee.*

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. Chairman, continuing, I want to say that a gentleman at this mike said a while ago that his sympathies went out to the man who lost a hand or a leg or an eye or both legs. I want to say to the Members of this House that my sympathy goes out to him, too, and if this bill sought to take a single dollar away from him I would be against it. If it did not seek to give him a raise in the pension he is presently drawing, I would be against it. But the Dorn amendment instead of taking money away from that sort of man gives him more and if it is not enough I hope that subsequent Congresses give him a still greater increase. I would not be a party to taking a single dollar away from a service-connected veteran. I am glad to help him get more compensation for the great loss that he suffered. The Dorn substitute for 7886 does give him more money. That is the reason I like that bill.

I am proud to say before this House that I am in support of 7886.

I do not believe the President of the United States will veto 7886. That is just a personal belief, it has no evidence in the world to back it up, but I still believe that. I did not vote for him but he is my President and I do not believe that of him. I think he is a finer man than one who would veto this bill if we passed it.

There are some 900,000 World War I veterans still alive at this time. They constitute the remnant of that once proud army which left our shores to the accompaniment of blaring bands and waving flags to fight the war to end all wars. They beat the Kaiser to his knees and ended his dream of world domination, but it probably never occurred to them their sons would later be called upon to cross the same ocean to prove to Hitler and Mussolini that they were as wrong as the Kaiser had been before them.

Death is fast thinning their ranks and whatever measures this Government takes to show appreciation of their heroic deeds, the unselfish way in which they offered their lives and bodies on the altar of their country, must be done soon. Seventy-four thousand of these veterans died in 1953; 78,000 in 1954; and 82,000 in 1955. It is estimated by the Veterans' Administration that death will claim at least 87,000 more during the coming year.

Now, I have the report of the Veterans' Administration calling my attention to their estimate that if this bill should become a law it would cost over a billion dollars a year. This report further states that the bill is not in accord with the program of the President. I am amazed that the President, who was himself a career military officer entitled to the many varieties of financial security that type of career provided, would permit anyone in his administration to go on record as not being in accord with the idea of helping improve the financial condition of World War I veterans—men who risked their lives in behalf of their country. I just find it difficult to believe.

It is just not true that all World War I veterans would be eligible for assistance under this bill. Some of them are well-to-do and would not be eligible because their incomes are more than $1,400 if single or $2,700 if married or with dependent children. Moreover with the death rate running to nearly 90,000 per year, the payments would soon become less and less. While there are many who would not qualify for assistance under this bill, there are others who, at age 65, are in real need.

Industry hesitates to employ men past age 65 and those who must work for a living past this age find it difficult to obtain employment at a wage which will allow them and their families to have a decent standard of living. The maximum income set up in this bill is $1,400 or $2,700. Many World War I veterans are living, or rather existing, on much less than that amount and it is these veterans who are in grave need for which I plead today. Those whose incomes are below the level of the minimum for decent food and shelter.

These are the men who marched through the mud and crouched in the shellholes and craters. These are the men who crossed the Atlantic in face of the German submarine peril and exposed themselves to bombs and poison gas in order that we might remain free. We should be glad we still have the opportunity to help those who, at age 65 though no fault of their own, I am sure, find themselves in need of assistance.

A request was made to this Congress to appropriate $4,900 million for foreign aid. I have always supported appropriations of this type, but I am fast reaching the breaking point. At least a part of this gigantic appropriation is to be used in the countries over which these veterans had to fight. This Government has already given, since the close of World War II, $92 billion to Europe and Asia in carrying out our foreign aid program.

Our foreign aid program has been building hydroelectric dams, irrigation projects, and God only knows what other improvements over most of the world and yet when someone proposed to help our own when they are in need, we are immediately reminded it will cost money. I seem to remember it is written in a book read all too seldom:

> He that provideth not for his own, especially they of his own household, is worse than an infidel and has already denied the faith.

H. R. 7886 seeks to provide for our own and is limited to the needy among the remnant of a proud army who fought our wars to victorious conclusions.

Christ was not crucified because He preached the fatherhood of God. He was crucified because He broke bread with sinners; scourged the moneychangers out of the temple at Jerusalem, saying "My Father's house is a house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves." He was crucified because He preached the Gospel to the poor and taught the universal brotherhood of man. I wonder if He should return today as a member of the family of a lowly carpenter and should preach on the banks of the Potomac the same Gospel He preached on the shores of Galilee if His reception would be any different.

We are a great Nation, a proud Nation, but I sometimes wonder just how proud we would be if we should all sit down in the seclusion of our chambers and commune honestly with our own souls, if we should try to see ourselves as God is going to see us when we stand at that final judgment. It is written, Then shall He say to those on His left hand, I was thirsty and ye gave me no drink, I was an hungered and ye gave me no meat. I was homeless and ye took me not in. Then shall they answer and say unto Him, When saw we Thee thirsty, hungered, or naked and ministered not unto Thee. Then shall He answer and say unto them, Inasmuch as ye did it not to the least of these, ye did it not to me.

Today I say to the members of this committee, charity should begin at home. However, I would remind you that H. R. 7886 is not charity, it is even-handed justice—justice which should have been provided long before now. Many of these veterans have died after reaching age 65. There is nothing we can offer those who are dead but a grateful remembrance. We still have time left for the privilege of helping those needy who are living and H. R. 7886 seeks to do just that. How can you, on your knees, ask God to bless you and yours until you prove that you love your needy neighbor as yourself? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts and I take this time merely to direct 2 or 3 questions to the chairman of the committee and also to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] if I may.

First of all to the chairman of the committee: As I understand it, one of the basic objections to the committee bill and also to the Dorn substitute which has been raised by the gentleman is in reference to the automatic disability provision at 65; am I correct?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman is very correct. That is one part of the objection. May I say just a little bit more in that connection. We have reached a point in our overall non-service-connected program that we certainly ought to stop, look, and listen. We are drafting boys today who serve 2 years anywhere and who come out as nonveterans. Are we going to keep on doing that? Are we going to give World War II veterans who stayed in this country, that did not do as much as the boys are doing now, benefits? I think it is time to look at the whole program.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am not debating the matter with the gentleman. I am leading up to a question that I think the gentleman will appreciate the purpose of in a moment. As I understand it, a further objection that has been raised is with respect to World War II and Korean veterans. There is a lapse of perhaps 20 or 25 years before the average age of those veterans will reach 65 years. This provision of automatic disability at 65 is legislating a long way in the future with respect to the veterans of those two wars; is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That was expressed. I did not express that thought.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Would the gentleman share that opinion?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I think it is a part of the overall picture.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Would the gentleman consider any merit at all to the possible consideration of the First World War veterans in a separate category with respect to automatic disability at 65 on the basis of a perhaps more readily demonstrable need for such automatic total disability for a group now at or near that average age?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Of course, the World War I veterans came earlier before our committee in behalf of that type of bill. The VFW came in and testified in behalf of that type of bill also. Are we setting a precedent with World War veterans in that respect? It seems to me it is an overall question. You cannot separate World War I, II, or any other war. The group of World War II and Korean veterans have to be considered as a group in your non-service-connected class.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Would you say that the problem of the two groups, World War I veterans, on the one hand, and World War II and Korean veterans, on the other, are identical without regard to the possible changes or expansion of social security or other economic changes which may occur in the next 20 to 25 years? I am asking not contentiously.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Certainly it is a good question, and a question that we went into. There is no question but what the World War I group are an older group, and I was very surprised to learn from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that 80 percent of the World War I veterans today are covered by social security and 95 percent of World War II veterans. So there is some difference in that group; some drawing $108 social security and $66 or $78 as far as pensions are concerned.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I gained the impression that possibly there would be a greater number of World War II veterans and Korean veterans drawing social security and probably drawing it more adequately at that time, presuming that it has not gone bust.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I hope the gentleman will understand one statement I made today as trying to determine the need of older people in our country. There is no question but that the problem of the older people is increasing all the time. But, we did call in the representatives of all the veterans' groups and asked if they would help us get the names of people turned down for pensions. Just what efforts they have made I do not know, but we received about 150 to 200 names, and my big fear is, in piling up the cost of this program—nearly everything is nonservice connected—that you are going to hurt the service-connected program, and certainly our problem is to deal with the service-connected disabled.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentleman. I would like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma to comment on the same line of questions.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would care to comment only in this way: The gentleman from Texas made the statement that 80 percent of these veterans are drawing social security of $108. I wonder if the gentleman has any figures to show how many of these veterans are drawing the maximum of $108 under social security. Do you have any figures on that, sir?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I would be glad to read the letter from the social security agency.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am aware that they are eligible for drawing up to the maximum, but it is my information that the great majority of them are drawing far less than the maximum under social security.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Well, the average that I have is $75 now; $949 in 1960; $994 in 1965; $1,027 in 1970 and from then on.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Then the average at the present time, rather than being $108 maximum, would be somewhere around $60 to $70 on the average; is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is close.

Mr. JOHANSEN. May I direct this further question to the gentleman from Oklahoma as to whether or not he would be willing under any consideration—I want to be entirely fair in my question—to consider the possibility of applying this principle of automatic total disability at 65 to the World War I veterans exclusively at this stage.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Well, I will say to the gentleman that that matter was given very serious consideration by the group supporting the Dorn substitute, and there were some members of the group who were very strongly in favor of that position. It was not the majority view of the group that it would be a fair and consistent position to take in line with the amendment appearing elsewhere in which we equalize the pension opportunities for the widows of the veterans of World War II and Korea with World War I. It was our feeling that in the sense of consistency and of fairness that any pensioner, no matter whether he was a veteran of World War I, or World War II, Korea, or one that we all pray is not fought 5 years from now but could very well be, that any one of those veterans, when he reaches the age of 65 and becomes disabled to the point that he cannot gain substantial employment and earn enough money to support himself, should be eligible for this pension.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am acutely aware of the significance and the implications of a precedent. On the other hand, I am toying with the thought from the standpoint of crawling before we walk or walking before we run, since we are actually venturing into a new concept here, if I understand this aright.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would say to the gentleman, and I believe the Chairman will support me in this, that I do not believe the cost effects of such a limitation in the bill would be felt in any substantial way for a good number of years, if you were to adopt the proposal the gentleman is speaking of.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I think that may be true, but at least we might gain that much experience, and it is the cost effects with respect to the application of this principle, in 15 or 20 years, which is a matter of honest concern, I am sure, to many Members.

Mr. EDMONDSON. It certainly is. But on the other hand, we would face this situation immediately, and while the number is small, there are some veterans of World War I who already are over the age of 65 and who could qualify for this pension. Most of them are Reservists or National Guardsmen or men who had spent a long period of time in the service before World War II was fought. But they are, nonetheless, men who would qualify for this pension and who would be forgotten if we limited it as has been suggested.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask one final question? Were there any figures developed in the hearings, or is there an estimate of the number of World War I veterans, for example, who are not now eligible for total and permanent disability but who would become eligible if we adopted this principle of automatic eligibility at age 65?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I will say to the gentleman that one of the members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs at present has a request with the Veterans' Administration which he has had in since early today for such an estimate. It has not been supplied. We do not have a breakdown of the 228,000 figure which has been supplied to us as the number who would be qualified as eligible under this new proposal in the Dorn substitute.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking with much emotion. I have been listening to the debate this afternoon and wondering why always when legislation for veterans of our wars is presented there is raised the cry of economy. There always have been those who would place the termination date of gratitude at the moment the last shot was fired and the danger was gone.

It was so many, many years ago when the ragged and hungry veterans of Washington's army marched on the Congress of the Confederation petitioning for the payment of arrears of wages for services during the Revolutionary War. All they sought was money that was due them and that had been earned in battle service, money for clothes to wear against the biting cold and food to keep the spark of life alive.

Three members of that early Congress, resentful that veterans should dare to petition their lawmakers, demanded that the guns of the State militia of Pennsylvania be turned on the petitioners. They were among the first Congressmen in the history of our country to place the termination date of gratitude at the moment the last shot was fired and the danger ended.

Not unrelated is the fact that the leader of the trio, later to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, passed the years from Valley Forge to Yorktown as a member of a committee supervising expenditures. He was far away and safe from the suffering and fighting of campaigns. Sentiment to him was something to be measured by the tables in books of arithmetic, and to gratitude he applied the table of 0×0.

Not unrelated, either, is the fact that in the Constitutional Convention he had advocated "power given to the few to save them from being destroyed by the many" and bitterly opposed the abolition of the foreign slave trade. People who place the termination date of gratitude at the moment the danger is over are that way.

Three voices in that early Congress were raised to give to Washington's veterans not money for food but bullets for liquidation. But only three, Mr. Chairman. It always will be that way as long as our country remains the land of the free and the home of the brave. In the veins of a tiny minority in any generation there may course unnaturally ice water instead of red blood, but the overwhelming majority of our lawmakers and

of our people will be responsive to instincts of sentiment and to the impulses of gratitude.

ECONOMY TALK A SMOKESCREEN

There are many places to effect economy. There are many ways of balancing the budget. I suspect that in all the turmoil that always attends the suggestion of something for the veterans is a smokescreen to cover the places where there should be economy and there is none and the ways where the budget should be balanced and is not.

The cruel fact is that there is no balancing the budget in the homes and in the lives that have been affected by war. When we wage war we do not weigh the cost and count pennies. We then do not talk of economy, even in the economy of human lives when military strategy requires the attaining of an objective at any cost. When we wage war instead of balancing the budget we make it a patriotic gesture to knock the budget into a cocked hat.

I know there are people, and good God-fearing men and women, who when the war is over want to forget it and get back to normal lives. There are people who when a tornado is over and their homes have been torn to the ground think in the same vein. It is a workable program when there is another home ready for occupancy, utterly unworkable when there is no other roof to find for protection. How do you get back to normal living when your home has been destroyed and there is no other home to which to go?

Mr. Chairman, let us be realistic. This Committee is composed in large part of war veterans, many with outstanding combat records, among them the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], the great chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. We know that no soldier, sailor, or marine with any length of service returns after a war to exactly the same home, the same life, the same normality. War where the training is to kill and to protect against being killed is in violent conflict with the concepts of kindliness that are woven into the training of youth for normal living in a world of peace.

DISABLED VETERANS COME FIRST

First consideration always must be given our disabled veterans. The time I hope never will come when any decent American would deny them anything within our means and power.

But our moral obligation does not end with caring only for our war-connected disabled veterans. That would be the easy way out for those who wish to discharge an obligation with a maximum of economy and a minimum of honor.

Every day that I have been in the Congress, batting my head against the concrete VA wall trying to get for a constituent veteran that which I believe to be his due, I have had less respect for the usage of the term "nonservice connected." Judging from my own experiences, and those related to me by my colleagues, I feel conservatively safe in saying that in a large percentage of the cases where veterans have been turned down as having ailments classified as nonservice connected those same veterans would not now be suffering with the same ailments if they had never been called to war. It seems to me silly and stupid and worse in so many, many cases to try to fix the blame away from the place where ordinary commonsense would place it.

In far too many cases, and every member of this committee knows what I am saying is true, the term "nonservice connected" is used as a device to cheat a veteran who is actually a casualty of war to make a record of economy for someone who holds to the ice-cold rule that the termination date for gratitude is the moment the danger is gone. There are modern prototypes of those early Congressmen who demanded liquidation by bullets of the petitioning veterans of Washington's army.

PENSIONS BASED ON AGE AND NEED

There are other ways of liquidating veterans than by the fire of musketry of the militia. Starvation is one. The veterans of World War I are getting old. Pray, tell me, where can a man or woman at 65 find gainful employment? Everyone knows that it is getting increasingly difficult for a person past 40 to get even an interview in the personnel offices of most large employers. When industry slams the door in the face of a World War I veteran who has to work in order to live I suppose the prototypes of those early American Congressmen I have mentioned with shame would demand that Uncle Sam do likewise.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt that the American people ever will take kindly to the suggestion of liquidation of veterans as the proper solution of the veteran problem. When any nation is run on the rule that the termination date of gratitude is the moment the danger is ended something fatal has happened to the moral fiber of the people of that nation and its decline and fall are inevitable.

The argument is advanced by many good and sincere men and women that in fairness to the other aged we cannot give pensions to our war veterans based upon age and need. They point out that the veterans of World War I and the veterans of World War II, who in time will reach the age of 65, constitute a large segment of our population. That is true, and the establishment of veteran pensions based upon age and need will open the door eventually for coverage of all aged persons. War veterans who gave the years of their youth to the defense of the Republic should be the first to be protected against want in their old age. That in honor and in gratitude having been done, the door will be opened for later legislation giving pensions to all citizens who are aged and in need. The first step is to discharge our moral obligation to the veterans. The rest will follow as day the night.

PENSIONS TO WAR DOLLARS

I have listened to much talk in the debate today from my colleagues who oppose liberal pension provisions about the staggering and impossible cost. I have not been impressed. I have not been impressed because I have before me some figures that have not been mentioned in this debate, some figures that are so hush-hush they never are carried even in a bill of appropriation. You will not find them in Public Law 467, the 1957 appropriations for the Treasury and the Post Office, but they are referred to in the report, which of course few of the American people ever see, let alone read. The figures are in what is described as the permanent indefinite appropriations.

These figures show that in 1957 about $7 billion of the taxpayers' money will go, not to paying for services and goods, but to paying interest on the national debt. I have not heard anyone say that $7 billion in meeting the legal obligations of war was fiscally unsound, that it would wreck the country. All the fire has been on the cost of meeting the moral obligations, and that cost would be tiny indeed compared with the $7 billion we pay as pensions to war dollars.

That is exactly what the $7 billion represent—pensions to war dollars. It was the material cost of World War I and World War II that plunged us so badly into debt. When war came we had to have both men and money. The men we drafted or accepted through enlistments; the dollars we borrowed. Inasmuch as both the men and the dollars served the purposes of war in the period of hostilities, both in a very true sense are war veterans. We pay $7 billion a year in pensions to war dollars, and you call it fiscal responsibility. When it is suggested that a very small part of $7 billion be paid in pensions, the charge of fiscal irresponsibility is hurled at those who think human war veterans are no less important than dollar war veterans.

TWO-FACED FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Sometimes I think fiscal responsibility is a term someone invented to condone follies and condemn virtues. They hurl the charge of fiscal irresponsibility at the supporters of this bill for pensions for veterans, their dependents and their widows. But the providing of pensions for dollars to the tune of seven billion a year they call fiscal responsibility. Funny, is it not, how publicized respectability digs into the dictionary for a big word or two to blind commonsense?

Let us face the facts. Gratitude to veterans reflected in pension legislation is not threatening the Nation with bankruptcy. The cost of all now proposed, and more, would not make a dent in our wealth and our prosperous economy. The danger is in the seven billion a year that goes into paying pensions to war dollars. Someday the Congress will listen more attentively when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], admittedly the foremost authority on money in the Nation, talks on that subject. Meanwhile I hope our consideration of the bill now before us will proceed on a level of commonsense.

PRESERVING PRECIOUS TRADITIONS

Mr. Chairman, I have been speaking with great emotion. In my youth in the Northland were the boys in blue, in the Southland the boys in gray, the aging veterans of a war that ended 17 years before my birth. They were revered and beloved. No one in the North would have wished a veteran of Grant's army, who had given of his youth to preserve this Union, to suffer in his age from a want that in some measure at least

could be relieved. In the South in every community and in every State there was similar concern for the veterans of Lee's army who in their youth had fought for the cause in which they believed.

It was in the very air of the world in which I grew up that this country of ours was a land where the virtue of gratitude was implanted in the Government itself as well as in the hearts of the people. I want to go to my grave in the assurance that our United States of America, now in the will of providence grown into world leadership and responsibility, will go on and on and on holding in all its acts of government to the virtues of a good man. And of those virtues that mark all good men and all good governments none is more enriching of character than that of gratitude. Honor and good conscience demand favorable action on the bill reported out by the committee.

WIDOWS OF SPANISH WAR VETERANS

I have spoken from the heart and from the experiences of one who has lived through 3 major wars, in 2 of which I have had the privilege of participation. I have spoken for the cause of the veterans of all our wars. But now I wish especially to make some observations on the provision in the pending bill affecting the widows of the Spanish-American War.

The committee amendment providing increased pensions for Spanish War widows is the bill introduced by me at the request of and designation by the national legislative committee of the United Spanish War Veterans. The Spanish War veterans ask nothing for themselves. Their concern is for the widows of their comrades who have departed this life.

The number of Spanish War widows is small. It is growing smaller every month. Soon there will be none remaining. They are indeed aged. For the most part they receive no social-security coverage. They are called upon to make heroic sacrifice of comforts and necessities to eke out existence on their piteously small pensions. Often they are forced to go without medicine so badly needed in the illnesses and the frailty of age. It is hard, my colleagues, in these days of high prices to find a corner under any roof and to buy the very minimum of food on pensions very slightly over $50 a month. I hope and pray that these widows have not looked in vain to the 84th Congress to vote an increase of their pension to $75 a month.

VA SAYS OLD WOMEN NEVER DIE

Upon what did the Veterans' Administration base its opposition to a pension increase to this handful of aged women? Let me read from VA's letter of disapproval:

> Since it is believed that this pension roll will be basically static for the next several years.

Mr. Chairman, that is plain asininity. Basically static? That is that women 70, 72, 74, 76, 78, some 80 and over need no attention and can wait for several years because, unlike all other humankind including the smart little brain in VA that thought up the idea of "basically static," they will go on just the same today as they were yesterday, the same tomorrow as they are today.

What VA says is that old women never die, never are ill, never have needs, just go rolling along. The fact is that in a few years there will be no Spanish War widows. There is nothing basically static in a pension roll composed of persons past the allotted threescore and ten. The Veterans' Administration owes an apology to the Congress of the United States for maintaining otherwise. I can assure VA there is no one in this or the other body so stupid as to fall for its argument that no relief should be given widows all past threescore and ten because they constitute a class "basically static." It was an affront to the intelligence of the Congress that VA should have assumed such stupidity, and a public apology should be immediately forthcoming.

I regret that in the substitute bill of the great and beloved chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], there is no provision for Spanish War widows. I know how he feels personally. He has always shown a warm friendship for the Spanish War group and I wish him to know my deep appreciation of the many courtesies and helpful services he has given me. He is a great American and is respected and beloved by all his colleagues. Whatever were the legislative reasons that impelled him to omit the provision from his substitute bill I know if the decision were left to him whether these widows should receive the pension increase to $75 a month the prompt response would be "Yes."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas, the great chairman of a great committee.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There were a lot of things in the substitute when it was prepared, which I thought should be in it. But, this is a substitute which I think could become law.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Sometimes for expediency we barter away principle. Sometimes we trade the shadow for the substance. I should hate to feel that because the bill provides for these old women, these widows of the men who fought in the Spanish-American War more than half a century ago, it if passed would be vetoed or that it would not be passed by the other body.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. As I said earlier today, being chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is not an easy job. But do you not think that our veterans' groups should have come in and made their No. 1 project legislation of that kind instead of coming in with a non-service-connected feature which is the least desirable of any kind of legislation that is before our committee? You know and I know that if they came in supporting this thing that you are talking about, it could have gone through without even a whistle. Do you not think that these veterans' groups should have come in before our committee and helped us to decide on the priority of these things and pick out the legislation which was needed the most, regardless of whether it was the smallest group, and try to get that legislation through?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Well, I do know, Mr. Chairman, that the veterans' groups going way back into the history of our country have done a great service for our Republic. Without them there never would have been any pension legislation for any soldier. They have done a great job. They make mistakes now and then, but all during the years they have been fighting for the veterans.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Certainly I recognize the fact, and I know it is true. I think that this particular piece of legislation was not passed by convention. It was decided by a small group. I do not mean the group here in Washington. The group here in Washington represents every veterans' group, and they have a job. But, so far as I am concerned as chairman of the committee, the people representing the American Legion, the DAV, and the AMVETS, and the VFW, all have been fair, and they have done everything they could to be fair to me as chairman of the committee. But I think the American Legion came before our committee with 180 mandates. As far as I am concerned, they took the least desirable of all the mandates for their No. 1 piece of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, may I have some additional time?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman such time as he may desire.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what has the top priority in the recommendations of the veterans' organizations. I understand that the American Legion has been concerned in getting a pension for veterans of World War I based on age and need. I think that is a perfectly proper position to take. Now, I also believe in the high principles of, and have great respect for the membership of the AVC. I am an active member of that organization, which is doing an outstanding job in good citizenship. I might say that while I understand AVC does not agree with me on the subject, no member of AVC has ever questioned the consistency of my position that, as a Spanish-American War veteran, I think the veterans of World War I on reaching 65 should receive the same kind of pension as is received by Spanish-American War veterans.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Am I to accept that as a compliment? Does the gentleman wish to get me an audience?

Mr. LONG. That was the idea.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am very grateful to the gentleman, whose friendship I deeply prize. I have had this thought, Mr. Chairman, that today when we are discussing this legislation for the veterans—and a great majority of the Members of this body are ex-servicemen—that if when we come here we get away from our buddies at home, if we are thinking of those buddies who served with us and to whom fortune may not have been as kind, and who are looking for us to help them, if we have forgotten them. That is my reflection when I look over this Chamber and we are discussing legislation in their behalf, and most of the chairs have no occupants.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the Dorn substitute. I am not satisfied with it. I do not think it goes far enough, but it seems to be the best compromise that can be worked out, and it does give some recognition to these old women in the Spanish-American War widow group. I trust that the Dorn substitute will be adopted.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois, a former member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, since having made a commitment I must keep, and which requires my absence from Washington tomorrow, Wednesday, June 27, I regret that it will be impossible for me to be present to vote for the veterans bill, which is before the House today, and will be voted on tomorrow.

For that reason, I wish to make a short statement for the benefit of the record:

During the many years I have served in this House, I have always supported all legislation that has come before the House in the interest of the veterans, including the GI bill of rights.

In this particular case, if it were possible for me to be here tomorrow, I would support H. R. 7886, or the bill as amended, that would render the greatest help to the veterans that is finally agreed upon and passed by the majority of the Members of this House.

I am sure the majority of the Members of this body realize, as I do, that World War I veterans, both service and non-service connected, and their dependents, are entitled to greater benefits with their increasing age than are now available to them.

In addition, the disabled veterans, and their dependents, are entitled to an increase over their present rates of compensation, and I feel certain that the Members of this House will show their continued interest in all of the veterans and their dependents by passing the bill tomorrow that will give them the relief to which they are so justifiably entitled.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before the House (H. R. 7886) is of great importance to all veterans and their widows. The purpose of the bill is to increase rates and liberalize the basis for payment of service-connected compensation and non-service-connected pensions. I am in full accord with the purposes and objectives sought to be attained.

The provisions of the bill have had wide publicity and discussion. Much of the talk in opposition to the bill has been somewhat exaggerated. It is true there may be some few instances, however, that may be justified. It is always difficult to deal rightly or adequately in all particulars with every conceivable type. In the discussion that has followed the introduction of this legislation, certain instances of this kind have come to light. An effort will be made to correct these conditions before this proposed legislation is finally adopted.

The most generally expressed reason advanced against the bill now before us relates to the cost. It is true that it does increase the cost of existing benefits, but if it did not do so, then it would fail in fulfilling the need that exists for new legislation. The principal cause for this revision of present law is to correct the inequities that exist under the present law. To accomplish this it is necessary in most instances to increase the allotted amount for the conditions intended to be provided for with benefits. However, the opposition that has been most loud has come against any increase in benefits whatsoever. This opposition has been most unreasonable. In most cases it comes from those who rendered no war service or who are so financially well fixed that they do not need the benefits provided and therefore cannot appreciate, as fully as they otherwise could, the need that exists among those who do need the benefits. The high cost of living and the increase in cost of living that has occurred since the benefits were last adopted give sufficient reason to justify the passage of legislation at this time that will increase both service-connected and non-service-connected benefits.

The basic reason for the passage of all legislation of this character is to care for the men who served their country in its hour of need and who are now in need. In other words, as they served their country in the hour of its need, there is an equal obligation upon their country to render aid to them in the hour of their need. A recognition of this obligation is just as necessary as it is for the individual to assist his Government in the time of its necessity. Whatever obligation exists upon the part of this country to render assistance to those nations located abroad, who were our allies, equally exists to give aid in the hour of necessity to our veterans and their dependents. I have very strong feelings in support of the principle that it is the duty of our Government to be helpful when our veterans, their survivors, and dependents are in need. And, this applies where the veteran has made the supreme sacrifice or whose need arises from disabilities incurred through war, or as the result of advancing years.

The bill, as reported by the committee, provides as follows:

TITLE I. PENSION

Authorizes a non-service-connected pension for veterans of World War I, II, and Korea of $85 a month if the veteran is less than 65 years of age and meets specific disability requirements, is unemployable, and has an income of less than $1,400 if single and $2,700 if with dependents; at age 65 establishes presumption that the veteran is totally disabled and unemployability requirements removed, the rate is $105; if the veteran is so helpless or blind as to need the regular aid and attendance of another person the rate is $150. The above rates are increased by 20 percent for any veteran who served overseas for 30 days or more. In addition the bill provides:

First. Increases the rate of pension payable to widows of Spanish War, World War I and II, and Korea to $75 a month.

Second. Places widows of World War II and Korea on the same basis as World War I widows for pension eligibility purposes.

TITLE II. COMPENSATION

Increases the rates of service-connected compensation for veterans of all wars ranging from $20 for 10-percent disability to $250 for a total disability. Overall ceiling on compensation is raised from $420 to $450 and statutory award rates are increased from $47 to $55; the rate for arrested tuberculosis rises from $67 to $75 monthly.

Makes veterans with service-connected disabilities rated 10 percent to 100 percent—present law applies to those rated 50 percent and above—eligible for increased compensation for dependents and also increases the rate available for this purpose. For example, a veteran totally disabled and having a wife would receive $25 additional in lieu of the present $21 additional. A veteran 10-percent disabled would receive 10 percent of $25.

Increases the rate of widows from $87 to $125 monthly with proportionate increases for widows with children.

TITLE III. BURIAL ALLOWANCE

Increases the rate for burial allowance from $150 to $200.

Since the bill (H. R. 7886) was reported, further consideration has been given to the possibility of decreasing the overall cost of the bill without doing an injustice to the great body of beneficiaries provided for therein. The group that gave this further consideration included members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and representatives of the major veterans organizations. After full consideration this group approved amendments to H. R. 7886 and its conclusions are embodied in what is known as the Dorn amendment. The original bill was also introduced by Mr. DORN of South Carolina. The major provisions of the so-called Dorn amendment are as follows:

Title 1, section 1: Continues the principle that all war veterans who are permanently and totally disabled, to the extent that they cannot follow a substantially gainful occupation, shall be entitled to a pension, subject to income limitation, and further provides that war

veterans of the age of 65 with income below certain annual figures—$1,400 if without dependents, $2,700 if with one or more dependents—shall be qualified for such pension. Establishes rates for pensions at $75, or at $90 when veteran has received pension for 10 consecutive years or is 65 years of age, and further provides increase in pension for helpless or blind veteran requiring attendant, from $135 per month to $150 per month. Further provides that otherwise qualified veteran with 30 days or more of overseas service shall be entitled to pension increase of 10 percent.

Section 2: Places World War II and Korean war widows and orphans on equal pension basis with World War I widows and orphans.

Section 3: Increases rates of pensions for widows and orphans by 10 percent, adjusted to nearest dollar.

Section 4: Increases rates of pensions for Spanish-American War widows from average rate of $60 to average rate of $70.

Title II, section 5: Increases rates of compensation for service-connected disabled veteran, for 10 percent disabled to totally disabled, by approximately 10 percent increase to the nearest dollar on some ratings, by approximately 5 percent increase on some others, and by approximately 22 percent for totally disabled.

Section 6: Increases rates of compensation for so-called statutory awards by average amounts of less than 10 percent. For example, veteran with loss of both hands, or both feet, is raised from $279 to $300; veteran with loss of both legs above knee, or of both arms above elbow, is increased from $329 to $350.

Section 7: Sets forth the basic rate of compensation for disability as outlined in section 5, and increases basic rate for total disability from $181 to $220, and for partial disability to $190—making it the basis for figuring disability compensation from 10 percent to 90 percent.

Section 8: Increases rates of compensation for disabled World War Veterans Act of 1924, to same general level provided by section 6. For example, veteran with loss of use of both eyes is increased from $231 to $300; with loss of both eyes and one or more limbs, from $347 to $400.

Section 9: Increases additional sum payable under World War Veterans Act of 1924, from $70 to $80, when the disabled veteran is in need of a nurse or attendant.

Section 10: Final statutory award increase, under 1924 act, raising monthly rate for arrested tuberculosis from $67 to $75.

Section 11: Increases rates of payment for dependents of service-connected disabled veterans receiving compensation by 10 percent where disability is 50 percent or more.

In support of the Dorn proposal I am in receipt of the following telegram from J. Addington Wagner, national commander, the American Legion. It reads as follows:

Reference H. R. 7886 under consideration today. Pleased to advise American Legion strongly supports substitute proposals of Hon. W. J. BRYAN DORN, which substantially reduce costs and still achieve bill's major objectives. They are product of extensive conferences between members Veterans' Affairs Committee and representatives major veterans organizations. Respectfully request your support. Regards.

J. ADDINGTON WAGNER,
National Commander, the American Legion.

I consider it a duty upon my part and a very pleasant one to perform, of giving my support whenever and in whatever way I can to promote the welfare of our veterans, their survivors, and dependents. Consequently I shall give my vote and my very best endeavors in behalf of this legislation now before us and any other that may come before the Congress for approval.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, when amendments are in order on H. R. 7886 I propose to submit for myself and for several of my colleagues on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs a series of amendments. These amendments are the result of most careful and prayerful consideration of the problems involved by my colleagues and representatives of the major veterans' organizations.

We recognize that H. R. 7886, as reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, involves a series of benefits for both the service-disabled and the non-service-disabled, as well as the survivors of service-deceased and widows and orphans of veterans who died without proving service-connected disabilities.

The committee, in reporting H. R. 7886, was seeking to do justice to a large segment of our veterans and the survivors of deceased veterans. The bill is a good one, and I believe that it was justified and that this Nation can afford the cost of such a bill. However, a nationwide attack in the daily press has been made upon the estimated costs of this legislation and I know that many of our colleagues not on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs are somewhat concerned about this furor over the estimated high cost of this legislation as reported from the Veterans' Committee.

Consequently, those of us who are primarily responsible for reporting the bill have been studying the reaction of the press and our colleagues, and we came to the conclusion that because of the costs and the concern over Federal expenditures that we should take another look with the view of seeing if some moderation and a reduction in cost could not be effected. At about the same time the representatives of the major veterans' organizations who are in favor of many phases, if not all, of this legislation also became concerned over the public clamor and approached members of our committee with the suggestion that consideration should be given to modifying the bill.

Inasmuch as the thinking of the responsible officials of the major veterans' organizations closely parallels the thinking of many members of our Veterans' Affairs Committee, a series of conferences began with the representatives of the veterans' organizations who ascertained what moderations could be effected without destroying the basic purpose of the legislation. It did not take long to discover that the members of your Veterans' Committee were thinking along similar lines with the veterans' organization representatives and that we could see eye to eye on several aspects of this legislation where a reasonable reduction could be achieved without seriously affecting the real purpose of the legislation.

As a result of this series of conferences, on behalf of my colleagues on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, when amendments are in order tomorrow, I shall propose a series of amendments that have been approved in their entirety by the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and in part by the Disabled American Veterans and the United States Spanish War Veterans. These amendments apply to both compensation and pension and will substantially reduce the original estimate of cost made by the Veterans' Administration. We are not in complete agreement with the cost estimate by the Veterans' Administration and during this discussion on the floor today evidence will be submitted to indicate that estimating costs is a most speculative venture and that the Veterans' Administration could be as much as 50 percent wrong in their estimates. Assuming for the purpose of example that the estimate of the Veterans' Administration on this original bill as reported out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is reasonably accurate, the substitute amendments which I shall propose shall cut that estimate almost in half or, in round figures, over $600 million.

It seems to us that cutting the cost of this bill in half or a savings of over $6 billion in the estimates submitted by the Veterans' Administration should be carefully considered by the Members of this House. It should answer the concern of many newspapers which have devoted considerable editorial space to attacking the magnitude of the legislation and those who have sponsored it. It has been necessary to reduce needed benefits all along the line to achieve this saving and I might add that many of our colleagues on the committee were disturbed over reducing proposed payments to elderly widows who have no other source of income in order to balance the range of benefits all along the line. We have tried, and I believe successfully, in modifying this bill to achieve a balance and to prevent more emphasis upon the non-service-connected disabled and their widows and orphans over those who have suffered disabilities incurred in the service. We believe a most careful and deserving compromise has been worked out on a give-and-take basis by the representatives of the major veterans' organizations and our colleagues on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Let us examine somewhat in detail what we shall propose in a compromise substitute for the bill as reported out by the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

First, we have reduced the original proposed rate of pension payments to the

non-service-connected disabled and aged veterans from $85 and $105 to $75 and $90. This represents a substantial savings in the cost of the pension feature. We have, however, retained the increase from $135 to $150 per month for those veterans who are blind or so helpless as to require attendance. In addition we have reduced the extra allowance for overseas service from 20 percent to 10 percent with a further reduction in cost. We have, however, maintained an important principle involved in the bill concerning which the major veterans' organizations were not willing to yield. That principle establishes age 65 as a pensionable age subject only to a modest income limitation. We recognize there is a sharp difference of opinion in and out of the Congress over the establishment of this principle of pension eligibility at age 65. We believe that the history of pension and retirement programs in private business and industry, as well as Government retirement program, supports the theory upon which we have proceeded.

We have also retained in this proposed compromise the existing income limitations of $1,400 per year where the veteran has no dependents and $2,700 where the veteran has one or more dependents. In effect, the main benefits of the pension program, with the exception of reduced rates, have been preserved in this modified version of the legislation.

Next, we have substantially reduced the proposed rates of pensions payable to the widows and orphans of World War I, World War II and Korea as well as the widows of Spanish-American war veterans below the rates originally proposed in H. R. 7886. The rates included in our compromise bill amount to approximately 10 percent adjusted to the nearest even dollar and will effect substantial savings in the cost of the bill. We have maintained, however, an amendment which meets the approval of all veterans' groups and most of our colleagues including some who were displeased with other features of the bill. This amendment would place the widows of World War II and Korean veterans on an equal basis for pension purposes with the widows of World War I veterans.

Next, in an effort to give prior and major consideration to those who have suffered disabilities by reason of their service we have retained to large extent the compensation rates contained in the original bill with some very minor reductions. We have followed a principle advocated by the Bradley Commission in granting a larger increase to those who have a lesser rating. We have deleted provisions contained in the original bill for the granting of benefits to the survivors of those who were killed or died in the service. The survivors benefit bill, which has been approved by the House of Representatives and reported out of the Senate Finance Committee, to a large extent provides substantial improvements and increase for the survivors of the service-deceased and to retain such benefits in this bill would create a duplication.

In the interest of economy we have deleted that section of H. R. 7886 which would extend the principle of dependency allowances to the families of service-disabled veterans who are rated below 50 percent. Under existing law veterans with disability ratings of 50 percent or more are entitled to a prorated additional allowance for wife and children and originally it was believed that this privilege should be extended to those veterans who are rated below 50 percent. While we have authorized an increase in the dependency allowances, for the time being we have taken out the language which would authorize dependency allowances to veterans rated less than 50-percent disabled. This effects a substantial saving in the bill.

In a further effort to reduce the cost my colleagues on the committee and representatives of the veterans' organizations were agreed that the increase in the burial allowance benefit provided in the bill as originally reported should be deleted. Removal of this section further adds to the savings established by our compromise legislation.

The foregoing constitutes a rather hasty explanation of the substitute amendments which I propose to offer for myself and my colleagues on the Veterans' Affairs Committee with amendments are in order. We believe our proposals represent the very minimum which this House should consider if we are to do justice to our veterans and the dependents of deceased veterans. When you stop to consider that the cost of this legislation for the first year as we propose to amend it, is less than one-fifth of what is proposed to be expended for foreign aid in 1 year, I am sure that the Members of this House will not begrudge this money to our needy and disabled veterans and the widows and orphans of our deceased veterans.

Charges have been loosely made that this bill represents boondoggling, a handout to able-bodied veterans, and is a general service pension. On behalf of my colleagues let me emphatically deny that this represents a handout to veterans or closely approaches a general service pension. The pension feature of this bill is closely safeguarded by age, disability, unemployment, and income-limitation requirements. No able-bodied, well-to-do veteran could receive a pension under the provisions of this bill. In fact, more than one-half of the estimated cost of this legislation will go to widows and orphans and to those who have been disabled by reason of service in the Armed Forces. This legislation is a far cry from being a handout or boondoggling.

In answer to those who have been frightened over the specter of national bankruptcy because of our veterans' benefit program, let me point out that the cost of pension and compensation today takes a smaller slice of our national income and of our Federal tax receipts than was used for this purpose many, many years ago. In 1931 compensation and pension payments absorbed over 30 percent of the total Federal tax receipts while today expenditures for this purpose absorb less than 4 percent of Federal tax receipts. These facts are all the more significant when you consider that veterans represent approximately 14 percent of our total population today as compared with approximately 3 percent when compensation and pension payments absorbed a larger slice of our national income and a larger percentage of our Federal tax receipts.

You will hear many arguments and pleas for economy and for other amendments to this bill, but may I again emphasize that the proposals which I intend to submit represent the most serious thought and has the approval of the major veterans' organizations and many of my colleagues on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to call to the attention of the House the usual way propaganda is spread over the country when veterans' legislation comes up.

Members of the House of Representatives should not permit themselves to be misled and become confused over the widespread editorial publicity with respect to fantastic projected cost estimates made by the Veterans' Administration on legislation, particularly pension and compensation legislation, affecting veterans and/or the dependents of deceased veterans. Projection of estimated costs on veteran legislation, even for the first year, are most unreliable. The Veterans' Administration has frankly admitted that attempting to project estimated costs for several years on an annual basis and for as much as 50 years on an accumulative basis is not guaranteed to be more than speculation based on some ascertainable factors. It is believed that if an accurate comparison could be made on all projected estimates of cost, with actual costs after a few years of operation, the facts would reveal that the estimates in every case are unreasonably high.

It has been possible to make such a comparison on one piece of legislation which met a veto at the White House and later passed over the veto by both branches of the Congress. Reference is made to Public Law 149, H. R. 3193, of the 82d Congress. This bill provided for a substantial increase in the pension rate for veterans of World War I, World War II, and Korea who were otherwise eligible and who were so blind or so helpless or so nearly blind or so nearly helpless as to need regular aid and attendance. This bill became public law after a White House veto was overridden by both branches of Congress and the law became effective in November 1951.

During the hearings on Public Law 149, H. R. 3193, on page 615 of the hearings, a representative of the Veterans' Administration made the following statement:

> It is estimated that the enactment of H. R. 3193 would affect approximately 400 veterans of World War II, 23,700 veterans of World War I and 50 veterans of the Spanish-American War group, during the first year, at an additional cost for that year of approximately $16,700,000.

In a letter dated November 25, 1952, the Veterans' Administration stated that as of October 31, 1952—which was the end of the first year of operation of the pension rates under Public Law 149—the number of veterans who were in receipt of the new pension rate provided by Public Law 149, 82d Congress, as amended, came to a total of 13,440.

This represents 10,710 fewer veterans receiving the pension than was estimated by the Veterans' Administration during hearings on the bill. Using the same factor of increased pension rates which was used by the Veterans' Administration to arrive at a cost estimate for the first year it is apparent that the first year's cost under Public Law 149, 82d Congress, was $8,709,120 compared to an estimate of $16,700,000 made by the Veterans' Administration during the hearings.

Consequently, one accurate test of a comparison of estimated costs with actual costs where only the first year of operation is involved reveals that the projected estimate made by the Veterans' Administration fell short of the mark by almost 50 percent in the number of veterans to be affected and the amount of money to be expended.

The Veterans' Administration recently estimated that a veterans' pension and compensation bill identified as H. R. 7886 would cost over $1.2 billion the first year; $1.8 billion the fifth year; with a total cumulative cost of $148.2 billion to the year 2000. I submit to you that if the cost experts in the Veterans' Administration could miss by nearly 50 percent the number of veterans and the cost involved on a simple bill which became Public Law 149, 82d Congress, why should we accept the fantastic estimate of cost for the first year, the fifth year and the cumulative total cost to the year 2000 of a pension and compensation bill so technical and involved as is H. R. 7886?

It is unfortunate that a representative section of the American press has seized upon this fantastic projection of estimated cost with respect to H. R. 7886 and is trying to frighten the economic wits out of the American taxpayers. Not only is the press publicizing the fantastic projected estimate of costs made by the Veterans' Administration but, in some instances, the press is adding exaggeration to exaggeration to create an estimated future expenditure that is not only incredible but impossible.

For example, the Evening News, of Harrisburg, Pa., on Tuesday, June 19, in a 2-column editorial, running almost the full length of the editorial page, attacked H. R. 7886, as well as its sponsors and advocates. Included among the many charges made in this editorial is the following:

> The result is a real grab-bag piece of legislation which the Veterans' Administration estimates will cost about one and a quarter billion dollars in its first year and over $148 billion annually by the end of the century.

This Harrisburg newspaper, not content to go along with a fantastic Veterans' Administration estimate of a cumulative cost of $148 billion to the year 2000, decided to go "whole hog" and charge the veterans' organizations and members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs with attempting to put over a veterans' grab bag which would reach an annual cost of $148 billion. It is significant to note that in the editorials which are conjuring up horrible visions of national bankruptcy where veterans' benefits are concerned, failed to point out that the great bulk of the potential expenditures involved in H. R. 7886, as approved, would be paid to widows, orphans, dependent parents and veterans with disabilities incurred in the service. The impression given to deliberately frighten the American taxpayers is that this legislation is a pension handout to all veterans regardless of their physical condition and/or need.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I want to take this opportunity to pay my respects to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], for his fairness, for his patience, in the consideration of this particular bill, H. R. 7886.

I would like to express my appreciation to the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], for her concern and for the work she has done with reference to H. R. 7886.

Mr. Chairman, I rise primarily to discuss for a moment or two the second section with reference to widows and orphans. I would assume from the things we have heard here today that tomorrow the House will be called upon to choose between two substitute bills to H. R. 7886, one the so-called Teague substitute, and the other the so-called Dorn substitute.

I was under the impression, and I think I am still correct, that the chairman of the committee, Mr. TEAGUE, was in favor of an amendment which I offered to the bill to place World War II and Korean widows on an equal basis with the widows of World War I veterans.

I am quite concerned about this particular matter because I think it is only just and only fair. In view of the fact that that particular provision is included in the Dorn substitute and is not in the Teague substitute, then, certainly, it means that so far as I am concerned I would have to support the Dorn substitute.

I feel that the amendment for the placing of these widows and orphans of World War II and Korea on the same footing with the widows of World War I is just. Actually it would seem to me that if there are any widows of war veterans who are entitled to consideration and who are in need of consideration today it is those widows of World War II and Korean veterans with small children, children they are attempting to educate, to send to school, to care for; and it would seem to me to be only justice and to be only fair that they be placed on an equal footing with the World War I widow; also I want to comment for just one moment on the figures that have been given as to the cost of this particular section. It is my understanding that the cost is indicated as about $84 million. Is not that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SISK. Certainly. I know a number of cases in my district and I know the same is true with other Members of this House, that they have a like situation, where these widows and children are today receiving public welfare and various types of State and local assistance. I have some grave doubts about this figure of $84 million being added because of the passage of this legislation or this amendment. I think probably what would happen to some considerable portion of that $84 million is that it would simply come out of one pocket instead of the other; whereas today it is represented by a burden on the State, county, and local people, it would probably be transferred to the Federal level through a pension which they would be entitled to as the widow of a war veteran. Certainly to me I think that in itself would be good, because I think they are entitled to the dignity that would come with qualifying them as widows of war veterans. And certainly it seems to me that before this legislation is passed, irrespective of which substitute may be adopted, that consideration be given to this particular problem.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I shall be glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I would like to see some particular veterans' group make this goal their project next year. Certainly it seems to me that when we pass this piece of legislation here which corresponds to about a $13,000 or $14,000 insurance policy that we are helping both the widow and the veterans. It is certainly legislation that should prove very helpful.

Mr. SISK. I certainly appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Texas. This is a proposition which should receive fair consideration on both sides of the Capitol. One other thing, which has to do with a statement by the gentleman from Illinois a little while ago regarding Spanish American War widows. They are reaching that age of life when they have very few years to look forward to in most instances. There again, in my own district I know of a few cases which I feel warrant our sympathetic consideration. Certainly it would be my hope that these elderly women, the widows of Spanish-American War veterans, will receive consideration tomorrow with reference to such legislation as we may pass through this House at that time.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I wonder if the gentleman will not agree with me that a wife or a mother who sends a husband or son to war deserves the protection of this Government as much as the man who goes?

Mr. SISK. I certainly agree with the gentlewoman on that and I appreciate very much her statement. I do feel that the widows and the orphan children of our war veterans are entitled to consideration in any type of legislation we pass dealing with pensions, and it is my hope that the Members of this House will give it earnest consideration in the passage of any pension legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I—NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY AND DEATH PENSION

That paragraph I of part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) is amended by striking out subparagraphs (e) and (f) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(e) No pension shall be payable under this part for permanent disability less than total. A permanent total disability shall be taken to exist when there is present any impairment of mind or body which is sufficient to render it impossible for the average person to follow a substantially gainful occupation and where it is reasonably certain that such impairment will continue throughout the life of the disabled person. A person shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled upon reaching the age of 65 years. In addition to the criteria established in the preceding two sentences, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may classify, as permanently and totally disabling, those diseases and disorders which in his judgment are such as to justify such a classification.

"(f) Pension shall be paid under this part at the rate of $85 per month, except that—

"(1) when the disability of the eligible person has been rated as permanent and total for an aggregate of 10 years, or when he has reached the age of 65 years, such pension shall be paid at the rate of $105 monthly;

"(2) when the eligible person becomes, on account of age or physical or mental disabilities, helpless or blind or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person, such pension shall be paid at the rate of $150 per month."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7886) to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee and to include charts and tables.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on H. R. 7886.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Will the first order of business tomorrow, in connection with H. R. 7886, be amendments to the first section of the bill?

The SPEAKER. Well, the Chair does not have any knowledge of what might happen in the Committee of the Whole or what amendments might be offered. Generally, under the rules of the House, when a section of the bill is read, it is open to amendment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the Chair.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 10003) making appropriations for the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10660) entitled "An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes."

FILING OF CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file reports on H. R. 9052 and H. R. 9352.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949

Mr. SPENCE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 9052) to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. SPENCE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 9852) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 10624.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

UNCLE SAM SELLS SONS OBSCENITY—JAPAN, KOREA PX RACKS OFFERING FILTH TO GI's

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, some shocking reports have been received from Japan and Korea concerning the peddling of pornographic magazines to American servicemen stationed in those countries. It is all the more shocking to learn that these pornographic magazines are being sold at post exchanges operated by the United States Armed Forces in those countries.

The chaplains of the various faiths have been fighting a great battle to maintain moral standards among the personnel of our Armed Forces stationed overseas. They know well of the many dangers and temptations that beset our Armed Service personnel stationed overseas and what it will mean to our Nation if we fail to maintain the highest moral standards among the cream of our youth who are defending the cause of freedom in many parts of the world.

But these chaplains see much of the results of their good work undone by the magazine racks of the American post exchanges which peddle literature calculated to incite those who read it to violate the principles of decency without which our Armed Forces will become little more than pagan occupiers.

This is a matter of grave concern to the parents and loved ones of the men and women in our Armed Forces stationed overseas. Many of them have written to me expressing not only their shock at the state of affairs permitted by the Department of Defense, which has jurisdiction over post exchanges, but also a state of grave worry that all the years of training their children to be good Americans, guided by those moral principles to which all the religions of the world adhere, might be turned into a complete loss. All clear-thinking people are compelled to demand action against the peddling of pornographic magazines to American Armed Service personnel stationed in Japan and Korea and elsewhere in the world.

The responsible officials in the Department of Defense should constantly be on the alert to prevent the destruction of the morals of our Armed Forces and the loss of prestige we, as Americans, suffer in foreign lands by allowing the sale or otherwise distribution of indecent por-

nographic magazines or other forms of indecent literature.

I have taken up this matter with the Department of Defense and have conferred with Brig. Gen. Clarence J. Hauck, Jr. I have been assured that the Department is making an investigation of this matter and wherever pornographic literature is sold or distributed to our PX's, it will be stopped immediately. General Hauck assured me that the sale of such pornographic literature is against the policy of the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, a very significant feature article appeared in the Catholic Universe Bulletin of Cleveland on June 15, 1956, which merits the careful attention of every Member of Congress. I include the article in the RECORD:

UNCLE SAM SELLS SONS OBSCENITY—JAPAN, KOREA PX RACKS OFFERING FILTH TO GIs

(By Father Patrick O'Connor)

Post exchanges (retail stores operated by United States Armed Forces) are peddling pornographic magazines to American servicemen in Japan and Korea.

From the magazine racks of the offending post exchanges, bawdy pictures and suggestive titles leer up at the soldier or airman customer.

He may have just attended a character guidance lecture given by his chaplain. Now he finds a Government agency trying to sell him literature that incites him to violate the principles of decency that the chaplain upholds.

Here are the titles of some feature articles heralded on magazine covers displayed recently in some post exchanges in Japan and Korea:

"Driven by Wild Desires," "My Evil Love," "Wife Without Honor—The Stark Confession of a Woman Who Was Brutally Assaulted," "Wicked Lover, Innocent Girl," "They Take the Wraps Off Sex Deviation," "What's Behind the Shocking Rise in Female Sex Crimes?" "The Shocking Murder of the Dismembered Blonde," "Billion Dollar Business in Sex Appeal."

There was one article with a title too grossly pornographic to quote in any decent newspaper.

Alongside the publications with the suggestivity titled articles you sometimes see photography magazines that are only thinly veiled essays in pictorial pornography.

Of course, the post exchanges also sell reputable magazines. Along with lurid pocket books, they offer a good selection of worthwhile reprints. Why they haul tons of printed filth across the Pacific to display beside clean wares is hard to understand.

Those in charge of post exchanges cannot plead that they have to meet competition. They have a monopoly. They are, or should be, under no compulsion even to make profits.

If they plead the excuse of customer demand, they can be challenged to prove a demand by any large segment of their customers.

In any event, customer demand does not justify selling anything. If it did, one might find the post exchanges selling narcotics or unlimited gallons of liquor.

The morbid, erotic publications, sold publicly by an agency of the United States Government, lower American prestige abroad while doing moral harm to individuals.

They can be bought only by American military personnel, their dependants and civilians working for the United States Government. But Japanese and Korean youths and girls, salesclerks in the post exchange, must handle and sell these magazines. Japanese and Korean domestics see them lying around in billets.

Most of the copies sold find their way ultimately into Japanese and Korean hands. Many of these Orientals, constantly scrutinizing Americans, read English. The purport of the illustrations in the magazines can escape nobody.

Like the immodest pinups permitted by some commanders in offices and clubs, smutty magazines sold in the post exchanges seem to have official approval. They are therefore all the more damaging to prestige.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. FEIGHAN, for 10 minutes today and to revise and extend his remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SCOTT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include the text of a bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan.

Mr. MCDONALD.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3693. An act to amend title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended;

H. R. 6782. An act to amend section 7 of "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 7227. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the disposal of surplus property for civil defense purposes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8634. An act to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in North Carolina to the city of Charlotte, N. C.; and

H. R. 10660. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 3295. An act to amend the act of April 28, 1953, relating to daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia; and

S. 3663. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 101. An act relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9, subsections (d) and (e), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939;

H. R. 3693. An act to amend title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended;

H. R. 5590. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Gustaf E. Lambert;

H. R. 5790. An act relating to the application in the Territory of Hawaii of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act;

H. R. 7227. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the disposal of surplus property for civil-defense purposes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8493. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 8634. An act to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in North Carolina to the city of Charlotte, N. C.;

H. R. 9582. An act to provide for the delayed reporting of births within the District of Columbia;

H. R. 9671. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the village of Carey, Ohio;

H. R. 10374. An act to amend the act to incorporate the Oak Hill Cemetery, in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 10768. An act to amend section 5 of the act of August 7, 1946, entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," as amended; and

H. R. 11473. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 27, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2016. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report for the month of May relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2017. A letter from the Chairman, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of its official proceedings for the year ended December 31, 1955, with other information relating to the regulation and operation of the public utilities in the District of Columbia coming under the jurisdiction of said Commission, pursuant to an act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PRIEST: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3163. An act to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to authorize permanent certification for certain air carriers operating in Hawaii and Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 2462). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5888. A bill to authorize settlement for certain inequitable losses in pay sustained by officers of the commissioned services under the emergency economy legislation, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2463). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 8817. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the city of Corbin, Ky.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 9339. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands of the United States situated in Union County, Ga., for lands within the Chattahoochee National Forest, Ga., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2465). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARDY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9660. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army or his designee to convey an 11¼-acre tract of land situated in the vicinity of Williamsburg, Va., to the State of Virginia; with amendment (Rept. No. 2466). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 11122. A bill to promote the development and rehabilitation of the coastwise trade, to encourage the construction of new vessels, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 11554. A bill to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of passenger vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2468). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 11799. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 11873. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act so as to eliminate delay in the start of projects; without amendment (Rept. No. 2470). Referred to the Committe of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1915. An act to provide for further effectuating the act of May 15, 1862, through the exchange of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture and employees of State political subdivisions or educational institutions; with amendment (Rept. No. 2471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 11375. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to further extend the special school milk program to certain institutions for the care and training of children; without amendment (Rept. No. 2472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1688. An act to amend the Federal Seed Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2473). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 997. An act to provide punishment for certain confidence game swindles; without amendment (Rept. No. 2474). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 10433. A bill to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry; with amendment (Rept. No. 2745). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. S. 2091. An act authorizing the reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2476). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KLEIN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10624. A bill relating to intercorporate relations between the General Public Utilities Corp., a corporation organized and operating in the United States, and the Manila Electric Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2477). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 9333. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to give to certain consuming processors of cotton the privilege of buying cotton futures contracts in certain cases; with amendment (Rept. No. 2478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee of conference. S. 890. An act to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act (Rept. No. 2479). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6997. A bill to include persons engaged in carrying out the provisions of labor laws of the United States within the provisions of sections 111 and 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to assaults and homicides; with amendment (Rept. No. 2480). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9038. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall be treated as a State for purposes of district court jurisdiction based on diversity of citizenship; with amendment (Rept. No. 2481). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11802. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, as amended, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits until July 1, 1957; without amendment (Rept. No. 2482). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10111. A bill to amend sections 657 and 1006 of title 18 of the United States Code in order to include certain savings and loan associations within its provisions; with amendment (Rept. No. 2483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RABAUT: Committee of Conference. H. R. 10003. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part againsts the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2484). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee of Conference. H. R. 9052. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 3 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports (Rept. No. 2485). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee of Conference. H. R. 9852. A bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2486). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 47. An act for the relief of Guiseppe Agosta; with amendment (Rept. No. 2437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1616. An act for the relief of Sumiko Ariumi Bilson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2438). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 649. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 650. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2440). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 651. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4152. A bill for the relief of Maria Pintos and her daughter, Eugenia Pintos; without amendment (Rept. No. 2442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10088. A bill for the relief of Rupert Waltl; without amendment (Rept. No. 2443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10984. A bill for the relief of Nikolai E. Khokhlov; without amendment (Rept. No. 2444). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 531. Resolution to refer the bill H. R. 5461 to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 2445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1178. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Simonson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1798. An act for the relief of Mrs. Charles C. Phillips; without amendment (Rept. No. 2447). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2008. An act for the relief of Winifred A. Hunter; without amendment (Rept. No. 2448). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2169. An act for the re-

lief of M. B. Huggins, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2240. An act for the relief of James Richard Hogan; without amendment (Rept. No. 2450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1093. A bill for the relief of Follett L. Greeno; with amendment (Rept. No. 2451). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAMER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2325. A bill for the relief of Joseph Santo; with amendment (Rept. No. 2452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3274. A bill for the relief of the Martin Wunderlich Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2453). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8068. A bill for the relief of Elma Agnes Gibson Hollingsworth; without amendment (Rept. No. 2454). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8216. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lidie Kammauf; without amendment (Rept. No. 2455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAMER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9029. A bill for the relief of John L. Hughes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9440. A bill for the relief of Miss Elizabeth von Oberndorff; without amendment (Rept. No. 2457). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9947. A bill for the relief of the estate of William Edward Wine; without amendment (Rept. No. 2458). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10983. A bill for the relief of P. R. Cox; with amendment (Rept. No. 2459). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAMER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11706. A bill for the relief of Kim Chung Hi; without amendment (Rept. No. 2460). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 220. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims arising as a result of the construction by the United States of Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande; without amendment (Rept. No. 2461). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 11947. A bill to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 11948. A bill to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 11949. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt nonprofit organizations from the tax on bowling alleys, billiard tables, and pool tables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 11950. A bill to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 11951. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a portion of Hammer Field, Calif., to the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 11952. A bill to amend paragraph 909 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to articles of corduroy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 11953. A bill to incorporate the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 11954. A bill to provide for the construction of a new stadium for the United States Naval Academy in order to permit the use of the land now occupied by Thompson Stadium for the expansion of needed facilities on the Academy grounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. R. 11955. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 and part VIII of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to require certain private educational institutions and training establishments to file non-Communist affidavits with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and to require disapproval under such act, or such part of any such institution or establishment which fails to file such an affidavit; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 11956. A bill to permit a taxpayer who has attained the age of 65 and is disabled or whose spouse has attained the age of 65 and is disabled to deduct up to $20,000 of medical expenses incurred in any year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. R. 11957. A bill to provide for the appointment of certain officers in the grade of rear admiral in the Retired Reserve to the grade of vice admiral in the Retired Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 11958. A bill to amend the acreage reserve provisions of the Soil Bank Act to permit inclusion of acreage up to 30 days prior to harvest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 11959. A bill to amend section 5 of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 to authorize the sale of goods and services by any department or independent establishment to the owner of an aircraft or his agent in an emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 11960. A bill to establish certain qualifications for Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States and for judges of United States Courts of Appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11961. A bill to provide that credit shall be given to Reserve officers for service performed by them with the Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 11962. A bill to provide for Federal participation and cooperation with States and local interests in developing water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 11963. A bill to amend the law in force with respect to the display and use of the flag of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11964. A bill to establish the principle of a basic single salary wage scale in the Canal Zone for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 11965. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Clark County, Nev., to the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 11966. A bill to provide increases in service-connected disability compensation; to provide increases in pensions for persons in need of regular aid and attendance; and to increase dependency allowances; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 11967. A bill to amend Public Law 523 of the 78th Congress entitled "Joint resolution to consider a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium to be erected in the District of Columbia," approved December 20, 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 11968. A bill to permit the State of New York to purchase from the District of Columbia Reformatory, at Lorton, Va., gun mountings and carriages for guns for use at historic sites and for museum display purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 11969. A bill to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. H. 11970. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Act of 1954 relative to nonrecognition of gain from involuntary conversion of certain real property used for agricultural purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. J. Res. 658. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps to be known as the national liberation stamp; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. J. Res. 659. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 11th World Health Assembly in the United States in 1958; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. Con. Res. 258. Concurrent resolution accepting without cost to the United States copies of the recording Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag and providing for distribution of such copies; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 555. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 627; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 11971. A bill for the relief of Louisa Der Hacobian Bost; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 11972. A bill for the relief of Edwin K. Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 11973. A bill for the relief of Maria Angela Magatelli, Angela Didone, and Irma Valsecchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 11974. A bill for the relief of Peter Alexander Zarcades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 11975. A bill for the relief of Antone Franchehkoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11976. A bill for the relief of Eloise Reyes Viuda de Velasquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 11977. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Cobb County, Ga., to the trustees of the Methodist Church, Acworth, Ga.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 11978. A bill for the relief of Francisca M. Jegers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 11979. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jacqueline Terzis and her minor child Nicole Terzis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 11980. A bill for the relief of Margherita Conca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 11981. A bill for the relief of Jan Baginski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 11982. A bill for the relief of Gaida Murnieks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 11983. A bill for the relief of Alice Selim Nakhla Fakhouri (also known as Denise Fakhouri); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 11984. A bill for the relief of Ursula Kruthoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11985. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., of West New York, N. J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 660. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 661. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 662. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1163. By Mr. BRAY: Petition of 180 persons of Monroe County, Ind., in support of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit advertisement of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1164. Also, petition of 180 persons of Monroe County, Ind., in support of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit advertisement of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1165. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Rev. V. F. Deditius and 19 other citizens of Tillamook, Oreg., urging the passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1166. By Mr. TUMULTY: Resolution adopted by Hoboken Chapter of Unico National in praise of the American Ambassador to Italy, Mrs. Clare Booth Luce; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Educational Benefits to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill in the House to amend Public Law 346, 78th Congress, which grants educational benefits to World War II veterans, and Public Law 550, 82d Congress, which grants educational benefits, among other things, to Korean war veterans.

Certain deficiencies in these two laws should be corrected and corrected at once. These deficiencies came to light early this year when a Senate subcommittee, investigating the Communist ownership of GI schools, discovered that under the existing provisions of these laws the Veterans' Administration is required to expend Federal funds for tuition of veterans attending schools which are Communist-owned. In fact, over $3 million was paid out by the Veterans' Administration to four schools which because of their Communist connections should be ineligible to participate in the veterans' training program. These four schools are the Cartoonists and Illustrators School, Inc., of New York City; the Radio and Television Technical School, of Allentown, Pa.; the Robert Louis Stevenson School, of New York City; and the California Labor School, of San Francisco, Calif.

During the hearings it was brought out that under the provisions of Public Laws 346 and 550, the approval of veteran training schools is left solely to the local State-approving agencies, customarily a local department of education, and unless the local department rules otherwise the Veterans' Administration must pay the tuition for the veteran at these Communist-owned schools or Communist-dominated schools.

In order to correct this situation, my bill requires private schools, below the college level, which are training veterans or seeking approval to train veterans, to submit to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs affidavits signed by the owner or owners and by the members of the governing body that he is not and never has been a member of the Communist Party or any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by illegal or unconstitutional methods.

It is estimated that there are approximately 2,400 schools throughout the country that will file affidavits under this proposal. The bill also provides that in the event a school fails to file an affidavit, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs will not approve the enrollment of veterans in such school. On the other hand, an individual who has been a member of the Communist Party in the past can comply with provisions of the proposed legislation if he files an affidavit that he has terminated his membership and since such termination is opposed to the doctrines, program, principles, and ideology of such organizations. Obviously this bill does not affect colleges or academic preparatory schools.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Veterans' Affairs Committee will act promptly on this measure so that it can be reported to and acted upon by the House before the 84th Congress adjourns. Passage of this bill will prevent millions of Americn taxpayers' money from being expended to train veterans at Communist-owned or at Communist-dominated schools.

A Strange Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, history teaches that whenever a nation prints an excessive amount of money, first comes inflation; then a depression inevitably follows.

The expression "not worth a continental" was created in Revolutionary days because the dollar purchased less and less of life's necessities, until it was worthless. One citizen, disgusted with the ever-decreasing value of his savings, caught a dog, plastered it from nose to tail with Continental currency, and turned it loose.

Despite subsequent periods of inflation and depression—we had a depression and panic in 1837, another in 1857, another in 1893, one in 1907, in 1920, and again in 1929—we refuse to profit by our experiences. Last week we made the temporary statutory national debt limit $278 billion. It carries an annual interest charge of more than $7 billion.

Annually Congress appropriates more of your dollars than are paid in taxes because pressure groups insist. That is no excuse. It is a reason.

Just remember that this is a government "of, by, and for the people." The Congress is only doing what the people or, more accurately, those who make the most noise, demand.

Greater efficiency and economy in the Government's activities I have always, both by speech and vote—and a vote is what counts—endeavored to bring about. But we will never get lower taxes, a balanced budget, until the people accept a share of the responsibility for Federal expenditures.

I am not making any excuse. Not offering any alibi. I will stand on my record. But attention is called to the fact—and it is a fact—that some of those who elect us have, in recent years, been demanding ever-increasing services from the Federal Government, all of which cost dollars; the payment of ever-greater benefits of all kinds.

Because we have appropriated and spent more money than the Government was able to collect, the national debt has increased, until it more than equals the value of all our property. The value of the dollar has shrunk, until it equals but half of what it was before.

The spenders are not a majority, but they make the most noise. Until those at home who want a sound economy become more vocal, more active, the present procedure will continue. Individuals and pressure groups have been yelling for cake. They cannot get it, eat it, enjoy it, and still keep it. When they call for a particular tune and it is played, they will have to pay the fiddler.

Just as long as the people elect spenders, those who believe that the Federal Government has an unlimited income, can give other nations unlimited billions, meet every demand made for home spending, we will have what I think are excessive taxes, and if we do not mend our ways, ruinous inflation. Make your choice.

A Bill To Oblige the Armed Forces To Issue Honorable or Dishonorable Discharges Based Solely Upon the Performance of the Serviceman While Under Military Jurisdiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill which would oblige the Armed Forces to issue their dischargees either honorable or dishonorable discharges, based solely upon the performance of the servicemen while under military jurisdiction. The bill would entirely eliminate unsatisfactory, undesirable, or less-than-honorable discharges based, in most cases, on supposed actions or derogatory information about supposed actions, allegedly performed in civilian life prior to induction.

There has been a steady encroachment by the military into the sphere of civilian jurisdiction. My bill is intended to curb this encroachment. No agency of the Armed Forces should arrogate unto itself the power of punishment for offenses allegedly committed by a civilian in civil life and, most especially, should this not be done when the manner of doing it is such that, in most instances, the victim is seriously hampered in his defense by imperfect knowledge of what he is charged with and no knowledge whatever of who is making the charges.

I am introducing the bill to give ample opportunity for discussion, although I realize that it is too late to get action on it in this session of Congress. It is my hope that my bill will focus attention upon an increasingly unsatisfactory situation and that, when I reintroduce it next year, opinions will have been formed and speedy action will be possible.

The armed services have been promising to do something about this for a long time, and just recently have stated that all undesirable discharges issued of late years will be reviewed. Now, however, we are informed that such reviews will not only take into consideration the man's actual service in the Armed Forces, but will also evaluate the derogatory information previously supplied about him while in civil life. This is exactly what they have been doing all along, and it is exactly what I object to.

If the military has information in its possession which indicates that a certain man would be undesirable in his country's service, they should not induct that man. Once a man is accepted for such service, he should be judged solely on how he carries out his duties while under military jurisdiction. Any other manner of procedure is, at best, an unwarranted encroachment on civil functions and, at worst, a deliberate entrapment.

For the information of the Members, I include the text of the bill:

H. R. 11921

A bill to provide that persons discharged from the Armed Forces who are proffered discharges other than honorable may reject such discharges and receive a court-martial, or if not court-martialed, shall be given honorable discharges; to provide for correction of records in the case of certain persons not given honorable discharges in the past; and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(a)," and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) Any member of the Armed Forces who, at the time of his discharge, is proffered a discharge under conditions other than honorable may reject it, unless such discharge is being proffered to him pursuant to a sentence of a court-martial. When he rejects such discharge, he shall be tried by a court-martial for the offense or offenses on the basis of which he was offered such discharge, unless the military department concerned determines that the evidence in its possession is not sufficient to sustain a conviction of any such offense, in which case he shall be given an honorable discharge. If he is tried by a court-martial and found guilty of any such offense, the court-martial (whether or not a summary court-martial) may prescribe as part of its sentence that he be given a discharge under conditions other than honorable; if he is not found guilty of any such offense, he shall be given an honorable discharge."

SEC. 2. Article 17 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) No court-martial shall have jurisdiction to prescribe any punishment for any person subject to this code for anything done or not done by such person while not subject to this code, or for any exercise of a legal or constitutional right or privilege."

SEC. 3. Subsection (a) of section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(a)" and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) Any person given a discharge under conditions other than honorable before the effective date of this paragraph and after March 21, 1947, may apply to the appropriate board for the correction of his record on the ground that he was given such a discharge solely because of something done or not done by him while not subject to either the Uniform Code of Military Justice, the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, or the Disciplinary Laws of the Coast Guard. If a review of the applicant's records do not indicate that the applicant was given such a discharge solely on such ground, the board shall grant the applicant an opportunity for an early hearing, at which the applicant or his counsel, or both, may be present. After such hearing, or opportunity for a hearing, the board shall consider all briefs, evidence, and arguments presented by the applicant, and all evidence in the possession of the military department concerned, and determine whether or not the applicant was given such a discharge solely on such ground. If, before or after a hearing, the board finds that the applicant was given such a discharge solely on such ground, the board shall correct the applicant's records in the military department concerned so as to show that the applicant was honorably discharged as of the date of his original discharge, cancel the applicant's original discharge, and issue to him an honorable discharge bearing the same date as the date of his canceled discharge."

Humane Slaughter Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to state my position on several bills which are now pending before the House and Senate. These bills are H. R. 8540, H. R. 9603, and S. 1636, also known as the humane slaughter bills.

While I am sure that the authors of this legislation were prompted by humane considerations, I do not believe that they have taken into account the full significance of what these bills, if enacted into law, would do.

Passage of such legislation would make illegal the ritual slaughtering of beef by members of the Orthodox and Conservative Jewish faith which is now carried on and has been carried on for centuries past. For this reason I am definitely opposed to these measures. I do not think that Congress should pass any laws which would abridge freedom of religion or of religious practices. This legislation would also drive out of business countless numbers of beef and poultry slaughterers.

I intend to continue in my opposition to the passage of these bills so long as they involve these undesirable consequences.

Commencement Address by Hon. Lister Hill, of Alabama, at Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a commencement-day address which I delivered at the commencement exercises of the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, at Philadelphia, Pa., on June 7 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE LISTER HILL, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM ALABAMA, AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF THE WOMAN'S MEDICAL COLLEGE OF PENNSYLVANIA AT PHILADELPHIA, JUNE 7, 1956

President Gordon, doctors, distinguished guests, graduates, students, and friends, I am happy and honored to be with you on this auspicious occasion. I share your pride in this splendid institution, which enjoys the distinction of being the only woman's medical college in the United States, this institution that has become so important a part of our Nation's great center of medical education, this institution that has made historic contributions in securing for women their rightful place in medicine.

I come as one who has deep roots in the medical history of Philadelphia and I rejoice at the opportunity to nourish them once again.

It was in Philadelphia that my father, a surgeon and practitioner of medicine for more than 50 years, was privileged to study at Jefferson Medical College under the renowned Samuel D. Gross.

It was here that my father acquired much of the foundation as a student and seeker of medical knowledge that prepared him to go forth into the night and by the light of a kerosene lamp in a crude cabin in Montgomery, Ala., perform the first successful suture of the human heart in America.

It was here that he formed warm friendships which endured throughout his lifetime.

And it was from here that he went forth to study under Joseph Lister, whose name I proudly bear, and it was at the time that great benefactor of mankind was enunciating and fighting for the acceptance of the principles of aseptic and antiseptic treatment of wounds, the treatment which gave birth to modern surgery.

Being with you today has a special significance for me—not only because of my father's association with Philadelphia; not only because of my efforts in the United States Senate in the field of health; but as the son of a doctor, the nephew of a doctor, the brother-in-law of two doctors, the first cousin of five doctors, and as one early imbued with a deep and abiding interest in doctors, and in the progress of medicine and medical care in our Nation. I appreciate the more the signal honor of having the opportunity to say to you on this your graduation day that which tens of thousands of men and women and children will say to you through the years yet to come.

Some will say it with their voices, some with their eyes, all in their hearts will say that which I would be the first to say to you:

Thank you for what you have done.

Thank you for what you will do.

Thank you for what you are.

Thank you for becoming doctors; for having taken the hard way; for having fought off the easy; for having worked and studied; for having sacrificed so much. Thank you for having had so early in life the wisdom to know that only in a life of constant study and service to your fellow man can your own lives be rich and meaningful.

We need you as doctors. People—some in fear, some in pain, some in danger—need you and need the art and the science you have learned.

In our society you have achieved a place of stature and of honor. The place you have won carries with it a formidable array of responsibilities. These responsibilities are many; they are varied; some are difficult to discern; too many are easy to forget; all are a challenge.

The first challenge is the challenge which confronts the woman in medicine in her capacity as a citizen. In matters of economics, of sociology, of social welfare, and particularly of the relationship of health and Government, that which you say and do will be accorded a respect unsurpassed by that given to any other member of your community.

In the past few years the revolutionary strides in the field of health have been achieved largely because of the willingness of men and women in medicine to assume the responsibilities of citizenship. Through vigorous leadership and co-operation with professional and lay leaders, and with legislators, doctors have contributed mightily to an ever-expanding pattern of progress in medicine and its related fields.

This progress is attested to by the fact that last year in Congress under our Hill-Burton program, which will celebrate its tenth anniversary in August, we sharply increased the funds for the construction of hospital and health facilities.

The Hill-Burton program has helped States, communities and nonprofit organizations to build critically needed hospitals, health centers, laboratories and expand facilities for medical education. Already more than 2,000 hospitals and health facilities have been built. Hundreds of them are in communities where there had never been a hospital. Almost 900 additional projects are now under construction or will soon be started. Last year for the first time funds appropriated were designated for the construction of rehabilitation facilities, diagnostic and treatment centers, nursing homes and facilities for the care of patients with chronic illness, as well as for research in the management and administration of hospital care.

With the active and indispensable roles played by men and women in medicine, we established the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda and inaugurated the programs for medical research—research through which we have already accomplished so much and which is so vital for the future progress of medicine and the health of our people.

It was through the initiative of members of the medical profession that we discovered to our consternation that the greatest library of medicine in the world, the Armed Forces Library, the library on which so much of our research depends and the contents of which are irreplaceable, is currently housed in a building constructed in 1887 and condemned over 30 years ago. Congress acted promptly, and I think I can promise you that soon we shall have a truly national library of medicine, adequately housed and properly located.

These programs and many others have been hammered out and shaped with the aid of members of the medical profession and such professional organizations as the American Medical Association and the American Hospital Association and similar groups. We in the Congress could never have developed such programs without the counsel, the co-operation and the leadership of the medical profession.

In determining the role of Government in the field of health, the leadership of women doctors is all important. The humanitarian concern for people and for their welfare, with which you as women are so richly endowed, coupled with the training and experience you have gained as physicians and scientists, bids you accept the responsibilities of citizenship and exercise the leadership which your position demands. Your determination to do so can mean the difference between an age of progress or an age of stagnation in the field of health.

United in the cause of bringing health and happiness into the lives of our people, we must go forward into a new day of health.

We must continue to carry forward the great programs already inaugurated and already proven so successful.

We must intensify and enlarge our medical research. Through research we will find the keys to unlock the doors to the cause and cure or prevention of so many diseases that have plagued and baffled mankind through the centuries.

We must train more doctors and dentists.

We must meet the crucial shortage of professional nurses, practical nurses and auxiliary hospital and health personnel.

We must provide more protection against catastrophic illness. We must extend voluntary health and hospital insurance to more of our people. We must meet the special and difficult problems involving the aged, the indigent, and the unemployed.

In these and many other fields government at its different levels—Federal, State, county and municipal—can and must do much. I am happy to tell you that last week the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I happen to be Chairman, recommended to the Senate a bill authorizing Federal funds for training nurses and other health personnel, for training doctors in mental health and in public health and for the establishment of research projects in these fields. I hope that we shall soon recommend a bill providing funds to assist in construction of medical educational and research facilities.

As we move forward along the whole front in the battle for better health for our people, we must remember that the doctor is ever the central figure in the drama of medical care. All else is but to assist him, to help him achieve the best possible results. And I hasten to add that I use the masculine "him" in a generic sense only. If the doctor is to do his best, he must remain free and uncontrolled. Only as the doctor finds the inspiration and enjoys the right of individual action that freedom gives—to explore, to inquire, to discover, to serve in his own way—only then can he give his best, only then can we continue the marvelous progress of American medicine.

We must preserve the incentives of our free medical system, the incentives for individual effort, initiative and resourcefulness, the incentives to give the best we have, the incentives that flow from the free choice and personal relationship of the doctor and his patient.

Equally as important as the responsibilities of citizenship is the challenge which will confront you as individuals entering into a noble profession. From the days of women doctors in ancient Greece until little more than a century ago, women were excluded from the medical profession. The belated re-entry of women into medicine—marked by the historic founding of this school—and the skepticism which unfortunately and unjustifiably is still in the minds of many may cause any lapse in meeting your responsibilities to be regarded more gravely than might be the case of a man.

Of utmost importance is constant vigilance in maintaining your intellectual integrity and the high standards which your profession calls upon you to uphold: Thou shall not bear tales but shall guard thy patient's confidence; thou shall not gamble with a patient's life; thou shall scrupulously avoid the temptation to let moneymaking and cupidity supplant ethics—the ethics with which I know you are now imbued. Nourish and hold fast to the ideals which led you to enter the medical profession; the ideals which won for medicine universal recognition as the most idealistic of all the secular professions.

Another challenge to you as individuals is the responsibility of understanding the importance of the cross-fertilization of knowledge and of the necessity for close and continuing contact between practitioner and scientist that is the hallmark of today's medicine.

My father once illustrated the importance of the relationship between doctor and scientist by telling me how in 1864 Joseph Lister, walking home with the professor of chemistry, Thomas Anderson, heard of certain papers on fermentation and putrefaction which had been recently published by a then little-known French chemist, Pasteur. Lister read these papers and found himself convinced that minute living particles floating in the air often turned the surgery of his day into a charnel house.

This casual meeting with Anderson, plus the reading of a newspaper article on carbolic acid, led, in 1867, to Lister's laying down the great principles of the modern treatment of wounds.

A fourth challenge that will present itself to many of you is that of preserving the wonderful missionary spirit that characterizes so many outstanding graduates of your school—to name but a few, Drs. Clara Swain, May Selye, Sara Seward, and Anna Kugler in India; Drs. Coombs, Reifsnyder, Root, and Fuller in China; and Dr. Rosella Sherwood Hall in Korea.

These and other valiant women missionaries, graduates of the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, have added splendor to the traditions of women in medicine. They have shown us in this distraught world in which we live today that through personal discipline, through wisdom and compassion, we can win for our people the affection, the understanding, and the loyal support of other peoples.

Through your dedication and devotion to the ideals of your profession you will add years to the lives of our people. And when the time comes for some of your patients to leave this earth, it will be your understanding, your compassion, and your gentle ways which will convert moments of fear and anguish into moments of peace and serenity. Never forget the admonition of the gentle Joseph Lister, "Let not mercy or truth forsake thee; bind them about thy neck."

I hope that you will also accept the responsibility of encouraging more women to enter the field of medicine. I was surprised to learn that last year, out of 28,000 students of medicine in this country, only some 1,500 were women and that the percentage of women students of medicine is now less than 5 percent of the total. We need not fewer men but more women in medicine.

Those who preceded you and passed down through the ages the traditions of women as doctors were few in number. So, relatively speaking, are you few in number. Yet your opportunities to enrich these traditions are as boundless as are the limits of today's ever-expanding world of medicine—the world you are about to enter.

On this your graduation day, as you pass through the portals of your beloved college into a profoundly challenging way of life, I wish you health, goodness, and usefulness as doctors, as scientists, as citizens, and as individuals. I pray that the blessings that befall you may be as abundant as will be the happiness I know you will bring to the lives of others.

It must ever be a glad distinction to have consecrated your lives to serve as those who have gone before have served—healing the sick and making whole the maimed, protecting the mother in childbirth and watching over the infant so newly come to this world, bringing life and health and happiness to your fellow man—following in humility and with faith in the footsteps of Him who nearly 2,000 years ago was called the Great Physician. I salute you, doctors, on the commencement of your service to mankind.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-living God, as we bow in this quiet moment dedicated to the unseen and the eternal, make vivid our abiding faith, we beseech Thee, in those deep and holy foundations which our fathers laid, lest in foolish futility in this desperate and dangerous day we attempt to build on sand instead of rock. In a day of aggression and of violence, of swift and shifting change, when the angry passions of men are bursting anew into devouring flame, enable Thy servants in this place of governance, in the discharge of great responsibilities of public trust, to be calm, confident, wise, and just, their hope in Thee as an anchor sure and steadfast.

Give us, O God, the strength to build
The city that hath stood
Too long a dream, whose laws are love,
Whose ways are brotherhood;
And where the sun that shineth is
God's grace for human good.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 26, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 21, 1956:

S. 1221. An act for the relief of the estate of Joseph Kelsch.

On June 22, 1956:

S. 910. An act for the relief of Lino Perez Martinez;

S. 1067. An act for the relief of Tibor Horvath; and

S. 2967. An act to amend the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and for other purposes.

On June 25, 1956:

S. 1146. An act to further amend section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, relating to fees of agents, attorneys, and representatives;

S. 2984. An act for the relief of Col. John A. O'Keefe;

S. 3265. An act to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for filing vessel utilization and performance reports by operators of vessels in the foreign commerce of the United States; and

S. 3857. An act to clarify section 1103 (d) of title II (Federal ship mortgage insurance) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

COMMITTEE AND CONFEREE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations; the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary; the Air Force Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee; and the conferees on the transit bill (S. 3073), of the Committee on the District of Columbia, were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to take action on the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Marvel A. Randol to be postmaster at Cape Girardeau, Mo., which nominating messages were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Andrew N. Overby, of the District of Columbia, to be Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the

postmaster nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Under the rule, there will be a morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection with the transaction of the routine morning business be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL OFFICE SPACE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the petition of Richard Katzenstein, of New York, N. Y., relating to the payment of social-security benefits to disabled workers who have attained the age of 50 and over, which was ordered to lie on the table.

RESOLUTION OF DEPARTMENT OF TEXAS, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Department of Texas, Disabled American Veterans, at Galveston, Tex., protesting against the enactment of the bill (H. R. 7089) to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"RESOLUTION NO. 29, DECLARING OUR TOTAL OPPOSITION AND REJECTION OF ALL THE PROVISION OF THE HARDY BILL, H. R. 7089, PASSED BY THE LOWER HOUSE OF CONGRESS JULY 13, 1955, UNDER THE 'GAG RULE' WHICH PREVENTED ANY CHANGES OR AMENDMENTS FROM THE FLOOR, AND WHICH IS NOW AWAITING SENATE ACTION IN THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE, AND CALLING UPON UNITED STATES SENATE TO DEFEAT THIS BILL

"Whereas over a year ago we learned that there had been created in the House of Representatives the Select Committee on Survivors Benefits, and which was given unusual scope of authority that cut across and took over the jurisdiction of 3 or 4 other standing committees of the House of Representatives, including the World War Veterans Committee, on the matter of survivors benefits, and which committee held extensive hearings over a period of 9 months, and which select committee introduced H. R. 7089, and secured a special rule, known as the 'gag rule' which only permitted debate, but prevented any amendments or changes in the bill by other Members of Congress, who at the time the bill was considered on the floor in many instances strongly objected to the tactics used under the procedure, and further objected to the contents of the bill; and

"Whereas the national convention of the Disabled American Veterans meeting in Des Moines, Iowa, in August 1955, after careful consideration and full debate rejected resolutions that were designed to approve the Hardy bill, and adopted in their place convention Resolution No. 315, declaring all-out and total opposition to H. R. 7089 as a 'one-package deal' to which the DAV gave a 'one-package rejection,' and

"Whereas the Hardy bill, H. R. 7089, contains some very radical departures and changes from the basic legislation now in force providing for both live veterans and survivors of veterans, and these radical proposals would among other things lay the groundwork for the destruction and elimination of the Veterans' Administration as a Government agency with the goal in hidden form to turn the administration of these benefits over to the Social Security Division of the Federal Government, and when the mask was pulled off of this disguised plan, the DAV found objections as follows:

"1. The bill would put death benefits and death compensation on the basis of rank and length of service and thereby set up a caste system in America beyond the grave. To gain favor for this they offered a bait to increase widow's death compensation, but a private's widow would only receive $122 per month while the general's widow would receive $242, and in order to get it they would steal the death compensation now paid by the Veterans' Administration to the children of a service-connected veteran where the mother is alive, and the children would be transferred over under social security, and which fact is not mentioned in the bill, and constitutes part of the 'big lie' technique, and under the present system the widow with minor children draws both death compensation for herself and minor children through the VA and social security at the same time if her deceased husband was covered.

"2. The bill proposes to put social security into the military service on a contributory basis. It was the DAV's belief that this would destroy the fighting morale of the military men and women so needed in time of war.

"3. The bill and the hearings of record behind the bill treats the fathers and mothers of deceased veterans disgracefully, and very much as though they had no right to any benefit whatsoever from the loss of their son or daughter unless they could show by stringent statutory requirements a 'need' amounting almost to pauperism.

"4. The bill proposes equal status and evaluation for peacetime service with its minimum dangers on the same basis as wartime service with its extreme extra hazards against life and limb. This is a depreciation of all sense of values, but it is made a part of the bill to form a part of the plot or pattern for the 'one-package deal.'

"5. The bill proposes to abolish insurance protection as a statutory benefit, and invoke another instance of the 'big lie' technique by combining the present indemnity insurance with death compensation, and thereby make it appear that they are actually increasing death compensation, when in reality they are taking away another very important benefit.

"6. The bill proposes to tie in one package the long-honored death compensation to Government insurance, and to use social security as an offset against the widow with minor children, which would materially reduce the overall benefits payable to the widow and minor children of the deceased servicemen called in the war's emergency and serving in the enlisted ranks.

"7. We oppose H. R. 7089 and its program of oversimplification for the reason that the military services should be free and unencumbered by any other Government or civilian agency, and that by placing social security into the Armed Forces on a compulsory basis will subject the members of the Armed Forces to fear and duress, and that before long the social-security people will be telling the military leaders how to run the Armed Forces.

"8. We in the DAV oppose the bill H. R. 7089 for the reason that the Select Committee on Survivors Benefits failed to provide for the continuation of one of the most important of survivors benefits adopted by the Congress on June 28, 1934, in Public Law 484, 73d Congress, and which the DAV fostered, and which provided for reduced rates of compensation in cases where the cause of death was not shown to have arisen from or to have been contributed to by the service-connected disability and, as a matter of fact, about 85 or 90 percent of all death benefits are paid under this act, even at the present time, as amended, and that a false picture has been created as only a small portion of cases die of their service-connected disability, which fact the high brass of the Pentagon may wake up to later on as they constitute about 4 percent of the beneficiaries against 96 percent of the citizen soldiers.

"9. We oppose H. R. 7089 because it provides for only one application for death benefits under both the Veterans' Administration and the social-security division, and it could be filed initially with either agency, and that this feature constitutes the real boobytrap whereby the social-security people hope to take over the Veterans' Administration because a veteran's power of attorney dies when he dies, and the social-security outfit gets a notice of death prior, in most instances, to the Veterans' Administration, and the widow and dependent would have no representation before the Veterans' Administration and, in the final analysis, it is also designed to eliminate veterans' representatives of veterans' organizations.

"10. The bill H. R. 7089 was opposed further for the reason that it has been uncovered that social security is not actually an insurance, and that there is no social security trust fund in fact, and that the money has all been spent for deficit spending and foreign aid and other Government projects,

since the United States Supreme Court has held that social-security deductions are only a tax, and that on top of this the planners of the social-security project could also incorporate into social security the civil-service retirement, in which the Government has already defaulted on their portion of the fund in the amount of over $6 billion, and the planners openly state that it will not be necessary then for the Government to make up that money, and to make up the money that is already owed for the stopgap social security placed in the military service during World War II in the amount of approximately $35 million. That the social-security program is now overloaded and that there is actually $15 billion less than nothing in the so-called social security trust fund at the present time, and that is only on paper.

"11. We oppose H. R. 7089 for the reason that the whole plan undertakes to put both the citizen soldier and the career soldier under the whiplash and compulsion of compulsory social security and to deny to the citizen soldier the prerogatives of free enterprise and to scale all his benefits down to one benefit to be determined by the lowest common denominator which is social security and their program, and it is our belief that the citizen soldier should have as many types of endeavor and enterprise as his energies and his talents may lead him into, and that the old-fashioned virtues of thrift and ambition should not be stifled or held down by this fear and compulsion of a socialistic state in which human liberty and human freedom will quickly evaporate and be lost; and

"Whereas we only suspected parts of what we now know in full, and which have confirmed our sound judgment in rejecting the Hardy bill, H. R. 7089, because that bill was part of a master plot, and it constituted the advance groundwork to snare the uninformed and the veterans who could be fooled, but their timetable got fouled up and they were not able to jam through the Senate this H. R. 7089 as they had hoped and planned upon before the release of the report of the President's Commission on Pensions and now the whole plot is crystal clear, and the pattern takes on a full form in the recommendation of the President's Commission as follows:

" '21. This Commission strongly approves of the system of survivors benefits that would be established by H. R. 7089, as it would, in a large measure, correct serious deficiencies in existing situations.'

"The whole plot of the Bureau of the Budget was to lay the basic groundwork through the select committee in H. R. 7089 upon which the subsequent recommendations of the President's Commission to make further drastic reductions and curtailment in veterans' benefits could be carried out; and

"Whereas it is our belief that the Hardy bill, H. R. 7089, should be defeated in the United States Senate, and that the veterans throughout the United States of America should be aroused and informed of the plan and plot to scuttle their historic rights and benefits, all to make available more funds for foreign giveaway programs and to care for the enemies, who in fact disabled many of our comrades, and which is the program of the international Socialists who want to set up a super world federation of governments in which the United States would surrender part of its sovereignty, and before long we would be sharing everything we've got with the socialistic countries of the world, and it is our belief that the basic statutory rights which Congress has heretofore provided for disabled veterans and their dependents is part of the cost of war, and that the veteran and his dependent is entitled to be treated as a separate class in this respect, and that social security and any other benefit are only collateral and supplementary thereto, and if the veteran and his dependents are entitled to benefits under social security by virtue of having qualified under that law by contributions from his own pay and the contributions of his employer, then in that event the social security benefits should also be paid simultaneously with the payment of benefits accuring under veterans legislation, without any setoff, deduction, or merging with social security, and that the fiction or fantasy that is sought to be created by clever phrases and manipulations to reduce veterans down to the lowest common denominator of one social security benefit deprives them of the human dignity established in the Declaration of Independence and perfected in the Constitution of the United States of America: Therefore be it

"Resolved, by the Department of Texas, Disabled American Veterans, in State convention assembled at Galveston, Tex., June 8, 9, and 10, 1956, That we hereby go on record expressing our total disapproval and opposition to the legislative proposals contained in the Hardy bill H. R. 7089 now awaiting action before the Senate Finance Committee of the United States Senate, and that it is our belief that this bill was too hastily considered and cuts across too many existing Federal laws to be workable, and that it was 'railroaded' through the lower House of Congress under a 'gag rule' that was both undemocratic and unfair to the other Members of that House of Congress, many of whom were the long and proven friends of the disabled veterans and their dependents, and who held strong and different views that the five men on the select committee, and many of whom prophesied that the bill would be the end of the Veterans' Administration, and in speeches on the floor stated that the bill neither was fair to the veterans nor did the tactics that were being used to ram it through the House of Representatives reflect any faith and confidence of its proponents in the merits of the bill; and be it further

"Resolved, That we hereby call upon the Members of the United States Senate to defeat H. R. 7089 and to leave the present basic laws covering veterans benefits and those of dependents in force without changing the basic philosophy of the long history of our Government in the past in this regard, and in doing this prevent one group of veterans being set against another group of veterans, and one group of fathers and mothers being set against another group of fathers and mothers, and discrimination between widows in the amount of their death compensation based upon the rank of a deceased husband which sets up a caste system beyond the grave; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be presented by the delegates from the State of Texas to the national convention of the Disabled American Veterans at San Antonio, Tex., August 19–24, 1956, and there requesting its adoption as a mandate of that convention as part of the national legislative program, and a declaration of the policy of the Disabled American Veterans; and be it further

"Resolved, That the State adjutant as secretary of this convention be, and he is hereby instructed to prepare at once additional copies of this resolution in the proper number and that the same be forwarded to the national adjutant at national headquarters, Cincinnati, Ohio, and that separate copies thereof be forwarded by him at once to each Member of the United States Senate, and that a further copy be sent to each Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Texas, and that further copies to be sent to each member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives."

The foregoing resolution unanimously adopted this 10th day of June 1956.

JOE F. RAMSEY, Jr.,
State Commander.

Attest:

H. V. ROYSTON,
State Adjutant.

RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH DAKOTA STATE CONVENTION OF DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of resolutions adopted by the State convention of the Disabled American Veterans, at Minot, N. Dak., May 25–27, 1956.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"RESOLUTION FOR INCREASED COMPENSATION

"Whereas veterans service-connected disability ratings and death compensation has not kept pace with the increased cost of living since World War II; and

"Whereas disabled veterans and dependents are finding it increasingly difficult to meet the meager essentials of living and in fact some veterans and their dependents are destitute and must receive welfare aid wherever and if they are able to obtain it; and

"Whereas it is an obligation and duty of the people of this Nation and Congress to give top priority to the wartime disabled veterans over any other class or group: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That this State convention of the Disabled American Veterans assembled at Minot, N. Dak., May 25, 26, and 27, 1956, go on record requesting that a 20 percent increase in disability compensation and death compensation be granted; and be it further

"Resolved, That we urge our national convention and our Congressmen to support legislation for increased service-connected disability ratings and death compensation."

Passed by the DAV convention in Minot, N. Dak., May 26, 1956.

MAX FOERSTER,
Department Adjutant.

"RESOLUTION REGARDING DEPENDENCY ALLOWANCE

"Whereas it has been the policy of the Disabled American Veterans to have all disabled veterans treated equally and correct discriminatory legislation; and

"Whereas under existing laws and regulations of the Veterans' Administration pertaining to dependency allowance, a veteran rated from 10 percent through 40 percent receives no additional allowance; and

"Whereas veterans rated 50 to 100 percent receive additional allowance for dependents: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That this convention of the DAV of North Dakota, assembled at Minot, N. Dak., May 25, 26, and 27, 1956, hereby respectfully request and urge Congress to amend Public Law 877, 80th Congress, to provide that dependency allowance be included and also paid to veterans rated from 10 percent through 40 percent."

Passed by the DAV Convention in Minot, N. Dak., May 26, 1956.

MAX FOERSTER,
Department Adjutant.

"RESOLUTION IN OPPOSITION TO CURTAILMENT OF MEDICAL TREATMENT AS NOW AUTHORIZED IN VA HOSPITALS

"Whereas it has come to our attention through the records of the press that the

American Medical Association and other organizations have called upon the Congress to enact such laws as are necessary to end the free medical care now received by the veterans in VA hospitals for non-service-connected cases; and

"Whereas only a short time ago the said American Medical Association did solicit and receive help from the various national veterans organizations to defeat a bill creating socialized medicine; and

"Whereas under the plans as advanced by the American Medical Association it would be impossible for hundreds of thousands of veterans to receive proper medical attention as a very small percentage of such veterans are financially able to finance such proper medical attention as now received: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the DAV Convention assembled in Minot, N. Dak., May 25, 26, 27, 1956, That if and when such legislation as suggested by the American Medical Association is introduced for passage that we request our Senators and Representatives to oppose such passage."

Passed by the DAV Convention in Minot, N. Dak., May 26, 1956.

MAX FOERSTER,
Department Adjutant.

"RESOLUTION OPPOSING TRANSFER OF VA FUNCTIONS TO ANY OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCY

"Whereas the VA has been operating successfully in the field of administering laws pertaining to veterans for over 25 years: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the DAV, Department of North Dakota, in convention assembled May 25, 26, 27, 1956, go on record as opposing any move to transfer any VA activities to any other governmental agency, and that VA continue to be operated exclusively for veterans rights and benefits; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to other veterans organizations for their support and also copies of this resolution be forwarded to our North Dakota Senators and Representatives."

Passed by the DAV Convention in Minot, N. Dak., May 26, 1956.

MAX FOERSTER,
Department Adjutant.

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas Senate bill 3067 provides a 1-year period during which certain veterans be granted the right to obtain National Service Life Insurance; and

"Whereas we of the DAV assembled in the 36th annual convention at Minot, N. Dak., are firm believers in the great value of National Service Life Insurance: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we urge the passage of Senate bill 3067; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our North Dakota Senators and Representatives urging their support of this Senate bill."

Passed by the DAV Convention in Minot, N. Dak., May 26, 1956.

MAX FOERSTER,
Department Adjutant.

"RESOLUTION—PROCEEDS OF COMMERCIAL LIFE INSURANCE BE NOT CONSIDERED AS INCOME IN DETERMINING PENSION BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS OF DECEASED VETERANS

"Whereas commercial life insurance paid to a beneficiary upon the death of a veteran is considered as income for death pension purposes; and

"Whereas this matured commercial life insurance is merely a return for premium payments made by the veteran during his lifetime; and

"Whereas the proceeds of such matured commercial life insurance paid to widows creates a bar to entitlement to death pension benefits; and

"Whereas in most cases where matured commercial life insurance is paid to widows a greater portion or sometimes all of such proceeds from this commercial life insurance is used by the widow to defray funeral, hospital, and other expenses, generally accumulated during the veterans terminal illness: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the DAV, That the Congress be memorialized to amend the insurance act to provide that commercial life insurance paid to widows be not considered for death pension purposes; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to our North Dakota Senators and Representatives."

Passed by the DAV convention, in Minot, N. Dak., May 26, 1956.

MAX FOERSTER,
Department Adjutant.

"RESOLUTION ASKING THAT PENSION PAYMENTS TO WIDOWS AND DEPENDENTS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT BE BASED ON THE SAME CRITERIA

"Whereas widows and dependents of World War I are entitled to pensions irrespective of whether the cause of death is due to military service or the veteran had a disability due to service at time of death; and

"Whereas widows and dependents of World War II veterans and of the Korean conflict in order to be entitled to a pension in cases where cause of death or any disability that contributed to the cause of death is not due to service, the veteran has to have a service-connected disability, disabling to an ascertainable degree at time of death; and

"Whereas it is inequitable for widows and dependents of World War I veterans to be entitled to pensions and the widows and dependents of World War II and Korean conflict veterans being denied benefits under the same circumstances or having the same qualifications: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That suitable legislation be passed granting the same pension rights to widows and dependents of World War II and Korean veterans as now is granted to widows of World War I veterans; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to our North Dakota Senators and Representatives."

Passed by the DAV convention, in Minot, N. Dak., May 26, 1956.

MAX FOERSTER,
Department Adjutant.

"RESOLUTION PERTAINING TO THE RECENTLY RELEASED BRADLEY COMMISSION REPORT

"Whereas it appears that the Commission created by the President known as the Bradley Commission to investigate the Veterans' Administration regarding veterans' benefits is on the whole unsatisfactory in that it appears to discriminate on proposed legislation for disabled veterans: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this 36th annual convention of the Disabled American Veterans of the State of North Dakota held in Minot, N. Dak., this 26th day of May 1956 go on record as opposing the President Committee report (Bradley Commission report)."

Passed by the DAV convention, in Minot, N. Dak., May 26, 1956.

MAX FOERSTER,
Department Adjutant.

RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN CITIZENS OF GREEK DESCENT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by American citizens of Greek descent, residing in Springfield, Ohio, and its environs, relating to immigration quotas.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN CITIZENS OF GREEK DESCENT RESIDING IN SPRINGFIELD, OHIO AND ENVIRONS CONCERNING UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION QUOTAS

"Whereas over 138 citizens of Greek descent residing in this area and suburbs are familiar with the privations and hardships of Greece from warfare, occupation, and communistic depredations of the last decade and from two destructive earthquakes within past 2 years and those Americans and their friends are cognizant of the inequities from national origins system of immigration and Refugee Relief Act of 1953; and

"Whereas the prevailing United States immigration laws are clearly discriminatory inasmuch as they assign northern and western Europe five-sixths of migration quotas and to southern and eastern nations only one-sixth; and as aptly stated by Secretary Dulles, this system 'draws distinction between the blood of another (which) cannot be reconciled with the fundamental concepts of our Declaration of Independence'; and

"Whereas State Department reports show over 14,000 Greek assurances still pending and without visas; and

"Whereas the economy of Greece is in an increasingly precarious state as a result of overpopulation and of depletion through her recurrent for liberation, for freedom, and for democracy from 1911 until 1947 wars; and

"Whereas immigrants from Greece, within past 50 years, have been assimilated with unrivaled rapidity and thoroughness in the United States of America and now with their children and grandchildren, aggregating over 1,250,000 citizens, are amongst the most respected, prominent, law-abiding, home-loving, loyal, and progressive Americans and American patriots, having proven as such in every endeavor, civil and military; and

"Whereas historic friendships, existing between United States of America and Greece, is predicated upon mutual devotion to the tenets of democracy and liberty, to the principles of the dignity and freedom of the individual, and to the culture of western civilizations, founded in ancient Greece, and now flowering intensively and illumiatively in America; and

"Whereas these two countries fought side by side in two great World Wars since the days when each gained its independence; and

"Whereas within the last decade, evidencing its interest in Greece, the United States of America, through the Marshall plan and Truman doctrine, aided decisively in the preservation of Greece within the orbit of western nations, for which people are most grateful; and

"Whereas Greeks have demonstrated repeatedly their loyalty as allies of western nations and their exemplary courage as a freedom-loving people by resisting heroically the mighty axis forces in 1940–41, and by exterminating vile communistic forces in 1944–47; and

"Whereas Greece, lying athwart the eastern terminus of the Mediterranean Basin, is strategically the controlling gateway of sea, air, land, and fuel-oil routes among three continents (Europe, Asia, and Africa), and because of its geographical location, Greece is the master hinge of NATO, Balkan, Baghdad, and SEATO defensive systems, and as such, an indispensable bastion for the security of western democracies:

"It is resolved by the undersigned, personally and collectively, That our Representatives in Congress, both Senators and Congressmen, be and hereby are respectfully urged and appealed to, to take timely and

appropriate action in urging the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, chairman, Subcommittee on Refugee Relief Program; the Honorable JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee; the Honorable FRANCIS WALTER, chairman, House Immigration Subcommittee; and the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman, House Judiciary Committee—

"(A) To expedite and support legislation for additional Greek refugee quotas by transferring an additional 10,000 visas for Greece from unused and undersubscribed quotas (and 10,000 or more for Italy); but not increase the overall total of 209,000 under entire refugee program, such transfer being within humanitarian spirit and purposes of prevailing immigration laws; and further

"(B) To support the effectuation of the amendments of present immigration laws, beneficially to Greece and Italy, both members of NATO, and particularly support the enactment of legislation within the contemplation of pending bills S. 3574 and S. 3876;

"(C) That copies of this resolution signed by officials of the Greek-American organizations and representative citizens be transmitted to the Honorable John Bricker, the Honorable George Bender, our United States Senators; and the Honorable Clarence Brown, our Congressman; and the Honorable William Langer, the Honorable James O. Eastland, the Honorable Emanuel Celler, the Honorable Francis Walter, Gov. Frank Lausche, and to the press."

Respectfully submitted.

Dated June 8, 1956.

Unanimously adopted in general community meeting.

——— ———,
Chairman.

Attest:

Gregory Speras, Secretary, Springfield Chapter No. 247, Order of AHEPA; George Keriobes, President, Hellenic Eastern Orthodox Church; Mary Katcifas, President, Hellenic Ladies Society; Olga Doney, President, Maids of Athens Chapter; Rev. George V. Dellaz, Pastor, Eastern Orthodox Church; George Gianokopoulos, President, Chapter No. 247, Order of AHEPA; Eugenia Grigiss, President, Hellenic Orthodox Sunday School Faculty; Georgia Giannakopoulos, President, Chapter No. —, Daughters of Penelope in U. S. A.

TERMINATION OF CONTROL OVER KLAMATH INDIAN RESERVATION—RESOLUTION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] had a report on the progress of Public Law 587, which provides termination of the Federal control of the Klamath Reservation. At that hearing, attended by management specialists charged with drawing up plans for the implementation of this termination law, we again were made aware that the problem of disposing of one of America's finest stands of Ponderosa pine timber, found on this reservation, was posing a real problem for the specialists.

Indicative of the general concern attending the administration of Public Law 587 is the resolution drawn at the recent annual meeting of the Oregon State Grange. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 19

Whereas Oregon State Grange is deeply concerned for the welfare of the Indian people of our State in general and of the Klamath Indian people in particular, believing that Public Law 587 does not provide the best program for handling the affairs of the Klamath Indians; and

Whereas early termination could bring hardship because of lack of explanation and confusion concerning the terms of the law in reference to guardianship, so every adult should know and understand section 15; and

Whereas the stated purpose of House Concurrent Resolution 108 declares it to be the policy of Congress to terminate all Federal responsibility for Indians at the earliest possible date. The avowed purpose is to bring about the integration of the Indian people with the rest of our people; and

Whereas 6 termination bills have been passed by the Congress, but only 2, 1 dealing with the Menominees, of Wisconsin, and the other with the Klamaths, of Oregon, have been pushed. Significantly, the Menominees and the Klamaths own two of the finest remaining stands of timber in the United States; and

Whereas the Klamath Indian Reservation at the present time is very rich in timber and grazing land resources. These resources if held in trust for the Klamaths and wisely developed and administered, will afford a good standard of living for the members of the Klamath Tribes for the foreseeable future; and

Whereas there is no valid reason why the Indian people cannot attain complete integration and still maintain tribal membership and tribal ownership of the Indian reservations; and

Whereas the National Congress of American Indians, over a year ago, set up a nine-point program which contains "a plan of positive action to alleviate the present poverty, lack of education and training, and the present ill health of the country's 450,000 Indians." Basically the plan rests on the Indian belief that, given full conservation and development of resources, reservations will in time be able to support the people who wish to remain on them, and Federal responsibility will become superfluous; and

Whereas this plan would hold in trust the Indian's heritage and keep in Indian ownership the remnant of the land and resources that we have allowed the Indians to keep until now: Therefore be it

Resolved, That House Concurrent Resolution 108 and all of the termination bills passed to date, including Public Law 587 dealing with the Klamaths be repealed; and be it further

Resolved, That legislation be enacted to implement the nine-point program drafted by the National Congress of American Indians, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Oregon's congressional delegation, the Department of Interior, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the National Grange.

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION—LETTER

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, congressional action on a bill providing Federal aid to school construction now seems a definite possibility.

This is very encouraging news. I know from the plight of school districts in my State of Michigan alone how vitally necessary it is to have prompt action.

I have received letter after letter from school officials, and I have had numerous personal contacts with them. All urge me to do everything in my power to bring about the enactment of the school-aid bill.

From the many letters I have received, I should like to have printed in the RECORD one from R. L. Collins, treasurer of the school district in Nankin-Dearborn Township, which is just outside Detroit.

This letter points out clearly the difficulties the school districts are facing, and it is a typical picture of many areas in my State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 20, 1956.

Hon. PATRICK V. MCNAMARA,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCNAMARA: It is my understanding that Congress will be considering the subject of Federal aid to education in the near future. Because our school district typifies the suburban "bedroom" areas of Wayne County, perhaps an explanation of our situation and the need for Federal aid will be of assistance to you in your deliberations.

The Cherry Hill School District comprises an area of 2½ square miles just west of Dearborn. Prior to 1950, it was farmland with one 6-room school serving the entire area. However, at about that time, small home developments began with the result that our school membership has been increasing at about 30 percent each year over the previous year.

School year:	*Elementary membership*
1951–52	575
1952–53	723
1953–54	975
1954–55	1,222
1955–56	1,485
1956–57 (estimated)	2,000

Of course, the tax base of the district has been increasing, too. Assessed valuation is almost entirely composed of residential property—with an average home being assessed in the range of $4,000–$4,500. We have no industrial tax base, and only limited commercial property.

	Assessed valuation
1951–52	$2,100,000
1952–53	3,600,000
1953–54	5,400,000
1954–55	7,600,000
1955–56	9,500,000
1956–57	11,600,000

During this period our facilities investments have totaled about $1½ million, and just last week the community voted an additional $2 million bond issue for further work.

Briefly, the above data is a summary of where we've been—now for the future load:

School census statistics show a 4,000-pupil membership by 1961. To house these children will take approximately $4 million over and above the expenditures now authorized—including a high school. (Over 150 children are now taken into Dearborn each day for high school—more than 200 next fall.)

Maximum forecasted tax base will be about $18 million assessed valuation, not sufficient to support the bond retirement requirements for such a program. Our new bond issue will put our outstanding debt at about $3.1 million—about 30 percent of assessed valuation, and principal retirements can average only about $80,000 annually. A locally sponsored

program would necessitate a debt ratio in 1959–60 of over 40 percent for school purposes only.

Clearly we are going to need help. While Michigan will loan us money to pay our debt costs, our program as now existing will require a $90,000 loan in 1956–57 alone to meet our obligations. The loan method does not add to our total resources—merely helps in meeting short-term peaks.

The people of our community are making real sacrifices today to face up to our needs. (The recent bond issue passed 310 to 8.) Our school tax load alone is over 30 mills—and to this must be added the village and county taxes.

Consolidation is not an answer to our problem, since neighboring school districts are in identical financial straits—Garden City to our north, Inkster to the south, Wayne to the west (and why should Dearborn people take us). We have earnestly studied such plans, but find that pooling our financial problems does not offer any advantage.

All in all, ours is a difficult situation. We've studied it carefully, the people have made sacrifices, we are doing our best, but the cold hard fact is that the toddlers of today will be school children tomorrow, and we just don't have the money nor foreseeable local resources to house them.

We've had Federal aid—about $225,000 altogether in the past 3 years. We're thankful for your efforts in our behalf previously—because needed classrooms were thus made available. But we need more—lots more—to keep our heads above water. We're hoping that your current deliberations will result in the assistance which is so essential to our job of educating our children.

We know we can count on you.

Sincerely,

R. L. COLLINS,
Treasurer, School District No. 2 for Nankin-Dearborn Townships.

P. S.—It is our feeling that the Powell amendment is unnecessary and that conformity to the Supreme Court decision regarding nonsegregation can and should be handled in administrative procedures. It seems to us that such an amendment is redundant—and its inclusion can only obscure the real need which must be met. Let's get school aid, then work out the mechanics concerning to whom it will be distributed—all in accord with the basic patterns established for our democracy.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1450. A bill for the relief of Mary C. Frederick (Rept. No. 2374); and

H. R. 1072. An act for the relief of Clyde M. Litton (Rept. No. 2371).

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 7663. An act to provide for settlement in part of certain claims of the Uintah and White River Bands of Ute Indians in Court of Claims case numbered 47568, through restoration of subsurface rights in certain lands formerly a part of the Uintah Indian Reservation (Rept. No. 2372).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

H. R. 5690. An act for the relief of Camp Kooch-i-ching (Rept. No. 2373).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 2167. A bill to make certain changes in the administration of the Panama Canal Company, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2375).

REPORT ENTITLED "INFLUENCE OF CARGO PREFERENCE STATUTES ON THE SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL DISPOSAL PROGRAM" (S. REPT. NO. 2376)

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, submitted a report entitled "Influence of Cargo Preference Statutes on the Surplus Agricultural Disposal Program," which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 4124. A bill to amend section 303 of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, so as to make certain persons who were citizens of the United States on the date of the enactment of such section eligible to file claims thereunder; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 4125. A bill for the relief of Wong Sau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 4126. A bill for the relief of Maria Sabatino;

S. 4127. A bill for the relief of Pedro Ampo;

S. 4128. A bill for the relief of Maria Concetta Di Turi;

S. 4129. A bill for the relief of Maria Lorenz; and

S. 4130. A bill for the relief of Genovaite Musinskas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 4131. A bill for the relief of Maja Veara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 4132. A bill to establish a teaching hospital for Howard University, to transfer Freedmen's Hospital to the university, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 4133. A bill for the relief of Livio Senni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 4134. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Filippina Huber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 4135. A bill amending the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to permit deductions for a self-help beef promotion program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. J. Res. 185. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 20, 1954, establishing a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolution was submitted and referred as indicated:

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LANGER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. MORSE):

S. Res. 298. Resolution opposing discriminatory action against United States citizens because of religious faith or affiliations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 299), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary not more than 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held by the Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency in the United States, on July 15 and 16, 1955, pursuant to Senate Resolution 62 of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, on Juvenile Delinquency (Interstate Adoption Practices).

CONTROL OF PRODUCTION CREDIT ASSOCIATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 10285) to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations; and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, which is now pending before the Senate. I ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. President, I had previously submitted this amendment and it was printed, but the amendment was to H. R. 10082, with an identical title, and the bill as reported out by the Senate is now H. R. 11356. Further, I am making one or two very minor changes in the amendment. Therefore, I am resubmitting it and ask that it be printed so that Members of the Senate may have the correct amendment before them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11356, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11356, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WOFFORD) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 11356, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South

Carolina, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 11356, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS — CHANGE OF CONFEREE

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] be excused from further service as a conferee on the part of the Senate on the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON GRAND RIVER, MICH. (S. DOC. NO. 132)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated May 14, 1956, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Grand River, Mich., with particular reference to flood control in the vicinity of Lansing, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of July 15, 1947. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON OSWEGO RIVER WATERSHED, AUBURN, N. Y. (S. DOC. NO. 133)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated May 11, 1956, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on Oswego River watershed at Auburn, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of September 18, 1951. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN INDIANS — STAR PRINT OF REPORT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on yesterday, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I reported favorably, with amendments, Calendar No. 2393, the bill (S. 3397) to amend section 3 of the act of May 19, 1947 (ch. 80, 61 Stat. 102), as amended, for the purpose of extending the time in which payments are to be made to members of the Shoshone Tribe and the Arapahoe Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, and for other purposes. By reason of an inadvertent error made yesterday in submitting the report, I ask unanimous consent that a corrected star print be made of the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM—POLITICAL COMPLEXION OF CONGRESS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in his final television appearance in the 1954 campaign, President Eisenhower urged the Nation to elect a Republican Congress. In spite of his warning in 1954, there was too much complacency. When he announced that he would seek a second term, he again reiterated the need for a Republican Congress. The following is taken from the transcript of his press conference of February 29:

RICHARD L. WILSON (of Cowles Publications). Mr. President, do you consider the lack of Republican control of Congress to be a handicap to your administration?

President EISENHOWER. That is what I believe; if we are honestly dedicated to a two-party system, that is, to a single party responsibility in this country, then the legislature and the Executive should properly be in the same hands so that there can be responsibility fixed without crimination or recrimination.

The Democrats organized the present 84th Congress in January 1955, and are responsible for its record.

Many columnists hailed this development after the 1954 elections, as they said the Democrats would support the President's program with more vigor than would the Republicans. As the present Congress draws to a close, the record clearly shows what has been accomplished. Very little of the President's extensive domestic program has been enacted into law. Much of it has never even been debated.

Within a few months the American people will once again have an opportunity to elect a President and a Congress. The reelection of President Eisenhower is almost a foregone conclusion. However, he will not be able to accomplish his objectives for the benefit of the American people unless they give him a Republican Congress when they go to the polls in November.

Raymond Moley, in the July 2 issue of Newsweek, published today, reviews the support accorded to the President's program by members of his own party and by the Democrats. His article clearly shows that the Republican Members of this body went down the line for the President on those issues which really mattered, and that little support was accorded his program by the Democrats. I shall bring Mr. Moley's analysis to the attention of the voters in those States where a Senatorial contest will take place this fall, so that they will clearly understand why the President needs a Republican Senate in January 1957.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Moley's article may be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTY RULE IN SENATE

(By Raymond Moley)

Liberals, who would have President Eisenhower as their very own, repudiate any suggestion that he might be a loyal Republican and a believer in a 2-party government. In their anxiety to injure the Republican Party they would destroy party government and exalt the independent, both at the polls and in Congress. Hence they would like to prove that support for the President is just as great among Democrats as among Republicans in Congress, and that bipartisanship, which really means a no-party system, is a state of affairs devoutly to be wished.

Incidentally, those people who used to call themselves liberals—a name stolen by collectivists from the traditional and genuine believers in individualism—have now stolen the word "moderate." It is more popular now, they believe. They would steal the livery of the right to serve the left.

The President, however, is wiser than these false friends. In May he offered this testimonial of his belief in party government and party loyalty:

"I am a Republican in our 2-party system. Consequently, to do that work best, I think it is only logical that the people you give to me as my closest associates—if that responsibility is again laid upon me—be bound to me by terms of party loyalty as well as official and personal loyalty. I think it is quite clear that in that way we preserve the integrity of the 2-party system and make it possible to hold one single party responsible for anything that happens within the Federal Government."

VITAL DIVISIONS

The facts bear out this view that the President needs strong party support in the next Congress. He cannot depend upon Democratic help.

A study has been made available to me which shows the vitality of party government in the Congress. I offer the Senate analysis here, and next week that of the House.

In the Senate there were 270 yea and nay votes in the 83d Congress, and 88 in the first session of the 84th Congress. However, there were only 78 and 24 respectively in which the parties were really divided. These issues were all of vital importance to the Eisenhower administration.

My criterion of a party division in a roll call in which the respective leaders and the policy committees of the 2 parties are on opposite sides.

The total positions taken by all Senators who voted or announced where they stood on the 78 divided issues in the 83d Congress were 6,915. Republicans following their party leadership accounted for 2,999 of these, and Democrats loyal to their leadership accounted for 2,818. Republicans voting with the opposition accounted for 490 positions, and Democrats supporting Republican leadership, 608.

The same pattern is found in the rollcalls of the first session of the 84th Congress. There were 2,195 positions taken on the 24 issues that really mattered. Republican leadership received the support of Senators taking 870 positions. Democratic leadership had 953 votes. Republican and Democratic votes which crossed the party lines were 199 and 173, respectively.

RELIABLE SUPPORTERS

It is a commonplace among commentators who fail to examine the facts to say that certain Democrats are more reliable supporters of the President's party than are many Republicans. That is not true. Senator MCCARTHY stands third from the bottom of

the list of members of his party supporting the leadership. But at that he is tied with two Democrats who are regarded as conservative supporters of Eisenhower—BYRD and ROBERTSON of Virginia.

When the chips were down, Senator SMITH of New Jersey never deviated. Senators BRIDGES, HICKENLOOPER, MARTIN of Pennsylvania, MARTIN of Iowa, MILLIKIN, SALTONSTALL, SCHOEPPEL, and WATKINS deviated only once.

On the other side of the Senate, the stalwarts were SPARKMAN, O'MAHONEY, MURRAY, MANSFIELD, LEHMAN, KILGORE, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, HAYDEN, HUMPHREY, HILL, FULBRIGHT, HENNINGS, DOUGLAS, CLEMENTS, and BARKLEY. Each of these deviated only once.

Thus party lines do make a difference. There could be no stronger argument than the foregoing analysis of Senate rollcalls for giving the President a Republican Congress at the coming election.

DEDICATION OF PLAQUE TO THE MEMORY OF THOSE WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN THE FIGHTING IN KOREA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in New York on Thursday, June 21, in the presence of the highest officials of the United Nations, a bronze plaque was dedicated in the great public concourse at United Nations Headquarters to the memory of the men who lost their lives in the fighting in Korea.

In attendance were the Secretary General of the United Nations, His Excellency Dag Hammarskjold; the President of the Security Council, His Excellency Dr. E. Ronald Walker of Australia; all of the representatives of the 16 nations which contributed to Korea; representatives of the military forces of many of these countries; the representatives of the Republic of Korea; and many others.

The representative of the United States of America, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., spoke on behalf of the Unified Command, which was exercised by the United States in Korea, both for member nations and for the Republic of Korea.

He was accompanied by Vice Adm. Arthur D. Struble, United States Navy, chairman of the United States delegation to the United Nations Military Staff Committee, who had commanded the naval forces at the landing at Inchon, in Korea; by Ambassador James J. Wadsworth; and by Minister James W. Barco, of the United States mission to the United Nations.

There was 1 minute of silent prayer.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the statements which were made on this occasion by the Secretary General, the President of the Security Council, and the representative of the United States of America.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEDICATION OF MEMORIAL PLAQUE IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE MEN WHO DIED IN KOREA IN THE SERVICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS, UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS, JUNE 21, 1956

REMARKS BY MR. DAG HAMMARSKJOLD, SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. President and Excellencies, we meet here to dedicate this plaque inscribed "in grateful remembrance of the men of the Armed Forces of member states who died in Korea in the service of the United Nations 1950–1953."

"In grateful remembrance of the men"—it is the individuals we honor with this plaque. But it is fitting that the organization in whose service they gave their lives; is here represented first by the President of the Security Council which assumed the main responsibility. Those who gave their lives came from many countries. Ambassador Lodge is on this occasion representing not only those from his own country—as we know they were the great majority—but all who made their personal sacrifice, irrespective of their nationality.

An occasion such as this one is a poignant reminder that behind every historic action, national or international, is the individual human being, each giving of his courage and his devotion. Those whom we honor today were called upon by their governments to fight, as loyal citizens of their own countries, for a common cause. In devoted service they made the supreme sacrifice.

To their memory it is fitting that we should pay simple and humble tribute. We cannot recall the lives they gave, and only in a small and imperfect measure can we share the grief of those they loved and left behind. But in paying them honor, we can resolve to remember always their example of selfless sacrifice. In the memory of their devotion we can find cause to renew our own. In the memory of their service, we can seek to be worthy in our lives to the building of a peace that will endure.

REMARKS BY AMBASSADOR RONALD WALKER, PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF AUSTRALIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS AND PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Mr. Secretary General, Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, we are about to unveil a memorial to the men of the United Nations forces who died in Korea. As President of the Security Council I consider it a privilege to pay tribute to those brave men who, at the call of the United Nations, took up arms to resist aggression and gave their own lives so that others might live in freedom.

The countries that contributed forces to the United Nations effort and suffered losses in Korea can of course never forget the extremely heavy sacrifices which were borne by the people of the United States, nor the leadership and generous cooperation which the United States gave to all who rallied to this United Nations cause. I consider it is particularly fitting therefore that the permanent representative of the United States should also speak to us in today's ceremony on behalf of all the countries which gave the men in whose memory we dedicate this plaque.

This occasion recalls many vivid memories for me personally. As Australian representative on UNCURK last year and as Ambassador to Japan for some years, it has been my privilege to know many of the men of the various components of the United Nations forces—in Korea, in bases and hospitals in Japan, and in the United Nations Headquarters in Tokyo. These men shared a noble comradeship that transcended all differences in nationality, in tongue and in race, and will long be an inspiration to those who observed it or experienced it.

Not long ago I stood in the beautiful United Nations cemetery on the outskirts of Pusan where the hills look down on the fields of silent graves. Some countries, such as the United States, have brought their dead home, while the men of other countries have found their last resting place in the land for whose freedom they have fought. Beneath the flag of the United Nations, beneath their own national flags and the flags of their comrades in arms flown in honor of all the fallen, for me as an Australian it was especially impressive when visiting the graves of my own countrymen, and our kinsmen of the Commonwealth, to lift my eyes to the neighboring rows of Turkish graves and the other United Nations graves beyond.

Today in the headquarters of the United Nations we honor the memory of all these men and we share the grief of those who mourn them, whether here or in distant lands. The fallen belong to their own people but they belong also to us all. Their lives and their sacrifice were dedicated not only to their own countries but also to that wider loyalty which in time to come will unite all men and women into one peaceful family. We shall not forget them.

REMARKS BY AMBASSADOR HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. Secretary General, Mr. President, Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, the United States of America was the unified command during the fighting in Korea and it is accordingly my privilege to speak on behalf of the 16 member states who contributed troops: That is, Austrialia, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, the Union of South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America. With the men of the Republic of Korea, who carried such a large part of the load, these men carried on the fighting, sustained the losses, and won the victory.

The passage of time since these men died has made it all the clearer that this victory was worth winning. At stake was the very existence of the organization, the United Nations. At stake was the question of whether peace-loving nations could band themselves together to repel a ruthless and unprincipled aggression—or whether the doctrine that might makes right would triumph and, having triumphed in Korea, would then, without much doubt, spread to the rest of the world. Stated in the simplest terms, such was the issue.

The men whom we remember here today faced this issue. They proved their capacity to endure and to conquer. They won their war—and they preserved for us the chance to go forward. Their sacrifice reminds us that we do not measure man's life by its length but by its height. Indeed, the English poet Ben Jonson saw this long ago when he said:

"It is not growing like a tree,
In bulk, doth make man better be;
Or standing long an oak, three hundred year,
To fall a log at last, dry, bald and sere:
A lily of a day
Is fairer far in May,
Although it fall and die that night;
It was the plant and flower of light.
In small proportions we just beauties see:
And in short measures life may perfect be."

For the future let the memories of our United Nations dead inspire us with the thought that the very existence of the United Nations must always depend on the willingness of the members to back up words by deeds—and in some cases by the blood of our sons.

It is fitting indeed that we here, in the presence of the highest ranking officials of the United Nations, should bow our heads in prayer, as we have just done, and that we should for these great ends dedicate this plaque.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR CARVILLE, OF NEVADA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it is my sad duty to inform the Senate of the death several hours ago, in Reno, Nev., of

one of its former distinguished Members, the Honorable Edward Peter Carville.

Formerly a practicing attorney, United States district attorney, judge, Governor, and United States Senator, Edward Carville was indeed one of Nevada's most illustrious citizens.

He served his country and his State well in this Chamber from July 25, 1945, until January 3, 1947.

Born in the small community of Mound Valley, Nev., on May 14, 1885, Senator Carville attended the public elementary and high schools in Elko County, Nev. He was graduated from the University of Notre Dame in 1909.

After admission to the bar of Nevada, he practiced law in Elko, before becoming district attorney of Elko County in 1912. He served in that position until 1918.

He served as district judge of that county—one of the largest and richest counties in the United States—from 1928 to 1934. From 1934 to 1938 he was United States attorney for Nevada.

He was elected Governor of Nevada in 1938, and was reelected in 1942, following which he continued to serve as Governor until his resignation at the time when he was appointed to the United States Senate.

A father, a quiet man and a kindly soul, he accomplished much for his fellowmen in his years of public service. Senator Carville will long be remembered as a true son of Nevada, as has been recognized not only by the people of his State, but by his country as well.

The State of Nevada and the Nation have indeed suffered a great loss. I feel sure, Mr. President, that all the other Members of this body join me in expressing to the members of Senator Carville's family our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy.

DEATH OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE ELTON WATKINS, OF OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have the very sad duty, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER], of announcing to the Senate that the Honorable Elton Watkins, formerly a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Oregon, has passed away.

Elton Watkins was a prominent figure and an able leader in public life in the State of Oregon. He was educated at Washington and Lee University; held a bachelor of laws degree from Georgetown University Law School, and held a master of laws degree from George Washington Law School.

He is survived by his widow and his son, Dr. Elton Watkins, Jr., and by a daughter, Wilma Virginia Weber.

To his widow and his children, Mrs. Morse and I express our deepest sympathy in the great loss they have suffered, and we pray that there will be vouchsafed to them the spiritual strength to sustain them in the hour of their bereavement.

Mr. President, Elton Watkins, as a Member of the House of Representatives, was very active in sponsoring and supporting wise and important legislation. He was a diligent worker for legislation designed for the benefit of veterans. He was very active in connection with the Soldier Bonus Act of 1924, and supported and worked ardently for the Immigration Act of 1925.

Mr. President, Mr. Elton was assistant United States attorney for Oregon in 1919; he was a Member of the United States House of Representatives, from the Third District of Oregon, from 1923 to 1925. He was instrumental in securing for Portland, Oreg., the present United States Veterans' Hospital. He was active in promoting the pay increase for postal employees.

During World War I, he was a member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He was Democratic nominee for United States Senator from Oregon in 1930, and was a presidential elector in 1920, 1936, and 1944. He was a member of the Oregon and the Multnomah County Bar Associations, and made his home in Portland, Oreg.

I knew Mr. Watkins very well. He was always on the side of those who advocated and supported the general welfare of the people in connection with issue after issue in our State. I wish to express for the RECORD—and I know I speak for all the people of my State, including members of both parties—my feeling that in the passing of Elton Watkins, Oregon has lost an outstanding citizen and a valiant public servant. His monument is his record of public service.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the senior Senator from Oregon concerning the career of Elton Watkins.

Mr. Watkins was a neighbor of mine. His son, now a physician, had been a student at the high school where Mrs. Neuberger was a teacher. We knew the family well, and we were great admirers of Mr. Watkins' contribution to our State and Nation. His loss will be felt by our State for many years to come.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE VICE ADMIRAL FRANCIS X. McINERNEY, UNITED STATES NAVY, RETIRED

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to pay a brief tribute to a patriotic and heroic citizen of Wyoming, a vice admiral of the United States Navy, who unfortunately died suddenly on June 24 last at the Naval Hospital in San Diego, Calif.

I refer to Vice Adm. Francis Xavier McInerney, who, following his graduation from the Naval Academy in June 1920, continued actively in the service of the Navy until about 2 years ago.

During his career he won the Bronze Star, the Navy Cross, the Presidential Unit Citation, the Silver Star Medal, and the Legion of Merit.

He was the son of a pioneer family of the State of Wyoming. The McInerneys were loved and respected by all who knew them.

He was appointed to the Naval Academy from the city of Cheyenne, my own hometown. I very well remember the date of his selection by the late Senator Francis E. Warren.

He served with distinction, as the awards indicate; and the people of my State are universally distressed at his untimely death. I am sure they all wish to express deepest sympathy to the family he has left.

Vice Admiral McInerney was only 57 years of age. He was born in Cheyenne, Wyo., on March 28, 1899, the son of Thomas and Phyllis O'Neal McInerney.

He attended the University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo., for 1 year before his appointment to the United States Naval Academy from Wyoming in June 1917. Graduated and commissioned ensign with the class of 1921 (A) on June 4, 1920, he subsequently advanced to the rank of captain on June 20, 1942. His selection to rear admiral, approved by the President on November 21, 1947, was confirmed by the Senate on January 23, 1948, to date from September 1, 1947. On June 30, 1955, he was transferred to the retired list of the United States Navy, and was advanced to the rank of vice admiral on the basis of combat awards.

After graduation from the Naval Academy in June 1920, he served until June 1921 in the U. S. S. *New Mexico*, flagship of Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet. For 6 years thereafter he had duty in destroyers of the Pacific and Atlantic Fleets, including the U. S. S. *Burns*, U. S. S. *Williamson* and again in the U. S. S. *Burns*. From June 1927 to June 1929 he was assigned to the Naval Torpedo Station, Newport, R. I., after which he served for 3 years in the U. S. S. *Dobbin*.

In June 1932 he reported for postgraduate instruction in law, under the supervision of the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, at George Washington University Law School, Washington, D. C., and received the degree of bachelor of laws. He was admitted to practice in the District Court of the District of Columbia on November 20, 1935, and later in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Between June 1935 and June 1938 he served in the U. S. S. *Concord* in Pacific waters, after which he was an instructor at the Postgraduate School, Annapolis, Md.

He assumed command of the U. S. S. *Smith* in May 1940, and was commanding that destroyer when the United States entered World War II on December 8, 1941. In February 1942, while in command of a destroyer division, he became the senior officer in destroyers attached to the ANZAC Squadron in the South Pacific, and as such participated in the early strikes in the Solomons and the Battle of the Coral Sea. He received a Letter of Commendation, with Ribbon, from the Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet, for "exemplary action on May 7, 1942, while in command of three destroyers attached to a task group when this group was attacked by enemy torpedo planes followed by enemy bombing planes, repelling the enemy attack without damage to our own forces and with the enemy loss of several planes."

In March 1943 he assumed command of Destroyer Squadron 21, first of the new 2,100-ton destroyers. These ships, under his command, operated in the

Solomons in the First and Second Battles of Kula Gulf, and rescued survivors of the U. S. S. *Helena*.

As I have already said, he was awarded the Bronze Star Medal with Combat "V," the Navy Cross, Presidential Unit Citation and Ribbon, the Silver Star Medal, and the Legion of Merit with Combat "V." Extracts from the citations read as follows:

Bronze Star Medal:

For meritorious achievement as commander of Destroyer Squadron 21 operating as a component of a task force during combined minelaying and bombardment missions in the enemy Japanese-held Kolombangara and New Georgia areas, Solomon Islands, on the night of May 13, 1943.

Navy Cross:

For extraordinary heroism as commanding officer of a squadron of destroyers in action against enemy Japanese forces in the Solomon Islands on July 5–6, 1943. As part of a task force in close support of the landing of United States troops at Rice Anchorage on New Georgia Island (he) skillfully led his group of destroyers through restricted submarine infested waters and effectively bombarded enemy shore batteries and installations in the face of intense hostile gun and torpedo fire * * * succeeded in sinking or severely damaging all of the hostile vessels.

Presidential Unit Citation, U. S. S. *Nicholas:*

For outstanding performance in action against enemy Japanese forces off Kolombangara Island, New Georgia Group, Solomon Islands, on the night of July 5–6, 1943. After waging a vigorous battle as part of the small task force which destroyed a superior Japanese surface force, the *Nicholas* remained behind with an accompanying destroyer to save survivors of the torpedoed U. S. S. *Helena*. * * * With the other destroyer (she) sank or damaged an enemy light cruiser and 2 destroyers with deadly torpedo and gunfire, returning to the area after each onslaught to complete the heroic rescue of more than 700 survivors.

Silver Star Medal:

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action as commander of a task group of destroyers during the engagement with enemy Japanese forces off Kolombangara Island, Solomon Islands, in the early morning of July 13, 1943.

Legion of Merit:

For exceptionally meritorious conduct * * * as commander of a naval task unit of destroyers which covered the operations of other naval units engaged in the rescue of about 165 survivors of the sunken U. S. S. *Helena* who had reached shore on the enemy-occupied island of Vella Lavella, New Georgia Island, on July 15–16, 1943. Skillfully conducting his unit during the night from Guadalcanal through the "slot" to the northward of Vella Lavella to appropriate positions (he) deliberately risked observation and attack by hostile aircraft and possible attack by superior enemy naval forces based nearby at Shortland Islands, to permit the rescue of the survivors of the *Helena*. By his strategic ability, and sound judgment, he was responsible for the successful completion of the operations of the covering and rescue units and the return through the "slot" on the morning of July 16, without damage to his forces.

In August 1943 he became representative of commander destroyers in the South Pacific and in March 1944 was named Chief of Staff for Commander Operational Training Command, Pacific Fleet. For his services in this capacity he received a letter of commendation from the Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet, and wears a bronze star on his commendation ribbon.

He assumed command of the battleship *Washington* on June 5, 1945, at San Pedro Bay, Leyte, P. I. Under his command the U. S. S. *Washington* returned to the United States in the summer of 1945 to join the Atlantic Fleet. After participation in Navy Day—1945—ceremonies at Philadelphia, Pa., she was assigned troop-transport duty, and in November of that year became part of the "magic carpet" fleet. On her last voyage bringing veterans to their homeland, she encountered a series of severe hurricanes.

In October 1946 he reported as commanding officer of the Naval Receiving Station, Naval Station, Treasure Island, San Francisco, Calif., and on February 5, 1948, was ordered to command Cruiser Division 15. He assumed command of Cruiser Division 3, March 11, 1949, and on July 17, 1949, was transferred to command of Cruiser Division 5. He remained in that assignment until September 1949 when he was ordered to report to the Commander Battleships-Cruisers Pacific Fleet, for further assignment.

In January 1950 he became Commander Amphibious Training Command, Pacific Fleet. On September 24, 1951, he assumed command of Amphibious Group 3, Pacific Fleet, and in November 1952 transferred to command of Service Squadron 3.

For meritorious service as Commander Joint Amphibious Task Force 7 and Commander Task Force 76, from 14 to 16 October 1953, and as Commander Task Force 92 from 21 November 1952 to 13 February 1953, during operations against enemy aggressor forces in Korea—

He was awarded a Gold Star in lieu of the Second Bronze Star Medal with Combat "V." The citation continues in part:

As Commander Joint Amphibious Task Force 7, Rear Admiral McInerney conducted a highly successful amphibious training exercise along the enemy-held beach at Kojo, Korea, without sustaining a single casualty. This operation was of exceptional planning value to the prosecution of the Korean conflict. As Commander Task Force 92, he was charged with the responsibility of providing logistic support to combatant units in Korean waters. Through the development of a technique of underway replenishment, he was instrumental in helping the 7th Fleet to maintain almost continual pressure on the enemy in Korea, reducing to a minimum the necessity for trips into port for upkeep and replenishment. Under his direction, the ships of his force established numerous records in the field of logistics. By his outstanding professional skill, sound judgment, and steadfast devotion to duty, (he) contributed materially to the success of the naval effort in the Korean conflict.

Ordered detached from command of Service Squadron 3, he reported in March 1953 as senior member, Board of Naval Inspection and Survey, West Coast Section, with headquarters in San Francisco, Calif. In October 1954 he became president of the Permanent General Court Martial, 11th Naval District, with headquarters in San Diego, Calif., continuing to serve in that capacity until relieved of all active duty, pending his retirement effective June 30, 1955.

In addition to the Navy Cross, the Silver Star Medal, the Legion of Merit with Combat V, Bronze Star Medal with Gold Star and Combat V, the commendation ribbon with bronze star, and the Presidential Unit Citation ribbon, Vice Admiral McInerney has the World War I Victory Medal, Atlantic Fleet Clasp; the American Defense Service Medal, Fleet Clasp; the American Campaign Medal; the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with three engagement stars; World War II Victory Medal; the Navy Occupation Service Medal; the China Service Medal; National Defense Service Medal; Korean Service Medal; and the United Nations Service Medal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., June 27, 1956.

Desiring to be temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR., a Senator from the State of Delaware, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. FREAR thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

CLAIMS OF VATICAN CITY FOR LOSSES CAUSED BY THE ARMED FORCES DURING WORLD WAR II

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2315, H. R. 10766.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10766) to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Montana to make a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the sum of $964,199.35 in full and final settlement of all claims of the Vatican City for losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces in the Papal Domain Castel Gandolfo during World War II. The same amount is authorized to be appropriated for that purpose.

Castel Gandolfo was accidentally damaged on February 2, 10, May 31, and June 4, 1944, by bombs dropped from United States planes in raids on nearby military targets.

This amount has been approved by the Defense Establishment and by the State Department, and the bill has already been passed by the House. I urge that it be passed by the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate, and is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 10766) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill (H. R. 10766) to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II was passed. I have consulted the minority leader, and he is agreeable to such action.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Rhode Island to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which House bill 10766 was passed.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 523, 78th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. LANKFORD of Maryland, and Mr. KEARNS of Pennsylvania, to serve as members of the National Memorial Stadium Commission, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10003) making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7 and 16 to the bill, and concurred therein.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, and 18 to the bill, and concurred therein.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3149) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to permit air carriers to grant free or reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CARLYLE, Mr. MACK of Illinois, Mr. WOLVERTON, and Mr. HINSHAW were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAHON, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. SIKES, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. RILEY, Mr. DEANE, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. CANNON, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. SCRIVNER, Mr. FORD, Mr. MILLER of Maryland, Mr. OSTERTAG, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 11926) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, to permit the negotiation of commercial leases at atomic energy communities, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 2512. An act to amend the act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving in such forces;

H. R. 6782. An act to amend section 7 of "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 7641. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10660. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 11926) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, to permit the negotiation of commercial leases at atomic energy communities, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

OPPOSITION TO DISCRIMINATORY ACTION AGAINST CITIZENS BECAUSE OF RELIGION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I submit for appropriate reference, a resolution opposing discriminatory action against United States citizens because of religious faith or affiliations.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution lie at the desk for 2 legislative days, so that other Members of the Senate who may wish to join in sponsoring the resolution may have an opportunity to do so.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New York; and, under the rule, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 298) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the protection of the integrity of United States citizenship and of the proper rights of United States citizens in their pursuit of lawful trade, travel, and other activities abroad is a cardinal function of United States sovereignty; and

Whereas it is a primary principle of our Nation that there shall be no distinction among United States citizens based on their individual religious affiliations and since any attempt by foreign nations to create such distinctions among our citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to United States citizens generally is repugnant to our laws and intolerable to our principles—an attitude which our Government has historically and successfully maintained in our relations with foreign countries on several notable occasions; and

Whereas recently certain United States servicemen, solely because of their religious

faith, affiliation or even derivation have been denied assignments to certain United States military bases abroad and these and other United States citizens have been refused entry and travel visas by the governments of certain foreign countries, which governments have also directed and organized a trade and economic boycott against American citizens and classes of American citizens based solely on the religious faith, affiliation or religious derivation of such citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that (a) the President of the United States should proclaim to all nations that the Government of the United States tolerates no distinction based on religious faith among its own citizens just as it makes none among the citizens and subjects of any other country and that it regards any such distinctions directed against United States citizens as incompatible with the relations that should exist among friendly nations; and (b) no agency of the United States shall refrain from assigning any otherwise qualified American citizen to military, diplomatic or other service within any foreign country solely because of that country's objection on grounds of religious affiliation to any American or class of Americans; and (c) every treaty, convention, or executive agreement entered into or renewed between any foreign state and the United States should expressly provide that no United States citizens shall, solely because of religious affiliation or derivation, be denied the advantages of travel, employment or trade or any other benefit made possible by such treaty, convention or agreement.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the resolution declares the sense of the Senate with regard to certain concepts of American citizenship, and with regard to the intolerable practices of certain foreign governments against some of our citizens, and distinctions being made among them, on the basis of their religious faith, all without protest by our own Government.

Mr. President, what I am about to say about this resolution reflects only my own views and observations. I do not purport to speak for other cosponsors of the resolution.

I wish to emphasize that my motive in bringing the resolution before the Senate and the country at this time is not partisan or political. I am, indeed, critical of the Department of State and of the Department of Defense for their acquiescences in the practices complained of. But I make this criticism without regard to partisanship and without any thought of political advantage. This is a matter which is of concern to all Americans, regardless of party. It involves the standing and prestige of our Nation abroad.

It may be that some of the practices with which the resolution deals were in existence before the Eisenhower administration took office and were also sanctioned by the previous administration. I do not know. I do not have any evidence that this is so. All the evidence I have received dates back only a year or so. And I have been agitating this matter since the first day that these practices came to my attention.

The reason why I am bringing this matter before the Senate at this time is that an agreement with Saudi Arabia covering the use of base facilities in that country is now being renegotiated. I feel it essential that the views of the Senate on this subject be conveyed to the State and Defense Departments while they are currently engaged in renegotiating the agreement with the Government of Saudi Arabia.

One of the oldest traditions of international law is the duty and function of every country to safeguard the proper and lawful interests of its nationals and citizens abroad. This includes, on the part of each sovereign nation, the duty to protect the life and liberty of its citizens while they are properly and legally traveling through or residing in foreign countries. Clearly implied is the duty of each sovereign nation to protect and defend the integrity of the citizenship status of its citizens in their business, travels, or residence abroad.

No country has recognized this function more clearly in past years than has the United States of America. We have always maintained, in the most vigorous and forceful manner possible, that American citizenship affords to every citizen the protection of his Government in all legitimate pursuits, activities, and travels abroad. We have always taken the position, as a nation, that the might and power of the United States accompanies each American citizen in all his legal and proper activities and travels abroad.

Above all, our Government has always maintained that it was not the concern or the right of any foreign government to make any distinctions, as among American citizens, in any way, shape, or manner. Thus, one of the underlying causes of the War of 1812 with Great Britain was the British insistence on seizing American naturalized citizens, former British subjects, and impressing them into the British military service. We fought a long and difficult war with Great Britain on this and related points. Our very National Capital was attacked and seized—and this very Capitol Building and the White House were burned—by British forces in the course of that war. We won our point. The doctrine of the freedom of the seas was established, and the doctrine of the integrity of American citizenship was authoritatively established.

Indeed, there is a statute on our books, enacted on July 27, 1868, requiring the President of the United States and the Department of State to take immediate action whenever the rights of any American citizen are violated or threatened by a foreign state.

This right, Mr. President, does not extend to just some American citizens. It extends to all American citizens. In this law no distinction is made between citizens of one religious faith and citizens of another, between citizens of one national origin and citizens of another. Indeed, this right was specifically defined by a former Secretary of State of the United States, Louis Cass, when he said that the object of our foreign policy is—

Not merely to protect a Protestant in a Catholic country, a Catholic in a Protestant country, and a Jew in a Christian country, but an American in all countries.

This, Mr. President, is one of the very cornerstones of American foreign policy. This was originally one of the most important and one of the most basic functions in the conduct of American foreign policy, as it is one of the basic functions in the conduct of all foreign policy by all countries in the world.

But what is going on today, so far as the United States is concerned?

Our country is today the leader of the free world, allegedly at the zenith of our world power and influence. Yet where do we stand today with regard to the traditional doctrine of the integrity of American citizenship? How valiantly does our Government uphold that doctrine?

The truth is that we have virtually abandoned and discarded it. Today, we tolerate on the part of other countries practices which we would never have tolerated in an earlier day, when we were much less of a power in world affairs.

I refer specifically, Mr. President, to the practices of some Arab countries with regard to American citizens, and, more specifically, to the policies of the Government of Saudi Arabia.

How does the Government of Saudi Arabia treat American citizens? Let me enumerate some of the affronts which we suffer today without official complaint, remonstration, or protest.

The Saudi Arabian Government has made it a practice to refuse both entry and transit privileges to any American citizen of Jewish faith or of Jewish descent. American citizens of such faith and descent on board planes which are forced, by emergency, to land in Saudi Arabian airports—and airports of some other Arab countries, as well—are treated like pariahs or lepers, and are denied even the basic courtesies of temporary emergency hospitality.

These Americans are frequently locked up until their plane takes off again, or are forbidden to leave the plane at all.

The Saudi Arabian Government has decreed and enforced a boycott against American firms and corporations in which Americans of Jewish faith have an interest. Questionnaires are circulated to all American firms doing business with Saudi Arabia, asking the impertinent question and sometimes impossible to answer, as to whether any Jews are associated with the firm.

Finally—and most insupportable of all—the Saudi Arabian Government, having granted to the United States the right to construct an airbase in Saudi Arabia, presumes to tell us that we must not station on this base or allow to land on this base any American soldier or other individual who is of Jewish faith or descent.

Americans of Jewish faith and descent, including GI's, are restrained by our Government from boarding any plane, military or otherwise, which is scheduled to land, even in transit, at the airports of most Arab countries.

Our Government accepts the boycott against certain American firms on the incredible basis that so-called Jewish interests are involved in these firms.

Finally, our State Department studiously refrains from sending to the American base in Saudi Arabia any American soldier who is of Jewish faith or descent.

Recently Secretary of State Dulles, in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, called the practices of the Saudi Arabia Government to which I have referred, an "eccentricity," a mannerism or characteristic rather odd and unusual, but surely to be politely and graciously accepted in all tolerance and affability.

Mr. President, I do not consider this an eccentricity of manner or character. I consider this a violent attack upon the whole concept of American citizenship. I consider the basic attitude of the United States Government in this matter to be reprehensible and insupportable.

Mr. President, I have spoken out on this matter before. I have written letters to the State Department and the Defense Department. I have made protests. I have made speeches on the floor of the Senate. They have been to no avail. The State Department and the Defense Department have replied politely that they do not approve of these practices on the part of the Saudi Arabian Government, but have shown no disposition to do anything other than to say to me, "That's too bad."

After all, it would not do to speak out loud and clear. The Government of Saudi Arabia might take offense. Today we seem to stand in awesome respect of this Government, the most feudalistic and totalitarian in the world, which has given us airbase rights and does have deposits and reserves of oil.

Mr. President, I believe that military and security considerations are very important. I believe in military preparedness. I believe in a posture of military as well as economic strength in the present world situation. I believe that our present system of off-shore bases is an integral part of our security. I believe that we must look after our supplies of oil, both at home and abroad, for the sake of the security not only of ourselves, but of our friends and allies throughout the free world. I believe that our Government should do all that is necessary and proper to protect and advance these vital considerations.

But, Mr. President, I do not believe that these are the only considerations to guide our foreign policy. I think—and I believe the country thinks—that it not only fails to help, but it actually hurts our national security and our position in world affairs if we do not stand up for our traditional principles, if we do not practice abroad what we preach at home—in short, if we do not adhere to high principles in the conduct of our foreign policy.

I think we lose the respect of friend and foe alike if we make expediency our guide; if we wink at violations of our high principles in the name of practical considerations; if we compromise with principle in order to gain some fancied military advantage.

In specific regard to the policies pursued by Saudi Arabia in which we appear, in the eyes of the world, to acquiesce, I think we lose the respect of Saudi Arabia and of every other government in the world when we seem so eager to have a base in Saudi Arabia and to enjoy the favor and good will of the Saudi Arabian Government and of other Arab governments, that we neglect our traditional principles and tolerate practices which are repugnant both to the national conscience and to our national traditions.

I believe that the Government of Saudi Arabia will respect us more if we stand up for our principles and refuse to accommodate ourselves to the intolerable prejudices of the Saudi Arabian Government in the name of either oil or base rights.

The free world needs Saudi Arabian oil and the security interests of the free world are, I assume, advanced by the maintenance of an American airbase in Saudi Arabia. But that is a two-way street. Saudi Arabia needs the revenue from that oil—the dollar revenue—and Saudi Arabia enjoys the security which the presence of an American airbase within that country affords.

We must, I believe, deal with Saudi Arabia as with an equal, not as if we were a weakling nation seeking favors.

Mr. President, as I have suggested, we have not always been as craven in our relationships with other countries as we seem to be today with Saudi Arabia. I believe that the spirit of the great American naval hero, Stephen Decatur, must gaze unbelievingly down at us today, as he sees the tiny republic now grown great in whose interests he fought in the Mediterranean against the might and power of the Ottoman Empire more than a century ago, endure, without protest, at the hands of Saudi Arabia, an economic boycott directed against some Americans and a ban against the admission of some Americans to an American airbase in Saudi Arabia.

Less than 75 years ago, Mr. President, the President of the United States appointed a gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Anthony M. Keiley, to be the American Minister to the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The United States Government was then officially informed by the Austro-Hungarian Government that this gentleman from Virginia could not be accredited and was unacceptable in Vienna because of the fact that he was married to a lady of the Jewish faith.

What was the reaction of the United States Government at that time? Did we accept this declaration of persona non grata by the Austro-Hungarian Government on the basis of the religious faith of the wife of the individual whom we had designated to represent us at Vienna? No, we did not. We had a Secretary of State at that time, a Mr. Bayard, who replied, in a note to the Austro-Hungarian Government, in language which could well be used today:

> It is not within the power of the President, nor the Congress, nor of any judicial tribunal in the United States to take or even hear testimony, in any mode, to inquire into or decide upon the religious belief of any official, and the proposition to allow this to be done by any foreign government is necessarily and a fortiori inadmissible.
>
> To suffer an infraction of this essential principle would lead to a disfranchisement of our citizens because of their religious belief, and thus impair or destroy the most important end which our constitution of government was intended to secure.

Mr. President, on that occasion the United States Government refused to accept the grounds for rejection of Mr. Keiley, of Virginia, and even though Mr. Keiley asked to have his name withdrawn, the United States Government, for a long time thereafter, declined to appoint a minister to the Government of Austro-Hungary, then one of the most powerful nations in the world.

Mr. President, there is an even more recent, and even more appropriate precedent—a precedent so similar that it is uncanny. I refer to the controversy between our Government and the Government of Czarist Russia in regard to the refusal of Russia to permit Americans of Jewish faith to enter or travel through Russia.

That was in the first decade of the present century. Czarist Russia was engaging at that time in large-scale repression against Jews. Pogroms were common. These outrages were, of course, directed against Russian Jews. But then the Government of Czarist Russia took it upon itself to decline to honor passports issued by the United States Government to American citizens, if those American citizens happened to be of the Jewish faith.

It happens that the American Minister to Russia at that time was a Mr. John W. Foster who was, in fact, the grandfather of the present Secretary of State of the United States. Mr. Foster, who was later himself to become Secretary of State, did not view the actions of the Czarist Government in the same light as that in which his grandson views the activities of the Saudi Arabian Government. He did not view this as an "eccentricity" on the part of the Czarist regime.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish to compliment the Senator from New York on his very fine speech dealing with the failure of the State Department to insist on permission to travel and permission of entry in certain countries. The Senator is referring to the same Secretary of State, a descendant of a very courageous Secretary of State, who will not even issue a passport for a United States Senator who wishes to travel to Israel if he intends first to visit an Arab country.

It would seem to me that the United States Government is cowardly indeed when, because of the fear of offending the military dictator of Egypt, or the complete and absolute monarch of Saudi Arabia, or the dictator of any of the other Arab countries, it will not issue a passport to a United States Senator who intends to visit Israel, but who first expects to enter an Arab country.

Certainly I wish that at some time or other someone in the State Department would have a little courage to issue a passport and to have an Israeli visa affixed to it, and then to let the Arab

countries decide whether they will deny entry to a United States Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives or even the head of a Government agency because the passport carries an Israeli visa.

I know of no time when the United States of America seems to have been so intimidated by the fear that we might incur the displeasure of men who, because of great oil interests, can dictate the policies not only of Jews, but of Members of the United States Congress who seek to obtain information regarding the lack of policy and the continued efforts to appease those who today govern Arab countries.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his statement, which I find very enlightening and interesting. I have heard that even Members of Congress and other high officials were denied passports unless they first gave assurance that they would not visit other countries before or after visiting Israel. That has not happened to me personally but I have no doubt that it may have happened to other Members of the Congress. I am not so much concerned by the effect of this policy on myself, a Jew and Member of the Senate, as I am about what has happened to our concept of democracy and equality, when we say to a Jewish soldier, "You cannot serve in any of the world in which your Government has vital interests, because of your religious faith."

To me that is an intolerable situation. It is intolerable to me to say to an American soldier who runs exactly the same risks as any other American serviceman, and who has exactly the same devotion and exactly the same love of country and of the traditions of our Nation, "You are going to be treated as a second-class citizen because of your religious faith. You are not going to be permitted to serve your country."

In 1654 the first Jews came to this country from Brazil. That was more than 300 years ago. One of the first things this little group of Jews demanded was not a special privilege, but the right to bear arms with their fellow citizens and with them to defend their country. They insisted on the right to fight for their country and to serve their country in exactly the same way, to the same degree, and in the same circumstances as other citizens.

Yet, our Government repudiates what has been the history and the tradition of our Nation ever since it was founded 180 years ago. Even after we have become a great power, the greatest in the world today, we are willing to stand idly by and supinely accept affronts and insults on the part of other countries. We are not willing to stand up for our long-cherished principles of treating all our citizens with exact equality and of expecting all our citizens to do their duty in exactly the same degree and manner.

Mr. President, Mr. Foster, who was then Minister to Russia, undertook an exchange of correspondence with his own Government and with the Government of Czarist Russia, protesting strongly against these practices of the Czarist regime.

Nor was the State Department the only agency of the Government to take note of this situation. The President of the United States spoke out on the matter. On December 4, 1911, there was introduced into the House of Representatives by Representative William Sulzer, of New York, a joint resolution calling upon the President of the United States to terminate, at the earliest possible time, the treaty of commerce and friendship with the Government of Russia on the grounds of the discriminations practiced against American Jews.

This resolution was passed by the House of Representatives. It was passed by the United States Senate. And, in fact, in 1913 the United States did terminate, on these grounds, its treaty of commerce and friendship with Czarist Russia.

Mr. President, we had vital interests in Russia in those days. We obtained considerable amounts of strategic minerals and other material from Russia. There was a profitable trade in furs and foodstuffs. There were vital diplomatic interests at stake, too. The world was forming into two armed camps. The interests of the United States lay pretty clearly with England and France, which were, in turn, allied with Russia. But did we let this stand in our way? No; we broke off our commercial treaty with Czarist Russia because of the principle involved.

Mr. President, we do not have a treaty of commerce and friendship with Saudi Arabia, but we do have a base agreement with that Government. That base agreement has run its course and has expired. It is in the process of renegotiation. I believe, Mr. President, that in any new agreement—and I hope there will be one—there should be a clause which protects the sanctity and integrity of American citizenship and puts an immediate end to the unseemly and undignified acquiescence on the part of the United States Government to the prejudicial, discriminatory, and intolerable attitude of the Saudi Arabian Government toward Americans of Jewish faith.

Certainly we should not allow the Saudi Arabian Government to tell us which American soldiers we can admit to an American airbase and which American soldiers can land on a base which flies the American flag.

Mr. President, a great many individuals and organizations in this country have expressed their deepest concern over the situation I have described, and have petitioned me, and other Members of the Senate, to take such action as we properly can in this matter. One of these organizations is the American Jewish Congress. The American Jewish Congress has, over the past year, undertaken a comprehensive study of this situation—of the practices of the Saudi Arabian Government and of the precedents of the past in similar situations. It has shown intense concern, and has been very active in gathering information and background material on this subject.

Very recently the American Jewish Congress published what it called a white paper entitled "The Arab Campaign Against American Jews." This document contains a great deal of very useful and illuminating material of a factual nature, as well as an expression of the viewpoint of the American Jewish Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the white paper issued by the American Jewish Congress under the title I have already cited be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I think it contains material which should be available to every Member of the Senate in considering the resolution we have introduced today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the American Jewish Committee, to which I have just referred, has also done a comprehensive and constructive job of collecting factual material and of assessing the situation. This organization has published a document entitled "The Assault on American Citizenship," a title which very appropriately describes the evils which the resolution I have submitted is designed to remedy. I should like to put this document also into the RECORD, but I understand that the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] intends to do so.

Mr. President, I assume that the resolution which we have submitted today will be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. I hope the resolution will be speedily considered and favorably reported by the committee, and I pray that the Senate will promptly act upon it; that the sense of the Senate will so impress the Secretary of State and the United States Government that appropriate action will be taken in the days ahead.

EXHIBIT 1

THE ARAB CAMPAIGN AGAINST AMERICAN JEWS—A STATEMENT OF THE FACTS AND A CONSIDERATION OF AMERICA'S MORAL AND DIPLOMATIC RESPONSIBILITY

FOREWORD

One of the least known byproducts of current Arab-Israel hostility is the widespread campaign by Arab League countries against Jews in the United States. Internal anti-Jewish campaigns indulged in by Arab States at the expense of their own subjects may be a matter for their sovereign discretion and even then may contravene commitments undertaken pursuant to the United Nations Charter. But efforts to package and export anti-Semitism to this country, especially when that anti-Jewish sentiment is directed at American citizens, becomes a matter demanding immediate remedial action by our own Government.

The principal forms of discrimination currently employed by the Arab States against American Jews may be classified into three categories: (1) Arab denial of entry or transit visas to American Jews; (2) Arab boycott of American Jewish businesses; (3) the establishment and subvention of large-scale Arab propaganda centers to disseminate anti-Semitic literature in the United States. Each of these is discussed in detail at a later point in this paper.

Some of these anti-Jewish discriminatory practices have been continued over a period of years without occasioning more than gentle rebuke from any agency of the United States. Whatever expressions of disapproval have recently been made by our State Department have tended to be perfunctory and

short lived, limited to the writing of notes and the routine exchange of correspondence. Not once in recent years has this country ventured beyond mild protest into any form of action.

Encouraged by this seeming official casualness, if not indifference, the Arab States continue to act virtually as they please in the mistreatment of American Jews, perfectly confident that our Government will not uphold the rights of its Jewish citizens. The apathy and apparent indifference of our Government has served not only to intensify Arab hostility to Jews within their own territories but to increase and introduce anti-Semitism in new and unexpected quarters here.

The most recent illustration of State Department thinking on these issues may be found in the testimony of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 24, 1956. Those portions of Mr. Dulles' statement that are relevant to matters discussed in this memorandum are contained in the following colloquy with Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota:

"Senator HUMPHREY. Speaking of Americans who are in Saudi Arabia, is it true what I read in the paper here, and which I spoke about in the Senate, and which today the Pentagon apparently seems to feel is true, but I want to get all departments in on it, to the effect that arrangements have been arrived at between our Government and Saudi Arabia under the terms of the Mutual Security Agreement and our air base at Dhahran, that certain American personnel are not permitted to be stationed in Saudi Arabia, American personnel of the Jewish faith?

"Secretary DULLES. It may be. I think that for may years, not just in recent years, but that running over a long period of years, there has been a prohibition on Jews in Saudi Arabia.

"Senator HUMPHREY. I mean Americans; I am talking about citizens of the United States of America.

"Secretary DULLES. I am talking about persons of Jewish faith.

"Senator HUMPHREY. Yes; but Americans.

"Secretary DULLES. Yes, of any nationality.

"Senator HUMPHREY. Is it true that American businessmen who may be of the Jewish faith are not permitted to engage in commercial enterprise in Saudi Arabia with our agreement and our recognition of that discrimination?

"Secretary DULLES. No, not with our agreement or recognition of it. The King of Saudi Arabia regards himself as the primary custodian of the sacred places of the Moslem faith, and they have a long time been extremely rigorous in the practice of the Moslem law.

"I was there—when I was there visiting King Ibn Saud, it was during the period of the Ramadan, where from the very time the sun rises in the morning—and at that time of the year it rises very early—until it sets at night, no one can take a drop of liquid or a bite of food, and the former King Ibn Saud was an aging feeble man, but he nevertheless stuck rigorously to that, and there is another prohibition that applies there also. There is not a drop of liquor that is allowed to be sold or used in the whole area.

"Now, they have got some practices which we may think curious.

* * * * *

"Now, we do not like or approve of or acquiesce, except perforce in any such practices, such as that, but we do have to recognize the fact that Saudi Arabia is an ally, became an ally in the first instance, through the conversations and subsequent communications with President Roosevelt, and then it was confirmed by President Truman, and we have a very special relationship there with that Government.

"That does not mean we approve of all its practices at all. It does mean we get along together in a way which is of mutual advantage.

"We, perforce, accommodate ourselves to certain practices they have which we do not like; they, perhaps, accommodate themselves to certain of our idiosyncrasies which they do not like, but on the whole, they have a pretty arbitrary rule, largely dictated by the strict tenets of the Moslem faith."

The American Jewish Congress is an organization of American Jews whose membership is generally sympathetic to Israel. But our concern over the serious errors in national policy and diplomatic judgment discussed in this paper does not derive from either of these factors. The injury and affront we discuss here is sustained by all Americans who are currently made witness to arrogant Arab violation and disregard of the rights of American citizenship. We respectfully submit that the time is past due for our diplomatic representatives to resist such encroachments upon American rights with firmness and dignity.

We are not unmindful that much is at stake. American officials in high places have made it their business to emphasize frequently that the present unusual solicitude in dealing with Arab governments is designed to protect military and economic relations presumed to be vital to our material interests. We are told repeatedly that important commercial and industrial undertakings remain possible only because of American willingness to compromise and to accommodate Arab prejudice. We are warned that substantial American interests will be put in jeopardy if Arab-American relations are, in any way, strained or impaired. It is even intimated that we must concede something, even at the expense of a certain number of our citizens, in order not to risk this economic stake.

We submit that this view is a perversion of traditional and basic American doctrine. It reflects a way of thinking that accepts the subordination of the rights of citizenship to the expediencies of international bargaining and that regards the legal incidents of citizenship as expendable items to be traded away. We cannot refrain from adding, though we do not believe this paper to be the appropriate occasion to argue this point at length, that it is doubly deplorable that this position should be urged to support a course of conduct that is not only morally wrong but badly calculated in terms of national advantage. We are convinced that a realistic appraisal of the economic potential of the Middle East will disclose that no legitimate American interest is in real danger from Arab rulers who, however fanatic their religious hatreds, nevertheless remain hard-headed businessmen whose economic advancement is wholly dependent upon American investment dollars.

Issues of precisely this character are not without precedent for the United States. The diplomatic history of any great nation is the record of its capacity to sustain, or its willingness to abandon, those ideals that embody its national creed. When confronted with a threat to the liberties of its citizens, indeed, when forced to choose between condoning exactly the kind of anti-Semitism now practiced by the Arab States and risking the possibility of economic loss, this country did not in the past waiver or equivocate. For us the claim of freedom has always been of greater force and dignity than the claim of profit.

When Woodrow Wilson was advised in 1911 (as we are now advised respecting the Arab States), that there must not be American diplomatic intercession against foreign anti-Semitism because of possible danger to American investment opportunities, he stated:

"There lies a principle back of our life. America is not a mere body of traders; it is a body of free men. Our greatness is built upon our freedom—is moral, not material. We have a great ardor for gain; but we have a deep passion for the rights of man. Principles lie back of our action. America would be inconceivable without them. These principles are not incompatible with great material prosperity. On the contrary, unless we are deeply mistaken, they are indispensable to it. We are not willing to have prosperity, however, if our fellow citizens must suffer contempt for it, or lose the rights that belong to every American in order that we may enjoy it. The price is too great." (48 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 497–498 (62d Cong., 2d sess., Dec. 6. 1911).)

Before turning to a detailed examination of Arab anti-Semitism in the United States, we believe it pertinent, therefore, to consider briefly past actions taken by this country in protest of foreign anti-Semitic excesses.

I. AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC PRECEDENTS

American diplomats have never been diffident in denouncing religious discrimination against any American nationals who travel abroad. Under the act of July 27, 1868 (15 Stat. 244) the President of the United States and the Department of State are required to take immediate action whenever the rights of any American citizen are violated or threatened by a foreign state. This right of protection admits of no religious limitation. As stated by Secretary of State Lewis Cass, the object of our foreign policy is "not merely to protect a Catholic in a Protestant country, a Protestant in a Catholic country, a Jew in a Christian country, but an American in all countries." (Quoted in J. B. Moore, American Diplomacy (1905), at p. 135.)

This diplomatic principle derives from the recognition by those charged with determining and administering our foreign policy that the defense of religious liberty is an inseparable aspect of all American undertakings. In a diplomatic note protesting Austro-Hungarian anti-Semitism directed at the family of an American Minister-designate, Secretary of State Thomas F. Bayard declared, in 1885:

"Religious liberty is the chief cornerstone of the American system of government, and provisions for its security are imbedded in the written charter and interwoven in the moral fabric of its laws.

"Anything that tends to invade a right so essential and sacred must be carefully guarded against, and I am satisfied that my countrymen, ever mindful of the sufferings and sacrifices necessary to obtain it, will never consent to its impairment for any reason or under any pretext whatsoever.

"It is not believed by the President that a doctrine and practice so destructive of religious liberty and freedom of conscience, so devoid of catholicity, and so opposed to the spirit of the age in which we live, can for a moment be accepted by the great family of civilized nations or be allowed to control their diplomatic intercourse.

"Certain it is, it will never, in my belief, be accepted by the people of the United States nor by any administration which represents their sentiments" (Foreign Relations (1885), p. 50).

A. Czarist Russia

Perhaps the most noteworthy of all of the interpositions by our Government to protect the rights of Jewish communities from the force and effect of foreign anti-Semitic decrees—if only because it is virtually on all fours, both in the character of the anti-Semitic discrimination and in its attempted rationale, with the discrimination currently practiced by the Arab governments—was that made over a period of years in protest against Czarist Russia's expulsion and exclusion of American citizens of Jewish faith. This intercession with Russia is significant not only because it unequivocally

fixed and defined American policy on this issue but also because it reflected the ardor with which American spokesmen insisted upon adherence to principle, even at the risk of commercial disadvantage, and in the enthusiasm and unanimity with which the people of this country endorsed that stand. We submit that neither the State Department nor the general community now should be content with any less zealous protection of fundamental rights.

In the 19th century, Russian anti-Semitism, like Arab anti-Semitism today, was intense and deeply rooted. The history of the Jews in Russia was a catalog of savage and bloody assaults upon them, attacks that were endorsed, either openly or tacitly, by the Russian Government itself. In addition, the Czar had promulgated a network of anti-Jewish legislation directed nominally at his own Jewish subjects but applied without distinction to Jews of any nationality who found themselves within Russian borders. Among these restrictions were rules forbidding the free entry, travel, or residence of Jews in certain parts of the country outside the pale of settlement. As a result American Jews who dared to enter the proscribed areas were forcibly expelled by order of the Russian authorities, while other Americans, non-Jews, but otherwise of identical status, were permitted freely to reside, travel, and transact business throughout Russia.

The State Department was thus forced to decide, exactly as it is forced to decide now, whether it would submit passively to the demands of religious prejudice or instead would endeavor to enforce throughout the world, even in those areas where it might be difficult or embarrassing to do so, the rights of American citizens of every religious persuasion, without distinction or difference. The State Department did not a hundred years ago hesitate to assume responsibility for all Americans, including American Jews, and it would be unconscionable and delinquent for any agency of our Government now to do less.

When protests were made during the 1880's that American Jews were systematically expelled from certain parts of Russia, repeated attempts were made by American diplomats, first by exhortation and moral argument, to persuade the Russian Government to adopt a more humane attitude toward its own Jewish population and to extend to American Jews treatment equal in all respects to that accorded all other Americans. When these moral entreaties failed, this Government moved firmly and decisively and abrogated the longstanding and profitable commercial treaty of 1832 between this country and Russia. Because of the failure of the Czarist regime to refrain from further anti-Semitic discrimination against American Jews, these treaty relations were never resumed.

The mere recital of the facts cannot fully disclose the high quality and courage of statesmanship, fully cognizant of all of its responsibilities, that culminated in this action. Some of the notes on this question prepared and dispatched by our highest diplomatic officers remain instructive in reminding us of the manner and context in which decisions affecting international behavior of this kind must be formulated.

Among those who were most forthright and uncompromising in demanding that the Russian Government deal with all Americans equally and fairly was John W. Foster, the American Minister to St. Petersburg and the grandfather of the present Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. It is an unusual family and an unusual historical era that permits grandfather and grandson during successive period to pass directly upon the same urgent problem. It is to be hoped that Secretary Dulles will reconsider and examine the precepts and policies laid down on behalf of the United States by his grandfather, himself later to become an eminent Secretary of State, and that he will find implicit in those policies a moral view and a national commitment of lasting and enduring force.

In the late summer of 1880, Henry Pinkos, an American Jew who had assumed residence in St. Petersburg for several months with his wife and family and had established a small business there, was expelled from the city and the country as soon as his Jewish identity became known. Despite efforts by American officials to delay execution of his expulsion, Mr. Pinkos left Russia without awaiting further steps in his behalf. The Chargé d'Affaires of the American Legation thereupon was disposed to drop the whole matter, stating that "there now appears to be no necessity for my communicating with the Russian Government."

Mr. Foster who was then newly appointed United States Minister to St. Petersburg and the then Secretary of State William N. Evarts, were agreed, however, that there was a principle in issue that transcended Mr. Pinkos and whose significance in no way depended upon his physical presence in Russia. Rejecting an easy opportunity to evade a difficult and troubling issue and disregarding staff suggestions that we silently absorb the affront to our Jewish citizens because the issue had become moot, Mr. Foster wrote in clear and unmistakable terms to Baron Jomini, acting Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs:

"The Secretary of State instructs me to state to Your Excellency that in the presence of the fact that an American citizen has been ordered to leave Russia on no other ground than that he is the professor of a particular creed or the holder of certain religious views, it becomes the duty of the Government of the United States, which impartially seeks to protect all of its citizens of whatever origin or faith, solemnly, but with all respect to the Government of His Imperial Majesty, to protest. As this order of expulsion is understood to apply to all foreign Jews, in certain cities or localities, at least, of Russia, it is, of course, apparent that the same is not directed specially against the government of which Mr. Pinkos is a citizen, and, indeed, the longstanding amity which has united the interests of Russia with those of the Government of the United States would of itself forbid a remote supposition that such might be the case. Notwithstanding this aspect of the matter the United States could not fail to look upon the expulsion of one of its citizens from Russia, on the simple ground of his religious ideas or convictions, except as a grievance, akin to that which Russia would doubtless find in the expulsion of one of her own subjects from the United States, on the ground of his attachment to the faith of his fathers" (Foreign Relations, 1880, p. 881, et seq.).

It is significant that Mr. Foster's intercession was not inhibited or deterred by the fact that the anti-Semitism practiced by the Russian Government was universal and "not directed specially against the government of which Mr. Pinkos is a citizen." Mr. Foster was aware that the larger interests of the United States dictate forthright opposition to all religious prejudice aimed at or affecting Americans whether our citizens are made to suffer indignity and insult as part of a general campaign of hatred and bigotry or directly in their capacity as American nationals. In either case our citizens are deprived of rights this country is committed to protect, and in either case this foreign conduct constitutes an encroachment upon American freedoms that must be requited and corrected.

Exactly as Arab extremists seek to manufacture an apology for their terrorism and to justify current anti-Jewish excesses as a security measure designed to protect them from supposed Zionist violence, so did the Czarist regime strive to rationalize its anti-Semitic decrees as a protection against a supposed Jewish insurrection. To this Mr. Foster replied:

"It having been intimated to the Secretary of State by this Legation that the reason of this order may be found in the supposed implication of Jews in the plots formed against the life of His Imperial Majesty the Emperor, the Secretary directs me to say that, insofar as this may be true, the Government of Russia has the entire sympathy of the Government of the United States in all just preventive efforts; and if there existed any good evidence that Mr. Pinkos has been connected with any of these attempts, the Government of the United States could not object to this expulsion on that ground. But neither the police authorities, in the several communications which the members of the consulate general and this Legation have had with them, in their efforts to obtain relief for Mr. Pinkos, nor Your Excellency's Department, in the notes addressed to this Legation on the subject, have ever intimated the existence of such a charge. Nor does the character of citizens of the United States of Jewish faith afford ground for the supposition that they would be likely to engage in conspiracies or plots against the established Government of the country. From the foundation of the United States as a nation they have been entitled to full and unrestricted privileges of citizens, and have shown themselves to be peaceable and law observing in their conduct, quiet and industrious in their habits, and are esteemed a valuable portion of the community, so that, insofar as the regulation for the expulsion of foreign Jews from Russia affects American citizens, whatever may be the conduct of their coreligionists of this or other countries, it is an unjust reflection upon American Jews as a class and a discrimination which cannot be acquiesced in by my Government" (ibid.).

When these notes were insufficient, Mr. Foster continued to press his demands with untiring vigor. In a letter to the Secretary of State on March 25, 1881, he was the first to suggest that this country base its demands for equal treatment for American Jews upon the treaty of 1832 and employ natory to that treaty as a means of enforc-the influence and status we enjoyed as a sig-ing our claims (Foreign Relations, 1881, at p. 1012). This device, in fact, became the solution finally adopted.

Mr. Foster enjoyed the support and encouragement of his superiors in the State Department. As has already been noted, Secretary Evarts first directed Mr. Foster's intervention with the Russian Government. Upon Secretary Evarts' death, his successor, James G. Blaine, shortly after his appointment, unreservedly ratified Foster's strong position. He wrote Foster as follows:

"Your course appears to have been discreet, and it is hoped that you will press your representations to the successful establishment of the principle of religious toleration for our citizens peacefully residing or traveling abroad, which we as a nation have such a deep interest in maintaining. * * *

"It would be, in the judgment of this government, absolutely inadmissible that a domestic law restraining native Hebrews from residence in certain parts of the empire might operate to hinder any American citizen. * * *

"I need hardly enlarge on the point that the Government of the United States concludes its treaties with foreign states for the equal protection of all classes of American citizens. It can make absolutely no discrimination between them, whatever be their origin or creed. So that they abide by the laws, at home or abroad, it must give them due protection and expect like protection for them. Any unfriendly or discriminatory act

against them on the part of a foreign power with which we are at peace would call for our earnest remonstrance, whether a treaty existed or not" (Foreign Relations, 1881, p. 1030).

The American people were no less sensitive to these deprivations based upon religious affiliation. When diplomatic intercession alone failed to correct this anti-Semitic discrimination, the issue became one for general public notice and for more direct executive and legislative action. Indeed, it became a matter of such moment that in his speech of acceptance of the Republican nomination for the Presidency in 1908, William H. Taft noted that "in some countries * * * distinctions are made in respect to the treatment of our citizens travelling abroad and having passports of our executive, based on considerations which are repugnant to the principles of our Government and civilization." He committed his party and administration "to make every endeavor to secure the solution of such distinctions which in our eyes are both needless and opprobrious." (Adler and Margalith, With Firmness in the Right (1946), at pp. 281–282.)

On December 4, 1911, conclusively to dispose of this issue, Joint Resolution 166 was introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative, later Governor, William Sulzer, of New York. The text of the resolution declared:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the people of the United States assert as a fundamental principle that the rights of its citizens shall not be impaired at home or abroad because of race or religion; that the Government of the United States concluded its treaties for the equal protection of all classes of its citizens, without regard to race or religion; that the Government of the United States will not be a party to any treaty which discriminates, or which by one of the parties thereto is so construed as to discriminate between American citizens on the ground of race or religion; that the Government of Russia has violated the treaty between the United States and Russia, concluded at St. Petersburg, December 18, 1832, refusing to honor American passports duly issued to American citizens, on account of race and religion; that in the judgment of the Congress the said treaty, for the reasons aforesaid, ought to be terminated at the earliest possible time; that for the aforesaid reasons the said treaty is hereby declared to be terminated and of no further force and effect from the expiration of 1 year after date of notification to the Government of Russia of the terms of this resolution, and that to this end the President is hereby charged with the duty of communicating such notice to the Government of Russia."

This resolution was adopted by a vote of 300 to 1 on December 13, 1911. On December 15, 1911, Mr. Sazanoff, then Russian Foreign Minister, was notified by Secretary of State Philander C. Knox that the United States had decided to abrogate the treaty of 1832.

Although this was perhaps the most extensive action yet undertaken to protect the rights of American Jews from foreign anti-Semitism it met with immediate and widespread popular approval. Thus, the Republican National Convention of 1912 adopted a plank declaring:

"We approve the action taken by the President and Congress to secure with Russia, as with other countries, a treaty that will recognize the absolute right of expatriation, and that will prevent all discrimination of whatever kind between American citizens, whether native born or alien, and regardless of race, religion, or previous political allegiance. The right of asylum is a precious possession of the people of the United States, and it is to be neither surrendered nor restricted" (American Jewish Year Book, 1913–14, p. 442).

Almost identical planks were adopted the same year by the Democratic and Progressive Party Conventions. The American people have consistently abjured any suggestion, whether by internal decree or foreign treaty, that there can be class distinctions among American citizens or that there are varying degrees of protection to which our citizens are entitled.

B. Switzerland

One of the earlier intercessions of this Government on behalf of American Jews abroad perhaps illustrates better than any other the personal zeal with which American statesmen have endeavored to combat foreign anti-Semitism.

In 1853, Theodore S. Fay, then United States Minister to Switzerland, was advised that Swiss cantons were denying visiting rights to American Jews. The Swiss Federal Council was willing to interpret liberally the treaty of 1850 between the United States and Switzerland and to extend to American Jews the same rights and privileges granted American Christians. Some of the cantons, however, persisted in their discrimination and refused to permit American Jews to establish themselves within their jurisdiction.

Mr. Fay became absorbed in the whole problem of anti-Jewish prejudices and made a detailed study of the condition of the Jews in Switzerland and neighboring countries, inquiring even into matters ranging far beyond those affecting American Jews. The Secretary of State encouraged Mr. Fay in this inquiry and notified him that the removal of oppressive restrictions upon the Jewish community was "a matter which the President (Buchanan) has much at heart." (See Ex. Doc. No. 76, House of Representatives, 36th Cong., 1st sess., p. 22.)

As a result of his extensive inquiry and investigation, Fay wrote the famous Israelite Note, which he circulated among the respective cantons. The then President of the Swiss Confederation, Dr. Furrer, wrote that as a result of Fay's note "an immense majority of the Council of Zurich is disposed to change the legislation respecting the Israelites in the interest of amity and progress" (ibid., p. 77). Many other cantons followed and gradually, one after another, removed all restrictions against the Jews. Thus, because of his personal concern over the oppression of religious minorities, an American Minister in Switzerland was able to play a decisive and crucial role in amending the Swiss constitutional system to eliminate all Swiss discrimination because of race and religion and, almost singlehandedly, was instrumental in restoring to American Jews the right to travel throughout that part of Europe without restraint or inhibition.

C. Other countries

Our deep attachment to the concept of religious freedom has motivated our Government to urge intercession even in instances of religious suppression and persecution that did not directly affect citizens of the protesting states and even if such protest entailed direct criticism of the internal legislation of other states, a matter not ordinarily within the purview of any foreign power. Thus in the very first representation relating to Jews made by the United States to any foreign state, Secretary of State John Forsyth at the direction of President Van Buren, in 1840 in a dispatch to the American Consul at Alexandria, Egypt, urged intervention in behalf of Damascus Jews who had been accused of murder.

Since that time the diplomatic record is studded with instances of genuinely altruistic intervention by American officials on behalf of persecuted Jewish populations abroad. See the account of protests made by the United States Government because of local anti-Jewish persecution in Morocco in 1863 (Adler and Margalith, With Firmness in the Right (1946), at 11); In Persia in 1897 (ibid, at 16); in Syria and Palestine in 1915 (ibid, at 65); in Italy in 1938 (ibid, at 386); in North Africa in 1942 (ibid, at 410); and in Argentina in 1943 (ibid, at 430). This is not even to mention the strenuous protest made through every available diplomatic medium against the atrocities of Nazi Germany. Indeed, the sense of revulsion against the barbarities of the Nazis and their attempt to import racial doctrines into the United States was one of America's moral armaments in the days of President Franklin D. Roosevelt (ibid., at p. 348 et seq.).

This brief review of American diplomatic practice indicates a continuing course of conduct by American foreign officers extending over 100 years to protest religious persecution by foreign states adversely affecting American citizens.

It is therefore both disappointing and disturbing that Secretary Dulles' recent testimony intimates that the United States in effect has acquiesced and yielded to the demands of current Arab and anti-Jewish aggression, even to the point of sacrificing some of the protection legally due its citizens. We do not believe it an adequate justification that this retreat has been undertaken in the hope of finding a way in which the Arab countries and the United States may live together in a manner which presumably is to their mutual advantage. We do not believe that the American people will concur in this bargain or will endorse or accept any diplomatic approach that requires the United States to hold the rights of its citizens less dear than did our predecessors. We are convinced that the only reason this position could ever have been suggested is that the full measure of American concessions required to meet the demands of Arab bigotry has not been completely understood. It is in the hope of correcting this general lack of information that this paper has been compiled. We are convinced that once the facts are fully and publicly stated, the people of this country and those who have been appointed to guide its foreign relations will be in a better position to assess and evaluate those factors that must dictate our future conduct if the freedoms of all our citizens are to be assured.

II. CURRENT ARAB ANTI-JEWISH PRACTICES

The discriminatory actions practiced by the Arab countries under the direction of the Arab League fall into three categories: A, the denial of entry or transit visas to American Jews; b, the commercial boycott of American Jewish businesses; c, the establishment and subvention of large-scale Arab propaganda centers to disseminate anti-Semitic literature in the United States. Each of these three practices is discussed below.

A. Denial of entry or transit visas to American Jews

In recent years various Arab countries including Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia have sought to extend and promote their programs of domestic anti-Semitism by promulgating a rule flatly prohibiting the issuance of entry permits and travel visas to American citizens who are Jews. This discrimination extends to Government officials and to members of the United States Armed Forces. A number of invidious consequences have flowed from this Arab policy: American State laws against discrimination in employment have beeen openly and repeatedly flouted, and recruiting for employment, even on defense contracts paid for by American taxpayers, has been conducted on a discriminatory basis because of Arab refusal to admit American Jewish workers. Thus, Arab bigotry has already forced its

way across our own borders and infected our own domestic practices.

(1) Restrictions Against Military Personnel

On May 20, 1955, a chaplain serving in the United States Air Force wrote Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN:

"United States Air Forces Europe (USAFE) Manual 30–1, dated June 1953 deals with 'Clearance and Documentations for Leave and Duty Travel' for members of the United States Air Force. In section XXVI, paragraph 3, we read: 'Individuals of Jewish faith or descent are strictly barred entrance to or transit of Saudi Arabia. Further, any passport containing an Israeli visa will not be honored.'

"In section XIII, paragraph 3c we read: 'Individuals of the Hebrew race will not be issued visas or admitted to Jordan.'

"By restricting the travels of a Jewish serviceman on military aircraft, the Military Air Transport Service (MATS), a lawful agency of the Government of the United States of America, subjects itself to the bigoted religious doctrines of a foreign power."

This letter elicited the following reply on June 20, 1955, from Harold E. Talbott, then Secretary of the Air Force, to whom it was forwarded by Senator LEHMAN:

"The countries of Saudi Arabia and Jordan for purposes of internal security will not issue a visa for persons of the Hebrew race. This restriction is not only applicable to American citizens, but applies to Jewish people of all nations. Further, Arabic countries, specifically Saudi Arabia and Jordan, will not issue a visa to any person regardless of race, if the passport of the individual is stamped with any marking which would indicate that the traveler had visited Israel prior to the application for entrance into Saudi Arabia and Jordan.

"These restrictions are promulgated and enforced by the Arabic countries and are not within the prerogative of the State Department or the military to change.

"The only exception to the above procedures is when the traveler receives special permission from the Arabic Government concerned to enter that country."

Senator LEHMAN wrote to Mr. Talbott on July 12, 1955:

"I have your letter of June 20. I am aware of the practice of the Governments of Saudi Arabia and Jordan in barring entrance to persons of Jewish faith. I had hoped, however, that the appropriate departments of the United States Government would work ceaselessly against any such regulation insofar as it affects American citizens. I was especially shocked to know that American GI's who happen to be of the Jewish faith are likewise discriminated against. I hoped that far from simply taking cognizance of the matter, the Air Force would use its influence to the extent possible to see that this discrimination was not practiced against Americans who were serving their country in the Air Force."

Secretary Talbott's answer, dated July 20, 1955, exhibits an odd lack of concern:

"The Air Force is cognizant of the situation concerning restriction of travel to members of the Jewish faith to Saudi Arabia and Jordan. However, it must be recognized that we are dealing with a tradition of long standing, and in all probabilities, will take much effort and time on the part of all governmental agencies, including the Air Force, to try and work out a satisfactory solution with the countries concerned. The Air Force together with governmental agencies, has worked ceaselessly to abrogate regulations of this nature put into effect by foreign governments which affect American citizens. Unfortunately, as indicated in my previous letter, these restrictions or regulations are promulgated and enforced by foreign countries and are not within the prerogative of the Air Force to change."

When, on February 24 of this year Secretary Dulles was specifically asked by members of the Foreign Relations Committee whether, pursuant to the terms of the Mutual Security Agreement between this country and Saudi Arabia, American Army personnel of the Jewish faith were not permitted to be stationed at the Dhahran Air Base, the Secretary replied,"It may be." We question Mr. Dulles' apparent belief that his further statement "over a long period of years there has been a prohibition on Jews in Saudi Arabia" can be a sufficient explanation for this Government's tolerance of foreign disqualification of American military personnel because of their religious beliefs.

We submit that continued collaboration in the exclusion of Jewish servicemen invites manifold invasion of the rights of American citizenship. If we accept the principle that foreign states are to be permitted to pass upon the religious qualification of any American in military service stationed abroad, reaching down even to the level of private soldier, then we necessarily become party to the negation of the constitutional concept of religious freedom and religious privacy. We should then be required to screen and survey the religious convictions of prospective public officials who may otherwise be fully competent and qualified. We would then be able to employ as our representatives abroad, whether as ambassador, technician, soldier, or clerk, only those whose religious beliefs correspond favorably to those of some foreign ruler. In contravention of express constitutional prohibitions, we should inevitably be obliged to impose a religious test for public office. The logical extension of this approach would require, obviously, that any emissary of this country sent, for example, to Communist countries should be required to pass Communist tests of nonreligious fitness. The absurdity and inequity of this practice seems patent.

That the first amendment to the United States Constitution obligates this country to refrain from entering into any treaty or agreement that might serve as an instrument for discriminating against any group of American citizens by limiting their right freely to travel abroad because of their religious convictions was plainly stated by Clifton R. Breckinridge, American Minister to St. Petersburg in 1895 in a note to the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs. Replying to a Russian contention that the American Constitution could not apply to Russian domestic legislation and therefore could not be invoked to interfere with treaty arrangements between the two States, the American minister declared:

"Our Constitution does not say that Congress shall not make a law simply 'prohibiting' or 'authorizing' a religious exercise or belief, as Your Excellency seems to understand.

"It says that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' Certainly if a law deprives any people or persons of a certain faith, because of that faith, of all or of any part of the rights, privileges, and immunities enjoyed by any other citizen, or class of citizens, it is made 'respecting' that religion, and it militates against the 'free exercise thereof,' as much so as if the sect had been mentioned in the title of the act and the consequences had been named as pains and penalties for the conscientious belief and observances entertained and practiced" (Foreign Relations, 1895, p. 1066).

We suggest that a proper attitude, one consonant with the requirements of our Constitution and with our own national temper, is reflected in the action of the United States in the one prior time in its history when one of its representatives was found unacceptable by a foreign country because of admittedly religious factors.

(a) The Keiley precedent

In May 1885 President Grover Cleveland appointed Mr. Anthony M. Keiley, of Virginia, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States at Vienna. The United States was informed, however, that Mr. Keiley would be unacceptable to the Austrian Government because "the position of a foreign envoy wedded to a Jewess by civil marriage would be untenable and even impossible in Vienna" (Foreign Relations, 1885, p. 48).

Secretary of State Bayard replied in unmistakable language:

"The supreme law of this land expressly declares that 'no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States,' and by the same authority it is declared that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.'

* * * * *

"It is not within the power of the President nor of the Congress, nor of any judicial tribunal in the United States, to take or even hear testimony, or in any mode to inquire into or decide upon the religious belief of any official, and the proposition to allow this to be done by any foreign Government is necessarily and a fortiori inadmissible.

"To suffer an infraction of this essential principle would lead to a disfranchisement of our citizens because of their religious belief, and thus impair or destroy the most important end which our constitution of government was intended to secure.

* * * * *

"The case we are now considering is that of an envoy of the United States, unquestionably fitted, morally and intellectually, and who has been duly accredited to a friendly government, toward which he is thoroughly well affected; who in accordance with the laws of this country, has long since contracted and has maintained an honorable marriage, and whose presence near the foreign government in question is objected to by its agents on the sole ground that his wedded wife is alleged to entertain a religious faith which is held by very many of the most honored and valued citizens of the United States.

"It is not believed by the President that a doctrine and practice so destructive of religious liberty and freedom of conscience, so devoid of catholicity, and so opposed to the spirit of the age in which we live can for a moment be accepted by the great family of civilized nations or be allowed to control their diplomatic intercourse.

"Certain it is, it will never, in my belief, be accepted by the people of the United States, nor by any administration which represents their sentiments" (Foreign Relations, 1885, p. 48).

The Austrian Government thereupon changed the ground of its opposition to a supposed "want of political tact evinced on his (Mr. Keiley's) part on a former occasion, in consequence of which a friendly power declined to receive him; and upon the certainty that his domestic relations preclude that reception of him by Vienna society, which we judge desirable for the representatives of the United States with which power we wish to continue the friendly relations existing between the two Governments" (Foreign Relations, 1885, p. 55).

This country, however, was not deceived by these representations and refused to appoint an envoy in Mr. Keiley's stead. The position of this Government was that the acts of Austria and her ministers in this case would require this country to agree to permit Austria to reserve for herself the right to prescribe a religious test for office in the United States and that this could never be found acceptable by the people of this country. In his annual message to Congress,

December 8, 1885, President Cleveland reviewed the entire case:

"Question has arisen with the Government of Austria-Hungary touching the representation of the United States at Vienna. Having, under my constitutional prerogative, appointed an estimable citizen of unimpeachable probity and competence as Minister at that court, the Government of Austria-Hungary invited this Government to take cognizance of certain exceptions, based upon allegations against the personal acceptability of Mr. Keiley, the appointed envoy, asking that in view thereof, the appointment should be withdrawn. The reasons advanced were such as could not be acquiesced in, without violation of my oath of office and the precepts of the Constitution, since they necessarily involved a limitation in favor of a foreign government upon the right of selection by the Executive, and required such an application of a religious test as a qualification for office under the United States as would have resulted in the practical disfranchisement of a large class of our citizens and the abandonment of a vital principle in our Government. The Austro-Hungarian Government finally decided not to receive Mr. Keiley as the envoy of the United States, and that gentleman has since resigned his commission, leaving the post vacant. I have made no new nomination, and the interests of this Government in Vienna are now in the care of the secretary of legation, acting as chargé d'affaires ad interim" (Foreign Relations, 1885, p. iv).

(b) The Government plea of noninterference

Unquestionably the qualification of an ambassadorial appointee depends in considerable measure upon his standing in the country in which he is designated to serve. It is not diplomatic custom for any state to impose an unwelcome envoy upon another. The grant of diplomatic standing normally is regarded as the exclusive prerogative of the host state. This country nevertheless felt that the exercise of religious prejudice in the Keiley case was a matter of sufficient importance to override all considerations of diplomatic practice. How much greater an affront is it, therefore, for the Arab States to dictate to our Armed Forces with respect to the religious affiliations of our military personnel ordered to serve in our defense installations in Arab lands. The religious beliefs of members of the Armed Forces of the United States can be no business of the Arab countries and it is a gross invasion of the constitutional guaranties of religious freedom for any agency of this Government to agree to the exclusion of Jewsh servicemen, or indeed Jewish public officials of any rank, from acting on behalf of their country anywhere in the world.

It is plainly no argument to allege, as Secretary Talbott alleges, that since these restrictions on the entry of Jewish military personnel are enforced by the Arab countries they are "not within the prerogative of the State Department or the military to change." Matters that impinge so directly upon the welfare and liberty of American citizens cannot thus be so immunized from American intervention. It should be remembered that upon proper occasion the United States has not been unwilling to instruct its diplomatic emissaries abroad to take action with respect to matters that entail criticism of the internal activities of another state, something that is not within the ordinary purview of normal diplomatic conduct. Thus, on November 22, 1881, in seeking to persuade Great Britain to join in protest against Russian anti-Semitic discrimination, Secretary of State Blaine wrote James Russell, then United States Minister at London:

"I am well aware that the domestic enactments of a state toward its own subjects is not generally regarded as a fit matter for the intervention of another independent power. But when such enactments directly affect the liberty and property of foreigners who resort to a country under the supposed guaranty of treaties framed for the most liberal ends, when the conscience of an alien owing no allegiance whatever to the local sovereignty, is brought under the harsh yoke of bigotry or prejudice which bows the necks of the natives, and when enlightened appeals made to humanity, to the principles of just reciprocity and to the advancing spirit of the age, in behalf of tolerance, are met with intimations of a purpose to still further burden the unhappy sufferers and so to necessarily increase the disability of foreigners of like creed * * * it becomes in a high sense a moral duty to our citizens and to the doctrines of religious freedom we so strongly uphold, to seek proper protection for those citizens and tolerance for their creed, in foreign lands, even at the risk of criticism of the municipal laws of other states" (Kohler, The United States and German Jewish Prosecutions, pp. 40–41).

It always will remain possible to search out reasons for not acting but the present prim and circumspect regard for every legalism that might justify American indifference must be contrasted with the attitude of former Secretary of State William N. Evarts. He did not hesitate to employ the power of his high office to instruct an American consul in Morocco that while intervention by this country in behalf of Jews who are Moorish subjects ordinarily might be considered improper, "Still, there might be cases in which humanity would dictate a disregard of technicalities, if your influence would shield Hebrews from oppression." (Letters of Secretary Evarts, March 20, 1878, quoted in J. B. Moore, American Diplomacy (1905), page 349.) We are forced to conclude that American diplomatic intervention against the Arab States is more likely deterred by lack of will than by lack of legal warrant.

(2) Restrictions Upon Private Travel

In the face of this official indifference toward limitations imposed upon the right to travel of military and Government personnel, it is hardly surprising that travel restrictions against American Jews who are merely private citizens should continue with almost no comment. The Passport Division of the Department of State expressly informs applicants for passports that persons of Jewish faith will be denied the right to visit Arab lands. Information supplied to passengers departing America aboard ships of the American Export Lines, which during cruises touch ports in Arab countries, declares that persons of Jewish faith or Jewish name (sic) will be denied certain cruise travel privileges in Arab countries freely available to other passengers. Airlines regularly traveling to Arab countries contain notations in their schedules indicating that Jewish passengers will not be allowed to disembark at Arab ports of entry.

This regular withholding of travel privileges by Arab officials in this country from American citizens of Jewish faith is demeaning and introduces a discordant and dissonant note in a free community. Thus, in 1895 Acting Secretary of State Alvey A. Adee reminded the American Minister at St. Petersburg that the refusal of Russian consuls to grant visas to American Jews was of continuing concern to this country if only because of the impact and effect of this practice within our own borders. Mr. Adee wrote:

"Apart from the constitutional objections to the discrimination made by Russian consular officers against American Jews, this Government can never consent that a class embracing many of its most honored and valuable citizens shall within its territory be subjected to invidious and disparaging distinctions of the character implied in refusing to visé their passports. For, notwithstanding Prince Lobanow's suggestion that his Government's consular regulation upon the subject under consideration does not apply to all Israelites and therefore cannot be regarded as a discrimination against them on religious grounds, the fact remains that the interrogatories propounded to applicants for the consular visé relate to religious faith, and upon the response depends the consul's actions.

"Viewed in the light of an invidious discrimination tending to discredit and humiliate American Jews in the eyes of their fellow citizens, it is plain that the action of Russian consular officers does produce its effect within American territory, and not exclusively in Russian jurisdiction" (Foreign Relations, 1895, p. 1067).

The denial of visas to Jews by Arab countries, moreover, frequently has a more serious consequence than the mere withholding of travel for pleasure. Arab anti-Semitism has been made the occasion and excuse for anti-Jewish discrimination in hiring practices in this country, in direct contravention of the purpose and policy of State fair employment practices legislation.

(a) SCAD and private employment

In 1950 a help-wanted advertisement inserted by a private employment agency in New York City newspapers sought welders for foreign service. When applicants for these positions were interrogated about their religious beliefs, a complaint was filed with the New York State Commission Against Discrimination charging that these inquiries constituted an unlawful employment practice.

The State Commission reported:

"Investigation disclosed that the welders were being recruited by a sub-contractor of the Arabian American Oil Co. for work on a pipeline in one of the Arabian countries, and that a visa from the Arabian Government was a prerequisite to employment.

"The investigating commissioner was informed by the Arabian American Oil Co. that the Arabian Government does not issue visas to persons of the Jewish faith. The company advised that it had an understanding with the Arabian Government to screen all prospective employees for work in Arabia before they applied for Arabian visas, for the purpose of excluding persons of the Jewish faith to whom visas will not be granted. The respondent urged the Commission not to take any action which would jeopardize this agreement in view of considerations important to the international interests and security of the United States.

"Pursuant to Commission policy to seek confirmation of the facts upon which the existence of a bona fide occupational qualification is predicated, the investigating commissioner communicated with the United States Department of State. He was advised by the Political Adviser for the Office of African and Near Eastern Affairs that as a result of the recent conflict between the Arabian countries and Israel, the Arabian governments refuse to grant visas to persons of the Jewish faith for work in any of the Arabian countries. This representative of the Department of State stressed the importance of not having anything interfere with the existing relationship between the Arabian Government and the Arabian American Oil Co., explaining that this relationship was the basis for the harmony between this Government and the Arabian Government and should it be disturbed in any way the international interests of the United States would be seriously affected." (Report of Progress, 1950, New York State Commission Against Discrimination, pp. 47–48.)

As a result of State Department intervention, the New York State Commission Against Discrimination found these employment practices not violative of State law. Two factors are worthy of note in this report.

First, it is indicative of the contagious effect of religious bigotry that an American employer in New York should enter into an understanding with Arabian Governments to screen American citizens who are candidates for employment "for the purpose of excluding persons of the Jewish faith." Thus, in direct contradiction of the intention and purpose of existing State fair employment practices legislation American employers are induced and even compelled to undertake religious inquiries and to fix religious standards as a qualification in hiring practices.

Secondly, it is shocking that a "representative of the Department of State (should have) stressed the importance of not having anything interfere with the existing relationship between the Arab Government and the Arabian American Oil Co." It should be remembered that the "anything" that might in this case have disturbed this relationship would have been a demand for the full and equal protection of the rights of American citizens. It is bad statesmanship as well as bad principle that our traditional concept of equal protection should be abandoned for the purpose of furthering certain commercial transactions, whether they be with the Arabian American Oil Co., or with anyone else. It is not true that the American people are willing to maintain contractual arrangements for international exchange of commodities, whatever they may be, when such arrangements are made contingent upon implementing in our own community the religious or racial hatreds and prejudices of foreign governments. Private deals cannot be sanctioned when they are made at the cost of national ideals.

(b) Defense contracts abroad

It is even more disturbing that Arab anti-Semitism has been made the occasion for the practice of religious discrimination by United States Army contractors engaged in defense projects, projects paid for by all the American people. The New York Times of February 2, 1952, reported that Maj. Gen. G. J. Nold, Deputy Chief of Engineers, United States Army, testified before a Senate subcommittee that New York workers were not recruited by Army contractors for building military bases in Arab countries because the contractors believed a large number of New York applicants would be of Jewish origin and, if hired, would be resented by the Arabs and possibly be in personal danger. It is not surprising that this was precisely the argument advanced by Russian Foreign Minister Prince Lobanow in 1895 to justify his government's refusal to visé the passports of American Jews, explaining that his country's attitude was essentially philanthropic, serving to warn American Jews while they were still in the United States and thus save them from "difficulties and dangers which they would encounter later if they had not been advised." (Adler and Margalith, op. cit, supra, at 250.) In any event, either forgetful of SCAD's prior ruling or uncertain whether the Army would be granted the same special license to discriminate previously accorded the Arabian American Oil Co., the New York State Employment Service had informed the airbase contractors that they must operate in conformity with the State law against discrimination in employment and could not screen out Jewish applicants for the jobs. General Nold testified that the contractors thereafter simply avoided the New York labor market and recruited their entire work force in the Middle West.

In response to an inquiry by the chairman of the New York State Commission Against Discrimination, the then Secretary of the Army, Frank Pace, Jr. on March 3, 1952, wrote:

"The charge that the Army has refused to recruit workers from New York for construction work in Arab countries because New York law prohibits discrimination in the hiring of workers has resulted from the recent testimony of the Deputy Chief of Engineers before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee. The Deputy Chief of Engineers there testified that a problem existed in recruiting people of the Jewish faith for work in Arab countries. Insofar as this testimony indicated that there were problems in recruiting Jewish workers for every country having an Arab population, the statements of the Deputy Chief of Engineers were broader than the facts justified. Although his testimony was not so limited, actually the Deputy Chief of Engineers was cognizant of the recruitment problem with respect to the country of Saudi Arabia. The situation there, however, is not one caused by Corps of Engineers contractors. These contractors have not discriminated against qualified Jewish workers for Saudi Arabian projects. They are willing to recruit workers of this faith; however, these workers are unable to obtain the required visas from Saudi Arabia."

This comment by Secretary Pace is characteristic of official nonchalance and indifference to this problem. It reflects the too frequently held view that mere reference to Arab anti-Semitism is all that is necessary to condone American collaboration in discriminatory acts. During the course of his letter to the chairman of the State commission, the Secretary claimed that contractors recruiting workers in the United States for military construction in North Africa by and large conform to the policies laid down by President Truman barring discrimination based on race, creed, color, and national origin; but he also admitted, somewhat coolly, that contractors do, in fact, discriminate against workers of Jewish faith in recruiting for military construction in Saudi Arabia. Government agencies as well as individual contractors usually disclaim any discriminatory intent, even loudly assert that exclusion of Jewish employees is contrary to their own wishes and forced upon them because Jews are refused visas for entry into Saudi Arabia. But the net result is no less an instance of discrimination in Government contracts, in clear, open, and undeniable violation of standing Executive orders.

(c) State Department passivity

More is required of the State and Defense Departments than mere passive recognition of existing facts. Regretably, Secretary of State Dulles, like his associates, appears largely undisturbed by the Arab policy of discrimination against American Jews. During his testimony on February 24, 1956, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in response to a question relating to our endorsement of discrimination against American Jewish businessmen, Secretary Dulles found it appropriate to refer to the religious requirements of Moslem law and to indulge in analogies concerning Moslem dietary customs. The general temper of Secretary Dulles' reply may perhaps be evident in his concluding comments that the Arabs "have some practices which we may think curious. * * * We, perforce, accommodate ourselves to certain practices they have which we do not like; they, perhaps, accommodate themselves to certain of our idiosyncrasies which they do not like, but on the whole, they have a pretty arbitrary rule largely dictated by the strict tenets of the Moslem faith."

It ordinarily might be supposed that the practice of religious discrimination against American nationals is not a mere "curious practice" to be likened to exotic dietary habits, nor would it ordinarily be thought properly comparable by an American Secretary of State to folk "idiosyncrasies" of our own to which the Arabs might conceivably object. At issue are national policies that impose serious penalties upon many American citizens and these cannot lightly be dismissed as quaint, almost charming, eccentricities which we need not trouble to regard seriously.

The occasional objections made by the State Department to this practice of religious discrimination thus far have been palpably inadequate. For all of its perfunctory assurances, the State Department has never indicated the precise nature of its protests or whether those protests when conveyed were pursued with vigor and persistence. Nor has Secretary Dulles, or any other Department spokesman, ever suggested any further course of conduct should our protests, as seems inevitable at present, continue to go unheeded.

The right to travel and to go abroad is a right much treasured and desired, and if the Arab States were suddenly to close their doors to all Americans we should unquestionably deem it to be an affront and unfriendly act. We can properly be no less affronted when the Arab countries single out one group of Americans to whom they bar their borders solely because of religious affiliation. And it becomes doubly unconscionable when this practice, abetted by American participation, becomes the prelude and apology for imposing economic penalties against American Jewish citizens.

It would seem, at the very least, that if any American citizens are barred from entry to any Arab States for religious reasons, this Government, with the exception of necessary and authorized diplomatic personnel, should prohibit all citizens from Arab countries from entry here. There is ample precedent for such a move. Section 243 (g) (7) of the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 authorizes this country to refuse any further immigration from those states who are unwilling to accept return of their nationals who are deported from the United States. Surely the crude religious discrimination practiced by the Arab countries is at least as significant a cause for invoking this reciprocal prohibition. There is no tenable reason for the United States to continue to receive immigration from countries who capriciously and arbitrarily deny an equivalent right to a considerable section of our own citizens. It is a well-established principle that no foreign government can with impunity discriminate between one American passport and another. That principle needs now to be implemented.

III. BOYCOTT OF AMERICAN JEWISH BUSINESSES

It is generally conceded that pursuant to a directive of the Arab League there is at present an Arab boycott of businesses throughout the world that have representatives or branches in Israel or that maintain commercial relations with Israeli firms, however small these transactions may be. This is evidenced by a recent statement by the Iraqi Consul in New York, Gen. A. K. Gailani, asserting that:

"Our policy is that all firms, be they Christain, Jew, or Moslem, are not allowed to do business with the Arab countries if they have a subsidiary or branch in Israel. This was a decision of the Arab League, not of Iraq alone, and the reason is that Israel is at war with the Arab countries." (New York Post, February 3, 1956.)

An article recently appearing in the Foreign Commerce Weekly, published by the United States Department of Commerce, further confirms this fact:

"Member states of the Arab League have agreed to take the following actions in implementation of their boycott against countries having relations with both Israel and the Arab countries, the Iraq Government has informed diplomatic missions in Baghdad.

"Imports of products from foreign countries will be banned if the companies have branches or assembly plants in Israel; if their general agents or regional offices in the Middle East are located in Israel; or if Israeli

companies are granted the privilege of using trade names.

"Foreign companies, bodies, and establishments, both public and private, having shares in Israeli firms or plants, will be prohibited from carrying out business in the Arab countries.

"Regularly scheduled foreign steamships passing through Arab ports on both-way trips will not be allowed to anchor in an Israeli port on either journey. Exceptions are world tourist steamships, provided the Arab States through which they are to pass are notified in advance of their names and dates of departure—Embassy Baghdad" (Foreign Commerce Weekly, vol. 51, No. 1, January 4, 1956).

There is irrefutable evidence, moreover, that this anti-Israel boycott has now been expanded into a blacklisting of all businesses throughout the world, whether or not they have branches in Israel, that are owned by Jews, employ Jews, or even subscribe to Jewish philanthropic activities. According to the Economic Bulletin of the Arab League (Cairo), there are now 162 Jewish firms on the blacklist: 45 are British, 44 American, 23 French, 14 Swiss; 11 are in Argentina, 10 in Canada, 8 in Belgium, 6 in Holland, and 1 in Australia. Despite the occasional camouflages that have been attempted, the character of this economic reprisal is now sufficiently clear as to leave no doubt whatever as to its anti-Semitic purposes.

The boycott is conducted by cooperation of a number of the member states of the Arab League. The Saudi Arabian Government has been the most active and consistent in this connection in the United States although other Arab States have also participated with increasing frequency.

A. Saudi Arabian boycott

The American Jewish Congress has in its possession correspondence from Arab firms located in Saudi Arabia, canceling contracts with American Jewish businesses because of a directive promulgated by the Saudi Arabian Chamber of Commerce, but unquestionably inspired by the Saudi Arabian Government, instructing Saudi Arabian firms to discontinue all relations with businesses abroad owned or controlled by Jews or that employ Jews. These letters state that any contract negotiated in violation of this directive will be subject to summary cancellation and that any merchandise imported into Saudi Arabia from firms employing Jews abroad will run the risk of confiscation. The Saudi Arabian Government evidently requires its domestic import companies to obtain affirmative and positive assurances that their business associates abroad are free of all Jewish connections.

The claim has been adduced by representatives of the State Department among others that this boycott is not by any official agency in Saudi Arabia but only by private individuals. This contention must be weighed against the undisputed fact that Saudi Arabia is an absolute despotism without any semblance of representative government. It is unthinkable that any influential agency in that country could issue policy directives without the prior knowledge and approval of responsible officials. Moreover, no body other than the government itself would possess authority to confiscate incoming shipments. The Government of Saudi Arabia has plenary authority to impose conditions on international transactions and it must be concluded that, despite the nominal denials glibly issued by their spokesmen and consular representatives in the United States, Saudi Arabian Government officials themselves have stipulated and directed the anti-Jewish restrictions now invoked.

The nature of the discrimination is clearly reflected in the following excerpts from letters in our files received by American firms owned by Jews from their Saudi Arabian customers. The names of the recipients and senders of these letters are not here disclosed in order not to disturb other commercial relations these firms may have. Photostatic copies of the letters, however, are in American Jewish Congress possession.

January 3, 1952:

"We very much regret to inform you that our Government has duly published a notice announcing that any importers of Saudi Arabia must not be permitted to import the goods, any kind of goods, from any Jewish firms of the world.

"Further, they have listed your name as being your firm is Jewish firm, as these steps are taken suddenly against you, we are obliged to cable you to stop the shipments of our orders until we write you.

"However, we are obliged to ask you to let us have full particulars as to what faith your firm is belong, to Jewish or Christian? And until we have full particulars from you, we are obliged to stop our business with you."

October 1, 1953:

"In connection with our request for not effecting the shipment of our order by any steamer which belongs to any Jewish steamship company. This is in compliance of our Government's regulation announced recently, further this ordinance warns that any shipment by such steamers will not be allowed to enter Saudi Arabia."

September 17, 1953:

"We have also to inform you that you are well aware we are quite prohibited to import any goods manufactured in any Jew factories. Now our Government has issued a new regulation warning all the importers that no goods may be brought by the steamers belonging to Jew steamship company. You are kindly requested to take this matter into consideration in order to avoid any sort of trouble arising by doing so."

September 22, 1953:

"We hope that you have not shipped our order by now. We append the text of notification from our local government, for your kind information and perusal. Merchant or merchants established in Saudi Arabia intended to import goods from foreign countries should know that it is forbidden to deal with a Jewish company or with a company whose any of its workmen is Jewish or has branch in Israel, and if a merchant intended to deal with a company and knows that the same company is not Jewish, should also be asked to submit a letter of certificate issued by the chamber of commerce certifying that neither of its workman is Jewish nor has branch in Israel. Therefore, we will request you to furnish us with a certificate issued by your local chamber of commerce to that effect."

November 27, 1955:

"We refer to your letter dated March 8, 1955, addressed to our associates —— from which we gather that you are desirous to establish business relations in Saudi Arabia.

"It may also be noted that according to Saudi Arabian Government's regulation all invoices for the goods supplied must be legalized by Saudi Legation of your side. We are strictly prohibited to deal with Jew firms and therefore it will be appreciated if you can furnish us with a certificate duly legalized by the Saudi Legation stating that your firm is not a Jewish firm, otherwise we regret we shall not be able to enter into business with you."

January 7, 1956:

"With reference to your letter No. IW:ek of November 21, 1955, we have to inform you that you will have to get the original certificate attested and certified by the Saudi Arabian consulate in your country to the effect that firm which exports the machine is not a Jewish firm, without which we cannot have dealings with your firm."

One of the recipients of the letters quoted above regularly exports wheat, flour, rice, and textiles to Saudi Arabia and prior to the boycott his business in that country amounted to about $2 million a year. No United States export license is required for shipment of these materials but under the terms of the International Wheat Agreement to which both the United States and Saudi Arabia are subject, the United States pays 70 cents for each bushel of wheat shipped as a subsidy to American exporters. The effect of this boycott, therefore, is that the United States Government may make grants to non-Jewish firms shipping wheat to Saudi Arabia, but because of American submission to Arab demands Jewish firms are excluded from comparable benefits.

The discontinuance of contracts by Saudi Arabia importers reflects not only an effort on the part of the Saudi Arabian Government to regulate the conditions of its internal economy, but to reach out far beyond its own borders to boycott what it regards as Jewish enterprise. American Jewish businessmen are flatly excluded from competition for a large segment of international trade. Certainly to the extent that funds used to subsidize this trade derive from taxpayments and other contributions on the part of all the people of this country, it would appear intolerable for any American national to be barred from participation because of religious considerations.

B. Boycotts by other Arab countries

Although the boycott carried out by Saudi Arabia has received the greatest attention in this country there are clear indications that other members of the Arab League have carried on an identical policy of barring Jews from international trade. The following excerpts from a letter to the chairman of the Board of Directors of Verkoopkantoor Van der Heem N. V., The Hague, Holland, on November 13, 1955, indicates the firm intention of all members of the Arab League to make the boycott of Jews universal:

"As you are aware the Arab countries are in a state of war with Israel and for this reason we are making an economical siege around that Israel. This siege is administered by a special control and investigation office with members of all the Arab states.

"An officer in said office visited us today and requested that following information be supplied about your company:

* * * * *

"5. Do you have any Jewish employees in your company, if yes how many and what are the positions held by them.

"6. Are there any Jews in your Board of Directors as members.

"7. Is any of your managers or branch managers a Jew, if yes please give name of the department headed by such a man.

"8. Is any of the persons authorized to sign on behalf of your company a Jew.

"9. What is the number of Jewish laborers in your factories and offices."

In a letter quoted below from the Assistant Secretary of State in 1953, the State Department acknowledged that there has been from time to time a blacklisting of American Jewish firms by the Lebanese Government. American newspapers report similar experiences by American Jewish businesses throughout the world in dealing with member states of the Arab League (New York Herald Tribune, February 12, 1956). The boycott now suffered by American Jewish firms is a vital part of the international plan of the Arab League to deny Jewish businesses access to principal markets.

C. The reluctant State Department

This matter was first brought to the attention of the State Department in 1952 when reports of his practice were first received by the American Jewish Congress. The issue

presumably was satisfactorily concluded, in May 1952, when in a letter to Senator LEHMAN, Jack K. McFall, Assistant Secretary of the Department of State, declared that the racial and religious restrictions imposed on international dealings by the Saudi Arabian Government had been discontinued effective April of that year:

"I refer again to your note of January 30, 1952, and my reply of February 6 regarding Saudi Arabian trade discrimination against Jewish firms in the United States. As you know, this action and its possible repercussions in this country were matters of real concern to this Department. The delicacy of the problem in Saudi Arabia recommended an informal approach rather than official representations to that Government as best designed to meet with success in causing the discontinuance of that discriminatory practice.

"Several frank but friendly discussions were held with the Saudi Arabian Embassy in Washington and by our Ambassador in Saudi Arabia with appropriate high authorities there. I am now happy to be able to report to you that these efforts have been successful, and the broad restrictive Saudi Arabian decree has been superseded as of April 4, 1952."

Regrettably, however, as is evident from the letters quoted earlier, the boycott of Jewish firms has not, in fact, been stopped and continues even to the present month without any lessening of its force.

(1) The claim of "private" boycott

Repeated efforts have been made to persuade the State Department to assert its influence to cause on effective discontinuance of this economic boycott of American Jews. In a letter to Senator LEHMAN on December 15, 1953, the then Assistant Secretary of State, Thruston B. Morton, declared:

"As I informed you in my letter of May 15 last, the Department at that time sought an appropriate occasion to reassert the United States feeling toward the boycott. This presented itself in July, when a report was received from our Embassy in Beirut that there were indications that the Lebanese Government contemplated blacklisting American firms dealing with Israel. The Department promptly took this occasion to instruct the Embassy, and to inform our other Embassies in the area, that if such action were taken it should state in positive terms to the Government of Lebanon that the United States Government was seriously concerned, and that the blacklisting action was unwarranted. Specific points upon which the Department based this position were transmitted to the Embassy for use if the occasion arose, and these points were also relayed to the other Embassies for guidance if they were confronted with a similar situation.

"Insofar as the Department has been informed up to this time, the action reportedly contemplated by the Lebanese Government has not been taken. In fact, the Embassy recently took steps to obtain an import permit for an American consignment in transit to Jordan, which had been refused some time ago by the Lebanese Government, and was successful in obtaining it. We are currently taking steps to remove from a blacklist three American tankers refused permission to enter a Saudi Arabian port.

"One of the cases cited in your letter had been previously brought to our attention and sent to our Embassy in Saudi Arabia for its report. The other case which you cite has now also been referred to the Embassy. The type of discrimination implicit in these cases is indeed serious. The Department hopes that these instances are in the nature of sporadic, out-of-bounds actions based on excessive zeal or misunderstanding on the part of certain individuals rather than an indication of fundamental intensification of boycott practice by the Saudi Arabian Government. This hope is supported by the report which we have just received from the Embassy on the first of the two cases reported to it. The Embassy states that it can find no decree of the Saudi Arabian Government barring imports from Jewish firms but is investigating the possibility that a local sheik or other official may have issued an order effective only in his area. A leading figure of the Arab League has also recently indicated to an officer of the Department that discrimination of the type exemplified in the cases under reference is not, to his knowledge, contemplated nor supported by the League."

A letter similar in import was sent to Dr. Nehemiah Robinson, director of the Institute of Jewish Affairs of the World Jewish Congress, on December 30, 1953, by Merrill C. Fay, Officer in Charge, Economic Affairs, Office of Near Eastern Affairs of the Department of State. Mr. Fay's letter declared:

"A report has now been received from the American Embassy in Jidda, Saudi Arabia, in response to the Department's inquiry whether a decree has been issued by that Government prohibiting merchants from trading with Jewish-owned firms in the United States.

"The Embassy reports that Decree No. 3/4/2179 of April 4, 1952, forbids the importation of "Israeli products or the products of foreign companies with branches in Israel." Order No. 11299 of August 26, 1953 (16/12/1372) prohibits this importation of goods on "Israeli ships or through Israeli navigation companies or on foreign ships which may anchor, during the trips to Arab countries, in Israeli ports."

"The Embassy reports further that no official action has been taken by the Saudi Arabian Government against trade with Jewish firms who do not have branches in Israel or engage in trade with Israel through Israeli shipping companies. It would therefore appear that the documentation requirement mentioned in your letter has no official status.

"The Embassy speculates that some Saudi Arabian importers entertain apparently groundless fears that their goods might be confiscated, under one of the foregoing regulations, if the supplying firm bore a Jewish name, may have written to their American connections that a certificate by the local chamber of commerce should accompany their shipments. There is nothing that the Department can do, unfortunately, to cause them to desist from such a practice which does not appear to accord with their government's regulations.

"You may rest assured, however, that this situation is being kept under constant study by the Department, and that all appropriate steps will be taken to protect the interests of American exporters."

It has already been suggested that the use of private fronts to conceal official governmental boycott of American Jewish firms is an obvious dodge, one designed to permit Arab countries to engage in anti-Semitic discrimination against American citizens while pleading innocent of any implications in these acts. The insistence by Arab exporters upon a certificate on non-Jewish ownership is too regular and consistent to be attributable only to "excessive zeal" on the part of some "local sheik." It would be naive to suppose that such a widespread pattern of conduct could be sustained without the approval and participation of Government agencies.

Occasionally, the mask has slipped. Recent newspaper accounts indicate that Arab diplomatic officers in this country have admitted Government sponsorship of the discriminatory boycott. The New York Mirror, December 29, 1955, reported the existence of a Saudi Arabian blacklist of Jewish firms and declared:

"At the Saudi Arabian Consulate in the Chrysler Building, a trade attaché admitted that American firms either owned or headed by Americans of the Jewish faith cannot do business with the Arab country."

Similarly, a report in the same newspaper on December 30, 1955, announced State Department disapproval of the exclusion of Jewish firms from this area of international trade and observed:

"An official of the Saudi Arabian Consulate in New York declined to confirm the report, but said that Saudi Arabian firms would 'naturally be reluctant to deal' with American businesses owned by Jews."

(2) The boycott becomes official

Moreover, evidence has come into the possession of the American Jewish Congress unmistakably establishing overt conduct, not on the part of private individuals, but by authorized representatives of the Saudi Arabian Government to promote, create, and maintain a boycott of American Jewish business firms. American Jewish exporters have separately filed affidavits with the American Jewish Congress declaring that the Saudi Arabian Consulate in New York City has refused to legalize commercial invoices they have submitted for approval on the grounds that they are "undesirable" concerns. And each of them has attested that he cannot account for this classification except for the intensive questioning that he or his representatives have recently undergone by members of the Consulate staff as to the fact of their Jewish ownership or as to their employment of Jewish personnel. Even the messengers employed by these firms merely to deliver and hand over papers have been interrogated about their religious affiliation. Under the existing custom of international trade the legalization of commercial invoices frequently is a prerequisite to the fulfillment of contractural obligations between American shippers and Arab purchasers. It will be noticed that in the letters quoted above demanding a certification of non-Jewish ownership, several Arab firms have referred to the fact that "according to Saudi Arabian Government regulations all invoices for the goods supplied must be legalized by the Saudi delegation of your side." A refusal by the Saudi Arabian Government, therefore, to validate these instruments precludes any possibility of maintaining commercial dealings by American Jewish exporters with their Arab customers.

None of the exporters affected by this ruling until this time had had any difficulty or disagreement with the Arab Consulate in New York or with their Arab customers. Despite the generally understood disapproval by the Saudi Arabian Government of commercial transactions carried on by its nationals and foreign Jewish businesses, many of these exporters with the cooperation and help of Arab purchasers had been able to work out devices to avoid official intervention in their transactions. However, the boycott now imposed by Arab Government officials flatly precludes any possibility of negotiation or cooperation on the part of private individuals of either country to carry out contracts for trade. It is precisely because this ban is conducted under the auspices of the Arabian governments themselves and not as a result of private individual decision that these American citizens are barred. It is no longer possible to attempt to evade this problem by lightly passing it off as a result of individual misreading of official regulations. This anti-Jewish discrimination stands clearly disclosed as the direct result of official governmental decision and decree.

Moreover, it is indisputable that our own Government by now must be aware that the current Saudi Arabian boycott of Jewish firms is, in fact, an official undertaking and an expression of anti-Semitic prejudice by the Saudi Arabian Government itself, and not merely a succession of sporadic, private acts. The following item appearing on page 7 of the Foreign Commerce Weekly

of March 5, 1956, published in Washington by the United States Department of Commerce establishes that the Department of Commerce, if not the State Department, is fully apprised of the facts:

"Saudi Arabia intends to boycott all Jewish or Jewish-directed firms from trading with that country, according to information received by the Bureau of Foreign Commerce.

"This new policy greatly extends the provisions of the existing boycott against firms having branches, assembly plants, or general agents in Israel, as well as firms having shares in Israeli companies.

"Implementation of the new policy normally will be accomplished by Saudi Arabian Consulates, who are responsible for legalization of commercial invoices and certificates of origin."

Similarly, the Minutes of the Monthly Round Table Conference of the Foreign Credit Interchange Bureau of March 7, 1956, discloses that Mr. Milton Blecher, Business Analyst of the New York Field Office of the United States Department of Commerce was among the discussants at the conference and that the following comments on the Saudi Arabian boycott were made:

"CHAIRMAN. Customers in Saudi Arabia have advised that a certificate is required by the Saudi Arabian authorities as to the Jewish or Christian status of the firm for which a letter of credit is to be opened. Such a certificate is to be verified or visaed by the Saudi Arabian Consul in New York. Lack of this certificate, or a certificate indicating that the supplier firm is 'Jewish' would make it impossible to conclude the sale. It is not clear just what is meant by a 'Jewish firm' nor can we comply with such a request without protesting the implication. Has there been any action by the Department of Commerce or by the FCIB to make the impertinence of this requirement known to the Saudi-Arabian authorities?

"Mr. MILTON BLECHER (United States Department of Commerce). Saudi Arabia intends to boycott all Jewish or Jewish-directed firms from trading with that country, according to information received by the Bureau of Foreign Commerce, United States Department of Commerce.

"This new policy greatly extends the provisions of the existing boycott against firms having branches, assembly plants, or general agents in Israel, as well as firms having shares in Israeli companies.

"Implementation of the new policy normally will be accomplished by Saudi Arabian consulates, who are responsible for legalization of commercial invoices and certificates of origin.

"CHAIRMAN. I think Mr. Blecher in his comments also answered question No. 2.

"Question: Several stories have appeared recently in the press regarding a trading boycott by Saudi Arabia against certain American firms. Can you develop this further at the Round Table?

"MEMBER. One part of the discussion has not been clarified. Is this something being considered or are there firms now shipping to Saudi Arabia and having any difficulty?

"PANEL MEMBER. I just heard of one case where the consulate in Beirut refused to clear the transshipment documents.

"MEMBER. Within the last month we received a letter of credit from Saudi Arabia and there was absolutely no question.

"PANEL MEMBER. I think there is a private clearance going on here by the consulate and they have certain information on certain firms on the strength of which they act.

"MEMBER. We have made several shipments and all that has been required of us has been certificate of origin and that would be legalized by the Saudi Arabian consulate.

"MEMBER. What would be considered a Jewish corporation?

"CHAIRMAN. Can anybody answer that?

"PANEL MEMBER. As far as I know if any member of the firm or part owner of the firm is of the Jewish faith they will not allow the goods in."

The Department of Commerce is thus aware of the facts. Foreign creditmen working in this country are aware of the facts. Virtually the only interested party not aware of the facts is our State Department.

In the one precedent in our history for this withholding of consular approval of commercial documents submitted by American Jewish firms, the then Acting Secretary of State, Alvey A. Adee, in 1895 found this practice to be an "unjust and invidious discrimination against American Jews":

"But the Russian discrimination against American Jews is not confined simply to the matter of visaing passports. This department was informed a few years since by the Russian Minister here that Russian consuls in this country would refuse authentication to legal documents for use in Russia when Jews are ascertained to be interested. This is an unjust and invidious discrimination against American Jews" (Foreign Relations, 1895, page 1067).

Acting Secretary Adee called for immediate cessation of these practices and the adoption of preventive measures by this country. It is to be expected that now that all pretense has been dropped and the actual involvement of Government officials in the current anti-Jewish boycott is a matter of full public disclosure and information, our State Department officials will similarly be disposed to demand an immediate stop to this intolerable behavior by Arab diplomats in this country.

It is also significant that none of these exporters maintains any branches or transacts any business with the Government of Israel or with any Israeli firms. The allegation that only firms with Israeli branches or connections are excluded from Arab trade is a transparent artifice employed by the Arab League to conceal its intention to boycott Jewish firms wherever situated, as is indicated in the remarks of Mr. Blecher, of the United States Department of Commerce, quoted earlier. It cannot be mere accident that so many individual Arab exporters should have felt constrained to interpret nominally anti-Israel regulations as, in fact, directed against any foreign Jewish enterprise. The merits of Arab hostility to Israel may be debated by other disinterested nations, but this hostility cannot in any way be made to justify the current campaign of universal anti-Semitism.

It is worth noting that in some countries, notably Italy and Holland, commercial organizations and Government authorities have denounced this Arab policy and have refused to cooperate with it. The Central Organization for Foreign Economic Relations at the Hague has recently advised the Netherlands branch of the International Chamber of Commerce that Dutch members should not supply information relating to the number of Jewish executives and employees employed in Dutch export houses as demanded by various Arab importers. It is also disclosed that: "The Belgian Foreign Ministry is reported to have told the Antwerp association that it is giving sympathetic consideration to the request for international action on the issue" (New York Herald Tribune, February 12, 1956).

(3) The "informal approach" of the State Department

No less should be expected of our own Government. Previous State Department demurrers on the ground that the Arab states have the sovereign right to regulate their commerce and their mode of international dealing are not a sufficient reply to the deprivation of rights suffered by American citizens. The operative facts here do not run to any country's sovereignty, but rather to our own country's policy of permitting an affront to a section of American citizenry to go unanswered.

Moreover, the State Department surely has a responsibility to reaffirm and continually press, through every possible international forum its wholehearted opposition to this practice. As Senator LEHMAN wrote Secretary Dulles on January 25:

"Would you not agree that our Government has an obligation to its citizens, and its own ideals, to let the Government of Saudi Arabia know not only on one occasion but on repeated occasions that we view with utmost distaste this policy of anti-Semitic discrimination?"

It has been already noted that the State Department at one time felt that its intercession had successfully resulted in ending the then concededly official Arab boycott against American Jewish ctizens. Recent events obviously disprove this claim. Part of the reason for our Government's notable lack of ability to bring this practice to a decisive end may be found in the hesitant and uncertain attitude of the State Department itself. It will be remembered from Mr. McFall's letter quoted earlier that the State Department was apprehensive about possible repercussions at least as much as it was agitated about the admitted fact of discrimination. Mr. McFall's language is suggestive of the State Department's thinking: "The delicacy of the problem in Saudi Arabia recommended an informal approach rather than official representations to that Government." And the State Department's notion of what needed to be done culminated in holding frank but friendly discussions.

It is high time the State Department steeled itself to the realization that informal approaches and friendly discussions, however frank, are not enough to drive home the proposition that this Government will not stand for further religious discrimination against its citizens. The fact that the agreement not to boycott did not stick must be attributed to the willingness of our representatives to pussyfoot and equivocate and to act out of fear of loss of advantage rather than out of strength deriving from conviction. Further representations can and ought to be made, but they must be made in firm language and in a formal context that makes it plain that we do not intend to be bought off; that, in short, we are determined with all the vigor and influence we can bring to bear to protect all our citizens alike. It should be made plain that no treaty or trade agreement will be negotiated or maintained between the Arab countries and the United States unless it is expressly understood that all American citizens shall have full and equal right to participate in the trade thus made possible, without regard to religious affiliation. The prestige and influence of the United States is not so inconsiderable that the Arab countries could easily remain recalcitrant and unyielding in the face of a clear and determined expression of policy by this country.

IV. ARAB ANTI-JEWISH PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Perhaps the most vicious offense committed by Arab governments against Jewish citizens in the United States is their deliberate fomenting of domestic anti-Semitism in this country and their collaboration with and sponsorship of elements in the American hate movement.

A. The Arab Information Center

Prior to the end of World War II, there were virtually no Arab propaganda activities at all in the United States. In November 1944, for the first time an office was established in New York under the name of the Institute of Arab-American Affairs to disseminate material about each of the Arab

countries separately as well as about the group of Arab countries united in the Arab League. Though its declared purpose was to seek to implement its policy as a medium of good will between the United States and Arab countries, most of its activities were concerned with the fight against the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine and by 1947 the Institute of Arab-American Affairs was dealing exclusively with the Palestine question.

The main organ of propaganda for the Arabs in the United States is the Arab Information Center recently reactivated in New York City at 445 Park Avenue, where it shares quarters with the U. N. delegation of the Kingdom of Yemen. The information center is currently headed by Kamil Abdul Rahim, a veteran diplomat who served from 1948 to 1953 as Egyptian Ambassador to Washington and is now an accredited member, with the rank of Ambassador, of the Yemen delegation to the U. N. As U. N. Ambassador, Rahim enjoys diplomatic immunity not only for his own person but also for the premises he occupies, which just happen to be coterminous with those of the Arab Information Center. The center itself, however, is registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. The center has recently been granted a special fund of $300,000 to expand its activities against Israel and Zionism. Egypt underwrote the major portion of this expenditure with an allocation of $140,000; the Arab League allotted $90,000, and Saudi Arabia $70,000. Besides this, the center has been given a regular budget of $400,000. Thus, it has a total of $700,000 to spend in the coming year's operations.

B. Collaboration with American hatemongers

In carrying out its anti-Jewish campaign, the Arab Information Center has determined upon a course of intimate cooperation with professional anti-Semites in this country.

A policy statement sent by Rahim on October 25, 1954, from Cairo before his departure for the United States to head the center, to Dr. Omar Haliq, Arab League representative in New York (Jewish Telegraphic Agency dispatch of March 17, 1955) declared that the center henceforth would welcome the cooperation and assistance of professional anti-Semites in all fields and ways. Rahim emphasized that such activities were to be handled discreetly so as not to expose the center to charges of anti-Semitism or compromise its character as a cultural exchange. Rahim indicated that he intended to deal with this facet of the center's activities personally.

It is further reported that at about this same time Dr. Haliq sounded out for possible Arab collaboration such figures as Gerald L. K. Smith, who runs the Christian Nationalist Party; Joseph P. Kamp, head of the Constitutional Educational League; Allen Zoll, whose American Patriots, Inc., was listed as fascist by the Justice Department; and Benjamin H. Freedman, confessed financier of anti-Jewish publications.

More recently open cooperation between Arab diplomats and American hate groups has become even more bold and unabashed. At a meeting last June of the American Nationalist Coalition, a front group for James H. Madole's National Renaissance Party, cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as an avowedly Hitlerite group, Abdul M. Hassan, a member of the Egyptian delegation to the United Nations, was a featured and inflammatory speaker. A table at the rear of the meeting room, attended by a uniformed American Nationalist Coalition youth member, offered for free distribution such pamphlets as Egypt's Agrarian Policy Under the New Regime, by Dr. Abd-El-Razzok Sidky, and the Story of Zionist Espionage in Egypt. According to Madole, the pamphlets were provided free by the Egyptian Embassy and proved the anti-Israel and anti-Jewish charges made in Hassan's remarks. Hassan inevitably later declared that his appearance at the meeting did not necessarily constitute endorsement of the coalition's entire program. National Jewish Post, June 10, 1955.

C. Distribution of anti-Semitic literature

The increasing voluminous literature published directly by Arab official propaganda agencies bears a comparable stamp of anti-Jewishness although, significantly, it does not usually bear any imprint identifying its source. Most of the anti-Jewish items now being freely distributed across the country, often elaborately and hansomely printed, are published by the embassies of the Arab states and distributed by the Arab Information Center.

Generally, Arab officials obey the advice given them by American consultants to avoid heavy-handed anti-Jewish themes in their propaganda. On the other hand, the Arabs understand that the terms "Zionist" and "Jew" are so closely identified in the United States by the general public that the theme of anti-Zionism can be handled adroitly to produce anti-Jewish implications, thus the continually repeated refrain concerning "the influence of the American Zionists in Washington."

Occasionally, however, the Arab line is directed into an unmistakable excursion into overt anti-Jewish incitement. This is especially true in two pamphlets now widely in circulation, Story of Zionist Espionage in Egypt and Jewish Atrocities in the Holy Land. Both documents originally were issued by the Egyptian Embassy and were sent without any indication of their source or sponsorship to a large mailing list. They are also distributed by the Arab Information Center. These pamphlets clearly seek not only to inspire antipathy toward Israel but, in addition, to invoke a feeling of anti-Jewish prejudice and bias generally. And as a matter of fact, domestic anti-Semites in the United States already has distributed and exploited these documents for their own purposes. Thus, The Story of Zionist Espionage in Egypt is now being circulated by Madole's National Renaissance Party, an openly Hitlerite group, and Jewish Atrocities in the Holy land, published 6 years ago, has been circulated and distributed, and its contents otherwise exploited, by such worthies as Conde McGinley, Gerald L. K. Smith, and Frank L. Britton.

The Story of Zionist Espionage in Egypt is openly anti-Jewish as well as anti-Israel. A detailed narration of an alleged spy plot is prefaced with the statement that the Israelis—

"Recruit hundreds of agents, financed through the international system of begging which Israel has invented and brought to an art, and disperse them throughout the Arab world to commit acts of sabotage, destroying the lives of the innocent."

After 40 pages on this subject, the pamphlet then devotes about 15 pages to alleged desecration of Moslem and Christian holy places by the Zionist and the Jewish forces, narrations of the assassinations of Lord Moyne and Count Bernadotte, and finally—after this lengthy warm-up of spying, bombing, atrocity, desecration and assassination—a one-page dissertation on Zionism and communism, which begins:

"Zionism and communism are two distinctive forces with one political objective—world domination. Both powers cooperate secretly and in public without friction since the power in the end will eventually go to Zionism.

"* * * They will not achieve supremacy until they destroy the Islamic and Christian countries all over the world. Therefore communism helps Zionism and each in its own way completes the other; only thus will they reach their aim—Zionist world supremacy."

Jewish Atrocities in the Holy Land exploits the excesses committed by unauthorized terrorists at the height of the Arab-Israeli conflict; the excesses are attributed to the Jews as Jews. Scattered throughout the pamphlet are photographs of the more revolting kind, including some which show dead victims in various states of decomposition.

The following excerpts are illustrative of the themes in the text of this pamphlet:

"Now we have once more to hear the horrible tale of sadistic cruelties and wanton brutalities perpetrated against an innocent population, mainly composed of women, children and old men. But this time the aggressors are those very Jews who were lately so loud in their outcry against the Nazis.

"* * * When reading of these atrocious acts, one unconsciously thinks of their perpetrators as being untaught savages, or barbarians of the remote past. Yet these same Jews have for centuries, by virtue of their money-amassing activities, gathered to themselves the cream of culture, and refinement of whatever country they have settled in. The weathly, educated Jew surrounded by all the culture and art that his riches can command has long been a familiar figure in civilized society."

An even more outrageous document, published by the World Truth League of POB 44, Jerusalem, Jordan-Arab side, is distributed widely in the United States through embassy offices of the Arab delegations to the U. N. as well as by the Arab Information Center. The sheet, composed in a sensational format, contains touched-up photographs of alleged Israeli massacres of Arab children, old men, and women. It quotes liberally from the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion to the effect that the Jews believe the gentiles are a flock of sheep and we are the wolves and you know what happens when the wolves get hold of the flock. This Jordanian leaflet maintains that Jews, not Israelis, are the unconscionable exploiters of the gentile world and they have very well proved it once again by their recent Judaic barbarities against innocent Arab shepherds. It declares that the basic material in all Jewish propaganda is composed of lies and distortion of facts as is known by now all over the world.

Another column contains citations from books and documents written by Jews of various nationalities around the world, purporting to illustrate the Jewish incendiary revolutionary spirit. Among the persons slandered are: Theodore Herzl, Louis Dembitz Brandeis, Harold Laski, and Bernard Baruch. The paper also discloses that: "Benjamin Cohen, a Jew from Chile, is just under Trygve Lie, the U. N. Secretary General and his job is to see that Lie follows the Jew plan." "The United States representative at the U. N. is the Jew, Ernest A. Gross." "Dr. Leo Paslovsky, 'special United States Assistant Secretary of State,' a Russian born Jew, naturalized American citizen, is the man who drew the United Nations Charter, with the assistance of Alger Hiss, the traitor, who was then in the State Department." "The United States is hopelessly run by Jews and the U. N. is the den of Jewish spies."

It is apparent that crude and vicious canards of this kind are not intended to be limited merely to incitement of hostility against Israel. They are designed for the larger purpose of promoting hatred toward Jews of every national allegiance throughout the world.

D. Defamation by Arab diplomats

The most astounding and arrogent conduct of all however is the persistent abuse

by Arab diplomats of the hospitality granted them by the United States. In addition to the spurious political arguments used by Arab diplomatic representatives to press their cause, they have now added an almost open appeal to prejudice, suspicion, and race hate. Recourse to anti-Semitism is nothing new in the history of calumny of the Jewish people but it never before has been attempted in America by foreign diplomats as part of a calculated design.

One of the first reported cases of an attack by Arab spokesmen on American Jews before their fellow citizens occurred in February 1953 during a conference of middle eastern affairs sponsored by the Foreign Service Educational Foundation in Washington, for the benefit of corporations from all over the country. During the conference, a State Department official read an address by Mr. Bakr, then Iraq Chargé d'Affairs in Washington and now his country's Foreign Secretary, in which Bakr used the then recent doctors' plot of Moscow to show that Jews could really not be trusted anywhere and that they are part of an international conspiracy, whether they are Russian citizens, Americans or citizens of any other country.

(1) Ambassador Zeineddin's Anti-Jewish Campaign

Dr. Zeineddin, Bakr's Syrian colleague, tried out this theme a month later in an address at the University of Vermont and then later in a full-fledged attack on April 15, 1953, at the Seventh Session of the United Nations in New York.

In his address, the Syrian Ambassador stated:

"The steps taken by the Soviet Union were met with deep satisfaction and appreciation in my country and the public opinion of other Middle Eastern countries * * * Zionism uses the Jewish religion for its political purposes * * * Jews who become Zionists act as a separate closely knit group within their nation. They serve their own Zionist interest. Their allegiance is therefore not to their legal country. Their allegiance to their legal country is formal and not real. Their real allegiance would be to Zionism and Israel, i. e., to a foreign authority. An American, an Argentinian, a Russian, or a Syrian Zionist are all one in furthering the aims of Zionism in Israel, be it to the detriment of the interests of their legal country. This, naturally, creates mistrust, suspicion, and apprehension between Zionist Jews and non-Jews. Thus Zionism breeds and enhances the growth of anti-Semitism. In fact everywhere that Zionism grew, it brought anti-Semitism in its wake."

After piously insisting that he is not anti-Semitic ("How can we Arabs be anti-Semitic? Are we not Semites ourselves?"). Dr. Zeineddin repeated the familiar calumny of the "international Zionist conspiracy" in the following remarks:

"Zionists today are organized all over the world * * * they join political parties ranging from diehard conservatism to communism, but as Zionists they work toward one end * * * Zionism works in a way which constantly adversely affects world peace and the security of other states by inciting the Jews to feel that they are exiles in their various homelands and by developing in them a conviction that they are an entity of their own in any country. It breaches, with one stroke, the national unity in their country on the basis of religion, thus diminishing national harmony."

These remarks have formed a consistent pattern. Thus, Zeineddin has declared over a radio program broadcast over the NBC network:

"As you may know, Zionism is based upon a distinction as to race and religion between the Jew and gentile. They (Zionists) attempt to have the Jews consider themselves as exiles in other countries * * * and there you have the idea of the diaspora * * * and that they should be assembled in Palestine. A Zionist, therefore, gets to be loyal to Israel and gets to be loyal to the Zionist movement if he is really a Zionist. His loyalty to Zionism undoubtedly may diminish his loyalty to the country in which he lives, and therefore Zionism brings some shade of doubt as to the loyalty of Jews in other countries of whom many might be loyal."

Similarly in a television broadcast some time later, carried over the Dumont network on November 2, 1953, he stated further:

"When an individual becomes a Zionist he acquires a double loyalty, his allegiance is divided. If he is a strong Zionist, his allegiance will certainly go to Israel, even against his very own country, be it the United States, or Syria, or any other country. He is then legally an American, but in fact his allegiance is due to some other principle, that of Zionism, or to some other country such as Israel."

Far from abating, Dr. Zeineddin's incitement of domestic anti-Semitism has become an increasingly intense preoccupation. In a speech delivered before the Women's National Democratic Club in Washington in November 1955 he brazenly impugned the loyalty of American Jews to their own country. Zeineddin charged that "Zionist pressures" on the United States Government and Zionist propaganda had distorted and perverted Arab and American relations. He characterized Jews throughout the world as "mongrelized Russians" who cannot ever claim to be an integral part of a country in which they reside, that they consider themselves "different," that they refuse to assimilate and owe their allegiance solely to international Zionism. He wound up his speech by declaring that if there is such a large and urgent sentiment in this country for a creation of a Jewish state "then the only fit place for them is New York City" (New York Post, November 16, 1955).

On November 17, 1955, in a lengthy meeting with George V. Allen, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, Zeineddin boasts of having said that: "Zionism seeks with some success to make of the United States and in the United States a center for its worldwide activity which is inimical to other states and which is morally unfounded." Zeineddin reportedly urged that the United States "find it fit to look into this matter in view of its international implications." He stressed that the Arabs were especially anxious to see the United States Government look into tax exemptions by Jewish charity contributors. He claimed such deductions really supported "a foreign political movement" (Jewish Telegraph Agency, November 18, 1955).

A similar refrain has recently been picked up by the diplomatic representatives of other Arab countries. In an address to the Economic Club of Detroit on October 31, 1955, Dr. Mohamed Fadhil Al-Jamali, Foreign Minister of Iraq and head of its U. N. delegation described the situation "created by a United States policy which has been inspired mainly by Zionist propaganda and pressure":

"They (the Arabs) feel that American policy cannot easily relieve itself from Zionist pressure and Zionist manipulation of the Jewish vote. Next year is an election year. Could the peoples of the United States who have peace and American interests at heart see to it that Zionist propaganda becomes ineffective in the election campaign? It is most important for United States interests in the Middle East that United States policy should no be influenced by Zionist pressure."

The canards currently being circulated by Arab diplomats have not gone unnoticed and they have not been condemned only within the Jewish community. The leaders of five prominent non-Jewish nationality groups in America, including the president of the Czechoslovak National Council of America, the director of the American Hungarian Federation, the chairman of the National Anti-Defamation Committee of the Order of the Sons of Italy in the United States, the director of the American Lithuanian Information Center, the executive secretary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee and the editor of the leading Polish language newspaper in the United States, recently protested to Secretary of State Dulles against Zeineddin's libels. They wrote, "To us, the substance of the Ambassador's remarks in many ways was virtually indistinguishable from Nazi racial theories which, within all our memories have brought about such ruin and loss to the world" (J. T. A. November 22, 1955).

(2) Recruiting Arab Student Propagandists

The anti-Semitic activities of the Arab diplomats have been supplemented by the more informal if no less intense propaganda efforts of Arab students now studying in the United States. Cairo radio broadcasts monitored in the United States report that the more than 2,000 Arab students in this country have been directed by the Arab League to assume an active role in the promotion of anti-Israel and anti-Jewish propoganda in this country. According to these broadcasts, Arab students have been supplied with anti-Zionist literature and have been instructed to deliver anti-Zionist lectures not only on campus but in the general communities outside the universities in which they study, and they have been directed to exert themselves to stimulate pro-Arab and anti-Jewish articles in the American press. The indefatigable efforts of the Arab League to exploit every possible resource to incite anti-Jewish feeling in this country is evidenced in the following item in the January 1956 Newsletter of the Arab Students Association at Columbia University:

"Arab Students Abroad To Defend Arabism. The secretary-general of the Arab League requested member states to furnish the League with the names of its nationals studying abroad. The secretariat intends to provide these students, wherever they may be, with information which will help them defend Arab interests."

The same Columbia University Newsletter includes samples of the materials to be used as factual information by Arab students invited to college forums and other public meetings. A characteristic example is the following item attributed by the newsletter to the Egyptian weekly Al Musawwar:

"We Egyptians do not face a small country called Israel, but a well-organized international movement called Zionism. This movement everts tremendous pressure on the Governments of the United States, France, England, and other Western countries.

"Some Western and Eastern bloc countries supplied Israel with arms during the 1947 conflict. Certain army generals, fliers, and soldiers who fought for Israel were not Jews; identification cards of prisoners taken during that war testify to that.

"Israel was established upon the bodies of Palestine's rightful inhabitants through funds obtained from the pockets of American, British, and French Zionists."

The Arab League is careful not to miss a trick. It does not scruple at abusing the special status enjoyed in this country by diplomats and visiting students, and it does not hesitate to attempt to convert each of its nationals in the United States into an instrument for the promotion of anti-Israel

and anti-Jewish doctrine in this country. That such conduct is improper, that it violates the hospitality extended by the host state, that it is offensive to the beliefs and traditions of the people of the United States is apparently a matter of no concern.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

While we recognize that the Government of the United States from time to time has expressed its passing disapproval of Arab anti-Jewish discrimination against American citizens, we submit that far more vigorous action is called for than until now has been forthcoming. American Jews have the right to expect their Government to protect their dignity and good name and their right to travel or engage in commerce abroad on an equal footing with their fellow citizens of other faiths. The effect of present Arab policy is not only to deny equal treatment to American citizens in Arab territories but to extend anti-Semitism into new and unexpected places here. The time is overdue for official American spokesmen to meet infringements by foreign states upon the rights of American citizens with decision, firmness, and a determination to protect American rights.

The argument that a firm protection of the rights of our Jewish citizens must be damaging to our economic interests is false and misleading. Arab leaders are if anything practical men. And Arab economic relations are based not upon sentiment but upon interest. Any concessions that may now be enjoyed by the United States in Arab lands do not derive from any innate liking that Arab leaders have for this country or from their natural sympathy for our democratic objectives. These benefits result more simply from the enormous consideration that the United States is able to pay in return. It is incredible that this immense American revenue, absolutely vital to the support of the Arab economy will be refused because of our insistence upon equal treatment for all our citizens. Sovereign decisions on economic and political matters are not made to turn solely upon such factors.

American spokesmen appear sometimes to misunderstand our role. Our relations with the Arab States are not those in which we entreat their favor. We come with gifts in our hands amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars a year and Arab statesmen perceive this truth, perhaps more clearly and accurately than our own. If the Arab governments have felt during the past decade that they could ignore the protests of American ministers and Secretaries of State, it is because and only because they felt American protests were halfhearted and unwilling and because they were convinced that this Government spoke only for some special interests or for some special point of view. The intolerable abuse of American citizens by Arab States will be corrected just as quickly as they become convinced that for this country it is indeed intolerable.

The action necessary by the United States to convince the Arab governments of our determination and resolve to protect the rights of all our citizens equally can readily be prescribed. It would quickly be achieved by adoption of the following measures:

1. No treaty or trade agreement should be negotiated between the Arab countries and the United States unless it is stipulated that all American citizens shall have full and equal right to participate in the trade thus made possible, without regard to religious affiliation.

2. No contract should be negotiated with the Arab States by any agency of the United States whether it be for defense, security, or for any other reason, that allows or requires American Jews to be excluded from employment pursuant to its terms. It shall be made a part of each American-Arab agreement that there shall be no religious discrimination as a result of these joint undertakings against any American citizens.

3. Existing American subsidies including those granted under the International Wheat Trade Agreement should be discontinued for trade in Arab countries unless it is explicitly understood that American Jews shall be permitted full participation without prejudice because of their religious beliefs.

4. No agency of this Government, military or diplomatic, should be permitted to consider religious affiliation in selecting personnel for assignment to Arab countries.

5. No discriminatory hiring practices should be condoned or excused because of the possible exclusion of Jews from Arab lands by Arab refusal to issue necessary visas.

6. The United States should prohibit immigration whether temporary or permanent, whether for tourists or for permanent residents, from any Arab State which bars entry to any American citizen because of his religious beliefs.

7. Any member of a diplomatic mission to this country who indulges in public anti-Jewish activities aimed directly or indirectly against American Jewish citizens or the American Jewish community generally should be declared persona non grata by our Government.

8. Any member of a diplomatic mission to this country who refuses to process commercial or legal documents because they are offered by Jewish business firms or who makes inquiries into the religious affiliation of persons who come before him in his official capacity should be declared persona non grata.

9. Any person present in the United States on a student visa who engages in public anti-Jewish activities aimed at American citizens should have his student visa terminated, since even the most permissive view of academic freedom cannot justify the promotion of race hatred.

10. The United States delegation to the United Nations should assume the initiative in demanding U. N. inquiry into practices of Arab States that are violative of the common pledge of all U. N. member states to promote universal respect for human rights.

Each of the nine other measures may be initiated by unilateral action of the United States. The anti-Jewish efforts of Arab countries, however, have spilled over every national border and while the general refusal of the civilized world to give way to Arab prejudice is gratifying, the fact that no concerted effort has been made to meet it decisively must be regarded as a serious shortcoming. The time has come for an international effort to put an end to a policy which is damaging to international trade and causes loss and grave inconveniences to people of many nationalities. Under article 55 of the charter, the United Nations undertakes to promote "universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion" and under article 56, "all members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in article 55." These texts are susceptible to many and varying interpretations but to seek to reconcile them with a new and deliberate policy of discrimination on an international scale is to denude words of their meaning. The action of Saudi Arabia in instituting discriminatory commercial practices against groups of citizens distinguishable only by their religion in countries with which it enjoys normal diplomatic relations is manifestly irreconcilable with the principles and purposes of the United Nations as embodied in the preamble to the charter and in articles 55 and 56.

Whatever may be thought about the right of a government to practice or tolerate discrimination against its own nationals, the practice of discrimination against the citizens of other states is clearly not compatible with an undertaking to promote universal respect for human rights, to say nothing of the comity of nations. If this precedent is allowed to stand without challenge, and is imitated elsewhere, the international community would be exposed to a new and serious menace. The national economy of every country would be opened to the operation of officially sponsored influences dangerous to its welfare and hostile to its traditions.

CONCLUSION

Decisive action by the United States will clear the air. We may confidently expect that Arab governments will desist in their discrimnatory practices once our position is indicated by unequivocal action. The arithmetic of advantage is plan. Arab leaders could not repudiate American support without the prospect of certain financial loss. Our serious insistence upon an end to discrimination would doubtless persuade Arab spokesmen acting out of an enlightened self-interest to discontinue their anti-Semitic conduct. In any event this is a risk we are fated to run. No honorable alternative exists. We respectfully disagree with Secretary Dulles that Arab affronts to American citizens must be suffered peaceably so that our nations may "get along together in a way that is to our mutual advantage." There can be no "mutual advantage" when one of the terms of the bargain requires that we condone and ratify religious bigotry. We believe, as President Wilson believed in a comparable situation, there comes a time—and that time is now—when we must finally say: the price is too great.

ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN,
President, American Jewish Congress.
PHILIP BAUM,
WILL MASLOW,
Of Counsel.

APRIL 1956.

SPECIAL STUDIES OF SICKNESS AND DISABILITY, AND SPECIAL REPORTS THEREOF

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3076) to provide for a continuing survey and special studies of sickness and disability in the United States, and for periodic reports of the results thereof, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "National Health Survey Act."

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(1) that the latest information on the number and relevant characteristics of persons in the country suffering from heart disease, cancer, diabetes, arthritis and rheumatism, and other diseases, injuries, and handicapping conditions is now seriously out of date; and

(2) that periodic inventories providing reasonably current information on these matters are urgently needed for purposes such as (A) appraisal of the true state of health of our population (including both adults and children), (B) adequate planning of any programs to improve their health, (C) research in the field of chronic diseases, and (D) measurement of the numbers of persons in the working ages so disabled as to be unable to perform gainful work.

(b) It is, therefore, the purpose of this act to provide (1) for a continuing survey and special studies to secure on a noncompulsory basis accurate and current statistical information on the amount, distribution, and effects of illness and disability in the United States and the services received for or because of such conditions; and (2) for studying methods and survey techniques for securing such statistical information, with a view toward their continuing improvement.

SEC. 3. Part A of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. ch. 6A) is amended by adding after section 304 the following new section:

"NATIONAL HEALTH SURVEYS AND STUDIES

"SEC. 305. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized (1) to make, by sampling or other appropriate means, surveys and special studies of the population of the United States to determine the extent of illness and disability and related information such as: (A) the number, age, sex, ability to work or engage in other activities, and occupation or activities of persons afflicted with chronic or other disease or injury or handicapping condition; (B) the type of disease or injury or handicapping condition of each person so afflicted; (C) the length of time that each such person has been prevented from carrying on his occupation or activities; (D) the amounts and types of services received for or because of such conditions; and (E) the economic and other impacts of such conditions; and (2) in connection therewith, to develop and test new or improved methods for obtaining current data on illness and disability and related information.

"(b) The Surgeon General is authorized, at appropriate intervals, to make available, through publications and otherwise, to any interested governmental or other public or private agencies, organizations, or groups, or to the public, the results of surveys or studies made pursuant to subsection (a).

"(c) For each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1956, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as the Congress may determine for carrying out the provisions of this section.

"(d) To assist in carrying out the provisions of this section the Surgeon General is authorized and directed to cooperate and consult with the Departments of Commerce and Labor and any other interested Federal Departments or agencies and with State health departments. For such purpose he shall utilize insofar as possible the services or facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, of any appropriate State or other public agency, and may, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, utilize the services or facilities of any private agency, organization, group, or individual, in accordance with written agreements between the head of such agency, organization, or group, or such individual, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Payment, if any, for such services or facilities shall be made in such amounts as may be provided in such agreement."

SEC. 4. Section 301 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. 241) is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (f), redesignating paragraph (g) as paragraph (h), and inserting immediately following paragraph (f) the following new paragraph:

"(g) Make available, to health officials, scientists, and appropriate public and other nonprofit institutions and organizations, technical advice and assistance on the application of statistical methods to experiments, studies, and surveys in health and medical fields; and".

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have consulted with the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and he has no objection to the House amendment. I have also consulted with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and that Department has no objection. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

FOREIGN POLICY

III. A NEW LOOK AT DEFENSE

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, over the past years our defense policies and preparations, so far as we have had any, have been based on our experience with the last previous war. This is a general statement. It is not a completely fair description of defense history, for there have always been individuals and groups and at times large sections of our defense forces who have been imaginative and have tried to project the future into present preparation.

Whatever may have been the case in the past, it is not true today that our defense forces are preparing on the basis of World War II or the Korean war. The pace of invention and development has been so fast as to stimulate the imagination, make necessary an appraisal of new possibilities, and, in general, lead to a complete review of our means and policies of defense.

It is scarcely necessary to do more than list the new developments, beginning with the atomic bomb which was dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This was followed by the hydrogen bomb exploded in the Bikini-Eniwetok area. More recently, our first air-dropped hydrogen bomb was exploded in the same area.

The development of these powerful weapons has put the emphasis on fast, heavy bombers for delivering them and on supersonic fighter planes for preventing their delivery on our own territory. This has emphasized the importance of the air arm in our forces. The expansion of this arm and of the defenses against air attack are our primary military concern. The most serious obstacle to further expansion seems to lie in obtaining flying personnel. This situation demands the best thought and effort of the Congress and the Defense Department.

Defense is also heavily dependent on early warning. We now have available the means, elaborate and expensive ones, to detect, track, and attack invading bombers. There is no such defense presently available either in the Western World or behind the curtain to detect and destroy the long-range missile.

At the present moment the most active development is in the field of missiles carrying atomic warheads. These may be either guided missiles which are presently available, medium-range ballistic missiles whose development is approaching successful ranges up to 1,500 miles or thereabouts, or the long-range, intercontinental ballistic missiles still in the early stages of development. It is hoped that the latter will have a range of several thousand miles.

Meanwhile, the size of the explodable charge of the atomic bomb has been continuously reduced so that there is now available a whole family of tactical atomic weapons for delivery by plane, rocket, or artillery.

It is obvious that this arsenal of death does not fit into any previous strategic pattern. We are forced to think and plan anew. Along what lines should this thinking and planning be done?

It is not the function of Congress to define defense policies in the first place. That must be left to the administration, whether in its political or its strategic aspects. It is certainly within our responsibility to raise some of the questions which must be answered and to see that those questions are answered. That responsibility we are not justified in leaving passively with the administrative branch of our Government.

Among the questions to be raised are these:

First, so far as concerns Europe, is there any doubt that the war for which we must be prepared will be an atomic war? Is there any slightest possibility that there will arise there a war which will be primarily one between foot soldiers?

Until we have more persuasive information and argument than is at present available, we must conclude that the European war of the future, if any, will be an atomic war. We cannot help facing this conclusion with regret, but we must face the facts, and we must make sure that the people whom we represent in the Congress of the United States face these facts also.

But let us not be too sure. We may be deceiving ourselves in this matter. Perhaps the Soviet Government will accept the atomic stalemate and, expecting us to do likewise, will initiate an invasion of Western Europe along old-fashioned, ground-army lines, where their greatest strength lies. To forestall this development, we should at once announce that tactical atomic weapons will be employed by us on invading forces within the boundaries of any invaded nation. This atomic deterrent extends the atomic stalemate to land warfare, and is a vital part of our defense measures. The importance of this action can scarcely be overrated. I presented the case for this action before the Subcommittee on Disarmament on March 7 last.

In other respects neither the people nor the Government are facing the facts. It may confidently be expected that the primary military targets of invading bombers will be our strategic airfields. There would be an endeavor to put these airfields out of business as nearly simultaneously as possible, so that we would lack the means of reprisal. What we have not been doing is to disperse these strategic fields in areas of low population density so that there would be as little civilian loss of life as possible. There have been definite reasons for

this policy. It is expensive to provide the necessary facilities and amenities for a large military installation far from large towns and cities. We must not let that consideration guide any further expansion of our strategic airfields. Furthermore, as a part of the education of the public, there must be an earnest request, amounting to insistence, that for its own protection, industrial expansion must be spread over the countryside so that it presents no concentrated target for destruction by the enemy. The workman's automobile and improved highways make this possible. In large measure this is taking place for economic reasons. Strategic necessity emphasizes the economic trend.

But perhaps the military attack may be, in essence, a political one. The 1,500 mile range ballistic missile is probably a political weapon. The proposed intercontinental ballistic missile is certainly political, not military. The difference between political and military weapons is this: If a weapon cannot be accurately aimed at a military target, it is not a military weapon. If it can be delivered over vast distances and exploded in the general areas of centers of population, its principal use and effect is to spread terror. This use is not military but political.

It is conceivable that a potential enemy, discouraged by the slow processes of infiltration and subversion in Western Europe, might shift to a new strategy. It might make it known that it has successfully developed the 1,500-mile missile and that, in consequence, it holds in its power every capital and every industrial center in continental Europe and the British Isles. On the basis of this threat it might demand of the nations of Western Europe a complete reorientation away from freedom and toward the acceptance of Soviet power and Communist doctrine.

With this as a lively possibility, we must make it the main element of our policy to press forward with the launching platforms and the missile supplies in Western Eorope which will counterbalance this threat and hold it in check. This contribution to the safety of our allies will be a main responsibility of the Army.

What about the Navy?

It would seem for the present and in the years ahead to have two primary functions. One of them is to keep the sea lanes open, and for this purpose it must be provided with the most advanced means of submarine spotting and submarine destruction and must likewise be able to detect and repel attack from the air. There is another mission, whether by surface ships or submarines, and that is to provide launching platforms for bomb-laden planes and particularly for guided and ballistic missiles. Such platforms can work from unexpected directions and can reach well within the lines of any hostile attacking nation.

What is the mission of the Marines?

The probabilities of trouble in Southeastern Asia are of a different sort from those in Europe. Experience in Korea and Indochina warns us of military infiltration supported by great reserves of enemy materiel and personnel. The ability to defend friendly areas and peoples against this warfare of military infiltration will depend on such a force in being as is represented by the Marines—a "force in being," with instant readiness of its air arm and sea arm. The reserve support comes from our land forces which will be deployed on occasion to form the present-day substitute for the impracticable permanent ring of steel about the great Communist heartland, which was our previous policy. This policy is now virtually discarded, as it must be, in favor of a more flexible, quick-striking means of defense and offense.

Finally, are the political aspects of defense growing in importance?

This question must be answered in the affirmative. The Geneva Conference marked a shift in Soviet policy toward a greater reliance on the political offensive. Having been convinced by our President that we had no intention or desire to attack behind the Iron Curtain—and the President spoke truly—this left the Soviet Government free to expand its political activity while maintaining its military strength. Since that date its change of front has been demonstrated in Burma, in India, in Afghanistan, in Egypt, and elsewhere on the face of the earth. The expansion and development of Soviet policy lie in the political field, while the Soviet Union continues to maintain and strengthen its military power.

Let it again be said that the ballistic missiles to which we are giving our most serious attention at this time cannot be, in their nature, military weapons at all. They cannot be delivered on precise military targets. The faster we press their development, the less accurate does their aiming become. They are by their nature an effective means for spreading terror, and only an inefficient means for attack on concentrations of military personnel, materiel, and production. In spite of anything that military development can do, the future of our defense deals primarily with political questions.

These facts and all the considerations previously set forth lead to the possibility that we can for a few years strengthen our defense without increasing our appropriations. This will result from the careful reappraisal which is now required. As against that possibility, we have to set the expense of converting our warships and our planes to atomic propulsion. This will be a tremendously expensive undertaking, but the burden of it will not fall heavily upon us in the next few years. There will be a breathing spell which we must use to expand our nonmilitary measures.

For we must recognize that there is no impregnable defense—no offense which can prevent attack. Doubling our defense billions would not bring safety. The delivery of a fraction of the presently available atomic megatons may determine the issue. Let us again listen to the words of Admiral Mahan:

> The purpose of military power is to provide time for moral ideas to take root.

To this it may be added that the soil for moral ideas is found in the political field.

The possibility of coming to a favorable political conclusion remains. Further talks in this series will therefore, for the most part, be addressed to political considerations.

Mr. President, let me close with the earnest suggestion that the questions raised in this speech be considered by the administration. Let us be presented in the next Congress with a defense program which will have evidently taken these and related questions into consideration. Let us for the last time be offered a compromise of interservice disputes, and for the first time let us consider an integrated program.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are now available the District of Columbia appropriation conference report and the conference report on the water-pollution control bill. Later in the day we shall have a conference report on the public-works bill, and I hope the conference report on the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill.

I now suggest to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] that he submit the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and ask for its immediate consideration.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10003) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 27, 1956, pp. 11115–11116, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a comparative summary table relating to appropriations included in the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1957.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

District of Columbia appropriation bill, 1957 (H. R. 10003)—Comparative summary of bill

Appropriations	Appropriation, 1956	Estimate, 1957	House bill	Senate bill	Conference bill
OPERATING EXPENSES					
Executive Office	$365,500	$330,800	$323,000	$323,000	$323,000
Department of General Administration	3,360,250	3,528,000	3,425,000	3,475,000	3,475,000
Office of Corporation Counsel	467,300	483,600	480,000	480,000	480,000
Compensation and retirement fund expenses	10,476,000	11,165,400	11,100,000	11,100,000	11,100,000
Regulatory agencies	1,022,700	1,068,000	1,053,000	1,058,440	1,058,440
Department of Occupations and Professions	262,100	262,100	262,000	262,000	262,000
Public schools	31,302,000	32,098,000	32,130,800	32,590,750	32,515,750
Public Library	1,737,800	1,784,000	1,783,000	1,783,000	1,783,000
Recreation Department	1,767,500	1,903,000	1,892,000	1,903,000	1,903,000
Metropolitan Police	13,888,300	13,673,000	13,773,000	13,773,000	13,773,000
Metropolitan Police (additional municipal services, inaugural ceremonies)		155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000
Fire Department	6,587,900	6,761,000	6,755,000	6,755,000	6,755,000
Veterans' Service Center	92,200	98,500	98,500	98,500	98,500
Office of Civil Defense	78,400	175,000	78,000	78,000	78,000
Department of Vocational Rehabilitation	140,000	147,400	147,000	147,000	147,000
Courts	3,814,674	3,974,500	3,972,000	3,972,000	3,972,000
Department of Public Health	25,005,800	25,334,000	25,434,000	25,503,400	25,503,400
Department of Corrections	4,671,820	4,729,000	4,710,000	4,710,000	4,710,000
Department of Public Welfare	10,147,800	10,675,000	10,642,500	10,642,500	10,642,500
Department of Buildings and Grounds	1,764,300	1,792,000	1,780,000	1,780,000	1,780,000
Office of the Surveyor	158,320	174,600	164,000	170,000	170,000
Department of Licenses and Inspections	1,600,276	1,676,000	1,640,000	1,658,000	1,658,000
Department of Highways	6,430,300	6,587,000	6,485,000	6,535,000	6,535,000
Department of Vehicles and Traffic	1,160,500	1,327,000	1,291,000	1,303,000	1,303,000
Motor-Vehicle Parking Agency	350,000	359,700	295,000	295,000	295,000
Department of Sanitary Engineering	10,409,500	10,900,000	10,846,000	10,896,200	10,896,200
Washington aqueduct	2,163,500	2,157,000	2,137,000	2,137,000	2,137,000
National Guard	125,600	136,700	128,500	136,500	136,500
National Capital Parks	2,484,000	2,539,000	2,535,000	2,535,000	2,535,000
National Zoological Park	690,900	725,000	720,000	720,000	720,000
Personal services, wage-scale employees	448,047				
Total operating expenses:					
General fund	129,190,699	131,899,191	131,603,170	131,799,229	132,224,229
Highway fund	7,377,467	7,620,625	7,521,094	7,565,025	7,565,025
Water fund	5,113,849	5,127,718	5,103,970	5,103,970	5,103,970
Sanitary sewage works fund	1,509,382	1,661,266	1,661,266	1,661,266	1,661,266
Motor-vehicle parking fund	395,600	410,500	345,800	845,800	345,800
Grand total, operating expenses, all funds	143,586,997	146,719,300	146,235,300	146,975,290	146,900,290
CAPITAL OUTLAY					
District debt service	443,800	394,500	394,500	394,500	394,500
Public building construction	7,544,400	6,311,700	5,200,000	6,221,700	6,221,700
Miscellaneous capital outlay	1,260,300				
Department of Highways	13,535,000	15,178,000	14,400,000	14,528,000	14,528,000
Department of Sanitary Engineering	9,662,000	10,526,000	10,068,000	10,068,000	10,068,000
Washington aqueduct	3,000,000	3,770,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Total, capital outlay:					
General fund	13,865,700	6,360,700	5,299,000	6,320,700	6,320,700
Highway fund	13,135,000	15,428,000	14,600,000	14,728,000	14,728,000
Water fund	5,444,800	8,714,500	8,205,500	8,205,500	8,205,500
Sanitary sewage works fund	3,000,000	5,677,000	5,458,000	5,458,000	5,458,000
Grand total, capital outlay, all funds	35,445,500	36,180,200	33,562,500	34,712,200	34,712,200
Recapitulation by funds:					
General fund	143,056,399	138,259,891	136,902,170	138,119,929	138,544,929
Highway fund	20,512,467	23,048,625	22,121,094	22,293,025	22,293,025
Water fund	10,558,649	13,842,218	13,309,470	13,309,470	13,213,970
Sanitary sewage works fund	4,509,382	7,338,266	7,119,266	7,119,266	7,119,266
Motor-vehicle parking fund	395,600	410,500	345,800	845,800	345,800
Total, all funds	179,032,497	182,899,500	179,797,800	181,687,490	181,612,490

EXTENSION OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 890) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report see House proceedings of June 27, 1956, pp. 11149–11154, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement with reference to the conference report, for the benefit and information of the Senate.

The committee of conference of the two Houses met on Senate bill 890. The bill is designed to extend the Water Pollution Control Act—Public Law 845, 80th Congress—which terminates on June 30, 1956. The Water Pollution Control Act, enacted in 1948, was the first comprehensive legislation in this field. In the meantime, substantial progress has been made in the field of water pollution control, with more than half of the States having made improvements in their water pollution control laws, resulting in strengthened programs.

The conferees recognized that the pollution of water is a very serious problem, and that as our population increases and industry expands, we must take all steps possible to assure an adequate potable water supply for our Nation. Therefore, this proposed legislation is extremely important to the welfare of everyone, and will provide a basis for implementing and extending the work now under way.

The bill is designed to encourage the States to prepare comprehensive programs for water pollution control, and to urge upon them the enactment of uniform laws relating to water pollution control. It requires the Surgeon General to conduct and encourage and assist in coordinating research, investigations, and demonstrations, and to publish information relating to water pollution control.

The States would be given financial assistance in the conduct of their water pollution control programs, with $3 million authorized annually for such assistance. There would also be authorized $50 million annually, up to a total of $500 million in the aggregate, for construction of treatment works. The Federal share would be limited to 30 percent of the total cost of each construction project, but not in excess of $250,000. At least 50 percent of the funds authorized for construction grants would be for municipalities of 125,000 population or under.

A Water Pollution Control Advisory Board would be established, and would be made up of nine non-Federal members, appointed by the President, under the chairmanship of the Surgeon General.

The bill also includes provisions under which pollution of interstate waters having an interstate effect may be subject to Federal enforcement procedures. The provisions call for full consultation with States and interstate pollution control agencies prior to public hearing and subsequent court action. The court shall, in determining the order to be issued by it, give due consideration to the practicability and physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

WHICH NEWSPAPER DO YOU READ?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, of late, in reading various of the newspapers of the country, I have almost felt impelled to apologize to the Senate and to the members of the Press Galleries. In the light of the new Madison Avenue school of journalism, I feel as though I have masqueraded, during the past 6 years, as a former working member of the press.

For many years, Mr. President, I thought perhaps the Madison Avenue school of journalism, which recently has come into the ascendancy in many American newspapers, would be confined to the paid advertising sections of the newspapers.

I had read with interest advertisements extolling the virtues of character-building whisky and of health-giving cigarettes. In fact, I finally felt that the Madison Avenue school of journalism would arrive at the idea of combating the fear of cancer from cigarettes by means of publishing beautiful headlines with medical claims under the caption, "Cancer Is Good for You."

Mr. President, so completely have such advertisements led us to believe that white is black and black is white, that I find myself confused as regards my earlier newspaper training. I thought, since such statements appeared in the advertising sections, they should be regarded as nothing but advertising. But somehow or other, claims designed to lead one to arrive at strange deductions from certain advertising seems to have also spread like a virus to news columns of certain newspapers.

I am almost ready to turn in my Sigma Delta Chi key, send back my certificate of graduation from my school of journalism, surrender any claim on my part to having had training in journalism. In the new type of journalism I feel like a forgotten relic of the past, instead of a veteran of the city room of a newspaper.

If it is not too old-fashioned, Mr. President, permit me to be specific. Mr. President, I have been startled, astounded, and confused at the coverage by certain newspapers of the recent setback suffered by the Eisenhower administration in connection with the defeat administered to Governor Shivers, of Texas, by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Apparently in the minds of the members of the Democratic Convention, Governor Shivers' great sin was in leading Texas into the Eisenhower column in the last presidential election. Whether that had any significance in the repudiation of Governor Shivers by a majority of nearly 10 to 1 escaped the attention of most of the newspapers in their news articles. Possibly, just possibly, Shivers' advocacy of President Eisenhower might have had something to do with Governor Shivers' defeat as a Democratic leader.

Therefore, Mr. President, it was very interesting to read in the New York Herald Tribune an article based on the strange logic—ala the Madison Avenue school of journalism—that, after all, the victory of Senator JOHNSON of Texas was a victory for President Eisenhower. That logic seems to have worked in this way:

Senator JOHNSON of Texas is a moderate.

President Eisenhower is a moderate.

Therefore, things equal to the same thing are equal to each other; and, therefore, the repudiation of Governor Shivers actually was an endorsement of Eisenhower.

Mr. President, as a result of such experiences, my faith and trust in the reliability of newspaper editing is getting low. Based on the motto instituted by E. W. Scripps: "Give light, and the people will find their way," my confidence in my judgment as an ex-newspaperman has begun to flicker, almost in the way that the flame of an old-fashioned tallow candle flickers. Perhaps I should say my newspaper lights have begun to grow as dim as the light from an old-fashioned kerosene lantern, as compared with the pitiless glare of a 5,000 candlepower Madison Avenue searchlight which can be turned on at will. Such has been my personal reaction as the public relations boys of Madison Avenue have started to warm up another great, significant political crusade.

Mr. President, it was rather significant to me that the day following the recent primary elections in Maryland, in which the votes cast by the Democrats for their nominee for President far exceeded in number the votes cast by Republicans for their presidential nominee, that in the Washington newspapers it was impossible to find a tabulation of the votes cast by the Democrats for the nominees of our great party.

On the other hand, the same newspapers seemed to find it quite significant, and worth a four-column headline, that in the State of Indiana, hundreds of miles away, the votes cast for the Republican presidential candidate far exceeded the number of votes cast for the Democratic nominee. Of course, Mr. President, perhaps such matters are merely coincidental, or perhaps they are a new part of modern journalism.

However, Mr. President, I think one of the most intriguing and interesting developments is to be observed in the treatment given by different newspapers to the same story, as evidenced by certain articles published yesterday and today.

I now take pleasure in reading, for the information of the Senate, an article published this morning in the erudite Washington Post and Times Herald. The headline is "Moral Imperative—Mrs. Meyer Emphasizes Individuality."

The text of the article reads as follows:

Agnes E. Meyer said yesterday that the greatest need today is for individuals to develop their own highest possibilities because individuality is the core of freedom.

This was her message to graduates of New York City's High School of Music and Art, which her late brother, Frederick Ernst, was instrumental in founding when he was assistant superintendent of New York City schools.

"An interest in the self and in its development—in who you are and what you wish to become—is a legitimate passion at any time but today it is a moral imperative," the writer and educator said.

"In an age of conformity such as ours, it is one of the most civilizing influences that could be generated in our mass society."

The quest for selfhood, formerly the outstanding characteristic of Americans, now is threatened by the social isolation of the individual in our mass society, she said.

The wife of Eugene Meyer, chairman of the board of the Washington Post Co., continued that individuals must be free to seek the truth if liberalism, which is essential to democracy, is to regain its strength and produce unity out of diversity.

"The world is not merely the world," she concluded. "It is our world. And since we made it what it is today, we can remake it nearer to the heart's desire."

That is the Washington Post's coverage of a speech made by the wife of the owner of the Post—and she is a very distinguished person in her own right—before the graduating class of New York City's High School of Music and Art.

In that connection, Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fine things expressed in the account of her speech, as published in the Washington Post. But I wonder whether that coverage is in line with all the things I was taught about journalism, namely, that one is supposed to report the entire story, and that anything less than the whole story is only half a story or no story at all. In the Washington Daily News, published yesterday evening, I find the following headline and an article by the United Press, published under a New York date line, covering the same speech. It is as follows:

"HE FAILS TO WARN"—IKE CALLED UNINFORMED

NEW YORK, June 26.—Agnes E. Meyer charged today that President Eisenhower is the prisoner of a propaganda machine which has put false words in his mouth.

The same high-powered public-relations machine has so intimidated public opinion, she said, that it poses a serious threat to democratic government and freedom of thought.

Mrs. Meyer, wife of the chairman of the board of the Washington Post and Times Herald, spoke at graduation exercises at the High School of Music and Art.

The President has a constitutional duty to inform the people of the facts, however unpleasant, Mrs. Meyer said. "He has not lived up to this definition of the constitu-

tional role * * * when he failed to warn the Nation that we are falling behind the Communists in our diplomacy, our armaments, and even in the education of sufficient scientists. * * *

"President Eisenhower's cheerful disposition has its value, but not when, as is often the case, he tells the American people what they want to hear instead of the stern realities which they should hear. * * * Obviously the President is not adequately informed by his assistants of the facts. For so honest a man would never stoop to deliberate distortion."

Mrs. Meyer said the silence of most United States newspapers "about this serious lapse in responsible leadership * * * is but one of many indications that there is outright fear in this country of expressing any criticism of the President."

Meanwhile, the latest medical bulletin on Mr. Eisenhower issued by the White House said his weight is holding steady as he continues his satisfactory progress. Ike is expected to leave Walter Reed Hospital this weekend for a trip to his Gettysburg farm where he will celebrate his 40th wedding anniversary on Sunday.

I believe it might be wise to reprint the line which was often printed in the days when I used to be a newspaperman, many years ago. Often when an indignant country editor wrote a blistering editorial, he would conclude with the admonition, "city papers please copy."

I think it might be wise to repeat, for the benefit of the distinguished editors of the Washington Post and Times Herald, the last paragraph of the story.

Mrs. Meyer said the silence of most United States newspapers "about this mysterious lapse in responsible leadership * * * is but one of many indications that there is outright fear in this country of expressing any criticism of the President."

Apparently the same lack of interest with respect to printing any uncomplimentary remarks about President Eisenhower in the speeches of Democratic Senators or other partisans extends, in this case, even to the speech of the distinguished wife of the chairman of the board of the Washington Post.

To one who used to be a newspaperman himself, such a wide divergence in the coverage of this event by two newspapers seems strange. I suppose it depends upon which newspaper one reads, when it comes to getting the entire picture.

I tried to call Mrs. Meyer, because I thought, from the wide divergence in coverage, that she might have made two speeches to the graduates, and that perhaps the Washington Post reporter was present at one, and the United Press reporter was present at the other. Unfortunately, Mrs. Meyer was out of the city, and I was unable to learn whether or not two speeches were delivered to the graduates.

At any rate, I think it is interesting to compare the two coverages of the same speech. They belong in the New Yorker's "which newspaper do you read?" section.

NEED FOR CONTINUED AID FOR SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the very able reporter of the Watertown Daily Times, Alan S. Emory, has written an article entitled "Continued Aid Need for Southeast Asia," which was published in that newspaper. It deals with the need for continued assistance in Southeast Asia, and especially Laos. It is the result of a conversation which Mr. Emory had with the able and hard working Mr. Yost, lately our Ambassador to the Kingdom of Laos, and now our Minister-designate to France.

I ask unanimous consent that this noteworthy article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTINUED AID NEED FOR SOUTHEAST ASIA

(By Alan S. Emory)

WASHINGTON, June 9.—The retiring Ambassador to Laos said today continued military aid to the nations of southeast Asia was essential.

Charles W. Yost said in an interview that if the United States halted assistance to Indochina no one else could step into the breech.

Mr. Yost added, however, that Communist propaganda charging the United States with colonial aims was not having much effect in the area.

"The Hanoi radio broadcasts to Laos says the people there are just puppets of American imperialists," the former Watertown, N. Y., resident said. "This hasn't affected the government directly, but it has made officials sensitive to appearances. The United States representatives there are remaining very much in the background."

The Communist threat still looms in Laos, Mr. Yost declared.

"I am quite encouraged about the situation now," he said. "At the time of the division of Vietnam at the Geneva Conference the people were quite pessimistic. The country has very few developed resources and a small population for its size. There is a long, exposed frontier.

"The people have shown a great deal of resolution. They have continued to fight, even since Geneva, in two northern provinces against the Pathet Lao, the native Communists, and the Vietminh, the Red forces from Vietnam.

"By themselves the Laotian Communists couldn't hold out at all, they would collapse in a week. But they have help from North Vietnam."

Mr. Yost, who will leave about August 1 to become minister in the United States embassy in Paris, said Laotian Government soldiers were being supplied by air in the northern outposts. Wounded are evacuated by international commission helicopter. The only other route open is a jungle path.

"Laos needs both military and economic aid," he continued. "The government income just barely is adequate to cover civil services, let alone economic development or armed forces. The country has an army of about 25,000, which normally would be concerned with internal security. But about half of the army is tied up in the northern provinces."

The picture in southeast Asia has "definitely improved," according to the career diplomat. When he went to Laos 2 years ago fighting was widespread and United States help was confined to supporting the French and the Thais.

Then the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) was formed as "an umbrella over the area."

"This shows the Communists that if they make an overt move they will encounter united resistance," Mr. Yost commented, "and it limits them to internal subversion."

In the 2 years the envoy was in Laos the capital city of Vientiane grew from 20,000 population to 50,000 and the number of United States employees there increased from 12 to 100, mostly economic technicians.

Few natives had any administrative training, he reported, and, while the men running the local government were good they were few in numbers and were desperate for foreign help.

Laos is not reached by the Voice of America, Mr. Yost related. There are few radios, although the Australian Government has a program of distributing sets and loudspeakers to villages.

The country has no single regular newspaper. The Government puts out a daily mimeographed bulletin, the diplomat said, and the political parties put out bulletins every 2 weeks.

It will be several years, he said, before Laos gets back to prewar footing in such fields as water, heat, trade, and roads. In addition to United States assistance, the French have an aid program, and help is forthcoming from the Colombo plan nations and the United Nations.

Living conditions for United States workers have just started to improve in what Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, called the roughest job in the Foreign Service.

The rundown condition of the Embassy there was so bad that stories resulting from Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' visit there last year startled people in this country. Now the Embassy has been cleaned up and replumbed, Mr. Yost reported.

He said he had hoped to break a bottle of champagne over the first prefabricated aluminum house to be constructed in the capital, but missed by about 2 weeks.

Mr. Yost's oldest son, Nicholas, is being graduated today from Hotchkiss School and will enter Princeton University this fall. Another son, Casimir, 11, attended school in South Vietnam at a place run by American missionaries, normally just for their own children. The Yosts also have a daughter, Felicity, 6.

HUMANE SLAUGHTERING OF ANIMALS FOR FOOD CONSUMPTION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in recent months there has been renewed interest in the subject of humane slaughtering of animals for food consumption. I have been extremely interested in this matter myself, and I recently appeared before the Senate Agriculture Committee in order to give my support to the Humphrey bill on this subject. In my judgment there has been considerable evidence proving the necessity for action against some of the cruel and wholly antiquated methods by which livestock and poultry are handled in certain meatpacking concerns.

I consider particularly pertinent two letters appearing in the New York Times of June 19, 1956, and in the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 26, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed in the body of the RECORD in order that others may have the opportunity to read them.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 19, 1956]

SLAUGHTERING LAWS URGED—HUMANE AND PRACTICAL METHODS ARE DECLARED AVAILABLE TO PACKERS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Twenty-seven years ago the meat-packing industry succeeded in making humanitarians believe that humane methods of slaughter would be voluntarily adopted by the

industry and that compulsory legislation was not necessary. To date only two major packers in this country have chosen to use humane methods.

In his letter published in the New York Times on June 5, the public-relations director of the American Meat Institute, Norman Draper, makes a bid for a still further extension of the 27 years and states flatly: "The meat-packing industry in the United States is using the most humane methods it knows of."

Of course, Mr. Draper knows of two more practical humane methods which are in everyday use in the plants of members of his organization: the captive-bolt pistol and the carbon-dioxide anesthetizing equipment; a third is the new stunning instrument to which he makes a vague reference.

However, he may not be too far wrong in his claim that the packing industry in general doesn't know of humane methods of slaughter. The trouble seems to be that, although literate in theory, packers do not even read their own trade papers. The prospect of educating them to voluntary humaneness is not, therefore, a very bright one.

MAGAZINE QUOTED

The National Provisioner, a leading meat-packing magazine, has been loyally supporting the American Meat Institute in its opposition to humane slaughter legislation. But in an editorial published June 2 the editor describes himself as "stunned by the apparent lack of knowledge on the part of a group of literate beef packers about a device and methods which have been described editorially and advertised in the National Provisioner and other publications for a decade."

Mr. Draper is incorrect when he claims that there is a country in Europe in which it is no longer compulsory to use electric current. No country has ever made it compulsory to use electric current for stunning animals. Most of the Western European democracies have compulsory humane slaughter laws. Denmark experienced difficulties with electric stunning and suspended their regulations for 1 year during a series of tests. The regulations are now in force again with the necessary specifications added.

Mr. Draper states that "when we find practical methods which actually are more humane and which can be used by all it will be a very easy matter to have these generally adopted." But the captive-bolt pistol, which is being used to stun many millions of animals every year and has been on the American market for more than a decade, is not even known to the group of "literate beef packers" mentioned above.

In no country have the majority of animals even been given a merciful death voluntarily. Legislation has always been necessary to obtain the use of humane methods by most meat packers. It must be enacted in the United States if we are to have standards as a humane nation and world leader which are equal to the standards of England, Scotland, Ireland, Holland Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, parts of Austria, Germany, France, and Australia, as well as New Zealand and Fiji. It is high time we took such action.

CHRISTINE STEVENS,
Secretary-Treasurer, Society for Animal Protective Legislation.
NEW YORK, *June 12, 1956.*

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 26, 1956]

HUMANE SLAUGHTER

It was in the best tradition of the Washington Post and Times Herald that on June 19 you gave to Mr. Norman Draper, public relations director of the American Meat Institute, virtually a full column of space for criticism of your editorial indorsement of S. 1636, H. R. 8540, and H. R. 9603, bills that would require packing plants to slaughter animals humanely. Mr. Draper abused your generosity and fairness, however, by being somewhat less than frank about the facts that have led to a strong public demand for the legislation that you have indorsed.

Mr. Draper says that it is not true that "cruelty is general practice in the meat-packing industry." The overwhelming weight of sworn testimony presented at a recent public hearing on S. 1636 contradicts Mr. Draper. It is almost universal practice in the American meat-packing industry to jerk hogs off the floor and upward by means of a chain shackled around one hind leg, then to stick the fully conscious animal in the throat with a knife, and allow the animal slowly to bleed to death.

The University of Minnesota recently reported that this technique is costing the packing industry millions of dollars every year because the frightened and agonized animals often cause severe bruises and tissue ruptures in frantic efforts to escape the shackle and hoist. More than 90 million hogs are subjected to this treatment every year in American packing plants.

Calves, sheep, and lambs undergo virtually the same suffering. Beef animals are commonly immobilized by being struck with a 5-pound sledge hammer. Studies both in the United States and in England show that an expert workman requires an average of more than 1.5 blows to pound an animal to the floor. I have myself seen steers hit with the hammer more than 10 times before they fell.

In many plants, in order to produce meat of certain qualities, steers weighing up to 1,200 pounds are shackled by one leg and hoisted in the air just as hogs are. It is common for steers so handled to suffer dislocated ankles, knees, and hips. All of this occurs while the animals are fully conscious. If this kind of treatment of animals be not cruelty, then Mr. Draper and I speak different languages.

Mr. Draper says that your editorial and an earlier letter published in your columns "make it appear that meat packers are opposed to humane slaughter legislation." The appearance certainly is not misleading, because Mr. Draper says in an immediately subsequent paragraph that "we do not believe that legislation of a compulsory and dictatorial nature offers an answer to a problem which is the cause of great concern within our own industry."

One can only suppose that Mr. Draper and the American Meat Institute would support humane slaughter legislation if it were not of a compulsory and dictatorial nature. It is in the nature of legislation, however, to be compulsory.

Mr. Draper says that "the meat-packing industry is using the most humane methods it knows of." Surely the meat-packing industry is not unaware that two of the largest packing plants in America are humanely anesthetizing all hogs with carbon dioxide before they are shackled, hoisted off the floor, or cut with a knife. The meat-packing industry certainly is not unaware that at least a dozen plants in the United States are using the completely humane captive-bolt pistol on cattle.

The fact is that both Mr. Draper and the American Meat Institute are fully aware that these humane techniques of slaughter are available, that they have been in use in a few plants in the United States and in hundreds of plants abroad for many years, and that they have been proved to be mechanically practical and economically advantageous.

It is a fact that an immense cruelty is being perpetrated in American slaughterhouses. It is a fact that the cruelty is unnecessary because humane methods of slaughter are available. It is a fact that these humane methods have been available for years, but the great majority of packers have shown no inclination to adopt them.

It seems to the National Humane Society and many Americans, therefore, that there is reason for action by Congress.

FRED MYERS,
Executive Director, the National Humane Society.
WASHINGTON.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 27, 1956, pp. 11116–11121, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to state to the Senate that the result of the conference was exceedingly satisfactory to the Senate conferees, and the report was signed by all of the Senate conferees. There was some compromising with reference to the Senate amendments, but that is the purpose of a conference.

The conference report provides an appropriation of $856,727,000, which is $15,459,000 below the amount approved by the Senate, and $65,969,000 above the amount approved by the House.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a summary of the bill, showing how the money is to be distributed among the various titles. Title I embraces independent offices and provides funds for the Tennessee Valley Authority. Title II covers certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and title III covers civil functions, Department of the Army.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Public Works appropriation bill, fiscal year 1957—Bill summary

	Budget estimate, 1957	House allowance, 1957	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
TITLE I—INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
Tennessee Valley Authority	$5,357,000	$5,357,000	$5,357,000	$5,357,000
Total, title I, independent offices	5,357,000	5,357,000	5,357,000	5,357,000
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
Office of the Secretary:				
Southeastern Power Administration:				
Operation and maintenance	1,378,000	1,378,000	1,378,000	1,378,000
Southwestern Power Administration:				
Operation and maintenance	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Continuing fund [1]	6,400,000	6,400,000	6,400,000	6,400,000
Total, Southwestern Power Administration	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Bonneville Power Administration:				
Construction	18,700,000	18,700,000	18,700,000	18,700,000
Operation and maintenance	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000
Total, Bonneville Power Administration	26,100,000	26,100,000	26,100,000	26,100,000
Bureau of Reclamation:				
General investigations	5,680,000	5,270,000	5,680,000	5,680,000
Construction and rehabilitation	150,900,000	125,900,000	138,961,000	131,225,500
Payment to Colorado River Basin fund	8,000,000	6,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
Bureau of Reclamation—Con.				
Operation and maintenance	$27,267,000	$26,500,000	$27,267,000	$27,267,000
General administrative expenses	3,942,000	3,942,000	3,942,000	3,942,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	195,789,000	167,612,000	188,850,000	181,114,500
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	224,267,000	196,090,000	217,328,000	209,592,500
TITLE III—CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY				
Quartermaster Corps:				
Cemeterial expenses	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,765,000	6,765,000
Corps of Engineers:				
General investigations	[2] 7,035,000	8,122,000	9,322,000	9,322,000
Construction	422,687,000	422,034,000	463,673,000	455,949,500
Operation and maintenance	85,900,000	85,900,000	95,900,000	95,900,000
General expenses	10,075,000	10,075,000	10,400,000	10,400,000
Mississippi River and tributaries	56,030,000	56,030,000	62,791,000	62,791,000
Niagara remedial work	[2] 500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
United States section, St. Lawrence Joint Board of Engineers	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Total, Corps of Engineers	[2] 582,377,000	582,811,000	642,736,000	635,012,500
Total, title III, Department of the Army, civil functions	[2] 588,877,000	589,311,000	649,501,000	641,777,500
Grand total, titles I, II, and III	818,501,000	790,758,000	872,186,000	856,727,000

[1] Limitation on the use of receipts not included in totals of this table.
[2] Amount shown reflects amendment to the 1957 budget submitted by the President on Feb. 21, 1956, as follows:

	Original budget	Revised request
General investigations (flood control studies)	$1,650,000	$2,050,000
Niagara remedial work	1,000,000	500,000

(The amendment also provides for changes under "Construction, general" without revision in total amount requested.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in connection with title I, there were no Senate amendments in conference.

I wish to deal now with title II. There were no Senate amendments pertaining to the power-marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior.

Under "General investigations of the Bureau of Reclamation," the House agreed to the Senate amendment, which provides $5,680,000 in lieu of the $5,270,000 proposed by the House.

For "Construction and rehabilitation" the conferees agreed on $131,225,500, which is $7,735,500 below the amount approved by the Senate, and $5,325,500 above the amount allowed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a tabulation showing the breakdown of the construction and rehabilitation item.

There being no objection, the table, Bureau of Reclamation—Construction and rehabilitation, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Bureau of Reclamation—Construction and rehabilitation

Projects	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
Construction and rehabilitation:				
Gila project, Arizona	$1,077,000	$1,077,000	$1,077,000	$1,077,000
Palo Verde diversion project, Arizona-California	3,702,000	3,702,000	3,702,000	3,702,000
Parker-Davis project, Arizona-California-Nevada	312,000	312,000	312,000	312,000
Boulder Canyon project, Arizona-Nevada	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000
Boulder City Municipal Office, Nevada	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Central Valley project, California	19,393,000	19,393,000	19,393,000	19,393,000
Santa Maria project, California	6,171,000	6,171,000	6,171,000	6,171,000
Solano project, California	12,200,000	12,200,000	12,200,000	12,200,000
Ventura project, California	250,000	250,000	2,250,000	2,250,000
Collbran project, Colorado	1,000,000	----------	1,000,000	1,000,000
Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado	530,000	530,000	530,000	530,000
Michaud Flats project, Idaho	2,480,000	2,480,000	2,480,000	2,480,000
Consttuction and rehabilitation—Continued				
Minidoka project, North Side pumping division, Idaho	$2,768,000	$2,768,000	$2,768,000	$2,768,000
Palisades project, Idaho	5,787,000	5,787,000	5,787,000	5,787,000
Fort Peck project, Montana-North Dakota	118,000	118,000	118,000	118,000
Middle Rio Grande project, New Mexico	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Washita Basin project, Oklahoma	500,000	375,000	500,000	500,000
Deschutes project, north unit, Oregon	1,035,000	1,035,000	1,035,000	1,035,000
Rogue River Basin, Talent division, Oregon	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
Savage Rapids Dam, fish protection facilities, Oregon	----------	208,000	208,000	208,000
Provo River project, Utah	659,000	659,000	659,000	659,000
Weber Basin project, Utah	10,066,000	10,066,000	10,066,000	10,066,000

Bureau of Reclamation—Construction and rehabilitation—Continued

Projects	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
Construction and rehabilitation—Continued				
Chief Joseph Dam project, Foster Creek division, Washington	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000
Columbia Basin project, Washington	13,850,000	13,850,000	13,850,000	13,850,000
Yakima project, Kennewick division, Washington	1,288,000	1,288,000	1,288,000	1,288,000
Yakima project, Roza division, Washington	1,720,000	1,720,000	1,720,000	1,720,000
Eden project, Wyoming	869,000	869,000	869,000	869,000
Shoshone project, Wyoming	554,000	554,000	554,000	554,000
Drainage and minor construction program	984,000	984,000	984,000	984,000
Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects	3,305,000	3,305,000	[1] 3,530,000	3,530,000
Missouri River Basin project:				
Bostwick division, Nebraska-Kansas	4,690,000	4,690,000	4,690,000	4,690,000
Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska	3,151,000	3,151,000	3,151,000	3,151,000
Glendo unit, Wyoming	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
Hanover Bluff unit, Wyoming	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
Helena Valley unit, Montana	2,500,000	[2]	1,750,000	1,750,000
Kirwin unit, Kansas	2,055,000	2,055,000	2,055,000	2,055,000
Lower Marias unit, Montana	155,000	115,000	115,000	115,000
Owl Creek unit, Wyoming	$1,397,000	$1,397,000	$1,397,000	$1,397,000
Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000
Sargent unit, Nebraska	728,000	728,000	728,000	728,000
St. Francis unit, Colorado-Kansas	317,000			
Transmission division	8,255,000	2,755,000	2,755,000	2,755,000
Webster unit, Kansas	540,000	540,000	540,000	540,000
Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming	10,850,000		[3] 7,510,000	
Drainage and minor construction program	634,000	634,000	634,000	634,000
Missouri River Basin investigations	3,105,000	[4] 2,654,000	3,105,000	2,879,500
Other department agencies	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
Total Missouri River Basin	52,732,000	33,074,000	42,785,000	35,049,500
Reduction due to available unobligated balances		−4,425,000	−4,425,000	−4,425,000
Total construction and rehabilitation	150,900,000	125,900,000	138,961,000	131,225,500
Upper Colorado River Basin fund:				
Colorado River storage project and participating projects	8,000,000	6,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000

NOTE 1.—Senate increase for rehabilitation of Bitter Root irrigation district, Montana.

NOTE 2.—House report disallowed new funds in view of the fact that there is no repayment contract with either the city of Helena for municipal water supply or with supplemental water users in the irrigation project area. However, should these deficiencies be overcome during the fiscal year committee approves use of $2,250,000 prior year funds to initiate construction.

Senate report states that it is the view of the Senate committee that construction should proceed immediately on this unit, and allowed $1,750,000 new funds to provide for the budget program of $4 million. However, the Senate committee urges the Bureau of Reclamation to continue its negotiations with the supplemental water users and the city of Helena to provide for additional repayment on the unit.

NOTE 3.—House states that should pending legislation or a favorable response to the Department's condemnation action permit entry to the dam site which is on land owned by the Crow Indian Tribe carryover balance of $3,340,000 would be available for construction.

Senate allows $7,510,000 to provide a total program of $10,850,000—the budget estimate, and states that it is the hope of the committee that the problems pertaining to the acquisition of the site will be resolved at an early date. Legislation was recently vetoed.

NOTE 4.—House eliminated the $451,000 programed for the Oahe unit and stated that should additional funds be necessary to complete reports, any unobligated balances existing in connection with the basin investigations may be used for this purpose.

Senate states that it is the view of the Senate committee that the budget estimate is required to finance the investigations program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, with respect to operation and maintenance, the House agreed to the Senate amendment.

On the Colorado River Basin item the House agreed to the Senate amount and the Senate receded on its amendment to transfer the appropriation to the appropriation for construction and rehabilitation.

Under "Administrative provisions" the Senate receded on its amendment pertaining to recreational facilities, and the House agreed to the remaining Senate amendments in this section.

Proceeding to title III, the House agreed to the Senate amount for cemeterial expenses. Similarly the House agreed to the Senate amendment on general investigations of the Corps of Engineers.

On "Construction, general," the conferees agreed on $455,949,500, which is $7,723,500 below the amount approved by the Senate and $33,915,500 above the amount allowed by the House.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a tabulation showing a breakdown of the construction and planning items as passed by the House, as passed by the Senate, and as agreed to in conference.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Corps of Engineers—Construction, general, fiscal year 1957

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1957		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Alaska:								
Craig Harbor					$365,000		$365,000	
Elfin Cove					173,000		173,000	
Gold Creek	$393,000		$393,000		393,000		393,000	
Ketchikan Harbor	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Kodiak Harbor					500,000		500,000	
Pelican Harbor					362,000		362,000	
Sitka Harbor						$31,000		$31,000
Valdez Harbor	[1]		[1]		[1]		[1]	
Alabama:								
Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia		$75,000		$75,000		75,000		75,000
Fort Gaines lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
Jackson lock and dam					750,000		750,000	
Mobile Harbor	[2] 2,543,000		2,543,000		2,543,000		2,543,000	
Paint Rock River				50,000		50,000		50,000
Warrior lock and dam	4,580,000		4,580,000		4,580,000		4,580,000	
Arizona:								
Painted Rock Reservoir	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
Whitlow Ranch Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Corps of Engineers—Construction, general, fiscal year 1957—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1957		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Arkansas:								
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma (emergency bank stabilization and channel rectification)	$3,000,000		$3,000,000		$3,000,000		$3,000,000	
Beaver Reservoir				$250,000		$250,000		$250,000
Calion			400,000		400,000		400,000	
Dardanelle lock and dam			500,000		750,000		650,000	
De Gray Reservoir						20,000		20,000
Greer's Ferry Reservoir			180,000		750,000		750,000	
McKinney Bayou and Barkman Creek, Ark. and Tex.				25,000		25,000		25,000
Murfreesboro Reservoir		[3] ($30,000)		[3] (30,000)		[3] (30,000)		[3] (30,000)
Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La		130,000		130,000		130,000		130,000
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La	500,000		500,000		650,000		575,000	
Table Rock Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Missouri.)								
Walnut Bayou						25,000		25,000
California:								
American River levees	[2] 400,000		400,000		500,000		450,000	
Black Butte Reservoir		[2] 125,000		125,000		125,000		125,000
Carbon Canyon Dam and Channel		59,000		59,000		59,000		59,000
Crescent City Harbor	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Devil, East Twin, Warm, and Lytle Creeks	[2] 1,150,000		1,150,000		1,150,000		1,150,000	
Half Moon Bay Harbor		[2] 53,000		53,000		53,000		53,000
Hogan Reservoir		[2] 293,000		293,000		293,000		293,000
Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors	[2] 485,000		485,000		485,000		485,000	
Los Angeles County drainage area	16,500,000		16,500,000		17,500,000		17,500,000	
Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Middle Creek		[2] 70,000		70,000		70,000		70,000
New Melones Reservoir		[2] 100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor	355,000		355,000		355,000		355,000	
Redondo Beach Harbor	1,500,000		1,500,000		2,000,000		1,750,000	
Removal of West Basin Bridge, Los Angeles	[2] 245,000		245,000		245,000		245,000	
Richmond Harbor	[2] 1,850,000		1,850,000		1,850,000		1,850,000	
Riverside	750,000		750,000		750,000		750,000	
Russian River Reservoir	2,150,000		2,150,000		2,150,000		2,150,000	
Sacramento River	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries (active units)	[2] 250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000	
Sacramento River deep water channel	[2] 2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
San Antonio and Chino Creeks	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
San Joaquin River, Stockton deepwater channel	[2] 450,000		450,000		450,000		450,000	
San Lorenzo Creek		164,000		164,000		164,000		164,000
San Lorenzo River	[2] 307,000	[2]	307,000		307,000		307,000	
Santa Clara River				50,000		50,000		50,000
Santa Maria River						50,000		50,000
Success Reservoir	[2] 2,490,000		2,490,000		2,490,000		2,490,000	
Terminus Reservoir	[2] 558,000		558,000		558,000		558,000	
Connecticut:								
Connecticut River below Hartford:								
(a) Eightmile River	[1]		[1]		[1]		[1]	
New Haven Harbor					536,000		None	
Silver Beach to Cedar Beach	[1]		[1]		[1]		[1]	
Thomaston Reservoir	360,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Delaware:								
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea. (See New Jersey.)								
Inland Waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md.:								
Summit Bridge	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
District of Columbia:								
Anacostia River, D. C. and Md	[2] 1,682,000		1,682,000		1,682,000		1,682,000	
Florida:								
Apalachicola Bay:								
(a) Channel across St. George Island	313,000		313,000		313,000		313,000	
(b) 6-foot channel at Eastpoint and 9-foot channel and turning basin at Scipio Creek			45,000		45,000		45,000	
Apalachicola River channel improvement	445,000		445,000		445,000		445,000	
Central and Southern Florida	[2] 8,750,000		8,750,000		10,000,000		8,750,000	
Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami	200,000				200,000		200,000	
Jim Woodruff lock and dam, Florida and Georgia	1,197,000		1,197,000		1,197,000		1,197,000	
St. Augustine Harbor	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
St. Petersburg Harbor	[2] 22,000		22,000		22,000		22,000	
Tampa Harbor: 30-, 34-, and 36-foot harbor channels	2,500,000		2,500,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
Georgia:								
Buford Dam	[2] 4,553,000		4,553,000		4,553,000		4,553,000	
Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)								
Fort Gaines lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)								
Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S. C	10,000,000		10,000,000		10,000,000		10,000,000	
Jim Woodruff lock and dam, Florida and Georgia. (See Florida.)								
Savannah Harbor	415,000		415,000		415,000		415,000	
Savannah River below Augusta		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
Hawaii:								
Kawaihae Harbor			1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000	
Nawiliwili Harbor	570,000		570,000		570,000		570,000	
Idaho: Columbia River, local protection (justification reports)						102,000		102,000
Illinois:								
Alton		60,000		60,000		60,000		60,000
Beardstown	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Campbell's Island		40,000				40,000		40,000
Carlyle Reservoir		125,000		205,000		205,000		205,000
Clear Creek Drainage and Levee District	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
East St. Louis and vicinity	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
Hunt Drainage District and Lima Lake Drainage District				75,000		75,000		75,000
Illinois Waterway:								
Calumet-Sag Channel, Part I	8,500,000		8,500,000		8,500,000		8,500,000	
Little Calumet River, Ill. and Ind		24,000		24,000		24,000		24,000
Mississippi River, between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn. (exclusive of St. Anthony Falls, Minn., and lock 19 at Keokuk, Iowa), Ill., Iowa, and Mo.: Rectification of damages	60,000		60,000		60,000		60,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

Corps of Engineers—Construction, general, fiscal year 1957—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1957		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Illinois—Continued								
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.: Regulating works					$200,000		$200,000	
New Harmony Bridge, Ill. and Ind.			$332,000		332,000		332,000	
Wabash Railroad bridges at Meredosia and Valley City	$500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Wilson and Wenkel and Prairie du Pont Drainage and Levee District	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Wood River Drainage and Levee District	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
Indiana:								
Evansville				$50,000		$50,000		$50,000
Little Calumet River, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)								
Mansfield Reservoir	[2] 500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio	5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000	
New Harmony Bridge, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)								
Vincennes	[2] 100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
Iowa:								
Coralville Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
Little Sioux River	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,250,000		2,250,000	
Lock No. 19 at Keokuk	1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000	
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri	[2] 1,700,000		2,850,000		2,850,000		2,850,000	
Missouri River:								
Kansas City to Omaha	3,300,000		3,300,000		3,300,000		3,300,000	
Omaha to Sioux City	5,400,000		5,650,000		6,500,000		6,500,000	
Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Miners Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa. (See Nebraska.)								
Muscatine	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine-Louisa County Drainage District No. 13		$75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
Rathbun Reservoir		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
Red Rock Reservoir				50,000		100,000		100,000
Sabula	284,000		284,000		284,000		284,000	
Upper Iowa River	[2] 500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Kansas:								
Abilene	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
Council Grove Reservoir						150,000		150,000
Elk City Reservoir						75,000		75,000
Kansas City, Kans. and Mo.	[2] 1,000,000		800,000		1,000,000		800,000	
Manhattan		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
Milford Reservoir						90,000		None
Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Iowa, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
Ottawa		80,000		80,000		80,000		80,000
Pomona Reservoir		60,000		85,000		85,000		85,000
Salina	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
Strawn Reservoir		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
Topeka	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
Toronto Reservoir	4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000	
Tuttle Creek	9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000	
Wichita and Valley Center	[2] 1,163,000		1,163,000		1,163,000		1,163,000	
Kentucky:								
Barbourville	765,000		765,000		765,000		765,000	
Buckhorn Reservoir	[2] 1,000,000				1,000,000		1,000,000	
Catlettsburg	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Greenup locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio	9,900,000		9,900,000		9,900,000		9,900,000	
Lock and dam 41		150,000		150,000	1,000,000	150,000	750,000	150,000
Barkley Dam (Lower Cumberland lock and dam), Kentucky and Tennessee		200,000	1,100,000		1,100,000		1,100,000	
Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Indiana.)								
New Richmond lock and dams, Kentucky and Ohio		50,000		100,000		150,000		125,000
Nolin Reservoir		50,000		100,000		150,000		100,000
Rough River Reservoir and channels	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
Louisiana:								
Amite River and tributaries		[2] 50,000	200,000		475,000		337,500	
Bayou Segnette Waterway					435,000		435,000	
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (New Orleans district):								
(a) Plaquemine-Morgan City alternate route	4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000	
(b) Franklin Canal	[2] 35,000		35,000		35,000		35,000	
Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to Gulf of Mexico						260,000		260,000
Mississippi River, gulf outlet				300,000		350,000		375,000
Morningsport Reservoir, La. and Tex.		[2] (35,000)		[2] (35,000)		[2] (35,000)		[2] (35,000)
Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)								
Overton-Red River Waterway		300,000				300,000		150,000
Red River levees below Denison Dam. (See Arkansas.)								
Maine:								
Portsmouth Harbor, N. H., and Piscataqua River, Maine and N. H. (See New Hampshire.)								
Rockland Harbor					810,000		810,000	
Scarboro River	205,000		205,000		205,000		205,000	
Maryland:								
Anacostia River, D. C. and Md. (See District of Columbia.)								
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va.	3,400,000		3,400,000		3,400,000		3,400,000	
Inland Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (See Delaware.)								
Massachusetts:								
Adams	[2] 1,576,000		1,576,000		1,576,000		1,576,000	
Barre Falls Reservoir	1,150,000		1,150,000		1,150,000		1,150,000	
Boston Harbor, extension to 40-foot anchorage					1,000,000		1,100,000	
Buffumville Reservoir	1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
Cape Cod Canal					157,000		157,000	
Chatham (stage harbor)			167,000		167,000		167,000	
East Brimfield Reservoir	340,000		840,000		840,000		840,000	
Fall River Harbor	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Falmouth Harbor	(1)		(1)		(1)		(1)	
Hodges Village Reservoir	360,000		360,000		360,000		360,000	
Mystic River: 35-foot project	[2] 1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
Nantucket Harbor of Refuge					162,000		162,000	
Newburyport Harbor			143,000		143,000		143,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

Corps of Engineers—Construction, general, fiscal year 1957—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1957		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Massachusetts—Continued								
North Adams	$2,000,000		$2,000,000		$2,000,000		$2,000,000	
Revere Beach	75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000	
Town River	302,000		302,000		302,000		302,000	
West Hill Reservoir				$100,000				$100,000
Weymouth Fore River	[2] 500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Worcester	840,000		840,000		840,000		840,000	
Michigan:								
Au Sable Harbor						$10,000		10,000
Battle Creek	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Black River Harbor, Gogebic County	156,000		156,000		156,000		156,000	
Cheboygan River and Harbor					110,000		110,000	
Great Lakes connecting channels	[2] 4,000,000		4,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000	
Harrisville Harbor					260,000		260,000	
Holland Harbor	[2] 160,000		285,000		285,000		285,000	
Houghton-Hancock Bridge	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Port Austin Harbor	[2] 200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
Saginaw River		$50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
Whitefish Point Harbor					100,000		100,000	
Minnesota:								
Hastings Harbor	[1]		[1]		[1]		[1]	
Red River of the North, S. Dak., N. Dak., and Minn	225,000		225,000		325,000		325,000	
Winona Harbor	[1]		[1]		[1]		[1]	
Missouri:								
Bear Creek Reservoir		60,000		60,000		60,000		60,000
Canton	275,000		275,000		275,000		275,000	
Cape Girardeau (Reach No. 2 only)	[2] 1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Fabius River Drainage District				75,000		75,000		75,000
Kansas City, Kans. and Mo. (See Kansas.)								
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.)								
Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth	2,000,000		2,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City. (See Iowa.)								
Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts 1, 2, and 3	[2] 800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
Pomme de Terre Reservoir	[2] 500,000		500,000		800,000		800,000	
St. Louis		[2] 551,000		551,000		551,000		551,000
Table Rock Reservoir, Mo. and Ark	14,750,000		14,750,000		14,750,000		14,750,000	
Montana:								
Billings					200,000		200,000	
Fort Peck Dam: Second powerplant	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Nebraska:								
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Miners Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebr., and S. Dak	1,100,000		1,100,000		1,400,000		1,400,000	
Norfolk		35,000		35,000		35,000		35,000
Waterloo		6,000		6,000		6,000		6,000
Nevada:								
Mathews Canyon Reservoir	[1] 250,000				250,000		250,000	
Pine Canyon Reservoir					200,000		200,000	
New Hampshire:								
Hopkinton-Everett Reservoir		[2] 50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
Otter Brook Reservoir	1,250,000		1,250,000		1,250,000		1,250,000	
Portsmouth Harbor, N. H., and Piscataqua River, Maine and N. H	[2] 775,000		775,000		775,000		775,000	
New Jersey:								
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey:								
Marcus Hook and Mantua Creek anchorages, New Jersey and Pennsylvania	1,060,000		1,060,000		1,060,000		1,060,000	
Delaware River, Philadelphia to Trenton:								
Interim 35-foot project	6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000	
New York and New Jersey channels	3,500,000		3,500,000		4,500,000		4,000,000	
Staten Island Rapid Transit bridge, New York and New Jersey. (See New York.)								
New Mexico:								
Albuquerque		170,000		170,000		170,000		170,000
Artesia		25,000		25,000		25,000		25,000
Chamita Reservoir (Abiquiu)	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
Los Esteros-Alamagordo Reservoirs		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
Two Rivers Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
New York:								
Allegheny River Reservoir, N. Y. and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.)								
Barcelona Harbor	[2] 250,000		[2] 250,000		250,000		250,000	
Black Rock and Tonawanda Harbor (deepen channel to 21 ft.)						6,000		6,000
Buffalo Harbor, North Entrance Channel					250,000		None	
Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal	1,030,000		1,030,000		1,030,000		1,030,000	
Genegantslet Reservoir						100,000		None
Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway: 13-foot depth through locks	[2] 275,000		275,000		275,000		275,000	
Jones Inlet	[2] 1,470,000		1,470,000		1,470,000		1,470,000	
New York and New Jersey Channels. (See New Jersey.)								
Oswego Harbor:								
Detached breakwaters	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Staten Island Rapid Transit Bridge, New York and New Jersey	1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000	
South Plymouth Reservoir						100,000		None
Wellsville	450,000		450,000		450,000		450,000	
North Carolina:								
Far Creek			179,000		179,000		179,000	
Manteo Bay			570,000		570,000		570,000	
Wilkesboro Reservoir		25,000		[4] 25,000		25,000		25,000
Wilmington Harbor	[2] 1,543,000		1,543,000		1,543,000		1,543,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

Corps of Engineers—Construction, general, fiscal year 1957—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1957		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
North Dakota:								
Garrison Reservoir	[2] $11,300,000		$11,300,000		$16,000,000		$16,000,000	
Lower Heart River		$60,000		$60,000		$60,000		$60,000
Marmarth	217,000		217,000		217,000		217,000	
Red River of the North, N. Dak., S. Dak., and Minn. (See Minnesota.)								
Ohio:								
Ashtabula Harbor: East outer harbor	1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000	
Cleveland Harbor: Bridge replacements and channel improvements	[2] 1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000	
Dillon Reservoir					1,500,000		1,500,000	
Greenup lock and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
Markland lock and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Indiana.)								
Muskingum River Reservoirs	[2] 425,000		425,000		425,000		425,000	
New Cumberland lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	[2] 8,000,000		8,000,000		8,000,000		8,000,000	
New Richmond lock and dams, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
Toledo Harbor (removal of center dike)			380,000		380,000		380,000	
Oklahoma:								
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)								
Denison Reservoir, Texas and Oklahoma (see Texas).								
Enid						38,000		None
Eufaula Reservoir			500,000		2,000,000		1,250,000	
Keystone Reservoir					1,500,000		1,500,000	
Oklahoma City Floodway	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
Oologah Reservoir	[2] 4,000,000		3,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
Oregon:								
Amazon Creek	100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
Chetco River					225,000		225,000	
Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
Columbia River between Chinook and Head of Sand Island, Oreg. and Wash		13,000		13,000		13,000		13,000
Coos Bay	[2] 300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
Cougar Reservoir	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,800,000		1,650,000	
Green Peter Reservoir		100,000		100,000		300,000		200,000
Hills Creek Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,250,000		2,125,000	
Holley Reservoir						100,000		100,000
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington		500,000		1,450,000		1,200,000		1,450,000
Johnson Creek	[2] 150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000	
Lower Columbia River improvements to existing works:								
(a) Beaver Drainage District						13,000		13,000
(e) John Drainage District						7,000		7,000
(g) Midland Drainage District						8,000		8,000
(h) Multnomah County Drainage District No. 1						8,000		8,000
(i) Peninsula Drainage District No. 1						59,000		59,000
(j) Peninsula Drainage District No. 2						59,000		59,000
(k) Rainier Drainage District						34,000		34,000
(l) Sauvie Island Drainage District						38,000		38,000
Malheur Improvement District	[1]		[1]		[1]		[1]	
McNary lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	[2] 4,500,000		2,828,000		4,500,000		2,828,000	
Pendleton		[2] 25,000		25,000		25,000		25,000
The Dalles Dam, Oreg. and Wash	[2] 42,457,000		42,457,000		42,457,000		42,457,000	
Skipanon Channel					185,000		185,000	
Tillamook Bay and Bar (Bay Ocean Peninsula)	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
Umpqua River; Scholfield River at Reedsport	[1]		[1]		[1]		[1]	
Willamette River, bank protection	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
Pennsylvania:								
Allegheny River Reservoir, N. Y. and Pa		[2] 384,000		384,000		384,000		384,000
Allentown		70,000		70,000		70,000		70,000
Bear Creek Reservoir	2,250,000		2,250,000		2,250,000		2,250,000	
Bethlehem		90,000		90,000		90,000		90,000
Bradford	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea. (See New Jersey.)								
Delaware River, Philadelphia to Trenton. (See New Jersey.)								
Dyberry Reservoir	600,000				600,000		600,000	
Kettle Creek Reservoir		95,000		95,000		95,000		95,000
Presque Isle Peninsula	380,000		380,000		380,000		380,000	
Prompton Reservoir	550,000		550,000		550,000		550,000	
Reynoldsville	578,000		578,000		578,000		578,000	
Stillwater Reservoir	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
Swoyersville-Forty Fort	625,000		625,000		625,000		625,000	
Rhode Island:								
Bullocks Point Cove			174,000		174,000		174,000	
Sand Hill Cove Beach					40,000		40,000	
Sakonnet Harbor					600,000		600,000	
Woonsocket	600,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
South Carolina:								
Channel Port Royal Sound to Beaufort	[2] 401,000		401,000		401,000		401,000	
Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S. C. (See Georgia.)								
South Dakota:								
Big Bend Reservoir						150,000		150,000
Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Miners Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebr., and S. Dak. (See Nebraska.)								
Oahe Reservoir	[2] 27,500,000		27,500,000		27,500,000		27,500,000	
Red River of the North, N. Dak., S. Dak., and Minn. (See Minnesota.)								
Sioux Falls	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
Tennessee:								
Cheatham lock and dam	[2] 2,900,000		2,900,000		2,900,000		2,900,000	
Lake City		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
Barkley Dam (lower Cumberland lock and dam) Kentucky and Tennessee. (See Kentucky.)								
Memphis, Wolf River and Nonconnah Creek	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
Old Hickory lock and dam	2,250,000		2,250,000		2,250,000		2,250,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

Corps of Engineers—Construction, general, fiscal year 1957—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1957		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Texas:								
Brazos Island Harbor	$400,000		$400,000		$400,000		$400,000	
Buffalo Bayou	[2] 6,900,000		6,900,000		6,900,000		6,900,000	
Canyon Reservoir	1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000	
Cooper Reservoir and Channels				$125,000		$125,000		$125,000
Corpus Christi Bridge	[2] 500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Dallas Floodway	2,600,000		2,600,000		2,600,000		2,600,000	
Denison Reservoir (Lake Texoma), Texas and Oklahoma:								
(a) Recreational facilities					250,000		250,000	
(b) Highway Bridge at Willis site					800,000		800,000	
Ferrell's Bridge Reservoir	4,300,000		4,300,000		4,300,000		4,300,000	
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway:								
(a) Channel in Colorado River (Bay City)						20,000		20,000
(b) Guadalupe River, channel to Victoria	[2] 110,000		110,000		110,000		110,000	
(c) Realinement vicinity of Aransas Pass		$31,000		31,000		31,000		31,000
Houston ship channel: 36-foot project	730,000		730,000		730,000		730,000	
Kenedy		[2] 36,000		36,000		36,000		36,000
McGee Bend Dam	4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
McKinney Bayou and Barkman Creek, Ark. and Tex. (See Arkansas.)								
Mooringsport Reservoir, La. and Tex. (See Louisiana.)								
Navarro Mills Reservoir		60,000		60,000		60,000		60,000
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway:								
34-foot Tule Lake Channel extension	319,000		319,000		319,000		319,000	
36-foot channel	330,000		330,000		330,000		330,000	
Channel to LaQuinta					500,000		500,000	
Proctor Reservoir						75,000		75,000
Red River levees below Denison Dam. (See Arkansas.)								
Sabine-Neches Waterway	[2] 695,000		695,000		695,000		695,000	
San Antonio	800,000				800,000		800,000	
Texarkana Reservoir	1,226,000		1,226,000		1,226,000		1,226,000	
Waco Reservoir		100,000		100,000		300,000		200,000
Utah: Salt Lake City						53,000		53,000
Vermont:								
Ball Mountain Reservoir	2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000	
East Barre Reservoir (modification)	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
North Hartland Reservoir		300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000
North Springfield Reservoir	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Rutland		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
Townshend Reservoir	420,000		820,000		420,000		620,000	
Waterbury local protection		100,000				100,000		None
Waterbury Reservoir (modification)	808,000		808,000		808,000		808,000	
Wrightsville Reservoir (modification)	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Virginia:								
Kings Creek					[1]		[1]	
Norfolk Harbor: Craney Island disposal area	[2] 1,784,000		1,784,000		1,784,000		1,784,000	
Norfolk and Portsmouth Belt Line RR. bridge	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Parrotts Creek					[1]		[1]	
Thimble Shoal Channel	820,000		820,000		820,000		820,000	
Waterway coast of Virginia, Chesapeake Bay to Chincoteague Bay					300,000		300,000	
Virgin Islands:								
Christiansted Harbor						2,000		2,000
St. Thomas Harbor						2,000		2,000
Washington:								
Bellingham Harbor	[2] 400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
Blaine Harbor					116,000		116,000	
Chief Joseph Dam	[2] 9,500,000		9,500,000		9,500,000		9,500,000	
Columbia River at Baker Bay						70,000	70,000	
Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
Columbia River between Chinook and Head of Sand Island, Oreg. and Wash. (See Oregon.)								
Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg.—27-foot channel. (See Oregon.)								
Eagle Gorge Reservoir	6,300,000		6,300,000		6,300,000		6,300,000	
Everett Harbor and Snohomish River					120,000		120,000	
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River					61,000		61,000	
Ice Harbor lock and dam	5,000,000		8,000,000		8,000,000		8,000,000	
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
Lower Columbia River levees at new locations: Washougal area		[1] 17,000		17,000		17,000		17,000
McNary lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
Quillayute River			444,000		444,000		444,000	
Shilshole Bay	[2] 300,000		300,000		400,000		400,000	
Stillaguamish River						5,000		5,000
The Dalles Dam, Oreg. and Wash. (See Oregon.)								
Willapa River and Harbor and Naselle River					130,000		130,000	
West Virginia:								
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va. (See Maryland.)								
Hildebrand lock and dam	2,000,000		2,000,000		3,500,000		2,750,000	
New Cumberland lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
Summersville Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
Sutton Reservoir	4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000	
Wisconsin:								
Milwaukee Harbor: River channels	130,000		130,000		130,000		130,000	
Prairie du Chien Harbor		14,000		14,000		14,000		14,000
Wyoming:								
Jackson Hole	[2] 400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
Sheridan		25,000				25,000		25,000
Local protection projects not requiring specific legislation	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,500,000		1,250,000	
Emergency bank protection	[2] 400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
Snagging and clearing	500,000		500,000		700,000		600,000	
Projects deferred for restudy		[2] 90,000		90,000		90,000		90,000
Small authorized projects	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
Total	415,192,000	6,095,000	422,949,000	7,685,000	462,113,000	10,160,000	454,987,500	9,562,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Corps of Engineers—Construction, general, fiscal year 1957—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1957		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Wyoming—Continued								
Lower Columbia River fish-sanctuary program (Fish and Wildlife Service)	$1,400,000		$1,400,000		$1,400,000		$1,400,000	
Program total, construction, general	416,592,000 (422,687,000)	$6,095,000	424,349,000	$7,685,000	463,513,000	$10,160,000	456,387,500	$9,562,000
Reduction based on unobligated balances			−10,000,000		−10,000,000		−10,000,000	
Grand total, construction, general	416,592,000 (422,687,000)	6,095,000	414,349,000 (422,034,000)	7,685,000	453,513,000 (63,673,000)	10,160,000	446,387,500 (455,949,500)	9,562,000

[1] Included under item of $2,000,000 for small authorized projects.
[2] Revised budget estimate.
[3] Included under planning request for "Deferred for restudy" projects.
[4] Recommended by House committee. Floor amendment prohibited use of funds for this project. Senate deleted amendment.
[5] In addition $4,543,000 will be applied to this project from savings and slippages on projects that have received completion funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a tabulation showing the projects wherein the amount agreed to in conference is different from the amount approved by the Senate.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Project:	*Reduction below Senate amount*
Arkansas:	
Dardanelle lock and dam	$100,000
Red River levees and bank stabilization	75,000
California:	
American River levees	50,000
Redondo Beach Harbor	250,000
Connecticut:	
New Haven Harbor	536,000
Florida:	
Central and southern Florida	1,250,000
Kansas:	
Kansas City, Kans. and Mo.	200,000
Milford Reservoir	90,000
Kentucky:	
Lock and dam 41	250,000
New Richmond lock and dam	25,000
Nolin Reservoir	50,000
Louisiana:	
Amite River and tributaries	137,500
Mississippi River, gulf outlet	25,000
Overton Red River Waterway	150,000
Massachusetts:	
West Hill Reservoir	+100,000
New Jersey:	
New York and New Jersey channels	500,000
New York:	
Buffalo Harbor, north entrance channel	250,000
Genegantslet Reservoir	100,000
South Plymouth Reservoir	100,000
Oklahoma:	
Enid	38,000
Eufaula Reservoir	750,000
Oregon:	
Cougar Reservoir	150,000
Green Peter Reservoir	100,000
Hills Creek Reservoir	125,000
John Day lock and dam	+250,000
McNary lock and dam	1,672,000
Texas:	
Waco Reservoir	100,000
Vermont:	
Townshend Reservoir	+200,000
Waterbury local protection	100,000
West Virginia:	
Hildebrand lock and dam	750,000
Local protection projects (sec. 212)	250,000
Snagging and clearing	100,000
Total reductions	8,273,500
Total increases	550,000
Net reductions	7,723,500

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on the item "Operation and maintenance," for which the Senate proposed an additional $10 million for deferred maintenance, the House agreed to the Senate amendment.

On the item "General expenses," the House agreed to the Senate amendment.

On the item "Mississippi River and tributaries," the House agreed to the Senate amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, first of all, I should like to join my colleagues in congratulating the able Senator from Louisiana for the magnificent accomplishments which he and the conferees have achieved with respect to the bill.

Mr. President, I should like to make a little legislative history at this time. Some of the language of the conference report, if misinterpreted, poses an extreme, unwarranted, and unintended hazard to a number of irrigation projects in the Nation today, because the language to which I refer is susceptible of a completely false and illogical meaning unless we are able by this colloquy to indicate that no such hazard is involved. I refer to page 4 of the report, and I read the following sentence from it:

> The conferees of both Houses are in agreement that no new contracts for construction of strictly irrigation features on any reclamation project shall be entered into where a repayment contract is required, until such repayment contract has been executed.

The first question I wish to ask my able friend from Louisiana is this: In his opinion, does this language of this report apply to any projects which are now in being?

Mr. ELLENDER. In my opinion it does not. When the language to which you refer was submitted, we were discussing new starts which were to be developed strictly as irrigation projects.

Mr. KUCHEL. In other words, as I understand the Senator's statement, in those instances where Congress in the past has authorized irrigation projects, or where any part of the work on such a type of project may be under way, the language to which the Senator and I refer does not apply, in his opinion.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. I appreciate the Senator's statement, because the situation can be illustrated, I think, by referring to the Sacramento Canal project in California. A canal system was authorized by Congress as a part of the Central Valley project. For example, canals were built on parcel A and parcel B in the area. But between those two parcels there happens to be a railroad right-of-way. It would be ridiculous if the language were to be applied so as to prevent a construction contract being awarded to connect the canals under the railroad property. I use that merely as an example of the sort of thing as to which some Members of Congress were apprehensive that an unrealistic and unintended interpretation of this language in the report might be made.

Mr. ELLENDER. I repeat that the language which was suggested by the House as to several of the projects, which were to be built for irrigation only, was discussed with reference to new starts, and there was no discussion of its application to projects which have already been started.

Mr. KUCHEL. I take it that the Senator from Louisiana is familiar with the Sacramento Valley canal system.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am. I have been living with it for the past 8 years.

Mr. KUCHEL. The able Senator is a friend of that beneficent project. Is it the Senator's opinion that this language in no sense applies to the Sacramento Valley canal system?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my opinion.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Louisiana, as chairman of the committee of conference, has done notable work and has rendered excellent service, for which I congratulate him.

I should like to ask about one of the conference items relative to the State of Florida. I think the other two Florida items which were considered by the committee of conference—namely, the one affecting the Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville to Miami, and the one affecting Tampa Harbor—are quite clear from the listing. The House in each of those instances simply acceded to the action of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. But in the case of the third item, the central and southern Florida flood-control project, action was taken which represented something of a

change from the position of the Senate, and also a change from the position of the House.

My understanding of the action taken by the committee of conference relative to the central and southern Florida flood-control project is that the amount allowed by the House, $8,750,000, was agreed upon by the conferees and appears in the conference report. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. But my understanding also is that that amount is distributed as between construction and repayment of the local agency on account of action heretofore authorized by Congress in a way different from that shown by either bill originally.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. If he will recall, the Senate committee provided $10 million. Out of that sum the State of Florida was to be repaid $2,900,000.

The Senate conferees receded from the figure of $10 million and accepted $8,750,000.

The House conferees receded from their position, that of the $8,750,000 which was provided by the House, $2,900,000 was to be paid to the State of Florida. The House receded from that position and agreed that only $750,000 of the $8,750,000 was to be used for reimbursement of advanced funds, thereby leaving $8 million for construction.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. It is my understanding that the $750,000 represents the amount which the State agency had requested in repayment this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. So the State gets what it had asked for by way of partial repayment, and the construction project gets $8 million, and everybody is as happy as can be with the smaller amount of money.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is exactly correct; and the repayment of the balance of the amount due the State is postponed.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is in this bill only an installment payment to the State of $750,000. That is the amount which the State had requested be repaid in this particular year.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

CONTROL OF NARCOTICS, BARBITURATES, AND DANGEROUS DRUGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11320) to effect the control of narcotics, barbiturates, and dangerous drugs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MORSE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MORSE, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. HRUSKA conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the message of the Senate announcing its agreement to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1622) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9720) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 11, 18, 22, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 44 to the bill, and concurred therein.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 909. An act for the relief of Charles O. Ferry and other employees of the Alaska Road Commission; and

H. R. 1963. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence M. Augustine.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 906. An act for the relief of William Martin, of Tok Junction, Alaska; and

H. R. 7763. An act to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determination of the claims, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 83) requesting the return of enrolled bill S. 3581 to the Senate.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. LANGER. I object. We are going to hear one of the greatest speeches delivered on the floor of the Senate this year, by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I think more Senators ought to hear him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will resume the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	McCarthy
Allott	Gore	McClellan
Anderson	Green	McNamara
Barrett	Hayden	Millikin
Beall	Hennings	Monroney
Bender	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bennett	Hill	Mundt
Bible	Holland	Murray
Bricker	Hruska	Neuberger
Bridges	Humphrey, Minn.	O'Mahoney
Bush	Humphreys, Ky.	Pastore
Butler	Ives	Payne
Byrd	Jackson	Potter
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Russell
Chavez	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Clements	Kerr	Scott
Cotton	Knowland	Smathers
Curtis	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Laird	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Duff	Lehman	Stennis
Dworshak	Long	Symington
Eastland	Magnuson	Thye
Ellender	Malone	Watkins
Ervin	Mansfield	Welker
Flanders	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Frear	Martin, Pa.	Wofford
Fulbright		Young
George		

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State convention.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair state the parliamentary situation affecting the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). The Chair will make the following statement in regard to the procedure to be observed in connection with the pending bill:

The committee amendment strikes out all after the enacting clause and inserts a complete substitute. In such cases, under the precedents of the Senate, the substitute is considered as original text for the purpose of amendment, and is subject to amendment in two degrees.

An amendment to the substitute, as also an amendment to the original House text, would be in the first degree only, and each would be subject to amendment in one further degree.

Amendments to the original House text, or to an amendment thereto, would have precedence, under rule XVIII, over an amendment to the substitute or an amendment thereto.

All amendments to the committee substitute or to the original House text, and amendments to each thereof, would have precedence over a vote on the committee substitute.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate that I not be interrupted in the course of what I hope will be a relatively brief statement on the bill. When I have finished, I shall be happy to answer, or to try to answer, any questions which may be asked.

Mr. President, the bill before the Senate is H. R. 11356. It is the Mutual Security Act of 1956, and is cast in the form of an amendment to the basic legislation—the Mutual Security Act of 1954. The House has so treated the bill, and it has been treated in the same way by the Senate Committee.

DIFFERENCES FROM HOUSE VERSION

By way of introduction I may say that the differences between the bill as passed by the House of Representatives and the bill reported to the Senate by the Committee on Foreign Relations are relatively few in number, but are of substantial importance.

The most important differences between the House version and the Senate version of the bill concern the sums of money which are authorized to be appropriated. In general terms the differences with respect to the sums in the two versions are as follows:

The President asked the Congress to authorize this year the appropriation of not to exceed $4.7 billion. The House of Representatives reduced that authorization to $3.6 billion—a cut in the President's request of about 20 percent, or a little over $1.1 billion. The Committee on Foreign Relations recommends that the Senate authorize the appropriation of not to exceed $4.3 billion, which is a restoration of some $703 million in the direction of the President's request.

I may say at this point that $100 million of that authorization results from striking out a provision in the House bill which would have repealed a portion of the act of 1954, which authorized an appropriation to the President for Asian economic development of $200 million over a 3-year period. The Senate committee simply struck out the repeal of that section, which had the effect of raising the authorization recommended by the Senate committee by $703 million in the direction of the President's request.

Continuing, in general terms, the Committee on Foreign Relations restored a total of $600 million to the military-assistance figure, which had been reduced by $1 billion by the House. Not only did we do that but we struck out a provision in the House bill which would have been disastrous had it become a part of the law, in that it undertook to limit to only $402 million the military assistance to all the NATO countries, that is to say, all the countries in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. But moneywise the Senate committee simply restored $600 million of the military-assistance figure for all areas of the world where we give assistance. We restored $600 million of the $1 billion reduction made by the House. The Senate committee restored a little more than $100 million of the cut in economic funds which had been made by the other House, principally in the way I have already described, by striking out a House provision repealing section 418 in the 1954 act.

I cite these figures to give the Senate a picture of the magnitude of the program we are discussing. Members who wish to explore in greater detail the sums authorized may examine the report of the committee. That report, to the extent practicable, spells out, country by country, the sums covered by the programs contemplated by this proposed legislation.

We have made the report as full as we reasonably could, in view of restrictions and the secrecy imposed with respect to certain items, which we had to consider. There is in the office of the committee, in this building, a report which any Member of the Senate may see. The committee staff is on the floor and will remain on the floor during the consideration of the bill, and will be pleased to give to any Member of the Senate any information he may wish.

I regret very much that in matters of this kind it is not advisable to make a full report of all the information which comes to the committee. I think it will be appreciated that much information comes to us on a confidential basis, and must remain so, because to divulge it would occasion us very much greater harm and cause very many more difficulties than we would otherwise have.

When Members of the Senate examine the committee report, however, they will find that precise figures on the amount of military assistance to be provided for particular countries are not given in detail. Generally speaking, they are given by regions. The reason, as I have already indicated, is obvious. It would not be in the national interest, in the opinion of the administrators, publicly to debate the amounts for military aid which have been planned for particular countries. I again remind the Senate, however, that the members of the staff are available, and will remain available during the entire consideration of the bill.

Members of the Senate will also find, when they consult the committee report, that the amount of economic assistance planned for certain countries is not listed. Again, the reason for omitting this information from the report is that a public listing of the amounts planned would invite debate which would not be in the national interest. This information, country by country, is also available to Members of the Senate on the same basis I have stated with reference to the military-aid figures. Sums for particular countries are not given, and the committee has followed the usual course in connection with mutual security legislation from the beginning, of omitting particular amounts for certain countries, for very obvious reasons. If a particular amount is given for country A, country A somehow concludes that it has a vested right in that recommendation, and it will, of course, arouse invidious comparisons by other countries, which think they ought to have a larger sum or a different sum from the amount specified for country A. At any rate, from the beginning of legislation of this kind, we have tried to omit lists of particular countries or specific amounts for economic or any other form of aid authorized by the legislation.

There is no place in the Senate's participation in foreign policy for it to become the focal point of the petitions of representatives, official and nonofficial, of foreign nations.

No foreign nation should be given assistance under this program merely because it has lobbyists in the United States. Our assistance must be conditioned, not by outside pressures, but by the needs of this Nation as a whole—needs which are to be measured by the national interest, and by the national interest almost exclusively. It is exceedingly bad practice to single out individual countries in this kind of legislation, a point which I have already tried to stress.

To turn my attention now to some more general features of the problem before the Senate in considering this proposed legislation, there has been a great misunderstanding about the nature of the mutual-security program. Some people talk in terms of giveaway and foreign ratholes. Strangely enough, Mr. President, it is these very individuals taken as a whole and as a rule who say they are most concerned with the Communist threat. How that conclusion can be entirely logical is a bit beyond me, unless one has a doubt about the entire method and the entire program of foreign assistance. It is difficult for me to understand the reasoning behind much of that opposition, because a large share of the funds are for the purpose of building military forces which oppose communism. Other sizable sums are to be used to help foreign countries remain independent and non-Communist.

Let us take a look at this bill. Of the $4.3 billion it authorizes—and let it always be borne in mind that the items in the bill authorize not to exceed a given sum, and that it is wholly within the prerogative and power and right of the Appropriations Committees of both Houses to say what the amount shall be, only that the amount cannot exceed the amount authorized by the bill—$2.5 billion of the total amount is for direct military assistance to allies, an additional $1.1 billion is for economic assistance to countries that are maintaining larger armed forces than they would otherwise be able to maintain, and the balance is for development assistance, for technical assistance, and for such special programs as the United Nations Childrens' Fund, the program to help escapees from the Iron Curtain, and so forth. Of the development assistance funds, which total $243 million, 75 percent are required to be in the form of loans, except for those portions administered in connection with the disposition of agricultural surpluses or through regional programs.

Those who object to the $2.5 billion this year for military assistance should take a very close look at what it does.

IMPORTANCE OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE IN ASIA

In Turkey, for example, it helps to maintain more divisions in being than we have in the United States.

In Korea the sums available are helping to maintain more divisions of Korean troops—battle-tried troops who, in most cases, face the Communists to the north—than we have in the United States.

In Formosa, in Pakistan, on the southern border of the Soviet Union, and at other critical points throughout the world we are helping to support in varying degrees a total of over 200 divisions, 2,000 naval ships, and 300 air squadrons.

It may be true that they are not all strictly modern, as we evaluate military arms, but they all have a value. It may be true that in many instances these divisions are furnished by small nations. But I may say that when the chips are down, Mr. President, small nations may be of very great consequence to the large nations of the earth.

With respect to our military assistance to the countries of the Far East and Asia, we must remember that most of them would not be able to maintain these forces without our help. They are not rich countries. But they have spirit and manpower. They are willing to defend themselves. It is in our national interest that these nations, if attacked, be in a position to slow or to stop the enemy. That is why we give them help. We give them help because if we did not, more of our own men would need to be under arms in far distant stations.

We give them help because if we did not there would be a standing invitation to the Communists to move into the defenseless vacuums that would exist.

IMPORTANCE OF NATO

The military assistance which this bill authorizes for Western Europe is in a lesser magnitude than that which we intend to supply for the Far East and Asia. But it is just as important in a slightly different way.

Most of these European countries are now economically able to support reasonably adequate armed forces of their own. Take the United Kingdom, for example. No military aid is planned this year for that nation. It maintains its own great navy and its own great air force. It has its own supplies of atomic weapons. Granted we helped them after the war to reestablish their military strength. But let us never forget that for 2 years prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor, the United Kingdom stood virtually alone against the forces of totalitarianism, protecting the heritage of freemen.

This bill does carry funds for assistance to other allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We know that we would stand together in the face of attack. They know, and we know, that we would need bases in their countries from which to launch a counterattack in the event the Soviet should risk the use of military means to achieve its ends.

It may be said that some of these nations would not stand with us, and someone may point to little Iceland, which yesterday or the day before had an election in which perhaps the majority of the votes cast indicates a sentiment in favor of inviting our armed servicemen to leave Iceland. That is quite natural, inasmuch as against the background of the whole population of Iceland, the number of American troops in that country is exactly in the proportion of 6 million foreign troops on our soil as against our population of 160 or 165 million. So, very naturally, a large foreign force may easily become offensive to a small country like Iceland. Moreover, Iceland has not yet finally determined what course she will take.

In the course of the debate someone is likely to say that France has withdrawn many of her troops and transported them to Algeria, there to fight her battles. Perhaps not so many French soldiers as one might think have been sent to Algeria or elsewhere, and perhaps none of the weapons sent there have been other than conventional arms; but that situation will make little difference to those who wish to criticize France. That nation unquestionably faces some very difficult problems at this time. Nevertheless, there is nothing to indicate that we could not rely upon the support of the French people in the NATO organization if we were faced with actual aggression.

One thing I know, Mr. President, is that since the organization of NATO, not a single hostile bomb has fallen upon a single American country, upon a single American city, or upon a single American home. Another thing we should know is that the NATO organization has been standing between the free states of Western Europe and the Russian aggressor.

I call attention to the fact that the total NATO armed forces exceed our own. They augment our naval forces and our air forces by more than 100 percent. These nations are bound with us by the North Atlantic Treaty, in which we jointly have agreed to view an attack on any one member as an attack on all.

I do not believe that war is inevitable. I have never accepted that philosophy. On the contrary, I think it is avoidable. Indeed, there is a chance that conditions have so changed in the past year that our children may be able to avoid the horrors of another war. But they will not be able to avoid that danger if we begin in this bill to liquidate the military strength of the free world. We have so built and maintained our joint defenses that potential aggressors have been put on notice that Soviet aggression cannot lead to victory.

In good time we may be able to reduce the size of our military-assistance program, but I doubt the wisdom of such a move this year.

Yesterday the Senate said that our military power should be increased. Who is there to say that the Senate was wrong? It is true that time may prove the Senate to have been wrong, but, yet, it would not prove we had committed a mistake.

FUNDAMENTAL CHANGES IN SOVIET

It has seemed apparent to me for some time that substantial changes have been taking place within the Soviet Union. They may not be basic, but these changes arise from a number of factors. Important, certainly, was the death of Stalin. This event had a tremendous impact within the totalitarian state which for three decades had been conditioned to one-man rule. It was the Communist system which produced Stalin. That system may well produce another Stalin. On the other hand, I do not yet believe we have seen the end of the Communist changes stemming from the death of Stalin.

We do know that his death has led to a committee type of dictatorship instead of a one-man dictatorship. It has led to increased demands on the part of the Russian people and the people of the satellites for more of the material things of life. A new generation is taking over from Stalin and in a few years others will succeed to power. Each of these succeeding generations will demand more good things from life than their predecessors. Each succeeding generation in Russia is better educated than the last. Education can be a good or a bad thing. I am inclined to agree with H. G. Wells, however, who wrote that "history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe."

But the future is not only one of darkness. There is a spark of hope for mankind that has arisen from man's understanding of the atom.

There are those who believe that the Geneva Big Four Conference of a year ago was a mistake. I do not share that belief. It is a matter of opinion. Some hold—and it is their right so to believe—that the Geneva Conference has led to a vast slackening of the will of the free world to build its defenses against atomic attack.

It has seemed to me, however, that the real achievement of the Geneva Conference was to crystallize the realization of the world that a great war would destroy the attacker as well as the defender. This tacit understanding has not been put into written words. But the fact that the understanding exists is evident by the changed tactics of the Soviet Union in the last year.

While—I repeat—the changes may not all be fundamental, they, nevertheless, are changes which I think the free world is bound to note.

While I believe during the past year that the Soviet switch from the threat of a military offensive to the threat of an economic offensive is in part attributed to this recognition of the danger of atomic destruction, it is also attributable to the fact that the free nations of the world have by their joint military strength made it clear that communism cannot be advanced by military conquest without the gravest threat to the home base of communism itself.

Certainly, our preparedness in connection with the war in Korea has played an important part in driving the Soviets to that conclusion.

It is true, however, that the Soviet by its switch from a military emphasis to an economic emphasis in its attack on freedom has had a tendency to induce us to lower our guard. That is human nature. Unless we take care to see that the alliances we have built to oppose Communist military action are adapted to meet Communist threats on other fronts, there is danger not only that our military defense may be weakened, but that the vastly greater economic strength of free nations may be sapped by Communist-induced divisions among friends.

I hope we may not be lulled to sleep, letting our defenses fall into discard. It is in our interest to support strong regional defense groupings, especially as we have now reached the point where such important sources of military power as the United Kingdom with its great naval, air, and atomic power are able to proceed on their own without any financial assistance from the United States. In time we may be able to slacken our military assistance. But to do so now would seem to me to invite disaster.

REVOLUTION AGAINST HUNGER

In the world of today we must also take account of the fact that huge masses of people are determined to raise their living standards. This revolution is going on independently of the struggle against Communist imperialism. In our own interest we must be ready to help these people choose a peaceful, democratic way of advancing rather than the Communist way. The bill, therefore, contains funds to help these people move toward freedom.

DANGER OF REDUCED AUTHORIZATION

If our consideration of this measure follows the usual pattern, we can expect that there will be some amendments offered that will go to the substance of the bill and others that will go only to the amounts authorized to be appropriated.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has examined at length all proposed amendments that have been brought to its attention. Some of those amendments have proposed to increase funds authorized; others have proposed to decrease the funds; and yet other amendments have sought to make various other changes. The committee adopted those amendments which it considered would serve the national interest. It rejected those which a majority felt would not best serve the national interest.

Our consideration was based upon more than 1,000 pages of testimony received from the foremost authorities in our Government and from many leading private citizens. On the basis of the testimony of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Director of the International Cooperation Administration, and numerous specialists, we have sought to balance the needs as seen by the experts with the political judgment of Senators on the committee.

Under these circumstances, it seems to me that those Members of this body who may want to alter drastically our approach to mutual security must assume the risk of drastic change. The greatest risk we face in consideration of this bill is that we may by ill-considered action sacrifice our present necessary position in world affairs.

I am very well aware that there are persons in the United States who think we do not have any obligations beyond our own shores. I can understand that there may be some in this body who entertain very much the same feeling. But I repeat that the greatest risk which we will assume in the consideration of the bill, if it be drastically changed, and if its direction be diverted, will be, not only possibly, but probably, the sacrifice of our present necessary position of leadership in world affairs.

There are some persons in the United States who do not care whether we have any position in world affairs. I certainly am not among them, and I hope I shall never be numbered among them.

Mr. President, the sums contained in the bill are important in their own right, I think, in the sense that they are needed for the purposes for which they are provided. They might be trimmed a little here or there. But any substantial cuts in the bill will involve us in consequences more far-reaching than can be measured by a few tanks or a few aircraft.

It is a fact that the United States is in a position of leadership in the world today. I do not assert that in the sense of arrogant pride, because, in my opinion, real world leaders are people of great humility of spirit rather than of arrogant pride. Yet, although we are in a position of leadership, we did not seek it; we did not ask for it. It devolved upon us because of our geographic position, our natural wealth, our great industrial machine, and our tradition as a champion of freedom, and because of the heroism and fortitude of the men and women who from the beginning have made America.

World leadership comes only to a people who in a time of great stress have risen to the challenge of stirring times, and have assumed their responsibilities because they were elevated by the mighty impulse which comes to a free people who want to live beyond narow selfish interests.

Is there any Member of the Senate or any person in America who thinks that the United States can abandon its responsibility of world leadership without causing the gravest consequences to humanity, ourselves included? If we do not hold the torch of leadership and carry it forward, into whose hands will it fall? What other free nation is in a position to assume the burden or to carry the burden?

I do not disparage the brave people of any other country. The brave people of many free lands would gladly bear the burden. They would stagger along under it as best they could. But if America becomes weary of well doing as the leader of freemen, nobody will be responsible but the men who make the policies of this, our American Republic.

Let no man think that he can escape the direst isolationism if world leadership falls into the hands of the Soviet groups, and if they alone shall grasp the standard. They have the ground forces; they have atomic weapons; they have nuclear weapons. They are able to take the standard of leadership and carry it. If they carry it, the United States will become the great nation of isolationism, to which some people have had a nostalgic hope of returning some time, some way, some day. If that should come to pass, let me say that we will trade, not as free agents in the world, but as traders at sufferance. We shall be doing business as tenants at sufferance all over the world that can be controlled by the Soviet group, if our position of leadership in world affairs passes away.

Mr. President, I do not want it to be said that I was one to call for an isolated America, for a Western Hemisphere fortified as a garrison, which it must inevitably become if we do not retain our position in world affairs. I want it, rather, to be said that I never advocated that position.

The simple consequence of the leadership to which I have referred is that if we should here take action which could be construed as an abandonment of our position in world affairs, if we should recklessly rip this bill of all its substance, where would the leadership go? As I have already asked, if we here should cut the assistance planned for our allies in NATO, what would our allies conclude? Would they think we mean business? In that event, Mr. President, there could be a falling away from NATO that would be truly alarming.

STUDY OF FOREIGN AID

Early this spring, Mr. President, I suggested that the general subject of foreign aid should be subjected to searching examination by an independent, nonpolitical group, if possible. While I shall not be in the Senate next year, and thus benefit from the advice of such a group, it seems to me that it is essential, before this body again considers the subject matter of this bill, that it have the benefit of such advice as it may be able to get.

In the past few years there has been a breakdown in the understanding of the so-called foreign-aid program. Since those days when the American people willingly gave of their goods and services, to help Europe rebuild after the war, through the Marshall plan, the Turkish aid program, and the Greece aid program, there has been a deterioration of their understanding of the need for continuation of the Mutual Assistance Program. There is a deep skepticism among many of our people. They are not convinced that it serves our national interest to supply military assistance and economic assistance to our allies in Western Europe and Asia. Many believe the funds we here authorize for help to foreign nations should better be put to use in our own Military Establishment. They are not convinced that the national interest is served by continued economic assistance to many nations and peoples who are less fortunate than we are. There are many questions in the public mind as to the way in which such assistance—if it is to be continued—should be administered to serve the national interest.

Mr. President, I do not believe we should permit such doubts at this time to destroy this program, but I do believe that a survey should be made, and that we should find a better way of administering aid. That, in my opinion, is one of the weak points of this whole program.

I would not have anyone think that the Foreign Relations Committee has been without its own doubts and has been lacking in its own effort to improve constantly the condition of the American people and the American taxpayer. I very well remember that in fiscal 1951–52, the then President of the United States asked Congress for an appropriation of $8,500,000,000 for foreign aid.

There were some of us who opposed that amount as being too large. We decreased the amount requested, but the actual appropriation made was $7,300,000,000. The appropriations went down and down gradually, step by step, until last year the appropriation was only $2,703,000,000, as I recall.

Mr. President, I very well remember that while I supported the NATO treaty, and supported it in good faith, I was called upon, within the short space of a few months, to oppose the first appropriation for NATO—the Senate at that time was sitting in the old Supreme Court chamber—because it was proposed to give to other nations some $2 billion in money and in reconditioned arms and military equipment, without a single blueprint having been made without a single line having been struck across a single piece of paper, to indicate what would be done with the money. I knew that was unwise. I opposed it. I opposed it very strongly. I did not prevail. I recite these events for the purpose of showing that all the while there have been members of the Foreign Relations Committee who have been mindful of the burden placed upon our own people and of the desirability of lessening that burden when and if we could.

Mr. President, I do not believe we should permit our doubts, whatever they may be, to destroy the program at this time; but I do believe, that the questions in the minds of our citizens should be well and fully answered before this body is again asked to authorize the appropriation of funds for mutual security. No annual program of this size can be carried on without public acceptance by a substantial majority of our people.

As I have indicated, Mr. President, it is my belief, after careful and prolonged study of the mutual security program, that it serves the national interest of this Nation; that it serves it exactly in the same way that a strong army, a strong navy, and a strong airpower serve the national defense. It serves the national interest for exactly the same reason—because it enables us to keep more of our own manpower at work on consumer goods and on products which our people must have; and yet, in a defensive way, we have a strong position because we have air bases, and because we have foreign divisions who will fight with us. These foreign divisions have been built up and are now maintained at a cost to the American people, it is true, but, nevertheless, these forces, along with our own, are rendering a great service to our civilization, Mr. President. The American people must know that is the case.

Furthermore, there is need, in view of the changing nature of the world and the relationships of the great powers, for a reassessment of the emphasis, scope, and direction of the foreign-aid programs. Hence, early in the year I made the suggestion that a study be made; and I am happy to say the committee only recently has resolved, through the whole committee, to make a study of this problem in all of its ramifications.

Mr. President, it is my earnest hope that, despite the doubts of many Senators, all Senators will support the bill which has been reported to the floor of the Senate by the Committee on Foreign Relations, by a vote of 13 to 2. The good of our Nation will not be served by ignoring the advice of the President of the United States, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of State, and the other responsible officials of the executive branch, and the judgment of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee, who have thoroughly examined the measure now before the Senate.

Mr. President, whatever happens in the future, I know that the American people are not going to step backward. They may change administrations, they may change methods, and they may change whole programs; but they are not going backward, because, Mr. President, I cannot think that the divine providence which watches over all of us, and which has permitted us to become the responsible leaders of the world, would do so only to break that hope.

Whatever some may say about the low estate to which we have fallen, I know that if the free people of this globe lose confidence in us, we shall disappoint the best hopes of mankind, and we shall utterly fail to justify the sacrifices of our heroic dead, who have died in nearly all lands and have been swallowed up by the blue waters of nearly all oceans.

So, Mr. President, I submit this matter to the Senate. My colleagues on the committee will, of course, argue the matter at greater length than I have attempted to do in this statement.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 890) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, all of us, I am sure, were deeply moved by the address of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. I know that I speak for all of my colleagues when I say that it is a great sorrow to all of us that he will not continue to be our chairman after this year. The service he has rendered and the inspiration he has given have made it a privilege to serve with him. I wish to pay him this personal tribute of affection before I continue the discussion of the pending bill.

Mr. President, my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Georgia, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has given us a complete outline of the purposes of the pending Mutual Security Act of 1956, including the overall total authorization figures which the committee recommends in its report.

In opening my remarks to supplement those of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, I wish to emphasize, first, that this is an authorization bill as distinguished from an appropriation bill, and, second, that it is not a foreign-aid bill as is so popularly believed but rather a bill to insure the security of the United States, and every one of us, as well as our families.

What we do in this bill is to authorize the appropriation of funds to be available to the President to protect our security in case of any emergency that may arise in any part of the world.

The proposed cut of $1,100,000,000 in the bill passed by the House is practically entirely a cut in the military authorization requested by the administration and the President himself. No one can deny that our great President is probably the most preeminently qualified person, due to his long career as a military man, to determine where the danger spots in the world are and what precautions we should take to prevent those danger spots from becoming enormous worldwide conflagrations which would inevitably threaten the security of the United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I respectfully ask that I not be interrupted. I have a continuous presentation. I shall be glad to remain indefinitely to answer questions after I have concluded, but I prefer not to be interrupted while I am presenting this statement.

No one can deny that President Eisenhower is probably the most eminently qualified person, because of his long career as a military man, to determine where the danger spots in the world are at the present time, and what precautions we should take to prevent those danger spots from becoming enormous, worldwide conflagrations which would inevitably threaten the security of the United States. I emphasize that we are seeking an authorization for the President to enable him to watch for the danger spots, and to act when he needs to act to protect us all.

The President is supported in his conclusions and recommendations by the National Security Council, his close advisory body, but especially by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Admiral Radford, who is Chairman of the the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Also as far as West Europe, which means NATO, is concerned, we have the strong testimony of General Gruenther, who has been in charge of the NATO organization, and who urges that the figures contained in

the bill reported by the Senate committee be not reduced any further. The figures we have arrived at are the figures which the administrators feel they can live with.

This leads me to a consideration of the main objectives of our present foreign policy, as they are related to the bill now before the Senate.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Starting with the Democratic Truman administration after World War II and continuing through the Republican Eisenhower administration, we find that our foreign policy has been guided by two main considerations.

A. Military strength to deter aggression anywhere in the world. This is particularly true in an atomic age when a sudden attack with hydrogen bombs might destroy our entire civilization. This is what I have called the negative approach to our policy—the approach which might be paraphrased by the words "Thou shalt not." We must continue to develop this approach if we are to preserve our existence as a nation.

B. The other approach to which I wish to call attention, which is also a vital part of our foreign policy, and which is reflected in the bill, is our partnership aid to other peoples of the world. This is our positive program of international understanding. It involves the economic buildup of free peoples in a free world so as to insure peace and also to insure the security of the United States. It involves the overall conception of good will between peoples, which includes legitimate trade and international intercourse.

DEFINITIVE ACTION WE HAVE TAKEN TO IMPLEMENT OUR POLICY

Our foreign policy has grown out of our experience in World Wars I and II and the realization that we are living in a smaller world than heretofore and that the concern of any part of the world is the concern of every other part. Isolationism is no longer possible, as it was in the early days of our Republic. Let me consider briefly what steps we have taken to implement our policy of building strength to deter aggression.

A. STRENGTH TO DETER AGGRESSION

After both World Wars I and II we endeavored to find some way by which the collective strength of the world might be mobilized to prevent aggression and to prevent the use of war as an instrument of national policy. We recall, of course, the experiments of the League of Nations and its failures, and we also recall the building up of the United Nations as the successor of the League of Nations, and our hopes that this might be a means by which we could prevent the use of force. In spite of all the promise for positive accomplishments by the United Nations, and in spite of its important contributions, there remains a fatal weakness which has been difficult for us to overcome.

Mr. President, I may say parenthetically at this point that I recall vividly, when we voted to set up the United Nations, the thrill I felt on realizing that it represented a great step toward collective action to prevent future war. But we are experiencing a profound feeling of sadness today that our hopes of that time have been temporarily sidetracked by Russian obstinacy.

The weakness in the U. N. has been the subtle and treacherous planning by Soviet Russia to obstruct any sincere efforts to obtain world peace. Russia was determined to follow the plan of divide and conquer. We found that Russia would obstruct every effort we made, as illustrated by the original Marshall plan, to bring recovery to a war-weary world. Russian obstructionism soon made us aware that we were dealing with a plan to overcome the world either by force of arms or by economic and political penetration. The Security Council of the United Nations became ineffective because of Russia's consistent use of the veto. Aggression which the free world desired to stop through the U. N. was permitted because of Russia's obstructionism.

We finally resorted to article 51 of the U. N. Charter, which permits and encourages within the U. N. the setting up of regional pacts by groups of nations for self-defense. This became a necessary method of security. It was part of the whole program of strength to deter aggression, and its operations are illustrated by NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization of Western Europe plus the United States; by the Rio Pact, which covers our Western Hemisphere; by the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization, SEATO, which covers Southeast Asia; by the so-called ANZUS Pact, which covers Australia, New Zealand, and the United States; by a number of bilateral pacts, particularly in the Far East, such as the pacts between the United States and Japan, the United States and the Philippines, the United States and Korea, and the United States and Nationalist China.

The so-called Baghdad Pact which has our full approval and support, should also be included, although we have not joined this pact because of certain sensitive situations in the area. The Baghdad Pact members are Turkey, Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, and Great Britain.

B. THE NONMILITARY BUILDUP OF FREE PEOPLES

Having reviewed the ways in which we have tried to build the strength against aggression which we feel we need for our own protection and for the security of the world, let me now consider the positive part of our policy—the nonmilitary buildup of free peoples.

The inception of this approach is what has come to be known as the Marshall plan for the economic recovery of Western Europe. We first had the ECA, which was purely economic and which was eminently successful in solving the problem of West Europe's dollar shortage and starting West Europe on the road to economic recovery. This economic program was of limited duration, and there has been criticism because when the first phase was terminated we found it necessary to extend military assistance to Western European countries to assist them to maintain their independence.

I recall very well that I was one of those who had said that after 3 years of the Marshall plan we would end the program. I was sincerely hopeful that we could do it. However, there then came the Russian threats. Although we did end the economic part of the aid, we were compelled to organize further, through NATO, in order to protect the European countries against aggression. The original economic aid took on the military aspect because of the threat of Russian Communist aggression. This led to the buildup of NATO becoming an essential part of the double program. When Russia saw a barrier being built up against any possible military aggression in Western Europe, what did she do? She turned her attention to other parts of the world. This led to such outbreaks as the Korean aggression, which challenged the U. N.

Our experience in meeting this aggression in Korea led us to realize clearly once again that the objective of Soviet Russia was to take over the world. The free world was now threatened by the back-door approach through Asia. We saw the threat to the last stronghold of free China, namely, Formosa, by the buildup of Red China, which had been subtly conquered by subversive tactics and treacherous movements. We began to realize that the millions in overpopulated Asia who for centuries had been subject to some form of imperialism, or colonialism, were presently to become engulfed in a new form of colonialism, namely, Soviet totalitarianism.

We were challenged—and I wish to emphasize this point—with the fundamental issue of whether we would let these billions of people slide behind the Iron Curtain and lose all in the wake of what had been done in China, or, in the alternative, whether we would offer to those stricken and underdeveloped peoples the opportunity to obtain the freedom, independence, and self-determination for which they were fundamentally yearning. In my personal trips to the Far East and after talking to the leadership in practically all of the underdeveloped countries in the area, I personally became convinced that the best hope for world peace lay in endeavoring to understand this turmoil and to help these people to find the freedom from external control which they so longed for.

Under President Truman's point 4 program, and more recently under the wise and guiding policy of President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles, we have been experimenting with the kind of help that would be most appropriate to attain these objectives.

Many mistakes have been made, including many false starts, but the pattern is resolving itself into the kind of legislation that has appeared in the mutual security programs of recent years, known popularly as our foreign aid programs.

Briefly defined, as I stated above, this means that there are two parts to our present program:

First. Military security pacts, which I have described above, and the strengthening of our military position throughout the world by air bases, and so forth, which we have discussed during the past few days. This is what I have called the negative defensive aspect.

Second. The nonmilitary, namely, the buildup of underdeveloped countries and our attempt to help them attain their freedom, independence, and self-determination, so that they may become equal partners in a free world. This is the positive aspect of our assistance program.

Both of these aspects, the military and the nonmilitary, are provided for by the bill which we are asking the Senate to support.

Now let me get to the bill itself, the Mutual Security Act of 1956.

THE MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

This bill involves our consideration of the dollar authorizations for the fiscal year 1957. At this point I desire to urge upon my colleagues the importance of carefully studying the report of the committee, which explains the present evolution of our foreign policy and presents the dollar issues involved. I call attention particularly to page 2 of the report, which sets forth in parallel columns the original request of the administration, the action by the House, and the recommendation of our Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Let me analyze these figures briefly.

I am comparing now the administration request, the House action, and the recommendations of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The administration request was for a total of $4,672,475,000, of which the military request was $2,925,000,000 and the nonmilitary request was $1,747,475,000.

The House action provided a total authorization of $3,567,475,000, of which the military authorization was $1,925,000,000 and the nonmilitary authorization was $1,642,475,000.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee recommended a total authorization of $4,270,075,000, of which the military authorization is $2,525,000,000 and the nonmilitary authorization is $1,745,075,000.

This means that the House in its action cut the military part—I emphasize the military part—of the program $1 billion. The Senate committee cut the military part of the program $400 million. In other words, the committee restored $600 million of the total House military cut.

The House cut the nonmilitary part of the program by approximately $100 million, but the Senate committee recommended substantially the same amount as the administration requested for the nonmilitary part of the program.

THE WORLDWIDE MILITARY PICTURE

This is what I have defined above as the first part of our overall foreign program and it involves the issues of adequate defenses to deter aggression.

In the program, as General Gruenther and Admiral Radford pointed out, it is necessary to bring the armed forces of the Western Powers up to date in the strenuous world competition. This applies especially to the NATO countries, accounting for $530 million of the total. There are certain critical danger spots in the Far East. With these I am very familiar because I have studied them during the past 8 or 10 years.

In the military part of the bill, as I have stated before, the Defense Department and the President feel that we will need authorization for $2.52 billion as in the Senate version of the bill. If we cut an additional $600 million below this amount as the House did, this cut must be made somewhere.

Let me analyze the situation. As I see it, there are certain "must" priorities in this military program:

(a) The program calls for $530 million in so-called advance weapons to bring the armed forces of the Western Powers up to date in the strenuous world competition. This applies especially to NATO countries.

(b) There are certain critical danger spots in the Far East.

These are:

First. South Korea, where there is an uncertain armistice which is being constantly violated by the Communists and especially the Red Chinese in North Korea.

As we all know, we have withdrawn our own troops from South Korea. We have there a military assistance group to train the South Koreans. They are prepared to defend their own homeland if it should be further attacked, and they will bear the burden of any attack which may come.

Second. The Formosa area, where there has been an enormous buildup of Red Chinese strength opposite Formosa and immediately threatening the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. This is the area covered by the Formosa resolution of last year.

Third. Vietnam and the overall Indochina area: Here again is an uncertain armistice line and free Vietnam is constantly threatened by the Viet Minh which is supported by Red China and Russia and which threatens to take over all of Vietnam as well as Laos and Cambodia.

The amounts which are contemplated to be set aside for these three critical areas are strictly classified for security reasons. I may say to my colleagues however, that these amounts and the amounts privately earmarked for other countries of the world, while classified, are of course available to any Member of the Senate in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee.

It is estimated that these critical areas of the Far East, including Pakistan, are so demanding on our resources to keep alive and effective the manpower defending the front in these areas that any reduction in these funds might well require a complete change in our Far Eastern military policy.

If at this time we should say that we will do less for NATO, we would be giving notice that we are withdrawing from our responsibilities. It might appear that we were failing our allies at this time. As I have analyzed the figures, if we give priorities to the Far East, we will have to take any reductions out of the NATO figures.

Let me emphasize here that it is native Koreans who have been trained into an effective army in South Korea. It is native Chinese who have been trained for an effective defensive army in Formosa and it is native Vietnamese who have been trained to defend their homeland in Vietnam. Our boys are not now involved. It is in the interest of our own security that we furnish the necessary resources to maintain these armies that are in the field and which are being trained by the United States in these areas.

The same is true of NATO. Admiral Radford and General Gruenther both point out that to maintain the military strength of NATO and possibly even its very existence it will be necessary for us to continue to support the assistance program which is recommended. Two billion fifty-two million dollars is the lowest figure that our military experts, including the President, feel we must authorize if we are not going to be compelled to revise our worldwide military program. Let me digress a moment to compare this military end of the pending bill and even the overall figures for the entire mutual-security program with our total defense budget that we have just approved our appropriation for in the Senate. As I said above, the military end of the bill is $2.52 billion. The overall figure for the entire program, both military and nonmilitary, is $4.27 billion. The total defense budget is over $35 billion, plus the additional billion dollars we voted for airpower.

It is obvious that the foreign military support which our present policy calls for is a relatively small percentage of the overall total of our defense program. It is estimated that our foreign military support—that is, the $2.52-billion Senate version—probably saves us at least 2 or 3 times what the cost to us would be without this foreign cooperation. On page 12 of the report there appears a chart which shows the relative contribution of the European NATO countries to NATO defenses and the United States contribution to NATO for the years 1950 to 1955, inclusive.

I invite especial attention to that, because it has been charged that we are carrying the load for the NATO countries. That is not true. The bulk of the expenses are carried by the countries with whom we are trying to work.

My conclusion on this part of the bill, therefore, is that it is vitally important for us to help to develop foreign security alliances and foreign manpower to aid in the defense of the free world. The expense is stupendous, I admit, even though it is but a small percentage of our overall defense picture. But the alternative seems to be a complete withdrawal from all security pacts and again a return to isolationism in the Western Hemisphere.

My colleague, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], pointed out most eloquently what it would mean if we had to withdraw from the world and to leave the world outside our own hemisphere to Soviet Russia. This, to me, is unthinkable in this modern age of hydrogen bombs.

I turn, now, to the nonmilitary side of the bill and what its provisions entail.

This is what I call the positive approach to our foreign policy. So far as the amounts involved are concerned, the differences are relatively small. The administration request is for $1.74 billion plus. The House bill calls for $1.64 billion plus and the Senate committee recommendation calls for $1.74 billion

plus. The Senate recommendation is, therefore, approximately the same as the administration's request. The House, on the other hand, deducted from the administration's request approximately $100 million beyond that figure, which, as I say, is relatively small compared with the $35 billion appropriated yesterday for our overall defense at home.

A question may arise as to whether this nonmilitary assistance is justified at all.

The Marshall plan countries, as the Senator from Georgia has pointed out, have, generally speaking, made such advances in their economic recovery that they need no economic aid from us this year. We provided them with such aid when they needed it; and although their political recovery is not clear, their economic recovery is. The main economic problem is in the underdeveloped areas of the world, especially in the Far East and the Middle East, in Africa, and, to some degree, South America.

Let me emphasize why I believe a nonmilitary aid program should have our support. I myself feel that this should be continuing support, as the President has requested. This does not mean continuing substantial grants, but, as the Senate bill contemplates, it means support in the way of loans, so as to help these people to solve their economic problems. We should give evidence that we are willing to assist these countries to be free and independent, and especially to help them to determine their own future destinies. To sum up briefly my position on this matter, I submit the following:

First, this partnership policy supplements military preparedness and collective security.

Second, it must have a more human and more universal objective than merely the prevention of the spread of communism. I wish to emphasize that we must aim to do more than merely to prevent the spread of communism. We must have a broader approach. We must determine how people can be brought into friendly relationships and thus, ultimately, to bring about world peace.

Third, our primary nonmilitary objective should be as friendly partners, to help fulfill the aspirations of people in the underdeveloped countries for freedom, independence, and self-determination, and higher standards of living. This does not require large dollar handouts, but loans and technical assistance.

If we could only get away from the need for military expenditures, we would be amazed at the ranges of assistance and the ranges of human understanding which could be opened up by simply helping many of these people to raise their standards of living, and to become self-sufficient members of the free world.

Fourth, if we can do this effectively, we can meet the threat of communism with its recent "smiling" promises. Bulganin and Khrushchev have recognized clearly what we have been doing. Now they are offering inducements from their own standpoint which they think will lure those people into the Soviet field.

Fifth, from my personal experience the people in these so-called underdeveloped countries are yearning to break away from the old imperialism and colonialism, and to be recognized as free and independent, without any form of external control.

Sixth, they are eager to learn the know-how of real government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Seventh, stated in another way, our primary nonmilitary objective might well be human, man-to-man contact with peoples who really wish to be free and who wish to know what brought freedom and liberty to the people of the United States.

Let me add that our own security will only be assured and the world can only be at peace if we do our part in helping to raise the standard of living in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

So I find myself in entire accord with the inspiring and noble words of my colleague, the Senator from Georgia. From my own experience of 10 years on the Committee on Foreign Relations, and from my trips to Europe and, especially, to the Far East, I have observed at first hand the yearning for freedom and independence which those people legitimately have.

Our ancestors came to this country because they sought to be free. They realized the possibilities of men being free. They realized the possibilities of releasing the creative energies of mankind, in order that mankind might express itself with the deepest emotions of the human spirit. Our ancestors realized that there is a God who is directing the destinies of His people. They realized that this Nation had been blessed by Almighty God. Our forefathers were blessed with the ideal of bringing to the people of the world a new conception of life, a conception never before known.

We have demonstrated by our freedom and our institutions of self-government that man can be protected against the encroachment of totalitarianism and dictatorship, and can be protected, really, against himself.

It seems to me that we are justified in continuing the policy which has evolved from our experience since World War II into a program, first, of strength against possible destruction, and second, of maintaining and improving our relationships with the people of the other countries of the world, so as to afford them the opportunity to secure for themselves the greatest blessings which we in America have enjoyed. I believe that is, for us, both a responsibility and an opportunity.

It is my sincere hope that the United States Senate will pass the bill as reported by the committee, and will support the authorizations which the committee, after a careful study of all the figures and facts presented to it, has seen fit to include in the bill.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9720) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 27, 1956, pp. 11125–11126, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as was announced by the clerk of the Senate, the report was signed by all the conferees on the part of the Senate, both the majority and the minority, and is now before the Senate.

This bill, H. R. 9720, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, as it passed the Senate was for $2,372,523,281, an increase of $75,541,500 over the House allowance, and $8,637,881 over the budget estimates.

The bill as it is now before us following the House adoption of the conference report and its acceptance of the Senate amendments affecting the National Institutes of Health, reported in disagreement, carries a total of $2,366,380,781, a decrease of $6,142,500 under the Senate allowance, an increase of $69,399,000 over the House allowance, and $2,495,381 over the budget estimates.

Amendment No. 3 provided for an increase of $48,500 for the Bureau of Labor Standards, with respect to which the report, No. 2093, had this comment from our committee:

> The Bureau has developed, the committee was advised, in the current year a model workmen's compensation law and circulated this draft among the States last November. There has been sufficient time to conclude this project, and the Department should finalize its conclusions based upon the work heretofore done and with funds heretofore provided, and make a report to the Congress.

The Senate conferees in receding from the action of the Senate increasing the funds $48,500 did not retreat from the position taken by the committee as set forth in the report just quoted, and the Department is expected to bring to a termination work on the model workmen's compensation law. As is pointed out in the report, sufficient time has elapsed for the exchange of views between the Department and the States with respect to the model law circulated last November and the committee contemplates the termination of the work on this particular project within a very short time.

The Senate had provided an increase of $313,000 for the Bureau of Labor Statistics to allow the full budget estimate of $7 million. In conference the managers on the part of the Senate were forced to compromise and accept $200,000, of which $150,000 may be used for a special survey of wages and hours in the

retail trade and $50,000 for extension and improvement of the State-Federal program for the collection of injury-rate data.

There was a great deal of interest in the Senate with respect to the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Education," for which we had an estimate for $6 million, but for which the House had allowed only $4,500,000. An additional $500,000 was added in the Senate, and the Senate amendment was accepted by the conferees. The House in its report on this item specifically directed that $675,000 be used for research on the problems of the mentally retarded children, and the Senate had specifically directed that a total of $817,905 of the increase over 1956 funds be allocated to certain work. The conference agreement provides sufficient funds over the 1956 appropriation to permit the effecting of both directions, and leaves approximately $250,000 for use in the discretion of the Office of Education, except that the conferees were in agreement that none of the funds could be used for the library.

The Senate had provided an increase of $260,000 to allow the full budget estimate for sanitary engineering activities, and to make the full amount sought available for air pollution work. The Senate conferees were unable to gain even a compromise on this amendment and were forced to recede.

The Senate provided an increase of $19 million for grants for hospital construction, approving a total of $130 million, of which $107,800,000 was for grants under the original Hill-Burton program, compared to the House allowance of $111 million, of which $88,800,000 was for the original Hill-Burton program. The conferees agreed upon a compromise figure of $125 million, of which $102,800,000 is for the original Hill-Burton program. This allowance has been exceeded only once, in fiscal year 1950, when the full amount authorized, $150 million, was made available.

The Senate had provided an increase of $100,000 for the Children's Bureau, to make available the full amount requested for work in the juvenile delinquency program. The Senate conferees were unable to gain even a compromise on this amendment, and were forced to recede. The managers on the part of the Senate strove to salvage at least something from this amendment, but our efforts were unavailing.

The conferees were unable to reach an agreement on amendments 31–38, inclusive, providing additional funds for the several accounts under the National Institutes of Health, for which the Senate had provided total increases of $48,912,000, for a total of $184,437,000, an increase of $82,279,000 over the current year's funds. The amendments were reported in disagreement to the House, and a motion was made by Mr. FOGARTY, of Rhole Island, chairman of the House conferees, to recede and concur in our amendments, a motion which was adopted.

Our committee report gave fairly explicit directions with respect to the use of the increases recommended, and later approved by the Senate, and the National Institutes of Health will be expected to observe our suggestions and directions, and to obligate funds only in accordance with the justifications and with the instructions from the committees as set forth in the reports accompanying the bill when reported.

The amounts approved for the National Institutes of Health represent an increase of 80.54 percent over the current year's funds. This is by far the largest amounts ever appropriated for health research, of the total appropriation, less that amount provided for construction of surgical facilities, 73.05 percent will be used for the extramural program—for grants for research and training purposes—a total of $133,544,000 for grants to research institutions, to hospitals, to medical schools and to individual scientists.

There have been expressions of doubt as to whether such increases could be prudently and wisely expended in medical research. The committee had advice and counsel from eminent doctors and scientists who were of the opinion that such sums as have been approved could be prudently and wisely spent in the coming year on medical research.

The committee expects to have these research programs followed closely to secure periodic and frequent lay reports on progress.

Mr. President, there was a great deal of interest in the Senate with respect to the appropriation for the Office of Education, and particularly with reference to the amendment offered by the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], an amendment in the amount of $500,000. I am happy to advise the Senate, as the Senator from Minnesota so well knows, that the House conferees agreed to accept the amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the agreement to the requested funds for research was possibly one of the greatest steps that has even been taken in furnishing funds for research activities in the field of health. I wish to say to my colleagues that the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], was a powerful factor not only in convincing us on the Senate side—he did not have to convince me—but in convincing all those concerned that the fund could be properly used for research activities. He certainly was a very potent factor in convincing the House conferees that there was a need for such funds, and that the research funds could well be used throughout the Nation to hurry the day when we shall have complete knowledge of how to deal effectively with cancer and heart disease, as well as to extend ourselves into the unknown field concerning mental disease and research in mental diseases. So I again commend the Senator for the very excellent job done in having the requests for the funds accepted.

Mr. HILL. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his very kind and generous comments, and also to say that there was no one who was more interested in having the figures adopted than was the Senator from Minnesota. He has been a longtime member of the committee, and was former chairman of the subcommittee, and during that time he has always urged funds to be used for research in health problems, and, as he mentioned, for research into cancer, heart disease, mental illness, arthritis, metabolic diseases, neurological diseases, blindness, microbiological diseases, including tuberculosis, and many other diseases. The Senator from Minnesota was a strong factor in behalf of the adoption of these figures.

Mr. President, I am proud of the fact that as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia a few years ago I successfully insisted on the appropriation of funds for the fluoridation program for the District of Columbia.

I also wish to discuss the progress of dental research, and the attitude of the Senate toward this area of investigation. Based upon testimony from highly qualified witnesses, the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has consistently recommended increases in funds for dental research, and has also suggested, based again on competent scientific advice, that the field of dental research be considered as involving the whole array of physiological processes and systems which affect dental health and dental disease.

Splendid progress is being made. For this reason the Senate proposed that $6,026,000 be appropriated for dental research and related activities in fiscal year 1957. This contrasts with $3,471,000 in the House allowance and $2,971,000 in the President's budget. The House voted to accept the Senate figures.

One of the most important factors affecting the desire of the Senate to see an expansion of dental research has been the discovery that fluoridation of water at optimum levels will curb the formation of cavities in the teeth without doing any harm to the people who drink the water. The long, tedious, and comprehensive research that resulted in this discovery and in means of applying the discovery as a public-health measure is an inspiring story.

Together with millions of Americans, I am grateful for this discovery.

The responsibilities of the Public Health Service in regard to fluoridation are quite clear. Not only should they continue research in this field, but also they should make the facts about fluoridation known to State and local health agencies. They also have the obligation to provide, upon request, technical assistance in the application of this important public health advance.

There are those who dispute the facts, or who, for a number of reasons, reject fluoridation of water supplies. These people are entitled to their opinions, and each community has the right—which we must zealously uphold—to decide for itself whether its water supply will be fluoridated. However, the decision should be based on knowledge rather than on misinformation and misunderstanding.

It is essential, therefore, that the Federal Government be free to pursue its investigations and report the results of its investigations. This is as true of community water fluoridation as it is of all scientific investigation.

In fact, the Government would be gravely remiss in its obligations if it failed to disseminate the results of its studies because the results might arouse criticism or cause public controversy. This would undermine the very foundations of scientific research. Freedom is the essence of science—freedom to pursue leads, to study the facts and evaluate the evidence objectively, to publish the findings—no matter what they reveal. I, for one, would be satisfied with nothing less, whether the subject of research be cancer, mental illness, or water fluoridation.

In this connection, I should like to clarify a point in the report of the committee which has given rise to some misinterpretation. I am sure the Members agree with me that the Federal Government must continue its traditional role of disseminating scientific facts through publication of articles, speeches, exhibits, and responses to requests by State and local authorities for technical advice and assistance. Nothing in the report of the committee should be construed as placing any limitation on this function or of providing information which will be of help to States and local communities in determining whether or not they should adopt community water fluoridation as a public health measure. Nothing in our committee report should be so interpreted. On the contrary, we believe the results of scientific research should be disseminated as widely as possible, and that it is an obligation of officials of the Public Health Service to assist in spreading knowledge scientifically arrived at.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter to me from the Surgeon General be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1956.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: Senate Report No. 2093, page 22, on the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill, 1957, contains the following statement:

"The committee was advised that less than $40,000 would be used in connection with fluoridation, and that only for studying the effects of its use."

This statement apparently relates to the research grant program alone, under which it is true that somewhat less than $40,000 is currently being expended in support of projects relating to fluoride metabolism and water fluoridation. Inasmuch as the committee may have been provided with inadequate or misleading information, I should like to bring the following facts about the dental program to your attention.

In addition to these research grants and without taking into account the laboratory studies in this field conducted under the intramural program of the National Institute of Dental Research, the Public Health Service has four other important programs in the water fluoridation field. They are:

1. Approximately $21,000 is expended annually on two study projects concerned with developing practical, efficient methods of removing excessive fluorides from water, so that the fluoride concentration may be adjustable downward to the optimal level of 1 part per million. These studies are being carried out in Bartlett, Tex., and Britton, S. Dak., where the natural fluoride concentrations are 8 parts per million and 7 parts per million, respectively.

2. Approximately $25,000 is expended annually on the Grand Rapids project, now in its 12th year of operation. This study, in which sodium fluoride is being used as the fluoridating chemical, is a primary demonstration of fluoridation in the reduction of dental caries.

3. Approximately $12,000 is expended annually in the Public Health Service's Montgomery County, Md., fluoridation study, where sodium silicofluoride is being used. This study is providing data for a comparative analysis of the effect of sodium fluoride and sodium silicofluoride as fluoridating chemicals.

4. Approximately $23,000 is expended annually in laboratory and field investigations directed toward simplifying the tests for fluoride concentrations in drinking water and devising a system for automatically and continuously recording fluoride concentration.

Thus the figure cited in the Senate committee report is conspicuously low and does not represent an accurate estimate of the Public Health Service's investment in studies and programs related to the effect of the use of fluoride in public water supplies.

Inasmuch as fluoridation is only part of a well-rounded dental public health program, it is most difficult to estimate the proportion of consultative time or funds devoted to this segment of the Public Health Service's dental activities. Nevertheless, it can be estimated that less than 5 percent of the total Public Health Service appropriation for dental health is devoted to activities which, in the very broadest sense, can be interpreted as promotional in character, consisting largely of advice and assistance to States and communities on technical matters relating to the fluoridation procedure.

Since more than three-fourths of the total appropriation for dental health activities is for the support of laboratory and clinical research activities at the National Institute of Dental Research, for grants to universities and research institutions throughout the Nation, and for the coordination of dental resources, it seems clear that the numerous protests from citizens alleging that virtually all of the dental health funds of the Public Health Service are being used to promote water fluoridation are not in accordance with the facts.

Sincerely yours,
LEONARD A. SCHEELE,
Surgeon General.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks an article prepared by Dr. J. Roy Doty, secretary of the America Dental Association's Council on Dental Therapeutics, regarding water fluoridation.

Dr. Doty's statement is a concise disposition of arguments raised by antifluoridationists and was prepared for presentation to the Senate Appropriations Committee in connection with the 1957 appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. Through inadvertence, the statement did not reach the Senate Appropriations Committee in time to be printed with the hearings on the appropriation bill, and at the request of the American Dental Association I am pleased to request unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IRRESPONSIBLE OPPOSITION TO FLUORIDATION

(By J. Roy Doty, Ph. D., secretary, Council on Dental Therapeutics, American Dental Association)

It is unfortunate that every advance in public health brings to light a group of crusaders who are determined to save the public from the imaginary dangers of the new public health procedure. Even today, in spite of the many years' experience with chlorination of water supplies and pasteurization of milk, and in spite of the innumerable lives that have been saved and the tremendous improvement in public health resulting from these procedures, there are still some individuals trying to save the public from the hazards of chlorination and pasteurization.

Today, with the widespread interest in fluoridation and the dental benefits which it has been shown to provide, a flock of so-called experts can be found who are opposing fluoridation just as vigorously as chlorination was opposed 30 years ago by the same type of individual. Since scientific fact has a way of eventually penetrating the barriers of confusion and misinformation, there need be no concern for the ultimate acceptance of fluoridation.

It is unfortunate, however, that thousands or even millions of the younger children of today could be denied the dental benefits of fluoridation because of the lies and half-truths being disseminated by a relatively small but vocal group which is apparently dedicated to the perpetuation of misinformation.

Since the general public is ordinarily not in a position to evaluate technical statements and does not have ready access to the medical and scientific literature which describes the studies bearing on fluoridation, many persons are particularly susceptible to flamboyant charges by irresponsible individuals who manage to surround themselves with an aura of expertness, and, like Don Quixote, manage to find innumerable windmills which threaten the health, sanity and well-being of the American public. It is unfortunate that these individuals must be dignified and given further publicity through the necessity of correcting the misinformation which they are spreading.

Many opponents of fluoridation use the old propaganda trick of attempting to inflame emotions through the use of a name which is expected to be distasteful to a large number of individuals. The author of the article attempts to convey the impression that fluoridation is simply a scheme which the former Federal Security Administrator attempted to foist on the public by means of the United States Public Health Service. He therefore conveys the impression that this was another line in the attempt to sell the public on the scheme of socialized medicine. These implications may be contrasted with the actual fact that studies of the dental significance of the fluorides began many years before the Federal Security Agency came into being. It is important to note also that two organizations, namely the American Medical Associa-

tion and the American Dental Association, that led the fight against the Federal Security Administrator's proposal of compulsory health insurance have both endorsed the fluoridation procedure. Thus, instead of being a visionary political scheme, fluoridation is shown to be a carefully considered recommendation of conservative professional organizations. Many authors of antifluoridation articles continually hammer away with the big lie technique. Thus we have a repetition of the old charge that there has been little study of the various factors relating to the safety of fluoridation. Contrast this charge with the fact that about 5,000 titles of scientific articles bearing on the physiological effects of fluorides appear in the list [1] which was compiled at the Kettering Laboratory at the University of Cincinnati School of Medicine. It is especially noteworthy to observe that nature herself demonstrated the safety of fluorides at the recommended level of approximately one part per million by providing a huge laboratory in numerous sections of the United States where several million persons have, for many years, used drinking waters which contain varying amounts of fluoride up to a level as high as 14 parts per million. In no instance has anyone demonstrated undesirable effects except with regard to mottled enamel in those areas where the fluoride concentration is distinctly higher than that recommended in controlled fluoridation.

One of the apparent causes of apprehension in the minds of the uninformed individuals is the fact that large quantities of fluoride are toxic. Many individuals, without a background in pharmacology, will therefore infer that even in small amounts fluoride must also be toxic.

It will perhaps allay the apprehension of many to know that a number of substances which are essential parts of our everyday diet, such as vitamin A and vitamin D, are toxic when consumed in concentrated form, and in large, uncontrolled amounts. Thus toxicity is not only a matter of what material is consumed but also of how much is consumed.

It is suggested that each individual answer for himself the following question: Which of the following groups is more likely to have reliable information regarding the effectiveness and safety of fluoridation: (1) professional organizations in the health field, including the American Medical Association, the National Research Council, the American Public Health Association and other similar groups, or (2) food faddists, purveyors of so-called health foods, publicity seekers and writers of sensation articles, together with a very few members of the health professions? In this latter connection it should be remembered that out of approximately 216,000 physicians and 94,000 dentists and several hundred thousand other scientists, it is not remarkable to find a dozen or so representatives who oppose fluoridation largely on the basis of the idea that the proponents of fluoridation should be willing to guarantee that no harmful effect, however insignificant, will ever result from this procedure. One may pose the rhetorical question: Can anyone guarantee that any individual's most trivial activity may not sometime result in injury? Can any scientist therefore be honest and be willing to provide such a dogmatic guarantee? When millions of people for many years have used drinking water bearing one part per million of fluoride without any evidence of adverse effect and when dozens of careful animal tests show that fluoride must be consumed at levels at least 50 to 100 times this high before toxic effects (other than mottled teeth) can be detected, then the public can know that the statement, "There is no evidence that fluoride in water at one part per million will have any undesirable effect," is an adequate assurance of safety.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the result of the conference between the two Houses.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Appropriation title	Appropriations, 1956	Estimates, 1957	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference agreement
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR					
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
Salaries and expenses	$1,677,850	$1,767,000	$1,751,000	$1,767,000	$1,751,000
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR					
Salaries and expenses	1,812,400	2,080,000	2,021,000	2,021,000	2,021,000
BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS					
Salaries and expenses	866,500	1,000,000	911,500	960,000	911,500
BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS					
Salaries and expenses	383,000	383,000	383,000	383,000	383,000
BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP					
Salaries and expenses	3,350,800	3,445,000	3,399,000	3,399,000	3,399,000
BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY					
Salaries and expenses	5,350,350	5,765,000	5,558,000	5,558,000	5,558,000
Grants to States	250,000,000	265,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000
Unemployment compensation for veterans	105,067,250	90,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000
Unemployment compensation for Federal employees	33,000,000	30,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
Mexican farm labor program	1,957,000	2,125,000	1,888,000	2,125,000	2,125,000
Total, Bureau of Employment Security	395,374,600	392,890,000	352,446,000	352,683,000	352,683,000
BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION					
Salaries and expenses	2,317,500	2,353,000	2,347,000	2,347,000	2,347,000
Employees compensation fund (indefinite)	[48,000,000]	Annual indefinite	Annual indefinite	Annual indefinite	Annual indefinite
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS					
Salaries and expenses	6,407,000	7,000,000	6,687,000	7,000,000	6,887,000
WOMEN'S BUREAU					
Salaries and expenses	371,000	403,000	403,000	403,000	403,000
WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION					
Salaries and expenses	8,143,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Total, Department of Labor	420,703,650	421,321,000	380,348,500	380,963,000	380,785,500
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND					
Education of the blind	224,000	230,000	230,000	230,000	230,000
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses (general)	6,144,000	5,779,000	6,779,000	6,779,000	6,779,000
Salaries and expenses (certification and inspection services)	[1,160,050]	Annual indefinite	Annual indefinite	Annual indefinite	Annual indefinite
FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL					
Salaries and expenses	2,980,000	2,755,000	2,755,000	2,755,000	2,755,000

[1] Kettering Laboratory, Department of Preventive Medicine and Industrial Health, College of Medicine, University of Cincinnati. Classified bibliography of publications concerning fluorine and its compounds in relation to man, animals and their environment.

Appropriation title	Appropriations, 1956	Estimates, 1957	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference agreement
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued					
GALLAUDET COLLEGE					
Salaries and expenses	$548,000	$615,000	$615,000	$615,000	$615,000
Construction	2,225,000	2,547,000	2,547,000	2,547,000	2,547,000
Total, Gallaudet College	2,773,000	3,162,000	3,162,000	3,162,000	3,162,000
HOWARD UNIVERSITY					
Salaries and expenses	3,090,400	3,410,000	3,300,000	3,410,000	3,300,000
Plans and specifications		150,000		75,000	
Construction of buildings	122,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Liquidation of contract authority	2,008,600	286,200	286,200	286,200	286,200
Total, Howard University	5,221,000	3,946,200	3,686,200	3,871,200	3,686,200
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Promotion and further development of vocational education	26,210,000	26,500,000	29,267,081	29,442,081	29,442,081
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts	2,501,500	2,501,500	2,501,500	2,501,500	2,501,500
Payments to school districts	90,000,000	79,000,000	79,000,000	79,000,000	79,000,000
Assistance for school construction	33,900,000				
White House Conference on Education	428,000				
Salaries and expenses	3,240,000	6,000,000	4,500,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Total, Office of Education	156,279,500	114,001,500	115,268,581	115,943,581	115,943,581
OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION					
Grants to States and other agencies	33,750,000	37,000,000	35,000,000	37,000,000	37,000,000
Training and traineeships	2,075,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,950,000	2,950,000
Salaries and expenses	1,058,000	1,337,000	1,160,000	1,260,000	1,160,000
Total, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation	36,883,000	41,087,000	38,910,000	41,210,000	41,110,000
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE					
Assistance to States, general	18,376,000	14,186,000	14,186,000	16,461,000	16,461,000
Grants to States for polio vaccination	57,800,000				
Venereal diseases	3,616,000	3,640,000	3,640,000	4,140,000	4,140,000
Tuberculosis	6,062,000	6,375,000	6,375,000	6,625,000	6,625,000
Communicable diseases	5,451,000	5,210,000	5,210,000	5,210,000	5,210,000
Sanitary engineering activities	4,880,000	6,260,000	6,000,000	6,260,000	6,000,000
Buildings and facilities, Cincinnati, Ohio	415,000				
Disease and sanitation investigation and control, Territory of Alaska	1,139,000	1,145,000	1,145,000	1,145,000	1,145,000
Hospital construction grants	111,000,000	130,000,000	111,000,000	130,000,000	125,000,000
Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services	1,290,000	1,419,000	1,381,000	1,381,000	1,381,000
Hospitals and medical care	35,396,000	35,811,000	35,661,000	35,811,000	35,736,000
Foreign Quarantine Service	3,170,000	3,245,000	3,245,000	3,245,000	3,245,000
Indian health activities	34,816,000	38,125,000	38,125,000	38,125,000	38,125,000
Construction of Indian health facilities	5,000,000	8,762,000	8,762,000	8,762,000	8,762,000
National Institutes of Health:					
Operating expenses	5,929,000	11,922,000	11,922,000	11,922,000	11,922,000
National Cancer Institute	24,978,000	32,437,000	34,437,000	48,432,000	48,432,000
Mental health activities	18,001,000	21,749,000	23,749,000	35,197,000	35,197,000
National Heart Institute	18,898,000	22,106,000	25,106,000	33,396,000	33,396,000
Dental health activities	2,176,000	2,971,000	3,471,000	6,026,000	6,026,000
Arthritis and metabolic disease activities	10,840,000	13,345,000	13,845,000	15,885,000	15,885,000
Microbiology activities	7,775,000	9,799,000	8,799,000	13,299,000	13,299,000
Neurology and blindness activities	9,861,000	12,196,000	14,196,000	18,650,000	18,650,000
Construction of surgical facilities				1,630,000	1,630,000
Construction of animal facilities	510,000				
Construction of Biologics Standards Laboratory	3,190,000				
Subtotal, National Institutes of Health	102,158,000	126,525,000	135,525,000	184,437,000	184,437,000
Gorgas Memorial Laboratory	147,000	147,000	147,000	147,000	147,000
Retired pay of commissioned officers	1,355,000	1,450,000	1,450,000	1,450,000	1,450,000
Salaries and expenses (Office of the Surgeon General)	3,090,000	3,210,000	3,172,000	3,172,000	3,172,000
Total, Public Health Service	395,161,000	385,510,000	375,024,000	446,371,000	441,036,000
ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL					
Salaries and expenses	2,644,000	2,737,000	2,737,000	2,737,000	2,737,000
Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds	600,000	270,000	270,000	270,000	270,000
Construction, maximum security building	269,000	6,821,000	6,821,000	6,821,000	6,821,000
Total, St. Elizabeths Hospital	3,513,000	9,828,000	9,828,000	9,828,000	9,828,000
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance	[91,229,000]	[97,711,000]	[97,000,000]	[97,000,000]	[97,000,000]
Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance	[3,870,000]				
Grants to States for public assistance	1,447,000,000	1,315,000,000	1,300,000,000	1,300,000,000	1,300,000,000
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance	1,636,250	1,748,000	1,698,000	1,748,000	1,748,000
Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau	1,740,000	1,922,000	1,822,000	1,922,000	1,822,000
Grants to States for maternal and child welfare	34,156,600	35,288,700	39,361,000	39,361,000	39,361,000
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner:					
Appropriation	184,400	212,000	212,000	212,000	212,000
Transfer from OASI trust fund	[138,600]	[160,000]	[160,000]	[160,000]	[160,000]
Total, Social Security Administration	1,484,717,250	1,354,170,700	1,343,093,000	1,343,243,000	1,343,143,000
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
Salaries and expenses (immediate Office of the Secretary):					
Appropriation	1,483,500	1,588,000	1,588,000	1,588,000	1,588,000
OASI transfer	[211,500]	[225,000]	[225,000]	[225,000]	[225,000]
Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Administration:					
Appropriation	1,908,400	2,030,000	1,985,000	1,985,000	1,985,000
OASI transfer	[427,000]	[526,200]	[500,000]	[500,000]	[500,000]
Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel:					
Appropriation	398,900	426,000	426,000	426,000	426,000
Transfers	[419,900]	[419,100]	[419,100]	[419,100]	[419,100]
Surplus property utilization	425,000	475,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
Total, Office of the Secretary	4,215,800	4,519,000	4,449,000	4,449,000	4,449,000
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	2,098,111,550	1,925,988,400	1,903,184,781	1,977,341,781	1,972,121,781

Appropriation title	Appropriations, 1956	Estimates, 1957	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference agreement
TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD					
Salaries and expenses	$8,800,000	$10,215,000	$8,951,500	$9,101,500	$8,951,500
TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD					
Salaries and expenses	460,000	470,000	435,000	460,000	460,000
Arbitration and emergency boards	225,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
National Railroad Adjustment Board, salaries and expenses	502,000	525,000	502,000	502,000	502,000
Total, National Mediation Board	1,187,000	1,245,000	1,187,000	1,212,000	1,212,000
TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD					
Salaries and expenses (trust fund limitation)	[6,988,000]	[7,308,000]	[6,493,000]	[7,000,000]	[7,000,000]
Military service credits		1,711,000			
TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE					
Salaries and expenses	3,284,000	3,390,000	3,295,000	3,390,000	3,295,000
Boards of inquiry	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Total, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	3,294,000	3,400,000	3,305,000	3,400,000	3,305,000
TITLE VII—INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN					
Federal contribution	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
TITLE VIII—SOLDIERS' HOME					
Maintenance and operation	[4,537,000]	[5,364,000]	[6,564,000]	[6,564,000]	[6,564,000]
Grand total, all titles of bill	2,532,101,200	2,363,885,400	2,296,981,781	2,372,023,281	2,366,380,781

EXTENSION OF EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9052) to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 28, 1956, p. 11283, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the conferees on the Export Control Act extension have agreed to a provision concerning the required survey of iron and steel scrap, which, I think, meets the objectives of both Houses.

The House bill required the Secretary of Commerce to make this survey, and required that he use only full-time employees of the Department. The Senate amended this to direct the Bureau of Mines to make the survey, but placed no restriction on the use of outside research organizations.

Both of these provisions were designed to insure an impartial and objective survey. The provisions were considered necessary because it was felt, first, that the "without compensation" employees from the steel companies in the Business and Defense Services Administration could not properly be charged with responsibility for a survey of such direct interest to their private employers; and second, that there was a danger that some private research organization might be selected to assist in the survey which, by reason of work done for one of the parties to the controversy or positions already taken on the subject, might not be in a position to make an impartial and objective survey to serve as a basis for decisions by the Congress and the Secretary of Commerce.

The conference bill places the survey in the hands of the Secretary of Commerce, and it permits the use of private research organizations. It prohibits without compensation employees from participating in the survey in any manner. It was the understanding of the Senate conferees, and was emphasized in the statement of managers on the part of the House, that this prohibition is intended to be applied broadly. These industry-paid employees are not permitted to participate in the preparation, formulation, or scope of the survey, in the selection of any private research organization to assist, or in the formulation of the conclusions and recommendations drawn from the survey. The selection of a private research organization was left to the Secretary of Commerce—subject to the prohibition on the participation of without compensation employees in the decision—in the belief that it was appropriate to rely on his judgment for selection of an organization or organizations which would be impartial and unbiased. The Statement of the Managers on the Part of the House emphasizes this responsibility of the Secretary:

> It is of the utmost importance that the survey be completely fair and objective. Accordingly, the Secretary of Commerce must exercise the greatest caution to insure that any research organization selected to assist in the survey shall be completely impartial and unprejudiced.

The interim report of the Secretary of Commerce, and the final report, will be reviewed to determine whether he has carried out this responsibility to the full satisfaction of all interested parties. We cannot emphasize too strongly that this survey will be worse than a waste of money if its results and conclusions are not completely above reproach.

In my judgment, the conference bill will fully protect the public interest.

In view of expiration of the Export Control Act of 1949 on June 30, 1956, I urge that the Senate approve the conference report promptly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report .

The report was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9852) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 28, 1956, p. 11284, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the clerk made the statement that the conference report had been signed by all the conferees. I believe that one conferee on the part of the Senate did not sign the conference report.

Mr. ALLOTT. I ask the Senator which one.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is the only one who did not sign the conference report. I think that is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator from Arkansas has informed the minority leader of the taking up of the conference report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We informed the conferees yesterday that we would take it up as soon as possible, because the act will soon expire. However, if the Senator from Texas does not wish to have the conference report acted on at this time, that will be perfectly acceptable to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest that further consideration of the conference report be postponed until the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] can be notified.

Let me inquire whether all the conferees have signed the report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All, I believe, except the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Did the Senator from Connecticut indicate that he would oppose adoption of the conference report?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He did not so suggest to me. However, it will be quite all right with me to defer the further consideration of the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understood there was complete agreement with everyone concerned. However, the minority leader did not inform me of that. Therefore, I suggest that the minority leader inform the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and that in the meantime we proceed to the consideration of other matters.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me say that in the Senate the two votes on the measure were overwhelming, and I really do not believe that the Senator from Connecticut intends to oppose the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. ALLOTT. Probably that is correct, Mr. President; but we shall appreciate it if further consideration of the report can be deferred until we are able to clear up this matter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That will be quite satisfactory.

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said: Mr. President, let me say that I now understand that the conference report has been cleared with the leadership.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it is satisfactory to the minority to have action taken on the conference report at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement with respect to the conference report on the Defense Production Act.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT, H. R. 9852

The conferees on the Defense Production Act extension had five problems to consider.

Two technical amendments—the change of date for the interim report on the nickel survey to August 15 and the payment of expenses of the Joint Committee on Defense Production out of the House contingent fund—were accepted without question.

The House conferees accepted the Senate amendment eliminating the requirement that members of the executive reserve must file in the Federal Register statements of their financial interests. This result, in my judgment, will preserve the executive reserve program.

The House conferees also accepted the Bennett amendment relating to dispersal, with an amendment substituting the word "encourage" for the word "promote." The Senate conferees, supported by the two overwhelming rollcall votes of the Senate on this amendment, pressed this amendment most vigorously. It is, I think, no overstatement to say that this amendment was the subject of considerable discussion in the conference.

Also in disagreement was the amendment proposed in committee by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] relating to allocations in the civilian market. The amendment was directed principally to the nickel situation.

The present system constitutes in fact an informal voluntary agreement between the Department of Commerce, the International Nickel Co., and the few other minor producers, and the distributors of nickel to platers and other small users. It is clear that International Nickel has agreed to carry on under the same arrangement which the old MPA had previously used. This is a very curious arrangement in which the Government through the Department of Commerce apparently concurs in the assignment by International Nickel Co. of a quota to each of its customers. On the one hand, the Government appears to lend its authority and approval to this arrangement; and, on the other, it assumes little or no responsibility for the consequences. It is my belief, and it was the will of the committee in the adoption of the Morse amendment, that if there are to be controls, they should be formal controls so that consumers, particularly small ones, would know the rules and have an orderly method of presenting their cases to their governmental representatives.

The present arrangement is not free competitive enterprise nor is it freedom from Government controls. Every nickel user in the country knows that he is subjected to controls by the International Nickel Co.

If such controls are necessary, they should be run in an open, public way by Government orders, printed in the Federal Register, so that all who are affected can know what is being done, with a formal procedure established for protests and appeals and with lawful penalties for violations.

Our committee's amendment was not mandatory in the sense that it required Government controls. However, it did require that the President take responsibility for a situation which is created by Government action, because of the fact that the Government is now taking approximately 40 percent of nickel production.

I regret that the House conferees did not accept our amendment. However, it was agreed by the conferees that the present situation is inadequate and unsatisfactory. I think this fact is clearly indicated in the statement of the managers on the part of the House, which appears at page 11284 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 28. It was also made apparent by the fact that the bill, as agreed upon by the conferees, and in fact as passed by both Houses, includes provision that a special study of the nickel situation be undertaken by the Secretary of Commerce in consultation with the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

It is also made clear and it was agreed by the conferees that existing provisions of the Defense Production Act give the President ample authority to impose allocation controls on either a general or selective basis to alleviate this problem.

In my opinion the administration now has a positive duty to reexamine the present arrangement with the International Nickel Co. and to take full responsibility for the system now existing, or to revise it in a manner which will be more equitable and straightforward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON CERTAIN UNPATENTED MINING CLAIMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2386, Senate bill 3773.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3773) to provide for an extension of the time during which annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims may be made, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the word "claim", to strike out "located and filed under the provisions" and insert "validated under section 2", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time during which labor must be performed, or improvements made, pursuant to the provisions of section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (30 U. S. C. 28), on any unpatented mining claim validated under section 2 of the act of August 11, 1955 (Public Law 357, 84th Cong., 69 Stat. 679), for the period commencing July 1, 1955, is hereby extended until the hour of 12 o'clock meridian July 1, 1957.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, action on the bill is urgent, in order that it may become law by the 1st of July, in order to correct a misunderstanding which arose as a result of a telegram sent by the Bureau of Land Management.

The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The bill has departmental approval, and it is very urgent that the bill be passed this afternoon. It extends the time for completing the work on a certain class of uranium claims, under a bill passed last August by the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for an extension of the time during which annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims validated under section 2 of the act of August 11, 1955, may be made, and for other purposes."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, today the majority policy committee considered approximately 50 bills and other measures now on the calendar, and cleared them for consideration by the Senate, to be called up or brought up by motion at the discretion of the majority leader. They are as follows:

Calendar No. 235, S. 300, Fryingpan-Arkansas project.

Calendar No. 2045, Senate Resolution 250, limiting the number of sponsors on Senate legislation.

Calendar No. 2135, S. 374, extending the statute of limitations for false statements by Government employees.

Calendar No. 2140, S. 3617, permitting State laws to be effective in the fields of subversion and sedition.

Calendar No. 2156, H. R. 7225, Social Security Act amendments.

Calendar No. 2163, House Joint Resolution 501, authorizing United States participation in NATO parliamentary conferences.

Calendar No. 2168, H. R. 10285, to merge production-credit corporations into farm Federal intermediate-credit banks.

Calendar No. 2252, S. 3143, establishing rules of interpretation for questions arising in the field of Federal-State concurrent jurisdiction legislation.

Calendar No. 2256, H. R. 9842, authorizing the Postmaster General to impound certain obscene mail for temporary periods.

Calendar No. 2284, S. 3704, authorizing the purchase of land for an extension of the new Senate Office Building.

Calendar No. 2298, S. 1333, Hells Canyon Dam project.

Calendar No. 1511, H. R. 3653, amending the Tariff Act with respect to amorphous graphite.

Calendar No. 1987, S. 3457, transferring certain land to Pierce County, Wash.

Calendar No. 2039, S. 3449, airlines capital-gains bill.

Calendar No. 2285, S. 3743, adding certain land to the Lassen Volcanic National Park in California.

Calendar No. 2021, S. 1907, declaring certain lands to be held in trust for Indians in New Mexico.

Calendar No. 2292, H. R. 10230, increasing the minor coinage revolving fund.

Calendar No. 2295, Senate Concurrent Resolution 79, reprinting A Handbook for Americans.

Calendar No. 2297, Senate Joint Resolution 165, relinquishing consular jurisdiction in Morocco.

Calendar No. 2299, H. R. 5256, providing for redemption of migratory-bird hunting stamps.

Calendar No. 2302, H. R. 9828, transferring certain lands to the Kanosh Indians, in Utah.

Calendar No. 2304, S. 3665, permitting homesteaders to make single final proof in Alaska prior to survey.

Calendar No. 2305, H. R. 8552, granting certain easements to Chincoteague, Va.

Calendar No. 2306, H. R. 5657, permitting certain land in Florida to be used for civil-defense purposes.

Calendar No. 2307, S. 976, conveys certain land to the city of Montgomery, W. Va.

Calendar No. 2308, S. 3404, conveys certain land to Virginia.

Calendar No. 2309, S. 3998, to develop a Federal fish hatchery in Vermont.

Calendar No. 2310, S. 1384, providing for the return of certain mineral interests in land acquired for flood-control purposes.

Calendar No. 2311, H. R. 9952, providing lump-sum readjustment payments for involuntarily separated reservists.

Calendar No. 2312, S. 3820, increasing the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Calendar No. 2313, S. 3903, amending the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act.

Calendar No. 2314, S. 2634, amending the laws governing highway post-office service.

Calendar No. 2315, H. R. 10766, authorizing payment of compensation for certain war damages.

Calendar No. 2316, S. 4011, authorizing the creation of a Coast Guard supply fund.

Calendar No. 2317, H. R. 4652, authorizing conveyance of certain lighthouses to the Panama Canal Company.

Calendar No. 2318, H. R. 5147, increasing congressional distribution of coast and geodetic survey charts.

Calendar No. 2319, H. R. 6245, authorizing Panama Canal Company to convey certain land to the State Department.

Calendar No. 2320, H. R. 6850, creating an academic advisory board for the Merchant Marine Academy.

Calendar No. 2323, Senate Joint Resolution 139, providing for a Commission to Commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the First Conference of State Governors.

Calendar No. 2324, S. 1087, authorizing aftercare payments for juvenile prisoners.

Calendar No. 2374, S. 2017, to prohibit the misuse by collecting agencies of Federal agency names and insignia.

Calendar No. 2375, S. 2891, to prohibit the use of the initials "U. S." by certain business firms.

Calendar No. 2388, H. R. 9893, military-construction bill.

I wish to have that statement printed at this point in the RECORD, so that all Senators, may be on notice that these measures have been considered by the majority policy committee, and that the leadership expects to bring them up by motion at the conclusion of the unfinished business and during next week.

I desire to announce again that next week the Senate will not be in session on Wednesday, but will be in session on Monday and Tuesday. Although we do not anticipate that there will be a great deal of controversial proposed legislation before us, there may be yea-and-nay votes on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, or Friday of next week.

PROTECTION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1275) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate employees of the District to protect life and property in and on the buildings and grounds of any institution located upon property outside of the District of Columbia acquired by the United States for District sanitoriums, hospitals, training schools, and other institutions, which were on page 2, line 3, after "jail", to insert ": *Provided*, That such employee shall be bonded for the faithful discharge of such duties, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall fix the penalty of any such bond"; and on page 2, line 17, after "weapons", to insert "and shall wear such uniform with such identification badge."

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, having been in almost constant attendance during the past 9 weeks while the Committee on Foreign Relations compiled a hearing record of more than 1,000 pages in connection with its consideration of the Mutual Security Act of 1956, I propose to address myself briefly to some aspects of the pending legislation.

Most of the testimony received by the committee was presented by representatives of the Department of State, the International Cooperation Administration, and the Department of Defense. In addition, the committee received the testimony of all those individual Americans and representatives of various private organizations who asked to be heard either in support of, or in opposition to, the President's proposals.

On the basis of all this voluminous testimony, I have come to the conclusion that the bill reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations should be supported. An appraisal of my past record in the Senate will reveal that I have generally supported the foreign aid bills of both Democratic and Republican administrations, and yet I have reached the conclusion to support this year's bill both in the committee and on the floor, only after a good deal of soul searching.

In the past my decisions have frequently been based on the assumption that the thousands of State Department,

International Cooperation Administration, and Defense Department officials abroad have been in a position to give the President and the Secretary of State the kind of information and advice they need to formulate a foreign policy calculated to advance consistently the interests of the United States.

In short, it has been my theory in the field of foreign policy that, if in doubt, I should support the President. I shall do so this year, as I have done in the past.

I cannot let the record rest there, however, because I must express my candid view that this year my doubts are greater than ever before. The coherence and rationality of the program are so open to question that I am close to the border of opposition. So that the record may be clear, I wish to indicate some of the reasons why I have been greatly concerned with foreign policy developments during the past year.

At the committee hearings on the pending legislation, I asked witnesses time after time to define the terms they used so freely, and I am sure there have been occasions when I have pushed my questions to the point where some witnesses may have wished I would stop my questioning.

In insisting that such terms as "defense support," "economic development," "long-term commitments," "flexibility," and others should be clearly defined, it was my purpose to find out if the witnesses had thought through their testimony. I must say that I found more evidence of loose language than of tight language—more evidence of loose thinking than of clear thinking. This disturbed me deeply, because I believe it is incumbent on the executive branch to be clear when it seeks to have Congress authorize annual programs involving billions of dollars. As disturbing to me as the lack of clarity in thinking was the apparent absence of perspective in planning the pending legislation.

One of my colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee some months ago, when the program was first presented to the Congress, remarked that this year's mutual-security bill looked like some more of the same old medicine in the same old bottle.

I have not had a great deal of experience with bottled medicine. Nevertheless, it is my impression that if the medicine prescribed is getting results, it ought not to be lightly discarded. However, if a man's symptoms have changed and the old medicine is not getting results, the time has come for a fresh diagnosis.

In the case of our foreign-aid programs, the symptoms of the world's situation today are quite different from those of the past year. Moreover, there is substantial doubt whether the old medicine is getting the results we have the right to expect. Thus, while the actions of the Soviet Union have undergone marked changes since last July, there is little evidence that the administration has shown the flexibility in thinking, and the clear thinking, necessary to meet these fresh challenges. We still hear the oft-repeated phrase with which the administration reacts to new Soviet moves.

When the Soviet Union announces a reduction in its armed forces, what do we say? We demand "deeds, not words."

When the Soviet Union proposes assistance to the nations of Asia, what do we say? We demand "deeds, not words."

When the Soviets suggest that exchanges of persons between the United States and the Soviet Union be stepped up or that their leaders visit this country, what do we say? We demand "deeds, not words."

I do not wish to be misunderstood as taking the position that the Soviet Union has changed its fundamental aims or that we should accept at face value the new look. The Soviet Union is still a totalitarian dictatorship, whether the dictatorship be that of Stalin or a committee of successors. The Soviet Union still threatens freemen everywhere.

But I do make the point that the Soviet Union's new tactics have an influence in neutral countries which we cannot counteract with automatic slogans. There is no doubt that the Soviet Union is making friends and influencing peoples by its actions. The peoples and the governments of many Arab and Asian nations believe that the Soviet Union is engaged in performing "deeds"; but all we do is to reply with the old sluggish, outmoded slogan, "Deeds, not words." Unless we show more originality of thought, more good old Yankee initiative in our foreign policy, we will find our own words hurled back in our teeth.

During this year, when Soviet actions have been undergoing a transition, the administration has been marking time. There is little evidence that it has comprehended the fact that world relationships are changing, that a fresh diagnosis of world relationships is needed, and that such diagnosis may require new action on the part of the United States.

The people of this Nation feel that things are not right with our foreign policy. They hear the reassuring words of the President but read in the press of our deteriorating international relationships. In the words of the nursery rhyme, the people are realizing that "it isn't the whistle that pulls the train." We cannot rock along in the same old fashion relying on slogans and preachments instead of action and expect free nations to admire us for our leadership and be willing to tie up their future with ours.

Never in my experience as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations have I seen so many amendments offered in the committee to a proposal submitted by the administration. No less than 15 amendments were proposed, many of them going to matters of substance. Furthermore, the committee this year received from the public more proposed revisions of the Mutual Security program than it has ever received before. This is evidence of the widespread and growing concern of our people. There is a vast uneasiness about the quality of our foreign policy. This is not election-year uneasiness. It is an uneasiness bred of the feeling that American influence is being diluted by aggressive Soviet advances on the political and economic fronts. It is an uneasiness compounded by a gradual realization that our reactions to the new Communist threats are unimaginative, stereotyped, and negative in quality.

My remarks thus far, Mr. President, have been directed to the foreign policy implications of this proposed legislation. There is one domestic aspect of the problem which has given me deep concern also, namely, the fact that some of the involved language in past legislation has seemed to hide the fact that much of the Mutual Security program has been used to modernize our own Armed Forces. In this connection, I invite the attention of my colleagues to that provision of the pending legislation which relates to the authorization of funds for military assistance. I am especially interested in this provision because it was my privilege in the Committee on Foreign Relations to offer an amendment which was accepted and which will, I believe, serve to increase the understanding of the people of the nature of the program being carried on under this legislation.

In the past, Mr. President, the military assistance funds have been appropriated to the President of the United States. Those funds have then been used in large part by the administration to purchase equipment from the Armed Forces of the United States. That equipment is then given to the nations which we assist.

What actually has been happening, however, is that when these Mutual Security funds are used to buy, for example, an F–84 jet fighter to be given to country X, the Air Force, which sells the jet fighter to the Mutual Security people, uses the funds received to replace the F–84 with a later model aircraft—perhaps an F–104. In effect, then, a substantial part of the funds made available for what some people call "foreign aid," has been used to modernize the arms in the possession of our own Armed Forces. Indeed, the Armed Forces of this Nation have been charging the Mutual Security funds not for the price of the F–84 in my example, but they have been charging the price required to replace it, namely, the price for the F–104. The present Mutual Security Act, however, will change that situation.

I sought by the amendment which I presented in the Committee on Foreign Relations to make it clear that a large portion of the funds we here authorize are used in the way I have described and thus serve far more directly the national interest than many had supposed.

If my colleagues will note section 3 of the pending bill, they will see that it authorizes the appropriation of a total of $2.5 billion. My amendment divides that total into two parts.

First, there is the figure of $925 million. . That amount may be used for military assistance of the type which will, for the most part, involve direct purchases for the mutual-security account. Thus, for example, if the President should determine to supply advanced-type rockets or guided missiles to one of our allies in Western Europe—missiles or rockets of a type not in supply in the United States in sufficient quantity to serve our own interests much less our allies too—he could order such equipment for the country we would be assisting and have it de-

livered. Such a purchase would come from this sum of $925 million.

However, the second part of the military assistance fund, the larger part of $1.6 billion is to be used—and I quote from the language of the section—"only for the purchase of equipment and materials for the Armed Forces of the United States." The section also provides that to the extent this sum of $1.6 billion is used for these purchases, a corresponding value of equipment may be furnished from Department of Defense stocks to countries receiving help under our mutual-assistance program.

In other words, Mr. President, what this language does is to make it crystal clear with respect of some two-thirds of the military assistance funds hereby authorized, that it is to be channeled into assistance to foreign nations only if it is processed through our own armed services in such a way as to enable our own armed services to have first claim on the latest, most modern equipment from our own manufacturers. The amendment, I believe, removes a cloud under which much of this program has operated, namely, the belief that somehow this military-assistance program was being operated to the detriment, indeed, to the damage, of the military defenses of this Nation.

These, Mr. President, are some of the reasons why I have had doubts about supporting the pending legislation. These are some of the reasons I view the pending legislation as a mark-time operation—a holding operation—while we diagnose and reassess a foreign policy which, though it may appear strong in defensive tactics, is weak in initiative.

I have heard that the administration is engaged in a reappraisal of the whys and the wherefores of our mutual-security program. I earnestly hope that such reappraisal will be objective, that the assumptions upon which our aid programs of the future must be based will be sound, and that our future actions may be bold and thus consistent with the character of our people.

The American people have the deserved reputation for honesty, ingenuity, and boldness. We have acquired a reputation throughout the world of being a haven for the oppressed, a nation dedicated to promoting self-government and individual freedom, and a nation of economic opportunity. However, this great reputation built by our forefathers is gradually being dissipated. We voice our sympathy for the oppressed, but we have largely closed our borders to them. We talk of self-government and independence, but we permit ourselves constantly to be allied with colonialism against independence. We talk of equality and independence of nations and of economic opportunity, but we are niggardly in helping so-called neutral nations unless they accept the ties of our apron strings. I have every respect for efforts to be prudent and careful in expenditures for aid. Frugality, however, ought not to degenerate into miserliness.

Mr. President, I support the pending bill as an interim measure because I have every hope that by this time next year we will have developed an approach to mutual security which will reflect the image of the real America. We are not by nature a fearful, defensive people. For that reason our foreign policy should not be couched in the negative terms of fear of communism.

It is not true, as many have suggested, that Congress will only support a foreign-aid program if it can be shown that foreign aid is necessary to fight communism. Programs of economic assistance must not be based on the negative concept that such aid is necessary only to prevent some nation from going Communist. I do not believe that most independent nations are motivated nearly so much by the fear of going Communist as by the positive desire to promote individual freedom and economic growth for their people.

The independent nations of Asia which we help are not nearly so interested in what the United States is against as in what the United States is for. It is a simple thing to be against evil, but it is a tremendous challenge to promote good. The truth is, of course, that the promotion of good is likely to have most serious setbacks to evil, but that must be the collateral effect, not the prime purpose.

I hope that the administration by next year will be able to approach Congress asking authority for foreign aid in positive rather than negative terms. Our country will not be able to grasp the initiative until our energies are devoted to promoting freedom instead of being sapped by the slogans against communism wherever it seems to threaten.

In the formulation of a fresh approach to foreign aid, I hope the administration will be honest with itself. We often hear reference to the man who looks at the world through rose-colored glasses or to the man who looks at the world through dark glasses. In both cases the way he sees things is conditioned by the glasses he puts on. He sees the world as he wants to see it. This characteristic of many men is most dangerous if applied to governments. When I read statements in the press one day that all is right with the world and that the United States has never been held in higher esteem, and the next day read reports that tragedy faces us if we do not speed up the arming of our friends, I become fearful that we see the world not as it is but as we want it to be, through rose-colored glasses one day and dark glasses the next.

In "Hamlet," the words "This above all—to thine own self be true," are especially applicable to governments. It is especially incumbent upon the leaders of a nation to be honest with themselves and with the people, as they analyze the foreign policy interests of this Nation and the factors which influence foreign nations and peoples in their attitudes toward us.

Finally, Mr. President, I ask that the administration be bold and forthright in presenting our foreign-policy problems to the Congress and the people. There must be no assumption that if a problem is serious it must somehow be made to look simple, that it must be sugarcoated, else the people will not respond. The American people view problems as challenges. Our history has shown that we are capable of rising to the needs of the hour once those needs are made clear. I believe this generalization is applicable to the conduct of this Nation in its foreign relations as well as in dealing with its internal problems.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say I am hopeful that the doubts which I expressed at the beginning of my remarks are exaggerated. I may have been too pessimistic and too critical in these remarks. However, I am hopeful that the lack of a fresh and forward approach to meet new challenges to which I have drawn attention is only a part of the democratic process of government—a process which is often slow and painful, but ultimately determined and productive. So, as I stated in the beginning, I have concluded that here and now I should vote to support the bill reported by the Foreign Relations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MORAL CRISIS IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a short time ago in a nationwide television broadcast, Secretary of State Dulles talked to the American people. He invited full and fearless discussion on all questions concerning our foreign policy.

It is not often that a Cabinet officer of the party in power asks for advice, debate, or criticism of the policy he adopts and the Department he administers.

Secretary Dulles showed courage in this proposal, especially as we are about to enter a great presidential campaign. But the Secretary realizes that the campaign, dramatizing personalities and issues, captures the attention and interest of millions of Americans. It provides an excellent opportunity to discuss our foreign policy, appraise its successes and its failures, and reach the solid conclusions on which vigorous action can be based.

Of course, there must be self-restraint. Our discussion must be carried on with a sincere desire to arrive at the truth and at the best interest of our people. We must not seek small partisan advantage. Our criticism must not be carping and destructive, but rather clear and constructive.

In this discussion we must be free of party discipline and executive dictation. We must honestly, courageously face the issues—admitting past mistakes, whether they have been made by Republicans or Democrats. This is in the best American tradition of public service.

Our duty during the course of the campaign in the convention halls, meeting places and on the street corners throughout the Nation, is to discuss our international problems fully and frankly. Our allies and opponents must understand that we are dedicated to the task of preserving the free world.

How we conduct our foreign policy, and whether we successfully handle the issues confronting us, will determine not only the fate of Americans now living, but also the fate of generations to come—and perhaps the fate of the civilized world. It is because of these awesome pending decisions that I ask for a searching examination of our foreign policy—what it is and what it should be to serve our people best.

I think we might well spend a few moments reviewing the fundamentals and thereby clear the air. Let us see whether we can determine the essentials for a foreign policy that would truly and effectively advance our national interests.

So much has been written, so much has been said, and the confusion becomes so great, that we have lost sight of the simple and obvious fact. That fact is that the purpose of our foreign policy is to promote and protect the true interests of our people. No one will deny this simple statement of purpose, and yet we become involved in incredible confusions.

The real interests of our people: What are they? The ideals of the Republic: What are they?

Our real interests are the preservation of our freedoms—our way of life. As individuals, we want to realize our greatest possibilities, morally, spiritually, economically; to live in decency and to raise our families in the best traditions of our free society. As Americans, we want to be citizens of a republic which provides a government under a constitution which guarantees those rights.

Because of war and circumstance, the United States has become the leader of the free world. The power of example is of overwhelmingly critical importance. To the extent that we are determined to maintain our own freedom, our friends and allies will be disposed to follow our example.

As Americans, we want to remain free to live according to our democratic traditions—to work, to hold property, to raise our families, to live in our town, city, State, and Nation, free from the danger of attack and foreign conquest.

By foreign conquest I do not merely mean military conquest. I also mean intellectual and spiritual conquest. The time has passed when only men's bodies are conquered. We now live in a world where the dictators are as much interested in the conquest of men's souls and minds as that of their bodies and their land.

Real security, which was once defined in only military terms as being freedom from the danger of armed invasion, has a wider meaning now. Security now means not only physical defense against our enemies. Security now also means defense against spiritual and intellectual demoralization.

I am as much concerned with our moral and spiritual security as I am with our military security. We are nearly all cognizant of our military security. Needless to say, our military security presents serious problems, but most of us are alert to these problems. Once aware and alerted, I have great confidence in American technological skill, American economic know-how, and American resourcefulness. These talents are a great asset in building a military defense.

It is with the moral and spiritual side of our problem that I am greatly concerned. I do not say Americans are morally weak. I do say we are morally confused. Nowhere is this moral confusion worse than among our so-called liberal intellectuals. This confusion tends to paralyze the mind and the will. The more extended the paralysis, the greater is the Communist victory.

There are moral questions on which we cannot be neutral. The recognition of physical torture as a deliberate instrument of government, the employment of secret police, the use of summary trials and executions behind closed doors, the dragooning of forced labor—these and other practices of tyrannical despotisms behind the Iron Curtain have been abhorrent to our people.

Yet these practices are a commonplace in Communist states.

Right now we are being told that some mysterious and inexorable law of history and economics is remaking the conduct of the Russians. Things are going to be different.

How different? In what way?

The "purported" speech of Khrushchev before the 20th Communist Party Congress was reported at length in the New York Times for June 5, 1956—just a few days ago.

Said Khrushchev, recounting the gruesome methods of the Stalin regime:

> When the cases of some of these so-called "spies" and "saboteurs" were examined, it was found that all their cases were fabricated. Confessions of guilt of many arrested and charged with enemy activity were gained with the help of cruel and inhuman tortures.

He continued with instance after instance of these horrors. He spoke repeatedly of trials in secret, of what he calls "illegality," and so forth.

What does he mean by the words "secret" and "illegality"?

This man, engaged in denouncing Stalin for these crimes, is the most prominent member of an oligarchy which, since it has come to power, has been doing the very things of which Stalin is now accused. Beria, the chief of the secret police, was not the only man the present regime sent to death. We do not know how many there were. We do know, however, that a few weeks ago the news was permitted to leak out that four lieutenants of Beria had been tried in secret and shot. Is this what is called "legal"? Is this what is called "open trial"?

I say we have no evidence whatever to prove that the leopard has changed his spots.

Only a short while ago Khrushchev and Marshal Bulganin paid a visit to Britain. While they were there, they were entertained at dinner by Labor Members of Parliament. When the dinner was over the time came for questions. At length, one of those present addressed Khrushchev and said that there was worry and concern in Britain over the fate of a number of Social Democrats who had been imprisoned or had disappeared in Eastern Europe. Would Mr. Khrushchev be so good as to receive a list of names and furnish, at his convenience, information about these Social Democrats? According to the press dispatch descriptions of the dinner, Khrushchev turned livid with rage. He brushed aside the list of names and said:

> Why should I take a list of names when I have no idea whatever of paying any attention?

Are we going to give way, here a little, there a little, to people of this stripe? There was once a British Minister who went to Munich to get what he called "peace in our time." You know what happened.

Are we to ignore and pass over and rationalize these things?

I say we cannot if we have any moral principle left. We cannot if we act on moral principle at all.

Whatever our faults, whatever grievous blunders our people have made in the past, the belief in freedom has been—and, I believe, remains—the spark of our national conscience. This belief in freedom is what shores up the demand for "Equal justice under law." In some of the darkest moments of our history, it was this belief that carried us through. Over and over again the declarations of this conscience have been given to the world and, what is more, have been made to stick.

Recall the phrases:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

There is no neutralism or indecision here.

Yet again:

> With a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor.

And once more:

> That government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

These are expressions of moral principle and I could quote a hundred more. Every last one an expression of honorable American tradition, down to the historic rejoinder of General McAuliffe at Bastogne. There is no neutralism about them. They are the enduring evidences of the determination of Americans to keep their freedom.

We can exercise self-restraint, I hope, in our international relations. We can respect the rights of other nations. We can understand the yearning of colonial peoples for their freedom, because we ourselves were a colonial people once upon a time. We can refrain from meddling with the traditions and religion and customs of others. We certainly do not want to say "Do it our way, or else."

But, by the same token, we cannot tolerate the systematic effort of Moscow to impose communism upon nations and peoples who do not want it. That is what the Kremlin has been doing for decades. Here a murderous coup d'etat as in Czechoslovakia. There a wrecking job done by infiltration as in Indochina. To suppose that the piecemeal absorption

of other countries by the Communists is of no direct concern to us is insane.

Let us never forget that not a single one of the countries and half-countries now under Russian domination ever asked for it. Remember that even the Russians themselves have never had a chance. I said never. In their earliest times they lived in slavery. Then, they endured the bloodthirsty rule of the Mongols. In place of that, they became serfs under the absolute autocracy of the Czars. Then, in 1917, the faint flickers of a democratic revolution were snuffed out when a handful of Bolsheviks hijacked control and set up the dictatorship of the proletariat.

We know that Russians have been brave. We know that their endurance seems inexhaustible. But no Russian now or ever in the past has known what freedom is.

From East Germany to North Korea and North Vietnam, the peoples of the Red empire were given no real choice. They were beaten down and trapped by methods ranging from propaganda, subversion, and infiltration, to military violence or the threat of military violence. And, once trapped, by whatever means, their captivity has been maintained by unlimited terror.

Those self-styled liberals who defend the "right" of the Russians or Czechs, the Chinese or North Vietnamese, to go Communist are talking nonsense. They might just as logically defend the right of inmates of concentration camps to be slaves. The captive peoples did not "go" Communist—they were driven into the Kremlin's prison of nations, hermetically sealed against escape.

Let us never forget, also, that the Red Empire is not limited to the countries already behind its iron and bamboo curtains. Every Communist Party in what remains of the free world, every false-front organization operating under Moscow discipline, every guerrilla warfare contingent under Communist direction, is an integral part of the Red Empire. We are not dealing with a group of conventional nations, but with a worldwide conspiracy dedicated to making this one world—one Communist world.

The necessity of international political life makes it necessary for foreign offices, including our State Department, to treat Soviet Russia as if it were "just another country," but we know it is nothing of the sort. In reality, Soviet Russia, its satellites, and its allies are the core of an apparatus of power and coercion which penetrates in varying degrees, every nation on every continent of this earth.

On the one hand, the dictators in the Kremlin are the bosses of a great domain; on the other, they are the bandit leaders of a vast revolutionary conspiracy which seeks to destroy not only opponent states, but moral values, religion, freedom, all that we hold dear.

When Comrades Khrushchev, Bulganin, Malenkov, and Mikoyan, stage state visits beyond the Soviet frontiers, they pose as merely the heads of one country. The pose, unfortunately, is accepted at face value. Yet only the most befuddled can be unaware that these despots are at the same time the heads of a world revolutionary movement. Their every word and act is related to a firm and fixed strategy of world dominion. When they are abroad, no matter how plausible their pretext, they are reconnoitering enemy areas which they are determined to seduce or bludgeon into the Communist sphere.

Nothing that has happened since the death of Stalin has changed the overriding Communist commitment. The so-called return to Leninism, which is to say, to the original Bolshevik principles, is being foolishly interpreted in some quarters as a policy of moderation. Actually, it is a reaffirmation of Lenin's militant dogmas of class war, civil upheaval, and unlimited deception, all directed to the achievement of a totalitarian, all-Communist world.

So why the new optimism? Why the disastrous letdown of our vigilance?

If only our optimists today could be induced to do their homework in Communist history they would realize that in the middle thirties, under cover of Stalin's pretenses of live-and-let-live united fronts, the Soviets forged the weapons of subversion and infiltration which they exploited to the full when the "line" was changed.

They would recall how generally it was then accepted that communism had "matured," that it had ceased to be interested in world revolution, that Stalin the realist was concerned only with improving conditions in his own country. Those who tried to warn the world that communism had not changed its nature, but was temporarily employing cunning instead of brute force, were denounced as "Red-baiters" and alarmists.

Yet today we are neck-deep in the same confusions and illusions, as if the 1930's had never been. In order to soothe our nerves and our conscience, we are fed with fairy tales about "new looks" in the Communist world and the magic of collective leadership.

I am tired of this kind of talk, and I am especially tired of being told that I am an alarmist. I am no Johnny-come-lately in watching the Communist pitch curves at the so-called liberals.

How well do I recall that during World War II we were being swamped with stories about how completely the Communists had changed, and how we were all going to dwell in peace and unity after the war. We were going to remake the world and usher in the golden age.

I did not believe it. I could see no fundamental change in Communist tactics at all.

I said so in an interview with the Boston Herald on September 12, 1943. I said:

> It is time to use more spine and less servility on this subject (of dealing with the Soviets). Joseph Stalin needs to be dealt with toughly, frankly * * * and with self-interest plainly in mind.

Numerous persons told me that I just did not understand the Communists, that I had been deceived by Red-baiters.

Was I deceived? I notice that in the Daily Worker for June 12, 1956, a prominent American Communist, Howard Fast, now confesses that the Khrushchev revelations of Stalin's record constitute, and I quote, "a record of barbarism and paranoic blood lust that will be a lasting and shameful memory to civilized man."

In 1944, immediately after Tehran, I questioned the nature of the political commitments made there. In a speech I made in the Senate on January 14, 1944, I said:

> Americans want to know whether the national life and independence of any people in Europe—or Western Europe—whether in the Baltic region, the Balkans, or Western Europe have been endangered by American commitments or the failure to make strong American representations. Americans want to know how Poland, which was the only full ally which England and France had at the beginning of the war and which has been so horribly ravaged, is to be rewarded for its loyalty and supreme sacrifices.

That speech was made a full year before the Yalta conferences. I was given to understand that my suspicions were groundless. I was told that Mr. Roosevelt would handle matters, and that, anyway, I utterly misinterpreted Communist intentions.

Did I misinterpret their intentions? We know now how the Poles were rewarded. Their territory was carved up, their people were handed over to a reign of terror, and a gang of Polish stooges for Moscow were put in power.

Ten months before Yalta, I returned to this subject in a Senate speech on May 23, 1944. The speech was entitled "What Are Our Peace Aims?" I said:

> Because the matter which I am presenting is so urgent, from this point on, I shall address myself directly to the President of the United States. President Roosevelt, the American people are not going to be content with a military victory only. We, as a people, are utterly in sympathy with your own sentiments which you expressed in a radio talk on May 27, 1941, wherein you said, "We will accept only a world consecrated to freedom of speech and expression—freedom of every person to worship God in their own way—freedom from want, and freedom from terrorism."

Well, how did we make out? Freedom to worship God? With Cardinal Mindszenty drugged, put through the third degree, flung into prison, let out again under the watch of the secret police, and now—as I understand it—in prison again? In Yugoslavia, Cardinal Stepinac under house guard and the constant surveillance of our friend Tito's goon squad. In Poland, the Archbishop of Warsaw shut up in a monastery and all but cut off from the outside world. As for China, you all have seen the photographs of those few missionaries who have been released. Although they went to China to spread the word of God, they have been shrunk to skin and bone, and are physical wrecks. These are the ways in which the Communists guarantee a person freedom to worship God in his own way.

Mr. President, let me point out that, despite those speeches which I made, I have heard Members of the Senate and other representatives of official Washington say, "Well, anyone can have hindsight." But, Mr. President, that was not hindsight; it was foresight. However, those in charge of our Government at that time closed their eyes and their ears to what was occurring. That was true not only of the executive branch

of the Government but also of some of the leading Members of the Congress of the United States at that time.

Yet again in the same speech of May 23, 1944, I said:

> We know that [President Roosevelt] risking our whole future and the future of the postwar world on the good will of Mr. Stalin * * * will never be accepted by the American people as their only safeguard against war and the threat of war.

And, I went on to say:

> What are our peace aims, Mr. President, and do they bode good or ill? * * * Are they a patchwork of unprecedented necessities which will merely postpone the final issue of war itself to the not-too-distant future? Why do you not take us, your own people, into your confidence, Mr. President? Is it because you wish to overwhelm us with joy when you suddenly pull a patchwork peace settlement out of your hat, or is it because the monster which you have helped to breed has broken its leash and is now at large?

Well, what happened? A year later, the Russians entered the Far Eastern war, just a few days before the Japanese surrender—just a few days, but with time enough to seize control of Manchuria and get their hands on North Korea, from which, in 1950, the Communists launched another bloody war.

We remember what happened. General MacArthur was forbidden victory; he was flung to the appeasers; and today, in North Korea, the arms buildup for a new Communist war goes on.

Now, we have the new look in Russia. Many of the intellectuals in this country are saying, "It is a new look." What is the reason for it? We can only speculate.

My own guess is that the reason is double. The first part of the reason is that their domestic political situation forced a new piece of window dressing. The rest of the reason is that those in charge of the Communist machine, never giving up for an instant, their goal of world dominion, now believe that an exhibition of sweetness and light will soften up the West.

The present Communist rulers cannot wash the blood from their own hands. Their helpless subjects have as yet no alternative but to pretend to accept the alibis.

But there is no such compulsion upon the free world, Mr. President. Why then, do we go along with the idea that Stalin's heirs are any different from their late boss? It should be obvious that only the most ruthless and corrupt of Stalin's subordinates, only those capable of doing his bloody work without wincing, could have survived a quarter of a century of purges under his suspicious eye. The very fact that they were at the time of Stalin's death—or was it murder?—his most intimate collaborators is proof enough that they are made of the same moral stuff. Whatever the interpretation for this sudden repudiation of Stalin, it could only stem from weakness.

Why not take advantage of this weakness in our opponents? Certainly this is not the time to dignify the culprits of the Kremlin by accepting them and extending the courtesies of normal statesmen. In doing this, we are only building them up with their own people at this time when they are weakest. Such action can only confound and confuse our friends and give aid and comfort to our enemies. The terrorism to which those men admit having been a party should earn them the deserved disgust of the entire world.

We cannot be optimistic about our dealings with men to whom Stalin could be a deity for 25 years, and overnight become a demon. We will not grasp to our bosom those men, who for 25 years as Stalin's lieutenants were responsible for the torture of millions of Russians and the condemning of hundreds of thousands of victims to death by starvation and the atrocities committed in far-off Siberian prisons.

I appreciate that there will be those who will ask that I be more diplomatic and temperate in my language. I shall answer that moderation and diplomacy are perhaps requirements of foreign-affairs officers; but it is good to clear the air.

If ever there was a moment when the revulsion of mankind should have found forthright expression, it is now. The most extreme of the charges against the Soviet regime, those which our muddled pro-Sovieteers once denounced as inventions and slanders, have now been confirmed by the culprits themselves.

But we see no such revulsion. It is as if free men had lost their capacity for telling good and evil apart, their capacity for indignation at the spectacle of millionfold crimes, even the crimes of which they themselves were the victims.

I am forced to conclude that many times in the past, in the conduct of our foreign relations, we have lost the compass of moral principle. More and more we operate in gray areas, somewhere between good and evil. The excuse, of course, is "political realism." But history is our guaranty that such realism is a snare and a delusion.

It was a false expediency which produced Munich and Yalta and the chain of appeasements on which our Soviet enemy has been nourished to his present dimensions.

What have we got in exchange for the billion dollars we gave to Tito? We fed him, and bolstered him when Stalin tried to crush him; we supplied and equipped his army. And what do we get for our pains?

We get a Tito honeymoon staged in Moscow. We get a statement from Marshal Zhukov to Tito that in war the Kremlin and Tito will fight "shoulder to shoulder." We get an official statement that Tito and the Kremlin "will make stubborn efforts" to see that Red China is admitted to the United Nations. Are we supposed to forget that the United Nations voted Red China an aggressor in the Korean War, and that the ban has never been revoked?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I wish to say that I am filled with the same amazement which seems to affect the Senator from New Hampshire at the proposal to include Tito in our mutual assistance. I raise the question—and I raise it with all the members of the Foreign Relations Committee—whether, by the millions of dollars we have spent—so much of it spent usefully and successfully—we have ever succeeded in actually buying anyone? I wish to suggest that the undertaking to buy Tito is a fruitless undertaking. We can rent him for a period of time, but the rent will be raised every month. I am ashamed to have my country enter into an auction with Soviet Russia for the good intentions of Tito, and I am going to find some way to vote against such a thing before our consideration of the pending bill has concluded.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Vermont. His idea about rental is a good one. I had not heard that expression used before about this matter.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Vermont to page 15 of the committee report on the bill, where the following statement appears:

> 7. ASSISTANCE TO YUGOSLAVIA (SEC. 5)
>
> Section 5 of the bill provides that, effective 90 days after its enactment, no assistance shall be furnished to Yugoslavia unless the President finds—
>
> "(1) that there has been no change in the Yugoslavian policies on the basis of which assistance under this act has been furnished to Yugoslavia in the past, and that Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union, and (2) that it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue the furnishing of assistance to Yugoslavia."
>
> The committee views this section primarily as a statement of congressional concern over the state of our relations with Yugoslavia and particularly the state of Yugoslav relations with the Soviet Union.

For the record, I wish to make it clear that such aid will be cut off within 90 days, unless the President finds such aid to be "in the interest of the national security of the United States."

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to give a little advice to the President on my own. My way of doing so is by protesting against any further monetary support of Tito.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that I find myself in practically full accord with the bill, except on that one point, and that I have found so much difficulty in swallowing that portion of the bill that I have decided not to swallow it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. If the system under which we have been operating since the end of World War II, whereby $60 billion have been spent by this country on foreign economic and military aid, had proved effective in buying good will

and guaranteeing the cooperation and support of the recipient nations, then would it not be in order to contend that, under that kind of system, that kind of strategy, this country could command the support and cooperation of Tito? Conversely, the fact that we have not gained his friendship, support, and good will, notwithstanding the fact that we have given him many millions of dollars, justifies us in concluding that the system has failed, and that it is not possible to bribe leaders like Tito into supporting the free nations of the world by the use of millions of dollars?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is a fair assumption, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Idaho. If anyone can show me why we should provide more money to Tito, I should like to be shown. There may be Senators who can show me. There may be those in the State Department who can show me; but I have yet to meet them.

We get an official statement that East and West Germany must be reunited, not by plebiscite and popular vote, but by a negotiated deal. We get an official statement that Formosa must be handed over to Red China. Americans paid $1 billion for this.

If any one can show me why we should provide more money to Tito, I should like to be shown. It was a disdain for moral values which maneuvered us into the folly for building up the dictator Tito of Yugoslavia. And it is the same retreat from moral standards which today creates the confusion over so-called neutralists.

"Neutrality," as I have said, made sense and still does where the opposing powers were primarily involved in a contest for territories, dynasties, frontiers, colonies, and economic advantages. We know—the whole world knows—that this is not the nature of the conquest at the present time. There is no quarrel between America and Russia on any such traditional grounds. If those were the issues, we would have no trouble coming to terms with the vast Soviet empire, just as we did with the British and other expanding empires in the past.

No. What divides us from the Communists are human, moral, and spiritual questions; the determination of a crusading totalitarianism to extend its pattern of life to the rest of the human race. Everytime a spokesman for the free world speaks of "neutrality" in the old sense in relation to our present dilemma, he cheapens the issue and betrays the high purpose of the free world. He helps make it seem—as the Kremlin wants it to seem—simply an old style duel for power. On that false assumption, the contest loses its true significance, and other countries are fortified in their delusion that the whole thing concerns only the main antagonists, namely, the United States and Soviet Russia.

It is at this point that I lose patience with those nations which are not only neutralist in their military position, but insist on neutralism in their moral position. I know of no worse offender in this regard than Nehru, who proclaims himself the moralist of Asia.

I know of no instance of Nehru having openly and sincerely taken the side of freedom and democracy. I know only weasel words and idle pretensions. Nehru has yet to denounce slave-labor, torture, trial without jury, political violence, and all the absolute ruthless dictatorship that goes with Soviet Russia. It is just possible that Nehru may yet come around and denounce Stalin. Everyone else is doing it. It is thoroughly fashionable and quite safe to do it today. Dead men cannot retaliate.

On a more specific level, I cannot feel justified in voting large sums of foreign aid to India. In my view, foreign aid, military, economic and technical, is an instrument of foreign policy. Our foreign aid should be employed to build and nurture those allies and alliances necessary to protect us and to assure our safety. We must match with bonds of friendship the enmities our opponents try to create. We want to help other nations to strengthen them spiritually and economically, so that if they are assaulted or if we are assaulted, we will all be much stronger to resist and to fight. I do not care about buying gratitude but we ought to be buying something. Surely we are not spending $5 billion a year on a huge giveaway charity program. We have no right to tax our people just to give largesse all over the world. If nations tell us they want our economic help but that what side they are on is none of our business, or that they see some good in both sides, and some bad in both sides—then how does helping them aid our foreign policy?

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. It has been a very great pleasure to the junior Senator from Idaho to listen to the profound remarks of the distinguished leader of the Republican minority policy committee. I know that the great statesman from the cradle of liberty, the State of New Hampshire, has devoted many months of thought to the speech he has just delivered. It is a speech which all America should read and heed.

In case any Member of this body thinks the foreign-aid program is generally popular, let him go among the people we are obliged to represent. Let him talk to the people who pay the taxes; let him talk to those who wonder what we are doing here. Let me say to my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Hampshire who has served nearly two decades in this body, that we are representing the American people. We must do so or we should not be here. We have a different duty from that of the executive branch of the Government, especially the State Department. If we authorize the giving away of money it is no one's responsibility but ours. I heartily join in the remarks just made by my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire, when he says that he does not intend to vote to give the money of the American taxpayers to Mr. Nehru, who sat out the Korean war. Was not that notice enough to us in America? He has done nothing during the 6 years I have been a Member of the United States Senate. Tito is considered by some to be beyond reproach. Because of his recent honeymoon with the Communists I would not give him 10 cents if he were the last thing under the canopy of heaven. How can we justify giving a cent to Tito? He has said he would never be separated from his mother land the Communists, and the Communists have said in the event of war they would be on the side of Tito.

Going to another matter. What did we receive in return for what we gave to Nasser the strong man and leader of Egypt? We saw him embrace the Communists—another went down the drain to the Communists and our American taxpayer justly asks why? If we have been so successful in the field of giveaway and foreign aid, I cannot see many friends we have made as a result of that program. In fact, as a member of the Armed Services Committee of the United States Senate, I am afraid Tito, Nehru, and Nasser have set an example that may spread to others who profess to be our friends. Is not it a fact that our principal and fighting friends are people to whom we have given less money than to any others. I doubt if this can be denied.

In my estimation, the program has been generally an utter failure during the 6 years I have been in the United States Senate. The American taxpayer can no longer carry this burden without more assurance than lip service.

I make this statement as one who does not care whether anyone at the State Department likes these remarks or not. I am speaking as a representative of my sovereign State of Idaho. I shall have to be convinced before I will vote to give money to anyone who is not a dedicated, fighting ally of the United States. Whenever there is a doubt, I shall resolve the doubt in favor of my country.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that is a sound conclusion.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I do not want the Senator from New Hampshire to feel that I follow him too closely in anything except with respect to our friend from Yugoslavia. If any Senators wish to remain in the Chamber long enough after the Senator from New Hampshire has concluded, when I can obtain recognition Senators will hear another of my 15-minute speeches, dealing with the case for India.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad the Senator from Vermont agrees with me on the Tito-Yugoslavia situation. I am sure his position is sound on that point, but I am not so sure that I speak for his views on the second point. Of course, there is always room for an honest difference of opinion.

Mr. WELKER. Does the Senator from Vermont intend to give 15 minutes to Nasser?

Mr. FLANDERS. No; I am not prepared to do that. I give him less than that.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Reference has been made to India and to Nehru, particularly to Nehru as an advocate of neutralism. I have been rather reluctant in the past to be critical of Nehru, on the basis that he was probably trying patiently to work out some of the difficult problems confronting his great country.

A few days ago a former Member of the Senate, who is now the Ambassador to India, testified before the Committee on Appropriations. During the testimony, colloquy developed with regard to the serious situation which confronts us today, in which the Soviet nations, particularly Russia, and the United States are competing for the good will and support of Nehru and India. The Ambassador said we had probably contributed a half billion dollars to help India. I presume that all of it was for economic aid, because I am sure that Nehru would not accept military aid from this country. I asked the Ambassador how much the Soviet nations had given India during that same period of time that we had given India a half-billion dollars. The Ambassador's answer was, "Nothing."

Therefore, after the United States has given India a half billion dollars in economic aid and the Soviet countries have given India nothing, according to the Ambassador, we are confronted with the serious situation that, although the United States, as the leader of the free nations, is attempting to help India to resist Communist aggression throughout southeastern Asia, the United States is not in the favorable position there that the Soviet countries enjoy, notwithstanding the fact that Russia has not given India so much as 1 ruble in aid.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am very much interested in that point. I was not at the hearing when that particular colloquy took place. That is a very interesting point.

Mr. President, what kind of global do-gooding is this? How can we respect ourselves for giving our money and substance all over the world and asking nothing in return? What has this to do with an effective policy which in this day and age ought to be pretty hard, and realistic? Our survival as a people and as a Nation may depend on who our allies are and how firmly they stand with us. And if we do not have any allies, we ought to know that too, and act accordingly. This confusion—this soft-headedness—must end. We must realistically reappraise the whole business or in the end we will waste our substance and perish.

In leaving this question of sharing our financial and material resources with other nations, I should like to make one thing very clear. I have long favored the basis for our foreign aid program. I was for foreign aid nearly two decades ago, at a time when that position was not entirely popular, because I believed that it was essential to the security of the United States and the protection of the free world. I am still for a truly mutual assistance program, with particular emphasis on aiding those countries who honestly intend to help themselves and the rest of the free world.

We do not lose sight of the fact that some countries and peoples are more exposed and more vulnerable to Soviet pressures than others. The temptation to forget moral values in their desire to live and stave off attack is understandably stronger upon them. But where are they to find a source of strength to resist if not in our America? We should be supplying the courage, the moral fiber, and the religious conviction to resist. Where are they to find a guarantee that all is not lost if America, too, begins to go neutralist, even if it evades the unpleasant word?

Let us bear in mind that every American compromise, however it may be explained, is multipled in other countries into surrenders. Our job, to insure our own security and to secure the survival of freedom on this earth, is to galvanize the stragglers, the fearful, the intimidated, by examples of moral valor and spiritual dedication. Such is the rule of leadership which, though we never sought it, we can reject only to our own peril.

That is what I meant when I said that attitudes and basic principles are no less decisive than actions and policies. An attitude of compromise on essentials, phony friendships with gangsters at any price, leads to one set of decisions. An attitude related to deep-rooted moral values leads to an opposite set of decisions.

It is precisely these underlying considerations which must be examined in the debate on foreign policy which will develop in the forthcoming election campaign. We can excuse and make up for failures of particular policies. Those reflect the mistakes of fallible men in a complex situation.

We dare not excuse a failure of nerve and a failure of principle, for those witness a weakening and threaten a collapse of our whole moral structure. If the present drift to cynical grayness, where once we knew the difference between black and white, is not arrested and reversed, we shall lose our ability to defend ourselves. Indeed, we shall have little left that is worth defending.

Mr. President, in making these remarks I have tried to make my views clear. I wish to point out, however, to the people of the United States, particularly to Members of the Senate, that my position has been clear and consistent over the years. I have stood here through the years—and the official records of the United States Senate will bear me out—and my position has never varied. Sometimes I have stood here almost alone.

I have taken abuse. I can remember submitting a resolution to prohibit the shipment of scrap iron and steel and aviation gasoline to Japan. I can remember the abuse I took for doing that. I was right, Mr. President.

I can remember voting for the extension of the Selective Service Act in the summer before Pearl Harbor. I walked out the door, and there was met by a group of women who were dressed in black, wearing black hats and black veils. They carried a sign reading "Mothers of America." Now, these were phony mothers. They were there, and they tried to spit on some Senators who dared to vote for the extension of the Selective Service Act.

That is how it has been in the past. We see the same thing today. We see people closing their eyes and burying their heads in the sand with respect to what is going on in the world.

As a believer in helping those who will help themselves and who stand on moral principles, I sincerely hope that we will be realistic in our approach to this problem.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Idaho can recall when the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire stood on the floor of the Senate and opposed the dismantling of the industrial plants in Germany, when efforts were being made by leaders of the Roosevelt administration to destroy the industrial and economic power of Germany, so that it would remain only an agrarian nation.

Mr. BRIDGES. I can remember that very well. The Senator from Idaho and the Senator from New Hampshire stood here together and protested. In spite of that, we were overridden. The dismantling program went on, and the plants went to countries which are now using them against us.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator from New Hampshire realize that in the interim this country has expended approximately $4 billion for economic aid to rehabilitate the German people and to build up the industrial potential of West Germany? Much of that money undoubtedly was expended in an effort to repair the damage which was done when this country participated in that tragic agreement to destroy the industrial power of Germany.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. We proceeded with the Morgenthau plan under which we allowed the dismantling of factory after factory, and the equipment was sent to Communist countries. Then the American taxpayers dug down to help carry on the rehabilitation program.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Eight years ago the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire was serving as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations when the first appropriation bill to implement the Marshall plan was passed. I was a member of the Appropriations Committee at that time, and I well recall the courageous position taken by the Senator from New Hampshire. While he was not opposed to the entire program of foreign aid at that time, he took the position that we could accomplish very little in our efforts to buy good will by bribing nations instead of encouraging them to display self-reliance and independence in order to attain a basis of equality in defending the free nations of the world.

The Senator from New Hampshire is deserving a commendation for the successive positions he has taken when he displayed such courage, intelligence, and good judgment at a time when some of the newspapers of this country and some of the leaders in both parties were taking untenable and indefensible positions

because it was popular at that time to take a calculated risk, and to roll out billions of American dollars in what has proved to be a fruitless and ineffectual effort to buy the good will of nations which have failed to cooperate fully with the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Idaho. I might point out to him that the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from New Hampshire were two of the very few Senators who opposed the Italian peace treaty. Let us mention just one provision of that treaty. It was to take what was left of the Italian nation, divide it up, and give it to some of the Communist countries. We have been spending money to build ships to give to Italy so as to build up the navy which we took away from her and gave to Russia and other countries. Some of the features of our foreign policy over the years, when we look at the record, are amazing, shocking, and inconsistent.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does not a summarization of many of these rather tragic experiences which have befallen the United States justify, probably, the agonizing reappraisal which was proposed not long ago by one of our officials, so that instead of expanding the foreign-aid program the time has arrived for us to be realistic in reexamining the program, and to determine whether it has been successful and whether we are justified in continuing to spend billions of dollars abroad?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, once again I commend the great Senator from New Hampshire for his profound speech. I wish to relate a certain conversation which I had with a prominent man in my State a few days ago. When the Tito incident occurred he said, in a jocular vein, "Well, Senator, you had better go back and appropriate twice as much money. We might buy him back."

I am firmly of the opinion that we cannot buy friendship. If one continually gives money to a needy person the minute the gift is discontinued, he will be criticized. Some of these recipients are not needy. Where is this thing going to end? I remember some of our leaders standing up and saying, "I am voting for the foreign-aid program for the last time." Yet today we hear them arguing for its continuance.

Has the situation improved with our allies? In my opinion, the situation has become worse.

Has the Senator given any thought to what happened in Iceland? We gave Iceland more than $34 million, outright, plus giant radar installations, plus the airbases there, which cost nearly $200 million dollars, bringing to them an economy which any country on the face of the earth would love to have. What has happened within the past few hours with respect to Iceland? Are we getting stronger, or are we getting weaker? The Communists have us in dire straits. We are about to get kicked out of the country we have helped so much.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that is a sample of the fear I have as to whether the countries which are members of NATO will stand up in a crisis when a great danger confronts us. If they weaken now, in peaceful, normal times, what will happen then? We have invested approximately $160 million in a great air base in Iceland. Having done that in good faith, under an agreement signed with that country, what are we going to do now? Are we just going to leave? I do not know what the policy will be, but I know it is a very uncertain thing.

Mr. WELKER. Can we assume for a moment that if any conflict occurred between the Communists and the United States Iceland would help us, in view of the elections of day before yesterday? Of course not; it is ridiculous even to think they will help us.

Mr. BRIDGES. I would have a great deal of doubt as to that.

Mr. WELKER. Why do not the Members of this body recall the words of the man who said he would let the nations spend themselves into bankruptcy, would bleed them white from within, and cause them to fall into his hands like overripe fruit, and take them without a shot.

I hope the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire will not assume, as I know he will not, that I know anything about foreign relations, but I do know something about commonsense. If the Senator and I do not use commonsense in representing our people, we are derelict in our duty.

Mr. President, I certainly commend the Senator from New Hampshire for the very enlightening and able speech he has made. I watched the Senator many years before I became a Member of the Senate. He is the oldest in service of any Republican Senator, but is still a young man. It will be the highlight of my life that I have known a statesman of his character and his ability.

Mr. BRIDGES. I appreciate the distinguished Senator's remarks. I hope for many years to come the Senator from Idaho will be a Member of the Senate, where he is serving his country and his State so conscientiously, so courageously, so ably and well.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield for a moment?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas withhold his suggestion for a moment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine will be good enough to yield to me before a quorum is called, I wish to submit four amendments to the bill to be printed overnight, and I desire to make a brief explanation of the four amendments. I am sure it will not take more than 5 minutes, unless I am interrupted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The quorum call will not take that long.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well. I withdraw my request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR ELLENDER AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning business tomorrow, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] may be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself, I submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Thursday, June 28, 1956, after the hour of 3 p. m., during the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11356, the Mutual Security Act of 1956, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received, with the exception of the Johnston (South Carolina)-Payne amendment relating to textiles and the Young amendment relating to agricultural commodities.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal (June 27, 1956).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to address a question to the distinguished majority leader. Does the Senator from Texas have any idea that any other Senator wants to debate the bill, or is this to be a sort of "closed corporation" action?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; every Senator can speak on the bill, and, I assume, can offer amendments.

Mr. WELKER. I have no amendments to offer. I simply want to vote against everybody who is not a friend of the United States of America.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Idaho will have ample opportunity to speak.

Mr. WELKER. I am wondering how there will be enough time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator will have ample opportunity to speak.

Mr. WELKER. How much time will be allowed on the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Idaho may have as much time as he wishes within the 2 hours on the bill.

I have worked out the agreement with the distinguished minority leader, with the distinguished chairman of the minority policy committee, with the chairman of the committee, and with as many other Senators as I understood intended to offer amendments. I was not aware of the interest of the Senator from Idaho in any particular amendment, but I shall be glad to offer an amendment to the proposed agreement, or the Senator himself can offer one, to enable him to have time in which to speak. There is no disposition to prevent any Senator from discussing the bill.

Mr. WELKER. I do not want to act under a subterfuge by offering a number of amendments merely for the purpose of using a little time. I want to debate the bill fully.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator will have ample opportunity to do so.

Mr. WELKER. I merely wanted to know. I realize that the majority leader has discussed the matter with the leaders on both sides of the aisle. I know there will be a great amount of argument on both sides, but there is nothing more important to me than that there be full debate on the matter.

Mr. FLANDERS. I might suggest to the distinguished majority leader that if there is some doubt as to there being sufficient time, the Senate might convene earlier tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There are committee meetings which would prevent that, but I should be glad, if the Senator from Idaho would like to have me do so, to provide additional time on the bill. On many occasions time is yielded back on bills. I feel certain the Senator can secure time in which to speak. If he cannot get it on his side of the aisle, he can get it on this side of the aisle.

Mr. WELKER. I do not wish to be argumentative.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. The Senator is entitled to time.

Mr. President, I modify the unanimous-consent agreement so as to provide 3 hours on the bill.

Mr. WELKER. I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement, as modified? The Chair hears none, and the agreement, as modified, is entered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me for 5 minutes?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Maine is very gracious.

Mr. President, I ask the Chair to call me to order if I exceed 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I submit four amendments to the bill and ask that they be printed overnight, so that they will be ready in time for the debate on the bill tomorrow. The four amendments deal with what I conceive to be very important phases of the measure.

The bill contains a statement of policy. In that statement of policy I should like to write a declaration that it is the policy of the Congress of the United States to maintain and expand its airpower through the construction, in accordance with appropriations heretofore or hereafter made by the Congress, of planes, guided missiles, and other advanced weapons, so long as Soviet Russia expands its power. I do not want American airpower to lag behind that of the Soviet Empire.

The second amendment deals with the same subject matter. It adds a new section 13 and reads:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, in the event any portion of the funds appropriated by the Congress in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1957, for aircraft and related procurement is impounded by Executive order or otherwise and not expended, there shall be withheld from expenditure a corresponding percentage of the unexpended balances of funds appropriated pursuant to authorizations contained in this act.

The other two amendments deal with the very important question of the authority of the officers and employees of the executive branch to withhold information from Congress. When Congress passes laws under which the Executive acts, and when Congress provides the money under which the executive department carries on its functions, Congress is entitled, in my judgment, to have complete information with respect to what is done.

The bill contains appropriations of billions of dollars to be expended by the President. It is impossible for him solely to spend them; it is impossible for him solely to make the arrangements which will be necessary for their expenditure.

So the third amendment to section 521 of the bill requires the President to transmit quarterly to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs a list of the names of all persons to whom delegations of authority have been made under this section, together with a statement of the experience, business affiliations, and employment status of each such person.

The fourth and final amendment I think I shall read, because it deals with this very important question. On page 46, between lines 5 and 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 538. Furnishing of information to congressional committees: Upon the request of any appropriate committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, any joint committee of the two Houses, or any subcommittee of any such committee, any officer or employee of the Government having information, or having custody of documents or other data, relating to the programs being administered under this act, shall promptly furnish any such information, documents, or other data to such committee or subcommittee.

Mr. President, I propose to offer these amendments when the proper time comes, because I do not believe that the executive authority should lower any iron curtain to bar the Congress of the United States from obtaining information regarding activities which can be carried on only by the authority of the Congress.

I thank the gracious Senator from Maine for yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments proposed to be offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be received, and printed, and will lie on the table.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine will yield very briefly, I should like to make an announcement. I do not know how many amendments will be offered tomorrow. It is planned to begin the session at 12 o'clock noon.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to have the Senate continue in session rather late tomorrow evening, as late as 9 or 10 o'clock, if it appears to be at all possible to complete action on the bill. If not, the Senate will meet on Friday, continue in session late on Friday, and conclude action on the bill. So I should like to give notice of an evening session, if that is agreeable.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I fully concur. I am glad the majority leader is giving notice now, so Senators may be advised and may make their arrangements accordingly. If action on the bill cannot be concluded tomorrow, I think it would be well to have the Senate sit later than it normally does so as to conclude action on the bill on Friday.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Heretofore when we have had sessions in the evening, there is one thing I have heard practically every Senator and everybody else who works in the Senate complain about, and that is the dining room. When we are going to be in session in the evening——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire we do not have to be in session in order to hear complaints about the dining room.

Mr. BRIDGES. When we are to be in session in the evening those who operate the dining room should take due notice, and they should have food and an appropriate number of waiters available, and should be prepared to give service. It is disgusting, when we have night sessions, to find that we cannot have good food and service available in the dining room.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like first to comment on the remarks made by the Senator from New Hampshire, and then I should like to hear from the Senator from Maine. I want the RECORD to show that we are not only

warning the Senate that we are going to have a night session, but we are warning the dining room and the managers of the dining room, and we are going to expect to eat, and we are going to expect them to have the help and the food in order to provide us with a good meal tomorrow evening.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. The Senator from Maine should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire if he would not be willing to join the Senator from Maine in her efforts for the past 3 years in an attempt to get decent and clean food at reasonable prices.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Maine that should be one of our objectives, and he commends the Senator from Maine, who has conscientiously and consistently tried to bring that about.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. But the Senator from Maine gets very little assistance. In fact, within the past 10 days, another effort was made, and we are still waiting for clean and good food at prices that at least the members of the staff can afford to pay.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope Senators will take judicial notice of the statement made by the chairman of the minority policy committee and the Senator from Maine, as well as the majority leader, to see that the restaurant is put on due notice that we expect to be visiting with them tomorrow evening. We expect to have clean and good food, in abundant quantity.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Will the majority leader join in asking that that objective be carried out through the year in the cafeterias as well as the Senate dining room?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I cannot speak for the minority leader, but the majority leader is always persuaded by his friend from Maine, and he will be glad to go into the question with her. If she will state what contribution he can make to the general cause, he will be glad to make it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Whether the question was directed to the majority leader or the minority leader, I shall be glad to join in that effort.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. This is the greatest cooperation I have been able to obtain in the restaurant matter. It is only a matter which requires the Committee on Rules and Administration to move.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say to the Senator from Maine that this cooperation is typical of the kind we get every day, but maybe it is more enjoyable because of the generous contribution which the distinguished lady has made today.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, for many years now I have gone along with and supported the foreign-aid program. It is my sincere belief that this program has produced results of benefit to our country and to the world, in that it has done much to provide the armed peace that we now have—and in stopping and reversing the spread of communism in Europe. It certainly checked and stopped communism from taking over France and Italy and Western Europe. It certainly prevented the loss of Turkey and Greece to the Communists.

But there have been flaws in that program, however unseen they might be. For example, one of the great flaws has been our aid to Yugoslavia—and more pointedly put, Communist Yugoslavia.

We have gambled on Yugoslavia—I am told to at least the tune of $1 billion—and we have lost. For Tito has now resumed his ties and affection with Communist Russia.

I do not say that we should not have gambled. I acknowledge that it was worth a try as long as there was some chance that Yugoslavia would make her break with Communist Russia permanent. It was worth the gamble—although I doubt in the amount we have paid—not only from the hope of severing Yugoslavia from Communist Russia, but of having such an example encourage other satellites of Communist Russia to have the courage and strength to assert their independence from Communist Russia.

I do not say that we have lost completely on the gamble we made. I acknowledge that for a few years our aid to Tito and Yugoslavia did weaken the position of Russia in Eastern Europe—or at least prevented it from getting stronger. But what we may overlook in making this acknowledgment is that the real gain was made by Tito instead of the United States.

Let us face the facts realistically: We have poured out a billion dollars to a shrewd international blackmailer who was playing both sides against the middle, Russia and the United States against each other. And talking about examples encouraging other nations to follow suit, surely we should wake up to the fact that there is a greater danger that Tito is an example of encouragement to other countries to do the same thing—to get huge sums of aid from the United States by threatening to go to the side of Russia—than the wishful hope of an example encouraging other countries to come to our side.

For if Tito can play Russia and the United States off against each other to the tune of a billion dollars worth of aid from the United States—and then at the very first wooing call of Communist Russia to come back into the anti-American Communist world to nearly break his neck going back to the side of Russia—then why will other countries not be encouraged to make a sucker out of the United States, just as Tito has done?

But the cry is made that Tito has said that while he has publicly proclaimed that Russia and Yugoslavia will stand together in case of war, he has quickly assured the United States and the Western world that he does not want to break ties with them. What kind of double talk is this? How long are we going to swallow it?

To those who propose that we set Tito and Yugoslavia up as an example to other countries to encourage them to break with Communist Russia, I say, "Yes. Let's make him an example, but not the way you want. Let's make him an example to the rest of the world that we are tired of his duplicity and blackmail and that we refuse to be made suckers any longer!"

Let us make an example of Tito to the rest of the world by showing that we want no part of his ways. It should be completely clear now that we could never depend upon him.

Some persons attempt to explain and excuse Tito by saying that he is acting independently. But what difference does it make if he acts independently, when he independently enters into a military alliance with Communist Russia—when he independently sides with Communist Russia? What kind of independence is that? Communist independence? Certainly not anti-Communist independence—and even hardly independence from Communist Russia!

Chapter 4, section 143, of the mutual security authorization bill provides that no assistance shall be furnished to Yugoslavia unless it is found that, first, there has been no change in Yugoslav policies on which assistance has been furnished in the past; second, that Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union; and third, that it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue furnishing assistance to Yugoslavia.

Let us consider these point by point. The only way that it can be concluded that there has been no change in Yugoslav policies is to conclude that all along Yugoslavia and Tito have really kept their sympathies with Communist Russia. That is hardly a basis for continuing aid to Tito.

Otherwise, how can we overlook the recent triumphal return of Tito to Communist Russia, and his statement that Yugoslavia and Communist Russia will stand side by side? If that is not a sufficient change from what some have contended was an independent Tito attitude, to stop assistance to Tito, then I do not know what is.

As for whether Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union, I say that is not necessarily the test. I say so because I predict that before too long the world may see Tito emerge as the chief international spokesman for the Communist world—perhaps even more powerful than the Russian leaders themselves. In that case it is idle to talk about independence of control by the Soviet Union.

As for whether it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue furnishing assistance to Yugoslavia and Tito, I ask these questions: Is it in the interest of American security to continue to pay blackmail to Tito? Is it in the interest of American security to show to other nations of the world that Tito's blackmail and ultimate siding with Communist Russia are the effective way to squeeze the most out of the United States? I think the answers are clear.

Now let us look at the statement of policy in the bill—that world peace and the security of the United States are in danger as long as international communism and the nations it controls continue by military threats, economic pressure, and internal subversion, to attempt to

dominate peoples now free and independent, and continue to oppress peoples and nations once free, but now subject to Communist domination.

What a mockery continued aid to Tito, that leader of international communism—and perhaps in the not-too-distant future the foremost leader of international communism—is to the statement of policy of this bill. What a mockery does continued aid to Tito make of the phrase "military threats" in the statement of policy, when Tito has just recently proclaimed that Yugoslavia will fight alongside Communist Russia in the event of war. What a mockery is the reference to "economic pressure," when that is exactly what Tito is doing to us with his blackmail. What a mockery when Tito himself has enslaved to Communist domination the once free people of Yugoslavia, and has recently reaffirmed his adherence and allegiance to that Communist enslavement.

Mr. President, in all good conscience to the people of my country—in all good conscience to my country—I cannot go along with continued payment of blackmail to Tito, and especially in the face of the clear manner in which he has recently wedded himself and Yugoslavia to Communist Russia and to her causes, aims, and objectives.

In a struggle for personal power, Tito broke with Stalin and Molotov over personal greed—but not over Communist principles. Now that Khrushchev and Bulganin have snuggled up to him and pampered his vanity, he visions himself as the future senior partner in the Communist ruling clique, jubilantly returns to the fold, not having for a second forsaken Communist principles.

Tito is no neutralist. Tito is a Communist, tied lock, stock, and barrel to the Kremlin, despite all his two-faced talk about independence. And the sooner we recognize it the sooner we keep the faith with the American people.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to pay my tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Maine for her very courageous and clear-cut statement outlining her belief in regard to what our policy toward Tito and Yugoslavia should be. She has spoken words of wisdom which all the American people should heed.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. I wish to state that he, himself, has led the way in the matter of the proper position for us to take regarding aid to Yugoslavia.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Maine yield to me?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, in line with the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], I wish to say that I appreciate very much, indeed, the excellent statement which has just been made by our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. Once again she is right, and once again she has spoken words which the American people can clearly understand. I know she has again been of very great aid to America.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho is always cooperative and helpful in working on matters in which both he and I are interested, especially in connection with the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I seek the floor; but before doing so, I wish to express my great admiration for the position taken by the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and for the way in which she has stated it.

Let me say to her that I believe the way in which she was presented the matter this evening to the Senate will be a tower of strength in connection with what we are endeavoring to do in regard to this matter. I am very glad, indeed, to have had the privilege of hearing the distinguished senior Senator from Maine speak.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont. As always, he is most generous and helpful in connection with all matters with which we are concerned.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President——

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] on her remarks. I agree with her remarks and her conclusions, and I appreciate very much the statement she has made to the Senate today.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Texas gives me great courage to go on.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I yield to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say that I have been very much impressed by the statement which has been made by the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. I must say that as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I have not been impressed fully, at any rate, by the arguments of the State Department in regard to this issue. I think it constitutes a very grave problem which we are facing in the field of foreign policy. Although, as in the case of many public issues, undoubtedly there are two sides to it, I think it most important that the distinguished senior Senator from Maine has presented the issue so forthrightly to the Senate.

Mr. President, I believe there is much danger that continued aid on our part to Yugoslavia may, in turn, encourage Communists in Italy or in France to say, "Well, look at Yugoslavia. She has a Marxian-Communist system, and is following a policy parallel to that of the men in the Kremlin. But Yugoslavia is receiving aid from the United States. Therefore, what reason is there for us to vote anti-Communist? Obviously, we can continue to receive both economic aid and military aid from the United States, regardless of how we vote."

Mr. President, if the Kremlin is attempting further to deceive the West—as I believe those in the Kremlin are attempting to do—then I believe that situation might encourage other satellite States—Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia—while still maintaining Communist governments, to say, "Let us show just a little independence, as Tito has done, and in that case we can apply successfully for both arms aid and economic aid from the United States." And the same argument might be made, namely, that we should supply both arms aid and economic aid to those Communist countries.

Therefore, Mr. President, certainly the State Department has not fully answered those questions—at least, not to my satisfaction; and I think it very important that this issue be laid forthrightly before the American people.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I thank my distinguished colleague, the minority leader, for his very generous words. I have not had the privilege of serving with him on the Foreign Relations Committee, but I have had the privilege of sitting with him at the table during meetings of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee dealing with foreign aid and State Department appropriations. I have found him well-informed, and have been delighted to go along with him on many issues. We are in complete agreement on the attitude of the Kremlin. I hope that before we are through we may know more about the question of where foreign aid should go, and where it should not go.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think there is one additional danger. It, too, is subject to two interpretations. When we are dealing with the men in the Kremlin and with communism as a whole, all Americans must recognize as a fact that, as a part of their doctrine, it is fundamental with them that they can cheat, deceive, and lie, so long as they achieve their ultimate objective.

Some people have jumped to the conclusion that because during the past few days the Communist Parties in France, Italy, the United States, and Great Britain have been critical of Khrushchev and his downgrading of Stalin, they have thereby demonstrated a degree of independence in the Communist world. I submit that the situation might well be just the opposite. It may well be that a new party line has been sent out by the Kremlin to the Communist Parties in the United States, Great Britain, France, and Italy, to this effect: "As a part of our new foreign policy, show a little independence. We are going to encourage our other satellites to do so, in an attempt to deceive the western nations and cause them to let their guard down."

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. The Senator from California is so right. I thank him.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

IV. INDIA

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, we are committed to the defense of the free world against Communist imperialism and colonialism. In that defense the key to the whole continent of Asia is the great new independent India.

A visit to that country last December sharpened my understanding and my apprehension as to its future. However, any of us can follow the trend of events in the news and many will come to much the same conclusions that I did in the course of a brief 15-day visit.

That visit coincided with the last week of the tour of Bulganin and Khrushchev. I was present at the airfield when they took off for Afghanistan and home. I was able to observe at first hand the procedures by which these two Soviet officials were received, entertained, and speeded on their way.

As at all their appearances, and there were many, the population was invited by every available means of communication to be present at the places of meeting, speaking, and departing, and to become acquainted with the nation's guests. Literally millions of the Indian population saw the Russians and heard translations of their addresses. Incidentally, I have never heard a public address system as nearly technically perfect as was that at the airfield when they made their departure. Understanding neither Russian nor the Indian language, into which the address was translated, I could not know what was being said, but what was said was said distinctly, clearly, and impressively.

Thousands of people were brought to the airfield that morning in response to broadcast appeals and instructions made throughout the streets of Delhi. There was needed no exercise of government authority to bring them together. The people made a gala of the occasion, coming by all means of transportation—afoot, by bus, by car, by taxi, by horse-drawn vehicles, and even in bullock carts. Apparently, as on other similar occasions, people came in from the country and camped out overnight. It was a moving spectacle.

But to the Western visitor the spectacle was one that boded ill for the future of India. On almost every appearance one or the other of the visitors said something that was not true and was obviously barefaced propaganda. Mr. Nehru picked up these misstatements as fast as they were offered and replied to and corrected them in the press. The difficulty is that millions of people saw and heard the visitors and only hundreds of thousands had access to the rebuttal. The net result must have been to leave the impression in the minds of the Indian citizens that their visitors were honored guests and bearers of sweetness and light. Is this a permanent deposit in the minds of the Indian citizens? Will that deposit remain as an effective element in the future of India? Mr. Nehru is anti-Communist in accordance with his own lights, but neither you nor I nor he will live forever.

There may perhaps be some significance in the fact that the Communist Party in India, according to latest information, is now directed to support the Congress Party instead of opposing it.

There are, it seems to me, other dangerous influences leading toward new strength for communism in India. One of them is the series of 5-year plans of which the first was largely and wisely devoted to the increase of food production. In spite of careful explanations and arguments to the contrary, I continue to fear that the second 5-year plan is directed toward an overindustrialization of India. The danger here lies in the fact that India has a surplus working population. Industrialization is directed toward efficiency in production and the reduction of labor costs. What India needs is not labor saving, but labor utilization. That great country must find, I am convinced, a purely Indian solution to its problem of food deficiency and labor surplus. The solutions which the Western World and the United States have found in industrialization will not apply in southern Asia. The pattern is not the economy of the United States or the forced industrialization of Russia or China. Following any of these lines will lead to unemployment, not employment. Increases in unemployment will make the country susceptible to Communist penetration and ultimate control. This fear seems unjustified to those who are planning for the future of India. But they seem reasonable to anyone familiar with Western industrial history who remembers that it took much more than a century before the common man of Great Britain received any benefit at all from the industrial revolution.

These are dangers to India in the present situation. Having an interest in the freedom of the world, which includes the Continent of Asia, we have to consider certain things. Is there anything we can do to help in this situation? The first thing for us to do is completely to revise our attitude towards India and its people. We have, most importantly, to reject any attempt to compel that country to accept and follow our world leadership. To offer large measures of assistance in return for accepting our hegemony will result in complete failure of our purposes.

Again, we must remember the principle stated earlier that we must know what other people are thinking about, what their ideals are, what their prejudices are, and in the light of this knowledge, must see to it that we do not needlessly stir them up.

The most useful thing we can do in behalf of our endeavor to strengthen freedom is to direct our main efforts toward help in the fundamental requirements of the citizens of India, which are food, clothing, shelter, health, and education.

In saying that, I am not suggesting that we feed them, clothe them, shelter them, and teach them. I am suggesting that we apply our resources of experience and technical ability to assisting them in a cooperative effort to undertake these things for themselves.

If we offer assistance in these fundamentals, we will be engaged in a field of assistance where the Russians are not prepared to compete with us. There are, in addition, general policies in our assistance to underdeveloped countries which apply in India as elsewhere. To those I will refer in a subsequent talk.

Above all there should be a wide extension of personal contacts between the Western people and particularly those of our own country and the people of India. These personal contacts must be on the fundamental basis of the equality of human beings in the sight of God.

In making those contacts the Westerner meets many puzzling problems. One of them is what seems to us a limited view of the field of moral responsibilities. It seems to be no concern of the Indian that Communist imperialism is the greatest colonial empire-maker in the world today. So deeply engrained in the Indian consciousness is the problem of the color line that this new colonialism appears to him to be a matter of no concern so long as it is a tyranny of white people over white people. The dangers to people of all colors, races, creeds, and social institutions are not immediately apprehended since the color problem does not seem at the moment to be involved. The best contribution we can make to overcoming this curtain of misunderstanding between the East and the West is to revert to our own slow but continuous improvement in the relations between the white and colored people of our own country.

Mr. President, let it be said that India is politically our equal among the nations. It surpasses us in population. It is inferior to us in area and resources. But politically it is our equal. This we must recognize in word, in action, and in our inmost thoughts if we are to maintain such relations as well help to save Asia for freedom.

In the first of this series of talks our national interest was defined in these terms: It "lies in so directing our words and our acts that we may help to organize a world in which freedom, justice, and peace prevail, and which is the kind of a world we would bequeath to our children and grandchildren."

This is the national interest of India also. If we can speak and act with sufficient wisdom, we and they can work together in a common cause.

Mr. President, in closing, let me express my regret at the way in which the intended visit of Mr. Nehru with our President has been canceled. The date set for that visit was from the 7th to the 14th of July. It is understandable that the President's convalescence has made that date an inadvisable one. It is unfortunate that practically simultaneously it was announced that the President would fly to the Conference of Pan-American Presidents in Panama on the 21st. Taken alone this is an understandable decision. Inevitably, however, it will be compared in the eyes and minds of the world with the decision to postpone the visit with Mr. Nehru.

The Conference of Pan-American Presidents is exceedingly important. It cannot, however, rank in importance with the necessity for a face-to-face conversation between our President and Mr. Nehru on which the whole fate of a great continent might well depend. It is imperative, therefore, that negotiations for a later conference should be undertaken at once. That conference should not be deferred for months. Let the world have some indication, some assurance, that the significance of the opportunity is recognized by us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are no other Senators who desire to address the Senate at this time,

I shall move that the Senate stand adjourned until tomorrow, pursuant to the previous order entered.

First, I wish again to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we may have a very late session tomorrow evening. I should like the RECORD to show that fact, so that all Senators should cancel other engagements, because we expect to have votes on the pending measure.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to repeat the statement which was made earlier today by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Although there is quite a bit of classified material which could not be presented in the committee report on the pending bill—and I am sure Senators can well understand that fact—as the distinguished chairman of the committee has indicated, any Member of the Senate who desires to examine the confidential worksheets which the committee itself had before it in the consideration of the bill, may do so by contacting the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations in the committee room, which is located just below us in the Capitol. Any Senator who desires to examine the records may do so.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 27, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2512) to amend the act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving in such forces.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, June 28, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 27, 1956:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Smiley F. Buck, Altus, Ark., in place of C. C. Pitts, deceased.

Herschel A. Webb, Beebe, Ark., in place of Sarah Abington, retired.

William E. Place, Parkdale, Ark., in place of J. H. Nobles, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Willabelle F. Spafford, Midway City, Calif., in place of J. E. Mixer, resigned.

John W. Harding, Ukiah, Calif., in place of R. J. Cunningham, resigned.

Harry A. Smith, Williams, Calif., in place of M. N. Harlan, retired.

COLORADO

Edward H. Hargraves, Creede, Colo., in place of P. A. Lemke, removed.

Alvah L. Pearsall, Monte Vista, Colo., in place of J. D. Wilson, deceased.

CONNECTICUT

Joseph B. Raccone, Windsor Locks, Conn., in place of W. F. Rabbett, Jr., retired.

FLORIDA

Harry Beckner, Jr., Mango, Fla., in place of W. A. Lehmann, retired.

John R. Higgins, Samoset, Fla., in place of W. D. Thomas, retired.

GEORGIA

Reita A. Williamson, Flintstone, Ga., in place of C. E. Rogers, resigned.

Clara Jean S. Bentley, Palmetto, Ga., in place of E. B. Cotton, retired.

ILLINOIS

Raymond D. Manis, Ewing, Ill., in place of W. H. King, deceased.

Stanley J. Fisher, Macomb Ill., in place of T. L. Roark, retired.

IOWA

Merle M. Funk, Monona, Iowa, in place of G. J. Carroll, removed.

KANSAS

Calvin C. Matteson, Manchester, Kans., in place of J. C. Swigart, retired.

KENTUCKY

Francis E. Ryan, Verona, Ky., in place of Mayro Hayden, resigned.

LOUISIANA

John W. Lewis, Jr., Alexandria, La., in place of J. L. Treadway, retired.

MAINE

Harold K. Joy, South Berwick, Maine, in place of J. P. Davis, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

Cecil B. Wheeler, Jr., Berlin, Mass., in place of R. E. Taylor, deceased.

Walter Rinki, Lunenburg, Mass., in place of E. A. Brown, resigned.

MICHIGAN

Frederick M. Davenport, Constantine, Mich., in place of E. L. Wittenberg, transferred.

Clark E. Nogle, Plainwell, Mich., in place of S. J. Doster, retired.

MINNESOTA

Maurice A. Walline, Starbuck, Minn., in place of D. R. Wollan, transferred.

MISSISSIPPI

Marvin L. Lindsey, Nettleton, Miss., in place of J. C. Young, transferred.

MISSOURI

Eugene H. Terry, Exeter, Mo., in place of E. L. Smithson, retired.

DeRoy Frazee, Willow Springs, Mo., in place of J. W. Brown, Jr., resigned.

NEVADA

Virginia M. Rowe, Ruth, Nev., in place of I. W. Van Camp, deceased.

NEW JERSEY

Andree M. Schroeder, Lincoln Park, N. J., in place of F. W. Lyman, retired.

Leora M. Wanamaker, Mahwah, N. J., in place of W. D. Finch, retired.

Helen H. Stryker, Ringoes, N. J., in place of R. E. Berger, deceased.

NEW YORK

Donald J. Clark, Earlville, N. Y., in place of S. E. Morgan, resigned.

Walter R. Ulmer, Treadwell, N. Y., in place of L. M. Oliver, retired.

OHIO

John R. Mericle, Bremen, Ohio, in place of C. T. Zwickel, retired.

Sam Verlenich, Jr., Warren, Ohio, in place of R. E. Schryver, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Jack H. Justice, Maysville, Okla., in place of B. C. Sparks, transferred.

PENNSYLVANIA

Clark H. Freas, Falls, Pa., in place of B. M. Durland, retired.

Albert F. Hilliard, Horsham, Pa., in place of W. S. Knipe, resigned.

Claude B. Faust, Macungie, Pa., in place of F. B. Neumeyer, removed.

Earl G. Smith, Mont Clare, Pa., in place of C. R. Miller, deceased.

George Cassett, Somerset, Pa., in place of O. F. Sutliffe, removed.

Herbert E. Readdy, Yeagertown, Pa., in place of E. L. Middleswarth, retired.

PUERTO RICO

Pablo Pedraza, Barranquitas, P. R., in place of Ricardo Pagan, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Bennett C. Bedenbaugh, Prosperity, S. C., in place of J. M. Bedenbaugh, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Lyman L. Bich, Cavour, S. Dak., in place of Josephine Tompers, deceased.

George H. Pryde, Keystone, S. Dak., in place of J. L. Manion, retired.

TENNESSEE

Louis W. Oliver, Jr., Hendersonville, Tenn., in place of E. B. Weisiger, retired.

Molly L. Casteel, Mosheim, Tenn., in place of L. F. Robinette, resigned.

Carl A. Thompson, Pleasant Hill, Tenn., in place of L. C. Treadway, resigned.

Luther L. Martin, Silver Point, Tenn., in place of A. H. Gill, transferred.

VERMONT

Carlton O. Tarbox, Orleans, Vt., in place of C. E. Jenkins, retired.

James H. Watson, Taftsville, Vt., in place of H. O. Dietrich, retired.

VIRGINIA

Harland B. Little, Jr., Blacksburg, Va., in place of W. W. Argabrite, resigned.

James E. Brunner, Riner, Va., in place of G. J. Akers, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Arnold Grant Porterfield, Bluefield, W. Va., in place of M. S. Smith, resigned.

Charles Manning Smith, Charles Town, W. Va., in place of T. T. Perry, Jr., retired.

John Samuel Stewart, Hundred, W. Va., in place of A. F. Cole, retired.

WISCONSIN

Arthur J. Reeths, Marshfield, Wis., in place of T. F. McDonald, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 27, 1956:

POSTMASTER

ALASKA

Everett J. Wilde, College.
Margaret P. Bohrer, Nome.
June E. Hutchinson, Whittier.

ARIZONA

Ethel M. Green, Gila Bend.

CALIFORNIA

Clarence E. Farrin, Azusa.
William H. O'Neill, Rosamond.
Eugene P. Guenther, Shafter.
Ilah M. Odem, Silverado.

COLORADO

Minta E. Gerry, Rangely.

CONNECTICUT

Camillo Altieri, Jr., Bantam.
Frederick D. Parker, Clinton.

DELAWARE

Herbert C. Whitney, Magnolia.

GEORGIA

James M. Cox, Whigham.

IDAHO

Martha W. Cook, Tetonia.

INDIANA

Robert M. Brett, Shoals.

IOWA

Gerald J. Andersen, Gilmore City.
Donald G. Burt, Polk City.
Earl E. Cowden, Sidney.

KANSAS

Bernice F. Harvey, Lenexa.
Glen L. Jenkins, Reserve.
Clarence M. McClelland, Studley.

LOUISIANA

Lottie E. Viguerie, Charenton.

MAINE

Everett A. Beal, Ellsworth Falls.
Paul C. Shaver, Stockton Springs.

MARYLAND

Alfred C. Huffer, Jr., Boonsboro.
Arthur F. Hightman, Brunswick.
Edmund W. Rodgers, Glen Burnie.
Stanley S. Sentman, Port Deposit.

MASSACHUSETTS

Alfred E. Pineau, Westport Point.

MICHIGAN

Viberta M. Martin, Bancroft.
Frank R. Sweeney, Bay City.
Arthur J. Jackson, Benton Harbor.
Charles A. Fisher, Bergland.
Harriet H. Tuttle, Comstock.
Carl R. Sterner, Dryden.
DeRossa A. Essex, Essexville.
Donald H. Hutchins, Glenn.
Mary M. Schlichting, Haslett.
Robert W. Dullinger, Hubbard Lake.
Alfred J. Pini, Hubbell.
Mason Holmes, Idlewild.
Daniel G. Picot, Lexington.
Arthur G. Jenkins, Livonia.
Richard F. Minzey, McBain.
John P. Danielson, Michigamme.
Rolla B. Crandell, Northstar.
William L. Osborne, Prescott.
David L. Bellinger, Rosebush.
William F. Kunst, St. Clair Shores.
John E. Luttmann, Sturgis.
Alice L. Thompson, Trout Creek.
Burr D. Eveleth, Jr., Ubly.
Alice R. Cox, Willis.

MISSISSIPPI

Alva G. Edmondson, Edwards.
S. T. Gray, Jr., New Augusta.

MONTANA

Charles P. Rapos, Fallon.

NEBRASKA

Enoch D. Long, Chappell.
Robert B. Shaw, Guide Rock.
Gilbert R. Fletcher, Hoskins.
Gerald E. Brown, Kenesaw.
Joel A. Schleiger, Overton.
Elmer R. Henkel, Ralston.
Leland D. Dewitz, Wisner.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mary W. Britton, Westmoreland.

NEW JERSEY

Anita Grace King, Allenhurst.
Francis J. Kiernan, Glen Ridge.
Raymond F. Woolf, Kingston.
Ralph F. Barra, Lake Hiawatha.
Daniel M. McArdle, Passaic.

NORTH CAROLINA

Charles L. Alexander, Kings Mountain.
Robert A. Liles, Lilesville.
Ida R. Irvine, Tarheel.

NORTH DAKOTA

Harold N. Gauthier, Williston.

OKLAHOMA

Glenn M. Moore, Morris.
Winslow W. Campbell, Stonewall.

PENNSYLVANIA

Thomas R. Lostrick, Ernest.
Rachel S. Rodgers, Hokendauqua.
Irvin R. MacMullen, King of Prussia.
William H. Hunsinger, Lattimer Mines.
Dolores P. Mattichak, Lopez.
Violet F. Nelson, Minisink Hills.
Catherine M. Viola, Morgan.
Waldo L. Dyson, Sr., Pocono Pines.
Kenneth E. West, Spring House.
Paul E. Ness, Yoe.

TENNESSEE

Willie L. Newberry, Gleason.

TEXAS

Donald L. Morrison, Throckmorton.

VERMONT

Florence H. Tute, Newport Center.

VIRGINIA

Robert J. Bradshaw, Rice.
Ruth G. Walden, Saluda.

WISCONSIN

Helen J. Mayne, Browntown.
Wallace Gordon Yadon, Delavan.
Ralph A. Nelson, Superior.

WYOMING

I. Isabell Schwab, Hawk Springs.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate, June 27, 1956:

POSTMASTER

Narvol A. Randol to be postmaster at Cape Girardeau, in the State of Missouri.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, may the hours of this new day upon which we have entered be rich and radiant in the realization of Thy presence, Thy peace, and Thy power.

Grant that, as the stewards of time and of talents, we may seek, in faithful service, to bring to fulfillment and fruition every noble aspiration and longing which Thou hast planted within our souls.

We pray that when we are fearful for our safety and security and seem to be the victims of a conspiracy of evil circumstances, we may lay hold of those moral resources which will make us equal to the demands of any occasion.

Impart unto us a larger measure of the gifts of spiritual vision which will enable us to look beyond the present perils to Thy all-encompassing grace and goodness.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10986. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HILL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. FLANDERS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. STENNIS, the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. NEELY, and the Senator from South Dakota, Mr. CASE, to the National Memorial Stadium Commission, authorized by Public Law 523, 78th Congress.

FREE OR REDUCED RATE TRANSPORTATION TO MINISTERS OF RELIGION

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3149) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to permit air carriers to grant free or reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HARRIS, CARLYLE, MACK of Illinois, WOLVERTON, and HINSHAW.

NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 523, 78th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the National Memorial Stadium Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey; Mr. LANKFORD, of Maryland; and Mr. KEARNS, of Pennsylvania.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 10003) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2484)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10003) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and

other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,813,950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$32,515,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 7 and 16.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
EARL WILSON,
BENJ. F. JAMES,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN STENNIS,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
ALAN BIBLE,
J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
J. GLENN BEALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10003) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $1,813,950 to the water fund instead of $1,613,950 as proposed by the House and $1,963,950 as proposed by the Senate. The conference committee has reduced the amount contained in the Senate approved bill from $350,000 to $200,000 as a Federal contribution toward the construction of a fishway on the proposed Little Falls Dam. The conference committee strongly believes that a fishway should be constructed and urges the Corps of Engineers to make immediate provisions for the inclusion of this conservation feature on the dam. It is the opinion of the committee that any funds in excess of the Federal contribution of $200,000 to construct a fishway in accordance with United States Fish and Wildlife Service criteria should come from the District of Columbia water funds as previously authorized and appropriated.

OPERATING EXPENSES

Amendment No. 2—Department of General Administration: Appropriates $3,475,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,425,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 3—Regulatory agencies: Appropriates $1,058,440 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,053,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5—Public schools: Appropriate $32,515,750 instead of $32,130,800 as proposed by the House and $32,590,750 as proposed by the Senate; and delete language proposed by the Senate authorizing the transfer of $500,000 from the motor-vehicle parking fund to the general fund. The committee of conference is agreed that, in lieu of the $75,000 proposed by the Senate for a citywide school census, funds shall be made available for spot check censuses of schoolchildren in the budgeted amount of $3,256, and the public-school system is directed to furnish upon request of the Committees on Appropriations of the Congress such information as may be available from existing school records. The committee of conference, in deleting the Senate proposal to transfer funds from the motor-vehicle parking fund to the general fund, has taken cognizance of the Washington regional mass transportation survey presently being made. It has also noted the large balance of funds accumulating in the motor-vehicle parking fund and suggests that the Commissioners begin planning for the immediate and proper utilization of the funds in accordance with the objectives of the act creating the fund.

Amendment No. 6—Recreation Department: Appropriates $1,903,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,892,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7—Department of Public Health: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 8—Department of Public Health: Appropriates $25,503,400 as proposed by the Senate instead of $25,434,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9—Office of Surveyor: Appropriates $170,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $164,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10—Department of Licenses and Inspections: Appropriates $1,658,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,640,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 11 and 12—Department of Highways: Appropriate $6,535,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,485,000 as proposed by the House; and provide that of the sum appropriated $3,966,235 shall be derived from the highway fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,934,304 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13—Department of Vehicles and Traffic: Appropriates $1,303,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,291,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14—Department of Sanitary Engineer: Appropriates $10,896,200 as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,846,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15—National Guard: Appropriates $136,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of $128,500 as proposed by the House.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

Amendment No. 16—Public building construction: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 17—Public building construction: Provides $348,900 for purchase of equipment for new school buildings as proposed by the Senate instead of $270,400 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 18 and 19—Public building construction: Appropriate $6,221,700 as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,200,000 as proposed by the House; and provide that of the sum appropriated $3,160,700 shall not become available for expenditure until July 1, 1957, as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,960,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 20 and 21—Department of Highways: Appropriate $14,528,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $14,400,000 as proposed by the House; and provide that of the sum appropriated $14,128,000 shall be derived from the highway fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $14 million as proposed by the House.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 22: Deletes language proposed by the House limiting the expenditure of funds for allowances for privately owned automobiles used for the performance of official duties.

Amendment No. 23: Provides that the total expenditures for the payment of dues and expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations shall not exceed $25,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $20,000 as proposed by the House.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
EARL WILSON,
BENJAMIN F. JAMES,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 15, line 23, insert "not to exceed $1,200 for fire prevention and protective services rendered to Glenn Dale Hospital under conditions to be determined by the Commissioners."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 28, line 13, insert "new Health School for Crippled Children in the vicinity of 13th and Allison Streets NW."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2413)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11319) "making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 8, and 9.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 6, 7, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$131,225,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$455,949,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, and 18.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
JOHN J. RILEY,
JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JAMES C. MURRAY,
DON MAGNUSON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
T. MILLET HAND,
JOHN TABER.

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
LISTER HILL,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
EDWARD J. THYE,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
ROBERT S. KERR.

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate on the bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of the Secretary

Southwestern Power Administration

The conferees on the part of both Houses endorse the statements in the House report concerning applications of preference customers for power and concerning service to the N. W. Electric Power Cooperative. The conferees also direct that up to $290,000 be used for construction of transmission facilities to servce Bentonville, Ark., referred to in the Senate report. In addition the conferees direct that the Central Electric Cooperative's existing facilities for serving the Como Electric Distribution Cooperative and facilities for serving the Cuivre River Electric Cooperative, when built, be included in Central's lease operating contract with the Southwestern Power Administration. This is in keeping with the desire of the conferees that facilities constructed by the generating and transmitting cooperatives subsequent to the date of the basic lease contracts should be considered for inclusion in the contracts.

Bureau of Reclamation

General Investigations

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: Appropriate $5,680,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,270,000 as proposed by the House, and provide that of this amount $4,970,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,560,000 as proposed by the House.

Construction and Rehabilitation

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $131,225,500 instead of $125,900,000 as proposed by the House and $138,961,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that the funds appropriated under this item shall be allocated in the following manner:

Project or unit	Budget estimate	Conference allocation
Gila project, Arizona	$1,077,000	$1,077,000
Palo Verde diversion project, Arizona-California	3,702,000	3,702,000
Parker-Davis project, Arizona-California-Nevada	312,000	312,000
Boulder Canyon project, Arizona-Nevada	130,000	130,000
Boulder City municipal office, Nevada	20,000	20,000
Central Valley project, California	19,393,000	19,393,000
SantaMaria project, California	6,171,000	6,171,000
Solano project, California	12,200,000	12,200,000
Ventura project, California	250,000	2,250,000
Collbran project, Colorado	1,000,000	1,000,000
Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado	530,000	530,000
Michaud Flats project, Idaho	2,480,000	2,480,000
Minidoka project, North Side pumping division, Idaho	2,768,000	2,768,000
Palisades project, Idaho	5,787,000	5,787,000
Fort Peck project, Montana-North Dakota	118,000	118,000
Middle Rio Grande project, New Mexico	3,500,000	3,500,000
Washita Basin project, Oklahoma	500,000	500,000
Deschutes project, north unit, Oregon	1,035,000	1,035,000
Rogue River Basin, Talent division, Oregon	2,400,000	2,400,000
Savage Rapids Dam, fish protection facilities, Oregon	----------	208,000
Provo River project, Utah	659,000	659,000
Weber Basin project, Utah	10,066,000	10,066,000
Chief Joseph Dam project, Foster Creek division, Washington	1,500,000	1,500,000
Columbia Basin project, Washington	13,850,000	13,850,000
Yakima project, Kennewick division, Washington	1,288,000	1,288,000
Yakima project, Roza division, Washington	1,720,000	1,720,000
Eden project, Wyoming	869,000	869,000
Shoshone project, Wyoming	554,000	554,000
Drainage and minor construction program	984,000	984,000
Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects	3,305,000	3,530,000
MissouriRiver Basin project:		
Bostwick division, Nebraska-Kansas	4,690,000	4,690,000
Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska	3,151,000	3,151,000
Glendo unit, Wyoming	11,000,000	11,000,000
Hanover Bluff unit, Wyoming	600,000	600,000
Helena Valley unit, Montana	$2,500,000	$1,750,000
Kirwin unit, Kansas	2,055,000	2,055,000
Lower Marias unit, Montana	155,000	115,000
Owl Creek unit, Wyoming	1,397,000	1,397,000
Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota	55,000	55,000
Sargent unit, Nebraska	728,000	728,000
St. Francis unit, Colorado-Kansas	317,000	----------
Transmission division	8,255,000	2,755,000
Webster unit, Kansas	540,000	540,000
Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming	10,850,000	----------
Drainage and minor construction program	634,000	634,000
Missouri River Basin investigations	3,105,000	2,879,500
Other department agencies	2,700,000	2,700,000
Total Missouri River Basin	52,732,000	35,049,500
Reduction due to available unobligated balances	----------	−4,425,000
Total construction and rehabilitation	150,900,000	131,225,500

The conferees of both Houses are in agreement that no new contracts for construction of strictly irrigation features on any reclamation project shall be entered into where a repayment contract is required, until such repayment contract has been executed. The only exception to be made to this policy will be for those projects involving public domain lands. The agreement arrived at by the conferees on funds for the Colbran project and for Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects is with the understanding that this policy will be applied by the Department.

On the Helena Valley project, the conferees are in agreement that construction should not proceed until either a contract for municipal water supply or an additional contract with supplemental water users has been executed.

With respect to the Provo River project, Utah, the conferees of both Houses are in agreement that $300,000 of prior year funds shall be used for the diversions of water into the Provo River and Deer Creek Reservoir by the most practical method.

Investigations on the Oahe unit in the Missouri River Basin are to be completed within the total amount provided by the conferees for the Missouri River Basin investigation program.

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5: Reported in disagreement.

Operation and Maintenance

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $27,267,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $26,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Upper Colorado River Basin Fund

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $13,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8: Strikes out language as proposed by the Senate, providing that funds appropriated under the "Upper Colorado River Basin Fund" heading should be transferred to the heading "Construction and Rehabilitation, Bureau of Reclamation."

Administrative Provisions

Amendment No. 9: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate providing for the construction of recreational facilities at reclamation reservoirs on a nonreimbursable basis.

Amendments Nos. 10, 11, and 12: Reported in disagreement. With respect to amendment No. 11, which inserts Senate language

concerning power facilities on the Trinity division, Central Valley project, the conferees of both Houses are in agreement that the provision has only one purpose, which is to increase the authorized power development from that of 233,000 kilowatts contained in the authorizing act (Public Law 386, 83d Cong.) to not to exceed approximately 400,000 kilowatts. It is not the intent of the conferees to in any way affect the provisions of the authorizing act set out in the proviso in section 1, pertaining to the negotiations with a private utility in the area for the development of the power facilities of the project. With respect to funds appropriated in the bill for the Central Valley project, the schedule presented in the budget justifications shall not be considered as being amended by this provision.

TITLE III—CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Cemeterial Expenses

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $6,765,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Rivers and harbors and flood control

General Investigation

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $9,322,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $8,122,000 as proposed by the House.

Construction, General

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $455,949,500 instead of $422,034,000 as proposed by the House and $463,673,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that the funds provided herein are to be allocated as follows:

State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1957		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Alaska:				
Craig Harbor			$365,000	
Elfin Cove			173,000	
Gold Creek	$393,000		393,000	
Ketchikan Harbor	500,000		500,000	
Kodiak Harbor			500,000	
Pelican Harbor			362,000	
Sitka Harbor				$31,000
Alabama:				
Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia		$75,000		75,000
Fort Gains lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia	3,000,000		3,000,000	
Jackson lock and dam			750,000	
Mobile Harbor	2,543,000		2,543,000	
Paint Rock River				50,000
Warrior lock and dam	4,580,000		4,580,000	
Arizona:				
Painted Rock Reservoir	2,500,000		2,500,000	
Willow Ranch Reservoir		100,000		100,000
Arkansas:				
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma (emergency bank stabilization and channel rectification)	3,000,000		3,000,000	
Beaver Reservoir				250,000
Calion			400,000	
Dardanelle lock and dam			650,000	
De Gray Reservoir				20,000
Greer's Ferry Reservoir			750,000	
McKinney Bayou and Barkman Creek, Ark. and Tex				25,000
Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La		130,000		130,000
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La	500,000		575,000	
Table Rock Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Missouri.)				
Walnut Bayou				25,000
California:				
American River levees	400,000		450,000	
Black Butte Reservoir		125,000		125,000
Carbon Canyon Dam and Channel		59,000		59,000
Crescent City Harbor	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Devil, East Twin, Warm, and Lytle Creeks	1,150,000		1,150,000	
Half Moon Bay Harbor		53,000		53,000
Hogan Reservoir		293,000		293,000
Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors	485,000		485,000	
Los Angeles County drainage area	16,500,000		17,500,000	
Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Middle Creek		70,000		70,000
New Melones Reservoir		100,000		100,000
Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor	355,000		355,000	
Redondo Beach Harbor	1,500,000		1,750,000	
Removal of West Basin Bridge, Los Angeles	245,000		245,000	
Richmond Harbor	1,850,000		1,850,000	
Riverside	750,000		750,000	
Russian River Reservoir	2,150,000		2,150,000	
Sacramento River	3,000,000		3,000,000	
Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries (active units)	250,000		250,000	
Sacramento River deep water channel	2,200,000		2,200,000	
San Antonio and Chino Creeks	2,000,000		2,000,000	
San Joaquin River, Stockton deep water channel	450,000		450,000	
San Lorenzo Creek		164,000		164,000
San Lorenzo River	307,000		307,000	
Santa Clara River				50,000
Santa Maria River				50,000
Success Reservoir	2,490,000		2,490,000	
Terminus Reservoir	558,000		558,000	
Connecticut: Thomaston Reservoir	360,000		1,000,000	
Delaware:				
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea. (See New Jersey.)				
Inland Waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md.: Summit Bridge	1,000,000		1,000,000	
District of Columbia: Anacostia River, D. C. and Md	1,682,000		1,682,000	
Florida:				
Apalachicola Bay:				
(a) Channel across St. George Island	$313,000		$313,000	
(b) 6-foot channel at Eastpoint and 9-foot channel and turning basin at Scipio Creek			45,000	
Appalachicola River channel improvement	445,000		445,000	
Central and southern Florida	8,750,000		8,750,000	
Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami	200,000		200,000	
Jim Woodruff lock and dam, Florida and Georgia	1,197,000		1,197,000	
St. Augustine Harbor	500,000		500,000	
St. Petersburg Harbor	22,000		22,000	
Tampa Harbor: 30-, 34-, and 36-foot harbor channels	2,500,000		4,000,000	
Georgia:				
Buford Dam	4,553,000		4,553,000	
Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)				
Fort Gaines lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)				
Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S. C	10,000,000		10,000,000	
Jim Woodruff lock and dam, Florida and Georgia. (See Florida.)				
Savannah Harbor	415,000		415,000	
Savannah River below Augusta		$40,000		$40,000
Hawaii:				
Kawaihae Harbor			1,700,000	
Nawiliwili Harbor	570,000		570,000	
Idaho: Columbia River, local protection (justification reports)				102,000
Illinois:				
Alton		60,000		60,000
Beardstown	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Campbell's Island		40,000		40,000
Carlyle Reservoir		125,000		205,000
Clear Creek Drainage and Levee District	700,000		700,000	
East St. Louis and vicinity	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Hunt Drainage District and Lima Lake Drainage District				75,000
Illinois Waterway: Calumet-Sag Channel, part I	8,500,000		8,500,000	
Little Calumet River, Ill. and Ind		24,000		24,000
Mississippi River, between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn. (exclusive of St. Anthony Falls, Minn., and lock 19 at Keokuk, Iowa), Ill., Iowa, and Mo.: Rectification of damages	60,000		60,000	
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.: Regulating works			200,000	
New Harmony Bridge, Ill. and Ind			332,000	
Wabash Railroad bridges at Meredosia and Valley City	500,000		500,000	
Wilson and Wenkel and Prairie du Pont Drainage and Levee District	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Wood River Drainage and Levee District	1,300,000		1,300,000	
Indiana:				
Evansville				50,000
Little Calumet River, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)				
Mansfield Reservoir	500,000		500,000	
Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio	5,000,000		5,000,000	
New Harmony Bridge, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)				
Vincennes	100,000		100,000	
Iowa:				
Coralville Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Little Sioux River	2,000,000		2,250,000	
Lock No. 19 at Keokuk	1,400,000		1,400,000	
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri	1,700,000		2,850,000	
Missouri River:				
Kansas City to Omaha	3,300,000		3,300,000	
Omaha to Sioux City	5,400,000		6,500,000	

State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1957		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Iowa—Continued				
Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Miners Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa. (See Nebraska.)				
Muscatine	$300,000		$300,000	
Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine-Louisa County Drainage District No. 13		$75,000		$75,000
Rathbun Reservoir		50,000		50,000
Red Rock Reservoir				100,000
Sabula	284,000		284,000	
Upper Iowa River	500,000		500,000	
Kansas:				
Abilene	200,000		200,000	
Council Grove Reservoir				150,000
Elk City Reservoir				75,000
Kansas City, Kans. and Mo	1,000,000		800,000	
Manhattan		40,000		40,000
Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Iowa, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
Ottawa		80,000		80,000
Pomona Reservoir		60,000		85,000
Salina	400,000		400,000	
Strawn Reservoir		50,000		50,000
Topeka	400,000		400,000	
Toronto Reservoir	4,500,000		4,500,000	
Tuttle Creek	9,000,000		9,000,000	
Wichita and Valley Center	1,163,000		1,163,000	
Kentucky:				
Barbourville	765,000		765,000	
Buckhorn Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Catlettsburg	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Greenup locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio	9,900,000		9,900,000	
Lock and dam 41		150,000	750,000	150,000
Barkley Dam (Lower Cumberland lock and dam), Kentucky and Tennessee		200,000	1,100,000	
Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Indiana.)				
New Richmond lock and dams, Kentucky and Ohio		50,000		125,000
Nolin Reservoir		50,000		100,000
Rough River Reservoir and channels	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Louisiana:				
Amite River and tributaries		50,000	337,500	
Bayou Segnette Waterway			435,000	
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (New Orleans District):				
(a) Plaquemine-Morgan City alternate route	4,500,000		4,500,000	
(b) Franklin Canal	35,000		35,000	
Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to Gulf of Mexico				260,000
Mississippi River, gulf outlet				325,000
Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)				
Overton-Red River Waterway		300,000		150,000
Red River levees below Denison Dam. (See Arkansas.)				
Maine:				
Portsmouth Harbor, N. H., and Piscataqua River, Maine and N. H. (See New Hampshire.)				
Rockland Harbor			810,000	
Scarboro River	205,000		205,000	
Maryland:				
Anacostia River, D. C. and Md. (See District of Columbia.)				
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va	3,400,000		3,400,000	
Inland Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (See Delaware.)				
Massachusetts:				
Adams	1,576,000		1,576,000	
Barre Falls Reservoir	1,150,000		1,150,000	
Boston Harbor, extension to 40-foot anchorage			1,000,000	
Buffumville Reservoir	1,200,000		1,200,000	
Cape Cod Canal			157,000	
Chatham (stage harbor)			167,000	
East Brimfield Reservoir	340,000		840,000	
Fall River Harbor	500,000		500,000	
Hodges Village Reservoir	360,000		360,000	
Mystic River, 35-foot project	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Nantucket Harbor of Refuge			162,000	
Newburyport Harbor			143,000	
North Adams	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Revere Beach	75,000		75,000	
Town River	302,000		302,000	
West Hill Reservoir				100,000
Weymouth Fore River	500,000		500,000	
Worcester	840,000		840,000	
Michigan:				
Au Sable Harbor				10,000
Battle Creek	500,000		500,000	
Black River Harbor, Gogebic County	156,000		156,000	
Cheboygan River and Harbor			$110,000	
Great Lakes connecting channels	$4,000,000		5,000,000	
Harrisville Harbor			260,000	
Holland Harbor	160,000		285,000	
Houghton-Hancock Bridge	500,000		500,000	
Port Austin Harbor	200,000		200,000	
Saginaw River		$50,000		$50,000
Whitefish Point Harbor			100,000	
Minnesota: Red River of the North, S. Dak., N. Dak., and Minn	225,000		325,000	
Missouri:				
Bear Creek Reservoir		60,000		60,000
Canton	275,000		275,000	
Cape Girardeau (Reach No. 2 only)	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Fabius River Drainage District				75,000
Kansas City, Kans. and Mo. (See Kansas.)				
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.)				
Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth	2,000,000		3,000,000	
Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City. (See Iowa.)				
Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts 1, 2, and 3	800,000		800,000	
Pomme de Terre Reservoir	500,000		800,000	
St. Louis		551,000		551,000
Table Rock Reservoir, Mo. and Ark	14,750,000		14,750,000	
Montana:				
Billings			200,000	
Fort Peck Dam: Second powerplant	500,000		500,000	
Nebraska:				
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Miners Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebr., and S. Dak	1,100,000		1,400,000	
Norfolk		35,000		35,000
Waterloo		6,000		6,000
Nevada:				
Mathews Canyon Reservoir	250,000		250,000	
Pine Canyon Reservoir			200,000	
New Hampshire:				
Hopkinton-Everett Reservoir		50,000		50,000
Otter Brook Reservoir	1,250,000		1,250,000	
Portsmouth Harbor, N. H., and Piscataqua River, Maine and N. H	775,000		775,000	
New Jersey:				
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey: Marcus Hook and Mantua Creek anchorages, New Jersey and Pennsylvania	1,060,000		1,060,000	
Delaware River, Philadelphia to Trenton: Interim 35-foot project	6,000,000		6,000,000	
New York and New Jersey channels	3,500,000		4,000,000	
Staten Island Rapid Transit Bridge, New York and New Jersey. (See New York.)				
New Mexico:				
Albuquerque		170,000		170,000
Artesia		25,000		25,000
Chamita Reservoir (Abiquiu)	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Los Esteros-Alamagordo Reservoirs		50,000		50,000
Two Rivers Reservoir		100,000		100,000
New York:				
Allegheny River Reservoir, N. Y. and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.)				
Barcelona Harbor	250,000		250,000	
Black Rock and Tonawanda Harbor (deepen channel to 21 ft.)				6,000
Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal	1,030,000		1,030,000	
Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway: 13-foot depth through locks	275,000		275,000	
Jones Inlet	1,470,000		1,470,000	
New York and New Jersey Channels. (See New Jersey.)				
Oswego Harbor: Detached breakwaters	500,000		500,000	
Staten Island Rapid Transit Bridge, New York and New Jersey	1,800,000		1,800,0000	
Wellsville	450,000		450,000	
North Carolina:				
Far Creek			179,000	
Manteo Bay			570,000	
Wilkesboro Reservoir		25,000		25,000
Wilmington Harbor	1,543,000		1,543,000	

State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1957		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
North Dakota:				
Garrison Reservoir	$11,300,000		$16,000,000	
Lower Heart River		$60,000		$60,000
Marmarth	217,000		217,000	
Red River o. the North, N. Dak., S. Dak., and Minn. (See Minnesota.)				
Ohio:				
Ashtabula Harbor: East outer harbor	1,800,000		1,800,000	
Cleveland Harbor: Bridge replacements and channel improvements	1,700,000		1,700,000	
Dillon Reservoir			1,500,000	
Greenup lock and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)				
Markland lock and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Indiana.)				
Muskingum River Reservoirs	425,000		425,000	
New Cumberland lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	8,000,000		8,000,000	
New Richmond lock and dams, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)				
Toledo Harbor (removal of center dike)			380,000	
Oklahoma:				
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)				
Denison Reservoir, Texas and Oklahoma. (See Texas.)				
Eufaula Reservoir			1,250,000	
Keystone Reservoir			1,500,000	
Oklahoma City Floodway	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Oologah Reservoir	4,000,000		4,000,000	
Oregon:				
Amazon Creek	100,000		100,000	
Cheteo River			225,000	
Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington	1,300,000		1,300,000	
Columbia River between Chinook and Head of Sand Island, Oreg. and Wash		13,000		13,000
Coos Bay	300,000		300,000	
Cougar Reservoir	1,500,000		1,650,000	
Green Peter Reservoir		100,000		200,000
Hills Creek Reservoir	2,000,000		2,125,000	
Holley Reservoir				100,000
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington		500,000		1,450,000
Johnson Creek	150,000		150,000	
Lower Columbia River improvements to existing works:				
(a) Beaver Drainage District				13,000
(e) John Drainage District				7,000
(g) Midland Drainage District				8,000
(h) Multnomah County Drainage District No. 1				8,000
(i) Peninsula Drainage District No. 1				59,000
(j) Peninsula Drainage District No. 2				59,000
(k) Rainier Drainage District				34,000
(l) Sauvie Island Drainage District				38,000
McNary lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	4,500,000		2,828,000	
Pendleton		25,000		25,000
The Dalles Dam, Oreg. and Wash	42,457,000		42,457,000	
Skipanon Channel			185,000	
Tillamook Bay and Bar (Bay Ocean Peninsula)	1,300,000		1,300,000	
Willamette River, bank protection	300,000		300,000	
Pennsylvania:				
Allegheny River Reservoir, N. Y. and Pa		384,000		384,000
Allentown		70,000		70,000
Bear Creek Reservoir	2,250,000		2,250,000	
Bethlehem		90,000		90,000
Bradford	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea. (See New Jersey.)				
Delaware River, Philadelphia to Trenton. (See New Jersey.)				
Dyberry Reservoir	600,000		600,000	
Kettle Creek Reservoir		95,000		95,000
Presque Isle Peninsula	380,000		380,000	
Prompton Reservoir	550,000		550,000	
Reynoldsville	578,000		578,000	
Stillwater Reservoir	600,000		600,000	
Swoyersville-Forty Fort	625,000		625,000	
Rhode Island:				
Bullocks Point Cove			174,000	
Sand Hill Cove Beach			40,000	
Sakonnet Harbor			600,000	
Woonsocket	600,000		1,000,000	
South Carolina:				
Channel Port Royal Sound to Beaufort	401,000		401,000	
South Carolina—Continued				
Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S. C. (See Georgia.)				
South Dakota:				
Big Bend Reservoir				$150,000
Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Miners Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebr., and S. Dak. (See Nebraska.)				
Oahe Reservoir	$27,500,000		$27,500,000	
Red River of the North, N. Dak., S. Dak., and Minn. (See Minnesota.)				
Sioux Falls	800,000		800,000	
Tennessee:				
Cheatham lock and dam	2,900,000		2,900,000	
Lake City		$50,000		50,000
Barkley Dam (Lower Cumberland lock and dam), Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.)				
Memphis, Wolf River and Nonconnah Creek	600,000		600,000	
Old Hickory lock and dam	2,250,000		2,250,000	
Texas:				
Brazos Island Harbor	400,000		400,000	
Buffalo Bayou	6,900,000		6,900,000	
Canyon Reservoir	1,600,000		1,600,000	
Cooper Reservoir and channels				125,000
Corpus Christi Bridge	500,000		500,000	
Dallas Floodway	2,600,000		2,600,000	
Denison Reservoir (Lake Texoma), Tex. and Okla.:				
(a) Recreational facilities			250,000	
(b) Highway Bridge at Willis Site			800,000	
Ferrell's Bridge Reservoir	4,300,000		4,300,000	
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway:				
(a) Channel in Colorado River (Bay City)				20,000
(b) Guadalupe River channel to Victoria	110,000		110,000	
(c) Realinement vicinity of Aransas Pass		31,000		31,000
Houston ship channel: 36-foot project	730,000		730,000	
Kenedy		36,000		36,000
McGee Bend Dam	4,000,000		4,000,000	
McKinney Bayou and Barkman Creek, Ark. and Tex. (See Arkansas.)				
Navarro Mills Reservoir		60,000		60,000
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway:				
34-foot Tule Lake Channel extension	319,000		319,000	
36-foot channel	330,000		330,000	
Channel to LaQuinta			500,000	
Proctor Reservoir				75,000
Red River levees below Denison Dam. (See Arkansas.)				
Sabine-Neches Waterway	695,000		695,000	
San Antonio	800,000		800,000	
Texarkansas Reservoir	1,226,000		1,226,000	
Waco Reservoir		100,000		200,000
Utah: Salt Lake City				53,000
Vermont:				
Ball Mountain Reservoir	2,300,000		2,300,000	
East Barre Reservoir (modification)	800,000		800,000	
North Hartland Reservoir		300,000		300,000
North Springfield Reservoir	500,000		500,000	
Rutland		100,000		100,000
Townshend Reservoir	420,000		620,000	
Waterbury local protection		100,000		
Waterbury Reservoir (modification)	808,000		808,000	
Wrightsville Reservoir (modification)	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Virginia:				
Norfolk Harbor: Craney Island disposal area	1,784,000		1,784,000	
Norfolk and Portsmouth Belt Line RR. bridge	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Thimble Shoal Channel	820,000		820,000	
Waterway coast of Virginia, Chesapeake Bay to Chincoteague Bay			300,000	
Virgin Islands:				
Christiansted Harbor				2,000
St. Thomas Harbor				2,000
Washington:				
Bellingham Harbor	400,000		400,000	
Blaine Harbor			116,000	
Chief Joseph Dam	9,500,000		9,500,000	
Columbia River at Baker Bay			70,000	
Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
Columbia River between Chinook and Head of Sand Island, Oreg. and Wash. (See Oregon.)				
Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg.—27-ft. channel. (See Oregon.)				

State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1957		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Washington—Continued				
Eagle Gorge Reservoir	$6,300,000		$6,300,000	
Everett Harbor and Snohomish River			120,000	
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River			61,000	
Ice Harbor lock and dam	5,000,000		8,000,000	
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
Lower Columbia River levees at new locations: Washougal area		$17,000		$17,000
McNary lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
Quillayute River			444,000	
Shilshole Bay	300,000		400,000	
Stillaguamish River				5,000
The Dalles Dam, Oreg. and Wash. (See Oregon.)				
Willapa River and Harbor and Naselle River			130,000	
West Virginia:				
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va. (See Maryland.)				
Hildebrand lock and dam	2,000,000		2,750,000	
New Cumberland lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
Summersville Reservoir		100,000		100,000
Sutton Reservoir	4,500,000		4,500,000	
Wisconsin:				
Milwaukee Harbor: River channels	$130,000		$130,000	
Prairie du Chien Harbor		$14,000		$14,000
Wyoming:				
Jackson Hole	400,000		400,000	
Sheridan		25,000		25,000
Local protection projects not requiring specific legislation	1,000,000		1,250,000	
Emergency bank protection	400,000		400,000	
Snagging and clearing	500,000		600,000	
Projects deferred for restudy		90,000		90,000
Small authorized projects	2,000,000		2,500,000	
Total	415,192,000	6,095,000	454,987,500	9,562,000
Lower Columbia River fish-sanctuary program (Fish and Wildlife Service)	1,400,000		1,400,000	
Program total, construction, general	416,592,000	6,095,000	456,387,500	9,562,000
Reduction based on unobligated balances			−10,000,000	
Grand total, construction, general	416,592,000 (422,687,000)	6,095,000	446,387,500 (455,949,500)	9,562,000

San Diego River and Mission Bay, Calif.: In view of the emergency conditions created by previous dredging work on this project, the conferees of both Houses are in agreement that the emergency work on the Federal portion of the project be accomplished in fiscal year 1957, using available prior year funds, to permit local interests to proceed with their portion of the work as soon as possible.

Central and Southern Florida: A total of $750,000 of the funds provided for this project are to be applied to repayment of advances made by local interests.

Missouri River, Omaha to Sioux City: As indicated in the House report, $250,000 of the funds provided for this project are to be used for bank stabilization work in Reach 4, Upper Little Sioux-Upper Blair.

Overton-Red River Waterway: The conferees are in agreement that the funds provided for this project should be used for study purposes only and that the action of the conferees in providing such funds does not imply commitment for construction of the project.

McNary lock and dam, Oregon and Washington: None of the funds provided for this project are to be used for the repayment of loans advanced in prior fiscal years. In view of the substantial unobligated prior year balances available to the corps and the authority which has been granted for the transfer of funds between projects on a permanent basis, the conferees are in agreement that there is no longer need to repay loans previously advanced to this project.

Amendments Nos. 16, 17, and 18: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 19: Provides that $2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate be allocated for small authorized projects instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20: Strikes out House language prohibiting use of funds for planning and construction of the Wilkesboro Reservoir, N. C.

Operation and Maintenance, General

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $95,900,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $85,900,000 as proposed by the House.

General Expenses

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $10,400,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,075,000 as proposed by the House.

Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $62,791,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $56,030,000 as proposed by the House.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
JOHN J. RILEY,
JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JAMES C. MURRAY,
DON MAGNUSON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
T. MILLET HAND,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the budget estimates for the items covered by the bill total $818,501,000. As the bill passed the House, it carried appropriations totaling $790,758,000, which is $27,743,000 below the budget estimates. The Senate bill totaled $871,886,000, which is $53,385,000 more than the estimates and $81,128,000 more than the House bill. We were able in conference to obtain a figure of $856,727,000 which is $15,159,000 less than the total in the Senate bill.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I desire to ask for clarification of the language which appears in the statement in connection with the execution of new contracts for construction of strictly irrigation features on reclamation projects, the statement of the conferees being that no new construction contracts shall be entered into. Will the gentleman elaborate that statement with reference to projects now under construction and where multiple contracts are involved?

Mr. CANNON. With respect to the language on page 4 in the managers' statement restricting construction until repayment contracts are executed it is the intent of the conferees:

First, that a new construction contract shall not be executed on either a going project or a new start where only irrigation features are involved unless the specific construction work involved is covered by a repayment contract, if such a contract is required.

Second, where a project is already under construction and it involves more than one repayment contract, construction may be started on each separate element when a repayment contract for that particular element is executed.

Third, construction contracts now in effect shall not be discontinued.

I trust that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, there are some things that I feel bound to call attention to in connection with this bill. Perhaps, the House could not have done any better than it did because there were so many amendments submitted here on the floor and so many amendments added in the other body.

The total amount of going work on the first of July next will be $2,736,000,000. The total amount in this bill is $856,727,000, quite a large amount above what we have provided in previous days. The total number of projects making up that $2,736,000,000 is 142.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DIES. Is the $2 billion the total cost of the projects?

Mr. TABER. Of those that will be going before this bill starts. After the bill starts, there will be a total of $2 billion more of projects, and with the $856 million, that makes a total of $4,736,000,000 of projects hanging out, and that is 5 years' work for the engineers with the amount of money that was carried this year.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is this the bill about which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] made the statement that they should make the bill as bad as they could? Is this the one?

Mr. TABER. I did not hear him make that statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is in the RECORD. But, I do not know whether it applies to this bill or some other bill.

Mr. TABER. I could not say. I did not hear it.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I understood, and I read the speech of the gentleman from Missouri, he said that they wanted to make it so bad that the country would revolt.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, they wanted to increase it. I understood that was the one.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to insert in the RECORD the breakdown of the new starts. There were 94 which were recommended in the budget totaling $486,600,000. There were 16 added by the House totaling $477 million. In addition, as the result of that addition and the Arkansas River proposition, there will be $700 million. There was added by the other body 36 new projects with a total cost of $311,600,000. The overall costs and the overall number of projects will be as follows:

Two hundred and eighty-eight projects hanging with an overall cost of $4,711,500,000.

I feel that I should call the attention of the Congress to this situation because we cannot go along continuing to pile up projects that are to be built and which are going to cost a tremendous amount of money and yet have the Nation land right side up.

The merits of some of these projects I know are quite questionable. Many are put up by the engineers that way. In addition to that, the estimates of the engineers are almost never as high as the actual cost of the project before you get through with it. I do not want to be in the position of saying that we should not have what we need for some meritorious flood-control project.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. TABER. On the other hand, I do feel that we must be more particular about these projects which are not sound and which are of a character that are just peddling money out of the Treasury. I am going to put this table in the RECORD because I think it will be a little easier for the membership to see what has been done.

I ask unanimous consent that I may include this table, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(The table is as follows:)

Corps of Engineers, Civil—Construction program

[In millions]

	Number	Amount required to complete
(1) Going work June 30, 1956	142	$2,736.1
(2) New starts in 1957:		
(a) Recommended by President	94	486.6
(b) Added by House	16	477.2
(c) Added by Senate	36	311.6
Subtotal	146	[1] 1,275.4
Total	288	4,011.5
Add cost of Arkansas project	------	700.0
Total	------	4,711.5

[1] Does not include over $700 million to complete additional authorized Arkansas River Basin comprehensive navigation projects, to which Dardanelle, Keystone, and Eufaula commit the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman was present the other day before the Committee on Government Operations, and made a statement there as to our spending. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] was also present and made a statement. Did he not at that time say in substance that unless we stopped our spending the country was going to be financially ruined?

Mr. TABER. I think he did. I do not think he has ever hesitated to say that, and I think I should say to the gentleman that I share his fears along that line.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But there is this difference, is there not? The gentleman from Missouri has voted for these bills and managed some of them on this floor; some of the appropriation bills of which he has been complaining before our committee. If the gentleman will permit me, I will put both of those statements in the RECORD at this point. I will put in the RECORD a transcript of that testimony.

Mr. TABER. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I understood the gentleman to say that experience shows that frequently the estimates made by the Corps of Engineers concerning the costs of some of these projects proved to be on the low side.

Mr. TABER. That has been the case too often.

Mr. JONAS. In that connection we held some hearings last fall on power policies, and in connection with those hearings the committee on which I served received some testimony indicating that a number of multiple-purpose dams constructed in the Southwest turned out to require the expenditure of 50 to 55 percent more than originally estimated.

Mr. TABER. I would not confine it to the Southwest. From my experience, it has been general.

Mr. JONAS. I did not mean to confine it to one section. That was the only section to which the testimony applied. I just wondered if the gentleman from New York was aware of that. I am sure he is.

Mr. TABER. Oh, yes.

Mr. JONAS. When we consider estimates of $4 billion, we might well assume that before those projects are completed they might cost several billion dollars more?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. I would like to say to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] that we should not confine our criticism to the Corps of Engineers. We should criticize the Bureau of Reclamation which perhaps was the responsible party in the project of which you spoke. The record shows that the estimates have been rather on the low side more so in regard to the Bureau of Reclamation than the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. JONAS. I did not intend to criticize anybody. I am merely bringing to the attention of the House the fact that those low estimates have been made, and when we get through with the project it costs a great deal more than was estimated.

Mr. BOLAND. I understand that but I wanted to get the record straight.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Appropriations Committee, I was one of the conferees in the matter that is now before the House. I am not in complete agreement with this report, and I do share the concern of the distinguished chairman [Mr. CANNON] and the ranking minority member [Mr. TABER] of the Appropriations Committee over the manner in which this Congress goes merrily on its way appropriating moneys for projects that have little economic justification. I find this to be particularly so with regard to some of the navigation projects. These projects are paid for by all of the people of the Nation and there is no return to the Treasury by any of the water users. I have no problem with the main rivers of the Nation. But when we start to move in on some of the smaller tributaries and in localities where there is sufficient transportation via railroads and highways, we ought to take a good look at these particular projects. In my judgment, they are wasteful, uneconomical and serve no good purpose. May I add that it is disappointing to me as it must be to other members of this committee to have many weeks of testimony in our hearings worked into what we thought was a good committee job, treated with so little regard on the other side of the Capitol. It appears that the Senate bill was loaded for compromise.

FLOOD CONTROL IN NEW ENGLAND

Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the conference report by the House today will greatly accelerate completion of the program designed to give adequate flood protection to the Connecticut River Basin, where millions of dollars in damages were inflicted by the disastrous floods of last August.

Under this measure, $17,794,000 will be spent on flood-control projects, in addition to the $28,329,000 urgent deficiency appropriation earlier in the year. I know that the people of New England are grateful for what this Congress has done for them so that they will have a measure of protection against floods in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have printed in the RECORD the following recent editorial in the Springfield (Mass.) Union concerning flood control:

FLOOD CONTROL

The Senate Appropriations Committee has voted to go along with substantially the same flood-control budget for New England that the House of Representatives approved. The program now goes before the full Senate and it is not expected that the upper Chamber will alter the recommendations of the committee, but will vote for them as they stand.

This is one of the best pieces of news for the New England region that has come out of the current session of Congress. What it boils down to is that Army Engineers will get more than $600 million to plan and build flood control, navigation, and power projects in the year starting July 1. The program that will be carried out according to present plans places almost total emphasis on flood control in the New England area, thus eliminating most of the political controversy surrounding construction for power generation.

With the anticipated Senate approval, Congress will have met the two main requirements for the program on which New England has insisted since the disastrous hurricanes and floods of last summer and fall—adequate funds and prompt application. The appropriations involved will not solve our entire flood problem, but they will pay for a tremendously important major start on solving it by key construction at the points of greatest potential danger. The need for such construction is as immediate as tomorrow's weather, and the relatively fast action Congress reflects recognition of that fact. The sooner flood control is started, the sooner it will be completed and the sooner New England will have the urgently needed measure of security that it affords.

People in the Connecticut Valley and other affected areas are happy that the program will soon be underway in all likelihood. Their Representatives and Senators are to be commended for their excellent work in seeing the legislation through. They did an outstanding job.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I asked the gentleman to yield for the purpose of inquiring about the amount the conference agreed to with reference to the general investigations.

Mr. CANNON. It is included in the statement which has just been read. It is of course in the conference report. The final draft appropriates $9,322,000 proposed by the Senate instead of the $8,120,000 plus proposed by the House.

Mr. HARRIS. That is the total amount the Senate included?

Mr. CANNON. The full amount of the Senate increase.

Mr. HARRIS. I assume that the record that was made in the Senate with reference to the utilization of these funds stands in the conference report.

Mr. CANNON. The conference report is final.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, in making this increase in the allowance for survey by the Corps of Engineers, there is provision for a number of surveys on which testimony has been presented. In this connection, a situation has developed concerning the authorized navigation project on the Ouachita River in Arkansas that should be reviewed and for which there is approved the necessary review resolution. The cost of this review survey is estimated to be $10,000 and it is expected that the Corps of Engineers will initiate this survey to determine the advisability of relocating lock and dam No. 8 near Calion, Ark., with the funds provided for general investigation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first Senate amendment in disagreement.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider en bloc the amendments reported in technical disagreement, Senate amendments numbered 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, and 18.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 6, line 24, insert ": *Provided further*, That not to exceed $233,800 shall be available for the emergency protection of medicinal waters of Soap Lake, Wash., from irrigation operations of the Columbia Basin project, which amount beyond the ability of the water users to repay shall be repayable from surplus power revenues of Grand Coulee Dam."

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 7, line 5, insert ": *Provided further*, That not to exceed $520,000 shall be available toward emergency rehabilitation of the works of the Hayden Lake unit, Rathdrum Prairie project, Idaho, to be repaid in full under conditions satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior."

Senate amendment No. 10: Page 13, line 6, insert "Sums which have heretofore been expended for construction purposes on the Boulder Canyon project from operation and maintenance appropriations and revenue receipts shall be considered as having been advanced to the Colorado River dam fund and repaid to the Secretary of the Treasury as of May 31 of the same operating year."

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 13, line 12, insert "Funds made available herein and hereafter to the Trinity division, Central Valley project, shall be available for the design and construction of power and hydraulic facilities totaling not to exceed approximately 400,000 kilowatts."

Senate amendment No. 12: Page 13, line 17, insert "All funds expended for construction, operation, and maintenance of the 2,000-second-foot Wahluke siphon, Columbia Basin project, shall be reimbursable, but repayment of those parts thereof and of other expenditures for said project which the Secretary finds properly allocable to irrigable lands located on the Wahluke slope shall be deferred until they are no longer needed in connection with operations of the Atomic Energy Commission and have been irrigated."

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 17, line 24, insert "*Provided further*, That in view of the physical conditions that developed during construction which increased the cost of land acquisition beyond the legal authority of the city of Grand Forks to provide, the Chief of Engineers is authorized to expend for land acquisition not to exceed the sum of $100,000 of the amount herein appropriated for the Grand Forks unit of the Red River of the North project."

Senate amendment No. 17: Page 18, line 6, insert ": *Provided further*, That in lieu of protecting the Lewis and Clark Irrigation District, the sum of $1,935,000 of the funds herein or hereafter appropriated for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River shall be available for the purchase of lands and improvements in the Lewis and Clark Irrigation District, and the sum of $1,196,000 shall be available for the relocation of highways and utilities therein. The substitution of land acquisition for the protection shall be made and the Secretary of the Army shall acquire such land and improvements if all of the landowners, on or before June 30, 1957, have offered to sell their property on terms agreeable to said landowners, and within the amount provided herein for such land acquisition."

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 19, line 19, insert ": *Provided further*, That in lieu of protecting the east bottom of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, the sum of $1,341,891 of the funds herein or hereafter appropriated for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River shall be available for the purchase of lands and improvements in and contiguous to the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, and not to exceed $2 million shall be available to the Corps of Engineers for protection of the intake structure of the pumping plant in zero bottom and for the construction of bank protection to prevent erosion in the Missouri River adjacent to the Buford-Trenton irrigation project. The substitution of land acquisition for protection shall be made and the Secretary of the Army shall acquire such land and improvements if all of the landowners, except the heirs of Louis Morin, Jr., on or before June 30, 1957, have offered to sell their property on the terms agreeable to said landowners, and within the amount provided for such land acquisition: *Provided*, That the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, is authorized to acquire by condemnation proceedings, in the appropriate United States district court, the public-domain allotment of Louis Morin, Jr., now deceased, described as the west half southwest quarter, section 16, and the north half southeast quarter, section 17, township 153 north, range 102 west, fifth principal meridian, North Dakota, in connection with the construction and operation of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir: *Provided further*, That in the event land acquisition is undertaken in lieu of protection of the east bottom, that

in recognition of the increased per acre annual operation and maintenance cost of the remaining lands in the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, the construction charge obligation assignable to the remaining lands of said district pursuant to the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), as amended, and the proposed contract between the United States and Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, approved as to form February 23, 1955, shall be nonreimbursable, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to enter into a contract with the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District to transfer operation and maintenance responsibility for project works constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation for the benefit of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District to such district: *Provided further*, That not to exceed."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, these are merely technical disagreements. I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendments Nos. 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, and 18 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

IMPROVED MARKET FACILITIES FOR PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 556, Rept. No. 2489), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4054) to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PERMANENT APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 557, Rept. No. 2490), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11683) to authorize permanent appointments in the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PROHIBITING SALE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES ON AIRPLANES IN FLIGHT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 558, Rept. No. 2491), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8000) to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

TO INCREASE BORROWING POWER OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 559, Rept. No. 2492), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11132) to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE IN THE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF SCHOOLS IN AREAS AFFECTED BY FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 560, Rept. No. 2493), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11695) to extend until June 30, 1958, the programs of financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities under the provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and to make certain other changes in such provisions. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, MAHON, SHEPPARD, SIKES, NORRELL, WHITTEN, ANDREWS, RILEY, DEANE, FLOOD, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, SCRIVNER, FORD, MILLER of Maryland, OSTERTAG, and DAVIS of Wisconsin.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9720) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2414)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9720) "making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 19, 26, 41, 43, 45, and 48;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 30, 42, 46, and 47; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,887,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,025,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$125,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$102,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$35,736,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4, 11, 18, 22, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 44.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
HENDERSON LANHAM,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,
T. MILLET HAND,
BEN F. JENSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LISTER HILL,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN STENNIS,
EARLE C. CLEMENTS,
EDWARD J. THYE,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
CHARLES E. POTTER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate on the bill (H. R. 9720) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 1—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $1,751,000 as proposed by the House instead of $1,767,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Labor Standards

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $155,900 for the President's Committee on Employ the Physically Handicapped Week as proposed by the House instead of $167,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $911,500 as proposed by the House instead of $960,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Employment Security

Amendment No. 4—Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 5—Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm-labor program: Appropriates $2,125,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of 1,888,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Labor Statistics

Amendment No. 6—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $6,887,000 instead of $6,687,000 as proposed by the House and $7 million as proposed by the Senate. The increase of $200,000 over the House bill includes $150,000 for a special survey of wages and hours in the retail trade and $50,000 for extension and improvement of the State-Federal program for the collection of injury-rate data.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Howard University

Amendment No. 7—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $3,300,000 as proposed by the House instead of $3,410,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8—Plans and specifications: Deletes appropriation of $75,000 proposed by the Senate.

Office of Education

Amendment No. 9—Promotion and further development of vocational education: Appropriates $29,442,081 as proposed by the Senate instead of $29,267,081 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10—Promotion and further development of vocational education: Provides that the apportionment to the States shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed $29,267,081 as proposed by the Senate instead of $29,092,081 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11—Promotion and further development of vocational education: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 12—Assistance for school construction: Increases the limitation on funds available for necessary expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies from $750,000 to $1,025,000 instead of $925,000 as proposed by the House and $1,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees were agreed that none of these funds should be utilized to establish a library.

Office of Vocational Rehabilitation

Amendment No. 14—Grants to States and other agencies: Appropriates $37,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $35,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15—Grants to States and other agencies: Provides that $33,500,000 of the total appropriation shall be for vocational rehabilitation services under section 2 of the Act as proposed by the Senate instead of $32,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16—Grants to States and other agencies: Provides that $2,000,000 of the total appropriation shall be available for special projects under section 4 of the Act as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17—Training and traineeships: Appropriates $2,950,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18—Training and traineeships: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 19—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $1,160,000 as proposed by the House instead of $1,260,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Public Health Service

Amendment No. 20: Authorizes payments, under certain circumstances, for expenses of schooling for dependents of Public Health Service personnel stationed in foreign countries, in amounts not to exceed an average of $250 per student as proposed by the Senate instead of $300 per student as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21: Authorizes the payment of compensation to consultants or individual scientists appointed for limited periods of time in any part of the Public Health Service at rates not to exceed $15,000 per year as proposed by the Senate instead of limiting such authority to the National Institutes of Health as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 23—Assistance to States, general: Appropriates $16,461,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $14,186,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24—Venereal diseases: Appropriates $4,140,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,640,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 25—Tuberculosis: Appropriates $6,625,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,375,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 26—Sanitary engineering activities: Appropriates $6,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $6,260,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27—Grants for hospital construction: Appropriates $125,000,000 instead of $111,000,000 as proposed by the House and $130,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28—Grants for hospital construction: Provides that $102,800,000 of the total amount appropriated shall be for payments for hospitals and related facilities pursuant to part C of the Act instead of $88,800,000 as proposed by the House and $107,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29—Hospitals and medical care: Appropriates $35,736,000 instead of $35,661,000 as proposed by the House and $35,811,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30—Indian health activities: Deletes authorization to transfer funds from this appropriation to other appropriations of the Public Health Service proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 31—National Cancer Institute: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 32—Mental health activities: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 33—National Heart Institute: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 34—Dental health activities: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 35—Arthritis and metabolic disease activities: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 36—Microbiology activities: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 37—Neurology and blindness activities: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 38—Construction of surgical facilities: Reported in disagreement.

Social Security Administration

Amendment Nos. 39 and 40—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 41—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: Deletes authorization to spend not to exceed $150,000 for research and development of automatic or electronic equipment proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance: Appropriates $1,748,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,698,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 43—Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: Appropriates $1,822,000 as proposed by the House instead of $1,922,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44—Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Amendment No. 45—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $8,951,500 as proposed by the House instead of $9,101,500 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Amendment No. 46—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $460,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $435,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Amendment No. 47—Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board: Appropriates $7,000,000 to be derived from the railroad retirement account as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,493,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 48—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $3,295,000 as proposed by the House instead of $3,390,000 as proposed by the Senate.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
HENDERSON LANHAM,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,
T. MILLET HAND,
BEN F. JENSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge there is no serious disagreement among the managers on the part of the House regarding the appropriations carried in the conference report. The report and statement of the managers have both been in print for 2 days and were both printed in the RECORD of proceedings last Monday so I shall not dwell on those items unless there are specific questions.

I regret that there was serious disagreement among the House conferees regarding the eight amendments of the Senate to the National Institutes of Health items. In fact the difference of opinion was so strong that it was not possible to reconcile these differences at the conference and so we have brought them back for a separate vote with no recommendation in the conference report. However, at the proper time I shall offer a motion to recede and concur in each of these amendments.

I would like to explain my reasons for taking the position I am taking on these amendments. Basic to my position is an opinion that I believe is shared by every Member of this House—that finding a cure to any one of these major crippling and killing diseases such as cancer, arthritis, heart diseases, mental diseases, multiple sclerosis, and the others would be worth many times the amount of money carried in either the House or the Senate bill. So, as I see it, the question is just this simple—How much can efficiently and effectively be spent?

It was my opinion that the bill as it was reported by the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman was a good bill for the National Institutes of Health. It represented the work and the carefully studied opinions of seven men who are real friends of the National Institutes and who thought they were providing all the financial support that could be efficiently and effectively utilized. The full Committee on Appropriations did not change our figures and neither did the House. The 8 amendments of the Senate increased the House bill a total of $48,912,000.

Now I would like to go back and review what happened last year because up to this point the actions of the 2 years closely parallel each other. Last year our subcommittee, composed of the same seven members, recommended appropriations for the National Institutes totaling $89,138,000. We went over the President's budget by a total of $7,870,000 because we thought that much could be efficiently and effectively spent. As was the case this year, the full Committee on Appropriations and this House supported us all along the line and our recommendation was not changed until the bill went to the Senate where it was increased to $112,240,000 or an increase of $23 million over the House bill.

It was my personal opinion, at that time, that the Senate figure last year was much too high and that there was grave danger of doing the program more harm than good by appropriating such a large increase. My personal opinion was backed up by the professional opinion of top doctors at the Institutes and as a result I spent a good many hours, as did the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and other members of our subcommittee, in gathering facts, figures, and expert opinions with which to combat these amendments. We spent many hours in conferences with the Senate. It was almost a month from the time the bill was sent to conference until we were able to get the Senate to most reluctantly agree to give up two-thirds of their increase.

It was only about 2 months after last year's bill was passed that the top doctors at the National Institutes found they had been wrong and had underestimated the amounts that could be wisely used in the field of medical research. Two months after we were battling with the Senate to get them down from $112 million to $97.5 million, these doctors were going to the Bureau of the Budget justifying an appropriation of $126 million for 1957.

To come back to the bill we now have under consideration—when it passed the Senate my first reaction was about the same as last year, that it was much too high and that such a sum of money was more than could be efficiently and effectively spent in view of the limited number of trained people in these fields. Since the Senate passed the bill I have read and reread both the House and Senate hearings and have discussed the matter with leaders in this field both inside and outside the Federal Government. The Senate figures receive enthusiastic support from many of the very eminent men that I have talked with. I have not found one that wishes to be recorded in opposition. Most of these men, naturally, are doctors, and I was concerned that I might be getting a biased point of view, so before we went to conference I asked the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Folsom, for his opinions on the Senate increases. His reply left much to be desired by one interested in getting a straightforward expression of opinion, but it was very clear that he was not convinced that these figures were too high.

I am still not absolutely convinced that the House bill was not the better and wiser bill with respect to the National Institutes, but the more I have studied the matter and the more people I have talked to about it, the more I am convinced that a very reasonable doubt exists. When there is such an obvious possibility of alleviating human suffering and prolonging human life I am in favor of resolving our doubts on the side of optimism regarding our research potential instead of on the side of economy. In view of the preponderance of opinion on the part of eminent medical men whose honesty and motives are above question, that the amount in the Senate bill can be well spent and will hasten the day when we get the answers to these dread diseases, I do not know how anyone can, in good conscience, vote for a lesser amount just for the sake of saving a few of the taxpayers' dollars. I do not think these are the kind of dollars that the taxpayers want saved.

Now, that is all I have to say with regard to my reasons for making the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendments on the National Institutes of Health items. I do want to mention one other thing just to establish legislative intent, and I want to emphasize it because it represents the thinking of all members of our subcommittee. That is, if we do agree to the Senate amendments, as I believe we certainly should, it is not a mandate to spend that amount of money come what may. We will expect that no funds be spent on any project or activity unless there is reasonable assurance that it will further the well-established purposes of the national institutes, and we will expect no fiscal maneuvering to obligate funds for activities to be carried on in any year except 1957. We will expect the Surgeon General, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, and others responsible for these programs to spend the funds

for worthwhile projects and activities during the fiscal year 1957 and to turn back funds at the end of the year rather than spend them for questionable purposes.

Mr. Speaker, unless there are questions, I move the previous question on the conference report.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in the nearly 8 years that I have been a Member of Congress, I cannot recall a single instance in which I have voted against an appropriation for research which had for its purpose the improvement of the health of people of this country. I have consistently supported increased funds for research concerning heart ailments, cancer, infantile paralysis, multiple sclerosis, mental health, and many others.

When the bill H. R. 9720, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare was approved by the House a few weeks ago, it carried an appropriation of some $135 million. There were no serious complaints at that time by any Member of the House that the bill failed to provide adequate funds to carry out programs already underway or to initiate new projects. Yet as the bill now comes to us from conference we find the Senate and House conferees have recommended the spending of approximately $184 million. That is an increase of nearly $49 million, or approximately 47 percent.

I can understand that the House committee might have underestimated spending needs by 2, 5, or even 10 percent; that a few essential research projects might have been overlooked, any of which might require additional funds, but it is almost unbelievable that with adequate hearings the House committee should have underestimated actual needs so badly that funds had to be increased by $49 million.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has quoted from hearings in the Senate which indicate that in some instances the increased funds are neither wanted nor needed.

Mr. Speaker, I find it an exceedingly strange situation to have supported the appropriations committee in good faith only to find later that the committee, with the greatest of ease, accepts a 37-percent increase which, in the absence of an emergency, is an admission that it either was wrong in the first instance or is easily influenced by others.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 5, line 4, insert "including purchasing and installing of air-conditioning equipment."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 16, line 22, after "year" insert *"Provided further,* That the amount of allotment which States and Territories are not prepared to use may be reapportioned among other States and Territories applying therefor for use in the programs for which the funds were originally apportioned."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendement No. 18: Page 19, line 23, after "$2,950,000", insert "of which not less than $200,000 shall be available only for a prosthetics education program."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 21, line 3, after "annum", insert ": *Provided,* That subsection (g) of section 208 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, is amended by striking out '$15,000', and inserting in lieu there of '$20,000'."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagrement.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the next eight amendments all pertain to the National Institutes of Health, only dollar amounts being involved. I therefore ask unanimous consent that amendments numbered 31 to 38, inclusive, be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 31: Page 28, line 4, strike out "$34,437,000" and insert "$48,432,000."

Senate amendment No. 32: Page 28, line 9, strike out "$23,749,000" and insert "$35,197,000."

Senate amendment No. 33: Page 28, line 13, strike out "$25,106,000" and insert "$33,396,000."

Senate amendment No. 34: Page 28, line 17, strike out "$3,471,000" and insert "$6,026,000."

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 28, line 20, strike out "$13,845,000" and insert "$15,885,000."

Senate amendment No. 36: Page 28, line 24, strike out "$8,799,000" and insert "$13,299,000."

Senate amendment No. 37: Page 29, line 2, strike out "$14,196,000" and insert "$8,650,000."

Senate amendment No. 38, line 3, insert "Construction of surgical facilities: For the construction and equipment of additional Clinical Center surgical facilities, National Institutes of Health, including the remodeling of existing surgical facilities, and for planning, architectural, and engineering services, $1,630,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

Mr. FOGARTY. This motion takes into consideration the amendments which the Clerk just read and which agree to the Senate figure, which is the higher figure between the House and the Senate for medical research.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the overall increase in the figures contained here is $48,912,000. The House bill was $135 million plus and the Senate figure was $184 million plus, an increase of about 37 percent.

Now, I favored, when the bill was before the House, such additions as the House committee felt could be effectively and efficiently used. I do not understand that there is anything to change that situation.

Now, I am just going to read a few things from an analysis that I have made of the hearings before the Senate. It appears that Senate committee may have accepted budget recommendation of National Advisory Cancer Council and then added to that sum (approximately $43 million) the amount of $5 million requested to expand work on steroid hormones. Attention is called to the testimony of Dr. Scheele appearing on page 542 of Senate hearings under the heading "Budget Process." In his remarks, Dr. Scheele gives impression that National Advisory Cancer Council has not viewed whole picture in arriving at its recommendation but is concerned only with its own field. Dr. Scheele says that programs of the National Institutes of Health are intertwined activities, that on one can stand by itself, that "there are certain impacts that these programs, if all are made very large, will have on total research manpower." In other words, they do not have the manpower to do the job.

I call attention to another one. On page 587 of the Senate hearings, Dr. Felix says that the National Institute of Mental Health can use the additional $2 billion granted by the House wisely and well.

In reply to a question by Senator SMITH as to whether he could use more money wisely and well, he stated:

If I were the whole National Institutes of Health and if I could command the services of all the scientists and professional people in the country for nothing but mental health, yes, I could, considerably more. * * * I think we are moving just about the speed that we should in order to build soundly.

That is what he said. That is the head of the Institute. Yet the other body has provided $11.5 million more. That sounds ridiculous.

With reference to the new tranquilizing drugs, Senator HILL on page 601 of the Senate hearings stated:

We have received reliable evidence that a minimum appropriation of $2 million for the coming year is necessary to do a proper evaluation and development job on the new drugs.

In his reply, Dr. Felix said:

I have a report from the Joint Commission giving their estimate of cost as being in the order of $1 million per year at the beginning of the study. Possibly I shall have to request additional funds for subsequent years.

The Senate allowed $2 million anyway, or double what the doctor said he could use.

Then I come to another item, that for the Heart Institute. Mind you, I am sympathetic to a reasonable amount that can properly be used, but I am not sympathetic to an amount that goes way beyond what can properly be used.

I want to call your attention to a little of what was said there. At least twice, on page 636 and page 641 of the Senate hearings, Dr. Watt, the man in charge of that Institute, told the Senate committee that there is a problem of competition for manpower among the various institutes. He indicated that it would be difficult for them to use the amount $29,981,000 recommended by the advisory council.

However, the other body allowed approximately $3 million more than this figure.

The Senate committee report states that the House committee heard testimony to the effect that while there is no immediate prospect of a major scientific breakthrough in heart research there is reason to believe that we could do something, and we did—$3 million above the budget. The Senate not only allowed what the advisory committee recommended but a $3 million fund for investigating breakthroughs, expecting that there can be major discoveries. There is no other testimony in the Senate hearings to justify it.

This whole picture is just like this: We are proceeding on the basis of turning these people in the National Institutes of Health loose with $184 million, an increase of $48 million, when I do not believe under any circumstances they could use more than the House allowed them and they themselves say so. The House increased the appropriations $9 million above the budget. The House went just as far as it thought they could use the money effectively and intelligently.

The result of this is going to be that either there will be a great lot of unexpended balances at the end of the fiscal year to come or they will have to proceed—if they have told us the story correctly as to the availability of scientists to work on it—with those who are not available in the better brackets of scientists and research people. Frankly, that is not the way I feel we should meet our responsibilities. For my own part, I cannot vote for those increases. I am not going to ask for a rollcall because I know it would put all the Members here on the spot, and I do not care to do that, but there is no merit in these increases. I do not believe the thing is good judgment from a legislative standpoint or from a health standpoint.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In view of the gentleman's explanation of the increases in this bill, I want the record to show that I am opposed to it.

Mr. TABER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, by way of résumé, the budget estimate on this item, as sent to us by the President through the Bureau of the Budget, was the largest for that purpose in the history of the Congress. Every year we have increased this appropriation until today it has attained a percentage beyond that reached by any activity in any department of the Government in a like time.

Now, as the House is generally aware, it has long been an unwritten rule of the Committee on Appropriations that the budget estimate is to be taken as the maximum and the efficiency of the subcommittee has been judged by—and the chairman of each subcommittee has for many years prided himself on—the amount he was able to cut below the budget estimate.

But, in recent years, we have had now and then chairmen of subcommittees who took the point of view that the budget estimate was the minimum—that it was the floor—and that they should increase the appropriation just as high as the situation permitted over the budget estimate.

That is what has taken place this year, although the budget estimate for this purpose was the highest in the history of the Congress and although in keeping with the old custom, all of us expected a reduction below the estimate submitted by the President. To the astonishment, I think, of all conservative members of the committee, they not only gave the full budget estimate but they added a million dollars above the budget estimate. And then still more surprising, the Senate increased it $2 million more above the $1 million we added on this side.

Now, my good friend the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] moves that we yield to the Senate and put in the full amount of the Senate increase aggregating $3 million above the President's request. And let me say, my friends, I am going along with him. You know in a superheated, hysterically pressured atmosphere like this, nobody is going to vote against home and mother and free beer—nobody is going to vote in favor of cancer and heart disease. The answer to that is a foregone conclusion.

And I want to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island on his moderation. He could have put over a Senate amendment for $50 million more just as easily as $3 million more.

And in addition to that we are dealing here today with the most adroit and most effective lobby I have ever seen. Yesterday morning alone, between 8 and 12 o'clock, noon, over 4,000 telegrams had come in, most of them demanding support of Mr. Fogarty.

If Mr. Fogarty ever expects to run for President, now is the time. And if I or JOHN TABER ever expect to run for President, now is the time to forget it.

You know, Mr. Speaker, there is no amount of money that would be too much for us to spend to exterminate disease. You could not name any figure, including the entire contents of the Federal Treasury, that would be too high a price to pay, if we could prevent or cure heart disaster or cancer.

I have, through the years, and at every opportunity, urged ample and adequate appropriations for this purpose. But the unreasonable increase here proposed will in the end retard rather than aid the search. We have already given Mr. FOGARTY every dollar he requested. At his suggestion we added a million dollars to the budget estimate. Now the Senate proposes to add to that an amount which will almost double the money available for the coming year.

As Mr. TABER has pointed out, no agency of the Government can effectively double its organizational activity in 1 year. As he well says, we can secure better results with a reasonable increase than with this abnormal inflation of the annual appropriation.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty-one Members are present; not a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 76]

Avery	Gamble	Thompson, La.
Barden	Lane	Thompson, Mich.
Bell	Morrison	Thornberry
Brownson	O'Hara, Minn.	Vursell
Chatham	Richards	Wolcott
Colmer	Saylor	
Denton	Scudder	
Eberharter	Shelley	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 411 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly that some of the Members were not here before the quorum call to listen to the discussion of this question by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. He presented one of the clearest, most convincing and best documented discussions of this matter I have heard in recent years.

But nobody listened to him. Even our able and aggressive Speaker was unable to maintain order. Nobody came to hear him and nobody listened.

They came here to vote in response to the 25,000 lobbying telegrams, without stopping to consider the merits of the issue at all. Not telegrams from unbiased individuals. Not telegrams from patients. And not a single telegram out of the 25,000 from anyone who has been cured from cancer or heart disease. All of them from institutions

and organizations and their membership who will profit from the extra money provided in the Senate amendment.

The exceptional attendance here on the floor today is in response to the most prodigious lobbying stunt ever pulled off here in the House within my recollection.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to sense the tenor of the House. I have been here before. I know what is coming. My distinguished and eloquent friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is going to rise and plead with us, not to die; "Don't die, don't have cancer, don't have heart disease, vote and be saved." This extra money will wipe away all tears. It is as simple as that. How can you appeal to reason in an atmosphere like that?

Mr. Speaker, in the early days, when the first railroad was built across the country, the movement of the trains was frequently interfered with by great herds of buffalo which crossed the track by the thousands and brought the locomotive to a stop. On one occasion as the train moved along, a buffalo bull stood in the center of the track and charged the engine head-on. The engineer said, "I admire your courage but damn your judgment."

The gentleman from New York is to be commended for the position he has taken. But he and I know what is coming.

For 10 years, we have appropriated an increasing amount every year and yet we are no nearer the solution of this tragic question than when we started. When the subcommittee reported this bill to the whole committee I asked Mr. FOGARTY, "Have you learned anything about the cause of cancer?" He said, "No." I asked, "Have you learned how to avoid cancer?" He said, "No." I asked, "Have you developed a cure for cancer?" And he said, "No." That sums up the situation. In 10 years, with an ever-increasing expenditure of money, they have discovered exactly nothing. I am in favor of continuing the search. We should not be discouraged. But we can do everything that can effectively be done with the million extra dollars the House has given Mr. FOGARTY. The Senate money is superfluous.

Read the testimony solicitously adduced in the hearings. Much of it reads like the testimonials from the medicine almanac that hung beside the kitchen door. And is about as pertinent.

Note where they say, "There are men walking around who would not be living today if it were not for this expenditure." No more misleading statement could be made. The only men who are living today are those who submitted to an operation in time; and we have known for 50 years that if you cut it out in time it can be cured. But after infiltration, nothing can be done. And nothing has been done up to this time notwithstanding the millions spent in research. We are spending this money for research—to learn the cause of cancer, to find the cause of heart disease, to learn how to avoid them and how to cure them. And Mr. FOGARTY told the committee himself that nothing has been learned about the cause or cure of cancer or heart disease.

It was known that when the President of the United States was subject to heart disease, they carried around oxygen tanks to be used in event of an emergency. If these 10 years had taught us anything about the avoidance or cure of heart disease it would certainly have been used in his case. But notwithstanding the expenditure of these millions they could not provide him with the slightest immunity.

Mr. Speaker, it is a heartless disservice to the public to lead them to believe we are providing a cure for these dread diseases when, as a matter of fact, we are not making the slightest progress in the prevention or cure of either of them.

Let us provide a reasonable amount for research, but let us not encourage depairing hope in order to go beyond that figure, when 10 years of research on cancer and heart disease have given us no new ground for hope on either of them.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the major questions raised by the conference report which we are now discussing is the question of the appropriation to be given to the National Institute of Mental Health for the fiscal year 1957. My colleague [Mr. FOGARTY] has asked that we accept the figure of $35 million.

In my opinion this figure is absolutely essential and to reduce it would be to cripple the entire program. As I am sure my colleagues in the House know, I have sponsored in the past legislation designed specifically to aid the States, within the framework of the Hill-Burton Act, in the construction of mental-health facilities to deal with the serious shortage which exists. Much to my regret and consternation, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare saw fit to report adversely on the bill which I introduced, basing its report on the fact that such facilities would come within the framework of the present Hill-Burton Act. The Department stated:

> Some question may be raised, however, as to whether the States, in general, are willing and ready to wisely utilize such funds. While the States and communities may not be providing mental or psychiatric facilities as rapidly as may be desirable, the basic problem is, in our opinion, one of appropriate education rather than legislation. Further, as the States more adequately fulfill their needs for general hospital facilities, increasing attention can be expected to problems of the chronic diseases, mental diseases, and long-term patient care.

I have not quoted this section of the report for the purpose of indicating that money is not needed for the Department, but rather because it is the duty of the Congress to inform the Department through the appropriation measure now before us, that this is a question not of education but of legislation.

It need not be pointed out to you, Mr. Speaker, nor to my colleagues, that a great deal of attention has been given to the subject of mental illness, its incidence in the community, the strain which it puts on the few facilities which exist for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of its victims, and the great strides which are continually being made in finding drugs for its alleviation and cures for its elimination. It is for these reasons that progress must be made in the field of mental illness and that this particular appropriation must be increased to the $35 million figure.

I have laid stress upon this one provision of the amendment because it is one in which I personally have taken an active interest. There are, however, many areas of Federal interest in our Nation's health which are incorporated and reflected in this amendment. Each and every one of them calls for an increase, to the level of the Senate figure, of the appropriation to be granted by this act.

My own interest in questions which bear on the health of our citizens prompts me to respectfully request of each and every Member of this body that he give due consideration to the necessity for the amounts which we are being asked to appropriate for the preservation of the health of our citizens and for the elimination of many dread diseases.

It occurs to me that there is no greater cause to which each of us can devote his attention than that of the health of our citizens.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my warm gratitude to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for leading this fight for our medical research program. It will be a real tragedy if we today do not face up to the gravity of this issue and supply the funds for this program.

The National Institutes of Health are one of the finest activities of our Government. With very modest funds, they are making contributions to medical science that are of enormous value. The tragedy is that—if they do not get the money to do this work—it will probably not be done. Every person in the United States has a stake in this issue. For instance, the National Institutes' current work in early detection of cancer is one of the great medical achievements of the day. The research discoveries they are making promise a real break-through in the effort to achieve techniques of detection of internal cancer early enough for successful treatment to save lives.

The money spent for research on diabetes and arthritis in the last few years has made possible tremendous advances, for which the National Institute is responsible. They are in process of developing and evaluating new drugs for the treatment of these two terrible diseases. They are playing a vital and leading role in this research. To cripple this program, to lose momentum on this research, would be criminal folly.

Mental illness is one of our great national problems, yet we are doing far too little and every day the seriousness of the problem runs far ahead of our efforts in this field. The modest increase proposed here is not an expense—it is one of the greatest economies this House can achieve.

The same thing is true in case after case. Funds for dental research and for heart research are not expenses—in a broad national view they are economies that will pay for themselves many times over in plain dollars and cents. But more important, their value in the lives they will save, the needless suffering they will prevent—these are beyond calculation in money terms.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a war. The National Institutes of Health are in the frontline and they are advancing all along the front. If they are to break through, if we are to win victory in this eternal fight against the killers of men, they must have support. They must have the sinews of war.

The Hoover Commission task force has told us how little we are doing to fight this war. Our Nation today is conscious of the vital importance of scientific research to national welfare, yet less than 5 cents out of every dollar of research funds in this great Nation as late as 1952 was spent for medical research. The Hoover Commission task force further pointed out that the Government was the worst offender, that medical research fared even worse in its share of Government funds than in private research funds. We spend billions for guns, planes, atom bombs, yet we fail to supply the few millions needed for a real war against disease.

Mr. Speaker, when we vote on this proposal, every one of us should, in his own conscience, face squarely the unavoidable facts stated recently by the Surgeon General of the United States, "Our national research effort has not expanded enough to realize its full potential. Financial support has not kept pace with medical progress." That is a serious indictment. We have the chance today to redeem ourselves and meet this challenge.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island on his amendment for more funds for research against cancer, heart diseases, mental illnesses, neurological diseases, arthritis, and metabolic diseases and blindness. These diseases are devilish scourges. Short of war, they are the greatest evils mankind has to endure. Funds offered now may save countless lives, for research will point the way both to the cause and the cure of these dread diseases. The moneys spent in this manner will be cheap indeed, when measured against the health and welfare of the people, and the loss in working time, payrolls and taxes when these diseases strike.

Many good men and women have urged support of this amendment; many splendid welfare organizations, including the American Dental Association, New York State Society for Mental Health, the Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, National Mental Health Committee, Eastman Dental Dispensary, Second District Dental Society of Brooklyn, the Brooklyn Association for Mental Health, Association for the Help of Retarded Children, Rochester School of Medicine Dentistry, the Dental Society of the State of New York, the Farmers Union, and others.

I was especially pleased to note that my very esteemed friend, Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, the chairman of the National Health Education Committee, is in the forefront of the fight for this amendment. She is a great humanitarian and I am pleased to call her my friend.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, you have just listened to a speech from one of the grand old men of the Congress, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I have a great deal of admiration and respect for him. I do not know how long he has been here, but it is much longer than I have been here. I have only been here 16 years, but he was here long, long before I arrived. I have a great deal of respect and admiration for him.

I suppose to some of you the speech he just made is a new one, but it is the same old story so far as I am concerned. I have been listening to that same speech for the last 10 years since I have been on this particular subcommittee. The gentleman from Missouri and I have never agreed on any of these items so far as research and public health are concerned in the 10 years that I have had the privilege of serving on this subcommittee—for 6 years as its chairman. I understand I have served longer on this subcommittee than any man in the House or in the other body who is in Congress at the present time. However, I do not think I should get excited about this matter because the House works its will and I am sure the majority will make the right decision regardless of what the gentleman from Missouri or I might say to you.

Before I tell you some of the things that we hope can be accomplished with this additional money, I want to refer to a statement made by the gentleman from Missouri. He just told you, and I do not know where he gets his information, but he has just made a very flat statement that no lives have been saved by what has been done in the past 10 years since the Federal Government has been in the field of appropriating money for medical research. That statement is just not true. It is not so. Some of the most eminent doctors, not here in Washington, and not solely in this country, but some of the most eminent doctors in the world have appeared before our committee to my knowledge for 10 years now. We have received the advice of men like Dr. Paul Dudley White, of Boston, who has taught more heart specialists in this country than any man living at the present time, and who is considered the leading specialist in this country and in the world. When a man like that appears before our committee and gives us advice on the basis of which we are asking you today to go along with the Senate figure, I think we should heed it. A man of that caliber and a man with that background knows much more about what is going on than I do or the gentleman from Missouri knows as far as heart disease is concerned. Dr. Paul Dudley White is 100 percent for this motion which we are asking you to vote for today, to go along with the Senate figures.

When we come to the field of cancer, we have men like Dr. Cornelius Rhoads, of the Memorial Hospital in New York, the oldest cancer research institution in this country, who appeared before us and told us of the gains that have been made in curing cancer. Regardless of what the gentleman from Missouri says, I have to take the word of a man like Dr. Rhoades because he is an expert in that field. I am not an expert and neither is the gentleman from Missouri. But, when Dr. Rhoads appeared before our committee this year he gave us instance after instance of cures of cancer. For instance he said, "Cancer of the large intestine has improved tremendously in the cure rates. From a figure of 14 percent of all patients presented in the doctor's office who could be cured by surgical treatment about 10 years ago, the figure has risen to 30 or 40 percent in the good hospitals equipped with these products of research.

"For cancer of the neck of the womb, the figure for cure has risen from about 22 percent to something over 40 percent in good clinics." He also said, "In the case of cancer of the stomach, in the past 10-year period, the cure rates have almost tripled." I say that is progress so far as I am concerned. When he made the flat statement before our committee this year that 15,000 Americans this year are walking around in this country because of the work that we have done in the past 10 years, I am willing to take his statement because it has never been refuted by anyone who has engaged in that work and who is in the field. It has never been refuted by anyone of the prominence of Dr. Rhoads.

Let me give you one example of a demonstration program that has been going on in Memphis, Tenn., for 2 years. It was a new approach to the discovery of cancer of the cervix in women. I had the pleasure of meeting the doctor that developed this new technique a few years ago when he was honored by the American Cancer Society. Because of his discovery it is the advice of all of these men who are experts in this field that cancer of the cervix in women will no longer be a problem as soon as this technique has been developed so that it can be given widespread application in our country.

I do not know how much we have expended on cancer research. I do not care. I do not know whether it is $100 million or $3 billion, but if any part of that was a help in finding this new technique in diagnosing cancer in a stage early enough to cure 100 percent of cancer of the cervix in women, every dime that we have expended has been well expended by the Congress of the United States.

Dr. Sidney Farber, of the Children's Hospital of Boston also appeared before our committee. He is an outstanding expert, not only in this country but in the world, in the field of leukemia which is cancer of the bloodstream, especially in children. He was the man who pioneered in the use of antifolic compounds in the treatment of leukemia. He has used these compounds to treat one boy since 1947. He discovered their use in Boston, with the help of funds from this appropriation, if you please. As a result of that discovery, for the first time in medical history a young boy

afflicted with acute leukemia is still living after 10 years. How much is his life worth, Mr. CANNON? I do not know, but to me it is worth every dime we have put into these programs over the past 10 years.

We also had testimony from people in the mental health field, like Dr. William C. Menninger, of the Menninger Institute in Topeka, Kans., which is training more psychiatrists today than any other place in the world. He told us of the new advances that have been made in the drugs that have come out within the last 2 years, with the help of some of our appropriations. He told us, and Dr. Kline, of New York State told us, that the discharges from mental institutions have increased 20 or 25 percent this past year because of the use of these new drugs. Ladies and gentlemen, I do not know what the cost has been for developing those new drugs, but if it is doing that we are not spending enough, in my opinion, in that field.

How many people two years ago would have paid any attention to me if I said at that time that we had some information from some of our leading experts in the field of polio that there might be developed a vaccine that would prevent polio? But that has happened, because of the program put on by the National Foundation, and also supported by the National Institutes of Health for which the appropriations we are now discussing are made. That vaccine now is being given to children and has proved to be 70 to 80 percent effective. The goal is to make it 100 percent effective. As a result of that discovery, the heartaches of mothers and fathers and the suffering of children, not only in this country but all over the world, will be relieved. I do not know how much money it cost to develop that vaccine, and I do not care. It is worth every dime that we have spent.

How many people would have believed that the death rate from tuberculosis would be on the downgrade as far as it is now, 10 years ago when we were appealing to you to appropriate funds for research on tuberculosis? TB hospitals and sanatoria are being closed all over the country because of some of the research work for which appropriations were recommended by this committee that you people have been good enough to vote for in the past. These appropriations have made it possible to get these new drugs that are making possible the discharge and cure of people with tuberculosis at the present time.

This year because of the discovery of a new drug, isoniazid, we are told that there is an excellent possibility that tuberculosis can be conquered just as we have conquered meningitis, typhus, diphtheria, and other dread diseases of the past. How much money this has cost I do not know, but those people in the sanatoria and other health institutions, you can bet your bottom dollar, are asking you to vote to continue that type of research.

I remember very well the leadership of Frank Keefe when he was chairman of this subcommittee in 1947. I worked with him to help in the development of the new drug that came out then, streptomycin. It was of great value in the treatment of tuberculosis but the cost was prohibitive. It was a new drug. He and I got together and we agreed, and the committee agreed that we would go above and beyond the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget and appropriate $3 million to try to find a way to manufacture this new drug, streptomycin, synthetically. That would get it to the people of the country more quickly and more cheaply. I do not remember exact figures but I will give you round figures that will be illustrative of the range in price. At that time the drug might have cost $250 a gram. We were able to get the cost down to $10 a gram through the expenditure of that $3 million.

The same year we acted on another matter. When we were told of the discovery of the application of sodium fluoride to children's teeth for the prevention of dental caries to the extent of 50 or 60 percent, we persuaded the Congress to appropriate $3 million to send demonstration teams to every State in the Union to show the dentists how to apply this sodium fluoride properly to children's teeth. It was before the date of fluoridation of drinking water. As a result I do not know how much savings were brought about, but the beneficial results since it has been in effect have been astounding.

A couple of years later when we were told about the use of these new wonder drugs ACTH and cortisone we asked you people again to appropriate more money than the Bureau of the Budget recommended. The cost of ACTH and cortisone was prohibitive. We were hopeful that a way could be found to manufacture these substances synthetically. You appropriated about $3 million for this purpose. As a result not only is it now plentiful but ways have been found to administer it orally, it can be taken by mouth; and I can say to you without fear of contradiction that had it not been for the action taken by the House and the Senate many many lives would have been lost in the past 7 or 8 years through lack of ACTH and cortisone which we have in sufficient quantities at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose but few Members would have paid any attention to me 3 years ago had I said that for an expenditure of $50,000 we would be able to find out what caused premature babies to become blind in early childhood. This is a disease they call retrolental fibroplasia. But the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda undertook a study of the problem and through their work in several hospitals over the country we have been able, for an expenditure of between $40,000 and $50,000, to determine the cause of this disease and learn how to prevent it. Today there is no reason in the world why any prematurely born child should become blind if the knowledge gained from this research is applied.

The Clinical Center of the National Institutes of Health cost $60 million to buy the land, draw the plans, build the buildings and to equip them. But there is nothing like it in the world at the present time. Some of these discoveries are being made there.

We were told by Dr. Bailey, head of the Neurological Institute, of a young man referred to him by the University of Virginia. The young man had suffered from epilepsy since he was 5 years of age. He was 29 years old and had suffered an average of 5 seizures a day for 24 years. As far as modern medicine was concerned, there was not anything that could be done for him. He was referred to this new institute. As a result of a new type of operation that they performed this young man was apparently cured. He has not had a seizure in 2 years, and he has a job for the first time in his life. In addition to several cures they have effected through this operation, they have taken the damaged brain tissue that was removed, and by analyzing it have been able to find out for the first time in medical history what causes these seizures. It is due to the lack of a substance called glutamine. As a result of that discovery and because of the prohibitive cost of manufacturing the substance, 2 years ago we asked you to appropriate $750,000 to simplify the manufacture of the substance. There have been great gains during the past few years in the way of an understanding of this problem as far as medical research is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on for hours and hours. Contrary to what any man or woman may say, gains have been made. I am not going to hazard a guess this afternoon as to how many of you would not be here today if we had not gone into this field 10 years ago. I only speak of the past 10 years because most of these institutes became law since 1946. The only one prior to that was the Cancer Institute. But since 1946, we have established a Heart Institute, a Mental Health Institute, the Neurological and Blindness Institute, the Arthritis and Rheumatism Institute, Microbiology Institute, and the Dental Institute. We have been supporting them year in and year out by almost a unanimous vote. The record is replete with the advances that have been made by medical science in general and these institutes in particular.

Mr. Speaker, if we were here appealing for these funds on the basis of a group of men who work for the Government alone, then I might say there would be some credence in the argument made by the gentleman from Missouri; but it is different when you call in some of these men I have mentioned who cannot be contradicted by the best in medicine in the world today and they give us their advice. We are only relaying to you today in this request the advice that was given to us in committee hearings by the top people in this field. If the gentleman from Missouri had sat in on only one hearing and had listened to just one word of that testimony from these eminent men that we have had the privilege of hearing, I am sure he would not have the thoughts he has in mind at the present time.

In each of these fields there is a scientifically demonstrated need for the funds for which I speak today.

In each of these fields there are solutions which are waiting on the work that can be done if we will provide the funds.

We are told sometimes that we must move at a measured pace—that a program of research to find the prevention and cure for disease must go along slowly.

I need not say to you that death and disability make their own pace and speed. They do not accommodate themselves to the tempo we set for research. They strike swiftly and relentlessly. Our vote today is to declare if we are willing to meet them on their own terms and show the way to better health for the people of this Nation of ours. Our vote today will indicate whether or not we really intend to help those who so desperately need assistance—the sick and the poor.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this opportunity go by without recalling that it was my privilege for 6 years to serve with the late Honorable Frank Keefe, of Wisconsin, and for 2 years with the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] upon this particular subcommittee. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, those two names should go down in history as Members of the House, as Members of the Congress, who have done more for the health of the people of America than any other two Members of Congress.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, if I am not mistaken, I heard the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, say in the well of the House that he was going to vote for the motion now being offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island. I think he should do so and that, most certainly, is the way I shall vote. Now, if I am going to make a mistake today, I am going to make it on the side of liberality rather than on the side of parsimony. For the first time in history, our Government is now waging an all-out fight against the great killers of mankind, and I do not want to see that fight restricted in any way.

It was not so many years ago that the Congress, appropriating funds for research into diseases of cattle and hogs, was loathe to vote substantial funds for research which might lead to discoveries that would help people live healthier and longer lives. Today, the United States leads the world in this approach and the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has been the legislative leader in a war against disease which gives promise of paying indescribable dividends.

It has been stated that mental illness alone cost our Nation last year more than $2½ billion and there is an abundance of testimony on the part of the leading doctors and researchers that the additional funds now requested can be intelligently used. Just one visit to the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda will be convincing to anyone beset with doubt.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has had such long experience in the study of these diseases to which the gentleman has referred, I wish to say that as a member of that committee, former chairman of the committee, and now ranking Republican member of the committee, I commend the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for the intense interest he has taken in this subject over a period of years. I am certain that if and when he ever leaves this House it will be with a feeling of compensation, that exceeds in value any monetary compensation that he may have received, for the work that he has done that has been helpful in promoting the welfare and the health of thousands of our people. This House is fortunate in having within its membership a man of his type and character that in the work of the Appropriations Committee puts heart and a humane touch into legislation and is willing to overlook strict adherence to a cold dollar mark, in order that the people of this Nation may have the health benefits that they are entitled to have.

I am surprised at a remark the gentleman from Missouri made today. I think we were all rather surprised after hearing the argument that he made against the Fogarty amendment and then to hear his closing remark that notwithstanding the views he had expressed he would vote in favor of the Fogarty amendment. It showed good judgment upon his part to at least vote for the amendment, even though he argued against its adoption.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I do not want to monopolize the limelight. Why does not the gentleman make some reference to the very conclusive argument made by his distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WOLVERTON. The gentleman from New York presented his views and he presented them in a logical, forceful, and intelligent way from his standpoint. But, I did not hear him say that he, notwithstanding his opposition to the amendment would cast his vote in favor of the amendment. I respect his sincerity even though I do not agree with his viewpoint. He was at least consistent.

Mr. CANNON. Why delay the inevitable by futile obstructive tactics. Twenty thousand telegrams cannot be wrong.

Mr. WOLVERTON. The argument that has been made by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], is unanswerable. It was logical and sound. He well stated in a few words the wonderful and far-reaching results that have followed and will follow as a result of the appropriations heretofore made for research in the many serious diseases that strike down our people.

I also wish to pay tribute to the interest that has also been taken by private citizens in this wonderful effort that is being made to find a solution and a remedy for the many diseases that have borne down so hard upon our people, and brought such distress to individuals and families—no tribute could be phrased in language too strong to express as fully as we should the great assistance given by these private sources. In this category we are particularly indebted to the fine service that has been rendered by Mrs. Albert D. Lasker over a period of many years. She has given willingly and unstintedly of her time and money to further this most worthy cause.

The amendment is entitled to the unanimous support of this House.

As part of my remarks I include a telegram I received from her and many others in support of the Fogarty amendment. They read as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 25, 1956.*

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Washington, D. C.

Won't you support JOHN FOGARTY's amendment to H. R. 9720 to concur with Senate action for more funds for research against cancer, heart diseases, mental illnesses, neurological diseases, arthritis, and metabolic diseases, and blindness, which will be on the House floor on Wednesday, June 27. These additional funds can be intelligently used according to testimony of leading doctors and research workers before the House and Senate committees, and will help in making major break through against these killers and cripplers of our citizens. With best wishes,

Mrs. ALBERT D. LASKER,
Chairman, National Health Education Committee.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 25, 1956.*

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

A few weeks ago you were kind enough to write me when you received my book Every Other Bed. As you well know, that book is essentially a documented plea for greatly expanded Federal and State expenditures for psychiatric research and training. On Wednesday of this week Congressman JOHN FOGARTY will go on the House floor to fight for acceptance of the Senate figure of $35 million for fiscal 1957 for the National Institute of Mental Health. The House conferees last Thursday refused to accede to the Senate figure holding to the earlier figure of $23 million voted by the House in February. It is absolutely vital that the Senate increase of $12 million be retained. If it is not the entire research grant program of the NIMH, of which 85 percent goes to States, will be seriously crippled. Furthermore, the House figure will only provide for the training of 49 more psychiatrists in the coming year. A minuscule amount compared to the documented shortages of thousands of psychiatrists and allied personnel. I therefore urge you strongly to support the full Senate figure of $35 million on Wednesday. This sum is a drop in the bucket when compared with the $711 million being spent by the States this year merely for care of the mentally ill, and the $650 million being spent this year by the Veterans' Administration for hospital care of mentally ill veterans and for compensation to veterans disabled by mental illness. Last year mental illness cost this Nation $2½ billion. Is it too much to spend approximately 1 percent of this enormous sum to find cures for this dread disease? If you have any questions or if you would like to notify me that you will support this item please communicate with me before Wednesday.

Respectfully,

MIKE GORMAN,
Executive Director, National Mental Health Committee.

CAMDEN, N. J., *June 25, 1956.*
CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
On behalf of the New Jersey State Dental Society and its 3,100 members, I urge your support of resolution to be introduced by Congressman JOHN FOGARTY on June 27 relative to H. R. 9720 to increase new appropriation.

JOHN G. CARR,
Secretary, New Jersey Dental Society.

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.
Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:
Deeply disappointed in House refusal to accept Senate figure $35 million for National Institute of Mental Health disregarding testimony of nationally renowned psychiatrists before Senate and House committees. We urge full support of $35 million which Senate and psychiatrists in their best judgment regarded necessary to promote national mental health for coming year.

ATLANTIC COUNTY ASSOCIATION FOR MENTAL HEALTH,
Mrs. H. A. DEAN, *Executive Secretary.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 25, 1956.*
Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The arthritis and rheumatism foundation urges your support of Fogarty's amendment to H. R. 9720 to increase by $48 million funds for research for the institute of arthritis and metabolic diseases and other institutes of health. Research is the key to the cause and cure of arthritis and of other forms of rheumatic disease which afflict more than 10 million of our population. Any amount spent for this is cheap, measured in probable results whether in terms of health and welfare of the people or loss in working time, payrolls, and taxes.

Gen. GEORGE C. KENNEY,
President.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 25, 1956.*
Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Washington, D. C.:
The 85,000 members of the American Dental Association urgently enlist your support of Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY'S motion that the House of Representatives concur with the Senate on H. R. 9720, the appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The association has been informed that Representative FOGARTY will present his motion to the House on Wednesday, June 27. The American Dental Association has given its full support to the Senate recommendation of $6,026,000 for dental research during fiscal 1957 and has completely justified that expenditure at hearings before the Appropriations Committees. Your favorable vote on Representative FOGARTY'S motion will represent an invaluable contribution to the improvement of the Nation's health.

BERNARD C. KINGSBURY,
President, American Dental Association.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 25, 1956.*
Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We understand that on Wednesday Mr. FOGARTY will propose an important amendment to House Bill 9720 providing for urgently needed $48 million for Institutes of Health. Strongly hope that you will give your support to Mr. FOGARTY'S amendment. The need for funds for the National Heart Institute was testified to by the eminent cardiologists, Dr. Paul Dudley White of Boston, and Dr. Irving Wright of New York. The funds for research and training efforts are desperately needed and offer the principal hope for conquering the major killing and crippling diseases.

Mrs. ANNA M. ROSENBERG,
Mrs. WENDELL WILLKIE.
Maj. Gen. WILLIAM J. DONOVAN.
EMERSON FOOTE.

CAMDEN, N. J.
Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:
In the name of all victims of cerebral palsy, we ask you to vote for H. R. 9720. Research on neurological diseases should be increased.

UNITED CEREBRAL PALSY, INC.
By JOS. PIERCE LODGE, *Counsel.*

JERSEY CITY, N. J., *June 26, 1956.*
Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
In view of urgent need for adequate dental research funds, your support of H. R. 9720 is requested.

M. M. MAXWELL,
Dean, Seton Hall College of Dentistry.

ROSELLE, N. J., *June 26, 1956.*
CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Washington, D. C.:
Union County Dental Society of New Jersey, 250 members, urges approval of $6 million for expanded dental research program.

Dr. ALBERT W. THEURER,
Secretary.

TRENTON, N. J., *June 26, 1956.*
CHARLES WOLVERTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge your support of Representative JOHN E. FORGARTY'S motion that House of Representatives concur with Senate on the appropriations for Department of Health, Education and Welfare contained in H. R. 9720.

Dr. EARL G. LUDLAM,
Chief, Bureau of General Health,
New Jersey State Department of Health.

PLAINFIELD, N. J., *June 26, 1956.*
Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
The breakthrough in the fight against mental illness is closer each year. Research along with education is the answer. I hope you will personally vote in favor of the $35 million appropriation for the National Institute of Mental Health as arrived at by the Senate for the coming year. This figure was supported by leading psychiatrists in testimony before both House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

This money will bring many benefits in the battle against mental illness. The National Institute of Mental Health program should include attention to needed training programs and to problems of juvenile delinquency and old age.

A few million dollars appropriated now may mean the savings of untold billions in national production in human suffering and in ultimate savings on mental hospitals support.

WILLIAM H. BAUMER,
President, New Jersey Association for Mental Health.

MORRISTOWN, N. J., *June 26, 1956.*
Hon. CHARLES E. WOLVERTON,
House of Representatives, Capitol Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The 200 members of the New Jersey Neuropsychiatric Association strongly urge you to vote for $35 million for National Institute of Mental Health for the coming year. Any figure below that recommended by the leading psychiatrists of our country would be detrimental to the health of our citizens.

EVELYN PARKER IVEY,
President.

COLLINGSWOOD, N. J., *June 25, 1956.*
Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Southern Dental Society of New Jersey urges you to support Representative JOHN FOGARTY'S motion to the House of Representatives that they concur with the Senate on the appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare contained in H. R. 9720.

EUGENE W. ROBERTS,
Secretary, Southern Dental Society of New Jersey.

TEANECK, N. J., *June 26, 1956.*
Representative CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We urge you to support H. R. 9720. This is an important health measure for the people of New Jersey and for our dental schools.

W. A. WILSON,
Dean, Fairleigh Dickinson School of Dentistry.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island on a very fine, factual, and informative statement and associate myself with his remarks. Although I have expressed myself many times that the American taxpayer must be given relief, I want to state that I am wholeheartedly in accord with Government spending for medical research. I know that many times it is the last $100 of the thousand dollar appropriation that has broken the case in finding the cure for one of the dread diseases that has killed so many people. As was the case with Dr. Salk, when it seemed that all expense had gone to naught, finally and at long last, the magic formula was discovered.

As a result of the tremendous amount of money spent on tuberculosis, the dread killer, we know that today this enemy is well in hand and its depredations have been checked. Yellow fever, smallpox, malaria, and leprosy, all of these that once were fatal are now controllable.

We are assured that in the foreseeable future, we shall have the magic bullet to destroy cancer and heart disease.

The majority of patients in all hospitals in this Nation today are either in mental institutions or suffering from a disability induced by mental aberrations. This is an appalling thing and it is my earnest prayer that the time will soon be at hand, when we will have found a cure for whatever causes mental breakdown.

This can only be accomplished through research—research requires funds, and I am sure that the taxpayers of this Nation will not begrudge the appropriation of money which is so well spent.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the committee that has developed the legislation authorizing all of the health institutes, I simply repeat in substance the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], with whom I have worked in developing that legislation.

I want to make it a matter of record at this point that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has on this day made one of the most challenging speeches in the interest of medical research it has ever been my pleasure or privilege to listen to. My thanks and my appreciation go to him for the great effort he has put forth in this respect during the last decade. His dedicated and sustained interest over the years in adequate funds for research have produced results that are unprecedented.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of serving on the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare with the able and honorable gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. Of course, no one can gild the lily. There is no man in this America of ours who has greater interest in the welfare of the people and in finding the cause and cure of these dread human diseases than has the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has enumerated many instances where this program has done great good. I wish the gentleman had talked about the new technique of operating on the brain, for epilepsy. I might say, as the gentleman knows is the fact, that many operations have been performed on epileptic patients and that over 50 percent of the patients have been totally cured, over 30 percent are helped, and the other 20 percent are not hurt in any way, shape, or form. That was developed at the National Health Center in Bethesda under this program; is that not correct, Mr. FOGARTY?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is true.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman and say I am in complete agreement with all he has said and that this program has done wonders for the suffering people of America, and that it will do more in the future.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to support the recommendations made by the gentleman from Rhode Island. I think there has been no one in this House who has shown the interest in public health to the extent evidenced by the gentleman from Rhode Island over a period of years. What I like about his interest is that it is not merely in appropriations but it is a day after day and year after year interest in results. I feel confident that he will sincerely follow up the expenditure of the funds appropriated today to see that they are wisely made.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 39:

Page 30, line 20, insert "and payments, not to exceed $3,800, to Bureau employees to reimburse such employees for expenses incurred by reason of the failure to relocate the Bureau in the District of Columbia."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40:

On page 31, line 4, insert ": *Provided further*, That hereafter funds available for administrative expenses of the Bureau shall be available for payment of rent for quarters for district offices in the District of Columbia."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 44:

Page 33, line 15, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That $1,000,000 of the amount available under section 502 (b) of such act shall be used only for special projects for mentally retarded children."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10766. An act to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3076. An act to provide for a continuing survey and special studies of sickness and disability in the United States, and for periodic reports of the results thereof, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 890) entitled "An act to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10003) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11319) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senator from Vermont, Mr. FLANDERS, has been excused as a conferee on the part of the Senate on H. R. 10986, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes."

RETIRED PAY OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE FORMER LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 83) requesting the return of enrolled bill S. 3581 to the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States is requested to return to the Senate the enrolled bill (S. 3581) to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service. If and when said bill is returned by the President, the action of the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in signing said bill shall be deemed rescinded; and the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of said bill, to make the following corrections: On page 1 and in the table following line 7, strike out "January 20, 1918" and insert "June 20, 1918."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF JAPANESE-AMERICAN EVACUATION CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7763) to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determination of the claims, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, after "award", insert "in an amount not to exceed $100,000."

Page 5, line 2, after "award", insert "in an amount not to exceed $100,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the amendments?

Mr. FORRESTER. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that this matter was cleared with the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. When the bill passed the House, it allowed the claimants to recover damages to any amount they could prove. The Senate amendment restricted it to $100,000. It is a limitation on the amount of recovery.

Mr. MARTIN. It was cleared with the ranking minority member of the committee?

Mr. FORRESTER. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM MARTIN

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 906) for the relief of William Martin, of Tok Junction, Alaska, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,135" and insert "$1,080."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, these Senate amendments as well as the others have all been cleared with the ranking minority member of the committee?

Mr. FORRESTER. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. They have all been approved?

Mr. FORRESTER. Yes. I may say to the gentleman that this is simply reducing an amount in a private bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES O. FERRY AND OTHERS

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 909) for the relief of Charles O. Ferry and other employees of the Alaska Road Commission, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "$1,339" and insert "$1,239."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. CLARENCE M. AUGUSTINE

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1963) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence M. Augustine, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, line 9, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING RATES OF, AND LIBERALIZING THE BASIS FOR PAYMENT OF, NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED PENSION AND SERVICE-CONNECTED COMPENSATION

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7886) to amend part III of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7886, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through section 1 of the bill.

The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment on page 1, line 3, insert:

"TITLE I—NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY AND DEATH PENSION"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment on page 2, line 24, strike out the word "month", the period, and the quotation mark and insert "month; and."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment on page 3, line 1, insert:

"'(3) if the eligible person served outside the continental limits of the United States for a period of 30 days or more during the creditable period of service, the foregoing amounts of pension shall be increased by 20 per centum.'"

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DORN of South Carolina to the committee amendment: On page 3, line 4, strike out "20" and insert "10."

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is self-explanatory. It only cuts the percentage in half with a total saving of approximately $42 million annually. I hope the committee will adopt the amendment.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Can the gentleman tell us whether the VFW, the sponsors of this amendment, agreed to it?

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Yes, they have.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, the well accepted principle of extra payment for extra performance, common even to a night shift differential, has been included in H. R. 7886. I strongly recommend this feature for the consideration and approval of my colleagues of the House.

The principle of extra pay for hazardous duty or overseas service in time of war for military personnel and the principle of extra pay for overseas service for Federal civilian personnel is well established.

Going back to World War I policies, when Congress authorized the issuance of adjusted service certificates as a bonus for World War I veterans, an extra amount was added for each day of overseas service.

In the State bonuses, the traditional pattern was for increased payment for overseas service.

During World War II, Congress authorized extra overseas pay and also extra pay for hazardous duty involving flying, submarine duty, and the paratroops. During the Korean action, extra pay was authorized for personnel engaged in actual combat. This overseas differential is a standard procedure for Federal employees in overseas posts.

Overseas service involves certain hazards and problems different from those of stateside service, even where no actual combat occurs. Some of these involve little more than strange lands with strange customs and minimum recreational advantages, but they do run to

substantial differences of climate, topography, and hazard. For example, food, shelter, and medical attention is often at a premium in forward areas, if available at all, and difficult even in areas adjacent to the front.

It occurs to me that recognition of this overseas service in the payment of pensions as an extra allowance to eligible veterans will appeal to the American people. They have long believed that extra hazard should have extra reward. Also, at this time there are those who contend that we have so many veterans that the Congress should impose additional requirements for pension eligibility, such as longer minimums of service time, currently 90 days, and requirements of overseas service. The inclusion of the feature of a recognition of overseas service in the calculation of pensions to otherwise eligible veterans is thus a forward step following the well defined path of extra payment for extra duty.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SISK: On page 2, line 6, strike out "A person" and insert "A World War I veteran."

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I feel the amendment which I have offered, and which has just been read, is the most significant amendment which will be offered to this bill, H. R. 7886. It draws the line or defines the veterans who are to receive non-service-connected pensions and has a very significant bearing, I think, on the overall problem of non-service-connected pensions. In the discussion which went on yesterday, one of the principal attacks made on H. R. 7886, as voted out of the committee, was the fact that we were attempting to pass a bill and set up pensions 20 or 30 years in the future without any knowledge of the conditions which might exist and what the situation might be at that time.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. If I understand the gentleman's amendment correctly, it provides that the non-service-connected pension, which is provided for in section 1 of this bill, shall apply only to World War I veterans as far as the presumption that they are permanently and totally disabled on reaching the age of 65 is concerned. Is that right?

Mr. SISK. That is exactly right.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I understand the gentleman has assurance from both the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion that this alteration in the bill is acceptable to their commanders. Is that correct?

Mr. SISK. That is correct. I expect to read excerpts from letters from both of them and will put the letters in the RECORD.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Would the gentleman tell the House what the position of the American Legion was with reference to this provision during our hearings.

Mr. SISK. I might say to the chairman that, of course, it was my understanding at that time that the American Legion, when they appeared before our committee, desired that not only World War I but World War II and Korean veterans be included in section 1 of the pension provision of the bill.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Of course, the reason for the gentleman's amendment is to try to cut down the cost of the bill? That is the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. SISK. Basically, certainly. One of the reasons is to reduce the cost. I will say this to the gentleman, it does not materially reduce the cost this year. There is a difference of some $11 million for the forthcoming year as against the original bill. But, of course, it will materially affect the billions of dollars which have been rather loosely projected into the future. That is one of the significant points of this particular amendment. But there are other compelling reasons of justice and equity why I am proposing this amendment. Traditionally, throughout our country's history, this Congress has moved to provide pensions at a time following its wars when veterans had reached ages when many of them were disabled and in need. That is the situation confronting us with respect to veterans of World War I, but it is not the situation with respect to veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict. A great majority of veterans of these most recent wars will not be in any way affected by this amendment for many years, 20 or 30 years, into the future. We have no means of knowing what their needs may be then, or of dealing now with a future problem. This amendment will not deprive veterans of World War II from receiving non-service-connected pensions if, in the meantime, they actually become disabled and are in need. They will receive all the pensions to which they are presently entitled, and increases in benefits which may be approved. The amendment does not seek to discriminate against them, or to deprive them of anything. It merely adds provisions with respect to veterans of World War I which would recognize in law the fact that at the age of 65, when a veteran is unable to earn income exceeding the limits provided, he is actually disabled, in need, and is entitled to have a very meager recognition of his service to his country.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. What the gentleman is endeavoring to do is to place into this bill the provisions of certain bills that were introduced, such as the bill offered by the gentleman from Colorado relative to pension benefits for World War I veterans alone. Is that correct?

Mr. SISK. That is exactly right. Of course, I understand that the gentleman's bill incorporated other things that we are now attempting to do here.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately following the adoption of the Dorn amendment at line 4, page 3.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. I might say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] introduced a bill, in January 1955, I think it was, which did almost the same thing.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes. Will the gentleman tell the committee whether or not your amendment, if adopted, would disturb any of the World War II or Korean veterans who are now drawing non-service-connected benefits.

Mr. SISK. It is not my understanding that it would have any effect in the least. That is the information I have.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In other words, your amendment applies to World War I veterans when they reach their 65th birthday?

Mr. SISK. That is correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. And they have to meet income limitations if they are eligible to continue.

Mr. SISK. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to associate myself with the gentleman's amendment. I also think it is fair to state that I am a World War I veteran. I am in very good health, excellent, health, but a great many of my fellow veterans that I find out in my country, around Stockton where I live, are getting in very bad shape. I think we ought to provide for them, because they did a magnificent job in winning that war.

My experience in the First World War left with me some imperishable memories. I signed up to go to the first officers' camp at the Presidio of San Francisco. I enjoyed the drilling and shooting on the range. But when I was asked to place a bayonet on my rifle and then at the command of an officer stab a replica of a human being hanging from a crossbar, I rebelled. On the advice of some friends I enlisted in the aviation section of the Signal Corps. In a few months I learned to fly at North Island, near San Diego, Calif., and just before Christmas in 1917 I received my wings as an aviator and a second lieutenant's commission in the aviation section of the Signal Corps.

My first experience in flying at the front was in a quiet sector near the Vosges Mountains. The town in which we were quartered had been built by Caesar when he invaded Gaul. He built

a beautiful bathhouse, which was still in good condition, and a typically artistic building constructed by the Italians who were wonderful architects. From there we went to the St. Mihiel sector and we had the misfortune of losing one of our pilots, whose name was Johnson and who came from California. Somehow he either had to go down because of a storm or he had been brought down by Hun shellfire. At any rate he was killed, but the mechanic which he had with him was saved when the Americans threw back the Huns and found this boy almost starved to death and brought him to an American hospital in Souilly, the headquarters of the First Army.

In that drive I flew a number of missions. One of the Divisions that fought in that sector, that threw back the Huns, was the 26th Division whose shoulder lapel was Y. D., which some called Yankee Division and others called it the Yankee Devils.

Then in a few days the American Army swung toward the north, from the Argonne Woods to Verdun. There is where the great Meuse-Argonne Drive broke the back of the retreating Huns. I will never forget the thousands of American doughboys that marched by our field on the way to the fighting front.

The nights were cold but this endless stream of men kept coming and their sleeping places were in houses in French villages, barns, chicken coops and on the ground. In that group were some wonderful men who had been trained in the Cantonments in America. I looked naturally for the 91st Division which was the Western Division that had the slogan "Power River—Let Her Buck." In that group were many friends of mine. Some who have become famous men were Douglas McKay recently our Secretary of the Interior. He participated in the first days of the battle. He was wounded 9 times and to this day he suffers pain and discomfort from the wounds he received 38 years ago. In that division and on the front was a young officer by the name of Harold Burton, who now graces the Supreme Court of the United States as one of its Associate Justices.

Another soldier in that group was Buron Fitts, who later became the lieutenant governor of California. He was shot in his right knee and to this day walks with a stiff knee. It happened that I had the misfortune of having an observer, Lt. Charles Rust, of Oklahoma, in my plane shot in his right arm while we were on a mission to locate the front line of the 32d Division. I attacked the German plane and then turned to bring back my wounded comrade and have him placed in an advance hospital. I landed him alive but during the night he died of loss of blood.

My regular observer, Frazer W. Kolb, and I attacked four machinegun nests used by the Germans to slow down the advance of the infantry. We attacked them on their flank and liquidated all of them.

I have no personal knowledge, but I know many of the men who fought in that great drive are now old and feeble men. Time takes its toll. I do not want these men to be neglected in order to save a few dollars for the national treasury. The Lord has dealt generously with me as my health is today, 38 years after my service in 1918, as good as it was then. In my whole life I have not been laid up because of ill health over a total of 15 days. I hope that the Veterans' Committee and its great chairman will be able to submit some sound legislation that we can agree on unanimously. The American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars as well as all the other veterans groups have, during the years that have passed, offered some legislative suggestions that have only one objective and that is to give justice to those heroes who represented America on the battlefield, especially those who were wounded and disabled.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. The gentleman from California indicated that the World War II veterans presently receiving pensions would not be affected. Is it not a fact that if this is adopted they will receive a lower sum than the veterans of World War I?

Mr. SISK. Actually, I am not sure as to the relative amounts they will receive as against World War I veterans. There are certain standards of eligibility applied to World War I veterans.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. But the World War II veterans cannot be raised even though they are disabled and this has been shown.

Mr. SISK. Is the gentleman talking about service-connected or non-service-connected cases?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Non-service-connected. They have to be disabled to a certain degree and be unemployable in order to get them.

Mr. SISK. Section 1 does not deal with that particular group. As I understand this particular matter applies only to the World War I veterans.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Answering the question of the gentleman from Wyoming, the only group that has an added presumption is the World War I veterans. The difference in rates under this section 1 would not be present between World War I and World War II or Korean veterans to qualify under the principal sections of existing law. There would be a difference as to those over 65 enjoying a presumption in the case of World War I veterans which would not be present in the case of World War II and Korean veterans.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma. If you will bear with me just a moment I would like to read excerpts from letters I received from the American Legion and from the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D. C., June 27, 1956.

Hon. ED EDMONDSON,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EDMONDSON: In response to your request, the American Legion will support the suggested amendment in the first section of title I of H. R. 7886 which would provide that only World War I veterans shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled upon reaching the age of 65 years.

At the same time we respectfully submit that consideration should be given in the near future to the enactment of similar legislation for World War II veterans otherwise qualified and reaching the age of 65.

Sincerely yours,

J. ADDINGTON WAGNER,
National Commander.

(Copy to Hon. B. F. SISK.)

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., June 27, 1956.

Hon. B. F. SISK,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SISK: In response to your inquiry concerning the position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars with respect to the provision in title I, section 1, of H. R. 7886, which would eliminate the requirement of proof of disability and unemployability for pension purposes at age 65, I am pleased to advise the following:

The VFW would have no objection to amending title I, section 1, of H. R. 7886, to provide that the assumption of permanent and total disability, as well as unemployability upon reaching age 65, for pension purposes shall be limited at this time to veterans of World War I.

Sincerely yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. GARMATZ. Under the gentleman's amendment would it not be a fact that there will be discrimination against the veterans of World War II who are now in their sixties and who did not serve in World War I? There may not be too many, but they would be eliminated would they not?

Mr. SISK. Yes. I may say to the gentleman from Maryland that this applies only to veterans who participated in World War I. I am aware that there are a few veterans of World War II and possibly Korea, mostly in the officer class, who are 65. It is actually a very small number.

Mr. GARMATZ. It would discriminate against both.

Mr. SISK. This amendment would not eliminate them from pensions to which they are entitled under existing law. It does not eliminate or discriminate against anybody. It merely provides a means of establishing disability at the age of 65 for veterans of World War I who are in need.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(On request of Mr. DORN of South Carolina and by unanimous consent, Mr. SISK was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I would like to say to the gentleman from California in view of the letters which he has just read from the Veterans of Foreign Wars and from the American Legion that I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I would like to quickly say that, of course, this does limit to a considerable extent the bill as initially reported out; yet, on the other hand, to me it offers a non-service-connected pension to a deserving group of men in this country because, certainly, the World War I veteran who went away in 1917 and fought that war came out without any of the benefits, such as educational benefits and other things, incorporated in the GI bill of rights. Not only that, but many of the cost figures that have been tossed around here I find a little hard to believe and a little hard to understand.

May I add that a great many of these men now are on public assistance. They are on the local, State, and county public-assistance rolls. So when we come down to a consideration of the money that is involved, I very gravely question some of the high figures that are being tossed around here.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not like to yield in any way on the bill reported, I may say to the gentleman, but it may be the matter of wisdom to do so. Of course, we will have another year coming and we can put in the World War II and Korean war veterans then.

Mr. SISK. I may say to the gentlewoman that is one of the things I would like to make clear. We are today some 30 or 40 years away from the war fought by the World War I veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I do not want to object to the request, but if other Members expect to get 15 or 20 minutes additional, we will be here today and tomorrow. We hope to be able to get through this thing today and I do not think everyone who offers an amendment should ask for an additional 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Texas. There is no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. I do hope we will not waste a lot of time arguing about something we are in agreement on.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in bringing this legislation to the floor. By so doing they have afforded us an opportunity to eliminate many injustices and discriminations that have crept into the veterans' program, and particularly an opportunity to do for the veterans of World War I what should have been done long ago. It is my contention that if there be any forgotten veterans it is those of World War I.

It was my great honor and privilege, Mr. Chairman, to serve as a member of the Veterans' Committee during my first term—the 78th Congress—as a Member of this House. We wrote a record during those years of great benefit to all veterans and particularly to those of World War II. It was during the 78th Congress that the Servicemen's Readjustment Act was written and became law. This legislation was better known as the GI bill. It was sponsored by the American Legion, but had the unqualified support of all veterans' organizations. I am most happy to have had a part in constructing the legislation and passing it through the Congress.

Down through the years I have done all in my power to see that justice was done our veterans, particularly the disabled and the widows and orphans of those who gave their lives to the cause of freedom.

Unfortunately there has not been unanimous agreement on the pending legislation. Differences among veterans, veterans' organizations and others for a time endangered the passage of a bill that could become law. Opposition to H. R. 7886 has been whipped up by a large segment of the Nation's daily press. The opposition has been based primarily on high cost estimates provided by the Veterans' Administration. The accuracy of these estimates has been seriously questioned by the American Legion as well as numerous members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I am inclined to believe that the estimates are high.

But, be that as it may, such strong opposition has developed that it is seriously endangering passage and acceptance by the President of H. R. 7886 as reported by the committee.

What amounts to a new bill will be presented today in the form of amendments which have been identified as the Dorn substitute. This substitute apparently has the support of a majority of the Veterans' Committee members as well as the major veterans' organizations. I have received and no doubt most of you have, too, telegrams from the veterans' organizations announcing their support of the substitute. This is most encouraging. It means that we will be successful in our effort to get an acceptable bill during this Congress. I congratulate our colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], and other members of the committee who, through hard work, diligence, and ingenious effort, seem to have solved the problem. They have rendered a very great service to our veterans.

It is particularly encouraging that we are, at long last, taking a major step toward providing pensions for veterans of World War I comparable to those afforded veterans of previous wars. I should like to repeat, the World War I veterans apparently are the forgotten men. Some of them are approaching the journey's end. They are in need. Others are getting along and fast approaching the end of their earning capacity. It is time that a benevolent and appreciative Nation—the richest and most powerful on the face of the earth—show its gratitude and afford them the treatment to which they are entitled.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I desire to congratulate all members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for the hard work and long hours they have devoted to the pending legislation. They have done a fine job under the leadership of one of the great men of this Congress, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. Throughout his service on the Veterans' Committee he has shown the same fighting spirit in behalf of the veteran that he displayed as a courageous fighting soldier of World War II. The Nation is indebted to him for his effort in behalf of freedom, and our veterans are indebted to him for his untiring efforts in behalf of their cause.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there are going to be a series of sweetening amendments offered to this bill. Let me read you what the commander of the American Legion said before our committee when this particular amendment was offered:

> Mr. WAGNER. Again I say that we feel that all war veterans who meet the requirements, regardless of the time of their service, or where they served, should be considered the same.

That situation will exist with reference to every amendment that is offered. They know they have a bad bill, they are afraid they are going to get beat. They are going to back down on everything they had to offer.

If the Members will stay on the floor, we hope to offer you an opportunity where you may vote for compensation for the service-connected veteran, or you will vote for pensions for non-service-connected veterans. You will have one choice. There is no way that I can object to any amendment that makes this bill more desirable, and I will not object. But, we hope to offer you the opportunity so that you can vote for service connected or nonservice connected. For example, they are going to change the rates and they are going to tell you there is a saving of about $600 million or $700 million, but actually they are going to add about $350 million to what is being paid for the nonservice pension program this year, and when that amendment is offered I want to point that out. But, we hope to offer you a choice to take the service-connected bill at a cost of about $182 million or the nonservice connected at a cost of about $350 million.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he was going to offer the House a choice between an

increase for non-service-connected veterans and an increase only for service-connected veterans?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I said that we hope to offer the House an opportunity to vote for one or the other: an increase for service-connected or an increase for nonservice-connected.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Would it not be possible to offer to the House the choice of voting an increase both for the service connected and the nonservice connected and not only for the service connected?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It will be possible to offer every type of benefit for the veteran and his dependents, something that can pass this House and make some people happy, but that is not what I am interested in. I am interested in something that can pass this House and the other body that will be beneficial to the veteran and will become law.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Does the gentleman feel he is giving the House an opportunity to work its will if he restricts by some parliamentary maneuver the choice between the two alternatives: the choice between the service connected and the nonservice connected?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman from Texas will assume that responsibility on his own.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I would like to ask the gentleman what difference is there between a World War I veteran at 65 and his disability and a World War II veteran at 65. Why should not a World War II veteran be disabled at 65 if a World War I veteran is?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Of course, there is absolutely no difference, as the gentleman knows. This is merely an attempt to get the camel's nose under the tent, and every year coming on now we will have the World War II veterans reaching age 65 and otherwise qualified who will not get the same presumption of disability as the World War I veteran.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. If we pass this in the form it is, it will do something for the World War I veteran and nothing for the World War II veteran in that respect?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. In that respect, yes.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. If we pass it in the form it is now, it will be something for the non-service-connected situations, but giving no special attention or priority to the people who did the fighting and received the injuries and the wounds which they survived in World War II.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Of course, it is my belief if we pass this bill with something in it for everybody, it will never become law. I believe that if we pass one doing something for the service connected, it will be doing something for the veteran.

Yesterday there was reference to the accuracy of the estimate of the Veterans' Administration.

The Veterans' Administration estimate of the first year's cost on section 1 of the Dorn substitute was $367,958,000 broken down as follows:

(a) New cases	$247,212,000
(b) Increases in basic rate to those on pension rolls	66,630,000
(c) Increases to those on the compensation rolls by transfer to pension rolls at higher rate	11,586,000
(d) Increased rate based on overseas service	42,530,000
Total	367,958,000

The calculations presented by Mr. EDMONDSON—page 11024, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 26, 1956—are substantially in accordance with items (a) and (b) of the Veterans' Administration estimate. It will be noted, however, that Mr. EDMONDSON's estimate fails to take into account items (c) and (d) of the Veterans' Administration estimate which total $54,116,000, which is roughly the amount which Mr. EDMONDSON considers as excessive in the Veterans' Administration estimate.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The impression was left that only those who were wounded might have won the war, but there might have been some of those fellows who came back not wounded who really helped win the war, too.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. That is true. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the Dorn substitute which will be offered, amendment by amendment, as it was accepted by the committee, will provide for practically a 14-percent raise for widows, orphans, and service-connected cases, almost straight across the board, and with the Sisk amendment prevailing, it will offer a pension to World War I veterans at age 65. Their average age is almost that now, and they are dying at the rate of 80,000 to 90,000 a year. So, every year the pension to those veterans will grow less, and they are the forgotten men. There is no question about that. I want you to remember it. The only thing we are trying to do here today is to raise the pension of the wounded, the service connected, the disabled man and at the same time give the World War I veteran a pension at age 65 if his income is less than $1,400 as a single man or $2,700 if he has one or more dependents. I hope the Members on both sides of this aisle will not become confused and get to the place where you do not know what we are voting for.

Mr. Chairman, I have told you the truth and all the truth. We could debate here the rest of the day and you cannot change it. I hope the committee will support the amendments that will be offered in line with the Dorn substitute. In that way the service-connected veteran will get a small raise of about 14 percent and his widow and orphans will get a raise.

We must assume that the World War I veteran is entitled to some kind of a pension when he reaches the age of 65. I ask the Members, do not get confused, let us hold it to that, because that is the truth and it cannot be disproven.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer 2 amendments to section 1 and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, are both of those amendments amendments to section 1?

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina that the two amendments be considered en bloc?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DORN of South Carolina: On page 2, line 14, strike out "85" and insert "75"; and on page 2, line 18, strike out "105" and insert "90."

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to try to save the Government some money. That seems to be the biggest objection to many portions of the bill. I offer these amendments, which have the backing of the veterans' organizations and it is estimated that they will save $168 million.

This section, I might say, Mr. Chairman, is the meat of the entire bill. This section, with the amendments, will retain the provision for total disability at the age of 65 with an income of less than $1,400 if single or $2,700 with dependents.

I hope the committee will adopt the amendment in the interest of the passage of this bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. At the present time the veteran who would receive $75 a month in the event the amendment is adopted, is now receiving $66.15; is that correct?

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. And under the next amendment, the veteran who would receive $90 a month is now receiving $78?

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. $78.75.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. So it represents a measly increase in both instances?

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. That is exactly correct.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. For the purpose of eligibility, as I understand it, a veteran's income is limited to $1,400 if single and $2,700 if married. Does social security count as income in these instances?

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Yes, it does.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Then many veterans reaching the age of 65 will be eligible for social security. Therefore, this pension would not be required in many

instances by virtue of their being eligible for social security.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. If the social security amounts to more than $1,400 that need is not present, or if he has an income of $400 or $500 and social security of such an amount that the two sums together amount to more than $1,400, he will not be eligible.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Is it true that there is no limitation in this bill whatever as to the net worth of an individual? For instance, a man may have a million dollars in the bank, but as long as he is not drawing any income from that money he can still draw his pension?

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. That is correct. However, may I say to the gentleman that I certainly would not think much of a man worth a million dollars, or $50,000 or $100,000, even, who would apply for a pension. Technically, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I would not, either, but I can conceive of situations where they might be turning their income over to some members of their family in order to draw the pension.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Does the gentleman's amendment in any way affect the eligibility at age 65? In other words, the amendment previously adopted would still prevail with respect to the limitation as to the First World War veteran?

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Exactly.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, just so the House will know exactly what this does, the gentleman from South Carolina said what I have been saying and said all day yesterday. Section 1, providing liberalization of nonservice pensions, is the heart of this bill. This adds to the presently existing law $356,772,000. The Sisk amendment brought it down $11 million. This leaves the cost of the Dorn amendment to section 1 $345,772,000. This year the existing nonservice pension program will cost $488,761,640, but with this amendment the first-year cost will be $856,719,640 for non-service-connected pensions.

With regard to the request of the gentleman from Utah, look on page 9945 and you can find specific instances where we have found that the situation he is talking about happened, where men with a net worth of $30,000, $40,000, or $50,000 were drawing a pension.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONSON. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that this amendment, which cuts the rate of the pension for these veterans, would increase the amount of the payment that would be made and would increase the total cost of the bill?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Is the gentleman saying that it does not increase costs of programs under existing law?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am not saying it does not increase the present existing law, but the gentleman is not maintaining that the amendment just offered increases the cost of the bill?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am talking about the net effect of the bill. The gentleman keeps saying if we do not pass the bill we will save money. In everything he said yesterday he said we would have that much money. The Dorn amendment adds $356 million to the total cost of the existing program.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I will agree that the gentleman has stated that accurately, but as to the $800 million, perhaps I misunderstood the gentleman as saying that was an additional cost created by this amendment.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Of course, anything we do here today is going to increase existing benefits. If it did not increase existing benefits we would not be here. We would have no reason to be here.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I notice that some of us get a little bit nervous, but I think we will do very well to stay here today and thrash this thing out. These fellows that fought this war were not able to vote any time they wanted to, and they were not able to quit and come home when they wanted to. I think it is very well that we stand here today and that we go through this bill in an intelligent manner and thrash it out in a way so that we can all understand what is being done.

I would like to direct my remarks to the editorial page of the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 27, upon which there appears a cartoon that, to me, is the epitome, the absolute, the all-time top in an ungrateful and undeserved insult to our veterans.

I wonder how the widows and orphans feel—the heirs and assigns of those fighting men whose bones lie rotting in the forests of Germany; the mountain crags of Italy; in Flanders Field; in the stinking mud of New Guinea and in the ruin and rubble of Korea.

Did the thousands of our Navy men go down in Pearl Harbor because the pay was great and promotions sure—or did they die because their country called them? How many ex-servicemen within the sound of my voice can show me important money saved from that magnificent salary paid them, which salary in World War I ranged from $21 to $30 every month—whether they needed it or not.

Let us consider the 3 million veterans of World War I who did not believe that America should bow her neck to the grinding heel of the Prussian aggressor. Does anyone believe those men left their farms, their offices, their shops, their foundries to serve because of a "cash register patriotism"?

I call upon the Washington Post and Times Herald to poll those 130,000 veterans in V. A. hospitals to see what motivated them. Was it cash?

To the 20 million veterans of this Nation, please accept our apologies for this ungracious and insulting attempt to slander.

True—the ring of the cash register was loud throughout the land—but very few times did the soldier, sailor or marine punch the button.

I, for one, do not have the guts, gall and audacity to return to my district and face the mothers, fathers, widows, and orphans of the "cash register patriots" the Post and Times Herald would have you believe them, and admit my interest in foreign development is greater than my gratitude to these dead, maimed and still living veterans who have made possible the continuation of the Washington Post and Times Herald's publication.

I want to talk a little bit about this service-connected business. Let me tell you something. There are many men today in this country that should be service connected, who should be getting pensions but are not getting them, because they cannot show a record of having gone to a doctor while they were in the service. There are thousands and thousands of such men and I see many of them every day. We are carrying this service-connection policy too far. I have compassion for all the men who have been wounded in war. In my judgment, there is nothing on earth too good for them.

Let the same openhanded welcome be extended when Johnny comes marching home, wounded and war-weary, as prevailed when the drums were beating and the flags were waving at his departure. Oh, yes. Nothing is too good for Johnny when our liberty is threatened.

When we marched a bunch of those boys off to war at $21 a month in World War I, they did not come home to the GI bill of rights. They did not come home to 52 weeks pay. I tell you they came home to an economy that was strained. They did not come home to a guaranteed job. I tell you, my good friends, it is high time that the American people began to look at a soldier from the point of view of what he lost because of his service in the Armed Forces. What is it that the soldier lost? We should not be talking about whether he is service connected or not. Many times it is impossible from a medical standpoint to establish whether or not a man's disease occurred in the service or after he got out of the service, or even before he went into the service. There is no use kidding ourselves about these things. We all know this is true. Let us stop quibbling about it and declare that if the man who went into the service and served his country well and good, and then comes out and becomes sick and disabled and can no longer work and care for himself, that a grateful Nation will say to him, "We owe to you the same thing that you owed us. You owed it to us to defend this country in its time of need and in its time of trouble,

and now we will defend you, your wife, and family in your hour of distress and in your hour of need." Let us give the soldiers what is coming to them.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman mentioned the fact that Sgt. Alvin York, the hero of World War I, was just granted a non-service-connected pension a few weeks ago at $66.15 a month; is that not correct?

Mr. LONG. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. And if this amendment is adopted, then Sergeant York will receive an increase from $66.15 a month to $75 a month.

Mr. LONG. That is correct, and I am sure there are many Sergeant Yorks.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The House has passed a bill which would give Sgt. Alvin York $100 a month, and it is pending in the other body, and we cannot even get that considered over there.

Mr. LONG. Bless your heart. I appreciate the contribution, but I wish that the Senate and House would both pass a bill to take care of all the Sergeant Yorks and not just one.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there have been some suggestions made regarding this particular amendment which appear to me to be calculated to cloud the issue which is actually presented by this amendment. The suggestion made by my good friend from Ohio a few moments ago that there is no limitation in this with regard to wealth, and that a man who has a million dollars of wealth can still be qualified to receive this pension is not relevant to the question whether or not this pension rate should be reduced from $105 to $90. It has no relevancy whatsoever in the consideration of that particular question and it has very little relevancy when you look at the actual facts of the situation because I doubt very much if the gentleman can conceive with the wide acquaintanceship that I know he must have of anyone having a million dollars and not having any income.

I doubt if you gentlemen know of anyone who is so situated and who receives no income from it. As far as a personal property limitation in this bill is concerned, there is no reason in the world why the gentleman cannot offer an amendment to place a property limitation as well as an income limitation. When it was considered, that opportunity was present in the committee. That opportunity is present on the floor and personally I would have no objection with reference to a property limitation. I submit that has nothing to do, however, with the question of whether or not we should lower the rates from $105 to $90 and from $85 to $75. That presents a simple question whether or not we are going to save some money and bring these rates down to a little more reasonable figure. Everyone who is for the measure will vote for this. People who are in favor of economy should also vote for it as a cost-saving amendment which is offered in this amendment.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am not interested in trying to make this House believe something that is not true. Our committee staff can furnish to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] the names of men who have $27,000, $31,000, $22,000, and $50,000 in the bank who were either drawing $66 or $78 a month. I pointed out yesterday that that is a weakness in the program that should be corrected. It is true it does not have any bearing on what this amendment provides.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I agree with the gentleman, and I would not quarrel with the point he is making. I suggest to the gentleman if he will introduce an amendment at this point or introduce a bill to establish a property limitation, it will have my wholehearted support, because I think it is a reasonable thing. However, I submit it has no bearing whatsoever on the question of whether or not we should lower the rates. I do not know why it was introduced in the discussion at this point.

I hope the House will vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do so in order to serve notice on the House that no further extensions of time or transfers of time will be allowed this afternoon, because the chairman has assured me that they are trying to finish this bill today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Subparagraph (a) of paragraph II of part III of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) No pension shall be paid under this part during any calendar year to any unmarried person whose annual income during that year exceeds $1,800 or to any married person or any person with minor children whose annual income during that year exceeds $3,000."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, strike out all of section 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) The amendment made by the first section of this act shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar month which begins after the date of its enactment.

(b) The amendment made by section 2 of this act shall take effect as of the first day of January 1956; however, no pension shall be paid by reason of such amendment for any period prior to the first day of the first calendar month which begins after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment.

Page 3, line 14, strike out all of section 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request. It is my understanding that the entire remainder of this bill, pertaining to a large number of different subject matters and different committee amendments, is proposed to be read in its entirety by the reading clerk, which will leave us in the position, when we get to the end, with regard to amendments, of having a difficult time explaining and analyzing the overall effect of different amendments that are proposed.

I ask unanimous consent, for the purpose of clarity in connection with the question of the remaining material in this bill, that each section be read and considered separately for amendment by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. AYRES and Mr. TEAGUE of Texas objected.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Would a motion calling for such reading be in order at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. It would not. It can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. EDMONDSON. May I be heard further on the ruling of the Chair with regard to the reading?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already ruled.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EDMONDSON. These sections, Mr. Chairman, represent separate amendments which were voted upon separately and adopted separately in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. They appear in the bill now before this House and in the report of the committee as one entire collective amendment, which is contrary to the committee proceedings with regard to the actual development of these amendments and their adoption by the committee.

I make the following parliamentary inquiry of the Chair: In circumstances where the actual record of the committee will support the fact that these sections and amendments were adopted and agreed to separately, would it not be in order to read them separately rather than in their entirety?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair invites attention to the fact that the committee report, the report reporting the bill to the House, is the only official document that is presented to the House with the pending bill, and the committee report shows clearly that this is one amendment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, on that point I have read the committee report and while I state to the Chair that it does not represent my understanding as to how these amendments were

adopted by the committee, I will agree with the Chair that it does set forth that they are in one entire collective amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has no knowledge of what may have transpired in one of the standing committees of the House except what is shown by the report which is the official document presented by the committee to the House.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I understand the Chair's predicament but I hope the Chair will understand ours as well.

The CHAIRMAN. It probably should have been handled in the committee.

The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That subsection (a) of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to compensate widows and children of persons who died while receiving monetary benefits for disabilities directly incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service in the World War", approved June 28, 1934 (38 U. S. C. 503), is amended by inserting immediately after "1920," the following: "or in World War II before January 1, 1947,".

SEC. 3. Section 2 of the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1281), as amended (38 U. S. C. 504), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The monthly rates of pension shall be as follows: Widow but no child, $75; widow and 1 child, $95 (with $11.25 for each additional child); no widow but 1 child, $41; no widow but 2 children, $62 (equally divided); no widow but 3 children, $82 (equally divided with $11.25 for each additional child) (the total amount to be equally divided)."

SEC 4. (a) That section 8 of the act of May 1, 1926, as amended by section 3 of the act of March 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 107), as amended (38 U. S. C. 364g), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. The rates of pension payable to widows and former widows under the provisions of section 2 of this act, as amended, are hereby increased to $75 monthly."

(b) Section 1 of the act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 645; 38 U. S. C. 364i), is amended by deleting the words: "authorized by section 4 of the act of August 7, 1946 (Public Law 611, 79th Cong.), as amended by the act of July 30, 1947 (Public Law 270, 80th Cong.)", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "prescribed by section 8 of the act of May 1, 1926, as amended by section 3 of the act of March 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 107), as now or hereafter amended (38 U. S. C. 364g)."

TITLE II—SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY AND DEATH COMPENSATION

SEC. 5. That subparagraphs (a) to (j), inclusive, of paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) If and while the disability is rated 10 percent the monthly compensation shall be $20.

"(b) If and while the disability is rated 20 percent the monthly compensation shall be $40.

"(c) If and while the disability is rated 30 percent the monthly compensation shall be $60.

"(d) If and while the disability is rated 40 percent the monthly compensation shall be $80.

"(e) If and while the disability is rated 50 percent the monthly compensation shall be $100.

"(f) If and while the disability is rated 60 percent the monthly compensation shall be $120.

"(g) If and while the disability is rated 70 percent the monthly compensation shall be $140.

"(h) If and while the disability is rated 80 percent the monthly compensation shall be $160.

"(i) If and while the disability is rated 90 percent the monthly compensation shall be $180.

"(j) If and while the disability is rated as total the monthly compensation shall be $250."

SEC. 6. (a) Subparagraph (k), paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is amended by deleting "$47" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$55," and the subparagraph is further amended by increasing the maximum rate of compensation set forth therein to $450 per month.

(b) The rate of compensation payable under subparagraph (l), paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby increased to $300.

(c) The rate of compensation payable under subparagraph (m), paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby increased to $350.

(d) The rate of compensation payable under subparagraph (n), paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby increased to $400.

(e) The rates of compensation payable under subparagraphs (o) and (p), paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, are hereby increased to $450.

(f) The minimum rate of compensation payable under subparagraph (q), paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, for an arrested tuberculosis disease, is hereby increased to $75.

SEC. 7. The basic rate of compensation provided by section 202 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, for any disability rated as total, is hereby increased to $250 per month. If and while the disability is rated as partial, the monthly compensation shall be the same percentage of $200 as the degree of the reduction in earning capacity resulting from the disability, but no compensation shall be payable for a reduction in earning capacity rated at less than 10 percent.

SEC. 8. The rate of compensation payable under section 202 (3) of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, for the loss of the use of both eyes, is hereby increased to $300; the rate payable under that section for the loss of use of both eyes and one or more limbs is hereby increased to $400; the rate payable under that section for double total permanent disability is hereby increased to $400; and the additional compensation payable under that section for the loss of the use of a creative organ or one or more feet or hands is hereby increased to $55.

SEC. 9. The additional sum payable under section 202 (5) of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, for a disabled person in need of a nurse or attendant, is hereby increased to $80.

SEC. 10. The minimum rate of compensation payable under section 202 (7) of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, for an arrested tuberculosis disease, is hereby increased to $75.

SEC. 11. (a) Section 1 of Public Law 877, 80th Congress, as amended (38 U. S. C. 740), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That any person entitled to compensation at wartime rates for disability incurred in or aggravated by active service as provided in part I, or paragraph I (c), part II, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, and restored with limitations by Public Law 141, 73d Congress, March 28, 1934, as amended, and whose disability is rated not less than 10 percent, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents in the following monthly amounts:

"(1) If and while rated totally disabled and—

"(a) has a wife but no child living, $25;

"(b) has a wife and one child living, $41;

"(c) has a wife and 2 children living, $53;

"(d) has a wife and 3 or more children living, $65;

"(e) has no wife but one child living, $17;

"(f) has no wife but two children living, $29;

"(g) has no wife but three or more children living, $41;

"(h) has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, $21 for each parent so dependent.

"(2) If and while partially disabled, but not less than 10 percent, in an amount having same ratio to the amount specified in subsection (1) hereof as the degree of his disability bears to the total disability."

(b) Section 2 of Public Law 877, 80th Congress (38 U. S. C. 741), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That any person entitled to compensation at peacetime rates for disability incurred in or aggravated by active service as provided in paragraph II, part II, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, except paragraph I (c) thereof, and whose disability is rated not less than 10 percent, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents at a rate equal to 80 percent of the additional compensation now or hereafter payable under section 1."

Sec. 12. Paragraph IV, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The surviving widow, child, or children, and dependent mother or father of any deceased person who died as the result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service as provided in part I, paragraph I hereof, shall be entitled to receive compensation at the monthly rates specified next below:

"Widow but no child, $125; widow with 1 child, $160 (with $35 for each additional child); no widow but 1 child, $75; no widow but 2 children, $100 (equally divided); no widow but 3 children, $150 (equally divided) (with $30 for each additional child, total amount to be equally divided); dependent mother or father, $80 (for both), $45 each."

TITLE III—BURIAL ALLOWANCE

SEC. 13. That Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a) is hereby amended by striking out "$150" each place it occurs therein, and inserting in lieu thereof each time "$200".

TITLE IV—REPEALS AND EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 14. (a) The following provisions of law are repealed:

(1) Section 6 of the act of December 14, 1944 (38 U. S. C., sec. 735); and

(2) Section 4 of the act of May 27, 1944 (38 U. S. C., sec. 507b)

(b) Persons entitled to pension for the day before the effective date of this act by reason of the provisions of law repealed by subsection (a) shall receive pension on and after such effective date under the act of June 28, 1934 (38 U. S. C., secs. 503–507a), as though their original award of pension had been made under such act of June 28, 1934.

SEC. 15. No amendment or repeal made by this act shall affect the entitlement of any person to compensation or pension for periods before the effective date of the act.

SEC. 16. The amendment made by section 13 of this act shall apply only with respect to deaths occurring on or after the effective date of this act.

SEC. 17. This act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of its enactment.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment just read is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman on his point of order.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I think it is quite apparent from the dcbate here that when we try to consider pension bills and compensation bills together, we become somewhat confused.

This bill has been classified as a general pension bill, and as such, comes up for debate as a privileged matter. The term "pension" means payment for a non-service-connected disability. Compensation, on the other hand, has been officially defined by Public Law 494, 79th Congress, which states that—

Under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration monetary benefits, other than retirement pay, for service-connected disability or death shall be designated compensation and not pension.

Therefore, payments for non-service-connected disabiilities are properly called pension.

Mr. Chairman, all of title II relates entirely to service-connected compensation for disabilities of a veteran or to his widow and/or children, and this is not germane to this bill.

The act, Public Law 494, was passed prior to the Reorganization Act, Public Law 601 of the 79th Congress, which gave the Committee on Veterans' Affairs the right to report a general pension bill at any time. It is presumed that the term "compensation" provided in Public Law 494 of the 79th Congress had the meaning intended when the term "general pension bill" was included as a privileged matter under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. By no stretch of the imagination, Mr. Chairman, may this bill, as reported, be considered a general pension bill.

There are numerous similarities and much closer questions than this on which have been decided to be related but not necessarily germane. I cite the following rulings from volume VIII of Cannon's Precedents:

2953: To a proposition providing for a class, a proposition providing for another related class is not germane.

To a bill for the relief of dependents of men in the Regular Army an amendment proposing to extend the benefits of the act to dependents of men in the National Guard and the Reserve Corps was held not to be germane.

2960: To a bill pensioning veterans of the Indian wars an amendment pensioning veterans of the Texas Rangers engaged in opposing Mexican marauders and Indian depredations was held not to be germane.

2983: To a bill granting soldiers the right to retain Government clothing an amendment to grant them extra pay was held not to be germane.

2985: To a bill providing for the payment of compensation under certain circumstances as a part of the benefits of insurance policies to be issued by the Government in consideration of the payment of annual premiums an amendment providing for the payment of such compensation as a pension was held not to be germane.

2986: To a law providing for the sale of insurance to soldiers in consideration of the payment of annual premiums an amendment proposing to grant such insurance for 2 years without payment of premiums was held not to be germane.

3035: A different subject from that under consideration may not be proposed under the guise of a limitation.

To a bill for the relief of women and children in Germany an amendment providing that the proposed legislation should not become effective until a soldiers' compensation law had been enacted was held not to be germane.

These and other precedents amply prove that this amendment, and particularly that portion which relates to title II thereafter, is extraneous material and certainly not covered by the subject general-pension bill. I therefore renew my point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman from Texas concedes the point of order.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has conceded the point of order. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma desire to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I most certainly do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, in order to hold that a non-service-connected pension enjoys a privilege on this floor superior to and above the privilege which this House will extend to a compensation bill for service-connected disabled veterans it seems to me we have to adopt the most strained and tecehnical interpretation of the word "pension" possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will kindly suspend. It is not a question of the gentleman's opinion or the Chair's opinion as to the merits involved. It is a question of the rules of the House of Representatives and the precedents based on those rules.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I understand that, but if I may speak for just a moment to the point on the basis of the rule of reason, if none other: At the time we first had pension legislation and at the time the word "pension" first came into operation in our jurisprudence and in our legislation, there was no distinction between pension and compensation. If I understand the history of pension legislation correctly, it is a modern development that we separate the two and call compensation something paid, generally at higher scales, to the service connected, than pensions which are paid to the nonservice connected.

It seems to me entirely outside the rule of reason to hold that this Congress would extend a higher privilege to compensation bills for nonservice connected than it would to compensation bills for the service-connected disabled. I think it is inconsistent with the position which has been taken by the Chairman and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] throughout this debate.

I earnestly hope the Chair will overrule the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The ruling of the Chair does not necessarily reflect the views of the Chair or an endeavor to meet the merits presented by the question at issue.

The gentleman from Ohio has made a point of order against the language appearing in the bill to which he has referred. The Chair is indebted to the gentleman from Ohio for the argument presented by him in support of this point of order. It shows considerable research of the rules and precedents of the House and is helpful to the Chair in meeting the issue here presented.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], the chairman of the committee reporting the bill to the House, concedes the point of order. As to the argument presented by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], it is not a question of what the merits might be or what the desire might be; it is a question of the rules of the House.

From the very beginning the House, in the adoption of its rules, has made a distinction between pensions and compensation. That has existed throughout the years and it obtains and applies now. Of course, the Chair is bound by the rules of the House and the precedents following those rules.

The Chair might invite attention to the RECORD that reflects considerable information with respect to the question here presented. It was on January 3, 1939, that the rules of the House were amended and they have stood thus amended from that date down to now. The Chair and the Committee of the Whole are bound by the rules and the precedents adopted under those rules:

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation has exclusive jurisdiction over all pension legislation affecting veterans of the World War.

This is on January 3, 1939.

The jurisdiction of the Committee on Pensions is now confined to pension legislation affecting veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions has jurisdiction over pension legislation affecting veterans of all other wars of the United States, including also civil pensions.

That was a statement made at the time the change in the rule was under consideration here in the House.

Mr. SABATH. I offer a resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Without quoting it, that was a resolution amendng and changing the rules of the House. Mr. Sabath made this statement:

Mr. Speaker, the resolution provides changes in clauses 24, 25, and 40 of rule XI of the last Congress, and this change of rule XI is proposed upon the urgent request of the chairmen of the three Pension Committees. I am satisfied this will expedite the work of the House and simplify the reference of bills to the respective committees.

Mr. MAPES of Michigan. My understanding of the proposed amendments to the rules which the gentleman has introduced, is that they more clearly define the jurisdiction of these three committees.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MAPES of Michigan. And that the amendments will avoid, perhaps, some duplication which now exists.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is again correct.

Mr. MAPES. While that is true generally, in the amendment proposed to clause 40 of rule XI, I notice that the word "pension" is inserted. It has not been in the rule heretofore, and I would like to inquire of the gentleman whether it is contemplated that in this Congress that committee shall consider legislation to give pensions to veterans of the World War.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Rankin]?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, who is the chairman of one of these committees, and who recommended many of the changes in this rule.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the World War Veterans' Committee, I desire to say that we have no idea of changing the policy that we have followed heretofore.

And so on, with other references in the debate at that time.

There can be no doubt that the bill as presented here was a pension bill. The committee amendment seeks to add among other things compensation provisions to the pending bill. The fact that it was a pension bill gave it a privileged status and enabled the bill to be called up as a privileged bill, but the compensation part of the bill does not have a privileged status, as is true in the instance of the pension provisions.

Therefore, as to the committee amendment, including both pension and compensation provisions, the rule is well established that if any part of an amendment is subject to a point of order the whole amendment is subject to a point of order. Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the provisions of the pending bill and many of the proposed amendments have been fully discussed. The debate indicates that almost everyone is in agreement that some additional pension and compensation increases for the veterans of this Nation are merited and deserved.

The point of variance of views and opinions centers around the amount of authorization to be provided.

Representatives of the American Legion proposed to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs the pending measure which is an omnibus veterans benefit bill with provisions for $105 a month pension for all needy war veterans at age 65.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars proposed a plan for a 20 percent benefit increase for veterans who served overseas.

The Disabled American Veterans and AMVETS have proposed an increase in service-connected disability payments to veterans by 10 to 15 percent.

The Spanish-American War Veterans organization proposed the modest increase in pensions for Spanish-American War widows from $67 to $75 a month. All of the veterans organizations have recognized a need for increased pension and compensation as the cost of living continues to rise.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee has reported a measure which embraces the principal of increased pension and compensation for both service-connected and non-service-connected disabilities.

The present law, as we all know, provides a criteria or standard of need before compensation can be authorized. To be eligible for non-service-connected benefits a veteran must be found to be permanently and totally disabled—and unable to follow a gainful occupation and with a total annual income of not more than $1,400 if unmarried or $2,700 if married and with dependents. These criteria—these standards—certainly demonstrate that benefits to veterans of this Nation are not going to be provided to any group of veterans who are not in need. The principal change provided in the pending bill is that the law would declare that a veteran at age 65 or over is deemed to be permanently and totally disabled.

Mr. Chairman, the World War I veterans are rapidly approaching this age and many have already exceeded the age of 65. It is of interest to observe that legislation for the benefit of veterans of this Nation is always considered and calculated on an estimated cost basis of 40 and 50 years after enactment of the legislation. We all should know that World War I veterans do not have an additional 40 or 50 years of life expectancy and, therefore, the estimated calculated costs are greatly exaggerated.

Shortly after World War II, if you will remember, the total appropriation for all veteran benefits was more than $8 billion, the largest appropriation for veterans in the history of our country. This was during the time when the citizens of this Nation vividly recalled the terrible sacrifices that our veterans gladly underwent to keep this country free. Their deeds of valor across the battlefields of the world were fresh in our minds and the huge appropriation for veterans benefits was the meager offering of a grateful Nation to a richly deserving group. But, as time wore on, the memory of the valiant deeds of our veterans began to fade from the mind of the American people and as the memory faded, so did the appropriations. Year after year, the appropriation for veterans benefits continued to decline until today the annual appropriation for veterans' benefits is only about one-half of what it was shortly after World War II.

And, we must remember that although the appropriations continued to decline, the number of veterans and their dependents continued to increase; and perhaps, more important, the veterans, their widows and children, grow older year by year and as they age, their need for assistance becomes greater and greater.

During the 2d session of the 83d Congress, the Veterans' Affairs Committee, on which I had the honor of serving at that time, unanimously recommended to the Congress that an across-the-board 10 percent cost of living increase be approved for veteran compensation and pension benefits.

However, the leadership of the House at that time proposed a 5 percent increase—in face of the unanimous committee recommendation of a 10 percent increase. As we know, a bill was passed with granted an overall 5 percent increase in compensation and pension benefits.

This was in 1954—the 5 percent increase was not adequate then and it is certainly not adequate today. The cost of living continues to rise in this country—and our veterans, their widows and children continue to struggle along on their meager pensions.

Many of the provisions to increase veterans benefits which were striken by the leadership of the House during the 83d session of Congress are included in this much-needed measure before the House today. This measure has the endorsement of major veterans' organizations of this Nation and the bill should receive the approval of the Congress.

As we consider this measure, gentlemen, let us remember that we sat here only a few days ago and authorized expenditure of approximately $4 billion for foreign aid for our allies overseas. This, of course, is considered a necessary and vital expenditure, but while we are spending huge amounts of money overseas, we should remember that our first obligation should be to the citizens of the United States and there is no group of citizens in this country more deserving than our veterans—those who have fought to defend our country.

I shall certainly lend my support to this measure and urge others to vote to secure passage of this measure.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, we are approaching this matter of veterans' compensation backwards. The American citizen has always recognized his duty to help the wounded war veteran and the widows and children and dependent parents of men killed in the service. He wants programs to aid these people to be just as good as they possibly can.

The American citizen also wants our system of veterans' hospitals kept in tiptop shape so our former servicemen can get the best care that our Government can furnish. We are currently spending millions of dollars per year on hospitals, but we are falling behind. Many need repairing, some need replacing.

We have before us now a bill that would increase expenditures by millions of dollars annually. How much of this additional expenditure would go to the disabled veteran suffering from wounds received in the country's service? Not one penny. How much of it would go to improve the living conditions of widows and children of veterans killed defending their country? Not one penny. How much of it would be used to improve our hospital care for veterans? Not one penny.

This measure would eventually cost hundreds of millions of dollars. Not a cent of this money goes to veterans who were wounded in service or dependents and widows of veterans who were killed. How can we vote for this bill?

We are asked to support this measure because it will help needy veterans of World War I. Need is not restricted to the veteran. I am as conscious as anyone about the need of some of our elderly citizens. Can I honestly vote to give one

65-year-old citizen a guaranteed pension on the basis of as little as 90 days' service to his country and deny that right to a 65-year-old neighbor who is in greater need but did not have the privilege of serving his country?

And this bill has another serious defect. There is no test of net worth. We have heard many examples of where veterans with thousands of dollars in the bank, but with little other income, are drawing pensions. In effect, this legislation in these cases just takes funds needed for service-connected disabled veterans, shifts it to nonservice cases where it eventually ends up as part of an estate enriching the veterans' heirs. How many hundreds of thousands of dollars will be paid under this bill to veterans who have large bank accounts and absolutely no need for a Government pension? No one can say.

We now have a fine veterans' program. Let us more adequately take care of the program we now have. We owe better treatment to our veterans who are disabled because of the service they rendered to their country. We owe better treatment to the widows and children they left behind. By launching into a new and expanded pension program, we are cutting into the amount of help we can give the deserving cases now on our program.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7886) to amend part III of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. AYRES. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. AYRES moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 7886, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That (a) all monthly wartime rates of compensation payable under public laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for disability less than total (not including special awards and allowances, dependency allowances, or subsistence allowances), are hereby increased by 10 percent.

"(b) All rates of compensation increased by subsection (a) shall be further adjusted upward or downward to the nearest dollar, counting 50 cents and over as a whole dollar.

"(c) In adjusting the rates of peacetime disability compensation under part II of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a) because of the increases provided in subsection (a) and the adjustments provided in subsection (b), such rates shall be further adjusted upward or downward to the nearest dollar, counting 50 cents and over as a whole dollar.

"(d) Paragraph II (j) of part I of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) is amended to read as follows:

"'(j) If and while the disability is rated as total the monthly compensation shall be $225.'

"(e) The maximum rates of compensation set forth in paragraphs II (k), II (o), and II (p) of such part I are increased to $450 per month.

"(f) The rate of compensation payable under paragraph II (l) of such part I is increased to $309.

"(g) The rate of compensation payable under paragraph II (m) of such part I is increased to $359.

"(h) The rate of compensation payable under paragraph II (n) of such part I is increased to $401.

"SEC. 2. (a) The basic rate of compensation provided by section 202 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, for any disability rated as total is hereby increased to $225 per month.

"(b) The rate of compensation payable under section 202 (3) of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, for the loss of the use of both eyes is hereby increased to $309; the rate payable under that section for the loss of use of both eyes and one or more limbs is hereby increased to $401; the rate payable under that section for double total permanent disability is hereby increased to $401.

"SEC. 3. (a) The act entitled 'An act to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents,' approved July 2, 1948 (Public Law 877, 80th Cong.), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 6. All rates of additional compensation established by this act are hereby increased by 10 percent.'

"(b) Such act is further amended by striking out '60 percent' wherever it occurs and inserting '50 percent.'

"SEC. 4. (a) Section 2 of the act of August 4, 1951 (38 U. S. C., sec. 370h), is amended by striking out '$120' and '$78' and inserting in lieu thereof '$150' and '$115', respectively.

"(b) Subsection (a) of section 6 of the act of May 23, 1952 (38 U. S. C., sec. 381–382), is amended by striking out '$129' and inserting in lieu thereof '$150.'

"(c) The monthly rates of pension payable to veterans of the Civil War under sections 1 and 2 of the act of June 9, 1930 (38 U. S. C., secs. 274, 275), shall be $101.59 and $150, respectively.

"(d) Paragraph I (f) (2) of part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) That where an otherwise eligible person is or hereafter becomes, on account of age or physical or mental disabilities, helpless or blind or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person, the amount of pension shall be $150 monthly.'

"SEC. 5. This act shall take effect on the 1st day of the 2d calendar month which begins after the date of its enactment."

Mr. EDMONDSON (during the reading of the motion to recommit). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the motion to recommit be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The Clerk completed the reading of the motion to recommit.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit on the same ground that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] made against the amendment to the first section of this bill namely, that it is not germane; that it is a compensation matter which he seeks by a motion to recommit to place in a privileged pension bill.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] desire to be heard?

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that it is subject to a similar point of order, but I do not feel, in view of the statement which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] made in defending his position on the other point of order that he should seek to take the responsibility for killing legislation for the disabled veterans.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair lived through the period which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union related, and is familiar with the precedents and the rules with reference to this matter. Without going into any long discussion of it, the Chair feels that the same point of order will lie against this motion to recommit with instructions as did lie against the committee amendment in the bill with reference to compensation; and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I offer another motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman still opposed to the bill?

Mr. AYRES. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies, and the Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. AYRES moves to recommit the bill (H. R. 7886) to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CHRISTOPHER) there were—ayes 159, noes 107.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 110, nays 305, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—110

Abbitt	Ellsworth	Mahon
Alexander	Fascell	Mailliard
Alger	Fisher	Mason
Allen, Calif.	Ford	Minshall
Ashley	Fountain	Mumma
Ashmore	Frelinghuysen	Murray, Tenn.
Auchincloss	Gamble	Nelson
Ayres	Gary	Norblad
Barden	Gentry	Phillips
Bass, N. H.	Gubser	Poage
Bates	Gwinn	Poff
Belcher	Hale	Ray
Bentley	Halleck	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton, Frances P.	Hand	Richards
	Hardy	Robeson, Va.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Harrison, Va.	Rutherford
	Hébert	Scherer
Bonner	Heselton	Scrivner
Bow	Hess	Shuford
Brown, Ohio	Hiestand	Smith, Miss.
Broyhill	Hoffman, Mich.	Smith, Va.
Budge	Holt	Springer
Burleson	Hope	Taber
Byrnes, Wis.	Hull	Teague, Calif.
Carlyle	Hyde	Teague, Tex.
Clevenger	Ikard	Thomas
Cole	Jackson	Thomson, Wyo.
Cooley	Jenkins	Tuck
Coudert	Jonas	Udall
Crumpacker	Jones, N. C.	Velde
Curtis, Mo.	Judd	Vorys
Davis, Wis.	Kean	Wainwright
Dawson, Utah	Kilburn	Westland
Derounian	Kilday	Widnall
Devereux	Kilgore	Wright
Dixon	Laird	Yates
Dondero	McIntire	
Durham	Magnuson	

NAYS—305

Abernethy	Coon	Harden
Addonizio	Cooper	Harris
Albert	Corbett	Harrison, Nebr.
Allen, Ill.	Cramer	Harvey
Andersen, H. Carl	Cretella	Hays, Ark.
	Cunningham	Hays, Ohio
Andresen, August H.	Curtis, Mass.	Hayworth
	Dague	Healey
Andrews	Davidson	Henderson
Anfuso	Davis, Ga.	Herlong
Arends	Davis, Tenn.	Hill
Aspinall	Dawson, Ill.	Hillings
Avery	Deane	Hinshaw
Bailey	Delaney	Hoeven
Baker	Dempsey	Hoffman, Ill.
Baldwin	Denton	Holifield
Barrett	Dies	Holland
Bass, Tenn.	Diggs	Holmes
Baumhart	Dingell	Holtzman
Beamer	Dodd	Horan
Becker	Dollinger	Hosmer
Bennett, Fla.	Dolliver	Huddleston
Bennett, Mich.	Donohue	James
Berry	Donovan	Jarman
Betts	Dorn, N. Y.	Jennings
Blatnik	Dorn, S. C.	Jensen
Blitch	Dowdy	Johansen
Boggs	Doyle	Johnson, Calif.
Boland	Edmondson	Johnson, Wis.
Bolling	Elliott	Jones, Ala.
Bosch	Engle	Jones, Mo.
Bowler	Evins	Karsten
Boykin	Fallon	Kearney
Boyle	Feighan	Kearns
Bray	Fenton	Keating
Brooks, La.	Fernandez	Kee
Brooks, Tex.	Fino	Kelly, N. Y.
Brown, Ga.	Fjare	Keogh
Brownson	Flood	King, Calif.
Buckley	Flynt	King, Pa.
Burdick	Fogarty	Kirwan
Burnside	Forand	Klein
Bush	Forrester	Kluczynski
Byrd	Frazier	Knox
Byrne, Pa.	Friedel	Knutson
Canfield	Fulton	Krueger
Cannon	Garmatz	Landrum
Carnahan	Gathings	Lanham
Carrigg	Gavin	Lankford
Cederberg	George	Latham
Celler	Gordon	LeCompte
Chase	Grant	Lesinski
Chelf	Gray	Lipscomb
Chenoweth	Green, Oreg.	Long
Chiperfield	Green, Pa.	Lovre
Christopher	Gregory	McCarthy
Chudoff	Griffiths	McConnell
Church	Gross	McCormack
Clark	Hagen	McCulloch
Colmer	Haley	McDonough
McDowell	Philbin	Simpson, Ill.
McGregor	Pilcher	Simpson, Pa.
McMillan	Pillion	Sisk
McVey	Polk	Smith, Kans.
Macdonald	Powell	Smith, Wis.
Machrowicz	Preston	Spence
Mack, Ill.	Price	Staggers
Mack, Wash.	Priest	Steed
Madden	Prouty	Sullivan
Marshall	Quigley	Talle
Martin	Rabaut	Taylor
Matthews	Radwan	Thompson, N. J.
Meader	Rains	Thompson, Tex.
Merrow	Reece, Tenn.	Tollefson
Metcalf	Rees, Kans.	Trimble
Miller, Calif.	Reuss	Tumulty
Miller, Md.	Rhodes, Ariz.	Utt
Miller, Nebr.	Rhodes, Pa.	Vanik
Miller, N. Y.	Riehlman	Van Pelt
Mills	Riley	Van Zandt
Mollohan	Rivers	Vinson
Morano	Roberts	Walter
Morgan	Robsion, Ky.	Watts
Moss	Rodino	Weaver
Moulder	Rogers, Colo.	Wharton
Multer	Rogers, Fla.	Whitten
Murray, Ill.	Rogers, Mass.	Wickersham
Natcher	Rogers, Tex.	Wier
Nicholson	Rooney	Wigglesworth
Norrell	Roosevelt	Williams, Miss.
O'Brien, Ill.	Sadlak	Williams, N. J.
O'Brien, N. Y.	St. George	Williams, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.	Schenck	Willis
O'Konski	Schwengel	Wilson, Ind.
O'Neill	Scott	Winstead
Osmers	Seely-Brown	Withrow
Ostertag	Selden	Wolverton
Passman	Sheehan	Young
Patman	Sheppard	Younger
Patterson	Short	Zablocki
Pelly	Sieminski	Zelenko
Perkins	Sikes	
Pfost	Siler	

NOT VOTING—17

Adair	O'Hara, Minn.	Thornberry
Bell	Saylor	Vursell
Chatham	Scudder	Wilson, Calif.
Eberharter	Shelley	Wolcott
Kelley, Pa.	Thompson, La.	
Lane	Thompson, Mich.	
Morrison		

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Bell with Mr. Scudder.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Chatham with Miss Thompson of Michigan.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Wilson of California.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Adair.

Mr. COOLEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BENTLEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BROYHILL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. LIPSCOMB changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. UTT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 365, nays 51, answered "present" 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—365

Abbitt	Albert	Allen, Ill.
Abernethy	Alexander	Andersen, H. Carl
Addonizio	Allen, Calif.	
Andresen, August H.	Feighan	McMillan
	Fenton	McVey
Andrews	Fernandez	Macdonald
Anfuso	Fino	Machrowicz
Arends	Fjare	Mack, Ill.
Ashley	Flood	Mack, Wash.
Ashmore	Flynt	Madden
Aspinall	Fogarty	Magnuson
Auchincloss	Forand	Mahon
Avery	Forrester	Mailliard
Bailey	Fountain	Marshall
Baker	Frazier	Martin
Baldwin	Friedel	Matthews
Barden	Fulton	Meader
Barrett	Garmatz	Merrow
Bass, Tenn.	Gary	Metcalf
Bates	Gathings	Miller, Calif.
Baumhart	Gavin	Miller, Md.
Beamer	George	Miller, Nebr.
Becker	Gordon	Miller, N. Y.
Belcher	Grant	Mills
Bennett, Fla.	Gray	Mollohan
Bennett, Mich.	Green, Oreg.	Morano
Bentley	Green, Pa.	Morgan
Berry	Gregory	Morrison
Betts	Griffiths	Moss
Blatnik	Gross	Moulder
Blitch	Gwinn	Multer
Boggs	Hagen	Mumma
Boland	Hale	Murray, Ill.
Bolling	Haley	Murray, Tenn.
Bonner	Harden	Natcher
Bosch	Hardy	Nicholson
Bow	Harris	Norrell
Bowler	Harrison, Nebr.	O'Brien, Ill.
Boykin	Harrison, Va.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Boyle	Harvey	O'Hara, Ill.
Bray	Hays, Ark.	O'Konski
Brooks, La.	Hays, Ohio	O'Neill
Brooks, Tex.	Hayworth	Osmers
Brown, Ga.	Healey	Ostertag
Brown, Ohio	Hébert	Passman
Brownson	Henderson	Patman
Broyhill	Herlong	Patterson
Buckley	Hess	Pelly
Burdick	Hiestand	Perkins
Burleson	Hill	Pfost
Burnside	Hillings	Philbin
Bush	Hinshaw	Pilcher
Byrd	Hoeven	Pillion
Byrne, Pa.	Hoffman, Ill.	Poff
Canfield	Holifield	Polk
Cannon	Holland	Powell
Carlyle	Holmes	Preston
Carnahan	Holt	Price
Carrigg	Holtzman	Priest
Cederberg	Horan	Prouty
Celler	Hosmer	Quigley
Chase	Huddleston	Rabaut
Chelf	Hull	Radwan
Chenoweth	Hyde	Rains
Chiperfield	Ikard	Reece, Tenn.
Christopher	James	Rees, Kans.
Chudoff	Jarman	Reuss
Church	Jenkins	Rhodes, Ariz.
Clark	Jennings	Rhodes, Pa.
Clevenger	Jensen	Richards
Colmer	Johansen	Riehlman
Cooley	Johnson, Calif.	Riley
Coon	Johnson, Wis.	Rivers
Cooper	Jonas	Roberts
Corbett	Jones, Ala.	Robeson, Va.
Coudert	Jones, Mo.	Robsion, Ky.
Cramer	Jones, N. C.	Rodino
Cretella	Karsten	Rogers, Colo.
Cunningham	Kearney	Rogers, Fla.
Curtis, Mass.	Kearns	Rogers, Mass.
Dague	Keating	Rogers, Tex.
Davidson	Kee	Rooney
Davis, Ga.	Kelley, Pa.	Roosevelt
Davis, Tenn.	Kelly, N. Y.	Sadlak
Dawson, Ill.	Keogh	St. George
Deane	Kilday	Schenck
Delaney	King, Calif.	Schwengel
Dempsey	King, Pa.	Scott
Denton	Kirwan	Scrivner
Devereux	Klein	Seely-Brown
Dies	Kluczynski	Selden
Diggs	Knox	Sheehan
Dingell	Knutson	Sheppard
Dodd	Krueger	Short
Dollinger	Landrum	Shuford
Dolliver	Lanham	Sieminski
Dondero	Lankford	Sikes
Donohue	Latham	Siler
Donovan	LeCompte	Simpson, Ill.
Dorn, N. Y.	Lesinski	Simpson, Pa.
Dorn, S. C.	Lipscomb	Sisk
Dowdy	Long	Smith, Kans.
Doyle	Lovre	Smith, Wis.
Durham	McCarthy	Spence
Edmondson	McConnell	Springer
Elliott	McCormack	Staggers
Ellsworth	McCulloch	Steed
Engle	McDonough	Sullivan
Evins	McDowell	Talle
Fallon	McGregor	Taylor

Thomas	Vorys	Willis
Thompson, N. J.	Walter	Wilson, Ind.
Thompson, Tex.	Watts	Winstead
Thomson, Wyo.	Weaver	Withrow
Tollefson	Westland	Wolverton
Trimble	Wharton	Wright
Tuck	Whitten	Yates
Tumulty	Wickersham	Young
Utt	Wier	Younger
Vanik	Wigglesworth	Zablocki
Van Pelt	Williams, Miss.	Zelenko
Van Zandt	Williams, N. J.	
Vinson	Williams, N. Y.	

NAYS—51

Alger	Ford	Minshall
Ayres	Frelinghuysen	Nelson
Bass, N. H.	Gamble	Norblad
Bolton, Frances P.	Gentry	Poage
	Gubser	Ray
Bolton, Oliver P.	Halleck	Reed, N. Y.
	Hand	Rutherford
Budge	Heselton	Scherer
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman, Mich.	Smith, Miss.
Cole	Hope	Smith, Va.
Crumpacker	Jackson	Taber
Curtis, Mo.	Judd	Teague, Calif.
Davis, Wis.	Kean	Teague, Tex.
Dawson, Utah	Kilburn	Udall
Derounian	Kilgore	Velde
Dixon	Laird	Wainwright
Fascell	McIntire	Widnall
Fisher	Mason	

ANSWERED "PRESENT" 1

Phillips

NOT VOTING—15

Adair	Saylor	Thornberry
Bell	Scudder	Vursell
Chatham	Shelley	Wilson, Calif.
Eberharter	Thompson, La.	Wolcott
Lane	Thompson, Mich.	
O'Hara, Minn.		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Scudder for, with Mr. Phillips against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bell with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Miss Thompson of Michigan.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Wilson of California.

Mr. ASHLEY and Mr. BOW changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California, Mr. SCUDDER. If he were present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas, secured permission by unanimous consent to allow the Members of the House 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD, regarding H. R. 7886, the legislation just passed.

I am delighted the Members of the House have this opportunity and I hope so much they will avail themselves of this advantage and will so express their views on the merits of the benefits for veterans and their dependents as recommended in the original legislation approved by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and reported to the House.

This legislation, still known as H. R. 7886, has now passed the House, but in such greatly amended form as to subject and content as to be hardly recognized as the original bill approved by the committee.

To me it is tragic that the pensions for widows of veterans were eliminated. Before this legislation is finally enacted into law I shall exercise every power at my command to have this tragic injustice corrected. If it is not corrected in this bill there will be corrective legislation introduced as soon as possible to provide these needed, yes, seriously needed, benefits.

Also I deeply regret all increases in compensation benefits were eliminated from this bill. To so penalize veterans in need in view of the marked increase in the cost of living, by a point of order, which is nothing more than parliamentary procedure, is, it seems to me, nothing short of foolishness and folly displayed upon the prongs of technical righteousness. Veterans struggling to pay the increased costs of these times can gain no satisfaction out of a point of order. A point of order will not help them to buy food or pay the rent. To raise a point of order under these circumstances seems to me to border on legislative immaturity.

In order to correct this costly error, I believe hearings should be commenced immediately in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on a bill providing for these increases in compensation. This bill should be reported to the House for action immediately. Certainly such a bill must be passed in this Congress, and there is very little time remaining if justice is to be afforded the large number of veterans who would be eligible for such benefits.

In my experience as a Member of this House I have never opposed legislation just because it failed to include every objective I thought it should. Always I have thought it the better course of wisdom to accept a bill and support it if it provided some of the desired benefits even though many others were eliminated or excluded.

In regard to H. R. 7886 I have followed this policy. The pension benefits are needed and are helpful. I hope they wil be enacted into law with some improvements. As for the benefits for veterans and their widows and dependents which were eliminated I feel it is only a question of time until the Congress will recognize the justice involved and will establish this justice by enacting the necessary legislation.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, the veterans bill, H. R. 7886, as amended, has lost, through amendment, many of the features which I supported most, retained the features which I supported least, and added discriminatory features which I cannot support at all.

The amendment to limit additional aid to World War I veterans only discriminates against World War II and Korean veterans, their widows, and children. It is, therefore, unfair.

A second amendment cuts almost in half the pension increase to disabled and service-connected World War I veterans, their widows and children. I have the conviction that all service-connected disabled veterans, their widows and children, should have received the full amount of the original bill, with no reduction whatever.

The measure goes so far as to assume every veteran of World War I to be permanently disabled; veterans in World War II and the Korean war, together with their widows and children, will receive not one extra cent under this bill.

The fact that the motion to recommit the bill was passed by a majority of 159 to 107 on a standing vote, is evidence that a majority of the Members who were on the floor felt this way, at least before they were subjected to the pressure of a rollcall vote. The best way to help our veterans, their widows and children, would have been to recommit the bill and revise it. Had this been done, its chances to help those who need help most, of passage in the other House, and of escaping a veto would have been greatly increased.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I certainly favor more adequate compensation for disabled veterans, their widows, and dependents. The bill sponsored by the Disabled American Veterans, H. R. 11310, was such a bill and I long ago urged that it be reported out favorably. That bill would have been passed promptly by the House and the Senate, signed by the President, and the benefits made available months ago to those who everyone agrees are the first responsibility of a grateful Nation.

But, unfortunately, action on H. R. 11310 was delayed and its provisions in substance were incorporated into H. R. 7886, a bill which then provided increases in pensions and increases in compensation for veterans with total and permanent disability, but which, in addition, introduced a wholly new concept into veterans' legislation. It decreed that every veteran upon reaching the age of 65 years shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled, and therefore automatically eligible for a pension, provided his annual income is less than $1,400 if he is unmarried, or is less than $2,700 if he is married or has minor children.

All the provisions granting increases in compensation to veterans with service-connected disability, and their widows, have been stricken from the bill. Remaining before us is only the shell of H. R. 7886 as reported by the House committee. As it now stands, it contains the worst feature of the original bill and none of its best features.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it is sound legislation or fair to our neediest veterans to make such a departure from the principles and practices long followed in veterans' legislation, as this remnant of a bill makes.

The assertion in it that every war veteran upon reaching the age of 65 shall be deemed to be totally and permanently disabled is plainly contrary to fact. Furthermore, it is unfair to those veterans who actually are disabled.

If we believe we ought to give special help to every needy citizen of 65 who is a veteran, let us say so directly and not adopt the fiction that he is totally and permanently disabled.

Mr. Chairman, the only real issue left before us today is whether we are to follow a concept that any person who served

90 days or more during a war, and who sustained no injury or disability as a result of this service, should nevertheless, when he reaches the age of 65 years be treated differently from other citizens of equal age and in equal or greater need.

It has been my own philosophy that veterans' benefits are a means of trying to equalize, as much as possible, the sacrifices that result from wartime military service. We should always give service-connected disabilities the highest priority among programs for veterans and the rehabilitation of disabled veterans and their reintegration into useful economic and social life should be our primary objective. Successful readjustment generally places the veteran on a postwar footing equal to or better than that of persons who were not in the service. There is then no need to treat him throughout the rest of his life as a citizen with either special handicaps or special privileges.

So, Mr. Chairman, I must vote against this mutilated bill, not because I don't want to provide more suitably for all veterans in need, but because I do. This bill simply will not accomplish what is needed.

It would be a cruel deception if any veteran needing more assistance from his Government, were led to believe passage of this bill today will provide it. The Bureau of the Budget has plainly stated the bill is not in accord with the views of the President. Can anyone believe the President will sign a bill that provides new pensions for veterans not disabled at all, and larger pensions for veterans not disabled in war, and then no increase at all in compensation for veterans with disabilities which were sustained in war?

For all these reasons I sincerely believe that the bill should go back to the committee for a re-do and be brought back to us in a form that can be passed, not only by the House, but also by the Senate and signed by the President.

Our veterans who have sacrificed so much for our country's welfare deserve this special effort to give them a fair bill.

I am sure the distinguished chairman of this committee, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, as true a friend as the veterans can ever have, will try again to get his committee to bring out a bill that will be adequate and fair and can become law. I could not look the veterans in my district in the face if I were to vote for the remnants of H. R. 7886, which helps only those who did not suffer any disabling injury or illness in war.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I hope that no points of order will be raised against H. R. 7886 or any of its provisions, for I would like to see adequate benefits provided for both non-service-disabled veterans and service-disabled veterans. After lengthy deliberation, the Veterans' Affairs Committee has seen fit to report to the House a single bill carrying both types of benefits. If we are now obliged to put aside the provisions for compensation of service-disabled veterans and wait for a new bill containing those provisions, we will be risking delay at a critical stage of this session. But, if that should be the case, I hope that a second bill can be brought to the House with all possible speed. I think that practically all are agreed that an increase in compensation benefits is warranted, and I certainly hope that we can take timely action and be sure of getting such an increase this year.

However, as to title I of the bill, providing for non-service-connected pensions, I think that is the place and this is the time to begin to make some distinction between veterans of World War I and those of later wars in considering such benefits. So long as that distinction is not made, we are going to continue to hear argument against these pensions in terms of cost and national policy and many other factors which might be debated endlessly.

These arguments against such pensions tend more and more to be based on estimates as to what effect the coverage of World War II and Korea veterans will have on the pension program. But I say there will be time and opportunity enough in another Congress to go into that matter. Let us not cloud the issue of World War I veterans pensions any longer. Their case is urgent. Time will not wait for them.

I believe that pensions to veterans of World War I are long overdue, and it was for that reason I introduced H. R. 656, which provides for the same pensions to be granted to World War I veterans as are granted to the veterans of the Spanish-American War. Nearly 40 years have passed since the close of World War I and no general pension legislation has been passed for veterans of World War I. No veteran of four previous wars in our history had to wait as much as 40 years to see Congress enact a pension for him.

Pensions were granted to the Revolutionary War veterans 35 years after the close of that war; to the Mexican War veterans 39 years after the close of that war; to the Civil War veterans 24 years after the close of that war, and to the Spanish-American War veterans 18 years after that war.

I am a veteran of both World Wars I and II, but I cannot help contrasting the differences in the way the veterans of the two wars were treated, after the close of each conflict. Those who enter military service in wartime must give up their positions or jobs, and when that service ends there generally follws a period of hardship during which they must find employment and readjust to civilian life. The Government did very little to help the veterans of World War I tide themselves over this period of adjustment.

When they were discharged they were given only $60 mustering-out pay. After a long struggle, an attempt was made to adjust this injustice by giving the veterans so-called "adjusted service certificates." The Government ascertained the amount of mustering-out pay that should have been paid to the veterans at the time of their discharge. An increment was added to make up for delay in payment, and it was determined how much paid-up insurance, due in 20 years, could be bought with each veteran's "adjusted service credit." Each veteran was given a certificate for that amount of paid-up insurance. The total amount paid under these certificates was $3.8 billion, but the expenditure would only have been about $1.5 billion if the veterans of World War I had been paid this money due them 18 years before when they were mustered out of service, as were the veterans of World War II.

Contrast the difference in the benefits given the veterans of World War II. They were given mustering-out pay, without question, of from $200 to $300 to each veteran, which cost the Government $4 billion. In addition, they were given terminal-leave pay, which cost the Government $3.1 billion, and unemployment compensation which cost the Government $3.8 billion. They were also given social security credits for the time they spent in service. Complete figures for the cost of this are not available, but it will amount to something over $600 million.

The veterans of World War II were also given the GI bill of rights. Under this program, they were given education benefits which have cost the Government to date $15 billion, and these veterans were also given guaranteed loans to purchase homes or to go into business or start farming. Such loans totaling $30 billion have already been made, and $16 billion of this sum is guaranteed by the Government. Similar benefits have been granted to Korean war veterans, although in some cases they are not as great as those granted to the veterans of World War II.

Excluding disability compensation, which is available to the veterans of all wars, and aside from the home-loan program which so far has cost comparatively little, the benefits paid to the veterans of World War II and the Korean war now total $26.5 billion, and this figure will certainly exceed $30 billion within 10 years from now. This sum is 20 times the amount paid to veterans of World War I, and per person, the benefits paid to the veterans of World War II and Korea are 4 times those paid to the veterans of World War I. The benefits were paid World War II and Korea veterans when they left the service, and so were much more beneficial to them than if paid to them years later.

It seems that when it is proposed to do anything for the veterans of World War I, someone always says the cost will be prohibitive. I do not know why there is this feeling about World War I veterans, and why people feel that these veterans should be treated so differently from the veterans of any other war.

I have made a rather intensive study of the financial and budget aspects of this question, and tried to get to the real essentials of it without reference to the elaborate presentations which the Veterans' Administration makes in its usual line of opposition. My conclusions were given in detail to the Veterans' Affairs Committee in my testimony there on February 27. I will mention the substance of it briefly here.

Forty-five years after the close of the Civil War, when pension costs of that conflict probably were at their peak, Civil War veterans' pensions took up 15.2 percent of the total budget of the Federal Government. But if every vet-

eran of World War I living today were paid a pension of $101 a month at age 62—as I proposed in H. R. 656—the cost would be less than 3 percent of the Federal budget. The Civil War pension of 15 percent of the budget did not break up the Treasury then, and I hardly see how a World War I pension of 3 percent of the budget could bankrupt us now.

Those Civil War pensions at peak cost amounted to one-half of 1 percent of the national income. And the World War I pensions which I proposed would amount to less than one-half of 1 percent of the current national income.

We were paying those Civil War pensions in 1910 at the same time as pensions to veterans of three other conflicts. Veterans benefits of all types then took 23 percent of the Federal budget. Today, we use only 7.4 percent of the budget to pay for veterans' benefits of every description.

All these figures I have presented are based on granting World War I pensions of $101 a month at age 62, without a means test of any kind. But, if we follow the idea of H. R. 7886, and set the eligible age at 65, and continue the limitation on outside income so that fewer would qualify, the cost of such a program would be much lower than the one of which I spoke. And, certainly, if any pension less than $101 a month were provided, the program's cost would be far lower than my figures—and I think I have shown the cost of my own proposal to be reasonable. In short, as to World War I pensions, the cost argument is no argument at all when we look at budget history.

There can be no question about the sacrifice that World War I veterans gave in their service. More of the population remained at home in their civilian pursuits during that war than in any of the five other major conflicts in which this country has fought. During the Revolutionary War, 14.2 percent of the population saw military service; 7.4 percent served in the War of 1812; 9.7 percent of the available population performed Federal service during the Civil War; 11 percent served in World War II; 4.4 percent served in the Korean conflict. But only 4 percent of the population was called up for service in World War I. Those who served in World War I were but a few selected from among the many.

For the veterans of World War I, the sands in the hourglass of time are running low. Today, their average life expectancy is only 15 years. Of the 4.6 million who came home when the fighting in France was done, barely 3 million remain. "Taps" has already sounded for more than one third of the "Doughboys" of 1918. Every passing day, 235 of them die. Tomorrow, 235 of them whom we could have pensioned today will be dead. A year from now, 90,000 more of the boys who faced shot, shell and gas in the trenches will have gone to Eternity—unpensioned and very nearly forgotten.

I think the arguments of those who oppose pensions for World War I veterans dwindle down to admitting that these pensions would be only just and proper, "but for the cost."

Surely no one would want to say that, while these veterans in all fairness are deserving of these benefits, we had better wait until death has thinned their numbers still more, and start paying them pensions when it can be done more cheaply. Surely no one would want to play such a cold-blooded waiting game as that.

I prefer to believe that all of us will recognize now the justice in the proposal to pension those veterans, and that we will take steps now to do now what ought to be done.

Let the veterans of World War I be treated with the same consideration as those of the other wars in which our Nation has fought. Let there be no generation of forgotten men among America's veterans.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, some months ago a veteran from Zanesville wrote to me on the subject of the forgotten man, pointing out in great detail that the veteran of World War I had not been afforded the consideration from his Nation that the veterans of other wars had received and are receiving. It was pointed out that the veteran of World War I who had faced the enemy with as grim determination as the veteran of any other war had not received the benefits of a GI bill of rights or adjustment to civilian life such as have been afforded to the veterans of the more recent conflicts. In addition, this letter pointed out that the veterans of World War I have now reached the place in life where a great number of them are no longer employable.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that it is one of the tragedies of our American way of life that when a man has reached an age of 50, or 55, or 60, that it becomes increasingly difficult for him to find suitable employment to meet the necessities of life. Indeed, it is a sad commentary upon America and its tremendous resources and opportunities that those opportunities show themselves less readily to those persons of the advanced years. The problem has become more acute in America because of the fact that we are living longer and that a greater number of our citizens attain advanced age.

It has been the thought of many of the veterans of World War I that some assistance from a grateful Government whom they served so faithfully and well should be forthcoming. In many of the communities throughout the United States organizations have been established by veterans of World War I to discuss and advocate legislation beneficial to them. There is one such organization in Zanesville, Ohio, which is the largest city in my district, and I have heard from the members of that organization on numerous occasions urging that Congress do something to benefit the veterans of World War I, for they have now reached the point in life which was reached by the veterans of the Civil War and the Spanish-American War for whom congressional action was forthcoming.

Specifically they have asked for consideration of a pension of $100 upon attaining the age of 60. It is pointed out that the average life of the veteran of World War I is now age 62 and that his years of life expectancy are not great. This bill does not go that far, but it is a step in that direction. This bill as amended will provide for a presumption of disability and a non-service-connected pension of $90 for veterans of World War I who have attained age 65. In voting in favor of this legislation I will have voted in behalf of the veterans of World War I, remembering "the forgotten man."

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TEAGUE OF Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATION FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I should like the Members of the House to know that as soon as possible I expect to call a meeting of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to consider a compensation bill which can come separately to the floor, so that the House will have an opportunity to vote legislation for the service-connected disabled.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 890) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2479)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 890) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C. 466–466j) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'DECLARATION OF POLICY

"'SECTION 1. (a) In connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the waterways of the Nation and in consequence of the benefits resulting to the public health and welfare by the prevention and control of water

pollution, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution, to support and aid technical research relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, and to provide Federal technical services and financial aid to State and interstate agencies and to municipalities in connection with the prevention and control of water pollution. To this end, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall administer this Act through the Public Health Service and under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"'(b) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the States with respect to the waters (including boundary waters) of such States.

"'COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMS FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

"'SEC. 2. The Surgeon General shall, after careful investigation, and in cooperation with other Federal agencies, with State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, and with the municipalities and industries involved, prepare or develop comprehensive programs for eliminating or reducing the pollution of interstate waters and tributaries thereof and improving the sanitary condition of surface and underground waters. In the development of such comprehensive programs due regard shall be given to the improvements which are necessary to conserve such waters for public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses. For the purpose of this section, the Surgeon General is authorized to make joint investigations with any such agencies of the condition of any waters in any State or States, and of the discharges of any sewage, industrial wastes, or substance which may adversely affect such waters.

"'INTERSTATE COOPERATION AND UNIFORM LAWS

"'SEC. 3. (a) The Surgeon General shall encourage cooperative activities by the States for the prevention and control of water pollution; encourage the enactment of improved and, so far as practicable, uniform State laws relating to the prevention and control of water pollution; and encourage compacts between States for the prevention and control of water pollution.

"'(b) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law or treaty of the United States, for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the prevention and control of water pollution and the enforcement of their respective laws relating thereto, and (2) the establishment of such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements and compacts. No such agreement or compact shall be binding or obligatory upon any State a party thereto unless and until it has been approved by the Congress.

"'RESEARCH, INVESTIGATIONS, TRAINING, AND INFORMATION

"'SEC. 4. (a) The Surgeon General shall conduct in the Public Health Service and encourage, cooperate with, and render assistance to other appropriate public (whether Federal, State, interstate, or local) authorities, agencies, and institutions, private agencies and institutions, and individuals in the conduct of, and promote the coordination of, research, investigations, experiments, demonstrations, and studies relating to the causes, control, and prevention of water pollution. In carrying out the foregoing, the Surgeon General is authorized to—

"'(1) collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, the results of and other information as to research, investigations, and demonstrations relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, including appropriate recommendations in connection therewith;

"'(2) make grants-in-aid to public or private agencies and institutions and to individuals for research or training projects and for demonstrations, and provide for the conduct of research, training, and demonstrations by contract with public or private agencies and institutions and with individuals without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes;

"'(3) secure, from time to time and for such periods as he deems advisable, the assistance and advice of experts, scholars, and consultants as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);

"'(4) establish and maintain research fellowships in the Public Health Service with such stipends and allowances, including traveling and subsistence expenses, as he may deem necessary to procure the assistance of the most promising research fellowships: *Provided*, That the total sum authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year for fellowships pursuant to this subparagraph shall not exceed $100,000; and

"'(5) provide training in technical matters relating to the causes, prevention, and control of water pollution to personnel of public agencies and other persons with suitable qualifications.

"'(b) The Surgeon General may, upon request of any State water pollution control agency, or interstate agency, conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of water pollution confronting any State, interstate agency, community, municipality, or industrial plant, with a view of recommending a solution of such problem.

"'(c) The Surgeon General shall, in cooperation with other Federal, State, and local agencies having related responsibilities, collect and disseminate basic data on chemical, physical, and biological water quality and other information insofar as such data or other information relate to water pollution and the prevention and control thereof.

"'GRANTS FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS

"'SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, $3,000,000 for grants to States and to interstate agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining adequate measures for the prevention and control of water pollution.

"'(b) The portion of the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for a fiscal year which shall be available for grants to interstate agencies and the portion thereof which shall be available for grants to States shall be specified in the Act appropriating such sums.

"'(c) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall from time to time make allotments to the several States, in accordance with regulations, on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the extent of the water pollution problem, and (3) the financial need of the respective States.

"'(d) From each State's allotment under subsection (c) for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall pay to such State an amount equal to its Federal share (as determined under subsection (h)) of the cost of carrying out its State plan approved under subsection (f), including the cost of training personnel for State and local water pollution control work and including the cost of administering the State plan.

"'(e) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall from time to time make allotments to interstate agencies, in accordance with regulations, on such basis as the Surgeon General finds reasonable and equitable. He shall from time to time pay to each such agency, from its allotment, an amount equal to such portion of the cost of carrying out its plan approved under subsection (f) as may be determined in accordance with regulations, including the cost of training personnel for water pollution control work and including the cost of administering the interstate agency's plan. The regulations relating to the portion of the cost of carrying out the interstate agency's plan which shall be borne by the United States shall be designed to place such agencies, so far as practicable, on a basis similar to that of the States.

"'(f) The Surgeon General shall approve any plan for the prevention and control of water pollution which is submitted by the State water pollution control agency or, in the case of an interstate agency, by such agency, if such plan—

"'(1) provides for administration or for the supervision of administration of the plan by the State water pollution control agency or, in the case of a plan submitted by an interstate agency, by such interstate agency;

"'(2) provides that such agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Surgeon General may from time to time reasonably require to carry out his functions under this Act;

"'(3) sets forth the plans, policies, and methods to be followed in carrying out the State (or interstate) plan and in its administration;

"'(4) provides for extension or improvement of the State or interstate program for prevention and control of water pollution; and

"'(5) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the plan.

The Surgeon General shall not disapprove any plan without first giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State water pollution control agency or interstate agency which has submitted such plan.

"'(g) (1) Whenever the Surgeon General, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State water pollution control agency or interstate agency finds that—

"'(A) the plan submitted by such agency and approved under this section has been so changed that it no longer complies with a requirement of subsection (f) of this section; or

"'(B) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with such a requirement,

the Surgeon General shall notify such agency that no further payments will be made to the State or to the interstate agency, as the case may be, under this section (or in his discretion that further payments will not be made to the State, or to the interstate agency, for projects under or parts of the plan affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until he is so satisfied, the Surgeon General shall make no further payments to such State, or to such interstate agency, as the case may be, under this section (or shall limit payments to projects under or parts of the plan in which there is no such failure).

"'(2) If any State or any interstate agency is dissatisfied with the Surgeon General's action with respect to it under this subsection, it may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State (or any of the member States, in the case of an interstate agency) is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The findings of fact by the Surgeon General, unless contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to

the Surgeon General to take further evidence, and the Surgeon General may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless contrary to the weight of the evidence. The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Surgeon General or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"'(h) (1) The "Federal share" for any State shall be 100 per centum less that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska), except that (A) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66⅔ per centum or less than 33⅓ per centum, and (B) the Federal share for Hawaii and Alaska shall be 50 per centum, and for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 66⅔ per centum.

"'(2) The "Federal shares" shall be promulgated by the Surgeon General between July 1 and September 30 of each even-numbered year, on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation: *Provided*, That the Federal shares promulgated by the Surgeon General pursuant to section 4 of the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1956, shall be conclusive for the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1959.

"'(i) The population of the several States shall be determined on the basis of the latest figures furnished by the Department of Commerce.

"'(j) The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to subsection (d) or (e) shall be as follows:

"'(1) The Surgeon General shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be paid to each State (or to each interstate agency in the case of subsection (e)) under the provisions of such subsection for such period, such estimate to be based on such records of the State (or the interstate agency) and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Surgeon General may find necessary.

"'(2) The Surgeon General shall pay to the State (or to the interstate agency), from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by him for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid such State (or such interstate agency) for any prior period under such subsection was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to such State (or such agency) for such prior period under such subsection. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, in such installments as the Surgeon General may determine.

"'GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION

"'SEC. 6 (a) The Surgeon General is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for the construction of necessary treatment works to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste into any waters and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith.

"'(b) Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations: (1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Surgeon General and unless such project is included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to this Act; (2) no grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 30 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Surgeon General or in an amount exceeding $250,000, whichever is the smaller: *Provided*, That the grantee agrees to pay the remaining cost; (3) no grant shall be made for any project under this section until the applicant has made provision satisfactory to the Surgeon General for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the treatment works after completion of the construction thereof; and (4) no grant shall be made for any project under this section unless such project is in conformity with the State water pollution control plan submitted pursuant to the provisions of section 5 and has been certified by the State water pollution control agency as entitled to priority over other eligible projects on the basis of financial as well as water pollution control needs.

"'(c) In determining the desirability of projects for treatment works and of approving Federal financial aid in connection therewith, consideration shall be given by the Surgeon General to the public benefits to be derived by the construction and the propriety of Federal aid in such construction, the relation of the ultimate cost of constructing and maintaining the works to the public interest and to the public necessity for the works, and the adequacy of the provisions made or proposed by the applicant for such Federal financial aid for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the treatment works after completion of the construction thereof. The sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (d) for any fiscal year shall be allotted by the Surgeon General from time to time, in accordance with regulations, as follows: (1) 50 per centum of such sums in the ratio that the population of each State bears to the population of all the States, and (2) 50 per centum of such sums in the ratio that the quotient obtained by dividing the per capita income of the United Sates by the per capita income of each State bears to the sum of such quotients for all the States. The allotment of a State under the preceding sentence shall be available, in accordance with the provisions of this section, for payments with respect to projects in such State which have been approved under this section. For purposes of this section, population shall be determined on the basis of the latest decennial census for which figures are available, as certified by the Secretary of Commerce, and per capita income for each State and for the United States shall be determined on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

"'(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year the sum of $50,000,000 for the purpose of making grants under this section: *Provided*, That the aggregate of sums so appropriated shall not exceed $500,000,000. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That at least 50 per centum of the funds so appropriated for each fiscal year shall be used for grants for the construction of treatment works servicing municipalities of one hundred and twenty-five thousand population or under.

"'(e) The Surgeon General shall make payments under this section through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury. Funds so paid shall be used exclusively to meet the cost of construction of the project for which the amount was paid. As used in this section the term "construction" includes preliminary planning to determine the economic and engineering feasibility of treatment works, the engineering, architectural, legal, fiscal, and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other action necessary to the construction of treatment works; and the erection, building, acquisition, alteration, remodeling, improvement, or extension of treatment works; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of treatment works.

"'WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD

"'SEC. 7. (a) (1) There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, composed of the Surgeon General or a sanitary engineer officer designated by him, who shall be chairman, and nine members appointed by the President none of whom shall be Federal officers or employees. The appointed members, having due regard for the purposes of this Act, shall be selected from among representatives of various State, interstate and local governmental agencies, of public or private interests contributing to, affected by, or concerned with water pollution, and of other public and private agencies, organizations, or groups demonstrating an active interest in the field of water pollution prevention and control, as well as other individuals who are expert in this field.

"'(2) (A) Each member appointed by the President shall hold office for a term of three years, except that (i) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (ii) the terms of office of the members first taking office after June 30, 1956, shall expire as follows: three at the end of one year after such date, three at the end of two years after such date, and three at the end of three years after such date, as designated by the President at the time of appointment. None of the members appointed by the President shall be eligible for reappointment within one year after the end of his preceding term, but terms commencing prior to the enactment of the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1956 shall not be deemed "preceding terms" for purposes of this sentence.

"'(B) The members of the Board who are not officers or employees of the United States, while attending conferences or meetings of the Board or while otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not exceeding $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular place of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"'(b) The Board shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Surgeon General on matters of policy relating to the activities and functions of the Surgeon General under this Act.

"'(c) Such clerical and technical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the duties of the Board shall be provided from the personnel of the Public Health Service.

"'ENFORCEMENT MEASURES AGAINST POLLUTION OF INTERSTATE WATERS

"'SEC. 8. (a) The pollution of interstate waters in or adjacent to any State or States (whether the matter causing or contributing to such pollution is discharged directly into such waters or reaches such waters after discharge into a tributary of such waters), which endangers the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which

the discharge originates, shall be subject to abatement as herein provided.

"'(b) Consistent with the policy declaration of this Act, State and interstate action to abate pollution of interstate waters shall be encouraged and shall not, except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to court order under subsection (g), be displaced by Federal enforcement action.

"'(c) (1) Whenever the Surgeon General, on the basis of reports, surveys, or studies, has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring, or whenever requested by a State water pollution control agency or the Governor of any State, he shall give formal notification of any such pollution to the State water pollution control agency and interstate agency, if any, of the State or States where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originates and shall call promptly a conference of the State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, if any, of the State or States where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originates and of the State or States claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution.

"'(2) The agencies called to attend such conference may bring such persons as they desire to the conference. Not less than three weeks' prior notice of the conference date shall be given to such agencies.

"'(3) Following this conference, the Surgeon General shall prepare and forward to all the water pollution control agencies attending the conference a summary of conference discussions including (A) occurrence of pollution of interstate waters subject to abatement under this Act; (B) adequacy of measures taken toward abatement of the pollution; and (C) nature of delays, if any, being encountered in abating the pollution.

"'(d) If the Surgeon General believes, upon the conclusion of the conference or thereafter, that effective progress toward abatement of such pollution is not being made and that the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates is being endangered, he shall recommend to the appropriate State water pollution control agency that it take necessary remedial action. The Surgeon General is to allow at least six months for the taking of such action.

"'(e) If such remedial action is not taken or action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of such pollution is not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originated, before a board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State in which any discharge causing or contributing to such pollution originates and each State claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution shall be given an opportunity to select one member of the board and at least one member shall be a representative of the Department of Commerce, and not less than a majority of the board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At least three weeks' prior notice of said hearing shall be given to the State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, if any, called to attend the aforesaid hearing and the alleged polluter or polluters. On the basis of the evidence presented at such hearing, the board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and whether effective progress toward abatement thereof is being made. If the board finds such pollution is occurring and effective progress toward abatement is not being made it shall make recommendations to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and equitable to secure abatement of such pollution. The Secretary shall send such findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution, together with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than six months) to secure abatement of such pollution, and shall also send such findings and recommendations and such notice to the State water pollution control agency, and to the interstate agency, if any, of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate.

"'(f) If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notice following the public hearing is not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the written consent of the State water pollution control agency (or any officer or employee authorized to give such consent) of the State or States where the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is discharged or at the written request of the State water pollution control agency (or any officer or employee authorized to make such request) of any other State or States where the health or welfare of persons is endangered by such pollution, may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

"'(g) The court shall receive in evidence in any such suit a transcript of the proceedings before the Board and a copy of the Board's recommendations and shall receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court, giving due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved, shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

"'(h) As used in this section, the term "person" includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, State, muncipality, and political subdivision of the State.

"'COOPERATION TO CONTROL POLLUTION FROM FEDERAL INSTALLATIONS

"'SEC. 9. It is hereby declared to be the intent of the Congress that any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, insofar as practicable and consistent with the interests of the United States and within any available appropriations, cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with any State or interstate agency or municipality having jurisdiction over waters into which any matter is discharged from such property, in preventing or controlling the pollution of such waters.

"'ADMINISTRATION

"'SEC. 10. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out his functions under this Act. All regulations of the Surgeon General under this Act shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Surgeon General may delegate to any officer or employee of the Public Health Service such of his powers and duties under this Act, except the making of regulations, as he may deem necessary or expedient.

"'(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the consent of the head of any other agency of the United States, may utilize such officers and employees of such agency as may be found necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this Act.

"'(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions under this Act.

"'DEFINITIONS

"'SEC. 11. When used in this Act—

"'(a) The term "State water pollution control agency" means the State health authority, except that, in the case of any State in which there is a single State agency, other than the State health authority, charged with responsibility for enforcing State laws relating to the abatement of water pollution, it means such other State agency.

"'(b) The term "interstate agency" means an agency of two or more States established by or pursuant to an agreement or compact approved by the Congress, or any other agency of two or more States, having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the control of pollution of waters.

"'(c) The term "treatment works" means the various devices used in the treatment of sewage or industrial wastes of a liquid nature, including the necessary intercepting sewers, outfall sewers, pumping, power, and other equipment, and their appurtenances, and includes any extensions, improvements, remodeling, additions, and alterations thereof.

"'(d) The term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

"'(e) The term "interstate waters" means all rivers, lakes, and other waters that flow across, or form a part of, boundaries between two or more States.

"'(f) The term "municipality" means a city, town, borough, county, parish, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law and having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes, or other wastes.

"'OTHER AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED

"'SEC. 12. This Act shall not be construed as (1) superseding or limiting the functions, under any other law, of the Surgeon General or of the Public Health Service, or of any other officer or agency of the United States, relating to water pollution, or (2) affecting or impairing the provisions of the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, or sections 13 through 17 of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1899, as amended, or (3) affecting or impairing the provisions of any treaty of the United States.

"'SEPARABILITY

"'SEC. 13. If any provision of this Act, or the application of any provision of this Act to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, and the remainder of this Act, shall not be affected thereby.

"'SHORT TITLE

"'SEC. 14. This Act may be cited as the "Federal Water Pollution Control Act."'

"SEC. 2. The title of such Act is amended to read 'An Act to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes.'

"SEC. 3. Terms of office as members of the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board (established pursuant to section 6 (b) of the Water Pollution Control Act, as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act) subsisting on the date of enactment of this Act shall expire at the close of business on such date.

"SEC. 4. As soon as possible after the date of enactment of this Act the Surgeon General shall promulgate Federal shares in the manner provided in subsection (h) of section 5 of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended by this Act (and without regard to the date specified therein for such promulgation), such Federal shares to be conclusive for the purposes of section 5 of such Act for the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1959.

"SEC. 5. In the case of any discharge or discharges causing or contributing to water pollution with respect to which the actions by the Surgeon General prescribed under paragraph (2) of section 2 (d) of the Water

Pollution Control Act, as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act, have already been completed prior to such enactment, the provisions of such section shall continue to be applicable; except that nothing in this section shall prevent action with respect to any such pollution under and in accordance with the provisions of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended by this Act.

"SEC. 6. This Act may be cited as the 'Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1956'."

And the House agree to the same.

JOHN A. BLATNIK,
ROBERT E. JONES,
JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
By JOHN A. BLATNIK,
GEORGE A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
ROBERT S. KERR,
ALBERT GORE,
By ROBERT S. KERR,
EDWARD MARTIN,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 890) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a new text. The agreement reached in conference differs from both the Senate bill and the House amendment. The following discussion explains these differences, except differences which are clerical, conforming, or purely technical.

Section 1: The Senate bill, in its statement of policy, indicates that Federal financial aid and services will be given only to States and interstate agencies (as provided elsewhere in the bill).

The House amendment added municipalities to the political agencies which may be assisted to reflect inclusion in section 6 of provisions for financial aid for construction of municipal sewage treatment works.

The conference agreement adopts the House amendment.

Section 2: The House amendment is identical with the Senate bill, except that the House amendment restricts the pollution with respect to which comprehensive programs for elimination or reducing pollution may be developed to pollution of "interstate waters and tributaries thereof."

The conference agreement is identical with the House amendment.

Section 4: The Senate bill (in subsec. (a) (4)) authorized the Surgeon General to establish and maintain research fellowships.

The comparable provision of the House amendment was similar, except that it authorized the Surgeon General to provide and maintain opportunities for study by students, and limited the total sums which may be appropriated for this purpose to $100,000 for any fiscal year.

The conference agreement differs from the House amendment in providing for research fellowships rather than opportunities for study; it adopts, however, the $100,000 limitation contained in the House amendment.

The House amendment added a subsection (c) to the bill, which provided that the Surgeon General shall collect and disseminate basic data on chemical, physical, and biological water quality, and certain other information, relating to water pollution prevention and control. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision.

The conference agreement provides that in collecting and disseminating such data he shall cooperate with Federal, State, and local agencies having related responsibilities.

Section 5: Subsection (a) of the Senate bill, in authorizing grants to State and interstate agencies for the administration of their water pollution control programs, provided that grants should be made for the fiscal years 1956 through 1960, that the maximum appropriated for a year should be $2 million, and that funds appropriated should remain available until expended.

The comparable provision of the House amendment, similar to the Senate bill in other respects, provided that the grants should be made for the fiscal years 1957 through 1961, and that the maximum appropriated should be $5 million; it also struck out the provision which permits the funds so appropriated to remain available until expended.

The conference agreement is identical with the House amendment, except that in lieu of the $5 million limitation, such agreement contains a $3 million limitation.

Subsection (f) in the Senate bill provided that the Surgeon General should approve any plan for the purposes of the section if it meets requirements prescribed in regulations of the Surgeon General.

The House amendment set forth in the bill the requirements which must be met by the State plans and provided that such a plan shall be approved only if it—

(1) Provides for administration, or for supervision of the administration of the plan by the State water pollution control agency or interstate agency concerned;

(2) Provides for making reports to the Surgeon General;

(3) Sets forth the plans, policies, and methods to be followed in carrying out the plan;

(4) Provides for the extension or improvement of the State or interstate program for prevention and control of water pollution; and

(5) Provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for proper and efficient administration of the plan.

The House amendment also provided for affording opportunity for a hearing to the State or interstate agency before disapproving a plan submitted by it.

The conference substitute is substantially the same as the House amendment.

Subsection (h) (2) in the conference agreement, except for certain date changes, is identical with the Senate bill. It was not included in the House amendment.

Section 6: Section 6 of the House amendment contained authorization for grants to be made to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for the construction of sewage-treatment works. Such authorization was not contained in the bill as it passed the Senate. The House amendment authorized $50 million annually for construction grants, up to a total of $500 million. It also provided that at least 50 percent of the funds appropriated would be used for the construction of treatment works servicing municipalities of 125,000 population or less, and that no grant would be made for any project in an amount exceeding 33⅓ percent of the reasonable cost of the project or $300,000, whichever is the smaller.

The agreement reached by the conferees retains the total amounts for grants but limits the grant for any project to 30 percent of the reasonable cost of the project, or $250,000, whichever is the smaller. In addition, the conferees agreed to a formula for the allotment of funds among the States which is as follows: (1) 50 percent to be allotted in the ratio that the population of each State bears to the population of all States, and (2) 50 percent to be allotted in the ratio that the quotient obtained by dividing the per capita income of the United States by the per capita income of each State bears to the sum of such quotient for all States.

In addition, the House amendment was amended by the conferees to provide that the projects to be constructed must be in conformity with the State water pollution control plan submitted pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the bill and must have been certified by the State water pollution control agency as entitled to priority over other eligible projects on the basis of financial as well as water pollution control needs. The funds would be made available to the municipality in which the treatment plant would be constructed.

The conferees deleted a provision in the House amendment which provided that the rates of pay for laborers and mechanics engaged in the construction of treatment works would not be less than the prevailing local wage rates for similar work as determined in accordance with Public Law 403, of the 74th Congress, approved August 30, 1935, as amended.

The conferees also deleted a provision which provided for setting aside at least 10 percent of the total authorized sums for advance planning grants. While the conferees were favorably disposed toward aid for advanced planning, they felt that the problem was adequately taken care of under existing laws and other provisions of this section.

Section 7: Subsection (a) in the Senate bill provided for an advisory board having members representative of, generally speaking, the following agencies and interests: The Surgeon General, Department of the Army, Department of the Interior, Department of Commerce, Department of Agriculture, Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, the Federal Power Commission, an engineer expert in sewage and industrial waste disposal, a person interested in wildlife conservation and recreation, municipal governments, State governments, affected industry, interstate agencies, a person interested in agriculture.

In contrast, the House amendment provided that the board would be composed of the Surgeon General or a sanitary engineer officer designated by him (who would be chairman) and nine members appointed by the President from persons other than Federal officers and employees. The amendment provided for the selection of the appointed members from among representatives of various State, interstate, and local governmental agencies, of public or private interests contributing to, affected by, or concerned with water pollution, and of other public and private agencies, organizations, or groups actively interested in water pollution prevention and control, as well as other individuals who are experts in this field.

Except for a technical date change and other technical changes, the House amendment was identical in other respects with the Senate bill. The substitute agreed upon in conference is the same as the House bill, except for one technical change.

Section 8: Both the Senate bill and the House amendment contain provisions relating to enforcement measures against pollution of interstate waters. While both provisions have the same end in view there is considerable difference between them in the manner in which this end is reached. The following discussion describes the differences between the Senate bill and the conference agreement (which, except for a technical change, is identical with the House amendment).

Subsection (a) is the same in both the Senate bill and conference agreement.

Subsection (b) of the conference agreement provides for the encouragement of State and interstate action to abate pollution of interstate waters, but that Federal enforcement action shall not displace State and interstate action, except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to a court order under the section.

Under subsection (b) of the Senate bill the Surgeon General would give notice simultaneously to persons who are causing the pollution and to the appropriate State agency or interstate agency. The notice would specify a reasonable time within which abatement of the pollution should be secured. Under the House amendment the Surgeon General would first call a conference of the State and interstate agencies concerned. If, after such a conference, the Surgeon General believes reasonable progress is not being made he would notify the State agency to take necessary remedial action. He would allow 6 months for the taking of such action. At that time the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would call a public hearing.

The provision of the conference agreement which provides for the hearing differs from the Senate bill in that each State adversely affected by the pollution must also be given opportunity to select a member of the hearing board. In the Senate bill only the State where the pollution originates and the Department of Commerce must be given such an opportunity. The conference agreement also requires that 3 weeks' notice of the hearing be given to the State, interstate agencies, and to the persons who are causing the pollution in question.

After the hearing, under the Senate bill, the Secretary would send the findings and recommendation of the board (if any) to the person causing the pollution together with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than 6 months) to secure abatement of the pollution. If action has not been taken within that period, then an additional 3 months is given.

The conference agreement does not provide for this additional 3 months period.

The Senate bill provided that where there is a joinder of defendants in different judicial districts, the action may be brought in any judicial district where the discharge caused by one of the defendants occurred.

This provision was not included in the House amendment or in the conference agreement.

The House amendment, in the provision giving the courts jurisdiction of actions brought under this section, provides that the court shall give due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved. This provision was not included in the Senate bill. The conference agreement is the same as the House amendment.

Section 9: This section of the conference agreement, which appears also in the House amendment, declares the congressional intent that Federal agencies discharging matter into any waters shall cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and State, interstate, and local agencies, in preventing or controlling the pollution of such waters.

The identical provision was contained in the Senate bill, but as section 5 of the bill rather than as a section of the Amended Water Pollution Control Act.

Section 11: This section, containing definitions, was the same in the Senate bill and the House amendments except that the House amendment defined "treatment works" and made some changes in the definition of "interstate waters."

The term "treatment works" was defined in the House bill to mean the various devices used in the treatment of sewage or industrial wastes of a liquid nature, including the necessary intercepting sewers, outfall sewers, pumping, power, and other equipment, and their appurtenances and includes any extensions, improvements, remodeling, additions, and alterations thereof. The conference agreement is the same as the House amendment.

The Senate bill defined "interstate waters" to mean all rivers, lakes, and other waters that flow across, or form a part of State boundaries. The conference agreement (which is the same as the House bill) defines the term to mean all rivers, lakes, and other waters that flow across, or form a part of boundaries between two or more States.

Section 4 (of the bill): Section 4 of the conference agreement is the same, except for certain date changes, as the Senate bill. It was not included in the House bill.

This section relates to promulgation of "Federal shares" for purposes of section 5 of the amended Water Pollution Control Act (relating to grants to State and interstate agencies for their water pollution control programs) for the first 3 years.

Section 5 (of the bill): Section 5 of the conference agreement was not included in the Senate bill. It preserves the legality of any Federal action relating to abatement of interstate pollution already begun under the existing law.

Section 6 (of the bill): This section contains a short title for the bill. It is the same as the House amendment (which differed from the Senate bill only in the date.)

JOHN A. BLATNIK,
ROBT. E. JONES,
JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
By JOHN A. BLATNIK,
GEO. A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CRAMER. Will the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] yield for a question on the conference report?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. As you recall, I supported an amendment to section 6 to provide for advance planning, making available up to 10 percent of the funds available under this grant section for this planning in order to clarify the situation and to make sure that funds under the grant program would be available for this advance planning. I believe this to be one of the great need areas in this field. I understand, as contained in the conference report on page 14, that it was the opinion of the conferees that the broad general language under section 6, and under the act, gives the Surgeon General this authority, and as a matter of fact the conference report specifically so states. Thus the matter is clarified beyond a doubt both in the wording in the act as approved by the conference and as further clarified in the conference report. Thus, the Surgeon General in the future will have authority to provide needed funds under the grant section for advance planning. This, as you know, was a matter of concern to the full committee, and to myself, as well as to the House on the passage of the bill. Is this interpretation of the Surgeon General's authority as regards advance planning correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. I wish to say to the gentleman from Florida, that is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR-RISK HAZARD AND DETENTION BENEFITS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 11802) to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, as amended, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits until July 1, 1957.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 201 of the act of December 2, 1942 (ch. 668, 56 Stat. 1033), as amended, is further amended by deleting the words "July 1, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1957."

SEC. 2. Section 5 (b) of the act of July 28, 1945 (ch. 328, 59 Stat. 505), as amended, is further amended by deleting the words "July 1, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1957."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF TIME ON UNPATENTED MINING CLAIMS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 10872) to provide for extension of the time during which annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims held in certain portions of the United States may be made, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time during which labor must be performed, or improvements made, pursuant to the provisions of section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (30 U. S. C. 28), on any unpatented mining claim in the existing lignite fields in northwestern South Dakota, southwestern North Dakota, northeastern Wyoming, and southeastern Montana, for the period commencing July 1, 1955, is hereby extended until the hour of 12 o'clock meridian July 1, 1957.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, lines 6, 7, and 8, strike out "in the existing lignite fields in northwestern South Dakota, southwestern North Dakota, northeastern Wyoming, and southeastern Montana," and insert in lieu thereof "validated under section 2 of the act of August 11, 1955 (Public Law 357, 84th Cong., 69 Stat. 679)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for extension of the time during which annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims validated under section 2 of the act of August 11, 1955, may be made, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORA R. SAVAGE

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 561) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives to Cora R. Savage, widow of Ward Savage, late an employee of the Architect of the Capitol, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Ward Savage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS AND THE PENSION BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the debate the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] made a statement with reference to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] which I think, upon reflection, he will realize he should not have made. The responsibility does not rest upon the gentleman from Oklahoma for the action taken by the House. I am not going to accuse anyone else of being responsible. The best evidence of the result is that the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, whom I admire very much, announced to the House he was going to call his committee together for the purpose of reporting out a bill providing increased compensation for service-connected veterans.

While the gentleman from Oklahoma needs no defense from me for his sterling leadership today, nevertheless, the statement made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] in my opinion was hasty and emotional and, if upon reflection he adheres to it, entirely unjustified.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to thank the gentleman for his kind remarks and to say that the gentleman from Ohio and I are old friends. I am sure there are no hard feelings between us on this score.

Mr. McCORMACK. Whether or not people are old friends, even under emotion they should not say things like that.

Mr. EDMONDSON. If the gentleman will yield further, may I say that the following members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs today have prepared a request to the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs that he schedule a meeting of that committee on Thursday, June 28, to act upon pending legislation in the committee for service-connected disabled veterans and for their dependent widows and orphans. That was signed by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE], the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], as well as by myself.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now that the gentleman has mentioned the names of some members of the committee, I am sure there are other members whom he has not contacted yet, but the fact that he does not include their names does not mean they would not enthusiastically sign such a round robin.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is correct. I think it would be the temper of every Member of this House that speedy attention be given to this matter of action for service-connected disabled veterans.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, my able friend from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] is not here at the moment. I would have preferred that the gentleman from Massachusetts wait until he was here if he was going to make any derogatory remarks with reference to him, because I thought he conducted himself very ably and distinctively and as a statesman in every respect today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD if he so desires.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts of course always says things in the presence of a Member. The gentleman from Ohio was here not long ago and I assumed he was here. However, the gentleman from Massachusetts has said nothing that he knows of derogatory of the gentleman from Ohio. The gentleman from Massachusetts took issue sharply with the statement he made during the debate.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman from Massachusetts can of course interpret his own remarks, but that was the interpretation I placed on them and I think that was the interpretation everyone else will place on them. I do not blame the gentleman from Massachusetts so much. At the same time, we had what we might call a big battle here today, a very big battle from the standpoint of parliamentary procedure. I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] conducted himself very ably and very honorably.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I do not raise that question. I also said that the gentleman from Oklahoma conducted himself ably and honorably. The gentleman from Ohio is trying to put the blame on the gentleman from Oklahoma for certain things that happened when the blame did not rest upon him.

Mr. JENKINS. I have nothing to say about the gentleman from Oklahoma or anyone else.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am talking about him.

Mr. JENKINS. I am just now taking this opportunity so that Congressman WILLIAM AYRES, a very fine, upstanding and able Congressman from Ohio, should have his right to speak for himself.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I have had a very pleasant association with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] and feel that he was given some very bad advice by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], who advised him to raise a point of order.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] felt that I made a remark that should not have been made. I assure the gentleman that in my heart the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] made a serious mistake in raising a point of order, because, had the House voted on my recommittal motion, the service-connected disabled veteran would be receiving larger payment checks within 60 days. Since the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] advised the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], he should share the responsibility for what happened today.

It should be apparent by now that no increase in pensions will be granted until those who suffered a disability from their war service are given a better break.

The bill passed today will never become law. However, as Chairman TEAGUE stated, he hopes to get a bill before the Congress that will help the most deserving group of veterans—those with a service-connected disability.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] made another mistake when, by indirection, he left the impression that he doubted the integrity of one of the most able Members of Congress, Combat Veteran OLIN TEAGUE. It was not necessary for the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] to petition Chairman TEAGUE to hold a hearing when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] had already told the House of his intentions.

It is all water over the dam now, and the persons who are temporarily injured again are those men who faced the gunfire for their country. What a shame.

It is my hope that we will be able to bring a bill back to the Congress that will correct this injustice, that the members had hoped to correct today, and would have been able to do so had the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] not made his point of order.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to express my complete surprise over the fact that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] would go around to members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs asking them for their signature on a petition directing me to call a meeting of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Certainly, it seems that the gentleman from Oklahoma would have come to the chairman and requested that a date be set for a hearing. As chairman, I personally resent very much that he has decided to take that action. I announced to the House that I was going to call a meeting of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

This debate as far as I am concerned has been conducted on a very high level. There has been nothing said that should offend anyone. But, I certainly do not appreciate the action of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], who evidently seems to have decided to take over the chairmanship of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I may lose some fights on the floor. I have lost fights before and I am sure I will lose fights on the floor in the future, but I know in my own heart that what I was doing was right and there are many Members of the House of Representatives who know the same thing.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee, I just want to say at this time that I have admired the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee in all respects throughout the committee consideration of this legislation. He was opposed to the pension provision, but nevertheless he repeatedly called hearings and actually rushed them along. He did that because of his responsibility as chairman of the committee. I know that it is not necessary for me to sign anything to make a demand upon him to call a meeting of the committee to consider compensation legislation. I know that the gentleman from Oklahoma and my other colleagues on the committee just mentioned by him, who are, every one, fine and fair members, do not intend to infer such. Throughout the hearings our chairman has shown that he is first, foremost, and always for the disabled veterans and he wants to see them taken care of first. I think that had a great deal to do with his position on the bill just considered. I certainly congratulate the gentleman for the fine job that he has done in his capacity as chairman of the committee; for his high sense of duty; for his fairness; and for the responsibility he has shown. He has repeatedly placed his self-assumed obligations as chairman ahead of his personal desires and preferences.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I appreciate very much the gentleman's kind remarks.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, there is no one in this House at this moment who holds the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of our committee, in higher esteem than I do and there is no one who recognizes and salutes his courage, his valor, and the high quality of his character any more than I do. But the gentleman from Texas will recall that in the course of the final rollcall when I asked him deliberately and directly the question: "Can we proceed to a hearing right away on service-connected disabled veterans legislation?" He said, "I do not know what I will do at this time." Is that not correct?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is exactly true because there is no reason to try to bring a bill out here that has no possibility of becoming law. I was going to contact the leadership to see what attitude they have toward some kind of compensation bill.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I did not ask a single Member to sign a request until I had received that answer from the chairman when I made my direct request to him with regard to this legislation.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Do you consider that a direct request for a hearing?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I consider it as a request for a hearing; yes, sir; I do.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I certainly do not so consider it. I consider that it was just a conversation sitting here around the table.

Mr. EDMONDSON. In any event, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear that I intend no disrespect of any kind toward the chairman of our committee. I think he is one of the ablest Members and outstanding chairman of the House of Representatives, and I will always regard him as a good friend of mine.

WHY NOT PERMIT AN UNBIASED COMMISSION OF NINE MEMBERS TO APPRAISE THE PROGRESS AND DIRECTION OF THE NUCLEAR ELECTRIC POWER PROGRAM OF THE UNITED STATES?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and that my remarks appear in today's RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, for many weeks the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has listened to numerous witnesses comment on S. 2725, introduced by Senator GORE of Tennessee, which would direct the Atomic Energy Commission to construct six nuclear plants for industrial or commercial use in selected geographical regions.

As a result of the hearings on S. 2725 there has developed three definite trends of thought. One group feels that unless we accelerate our nuclear powerplant program we will lose the nuclear kilowatt race with Russia; another group is of the opinion the present program of the Atomic Energy Commission is in keeping with the development of the art; while the third group contends that the construction of six nuclear industrial and commercial powerplants would destroy the incentive of American industry in the nuclear field where millions of dollars have already been obligated.

Even though S. 2725 has been modified in many ways by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy there still remains in the minds of many that the most logical approach in determining the progress and direction of the nuclear electric power program in the United States is through the appointment of a nonpartisan Commission on Nuclear Power. The Commission, after a thorough study, would make suitable recommendations as to where we stand as a nation in the kilowatt race with Russia and whether a crash program as now being advocated and costing millions of dollars is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have attended most of the hearings and I find myself greatly disturbed as to charges and countercharges regardless of their sincerity. It appears that everyone is groping for the right answer and that unbiased, nonpartisan, expert guidance is the need of the hour. It is for that reason that I have introduced the following joint resolution which would create a commission of nine persons all experts in one or more fields of nuclear science, engineering, economics, and electric utilities.

It will be the duty of this Commission, after a thorough study of the state of the art of electric power generation from nuclear sources in the United States and such other countries as the Commission may deem appropriate, to recommend, if any, revisions of the present nuclear power program of the United States and suggest legislation deemed necessary as a result of its study.

The joint resolution is as follows:

Joint resolution to establish a Commission to appraise the progress and direction of the nuclear electric power program of the United States of America

Whereas the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 declares it to be the policy of the United States that the development, use and control of atomic energy shall be directed so as to make the maximum contribution to the general welfare; and

Whereas the possibility of developing economically competitive generation of electric power from nuclear sources gives promise of making a major contribution to the general welfare of the United States and to the promotion of world peace; and

Whereas questions have been raised whether the present direction and progress of the nuclear power program of the United States are appropriate and adequate to the rapid achievement of these goals: Be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

(1) That there be appointed a Commission on Nuclear Power consisting of 9 members of which 3 shall be appointed by the President, 3 shall be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 3 shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(2) That members of such Commission shall be chosen for their expertness in one or

more of the fields of nuclear science, engineering, economics and electric utilities. They shall serve without compensation but shall be reimbursed for travel and other expenses.

(3) That the Commission shall study and report to the Congress not later than January 1, 1957, with respect to—

(a) the present state of the art of electric power generation from nuclear sources in the United States, and such other countries as the Commission may deem appropriate;

(b) the present state of the economics of conventional electric power generation in the United States and such other countries as the Commission may deem appropriate;

(c) its recommendations, if any, for revision of the present nuclear electric power program of the United States and for whatever legislation it deems necessary as the result of its study.

(4) The Commission is empowered to appoint such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necesary and advisable. No member of the Commission or individual in its employ shall be permitted to have access to restricted data unless and until the requirements of section 145 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 shall have been fulfilled with regard to such member or individual. The Commission is authorized to utilize the services, information (including restricted data subject to the requirements of the preceding sentence), facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishment of the Government.

(5) Vacancies in the membership of the Commission shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Commission, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The Commission shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(6) The Commission, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to (a) hold such hearings, (b) sit and act at such places and times, (c) require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, (d) administer such oaths, (e) take such testimony, (f) procure such printing and binding, and (g) make such expenditures, as it deems advisable.

(7) The expenses of the Commission, which shall not exceed $------, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Commission. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

THE INDOMITABLE SPIRIT OF POLAND

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the materialistic philosophies and practices which have taken hold of so much of the world since the advent of government resting upon the fallacious, godless, totalitarian concepts of Marx, Engels, and Lenin have made little, if any, progress in the Polish nation.

Even though the Polish nation has been forcibly contained behind the Iron Curtain no amount of Soviet pressure, no measure of brutality, no ruthless police state repression has succeeded in breaking the will of the Polish people. One of the edifying, reassuring features of the present battle against communism is the high morale and unyielding spirit of the Polish nation and people who bravely and resolutely carry on their age-long struggle for personal liberty in the face of overwhelming odds and in spite of bitter persecution.

Of all the satellite nations, Poland shows far greater courage and an insistance on free speech and free activities of the individual regardless of all extreme measures of totalitarian control.

Oppression is not new to the Poles. For centuries they have been fighting against brutality and tyranny and in their long fight for freedom they have even stood up against mass butchery. To lose their sovereignty is no new experience for the Poles, and they understand the tactics required to win it back.

One who studies the Polish question and observes conditions in Poland inescapably comes to the conclusion that the indomitable spirit of the Poles derives from their unwavering religious beliefs. They have not succumbed to the neoliberalistic theory, so prevalent in sophisticated intellectual circles, that shuns and condemns the Almighty and avidly embraces atheism and paganism for a creed as a special mark of fashionableness and scholarly distinction. Oppression has served principally to intensify the ardor of Polish religious devotion. Notwithstanding the Communist regime's bitter hostility to religion, the Polish churches, we are authoritatively informed, are so full on Sundays that people have to stand in line waiting to be admitted.

The cruel Soviet masters brutalize, drug, and imprison members of the Polish hierarchy, priests, friars, and innocent nuns, but so strong are the religious loyalties of the Poles that the Communists have been compelled to permit religious education in the state schools, finance the university at Lublin, and rebuild churches and cathedrals and generally follow a policy of grudging toleration of religious worship.

A recent visitor to Poland was struck by both the shabbiness and nobility of the people, and described it as an aristocratic and democratic nation at one and the same time—proud, witty, turbulent, and made of just the stuff that rebels against oppression and refuses to bow to tyrants.

One of the great tragedies of Poland lies in the destruction after the last war of its geographical integrity. This was rightfully interpreted as a great handicap of the reestablishment of Polish-German amity which is so vital and essential for the defense of Western Europe. Moreover, it intensified the population problems of the area by causing pressures in a region where the present populations are dense.

To think that this carving up of a great nation, devoted to religion and freedom, officially received the sanction of our own Government is a sad commentary indeed upon our willingness to follow a policy of appeasement even when it called for the liquidation and enslavement of one of our noblest allies. Some of the war lords and misguided, allied statesmen of the World War II period may have been willing to agree to the dismemberment of Poland and the surrender of its territory to the Soviet. They did this on the theory that while it was an unpalatable act morally, ethically, and politically, it would in due course be forgotten. Persons who held this view in the name of a base political opportunism failed to reckon with the invincible, never-say-die spirit of the Poles, and less with the moral indignation of America and the free world at this heartless betrayal.

This Polish spirit can never be broken and will never die, because it is based on allegiance to the eternal God. On the other hand, it will constantly grow in strength, fervor, and aggressiveness, since it is fed from a divine source, and nurtured by the never-failing loyalty of millions of Polish people who made up their minds long ago that, as sons and daughters of the living God, they would rather die as free men than live as slaves.

This kind of spirit is the one thing that discomfits Soviet leadership and disorganizes Soviet plots to conquer the world. It telescopes for the benefit of K–B and their ilk the clear message that in every nation, even in those behind the iniquitous Iron Curtain, held fast in the steellike grip of oppression, there are powerful Trojan horses of freedom daily growing in number and vitality, which will one day rise up, with God's help, and with the help of other freedom-loving peoples, I hope, to throw off their shackles, to override their masters and to achieve again their rightful place of honor and independence in the society of free nations.

Such is the inconquerable spirit of the Polish cause. It may be suppressed for a while. It may be stifled by murder, pillage and rapine. It may be hammered into temporary quiescence by the mailed first. But it never can be quenched as long as liberty lives in the human breast. One day it will liberate Poland, and restore her to the freedom and independence her gallant people so richly deserve, and so zealously seek.

She must have our help and encouragement in this brave fight for freedom. America must support the cause of Poland because it is the cause of liberty itself. And all nations who believe in the dignity, independence, and freedom of man must join hands in this cause. It is the test of our sincerity and the end-all and be-all of the preservation of liberty for mankind.

THE CYPRUS SITUATION

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for the better part of the past

2 years I have been identified with the efforts of the valiant inhabitants of Cyprus to be united with their mother country, Greece, and to gain their freedom from British rule. I became an honorary member of the Justice for Cyprus Committee in September 1954 and was honored to be associated with this group dedicated to the cause of freedom.

We, as present-day Americans, in this land of the free, cannot quite comprehend alien tyranny as is being experienced by so many peoples at the present time. Yet in spite of such tyranny these groups have remained true to their ancient traditions, cherishing the ideal of national independence. We in this country hope and pray that a just, honorable, and immediate solution to the Cyprus issue will be effected since it is obviously in the interest of the entire free world as well as in the interest of the peoples most directly concerned. I feel it would be wise for our present administration and our Government to take steps to contribute to an immediate solution.

The development in this issue that has brought great reaction is the removal of Archbishop Makarios from Cyprus by the British. The archbishop of Canterbury has voiced his sentiments in favor of the immediate return of Archbishop Makarios, and many voices in our country have been raised to the same effect. The world is looking to England to see what her position will finally be regarding the return to Cyprus of Archbishop Makarios, one of the highest church officials of the Orthodox faith on the island of Cyprus.

A famous English writer, H. G. Wells, with whom all of us are familiar, said in his Outline of History that—

> The British acquired the island of Cyprus to which they had no right whatever and which has never been of the slightest use to them.

Other English scholars and writers have similar views on enosis, which stands for the Cypriot movement aimed at the union of Cyprus with the Greek motherland. Back in 1880 Prime Minister Gladstone was sympathetic to this cause and so expressed himself, but the then Queen of England would not consent to the cession of Cyprus, and Gladstone announced that although he was very anxious for the happiness of the Cypriots he regretted he was bound by treaties which he could not break. The British press has more recently made statements favoring the union of Cyprus with Greece and condemned the negative attitude of Prime Minister Eden and his colleagues.

It seems to me that if the British do not recognize, and soon, the inherent dangers of suppressing and ignoring the fundamental need of dependent peoples to self-respect and recognition, further alienation of democratic world opinion will take place and Greece may withdraw into a neutralist position, an extremely dangerous step which would acutely affect the eastern wing of the NATO defense structure. In the meantime, however, since Cyprus is the only position in the Middle East where the strategic forces of the free Western World can be based, the British maintain they cannot permit enosis at the present time.

It seems clear to me that the British have failed miserably in their duty to the Cypriot people and to their ally, Greece. It is true that Cyprus is an important base through which allied troops can be staged to defend the Middle East against Communist aggression. But this is in no sense a justification for the British to refuse concessions. On the contrary, it more likely makes them mandatory.

We have sympathy for these faithful Cypriots and continue to hope and pray for early action that will result in self-determination for the inhabitants of the island of Cyprus.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order for today. I ask unanimous consent that that be vacated and that I may have the same privilege on next Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WATER POLLUTION CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the colloquy between myself and the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. BLATNIK] in consideration of the conference report with regard to the water pollution control bill be inserted in the RECORD prior to the vote on the conference report.

BRAZIL TO ACT AGAINST RED INFILTRATION

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Catholic Universe Bulletin, of Cleveland, in its issue of June 22, 1956, carried a very interesting article on the campaign of the Brazilian Government against the growing Red menace in that country. This article points out that the Communists have launched an intensive campaign in Brazil to infiltrate all levels of civilization, and particularly to place Communist agents in Government posts.

I consider this news article important because for the last 6 months I have been attempting to close a serious breach in the free world security through which, I am convinced, a number of high Communist agents have wormed their way into Brazil and other countries of Latin America. I refer to the efforts I have made to prevent the continuing misuse of the American taxpayers' money for the payment of transportation costs of so-called White Russians from Red China to thirty-odd countres of the free world. These so-called White Russians living in Red China are permitted to enter the free world with no field security investigation whatever made on them. This is in direct violation of United States public law. Moreover, these so-called White Russians are on the friendliest terms with the plotters in the Kremlin because most of them have in their possession valid passports issued by the Government of the U. S. S. R. None of these so-called White Russians is looked upon with suspicion by the Red Chinese because all of them have obtained and are still getting exit permits from the Red Chinese. The obvious danger of allowing this fraud to continue is underscored by these two irrefutable facts:

First. The Brazilian Government in admitting into their country some of these so-called White Russians, laid themselves open to wholesale infiltration by Russian propagandists and Communist espionage agents. The Brazilian Government uncovered a top Russian espionage agent who entered Brazil as a so-called White Russian, but who, in fact, had just previously been the Communist security officer in the Red Polish Embassy in Peking, China. When his true identity became known the Brazilian Government expelled him from the country and he is now one of the special problems for the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration.

Second. The Brazilian Government wisely shut off all further emigration into their country of these so-called White Russians residing in Red China and have kept this ban in effect ever since. It is significant, however, that the Brazilian Government has continued to admit bona fide victims of communism from other areas of the world.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Scott McLeod, administrator in charge of the United States escapee program, through which the misuse of the taxpayers' money on these so-called White Russians is made, has stated publicly that he intends to continue the misuse of public funds on these so-called White Russians in spite of the record, only part of which has been here described today. It appears Mr. McLeod has little regard for the threat of communism which our sister Republic of Brazil and all the other nations of Latin America are faced with today. I say this because he has made no effort to prevent the further infiltration of these so-called White Russians into other countries of Latin America.

According to official records which I have in my possession, a total of 2,693 so-called White Russians who once resided in Red China emigrated to Brazil during a 4-year period ending September 30, 1955. It is anybody's guess as to how many Russian propaganda and Communist espionage agents are numbered among the total of 2,693 so-called White Russians who were transported through Red China to Brazil largely at the expense of the United States taxpayers. In my judgment the number is large and their danger to the freedom and independence of the people of Brazil cannot be overestimated. It is my fervent hope that other Latin American governments will follow the example of Brazil in plugging the gap in the free-world security by barring the admission into their countries of so-called White Russians residing in Red China.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD this article:

BRAZIL TO ACT AGAINST RED INFILTRATION

RIO DE JANEIRO.—The announcement by Minister of Justice Nereu Ramos that the Brazilian Government will launch a campaign against communism follows repeated warnings by Brazilian prelates and priests against the growing Red menace in Brazil.

Jaime Cardinal Camara, archbishop of Rio de Janeiro, said that "anyone who thinks there is no Communist danger in Brazil is profoundly deceived." He said the Reds look upon Latin America as a colonial territory that must be liberated.

Father Sebastian Kauzin, Dominican provincial in Brazil, warned that the political situation in Brazil was so bad that it favored Communist infiltration.

He said the Communists had launched an intensive campaign to place Reds in government posts.

Although the Communist Party was outlawed in Brazil in 1948, it has since actually strengthened its power through clandestine activities.

PRAY FOR PEACE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the ablest and most effective Members of the Congress, a man of deep faith, is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]. His record in this body on humane and progressive legislation, as well as in the field of foreign affairs, and for a strong defense of our country, is outstanding.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is a profound student of government—knowing well the origin and history of our Government; that it is a government of law under God; that the motto on our coins, "In God We Trust" is more than mere words, but represents and symbolizes the spirit and intent of our people and our Government.

Being a man of deep faith himself, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] knows full well the meaning and significance of the people of our country possessing deep faith; that in a crisis, faith itself could constitute the difference between victory and defeat.

As a constant reminder to our people that we must have spiritual strength, as well as military strength, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] introduced a bill in this body several years ago authorizing the motto "Pray for Peace" to be carried as a message on letters and other matter through the mails, through the cancellation machines of the Post Office Department.

As Postmaster General Summerfield so well said several days ago in commenting on this bill after it became law:

This motto "Pray for Peace" epitomizes the highest aspirations of the American people.

And I might add this law symbolizes the origin, the history, and the spirit of America.

The people of the United States are indebted to my valued friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] for introducing this bill and having it enacted into law under his leadership.

The people of his district are justified in being proud in the manner in which he represents them in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks an article on the bill written by Belmont Faries and which appeared in the Sunday Washington Star of June 24, 1956:

SLOGAN CANCEL TO ASK PRAYERS FOR PEACE

(By Belmont Faries)

"Pray for Peace" slogan cancellations will be placed in use in every first- and second-class post office in the United States under terms of a bill signed Wednesday by President Eisenhower.

Postmaster General Summerfield said his Department is moving promptly to supply the special dies needed.

"This motto, 'Pray for Peace,' epitomizes the highest aspirations of the American people," Mr. Summerfield added. "I believe that by repeating this message on millions of letters and other mailed matter passing through the cancellation machines, we will reaffirm our faith in prayer to achieve the Nation's most cherished hope—everlasting world peace."

Enactment of the legislation is the culmination of a long campaign by Representative RABAUT, Democrat, of Michigan, who also was author of the amendment inserting the words "under God" in the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

Mr. RABAUT's proposed design for the cancellation is a pictorial one, including praying hands as well as the words "Pray for peace."

The Michigan Representative originally favored an "In God We Trust" cancellation. When that wording was placed on the 3-cent and 8-cent Statue of Liberty stamps of the new regular series he turned his attention to the prayer slogan.

His bill passed the House but not in the Senate in the 83d Congress. Introduced again in the present Congress it was approved by the House on June 20, 1955, and by the Senate on June 11, 1956.

The Post Office Department opposed the bill on the basis of cost, estimated at $250,000 for one die for each of 10,000 first- and second-class post offices.

Slogan cancellation dies currently in use are paid for by interested organizations. Under Mr. RABAUT's bill, the "Pray for Peace" dies will be purchased from the Department's funds.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, for the balance of the week on account of very important personal business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. FEIGHAN, for 10 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BYRD (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAMBLE in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. HARDEN and include a statement.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIDSON.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7641. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 11319. An act making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2512. An act to amend the act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving such forces.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6782. An act to amend section 7 of "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 7641. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations; and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10660. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 28, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2018. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States transmitting a draft

of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space" was taken from the Speaker's table, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to their proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 3547. An act to amend section 1 of the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 555), authorizing the sale of certain land by the Pueblos of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque; without amendment (Rept. No. 2487). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 11163. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of March 29, 1956 (70 Stat. 58), authorizing the conveyance to Lake County, Calif., of the Lower Lake Rancheria, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2488). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 556. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4054, a bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; without amendment (Rept. No. 2489). Refered to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 557. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 11683, a bill to authorize permanent appointments in the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2490). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committeee on Rules. House Resolution 558. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 8000, a bill to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight; without amendment (Rept. No. 2491). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 559. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 11132, a bill to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2492). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 560. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 11695, a bill to extend until June 30, 1958, the programs of financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities under the provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, Eighty-first Congress, and to make certain other changes in such provisions; without amendment (Rept. No. 2493). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6716. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to actions for infringements of copyrights by the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2494). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2711. An act to authorize medals and decorations for outstanding and meritorious conduct and service in the United States merchant marine, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2496). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. House Joint Resolution 643. Joint resolution to provide for an investigation of the need for a geophysical institute in the Territory of Hawaii; without amendment (Rept. No. 2497). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5608. A bill to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation in South Dakota and North Dakota, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2498). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 9265. A bill to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended, relating to the audit of Government (Territorial and county) accounts; with amendment (Rept. No. 2499). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 11923. A bill to provide for the conferring of an award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement; without amendment (Rept. No. 2500). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 10872. A bill to provide for extension of the time during which annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims held in certain portions of the United States may be made, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2501). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 146. An act for the relief of Isabel Tre; with amendment (Rept. No. 2495). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 11986. A bill to settle land claims in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 11987. A bill to authorize the Judicial Conference of the United States to promulgate minimum standards of qualifications for probation officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 11988. A bill to disclaim any rights of the United States to the island of Navassa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 11989. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide that any individual aggrieved by the action of a State agency with respect to his claim for assistance shall be entitled to judicial review thereof in an appropriate State court; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 11990. A bill to authorize funds for the improvement by the Secretary of Commerce of the Pentagon road network and that portion of the Henry G. Shirley Memorial Highway in Arlington County, Va., and to provide for the transfer of such highways to the Commonwealth of Virginia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 11991. A bill to amend section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide an additional period for World War II veterans to obtain guaranteed loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 11992. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 11993. A bill to discharge more effectively obligations of the United States under certain conventions and protocols relating to the institution of controls over the manufacture of narcotic drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 11994. A bill to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 11995. A bill to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1956; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 11996. A bill to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1956; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 11997. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 11998. A bill to restore the authority of the Postmaster General to adjust postage rates for air parcel-post service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 11999. A bill relating to the appointment of certain officials in the Bureau of Customs and the United States mints; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 12000. A bill relating to the transfer of Federal employees from the classified civil service to another personnel merit system; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 12001. A bill relating to the simplification of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 12002. A bill relating to the method of appointment of United States marshals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 12003. A bill to provide for comprehensive reports by the Bureau of the Budget with respect to all branches of the Government and the executive agencies thereof; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 12004. A bill to improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 12005. A bill to provide for Government contribution toward personal health service benefits for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service, to authorize payroll deductions for participants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 12006. A bill to provide for the reconveyance of certain lands in the Benbrook Reservoir project, Texas, to former owners of

such lands where such lands are not required for public purposes, including public recreational use; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. J. Res. 663. Joint resolution to establish the 12th day of April as National Health Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. J. Res. 664. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. J. Res. 665. Joint resolution to establish a Commission to appraise the progress and direction of the nuclear electric power program of the United States of America; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 12007. A bill for the relief of Taimi Maria Erkkila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 12008. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Tejima Powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 12009. A bill for the relief of Richard J. Aranjo Rodriguez, Roberto Rodriguez, Cecilia Rodriguez, and Basilio Rodriguez; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 12010. A bill for the relief of Jesus Marie Ambriz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H. R. 12011. A bill for the relief of Diego Moncado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 12012. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Patricia Joyner Altenbach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 12013. A bill for the relief of Miss Hedwig Dora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 12014. A bill for the relief of Martin A. Mastandrea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 12015. A bill for the relief of Emil Heineke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. J. Res. 666. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell one war-built cargo vessel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. Res. 562. Resolution providing that the bill, H. R. 6185, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1167. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Carl E. Lehrer and 19 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging the passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1168. Also, petition of Mrs. Alice F. Sauerwein and 19 other citizens of Salem, Oreg., urging the passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1169. Also, petition of Russell A. Peterson and 25 other citizens of the State of Oregon urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1170. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of 174 members and friends of Sgt. Reginald Vought Post, No. 821, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Berwick, Pa., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

April 12: National Health Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution calling for the establishment of the 12th day of April of each year as National Health Day. We have witnessed in the past few decades the increasing interest of the Federal Government in the improvement of the health of all of our citizens and in the elimination of disease. The war which is constantly being waged against the destructive diseases which afflict both the mind and the body is, I am sure, the only war, be it hot or cold, which honestly commends itself to the hearts, souls, and minds not only of the people of this Nation but of the peoples of the world. The continual struggle to conquer the many dire illnesses and diseases to which man is still subject is the greatest battle remaining for man against nature.

We have, not only in the United States but elsewhere in the world, vast resources of people skilled and trained in scientific research, investigation and analysis and the utilization of those resources is still required to aid in the conquest of disease. In addition, vast sums of money together with nationwide and worldwide correlation of experimental data and progress are needed to supply the weapons for the successful conquest of disease.

The resolution which I have today introduced, for appropriate reference in the House, would set aside the 12th day of April of each year for the purpose of a public dedication in the never-ending struggle for improvement in our Nation's health. It would invite the medical profession, the press, and all agencies and individuals interested in the national program to unite in a concerted effort to impress upon the people the necessity and the value of our Federal Government's interest in national health.

The reasons for the designation of the 12th day of April are rather simple. In the first place, that day is the birthdate of our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who, perhaps more than any other President in our Nation's history, oriented our thinking and our efforts to the need for a national health program. The crippling paralysis from which he suffered was well known to everyone in the world. His personal interest and his efforts to eliminate the dread disease, infantile paralysis, caused him to found the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. The annual March of Dimes is not only a yearly drive to aid the foundation, but acts also as a memorial to his memory and to his ability to lead a useful and dedicated public life despite his affliction.

In the second place, the 12th day of April became the day on which the entire world was informed of the results of a study made on the effect of the use of the Salk vaccine in the reduction, and perhaps eventually the elimination, of paralytic polio. The contribution which Dr. Salk has made to our Nation's health cannot be measured—each of us knows that countless children have been saved from a crippling disease. The discovery of the Salk vaccine is perhaps the outstanding health contribution of our lifetime, and the day upon which the Francis report was issued will serve as a constant reminder of the great strides that can be made by scientific research to eliminate the as yet unconquered illnesses of man.

These two reasons, then, would indicate that the 12th day of April is, indeed, the proper day for the observance of a National Health Day.

I respectfully request the support of each Member of the House for the resolution which I have introduced.

State Sedition Statutes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would restore to the States authority to enforce their State sedition statutes.

I was privileged to be a member of the Florida State Legislature when that body enacted the Subversive Activities Act in 1953. I supported and voted for this measure because I felt that it was a proper field of legislation for a State. Every State and all the citizens within its borders have a major interest in opposing any activity which is designed

to overthrow or destroy our constitutional form of government. Our Florida law makes it a felony for any person to knowingly and willfully participate in any way in such activity and prescribes a fine of not more than $20,000 or imprisonment for not less than 1 year nor more than 20 years, or both. Membership in a subversive organization carries the penalty of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment of not less than 1 year nor more than 5 years, or both. Persons convicted of subversive activities are prohibited from filing for or holding public office or of voting in any election. The attorney general of the State, all prosecuting attorneys, the secretary of state, and all law-enforcement officers of the State have the duty and authority to enforce this law.

As we all know, the recent Supreme Court decision in the Nelson case decreed that because the Congress enacted the Smith Act of 1940, the Internal Security Act of 1950, and the Communist Control Act of 1954, the Federal Government had a dominant interest in the legislative field of sedition which precluded the enforceability of the Pennsylvania Sedition Act, thereby nullifying every State statute dealing with seditious activity. This decision constitutes an unwarranted and unnecessary invasion of the rights of the State of Florida.

I do not believe it was the intent of Congress in enacting legislation dealing with subversive activities, to give to the Federal Government exclusive jurisdiction over the prosecution of those who are engaged in such activity within our country, thereby depriving the States of all authority to enforce their sedition laws.

The Attorney General of the United States states there is no conflict from the standpoint of administering Federal and State law. The United States Attorney General is of the opinion that this dual jurisdiction allows for a beneficial and necessary degree of flexibility in meeting the crises of the present and of the future in the field of subversive activities.

It certainly seems to me that the ever-increasing congestion of the Federal docket would make cooperation and participation in this type of court action on the part of the States not only feasible, but judicious. If court actions on sedition charges can be expedited by means of proper prosecution by a State, the Federal Government which is both the individual State and the Nation, will come that much closer to effectively meting out full justice to those who seek to overthrow or destroy it.

Daniel Wolsey Voorhees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, today it was my privilege to participate in a ceremony at the Library of Congress honoring the late Senator Daniel Wolsey Voorhees, of Indiana. The ceremony, and the presentation of a plaque to the Library in honor of the contributions made to the Library by Senator Voorhees, was arranged by my friends and fellow townsmen, the Business and Professional Women's Club of Covington, Ind. Several of the club's officers and members were here for the presentation, and I know you will join with me in bidding them welcome to our Nation's Capital.

Following are my remarks in connection with the ceremony in honor of Senator Voorhees and the inspiring remarks of the Honorable K. M. LECOMPTE, Representative from Iowa, member of the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress:

ADDRESS BY MRS. HARDEN

We have gathered here today to honor the memory of a great son of Indiana, and a great American, who died nearly 60 years ago, but whose works live after him, and nowhere more visibly than in this main building of the Library of Congress. This man is Daniel Wolsey Voorhees, who entered Congress on the day that Abraham Lincoln became President of the United States, and represented Indiana in the House for 9 years, and in the Senate for 20.

A fitting memorial to this statesman has been a long-time dream of my friends and neighbors, the Business and Professional Women's Club, of Covington, Ind. The great-grandmothers and great-grandfathers of many of them were the friends and neighbors of Daniel Voorhees and his family when he was growing up and when he was entering on his distinguished career.

Daniel Voorhees was born, not in Indiana, but not far from it—in Butler County, Ohio, whose western boundary is the Indiana State line. He was still a mere child when his parents brought him to Fountain County and settled on a farm in Van Buren Township about 10 miles from the county seat, Covington. When he entered college in 1845, he went only some 57 miles southeast of Covington, to Greencastle in Putnam County, where Indiana Asbury University was located, or DePauw, as it is now called. When he entered the office of a law firm for his professional training, he chose the partnership of Lane & Wilson in Crawfordsville, Ind., less than 30 miles east of Covington. In April 1850, well before his 23d birthday, he was ready to hang out his shingle as a young attorney, and he hung it out in Covington, where he practiced for the next 7 years.

By 1857 he was ready for a larger sphere of action and transferred his law office to Terre Haute, some 60 miles south of Covington but, like it, on the left bank of the lovely Wabash River, and still within my Sixth Congressional District. Four years later he went on to Washington, but to us he has always been a Covington man, who left our farm county for the world of larger towns and cities and the stage of national politics.

If we did not forget him, still less did he forget us. All through the 30 years following the Civil War, Daniel Voorhees spoke and acted in the interest of the dirt farmers from whom he sprang—the men who took over from the buffalo and the Indian, cleared the ground, and first brought it under cultivation. During those three decades, the Nation's economic development went forward at an immensely accelerated pace, but it was a one-sided development which vastly enriched certain forms of enterprise, and left the average farmer with little beyond his subsistence. Speaking on tariff reform, Voorhees told the Senate of the United States in March 1890:

"Over 20 million of the present population of the United States, counting all ages and both sexes, are engaged in the cultivation of the soil, and on their productive labor, not only the Government itself leans for support, but also all other classes of citizens derive from the same source their prosperity, their wealth, and, too often, their profuse and criminal luxuries."

The remedies of his time for the inequities that he saw are not our remedies, but he believed with us that a healthy and prosperous agriculture must be at the base of any sound economic structure.

Senator Voorhees' championship of "the farmers and other over-taxed and underpaid laborers of the United States," as he called them, went hand in hand with another kind of advocacy which it does not always, or perhaps even often, accompany. Throughout his career this graduate of a frontier college and of a small-town law office displayed an unsurpassed zeal for the things of the mind. Few practical statesmen of his own or any other day, of his own or any other country, have possessed so clear an understanding of the whole sweep of the civilized tradition, and of the importance of the human mind in social progress. He was a firm supporter of natural science and the increase of human power which it makes possible. But, as he exhorted the literary societies of the University of Missouri in 1874: "No man can properly understand and appreciate the present without correct information of the past. Combine, therefore, as far as possible, the practical and useful ideas of your brilliant age with a full knowledge of the various developments of the human races in other ages and under different circumstances."

It was for this triple purpose—the maintenance of tradition, of scientific progress, and of civilization itself—that he stood out among the statesmen of his day as a friend of the Library of Congress. During his 20 years in the Senate, Daniel Voorhees sought unceasingly to obtain for this Library the physical setting in which its huge potentialities might be realized, as they could not possibly be in the cramped and crowded quarters of the Capitol. The end may well remind us of the Old Testament story: Like Moses, Daniel Voorhees was vouchsafed a sight of the Promised Land, but he might not enter and possess it. In the spring of 1897, this building in which we stand—the new library building—was rapidly nearing completion, and on April 10 the transfer of the special collection presented by Dr. Joseph M. Toner, which had been in storage, was begun. On July 24 Congress adjourned, and on the last day of the month the old Capitol Library was closed forever, and the mass transfer of the collections to this building was begun. On November 1, 1897, the new Library of Congress opened for service. Daniel Voorhees could not be there to see it. His health had been failing for several years, and on April 10—the very day on which the transfer of the Toner collection began—he had died at his home, a stone's throw away on Maryland Avenue, and he was buried beside the Wabash in Terre Haute.

Although Senator Voorhees himself could never be in this building, yet his hopes, his aspirations, and his efforts over many years were focussed here, and this building owes its existence in large measure to him. It is only fitting, however, that he should be commemorated here, and we women of Covington have arranged a simple memorial, such as we believe Senator Voorhees himself would have approved, to signify and perpetuate the record of his relationship to this great establishment which has so fully justified his expectations and his dreams. It is my great privilege, on behalf of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Covington, Ind., to dedicate and to present to you, Mr. Librarian, this memorial plaque to Daniel Wolsey Voorhees, which I now unveil.

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN LECOMPTE

Representative HARDEN, Mr. Mumford, Miss Dice, distinguished guests and friends, as a long-time member of the Joint Committee on the Library, I am happy to be given this opportunity to honor a great man of vision, Daniel Woolsey Voorhees. We are indebted to the Business and Professional Women of Covington, Ind., who have afforded us this event as an occasion to remember him.

Indeed, this very building in which we stand is his monument. It was his advocacy, as well as his concept of a national library, to have a separate congressional library building to be located on the grounds of the Capitol, that has had so much to do with this institution's place and standing in the world. Senator Voorhees, more than any other public figure, in 1880, first realized that the American people's library collections would someday exceed the national collections of the older and more populous nations. His was the prediction also that the United States would succeed in its determination to have as complete a repository of human learning and printing as had been known since the beginning of time.

In his endeavors we know how he was assisted by Representatives Reed, of Maine; Cox, of New York; and by his colleagues in the Senate, Senator Timothy Howe, of Wisconsin, Senator Bayard, of Delaware, and one more of very great prominence, Senator Morrill, of Vermont. Much could not have been accomplished, however, had not Senator Voorhees provided the spirit. When he arose in the Senate on May 5, 1880, to sponsor the first important measure for a new library, there were many obstacles to overcome if his idea was to materialize. The congressional collection was a jumble of books and manuscripts, organized like a country store, in the west front of the Capitol. Maps and bulletins were stacked in piles, rather than in files. Every fourth book was shelfless. Another obstacle at that time was the fact that the Congress was undecided as to whether to undertake the expansion of its east front to accommodate its library, or to construct a building to house its collection on Judiciary Square. Even the plans for the design of such a building had varied seemingly between Romanesque, French Renaissance, and the red-brick architecture of the old Pension Building.

There is a picture today which shows a proposed extension of the east front of the Capitol, utilizing turrets, to house the Congressional Library. Fortunately, this was never done. The measure which Senator Voorhees sponsored in 1880 set up a joint select committee, with himself as its chairman, and authorized a commission of three experts to advance plans, designs, and estimates on the feasibility of a new Library building on a new site. The unanimous report of these experts, in substance, led later to the location of the present building and its design along modified Renaissance lines. We find Mr. Voorhees also at the front of those voting for its final creation in 1886, and we can well suppose, as he continued to live in Washington, that he saw and walked in the new building before its completion.

To him, certainly the concept of a great national library was an integral part of a great constitutional government. Senator Voorhees could see that the wealth and store of learning which he knew his Nation must assemble would in the end identify it as a treasure house of truth and information before the world. He knew, as we know, that in this building we would preserve the writings of the past, as well as provide space for the writings of the future. So long as it stands, so long as its collections are for the free access of scholars, there will be liberty in this Nation. The most indestructible thing on earth is a book. It may be burned or disappear, but its ideas and hopes invariably live beyond it.

A philosopher has said: "Some men have only one book in them; others a library." We see now how applicable this phrase is to Senator Voorhees, and we pay him tribute for his vision, fortitude and work in establishing the Library of Congress.

Texas City Tin Smelter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the continued operation of the Texas City tin smelter has been the subject of numerous editorials in the publications specializing in the metal trades.

More than a year ago on Friday, March 25, 1955, the American Metal Market predicted that we would continue the operation of the Texas City smelter for another year. This prediction was fulfilled when we passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 on April 21, 1955. The American Metal Market on April 29, 1955, commented editorially on this action.

I ask unanimous consent that these two editorials from the American Metal Market, which review the history of the tin smelter, may be reprinted in the RECORD.

The two editorials follow:

[From the American Metal Market of March 25, 1955]

SPRING, AND THE TEXAS SMELTER

With the fidelity of robin redbreast, as harbinger of the returning spring, the issue of the Texas City tin smelter may be counted to occupy the attention of the national Congress. It is true that, owing to the vagaries of the weather, the eastern robins cannot boast the punctuality of the swallows of Capistrano, but they always show up. In 1954, the continued operation of the Texas smelter was the subject of discussion as early as the beginning of March. Not forgotten but merely a trifle delayed, as the robins sometimes are, it is now back with us again, as full of vim, vigor, and vitality as if it had not added another year to its old age.

A year ago we suggested that the smelter would continue in operation for another year. It was not our view that this was because the plant was needed by the tin-consuming industry or in the interest of the national defense. It involved other factors, with which Washington is well acquainted and, whatever the deciding reason, the smelter continued to function, as was anticipated.

It was contended then that time was required for a congressional investigation into the need for the smelter. Although the closing of the smelter had been recommended by the administration, and although no provision has been made in the budget for the continued operation of the smelter after June 30 of this year, the report on this investigation is still awaited. It may become available in a few days, but whatever it may conclude, friends of the operation are already urging its being continued for another year, as, among other things, it would have greater value as a going concern than as an abandoned project.

One must concede that there is considerable validity to such reasoning. Admittedly, the continuing operation of the plant in private hands would appear to depend on the granting of a protective tariff on pig tin (something which has not yet occurred in all our history), but the reason mentioned does constitute a good basis for urging the continued operation of the plant—with the incidental employment it provides for a couple of hundred persons in a community of moderate size. The surprising thing is that such resourceful advocates appear to think it necessary to supplement so ingenious an argument (readily understandable to all political realists) with the rehashing of old chestnuts that time has demonstrated have no merit at all.

One of these old standbys is, of course, the need of the smelter for defense purposes, as it is the only tin smelter in the Western Hemisphere. This argument grows out of the conditions of the last war, when Hitler took over all the European smelters on the Continent and threatened from the air (but never stopped) those in the British Isles, and when Japanese sea power disrupted all contact with Malaya and Indonesia. Falling into the old failure of "fighting the next war by preparing for the last," it overlooks that there is no longer any Japenese sea power to disrupt communications with southeast Asia, and that the eastern frontier of the Western World is now in Eastern Germany.

It ignores also the fact that we met all tin requirements with a backlog of only about 50,000 tons of reserve stock, whereas today it is pretty well established that the Government can command control of nearly 6 years' consumption at the rate of last year's industrial absorption of primary tin. In short, without any more tin, our accumulated stocks would see us through 6 years' severance of new supplies, and the talk now is that with atomic weapons, a decision could eventuate within a few months.

Next only to our supposed need of the smelter for defense, is the claim that it is essential to the Bolivian economy. This ignores, of course, the fact that about half the Bolivian production has been going to Britain for smelting for a number of years and that all of it went to Europe before the opening of the Texas City smelter in 1942. It can be smelted in Europe today, through private companies, just as it was in the past. There is no need for the United States Government to subsidize the smelter, at a cost of a couple of millions a year, for this purpose.

Indeed, instead of a blessing for Bolivia, the smelter remains something of a curse, since it continues to be an excuse for the disastrous economic policies of the Bolivian Government since it "nationalized" the mines. As private operations, the mines were the main support of the country, and its principal source of foreign exchange. Whatever the faults of the private operations, they were not a drain on the very limited resources of that unfortunate land. They were the main prop of the Nation, even though the Government obliged them to accept only 60 Bolivianos for their dollars, to meet operating expenses and pay taxes, when the free rate would have yielded them as much as 160 Bolivianos.

Since then, nationalization of the mines has benefited the country by turning a source of income into a millstone of deficits. Precise figures are lacking, but it is reasonably well established that, although the number of miners has been vastly increased (some say doubled) costs have so mounted that every pound of tin concentrates produced results in a loss of possibly as much as 35 cents per pound, which an impoverished Government must make good. The result has been the fall of the Boliviano to about 2,400 to the dollar from 160. It is eloquent testimony that the continued operation of the Texas City smelter has not halted deterioration of the Bolivian economy, let alone sustained it.

As for the smelter being an anchor to windward against the machinations of the international tin cartel, it is worth noting that

there has been a world surplus production of tin over the last half-dozen years. This has proved to be of manageable proportions only because the output of the Texas City smelter has been impounded in the national stockpiles, instead of overhanging the world's markets.

However all this may be, let us not be surprised if, in the interest of preserving a supposedly salable piece of merchandise, we continue to hold off some 30,000 tons of tin a year from the world markets, provide a dollar refuge for uneconomical operations in Bolivia and give orators continuing excuse for denouncing cartels. Nor let it cause surprise if we again hear some other reason for continuing the operation of the smelter, for just another year, about the time the robins fly north in March of 1956.

[From the American Metal Market of April 29, 1955]

TEXAS CITY WILL CONTINUE TO SMELT

The Senate, acting on the report and recommendation of its Committees on Armed Services and Banking and Currency, has passed without dissent a resolution favoring the continued operation of the Texas City tin smelter during the fiscal year 1955–56. If this action occasioned surprise in any quarter, it was certainly not in the tin trade, which has grown accustomed to this procedure and recognizes that the realities of politics are pretty much as established a part of our daily life as the merits or demerits of a proposition.

The trade, too, has become quite inured to indulgence by political figures in campaign oratory and would have been greatly surprised if such considerations did not continue to feature reports on this subject. Nevertheless, on this occasion the report rather surpasses all previous efforts and, if it has occasioned any surprise whatsoever, it is because the committees still feel constrained to resort to such deviations from fact to buttress their recommendations.

As a report of the committees points out, tin is produced outside the territory of the United States. Also, there is only one tin smelter on American territory and that is owned and operated by the Government. Consequently, tin is in a most unusual position. It has no constituency, except the staff of the smelter, and therefore is fair and safe game for hunting, since it cannot talk back at the polls. Therefore, once again, tin producers everywhere—except for the highest-cost mines in the world, which are presently operating only with the support of United States subsidies—are made the whipping boy for continuing an operation which the trade is virtually unanimous in regarding as an unnecessary and costly drain on the Public Treasury.

It is asserted that the maintenance and operation of the Government smelter "decreases the risk of the country's being at the mercy of price gouging by those controlling foreign tin supplies." If this were the case, why did the Government consider it safe to divest itself of the control and operation of the much more extensive artificial rubber plants, as natural rubber is wholly a product of foreign areas, identical in respect to two of the most important producers, as the two most important tin-producing areas?

If there existed a "tin cartel" of the character so frequently denounced by certain of our public figures, why is it that business and governments in the tin producing and tin consuming nations of the world have considered it desirable (in the interest of relative price stability and dependable supply) to set up an international tin agreement? If a cartel existed, would not such an agreement be entirely a superfluous duplication? And if such an agreement is regarded as desirable for all concerned—producers and consumers alike—why is it that after 7 years of effort, the required number of assents is still lacking? Can it be that some nations prefer to continue uncommitted, confident in the belief that the Congress itself will assure a tight and constant market for all the production the world's mines can turn out? It could very well be, for the Congress, deliberately or otherwise, is contributing to the creation and maintenance of the very condition it denounces.

In 1952, world production of tin exceeded consumption by some 40,000 tons; in 1953 by some 45,000 tons; and in 1954 by nearly 37,000 tons. In free markets, the law of supply and demand still functions. That explained the temporary aberrations of virtually all primary markets—not only that of tin—during the hectic months following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. Why hasn't it operated, then, on the reverse side, now that there is a persistent excess of supply over commercial demand for tin? Can it be that continuing operation of the Texas City smelter and the stockpiling of its output (37,651 tons in 1953) is contributing to the maintenance of the existing price of tin, without requiring any effort whatsoever on the part of the cartel. Heaven forbid.

It is interesting, nonetheless, to speculate on what the present price of tin would be if the subsidized Texas City output were not being taken out of current consumption, and considerable uneconomic foreign production were not being subsidized out of our Public Treasury. Naturally whatever Texas City produces must be isolated, since the administration is opposed to Government competition with private, taxpaying enterprise. One wonders if the committee really intends to denounce others for creating—by unproved attribution only—a condition of which it, itself, is quite undisputably responsible.

Of course it is fantastic to assert that Bolivian concentrates can be smelted in quantity only in the Government smelter. Before the Texas City smelter existed all Bolivian concentrates were smelted in private smelters. Around half the Bolivian output continued to be smelted abroad all through the war and up to this moment. It is nonsense to infer that all Bolivian concentrates could not now be handled in private smelters.

The assertion that our consumption in the war years was as much as the total world production during peacetime is pure, ignorant nonsense. Our consumption was nearer one-third of normal peacetime production. Other similar deviations from reality could be cited, but why go on. Everybody knows the Texas City smelter will continue in operation, but hardly for the reasons cited by our august legislators.

Mr. Speaker, the reports of the Hoover Commission show that the Federal Government is still engaged in numerous operations of a commercial nature which cannot be justified as essential to any legitimate governmental function. The Hoover Commission and President Eisenhower have both stated that Government operation of the tin smelter was not necessary for our national interest. It was because of this that I introduced House Joint Resolution 285 on April 21 to authorize the immediate termination of this venture into socialism.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the House has passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 to authorize the operation of this facility for another year. So that the RECORD may be complete, I wish to explain fully my opposition to the resolution we adopted last week.

The 83d Congress conducted extensive studies of Government operations of a commercial nature and recommended the discontinuance of many such activities with no detriment to any proper Government function and with substantial savings to our taxpayers. The Hoover Commission has also covered this area thoroughly. Unfortunately, when we recently passed the appropriation bill for the Defense Department for the fiscal year 1956, we included a provision requiring congressional sanction to terminate commercial-type activities which the Secretary of Defense believes should be eliminated with no loss to our fighting effectiveness and with benefit to our taxpayers. This act is regrettable and will hamper President Eisenhower in carrying out his basic philosophy which is to limit the intrusion of the Federal Government into fields normally served by private enterprise. His policy is designed to afford the greatest possible opportunity for the exercise of individual initiative by our private citizens consistent with our security and the welfare of our people.

The activities of the Federal Government in areas which we normally do not regard as governmental are so vast that they defy description. When President Eisenhower was inaugurated, the Federal Government was engaged in more than 100 different ventures including bread baking, coffee making, scrap-metal baling, rope making, clothing manufacture, furniture repairing, the operation of sawmills, laundries and dry-cleaning establishments, paint manufacture, tire retreading, the making of ice cream and motion pictures, operating railroads and ships, and writing life insurance.

The Federal Government, in addition to its proper governmental activities, is the largest single electric power producer in the country, it operates the largest insurance business, it is our greatest banker, it is the largest tenant and the largest landlord, it owns more grain than anyone else, it operates more warehouses, more ships, and more trucks.

Mr. Speaker, some Members of the Congress have been devoting long hours to a study of monopoly and the concentration of economic power. There has never been such a concentration as exists within our Federal Government.

In the comparatively short time since President Eisenhower has been in office great progress has been made in better defining the proper scope of governmental activities. One of the first acts of the administration was to sell the Inland Waterways Corporation to private enterprise for $9 million. It operated barge lines for many years.

The Federal Government is now out of the hotel business. The Department of the Interior no longer operates Bluebeard's Castle in the Virgin Islands. It has been sold with the proceeds going into the general funds of the Treasury and the property is now on the tax rolls.

The Congress recently authorized the sale of our synthetic rubber producing facilities to private industry. This is probably the largest and most important transfer of activities by the Federal Government to private enterprise.

However, the Federal Government is still operating a tin smelter. Mr. Speaker, I have investigated this operation and

I am completely convinced that it is unnecessary for the defense and security of this country which is the only reason that we embarked on this activity in the first place.

Prior to World War II we depended upon the Far East for almost all of our commercial tin supplies. Indonesia and the Malay Peninsula supplied tin concentrates which were smelted in Western Europe. Access to the tin producing areas was denied by the Japanese and to the European tin smelters by the Germans. The only available source of tin concentrates was the Bolivian ores. Steps were taken to erect a tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., to refine these concentrates. This was the proper step for our Government to take as a war measure.

Mr. Speaker, let us contrast this situation with the picture which now confronts us. When the Texas City smelter was built our reserves of tin were most inadequate and industry had given little thought to conservation and substitution. The lack of availability of tin stimulated industry to use its ingenuity and get along with far less tin. For example, prior to World War II most of our tinplate was produced by the "hot dip process." Steel sheets were dipped into molten tin and thus coated with a protective covering necessary for can making so as to insure the preservation of the contents.

Today, most of our tinplate is produced by an electrolytic process which uses far less tin and produces an even better protective coating. Furthermore, substitutes for tin have been developed so that it can be dispensed with entirely in many applications.

The 79th Congress enacted Public Law 520 providing a realistic stockpiling program. Strategic stockpiles of tin have been accumulating now for many years. The Office of Defense Mobilization has recently raised our stockpiling goals so that today a very substantial stockpile of tin is available. The amount now on hand exceeds the expanded present minimum requirements which adequately meet our immediate needs. Furthermore, tin is once again available from the Far East and can be procured in refined form at prices more advantageous to the taxpayer than through the operation of the Texas City smelter to complete our long range stockpiling program. This very large stockpile goal is quite close to attainment.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to follow President Eisenhower's program of encouraging private enterprise wherever possible, there can be no justification for continuing governmental operation of a tin smelter under these conditions unless we deliberately wish to foster Government operation of industry which, frankly, is nothing but socialism.

A year ago, Charles W. Merrill, the Assistant Chief of the Minerals Division of the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, testified on this subject before the Special Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics, of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He said:

It is believed however first, that the United States Government should get out of the tin-smelting business. Second, it is believed that it is desirable to have a tin smelter in the United States operated privately, but that that desirability is not sufficient to justify a direct subsidy or tariff protection.

And third the security angle is considered of sufficient importance so that, if it were possible to find some private operator to take over the smelter and agree to run it at some minimum output, the Government would be justified in a lease or sale arrangement which would give only a nominal return of the capital investment that the Government has in the smelter.

That is a general outline of the Interior's approach to this thing (hearings, pt. 10, p. 845).

This statement by Mr. Merrill which I know is supported by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Mineral Resources, Felix E. Wormser, a man who has devoted his entire life to the mining industry, represents in my opinion, a sound and proper solution to this problem.

The report of the Hoover Commission on Business Enterprises, page 90, reaffirms this statement. The Commission said:

The Texas City tin smelter was a necessary enterprise begun during World War II. The tin sources in the East had been captured by the Japanese and there was no smelter for South American tin ores in the Western Hemisphere. South America was the only source of tin in this hemisphere, as there are no substantial deposits known in North America. The Texas City smelter property, plant, and equipment cost about $13,200,000 and the current depreciated book value is $6,500,000.

The smelter has produced about 33,000 tons of tin annually. In recent years the metal has been added to the strategic stockpile. The stockpile is now estimated at a 5-year war supply.

The smelter is uneconomical for many reasons and the loss in 1954 was $1,504,233. As there is no reason for continued operation, President Eisenhower on January 2, 1954, recommended that it be closed on June 30 of that year (pp. 90 and 91).

The time has come for us to permit normal economic forces to be operative in this situation and Government operation of the smelter should be terminated as soon as possible.

A Bill To Extend the GI Home-Loan Guaranty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to extend the GI home-loan-guaranty program. This is the second of such measures that I have introduced. The first proposal, H. R. 10469, was introduced April 12, 1956. The merits of this proposal and the principles set forth therein have been recognized and endorsed by numerous national organizations. They include veterans' groups, labor groups, savings and loan associations, home builders, realtors, and furniture and electrical-appliance manufacturers, wholesalers' and retailers' organizations.

The original intent of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 was to provide a period in which our veterans could rehabilitate themselves. That they have not been completely rehabilitated is evident by the fact that some 11 million of these World War II veterans have not yet been able to avail themselves of their GI entitlement.

In an effort to provide a solution to an extension of this program that will be agreeable to all, I am submitting the following for the immediate consideration of my colleagues:

A bill to amend section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide an additional period for World War II veterans to obtain guaranteed loans

That (a) subsection (a) of section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C., sec. 694) is amended by striking out "Any loan made by such veteran within 10 years after the termination of the war," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Any loan made by such veteran within 11 years after the termination of the war, plus the period determined under the next sentence of this subsection,".

(b) Such subsection is further amended by inserting immediately after the fourth sentence thereof the following new sentence: "The period referred to in the preceding sentence shall equal, in the case of each veteran, 3 months for so much af his active service after September 15, 1940, and before July 26, 1947, as exceeds 6 months and does not exceed 12 months, plus 3 additional months for each 6 months (or fraction thereof) of active service performed by him in excess of 12 months between such dates, but in no event to exceed 24 months; however, if such veteran was discharged or released from active service between such dates under conditions other than dishonorable by reason of an injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by such service in line of duty, then such period shall equal 24 months."

This measure provides for a gradual 3-year termination of the program, as did H. R. 10469. It, however, provides a straight 1-year extension of eligibility to all World War II veterans. Thereafter, during the next 2-year period, it would provide for nine separate stepdowns. However, it allows disabled veterans the benefit of the full 3-year extension. I am advised by the Veterans' Administration that the following would be the effect of this bill for the remaining 2-year period:

First. July 1958 there will be 280,000 eligibles cut off.

Second. October 1958, 670,000 cut off.

Third. January 1959, 805,000 cut off.

Fourth. April 1959, 1,045,000 cut off.

Fifth. July 1959, 1,149,000 cut off.

Sixth. October 1959, 1,595,000 cut off.

Seventh. January 1960, 1,550,000 cut off.

Eighth. April 1960, 860,000 cut off.

Ninth. July 25, 1960, 1,316,000 cut off—including 325,000 disabled veterans.

The Veterans' Administration advises me that it is estimated that there will be 14,178,000 veterans with World War II service only in civilian life as of July 25, 1957, and that 4,912,000 will have made some use of their GI entitlement by that date, leaving 9,266,000 veterans whose entitlement would expire under the existing law on July 25, 1957, without having used any GI entitlement.

This proposal merits your most serious study and consideration. I am hopeful that my colleagues in the House will join me in calling for immediate consideration of an extension of this all-important program.

Secretary Wilson and the Veterinary Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Defense Wilson on May 15, 1956, directed the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force jointly to develop and submit for his consideration appropriate plans to implement his little personal venture to eliminate the Veterinary Corps in the armed services. In this regard, permit me to direct the attention of our colleagues to the letter which I addressed to Secretary of Defense Wilson on June 18 and the reply thereto, forwarded to me on June 29 by Assistant Secretary of Defense Robert Tripp Ross.

The correspondence follows:

JUNE 18, 1956.

The Honorable CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: My attention has been directed to the memorandum issued by you on May 15, 1956, addressed to the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, on the subject of Utilization of Veterinary Personnel in the Armed Services. I have also read your recent testimony in hearings before the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations of the House Committee on Appropriations. At that time you made the following remarks, among others, concerning the position of the Veterinary Corps in the Army and in the Air Force:

"I have a couple of little personal ventures where I think ultimately we are going to save some money.

"I think it is about time we eliminated the Veterinary Corps in the Army and in the Air Force. I think that is a holdover from the old cavalry days.

"I know they have a nice lobby down here, and they are trying to bring themselves up with the doctors and dentists, but it is time that one is finally washed out although there is not a great deal of money left in it.

* * * * *

"That is just one of my projects which is used as an example of how hard it is to get people out of the old rut, and to face the new. In other words, there are people with fixed interests in what is going on and they do not want to step up to the new programs."

The printed record of the same hearings contains a statement classifying the functions and responsibilities of the Veterinary Corps, which include the inspection of food products of animal origin and the sources thereof, the investigation and control of diseases common to man and animals, the care and treatment of military animals, and research and development in chemical and biological warfare and in radiation hazards.

If the above statement presented a proper description of the Veterinary Corps, then an injustice has been committed in not bringing these facts to your attention during the long period over which you have nursed this little personal venture. After reading an article that appeared in the May 21, 1956, issue of the New York Times, one wonders if there exists on your part a prejudice against accepting such facts. Over and above all this, I am distressed by the contumelious treatment you have shown toward the individuals who make up the strength of our Veterinary Corps. It is evident that your remarks could have a demoralizing effect on the vital role which the Veterinary Corps performs in protecting the health of our military personnel here and abroad, as well as that of American service families scattered abroad.

Mr. Secretary, I am not taking this occasion to bring a formal expression of my views to your attention simply to point up what might have been an unhappy choice of words or action resulting from a lack of information. What I am interested in, however, is the fact that throughout World War II, and since then, the health of our troops has been peerless—credit therefor going to the Veterinary Corps. In substantiating my position, permit me to cite the Army milk program on the continent which has not only benefited our military personnel abroad, but has also been helpful to foreign countries themselves. The Army Times (Europe) for June 21, 1955, delineated the worthy activities of the Army veterinarians in Denmark, Holland, Yugoslavia, Belgium, Norway, and Sweden. Veterinarian units in those countries check all food products purchased by the forces for sale to Americans in commissaries, post and base exchanges, clubs, and messes throughout Europe and North Africa. In this regard, the article states "they test animals before and after they are slaughtered; candle eggs by the millions; and run all tests known to man before letting milk and its by-products flow into Army and Air Force run facilities." It is a known fact that the Veterinary Corps in the Armed Forces performs an admirable research task in comparative pathology and in exotic diseases. The fact that the military operates anywhere in the world enables veterinary personnel to carry on research programs in foreign areas when appropriate and necessary. It should be noted that, should an emergency arise, it is unlikely that civilian technicians would be available for assignment in any part of the world.

I sincerely trust that the important functions of the Veterinary Corps and the position of such technicians in our Armed Forces will be given full and serious consideration before any decision is reached to transfer, reassign, or abolish this group which is so vital in safeguarding the health of our military personnel.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. BYRD,
Member of Congress.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BYRD: Secretary Wilson has asked me to reply to your recent letter concerning changes contemplated by the Department of Defense with respect to the utilization of veterinarians in the Armed Services.

The Secretary long has had the greatest respect personally for the veterinarians in this country. He fully recognizes and is most appreciative of the considerable contribution which these personnel have made to our defense effort over a period of many years.

He is of the opinion, however, that a further unification of these functions among the agencies of the Federal Government is desirable in the interest of effecting increased economy and efficiency. With this objective in mind, on May 15, 1956, following detailed study of the problem and personal consultation with these officials, he directed the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force jointly to develop and submit for his consideration appropriate plans which would generally provide for the following:

1. Further utilization, where possible, of facilities and services available within the Department of Agriculture for the inspection and grading of subsistence items required for the Department of Defense as well as for such research as may be required on food-borne diseases and animal disease control.

2. The utilization of civilian veterinarians to provide medical care for public animals wherever possible.

3. The discontinuance of the current practice of providing, at Government expense, veterinary care for the private pets of military personnel except in emergencies.

4. Equitable disposition to be made of all veterinary personnel presently performing functions to be reassigned, discontinued, and/or obtained by contractual arrangements in accordance with the above.

Future action to be taken by the Secretary of Defense, upon submission of these plans, will be based on the needs and best interests of the Department of Defense as a whole, with due regard to the rights and equities of all personnel involved. Matters of significant interest to the Congress and particularly requirements for legislation will be promptly referred for their consideration.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT TRIPP ROSS.

Address of Hon. John J. Rooney, Member of Congress, at Commencement Exercises of Bay Ridge High School Held at Brooklyn Technical High School Auditorium, Brooklyn, N. Y., June 25, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, last night at the 84th commencement exercises of Bay Ridge High School, held at the auditorium of Brooklyn Technical High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], had the great privilege of delivering the address to the graduates.

Under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include Mr. ROONEY's address on this occasion as well as the program of the ceremonies, the names of the graduating class of June 1956, and the names of those who received highest scholastic honors, scholarships, and awards:

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN J. ROONEY, OF NEW YORK

Miss Fitzpatrick, Reverend Mouland, distinguished guests, members of the faculty, the class of June 1956, ladies and gentlemen, it is always a pleasant occasion for a Member of Congress to be asked to give a speech, but I feel particularly good when I am asked in behalf of a high-school group. It proves that the virtue of courage is still one of the prime qualities of youth. It has ever been to the discredt of men that as they grow older, they tend to lose some of that youthful courage, enthusiasm, and optimism, for it is then, more than ever, that they need those very qualities. But youth, too, has a lack of some of the things that are of importance in adult society—experience, self-discipline, and a sense of dedication. These can only be acquired with the passage of time. You can be

sure, though, that you will gain these attributes if you will keep the goal ever in sight.

Now, we are not all endowed with the same potentialities. It has always been so. Some of you are destined to become professional women and professional men; others, statesmen or stateswomen; more of you, housewives; and still others, businesswomen and artisans. It is not important into what field you turn your endeavors as long as you exert yourselves to do the best possible in the job that you have chosen. It's similar to the story of the judge who was hearing the case against an elderly man who had been convicted of robbery for the seventh or eighth time. The judge, knowing that the man was an habitual criminal, and as such would be a threat to society, sentenced him to a total of 20 years in State's prison.

"But, judge," said the thief, "I'm 65 years old. I can't possibly serve out a sentence of 20 years."

"That may be true," said the judge, understandingly, "but do the best you can."

Those are sound words for all of us to heed. Do the best you can. Our great country is made up of people from all walks of life, from all income levels, from all intelligence levels. The tremendous advantage we have over many other countries of the world is that each one of us has equal power at the polls and equal justice before the law. You may think it a little early to start thinking about the responsibilities of citizenship, but the best time to prepare for any future job is now. It takes practice and perseverance to gain the experience needed to do any task well. In fact, the only job I can think of offhand where you must be perfect from the very first try is parachute jumping. Preserving democratic principles, fortunately, is not quite this demanding, but the results of not learning how to keep them can be just as fatal. We, all of us Americans, have a tremendous responsibility not only to ourselves and our families, but to the rest of the world that still lingers in chains, and to future generations yet unborn. We have received the inheritance of freedom from our forefathers who fought and died to preserve it for us. It is only right that we pass it on intact.

What then can you do to fulfill your role as good citizens? You can do much. You can start right now. As you go out the doors of this auditorium tonight, you will be leaving one phase of your life behind you forever. The next will have already begun, and it is up to you whether it shall lead to the peaceful world that man has not known to this time, or whether it shall stagger blindly along in the well-worn paths of the past. There is not one good reason, in this world under God, for believeing that wars are inevitable; that depressions will visit us periodically; or that crime is a necessary evil. True, throughout history there have been periods of two or three hundreds of years when the world seemed to stagnate, or seemed bent on self-destruction. However, there have also been times when mankind seemed kindled with the spirit of enlightenment; the Golden Age of Greece, the Renaissance, the Elizabethan Age, and the period of the American Revolution are but a few examples. These are the eras that make use take pride in our membership in the human race, sweeping aside with the grandeur of their purpose the shameful memories of other ages. Shall we pessimistically say that their likes will never be seen again? Better we should turn in our membership cards and take our places with the dumb, unthinking beasts, for progress of civilization can only come with optimism born of hope for better things.

You have probably heard it said that the frontiers have all been conquered; that there is no longer room for the pioneering spirit; that opportunities have lessened in scope since your grandfathers were young. Don't you believe it. Your ancestors and mine had only to conquer natural obstacles. No one will deny that that takes courage, nor will anyone deny them the fame they justly deserve. At the present time, even though the frontiers have no longer a geographic location, the challenge is all the more exciting. These new wastelands that must be conquered so that they will be productive are the wastelands of men's and women's minds. The cudgels must be taken up in the fight against intolerance, against bigotry, against those who would pervert our democracy to their own selfish ends. Although men have been exploring the fringe areas of these frontiers for hundreds of years, they are far from conquered. Here is where you can do much. Examine your own thoughts and attitudes. Keep those that you now have that are fine and noble. Keep those which you know are right for you and for others as well. This is a matter between you and your conscience—and I will not attempt to tell you what should be weeded out. This I will say. Examine all things in the clear light of reason, knowledge and morality. Don't be swept into following emotionally each new ism or belief that people will try to force on you. Think for yourselves.

Once you have determined the values that are worth fighting for, stick with them unswervingly, just as long as they represent truth. This does not mean that you should close your ears to arguments that present the other side, for without knowing the opposition's claims, you can never be sure that you are right * * * and not just being stubborn. You probably will not grow rich by following such a course; you very possibly will not be popular with everyone; you undoubtedly will be very heartily disliked by some. Taking the long-term view, these things simply do not matter. The reward of a clear conscience is beyond price. Just remember this: when your conscience starts bothering you because of the beliefs that you hold, then it is time to start reexamining—for we are only human beings, and, as such, are not infallible. It is keeping this in mind that will make us tolerant of those who hold opinions that differ from ours. Only if we ourselves are understanding can we expect to guide others toward this virtue.

The paths that lead to the attainment of the better qualities of man are not easy. They are not for those who believe that the world owes them a living merely because they didn't ask to be born into it. They are not for those who become discouraged when presented with failure. They are, however, for the group that has ever become the leaders; those who have determination, who have the courage to see things through to the end, and those who have become mature through the exercise of self-discipline.

Discipline, perhaps one of the most important learned qualities, has more to do with the molding of our character than any other factor. It can be said that more thoughtless, unethical, and criminal acts are committed because of lack of discipline than through lack of any other single quality. Discipline is not the imposition of one's will on another just because he or she can get away with it. Rather, it develops one so that he can take his proper place among his fellowmen. I know that many of you have balked at some of the disciplines imposed on you during your school career. I know this because we all have done so. This is a natural reaction among men whose animal instincts encourage freedom of action. It has resulted, at time, from a misinterpretation of the word "democracy." We must recognize, though, that even in a democracy, all must give up something of their natural inclinations in order to give the whole of society a deeper feeling of security. When we are young and inexperienced, discipline must of necessity be imposed upon us, but as soon as we learn to have mastery of ourselves, it becomes self-discipline. At that point, an imposed discipline is no longer necessary. This is what we all hope and feel you have received at Bay Ridge High School.

I have no fears about your knowledge of the subject matter that has been presented to you. It is to the credit of faculty members everywhere, who have been working under the handicaps of crowded classrooms that include a wider range of intelligence levels than at any time in the past, who in many areas have been working under the added handicap of inadequate pay schedules—it is to their credit that high school students graduating today have a much wider background in world affairs, and place higher on achievement tests than the same groups who graduated a generation ago.

I mentioned earlier three of the qualities that you yourselves will have to develop now that you are going into the world as adults: experience, self-discipline, and a sense of dedication. Experience you will gain as you join the ranks of working men and women, the armed services, or the institutions of higher learning. Self-discipline should be the natural result of the restrictions that have been imposed on you through your school career. What of dedication? Does this mean that you must choose one phase of life that you think needs changing, and fight forevermore to see that it is changed? Not at all. A sense of dedication can be merely a belief in something bigger than yourself, something to which you are willing to devote time and effort without thought of monetary gains. It can be in the field of religion, or in opposing communism and ideas which you believe to be evil, or it can be in striving to raise the conditions of your fellow man all over the world. It can be found in your parents who raised you with love, although at times you were anything but lovable; it can be found in your teachers who taught you in spite of your occasional unwillingness to learn; and it can be found, in its early stages, in each one of you tonight who harbors the hope for a better world to come.

When you receive your diplomas tonight, your quest for knowledge has not ended. This is your commencement. Your search is just beginning. Keep looking for truth until, when you're sure in your own mind that you have it, you can look anyone in the eye and say, "On these principles will I stake my life." And though I fervently pray that no one here will be called upon to sacrifice his or her life, it is better to die nobly free than live a slave to the whims of dictators or tyrants.

God bless you all, and may you and He working together bring this world to its rightful heritage of peace and prosperity.

PROGRAM

Music: Bay Ridge High School Orchestra, Miss Marie G. Petrullo, director.

Processional: America—Our Heritage, Steele.

Salute to the flag: Led by Theresa A. DePompa, president of grade; Marion Masefield, president of GO; Barbara A. Olesak, grade service leader.

Invocation. Rev. Cyril Mouland, pastor, Christian Soldiers Church.

The Lord's Prayer, Malotte: Senior chorus.

Greetings from the principal: Miss Elizabeth T. Fitzpatrick.

Hymn of Praise, Mozart: Senior class, Miss Lilian Chianta, director.

Salutatorian: Marion Masefield.

Young and Foolish (Plain and Fancy), Hague-Horwitt: Senior class, Miss Marie Petrullo, director.

Address to the graduates: Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY, Member of the House of Representatives, 14th Congressional District.

Valedictorian: Katherine Sgouros.

It's a Grand Night for Singing (State Fair), Rodgers and Hammerstein: Vocal solo, Harriet Rosenblum; accompanist, Dorothy Pellechia.

Presentation of honors and awards: Miss Rose R. Restaino, administrative assistant; Mr. Charles E. O'Neill, administrative assistant.

Parent-Teachers Association, Mr. William Kostecki, president: Scholarship awarded to Rita Hagman.

Class of June 1956, Bay Ridge High School: Mrs. Ethel N. Sarafian, dean of senior class.

Conferring of diplomas: Miss Elizabeth T. Fitzpatrick, Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY.

Presentation of Arista Keys: Mary A. Uravic.

Presentation of class gift: Theresa A. DePompa.

Valedictorian of Bay Ridge Evening High School: William H. Truax.

Presentation of honors and awards: Mr. William P. Mannix, dean of senior class, evening session.

Class of June 1956, Bay Ridge Evening High School: Mr. Leopold J. DeMaio, teacher in charge of evening session.

Conferring of diplomas: Miss Elizabeth T. Fitzpatrick.

Recessional—School Song: Morris.

GRADUATING CLASS OF JUNE 1956

Rae Acquiviva, Joan D. Adeeb, Carmela Aiello, Carol Aievoli, Phyllis Alamia, Isolina Alicea, Carole Alioto, Rosemarie T. Allegretta, Eleanor C. Aloi, Annarose M. Alvaro, Marie T. Amante, Louise Amendola, Doris Andersen, Elizabeth Andersen, Esther Andersen, Anita Andresen, Anne Angelo, Frances Antino, Christine Apreda, Nina Arcuri, Molly Arizzo, Carmen Arrieta, Benedetta Arrigo, Rosemarie Ascrizzi, Mary Auletta, Marie Auteri, Arleen Avena, Barbara Babich, Lorraine Baloy, Laura Bandiera, Mary Ann Barletta, Anna Barone, Marilyn Barra, Jennie Barraco, Mary E. Barry, Frances Basile, Anna Bassolino, Dolores Batanjany, Phyllis Battiloro, Dorothy Battista, Gloria Bayard, Patricia Becker, Joan Beinert, Lucretia Beltrone, Rosanne Bencivenga, Alba Beneforte, Shirley Bensen, Mary Ann Bentivegna, Catherine Bergersen, Gladys Bernius, Greta Berntson, Linnea Berntson, Christina Beshara, Penelope Birlidis, Geraldine Bitetto, Michelina Biunno, Virginia Biwer, Lucy Blanco, Rosalie Blasko, Rena Bloom, Louise Bocchicchio, Irene Bogdan, Frances Bonilla, Phyllis Botte, Ramona Bowen, Beryl Boyle, Carol Bredal, Anna Brett, Caroline Brockway, Nancy Brunner, Rosemarie Bruzzese, Elizabeth Buononato, Veronica Burulcich, Angela Burzi, Norma M. Byrne.

Annamae Cacace, Alice Caccavo, Florence L. Cafaro, Johanna Calacanis, Joyce Calderone, Helen Calla, Rose Marie Calvanico, Diane H. Campbell, Theresa Capalbo, Helen Cappadona, Irene Caputo, Joan K. Carey, Nancy Carlsen, Edith Carlson, Janet Carlson, Joan Carroll, Agnes Carrozza, Frances Carta, Patricia Caruso, Madeline Casanova, Marlene Cascio, Rosemarie Casciola, Antoinette Cassata, Sophie Castagna, Cynthia Castellano, Angelina Castelli, Josephine Castore, Dolores Cataffo, Caroline Cavalli, Elizabeth L. Cavallo, Phyllis Celifarco, Josephine Cervasio, Rae Cervino, Caroline Cherdron, Rachel Chierchio, Janet Christensen, Helen Christopher, Louise Ciccone, Gloria Ciminieri, Barbara Cioffi, Josephine Cioffi, Gertrude Clark, Joan Clauberg, Geraldine Colabella, Helen Connolly, Barbara Conte, Mary Conti, Barbara A. Corbett, Mary Ann Corliss, Anna R. Cotolo, Catherine Coughlan, Gertrude Crane, Geraldine Crecco, Catherine Crisera, Camille Cristiano, Georgia N. Cuomo, Jeannette Cuomo, Ann Curry, Kathleen Cusack, Dorothy E. Cushing.

Mary D'Agostino, Helen Dalessio, Rosalie D'Ambra, Joan D'Amico, Marlene D'Andrea, Marilyn J. Dangelo, Carole D'Antonio, Angela D'Antuono, Rosemary Davis, Jeanette DeCarlo, Grace DeCaro, Joan DeCaro, Wanda DeJesus, Rita Del Gatto, Rosalie Dello Russo, Dolores Delmonico, Rose Delosa, Norma Del Rosso, Alice del Valle, Catherine DeMarco, Katherine DeMarco, Rosanne DeMichele, Louise DeOliveira, Theresa DePompa, Martha DeSantis, Joan C. Dethlefs, Loretta Devino, Marilyn DeVita, Theresa Diano, Frances DiBitetto, Gloria DiDonato, Jennie DeGiacomo, Clara Dilorenzo, Pauline DeMartino, Rita DiMauro, Frances Diomede, Valerie R. Dorman, Lillian Driller, Dorothy Dudeck, Patricia Dunne, Mona Ecks, Rose Elia, Margo Ellis, Arlita Ericksen, Helen Ericksen, Marie Etrasco, Marietta Facchino, Barbara Fager, Evelyn Fannin, Florence Fauci, Rita Ferraiulo, Concetta Ferrante, Joy Ferranto, Louise Ferraro, Rasalie Ferraro, Rose Fioriello, Patricia Louise Fioto, Barbara Fischer, Marion Forte, Emily Fortunato, Fina Frangella, Joan Frasca, Frances J. Freddoso, Shiela Freund, Eleanor Frias, Nina Friscia, Margherita Fusco.

Barbara Gabrielsen, Antoinette Gagliardi, Marilyn Gagliardo, Aldona Galas, Josephine Galdieri, Mary Jane Gambale, Joan Ganim, Blanche M. Garcia, Elizabeth Garcia, Lucretia Gatto, Concetta Genovese, Margaret Gentile, Rose Gentile, Barbara Gerrity, Roberta P. Giacalone, Lillian Giacone, Rosalie Giammanco, Phyllis Gigante, Barbara Sue Ginn, Patricia Giordano, Joan Giovannone, Patricia Giuliano, Loretta Gobeil, Mary Jane Goebel, Constance Gold, Anna Gonzalez, Olympia Gonzalez, Rita Governale, Hilda Graff, Pauline Graffeo, Rosalie Graziano, Carmela Griffo, Lucile Guarnaccio, Ann Guggino, Angela M. Guido, Mary Guinan, Rita Hagman, Diane Hansen, Barbara A. Hanson, Jeanette Hanson, Carol Harrington, Linda Hartford, Dorothy Hayes, May Helen Hedland, Ruth B. Hernandez, Juliana Hild, Elaine Hoffman, Evelyn Holt, Ann Hom, Linda Fay Hom, Signy Hoyvik, Joan Hunter, Marie Iacobelli, Antoinette Iacovano, Bridget D. Imperato, Rosemarie Inganamorte, Alice Isaksen, Irene C. Ischia, Rose Marie Janicke, Barbara Jerembinsky, Edith Jensen, Katherine Johannesen, Elaine John, Antoinette Kanakry, Linda Karpa, Joan Kasold, Noreen Kearns, Margaret Kelly, Mary Kenny, Elizabeth Kerr, Margaret Kolz, Barbara Kostecki, Corinne Koster, Mary Kriskiewicz, Barbara Krooss, Gladys Kvinge.

Anita Lacerra, Nora J. LaCorte, Arline B. Ladanyi, Judith Laface, Marie F. Lantieri, Elaine Larnaitis, Rosalie LaRosa, Diane Larsen, Doris Larsen, Margaret Larsen, Judith Lashway, Janet LeBlanc, Naida M. Lebron, Lucille Lecompte, Carmela Lembo, Lynda Lembo, Angela Lentino, Viola R. Leone, Rose Leonini, Marianne LePore, Elenore Leschier, Ingrid Lindfors, Immaculata Linguiti, Josephine Locilento, Theresa LoFiego, JoAnn LoFrisco, Alice Loland, Julia Lombardo, Theresa C. Lombardo, Mary Lou Lonardo, Joan Long, Barbara Longo, Ann Lozito, Maureen Lucey, Barbara Luciano, Carol Maffucci, Louise Magnussen, Gloria Magone, Virginia Main, Rosemarie Maiolo, Adrienne Majewski, Louise Majka, Catherine Mainolfi, Rae L. Maiorino, Rosalie Maiorino, Alice Malinowski, Geraldine R. Malvicini, Ann Marie Mancini, Laura Mangano, Louise V. Mangia, Adele V. Manni, Lillian Marino, Marilyn Marino, Patricia A. Marino, Virginia Marino, Jeanette Margiotta, Geraldine Markianus, Marion Masefield, Angela Mastrianni, Carolyn Materdomini, Betsy Mauro, Gloria Mavrikis, Rose Mayo, Roberta McCann, Patricia McCarthy, Bridget McCormack, Kathleen McFall, Mary Ann McGowan, Cecelia McKee, Sarah McNally, Florence A. Medaglia, Mildred Meinsen, Carol Melamedorf, Mary Ann Menichini, Rose Marie Mercurio, Edith Merendino, Joyce Messadi, Rose Messina, Theresa Michalski, Elvira Miglino, Dolores J. Miller, Theodora K. Milonis, Mary Mingolla, Margaret Mistretta, Ronnette Mitchell, Anna Moa, Rosemarie B. Mokarry, Elba Monroig, Barbara Montemarano, Virginia Moon, Lillian Morabito, Patricia Morabito, Angela Morgante, Joan Morris, Lila Morterud, Louise Mottes, Gertrude G. Mouland, Julianna M. Mount, Barbara Mullio, Elizabeth Multari, Eileen Murray, Mary Murray, Theresa Muscarello, Anna Rose Muscolo.

Paula Napoli, Grace Napolitano, Norma Nasso, Clara Nastasi, Pola Nancy Navarro, Ruth Neilson, Jeannette A. Neiro, Julie A. Ness, Marion Niceforo, Loretta Nicols, Lorraine Nicols, Barbara A. Nilsen, Lillian Nilsen, Arlene Nixon, Barbara Nobiletti, Ann Nocito, Anna Noia, Irene Notwicz, Patricia A. Nystrom, Eileen O'Donnell, Julia O'Donnell, Yolanda A. Odstrcil, Carolyn O'Keefe, Barbara A. Oleksak, Virginia Oliva, Anne Olsen, Lorraine Olsen, Mary O'Mahoney, Rita O'Malley, Mary Oswald, Barbara Ann O'Toole, Myra Owens, Jeanette Pace, Marilyn Palm, Vivian Palmeri, Ida Palmieri, Gladys Panisse, Loretta Papa, Victoria Pappas, Shirley Parris, Angela Pasqualicchio, Constance Passante, Carmela Patti, Frances Patti, Marie Patti, Mary Anne Patti, Elizabeth Pearce, Marilyn Pedersen, Ruth Pedersen, Deanna Pehowich, Mary Louise Pehowich, Jean Pekara, Irene Pellecchia, Dorothy Pellecchia, Camille Peluso, Carmen Perez, Marian Pergolizzi, Marie A. Pergolizzi, Rose Marie Perillo, Santa Perone, Kathleen Perrotto, Josephine Perticone, Louise Pettine, Marie Picarelli, Kathleen Piccarelli, Loretta Pilch, Patricia Pinto, Theresa Pinto, Anna Piro, Rose Mary Piscopo, Anne Platis, Theresa Polanish, Theresa Ponziano, Jean Potter, Rita Pozza, Irene Prelewicz, Barbara Prevete, Menica Proscia, Marie Pucci, Marian Pulco.

Julia Quagliano, Dorothy Quina, Frances Quinn, Gladys Quintana, Dorothy Radolinski, Patricia T. Raffaele, Juanita Ramos, Judith Ann Randazzo, Catherine Raucci, Caroline Reese, Jean Reffelt, Eileen Regan, Sallie A. Rhyne, Dolores J. Ribertelli, Carol Ricci, Dulcie A. Ridd, Aida Rivera, Carmen A. Rivera, Maddalen Rivera, Norma Rivera, Matilda Robusto, Rose Rojnikoff, Eva Romagnano, Rose Marie Romano, Sylvia Rosanelli, Rita Rosen, Harriett Rosenblum, Norma Rubinich, Rosalie Rubino, Irene Russo, Carole Rutkowski, Lillian M. Ryan, Patricia Ryan, Catherine Sabo, Angela Sacco, Irene Saier, Lynn Sandstrom, Valerie Sandstrom, Rachel San Flice, Reina Santiago, Josephine T. Santore, Josephine E. Santoro, Roseann Santulli, Diana Santus, Pauline Saraceno, Josephine Sarnicola, Lucy Savastano, Carole Savettiere, Angela Scalogna, Phyllis A. Schaudel, Ann Schifferdecker, Rosemary Schulz, Rose Sciusco, Theresa Scognamillo, Annette Scotto, Isidora Scotto, Joan Scotto, Barbara Seigle, Laura L. Senatore, Eleanor Sgarlato, Katherine Sgouros, Mary Shannon, Rosanne Silvestri, Helen Simonsen, Marie Sirletti, Helen Skiba, Ronda Skoblow, Barbara Small, Joan Smigel, Marion F. Snyder, Christine Somma, Mary Anne Sorrentino, Carmela Spada, Iva Spallino, Anita Spatola, Florence Spinelli, Virginia Spinello, Dorothy E. Stafford, Arlene Steinbuch, Jean Stene, Patricia Stevens, Dolores Stigle, Viola Stucchio, Marie Sturiale, Joan Sylvester.

Anne Talluto, Barbara Tamer, Marian Terranova, Violet Terzano, Iris Tessitore, Mildred Testa, Lorrain Thorgersen, Emily I. Thorson, Jennie Todisco, Elaine Tomasetti, Carmen Torres, Rosann Trumbull, Frances Tufano, Barbara Tuffy, Joan Twigg, Mary Uravic, Ann Valente, Yvonne Van Oppre, Marie Vele, Marie Vetere, Anita Vina, Grace Vindigni, Josephine Visconti, Yolanda Vitale, Renate Volkhardt, Sonia Marie Wahl, Dorothy C. Ward, Faith Warrington, Margaret Watson, Ellen Weidmyer, Elfriede E. Weinreich, Joan Weller, Sarah Ann Wilson, Mary Jane Wink, Janet Wojcison, Carol Ann Woodman, Irene Woods, Marilyn Yarzab, Josephine Yodice, Joan Zablocki, Josephine Zach, Anna Zapulla, Rosina Zavaglia, Mary Zervoudakes, Marie Zosimo.

Evening session: William J. Anderson, Barbara A. Belmont, William H. Blake, Donald J. Byrnes, Carlo Campagnuolo, Arlene T. Caravella, Josephine B. Corso, John C. Cun-

ningham, Richard M. Carrique, Chris Demetriades, Joanne Garry, David J. Gilmartin, John R. Ginty, Arne H. Hansen, Helen A. Iwaniuk, Helen Kenan, Kennedy A. Kilroy, Richard D. Lalor, Marion C. Lawrence, Norah M. Lonne, Margaret M. McDonnell, Idalia Merced, William J. Morton, Salvatore A. Petrolino, Patsy D. Rizzo, Racel Roman, William H. Truax, Herbert L. White.

Highest scholastic honors: English, Norah M. Lonne; mathematics, Christos Demetriades; social studies, Richard M. Carrique.

Awards: Elizabeth T. Fitzpatrick award, William H. Truax; Theodore Roosevelt medal, Joanne Garry; Bausch & Lomb award in science, Christos Demetriades.

Highest scholastic honors: Accounting, Katherine Sgouros; art, Barbara A. Kostecki; biology, Rita Ferraiulo; chemistry, Sallie A. Rhyne; economics, Louise R. DeOliveira; English, Louise R. DeOliveira; French, Rita Hagman; health education, Katherine Johannesen; history, Rita Ferraiulo; home economics, foods, Ellen Weidmyer; home economics, clothing, Caroline Cherdron; Italian, Alba Beneforti; Latin, Sylvia Rosanelli; mathematics, Louise Magnussen; music, vocal, Harriet Rosenblum; music, instrumental, Ann Marie Mancini; Norwegian, Margaret Larsen; physics, Victoria Pappas; secretarial studies, Alice Malinowski; Spanish, Katherine Sgouros; stenography, Angela Mastrianni.

SCHOLARSHIPS

Admission to Cooper Union for the Advancement of Art and Science: Mona H. Ecks.

Eastern School for Physicians' Aides, Inc.: Jean H. Pekara.

Fashion Institute of Technology scholarships: Irene A. Bogdan, Helen D. Connolly, Mona H. Ecks, Iris C. Tessitore.

Generoso Pope memorial scholarship: Theresa A. DePompa.

Grand Street Boys' Foundation scholarship: Ingrid M. Lindfors.

New York State regents college scholarships: Mona H. Ecks, Rita L. Ferraiulo, Anna Stavrand (January class).

New York State regents science scholarship: Ingrid M. Lindfors.

New York regents scholarships for nursing education: Linda Hartford, Joan Hunter, Nora J. LaCorte, Dorothy C. Ward.

School Art League scholarships: Mona H. Ecks, Carmela F. Lembo.

AWARDS

Alexander Medal for Merit in Art: Carmela F. Lembo.

Youth's Friends Association medal for outstanding contributions in art: Mona Ecks.

Belding memorial award for excellence in accounting: Katherine Sgouros.

Belding memorial award for excellence in secretarial studies: Katherine Sgouros.

St. Gaudens medal for fine draughtsmanship: Marilyn Barra.

New York Classical Club medal for excellence in Latin: Victoria Pappas.

Alliance Francaise membership award for interest in French culture: Rose Rojnikoff.

American Association of Teachers of French, Spiers memorial medal for excellence in French: Marie Iacobelli.

Pan American medal for creative work in Spanish: Barbara Mullio.

Italian Teachers' Association medal for excellence in Italian: Marion Niceforo.

American Association of Teachers of Spanish medal for excellence in Spanish: Angela D'Antuono.

Steuben Society of America—Gen. Theodore Schwann, Unit No. 316, award for interest shown in American history: Ingrid M. Lindfors.

Louise Wingate Underhill memorial certificate: Rosemarie B. Mokarry.

Public School Athletic League medals: Patricia Louise Fioto, Mary Jane Goebel, Diane Hansen, Louise Majka.

Bausch & Lomb medal for exceptional progress in science: Victoria Pappas.

Cooperation in Government medal award: Theresa A. DePompa.

Cooperation in Government diplomas: Christine Apreda, Marilyn Barra, Alba N. Beneforti, Louise R. DeOliveira, Rita Hagman, Barbara Kostecki, Carmela F. Lembo, Eleanor J. Leschier, Ingrd M. Lindfors, Marion Masefield, Barbara A. Oleksak, Sallie A. Rhyne, Mary A. Uravic.

Medals awarded by the mayor's committee on scholastic achievement: Theresa A. DePompa, Ingrid M. Lindfors, Rita Hagman, Marion Masefield, Mary A. Uravic, Dorothy C. Ward.

Perfect attendance pins: Carmela Aiello, Phyllis Alamia, Marie Auteri, Marilyn Barra, Mary E. Barry, Greta Berntson, Michelina Biunno, Elizabeth Buononato, Joan Carey, Edith Carlson, Madeline Casanova, Elizabeth Cavallo, Angela D'Antuono, Louise DeOliveira, Theresa DePompa, Rita Hagman, Ann Hom, Marie Iacobelli, Antoinette Iacovano, Barbara Jarembinsky, Barbara Kostecki, Louise Majka, Adele V. Manni, Anna Moa, Carolyn O'Keefe, Barbara A. Oleksak, Mary O'Mahoney, Vivian Palmeri, Victoria Pappas, Angela Pasqualicchio, Marie Patti, Carmen Perez, Sylvia Rosanelli, Carole Rutkowski, Irene Saier, Joan Smigel, Christine Somma, Dorothy Stafford, Joan Twigg, Mary Uravic, Margaret Watson, Ellen Weidmyer, Mary Jane Wink, Janet Wojcison.

Publications awards: Senior book editor in chief, Louise R. DeOliveira; senior publication art editor, Eleanor J. Leschief; assistant editor, Elizabeth Pearce; Literary art publication, Marilyn Barra, Carmela F. Lembo.

Ridge Echo: Coeditors, Barbara Kostecki, Barbara A. Oleksak.

Gold medal for highest average for 4 years, Katherine Sgouros.

Texas City Tin Smelter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the disposal of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., will constitute an important step in removing Government from fields which should be left to private enterprise.

In the past, the Congress hesitated in taking action on a disposal program which was recommended by the President, the Hoover Commission, and almost the entire business community.

As we consider House Joint Resolution 607, which provides for the disposal of this facility, it is helpful to review past informed editorial opinion dealing with Government operation of the tin smelter. Barron's in its issue of May 23, 1955, had a lead editorial entitled "Mischief in Tin—the United States Is Punishing Its Friends, Rewarding Its Foes."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be reprinted in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From Barron's of May 23, 1955]

MISCHIEF IN TIN—THE UNITED STATES IS PUNISHING ITS FRIENDS, REWARDING ITS FOES

"Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel," wise old Samuel Johnson once remarked. True perhaps of 18th century London, the good doctor's words also happen to have an uncomfortable relevance to the city of Washington in the mid-20th. For in recent years, in the fair name of defense, an astonishing number of dubious ventures have been sanctioned by lawmakers and executive agencies. Despite the change in administration, the habit has proved hard to break. Admittedly, under Engine Charlie Wilson, the military have abandoned their bootless efforts to equip the B-36, an obsolete piston-engine craft, with jets; similarly, they no longer encourage marginal auto makers to turn our flying boxcars. Yet, even today, if it is wrapped diligently enough in the American flag, the most barefaced raid on the Treasury is still all too likely to succeed.

In this connection, consider the strange case of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex. Some week ago, contrary to White House recommendation, the Senate voted unanimously to continue its operations for another year; the House is expected soon to follow suit. The drive was led by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, hundreds of whose constituents are gainfully employed at Texas City, but the case for the smelter was put on other grounds. In particular, Senator JOHNSON stressed its contribution to the national security, as well as to the welfare of a strategic good neighbor, the tin-rich Republic of Bolivia. The fact is, however, that the tin operation, far from furthering United States interests, is a purposeful drain on the taxpayer. At the same time, it is helping to support a revolutionary South American regime, which has as little respect for liberty as it has for property or law.

The smelter at Texas City, then, should become the object of a controversy as hot as anything in its furnaces. But its beginnings were rather different. The plant was constructed in 1941, when the rapid conquest of the Continent by the Nazis, and the imminent danger to the British Isles and Eastern Asia, threatened to cut off this country from its vital supply of tin. The metal, of course, is the indispensable ingredient of many chemical and metal products, most notably the tin can, without which the civilian economy would grind to a halt and no army could take the field. Completed in the spring of 1942, the Texas City smelter was, and is, the only one of its kind in the Western Hemisphere; it undoubtedly played a valuable role in World War II. Since then, however, with the gradual reopening of the normal channels of trade, its usefulness has been steadily dwindling. It has, besides, been running up a regular deficit of some millions of dollars annually and it has kept Washington, willy-nilly, in the metal business. Hence, for the past 2 years the Eisenhower administration has urged Congress to liquidate the wartime tin program.

These efforts have aroused the wrath of a small but determined group of local politicos who, while not shooting quite as straight as Davy Crockett at the Alamo, have defended their smelter with no less zeal. Their arguments, while rarely on target, nonetheless have been varied and far ranging. To illustrate, the Texans and such out-of-State supporters as Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, Missouri, lately have concentrated their fire on what they like to call the international tin cartel. This rapacious group, which comprises the tin mines of Malaya and Indonesia as well as the British smelting firms, apparently knows just one business tactic—gouging. Without the Texas City smelter, it is said, the American consumer would be fair game.

While perhaps persuasive in some circles, this line of reasoning overlooks 1 or 2 cardinal points. First, the wide fluctuations of the tin price in the postwar years, so costly at times to producers, suggest that the cartel,

if in truth it does exist, is more properly an object of pity than terror. More to the point, the Texas City smelter and the United States stockpile it supplies, far from protecting domestic users, actually tend to raise prices by keeping metal off the market. It's no accident that after every Congressional vote against abolishing the Texas City works, tin quotations have firmed in London and Singapore.

From the angle of defense, the Texans' shots seem equally wild. For one thing, the trade estimates that the United States already has piled up enough tin to last for at least 6 years and possibly 10—longer than any war in its history. But even if more of the metal were genuinely needed, the Republic of Bolivia, which ships concentrates to Texas City, is a dubious source to depend on. The present regime came to power a few years ago through a leftist revolution, and ever since, by word and deed alike, it has shown an alarming resemblance to a dictatorship of the proletariat. It has burned newspapers, suspended civil liberties, and imprisoned thousands of its citizens. In addition, it has expropriated the private tin mines. As a consequence, output has dropped off shortly, inflation is rampant and the people are in growing want. In fact, but for the massive financial aid which Washington foolishly provides, the Government at La Paz in all likelihood would not long survive.

In regard to tin, then, this country has been following the absurd policy of punishing its friends and rewarding its enemies. Other South American countries, which have little liking for Communist or racist revolts, cannot help but wonder at United States generosity to a fundamentally hostile and anti-Yanqui Bolivia. By the same token, the British are growing restive at what they rightly consider unwarranted senatorial sniping. Just last week the head of one of the biggest tin firms in the United Kingdom protested several "glaring inaccuracies" in a report recently issued by a committee of the upper House, and requested a retraction. All this suggests that the issues go far beyong the confines of Texas City; more than a local industry is at stake. It's up to Congress as a whole to overrule the Senate and to set things to rights in tin.

Mr. Speaker, I take great satisfaction in supporting House Joint Resolution 607 which will finally authorize the disposal of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex.

More than a year ago on April 21, 1955, I introduced House Joint Resolution 285 to authorize the immediate disposal of the smelter. The Congress, in its wisdom, adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution 26, which authorized the operation of the Texas City tin smelter by the Government for another year. It also requested the President "to have conducted a study and investigation for the purpose of recommending the most feasible methods of maintaining a permanent domestic tin smelting industry in the United States."

The President asked the Office of Defense Mobilization and an interagency group comprised of representatives of the Departments of State, the Treasury, Defense, the Interior, and Commerce, the General Services Administration, and the United States Tariff Commission, to make this study for him. The President presented the study to the Congress on March 29, 1956. It has been given careful consideration by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I heartily endorse its conclusions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conclusions of this committee may be reprinted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

CONCLUSIONS

Major conclusions are: that the determination as to the practicability of establishing a permanent tin-smelting industry in this country should be left to private enterprise; that Government participation in the tin business should terminate and Government operation of the Texas City smelter should cease not later than June 30, 1956; and that announcement of the termination of Government activities in this field should provide the impetus for serious consideration by private enterprise of the feasibility of establishing such an industry independently. More specifically:

1. Neither the United States defense nor the national economy nor relations with other friendly countries requires the Government's continued participation in a domestic tin-smelting industry in the United States:

(a) The minimum stockpile objective for primary tin metal has been fulfilled, and the long-term objective is expected to be fulfilled by June 30, 1956. These will more than adequately offset the currently estimated deficit in a wartime emergency.

(b) Should a wartime demand arise for domestic smelting facilities as a result of unforeseen developments, an up-to-date and efficient smelter could be built quickly, as in World War II. Ores and concentrates could be contracted for and held in readiness for the smelter, and stockpile metal could supply industry until the new flow of domestic production began.

(c) The national economy has not been dependent upon a domestic tin-smelting industry. Industrial requirements for primary tin are now being met through imports alone.

(d) Countries that have supplied material to the Texas City smelter and to the stockpile have been apprised of the probable discontinuance of the smelter and the impending cessation of stockpile purchases in ample time to find other markets. Their dependence upon the United States as a market has been a relatively recent development and should not be considered unalterable. However, should a tin-smelting industry be established in this country by private enterprise, obviously there would continue to be a market for foreign ores and concentrates since the domestic raw material supply is negligible.

(e) Some advantages would accrue to relations between the United States and countries supplying ores and concentrates if the smelter were to remain in operation. However, these are not of such significance that the decision concerning its future operation should hinge on them.

2. The establishment of a domestic tin-smelting industry should be left to private enterprise on a free enterprise basis.

(a) Government participation in the tin business should be terminated and the operation of the Texas City tin smelter by the Government should cease not later than June 30, 1956. An announcement to this effect and the terms of disposal of the Texas City smelter should be made promptly, while the smelter is still in operation. Continued Government operation discourages interest of private enterprise in operating a domestic tin smelter.

(b) Government assistance, other than aid to a private operator in negotiations with foreign governments, should not be depended upon for maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry. Government subsidy in any form, for other than national defense, national economy, or foreign relations reasons, would be considered unwarranted competition with friendly foreign suppliers and with domestic importers, would be burdensome to taxpayers, and might result in additional expense to domestic tin consumers.

3. Government maintenance of a smelter in standby status is not practicable.

4. A domestic tin-smelting industry does not contribute fundamentally to this country's independence of foreign supplies; there are no known appreciable tin deposits in the United States or in contiguous countries.

5. A domestic tin-smelting industry would not remove the vulnerability of this country to restrictive actions on the part of producers of ores, concentrates, or metal acting in concert (pp. 1–3).

Mr. Speaker, I am not unmindful of the necessity of maintaining adequate supplies of tin to meet any war emergency. Let me contrast the conditions which prevail today with those in existence when our Government decided to construct the tin smelter. At that time Indonesia and the Malay Peninsula supplied tin concentrates which were smelted in Western Europe. Access to the tin producing areas in the Far East was denied by the Japanese, and to the European tin smelters by the Germans. Our only available source of tin concentrates was from Bolivian ore. These concentrates could not be smelted in the Western Hemisphere. Steps were accordingly taken to erect the tin smelter at Texas City to refine these concentrates. This was a proper step for our Government to take as a war measure.

The 79th Congress enacted Public Law 520 which provided for a realistic stockpiling program. President Eisenhower has implemented this law by establishing two stockpile objectives, a minimum stockpile objective which has been fulfilled for tin, and a long-term objective which is expected to be fulfilled by June 30, of this year. The long-range stockpile objective represents this country's total foreseeable wartime requirements for primary tin, based on an assumption that neither tin in ores or concentrates nor tin metal will be imported from overseas sources in time of war. With the fulfillment of this long-range stockpile objective, there can be no justification on the ground of national security for continued operation of a Government facility of this type.

In the past it has been argued that this facility would lessen this country's dependence upon foreign sources for tin. I am referring to peacetime requirements, as the stockpile meets our needs in time of war. The report of the interagency committee to the President clearly showed that this dependence would not be lessened by the presence of a tin smelter as long as we still require imports of tin concentrates. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the chapter of the report to the President reviewing this subject may be reprinted at this point in my remarks:

1. Dependence of the United States on other countries: Since the United States has no appreciable tin deposits, she must import practically all her supplies of tin from other countries, some of which are substantially underdeveloped and often subjected to political disturbances. She is not a substantial exporter of primary tin, but does export a

large quantity of manufactured products containing tin, principally tinplate, canned goods, and machinery.

Before the construction of the Texas City tin smelter, commercial supplies of metal were imported primarily from Malaya, with lesser amounts from Indonesia, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom. After the smelter was established, Bolivia, Indonesia, the Belgian Congo, and Thailand became important sources of concentrates for the United States.

With the advent of war in Europe in 1939, the United States had no significant stockpile of tin, neither was she adequately prepared to offset the possible loss of access to the major tin-producing areas in the Far East. Germany's assault on Belgium, the Netherlands, and France in 1940 provided the incentive for a greatly intensified national defense effort, and the Department of the Treasury began acquiring a stockpile under Public Law 117 (76th Cong.). As the quantity of tin available for purchase was limited by quotas, the United States Government negotiated with the International Tin Committee for removal of restrictions in exchange for a guaranty that the United States would purchase all supplies at a stipulated price. As a result of these negotiations, production was permitted at the rate of 130 percent of a predetermined quota for the year beginning July 1, 1940, as compared with 80 percent level in force during the second quarter of 1940. This represented virtually unrestricted production. The United States Government contracted to purchase all supplies of tin offered, up to 75,000 tons, at not less than 50 cents a pound, cost, insurance, and freight, domestic ports, which enabled industry to build up inventories far above normal needs and the Government to add to the stockpile of tin.

Smelting facilities in the United States cannot in time of peace or war lessen this country's dependence upon foreign sources, nor can they remove vulnerability to restrictive actions by producers of ores, concentrates, or metal, acting in concert. An assumption that domestic smelting facilities could remove this vulnerability would be valid only if it could be assured that some major seller of concentrates would pursue a policy different from that of those producers acting in concert. There is nothing in the record of previous actions by any seller to substantiate this point of view. An effective safeguard in the event of a war emergency is the United States stockpile of tin metal. In normal times, the satisfaction of United States industrial needs is dependent upon international trade under which this country's industry can acquire supplies from abroad in adequate quantities and at reasonable prices (pp. 9–10).

Mr. Speaker, I know of no subject which has been more carefully reviewed over the years than the problem of insuring adequate tin supplies.

In 1954, a Special Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs received testimony on the operation of the Texas City smelter from Charles W. Merrill, the assistant chief of the Minerals Division of the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior. Mr. Merrill said:

It is believed however first, that the United States Government should get out of the tin-smelting business. Second, it is believed that it is desirable to have a tin smelter in the United States operated privately, but that that desirability is not sufficient to justify a direct subsidy or tariff protection.

And third, the security angle is considered of sufficient importance so that, if it were possible to find some private operator to take over the smelter and agree to run it at some minimum output, the Government would be justified in a lease or sale arrangement which would give only a nominal return of the capital investment that the Government has in the smelter.

That is a general outline of the Interior's approach to this thing (hearings, part 10, p. 845).

Mr. Merrill's statement has been supported by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Mineral Resources, Felix E. Wormser, who happens to be one of my constituents. He is a man who has devoted his entire life to the mining industry.

The Report of the Hoover Commission on Business Enterprises, page 90, reaffirms Mr. Merrill's statement. The Commission stated:

The Texas City tin smelter was a necessary enterprise begun during World War II. The tin sources in the East had been captured by the Japanese and there was no smelter for South American tin ores in the Western Hemisphere. South America was the only source of tin in this hemisphere as there are no substantial deposits known in North America. The Texas City smelter property, plant, and equipment cost about $13,200,000 and the current depreciated book value is $6,500,000.

The smelter has produced about 33,000 tons of tin annually. In recent years the metal has been added to the strategic stockpile. The stockpile is now estimated at a 5-year war supply.

The smelter is uneconomical for many reasons and the loss in 1954 was $1,504,233. As there is no reason for continued operation, President Eisenhower on January 2, 1954, recommended that it be closed on June 30 of that year (pp. 90 and 91).

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to permit normal economic forces to be operative in this situation. Government operations of the smelter should be terminated as soon as possible.

The resolution reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, House Joint Resolution 607, provides for operation of the smelter to no later than January 31, 1957. In other words, we are extending the authority for Government operation of the smelter for an additional 7 months from its expiration under present law on June 30, 1956. This is a wise provision as it will promote the sale of the smelter as a going concern if private enterprise can be induced to take over the facility.

The 83d Congress conducted extensive studies of Government operations of a commercial nature and recommended the discontinuance of many such activities with no detriment to any proper Government function and with substantial savings to our taxpayers. The Hoover Commission has also covered this area thoroughly. Fortunately, when we passed the appropriation bill for the Defense Department for the fiscal year 1957, we removed the provision requiring congressional sanction to terminate commercial-type activities which the Secretary of Defense believes should be eliminated with no loss to our fighting effectiveness and with benefit to our taxpayers.

President Eisenhower's policies are designed to afford the greatest possible opportunity for the exercise of individual initiative of our private citizens consistent with our security and the welfare of all of our people.

The activities of the Federal Government in areas which we normally do not regard as governmental are so vast that they defy description. When President Eisenhower was inaugurated the Federal Government was engaged in more than 100 different ventures, including bread baking, coffee roasting, scrap metal baling, rope making, clothing manufacture, furniture repairing, the operation of sawmills, laundries, and dry-cleaning establishments, paint manufacture, tire retreading, the making of ice cream and motion pictures, operating railroads and ships, and writing life insurance.

The Federal Government, in addition to its proper governmental activities, is the largest single electric-power producer in the country, it operates the largest insurance business, it is our greatest banker, it is the largest tenant and the largest landlord, it owns more grain than anyone else, it operates more warehouses, more ships, and more trucks.

Mr. Speaker, some members of the Congress have been devoting long hours to a study of monopoly and the concentration of economic power. There has never been such a concentration as exits within our Federal Government.

In the comparatively short time since President Eisenhower has been in office great progress has been made in better defining the proper scope of governmental activities. One of the first acts of this administraiton was to sell the Inland Waterways Corporation to private enterprise for $9 million. It operated barge lines for many years.

President Eisenhower has taken the Federal Government out of the hotel business. The Department of the Interior no longer operates Bluebeard's Castle in the Virgin Islands. It has been sold with the proceeds going into the general funds of the Treasury and the property is now on the tax rolls.

Our synthetic rubber producing facilities have now been sold to private industry. This is probably the largest and most important transfer of activities by the Federal Government to private enterprise. President Eisenhower on April 30, 1956, submitted his report to the Congress concerning the Nation's rubber requirements and resources, pursuant to section 10 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953. He recommended the disposal of the Akron laboratories to private industry. I voice my approval of this further step in getting Government out of business.

Mr. Speaker, passage of House Joint Resolution 607 will save the taxpayers millions of dollars. It will promote private enterprise, and it will be done without, in any way, jeopardizing our national security, as the attainment of the long-range stockpile objective for tin assures us of ample supplies of this vital material to meet any contingency. We must get the Federal Government out of the tin-smelting business and continue our efforts to promote private enterprise in essentially commercial fields.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, amid all the contradictions and perplexities and confusions of these days which darken the earth, but in which we believe, in Thy providence, America has come to the "kingdom" for such a time as this:

We pray for this great land of ours
Founded by men who put their trust in Thee;
Help us again to find the mighty powers
Of truth and faith and hope, to set us free.
Inspire our leaders, give us grace to find
The people who can steer the Ship of State
In troubled waters, men who are not blind
Through pettiness, self-interest, or hate.
And may we pledge, as statesmen long ago,
Our sacred honor, lives and fortunes, too,
To make our country free—for well we know
That freedom only comes through serving Thee.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 27, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9052) to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7886. An act to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards;

H. R. 10872. An act to provide for extension of the time during which annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims validated under section 2 of the act of August 11, 1955, may be made, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 11802. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, as amended, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits until July 1, 1957.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 890. An act to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act;

S. 1275. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate employees of the District to protect life and property in and on the buildings and grounds of any institution located upon property outside of the District of Columbia acquired by the United States for District sanatoriums, hospitals, training schools, and other institutions; and

S. 3076. An act to provide for a continuing survey and special studies of sickness and disability in the United States, and for periodic reports of the result thereof, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 7886. An act to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 11802. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, as amended, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits until July 1, 1957; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Special Committee To Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business and take action on the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Howard H. Shannon, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Director of Locomotive Inspection, vice James E. Friend, resigning.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Frederick G. Hamley, of Washington, to be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit, vice Homer T. Bone, retired.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Edwin R. Price, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review (reappointment);

Russell O. Settle, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service; and

Herbert A. Hudgins, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Andrew N. Overby, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nomination today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there is a regular morning hour today. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection with the transaction of the routine morning business be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESOLUTION OF NEW ENGLAND CONFERENCE, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of a resolution which was submitted to the New England Conference of the International Association of Machinists. The resolution has to do with a case, which will be pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board, relative to the request of the Northeast Airlines to be certificated for extension of their route.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION SUBMITTED TO THE NEW ENGLAND CONFERENCE OF MACHINISTS CONVENED ON APRIL 21 AND 22, 1956, IN BOSTON, MASS.

Whereas the needs of the New England area warrant one carrier airline service between the New England States and Florida; and

Whereas the volume of air traffic and other factors clearly manifest the need for an additional carrier linking the New England States with Florida; and

Whereas the need for the proper development of employment in the aviation trades in the New England States is acute and can

best be served through the expansion of a New England-based airline; and

Whereas Northeast Airlines is the only New England-based airline and has not been allowed by our Government to expand while other airlines have been allowed almost unlimited expansion; and

Whereas a recent report by a CAA examiner recommended that Delta Airlines, a large non-New England-based airline, be the additional airline service to Florida; and

Whereas this recommendation is neither in the best interests of our members, the New England States or the Nation; and

Whereas the failure of Northeast Airlines to be allowed to expand its routes into Florida would threaten not only the wage structure of our members but the very security of their employment and would not be in the best interests of this area: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the New England Conference of Machinists convened on April 21 and 22 in Boston, Mass., go on record as strongly opposing the granting of any route mentioned herein to other than a New England-based airline; and be it further

Resolved, That the Governors of these New England States, Senators and Congressmen, and our grand lodge, as well as the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, be requested by copy of this resolution to exert every possible effort to insure the expansion of a New England-based airline into Florida.

(Submitted by New England Conference of Machinists, I. A. of M., CIO.)

Respectfully submitted.

HOWARD F. DOW,
Secretary-Treasurer.

INCLUSION OF POLICE AND FIREMEN UNDER SOCIAL-SECURITY LAW—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Grand Forks, N. Dak., local of the International Association of Fire Fighters, protesting against the inclusion of police and firemen under the social-security law.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF FIRE FIGHTERS,
LOCAL NO. 1099,
Grand Forks, N. Dak., June 25, 1956.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER.

DEAR SIR: We, the members of Grand Forks Fire Department, local No. 1099, have been informed by the IAFF, Washington, D. C., of the intention of including police and fireman coverage under social security in H. R. 7225, page 34, in the Senate.

We wish to inform you that we are unalterably opposed to such legislation and anything you can do in regard to this will be appreciated.

Thanking you.

Yours very truly,

KENNETH WADDELL,
Secretary-Treasurer.

COMPULSORY INSPECTION OF POULTRY—RESOLUTION AND LETTER

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from W. R. Davisson, secretary and business representative of the Egg Candlers & Poultry Workers Local Union, No. 231, of Portland, Oreg.; and from H. E. Barker, secretary of the Oregon Federation of Butchers of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America. I have received a resolution adopted by that organization at its annual convention in Salem, Oreg., on May 14, 1956. There is no question about the pertinency of the bills to which reference is made. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON FEDERATION OF BUTCHERS
OF THE AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS & BUTCHER WORKMEN
OF NORTH AMERICA,
Portland, Oreg.

RESOLUTION

Whereas Oregon has just experienced an outbreak of psittacosis and many members of Egg & Poultry Workers Local Union, No. 231, have been stricken with said disease and some are still hospitalized; and

Whereas there has been at least two deaths due to psittacosis in this area; and

Whereas there are 26 diseases that are transmissible from poultry to man; and

Whereas one-third of food poisoning has been traced by the Public Health Service to poultry or poultry dishes; and

Whereas poultry and poultry products are being processed in uninspected plants under conditions that are far from sanitary, and in many cases are unfit for human consumption: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon Federation of Butchers, AFL–CIO, in convention assembled this 14th day of May 1956, in the city of Salem, Oreg., go on record as being in favor of and supporting S. 3176 and H. R. 8599 in an effort to clean up this very undesirable and dangerous practice of slaughtering, processing, and selling of poultry and poultry products that are unfit for human consumption; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our delegation in Congress, the chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, the chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL–CIO, urging their support and passage of S. 3176 and H. R. 8599.

Respectfully submitted.

H. E. BARKER,
Secretary, Oregon Federation of Butchers.

LOCAL UNION NO. 231,
EGG CANDLERS AND POULTRY WORKERS,
Portland, Oreg., May 17, 1956.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: We are writing in regard to compulsory inspection of poultry as proposed in S. 3176, H. R. 8599, and H. R. 9006, which are now up for your consideration.

We would like to point out that this legislation has been needed for the past several years as the poultry industry has grown to be a large industry. We believe it produces the third largest agricultural income in the Nation, supplying a large portion of our food products to the consuming public. Yet the industry is very unethical in its practice with respect to sanitation and edibility of product. It is no different than any other food processing industry. They have all had to have restrictions in order to maintain sanitation and edibility of product. The meat packing industry did not clean up until it was forced to do so.

We know in our area there are a number of operators who put anything on the market, dead or alive when they receive it. We now are faced with the problem of psittacosis in our turkey industry here. We are forcing the few USDA plants we have to leave sick and diseased birds on the farm by our people not handling them; but there are a few unethical processors who have approached the larger growers with the idea of permitting them to pick up the birds in the "hospital" pens and process them, thus creating a hazard for the people working in the plants as well as giving the consumer a product which is not edible. Sanitary conditions in these plants are just as deplorable.

Any consideration or effort given by you to the passing of these bills for compulsory poultry inspection will be greatly appreciated by this local union and by the consuming public in the State of Oregon. We feel our standard of living is too high for us to settle for anything less than a compulsory poultry inspection law. The public here is demanding it and will continue to demand it more and more as they are educated to the facts.

Yours very truly,

W. R. DAVISSON,
Secretary and Business Representative.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 6643. An act to amend the reclamation laws to provide that excess lands acquired by foreclosure or inheritance may receive water temporarily for 5 years (Rept. No. 2378).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H. R. 7089. An act to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2380).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 249. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; and

S. Res. 271. Resolution providing additional funds for the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. 3381. A bill authorizing the demolition and removal of greenhouses and other structures, and the replacement thereof, at the Botanic Garden, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2382).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

H. R. 10441. An act to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 to restrict its application to insurance which has been in effect 6 months at the time benefits are sought under such act (Rept. No. 2383).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, without amendment:

H. R. 11926. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, to permit the negotiation of commercial leases at atomic energy communities, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2384).

DENA B. CONNERY

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 300) to pay a gratuity to Dena B. Connery, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Dena B. Connery, widow of David P. Connery, an employee of the Senate at the

time of his death, a sum equal to 2 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

REPORT ENTITLED "COMMUNIST OWNERSHIP OF GI SCHOOLS" (S. REPT. NO. 2377)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, during hearings held earlier this year by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, it was learned that because of deficiencies of Public Law 346, 78th Congress and Public Law 550, 82d Congress, the Veterans' Administration has been required to expend Federal funds for the tuition of veterans attending Communist-owned schools. The subcommittee's investigation of this matter revealed that the Veterans' Administration was on notice as early as 1946 of these deficiencies in Public Law 346, 78th Congress, yet never recommended corrective legislation, nor apprised appropriate committees of Congress of the situation. Such inaction has resulted in an inexcusable expenditure of Federal funds in support of Communist-owned schools.

Mr. President, with a view to correcting this situation, on June 18, 1956, on behalf of myself, and the full membership of the subcommittee, I introduced the bill (S. 4078) to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 and part VIII of Veterans' Regulation numbered 1 (a) so as to require certain private educational institutions and training establishments to file non-Communist affidavits with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and to require disapproval under such act or such part of any such institution or establishment which fails to file such an affidavit. The bill would amend Public Law 346 and Public Law 550. A companion bill (H. R. 11955) has been introduced in the House by Representative TORBERT H. MACDONALD.

Mr. President, on behalf of the subcommittee, I recommend the passage of the proposed legislation by Congress during this session to preclude, insofar as practicable, any further Federal support of Communist-owned schools.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, I submit a report of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, embodying the results of its investigation of Communist ownership of GI schools, and containing the subcommittee's findings and recommendations. I ask that the report be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

TRANSFER OF TITLE TO CERTAIN IRRIGATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 2217) to provide for transfer of title to irrigation distribution systems constructed under the Federal reclamation laws upon completion of repayment of the costs thereof, and I submit a report (No. 2379) thereon.

At the instance of the committee the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] was included as a cosponsor of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

This measure is of considerable importance to water-user organizations on reclamation projects in Nevada and other Western States. As amended, it is recommended by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to its enactment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—INTERIM REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY (S. REPT. NO. 2381)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I submit an interim report of the Committee on the Judiciary, which has approved the report made to it by the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency in the United States on Obscene and Pornographic Literature and Juvenile Delinquency.

I request that 5,000 copies of this report be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency. I know of no subject in dealing with the overall problem of juvenile delinquency that has aroused the attention of parents and church and community leaders as much as the deleterious effect that obscene and pornographic literature has on the minds of our young people.

The subcommittee was amazed at the evidence received, which showed the nationwide extent of the production, distribution, and sale of pornographic material. It is estimated that this traffic in filth has grown into an approximately $500-million-a-year business, embracing practically every conceivable media of communication. Also, that there are great numbers of debased and unscrupulous individuals who turn to this field to garner profits by appealing to warped personalities and youth with their curiosity and lack of knowledge.

This report is one that should be read by every person interested in the juvenile delinquency problem, and especially by religious, civic, and community leaders, many of whom have united in cities throughout the country to curb the production, distribution, and sale of indecent matter.

The subcommittee realizes that much needs to be done on a Federal, State, and local level to bring this problem under control. One bill has been enacted into law and several bills are pending before the Congress of the United States on this subject. Several States have amended their legislation to put teeth into their laws relating to pornography. Numerous cities throughout the United States have also strengthened their ordinances. Our subcommittee recommended the reevaluation by Federal, State, and local authorities of the laws to curb this traffic. We should lead the way by enacting the said pending legislation.

I would like to point out one significant feature, which is a result of our investigation. Six of the largest producers, distributors, and wholesalers of obscene and pornographic material have come under the scrutiny of Federal and State authorities, as well as the United States postal inspectors. The latest reports are that these people are practically out of business, and we are hopeful that this is a trend, for the most effective type of law and order is needed in this field to eradicate this menace to our youth.

I ask that the report be printed, with illustrations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, with illustrations.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. DANIEL):

S. 4136. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps as a tribute to the surveyors of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 4137. A bill to apportion more equitably between the State of North Dakota and the Federal Government the cost of providing aid and assistance under titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act to Indians residing in such State on reservations or on allotted or trust lands; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 4138. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 4139. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain surplus-real property of the Veterans' Administration Hospital Reservation, Lexington, Ky., for educational use pursuant to section 203 (k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for expenses of the Pan American Games to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1959; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENDER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

The following resolution was reported and placed on the calendar:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 300. Resolution to pay a gratuity to Dena B. Connery.

(See resolution printed in full when referred to under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

GRADUATED TAX ON TAXABLE INCOME OF CORPORATIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill

to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4138) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed 5 minutes to make a statement on the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Alabama that he be permitted to proceed for 5 minutes? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have just introduced a bill which would amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the income tax on corporations. The bill would substitute graduated rates for the present normal and surtax rates applicable to corporate income. It is drawn in such a fashion as to bring the maximum benefit to those who need it most, the smallest corporations.

The present law imposes a normal tax of 30 percent on the first $25,000 of corporate net income and a surtax of 22 percent for a total statutory rate of 52 percent on all net income over that amount. The bill which I have introduced today would substitute the following rates:

If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $5,000	5 percent of the taxable income.
Over $5,000 but not over $10,000.	$250, plus 10 percent of the excess over $5,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $15,000.	$750, plus 15 percent of the excess over $10,000.
Over $15,000 but not over $20,000.	$1,500, plus 25 percent of the excess over $15,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $25,000.	$2,750, plus 35 percent of the excess over $20,000.
Over $25,000 but not over $100,000.	$4,500, plus 45 percent of the excess over $25,000.
Over $100,000	$38,250, plus 55 percent of the excess over $100,000.

I am informed by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation that this small-business bill would not cause any loss in estimated revenues from corporate-income taxes, but would on the contrary result in a modest gain in revenues of approximately $45 million. I believe this is important, for, although we anticipate some surplus in the fiscal year 1957 budget and although, in my judgment, the need for tax relief for small corporations is urgent, I do not believe it wise at this time to enact legislation which might reduce Federal revenues for the benefit of one class of taxpayers, namely, corporations, while deferring relief to others.

In the event, however, that future budget surpluses warrant general relief for the various classes of taxpayers, this small-business bill contains a built-in flexibility that would enable the Congress to adjust corporate income tax rates in an orderly fashion. Any 1 or all of the 7 graduated rates could be adjusted as the revenue situation and other circumstances of the national economy might indicate such action to be desirable and feasible. My own feeling at this time is that any adjustments in the rates contained in this bill should be made first in the income bracket above the $100,000 net income level. As I have noted previously, the bill as drafted provides for a statutory rate of 55 percent on taxable corporate income over $100,000. Should circumstances permit at some future date, I would urge that the Congress either raise the income level at which the maximum rate would become effective, or lower the maximum rate, our objective being to reduce the maximum rate to 52 percent, the rate now in effect on all taxable corporate income above $25,000.

I am sure my colleagues will be interested in a comparison of this bill and the present law, and I am therefore requesting that there be printed in the RECORD, at this point, a table showing the tax yields at various taxable income levels ranging from $5,000 to $10 million, together with data showing the amount and percent of change in corporate income tax payments that would result from the small-business bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Comparison of present and proposed corporate income tax laws*

Income subject to tax	Effective rate (percent)		Present tax liability	Proposed tax liability	Change		Income subject to tax	Effective rate (percent)		Present tax liability	Proposed tax liability	Change	
	Present law	Proposed law			Amount	Percent		Present law	Proposed law			Amount	Percent
$5,000	30	5	$1,500	$250	−$1,250	−83.3	$250,000	49.8	47.7	$124,500	$120,750	−$3,750	−3.01
$10,000	30	7.5	3,000	750	−2,250	−75	$375,000	50.53	50.53	189,500	189,500	None	None
$15,000	30	10	4,500	1,500	−3,000	−66.6	$500,000	50.9	51.65	254,500	258,250	+3,750	+1.22
$20,000	30	13.75	6,000	2,750	−3,250	−54.2	$1,000,000	51.4	53.33	514,500	533,250	+18,750	+3.6
$25,000	30	18	7,500	4,500	−3,000	−40	$5,000,000	51.9	54.68	2,594,500	2,733,250	+138,750	+5.3
$50,000	41	31.5	20,500	15,750	−4,750	−23.2	$10,000,000	51.95	54.83	5,194,500	5,483,250	+288,750	+5.6
$100,000	46.5	38.25	46,500	38,250	−8,250	−17.7							

Mr. SPARKMAN. I said at the outset of my remarks that the bill is designed to bring the maximum benefit to those who need it most, the smallest corporations. I believe the table which I have just introduced will establish this point. Corporations with taxable net incomes up to $5,000 would save upward of 83 percent of the taxes they pay under the present law. According to statistics on corporate income for 1952, the most recent year for which complete data are available, corporations with less than $5,000 taxable net income constituted nearly 47 percent of all corporations filing returns with net income for that year.

All corporations with taxable net incomes up to $375,000 will benefit from the small-business bill. Corporations in this category constituted nearly 98 percent of all corporations with net income in 1952. Expressed in another way, on the basis of the 1952 statistics, only 2 percent of all corporations liable to pay a corporate income tax would be paying increased taxes under the small-business bill.

I believe it would be helpful to the Members of this body in studying the proposed law if they had before them some additional data which are based on the Treasury Department's publication, Statistics of Income for 1952, and I am therefore requesting that a second table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 2.—*Corporation income-tax returns for 1952—Returns with net income*

Net income classes	Number of returns	Percent of total	Net income	Percent	Income tax	Net income classes	Nu of returns	Percent of total	Net Income	Percent of total	Income tax
			Thousands		*Thousands*				*Thousands*		*Thousands*
Under $5,000	207,201	46.8	$340,250	0.8	$85,457	$250,000 under $500,000	5,968	1.3	$2,080,026	5.1	$961,861
$5,000 under $10,000	61,780	14.0	447,571	1.1	119,909	$500,000 under $1,000,000	3,243	.7	2,260,864	5.6	1,052,863
$10,000 under $15,000	37,136	8.4	458,022	1.1	126,748	$1,000,000 under $5,000,000	3,020	.7	6,351,075	15.7	2,933,348
$15,000 under $20,000	27,752	6.3	483,872	1.2	137,321	$5,000,000 under $10,000,000	455	.1	3,129,000	7.7	1,453,751
$20,000 under $25,000	26,357	6.0	594,566	1.5	171,104	$10,000,000 or more	508	.1	19,344,152	47.9	8,539,788
$25,000 under $50,000	33,470	7.5	1,162,855	2.9	388,666						
$50,000 under $100,000	20,623	4.7	1,443,968	3.6	582,342	Total	442,577	100.0	40,431,697	100.0	17,596,832
$100,000 under $250,000	15,064	3.4	2,335,476	5.8	1,043,674						

Mr. SPARKMAN. This table shows the number of corporations reporting net income in 1952, namely 442,577. It sets forth data on these corporations by various income classes, showing their taxable net income and the tax paid by them.

Actually, the total number of corporation income-tax returns filed for 1952 was 705,497, but of this number only 672,071 were shown to be active corporations, and of the latter category only 442,577 showed net income in that year.

I should like now to call your attention to some statistics appearing in this table which have special significance in light of the provisions of this bill.

The table shows that the most numerous class of corporate taxpayers, those with less than $5,000 of taxable net income, while making up nearly 47 percent of all corporations with net income in 1952, actually accumulated only eight-tenths of 1 percent—less than 1 percent—of the total net income reported by all corporations, nearly $40 billion.

The same table shows that corporations with less than $375,000 of taxable net income in 1952, the group that would benefit from the small-business bill, while constituting nearly 98 percent of all corporations with net income, accounted for only 20 percent of all corporate net income in 1952. The other 80 percent was accumulated by 2 percent of the corporations.

These statistics illustrate a simple and dramatic fact—that the small corporations of this country are very small when measured in terms of income, and that the large corporations are indeed very large.

The need for a change in the corporate income-tax law such as I have proposed here today is very clear to me. My conviction on the need for this change stems largely from my service and experience as chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee. By far the most common problem brought to the committee by small-business men from all over the country is the problem of taxes generally, and corporate income taxes particularly.

The heads of small corporations tell us that their principal difficulty in operating their businesses lies in their inability to acquire and retain the funds necessary to keep the business going and growing, as it must do to survive in a competitive economy.

The principal sources of funds for a small or new business are equity capital, loans, and business earnings.

Investors are not inclined to favor new or small enterprises because of the high risk involved in such investments. A small corporation's lack of diversification in its product line, its limited financial cushion against loss in case of economic retraction, the statistics on the increasing rate of failures among small companies—all of these factors discourage most investors with funds available to buy a share of an American small business. Where the investor is attracted in spite of the risk, he demands a high price for his money—either a guaranteed high rate of return or a large share in the ownership and direction of the business.

Should the management of a small corporation attempt to raise needed funds in the securities market they will discover that the cost of raising $300,000 may run from 20 to 30 percent. This contrasts with the large issues of some of our giant corporations where the cost to them in recent months has run less than 1 percent.

The situation is comparable where the small corporation seeks to raise funds through borrowing. The interest rate to a small-business man on a bank loan is commonly established at 6 percent or higher, while he finds that his giant competitor can get long-term loans at interest rates of 3½ or 4 percent.

The differential in favor of large corporations on both equity financing and borrowing further increases the competitive advantage of the large corporations. The savings which they enjoy reduces their costs, and thus could result in lower prices to customers or higher returns on their stockholders' investments.

The last source for funds remaining to the small corporation is its earnings, and here is where the present corporate income tax hits hardest. But as long as the Federal Government demands 30 percent of a corporation's profits up to $25,000 and 52 percent of all earnings above that amount, this will remain a meager source for the funds which are so vital to the growth and vitality of small companies.

There is a great deal of evidence to support the conclusion that small business is in need of help in this area, and quickly.

I have already referred to the great disparity in earnings between small and large corporations. I am also alarmed by the available data on the growth of mergers. Latest statistics published by the Federal Trade Commission show that there were 846 corporate mergers last year, the highest number since the Commission started recording such statistics in 1951. And it is estimated by Commission economists that mergers in 1955 were actually at a 25-year peak and probably continuing at a faster pace this year.

There is little doubt but that the ability of corporations to carry over business losses from one year, to offset profits in another year, is a strong factor in this merger movement. The large corporations, with large profits, are encouraged to absorb their smaller competitors in order to take advantage of the tax savings through loss carryovers. This conclusion is confirmed in part by the report of the Federal Trade Commission on 1955 mergers which shows through an analysis of 1955 mergers that 70 percent of the buying companies had assets of at least $10 million, and 33 percent were in the $50 million or more class.

In its sixth annual report, the Small Business Committee pointed to other signs of the fact that the big are getting bigger and the small are getting smaller. The following quotation from that report is pertinent:

> In the first half of 1952, the smallest manufacturers enjoyed a 10.6-percent return on stockholders' equity while the largest size group earned at a rate of 11.25 percent.
>
> Since then, while the profit rate of the largest corporations, expressed as a percentage of stockholders' equity, has either held steady or increased, the earnings of the smallest firms have plummeted to a low of 2.25 percent in the last half of 1954. It is significant to your committee that while the prosperity of 1955 brought a profit rate of 14.4 percent to the biggest corporations, the smallest group reported earnings in the first 6 months of but 4.45 percent. In other words, between the first halves of 1952 and 1955, while the giant companies' earnings, in the current phrase of the marketplace, "went through the roof," the smallest manufacturing plants' profits headed for the cellar. Expressed in percentages, the earnings of the small concerns fell off 27.4 percent between the two periods while the earnings of the large companies increased by 58.5 percent.

I believe all of these facts and statistics are self-evident. Small business is in dire need of assistance. We can best render that assistance in the area of corporate income taxes. The bill which I have introduced will go far to stimulate the health and growth of small companies. It will assist, I trust, in stemming the trend to mergers and will encourage both the start of new enterprises and the renewed fight of present enterprises to stay independent and to prosper.

Small, independent businesses are the yeast of our economy. They are the outlet of much of the creative genius that made this country great, they stimulate their larger competitors to continue the improvement of products and to force lower prices, all with the result that all of us continue to enjoy an ever-increasing higher standard of living. We cannot afford to stand idle while small companies continue to fail or to merge with their larger competitors.

In my opinion, and this is based on many years of close study of the problems of American small business, the bill which I have introduced today gives promise of bringing the greatest and quickest relief to the American small-business community.

Mr. President, other bills have been introduced in both the Senate and the House dealing with this problem of badly needed tax relief for small business. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a table showing some comparisons under the several bills.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Effects of pending corporation income-tax bills

Income level	Sparkman	Fulbright (S. 3129)	Patman (H. R. 9067)	Seely-Brown (H. R. 9851)
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
$5,000	−83.3	−26.7	−26.7	−66.7
$10,000	−75	−26.7	−26.7	−50
$25,000	−40	−26.7	−26.7	−40
$50,000	−23.2	−8.5	−46.3	−29.3
$100,000	−17.7	−2.7	−52.7	−25.8
$500,000	+1.22	+1.1	−41.1	−1.6
$1,000,000	+3.6	+1.5	−32.9	+1.2
$5,000,000	+5.3	+1.8	−18.9	+3.3
$10,000,000	+5.6	+1.9	−10.4	+3.6

Break-even points

Sparkman	$375,000
Fulbright	225,000
Patman	37,000,000
Seely-Brown	700,000

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be

printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 4138

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations

Be it enacted, etc., That subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 11 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on corporations) are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Corporations in general: A tax is hereby imposed for each taxable year on the taxable income of every corporation. The tax shall be computed under subsection (b) in the case of a taxable year beginning before July 1, 1956, and under subsection (c) in the case of a taxable year beginning after June 30, 1956.

"(b) Taxable years beginning before July 1, 1956: In the case of a taxable year beginning before July 1, 1956, the tax shall consist of—

"(1) a normal tax equal to 30 percent of the taxable income; and

"(2) a surtax equal to 22 percent of the amount by which the taxable income (computed without regard to the deduction, if any, provided in section 242 for partially tax-exempt interest) exceeds $25,000.

"(c) Taxable years beginning after June 30, 1956: In the case of a taxable year beginning after June 30, 1956, the tax shall be determined in accordance with the following table:

"If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $5,000	5 percent of the taxable income.
Over $5,000 but not over $10,000.	$250, plus 10 percent of excess over $5,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $15,000.	$750, plus 15 percent of excess over $10,000.
Over $15,000 but not over $20,000.	$1,500, plus 25 percent of excess over $15,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $25,000.	$2,750, plus 35 percent of excess over $20,000.
Over $25,000 but not over $100,000.	$4,500, plus 45 percent of excess over $25,000.
Over $100,000	$38,250, plus 55 percent of excess over $100,000."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 12 (7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (cross references relating to tax on corporations) is amended by striking out "section 11 (c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 11 (b) (2)".

(b) Section 244 (2) (B) of such Code (relating to dividends received on certain preferred stock) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) the denominator of which is that percentage which equals—

"(i) the sum of the normal tax rate and the surtax rate prescribed by section 11, in the case of a taxable year beginning before July 1, 1956, or

"(ii) the tax rate prescribed by section 11 (determined as though the amount of such tax were expressed entirely in terms of a percentage of taxable income), in the case of a taxable year beginning after June 30, 1956."

(c) Section 247 (a) (2) (B) of such Code (relating to dividends paid on certain preferred stock of public utilities) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) the denominator of which is that percentage which equals—

"(i) the sum of the normal tax rate and the surtax rate prescribed by section 11, in the case of a taxable year beginning before July 1, 1956, or

"(ii) the tax rate prescribed by section 11 (determined as though the amount of such tax were expressed entirely in terms of a percentage of taxable income), in the case of a taxable year beginning after June 30, 1956."

(d) Section 511 (a) (1) of such Code (relating to imposition of tax on unrelated business income of charitable, etc., organizations) is amended by striking out "a normal tax and a surtax" and inserting in lieu thereof "a tax".

(e) (1) Sections 802 (a) and 802 (c) (2) (A) of such Code (relating to imposition of tax on life insurance companies) are amended by striking out "a normal tax (computed under section 11 (b)) and a surtax (computed under section 11 (c))" and inserting in lieu thereof "a tax (computed under section 11)".

(2) Section 811 (a) of such Code (relating to imposition of tax on life insurance companies) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Tax imposed: A tax (computed under section 11) is hereby imposed on the life insurance company taxable income of every life insurance company for each taxable year beginning after December 31, 1955."

(f) Section 852 (b) (1) of such code (relating to taxation of regulated investment companies and their shareholders) is amended (1) by striking out "Normal tax and surtax" in the heading and inserting in lieu thereof "Tax", (2) by striking out "a normal tax and surtax" and inserting in lieu thereof "a tax", and (3) by striking out "the normal tax under section 11" and inserting in lieu thereof "the tax under section 11 (but only the normal tax under such section in the case of a taxable year beginning before July 1, 1956)."

(g) Section 922 (2) (B) of such code (relating to special deduction for Western Hemisphere trade corporations) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) the denominator of which is that percentage which equals—

"(i) the sum of the normal tax rate and the surtax rate prescribed by section 11, in the case of a taxable year beginning before July 1, 1956, or

"(ii) the tax rate prescribed by section 11 (determined as though the amount of such tax were expressed entirely in terms of a percentage of taxable income), in the case of a taxable year beginning after June 30, 1956."

(h) Section 1361 (h) (1) of such code (relating to imposition of taxes on unincorporated business enterprises electing to be treated as domestic corporations) is amended by striking out "the normal tax and surtax" and inserting in lieu thereof "the tax."

(i) Section 1503 (a) of such code (relating to computation and payment of tax on consolidated returns) is amended (1) by striking out "tax imposed under section 11 (c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "surtax imposed under section 11", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of the first sentence of this subsection, the term 'surtax imposed by section 11' means (1) the tax imposed by section 11 (b) (2), in the case of a taxable year beginning before July 1, 1956, and (2) that portion of the tax imposed by section 11 (c) which is attributable to taxable income exceeding $25,000, in the case of a taxable year beginning after June 30, 1956."

(j) Section 1551 of such code (relating to disallowance of surtax exemption and accumulated earnings credit) is amended by striking out "provided in section 11 (c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "provided (in the case of a taxable year beginning before July 1, 1956) in section 11 (b) (2)."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after June 30, 1956.

EXPENSES FOR PARTICIPATION IN PAN AMERICAN GAMES

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution providing for United States participation in the Pan American Games to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1959.

Last year the Congress passed unanimously a joint resolution providing for the expenditure of $1 million to enable military personnel to train for the Pan American and the Olympic Games. This joint resolution provides for the expenditure of $5 million. It has been approved by the administration, by the Bureau of the Budget, and by the State Department. Therefore, I introduce the joint resolution, which I trust will receive prompt consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 186) authorizing an appropriation for expenses of the Pan American Games to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1959, introduced by Mr. BENDER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 28, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 890. An act to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act;

S. 1275. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate employees of the District to protect life and property in and on the buildings and grounds of any institution located upon property outside of the District of Columbia acquired by the United States for District sanitoriums, hospitals, training schools, and other institutions; and

S. 3076. An act to provide for a continuing survey and special studies of sickness and disability in the United States, and for periodic reports of the result thereof, and for other purposes.

YELLOWTAIL DAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the President vetoed the joint resolution affecting the Yellowtail Dam on the Crow Indian Reservation in southeastern Montana. I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point a letter which I have received from a constituent in my State, my answer, a statement by Barry Dibble, consulting engineer, Redlands, Calif., dated June 15, 1956, in relation to the Yellowtail Dam, an editorial, and various news stories in connection with the Presidential veto of this much-needed and most worthwhile project.

There being no objection, the letters, statement, editorial, and news articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I realize there isn't much time left before Congress closes but you are certainly not going to stop now in regard to Yellowtail Dam, are you? As long as the President rejected the $5 million couldn't you go along with Representative FJARE and have Congress approve the $1½

million for the Indians. This dam is surely not a political issue and everything possible should be done to get construction started. We are certainly counting on you.

Sincerely,

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ———: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 12 which I was delighted to receive. You mentioned the possibility that Yellowtail Dam is a political issue and that I should go along with Representative FJARE and have the Congress approve the $1½ million for the Crow Indian Tribe.

I believe I have kept you fairly fully informed of the developments on this matter and certainly on the basis of the facts which have been presented there has been no politics so far as the Montana Democratic delegation is concerned.

Insofar as the $1½ million figure proposed by Representative FJARE, I think it is pertinent to point out that legislation for this figure is not necessary; that the Interior Department made a similar proposal to the Crow Indian Tribe of the one and one-half million; and that the Crow Tribe turned it down. Then on the basis of a report made by a reputable consulting engineer, Mr. Barry Dibble, who had gone into the question over 5 years, the Crows came up with the $5 million figure which we felt was fair in view of the value of the dam site—not the land—and in view of the precedent which had been created previously between the Montana Power Co. and the Flathead Indians concerning the Kerr Dam in western Montana, and that it was a reasonable offer.

In my opinion, there is not much that can be done before Congress adjourns. It is my hope that the Interior Department will not again initiate condemnation proceedings because I am opposed to proceedings of this kind and feel that the rights of the Crow Indians should be given every possible consideration.

Must close now, but thanking you for your good letter and with best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

STATEMENT BY BARRY DIBBLE, CONSULTING ENGINEER, REDLANDS, CALIF., JUNE 15, 1956

It is disappointing that President Eisenhower has seen fit to veto the joint resolution of the Congress (S. J. Res. 135) which accepted the fair value of $5 million as just compensation for the interests of the Crow Tribe of Indians in the Yellowtail dam site and reservoir site. The assumption must be that the President was not fully informed of the facts concerning this site and the physical and other conditions which are important in evaluating it.

Dam sites are natural formations which do not fit definite standards. No two are alike and their values differ widely. Good ones are rarities particularly in the Missouri River Valley, where several sites have been used even though foundations were poor and costly special treatment has been necessary to make them suitable and the dams safe. But in the case of Yellowtail the entire dam site is in solid rock of excellent quality. Evacuation need go only a few feet below the river bed. The sides are nearly vertical cliffs of massive limestone suitable as abutments for a concrete dam over 500 feet high. The steep-sided canyon on the Crow Indian Reservation above the dam exposes only a narrow water surface subject to evaporation. The powerhouse can logically be located at the toe of the dam where the penstocks will be very short. This places it about midway between the transmission systems of the Montana Power Co. to the north and Pacific Power & Light Co. in Wyoming to the south, less than 30 miles from either. Both these companies have indicated their interest in Yellowtail power and together they will have the ability to absorb it as soon as it can be made available.

An act of Congress approved June 4, 1920, provides: "that any unallotted lands on the Crow Reservation, chiefly valuable for the development of waterpower, shall be reserved from allotment or other disposition hereunder, for the benefit of the Crow Tribe of Indians."

This is the property which the Federal Government has expressed the desire to purchase and which the Crows have offered to sell for $5 million.

This $5 million figure is derived from the estimated fair rental value under an alternate plan for leasing the Yellowtail site to the United States for $150,000 per year. While comparisons cannot be absolute, it is interesting to note the rentals which two privately owned power companies pay for power sites on Indian reservations. Both the dam sites are located in narrow canyons with rock bottoms and sides, being similar to Yellowtail in this feature.

The first site is covered by Federal Power Commission license No. 5 approved in 1930 under which the Montana Power Co. is now paying a stipulated rental of $175,000 per year to the Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, where it installed 112,000 kilowatts of rated capacity at the Kerr site on Flathead River in Montana, or $1.56 per kilowatt of rated capacity. (The installation has recently been increased by the addition of a third 56,000-kilowatt unit but the rental charge for this unit has not been finally determined.)

The second illustration is a lease, with Federal Power Commission license approved early in 1956, under which Portland General Electric Co. is developing the Pelton site on the Deschutes River in Oregon.

Only one-half of this site is included in the Warm Springs Indian Reservation. The rated capacity is to be 108,000 kilowatts and the Warm Springs Indians are to receive a monthly rental of $4,320 plus one-tenth of a mill per kilowatt-hour of output. This rental is estimated to amount to an average of $94,340 per year, or $0.78 per kilowatt of capacity for the Indians' one-half ownership.

The estimated annual rental value of $150,000 for the 200,000-kilowatt site of the Crows is only $0.75 per kilowatt. (Proportionately there is somewhat less water available in Big Horn River at Yellowtail than in the Flathead at Kerr or the Deschutes at Pelton and this affects the potential energy of the site. These rentals tabulate as follows:

Site	Rated capacity in kilowatts	Annual rental	
		Total	Per kilowatt of rated capacity
Kerr	112,000	$175,000	$1.56
½ Pelton	108,000	84,340	.78
Yellowtail	200,000	150,000	.75

The annual rental of $150,000 proposed at Yellowtail when capitalized at 3 percent per annum computes to be the sale price of $5 million for which the site has been offered by the Crows. This price is clearly fair and reasonable and the President has evidently been misinformed or he would not have asserted that it is in excess of what is just compensation to the Crow Tribe.

[From the Ekalaka (Mont.) Eagle of June 15, 1956]

MONTANANS WANT MONTANA CONSIDERED, TOO

This publication is inclined to agree with those informed Montanans who have expressed the opinion that President Eisenhower had bad advice when he disapproved the $5 million payment to the Crow Indians for the land to be used for the Yellowtail Dam site. Outwardly, Mr. Eisenhower approves of the dam, but his disapproval has nevertheless thrown a considerable monkey wrench in the plans for the project.

We do not agree that this action took the question of Yellowtail Dam out of politics. In fact, it seems quite likely to stir up the political implications of the matter like fat stimulates an already brisk fire.

There is some disappointment, too, over the President's term, "extravagance," as applied to the price suggested by the Crows as to what they considered fair for the site. Compared with payments made in comparable situations, the price would of itself reflect deflation, rather than inflation.

While Mr. FJARE, our Congressman, has indicated his interest in the national welfare in his action to protect the Treasury against the raiders from Montana, who would give the Crows what they have asked, he has correspondingly raised the question in the minds of some of his constituents, whether he is equally mindful of having been sent to Washington to look after the welfare of Montana. Some people are inclined to question whether $5 million sensibly spent in Montana might not be even more useful than any amount spent in promoting Jordanian agriculture, for instance. And, as for politics, could it be possible Mr. FJARE thinks more highly of disagreeing with the other members of the Montana delegation than of doing something a lot of other Montanans believe constructive toward Montana industrial development?

Montanans have always carried a full per capita load in any national emergency requiring men and materials. They have also had a full share of watching industry after industry bypass Montana for here, there, and obviously anywhere in the defense effort. Even North Dakota is anticipating a uranium-processing mill which will handle Montana uranium material. And why should Montana be so impotent when it comes to interesting Washington in things like that, and simultaneously so eager when it comes to advising our National Chief Executive not to spend money in Montana?

[From the Billings (Mont.) Gazette of June 9, 1956]

FIVE-MILLION-DOLLAR YELLOWTAIL PAYMENT TO CROW TRIBE VETOED BY IKE—PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE DECLARES AMOUNT IS EXTRAVAGANT

WASHINGTON.—A Presidential veto Friday killed proposed payment of $5 million to the Crow Indian Tribe in Montana for a site for the Yellowtail Dam of the Missouri River Basin project.

The veto message was signed by President Eisenhower Thursday and sent to the Senate Friday. The President described the payment as extravagant.

He said the standard of payment for land taken over by the Government is just compensation, although the Government has made awards larger than just compensation in other cases involving Indian lands.

He went on:

"If the Congress determines that it wishes to provide for an extra payment in this case, it should not be done under the claim that it is just compensation.

"The amount, the method for computing it, and the equitable justification for it, should be clearly established on acceptable premises. Neither the resolution nor the legislative history does this."

The President said he regretted that the extravagant nature of the award approved by Congress necessitated a veto "which may cause some additional delay in proceeding with the construction of the Yellowtail unit." He expressed hope that Congress would approve a settlement which would permit a speedy start on this much-needed project.

PLANS WERE READY

The Bureau of Reclamation revealed Friday that had the Crow right-of-way payment for $5 million been approved by President Eisenhower, an invitation for bids on the prime contract for the proposed 520-foot high Yellowtail Dam would have been issued next week.

Frank M. Clinton, director of the Bureau's region 6, said the project had received a high priority listing during the last several months in order to have plans ready for a quick start if final approval had been given.

Clinton said plans for the Big Horn Canyon Dam "would be placed on the shelf until further action is taken by Congress."

NOT SURPRISED

John L. Glenn, president of the River Crow Club, said Friday the Presidential veto of the $5 million payment for Yellowtail Dam did not come as a surprise to him.

"For the time being, the dam is apparently a dead duck. I am certain that the Crow Tribe will continue to oppose condemnation or congressional taking. We know from experience that little can be settled in Court of Claims actions," Glenn said.

By retaining the dam for a future power site, Glenn expressed hope that the Federal Power Commission would give the Crows the same backing that it did the Flathead Tribe in negotiations with private power interests.

CHAMBER SHOCKED

"The President's veto of the $5 million Yellowtail Dam appropriation bill is a distinct shock to the Billings Chamber of Commerce and a terrific loss to this community," William F. Stevens, chamber president, said Friday.

"However, the Billings Chamber of Commerce and the Hardin Chamber have been at work 17 years for the building of Yellowtail Dam and I'm sure we're ready to work another 17 years for a project that would mean so much to eastern Montana and northern Wyoming.

"We will take this loss in our stride and push ahead with renewed vigor."

BOARD CONDEMNS MOVE

HELENA.—President Eisenhower's veto of a proposed payment of $5 million to the Crow Indians for the Yellowtail Dam site was condemned Friday by the Montana Intertribal Policy Board as "a repudiation of an agreement reached in good faith."

Walter McDonald, of St. Ignatius, board chairman, said:

"The board was shocked and stunned at the President's veto of the Yellowtail bill for payment of the $5 million for the dam site.

"We think the veto is most untimely, in that both the Government and the tribal council had reached an agreement (treaty) over the figure to be paid after long and costly negotiations.

"The veto is a direct repudiation of the agreement reached between both parties and consummated in good faith."

The Intertribal Policy Board adopted the McDonald statement unanimously Friday at close of a 2-day meeting in Helena.

In vetoing the bill, President Eisenhower described the proposed payment as extravagant. He added that if "Congress determines that it wishes to provide for an extra payment in this case, it should not be done under the claim that it is just compensation."

LEADERS DISPLEASED

HELENA.—Two leaders of the Crow Indian Tribe, commenting Friday on the Presidential veto of the Yellowtail Dam payment resolution, said: "Now that the valuable hydroelectric and irrigation potentialities of our dam site have been revealed to the white man, he wants to take it back."

In a joint statement, William Wall, chairman of the Crow Tribe, and Edward P. Whiteman, tribal chairman-elect, added:

"This he should do only after paying the just, reasonable and fair price which has been determined in Senate Joint Resolution 135. When the white man takes it from his Indian brother for less, he thereby becomes, in his language, an 'Indian giver.'"

The two tribal officers said news of the veto "is most shocking and disheartening to us. * * *

"The dam site is a part of the Crow Indian Reservation where our people were committed and confined by the act of the Federal Government years ago.

"The site is of great value and will be capable of producing over five times the electrical energy that can be produced by the Kerr Dam, where a private utility company enjoys but a 50-year lease with the Flathead Indian Tribe and for which the utility will pay to the Flatheads not less than $7 million during the term of that lease.

"At the end of the lease term the site will be returned to the Flathead Tribe subject to renegotiation.

"Only a few days ago President Eisenhower requested from Congress $5 billion to be spent overseas in such countries as Yugoslavia. This is thousands of millions of dollars more than would be received by the Crow Indian people through the passage and approval of Senate Joint Resolution 135.

"The price which our people ask is a reasonable one. Montana Senators Murray and Mansfield, as well as Congressman Metcalf and Governor Aronson, have stood for the reasonableness of the proposed $5-million settlement for the dam site.

"This settlement they recommended to the President and to Congress. Congress, in passing Senate Joint Resolution 135, approved the reasonableness of the amount of the proposed settlement."

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of June 9, 1956]

CROW LEADERS ASSAIL VETO OF YELLOWTAIL PAYMENT

HELENA.—Two leaders of the Crow Indian Tribe, commenting Friday on the Presidential veto of the Yellowtail Dam payment resolution, said: "Now that the valuable hydroelectric and irrigation potentialities of our dam site have been revealed to the white man, he wants to take it back."

In a joint statement William Wall, chairman of the Crow Tribe, and Edward P. Whiteman, tribal chairman-elect, added:

"This he should do only after paying the just, reasonable, and fair price which has been determined in Senate Joint Resolution 135. When the white man takes it from his Indian brother for less, he thereby becomes, in his language, an 'Indian giver.'"

The two tribal officers said news of the veto "is most shocking and disheartening to us.

"The dam site is a part of the Crow Indian Reservation where our people were committed and confined by the act of the Federal Government years ago.

"This site is of great value and will be capable of producing over five times the electrical energy that can be produced by the Kerr Dam, where a private utility company enjoys but a 50-year lease with the Flathead Indian Tribe and for which the utility will pay to the Flatheads not less than $7 million during the term of that lease.

"At the end of the lease term the site will be returned to the Flathead Tribe subject to renegotiation.

"Only a few days ago President Eisenhower requested from Congress $5 billion to be spent overseas in such countries as Yugoslavia. This is thousands of millions of dollars more than would be received by the Crow Indian people through the passage and approval of Senate Joint Resolution 135.

"The price which our people ask is a reasonable one. Montana Senators Murray and Mansfield, as well as Congressman Metcalf and Governor Aronson, have stood for the reasonableness of the proposed $5 million settlement for the dam site.

"This settlement they recommended to the President and to Congress. Congress, in passing Senate Joint Resolution 135, approved the reasonableness of the amount of the proposed settlement."

Whiteman and Wall were reached at the capital where they were attending a Montana Intertribal Policy Board meeting.

[From the Montana Standard, Butte, Mont., of June 9, 1956]

YELLOWTAIL BILL VETOED BY PRESIDENT

WASHINGTON.—A Presidential veto Friday killed proposed payment of $5 million to the Crow Indian Tribe in Montana for a site for the Yellowtail Dam of the Missouri River Basin project.

The veto message was signed by President Eisenhower Thursday and sent to the Senate Friday. The President described the payment as "extravagant."

He said the standard of payment for land taken over by the Government is "just compensation," although the Government has made awards larger than just compensation in other cases involving Indian lands.

He went on:

"If Congress determines that it wishes to provide for an extra payment in this case, it should not be done under the claim that it is 'just compensation.'

"The amount, the method for computing it, and the equitable justification for it, should be clearly established on acceptable premises. Neither the resolution nor the legislative history does this."

The President said he regretted that the "extravagant nature of the award" approved by Congress necessitated a veto "which may cause some additional delay in proceeding with the construction of the Yellowtail unit." He expressed hope that Congress would approve a settlement which would permit a speedy start on "this much-needed project."

WASHINGTON.—Montana's three Democrats in Congress Friday said the Yellowtail Dam payment resolution vetoed by President Eisenhower was "a test of the administration's willingness to deal fairly with its Indian wards and citizens."

Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD and Representative LEE METCALF, in a joint statement, termed the veto "bad news for Montana, especially eastern Montana, and for Western States interested in power and irrigation."

Their statement added:

"The veto by President Eisenhower gives the Republican administration a perfect record against starting any new multiple-purpose project during the years it has been in office.

"It emphasizes the statement made by former President Harry Truman at the dedication of the Hungry Horse Dam in Montana in October 1952, when he said to the crowd assembled there: 'Take a good long look at Hungry Horse, because if a Republican administration comes in, it will be the last such project you will see for a long, long time.'

"It would appear that no truer words were ever spoken. Yellowtail Dam would have meant 200,000 kilowatts of power for Montana; it would have brought in new industry, broadened the tax base, furnished employment, and given more security to our people. It would have meant that the Crow Indian Tribe would have received a fair and equitable amount in accord with its wishes for this precious and one of the few great remaining dam sites in America.

"Power supply for a considerable number of REA cooperatives in the upper Missouri Basin in the years just ahead is jeopardized as a result of the President's action. These cooperatives could not be started until Federal power became available in the area.

"The charges of 'giveaway' directed to the provisions of S. J. Res. 135 are baseless and entirely unfounded. The $5 million price recommended by Congress to be paid to the Crow Indian Tribe for the transfer of right-of-way of 7,000 acres of land in the Yellowtail unit is based upon a sound and reasonable evaluation of a dam site.

"The precedent for this action was set in the 1930's when the Montana Power Co. agreed to compensate the Flathead Indian Tribe for rights-of-way of 2,100 acres of land in connection with the construction of the Kerr Dam.

"While the veto by President Eisenhower means that after 12 years of intensive effort the Yellowtail Dam has been stymied we shall, of course, do everything in our power to see if there are other avenues for speeding Yellowtail Dam construction."

WASHINGTON.—Representative ORVIN B. FJARE, Republican, of Montana, Friday commended President Eisenhower for vetoing a $5-million payment to the Crow Indians for Yellowtail Dam land instead of following the easy route of so-called political expediency.

FJARE had consistently argued that the payment should be $1½ million despite support of the $5 million figure by Senators James E. Murray and Mike Mansfield, Representative Lee Metcalf, and Gov. J. Hugo Aronson.

As soon as the veto was announced, FJARE introduced legislation providing for the payment of $1½ million to the Crow Tribe of Montana.

In a statement, FJARE said:

"I sincerely commend President Eisenhower for his courageous veto of the Senate Joint Resolution 135, which would have provided for the payment of $5 million to the Crow Indian Tribe for the Yellowtail Dam site in the Big Horn Canyon near Hardin, Mont.

"This veto has proved, as have his actions in the past, that the President has the courage to do what is right rather than follow the easy route of so-called political expediency.

"It also indicates that he is unwilling to horse trade to gain support for his administration.

"President Eisenhower in his veto of this resolution has agreed with my stand that $5 million was too much money to pay for the proposed dam site.

"Montana's citizens should commend the President for not bowing to Washington press releases which stated that he would not dare to veto the bill since the dam was in my congressional district where I held only a 1,608-vote margin in 1954.

"I have today introduced legislation providing for the payment of $1½ million to the Crow Indian Tribe for clear title for the tribal lands used for the proposed Yellowtail Dam site.

"My proposal further provides that at any time during a 3-year period, the Crow Tribe, by majority consent of the tribal council, can bring suit against the United States in the Federal Court of Claims, for any additional compensation deemed proper. The most important virtue of my bill is that the question of additional payment will be placed in the Federal Court of Claims, thereby avoiding political logrolling and assuring the proper legal protection to the taxpayer and the Crow Indian Tribe.

"It is my fervent wish that my colleagues in the House and Senate will see fit to support this measure providing a just and fair payment to the Crow Tribe and thus resolve this long-delayed, thorny controversy."

HELENA.—Two leaders of the Crow Indian Tribe, commenting Friday on the Presidential veto of the Yellowtail Dam payment resolution, said: "Now that the valuable hydroelectric and irrigation potentialities of our dam site have been revealed to the white man, he wants to take it back."

In a joint statement, William Wall, chairman of the Crow Tribe, and Edward P. Whiteman, tribal chairman-elect, added:

"This he should do only after paying the just, reasonable, and fair price which has been determined in Senate Joint Resolution 135. When the white man takes it from his Indian brother for less, he thereby becomes, in his language, an 'Indian giver.'"

The two tribal officers said news of the veto "is most shocking and disheartening to us. * * *

"The dam site is a part of the Crow Indian Reservation, where our people were committed and confined by the act of the Federal Government years ago.

"This site is of great value and will be capable of producing over five times the electrical energy that can be produced by the Kerr Dam, where a private utility company enjoys but a 50-year lease with the Flathead Indian Tribe, and for which the utility will pay to the Flatheads not less than $7 million during the term of that lease.

"At the end of the lease term the site will be returned to the Flathead Tribe, subject to renegotiation.

"Only a few days ago President Eisenhower requested from Congress $5 billion to be spent overseas in such countries as Yugoslavia. This is thousands of millions of dollars more than would be received by the Crow Indian people through the passage and approval of Senate Joint Resolution 135.

"The price which our people ask is a reasonable one. Montana Senators Murray and Mansfield, as well as Congressman Metcalf and Governor Aronson, have stood for the reasonableness of the proposed $5 million settlement for the dam site.

"This settlement they recommended to the President and to Congress. Congress, in passing Senate Joint Resolution 135, approved the reasonableness of the amount of the proposed settlement."

HELENA.—President Eisenhower's veto of a proposed $5-million payment to the Crow Indians for the Yellowtail Dam site was condemned Friday by the Montana Intertribal Policy Board as "a repudiation of an agreement reached in good faith."

Walter McDonald, of St. Ignatius, board chairman, said:

"The board was shocked and stunned at the President's veto of the Yellowtail bill for payment of the $5 million for the dam site. We are fearful this action will set a precedent for future negotiations between the Federal Government and tribes of Montana.

"We think the veto is most untimely, in that both the Government and the tribal council had reached an agreement (treaty) over the figure to be paid after long and costly negotiations.

"The veto is a direct repudiation of the agreement reached between both parties and consummated in good faith."

The intertribal policy board adopted the McDonald statement unanimously Friday at close of a 2-day meeting in Helena.

In vetoing the bill, President Eisenhower described the proposed payment as "extravagant." He added that if "Congress determines that it wishes to provide for an extra payment in this case, it should not be done under the claim that it is just compensation."

HELENA.—Attorney General Arnold H. Olsen Friday said of the veto of the $5 million Yellowtail Dam site measure, "Congressman FJARE and President Eisenhower have combined to render the greatest disservice to Montana in our generation."

The Democratic nominee for governor added, "The Billings area * * * needs only the spark of cheap electric energy to make it the fastest growing area in the West.

"The Nation must still import chrome, although Montana has great chrome deposits which could be recovered cheaply with power from Yellowtail Dam * * *."

CONRAD.—State Senator Leroy H. Anderson, Democratic nominee for Congress from Montana's eastern district, Friday said President Eisenhower's veto of the Yellowtail Dam site purchase "is a purely political move to try to save the skin of a reckless Congressman."

"The President overrode his own Secretary of Interior who had recommended signing the Yellowtail bill," Anderson said, adding:

"Victory for (Representative ORVIN B.) FJARE (Republican, Montana) is a defeat for the entire eastern district and an eventual loss to the taxpayers of Montana of tens of millions of dollars."

OBLIGATION AND RESERVATION OF MUTUAL SECURITY FUNDS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Montana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Last year, during consideration of the Mutual Security Act of 1955, the Committee on Foreign Relations adopted an amendment requiring that all unobligated and unreserved funds in excess of $200 million on June 30, 1955, revert to the United States Treasury. That amendment was proposed in good faith, and was based upon estimates of the Department of Defense that unobligated and unreserved funds as of that date would be about $100 million.

As a result of that amendment, Senators will recall, the Department of Defense engaged in a last minute financial operation, and on June 28 and June 30 managed to obligate and reserve approximately $1 billion which would otherwise have reverted to the Treasury. The Committees on Appropriations reacted to this orgy of obligations and reservations by reducing the funds appropriated by some $700 million.

I have pursued this matter in an effort to determine whether those last minute obligations and reservations were based on firm programs or whether they represented a frenzied effort on the part of the Department of Defense to frustrate the law by technical sleight-of-hand. I believe I now have the answer in the form of a letter from the Comptroller General.

At the conclusion of these brief remarks, I intend to ask that my full exchange of correspondence with the Comptroller General be printed in the RECORD, but at this time I desire to emphasize several points from his letter to me of June 22, 1956.

On May 23, I asked the Comptroller General a number of questions. But in particular I asked him to ascertain

whether any action had been taken by the Department of Defense to de-obligate or de-reserve any of the funds stored away in the June rush.

In reply, the Comptroller wrote that with certain exceptions, the last-minute, common item orders were "neither specific nor restricted in terms of the items to be delivered." He added that the procedure followed "can be viewed as a method for reserving funds for which final determination as to the specific items to be delivered is made at a later date.

In other words, the fact is that the obligations and reservations made in the last days of last June were made in general terms, and did not envisage specific items for specific programs. These funds, I might note, were funds which Congress had appropriated a year earlier on the basis of programs submitted in such detail as to include types of aircraft, rounds of ammunition, calibers of guns, and so forth. These programs were described as "illustrative." They were so highly "illustrative," I fear, that they were not much more than the gleam in the eye of some Defense Department planner in the direction of Uncle Sam's pocketbook.

The letter from the Comptroller General continued to describe this practice as follows:

> The lack of firmness and specificity in the common-item orders were contrary to the Department of Defense regulations.

He added that the—

> reservations in question were made without adequate support of specific lists of end items to be furnished at the time such orders were issued. The orders—

Continued the Comptroller in referring to the June rush—

> were supported only by category totals and we were advised that the reason for the failure to attach detailed items lists was due to lack of time to accomplish the necessary paperwork prior to the end of the year.

But note this, the paperwork was so heavy that, according to the Comptroller, "such determinations of specific items and uses were made at subsequent periods extending through November 1955," 5 months later.

Mr. President, I could continue in this vein. But the letters speak for themselves. Moreover, I think the Senate now has enough information before it on this matter to warrant it in drawing the conclusion that it must never relax its searching examination of proposals presented by the Executive. Fortunately, the Founding Fathers had foresight enough to give the Congress power to check the Executive, otherwise there would be the constant danger that we would not live under a Government controlled by the people, but under a Government controlled by the Executive.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the following materials: First, my statement to the Senate of July 7, 1955, in which I discussed this situation; and, second, my correspondence with the Comptroller General in May and June this year.

There being no objection, the statement and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 7, 1955]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I rise to discuss briefly a most disturbing situation which has come to light during congressional consideration of the Mutual Security Act of 1955. The Department of Defense supplied estimates to the Congress which were at one point more than $800 million in error. Whether that error resulted from gross negligence or from a calculated attempt to mislead the committee, I am not prepared to state. The discrepancies in estimates were so great, however, that they should serve as a warning to every Member of this body that henceforth figures and estimates supplied by the executive branch must be reviewed with the utmost care.

I should like to give a chronological account of the facts and let them speak for themselves.

First. April 20, 1955: On that date the President asked the Congress to authorize a mutual-security program of $3.4 billion. At that time the Committee on Foreign Relations was informed that the Department of Defense estimated that military assistance funds which the Executive would not be able to obligate or reserve—and the terms are interchangeable—in accordance with provisions of law would total $100 million on June 30, 1955.

Second. May 1955: During consideration of the mutual-security legislation, the Committee on Foreign Relations noted that the Executive did not ask for simple authority to carry over this $100 million amount, but asked instead for broad language which would have permitted the carryover of any amounts not obligated or reserved by the end of the fiscal year.

Third. May 26, 1955: During consideration of the bill in the committee, I offered an amendment which instead of leaving the Executive with blank check, carryover authority, provided that unobligated and unreserved funds in excess of $150 million should lapse into the Treasury. During discussion of that amendment, the minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], asked representatives of the Department of Defense whether the limitation of carryover funds to $150 million would be adequate. They indicated that they had no objections to my amendment provided the carryover amount could be fixed at $200 million. I accepted that amount as an amendment, and it was written into the bill.

Fourth. June 2, 1955: During Senate floor debate the usual criticism was leveled at the Mutual Security Act to the effect that vast unexpended, unobligated, or unreserved funds would be carried over into the new fiscal year. The distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] was asked why the $200 million limitation was placed in the bill. The Senator from Georgia replied:

"It was placed in the bill because the testimony was undisputed and it was unquestioned that every dollar of this money had been allocated under the statutory definition made by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, which was binding upon that committee. It was stated there was remaining only $100 million. It was first proposed that only $100 million of the unexpended balances should be carried over. It is true we did reappropriate the unexpended balances, but in accordance with the testimony, and we limited the carryover to $200 million.

"So do not worry about the unexpended balances or the unallocated balances. That is all there is to the question. More than $200 million cannot be carried over. There is no way for more than that amount to be carried over." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 6, p. 7505.)

This statement emphasizes the good faith with which the chairman and the other members of the committee accepted the estimates of the executive branch.

The Senate passed the bill.

Fifth, June 13, 1955: According to the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, information was received on June 13 that the estimated unobligated balances would exceed the $200 million limit fixed by the Senate amendment. I understand that a plea was then made to the House committee to restore the original language—the language permitting a blank-check carryover. That change was successfully resisted by the House committee.

Sixth. June 21, 1955: On that date, according to the House committee report, it received a memorandum from the executive branch stating that the unobligated carryover of military funds would be "some $600 million."

Seventh. June 28, 1955: On this date, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives stated, in presenting the Mutual Security Act to the House, that "on June 21, we received word that the estimated unobligated balance on June 30 would be $670 million"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 6, page 9389.

Eighth. June 30, 1955, the last day of the fiscal year. This was a memorable day with respect to the unobligated balances of the Department of Defense.

Mr. PASSMAN, of the House Appropriations Committee, announced on the floor of the House that "they—the Department of Defense—called yesterday and said it—the unobligated balance estimate—had gone up to $932 million"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 7, page 9635.

The same day, Mr. VORYS announced on the floor that he had "been informed that the amount of unobligated funds is not $600-some-odd millions, but has been reduced to about $200 million."

At this point I addressed a letter to the Secretary of Defense asking him for a report on this situation. I ask unanimous consent that my letter of June 30 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 30, 1955.

The Honorable CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During consideration of the Mutual Security Act of 1955 by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, it received information from the Department of Defense that the "estimated unobligated and unreserved balance" of mutual-security funds as of June 30, 1955, would be $100 million. The Department asked, however, for a blanket authorization to carry over any funds that might have been unobligated or unreserved on that date.

On the basis of the $100 million estimate, I offered an amendment to the bill which provided that unexpended balances in excess of $200 million, not reserved or obligated by June 30, should not be continued available after that date. The figure was raised to $200 million on the chance that Defense Department estimates might have been optimistic.

I now understand on the basis of information obtained from House debate on the bill that about the middle of June the Department of Defense stated that the unobligated and unreserved balance would not be $100 million, as estimated to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but would exceed $200 million. I understand further that on June 21 the House Committee on Foreign

Affairs was informed that the estimated unobligated balance on June 30 would be $670 million.

Could you tell me if this is an accurate picture of the situation and, if so, why the estimates received by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in April were in error by $570 million?

I have noted, in the statement of Congressman RICHARDS in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 6, page 9389, that he said the "rules governing the process of obligation of funds were changed this year by the appropriations legislation" and this change has "interfered with operations in the Pentagon." According to my recollection, however, the obligating procedures were changed during the last Congress and those changed procedures should have been known to the Department of Defense when it submitted its original $100 million estimate.

I should like to have a reply to this letter by July 6 at the latest since the Mutual Security Act will be in conference between the two Houses at that time.

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I had hoped that the reply of the Department of Defense would have been received by this time so that it could also appear in the RECORD at this point, but, unfortunately, up to 11:30 this morning I had received no answer. My letter was delivered by hand on last Friday.

Ninth. July 1, 1955: On this date, at my request, a member of the staff of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations spoke with Mr. Markley Shaw, Office of International Security Affairs Comptroller, Department of Defense. Information was received that during the last 24 hours of the month of June $575 million had been reserved or obligated and that during the total month of June $983 million—nearly $1 billion—had been obligated or reserved.

Mr. President, that is the record. Between April 20 and June 30, the Department of Defense gave various committees and Members of Congress estimates of the unobligated carryover of military assistance funds running from $100 million to $932 million. Then, during the last 24 hours of the fiscal year, the executive branch managed to go through the motions of reserving more than half a billion dollars.

I suppose it will be argued that my amendment limiting the unobligated carryover to $200 million had the effect of forcing the Department of Defense to commit its funds recklessly. If the amendment had that effect, it was because the Department of Defense either did not give the Congress reliable figures in the first place, or because the Department sought to mislead the Congress. Certainly no objections were heard from the Department's representatives when my amendment was offered in the committee. They were there.

My amendment was not designed as an invitation to reckless last-minute obligation of funds. It was not an invitation to financial gyrations which, as I think the record will show, thoroughly confused congressional consideration of a most important matter. The amendment was designed to keep mutual defense funds within reasonable limits so far as planning is concerned. It was designed to keep the authorization funds to those amounts which the Department of Defense can reasonably expect to obligate within 1 year. It was designed to permit excess funds to revert to the Treasury so that the budget might be balanced, rather than to keep it unbalanced by giving the Defense Department a billion dollar "kitty" as a backlog in the event Congress should not appropriate the funds requested.

In concluding my remarks, Mr. President, I want to make three points as forcefully as I can.

First. In a government of separate powers it is essential that the Congress and the Executive deal with each other with a mutuality of confidence. That means Congress must be able to accept proposals of the Executive with assurance that they are backed up by reliable figures and estimates. This Government cannot operate efficiently if Congress must view every Executive estimate with suspicion.

This Congress has been criticized in recent weeks for not acting with sufficient alacrity on the President's program. I do not accept that criticism as valid. I do say that if Congress is confronted by financial manipulations of the kind which have gone on in connection with the unobligated mutual security funds, the interests of the American people require far more careful scrutiny of executive-branch proposals than is possible if we rubberstamp them as is so often suggested.

The second point I want to emphasize, Mr. President, is that despite 24-hour reservations of more than one-half a billion dollars, there is still opportunity for Congress to control these irresponsible actions of the Department of Defense. I hope the Committee on Appropriations will examine these June operations with the utmost care and submit its recommendations accordingly. While I would not intentionally cast any vote which would cripple our mutual-security program, I cannot become a party to loose financial operations in the Department of Defense or anywhere else.

Finally, Mr. President, during the fiscal year just completed the Department of Defense had available for obligation for military-assistance purposes some $3.3 billion. As I indicated earlier, $983 million was reserved or obligated during the 1 month of June. In other words, more than one-fourth of the funds available for obligation during 12 months was obligated in 1 month.

I think the operations of the Department of Defense during the month of June in dealing with these unobligated and unreserved mutual-security funds deserve the most careful investigation and scrutiny by the General Accounting Office and the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., May 23, 1956.

Hon. JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States,
General Accounting Office, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: You will recall that at the hearing on May 21, 1956, I asked you a number of questions with the request that you make a study of the situations I brought to your attention and report back to the committee.

In your followup, I wonder if you would look particularly into these questions:

1. You stated that the Department of Defense overcertified $400 million, which should have reverted to the Treasury. Instead of returning these funds, the Department in a letter to Representative CANNON last December stated that it would reduce its request for fiscal year 1957 military assistance appropriations by $225 million. Is there any reason in your opinion why the Committee on Foreign Relations should not reduce the authorization request by the full $400 million in view of the amount previously retained by the Defense Department in violation of law?

2. You will recall that I asked if you maintained a continuous review on funds expended under this program. Mr. Powers replied that "It is highly selective and does operate on a continuing basis." Does "highly selective" mean that you just check on selected orders?

As you know, I am particularly interested in the obligation and reservation of funds during the last days of fiscal year 1956 and I asked you to find out how much, if any, of those funds, which amounted to at least $1,300 million, were deobligated, dereserved, or in some other way were used to augment funds available during the current fiscal year. I believe that the Foreign Relations Committee should have the information for all the funds obligated and reserved during those last days and not just on a "highly selective" basis.

I am also particularly interested in any suggestions which you may have on ways in which this last minute rush to obligate and reserve can be controlled or checked, even though the "rush" date may be moved forward to April 30.

3. You discussed common item orders at some length. I had in mind to ask several questions about these common item orders which because of the lateness of the hour, I deferred. These were based on an examination of the common item orders issued during 1955 and 1956. This shows that on 2 days, June 28 and 30, 1955, 6 orders were issued, reserving approximately $1 billion. These orders list only general categories of items (for example, "Weapons, complete"), whereas the orders issued during the rest of the year describe the items in detail (for example, "Weapons, complete: Carbine, Cal. .30 (all Models); Rifle, U. S. Cal. .30, ML; Gun, Machine, Cal. .30 (all Models)" etc.), and give the quantity ordered.

The June 28 and 30 orders also differ from other orders in that they include this sentence: "Item content of this common item order will be issued to you by ISA/OMAP under separate cover and is to be made a part of this order." The committee, I believe, would be interested in information explaining the difference between the June 28 and 30 common item orders and the others issued during the course of the year.

I have also noted that no common item orders have been issued between June 20, 1955, and February 14, 1956. Is that an indication that we may expect a repetition of last year's June reservations and obligations?

4. In your statement you say: "The Department of Defense has not complied on a proper basis with the certification requirements of section 1311 or the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, and the provisions of section 110 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1955, and its own implementing instructions." My attention had been called to the requirement of section 110 which provides: "Within the limits of amounts available from funds so allocated, the Department of Defense is authorized to incur, in applicable appropriations, obligations in anticipation of reimbursement from such allocations, and 'no funds so allocated and available shall be withdrawn by administrative action until the Secretary of Defense shall certify that they are not required for liquidation of obligations so incurred.'" [Quotes supplied.] I have been informed that the Office of the Secretary of Defense does not have a record of deobligations and dereservations, which would seem to be required by that section. I would be interested again, if you have any remedial suggestions for this situation.

I would be most grateful if you could look into these questions and have a report prepared for inclusion in the committee's records which may go to press within the next week.

Your appearance last Monday was most helpful. I found your comments the most lucid and informative of any I have heard on this complex subject.

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, June 7, 1956.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: In your letter of May 23, 1956, you requested information relating to particular areas of the military assistance program being administered by the Department of Defense.

In our letter of acknowledgment of May 24, 1956, we advised that we would undertake a detailed examination of the fund reservations made by the Secretary of Defense in the latter part of June 1955. This examination has been initiated, but it is doubtful that we will be able to complete and furnish the information requested in your second and third questions before June 18, 1956.

The information requested in the first and fourth questions of your letter follows.

You first inquired whether there is any reason, in our opinion, why the Committee on Foreign Relations should not reduce the authorization request by the full $400 million in view of the amount previously retained by the Defense Department in violation of law.

The act of September 3, 1954 (Public Law 778), appropriated for military assistance specified amounts of unobligated balances of prior appropriations as well as new funds for the fiscal year 1955. In addition, under section 101 of the act, amounts certified pursuant to section 1311 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, as having been obligated against appropriations previously made for such purposes were authorized to be carried forward and consolidated under the current appropriation. In view of this statutory requirement, any balances which were found to be overstated were not proper for continued availability in the 1955 fiscal year.

Our examination of the report submitted on July 13, 1955, by the Secretary of Defense under section 1311 certifying to the balances of appropriations and funds under the control of the Department of Defense as of June 30, 1954, disclosed that the unliquidated obligation balances certified for the Military Assistance appropriations were overstated by at least $400 million. The amounts overstated have been retained by the Department of Defense contrary to the provisions of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1055. The exact amount erroneously certified, in addition to the $400 million, is not determinable because the records and documents supporting the unliquidated balances were not in condition to readily permit audit and reconciliation. In fact, the confused and unsatisfactory conditions made it impracticable for the Department to submit reliable certificates. Our report of examination which disclosed the overstatement was submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on September 26, 1955, and copies were furnished to the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense.

Although the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) in a letter dated December 23, 1955, to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, endeavored to explain the circumstances and certain administrative and congressional actions subsequently taken, which he believed "would in the aggregate, if it were possible to identify the effect of each item, more than offset any overcertified or questioned amount as of June 30, 1954," the explanation does not alter the fact that the Department of Defense retained funds in excess of $400 million which were not authorized. Whether or not subsequent actions taken by the Congress did, in fact, negate the effect of the overcertification, as indicated by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) in his letter of December 23, 1955, is a matter only the Congress can determine. Consequently, we are not in a position to answer categorically your question as to whether the authorization request for the fiscal year 1957 should be reduced by $400 million. However, in order to remove any doubt, we suggest that Congress take positive action to dispose of the matter by either granting legislative authority for the retention of the $400 million or by requiring restoration of the amount to the Treasury.

In your fourth question, it was indicated that you would be interested in obtaining any remedial suggestions which we might have concerning the lack of records in the Office of the Secretary of Defense of deobligations and dereservations which you state seem to be required by section 110 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1955.

That portion of section 110 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1955, quoted in question 4 prohibits the withdrawal of military assistance funds allocated to the Department of Defense in the absence of a certification of the Secretary of Defense that such funds are not needed to liquidate obligations incurred in the regular military appropriations in anticipation of reimbursement from reservations established under the military assistance appropriations. It should be recognized that when procuring common-use items, it is not feasible to separately identify obligations applicable to the military assistance program from those of the regular military programs. The establishment of reservations by the issuance of common-item orders is accomplished in the Office, Secretary of Defense. Likewise, any decreases in the total dollar value of the common-item orders issued would be effected by the Office, Secretary of Defense. There are adequate records maintained in that Office of those fund actions and of the balances available.

The results of our review to date indicated that, with the exception of aircraft and certain other major items, the common-item orders are not definitive orders of specific quantities of equipment or material to be delivered. The military departments effect deviations and substitutions between items to be delivered within the dollar limits of the common-item orders received. It is the opinion of program officials of the Office, Secretary of Defense, that these adjustments are entirely too voluminous and not of sufficient import for that organization to control. Under the system as it is administered, the total amount of the common-item orders constitutes a monetary limitation against which the military departments are authorized to modify or change as the need or conditions warrant within the approved dollar ceiling for each country. In answering your questions 2 and 3, we will endeavor to determine the extent of control exercised by the Office, Secretary of Defense, as it relates to the amounts reserved for specific items ordered, delivered, and the undelivered balances.

We understand that recently the Bureau of the Budget and the Office, Secretary of Defense, have reached an agreement to effect a more rigid control over common-item orders in accordance with prior representations to the Congress. It is contemplated that the military departments would not be permitted, except to an extremely limited degree; to vary from the delivery requirements of the common-item orders issued. We were not able to obtain any written evidence as to the criteria under which the military departments could determine the degree of deviation permissible.

It is our opinion that this problem is one which requires reconsideration of the basis of providing appropriations for military assistance. At the time funds are requested to be appropriated by the Congress, or even at a later date at which time reservations are established, the military departments are not, as a rule, in a position to firmly identify the specific items which will be delivered to the military assistance program within the funds authorized. As stated in our testimony before the committee on May 21, 1956, a possible approach to this problem would be the granting by the Congress of appropriate authority to permit administrative and programing actions with actual appropriations to be made for the fiscal year during which deliveries will take place. The original program approvals might contain the element of restriction as to the total dollar value authorized by country whereas the amounts to be appropriated for deliveries should be supported by more specific detailed information. It is unlikely that any such revision to the method of appropriating funds could be installed for the fiscal year 1957. However, it does not appear unreasonable for the Congress to require initiation of the necessary changes to bring about the stating of appropriations on an accrued expenditure basis beginning with the fiscal year 1958. We have today sent a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations on this point. A copy is enclosed for your information.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, June 22, 1956.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: Reference is made to our letter dated June 7, 1956, in which we stated that the answers to questions 2 and 3 of your letter dated May 23, 1956, would be submitted at a later date.

We have reviewed the actions of the military departments in connection with six common-item orders issued on June 28 and 30 amounting to approximately $1 billion and the relationship of such orders to the total military assistance program. Obligations of "direct-citation funds" in June totaling $225 million were reviewed during our examination of the certifications of obligations as of June 30, 1955, under section 1311 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1955. Our examination did not reveal any specific instances of invalid obligations in the military-assistance program. Our review of the six common-item orders in question included the verification of the actions taken for a number of selected items, representing a significant portion of the dollar value of each order, so as to provide sufficient information on which to base sound conclusions and fully support our answers to your questions.

As indicated in our testimony before the committee on May 21, 1956, our examination of the common-item orders issued by the Department of Defense, other than for aircraft and certain other major items, disclosed that such orders were neither specific nor restrictive in terms of the items to be delivered. The common-item order procedure, as it is operated, can be viewed as a method for reserving funds for which final determination as to the specific items to be delivered is made at a later date. Under these practices no deobligations or dereservations are made since the orders represent only dollar limitations or allocations within which adjustments of types of items or quantities thereof can be accomplished. The lack of firmness and specificity in the common-item orders were contrary to the Department of Defense regulations for effecting the reservation actions authorized under section 110 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1955. The reservations in question were made without adequate support of specific lists of end items to be furnished at the time such orders were issued (June 1955). Actions taken by each military department subsequent to June 1955 are reported hereinafter. The orders were supported only by category totals and we were advised that the reason for the failure to

attach detailed item lists was due to lack of time to accomplish the necessary paper work prior to the end of the year. Such determinations were made at subsequent periods extending through November 1955. In the absence of having issued these orders the amounts thereof would, under the specific provisions of law, have lapsed and it would have been necessary for the Department of Defense to request additional authority and/or appropriations to provide for the execution of the same programs under which the specific items were required. However, as indicated in our testimony before your committee on May 21, 1956, the nature of the orders, that is merely fund reservations, should be clearly recognized by the Congress in connection with the authority granted to continue through reservation action the availability of funds appropriated for military assistance.

In the statement of the Bureau of the Budget, submitted to the committee by the Director on May 24, commenting on our testimony before the committee on May 21, it was stated that:

"Both the Bureau and the Office of the Secretary of Defense insist that the common-item orders be for a specific list of end items rather than just for a lump sum of money. This has recently been clarified and reaffirmed. The orders now being signed contain a statement to the effect that, 'An order is hereby issued for the common items listed in the attachment, which is made a part of this order.'"

It should be recognized, however, that it will still be necessary to effect changes in the items to be delivered in accordance with current needs rather than effect the delivery of the items merely because they were programed at a much earlier date.

As previously indicated, while there were no actual dereservation actions taken relative to the $1 billion of common-item orders issued in June, there were program changes and numerous amendments subsequent to June 30, 1955, which reduced certain items to be delivered and increased others, or changed the same items between countries within the dollar limitation of the cumulative amounts reserved. Under the system as it is operated, such actions cannot always be separated as between those applicable to the common-item orders in question or prior orders.

Our review of the actions taken in each of the military departments disclosed the following information evidencing the extensive degree to which adjustments are made within overall common-item order fund limitations.

1. Department of the Army: $328 million of the $454 million included in the common-item orders issued in June was for the purpose of funding the remaining portion of the unfunded 1950–54 program which amounted to $438 million. It was not determined at that time what unfunded items in the $438 million were applicable to the $328 million common-item orders. A subsequent revalidation of the entire military assistance program conducted by the Office, Secretary of Defense in November 1955 deleted the $110 million from the 1950–54 program, thereby bringing the program and the dollar value of the common-item orders into agreement. It was not feasible to separately identify the subsequent adjustments to this program as to those applicable to the June common-item orders. Of the remaining $126 million included in the June common-item orders, we examined subsequent actions applicable to $52 million, representing major items to be furnished by the Ordnance Corps. It was determined that as of March 31, 1956, $23 million was available for other items as a result of deletions of the items originally included or by furnishing such items from excess stocks. As of May 31, 1956, the items programed for delivery by major categories differ from the common-item orders by major categories in amounts totaling approximately $400 million although the overall dollar totals of the two are in agreement. Another factor of interest indicating the extent of adjustments in the items programed is that during the fiscal year 1956 there have been over 1,000 amendments issued applicable to both the common-item order and direct-citation portions of the program. The Department of the Army maintains an account which represents the value of common-item orders received which determination has not been made as to the items to be delivered. As of July 31, 1955, the balance in this account amounted to $130 million and as of May 31, 1956, it amounted to $29 million.

2. Department of the Air Force: The general situation regarding the basis for the issuance of the June common-item orders was the same as for the Department of the Army. Of the $476 million in common-item orders issued in June, $117 million was applicable to the unfunded portion of the 1950–54 program. We examined subsequent actions in connection with the programs for complete aircraft and electronics and aircraft components which represented 67 percent of the value of the orders in question. We found that as of March 31, 1956, the items included in the program were still scheduled for delivery with the exception of adjustments made during the revalidation process conducted by the Office, Secretary of Defense in November 1955. At that time $328 million was made available for the inclusion of additional items as a result of the following factors: $223 million represented a reduction in the percentage factor in determining the value of initial spares to be included in the program; $16 million represented a decrease in aircraft prices; and $89 million represented a reduction of spares for equipment other than aircraft and other minor adjustments. As a result of the adjustments approximately $86 million of the common-item orders issued in June was made available for the inclusion of additional items under the amounts reserved.

3. Department of the Navy: The lack of firmness in the program which supported the common-item orders in question was recognized to the degree that of the $61 million included, $46 million was not released to the Military Assistance Advisory Groups for implementation during July 1955. It was contemplated that the entire program would be subjected to further review at a later date. This action was accomplished and a revised program was issued in September 1955. We examined items amounting to $83 million included in the cumulative 1955 material program of $88 million as of June 30, 1955; $50 million of these items was also included in the revised program issued in September 1955. As a result of the program revision in September 1955, $33 million was used to substitute items not previously included. In addition to the deletion of certain items, a small portion of the $33 million resulted from furnishing certain ammunition items from excess stocks and price reductions. In addition, there were several changes in the country limitations for the common-item order program. It was also noted that the Chief of Naval Operations advised the Office, Secretary of Defense on May 21, 1956, that $11 million of the common-item orders for the 1950–54 program was no longer needed.

The situation as to the issuance of common-item orders late in the fiscal year is caused by the problems inherent in the system of reserving and obligating funds far in advance of the period during which deliveries are made. This results in the continual reviews of prior program actions and delays in finalizing programs in consideration of fund availability. Our review disclosed that additional funds were made available for common-item order use when late in the year it was determined that it would not be feasible to obligate all of the funds established for direct citation purposes. Further, the delay of the military departments in effecting certification of obligations under section 1311, within the statutory time for reporting, deferred determinations as to the amount of prior year funds which could be carried forward. The certifications for June 30, 1954, were not available until June 1955 and for June 30, 1955, not until the end of December 1955. If the Department complies with the statutory reporting requirements for the period ending June 30, 1956, this situation will be alleviated.

We were advised that it is intended to start the program and procurement cycle earlier this year. Representatives of the Office Secretary of Defense, indicated that all common-item orders for this fiscal year have already been issued and that it is not contemplated to issue any additional orders during June of this year. However, we believe that program determinations will be subject to continual changes as long as the fund requirements therefor are based upon reservation and obligation projections far in advance of actual deliveries. As indicated in our testimony before the committee and our previous reply to your letter, this problem would be alleviated if the basis for appropriations was changed to provide overall dollar limitations as to program authorizations and subsequent appropriations each fiscal year in the amount of estimated deliveries.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH COMMENTS IN THE AL SARENA TIMBER CASE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a great deal has been said in recent weeks about the policy issue which was clearly revealed by Department of the Interior activities in the Al Sarena timber-mining case. But nowhere has it been more cogently stated than in a recent editorial in one of our Nation's most distinguished journals—the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the editorial from that excellent newspaper, dated June 25, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHT COURSE ON AL SARENA

Referring the file of the Al Sarena case to the Department of Justice, as the majority of the investigating committee proposes, seems the manifestly proper course.

It is unfortunate that the members of the House Government Operations Committee have divided along straight party lines. The Republicans on the committee should be as much concerned as the Democrats to keep the United States Treasury from being milked by false mining claims. And the central facts of this case are clear, regardless of partisan position.

The Al Sarena Mining Co. obtained more than a quarter of a million dollars' worth of timber for $2,375 by filing a mining claim whose falseness has been amply shown by the fact that no mining has since been done though timber cutting has proceeded apace.

The Democratic majority on the investigating committee wants this mining claim canceled. It charges that Undersecretary of the Interior Clarence Davis violated the law by using secret methods of favoritism to grant a claim that had already been denied as specious by former Interior Secretary

Chapman and by the United States Forest Service. The investigating Democrats want the Attorney General to go over the testimony to determine if some of it is false.

What is wrong with any of that?

If, as the Republican members are trying to prove, the investigation was politically inspired, a test of the findings at law should be the best way of showing as much. And whether the investigation was inspired by partisan politics or by motives as white as snow, the results are still stubbornly there.

The mistake of granting the Al Sarena claim was bad enough. Blind defense of it compounds the error. A quarter of a million dollars out of the public pocket is not political, it is financial.

It is strange indeed that it should be members of the party in power, affiliated with a dominantly budget-conscious administration, who would want to write off this costly blunder.

THE FOURTH OF JULY

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, next Wednesday the United States will be celebrating its 180th birthday anniversary. I wonder how many Americans still attach the true meaning and significance of Independence Day to that occasion? I can remember when the Fourth of July was celebrated as a day of national rejoicing, with parades, bonfires, sports, and resounding oratory. In late years, it seems as though the patriotic vigor with which the Fourth of July was characterized down through the years has been lost to a rather light-hearted holiday spirit of going places and doing things that have little connection with the Spirit of '76.

In fact, the present-day type of Independence Day is a shameful contrast to the one envisioned by our Founding Fathers. President John Adams wrote that the day of the signing of the Declaration of Independence "ought to be celebrated as a day of deliverance, by acts of devotion to God Almighty. It ought to be solemnized with pomp and parade, with shows, games, sports, guns, bells, bonfires, and illuminations, from one end of this continent to the other from this time forward, evermore."

I, for one, would like to see a revival of an old-fashioned community type of Fourth of July celebration. I am sure that towns and cities from Maine to California could spend the time and money to design, for our Nation's most important holiday, programs that would emphasize the historic and patriotic features of Independence Day in terms of 1956.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial on this subject entitled "Bring Out the Bands and Bunting," which was published in the Bangor (Maine) Daily News of February 11–12, 1956, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRING OUT THE BANDS AND BUNTING

In a recent letter to the News, a Brewer reader called attention to the fact that July 4 will mark the 180th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. She proposed a joint Bangor-Brewer celebration and expressed fear that our children are going to grow up thinking the Fourth of July is just a day to eat watermelon unless this great day receives the public attention it used to get.

We agree with the reader's suggestion and sentiments 100 percent. Only we would go further. We believe there should be a grand revival of Independence Day celebrations from Maine to California.

Independence Day is America's No. 1 holiday. It marks the birth of our free and sovereign Nation. Yet we have seen its observance deteriorate rapidly in recent years. It now is principally noted as a day when the accident toll may set a new record as pleasure seekers whoop it up on our highways.

What a shameful contrast from the feelings held by our Founding Fathers. John Adams, second United States President, for instance, wrote his wife, Abigail, as follows on the occasion of the Declaration signing:

"It ought to be celebrated, as the day of deliverance, by solemn acts of devotion to God Almighty. It ought to be solemnized with pomp and parade, with shows, games, sports, guns, bells, bonfires, and illuminations, from one end of this continent to the other, from this time forward, evermore."

These words represent humble yet two-fisted, wholehearted patriotic fervor, the kind that prevailed in the glorious days of the Revolution. Can we hope to protect the freedom we have inherited if our own fervor is any less in these perilous times?

The old-time type of observance probably cannot be revived. The automobile has revolutionized the American way of life and among other things has brought about a decline in the popularity of the hometown type of Fourth of July. Perhaps it would be better for groups of communities to hold joint programs. They would be fewer but bigger and more attractive to motorized America. The programs should revive the spirit of 1776 in terms of 1956.

The vacation season will be in full swing. This suggests staging some bangup celebrations for both visitors and residents. The time to start is now, for successful programs require considerable planning and some fund raising.

There is another reason for thinking about Independence Day in February. This is the birthday month of the Nation's two greatest leaders—Abe Lincoln, whose anniversary is on Sunday, and George Washington, whose anniversary is on the 22d.

Who'll start the patriotic parade?

RECURRENCE OF ILEITIS IS RARE IN PATIENTS OVER 50

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, there are certain columnists whose adherence to the New Deal has never been concealed. They have spent their time since the President's operation in attempting to capitalize on his misfortune for crass political purposes. I have never witnessed a more disgraceful performance in over a quarter of a century of active political life.

The American people have complete confidence in the integrity of President Eisenhower. At his press conference on March 7, President Eisenhower assured the people that he would only continue in the Office of President as long as he felt that he could carry all of the responsibility inherent in that Office. In response to a question on the health issue, he said:

Should I be reelected, there is going to be no neglect of the duties of the Presidency of the United States; and when I feel I can't carry them on, I won't be there.

Robert E. Clark, of International News Service, said:

Mr. President, in answering the last question about your health, you seemed to be saying if at any time you feel that your health is not up to carrying the burden of the Presidency you will withdraw from the race. Is that correct?

President Eisenhower:

Well, now, don't hold me down if I get a week's case of the flu or something else. I am talking about my general, let's say, organic fitness for the job as I see it. And that means carrying a burden of hard work right on through the year and through the months. Now, any time that I believe that has failed to the point of inability to perform the job properly, then that goes before the American people instantly.

President Eisenhower's first concern is the welfare of the American people. They will accept his word that he would never continue in the Office of the President if he did not feel that he was able to fulfill completely the responsibilities of the highest office in the land.

I remind those reporters who have been seeking a statement from the President on his present political intentions to reread the statement which I have quoted above. His present silence on the subject answers the question as to his second-term plans.

Doris Fleeson has attempted to prove that ileitis is likely to recur, and bases her medical findings on reports prepared by reputable doctors. However, Miss Fleeson is not a physician nor a statistician, and hence misinterprets their studies. It is generally known that ileitis is a disease more prevelant among young people than among older people. The studies which Miss Fleeson used to make her political case clearly show that the rate of recurrence of ileitis is much lower in those over 50 than in the age group between 30 and 40. Miss Fleeson found that her medical opinions were being discounted, so she has now resorted to a handwriting expert to prove that the President's health has deteriorated. I expect that she will next be quoting from the findings of fortune tellers and astrologers. Because she is so anxious to eliminate the President, who is sure to defeat anyone the Democrats may nominate, she does a poor job in concealing her obvious biases.

Raymond Moley, in his usual thorough fashion, has made an exhaustive review of all the medical findings that have been published on the subject of ileitis. His study confirms the statements made by the President's doctors, who said that there is no reason why the President cannot ably serve the American people for another 4 years in the White House.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Moley's column entitled "Doctors' Views On Ike Defended," which appeared in the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican of June 22, 1956, may be printed as a part of my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOCTORS' VIEWS ON IKE DEFENDED

(By Raymond Moley)

Partisan sources are charging that the optimistic opinion of the President's physicians concerning his future physical fitness is propaganda. Thus the integrity of these medical men has been challenged and the public is consequently confused.

Since the material so far offered to the public is sketchy and deceptive, I asked a friend who is a competent surgeon to survey the available literature on the disease for which the President was treated and to interpret to me what he found. This precaution on the part of a layman is important since so much of what is authoritatively published in medical journals needs translation from medical semantics. The result of this survey abundantly supports the verdict and predictions of the medical men who attended the President.

The real issue comes down to the probability of the recurrence of the disease, ileitis, and the capacity of the President to serve another term.

There are several articles on the subject, two of the most pertinent of which are published in the journal "Gastroenterology."

One of these articles was published in 1954 and is entitled "Regional Enteritis Report for Mayo Clinic." It considers 600 cases from 1912 to 1949. Apparently some of the confusion and misrepresentation which have been created by partisan sources are due either to a misreading or an incomplete representation of some of the tables in this study which show the numbers and percentages of recurrences of the disease. The figures quoted by one pessimist would have you believe that the President is almost certain to have a recurrence. That is because the statistics used by these people include all ages of patients and all types of the disease. Thus, account is not taken of the fact that the recurrence rate is much lower among older people and that the President had a rather mild form of the disease.

The Mayo report makes this very important point:

"The recurrence rate was high among patients who were between 31 and 40 years of age and low among those who were more than 51 years of age." In the Mayo compilation there were only 9 cases in the age group above 51, and only 2 of these had recurrences.

Indeed, it is made clear in the literature on the subject that ileitis is a young people's disease.

The other important article, also published in Gastroenterology, appeared in 1951. Its title is "An Appraisal of the Long Term Results of Surgical Treatment of Regional Ileitis." It was signed by Dr. John H. Garlock, with the collaboration of Dr. Burrill B. Crohn and others. Dr. Crohn was a pioneer in the study of the disease, and it is often called Crohn's disease. The authors were at the time of publication connected with Mt. Sinai Hospital in New York City.

The first survey of the cases was taken in 1945. There were 57 cases in which the operative method used on the President was employed—i. e., "Ileocolostomy with exclusion." (This means by-passing a diseased section of the intestine without the removal—resection—of any part.)

It was impossible to check on 10 of the cases, so the actual number studied was 47. Among these there had been six recurrences by 1945. That is about 12 percent. In three of these recurrences the surgeons employed resection (removal). These patients were well in 1951. In two cases, evidence of recurrence was discovered by X-ray, and recovery was achieved without further surgery. In one case there was extensive involvement, but the patient was reported to be getting along without surgery in reasonable comfort.

In 1951 the 47 cases were checked again, and it was found that 5 more had recurrences. These recurrences, it should be noted, developed several years after the original operation. All were well, with the exception of one case, which was doing "poorly."

It should be noted that these cases are from all age groups.

The conclusions that can be reached from these data and other sources, including accounts of the President's case, are:

1. The President's case of ileitis was, in medical terms, a low-grade, cicatrizing terminal ileitis. It probably began several years ago, perhaps between 10 and 20 years ago. The description means that there would have been small, successive flareups followed by scarring. Thus it progressed to a point at which about 10 inches were involved in scar tissue. Unlike most cases, there was no extensive acute inflammation and there were no complications. There were also no skip areas, which are intermittent diseased spots in healthy areas. The President's case was much milder than is usual in this disease. This would be a most favorable circumstance so far as the avoidance of a recurrence is concerned.

2. Recurrence is much more likely if treated surgically in the early stages of the disease. In the President's case, treatment was in an advanced stage after scarring.

3. As is indicated above, recurrence is much less likely in a man of the President's age.

4. It has been said that, since the Presidency involves serious mental and nervous strain, recurrence might well occur just as ulcers are developed for that reason. Dr. Garlock disposed of this point in the discussion of the paper cited above:

"We are convinced by rather prolonged observations by the psychiatrists at our hospital that there is nothing to indicate a psychosomatic basis for this disease." Dr. Crohn in an interview in U. S. News & World Report said that hard work by the President after recovery from an operation would not increase chances for a recurrence.

5. Finally, and most important, there is the great respect which must be accorded the men who were present at the President's operation and who participated in the press conference later. General Heaton, who performed the actual surgery, is highly respected in his profession. Dr. Isidor Ravdin, a major consultant, is a specialist of great distinction. The statement that there is no reason why the President should not run again must be taken as a serious and responsible expert opinion.

FOREIGN POLICY

V. UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, why are we appropriating billions of dollars in the aggregate, for assistance to underdeveloped countries? We do well to ask ourselves this question, not rhetorically, but in all seriousness.

We are moved to a certain extent by charitable impulses. These are strongest when a great disaster, such as a famine or an earthquake, strikes at the lives of masses of people. In the past, both privately and governmentally we have responded to the call of distress. But this impulse should be confined to emergencies. It is not and should not be the basis of continuing policy. It is not good for the recipients, who would be treated as permanent objects of charity, instead of being assisted back to self-support. Furthermore, large-scale and costly benevolence cannot be maintained as a permanent factor in the guidance of our foreign policy.

A more widespread acceptance has been given to the purpose of persuading other governments to adopt our ideals and accept our leadership in world affairs. We have thought that alliances might be bought in this way. It now appears, particularly in Asia, that acceptance of our leadership cannot thus be bought. Not even gratitude can be so bought. As examples, the political leaders of both India and Indonesia have made this abundantly clear. We would do well permanently to write this off as a purpose and a possibility.

The endeavor to purchase support for our policies runs into other and obviously practical difficulties. At the Summit Conference in Geneva, last year, the Soviet rulers became convinced that we have no aggressive designs on their people, territory, or resources. This gave them a new freedom to expand their economic and political efforts. They are prepared to bid against us in the purchase of influence by developmental expenditure. If we offer 10 billion, they will offer 20. If we suggest 4 percent on terms, they will take 2 percent. If we ask hard cash, they will take rice or rubber—and so it goes. We can exhaust ourselves bidding against the Soviet, and get little in return.

Is there then any useful purpose in spending billions abroad? I believe that there is. In fact, there are two good reasons. The first one is the purpose of profit in mutually useful business. For this the institutions are already in existence. They are the Export-Import Bank, the World Bank, and the latter's newly organized associate—the International Investment Corporation. All of these operate on a business basis, within the limits of risk set by the dangers of expropriation. It may well be that other private counterparts of the International Investment Corporation may be organized and serve useful purposes where the threat of expropriation is at a minimum.

The second purpose is that of doing our part to establish in the underdeveloped countries the means by which they may provide themselves a steadily rising way of life, as was suggested in the talk on India. This purpose is directed toward the well-being of people. It concerns itself with food, clothing, shelter, health, and education. In this undertaking we look for no monetary return. We demand no political alliance. We do not even ask for gratitude. We base our hopes on the reasonable belief that peoples who are making steady progress socially and economically will not easily be lured by the false promises of communism into a life of slavery and deprivation. Thus our basic national interest, as already defined, will be served.

Our hopes in this regard gain strength from the recent experience of Burma. That country bartered useful rice for technical assistance and attractive public works. The latter is reported to have come in the first instance in the form of inconvenient masses of cement, dumped on the docks of Rangoon. The technical assistance came in the form of engineers having a high technical proficiency in spreading Communist propaganda.

India, Egypt, and other countries have yet to experience the true nature of Soviet assistance. Now Burma knows, and the results are so serious that U Nu has resigned the premiership to reorganize his party as a fighting weapon against Soviet domination.

In concentrating on the well-being of people, we will not find ourselves outbid by the Communists. It will be our own,

unchallenged sphere of action. Let us move into it. We may, I suggest, let the Soviet Government engage in spectacular undertakings at the expense of the well-being of their own people. If, as I will later suggest, we can raise questions in the minds of Soviet citizens as to their own well-being, the lavish Soviet plans may well find their limits.

There are great advantages in addressing our efforts to people, so far as governments permit. Governments change. Governments disappear. The people remain.

There are, however, techniques which we must observe and practice. Among them are these:

First. The help must be given in cooperation, not shipped in and dumped.

Second. The help must be scaled to the local needs. It should be neither grandiose nor skimpy.

Third. There must be continuity to the work. Congresses and administrations must be willing to appropriate for it year after year, until a given mission has accomplished its purpose.

Fourth. Since such assistance has no military purpose whatsoever, it should be completely separated from military assistance, both legislatively and administratively.

Fifth. The help should be administered by men and women who have an instinctive sense of the brotherhood of all men under the fatherhood of God. They must know, with St. Paul, that He "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." The limitations on our effectiveness may well turn out to be those of recruiting devoted personnel, rather than demands on the budget.

Sixth. More and more the administration must rest in the hands of nationals trained in America. There is great value in a large-scale interchange of this sort.

That such a policy would cost less than the one we are now pursuing seems evident, but that is not the important thing. The real criterion is its possibility of making the world inhospitable to communism. It serves our national interest of so directing our words and our acts that we may assist in organizing a world in which freedom, justice, and peace prevail.

Our chief interest is then in people. As we look around the world, there are three regions open to us where, by serving people, we can contribute to political stability and to our ultimate national interest. These countries are India, Pakistan, and the Arab States. All three have a common problem and that problem is the resettlement and retraining of great refugee populations, so that they may be supporting themselves and working toward a better life.

In India the refugee population is great, but diffused so that it does not strike the visitor's eye. The first undertaking of any proper 5-year plan should be to restore these people to a self-sufficient, self-respecting way of life, and we should be glad to help.

In Pakistan, on the noisome mud flats of Karachi, are gathered hundreds of thousands of the most miserable people who have ever gone under the name of "man." Despite the hearty acquiescence and support of our military policies by Pakistan, should we not consider that we have there a nonmilitary field wherein action can greatly strengthen a valued ally?

Finally, there are the Arabs and Christians displaced from Palestine. They, too, are living in misery, and have been doing so for many years now. Their presence exacerbates the hostility between Arab and Jew. Here again our principle of helping people opens an opportunity.

While assisting by all possible means to prevent the outbreaks of violence in the Near East, would we not do well to remove one of its causes? New homes must be found for the refugees. Perhaps these will be in the Jordan Valley. Perhaps the irrigation works now started in the Euphrates and Tigris Rivers will reestablish the ancient agricultural wealth of Mesopotamia. If so, the region will call for hundreds of thousands of new settlers. The Government of Iraq would itself be strengthened by such an immigration.

And so it goes in the underdeveloped countries. The opportunities for building stable communities are endless. As we move into this field and take up this task, more and more opportunities will arise for building stable communities in an unstable world. This serves our national interest.

THE GOVERNMENT'S DEFENSE IN THE DIXON-YATES CASE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President I am wondering whatever happened to the Government's defense of the approximately three and a half million dollars in claims filed by the Dixon-Yates combination for damages.

The Government's answer was due to be filed in the Court of Claims on February 13. Instead of filing, the Justice Department secured a postponement to April 12.

That day rolled around and Justice Department lawyers appeared to secure another adjournment—this time to June 12.

June 12 arrived—and back marched the Justice Department lawyers. They did not carry briefcases bulging with defense documents, however. Instead they had only another request for postponement and the court this time gave them until July 12.

July is almost here and I am raising this point on the floor today to remind Mr. Herbert Brownell that his lawyers have another date in court.

I can understand why it is taking the Department so long; it is because it has an embarrassing task to perform. The three Justice Department lawyers appointed to defend this case have to first figure out some way they can reverse their bosses gracefully and convincingly, since, under Mr. Brownell's direction, the Justice Department heretofore has always been actively engaged in defending Dixon-Yates instead of the Government.

After Joe Dodge, who is no longer with us, got the Dixon-Yates ball rolling, and Rowland Hughes, who is no longer with us, carried it through, although that necessitated deceiving Congress, and Sherman Adams, who is still with us, successfully intervened to influence the Chairman of the SEC, Mr. Brownell's Department held that the contract was legal. The Department did so both in appearances before the SEC and in a brief, filed with the Court of Appeals, when the State of Tennessee appealed to show that it was illegal.

The Court of Appeals case was never tried, because in the meantime our committee in the Senate had managed to expose so thoroughly the corruption involved in this contract, and its violation of the law, that the President ordered it cancelled.

This was done; whereupon the Atomic Energy Commission refused Dixon-Yates claims of damages, after which Dixon-Yates filed their case in the Court of Claims.

Now the Justice Department is preparing to take the other side. This is comparable to the senior partners of a big law firm representing a client, and then, turning the matter over to the junior partners, to present the defense, legal ethics and customs notwithstanding.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and I filed a resolution in the Senate, calling for the appointment of a special counsel, to defend the Government, pointing out that the Justice Department itself was involved in this mess.

Mr. Brownell opposed our resolution. He held that the Justice Department was ready, willing, and able to undertake the case. Mr. Warren E. Berger, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Division, testified before our committee that the reversal in direction would not embarrass him in the least.

We pointed out that the defense attorneys assigned to the case, Mr. S. R. Gamer, Chief of the Court of Claims Section, and two of his assistants, would have to clear their defense with their bosses—Mr. Berger and Mr. Brownell.

We pointed out that this might cause no end of diplomatic and procedural difficulties.

Furthermore, we pointed out that since they were subordinate officials of the Government they might have as much trouble getting information from the Atomic Energy Commission and the Bureau of the Budget and the White House as we had.

I rather think, Mr. President, that unless the Justice Department gets its answer in by the next deadline—and unless that answer contains all the good defenses that we know exist as a results of our committee hearings—then it is about time we stood up and said "I told you so."

Since there are so many defenses—namely, the conflict of interest of Adolphe Wenzell; the illegality of the agreement under the Holding Company Act; the violation of the Gore amendment on taxes, to mention a few—and since the evidence was in months before the first deadline, we are forced to conclude that the only reason for the repeated postponements must be the reluctance of the Attorney General to file an answer which would reverse the position he has taken heretofore. And this is

precisely the reason we proposed special counsel.

If it is simply the plan to drag this whole matter out until after the November elections, then I think we should serve notice that it will be periodically discussed on the floor of the Senate.

DREDGING OPERATIONS OF NORTH CHANNEL OF BUFFALO HARBOR

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to voice my disappointment at the action taken by the conferees on the public works appropriation bill in deleting the item of $250,000 for the commencement of dredging operations on the North Channel of Buffalo Harbor. The loss of this item will be a deep disappointment to people throughout the Buffalo, N. Y., area. Its loss means that for a minimum of 1 more year no work can be commenced on this last major improvement needed by the port of Buffalo.

I ask unanimous consent to have these items printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. Two are telegrams, one from the chairman and one from the director of the Niagara Frontier Port Authority. The third item is a copy of the letter which I addressed to the chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, in which I explained why this relatively small item was of such critical importance.

I wish the record on this channel-improvement project to be clear and to contain all the essential information, in order that my colleagues may have it available to them in the future when the people of the Buffalo area will again have the opportunity to present to the Congress their case for this appropriation.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUFFALO, N. Y., *June 22, 1956.*

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Press reports from Washington indicate that House-Senate conferees do not intend to recommend Buffalo harbors $250,000 request in the compromise bill now being worked out. The Niagara Frontier Port Authority urges you to do all you can to save this appropriation in a last minute fight over the weekend. Compared to other harbors and to needs of our harbor this is indeed a modest request. This additional appropriation would be used for a continuing contract if field studies now underway proved the desirability of a new entrance or retention of the old. These studies and this appropriation are necessary for the future development of this area. The Niagara Frontier Port Authority which begins operation on July 1 urgently requests that our local and State representatives get together this weekend to iron out their differences and restore the appropriation. Your stand on this question will indicate your interest in the future economic development of our area. Do not make our habor the victim of political differences.

WILLIAM M. CONNELLY,
Chairman, Niagara Frontier Port Authority.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *June 22, 1956.*

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Press reports indicate Buffalo harbors $250,000 appropriation will not be included in compromise bill worked out by House-Senate conferees. Since reports indicate this decision will not be made official until Monday we are asking you to do all you can in a last minute fight to see that we do not lose this $250,000. This money would have been added to moneys now being used for field studies by local Army engineers in order to determine a new entrance as well as survey studies for other parts of the inner and outer harbors. This additional appropriation would be used for a continuing contract if studies proved the desirability of a new entrance or retention of the old. This information will be used in future harbor development and is of utmost importance for future of port of Buffalo and Niagara Frontier. It is our hope that our local and State representatives will get together this weekend to iron out their differences and restore the appropriation. Our original request was for 4½ million and on recommendation of Army engineers because of need of a study this was stricken from appropriation request and reduced to $250,000. To eliminate this extremely modest request is to indicate that the Federal Government has no interest in the future economic development of our area. Let us hope that instead of our representatives trying to find who is to blame for elimination of item that by Monday we find out that all are responsible for its retention in public works appropriation law.

DR. MARVIN A. RAPP.,
Consultant Division of the Port of Buffalo.

MAY 3, 1956.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALLEN: I am writing to you to urge your favorable consideration of a certain small, but vitally important, appropriation for dredging operations in the port of Buffalo. The item has a history, which is briefly as follows:

Early this year the people of Buffalo and the surrounding region were incensed to discover that the administration's budget failed to include any money for the dredging of the north channel in the port of Buffalo. This project has been authorized for some time. Adequate depth in this channel is vital to a critically important Great Lakes port.

However, I understand that in view of the pressing need for this project, a compromise was reached as a result of many successive conferences between local representatives, interested Congressmen, members of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget. The Corps of Engineers proposes to make a thorough survey to discover whether there is some alternate alinement of the north channel which would be cheaper. I understand such a survey can be undertaken without the appropriation of additional funds.

This survey will be completed well before the end of fiscal 1957. When it is completed, there will no longer be any possible question as to what will be the most economical placing of the north channel.

I understand that the Corps of Engineers has informed the Public Works Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee that it will then need $250,000 to make it possible to commence dredging operations on whichever alinement is chosen, and to carry them out through the end of fiscal 1957.

This channel is the last major improvement needed by the port of Buffalo. It is a matter of intense interest throughout the entire region. These people understand and have been persuaded to accept the additional survey described above for the sake of making doubly sure that not a penny more is spent than is absolutely necessary. In return they ask only for this small appropriation which will make it possible—once this final survey has been completed—to start on this long-delayed project.

I earnestly recommend this to your favorable consideration.

Yours very sincerely,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

FEDERAL FLOOD INSURANCE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as I speak these words, we are in the first month of the hurricane season of 1956. The hurricane season extends from June 1 to November 30, with the months of maximum danger being August and September. Thus the few remaining days of this session of Congress afford the last opportunity there will be to enact the Federal flood-insurance legislation now pending in the House of Representatives—the last opportunity to make it possible to get this program underway before hurricanes Anna, Betsy, Carla, Dora, Ethel, and Flossie are upon us.

Anna, Betsy, Carla—it is a curious irony that these pleasant names represent so much violence. Each year's hurricanes are given girls' two-syllable names, in alphabetical order. The names are always of two syllables in order that they may be readily understood in radio transmission marred by the static and crackle of the violent storms. The names are selected in advance and I could ascertain for you, Mr. President, by a simple phone call, the entire roster for the coming year.

Anna, Betsy, Carla, Dora—they have been christened before their birth, Mr. President. Each of them will be a circular storm, containing winds exceeding 75 miles an hour. Each of them will come to life in the Atlantic Ocean, somewhere between Africa and the Carolina coasts. Each of them will swing west and northward along a curving path toward the coastline of North America.

Most of these ladies of violence will live and die at sea. A few may not. The difference between a hurricane which dies at sea and one which comes ashore at Florida, Georgia, or the Carolinas, and wreaks a half-billion dollars worth of devastation and tragedy may be a matter of a mere 10 degrees difference in course. The factors which can make a hurricane swerve 10 degrees one way or the other are so many and so slight that no man can predict, until they are virtually upon us, whether Carla and Dora will be harmless disturbances at sea or the equal of Connie and Diane, the violent and devastating storms of last year.

Mr. President, on the 10th of May of this year the Senate passed S. 3732, the Federal flood-insurance bill which was recommended without dissent by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. This bill is now pending in the House of Representatives.

I hope and trust, Mr. President, that our colleagues in the House will take affirmative action on this bill before the end of the session. It will be a bitter blow to the hopes of the many, many victims of last year's floods, who have written asking that the Federal Government undertake such an insurance program, if this session should terminate without Congress having enacted Federal flood-insurance legislation.

I send to the desk a number of letters from these people and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point. I wish my colleagues on both sides of Capitol Hill to be able to see for themselves the deep public interest which the proposal for a Federal flood-insurance program has aroused.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *October 25, 1955.*

Hon. HERBERT LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: The published report of your interest in proposed flood insurance legislation is of vital interest to me.

Much of what represents our total savings went down the raging Croton River during the weekend of October 15. What is normally a charming little house, grown in the last 10 years of our do-it-yourself ownership from very modest beginning, was flooded to the eaves; furniture swished about indoors or floated downstream altogether; one porch was torn away and another now lacks the supporting column in one corner; the surrounding grounds are gullied; trees are washed away and all that devastation is a total loss.

We are in the throes of deciding whether to go into debt to attempt rehabilitation; it is too much to bear thinking that we might lose all that, too, if the waters should rise again. We are, moreover, one of very few houses in the community that are victims of the flood; most of the houses in Croton are up on the hills or away from the river. There has been no need, as far as I can learn, for the community to organize to seek relief from flood damage and flood danger. For that reason, I am making a personal appeal to your understanding.

I realize that we are fortunate in that no one was hurt. We live in New York City where we earn our living as teachers. The house in Croton-on-Hudson has been our vacation spot and our "money in the bank" against the day when, the children grown, we would realize on our investment (of a little cash 10 years ago and much labor and improvement since then) to finance the children's education.

1. May I urge your support of legislation that may provide relief from this loss and insurance against possible future loss?

2. May I ask for whatever information and/or application forms are available to facilitate our sharing, if we can, in the flood-relief program now in operation?

Thank you very much.

Very truly yours,

ANNA S. DAVIS,
Mrs. Alfred H. Davis.

Our house is in Westchester County which was declared a disaster area.

OCEAN BAY PARK,
Fire Island, N. Y., March 8, 1956.

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Thank you for your efforts to obtain proper legislation on flood and disaster insurance at rates that are not prohibitive.

We urge and expect your continuing initiative until such legislation is adopted.

It is wrong that whole sections of the population should be financially ruined by causes beyond their control. Reasonably priced insurance would permit people to start again after a disaster.

Thank you for your continued support.

Sincerely,

ALBERT I. DROSIN.

ELLENVILLE, N. Y., *January 16, 1956.*

Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SENATOR: I am the wife of a very sick and totally disabled veteran. We live on the veterans pension and for all the years saved for a small home. This is all we have. Our home happens to be one of many situated on and by a mountain brook. This brook has been and is a threat to our homes and lives.

Since last August 12 we were dangerously flooded twice. We live in constant fear and danger and our nerves are shot and hearts heavy. No person can live in fear every time a cloud shows in the skies.

Permanent flood prevention is a necessity and has been for a long time. The expense of temporary relief which is just waste in our case, is a much higher expenditure as to something permanent which will not wash away with each flood that takes more and more of our land away and makes it more dangerous to live by.

Please see that a permanent flood bill shall be enacted to make our lives and property safe. And it must be in the very near future, please.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. NATHAN LASKIN.

ANGLO FABRICS CO., INC.,
New York, N. Y., September 20, 1955.

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: I have read with great interest that you were authorized to conduct Senate Banking Committee hearings on disaster insurance.

Our mills are located in Webster, Mass. The disaster of the last flood was so severe, and we stood without any protection whatsoever. Overnight thousands of people were jobless and homeless, and many lives were lost. Also, our mills were flooded with water 8 to 10 feet deep.

Everybody realizes that something must be done in order to protect us from repetition of such happenings, and I therefore hope that you will succeed in your mission to establish a system whereby we would, in the future, be able to insure ourselves against such disasters.

Sincerely yours,

LEO HONIG, *President.*

FLUSHING, N. Y., *August 23, 1955.*

Hon. HEBRERT LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you in the wake of the recent tragic flood disasters, because it has occurred to me—that our Government should sponsor some type of low cost disaster insurance—every year, somewhere in this country, disasters such as tornadoes, floods, hurricanes, and earthquakes destroy and consume the life's accumulations and health of thousands of hard working citizens, who have contributed to the wealth and prosperity of all of us.

Surely, when they are struck by such an awesome thing, it seems hardly fair that they should suffer the penalty of being wiped out, when the cost spread out over the entire country would be hardly noticeable.

I'm sure that if you could sponsor such a plan in the legislative body, of which you are an honored Member, you would be performing a great service, and I'm sure it would be welcomed by all the people.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. LEONARD FRANK.

RYE, N. Y., *January 4, 1955.*

Re flood insurance.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: I must write to congratulate you on your introduction of a bill for a form of Federal flood insurance. I think you are doing the public a valuable service. I was very close to being flooded out myself on October last.

If you are not already familiar with insurance policies for small homeowners, I believe many of us hold a "package" type "A" policy, which provides amongst other items, basic house insurance. There is also a type B policy, more expensive, but which has certain additional coverages, including a so-called very limited claim for seepage.

I hope, that when your bill is passed, it will be possible to obtain flood insurance under the policy type A so that small homeowners may be protected and that insurance companies cannot force type A holders to take out a higher cost type B policy before holders can secure flood insurance. Flood insurance under type A policy would seem possible as the reinsurance risk would be borne in some way by the Federal Government.

A very happy and prosperous New Year to you and once again congratulations on your proposed bill.

Sincerely yours,

J. MICHAEL A. BIRD.

SANFORD, N. C., *December 29, 1955.*

Hon. HERBERT LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I regret that I did not get to attend the meeting you recently held in the city of Raleigh in connection with the disaster insurance question.

I have for many years admired you and the positions you have taken on matters before the Senate and would have enjoyed meeting you personally.

I am interested in disaster insurance at reasonable rates not only because I feel that the people who have invested their money to provide places for the people to have resorts to visit for rest and relaxation but for the benefit of the thousands who live near resorts and ocean fronts.

One of my sons bought a small hotel at Myrtle Beach, S. C., and the first year of his ownership, hurricane Hazel struck at that beach and wrought havoc to much property.

Last season hurricanes Connie and Dianne while not causing any physical damage did frighten away guests and caused cancellation of reservations in many instances.

We conservatively estimate that we had a loss on this account of from $2,500 to $3,000, last season and it seems that this phase of the resort business should be protected by some form of insurance at reasonable premiums.

In our case we have our life savings invested and trying to pay for the property and facing the possibility of storms make life rather unpleasant at times.

While this letter may sound as if based on a selfish basis I assure you that I am trying to speak for all the small owners of resort property and any others in need of this kind of protection.

I am sending a copy of this letter to my two Senators both of whom I claim as good friends and I am sure that when a bill is submitted on this vital subject that it will receive the support of both gentlemen.

With all good wishes, I am,

Very sincerely,

ROBERT W. VICK.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *October 20, 1955.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: I have read that hearings on a plan for federally sponsored insurance against floods and other disasters will soon commence. And since you are a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, I wish to stress the grave need for insurance against such disasters. You asserted in a television interview that the individual must be able to protect himself against such misfortunes. This could only

be accomplished if those hearings are a success. Therefore, I feel that you should give these hearings your full support as you have done previously. I am sure that you will have the interest of the people in mind when these hearings begin.

I would appreciate any literature that may result from these hearings. Please place me on your general mailing list.

Respectfully yours,

NUNZIO D. CAZZETTA.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *August 23, 1955.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. LEHMAN: As a member of the Ridgewood section of Queens County and one who has a summer home in the Poconos, I am extremely interested in the matter of flood insurance as a step forward to additional protection to those who may be the victims of a casualty as occurred in our Northeastern States during the past few days. I have contacted a number of insurance companies who have advised me that they do not carry flood insurance or that the rates thereof are so prohibitive as to make it impossible for owners to protect themselves.

Under the circumstances I think it behooves our Government to do something to aid those who are unfortunate enough to lose their homes and in some cases, their lives, through an act of God of which they have no control. If our private insurance companies refuse to issue flood insurance except at prohibitive cost, then, I believe, a bill should be sponsored which would have the effect of allowing those who desired to do so, to take out insurance with our Government so that if such a casualty should again happen, they would at least have the consolation of receiving some compensation in return for their lost homes.

During the past war we did have war-risk insurance sponsored by Congress and I feel that our Government should take the initiative in this instance of protecting owners along river banks against a repetition of such tragedies as we have witnessed during the past week.

Very truly yours,

JOHN F. MIDDLEMISS.

UNITED STATES PROGRAM FOR ATOMIC POWER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and I made some comments on June 13, 1956, concerning a misleading advertisement by a group of power companies with reference to the status of the United States program for atomic power development. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a speech delivered by Edward R. Trapnell, of Bozell & Jacobs, Inc., which sets forth a more enlightened view toward the atomic power program.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUBLIC RELATIONS CHALLENGE IN NUCLEAR POWER

Next year, 1957, is the International Geophysical Year, a time for concentrated examination of our earthly environment.

It's a good idea, this hard look at our surroundings, and can well be applied to atomic energy, particularly the nuclear power business.

We've lived in an atmosphere charged with expectancy for more than a decade. It might be well to take a look at where we are and where we are going. What is this challenge we've so glibly accepted? And what does it have to do with our business of mass communication? Perhaps it would be well to try to get some perspective on ourselves as well as on the atom.

The International Geophysical Year, with man-made satellites to be launched, is a reminder of a fabled examination of our world in an account often credited to Dr. Alvin Weinberg, Director of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory but attributed by him to the New York Times. I believe it came from England. It's the pick of all the atomic fairy tales and folklore, which I have embellished a bit.

It seems the Saturnalians, a very advanced people on some outer planet, had kept earth under observation for many years—using powerful radar-telescopes. Three unusual blips on their scopes in July and August of 1945 aroused their curiosity; the Earthlings, they thought, must have made some terrible mistake fooling with energy mechanisms.

Enjoying a completely nuclear-energized economy, these people knew you could have accidents with nuclear power machines. They'd had plenty. But the phenomena observed on Earth indicated something more. Some of their scientists believed an actual nuclear explosion was theoretically possible, but it never occurred to them to try to make one. Besides, they didn't know how. Wars were part of their prehistoric era, so there was little incentive to learn.

An expedition to visit Earth was organized, staffed largely by specialists from the Saturnalian utilities, but with some theoretical physicists and some social scientists. The head of the expedition was a social scientist.

The mission, a quick but very broad inspection of the United States, was successfully completed, reports written, and plans made for the big presentation before the Saturnational Academy of Sciences and heads of government. The power people were a bit miffed because the social scientists took the best material—on grounds of its sociological significance.

Now the Saturnalians had an acute sense of irony—but not humor. They seldom laughed. Everything was deadpan. Some of the reports were not quite complimentary to Earth, others were amusing. Minor reports were made first. One concerned the habit of the Earthlings of living in vertical cities but not leaving enough space between structures to get around, then compounding the error by using vehicles too big and too fast for the ground left in cities.

A Saturnuclear energy distribution man told how this habit complicated the consumption of data collection system used by Earthlings. Instead of using the Saturnuclear method of automatically assembling and recording consumption data—by carrier impulse from the customer's meter—with electronic computation of bills, Earth utilities sent a man regularly to read each customer's meter. Since the big vehicles were just in the way, of course, he had to walk. The speaker also chided Earth a bit for the system of annoying customers with bills instead of feeding the automatically punched tapes to the accounting machines at banks and letting the banks send receipts with periodic statements. No Saturnuclear customers were ever in arrears.

He said some Earth companies appeared to consider the bills a good system of communicating with customers, but he personally felt the open communication by a thing called advertising was better. The only trouble with this was that the companies sold the public on the advantages of electricity, then the Government stepped in to deliver the stuff in competition.

The Saturnalian utility man also reported that Earthlings were planning to use nuclear fuels, but it seemed a bit silly to him in view of the amazing resources of Earth to be described in the main report by the Chief of the expedition.

The Great Hall of the Saturnalian Academy was tensely silent as the Chief began. First, as a good politician, he reported the Saturnalian Government had already launched a mining and exploration program, with guaranteed prices and bonuses to encourage prospectors and vacationers to search their western plateau for a special kind of ore found on Earth. They also agreed producers would not be subject to price controls. Senators from the concerned States nodded approval.

"Earthlings," he said, "do not worry about radioactivity from their great heat generators. They have few health and safety inspectors. Powerplant builders do not have to get Government licenses to use fuel. Politics has no place in their decisions as to where to build powerplants, or when. The Government does not have to approve their plans. They build boilers with very inexpensive materials. They do not have to account for fuels by the fraction of a gram.

"They have several wonderful materials which are very plentiful, so minutely radioactive the Earthlings pay no attention. These materials can be collected and distributed to provide heat energy directly at the point of use. Necessary conditions are easily attained, whereby the reaction of these materials with the oxygen in their air causes a beautiful pyrotechnic pattern, in glowing colors, all at very low temperatures so that each family can have its own fire. These are indeed appealing materials. Earthlings call the solid form coal, which is best used in big installations, and the gaseous form, which is ideal for home consumption, they call simply gas."

He spoke at length about these resources citing other uses, pointing out that extracted products were used in medicines and flavorings, and a wide variety of chemicals, including those used in making "very thin fabrics which female Earthlings wear on their legs in a very attractive manner, but doubtless with slight advantage otherwise."

Sometimes, you may wonder, as the Saturnalians did, why we Earthlings are making such a fuss over an energy source that is going to make life so complicated for us.

Anyway, we are, and it will. And we have no choice in the matter.

We are going to use nuclear fuels for no other reason than that we will need them. Our future depends on such a supplement to chemical energy sources.

Nuclear fuels include anything that releases usable energy by changes in the hard central core of atoms, which we call the nucleus. We call the change fission, nuclear fission, when the nucleus is broken down—as with uranium—and fusion when two or more nuclei are combined. We can split, or fission, the nuclei of heavy atoms, and fuse, or combine, the nuclei of light atoms, such as hydrogen. So far, we've only done the latter under conditions in which the apparatus is destroyed, as in the so-called H-bomb.

Nobody will ever measure or evaluate the trouble we've caused ourselves by going at these things backward. It's as though we had learned to make TNT before we found other uses for oil. We should envy the Saturnalians.

But we are on earth. We must live with the conditions we have created, now, in the midtwentieth century, in the United States of America.

PUAA is the gathering place of the people who write the messages the Saturnalians admired, the people who in public media portray a great industry, the industry of supplying energy to the homes and hospitals and stores and factories of the Nation. Utility advertising people must have an appreciation of some of the foundations of the environment in which the distributors of energy, gas and electric, will be doing business from now on.

Most important of all the special conditions of this new environment is the fact that the Government, the Federal Government primarily, but State governments too, will be in the business with you. This stems from four basic factors which can't be got around:

The business involves the national defense;

The business can involve the public health and safety;

The business has been nourished on tax dollars;

The business involves international trade and prestige.

Now, with all these involvements, just what are we trying to do?

We are trying to reap the benefits of this new salient—atomic energy—on the frontier of man's knowledge. In the utilities business, we are trying to make practical use of the energy of the atom's nucleus, and we are trying to realize its great promise in a manner which will not destroy or weaken the social and economic structure which we believe permits the maximum application of our talents and resources and the fullest development in freedom of our people.

We start from the premise that we want to preserve and strengthen a free enterprise economy, not because of tradition, sentiment, affection nor opportunity for gain, but for the simple reason we believe it can do a better job and provide basic guarantees and protections against the expansion of statism.

This is not to say we want to escape the restraints and corrective measures a free people may from time to time feel justified in applying through government to any segment of their economic system. It is just that when we apply the powers of government in this way, we want to make sure we don't use a tourniquet around the neck to stop a nosebleed.

Electric companies have had the tourniquet. The utilities business happens to be one which for a quarter of a century has been at the center of one of these political swirls of mixing the ends and the means. Now atomic energy offers a new and glamorous means to the end that the business of supplying energy in usuable form to the Nation shall be a function of Government.

The Government got into the power business as the means—nay, even the by-product—of utilization and conservation of natural resources, and as a declared means of measuring the operations of a franchised industry with a yardstick which we now know is short by the length of tax advantages and access to the public credit. But getting the Government further into the power business is for some people today an end, not a means—the end is more public funds for power itself, not for development of resources or for the establishment of standards, dubious or otherwise.

The American people will reject such a proposition if they are given an opportunity, if they can see clearly that they don't have to take a heavy dose of further Government investment in the power business in order to get progress in atomic energy.

But we will be certain to get such a dose if the electric industry fails in the obligation which it has properly taken on for the development of nuclear power, or if the industry can be made to appear to be letting down after an enthusiastic start.

The start is impressive indeed. The electric companies, with their supporting technical services and equipment suppliers, have launched a program which will cost more than a quarter of a billion dollars and will provide nuclear-fueled generating capacity of a million kilowatts of electricity.

These will be expensive kilowatts, costing half again as much at the best as kilowatts from new and modern plants using conventional fuels. With the difference, we are buying information and experience and establishing a special new competence in that segment of industry which designs and builds the equipment and machinery of powerplants. It is an investment in America's future.

The good start that has been made, however, and the progress to be expected, may be something less than thrilling to the public in the light of promises made in seeking the opportunity through amendments in 1954 to the basic atomic energy law. Now, after a year of work, some of those promises can be made to appear almost gaudy, by people who want to make the case that atomic development under industry sponsorship in America is not going fast enough.

If it is true that because of the engineering and materials problems the job is going to take longer than expected, how much better it would be to say so clearly and unmistakably. There is little profit to beating our breasts about free enterprise while the engineers are beating their brains out on the problems of translating laboratory scale tests into near profitmaking powerplants.

There are, of course, problems other than the technical ones. The question we must ask ourselves is: Are they really holding us up—now? One of these, the problem of adequate liability insurance, has been clearly defined for the Federal legislators who, unless other issues intervene, are now of a mind to respond precisely. But before it was cleared up—largely by Philip Sporn of American Gas & Electric—there was clear indication of the hazards in these nontechnical problems. The warning signal came during the record of hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, an excerpt from which I want to read.

Representative CHET HOLIFIELD of California was questioning an industry witness. Mr. HOLIFIELD is one of the most vigilant students of the national atomic-energy program and devotes a great deal of time to the work of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, probing with particular thoroughness, the many aspects of nuclear power development. He is impatient with arguments that additional legislation is needed to further the industry program of nuclear power development. These same arguments may be heard as the reason for a Government program such as proposed in the Gore bill, hearings on which will doubtless follow next week's scheduled sessions on the insurance problem. The bill introduced by Senator ALBERT GORE of Tennessee provides for AEC to build six big plants throughout the United States, a type of program similar in many respects to that advocated by AEC Commissioner Thomas E. Murray. The warning is reflected in the following comment (p. 458 of pt. 2 of the hearings on the development, growth, and state of the atomic-energy industry, 84th Cong., 2d sess., testimony of March 5, 1956):

"Representative HOLIFIELD. * * * We were told when we passed this act that private enterprise was ready to go, and all we had to do was to pass this act, and they were coming in and going to enthusiastically build up this great atomic industry.

"Now you are telling us what a lot of us felt all along would be the case, that they were not ready to come in and take the risks of this uneconomic industry because it is an uneconomic industry, and we might as well face it at this time. So now we find out that this seems to be the drawback."

The discussion was at that time on the insurance problem. The witness was Francis K. McCune, vice president of General Electric.

Then Mr. HOLIFIELD said: "What other drawbacks are there? Assume the Government now takes over the function of private enterprise in guaranteeing you against industrial accident hazards—assuming it does that, what is the next thing you are going to come in for? Are you going to come in for guaranteed long-term contracts on plutonium at a stated price? Is that the next request that is going to come from private industry?"

In announcing that hearings would be held on the proposed insurance legislation during the week of May 14, the committee also announced that industry witnesses would also be asked to bring up any other problems which may be retarding nuclear power development.

The Washington editor of a subscription news service called me about a week ago, with this question:

"Say, what are the utilities trying to do? Things are getting all fouled up with talk about income taxes and holding company act and antitrust provisions and fuel prices. People are going to say the industry is dragging its feet, so we have to have a Government program."

This observation is from one man, but from a man who watches the goings on in Washington, who talks to a lot of people, and who sends information to a lot more.

Now, when things like this are talked against the background of the Government's primary concern with atomic energy—national defense, the public health and safety, the Government's own investment, and international prestige—the possible result becomes all too clear.

The international situation is an important influence. There are many advocates for an expanded Government program of building powerplants in order to demonstrate for the world our competence in nuclear fields and assure our place in world markets.

All tied together, the facts and fancy, the economics and the politics, the technology and the legalism—all add up to these arguments for Government entry into the nuclear power business: That privately sponsored development is hung upon one problem or another and Government action is required; that additional types of nuclear systems should be tested in large-scale plants built by the Government; that national prestige demands a world-impressing demonstration which only the Government can put across; that we will lose world markets if we fail to display a massive accomplishment that provides experience for our manufacturers on a scale which only the Government can afford to back with dollars.

Now, the utilities have as much stake in America's world position in nuclear power as every other citizen—in a sense, much more, because the electric industry is contributing to it so heavily, and will continue to contribute. The industry has a right to be heard.

We must recognize, however, that the same powerplants which fit central station requirements in America are not necessarily the types of plants which meet foreign requirements. We must also recognize that the Government has a real concern that American industry be ready to offer systems which will meet needs in other parts of the world.

Furthermore, we acknowledge both the necessity and the propriety of Government stimulation and conduct of research and development which will bring nuclear power closer to the stage at which it can be worked into the economic structure in a manner which assures the whole Nation the fullest reward of its technological progress. It seems to me a primary job of the members of the PUAA to make clear that this can be done without putting AEC in the power business.

This is the challenge. It is more than a public relations challenge. It is a challenge to industrial statesmanship. The leadership of the industry must encompass requirements and considerations of the Nation far beyond the immediate, or even the long-range problems of the utilities industry.

The public relations challenge is equally broad. It is to make clear to the public the difference between the Government's definable and proper role as stimulator and regulator and the Government's pervasive and oblique role as purveyor of services.

We can realize the great promise of atomic energy without extending statism, without building more of that centralism in Government from which there is no recourse. But we cannot do it without full recognition and practice of the obligations of corporate citizens in a free society, nor without absolute integrity in our communication with the public which controls our destiny.

We can do it by taking the public into our confidence, by making sure that our customers, our employees, and our stockholders understand the real problems and the real issues, and that we continue to demonstrate for the whole public—making sure the public has at the same time an opportunity to understand and evaluate—the aggressive and unstinting pursuit by the electric companies of the objectives which we in the utilities business have helped the American people define.

Atomic energy, nuclear energy, nuclear power, whatever you want to call the harnessing of the energies which hold the nuclei of all matter together, has two edges to its peacetime application, edges no less sharp in their way but somewhat less visible than the oft-noted double edge of peace and war. In our peacetime exploitation of the new energy source, we can strengthen and improve the system of free enterprise, by the utility industry's contribution to it, or we can puncture and weaken that system, with the utilities at the point of the puncture.

The American people cannot be expected to make the distinction unless they have two things which are within our power to give them: First, ample evidence that the Nation's energy suppliers are aggressively doing their part to develop and apply a resource important to the Nation's future; and, second, ample information by which to distinguish between the advancement of atomic energy development on the one hand, and on the other, the expansion of government in the field of supplying energy to our people.

Stated another way, we have the job of seeing to it that the American people know and understand the job the utility industry is doing in the nuclear power field, that they appreciate the scope in dollars and manpower effort as well as the technical difficulties of the industry program, and finally that they are sufficiently well informed to demand a government program of clearly defined objectives to meet an intelligently established national requirement.

Here is the challenge in nuclear power. If we have any skill in the field of communication with the public, this is the time to apply it. Policy and purpose are defined in the Atomic Energy Act, for all programs and for all the people in the business, "to promote peace, improve the general welfare, increase the standard of living, and strengthen free competition in private enterprise."

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON CERTAIN UNPATENTED MINING CLAIMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed Calendar No. 2386, S. 3773, to provide for an extension of time during which annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims may be made, and for other purposes. On the same day the other body passed an identical bill, H. R. 10872. The Senate measure was sponsored by the distinguished and able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. However, since time is of the essence, and since the measure must be signed and become a law by July 1, if it is to accomplish its purpose, the Senator from South Dakota has graciously consented that the House bill should be the one to become law. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be laid before the Senate, House bill 10872 and that that measure be considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives, namely, House bill 10872, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10872) to provide for extension of the time during which annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims validated under section 2 of the act of August 11, 1955, may be made, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 3773 was passed yesterday, and that further consideration of the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN RADIO COMMUNICATIONS IN THE ANTARCTIC

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the June 11, 1956, issue of the Washington Star there appeared an intriguing article relative to the establishment of radio communications between the Antarctic team of the United States at Little America and the similar Russian expedition on the Knox Coast in the Antarctic. Both of these parties are carrying out scientific missions in Antarctica as a part of the important worldwide program for the International Geophysical Year. I feel that this article will be of great interest to Members of Congress and to other citizens for the following reasons:

First. It indicates clearly that our own mission at Little America has established cordial radio contact with the Russian IGY station on the Knox Coast and is exchanging information, especially relative to weather, thus developing a new basis of friendly contact with the Russians which may throw additional light on the numerous contacts in other fields of activity which are resulting from the changed policy of the Kremlin. This new chain of communications that is established and operating in the far off Antarctic on a mutually helpful basis between the representatives of our Nation and those of Russia affords one other instance of an apparently more cooperative attitude which has not heretofore existed on the part of Russia since World War II.

Second. I am of course pleased to note from this article that the young officer who is acting as translator for the Russian messages, Lt. (jg) Wesley H. Seay, United States Navy, is from Chipley in the State of Florida, a fact which I am sure will be of interest and pride to the people of our State.

Third. I feel that the principal effect of this article should be to create added and merited interest in "Operation Deepfreeze" which is a logical development from the long continued and vital services rendered by Adm. Richard E. Byrd, United States Navy, brother of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, through his difficult and dangerous explorations and expeditions in the Antarctic. I strongly feel that the present activities of "Operation Deepfreeze" cannot help but create greater understanding among our people of the importance of Antarctica to us and of our vital need to protect our interests there which have been created by the invaluable activities of Admiral Byrd and his associates.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Star may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES, SOVIET ANTARCTIC TEAMS GET REAL CHUMMY VIA RADIO

Americans and Russians are extending the mittened hand of friendship down in the Antarctic, where you can't have too many pals.

The latest newsletter published here by the rear echelon of Operation Deepfreeze included the following item:

"LITTLE AMERICA, May 26.—This base has established radio contact with the Russian IGY station on the Knox Coast.

"An exchange of information, especially weather, was requested by both parties. The message was received from the Russians, which also extended best wishes to Rear Admiral Byrd, Rear Admiral Dufek, and Commander Whitney, Little America base commander.

"Lt. (jg.) Wesley H. Seay, United States Navy, of Chipley, Fla., acted as translator for Russian messages, since he is able to converse in that language. Visits from American and Russian stations by representative groups have been suggested."

THE UNWARRANTED ATTACK ON THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Nation was shocked when it learned of the unwarranted attack on the Supreme Court and on the Chief Justice and other members of the Court.

I do not propose to discuss the political implications of the colloquy between my colleagues at this time and it certainly is not my purpose to drag the Chief Justice or the other members of the Court who have been charged with following the Communist Party line, into the field of partisan politics.

To disagree and to attack publicly the decisions of the Supreme Court is the prerogative of every American as well as of the Members of the Senate, but to besmirch their persons and to smear with communism the motives which

guided the members of the Court in making their decisions is, to me, unpardonable.

The Supreme Court needs no defense and to charge its present members with incompetency, irresponsibility and left-wingism is sheer idiocy and would not be worthy of comment were the practice not so dangerous and threatening to one of the branches of our Government.

The Chief Justice needs no defense. His life and record are known to every living American. In fact, most Americans love him and consider his appointment the foremost achievement of the Eisenhower administration.

I know him to be a kindly, unassuming and friendly person. He is an outstanding administrator, a competent, brilliant and humane jurist. The Chief Justice has served his country and his State with outstanding success.

To vilify Chief Justice Warren is gutter politics and is unworthy of those who perpetrated it. Had they paused to examine his record as district attorney for 18 years in Alameda, Calif., and as attorney general of his State, during which time he attacked the Communists when it was unpopular to do so, even these men would have been convinced that in him we have no follower of the party line. The State of California has not forgotten his prosecution of the brutal S. S. Lobos case against the violent opposition of Harry Bridges whose power on the west coast was, at that time, at its highest.

The brilliant record, the patriotism, the Americanism of our former colleague, Justice Hugo Black of Alabama, can be questioned by no one. I am proud to call him a friend and I decry attacks on his person.

It cannot be said that Justice Black is dependent upon northern votes or upon city votes. He has made a great Supreme Court Justice.

For this action I apologize to the Chief Justice and to his family and to the other members of the Court and their families who have been vilified.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "The Supreme Court Ends a Busy Term, Draws a Heavy Fire," published in a recent issue of Time magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUPREME COURT ENDS A BUSY TERM, DRAWS A HEAVY FIRE

"Our judges are not monks or scientists, but participants in the living stream of our national life, steering the law between the dangers of rigidity on the one hand and of formlessness on the other. Our system faces no theoretical dilemma but a single continuous problem: how to apply to ever-changing conditions the never-changing principles of freedom." (Chief Justice Earl Warren in Fortune (1955).)

Earl Warren has gained weight since he left California. His hair is whiter, softer and fluffier, and a benign fullness has smoothed from his face all the small pinches of arrogance that led California political rivals to dub him the Earl of Warren. He loves the Supreme Court, presides over its sessions, both public and private, with easy skill. The eight associate justices love Warren, and under his influence work together as rarely before. But by last week, when Warren and his colleagues put their robes in mothballs after one of the busiest terms in history, the United States Supreme Court was under its heaviest fire in a decade. The charges: that in steering the law between rigidity and formlessness, Chief Justice Earl Warren has plotted a deliberate course to the left, with far more emphasis on ever-changing conditions than on never-changing principles.

A NAGGING SENSE

Behind much of the criticism lies the resentment of southern lawyers and laymen over the desegregation decision and the rulings that implemented it. But all the concern is not southern; many thoughtful observers who are devoutly on the side of desegregation are nagged by a feeling that the decision, as written by Warren, smacked more of a sociological treatise than a legal document. They believe they see the same signs in other principal Supreme Court opinions of the last term. Items:

In tossing out the conviction of Pennsylvania Communist Leader Steve Nelson, the Supreme Court held that the Smith Act of 1940 preempted the antisedition laws passed by the States, and that that was the intent of Congress. But Virginia's Democratic Representative HOWARD SMITH, author of the Smith Act, said flatly that Congress had no intention of writing off the State sedition laws. The Smith Act comes under title 18 of the Criminal Code, which also provides that "nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof."

The Supreme Court ordered Brooklyn College to reinstate Prof. Harry Slochower, who had been a prickly, evasive, smart-aleck witness as he pleaded the fifth amendment before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. The Court ruling invalidated a New York City charter requirement for automatic dismissal of any city employee taking the fifth. Justice John Marshall Harlan, dissenting, wrote that the Court majority had "unduly circumscribed the power of the State to insure the qualifications of its teachers."

States righters were alarmed and angered by a Supreme Court decision holding that the Railway Labor Act overrode State right-to-work laws in the case of railroad employees.

A Supreme Court majority ruled that Wisconsin had a right to halt a prolonged, violence-ridden strike against the Kohler Co., a plumbing-equipment firm. But Warren, Black, and Douglas dissented vigorously. Arguing that the Wisconsin fair labor statute duplicated Federal law, Justice Douglas wrote that the overlapping of remedies was "pregnant with potentialities of clashes and conflicts" and that the Court majority was opening the door "to unseemly conflicts between State and Federal agencies."

A Supreme Court majority did hold that Cutter Laboratories of California had the just cause required by its union contract for firing a Communist woman employee. But Justice William Douglas, bitterly dissenting, argued in effect that the Communists are simply another political party and that an employee might just as well be dismissed for being a Republican. The dissent came despite the clear judgment of Congress, as expressed in specific legislation, that the Communists form a conspiracy, not a political party. And joining in the Douglas dissent were Justice Hugo Black and Chief Justice Warren.

Warren, 65, Douglas, 57, and Black, 70, are the Supreme Court's liberal leaders. On the opposite side in case after case are egg-bald Stanley Reed, 71, dour Sherman Minton, 65, and imperturbable Harold Burton, 67, the Court's conservatives. The swing men are Felix Frankfurter, 73, Tom Clark, 56, and John Marshall Harlan, 57. Frankfurter, the perky sparrow, brilliant but baffling, is still disliked by many conservatives who originally fought his appointment, and is now distrusted by many liberals who feel he has betrayed them. As a general rule, he would rather decide a case on statutory law or a legal technicality than on a basic constitutional issue. Tom Clark, still trying to live down his name as Harry Truman's most patent political appointee, tends (with some notable exceptions) to follow the lead of the Chief Justice, whether it be Fred Vinson or Vinson's successor, Earl Warren. Harlan, a lawyer's lawyer, has broader previous experience at the bar and the bench than any of his colleagues, but he is the Court's newest member and his way has not been clearly charted.

NINE DIFFERENT GUYS

Chief Justice Vinson, questioned about dissents in the Court, once exploded. "Look, these are nine guys, all with some reputation, ability, and confidence in themselves. If any Chief Justice can knock their heads together and get unanimity, he's better than I am." Earl Warren, by persuasion rather than head-knocking, won unanimity in all the desegregation decisions. And it is in testament to his skill and effectiveness as Chief Justice that his will and his liberal bent have come to dominate the Supreme Court over the last year.

Warren's unfailing warmth and graciousness have capitivated his colleagues. "The Chief," glows Justice Bill Douglas, "is magnificent." Hugo Black and Felix Frankfurter have used almost the same words. Says Harold Willey, who is retiring after almost 30 years as court clerk: "I've never seen the atmosphere so good as it is under Warren. He doesn't make the mistake of trying to compete with the old hands on the fine points of constitutional law. He doesn't have to be a scholar; he gets by on common sense and the ability to make people like him."

But Warren is more than a judicial glad-hander; he is a top administrator (he has changed schedules, e. g., by switching conference day from Saturday to Friday, so as to permit the Court to handle more work with less effort) with a remarkable memory and grasp of essential facts. One Federal judge says that Warren recently recalled "out of the blue" all the relevant details of the judge's 10-year-old report on whether there should be uniform procedure for admitting lawyers to practice in Federal courts. When presiding over the annual Judicial Conference (which handles administrative business for the Federal court system), Warren is a pleasant contrast to his predecessors.

Chief Justice Harlan Stone was peremptory, cutting off judges before they were able to make their points. Chief Justice Vinson was passive; he had no agenda and simply slumped down in his chair while garrulous judges wasted the time of the conference. Earl Warren is neither peremptory nor passive. When a judge begins to ramble, Warren is likely to break in with the graciously smiling remark: "Now, Judge, doesn't your argument come down to these four points?" He lists the points tersely and with unerring accuracy. The judge nods bemusedly, and Warren turns briskly to the next speaker.

TO STEER OR BE STEERED?

Such qualities are invaluable to Warren in the Supreme Court conference room, where the real work of the Court is done and where Warren has the key privileges of opening discussion on all cases and of assigning the writers of majority opinions (when he himself is in the majority). They are the qualities that have enabled Earl Warren to make such an imprint on the Supreme Court and all its work. And that imprint is the reason that critics, when blaming the Court for its 1956 record, point specifically to Earl Warren.

More than 70 bills now before the Congress are aimed at whittling down the power of

what their backers consider a runaway Court. Example: last week the Senate Judiciary Committee approved a bill to prevent the Supreme Court from interpreting any Federal law as overriding any State law unless the act of Congress "contains an express provision to that effect."

Most of the attacks on the Supreme Court are emotional instead of cerebral. Most of the seventy-odd congressional bills are bad ones, with little likelihood of passage in the foreseeable future. But the widespread reaction against the Court's use as a social instrument is a clear and present danger. It is the risk that Earl Warren assumes when he views his role as "steering the law" rather than being steered by it.

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR JUDICIARY COMMITTEE MEETING DURING TODAY'S SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, plans have been made for the Judiciary Committee to hold a meeting today to take action on a nomination. The members of the committee hoped they would be able to vote before 4:30 p. m.; and their meeting was scheduled before the unanimous-consent agreement regarding the mutual security bill was entered into. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee may meet today during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, when the Judiciary Committee set the time for its session this afternoon, we did not know about the unanimous-consent agreement which now has been entered into in regard to the mutual security bill. I am a member of the Judiciary Committee, and am very much interested in a nomination which is pending before it. Therefore, at this time I must object to the request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

MODIFICATION OF UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the effective time for the limitation of debate on the unfinished business be moved from 3 o'clock p. m. this afternoon to 3:30; and I further ask unanimous consent that during the next 30 minutes the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2388, H. R. 9893, the military construction authorization bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, am I to understand that not more than 30 minutes will be devoted to the consideration of H. R. 9893?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct. If more time is required, the bill simply will have to be laid aside.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will I still retain the floor?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Certainly. This action is taken, Mr. President, with the understanding that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] will have the floor immediately after the consideration of Calendar 2388, H. R. 9893, shall have been concluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair lays before the Senate Calendar No. 2388, H. R. 9893, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Technical Services Facilities

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.: Training and storage facilities, $147,000.

Jet Propulsion Laboratory (California Institute of Technology), California: Research and development facility, $143,000.

Pueblo Ordnance Depot, Colo.: Maintenance facility, $2,142,000.

Seneca Ordnance Depot, N. Y.: Utilities, $88,000.

Umatilla Ordnance Depot, Oreg.: Storage facilities, $258,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Ala.: Maintenance facilities, training facilities, family housing and utilities, $6,159,000.

White Sands Proving Grounds, N. Mex.: Utilities, $693,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Atlanta General Depot, Ga.: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $832,000.

Columbia Quartermaster Center, S. C.: Administrative facility, $98,000.

Fort Worth General Depot, Tex.: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, land acquisition, and utilities, $1,285,000.

New Cumberland General Depot, Pa.: Maintenance facilities, $631,000.

Sharpe General Depot, Calif.: Maintenance facilities, $655,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Army Chemical Center, Md.: Troop housing, community facility, and operational facility, $889,000.

Camp Detrick, Md.: Storage facilities and utilities, $913,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Research and development facilities and utilities, $867,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Ariz.: Troop housing, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, administrative facility, and utilities, $6,856,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Va.: Storage facility, training facility, operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research and development facilities, and utilities, $492,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Va.: Operational facility, maintenance facility, and utilities, $1,231,000.

(Medical Corps)

Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia: Research and development facility and community facility, $4,209,000.

Field Forces Facilities

(First Army area)

Fort Devens (Camp Wellfleet), Mass.: Land acquisition, $302,000.

Fort Dix, N. J.: Training facility, $54,000.

Oswego, N. Y.: Training facilities and land acquisition, $583,000.

Fort Totten, N. Y.: Troop housing, storage facilities, and utilities, $1,212,000.

(Second Army area)

Fort Knox, Ky.: Maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,698,000.

Fort George G. Meade, Md.: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facility, troop housing, and utilities, $5,885,000.

South Park Military Reservation, Pa.: Administrative facility, storage facilities, and utilities, $190,000.

(Third Army area)

Fort Benning, Ga.: Administrative facilities, maintenance facilities, communications facilities, and community facilities, $422,000.

Fort Bragg, N. C.: Administrative facilities, operational facility, and utilities, $645,000.

Charlotte Armed Forces Induction Station, N. C.: Administrative facility, $302,000.

Fort McClellan, Ala.: Troop housing, training facility, and community facility, $397,000.

Fort Rucker, Ala.: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, training facilities, storage facilities, administrative facilities, trailer site facilities, land acquisition, and utilities, $7,300,000.

(Fourth Army area)

Fort Bliss, Tex.: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $5,301,000.

Fort Hood, Tex.: Community facilities, maintenance facilities, and storage facilities, $2,457,000.

Fort Sill, Okla.: Training facilities, $4,173,000.

(Fifth Army area)

Fort Carson, Colo.: Storage facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, training facilities, and land acquisition, $3,253,000.

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.: Troop housing, $140,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kans.: Communications facilities and troop housing, $1,092,000.

Fort Riley, Kans.: Administrative facilities, community facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,519,000.

St. Louis Support Center, Mo.: Administrative facility, $3,346,000.

(Sixth Army area)

Fort Lewis, Wash.: Community facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, family housing, and utilities, $3,022,000.

Fort Ord, Calif.: Maintenance facility and community facility, $223,000.

United States Disciplinary Barracks, Calif.: Community facility, $197,000.

Yuma Test Station, Ariz.: Troop housing, research and development facility, and storage facility, $1,520,000.

(Military District of Washington)

Fort McNair, D. C.: Academic facilities, $4,111,000.

(Armed Forces Special Weapons Project)

Various installations: Utilities, $478,000.

(Tactical Site Support Facilities)

Various locations: Administrative facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, and land acquisition, $8,506,000.

Outside the United States

(Alaskan area)

Ladd Air Force Base: Troop housing and maintenance facilities, $1,688,000.

Fort Richardson: Storage facilities, $2,333,000.

Whittier: Storage facilities and training facilities, $2,849,000.

Wildwood Station (Kenai): Storage facility, $352,000.

(Far East Command Area)

Okinawa: Storage facilities, operational facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $540,000.

Korea: Maintenance facilities, storage facilities, port facilities, community facilities, improvements to buildings and utilities, $6,000,000.

(Pacific Command Area)

Alimanu Military Reservation, Hawaii: Land acquisition, $143,000.

Helemano, Hawaii: Community facility, land acquisition and utilities, $136,000.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Family housing and land acquisition, $2,663,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Panama Canal Zone: Sewage disposal system for Army, Navy, and Air Force facilities, $1,060,000.

(United States Army, Europe)

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, storage facilities, training facilities, administrative facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $17,994,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in a total amount of $200,783,000.

SEC. 103. (a) Public Law 161, 84th Congress is amended with respect to Fort Jay, N. Y., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheadings "Field Forces Facilities (First Army Area)" in section 101, by striking out "$731,000" and inserting in place thereof "$1,081,000", and in clause (1) of section 502, by striking out "$224,927,000" and "$533,904,000" and inserting in place thereof "$225,277,000" and "$534,254,000", respectively.

(b) So much of section 401 of Public Law 534, 83d Congress, as reads "Adak Station, Alaska: Operational Facilities (including troop housing), $70,000" is amended to read "Adak Station, Alaska: Operational facilities (including troop housing), $180,000" and clause (4) of section 502 thereof is amended by striking the figure "$462,600" and inserting in place thereof "$572,600".

SEC. 104. The Secretary of the Army shall make all necessary studies, by contract or otherwise, to determine an appropriate site for the relocation of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Tex.; such studies to be completed by January 31, 1957. Expenditures of $25,000 out of appropriations available to the Department of the Army is authorized for such studies.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Shipyard Facilities

Naval shipyard, Boston, Mass.: Replacement of pier, and plans and specifications for drydock facilities, $7,332.

Naval shipyard, Charleston, S. C.: Dredging equipment, $148,000.

Naval minecraft base, Charleston, S. C.: Operational facilities, personnel facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, community facilities, security facilities, and utilities, $7,902,000.

Naval shipyard, Long Beach, Calif.: Facilities for remedying effects of ground subsidence and waterfront facilities, $5,984,000.

Navy underwater sound laboratory, New London, Conn.: Research and development facilities and land acquisition, $304,000.

Harbor defense base, Norfolk, Va.: Personnel facilities, $300,000.

Naval shipyard, Norfolk, Va.: Utilities and land acquisition, $244,000.

Navy mine defense laboratory, Panama City, Fla.: Medical facilities, $84,000.

Naval shipyard, San Francisco, Calif.: Plans and specifications for drydock facilities, $1,300,000.

Naval industrial reserve shipyard, Tampa, Fla.: Land acquisition, $200,000.

Fleet Base Facilities

Naval station, Key West, Fla.: Utilities, $927,000.

Naval station, Long Beach, Calif.: Waterfront facilities, $2,256,000.

Naval station, New Orleans, La.: Utilities, $226,000.

Naval station, Newport, R. I.: Waterfront facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities and utilities, $11,672,000.

Naval station, Norfolk, Va.: Personnel facilities, $2,844,000.

Naval station, Orange, Tex.: Flood-protection facilities, including land acquisition, $265,000.

Aviation Facilities

(Naval air training stations)

Naval auxiliary landing field, Alice-Orange Grove, Tex.: Airfield pavements, $2,242,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Chase Field, Tex.: Personnel facilities, operational facilities, community facilities, station and aircraft maintenance facilities, and utilities, $2,247,000.

Naval air station, Glynco, Ga.: Airfield pavements, personnel facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, fuel pipeline and storage facilities, and land acquisition, $4,003,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Kingsville, Tex.: Personnel facilities, training facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $2,610,000.

Naval air station, Memphis, Tenn.: Fuel storage facilities and aircraft maintenance facilities, $511,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Meridian, Miss.: Site preparation, utilities, plans and specifications for jet aircraft training facilities, and land acquisition, $8,231,000.

Naval air station, Pensacola, Fla.: Community facilities and plans and specifications for waterfront facilities, $347,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Whiting Field, Fla.: Land acquisition, $13,000.

(Fleet support air stations)

Naval air station, Alameda, Calif.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, $2,675,000.

Naval air station, Atlantic City, N. J.: Navigational aids and land acquisition, $421,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Brown Field, Calif.: Personnel facilities and utilities, $778,000.

Naval air station, Brunswick, Maine: Personnel facilities, airfield pavements, station maintenance facilities, community facilities, and storage facilities, $3,738,000.

Naval air station, Cecil Field, Fla.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, personnel facilities, storage facilities, operational facilities, training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $4,052,000.

Naval air station, Chincoteague, Va.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, $170,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Edenton, N. C.: Aircraft and station maintenance facilities, airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, administrative facilities, personnel facilities, communications facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $13,926,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, El Centro, Calif.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, and land acquisition including not to exceed $600,000 to be paid to Imperial County, Calif., to partially defray the county's cost in relocating the Niland-Blythe Road, $831,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Fallon, Nev.: Training facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, $3,304,000.

Naval air facility, Harvey Point, N. C.: Airfield pavements, waterfront facilities, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, navigational aids, aircraft and station maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $6 million.

Naval air station, Jacksonville, Fla.: Navigational aids, operational facilities, and land acquisition, $2,380,000.

Naval air station, Key West, Fla.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, $170,000.

Naval air station, Lemoore, Calif.: Plans and specifications for development of master jet aircraft facilities, and land acquisition, $10,089,000.

Naval air station, Miramar, Calif.: Personnel facilities, operational facilities, training facilities, ordnance facilities, land acquisition, and obstruction removal for flight clearance, $8,835,000.

Naval air station, Moffett Field, Calif.: Land acquisition, $89,000.

Naval air station, Norfolk, Va.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, $170,000.

Naval air station, North Island, San Diego, Calif.: Airfield pavements, ordnance and ammunition storage facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, waterfront facilities, operational facilities, navigational aids, and land acquisition, $13,072,000.

Naval air station, Oceana, Va.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, personnel facilities, operational facilities, community facilities, training facilities, ordnance facilities, open storage facilities, security facilities, utilities, and relocaton of Coast Guard facilities, $5,286,000.

Naval air station, Quonset Point, R. I.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, and navigational aids, $2,753,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Sanford, Fla.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, airfield pavements, personnel facilities, and utilities, $6,926,000.

Naval air station: Whidbey Island, Wash.: Utilities, $149,000.

(Marine Corps air stations)

Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort, S. C.: Aircraft and station maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, medical facilities, personnel facilities, training facilities, operational facilities, covered and cold storage facilities, community facilities, fuel dispensing facilities, and utilities, $17,384,000.

Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point, N. C.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, $170,000.

Marine Corps air station, El Toro, Calif.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, airfield pavements, storage facilities, ammunition storage facilities, medical facilities, training facilities, personnel facilities, operational facilities, and utilities, $6,863,000.

Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Mojave, Calif.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, airfield pavements, personnel facilities,

training facilities, community facilities, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, land acquisition, and utilities, $12,556,000.

(Special purpose air stations)

Naval air development center, Johnsville, Pa.: Plans and specifications for research and development facilities, $693,000.

Naval air station, Lakehurst, N. J.: Research and development facilities and equipment maintenance facilities, $6,438,000.

Naval air station, Patuxent River, Md.: Aircraft maintenance facilities and research and development facilities, $475,000.

Naval air missile test center, Point Mugu, Calif.: Waterfront facilities, fuel dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,682,000.

Naval air turbine test station, Trenton, N. J.: Research and development facilities, $128,000.

Supply Facilities

Naval supply depot, Clearfield, Utah: Utilities, $149,000.

Naval supply depot, Newport, R. I.: Storage facilities, $390,000.

Naval supply center, Oakland, Calif.: Utilities, $50,000.

Naval supply depot, Seattle, Wash.: Replacement of seawall, $199,000.

Marine Corps Facilities

Marine Corps supply center, Albany, Ga.: Storage facilities, personnel facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,742,000.

Marine Corps supply center, Barstow, Calif.: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, $3,436,000.

Marine Corps base, Camp Lejeune, N. C.: Personnel facilities, administrative facilities, training facilities, community facilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, and utilities, $5,092,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S. C.: Personnel facilities, administrative facilities, storage facilities, training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $4,266,000.

Marine Corps base, Camp Pendleton, Calif.: Utilities, boat basin facilities, and land acquisition, $3,429,000.

Marine Corps cold weather battalion, Bridgeport, Calif.: Utilities, $294,000.

Marine Corps training center, Twentynine Palms, Calif.: Community facilities and land acquisition, $1,165,000.

Marine Corps supply forwarding annex, Portsmouth, Va.: Security facilities, $91,000.

Marine Corps schools, Quantico, Va.: Training facilities, ammunition storage and ordnance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $2,178,000.

Marine Corps recruit depot, San Diego, Calif.: Personnel facilities and community facilities, $1,679,000.

Ordnance Facilities

Naval ammunition depot, Bangor, Wash.: Ordnance facilities, $1,100,000.

Naval ammunition depot, Charleston, S. C.: Ordnance facilities, $404,000.

Naval ordnance test station, China Lake, Calif.: Research and development facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, airfield pavements and fuel storage and dispensing facilities, $6,028,000.

Naval ammunition depot, Earle, N. J.: Ordnance facilities, $600,000.

Naval ammunition depot, Fallbrook, Calif.: Ammunition storage and ordnance facilities, $1,584,000.

Naval ammunition depot, Hingham, Mass.: Ammunition storage and ordnance facilities, $993,000.

Naval ammunition and net depot, Seal Beach, Calif.: Ordnance facilities, $2,176,000.

Naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va.: Ammunition storage and ordnance facilities and utilities, $3,480,000.

Service School Facilities

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.: Earthwork and land acquisition, $7,469,000.

Naval training center, Bainbridge, Md.: Personnel facilities, training facilities, and utilities, $6,569,000.

Naval receiving station, Brooklyn, N. Y.: Personnel facilities, $97,000.

Naval amphibious base, Coronado, Calif.: Training facilities, personnel facilities, and utilities, $5,660,000.

Fleet air defense training center, Dam Neck, Va.: Personnel facilities, $237,000.

Naval training center, Great Lakes, Ill.: Personnel facilities and training facilities, $8,413,000.

Medical Facilities

Naval hospital, Great Lakes, Ill.: Medical facilities, $12,730,000.

Naval hospital, Portsmouth, N. H.: Hospital elevator, $57,000.

Communications Facilities

Naval radio station, Cheltenham, Md.: Communications facilities, personnel facilities, and utilities, $2,489,000.

Naval radio station, Maine: Utilities and land acquisition, $2,450,000.

Naval communication station, San Francisco, Calif.: Communications facilities and personnel facilities, $2,029,000.

Naval communication station, Seattle, Wash.: Communications facilities, $45,000.

Naval radio station, Winter Harbor, Maine: Communications facilities, $83,000.

Office of Naval Research Facilities

Naval research laboratory, District of Columbia: Plans and specifications for research and development facilities, $1,300,000.

Yards and Docks Facilities

Public works center, Norfolk, Va.: Utilities and land acquisition, $443,000.

Naval construction battalion center, Port Hueneme, Calif.: Replacement of wharf and storage facilities, $2,581,000.

Outside the United States

Shipyard Facilities

Naval ship repair facility, Subic Bay, Philippine Islands: Waterfront facilities, $1,637,000.

Naval base, Subic Bay, Philippine Islands: Utilities at Olongapo, flood control and drainage facilities and community facilities, $9,378,000.

Fleet Base Facilities

Naval station, Adak, Alaska: Operational facilities, and laundry and dry-cleaning facilities, $2,351,000.

Naval station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, $680,000.

Aviation Facilities

Naval air station, Atsugi, Japan: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, fuel storage facilities, personnel facilities, and utilities, $1,961,000.

Naval air station, Barber's Point, Oahu, T. H.: Personnel facilities and aircraft maintenance facilities, $870,000.

Naval air station, Cubi Point, Philippine Islands: Personnel facilities, $1,264,000.

Naval air station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Aircraft maintenance facilities, personnel facilities, communications facilities, family housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,572,000.

Naval air station, Iwakuni, Japan: Aircraft maintenance facilities, airfield pavements, dredging, navigational aids, and fuel-storage facilities, $1,704,000.

Marine Corps air station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, T. H.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, airfield pavements, and operational facilities, $1,045,000.

Naval air facility, Port Lyautey, French Morocco: Aircraft maintenance facilities, and family housing, $1,401,000.

Naval station, Roosevelt Roads, P. R.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, airfield pavements, fuel-storage facilities, ordnance facilities, personnel facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $4,470,000.

Naval aid station, Sangley Point, Philippine Islands: Airfield pavements, breakwater, and personnel facilities, $3,811,000.

Supply Facilities

Naval station, Adak, Alaska: Replacement of fuel-storage facilities, $5 million.

Naval station, Argentia, Newfoundland: Fuel storage facilities, $1,599,000.

Naval supply depot, Subic Bay, Philippine Islands: Covered and cold storage facilities, administrative facilities, operational facilities, maintenance facilities, waterfront facilities, and utilities, $11,598,000.

Ordnance Facilities

Naval ammunition depot, Oahu, T. H.: Ordnance facilities, $971,000.

Naval ordnance facility, Port Lyautey, French Morocco: Ordnance facilities, $245,000.

Naval ordnance facility, Yokosuka, Japan: Ordnance facilities, $241,000.

Communications Facilities

Naval communication unit, Futema, Okinawa: Communications facilities, $75,000.

Naval communication station, Guam, Mariana Islands: Communication facilities, $222,000.

Naval communication facility, Philippine Islands: Communications facilities, and land acquisition, $4,320,000.

Yards and Docks Facilities

Fifteenth naval district, Canal Zone: Utilities, $2,210,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to obtain by contract, such engineering, location, and site planning studies as may be necessary to enable him to determine the feasibility and advisability of establishing, continuing, or relocating the following facilities: Naval air station, Norfolk, Va. (bombing targets); Naval air facility, John H. Towers Field, Annapolis, Md.; Naval magazine, Port Chicago, Calif. Expenditures not to exceed $200,000 for such studies may be made out of the appropriation "Military Construction, Navy." The Secretary of the Navy shall report to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives the conclusions of these studies together with such recommendations as he shall consider appropriate.

SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment, and family housing in the total amount of $84,043,000.

SEC. 204. Public Law 564, 81st Congress is amended as follows:

(a) In title II under the heading "Continental United States", change the amount for "Naval base, Newport, R. I.: Sewage facilities", from "$1,243,000" to "$1,268,000."

(b) In title IV section 402, clause (2) change the amount for public works authorized by title IV: "Inside continental United States", from "$135,719,800" to "$135,744,800."

SEC. 205. Public Law 155, 82d Congress, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 201, as amended, strike out so much thereof under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Supply facilities" as reads as follows:

"Harpswell Neck Fuel Facility, Portland, Maine, area: Aviation gasoline and jet fuel

bulk storage; $2,766,500"; and insert in place thereof the following:

"Harpswell Neck Fuel Facility, Portland, Maine, area: Aviation gasoline and jet fuel bulk storage and land acquisition, $2,766,500."

(b) In section 201, under the heading "Outside Continental United States" and subheading "Communication facilities", strike out so much thereof as reads as follows:

"Naval communication station, Philippine Islands: Consolidated communication facilities; $2,694,500"; and insert in place thereof the following:

"Naval communication station, Philippine Islands: Consolidated communication facilities, and land acquisition, $2,694,500."

SEC. 206. Public Law 534, 83d Congress, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 201, under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Aviation facilities," change the amount for Naval air missile test center (San Nicolas Island), Point Mugu, Calif.," from "$1,132,000" to "$1,816,000".

(b) In section 201, under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Ordnance facilities," change the amount for "Naval ammunition depot, Hawthorne, Nev.," from "$308,000" to "$538,000".

(c) In section 502, clause (2), change the amount for public works authorized by this title II for inside continental United States from "$102,042,000" to "$102,956,000"; and total amount from "$201,893,000" to "$202,807,000".

SEC. 207. Public Law 161, 84th Congress, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 201, under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Shipyard facilities," change the amount for "Naval electronics laboratory, San Diego, Calif.," from "$143,000" to "$162,000".

(b) In section 201, under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Fleet base facilities," delete that portion which reads as follows: "Navy Department, District of Columbia: family housing, $81,000".

(c) In section 201, under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Aviation facilities," change the amount for "Naval auxiliary air stations, El Centro, Calif," from "$366,000" to "$450,000"; strike out so much thereof as reads as follows:

"Naval air station, Norfolk, Va.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, communication facilities, operational facilities, $4,660,000"; and insert in place thereof the following:

"Naval air station, Norfolk, Va.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, communication facilities, operational facilities, and land acquisition, $4,660,000".

(d) In section 201 under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Ordnance facilities," delete that portion which reads as follows: "Naval proving ground, Dahlgren, Va.: Land acquisition, $200,000".

(e) In section 201, under the heading "Outside Continental United States" and subheading "Ordnance facilities," strike out so much thereof as reads as follows:

"Naval ammunition depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Testing facilities, and railroad facilities and barricades, $1,132,000"; and insert in place thereof the following:

"Naval ammunition depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Testing facilities, railroad facilities and barricades, and land acquisition, $1,132,000".

(f) In section 502, clause (2), change the amount for public works authorized by title II for inside continental United States from "$299,690,600" to "$299,409,600"; and the total amount from "$564,224,300" to "$563,943,300".

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Air Defense Command

Buckingham Air Force Base, Fort Myers, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, $629,000.

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minn.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, $863,000.

Ent Air Force Base, Colorado Springs, Colo.: Housing and community facilities, $342,000.

Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vt.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, $4,211,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and housing and community facilities, and family housing, $2,827,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Mont.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and group improvements, land acquisition, and family housing, $2,470,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, N. Dak.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $18,969,000.

Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Mo.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $1,673,000.

Greater Pittsburgh Airport, Coraopolis, Pa.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $1,087,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $2,966,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $5,051,000.

Kalkaska Air Force Base, Kalkaska, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $2,906,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $2,156,000.

Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Oreg.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $1,130,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, $1,514,000.

McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tenn.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $2,054,000.

Majors Field, Greenville, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, $440,000.

Minneapolis-Saint Paul International Airport, Minneapolis, Minn.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $3,015,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, N. Dak.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $21,215,000.

Newcastle County Airport, Wilmington, Del.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $6,184,000.

Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, N. Y.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $3,030,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and family housing, $11,577,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $2,392,000.

Paine Air Force Base, Everett, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, $4,127,000.

Greater Portland, Oreg., area: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $13,508,000.

Presque Isle Air Force Base, Presque Isle, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $8,057,000.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wis.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities and utilities and ground improvements, $6,801,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, $2,494,000.

Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $2,288,000.

Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, N. Y.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $1,802,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, N. Y.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $5,441,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wis.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $4,876,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and family housing, $3,278,000.

Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $2,255,000.

Yuma County Airport, Yuma, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, housing

and community facilities, and land acquisition, $3,545,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acquisition, $21,510,000.

Air Materiel Command

Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Ala.: Housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $1,541,000.

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $17,966,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $1,339,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $1,570,000.

Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pa.: Supply facilities, $52,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif.: Administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $1,424,000.

Mukilteo Fuel Storage Station, Mukilteo, Wash.: Land acquisition, $4,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, and housing and community facilities, $1,572,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pa.: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,983,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $5,478,000.

Searsport Fuel Storage Station, Searsport, Maine: Supply facilities, $473,000.

Tacoma Fuel Storage Station, Tacoma, Wash.: Supply facilities, $129,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, hospital facilities, and housing and community facilities, $5,990,000.

Wilkins Air Force Station, Shelby, Ohio: Family housing, $89,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $17,138,000.

Various locations: Administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities, and ground improvements, $444,000.

Air Proving Ground Command

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, hospital and medical facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $21,094,000.

Air Training Command

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $17,121,000.

Bryan Air Force Base, Bryan, Tex.: Housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $1,288,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Ala.: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, $18,000.

Edward Gary Air Force Base, San Marcos, Tex.: Maintenance facilities, $783,000.

Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Tex.: Land acquisition, $63,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyo.: Housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $1,654,000.

Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $8,804,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, $4,687,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Miss.: Land acquisition, $34,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Hospital and medical facilities, $3,440,000.

Laredo Air Force Base, Laredo, Tex.: Utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $225,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and housing and community facilities, $212,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colo.: Land acquisition, $410,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, $2,902,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $21,650,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kans.: Land acquisition, $396,000.

Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,848,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nev.: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, $3,456,000.

Parks Air Force Base, Pleasanton, Calif.: Utilities and ground improvements, $111,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, $2,260,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Land acquisition, $133,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, $4,164,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Ill.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, $3,296,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $24,433,000.

Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nev.: Supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $2,221,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $716,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, $977,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, $90,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, $6,347,000.

Air University

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Ala.: Operational and training facilities, and housing and community facilities, $215,000.

Continental Air Command

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $13,395,000.

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $237,000.

Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Ga.: Housing and community facilities, $345,000.

Mitchel Air Force Base, Hempstead, N. Y.: Utilities and ground improvements, $205,000.

Headquarters Command

Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.: Utilities and ground improvements, $8,000.

Military Air Transport Command

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Md.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $7,335,000.

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, S. C.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $868,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,195,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, N. J.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, and housing and community facilities, $2,169,000.

Palm Beach Air Force Base, Palm Beach, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $1,545,000.

Vint Hill Farm Station, Warrenton, Va.: Operational and training facilities, $768,000.

Washington National Airport, District of Columbia: Maintenance facility, $275,000.

Research and Development Command

Canel Air Force Plant No. 62, Hartford, Conn.: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $22,445,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, Calif.: Research, development, and test facilities, and housing and community facilities, $5,488,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogorda, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and housing and community facilities, $7,877,000.

Indian Springs Air Force Base, Indian Springs, Nev.: Housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, and family housing, $961,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $5,481,000.

Laredo Test Site, Laredo, Tex.: Research, development, and test facilities, and land acquisition, $1,219,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $6,939,000.

National Reactor Test Station, Idaho Falls, Idaho: Operational and training facilities, research, development and test facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $11,415,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, research, development and test facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $15,169,000.

Sacramento Peak Observatory, Sacramento Peak, N. Mex.: Family housing, $153,000.

Strategic Air Command

Abilene Air Force Base, Abilene, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $1,043,000.

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Okla.: Housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $1,003,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, La.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities,

housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $2,117,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisitions, $15,938,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and housing and community facilities, $922,000.

Campbell Air Force Base, Hopkinsville, Ky.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $479,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $2,438,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital and medical facilities, and housing and community facilities, $2,179,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $7,004,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Miss.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $14,518,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, $503,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $7,665,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquision, $943,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $4,457,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, and housing and community facilities, $1,271,000.

Gray Air Force Base, Killeen, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, $23,000.

Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Miss.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, $2,483,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, hospital and medical facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $1,694,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $1,131,000.

Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, La.: Operational and training facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $1,552,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebr.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $4,685,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Ark.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $1,528,000.

Lockbourn Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $4,952,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and housing and community facilities, $2,522,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and housing and community facilities, $3,262,000.

Malstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and housing and community facilities, $1,236,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $5,156,000.

Mitchell Air Force Base, Mitchell, S. Dak.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $6,374,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $2,064,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and family housing, $5,697,000.

Pinecastle Air Force Base, Orlando, Fla.: Housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $786,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, N. Y.: Housing and community facilities, $1,491,000.

Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, N. H.: Operational and training facilities, and housing and community facilities, $661,000.

Smoky Hill Air Force Base, Salina, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $3,882,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $923,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $781,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and housing and community facilities, $2,791,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $9,315,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Mo.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $815,000.

Tactical air command

Ardmore Air Force Base, Ardmore, Okla.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, $330,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Ark.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $933,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Ind.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and removal of hazard, $2,169,000.

Clovis Air Force Base, Clovis, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and relocation of structure, $4,505,000.

Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, S. C.: Operational and training facilities, $2,428,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, La.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and housing and community facilities, $2,919,000.

Foster Air Force Base, Victoria, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $952,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and housing and community facilities, $3,144,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Va.: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, $2,613,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $1,111,000.

Myrtle Beach Municipal Airport, Myrtle Beach, S. C.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital and medical facilities, and housing and community facilities, $1,665,000.

Pope Air Force Base, Fort Bragg, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, $1,106,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tenn.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $1,583,000.

Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, N. C.: Operation and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, and housing and community facilities, $6,637,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, S. C.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and housing and community facilities, $3,805,000.

Wendover Air Force Base, Wendover, Utah: Operational and training facilities, $67,000.

Special Facilities

Various locations: Research, development and test facilities, administrative facilities, and land acquisition, $1,240,000.

Aircraft Control and Warning System

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and family housing, $80,942,000.

Outside the United States

Alaskan Air Command

Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and family housing, $14,984,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $5,444,000.

Galena Airfield: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, $1,772,000.

King Salmon Airport: Operational and training facilities, $289,000.

Ladd Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $7,055,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, $6,628,000.

Far East Air Forces

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, $991,000.

Johnston Island Air Force Base, Johnston Island: Operational and training facilities, and housing and community facilities, $724,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisitions, and family housing, $25,969,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply

facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $55,859,000.

Northeast Air Command

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and family housing, $75,650,000.

Strategic Air Command

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and family housing, $23,980,000.

Harmon Air Force Base, Guam: Land acquisition, $14,000.

Northwest Air Force Base, Guam: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $229,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, $1,213,000.

United States Air Force in Europe

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and erection of prefabricated structures, $114,260,000.

Aircraft Control and Warning System

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $70,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop: (a) Classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in the total amount of $163 million.

(b) Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $50 million: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this subsection, including those real-estate actions pertaining thereto.

SEC. 303. Section 1 of the act of March 30, 1949 (ch. 41, 50 U. S. C. 491), is amended by the addition of the following:

"The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to procure communication services required for the semiautomatic ground environment system. No contract for such services may be for a period of more than 10 years from the date communication services are first furnished under such contract. The aggregate contingent liability of the Government under the termination provisions of all contracts authorized hereunder may not exceed a total of $222 million and no termination payment shall be final until audited and approved by the General Accounting Office which shall have access to such carrier records and accounts as it may deem necessary for the purpose. In procuring such services, the Secretary of the Air Force shall utilize to the fullest extent the facilities and capabilities of communication common carriers, including rural telephone cooperatives, within their respective service areas and for power supply, shall utilize to the fullest extent the facilities and capabilities of public utilities and rural electric cooperatives within their respective service areas. Negotiations with communication common carriers, including cooperatives, and representation in proceedings involving such carriers before Federal and State regulatory bodies where such negotiations or proceedings involve contracts authorized by this paragraph shall be in accordance with the provisions of section 201 of the act of June 30, 1949, as amended (40 U. S. C. A. sec. 481)."

SEC. 304. (a) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, is amended, under the heading "Continental United States" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "Air Defense Command"—

(1) With respect to Buckingham Weapons Center, Fort Myers, Fla., strike out "$11,577,000" and insert in place thereof "$15,462,000."

(2) With respect to Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minn., strike out "$1,200,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,623,000."

(3) With respect to Grand Forks site, North Dakota, strike out "$5,822,000" and insert in place thereof "$7,709,000."

(4) With respect to Greater Milwaukee area, Wisconsin, airbase to be known as "Richard Bong Air Force Base," strike out "$16,608,000" and insert in place thereof "$23,859,000."

(5) With respect to Greater Pittsburgh Airport, Coraopolis, Pa., strike out "$404,000" and insert in place thereof "$525,000."

(6) With respect to Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, Calif., strike out "$1,501,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,229,000."

(7) With respect to Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Oreg., strike out "$2,042,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,656,000."

(8) With respect to McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tenn., strike out "$582,000" and insert in place thereof "$817,000."

(9) With respect to Minot site, North Dakota, strike out "$5,339,000" and insert in place thereof "$6,603,000."

(10) With respect to Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, N. Y., strike out "$1,748,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,575,000."

(11) With respect to Paine Air Force Base, Everett, Wash., strike out "$1,039,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,199,000."

Under the subheading "Air Materiel Command"—With respect to Searsport Air Force Tank Farm, Searsport, Maine, strike out "$133,000" and insert in place thereof "$329,000."

Under the subheading "Air Training Command"—

(1) With respect to Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Tex., strike out "$2,816,000" and insert in place thereof "$3,438,000."

(2) With respect to Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Miss., strike out "$349,000" and insert in place thereof "$500,000."

(3) With respect to Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Ariz., strike out "$1,557,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,923,000."

(4) With respect to Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nev., strike out "$1,153,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,837,000."

(5) With respect to Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Tex., strike out "$956,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,210,000."

(6) With respect to Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex., strike out "$549,000" and insert in place thereof "$730,000."

(7) With respect to Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Ill., strike out "$1,247,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,862,000."

(8) With respect to Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Fla., strike out "$478,000" and insert in place thereof "$534,000."

(9) With respect to Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Okla., strike out "$871,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,181,000."

(10) With respect to Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Ariz., strike out "$1,045,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,215,000."

(11) With respect to Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyo., strike out "$1,403,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,746,000."

Under the subheading "Air University"—With respect to Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Ala., strike out "$2,661,000" and insert in place thereof "$3,031,000."

Under the subheading "Continental Air Command"—

(1) With respect to Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex., strike out "$590,000" and insert in place thereof "$697,000."

(2) With respect to Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Ga., strike out "$758,000" and insert in place thereof "$859,000."

Under the subheading "Military Air Transport Service"—With respect to Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, S. C., strike out "$4,032,000" and insert in place thereof "$5,306,000."

Under the subheading "Research and Development Command"—

(1) With respect to Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, Calif., strike out "$12,429,000" and insert in place thereof "$13,299,000."

(2) With respect to Hartford Research Facility, Hartford, Conn., strike out "$22,375,000" and insert in place thereof "$25,780,000."

(3) With respect to Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, N. Mex., strike out "$4,965,000" and insert in place thereof "$5,637,000."

Under the subheading "Strategic Air Command"—

(1) With respect to Abilene Air Force Base, Abilene, Tex., strike out "$4,214,000" and insert in place thereof "$4,656,000."

(2) With respect to Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak., strike out "$12,380,000" and insert in place thereof "$15,186,000."

(3) With respect to Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kans., strike out "$4,753,000" and insert in place thereof "$5,885,000."

(4) With respect to Great Falls Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont., strike out "$5,435,000" and insert in place thereof "$6,713,000."

(5) With respect to Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Ga., strike out "$4,115,000" and insert in place thereof "$4,951,000."

(6) With respect to Pinecastle Air Force Base, Orlando, Fla., strike out "$4,118,000" and insert in place thereof "$5,599,000."

Under the subheading "Tactical Air Command"—With respect to Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Wash., strike out "$3,574,000" and insert in place thereof "$4,724,000."

Under the subheading "Aircraft control and warning system"—With respect to "Various locations" strike out "$100,382,000" and insert in place thereof "$120,382,000."

(b) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, is amended under the heading "Outside Continental United States" in section 301, as follows:

(1) With respect to Kenai Airfield under the subheading "Alaskan Air Command" strike out "$356,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,247,000."

(c) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$743,989,000", "$530,563,000" and "$1,279,902,000" and inserting in place thereof "$801,256,000", "$532,454,000" and "$1,339,060,000", respectively.

(d) Public Law 534, 83d Congress, is amended, under the heading "Continental

United States" in section 301, as follows: Under the subheading "Air Defense Command" with respect to Klamath Falls Airport, Klamath Falls, Oreg., strike out "$4,133.000" and insert in place thereof "$5,077,000."

(e) Public Law 534, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$405,176,000" and "$415,005,000" and inserting in place thereof "$406,120,000" and "$415,949,000," respectively.

TITLE IV

General provisions

SEC. 401. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this act without regard to sections 1136, 3648, and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to provide family housing includes authority to acquire such land as the Secretary concerned determines, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to be necessary in connection with that housing. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, and III shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $86,916,000; outside the United States, $35,763,000; section 102, $200,783,000; or a total of $323,462,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $292,572,000; outside the United States, $61,625,000; section 203, $84,043,000, or a total of $438,240,000; and

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $726,848,000; outside the United States, $405,061,000; section 302 (a), $163,000,000; section 302 (b), $50,000,000 or a total of $1,344,909,000.

SEC. 403. Any of the amounts named in title I, II, or III of this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 percent for projects inside the United States and by 10 percent for projects outside the United States. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 404. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 4 (c) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (41 U. S. C. 153 (c)) for contracts made under this act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods for adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 405. Contracts made by the United States under this act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (41 U. S. C. 153 et seq.).

SEC. 406. The Secretaries of the military departments may acquire land, and interests in land, not exceeding $5,000 in cost (exclusive of administrative costs and deficiency judgment awards), which the Secretary concerned determines to be urgently required in the interests of national defense. The authority under this section may not, however, be used to acquire more than one parcel of land unless the parcels are noncontiguous or, if contiguous, do not exceed $5,000 in total cost.

SEC. 407. The Secretaries of the military departments may, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense and following notification of the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, acquire, construct, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, to restore or replace facilities damaged or destroyed.

SEC. 408. (a) Under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments may expend out of appropriations available for military construction such amounts as may be required for the establishment and development of military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing (except family quarters), converting, extending, or installing permanent or temporary public works determined to be urgently required, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for projects not otherwise authorized by law when the cost of the project is not in excess of $200,000, subject to the following limitations:

(1) No such project, the cost of which is in excess of $50,000, shall be authorized unless approved in advance by the Secretary of Defense.

(2) No such project, the cost of which is in excess of $25,000 shall be authorized unless approved in advance by the Secretary of the military department concerned.

(3) Not more than one allotment may be made for any project authorized under this section.

(4) The cost of conversion of existing structures to family quarters may not exceed $50,000 in any fiscal year at any single facility.

(b) The Secretaries of the military departments may expend out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation amounts necessary to accomplish a project which, except for the fact that its cost does not exceed $25,000, would otherwise be authorized to be accomplished under subsection (a).

(c) The Secretary of each department shall report in detail semiannually to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives with respect to the exercise of the authorities granted by this section.

(d) Section 26 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 853, 856; 34 U. S. C. 559), is repealed.

SEC. 409. (a) The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Secretary of a military department, may provide family housing at Fort McNair, District of Columbia, for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff by the construction or rehabilitation of one set of family housing, and special communication facilities, without regard to the second proviso of section 3 of the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 375, 379), or section 3 of the act of June 16, 1948 (62 Stat. 459, 462).

(b) Appropriations not to exceed $180,000 ($80,000 for the family housing unit and $100,000 for special communication facilities) available to the military departments for military construction may be utilized for the purposes of this section without regard to the limitations on the cost of family housing otherwise prescribed by law.

SEC. 410. As of July 1, 1957, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in acts enacted before July 15, 1952, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts in whole or in part before July 1, 1957, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for family housing in the amount of $100 million that is contained in section 302 of Public Law 534, 82d Congress;

(4) the authorizations for public works and the appropriation of funds that are contained in the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended (50 U. S. C. 881 et seq.); and

(5) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of $82 million, that is contained in title I, section 102 of Public Law 534, 82d Congress.

SEC. 411. (a) The first paragraph of section 407 of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"In addition to family housing and community facilities otherwise authorized to be constructed or acquired by the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense is authorized, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters, and community facilities, in foreign countries through housing and community facilities projects which utilize foreign currencies to a value not to exceed $250 million acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation."

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretaries of the military departments such amounts other than foreign currencies as are necessary for the construction, or acquisition by lease or otherwise, of family housing and community facilities projects in foreign countries that are authorized by section 407 of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), as amended, but the amounts so appropriated for any such project may not be more than 25 percent of the total cost of that project.

SEC. 412. Section 515 of the act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During the fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1958 the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense or his designee that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than 3,000 of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental for such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed $150 a month for any such unit."

SEC. 413. (a) The net floor limitations prescribed by section 3 of the act of June 12, 1948 (5 U. S. C. 626p) do not apply to 47 units of the housing authorized to be constructed at the United States Air Force Academy by the act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47). The net floor area limitations for those 47 units are as follows: 5,000 square feet for 1 unit for the Superintendent; 3,000 square feet for each of 2 units for deans;

and 1,750 square feet for each of 44 units for department heads.

(b) The last sentence of section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act (68 Stat. 49) is amended by striking out "$1 million" and inserting in place thereof "$1,858,000."

SEC. 414. Section 3 of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended (50 U. S. C. 882), is further amended by striking out clause (a) and inserting in place thereof the following:

"(a) acquire by purchase, lease, or transfer, construct, expand, rehabilitate, convert, and equip such facilities as he shall determine to be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act, except that expenditures for the leasing of property for such purposes may be made from appropriations otherwise available for the payment of rentals and without regard to the monetary limitation otherwise imposed by this section;".

SEC. 415. To the extent that housing is to be constructed at a military installation under title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 635, 646), any outstanding authority under the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), the act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and this act to provide housing at that installation may be exercised at other military installations of the department concerned.

SEC. 416. The Secretaries of the military departments are authorized to contract for the storage, handling, and distribution of liquid fuels for periods not exceeding 5 years, with option to renew for additional periods not exceeding 5 years, for a total not to exceed 20 years. This authority is limited to facilities which conform to the criteria prescribed by the Secretary of Defense for protection, including dispersal, and also are included in a program approved by the Secretary of Defense for the protection of petroleum facilities. Such contracts may provide that the Government at the expiration or termination thereof shall have the option to purchase the facilities under contract without regard to sections 1136, 3648, and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and prior to approval of title to the underlying land by the Attorney General: *Provided further,* That the Secretaries of the military departments shall report to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives with respect to the names of the contractors and the terms of the contracts, the reports to be furnished at times and in such form as may be agreed upon between the Secretaries of the military departments and the Committees on Armed Services.

SEC. 417. That, notwithstanding any other law, the Secretary of a military department may lease, for terms of not more than 5 years, off-base structures including real property relating thereto, in foreign countries, needed for military purposes.

SEC. 418. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, no contract shall be entered into by the United States for the construction or acquisition of family housing units by or for the use of military or civilian personnel of any of the military services of the Department of Defense unless the Department of Defense, in each instance, has come into agreement with the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives.

SEC. 419. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project within the continental United States at an average nationwide unit cost in excess of—

(a) $22 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

(b) $6 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(c) $1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

(d) $6,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters,

unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitation on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

SEC. 420. None of the authorization contained in section 101 of this act for the construction of 326-man barracks with mess shall be used to provide, with respect to any such barracks, for mess facilities other than a single, consolidated mess.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to authorize construction by the military departments, within and outside the United States, in the total amount of $2,106,611,000, broken down as follows between the three services: Army, $323,426,000; Navy, $438,240,000; and Air Force, $1,344,909,000.

This year's bill is slightly less than the $2,357,313,000 reported by the Committee last year.

I invite the attention of the Senators to the fact that the committee report contains a breakdown by State and by military department. At the conclusion of my statement, I shall be glad to discuss items in which any Senator is particularly interested.

Full and impartial hearings were held on all such matters, and interested parties were given the opportunity to present their views. The committee actions on the contested subjects and more salient features are reviewed beginning on page 2 of the committee report.

There are almost 3,000-line items in the bill. Hearings were held on every one. The subcommittee held hearings from shortly after January 1 until very recently. We feel we have given the bill complete consideration.

There are a few innovations in the bill. For instance, the bill requires that before dwellings for the military service can be constructed, their construction must be cleared through the Committees on Armed Services of the House and the Senate, even though they are not built by appropriated funds.

The committee has deleted funds for certain installations for Talos. It is not a rejection of that program, but installation and construction of a part of that program have been held up until further tests are made.

Mr. President, the bill was handled by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and myself. The subcommittee filed a unanimous report on the bill, and the full committee in turn has filed a unanimous report. The report on the bill fully covers the contents of the bill. I am glad to refer Senators to the report.

I shall be glad to yield for any questions, but, before I do so, I want the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Washington to have a chance to say a few words on the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, General LeMay made a very good case when he requested money to build bases offshore as well as in the United States. To what extent has the request of General LeMay been met? In other words, have sufficient funds been provided to build the air bases recommended by General LeMay?

Mr. STENNIS. Those have been provided funds which were requested in the regular budget message in January, and certain additional authorizations are included to take care of expanding facilities for the Strategic Air Force.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume then that a portion, at least, of General LeMay's request is provided for in the pending bill?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. We are expecting another portion of that request to be included in the next bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have another question. The Senator will recall that last year I objected strenuously to the erection of a new home for Admiral Radford at the Naval Observatory, and the construction of, as I recall, five buildings to form a compound, where Admiral Radford was to remain or live during his tenure as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It was, of course, also to be occupied by his successors.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell us whether or not that item has been deleted from the bill, and if so, what provisions, if any, have been made for the construction of a permanent dwelling place for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. STENNIS. The subcommittee and the full committee considered that phase of the matter, and there is in the bill a provision at Fort McNair for a suitable dwelling for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The sum is $80,000. Fort McNair is the location where the other members of the staff will also live. There was also a request for certain special communications, some of which are rather expensive to install. We allowed for that purpose the sum of $100,000. That is all there is in the bill for this item.

Mr. ELLENDER. There will be only one dwelling?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. To be occupied by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Mr. STENNIS. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and his supporting officers can also live at Fort McNair.

Mr. ELLENDER. The other flag officers have quarters in that same locality, so it will not be necessary to erect additional quarters for the flag officers, as was contemplated last year.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. Under this plan, it will not be necessary.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. So as to complete the RECORD at this point, I think it was the unanimous opinion of the committee that the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be on neutral ground, so to speak, if possible, with the respective Joint Chiefs of Staff, and should not be in an installation which was primarily Army, Navy, or Air Force. That is why we chose Ft. McNair, where there are representatives of the State

Department and different services, but which is not exclusively in the possession of any one single service, although the Army does provide the housekeeping and administrative detachments.

Mr. ELLENDER. There would not have been any objection at all on my part if the facility originally planned had been built alongside of other existing facilities at Ft. McNair, but I strenuously opposed the plan to take the Naval Observatory over and convert it into living quarters for the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and a host of flag officers.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. The approximately 72 acres of the Naval Observatory grounds are in the city of Washington, and there are only a few buildings there. We thought that this particular construction should be accomplished on an existing post capable of providing the necessary supports.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has made a very able statement of the items included in this very important military construction bill. I should like to take this opportunity to compliment the chairman and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for the very fine and comprehensive job that they were able to do in connection with this bill. As the chairman of the subcommittee has pointed out, all our decisions were unanimous.

In the bill we have provided construction support for all three services. Many of the items contained in the authorizations are of a classified nature. The committee spent several months taking extensive testimony from witnesses from the Department of Defense, from the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

Mr. President, of necessity we had to rely on the judgment, the wisdom, and the professional military advice of the representatives of the Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force.

I believe, that the bill is a fair one, based on the budget presented to us. However, it means that, in light of increased defense requirements, the military construction costs will rise next year. It may well mean that we shall have to pass some supplemental authorizations before Congress concludes its session this year, in view of the increased funds for the Air Force.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington and the Senator from South Dakota for their remarks, and I wish especially to thank them for their long, patient, untiring, and very helpful, as well as able and constructive, work in connection with handling the multitude of matters and nearly 3,000 lines in the text of the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my statement on the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STENNIS

This year's military construction bill (H. R. 9893) is about the same size this year as last year. Our bill contains an authorization slightly in excess of $2 billion, the exact figures are in the subcommittee's report that is before the Members.

The Army's portion is a little more than $323 million. The Navy gets $438 million, and the Air Force, with the lion's share, has in round figures $1,345,000,000.

As Senators know, we held detailed hearings on most all aspects of the bill and whenever items were contested, arrangements were made for witnesses to present their views to the subcommittee.

The Army portion of the bill is relatively routine and is about 40 percent less than it received last year. About 12 percent of the Department's total request is for guided missiles and rocket development, and somewhere around 40 percent for NIKE, of which I will speak more about a little later.

The $438 million for the Navy is basically for the modernization of its shore establishment and various strategical overseas stations. That portion pertaining to its shipyard facilities expands and modernizes them to take care of *Forrestal*-type carriers. In addition, there are substantial percentages for the modernization and maintenance of the facilities required by the fleet air arm and its submarine and antisubmarine activities.

The Air Force portion can be fundamentally broken down between the maintenance and operational facilities required for the newer type airplanes and the extension, widening, and strengthening of runways for these planes, such as the 100-series fighters and the B–52 bomber.

There are, of course, more definitive details that I could go into, but I hope the committee report covers them adequately, and I would prefer to answer questions that Senators may care to ask.

Especial consideration was given to more salient subjects, including facilities for Nike-Talos, DEW line, Sage, family housing, and quarters for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

As most of the Members of the Senate know, there has been considerable discussion concerning Nike-Talos during the last few months. Title I contains about $130 million for Army antiaircraft installations, most of which are for Nike. As a result of our investigation, the subcommittee found that Nike is operational and in being and is the only such system the country has. We learned that Talos is nonoperational and in the experimental stage. Incidentally, the Air Force originally requested better than $16 million for Talos and with this authority planned to establish four operational sites at four SAC bases. We also came to the conclusion that there is an apparent overlapping of assigned roles and missions in this field. We, therefore, recommend approval of the Nike request, but that no moneys be spent to establish operational sites for land-based Talos until a test has been conducted to ascertain the relative merits of the two systems. In the report, the subcommittee also suggests that the assigned roles and missions be clarified.

DEW line will eventually be about a billion-dollar program, with a $200 million annual operating cost. This bill contains around $125 million for DEW line. In recommending approval, we feel it necessary to call on the Department of Defense to maintain constant surveillance of the cost, utilization, and construction progress, and to report periodically thereon to the committee.

Sage, as Senators know, is the system which collects the information picked up by DEW line and puts it in a militarily usable form. This is also a billion-dollar program and will cost about $400 million annually in operational charges once established. Of this $400 million, approximately $240 million will be for leased telephone circuits.

The subcommittee's main concern in reviewing this item was to insure that the Government is given adequate protection with regard to the rates. The Department of Defense and the Air Force have assured the subcommittee that they believe they have adequate authority in this area. The subcommittee report calls upon the Department of the Air Force to maintain constant surveillance of the rates charged and to make semiannual reports to the committee.

Passage of this bill will authorize the construction of 3,790 family housing units from appropriated funds for special purposes within the United States and at certain overseas locations.

This is not the full picture for, as I believe my colleagues know, the so-called Capehart Act gives the Secretary of Defense almost unlimited authority to contract for the construction of family quarters in the amount and at locations of his own choosing. Section 418 of the bill requires that the Department of Defense come into agreement with the Armed Services Committees in each instance where housing projects are to be constructed or acquired. In addition, this report calls for the establishment of criteria more consistent with the planned long-range peacetime troop structure of the Defense Establishment.

The bill contains, as it did last year, the request to authorize 5 sets of family housings and special communications in the amount of $300,000 for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to be constructed on the Naval Observatory Grounds in the District. The subcommittee is not fully in sympathy with the request and recommends approval of only one set of quarters for the Chairman, himself, in the amount of $80,000, and $100,000 for the communication facilities, all of which it believes should be constructed at Fort McNair, in the District, which is an existing establishment capable of providing the necessary logistical support. The Naval Observatory grounds encompass approximately 72 acres of extremely valuable land and we feel that it would be unwise to take action designed to build a new military post at that location.

Originally, the bill as presented by Defense totaled about $1.862 billion. The House approved $1.843 billion, or substantially the same amount. Subsequent to House action and while we were still reviewing the matter, the President, in his April message, and Defense requested additional authority for extension of DEW line and SAC facilities. These, plus subcommittee action, resulted in our total of $2.106 billion (approximately $263 million difference). The difference is divided roughly between DEW line, overseas bases, missile facilities, and SAC facilities.

SAC needs no explanation. The "beefing up" of bases to take the B–52 and the provision for alternate sites in accordance with the dispersal policy results in an authority for SAC of more than $200 million. Approximately 12 alternate SAC bases are covered in this bill. Based on communications from the Secretary of the Air Force, we possibly would have been justified in adding 4 or 5 additional dispersal sites at approximately $22 million each at this time. However, there was not sufficient time to review them all.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], who desires to submit an amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from

Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and myself, I submit to the committee amendment the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 81, in line 2, it is proposed to strike out "$8,304,000", and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

Except none of the authorization for land acquisition pertaining to the Black Rock area shall apply unless the Secretary of Defense shall resurvey the entire requirement, including the possible use of other Government-controlled lands in the State of Nevada and the possibility of joint Navy-Air Force utilization of existing facilities, and the Secretary of Defense shall certify to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives that the acquisition of the Black Rock extension is essential to meet the Navy's training requirements, $8,304,000."

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment submitted by me, on behalf of the senior Senator from Nevada and myself, to the committee amendment is to require the Department of Defense to prove its need to acquire from private interests within the 1½ million acres of public lands in northern Nevada, land for a naval aerial gunnery range. Today, by means of this bill, the Navy is seeking to acquire 3 million acres of land in northern Nevada for a gunnery range. It may be significant for the Senate to know that this exceeds the total acreage of the States of Delaware and Rhode Island, as well as 4 or 5 Districts of Columbia.

Our amendment to the committee amendment calls upon the Secretary of Defense to resurvey the Navy's entire requirement with respect to naval aviation training in northern Nevada, and to certify to the Senate and the House of Representatives Armed Services Committee, after the making of such resurvey, that the acquisition of land in the Black Rock region is essential to meet such training requirements. If such certification is not provided, this amendment to the committee amendment would withhold authorization of funds for land acquisition in that particular area, the Black Rock desert region.

Mr. President, the problem of having each military service have its own "private shooting gallery" to train our Armed Forces is becoming a big handicap to the ordinary way of life for many thousands of the residents of the West.

Interestingly enough, the military is now seeking, in the West, a total area larger than that of the States of Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Vermont, combined.

Of course, all of our military services must be kept the best in the world; and I know that the people of my State of Nevada, as well as all the other people of the West, want the services to be maintained in that way. However, I feel that the Congress must approach this matter and the other phases of the land-withdrawal problem affirmatively, so that the public-land States will not have their basic economies completely upset. Those basic economies are grazing and mining; and in this particular area there are also tremendous fish and wildlife resources.

I have always maintained that the Fallon Naval Air Base, in our State, should be enlarged. I believe that should be done because of its outstanding facilities. But in this instance I believe that the Navy Department can use jointly—and I particularly wish to emphasize the word "jointly"—with the Air Force and other Government agencies another 3½ million acres of land in southern Nevada, where, incidentally, there is located the largest Air Force bombing and gunnery range in the United States.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to adopt this amendment to the committee amendment, as a means of pointing out to our military that the land resources in the West are not inexhaustible.

I yield now to my very distinguished senior colleague from Nevada, who is equally interested in this problem.

WITHDRAWAL OF PUBLIC LAND FOR A PUBLIC PURPOSE—NEVADA AIR TRAINING BASES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleague, the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] in urging the adoption of this amendment to the committee report.

I desire to add that it is my deep feeling that when public land is proposed to be withdrawn for a public purpose the State administrative and the legislature and the county commissioners of the counties concerned should be consulted, inasmuch as they have continually to wrestle with the problem of taxes to support the State government. I believe that our action in this case will establish a precedent.

Furthermore, Mr. President, during World War II, many millions of dollars were expended in the Tonopah, Nev. air base and bombing range, for the erection of facilities which, if now repaired, can be utilized for the Navy's purpose. That location may be 4 or 5 minutes' air time further from Fallon than the northern area; but the establishment there of a refueling base will answer the purpose. This procedure will fit in with expansion of the Fallon Air Base, which, as my junior colleague from Nevada has so well said, all of us want to have expanded.

I would like to say, Mr. President, that the State of Nevada is one of the 11 public land States; 87 percent of our area has been retained by the Government.

ALL PUBLIC LAND UTILIZED

But what the Government bureau heads do not understand when they look at a map in Washington is that the entire 87 percent, about 60 million acres, has been utilized by the people of Nevada and taxed for nearly a century by the sovereign State of Nevada, through the livestock units.

The patented land throughout the State, wherever there was water sufficient to patent a homestead, has provided the headquarters ranches for the livestock units.

The reason the 60 million acres—87 percent—is still publicly owned is because there was not sufficient water to irrigate the amount of land that is required under a homestead patent act—therefore there was no way to pass it into private ownership and put it on the regular tax roll.

If water for irrigation was available for all of the land, practically all of it would have been patented long since.

STATES RIGHTS

The method of taxing the 87 percent of federally owned land through the livestock units must be understood to understand the economy of my State of Nevada.

Each State of the Union has its own peculiar problems and many of them not common to all States. That, Mr. President, is the basis of "States rights"—which is thoroughly understood by many Members of this body.

These livestock units include the entire area of our State suitable for grazing. I served as State engineer from 1927 to 1935, eight years and a half.

THREE PARTS TO LIVESTOCK UNIT

We have patented lands wherever there was water enough for irrigation, and that is where the feed is raised to winter the livestock.

In the northern half of our State, it requires about a ton of hay to the year average to "winter" a cow unit, a cow and a calf. That means that if you have 500 acres in cultivation you could run 500 cattle on that theory that you had enough feed to "winter" the stock—and in addition you have the public summer, spring, and fall range and in some places winter range to run the stock—sheep or cattle—except when there is snow on the ground or extreme cold.

There are three parts to a livestock unit; the patented land where the feed is raised; the water rights for irrigation and stock-watering rights throughout the range—and the use of the public land in connection with it, already described and has been used for generations, some for nearly a century, eighty or ninety years by successors in interest.

LOOKS SIMPLE FROM WASHINGTON

Now in Washington it looks very simple. The bureau heads look at a map and here is public land we already own so all we have to do is just withdraw it for a special public use. But when you withdraw it, you take a slice out of a range unit, even if you do not include the ranch, you impair the earning power of the unit without cutting the rancher's investment; therefore he is in any case destroyed.

ANY BUREAU CAN MOVE IN

As of this moment the armed services or any bureau in Washington can move into the public land States and say we want this land set aside for a particular public use that already belongs to the Government.

There is nothing to stop them except the Bureau of the Budget, or, in this case the Armed Services Committee or whatever committee to which a particular use might be assigned. If then they get authorization from the proper committee and their request for funds is approved by the budget committee, the

government of the State of Nevada, the State legislature, or the United States Senators representing that State have nothing whatever to say about it.

The armed services or the particular bureau can move right in, and if an actual or potential mine is located within the area or a livestock unit or whatever industry it may be, all they have to do if they cannot agree on their price, is to move in and let victims sue and then it is settled in a court through condemnation proceedings. There is no other recourse.

NO TAXABLE PROPERTY STABLE

So as long as that condition prevails, nothing will ever be definite, and no taxable property unit described can be stable in a public-land State, especially where 87 percent of the land is owned and controlled by the Federal Government.

START BY CONSULTING THE STATE

What is needed and what I have asked for continually, is that any bureau or Government service that contemplates the withdrawal of public lands for public purposes be required to consult the State administration through a proper committee set up by the legislature whatever course is the most advantageous. I think the committee system would be the most direct. Get the consent of this committee or the refusal with reasons which then can be submitted to Congress where they can be considered by the proper committees, just as you are doing today, but start with the State, where the proper consideration for the rights of the States would properly direct.

I would favor an official approval by the Congress. There are bills already introduced in the House that could be made to cover the subject. It is necessary for the protection of the taxable property of the State, the economic structure, and the protection of the citizens of the State, to which they are rightfully entitled.

Now I have faced this for 35 years, Mr. Chairman, as State engineer and in my private engineering business in the State of Nevada and throughout the public land States.

No bureau in Washington understands the economic structure of a State—or in fact is very interested in it—you, as chairman of this committee, understand States rights. I have carried a transit over most of these counties. I have slept in the brush, with the sheep herders and buckaroos and liked it. Then when I was State engineer we took the responsibility.

Mr. President, I am very gratified that the committee is accepting our proposed amendment so that a thorough survey can be made to determine the actual needs and the available facilities.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield briefly to me?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am persuaded by what my colleagues, the Senators from Nevada, have had to say about their amendment to the committee amendment. I talked to them prior to the time when they drafted it, and I also talked to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, who has done such outstanding work on the bill.

I hope their amendment to the committee amendment will be acceptable, because I think they are justified in everything they have said.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator from Texas very much, indeed; and I also wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], for discussing with us this amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that I think this amendment to the committee amendment offers a very good solution to a very vexing problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] for himself and his colleague [Mr. MALONE] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. FREAR], I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 139, in the committee amendment, after line 14, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 421. The Secretaries of the military departments, and such other officer or officers as may be designated for such purposes and under such regulations as may be prescribed, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, are authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, settle, and pay in an amount not to exceed $1,000 where accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction and final settlement, any claim against the United States, where such claim is substantiated in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe in such regulations, for any decrease in the fair market value of real property owned in fee by the claimant arising out of and as a direct result of any acquisition of other land, or interests therein, authorized under this act from nongovernmental sources for the extension of military operational flying facilities: *Provided*, That only one claim may be submitted under this section for any tract or parcel affected, and such claim shall be presented in writing within 1 year from the date of the completion of any such military construction project: *Provided further*, That any settlement made by the Secretary, or his designee, under the authority of this section and such regulations as may be prescribed hereunder, shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provisions of law to the contrary. The Secretary may report such claims as exceed $1,000 to Congress for its consideration.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have previously discussed this amendment with the chairman of the subcommittee, who is in charge of the bill.

The purpose of this amendment is to provide the legal authority whereby certain citizens in the area of the New Castle County Air Base, near Wilmington, Del., who will be adversely affected as the result of the extension of a jet runway at that base, may file claims and be eligible for payments for damages resulting from depreciated property values when it can be established that such damages resulted from the new project.

Under this bill the Air Force is asking for the authority to condemn certain property in the area of that base for the building of this new runway. Under the existing law they are only able to pay the property owners for that property which lies immediately in the path of the runway, and they have no authority under the existing law to recognize or make payments to any property owner who has property immediately adjacent to the runway.

This proposed extension of the runway will cut a major highway, and certain property owners on the far side of the runway will, after its construction, be forced to drive 12 to 15 miles in order to get to a point which in reality is located less than 1 mile from their homes.

Many of these property owners located in this area in order to be convenient to their work, and now the establishment of the new jet runway will not only prove to be a great inconvenience but also greatly depreciate the market value of their homes.

In instances where there are farms near these runways, poultry houses or other buildings have likewise become useless, and these farmers too should be compensated for such damages.

It is recognized that we in Congress cannot intelligently include in this authorization bill a specific amount to which each property owner should be entitled. We do not have the adequate facilities to make the necessary appraisals for such decisions; however, we can adopt this amendment which recognizes the problem and confers upon the Air Force the authority to negotiate with property owners in the area immediately surrounding any extended runway and make the necessary settlements.

Under the proposed amendment the Air Force would be authorized to make direct settlements on any claims up to $2,500 and on any claims in excess of $2,500 to negotiate an agreement and submit their recommendations regarding that agreement to the Congress, which in turn can approve and make the necessary appropriations for payments.

I understand that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], a member of the committee, would prefer that this amount of $2,500 be reduced to $1,000 to conform with similar authority extended to other Government agencies. If so, I shall have no objection to modifying my amendment accordingly since neither the $2,500 nor the $1,000 item would in any manner indicate what any claim should be. Nor does it confine the claims to those amounts.

It merely means that the Air Force can go ahead and settle any claim up to that figure, and all claims in excess of that amount would be submitted to Congress for approval and payment.

This problem which I have outlined here as affecting residents in the New Castle County area is not a problem necessarily confined to them, but it is a problem which can arise in any State in the country where an extension of a runway is being requested.

The amendment is applicable to all such projects coming under the jurisdiction of the Air Corps, and certainly if the Air Corps is going in a State and taking over certain property they should be liable not only for the payment of the property acquired but also for the payment of damages to surrounding property owners.

The amendment merely provides a method by which adjoining property owners could negotiate with the Department for compensatory damages.

I urge its adoption.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator presents a very serious question. It deserves the utmost consideration. It involves a broad policy question which we think should have careful attention. There is some doubt in the minds of members of the committee as to whether or not such a policy question should be decided in a bill of this kind. However, there is merit in the amendment. We are very glad to accept the amendment and take it to conference, to see if a proper provision can be drafted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I was wondering if the Senator from Delaware would not be content to set the limit at $1,000, instead of $2,500. Under the Torts Act the heads of departments have authority to settle administratively claims against the Government up to $1,000, without going to court. It seems to me that this amendment should conform to the provisions of that act. I hope the Senator will modify his amendment so as to make the maximum figure $1,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no objection to that, if that is the desire of the committee. The amendment including the other amount was prepared by the Department, at its suggestion. The amendment is in no way an indication that everyone would receive either $1,000 or $2,500, or that the amount would be the limit of their claims.

Mr. President, I modify my amendment by changing the figure from $2,500 to $1,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the committee is glad to accept the amendment, under the circumstances already outlined.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] for himself and his colleague [Mr. FREAR] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 111, in the committee amendment, between lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

Hobbs Air Force Base, Hobbs, N. Mex.: Operation and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities, and ground improvements and land acquisitions, $6,547,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to the committee amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me for 2 minutes?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Hobbs Airfield was an active airfield during the war. It is now an auxiliary airfield to the airfield at Lubbock, Tex., a distance of only 60 or 70 miles away. The Department has not furnished estimates as to what the reactivation would cost. The reason given is that it would be too expensive to reactivate it, because the altitude is too high, and too long runways would be necessary for the operation of the planes.

The following figures show that the altitude is not so great as that of some of the other fields operating in the same area.

Hobbs, N. Mex., the field to which the amendment refers, is 3,630 feet above sea level. Clovis, within 120 miles, is 4,265 feet above sea level. Albuquerque is 4,950 feet above sea level; Alamogordo is 4,303 feet above sea level; Colorado Springs, 5,980; Denver, 5,280; El Paso, 3,700.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, there is merit in what the Senator says. This field may well be a part of a pattern of development of auxiliary fields, to which the Senator from New Mexico has referred. The committee has considered the amendment and is glad to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi and his subcommittee have done an excellent job on the bill, and I wish to commend them. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee one question, which concerns the so-called Capehart military housing.

As the Senator knows, military housing is very important, as one of the benefits designed to keep people in the service. The Senate passed a bill on this subject. The House has held up the bill, for certain reasons. Personally I do not believe that we should try to attach housing provisions to a military construction bill at this time. It would involve too many complications.

Does not the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Mississippi, who is so familiar with all these questions, believe that if it appears that the housing bill is to be held up in the House and not passed, we should act promptly on a separate bill dealing with the so-called Capehart military housing, before the Congress adjourns?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct. Some provision must be made for military housing. It would not fit into this bill at this late time. If the housing bill does not pass, we would look with sympathetic consideration upon the idea of having a bill reported which would meet the situation.

Mr. President, I offer a series of technical amendments to correct certain figures in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Mississippi will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 77, line 11, it is proposed to delete the figure "$7,332.00" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$7,332,000."

On page 80, line 21, it is proposed to delete the figure "$600,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$660,000."

On page 91, line 24, it is proposed to delete "title IV:" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "title II:".

On page 95, line 2, it is proposed to delete the figure "$299,409,600" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$299,512,600".

On page 95, lines 3 and 4, it is proposed to delete the figure "$563,943,300" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$564,046,300".

On page 120, line 2, it is proposed to delete the figure "$70,000." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$70,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Mississippi to the committee amendment.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words of appreciation of the leadership of the Senator from Mississippi in handling this bill and conducting the hearings. I also express my appreciation for the fine contribution made by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], growing out of his vast experience and knowledge in the field of missiles.

I should like to say more upon this subject. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I shall furnish later.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. President, the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has well covered the general scope of this authorization bill for military construction. I desire only to mention a few matters for the sake of emphasis.

First, however, let me say that this bill had more extended hearings, I think, than any like bill which has been presented to the Senate in recent years. The Senator from Mississippi devoted long hours over many days to taking testimony. His knowledge in this field and his ability to get at the facts were of great value to the committee. He dealt fairly with every witness and was most courteous to the other members of the committee in every respect.

And I should also like to commend the contribution to the work of the committee

by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. His experience in, and knowledge of, the field of atomic energy and the development of missiles were of special value in developing the committee's conclusions regarding related facilities. It was a genuine pleasure to work with him on this bill.

The committee had the benefit, also, of extraordinary talents in Col. Kenneth BeLieu as our clerk. He not only did the ordinary work one expects of a staff specialist, but gave us tireless research enriched by his background knowledge in military procedures. He has been one of the best clerks I have ever encountered in serving on a congressional committee.

With respect to the contents of the bill, I desire at this time only to speak of the decisions we were necessarily forced to make on matters that involve policy.

I refer, for example, to the proposals for installations involving the use of the defensive weapons of Nike and Talos. The press has carried much about these competitive weapon systems. The committee does not claim to have the expert knowledge that would let us scientifically evaluate their respective merits. We had hoped to have the benefits of a field test of some sort. That was not possible because of the incomplete development of Talos.

So, our committee was obliged to adopt a tentative decision. We delay the decision that must some day be made. In the meantime, I hope that an objective evaluation can be made of the merits of the respective systems by competent, objective people. That evaluation on the basis of laboratory and scientific standards can be made. It should be done before the military construction bill comes up next year.

A second illustration of a policy decision had to be made on the extension of the so-called DEW line, the distant early warning system. This is a tremendously costly thing—the DEW line. Its possible use and its capabilities lie in the realm of uncertainty. Yet it seemed too much of a gamble not to proceed with what has been started.

For one, however, I hope that the General Accounting Office and the fiscal people in the Department of Defense will take a good hard look at the costs of the DEW line. Everyone knows that construction conditions are rough in many locations. But there should be some way to check costs, a better way than has been brought to the attention of this committee to date.

The third matter I would mention has to do with the need for improving the security and usability of our bases.

In 1953, when this same subcommittee returned from its overseas inspection trip, we made certain recommendations relating to construction overseas. Number 1 of those recommendations was this:

"Greater care should be taken to insure the security and usability of bases on which United States money is spent."

In support of that, we said:

"For example, (a) about $5 million was expended on a field in Egypt, the use of which is now denied to the United States. No firm rights were obtained before the money was spent."

Events of the past few days certainly lend force to the words we used. The election in Iceland is said to have imperiled the tenure of our great base built at Keflavik. The head of the new government in Morocco is now saying that the base agreements negotiated with France are obsolete, implying that our tenure of the bases in north Africa is insecure.

I need not argue the point. The significance of this matter must be apparent to everyone. Consideration of this problem led the committee to be receptive when testimony was offered for developing more bases in this country to handle the new heavy jet bombers. The bill as presented carries authorizations that would strengthen or develop a dozen bases in various parts of the country and make them capable of serving the big jets.

I shall not develop the figures on either planes or bases but will simply say that even with the increased number authorized for development, we will not have all we shall need.

These policy decisions which the committee was called upon to make are not normally anticipated in bills on construction, but those who read the printed hearings will realize how the decisions were an inevitable part of passing on the projects proposed in the bill. Naturally a great deal of the most important testimony was off the record on these matters but what was left on the record constitutes an impressive story.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I again express my appreciation of the opportunity to serve with the very able Members of the Senate who constitute the Committee on Armed Services. They are devoted people, devoted to the security of the United States.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. What little I have been able to accomplish has been made possible through the fine support of other members of the subcommittee.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, let me add my words of commendation and thanks. The Senator from Mississippi has been most helpful and cooperative, as have the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, we appreciate the efforts of the Senators from Nevada [Mr. MALONE and Mr. BIBLE] in presenting the merits of the problem at Fallon. The people of Nevada have been very ably represented before our subcommittee by their two Senators. They were very helpful to us. I hope some adjustment can be arrived at which will keep the Fallon Air Base in operation, and at the same time meet the local situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 9893) was passed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish especially to thank Col. Kenneth E. BeLieu for his very fine and helpful services to the subcommittee during the months of hearings and consideration of the bill. His work has been outstanding and helpful. He has a fine background as an excellent soldier, and has a fine understanding of both military questions and the practical side of the problems involved.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi about Colonel BeLieu. I expect to say something about him in the statement I shall submit for inclusion in the RECORD.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. PILLION had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 6376) to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes, vice Mr. SAYLOR, excused.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9852) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 906. An act for the relief of William Martin, of Tok Junction, Alaska;

H. R. 909. An act for the relief of Charles O. Ferry and other employees of the Alaska Road Commission;

H. R. 1963. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence M. Augustine;

H. R. 9052. An act to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports;

H. R. 9720. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10003. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10766. An act to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II; and

H. R. 10872. An act to provide for extension of the time during which annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims validated under section 2 of the act of August 11, 1955, may be made, and for other purposes.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] will be recognized at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that I am very deeply indebted to the Senator from Louisiana for his understanding and for his graciousness and for his truly cooperative attitude on matters affecting the Nation. I appreciate his cooperation very much.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I thank our distinguished majority leader for the compliment. For the past hour I have been sitting here in amazement watching our fine majority leader at work. I can state from personal knowledge that he really gets what he goes after. I can vouch for the good job he is doing. Yesterday he persuaded me to forego a 6-hour speech that I had planned to make today on foreign aid. He is indeed a good operator, and he knows how to get the job done. I wish to take this opportunity to compliment him and to sincerely and from the bottom of my heart commend him for the exceptional manner in which he has been able to facilitate and expedite the work of the Senate.

Mr. President, it was my privilege last year to make another personal inspection of overseas missions. As a matter of fact, this was my fourth complete circuit of the world by air. On this trip I had occasion to visit 22 countries, in all of which I made notes and recorded my observations on the manner in which our foreign aid program is being operated, as well as a detailed study of our embassies and legations operations, and the United States information program. On the desk to my left are the individual country reports made by me on all the countries I visited. The stack measures probably a foot in thickness.

In addition, I hold in my hand the diary which was written by me on the trip. It consists of 328 pages, and it contains the observations made by me as to conditions I found in the countries visited.

A few days ago the country-by-country reports to which I have just referred, plus pertinent parts of my diary, were filed with the Senate Committee on Appropriations. It is my hope that members of the Committee on Appropriations, as well as other Members of the Senate, who desire to inform themselves of the operations of our embassies and legations abroad, as well as the way our information program and our foreign-aid program is being administered, will take the time to consult these records. I am happy to make available to them on a confidential basis my findings and observations.

Mr. President, I devoted much time last year to this inspection of our foreign missions. Immediately upon my return from abroad, I boarded a chartered plane with the members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and proceeded to hold hearings at the grassroots on the farm problem, out of which hearings developed the the farm bill that became law in April.

From the middle of October of 1955, and until April of this year when the farm bill was approved by Congress, practically all of my time was spent in that endeavor. Then, beginning in the latter part of March, I opened the hearings on the public works appropriation bill. These hearings before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, continued for more than 2 months; we heard over 650 witnesses; as Senators know, the public works appropriations bill was not finally enacted into law until yesterday.

Mr. President, I am relating these facts merely to explain why I was unable to complete until now my report on our overseas missions. I had planned on having the report in the hands of the Committee on Appropriations not later than March, but because of the two time-consuming tasks I had to perform in the meantime, I was unable to do so until last week.

I repeat, Mr. President, that I hope this report will not have been made in vain and that Senators will obtain some benefit from reading it, it will offer particular advantage to any Senator who is interested in seeking information on specific country programs.

Mr. President, as I have stated on many occasions, I cheerfully voted in 1948 for the so-called Marshall plan in the hope that our great country might be of assistance to our neighbors across the seas who had been devastated by war. I agreed with the advocates of the Marshall plan, that by assisting our Western European allies financially, we could revitalize their industry and improve their agriculture to the point where, within a space of a few years, they could produce both industrially and agriculturally to the same level or even at a higher level than they were able to produce prior to the war—that is, in 1938.

The second year that Mr. Hoffman appeared before our committee, he established our goal. Mr. Hoffman indicated to us that if by spending approixmately $18 billion within the space of 4 or 5 years we could increase the industrial capacity of the countries of Western Europe by 125 percent of prewar; he indicated that upon reaching this goal, we could withdraw from the scene and those nations would be able to carry on without outside assistance and moreover could, no doubt, assist us in bearing the load in other areas of the world.

I should like to point out, Mr. President, that I never oppposed any of the foreign-aid programs except within the past 2 or 3 years. I have tried my best in past years to reduce many of them in the light of the studies which I made. I am seeking a major reduction this year. At this time the countries of Western Europe are better off than they have ever been before. Instead of having reached a goal of 125 percent prewar for industrial production, the average for Western Europe today is 157 percent of the industrial production level that existed before the war.

Surely, Mr. President, when all of us voted in prior years for the huge sums which have been expended for foreign aid, when we asked our taxpayers to carry this huge burden, it was with the understanding that upon those nations getting back on their feet they would carry their own burdens and in addition help us to carry the burden of maintaining freedom in Asia and other parts of this troubled world.

But what has occurred, Mr. President? What does the record show? We have, through this current fiscal year, spent under the Marshall-aid plan and under our past and present mutual-security programs, including not only foreign military aid but foreign economic aid as well, the staggering sum of $47,126,600,000. The record shows that after the war but prior to 1948, huge gifts and loans were made to our friends across the seas under UNRRA and other programs, which sums are not included in the $47 billion total. It does not include the amounts we made available to those countries by way of purchases from us after the war, whereby we received about 10 cents on the dollar for goods, wares, and merchandise, hardware, airplanes, and other items in many parts of Europe. During World War II we had stored much oil, much gasoline, many tanks, tractors, and all kinds of merchandise, including clothing, and so forth, amounting to more than $6 billion.

That was made available to the British at 10 cents on the dollar, with the provision that repayment of the 10 cents on the dollar would be made over a period of years, and that we could not spend any of that 10 percent except within the United Kingdom or some British possession.

Mr. President, since the termination of World War II we have spent upon our friends across the seas the enormous sum of $53,151,468,000, and there remains in the pipeline, appropriated but unspent, an additional $9 billion for carrying on the current military and economic aid programs.

Mr. President, that is not all. We have not stopped at that. As we all know, we entered into an alliance called NATO. I think that in voting to have the United States become a member of NATO, all of us felt that Europe, having made the recovery that is hers, would give assistance to us in providing the hardware, the tools, and so forth needed to perform at least her part of the NATO contract.

But such, Mr. President, was not the case. As the record will show, we are now paying for a substantial part of the cost of NATO. We have assumed from 38 to 40 percent of the amount which our friends across the seas should contribute toward their NATO obligations. That amounts to a hugh sum. It is over and above the huge amounts about which I have just been talking.

Was that all? Of course not. We had a program to build airfields all over Western Europe and North Africa. Did

we get assistance from any of our friends who are just as prosperous, if not more prosperous, than we? No. We had to spend in addition to all these amounts I have just stated, on our own, tremendous sums for the construction of overseas airbases and other facilities. I shall not state where these amounts were spent or where the airbases are located. Perhaps that is known. All I shall do is to place the total amount involved in the RECORD, because the other information, as the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] stated yesterday, is more or less confidential. If Senators want the details on that subject, they must go to the Committee on Foreign Relations to obtain it.

If certain amounts have been allocated for military purposes, but there has never been a purchase of the hardware or other equipment required to equip certain armies in Western Europe, I can well understand that it might be damaging to supply those details.

But why in the name of commonsense should there be objection made to stating where the money will be spent on foreign aid other than military aid, I cannot understand. Yet there is that restriction. I have before me a large amount of evidence which I should like to present, which I have obtained from the clerk of our committee, on both nonmilitary and military aid, but I cannot give it to the American people. Why? Because of an inhibition which has only this year been placed on the disclosure of such information. Why should that be? I should like to have an explanation from members of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I must leave the Chamber in order to attend a committee meeting, but I desire to commend the Senator from Louisiana for his remarks on the issue he is discussing—the issue of secrecy. The point has been reached where we in Congress cannot get information about expenditures. I shall have some remarks to make on this subject before the bill comes to a vote. I have submitted, to be printed and to lie on the table, amendments in which I feel certain the Senator from Louisiana will be interested.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wanted to ask the Senator from Arkansas if he noticed in the RECORD this morning that yesterday I submitted, to be printed and to lie on the table, an amendment which I think will cover exactly the practice to which the Senator from Arkansas has found so much objection.

My amendment, which I intend to call up at the appropriate time, adds a new section to the bill and reads as follows:

"SEC. 538. Furnishing of information to congressional committees: Upon the request of any appropriate committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, any joint committee of the two Houses, or any subcommittee of any such committee, any officer or employee of the Government having information, or having custody of documents or other data, relating to the programs being administered under this act, shall promptly furnish any such information, documents, or other data to such committee or subcommittee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I compliment the Senator from Wyoming for offering that amendment. I have offered one similar to it to be printed and to lie on the table.

I think this is a serious matter. I have not submitted my amendment, nor shall I support the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, merely from a mere light, inconsequential motive. We have reached the point in this country and in the Government where congressional committees are being denied material and documents, in the possession and custody of the executive branch of the Government, which Congress needs in order properly to perform its legislative duties. We are being denied that information.

On the other hand, we find that the administration is giving out material and documents, which are obviously of a more highly classified and secret nature than those which are being denied Congress, for the purpose of enabling some reporter to write a book.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am in thorough agreement with the amendment which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has just read. This new policy of denying Congress information relating to foreign nonmilitary expenditures is something which I simply cannot understand.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The executive branch has drawn an iron curtain down around itself.

Mr. ELLENDER. The evidence is abundant that we are preaching democracy in Korea and Formosa, yet our foreign aid administrators are teaching the people of those countries socialism. That may be the reason why we cannot get the details of how the money is being spent or is to be spent. I am here to tell Senators that we have spent millions of dollars in Korea in order to build flour mills. Korea does not produce wheat. The mills are owned by the Government. We have built pharmaceutical houses that are owned by the Government. There are many other enterprises of that nature which are being built with American taxpayers' money and turned over to the Korean Government to operate.

Whether our Government officials are simply trying to prevent an exposé of operations of that kind, I do not know. But I serve warning here and now that as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I shall do my utmost to obtain the details, to ascertain where and for what purposes all these huge sums which are being now appropriated, and which have been appropriated but are not yet spent, will be spent. I want to learn the details about each country's program. Whether or not I can make the information available to the Senate and to the taxpayers of our country, I do not know; but I shall certainly try to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the amendments which I shall propose are adopted—and I think they ought to be adopted—it will be possible for the committee which appropriates the money to know what it is doing. It will not have to continue to appropriate, with a blindfold, money belonging to the people of the United States.

Does the Senator believe for one moment that the people of the United States are being informed of the fact that the billions of dollars authorized to be appropriated in the bill are authorized to be appropriated to the President, and only to the President?

I read from page 27 of the bill, paragraph 3, beginning on line 12:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the purposes of this chapter not to exceed $925 million which shall remain available until expended.

Here we are being called upon to appropriate to the President money which shall be available until it is expended, and no committee of Congress shall dare ask an executive employee what is being done.

Who is the President, according to this bill? He will be whoever may be elected in November. This is not money which is being appropriated to any idol of the people; it is money being appropriated to the man who fills the office; and we have been told by good Republican authority that the decisions of the President for the most part are being now made by the assistant to the President, the former, very able and distinguished Governor of the State of New Hampshire, Mr. Sherman Adams. We read in the newspapers and editorials references to the regency. Are we going to appropriate money without its being set forth clearly in the bill that reports will have to be submitted, giving the name of anybody who takes any part in the administration of the particular sum? Unless we so provide, I say to the Senator, with his indulgence, we are undermining the foundations of congressional authority in the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Not only should the committees of Congress be told, Mr. President, but the taxpayers of the Nation ought to be informed as to how these moneys are being spent. I am not here today urging that the people ought to be given the details of how many rifles we are buying and to whom they are being handed, or other military information which obviously must not be disclosed for security reasons, but when it comes to the spending of nonmilitary foreign-aid funds, I do not see or understand why any of that information should be kept from the people.

In connection with our discussion, I refer to page 34 of the hearings held by the Foreign Relations Committee, when the subject of 10-year commitments on foreign aid were being discussed. Mr. Dulles had this to say:

I doubt very much the wisdom of submitting to Congress the details of these projects. Congress has appropriated a very considerable amount of money which has gone to make up the capital of what we call the World Bank, but there is a certain confidence that the management of the World

Bank will use that money prudently and wisely, and I would hope that there will be sufficient confidence in the administration so that it would not be necessary to submit specific projects as such to the Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator if the reference is to the World Bank?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. Dulles compares this phase of the foreign-aid program to the World Bank. He states that since the World Bank is not bound to give the Congress details, why should we get details from the foreign-aid administrators? In other words, why should we not trust the administration to spend all of these funds overseas without a full accounting being made to Congress?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But do we know whether or not this is the World Bank or the bank which is going to make the loan to build the great Aswan Dam on the Nile for Egypt, which has just established a totalitarian government? Do we know?

Mr. ELLENDER. I know as well as does the Senator from Wyoming that there is something going on there, and I believe the American people ought to know how far we are going, even if the World Bank is to handle the money. For that matter, this country contributes most of the money to the World Bank. We furnish 65 percent of its capital, if I remember the figures correctly. Why should the Congress not be told about these huge foreign loans?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no reason why we should not be told. I am happy the Senator is taking advantage of the opportunity to state the facts which have come to his attention with respect to this matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, before being interrupted—and I wish to make it clear that I do not mind interruptions—I was trying to show the huge sums we have spent, in addition to the sums mentioned by me, on foreign-aid programs, both military and nonmilitary.

Now, in addition to those sums, we have spent, up to June 30 of this year, for construction programs in foreign countries—countries that are well off today, countries that should assist us because of the help given by us to them under the Marshall aid plan—we have spent $2,817,710,000 to construct facilities designed not only to protect us, but to protect them as well.

We have spent on offshore procurement in the United Kingdom, France, and other countries, the huge sum of $2,771,147,000. That was for offshore procurement of materials of war that were manufactured by our overseas friends. They made profits out of those sales, and the military items produced by those countries and purchased by us, were then turned over, free of charge, to our NATO allies.

It is true that the amount I have just mentioned is a part of the military-aid program, and is included in the overall total; the point I am trying to stress is that not only has this huge amount been handed over as a gift to our friends who are well able to take care of themselves, but our friends across the seas undoubtedly made profits from those transactions.

I am sure that many Senators will remember that approximately 2 or 3 weeks ago, France sent 12 airplanes to Israel. The United States did not send those airplanes to Israel; but those 12 airplanes were built in France with United States funds, and then were given by France to Israel. I could cite numerous other cases, which have been reported publicly—although that is the only one about which I know the details—in which these funds have been used to make expenditures in France, in Belgium, in Portugal—in fact, in practically every country in western Europe—to purchase materials of war for the NATO members. By using our money to purchase overseas rather than procuring from the United States, the economics of those countries have been given a further boost.

As I have said, all of this has been done in addition to the huge foreign-aid grants we have made. Yet today our country owes more money than all the other countries of the world combined. We still continue to be blood-sucked for more and more by our friends, who argue that we must continue to make these funds available to them, or the mutual defense program will collapse.

Mr. President, I ask any Senator here to find any justification for continuing to give military or economic aid to a country such as Belgium. In all of Western Europe there is no more prosperous country than Belgium. Belgium owns the great Belgian Congo, in mid-Africa, and from the Belgian Congo we purchase millions of dollars' worth of materials each year. The Belgian Congo is a prosperous colony, rich in natural resources. I visited there 3 or 4 years ago; at that time the Belgian Congo not only had balanced its budget, with some $5 million to spare, but also boasted a surplus of more than one-quarter of a billion dollars. Yet we were spending money in the Belgian Congo, to assist the Belgians.

Mr. President, it seems to me we have reached the end of the road. The printed hearings, which we have on our desks, contain all the evidence which was presented before the Foreign Relations Committee. I have been unable to find in them where any effort was made by our officials to ascertain how much assistance we might obtain from our friends. No such effort was made. A few questions were asked Mr. Dulles by members of the committee, and Mr. Dulles said he would furnish the information. That was back in March, and the Senate is still waiting for the information. On the basis of the evidence before us, it appears that no effort is being made to cause our allies who are prosperous today to assist us in carrying this load.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WOFFORD in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to his colleague?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. The only good excuse which could be offered for giving our funds to help arm Belgium—which, after all, is not making as great a contribution, relatively, as we are making for defense purposes—would be that Belgium might not have the dollars with which to pay. Sometimes that excuse is offered. If my colleague will examine page 925 of the hearings, he will see that last year Belgium increased her holdings of American dollars from $1,039,000,000 to $1,198,000,000. In other words, during the last year she increased her dollar holdings by almost $160 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. And a similar improvement in dollar balances—although perhaps not to the same extent—can be shown for most of the other European countries we are now helping and for which the pending bill provides further assistance.

Belgium owns the Belgian Congo; we buy from the Congo large amounts of uranium and various other metals; American companies make many other purchases there, including coconut and other oils among other things. The Belgian Congo is very prosperous, and its wealth provides an abundant income for Belgium.

Why our advisers on the Washington level should ask, in connection with this bill, that we contribute many millions of dollars—I am not permitted to say how many—for further assistance to a country that is actually as prosperous as we are, if not more so, I cannot understand.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will my colleague yield further to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. From the same chart, which relates to the 14 countries in Europe for which aid is proposed, we see that during the period from 1954 to 1955 those 14 countries increased their dollar balances by almost $1 billion. Yet we are told that they cannot afford to pay their share.

Mr. ELLENDER. Well, I will say to my colleague that, if we continue to spend at the rate we are now going, then, as I have often stated, we are bound to lose our way of life. If, by means of overtaxation, initiative in this country is destroyed, just think what will happen.

The only salutary thing about our debt is that we owe it to ourselves. If we owed it to foreign governments, there is no telling what would happen.

Mr. President, to judge from my mail, I would say that the American people are getting sick and tired of these give-away programs—programs of gifts to countries which are well able to take care of themselves, or at least are well able to take care of their fair share in this assistance effort.

This is labeled a "mutual security program," but there is nothing mutual about it; we are carrying the entire load.

Mr. President, included in the bill is an item for research and development. This is not a new authorization. It has been going on for some time. Why, I may ask, we should increase the funds for research and development; why we should undertake to help pay for Western Europe's military research program as well as our own is beyond my comprehension.

As I pointed out several days ago, we are spending more than $5 billion for our own military research and develop-

ment, and for facilities necessary for that work. During the last 3 years, our allies have been spending, altogether, $49,077,000 for similar programs abroad and big-hearted Uncle Sam is putting up approximately $65 million of our money—over and above the domestic research and development effort—for those foreign projects.

Mr. President, the whole scheme is just beyond all reason. Why cannot those countries carry their own research load; why should not they be willing cheerfully to give to us—for their own protection, as well as for ours—any discoveries they may make. But, no; at the Washington level, as well as abroad, those who are desirous of spending American dollars have succeeded fairly well in convincing some Members of the Senate that we have to put our money in the "kitty," too.

A moment ago I mentioned that we are building airbases in Europe and north Africa. We are spending substantial amounts for those installations—which guard Europe as well as America against attack—but our allies under this so-called mutual security program do not give us one iota of assistance. However, this is not all. We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars in Southeast Asia to do the same thing. We have bases in Japan, in Okinawa, in Formosa, and in the Philippines. Are we getting any assistance from our friends in these localities? Are the Australians helping us? They are not. Are the New Zealanders? They are not. Yet, these countries should be more interested in the security of that area than we are. I visited Australia 2 or 3 years ago. It is a very prosperous country. In my opinion, the Australians, for instance, could well afford to help us pay the bills for defending and developing Southeast Asia. But they do not. Good old big-hearted Uncle Sam is carrying the whole load of not only building the bases, but supplying the airplanes, technicians, and everything else in order to operate them.

General LeMay recently appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee. He is "sold" on the Strategic Air Command. He believes—and I am sure he is honest about it—that the Air Force is the most important branch of the service, and that the most potent arm of the Air Force is SAC—which could deliver the blow which would crush any enemy who might dare to attack our Nation. I asked General LeMay, "How much are our allies contributing to the building and maintenance of air bases? How much are they doing in the way of creating a great retaliatory striking force? The answer was that they are contributing not a single dime. The burden is all being carried on the shoulders of Uncle Sam and the taxpayers of this country.

My plea, in connection with the measure before us, is that we cut to the bone many of the authorizations carried in this bill. I am satisfied that if an effort were made to get our friends to assist us, we might get somewhere. But judging from the record before us, no effort is ever made to get assistance from our friends. It seems to be too much trouble to even make the effort, as I found in Korea, for example, in conection with a plan to rehabilitate that land.

The United Nations offered to rehabilitate Korea. Various countries contributed to a fund of $250 million. We promised to put up about 65 percent, as I remember the figure. The U. N. did not raise the $250 million; it raised only about $175 million or $180 million. But the U. N. went to work on rehabilitation. When our people went there, that plan was too slow for them. They said, "We cannot work through the United Nations. It is too slow." Uncle Sam decided to undertake the job. Today we are spending in that area more than $1 billion a year in order to assist Korea.

I believe there should be an end to these expenditures. We cannot afford to continue spending as lavishly as we are; we cannot afford to carry the whole load, without the assistance of our so-called allies and retain our way of life.

What is the situation in Western Europe today? What is the attitude of our NATO friends? I say, Mr. President, that we hear more war talk in the United States than one hears in any country in Western Europe, or in Asia, for that matter. I am sure that many Senators have read an editorial from the Manchester Guardian of May 2, 1956, which was reprinted in the U. S. News & World Report for May 18, 1956, stating that NATO is about to fall apart.

I hope that is not true. I hope that NATO can be maintained, and that the countries which formed the alliance with the United States will get together and at least live up to the contracts which were formally made when NATO was born.

It may be that because of new weapons which have been found, the size of NATO forces can be reduced. But those forces should be reduced by order of the NATO commander, by order of the countries involved, not by allowing each country to act for itself.

This editorial from the Manchester Guardian mentions the fact that France took her troops out of the NATO structure without consultation. France said, "We need them in North Africa, and we are going to take them out." That is what happened. She did not ask permission of NATO. France merely removed her soldiers who supposedly were there to assist if the worst were to come. They were picked up almost bodily and taken to North Africa. If France is able to do that, and cannot be stopped from doing it, I ask, why have NATO? If the British can pull out at any time they choose and go off to fight in Cyprus, and leave good old Uncle Sam holding the bag, with the six divisions we have there, what purpose does NATO serve?

All of us are acquainted with what Mr. Dulles said some time ago, to the effect that he thought NATO should be reorganized, and that we should not place so much emphasis on the military aspect of the NATO pact. He said he thought something else ought to be done with NATO. All of this indicates, as the article to which I have referred sets forth, that something is happening to NATO—that it is weakening; that the NATO countries are desirous of pulling out.

It would be a great pity if anything should happen to NATO, in view of all the money we have invested in it, and in view of the protection it would afford the free world if it were maintained as first contemplated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the entire article from the Manchester Guardian to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U. S. News & World Report of May 18, 1956]

NATO IS FALLING APART: A BRITISH VIEW

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following is full text of an editorial, Rhine Armies, from the Manchester Guardian of May 2, 1956.)

Much has been said of the nonmilitary questions which the North Atlantic Council will discuss this week, but little has been said of its military business. Mr. Dulles, M. Mollet, and Mr. Pearson have talked of broadening NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) into political and economic fields. Nobody, however, has said anything in public about the disagreeable military facts which the Council ought to face.

When Mr. Dulles says that "the unanimity of our thinking upon the great basic issues makes it apparent that the time has come to advance NATO from its initial phase into the totality of its meaning," he means that, militarily, NATO is falling apart.

The French have stripped their contingents in Europe to reinforce North Africa. The West Germans have failed to pass a conscription law and are refusing to pay their share of common defense costs. The Belgians and Dutch are turning a deaf ear to General Gruenther's renewed appeal for a 2-year period of conscription. There is, in short, no prospect that General Gruenther or his successor will get the troops which were promised for the defense of Western Europe. He now has about 12 divisions where he was supposed to have about 25 or 30.

Militarily, the 12 are ineffective. They are too few to hold a front, even with atomic weapons, and they are backed by negligible reserves. This is what the Council should discuss. The Council shirked it in December, although the military disintegration was plain to be seen. It is even plainer today. The nonmilitary aspects of NATO are important, but secondary. The primary business of the North Atlantic Council is defense, and it should not again run away from its awkward duty.

What should be done? The first thing is to drop the pretense that the forces in Europe are going to be completed, and the second is to devise a strategy in keeping with the troops and aircraft which will be available.

The continental countries are going to devote less money and fewer men to defense, not more. The French cannot be blamed for treating North Africa as more urgent than Europe, for the immediate threat is there. What the Germans will do is anybody's guess, but they evidently do not feel in any great danger of attack from the East, or they would be rearming in a hurry. Is it, then, necessary for the British and Americans to continue spending a large amount of money on their forces in Germany?

Perhaps not. For defense of the central front in Europe, we might rely chiefly on the threat of massive retaliation—which, in fact, is what we are now doing anyway. The threat might be more effective as a defense if it were explicitly acknowledged. Instead

of falsely pretending that there will be sufficient forces on the ground and in the skies over Germany to repel attack there, the North Atlantic Council could say openly that any move forward by Communist forces would be met by all-out war.

If it is correct that the Russians have abandoned thought of direct military advance in Europe, as many people seem to think, the threat of massive retaliation is an adequate protection, and we do not need the Rhine armies. If that is not correct, and it might not be, we had better not try to bluff with General Gruenther's skeleton forces. The Russians, who can estimate their worth, are aware that they could offer no effective resistance in their present numbers. But their weakness might tempt the Soviet Government into action, if it were at all inclined that way, unless the threat of retribution on Russia was alone sufficient to hold the Soviet Government back. And if it is sufficient, why waste millions of pounds and thousands of men on the ordinary forces?

There are two snags. First, the possibility of nibbling at points on the periphery. The threat of massive retaliation may be effective against an invasion of Western Europe, but not against Soviet pressure for frontier revision in northern Norway or against Bulgarian demands in Thrace. The Americans are not going to risk the destruction of New York or the British of London for the sake of a few square miles of ice-bound Arctic land.

Yet if there were no means of resisting pressure, nibbling could not be stopped. The remedy lies in a small number of highly mobile units, available to go at once to any threatened part of the NATO area. The places where they might be needed can be listed—Spitsbergen, northern Norway, the Baltic Islands, the mining districts on the Saxon border, possibly Trieste, Macedonia, and Thrace, and the Turkish toe of Europe.

Units ready to move to any of these would be of greater value now than the incomplete field formations in Germany. What is more, these troops should not be equipped with tactical atomic weapons, as our forces in Germany are now being. It seems folly to provide atomic weapons which would turn a small action into all-out war. If a clear distinction had been drawn between tactical and strategic uses of nuclear weapons, and if the distinction were widely understood by public opinion and governments of East and West, the smaller atomic weapons would have some value. But no such distinction has been publicized. That is another matter which the North Atlantic Council has been unwilling to tackle.

Apart from the risk of nibbling, the second snag about disbanding the Rhine armies would lie in the political consequences. Could it be done without weakening American ties with Europe? And would it not, in spite of Western Germany's unwillingness to share the burdens of alliance, cause a great shock there? Perhaps it would, but to cause the shock might be better than continuing to spend money on ineffective forces. That, at any rate, is what the Council ought to be discussing.

Mr. ELLENDER. In connection with the statement I have just made, in the last issue of Newsweek dated July 2, 1956, there is an article on page 36 under the headline "British Defense Cutback—Lure to the West?" The article reads in part as follows:

Britain is planning a sweeping cut in its military defenses. It wants the United States and the rest of the Western Alliance nations to do the same.

This week, Chancellor of the Exchequer Harold Macmillan announced that defense spending would be slashed by $200 million as a starter.

I have been wondering what prompted this administration to ask for an increase in military aid over and above the amount we provided last year. Might not the answer be found in this article?

I read further:

The economy ax had already deactivated the entire British Antiaircraft Command and is closing Scapa Flow, Britain's storied naval base of both World Wars.

"The cuts," Newsweek's Eldon Griffiths cabled from London, "herald what Sir Anthony Eden's government expects will be a fundamental reassessment of the defense system of the whole Western Alliance."

Many of us, including some members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, took the position that a reevaluation of the entire aid program, particularly military aid, should be undertaken. I believe that should be done. However, while this is in progress why should we give more money to these countries? At the very most, we cannot sensibly afford to give more than we gave last year. At the same time, we should further investigate the aid situation, further evaluate it, and determine the extent to which our friends abroad are to be given additional assistance in meeting their NATO obligations.

From all I have heard, many of the countries are in the process of withdrawing from NATO and cutting their defense budgets. However, so far as we are concerned, we are increasing our overseas military aid—we are raising the ante so as to offset budget cuts in foreign lands.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article from Newsweek be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH DEFENSE CUTBACK—LURE TO THE WEST?

Britain is planning a sweeping cut in its military defenses. It wants the United States and the rest of the Western Alliance nations to do the same.

This week, Chancellor of the Exchequer Harold Macmillan announced that defense spending would be slashed by $200 million as a starter. The economy ax had already deactivated the entire British antiaircraft command and is closing Scapa Flow, Britain's storied naval base of both World Wars.

"The cuts," Newsweek's Eldon Griffiths cabled from London, "herald what Sir Anthony Eden's government expects will be a fundamental reassessment of the defense system of the whole Western Alliance."

London insists that the West cannot afford to spend vast sums on conventional tanks, guns, and even aircraft that may be useless in a nuclear war that may never come. With the Kremlin switching from armed aggression to commercial penetration, it is more important, they say, that the democracies maintain strong economies. In Britain's case, according to the Cabinet, this can only be done by reducing arms spending.

This line of thought has generated months of bitter argument and table thumping along Whitehall. The problem: How to get maximum defense in the hydrogen age from a minimum amount of money?

NEW NEW LOOK

A broad blueprint of what some Britons call "the second new look" has now emerged. In it is a reassuring determination to consult the United States before making any great change. But Washington is likely to produce agonized shouts, nonetheless. For, in essence, the second new look envisions a one-third reduction in British defense spending (now nearly $5 billion yearly).

No one in London knows just how the economies will work out. But this is, broadly, how the program shapes up:

Within 3 years, Britain to have less than 500,000 men under arms (against a current 775,000).

Conscription to be abolished by 1959. It would be replaced by a United States style selective service built around small numbers of specially trained men.

Britain's 4½-division force in Germany to be cut back to 2 divisions.

The Royal Air Force bomber command and missiles would become the main line of defense, but the fighter command would be scrapped. Jet fighters are regarded as overpriced and obsolescent.

London thinks that Britain could defend itself and fulfill its obligations to its allies with 100 supersonic bombers carrying British-built hydrogen weapons, a small nuclear navy, and an army of airborne atomic specialists.

The arguments behind the second new look: The Kremlin won't risk world war; nuclear weapons make it possible to rely on deterrent power alone.

GLOBAL SUICIDE

Eden came out of his April talks with Russia's new masters convinced that "conflict between great powers is unthinkable because it would be suicide on a world scale."

Eden's thinking on hydrogen weapons runs this way: "Where the ultimate deterrent is present, large forces confronting each other with all the panoply of guns and tanks have not the same significance. The time has surely come when all military planning should take account of changed circumstances." Bulking large in Downing Street calculations is the economic factor. Arms cuts are imperative, the Government feels, if Britain is to remain solvent.

The contemplated remodeling of Britain's defense establishment would undoubtedly ease the economic strain, enable the treasury to contribute more to Commonwealth development, and help British industry compete more effectively against Russia's economic offensive in the world's underdeveloped areas. The greatest peril—conceded in London, too—is that the West may forget that it was strength that persuaded the Russians to recognize that war wouldn't pay. If the West, for whatever reason, appears to weaken again, history has shown that the Communists might chance it after all.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there is another item in the program I think our people should know more about. It is a new item. Why it should be included in the program, I cannot understand. Some time ago, while I was examining one of the witnesses before the Committee on Appropriations, I was informed—and here it is in writing now, for it appears in the Mutual Security Act of 1956 hearings of the House of Representatives—that there was a program being hatched for the United States to undertake the protection of the big cities in Western Europe, much the same as we are now endeavoring to protect our own cities. That is a program that our country should have no part in. It should be done by the countries that want that protection. We have Nike batteries around our most important cities—we are trying to protect ourselves. But now, we are going to protect Europe, too. We are being asked to spend a half billion dollars to build a radar screen for Europe and to guard European cities with Nike missiles. That is in this bill.

Of course, there are no details. We are not permitted to make public just what cities are to be so protected or what the local governments are doing in the way of helping us on this program.

Why we are not being given all the details about that plan, I do not understand. I believe the taxpayers of the United States would like to know something about it; they certainly deserve to know, particularly since it is reported in the Newsweek article I read from earlier that the entire British antiaircraft command has been deactivated. Are we proposing to do for Britain what she has decided she will not do for herself?

It is my hope that during the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations I shall have the opportunity to get all this evidence. I will do my best to get permission to present it on the floor of the Senate, so that the people of this country can be told how their money is being spent.

A short time ago I referred to the vast sums that we have already spent and the huge amounts of money that are still in the aid pipeline appropriated in prior years but still unspent. The figures I have cannot be given in detail; all such detailed information is classified. All the documents relating to this detailed information are marked "Confidential." However, this morning I obtained permission to give to the Senate the lump-sum figures, without breaking them down country by country.

As of February 29, 1956, for military assistance and nonmilitary assistance for all countries, we had delivered $33,608,694,000.

In unexpended funds, we had on hand $8,332,845,000.

Now, let us take this program on a regional basis. First is Europe. As of March 1, 1956, unexpended balances for military assistance for the countries of Western Europe totaled $3,346,848,000. Those countries are as prosperous as our country, yet our planners still have over $3⅓ billion in unexpended funds which they plan to use in Europe. It is proposed in the pending bill to add to that figure $760,471,000. A good deal of that money goes to Belgium, which is very prosperous. Some of it goes to France and to other prosperous countries of Western Europe.

Let us look now at nonmilitary assistance for Europe. Our planners tell us there is no need for economic aid to Western Europe and that none is being requested. I want the American people to know that we now have in the pipeline in unexpended economic aid funds, for projects which perhaps have been evaluated and have been given the go-ahead sign, but not yet started, or perhaps for projects now in the process of completion, $271,216,000. That is all economic aid yet to be delivered to the countries of Europe. The bill provides for an additional sum of $90,900,000.

Now I turn to the Near East and Africa. Up to February 29, 1956, we have delivered military assistance to those countries totaling $1,411,577,000. We still have in the pipeline $533,770,000. We propose to give those countries an additional $471,918,000 under this bill.

For nonmilitary assistance for the Near East and Africa we have paid out $1,792,173,000, and there is still $388,731,000 unexpended. Yet the administration proposes to add to that unexpended fund, $412,400,000 in the pending bill.

Mr. President, I wish I could give all this in detail, but I cannot.

For military assistance to Asia we have already delivered $2,420,045,000. There was unexpended as of February 29, $1,359,526,000. In addition to this huge unexpended carryover, this bill proposes for military assistance to Asia $1,166,813,000.

Now, listen to this, Mr. President. For nonmilitary assistance for Asia we have already delivered to the countries of Asia—and there are not many—$2,867,709,000; there was still unexpended as of February 29, $1,545,065,000.

This bill proposes to authorize an additional appropriation of $1,215,250,000.

The amounts for Latin-America are very small in contrast to the other areas I have just mentioned. For military assistance to Latin-America we have already made available $83,327,000, with an unexpended balance of $43,414,000. The bill would authorize an additional $35,546,000 in military aid for Latin-America.

Nonmilitary assistance we have already delivered to Latin America totals $104,761,000; $78,646,000 is unexpended; and the bill asks for an additional sum of $60,850,000.

Mr. President, there is another little gadget in the aid program with which some of us are familiar. The President has, in addition to all the sums I have mentioned, a certain fund to expend more or less as he sees fit. It is labeled "nonregional." In military assistance in that category $552,968,000 has been delivered. There is in the pipeline $547,132,000. This bill provides an additional $565,253,000.

For nonregional nonmilitary aid we have already spent $663,622,000. There is unexpended a balance of $118,498,000. We are being asked to appropriate $215,875,000 more for that purpose.

Mr. President, this makes a grand total of delivered assistance, as of March 1, 1956, for the areas I have mentioned, of $33,608,694,000. There is $8,332,845,000 in the pipeline, and the President has asked us to appropriate $4,995,275,000 to supplement that huge sum—which would make a total available for expenditure in 1957 of roughly $13.2 billion.

Mr. President, I would now like to devote a little time to discussing how some of our money is being spent in Asia. I have found that in Asia, as in other parts of the world—particularly in South America—our technical assistance and economic-aid programs in many instances look too far to the future. Some of the programs now under way cannot possibly be effective for perhaps another decade. I have in my notes, on a country-by-country basis, much evidence supplied by our own representatives that although quite a few million dollars have been spent, it will still require years before the work which is being done will show any appreciable results.

Mr. President, we are dealing with problems which require relief for the people who are now living, not for their children 10 or 12 years hence; this is basic, because it is the present populations of underdeveloped lands that we are trying to assist, and win over to freedom. Also, in many cases, our ambitious planners just want to move too fast for the capabilities of the people. Instead of starting at the bottom rung of the ladder, taking into consideration the education, and level of learning of the people, and other matters of that kind, our planners start about midway up the ladder; many of the projects proposed and implemented go far beyond the comprehension of the people whom we are trying to assist.

Our administrators are so anxious to get things started that they practically force down the throats of countries like Thailand, Vietnam, and Formosa ambitious and unrealistic plans to develop their economies—programs so huge that the countries themselves could not handle them if they were placed in operation.

What is the result? We must come in and operate many of these projects. South Korea is a good example. South Korea does not have the technicians necessary to operate many of the highly technical projects we have undertaken there. Mr. President, we are frequently doing more harm than good when we build colleges, for instance, in countries where only a very few people can read or write. We should help build elementary schools—not universities.

The same thing applies in a variety of other nations which we are now assisting, particularly in Southeast Asia. We are trying to carry on a program far beyond the capabilities of the people in these countries to maintain or efficiently use. As a result, we make enemies, because unless we use our own money to carry on these projects and provide the technicians to proceed with the work, the people get mad. They ask:

"Why do you build these works—these mills, dams, plants, and schools—if you won't operate them for us?"

That is the position they take. It strikes me that we could spend one-fourth of the money we are now spending in those areas and get more for it, if we only undertook reasonable, realistic projects instead of the grandiose schemes hatched by the fertile minds of our eager Washington planners.

Mr. President, in Korea we have moved in and taken charge. As I said earlier, the United Nations had set up a plan to rehabilitate that country, but our administrators found the plan was too slow for their ambitious ideas; so they took over. The United States is now spending huge sums of money in Korea. There is a large number of technicians in South Korea who are constantly seeking ways and means of spending American dollars in an effort to balance industry with agriculture in that country. That is something which cannot be done simply because there are no minerals in Korea with which to work.

Today, as my report shows, the agricultural economy of South Korea is better than it has ever been. Korea is raising more livestock today than ever before in its history. Korea is growing

more rice per acre than ever before in its history. Yet we have technicians in Korea who are trying to better an agricultural economy that is far superior to anything which that country ever before experienced.

We raise much rice in Louisiana, but the per acre production of rice in Korea is many times the per acre production in Louisiana—and we use modern methods in Louisiana. All the rice in Korea is planted by hand, and every little bit of ground counts. Yet, although more rice is produced per acre in Korea than in Louisiana, some of our rice experts are trying to teach Korean farmers how to grow more rice. In my humble judgment, based upon my firsthand knowledge of agriculture, I do not see how any more rice can be produced in Korea than is now being produced there.

The production of poultry in Korea has been increased a thousandfold through our assistance. Cattle production has been increased tremendously, too.

In order to provide work, our administrators on the local level have actually poured millions of dollars of our cash into programs which, speaking bluntly, smell to high heaven of socialism. Industrial plants are being built almost entirely with our own money. I will not say "entirely," because the Koreans do contribute, although the contributions paid by Korea are in counterpart funds, which are generated from goods which we send to Korea under our aid program and are sold there.

There are in Korea two large fertilizer plants, one costing $26,400,000, the second one costing $19 million. All of that money is being put up by Uncle Sam.

There is an auto tire manufacturing plant in Korea, the cost of which was $635,000. We put up $540,000 of our own money for that plant, and it is owned and operated by the state.

There is also a rubber reclaiming plant, the cost of which is $420,000. There is a pesticides plant. There are five pharmaceutical plants, all being built in large part by the United States.

Of course, Korea does not have the necessary technicians to run and operate these plants, so good old Uncle Sam operates them for South Korea.

Although not an ounce of wheat is grown in Korea, and all the people of Korea eat in the way of starch is rice, we have constructed four flour mills. What is the idea? The idea is for them to operate flour mills to process wheat we send them, so they can sell their rice for export.

Four starch plants were built, almost entirely from funds Congress appropriated.

Incidentally, a few days ago I mentioned the matter to Mr. Hollister, who is now the Administrator of the ICA program, and he indicated that no more of these plants would be erected. I think the program should have been stopped a long time ago. In view of this picture, in this one country alone, I can well understand why there is an unwillingness to divulge to the American people how the huge sums we are providing for Korea in nonmilitary aid will be used.

We have also built in Korea a large plastic molding plant; an aluminum rolling plant; a clothing factory; a shoe manufacturing plant and a book publishing plant. We put up almost all the money for those plants. The cost of the book publishing plant was $475,000. We put up $375,000 of the cost, and the Korean Government put up the rest, by way of counterpart funds derived from goods purchased with aid money and sold to the Korean people.

We have also built in Korea a chemical processing plant, a motor vehicle manufacturing plant, a tire manufacturing plant, a glass bottle plant, a chemical processing plant, a ball-bearing plant, a silk textile plant. Most of those factories are being operated by American technicians, because the Koreans simply do not have the necessary know-how to operate them.

A marble-polishing establishment was also built, the cost of which was $445,000. We put up $350,000 of that.

A limestone-crushing plant was built, with Uncle Sam picking up 74 percent of the tab.

We put up 85 percent of the money for three food-processing plants, one of them costing $490,000, and the other two $235,000 each.

We put up substantially all of the cost of three paper-manufacturing plants. One of them cost $760,000, another $1,300,000, and still another $771,000.

For small enterprises—that is, for one- or two-man shops and family enterprises, all very small manufacturing enterprises—we have provided every dime of $3 million in the way of assistance.

Mr. President, I have a hunch that one of the reasons why we are not being permitted to tell the American people how the money authorized in the pending bill is going to be spent is that more of the same, more of this huge spending for what is, in essence, the furtherance of a specialized Korean economy, is proposed. As I stated before, almost all of the factories I have mentioned are owned by and are being operated for the benefit of the Government of Korea. Our technicians are over there running the factories.

Aside from these manufacturing enterprises, Mr. President, we have built thermal plants to develop electricity, all of them put up at our expense, and all owned by the Korean Government. The Government of Korea sells the electricity generated by these plants and the proceeds then find their way into the hands of the Korean Government.

I realize that Korea was at one time in a bad way. Korea had almost no industry after liberation from the Japanese. It went through a cruel war which destroyed much of what it had. Efforts are now being made—and I think they will be successful since the President of Korea is demanding their approval—to have the United States recognize as our bounden duty to rebuild for the Korean any factory of any kind which had been built by the Japanese and which was destroyed during the war. We have rebuilt some of them; we are building new ones, and I assume that process is going to keep on ad infinitum.

On top of this economic effort in Korea, we are also maintaining a large ROK Army. I am not going to mention the number of divisions, but it is quite large. We are doing that all at our own expense. Not one single solitary dime comes from any of our allies; no nation assists us in this effort. We are also rehabilitating and maintaining all the ports in Korea, and all the roads in Korea. In short, good old Uncle Sam is supporting South Korea from A to Z, alone and without outside help. We even maintain 99.9 percent of the foreign troops now manning the truce line in Korea.

There are in Korea only a handful of Turks, a handful of Greeks, a handful of Ethiopians, and a few Englishmen on the truce line.

While we have quite a few divisions there, every military expense—for foreign as well as our own troops—is being paid by us—food, ammunition, everything. There is one minor exception. The English will not take ammunition that we manufacture, or the hardware for war that we have. They have their own. Other than that, we are carrying the whole load, without any assistance from any quarter.

It strikes me, Mr. President, that if this is to be a mutual security program in name it ought to be mutual in practice. We ought to get assistance from those who will be protected by this program just as we will be.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator is not quite correct when he says there is no mutuality about the program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean in that area?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am speaking about the specific area of Korea, because the small Republic of Korea, which was a victim of Communist aggression, is itself, as the Senator has pointed out, carrying a very heavy burden in the maintenance of its armed forces. The Senator has, quite properly, not mentioned the exact number of divisions, but I can say in general that Korea is manning the line with more than 500,000 men. The cost of maintaining such defenses is taking about 60 percent of Korea's national budget.

So the little Republic of Korea certainly is carrying its share of the burden in the collective defenses of that area of the world. Unless the Senator from Louisiana is prepared to see the Republic of Korea "go down the drain"—which I am sure he is not—I do not think it is quite fair to say that that country, at least, which was devastated by the Communist aggression, is not carrying its share of the burden.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there is no doubt that the South Koreans are carrying some of this burden. I had in mind, in particular, the other nations with an interest in the security of that area, such as the Australians, the British, and the French. They are as inter-

ested in this matter as we are. None of those people are helping us; none of our other allies is assisting us.

In the case of South Korea, the Senator from California knows that we are providing practically all the money for food, clothing, hardware, and so forth for the Korean armies, and in addition, we are furnishing a good deal of the money that is paid to the South Korean Army since it comes from counterpart funds.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not complaining about the statement the Senator from Louisiana has made; in fact, he and I have agreed, both in the Appropriations Committee and elsewhere, and both during the Korean war and since then, that some of our allies elsewhere in the world were not carrying their fair share of that war and the general effort to combat communism; and to the Senate I have pointed out that during the operations of the United Nations members in Korea, we were providing 90 percent of the manpower and 90 percent of the resources, although the little Republic of Korea was making a substantial contribution, herself. If my recollection is correct, at one time we had 450,000 men in Korea, and at one time the little Republic of Korea had more than 500,000 men, resisting the Communist aggression there. All the other United Nations countries had, together, approximately 45,000 men there. Furthermore, the Republic of Korea suffered a million casualties, both civilian and military, in addition to a terrific amount of property damage and other devastation.

So I am not criticizing the remarks the Senator from Louisiana has made about this matter, because I know he has given profound study to it and feels very deeply about it. We may happen to differ on some aspects of the matter, of course.

However, I am saying that there is a mutual arrangement, so far as the Republic of Korea is concerned. I think Korea has made a great contribution to the preservation of freedom in that area of the world.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not deny that. What I emphasize principally is that none of the countries of Western Europe—which we have been aiding "until it hurts"—and also countries such as Australia, which are vitally interested in keeping peace in that area, are not contributing a dime to this effort. Furthermore, I have been informed that Australia did not ask anyone else about withdrawing her soldiers from South Korea but simply withdrew them, leaving only a handful of her troops there. On the other hand, we have kept our divisions there. As the Senator from California knows, they are located where the enemy will make its first attempt to break through, if an attack is made.

Certainly we cannot continue to provide this money at such a rate. I believe it was stated, the other day, that over the next 10 years we could expect to spend approximately $40 billion a year on defense. Anyone with commonsense knows that we cannot keep that up plus maintaining this program and still hope to retain our way of life.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Again, I say that at a later time I expect to discuss this matter, and I shall make some of the same criticisms of some of our allies to whom we have furnished funds that the Senator from Louisiana has made. Like the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, I have been in that area of the world, and elsewhere, also.

In the case of Australia, it is true that she has a large land area and a fine population; and the Australians were very stout allies of ours during World War II. Australia was one of the few nations to send troops to stand at the side of our troops and at the side of the forces of the Republic of Korea, during the Korean aggression by the Communists. But we must constantly keep in mind that the total population of Australia is about 9 million, or 4 million less than the population of my own State of California, and less than the population of the island of Formosa, and considerably less than the population of the Republic of Korea, which has a population of approximately 23 million, I believe, south of the 38th parallel.

Furthermore, Australia has additional commitments under the ANZUS Pact and under the Southeast Asian Pact. I make that statement because I believe that when the chips are down, there are a few countries that will stand up and be counted, along with us; I think Australia will be one, the Republic of Korea will be one, Turkey will be one, and the island of Formosa will be another. I think those countries would stand up and be counted along with us, when the chips were down.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not think there is any doubt about that. My point is that we need assistance too; now is the time when we must lessen our huge economic burdens.

Next let me refer to Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam, in Southeast Asia. We are carrying the whole load there. We even paid for the upkeep of French troops, for as long as they were there. All of that was our own burden; and even today, no other outside country is helping us carry the burden in Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos.

I may say that I found in Vietnam the cooperation between that infant Republic and our Nation is very good. The great trouble, as I see it, is that our administrators on the local level are trying to go too fast with the program; they are spending too much money for the results they are obtaining. They could move more slowly, operate in keeping with the ability of the people themselves to absorb the effort, in keeping with the ability of that country to maintain it after our contributions have been completed, and accomplish more with less money. That is what I am pleading for.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator's criticism in that regard is quite justified. I made similar complaints when I visited those countries. In many cases I think we have pushed our aid beyond the capacity of the people to handle it. But I wish to point out the significant fact that from 1945 until the outbreak of the Korean war, in 1950, the number of people behind the Iron Curtain, in the Soviet bloc, increased from 200 million to 900 million, representing a terrific expansion of international communism. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana will agree that that was not in our national interest or in the interest of the preservation of a free world of freemen.

Since that time, with the exception of northern Vietnam, there has been no expansion of international communism.

Of course, I believe that Premier Diem, of Vietnam, has a very difficult problem. His country is disorganized; the French have left, and they did not properly train administrators there. In that respect, the French did not give training similar to that which we gave in the Philippines. So Premier Diem has a terrific problem. Yet I think it is very important to the free world that Vietnam, Thailand, Laos, and Cambodia shall not pass behind the Communist Iron Curtain, if it is possible to prevent that from happening, because if the same type of expansion should take place in the next 10 years that took place in the period between 1945 and 1950, we might very well find ourselves as an isolated island of freedom on the North American Continent—a continental Dien Bien Phu. I do not think we could preserve our economic or political system, or our security as a Republic, if the remainder of the world were operating behind the Communist Iron Curtain.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am in basic agreement with that statement. The thing is that people who should be as interested as ourselves in preserving peace and freedom are not assisting us in that effort. I do know that the citizens of Vietnam, under President Diem, who is a very fine leader, are doing a good job, but our administrators are going beyond the capability of those people to absorb all we are trying to teach them. In other words, we are the ones who are constantly urging haste. We could take the money now sought to be authorized, spend it over a period of 2 or 3 years instead of this year, and get much more out of it than at the rate we are proceeding.

Mr. President, it is now 3:20 p. m. I must yield the floor at 3:30. I want to discuss the situation in Formosa, which I shall be able to do only briefly.

Formosa is a small island, yet we are spending many millions of dollars there. I had occasion to talk with Chiang Kai-shek. He paid glowing tribute to America and I think justly so—because we have certainly spent huge sums of money there. As is the case with South Korea,

we now have on Formosa some one hundred and fifty technicians who are constantly seeking ways and means of spending money in order to balance agriculture with industry, when Formosa does not have the basic resources to work with.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator has mentioned Taiwan, which is an important country. The Senator may have noted from press reports today that Chou En-lai, the Communist Premier of China, has called upon the free Chinese on Formosa to put their heads in the noose, to come forward and negotiate, and be taken over by him. That shows that he has not given up. He says that if they will not do so peacefully, he intends to take the island by force, if necessary.

Mr. ELLENDER. The point I intended to emphasize was this: In my conversation with Chiang Kai-shek, he was very grateful for all we had done. In answer to a question from me, he stated that food production on Formosa had been greatly increased, that presently it was enough to sustain the civilian population of that island, plus a third of the number of soldiers who must be maintained there. I asked him, "Why then are our planners here spending all this money for various programs?" He replied, in essence, "Of course, that is your business."

Our administrators there are always on the lookout for new ways to spend our scarce tax dollars. We have built 410 new plants in that area, as I recall the figure. About 50 percent of the cash for these installations was furnished by us. I visited some of them. One or two of them had been built without a thorough examination into the question of whether or not there would be material on the island to operate them. I remember one which used silica. Many thousands of dollars were spent to erect the plant. It was operated for about 30 days, and had to close, because it ran out of silica.

I made a visit to the Honshu Window Glass Works, a brand new plant which we erected. We provided about half the money necessary to build the plant, which is a comparatively small one. There is not very much window glass used in Formosa, but our administrators conceived and implemented the idea of building the plant. It was supposed to have been built on a 50–50 basis. It required 15,795,000 in Chinese currency, which, in United States dollars, amounts to about $526,000 to build.

What did the Chinese furnish? Those who promoted it are pretty smart Chinese from the mainland. They put up some equipment and technical services. Of course, we had our own technicians. They placed the value of those services at 2,737,000 Nationalist Chinese dollars, which are worth about 3 United States cents. They furnished certain supplementary equipment. I could not find out what it was, but it was valued at 2,349,000 units of their currency. For building construction, they put up 2,945,000 units of their currency. For preoperation expenses—I could not find out what that meant—they put up 4,405,000 units of their currency. For customs duty, that is, to pay the import duty on machinery to help the Government of Taiwan, they put up 2,000,000 units of their currency.

I asked for an analysis of the figures in connection with this plant. Up to the present time I have not obtained it. My guess is that less than 10 percent of the actual cost of this glass factory was contributed by those who now own it, Chinese from the mainland. Uncle Sam put up nearly all the money—there is no question about that.

I have before me a list of all capital development projects built on Formosa since 1950. I do not have time to discuss them all, but many projects have been constructed almost entirely with contributions by us, and they are now being operated by Chinese from the mainland. They were, in essence, gifts from our taxpayers to a fortunate few, a selected elite of Chinese businessmen.

When I was there I found, to my surprise and disappointment, that efforts were being made to have Uncle Sam foot the bill for a Nationalist Chinese GI bill of rights. The entire cost of this program was to be furnished by the United States Government. The amount necessary to undertake the initial program was estimated to be $38 million. The money would be used to rehabilitate, hospitalize, and otherwise take care of Nationalist soldiers who are too old to be useful for military service.

I was told, without question, that our local mission would never consent to such a project, but I have learned lately that we are to undertake it after all. In this very bill there is a sum proposed to be appropriated for that purpose. I do not know how much it is, but I shall find out, and I hope to be able to tell the Senate and our people the facts when I get the information. I think it is beyond all reason for the United States Government to be called upon to put up money to provide a GI bill of rights for Nationalist Chinese soldiers. I hope to lay bare the details of the plan for the benefit of our taxpayers.

We are also being asked to build a huge dam in Formosa. I cannot understand why this structure, which would cost more than $45 million, and which would produce power to be sold for use on Formosa, could not be built by the Chinese people on a more or less bonding basis if our own planners would just exercise a little reason. China could certainly borrow the money and repay the loan out of proceeds derived from the sale of power generated from the dam. Of course, that would not be to the liking of our eager bureaucrats there, our American giveaway artists. They want Uncle Sam to build the project on a gift basis.

Mr. President, I see that I must conclude my remarks; however, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, my recommendations resulting from my recent trip abroad. I regret that I cannot insert in the RECORD my entire series of country reports, but they are most voluminous and, too, they contain much classified information. I do invite Senators to use these reports; they will be on file with the Senate Committee on Appropriations and available to all Senators.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS

MILITARY ATTACHÉS

This year, I desire to reemphasize the recommendations which I have submitted over the past 2 years with respect to this aspect of our Government's foreign activities. In almost every post I visited, the three military services still maintain separate attaché systems, with separate staffs, separate transportation, separate administrative support and, in many instances, separate bookkeeping activities. The net result of this duplication is, of course, intolerable waste. I therefore will again recommend that:

1. Unification consistent with the intent of the Armed Forces Unification Act be in fact practiced in the military attaché system. In areas where the interest of one service is predominant, the representative of that military agency should be given responsibility for the operation of the entire section. Other services desiring representation there should be required to accredit their officers as deputies. In this connection:

(a) Technical staffs should be as small as possible. The situation existing in Hong Kong where our Government maintains a huge staff to report on activities of the British and to channel into Washington information identical to that forwarded to London by British observers is extremely wasteful. By coordinating our activities with those of our allies, I feel certain that technical attaché staffing can be greatly reduced.

(b) Administrative support for all arms should be provided by the dominant military agency at the post concerned. By so doing, administrative work could be centralized and duplicating staffs eliminated.

(c) Transportation should be the responsibility of the dominant arm. The present wasteful anomaly of duplicating transportation pools for each service must be terminated.

2. Attention should be given to eliminating separate attaché staffs in nations where the United States maintains a military advisory group. I discovered again this year that in a number of nations receiving United States military aid, our Government is supporting separate attaché and advisory sections. There would appear to be no valid reason why the advisory group could not provide the various services with the intelligence and other data presently the responsibility of the military attaché.

3. Realistic staffing should be enforced. It is my belief that in many instances the position of military attaché is regarded as the fruit awarded an officer or enlisted man for loyal and lengthy service. Some posts I visited appeared to maintain swollen military attaché staffs simply because that particular area was a desirable one. I must emphasize that if the necessary reporting requirements can justify only a specific number of attachés, no others should be assigned.

EMBASSY OPERATIONS

It is a pleasure for me to report to the committee that I this year noted a considerable improvement in the efficiency with which our foreign missions are operated. In addition, I was once again impressed with the caliber of employees who man our diplomatic establishments. In many instances, their personal sacrifices are deserving of the Nation's highest gratitude.

1. I have frequently criticized both the type and number of economic, commercial, and similar reports which are required of our foreign missions. In my past two reports, I have urged the Department of State and other interested Government agencies to revise their reporting criteria, to utilize

data which is already in their files before requesting special reports, and to otherwise lighten the burden on the specialized staffs of our foreign posts. I have determined during my inspection trip this year that implementation of any appreciable degree of reason in reporting requirements will require a coordinated effort of all affected agencies; unless this effort is undertaken voluntarily, then I must heartily recommend that the committee instruct them to do so as soon as possible.

The committee will note frequent references in my country reports to the apparently excessive staffs of the economic and political sections of our overseas missions, in particular. I have frequently recommended that these staffs be reduced. However, it must be recognized that the primary reason for the large numbers of persons engaged in these functions is traceable directly to unrealistic reporting demands imposed at the Washington level. Therefore, I recommend that:

(a) All affected Federal agencies meet as soon as possible, coordinate their reporting demands, eliminate requirements which are nonessential, and promulgate reporting requirement standards which take into consideration side, staffing patterns, and locations of various overseas missions.

In this connection, I have attached to the Thailand country report a sample of the reporting requirements imposed upon that mission. This 11-page summary of required reports appears to be typical of the unrealistic demands imposed upon all overseas posts. The committee will note that this mission is required to report on almost every phase of the Thai national life, and, in addition, is also required to file a number of special reports.

It is my fervent hope that the reporting requirements can be revised, that unnecessary reports can be eliminated, and that the practice of imposing identical reporting requirements upon our staffs of large and small nations alike can be ended.

I also recommend that the interested agencies take adequate steps to determine whether the data they need on a given occasion may not already be in their files before filing cabled requests for identical information.

(b) Wherever possible, the size of political reporting staffs be reduced, and heavier reliance be placed upon personal observations supplied by the chief accredited United States representative to the nation concerned. In many instances, political reports filed by the political sections duplicate reports submitted by the chief of mission. In others, it is obvious that a number of the special political reports are in the nature of "make-work" rather than necessary.

(c) The responsible departments use care in assigning specialized attachés abroad, since I discovered instances where such are definitely not needed. Special commercial attachés frequently duplicate work which is normally done by post economic sections, or which could be performed by that section in the normal course of its business. A case in point is Poland where, at the time of my visit, the new agricultural attaché had no idea as to what specific tasks he was to perform. Although he said he was a farmer, and was apparently an able individual, it would appear that the position of agricultural attaché there could be abolished with no appreciable injury to our Government. Similar situations exist in a number of areas.

I therefore recommend that the various Federal departments which presently maintain specialized attachés in foreign posts reexamine and reevaluate the necessity for these positions, with a view toward reducing operational costs and utilizing data compiled by existing diplomatic sections wherever possible.

2. The Department of State, in undertaking a review of the necessity for what are apparently "padded" staffs in some areas of the world, should also reduce the size of administrative sections as workloads are reduced. It is my belief that by eliminating unnecessary positions in overseas posts, those economies can be reflected in smaller administrative and other support operations.

3. I recommend that the Federal departments maintaining staffs in Tokyo, Hong Kong, and other Far Eastern cities immediately reduce the number of Americans assigned and utilize to the maximum extent possible local employees. Hong Kong and Tokyo, in particular, are swarming with Americans.

I further recommend that the Department of State and the Department of Defense conduct a joint review of their staff needs in these areas with a view toward coordinating their efforts and reducing the number of staff positions required.

4. I recommend that the Department of State undertake to supply American employees in the U. S. S. R. and other Iron Curtain nations with better housing and recreational facilities.

(a) In the U. S. S. R., our employees are in urgent need of recreational advantages. Children of Americans employed there need a decent playground, and United States employees and their dependents should be supplied with a greater volume and variety of recreational pursuits—movies, magazines, similar things.

(b) In Yugoslavia, living conditions for American dependents are abominable. I found that inflated prices consume the entire living allowance for our employees, most of whom reside at hotels. Where dependents and families are also present, they are frequently forced to share dwellings with Yugoslav locals; this involves sharing bathroom and laundry facilities, as well as the sharing of kitchen conveniences. I cannot emphasize too much my belief that the majority of Americans assigned to Yugoslavia are living under substandard conditions, and that their families are being subjected to unnecessary and unfair hardships.

I therefore recommend that at least a part of the present counterpart balances which have accrued to our credit in Yugoslavia be used to construct a compound, with decent living accommodations for Americans and their dependents stationed here. As an American citizen, and as a Member of the Congress, I frankly was provoked at the luxury in which some staffs live, while others live in comparative poverty. The contrast between West German living facilities and those available in Yugoslavia is astounding; by all means, an effort should be made to provide all Americans assigned to State Department posts with decent living conditions. It is not fair for some Americans to live in luxury, as is the case in West Germany, while the families of others must share bathroom facilities with the local population, as in Yugoslavia.

5. I recommend that the Department of State reexamine its present assignment of functions with respect to the Foreign Buildings Operations Regional Office in Hong Kong. It is my understanding that Foreign Buildings Operations Regional Office, Hong Kong, is responsible for all construction, etc., in the band of nations stretching from that point to Burma. I further understand that a second Foreign Buildings Operations office is being opened in Bangkok. It is my recommendation that the Hong Kong office be closed, and that all Foreign Buildings Operations work in Southeastern Asia be centered in Bangkok, thus reducing operating expenses. I believe this is particularly necessary inasmuch as living costs are extremely high in Hong Kong.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Some economies in the performance of information missions have been accomplished in the operation of this agency since my inspection of last year. The necessity for economy in operation seems to be more widely understood. In particular, the establishment of the Philippine Islands printing facilities has resulted in a considerable long-term saving to our Government; by concentrating printing facilities in the Philippines, USIA has been able to provide excellent service to a number of posts, at a much smaller cost than had the printing been contracted out on a country-by-country basis.

Nevertheless, there is still room for improvement in the agency's overall operation; much "missionary work" remains to be done before the operations of this agency can be generally termed satisfactory.

1. I recommend once again that USIA discontinue what appears to be a standard practice of maintaining at least one of each type of medium available in each and every nation where its operations are conducted. In many nations I visited, the motto seemed to be: "You name a medium, we have it."

In nations where literacy is the rule rather than the exception, libraries would appear to be unnecessary. This is especially true in those nations where the library facility contains books which are almost all printed in the English language. Efforts should be made to concentrate on those mediums which are best suited to the particular area; secondary mediums, unsuited for the local population, should be discontinued.

As an example of what I have in mind, I might cite our information activities in Japan. There we employ over 350 persons just to disseminate information. We have in that country a full-scale motion-picture operation, and press service; we publish periodicals, operate cultural centers, finance exchange of persons programs, and in general, engage in all the various types of information activities that are authorized by law. It is my belief that rather than try to carry on an activity in each of the fields of endeavor, we should limit our operations to those activities which can best reach the masses of the Japanese people, in order to acquaint them with our way of life and our democratic principles.

To cite another example: In India much work could be done through moving pictures. Much effective work could be done in other underdeveloped areas also by concentrating our efforts on the use of moving pictures. But in India I found that we are using every form of informational activity, including those designed for use in countries like England, France, and others, where there are different kinds and temperaments of people, and different economic and cultural standards.

The information service could maintain itself and perform a commendable job, if only the agency would eliminate many of its services which, in my opinion, are being wasted because they do not reach the people of the host country.

2. I recommend that USIA employ locals to perform as much of its grassroots work as possible. I frequently heard local criticism of our information effort which was predominantly on them: "Yes, you have a program here, but your workers are all Americans."

3. The United States Government should obtain increased cooperation from allied nations where we maintain information facilities, both in the line of sharing administrative expenses (such as rental, costs, etc.) and in distribution facilities as well. In this connection, the program in Vietnam is utilizing local troops to distribute pamphlets; this practice is to be commended, since information flowing from native to native carries a greater impact than material which has its obvious genesis in American hands.

I have much information to the effect that the Government spends thousands of dollars in foreign countries in order to pay the rent for libraries. We have operated these libraries long enough to teach the people the value of libraries. Our information service

people want the libraries to remain under their supervision rather than be placed under the supervision of the people of the host countries, in spite of the fact that we could thereby save substantial sums each year, and the library program would have a better chance to become an established, integral part of the country's culture.

In London, England, we spend $10,575 each year on rentals for library quarters, when that city already boasts 31 public libraries and 502 special libraries. We are spending $6,200 a year just for rental on library quarters in Brussels, Belgium. In Italy we spend $34,500 a year to rent facilities for USIA-operated libraries in 11 cities. We also furnish at least a portion of the staff in these libraries, the cost of utilities, and other items of maintenance. I cite these expenses as an example of the money that, as I evaluate the program, is being spent needlessly and to no good advantage, by our United States Information Agency in its ambitious policy to conduct information activities in every country of the world, regardless of the need for such activities.

I further recommend that in those nations where USIA is performing essentially local-government information functions, local contributions should be obtained. In the new nations of Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam, our information officers are performing tasks which, in older governments, are done by local governing authorities. Reimbursement for these functions should be sought, and obtained.

By all means, our burgeoning information programs in Western European nations should be ended immediately. I can see no reason why our Government should be investing in information programs in order to sell America to Western Europe, to Australia, New Zealand and other nations closely allied with us.

As an American citizen, it disturbs and aggravates me to discover that our own State Department takes the position that vast sums of money must be spent to send orchestras, actors, bands, etc., to these nations, which are presumably our allies, in order to convince them that the United States is not inhabited by barbarians. If the citizens of these nations do not know and understand the temper of our people, after we have given generously of our national wealth to them, then the dispatching of entertainment groups is not going to change their minds.

I wish, also, to caution the committee that the information service, which was initially presented to the Congress as an emergency program designed to take the truth behind the Iron Curtain, is becoming a permanent operation. Efforts are being made to make the information service a perpetual organization, operating on a grandiose scale, with built-in facilities in nearly all of our foreign posts.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

It is frankly difficult for me to find a place to begin my observations upon the myriad activities of this mushrooming operation. The local functioning of our aid program must be seen to be actually believed.

As the committee is well aware, I have frequently criticized the scope and nature of many of these aid efforts. I feel sure that if the full membership of the committee could but have inspected the same areas I visited, they would all share my feelings.

The following recommendations are necessarily broad; specific examples of the evils cited can be found in almost all of the country reports which I have attached.

1. I recommend that each year the International Cooperation Administration be instructed to provide the committee, at least 6 weeks prior to hearings on the mutual security appropriation, with a by-country breakdown of funds in "pipeline" status, counterpart balances and unobligated and obligated funds. I feel that this material is of utmost necessity if the committee is to be in a position to act intelligently on new money requests. For example, I determined that in Austria, there is in excess of $1 million worth of commodities in pipeline status. Some $30 million in counterpart equivalent still is unexpended, and the United States has on deposit to its credit there a counterpart balance equivalent of $4 million. Similar breakdowns for all nations where aid operations are in effect or contemplated would provide the committee with a better picture of precisely what the actual fiscal needs are in any given instance, and indicate where unused funds might be recaptured for new uses and/or redistribution.

2. I wish to compliment the manner in which our allies are assisting the Yugoslavian aid program. This is the first example of a practice which should be extended to every nation presently receiving United States assistance. I have long advocated obtaining greater assistance from our allies in assisting the cause of freedom in the world. British and French assistance in the Yugoslavian program proves that the sharing of burdens is practical and feasible. By all means, the practice should be extended to more areas.

3. I recommend that if a program is to be continued, our officials in Yugoslavia insist upon full inspection of the use to which our military assistance is put. It is my belief that the Yugoslav Government will permit this inspection if it is but assured that our officials are not examining their operations with a view toward gathering military intelligence, but only seeking to determine whether the assistance we render is being put to the best possible use. Under no circumstances should military aid continue to be given Yugoslavia on a "carte blanche" basis.

4. I recomend that the program in India be reexamined. As the committee will note in the attached country report, a tremendous backlog of unexpended balances is presently on our aid books in India. New appropriations should be curtailed for this area until such time as these balances are reduced. The appropriation of new moneys while balances of prior year funds remain unspent leads to unconscionable extravagances.

5. I further recommend that Indian and Egyptian threats to enlist Soviet aid unless the United States meets certain demands be ignored. Our aid effort in India should be governed by a rule of reason consonant with respectable requirements and present United States fiscal capabilities. The United States should not yield to pressure which amounts, in essence to international blackmail.

6. I recommend that attention be given to the implementation of a modest assistance effort in Burma, where technical aid in particular is urgently needed. Since the Burmese do not desire American handouts, I recommend that arrangements be made to permit reimbursement by the Burmese for any aid rendered them.

I also recommend that no commitents be given the Burmese as to either the scope or length of our aid effort there. There are efforts underway to obtain assurance from the United States Government that a 10-year program will be maintained. These assurances should not be given.

7. The assistance program in Thailand should be reevaluated in line with specific recommendations outlined in the attached country report. Tremendous sums of money have been spent in this nation, with apparently no appreciable results.

8. I recommend that in the infant Republics of Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam a coordinated program with a specific number of objectives be promulgated and implemented at once. Assistance in this area has been on a piecemeal basis, with no assurance that any comprehensive improvement will result. I realize that to a large extent the program here was a crash effort, brought about as a result of the Indochina war. Nevertheless, with the present truce in effect, attention must be given to promulgating a specific program for the entire area. I further recommend:

(a) That our officials press for the removal of new and artificial trade barriers which presently choke trade among the three nations of Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. Economic difficulties of the first magnitude have been generated by these barriers, not the least of which involves the interchange of rice supplies between Cambodia and Vietnam.

(b) That the assistance effort be confined to programs which will quickly show results. The crying need in this area, as well as the entire arc of free Asia, is for assistance which will better conditions today, not tomorrow. Unless improvement is shown quickly, it is entirely possible that the entire Indochina area will fall to the Viet Minh by default.

(c) That under no circumstances should assistance funds be used to construct a new palace for the King of Laos. These moneys could be much better used to improve conditions among the people of Laos. I can conceive of no greater propaganda weapon we could supply to the Viet Minh than to construct a sumptuous palace for the King while his subjects dwell in appalling poverty.

(d) Here, as in Thailand, no commitments should be given as to the scope or length of the aid program. Efforts are presently underway to obtain commitments for a long-term capital investment program. These should not be given. As I indicated previously, the assistance should be confined to that which will show immediate results.

(e) That proposed plans for the construction and maintenance of a military academy in Cambodia be abandoned.

(f) That ICA administrators cease accepting counterpart funds generated by the sale of items purchased with appropriated dollars as local government contributions in Vietnam and other areas. If required local contributions cannot be obtained from bona fide local government sources, the program should be curtailed. In any event, our officials should be discouraged from resorting to what is an obvious subterfuge in the matter of local contributions.

(g) That the United States Government immediately cease the flow of funds used to support the small contingent of French troops remaining in Vietnam. The committee should note that not only does the United States Government carry the entire assistance burden in this area, but it also pays for the upkeep of the remnant of French forces assigned here. This practice is unconscionable.

9. I recommend that our Government make immediate and strong representations to the Government of the Philippines with respect to the collection of taxes levied, to the end that either local government contributions to the aid effort there are increased, or our program is curtailed. In the Philippines, the rich grow richer and the poor seem to make no financial progress. A reasonable system of taxes is levied, but only a fraction of the revenue due is collected; tax evasion is rampant. I feel it unfair to our people, who are conscientious in paying their taxes, to be forced to contribute to the support of governments whose people refuse to pay their own taxes.

10. I wish to emphasize my prior-year recommendations that our foreign aid planners adopt a rule-of-reason in programing operations in all areas. In this connection, I specifically recommend:

(a) That a proposed program for the rehabilitation of retired soldiers from the Chinese Nationalist Armies be terminated. Under this scheme, American funds would

be used to provide hospitalization benefits, teach trades, and otherwise rehabilitate for civilian life nationalist soldiers too old for active combat status. Under no circumstances should this Government pay for a Nationalist Chinese GI bill of rights.

(b) That the so-called Nixon plan, under which the United States would pay the full cost of educating Formosan and other Asian nationals in American schools be abandoned.

(c) That the committee staff conduct an immediate study of the influence of the Chinese Technical Mission in this country. I am informed that the C. T. M., supported by local currency counterpart equivalent to the extent of $60,000 per year, has succeeded in obtaining Washington approval of programs which local-level administrators rejected as not feasible.

(d) That the practice of permitting the use of counterpart balances or other funds to balance local government budgets be discontinued immediately.

(e) That I. C. A. take steps to halt the practice of Washington officials reversing local administrative decisions as to the wisdom of undertaking any specific project. It is my information that a proposed hydroelectric project on Formosa was turned down by the local operations mission only to be reinstated at the Washington level.

11. I recommend that no aid program be undertaken in Japan, but that this Government assist the Japanese, through existing diplomatic channels, in finding outlets for their manufacturing output. It is my understanding that the United States Ambassador to Japan recommended against an aid program in Japan, but that his views were overridden by Washington.

12. In Korea, I recommend that:

(a) The practice of counting counterpart funds toward local government contributions be discontinued.

(b) The United States Government cease providing direct budgetary support to the South Korean Government.

(c) That the entire aid effort be restudied with a view toward increasing private capital participation. As the program now stands, it would appear that the United States Treasury is supporting works which are resulting in the socialization of the South Korean economy.

13. I recommend that special General Accounting Office teams be dispatched as soon as possible to Formosa, South Korea, and the three nations of Indochina and that a complete audit of FOA (ICA) accounts be undertaken. The aid program in these nations is floundering in fiscal chaos; it is my belief that unless an adequate accounting as to the sources, uses to which put and present status of United States funds is obtained in this area, the Congress will have lost complete control of expenditures.

14. I recommend that tighter justifications be required of FOA officials, and that present transferability provisions be reexamined. Broad-purpose appropriations and wide transfer authority have resulted in what is apparently a complete breakdown of program control by the Congress in almost all areas of the world.

15. I recommend that no capital investment programs be undertaken anywhere unless the local economy can justify them. A case in point is the glass factory which American dollars helped build on Formosa, which, I understand, has but a negligible demand for window glass.

16. I recommend that in rehabilitating any war-ravaged land, or in extending technical assistance in the fields of community development, health, etc., our administrators take into consideration normal living habits of the area. In Korea, we are building brick and stone structures to replace those of traditional Korean materials. This, of course, leads to an expanded aid effort, and even much dissatisfaction, since if village A gets a brick hospital, village B is automatically dissatisfied with its timber hospital. The barrios program in the Philippines is an excellent example of how the program can be developed in an intelligent manner. There, community development has followed the natural habits and customs of the people.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am supporting now, as I always have supported, our program for mutual assistance: First, because it is an integral part of our own national defense; second, because it aids the cause of freedom everywhere; third, because it is an investment for peace, and averts the crushing cost of war. I am supporting it now because, in my opinion, at this critical hour it is especially important that we do not let down our guard in any respect in leading the world in the cause of freedom and protecting it from communistic dictatorship.

However, I wish to take this opportunity to say that I cannot support any part of the measure which extends aid to Yugoslavia.

At this time I should like to read into the RECORD excerpts from a statement I made as a Member of the House of Representatives in the 81st Congress, on December 13, 1950, when the first bill extending aid to Tito was before the Congress. At that time I said:

> For 4 years I have gone along with all of our foreign policy, with all of the foreign aid, and with all our endeavors to strengthen the western democracies and extend our own influence. But here we have something entirely different. This is not aid to the friends of freedom, as was the Marshall plan for the western democracies. We know that this is tribute, hush money, appeasement to an enemy. This is not building up our own strength, but is advertising our weakness. This is not creating good will, but is inviting the contempt of the world.
>
> * * * * *
>
> This is nothing but an effort to try to immobilize the power of the Yugoslavian Army, an attempt to buy it off. When the 5 American flyers were slain by the airpower of Yugoslavia, 1 of those boys came from a town neighboring my own. I remember the day when I talked with his father and his mother. I did not want to permit that experience to affect my judgment on this bill. I wanted to accede to the request of the President, if I could; but the more I have listened, the more I have become convinced that the time has come when we should let it be known that we are through with appeasement. * * *
>
> I shall vote against this bill.

Mr. President, I made that statement 6 years ago in the House of Representatives when President Truman first requested aid for Tito. With the same firmness with which I refused to support that request by a Democratic President I must today refuse to support any aid to Yugoslavia when it is now requested by the present administration.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I have submitted for consideration an amendment designated "6-25-56-B."

Simply stated, the proposed amendment would create a special economic development fund for Latin America with an authorized appropriation to the President of $50 million to remain available until expended. The amendment in emphasizing loans rather than grants provides that not less than 75 percent of the funds shall be available only for furnishing assistance on a loan basis. Since health, education, and sanitation are primary factors in preventing the economic development of Latin America, the amendment contains a proviso that the President in utilizing the fund shall give preference to projects or programs which will clearly contribute to promoting health, education, and sanitation in this region, and such joint programs undertaken by the members of the Organization of American States. The authorized appropriation under the amendment would be in addition to the recommended authorization under the bill, as reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There is nothing novel about the creation of this fund. We have in the past set up similar funds for Asia in the amount of $200 million, $100 million of which was appropriated last year, and it is my understanding that the administration has requested that the balance be appropriated this year. Under the provisions of the bill as reported by the Foreign Relations Committee, a special fund providing for an authorization of $100 million is set up for the Middle East. It is high time that we arouse ourselves from the slumber of the past and give to Latin America a little special treatment, too. In setting up the regional economic development fund for Latin America as proposed by the amendment, the area will be given the special treatment which it has so long deserved in our foreign-aid program, and at the same time we will demonstrate by deed that our good-neighbor policy is more than merely a play on words.

As I have indicated in the past, I am concerned about the trend of our relations with Latin America. On every proper occasion, the administration has indicated the importance of maintaining and strengthening our ties with the other American Republics. The President in his State of the Union Message restated our interest in the welfare of the region. At the various Pan American conferences, we invariably declare our devotion to inter-American solidarity. Mr. Henry Holland, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, in his testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee, summed up the situation this way:

> A basic objective of United States policy in the economic field is to make as effective a contribution as is possible to the efforts of individual Latin American States to maintain a stable, healthy, national economy. The security and well-being of the people of the United States demand that we be surrounded in this hemisphere by strong, prosperous neighbors. It is, therefore, in our interest to offer constructive assistance to the efforts of our sister Republics. Humanitarian and philanthropic motives are thus not the only justification for this program, although they do play an important part. (U. S. Senate. Mutual Security Act of 1956, hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, p. 261.)

What worries me is the wide gulf between declared intentions and action. Earlier this month I reviewed the situation with regard to United States assistance to Latin America. At that time I pointed out that in the postwar decade the American Republics received only 2.8 percent of the total nonmilitary grants and credits extended by the

United States. They fared even worse when grant aid alone is counted, receiving $317 million of a total of $26.5 billion or 1.2 percent. In that same period, the three Scandinavian countries—Norway, Denmark, and Sweden—whose populations total only about 15 million, received $528 million in grant aid, or 60 percent more than all 20 Latin American Republics which have a combined population of well over 160 million.

This year the same pattern is being repeated. The pending bill provides a total of approximately $100 million for Latin America, of which $37 million is for defense support to be used principally in two countries, Guatemala and Bolivia; $33.9 million for technical assistance and approximately $35.5 million for military assistance. These figures represent approximately 2.3 percent of the total foreign aid authorization recommended by the Committee on Foreign Relations. This percentage of the total recommended authorization can hardly be said to include a realistic and effective foreign-aid program for Latin America when we think of the $368.1 million in nonmilitary aid recommended for the Near East and Africa and a little more than $1 billion in nonmilitary assistance for Asia. Our friends to the South will most certainly conclude, and rightly so, that they have once again been relegated to the position of last in line at the cashier's window. If we continue this policy of neglect toward Latin America, we are bound to suffer disastrous consequences.

I have read with great interest a letter to the Foreign Relations Committee which expresses the State Department's views as to why the meager United States assistance is considered adequate to promote our objectives in our hemisphere. I have also studied the testimony of representatives of the Department of State and of ICA at the hearings on the MSA proposals. In brief, the administration feels that Latin America's needs are adequately met by United States private investments, foreign trade earnings, dollar receipts from the tourist trade, and loans from the Export-Import and International Banks, plus the comparatively small programs of technical assistance underway. To judge in context the State Department viewpoint, let us examine briefly some of its contentions against a backdrop of the realities of Latin America.

Development in the 20 republics is uneven, of course, but in general all suffer from chronic weaknesses due to a lack of diversified economies. All are dependent upon one, or at best several, export commodities for the foreign exchange necessary for economic development: Cuba, for instance, depends on sugar; Venezuela on oil; Brazil and Colombia on coffee; Bolivia on tin; Honduras on bananas, and so forth. All of them have to import tractors, locomotives, machine tools, motors, dredges—in fact, almost all of the manufactured goods they need for consumption, or even use in production. As more industries get started in the drive to get away from overdependence on a single commodity, pressures upon the economy increase all down the line. The demand for electric power grows; so does the necessity for more imported capital goods; agricultural production must meet the demand of the growing labor force in the cities; transportation systems must cope with heavier movements of foodstuffs to urban areas and raw materials to factories.

It is generally agreed that most of the countries have the human and physical resources to diversify their economies, to get away from the precarious dependence upon single commodities for their prosperity or even their sustenance. But diversification takes capital, for new industries need equipment and additional electric power. At present the United States per capita electric power supply amounts to 3,350 kilowatt-hour per year. In Latin America the supply averages but 170 kilowatt-hour per capita yearly. The contrast is even more startling when we examine individual countries. In Ecuador, for instance, electric power per capita amounts to only 42 kilowatt-hours a year; in Haiti the figure is 14 kilowatt-hours; in Chile, with a degree of industrialization already underway, available electric power is but 643 kilowatt-hours per capita.

Another roadblock to development is the antiquated transportation systems of the region. The United States has more than 1,100 miles of road for each 1,000 square miles. Latin America, on the other hand, averages 86 road miles per 1,000 square miles. All of us know the great impetus to the economy of the United States that came from our railroads, highways, and feeder roads from rural areas. In short, a new network of roads and railroads and improved harbors along both the ocean and the river routes are vital to the growth of the Latin American economies.

The greatest obstacle in the path of progressive economic development, and the one which hampers the up-hill climb, is the persisting poverty which plagues the entire region. In the first place, per capita incomes are still painfully low. Twelve of the twenty republics have per capita incomes of less than $200 a year, while only in Venezuela does per capita income exceed $400. For example, in Paraguay it is but $68 annually, in Haiti $65, in Peru $117, in Costa Rica $125. Naturally, under the circumstances, the rate of savings plowed back into development most perforce be low. In the meantime, the general poverty has been accompanied by its usual manifestations; lack of education, malnutrition, and sickness, which in turn lead to low productivity. Meanwhile, so long as productivity remains low, there will, of course, be general poverty, and the cycle will continue to repeat itself.

Health statistics for the region are an appalling revelation. For example, the average life span of men in Latin America is 45 years; compare this with the 68 years of age in the United States. To be a little more specific, the life expectancy of a man in Guatemala is 37 years of age; in Mexico 38 years of age; in Peru and Chile, 39 years of age; in Costa Rica, 41 years of age; and in Brazil 46 years of age. These facts are startling indeed, and serve amply to demonstrate that if we are ever to assist our Latin American friends effectively in their difficulties, our foreign aid program for the area should be pinpointed so as to help them where they need help the most, and in adequate amounts.

In 1952 the infant death rate due to diarrhea in the United States was 113.5 per 100,000 infants. In Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, and Venezuela, the death rate exceeded 1,000 per 100,000 infants. In the age group of 1 to 4 years, the contrast is even sharper. In the United States the death rate for children in this age group was held at 6.1 per 100,000, while in El Salvador and Guatemala, and also right across the border in Mexico, the death rates were around 1,000 per 100,000.

Malaria, a disease which depopulates and makes uninhabitable rich agricultural lands, has been almost eradicated in the United States. But it still takes a mighty toll of lives in Guatemala, Honduras, the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, Mexico, and Bolivia. Moreover, not all the damage can be measured by the death rate. Someone once said of malaria, "When it doesn't kill, it enslaves." Without a doubt malaria, to a large degree, saps the productivity of the people of Latin America. Yet medical authorities are convinced that its complete eradication from all of Latin America is possible and practical. But it will take a bold and progressive program adequately financed. Surely, there is ample room for help in this field.

Let's look at the education picture in Latin America. Obviously the lack of education is retarding the economic development of the Latin American republics. Only a little more than half of the Latin Americans over 10 years old are able to read and write. And in nearly half of the countries, less than 50 percent of children of school age actually attend school. Furthermore, only a small proportion go beyond the third or fourth grade. Moreover, with the high birth rate in the region—the highest birth rate in the world—the proportion of children to the total population is quite high and is increasing. Therefore, the already deficient educational facilities are constantly being taxed even more. Lack of buildings, lack of supplies, lack of teachers, historical lack of training in technical subjects, are just some of the barriers in the field of education that Latin America must surmount if it is to achieve a degree of economic development that will provide acceptable standards of living for its ever growing population. Surely, there is some room for our advice, counsel and assistance in this field.

I have painted only a very cursory picture of a great region of the world at a crucial juncture of its history. The people of Latin America are determined to overcome the conditions which have held them in bondage to poverty for centuries. They have the will and the courage to overcome them but are badly in need of effective assistance which they can and will repay. Meantime, our Government officials, time and again, voice the interest of the people of the United States in helping our neighbors achieve their goals of a better life for themselves and their children. However, despite

these good intentions, it does not appear that we are living up to our pledges.

The executive department contends that Latin America has access to the capital necessary for desirable economic development; that there is no reason for us to do more. I would like to examine some of the points brought out in the letter from the Office of the Director of ICA in support of its view. Among the sources of capital indicated are included the following:

(1) New loans authorized for Latin America from the Export-Import Bank alone have averaged over $210 million a year during the past 3 years.

(2) Over the period 1947–54, Latin America received approximately $400 million annually in new private investments from the United States.

(3) It received $387 million from our great and growing tourist industry.

Taken at face value, these figures indicate substantial sums. Certainly any help afforded the region by the Export-Import Bank is to the good. Admittedly, private investments from the United States do much to stimulate the economies of their host countries, and frequently carry with them important technical know-how. As for the third point, speaking as a Floridian, I agree that several million from the tourist trade should never be deprecated.

However, let us examine these arguments below the surface. Since I just mentioned the dollar earnings from the tourist trade, I shall take up that point first. I am informed, in the first place, that the $387 million figure cited by ICA includes the amounts spent in the European possessions in the Caribbean. This includes such popular resorts as Bermuda, Trinidad, Nassau, and Jamaica, among others. Bermuda alone drew at least $25 million, while the British West Indies earned over $37 million. Moreover, Mexico's share of the total was $260 million. The whole of South America, including the great countries of Brazil, Chile, Argentina, Peru, Colombia, and others, shared only $20 million in tourist dollars. The statistic falls even more into focus when we consider that Europe and the Mediterranean area earned $427 million from American tourists in the same period.

With regard to the ICA indication that the Export-Import Bank over the last 3 years has authorized $210 million a year to Latin America, or $630 million. However, a similar change occurs in the picture painted when we examine the figure a bit more closely. Out of the total, $300 million, approximately one-half went to Brazil alone. In addition, the loan to Brazil was to liquidate past-due dollar accounts to United States firms. Besides the $300 million which went to Brazil, another $100 million went to the Southern Peru Copper Co., which is owned by United States citizens. Thus two-thirds of the loans in the past 3 years went to only 2 countries and for only 2 purposes, namely, for the development of copper in Peru and to pay off past debts in Brazil. Almost one-half of the total, which was the loan to Brazil, was for a purpose that cannot be deemed future economic development. Moreover, as Senators know, much of the remaining portion of the Export-Import Bank loans during the 3-year period was extended to American business firms in the form of export credit lines. I hasten to add that I consider invaluable this type of assistance, both from the point of view of American business which must meet growing competition from Europe and Asia, and from the point of view of Latin America which needs to purchase United States capital goods on long-term credits. Nevertheless, this type of loan does not provide the kind of general broad range assistance Latin America so vitally needs. The Export-Import Bank loans are primarily to help American business compete in foreign countries. It is a shame the State Department attempts to justify its lack of help to Latin America by the use of this argument, which they do not use with respect to other countries around the globe.

As for the $400 million in annual direct private investments made durng the period 1947–54, I again agree that this capital can do much to stimulate the economies of the recipient countries. I note that the figure cited by ICA includes a good proportion of reinvestments, as well as new dollar capital. It is even more important to observe the manner in which United States private investments have tended to concentrate in certain sectors of the economy and in certain countries. For example, of a total of $245 million in direct United States investments made in industry in Latin America in 1953, $237 million, or about 97 percent, were in the extractive industries, mining and petroleum. In that same year Venezuela held $1.3 billion of a total of $6 billion in private United States investments, or 22 percent of the total for the entire Latin American world. Moreover, private investments, for all the good they do, will not build costly sewage-disposal systems or provide pure water, which, of course, pay dividends only in improved health and increased productivity of their users.

There is another reason frequently stated by members of the executive departments for not further implementing our declared policy in Latin America. That is, that there is plenty of money available at the Export-Import Bank or the International Bank if only the Latin American governments will come up with good, sound projects. Until recently the bank's rules were so rigid that few of the countries could meet the requirements. Even now, although there has been a degree of relaxation, it is still difficult to get a loan. The principle works much the same way as with individuals who try to borrow from a bank—the more security one has to put up the easier it is to get a loan. But the poorer one is the harder it is to get a loan. In the case of the Export-Import Bank, we have the anamolous situation that the countries which need the capital most to prime their economies are the very ones which meet with the most obstacles. This may be excellent banking procedure, but it will not accomplish the purposes of our foreign policy in this region.

I read with great interest in the MSA hearings a reference to Guatemala made by Mr. Holland, the Assstant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. He said:

> We are determined that the assistance of the United States—and I know that in this the entire Congress as well as the people of this country joins—we are determined that the assistance of this Government and of these people shall * * * contribute to making of Guatemala a living example of the fact that people under a free government can live better, feed themselves better, house themselves better, raise more healthy children, than they can under a Communist government (United States Senate, Mutual Security Act of 1956, hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, p. 279).

I heartily agree with this statement. But what has happened and is happening in Guatemala? We say only too vividly how the Commies attempted to establish a beachhead there and are trying to do so today. Those Commies must not have read Mr. Holland's speeches, or if they did, they must have a substantial degree of confidence that he intends to do nothing else but make them. In the light of the State Department's past performance toward Latin America one cannot escape the realization that there is some justification for this conclusion.

Frankly I think Congress and the American people are away ahead of the Department of State. Each year the Congress found it necessary to increase its request for the Latin American region. In the pending bill, the House increased development assistance for the area by $10 million. Though the Senate Foreign Relations Committee transferred the total development assistance to defense support, it sustained the increase.

Make no mistake about it, Latin America is under the gun so far as Russia is concerned. This being so, what effective program has the State Department come up with, for example, to eradicate the communicable diseases which plague the area and retard its economic growth.

Must we wait until after the Communists have taken over and then move in with a mopping-up operation as we did when they moved into Guatemala a couple of years ago. It is my strong conviction that we can and must demonstrate to the world that the people of underdeveloped regions, who are historically our friends and who live in the same hemisphere with us, can achieve stability and prosperity by means of cooperative efforts. To carry out this objective we must abandon the policy of the steely eyed banker and pursue the policy of mutual help among good neighbors.

Our private investments and our substantial foreign trade, as the executive department indicates, will continue to play a major role in the economic development of the region. But we can and should undertake the humane and practical task of expediting Latin America's climb into the 20th century. The health and vitality of the people have a direct bearing on their productivity and on their ability to achieve higher standards of living. Health, education, and sanitation are the foundation stones upon which any investment, foreign or otherwise, can profitably be undertaken.

As an example, if we can help erase malaria from the hemisphere in 3 or 4 years—as I am assured by the experts we can—we will have conquered the most important single economic health problem in the Americas. It would, of course, be only one aspect of a many-sided problem. But it would afford real relief from the costly toll of lost manhours and lost lives. The Pan American Sanitary Conference in 1954 did, in fact, adopt a resolution emphasizing the utmost urgency in the eradication of malaria from the Western Hemisphere. If we would now implement the resolution, which we affirmed, we would prove that our relations with our sister Republics are based on something more solid than high-sounding resolutions at conferences, windy speeches by important Government officials, and frightening banquet invitations.

We have in the Americas an opportunity to demonstrate to our friends south of the Rio Grande that we are sincere in our intentions. I am convinced that the people of the United States do not want us to lose the opportunity.

On numerous occasions in the past, I have stressed the importance of further strengthening friendly ties with Latin America if we are to continue to enjoy its good will which is so vitally essential to our own economic welfare and security. There is no one who will deny the fact that from the standpoint of trade, strategy, and raw materials this region is of extreme importance to us. We, of course, are equally important to Latin America. Should war strike—and God forbid such a calamity—we would be dependent to a major degree on Latin America as a source of raw materials such as copper, tin, asbestos, vanadium, and other items.

In the postwar period we have spent a total of $42.3 billion in foreign aid, of which Latin America received only $552 million, or approximately 1.3 percent. If we continue this niggardly treatment we must be prepared to suffer the consequences.

The latest disquieting report comes from the Department of Commerce. At the very time the American republics desperately need United States capital goods and material to convert their antiquated economies, they are being forced to curtail their imports from the United States. According to the Department of Commerce, the total value of United States exports to the whole world in 1955, excluding military-aid goods, jumped by $1.4 billion; yet in this booming year, United States exports to the American Republics dropped by $56.6 million. The American Republics fell to third place, behind Western Europe and Canada, among the regional markets for United States nonmilitary goods. With the population of Latin America ever increasing, it promises to be the greatest market in the world for our goods. If we assist the people of this region to increase their productivity we can acquire these markets. It is in our own enlightened self-interest that we should do so, and do so as rapidly as we can.

It appears hypocritical to abandon our traditional friends to their fate, while turning so much time and money and energy to the problems of distant countries which have sometimes failed us in time of crisis. It is essential that we take decisive steps toward working out with the other American republics a courageous, imaginative solution to their economic dilemma.

The unanimous adoption of my proposed amendment would immeasurably contribute toward the accomplishment of this objective and prove to our friends in Latin America that our intentions are backed by positive action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The hour of 3:30 p. m. having arrived, the unanimous-consent agreement on limitation of debate and control of time now becomes effective.

The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "6-27-56-J."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed on page 51, at the end of line 12, strike out the double quotation marks.

On page 51, after line 12, to insert the following:

Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(g) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that there is, or that there is likely to be, a surplus of any agricultural commodity in the United States, no such commodity and no product thereof shall be permitted to be entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during any calendar or marketing year in excess of the annual average quantity of such commodity or product, as the case may be, entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during the three calendar years immediately preceding such calendar or marketing year: *Provided*, That whenever any agricultural commodity or whenever any product thereof is subject to quantitative import limitations under subsection (b) of this section, that commodity or that product, as the case may be, shall not be subject to the quantitative import limitations imposed by this subsection. To assure to the maximum extent practicable equitable treatment among exporting countries and to prevent excessive imports of any class or kind of agricultural commodity or of any particular product of such commodity, the Secretary of Agriculture, to the extent he deems such action necessary to effectuate either of these objectives, is authorized and directed to establish reasonable classifications of any agricultural commodity and of the products thereof on the basis of either their physical qualities, value, use, or upon such other basis as he shall determine, and to specify the quantities of each commodity and of each product thereof, or of any class, kind, type, grade, or other specification or classification thereof, which may be entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during any calendar or marketing year or portion thereof. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect any right, privilege, or remedy otherwise provided by this section or by section 7 of the act of June 16, 1951, as amended.

"For the purposes of this subsection, (1) the term 'product' or 'products' means any article or articles included within or classifiable under each paragraph of schedules 7 and 9 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as originally enacted or as amended, and the articles included within each paragraph of said schedules or within such further classification as may be made by the Secretary of Agriculture shall be deemed to be a separate product, and (2) any agricultural commodity in the United States shall be deemed to be in surplus whenever any class, kind, type, grade, or other specification thereof, is or may reasonably be expected to be in excess of domestic requirements, adequate carryover, and anticipated exports, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"The enforcement provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall be applicable for the enforcement of the provisions of this subsection."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by myself, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT].

The purpose of this amendment is to protect the producers of agricultural commodities that are in surplus from having their surplus problems further aggravated by additional imports, in those cases where the executive branch of the Government has not applied import limitations under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended.

The amendment would apply only if both of the following two conditions exist:

First. The agricultural commodity involved is in surplus, and

Second. No quantitative import limitation is in effect on that commodity and its products under section 22.

Whenever both of these two conditions exist, and so long as they continue to exist, the amendment would limit the annual imports of the commodity and its products to the annual average quantities imported during the preceding 3 years. Whenever the commodity ceases to be in surplus, or whenever the executive branch limits the imports of the commodity and its products under section 22, the amendment ceases to apply.

This amendment is urgently needed for the following reasons:

First. Our whole agricultural production plant is overexpanded. Most of the major commodities, including livestock, are in surplus and their prices are depressed.

Second. Under these conditions, additional imports of these surplus commodities or their products compound the difficulties not only of farmers, but also of the Government in the operation of its various agricultural programs. This will be especially true in the operation of the new soil bank, where the decreases in production achieved at great cost to the Government can be completely offset by increases in imports.

Third. Section 22 was designed to meet this very situation. It authorizes and directs the executive branch to apply import limitations whenever imports threaten to materially interfere with the operations of any agricultural program.

Fourth. The executive branch for years has refused to recognize that imports are materially interfering with agricultural programs and, for the most part, has avoided the directive of Congress to use section 22 to limit such imports.

Fifth. There is every indication that the executive branch will not make effective use of section 22 to meet this agricultural import problem without further action by the Congress.

Sixth. This amendment would meet this situation by providing a direct limitation on the imports of surplus agricultural commodities and their products by the Congress, if the executive branch does not do so under section 22.

Mr. President, the Federal Government is about to spend approximately $1¼ billion a year on the new soil bank program. The major purpose of this worthy program is to curtail production of many agricultural commodities which we now have in great surplus. This is a worthy and most necessary program. It could, to a considerable extent, reduce the production of agricultural commodities and, at the same time, increase the soil fertility of this Nation.

If this program really curtails agricultural production, it will mean an increase in the price for agricultural commodities to a more fair level; that is, if we have sense enough to take the necessary steps to prevent other nations with surplus commodities from dumping their products upon us.

It makes no sense at all to curtail production here in the United States and permit other countries to dump their surpluses upon us, and continue to ruin our prices. There will be no increases in the prices of agricultural commodities if we continue to permit our country to be a dumping gound for foreign agricultural products.

Mr. President, last year, 1955, we had an over-production of hogs which resulted in disastrously low prices. In an effort to bolster pork prices, the Department of Agriculture embarked upon a program of purchasing pork and pork by-products which resulted in a cost to the Federal Government of $102.5 million. It was a tremendous undertaking, and a costly one, but I think it gave some relief to our hog producers.

During exactly this same period, however, in 1955, when our pork producers were in serious trouble, and when our Federal Government was spending $102.5 million to relieve our markets of some of the surpluses, we imported $107,600,000 worth of foreign pork products.

I say again it makes no sense to spend $100 million in an effort to relieve our markets of the pork surplus, and at the same time import even more of such products from foreign nations. In other words, our imports of pork products exceeded the $102.5 million worth of pork products which the Department of Agriculture purchased on the open market to stabilize pork prices.

For many years we have imported a great deal of grain. This has been very disastrous to the grain producers in my area.

If the soil bank really works as we hope it will, resulting in the curtailment in production and the improvement of prices, our imports of agricultural commodities will naturally increase beyond the high levels of recent years.

During the past year, Mr. President, 20 percent of all of the barley reaching the cash markets in the United States was of foreign origin. Seven percent of all the oats in the United States was of foreign origin. Obviously, imports of this magnitude have a disastrous effect on cash prices.

Mr. President, this amendment does not go nearly as far as I would like to see it go. It would only hold imports to the average of the previous 3-year period when any given farm product is in surplus and when no action has been taken under section 22 of our present law.

Oats imports, for example, in the 1952–53 fiscal year amounted to 86.6 million bushels. In the 1953–54 fiscal year oats imports were 79.7 million bushels, and in the 1954–55 fiscal year oats imports were 20 million bushels. Using the average of the previous 3-year period, oats imports could increase 39.5 million bushels before they would be affected under the amendment we are proposing today.

This amendment would help our barley surplus and price situation materially. I know of nothing that would do more to stabilize the prices of feed grains than to have some limitation, even though it be a liberal one, placed on future imports of feed grains and other farm products.

The producers of pork, beef, and dairy products can never expect good cash prices for their commodities so long as we have great surpluses of cheap feed grains. Sooner or later these cheap feed grains are going to be translated into more and more surpluses of beef, pork, and dairy products, and other similar commodities.

If it were not for the present dairy price-support program, the prices of dairy products would certainly be at an extremely low level. The cost of maintaining the dairy price-support program this last year was approximately $450 million. I believe this program was fully justified.

However, I do not think we are justified in continuing a program of cheap feed grains which in turn will make necessary continued heavy expenditures for a dairy price-support program.

Mr. President, a similar amendment was offered on March 16, 1956, to the then pending agriculture bill. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks all the tables prepared by the Department of Agriculture which I used in that speech.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fiscal year 1954–55

Oats:	*Bushels*
Total production	1,497,000,000
Left the farm to commercial channels	300,000,000
Imports	20,000,000

About 7 percent of the oats on the United States market were of foreign origin.

Barley:	*Bushels*
Total production	371,000,000
Left the farm to commercial channels	125,000,000
Imports	24,000,000

About 20 percent of the barley on the United States market was of foreign origin.

Grain imports in millions

[Fiscal or marketing years]

	1952–53	1953–54	1954–55	1955–56 (estimate)
Oats	68.6	79.7	20.0	20.0
Barley	24.9	38.3	24.1	25.0
Rye	5.6	13.4	3.4	3.0
Feed wheat	20.4	4.3	2.9	3.0
All wheat	21.6	5.5	4.4	4.0

(Information obtained from Schaefner—USDA.)

Pork and pork product imports (except lard)

[Calendar years]

	Pounds
1953	146,026,000
1954	170,327,000
1955: January-November	150,456,000

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks some figures I received during the past week from the Department of Agriculture concerning the imports of pork products, and figures concerning the Federal Government's pork-buying program of last year.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States imports of hog products—by country of origin

Country	Thousand pound product weight				
	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955
Canada	22,427	18,542	65,083	66,923	64,343
Dominican Republic	0	85	0	0	0
Belgium	0	125	950	819	736
Czechoslovakia	94	0	0	216	935
Denmark	4,170	8,819	15,566	23,079	23,998
France	0	65	129	0	0
Germany	0	3,645	13,061	15,585	13,189
Ireland	0	67	81	94	111
Italy	459	530	649	446	754
Netherlands	16,158	20,252	36,707	42,308	32,966
Poland	5,125	9,366	13,409	20,305	24,864
Sweden	186	235	66	151	0
Others	334	280	255	401	345
Total	48,953	62,011	146,026	170,327	162,241

A small number of hogs are imported each year. These hogs are for breeding, as well as feeding and slaughter. Table shows actual number of hogs: 1951, 1,000; 1952, 100; 1953, 24,000; 1954, 31,000; 1955, 6,500.

NOTE.—Figures obtained from Price Division, Commodity Credit Corporation.

1955 imports of pork products compared with pork-buying program [1] (mid-November 1955 through March 1956)

Imports of pork products, 1955:

Quantity (in thousand pounds)	162,241
Value (million dollars)	107.6

Product	Quantity	Equivalent in hogs	Cost
Cost of pork buying program:	*Million pounds*	*Million*	*Millions*
Canned pork	151	2	$90.9
Frozen pork	7		3.0
Lard	39	1	5.6
Total	197	3	99.5
Transportation cost			3.0
Total cost of pork-buying program			102.5

[1] Figures obtained from the Price Division of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield 10 minutes to me?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I rise to support the Young amendment. My remarks will be equally applicable to the Johnston amendment, because I wish to speak particularly with reference to the textile industry.

Mr. President, when the reciprocal trade concept originated, it was contemplated that the United States would export to other nations goods which the United States produced in surplus quantities, and that the United States would import from other countries goods which the United States either did not produce or goods which the United States produced only in negligible quantities.

When the Congress passed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act last year I think it contemplated that the act would be administered in accordance with the true purpose of reciprocal trade. It was not contemplated by the Congress that the United States should encourage the importation of goods which were already being produced in the United States in surplus quantities. We find, however, that under this act some of the most peculiar events ever known in the history of the world have occurred. When Congress passed the act, it delegated to the President the power to determine how our foreign trade should be regulated. The President, in turn, delegated that power to the State Department, and the State Department, in turn, delegated that power, insofar as it relates to textile products, to some private businessmen in Japan. For the first time since the dawn of creation, Mr. President, a sovereign nation has voluntarily delegated to a private industry in a foreign country the power to control and determine the destiny of one of its own industries.

I have witnessed the effect of the maladministration of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act by the State Department upon the textile industry, and upon the million or more Americans who labor in that industry and upon the hundreds of thousands of those who labor in the garment industry.

Unbelievable as it may sound, a group of Japanese textile manufacturers, known as the Japanese Textile Export Council, has been empowered by the State Department to determine the destiny of the American textile industry. In other words, this country, acting through the State Department, is delegating to a group of foreign businessmen, who are competing with one of our basic industries, the power to determine how much of the domestic market the foreign businessmen are to take away from their American competitors.

I have appealed to the State Department on many occasions for some degree of protection for the textile industry and those who earn their daily bread in it. The State Department sends back word that the Japanese textile manufacturers constituting the Japanese Textile Export Council have agreed to set up voluntary quotas on the exports of Japanese textile products to the United States.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that experience shows that the notion of the State Department that such quotas set up by Japanese textile manufacturers afford any protection whatever to the American textile industry is nonsense. I shall give an illustration to show how it works.

Last year we imported from Japan 36 million blouses—one-third of the entire number of blouses sold in the United States during that year. The Japanese Textile Export Council which, with the approval of the State Department, is ruling the textile industry in America, came to the conclusion that if the Japanese textile manufacturers continued to take one-third of the American market for blouses Congress might have the good judgment to return to the old-fashioned notion that the American Government should stand for the protection of Americans.

So the Japanese Textile Export Council put a quota on the exportation of blouses from Japan to the United States. It set a quota of 30 million blouses. Then Japanese textile manufacturers evaded this quota by shipping other blouses to Canada and other countries, which reshipped them to the United States.

Japanese textile manufacturers also sold material to Hong Kong, where the material was manufactured into blouses. The blouses thus manufactured at Hong Kong were then shipped into the United States as Hong Kong production.

Not content with that, Japanese textile manufacturers took the material which could have been devoted to the manufacture of blouses and made it into shirts, handkerchiefs, pillowcases, sheets, and other things, and shipped them into the United States in large quantities.

So the notion of the State Department that the quotas imposed by the Japanese Textile Export Council affords any protection to the American textile industry is just so much nonsense. Let us see what the effect has been and what it will be.

Last year the Japanese took from the United States 70 percent of the entire American domestic market for velveteen. In the competition which enabled them to take this 70 percent of the market for velveteen, the Japanese demoralized the price structure of the other 30 percent of the velveteen market to such an extent that it could not operate at a profit.

I could show how the Japanese imports have multiplied since the State Department in its maladministration of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act blasted a hole in the dike.

Since 1953 the importation of cotton cloths and apparel from Japan has increased 700 percent. The importation of velveteens from Japan has increased 2,000 percent over 1953. The importation of finished sheets and pillowcases from Japan has increased from 791,000 units in 1953 to 12 million units in 1955, an increase of 1,382 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. ERVIN. May I have 2 more minutes?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. This is what is happening. Japan is sending into the United States hundreds of thousands of dozens of shirts. The Japanese make them for $9 a dozen. The American shirt industry makes the same kind of shirts, at $22.50 a dozen.

Japanese ginghams are selling in New York at 33¼ cents a yard. It costs American mills 37½ cents a yard merely to make the same ginghams. The same is true of Japanese broadcloths.

I do not know how other Senators may feel; but as for me, I intend to do all I can to protect the American textile industry, the hundreds of thousands of persons who work in that industry, and the American cotton growers who lose the partial support of their best customer, namely, the American textile industry, every time foreign-manufactured textile goods are brought into this country.

It seems to me it is time for Congress to restore the control and the destiny of a great, fundamental American industry to the hands of private enterprise in this country.

As for me, I expect to vote for the Young amendment, because it will afford some measure of protection for the fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, and children of those upon whom the bombs fell at Pearl Harbor. I expect to support the amendment because it is necessary to preserve and protect a great American industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the opposition to the Young amendment desire to use any time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

An amendment in almost identical form was considered and rejected by the Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee believed that the amendment should more properly be considered by the Committee on Finance. I understand the Committee on Finance has taken some action on the proposal.

The amendment has nothing to do with the mutual security program. It is not germane to the bill, as is recognized in the unanimous-consent agreement. In other words, it was necessary to except the amendment from the parliamentary rule of germaneness which might have been raised in the usual type of unanimous-consent agreement.

The amendment should have been referred to the Committee on Finance for study. I believe it is unnecessary in the bill.

Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 contain provisions authorizing the imposition of import quotas. Applications for relief from the imports of cotton textiles, for example, are now being investigated on an urgent basis by the Tariff Commission, as provided by law.

I may say to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] that there is no question that this is a serious problem in the textile industry. If the present legislation which deals with reciprocal trade is not sufficient to meet the problem, I am prepared to join with the Senator in strengthening that law. But I think that should be done in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to aline myself with the remarks being made by the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and to corroborate what he has said about the action taken in the Committee on Foreign Relations. I should like to read from the report on the Mutual Security Act of 1956, page 57, with reference to the textile amendment.

Before doing so, I may say that the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], voted in favor of the Green amendment when it was considered by the committee; but despite his favorable attitude toward this particular amendment, the amendment was referred, by a substantial vote, to the Committee on Finance. It was urged by the Committee on Foreign Relations that serious consideration be given to implementing and expediting action on the amendment.

I now read from page 57 of the report on the Mutual Security Act of 1956:

> The problem involved here is of great concern to the Foreign Relations Committee, but the committee was in some doubt as to its jurisdiction over the question in the precise form in which it was presented—namely, a proposal involving tariffs.

Tariffs, by the way, do not come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but come under the control, as do customs and duties, of the Committee on Finance.

> For these and other reasons which have been indicated, therefore, the committee voted to refer the matter to the Committee on Finance with an expression of the Foreign Relations Committee's hope that the Finance Committee would follow the Tariff Commission proceedings closely and would give the question its most careful consideration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana.

The amendment is very broad in its application. It is impossible to tell how many products would be placed under import quotas. It is doubtful if the proponents of the amendment know how far it really goes.

It is almost certain that a number of import quotas would be required by the amendment. The imposition of these quotas would have very serious adverse effects on the political relations of the United States with countries which are important to the security of the United States. The amendment would tend to cut off trade with important allies of the United States and would make it more difficult for them to share the defense burden of the free world. The amendment is, therefore, inconsistent with the objectives of the Mutual Security bill.

The amendment is certain to require import quotas on cotton textiles, which would create serious difficulties in our relations with Japan. The impact on Japan would tend to push that country toward the Communist orbit. Japan is our biggest customer for surplus agricultural commodities.

The amendment would hurt our efforts to dispose of surplus agricultural commodities. We are trying to get other countries to eliminate import quotas on our agricultural commodities. This amendment would tend to cancel out that effort.

The amendment requires the establishment of import quotas on the products of agricultural commodities regardless of whether a shortage or surplus of these products exists on the domestic market.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The test is whether or not there is a surplus of the agricultural commodity, not of the products manufactured therefrom, which may not be in surplus; yet the amendment would establish import quotas on products processed from agricultural commodities as well as on primary commodities in surplus.

If the amendment is designed to curb importation of cotton textiles, it should be pointed out that imports of textiles are very small in relation to domestic production—less than 2 percent—and very small in relation to United States exports of cotton textiles. Exports in 1955 were 4.5 times the level of our imports.

To take the specific case of Japan, our total exports to Japan in 1952 amounted to $622 million. The total imports of all commodities amounted to $229 million.

In 1953, the total exports of all commodities to Japan amounted to $670 million. The imports of all commodities from Japan amounted to $262 million.

In 1954, the total American exports to Japan amounted to $680 million. The total imports from Japan amounted to $279 million.

In 1955, total American exports to Japan amounted to $643 million. Imports of all commodities from that country amounted to $432 million.

United States imports of cotton textiles from Japan in 1955 amounted to about $60 million.

Our chief agricultural export to Japan has been wheat. Taking the year 1955, the latest figure available, although I have other figures for the other years, wheat exports amounted to $70 million. Total agricultural exports amounted to $386 million, made up as follows: Wheat, $70 million; barley, $17 million; rice, milled, $42 million; soybeans, $57 million; raw cotton, $120 million. These were our agricultural exports to Japan for the year 1955.

I ask unanimous consent to have a table showing United States trade with Japan for the years 1952 through 1955 printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States trade with Japan

[In millions of dollars]

	1952	1953	1954	1955
Agricultural exports, total	429	367	418	386
Wheat	99	72	71	70
Barley	24	11	11	17
Rice, milled	57	48	49	42
Soybeans	27	51	52	57
Cotton, raw	175	115	174	120
Total exports, all commodities	622	670	680	643
Total imports, all commodities	229	262	279	432

NOTE.—United States imports of cotton textiles from Japan in 1955, $60 million.

Source: Department of Commerce June 28, 1956.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I commend the distinguished minority leader for bringing out the fact that Japan is an important cotton customer of this country. If that market were taken away, it would mean, of course, greater difficulties for our cotton farmers.

I am happy to note also that the Senator from California has indicated the importance of wheat, because I believe, unless I am mistaken, that Japan is our greatest single customer for wheat exported from this country. Those matters should be taken into consideration.

There is a great deal to be said in favor of the amendment advanced by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, but I think this is a matter which should not be considered by the Foreign Relations Committee, but is one which should be considered, and seriously considered, by the Finance Committee. I am informed that either yesterday or today the Senate committee did make strong representations to the Tariff Commission to do everything possible under the existing law, and especially under the escape clause of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, to bring about alleviation of some of the difficulties which confront American textile manufacturers.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I fully agree that the textile industry as a whole, and particularly specific segments of it, need assistance. I hope that the Tariff Commission will very promptly act on the particular cases which are now pending before it, such as the one involving velveteen and a number of other cases which are extremely important. When the Tariff Commission, under the laws and procedures laid down by the Congress will have made its recommendations, I certainly hope the President of the United States will very promptly act upon them, in order to give the necessary protection to American industry. That, I submit, is the orderly procedure, and it is the procedure which has been established by the Congress of the United States for the handling of such matters. I believe that is the way this one should be handled, and I hope the Senate, in its judgment, will handle it in that way. Otherwise I think we shall in effect destroy the legislation previously enacted by the Congress.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask the Chair how much time remains to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has 10 minutes remaining. The Senator from California has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield the Senator from New Jersey 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am very much concerned with this question because, as my colleagues know, the State in which I live, New Jersey, has very important textile industries located in it. I have had a good many conversations with my friends in the industry. We have discussed the subject at great length.

I joined the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] when he introduced a resolution calling on the Tariff Commission to study the whole question. What disturbs me as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee is that, as the amendment is worded, no discretion is placed in anybody, whether an emergency situation exists or not. There is no discretion placed in the Secretary of Agriculture or in the President with respect to the imposition of quotas. The amendment simply provides that if certain surpluses exist, then the provision is mandatory and the quotas must be imposed, no matter where they strike.

As one who is familiar with the delicate negotiations going on with certain foreign countries, especially with Japan, and having talked with some of my friends on the Japanese side, I feel it would be a serious mistake to adopt the amendment. I know that the negotiations are directed toward getting these problems worked out with the Japanese people, and I feel that negotiation is the way to do it.

The proposed amendment gives no discretion whatsoever to the Secretary of Agriculture or to the President. Under the proposed amendment, the Secretary of Agriculture and the President would be required by congressional mandate to impose import quotas whenever certain stated surplus conditions exist—such as presently obtain with respect to cotton. There would be no discretionary finding that a condition exists requiring emergency treatment either by the Secretary of Agriculture or by the President.

For these reasons, I hope no amendment will be adopted making it mandatory for the Secretary of Agriculture to impose import quotas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

I wish to say that, on the very highest level of the Government there is full cognizance of the problem facing the textile industry. The steps taken thus far by the administration to aid the cotton textile industry are as follows:

First. Escape clause investigations are now being conducted by the Tariff Commission in connection with velveteens, ginghams, and pillow cases. The public hearing on the velveteen case was conducted a week ago by the Commission. A few days earlier the Commission recommended a tariff increase on linen toweling, and the President has ordered that the increase be put into effect.

Second. Representatives of the administration have discussed the question of cotton textile imports with the Japanese Government. Following this, the Japanese industry on December 15, 1955, imposed voluntary restrictions on the export of their textiles to the United States for the calendar year 1956.

I wish to say the Senator from North Carolina put a little different emphasis on the situation. We have not surrendered to any private industry in Japan or any other country. It was taken up with the Japanese Government. The Japanese Government has volunteered to limit exports.

In addition to that, more recently, as a result of further discussions with the Japanese Government, an exchange of notes took place by which the Japanese Government itself formalized the above restrictions, declared their intention to continue a similar commitment through 1957, and assured our Government of a minimum of 90 days notice prior to any intended increase.

Third. The Japanese recently further reduced their quotas on exports to the United States of cotton blouses from 2,500,000 dozen to 1,500,000 dozen per annum beginning April 1st last. As a result of this quota reduction, the National Association of Blouse Manufacturers, which had filed an escape clause action with the Tariff Commission, withdrew its application declaring satisfaction with the new Japanese quota.

Fourth. The administration has just announced a program to subsidize the cotton content in American textile exports to equalize the domestic cotton cost with world cotton prices. This program will be effective August 1.

This whole problem is continually under study.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire statement be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE MUTUAL SECURITY ACT WHICH WOULD AMEND SECTION 22 OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT BY PROVIDING FOR THE MANDATORY IMPOSITION OF QUOTAS ON IMPORTS OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AND PRODUCTS MADE THEREFROM

The following comments have been prepared for the purpose of throwing as much light as possible upon the complicated cotton textile situation as an aid in considering the merits of the proposed amendment.

The textile industry admittedly is confronted with troublesome difficulties. Many of these difficulties are of long standing and, although the troubles have been aggravated by recent imports from Japan, they are not all related to imports. There is no question of the need for the Government to carry its proper role in helping the industry solve its problems. There has been some difference of opinion, however, as to the means which would best serve to safeguard American textile interests. That difference of opinion is reflected by the effort to gain support for this proposed amendment.

Recognizing that the recent upsurge of Japanese textile imports has affected textile manufacturers and particularly some segments of the industry, a number of measures already have been taken by the Government which should prove helpful. The questions raised by the proposed amendment are: (a) whether or not present laws adequately safeguard the industry, and (b) whether or not actions taken within those statutes will provide appropriate remedy. In order to put the issue in clear perspective, there are hereafter itemized the avenues of relief from cotton textile import pressures available to the industry, some of the actions thus far undertaken by the administration, and principal objections to the proposed amendment.

I. AVENUES OF RELIEF AVAILABLE TO THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

1. The existing escape clause procedures of the Trade Agreements Act make it possible for import restrictions to be imposed whenever the facts indicate the need for such controls. The Tariff Commission has the authority to recommend either tariff increases or quotas should their findings justify such action, and the President has the authority to impose them.

2. Under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Secretary of Agriculture presently has the authority, upon a finding that textile imports are interfering with agricultural programs, to recommend specific protective actions to the President who has the power on a concurring finding by the Tariff Commission to impose them.

3. It is also possible for industries or segments of industries injured by imports to gain relief by application to the Office of Defense Mobilization where it can be demonstrated that relief is warranted because of the relationship of the industry to national defense.

II. ACTIONS THUS FAR TAKEN BY THE ADMINISTRATION TO AID THE COTTON TEXTILE INDUSTRY

1. Escape clause investigations are now being conducted by the Tariff Commission in connection with velveteens, ginghams, and pillow cases. The public hearing on the velveteen case was conducted a week ago by the Commission. A few days earlier the Commission recommended a tariff increase on linen toweling, and the President has ordered that the increase be put into effect.

2. Representatives of the administration have discussed the question of cotton textile imports with the Japanese Government. Following this, the Japanese industry on December 15, 1955, imposed voluntary restrictions on the export of their textiles to the United States for the calendar year 1956. Shipments limited by these quotas included orders booked before January 1. This self-imposed quota will be limited to 150 million square yards of cotton cloth.

Within this quota print cloth limited to 20 million square yards; velveteens limited to 5 million square yards; no formal quota on ginghams, but 70 million square yards noted as maximum by Japanese.

It should be noted that substantially more than half of the self-imposed quota has been imported thus far this year. Imports from Japan should decline sharply in the weeks ahead under the quota restrictions.

Cotton blouse imports reduced from more than 3 million dozen in 1955 to a quota of 2,500,000 dozen for 1956.

3. More recently, as a result of further discussions with the Japanese Government, an exchange of notes took place by which the Japanese Government itself formalized the above restrictions, declared their intention to continue a similar commitment through 1957, and assured our Government of a minimum of 90 days' notice prior to intended increase.

4. The Japanese recently further reduced their quotas on exports to the United States of cotton blouses from 2,500,000 dozen to 1,500,000 dozen per annum beginning April 1 last. As a result of this quota reduction, the National Association of Blouse Manufacturers, which had filed an escape clause action with the Tariff Commission, withdrew its application declaring satisfaction with the new Japanese quota.

5. The administration has just announced a program to subsidize the cotton content in American textile exports to equalize the domestic cotton cost with world cotton prices. This program will be effective August 1.

This whole problem is continually under study.

III. PRINCIPAL OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT

The issue before us is not one of granting or denying textile-industry support; the issue is whether or not this proposal is sound. The administration already has clearly demonstrated its purposes of cooperation. The following objections are listed because they show why the proposed amendment cannot provide a proper solution to the textile-import problem.

It is understood that the latest version of the proposed amendment requires the imposition of quotas whenever imports of an agricultural commodity or the products manufactured therefrom exceed such imports during 1955. Previously, the amendment was limited to raw cotton and cotton products and would have been applicable whenever such imports exceeded their annual average for the three preceding calendar years.

These modifications in no way and in no degree alter the fundamental objections to the proposed amendment.

The proposed amendment, with the changes, will still bypass the procedures established under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act and section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act for dealing with cases of injury from imports; it will still make the imposition of import quotas under section 22 mandatory, whereas under section 22 as it now stands, even under the emergency authority contained in section 22, the imposition of import quotas is discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture in the first instance and in the last instance with the President; it will still engraft upon the Mutual Security Act a totally unrelated provision amending an entirely different law (the Agricultural Adjustment Act); it will still accomplish a legislative purpose which should be properly considered in a separate bill, on its own merits, and only after being thoroughly aired and discussed in public hearings before the responsible committee of the Senate; it will still be a major departure from the long-standing decision of the Congress against legislating with respect to tariffs or quotas on specific commodities or products; it will still be an open invitation to all other domestic industries to demand equal treatment and similar legislation, thus shattering one of the main underpinnings of our carefully and laboriously constructed foreign economic policy framework; it will still lead to retaliation in kind by other countries—retaliation which will increase in degree and spread as other American industries are successful in demanding equal treatment and similar legislation; it will still lead to the unraveling of the free world's strong economic ties established by cautious and gradual liberalization of trade barriers and resulting increased trade among the free nations, and, finally, it will still lead thus to the eventual deterioration of free world resistance to the blandishments of communism.

These, then, are the projected consequences of the proposed amendment. They are very real and they pose very grave threats to our economy and to our national security.

It is claimed that the proposed amendment does no more than require the use of the emergency authority already contained in section 22.

This is a misleading statement. The present emergency authority in section 22 may be invoked only where the Secretary of Agriculture determines that a condition exists requiring emergency treatment. When the Secretary of Agriculture makes such a determination and so reports to the President, the emergency authority in section 22 provides only that the President may take immediate action. The initial determination that a condition exists requiring emergency treatment is, under the law, discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture. And what the President shall do upon receiving such a report is, under the law, plainly left to the President's discretion.

The proposed amendment gives no discretion whatsoever to the Secretary of Agriculture or to the President. Under the proposed amendment the Secretary of Agriculture and the President would be required by congressional mandate to impose import quotas whenever certain stated surplus conditions exist—such as presently obtain with respect to cotton. There would be no discretionary finding that a condition exists requiring emergency treatment either by the Secretary of Agriculture or by the President.

Enactment of this amendment would adversely affect United States exports of agricultural products, including cotton.

Japan is the most important foreign customer for agricultural products. In 1955 one-eighth of all United States agricultural exports went to Japan. During that year United States cotton sales to Japan totaled $120 million while cotton-textile imports from Japan totaled $60 million.

Enactment of this amendment could seriously injure our cotton-textile export market.

The United States is a net exporter of textiles. Its exports of cotton manufactures alone in 1955 were approximately twice its cotton manufactured imports ($124 million imports; $242 million exports.) It is essential that any solution to the United States cotton-textile situation be compatible with the preservation of its position as a net exporter of textiles. That position would not be preserved by enacting legislation which would invite foreign retaliatory import quotas not only against American agricultural and industrial exports, but also against the exports of the very industry—the cotton-textile industry—that the legislation was devised to assist.

This amendment could damage United States exports generally.

United States exports in 1955 exceeded $14 billion. Import quotas imposed by the United States would invite similar restrictions on our sales to other countries. The United States has attained substantial success in obtaining the removal of many of the post-World War II foreign-import restrictions necessitated by the shortage of American dollars. This success would be jeopardized and further progress in securing the removal of foreign import controls rendered doubtful if the proposed amendment were to be enacted inasmuch as it would provide a precedent for comparable restrictions by foreign governments on imports of American products.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for a correction?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from California said that a further reduction would go into effect on April 1. He meant April 1 of this year, did he not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, does the Senator from California question the validity of my assertion that as a result of the failure of the State Department to take action, the Japanese themselves are determining the amount of the American textile market which they will preempt?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. I say most respectfully to the Senator from North Carolina—and let me observe that of course it is possible for somewhat different interpretations to be drawn by different persons from the same set of facts—that there was not a failure on the part of the State Department to act. I think the State Department had carried on negotiations with the Japanese Government, looking toward a limitation of the exports of cotton textiles into the United States; and as a result of those negotiations, I think the Japanese industry itself voluntarily agreed to some additional restrictions.

In the meantime, the administration also has before it, under the normal procedures in connection with the Reciprocal Trade Act, the proceedings before the Tariff Commission, and has taken the other steps to which I have referred.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair). The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for an additional minute.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Now I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Does the Senator from California think that the Congress should permit the destiny of American investors and the destiny of American labor to be determined by a group of competing persons in a foreign country?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course the answer is no. I do not believe in any such thing. But I think the State Department was well advised—pending the decision following the normal legal proceedings for which we have provided in the case of the Tariff Commission—in seeking to obtain a voluntary restriction on the part of the Japanese in the case of sending textiles into the United States. I think the State Department should be commended for that.

Under our laws and under our Tariff Commission procedure, when the matter is processed in the way we have provided in the statutes themselves, certainly I believe that further restrictions will be necessary; and of course the Congress and the other branches of the Government of the United States must retain the power to protect the American people—both industry, labor, and agriculture.

Let me say that I am glad to see that the distinguished Senator from North Carolina is adopting what I believe to be some sound Republican doctrine, judging from the remarks he has made today. [Laughter.]

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Senator from California has been very kind in yielding. Will he yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired. Does he desire to yield further time to himself?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, Mr. President; I yield myself one more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for an additional minute.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Now I yield again to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from California agree with me that, because of the failure of the State Department to act and because of the failure of the Congress to act, the destiny of the American textile industry at this particular time is being controlled by the Japanese textile industry?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No, I do not agree to that at all. I think we are proceeding according to law. By the action in subsidizing cotton, so as to make it available for domestic manufacturers, to enable them to obtain at a competitive world price the cotton they need, I

think the administration has taken a constructive step.

I believe the proceedings by means of the Tariff Commission constitute a constructive step. I also believe that it was a constructive step to obtain this limitation, on a voluntary basis, on the part of the Japanese Government and the Japanese manufacturers, until the law could operate in the way the Congress intended it to operate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has again expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for an additonal minute.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Now I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad the Senator from California has emphasized that the State Department has really gone out of its way in attempting to bring some order out of the chaos existing in this particular matter. Moreover, the Congress has directed the Tariff Commission to take steps in this case, so I do not think the fault lies with either the State Department or the Congress. We already have on the statute books certain laws by means of which this matter can be handled.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the future we may have to amend those laws.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; if the Tariff Commission does not act in accordance with the responsibility which is imposed upon it under the laws already passed by the Congress, the Congress will have to direct the Tariff Commission to proceed in the way that it should and, if necessary, can and should do so as the distinguished Senator suggests. In other words we should face up to this problem—and it is a problem—and do something about it directly rather than indirectly.

The Tariff Commission has authority to handle this matter, and the Tariff Commission is under the legislative jurisdiction of the Finance Committee. Both the Foreign Relations Committee and the Finance Committee have been trying to do something to get the Tariff Commission to take steps to help this ailing industry at this time and both committees under Chairmen GEORGE and BYRD have been exerting all the pressure they could to expedite action on this matter. There is no question that this is a serious matter; there is no question of the sympathy of the Foreign Relations Committee; the only question is as to what is the proper procedure and what committee should handle it. The amendment is not germane to this bill and the proper committee is the Finance Committee now holding hearings on this question.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield time to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I cannot imagine any more shortsighted step for us to take than for us to adopt an amendment which would take a direct slap at one of our best friends among the other nations of the world, or one of our best customers. In this case one of the two principal losers would be the Dominion of Canada, which is one of our best friends, and constitutes one of the best markets for our exports. The other principal loser, as a result of adoption of the amendment, would be the Government of Japan, which is the largest importer of agricultural commodities from the United States.

I realize that in 5 minutes I cannot say anywhere near as much as I would like to say about this matter, and it is difficult to know where to begin.

However, let me say that all the grain imported by us from the Dominion of Canada does not amount to as much as our exports of manufactured and semiprocessed cotton goods to Canada in any one year. Therefore, why should we invite Canada to retaliate by putting an embargo on our manufactured cotton goods, simply in order to obtain a little imaginary protection in the case of the feed grains? Canada is an increasingly good customer of ours. She has been buying increasing amounts of meat from us, and she bought a total of $282.3 million of agricultural commodities from us in 1955, as compared with $161.9 million of agricultural commodities which are imported into the United States from Canada. We do obtain some seed wheat from Canada. We import some barley, as the Senator from North Dakota pointed out. That is not because of the price, but because of the quality, inasmuch as our brewers demand Canadian barley. We in the Northeast obtain some oats from Canada, and some feed wheat is sent into the Northwestern States from western Canada.

But why should we adopt this amendment, which I suppose is intended to benefit our wheat growers? Have not we done much for our wheat growers? Would they prefer to have this amendment adopted, rather than to have $2 support for wheat, for instance? In the case of the soil bank, we have made provision not only for wheat, but also for certain other crops in addition to wheat, which will implement the income of the grain grower materially. Possibly $200 million or $300 million will be spent for that purpose this year.

In this case there seems to be an alliance between the cotton textile mills and the wheat-producing areas of the United States.

However, Mr. President, in 1952 the cotton textile mills made the greatest of profits in recent years.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Will the Senator from Vermont state what it was——

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I decline to yield; I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has the floor, and he may proceed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let us see what the cotton people have been doing. They made large profits during the Korean war. In 1954 they had a slump but last year their earnings rose. In 1954 the Burlington Mills for instance earned $8,400,000, and in 1955 they earned $16,400,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes yielded to the Senator from Vermont have expired.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sorry they have expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, as I was saying, the cotton mills have made large increases in their earnings from 1954 to 1955. The first quarter of 1956 shows still further increases in their earnings.

I do not know what would satisfy them, in view of the rate at which their earnings are increasing. Instead of losing money, they are now making ever-increasing profits. In the first 10 months of this marketing year they have used nearly 800,000 more bales than they did in the corresponding period the year before, and they paid a higher price for the raw cotton they purchased.

Mr. President, this amendment is simply ridiculous. It would jeopardize our great agricultural export program, and would do so solely because the cotton mill owners desire more profits, and solely because a little more imaginary benefit might redound to the wheat growers and feed growers in certain States of the Union. It is absolutely ridiculous and selfish for them to take the position they take. This amendment does not belong in this bill anyway. It belongs with the Finance Committee, because it affects our revenue.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

Let me say that the wheat growers are not involved in this amendment. It is not an unreasonable amendment. The amendment would apply only if both of the following two conditions existed: First, that the agricultural commodity involved is in surplus; second, that no quantitative importation limitation is in effect under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933.

All the Federal Government would have to do to comply with the provisions of this amendment would be to place a limitation on the imports of commodities which were in surplus in this country. That is not an unreasonable provision.

The statement has been made that we are importing barley from Canada because of quality. The United States produces some of the very best barley in the world. The only reason we are importing is that foreign countries can produce it cheaper than we can. They can produce most agricultural products cheaper than we can.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the amendment. I wish to read into the RECORD an article which appeared on the business and

financial page of the Providence Journal of Thursday, June 14, 1956. I am reading this article merely to prove that there is a little more involved than imaginary profits. We are dealing with jobs of American workers.

The headline of the article is: "Japanese Imports Cited—Berkshire, Bates Extend Vacation Shutdowns."

The article reads as follows:

JAPANESE IMPORTS CITED—BERKSHIRE, BATES EXTEND VACATION SHUTDOWNS

Berkshire Hathaway, Inc., said yesterday its summer vacation will be extended a second week because of curtailment forced by Japanese imports. Approximately 13,000 employees are affected.

Seabury Stanton, chairman of the textile firm's executive committee, said all 16 manufacturing and finishing divisions will close for 2 weeks beginning Saturday, June 30.

"This shutdown period will include the usual 1 week's vacation * * *. The second week of the shutdown represents curtailment made necessary by poor business conditions aggravated in large measure by the increasing importations of low-priced fabrics made in Japan at an average wage of less than 15 cents an hour, with which it is impossible for our United States cotton textile industry to compete."

Berkshire Hathaway operates mills at Adams, North Adams, Holyoke, Fall River, and New Bedford, in Massachusetts; at Albion, Anthony, and Warren, R. I.; Brattleboro, Vt.; its Bourne Mills subsidiary at Tiverton; the Swansea Print Works, Swansea; a bleachery and dye works at Lonsdale; curtain factories at Warren, and Fall River, and a laboratory and machine shop at Warren.

The company said that "in keeping with our labor agreement, employees will receive vacation pay based on their length of service."

Mr. Stanton said in a statement that "the State Department has so far refused to establish quotas on goods which may be imported into this country from Japan and apparently feels that our textile industry is expendable.

"The only chance of minimizing this threat to our United States industry lies with the Congress, and it is hoped that legislative action will be taken to limit these low-priced imports before our industry is completely wiped out of existence."

William F. Sullivan, secretary of the Northern Textile Association, in a statement released with Mr. Stanton's reported that imports of cotton cloths from Japan during the 1956 first quarter "have increased 183 percent over the corresponding quarter a year ago." The current annual rate of imports of Japanese ginghams, he said, "is equal to almost 50 percent of total United States production during the entire year of 1955."

BATES FOLLOWS SUIT

LEWISTON, Maine.—The Bates Manufacturing Co. said yesterday it would give a second week's vacation, without pay, to 2,800 of its 6,000-odd textile workers.

The announcement attributed the decision to the competition of Japanese textile imports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. May I have 2 more minutes?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. In conclusion, let me say that what I have read is not something I have said. It was said by Mr. Seabury Stanton, who is the head of these mills, and who says that because of the importations and because of the low cost of Japanese labor, our mills are being affected to the tune of 13,000 unemployed American workers.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield half a minute to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I had not intended to mention the names of any cotton mills, but inasmuch as the Senator from Rhode Island has brought Berkshire Hathaway, Inc. into the picture, I point out that their net profit for the 6 months ending March 31, 1956, was $1,190,765, or 53 cents a share, as compared with $786,707, or 34 cents a share for the corresponding period a year ago, or almost double. In addition they wrote off twice as much depreciation last year as they did in 1954. They have also paid their regular quarterly dividend to stockholders.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I know that they had a slump in 1954. I hope they will not have any worse trouble. I am willing to protect them, but I am not willing to protect them by injuring most every other New England industry.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield an additional half minute to the Senator from Vermont for the purpose of answering a question.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator deny that 13,000 workers are to be laid off for an extended period?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not deny that they are being laid off; and I do not deny that the company has had every one of its workers in Vermont sign a card which has undoubtedly been provided by the company, asking me, in effect, to support this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. WOFFORD].

Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, there are many reasons why the United States should protect its cotton textile industry against the importation of foreign products. I shall not attempt today to recite all of the reasons. I shall only attempt to point out a few basic ones.

First of all, it should be clear that the American textile industry and its employees are not complaining because they fear damage will be done as a result of imports from Japan and other textile manufacturing countries. They are complaining and asking for relief because damage has already been done.

Already the cotton textile industry in the United States has lost 30 percent of its cotton blouse business. It has lost 40 percent of the gingham business. It has lost 70 percent of the velveteen business.

Several laws are on the books which give full authority to the executive branch of the Government to take action to give relief to any industry which is so hard-pressed as the textile industry. These laws include the peril-point determination which gives the President authority to prevent further tariff reductions on items found in danger from imports. Then there is the so-called escape clause which gives the President authority to increase the tariff on imported items found to be seriously endangering a domestic industry. Both of these provisions are contained in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Another provision is found in section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. This authorizes the fixing of quotas on the importation of items made of commodities on which prices are guaranteed by parity provisions.

This is the section of the law this amendment would amend so as to make protection mandatory instead of discretionary. Since it has not been used in its present form, I believe we have no choice except to make it mandatory—unless we are prepared to take part of the responsibility for the serious damage to our textile industry.

But the 2,400,000 employees of the cotton textile industry and its related industries have received no relief from these provisions of the law. This is not because relief cannot be given. It is because the State Department, the Agriculture Department, and the Chief Executive apparently consider the wants of the peoples of foreign lands more highly than they do the needs of the people employed in and operating the American textile industry.

The only relief that has been secured for this trouble-besieged industry has come from the Congress itself. That was the relief given when the Congress last year approved the amendments to H. R. 1 limiting the possible reduction in tariffs. Even that came too late to prevent the harmful results of the negotiations then going on in Geneva, Switzerland. The GATT conference of 1955 dealt the American textile industry severe blows from which it will take many years to recover.

The only hope that this basic industry will be properly protected lies in the hands of the Congress. Unless we take action to insure this great industry against the inroads of foreign imports, we must expect further curtailments of production and additional laying off of workers in the plants. We shall hear of more plants closing. We shall find ourselves in the position of a doctor who failed to use preventive measures for a sick patient to keep him from becoming even sicker.

Already closings, work curtailments, or canceled plant expansions have been announced by the following mills:

Springs Mills, of Lancaster, S. C., including curtailment of operations and postponement of expansion plan.

Camperdown, of Greenville, S. C.

Greylock division of Berkshire Hathaway, of North Adams, Mass., including lengthened vacation period beyond normal vacation.

Consolidated Textile Co. at Martinsville, Va.

Luther Manufacturing Co., of Fall River, Mass.

Windsor Print Works, of North Adams, Mass.

Cone Mills, of Greensboro, N. C., plans for new plant in Texas, canceled in October after flood of Japanese textiles as result of GATT negotiations.

An ounce of preventive medicine for our textile industry now is much better than trying to find the right pound of cure later.

Perhaps there are some here who believe the Japanese will take care of the situation themselves through their self-imposed quotas. Let me disabuse you of any such idea.

The Embassy of Japan here in Washington issued a report on May 31 with which it enclosed a copy of an economic report on Japan by the Foreign Information Service of the First National City Bank of New York. That report is a glowing account of the progress Japan has made economically and of future prospects.

Let me cite a few sections from the report. The very first paragraph says:

> Japan, during the past 2 years, has made impressive economic progress at a rate matched by few countries. And the outlook for the rest of this year is favorable. * * * Exports are running at record levels.

Even after admitting that the exports of Japan face growing protectionist moves abroad, the report paints a rosy picture.

I am happy that Japan is making a fine recovery from the devastation of World War II. I am not pleased that it appears evident from this report that Japan intends to score most of its progress at the expense of the United States, and particularly at the expense of our textile industry.

Speaking of streamlined production, the report states:

> New processes were adopted in cotton spinning, and almost all industries achieved economies in power consumption per unit and in labor productivity.
>
> In principal industries, costs were reduced 15 to 25 percent between September 1953 and March 1955. Export prices have remained stable, or even declined in some instances. This is in marked contrast to the upward movement of prices in many other countries during the same period.

Under the subhead of "Sharing in World Prosperity," the report states:

> Faced with a sharply reduced domestic market, many Japanese producers have no alternative but to aim for the export market. The result was that since 1954 practically all industrial expansion has a place in export industries. * * * And there were other factors, including * * * easing of trade restrictions in many countries.
>
> Special procurements (so-called invisible exports), although considerably below 1953 levels, have held up fairly well as a result of heavy United States spending in Indochina and elsewhere in Southeast Asia.

Discussing diversification of exports by Japan, the report points out:

> Except for the United States, no single country now purchases more than 4 percent of Japan's total exports. Only 15 countries last year bought more than 2 percent of the total.

The report makes clear that United States exports to Japan are decreasing while Japanese exports to the United States are increasing.

It states that imports from Japan to the United States increased 50 percent in 1955 to $416 million.

> From all indications they have continued high this year. Japan's efforts to broaden her market here—and to raise the quality of goods sold—have been successful. * * *
>
> The slight decline in United States exports last year—to $637 million from $677 million in 1954—was chiefly due to smaller cotton sales.

While all of the statements of the report are intended to show the remarkable recovery which Japan has effected since the end of World War II, they also show who is paying for the progress to a large extent.

Let me refer further to the matter of the self-imposed restrictions of the Japanese on textile exports to the United States.

An actual quota has been applied on only one item of made-up apparel. That is women's blouses. The Japanese have promised to reduce the export of blouses to the United States this year to 30 million. Last year the figure was 48 million.

Twenty other items of apparel have been placed under Japanese export licensing, but no quotas established.

They have also announced they will limit their fabric exports to the United States to a quota of 150 million square yards in 1956. That is quite a volume.

But now let me point out how simple it is for the Japanese to wipe out their self-imposed restrictions. I wish to add here that it is my understanding that our State Department has refused to agree even to permit negotiated quotas with Japan. Therefore, we should not be surprised to learn that the Japanese have decided to remove the restrictions they have temporarily placed on textile exports to the United States.

The note delivered to the Secretary of State by the Japanese Ambassador on May 16, 1956, stated the intention of the Japanese textile circles to continue self-imposed quotas, but the note also contained a very important qualification to that statement.

It stated:

> If for any reason they decide to increase the export quantity, they will take appropriate steps to inform the United States circles concerned of such a decision not later than 3 months before enforcement.

Thus, Japan can with only 90 days' notice, launch even stronger onslaughts against our textile industry than are underway now. There is no agreement to bind the Japanese. They are free to act at any time.

Yet our protective provisions under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, as amended, gives the Tariff Commission 120 days to make a peril-point determination—30 days more than the Japanese promise in notifying us of lifting their voluntary quotas.

Also, before the escape clause can be invoked when an American industry makes a complaint that it is being seriously damaged by the importation of foreign products, the Tariff Commission has 9 months before it is required to make a report to the President.

This means that if the Japanese were to lift their restrictions, the Tariff Commission would have 6 months even after the new Japanese regulations went into effect before the Commission is required to report how serious the damage is.

However, my purpose here is not to criticize the Tariff Commission. Under the escape-clause provision, 72 complaints have been filed with the Commission. Some have been terminated and some are still pending.

In 25 cases the Commission decided against escape-clause action and in 15 cases the Commission recommended to the President that the escape clause be invoked. In four other cases the Commission divided evenly.

The important point is, however, that the President declined to invoke the escape clause in 11 of the 15 positive recommendations by the Commission. The escape clause has been invoked only 6 times and 2 cases are now pending before the Chief Executive.

These figures involve cases before both President Eisenhower and President Truman. They make clear the point that American industry—of whatever nature—cannot depend upon our present provisions of law for adequate protection from the inroads of foreign imports.

Further proof that the present laws are not adequate to provide the protection necessary for our domestic industries is found in a memorandum of May 9, 1956, from the Tariff Commission to the Senate Finance Committee.

This memorandum dealt with Senate Resolution 236, introduced by Senator PAYNE and cosponsored by a number of other Senators, including myself. The resolution would direct the Tariff Commission to determine whether any textile or textile products are being imported into the United States in such quantities as to cause or threaten serious injury to American industries producing competitive products.

The Tariff Commission stated in its memorandum that the proposed resolution would "impose upon it a task of such magnitude that the Commission could not complete any substantial part of it within the limitation of 9 months" and that the "objection sought in the proposed resolution can better be achieved in other ways."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield an additional minute to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. WOFFORD. The Commission did not specify what other ways might be employed. But the very fact that the Commission declares the task of keeping up with the problem of a single large industry is too great an assignment, makes clear that action must be taken by the Congress to establish a safe and sure method of protecting domestic industries against foreign imports.

We are here dealing with the same problem which the Congress considered last year in connection with H. R. 1 and Senate Resolution 121. But now we have the additional problem created by the sale of America cotton at world market prices.

The Japanese have long had a great advantage in the fact that wages in the Japanese textile plants are approximately one-tenth as high as American

textile wages. Now they can buy our raw cotton at prices from 8 to 10 cents less per pound than paid by American mills.

Everything that has happened has been to the advantage of our competitors in foreign countries. Nothing has been done to provide the insurance essential to the industrial health of our own country. Now is the time to write into law a provision which will give our own people an even break with their competitors who have been aided so much through the postwar years by American tax dollars.

You have heard the arguments that textile imports to the United States amount to only 1½ percent of the total consumption of textiles in this country. You have not been told very much about the bare 2½-percent average profit margin of our domestic textile industry.

Of course, what that means is that even a minute increase in cheaper foreign textiles can have a disastrous effect on the industry. The comparative percentage of imports do not have to be high to ruin the industry. This is particularly true when the imports are in certain specialties because plants producing those same items in this country must take the brunt of the injury.

Mr. President, I am not making a plea for any Federal aid or for any handouts to the people of the textile industry. My plea is simply for them to be given an opportunity to compete on even terms with foreign manufacturers. I believe our people are due that consideration when we spend billions of dollars overseas to sustain the economy of foreign countries.

I am trying, Mr. President, to prevent increased cries for aid to depressed areas in this country. What we should do is to establish safeguards against depressions which are caused by foreign competition. Then there will be no necessity for handouts at home.

Many of us have seen the faces of unemployed men. We have heard the cries of hungry children when the industrial plants were closed in our States.

I hope the Senate today will approve this amendment and help to keep our plants running and our people at work.

If we are not willing to provide for the well-being and opportunity of our own people, we should not vote for 1 cent of assistance overseas.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], myself and other Senators. I would be less than frank if I did not state that I do not necessarily agree that this is the best way to handle the problem of agricultural imports. However, it is a matter which is now before the Senate. Those of us who are concerned with the problem of farm surpluses as affected by imports should support this amendment. We must remember that our imports of farm commodities in dollar value are greater than our exports in dollar value.

We have a surplus of more than 1 billion bushels of wheat; yet we will import about 6 million bushels of wheat this year. I realize this is a small amount, but let us keep in mind that we have forced our wheat growers to reduce their acreage of some 78 million acres in 1951 to 55 million acres at present.

Last year we imported pork products valued at more than $107 million and at the same time the Federal Government spent about $103 million on a pork buying program. This to me does not make sense. This is a problem that is not easy of solution, but it is one Congress must face. I predict that if the departments authorized to act on this problem fail to do so, the next session of Congress will take early action.

Mr. YOUNG. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. For the last year and a half we have been trying our best to get some action from the administration which would help to solve the problem we are discussing this afternoon. It is because we cannot get any results from the administration that we are discussing the matter on the floor today, in an effort to do something for the people who are engaged in the textile business throughout the United States.

It is true that thousands of textile workers are being thrown out of employment at the present time. Mills are closing down or curtailing their production. Some are cutting their production from 5 days a week to 3 days a week. In a great many instances the profits are going down year by year. In 1952 the profit was 5 or 6 percent. Today it is down to 2 percent.

The real issue involved in the problem of increasing cotton textile imports has been overlooked in recent discussions.

Some people agreed with the executive director of the Council for Improved United States-Japanese Trade Relations when he said recently that the greater national interests of this country will suffer if imports of any products are restricted. It is clear, by this time, that the administration shares this view and that appraisal may well be a true one.

But that is not the issue.

The real issue is centered in the fact that cotton textile imports are materially interfering with America's programs of acreage reduction and price support programs. There can be no doubt of this fact.

Some people probably will be surprised to know that the United States Congress passed a law in 1935 to restrict imports when those imports materially interfere with any price support, acreage restriction or other type of agricultural program.

This law is known as section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Its general purpose is to prevent an increase in imports from, first, partially or completely offsetting effects of farmers to eliminate surpluses and bring supplies into balance with demand, and from, second, taking over part of the United States market and forcing more United States farm products into Government warehouses.

Here is the point. If cotton textile imports are materially interfering with acreage reduction and price support programs, and if there is a written law to prohibit just such a situation, why is that law not put into effect?

A raw cotton import quota was fixed at 29,000 bales under section 22. Reasoning behind this quota held that imports in large amounts would materially interfere with agricultural programs already mentioned. The important thing to realize here is that imports of cotton in the form of cotton products last year were almost nine times 29,000 bales. And, if estimates of future imports are anywhere near correct, they will account for 35 times 29,000 bales.

Section 22 clearly states that whenever the Secretary of Agriculture has reason to believe that any articles are being imported—or are practically certain to be imported—in the United States "in such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation undertaken under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law No. 320, 74th Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, or any loan, purchase, or other program or operation undertaken by the Department of Agriculture with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken, he shall so advise the President, and, if the President agrees that there is reason for such belief, the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts."

That can be found on page 182 of a little book published by the Department of Agriculture's Commodity Stabilization Service. It is a compilation of statutes relating to marketing quotas, price support and related statutes. I invite you to read section 22 carefully.

Let me repeat, this whole question does not even relate to one's views on the question of whether the United States should import or export textiles, raw cotton, other farm products, or industrial products. It is simply a question of whether the present level of textile imports "materially interfere" with Government cotton programs or whether the level of imports is "practically certain" to increase to the point where they will "materially interfere" with the programs.

Here are the facts: United States supplies for the current season are at an all-time peak. United States exports are the lowest in 100 years—except for World War II and the Civil War—United States cotton acreage has been cut 40 percent in 3 years, with current acreage the lowest since 1883.

And even in the face of this critical surplus situation and while American farmers cut acreage, the raw cotton equivalent of textile imports has been constantly increasing and is currently two and a half times the 1954 level.

This quantity of cotton is the normal production of about 640,000 acres, more acres than the Government will permit farmers to grow in any of the States of Arizona, Florida, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, or Virginia.

There is no doubt on the part of informed members of the industry that

these imports will increase rather than diminish, if left unrestricted. When the Japanese, for instance, relax or abolish their export quotas, imports of cotton products into the United States can be expected to jump sharply. And there is serious apprehension in many quarters these quotas—such as they are—will be relaxed or abandoned after Congress adjourns.

To date, the United States Government has consistently refused to make controls on Japanese-United States trade effective. The administration has turned down every suggestion, offered by Japanese and American manufacturers alike, that steps be taken toward the negotiation of a mutually acceptable limitation on shipments.

Lacking the benefit of industry-to-industry consultations, because the American Government does not sanction them, the Japanese are unable to maintain export controls that preclude excessive concentrations of shipments, such as the current inrush of gingham fabrics.

The gravity of the present import crisis is accented by the fact that the textile industry has no margin or profit with which to meet foreign competition in home markets. At no time in the past 7 years has the textile industry of the United States earned a rate of profit as high as the average of American manufacturing industries in general. Even in 1955, the most profitable year the American economy has ever known, textile profits were less than one-half the all-industry average.

The whole idea of international trade is based on the assumption that countries export more of certain items than they import, in order to import more of certain other items than they export. Doubtless, there is no example in the whole picture of United States foreign trade where exports of a particular item exactly balance the imports of that same item.

America, traditionally, has been for many years an important exporter of cotton textiles. In view of the surplus of raw cotton in this country, the high level of clothing consumption of the American population, and the low level of clothing consumption in many areas of the world, this is expected certainly, in any logical world trade pattern.

Let me point out here that there was no hesitancy in using section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to restrict imports of wheat, as well as wheat flour. Why? Because wheat is a price supported commodity and large imports of wheat or wheat flour would imperil the success of the price support program on wheat.

In other words, flour made from American-grown wheat was imported in such quantity as to "materially interfere" with the price control program, and the restrictions were imposed to protect wheat farmers.

None of us should ever forget that the American cotton farmers biggest, most immediate, and most reliable market is the domestic textile industry. Mills in this country currently are consuming cotton at an annual rate of 9.2 million bales, or two-thirds of the crop.

In contrast, exports of raw cotton to overseas buyers have been declining and it now appears that the overseas sales for the 1955–56 crop year will be less than 2 million bales. The bulk of these export sales of raw cotton are being financed by the United States Government. Even Japan's takings of American cotton have declined during the very period of her increasing textile sales to the United States.

The farmer's biggest stake is in his home market. His future well-being depends first of all on a profitable, expanding textile industry in the United States. Producers of cotton or any other commodity cannot long be prosperous if their best customer is going broke.

A reasonable and workable control system on foreign textile imports, restoring confidence to American mills as a basis for future expansion, will increase the farmer's chances for sounder prosperity.

Based on Japan's own estimates, cotton product imports from that nation during 1956—as I said before—will be equivalent to at least 375,000 bales of cotton.

Will that "materially interfere" with Government programs of acreage control and price support? Will importing the equivalent production of 375,000 bales of cotton seem inconsistent with the aims of the soil bank to the American farmer?

Certainly it does seem clear that the point has now been reached where cotton textile imports are, in fact, materially interfering with current agricultural programs engineered to relieve farm problems.

If the executive branch fails to act, then Congress has no alternative but to impose section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that, in the judgment of the President of the United States and of the State Department, adding the proposed amendment to the bill would be highly detrimental to our foreign policy.

I have pointed out that the administration is following procedures which have been established by laws passed under both Democratic and Republican administrations. Those procedures have been set up under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and under amendments to that law. First, the Tariff Commission considers a matter and then it goes from the Tariff Commission to the President of the United States.

I give assurance to all Members of the Senate that I have personally brought to the attention of the very highest level of Government, at the White House and elsewhere in the executive branch of the Government, the importance of taking some action to protect the textile industry of the United States. This matter is not being bottled up in the State Department. The State Department is mindful of the problem. The President of the United States is mindful of the problem. The proper procedures are being followed, and I submit they are the orderly procedures.

In the meantime, we have taken certain other steps to provide a subsidy to manufacturers of raw cotton, so that their products will be competitive with world cotton from the standpoint of the world price. In that way, American manufacturers of textiles will not be in a difficult position in connection with this situation.

Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be rejected. I do not say that there is not in existence a problem which must be solved. I know that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota is vitally interested in this agricultural problem, as all of us are, and I know that Senators from textile-manufacturing States are faced with a very difficult situation.

I am frank to say that I do not believe a statement of profits in the textile industry tells the whole story, because it is possible to have an overall average profit in the industry and yet to find segments of the industry involved in serious economic difficulty. That has happened in the velveteen, in the gingham, and in other branches of the industry.

However, I believe that if we follow the procedures established by law, we will greatly benefit the textile industry and will not set off a chain reaction which may prove to be highly detrimental to American agriculture and industry and labor, by bringing about a whole series of embargoes against American products abroad.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on the Young amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, has all time on the amendment been consumed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, is is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the pending amendment; have they not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And the vote will be on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] for himself and other Senators?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

All time has expired, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD] and [Mr. NEELY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State convention.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business, and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is detained on official business, and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—43

Barrett	George	Morse
Bender	Goldwater	Mundt
Bible	Green	Murray
Bricker	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hill	Pastore
Carlson	Humphreys, Ky.	Payne
Case, S. Dak.	Ives	Russell
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Clements	Kennedy	Smathers
Cotton	Kuchel	Sparkman
Curtis	Langer	Stennis
Dworshak	Magnuson	Welker
Eastland	Malone	Wofford
Ervin	McClellan	Young
Frear		

NAYS—45

Aiken	Hennings	Millikin
Allott	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Anderson	Holland	Neuberger
Beall	Hruska	Potter
Bennett	Humphrey, Minn.	Purtell
Bush	Jackson	Robertson
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kerr	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Long	Symington
Duff	Mansfield	Thye
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Watkins
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Fulbright	McNamara	
Gore		

NOT VOTING—8

Capehart	Kefauver	Neely
Daniel	Laird	Wiley
Jenner	McCarthy	

So the amendment offered by Mr. YOUNG, for himself and other Senators, was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "6–27–56–D"

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina desire to have his amendment read?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is not necessary to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The amendment proposed by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WOFFORD, and Mr. KENNEDY) is as follows:

On page 51, strike out the double quotation marks at the end of line 12.

On page 51, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

"(j) Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(g) The import of cotton or products manufactured therefrom into the United States in quantities in excess of the annual average quantity of such commodity or of such products, respectively, imported during the preceding three calendar years whenever there is or is practically certain to be a surplus of cotton in the United States, renders or tends to render ineffective or materially interferes with the agricultural programs or operations referred to in subsection (a) of this section or operations under the provisions of the Soil Bank Act and will also reduce substantially the quantity of products processed in the United States from cotton or cotton products, and therefore establishes a condition requiring emergency treatment in the form of quantitative limitations as authorized under the provisions of this section. The Secretary of Agriculture is, therefore, directed to determine and report to the President whenever there is or is practically certain to be a surplus of cotton in the United States and whenever such commodity or the products manufactured therefrom are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States in excess of the annual average quantity of such commodity or of such products, respectively, imported during the three preceding calendar years. Upon such a report, there shall be imposed, under the emergency authority of this section, such quantitative limitations as may be necessary to remove such interference and to prevent imports of cotton and the products manufactured therefrom in excess of the annual average quantity of such commodity or of such products, respectively, imported during the preceding three calendar years. Such limitations shall continue in effect pending report and recommendations of the Tariff Commission and action thereon by the President pursuant to the other provisions of this section. A determination by the Secretary of Agriculture under this subsection shall be made immediately upon the enactment of this Act and thereafter between August 15 and October 15 of each subsequent calendar year.

"'To assure to the maximum extent practicable equitable treatment among exporting countries and to prevent undue concentration of imports of any article within any tariff schedule or classification of product, the President is authorized to establish reasonable classifications of cotton and the products thereof on the basis of either their physical qualities, value, use, grade, or upon such other bases as he shall determine and to impose such further limitation by classifications of cotton or cotton products as he determines necessary to effectuate either of these objectives. Notwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions, whenever any cotton or classification thereof, or any such product is subject to quantitative import limitations under any other provision of this section, that cotton or that product, as the case may be, shall not be subject to the provisions of this subsection.

"'Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect any right, privilege, or remedy provided under section 7 of the act of June 16, 1951, or under the other provisions of this section.

"'For the purposes of this subsection, cotton shall be deemed to be in surplus in the United States whenever the supply thereof is in excess of the normal supply thereof, as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.'"

The VICE PRESIDENT. How much time does the Senator from South Carolina yield himself?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield myself 5 minutes. The purpose of the amendment is to place a temporary limit on the constantly increasing imports of cotton textile products into the United States pending an investigation by the Tariff Commission and action by the President on this very serious problem, in accordance with authority already provided in section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933.

The amendment would require the use of the emergency authority of section 22 to establish quantitative limitations on the imports of cotton textiles at a level not to exceed the past 3-year-average imports. This emergency limitation would remain in effect during the period required for the Tariff Commission to investigate the situation and develop its recommendations to the President, and for the President to act upon such recommendations, as is now provided in section 22.

This amendment makes no fundamental change in the prescribed procedure for the determination of the facts by the Tariff Commission. Neither does it limit the authority of the President to decide ultimately whether quantitative limitations should be imposed, and if so, in what amount. It merely, first, temporarily controls imports to keep a very serious situation from getting further out of hand and, second, sets the wheels in motion for finding a solution to this problem through the presently established procedures of section 22.

I wish to call to the attention of the Senate some of the things which are happening in regard to the importation of materials made in Japan.

In 1953, 30,666,000 square yards of cotton cloth were shipped into the United States. In 1956, at an annual rate based on actual imports during January and February, and reports from Japan of March exports to the United States, the amount will have increased to 243,756,000 yards. That is an increase of 696 percent from 1953 to 1956. It shows the seriousness of the situation at present.

In 1953 only 277,000 square yards of cotton velveteens were imported. But let us look at the year 1955. In that year 5,754,000 square yards were imported, an increase of 1,977 percent.

In 1953, 791,000 cotton sheets and pillow cases were imported. In 1956 the number will have increased to 11,792,000, an increase of 1,391 percent.

In 1953 and 1954 cotton outerwear to the value of $540,000 was imported. In 1956 the import will be valued at $2,448,000, an increase of 353 percent.

Moving on to cotton wearing apparel, in 1953 and 1954 the value of the imports was $1,315,200. In 1956 it will be $44,055,600, an increase of 3,250 percent.

In 1953 and 1954, 139,200 dozen handkerchiefs were imported. In 1956 the imports will be 1,228,400 dozen, an increase of 768 percent.

Mr. President, it can readily be seen why the cotton mills are closing down. The Camperdown Mill in Greenville, S. C., where my mother worked as a little girl, and which has been operating

for 84 years, closed down, with the statement that it could not compete with cheap labor of 15 and 16 cents an hour.

The PRESIDING OFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield myself 2 more minutes.

Then it will be found that other cotton mills are cutting down their working week from 5 days to 3 days.

I am offering the amendment as an emergency measure at the present time, a temporary stopgap, so to speak, in order that the administration may look into the situation, make its report, and then put into effect such measures as it believes to be right and just.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. May I ask my distinguished friend from South Carolina whether his amendment is optional or permissive? Did he make that plain in his explanation of the amendment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is permissive.

Mr. HENNINGS. It is permissive for the President to do so?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes. When a recommendation is made, he can either accept it or not accept it.

Mr. HENNINGS. It is not a mandate to the President?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I will ask the Senator if the escape-clause procedure is not a device to bring about a locking of the stable doors after the horse is stolen.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true at the present time. Many mills have gone out of business, and others have had their profits greatly decreased. Industry in America as a whole will be found to be making an average profit of 6 percent. That is the average for all the United States. But profits in the textile industry have dropped to almost 1 percent in the last year. That means that a great many of the mills are not making any profits.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Does not the Senator from South Carolina feel that, if it is in the national interest for the United States to encourage Japanese industry, the burden should be carried very substantially by new and growing and strong industries, rather than by the textile industry, which, unfortunately, pays low wages and which has suffered severe losses in the past 10 years? Does the Senator not believe that it is unfair, if it is in the national interest to maintain the industry of Japan, for an industry which is already staggering to maintain the great load which the United States Government has placed on it?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is very unfair to the textile industry of America to have to carry the load of trying to compete with imports of products from countries having cheap labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it not a fact that from 1947 to the first quarter of 1955 the decline in textile jobs in New England was from 301,000 to 172,000, or a drop of 43 percent, and that the persons who are still working in that industry are getting extremely low wages in comparison with those paid in other industries? Should an industry which has been suffering in that way be asked to carry that heavy load?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad the Senator has mentioned that fact. Not only have that many workers been laid off, but many are working 2, 3, and 4 days a week, and that fact is not shown in the statistics I have given.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield myself 1 additional minute in order that the Senator from Mississippi may ask me a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the distinguished Senator see any justice in forcing one American industry to pay for the foreign policy of this country?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is not right to have one industry pay for the foreign policy of this country and thus to be kept in a difficult condition.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator realizes, does he not, that representatives of the textile industry have been to the Secretary of Agriculture and have pleaded with him to proceed under section 22? They have been to the State Department, and to the White House, and they have been blocked every step of the way by the men in the State Department who sell their country out.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is entirely correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I ask the Senator if he does not agree with me that all Senators ought to vote for the amendment. Otherwise, it would indicate that they were not willing to save the textile industry.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The vote on the amendment involves the question whether or not one wants to save the textile industry of the United States.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield me time?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, in speaking in behalf of the pending amendment, I should like to first quote a few statistics relative to the importation of some cotton textiles and textile products. In 1955, imports from Japan of cotton cloths, which include broadcloths and ginghams, were more than 99 million square yards, and almost 3 times what imports of cotton cloth from Japan were during 1953. The annual rate for 1956, based on actual import figures for January and February, is more than 243 million square yards, or about 2½ times the 1955 level, and more than 8 times the 1953 level. In velveteens, the comparison is even more dramatic. In 1954 imports from Japan were 64,000 square yards, and in 1955 more than 5½ million square yards. This 5½ million square yards is equivalent to about half of domestic production of velveteens. In 1954 imports of sheets and pillowcases from Japan were about 1⅓ million in number. In 1955, the figure was more than 11½ million; and the figure will be at least duplicated, if not surpassed, in 1956.

Statistics considered in a vacuum are admittedly meaningless. Let us then consider what increased imports have meant to the textile industry. As the Tariff Commission has so ably pointed out, the distress of the domestic textile industry is not general. However, where the distress is present it is acute. For example, in Maine, where ginghams, broadcloths, sheets, and pillowcases are important constituents of the overall textile production, the 1956 picture has not been a pleasant one. Two months ago, layoffs and curtailed workweeks were announced in several divisions of the leading textile firms.

A 4-day workweek means the loss of 20 percent of income to thousands of workers and their families, who were at best making little more than enough to subsist on. This month these same mills, along with other mills throughout New England, have announced an extra week's vacation. This will not be a holiday for these workers, Mr. President. This extra week's vacation, which affects some 2,800 workers in Maine alone, is vacation without pay, and is appropriately called a "Japanese vacation." In addition to these cutbacks, layoffs, and forced vacations, the 1956 textile-industry picture has been one of liquidations and plant closings. Although this has not hit Maine as hard as it has some other areas in New England and in the South, these shutdowns and liquidations are a part of the overall picture of serious trouble in the cotton-textile industry.

What is the remedy? Some would say that the textile industry has adequate protection in its recourse to an escape-clause investigation by the Tariff Commission to determine if real damage to the domestic textile industry is in fact being caused by increasing imports of textiles and textile products. The industry has in fact attempted to get remedial action through this escape-clause device. There are investigations now pending on several cotton-textile items. But, Mr. President, while the Tariff Commission takes anywhere from a year to

18 months to 2 years to investigate the situation, plants are closing, workers are filing into the rolls of the unemployed, or are receiving substantially lighter pay envelopes, and whole segments of the domestic textile industry are faced with annihilation.

Mr. President, in the case of cotton-textile imports, the events of the past 2 years have demonstrated that the regular escape-clause device is an inadequate means for providing the kind of remedial action which is needed. In the case of cotton textiles, increases in imports have been so sharp and so rapid that the damage is done before help arrives.

Mr. President, we are faced with a situation in which we close the barn door after the horse is stolen. Relief, when and if it comes as the result of an escape-clause investigation, does not replace the sales lost by the domestic industry, does not buy back plants which have been liquidated because of production curtailment, and does not put money back into the pocket of the textile worker who has been working a 4-day week or who has been put off the payroll for a week.

The amendment now pending before the Senate will not legislate a permanent quota restriction. It will, however, curb the inflow of textile imports, pending a full review of the situation, when imports have passed a specified point. In other words, the amendment will protect the horse, in the face of an apparent danger, until the competent authorities can determine whether the danger is real. If the danger is only apparent, the quota can be removed. If the danger is real, the President may maintain the quota, adjust it to meet the needs of the situation, or take other remedial action within the scope of section 22. Mr. President this procedure seems to me to be eminently fair, and one with which no one can quarrel. The amendment will not grant to the domestic textile industry protection all out of proportion to the facts. On the contrary, the amendment, as in the case of judicial procedure, calls a halt to the action in question until the facts can be determined and the issues decided.

Before concluding my general remarks in favor of the pending amendment, I should like to discuss one more aspect of the textile-import problem. The Japanese Government has announced an export-control program to limit the quantities of cotton textiles which may be shipped to the United States. The action of the Japanese Government is highly commendable. I would not question the sincerity of the Japanese Government's efforts to contribute to a solution of this problem. It, itself, has recognized the fact that constantly increasing exports of cotton textiles to the United States constitute a threat to the domestic textile industry which cannot be tolerated in the United States. Nor do I question the intention of the Japanese Government to do everything it can to implement and make effective the controls on textile exports which it has adopted. However, I do suggest that it is beyond the power of the Japanese Government, as it would be beyond the power of any other free and democratic government, to control effectively the export of certain goods to another nation, while permitting a free flow to most other countries. What is to prevent the Japanese exporter of cotton textiles from shipping his goods to Hong Kong, for example, and to prevent the Hong Kong merchant, in turn, from shipping these textiles to the United States? Transshipment is extremely difficult to control, even when a government has the best of intentions. I think it is significant to note that shipments of cotton cloth from Japan to Hong Kong in the first 3 months of 1956 are 13 times larger than they were a year ago.

Mr. President, effective control over Japanese exports to the United States cannot come from the Japanese Government. Only the United States Government, through quantitative controls, imposed at points of entry into the United States, can insure a safe level of textile imports.

Mr. President, I urge adoption of the pending amendment in the firm conviction that the textile industry needs this safeguard. And I am equally convinced that the interest of the textile industry and of the million and more people the industry employs requires the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions relative to the textile-import problem, which were adopted by the local unions affiliated with the Biddeford-Saco Joint Board of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, and by a group of merchants in Biddeford, Saco, and Old Orchard Beach, Maine, be made a part of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON FOREIGN TEXTILE IMPORTS

The health of America's textile industry, of which Biddeford-Saco is an integral part, is being particularly threatened by rising imports from foreign countries, particularly Japan.

Expanding imports of cotton cloth, broad-woven fabrics, sheets and pillowcases, rope and twine, have aggravated American textile conditions generally and Biddeford and Saco prospects in particular. In 1947, 16 million yards of broad-woven fabrics were imported. By last year the yardage had risen to 133 million.

Their postwar rehabilitation completed, Japanese mills once again have become highly efficient low-cost producers. Along with that, acceptance of Japan into the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade allows them to reap benefits from many tariff reductions.

From Japan alone imports of cotton cloth more than doubled in 1 year, jumping from 47.8 million yards in 1954 to 99.5 million in 1955.

In the United States market last year, Japanese imports had assumed the following proportions: Ginghams 25 percent, damasks 58 percent, velveteens 65 percent. Finished cotton products imported from Japan in 1955 included 12 million sheets and pillowcases. Imports of Japanese twines rose from 53 million yards in 1947 to 194 million in 1955. Rope imports from Japan were 4 million yards in 1947, 8 million in 1955.

Clearly, employers processing basic textiles from Japan are undermining our native industry both nationally and locally.

The remedy for this obviously is not liberalization of the textile-tariff structure. Rather, such a move would compound confusion into chaos, enabling foreign nations through callous and indifferent employers here to build a permanent, large-scale market at a cost of widespread unemployment among American workers.

The only answer possible is further restriction on imports through quotas or an ascending scale of tariff rates to protect the American textile industry.

A sound American economy requires a sound American textile industry. The leadership the industry has provided through technological advances has pushed our productivity ever upward. To allow foreign textile imports to erode what has become the economic mainstay of communities such as Biddeford, Saco, and Old Orchard Beach and regions such as New England cannot and must not be tolerated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

1. We urge the adoption of quotas or an ascending scale of tariff rates on textile imports from low-wage areas abroad, particularly on printcloths, velveteens, ginghams, sheets, and pillowcases. Imports of cotton garments should not be permitted to circumvent the effect of such measures.

2. We urge the International Labor Organization's early development of an international fair labor practices code to establish an appropriated minimum wage and 40-hour workweek in all other textile countries.

3. We urge modernization of dumping laws to prevent sale of goods in the United States at prices below those in the country where they were manufactured.

4. We urge imposition of duties on all soft- and hard-fiber products and a quota on imports of textile products.

5. The Biddeford-Saco Joint Board, TWUA, will solicit from the Biddeford, Saco, and Old Orchard Beach merchants signatures on petitions to be sent to President Eisenhower urging action to stop the destruction of the American textile industry.

BIDDEFORD-SACO JOINT BOARD,
TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, AFL–CIO,
MICHAEL SCHOONJANS,
International Representative.

Adopted by local unions affiliated with the Biddeford-Saco Joint Board at special meeting June 23, 1956.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the State Department of the United States is resolved to refrain from assisting the textile industry of this country from the suicidal Japanese textile imports, and

Whereas it is our opinion that the State Department feels that our textile industry, including the textile machinery industry, is expendable, and

Whereas we believe it is for the best interest of the citizens of our community and the economy of this area that these Japanese textile imports be curtailed: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the undersigned merchants of Biddeford, Saco, and Old Orchard Beach, Maine, That we will not purchase, stock, or offer for sale any Japanese textile goods which compete with the products of our local textile industry; and be it further

Resolved, That we take this stand to inform our customers and our neighbors of our concern over recent developments in the textile industry and our belief that the continued sale of such goods will eventually endanger the welfare of our community and the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That we pledge to continue to cooperate with the Biddeford-Saco Joint Board, T. W. U. A. and local industries in their effort to protect the textile industry

from excessive Japanese textile imports by enacting and subscribing to the above resolves.

Medora Salvas, Bell Shops, Priscille Desrochers, Bell Shops, Claudette Gagne, Bell Shops, Janet Levasseur, Bell Shops, Wilfred Sevigny, Sevigny's Men's Shop, Morton Wolfe, Bazaar Store, Fred B. Green, Green's Shoe Store, Ben Remar, Remar's, Robert Hanna, Allain's Jewelry, Albert F. Deshaies, Liggett's Drug Store, Bernard G. Boutin, S. K. Ames, Maurice R. Matson, Matson's, Josephine Rocheleau, Corset Shop, Joseph O. Marcille, jeweler, Conrad Fortier, Boston Shoe Store, Laura Delisle, Delisle's Yard Goods, Lucille Gosselin, D. & H. Sundries, Irene Shevenell, Children's Shop, Curtis News Store, Murphy's Music, Ida H. Baker, furrier, Annette L. Gagne, Theresa Melanson, Claire Morel, Roland M. Horn, Biddeford Hardware & Plumbing Supply Co., Warren Furniture, George Dumouchel, Jean M. Boisse, dry goods store, B. Weinstein, men's store, Jeanne W. Bibeau, dress goods, Mrs. G. H. Spenard, children's shop, Sam Robinson, men's shop, Betty A. Simensky, dress shop, Biddeford, Maine; Fred Rowe Co., C. G. Milliken, manager, Wellwood Stores, Little Folks Shop, I. A. Vanasse, D. Baillargeon, Unity Shop, Saco Pharmacy, S. Victor & Co., Sophocles Victor, Sam Peterson, Jack Roberge, Yvonne Martin, Fenderson's Men's Wear, James C. Nadeau, Saco, Maine; Francis G. Carr, 5 cents and $1 store, Ritz Gown Shop, John Vamoakroder, Molko's Department Store, Robert Molko, Thompson's Store, Marion's H. A. Ramsay, Falla's Jewel Shop, Old Orchard Beach, Maine; Nichols & Co., H. S. Nichols, A. H. Benoit & Co., Ray Bonang, W. B. Youland Co., Lawrence J. Lumb, A. L. Giroux, Quality Shop, C. R. Lavigne, Butler's Department Store, Jeanne Pepin, Parisian Shop, Biddeford, Maine.

Mr. PAYNE. I also ask unanimous consent that a copy of a telegram from Homer L. Brinkley, executive vice president, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, supporting the principles embodied in the Johnston-Payne amendment, be made a part of the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 28, 1956.*

Senator FREDERICK G. PAYNE,
United States Senate:

By action of its delegate body, the policy of this organization has been that it is fundamentally unsound for our Government to tolerate and encourage excessive importation of agricultural commodities and the products thereof which are produced in surplus in this country and are the beneficiaries of Government farm programs. Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act was devised to authorize import fees or quotas whenever imports of a commodity interfered or threatened to interfere directly or indirectly with the successful operation of a Government program on behalf of producers of a commodity. We believe the provisions of section 22 should be invoked promptly and effectively when imports impede or threaten to impede farm programs and the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture, approved by the Tariff Commission findings should be conclusive on section 22 action. We urge a clarifying amendment to section 22 to provide in the present cotton and cotton textile situation, that on recommendation by the Secretary of Agriculture a temporary quota of imports of cotton products based on 1955 imports be directed, pending a finding by the Tariff Commission and action by the President under the emergency provisions of section 22 authority.

HOMER L. BRINKLEY,
Executive Vice President, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I doubt whether any Member of the Senate has spent more time than I have this year in trying to convince the higher echelons of Government that the various segments of our cotton-textile industry need adequate protection. In view of that situation, I am somewhat resentful of the tactics which I find the cotton-textile industry has been using, apparently in an attempt to have legislation of the type now proposed enacted. It is simply amazing that at this time with this bill before the Congress, the cotton-textile mills would lay off their employees for an extra week, in addition to the normal vacation period, and say that that is done because of imports of Japanese cotton goods.

The United States cotton textile industry has applied on the basis of the entire year the imports for January and February. It is well known that one of the weaknesses of our import system has been that the Japanese have been prone to send a large part of their cotton goods into the United States during 2 or 3 months of the year, primarily. I suppose that, in January and February, the Japanese send into the United States at least one-third of their total exports to this country for the whole year. Therefore, it is simply misrepresenting the case to multiply by 12 the figure for January; in that case, the annual figure obtained is simply ridiculous, of course.

Mr. President, I know that the cotton-textile industry is having its troubles. However, it is having its greatest troubles from the competition from paper products and synthetic goods. I do not know how we can stop people from using paper towels or paper diapers or synthetic shirts, if they wish to buy them and use them.

But I am happy to say that I do not believe the cotton-textile industry is in so bad a shape now as it was last year. I make that statement on the basis of the industry's own figures. In 1954 the cotton textile industry in the United States had a bad year, although in 1952 it had a good year. I have made a point of finding out how the various cotton-textile corporations have been doing in the past years, and I find that compared to 1954 they have been doing very well, indeed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from California whether I may have 2 minutes more.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, I find that the various cotton-textile corporations have been doing very well indeed in making progress, although I am willing to concede that probably their earnings are not what they should be, if investment in this industry is to be made an attractive proposition.

For the fourth quarter of 1954, the net profit of the cotton textile industry in the United States was $37 million. For the comparable period of 1955, its profit was $99 million—or an increase of approximately 300 percent. For the first quarter of 1956, its profit rose to $110 million; and these firms are still making progress. Although I intend to support the cotton textile industry in every legal and ethical manner, I do not intend to vote for any remedy which they propose which would seriously hurt other segments of our industrial and agricultural economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Maine will be adopted. The textile industry in Massachusetts and other areas of New England is in a very, very difficult position because of imports from Japan. Japan herself has recognized that fact by establishing voluntary quotas. The difficulty is that those quotas do not by any means help to the extent they should help, because in the case of certain American products the competitive imports come in great quantities, while in the case of others the imports are small. The overall imports are only about 2 percent of our domestic production but with respect to gingham, which we make in Massachusetts, imports represent about 47 percent of our production. I hope, therefore, that this amendment will be adopted. I did not support the Young amendment, which has just been rejected, because, as the Senator from Vermont pointed out so clearly, it represented far too sweeping an effect upon our Nation's agricultural program, while offering no practical helpful relief to our textile industry as such.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Am I to understand that the quota system proposed to be imposed would be mandatory? Or would it be discretionary?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, it would be a mandatory quota, based on the averages for the last 3 years, until the Tariff Commission acted.

Mr. LEHMAN. There would be no discretion whatsoever.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wanted to establish the fact that the quota system would be mandatory.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. At this writing it appears that the freeze might be temporary. However, would it not be possible to make the freeze on imports permanent by the simple method of making new application from time to time? As I understand, the freeze would last until the various applications had all been decided upon and recommendations had been made by the Tariff Commission. I think it could be made into a permanent freeze.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope very much indeed that it would not be permanent; that certainly would not be desirable from any standpoint.

Mr. AIKEN. If it were a temporary freeze, I would feel much better about it, but I believe it could be made a permanent freeze through the simple process of putting in one application after another.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me half a minute more, to answer a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts with respect to this amendment. With textile wages in the United States 10 times as high as they are in Japan and in the light of the effect of farm price supports on the raw material prices of our textile mills I feel very strongly that the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator know of any other instances of the Congress of the United States having mandated the President to make quotas or reductions in tariffs?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; I do not. However, as I have said, I hope this situation will be temporary and not permanent, as the Senator from Vermont fears it may be.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does not the Senator agree that it is most unusual for the President to be mandated by Congress, which has not for many years, so far as I know, set quotas or tariffs?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My only objective is to call attention as forcibly as I can to the very difficult situation which exists in the Massachusetts textile industry today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a letter dated June 22, 1956, addressed by William F. Sullivan, of the Northern Textile Association, to Hon. Herbert Hoover, Jr., Under Secretary of State. The letter sets forth the New England textile case very clearly.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTHERN TEXTILE ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., June 22, 1956.

The Honorable HERBERT HOOVER, Jr.,
Under Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOOVER: I regret that it was not possible for you to attend the conference on Thursday arranged by Mr. Hill and Congressman MARTIN to discuss the problems caused by imports of Japanese cotton textiles and apparel on New England mills. Mr. Seabury Stanton, chairman of the executive committee, and Mr. Malcolm G. Chace, Jr., president of Berkshire Hathaway, Inc., operators of mills employing 14,000 in New England, explained the very serious situation with which they are confronted as a result of these imports.

Briefly stated, our problem is this:

1. The policy of the Federal Government regarding the importation of textile products is a matter of survival for our mills. The ability of Japanese manufacturers to produce at vastly lower cost makes it impossible for us to compete in any market to which they have access and which they choose to take over.

2. A clarification of administration policy on the question of whether Japanese textile imports will be permitted to increase is essential because of the present confusion on this matter.

The President wrote to Congressman MARTIN last year in connection with the passage of H. R. 1 to the effect that no American industry would be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure. Shortly after, duties on most cotton textile items were reduced by an average of 25 percent, and in some cases by as much as 50 percent. Japanese imports have been increasing at an accelerated rate since that time.

While every attempt to secure relief by executive action has been rebuffed and our efforts to secure legislative action have met the strongest opposition from the administration, representatives of the Department of State, Commerce, and Agriculture have told us that they recognized that a problem does exist. Even the Japanese have indicated an awareness of the situation by announcing voluntary quotas for a limited period on certain types of cotton goods.

A clarification of the United States position is necessary to avoid further demoralization and confusion and to permit the industry to plan realistically for the future.

3. Although Japanese imports of cotton textiles are about 2 percent of the total United States production, these imports tend to concentrate on certain types of fabrics and create problems far greater than the overall figures would indicate. For example, fine combed cotton goods, although made throughout the country, are a type of goods which New England mills make almost exclusively. In the case of velveteens, Japanese imports in 1955 equaled 71 percent of the United States production. In the case of ginghams, Japanese imports during the first quarter of this year equaled 47 percent of United States production.

This uneven distribution of Japanese imports at prices below United States mill costs coupled with the uncertainty as to the total amount of Japanese fabrics and apparel deliveries aggravates an already serious condition. Some mills are in the process of liquidation and many others are operating on short time. Extended shutdowns during the summer have been announced.

4. Tariff Commission proceedings under the "Escape Clause" are frankly too cumbersome and uncertain to be a basis for sound business decisions. In the first place, injury is usually inflicted before a "recommendation" for relief (which may or may not be adequate) can be obtained. Secondly, there is no assurance that the Commissions' "recommendations," if favorable, will be adopted. Past experience, and the absence of a clear administration statement, would indicate that such recommendations are more apt to be declined than accepted.

5. The voluntary quotas established by the Japanese do not provide the kind of assurances upon which the mills can rely. The Japanese industry has specifically reserved the right to change such quotas. Furthermore, in the absence of a firm United States policy and regardless of the sincerity of the Japanese, the enforcement of such quotas by the Japanese alone is probably impossible. Transshipment of Japanese goods from third countries is a simple method of evasion.

Even if we assume, however, that the present voluntary quotas are maintained and enforced in the future, two serious objections still remain. First, the Japanese quota on cotton textiles is fixed in an overall amount and permits concentration on certain types of fabrics with consequent unemployment and hardship. Secondly, Japanese quotas have not been announced on many types of fabricated cotton textiles such as apparel and, therefore, there is no limitation on the amounts which may be landed in the United States market.

Although this problem is serious we believe that its solution does not necessarily involve a conflict with State Department policies. We do not seek to exclude Japanese textiles from the United States market. Indeed the industry has suggested that imports 50 percent greater than the average imports of 1953–54 be accepted. This has been done despite great losses in our export markets. The industry has approached this problem with an appreciation of the importance of Japan to the free nations.

We are, however, fully aware of the fact that in the absence of remedial action or a clear, firm and lasting understanding, Japanese textile manufacturers are in a position to cause unemployment and liquidations of American mills or any segment of the textile industry. This, we believe, can be avoided. We earnestly solicit your help in finding a solution.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAM F. SULLIVAN.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am always sorry when I must differ with my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. The situation in my State is similar to that in his State. We are suffering from the same trouble. There is no question about our intense interest in the textile problem; but, as decided in the Foreign Relations Committee, this is not the way to deal with the question.

An amendment having the same purpose was considered and rejected by the Foreign Relations Committee. This amendment is different, in that the imposition of import quotas on cotton and cotton textiles would be mandatory unless and until the President, on the recommendation of the Tariff Commission, canceled the import restriction.

I say without fear of contradiction that this is a mandatory provision, and, as the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] has just pointed out, it is a new

idea for the Congress to dictate to the President of the United States under conditions which he cannot completely control.

If I have correctly analyzed the situation after the consultations which I have had with interested persons the difficulty in the textile industry, and the real problem with respect to Japan can be summed up in this fashion:

Japanese textile imports to the United States cover only a few items, but, the Japanese have concentrated on those items to quite a degree, injuring some of the industries in my State. Therefore the impact on the United States textile producers is not spread out, but is concentrated on a few segments of the industry.

The solution to this problem, as some of us see it, is to work out with the Japanese a better distribution of textile imports, without an increase in total imports, so that no single part of the industry will be adversely affected.

Conversations are now in progress with our Japanese friends on this very point. The question is how to deal with the problem in an effective way. The Japanese have been very cooperative in connection with the entire problem. There is no economic warfare going on. We are trying to solve the problem in the best way that it can be solved, consistent with the interests of both countries. This is the only way to work out the problem satisfactorily.

This amendment has nothing to do with the mutual security program. In our dealings with people abroad, and especially with our Japanese friends, we have a situation which is being constantly readjusted. If the President is suddenly directed to impose certain import restrictions without any consideration of our foreign relations, the result may be serious damage to our entire foreign-relations program.

I feel that this amendment is unnecessary. Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 contain provisions authorizing the imposition of import quotas. Applications for relief from imports of cotton textiles are now being investigated on an urgent basis by the Tariff Commission.

As I stated in discussing the previous amendment, I joined the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] and other Senators in a resolution urging that the Tariff Commission take up the question promptly. The pending amendment would require immediate imposition of quotas, without any investigation or public hearings which would safeguard the interests of all affected parties, and especially our relations with foreign countries.

The imposition of these quotas would have a very serious, adverse effect on the political relations of the United States with countries which are important to our national security. The amendment would tend to cut off trade with important allies of the United States and make it more difficult for them to share the defense burden of the free world. The amendment is therefore inconsistent with the objects of the mutual security program.

The amendment would hurt our efforts to dispose of surplus agricultural commodities. We do not wish to confuse our surplus agricultural commodity program and our efforts to dispose of such surplus agricultural commodities with the mutual security program. We are trying to persuade other countries to eliminate import quotas on our agricultural commodities.

It should be pointed out that imports of textiles are very small in relation to domestic production of textiles. They represent less than 2 percent, and they are very small in relation to the United States export of cotton textiles.

Let me emphasize again that the question is one of readjusting the spread in the amount of cotton textiles imported from Japan, and it is a question of working out that problem. I believe if that problem could be solved the textile industry would find it would get the relief it needs. In any event, the matter is being acted upon by the Government through the Tariff Commission and others who have the responsibility of protecting our textile industry.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not a fact that the amendment could create serious difficulties in our relations with Japan and that the impact on Japan of the amendment might tend to push Japan toward the Communist orbit?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator from New Jersey believe that if Japan loses some of its markets in this country, ways and means would have to be found by which to take up the slack, perhaps in Red China; and that perhaps the opening of that market would be sufficiently important to us to recognize the significance of the position which Japan occupies in the world today?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is a problem which we discussed in the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I am glad the Senator from Montana has called attention to it. We do not wish to push Japan into a horse trade with Communist countries. Japan must find some way of solving its problems. Japan is willing to find a solution of the problem which will be satisfactory to the United States and to our industries, and it is willing to agree to a proper distribution of its textile exports.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be glad to yield if I have the time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from New Jersey, I believe, has 3 minutes. I am unable to yield any more time to him, because of prior commitments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not correct to say that the Japanese Empire is about 10,000 square miles smaller than the State of California but has a population of 90 million people and has a birth-rate increase of about 2 million a year?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I believe that is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Therefore Japan is faced with the necessity of making her livelihood, not with what she produces internally but with what she sells externally. Consequently her trade must continue with the outside world or in part must be continued to be subsidized by us or she will go Communist. What does the Senator think about that being the choices facing that country in realistic terms?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator's observations and conclusions. I believe we should be very much concerned at this time to keep Japan in a strong position economically and politically. We must work out that problem without any confusion. That is the only way to do it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Some statements have been made to the effect that the State Department was selling this country out. Is it not true that the State Department has no power under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, but that the power rests primarily in the hands of the Tariff Commission and, ultimately, in the hands of the President of the United States, based on the recommendations of the Tariff Commission?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct; under legislative act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true also that at the present time hearings are being held by the Tariff Commission on cotton towels, velveteen, gingham, and pillow cases?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am so advised.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true also that the Tariff Commission, in the case of cotton towels, has raised the import duties from 10 percent to 40 percent, I believe, and that the increased rate was approved by the President? In addition, did not the Tariff Commission rescind previously granted concessions on cotton towels and was not that also approved by the President?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I could not verify the percentage, but I am advised that the Tariff Commission was working on that problem and has made some recommendations which the President has approved.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Those recommendations were very satisfactory to the textile industry, as I understand. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 1 additional minute on the bill to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true also that so far as towels, blouses, velveteen, and pillowcases are concerned, at the present time, at the urgings of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the Senate Committee on Finance, the Tariff Commission is doing everything within the limits of its appropriation and its personnel to bring this particular matter to a head? Should we not face this serious problem squarely through appropriate legislation from the Finance Committee rather than indirectly through this measure? Would the Senator agree with the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Montana that the way to correct

this situation may well be through additional necessary legislation from the Finance Committee?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator's statement. It is a part of the suggestion I have just made, namely, that we arrange with Japan for a better spread over a larger area of textile imports to the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from New Jersey said also that the amendment is different, in that the imposition of import quotas on cotton would be mandatory unless the President, on the recommendation of the Tariff Commission, canceled the import restrictions. As a matter of fact, does not the President have that power already?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I believe he has; yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I hope that this amendment will be withdrawn because in all realism I do not think it is any more than a gesture and I fear that it will be defeated if pressed for a vote. I doubt the wisdom of trying to attach it to this bill and I fear that some Members who may sincerely believe that some real action should be taken to protect the textile industry will resent its being offered now and vote against it.

Should that happen the vote will be subject to misinterpretation and will in the long run harm the cause of the textile workers and industry and those of us who seek protective action for the workers and the industry.

I am tired of surveys and studies. I want action. I want protective quotas on imports of textiles. And I want that voted on in a clear manner rather than in a mixed-up manner now on this bill and only on a proposed study or survey.

Mr. President, I have been working for some time on this serious problem of the textile industry. I must confess that on the basis of my past experiences with Secretary of State Dulles and the Tariff Commission I do not have much hope that they will take any corrective action. Since 1954 I have been fighting this battle and their responses have certainly been negative.

So that Senators may be better informed on this negative reaction, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point two letters which I wrote to the Secretary of State, and his answer. I am sure that a reading of the Secretary's answer will show that the adoption of the amendment will result in nothing but further delay in meeting the problem head-on, and that it can be a harmful gesture which will produce delay instead of constructive results.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., December 14, 1954.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Of considerable concern to the State of Maine and its people as well as the New England region, is the threat of a lowering of the tariff schedule on textile products. The adverse effect that it would have on the economy of our area is clear.

As has been pointed out to you, the largest single New England manufacturing industry is textiles—providing a payroll of 178,000 persons.

I have been advised that negotiations for tariff-rate changes, involving Japan and other nations are to be conducted in Geneva early next year and that the United States may offer concessions detrimental to the New England textile industry.

The objective of maximum trade between nations of the world is worthy. I have consistently supported the reciprocal trade agreements legislation. But we must not let our desires in that regard blind us to the inequities, both to textile workers and textile manufacturers of New England, that would result from any reduction of tariffs on textile products which would allow nations with lower wage and living standards than ours to invade the American market and cause unemployment and a loss to our regional economy.

It is one thing to help other nations of the world raise their living standards, but it is another thing to permit cheap foreign labor to undermine our own textile industry and thus take jobs away from textile workers and destroy the hard-earned investments of textile managements and investors with unemployment and the shutting down of textile plants.

The administration has a solemn duty to protect American workers and management from the cut-rate competition created by the lower wages and lower living standards of competing foreign nations.

In all sincerity and respect, I urge that you and your associates who make the decisions at Geneva keep this in mind.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
United States Senate.

NOVEMBER 21, 1955.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It was almost a year ago on December 14, 1954, when I protested to you against the threat of a lowering of the tariff schedule on textile products. At that time, I pointed out that the largest single New England manufacturing industry is textiles, providing a payroll of 178,000 persons.

Ultimately protective measures were agreed upon by Congress and the State Department and the threat was lessened. Perhaps the action of the Japanese in restricting exports while the Reciprocal Trade Bill was being debated in Congress gave the impression that the threat was not as grave as it seemed at the time. But if that were the case, then all such illusions were dispelled when after the passage of the Reciprocal Trade Bill Japanese exports soared.

As I stated to you a year ago, the objective of maximum trade between nations of the world is worthy. I have consistently supported the Reciprocal Trade Agreements legislation. But, as I pointed out, we must not let our desires in that regard blind us to the inequities, both to textile workers and textile manufacturers of New England, that would result from any reduction of tariffs on textile products which would allow nations with lower wage and living standards than ours to invade the American market and cause unemployment and a loss to our regional economy.

I want to emphasize again that it is one thing to help other nations of the world raise their living standards, but it is another thing to permit cheap foreign labor to undermine our own textile industry and thus take jobs away from textile workers and destroy the hard-earned investments of textile managements and investors with unemployment and the shutting down of textile plants.

The administration has a solemn duty to protect American workers and management from the cutrate competition created by the lower wages and lower living standards of competing foreign nations.

I am not unmindful of the complexity of this problem—of the desire to help Japan become so strong economically that the danger of the Communists taking over that country would be removed. In fact, earlier this year I conferred in Tokyo with the then acting Foreign Minister of Japan on this subject. I assured him that our country wanted to be helpful on this point—but I warned him not to the point of literally exporting textile jobs and industry out of Maine to build up such industry in Japan, especially when Japanese labor received wages of only one-tenth or less of that which American labor received.

Our country has been more than generous to Japan, giving her the money to build an entirely new and modern textile industry of 7 billion spindles. The tariffs were then lowered, making it possible for 13½-cent-an-hour Japanese labor to flood our markets with textile merchandise.

The element of reciprocity seems to be absent, as Japan expresses its appreciation for the help we have thus given her by now buying their cotton in Brazil and Mexico.

These results lead me to the inescapable conclusion that in this Japanese textile matter our country must make a reappraisal of its policy, however agonizing that reappraisal may necessarily be, because of these facts:

1. The present policy is leading to the destruction of the New England textile industry;

2. It is forcing American labor to compete with cheap 13½-cent-an-hour Japanese labor;

3. And at that rate it is not helping Japan raise her living standards, but rather would only serve to lower our own, with the ultimate choice being that of either forcing our American economy back to a 13½-cent-an-hour standard or writing the textile industry off as expendable;

4. There is nothing reciprocal in this policy with Japan purchasing her cotton from other nations;

5. We must be mindful that our country has given Japan the money to build an entirely new and modern textile industry, when our own New England textile industry could well have used such United States financial assistance to modernize its mills;

6. While the threat of a nation going Communist because of economic weakness is serious, we must not let that be used as a perpetuated economic blackmail; and

7. While we want to help our foreign friends, even our once bitter enemies like Japan and Germany, let us use reason that invites respect from the recipient instead of blind, unlimited generosity that ultimately breeds contempt.

The time is overdue when we must stop the cutting of tariffs and the increasing of quotas on Japanese textile imports. I am sure that many of my colleagues in the Congress share these views and that in the next session of Congress appropriate action will be sought.

In closing, let me say that while I expect to continue the past support that I have given to reciprocal trade, I will not do so in such extreme as to join those who seem to feel that the New England textile industry is expendable. To the contrary, I intend to fight not only for the survival of the New England textile industry, but for its full recovery and maximum expansion in which I have the greatest confidence, if its own Government will permit.

I would appreciate hearing from you on this matter at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
United States Senator.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: I have read with much interest your letter of November 21, 1955, on the cotton textile situation. The problem you describe has been of concern to the Department and I have discussed the matter personally with leaders of the American textile industry.

I do not believe that there is any real difference between the administration's foreign trade program and the position that you state in your letter. You will recall that on February 17, 1955, the President wrote to Representative JOSEPH A. MARTIN in support of the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act. In this letter, the President said that no American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of the act. This Department and the eight other departments and agencies of the Government that participate in the Trade Agreements Committee follow this policy. Furthermore, I have personally advised representatives of the Japanese Government that they should exercise restraint in their exports and not attempt to capture so much of the American market that an American industry will be injured.

The Japanese Government and textile industry are aware of the attitude of the domestic textile industry toward increased imports of cotton textiles. They appear to be genuinely engaged in an attempt to allay the fears of our domestic producers by devising controls on exports of textiles and finished goods to the United States. Reports from Tokyo indicate that apparently both quality standards and quantitative controls will be instituted. We are informed that until these controls have been worked out the Japanese Government will refuse to accept any further applications for the export of cotton textiles and finished goods to this country.

The legislation under which the trade agreements program operates has a number of safeguards for American industry. The Tariff Commission determines in advance of trade agreement negotiations the limit to which concessions may be made in the existing tariff structure without causing or threatening serious injury to a domestic industry. These so-called peril points were not breached in the 1955 concessions granted to Japan.

The domestic textile industry has complained that despite the fact that the peril points were not breached, the industry is being injured or threatened by imports of Japanese textiles. A further safeguard exists in the so-called escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act. Under this provision the domestic textile industry could request the Tariff Commission to conduct an investigation to determine whether, as a result of the concessions granted to Japan or to other countries, textile imports have increased to such a degree as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry. It may be that certain sectors of the domestic textile industry may require relief from imports. If such is the case this provision offers the industry the avenue through which to get relief. Under the provisions of Senate Resolution 121 of the last session of Congress, the Tariff Commission was directed to keep itself currently informed on the effect of textile imports on the domestic industry so that it may act promptly on an escape clause action.

The Department has explained these procedures to the textile industry. The industry appears reluctant, however, to apply for relief under the escape clause. Considering that the peril points were not breached in the concessions granted to Japan, that the reduced tariff rates have been in effect only 10 weeks, and that the industry has been reluctant to request an escape-clause investigation, this Department has no basis on which to concur in the industry's claims that it is being injured or threatened by Japanese textile imports. Our difficulty is enhanced by the fact that although textile imports have increased over 1954 levels, cotton-cloth imports during the first 8 months of this year were at an annual rate of only slightly more than 1 percent of our domestic cotton-cloth production and less than one-fifth the level of our own cotton-cloth exports. Furthermore, there is every indication from press reports that the domestic textile industry in general is operating at a high level of activity, with the output of many mills sold ahead as far as the spring of 1956.

You refer in your letter to Congress taking appropriate action at its next session presumably to curb imports of Japanese cotton textiles. The Department is aware of legislation (S. 2702) sponsored by more than 60 Senators at the last session to accomplish this purpose. I consider legislation to establish import quotas on Japanese textiles would be most unfortunate.

Such action would strike a serious blow at the administration's foreign-trade program which the President has worked so hard to establish over the last 3 years. It would serve to restrict trade at a time when the free world must depend for so much of its strength on the expansion of trade and the economic viability of countries such as Japan. Only economically strong countries can share with the United States the mutual-defense burden of the free world.

The United States does not have in effect today a single import quota on manufactured products. We are continually using this fact in negotiations with other governments in our efforts to get them to liberalize their own trade restrictions to admit more American goods into their countries. Significant progress has been made in this direction. But the opportunity for further progress would be seriously diminished by congressional action establishing import quotas on textiles. In fact, such restrictive action on our part might prompt other governments similarly to increase restrictions on imports from Japan.

Such action would be unfortunate as well in view of Japan's efforts to establish a policy of restraint on her textile exports to the United States, particularly in view of the reluctance of the American textile industry to request an escape-clause investigation that would determine the nature of the injury caused or threatened to the domestic textile industry.

Finally, I believe such action would be unfortunate because of its effects on the ability of this country to sell goods to Japan. We want Japan to be able to buy our surpluses of cotton, wheat, and rice, and our coal and petroleum because these goods are essential to Japan's economic stability and her national security and because American producers of these goods look upon Japan as a good market. It should be noted that Japan is the largest importer of American raw cotton, taking 653,000 bales during the 1954-1955 cotton season, or nearly 20 percent of our total raw-cotton exports. Japan cannot be expected to maintain a high level of imports from the United States if we restrict her exports to us to a low level. In 1954, Japan exported $276 million worth of goods to the United States and imported $677 million, leaving a net import deficit of $400 million. This gap was filled by the expenditures of our military forces in Japan, but such expenditures are declining as a result of the redeployment of our forces in the Far East and diminishing offshore procurement. Instead of restricting her exports to the United States Japan is faced with the problem of increasing her dollar earnings to bridge its dollar gap or eventually her imports from the United States will decline.

I know that the many and complex factors bearing on the problem which I have attempted to outline will be considered carefully by you and your colleagues in the Congress.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, if the amendment provided for discretion to be given the President, I would support it. I think it would be a proper procedure, and probably a useful one. However, the amendment does not provide for discretion on the part of the President. It is mandatory. I believe that if the Senate, by a mandate to the President or otherwise, were to set import quotas or tariff schedules, it would be an exceedingly dangerous course to follow. It would be a great step backward. I do not believe that Congress is equipped to set quotas or to adopt tariff schedules. That would merely lead to confusion and logrolling. It would be detrimental to the orderly conduct of our Government's business. Therefore, I cannot support the amendment in its present mandatory form. May I say again however, that if it were discretion in character, I would support it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to correct a statement which was made, not by the Senator from New York, but by another Senator, to the effect that the duty on cotton towels was increased from 10 percent to 40 percent. The duty was increased on linen towels, not on cotton towels. I wanted the RECORD to be correct in that respect.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I wish to clear up one point. This is not a study proposal at all. It gives authority, under section 22 of the Agricultural Act, to the Secretary of Agriculture to impose import quotas when damage is in the offing. It offers immediate protection and is, in effect, exactly the same as a case in which one engaged in an industry who feels he is suffering damages because of the act of someone else obtains an injunction. The injunction is put into effect so that further damage will not be done until the study and all the other factors are known by the court, so that a decision is finally rendered, and either the injunction is lifted or action is taken on a positive basis.

So, I think it should be specifically clear as to what this particular amendment proposes. It offers immediate relief if the industry is suffering injury.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I believe all of us recognize that we owe some

responsibility to the economy of Japan. We do not want her to have to trade with Communist countries. On the other hand, it appears to me that it is not fair to require that one depressed industry should have to bear the complete weight of our Foreign Relations program, particularly an industry which is already in great distress, with factories closing and workers losing their jobs every week.

As I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina, all it does is to give to the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to impose a quota on the basis that importations could not exceed the amount which had been coming into the United States during the period of the past 3 years. It would seem to me that Japan has done very well in the past 3 years. The textile industry in Japan has been receiving a 12 percent profit on the operation. Certainly, no one could say Japan would be hurt by such an amendment as this. In the United States the textile industry is realizing a profit of a little less than 2 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, it seems to me that this is a fair and reasonable amendment which would give immediate relief to an industry in the United States which needs relief, and while giving relief, it would do no real harm to Japan, because Japan has been progressing very well during the past 3 years. So, Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senate would be well advised to adopt the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time. This amendment, for the reasons stated with reference to the prior amendment, is just as objectionable as was that amendment.

So far as the statement by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] is concerned, I say again, that there is certainly a problem in the textile industry, but I do not believe this amendment to this bill is the proper way to meet that problem. I should be prepared to consider legislation amending the Reciprocal Trade Act. If we do not now have on the statute books an adequate act to protect American industry, labor, and agriculture, I should be prepared to join with others in supporting such an amendment.

I am very hopeful that the real problem facing the textile industry will be recognized and that the President will very promptly act to give equitable protection to American industry in this case and in other similar cases. If we cannot secure protection in that way, I would be prepared to join in amending the statute.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not a fact that a gentlemen's agreement was entered into with Japan which was satisfactory to Japan and satisfactory to our textile interests, and does the Senator know of any reason why the State Department should not operate in that field again?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I heard the discussion which was carried on by the Senator from Montana and other Senators, and I think, pending action by the Tariff Commission and the President, steps can be taken to give protection to the American textile industry.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The American textile industry was represented at that time by Dr. Murchison, in the State Department. It is a matter which the State Department should consider.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I fully agree with the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the statement which the Senator from California has just made, and I agree that something can be done. The Senator knows that representatives of the departments were before our committee, and they made some pretty straight promises.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Representatives of the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, and the State Department.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. But here is a disturbing thing about it: In the Wall Street Journal of today the Secretary of Agriculture is quoted as saying that he does not contemplate any action being taken by the Department of Agriculture to correct this situation, or, at least, to do the thing which we were given to understand was actually being worked out. If they would do the things they told us in the committee they would do, and do them expeditiously, we could abide the situation. But why did the Secretary of Agriculture make the statement which he made yesterday?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator I have not seen that statement. I sat in the Committee on Foreign Relations with the Senator from Alabama and other Senators and heard the statements which were made. I took them at full faith, and as the minority leader, I expected those who made the statements to proceed as they indicated they would proceed, and I shall be the first to join with the Senator from Alabama and other Senators if there is any indication that they are not going to proceed in the way indicated.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I commend the Senator, because I know he keeps his promises.

I wonder if the Senator will yield long enough for me to invite attention to the article written in the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 1 minute on the bill. If the Senator will let me have the article, I shall see that the matter is taken up this afternoon.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Here is the headline, which is found on page 15 of the Wall Street Journal:

Benson "Doubts" He Will Seek Curbs On Cotton Goods Imports.

Here is what he said in his news conference yesterday——

Mr. KNOWLAND. I find that many persons get into trouble in news conferences.

Mr. President, has all time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at the point where I made some remarks on the subject this afternoon, an article entitled "Benson 'Doubts' He Will Seek Curb on Cotton Goods Imports," published in the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENSON DOUBTS HE WILL SEEK CURB ON COTTON GOODS IMPORTS—PLAN TO SUBSIDIZE TEXTILE EXPORTS IS ADEQUATE AID FOR INDUSTRY, FARM CHIEF SAYS

WASHINGTON.—Agriculture Secretary Benson said he doubts very much his Department will ask for restrictions on cotton textile imports.

He told a press conference he believed the Department's plan to subsidize exports of cotton goods will be all that is needed to help the textile industry.

Mr. Benson was asked about conflicting statements he has made recently as to whether the Government should restrict imports to help the hard-pressed cotton textile makers. At his last press conference, Mr. Benson had said he believed some action by the Government was warranted. The next day, however, he issued a statement saying practically the opposite.

At his meeting with reporters yesterday, the farm chief said perhaps he went too far before. He didn't intend to give the impression the Agriculture Department was contemplating any import restrictions, he said, but his agency is continuing to watch the situation.

COMPLAIN ABOUT JAPANESE IMPORTS

Cotton textile producers are complaining about the rising volume of Japanese goods coming into the United States at low prices. They argue, furthermore, that the Government's plan for selling surplus cotton abroad at cut-rate prices will make it even easier for foreign producers to take away American markets from the domestic industry. The textile men are urging the Agriculture Department to recommend import restrictions as necessary to protect the Government's price-support program. Elsewhere in Washington, the textile producers also are urging Congress, the Tariff Commission, and the State Department to push for import restrictions.

The farm chief announced his Department is going to start studies of the effect of dairy price supports on consumption and production; how the whole party concept is working and what, if anything, can be done to step up consumption of livestock products.

Mr. Benson said his Department will report on these subjects when its Agricultural Advisory Commission, made up of non-Government farm experts, meets again in September.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Do I correctly understand that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the Johnston amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] for himself and other Senators to the committee amendment.

All time having expired, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "Yea" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "Nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [CHAVEZ] and the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD and Mr. NEELY] would each vote "Yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State convention.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—36

Bible	Humphreys, Ky.	Payne
Bricker	Ives	Purtell
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Bush	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Clements	Kerr	Scott
Cotton	Malone	Smathers
Eastland	McCarthy	Sparkman
Ervin	McClellan	Stennis
Frear	Millikin	Welker
George	Morse	Wofford
Goldwater	O'Mahoney	Young
Green	Pastore	
Hill		

NAYS—52

Aiken	Flanders	Mansfield
Allott	Fulbright	Martin, Iowa
Anderson	Gore	Martin, Pa.
Barrett	Hayden	McNamara
Beall	Hennings	Monroney
Bender	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bennett	Holland	Murray
Butler	Hruska	Neuberger
Byrd	Humphrey, Minn.	Potter
Carlson	Jackson	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Langer	Symington
Douglas	Lehman	Thye
Duff	Long	Watkins
Dworshak	Magnuson	Williams
Ellender		

NOT VOTING—8

Capehart	Jenner	Neely
Chavez	Kefauver	Wiley
Daniel	Laird	

So the amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and other Senators) to the committee amendment was rejected.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. McCARTHY obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator will yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to do so. I hope it will not be taken from my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It will only take 30 seconds. I shall yield time to the Senator if he needs it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the completion of morning business on Monday there be a call of the unobjected to measures on the calendar beginning at the point where the last calendar call concluded. In addition, pursuant to orders entered at the last calendar call, there will be included in the call on Monday Calendar No. 2232, S. 2691, and Calendar No. 2249, H. R. 6888.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me again for a moment?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are 16 amendments at the desk. It is the plan of the leadership to have the Senate remain in session until at least 10 o'clock this evening. I make that announcement so that Senators may be on notice that votes will be taken throughout the evening. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

Mr. McCARTHY. I send to the desk an amendment, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 29, line 17, it is proposed to strike out the words "expiration of ninety days following the".

On page 29, line 18, beginning with the comma, it is proposed to strike down through the word "Act" in line 25.

Mr. McCARTHY. Did the Senator from New Hampshire desire me to yield to him?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask to have it printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] to the committee amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the amendment which I have sent to the desk——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall yield to myself all of the time allotted to me, unless some other Senator wants a part of that time, in which event I shall relinquish some of my time.

Mr. President, very simply stated, this amendment provides that no aid shall be given to Yugoslavia under the Mutual Assistance Act. That includes cutting off funds of $30 million which have not been committed and which are now available to Yugoslavia.

Mr. President, yesterday on this floor, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] delivered a moving and eloquent address on "The Moral Crisis in American Foreign Policy." The Senator from New Hampshire said:

> In the conduct of our foreign affairs, I am driven to conclude we have lost the compass of moral principle. More and more we operate in gray areas. Somewhere between good and evil. * * * If the present drift to cynical grayness, where once we knew the difference between black and white, is not arrested and reversed, we shall lose our ability to defend ourselves.

This afternoon, I desire to discuss a situation that illustrates the Senator's thesis. There is no more vivid way of portraying the amoral character of our foreign policy than by a sober and dispassionate consideration of our policy toward Communist Yugoslavia.

But moral issues are not the only ones involved here. A policy of constructing the military machine and subsidizing the economy of a Communist dictatorship that has declared itself to be an implacable foe of our way of life is, to be sure, an outrage against the most fundamental concepts of right and wrong, but beyond that, it presents a grave threat to the security of the United States.

In the past 5 years the United States has poured into Communist Yugoslavia $946 million in military and economic assistance. We have rationalized that policy of subsidizing Communist tyranny by telling ourselves that there was a chance that this particular Communist nation could be permanently separated from the power bloc dominated by the Soviet Union. Let us assume, for purposes of the argument, that our past policy was justified as a matter of hard-headed power politics. The point I make today is that that rationalization is no longer available to us. And since it is no longer available to us, continuation of aid to Yugoslavia is a crime against morality.

There is, of course, always the strongest kind of presumption—based on our

knowledge of Communist teaching and Communist practice—that two Communist nations will fight on the same side in the battle between communism and freedom. This means that in order to responsibly pursue the hope that two Communist nations—such as Yugoslavia and Russia—will not end up side by side, we must have positive and cogent evidence that those two countries present an exception to the rule.

I contend that every item of evidence available to us points directly the other way; every item of evidence suggests that those two nations, Communist Russia and Communist Yugoslavia, mean to stand side by side to the very end, and that, as Zhukov said, "If war ever comes, Yugoslavia and Russia will be found fighting on the same side."

I invite any member of this body to bring to the Senate's attention a single item of evidence that suggests the contrary. And if such evidence is not forthcoming, I hold that voting further aid for Yugoslavia is absolutely incompatible with our solemn duty as United States Senators to look after the safety and welfare of our country.

Mr. President, what is the evidence that supports the presumption that these two Communist nations are like any other Communist nations—that they are hellbent for world revolution, and mean to work together toward the Communist objective of conquering the world?

In 1948, Marshal Tito withdrew from the Comintern and entered into a period of strained relations with the Soviet Union. I shall assume, for the purposes of this debate, that a genuine quarrel ensued, although I am not convinced that it may not have been fundamentally a hoax to deceive the West. The reason for this alleged quarrel—as both the Yugoslavs and Russians have told us a thousand times since—was that Tito disagreed with Stalin as to the best method of promoting world communism. Tito at no time denied that he was a Communist; at no time did he deny that Communist domination of the world was his objective as well as Stalin's; at no time did Tito's government deviate from the principal tenets of what is known as Marxism-Leninism. Therefore, from the very nature of things—from the very nature of the quarrel as defined by the participants—the breach between Tito and the Kremlin was one that could be healed. It could and it would be healed when the two dictatorships once again agreed on the best method of promoting the world Communist revolution. Concretely, it could and would be healed when the Soviet Union agreed to permit other Communist nations a certain amount of autonomy in the conduct of their internal affairs.

Mr. President, I yielded myself 30 minutes. Inasmuch as I understand that other Senators wish to speak, I shall change that, and shall yield myself only 25 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin may proceed accordingly.

Mr. McCARTHY. But, Mr. President, we must be very clear about this: The issue between Tito and Stalin was not whether governments should be Communist governments; it was not whether they should be despotic governments; it was not whether they should be governments dedicated to the overthrow of Western civilization. On all of these things they were in agreement. The point of disagreement—and I think I am not guilty of oversimplification—was whether Yugoslavia's Government should be controlled by Yugoslav Communists or from the Kremlin, as is the case in other satellite nations.

After the death of Stalin in the spring of 1953, the Soviet Union began a campaign to persuade Tito that the Kremlin had come around to Tito's position on the question that allegedly separated the two governments. Whether the Soviet Union has really changed its views about having indigenous Communists run the internal affairs of a Communist country is quite beside the point. The point is that Tito has taken up the Kremlin's overtures and has declared that he is now satisfied that whatever separated the two countries is something of the past.

The rapprochement between Russia and Yugoslavia has been under way, as I have said, since 1953. The preparations for the final joining of hands were made last spring, when Khrushchev and Bulganin visited Belgrade. The alliance was finally sealed 3 weeks ago, when Tito made a state visit to Moscow.

What Tito said on his arrival in Moscow was well publicized; but in the light of our Government's position that we must continue aid to Yugoslavia, I can only conclude that a vast number of people, at least in the executive branch of our Government, did not read the newspapers. Therefore, it will be well to set down here, for the record, Tito's formal declaration of an alliance with the Soviet Union. Mr. President, I doubt that the case for cutting off American aid to Yugoslavia could be put more forcefully or more compellingly than Marshal Tito put it on that occasion.

Referring to the temporary break between Russia and Yugoslavia, Tito said:

> We were greatly pained, but we believed that the time would come when everything separating us would be overcome and when our friendship would receive a new and still more firm foundation. This time has come, thanks to the Leninist policy of the Government and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.
>
> The arrival of Comrades Khrushchev, Bulganin, Mikoyan and others in Belgrade, the talks with them, the declaration which was drawn up on that occasion, and afterward the courageous and farsighted foreign policy of the collective leadership of the Soviet Union are, in my profound conviction, a guarantee that nothing of the kind will ever happen again—

Mr. President, I call particular attention to this—

> between the two countries marching along the path of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

And at the end of his speech, Tito cried:

> Long live the Soviet Union. Long live the friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

Mr. President, I think that two statements made by Tito are especially significant; I refer to his statement that the Leninist policy of the Soviet Union was one of the things which healed the breach, and his statement that both Soviet Russia and Yugoslavia are "marching along the path of Marx, Engels, and Lenin."

Mr. President, during my years of investigation of the Communist conspiracy, I have found that, unfortunately, a vast number of persons—including a sizable number of Senators, unfortunately—do not fully understand what is meant by Marxism-Leninism. For the record, I should like to state, once and for all, a brief history of that matter.

In 1848, Karl Marx wrote the Communist manifesto. At that time, of course, he said the whole world had to be communized. But he said that in England and in the United States a different situation existed; he said there it would be possible for them to communize without the necessity of having a bloody revolution, but that in the rest of the world there would have to be such a revolution. That was in 1848.

In 1914, Lenin revised the Communist manifesto. At that time Lenin said, in effect, that Marx was correct as to the situation in 1848, but that times had changed, and that it would be necessary to have a revolution in both England and in the United States. So that is what is meant by Marxism-Leninism. It is Marx's manifesto, corrected by Lenin, when he said there must be a bloody revolution in the United States.

In 1947 Stalin reaffirmed Leninism; and Tito did so on June 2. So when Tito says that it is the Leninism of the Soviet Republic that caused them to get together and go marching along the path of Lenin, he knows what it means. One of the things he was saying—and he knows what Leninism is—is, "I believe in Leninism," which advocates a bloody revolution in the United States and in England.

Mr. President, may I ask how much time I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 15 minutes.

EXPLAIN MARXISM-LENINISM

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, when Tito proclaims that Russia and Yugoslavia are now marching together "along the path of Marx, Engels and Lenin", he is proclaiming that Russia and Yugoslavia are marching together toward their joint goal of destroying the United States. No one today can deny that the "path of Marx, Engels and Lenin" is a path that leads to Communist conquest of the world and the overthrow of our free, capitalistic society. This is freely conceded even by the Soviet leaders who are peddling the current Communist coexistence line. Even the most conciliatory remarks in recent months by Khrushchev and Bulganin have included a reminder that, whether by forcible revolution or otherwise, the Communists mean to rule the world.

But putting aside Communist coexistence propaganda, I would point out again that a cardinal principle of Leninism—which Tito professes to be following—is that the Communist world

must bring about a bloody revolution in the United States.

So much for what Tito says are the intentions of the Yugoslav Government. In the area of action, everything Tito's government has done fully corroborates what he says Yugoslavia intends to do. Yugoslavian foreign policy, as Tito himself boasted in Moscow, has consistently supported the Soviet Union on every point on which the Soviet Union and the free world are in disagreement. The Senate is well aware, for example, of the efforts of Tito to scuttle our defense system during his recent trip to the Far East.

Our policy of aiding Yugoslavia in hopes of making Tito an ally of the West has been a catastrophic failure. Our aid has been bestowed in great abundance in the past and our reward has been the emergence of a firm, unequivocal alliance between Yugoslavia and Soviet Russia.

Mr. President, I wish now to turn to the arguments put forth by those who believe that the aid to Yugoslavia should be continued. But before doing so, I shall call to the Senate's attention a disturbing chronology of events.

On Saturday, June 2, Communist Yugoslavia made its definite declaration of solidarity with Communist Russia.

On Tuesday, June 5, I introduced S. 4001 calling for the immediate cessation of previously appropriated aid to Yugoslavia.

On Wednesday, June 6, Marshal Tito stated in Moscow that he thought the McCarthy bill was unimportant. The question of whether this statement was only bravado, or reflected the smug confidence of a man who had somehow been assured, perhaps by the American State Department, that the United States Government had no intention of cutting off Yugoslav aid, I leave for the Senate to decide.

On the same day, June 6, President Eisenhower in his news conference stated that our Yugoslav policy would have to be reevaluated.

Two days later, on June 8, the President was stricken with his current affliction and taken to the hospital.

Let me say in passing that I certainly hope the President will recover fully in the very near future.

Then, finally, on June 13 the Secretary of State wrote a letter to the Committee on Foreign Relations explaining why the State Department "vigorously opposed" cutting off aid to Yugoslavia. This letter is, in every possible sense, an astounding document and I shall refer to it in some detail in a moment. But the thing about the letter I want to mention now is that it nowhere even remotely suggests that our policy has undergone the "reevaluation" which the President promised. It is clear on the face of the letter that United States policy has not been reconsidered in the light of Marshal Tito's statement; the argument Mr. Dulles gives for supporting continued aid to Yugoslavia, as he says, is the result of a study of United States policy toward Yugoslavia that took place "within the past 6 months."

I think it is important for the Senate to know that the administration's views, as expressed by the Secretary of State and others, do not represent a fresh appraisal of the situation. And this, despite the fact that the President thought our policy should be "reevaluated." The minority leader of the Senate [Mr. KNOWLAND] said he believed the policy should be reevaluated; the head of the Republican policy committee [Mr. BRIDGES] said the same thing, as have many others. One of the questions that concerns me is why this promised "reevaluation" was evidently called off by the State Department after the President was stricken and unable personally to enforce his declared policies.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, my time will run out before I can complete this prepared statement. I ask unanimous consent that I may skip portions of it, and that it may be printed in the RECORD in toto, as though delivered on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). The Chair must inform the Senator that unanimous consent cannot be granted.

Mr. McCARTHY. Be that as it may, let us now consider what the administration has told us about its reasons for continuing aid to Yugoslavia. The long and the short of the administration's position is, as Secretary Dulles put it to the Foreign Relations Committee the other day, that we must not "drive the Yugoslavs into the Russian camp." This is regarded as one of the most extraordinary statements ever uttered by a responsible Government official. Such a statement blithely ignores what Tito said in Moscow this last month and what he has been doing this last year, and treats his acts and statements as though they never occurred.

What sense does it make to say that we must not drive Tito into the Russian camp when all of the evidence tells us that Tito is already as far into the Russian camp as he can get?

These arguments of Mr. Dulles were unusual, but the same argument was expressed by Secretary of Defense Wilson before an executive session of the Appropriations Committee. I hasten to add that ordinarily, of course, I would not refer in public to executive session testimony. However, in this case Secretary Wilson released to the press an alleged copy of his remarks before this executive session. Therefore I believe he waived any right to have what he actually said held in confidence.

I might say that when they testified, neither Mr. Dulles nor Mr. Hollister released a prepared statement; therefore I do not feel at liberty to discuss the testimony which they gave before the Appropriations Committee. I assure the Senate that there is nothing in the 2 or 3 paragraphs I am going to quote that in any way affects our security. It is not security information at all; it is simply an opinion of Mr. Wilson's. Still, I think it is terribly important that the American people know what the opinions of our Secretary of Defense are with respect to the Yugoslav controversy. I am sure they will be as shocked as I was on learning about the kind of thinking upon which some of our major foreign policy decisions are predicated.

I asked Mr. Wilson this:

Mr. Secretary, do you favor military aid to Yugoslavia?

Here is Secretary Wilson's answer:

The Yugoslavia situation is a very delicate one. The amount of aid to Yugoslavia is being reduced. The break of Tito with the Communist group in Moscow was an important thing. There is a difference of opinion about what is going to finally come out of it, whether he is going to go back with the Moscow business or not. We have made quite a big bet that he was not. I do not think that we should call the game right now. I think we ought to study it very carefully, which is being done.

Mind you, Mr. President, this statement was made only last week. Mr. Wilson says that there is a difference of opinion about whether Tito "is going to go back with the Moscow business." I wonder if the Secretary of Defense reads the newspapers. I wonder if he has read the accounts of Marshal Tito's statement in Moscow when he said, referring to the 1948 split between Russia and Yugoslavia, that—

Nothing of the kind will ever happen again between the two countries marching along the path of Marx, Engels, and Lenin * * * Long live the Soviet Union. Long live the friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

I wonder when Mr. Wilson will find out that Tito has already gone back to the "Moscow business"—and that he has done it with a deliberate propaganda flourish that is frighteningly informative to all but those who bury their heads in the sand.

We have indeed, as Mr. Wilson says, made "quite a big bet that Tito will not go back to Moscow." Unfortunately, this was a bad bet. Why, Mr. President, should we go on throwing good money after bad?

The remainder of Secretary Wilson's answer to my question is even more astounding:

It is quite important and very important from my point of view if the Communist business did break down so that it was not all dominated out of Moscow and [so that] the different countries did the best they could with their own people in their type of government, whether it is socialistic or capitalistic in our terms, or whether temporarily they run some kind of a Communist regime. We cannot exactly try to police the whole world, and to some degree we have to put up with what they do. Some of them are very delicate and difficult positions and getting out of the old colonialism of the past into some new and proper, from our point of view, type of society, somewhat on our pattern.

In effect, Mr. President, Secretary Wilson is telling us that we should not discriminate in our foreign aid program against Communist nations.

It is absolutely incomprehensible to me, Mr. President, how Mr. Wilson—in the teeth of everything we know about the world Communist movement, and in the teeth of all of the publicly recorded evidence concerning Tito's conduct—can imply that there is a reasonable chance that Tito's government may evolve into a government "somewhat on our pattern."

I can only conclude, Mr. President, that the reasons the administration gives for its Yugoslav policy are even more fantastic than the policy itself.

Let me now turn to the letter Mr. Dulles sent to the Foreign Relations Committee, which purports to explain the administration's position in more detail.

After conceding that there are "tendencies in Yugoslavia toward rapprochement with the Soviet Union," Mr. Dulles states that—

None of this obscures the fact * * * that decisions on Yugoslav Government problems and policies are being made in Belgrade and not in Moscow. To be sure, many of these decisions in the foreign policy field do not correspond with our own. * * * Yet there has been no credible evidence that President Tito wishes or is ever going to enter into a subservient status vis-a-vis the Soviet Union.

Let us assume that this opinion of Mr. Dulles is correct. Let us assume that he is right that Yugoslavia is not a satellite of our enemy, but merely an ally of our enemy. Does this strike the Members of this body as a good reason for building up the economy and the military machine of Yugoslavia?

Precisely the same argument could have been made during the Second World War in favor of giving American aid to Japan on the grounds that Japan, though allied with Nazi Germany, was not subservient to Nazi Germany. But anyone who would have made such a statement at that time would have been hooted out of town; and if the Secretary of State had made it, he would have, I trust, been summarily dismissed from his office.

What is the difference between that case and the one confronting us today? Surely everyone recognizes that we are in a war situation with the Communist world today. How can our Secretary of State recommend that we give financial assistance to one of our enemies? The war is a cold war today; but in all of the crucial diplomatic battles, Yugoslavia is alined with the Soviet Union. And if the war should become a hot one, we have it on the word of Marshal Zhukov that the Soviet Union will march shoulder to shoulder with Yugoslavia. I am sure that if American boys ever fall victims to Yugoslav bullets, they will not be able to derive much consolation from the fact that the bullets were fired by a Soviet ally instead of by a Soviet satellite.

To be sure, there is always the possibility that Yugoslavia will renounce its present alliance with the Soviet Union before a hot war begins. But it is also possible that Communist Poland will break off from Moscow, even as Tito once did. Does this mean that we should start sending military supplies to Communist Poland? It is also theoretically possible that Russia herself will overthrow the Communist tyranny. But does this mean that we should begin sending military supplies to the Soviet Government? The point here is that we cannot base our foreign policy on an extremely remote possibility. We have every reason to expect that Yugoslavia will be an enemy of the United States for as long as we can see into the future. No responsible statesman can, under those circumstances, advocate that we build up Yugoslavia's military might.

Let me now go on to the next sentence of this incredible letter by Mr. Dulles. He states that "without the alternative availability of American assistance," dire economic necessity may force Tito to become overly dependent on the U. S. S. R. Dulles goes on to say that "the Yugoslav portion of the pending mutual-security legislation is designed to contribute toward preventing that situation from arising."

Now, why in the world, Mr. President, should we want to prevent that situation from arising? Will it be bad for the United States if Communist Yugoslavia faces dire economic necessity and is forced to become dependent on the Soviet Union? If Yugoslavia will face dire economic necessity as the result of cutting off American aid, so much the worse for Yugoslavia. If this makes Yugoslavia more dependent on Soviet Russia for economic assistance, so much the worse for Soviet Russia, which will then have to expend a greater portion of her economic wealth in order to keep Yugoslavia a going concern. Actually, the State Department is advocating that we indirectly help Communist Russia by taking the burden of Yugoslavia off her hands.

I sometimes think, Mr. President, that the State Department forgets whose side it is on. If Yugoslavia is politically committed to an alliance with the Soviet Union, as it is, what does the United States stand to lose by the fact that Yugoslavia becomes economically dependent on Russia? Over and over again State Department documents, such as Mr. Dulles' letter, give the impression that it is a great triumph for the United States that we are permitted to furnish financial assistance to a foreign country. It does not seem to much care how the funds are used; it is only interested in beating out any rival financier.

This same argument is stated even more blatantly and thus more absurdly in a letter addressed to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee by the Director of the International Cooperation Administration, Mr. John B. Hollister:

If at this critical juncture—

Mr. Hollister argues—

the United States were to end these programs of assistance, Yugoslavia would be forced to seek further Soviet assistance, at whatever terms it could get, to meet urgent needs. Hollister goes on to say that "Despite some improvement made possible by United States assistance, the Yugoslav economy continues to be weak, particularly with respect to food supplies. For these supplies, Yugoslavia will be dependent on essential sources for years to come. The Yugoslav Government would find it difficult to maintain an independent approach if forced to rely primarily on the Soviet bloc sources for essential food and raw material supplies.

Once again, Mr. President, who benefits if the Yugoslav economy continues to be weak—the free world or the Communist world? Who benefits if American dollars are used to make the Yugoslav economy strong—the free world or the Communist world? Who loses if the Soviet Union is forced to divert its own food and raw material supplies to Yugoslavia—the free world or the Communist world? And why, Mr. President, why do American officials continue to remind us that it will be difficult for Yugoslavia "to maintain an independent approach" without American aid—when the fact of the matter is that Yugoslavia's dictator has already publicly alined his regime with the Soviet Union?

Finally, Mr. Hollister says that America's "substantial investment—in Yugoslavia—made over the past several years should not be lost for the want of continued assistance." All of this would be very well if it were not for the fact that we have already lost our "substantial investment." That happened when Marshal Tito turned his back on the West and embraced the Soviet Union. Both of these letters from the administration blithely ignore the event that occurred in Moscow on June 2, as though it had never occurred.

Let us weigh the Dulles-Hollister-Wilson argument by means of an analogy. The Republic of China, now exiled on Formosa, is probably as firmly allied to the United States as Yugoslavia is to Russia. Now is it conceivable that the Soviet leaders in the Kremlin would decide to send military equipment to Chiang Kai-shek on the grounds that Nationalist China would otherwise become "overly dependent" on the United States? Chiang probably would accept the aid—he, like Tito, needs all the guns he can get—but he would keep on being an ally of the United States. None of this, of course, is going to happen because the Russian leaders are not that stupid. But what perverse strain runs through our Government, Mr. President, that makes us so determined to build up our enemies?

The next argument Mr. Dulles employs to support his position is even more fantastic.

It is evident—

Mr. Dulles states—

that the state of United States-Yugoslav relations has important implications for Eastern as well as Western Europe.

So far so good. But then Mr. Dulles observes that—

It may well be useful for [the satellite countries] to know that the United States is holding to its record of assisting nations such as Yugoslavia which make efforts to assert and preserve their independence.

Dulles later elaborated on this thought and said that our policy toward Yugoslavia will teach the satellites that Titoism pays off and is thus our main weapon for disrupting the Communist empire.

May I suggest, Mr. President, that we will have taught the Eastern European countries a slightly different lesson from the one Mr. Dulles describes? We will have taught them that a nation can declare itself to be an eternal ally of the Soviet Union and expect to receive as a reward millions of dollars annually in American aid. Indeed, it is not too improbable that the Soviet Union will direct all of the satellite countries to pretend that they are "independent," so as to qualify for American aid.

We might also consider, Mr. President, the effect of our continuing aid to Yugoslavia on the so-called "neutral" countries in Southeast Asia. The State Department and the ICA repeatedly tell

us that American aid to these areas is designed to prevent India, Burma, Indonesia, and the rest, from joining up with the Soviet bloc. If we continue aid to Yugoslavia we will have advertised the fact, as conspicuously as it is possible to advertise it, that joining up with the Soviet bloc is no hindrance to receiving American aid. How can we expect our foreign-aid program to keep the neutralists out of the enemy camp when we let it be known that American aid is available to friend and foe alike?

It is time, Mr. President, to inject some sense into our foreign policy, and a policy of building up the war machine of the avowed enemies of our way of life surely makes no sense. If the administration insists on pursuing such policies, then it is the duty of Congress to step in and restore sanity.

It is for this reason that I have introduced an amendment to the mutual security bill which will have the effect of preventing any of the funds authorized by the act from being given to Yugoslavia.

And let me add this, Mr. President: It is imperative that we infuse our foreign policy with some of the moral sternness called for yesterday by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. A policy of helping a Communist dictator subjugate millions of human beings is wrong—and no amount of rationalization can ever make it right. Let us prove to the world that we in America understand the difference between right and wrong and that we are determined to make our foreign policy reflect our moral values.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield myself 1 more minute.

Mr. President, I have learned that the very able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has submitted an amendment which will accomplish the same purpose that my amendment would bring about. He has been working on this subject for a long time. I should dislike to have both amendments considered at the same time. I discussed the matter with the Senator from New Hampshire and I suggested to him and he has agreed that I withdraw my amendment and obtain unanimous consent to be a cosponsor with him of his amendment.

However, I do not wish, by withdrawing my amendment, to deny any Senator who wishes to speak in opposition to the amendment time necessary to do so. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment, in favor of the amendment to be offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], but that any Senator who is in opposition to my amendment, even though my amendment has been withdrawn, may have 30 minutes to speak in opposition to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). The Senator from Wisconsin has the right to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Again, I do not wish to deny anyone the right to speak in opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment for myself and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 29, beginning with the comma in line 18, it is proposed to strike out down through the word "Act" in line 25.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not believe the Senator from Wisconsin can yield to another Senator his remaining time on an amendment which he has withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from New Hampshire in his own right.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Are we to understand that there will be 30 additional minutes on the pending amendment, which is offered in lieu of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin, and that therefore there will be an hour of debate available in favor of the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be treated as a separate amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Therefore there will be an additional 30 minutes available?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Does that mean that those who are in opposition to the amendment will have 1 hour to speak on it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is not correct. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin has been withdrawn. The amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire will be treated as a new and different amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, with the withdrawal of the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, there may be those of us who would like to express opposition to that particular amendment, on the basis of the time that was utilized in speaking in support of the amendment. In other words, a total of an hour's time will be available on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin and on the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire, but only a half hour will be available in opposition? Is that what we are to understand?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not correct to say that if the opponents of the amendment feel that they wish to speak for more than a half hour, they may move to strike out a part of the amendment and in that way gain additional time? Of course that would furnish additional time on the other side also. However, I do not believe they would be foreclosed from using such time as they would feel necessary to use in order to express their views.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say that the Senator from Minnesota makes a very good point. For that reason I said that if any Senator wished to speak in opposition to my amendment, I would be glad to withhold the withdrawal of my amendment until such time as the opposition had used its half hour to speak in opposition to it. If the Senator from Minnesota desires time on my amendment, I shall be glad to ask unanimous consent to withhold the withdrawal of my amendment until after the Senator has spoken.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My inquiry is directed to the procedure. It is not my intention to utilize time in opposition to the amendment. I feel, however, that we may be establishing a practice under a unanimous-consent agreement which may alter the time schedule in an unfavorable manner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has ruled that the pending amendment is a different amendment. The delegation of time starts anew.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to ask one question of the Senator from Minnesota. Does he wish me to ask unanimous consent that I withdraw, so to speak, by withdrawal of my amendment so as to give Senators in opposition an opportunity to discuss the amendment? If he does, I shall be glad to ask such unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair states that the time for debate is under control. The Senator from Wisconsin will have to get unanimous consent to speak at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The only purpose I had in making this inquiry was to establish the rules, so to speak, of the Senate, so far as they relate to this particular proceeding. I wished to be sure that we would not act on an amendment on a 2 to 1 basis so far as time was concerned. I understand that those who are in opposition to the amendment are not asking for additional time. I wish to make it crystal clear that if we are to proceed on a 2 to 1 basis, we may find it necessary to object to future unanimous-consent requests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to state that any Senator may, without unanimous consent, withdraw his amendment, if the Senate has taken no action on it. Then the Senate proceeds to the consideration of a new amendment. That is what was done in this case.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, in offering the amendment I do so with the purpose of bringing to a close a sorry chapter in our program of foreign aid and our foreign policy. To those who wish to call our flirtation with Tito an experiment or a calculated risk, I say let us write it off as an experiment that did not pay off.

Let me review briefly the situation which has led up to the present state of affairs. After World War II, despite the well-documented evidence of the

aid which Mihailovich and his followers had given to our downed flyers in Yugoslavia, we nevertheless supported Tito in the struggle for power in that country because it appeared to those making the policy decisions that he had the stronger following. We all know that the result was the liquidation of Mihailovich and many of his followers and the emergence of Tito and his completely Communist regime.

Tito's only claim to fame, and indeed his only claim to our foreign aid bounty, was the fact that for reasons best known to himself he appeared to defy the Kremlin line and followed his own independent course, Communist as it was. It was his bid for a place in the sun and we helped to build that place for him by making him the darling of our foreign policy. For the size of Tito's country and its military potential we were really lavish. We have given him approximately $1 billion of aid of various types.

Mr. President, we have sent more than a billion dollars—that is a thousand million dollars—on various types of aid to Yugoslavia and Mr. Tito.

The justification for this was that he was the key by which we might unlock some of the other imprisoned satellite countries because they would be encouraged to likewise defy the Kremlin when they saw that he could do so with impunity. We also thought that regardless of his ideology we effectively controlled his military potential because it was equipped with our hardware.

Whatever small validity these justifications may have had in the past they certainly have none whatsoever today. Tito swaggered and blustered like a junior Hitler, junior Mussolini, and a junior Stalin, deliberately showing his neighbors in that part of the world that he could call the tune for us to dance any time he wanted to. Even though gobbling up all the aid that we would give him he deliberately refused to allow us the inspection of the end use of that aid, a course no one else dared to follow, and we let him get away with it until the Senate provision of last year, that any further aid would be based on his observance of all the terms as other nations did.

With his present demonstrated eagerness to jump into bed with Khrushchev and Bulganin and the pledges of undying comradeship and cooperation in every sense that he has made to these two new Kremlin masters, it would seem that he at last came home to roost. Certainly those who use the argument that he was valuable to us because he defied the Kremlin must admit that he could now be equally valuable to the Kremlin for having defied us, particularly if we continue to bestow aid upon him in the light of his newly announced course.

I have contended for many years that our foreign aid program must be put on a more selective basis for the sake of greater security of the country and for the sake of lessened burden to our taxpayers. I am proud of the part I took toward that end in cutting aid to Yugoslavia last year and I shall be even more proud if this amendment that I have introduced passes today to the end that aid to Yugoslavia is discontinued.

Mr. President, this is not the first time I have called attention to the dangers in aid to Yugoslavia.

What have we got in exchange for the billion dollars we have given Tito? We have bolstered him up when Stalin tried to crush him. We equipped his army. I ask again, what did we get? I'll tell you what we got, we got a statement from Marshal Khrushchev that Tito, henceforth, would fight shoulder to shoulder with Russia. Tito was only too happy to confirm this. We get an official joint statement during Tito's visit to the Kremlin leaders that they will make a stubborn effort to see that Red China is admitted to the United Nations.

Are we supposed to forget that the United Nations voted Red China an aggressor in the Korean war and that that ban has never been revoked?

What further did we get for official statements, as a result of Tito's infamous honeymoon in the Kremlin.

We get an official statement that East and West Germany must be reunited, not in the democratic way by popular vote but by a negotiated deal presumably with the Kremlin calling the turn. We get an official statement that Formosa must be handed over to Red China.

America paid over a billion dollars to get that type of support from Tito.

If anyone can show me why we should give another cent to Tito I should like to have him do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 1 more minute to myself. I want to say that no one has greater regard for President Eisenhower than I; he has shown himself a great leader of the American people and the Republican Party but that does not preclude me from performing my constitutional duty to debate this issue.

Mr. President, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. It appears to me that the item for Marshal Tito weakens the entire bill. We are asked to give approximately $65 million in addition to the $600 million in military equipment we have already given to him. The testimony on this point should have demonstrated that no one expects Tito to come to our assistance if we should be attacked by Russia, nor that Tito would go to war against Russia if the Soviet Union should attack the nations in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

This $800 million program for Tito is apparently for no better purpose than to assist him to defend himself should Russia see fit to attack Yugoslavia. Obviously, the danger to Tito has subsided. Tito is safe to walk the streets of Moscow which were strewn with rose petals in anticipation of his arrival.

If Tito wants additional equipment, why should we not sell it to him and let him pay for it, just as Russia expects pay for what it sends to Egypt?

I recall that former Secretary of State Dean Acheson stated that he was positive Tito would never under any conditions resume cordial relations with the Kremlin. Khrushchev and Bulganin, after the death of Stalin and Beria, explained to Tito that what had happened was all a big mistake, that it was the traitor Beria and the bad man Stalin who were responsible for the situation. They made up their differences and will be friends forever. Under those circumstances, it seems to me there is no basis for supplying money to Tito.

Mr. President, I had the privilege of hearing the testimony of the Secretary of State. That testimony is not available to the public. In my judgment, there is nothing whatever about it that should not have been placed on the record, because there is nothing secret about it. If the Secretary had said that certain information, not available to us, was the basis of the administration's judgment in this matter, I would be willing to go along with such a statement. But, having heard the presentation, it seems to me we took a calculated risk in spending a great amount of money in aiding a nation which we thought would be of advantage to ourselves. That nation is much safer than it was to begin with. It is safer than we are. No one is strewing rose petals on the streets of Moscow in honor of General Twining.

Tito is safe enough with the arms we have given him. He has a well-equipped army, and he is in position to become an ally, but I think the testimony will clearly show, if it is placed in the record, that no one expects him to come to our aid in the event we are attacked or in the event our allies are attacked.

Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I see no reason why we should continue to aid Tito.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am ready for a vote. If the opposition——

Mr. GEORGE. No, Mr. President.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield such time as the Senator from Georgia may require.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think I can conclude in 5 minutes. I was asked to yield some time to the Senator from Oregon and possibly some other Senators.

Mr. President, what is the purpose of the foreign-aid program? Is it for us to go out on the streets and hand out money to friends? Is it to hand out money to someone we like? Is that the purpose of it? If that is the purpose, then we are quite crazy to have introduced it, supported it, and continued it for another moment. All we can do is to give some support to bring about certain conditions which we believe will be in the interest of this country if and when we are faced with an aggressive movement by potential enemies.

It is not the purpose, let me say to my distinguished friend from New Hampshire and to my distinguished friend from Wisconsin, merely to give money to a friend or to an enemy. That is surely not the program. Both of the distinguished Senators who have spoken have said that we had already given perhaps a billion dollars to Tito. I think the actual figures are strictly confidential. I do not know what they are. I certainly shall not violate any confidence by

stating figures which are strictly confidential. I do not feel at liberty to do so.

But if we have already done so, how will Tito repair his machines if we do not continue to assist him? How will he be able to get ammunition for American guns? How will he be able to get spare parts for replacements? How, I ask? Certainly if we close the door on him and say that under no circumstances will we let him have anything now to use in connection with what is said to be a billion dollars worth of arms and munitions he has obtained from us——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. No, I will not yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator will yield for 10 seconds, I merely wish to say that the Senator just made a statement that certain figures should not be revealed—and I think rightly so—because they were disclosed in executive session.

However, in answer to a question asked by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], Mr. Dulles said there was no reason why those figures should remain secret. Am I not correct in that statement?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know what anyone may have said to anybody else. I simply know what the facts are so far as I am concerned, and I will not divulge them.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I will not yield except for a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The question is this: When General Gruenther testified before the committee on the subject of mutual aid, I asked him if Tito could use anything except American ammunition in American guns, and General Gruenther said he could not. Is that not correct?

Mr. GEORGE. Of course he cannot. Therefore, while this proposal may satisfy our own natural hostility toward Tito, I say frankly it does not display any good sense, because Tito already has obtained whatever he is going to get. There is very little in this program for Tito—very little indeed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. No, I will not yield, because I am not going to say what the amount is.

Mr. BRIDGES. I merely say that there is quite a difference between what is a great amount and what is a small amount. I feel certain the Senator did not want to imply that there is only a little in this program.

Mr. GEORGE. There is not much in this program for Tito. The economic aid is about $30 million. It is to be used to buy wheat. It has got to be used by Tito to buy bread for his people. The military aid is on the same general order, so far as the bill is concerned. There may be some funds yet remaining in the pipeline, but there is not a great amount.

What is the situation? We may naturally be very hostile toward Tito and his form of government. I grant that we can be. But I repeat my statement: There is no good judgment in it. If Tito now has a billion dollars' worth of our arms and equipment, and if he cannot get any spare parts for those arms and equipment, what will be the natural result? He must go over to the Communist orbit. He may be glad to wait. It would be only a chance that we would have to keep him out of that orbit and keep him independent. But Tito certainly would have no choice if he now had to buy other arms and other equipment because he was unable to get any munitions, arms, or spare parts to take care of his investment, although it be a gift. So we would deliberately force him into the Russian orbit.

We are not simply going around handing out gifts to friends or foes. I do not care too much when a country is honestly neutral. I do not run the State Department, of course. But I would not be alarmed if I knew that a country was honestly neutral. I do not know that Tito will be neutral, but I do know that Tito will have nowhere else to go if we say to him, "Henceforth and from this day on you will get nothing from us. You cannot get any spare parts or replacements from us." He will then have to move into the orbit of the Soviets; that is all. And we ourselves will have been the cause of it.

In my opinion, that is not good judgment, even if some Senators feel they must vote that way. I do not like Tito's government or his attitude. But that is not the point. That is not the question at all. The question is, Is there an existing condition which is in the interest of the United States and the other countries of the free world? We cannot end the aid, we cannot close it up, we cannot shut it off simply because we do not like Tito. Heaven knows, there are many countries I do not especially like at all. We cannot simply hand out money or withhold it simply on the basis that one country is our friend, while another is not, because we do not like its form of government.

Show me an honestly neutral country, one which will say, "We will fight for our neutrality," and I will show you a country which stands in the way of Soviet aggression. I know that that is true of India, if India is neutral. I know it is true of Burma, if Burma is truly neutral.

We cannot have peace in the world unless we are willing to fight for it; and we cannot fight for peace unless we are prepared to fight. We cannot have peace unless we are willing to work for it day in and day out, year in and year out. A peaceful world simply does not happen.

So it seems to me that the House of Representatives, followed by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, dealt with this matter in a very sensible way. In section 143 the bill provides:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no assistance under this title or any other title of this act, or under any provision of law repealed by section 542 (a) of this act, shall be furnished to Yugoslavia after the expiration of 90 days following the date of the enactment of this section, unless the President finds (1) that there has been no change in the Yugoslavian policies on the basis of which assistance under this act has been furnished to Yugoslavia in the past, and that Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union, and (2) that it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue the furnishing of assistance to Yugoslavia under this act.

For my part, I believe that if the President affirmatively finds those positive conditions to exist, he will meet them. I will not question his finding if he says, "I find these conditions to exist." Otherwise, under the bill he cannot give any aid to Yugoslavia, whether it be little or big.

The aid provided in the bill is relatively small, so far as it goes. But certainly it is true that if we say that from now on there shall be nothing given or nothing advanced to Yugoslavia, then Tito will seek the only recourse he has, namely, to become a part and parcel of the Soviet Army; and Yugoslavia today has the largest force in Europe outside the Iron Curtain, outside of Russia herself.

She has, relatively, a sizable and powerful army. It looks like we shall be wasting time if we drive that strong military force into the use of Russian arms and Russian munitions. I am willing to leave it to the President.

I should like to yield time to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 10 minutes to me?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in my opinion this is the most difficult section of the bill on which we shall be called upon to vote. There is so much merit in what the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Wisconsin have said on this subject, that we may very well make a very serious mistake if we adopt the committee's language. Nevertheless, Mr. President, I propose to point out what I think the comparative merits of the two positions are, and to express my reasons for standing with the committee.

If the calculated risk we run in terms of time goes against us, those of us who vote for this committee amendment may very well find that we have blood on our hands. That is how serious I consider this issue to be, and I do not think anyone has a right to vote on the amendment without fully appreciating the seriousness of the alternatives with which we are confronted.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of the committee, has appropriately commented upon the point that if we adopt the Bridges amendment, there is no question of what we shall do to Yugoslavia. We shall drive her into the arms of Russia, because she will have no other place to go. At the present we at least have entree into Yugoslavia. I look upon Yugoslavia as pretty much of a satellite country of Russia, but she is one satellite with which at least we have some connection, on which we have some influence, I hope, and which we have some opportunity of winning over to the side of freedom.

But, let me say, a tremendous risk is involved—a risk I do not relish taking as I vote with the committee on this issue. If I wanted to take advantage of the political situation raised by this issue I would avoid taking sides on this question; but I do not duck the tough ones.

I believe the point made by the Senator from Georgia is well taken, that the only source Yugoslavia has for spare parts and munitions for the equipment which she has received is the United States, and we stand in a position to cut off that source momentarily if we find that future events show that there is no hope of winning Yugoslavia over to the side of freedom.

So the position I am taking in supporting the chairman of the committee is the position which the administration supports. It is the position of the State Department. It is the position backed up by the White House. In this instance I feel that we should cast our lot with the President of the United States, and give to the President the 90 days the bill allows, within which to appraise and review the situation and decide whether or not, in the best interests of American foreign policy, we should continue or discontinue aid to Yugoslavia.

This gives me an opportunity to say, Mr. President, that for the most part, I intend to support the President of the United States in connection with this foreign aid bill. I intend to support the maximum figure of appropriation. In saying that I do not mean to indicate that the bill cannot be improved in several particulars, for instance, by increasing loans and decreasing grants. But we have threshed all that out in committee, and we have reported to the Senate a bill which has the backing of the administration, save and except with respect to the certain amounts of appropriations recommended in the bill. I understand amendments regarding amounts will be offered, but I shall vote for the amounts agreed upon by the committee unless some of the proposals of the President for increasing the amounts are offered by way of amendments.

Under the separation-of-powers doctrine, our primary obligation is to give advice and consent to the administration on foreign policy; but, in the last analysis, the decisions in a matter such as is involved in the amendment shall be left with the President and Secretary of State. Of course I recognize that under the Constitution the Congress has the right and power to raise armies and provide for the defense of our country.

However, the issue we have before us now is so related to the diplomatic functions of the State Department and the foreign policy obligations of the President that I think we should accede to the President's wishes in this matter and adopt the language of the committee in respect to Yugoslavia. The language of the committee provides adequate checks upon the President and at the same time safeguards the objectives which we all have in mind. Not a single one of us wants to support Tito with foreign aid if he goes over to the Soviet Union of Russia. However, the administration thinks there is still a chance of at least neutralizing Yugoslavia. At least we pray that the people of Yugoslavia will be saved from complete enslavement by Russia. While diplomatic negotiations are being carried on by our own State Department we should not slam the door in the face of the President and the Secretary of State.

The bill in its present form gives the President 90 days to review our Yugoslav policies. I think we should give the President the 90-day period to reappraise the Yugoslav foreign aid program and decide if the best interests of the United States justify continuing the aid program to Yugoslavia. I grant that serious risks are involved, but I think we should stand behind the President on this issue. I do not deny that the Senator from New Hampshire makes a strong argument in support of ending Yugoslav aid now.

Thus I cannot stand on the floor of the Senate and assert that I think the Senator from New Hampshire is wrong in the position he takes, because who knows? It is in the laps of the gods. It is in the lap of future events. We can pray that the language contained in the bill will prove to be the best course, and I am resolving my doubts in favor of that language.

I know there is danger that within the near future Tito may go over to the side of Soviet Russia. If he does, I know what will be said of those of us who voted for the language of the bill and not for the Bridges amendment. Future events may prove that we made a great mistake in judgment; but that is one of the risks of statesmanship we have to run. We have to decide whether or not to resolve doubts in favor of the language of the bill, which is the language the administration is asking for, or whether to take the position that in the field of foreign policy we will set ourselves above the administration and say, "Even though you would like further time with which to negotiate with Tito, and further time to try to win Yugoslavia over to the side of freedom, we will stop that possibility by adopting the Bridges amendment." In my judgment, that would be the effect of the Bridges amendment. It would indicate that we have lost all hope—I do not know how much hope we have; I fear it is not much—of holding Tito on the side of the free nations.

The 90 days' interim provided by the committee bill does not represent a period of danger, because I do not think much equipment and supplies will go into Yugoslavia in 90 days. So I believe that for 90 days we can run this calculated risk and place our trust in the administration, which is primarily responsible for American foreign policy, to make the final decision. I think the administration deserves from us the confidence of leaving to it the final determination of foreign policy in relation to Yugoslavia.

I betray no confidence—and I call this to the attention of the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member of the committee—when I say we cannot tell on the floor of the Senate all we know as members of the Foreign Relations Committee as to what the administration is trying to do by way of further diplomatic negotiations to hold Yugoslavia at least on the side of neutrality, if not completely on the side of freedom, in the critical months and years immediately ahead.

However, the briefings we have had from State Department representatives about the Yugoslavia situation make me very hopeful that all is not lost for us in Yugoslavia. I plead with the Senate not to give up hope in respect to Yugoslavia because I think we may still prevent Tito from going over to Russia.

I have said all I can say, Mr. President, in support of the language recommended by the committee. By way of summary, I should like to add that the doubts should be resolved in favor of the President on this issue. I say that as one who has opposed the President on many issues but who has supported him on most foreign policy issues. In fact, with the exception of his Formosa resolution, I have supported the President on foreign policy issues to a much greater extent than many members of his own party here in the Senate. I am glad to support him when I think he is right and on this Yugoslavia issue I think the doubts should be resolved in his favor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a memorandum issued by the State Department concerning the capabilities of Yugoslavia for the production domestically of spare parts for United States supplied military equipment and dealing with other Yugoslavian matters.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YUGOSLAV CAPABILITIES FOR THE PRODUCTION DOMESTICALLY OF SPARE PARTS FOR UNITED STATES-SUPPLIED MILITARY EQUIPMENT

A careful examination has been made both in Washington and by American representatives in Yugoslavia of the extent to which Yugoslavia has the capability for manufacturing in its own plants the spare parts which are essential for the continued operation of military equipment supplied by the United States under the MDA program. The conclusion reached is that to conceive of Yugoslavia's developing self-sufficiency in spare-parts output in the foreseeable future taxes the limits of both possibility and probability.

For the equipment supplied under the Army portion of the MDA program for Yugoslavia alone there are about 85,000 distinct types of spare parts. The Air Force program would require the Yugoslavs to turn out thousands of spare-parts categories for items like aircraft instruments, jet engines, and fire-control devices for which Yugoslav capacity is nonexistent. Moreover, the complexity and diversity of this production is such that, under the best of circumstances, with full American financial and technical support, a number of years would be needed before any significant indigenous local output could be achieved. The same is true in the Army Signal Corps field, since Yugoslavia has no known electronics capacity of this nature. Since the United States is not giving any assistance to such spare-parts production in Yugoslavia, it can be seen that the difficulties would be well-nigh insuperable.

Another relevant factor arises from the physical limitations of the Yugoslav economy. Under any conditions, it is impossible to imagine that Yugoslav industry could turn out the special metals alloys and the special-purpose tools needed for substantial spare-parts production. There is already a serious

shortage in the country of scientists, designers, engineers, and skilled technicians who would be essential for an expanded military industry, but who are now fully employed in keeping essential civilian industries in operation.

At the present time, Yugoslavia manufactures a good range of small-arms ammunition, small rockets, and light- and medium-caliber artillery shells. Infantry weapons and light artillery are also produced, but the output of trucks, tractors, and other vehicles rests almost entirely on an assembling process under foreign license (Italian and Austrian, for the most part) of component parts manufactured in Western Europe. Only light aircraft can be produced domestically, but even for these the engines are imported. Yugoslavia's balance of payments is very unfavorable. Under present conditions, when Yugoslavia finds it impossible without foreign grants or credits to import enough food for the population and sufficient raw materials for indispensable civilian factories, Yugoslavia would scarcely be able to finance the imports of metals, tools, and essential foreign technicians needed before even a start could be made on serious spare-parts output. If, in addition, United States licenses, blueprints, and specifications were not furnished, it is clear that the United States equipment would have become obsolete before any Yugoslav-made spare parts would be available. In this connection, Yugoslavia's budget for 1956 indicates some curtailment rather than expansion of investment programs for both military and civilian industries.

According to information at hand, most machine tools imported in recent years seem to come from West Germany, Italy, and Switzerland. Imports from the United Kingdom amounted to 302 metric tons of machine tools worth $589,000 in 1953, 410 tons worth $780,000 in 1954, and 255 tons worth $337,000 in 1955. In those years the value of boring mills imported from England (and included in the above figures) was $26,000, $4,000, and $8,000, respectively. Machine-tool imports from the United States in the same 3 years totaled about $2 million.

ANALYSIS OF YUGOSLAVIA'S PRESENT INTERNATIONAL POSITION IN THE LIGHT OF TITO'S VISIT TO MOSCOW

In order to understand fully the respective positions of Yugoslavia and the U. S. S. R. with regard to their governmental and party agreements announced on June 20, it is essential to consider at the same time the speeches of Tito and Khrushchev at a Moscow mass meeting on June 19. In this light, considerable divergencies in motivations and aims appear.

Tito's speech sticks quite closely to an elucidation of the points made in the two agreements. He seeks to develop an unemotional and pragmatic rationale for the foreign policy positions adopted in terms of Yugoslavia's own interests. He pleads for the most extensive and persistent possible efforts at conciliation between the opposing major powers in a spirit of great patience, and he repeatedly stresses his determination to keep all of Yugoslavia's foreign relations on a basis of equality and independence. He also does not intend, as he stated once before during his visit, to allow Soviet ties to injure his relations with the West.

Khrushchev pays little attention to the agreements and, instead, makes a belligerent address on how the rapproachement marks the defeat of plans by the imperialist "enemies" to exploit Yugoslavia's fight with Russia to bring about further intra-orbit conflicts. He claims that Yugoslavia must inevitably be closer to socialist than to capitalist countries and again promises the final victory of socialism over imperialism. He speaks of the unity of political views of all Communist parties based on ideology and on their "revolutionary stand" and predicts that any disputes between them will be speedily settled. Khrushchev's emphasis is on the struggle of the socialist and capitalist worlds for ascendancy, whereas Tito's is on their conciliation without victory for either, except through the normal working out of social forces in each individual country.

The government-to-government agreement does, unfortunately, give additional prestige to many Soviet foreign policy positions by lining Yugoslavia up in support of them. However, such Yugoslav positions are not new, and many were included in the June 2, 1955, Soviet-Yugoslav communique of Belgrade. Yugoslavia now agrees to describe East Germany as a "sovereign state," to favor East-West German talks as the best means to achieve reunification, and to give the drawing up of an international disarmament convention the first priority among all international problems. Naturally, such disagreements as there were are not voiced. But the Yugoslavs apparently refused to pledge diplomatic recognition of East Germany (although this may eventually happen anyway) and to attack Western alliances by name, though urging that "military blocs" generally should be liquidated. Also, it seems that Tito tried to impress the Soviets with the danger of a Middle East conflagration by singling this out for specific mention in his speech, in contrast to the communique's silence on this point.

The party ties agreement reaffirms the recognition and even desirability of multiple roads to socialism and of the complete freedom of will and equality of both sides. It amounts to a blueprint for a new type of loose relationship among Communist parties and Socialist states which conforms to previous Yugoslav specifications, but contradicts almost every aspect of worldwide Soviet practice in this sphere. The call for all inter-Socialist contacts to be equal, frank, democratic, and accessible to world public opinion is especially interesting.

Events of the visit made it clear that the Soviet leaders had decided to embarrass Tito in every way possible vis-a-vis the West. They repeatedly made bellicose speeches hostile to the West while Tito was on the same platform, and, on June 20, when Tito gave Zhukov a medal, the latter said that if war again broke out despite their best efforts to avoid it, Russia and Yugoslavia would undoubtedly fight together again. Tito is reported to have been visibly annoyed at this Soviet sally, which ran counter to Tito's public position that no bilateral military issues were considered. On June 22, moreover, the Yugoslav Foreign Office publicly disassociated Yugoslavia from the portion of Khrushchev's June 19 speech which imputed evil motives to the West's efforts after 1948 to establish close ties to Yugoslavia.

The combination of speeches, communiques, and incidents appears to merit the conclusion that Tito has not sacrificed his country's independence or freedom of action or subordinated Yugosalvia to the U. S. S. R. His terms of reference for party ties, furthermore, exclude collaboration with the presently operating worldwide Soviet-dominated subversive Communist movement, and, in fact, suggest an entirely different kind of movement.

From the United States policy viewpoint, and particularly with regard to the aid which Tito still undeniably needs, the question nevertheless arises whether Tito's continued independence is still worth anything to the West. Some observers, for example, have concluded that as matters now stand Titoism constitutes no danger in itself to the Kremlin, and that the way is now clear for Tito to return to the Communist family without losing his independent position. If true, this would, as Khrushchev gloated in his speech, eliminate Western hopes that Titoism may yet be a catalyst for producing an evolution within the Soviet orbit leading to a disruption of Soviet dominance over the orbit.

Such a judgment seems premature, however. Tito may still have an important role to play in bringing about the evolution of the satellites toward that degree of national independence vis-a-vis Moscow which the United States has believed would enhance United States security. For the fact is that, except with regard to Tito and Yugoslavia, the blueprint for new relations between Communist parties and states remains only hypothetical. Tito can be expected to be active in his endeavors to have it carried into practice, and, while Khrushchev gives the appearance of being sure that the end result will benefit the U. S. S. R., his very boastfulness may betray some uncertainty. Indeed, it is not unlikely that he is as unsure about the implications of the forces now set in motion as is the United States, and that his remarks are intended to improve the odds on the Soviet gamble by inducing the West to write Tito off.

No United States policy toward Yugoslavia can, of course, prevent Khrushchev from making efforts to bring about these new type inter-Communist and Communist-Socialist relationships, if, in fact, he desires them. However, the termination of United States assistance to Tito would symbolize United States hostility to these new relationships before the United States determined whether the new situation created by them resulted in a net gain to the United States or not, and before some well-thought-out accommodation of Western policy to the changes could be prepared. In any event, until it can be seen whether these changes are actually the Soviet intention or merely an insincere sop to Tito, it appears wise to await the outcome of present trends. In this process, unless the situation changes, it seems only prudent for the United States to continue its present policy toward Yugoslavia, including its position on economic and military aid. This should demonstrate to the Soviets that not only has Yugoslavia not lost Western support and not fallen into Russia's power, but that, on the contrary, they (the Soviets) must continue to make major efforts to adjust themselves to what Yugoslavia, as an independent Communist state, represents and to their as yet unhonored commitments to Tito on satellite independence and on a new type of loose interparty relations.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, as I stated, when Secretary of State John Foster Dulles came before our committee, I really thought I would vote for aid to Tito if a case could be made. I heard the case made by the Secretary of State, and he was completely convinced that aid to Tito should be continued. The argument made by the Secretary of State, and very well restated by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, whom we all love dearly, was fundamentally that if we should fail to continue the aid which has been given, we could be sure that Tito would go over to the Communists.

At least, that is what it meant to me. It is a case of saying, "Here is a man who may be our enemy any day; he may be our enemy now. But we do know, gentlemen, that if we do not keep handing him American money and American wealth, he will be our enemy; we feel sure of that."

Mr. President, that is a far cry from the day when a famous American said,

"Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

In this case we are considering our relations with a man of whom it is proposed that we say, "We do not know where his interest lies, but we will keep on giving him our money."

Mr. President, the figures in regard to this matter are very detailed; they are sufficient to confuse anyone. However, any Senator who wishes to know how much of our aid goes to Tito can see for himself; the document to which I refer is confidential, but it is not confidential insofar as Senators are involved.

Let me say that one reason, in my opinion, why these matters become so confused is that the hearings are held behind closed doors. At the hearings, all the witnesses—including some of the most brilliant men in the world—sat there day after day, faced by an audience also composed of brilliant men; and all the witnesses urged that the appropriation now proposed be made. Any Senator who wishes to see for himself the amounts proposed to be appropriated as aid for Tito can see the figures which I have before me. Certainly there has been great misunderstanding about them. John Foster Dulles himself did not know; he was confused.

However, one thing that is entirely clear is that at the present time Tito himself already has all the ammunition he wishes to have. If he should ever have a falling out with his old friends, the Russians, he would be able to do very well with the ammunition he now has, because all Senators can see from the figures I have before me that most of the ammunition and most of the tanks and most of the guns that Tito needs have already been delivered to him; deliveries of those munitions of war have been made to him in large quantities, and only a relatively small percentage of the total amount remains to be delivered.

This program was undertaken on the theory that Tito might have to fight the Russians. However, the testimony before the committee is, as we know, that Tito will not come to our aid, and that he has no commitment to aid any friends of ours, except that if Russia decides to attack Greece or Turkey, Tito will be willing to talk to them.

So that is what our money has gone for. It has been paid to a man who has made up his quarrel or his disagreement with Russia, and has said that their misunderstanding was a terrible mistake, and that it was Stalin's fault or Beria's fault, and that, thank goodness, the misunderstanding is cleared up now, and that they will not have a misunderstanding again.

Now it is said that Tito may need more help. Mr. President, perhaps he may need more parts for some 90 millimeter guns, or perhaps he may need more parts for some tanks. If he does, let him buy them. I do not see why we should give them to him. As a matter of fact, our prospective enemy, Russia, is doing fairly well in selling arms to Egypt, and Egypt is paying for the arms. Why should we treat Communist Tito any better than Russia apparently is treating Egypt? As a matter of fact, Mr. President, if I were required to make a choice, I would be willing to loan Tito money, rather than simply give it to him, because I see no reason whatever for believing that the resources it is proposed we give to him will be spent for the benefit of those who are on our side.

Yes, if Tito had a falling out with his Communist brethren, and was willing to go to war against them, I would be willing to give him aid. But we see no indication that anything of that sort will happen. On the contrary, the testimony is that Tito is not our friend; that we cannot depend upon him; that he will not come to our aid; and that in the event of trouble in the days to come, he may very well be against us. In fact, it is said that he may already be against us, but that is not definitely known. However, it is said that if, in fact, Tito is not already against us, we might be able to keep him from joining our enemy by giving him more of our arms and resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, first I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and then I shall yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

I understand that I have 10 minutes remaining. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Does the Chair correctly understand that the Senator from Georgia yields first to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; if that is agreeable.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not care.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to have the Senator from Arkansas proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Georgia has yielded 5 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas and 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey. The Chair will recognize each of those Senators for 5 minutes.

At this time the Chair recognizes the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about the pending amendment to the committee amendment. I hope the Senate will reject it.

In the committee we examined this matter at considerable length. I confess that in this case I find myself defending the position of the administration, although I have criticized some of the purposes to which the administration proposes to devote the funds provided by this bill. However, this instance is not one of them.

Mr. President, apparently I have more confidence in the administration than do some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—at least, in this respect.

I think the Senator from Louisiana misconstrues the object of this program with Yugoslavia. I do not expect Yugoslavia, or Tito, either, to love us or to throw overboard his ideas of how to organize a community, or any of those things.

What I hope to achieve by this program—and we have done so up to now—is to have Yugoslavia remain independent of domination by Moscow. If we can enable Tito to remain independent, no matter how his affections are alined, I think we shall have achieved a worthwhile purpose.

Let us consider for a moment the effect on Italy or on Greece if we were to drive Yugoslavia into the Russian camp. How embarrassing that would be to Tito's neighbors, upon whom we count as being our direct allies. If we drive Yugoslavia, with her great military potential, under the domination of Russia, we shall have created a very difficult situation for some of our very valuable allies.

However, Mr. President, I dislike to see emphasized, in connection with this program, the idea that everyone must be either our bosom friend whom we love, or our enemy. As a matter of fact, the idea of affection and allegiance is greatly overemphasized. That is not what is important in connection with this bill. Not only in the case of Yugoslavia, but also in the case of many other countries, I do not expect many other countries to love and cherish this country. What I do hope is that they will respect our intelligence; and that intelligence should be directed, if possible, toward maintaining a balance of power which will discourage the masters of the Kremlin from undertaking an adventure in international warfare. The way to maintain peace is the traditional way, I believe; and I believe that way has not been supplanted by an international organization. We hope that some day it will be; we strive to maintain and strengthen the United Nations. But no one can be sure what the future of the United Nations will be. Therefore, we try to maintain the balance of power, and at the present time the balance of power is in our favor. One of the favorable factors is that Yugoslavia is not allied with the enemy. A statement to that effect appeared only this morning in one of the newspapers.

It is obvious that Tito could not prevent Khrushchev and the other Russian leaders from making the statements they made while Tito was in Moscow. But when Tito returned to Belgrade, he disavowed any subservience to Moscow. I think that is a very important matter; and I am sure it is in the national interest of the United States to continue this aid program.

As all of us know, it has been going on for a number of years, and it has achieved its purpose. Its original purpose was the same as its present purpose, namely, to enable Tito to maintain independence from domination by Moscow. I think that purpose has been achieved, and that it has been of benefit to the United States, and that it continues to be of benefit to the United States. Tito stands there as an example to all other satellites; he is an example to all other satellites that they may aspire to independence from Moscow and to the control of their own destinies, if they have the nerve to do as Tito did

when he broke with Stalin. So in my opinion it would be a very great disservice to the western peoples if we should, by our action here, drive Tito into the arms of Moscow by reason of necessity. Whether he likes it or not, he would become so dependent upon economic strength, alliance, and sustenance from Moscow, that he would have no alternative, I think. This is in no way a denial of any statement as to whether he loves us or not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has yielded 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey, which is all the remaining time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield one additional minute on the bill to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. KENNEDY. Does not the Senator from Arkansas feel that Marshal Tito helped the de-Stalinization of the Soviet Union, which offers the United States a potential opportunity at this time to readjust the balance in our favor in Western Europe and other areas of the world? Did not Marshal Tito, in assisting us to that end, increase the security of the United States?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. His action was certainly one of the contributing factors to the de-Stalinization of Moscow, because the defection of Tito from Russia when Stalin was in control was one of the greatest failures Stalin suffered during that period. I think that was also a contribution to the security of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am happy to rise on this side of the aisle to express my absolute confidence in the President of the United States. I think someone on this side of the aisle ought to say that. I am happy to do it. I thank the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] for saying that he had confidence in the President of the United States. I thank the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for saying that he has confidence in the President of the United States on this particular issue.

I have known the Yugoslav people in years past. I knew them in World War I. I have seen them since then. I have seen the troubles they have gone through. I was sorrowful when troubles came in Yugoslavia, and the Yugoslavs went Communist, but I am holding no brief for Tito. I am absolutely of the feeling that there is doubt in the minds of many people as to what has been happening in Yugoslavia over the past several years. We were all elated when Yugoslavia broke away from Russia. We were elated when Tito was having difficulties with Stalin. It may be that Tito has gone back now. There may be 1 chance in 10 that he has not gone back. If there is 1 chance in 10, or 1 chance in 20 that the Yugoslav people, with their spirit, their great fighting ability, and their self-assertiveness, have not gone back to the Communists, I feel that that chance must be taken. It may be that we can hold them outside of the Iron Curtain.

I invite attention to the language of the paragraph in the bill which the Foreign Relations Committee has reported, dealing with this subject. I commend the committee for what it did. I read from page 29 of the bill:

SEC. 143. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no assistance under this title or any other title of this act, or under any provision of law repealed by section 542 (a) of this act, shall be furnished to Yugoslavia after the expiration of 90 days following the date of the enactment of this section, unless—

Unless what? Unless the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, makes certain determinations. No one has a better understanding of world conditions, world peace, and world difficulties; and no one knows the situation with respect to Yugoslavia better than does the President of the United States. In any event, he is our President, our Commander in Chief. We must give him a vote of confidence right now. We must not say that he cannot have any discretion in this matter. So the committee says—

unless the President finds (1) that there has been no change in the Yugoslavian policies on the basis of which assistance under this act has been furnished to Yugoslavia in the past,——

And I maintain that we were justified in giving aid at that time.

Further—

and that Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union—

The President must determine that. Who could better determine it?—

and (2) that it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue the furnishing of assistance to Yugoslavia under this act.

The President is to make both of those decisions. I maintain that for us to say at this point that we will not give the President such discretion, when he is asking for it, and when he knows so much more about the subject than any of us do, is unthinkable.

I disagree with the implications of my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] during the executive hearings. We were shown what the doubts were; and there are many things that cannot be disclosed.

If we do not support this provision, if we do not give the President this vote of confidence, we shall live to regret it.

I agree with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I do not know what is going to happen; but assuming that the worst happens, and that Tito goes over completely to the Soviet Communists, at any time we can cut off the pipeline. The President always has authority to do that.

So I am glad to rise to the support of the chairman of our committee and other Senators who have previously spoken and to urge that the amendment cutting off Yugoslavia at this time be rejected, and that the Senate accept the provision in the committee bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, this is a question on which men can honestly differ. It is extremely difficult to determine what is the wisest course to pursue. This is a delicate diplomatic question. I believe that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has stated the case well. This is a question which we must weigh carefully. Do we want to drive Tito completely over into the Soviet orbit, or do we want him to remain independent?

President Eisenhower recognizes the diplomatic problem with which he, the President of the United States, is confronted in making this vital determination.

Secretary Dulles, in appearing before the Appropriations Committee and giving testimony on this question, likewise recognized the delicate diplomatic question with which we are confronted.

I believe that we must stand with our President. We must stand with the Secretary of State. Those two gentlemen have all the information at their command. Such information has brought them to the conviction that they must examine this question for at least 90 days before they say, "We will no longer recognize Tito; we will no longer give him a penny."

For that reason I must definitely vote against the pending amendment, and in support of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from New Hampshire that he has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire realizes that, but he would like to have a quorum present when the 14 minutes are used.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the time occupied by the quorum call would come out of the 14 minutes.

Mr. BRIDGES. If my request would cause trouble or inconvenience, I withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I was about to ask that the time be not taken from the 14 minutes remaining to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Time has been yielded on the bill upon several occasions. If we are to proceed under the rules, the Senator from New Hampshire is willing to proceed.

In that event, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Mr. MCCARTHY. I should like to have the attention of the very able Senator from Georgia. I should like especially to have his attention, if I may. I have always had tremendous respect for the Senator from Georgia. I merely wish to call his attention now to what I believe to be misinformation which he has received. He referred to the statement which Mr. Dulles had made in executive session. I did not discuss it on the floor of the Senate, because I believed I was bound not to do so, because it was an ex-

ecutive session. The statement was that Yugoslavia was dependent upon America for spare parts, ammunition, and so forth.

All the evidence is that both the British and the United States have been furnishing Yugoslavia with sufficient machine tools to make all the spare parts necessary for their war machine. Therefore, it will have no difficulty whatever in furnishing all its spare parts. Therefore, the argument made by Mr. Dulles and the statement made by the able Senator from Georgia—and I am sure he was very sincere when he made it—do not jibe with the facts.

So far as the figures are concerned, I have heard much on the floor of the Senate about the figures being secret. I do not believe the figures were given to the Committee on Appropriations. They may be in the budget book that we received. However, I read them in at least three newspapers. As I recall—I cannot vouch for the authenticity of the figures—the amount is $65 million. That is the amount that is to go to Yugoslavia. There is nothing secret about that figure. It has been published. The carryover figure, as I read it, has varied. The last figure I read was $30 million. That would make $95 million.

I may say to the very able Senator from Georgia that I do not believe he was present when I discussed this matter on the floor of the Senate. Normally, I would not discuss executive-session testimony. However, Mr. Wilson issued a statement after he left the executive session of what he had allegedly said in executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MCCARTHY. May I have 30 additional seconds on the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 30 seconds on the bill.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Wilson issued a statement on what he had allegedly said in committee. Therefore, I believed I was relieved from any compulsion to keep it secret. One of the things that Wilson said, in effect, and it is a matter of record—and I am not quoting verbatim, although previously in my remarks I did quote Mr. Wilson's statement verbatim—was "Don't discriminate against a country in giving aid merely because it is Communist."

I ask Senators: Why are we giving aid if it is not to fight communism? Why say, "Yes; we will give aid to Communist countries, and we will not discriminate against them"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, this matter has given me a great deal of concern. I speak of concern in this case as something really deep and serious, not a simple case of perplexity. From the very beginning, our help to Tito, so far as I am concerned, has smelled. It has smelled from the first day on which I learned we were supporting Tito. The way in which I justified our action to myself and to others who discussed the matter with me was that the seacoast of his country is an ideal nest for submarines, and I believed that the safety of the Mediterranean depended on there being no Soviet submarine nests on the Adriatic coast. Technical differences and changes which have taken place in the past few years have made that consideration less important.

The coming together, to the extent that they have come together, of Tito and the Soviet Government completely erases the situation. Any reason I have ever had for being favorable to the support of Tito has completely disappeared.

Now I wish to speak of the question of buying assistance. We have spent billions of dollars in Europe, and many, many billions of those dollars were spent effectively and usefully. They were not spent in buying support. They were spent to strengthen the economies of Western European countries and to aid their recovery from World War II. They were spent in such a way that production was increased and employment was increased. In that way the countries were put on a sound financial basis. As a result of those expenditures, up until now communism has been stopped, particularly in Italy and in France. Those were billions well spent. The millions for Tito are not of that kind.

I doubt whether anyone in the Senate can give a successful instance of buying support or buying neutrality. Support and neutrality cannot be bought. I wish my voice and my vote on the bill to be recorded to the effect that that is my conviction that they cannot be bought.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to have 30 seconds more.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad to yield 30 additional seconds to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I believe it incumbent upon me to inform the President and the Secretary of State, in the most direct and effective way possible, that I am of that conviction and will act in accordance with that conviction.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. I merely wish to say that the statement that we lack confidence in the President of the United States in sponsoring this amendment is not correct. It is not true. What we would do by adopting the committee amendment would be to pass the buck to the President. The President would be forced to make the decision on this question. If the Communist issue is clear enough, let us stand up and be counted now; let us read the record and have a vote, yea or nay. I shall be proud of the way I cast my vote, and I know other Senators who vote in favor of the amendment will also be proud of the way they vote.

I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment. Yesterday I gave my reasons in detail for opposing any further aid to Tito and Communist Yugoslavia. Today I shall summarize them as succinctly as I can.

I oppose further aid to Tito and Communist Yugoslavia because—

First. Tito has announced Yugoslavia's determination to stand side by side with Communist Russia—he never once forsook Communist principles—he only broke with Stalin over their respective personal greed in a struggle for personal power.

Second. We have gambled a billion dollars on Tito and lost—more than anyone else, he has proved by his actions that he is not even a poor risk for us but rather a guaranteed ally of Communist Russia.

Third. Tito is nothing less than an international blackmailer who aspires to become the leading spokesman for international communism and he may well before too long if Khrushchev and Bulganin continue to pamper his vanity.

Fourth. It is a disastrous illusion to hold to the hope that our continued payment of blackmail to Tito will encourage other Communist satellites to break with Communist Russia—instead it is far more realistic and likely that such countries will say if Tito can blackmail the United States out of a billion dollars why do we not?

Fifth. To continue aid to Tito, the self-styled leading spokesman of international communism and jubilant ally of Communist Russia, would make a mockery of the very statement of policy of this bill which says that the purpose of the bill is to fight the spread of international communism—how ridiculous and contradictory are we going to make ourselves?

Sixth. With respect to chapter 4, section 143, who can deny that there has been a change in Yugoslav policies unless they admit that there has been no change only because Tito has really been for international communism all along and has not changed—what difference does it make if Tito and Yugoslavia are independent of control by the Soviet Union as long as they have now rewedded themselves on dedication to international communism and proclaiming that they will stand side by side in war—just what kind of independence is that that we should blindly accept it as a reason to continue to give aid to Tito—and after the recent Tito-Khruschev-Bulganin display in Moscow, who can really in all seriousness and sincerity contend that it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue furnishing assistance to Yugoslavia?

Seventh. Make no mistake about it, Tito is no neutralist—like such countries as Sweden, Ireland, Switzerland, Burma, and others—Tito is a Communist, tied lock, stock, and barrel to the Kremlin now as a senior partner instead of a junior partner and having bought his senior partnership with the billion dollars he blackmailed out of the United States, having merely used us to make the Kremlin accept him as a senior partner.

Eighth. It is about time that we started some intelligent discrimination on to whom and which nations we should give our aid—it is about time that we

stopped paying blackmail and thus encouraging other nations to play the Tito game against us.

Ninth. We should make an example of Tito to the rest of the world by cutting off aid to him—we should show to the world that international crime does not pay and that Tito is no exception as far as we are concerned.

Tenth. The sooner we recognize these truths—the sooner we take our heads out of the international sands about Tito—the sooner we keep faith with our own American people.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The acting majority leader is recognized.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, of course, no one can possibly be certain of what is going to happen in the future, but it seems to me that we would be making a serious mistake if at this time we should tie completely the hands of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State who are, after all, responsible, in the main, for our foreign policy, by issuing a mandate to them that they must immediately cut off all supplies from Tito.

Certainly, Mr. President, regardless of what the future may develop or what it may have in store for us, a difference of 90 days in the implementation of any plan will not make any serious difference. If we shut off all aid to Tito, we shall drive him into the arms of the Soviets. We have no assurance, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has pointed out, that if we continue our aid we shall hold his friendship or his support. But, certainly, the issue is entirely clear that if we cut off aid completely, now, without giving sufficient time for diplomatic investigation and study, we shall inevitably force him into the arms of the Soviets.

So, Mr. President, I hope we will maintain and sustain the position taken by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and not accept the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do I correctly understand that the amendment which is now before the Senate is to strike out the language on page 29, line 18, beginning with the word "unless" and extending through line 25?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, would it now be in order to offer an amendment to the amendment to strike out?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be in order to insert language in lieu of that sought to be stricken out.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then, Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Oregon and myself, I desire to offer an amendment. I assume I shall have time to explain the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Wyoming send his amendment to the desk?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall have to read it, Mr. President, because no one else can read my writing.

On line 18, after the word "finds," insert the words "and so report to the Congress with his reasons therefor."

On line 22, strike out the word "and" and after the figure "(2)" insert the following: "that Yugoslavia does not adhere to any policy for the Communist conquest of the world, and (3)."

With these amendments that portion of the committee amendment would read as follows: "unless the President finds and so reports to the Congress with his reasons thereof (1) that there has been no change in the Yugoslavian policies on the basis of which assistance under this act has been furnished to Yugoslavia in the past, and that Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union, (2) that Yugoslavia does not adhere to any policy for the Communist conquest of the world, and (3) that it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue the furnishing of assistance to Yugoslavia under this act."

Mr. President, I ask that the clerk may read the amendment as I have dictated it, so that it may be clear to me and to all other Senators that the amendment has been correctly stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the language proposed to be stricken by the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], it is proposed to insert the following: "unless the President finds and so reports to the Congress with his reasons therefor, (1) that there has been no change in the Yugoslavian policies on the basis of which assistance under this act has been furnished to Yugoslavia in the past, and that Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union, (2) that Yugoslavia does not adhere to any policy for the Communist conquest of the world, and (3) that it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue the furnishing of assistance to Yugoslavia under this act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield himself on his amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ALLOTT. To what page of the bill is the amendment directed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Page 29, line 18.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FLANDERS. Am I to understand that this is an amendment by way of substitution?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; that is the purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment now before the Senator is an amendment to the language proposed to be stricken out by the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in order that the amendment may be clear and that my own position may be clear, I wish to make it understood in unmistakable language that I have no faith in any of the leaders of the Communist movement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have order? The Senator from Wyoming is making an important statement which all Senators are entitled to hear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. All Senators will observe the admonition.

The Senator from Wyoming may proceed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I want it clearly understood that I have never cherished any faith in any leader of any part of the Communist movement. I believe that movement was generated by men who were convinced that they were engaged in a world movement to conquer and to impose totalitarian dictatorships upon the people.

That general statement of mine applies to Tito. I cannot forget the sort of warfare and the sort of persecutions which were carried on by Tito against Mikhailovich before the European war was brought to an end. I know him to be, on all the evidence which has been presented to us, an intolerant dictator, and therefore totally opposed to everything for which this Government stands.

I believe the only difference between Tito and the Soviet Communists is that Tito did not submit to all of the bloody tyranny of Joseph Stalin. The other leaders of the Soviet Government in Moscow today did submit to the bloody, arbitrary, and tyrannous policies of Stalin. All their pretenses now that they have forgotten Stalin, had no faith in him, and did not adhere to his policies, are not worth the wind that blows them away.

But I also know, Mr. President, that the United States is now and has been throughout this war endeavoring to bring peace to the world by negotiation. Because of the great improvement which has been made in the destructive capacity of arms, we cannot satisfy ourselves any longer that we can effectively wage war. I do not believe in a preventive war. I think it would be absurd folly and would send millions of men, women, and children to their death, not only upon the battlefields, but also in

their homes. So I feel that if we desire to have peace, we have no recourse except to try to secure peace by negotiation and through the United Nations.

I have supported the United Nations. I have supported the conversations which have taken place there, although I have never been satisfied with all of them. I have believed completely in the statement which was made by former Senator Warren Austin, of Vermont, when he was appointed by President Truman to be the first American Ambassador to the United Nations. I remember his statement to the people of the United States in a television speech, when he explained that he was willing to talk with the Soviet Russians following their return to the Council of the United Nations, after they had ignored the Council for months, if not for years.

He said, in effect, in simple words, "I would rather die of ulcers from nervous tension and from struggles in these meetings than involve the world again in a great war."

That was commonsense. We cannot go to war. We should not go to war.

But the Senate only a day or so ago appropriated an additional billion dollars for the United States Air Force, because it wanted to make certain that the United States would have the greatest airpower in the world for protection and not for attack. I am advised that the House conferees have agreed to that increased appropriation.

So it is clear that the policy of Congress is to maintain, so far as expenditures can maintain it, the greatest airpower in the world, not because we want to wage a preventive war, but because we desire to make it clear to all the world that we have the power to destroy an aggressor, if an aggressor should ever attempt to attack us.

Therefore, I offer my amendment with the thought not that we should waste money on Tito, not that we should let the world know that we have any special faith in him. Not at all. I offer it merely so that we may continue our conversations and that we may continue the policy which we have launched until it becomes clear that there is no hope of reaching an understanding with the Yugoslav Government.

The changes which I have proposed by this amendment to the committee amendment make it the responsibility of the President to make his finding in written words reported to Congress. I am tired of granting blank checks of power and blank checks of spending money appropriated by Congress without knowledge of what they will be used for. I want it made crystal clear that if this authorization of an appropriation for Yugoslavia is to be made, it will be the direct responsibility of the President of the United States to report to Congress, first, that there has been no change in the Yugoslavian policies which we have heretofore followed; and second—and this is new—that Yugoslavia does not adhere to any policy for the Communist conquest of the world.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In a moment.

Third, that it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue to furnish assistance to Yugoslavia in this act. The purpose of the amendment, therefore, would be to make the President understand——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I grant myself 2 more minutes.

The purpose of the amendment, therefore, would be to make the President of the United States understand that what we want from him is a written finding upon these facts, particularly upon the fact that Tito does not adhere to the Communist policy of world conquest. If the President finds that, he can find it only by negotiation; and if he does find it, and if Tito does make such a declaration, I believe indeed we shall have our feet upon the path to peace.

That is the explanation of the amendment.

I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana. I yield myself time enough to answer his question.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator be agreeable to including in the amendment language to the effect that there has been a determination that there has been no change in Soviet policy toward Yugoslavia—upon the basis of which policy the United States has granted aid to Yugoslavia?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am afraid the Senator's suggestion is not clear. It would be ambiguous.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator realize that the change has come in Soviet policy toward Yugoslavia? Tito did not want any separation from the Communists, but the Communists forced him away. Perhaps the Senator could include in his amendment language that there has been no change in Soviet policy—which was really the reason why there was a split in the first place.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What the Senator means is that there has been a change in Soviet policy.

Mr. LONG. Up until Soviet Russia began to make threats against Yugoslavia, there was no reason why this Nation should grant aid to Yugoslavia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My feeling is that the amendment which the Senator from Louisiana suggests is too vague and uncertain. As this language has been prepared, it makes clear what the policy of our Congress is.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I prefer to have the Senator take time of his own.

Mr. LONG. Does it occur to the Senator, however, that the problem here——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish the Senator, who seems to be wanting to file another amendment, would speak on time against the amendment rather than on time for it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield 5 minutes to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present time is under the control of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My time has expired. I wanted to allow time to the Senator from Oregon to speak.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have joined with my friend from Wyoming as a cosponsor of the amendment because I believe it is a very helpful and clarifying amendment, as well as a very practical amendment. Let us be practical about what would happen under the language of the committee's bill as it is now written. The language, starting on line 13, page 29, reads:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no assistance under this title or any other title of this act, or under any provision of law repealed by section 542 (a) of this act, shall be furnished to Yugoslavia after the expiration of 90 days following the date of the enactment of this section, unless the President finds—

Now, let us consider the situation after the expiration of the 90 days. The President will go into a press conference. He will be asked about his findings in respect to Yugoslavia aid. For that matter, in my judgment, at the end of those 90 days, the President of the United States undoubtedly would make clear his position, under the language of this bill, through some medium, be it radio or television or White House release or State Department release or in answer to questions at a press conference. It is only commonsense to expect the President under the language of the committee bill to make some public statement in this problem at the end of the 90-day period. Therefore I think the language of the O'Mahoney-Morse amendment requiring a report to the Congress from the President would be helpful to the President. It would give legislative formality to his decision on the matter of whether to continue or discontinue Yugoslavia aid. It would be in keeping with our check-and-balance system.

In my opinion, any President should welcome language in the bill which simply says that he shall report to the Congress his finding in respect to whether we should continue aid to Yugoslavia. I am confident the President would welcome the O'Mahoney-Moore amendment, because we have been advised that the language of the committe bill carries out a program the President himself desires. I do not believe that Dwight D. Eisenhower, or any other President, would object to giving to the American people his reasons for finding that the aid should be continued or discontinued.

The last point I desire to make, Mr. President, is to supplement what I said earlier this afternoon. I believe we should resolve the doubts in favor of the calculated risk we are running on this issue, because we should not overlook a great force on our side in Yugoslavia, which is to be found in the people of Yugoslavia. We have heard a lot of discussion about Tito this afternoon, but Tito is not Yugoslavia. He is the dictator of it; but, Mr. President,

men come and men go, dictators come and go but the spirit of the people of Yugoslavia will live on.

The greatest support the American people have in Yugoslavia is the spirit of the people of Yugoslavia? It is the religious faith of the people of Yugoslavia. I would have the Senate pause long enough to remember that the people of Yugoslavia are a religious people. The people of Yugoslavia are a deeply Christian people. Christians cannot be subjected to the enslavement of communism for long.

I want to say, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, that every report I have had in regard to what is going on within Yugoslavia, among the rank and file of the people of Yugoslavia, is that they are on the side of the people of the United States in their religious dedication to the spiritual values of freedom. I do not think, Mr. President, we should walk out on that spirit which abides in the people of Yugoslavia. It is one of the greatest assets we have. We can afford to gamble on it. We ought to capitalize on it. We ought not to turn our backs on the people of Yugoslavia by turning down the language proposed by the committee. We should support the President on this matter. We should allow him to make a full reappraisal of Yugoslavia relationships for the next 90 days. We should let him continue diplomatic negotiations with Yugoslavia on this issue. The amendment obligates the President to report to the Senate and the House of Representatives and to the American people his reasons for finding that we should or should not continue support for Yugoslavia. I think it is the practical and the statesmanlike way to approach the problem. Therefore, I am glad to join the Senator from Wyoming in his amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I am sure every Member of this body recognizes that aid to Yugoslavia at best is a very calculated risk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time did the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Five minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I think the record is crystal clear that Mr. Tito is a dictator. I think it ought to be clear that he is a Communist. I think it also should be clear that Mr. Tito and his forces were responsible for one of the first breaks in the orbit of international communism as a combined force organized against the free world.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wonder if the distinguished author of the amendment does not want to ask for the yeas and nays now, so that they may be ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I wish to make my position clear. I have never been particularly happy about aid to Tito. I was not happy at its inception, and I am not happy at this particular hour about it. But I think we ought to recognize that one of the first objectives of American foreign policy was to break up the closely knit Comintern, the closely knit international movement of communism. If we could break through and fragmentize the international Communist movement, at least that was a good sign. It was a hopeful sign.

This United States Senator does not like dictators of any kind. I do not like Nazi, Fascist, or Communist dictators. If it were strictly on the basis of voting one's emotions or philosophy, without any regard to the intricacies of power politics, I would not vote a single penny for any one of the dictators. I do not like dictators in any country. We are allied with some dictators. Let us put our cards on the table. This country is in alliance with some dictators. We have been in alliance with some dictators because it was a part of the power struggle. We have not subjected all these dictators to a blood test, because if we did, I am afraid they would not look too good.

Mr. President, Tito was the first to break away. At the present time the Communist Parties in Italy, in France, and in other countries are beginning to show signs of restlessness; they are beginning to indicate that perhaps they should be a little Tito-like themselves. Some persons may say, "That is all a sham and a trick." It may be, Mr. President. Other persons may say that since the debunking of Stalin, there is an indication of a break in the solidarity of the Communist movement. I do not know.

But in 1952, the Senators on the other side of the aisle told the American people that Dwight Eisenhower knew more about foreign policy than anyone else in the United States did, and that he understood best the responsibilities of the United States toward other nations.

Mr. President, I wish to say that the President of the United States is, of course, well informed in the field of foreign policy. I have disagreed with him, and even today I disagree with him, on many areas of our foreign policy. But let the record be clear that the Secretary of State, as the official representative of the President of the United States, came before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with a special plea regarding this item, and none other, in the bill; in the case of no other item in the pending bill did the Secretary of State come before the Foreign Relations Committee and say, "This one is so important, gentlemen, that we ask you to reconcile your doubts in favor of our proposal."

Mr. President, the language of this proposal is the language of the executive branch of the Government. This proposal is included in the bill in the way requested by the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State has said that the decision in regard to this matter is critical and vital. He has said that we could do a great deal of damage if we were to strike out the language which presently appears at this part of the bill, as it has been modified—and, let me say, in my opinion, improved—by the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I say very frankly that in reaching my judgment on this matter, I am in an unhappy state. My immediate reaction was, "Away with Tito. Not one nickel, not one gun, not one bit of aid for Tito."

But then the President of the United States sent his Secretary of State to the Foreign Relations Committee, and there the Secretary of State said to the committee, "If this authority is stricken from the bill, if we are forbidden to have this authority, the result may very well be to drive Tito smack-bang into the hands of the Kremlin, totally and completely, and also to drive every other Communist group that today indicates even a slight amount of restlessness, completely into the hands of the Kremlin."

Mr. President, I conclude by asking, Whom are we supposed to believe? Are we supposed to believe our fellow Senators, who, in this case, do not have one bit more information than the Senator from Minnesota has? Are we supposed to believe an editorial writer? Or in the case of a delicate matter of this kind, are we supposed to believe the Central Intelligence Agency of our Government and our Ambassador to the Soviet Union and our Secretary of State, with 50,000 employees and a network of agencies at his command; and are we supposed to believe the President of the United States?

In this case, since it has been made a matter of official policy, and since I gather that it has been made a matter of supreme importance by the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, I judge that there is only one thing to do, and that is to let them have the responsibility and let them report to the Congress of the United States.

I am willing to trust the President of the United States not to put money and arms into the hands of our enemies. I am willing to trust the President of the United States to do what is right and what is honorable in this critical situation, because he has said, through his agents, that this matter is vital and important and sensitive, and that it should not be played with loosely.

On that basis, Mr. President, I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], because I think it improves this part of the bill a great deal, and at least it puts the responsibility right where the situation requires that it be put, namely, upon the President of the United States and his official agents.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Like the Senator from Minnesota, I shall support the amendment, and I subscribe to all the arguments he has made and to all the arguments which have been made by the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, let me say——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yielded time to the Senator from Minnesota, but that time has expired. I must conserve the remaining time, inasmuch as only 7 minutes remain. I wish to hear any arguments which may be made against the amendment, if there are any arguments to be made against it. I shall save time for the Senator from Rhode Island, if any time is left.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized for 3 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I have listened to the debate on the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]; and I have listened to the debate on the pending innocuous amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], which to my mind, will do nothing to help our country remain strong. The pending amendment constitutes just another attempt to evade an issue which at some time all Senators will have to face before the American people, whom Senators are supposed to represent.

Mr. President, I well remember when ton after ton and boatload after boatload of scrap iron were being sent from the United States to Japan. I remember that at that time the Japanese were not enemies of ours, although voices such as that of the great Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] had been raised on the floor of the Senate, telling us to beware, telling us that we might be getting into trouble.

Today, I have heard hour after hour of debate, including the words of the great statesman and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who told us that, yes, Tito and Yugoslavia might well be in the Communist orbit, as of this moment. Yet he expects us to vote our taxpayers' money to that dedicated Communist, Tito.

Mr. President, are we men or are we mice? Will we sit idly by and gamble with the future of our country? In this case, let us not be weaker and even more spineless than Senators were in regard to the shipment of scrap iron to Japan. We have heard it said that we are giving aid to Yugoslavia and to Tito, so that Tito can buy shells for his guns, and so that he can equip the tanks that we gave him—so that he can have those necessary things, which only we can supply.

Mr. President, I never thought I would serve in the Senate of the United States and hear it argued that we should give Tito our money, so that he would be able to buy from us shells to use to kill American boys. That is exactly what is now being done, and what it is proposed that the United States continue to do. Mr. President, we are not statesmen when we sit here and listen to arguments of that sort.

I say let us support the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and let us knock off Tito and Yugoslavia from our aid right now.

For nearly 6 years I have heard the same arguments that I have listened to today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield 2 additional minutes to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, Mr. President; I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, I heard a great statesman in this body say, as far back as 1953, "This is the end of foreign aid and mutual security."

Mr. President, if, after 7 years of such use of the money of the American people, Senators cannot stand on their own feet and do what is right and stop this program, they will never be able to do it.

Let us consider, too, the argument we have just heard from Senators on the other side of the aisle—yes, and also from some Senators on this side of the aisle, Mr. President—namely, that we must give money to Tito, so that he can buy shells for the guns we have already given to him. In other words, we are told that we must give money to Tito, to enable him to buy shells for guns which will be used to kill American boys.

Mr. President, it is about time for the Members of the Senate of the United States to stand up and be counted as Americans.

Mr. President, regardless of how other Senators may vote, I will never vote for the adoption of such an amendment as the pending one, an amendment to pass the buck, although we are responsible to the people of the United States.

Mr. President, we represent the American people. Let us do it proudly, strongly, and bravely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield 3 minutes to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it seems to me that the question which those who would like to vote funds for Tito will have to answer is: How can they give these hundreds of millions of dollars to Tito without the American people resenting it? How can they vote money for Tito and escape responsibility if he turns against the United States?

Therefore, some measure must be devised whereby a Senator can explain his vote of hundreds of millions of dollars for Tito. We are told that the President is to determine that Tito has not changed his foreign policy. That should not be too difficult to determine. Mr. Khrushchev made a speech to the Communists a while back, and he explained that Tito had shown some independence, and he said that he—Mr. Khrushchev—had advised Stalin to tolerate that degree of independence, and to keep Tito in the Communist group. He said that it was a terrible mistake when Stalin said he could raise his little finger and Tito would fall. He said that Russia paid dearly for that mistake. So according to Khrushchev, the change in policy was not a change by Tito. It was a change by Russia.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming if he would be willing to modify his amendment to take care of that aspect of the situation, and to say that the President must determine that Russia has not changed its policy toward Yugoslavia, because according to Russia, and according to Tito, that is what it is all about. That is why we gave Yugoslavia the money.

The Senator knows as well as I do that his amendment would not be worth the paper on which it is written if it were amended to say that before we could give 5 cents to Tito we had to first determine that Russia has not changed her policy toward Yugoslavia. Otherwise, it is possible for Tito to go into the same close alliance that has always existed, with Khrushchev tolerating the slight degree of independence which Stalin would not tolerate. They say they are good friends. The money for Tito could be used to our disadvantage.

We talk about encouraging people to show independence. We talk about encouraging all the people involved in the Communist conspiracy to show some independence. Apparently, the Russians think that is a good idea, because that is what they are also encouraging.

My best information is that they are now encouraging Communists all over the world to demonstrate some degree of independence. Why? Because it appears to their advantage that Communists throughout the world trying to subvert free government should indicate that they are thinking about the welfare of the people of the nations where they are located, rather than thinking about the welfare of the Soviet Union.

As a matter of fact, even in Russia some independence is being shown.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I understand that yesterday Pravda carried a front-page story reprinting an editorial from the Communist Daily Worker of the United States, in which the question was asked, "Why was it that the other men in the Kremlin tolerated what Stalin was doing?" Apparently it is the policy of the Kremlin today that questions should be asked. Why that is so I am not sure. That is apparently what they want done.

Senators will wait a long time to see any good results from any funds which we may vote for Tito. If the Senator

from Wyoming would be willing to modify his amendment so as to say that the President would have to determine that there had been no change in Russian policy, which makes it possible for Tito and Russia to be very close now, I might be willing to go along with the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I invite the Senator's attention to the language of the committee amendment on page 29, line 21. The President must find that Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union. I think that covers everything the Senator is interested in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, is further time desired?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LONG. Is the pending amendment offered as a substitute for or as an amendment to the Bridges amendment, or is it offered as an amendment to the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Louisiana that it is offered as a perfecting amendment to the language which the Bridges amendment proposes to strike out.

Mr. LONG. Therefore if the O'Mahoney amendment should prevail, the next vote would occur on the Bridges amendment, which proposes to strike out the entire section providing aid for Tito.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Bridges amendment proposes to strike out that language, whether or not amended by the perfecting amendment of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. LONG. Then this amendment is in no sense a substitute for the Bridges amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a perfecting amendment, not a substitute.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I recall correctly, the inquiry I addressed to the Presiding Officer at the very beginning was whether or not I could offer this amendment as a substitute for the Bridges amendment, and the ruling of the Chair was that I could.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The previous occupant of the chair gave a different answer to the query of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. When he propounded his inquiry, the reply of the Chair was that it was a substitute.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let us have the parliamentary ruling of the Chair at the present moment, so that we may proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the O'Mahoney amendment is a perfecting amendment to the language of the committee amendment which the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire proposes to strike out.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Accepting the ruling of the Chair, am I correct in understanding that my amendment will be voted upon by the yeas and nays as a perfecting amendment to the committee amendment, and that, if it prevails, the vote will then occur upon the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire to strike out everything after the word "unless", which would include the perfected amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In that event, Senators who wished to have the perfected amendment prevail would vote "nay" on the Bridges amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators who are in favor of the O'Mahoney amendment would vote "yea."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. At this stage, certainly. I understand that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair cannot anticipate what the vote will be.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, we must take one step at a time. I understand that the first vote will come on the O'Mahoney perfecting amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first vote will come on the O'Mahoney amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And when that has been disposed of the question will be on agreeing to the Bridges amendment, upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the Senator from New Hampshire desire some time?

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like about 3 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the time situation on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has 7 minutes remaining, and the Senator from California has 20 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, which his characteristically versatile mind has produced at the last minute, actually is not far different from the committee amendment. True, he requires the President to report to the Congress. That requirement would not have much significance, however, because I assume the Congress will not be in session at the end of the 90-day period.

He requires the President to furnish a report to the Congress giving his reasons for the continuance or discontinuance of aid to Yugoslavia. The committee amendment in substance provides that the President must make a determination on the question of continuing aid to Yugoslavia without making a report. Therefore, in effect, the O'Mahoney amendment is not far different from the committee amendment. The Senator from New Hampshire is not challenging the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming on the ground that it is a good amendment or a bad amendment, but he points out that it does not differ substantially from the committee amendment. The Senator from Wyoming merely adds certain obligations, one of which is that the President shall report to Congress. I state again that there is not much point to that provision, because Congress will not be in session 90 days from now. I do not know what action we could take in that case. The Senator from Wyoming would be in Wyoming. The Senator from Alabama would be in Alabama, the Senator from California would be in California, and other Senators probably would be in their home States. I do not see what could be accomplished by the amendment. It is not a harmful amendment, but I cannot agree that a great deal of good would be accomplished by it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. As a matter of fact, we are calling upon the President to determine what we already know. In other words, we are asking the President to make the determination whether or not the brand of communism in which Tito is indulging has for its purpose world conquest. As a matter of fact we know that to be so. We can say so now.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. I believe the issue would be much clearer if we could get a vote on the amendment which I have offered. There cannot be too much uncertainty about this question.

I quote from a newspaper article of June 12, 1956:

> Tito told a cheering crowd of Russians that Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union "must march shoulder to shoulder toward the victory of socialism."

I quote from a statement made by Marshal Zhukov, in which he said: "The Kremlin and Marshal Tito will fight shoulder to shoulder."

The question of where Tito and Yugoslavia stand should be clear to everyone. We have spent a billion dollars in Yugoslavia and the result is a honeymoon in Moscow between Tito and the Russian rulers. That is what we have accomplished. The Senator from New Hampshire is willing to take a calculated risk but in doing so he feels there should be some reasonable expectation of success.

When I hear Senators say, "Yugoslavia may be already in the Russian orbit," I conclude that the chances of that calculated risk becoming successful have diminished to a great extent even to the vanishing point.

I hope the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming will be voted down. There is little point to it because there seems to be little difference between it and the committee

amendment. In fact, I believe the committee amendment is the more desirable of the two. However, the real issue and the only issue is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire. The question to be decided is whether we will continue to furnish military aid to a Communist power which has unmistakably oriented itself with the Kremlin.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming will be defeated so that we can vote on the straight issue of the Bridges amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire desire to use any additional time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is any additional time desired on this side, or in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I intend to vote for the O'Mahoney amendment, because I think it is an improvement on the committee amendment. However, after I vote for it, I expect to vote for the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, because I think that is a more direct approach and because it assumes courageously a responsibility which I think is the responsibility of Congress. We know what communism is. We know it is an international conspiracy. We ought to have the courage to stand up and say so now, without passing the buck to the President of the United States to determine it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time if the Senator from Wyoming is prepared to do so also.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I wish to make a comment. We recognize that Mr. Tito is a Communist. I recognize that communism is evil. However, I should like to say to my good friends in the Senate that the Senate has been voting aid to Tito as a Communist right along. I did not vote for aid to Tito at the initiation of the program.

I wish to say that the comments made by the Senator from New Hampshire were made in the committee on Foreign Relations and that the Secretary of State disputed those comments. The Secretary of State said those comments were not accurate. Furthermore, he said that some of the comments of Marshal Zhukov were embarrassing to Marshall Tito.

Whom are we to believe? If I, as a Senator, have been misled by the State Department and by the President's representatives, then I say things have come to a sad juncture indeed. I understand that the Secretary of State not only came before the Foreign Relations Committee but that he went also to the Republican Policy Committee and said the same thing. It seems a little peculiar to me that after those visits some of us should have to stand on the floor of the Senate and defend the Secretary of State.

I am about ready to join the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. I am about ready to accept what I believe in my heart, and what I believe to be true; namely, that this man Tito is an evil dictator. However, the President, through his agent, says, "Senator HUMPHREY, don't you do this to me. I am your Commander in Chief. I am in charge of the foreign policy of the country. Give me the benefit of the doubt. Don't tie my hands. This is a sensitive matter."

What is a Senator to do? Is he to stand on his honor to do his patriotic duty, or to listen to press reports, or to yield to his passions and emotions? Then he is confronted with the President's top man, his No. 1 man, John Foster Dulles, saying, "Give the President the leeway that is contained in the bill."

Mr. President, we were told that the President and the Secretary of State knew communism and knew how to fight it and how to conduct the foreign affairs of the country. I am willing to give them a chance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Does not the Senator realize that those representations may be another "march to the brink"?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. If so, they will provide another good issue for Life magazine.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I should like to make this point clear. Although the hearings of the committee were held behind closed doors, there is not one argument that was presented in committee which has not been put forth on the floor of the Senate in public. The issue has been fully discussed on the floor of the Senate.

Although the record of what transpired in committee is not available to the public, I assure Senators they have heard the exact argument that the Secretary of State made before the committee.

If the Secretary of State had told the junior Senator from Louisiana, "Senator, there are some secret things about which not even to the Foreign Relations Committee can be told," I would have been willing to go along with him and take his word for it.

However, he was willing to lay it right on the record, and Senators on the floor of the Senate have heard every argument that was made in committee. We were told, "If you do not give Tito this money, we are afraid that Tito will join the Russians, and we are afraid that he has already joined them." In effect it meant to me: "Give Tito the money because we cannot trust him. He may have joined the Russians already. However, we are afraid that he will join the Russians, if he has not joined them already, and not giving him the money will make him more inclined to join them."

That is the argument that was made in committee. If Senators wish to vote money to that man, and if they wish to give more millions of dollars to him on that basis, they can do it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield two minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. president, I say to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] that we are not giving money. The bill provides that there shall be no money given to Tito unless the President of the United States finds the existence of certain facts. What we are really saying is that the President of the United States apparently needs a little time and the Secretary of State needs a little time to decide whether or not Mr. Tito has turned out to be a first-class scoundrel or a second-class scoundrel. What we are asking for in the amendment is to give the President and his State Department, the National Security Council, the Central Intelligence Agency, and our embassies enough time to evaluate this whole situation.

I may say for the record that a year ago the State Department did cut off funds and supplies from Tito. That is what we are told. I do not believe this information ought to be kept secret. We ought not to legislate in the dark. The Senator from Louisiana is correct, that everything the Secretary of State has said in committee has been repeated on the floor of the Senate at least 2 or 3 times. I emphasize that the Secretary of State said, "Don't you do this to me." He said, "This is a very dangerous and sensitive matter. I ask you to give us a chance to work this out."

That is exactly what the bill provides. If the Secretary of State had not pleaded in that plaintive voice of his, and if he had not also pleaded with the Republican Policy Committee, I would be glad to cut off all aid to Tito.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we are speaking as if the State Department were acting at the present time in a vacuum. Some of us know, as members of the Foreign Relations Committee, that the Secretary of State considers that what has been transpiring between Tito and Russia is a matter of very delicate diplomatic concern to the United States. At the present time our diplomatic representatives are carrying on negotiations with Yugoslavia. What we shall do if we adopt the amendment is to cut off the negotiations, in effect. There will be only one place for Tito to go, and that will be into the Russian orbit. We should be willing, at least, to run the risk for 90 days of continuing foreign aid until the President of the United States can look into this entire matter and reach a decision.

We should not be overlooking the Yugoslavian people, because so long as we stand with them we have a chance to support dissident groups in Yugoslavia

if Tito should try to lead them completely into the arms of the Russians. I do not think we ought to let down the Yugoslavian people or overlook the great asset we have and the alliance we have with the people of Yugoslavia when it comes to a common Christian faith. I think that happens to be the greatest weapon we have against communism in Yugoslavia. But if we adopt the Bridges amendment, in my judgment, we shall bring to an end all the hope we have of our State Department working out satisfactory diplomatic relations with Tito. Furthermore, I think we will do great injury to the morale of the people of Yugoslavia. As long as the church doors of Yugoslavia remain open there is hope for the cause of freedom in Yugoslavia. If we decide here tonight to end all aid to Yugoslavia I think we may start a reign of Communist terror in Yugoslavia that will weaken the morale of fellow Christians in Yugoslavia. I grant that Tito's recent conferences with the Russians spell no good. However, I refuse to believe that all hope is lost for eventual freedom in Yugoslavia. I am going to support the request of the State Department and the President on this very serious foreign policy issue.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has 7 minutes remaining, and the Senator from California has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming is a strengthening amendment. I am prepared to support the Senator on his amendment.

Furthermore, when we have disposed of the amendment, which changes the section with which we are dealing in the bill, I understand that the Senator from New Hampshire will present his amendment.

Is that a correct statement, Mr. President? I ask that as a parliamentary inquiry. I understand the Senate will vote, first, on the O'Mahoney amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. And when that is disposed of, it is my understanding that the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire, directed at the language in the bill, will be voted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The language of the committee amendment as amended by the O'Mahoney amendment, if that amendment is agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I confess that I am very much puzzled by the remarks I hear from the Republican side of the Chamber, save those which have just been uttered by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

I hear voices say over there, "You are passing the buck to the President."

Who are these Republican Senators who refuse to "pass the buck" to the President? Does not the Constitution of the United States vest in the President the control of the foreign policy of the United States? Has not that been held over and over again by the courts of the United States, up to the Supreme Court? And yet Senators rise on the other side of the aisle and say, "When you ask the President to submit a written report you are passing the buck to him."

Why, Mr. President, the Senators are rationalizing their position. The present President of the United States is carrying out a policy with respect to Yugoslavia which was initiated before he became President.

What my amendment does is to ask the President to make a report that he finds not only that Yugoslavia is not under the control of Soviet Russia, not only that the situation in Yugoslavia has not been altered since we first granted aid in order to protect Greece, Turkey, and other nations around the periphery which the Soviet Government was trying to gobble up, but we also ask the President to make his report in writing to the Congress that Yugoslavia does not adhere to any policy for the Communist control of the world, and that it is in the interest of the United States to do this thing.

What we are saying, through this amendment, I would say to my Republican friends who, I see, are smiling, "Have faith in your President. Have faith that when he sends the written report to the Congress he will be adhering to his oath of office to carry out the law."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In a moment. The Senator has had his time.

This will be the law, that he shall make a report finding that Yugoslavia is not a tool of Soviet Russia.

That answers every argument which has been made in support of the amendment of the senior Republican Senator, the man who has served in the Senate longer than has any other Republican Senator upon the floor, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The President will also have to find that Yugoslavia is not adhering to any Communist policy. How will he find that? He will find it by negotiation of some kind, and when he reports he will do so as the man whom the Republicans want to run for President and the man who is now their President. Do they not believe in him?

They argue as if they had no faith in him. They argue as though their only purpose in adhering to the President of the United States is to make him a symbol to carry along the unthinking vote of the people, to carry the conservative Republicans into power again.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. With reference to passing the buck to the President, I am sure the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is familiar with the letter which is set forth in the report at pages 16 to 18 in which the Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles, repeatedly says that this is the wish of the President. In one paragraph he says:

> Within the past 6 months, the executive branch of this Government, with the participation of the President, has reviewed the question of United States policy toward Yugoslavia, and both the programs now being implemented and those proposed in the mutual security bill before your committee are consonant with and in support of the national policy thus established.

In the closing paragraph he says this:

> It is my hope, however, which I know the President has shared, that the Congress will not want to deprive us of the instrumentalities and funds whereby the executive branch will be enabled to pursue the flexible policy toward Yugoslavia which is needed to counter the present Soviet drive to retrieve its own failure in Yugoslavia since 1948.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Alabama. I may add that I do not wish to be responsible for killing an opportunity for the President of the United States to work out a possible solution, if it can be done; but I ask that he report to the United States Congress.

I may say too, that when other amendments which I have had printed, and which are lying on the table, are called up, it will be made clear that I also want every officer and employee of the Government of the United States who is engaged in the administering of the act to answer the questions of the authoritative committees of Congress, which is something those officers and employees have not been doing.

I want to hold up high the power of Congress. I am passing no buck to the President of the United States, although my friend from New Hampshire is expressing his deep lack of faith in the symbol of the GOP.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, at one time the Senator from Wyoming talks as if he is willing to pass the buck to the President of the United States; the next time he speaks he talks as if he did not have faith in the President of the United States. Let me say I yield to no one in my regard, affection and faith in the President.

The committee amendment provides that the President shall certify. That is enough.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from New Hampshire is mistaken.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Wyoming says the President must give his reason.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The bill says that the President shall only "find"; it does not say he shall "certify."

Mr. BRIDGES. "Find"; that is enough; it has the same import. But the Senator from Wyoming wants to spell it out in fancy language. Perhaps he will want to supply the President with a dictionary, so as to make sure that the President spells out all the words to Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. The Senator would not yield to me, so I will not yield to him.

The Senator from Wyoming talks about the giving of military aid to another country. He talks in general about aiding foreign powers. Why does he not get the Constitution of the United States and read it? If he can find anything in the Constitution about the President having the sole right to determine the giving of military aid to another country, I should like to see it. The Constitution provides that Congress shall have the final determination of that so why is not this the time to decide it right here and now?

The issue will be clear on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire. I would have the hope that once the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming has been defeated, the Senator from Wyoming, when the roll is called, will answer "yea" to the clear issue presented by the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My time has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield back the remainder of my time and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California yields back the remainder of his time. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	McClellan
Allott	Gore	McNamara
Anderson	Green	Millikin
Barrett	Hayden	Monroney
Beall	Hennings	Morse
Bender	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bennett	Hill	Murray
Bible	Holland	Neuberger
Bricker	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Humphrey, Minn.	Pastore
Bush	Humphreys, Ky.	Payne
Butler	Ives	Potter
Byrd	Jackson	Purtell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Clements	Kerr	Schoeppel
Cotton	Knowland	Scott
Curtis	Kuchel	Smathers
Dirksen	Langer	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Long	Sparkman
Dworshak	Magnuson	Stennis
Eastland	Malone	Symington
Ellender	Mansfield	Thye
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Watkins
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Welker
Frear	McCarthy	Williams
Fulbright		Wofford
George		Young

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State convention.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Do I correctly understand that regardless of the result of the vote on the O'Mahoney amendment there will later be a vote on the Bridges amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the Bridges amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been ordered on the Bridges amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Bridges amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays having been ordered on the O'Mahoney amendment, the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. In the event the O'Mahoney amendment should prevail, and in the event the Bridges amendment later should prevail, would the effect of the Bridges amendment be to strike out all of the provisions of the section from line 18 to line 25, inclusive, including the O'Mahoney amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Bridges amendment would strike out the language which the O'Mahoney amendment proposes to modify.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD and Mr. NEELY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State convention.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent and, if present and voting would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business, and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—52

Anderson	Hennings	McNamara
Barrett	Hill	Monroney
Bennett	Holland	Morse
Bible	Humphrey, Minn.	Murray
Carlson	Humphreys, Ky.	Neuberger
Case, N. J.	Ives	O'Mahoney
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Pastore
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Payne
Douglas	Kennedy	Purtell
Duff	Kerr	Robertson
Eastland	Kuchel	Russell
Ellender	Lehman	Scott
Ervin	Long	Smathers
Fulbright	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
George	Mansfield	Sparkman
Gore	McClellan	Stennis
Green	Monroney	Symington
Hayden	Morse	Wofford

NAYS—36

Aiken	Dworshak	McCarthy
Allott	Flanders	Millikin
Beall	Frear	Mundt
Bender	Goldwater	Potter
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hruska	Schoeppel
Bush	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Butler	Knowland	Thye
Byrd	Langer	Watkins
Cotton	Malone	Welker
Curtis	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Dirksen	Martin, Pa.	Young

NOT VOTING—8

Capehart	Jenner	Neely
Chavez	Kefauver	Wiley
Daniel	Laird	

So Mr. O'MAHONEY's amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], to strike from the committee amendment all after the word "section" in line 18, on page 29, down to and including the word "Act" in line 25, as amended by the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD and Mr. NEELY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate, for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State convention.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—38

Anderson	Ervin	McClellan
Barrett	Flanders	Millikin
Bible	Frear	Mundt
Bricker	Goldwater	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Potter
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Byrd	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Case, S. Dak.	Knowland	Symington
Cotton	Langer	Welker
Curtis	Long	Williams
Douglas	Magnuson	Wofford
Dworshak	Malone	Young
Eastland	McCarthy	

NAYS—50

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Morse
Allott	Hill	Murray
Beall	Holland	Neuberger
Bender	Humphrey,	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Minn.	Payne
Bush	Humphreys,	Purtell
Carlson	Ky.	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Ives	Russell
Clements	Jackson	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Duff	Kennedy	Smathers
Ellender	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	Lehman	Sparkman
George	Mansfield	Stennis
Gore	Martin, Iowa	Thye
Green	Martin, Pa.	Watkins
Hayden	McNamara	
Hennings	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—8

Capehart	Jenner	Neely
Chavez	Kefauver	Wiley
Daniel	Laird	

So the amendment offered by Mr. BRIDGES, for himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment, as amended, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on behalf of my senior colleague [Mr. ELLENDER] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the committee amendment it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the total appropriation made under authority of this act (including unobligated and unreserved funds continued available) shall not exceed $2,765,875,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana wishes the yeas and nays on his amendment, they can be ordered at this time.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is not anticipated that all the time against the amendment will be used. I assume the author of the amendment will wish to use all the time allotted him, and perhaps some additional time. However, we hope to vote on the pending amendment, and then suspend until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, before addressing myself to my amendment, I wish to express my great admiration for the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, our President pro tempore and dean of the Senate, the distinguished and able senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. The Senator from Georgia has exceeded every other Member of this body in his years of service here, and the calibre of his service has not been exceeded by that of anyone who has served with him during the past 34 years.

While I would differ with my friend, who is much beloved by all of us, I wish to make it clear that my objective is the same as his. I share his deep desire to preserve and protect this Nation. I likewise agree with him that we should have a foreign-aid program. It has always been my view that much of the expenditures under the foreign-aid program have been wasteful and excessive. In some cases, expenditures have been unnecessary, and, I fear, even foolhardy. But those are the risks that we must take in a program of such magnitude, involving so many foreign nations whose characters and backgrounds are so different from ours.

Since the day I entered this body, I have believed steadfastly that our expenditures for foreign assistance were excessive and that we could obtain as much results with a lesser expenditure of funds. In some instances, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia has been my leader in this point of view.

I followed his leadership when he voted to reduce the first appropriation for mutual defense by one-half. As a matter of fact, it was his amendment. At that time, I recall that the senior Senator from Georgia had such doubts about the program, particularly about the large amount that was to be spent in view of the limited information available to support the plan, that he voted against the entire project. I cast the same vote.

During the intervening years, I have voted to support the foreign-aid program. I have consistently voted for reductions and economies in that program. Last year was the second time that I voted against final passage of the mutual security bill. I did so because I felt that the amount being appropriated was excessive. I hope that I shall not be compelled to vote against the pending measure for the same reason.

My attitude toward this matter is rather simple. To me the question is not one of whether we shoud have a foreign-aid program. It is a question of how much money we should appropriate. It is the decision of Congress, and it will be the decision of the Executive to distribute the funds that we appropriate, using the great amount of flexibility available to the Executive in connection with this program.

I am one of those who was led to believe that this administration had adopted a policy of gradually reducing expenditures for foreign-aid purposes on the theory that after we had given a reasonable amount of arms to our friends and allies, we could expect the program to fall off in dollar volume to one that was well within the ability of the American taxpayer to stand over a long period of time. The conduct of the Eisenhower administration certainly gave us reason to anticipate that this would be the case.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a tabulation of the past appropriations, expenditures, and unexpended balances at the end of each fiscal year.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mutual-security program—Appropriations and expenditures

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Appropriations	Expenditures	Unexpended balance at end of fiscal year
1948–49	6,386.8	4,549.6	1,837.2
1950	5,173.2	3,488.7	3,521.7
1951	7,359.4	3,735.8	7,145.3
1952	7,282.3	4,532.5	9,895.1
1953	6,011.9	5,722.7	10,062.6
1954	4,723.9	4,875.4	9,564.6
1955	2,804.5	4,264.3	7,932.5
1956	2,703.5	[1] 3,770.0	[1] 6,877.7

[1] Estimated.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have asked that there be placed on each Senator's desk a copy of the same table, demonstrating what the appropriations have been through the years.

Senators will note that the amount appropriated for the foreign aid program has been steadily reduced, commencing in the year 1951 through the year 1956. Expenditures for foreign aid purposes reached their peak in the year 1953. Those expenditures have steadily declined through the year 1956. Unexpended balances for foreign aid purposes reached their peak in the fiscal year 1953 when the unexpended balance amounted to $10,062,600,000. Since that date, the unexpended balance has declined to an estimated balance of $6,887,700,000.

Now we are faced with the question, Mr. President: Are we going to continue the trend of a gradual reduction of expenditures for foreign aid purposes—a trend which has been going on for the past 3 years, or do we now propose to reverse ourselves and step up the rate of our foreign aid expenditures? Are we going to continue to reduce the billions of dollars of unexpended balances carried over from year to year or are we going to start building up those unexpended balances again?

Last year the fight was made to reduce the amount of funds requested by the President for foreign aid purposes. Some of us stood here on this floor and pointed out that if the administration's request were granted, the amount of appropriations for foreign aid purposes would greatly exceed the amount which had been appropriated in the previous year. After a bitter fight in both Houses, both on the authorization bill and the appropriation bill, we were eventually successful in reducing the foreign aid appropriations to a figure below that which we appropriated in the year 1955.

Now the same issue is presented. Recognizing the tremendous pressure of the administration for increasing the rate of foreign aid appropriations, I am not attempting to hold our authorization at a figure below that which we appropriated last year. I am only urging

that we hold the appropriation to a precise figure that the Congress appropriated for the foreign aid program last year. That figure is $2,765,875,000.

If my amendment should prevail, I am positive that it will do no harm to the overall program. It will simply indicate that we are not going to expand our rate of foreign aid, and that we are anticipating a gradual reduction of our foreign-aid spending in the future. It would result in a further decline of the unexpended balance that would be on hand at the end of the next fiscal year.

The figures furnished me by our committee indicate that expenditures for foreign aid this year will run $3,770,000,000. Assuming that my amendment should carry, the administration will start the fiscal year with $9,643,575,000 of unexpended funds. If expenditures during fiscal 1957 should be exactly the same figure as fiscal 1956, then on June 30 of next year the unexpended balance would amount to $5,873,575,000. The administration would be left with a flexibility to spend this vast sum of cash, roughly $10 billion, with a great amount of flexibility and discretion. The administration would be requested to make reductions in the military and economic aid program in those areas where it felt the reduction could best be made.

If the Appropriations Committee should so desire, it could make certain of these reductions for the administration by pinpointing certain items which have the least justification and reducing them.

The witnesses that go before the Appropriations Committee for the administration could be asked to advise the Congress wherein reductions could best be made, looking at the entire broad swath of the program.

There is no reason why the adoption of this amendment should alarm or upset any of our allies. It does not say to them that we are pulling out of NATO. It does not say we are liquidating our military obligations. It says merely that we are continuing our foreign-aid program to friendly nations situated around the earth at the same rate of appropriations as last year. It further says that we expect to continue to reduce our unexpended balances which reached their peak during the Korean war.

As a matter of fact, the adoption of this amendment does not necessarily mean that the administration would spend 5 cents less for foreign aid this year than it spent last year. For that matter, it could spend substantially more. All it means in the last analysis is that the unexpended balance, as of June 30 next year, will be less than the unexpended balance as of the present date.

Mr. President, in my view, our expenditures for foreign aid have been excessive in the past and that a considerable number of the proposals are excessive at the present times. I shall express myself with regard to certain of the items which, in my judgment, could very well be drastically reduced or even eliminated completely. The adoption of my amendment does not mean that this will happen. However, in view of my philosophy that the foreign-aid program should be reduced over a period of time, I should like to explain the reasons why certain of the proposed authorizations appear to be greater than I believe necessary.

Mr. President, since the end of World War II this Nation has expended in foreign aid sums in excess of $60 billion. In past years I have voted for a considerable portion of that figure. Every year, however, I have associated myself with that group of Senators who believe that the spending for this purpose is excessive, and that the amounts appropriated for this purpose should be reduced. It is the feeling of many of us that in many instances our Nation has expended its funds to do for others that which they are perfectly capable of doing for themselves. I am willing to assist nations to provide for their own defense against Communist aggression when they are unable to provide it for themselves. I am unwilling to vote American funds to assist foreign powers to do that which they could do for themselves, but refuse to do, even for their own defense. This draws the distinction between a proper military security program and a giveaway program which could deplete the resources of this Nation in useless and unnecessary expenditures.

I will support the foreign-aid bill which is presently before us if the sums available for that purpose are drastically reduced, to provide assistance only for those who are not capable of providing adequately for their own defense. I will not support it if the present enormous figures are maintained to do for great numbers of nations those things which they are perfectly able to do on their own behalf. Looking at the bill before us, it provides more than $700 million for European nations, in addition to the large balances of unexpended funds already available for those nations. For the most part those nations are entirely capable of paying their own way. The arguments made in prior years that we had to give necessary resources to those nations because they could not pay it themselves is no longer valid. The figures demonstrate, too, that during the past several years the nations of Europe have been accumulating cash balances of American dollars at a rate in excess of $1 billion per year.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point the table that appears on page 925 of the committee hearings which illustrate the steady increase of dollar balances on behalf of the nations of Europe.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Real value of gold and dollar reserves, 14 European countries, 1938, 1953–55

Country	1938		1953			1954			1955		
	Reserves, Dec. 31 (million dollars)	Months imports covered by reserves	Reserves, Dec. 31 (million dollars)		Months imports covered by reserves	Reserves, Dec. 31 (million dollars)		Months imports covered by reserves	Reserves, Dec. 31 (million dollars)		Months imports covered by reserves
			Current prices	Constant prices [1]		Current prices	Constant prices [1]		Current prices	Constant prices [1]	
Austria	46	2.3	238	117	5.2	329	164	6.0	324	159	4.4
Belgium-Luxembourg	828	12.7	1,098	538	5.4	1,039	517	4.9	1,198	587	5.1
Denmark	60	2.0	127	62	1.5	102	51	1.1	91	45	.9
France	2,952	26.9	1,048	514	3.0	1,358	676	3.7	2,034	997	5.2
Germany	219	1.2	1,225	600	3.9	1,998	994	5.2	2,374	1,164	4.9
Iceland	1	1.1	9	4	1.6	10	5	1.7	10	5	1.5
Italy	216	4.4	814	399	4.1	927	461	4.6	1,133	555	5.0
Netherlands	1,057	16.3	980	480	5.0	1,045	520	4.5	1,065	522	4.0
Norway	99	4.1	171	84	2.3	148	74	1.7	124	61	1.4
Portugal	86	10.1	469	230	17.1	559	278	19.1	602	295	18.1
United Kingdom	3,316	8.8	2,518	1,234	3.2	2,762	1,374	3.5	2,120	1,039	2.3
Spain	[2]	[2]	150	74	3.0	188	93	3.7	221	108	4.3
Yugoslavia	57	6.0	20	10	.6	23	11	.8	29	14	.8
Total, 14 countries	[3] 8,937	[3] 9.5	8,867	4,346	3.8	10,488	5,218	4.1	11,325	5,551	3.9

[1] Adjusted by United States export prices, index 1936–38—100.
[2] Not available.
[3] Excludes Spain.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, we have discussed the item involving aid to Yugoslavia. I believe that has been reasonably fully covered.

There is a large sum in this bill far in excess of $100 millions for military aid to Japan. Once again, Japan is a nation fully capable of providing her own arms. Japanese industry has recovered from wartime destruction with American economic aid and assistance to the extent that our textile industry is now clamoring for relief from the expanding quantities of Japanese imports. Throughout the world Japan is seriously challenging all the major trading powers. If Japan is genuinely interested in a program for mutual security, then Japan can easily provide for herself everything that is programed for delivery to that country. Otherwise, Japan could pay in its own

currency and that currency could be used to finance much of our economic aid program for Korea, Vietnam, or Taiwan.

A large portion of the funds requested in this bill are for Pakistan. Here we find that we are creating a serious problem for ourselves in our dealings with Indians. If we ship huge quantities of arms to Pakistan, the Indians become less and less friendly with us. They feel the arms will be used not to fight the Russians, but to fight Indians over the disputed Kashmir territory.

I would not question the necessity of large sums provided in the present bill for economic aid to Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. However, I very much doubt that the full amount of those funds are necessary.

Certain arguments made in support of this program should be better understood. In the first place, let us consider the argument that our aid to these many countries serves as defense of the United States. The statement has been made here that non-Communist powers have over 200 divisions which have received help from our foreign-aid program. Without questioning the accuracy of the statement, we should recognize that we have no assurance that any substantial portion of these divisions will be fighting on our side in the event that we should become involved in a war with the Soviet Union. For example, if the explosive situation in Formosa should develop into an all-out war with the use of atomic weapons, there is no reason to anticipate that any of our European allies would come to our aid. Nor could we expect Japan, Pakistan, or the SEATO powers to enter the struggle.

If the dangerous situation in Vietnam should develop into an all-out war, we have no reason to believe that any more than perhaps 15 percent of the arms we have given foreign nations will be employed in opposing the Communists. The same thing is true of Korea and Japan.

If our Intelligence Service should acquire proof beyond doubt that the Russians were about to attack us with an all-out assault using hydrogen bombs, and we should decide to strike their bases before they could destroy us, there is no reason to anticipate that any substantial number of these 200 divisions would be employed in our defense.

In other words, we have provided assistance to friendly nations to encourage them to defend themselves. We have no guaranty that these nations will come to our aid in the event that we are compelled to fight the only military power on earth that has the capabilities to engage us in a protracted struggle.

Only yesterday the Senate voted to appropriate even more funds for our Strategic Air Command than the administration thought necessary or advisable. While I supported the administration's position on that vote, I would be the first to agree that most of the foreign powers would rather see these funds spent in building American air power than spent in doing for a score of other nations things which they are well capable of doing for themselves. For example, I should imagine that the Chinese Nationalist Government on Taiwan would much have preferred that we spend an additional billion dollars in air power than to have seen us spend an additional billion dollars providing arms for Western Europe which Western Europe is capable of providing for itself. Those people know very well that American fighting power will be on their side in the event that war should break out in the Pacific. The same thing would be true of the Japanese, the Koreans, and every other power in Asia which is allied to the United States. Likewise, I should imagine that many countries of Europe associated with the free world would prefer to see America build its own defenses and its retaliatory power in priority to many of the expenditures we are making in the Asiatic area.

Nor can I agree with the argument that we abandon world leadership if we amend our foreign program to require that it make better sense. The statements that we will assist nations to provide for their own defense when they are unable to do so should be accompanied by the corollary that we will not assist nations to provide for their defense when they are fully capable of doing it for themselves.

The American people are right when they protest against a foreign policy which proceeds upon the assumption that other free human beings will not make sufficient sacrifice for their own defense.

If I tried to make a starting point for a mutual defense program, I would start with the statement of Daniel Webster, that the only persons who posses freedom are those who love it and are willing to fight for it. As an American, I would never vote to have a single American boy killed fighting for the freedom of any people who were unwilling to make proper sacrifices for their own defense. Those who would not fight for their freedom are not much of a threat to us, no matter who possesses their bodies.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield for a question.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana how much his amendment will cut from the recommendations of the committee?

Mr. LONG. The amendment would provide $2,765,000,000 of new money this year, which would be approximately $1,500,000,000 below the committee recommendations.

Mr. SMATHERS. How much money does the Senator say is now unexpended and in the pipeline going to these nations around the world?

Mr. LONG. It is $6,887,000,000.

Mr. SMATHERS. Would it be a correct statement to say that if we adopt the Senator's amendment there would still be available to the nations around the world $2,700,000,000, or whatever the sum is, plus the $6 billion referred to by the Senator?

Mr. LONG. It would total almost $10 billion as of June 30, this year.

Mr. SMATHERS. Have we spent any similar sum in the past 2 or 3 years?

Mr. LONG. No. As a matter of fact, last year we spent $3,770,000,000, slightly more than a third of the amount of money available if this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, is he not?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Did the Senator hear anything during the time of the taking of testimony of witnesses from the State Department that would indicate to him that there would be any great damage done to any of those countries if this particular amendment should be adopted?

Mr. LONG. I am sure the State Department would vigorously oppose this amendment. However, if expenditures continue at the present rate or at a rate much exceeding that amount, there would still be more than half of this amount of money available at the end of the next fiscal year. So, if we feel we should appropriate more at a later date, we can still do so. I would hope that the adoption of this amendment would be some indication that we have no intention of building up an additional dollar balance. The money to be appropriated this year amounts to almost a 70 percent increase over the amount appropriated for fiscal 1956.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it the Senator's understanding that this program in which we have been indulging for close to 10 years is supposed to diminish each year rather than to increase?

Mr. LONG. That is the burden of my argument. I feel it should be gradually reduced, and I feel that a figure of $10 billion as of the end of the year 1953, and which has now declined to $6,887 million should be gradually reduced.

If we are trying to develop a new weapon and it takes a long time to get delivery, the weapons we are giving are already standard weapons which we have in stock in large quantities in this country, and for that reason I do not think it is necessary to build up a great unexpended cash balance.

Mr. SMATHERS. In other words we can appropriate the money which the Senator asks in his amendment and add that to the unexpended balance in the pipeline; and from the evidence, as the Senator heard it, that would make a sufficient amount to carry on the programs which are now going on in these foreign countries, and if money were needed thereafter we could provide for that particular necessity?

Mr. LONG. Yes. Assuming that the administration will spend as much money next year as it spent during this year, the effect of the amendment would be that next year, instead of having a balance of $6,887,000,000, we would have an unexpended balance of $5,800,000,000, which, of course, would be a tremendous amount of money to be carried forward into the future.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. As I was saying, Mr. President, if a man has not the courage to fight for his own freedom, he is not a serious threat to me, even if he is on my enemy's team.

I am not for a moment suggesting that our European and Asiatic allies will not make the necessary sacrifices to pro-

vide adequately for their own defense. In fact, I am certain that given proper leadership they will respond. It is time we started emphasizing the fact that we are carrying a tremendous burden in Asia to resist Communist expansion, a burden which they are spared because of our tremendous sacrifices. It is time we make clear to them that the tremendous burden of our atomic stockpile and our long-range strategic bombers are available for their defense, spelling the difference between victory and quick defeat. It is time we emphasize to them the tremendous contribution we are making and make clear to them that the enormous contribution which we make requires that they should, in good faith, make a proportionate contribution. Most of the nations we are assisting are contributing a smaller portion of their gross national production to their own defense than this Nation which is not only paying its way but giving to help them.

A foreign-aid program which spends the resources of our country without driving fair bargains, without obtaining commitments from those whom we aid to assure us they will be our friends in times of adversity is not a wise approach to the expenditure of American funds, in the hope of preserving this Nation.

I have heard the statement made that it is much cheaper to maintain a foreign soldier than it is to maintain an American in uniform. Undoubtedly, that statement is true. However, that statement misleads the public. Those in charge of this program know as well as I know, that many of those who are receiving our funds for foreign-aid purposes could not be counted on for a moment to fight if the Soviet Union decided to attack the United States. I cannot blame them too much. A war between the United States and the Soviet Union would be an atomic holocaust. The destruction and the casualties would be far beyond anything ever dreamed of in history. Any nation which has the privilege of sitting on the sidelines while America takes the casualties, the deaths, and destruction in the defense of freedom would be tempted to avail itself of that opportunity. It could be easily excused for doing so, if it were one of the enormous majority who have no atomic weapons. Few countries without atomic weapons will intervene in a war between two countries who possess nuclear weapons in vast numbers.

Those conducting this program recognize that the nations receiving our aid cannot be depended upon to come to our aid if we become involved in a major war. In that respect, we all know that the whole $60 billion plus the $10 billion more on its way, may not help us defend ourselves.

We are giving this aid so those countries will be better able to defend themselves if they fall prey to aggression. We well know that it is not likely that all these arms will be used on our side. It is possible that none of them will be used on our side.

That is the risk we take. That is why for years General Bradley and other high-ranking officers told us during the early years of the program that the funds spent in this program did not reduce by a dollar the funds necessary for our own defense. We must stay strong enough to confront the greatest military power on earth alone if necessary. To take the risk that our allies will save us if we permit ourselves to become incapable of adequately defending ourselves would be foolhardy indeed.

We are helping to arm foreign nations principally because we do not want to see their people and their resources captured by aggressors and eventually used against us. We want them to remain on our side, as allies if possible; as helpful friends if not allies.

That is our purpose in giving them more than $60 billion of assistance since World War II. Yet the program should not be a one way street. We should not give them arms and economic aid merely because they will not do their share, even though they are able to do it.

It is true that the cost of maintaining a Japanese soldier is less than the cost of maintaining an American soldier. The cost of maintaining an Italian soldier, a French soldier, a Dutchman, a Belgian, or even an Englishman is less than the cost of maintaining an American soldier. Yet the fact of the matter is that every one of those countries is perfectly capable of maintaining their own soldiers.

The further fact of the matter is that we have a lot more to offer them than they have to offer us. Just to give a simple example, if I were a Belgian faced with the prospect of Russian aggression, I would know that I would have no chance whatever of successfully defending my freedom if my nation were standing alone. I would know that the United States of America is the last power on earth with which the Soviet Union would care to go to war, and I would direct my entire foreign policy toward obtaining an arrangement whereby the United States would agree to go to war in my defense provided I would go to war in the event the Soviet Union would commit suicide by attacking the United States directly. If I were clever enough to work out such an arrangement without having to agree to support the United States in the event that great Nation were forced to fight in the defense of freedom in Asia, I would feel I had driven a clever bargain, indeed. It would be something like giving a blade of grass in return for a barnful of hay.

Yet, Mr. President, our diplomats would take the attitude that, having given away the whole barnful of hay, they had made a good deal and that we had made such a fortunate arrangement we should now pay the expense of maintaining the Belgian forces, although that nation is completely capable of maintaining its own forces.

For many years our State Department had an easy excuse for its failure to drive a hard-headed bargain. Rather than place the international economic aid program on a loan basis, they contended those nations would never be able to repay. Therefore they contended that the money should be given, not loaned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana on the amendment has expired.

Mr. LONG. I ask the majority leader if he will yield me an additional half hour to enable me to finish my speech.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana 30 minutes on the bill.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, has the opposition any time on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The opposition has 30 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Who is in control of the time of the opposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time in opposition to the amendment is in the control of the minority leader.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Louisiana for an additional 30 minutes.

Mr. LONG. Looking from hindsight at the argument that the European nations could not afford to pay, we now see that those nations are accumulating dollar values at a rate exceeding $1 billion every year. Still, once in a while, they will attempt to make the argument that the economic condition of those countries is such that they cannot afford to pay their way, notwithstanding the fact that their production is now 45 percent above prewar level.

This brings me to one of our historic mistakes in giving away $17 billion to Europe under the Marshall plan. If Europe did not need the money badly enough to agree to repay it even in soft currencies when the war damages had been repaired, then they did not need it badly enough to justify our giving $17 billion of the resources of our people.

The program for economic aid should become a loan program rather than a grant program. If we had used this good judgment in the beginning, we would have available over $17 billion owed to us by the nations of Western Europe. If those nations did not have the dollars with which to pay it, it would have been reasonable for us to permit them to pay in their own currencies and to have used that vast quantity of funds to finance the economic development of the backward and less fortunate countries of Africa, Asia, and Central and South America. In this manner we could have avoided a great portion of the cost that will eventually fall upon us as we strive to assist backward nations to better their conditions.

At this late date our program of economic assistance has been shifted to place emphasis upon loans rather than grants. We have been willing to accept foreign currencies in payment for agricultural commodities and in repayment of our obligations owed to this country as a result of our economic asssitance in certain cases. The countries which are presently receiving economic assistance are, for the most part, much less able to repay the loans than many of the Marshall plan countries would have been. This could have been a vast program of enlightened capitalism in which the funds available could have been used over and over again to assist free peoples to realize their aspirations under the capitalistic system.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield for a question.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator tell me which parts of the program would be cut if the amendment went into effect? Would the amendment affect military or nonmilitary expenditures? Would it affect technical assistance? The programs of which countries would be affected?

Mr. LONG. That would be entirely at the discretion of the administration. Large balances would be carried over, and there would be an additional $2,765,000,000. The administration would make the decision as to the parts of the program to which the funds should not apply.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for an observation?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. To answer further the question asked by my good friend from Massachusetts, with respect to the program for military assistance in Europe there was an unexpended balance of $3,346,848,000 as of February 29, 1956.

Mr. KENNEDY. That program is obligated; is it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is money which is unexpended. It is in the reserve.

The bill as presently drafted, as proposed by the administration, asks for an additional $760,471,000 only for Europe.

As I tried to demonstrate early this afternoon, all of the countries of Western Europe are more or less able to take care of themselves, the same as we are. But what the countries of Western Europe will have for military purposes only will be in excess of $4 billion if the bill shall be enacted as it is proposed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, continuing my point about economic aid, under the circumstances, we are in for a severe disappointment if we ask any of those whom we helped most liberally to make a major contribution now in assisting others less fortunate than they.

The one country which has led the way from an economic point of view, the hope of all Europe today, is the one country which has been given the least. I have in mind West Germany. That nation suffered greater damage than any of the Western Powers. It paid the tremendous expenses of the cost of maintaining the occupation troops of foreign powers on German soil. It did all of this and rebuilt its country at the same time. While we were being told France would collapse, Italy would sink into the Mediterranean, and Britain would disappear if we did not shell out billions of dollars to assist those powers, the Germans went to work, paid for the support of troops maintained on German soil by Britain, France, and the United States, cared for untold thousands of human wretches who walked out from behind the Iron Curtain to live for years on little better than bread and water until the Government could find a place for them in the West German economy, and emerged one of the proud nations of the earth.

That is what Germany did without any of the material benefit of the $60 billion give away. She did not have the United States to do it for her, so she did it herself. There is not much doubt in my mind that Germany would do a lot more for herself today except for the demoralizing effect of those voices which say, "Don't pay. Don't put up your share, because if you drag your feet the United States will pick up the check."

It should encourage the Germans to rearm if this nation were to make it clear that we will not indefinitely extend the protection of our arms to foreign powers unless they are willing to take reasonable measures to provide for their own defense. I am aware of the tremendous difficulties facing the Germans at this time. It is a difficult decision for them to make, that they should arm, in view of the fact that the Russians control East Germany. Nevertheless, the amount of funds in the bill for Germany is small indeed. If the Germans are willing to arm their country, they are the kind of people who will do their share unless they are led to believe that they can get the benefit of mutual protection by contributing much less than their share.

We are learning in Iceland about the lack of judgment in our foreign policy, insofar as that country is concerned.

In 1952, I visited Iceland as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and I wrote a report concerning that trip through the North Atlantic area. I made the point that the presence of so fantastic a number of American men in a country so sparsely populated would create resentments and misunderstandings. I further pointed out that the presence of foreign troops on any nation's soil is resented in time of peace.

At that time I opposed the concept of maintaining American soldiers on Iceland to defend Iceland, in view of the fact that the Icelanders did not have an army themselves. It was my theory that the ground defense of the land on which the base was situated should be provided by soldiers of that country.

I recall an Army request that this Nation should provide housing and facilities to maintain an Army contingent with well-equipped weapons, including heavy tanks, near the Iceland capital in order that this Nation could rush its soldiers there in the event the local Communists should rise up against the government of Iceland. It was my reaction that our program should stress to Iceland that it remain free and that the cities of Reykjavik, Keflavik, and the other populated areas of that island should be defended by Icelanders. If they needed reinforcements, they should be rushed there from England or the United States. The presence of large numbers of American soldiers living under frigid conditions in 24 hours of darkness during the winter and the low temperatures and high winds of that area could only establish in the Icelanders our distrust of their basic patriotism.

Our foreign policy failed to strengthen the slightest conviction in the Icelanders that we were interested in them as people, and in their heritage and tradition of pride, courage, and freedom. Now we are reaping the harvest of a failure to understand the essential human dignities of the free people of Iceland. What is true of Iceland is true of other parts of the world.

Mr. President, there has never been a phase of United States activity, with the possible exception of UNRRA, where funds have been spent more loosely or accounted for with less responsibility than the foreign aid program. Although we have attempted to make order out of chaos, to find out what we had spent and what we had not spent, what we had on hand and what we did not have on hand, that which was obligated and that which was not obligated, we have wound up without the facts and with a feeling of frustration.

Here is the program of expending our resources to assist foreign nations. Above all others, it is the one in which funds should be most scrupulously accounted for. Instead, it heads the list as number one in loose bookkeeping, slipshod accounting, juggling, and losing contact with vast unexpended balances. For example, last year, at a time when those who were insisting on the high figure of the foreign aid bill were fighting in conference to make available to our allies and neutral powers the greatest possible figure, there was discovered a $500 million balance which no one knew existed. Imagine, out of the clear blue someone shows up with $500 million which no one knew was on hand.

My proposed amendment is very simple. It simply undertakes to hold the executive branch of the Government to the informal assurance they have been giving Congress for years. They have been implying that eventually they were going to cut down the rate of foreign giveaways. They have been suggesting that sometime in the foreseeable future we could expect to see the foreign aid program reduced to a figure which would not be too burdensome for the taxpayers.

This amendment simply says that we will appropriate as much money for foreign aid this year, no more, as last year. No more, just the same amount. The administration is requesting $4.7 billion of new money for the foreign aid program. This is $1.9 billion more than it requested last year. My amendment simply says that we will hold to the figure we appropriated last year, which was $2,765,875,000. There is already on hand $6,877,700,000 unexpended. This will leave our friends and those who are not our friends but are receiving our aid, with an unexpended sum of $9,643,575,000 to go along with $60 billions that we have given them already.

If we should find we have made a mistake and someone shows up with a new idea that somewhere else additional resources can be given away to our advantage, we will have plenty of time to grasp the opportunity next year. There is not an item in the program which requires long lead time. As a matter of fact, one of the most frequently used arguments for the high figures of foreign aid relates to the assumption that we are simply giving away obsolete American weapons anyway. Of course, the argument is erroneous. Most of the weapons we are giving are standard for our services. For example, the rifles are American Garand rifles, which I regard as the best in the world. If they are not the best, at least we regard them as the best we can provide our own soldiers. The 90 mm. general purpose artillery, our 105 and 155 mm. howitzers, our ammunition, our

electronics equipment, are all still standard for American services. The trucks, tanks and other armored equipment we are giving are of the same type our own soldiers use. Even the planes we are giving were the best we had 2 or 3 years ago.

While we are not giving away obsolete equipment, as some people would lead one to believe when it suits their purpose, the fact is that items we are giving are standard equipment generally available throughout our services which have been coming off our production lines for a great number of years. Additional quantities of these materials can be produced on short notice. I know, for example, that the type of ammunition which is being supplied is being produced in large quantities in the State I have the honor, in part, to represent. Most of the production lines at our shell loading plants are today closed. If we should find that some foreign power runs low on these items, we can supply vast quantities of it on short notice. For this reason, there is no need of carrying tremendous unexpended balances.

If my amendment is adopted, it will be possible for the administration to continue to carry the same program at about the same rate they are now spending money. I would hope, however, that the effect of the adoption of this amendment would be to place the administration on notice that the program must be restudied. The taxpayers are getting tired, indeed, of such a tremendous expenditure for a program, many parts of which are of such doubtful value. Perhaps the adoption of this amendment will lead to an eventual reduction of expenditures for purposes of foreign aid, which will bring this phase of our burden to a point our public is willing to sustain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has control of the remainder of his time.

Mr. LONG. I am in control only of the time yielded to me. I will reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, has not the time of the Senator from Louisiana on the amendment expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct. The time of the Senator from Louisiana on the amendment has expired, but he was yielded an additional 30 minutes on the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am in control of the time in opposition, and I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I have no prepared speech, and I had not intended speaking on this subject. I listened very attentively to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. In my section of the country, Ohio and the Middle West, foreign aid is very unpopular. As a matter of fact, the people of that area definitely do not like foreign aid. They do not like this program. And I do not like foreign aid any more than my constituents do. But they do have a great respect for President Eisenhower; indeed, the most popular figure in American public life in my part of the country, during my lifetime, has been President Eisenhower.

President Eisenhower did not create the situation with which we are faced today. As general of the American forces in World War II, he did a tremendous job. As a military leader he performed one of the greatest services that has ever been performed in the annals of our history—in fact, in all history.

I know of no man who is better informed regarding the problems of the world than is the man who has had the experience President Eisenhower has had in fighting wars. Certainly, President Eisenhower is not a warlike individual. He is a man of peace, a quiet, unassuming man, a man who has no disposition to rattle sabers or issue challenges to other nations. I believe the President knows what he is doing.

The Senator from Louisiana speaks of an unexpended balance of $6,877,000,000. In private life I am the president of an insurance company. I believe in insurance, and I believe in taking out insurance. I know that, on the basis of his own figures, the President has not been wasting money. The President has had balances every year, indicating that he is not wasting money; indicating that, of course, he is interested in preserving the taxpayers' money.

I remember when President Truman left his office. He presented a budget and he said it could not be cut 15 cents. President Eisenhower cut it by $10 billion. Under the circumstances, I know President Eisenhower does not want to spend money foolishly.

I also wish to say I know we could not have a better man at the helm than we have today in the White House. He is endeavoring to save all the money it is possible to save.

New world conditions are created as a result of new instruments of warfare. As I understand, the enemy has all the information concerning the new military weapons we have because, under previous administration, spies were enabled to get hold of secret information on weapons. Certainly, we know that colonialism is going out the window everywhere in the world. We know that new situations are being created.

I have to run for office in Ohio this year. I am running against a part-time Democrat, and a part-time everything else; but I want to say that I believe in President Eisenhower. I believe he knows what he is doing. I believe that he understands what the problem is, and I trust him, and I know that the $6,877,000,000 will not be spent unless absolutely necessary. That is insurance money; and we need to have it on hand, because we do not know from day to day what is in store for us. Under the circumstances, I think for us to limit an expenditure of this kind at this time would be the most hazardous and unfortunate thing we could possibly do.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. How about the $40 billion given away under President Truman? Did the Senator have the same confidence in President Truman that he has in the present administration?

Mr. BENDER. What $40 billion? He gave away so much money I do not know what the Senator from Louisiana refers to.

Mr. LONG. Let us start with $17 billion under the Marshall Plan.

Mr. BENDER. So far as giving money away is concerned, we gave away more at Potsdam, Teheran, and Yalta. We won the war on the battlefields, and gave it away at those conferences. I say as a result of giving away to Russia the countries of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Latvia, China, and other areas, we are now faced with this problem.

Frankly, we cannot afford to be narrow and provincial in a matter that affects our security. Frankly, so far as we are concerned, we are in this all by ourselves. I am sure the Senator understands we have part-time friends, just as there are part-time Democrats. We have part-time friends. France has 5 million Communists—voting Communists; 40 percent of the members of her Parliament are members of the Communist Party.

But we need France as our friend. We need some of the other foreign countries as our friends. Under the circumstances, we have to deal with them, and we must be realistic about the situation. We cannot be narrow and provincial about it.

I know I may be saying things of which my constituents possibly do not approve; but I believe in President Eisenhower. I believe he is a man of peace. Regardless of what may be said about what happened at Geneva, our President did a terrific job at Geneva. All the world had been propagandized by the Communists to the effect that we were a warlike nation, a nation which was interested in seizing another's property; but President Eisenhower, as a man of peace, appeared at the conference and announced our philosophy and our Christian point of view. He did a terrific job for all the people of the world, and especially for the United States of America.

We have no desire to seize anyone's property, but certainly we need to have insurance; and the money that is in the "kitty," the $6,877,000,000, is insurance money. I am sure that President Eisenhower, except for that part which has been committed, does not want to spend a nickel of it unless it is absolutely necessary.

I want to say very emphatically that I agree very strongly with the view that we ought to be realistic about the matter. When we have a leader we respect, when we have a leader who has been through the wars our President has been through, we have to follow his judgment; and this is his judgment.

He is asking for this amount, not because he wants to spend the taxpayer's money. He saved $10 billion in the first year, as compared to his predecessor's budget. He does not want to spend a nickel. Possibly the money we shall appropriate will not be spent at all. I hope not. But so long as communism is on the march, as obviously it is, so long as Tito and other dictators are on the march in the world, we need to be realistic, and we need to follow some leadership.

Obviously, the Foreign Relations Committee of this body felt very deeply about this problem, and supported the proposed program. So far as the unexpended balance is concerned, I hope not only that the unexpended balance will be left there, but that the money appropriated will remain in the "kitty" and will not be spent.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Of the funds appropriated, $31 billion was appropriated under Truman, and only $8 billion was appropriated under Eisenhower. All I am advocating is that President Eisenhower continue to do what he has been doing—gradually draw down the balances left on hand by President Truman.

Mr. BENDER. I am sure the distinguished Senator feels very much about President Eisenhower as I do, and I am sure that in the statement the Senator has just made, he compliments President Eisenhower.

Mr. President, I wish to say that so long as we have some responsible person running this show and in charge of our Government, we are not afraid of what the result will be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 5 minutes to me, also?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not understand how the Senator from Louisiana has any time to yield. He spoke his full 30 minutes on the amendment, and additional time was yielded to him, but not for his allocation to other Senators, as I understand. Otherwise, the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered into would amount to nothing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senator from Louisiana reserved 22 minutes of his time, to be allocated later.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana exhausted his full time on his amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then let him submit another amendment, and obtain time in that way.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well; he may do so.

Mr. President, additional time on the bill was yielded to the Senator from Louisiana, but certainly that is not time which he is at liberty to allot to other Senators; and I raise the point of order that he cannot do so.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have 22 minutes remaining, and I should like to use 1 of my 22 minutes; and——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair rule on the point of order which has been raised by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to speak to the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for that purpose.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, at the time when the pending unanimous-consent agreement was proposed, I had serious doubts as to whether I should agree to it. I explained to the majority leader or to his representative that I disliked the idea of allowing the proponents of the bill to have an entire day of debate in which to make their case to the Nation, and thereafter, under the provisions of the then proposed unanimous-consent agreement, to have 1½ hours on the bill, in addition to half an hour on each amendment or motion. Nevertheless, to accommodate the Senators who wished to have the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, I was willing to go along with the proposal. It was my understanding, however, that there would be an opportunity for all Senators who wished to do so to speak both on any amendment or motion which might be submitted—in which case under the provisions of the unanimous-consent agreement, any such Senator offering an amendment would be subject to a one-half hour limitation—and on the question of the final passage of the bill under unanimous-consent agreement there would be a total of 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority leaders. I so stated, Mr. President, at that time; and it was then that the representative of the majority leader in return for the cooperation shown him, agreed that I would be yielded additional time in connection with the amendment which I wished to offer, which is one of the most significant amendments.

It is true that from a strict parliamentary point of view, a point of order could be made, namely, that I should request the majority leader to yield me 30 minutes on the bill before I commence to speak on the amendment. If some Senator wishes to take advantage of that situation, after Senators on the other side have used their full amount of time, and in that way cut us off, perhaps such Senators could take that advantage of the parliamentary situation.

However, all we wish is to have a chance to be heard.

My senior colleague [Mr. ELLENDER] would like to speak for 5 or 10 minutes; and then the junior Senator from Mississippi would like to be heard on the bill; and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would like to be heard on the amendment. Not one of them cares to speak longer than 10 minutes.

We have accommodated ourselves to the wishes of the Senators who had the entire first day to support the bill, and who since then have had half of the time under the provisions of the unanimous-consent agreement, an opportunity to discuss each amendment under the one-half hour limitation, as well as an opportunity to discuss the bill, under the limitation of 1½ hours to each side.

Therefore, Mr. President, under these circumstances I hope such Senators will be sufficiently tolerant to permit us to speak on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the point of order which has been raised by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Chair will state that it is the understanding of the Chair that the majority leader yielded to the Senator from Louisiana 30 minutes, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered; and the Chair understands, further, that the Senator from Louisiana has remaining approximately 22 minutes.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as printed on the first page of the calendar of business, and as agreed to by all Senators, including the leadership on both sides, specifically states, in the second paragraph:

> *Ordered further,* That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal. (June 27, 1956.)

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I rise to a point of information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. LONG. Have I the right to yield 5 minutes of the time remaining to me to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from California has yielded 5 minutes to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct, Mr. President.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada asked me to yield to him 5 minutes of the time remaining to me. Do I have the right to do so?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that the Senator from Louisiana has that right.

Mr. LONG. Then, Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes of my time to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], in addition to the 5 minutes yielded to him by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized for a total of 10 minutes.

RECKLESS EXPENDITURE OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY VERSUS COMMON SENSE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, during the Marshal plan debates on the floor of the Senate, in March and April of 1949, I listed 97 trade agreements between Soviet Russia and her Communist satellites and the so-called free-world countries to which we have been extending foreign aid under the guise of deterring communism.

I said in those early debates that through foreign aid we were helping to arm Russia and her satellites by providing the nations of Europe with money and industries to produce goods for the Iron Curtain countries.

Under these trade pacts they are committed to supply such goods as Russia and her satellites wish to buy and to maintain trade with the Communists. It is a Tinkers-to-Evers-to-Chance proposition.

We furnish the aid to foreign countries. They produce goods. Goods which they cannot sell in this country

they sell to Russia; and all of them have been doing it.

MORE FOREIGN AID: MORE FOREIGN TRADE PACTS WITH RUSSIA

What has happened is that the more foreign aid we grant each year, and the longer we grant foreign aid, the more the countries being aided by us sign trade pacts with Russia and her satellites.

There are now 196 such pacts, according to the latest list, supplied me at my request by the International Cooperation Administration—100 more than the number existing only several years ago—in fact, more than double that number.

It is a very interesting list. Several new Communist satellites not in the previous list have been added, and many more of our non-Communist friends and allies, to whom we have given billions of taxpayers' dollars, have also been added.

TWENTY-FIVE FOREIGN AID BENEFICIARIES NOW HAVE TRADE PACTS WITH RUSSIA

Whatever effect our foreign aid has had on deterring communism, it has certainly expanded Red trade with the countries on our hand-out list, and has encouraged new trade pacts and treaties.

From this new list, I find that Russia now has trade pacts with 25 nations on our side of the Iron Curtain, 16 more than when I addressed the Senate in 1949.

Actually there are only 24, because the International Cooperation Administration mistakenly includes Yugoslavia among the so-called free-world countries, and of course Russia has a trade pact with her. I call Yugoslavia a communist nation, but I presume the ICA prefers to list her on the free world side because the ICA has been extending huge foreign aid bounties to Yugoslavia, and intends to continue to do so under the bill now before us.

Other countries with which Russia has trade pacts are:

In Europe—Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland—which has received a considerable amount of aid from us, and now wishes to kick us out; also Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland. All these countries have trade treaties with Russia, some of them with dates as recent as this year, 1956.

In the Western Hemisphere, Russia has trade agreements with Argentina, Uruguay, Canada; in the Near East and Africa, with Egypt, Iran, Israel, Lebanon, Syria, and Yemen; in South and Southeast Asia, with Afghanistan, Burma, and India.

Among the satellites, we find Albania with two trade pacts—with Italy and Yugoslavia.

Bulgaria has trade pacts with Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, West Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Yugoslavia, and the United Kingdom, all of which have been receiving foreign aid in varying degrees, and presumably will continue to do so. Bulgaria also has trade pacts with Egypt, Israel, Burma, India, and Indonesia.

Finland, Yugoslavia, Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, India, and Indonesia have trade pacts with Red China; and Japan has one also, which the International Cooperation Administration describes as nongovernmental.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA MEMBER OF GATT AND ALSO PARTY TO 33 PACTS

Communist Czechoslovakia has more trade pacts than any other Red satellite—33. They are with Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, West Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Yugoslavia, and the United Kingdom, in Europe; with Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Paraguay, Uruguay, in Latin America; with Afghanistan, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iran, Lebanon, Sudan, and Syria, in Africa; and with Burma, Ceylon, India, and Indonesia, in South and Southeast Asia.

In addition to these trade pacts, I should also remind the Senate that Communist Czechoslovakia is a member in good standing in the Geneva General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, comprising 35 governments, including the United States. It is through GATT that, during recent weeks, our State Department has been carrying on its negotiations to reduce tariffs, and with such unfortunate and foreboding results to numerous United States industries.

Communist East Germany is listed as being linked with Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, West Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Colombia, Uruguay, Egypt, Lebanon, Sudan, Syria, Burma, India and Indonesia in trade pacts of one kind or another.

Communist Hungary has trade pacts with Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, the German Federal Republic or West Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Iran, Israel, Sudan, Syria, Burma, India and Indonesia.

FOREIGN AID EXTENDED TO MANY NATIONS IN TRADE TREATIES WITH POLAND

Poland, next to Czechoslovakia, has more trade pacts with non-Communist nations than any other country under the Red flag. She has trade pacts with Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, the German Federal Republic, Greece, Iceland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, Egypt, Iran, Israel, Lebanon, Sudan, Syria, Burma, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, and Pakistan.

Rumania has pacts with Australia, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, German Federal Republic, Greece, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Yugoslavia, Egypt, Israel, Lebanon, Burma, Ceylon, India and Indonesia.

Even the new Communist Government of Vietnam has a trade pact now with France, from whom the country was wrested by the Communists.

"FREE WORLD" TRADE PACTS WITH REDS IN 1949 AND 1956 LISTED

Mr. President, for purposes of comparison, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the list of foreign-aided countries having trade agreements with Iron Curtain countries, which I introduced in the RECORD in 1949; and the list of such trade pacts today as supplied to me by the International Cooperation Administration on May 25, 1956.

There being no objection, the lists were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Commercial agreements between OEEC countries and countries of Eastern Europe—1949

Partners	Period	Special provisions
France-Finland	May 1948–49, supplemented November 1948	
France-Czechoslovakia	August 1948–49	
France-Hungary	November 1947–48, extended to Apr. 30, 1949	
France-Rumania	July 1946 to completion	
France-Yugoslavia	May–December 1948	
France-Bulgaria	June 1947–48, presumably continued	
France-Poland	January–December 1949	Investment agreement; March 1948–52.
Belgium-Finland	November 1948–49	
Belgium-Czechoslovakia	March 1948–49	
Belgium-Hungary	April 1947–May 1948	
Belgium-Rumania	September 1948–49	
Belgium-Yugoslavia	do	
Belgium-Bulgaria	April 1947–48	
Belgium-Poland	Nov. 1, 1948–Dec. 31, 1949	
Belgium-U. S. S. R.	January–December 1948	(Some Belgian deliveries for 1949.)
Belgium-Soviet zone, Germany	November 1947–48	
Netherlands-Finland	June 1948–49, supplemented September 1948	
Netherlands-Czechoslovakia	January–December 1948, prolonged to March 1949	
Netherlands-Hungary	January–December 1949	
Netherlands-Rumania	February 1948	Preliminary agreement; Rumanian but not Netherlands deliveries specified.
Netherlands-Yugoslavia	February 1948–51; annual quotas supplemented November 1948	Investment agreement.
Netherlands-Bulgaria	November 1948–49	
Netherlands-Poland	January–December 1948	1947–49 investment agreement, revised March and July 1948.
Netherlands-U. S. S. R.	June 1948–53 (most items for 1 year delivery)	Investment agreement.
Netherlands-Soviet zone, Germany	June 1948–49	

Commercial agreements between OEEC countries and countries of Eastern Europe—1949—Continued

Partners	Period	Special provisions
Norway-Finland	November 1948–49	
Norway-Czechoslovakia	March 1948–49	
Norway-Hungary	November 1947–48	
Norway-Yugoslavia	April 1948–49	
Norway-Poland	January–December 1949	
Norway-U. S. S. R.	do	
Norway-Soviet zone, Germany	do	
Sweden-Finland	February 1948–49	
Sweden-Czechoslovakia	November 1947–48	
Sweden-Hungary	October 1948–49	
Sweden-Yugoslavia	April 1948–49	April 1947–51 investment agreement.
Sweden-Bulgaria	October 1947–Dec. 31, 1948	
Sweden-Poland	May 1948–49	March 1947–51 investment agreement.
Sweden-U. S. S. R.	January–December 1948	October 1946–51 investment agreement.
Sweden-Soviet zone, Germany	July 1948–49, supplemented December 1948	
Denmark-Finland	January–December 1948; November 1948 supplemented extends and expands agreement to May 1, 1949.	
Denmark-Czechoslovakia	September 1948–49	
Denmark-Hungary	October 1947–48	
Denmark-Yugoslavia	July 1947–48	
Denmark-Bulgaria	May 1947–48	
Denmark-Poland	October 1948–49	
Denmark-U. S. S. R.	July 1948–Dec. 31, 1949	
Switzerland-Finland	September 1948–Feb. 28, 1950	
Switzerland-Czechoslovakia	October 1948–49	
Switzerland-Hungary	do	
Switzerland-Rumania	March 1947–50; annual quotas	
Switzerland-Yugoslavia	October 1948–53; annual quotas	Investment agreement.
Switzerland-Bulgaria	January–December 1947	
Switzerland-Poland	January–December 1948; revised June 1948	Investmend orders; delivery to 1952.
Switzerland-U. S. S. R.	April 1948–49	Investment orders; delivery to 1951.
Switzerland-Soviet zone, Germany	July 1947–48	
Austria-Czechoslovakia	August 1948–June 30, 1949	
Austria-Hungary	January–December 1948, supplemented September 1948	
Austria-Yugoslavia	September 1948–49	
Austria-Bulgaria	October 1948–49	
Austria-Poland	August 1948–49	
Italy-Czechoslovakia	September 1948–49	
Italy-Hungary	December 1948–49	
Italy-Yugoslavia	November 1947–48	1947–52 investment agreement.
Italy-Bulgaria	November 1948–49	Investment deliveries may be authorized.
Italy-Poland	January–December 1948, revised April 1948; extended to 2 months.	October 1946–50 investment agreement.
Italy-U. S. S. R.	December 1948–49	December 1948–51 investment agreement.
Italy-Soviet zone, Germany	July–December 1947	
Greece-Czechoslovakia	August 1948–49	
Iceland-Finland	July 1948–49	
Iceland-Czechoslovakia	March–December 1948 extended to Feb. 28, 1949	
Iceland-Poland	July 1948–Dec. 31, 1949	
(Iceland-U. S. S. R.)	(May 1946–47 agreement not renewed in 1948)	
Western Germany-Finland	July–December 1948	
Western Germany-Czechoslovakia	October 1948–49	
Western Germany-Hungary	August 1948–49	
Western Germany-Yugoslavia	April–September 1948, automatically renewable	
Western Germany-Bulgaria	October–December 1947, automatically renewable	
Western Germany-Poland	January–December 1949	
Turkey-Finland	June 1948–49	No quotas scheduled.
Turkey-Czechoslovakia	December 1946–Apr. 1, 1948, automatically renewable to Mar. 31, 1949.	Do.
Turkey-Yugoslavia	September 1947–48	Do.
Turkey-Poland	August 1948–49	Do.
United Kingdom-Finland	January–December 1949	
United Kingdom-Czechoslovakia	November 1945	Payments only.
United Kingdom-Hungary	August 1948–49	
United Kingdom-Yugoslavia	October 1948–49	
United Kingdom-Poland	January 1949–53, annual quotas	Investment agreement; not all goods have annual quotas.
United Kingdom-U. S. S. R.	December 1947–51; U. S. S. R. deliveries, February–September 1948; United Kingdom deliveries, 1948–51.	Investment agreement.
Total (88).		

Most recent commercial agreements between OEEC countries and Spain

Partners	Period	Special provisions
France-Spain	May 1948–49 revised November 1948	
Netherlands-Spain	November 1948–May 1949	
Sweden-Spain	July 1948–49	
Denmark-Spain	March 1948–49	
Switzerland-Spain	December 1947–48, prolonged to Mar. 31, 1949	
Italy-Spain	July 1948–49	
Bizone-Spain	January–December 1949	
United Kingdom-Spain	June 1948–April 1949 revised December	No quotas.
Ireland-Spain	September 1947–48	
Total (9)		

LATEST TRADE AND/OR PAYMENTS AGREEMENTS IN EFFECT BETWEEN COUNTRIES OF THE SOVIET BLOC AND THE FREE WORLD DURING 1955 AND 1956 [1]

A. UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

I. Europe

Austria: "October 17, 1955, to October 16, 1960."

Belgium: "February 18, 1948–indefinite."

Denmark: May 15, 1956 to May 14, 1958.

Finland: January 1, 1956 to December 31, 1956.

France: January 1, 1956 to December 31, 1956.

Greece: July 28, 1955 to December 31, 1956.

Iceland: January 1, 1956 to December 31, 1956.

Italy: January 1, 1956 to December 31, 1956.

Netherlands: July 2, 1948–indefinite.

Norway: January 1, 1956 to December 31, 1956.

Sweden: January 1, 1956 to December 31, 1956.

Switzerland: "April 1, 1948–indefinite."

Yugoslavia: January 1, 1956 to December 31, 1956.

II. Western Hemisphere

Argentina: January 1, 1955 to December 31, 1955.

Uruguay: "July 28, 1954, to July 27, 1956."

Canada: "February 29, 1956, to February 28, 1959."

III. Near East and Africa

Afghanistan: July 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956.

Egypt: March 27, 1955, to March 26, 1956.

Iran: April 1, 1955, to March 31, 1956.

Israel: "February 18, 1954—indefinite (payments only)."

Lebanon: September 11, 1955, to September 10, 1956.

Syria: "April 3, 1955, to April 2, 1957."

Yemen: March 8, 1956.

[1] Based on information available through May 18, 1956. Quoted data indicates first postwar agreement. Data in parentheses indicate date of signature; exact duration not specified.

IV. South and southeast Asia

Burma: July 1, 1955, to June 30, 1960.
India: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956.

B. ALBANIA

I. Europe

Italy: "October 1, 1955, to September 30, 1956."
Yugoslavia: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956.

C. BULGARIA

I. Europe

Austria: November 1, 1955, to October 31, 1956.
Belgium: "April 21, 1947"; extended to April 1956.
Denmark: "January 28, 1948"; extended to January 27, 1956.
Finland: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956.
France: July 28, 1955, to July 27, 1956.
German Federal Republic: April 1, 1955, to March 31, 1956.
Greece: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956.
Italy: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956.
Netherlands: "June 15, 1947"; extended to December 31, 1955.
Norway: December 2, 1955, to May 31, 1957.
Sweden: April 1, 1955, to March 31, 1956.
Switzerland: January 1, 1955, to December 31, 1955.
Turkey: "March 10, 1955, to March 9, 1956."
United Kingdom: "September 23, 1955, to December 31, 1957."
Yugoslavia: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956.

II. Near East and Africa

Egypt: March 17, 1956—3 years.
Israel: "December 20, 1954, to December 31, 1955."

III. South and southeast Asia

Burma: "May 16, 1956"—1 year.
India: April 18, 1956, to December 31, 1959.
Indonesia: "December 14, 1954."

D. COMMUNIST CHINA

I. Europe

Finland: May 1, 1955 to April 30, 1956.
Yugoslavia: (February 17, 1956) to December 31, 1956.

II. Near East and Africa

Egypt: (April 16, 1956)—1 year.
Lebanon: "(December 31, 1955)"—1 year.
Syria: "(November 30, 1955)"—1 year.

III. South and southeast Asia

Burma: December 29, 1955 to December 28, 1956.
Cambodia: "(April 24, 1956)."
Ceylon: January 1, 1956 to December 31, 1956.
India: October 14, 1954 to October 13, 1956.
Indonesia: January 4, 1954; extended to July 31, 1956.

IV. Far East

Japan: May 4, 1955 to May 31, 1956 (nongovernmental).

E. CZECHOSLOVAKIA

I. Europe

Austria: January 1, 1956 to December 31, 1956.
Belgium: April 1, 1956 to March 31, 1957.
Denmark: June 1, 1955 to May 31, 1956.
Finland: January 1, 1956 to December 31, 1956.
France: July 1, 1955 to June 30, 1956.
German Federal Republic: January 1, 1956 to December 31, 1956.
Greece: January 1, 1956 to December 31, 1956.
Iceland: September 1, 1955 to August 31, 1956.
Italy: "July 2, 1947"; extended to September 30, 1955.
Netherlands: February 1, 1956 to January 31, 1957.
Norway: January 1, 1956 to December 31, 1956.
Portugal: "March 1, 1956, to February 28, 1957."
Sweden: August 1, 1955 to October 31, 1956.
Switzerland: April 21, 1955 to December 31, 1956.
Turkey: July 1, 1954 to June 30, 1955.
United Kingdom: August 19, 1949; extended to August 18, 1956 (payments only).
Yugoslavia: January 1, 1956 to December 31, 1956.

II. Western Hemisphere

Argentina: February 11, 1955 to February 10, 1958.
Brazil: May 17, 1955 to May 16, 1956.
Mexico: November 9, 1949 to December 31, 1954; annual tacit renewal.
Paraguay: "November 15, 1953, to November 14, 1954"; annual tacit renewal.
Uruguay: (September 12, 1955)—3 years.

III. Near East and Africa

Afghanistan: "(August 22, 1954)"—1 year.
Egypt: July 19, 1955, to July 31, 1956.
Ethiopia: "April 25, 1956)."
Iran: (January 1955).
Lebanon: November 20, 1954, to November 19, 1955.
Sudan: (May 20, 1955)—indefinite.
Syria: March 27, 1953, to March 26, 1954; annual tacit renewal.

IV. South and southeast Asia

Burma: February 14, 1955, to January 31, 1958; supplement (May 26, 1955).
Ceylon: (December 16, 1955) trade. (March 13, 1956) payments.
India: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956.
Indonesia: July 15, 1955, to July 14, 1956.

F. GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

I. Europe

Austria: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956 (nongovernmental).
Belgium: February 1, 1956, to January 1, 1957 (nongovernmental).
Finland: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956.
France: March 1, 1955, extended to June 30, 1956 (nongovernmental).
German Federal Republic: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956 (nongovernmental).
Greece: January 1, 1955, to December 31, 1955 (nongovernmental).
Iceland: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956 (nongovernmental).
Italy: January 1, 1955, to December 31, 1955 (nongovernmental).
Netherlands: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956 (nongovernmental).
Norway: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956 (nongovernmental).
Portugal: "March 1, 1956, to February 28, 1957" (nongovernmental).
Sweden: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956 (nongovernmental).
Turkey: May 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956 (nongovernmental).
Yugoslavia: August 25, 1954, to June 30, 1955 (supplement, September 22, 1955), extended to June 30, 1956 (nongovernmental).

II. Western Hemisphere

Argentina: "January 1, 1955, to December 31, 1955" (nongovernmental).
Colombia: February 14, 1955, to March (nongovernmental).
Uruguay: "June 29, 1954, to June 28, 1955" (nongovernmental).

III. Near East and Africa

Egypt: November 10, 1955, to December 31, 1956.
Lebanon: (November 12, 1955)—5 years.
Sudan: July 10, 1955, to December 31, 1956.
Syria: "April 17, 1956, to April 16, 1957."

IV. South and southeast Asia

Burma: February 27, 1955—3 years.
India: "October 16, 1954, to October 15, 1955."
Indonesia: June 9, 1954, to December 31, 1955 (nongovernmental).

G. HUNGARY

I. Europe

Austria: September 1, 1955, to August 31, 1956.
Belgium: February 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957.
Denmark: March 1, 1956, to February 28, 1957.
Finland: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956.
France: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956.
German Federal Republic: February 1, 1956—indefinite (payments); July 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956 (trade).
Greece: May 3, 1955, to December 31, 1955.
Iceland: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956.
Italy: April 1, 1956, to March 31, 1957.
Netherlands: To March 31, 1957.
Norway: February 1, 1955, to April 30, 1956.
Portugal: "March 1, 1956, to February 28, 1957."
Sweden: October 1, 1955, to September 30, 1956.
Switzerland: October 1, 1955, to September 30, 1956.
Turkey: June 1, 1949; extended to May 31, 1956.
United Kingdom: September 1, 1954, to August 31, 1955.
Yugoslavia: January 1, 1955, to December 31, 1955.

II. Western Hemisphere

Argentina: September 8, 1953, to September 7, 1956.
Brazil: "April 26, 1954, to April 25, 1955."
Paraguay: November 1, 1953, to October 31, 1954; annual tacit renewal.

III. Near East and Africa

Iran: (June 4, 1955)—1 year.
Israel: February 26, 1954; extended to February 25, 1957.
Sudan: "May 20, 1955, to May 19, 1956."
Syria: "(May 3, 1956)"—1 year.

IV. South and southeast Asia

Burma: February 21, 1956, to February 20, 1957.
India: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956.
Indonesia: July 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956.

H. POLAND

I. Europe

Austria: April 1, 1955, to March 31, 1956.
Belgium: January 1, 1954; extended to March 31, 1956.
Denmark: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956.
Finland: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956.
France: December 1, 1955, to November 30, 1956.
German Federal Republic: January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956.
Greece: January 1, 1954; extended to March 31, 1956.
Iceland: March 1, 1956, to February 28, 1957.
Italy: July 1, 1949; extended to December 31, 1956.
Netherlands: August 1, 1955, to July 31, 1956.
Norway: May 1, 1956, to April 30, 1957.
Portugal: "March 1, 1956, to February 28, 1957."
Sweden: May 1, 1956, to April 30, 1957.
Switzerland: July 1, 1949, to June 30, 1954; annual tacit renewal.
Turkey: "July 1, 1948"; extended to June 30, 1955.
United Kingdom: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956.
Yugoslavia: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956.

II. Western Hemisphere

Argentina: January 1, 1955, to December 31, 1955.

Brazil: April 1, 1954; extended to April 1, 1956.
Paraguay: "November 23, 1955)"—1 year.
Uruguay: "April 24, 1953, to April 23, 1954"; annual tacit renewal.

III. Near East and Africa

Egypt: April 1, 1955, to March 31, 1956.
Iran: April 16, 1956, to April 15, 1957.
Israel: July 1, 1954, to June 30, 1955; annual tacit renewal.
Lebanon: "(January 4, 1956)"—1 year.
Sudan: "May 20, 1955, to May 19, 1956" payments).
Syria: "May 1956 to May 1957."

IV. South and southeast Asia

Burma: "November 1, 1955, to October 31, 1958."
Ceylon: "February 28, 1956, to February 27, 1957."
India: April 1, 1956, to December 31, 1959.
Indonesia: May 1, 1955, to April 30, 1956.
Pakistan: February 4, 1956, to February 3, 1957.

I. RUMANIA

I. Europe

Austria: April 1, 1955, to March 31, 1956.
Belgium: "September 3, 1948," extended to December 31, 1955.
Denmark: April 1, 1954, to March 31, 1956.
Finland: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956.
France: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956.
German Federal Republic: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956 (nongovernmental).
Greece: July 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956.
Italy: December 20, 1950, extended to December 19, 1956.
Norway: June 1, 1955, to May 31, 1956.
Sweden: April 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956 (nongovernmental).
Switzerland: August 1, 1953, extended to July 31, 1956.
Turkey: April 15, 1955, to April 14, 1956.
Yugoslavia: January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956.

II. Near East and Africa

Egypt: January 18, 1954, to January 17, 1955; annual tacit renewal.
Israel: "September 9, 1954, to December 31, 1955."
Lebanon: "January 6, 1956"—1 year.
Syria: "January 14, 1956'—I year.

III. South and southeast Asia

Burma: "February 7, 1956"—3 years.
Ceylon: March 16, 1956"—1 year.
India: "March 23, 1954, to December 31, 1954," annual tacit renewal for 1 additional year.
Indonesia: July 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956.

J. DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

I. Europe

France: July 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956.

STATE COSTS OF FOREIGN AID LISTED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on June 6 of this year, the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, which is much concerned over the Federal tax and cost burdens imposed on the various States, prepared a study of what this foreign-aid program has cost each of them, and what the funds requested for the fiscal year 1957 program will cost each of them.

In an introduction to this interesting tabulation, the council expressed its vigorous support of the $1.1 billion cut made by the House of Representatives in the original $4.9 billion request, and pointed out that there would still be $10½ billion available, enough to carry the program another 2½ years.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce and its tabulation of costs to each State, both for the program from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1956, the coming fiscal year, should the full or original request be approved, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNCIL OF STATE CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE

Large unspent balances in foreign aid funds were cited today by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce in supporting the cut of $1.1 billion which the House Foreign Affairs Committee made in the $4.9 billion requested by the administration. The council said:

"That the committee's reduction would hardly cripple the mutual-security program is shown by the fact that there would be over $10½ billion available for expenditure at the beginning of fiscal year 1957. This would be enough to carry the program 2½ years at the present rate of foreign spending."

These points were developed by Eugene F. Rinta, director of research, in a study, released today, for the 30 State and regional chambers of commerce in the council.

The Rinta study called for "a thorough critical re-examination of the entire program" and suggested that "the Congress itself, with the assistance of the best talent available, might well be the best body to make the investigation."

Unless Congress assumes the full responsibility for cutting off large-scale foreign aid, the council warned that it is likely to burden the American taxpayer for years to come.

But action by Congress to cut foreign-aid spending appreciably is improbable because of the limited information now available on which to determine the wisdom of continuing foreign aid, the council declared. For that reason, the council said, it urged Congress to authorize a thorough examination and review of the whole problem.

Calling attention to statistics of the International Cooperation Administration, the Rinta study pointed out that the relative economic growth of European countries aided since 1948 "has been just about as great as in the United States and in some cases even greater."

The council also noted in these countries "a general trend toward lower defense spending in relation to both gross national product and central government budgets." It said the ICA statistics also indicate that "the United States has been making a far greater contribution of its total national product and its National Government budget for defense than any of the countries, except Communist Yugoslavia."

MEMORANDUM

This council study is another in the series of Federal Spending Facts. These studies are published by the council's research office in Washington for the use of State chambers of commerce as basic background material for the information of their members. They are also made available at the same time as a service to the press.

The study follows:

Cost of foreign aid to the States for the 11 postwar years, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1956, and additional cost if the President's request for fiscal year 1957 is approved

	Federal tax burden, percentage	Net funds provided, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1956			Funds requested for fiscal year 1957		
		Economic	Military	Total	Economic	Military	Total
Alabama	0.91	$390,390,000	$202,930,000	$593,320,000	$16,926,000	$27,300,000	$44,226,000
Arizona	.42	180,180,000	93,660,000	273,840,000	7,812,000	12,600,000	20,412,000
Arkansas	.46	197,340,000	102,580,000	299,920,000	8,556,000	13,800,000	22,356,000
California	9.29	3,985,410,000	2,071,670,000	6,057,080,000	172,794,000	278,700,000	451,494,000
Colorado	1.14	489,060,000	254,220,000	743,280,000	21,204,000	34,200,000	55,404,000
Connecticut	1.88	806,520,000	419,240,000	1,225,760,000	34,968,000	56,400,000	91,368,000
Delaware	.52	223,080,000	115,960,000	339,040,000	9,672,000	15,600,000	25,272,000
Florida	1.62	694,980,000	361,260,000	1,056,240,000	30,132,000	48,600,000	78,732,000
Georgia	1.34	574,860,000	298,820,000	873,680,000	24,924,000	40,200,000	65,124,000
Idaho	.25	107,250,000	55,750,000	163,000,000	4,650,000	7,500,000	12,150,000
Illinois	7.59	3,256,110,000	1,692,570,000	4,948,680,000	141,174,000	227,700,000	368,874,000
Indiana	2.41	1,033,890,000	537,430,000	1,571,320,000	44,826,000	72,300,000	117,126,000
Iowa	1.26	540,540,000	280,980,000	821,520,000	23,436,000	37,800,000	61,236,000
Kansas	.98	420,420,000	218,540,000	638,960,000	18,228,000	29,400,000	47,628,000
Kentucky	.99	424,710,000	220,770,000	645,480,000	18,414,000	29,700,000	48,114,000
Louisiana	1.10	471,900,000	245,300,000	717,200,000	20,460,000	33,000,000	53,460,000
Maine	.37	158,730,000	82,510,000	241,240,000	6,882,000	11,100,000	17,982,000
Maryland	2.19	939,510,000	488,370,000	1,427,880,000	40,734,000	65,700,000	106,434,000
Massachusetts	3.24	1,389,960,000	722,520,000	2,112,480,000	60,264,000	97,200,000	157,464,000
Michigan	5.66	2,428,140,000	1,262,180,000	3,690,320,000	105,276,000	169,800,000	275,076,000
Minnesota	1.70	729,300,000	379,100,000	1,108,400,000	31,620,000	51,000,000	82,620,000
Mississippi	.45	193,050,000	100,350,000	293,400,000	8,370,000	13,500,000	21,870,000
Missouri	2.47	1,059,630,000	550,810,000	1,610,440,000	45,942,000	74,100,000	120,042,000
Montana	.30	128,700,000	66,900,000	195,600,000	5,580,000	9,000,000	14,580,000
Nebraska	.74	317,460,000	165,020,000	482,480,000	13,764,000	22,200,000	35,964,000
Nevada	.17	72,930,000	37,910,000	110,840,000	3,162,000	5,100,000	8,262,000
New Hampshire	.27	115,830,000	60,210,000	176,040,000	5,022,000	8,100,000	13,122,000
New Jersey	3.71	1,591,590,000	827,330,000	2,418,920,000	69,006,000	111,300,000	180,306,000
New Mexico	.30	128,700,000	66,900,000	195,600,000	5,580,000	9,000,000	14,580,000
New York	14.95	6,413,550,000	3,333,850,000	9,747,400,000	278,070,000	448,500,000	726,570,000
North Carolina	1.41	604,890,000	314,430,000	919,320,000	26,226,000	42,300,000	68,526,000
North Dakota	.19	81,510,000	42,370,000	123,880,000	3,534,000	5,700,000	9,234,000
Ohio	6.26	2,685,540,000	1,395,980,000	4,081,520,000	116,436,000	187,800,000	304,236,000

Cost of foreign aid to the States for the 11 postwar years, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1956, and additional cost if the President's request for fiscal year 1957 is approved—Continued

	Federal tax burden, percentage	Net funds provided, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1956			Funds requested for fiscal year 1957		
		Economic	Military	Total	Economic	Military	Total
Oklahoma	1.02	$437,580,000	$227,460,000	$665,040,000	$18,972,000	$30,600,000	$49,572,000
Oregon	.93	398,970,000	207,390,000	606,360,000	17,298,000	27,900,000	45,198,000
Pennsylvania	7.12	3,054,480,000	1,587,760,000	4,642,240,000	132,432,000	213,600,000	346,032,000
Rhode Island	.52	223,080,000	115,960,000	339,040,000	9,672,000	15,600,000	25,272,000
South Carolina	.62	265,980,000	138,260,000	404,240,000	11,532,000	18,600,000	30,132,000
South Dakota	.23	98,670,000	51,290,000	149,960,000	4,278,000	6,900,000	11,178,000
Tennessee	1.17	501,930,000	260,910,000	762,840,000	21,762,000	35,100,000	56,862,000
Texas	4.22	1,810,380,000	941,060,000	2,751,440,000	78,492,000	126,600,000	205,092,000
Utah	.33	141,570,000	73,590,000	215,160,000	6,138,000	9,900,000	16,038,000
Vermont	.15	64,350,000	33,450,000	97,800,000	2,790,000	4,500,000	7,290,000
Virginia	1.49	639,210,000	332,270,000	971,480,000	27,714,000	44,700,000	72,414,000
Washington	1.60	686,400,000	356,800,000	1,043,200,000	29,760,000	48,000,000	77,760,000
West Virginia	.66	283,140,000	147,180,000	430,320,000	12,276,000	19,800,000	32,076,000
Wisconsin	2.00	858,000,000	446,000,000	1,304,000,000	37,200,000	60,000,000	97,200,000
Wyoming	.15	64,350,000	33,450,000	97,800,000	2,790,000	4,500,000	7,290,000
District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, etc	1.25	536,250,000	278,750,000	815,000,000	23,250,000	37,500,000	60,750,000
Total	100.00	42,900,000,000	22,300,000,000	65,200,000,000	1,860,000,000	3,000,000,000	4,860,000,000

COUNCIL BULLETIN SHOWS COUNTRIES ABLE TO FINANCE OWN DEFENSE

Mr. MALONE. In addition to the above, the Council of State Chambers of Commerce issued its bulletin No. 142 on June 4, 1956, reviewing the entire 12-year foreign handout program, showing the carryover from previous appropriations, presenting a table of the ability of these nations to pay for their own defense, should they be willing to do so, instead of having United States taxpayers carry the load, and, more important, giving tables showing the percent of gross product spent by these nations on defense, and the total Government expenditures for defense of these countries for 1953, 1954, and 1955.

At the conclusion of this statement, the report on overseas economic operations by the Hoover Commission, submitted to the Congress last year, is cited; and the council calls attention to the fact that—

Certainly there is no reason to believe that any real moves to curtail foreign-aid spending will emanate from the bureaucrats who administer the program.

Accordingly, it concludes:

Large-scale foreign aid is likely to burden the American taxpayer for years to come, unless Congress assumes the full responsibility of cutting it off.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the Council of State Chambers of Commerce bulletin.

There being no objection, the bulletin was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 12TH YEAR OF POSTWAR FOREIGN AID

The Congress has now reached the point in the congressional session when it begins to vote on how much American wealth may be pledged in the coming fiscal year for donation abroad. Two separate bills are involved in determining the size of the allowable pledge. The first is a legislative measure which authorizes the foreign-aid program for another year and sets ceilings on the amounts of money that can be appropriated for various foreign-aid purposes. The second is a bill which actually appropriates the funds.

When Congress completes action on these two bills for the fiscal year 1957, it will be the 12th consecutive year for which foreign-aid appropriations have been provided since World War II. And, according to the Secretary of State, the end to such appropriations is not in sight.

Before looking ahead to the prospective future burden of foreign aid, let's see how much assistance the American people, through their Congress, have already made available to other countries in the post-World-War-II period. The table below tells the story for the period July 1, 1945, to date:

Foreign-aid funds paid out during the postwar period from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1956, and foreign-aid funds available from July 1, 1955, to date [1]

	Million
Grants paid out July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1955	$41,842
Grants unexpended as of June 30, 1955	8,700
Appropriations provided for fiscal 1956	2,703
Total grants	53,245
Less: Returns on grants to June 30, 1955	1,493
Net aid in grants	51,752
Loans paid out July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1955	12,117
Grants converted to loans and not included in grants above	2,256
Loans authorized but not paid out June 30, 1955	2,433
Total loans	16,806
Less: Principal collected on loans to June 30, 1955	3,386
Net aid in loans	13,420
Total net aid	65,172

[1] Source: Office of Business Economics, U. S. Department of Commerce.

In each of the last 2 years several congressional leaders intimated that they would vigorously oppose any further substantial outlays for foreign aid. But when the chips were down and the issue was debated, no strong opposition leadership developed. While some reductions were made in the appropriations requested for both 1955 and 1956, they were not of sufficient size to slow down foreign-aid spending appreciably.

This year the Congress is considering a much bigger request than it did for 1955 and 1956. In fact, the $4.9 billion which the President asked for is over $2 billion more than Congress approved in either of those years. And some strong voices of congressional disapproval have again been heard, but it remains to be seen what Congress will finally do about the President's request.

House committee makes first move to cut

The House Foreign Affairs Committee has taken the first step toward cutting down our foreign-aid commitments in fiscal year 1957. The committee did this in the mutual security authorization bill, H. R. 11356, which it reported to the House May 25. This bill, which extends the foreign-aid program through 1957, authorizes appropriations of not over $3,563,475,000. This amount is $1,109 million less than the $4,672,475,000 new authorization which the President requested.

The committee's action brought forth immediate cries of protest from administration officials and from others who consistently advocate large foreign-aid programs. It is probable that an effort will be made to restore at least a part of the cut when the bill is taken up by the House June 6. On the other hand, there are many House Members who consider the $3.6 billion authorization still too large. Accordingly, the chances are good that the House will approve just about what the committee recommended.

An all-out effort by the administration to get the House cut restored by the Senate can be expected. In fact, its heavy artillery is already trained at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which will act on the mutual-security authorization after the House has passed it. But regardless of how successful the administration may be in the Senate, the opponents of continued large-scale foreign aid can still win out if they stick to their guns. In the first place, any differences in the House and Senate versions of the authorization bill will have to be ironed out. Then the process will start all over in the House when the President asks for appropriations. His request will have to be limited to the amounts approved in the authorization bill plus $187.5 million which he has already requested on the basis of authority carried over from prior years.

Large unexpended balances noted

Of the $1,109 million net reductions made by the Foreign Affairs Committee, exactly $1,000 million is from the military-assistance request of $2,925 million. The committee cut development assistance $100 million and made a net reduction of $9 million in defense support (economic aid) funds. The latter cut is the net of a reduction of $15 million from a $30 million allocation for Yugoslavia and increases of $6 million in other items.

The administration's $2,925 million request for military assistance includes $760 million for Europe. In making its $1,000 million cut the committee specified that no more than $450 million may be used in Europe. Thus, the cut from military-assistance funds for Europe is $310 million. The remainder of the $1,000 million reduction is applicable to funds assigned to other areas and to nonregional funds.

In making its reductions the committee took note of the large unexpended balances of foreign-aid funds from prior years which

will be available for expenditure after June 30, 1956. This availability of funds was estimated at $6.4 billion in March, but the figure has now been revised upward to $6.8 billion. Here is a comparison of the funds that would be available after June 30, 1956, under the administration's request and under the committee's bill:

	Administration request	Committee bill H. R. 11356
Military carryover	$5,000,000,000	$5,000,000,000
Nonmilitary carryover	1,800,000,000	1,800,000,000
Unexpended June 30, 1956	6,800,000,000	6,800,000,000
1957 appropriations under existing authority	187,500,000	187,500,000
New authorizations	4,672,475,000	3,563,475,000
Total available July 1, 1956	11,659,975,000	10,550,975,000

That the committee's reduction would hardly cripple the mutual security program is shown by the fact that there would be over $10½ billion available for expenditure at the beginning of fiscal 1957. This would be enough to carry the program 2½ years at the present rate of foreign-aid spending.

The ability and willingness of Europe to pay for defense

A total of $839 million of the 1957 appropriations requested by the administration for direct military assistance and for defense support is allotted to Europe, exclusive of Greece and Turkey. Another $565 million for new weapons and other purposes is labeled as nonregional, but a substantial part of that total very likely is applicable to Europe. Then there is a $642 million amount allotted to Mediterranean and Near East countries of which amount Greece and Turkey would receive a substantial portion.

On the basis of the above allotments it appears that at least $1.5 billion of the $4.1 billion total request for military assistance and defense support would go to Europe, including Greece and Turkey. Whether the ability and willingness of at least most of these countries to support their own defense programs have been thoroughly examined is not clear from available information. The International Cooperation Administration has statistics available, however, which point to their growing capacity to do the job. Following is a table illustrating this growth with indexes of gross national product for each country in 1954 prices:

	1948	1950	1952	1954	1955[1]
Belgium-Luxembourg	82	88	95	100	103
Denmark	86	95	94	100	102
France	73	86	93	100	106
Germany (Federal Republic)	47	70	86	100	110
Greece	64	77	83	100	106
Italy	70	80	89	100	108
Netherlands	75	86	88	100	108
Norway	82	89	95	100	102
Portugal	82	92	94	100	103
Spain	67	71	90	100	103
Turkey	73	78	98	100	109
United Kingdom	85	91	92	100	103
Yugoslavia	58	53	76	100	107
United States	81	88	98	100	107

[1] Estimates by the International Cooperation Administration.

It is apparent from the above table that relative economic growth in all of these countries has been just about as great as in the United States and in some cases even greater.

Some idea of the effort being made by the European countries to provide for their own defenses can be gained from ICA statistics below. They show for the fiscal years 1953, 1954, and 1955 the share of gross national product and the share of total central government expenditures which each country has been devoting to defense.

	Percent of gross national product spent on defense			Percent of total Government expenditures spent on defense		
	1953	1954	1955	1953	1954	1955
Belgium-Luxembourg	5.9	6.6	4.5	21.7	23.9	20.3
Denmark	2.9	3.9	3.2	19.6	26.0	20.7
France	10.5	10.4	7.8	37.7	36.8	29.3
Germany (Federal Republic)	6.4	6.0	(1)	22.7	21.2	(1)
Greece	7.1	7.1	6.3	32.1	30.2	30.0
Italy	4.6	4.5	4.4	20.6	20.5	21.6
Netherlands	5.3	6.7	5.9	20.0	24.7	23.1
Norway	4.7	5.2	4.9	25.0	27.3	28.6
Portugal	3.7	4.0	4.2	31.5	33.3	31.0
Spain	4.1	4.3	4.3	37.5	35.1	29.3
Turkey	6.2	6.9	5.7	40.0	40.0	35.2
United Kingdom	11.0	10.6	9.4	35.5	36.9	35.2
Yugoslavia	18.5	16.2	11.6	79.6	80.0	77.5
United States	13.8	13.2	10.9	67.3	67.8	62.9

[1] Not available.

These figures show a general trend in these countries toward lower defense spending in relation to both gross national product and central government budgets. They also indicate that the United States has been making a far greater contribution of its total national product and its National Government budget for defense than any of the countries except Communist Yugoslavia. And in the case of Yugoslavia the figures are distorted by the fact that a few years ago most nondefense central government expenditures were transferred to local government budgets.

Is our foreign aid program here to stay?

In a report on overseas economic operations submitted to Congress a year ago by the Hoover Commission, a majority of the Commission expressed concern with the continuing large outlays for foreign aid. This majority cited the fact that over $50 billion had already been spent in the postwar period, that $8 billion remained available for expenditure from prior appropriations, and that another $3.5 billion had been requested for fiscal 1956. They concluded their separate statement in these words:

"Surely, after almost 10 years, the time has come to apply some brakes to this overseas spending program. We believe, therefore, that the Commission should recommend substantial reductions in expenditures for this purpose. By no other means will the growing trend toward permanent foreign spending be halted."

The administration did not, of course, go along with this recommendation, at least for 1957. And Secretary of State John Foster Dulles offers no real encouragement for lower foreign spending beyond 1957. He told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee some weeks ago that defense and defense-related aid "will have to go on so long as our security is threatened." Unfortunately, that situation may continue so long as the Communists control Russia. As for economic development assistance, the Secretary offered the hope that it may be taken over more and more by private capital, but only when political risks are lessened. When that might be, he did not suggest.

Best hope for curtailment is congressional action

Certainly there is no reason to believe that any real moves to curtail foreign-aid spending will emanate from the bureaucrats who administer the program. Such action simply is not in the cards, because the bureaucrat is rare, indeed, who finds reasons and offers recommendations for abolishing jobs. Moreover, it is the information and recommendations of the operating employees on which top administrators must rely, to a large extent, in developing proposals for consideration by Congress.

Accordingly, large-scale foreign aid is likely to burden the American taxpayer for years to come unless Congress assumes the full responsibility of cutting it off. But such action is improbable on the basis of the limited information now available to Congress. What is first needed is a thorough critical reexamination of the entire program. And the Congress itself, with the assistance of the best talent available, might well be the best body to make the investigation.

Some weeks ago Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, proposed that a searching study of future foreign aid be initiated by Congress in time for completion before consideration of the fiscal 1958 aid request. Subsequently President Eisenhower agreed that such a study would be desirable.

It is probable that a special authorization by Congress will be necessary for the kind of investigation that should be made. The House committee did not, however, provide for it in H. R. 11356, although it considered the idea. It is to be hoped, therefore, that the bill will be amended to include an authorization for this investigation before it is sent to the President for approval.

FOREIGN VIEW OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN AID PRESENTED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times recently rendered what I consider a substantial public service by reprinting a statement by Raymond Cartier, executive director of the magazine Paris-Match, of Paris, France, and published in the National Review under date of May 2, 1956. The statement is entitled: "Why Does the World Hate America".

The statement has also been published by the New Bedford Standard-Times as an advertisement in a number of other American newspapers and in other American cities.

Subheads include, "Vast American Aid Funds Bring Only Distrust and Hate," "Foreign Aid Calamitous for Helped as Well as Helper," and "United States Foreign Policy Should be Dictated by Realistic Self-Interest."

There is much common sense in this article. It shows, if any expression by a foreign editor can show, that Congress has been sold a bill of goods in voting for these billion and multi-billion dollar handouts for the past 12 years.

Why do we have to continue on year after year giving foreign countries money they do not need, goods they do not want, and pronouncements from the State Department they do not heed?

SELF-INTEREST OF AMERICA SHOULD BE OUR FIRST CONSIDERATION

Why cannot we look to our own realistic self-interest, as this editor suggests, and thus regain the respect of all the nations of the world, who eternally look to their own self-interest, and particularly so when they receive billion-dollar handouts from the United States without even being required to pretend friendship for this country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the article referred to, by the editor of Paris-Match as republished by the New Bedford Standard-Times and other American newspapers.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 12, 1956]

WHY DOES THE WORLD HATE AMERICA?—A BLUNT STATEMENT OF THE FRENCH VIEWPOINT BY RAYMOND CARTIER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE MAGAZINE 'PARIS-MATCH,' PARIS, FRANCE

(From National Review May 2, 1956, republished as a public service by the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times)

(By Basil Brewer, Publisher)

If his arrival was not clandestine the word has no meaning. The only crowd was the police, closely guarding the Palam Airport.

Pandit Nehru had disdained to come, on the pretext that he was not only foreign minister but head of state.

And in the absence of an Indian foreign minister, Mr. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State of the great Republic of the United States, was received at New Delhi by a functionary so minor that the American press agencies were ashamed to mention him.

They preferred to dwell on the fact that the Secretary of State had been gratified by a special and unusual favor—the authorization to fly over the Taj Mahal, in spite of the risk from vibrating motors to its fragile architecture.

A few weeks earlier Messrs. Bulganin and Khrushchev had arrived at this same Palam Airport amid the mobilized enthusiasm of the capital and the whole nation.

Delhi had been as red as a cock's comb—red with pleasure—under a grand array of waving flags which the police themselves had distributed to the people. A million persons, cheering the jovial Khrushchev and the debonair Bulganin, had lined the route along which the closed limousine of Mr. Dulles sped, as swiftly as an American hearse.

"The warmth of our reception of the Soviet leaders simply conforms to our national tradition," a slightly embarrassed Indian official had explained. "The Queen of England, or Mr. Dulles, arriving tomorrow, would be received with the same cordiality." Mr. Dulles arrived. He saw.

DULLES ROAMS THE GLOBE IN QUEST OF FRIENDS

It is not always easy to understand the case of Mr. Dulles.

Why, for example, did he choose to expose himself, and his country with him, to inevitable comparison in a Jakarta still vibrating with last year's acclamation of the Chinese President of Council, Chou En-lai? Nothing essential, said official Washington, nothing very important, motivated his conversations in Indonesia.

Mr. Dulles is already, by a wide margin, the record-holder in mileage for his category. If he added to that mileage; if he visited capitals which no longer have any touristic attraction for him; if he incurred a supplementary and superfluous fatigue; he no doubt hoped to improve his contacts, to reduce misunderstandings, to rewarm atmospheres.

In a word, to make himself liked—the very symbol of the aim which America has been pursuing desperately and disastrously for 10 years.

The case of India, alongside that of Mr. Dulles, is edifying.

America powerfully helped India to gain its independence. In the very midst of the war, President Roosevelt pressured Winston Churchill to grant complete political liberty to a country whose sympathies were almost entirely with Japan.

Liberated India became one of America's darlings—the great spiritually enlightened democracy which would follow arm in arm with America the bright road of progress. Material aid was not omitted, even though the Delhi government always refused to undertake the slightest political obligation.

The United States subscribed $20 million to the last 5-year plan of the Indian Republic, and the total of its gifts is some $454 million. When the chronic Indian famine threatened to become tragic 3 years ago, America threw into the bottomless pit 2 million tons of wheat, part of which was lost through inefficiency.

Private aid—the phenomenal American private aid—has been added to this Government effort, representing for the year 1955 alone, nearly 25 million pounds of foodstuffs with a value of $18,326,000.

American point-4 teams, and those of several large charitable organizations are at work in every part of the peninsula, helping the Indians to try not to die—while Russia has never offered to Indian distress the alms of a single sunflower seed.

VAST AMERICAN AID FUNDS BRING ONLY DISTRUST AND HATE

The dividends of these two policies are illustrated by the contrast between the reception of Mr. Dulles and that of Bulganin-Khrushchev.

There is certainly not a country in the world where America is more suspect as a nation, and the American more despised as an individual, than in India.

Nehru has never ceased to obstruct every American effort to organize the defense of Asia, but Nehru in this case merely interprets the distrust and animosity of his people.

When the Communists circulated the fable of American bacteriological war in Korea, probably not one Indian in a hundred thousand refused to believe it—just as not one in a hundred thousand doubted that the Americans were the aggressors.

The same quasi-unanimity admits as an absolute fact that the Americans dropped the first atomic bomb on Hiroshima, instead of a German city, because the Japanese are Asiatic and colored.

America could spend billions—and never succeed in effacing from the Indian mind the conviction that, more than any other nation, it represents the white man's privilege of aggressiveness and imperialism * * * while Russia, whose colonial conquests cover half of Asia and reach to India's very gates, is synonymous with racial equality and emancipation.

Take even England. Theoretically she oppressed India for two centuries, fattened on its substance, built on its misery the insolent fortunes of Belgravia and Mayfair, shed Indian blood in cruel repressions.

Nevertheless today the Englishman—the hard, indifferent Englishman—compared with the American is to Indians a friend and brother.

No lesser person than Gamal Abdel Nasser told me recently that he had learned in conversation with Nehru this enormous difference in the degree of unpopularity of the two Nations.

But when I asked Nasser what he himself thought of the Americans he thrust out his chin and answered only: "I like their films."

What applies to India applies to all Asia. America in 1948 literally tore Indonesia from the Dutch—and in his Jakarta press conference John Foster Dulles was reduced to pleading the cause of his country before accusers.

Japan, guilty and beaten, was coddled by America like a newborn babe, reeducated with immense care in democracy and the cult of baseball, presented with $2½ billion in accordance with the American system of reverse payment of war damages.

All of which resulted in the neutralist Hatoyama government, Tokyo crowds burning American vehicles, Japanese horror films on the atomization of Hiroshima—as if the Japanese were tender—and the immense, bitter resentment of defeat slowly fermenting in this profound people.

ASIAN NATIONS' ONLY COMMON INTEREST IS DISLIKE FOR UNITED STATES

South Vietnam, Korea, and Formosa are border cases; they owe their every breath to America, yet even this does not always suffice to restrain the violence and impatience of their anti-American sentiment.

One could continue this world tour. It is the same everywhere.

Anti-Americanism is often the sole common interest of violently antagonistic nations or groups, as in South Africa where the whites curse America for its anticolonialism and the blacks blame it for its segregation.

Or in the Near East where the Arabs abominate it while the Jews accuse it of egoism and meanness. Latin America has not a single country where the anti-Yankee spirit does not preponderate.

The single fact that United States citizens have practically usurped the name of Americans causes a gnashing of teeth all the way to Canada, where, a Foreign Minister has said, "The time of automatically easy relations with our southern neighbor is ended, I believe, forever."

In Washington the accounts are kept. They are enormous. Since the war America has distributed to the world $52,287,000,000, of which $45,107,000,000 were gifts pure and simple. With this sum it could have rebuilt every road in the country, or created a superaviation far beyond Russia's ability to compete.

Moreover, what was given away was not merely money but wealth, particularly raw materials of which America, with its intense activity, does not have unlimited reserves.

Strictly speaking, say the economists, foreign aid is national impoverishment. It is acceptable if it buys political advantages.

Otherwise, it is lunacy.

Western Europe always heads the list. It has received two-thirds of the $52 billion distributed since the war by the United States Government. England leads with $6 billion in economic aid, followed by France with $5½ billion, Germany with a little under $4 billion, and Italy with $2,800,000,000.

Countries small in size but deeply shaken by the war, such as Holland, Austria, Greece, have cost the United States more than a billion each.

What is more extraordinary is that 11 years after the end of hostilities, when Europe is completely restored, private American generosity continues to feed a large number of Europeans.

France, an agricultural paradise, still receives from 14 philanthropic organizations almost 4,400 tons of foodstuffs, which is nothing compared with 66,000 to Italy and 33,000 to a Germany bathed in prosperity. The dollars which paid for these gifts, estimated at $160 million in 1955 for the whole world, are collected from individuals of whom many are mere wage earners.

PROSPEROUS FRANCE, JEALOUS BRITAIN VIE IN ANTIPATHY FOR UNITED STATES

These public billions and private millions have not made Western Europe a much more favorable milieu (environment) for the United States than South America or Asia.

It is hard to say whether anti-American sentiment is stronger in England or in France. In France it is aggravated by Communist influence and at present overexcited by the events in North Africa; but in England it is fed by the intense frustration of a nation recently supplanted in its world role.

In any case, it crosses social barriers in the two western countries nearest to America.

The United States logically should have the sympathy of the working classes because of the condition of its own workers, and of the property-owning classes which it is protecting from annihilation by communism.

Yet more often it meets on the one side only principled opposition and on the other only misunderstanding, flippancy, often disdain.

Germany is not, for Washington, the consolation many Frenchmen imagine it to be.

There were those early days when the GI's felt less foreign in the conquered nation than anywhere else in Europe. But like Japan, Germany restored does not not have the unctuous humility of Germany in collapse.

The "go home" campaign began there, and the movement which is alienating the Bonn Government from American policy expresses the dominant attitude of the German people.

The idea of an exclusive alliance with an ideologically conquered Germany is no longer one of the variants in American planning.

It is curious to interview American officials on the universal anti-Americanism. In general they act as if the matter were not very important. "We hold," they say, "too much of a place in the world, and we are too rich, for American unpopularity not to be inevitable. No matter what we do we shall be criticized. We are making the best of it—it is for others to change."

But this defensive attitude masks a great perplexity and a serious disillusion. The State Department files are full of studies of the phenomenon and reports on remedial means. In the center of a powerful continental system, surrounded by armies all ready to march, Napoleon could allow himself the illusion of despising with impunity the opinion of foreign peoples. America, in spite of its wealth and power, is not in the same situation.

In Europe, the response to American wealth is an attitude of intellectual hauteur. Outside Europe, it is more simply a burning reaction of antipathy and envy.

America's desperate efforts to dissociate itself from colonial or ex-colonial Europeans, masters of yesterday's world, are in vain.

One: Americans are white; two: they are rich; three: they are the richest of the white peoples—three indelible facts which insure them, no matter what they do, the unfavorable prejudice of a majority of the world's inhabitants.

Americans do not share the resentment left by white imperialism; they take it more and more exclusively on their own shoulders. Their disinterestedness, even if sincere, does not exempt them from it.

Besides, a people fighting on a world field of battle cannot be disinterested. The Americans make themselves think they are, by considering the purity of their intentions and the quantity of good money which they throw after bad. But on this point the Arabs and Hindus are more perspicacious.

FOREIGN AID CALAMITOUS FOR HELPED AS WELL AS HELPER

Unfortunately there is little chance that America will change its attitude in the foreseeable future. Urgent voices are heard demanding that it stiffen its anti-colonial attitude and increase a foreign aid which, it is becoming clear, is calamitous for the helped as well as the helper.

"Whether we are criticized or not," said one Washington official, "we cannot let Iranian children die of hunger." A boundless idealism; a "do-good" conception of foreign policy; a conviction that all peoples should be free and all men electors; these ideas still reign firmly in Washington.

In the burning affair of North Africa, the State Department energetically eschews the slightest anti-French intervention, but official as well as public sentiment is categorically declared in favor of total independence for Algeria, Tunisia, and Morocco.

The precedents of the past 10 years; the decline of every liberated country into communism or neutralism; the dizzy growth of anti-Americanism in decolonialized Asia; the fact that liberated North Africa will join an Arab league which is practically Moscow oriented; the further fact that the loss of North Africa will push France itself—humiliated and desperate—into the Soviet system.

These realistic arguments, these indisputable truths, are unavailing against a sentimental enthusiasm that comes from a misinterpretation of history: The United States was born of a colonial rebellion (which is a false notion), and consequently all colonial rebellions deserve its sympathy.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY SHOULD BE DICTATED BY REALISTIC SELF-INTEREST

It is terribly difficult to be the dominant power of an epoch. The Washington officials are not wrong in saying that anti-Americanism will exist, no matter what America does, so long as the United States holds its present rank. But anti-Americanism is also maintained by faults in judgment and by grave and avoidable errors. One of the most frequent is America's incapacity for taking sides. Its most general mistake is obedience to ideology, or more exactly to an intellectual confusion in which ideology and egoism blend and obscure one another.

There would be less anti-Americanism in the world if America abandoned its philanthropic aspirations, its vocation of Santa Claus, its transcendental morality, all its missionary trappings, all its boy-scout gear, and if, at last, it followed openly and intelligently the policy of its own interest.

FOREIGN AID MEANS HIGH TAXES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article by Henry Hazlitt titled "Foreign-Aid Mania," published in the magazine Newsweek, issue of June 4, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN-AID MANIA

(By Henry Hazlitt)

One of the most baffling developments of the last decade has been the persistence and growth in Washington of the mania for giving away billions of the American taxpayers' money to foreign governments. The pressure for ever-greater farm aid, old-age assistance, grandiose roadbuilding programs, home-mortgage guaranties, and a score of other projects is not difficult to understand politically. The pressure groups who want and get this aid have votes. But foreigners don't vote here. Why is the pressure for foreign aid in Washington so persistent?

Part of the answer, no doubt, lies in an established bureaucracy. Once a bureaucracy of hundreds of thousands of people is built up to exercise any function whatever, its tendency is to keep pushing for the continuance or expansion of that function, regardless of whether changed conditions may have made the original reasons for it no longer valid.

AID MEANS HIGH TAXES

This bureaucratic pressure is not in itself a complete answer to the puzzle. And certainly the answer is not that the amounts involved are negligible. We have already turned over to foreign governments since the end of the Second World War the enormous sum of more than $50 billion. The Government now wishes to spend $4.4 billion on foreign aid in the next fiscal year alone. It wishes Congress to appropriate $4.9 billion. At any time prior to the last 15 years this would have been thought a staggering sum. It represents four times the entire amount spent for our own national defense in the fiscal year 1939.

But perhaps it is more meaningful to make a comparison in terms of present taxes. It has been estimated that if the top progressive income-tax rate stopped at 50 percent (instead of going on to 91 percent as at present) the revenue loss would be only $1.2 billion. On various estimates, in fact, if progression above the basic rate of 20 percent were totally abolished, the annual revenue yield would be only $4.7 to $5.8 billion less than now. But this approximates what the Government is asking for foreign aid alone in the next fiscal year. In any case, anyone who is now paying a top income-tax rate of more than 22 percent can consider that the excess all goes for foreign aid. It need hardly be pointed out that if the top rate stopped at 22 percent, the result would be to give an enormous impetus at home to incentive, saving and investment, production, and jobs.

As former hopes of the benefits from foreign aid have been successively disappointed, the rationalizations for its continuance keep constantly changing. They become increasingly rhetorical and vague. We are now being told by experts that we are placing too much emphasis on military instead of economic aid; that our foreign giveaway should be given away without conditions; and that we should not try to foster free enterprise abroad or even to win friends with our aid. If such arguments are accepted, it becomes difficult to see what excuse for foreign aid remains. As National Review has put it: "A government has no right to dispose of the property of its citizens, except as their prudent, responsible steward and in their palpable interest. A government has no obligation, moral or political, to give aid to other governments." In fact, the only foreign aid Congress is justified in giving at the expense of the American taxpayers is military aid or aid with a definite quid pro quo.

FOR PRIVATE LOANS

The blunt truth is that the only "economic" foreign aid that is likely to be beneficial either to the receiver or the giver is that in the form of private trade or private loans and investments. If foreign governments could no longer get these easy handouts from our Government, they would be forced to turn for capital to private sources, either at home or abroad. In that case they would be obliged to move toward free enterprise. They would have to give real assurances against socialization or expropriation. Such reforms are necessary in any case for any permanent or rapid economic development. The underdeveloped countries have remained underdeveloped chiefly because of their own hostility to the profit-seeking system.

THREE EDITORIALS SHOW HOW UNITED STATES TAXPAYERS' DOLLARS ARE WASTED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks three editorials from the Wall Street Journal, published consecutively on April 3, 1956, May 24, 1956, and June 16, 1956, and titled respectively "How To Cadge Dollars," "Military Aid Illusions," and "The World and Us." They are all brief and have each a bearing in my opinion on the matter before us today.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of April 3, 1956]

HOW TO CADGE DOLLARS

Let us suppose that you were the premier or president of a country that considers itself underdeveloped and would like to have some United States dollars to fix things up.

You would, of course, have been reading in the American press that the New Look in foreign aid is to keep it flexible. Or, as one Washington dispatch put it, to make

possible fast adjustments in who gets how much from the United States in order to meet Soviet rivalry.

In other words, the new idea is to avoid the hobgoblin of consistency but be ready to shift our dollars around from one country to another as countermoves to offers of aid or friendship to those countries from Soviet Russia.

You would also have been reading about how the new United States foreign aid emphasis is upon projects that stir the imagination, the big things that can be photographed in Cinemascope and propagandized with stereophonic sound. That way we get more of a run for our money than with such dull prosaic things as developing foreign trade, supporting currencies, or providing technical know-how.

Well, if you were at all bright, this New Look in foreign aid might give you some pretty good ideas on how to go about cadging dollars.

The first thing that might occur to you is that it is better to be wooed by the Soviets than not to be loved at all. The poor country that is struggling along firmly dedicated to freedom, democracy, and western civilization would not seem to be in as good a receiving position as a country that flirts with the Communist empire.

The second thing is not to pay too much attention to what kind of economic aid might really be best for your hypothetical country, but to concentrate instead on the spectaculars that will catch the imagination of the American dollar-givers.

Both of these things, for one example, seem to have occurred to Premier Nasser of Egypt. One project he has in mind, the Aswan Dam on the Nile, is certainly spectacular; it promises to outdo the pyramids. And just the other day he blandly announced that he still has in his pocket a Soviet offer to help finance the dam if the West (primarily the United States) should demur. This is something well calculated to fit into the new look in Washington. The mere thought that something might be done with Soviet money is enough to tempt Uncle Sam's pocketbook.

The Nasser technique is particularly interesting because Mr. Nasser's stock with the State Department has gone up and down like this spring's thermometer. The State Department started out being very high on Mr. Nasser. Then it cooled off. And now it is again anxiously feverish about him.

But we suppose that is a thing one has to expect when the foreign aid program is to be used flexibly to counterbalance Soviet moves. We assume the moral of it is not lost on other countries which would like to be in line for United States aid.

The moral, of course, is that if this is the way we are going to manage our foreign aid program then it is neither need nor true friendship but gamesmanship that will best cadge those dollars.

[From the Wall Street Journal of May 24, 1956]

MILITARY AID ILLUSIONS

Most of the congressional criticism of foreign aid, over the lengthening years, has been directed at economic assistance. Military aid, because it seems an extension of our own defenses, has been treated as almost untouchable.

Now, however, the House Foreign Affairs Committee has recommended that the administration's total $4.9 billion aid request be cut by $1.1 billion, almost all of it to come out of the military program. It is probably doubtful that a reduction of this size will stand, but at least it shows that Congress is beginning to ask some of the basic questions about military aid that it should long since have asked.

One question, of course, is why the administration should find it necessary to ask for an increase in the military aid request anyway. Granting for the moment—but only that—the argument that our allies' obsolescent equipment should be replaced by us, there would still be some $5.2 billion in unexpended military aid funds, according to Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman RICHARDS, even if Congress voted not a further cent.

But a more important question concerns the very premise of military aid, as it is currently accepted in Washington. The original idea was that the United States would help its allies get started on rearmament. Once they had amassed sizable forces, they would maintain them on their own. Now the thinking is that they will probably never be able to do this, and the United States will have to spend several billions a year indefinitely on their military establishments.

In other words, they can't afford the kind of defense the United States would like them to have. Whether they really can't afford it is debatable. Certainly their enthusiasm for joint defense has dwindled. France, for example, diverts many American-financed divisions to quell what it regards as a domestic revolt in North Africa. Undoubtedly a necessary step from France's point of view, but hardly the reason the United States gives military aid to France.

But if it is true that the allies can't afford their present defenses, then their defenses rest on a very shaky foundation. A military machine that must forever be fueled from outside is an economic monstrosity for the nation maintaining it.

It could also be a military liability for such a nation. For when the United States finally decides it can no longer afford to keep buying this luxury, the adjustment will be more drastic for the beneficiaries than if the sights had never been set so high in the first place.

Perhaps a substantial reduction in military aid now would cause the allies to exert more efforts of their own in the interests of their own defense. Indeed, it is possible nothing else will.

In any case, however, it is far beyond the call of any political or moral duty to suppose that the United States should pay others' military bills not once but over and over without end. If the allies are unwilling or unable to pay their own bills, the United States may well find it is buying not an indispensable extension of its own security, but an illusion of defense.

Representative VORYS, complaining about the size of the recommended cut, said yesterday the Joint Chiefs of Staff think it would force a major revamping of America's military aid program. That is exactly what should happen.

[From the Wall Street Journal of June 10, 1956]

THE WORLD AND US

For many years a prime function of American foreign policy has been the manufacture of defense alliances with other countries. Apart from the United Nations, which theoretically at least is an alliance, the United States has concluded such pacts with more than 40 nations. Now circumstances are forcing a reappraisal of the value of this approach.

That, we think, is the import of the confusion which Washington has been generating about this country's attitude toward other nations' neutrality. President Eisenhower said in effect that neutrality is understandable and maybe a good thing. Secretary of State Dulles suggested that, except in unusual circumstances, it is shortsighted and immoral.

The confusion may be, as Mr. Dulles contends, largely one of language. But the problem it reflects is real enough.

The reason for the American eagerness for defense alliances was, of course, the threat and at times the actuality of Communist aggression. Some pacts, like the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, have undoubtedly helped deter further Communist aggression.

Something happened, though, at last summer's Geneva conference to alter the aspect of the Soviet threat. There was a tacit agreement that hydrogen and other new weapons had made resort to war unthinkable. In other words, the Communists would no longer pursue their aims by military means where such means might lead to global war.

That notion may be the sheerest kind of wishful thinking. It may be more likely that the Soviets will blast this country when they are good and ready. Certainly the Pentagon assumes they will. But the fact is that the no-war theory is widely accepted in the world.

And whatever the Soviets' military intentions, they have in fact turned from angry to soft words, directed mainly at the so-called neutral nations of Asia and the Middle East. This combination of circumstances makes America's policy of military alliances increasingly unpopular in the world, and therefore increasingly ineffective.

So the United States now appears to be trying to evolve a policy which will not anger nations that have risked something to enter alliances with this country, and which at the same time will make clear that there is ample room in the world for genuinely neutral nations—that they do not have to be with us in order for us to consider them not against us.

What will come of this reappraisal is anybody's guess. But we think a couple of basic points ought to be clear.

One is that the United States has put too high a value on defense pacts. Indiscriminate scrambling for allies is a dubious way of strengthening our own security. It is fairly absurd to suppose that some impoverished, politically illiterate Asian country is going to view the Communist threat with the same seriousness or interest as the United States. It is equally unlikely that such a country would be much help if the Communists did attack.

A second point is that the answer to the declining prestige of military pacts is not vast new economic aid. There is nothing to suggest that such aid makes neutrals less susceptible to communism or, indeed, that it even significantly strengthens the economies of backward lands.

The growing unpopularity of pacts ought, in fact, to suggest to the United States that the world has been too much with us, and we too much in it. Perhaps we could just calm down for a while. Instead of proposing defense alliances all over the place, let other nations ask our military help if they want it. Instead of insisting on subsidizing them, let them ask our aid. That is the only basis on which military or economic aid can be useful anyway.

That kind of policy could be applied to allies and neutrals alike. It would go far toward resolving the neutrality problem now bothering Washington. And its results, in terms of the world's attitude toward us, might be surprisingly refreshing.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial article by William Henry Chamberlin published in the Wall Street Journal on May 15, 1956, titled "Dead End—The American Foreign Aid Route for Winning Friends Among

Neutral Nations Has Proved a Blind Alley."

There being no objection, the editorial-article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAD END—THE AMERICAN FOREIGN AID ROUTE FOR WINNING FRIENDS AMONG NEUTRAL NATIONS HAS PROVEN A BLIND ALLEY

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

So-called lend-lease aid to nations fighting against Germany, Italy and Japan was advocated as an essential means of winning a war that would usher in an era of peaceful cooperation among peoples. The war was technically won; but the era failed to materialize. Since the end of hostilities against the Axis the United States has disbursed close to $55 billion in relief, economic aid and military assistance to foreign powers.

The sum is considerable, even in this age of easy spending and currency inflation. Had it not been spent at all, American individual citizens would have had much more money to spend or save. Had it been spent directly on such defense objectives as intercontinental bombers, guided missiles and scientific teaching and research, there would probably be fewer pessimistic comparisons between American and Soviet accomplishments in these fields.

It would be unfair and unrealistic to write off this whole expenditure as a total loss, although some items, like the subsidization of the French colonial war in Indochina seem to fall in this category. Had it not been for United States aid, the recovery of Western Europe would not have been so rapid. Japan, Korea, and Formosa would be in much worse shape than they are, and one or more of these Pacific bastions might have fallen.

However, at a time when there is a good deal of agitation for continuing and expanding some of the most debatable aspects of America's giveaway program, it seems worth remembering that in two respects this program has not lived up to the claims and expectations of its advocates. It has not made America or Americans particularly liked. And, what is more important, it has not transformed the beneficiaries into reliable allies or, in some cases, even into friends.

DOLLARS VERSUS EMOTIONS

It should be clear by this time that dollars, even a great many dollars, will often not outweigh stronger political and emotional factors. Take the case of India, for instance.

American aid to that country has been far in excess of Soviet aid. But a red carpet of organized cheering hosts was prepared for Khrushchev and Bulganin, while Secretary of State Dulles, on his visit to New Delhi, was given the chilliest reception compatible with formal correctness. Prime Minister Nehru of India is frequently and sharply critical of American policy, seldom if ever critical of Soviet and Red Chinese actions.

There is no reason to believe that this situation, an outgrowth of Indian antagonism to what its leaders like to call western imperialism and materialism plus Indian resentment toward America's anti-Communist policy, would change if the United States doubled or trebled its giveaway program to that country.

Greece offers another illustration of the same point. The United States poured into Greece for economic reconstruction and military aid over $2 billion, a considerable sum for a small country. But at the present time the Greeks show far more inclination to be resentful over Cyprus and over American failure to induce Great Britain to consent to the union of that island with Greece than to remember the American aid. There are many similar examples.

It should be clear to us by this time, after the expensive education we have received, that favors between nations, like favors between individuals, do not always make for friendship, and sometimes make for the reverse. Such favors, if they are too one-sided, can easily arouse a defensive psychology of envy and a suspicious tendency to seek ulterior motives for the behavior of the bountiful giver.

TARGET OF THE MOBS

The United States Information Agency is sometimes made the scapegoat for these attitudes. And it is an ironical fact that when foreign mobs go on the rampage the first building they seem to attack instinctively, perhaps because it is apt to be large and prominent, is the office of the USIA.

But even if all our information agency representatives spoke with the tongues of angels, it is doubtful whether they could succeed in overcoming the psychological reaction of envy and suspicion generated by the spectacle of a country so rich that it is able to give away so much, and perhaps sometimes in rather too lavish and ostentatious fashion. The number of American automobiles with diplomatic immunity in the heyday of the Marshall plan was a subject of some acid comment.

In any case, there is something repelling about government-to-government aid, with its inevitable overlay of bureaucratic procedure. Private undertaking is an entirely different matter, when it is accompanied by friendly interest and a complete absence of anything savoring of a superiority complex. The American Friends Service Committee has earned widespread international goodwill by sponsoring humanitarian and reconstruction projects in which young men and women work with their hands on local jobs.

INCIDENTAL UNDERSTANDING

American educational enterprises like the American University in Beirut, Robert College in Istanbul and similar institutions in Japan, China (until the bamboo curtain fell) and other Asian countries won much incidental friendship and understanding for America among the native students whom they attracted.

While there are cogent practical reasons for continuing to subsidize reliable allies, in the interest of our own security, no particular benefit is likely to accrue from increasing handouts to uncommitted and sometimes unfreindly neutrals or from channeling American aid through that Tower of Babel, the United Nations. As a means of winning friends and influencing people lavish Government aid has proved a dead-end street, which only the blind would continue to try to travel.

EUROPE'S CAPACITY TO PRODUCE BUILT BEYOND CAPACITY TO CONSUME

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it is time for the common horse sense of this body to take over. We have built the production capacity of the European nations far beyond their consuming capacity. As a matter of fact, in 1948, when the Marshall plan was first proposed, I stood on the floor of the Senate and said that any industrial engineer could say at that time that the European nations were being built beyond their capacity to consume, and that therefore they had to sell to someone. They could not sell to each other. They could sell to us and to Communist countries, or both—and they are selling to both.

WHY BUILD CHEAP LABOR FOREIGN INDUSTRIES TO DISPLACE AMERICA'S OWN WORKERS

Russia can become self-sufficient in the production of everything she needs, for war or peace, in a very reasonable time. So I ask, Is it not time for us to stop trying to send money abroad to buy our own goods, which we are not otherwise able to sell abroad? Is it not time that we quit building industrial plants throughout the world to use the cheap labor of the world for the purpose of displacing American workingmen?

I thank the Senator from California and the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Georgia, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not care to take much time on this amendment.

If the pending amendment is agreed to, it will very seriously reduce the allocations to all Central and South American countries. Those who are interested in South America or the Latin American countries would do well to study what this amendment would mean.

I wish briefly to refer to the so-called unexpended balances at the end of the fiscal year. All the testimony before the committee—and we went into the subject in great detail with every witness who could shed any light on it—indicates that at the end of this fiscal year, which is certainly in sight—it is just around the corner—the actual unobligated amount of prior appropriations will be less than $350 million.

We have approved another amendment, providing that all the unexpended balance which is not definitely obligated or reserved, except $200 million—and except for 2 other items—shall go back into the Treasury anyway on the 30th of this month. So there is no unexpended balance, in the sense that there is a large sum of money that would be available for future expenditure.

The real money which will be available to the administrators of these funds will be whatever is authorized by this bill and subsequently appropriated by the Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield for a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that if we appropriate this year the amount authorized, it is estimated that practically the same amount will be expended during the 1957 fiscal year? In other words, the appropriation and the expenditure in the fiscal year 1957 will be almost the same?

Mr. GEORGE. Very nearly the same.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So the unobligated balances certainly will not increase?

Mr. GEORGE. The unexpended balances are already obligated; and every man who has made a conscientious study of the bill knows it. Hour after hour and day after day we labored with it. When Senators talk about unexpended balances, in the face of all the testimony we received, if those witnesses are reliable and responsible, such so-called unexpended balances simply do not exist in the sense that they are available for obligation.

As I have said, in the bill there is an additional amendment, providing that not more than $200 million should be carried over at the end of this fiscal year.

So there is nothing to it except what is to be appropriated this year.

A great deal is being said about how the countries with which we are associated are lying down on the job and doing nothing. Against those words, let me place this statement in the RECORD:

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries, exclusive of Germany, have an authorized military strength in that organization, or available today, of 3,500,000 men, against the United States 2,080,000 men.

The other NATO countries have divisions, or equivalent forces, of 90, as against our 20. Are they doing nothing? Are they making no contribution?

In air power, they have more than 250 squadrons. We have more than 125 wings.

With respect to active naval vessels, all the other countries in the NATO organization have a total of about 1,400, as against our 980.

Consider next the total national product. That is the real test of whether they are doing anything or not.

The total national product of the NATO countries is $152,200,000,000, as against our national product of $387,200,000,000.

The total gross national product after defense expenditures of all the North Atlantic Treaty countries is $141,800,000,000, while our total gross national product after defense expenditures is $346,500,000,000.

Now let us compare the per capita gross national product of all the NATO countries with the per capita gross national product of our country. The per capita gross national product of all the NATO countries is $719, against $2,343 in the United States. The per capita gross national product after defense expenditures of all the North Atlantic Treaty countries is $670, against $2,097 in the United States. Yet it is said that the NATO countries are doing nothing.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. No; I shall not yield at the moment. I shall be glad to yield later. It is said they are doing nothing; that they are doing nothing compared to what we are doing.

Mr. President, let anyone who thinks we can reduce the amount of money in the bill by the amount carried in the proposed amendment see what it will do. The total amount of the committee amendment in dollars, with no unobligated balance except $200 million, is $4,270,075,000. The amendment proposes to reduce the amount to $2,765,875,000, a total difference of $1,504,200,000.

Let anyone who is interested in Latin America or in South America or in this continent see what will be left for those countries if we cut this bill by that amount.

Do we not owe something to our friends in this hemisphere?

On Wednesday I said if the bill were reduced by any such extravagant amount as this, our country would head into real isolation. It would head into a stagnant philosophy, a stagnant economy, a stagnant commerce. We will certainly have isolation in this country if we lose all the friends we have in Europe.

I am satisfied that the Senate will not vote for the pending amendment. I merely wished to make this statement before a vote is had on the amendment, because if the amendment should carry we will reduce all the chance we have for peace in the world. After all, as the Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff said in his final words to our committee:

> In the aggregate, I am convinced that our mutual-security program is our best instrument for building up and maintaining the collective strength of the free world for the common defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired. Do both sides yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I shall ask the indulgence of Senators for only a few minutes. I spoke for more than 2 hours this afternoon on the bill. All I wish to do is to add more emphasis to some of the points I made this afternoon.

A moment ago I rose to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Georgia. He refused to yield. My question would have been, What about the debt structure? He talked about the gross national product. As I pointed out this afternoon, our country owes more money than all the countries of the world put together. That fact should be noted in the RECORD also.

Mr. President, I said this afternoon that if we continue to spend money at the rate we are now spending and at the rate advocated by Mr. Dulles, of as much as $40 billion a year, we will not need any armed services. Taxes will keep on rising. If we wish to destroy initiative, let us take that course.

I pointed out this afternoon the vast sums of money we have been spending since 1948 in order to put the countries of western Europe on their feet.

We have spent far more than we anticipated we would spend. The program called for about $17 billion. We have spent over $23 billion in delivered goods, and we still must deliver—and this for Europe only—$3,618,000,000. That is as of March 1, 1956.

Anyone with commonsense ought to know that we cannot keep that up and hope to survive.

We have appropriated for military assistance to the countries of western Europe $9,181,320,000. Since these appropriations have been made, we have spent only two-thirds of that amount, and we still have, as of February 29—those are the latest figures I have—we still have in the kitty, for delivery, more than $3⅓ billion. This year's program calls for an additional $760,471,000 for countries which are as well off as we are and are as able as we are to carry on, notwithstanding the statement just made by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia.

Take the Near East, Mr. President. We have delivered in goods and materials up to this time over $3 billion. We still have in the "kitty" almost a billion dollars, and the bill provides for that area $884 million additional.

Take Asia, Mr. President. We have spent there more than $5⅓ billion, and we still have in the "kitty," as of February 29, almost $3 million left to spend.

The program for that area will be in excess of $2⅓ billion.

Why can we not cut something out of that? The great trouble with expenditures for military aid is that there is available today for Asia more than a billion and a half dollars, and we are providing a billion and a third more. The program is going too fast. We should take the money appropriated and spend it more slowly, in keeping with the ability of the people there to absorb it and to understand what we are trying to teach them, not to let it go over their heads. We should start at the bottom of the ladder. That is what we should do.

Mr. President, I have spent a good deal of time in that area, and I have seen how, in many cases, our money is being frittered away, how it is being wasted, because we are trying to do the job too rapidly. We should teach the people in accordance with their ability to absorb what we are trying to teach them. But we go beyond their mental capability and the physical ability of the people to carry on projects after we erect them.

Mr. President, I plead with the Senate not to increase the amount. All we are asking for is the same amount appropriated last year for these purposes, and that the executive department distribute it to the best advantage.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this is the ninth consecutive year that as a Member of the Senate I have been called on to vote on the foreign aid program. I have always supported the overall program, including appropriations therefor, after voting for certain reductions in 1954 and 1955. For the last 2 years I have supported the program on the hope that it would be improved and would be gradually reduced in the overall amount.

In a broad way, those sponsoring the program have held out hope continuously for reductions, always to begin about 2 years in the future. Nevertheless, this year we are confronted with the request for an amount almost double the sum provided last year.

The sums authorized for the past several years, together with the request for the year 1957, are as follows:

Foreign aid appropriations—By billions (from beginning of Marshall plan)

Fiscal year	Military aid	Other	Total
1948	$0.392	$4.9	$5.4
1949	.213	5.4	5.65
1950	.524	3.6	4.15
1951	1.47	3.1	4.63
1952	2.66	2.3	5.04
1953	4.34	2.0	6.41
1954	3.23	1.5	4.76
1955	2.21	1.7	3.95
1956	.7	2.0	2.7
1957	3.0	1.86	4.86

From end of World War II through December 31, 1955, the total amount of $53,151,000,000 was actually delivered to countries.

In addition, on December 31, 1955, there was an unexpended balance of $9,300,000,000 on hand, appropriated for the program.

There is now pending the request for an additional $4,859,000,000 in appropriations.

As one supporting foreign aid in the past, I have reached certain conclusions about the program and I accept the program as a part of our foreign policy.

First. I think we shall make a great mistake to try to outbid Russia in her new field of activity of economic aid to various nations of the world. We must call her hand on her new policy of economic aid and see just what she will deliver to these other countries. I do not believe that there will be any substantial delivery on these promises—but further, I do not believe there is any chance of obtaining and holding the good will of any nation by merely outbidding some other nation that may be offering aid.

Second. I think there must be a thorough reappraisal of this entire foreign-aid program, a reevaluation and a new start taken. This is no hasty decision on my part. I announced this firm conclusion in January of this year.

As a part of this new start on a program of foreign aid over the years, we should convert the program largely into long-term loans at low rates of interest for projects that the people of the countries involved are really interested in and will be willing to put up some of their own money to complete. In this way, the administration of each country, as well as the people have a real stake in the program.

I believe that this is the only sound, long-range program that will stand the test of time, and that until we do this it will be an annual battle on the foreign aid question, with a mass of conflicting facts and propaganda thrown at the people and at the Congress. The general trend of this annual debate on this subject tends to confuse the people and decrease their faith in the program as a whole.

Further, I am fully convinced that the only thing that will really insure a reappraisal and a new start is a firm stand and demand therefor by the Congress. It is our responsibility as we are the only ones who can appropriate the money.

The drive to obtain these funds, year and year, by those charged with administering the program has actually gone so far that one responsible, high-level witness, testifying a few days ago before the Senate Appropriations Committee in behalf of the foreign aid program, actually said: "I am here to sell a bill of goods."

MILITARY AID

In connection with military aid, I expect to support a figure at approximately what we voted for fiscal year 1956.

I think the military-aid program has been of value to us and would not want to see it abandoned. At the same time, my own, on-the-ground observation of some of its units in Europe has made it clear to me that a mere pouring out of large sums of money in these countries by the United States will not increase our military protection or theirs. The aid that we are giving them is largely in keeping with their own effort.

Frankly, I do not think the American people will much longer support a draft law that requires their sons to serve for considerably longer periods of time than that served by the young men of nations we are aiding.

I strongly support military assistance to Western Germany, but think the time has already come when they must show more actual results in building their own military strength, not only in weapons but in men with the spirit to make their military effort a success.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

This program, which has had my consistent support, is a disappointment when you see it in actual operation in the field.

The administrators of our program are necessarily at the mercy of the administration in each foreign country. In a large measure, the programs approved are designed more to benefit those in favored groups than the masses of the people.

This program too must be reevaluated. I am satisfied we have employed too many people and have pushed the program too rapidly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has only 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, before me is a book which every Senator should have an opportunity to study before voting on this amendment or on any other amendment involving unexpended balances.

We are told that the money is allocated or reserved, which means that we will expect to give Country A so many millions of dollars and expect to give it so many tanks, guns, planes, and so forth. That does not mean it will ever get any of the value represented, but that is what they have in mind at the time. It can be held up; the administration can scratch the figures out and change them around.

That is the only reason why this book, with all the details, is confidential. Just as the chairman of the committee explained yesterday, we would not want to disappoint those countries and have them depending on the money and not receiving it.

In 1953, Mr. President, I stood on this floor arguing on a bill for the fiscal year 1954. The unexpended balances then were $10 billion. I was urging that we cut down on the amount authorized, which was $4,700,000,000. If we had not passed a single appropriation since that time, the amount which was on hand at this time would have been sufficient to carry on the program.

Instead of increasing the amount we are appropriating from year to year, we should do what we have been doing every year since 1952, namely, appropriating less. That does not mean the administration has to spend less. It can spend twice as much if it wants to. Last year the administration spent $3,770,000,000.

The senior Senator from Georgia picked the $35 million for Latin America. It could be subject to reduction, also, although it is a very small item compared to the others and should be left alone.

I believe the Committee on Appropriations will show the good judgment to make certain that that items is left in should the amendment be agreed to.

Furthermore, I have never said the European countries are not doing much. I did not say they are doing nothing. I said that when the argument is made that they are putting up $10 out of every $11 for their own defense, the fact is overlooked that they are totally capable of putting up the entire $11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

The Senator from California has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time. I hope the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will be rejected. I fully support the position taken by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement made by Adm. Arthur Radford before the Committee on Foreign Relations on the effects of the House cuts in the proposed military assistance appropriations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY ADM. ARTHUR RADFORD ON EFFECTS OF HOUSE CUTS

UNEXPENDED BALANCES

The Department of Defense estimates that $5 billion of unexpended balances of prior appropriations will exist on June 30, 1956. There seems to be considerable feeling that these unexpended balances make new appropriations largely unnecessary, and that undelivered items designed for Europe could be diverted to other parts of the world. Both these impressions are incorrect.

Appropriations of earlier years have been obligated (or reserved) to procure items, now on order, which will be furnished to our allies principally in fiscal years 1957 and 1958. The money will not be spent until the items are delivered. However, the money is firmly committed.

The major part of the appropriations sought for fiscal year 1957 will be to enable the Department of Defense to place orders in that year for delivery in fiscal year 1958 and in fiscal year 1959, after the money from existing appropriations has been spent. The production lead times of the various items to be ordered were carefully considered in this request for funds. Any substantial reduction in the fiscal year 1957 requested appropriations would inevitably result in either:

(a) A stretch-out of deliveries from the fiscal year 1950–56 balances (with resulting delay in achieving the desired combat capability of our allies); or

(b) A hiatus in vital support of our allies which will become apparent in late fiscal

year 1958 or in fiscal year 1959, at which time we cannot repair the damage except by diverting equipment from our own United States mobilization requirements.

We have already communicated to our allies in Europe the details of the items which we plan to furnish to them under prior programs. Their defense plans are based upon receiving this equipment. Any diversions of this equipment would completely destroy their defense planning and give rise to fear that we have lost our interest in NATO; and would also reduce their expected defense capabilities, which have been taken into account in our own military planning.

EFFECTS OF HOUSE CUTS—H. R. 11356

The House bill calls for $1 billion cut in the military-assistance program, or a cut of one-third, and further restricts the amount that may be spent in Europe (excluding Spain) to $402 million. I strongly urge that Congress restore not less than $600 million of this billion-dollar cut, and I likewise urge that the limitation on expenditures in Europe be removed.

I am of the opinion that the military-assistance program which was presented to the Congress is necessary and essential to accomplish the security objectives of the United States, that the program was austere to the degree that any major reduction would require a complete restudy of our own military program.

A cut of the magnitude made by the House, especially in the face of the new Soviet tactics, will have a very serious political and psychological effect upon our friends and allies throughout the world, especially in the crucial NATO area. It will be interpreted as indicating that the United States is relaxing its efforts at the very time we are urging others to maintain with firmness the strength which has been developed in the free world.

INITIAL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAM

The $3 billion program provided for the following principal requirements:

(a) For so-called fixed charges if we are to have a program at all: $255 million.

(b) Five critical countries (Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam, Turkey, and Pakistan): $1.2 billion. These five countries have developed forces at our instigation. They are strongly anti-Communist and are reliable allies. It is recognized that these forces are far in excess of those which could be maintained without our support. Therefore, any considerable reduction could not fail to have a damaging impact on their military capability. Any major reduction for these five countries would immediately affect United States security interests.

Therefore, we are reduced to a figure of $1.55 billion for all the programs in all the rest of the world against which the billion-dollar cut must be applied, unless there is also some reduction in the program for these vitally important countries.

(c) The initial increment of advanced weapons and equipment, vital to achieving modern defense capability in NATO and important to the early warning and defense of the United States itself, amounts to $426 million.

(d) The balance of the $3 billion program was to furnish to all other allies throughout the world spare parts and maintenance considered necessary to protect the large investment made by previous programs. This included about $100 million for training of allied forces which I consider one of the most vital elements of the entire program.

EFFECTS OF BILLION DOLLAR CUT

During the preliminary stages of the formulation of the executive department recommendations the Joint Chiefs of Staff actually considered a $2 billion program and found that it would be incompatible with the United States commitments and security interests around the world and would require a basic reevaluation of the plans and policies of the program. If this $1 billion cut is maintained the European program would sustain more than half—say $600 million. However, the effect on non-European country programs would also be very great. For example, we estimate that the Korean program would have to be cut in the neighborhood of 23 percent, Taiwan 14 percent, Pakistan 27 percent, Turkey 24 percent, and Greece 22 percent. The $1 billion reduction would also result in the elimination of approximately half of the increment for advanced weapons for NATO.

FOUR HUNDRED MILLION DOLLAR CUT FOR PROGRAM OF TWO BILLION SIX HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS

Our plea today is to reduce the House cut to a more reasonable one that we can live with. If the $1 billion cut can be reduced to $400 million we believe that such a cut could be applied without destruction of the program. It would involve the following adjustments:

(a) One hundred million to be absorbed by potential miscellaneous savings now in sight and already reported to Congress.

(b) The deferral or elimination of the following: $100 million of ammunition, $50 million of general-purpose vehicles, $50 million of spare parts, and $100 million in the aggregate from attrition aircraft, the mutual weapons development program, the facilities assistance program, and the advanced weapons program.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. Both sides having yielded back the remainder of their time, and the yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. BENDER (after having voted in the negative). I voted "nay"; but I have a live pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD and Mr. NEELY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State convention.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent, and his pair with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has been announced previously.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business and if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on official business, and if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—27

Bible	Frear	McCarthy
Bricker	Goldwater	McClellan
Byrd	Hruska	Monroney
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Curtis	Kerr	Smathers
Dworshak	Langer	Stennis
Eastland	Long	Welker
Ellender	Magnuson	Williams
Ervin	Malone	Young

NAYS—58

Aiken	Green	Millikin
Allott	Hayden	Morse
Anderson	Hennings	Mundt
Barrett	Hickenlooper	Murray
Beall	Hill	Neuberger
Bennett	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Humphrey, Minn.	Payne
Bush	Humphreys, Ky.	Potter
Butler	Ives	Purtell
Carlson	Jackson	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Cotton	Knowland	Scott
Dirksen	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Mansfield	Sparkman
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Symington
Fulbright	McNamara	Thye
George	Morse	Watkins
Gore	Mundt	Wofford

NOT VOTING—11

Bender	Jenner	Neely
Capehart	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Laird	Wiley
Daniel	Martin, Iowa	

So Mr. LONG's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

RIOT OF WORKERS IN POZNAN, RED-RULED POLAND

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think it might be appropriate to read into the RECORD a brief Associated Press dispatch which came over the wires today. The dateline is Berlin, and the dispatch reads:

Workers rioted for more food and better living conditions today in the industrial city of Poznan, Red-ruled Poland. A number were killed.

Troops and tanks went south to control the outbreak with shooting attacks in the streets.

The workers stormed Communist Party headquarters and public buildings in a carefully organized general strike.

Tonight the Red radio in Warsaw, the Polish capital, reported the attacks "resulted in loss of life."

A later broadcast said the rebellion had been suppressed.

The strike hit dramatically in the midst of Poznan's international fair. It is attended by exhibitors and viewers from both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Western travelers returning from the fair reported a jail was set on fire and streetcars and autos were overturned in addition to the attacks on Red headquarters and buildings.

The workers' rebellion appeared to be the biggest onslaught against Communist bosses since the June 1953 revolt of 200,000 workers in East Germany. That rebellion was put down by a Soviet tank division.

Warsaw radio accused "the imperialists and the reactionary underground movement" of using economic difficulties in several Poznan factories as pretexts for inciting the demonstrations.

The Communist broadcast acknowledged there was serious unrest and charged "the enemy did not choose Poznan by accident for his provocations.

"The 25th international fair is being held there at present. The aim was to cast a dark shadow on the good name of the Polish Peoples Republic."

Poznan, an industrial city of about 300,000 population, has had an international fair since 1922. It was the German city of Posen before World War II. It is 175 miles west of Warsaw, 155 miles east of Berlin.

I merely believe this is another indication that ultimately the desire for freedom will overcome any type of totalitarian tyranny. It is also indicative, perhaps, of the restlessness behind the Iron Curtain, and of movements which some day once again will result in the freedom of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Latvia, Esthonia, Lithuania, Albania, and the other countries which have been drawn behind the Iron Curtain, and whose people have been forced to endure the most godless tyranny the world has ever known.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—POSSIBILITY OF SATURDAY SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, first I wish to express my very deep appreciation to all Members of the Senate for having worked so long and so late today, and particularly to members of the staff for bearing with us during the trials we have had.

It is the intention of the leadership to have an evening session tomorrow, in an attempt to complete action on the bill. There are pending some twenty-odd amendments. If we are unable to complete consideration of the bill on tomorrow, we shall have a Saturday session, unpleasant as that may be to many of us.

The mutual security authorization bill must be passed; it must go to conference, the conference report must be adopted, and the bill must be signed by the President before there can be a mutual security appropriation bill.

Today the Senate passed the military public works bill, and, therefore, shortly we shall receive from the House of Representatives the supplemental appropriation bill. The only remaining appropriation bill to be passed after that will be the mutual security appropriation bill.

For that reason I should like all Members to be on notice that it may be necessary to have a Saturday session.

The Senate will convene at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. I should prefer to have the session begin earlier, even though we are concluding our deliberations late this evening, but, because committee meetings have been scheduled—and there are some very important committee meetings—I do not think they can be called off at this late date without breaking faith with Members who have relied on our commitments.

So I hope Members will be as considerate and as indulgent as possible, in an attempt to make as much progress as possible.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Will the Senator give us an idea of the agenda for Monday and Tuesday?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is in the RECORD. The public-debt-limit bill and the survivors' insurance bill are among the more important measures to be considered.

I may say to Members that there will be no more votes tonight.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. HUMPHREYS] be assigned to service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Public Works.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11356, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McCARTHY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11356, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11356, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LONG submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11356, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are no other Senators who desire to address the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, June 29, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 28, 1956:

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Andrew N. Overby, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, term of 2 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art always inclining our hearts to come unto Thee in the fellowship of prayer, inspire us now with a vision of the worth and sanctity of this new day.

We humbly confess that in thinking of our days with their mornings and evenings, their problems and tasks, we frequently find so much that baffles and perplexes us.

May we receive Thy divine wisdom and guidance to discern each day's meaning and mission and to know what is best for ourselves, for our country, and all mankind.

Grant that our faith in the triumph of Thy righteous purposes may never grow dim or become eclipsed by doubt or fear, but may we believe in Thy sovereign power.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10872. An act to provide for extension of the time during which annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims validated under section 2 of the act of August 11, 1955, may be made, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1275. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate employees of the District to protect life and property in and on the buildings and grounds of any institution located upon property outside of the District of Columbia acquired by the United States for District sanatoriums, hospitals, training schools, and other institutions.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 11320) entitled "An act to effect the control of narcotics, barbiturates, and dangerous drugs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MORSE, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. HRUSKA to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9052) entitled "An act to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9720) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9852) entitled "An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes."

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT ON H. R. 11947

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Saturday to file a report on the bill H. R. 11947, together with minority views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 11619

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on H. R. 11619 may have until midnight Saturday to file the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9052) to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2485)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9052) to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"The Secretary may contract with any private organization for the collection of information necessary to such survey, but any conclusions or recommendations in any report to the Congress under this section shall be made by a full-time officer or employee of the Department of Commerce, and no person employed under section 710 (b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, shall in any manner participate in such survey."

And the Senate agree to the same.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
ALBERT RAINS,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
by HENRY O. TALLE,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
HENRY O. TALLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
WILLIS ROBERTSON,
by J. W. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.,
JOHN W. BRICKER,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
PRESCOTT BUSH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9052) to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of two years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Section 2 of the House bill directed the Secretary of Commerce to make a complete survey of the iron and steel scrap available and potentially available, and to file with the Congress an interim report within three months and a final report by January 31, 1957. This section of the House bill also required that the survey be made by full-time employees of the Department of Commerce, although the Department would be authorized in making the survey to call upon other Federal departments for any information available to them.

Senate amendment No. 1 provided that the survey should be made by the Bureau of Mines rather than by the Secretary of Commerce. Senate amendment No. 2 deleted the requirement that the survey be made by full-time Federal employees and substituted language providing that, while the survey would be made under the authority and direction of the Bureau of Mines, the Bureau could make use of such assistance in making the survey as the Director of the Bureau deemed desirable.

The Senate recedes from its amendment No. 1, and the House recedes from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 2 with an amendment which is in effect a substitute for both the House and Senate language dealing with the manner in which the survey is to be conducted. Under the actions thus taken by the conferees, the survey would be made by the Secretary of Commerce and any conclusions or recommendations reported to the Congress would have to be made by a full-time officer or employee of the Department of Commerce, but the Secretary could contract with private organizations for the collection of information necessary to the survey. A further provision in the language agreed upon by the conferees would specifically prohibit any person who is employed without compensation under section 710 (b) of the Defense Production Act from participating in the survey in any manner whatsoever.

It is of the utmost importance that the survey be completely fair and objective. Accordingly, the Secretary of Commerce must exercise the greatest caution to insure that any research organization selected to assist in the survey shall be completely impartial and unprejudiced.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
ALBERT RAINS,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
By HENRY O. TALLE,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
HENRY O. TALLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9352) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 79]

Adair	Eberharter	Prouty
Barrett	Gamble	Saylor
Bass, Tenn.	Green, Pa.	Scudder
Bell	Harden	Shelley
Blitch	Hoffman, Ill.	Thompson, La.
Celler	King, Calif.	Thompson, Mich.
Chatham	Lane	Thornberry
Cunningham	Morrison	Tuck
Davis, Tenn.	Moulder	Wilson, Ind.
Davis, Wis.	Murray, Tenn.	
Dawson, Ill.	O'Hara, Minn.	
Dorn, S. C.	Phillips	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and ninety-five Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2486)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9852) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, and 6, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the sixth line of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, strike out "promote" and insert "encourage"; and the Senate agree to the same.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
ALBERT RAINS,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
by HENRY O. TALLE,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
HENRY O. TALLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
WILLIS ROBERTSON,
by J. W. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr.,
JOHN W. BRICKER,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9852) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

EXECUTIVE RESERVE

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: Section 3 of the House bill provided that before a person in private life may be designated as a member of the Executive Reserve he must comply with certain requirements which now apply to persons appointed to serve without compensation under the Defense Production Act. The main effect of this provision would have been to require persons designated as members of the Executive Reserve to file in the Federal Register statements of their financial interests at the time they are designated. The Senate amendments struck this provision from the bill. The Senate conferees pointed out that after this provision had been inserted in the House bill the Senate Banking and Currency Committee received extensive testimony to the effect that this amendment would hamper recruitment of Executive Reserves to the point where it would render this program virtually inoperative. After weighing the advantages and disadvantages of this provision of the House bill the conferees decided that rather than risk disruption of the Executive Reserve program this provision should be eliminated from the bill.

NICKEL SURVEY

Amendment No. 3: Under the House bill, the Secretary of Commerce was required to file an interim report on the nickel survey (discussed under Amendment No. 5, below) by July 15, 1956, followed by a full report by December 31, 1956. Because of the lapse of time since the passage of the House bill, there is not sufficient time to prepare and file an interim report by July 15, 1956. Accordingly, the conferees have agreed to the Senate amendment which postponed the date of the interim report to August 15, 1956.

DISPERSAL OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES

Amendment No. 4: This amendment added to the House bill a new provision amending the Defense Production Act so as to declare that it is the policy of Congress to encourage geographical dispersal of industrial facilities, and to provide that the Government, in building or assisting construction or improvement of industrial plants, and in procuring goods and services, shall follow the dispersal principle when practicable and consistent with existing law and the desirability of maintaining a sound economy, where such dispersal is in the interest of national defense. The conferees have agreed to include this provision in the bill.

The amendment is designed to give an expression of congressional support and approval of the dispersal policies which the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Department of Defense have already adopted, and are carrying out. The amendment does not apply the principle of dispersal to existing plants. It does not require replacing existing industries. And it does not mean that geographical dispersal is the only, or in some cases even the principal, factor to be considered. The amendment calls for the application of the principle of geographical dispersal of industrial facilities, under the coordination of the Office of Defense Mobilization, (1) when practicable, (2) when consistent with existing law, and (3) when consistent with the desirability of maintaining a sound economy. Full recognition can and should be given under this provision to the many other factors entering into the location of industrial plants, such as access to raw materials, power, labor, and transportation.

ALLOCATIONS IN THE CIVILIAN MARKET

Amendment No. 5: This amendment added to the House bill a new provision amending section 701 (c) of the Defense Production Act which related to allocations in the civilian market. This provision was primarily directed to the difficulties that have been experienced by civilian users of nickel, particularly small-business users, in obtaining an equitable share of the civilian supply. The conferees recognize the seriousness of this situation, and are concerned over shortcomings in the present system of distributing nickel. The bill, as agreed to in conference, does not contain the Senate provision in view of the fact that the bill contains another amendment to the Defense Production Act, directing the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Joint Committee on Defense Production, to make a special study of the nickel situation. This study will include, among other factors, allocation and distribution of nickel, the various uses of nickel, and resale of nickel as scrap. An interim report of the results of the study is to be made by August 15, 1956, and a final report is to be made by December 31, 1956. This report is to be made to the Senate and the House and is to include such recommendations as the Secretary of Commerce deems advisable. The final report will be made just before the next Congress convenes. This will enable the Congress to take such action as it may deem advisable with respect to the nickel situation. It should be emphasized that the existing provisions of the Defense Production Act give the President ample authority to impose allocation controls on either a general or selective basis where appropriate to alleviate this problem.

PAYMENT OF EXPENSES OF JOINT COMMITTEE

Amendment No. 6: Section 712 (e) of the Defense Production Act provides that the expenses of the Joint Committee on Defense Production shall be paid half from the contingent fund of the Senate and half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives. Under this provision the House disbursing officer makes all the payments for committee expenses and every 6 months is reimbursed by the Senate disbursing officer for half the payments to date. In order to eliminate this unnecessary bookkeeping and to be consistent with the general practice followed with respect to joint committees the conferees adopted the Senate amendment providing for payment of all the expenses of this committee from the House contingent fund.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
ALBERT RAINS,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
by HENRY O. TALLE,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
HENRY O. TALLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report is the unanimous report of the conferees on the part of the House and it extends the Defense Production Act for 2 years from June 30, 1956. I am sure you all know the importance of the Defense Production Act. It is to coordinate and strengthen our defense.

It was enacted in 1950 and has been extended periodically to the present time.

It seems to me it would be very bad policy at this time to do anything that would result in failure to extend the act.

I am sure that the only opposition to this conference report is to amendment No. 4 which declares it is the policy of Congress to encourage geographical dispersal of industrial facilities and to provide that the Government, in building or assisting construction or improvement of industrial plants, and in procuring goods and services, shall follow the dispersal principle when practicable and consistent with existing law and the desirability of maintaining a sound economy, where such dispersal is in the interest of national defense.

I think that the apprehension and fears that have been engendered in the minds of many of our Members are entirely without foundation. This amendment will not apply to any of the industries that are financing themselves without Government aid. These industries may select their locations and expand as they please. When the Government furnishes financial assistance in the interest of national defense it should have the right to influence the location of the industries aided.

I am confident that no financial injury will result to the industries established on the Atlantic or Pacific seaboard and I am equally confident that the carrying out of this policy will strengthen our national defense.

This amendment was offered by the Senate. It has been twice passed by it, once by a vote of 40 to 20, and again by a vote of 48 to 13.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Does the gentleman know whether the other body has already discharged its conferees?

Mr. SPENCE. They have. No motion to recommit will be in order. If you vote this conference report down, the Defense Production Act dies day after tomorrow night. If you do not agree to this conference report and other conferees are appointed, under the circumstances I feel confident that no agreement will be reached for a long time.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, first I want to say that I am opposed to the amendment most vigorously. Is it not true that the other body can appoint new conferees if we should vote down this conference report?

Mr. SPENCE. You cannot recommit this report because the conferees on the part of the Senate have been discharged.

Mr. MORANO. I am not asking about a recommittal. I am asking if you vote down this conference report.

Mr. SPENCE. This ends the matter so far as this conference is concerned.

Mr. MORANO. Could not the Senate then appoint new conferees?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes; but as a practical matter the Defense Production Act would die day after tomorrow.

Mr. MORANO. Can they not be reappointed and go to conference again?

Mr. SPENCE. Oh, yes. Both bodies will still function. They can appoint conferees, but the result that I have stated will take place.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, what could happen would be a continuing resolution for 30 days. We have done that before on this particular bill when we did not get it through by June 30. The main question that concerns many of us is this: We know that our distinguished friend the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] knows the situation, but there is a matter of serious concern which would bring about an injustice to certain sections of our country. This idea of sectionalism is repugnant to me, but there is a question of injustice that is equally repugnant. We can understand what a target area is. I think every Member can understand that. Suppose some company wanted to go in the future to Massachusetts, New York, California, Michigan, Ohio, or any other State, into a big city, a target area. We can understand that. But suppose they could locate 40 or 50 miles outside the target area. Under this they could be denied and compelled to go to some other State. I know the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] does not intend that. It is his opinion that that would not happen. But can the gentleman say that it is the intent of the conferees that that shall not happen?

Mr. SPENCE. I cannot speak for all the conferees, but if this power is used arbitrarily or capriciously and not in the interest of all the people, the Congress is still in session and we can remedy that.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the conferees in their report say that that is not intended, that it is not intended to result in discrimination, that dispersal would be within a State, and outside of a target area within a State, probably a great deal of the difficulty would be obviated. The gentleman has referred to his own personal opinion, which is consistent. But that is not evidence of the intent of the Congress. We would have to have something more than that.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri, a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you very much. I know the distinguished chairman of our committee will be able to clear up some puzzling aspects of this for me. I wonder, if this amendment merely is supposed to reiterate what is already the policy of the Office of Defense Mobilization and of the Department of Defense, then why do we have to write it into the law? What purpose is served?

Mr. SPENCE. The purpose is to emphasize the necessity of this policy, and to be assured that it will be followed.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Does that mean that the ODM and the Defense Department have been assuming this power and assuming authority that they do not have in this matter? Have they been in violation of the existing law on this, requiring us to rewrite the law to conform to their policies?

Mr. SPENCE. No. The policy is obviously sound, in the interest of the national defense, and does not violate any law.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. As a Representative from a highly industrialized area, I am fearful of what this does to St. Louis business. Does it stop our firms from expanding, where Government aid or tax benefits might be involved?

Mr. SPENCE. If there is an undue concentration of some particular defense industry at a particular location, it will mean that Government aid will probably not be extended to increase this concentration. I think it will have very little effect on the industries of St. Louis. Unless defense industries are unduly concentrated in St. Louis, it will have no effect.

I might point out to the gentlewoman that the Joint Committee on Defense Production maintains a constant watch over the administration of this act, and I am sure that committee will be vigilant in guarding against any abuse of this power. In addition, the Banking and Currency Committee, on which the gentlewoman serves with great ability, will act promptly to correct any abuse, should the need arise.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the chairman for his statement, which has clarified the issue for me. While it has not reassured me in my fears about this amendment, I shall not take his time to state my opposition. I appreciate his frankness.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] has again expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1957

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1957.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to consult with my chairman about allocation of time to this side.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, how much time does the gentleman from Iowa desire?

Mr. TALLE. I may say to the gentleman from Kentucky that there are requests for considerable time on this side. I trust that my chairman will grant this side half of the time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Iowa 20 minutes to be distributed among Members on this side.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, may I hold out some prospect for some additional time, inasmuch as I have had many requests for time?

Mr. SPENCE. The gentleman may hope for that, but I do not know that I can guarantee it.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, my relationship with the gentleman from Kentucky has always been pleasant, and I may say that that is not a forlorn hope.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Kentucky may yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa to be allocated as he desires.

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief, in the light of careful inquiry and what I learned in conference, which I may say was very amicable, that some Members of Congress are more disturbed about the dispersal amendment than close scrutiny warrants. May I make a few comments to support my point?

In the first place, it is a statement of policy. In the second place, the amendment says that this is a policy which shall be followed when practicable. In other words, it certainly is not an iron-clad policy. Geographical dispersal may not occur without taking several other factors into account. In the third place, it relates to national defense, to maintaining a sound economy and must be consistent with existing law. And the

last sentence of the amendment says that nothing contained in this paragraph shall preclude the use of existing industrial facilities. The amendment does not disturb anything which exists now.

May I now quote from the statement of the managers on the part of the House on page 3 of the conference report:

> The amendment is designed to give an expression of congressional support and approval of the dispersal policies which the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Department of Defense have already adopted, and are carrying out.

Mr. McDONOUGH.. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. If it is the policy already being carried out, why reiterate it in this conference report? By such a reiteration the Department of Defense is encouraged to stimulate its action along these lines.

Mr. TALLE. The House conferees certainly did very well in conference, for in the original version of the amendment the word "promote" was used. We asked that the word "promote" be deleted and that the word "encourage" be substituted for it. Our purpose was to avoid the use of a word that might connote the intent to stimulate.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I am not going to vote for anything that will put the great automobile business of Detroit and Michigan in a goldfish bowl and circumvent their expansion. That is what this does. I am not going to vote for it. I cannot vote for it. I do not think anybody from a great industrial district can vote for anything like this. The committee can give all the permission they desire; what they ask here is congressional approval. The industrialists have some idea of business or they would not be the giants they are today. They recognize hazards and will insure accordingly. They manned the factories called the hub of the arsenal of democracy in the darkest days of this country. We are circumventing these people. We are saying by this legislation, "You cannot expand any further." I do not think it is good legislation. These people will know whether or not they are in danger. I do not think we should approve the fourth section in this report.

Mr. TALLE. I can assure the gentleman from Michigan, for whom I have great affection, that there is no intent on the part of the conferees to place existing industries in jeopardy or cause injury to our great industrial centers.

Mr. Speaker, rather than consume more time, may I invite the attention of Members to what this amendment does not do, as stated at the top of page 3 of the conference report?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, this amendment has the effect of putting the congressional stamp of approval on Office of Defense Mobilization Order I–19. I believe that is the number. I am quoting it from memory. It is a very long order of some 15 or 20 pages, giving an order to the Defense Department on how they should procure materials and when they should approve of the construction of facilities.

I think all those of us from the industrial areas have been aware of that Office of Defense Mobilization order and have been fighting it tooth and toenail as far as we could, but that is an order carrying the weight of the White House.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 80]

Barrett	Fisher	Scudder
Bass, Tenn.	Gamble	Shelley
Bell	Gentry	Thompson, La.
Blitch	Gray	Thompson, Mich.
Celler	Green, Pa.	Thomson, Wyo.
Chatham	Harden	Thornberry
Coudert	Hoffman, Ill.	Widnall
Cunningham	Lane	Wilson, Ind.
Davis, Tenn.	Morrison	Wolcott
Davis, Wis.	O'Hara, Minn.	
Deane	Phillips	
Dorn, S. C.	Prouty	
Eberharter	Saylor	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 395 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, when the roll was called I was saying to the Members of the House that the very statement contained in the statement of the managers on the part of the House is designed to give expression of congressional support and approval to the dispersal policies of the Office of Defense Management as they are contained in Defense Management Order No. I–19 of January 1956. Do you know what is in that order? I have read parts of it, but not all of it. It is a long order.

Do you know what is contained in that order? There is contained in the order, among other things, a requirement that the procurement of goods and services be dispersed geographically. It affects not only in the construction of plants but the procurement of goods and services.

Now, what can that mean to you? It can mean that if you have a plant in production and some fellow down in the Defense Establishment placing defense orders decides that placing an order in your district would be a violation of congressional intent, then your labor is going to be out of work; your labor will be forced to move, and your management will be forced to move. That has happened in my own district and adjoining districts in my own part of the country. Here we are accepting, if we accept it, a policy that has been approved only by 7 Members of this House, the 7 Members of this House who were the conferees on this particular bill. It was not a subject of hearings before the House Committee on Banking and Currency. Yet, we would give the stamp of congressional approval on a policy which that committee has not studied. I have not, for example, had an opportunity to appear before any group of the Congress to present my views, and you do not know what your views ought to be, because you have not seen the ODM orders. Now, that is what this thing does. It is an outrage upon the industrial areas of the United States. It would make farm communities out of the industrial areas and industrial areas out of the farm areas.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Would it not be a bad thing to lock into law a matter of defense strategy? In other words, there might be some change in defense tactics when you would want to concentrate things, and here you have a law that says you cannot do it, the same as military tactics in regard to making an offense on a particular day and time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Would not the effect of this action be to have the Congress fix an economic policy of the country contrary, probably, to the best economic interests of the Nation as a whole?

Mr. HINSHAW. It would have us adopt an economic policy of which we have no knowledge at all.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And without study by the Congress itself.

Mr. HINSHAW. Exactly. There has been no study given to it. There have been studies made of civilian defense and there have been studies made of other subjects, but I know of no genuine study made of this dispersal question.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, economic conditions and good commonsense have established these different plants in the locations in which they are now situated; is that not true?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And we would be upsetting that policy.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes.

Now, one other thought in closing. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] points out that the law will expire Saturday night if we do not agree to this amendment and agree to the conference report. Well, that is perfectly true; but it can be reinstituted on next Monday without this amendment, which has been presented with no knowledge on the part of the Members of the House and no hearings held.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this, in my opinion, is not the way to legislate, and I urge that this conference report be rejected.

You need not fear that the law will expire or we will have no Defense Production Act if you do reject the report. I am certain that the majority and the minority leadership will agree to bring in a concurrent resolution and we will pass it almost as fast as it can come to the floor extending the law as it exists at least for 30 days, so that you can consider this problem further if you want to. I do not think you will want to consider it further, because this dispersal provision was recommended some years ago by the House Committee on Banking and Currency. It came to the floor and was overwhelmingly rejected, and the Senate at that time went along with the House action.

This year nobody, but nobody, from the executive department appeared before the House Committee on Banking and Currency and asked for this dispersal provision. There is not a word of testimony in the record of the hearings conducted by the House committee on this subject. There is nothing that I know of that was sent to the committee after the hearings were closed that asked for this provision. There was some testimony on the other side, and then the Senate adopted the provision. Now the House is asked to write it in, because the Senate thinks it is a good thing.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MULTER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that this would wipe out the industries in the thickly populated States, and spread them out into the country?

Mr. MULTER. That is the theory behind it. Whether it would wipe them out or not, it would certainly prevent their expansion.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I wonder if the gentleman would explain to us the necessity for this kind of action. We are told in the report on the amendment that this is already policy. If this is so, why should we be asked to legislate on the matter? It appears to me that there must be some sinister influence at work here. What is behind all this? I wonder if the gentleman could help us to clear that up.

Mr. MULTER. All I can tell the gentleman is that if it is policy, and apparently it has been announced as policy, Dr. Flemming, representing the Office of Defense Mobilization told the Senate Committee—and I take that from their hearings—that the effectiveness of the Executive order is reduced without this provision. I say let us not give it to them until the House Committee on Banking and Currency has considered it fully again, heard all the witnesses and reported to the House. The House will then have an opportunity to debate it and work its will on it, as it did several years ago.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. I notice in the report the words are used, "It does not require replacing existing industries." Why did they not say that it does not permit it?

Mr. MULTER. Nor does it permit existing industries to expand. If you have a little shop in your district that wants a Government contract, but it cannot do the job unless it expands, then ODM will say, if you give them this authority, that the firm must expand at some other place, possibly in another State.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman has just brought up a very good point. That is where the bite comes here. Take the great automobile industry. As I said before the rollcall, they would place that industry in a goldfish bowl. These are businessmen. They know how far they want to expand. They know what property they have purchased for expansion. They have the responsibility for the use of that property.

Mr. MULTER. I cannot cry too much about General Motors and the automobile industry. I know they are in the gentleman's district and they could be hurt by this provision and we shouldn't hurt them. But I am more concerned about the little fellows all over the country who would be hurt.

Mr. RABAUT. They are all going to be hurt.

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. The conference report, in reference to amendment 4, while not numbering the bill, refers to H. R. 9852. I should like to call attention to page 3, lines 21 to 25 of that bill and ask the gentleman what his opinion is with reference to whether or not this proposal would control the granting of any loans or financial aid.

Mr. MULTER. Unless I do not understand the English language, the lines the gentleman refers to on page 3 will prohibit Government loan or aid for the construction, the expansion or the improvement of any—and I quote "any"—industrial facility in any part of the country.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PATTERSON. From what the gentleman has said, they will not allow expansion within one of our congressional districts. If they do not allow that, will they then direct a factory where to go, or where it may expand?

Mr. MULTER. Yes. If you need Government assistance in order for that little plant to expand, they will say that you may do it, provided that you go to the State or the place that they pick out for you. And you will not get help unless you do.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Is it not true that if you require the geographical dispersal of plants you will also require the dispersal of skilled workers to places where they may not want to go?

Mr. MULTER. That is true.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Is it not a fact that if there is a dispersal it will also mean a dispersal of the defense installations? The Nike sites, and jet bases, will have to be dispersed all over the country.

Mr. MULTER. That is supposed to be the purpose of this provision.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Does not the gentleman think if we are going to have geographical dispersal of plants we ought to have geographical dispersal of people? We ought to move the people out of these areas, too. Does the gentleman believe this is going to be the answer to safeguarding industry from all the problems of the atomic bomb?

Mr. MULTER. I think the gentleman's questions pose very real problems. This provision will assure no one of any safety from bomb damage or destruction.

Mr. BOLAND. No matter where you drop the bomb it is going to ruin industry no matter where it is, North, East, South, and West.

Mr. MULTER. That is true.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. It is going to disrupt industry all over the country.

Mr. MULTER. If I can sense the temper of this House, I think it agrees that this conference report must be rejected.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I have been anticipated on some of the notes I have made on this very vital amendment but I call your attention to amendment No. 4 as it is referred to in the statement of the managers on the part of the House. The statement reads:

> This amendment added to the House bill a new provision amending the Defense Production Act so as to declare that it is the policy of Congress to encourage geographical dispersal of industrial facilities and to provide that the Government, in building or assisting construction or improvement of industrial plants, and in procuring goods and services, shall follow the dispersal principle.

So not only are we affecting existing plants but also the existing means of procurement.

In my estimation, this bill will not only make us disunited, it will bring about a disrupted national defense.

We want to set here as a matter of congressional policy something on which we have had no hearings whatsoever. As has been mentioned by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], we had this very idea in the Rains amendment some 5 years ago and we defeated it overwhelmingly.

If we desire this dispersed amendment we ought to act in a direct way; following the parliamentary procedure provided for, by having hearings on this matter of such vital importance, and not doing it by indirection.

Unfortunately, at this point in the legislative process, the parliamentary situation is this: The other body has already discharged its conferees. We cannot recommit the conference report, we must of necessity defeat it. Then the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee can ask for a new conference. I ask you to vote down this conference report in order that we, in the House, be given an opportunity to deal directly with this disruptive geographical dispersal policy as it is now incorporated in this bill.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed over the fact that the House conferees agreed to accept the Senate amendment which added to the House bill a new provision amending the Defense Production Act so as to declare that it is the policy of Congress to encourage geographical dispersal of industrial facilities.

In previous Congresses, amendments which would have had the effect of dispersing industries were resoundly defeated. This year, the bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, did not include the dispersal principle. In my opinion, it is, indeed, unfortunate that the House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment without having the matter of dispersal fully debated on the floor of the House.

While the language of the amendment may appear to be innocent, it could, in fact, be most detrimental to the long-range economic development of the entire New England industrial region.

The amendment provides that the Government, in building or assisting construction or improvement of industrial plants, and in procuring goods and services, shall follow the dispersal principle when practicable and consistent with existing law and the desirability of maintaining a sound economy, where such dispersal is in the interest of national defense. While there should be taken into consideration the many factors entering into the location of industrial plants, such as access to raw materials, power, labor and transportation, no safeguards are provided to make sure that geographical dispersal will not be the only or principal factor considered. The effect of the amendment, also, might very well result in the denial of defense-production contracts not only to our great industrial firms in Connecticut but throughout New England.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, if this conference report is accepted, including amendment No. 4, the result will be complete stagnation of all present industrial districts in the United States. The words of this amendment are far-reaching. It does not apply only to new industries. To use the exact words of the amendment, it applies "in building or assisting construction or improvement of industrial plants. I emphasize the words "improvement of industrial plants." This means that in the congressional district I represent, one of the largest steel centers in the United States, there would be no more expansion in steel. At the present time Jones-Laughlin and the United States Steel Corp. are contemplating a large expansion program in and around Pittsburgh. All of these plans have been made over the years. They are part of the big renaissance of the big steel center of Pittsburgh. This amendment would destroy our plans and stop our progress. I am sure the same conditions exist in every industrial center in the United States. I think we owe it to the people of the great industrial centers of our country to defeat this amendment. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that we refuse to accept this conference report and request that a new conference report be brought in that will not destroy the great industrial centers of our country.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman for his remarks and associate myself with him.

It strikes me as strange that the House Members who met in conference with certain Members of the Senate with respect to the legislation extending the Defense Production Act should come back to us with an amendment having to do with geographical dispersal of industrial facilities.

It is strange to me because when this same legislation was before us no mention was made of this proposal, probably because the committee members knew that in recent years every effort to write legislation of this kind in the House of Representatives has met with defeat.

It is a fair assumption, therefore, that those who for several years have been trying to achieve industrial dispersal decided this year to circumvent the House of Representatives.

From a legislative standpoint, what has happened is perfectly clear. The amendment was adopted in the other body and approved in conference and as a result we are faced with a difficult parliamentary situation today.

In the first place, there is not nearly adequate time for the discussion of such an important matter, and in the second place we find ourselves with a kind of legislative pistol at our heads because we are told that unless the House now approves the extension of the Defense Production Act with this amendment, that act will expire.

All of these maneuvers increase my suspicion with respect to the geographical dispersal amendment and make me wonder exactly what is in the minds of those who seek this kind of congressional authorization.

We have been told this afternoon that the administration supports this measure and we have also been told that this amendment will but give approval to already established policies in the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Department of Defense.

If this is so, the question arises in my mind as to why we are called upon to make law with respect to policies already established.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened carefully to the debate thus far and I have heard no good reasons advanced for the adoption of this amendment in the conference report.

I am deeply fearful that the real purpose behind this series of strange maneuvers is to gain economic advantages for certain parts of this country at the expense of others.

Until and unless those who urge our approval for this type of policy give better reasons than advanced here today, I will not vote for this legislation and I urge my colleagues to vote it down.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the principle of geographical dispersal is to protect our industries against the hazards of a nuclear attack, but I question the ability of such a plan in this atomic age. Where are the industries going to be located in the future so that they will have such safeguards? Testimony given before our committees proves that there is no safe place that we can pinpoint in this country as having a perfect defense against such a devastating weapon.

The experts in the Defense Department and the Civil Defense Administration are deeply concerned over this very problem, the inability to give adequate protection to human beings and property in the dreaded event of a nuclear war.

The geographical dispersal provision of this bill will prohibit Government loans or aid for the construction, expansion, or improvement of "any" industry with a Government contract in any part of the country if the area in which the industry is located is deemed to be a so-called "target" area. New England areas, and particularly the Greater Springfield area of my district, have been so classified by the Civil Defense Administration. This geographical-dispersal provision could very well mean that no Government contracts would be let to industries in New England in the future.

It would seem to me that if we are going to have geographical dispersal of industry, then the next logical step would be a geographical dispersal of populations to protect them from the atomic bomb. But where would the industries and populations be relocated? There is no such safe place in the entire country.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this provision of the bill is defeated.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is unbelieveable that any member of this body who comes from an industrial State would approve this conference report. Speaking for Michigan, I want to point out that we in our State have the plants, facilities, manpower, trained personnel and the knowhow to undertake a great deal of the defense production work which is before us. Let me point out one thing in particular. In the Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal 1957, it is my belief there is approximately $5 billion for production of guided missiles. That kind of production will require new plants, the expansion of existing facilities. If we put our stamp of endorsement on this language, it means that industrial States, including the State of Michigan, will be precluded from participating in this kind of production for the Armed Forces. I say to you, it would not only be bad from the defense point of view to throw away all of this available talent and facilities, but in our State it would have a very serious psychological impact at a very bad time from our economic point of view.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman as they pertain to the great industry in his State, and also to say that the same situation pertains to the aircraft industry in the State of California and on the west coast generally.

Mr. FORD. There is no reason whatsoever why a State like Michigan or any other industrial State should be precluded from getting into the future procurement for the national defense program. This legislation, if approved, would stop us from getting into that type of new procurement.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan because he is expressing my views on this very matter.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is absolutely correct in what he has said. But, over and above that, you would have a complete dispersion of many families in the area. Families cannot follow plants as you move them wholesalelike all over the Nation. Where will housing be found? What about schools, and so forth?

Mr. FORD. We have the personnel, the facilities, and the know-how to handle this kind of work. There is no reason that I can understand why we should be precluded from undertaking that kind of procurement. Approval of the conference report will hurt Michigan seriously.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. I agree with the gentleman, but would we not be going one step further. Would we not be taking the powers away from the Congress, which we now have, which powers are given to us by the Constitution?

Mr. FORD. I want it clearly understood that under no circumstances can I endorse what the managers on the part of the House have said on page 1, and I urge rejection of the conference report.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I must now appeal to the chairman of the committee for more time because I have much demand on this side for time and I am now down to my last 5 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. TALLE. I am grateful to my chairman.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield; is any time allotted for the proponents?

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members fully understand the importance of the kind of action we are about to take, to declare it the policy of Congress to disperse into geographical areas the services and materials for war production. That means we are entering into a new phase of a planned economy. We are not only saying that the plant shall be located in a certain location but the labor has to be moved to that location in order to provide the service to operate the plant.

We have had no hearings and no understanding as far as the attitude of various Members of Congress is concerned, but there is a bill coming before you that has to do with unemployment in depressed areas. We have held extensive hearings on that. There has been divided opinion in the committee. That is another move in the direction of planned economy.

This conference report should be defeated, because you will have an opportunity to hear the whole story about geographical location of industries when this other bill comes before the House.

By the adoption of this conference report we are approving a means and method to disrupt the economy of all the large industrial areas in the Nation and also giving the Defense Mobilizer and Secretary of Defense the authority to move thousands of skilled and unskilled workers from their present homes to new locations.

I urge the defeat of this report.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to commend the gentleman for his statement. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] asked about hearing from some of the proponents. I cannot understand how any Member who has read this amendment could be for the amendment, because it would completely revolutionize industry in this country if it is carried out the way this amendment is written. This amendment says: "It is the policy of Congress to encourage geographical dispersal of industrial facilities." This amendment allows the bureaucrats to supervise industrial location and expansion under the umbrella of defense.

It is remarkable that the support for this amendment comes from areas where very little industry is now located. Several distressed areas would not exist today if Secretary of Defense Wilson did not siphon billions of dollars of defense contracts to General Motors. Studebaker, at South Bend, Ind., and other independent automobile factories have been hit hard since General Motors took over the Defense Department. This amendment will encourage that policy.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Is there a provision that would allow the Department of Defense, in the event of a forced dislocation of people and activity, to cite that such new activities and facilities could be set up in a new area? Suppose an act of God came along and disrupted the whole economy, would this bill take care of such disruption?

Mr. McDONOUGH. No. It has no reference to that at all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I have been amazed at some of the statements that have been made in this rather uproarious debate. I wonder if some of my distinguished colleagues realize that what you say in this conference report might become evidence against you, when I know you were overtestifying in your own behalf.

The simple truth is that we are losing sight of the real purpose of the amendment. From some of the debate we get more heat than light.

I also come from a great industrial center. But this amendment does not prevent expansion of industry. I have listened to statements here to the effect that if this became law General Motors could not build a plant any place it wanted to. All this does is to say to the people of America, the taxpayers, yours and mine, that where we spend your dollars for defense, we must spend it in those places where it will not be subject to destruction by atomic attack.

This bill is a bill for the defense of this country. This bill is for the defense of the Nation—not to promote industry. This bill is to take care of the taxpayers of America who are paying the defense bills—yours and mine—and not to take care of any industry in any particular place.

I think we ought to look in the Defense Production Act at the defense interests involved, just a little bit. This bill is not half the bugaboo the gentlemen would have you believe. I invite your calm and sober reading of just what it actually says. It does not prevent the expansion of existing facilities. It does not say that a plant must be moved

to another State. There is in both the conference report and the bill itself the statement that the Office of Defense Mobilization shall take into consideration all of the factors involved. I have heard statements made on the floor which would make one think we were going to move General Motors out of Detroit. There is nothing in the bill that would allow it to be done or even suggest that it be done. There is not a single provision in here to prevent the expansion of existing facilities if in the interest of national defense.

This is a very important and vital amendment if we are concerned with national defense. Much excitement has been created because of telegrams that pour in from chambers of commerce and people who do not understand the problem involved.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. I wonder if the gentleman from Alabama would make it crystal clear to us whether or not we will prevent General Motors, if it wants to spend its own money, prevent it from spending it where and when it gets ready to do so.

Mr. RAINS. The answer, of course, is completely and totally obvious: There is not one line in this bill that would prevent it; and all of the statements that have been made to the contrary are not in point and are not in keeping with the bill itself.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. It may not prevent General Motors from spending its own money to erect an expanded plant, but would it not prevent General Motors from getting a contract from ODM in that expanded plant?

Mr. RAINS. The gentleman from Connecticut is reading things in here that are not in the bill or in the report whatsoever.

Mr. MORANO. Would the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. RAINS. I have answered the question.

Mr. MORANO. And the answer the gentleman says is "No"?

Mr. RAINS. The answer is "No." Now, let me ask the gentleman one question, since he is taking my time. If the Office of Defense Mobilization said that it was in the interest of national defense and the safety of the United States to move a section of the plant, a new section which was being built, 50 miles outside of the gentleman's city, would the gentleman be for it or against it?

Mr. MORANO. From the fact that the gentleman has asked me that question he admits and concedes that the Government could move the plant outside Detroit.

Mr. RAINS. No; that is not what I said. I did not say that at all.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. First I want to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the conference report states that the amendment does not apply the principle of dispersal to existing plants; but in the act itself on page 3, to which the gentleman has referred, it clearly states that in the rendition of any Government financial assistance it does apply to the construction, expansion, or improvement of any industrial facilities. Is it not true, therefore, that it does apply to the expansion or improvement of any existing industrial facility if that facility gets any Government assistance?

Mr. RAINS. That is not correct, because the section carries with it other saving clauses which the gentleman failed to read.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is making an excellent statement. If the taxpayers' money is used why should not the Government insist upon construction of a facility somewhere other than in a target area? Why not?

Mr. RAINS. I can only say that in the days since World War II this particular bill has had the approval of the National Security Council in other administrations as well as in this one.

I would like to say one other thing. If you have the idea that you can send us back to conference with the Senate of the United States, those of you who have been there, and if you read the Senate debate between two distinguished Republicans in the United States Senate, one of them the author of this amendment, and, think they are going to surrender a 4 to 1 vote you have another thought coming. Too, if you have some idea that the people of this country will not wonder about letting the Defense Production Act with all of the activities which it must carry for the national defense, expire and go into limbo simply because of some selfish interest or imagination about a plant, I am sure you are wrong.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the conference report now being considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in its present form, I am forced into opposition to the Defense Production Act presently before us. I cannot vote for this bill as long as it contains the Senate amendment providing for geographical dispersal.

I understand that the amendment as approved by the Senate reads as follows:

In order to insure productive capacity in the event of such an attack on the United States, it is the policy of the Congress to promote the geographical dispersal of the industrial facilities of the United States in the interest of national defense, and to discourage the concentration of such productive facilities within limited geographical areas which are vulnerable to attack by an enemy of the United States.

I am particularly concerned with the interpretation which might be placed upon the phrase "geographical dispersal" by some of the executive agencies should this section become law. My own State of Rhode Island because of its relatively small size in comparison to its industrial capacity could be disastrously hit should the executive branch adopt a loose interpretation of this provision.

Heretofore, the matter of plant dispersal has been considered exclusively on the basis of satisfactory location within a certain section or area and the idea of scattering industrial plants throughout the land has been repudiated. A broad interpretation of this amendment as read today could possibly rule out the entire State of Rhode Island as a suitable location for industrial facilities simply because of the fact that the city of Providence, with its concentration of defense production plants, virtually dominates the entire State.

The amendment further states that this principle of geographical dispersal shall be considered by the Government in matters of financial assistance for construction, expansion, or improvement of defense production facilities and also in the procurement of goods and services. A loose interpretation of this phrase could deal a death blow to the hopes and aspirations of many of our Rhode Island communities which are so desperately striving to pull themselves up virtually by their own bootstraps to a secure plane of economic stability. A perfect example of the damage which could be caused is the city of Woonsocket which already qualifies as a distressed area in other matters relating to Federal assistance and which has been doing an excellent job in industrial redevelopment. Passage of the Defense Production Act with this section intact could conceivably reverse all the work the city of Woonsocket has done and plunge that community into the abyss of economic chaos.

We, in Rhode Island, have long been suffering from the problems which necessarily attach to a 1- or 2-industry State. We know intimately the burdens inflicted by the flight of the textile industry to mills in the South and the movement of the center of the machinery-manufacturing industry to the Middle West. We further know, however, that we still have the exceptional skills of our people—skills which can be used by other types of industry.

Both public and private sources have been constantly working with diligent effort to bring to Rhode Island diversified industries. All this effort will be wiped out, I am convinced, should the bill before us today be approved with the geographical dispersal still included in it.

That amendment will certainly be considered as virtually a warning to any interested industry to stay away from Rhode Island. It implies that the Federal Government may step in to wreck their operations.

In this amendment, Mr. Speaker, I see all the efforts of our Rhode Island communities being jeopardized, and I cannot in good conscience register my vote in favor of the bill so long as the geographical-dispersal amendment attaches to it.

I intend therefore to vote against it.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the conference report accompanying H. R. 9852, a bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and am extremely disappointed that managers on the part of the House saw fit to include in the report, amendment No. 4, which adds a new provision to the present Defense Production Act so as to declare it the policy of Congress to encourage geographical dispersement of industrial facilities, and in providing that the Government in building or assisting construction or improvement of industrial plants and in procuring goods and services shall follow the dispersal principle when practicable and consistent with existing law.

There is no question in my mind but that this is a back door attempt to further pirate industries in the industrial areas to be established in other localities under the guise that their present location may become a delicate area in the event of war. In my opinion, in the event of an all-out war, I do not believe there is any part of the United States which would not be vulnerable to attack and there would be no part of the United States which would be safer than any other.

Those of us representing industrial areas have already felt the impact of industry being removed from our midst either by volition on the part of management or because of the lure and inducements held out to them by those of other States who have shown by their offers that they are able to take care of these plants by reduced taxes, cheap power, and other benefits.

We of the present industrial area have been contributing to the funds which have made all of this possible and what we are, in fact, doing is indirectly depriving ourselves of the wherewithal to produce and the industries which have made our country so highly productive.

While it has been said on the floor of the House that there is no sectionalism involved in those who are supporting this amendment, I am convinced that there is no other reason which prompts their action. Hiding behind the cloak of national defense is only a sham.

I trust that enough Members of this Congress can see the hypocrisy behind the move to include this amendment in this report and telling us that if we vote against the report we are, in effect, killing the Defense Production Act which expires within the next 2 days.

If the proponents were so interested in its continuation it would appear that they would have put up a greater resistence to the inclusion of the amendment rather than submit it meekly to its incorporation in the report.

DISPERSAL AMENDMENT GIVES GOVERNMENT GREAT POWER

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier I asked the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency several questions about the affect of the dispersal amendment on industry in areas such as St. Louis, where we are heavily industrialized. As always, the gentleman from Kentucky was most forthright and helpful. It is seldom indeed that I do not follow his leadership on legislation coming before our committee. In this instance, however, I must vote to recommit the conference bill to strike this amendment.

The dispersal amendment was not in the House bill. It was added in the Senate. In conference it has, perhaps, been watered down a little, to use the word "encourage" in place of the word "promote."

But I am nevertheless afraid that in "encouraging" dispersal of industry, the vast powers of the Federal Government in allocations, or in the use of the tax amortization laws, can be used very definitely to the disadvantage of existing industrial centers. Does this mean that a firm cannot expand its facilities without suffering substantial tax penalties sufficient to persuade it to go elsewhere? Does it mean a firm in St. Louis with a plant which is becoming obsolete or obsolescent would be pushed into closing it down and building a replacement plant elesewhere?

The chairman has said that it applies only where there would appear to be undue concentration of a particular defense industry. Do we mean undue from the standpoint of some underdeveloped area of the country looking for new industries, or undue from the standpoint of an atomic bomb attack, or undue from the standpoint of competing firms or competing industries? This is a pretty broad range of possibilities.

What I very much fear is that with an amendment like this written into the law, the Government administrators might well believe they have been advised and instructed—directed, you might say—by Congress to push industry out of the industrialized centers and set it up instead in the weed patches of undeveloped or underdeveloped States.

If the amendment is intended to protect us against hydrogen bomb attack, it is indeed a very weak reed. The Civil Defense Administration says there is only one real defense and that is peace. We are told that in order to be reasonably secure, we should build underground shelters and factories where we could remain up to 3 weeks after a bomb is dropped.

Now moving a plant out of St. Louis to a weed patch somewhere is no solution unless there is the guaranty the enemy will not drop any bombs near the new location. How far off was the Bikini bomb—how many miles off target?

No, Mr. Speaker, I do not think we protect our country's defense potential with a few words like this inserted in the Defense Production Act. If we are to have our defense industries made secure against attack, then we must build them underground, I suppose. We must do a real and effective job of protecting our industrial potential, and we have not done it up to now, just as we have not protected our civilian population.

But let us not play at this and pretend we are safeguarding our production facilities, when all we seem to be doing is to make it harder for existing industrial centers to hold on to their industries under the pressures from our own Government to disperse us into unemployment and economic disaster. I cannot vote for this conference report.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, a reappraisal of the Defense Production Act is long overdue. The wide-scale economic effect of the activities of this important function should be carefully scrutinized. The administration of this law has gone far beyond its originally stated concepts. Defense mobilizing is used in our economy to prop up sagging conditions in various businesses and industries.

In the stockpiling of strategic metals, the emphasis seems to be on the establishment of a program of price supports for certain mining industries. The need for a price-support program for the development of a domestic metals industry may be justified, but that kind of activity should bear a proper label and should not be classified as "production for defense."

Although this legislation does not authorize the accelerated amortization program which is in the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee, that committee is undoubtedly affected by the discretion of the Banking and Currency Committee relating to an extension of the Defense Production Act.

It is high time to calculate the cost of the accelerated amortization program and to determine whether there is a more efficient way to create productive facilities in the interests of national defense. Defense Mobilizer Flemming testified that tax certificates have already been granted to the extent of $18 billion or 60 percent of the cost of expanded facilities. In view of the fact that these certificates have been granted at a high-income period, it may be assumed that a good portion of the cost of this expansion would have otherwise flowed to Government as taxable income. Dr. Flemming stated he did not know whether it would have cost less for the Government to have collected the taxes due and paid for the expanded facilities on a direct contract basis.

The recent wide-scale grant of quick depreciation certificates for expansion of power facilities is certainly questionable. Most public utilities already operate on a cost-plus basis. The tax amortization certificates were granted in many cases where expansion would have been undertaken without them. The granting of these certificates constitutes a needless bonus to this large and powerful industry.

The current June 25 release of amortization certificates includes a vast number of applications previously denied and lists electrical power company expansions in the name of national defense in predominantly rural areas including some in Ohio such as Tiffin, Kenton, Brilliant, and Forest, Ohio. To my best

knowledge, no intensive defense enterprise operates in either Brilliant or Forest, Ohio. The current list of certificates includes certificates for the Phillips Realty Co., of Bartlettsville, Okla., a wholly owned subsidiary of the Phillips Petroleum Co. Ostensibly, the Phillips Realty Co. is engaged in plastic research. This is indeed an extraordinary enterprise for a realty corporation.

Among the other interesting attractions in the current list of certificates of necessity we find that Jack Cohen, of New York City, has received a railroad freight car certificate for $206,000; that Edwin L. Weigand, of Miama, Fla., has received a similar $206,000 certificate; while Mrs. Georgene Renick, of Las Vegas, Nev., has also picked up a $99,000 certificate. If these individuals can obtain these certificates, why cannot anyone else? And if these individual persons can obtain certificates, can they become a transferable asset which may be assigned to someone else at a profit?

It is particularly important in this campaign year that political use not be made of the quick tax write-off certificates. The danger is ever present. The current trend of diffused certificate grants appears to be more political than in the interest of the national defense. It would take blushing explanations to justify tax exemptions for real-estate companies, for crossroads powerplants, and for ladies who want to build railroad cars.

The quick tax depreciation device has served all of the useful purposes for which it was designed during the critical days of World War II and the Korean crisis. No justification exists for the existence of this tax-dodging device at the present time. The only purpose it can achieve is the destruction of any efforts at an equitable income-tax system.

This legislation to extend the Defense Production Act would be improved if the authority to grant quick tax depreciation certificates was eliminated.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I support amendment No. 4, of the conference report on H. R. 9852 to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950.

The matter now at issue between members is this amendment No. 4 which says that—

> It is the policy of Congress to encourage geographical dispersal of industrial facilities and to provide that the Government in building or assisting construction or improvement of industrial plants, and in procuring goods and services, shall follow the dispersal principle, when practicable and consistent with existing law and the desirability of maintaining a sound economy, where such dispersal is in the interest of national defense.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal, or a similar one has been before this body on at least one previous occasion since I have been a member.

As in the past, it is hard for me to see how anyone can conscientiously fight this principle of dispersal. When Uncle Sam is putting up the money for the new plant, or is buying the product of a new plant, it seems to me that he certainly has the right and the duty to see that the money furnished by taxes is wisely spent.

I believe that the principle of industrial dispersal is going to be invoked more and more as the future unfolds.

The adoption of this amendment will provide a real chance for the principle to be put into practice, and a backlog of experience built up under it. The amendment does not require or envision the dispersal of existing plants. It is not an attack on existing industries. It does not apply to or affect non-defense industries. The owners of such industries can build them wherever they want to do so. Even with respect to defense industries dispersal is not the only matter of importance. Other factors to be considered are access to raw materials, power, labor and transportation.

I urge the house to adopt this dispersal amendment by adopting the conference report.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we are faced, and I am the first to admit it, with a serious problem in this country. We are faced with the probability of atomic and hydrogen weapon attack. If we are not, we are wasting some $35 billion a year. That attack, if and when it comes, is going to involve a lot more than the dispersal of plants. I point with some modesty to the stack of documents on this table.

For 5 months the Subcommittee on Military Operations of the House Committee on Government Operations has been exploring as completely as we could the subject of civilian defense. We think we have covered a great deal of territory. We think we know a great deal about urban vulnerability. But we know that we have not covered the problem of dispersal of industry, with all of the related problems which such a dispersal would involve. We know that is a problem within itself that is so big it would require several months of consideration by the proper committee, the Committee on Banking and Currency probably, or the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, before there could be brought to this House a piece of legislation which would deal properly with this particular subject.

We also know that the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization is operating not only under legislation but under three Presidential Executive orders. We know that in this amendment, if it is agreed to and becomes law, that we give congressional support to an enunciated policy of the Defense Department, but I say to you a policy which is very indistinct, and unclear. It has never been carried out as provided in the language of this amendment. The reason it has not been carried out is because there has not been a clear-cut policy enunciated by either executive branch or the Congress. That is the reason I say this question requires a great deal of study before you jump blindly into such an economy-shocking or industry-shocking problem as this dispersal amendment involves.

I ask the Members of this House to think about that very seriously because it is a serious problem. The problem of dispersal of industry is tied in with the problem of Government assistance to industry and Government procurement of the products of industry, and any attempt at geographical dispersion without a well-thought-out policy at this time would create chaos in our industrial life.

People live in urban centers. Whether we like it or not, the laborers in these industries live in urban centers. That is where they live, that is where they have lived for some time in connection with our war production.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this conference report be voted down so that this matter can be given the proper study by the proper committee, so that all Members of Congress may have an opportunity to speak on this subject.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, with modern methods of attack, all America is a target area. This bill is called a bill for the defense of America, but it is also a bill for economic stabilization. We have a dispersal of defense industries in America. That is already indicated by the various Members who have expressed concern over this dispersal amendment; representatives from Michigan, California, Ohio, Massachusetts, New York, and other parts of the Nation. We must remember that the national defense of America was designed to protect our industrial cities. We have a tremendous investment in the establishment of jet air bases and in the establishment of NIKE defenses to protect the cities of America. They are designed to protect these important industrial centers. Our military leaders tell us that this defense is adequate; that it is modern, and that it will take care of the need. Now, if we disperse defense production industries, it means that we are going to have to disperse and weaken national defense installations. We will have to locate more jet air bases and NIKE defenses around the country. The further dispersal of defense production industries will only develop new urban areas which will require new military and civilian defense installations.

Furthermore, the dispersal amendment will vest the Defense Mobilizer and the Office of Defense Mobilization with unprecedented power to determine the location of defense production industries and therefore dictate the areas of future growth and development in America. No greater peacetime powers have ever been vested in one person. It seems to me the economy will be better served by leaving the law as it is, and I urge that this amendment be defeated and that the conference report be defeated.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I raise my voice in support of the conference report. I represent a so-called distressed area. There are 149 distressed areas in the United States, as a result of pockets of unemployment. I say to you in all fairness that if the language stays in the bill as provided for in this conference report, we who have distressed areas will get a little special consideration from the Government of the United States through the allocation of defense contracts or the location of new plants. I am wondering how many of

you Members of the House of Representatives have unemployed groups in your districts. In my district I have in one county alone, as high as 36,000 residents out of a total of about 56,000 dependent upon surplus commodities. I have people in my congressional district whose annual income is only $1,180. We have this blighted area, and are reminded of it daily by the agonizing pleas of the unemployed. We have tackled this distressing problem, and we have raised thousands of dollars through public appeals in an effort to bring new industries into the area to provide these unemployed persons with jobs.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I said when I was on the floor a moment ago that there is a bill coming out of the committee to take care of the problem the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I appeared before your committee and testified.

Mr. McDONOUGH. This report has nothing to do with providing employment.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Years ago, when the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], was a Member of the House, we had the subject on the floor and we had a debate on the subject. It is nothing new. All we are asking for is action and that you people who represent these great industrial areas give a little consideration to us who represent distressed areas. I am in support of the language of this conference report.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman assumes because he has a distressed area that the distressed area will not be a target area. How can you assume that any of these distressed areas will get any plants under this bill? This is dispersal for defense.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In reply to the gentleman, I will say that I appeared before the committee of which he is a member. The gentleman from New York took a negative position on this subject. In reply to your question, before any critical or distressed area gets any Government contract, it has to be declared a nontarget area, and my district in Pennsylvania is a nontarget area.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Suppose this passes and then your district changes into a very highly industrial area with great employment, and then my area or some other area becomes labor distressed and we then try to take away from you. What would you say?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I would say it would be impossible.

Mr. McCORMACK. What would you say?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It involves the allocation of Government contracts, and the location of plants, but it does not apply to the dispersal of existing plants or require replacing existing industries.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard all afternoon expressions of unreasonable apprehensions and fears as to what will happen if this conference report is agreed to. It will only continue a program that has been in effect and must continue to be in effect as long as there is fear of hostilities. The amendment will not affect any existing industries or any industry that is willing to expend its own money. It will affect only those industries that ask for Government help. When Government aid is requested I think it cannot be denied it should have the right to determine the location of the industry in the interest of national defense.

I hope the House will adopt this conference report. I think if it does not, we will have a long delay before this organization which has done much for our national security gets into operation again.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues are anxious to get on with the business before the House. But I would just like to take these 2 minutes to see if I cannot dispel a little of the heat and get down to the facts that are to be considered here today.

I have heard various Members talk about how this is going to affect their area. They are taking a rather provincial view of this matter, as far as I am concerned. After all, is not the matter that we ought to consider here what is best for the country as a whole? Of course, I am a country boy and we may get the advantage of some of these industries in our area, but after all, we are spending billions of dollars to defend this country. If we do not give some consideration to the views of the Department of Defense, and give them the right to say where these industries are to go, I think we are wasting our money. Our enemies are taking every precaution to protect their war plants by dispersal and why should we permit our defense industries to be concentrated in the coastal areas where they are sitting ducks for an atomic attack. We had better wake up before it is too late.

After all, that is all the conference report does. It gives confirmation to the power which we have already given, as I understand it, to the Department of Defense to decide whether they are going to disperse; and if that is the case, why should we not go ahead and give them that power to decide what they think is best for the country? Is it not about time we cast aside our selfish interests in our various areas and uphold the hand of the Department of Defense in locating these industries in those places where they think it is best for the good of the country? I urge my colleagues to accept the conference report.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks the gentleman has made and he has done very well with them. But I am impelled to ask why is it necessary to write into law the Department of Defense's present discretion in this case? It seems to me they have this discretion and the gentleman has confidence in the way they are administering their duties; what is the necessity of tying them down to a law?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I am sorry time does not permit me to answer the gentleman's question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 200, nays 197, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

YEAS—200

Abbitt	Fascell	Lovre
Abernethy	Fenton	McCarthy
Albert	Fernandez	McDowell
Alexander	Fisher	McMillan
Andersen, H. Carl	Fjare	Mahon
Andresen, August H.	Flood	Marshall
Andrews	Flynt	Mason
Ashley	Forrester	Matthews
Ashmore	Fountain	Merrow
Aspinall	Frazier	Metcalf
Avery	Gary	Miller, Nebr.
Ayres	Gathings	Mills
Baker	Gentry	Mollohan
Barden	George	Moulder
Beamer	Grant	Murray, Tenn.
Belcher	Gray	Natcher
Bennett, Fla.	Green, Oreg.	Norblad
Bennett, Mich.	Gregory	Norrell
Berry	Griffiths	O'Konski
Blatnik	Gross	Passman
Boggs	Haley	Perkins
Bolling	Halleck	Pfost
Bonner	Hardy	Pilcher
Boykin	Harris	Poage
Bray	Harrison, Nebr.	Poff
Brooks, La.	Harrison, Va.	Preston
Brooks, Tex.	Hays, Ark.	Priest
Brown, Ga.	Hays, Ohio	Prouty
Budge	Hébert	Quigley
Burleson	Henderson	Rains
Burnside	Herlong	Reece, Tenn.
Byrd	Hill	Rees, Kans.
Cannon	Hoeven	Rhodes, Ariz.
Carlyle	Hope	Rhodes, Pa.
Carnahan	Horan	Richards
Carrigg	Huddleston	Riley
Chase	Hull	Rivers
Chelf	Ikard	Roberts
Chenoweth	Jarman	Robeson, Va.
Christopher	Jennings	Rogers, Colo.
Colmer	Jensen	Rogers, Fla.
Cooley	Johnson, Wis.	Rogers, Tex.
Coon	Jonas	Rutherford
Cooper	Jones, Ala.	Schwengel
Cramer	Jones, Mo.	Scrivner
Curtis, Mo.	Jones, N. C.	Selden
Davis, Ga.	Judd	Short
Dawson, Utah	Kearns	Shuford
Dempsey	Kee	Sikes
Denton	Kelley, Pa.	Siler
Dies	Kilburn	Simpson, Ill.
Dixon	Kilday	Smith, Miss.
Dolliver	Kilgore	Smith, Va.
Dowdy	Knox	Smith, Wis.
Durham	Knutson	Spence
Edmondson	Krueger	Springer
Elliott	Landrum	Staggers
Evins	Lanham	Steed
	LeCompte	Talle
	Long	Teague, Tex.

Thomas	Vinson	Wier
Thompson, Tex.	Vursell	Williams, Miss.
Thomson, Wyo.	Wainwright	Willis
Trimble	Walter	Winstead
Tuck	Watts	Wright
Udall	Weaver	Young
Van Zandt	Whitten	
Velde	Wickersham	

NAYS—197

Addonizio	Frelinghuysen	Morano
Alger	Friedel	Moss
Allen, Calif.	Fulton	Multer
Allen, Ill.	Garmatz	Mumma
Anfuso	Gavin	Murray, Ill.
Arends	Gordon	Nelson
Auchincloss	Gubser	Nicholson
Bailey	Gwinn	O'Brien, Ill.
Baldwin	Hagen	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bass, N. H.	Hale	O'Hara, Ill.
Bates	Hand	O'Neill
Baumhart	Harvey	Osmers
Becker	Hayworth	Ostertag
Bentley	Healey	Patterson
Betts	Heselton	Pelly
Boland	Hess	Philbin
Bolton, Frances P.	Hiestand	Pillion
	Hillings	Polk
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hinshaw	Powell
	Hoffman, Ill.	Price
Bosch	Hoffman, Mich.	Rabaut
Bow	Holifield	Radwan
Bowler	Holland	Ray
Boyle	Holmes	Reed, N. Y.
Brown, Ohio	Holt	Reuss
Brownson	Holtzman	Riehlman
Broyhill	Hosmer	Robsion,, Ky.
Buckley	Hyde	Rodino
Burdick	Jackson	Rogers, Mass.
Bush	James	Rooney
Byrne, Pa.	Jenkins	Roosevelt
Byrnes, Wis.	Johansen	Sadlak
Canfield	Johnson, Calif.	St. George
Cederberg	Karsten	Schenck
Chiperfield	Kean	Scherer
Chudoff	Keating	Scott
Church	Kelly, N. Y.	Seely-Brown
Clark	Keogh	Sheehan
Clevenger	King, Calif.	Sheppard
Cole	King, Pa.	Sieminski
Corbett	Kirwan	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	Klein	Sisk
Cretella	Kluczynski	Smith, Kans.
Crumpacker	Laird	Sullivan
Curtis, Mass.	Lankford	Taber
Dague	Latham	Taylor
Davidson	Lesinski	Teague, Calif.
Dawson, Ill.	Lipscomb	Thompson, N. J.
Delaney	McConnell	Tollefson
Derounian	McCormack	Tumulty
Devereux	McCulloch	Utt
Diggs	McDonough	Vanik
Dingell	McGregor	Van Pelt
Dodd	McVey	Vorys
Dollinger	Macdonald	Westland
Dondero	Machrowicz	Wharton
Donohue	Mack, Ill.	Widnall
Dorn, N. Y.	Mack, Wash.	Williams, N. J.
Doyle	Madden	Williams, N. Y.
Ellsworth	Magnuson	Wilson, Calif.
Engle	Mailliard	Withrow
Fallon	Martin	Yates
Feighan	Meader	Younger
Fino	Miller, Calif.	Zablocki
Fogarty	Miller, Md.	Zelenko
Forand	Miller, N. Y.	
Ford	Minshall	

NOT VOTING—35

Adair	Dorn, S. C.	Phillips
Barrett	Eberharter	Saylor
Bass, Tenn.	Gamble	Scudder
Bell	Green, Pa.	Shelley
Blitch	Harden	Thompson, La.
Celler	Kearney	Thompson, Mich.
Chatham	Lane	
Cunningham	McIntire	Thornberry
Davis, Tenn.	Morgan	Wigglesworth
Davis, Wis.	Morrison	Wilson, Ind.
Deane	O'Hara, Minn.	Wolcott
Donovan	Patman	Wolverton

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Cunningham for, with Mr. McIntire against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Wolverton against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Wigglesworth against.

Mrs. Harden for, with Mr. Barrett against.

Mr. Dorn of South Carolina for, with Mr. Green of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Morgan against.

Mrs. Blitch for, with Mr. Kearney against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Phillips against.

Mr. Wolcott for, with Mr. Donovan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Celler with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Deane with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Patman with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Scudder.

Mr. Eberharter with Mrs. Thompson of Michigan.

Mr. Bass of Tennessee with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Messrs. BOWLER, GORDON, DAVIDSON, and COLE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREE

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. SAYLOR, be excused as a conferee on the bill H. R. 6376 and that the Speaker be authorized to appoint a Member to fill the vacancy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from New York, Mr. PILLION, to fill the vacancy, and the Senate will be notified of the action of the House.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 554 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7535) to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, millions of parents and school children in congested areas over the country will be happy to learn that the Congress is finally considering legislation which will relieve the critical schoolroom shortage in many areas.

The Committee on Education and Labor commenced hearings on this subject in March of 1955, over 1 year and 3 months ago, and it is indeed unfortunate that such a long time has elapsed before this bill finally reached the floor of the House.

President Eisenhower, as far back as 1952, when he was a candidate for the Presidency stated in a speech in Chicago, Ill., that the country needed 340,000 additional classrooms. Almost 4 years has passed, and today is the first time the Congress has had an opportunity to consider this important problem. As far back as January 1954, the Office of Education estimated we needed approximately 300,000 classrooms and that this deficit would increase at the rate of 50,000 classrooms annually because of increased enrollment and other factors. A great deal of false propaganda has been sent throughout the country regarding H. R. 7535 known as the Kelly bill, which we are now considering. This false propaganda endeavors to frighten the public into thinking that aid for school construction means Federal control; such is not the case. This bill is temporary legislation over a 4-year period for school construction in critical areas.

No provision of this bill takes one iota of control of the operation of city, township, and county schools. This bill, under three various titles, provides methods of aiding local communities in financing school construction. During the debate, the members of the Committee on Education and Labor will explain in detail the various methods contained in these three titles as set out in the bill.

There is urgent need to start this school construction now. Within the next 2½ years we will need over 500,000 new classrooms. Counting the time it takes for local bond issues, securing real-estate locations, architectural planning, and construction, almost 2 years will intervene before an average school building is completed. The log jam in school construction started during the war period when strategic building materials were difficult to obtain and thousands of communities postponed needed school construction until after the war.

Communities have been unable to catch up with this unavoidable delay. This is a national responsibility which Congress should discharge without further procrastination.

The enormous growth of population of this country since the war has further added to our schoolroom crisis. In the highly industrialized Calumet region of Indiana, the population has multiplied beyond all expectations during the last 10 years. Thousands of families have moved from nearby Chicago into this area and particularly into areas surrounding Gary, Hammond, and East Chicago.

Tens of thousands of new homes have been erected in the last 10 years in my congressional district but it is impossible for local communities to keep pace in schoolroom construction with this great influx of families. Last October, I attended a dedication of a new school in the town of St. John, Ind., which a few years ago was a small community; since then hundreds of families have moved into this area. The township trustee informed the citizens at the dedication that the new school would be a financial burden on the local taxpayers for years to come. He further stated that the community needed a similar school immediately to take care of children which the new school could not accommodate.

I have in my hand the Saturday, June 16, 1956, edition of the Gary Post Tribune which sets out in the headlines, which you all can read: "Three Thousand Face Half-Day Classes at Nine Schools."

The newspaper also states:

The cities enrollment to increase by 3,000 to 36,138 in fall.

This statement was made by the superintendent of schools, Mr. Clarence E. Swingley, and the article proceeds to tell about the critical shortage in schoolrooms surrounding the city of Gary and its outside limits. This same headline could be applied to every city, town, and hamlet in my district that is located close to the industrial areas.

The Committee on Education and Labor has received testimony gathered by its subcommittee which held hearings in congested areas throughout the country. This subcommittee found startling conditions concerning lack of schoolroom facilities in all fast growing areas.

Last week Congress appropriated billions for highway construction. Additional millions have been appropriated to maintain the farm economy. Billions also have been appropriated for defense and aid to war stricken countries in our aim to curtail communism. Has our civilization become so grossly neglectful and shortsighted as Congress thinks this is more important than passing a bill to help critical areas with school construction? These school children in areas throughout the country are attending classes in garages, churches, basements, warehouses, and wornout firetrap schoolrooms, let us strive to give to every child possible the education and culture that ought to be the birthright of every American.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule will make in order the consideration of H. R. 7535, which is a bill to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms.

The rule provides that there shall be general debate for not to exceed 6 hours, which I think rather obviously means that general debate on this bill will continue probably through 2 days or more and will give all Members ample opportunity to express their views and to discuss the bill.

This bill for assistance to local schools was reported to the House almost a year ago on July 28, 1955, in fact. The bill resulted from a recommendation or a suggestion sent to the Congress by the President which pointed out that there exists an emergency, so far as facilities for local schools are concerned; that there is a shortage of classrooms throughout America. The President's suggestion, in part, called for congressional action in the form of assistance in the financing of local school construction through the underwriting of bond issues and such other credit aids as could be set out properly in a bill. In the President's suggestion and in the bill which later become known as the Administration Bill, was also a provision for grants to the States over a 5-year period on the basis of need, and requiring certain qualifications. As has happened to many of the Administration's proposals in this Congress, the House Committee on Education and Labor sought to take the administration's proposal apart and put it back together again and come up with something similar but different that would relieve the shortage of schoolrooms in the United States.

The Kelley bill, as this bill is known, will accomplish that purpose, there is no doubt about that, but the bill leaves me in doubt as to the advisability of adopting the allocation provisions as to the manner in which the grants to the States shall be made. I think the bill should be amended on the floor to conform to the President's proposal.

In that connection, I received a letter from a man in the congressional district I represent for whom I have the highest respect as one of the leading educators of the West. His name is Marion B. Winslow. He is superintendent of schools at Coos Bay, Oreg., on the Oregon coast. Mr. Winslow has studied this matter for many, many years and he feels that the allocation provision, the straight-out grant to States on the basis of $11 and some cents per pupil regardless of need, is not the proper way to get at assistance to education in America.

With the indulgence of the House I should like to read the suggestions made by Mr. Winslow. I realize that since the bill was long ago reported and since this suggestion has come to me, at a time when it could not be incorporated in the bill by the committee, I should like to present it to the House now with the possibility that it may arouse enough interest so that some members of the committee may wish to take it up and consider offering it as an amendment when the bill is on the floor.

This is the suggestion made by Mr. Winslow:

I wish to make a suggestion in regard to distribution. In the first place I believe that the funds should be used to give equal opportunity to all for a basic education. This means that some States may get more money per pupil than other States. I do not believe that the school census is a sound basis for distributing funds to States for the following reasons:

1. Some States require only school attendance through the first 8 grades, or to age 16.
2. Some States require attendance to 18 years, or through high school graduation.
3. Some States have very lax attendance laws and poor enforcement of its attendance laws.
4. Some States have an effective attendance program.
5. Some States have a high percentage of private school attendance.
6. Some States have few private or parochial schools.
7. Some States have a very short school year of 8½ months, while others may have a longer school year.

It is important that we should share on a national level in the support of educational service to pupils. I know of no reason for distributing educational funds purely on the basis of the number of pupils in a State.

The following is the important part of this suggestion:

I believe that money should be distributed to the several States in proportions that the total days' attendance in the public-operated schools of a State bears to the total days' attendance in the public schools of the United States.

This is a simple formula, but it insures absolute justice throughout the entire Nation on the basis of the actual days of education given to the pupil. As he points out in his letter, this will encourage:

1. A school year of adequate length.
2. Increase the number of years of educational service to high school completion.
3. Greater attendance in the public schools.
4. A higher percentage of pupils to attend school.
5. A better attendance record.

Distribution on the basis of attendance would be based on the actual educational service given to pupils. I notice in the report of Atlantic City schools, for example, that with a population of approximately 100,000 the school attendance is approximately 8,000 or 1 in 12¼ in school. Here in the Coos Bay School District we have a population of approximately 22,500 with a school attendance of 4,200, or 1 in 5.4 in school. It makes a big difference whether a district is providing for educational services for one-twelfth of its population or for one-sixth of its population. Those States that have the greatest portion of their population in school face the greatest financial need.

If Federal funds were distributed to the States on the basis of actual days' attendance at a public school, I believe this would encourage public school attendance. States with lax attendance laws with large numbers of the school population attending private schools, who thus carry a very light public education program, would get Federal funds only on the basis of the actual public educational service given.

Mr. Speaker, I have presented this letter to the House in the hope that it might, if not in this body, perhaps, in the other when the bill is considered there, receive some attention as a reasonable

and better formula for the distribution of such funds as the Congress may determine to allocate to public schools.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon has consumed 8 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, in anticipation of the fact that I expect the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, to speak on this rule and to oppose it, I would like to make this point, that the demands of the organized and unorganized groups throughout the United States that this Congress do something on this situation which is fast becoming a national disgrace will answer anything the distinguished gentleman from Virginia has to say far more effectively than I can answer. I would like to say to the gentleman from Virginia that the Committee on Education and Labor as the result of objection which he raised to the language in title II and title III of the legislation has ordered that the sections to which he was objecting be stricken from the legislation. I refer first to removing from the legislation a provision that the Comptroller General's Office be relieved from responsibility for auditing and controlling these expenditures. That would affect both title II and title III. The other objection raised by the gentleman from Virginia and some other members in the committee was to the effect that it looked as if in one section of title II we were trying to obligate the Federal Government to pay the total sum of $6 billion. The amendment in question, which I shall offer, will clarify and show that the Government obligation under title III could never be more than $150 million. I would just like to add here that all that money will be returned to the Government. That is just a case of the Government lending its credit until such time as the school boards who will rent the building from the State Building Association will have the money to return the funds which the Government advanced. It is not an actual Government expenditure.

Now, to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] may I say that the committee also ordered that section 315 of title III of the bill be eliminated. That amendment is to be offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BOSCH] a member of the committee. It appears that in preparing the legislation, we encroached upon the prerogatives and were probably proposing to pass some legislation here that might interfere with the national banking law. So in an effort to clarify that, the committee will offer at the proper time when we are in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union this amendment which will be offered as an official committee amendment.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman tell us the total amount of loans authorized under this bill?

Mr. BAILEY. Under title II the Government would set up a revolving fund, not to exceed $750 million, to buy the loans of districts where they have to pay interest in excess of 4 percent. That is just money loaned by the Government. That will be repaid. The Government can sell those bonds any time it wants to and get its money back.

Mr. DIES. Then I understand there is a $400 million grant.

Mr. BAILEY. A $400 million grant each year for 4 years, a total of $1,600 million.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Will that revolving fund take care of any part of the outstanding bonds for school construction?

Mr. BAILEY. You mean the present bonds?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. No, sir. It is for new construction.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me appeal to my colleagues, whether you are proponents or opponents of this legislation I personally feel that no legislation is so controversial that it cannot be brought to the floor of the House and disposed of in the good old American way, as the citizens of our country expect us to handle it. So I am glad that the House has finally decided to consider the pleas of millions of American people that something be done to meet this situation. I personally will be satisfied with whatever the result may be, but do not let anybody mislead you into voting to kill this rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the pending legislation, I do not feel that I can improve greatly on a presentation I made February 22, 1955, in setting forth a proposal for some relief of the problems the communities now face relating to schools and education.

On that occasion I pointed out that if you are looking for a simple, direct program for aid to education, free from Government controls, without costly administration, and devoid of any share-the-wealth attributes, the joint resolution I introduced February 22, 1955, deserves your consideration and support.

Most, if not all, State treasuries are in better shape financially than is the Federal Treasury, there is no doubt but that in many States the demands, especially for education, call for more finances than the States are able to raise to provide needed buildings, maintenance, improved equipment, increases in teachers' salaries, and other items. The combined debt of the 48 States is about $20 billion. Uncle Sam owes over $275 billion.

With the enormous increase in Federal expenditures over the past 25 years the Federal Government has tapped every practical possible source of tax revenue, with little consideration for the tax needs of State and municipal governments. The States are now dependent almost entirely upon direct taxes on real estate and personal property, duplicated income tax and and sales taxes which fall heavily on persons of low income. In seeking new revenue the States find available sources already drained by Federal taxation—income taxes, admission taxes, beverage taxes, luxury taxes, transportation taxes, tobacco taxes, excise taxes, to name but a few. Enormous sums, billions of dollars annually, are siphoned out of the States in individual and corporate income taxes.

It is neither economical nor efficient to withdraw huge sums from the States and then have a portion of these funds trickle back under any of the proposed bureaucratic-administered programs of aid to education. If any of the presently proposed and pending programs are adopted, a large overhead for administration is unavoidable, and, in some instances, the only thing offered the State is an opportunity, lured on by Federal dollars in matching funds, to go into debt, and even this is prohibited by law in some States.

Under the best-intentioned Federal administration, there remains the well-founded objection that the compulsory requirement that each State meet conditions imposed by law and regulations of the administering bureau must be complied with to qualify for benefits. Furthermore, there is a deep-seated fear—also well founded—that with Government intervention in education programs, opportunity might well be found for Federal controls which naturally follow Federal dollars flowing from Washington.

The prime responsibility for education programs is in the local community and the State. Conditions now existing are not emergency short-time situations, and can be expected to continue for the long indefinite future, as more children are born.

To easily, simply, cheaply, and efficiently provide the States with some financial aid for meeting their needs for the improvement of their respective educational programs, without increasing their debt, without building up a huge Federal bureaucracy, without fear of Federal controls, dictation, or propaganda, without the slightest element of distribution of wealth, I proposed, by a joint resolution which I introduced, a simple, direct, unrestricted plan for aid to the States and the Territories to help them meet the educational demands within their respective borders.

House Joint Resolution 228

Whereas the Government of the United States, through taxes, is siphoning a great part of the wealth of our Nation out of the several States and Territories into the Federal Treasury; and

Whereas the Government of the United States is collecting taxes from nearly all sources of revenue, including taxes on individual and corporate incomes, admissions, beverages, communications, gifts, luxuries, transportation, and from excises and other taxes, leaving to the States little but real and personal property and consumer sales as sources of tax revenue; and

Whereas at rates approaching confiscation of property, States are still not able to raise revenue sufficient to carry the rising costs of State and local governments, and especially not to meet the demands for needed improvements and higher salaries for the training of our youth; and

Whereas it has been proposed that the Federal Government grant aid to the States for educational purpose; and

Whereas it is neither economical nor efficient to withdraw huge sums out of the States and Territories and redistribute funds under bureaucratic regulation from the Federal Treasury; and

Whereas it is desirable that such aid be accomplished by a simple, easy, direct, and efficient method, not hampered with bureaucratic restrictions, directions, or dictation: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That 1 percent of all income taxes collected on individual and corporate incomes under Federal statutes shall be deemed to be revenue for the State or Territory within which it is collected, for use, for educational purposes only, without any Federal direction, control, or interference.

SEC. 2. District directors of internal revenue are hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the treasurer, or corresponding official, of the State or Territory within which their respective internal-revenue districts are situated, at the end of each quarter, an amount equal to 1 percent of the taxes from individual and corporate incomes collected within such State or Territory during said quarter.

SEC. 3. For purposes of information only, district directors of internal revenue shall report the amounts transferred to State treasurers, or corresponding officials, as authorized in section 2, to the Department of the Treasury, accompanying such report with receipts from the proper State officials verifying the amounts received by said State official.

Mr. Speaker, although I had hoped this resolution could be referred to the Committee on Labor and Education, it was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. Although I have called this resolution to the attention of all House Members, I feel I should call it to the attention of the House again at this time.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me continue my remarks.

Under this plan the handling of funds through Washington and back will be eliminated; the amounts available to each State will be determined annually by individual and corporate incomes within that State. The money will remain in the several States where it was collected. The total amount to be thus collected through Federal facilities for the States each year will be automatically geared to the national income for that year. There will be no danger or possibility of Federal control or dictation. It will provide many States with a larger amount than would be available under many other plans which have been proposed. There would be no need for a growing bureaucratic horde with an insatiable hunger for power ready to consume ever-increasing amounts of taxes.

For example, in fiscal 1954 the district director for internal revenue for Kansas collected in individual and corporate income taxes approximately $407,343,360. On this basis there would have gone to the State of Kansas under this plan, for the fiscal year 1954, $4,073,433 every cent of which would be available for use within the State.

This is not a new proposal. I first presented it in 1949—H. R. 1582—at which time several various proposals were pending.

In the 80th Congress—1946—the Senate passed S. 472. Under that measure, the only direct aid-to-education bill to pass in either House of the Congress, the estimated initial contribution Kansas would have been required to make to the Federal Treasury would have been $2,552,000. From the benefits authorized by S. 472, Kansas could have received back as aid to education a total of $1,960,000—a net loss of $600,000. The other proposals so far advanced would operate to take out of most States more to support the proposed program than would be returned in benefits, and on the whole would provide less in effective aid than is offered by my proposal.

Certainly, under the plan I propose, the States, generally, by having this 1 percent of the individual and corporate Federal income taxes paid by its citizens withheld for use within each of the respective States for educational purposes, would be much better able to cope directly, as they deemed best, with their educational problems than they would under any program directed from a Washington bureau.

This proposal will be a step toward retaining our constitutional Republic and a move away from centralized government.

Such legislation will be in keeping with suggestions made by the then Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, by keeping the control and responsibility local. He said:

> When financing of schools is turned over to the Federal Government you get bureaucracy, and this is the approach to statism.

Every advocate of aid to education to whom I have talked insists he wants no Federal control, no bureaucracy. This resolution will meet that desire, for it need not add a single person to the Federal payroll and will certainly eliminate all possibility of Federal controls—even those found in most other proposals before the Congress.

From the table below based on tax collections for the fiscal year 1954—approximately—you can see the benefits for your own State. The logical appeal and the elimination of the danger of Federal bureaucratic controls under this plan would enable your State to provide more adequately and more efficiently for the needed enlargement of educational facilities and the necessary increase in salaries of teachers.

This direct use of income taxes is possible. It can be done. Precedent is established by Public Law 630 of the 81st Congress, where it is provided that all of the taxes of incomes earned by American citizens in Guam, while resident there, including stateside Americans, both civilian and military, should be turned over to the Government of Guam. Not just 1 percent, but all of the income tax collected from Americans there—and Guam is merely an unincorporated Territory.

TABLE I

	Income tax collections, fiscal year 1954 (including tax for old-age insurance)	1 percent of tax collected
Alabama	$355,904,000	$3,559,040
Arizona	153,119,000	1,531,190
Arkansas	148,110,000	1,481,100
California	4,671,633,000	46,716,330
Colorado	553,265,000	5,532,650
Connecticut	1,168,589,000	11,685,890
Delaware	869,525,000	8,695,250
Florida	599,990,000	5,999,900
Georgia	581,573,000	5,815,730
Hawaii	126,170,000	1,261,700
Idaho	100,902,000	1,009,020
Illinois	4,926,633,000	49,266,330
Indiana	1,205,079,000	12,050,790
Iowa	494,575,000	4,945,750
Kansas	437,870,000	4,378,700
Kentucky	441,333,000	4,413,330
Louisiana	459,357,000	4,593,570
Maine	159,030,000	1,590,300
Maryland	851,777,000	8,517,770
Massachusetts	1,708,884,000	17,088,840
Michigan	4,857,146,000	48,571,460
Minnesota	917,256,000	9,172,560
Mississippi	129,336,000	1,293,360
Missouri	1,472,722,000	14,727,220
Montana	109,285,000	1,092,850
Nebraska	320,620,000	3,206,200
Nevada	70,308,100	703,080
New Hampshire	118,150,000	1,181,500
New Jersey	1,745,232,000	17,452,320
New Mexico	99,351,000	993,510
New York	11,626,091,000	116,260,910
North Carolina	673,436,000	6,734,360
North Dakota	60,929,000	609,290
Ohio	4,147,301,000	41,473,010
Oklahoma	504,416,000	5,044,160
Oregon	403,821,000	4,038,210
Pennsylvania	4,531,795,000	45,317,950
Rhode Island	271,663,000	2,716,630
South Carolina	239,806,000	2,398,060
South Dakota	67,056,000	670,560
Tennessee	463,856,000	4,638,560
Texas	1,969,318,000	19,693,180
Utah	135,924,000	1,359,240
Vermont	70,790,000	707,900
Virginia	641,430,000	6,414,300
Washington	711,456,000	7,114,560
West Virginia	270,198,000	2,701,980
Wisconsin	1,121,973,000	11,219,730
Wyoming	51,764,000	517,640
Alaska	45,843,000	458,430
District of Columbia	707,455,000	7,074,550
Puerto Rico	(9,571,000)	(95,710)
Total	58,578,533,000	585,785,330

NOTE.—Because collections for old-age insurance are not shown separately in internal revenue reports, actual benefits would be somewhat less than shown here when adjustment is made for that factor—an average of about 7.2 percent.

Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the Military Appropriations Committee is in conference on the 1957 appropriation bill I doubt that I can be present to offer the last three sections of this joint resolution as a substitute for the present bill. Perhaps it may have sufficient appeal to some member of the committee to so propose this language.

Mr. Speaker, my suggestion deserves favorable consideration by this Congress.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] may revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I will take all of the 10 minutes, but I did want to call your attention to a few points about this bill that the House will have under consideration when and if this rule is adopted.

Let me say in the first place that it comes as a surprise, I am sure, to quite a

group of the membership that this rule is up here today at all for consideration when it is recalled that for a year and a half this proposal has been in the Committee on Education and Labor and then for the past several months has been in the Committees on Rules. There seemed to be no enthusiasm for this legislation, but for some reason, reasons that you can deduce for yourself, the resolution and the proposed legislation were suddenly revived and the Committee on Rules was put in the position where it had to report it out.

I know there is no enthusiasm today among the general membership for this legislation, and there are a number of reasons for that, but time will not permit me to discuss them.

First, I want to make clear to my southern colleagues, those who have not had an opportunity to study this legislation, just what they might expect. I understand that there will be a proposal offered in the form of an amendment by some Member of the House to provide for the denial of any of these funds to those schools in my section of the country which maintain traditional segregation in their public schools. I am not too much concerned about that—that might be a little surprising to you, too—because I do not think it is material whether that amendment is adopted or not.

In the first place, that objective can be reached and, no doubt, will be reached in this or some other administration through administrative action.

If there be any doubt in the minds of my colleagues about this, I call your attention, first, to the fact that the argument will be made that the Supreme Court has spoken; that segregation is not permitted in the public schools of the land and, therefore, no Federal funds should go to States practicing school segregation. Further, I call your attention to the fact that only a few weeks ago the Civil Aeronautics Administration, another administrative agency of the Government, denied Federal funds by administrative action to airports in communities requiring segregation in the airport facilities.

However, if the funds are not denied administratively, you and I know that when the appropriation bill comes up making the funds available provided by this proposed legislation that a rider in the form of an amendment will either be placed in the bill in committee or will be offered on the floor of the House to accomplish the same end. And if such an amendment is offered before an election—and I call your attention to the fact that there will be an election just a few weeks after the appropriation bill comes to the floor this year—such an amendment will in all likelihood be adopted.

Finally, if that hurdle is overcome and neither of these things happens, is anyone here so naive as to think for one moment that those who advocate the denial of funds to segregated school systems will not resort to the friendly Federal courts? How long would the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, with unlimited funds and lawyers at its disposal, withhold such action? Finally, is there any doubt in the minds of either friends or foes of this legislation as to what the present nine men who occupy the marble palace across the plaza from this Capitol would do?

In this connection, each of you recently received a copy of a statement from the executive council of the American Federation of Labor and the CIO telling you in substance just what I have said. I quote from the last paragraph of that statement:

> For our part, the AFL–CIO pledges that if Congress enacts a Federal school-aid program we shall keep an alert watch over its administration. If Federal money is allocated to States or school districts which have not complied with the Supreme Court's decision, we will support and, if necessary, initiate legal steps to prevent such misuse of the taxpayers' money.

To sum it up, what does this mean? Is not the conclusion inescapable that the States maintaining segregation in their public schools are going to be taxed to build in other States without receiving any of their tax money back from the Federal Government to help construct their own schools?

Make no mistake about it, the people of those States are going to have segregated schools as long as they have public schools. That is one phase of the matter I wanted to discuss.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to another phase of it and this is nothing new from me. You have heard me in the well of this House for the past several years point out to you that the danger to this country is not from an armed invasion by the Soviet Republic; the danger lies in the destruction of the financial setup of the country with resultant inflation; then the Communists come in through the back door and work their will when the value of the dollar is destroyed. Therefore I make the unchallenged statement—and there will be plenty of opportunity here to answer it before this debate is over—that there is not a State in this Union, there is not a county or parish in any State of this Union, and I doubt if there is a municipality in one of those counties or parishes whose financial situation is not better than that of the Federal Government. Therefore, why should the Federal Government go into this one field that the people are so jealous of, the field of their public education? The most prized and jealously guarded institution, the one closest to the hearts of the people of this country, is the education of the youth, our public school system. Your and my people want no Federal interference in the conduct of their schools. You are tampering with an institution which ranks almost in the category of religion. Once the gap is let down who can foresee to what length the strong arm of the Federal Government will finally extend into our public school system?

Now I want to call your attention to another matter. This morning there came to your desk a letter from the American Legion. Some of you may not have had the opportunity to see it. It gives many of the arguments that I would like to make and speaks the voice of that great patriotic organization, which, too, is jealous of our public school system and of maintaining it as such without Federal interference. I hope you will have an opportunity to read it before the debate is over.

Omitting the first two pages, the document reads as follows:

> At the 37th national convention of the American Legion held at Miami, Fla., from October 10 to 13, 1955, the matter of the relationship of the National Government to general public education was reconsidered; and the 3,158 accredited delegates to the convention, representing every State in the Union, without a dissenting vote, adopted resolution 588, containing the following restatement of principles with respect to public education:
>
> 1. That the State and local governments ought to, can, and should assume and take care of primary- and secondary-school needs.
>
> 2. That under the Constitution of the United States, the full responsibility and authority (including financing) over the education of our children is reserved to the several States respectively and to the people.
>
> 3. That the States and local communities have the capacity to meet the financial requirements for education.
>
> 4. That the National Government should avoid interference, control, or direction in educational processes or programs of the respective States, either directly or indirectly, or by grants-in-aid, appropriation, curriculum, of program control, or by action of any agency, branch, or department of the United States Government.
>
> By virtue of this resolution, the national commander and officials of the American Legion were directed and mandated to present the position of the American Legion to the Congress of the United States and to vigorously oppose all legislation seeking the destruction of State control over public education or making appropriations of Federal funds for the needs of general public education; or which, in any way, violates the principles enunciated above.
>
> Naturally, many Members of Congress and many other Americans will ask: "Why should this great organization of war veterans, the American Legion, concern itself with the problems of general public education?"
>
> The answer to that question is that the American Legion has always strongly adhered to the philosophy of broad popular education for citizenship. While recognizing, applauding and supporting the role, the right and necessity for private and religious schools in the field of education, the American Legion vigorously subscribes to the necessity of a universal publicly supported system of primary and secondary education to insure that every American child has the opportunity for an adequate education.
>
> The American Legion believes that popular self-government, based upon a federation of states, as created by the covenant set forth in the Constitution of the United States cannot continue to exist unless there is the bulwark of a continuing system of locally controlled and financed free public education. Not only does proper national defense require trained personnel, but the daily operation of our local, State, and Federal Governments, our farms, our professions, our commerce and industry, and in fact, every phase of life today demands that we have competent citizens, who are qualified, willing, and able to discharge their responsibilities.
>
> By and large, the State governments and the local school districts have compiled a remarkable record of achievements in providing educational opportunities to the people of this country in the last 50 years. Without a doubt, we have in the United States today the finest educational facilities that the world has ever known.
>
> Everything in the record of our educational accomplishments in this country indicates that our national interests in education will

be best served and most quickly solved by leaving the problem in the hands of local administration and control.

However, the American Legion is aware of the fact that despite record-breaking State and local expenditures for public education in recent years, our Nation is faced with a serious immediate shortage of school buildings and teachers.

We recognize that the sharp rise in birthrate following World War II, heavy population migrations, a backlog of construction in the years of depression, war and material shortages, and the depletion of teachers and educational personnel by attraction of higher salaries in other fields of work and a decrease in the percentage of new persons entering teaching have all combined to create a difficult situation.

Nevertheless, the American Legion is of the opinion that sound judgment indicates that the only effective solution to our educational shortages is prompt and incisive action by the States and the local school districts.

What are the reasons for the policy stand of the American Legion? In summary outline they are set forth as follows:

1. The respective States have the financial capacity to meet their educational requirements if they wish to do so.

2. Federal aid is not the way to get good schools; under any moderate program of aid, the amount going to individual States would not be large enough to count effectively. And Federal aid in an amount sufficient to mitigate the problem significantly could result in such undermining of the State and local responsibility as to seriously endanger the kind of educational system that has served us so well since the founding of our country.

3. If substantial financial support is provided to local public schools by the Federal Government, local community interest and responsibility will diminish.

4. The wealth of the Nation is to tbe found in the States. In most instances, this wealth is as available to the States as to the National Government. Generally speaking, all taxes come from the same pocket. Sending tax dollars to Washington, which are intended for local use merely increases overhead and administrative costs and adds to the size of the Federal bureaucracy.

5. If a reappraisal of tax values on taxable property in the various communities and States is conducted in order to equalize tax responsibility on all types of property and education given its proper recognition in the reappraisal, there would be no need for Federal aid to general education.

6. There are serious dangers in creating a powerful centralized authority. It could lead to attempts at thought control and might invite infiltration by the Communist conspiracy.

7. It would seem impossible to have Federal aid to general education without the minimum of Federal control. Education certainly should be left up to the communities and the States and not to the Federal Government.

8. Local and State ability and willingness to deal with school problems is impaired by injecting a third level of government. The task of school administration will become even more difficult and complicated. Administrative differences with respect to controls or agreements as to division of funds will make for delays and inequities.

9. If you have Federal aid to education and a minmum of Federal control over this Federal aid, then there is great danger that the Federal Government will want to prescribe the curriculums, textbooks, and other instructional materials. All of this should be left up to the community and State.

10. Federal aid whether by grants-in-aid or other forms cannot be provided without Congress imposing legal and accounting safeguards or formulas or criteria of distribution. Some type of control or supervision whether large or small, direct or indirect, is an essential ingredient of Federal action. The mere fact that Congress could discontinue the funds in future appropriations is a potent factor in itself.

11. History indicates that once Federal appropriations are made for any purpose the tendency is for the affected groups to lobby for their continuation and enlargement.

12. Approximately 12 percent of the schoolchildren in the United States are educated in private or religious schools. The exclusion of these schools raises difficult problems. Their inclusion would raise even more difficult legal questions and policy issues.

13. There are about 62,000 separate public-school districts or systems in the United States. If the National Government dealt directly with these local school organizations, it would seriously conflict with State educational responsibility and control. If the National Government dealt with only the States, it could not achieve the objectives sought by Federal grants or funds without imposing important and unwanted conditions.

14. The general public already feels that Federal taxes are too high. There is great pressure for reduction of Federal taxes. Certainly sound national policy should require that serious consideration should be given to the balancing of the Federal budget and a planned and consistent reduction of the Federal debt before the National Government embarks upon a new and tremendous program of Federal expenditures for general public education in our elementary and secondary schools.

15. The usual purpose of Federal grants-in-aid is to stimulate State and local activities. There is no need for this in the field of public education since expenditures by States and local governments for education are already the largest and most expensive of any of their activities.

16. There is no need for Federal leadership in setting minimum educational standards. These are already well defined and administered. There is a strong desire on all sides to avoid Federal control or supervision or the imposition of Federal standards or conditions. There is a widespread feeling that any degree of Federal control over education would be dangerous. No one has ever enunciated any practical method of providing Federal funds without some scintilla of authority or administration.

17. There are other well-defined responsibilities and activities of the Federal Government, such as national defense, the Post Office Department, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, to name but a few which require all of the foreseeable Federal funds that are likely to be available.

18. If Federal aid is predicated on the determination of necessity of local school districts or systems, who will establish the criteria of need and formulas of distribution? What agency will determine which are needy and who gets what? What weight will be given to the relationship between those districts which have for years taxed themselves to the bone to meet their requirements and those which have the resources but do not choose to impose the local taxes? What equalization assistance will be required of the respective States before the Federal Government lends a hand?

19. Federal funds could place in the hands of those in political authority the power to transform our whole way of life. The opportunity which would be opened up for the imposition of requirements as to what would be taught is frightening.

20. The creation of a system of Federal educational assistance, nationwide in scope, would destroy the traditional role of the State and local governments in the field of educational activity and would represent an unnecessary and radical expansion of the functions of the National Government beyond anything evisioned by Thomas Jefferson and the other architects of our Federal system.

21. This is not the kind of governmental functions which has to be done by the National Government or which it can do best. In fact, efficiency, economy, forthrightness, cultural experimentation, opportunity for differences of approach and educational pioneering and programs will be sacrificed if the Congress should embark the National Government upon a program of Federal aid to education.

To prevent any confusion or misconceptions about the extent of the position of the American Legion on this subject, it should be stated that the policy as set forth herein is confined to the matter of across-the-board, general Federal financial aid to public education in the primary and secondary schools (first grade through high school) and should be strictly construed.

The American Legion as of this time has not taken a position or fixed any legislative policy of opposition upon the following matters:

1. Financing by the Federal Government in the field of higher education—such as assistance to land-grant colleges, agricultural extension programs, agricultural research (all being administered and designed as agricultural programs), support of ROTC and similar training programs, defense research and veterans' programs (all being administered and designed as defense or veterans' programs).

2. Continuation of Federal commodity donations to school-lunch programs as long as these stocks continue to be acquired and held as surplus by the National Government as part of its agricultural program. (However, the American Legion is in favor of the elimination of cash grants by the National Government, with the assumption by the States and local communities for all cash financing required—now constituting about 12 percent of the total cost of the program.)

3. Existing legislation providing for special and limited grants for school construction and operation in critical defense areas on a temporary emergency basis in support of our national-defense program.

4. Research, advisory, and clearinghouse functions presently performed by the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (However, the American Legion's position is opposed to the continuation of existing Federal appropriations to general aid in the form of cash grants to public school vocational education programs presently administered by the Office of Education.)

Let me say to you, I claim no corner on patriotism or zealousness in protecting the public-school system, but the Founding Fathers recognized it as a responsibility and the exclusive responsibility of the States. Now, once you disturb that, once you start to undermine that, there is no telling how far it is going. The bill should be defeated.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on this side, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the so-called school construction aid bill which has been hanging around here for something like a couple of years. It is a matter of great interest both to those who are in favor of it and those who oppose it. Therefore, it has been brought to the House. I know of no opposition to the resolution which provides for 6 hours of general debate. The

resolution should be adopted so that we may go into the consideration of this highly controversial measure.

I wanted to talk a little about the merits of the bill, if any can be discovered. This is an innovation. We are starting off on an entirely new road, a road that the American people, from the founding of the Republic, have said that we should never follow. That is to permit the control of our public education to go out of the hands of the local people. It is a fundamental principle of our system of government. That is the principle that this bill proposes to depart from.

If anyone thinks, having once launched on this path of Federal appropriation that we are ever going to depart from it, he is very much mistaken, because it would be without precedent. Whenever we have started on any of these programs we have always gone on and increased the appropriation from time to time.

I am in favor of public education. Everybody here is in favor of public education. Everybody here is in favor of the youth of the Nation. Everybody here loves the children and wants to see them do well. Everybody here, I venture to say, is violently opposed to sin.

But let us talk about what is between the covers of this bill itself. Let us talk about the bill. When we considered this bill in the Committee on Rules and some questions were asked about it, I was so shocked at the draftsmanship of the bill and at the provisions contained in the bill that I came here to the floor of the House, at the time of the very first rule that I had to call up and asked permission to speak out of order. I asked the Members of this House—and there were a goodly number here—"Before you are called upon to consider this legislation, please take this bill of only some 25 pages, look at it, read it, and see for yourselves what is between its covers."

I had done so, and I want again to ask you before you vote on this measure to look at it. Read it yourselves; do not take anyone else's word for it. It is supposed to be a bill to help education. It is supposed to be a bill to help those States that cannot help themselves. There is not a State in the Union as poor as the Federal Treasury. It is not supposed to be a bill to promote labor unions. It is not supposed to be a bill to promote the employment of a great many more Federal employees to set up a bureau here to tell you how to run this thing.

What we are aiming to do and what I know the membership of this House is aiming to do, if they are aiming to do anything, is to help education. Now, are you helping education by this bill? You take a whole lot of "gobbledygook" in this first title of it, and you have a lot of words in there, and you wind up by trying to appropriate $1,600,000,000 payable in 4 yearly installments to aid the States, rich and poor alike. It does not make any difference about whether you need it or not. If you pass this bill, they are going to shovel this money out anyway. All the function of the Federal Government and the intent of this bill is to give the States $400 million a year to help them build schools.

Will you tell me why we could not do that in a few simple words, and say so, and not have all of these conditions and ramifications and words that nobody can understand in it? All you have to do is just say, "We are going to give each State its proportion according to the population and the formula. It is a grant of $400 million every year for the next 4 years." Why do you not do that? What is the objective of inserting all this language, and I will guarantee you there is not a man on this floor who has not been on that committee who can understand it. I challenge them, before this debate is over if there is anybody who understands the meaning of all the language of this bill, I want him to get up here and say so before this debate is over, and I hope he will let me know so I can be here to understand it myself, because I have tried awfully hard, and I thought I understood the English language fairly well.

So title I is doing what they all want to do, help education, oppose sin, and all those other things. All you have to do is appropriate the money and call it a day, and save a lot of money in all these extra expenses.

So much for title I. I am going to skip title II because the time is short. That is only $700 million, and that is hardly worth discussing in a body of this kind when we are dealing with Federal funds, because everybody has forgotten all about the exhaustibility of Federal funds. I say everybody has forgotten them. I think there are some people back in the country who think something about fiscal affairs. But it is so easy to get up here and induce Members of Congress to promote these schemes for spending this money, which somehow or other they have gotten to think does not cost anybody anything, back down to the States. So in this bill, with all this language we have in here, we have got it so that these States have to come up here to the Commissioner of Education, a bureaucrat. They have to come with their hats in their hands, they have to comply with all the regulations, they have to grovel before a Federal bureaucrat in order to get the money back for their States which their States have sent up here with the blood of taxation year after year in increasing amounts. I do not believe that is what you fellows mean. I do not think you mean you want to do that. So I say, if you are going to do this thing, and in my judgment it should not be done at all, let us do it in a simple way so that I, and a few other Members of the Congress can understand what we are doing.

Now, I want to talk to you about title III. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] and I had some discussion on that subject last week, and the gentleman from West Virginia discussed it a few minutes ago. I want to say to you in all of the discussions of the gentleman from West Virginia who is ardently, sincerely, and honestly for this bill, he has been frank and open, and when things have gone wrong he has been free to admit it. So, he got up here a while ago and he admitted that after his committee had struggled with this bill for a year and had labored diligently and brought forth this mouse, there were four serious errors that he was willing to correct, serious errors. Now, I do not know how many more errors are in it because, as I say, I cannot understand all the implications of this language. If there were four admitted errors in one section of the bill, and four errors that ought to be corrected and must be corrected, then I am going to pose to this House this question: Do you not think that after all this study, this bill had better go back to the Committee on Education and Labor and let them study it and let them labor a little bit more and maybe they will bring forth something a little more palatable?

Let us see about these provisions in title III, that I want to talk to you about. You have been told that this is a $1,600,000,000 bill. Well, title II is $750,000 more. Title III provides that if these poor, hamstrung, broken-down, bankrupt States cannot sell their bonds, and I am ashamed to see us here in this House admitting that our States are poor, hamstrung, broken down and no account and cannot take care of their own affairs in any way, shape, or form even in education, I am ashamed to see this House admit that—so finding us in that condition, this great paternal Federal Government of ours is going to see that our bonds are taken care of. So they are going to provide a $6 billion merry-go-round here and they obligate the Federal Government for one-half the service charge of this $6 billion worth of bonds. They are going to say that that language here does not mean what it says—of course, it does not mean what it says. But, there are a lot of people still alive who think that plain language does mean what it says—and I am one of them and I hope there are some more of them here. So, the Committee on Education and Labor proposes to offer an amendment. The gentleman from West Virginia said that he is going to offer an amendment to strike out that $6 billion. Well, I went back and studied that language a little bit more and I discovered that if you cut out the $6 billion that that would just be taking the lid off and then there would not be any limit on what it was going to cost the Federal Government and you would not know what the amount was going to be. If you just take the lid off, there you go. I do not know what it is going to cost.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will reserve some time so that I may yield to the gentleman from West Virginia because he has been fair to me and I want to be fair to him.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. This provision here authorizes this $6 billion—and if they need any money that is not appropriated in order to get it you have another provision further down whereby the Commissioner of Education is authorized to issue obligations of the Federal Treasury. In other words, he can issue bonds of the Treasury, or having the effect of bonds of the Treasury, to get what money he is going to need for these purposes.

In the back of this conglomeration of language, you will find definitions. Under definitions, there is defined the phrase "service charge" and service charge is defined as enough money to take care of the interest and the annual amortization, on the principal payment of those bonds to the extent of 50 percent. So that whatever is issued under that title III of that $6 billion, you are obligating the United States Treasury to one-half of the principal and interest. In case there is any doubt in anybody's mind about what that language means, that is taken care of on page 24 in a subsequent section of the bill. That section has some very astute language in it. I have tried to find out who wrote that language. I could not find anybody on the Committee on Education and Labor who would confess to having had anything to do with the writing of that language, and I was finally told it was written down in the Department of Education. They need never have told me that, because I knew it before. You would know it as soon as you read it. It says:

> The Commissioner, in addition to other powers conferred by this act, shall have power to agree to modifications of agreements made under this title and to pay, compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however arising or acquired under this title.

And all of this money is involved in this. He can give it all away. Have any of you ever voted for a bill that gave any official of the Government that much power?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

That is not all. With that very bold language in there, somebody might have commenced to fuss about giving all that away. That is taken care of in the next paragraph:

> Financial transactions of the Commissioner in making advances pursuant to this title, and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government.

If I understand the language, and I think I do, those words mean that the Congress says for the purpose of this title the General Accounting Act is hereby repealed. I want to get somebody who would be willing to stand up here and debate that question. I want to find somebody who is going to stand up here and say that that language does not, for the purpose of this bill, repeal the General Accounting Act. It says so in so many words.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, those are the kind of errors that are in this bill. If you think it is a bill that you can straighten out on the floor of this House, very well, but if you do not, you had better send it back to the committee.

I now yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. I appreciate the generosity of the gentleman from Virginia in allowing me to clarify some of the questions.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yielded for a question.

Mr. BAILEY. The question I wanted to ask was, if you think the objections that were raised in the Rules Committee some days ago would be answered if the committee amendments which were approved by the committee, striking out that section that you read, which gave the Commissioner of Education the authority to preempt the Comptroller General's authority, would that clear up the matter as to that point?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. I wanted to ask another question. The gentleman raised the question about $6 billion, with the implication that that was a $6 billion obligation on the part of the Federal Government. I think the amendment I presented to the Rules Committee and which I expect to offer on the floor to limit the Government obligation under title 3 to not to exceed $150 million is plain enough. Then it will be not $6 billion but not to exceed $150 million.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think that would be a decided improvement. I think it still does not cure the principle involved in this bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I must yield first to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL].

Mr. MCCONNELL. I appreciate the gentleman's willingness to yield to me but I think it will take more time than I have at my disposal unless the gentleman is willing to give more time to me, because I am going to start right at the beginning where the gentleman started.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sure the gentleman will do that if the bill is called up.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I will be very glad to and I will take it up point by point.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I know the gentleman and I do not see eye to eye on the amendment sometimes known as the Powell amendment. I would like, however, to ask the gentleman whether he shares the view of the gentleman from Mississippi that the addition of the amendment really adds very little to the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will go further than that; it does not add anything to the bill and I think it is utterly unnecessary. I think there are many other ways that this nefarious purpose can be accomplished.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman not agree then there could be no harm in voting for the amendment on the part of those who believe in the principle enunciated in it?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Except that some people do not like to be affronted.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety Members are present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 327, nays 67, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

YEAS—327

Addonizio	Dempsey	Hull
Albert	Denton	Hyde
Alger	Derounian	Jackson
Allen, Calif.	Devereux	James
Andersen, H. Carl	Diggs	Jarman
	Dingell	Jennings
Andresen, August H.	Dixon	Johnson, Calif.
	Dodd	Johnson, Wis.
Andrews	Dollinger	Jones, Ala.
Arends	Dolliver	Jones, Mo.
Ashley	Dondero	Judd
Aspinall	Donohue	Karsten
Auchincloss	Donovan	Kean
Avery	Dorn, N. Y.	Kearns
Ayres	Doyle	Keating
Bailey	Durham	Kee
Baker	Edmondson	Kelley, Pa.
Baldwin	Elliott	Kelly, N. Y.
Barden	Ellsworth	Keogh
Bass, N. H.	Engle	Kilburn
Bates	Evins	Kilday
Baumhart	Fallon	Kilgore
Beamer	Fascell	King, Calif.
Becker	Feighan	King, Pa.
Belcher	Fenton	Kirwan
Bennett, Mich.	Fernandez	Kluczynski
Bentley	Fino	Knox
Berry	Fjare	Laird
Betts	Flood	Lankford
Blatnik	Fogarty	Latham
Boggs	Forand	LeCompte
Boland	Ford	Lesinski
Bolling	Fountain	Lipscomb
Bolton, Frances P.	Frazier	Long
	Frelinghuysen	Lovre
Bolton, Oliver P.	Friedel	McCarthy
	Fulton	McConnell
Bosch	Gamble	McCormack
Bow	Garmatz	McCulloch
Bowler	Gathings	McDonough
Boyle	Gavin	McDowell
Bray	George	McGregor
Brooks, Tex.	Gordon	McIntire
Brown, Ohio	Grant	McVey
Brownson	Gray	Macdonald
Broyhill	Greene, Oreg.	Machrowicz
Buckley	Gregory	Mack, Ill.
Budge	Griffiths	Mack, Wash.
Burnside	Gross	Madden
Bush	Gubser	Magnuson
Byrd	Gwinn	Mailliard
Byrne, Pa.	Hagen	Martin
Byrnes, Wis.	Hale	Meader
Canfield	Halleck	Merrow
Cannon	Hand	Metcalf
Carnahan	Harris	Miller, Calif.
Carrigg	Harrison, Nebr.	Miller, Md.
Cederberg	Harvey	Miller, Nebr.
Chase	Hays, Ark.	Miller, N. Y.
Chelf	Hays, Ohio	Mills
Chenoweth	Hayworth	Minshall
Chiperfield	Healey	Mollohan
Christopher	Henderson	Morano
Chudoff	Heselton	Morrison
Church	Hess	Moss
Clark	Hiestand	Moulder
Coon	Hill	Multer
Cooper	Hinshaw	Mumma
Corbett	Hoeven	Murray, Ill.
Coudert	Hoffman, Mich.	Murray, Tenn.
Cretella	Holifield	Natcher
Curtis, Mass.	Holland	Nelson
Curtis, Mo.	Holmes	Norblad
Dague	Holt	Norrell
Davidson	Holtzman	O'Brien, Ill.
Dawson, Ill.	Hope	O'Brien, N. Y.
Dawson, Utah	Horan	O'Hara, Ill.
Deane	Hosmer	O'Konski
Delaney	Huddleston	O'Neill

Osmers	Sadlak	Thomson, Wyo.
Ostertag	St. George	Tollefson
Patterson	Schenck	Trimble
Pelly	Scherer	Tumulty
Perkins	Schwengel	Udall
Pfost	Scott	Vanik
Philbin	Scrivner	Van Zandt
Polk	Seely-Brown	Velde
Powell	Selden	Vorys
Price	Sheppard	Vursell
Priest	Short	Wainwright
Prouty	Shuford	Walter
Quigley	Sieminski	Watts
Rabaut	Sikes	Weaver
Radwan	Siler	Westland
Rains	Simpson, Ill.	Wharton
Ray	Simpson, Pa.	Wickersham
Reece, Tenn.	Sisk	Widnall
Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Wis.	Wier
Rees, Kans.	Spence	Williams, N. J.
Reuss	Springer	Williams, N. Y.
Rhodes, Ariz.	Staggers	Willis
Rhodes, Pa.	Steed	Wilson, Calif.
Riehlman	Sullivan	Withrow
Roberts	Talle	Wolverton
Robsion, Ky.	Taylor	Wright
Rodino	Teague, Calif.	Yates
Rogers, Colo.	Thomas	Young
Rogers, Fla.	Thompson, Mich.	Younger
Rogers, Mass.	Thompson, N. J.	Zablocki
Rooney	Thompson, Tex.	Zelenko
Roosevelt		

NAYS—67

Abbitt	Forrester	Pillion
Abernethy	Gary	Poage
Alexander	Gentry	Poff
Allen, Ill.	Haley	Preston
Ashmore	Hardy	Richards
Bennett, Fla.	Harrison, Va.	Riley
Bonner	Hébert	Rivers
Boykin	Herlong	Robeson, Va.
Brooks, La.	Ikard	Rogers, Tex.
Brown, Ga.	Jenkins	Rutherford
Burleson	Jensen	Smith, Kans.
Carlyle	Johansen	Smith, Miss.
Clevenger	Jonas	Smith, Va.
Cole	Jones, N. C.	Taber
Colmer	Landrum	Tuck
Cooley	Lanham	Utt
Cramer	McMillan	Van Pelt
Crumpacker	Mahon	Vinson
Davis, Ga.	Marshall	Whitten
Dies	Matthews	Williams, Miss.
Dowdy	Nicholson	Winstead
Fisher	Passman	
Flynt	Pilcher	

NOT VOTING—38

Adair	Eberharter	Patman
Anfuso	Green, Pa.	Phillips
Barrett	Harden	Saylor
Bass, Tenn.	Hillings	Scudder
Bell	Hoffman, Ill.	Sheehan
Blitch	Kearney	Shelley
Burdick	Klein	Teague, Tex.
Celler	Knutson	Thompson, La.
Chatham	Krueger	Thornberry
Cunningham	Lane	Wigglesworth
Davis, Tenn.	Mason	Wilson, Ind.
Davis, Wis.	Morgan	Wolcott
Dorn, S. C.	O'Hara, Minn.	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Bell against.

Mr. Wigglesworth for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Klein for, with Mrs. Blitch against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr. Sheehan for, with Mr. Dorn of South Carolina against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Shelley with Mrs. Harden.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Hillings.

Mrs. Knutson with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Krueger.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Scudder.

Mr. Bass of Tennessee with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. VELDE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7535) to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 7535, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] will be recognized for 3 hours, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL] will be recognized for 3 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

At this time I wish to discuss the bill as it is before you. I will not attempt to go into detail, because I believe other committee members will desire to discuss the various titles, some of them in detail.

I believe the House would be interested in a little history of this legislation. I do not have to say to the House that I have been interested in the subject of education for many years. I guess I started my education in what was about as near the little red schoolhouse as anyone in this Chamber; a little schoolhouse in the country, a little one-room schoolhouse built by my father on his farm. I have been interested from that day to this. I served on the education committee in the State Legislature of North Carolina, at which time we made a thorough and full and complete study of the educational system in North Carolina.

I have been serving on this committee for over 20 years in this House. I have probably attended more hearings and listened to more witnesses on the subject of education than any living man.

When we started consideration of this bill my remarks to the committee were simply these: That I thought our objective was important enough, big enough, to require our full time, our best thought, and our most careful consideration. My own views were a little like those expressed by the superintendent of schools in North Carolina when one member inquired of him how he could justify calling for some Federal assistance. His answer was simple and clear and is known to every Member of this House. He simply said, "The Federal Government has invaded virtually every source of revenue of the States, and we are finding ourselves in trouble. So I say to you, sir, my plea is either leave more money down with us to take care of our obligations, or divide with us." That is rather a hard answer on which to comment.

Then I said to this committee, as important as this objective it, and as large a field as it will be necessary for us to cover, we should keep our eyes on the one and all-important objective of building these school buildings, and stay out of the field of social legislation and labor legislation. That admonition, suggestion, or request did not last long, for the labor unions were very quickly more concerned over the Davis-Bacon law than they were on the school bill. Finally, the old racial question became so important that it almost crowded out the other. Finally NEA, who has been so anxious about education, focused their attention particularly upon the money and not on the details and the all-important language of the bill.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes, I yield briefly.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman explain to the Congress why he voted for Public Law 874, the Bacon-Davis law?

Mr. BARDEN. I do not have to explain my acts to any person in this House. They understand me.

Mr. KEARNS. But you did vote for that.

Mr. BARDEN. I do not yield any further. I want to be courteous to the gentleman and I want to be considerate, and I would like to be an angel in his presence, but it is just a little different situation right now.

Then we were left to grapple with many problems. At one time this bill was assigned to a subcommittee and the subcommittee worked hard. They came up with a proposal to the full committee. In that bill there are some things with which I do not agree. So we started as objectively as possible to give it the most careful consideration paragraph by paragraph and sentence by sentence.

I do not like the so-called State plan but we wrestled and grappled with it. We went along and people began to get impatient. We started a big building on Capitol Hill and nobody gets impatient when it takes years to complete, but start an all-important piece of legislation affecting the lives and pocketbooks of everybody in America and we soon get impatient and ask why something is not done; and this I did not agree with in my committee and, of course, they all know it.

Suddenly about the time we had read 12 or 13 pages, the motion was made to report the bill out, and it was reported out. Since then we have been called together to consider some committee amendments, which in my opinion, are good amendments and should be added to this bill. Frankness compels me to say to the House, that those amendments will correct serious defects. There may be others that are needed which will develop when we begin to read the bill in detail.

Without consuming too much time, I want to brush through the bill. The purpose of the bill is stated, then the formula under which the funds are to be divided among the States. It then goes into the State planning, which under some circumstances I think might be workable were it not applicable to the entire school system of America. That deals with certain powers, implied powers, and so forth, for the Commis-

sion, and then it proceeds to provide a court review with the idea in mind of protecting Federal funds. Following that, we go into title 2 which deals with the purchase of bonds for the Federal Government to assist these various school districts throughout the Nation.

The third title deals with an arrangement whereby it will help the States to take care of bonds issued by the States.

The cost of this bill does not frighten me at all. I would say to the people of America that $1,500,000,000 is not too much to spend for education; but I would object to the expenditure of $1 million wrongfully, because $1 million might set a precedent that would be dangerous. I would like to see some buildings built; I would like to see some school buildings provided; I would like to see a revival of interest in the people of all America in education, but unfortunately for some reason, whether it be on account of world conditions or whether it be one of the prices we paid for war, or whatever it may be, something has killed off the ardor. I remember so well the fights I have been involved in on this floor in trying to make it possible for young men who had the ambition to have the opportunity to finish their education and to take postgraduate work and become experts in the field of education, in the field of engineering, in the field of medicine, or of the sciences. Of course, you know the results of those fights. It did not work. Now we are crying to the world that we are short of doctors, we are short of engineers, we are short of experts in many fields of the sciences. The sad part about that is we are short of them. Little are we doing to correct it.

A draft act does not make doctors, a draft act does not make engineers, a draft act does not produce chemists. There should be a middle ground of commonsense with plenty of room for us to exercise our good judgment in providing the protection that this country needs. So I say to you there is no harm in being enthusiastic over education. I am enthusiastic over it myself.

Let me say to you, Mr. Chairman, that once you touch the educational situation in America, you touch the nerve center of the American people. First their reaction may be quiet but it could become violent.

I have prepared an amendment, and I did it with the assistance of some of the best minds I could find. I prepared it sincerely and honestly because I believe this House expects me as chairman of the Committee on Education to do my best, not up to the point where it may cross some selfish desire of mine, but you expect me to do my utmost to bring the best product to this House, the best bill to the floor of the House of which I am capable. For that reason I thought the bill could be materially improved and I set about with that desire and with that objective in mind.

My amendment would begin on page 3 of the bill as it is printed, and beginning in line 20 strike out about 6 pages of language that I greatly fear, both from the standpoint of precedent and from the standpoint of looking at the future of education in this country. In those 6 pages there is enough discretionary power, enough direct power, enough implied power for a Commissioner of Education to foul up the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the question may be asked, Why should that trouble anyone? This is a school-building program and when the building is completed they walk out and there it is, and there you are with the precedent you have written into the law of this land and into the statute books. You and I know what history will be.

There are such bonding provisions as would provide for lending money, the Government buys the bonds and the commissioner owns the bonds for that school district. They start operating the school district on a rental basis, if you please, and then there is default in the bonds. Who takes over the school building and who runs it? To me that is of great concern.

Now, take these various sections between page 3 and page 9 and read them. You will find statements such as this set forth: "Principles for determining the priority of projects in the State for assistance under this title which will assure that first priority will be given" to this one or that one or the other. Who determines that? Nobody under the sun but the United States Commissioner of Education. If you get into an argument with the Commissioner, to whom do you appeal? You appeal to the Commissioner. Well, it would not be hard to guess what his final decision would be in that case, of course. And then you go into the courts by a procedure that is all right, I guess. I will not question the legality of it.

Turning now to page 7:

> If any project for which one or more payments have been made under this section is abandoned, or is not completed within a reasonable period determined under regulations of the Commissioner—

Well, there is no paragraph in there that gives the Commissioner authority to write regulations, but there it is in the body of the law.

Now, I do not like to make these kinds of statements about a bill that I am bringing to the floor, but I want to say this in connection with my amendment: That at the time it was prepared the major portion was liked by an overwhelming majority of the committee. But at that time I had attached to it a provision that would have removed the Davis-Bacon Act from the bill. Of course, when the committee asked me if that was true, I told them "Yes," and they voted down the amendment. Well, I still do not like some features of the Davis-Bacon Act, to be spending State tax money, but I am practical enough to know that I doubt very much it could be defeated in this House, and at the same time I recognize the fact that the rest of the amendment was so much more important than the Davis-Bacon portion that I separated the Davis-Bacon portion and left the Davis-Bacon Act in the bill as it now is. My amendment does not affect the operation of the Davis-Bacon Act in one particular in this bill.

My amendment that takes the place of six pages says this:

> The Commissioner shall pay the State allotment for any fiscal year, or so much thereof as the State educational agency requests, to the State educational agency upon certification by it that the amount to be paid does not exceed one-half of the cost of constructing the school facilities for which such funds are to be expended. Funds paid to a State educational agency under this section shall be expended solely for construction of school facilities in the State, and shall be used to pay not more than one-half of the total cost of constructing all school facilities in the State which are assisted under this title.

Now, that is to be determined by the operation of the formula as it is written in the beginning of the bill. What does that do? That takes 6 pages of dangerous and unnecessary authority out of a nebulous state, floating around, that the Commissioner could use or not use and consolidates it and says that when it is certified, that the State is entitled to this much money and shows that it will be spent, that it shall be paid to the State agency. And then I provide direct jurisdiction to the United States district court of the district in which the capital of the State is located to handle these matters expeditiously and settle any argument that may come up, without the whole State having to come to Washington and crawl around in front of the United States Commissioner of Education.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. I certainly do not want to make any comment on the gentleman's proposed amendment, but I should like to clarify one statement concerning the plan set out in the first 6 pages of this bill. I should like to ask the chairman if we did not have similar plans in the so-called impacted-area legislation and also in the vocational-educational bills.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman that I was the first man to work out the first State plan under the vocational training bill. I was certainly also concerned in handling the impacted school area bill. One was a specified, limited area in vocational training. The other was to take care of a situation created by the Federal Government, was a Federal problem, and was to be handled by the Federal Government. It was entirely different.

Here we have a problem that covers all of the 48 States of the Union and involves our educational system and involves altogether the public school system of America. There can be no comparison whatever.

But that just illustrates what I said a few minutes ago about writing this kind of legislation. Two years from now, 5 years from now, 10 years from now, it will be pointed to as a precedent and someone will say, "You gave that much authority to the United States Commissioner of Education; why should you not do it again and expand it?"

No man in America loves the educational system of this Nation more than I. I am as jealous of its proper place and against anyone's attempting to interfere with it, as any man who ever lived. I am not basing this on any racial prejudice, or any other side issue, political or otherwise. Mr. Chairman, I say to you that the thing we are dealing with here is big enough, important enough, affects our Nation enough so that we can throw the rest of those side chips in the wastebasket. This will tax the best brains in this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, today we begin a debate of vital and far-reaching significance to America. Because it concerns the welfare of our Nation's children; because it involves questions of fundamentals of government; and because it contains the elements of emotional conflict, there is need for sober reflection and restraint on the part of the membership of this body.

I do not know a single Member who is not sincerely interested in the welfare of our children and in the preservation of the intrinsic strength of our country. We may differ over methods, but not over objectives. No amount of differences over provisions of a bill could persuade me that any Member does not desire earnestly to do that which is right as he or she sees the right.

The bill, H. R. 7535, now before us, would authorize Federal assistance to States and local communities in financing a program of construction of school facilities to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms.

Federal aid to education has been discussed for a number of years. Roughly, the subject can be divided into three broad categories.

First, aid to school districts adversely affected by the impact of Federal activities, principally defense establishments.

Second, aid for the maintenance and operation of schools, principally the expenses of school operation, textbooks, teachers' salaries, and so forth.

Third, aid for the construction of school facilities.

Legislation for maintenance and operation and construction of schools under category one has been overwhelmingly approved by Congress. There has been sharp controversy over category two. Legislation for category three, which is somewhat less controversial than category two, provides for the construction of school facilities and is now before us.

During the period from 1930–50, school construction lagged very noticeably. An economic depression and a low birth rate, and labor and material shortages due to World War II, caused school construction deficiencies to accumulate. In recent years the deficiencies have been accentuated by rapid increases in school enrollments—from 25,070,000 in the school year 1949–50, to about 30,500,000 this past fall. The enrollment increase is expected to continue to about 37,300,000 pupils in 1959–60. The shifting of the population has aggravated the conditions in many communities.

States and local school districts have been increasing their efforts to meet the classroom shortages. In 1949–50, they spent about $1 billion to build 36,000 new classrooms. Each year since they have been increasing their construction efforts; during the past year they have been spending about $2½ billion to build 67,000 classrooms. For several years the increased construction failed to keep pace with the expanding needs, and the accumulated deficit continued to increase. For the past 2 years the construction rate slightly exceeded each year's new classroom needs, showing that some progress has been made in reducing the deficit. However, at the current increased rate, it would take many years before the shortage would be eliminated.

Exact estimates are impossible to obtain, but the best information available indicates these probabilities:

Over the next 5 years based on population estimates, school enrollment increases alone will require about 210,000 classrooms.

States report about 2,250,000 pupils are enrolled in excess of normal capacity of public schools now in use. To relieve overcrowding, double shift school sessions, or use of buildings not designed as schools, the States estimate an additional need of 80,000 classrooms.

There is need for replacement of obsolete, unsafe and unsuitable facilities. Although replacement needs are matters of judgment and hence difficult to figure precisely, a fair and reasonable estimate from available information by the Office of Education would fix a goal for replacement of 180,000 classrooms.

Adding these figures, a reasonable objective for classroom construction for the next 5 years would be approximately 470,000.

Naturally, those favoring larger appropriations or those opposing this or any legislation will contend that the figures are too low or too high, but no one has been able to sustain by reliable figures that no sizable classroom shortage exists.

No one has argued for no action to meet the situation.

No one has favored Federal control of education; all proponents and opponents of this type of legislation have favored State and local control of education, which is traditional in America. And I most emphatically want it to continue that way. Therefore, the methods employed to meet the problem must be those which will not mean the running of our school systems from Washington.

Differences arise over the question of whether any type of assistance can be provided by the Federal Government without Federal control of our schools. In proposing methods of Federal aid for construction of school facilities for a period of 4 or 5 years to help the State and local districts to more rapidly eliminate the shortages of classrooms, it is sincerely believed that Federal control of the operations of our schools will not occur from that kind of assistance. I have never been able to understand how the Federal Government could control the running of the school systems of America after the classrooms have been constructed in various school districts.

The administration has been seriously studying the factors involved in the problem for the past few years. President Eisenhower's messages on education to Congress at past and present sessions contained certain recommendations. It has been and is now the administration's belief—in which I concur—that no single approach to the problem will suffice. I agree that the purpose of the proposed methods should be so designed as to stimulate State and local action.

The recommendations of the President to this session of Congress, which are embodied in S. 2905, except for certain specific differences which will be discussed during the debate, are also in H. R. 7535, the bill now before us, which was reported out by the Education and Labor Committee last year by a vote of 21–9. There was an earnest effort in the committee to work out a compromise bill.

Both bills provide for a multiple rather than a single approach to the problem.

The administration bill, S. 2905, proposes a 5-year program. It authorizes Federal grants to State educational agencies of $250 million annually for 5 years. H. R. 7535 authorizes $400 million annually for 4 years.

In S. 2905 a different method of Federal allotment to the States is provided than in H. R. 7535. The administration bill would allot the sums appropriated to the States on the basis of the school age population; the income per person of school age; and the effort for school purposes of the respective States.

S. 2905 provides that the Federal payments shall be matched on a 50–50 basis by the States and local communities for 1 year—thereafter by the States alone for the remaining 4 years of the program.

Both bills make provisions for hearings of a State educational agency before the Commissioner, and for judicial review if any State is dissatisfied with the final action of the Commissioner.

Both bills authorize the Commissioner to purchase obligations of local educational agencies to assist them in financing construction of school facilities, where such agencies are unable to obtain such financing or reasonable terms from other sources.

Both bills limit the aggregate principal amount of obligations to be purchased to not exceed $750 million.

Both bills limit the aggregate principal amount of obligations to be purchased in any fiscal year in any single State to not exceed 15 percent of the aggregate principal amount of obligations purchased during the fiscal year.

Both bills provide that the obligations purchased may be either general or special obligations; shall be purchased at par or face value; shall be repaid within a period of 30 years or less and shall bear interest at a rate equal to the quarterly rate specified by the Secretary of the Treasury as applicable to the calendar quarter during which obligations are

purchased by the Commissioner plus three-eighths of 1 percent.

The quarterly rate applicable to each calendar quarter shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury by estimating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations of prices during the month preceding such calendar quarter, on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 or more years from the first day of such month, and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent.

Obligations purchased must be accompanied by a certification that the local educational agency issuing them was unable to obtain the necessary funds by a public offering upon reasonable terms. That there is an opinion by a qualified attorney that the obligations were legally issued and are binding on the local educational agency. That the school facilities to be constructed with the proceeds of the sale of the obligations are needed and are in compliance with applicable State construction laws and standards. Also any additional information as may be necessary to make a reasonable showing that the local educational agency is financially able to pay them as they become due.

The Commissioner may sell or exchange any obligations purchased by him at public or private sale upon such terms and at such prices as he may fix. Also, he may consent to a modification of any term of an obligation purchased by him, or any agreement entered into by him under this title where necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States.

An annual report of his activities under this title is required.

Both bills authorize the Commissioner to enter into agreements with State school-financing agencies to make advances to a basic reserve fund established by such agencies to help assure payment of obligations issued by them to finance the construction of school facilities for rental use and ultimate ownership by local educational agencies.

Briefly, a State would establish a State school financing agency. That agency would sell its obligation to obtain funds. With those funds school facilities would be constructed. Then a local school district would use the school on a rental basis, paying an amount sufficient to take care of principal and interest and certain other charges. At the end of a specified period of time the school facilities would be paid for and could be turned over to the school district.

The agreement with the Commissioner would provide that the State school financing agency shall establish and maintain a basic reserve fund and a supplemental reserve fund for each issue of obligations. Into the basic reserve fund the State would deposit an amount equal to one-half the maximum annual debt service, to be known as the State account. The annual debt service means the aggregate amount required to pay the interest and principal of each issue becoming due in each successive 12-month period.

The Commission shall also advance for deposit into the basic reserve fund for each issue an amount equal to one-half the maximum annual debt service and that will be known as the Federal account.

Into the supplemental reserve fund established by the State school financing agency would be deposited the rental payments of the local school district, which would be sufficient to pay, first, the annual debt service; second, an amount equal to one-fourth of 1 percent of the original principal amount of the issue of obligations to repay the Federal and State advances to the basic reserve fund and any subsequent advances if required by a default in rental payments; third, the cost of maintenance, repairs, replacements, and insurance of the school facilities; and fourth, other expenses of the school financing agency in respect to the financing of such facilities.

Federal advances may be made with respect to obligations issued by State school-financing agencies to an aggregate principal amount not to exceed $6 billion.

S. 2905 proposes a total of $20 million Federal funds as grants to States to assist them in meeting administration expenses in the development of State programs to increase school construction.

The allotment shall be made to each State on the basis of its school-age population in relation to the total school-age population of all the States.

From the State's allotment the Federal Government shall pay 50 percent of the State's administrative expenses in the development of a program to promote greater efficiency in planning or financing school construction to eliminate restrictive debt or tax limits and to achieve a more efficient organization of school districts in the State.

This represents a stimulus by the Federal Government to a greater effort by the States and local areas to construct more schools in the future.

H. R. 7535 contains no such provisions.

It should be evident at this stage of the discussion that the differences between H. R. 7535 and the administration proposal, S. 2905, are not numerous.

Summarized briefly they are as follows:

H. R. 7535 proposes Federal grants to States for school construction of $400 million annually for 4 years, or a total of $1,600,000,000.

S. 2905 proposes Federal grants to States of $250 million annually for 5 years, or a total of $1,250,000,000.

H. R. 7535 would allot Federal funds to States on the basis of the school-age population alone.

S. 2905 would allot Federal funds to States on the basis of the school-age population; the average income per child of school age; and the school effort of a State to take care of its needs.

H. R. 7535 provides for State and local matching of Federal funds for 4 years.

S. 2905 provides for State and local matching of Federal funds for 1 year, and State matching along for 4 years.

If there is State and local matching the result would be that Federal funds would go to the local school districts financially able to provide matching funds, thereby passing many needy districts not able to provide the necessary funds. It should be a Federal-State relationship—not a Federal-local relationship.

S. 2905 provides under title 4, Federal grants to States totaling $20 million to encourage and assist them in developing programs to build more school facilities by better planning, more efficient organization of school districts and by the elimination of restrictive debt and tax limits.

Federal funds are to be allotted to all States on the basis of their school-age population.

The funds allotted shall be used to pay 50 percent of the administrative expenses of developing such programs.

H. R. 7535 contains no provisions for Federal funds for such purposes.

I favor a bill for Federal aid of a temporary nature to eliminate more rapidly the present shortages of school facilities in various areas of the United States.

As I stated at the beginning, and because it is a true statement, I will repeat it. I do not know a single Member who is not sincerely interested in the welfare of our children. Education by better fitting them for a useful life is a necessary contributing factor to the welfare of our youth. The Nation's present and future need for trained manpower is widely recognized. Shortages exist in virtually all professional and technical fields. The development of trained manpower and the overcoming of those shortages can only be done by making our educational systems more effective.

No one will contend that adequate school facilities are not indispensable to an effective educational system. No one has been able to show by reliable figures that no classroom shortages exist. No one has advocated doing nothing to correct the condition. And no one advocates the running of our school system from Washington.

The bill before us today seeks to provide adequate school facilities, and in such a way that danger of Federal control in the operation of our schools is avoided. Rather it seeks to stimulate State and local action.

It is a temporary measure, designedly of short duration and for the sole purpose of reducing rapidly the deficiencies in school facilities; deficiencies which accumulated principally because of national and international situations, and not from State and local inaction alone.

I earnestly ask your support of this legislative effort for a very worthy objective.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman refers to the shortage of classrooms and I find the title of this bill refers to eliminating the national shortage of classrooms, but as far as I can see throughout the bill they refer to the construction of school facilities. Now a gymnasium is an ordinary school facility in many parts of my State. Some schools have swimming pools and playing fields. I wonder if this is a classroom bill, why it does not say so and provide for classrooms instead of school facilities.

Mr. McCONNELL. The main purpose of the bill is to eliminate the shortage of classrooms. The term "facilities" is defined on page 27:

The term "school facilities," except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, means classrooms and related facilities (including initial equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes), for education which is provided as elementary or secondary education, in the applicable State.

Classroom facilities is a little more inclusive term than just classrooms. We not only mean to provide for assistance to the States in providing classrooms, but also the various facilities in connection with classrooms such as light fixtures and facilities that would be used in a classroom, and so on. It is not just limited to the actual space known as a classroom.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Would the gentleman continue reading to show what it does not include? That follows the language which the gentleman just read.

Mr. McCONNELL. Yes, I will read it from the beginning and go all the way through:

The term "school facilities," except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, means classrooms and related facilities (including initial equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes), for education which is provided as elementary or secondary education, in the applicable State, at public expense and under public supervision and direction; and interests in land (including site, grading, and improvement) on which such facilities are constructed. Such term does not include athletic stadia, or other structures or facilities, intended primarily for events, such as athletic exhibitions, contests, or games, for which admission is to be charged to the general public. For purposes of title I, such term does not include interests in land, offsite improvements, or structures or facilities designed to be used exclusively for special activities, such as single-purpose auditoriums and gymnasiums.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The gentleman, as I understood him, made the statement that this bill referred purely and simply to school construction. The gentleman could not see how that had anything to do with the running of the schools. Is that correct?

Mr. McCONNELL. That is correct.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Would the gentleman say that after we constructed these schools and built the schools, then the next step is for the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the running of those schools, and then the question is before us again.

Mr. McCONNELL. No, I do not say that is the next step at all. I have heard statements made in this body that if we do this or that it is a precedent. It is not necessarily a precedent. Each Congress will have to determine for itself whether it will agree to embark on a new adventure, broaden this one, or even do away with some of the programs we have started. I was quite interested in some of the statements made earlier by some speakers during the debate on the adoption of the rule. There seemed to be a feeling at that time that the Federal Government should not be in these educational activities. I wondered if some of them had forgotten some of the programs the Federal Government is engaged in, in connection with Federal aid to education. I was quite interested when a man handed me a book yesterday and he said, "I do not know whether you know how many activities the Federal Government is engaged in with respect to educational matters."

The State College of Washington had a compilation made of the laws and proposals relating to Federal aid to education. It contains 425 pages. Here it is. You can see how large a volume it is. These activities of the Federal Government occurred prior to any consideration of the present bill. These are the activities in connection with Federal aid to education. Talk about setting a precedent. The precedent has been set long ago.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Is it not also true that under Public Law 874 we provide money for maintenance and operation of federally impacted schools and that the Federal Government deals directly with school districts in determining the allotment for maintenance and operation?

Mr. McCONNELL. That is right.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Whereas, under this bill, the Federal Government is dealing exclusively with the States?

Mr. McCONNELL. With the exception of one title. That is the bond-purchase section.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The analogy I was making between two grant programs, where one of them is dealing directly with a school district, this one is a grant program dealing with a State agency, which is a go-between.

Mr. McCONNELL. That is right.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I gladly yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. If the gentleman returns to the criterion set up in the definition, would he be able to state that the term "equipment" does not include schoolbooks?

Mr. McCONNELL. It does not include schoolbooks. Textbooks will not be provided under this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 15 minutes.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. The gentleman has mentioned that in 1 year the States and localities built 67,000 classrooms at a cost of $2½ billion. The gentleman then made reference to the fact that within the next 5 years we ought to be able, in order to bring up the deficiency which exists, to build some 470,000 classrooms, if I remember what the gentleman said. In view of the obvious billions that any such construction program as that would cost does the gentleman care to comment on the significance of the Federal assistance here involved, $400 million a year?

Mr. McCONNELL. I think it would be well on the part of all Members to understand the purpose of this Federal assistance bill. It is not alone in the amount of grants involved; the amount involved is not a large one, as shown in the analysis of the bill, but it is hoped by the entire provisions of this bill to stimulate a much larger State and local action.

Mr. HAND. I understand that; the Commissioner of Education has mentioned that before my committee. I want to illustrate to the gentleman what I mean. The State of New Jersey under this bill would get something like $11 million a year for the 3 years of the program. They would, of course, pay much more than that into the Federal Treasury in taxes.

Mr. McCONNELL. The gentleman is speaking of the grants program.

Mr. HAND. I am speaking of the grants program. In the very small community in which I personally live, having some seven thousand or eight thousand people, we are considering the building of an addition to the school facilities which will cost us $1,300,000. Does not that make the Federal school construction program seem rather insignificant and inadequate?

Mr. McCONNELL. It is not a large program.

Mr. HAND. The gentleman's feeling is that it is to encourage State and local programs rather than supplant them.

Mr. McCONNELL. I consider it one of the best programs to stimulate action to meet classroom shortages that I have seen since I have been in Congress.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. How many classrooms would $400 million a year build? Does the gentleman have the figures available? This is along the lines of the questions just asked by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. McCONNELL. No; I do not have such figures available. It would be a little difficult to get.

Mr. JUDD. I mean, for instance, if the States have been building about 67,000 classrooms a year it ought to be possible to find out what their total expenditures in a year for that purpose were, and simple division would show how much each classroom cost, on the average. We could then divide that figure into 400 million and find out about how many classrooms a year the money in this bill would build. It would seem to me very important to get an idea of the cost per classroom. I would just like to get an idea of how far this program will go in meeting the needs.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. It has been the experience of the office of the Commissioner

of Education that the average cost is approximately $32,000 per classroom.

Mr. JUDD. $32,000 per classroom?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, it varies in different sections of the country.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I ask for this time only to try to clear this matter up. I do not think the gentleman from Kentucky intended to say $32,000 per classroom.

Mr. PERKINS. That is what I intended to say, Mr. Chairman. That is the average cost according to the office of the Commissioner of Education under H. R. 815.

Mr. BARDEN. Per classroom?

Mr. PERKINS. Per classroom.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I think that is rather close to it.

Mr. JUDD. According to that, this $400 million a year would provide for only about 13,000 classrooms. I am not sure of my arithmetic, but it seems to me it would be about 13,000 a year, yet the States are building 67,000 a year already.

Mr. McCONNELL. May I say this to the gentleman once again, the philosophy of this whole approach——

Mr. JUDD. I understand that philosophy and I have no criticism of it. I am merely trying to find out how far this $400 million a year in grants would go.

Mr. McCONNELL. We are assuming that most districts can take care of their needs, but there are certain districts whose financial resources are so meager that they cannot meet their problems, and it seems to me there is the place where help is needed to build classrooms.

The real spending, I may say to the gentlemen from Minnesota, will occur under those provisions providing for the issuance of bonds. There is where the real expansion and the building of classrooms will take place, also in the setting up of school authority finance agencies in the States.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman feel that once this bill is passed the school districts that are in the process of planning and selling bonds to build their own school facilities may perhaps be discouraged from doing so? May they not say, "Let us wait to see if we cannot get something out of the $400 million from Washington"? Does the gentleman feel it might operate in that way?

Mr. McCONNELL. There may be some operation of that kind, but the program is not that big to risk delay.

Mr. JUDD. Of course, it cannot go far; but is not every school district likely to say, "I hope we can get some of that money. Let us try that first"? Might we thereby delay the building of classrooms instead of speeding up the building of classrooms?

Mr. McCONNELL. I am planning to offer an amendment which will take into consideration the financial income and the school-age population of the States, and also the efforts they are putting forth to meet their own educational needs. All of those things are a restraining factor to those districts which are seeking to coast in any way. I am not ready now to say that the character, the temper, and the type of our school communities and educational officials in America are such that they will not attempt to make an earnest effort to meet their own school needs.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. So that the committee may not get any erroneous information, I would like to give the gentleman the cost per classroom figure we are spending in the State of Georgia as of February 14, 1956. Certainly it would be absurd, in my opinion, to think one classroom would cost $32,000. Under date of February 15, 1956, the State superintendent of schools of Georgia, M. D. Collins, in a letter stated:

> Current costs per classroom average around $13,000.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to clarify again a point which the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] raised in connection with our needs in New Jersey. The gentleman pointed out that approximately $11 million would be available under the formula of the Kelley bill. If the formula which the gentleman suggests he is going to offer as an amendment should be accepted by the House, New Jersey would get even less than the $11 million that he has just discussed. I think that points it up and I think the overall figure of how many classrooms $400 million would build points up the danger of overemphasizing the importance of Federal grants. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania has already stated, Federal cooperation with States and local communities is primarily to stimulate further action at those levels. The assistance which is provided in the form of grants is inevitable no matter how much we try to provide a small portion of the total that will be needed over a 5-year period to clear up a backlog of 500,000 classrooms by the year 1960. Is that not true?

Mr. McCONNELL. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Further clarifying the point made by the gentleman from Minnesota and referred to by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] I think the $32,000 figure includes auxiliary facilities, no doubt, and I believe the records will disclose that the classrooms south of us in Arlington cost more than $35,000 on the average.

Mr. McCONNELL. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the purpose and the proposed method should be so designed as to stimulate State and local action. We have just brought that out in our discussion. The recommendations of the President to this session of Congress which are embodied in Senate bill 2905, except for certain specific differences which will be discussed during the debate, are also in H. R. 7535, the bill now before us, which was reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor last year by a vote of 21 to 9.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. BARDEN. During my remarks I made reference to the fact that in title II the Commissioner buys bonds from the local school districts. I believe that is provided for, is it not?

Mr. McCONNELL. That is correct.

Mr. BARDEN. The subject I made mention of was, assuming that the local school district issues bonds and the Commissioner buys them and they construct the school building, what happens in case of default of those bonds? Does the commissioner take over; or what is the next step?

Mr. McCONNELL. The Commissioner has first the obligation to discuss the situation with the officials of the local school district, to find out what they can do, if anything, in the matter of their default. In other words, do they have a proposal to offer to the commissioner in connection with the payment on the bonds? Could they handle the payment on the bonds if there were a moratorium for 1 year? Could they call for a reduction of the amount of principal? Would he consider that? The local school district would discuss those matters with him. My understanding is that he would take the matter up with the Attorney General of the United States to determine what legal action would be taken from then on to protect the interests of the United States and to obtain as much of the money as possible for the Treasury.

Mr. BARDEN. Is that one of the instances where the Commissioner would have the authority to waive, adjust, settle, or give back, so to speak, the amount owing to the Government by virtue of that obligation?

Mr. McCONNELL. You are running into two questions here. One of them is, Should he have such authority and to what extent? We are trying to deal with that, I understand by some amendment to that section. I think the gentleman has spoken of it. If that section is thrown out, and I believe the committee has worked on such an amendment—to strike out that provision—you have the problem of who is to be responsible to the individual holder of the bonds or the bankers who might purchase them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

These bonds will be resold as a revolving fund by the Commissioner. In other words, it is not his intention or obligation to keep holding these bonds. If he can sell them in the bond market or privately he then does that and the proceeds go back into this revolving fund. If he does sell those bonds he has to give some assurance to the people

who are buying them that he is obligating the United States in certain respects as to the payment or performance of certain obligations, that the United States will do whatever they say they will do. Somebody has to speak authoritatively for the United States. The Commissioner of Education, carrying on the negotiations, would probably be the logical one to do that, subject to any litigation over possible fraud or irregularities to protect the interests of the Government.

Mr. BARDEN. As I understand it, there would be no question about the Commissioner's authority to buy the bonds. I assume if some bank bought them from the Commissioner of Education the Commissioner of Education would be required to protect that banking institution on those bonds, which would in effect be a Government obligation. I understand it up to that point, but now we will say the school district did not get the returns from taxation or any other source that would take care of it, and they overestimated the possible yield. Then there is a default on those bonds. Then you start back down the road. The bank calls on the Commissioner, he pays the bank, and the Commissioner has the bonds. Now, what does he do with the obligation? Does he by mandamus or otherwise force the school district, or does he take over, or does he operate the building? Where is it left then?

Mr. McCONNELL. The gentleman knows, of course, that I am not a lawyer.

Mr. BARDEN. I have ceased to claim that I am, since they have mixed it up, but I used to be one.

Mr. McCONNELL. My understanding would be that if the Commissioner was the holder of the bonds and not some bank or other purchaser he would discuss the matter with the local school district authorities and find out what the situation is. He would then have to determine in his mind whether he should agree to certain changes in the original agreement as to the purchase of the bonds. That would be my understanding of it. All of this, however, is subject to the overall general scrutiny of the Attorney General of the United States. In other words, I think there are certain things he could not do of a nature which would cause us loss by negligence or any type of illegal or fraudulent action. I am sure the Attorney General would have authority over his actions if they involved the standing of the United States.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. I dislike to trespass again on the gentleman's time. However, section 201, which is the general title we are talking about now, provides that the Commissioner—the Federal Commissioner, of course—may purchase obligations of local educational agencies, as provided in this title, to assist such agencies, and so forth. Can the gentleman give me his thinking as to why the purchase of those bonds should not be made for the local school districts by the respective States, most of which have superior credit and superior financial resources to the United States? State bonds, for example, sell at a cheaper rate of interest and at a higher premium than Federal bonds do. Why do they not finance these school districts?

Mr. McCONNELL. I wish they would. That is the answer: I wish they would.

Mr. HAND. They will not if we do. Is not that the further answer?

Mr. McCONNELL. I would say they should supplement it if there are no State statutory or constitutional restrictions. This is a big problem for Federal, State, and local agencies, I believe, to work out to correct these deficiencies in classrooms. They should use whatever method they can, jointly or separately. That is quite in line with the overall theory of this pending legislation.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to discuss in detail the bill H. R. 7535 because there are many members of the Committee who are very familiar with the financial and legal aspects of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 7535, a bill to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms, is the result of long and intensive study by the members of the Committee on Education and Labor. The shortage of classrooms in our Nation began to develop during the depression years, when, because of poverty, school construction was curtailed. The shortage grew rapidly during the war years, when because of lack of materials the building of schools virtually ceased. But, as always during war, the birth rate increased rapidly so that by the end of the war practically every community in the Nation was faced with a serious classroom shortage and the vexing, complicated problem of how to finance the building of needed schools. Many, many school districts throughout the country needed buildings; they needed equipment and textbooks; they needed more teachers, and they watched their children go to packed and jammed classrooms, sometimes in obsolete and unsafe buildings, sometimes on a part-time basis, and in many cases not at all because there was simply not enough classrooms even of a makeshift nature. And, as they pondered the problem, bonded themselves to the limit, and built what schools they could, the problem continued to grow.

The interest and concern on the part of Congress was reflected in the enactment of Public Law 815 in the 81st Congress which was designed to assist school districts to meet their classroom shortage problem insofar as that problem was aggravated by Federal activities. During the 82d Congress a subcommittee gave further study to the problem and recommended that the Federal Government take appropriate steps to assist local school districts in financing needed school construction. In the 83d Congress another subcommittee held extensive hearings in an effort to determine the existing need for additional classrooms. In its report dated December 2, 1954, that subcommittee unanimously recommended that legislation be enacted providing for Federal payments to enable States and local communities to expand their school construction program. That subcommittee estimated that it would cost from 10 to 12 billion dollars to provide adequate classrooms for children then enrolled in schools and that the hearings held by the subcommittee had demonstrated that the national interest required that the Federal Government join with State and local governments in solving the pressing problem of building needed schools.

The President sent a message to Congress on February 8, 1955, in which he pointed out the current problem with respect to the classroom shortage existing in our country and recommended that the Congress enact legislation authorizing the Federal Government to assist in the financing of school construction in several ways, without interference in the responsibility of State and local school systems. At the beginning of the first session of this Congress, a large number of bills were introduced by Members of Congress and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. Some encompassed the recommendations of the President. Others provided for a wide variety of methods by which the Federal Government would assist in school construction. Most of the bills provided for a grant-in-aid program and contained a variety of formulas for matching State and local funds.

The Committee on Education and Labor decided that emergency school-construction legislation was the most important issue before it and therefore the full committee commenced hearings on the subject March 1, 1955. Although some conflicting testimony was presented to the committee regarding the extent of the classroom shortage and the ability of States and local communities to meet the shortage without Federal assistance, there was general agreement that a serious classroom shortage did exist in practically every State in the Nation. Although it is probably impossible to obtain an accurate figure regarding the number of classrooms needed throughout the Nation, the committee believes that the estimates made by the United States Office of Education are as accurate as any that are possible to obtain. The Office of Education estimated that at the beginning of 1954 there was a classroom deficit of more than 300,000 and that, if no additional rooms were built, this deficit would increase at the rate of 50,000 classrooms annually because of increased enrollments, and 8,000 classrooms a year because of obsolescence. However, they estimated that 50,000 classrooms were built in 1952–53, 55,000 in 1953–54, and during 1954–55, 60,000 classrooms would be built. This rate of construction has more than kept pace with mounting enrollment but it has only slightly reduced the total classroom deficit. As a consequence, millions of children still attend schools which are unsafe or which permit learning only

part time or under conditions of serious overcrowding.

After hearing 49 witnesses over a period of 27 days, the chairman appointed a subcommittee consisting of 9 members and charged them with the responsibility for writing a bill to be considered by the full committee when completed. The subcommittee, of which I had the honor of being chairman, consisted of the following members, Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY; Hon. CARL ELLIOTT; Hon. PHIL M. LANDRUM; Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.; Hon. SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, JR.; Hon. RALPH W. GWINN; Hon. CARROLL D. KEARNS; Hon. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR. On July 1, 1955, the subcommittee reported a bill to be considered by the full committee. After 9 days of consideration by the full committee in executive session, H. R. 7535 was reported by the full committee.

The primary objective of the committee during all of its sessions was to provide a method whereby the Federal Government could join with the States in meeting the classroom shortage problem, and at the same time insure against any Federal control or interference in the operation of schools and school systems. The committee was unanimous in its belief that any legislation on this subject should carry with it the least possible amount of Federal control. The same position was voiced by every witness appearing before the committee during the hearings. The majority of the committee believes that H. R. 7535 meets these objectives.

Local school districts, of which there are 63,000 in the country, have several ways in which they finance new school construction. A few of them are able to build schools out of current funds. A few get loans from the States to supplement local funds. Some rent schools from State school-construction authorities, but most districts must borrow funds by voting bond issues. They operate under widely varying laws which in many cases make it difficult to finance school construction. There are debt limits, constitutional in 26 States and statutory in 21, beyond which a district cannot issue bonds. There are tax limits in 16 States. These common difficulties are often aggravated by underassessment of property, and school district size. In some cities the children attend schools in areas of low assessed valuations and adjacent industrial areas with high assessed valuations do not contribute to the school costs. This most common method of school financing through bond issues is an involved process. The cost of the building must be estimated, plans must be cleared with the State authority, the bond issue made, a vote taken and a two-thirds majority obtained. Then the bonds must be sold and sometimes these bonds can only be sold at a high interest rate.

It is the purpose of H. R. 7535 to provide alternative programs for the solution of these different problems by authorizing: First, payments to State education agencies for assistance on a grant basis to communities where this type of assistance can be most effectively utilized as determined by a priority system established by the State; second, purchases by the Federal Government of bonds issued by school districts which are capable of financing from ordinary sources on reasonable terms; and, third, credit assistance to State school-financing agencies to provide schools and related facilities in States where such agencies exist or are created.

Title I of the bill, which deals with payments to State educational agencies, authorizes an annual appropriation of $400 million for 4 consecutive years beginning July 1, 1956. The funds appropriated are to be allotted to each State on the basis of school-age population, which means that part of the population between the ages of 5 and 17, both inclusive.

In order to participate in this program a State is required to submit to the United States Commissioner of Education through its State educational agency a State plan setting forth a program under which the plan will be administered. Among other things, such as adequate reporting and accounting, this plan must set forth principles for determining the priority of projects within the State for assistance under this title which will assure that priority will be given to local school districts that are making an effort commensurate with their economic resources and are unable to finance the full costs of needed facilities, taking into consideration the financial resources, the efforts being made to meet needs on a local basis, and the urgency of their needs for school facilities. These State plans are made by the States: They are their own plans and cannot be finally disapproved by the United States Commissioner of Education without affording the State an opportunity for a hearing.

Payments under this title are made to the States in an amount not to exceed one-half the total costs of constructing the projects to be assisted under the plan. This means that the Federal grants are matched dollar for dollar by State and/or local funds on a statewide basis. It should be noted that the bill provides that within the State, Federal funds can be used to whatever extent necessary to pay for the construction of a school building. For example, it is possible and probable that of all the projects receiving Federal assistance under this title within each State some may receive as much as 80, 90, or even 100 percent of Federal money and others receive as low as 10, 15, or 20 percent. The only requirement is that, of the total cost of construcing all of the projects receiving Federal assistance within the State, the Federal Government shall not pay more than 50 percent.

The bill provides that if any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of State plans the State may appeal to the United States District Court for the district in which the capital of the State is located. It also provides that in order to receive payments under this title a State must provide assurances that the schools built under this title shall be subject to the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act, including the fixing of wages by the Secretary of Labor.

Title II of the bill, which deals with the purchase of obligations of school districts, establishes the second of the alternative methods of assisting communities to provide the needed schoolrooms. This title authorizes the Commissioner of Education to purchase bonds issued by local communities which are capable of financing their own school construction, but which cannot obtain such financing from other sources on reasonable terms.

Many of the districts to which this title of the bill is directed are districts with unexplored credit standings—generally small districts with low assessed valuations. Others are areas where a sudden expansion of population has resulted in an increase in the public expenditures and debt more rapid than the increase in assessed valuation. Some are subject to financial uncertainties created by shifts in population or local industry.

Title II of the bill enables the Federal Government to help these communities finance their own school construction. Under it, the districts which qualify will be able to sell their bonds at reasonable rates to the Federal Government. A revolving fund will be established, to be used during the four fiscal years beginning July 1, 1956, for the purchase of these obligations. Any proceeds from the resale of the obligations during this period will be deposited in the fund.

An initial appropriation of $300 million and such additional sums as might be necessary thereafter is authorized to be appropriated to the revolving fund. However, the aggregate principal amount of the obligations purchased under the title is limited to $750 million over the 4-year period.

The obligations purchased will bear interest at the rate for long-term Federal obligations, plus three-eighths of 1 percent.

To be eligible for Federal purchase of obligations under this title a community will have to demonstrate that it is unable to market its obligations on reasonable terms and at the interest rate applicable under this title of the bill. It will also have to show that the bonds were legally issued and that the classrooms to be constructed are for current and reasonable anticipated enrollments and are consistent with applicable State redistricting plans and policies.

Title III of the bill, which deals with Federal credit assistance to State school-building agencies enables the Federal Government to assist States desiring to do so to issue and market obligations to finance the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities for use and ultimate ownership by local educational agencies. It establishes a program for assistance to State school-financing agencies through sharing in the cost of establishing and maintaining a reserve fund equal to 1 year's payment of principal and interest on the bonds issued by such agencies to build schools. The Federal Government is authorized to share in establishing reserve funds to cover $6 billion of State school-financing-agency bonds.

The urgent need for construction of more classrooms is not limited to areas

of low per capita income, or to rural areas. There are also serious shortages in many rapidly growing suburban areas. For it is in the suburban areas that the population growth has, in general, been the fastest. Population in these areas grew between 1940 and 1950 at a rate 2½ times as great as the rate of growth for the United States.

These areas can generally be expected to finance the cost of construction of their school buildings over a period of time. Their difficulties result from their inability to finance this construction now. Their potential resources are adequate; but, because of restrictive debt limits or because the need for schools, sewers, water, streets, and so forth has occurred simultaneously, or for both of these reasons. These localities cannot now pay for the school construction.

This program is principally designed to facilitate immediate construction of schools for localities such as these. It is keyed to the establishment of a State school-financing agency, coordinated with the State's educational authorities, which will issue bonds to build schools for local school districts. The school districts will pay annual rentals—or other payments for the use of the buildings—sufficient to cover the interest and principal on the bonds, make payments to a reserve fund, and pay the administrative costs of the State agency. Each district can thus ultimately receive title to the building through these rentals or other payments over a period of years.

The role of the Federal Government is to advance to the State school-financing agency for each issue of its bonds one-half of a basic reserve fund equal to 1 year's debt service on the bonds. Should deficits occur and be paid out of this fund, the Federal Government will undertake to restore its half of this reserve to its initial level, up to a maximum of one-half the annual debt service. The State will be required to advance an equal amount to the basic reserve fund, and thereafter, to the extent State appropriations are made available for the purpose, to maintain its half of the fund in case of deficits.

Federal and State advances will be repaid from a supplemental reserve fund, built up through small annual payments charged the school districts as part of their rentals, when this reserve fund reaches a specified level.

Most of the members of our committee believe that with emergency Federal assistance as provided under this bill the backlog of needed classrooms can be overcome in a 4-year period after which the States and local school districts will be in a position to meet their needs without further Federal assistance.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss this matter of Federal control for a few minutes. Federal control of our educational system is feared by all of us in Congress, by every witness that came before our committee, and I believe by the vast and overwhelming majority of our citizens. It has for years been of deep concern to me in connection with every measure dealing with education that has been brought to the attention of our Committee. There is no Member of Congress, indeed, no one anywhere who is more unalterably opposed to Federal control of our schools in any way than I am.

Now let us examine H. R. 7535 from this viewpoint. First of all, it must be borne in mind that the life of the legislation is 4 years. By 1960 the backlog of needed classrooms will be to a large degree, if not completely, met. The schools will be built, the law will expire, and the Federal Government will be completely out of the picture. Secondly, I want to point out that during the 4-year life of this legislation, the States will participate in the program according to a State plan that is submitted to the United States Commissioner of Education through its State educational agency. This State plan will set forth a program under which the program will be administered by the State educational agency. The State educational agency will determine which school projects in the State are to receive assistance under this plan. The plan must assure that first priority will be given to local educational agencies which, upon making an effort commensurate with their economic resources, are unable, solely because of lack of such resources, to finance from the resources available to them the full cost of needed schools. The priority system established under the plan must take into account the financial resources of the educational agency in the State, past and present efforts to meet the needs for schools, and the urgency of their needs for schools. In addition the plan must contain provisions for accounting and reports, establishment of standards for planning and constructing schools, and hearings for local educational agencies which apply for assistance under the plan. These requirements are the minimum needed to expedite the building of schools in the places where they are most needed and for the proper reporting and accounting of the Federal funds used. These State plans are made by the States; they are their own plans and they cannot be finally disapproved by the United States Commissioner of Education without an opportunity for a hearing, after which the State can obtain judicial review of the Commissioner's action in the Federal district court.

Thirdly, I want to call attention to section 404 of the bill which gives assurance against Federal interference in schools. This section provides that in the administration of the act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curriculum, or program of instruction of any school or school system.

And finally on the subject of Federal interference, Mr. Chairman, I would like to consider for a moment whether or not right now, even without any legislation on this subject, Federal interference is affecting our school systems. The Federal Government over the years has been gradually but surely invading the sources of income of our State and local governments. Federal taxes are drying up these sources of income to States, counties, cities, and towns. Federal taxes are interfering with their ability to finance school construction programs. Is this not Federal interference? Inadvertently, we have visited upon our State and local governments an insidious type of interference that affects our school systems to a degree that is appalling.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this bill not only has adequate safeguards against Federal control, but that when it is enacted it will go a long way toward eliminating the indirect Federal interference that has crept in upon our school systems and is operating right now.

On May 8 of this year this House voted 377 to 0 for a bill providing $36 billion for defense purposes. Now that legislation is needed, and we did our duty. But, unfortunately, not one dime of that $36 billion will go to our first line of defense which is the education system of our Nation. Education is as vital to our defense and development as our Armed Forces with their planes, tanks, battleships, A-bombs, H-bombs, and guided missiles. If for no other reason than defense, and there are many, we must pass this measure.

H. R. 7535 provides a program for eliminating the classroom shortage within the next 4 years. It forces nothing upon our State and local governments, it requires no change in the many different methods of taxing and financing school buildings now employed by State and local governments; it offers concrete help, hope and stimulation. I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of our citizens want this legislation, the administration wants it, and I am confident that the Congress will reflect the desires of the people by approving H. R. 7535 without any major amendments.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the members of the Committee on Education and Labor for the long and careful study they have given to this problem of Federal assistance for school construction, and their unceasing efforts to find solutions to the many aspects of the problem, which have culminated in this bill.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SELDEN. Is the gentleman satisfied in his own mind that the passage of this legislation will not result in Federal control of our public-school system?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I definitely am of that opinion and if I thought so I would not support this measure.

Mr. SELDEN. In the gentleman's opinion, is there any possibility that funds authorized under this bill will be denied to those States which practice segregation in their public-school system?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I do not believe so.

Mr. SELDEN. The gentleman does not think so?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. That is my opinion.

Mr. SELDEN. In the gentleman's opinion, and under the terms of this legislation, could any organization or group

that is opposed to segregation obtain an injunction that would prohibit money being spent in any State that practices segregation in their school systems?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. There is nothing in here. Someone who is an attorney could answer that question. In the bill as presented there is nothing that would permit such a thing.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I think I can answer the gentleman's question. I assume he is thinking about the supposed authority of Dr. Brownell, of the Office of Education, to get into this picture on the distribution of these funds. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to hearings before the Appropriations Committee, page 150, when Dr. Brownell was testifying. Mr. LANHAM, a member of the committee from Georgia, asked Dr. Brownell practically the same question you are asking Mr. KELLEY. Here is what was said:

Mr. LANHAM. Dr. Brownell, I was particularly interested in what you said about Federal influence or pressure on the States if the complete program is adopted. We have Public Law 815 in operation and there has been very little attempt to dictate to the States and, certainly, there has been no complaint from our school people that there was any attempt to influence the States. However, I have seen some statements in the press recently that seemed to indicate that there might be some administrative action to withhold funds from States who have not fully integrated their schools, under this bill if it were passed.

Is there any attitude or intention on the part of the Department to pass any such administrative order or to deny the Southern States funds, especially since this legislative decision of the Supreme Court?

Dr. BROWNELL. We have taken the position, and have tried to be consistent in our application of it in all respects along this line, Mr. LANHAM, that the decrees of the Supreme Court indicated that the question of whether or not a State was in compliance with the Constitution was a matter for the determination of the Federal courts in the district where a particular case might be raised.

To that extent, therefore, we have assumed that the matter was taken out of the realm of the jurisdiction of the Department to make any such interpretation, so that when the question has been raised, I have repeatedly said that from my point of view the administration of Federal funds had to be within the Constitution, but that the determination of whether it was within the Constitution was a matter for the courts to decide.

So apparently they say they have no authority to withhold those funds.

Mr. SELDEN. The gentleman was speaking primarily of an administrative ruling?

Mr. BAILEY. That is right.

Mr. SELDEN. What would be the case in the event an injunction was sought?

Mr. BAILEY. Well, you know, the court was interpreting the Constitution. They were not acting on a statutory enactment by the Congress. This is a different proposition entirely. There was no law under which the Attorney General of the United States could come in. The Congress had never passed any law affecting segregation. This is just an interpretation of the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. SELDEN. Then possibly the gentleman would express his opinion as to whether or not, in the event this legislation is passed, an organization opposed to segregation could obtain an injunction that would prohibit money being spent in States where segregated schools now exist.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I have been informed by the Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Alabama, that I will get some time to talk on this very subject tomorrow. I take a little different view than my friend from West Virginia, but I would like during my time to have the gentleman from Alabama ask me the question tomorrow.

Mr. SELDEN. I shall be happy to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yeld?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I would like to direct this question to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY]. Several years ago, through your help, a school district in my area, on the edge of Stockton, received $145,000 to help them out in the building of a school. In the next year more people came in. We have a continual tide of migrants coming in all the time. We cannot stop them. We get on the average about 1,000 a week. The next year they were not able to increase their allotment, although they had bonds out. The bonds were very poor sellers. Now, my question is, what relief can these people get, if any, under this law.

Mr. BAILEY. What the gentleman is referring to is Public Law 815. The Committee on Education and Labor just reported out a bill, and have a rule now that will probably reach the floor of the House next week, whereby we are reenacting and extending Public Law 815 until June 30, 1958. Now, if the impact is still continuing, you will be eligible to receive funds under Public Law 815 during this coming year, during 1957 and during 1958, just like you received them in the past. You have a new impact.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. Due to Government activities.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The migrants keep coming in, but the value of the property in the district does not rise very much.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand that.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It is not rising at all.

Mr. BAILEY. It is what you call a new impact due to the Federal Government probably installing an airbase or something. You just make an application like you made to get the original $145,000 and make it to the Department of Education and Labor.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do this purely and simply for what I think is a correction of the RECORD. I have consistently refrained from indulging in any discussion concerning the racial question. But when the question is directly asked as to whether or not the Commissioner of Education could, within the law, withhold funds under the bill as it is now written, I think the RECORD should show that he most definitely can; because I have gone thoroughly over that with some legal minds in which I have great confidence.

I will say that the amendment which I have offered and discussed does not protect the situation. It is a matter now that is with the courts and probably will remain with the courts for some time. My amendment only removes it from the administrator. Then whatever is to be done will be done by law and not by the whims of some administrator.

I might say further that I think the membership of the House might be interested in inquiring about an administrative order that I believe has already been issued by the Civil Aeronautics Administration which definitely and specifically says that the requirement will be imposed in the matter of the construction of airports.

As I said a minute ago, I do this only to alert the House, because in a matter as important as this, I think we should certainly sift all information and statements to be sure that we are acting on accurate and reliable information.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK, having assumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7535) to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms, had come to no resolution thereon.

FIRST BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF ROLL CALL

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is a day of happy anniversary. Today Roll Call, the newspaper of Capitol Hill, is 1 year old. I know I speak for all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in extending an expression of appreciation and words of congratulations to Sid Yudain, the editor and publisher. I have in my hands a copy of Roll Call, just off the presses, and identified as "Vol. 2, No. 1." Many publications are born and perish before they have grown beyond volume 1. That has been true on Capitol Hill. Roll Call is the first Capitol newspaper in the entire history of the Congress to reach the prestige and

the dignity of volume 2. That accomplishment was made possible by the fact that Sid Yudain is an experienced and unusually brilliant newspaperman. His background is rich with journalistic accomplishment. I wonder how many in this body are familiar with the fact that for 3 or 4 years Sid Yudain was an outstanding scenario writer in Hollywood and that his scripts have furnished the foundation for entertainment and enlightenment enjoyed by millions in TV and radio audiences.

But no matter how great his experience and his talent, Sid Yudain could not have succeeded in the most difficult of tasks if it had not been for his tremendous industry and his spirit of perseverance. He started with a meager shoestring. About all that he had was faith and determination. How he did it I shall never know because I, too, in my younger years, have had experience in this field. Readers can say nice things about you, and you can be proud of the production that has come from the presses, but printers do have to be paid, and when you have no advertising agencies giving you copy and no advertising solicitors beating the bushes for you, you have a lot of headaches.

To Sid Yudain go my most sincere and heartiest congratulations. I know in that I am joined by all my colleagues. He has given Capitol Hill a great newspaper. It has been clean, fair, and always interesting. It has served to bring the Members of Congress, their staffs and all who work on Capitol Hill into the circle of an intimate family. Roll Call in the 1 year of its existence has woven itself embracingly into our lives.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE LATE ELTON WATKINS

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned that yesterday in my home city of Portland, Oreg., the late Honorable Elton Watkins was laid to his final rest. Mr. Watkins was the Representative of the 3d District of Oregon in the 68th Congress.

I want to take this moment to pay my respects to a distinguished Oregonian and a distinguished American at the end of his long and proud career. I know other Members of this House, some of whom were colleagues of Mr. Watkins over 30 years ago, will join me in offering sympathy to his family and a tribute to his memory.

Mr. Speaker, Elton Watkins was one of those who left his home and a successful career in the East to go west in 1912 and join his future to that of the young Northwest. He and his generation made a contribution to the greatness of our region for which we of later generations must be eternally grateful. Born in Mississippi, Elton Watkins as a young man attended law school here in Washington, at George Washington University and at Georgetown University, after which for a number of years, he served with distinction in the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In Portland, where he moved in 1912, he quickly achieved eminence in his profession. Many further honors testified to his prominent position and the respect in which the community held him. Assistant United States district attorney, a presidential elector on the Democratic ticket on three occasions, he was his party's candidate for United States Senator in 1930, in addition to representing his city in the House of Representatives. He was, until his death, an outstanding Portland attorney, giving generously of his wisdom and experience to the community he served so long.

Elton Watkins will long be remembered by the people of Portland for the qualities of character and personality that made him an outstanding man and citizen. I consider it an honor to have this opportunity to memorialize this great and good man here today. But his memorial is written, in a form more durable and more important than any words of mine, in the achievements and the friendships that will long keep his name and memory alive and warm for the people of Oregon.

HON. CECIL M. WEBB AND THE ROAD BUILDING PROGRAM OF THE NATION

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, after 2 years of hard work by the Congress and a longer period of time by others, a workable road bill finally has been passed.

It was my privilege to serve several terms in the Georgia State Legislature before I came to Congress. No problem that I ever faced there was any more challenging than the building of good roads.

We had been through a long war, and even the maintenance of our roads was discontinued. As hard as I worked and as hard as many of the other members worked, the problem seemed to continually get larger and the outlook darker.

As the Nation began to prosper and more vehicles were using these roads, it seemed to me that we would never find a solution that would take care of the terrible situation that we were in.

Georgia did not face this problem alone. Every State in the Union was in the same condition.

But no one, absolutely no one, including myself, seemed to be able to come up with an idea that would be breathtaking to the imagination and yet so thoroughly practical that the Nation could afford to do what inevitably would have to be done about our highways.

One day in March of 1954, I left Atlanta to spend the weekend at home. I was in my living room watching a news broadcast on television.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I ever saw a more exciting program than the one which transpired before me during the next 15 minutes.

It was my great privilege to witness a news interview of a man whom I yet have not had the privilege to know.

This man, with a party of friends, had just left the White House.

Mr. Speaker, this man was the Honorable Cecil M. Webb, chairman of the State road board for my neighboring State of Florida.

I was absolutely astounded at what he said when he was asked what he had discussed with the President.

He outlined a plan—a roadbuilding plan. His plan, if it could be carried out, would give the 48 States of this Union the kind of a road transportation system that the American people could depend upon in peace and in war.

I doubt, Mr. Speaker, that few people who were not closely associated with the tremendous problems that have to be met in a paving project were able to appreciate that day what Mr. Cecil Webb had just done for our country.

There was a long way to go, of course, following that interview. A great deal of hard work has been done by some of the most experienced people in our country—engineers, financiers, lawyers, legislators, and others.

There is a famous motto which says:

There is no limit to what a man can accomplish if he doesn't care who gets the credit for it.

Mr. Webb's name has never been mentioned in connection with this bill, but here today, Mr. Speaker, as our long, hard work on the bill has been concluded, I cannot help remembering the television broadcast where I heard the idea expressed for the very first time.

Mr. Webb visited the President on March 17, 1954. Shortly after that, in New York, the Vice President read a speech prepared for President Eisenhower to deliver proposing this program to the Nation.

I do not even know Mr. Cecil M. Webb, but I cannot let the day go by without paying tribute to this man of vision—the man who first had the dream and was not afraid to make every effort he possibly could to see that the idea was personally presented to the President of the United States.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, following yesterday's debate on veterans'

legislation, some remarks were made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] which I cannot permit to pass without comment.

I do not make reference to what he said about responsibility for failure to pass needed rate increases for disabled veterans' compensation, because I believe the record speaks for itself on that issue. I deeply regret that the House did not have the opportunity to vote on the service-connected disabled veteran features, and on the widow and orphan provisions, of the Dorn substitute—and I am confident these matters will receive speedy attention in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, for we have had the assurance of the chairman of the committee on this point.

The comment by the gentleman from Ohio which I deeply regret was his statement that I had "left the impression that I doubted the integrity" of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. No impression could have been further from my true thoughts than that—and no Member holds the gentleman from Texas in higher esteem than I do.

For the information of the gentleman from Ohio, the letter requesting immediate committee consideration of disabled veterans' legislation, and of legislation for widows and orphans of veterans, had already been circulated and signed by nine members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, when the chairman made his announcement of his intention to call an early committee meeting on these matters. No signature was sought after his announcement was made—for the word of "TIGER" TEAGUE was and is good enough for me, on any matter, at any time.

The only purpose in making known to the House the existence of this letter, and its signers, was to make our position on this question a matter of record, since some question had been raised regarding our interest in the future of disabled veterans' legislation.

Certainly there was no intention on the part of any signer of that letter to do anything other than join in the effort to speed action on worthy legislation, and to make clear and plain for the record our stand in that regard.

I am convinced that ample time remains in this session to complete our work in this direction, and I want to assure my good friend from Ohio that his efforts in behalf of service-connected disabled veterans, and the widows and orphans of all veterans, will have my wholehearted cooperation.

PRESERVE AMERICAN INDUSTRY

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is of considerable moment to the House to learn that the President recently concurred with the United States Tariff Commission's unanimous recommendation for an increase in the tariff on certain imports of linen toweling. The President's action, following extended hearings and recommendations of the Tariff Commission, under the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act, increases the tariff on linen toweling imports under paragraph 1010 of the Tariff Act of 1930 from 10 percent ad valorem to 40 percent ad valorem.

While it will be noted that the increase does not affect other types of imports under paragraph 1010, which comprise the great bulk of entries under that provision, the action will nevertheless be very helpful to a branch of the textile industry which, like many other branches of this industry, has developed serious problems as a result of cutthroat foreign competition.

The President's action is significant in that it renders help to a distressed industry, but even more so because it indicates a complete awareness on the part of our distinguished Chief Executive of the fact that the textile industry is besieged and embattled and desperately needs relief in the form of federally applied barriers to competition from abroad based on meager wages, long hours, and substandard working and living conditions. The immediate application for the relief given by Presidential and Tariff Commission action was filed by a long-established, highly reputable firm in my district, the Stevens Linen Associates, Inc., of Dudley, Mass.

This action is a step in the right direction. It is affirmative evidence of willingness on the part of the President and the Tariff Commission to help in alleviating the more than baneful conditions flowing from the avalanche of textiles pouring into this country and threatening American industry, standards of living, and the jobs of many citizens.

It was a pleasure for me to have urged the action taken at every level since the application was first filed. I hope that the President's concurrence will be speedily followed by similar relief in other branches of the textile industry, which it may be said cannot possibly continue very much longer to keep its head above water, if it is forced to compete against the sweatshop, peonage standards of foreign competition.

I take pleasure in congratulating and thanking the President for his forthright, prompt concurrence. At the same time I express the fond hope that this will be a forerunner of additional action designed to assist our textile industry and its thousands and thousands of faithful workers and their families.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, June 25, 1956.

TARIFF COMMISSION INVESTIGATION REGARDING IMPORTS OF TOWELING, OF FLAX, HEMP, OR RAMIE—WHITE HOUSE ANNOUNCEMENT

There is reproduced below the White House announcement and the text of the President's proclamation concerning the Commission's report on toweling, of flax, hemp, or ramie:

"The President today concurred with the United States Tariff Commission's unanimous recommendation for an increase in the tariff on certain imports of linen toweling. The President's action and the United States Tariff Commission's investigation and recommendation were made pursuant to the escape clause provisions of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended. The tariff increase from 10 percent ad valorem to 40 percent ad valorem applies only to linen toweling (i. e., fabrics chiefly used for making towels) imported under paragraph 1010 of the Tariff Act of 1930 and brings the duty on such imports into line with the duty on similar imports under paragraph 1009a. As recommended by the Tariff Commission, the increase does not affect other types of imports under paragraph 1010. These other imports comprise the great bulk of entries under paragraph 1010.

"The application leading to the Tariff Commission's escape clause investigation was filed on August 29, 1955, by a single firm, the Stevens Linen Associates, Inc., of Dudley, Mass. The Tariff Commission instituted its investigation on October 4, 1955. The Tariff Commission's report of its investigation was transmitted to the President on May 15, 1956. Copies of the Tariff Commission's report may be obtained at the Commission."

The text of the President's proclamation is attached.

"WITHDRAWAL OF TRADE AGREEMENT CONCESSION AND ADJUSTMENT IN RATE OF DUTY WITH RESPECT TO TOWELING OF FLAX, HEMP, OR RAMIE

"By the President of the United States of America—A Proclamation

"1. Whereas under the authority vested in him by the Constitution and the statutes, including section 350 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the President on October 30, 1947, entered into a trade agreement with certain foreign countries, which trade agreement consists of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the related protocol of provisional application thereof, together with the final act adopted at the conclusion of the second session of the Preparatory Committee of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment (61 Stat. (pts. 5 and 6) A7, A11, and A2050), and, by Proclamation No. 2761A of December 16, 1947 (61 Stat. 1103), proclaimed such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions of the United States and such continuance of existing customs or excise treatment of articles imported into the United States as were then found to be required or appropriate to carry out the said trade agreement on and after January 1, 1948;

"2. Whereas item 1010 in part I of schedule XX (original) annexed to the said general agreement (61 Stat. (pt. 5) A1264) reads as follows:

"'Description of products, rate of duty

"'Tariff Act of 1930, paragraph 1010: Woven fabrics, not including articles finished or unfinished, of flax, hemp, ramie, or other vegetable fiber, except cotton, or of which these substances or any of them is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for, 10 percent ad valorem.'

"3. Whereas, in accordance with article II of the said general agreement and by virtue of the said Proclamation No. 2761A, the United States duty treatment of toweling (i. e., fabrics chiefly used for making towels) of flax, hemp, or ramie, or of which these substances or any of them is the component material of chief value, described in the said item 1010 is the application to the said toweling of the rate of duty specified in the column designated 'rate of duty' in the said item 1010, which treatment reflects the duty concession granted in the said general agreement with respect to the said toweling;

"4. Whereas the United States Tariff Commission has submitted to me its report of an investigation, including a hearing, under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (65 Stat. 72; 67 Stat. 472; 69 Stat. 162), on the basis of which it has found that the said toweling is, as a result in part of the duty reflecting the concession granted thereon in the said general agreement, being imported into the United

States in such increased quantities, both actual and relative, as to cause serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products;

"5. Whereas the said Tariff Commission has further found that in order to remedy the serious injury to the said domestic industry it is necessary to restore the rate of duty originally imposed on the said toweling by paragraph 1010 of the Tariff Act of 1930; namely, 40 percent ad valorem, and has accordingly recommended the withdrawal of the duty concession granted in the said general agreement with respect to the said toweling;

"6. Whereas I find that the withdrawal for an indefinite period of the duty concession granted in the said general agreement with respect to the said toweling, to permit the application to such products of the original rate of duty imposed thereon under paragraph 1010 of the Tariff Act of 1930, is necessary to remedy the serious injury to the said domestic industry; and

"7. Whereas upon the withdrawal of the said concession the rate of duty which will apply to the said toweling will be 40 percent ad valorem:

"Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, acting under the authority vested in me by section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and section 7 (c) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, and in accordance with the provisions of article XIX of the said general agreement, do proclaim that, effective after the close of business July 25, 1956, and until otherwise proclaimed by the President, the duty concession granted in the said general agreement with respect to toweling (i. e., fabrics chiefly used for making towels) of flax, hemp, or ramie, or of which these substances or any of them is the component material of chief value, described in item 1010 in part I of schedule XX (original) of the said general agreement, shall be withdrawn, and Proclamation No. 2761A of December 16, 1947, shall be suspended insofar as it applies to the said toweling described in the said item 1010.

"In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"Done at the City of Washington this 25th day of June in the year of our Lord 1956 and of the independence of the United States of America the 180th.

"[SEAL] DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

"By the President:

"JOHN FOSTER DULLES,

"Secretary of State."

DENYING BENEFITS OF SOCIAL SECURITY TO EMPLOYEES OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to deny the benefits of the Federal social-security system to employees of the Communist Party or any organization affiliated with that party. I do not believe that Congress ever intended that such individuals receive social-security benefits.

Since the inception of the social-security system in 1936, the law has provided that service performed in the employ of a foreign government shall not be covered for social-security purposes. It is common knowledge that the Communist Party of the United States is nothing more or less than an agency of Soviet Russia. Employees of the Communist Party in the United States take their orders from the bosses in the Kremlin just as surely as if they were employed in Moscow itself.

Despite this undisputed fact, it has recently been ruled that service in the employ of the Communist Party does not constitute service in the employ of a foreign government. As a result, these individuals who are dedicated to the overthrow of this Nation by force are continuing to enjoy the benefits and protection of the social-security system. My bill corrects this intolerable situation. First, it provides specifically that service performed in the employ of the Communist Party in the United States or any organization affiliated with that party shall be deemed to be service performed in the employ of a foreign government. Second, the bill directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to strike out any wage records which may have arisen since 1936 by reason of such employment.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am fearful that the great Committee on Appropriations has invaded the freedom of the press and it has embarked on a political excursion far beyond its jurisdiction.

The first article of the Bill of Rights restrains the Congress from interfering with the freedom of the press.

Rule XI, paragraph A, of the Rules of the House of Representatives describes the powers and duties of the Committee on Appropriations. The authority of the Appropriations Committee is "appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government," and the committee may, in order to assist it in the determination of matters under its jurisdiction, issue subpenas to require the attendance of witnesses and such books, papers, or documents as it deems necessary.

Mr. Speaker, in a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations I opposed and voted against the motion to subpena those responsible for newspaper ads and editorial writers to appear before the committee.

Many times I do not agree with the editorial comment of our newspapers. I have at times questioned the content of their ads. Many times I have been the subject of pointed, and in my personal opinion unfair and unjustified, attacks by editorial writers. However, I do not feel that these attacks lay any groundwork for a violation by me or any committee of Congress to in any manner circumvent the Constitution of the United States.

If the newspapers of this country are served with notice that what they print in the way of ads or what may be their editorial comment may subject them to being brought before a congressional committee to explain the source, facts, or purpose of such ads or editorials, it is certainly an inhibition of freedom and an attempt to perhaps indirectly control the press by congressional mandate.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a dangerous road to follow.

The freedoms and liberty guaranteed by the Constitution must be preserved regardless of personal or political feelings. I sincerely hope that the action taken by the Appropriations Committee to subpena the officials of newspapers, advertising firms, and editorial writers will not become a precedent of that committee or any other of the committees of the Congress.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this is a dangerous and unprecedented action of a great committee of this House.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that the first order of business tomorrow will be the conference report on the Defense Department appropriation bill.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted Mr. HESELTON for today be transferred to next Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DONOHUE (at the request of Mr. PHILBIN) in two instances.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. McCONNELL) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN PELT (at the request of Mr. McCONNELL) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON.

Mr. SIEMINSKI and include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 906. An act for the relief of William Martin, of Tok Junction, Alaska;

H. R. 909. An act for the relief of Charles O. Ferry and other employees of the Alaska Road Commission;

H. R. 1963. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence M. Augustine;

H. R. 9052. An act to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports;

H. R. 9720. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10003. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10766. An act to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II; and

H. R. 10872. An act to provide for extension of the time during which annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims validated under section 2 of the act of August 11, 1955, may be made, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 890. An act to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act;

S. 1275. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate employees of the District to protect life and property in and on the buildings and grounds of any institution located upon property outside of the District of Columbia acquired by the United States for District sanitoriums, hospitals, training schools, and other institutions; and

S. 3076. An act to provide for a continuing sanitariums, hospitals, training schools, and disability in the United States, and for periodic reports of the result thereof, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 906. An act for the relief of William Martin, of Tok Junction, Alaska;

H. R. 909. An act for the relief of Charles O. Ferry and other employees of the Alaska Road Commission;

H. R. 1963. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence M. Augustine;

H. R. 9052. An act to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports;

H. R. 9720. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10003. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10766. An act to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II; and

H. R. 11319. An act making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 29, 1956, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5435. A bill to amend further the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize the Federal Civil Defense Administration to procure radiological instruments and detection devices, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2502). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 8157. A bill to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Korean conflict; with amendment (Rept. No. 2503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 8898. A bill to provide an additional authorization of appropriations for the purchase by the Secretary of Agriculture under the act of May 11, 1938, of lands within the boundaries of the Cache National Forest in the State of Utah; with amendment (Rept. No. 2504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 10432. A bill to amend further the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize the Administrator to pay travel expenses and per diem allowances to trainees in attendance at the National Civil Defense Staff College, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2505). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 11575. A bill to provide for an Assistant Secretary for Research and Development for each of the three military departments within the Department of Defense; with amendment (Rept. No. 2506). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1637. An act to extend the time limit within which awards of certain military and naval decorations may be made; with amendment (Rept. No. 2507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 2569. An act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State; with amendment (Rept. No. 2508). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 3116. An act to provide for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals; with amendment (Rept. No. 2509). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRIEST: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3412. An act to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, relating to war-risk insurance for an additional 5 years; without amendment (Rept. No. 2510). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 985. An act to establish an Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission; with amendment (Rept. No. 2511). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 3498. An act to extend the authority of the American Battle Monuments Commission to all areas in which the Armed Forces of the United States have conducted operations since April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2512). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRIEST: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 9319. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 3 of the Securities Act of 1933, to provide that responsible officers or other persons shall be liable in damages on account of untrue statements or material omissions in statements or documents filed under such subsection as a condition of exemption; without amendment (Rept. No. 2513). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 11024. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act relating to the compensation of commissioners for the Territory of Alaska, approved March 15, 1948 (62 Stat. 80), as amended by the act of July 12, 1952 (66 Stat. 592, 48 U. S. C. 116a); with amendment (Rept. No. 2514). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 11254. A bill to amend section 104, title 4, United States Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 2515). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. House Joint Resolution 413. Joint resolution to provide for the conveyance of federally owned lands which are situated within the right-of-way for the proposed navigable barge canal across Florida, to the Ship Canal Authority of the State of Florida, in order to consolidate ownership thereof; with amendment (Rept. No. 2516). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 3032. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Middle Atlantic interstate forest fire protection compact; without amendment (Rept. No. 2517). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. KELLY of New York: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 604. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the United States World Trade Fair to be held in New York, N. Y., from April 14 to April 27, 1957; with amendment (Rept. No. 2518). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 11570. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fisheries and wildlife; to strengthen the fisheries and wildlife segments of the national economy; to create and establish within the Department of the Interior the office of Under Secretary of Fisheries and Wildlife, a Fisheries Service and a Wildlife Service; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2519). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 11995. A bill to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life-insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1956; without amendment (Rept. No. 2520). Referred to

the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1833. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2521). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. S. 3388. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the port of Port Townsend, Wash.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2522). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 138. A bill to make the retirement benefits of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 available to certain persons who rendered active Federal service during the Korean conflict; with amendment (Rept. No. 2523). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 11613. A bill to authorize the loan of naval vessels to the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Portugal, Spain, and friendly Far Eastern nations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2524). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee of conference. H. R. 10986. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2529). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Joint Resolution 163. Joint resolution granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2525). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2244. An act for the relief of Maria Novak; without amendment (Rept. No. 2526). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1895. An act for the relief of Anna Maria Fuller; with amendment (Rept. No. 2527). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8181. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Lucie Leon (also known as Lucie Noel); with amendment (Rept. No. 2528). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 12016. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection of poultry and poultry products so as to prohibit the movement in interstate or foreign commerce of unsound, unhealthful, diseased, unwholesome, or adulterated poultry or poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 12017. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend the period of time during which naturalized citizens of the United States may reside in certain foreign countries without losing their nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 12018. A bill to deny social-security benefits to employees of the Communist Party and its affiliated organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 12019. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, so as to direct the Federal Communications Commission to provide for the licensing of television reflector facilities and VHF translator facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 12020. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Euclid, Ohio; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 12021. A bill to modify the requirements for the automatic renewal of expiring 5-year-level-premium term policies of United States Government and national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 12022. A bill to provide relief for the sponge-fishing industry by making special nonquota immigrant visas available to certain skilled alien spongedivers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 12023. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $5 million to be spent for the purpose of promoting the Pan-American games to be held in Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H. R. 12024. A bill to establish the concurrent jurisdiction of the Federal Government and the States and Territories with respect to sedition against the Government of the United States, States, Territories, and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama (by request):

H. R. 12025. A bill to provide for a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KNOX:

H R. 12026. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to provide for the retroactive payment of certain unpaid entitlements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 12027. A bill to authorize the city of Rock Hill, S. C., to acquire certain tribal lands on the Catawba Indian Reservation, S. C.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:

H. R. 12028. A bill to provide for the transfer to the Yorktown Battlefield Area, Colonial National Historical Park, Va., certain howitzers surrendered by the British at Yorktown; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 12029. A bill to liberalize the basis for payment, and to increase the monthly rates, of death pension payable to widows and children of deceased war veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 12030. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to terminate for future construction the deductions for amortization of emergency facilities and grain-storage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 12031. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees of the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 12032. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 12033. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $5 million to be spent for the purpose of promoting the Pan-American games to be held in Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 12034. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute a contract with the Tule Lake Irrigation District, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McGREGOR (by request):

H. R. 12035. A bill to provide for a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H. R. 12036. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $5 million to be spent for the purpose of promoting the Pan-American games to be held in Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 12037. A bill to require that all negotiable securities, paper money, and stamps be plate-printed from engraved plates in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 12038. A bill to provide increases in service-connected disability compensation and to increase dependency allowances; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. J. Res. 667. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. Res. 563. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 262; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. Res. 564. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 232, 84th Congress, entitled "The Capitol in Story and Pictures"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. Res. 565. Resolution for the relief of Jeann C. Marsh; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. Res. 566. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 12039. A bill for the relief of Miss Inge Wallaberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 12040. A bill for the relief of Everett B. Alford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 12041. A bill to authorize the sale of certain keys in the State of Florida by the

Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 12042. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. Bernard J. Flood; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 12043. A bill to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States to certain real property in Prairie County, Ark.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 12044. A bill for the relief of Guadalupe Vargas-Alamillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 12045. A bill for the relief of Tam Luen-Kwong (also known as Kwong Tam); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 12046. A bill for the relief of Carmel C. McDonald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 12047. A bill for the relief of Tadeusz and Elzbieta Faliszewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 12048. A bill for the relief of Patricia Joyner Altenbach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 12049. A bill for the relief of George C. Constantacopoulos, Helen G. Constantacopoulos, and Trisvegenia Constantacopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

1171. Mr. BUSH presented a petition of Tioga County (Pa.) Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in opposition to the recommendations of the Bradley Commission on Veterans' Pensions, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Housing for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include the speech I delivered in Worcester, Mass., on June 22, 1956, on the occasion of the public dedication of the George F. Booth Memorial Apartments for the Elderly.

This housing project is the first of its kind in the Worcester County area and, indeed, one of the first in the Nation.

The project name honors the memory of the late George F. Booth, former publisher and editor of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram and Evening Gazette newspapers, and is intended as a lasting indication of the genuine interest and concern in the problems of the elderly Mr. Booth consistently expressed and perseveringly worked to solve.

The memory of Mr. Booth is revered for multitudinous public benefactions, but this housing project is a particularly fitting memorial as a prime example of the Christian humaneness which characterized his whole life.

The address follows:

It is a high honor and deep pleasure for me to take part in the public dedication of this most attractive housing project as the George F. Booth Memorial Apartments for the Elderly.

It is doubly gratifying to be present with you today because of the vital importance of the problem to which the erection of these buildings gives recognition—Christian concern for our older citizens—and because of the genuine tribute this project bestows upon one of the greatest men and benefactors with whom any community was ever blessed.

No person of any religious training, and particularly no American legislator, can help being more and more concerned about the proper solution of the many and varied problems plaguing the increasing numbers of our older people in the sunset of their fruitful lives.

According to authorities, our ancestors of 2,000 years ago had a life expectancy of only 20 to 30 years, as compared with an average life span of nearly 70 years in the United States today. Realizing the great modern strides in preventive medicine and disease control resulting from medical research in all fields, we can appreciate vividly that the life expectancy of every American will become longer and longer, which means, of course, that we will continuously have greater and greater numbers of older citizens who must be reasonably assisted in their later years.

Let us realize that our American economy is largely industrial. Its frightening materiality is geared to maximum production of the unit and the individual, with exaggerated emphasis upon the robust energy of youth to the unhappy neglect of the wisdom and prudence of the aged. Too many competent American workers over 45 are being too often denied suitable employment opportunities by more and more industries, thereby visiting financial catastrophe upon increasing numbers of our people in the upper age brackets.

It is a startling story to hear that among the some 14 millions of people in this country over 65 years of age today, the average income for a man and his wife is about $1,500 and their average savings are less than $1,000. The unfortunate significance of these figures is that in spite of our great economic gains over the past quarter of a century, old age in America still remains for the majority a time of insecurity, fear, and dependence upon charity. In other words, in the richest and most blessed land in the world, those who have worked the longest and given the most can look forward only to the least.

I don't think that anyone here or any other decent person in the country is willing to accept the continuation of this un-American picture of abandonment of and distress for our older people.

Rather, I think you will agree that all segments of our society at the local, State, and Federal levels should humanely cooperate in sensibly doing whatever is necessary to make old age in America a dignified period of usefulness and satisfaction that can be approached without discouragement and fear.

That is why a great many of us who are charged with national legislative responsibility have consistently urged over the past several years that the executive agencies of our Government devote greater attention to the complex problems of the aged before it becomes a disgrace to our American principles and traditions.

Our Federal Government includes about 2 million persons with a budget of some $65 billion a year. Among that vast personnel, there are perhaps less than 50 people, with a budget less than $100,000, engaged in seeking ways to help our elders comfortably through their threshold years. Such a situation certainly is not wholesome.

Through the great resources of our Government departments, we have the duty of expanding our efforts to discover opportunities for our senior citizens to continue to be active, useful, and satisfied. We must, for instance, find ways to encourage our older persons to work, if they can and if they want to. We must try to convince industry that there are substantial advantages in the employment of older people. We ought to attempt to develop a program for training our older people to learn to do other things when they have retired from their regular work.

On the legislative level, we must constantly and conscientiously investigate the need for new laws and the proper revision of existing laws, to adequately meet the desperate needs of our old folks in the critical fields of social security, housing, medical care, and gainful employment.

Assisting the aged is a truly American action, and as in all nationwide problems, much can and should be done on the initiative of communities themselves. That is why I am, as you are, today so proud of my own city where the problem has been recognized and as a result, these clean, healthy, livable housing accommodations have been provided. Viewing these beautiful structures, we should be mindful of the substantial civic merit they reflect upon all our city officials, and we are impelled to recognize the unselfish sacrifices of so many private citizens like Raymond Harold and Samuel Donnelly, their staffs and associates. The unity in action of all their good hearts and their good wills in bringing this project to reality is an inspiring example for the people of other communities and cities to follow.

To perpetuate the memory of beloved citizens, it is often customary and appropriate to erect personal images of stone or steel. It has frequently seemed to me that while such monuments are acceptable, too often they fall short of the real objective. Somehow they fail to convey any living impression of the nature and the spirit of the person we desire to revere. To my mind, the dedication of these most livable homes for the most needy of our citizens in the memory of George F. Booth happily hits the mark.

To those who had the honor of personally knowing him, nothing is necessary for them to remember him. George Booth was a man who worked hard and lived fully through his entire life. He worked untiringly to give good example; he was highly ambitious, but strictly ethical; he was stern, as all strong men must be, but he was essentially kind, as all great men are. He was a driving leader in his profession, but a respected and beloved employer. He was a devoted family man with genuine concern for his fellow man. He respected God and he generated respect for himself. The height of his character was integrity of word and action. The genius of his talent was wise prophecy. The courage of his heart was tempered with sympathy. The depth of his mind was illuminated by gentle humor. The self-discipline of his

own life was persevering work, and the substance of his nature was unselfish service to his fellow men, to his community, and to his country.

These are some of the things we mean whenever we talk about a man and the way he lived. The outstanding attribute of George Booth was his remarkable and extraordinary vision, recognized by everyone who ever had any contact with him. He could see into the future and advise upon its coming. This unique quality was strikingly placed upon him at the immature age of 30, at which age the affectionate and endearing term of "the old man" was attached to him forever by his friends and associates.

It is, therefore, particularly fitting that the living character and nature of George Booth be carried on by naming this haven for the old folks after him and in his memory. It was he who first saw the need for these homes and who originally recognized the suitability of this area for their development.

George Booth knew better than most men that taking care of the aged is a clear moral obligation upon any Nation claiming to live under God and a duty distinctly placed upon us by His command to "Honor Thy Father and Thy Mother." He also well understood that so long as the American system retains its premium on personal initiative while making reasonable provision for the economic security of the young and the old, we need have no doubt of our triumph over the Communist challenge.

May the memory of George F. Booth ever inspire others to carry on similar humanitarian programs.

Dispersal of Industrial Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on extension of Defense Production Act of 1950, accompanying H. R. 9852, contains an amendment to the House bill that is a new provision. It declares that it is the policy of Congress to encourage geographical dispersal of industrial facilities and to provide that the Government in certain instances shall give recognition to this new principle. While I am of the opinion that there may be instances where such a principle could properly operate, yet, it is doubtful whether in the administration of the act there can always be assurance that the location of new industries will be entirely controlled alone by the best interest of national defense. I have too often seen other considerations of a political character enter into such decisions. Furthermore, there has been no hearing held in the House committee on the subject and no real opportunity, other than by the limited means of this report, to consider the subject with the care that there should be prior to the adoption of such a far-reaching amendment. For the reasons I have expressed, I am opposed to the adoption of the conference report with such an amendment to the basic law contained in it.

Pleasure Boating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, pleasure boating is rapidly becoming one of the Nation's most popular recreational activities. From this sport stems a substantial boat and motor industry, a number of important units of which are located in the Sixth District of Wisconsin, which I have the honor to represent.

A leader in the industry is Mr. Ralph Klieforth, president of Universal Motors, Inc., located at Oshkosh, Wis. He is also president of the National Association of Engine and Boat Manufacturers, Inc.

This association has pointed up the advisability of adopting new Federal regulations to provide additional safety for the growing pleasure-boating fraternity.

Attesting to his keen interest in all matters pertaining to boating and shipping, our distinguished colleague, Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, has scheduled hearings starting July 2 to explore the need for such regulations. It will be an extremely interesting hearing.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a news release issued by Chairman BONNER describing these hearings. The item follows:

Representative HERBERT C. BONNER, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, announced today that his committee would begin public hearings July 2, 1956, to determine the necessity or desirability of additional Federal legislation to regulate pleasure boating in the United States.

This will mark the opening of a study which the committee is undertaking, in advance of any specific legislation being introduced, to examine the problems which have been raised on the navigable waters of the United States by the phenomenal growth of pleasure boating and attempt to arrive at conclusions and recommendations for legislation, if such is found to be necessary.

Mr. BONNER said: "With the wholehearted support of the Coast Guard, the industry involved and the States themselves, where similar problems exist, I feel that constructive results can be achieved which, though regulating, will not restrict the growth and popularity of this healthy recreational sport which today is such a unifying family activity in our country."

Mr. BONNER stated that Vice Adm. Alfred C. Richmond, commandant of the United States Coast Guard, would be the witness on July 2 and that he would outline the problems faced by the Coast Guard in their efforts to keep pleasure boating safe for the approximately 25 million citizens of this country who go afloat each year.

On July 10 to 13 of the following week the committee will hear various industry and yachting groups at further hearings in Washington. Later in the year it is expected that hearings will be held by the committee in boating centers of the United States in order that both the interested State officials and other interested groups and individuals may conveniently be heard.

The Unity Achieved by Coal Producers, the United Mine Workers of America, Exporters, and the Railroads Merits Special Attention of Congress Regarding Government Policy and Its Effect on the Coal Industry of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, among the many interesting sessions incident to the National Coal Association's Convention in Washington on June 12 to 14 was the luncheon of the Coal Exporters Association at which Mr. Walter J. Tuohy, president, Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad, announced formation of a new corporation to be known as American Coal Shipping, Inc. After his announcement of this unprecedented action, Mr. Tuohy concluded his address to the convention with this statement:

This is an historic moment in the coal industry. We stand as a cohesive group—the coal producers, the miners' union, the exporters, and the railroads. Our unity is the assurance to the free nations that coal, America's greatest and most abundant resource, will find its vital role in world prosperity and peace.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this development in the coal and railroad industries merits the special attention of the Congress. Heretofore coal has been a neglected—yes, an abused—industry as far as Government policies are concerned.

For almost a decade after the conclusion of World War II, foreign oil was encouraged to flow into our great fuel markets of the east coast in ever-increasing volume, thus harassing the coal industry to the point where many mines were forced to close, thousands of mineworkers were thrown out of employment, and selling prices were so depressed as to prevent coal companies from making investments in conformity with anticipated demands of the years ahead. Other Government policies—including TVA's fuel-buying program—were equally reprehensible.

Some adjustments have been made in the past year with the realization of coal's importance to the Nation. We who are more cognizant of the role which coal must assume in the national economy and security will continue to demand further action toward removal of the inequalities inflicted upon the coal industry.

With the announcement of the new shipping corporation, Americans are becoming more aware of the contributions of the United States coal industry toward stabilizing the economies of other countries throughout the free world. I question whether the outstanding job performed by coal industry management and labor in the past 10 years is generally recognized.

Europe's coal industry was hit hard by the long war of 1939–1945. Some

mines were knocked out by enemy attack. Transportation facilities were disrupted. Labor forces were depleted by the call to arms, and many experienced miners were never to return.

To assist in the rebuilding of Western Europe and the United Kingdom, American mines sent more than 16 million tons of bituminous coal across the Atlantic in 1946 and in excess of 36 million tons in 1947. As mines abroad were reactivated, the need for our coal gradually decreased until by 1950 Europe required less than a million tons.

The following year, with very short notice, United States mines were called upon to send abroad more than 30 times the tonnage that had been required in the preceding 12 months. The sudden upsurge was the result of an extremely cold winter and of an industrial reactivation resulting from the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. Had adequate shipping facilities been available, there would have been even more than the 28 million tons of bituminous coal leaving our eastern seaboard in 1951.

By 1952, Europe's own mines had made substantial gains in productive capacity, so that only 20½ million tons of American coal were needed that year. In 1953 the figure declined to 8 million tons, with a slight recovery—10½ million tons—for 1954.

Last year it became obvious that American coal would have a permanent place in the energy picture of Western Europe—at least in the foreseeable future. We sent 28½ million tons across the Atlantic in 1955, and present indications are that these exports will reach 38 to 40 million tons this year. In other words, 1956 will mark a record tonnage moving from the United States to Europe. Thus the American coal industry, having been beset by extreme fluctuations in Europe's markets over the past decade, may at last look forward to a stabilized demand. To a mining industry, the violent ups and downs of the European market have a most upsetting impact. Mines cannot be expected to remain open through periods of depressed demand in anticipation of a future change in market conditions, nor can miners be expected to remain out of work in their home communities on the theory that the outlets for their productive efforts will be placing orders a year or two hence. Despite these inconsistencies, however, the United States bituminous-coal industry did not fail to respond to any situation; I believe the present outlook for a sustained demand on the part of European consumers is only a fitting reward to this industry. A stabilization of shipping facilities will also be appreciated, as in the past it has been most difficult for both coal producers and railroads to find necessary shipping bottoms at tidewater when needed.

There is still a lot of coal in the ground in Western Europe, but the difficulty in getting it out is the principal factor involved in the expected rise in demand for American coal. Reserves in Great Britain are estimated at more than 185 billion tons, and the continental territory west of the Iron Curtain is believed to contain more than 150 billion tons. Recoverable reserves in the United States are estimated at approximately three times the combined total of Great Britain and this portion of the continent; what is more, in America they are largely more accessible, and of course our industry is so modernized as to be able to extract this valuable fuel at far less expense than their contemporaries across the sea.

In past years Great Britain always showed a surplus of output over demand. She has been a traditional exporter for centuries. Probably the first instance of coal exportation took place in 1362 when a ship from France brought a cargo of corn to Newcastle and returned with a load of coal. As the importance of this fuel became recognized over the years, the British Isles began to engage more actively in its exportation, most of the coal coming from the mines of Wales.

A monopoly in the coal export trade was eventually established by the British, and at one time—in 1923—the United Kingdom's shipments to other countries amounted to 90 million tons. With Germany also able to produce more coal than was required for her own consumption, Europe never faced a coal shortage except in periods of work stoppages or as a result of the ravages of war.

Under her socialistic mining industry, England has had great difficulty in meeting her own domestic demands, much less being able to continue to serve other countries. Added to this problem is the fact that the most easily recoverable coals have already been taken from the ground and the British have been forced to dig deeper and into less desirable veins.

Germany's coal fields were split by diplomatic and military negotiations after the conclusion of World War II, and now about 20 percent of her potential production is within the Soviet perimeter of influence. Western Germany's mines have indeed made great progress, but neither their production nor that of France, Belgium, The Netherlands, and other coal-producing nations of free Europe are going to be able to meet the energy demands of the foreseeable future. America's coal will consequently be required in great quantities to supplement domestic supply.

I commend the action of Mr. Tuohy, Mr. John L. Lewis, of the Mine Workers, and his vice president, the former Lieutenant Governor of Pennsylvania. I congratulate all the coal producers who have had a hand in forming the new shipping corporation, and I trust that it will lead to a solution of the overseas coal-shipping problems. American coal is needed in South America in ever-increasing quantities, and it must continue to be shipped wherever else it is needed by friendly peoples.

The National Coal Association's convention was held in an atmosphere of enthusiasm and determination on the part of the coal operators. They have had the foresight and have been willing to invest in mechanization to such an extent as to be far and away the world's leaders from the standpoint of output per man-day. I had the pleasure of talking with a number of the mine owners—large and small—during the NCA convention, and I was pleased to find that they are extremely optimistic about business conditions in the years immediately ahead as well as in the long-range future. It is incumbent upon the United States Government to remove any unfair restraints against this great industry so that it will be able to continue to progress and thus fulfill the energy needs of our Nation as well as those which are depending upon us across the seven seas.

Important Legislation Requiring Prompt Attention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as we move into the last few weeks of this Congress, it is most distressing to me that some very vital and important legislative proposals affecting large segments of our American people remain unacted upon.

ASSISTANCE TO ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS

For instance, there is legislation pending to provide assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and industries in areas needing redevelopment to enable them to expand and adjust their productive activity to alleviate substantial unemployment by providing new employment opportunities for developing and expanding existing facilities and resources without reducing employment in other areas of the country.

Mr. Speaker, up in my area where inroads are constantly being made because of cheap foreign importations and sectional competition upon the textile, machinery, and armament manufacturing industries, among others, and their associated employment opportunities, there is vital need of sensible legislation of this type.

I sincerely trust that this Congress will not close without corrective legislative attention being devoted to the solution of this problem affecting my own region, and so many other regions of the country.

Because of the hardships continuously being visited upon the textile industry, I earnestly hope that the Congress will go on record with an expression of concern over the disintegration of this most essential industry because of increasing foreign cheap importations and also urge the President to use his emergency powers to control the excess of these damaging imports.

IMMIGRATION REVISION

Mr. Speaker, I very earnestly also hope that this Congress will not adjourn without enacting revision and correction of some of the injustices that are contained in our present immigration laws.

I urge the adoption of sensible amendments which will permit the pooling of unused immigration quotas and their use by those countries such as Greece, Italy, Poland, and others, whose quotas are

vastly oversubscribed and impose abnormal waiting periods of several years' duration upon otherwise qualified and desirable applicants.

It would be an added injustice not to renew the provisions of our outstanding Refugee Relief Act and permit the many qualified thousands of refugee relief applicants from the Iron Curtain countries to come to the United States who otherwise will have little hope of ever entering America.

Among other injustices that should be corrected are the present exclusion of certain tubercular immigrant applicants who are members of American families and a great many who are barred because of conviction of a felony in another country when the same offense would not be considered a felony in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot forget that this Nation itself was founded almost altogether by refugees and displaced persons. In advancing our position of world leadership in these perilous days, we can speak more convincingly for freedom everywhere when we have done our Christian utmost to give real freedom to those now faced with Communist extinction. Security-screened and qualified refugees are the kind of people in whose behalf the original American tradition of asylum was established and whose immigration to these shores has enriched our country from its earliest days right up to this hour.

I hope and trust that we will be granted an opportunity to enact sensible legislative amendments to expand and correct our present immigration laws before this Congress terminates.

OUR OBLIGATION TO THE VETERAN AND DEPENDENTS

Mr. Speaker, I and a great many other Members of this House have become deeply disturbed by the increasing publicity and propaganda questioning the continuation and cost-of-living adjustments and other benefits being reasonably accorded our veterans.

It is strikingly noticeable that the sources of these doubts about our obligation to war veterans have no hesitancy or question at all about the wisdom of continuing to provide billions of dollars in subsidies to carry on our faltering foreign-aid program. Some of these people even seem to prefer the vaccilating actions of Tito to the loyalty of the American veteran and his family. They seem to think that an astronomical gambling investment in Tito is more valuable than a reasonable investment to fulfill our duty to these American patriots who have been disabled in war and whose families have been visited with extreme material hardship because of military service sacrifices.

I do not believe that the people of this country now wish to turn their backs in forgetfulness of the substantial sacrifices made by our war veterans and their dependents in protecting this Nation from armed enemies. On the contrary, I believe the great majority of the American people realize there is only one safeguard for this Nation in time of emergency, and that is the willingness of American men and women to fight and die to preserve our national security. I am sure they further understand that the efficiency of our fighting men is governed by the morale of their families and dependents. In these tense days of international turmoil, it is not only just but patriotically wise to inspire the veteran of the future with the example of our real concern for the veteran of the past.

Mr. Speaker, there is legislation pending to extend farm, home, and business loan guaranties for our veterans, to continue vocational rehabilitation adjustment assistance, to raise the ratings and pensions of the disabled war veterans and dependent allowances, as well as income limitations, in accord with our increased basic living costs. There is pending legislation to extend simple justice to Spanish-American War veterans and their widows, who are trying to eke out a bare existence on some $54 per month.

These, and other beneficial measures, such as the so-called War Orphans Education Act, should be enacted without delay. Most of the pending bills are substantially sound and beneficial and are intended to discharge our just obligation to the war veteran and his family. I shall continue to work in support of their enactment as the best investment we can make to insure our national security.

SMALL BUSINESS MUST BE PRESERVED

Mr. Speaker, it has always been an unquestioned American tradition that this Government shall counsel, assist, and protect the interests of small business in order to preserve our democratic system of free competitive enterprise.

It is perhaps not surprising that the various department heads in the executive branch have not been overwhelmingly zealous in presenting a program to us to aid the small businesses of the Nation, that nevertheless does not discharge the Congress from its own legislative responsibility.

There are a great many sound measures to grant vitally needed help to small business pending in the Congress, and I sincerely trust that they will not be passed over in the adjournment rush.

It is true that we extended the life of the Small Business Administration last year, and I am proud of the part I had in the original enactment of that beneficial legislation, but thus far that is about all that has been done for small business.

There remain many additional conditions affecting the vitality of small business that can be at least partially removed by applicable legislation.

One of the substantial helps we could give to small business would be to adopt a measure amending the Robinson-Patman Act to correct the weakening of that act which has resulted from several court decisions beginning with the Supreme Court's decision in Standard Oil of Indiana against Federal Trade Commission. It appears the Supreme Court misinterpreted the original intention of Congress and the objective, therefore, is to reemphasize and make clear that intention. The original purpose, and the purpose of current legislation, is simply to grant small business equality of opportunity and remove present discrimination that is allowed against him. It is designed to prohibit the larger concerns from getting preferential discounts, secret rebates, and under-the-counter deals which are discriminatory against the average merchant. The legislation is meant to apply only where there is interstate commerce and its end objective is to guarantee to the man who buys his goods for resale that he will get the same price from the supplier that this supplier grants to his competitors under the same terms and conditions. It permits differences in prices in accord with the normal rules of good business practice but it prevents the good-faith defense where the effect of the discrimination may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. This is sound legislation in the American tradition and it should be passed by the Congress.

There are other bills pending which recognize problems associated with the suffocation visited upon small business when a few giant corporations control raw materials, processing, and manufacturing segments of industry and a large number of very small business firms serve as retail distributors for these corporations. Retail gasoline dealers and automobile dealers are two prime examples. It appears clear from the evidence that legislation is urgently needed to restrict these giant suppliers' freedom to unjustly and summarily cancel dealer's franchises without good cause and we particularly need to restrict suppliers' freedom to coerce dealers to follow certain policies or to deal only in the brands of merchandise dictated by these corporations.

There is a further need for legislation to strengthen our antimerger laws in these days of increasing tendency of great corporate mergers with resultant harmful limitations upon our traditional competitive enterprise system. These laws should be made more strengthened by helpful amendments and the penalties for criminal violation should be greatly increased.

The Congress should also do all in its power to encourage and request the executive branch to permit small business to participate in defense contracts. It has been authoritatively revealed that in the last 3 years the Department of Defense has been awarding 95 percent of the value of all contracts on the basis of negotiations. Therefore, it is certainly in order for this Congress to enact legislation of stronger intent and requirement for the award of Government contracts on the basis of advertised competitive bids so that small business will have a better opportunity. The Department of Defense in all fairness should itself initiate a program of negotiating contracts with small business whenever such contracts are suitable.

Another field in which remedial action could be taken is in the tax setup affecting small business. Action should be taken to make the corporate form of business more attractive taxwise to small firms now existing as partnerships so that these units could accumulate retained business earnings at corporate rates and taxes on smaller corporations should be investigated in order to work

out a system of graduated or progressive rates similar to that applying to individual income. There is much that can be done to help small business in this tax field and I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to give the subject their prompt and earnest attention.

It we neglect the health of small business in this Nation we are betraying our duty of preserving the economic integrity of the Nation; let us then assume our rightful obligation to grant reasonable assistance to small business by the prompt enactment of suitable legislation.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT BE ADJOURNED WHILE VITAL PROBLEMS REMAIN UNSOLVED

Mr. Speaker, at this point I desire to express my opposition to any early sine die adjournment of the House of Representatives while vitally important legislation remains pending.

Just a few of the problems that still challenge our legislative conscience are the enactment of a civil rights program, school construction aid, adequate housing and slum clearance, and flood disaster insurance. These problems, as well as many others, very deeply affect the general welfare and progress of the country. It is my judgment that we are morally bound to remain in session until these vitally important problems are legislatively solved for the good of all Americans.

In Memoriam: To a Great Man, and a Great Patriot, Ignace Jan Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, June 30, 1956, marks the 15th anniversary of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski, world-renowned composer and pianist, who became the first Premier of the Polish Republic in 1919 after the people of Poland asserted their independence according to the principle of national self-determination embodied in the famous 14 points of President Woodrow Wilson.

The inspiration Paderewski gave the Polish people is still nurtured in their hearts.

At home and abroad, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, Paderewski left a sublime understanding of freedom with a humility that strove to walk in the footsteps of God.

The anniversary today of the passing of this great man, of this great patriot, more fully serves to remind me that freedom is indeed worth living for and, if need be, worth dying for. May God ever bless and keep green the memory of Ignace Jan Paderewski. He lives in the hearts of all who love freedom and its thrilling song.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 29, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou in whom there is no darkness at all, the light which on this bright June morning scatters the shadows that have hid the flowers and darkened the streets is Thy messenger to us. Be Thou the light of our minds as the sun is the light of the day. Take away every evil thought that leaves its shadows there. Drive out the darkness of anger, selfishness, covetousness, and impurity. Make us centers of Thy radiance that we may reflect Thy spirit in all the gloom of this day that tries men's souls.

O Light that followest all the way,
We yield our flickering torch to Thee;
Our heart restores its borrowed ray,
That in Thy sunshine's blaze its day
may brighter, fairer be.

We ask it in the name of that One who is the light of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 28, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

INCREASED RETIREMENT PAY OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE FORMER LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was ordered to lie on the table:

To the Senate of the United States:

In compliance with the request contained in the resolution of the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), I return herewith S. 3581 entitled "An act to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service."

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 29, 1956.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. ARENDS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and concurred therein.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 7763. An act to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determination of the claims, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9852. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations and the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule there is a regular morning hour today. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection with the transaction of the routine morning business be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and take up nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Raymond J. Kelly, of Michigan, to be United States district judge for division No. 1, district of Alaska, vice George W. Folta, deceased;

Richard E. Robinson, of Nebraska, to be United States district judge for the district of Nebraska, vice James A. Donohoe, deceased; and

James F. Brophy, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Georgia.

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

R. Jasper Smith, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the western district of Missouri, vice Charles E. Whittaker, elevated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calender will be stated.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frederick H. Hamley, of Washington, to be a United States circuit judge, ninth circuit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edwin R. Price, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Howard H. Shannon, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Director of Locomotive Inspection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Presidential Advisor on Personnel Management, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to consolidate and revise certain provisions of law relating to additional compensation of civilian employees of the Federal Government stationed in foreign areas and to facilitate recruitment, reduce turnover, and compensate for extra costs and hardships due to overseas assignments (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RESOLUTIONS OF MINNESOTA BRANCH, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTAL SUPERVISORS

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, the State convention of the Minnesota Branch, National Association of Postal Supervisors, met in Minnesota on June 8 and 9. I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions adopted by this convention be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas many employees accumulate large amounts of sick leave during their years of service and are not now given credit for it in any way whatsoever: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota branch of the National Association of Postal Supervisors, in convention assembled in St. Paul, Minn., June 8 and 9, 1956, go on record as approving H. R. 8830, which gives an employee who is retiring credit for all unused sick leave upon retirement; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Minnesota delegation in Congress and to THOMAS MURRAY, chairman of the Post Office Committee.

Approved by the State convention, Minnesota branch, National Association of Postal Supervisors.

D. O. BODIEN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

CAMBRIDGE, MINN.

Whereas the postage rates have not appreciably increased over a long period of years: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota State Branch, National Association of Postal Supervisors, in convention assembled held in St. Paul, Minn., June 8 and 9, 1956, go on record endorsing the provisions of H. R. 9228 and urging the speedy adoption of the postage rate increase bill; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the entire Minnesota congressional delegation and also to Representative THOMAS MURRAY, chairman of the Post Office Committee, and also to the Postmaster General.

Approved by Minnesota State Convention of the Minnesota Branch, National Association of Postal Supervisors, St. Paul, Minn., June 9, 1956.

D. O. BODIEN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

CAMBRIDGE, MINN.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MCCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution to extend the time for filing the final report of the Commission on Government Security to June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2385).

By Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. Res. 291. Resolution opposing Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1956 (Rept. No. 2388).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 3482. A bill to provide for transfer of title of certain lands to the Carlsbad Irrigation District, N. Mex. (Rept. No. 2389).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 4116. A bill to increase the membership of the Senate Office Building Commission (Rept. No. 2387).

REVISION AND PRINTING OF COMPILATION OF LAWS RELATING TO THE REGULATION OF CERTAIN CARRIERS

Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported favorably an original bill (S. 4145) providing for the revision and printing of a compilation of Federal laws relating to the regulation of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, and submitted a report (No. 2386) thereon, which was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unan-

imous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THYE:

S. 4140. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims resulting from the crash of a United States Navy plane at Minneapolis, Minn., on June 9, 1956; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 4141. A bill for the relief of Nicolaos Papathanasiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 4142. A bill for the relief of Nicolaos Theocharous Grammatikos; and

S. 4143. A bill to provide for an additional payment of $165,000 to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., toward the cost of the water filtration plant constructed by such village; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOFFORD:

S. 4144. A bill to authorize the city of Rock Hill, S. C., to acquire certain tribal lands on the Catawba Indian Reservation, S. C.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 4145. A bill providing for the revision and printing of a compilation of Federal laws relating to the regulation of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to above bill, when reported by Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. GORE (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 4146. A bill providing for a civilian atomic power acceleration program; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 4147. A bill to deny social-security benefits to employees of the Communist Party and its affiliated organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 4148. A bill for the relief of Way Tong Jung, Kin Koo Jung, Chor Yen Jung, Koo Ming Jung, and Poy Kee Jung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 4149. A bill to implement a treaty and agreement with the Republic of Panama, by amending the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution to extend the operation of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

EXTENSION OF GREETINGS TO CITY OF ORANGE, N. J.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 301), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas the city of Orange in the county of Essex is observing this year the 150th anniversary of the granting of a charter by the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; and

Whereas the city of Orange has played an important role in the growth and development of Essex County, the State of New Jersey, and the Nation; and

Whereas the city of Orange has given to the Nation and the State of New Jersey many leading citizens and was an early center of industry and the arts in the 19th century; and

Whereas by action of the mayor and board of commissioners of such city there has been appointed a citizens' sesquicentennial committee to prepare for appropriate observance of the historic occasion when the city of Orange was partitioned from the city of Newark, November 27, 1806: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby extends its greetings and felicitations to the city of Orange, Essex County, N. J., on the celebration of its sesquicentennial, and expresses its appreciation for the splendid services rendered to the Nation by the citizens of the city of Orange during the past 150 years.

NICOLAOS PAPATHANASIOU

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Nicolaos Papathanasiou.

This young man, a citizen of Greece, was employed as a cadet officer in the Hellenic merchant marine until 1950 when he joined a United States merchant ship. The United States Coast Guard subsequently issued merchant marine documents to him that were validated for emergency service also. In September 1950 Mr. Papathanasiou voluntarily arranged to be drafted and was inducted into the United States Army in October of 1951. He served overseas in Germany in the transportation branch of the Army in 1952 and was separated from the service September 10, 1953.

Among his documents is a letter of commendation from his commanding officer, Lt. Col. Samuel E. Sax, praising him for his conscientious attitude and efficient performance.

Here is a young man who says his one desire since he attended the American College of Athens in Athens, Greece, was to become a citizen of the United States. He says: "My spirit, heart, and soul are dedicated to the ideals of the American Nation and way of life."

Since Mr. Papathanasiou has been in this country he has conducted himself with dignity and honor and has in every way shown his appreciation of our democratic processes.

The bill provides that Mr. Papathanasiou be granted permanent residence and that the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

When I was in Portland, Oreg., a few days ago I had a conference with Father Angelo Gavalas, of the Greek Orthodox Church. I had the conference at his request. Father Gavalas explained to me that this man was an exemplary member of his parish and that, if he is allowed to remain in this country and become an American citizen, he plans to prepare himself for the priesthood.

I have gone into this case very carefully because I do not believe a Senator has the moral right to introduce a bill in the Senate which will have the effect of holding a man in this country, if such Senator is not satisfied the man is a fit subject to remain in the country.

Here we have a young Greek who has served our country in the armed services after having been inducted voluntarily, and who has come out of the military service with the commendation of his commanding officer. It would be a great mistake to deport this young man, without first giving careful consideration to all the merits of his case. I deeply regret this case has been called to my attention so late in the session, because I believe the appropriate committee of the Senate should have adequate time in which to accomplish a study of the case.

However, I sincerely hope that if the committee finds in the closing days of the session it cannot take final action in the case, our Immigration Service will recognize the surrounding circumstances which have caused me to introduce the bill and will hold up deportation proceedings at least until the next session of Congress, and until another bill can be introduced and a thorough study of the case can be made.

I am satisfied that here is a young man who in the interest of justice and equity is deserving of being allowed to remain in this country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4141) for the relief of Nicolaos Papathanasiou, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY SHIP REPAIR ACT OF 1954

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to extend the operation of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954, Public Law 608, of the 83d Congress.

I should like to say a few words about the background of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954, and the justification, or, indeed, better yet, the urgent necessity for promptly extending that act until at least July 1, 1958.

During the 2d session of the 83d Congress, when I had the honor to serve as chairman of the Water Transportation Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I introduced S. 3546, a bill which was designed to provide an immediate program for the modernization and improvement of certain key vessels in our laid-up national defense reserve fleet. By key vessels I mean only those determined to be necessary for the defense of this country in time of break-out emergency.

As drafted, the bill authorized the Secretary of Commerce, within 6 months after the date of enactment, to enter into contracts for the repair, modernization, and conversion of certain vessels in the national defense reserve fleet to provide, for the purpose of national defense, an adequate and ready reserve fleet. The amount of the contract authority in the bill as drafted was limited to $45 million. The contracts were required to be placed with private shipbuilding and ship repair yards. The bill further provided that such contracts should be entered into in accordance with applicable provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

Senators will recall that at that time, in June 1954, our privately owned American shipbuilding and ship repair yards were in desperate straits. In July 1954 Fortune magazine ran a feature article entitled "Gloom in the Shipyards." Therein it said:

The United States shipbuilding industry is not in danger of disappearing overnight, but it is quite sick—sicker, in fact, than any other major United States industry, with the possible exception of soft coal.

Therefore, there is no doubt that one of the factors which contributed to the need for, and passage of, the emergency ship repair bill was the plight of our privately owned shipbuilding and ship repair yards.

However, Mr. President—and this I want to emphasize—the emergency ship repair bill was in no way a "make work" program. In the thousands of vessels which comprise our national defense reserve fleet, the Secretary of Commerce, after consultation with defense authorities, designated only 205 as "key vessels" which should, under this program, be put in "immediately ready" status so that in the event of national emergency we would not have to spend 3 to 6 months in repairing them before they could be put into active service.

While the original Emergency Ship Repair Act authorized the making of contracts by the Secretary of Commerce for the repair of vessels in amounts not to exceed $25 million, in a wise spirit of caution we appropriated only $18 million with, I believe, the understanding that we would appropriate the additional $7 million after we had had substantial experience in doing $18 million worth of repairs to however many of the 205 ships it took to use up the sum appropriated.

As the sponsor of this bill, I felt it my duty to keep in close touch with the Department of Commerce so that I could report, from time to time, to the Senate the progress being made. I am happy indeed to be able to announce that the authorities of the Maritime Administration feel that the program has been a successful and wise one within the limits of the $18 million appropriated. However, of the 205 vessels originally designated, 67 remain unrepaired and the $18 million has been exhausted. Therefore, I introduce a joint resolution in the nature of an amendment to the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954. This joint resolution would extend the time for entering into contracts for repair—expiring August 20, 1956. I believe this is all that is necessary by way of enabling legislation to permit us to conclude the original program.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 187) to extend the operation of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954, introduced by Mr. BUTLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 4 of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954 (Public Law 608, 83d Cong.) is amended by striking out the words "within 24 months after date of enactment of this act," and inserting in place thereof "before July 1, 1958."

OPPOSITION TO DISCRIMINATORY ACTION AGAINST CITIZENS BECAUSE OF RELIGION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 27, 1956,

The names of Mr. BUSH, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. DUFF, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota, and Mr. CHAVEZ were added as cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 298) opposing discriminatory action against United States citizens because of religious faith or affiliations, submitted by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and other Senators) on June 27, 1956.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON H. R. 3073 FOR THE RELIEF OF THE SIGFRIED OLSEN SHIPPING CO.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for Mr. KEFAUVER). Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given of a public hearing that will be held on Monday, July 2, 1956, at 1 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on H. R. 3073, a bill for the relief of the Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co. At the indicated time and place those interested in the proposed legislation will be afforded an opportunity to be heard.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]; the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and myself, chairman.

PINGFONG NGO CHUNG AND PEARL WAH CHUNG

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1375) for the relief of Pingfong Ngo Chung and Pearl Wah Chung, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pingfong Ngo Chung, Pearl Wah Chung, Dorothy May Ackermann, Dr. Mahmood Sajjadi, and Wan Ngo Lim shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

And to amend the title so as to read: "A bill for the relief of certain aliens."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on January 16, 1956, the Senate passed S. 1375, to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the two beneficiaries. On June 19, 1956, the House of Representatives passed S. 1375, with amendments to include the beneficiaries of three similar individual Senate bills.

The amendments are acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 1375.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

TOINI MARGARETA HEINO

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2842) for the relief of Toini Margareta Heino, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Toini Margareta Heino may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent membership if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on June 19, 1956, the Senate passed S. 2842, to waive an excluding provision of existing law in behalf of the beneficiary. On the same date, the House of Representatives passed S. 2842, by substituting the language of a similar House bill, which made no substantive changes in the bill.

The amendment is acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 2842.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

AHMET HALDUN KOCA TASKIN

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 245) for the relief of Ahmet Haldun Koca Taskin, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ahmet Haldun Koca Taskin may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That nothing in this section of this act shall be construed to waive the provisions of section 315 of the Immigration and Nationality Act as they apply to the said Ahmet Haldun Koca Taskin.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ursula Jadwiga Milarski Goodman may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 3. The exemptions provided for in this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Ahmet Haldun

Koca Taskin and Ursula Jadwiga Milarski Goodman."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on March 28, 1955, the Senate passed S. 245, to waive a ground of inadmissibility in behalf of the beneficiary. On June 19, 1956, the House of Representatives passed S. 245 with amendments to include the beneficiary of one similar Senate bill.

The amendments are acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 245.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

TERESA LUCIA CILLI AND GUISEPPE CORRADO CILLI

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1814) for the relief of Teresa Lucia Cilli and Guiseppe Corrado Cilli, which were, after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Manda Pauline Petricevic, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Paul G. Schuldt, citizens of the United States.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Teresa Lucia Cilli, Guiseppe Corrado Cilli, and Manda Pauline Petricevic."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on March 19, 1956, the Senate passed S. 1814, to grant to two minor children to be adopted by a United States citizen the status of nonquota immigrants, which is the status normally enjoyed by the alien minor children of citizens of the United States. On June 19, 1956, the House of Representatives passed S. 1814, with amendments to include the beneficiary of one similar individual Senate bill.

The amendments are acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 1814.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD, OF KENTUCKY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, it is with extreme sadness that I announce to the Senate today the death of a former member of this body and a distinguished son of Kentucky, Tom Underwood. He passed away in his hometown of Lexington this morning.

In his passing, Kentucky has lost one of its finest citizens; his community has lost one who had contributed much to its good; his family has lost a devoted husband and father, and I have lost one of the finest friends I have ever had over a period of 40 years.

Tom Underwood was a classmate of mine at the University of Kentucky. We continued our friendship throughout our adult life. In 1947, he gave of his time and his great talents to manage my campaign when I was a candidate for governor. I then had the privilege of working with him in that official capacity. Later I was privileged to serve with him in Washington in the House of Representatives. When he came to the Senate to fill the vacancy and complete the unexpired term following the passing of another distinguished classmate of ours, Virgil Chapman, I was privileged to serve with him in this body, in the years 1951 and 1952.

I shall miss him. There are few in Kentucky whose passing would occasion a greater loss to us than that of Thomas R. Underwood.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I associate myself with the tribute which my colleague and friend from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] has paid to former Senator Tom Underwood. He was a very genuine person, and was one of my best friends during my service in both the House and Senate. He was always cooperative, always willing to bear more than his share of the load. I considered him a highly competent legislator. He was a true and genuine friend.

To his wife and family Mrs. Johnson and I send our deepest regrets.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I appreciate the comments of the distinguished majority leader, because I know in what high esteem Tom Underwood held the majority leader, and, through service with both of them, I know just what the majority leader thought of Tom Underwood.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the senior Senator from Kentucky and the majority leader.

I had the privilege and pleasure of serving with our late colleague, Tom Underwood, in both the House and Senate. To me, he was a man of sterling character, fine ability, and great integrity.

On occasion I received copies of his newspaper, and read it with great interest. He was fair and dispassionate in his discussion of the stories which he was using in his newspaper. He compiled a fine and outstanding record while a Member of the House of Representatives and during his service as a Member of the United States Senate.

It was with a great deal of sorrow that I heard the news today of the passing of our old friend. In view of the exemplary life which he led, I know that he is going to a greater and just reward.

ADMISSION OF RED CHINA AND OTHER COUNTRIES TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter which I, as chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee, sent to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles yesterday.

This letter asks the Secretary of State to disclose the identity of the United States officials who are issuing stories that the United States cannot exclude Red China from the United Nations beyond the next session of the General Assembly, and that the State Department may have to adopt a more flexible attitude toward Yugoslavia and other halfway allies of the Reds. Representative JUDD, in testimony before the subcommittee, has told us how dangerous these leaks are.

I hope to have an early answer to this letter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 28, 1956.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
The Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On May 31 of this year, Congressman WALTER H. JUDD testified at length about security matters before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Among other things, he testified to the fact that from time to time systematic leaks seem to emanate from Government departments, the effect of which is to induce a conditioning of public opinion that is favorable to the Communist cause. I quote from his testimony as follows:

"Another thing—the leaks that come to the press. Here is one recently. All of you have seen in the press for 6 months repeated stories, especially from certain columnists, that the United States is going to recognize Communist China, and, after the next election, the United Nations Assembly will meet and admit Communist China to the United Nations. I asked about it 2 or 3 times down at the State Department, if this is true. It has been denied completely by everybody at the top.

"Finally, one came out a few weeks ago in a Kiplinger Letter. It said that at one of these conferences it was tentatively agreed that this should be done. It would be denied officially, the letter said, but the fact is the United States is going to recognize Communist China and not veto its entrance into the United Nations.

"I called up keymen and said, 'Has there been a change?'

"They said, 'No; we saw it, too. There is not a word of truth in it.'

"Now, the newspapers didn't think that up. Somebody in the Department told them that. This is the thing that goes on again and again. Leaks go out from underlings that this is what our policy is going to be. Now, we are going to recognize Communist China.

"That is not the President's policy. That is not Mr. Dulles' policy. That is not the policy of the Far East Division. Yet, somewhere down in the State Department or in the Pentagon or the National Security Council or somewhere there are people who passed this out. You go to the press people and they won't reveal their sources. I don't blame them.

"But this is handed to them as inside dope to pass out to their readers. This is the way in which they shift the thinking of the people toward further appeasement of the Communists."

I write this letter to call your attention to what would seem to be still another instance of what Congressman JUDD complains about, in the July 2 issue of Newsweek. There, on page 13, under the heading Washington Trends, item No. 1 reads:

"RED CHINA IN THE U. N.

"Privately, responsible United States officials have about reached this conclusion: The United States probably can't exclude Red China from the United Nations beyond the next session of the General Assembly, which is due to convene in November, after the United States elections.

"Admission of Peking cannot be blocked by veto since the matter will come up in the General Assembly, not the Security Council. This is because the issue is not one of admission but of determining which regime will represent China.

"They also believe the United States may have to adopt a more flexible attitude toward neutrals and even such halfway allies of the Reds as Yugoslavia.

"Their reasoning: Developing of national communism, as distinct from satellite communism, will create opportunities which America can and must exploit in the years which lie ahead.

"Note: There will be vigorous dissenters in both parties. Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California, GOP floor leader, may lead a movement to take the United States out of the U. N. if Red China is admitted."

As chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee, I am acutely aware of the serious damage that such reports are doing, not only here at home, but among our friends abroad. I write this letter to ask you if you will undertake to determine who are "the responsible United States officials" who have informed Newsweek that "the United States probably can't exclude Red China from the United Nations beyond the next session of the General Assembly." I ask you also to determine who are the United States officials who "believe the United States may have to adopt a more flexible attitude toward neutrals and even such halfway allies of the Reds as Yugoslavia."

I write this with the realization that you feel as strong as I do that these stories are seriously undermining the foreign policy of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I noticed in the press that the distinguished chairman of the committee had addressed a letter to the Secretary of State. I hope when he receives a reply he will make his information available to the Senate. I have seen articles in magazines and newspapers with reference to the subject to which the Senator has referred. To the best of my knowledge, it certainly does not represent the policy at the highest level of the Government. If there are those in the lower echelons in the Government who are deliberately throwing up these trial balloons in an attempt to change American foreign policy, I think we should know who they are and let them have the responsibility for it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me say first that I entirely agree with the distinguished Senator from California, and the information will be made available to the Senate if we receive it.

Now I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I join with the Senator from Mississippi in his search for the evidence he is asking for in his letter to the Secretary of State. If there is going on within this Government a "creeping up," shall I say, to the acceptance of the notion of letting Red China into the United Nations at this time, or to the recognition of Red China, we had better know about it in the Congress of the United States. I reiterate what I have said before that I am one Member of the Senate who is not going to support any move to admit Red China to the United Nations or to give her diplomatic recognition until Red China demonstrates by her record that she can be relied upon to keep her obligations under existing international law.

On this question the Senator from California and I have stood shoulder to shoulder more than once, and I am sure he joins with me in the position I take this morning. There are several things Red China must do—not merely talk about—to prove that she can take her seat in the family of peaceful nations. One is to release every American soldier and every American civilian now held in Chinese prisons, contrary to existing international law. Another is to proceed to abide by the truce made in Korea, and to proceed to abide by one obligation after another, under international law, which she at this moment is violating.

On this issue let me say there is no room, in my judgment, for division of opinion in the Senate of the United States. We are entitled to get the information for which the Senator from Mississippi is asking.

Mr. President, I am disturbed by another thing. I say this on the basis of some news releases——

Mr. EASTLAND. At that point, let me ask the Senator from Oregon a question. Does the Senator not think it is deplorable that those who have been put in prison in Red China have been forgotten?

Mr. MORSE. They have not been forgotten here in the Senate.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know.

Mr. MORSE. Every once in a while we try, I say most respectfully, to put the pressure on to get some action in the matter, not only through the State Department, but through the United Nations.

Mr. EASTLAND. May I make another comment——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The 2 minutes allowed for statements in the morning hour have expired.

Mr. EASTLAND. I ask unanimous consent to have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. I am disturbed about a press report which is made on the Donovan book, indicating that at one time the President himself expressed some concern about an alleged inflexible attitude in regard to Red China and the United Nations. I do not attribute it to the President, but I am disturbed about a book which attributes that attitude to the President. I think we ought to know if that is the President's attitude. The book is published, and it would be a very simple matter for him either to confirm or to deny what is said in it, in regard to his alleged attitude.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I have relinquished the floor. The Senator from New Jersey can take the floor in his own right, and speak in his own time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to identify myself with what the Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from California, and the Senator from Oregon have said this morning. I feel confident regarding the attitude of the State Department with respect to proposals to admit Red China to the United Nations.

Let me say that for some time I have been identified with the movement in opposition to the admission of Red China to the United Nations; and in that connection I have been associated with Members of both the Senate and the House of Representatives in taking steps to have a plank in opposition to the admission of Red China to the United Nations included this year in both the Republican and the Democratic platforms. I certainly hope that will be done.

Mr. President, I am aware of the undercurrent of talk regarding this matter; and I have been connected with the United Nations, and know what is occurring. All of us must stand together in opposing any movement to admit Red China to the United Nations.

BENEFITS FROM STUDY OF INDIAN EDUCATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on Monday, June 18, the Senate, in its wisdom, passed Senate Joint Resolution 110, which calls for a study of Indian education. I was unable to be present that day, because of the wedding of my oldest daughter, which of course required my presence in Arizona. Had I been here, I would have made a few remarks in explanation of this measure, which I introduced earlier this year. A letter from Dr. William Kelly, of the bureau of ethnic research of the University of Arizona, so well explains the need for this proposed legislation and so encompasses what I would have said on the subject, that I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA.
Tuscon, June 18, 1956.

Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: The following is in answer to your request for our analysis of some of the benefits that might be expected to result from a study of Indian education.

Such a study should, of course, be limited to those areas where practicable and possible changes can be made in existing policies and methods. What I have to say is therefore tentative and subject to revision in light of recommendations to be made by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Indian education: Your resolution asks for a study and investigation of the "education problems of Indian children from non-English-speaking homes."

As was pointed out by the Arizona subcommittee on Indian education, problems in Indian education have now shifted, for the first time, from the task of placing Indians in school to the task of finding more economical and efficient methods in Indian education. Crucial problems revolve around

methods for dealing with children from non-English-speaking homes.

Great dependence is rightly placed upon the system of formal education as the most effective means for bringing the American Indian population into a satisfactory adjustment with the non-Indian way of life. This is one reason why more than ordinary excellence should be demanded of the Indian school system.

On the score of costs, there is an equally potent reason for continued refinement of Indian school methods. National figures are not available, but data compiled on the cost of educating Indian children in Arizona tell the story:

1. Enrollment of Arizona Indian children in Federal schools during 1954–55 totaled 15,068.

2. The cost of operating the schools, not including construction costs and some administrative costs, was about $10,956,800. The per capita cost was approximately $727.15.

3. The per capita cost of educating non-Indians in Arizona elementary schools, during the same year, was approximately $271.

The principal reason for the difference in costs is the necessity for maintaining boarding schools for about two-thirds of the Arizona Indian children in Federal schools.

Under such circumstances, where nearly two-thirds of the cost of education is devoted to student maintenance and one-third to education itself, no argument for highest efficiency in the classroom seems necessary. This is doubly true when it is intended that the school system itself play a major part in correcting the situation that requires the maintenance of boarding schools.

Efficiency in the Indian classroom is not merely a matter of professional skills and perfected curricula. The performance of the child, his willingness and ability to learn, also relate very definitely to the total Indian situation and most particularly to the nature of the triangular relationship between the child, the teacher, and the parent. This is especially true where parents do not speak English or where, for any reason, they do not understand the methods, purposes, and goals of education for their children.

To gain the greatest benefit from the study suggested in your resolution it is recommended that the investigation be started with a review of the results of experience in various situations in Indian education, such as the Navaho 5-year program, and combine this with a survey of the results of educational studies, world wide, in situations where special methods have been used for introducing European or American civilization to nonliterate people by means of formal education.

On the basis of these studies, and with the help of education specialists in the Indian Service, a program of research to discover answers to some of the critical problems in American Indian education can be carried through. It should be pointed out in this connection, as mentioned above, that research of this kind must be turned very sharply to the areas of school operation where change is considered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs to be practical and possible.

Transfer of Indians to public schools: Your resolution also calls for a study of the "possibility of establishing a more orderly, equitable, and acceptable program for transferring Indian children to public schools."

The problem, together with present State and Federal policies, should be reviewed and reported. It is possible that a new and acceptable approach could thus be suggested, but no large sums of money should be expended for this purpose. The present situation is, in many respects, based upon historical, legal, and self-interest aspects which no amount of study and reporting could change. In some instances, however, attitudes and opinions, especially of local school-district officials, are based upon incomplete information and inadequate reports. Where this is the case, data should be gathered and a system established for the maintenance of necessary information.

State and local officials, for instance, are often reluctant to assume responsibility for Indian education because they do not know what is involved or what to expect in the future. At the present time there is no adequate record, for instance, of the numbers of Indian children, by age and grade, in all schools (public, mission, and Federal). Much more serious, there are no reliable demographic studies of Indian populations so that accurate forecasts can be made of future Indian enrollment, particularly in the more expensive high-school grades.

Of equal importance in determining State and Federal responsibility for Indian education is the local economic condition of Indian families, the extent of their tax contribution, and the extent of taxable property within school districts on Indian reservations.

It is recommended that the study to be authorized by your resolution determine, first, the extent of the need for this kind of information and, second, a practical and feasible method for maintaining and processing the necessary records. The study probably should not, in this instance, gather the field data since this work could no doubt be done more efficiently and economically by Bureau of Indian Affairs personnel.

A revised system for maintaining and processing record cards on Indian schoolchildren would serve the further purpose of providing the Bureau of Indian Affairs with invaluable data on the total Indian population, particularly with reference to shifting residence patterns, family size, family income, occupational interests, and similar matters.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs, given the Federal policy of terminating special services for Indians, and the nature of the problems it must now solve, is operating in an information vacuum. There are no reliable reports being prepared on even the simplest and most basic kinds of statistical data. Federal-State relations with respect to Indian education, as well as many other aspects of Indian administration, would be served by study and experiment leading to the establishment of such reports.

Indians in public schools: Over and above the financial responsibility for educating Indian children in public schools, is the matter of determining under what situations and circumstances the Indians themselves are to be benefitted through public school education, as opposed to Federal school education.

This is an area, so far as we have been able to determine, of almost total ignorance. It is assumed, on logical grounds, that Indian adjustment to white society will be hastened if Indian children come into close and daily contact with non-Indian children in the school environment. Circumstances and conditions vary from place to place and these should be studied, not only to test the basic assumption, but to discover the nature of those situations where Indian children are deriving the greatest benefits from public school education.

Scientific verification of more rapid Indian economic and social development as the result of public school influence could produce an understanding among local people of the possibilities for the creation of human resources in the Indian population which would outweigh financial and other arguments which have been advanced in opposition to the idea of public school education for Indian children.

It is true that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has made great strides over the country in transferring Indian children to public schools. This is only part of the task. The other, which will be needed for some years to come, is to demonstrate to Indian parents and to local taxpayers that the transfer was a wise and necessary action.

It is recommended, therefore, that the study of Indian education include a comparative study of Indian children in a sample of varying school attendance situations.

Study costs: It would be unwise, in my opinion, to undertake extensive and detailed studies that, under the terms of your resolution, must be completed within 2 years. The Congress, and the American people, especially the Indian people, are not entirely convinced that social science and educational studies can result in solid benefit for the Indians concerned. A relatively modest beginning under the authorization of your resolution could lay the foundation for more profitable and acceptable studies later on. It would be premature for us to attempt to determine the exact cost, but competent initial studies, covering the essential points as outlined above, could perhaps be made for no more than $200,000.

I appreciate this opportunity to be of some assistance to you in this matter, and I sincerely hope that our comments will be helpful to you.

Yours very sincerely,

WILLIAM H. KELLY,
Director, Bureau of Ethnic Research.

UNUSUAL WAY IN WHICH HELLS CANYON PROJECT BILLS HAVE REACHED THE CALENDARS OF BOTH HOUSES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, indignation is growing in this country, and rightly so, against the unusual way the Hells Canyon project bills have reached the calenders of both Houses of Congress. These manipulations would put to shame the most skillful operator of the age-old shell game; and even Houdini himself, if he were alive, would have difficulty imagining that such could be done. To indicate this growing wave of feeling, I have selected editorials from 4 newspapers in 4 different States of the Union. I ask that they be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Austin (Tex.) American of June 21, 1956]

FEDERAL POWER FORCES PUSH HALF BILLION DAM

Hungry for issues in this election year, Democrats on Capitol Hill appear ready to stage a big battle over a Federal dam at Hells Canyon, opposed by the Eisenhower administration. Their hope would be thus to dramatize their advocacy of public power and their dissatisfaction which the administration's preference for development of natural resources by private industry.

Hells Canyon, a deep and narrow gorge separating eastern Oregon from western Idaho, has been a subject of controversy for years. As Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, now running for United States Senator in Oregon against Senator WAYNE MORSE (Democrat), in May 1953 withdrew a long-standing opposition of that Department to the application of the Idaho Power Co. for permission to build three smaller dams in the canyon.

The Federal Power Commission on July 27, 1955, handed down a unanimous decision favoring the company's application for a 50-year license to build the 3 dams on a 100-mile stretch of the Snake River. These dams would flood the site of the proposed Federal Hells Canyon Dam.

The company already has begun work on 2 of the 3 dams. The FPC on June 15 announced that it had authorized the company to issue $20 million in promissory notes to finance construction of one of the dams, but the National Hells Canyon Association and other public power groups are challenging the company's license in the United States Court of Appeals.

And Senator MORSE and 29 other Senators, including the 2 North Dakota Republicans, WILLIAM LANGER and MILTON R. YOUNG, are backing a bill to authorize Federal construction of a high dam at Hells Canyon. After the death of Senator Alben W. Barkley (Democrat, Kentucky) the Democratic leadership of the Senate switched Senator RUSSELL B. LONG (Democrat, Louisiana), who had voted against the bill in the Interior Committee, over to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to fill the Barkley vacancy.

McKay in May 1955 outlined before the Senate committee the administration's opposition to the Federal dam. He did not specifically endorse the Idaho Power Co.'s project. But he declared:

"We are firmly convinced that where a non-Federal proposal can provide results which, in terms of comprehensive development, are reasonably comparable with those anticipated from a Federal project, the people of the region should be encouraged to utilize in every proper way the available capacities of public or private organizations for doing the job on a non-Federal basis under conditions fully protecting the public interest."

The Federal dam proposed by the Morse bill and a companion bill in the House would be built at a cost of $500 million. By comparison, the private power company would spend only about $250 million on its three dams and transmission lines. And it would pay close to $10 million a year in taxes on the project.

Even so, Democrats are calling the granting of a license to Idaho Power Co. a "giveaway." Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER (Democrat, Oregon), who will campaign for MORSE this year, called FPC support of the private project a major step in the destruction of the Army engineers' master plan for the full development of the power resources of the Columbia Basin.

[From the Oregon Journal of June 22, 1956]

WHERE EMOTION RULES

It now becomes pertinent to ask whether the 11th hour drive in Congress to push through authorization of a high Hells Canyon dam is designed primarily to benefit the region or reelect Democratic Congressmen in key States.

The word sent down from Democratic Chairman PAUL BUTLER to Democratic leaders in both houses would seem to indicate the latter reason is paramount.

Committee reshuffling following the death of Senator Alben Barkley (Democrat of Kentucky) has made it possibe to jar loose from the Senate Interior Committee a Hells Canyon bill. Democrats on the House Interior Committee are confident of sending out a companion bill by having bought the vote of Representative J. EDGAR CHENOWETH (Republican of Colorado) in return for their support of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in his State. Whether Hells Canyon legislation can be forced through before the planned mid-July adjournment is a matter of speculation. Even if it can, it seems unlikely President Eisenhower will sign it in view of his past attitude.

What must be borne in mind is that even if a high Hells Canyon dam is authorized, authorization doesn't mean construction. It could be years before any money is appropriated. This has been the experience with many other projects in the Columbia basin. And even after the go-ahead construction would require 6 to 8 years.

Meanwhile, Idaho Power Co. is proceeding with the building of Brownlee Dam, largest of the three for which it has approval from the Federal Power Commission. It has 1,000 men at work and already has built a tunnel 2,500 feet long and 38 feet in diameter, for the purpose of diverting Snake River waters at the low water period this summer.

If it is not stopped, it will be producing power from Brownlee in the summer of 1958. This dam is expected to yield 414,000 kilowatts, and any of these not needed by Idaho Power will be fed into the Northwest power pool. Immediately upon Brownlee's completion, Idaho Power will start construction on Oxbow and follow it with low Hells Canyon. The three will produce 783,400 kilowatts, nearly as much as high Hells Canyon.

Brownlee is consistently referred to as a low dam. It will be 395 feet high, one of the 15 highest in the world. For the kinds of flows produced by the main stem of the Snake, its effectiveness in lowering flood crests in the lower Columbia would not be greatly less than that of high Hells Canyon, even in such a high runoff year as this one. Army engineerrs' figures prove the real flood control problem lies elsewhere than the main stem of the Snake.

In our view, the difference in power and flood control which high Hells Canyon would offer is not great enough to justify perhaps a 10-year delay in time and more than triple cost.

Wouldn't it be wiser, as one of our readers has suggested, to put the money high Hells Canyon would cost into other Columbia Basin projects which will furnish more effective flood control, and let Idaho Power get on with a project that will provide substantial benefits to the region?

It is unfortunate that Hells Canyon has been regarded, on both sides, as a symbol of the private versus public power issue. The Journal, which believes in both public and private power, has never regarded it so. Here is a place where emotion has replaced reason, to the detriment, we believe, of our region.

[From the San Francisco News of June 20, 1956]

POLITICS IN HELLS CANYON

For years now, there has been a political tussle—fanatical at times—over who builds what dams in Hells Canyon, Idaho.

The New Dealers have wanted the taxpayers to put up a single dam, to cost some half-billion dollars.

President Eisenhower has another policy. He says the Government should help develop natural resources—but only where there is a national benefit and where private enterprise can't or won't do it.

So the Idaho Power Co., under license from the Government, is ready to go ahead with a series of three smaller dams, to cost half as much as the Government project would have cost.

And private enterprise, unlike Government-owned projects, pay taxes—which is a double relief to the taxpayers.

In any case, the Democratic leadership in Congress has worked up a political spectacular out of this situation. It is hauling out of committee bills to authorize construction of the Federal dam.

The idea is not so much to get the dam built, but to get votes for Democratic candidates—especially Senators MORSE, of Oregon, and MAGNUSON, of Washington. The Democrats figure President Eisenhower would veto the bill, as he doubtless would. But they estimate the veto would enhance their claim that by letting private, taxpaying enterprise develop these resources, the administration is "giving away" public property.

How much "giveaway" there is in pouring taxpayer money into something private capital can do is a question they don't answer, of course.

Politics. It's wonderful.

[From the Idaho Daily Statesman, Boise, Idaho, of June 8, 1956]

MR. RAYBURN DEMANDS A TRADE

Congressman CHENOWETH, of Colorado, admitted Wednesday that he had agreed to change his previous stand against Hells Canyon and give it committee support to allow it to come to the House floor. The Colorado Representative said he had agreed with Speaker SAM RAYBURN that he would trade his vote for a promise to force out action on a Colorado dam, long bottled in committee.

We have no way of knowing what the Idaho delegation thinks of this political horse-trading but we wonder how Mr. RAYBURN, who not so long ago was rounding up support for the tidelands bill, which affected his home State of Texas much the same way Hells Canyon affects Idaho, fares with our elected representatives. We believe that at least three of the Members of the Idaho delegation supported the Texan in the tidelands matter. We also are sure that the Colorado delegation was equally as helpful in that States' rights contest. But to get out a Colorado dam, Mr. RAYBURN demands a trade. If this is not hypocrisy of the first water, it certainly is brazen politics.

As far as the Hells Canyon legislation is concerned, it doesn't matter whether it passes Congress or not. President Eisenhower will veto any Hells Canyon bill that comes to his desk and Congress does not have the power to override such a veto.

Mr. Eisenhower will veto the bill for the simple reason that his partnership plan, in this instance especially, is really at work, relieving the Federal Treasury of the expenditure of funds for power dams. Additionally, the Hells Canyon legislation is what the Democrats believe will be a helpful gesture to Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, a late comer in Democrat ranks. Mr. Eisenhower is especially interested in that race. The trade of Hells Canyon for one United States Senator shows the respect the Democrats have for either public opinion or the rights of a small State.

No matter what happens, Idahoans have learned that its delegation gains nothing by supporting other States in their fights for their resources. When the chips are down, as they are at this time, the Democrats prove to be of short memory and poor principle.

We hope either Senator WELKER or Senator DWORSHAK, or both of them, make this point clear when and if Hells Canyon reaches the Senate floor.

SENATOR GEORGE OF GEORGIA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, during the debate yesterday and the day before on the mutual security bill, all of us were once again impressed by the valuable and notable service which the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], is rendering to the people of America and to all people who yearn to be free and remain free.

The contribution which my colleague, the Senator from Georgia, has made and is making to the cause of peace and for the sake of all humanity will be remem-

bered and extolled when the history of these difficult times is recorded. His place in the history of the fight for peace is absolutely secure.

He is one of the giants who all too infrequently are called to serve in this distinguished body.

Mr. President, today in the New York Times there appears an editorial which pays a very fine tribute to Senator George and to the inspiring and moving speech he delivered last Wednesday in support of the pending mutual security bill. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PLEA BY SENATOR GEORGE

It is unlikely that the United States Senate will often hear a more dramatic or moving plea than that on behalf of the administration's foreign-aid program made by Senator WALTER F. GEORGE. Senator GEORGE is the senior Member in point of service. He is leaving the Senate at the end of this term and this may have been his last great policy speech. He is a member of the opposition party and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. He has urged a reluctant Senate to make no further cuts in our assistance program and has asked Democrats and Republicans alike to support the President.

Senator GEORGE does not view this issue in the light of expediency or superficial economy. Obviously he does not view it in any sense that could be called partisan. He is seeking no personal advantage and no political acclaim. He has said that he has already had his reward for his services to the Nation in the feeling that he has tried to aid his country's cause and may have been able to do so. He gave a son to that cause.

This question of foreign aid, in his thinking, is a matter of morals. It involves the leadership of the United States in world affairs. It takes in broad areas of human hopes and aspirations, of frustrations, fears and dangers. It is not a problem for the adding machine, but for the conscience. In this connection he said to the Senate:

"I cannot think that divine providence has permitted us to become the responsible leaders of the world only to break that hope now. If the free peoples lose confidence in us we will have disappointed the last hope of mankind and we will have utterly failed to justify the sacrifices of our heroic dead, whose bodies rest now in the blue waters of nearly every ocean around the world."

This is the strongest ground upon which to make the case for our aid program. Senator GEORGE has suggested that it is a matter of keeping faith. We must keep faith with our allies and friends and with those helpless ones who need us. We must keep faith with ourselves and with our position of leadership. We must keep faith with our own traditions and with our own dead who died for those traditions.

It is possible to question the fashion in which some of our assistance is given and is used. It does not seem possible to question the moral ground upon which a plea such as that of Senator GEORGE is made nor possible to be deaf to it.

RECENT LONG-RANGE GROWTH IN ARIZONA

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, those of us who live in the youngest State in the Nation have every reason to be proud of that residence. To tabulate the phenomenal growth populationwise and economicwise in Arizona, one of our leading banks has prepared, by one of its vice presidents, a monthly summation entitled "Arizona Progress." Because the June issue of this remarkable journal contains a very comprehensive record of recent and long-range growth in Arizona, I am anxious that my colleagues have an opportunity to observe these figures. The author, Mr. Leggett, is not only one of the Nation's outstanding economists and bankers, but he is also possessed of an ability to present economic figures in an interesting and sometimes entertaining way. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARIZONA PROGRESS

PRODIGAL SON'S LETTER TO HIS FATHER

DEAR PATER: Ever since I can remember you have written me a long letter on Father's Day. These letters came to me when I was in school, in the service, and lately in business. They have been full of fatherly counsel on a variety of subjects ranging all the way from sex to economics. This year let's reverse the procedure. I think you should be told some of the facts of life.

In retrospect you must admit that most of the advice you have given me has been wrong. For example, you always harped on the importance of working hard and going to bed early. I soon discovered for myself that hard work is for peasants and retiring early is for the birds. On the few occasions when I did these things I missed out on a lot of fun and good contacts.

Another mistake was your admonition not to gamble or go into debt. Everything in life is a gamble, including marriage and Government bonds. Remember the fellow in the Scriptures who buried his talent, i. e., put it in a safe-deposit box, but wound up losing it (probably inflation). On the other hand, a neighbor who played the stock market with his talent got 2 for 1 (apparently a stockpile splitup).

As for debt, well now. A man is no longer judged by what he owns but by what he owes. One's standing in the community is measured by his borrowing power. As a result of taking wild chances on borrowed money I shall soon be able to retire in comfortable luxury whereas you and brother Joe, who followed your advice, will probably plod along until age 65 and then be forced to live on social security.

Meanwhile, however, my own boys are quite a problem. They are lazy, undependable, and don't appreciate the value of money. When I tell them they must study hard and go to bed early, they just give me the you-know-what. I hope that you and mother can do something with them when they vacation with you this summer.

Sheepishly yours,

BLACKIE.

ARIZONA AND NEIGHBORING STATES LEAD NATION'S POPULATION PARADE

In the 10-year period since World War II, Arizona holds undisputed rank as the Nation's fastest growing State. It has not only led the Nation in rate of population growth, but it also stands first in percentage growth of income, bank deposits, manufacturing output, mineral production, and value of farm crops.

At the same time Arizona is not an isolated oasis of growth in a desert of stagnation. It is literally surrounded by other areas of dynamic development. All four States bordering on Arizona were listed among the top 10 in population growth over the past decade.

Leading States in population growth

State	1945 population	1955 population	Percent gain
Arizona	594,000	980,000	65.0
Nevada	149,000	225,000	51.0
New Mexico	537,000	795,000	48.0
Florida	2,465,000	3,452,000	40.0
California	9,344,000	13,032,000	39.5
Delaware	286,000	387,000	35.3
Michigan	5,475,000	7,236,000	32.2
Utah	591,000	781,000	32.1
Maryland	2,096,000	2,669,000	27.3
Connecticut	1,769,000	2,241,000	26.7

Source: U. S. Census Bureau Population Estimates by States.

As to the future, projections of the United States Census Bureau indicate that Arizona's population will double during the next 20 years, reaching a figure of about 2 million by 1975. For some mysterious statistical reason, it is ranked second to Nevada in rate of projected growth but, considering the fast company in which we are traveling, even the most enthusiastic Arizona booster will probably settle for any position "in the money." If the census bureau statisticians are right, the southwest corner of the United States will continue to be the hottest growth area in the country.

Leading States in projected growth

State	Estimated population, 1955	Projected population, 1975	20-year percent gain
Nevada	225,000	461,000	104.9
Arizona	980,000	1,977,000	101.7
California	13,032,000	25,896,000	98.7
Florida	3,452,000	6,429,000	86.2
Oregon	1,669,000	2,871,000	72.0
Washington	2,570,000	4,138,000	61.0
New Mexico	795,000	1,206,000	51.7
Delaware	387,000	574,000	48.3
Maryland	2,669,000	3,956,000	48.2
Utah	781,000	1,153,000	47.6

Source: U. S. Census Bureau and U. S. News.

ARIZONA RANKS FIRST NATIONALLY IN RATE OF INDUSTRIAL GROWTH

Manufacturing jobs in Arizona hit a new all-time peak of 35,000 last month. This compares with a figure of 15,000 5 years ago and 11,000 10 years ago. In the postwar period, Arizona has far outstripped all other States in percentage growth of industrial employment. Manufacturing output, now running at an annual rate of nearly $400 million, has doubled since 1951 and is 4 times the 1946 volume.

The following table lists the leading States in percentage growth of manufacturing activity over the past 10 years. It will be noted, incidentally, that all of the States bordering Arizona are included in the top 10, namely: New Mexico, Nevada, California, and Utah. In short, the great Southwest is going great guns industrially as well as in other respects.

Manufacturing employment by States

State	December 1945	December 1955	Percent gain
Arizona	11,200	32,700	192.0
New Mexico	7,100	17,600	147.9
Nevada	2,700	5,900	118.5
California	636,000	1,113,700	75.1
Florida	86,600	144,900	67.3
Utah	20,900	33,900	62.2
Kansas	77,000	123,600	60.5
Idaho	16,100	25,400	57.8
Michigan	758,700	1,178,200	55.3
Oklahoma	61,400	91,600	49.2

Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

CONSTRUCTION VOLUME IN ARIZONA AT NEW ALL-TIME HIGH IN 1955

Although we accumulate a lot of statistics that we have no particular call for, by the same token we sometimes lack figures which would be very useful. An example of the

latter is the amount of building that is done in Arizona. No statistics are available either on the volume of construction or on the value thereto.

However, in view of the importance of this industry, we have worked out a method for approximating the dollar value of construction in the State. Based on a study of building permits, wage payments to construction workers and reports by contractors to the State Tax Commission, some rough calculations can be made. The following table is a result of these studies.

Construction expenditures in Arizona (As estimated by Valley National Bank)

[Dollar volume]

1946	$75,000,000
1947	100,000,000
1948	125,000,000
1949	100,000,000
1950	125,000,000
1951	160,000,000
1952	200,000,000
1953	250,000,000
1954	270,000,000
1955	300,000,000

The above estimates include all types of construction, public and private, including highways and municipal facilities. According to our calculations, the dollar amount of building in Arizona last year totaled about $300 million, a new all-time record. This is about triple the annual volume from 1946 through 1949 and is probably equal in dollar value to all the building in Arizona during the decade of the 1930's exclusive of public works.

So far this year some decline in local building activity has been taking place. Residential volume has definitely slowed in the Phoenix area although it is still good in many other parts of the State. Commercial construction, particularly for new manufacturing facilities and shopping centers, continues high. The same is true of new schools, churches, etc.

ARIZONA, TOP PRODUCER OF NONFERROUS MINERALS, ALSO LEADS IN GROWTH RATE

Arizona, of course, leads all other States in the domestic production of copper, accounting for about 45 percent of the national total. It also stands first in the combined production of the so-called nonferrous metals which include lead, zinc, gold, and silver. Utah ranks second in this field but has dropped far below Arizona in the dollar amount of output. Arizona not only leads in volume but also has had by far the best percentage gain since World War II.

Leading producers of nonferrous metals

State	1945	1955	Percent gain
Arizona	$95,963,006	$351,631,254	266.4
Nevada	24,186,294	62,436,160	158.1
Montana	35,405,505	88,061,823	148.7
Utah	90,018,641	217,173,000	141.3
Washington	7,140,242	16,360,324	129.1
New Mexico	26,386,781	52,883,000	100.4
Colorado	16,676,521	22,304,000	33.7
Idaho	37,799,975	48,897,254	29.4
California	11,152,081	13,882,100	24.5
Missouri	36,456,309	40,528,800	11.2

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines Reports, 1955 figures preliminary.

10-year growth of Arizona retail business by counties

County	1945 sales	Percent of State	1950 sales	Percent of State	1955 sales	Percent of State	Percent gain 1945 to 1955
Apache	$2,957,059	0.7	$5,546,550	0.7	$7,799,025	0.6	163.7
Cochise	20,796,431	5.3	29,780,441	3.8	48,281,309	4.0	132.2
Coconino	11,982,959	3.1	26,541,508	3.4	34,481,437	2.9	187.8
Gila	11,633,773	3.0	20,203,877	2.6	26,999,848	2.2	132.1
Graham	6,205,004	1.6	12,887,992	1.7	14,020,472	1.2	126.0
Greenlee	4,646,885	1.2	10,597,703	1.4	11,344,163	.9	144.1
Maricopa	185,914,532	47.8	389,759,540	50.2	631,093,494	52.1	239.5
Mohave	6,354,283	1.6	9,348,019	1.2	9,318,967	.8	46.7
Navaho	10,467,535	2.7	17,395,970	2.2	22,479,417	1.9	114.8
Pima	72,246,132	18.6	149,942,163	19.3	246,143,554	20.3	240.7
Pinal	14,549,843	3.7	34,804,673	4.5	52,726,594	4.4	262.4
Santa Cruz	7,216,629	1.9	11,440,077	1.5	15,899,776	1.3	120.3
Yavapai	14,709,861	3.8	24,521,352	3.2	29,440,263	2.4	100.1
Yuma	19,296,050	5.0	33,746,530	4.3	60,719,495	5.0	214.8
State total	388,970,976	100.0	776,576,395	100.0	1,210,747,814	100.0	211.3

Arizona statistics

	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955
Annual totals:					
Retail sales	$905,392,750	$1,000,103,901	$1,051,887,109	$1,048,366,581	$1,210,747,814
Income of individuals	1,225,000,000	1,387,000,000	1,428,000,000	1,468,000,000	(1)
Agricultural marketings	359,969,000	384,844,000	419,972,000	370,485,000	337,270,000
Manufacturing output	214,000,000	292,000,000	312,000,000	300,000,000	350,000,000
Mineral production	235,289,000	220,686,000	242,572,000	239,974,000	351,631,254
Tourist business	120,000,000	135,000,000	150,000,000	160,000,000	175,000,000
Bank deposits (December 31)	536,096,163	617,261,001	641,833,880	695,052,812	757,782,163
Bank loans (December 31)	225,226,728	274,967,294	254,096,097	298,294,693	371,953,373
Federal tax payments (fiscal year)	106,356,762	142,525,946	165,840,697	163,109,922	167,714,000
State and local taxes (fiscal year)	96,652,039	102,525,226	111,313,179	121,298,525	129,114,065
Population data:					
State total	796,000	870,000	930,000	993,000	1,040,000
Maricopa County	360,000	385,000	420,000	460,000	490,000
Phoenix, city limits	109,000	119,000	130,000	140,000	167,273
Greater Phoenix	250,000	265,000	290,000	315,000	335,000
Pima County	155,000	175,000	190,000	205,000	215,000
Tucson, city limits	46,000	48,000	50,000	54,000	91,800
Greater Tucson	140,000	160,000	170,000	185,000	195,000

	April 1952	April 1953	April 1954	April 1955	April 1956
Nonagriculture employment:					
Contract construction	14,900	18,100	18,600	18,900	17,900
Manufacturing	26,800	29,400	26,200	30,500	34,800
Mining	12,800	12,700	13,700	13,700	14,900
Service industries and miscellaneous	30,900	33,000	33,800	35,800	39,000
Transportation and utilities	19,600	21,000	19,600	20,300	19,800
Wholesale and retail trade	48,200	51,800	52,100	54,000	55,700
Government, Federal	14,000	13,200	13,600	14,600	15,700
Government, State and local	23,300	26,300	26,700	28,600	32,500
Total (BLS and ESC estimates)	190,500	205,500	204,300	216,400	230,300
Monthly comparisons:					
Retail sales	$80,525,118	$92,838,784	$87,737,012	$98,579,731	$110,691,932
Printing and publishing	1,861,354	2,137,935	2,243,625	2,653,909	2,905,631
Rental income	3,294,097	3,537,153	3,632,142	4,340,014	5,229,219
Restaurant sales	7,743,630	8,583,743	8,027,948	8,747,391	10,285,751
Utility revenues	6,217,354	6,003,746	9,010,476	9,695,026	10,695,192
Gasoline consumption (in gallons)	25,819,823	27,606,480	27,317,153	30,445,540	32,152,502
Valley Bank business index	143.0	154.2	151.2	158.9	164.9

1 Not available.

Phoenix statistics

	May 1952	May 1953	May 1954	May 1955	May 1956
Monthly comparisons:					
Bank debits (in dollars)	286,158,000	276,446,000	323,470,000	371,726,000	429,865,941
Building permits (in dollars)	775,107	1,134,475	1,391,865	602,755	2,360,545
Postal receipts (in dollars)	235,258	249,702	268,176	318,581	358,752
Telephones in service (number)	74,832	85,036	96,647	108,112	119,240
Electric connections (number)	76,199	82,099	90,058	96,542	104,737
Gas connections (number)	66,300	72,347	80,293	87,916	94,406

Tucson statistics

	May 1952	May 1953	May 1954	May 1955	May 1956
Monthly comparisons:					
Bank debits (in dollars)	95,083,000	104,865,000	106,683,000	132,503,000	162,133,944
Building permits (in dollars)	420,559	684,583	400,230	965,138	2,292,668
Postal receipts (in dollars)	118,325	129,484	132,480	146,688	184,170
Telephones in service (number)	46,428	49,914	55,012	59,034	64,774
Electric connections (number)	44,545	48,429	50,473	53,916	57,741
Gas connections (number)	34,643	38,498	41,531	45,671	49,689

DISCRIMINATION INVOLVING RELIGIOUS BELIEFS AND UNION MEMBERSHIP

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I was very happy to note that a resolution has been submitted by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] in opposition to discriminatory action against United States citizens because of religious faith or affiliations.

The purpose of this worthy resolution, Senate Resolution 298, is to protect American citizens while abroad from being discriminated against because of religious affiliation. I am in full accord with this purpose.

However, Mr. President, I should like to call attention to a matter of discrimination within this Nation against members of a religious group. I hope that discrimination will gain the same concern of my colleagues who sponsored this resolution, especially those who are members of or who are allied with the Americans for Democratic Action, an organization which constantly is proclaiming its belief in the rights of individuals.

I, too, have spoken out on the subject of the rights of individuals, only to find that the ADA line of protection of individual rights does not extend to labor-union members. Just as this resolution opposes discriminatory action against those outside our country, the ADA line opposes discriminatory action against individual rights for those outside the unions.

Two examples of the failure of the ADA and its supporters to uphold the rights of individuals have been reported in the press recently. Both involve religious beliefs and union membership, and in neither case did the ADA protest.

First, I refer to an article which appeared in the May 29 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald. This United Press dispatch tells of the Supreme Court ruling which allows railroad workers to be discharged under union-shop contracts, even though their religious beliefs forbid them from belonging to unions. These workers are members of the Plymouth Brethren religious sect. Mr. President, I ask that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECT MEMBERS LOSE IN UNION-SHOP TEST

The Supreme Court yesterday left standing a lower court decision that railroad workers whose religious beliefs forbid them to join labor unions may be fired under union-shop contracts.

The challenge to the Railway Labor Act's union-shop provisions was brought by two Los Angeles members of the Plymouth Brethren religious sect.

When they refused to join unions, they were fired from their railroad jobs under the union-shop agreements prevalent in the industry. They sought Federal court intervention, but the lower courts upheld the firings.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the second article is an Associated Press dispatch which appeared in the June 12 issue of the New York Times. It deals with a similar case in Staten Island, where another member of the Plymouth Brethren faced the predicament of violating his religious beliefs or losing his job. Mr. President, I ask that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAILROAD MAN LOSES JOB APPEAL IN COURT

WASHINGTON, June 11.—The Supreme Court today denied a hearing to Theodore F. Otten, who was dismissed from his railroad job on Staten Island because his religious beliefs prevented him from joining a union.

Mr. Otten contended his constitutional rights were violated by the 1951 amendment to the Railway Labor Act, which permitted union-shop agreements in that industry. Under those agreements a worker must become a union member 60 days after he is hired.

The Supreme Court on May 21 decided that the amendment superseded State right-to-work laws as applied to the railroad industry.

Mr. Otten, a member of the Plymouth Brethren, refused to join the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. He was dismissed as a railroad maintenance worker on the Staten Island Rapid Transit Co., a subsidiary of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I also request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a third article; it is from the April 19, 1956, issue of the Washington Star. This Associated Press dispatch tells of the efforts of another religious group, the German Baptist Brethren, to meet this dilemma.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECT'S BAN ON UNIONS POSES PROBLEM ON JOBS

Members of a religious sect forbidden to join labor unions headed back home today with little guidance from Government officials on how they can otherwise get industry jobs.

A half dozen bearded, black-garbed members of the sect, the old German Baptist Brethren, conferred yesterday with Secretary of Labor Mitchell and Theophil C. Kammholz, General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

Both officials said the group's problem was more with the unions than with the Government.

The church members arranged to return here in a couple of weeks for a conference with AFL-CIO president, George Meany.

They gave the officials a statement saying that while they had no objections to labor unions for other people and recognized they had accomplished much for the working classes, their faith prevented them from belonging to unions.

They said they believe strictly in nonresistance, and unions are often involved in conflict including "violence, coercion, compulsion, picketing, and other means of force."

They said they hope to work out a mutual understanding wherein they could work in union-organized plants and, instead of belonging and paying dues to a union, could regularly donate an equal sum to some public charity.

"We do not desire to profit individually above that accorded to union members for the same labor," they said. "We know the unions would not profit from this arrangement, but they could receive a blessing by recognizing this divine principle of the New Testament."

Lester Fisher, of Covington, Ohio, spokesman for the group, said the 250-year-old sect's youth was being crowded off the farms into industry. Some, he said, had found jobs only to lose them when they refused to join unions.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am not familiar with either of these religious groups, but I know that it is a serious matter when a man must choose between supporting himself and his family and violating his religious principles and beliefs, especially when that choice comes in the United States of America.

I can only ask where the ADA defenders of individual rights were when these actions took place.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF IGNACE JAN PADEREWSKI

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am happy to join the many other freedom-loving peoples the world over in commemorating June 30 as the anniversary of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski.

Paderewski enriched the lives of millions while he lived, as a superb pianist and composer; indeed, his works live after him. But he was more than a great creative artist. He was also a great patriot and a symbol of the aspirations for freedom of the Polish people. As such he merits our special homage today.

We can draw rich inspiration from Paderewski's life, because he demonstrated that an artist can contribute not only in the eternal field of art but in the day-to-day affairs of men. He not only identified himself in his works and words with the cause of Polish freedom and independence, like Chopin before him, but he also undertook the statesman's role as first Premier of the Polish Republic following World War I. Subsequently, his feeling for Polish independence was so profound that he declined to give public musical concerts during World War II when Polish independence had again been snuffed out.

We Americans have an additional tie with Paderewski and the cause of Polish independence through that great American President and spokesman for the principle of self-determination, Woodrow Wilson, who cherished a special concern for Polish independence and a special regard for Ignace Paderewski, who played a heroic role in helping reestablish the Republic of Poland in 1919.

In these difficult days we must all pray and work together to achieve the day when Poland may again occupy its rightful place among the great free nations of the world and when the people of Poland will again be free.

Let no one in the world ever doubt for one instant the continued, burning opposition of the Polish people toward their Soviet tyrants; the demonstration in Poznan yesterday is positive proof of their strong feelings against injustice, degradation, and treatment as slave laborers.

In the meantime, the United States should liberalize its immigration and refugee laws to provide a refuge and a chance for a new life for those who may escape the oppression of the Soviet masters in Poland and in all countries behind the Iron Curtain.

As is true of all truly great men in the history of civilization, Paderewski belonged not only to his native country, Poland, but to mankind, to the universal cause of art, justice, and freedom.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, it is a strangely fateful coincidence that today as we pick up our newspapers and read reports that the people of Poland are rebelling against their Communist masters, we also note that today marks the 15th anniversary of the death of one of Poland's great heroes—Ignace Jan Paderewski.

Had he lived, Jan Paderewski would have been in the van of every new effort to bring freedom to the people of his beloved Poland, as he fought so courageously to do for so many years prior to his death.

The gallant Poles look to the memory of Jan Paderewski as one of the shining beacons on the hard road back to freedom.

Paderewski, as a composer, was world famous. But music came second to his patriotism. At the first premier of the Polish Republic after World War I, he instilled in his people the love of freedom. He died in New York on June 29, 1941, as president of the Polish Parliament in exile.

We salute Jan Paderewski today—and we salue the people of Poland in their never-ending efforts to be free.

PAYMENT FOR CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS ON PUBLIC LANDS IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up my motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1622 were concurred in. The matter has been cleared with the majority and minority leaders.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota, entered on June 22, last, to reconsider the vote by which the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1622, a bill entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes," were agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1622) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out "of the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota"; on page 2, line 5, strike out "$18,383 as reimbursable" and insert "$16,382 as reimbursement"; on page 2, line 7, after "thereof", insert "on other lands"; and on page 2, line 10, strike out "13" and insert "30."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I move that the Senate concur in House amendments Nos. 1, 3, and 4, disagree to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon; and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. MURRAY, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. WATKINS conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMERICAN POWER POLICIES MUST NOT LAG BEHIND THOSE OF THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the power policies of this administration are against the national welfare, when we consider the fact that the administration has yet to propose one new major Federal start in the watershed of the Columbia River system, where lurks over 40 percent of our country's hydroelectric potential.

By contrast, the June 26, 1956, issue of the New York Times declares that the Soviet Union has begun an all-out crash program to add to its power capacity. Today the United States produces 623 billion kilowatt-hours of energy, and the Soviet Union 170.2 billion. But Russia has a 1960 goal of 320 billion kilowatt-hours, and a 1970 goal of 600 billion. This is dramatically symbolized by the fact that Russia has under construction power plants which will be the largest on earth, when completed.

Can we afford to surrender for piecemeal use such vast sites as Hells Canyon, when Russia is tapping to the utmost the sites on its own mighty rivers? Harry Schwartz, Russian editor and expert of the New York Times, has pointed out that "the Kremlin's leaders expect that industry in the Soviet Union will have outproduced the United States by 1970."

We hope that this event never occurs. But hopes are not enough. Policies and programs are needed, too. Is the administration playing ducks and drakes with our national security when it abandons for full development our finest waterpower sites, at a time when Russia is utilizing to the maximum the sites on such rivers as the Volga, the Ob, and the Yenisei? Energy, after all, may decide the industrial race of t he future. Hydroelectric power is the most dependable of all energy sources, because it continues as long as water flows off the mountains, and rain and snow descend from the sky. It does not rely upon fuels which can be depleted like coal, oil, natural gas and uranium. The administration must reverse its present stand against full use and development of the vast power potential of the Columbia River Basin.

WASHINGTON LOWDOWN, BY LARSTON D. FARRAR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on June 13, I made some comments on the floor of the Senate in regard to a book entitled "Washington Lowdown," written by Larston D. Farrar. I have been advised by the publishers of the book, the Signet Book Co., that since June 15, not a single copy of the book can be bought on Washington newsstands.

Mr. President, I am opposed to all forms of censorship, overt and covert. There is strong evidence which seems to indicate a prima facie case that censorship is being extended to this book. It is not a book which is particularly complimentary to the present administration; indeed, it contains a great many critical statements in regard to the administration, in regard to members of the

executive branch of the Government, and in regard to some executive agencies.

Mr. President, I believe we are confronted again with that very basic principle of freedom which Voltaire expressed in more eloquent words, that though we may disagree with what a man says, we should defend to the death his right to say it.

So far as I know, there is no question that the book is free from libelous statements. If it be true that a covert censorship is being practiced against the book by distributors of books in Washington and in other areas of the country, I believe the public should take notice of that kind of dangerous censorship. I feel the book should stand or fall on its own merits, and that the reading public should be able to go to a newsstand and buy the book if it wants to read it.

I have been advised by the publisher this morning that they could sell a great many thousand copies of the book in Washington, D. C., if they could get it on a single newsstand in the city. They said, "If you have any question, Senator, as to what the situation is, go to any newsstand and try to buy the book, and you will be told by the vendors that they cannot obtain a copy of it."

I understand that a similar situation exists in Chicago and in some of the other great population centers. If the representations which have been made to me are true, I believe the American people should express their resentment against this type of covert censorship aimed at the Farrar book.

LUMP-SUM READJUSTMENT PAYMENTS FOR MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, would the majority leader be willing to call up Calendar No. 2311, House bill 9952, at this time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, H. R. 11356, the mutual security bill, be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2311, H. R. 9952.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9952) to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments on page 1, line 7, after the word "duty", to insert "after the enactment of this section and"; on page 2, line 6, after the word "year", to strike out "For the purposes of this subsection, a part of a year that is 6 months or more is counted as a whole year, and a part of a year that is less than 6 months is disregarded." and insert "For the purposes of computing the amount of readjustment payment (1) a part of a year that is 6 months or more is counted as a whole year, and a part of a year that is less than 6 months is disregarded, and (2) any prior period for which severance pay has been received under any other provision of law shall be excluded. There shall be deducted from any lump-sum readjustment payment any mustering-out pay received under the provisions of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 or the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952."; on page 3, line 1, after the word "Defense", to insert "or by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to members of the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy"; in line 5, after the word "duty", to strike out "would be" and insert "is"; at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "would be" and insert "is"; in line 14, after the word "duty", to strike out "would be" and insert "is"; and in line 21, after the word "may", to strike out "subsequently become entitled under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration" and insert "become entitled, on the basis of subsequent service, under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the bill would authorize a system of readjustment payments to members of the Reserve components when they are involuntarily released from active duty after having served at least 5 years of substantially continuous active duty.

The amount of the readjustment payment would be computed by multiplying one-half of 1 month's basic pay of the grade in which the member of the Reserve component is serving at the time of his release from active duty, times the number of years of the reservist's active service, but not more than 18 years. The maximum payment that could result from this computation would be 9 months' pay.

This is not a retroactive bill. It is estimated that the cost would be approximately $11,800,000. It is our hope that enactment of the bill will further contribute to personnel stability in our Armed Forces by affording an element of security to reservists whose services are needed on extended active duty.

The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services. The reason for asking that the bill be passed at this time is to permit men who retire on July 1 to receive its benefits.

I hope the bill will be passed. I ask unanimous consent that a statement on the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

PROVIDING A LUMP-SUM READJUSTMENT PAYMENT FOR MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS WHO ARE INVOLUNTARILY RELEASED FROM ACTIVE DUTY

Mr. President, this bill would authorize a system of readjustment payments to members of the Reserve components when they are involuntarily released from active duty after having served at least 5 years of substantially continuous active duty.

The amount of the readjustment payment would be computed by multiplying one-half of 1 month's basic pay of the grade in which the member of the Reserve component is serving at the time of his release from active duty times the number of years of the Reservist's active service, but not more than 18 years. The maximum payment that could result from this computation is 9 months' pay.

So far as responsible defense planners can now foresee, the active duty strength of our Armed Forces will remain at approximately 2,850,000. The maintenance of this active duty strength requires the service on extended active duty of many members of the Reserve components, especially officers, because of the existing statutory ceilings on the number of Regular officers. There comes a time when some of these reservists must be involuntarily released to inactive duty so as to vitalize the active forces with younger personnel. When this happens, the reservist must readjust himself to civilian life, frequently at a time when employment opportunity is limited and the reservist has passed the age group most desired by private employers. The problems attending such readjustments serve to discourage capable reservists from continuing on active duty when their services are eagerly desired by the Armed Forces and produce very real hardships to many of the reservists concerned. The readjustment payments that this bill would authorize are intended to serve as a monetary cushion in assisting the involuntarily released reservist to relocate and to readjust himself to civilian pursuits.

There are many precedents for the payment of severance or readjustment pay, most of which are now applicable only to members of the Regular components. While section 235 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act authorizes active duty contracts of up to 5 years for reservists and provides a separation payment of 1 month's pay for each year of the contract that is not performed through no fault of the reservist concerned, this authority has not been found practical of utilization by all the military departments and it produces relatively small separation payments in those instances in which it is used. The severance payments authorized in the case of Regular officers who fail of promotion or who are physically disqualified without meeting all of the requirements of the Career Compensation Act for disability retirement pay generally are computed on the basis of 2 months of pay for each year of active duty performed, with a maximum payment of 2 years' pay. Obviously, the payments authorized for Regular officers are in excess of those that would be authorized by this bill for reservists. The rationale for such a distinction is that the reservists who would be affected by this bill may continue to participate in Reserve activities while on inactive duty to qualify for Reserve retirement pay when they reach the age of 60. Presumably, officers who are separated from a Regular component for failure to be promoted or for physical disability would not ordinarily be eligible for reappointment in the Reserve or to qualify for Reserve retirement pay. The separation of Regular officers generally is completed and final and the severance pay is in the nature of an ultimate settlement. Furthermore, the computation of readjustment pay in this bill was formulated in the knowledge that its amount should not be so attractive as to encourage reservists to seek involuntary release, so as to qualify for the readjustment pay, or to discourage them from competing for appointments in the Regular services.

The bill contains provisions that are intended to prevent inequitable receipt of readjustment pay by those who do not deserve it and to avoid duplicate payments for the same service. For example, persons released from active duty voluntarily or because of moral or professional dereliction would be ineligible, as would persons who are immediately eligible for retirement pay upon their release. A person who is eligible

for both readjustment pay and severance pay under other provisions of law would have to elect one or the other. A reservist who is eligible for disability compensation from the Veterans' Administration would be required to elect this compensation or readjustment pay, but not both. Election of readjustment pay would not deprive such a person of any disability compensation to which he might become entitled because of service subsequent to the readjustment payment. Any amounts of mustering-out pay previously received by the reservists eligible for readjustment pay under this bill would be deducted from the amount of readjustment payment, but the years of service on which the mustering-out payments were based could still be counted in computing the readjustment pay under this bill.

The number of years of active duty that may be counted in computing the readjustment pay is 18. This limit was established in conjunction with another provision, which requires approval of the Secretary of the service concerned before a reservist who is within 2 years of qualifying for retirement pay may be involuntarily released from active duty. Since eligibility for retirement pay normally begins after 20 years of active duty, this second provision affords a measure of protection to the reservist who has more than 18 years of active duty.

The committee noted the many requests to make the bill retroactive in effect to cover the reservists involuntarily released after the termination of hostilities in Korea but before enactment of this measure. The committee is not unsympathetic to these appeals but retroactivity presents vexing questions in connection with the selection of a retroactive cutoff date that is fair to all concerned. It also would add substantially to the cost of the bill. For these reasons, the committee has decided not to give retroactive effect to these readjustment payments.

Mr. President, it is our hope that enactment of this measure will make a further contribution to personnel stability in the Armed Forces by affording an element of security to reservists whose services are needed on extended active duty. If there are no questions, I urge approval of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the majority leader for his usual courtesy and helpfulness.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to announce the legislative program for next week.

An order for a call of the calendar on Monday has already been entered. Following the calendar call on Monday, the Senate will consider Calendar No. 2401, H. R. 7089, the omnibus survivors' benefits bill. It is expected that this bill will be followed on Monday or Tuesday by the bill to increase the public-debt limit, H. R. 11740. Also on Monday or Tuesday, we hope the Senate will consider Calendar No. 2039, S. 3449, the airlines capital gains bill.

The following list of bills will also be considered next week, if not on Monday or Tuesday, on Thursday or Friday:

Calendar No. 1987, S. 3457, conveying certain lands to Pierce County, Wash.;

Calendar No. 2163, House Joint Resolution 501, authorizing participation in the NATO Parliamentary Conference;

Calendar No. 2256, H. R. 9842, authorizing the Postmaster General to impound certain obscene mail;

Calendar No. 2285, S. 3743, adding certain land to the Lassen Volcanic National Park;

Calendar No. 2292, H. R. 10230, increasing the revolving coinage fund for minor coins;

Calendar No. 2297, Senate Joint Resolution 165, relinquishing consular jurisdiction in Morocco;

Calendar No. 2299, H. R. 5256, providing for the redemption of unsold migratory bird hunting stamps;

Calendar No. 2304, S. 3665, permitting single final proof prior to survey by Alaskan homesteaders; and

Calendar No. 2313, S. 3903, amending the Agricultural Development and Assistance Act.

Mr. President, in addition to the list of bills which the majority leader previously placed in the RECORD, conference reports, of course, are privileged and may be called up at any time.

I should like to announce that the conferees on the Defense Department appropriation bill have agreed. The House is considering the conference report, and I expect it to come to the Senate momentarily, at which time I shall ask that it be considered.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that a message from the House with respect to the conference report on the Department of Defense appropriation bill has been received.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 29, 1956, p. 11444, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think the House action in agreeing to the conference report is what should be considered by the Senate. I do not want to belabor the Senate by asking for discussion on the report. I move that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from New Mexico what the conferees agreed to with respect to the increased appropriation which was made by the Senate for the Air Force.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The conferees agreed on $800 million for aircraft and related procurement. They agreed on $100 million for research and development. They agreed on $40 million for operation and maintenance. They agreed on $20 million for personnel.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. These were all agreements upon amendments which were added by the Senate, in order to guarantee the continued development of United States airpower, were they not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That was the only justification for the Senate to insist on its amendments, and the House has agreed to the amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. These appropriations were above the Bureau of the Budget estimates, were they not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. They were. As a matter of fact, they were one-fourth less than the amounts actually asked for by General LeMay.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Once more, then, the Senate and House have agreed that the air arm of the defense of the United States should be our primary concern in building up the defensive institution.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is quite clearcut. I assure the Senator from Wyoming that what we had in mind was to take care of the national security, and nothing else.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I congratulate the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations upon the excellent work which he has done.

I remember very well that when I was chairman of that subcommittee in 1951 and 1952 the Senate was unanimous in a yea-and-nay vote for the establishment and extension of airpower.

Mr. CHAVEZ. One significant thing is that 88 Senators voted for the bill. Five others—making a total of 93 out of 96—were announced as favoring the bill, and had they been present they would have voted for it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. During 1951 and 1952 the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who is now the majority leader, and who was then a member of the Committee on Armed Services, also was very outspoken and very effective in carrying out the policy of strengthening the airpower of the United States.

Mr. President, I hope the conference report will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the report be agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table prepared by the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Defense Department appropriation bill, fiscal year 1957, bill summary

Item	Appropriation, 1956	Budget estimates, 1957	House allowance, 1957	Senate allowance, 1957	Conference allowance, 1957
TITLE I—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE					
Salaries and expenses	$13,019,000	$14,500,000	$14,500,000	$14,500,000	$14,500,000
Salaries and expenses, Office of Public Affairs	447,500	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
Total, title I—Office of Secretary of Defense	13,466,500	14,950,000	14,950,000	14,950,000	14,950,000
TITLE II—INTERSERVICE ACTIVITIES					
Claims	11,930,000	12,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
Contingencies	40,000,000	35,000,000	32,500,000	32,500,000	32,500,000
Emergency fund	35,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000
Reserve tools and facilities	100,000,000	(1)			
Retired pay	495,000,000	525,000,000	515,000,000	515,000,000	515,000,000
Salaries and expenses, Court of Military Appeals	361,400	375,000	375,000	375,000	375,000
Total, title II—Interservice activities	682,291,400	657,375,000	643,875,000	643,875,000	643,875,000
TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Military personnel	3,679,095,000	3,585,000,000	3,566,704,000	3,566,704,000	3,566,704,000
Maintenance and operations	2,831,019,000	3,192,000,000	2,954,581,000	2,967,057,000	2,967,057,000
Military construction, Army Reserve Forces	31,611,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	60,000,000	55,000,000
Reserve personnel	141,589,000	223,000,000	215,000,000	215,000,000	215,000,000
Army National Guard	308,239,000	306,000,000	306,000,000	321,492,000	320,162,000
Research and development	333,000,000	410,000,000	410,000,000	410,000,000	410,000,000
National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice	400,000	425,000	297,000	534,000	357,000
Alaska Communication System	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Total, title III—Department of the Army	7,329,953,000	7,761,425,000	7,497,582,000	7,545,787,000	7,539,280,000
TITLE IV—DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY					
Military personnel, Navy	2,486,109,900	2,483,900,000	2,478,316,000	2,478,316,000	2,478,316,000
Reserve personnel, Navy	91,811,000	95,000,000	95,000,000	95,000,000	95,000,000
Navy personnel, general expenses	83,000,000	83,980,000	83,980,000	83,980,000	83,980,000
Military personnel, Marine Corps	650,244,000	647,500,000	647,100,000	647,100,000	647,100,000
Reserve personnel, Marine Corps	20,606,000	26,800,000	26,800,000	26,800,000	26,800,000
Marine Corps procurement	290,190,000	179,000,000	164,000,000	164,000,000	164,000,000
Marine Corps troops and facilities	181,605,000	175,820,000	171,820,000	171,820,000	171,820,000
Aircraft and related procurement	905,602,000	1,732,900,000	1,732,900,000	1,732,900,000	1,732,900,000
Aircraft and facilities	809,632,000	813,400,000	810,772,000	810,772,000	810,772,000
Shipbuilding and conversion	1,387,634,000	1,479,700,000	1,479,700,000	1,479,700,000	1,479,700,000
Ships and facilities	779,685,000	769,040,000	766,040,000	766,040,000	766,040,000
Procurement of ordnance and ammunition	185,842,000	299,000,000	294,000,000	294,000,000	294,000,000
Ordnance and facilities	182,889,000	166,680,000	163,680,000	163,680,000	163,680,000
Ordnance for new construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	28,000,000				
Medical care	62,494,556	61,340,000	61,323,000	61,323,000	61,323,000
Civil engineering	120,069,700	130,100,000	129,600,000	129,600,000	129,600,000
Military construction, Naval Reserve Forces	28,061,400	17,000,000	9,704,000	9,704,000	9,704,000
Research and development	431,933,000	493,000,000	492,000,000	492,000,000	492,000,000
Servicewide supply and finance	303,000,000	289,720,000	289,644,000	289,644,000	289,644,000
Servicewide operations	96,500,000	102,508,000	102,472,000	102,435,000	102,435,000
Naval petroleum reserves	2,851,000	1,212,000	683,000	1,183,000	683,000
Total, title IV—Department of the Navy, general	9,127,759,556	10,047,600,000	9,999,534,000	9,999,997,000	9,999,497,000
TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE					
Aircraft and related procurement	6,306,000,000	6,048,500,000	6,048,500,000	6,848,500,000	6,848,500,000
Procurement other than aircraft	349,862,600	1,177,000,000	1,100,000,000	1,177,000,000	1,140,000,000
Research and development	570,000,000	610,000,000	610,000,000	710,000,000	710,000,000
Operation and maintenance	3,597,496,570	3,786,000,000	3,684,185,000	3,780,185,000	3,724,185,000
Military personnel	3,680,650,000	3,727,000,000	3,718,440,000	3,745,440,000	3,718,440,000
Reserve personnel	43,563,000	59,300,000	59,300,000	59,300,000	59,300,000
Air National Guard	192,191,000	258,700,000	258,700,000	258,700,000	258,700,000
Total, title V—Department of the Air Force, general	14,739,763,170	15,666,500,000	15,479,125,000	16,579,125,000	16,459,125,000
Total appropriations, titles I, II, III, IV, V	31,893,233,626	34,147,850,000	33,635,066,000	34,783,734,000	34,656,727,000

[1] Reappropriation.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMPLETION OF ACTION ON REGULAR APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, agreement by the Senate to the conference report just adopted concludes action on all the appropriation bills with the exception of the foreign-aid appropriation bill. All the regular bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations, under the leadership of the chairman, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the ranking minority member, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], have now moved through the Senate and through Congress. I think the Committee on Appropriations has done outstanding work, and I commend them.

I am informed that a foreign-aid appropriation bill will follow very shortly after we conclude action on the foreign-aid authorization bill.

The distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, and the chairman of various other subcommittees. No Member of the Senate has been more thorough, more efficient, and more capable in his work than the senior Senator from New Mexico.

I think the results he obtained in the conference on the Department of Defense appropriation bill are almost unprecedented. It is rare for the House to agree to the exact amendment which the Senate includes in a bill.

I know that the people of his own State and of the whole Nation are grateful.

As majority leader, I am very happy we have had the cooperation we have received from the diligent members of the Committee on Appropriations and from the distinguished minority leader in making it possible to clear all the departmental appropriation bills before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Texas will yield to me for a moment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I desire to thank the members of the minority who are on the Defense Department Appropriations Subcommittee. They have cooperated to the fullest extent. We have not always agreed, but we have respected the right of disagreement, and I want to make my voice heard, at least at this time, in thanking the members on the minority side of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, with the adoption of the conference report on the Defense Department appropriation bill for 1957, action has been completed by the Congress on all the regular appropriations bills for next year. I have a table which reflects the action of the House of Representatives and the action of the Senate on the budget estimates submitted to each body. The final amount approved for the regular appropriations bills is $52,014,166,315. This amounts to a net increase of $543,722,069 over the budget estimates of $51,470,444,246 submitted to the Senate. The chief reasons for the increase in the amount appropriated over the budget estimates are the folowing: Civil Service retirement and disability fund, $230 million; rivers and harbors and flood-control projects, $38,226,000; Air Force build-up recommended by Senate Appropriations Committee, $900 million.

There are two appropriations bills pending, and the figures on these bills are not reflected in the totals I have mentioned. The budget estimates submitted so far for the supplemental appropriation bill total $3,133,980,325 and the budget estimate submitted for the mutual security program totals $4,859,975,000. It is expected that these two bills will come to the Senate from the House in the near future.

The table does not reflect permanent appropriations, estimated to total $7,564,859,833, which require no further action from Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the details for each department.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Table of regular appropriations bills, 84th Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1957

Bill No. H. R.	Title of bill	House			Senate			Public law, amount as approved	Increase (+) or decrease (−), law compared to budget estimates Senate	Public Law No.
		Budget estimates to House	Amount as reported	Amount as passed	Budget estimates to Senate	Amount as reported	Amount as passed			
11177	Agriculture	$1,987,302,268	$1,983,512,568	$1,983,512,568	$1,989,841,668	$2,016,771,068	$2,018,331,068	$1,993,744,968	+$3,903,300	554
10899	Commerce	1,522,673,000	1,382,003,000	1,382,003,000	1,522,673,000	1,445,566,000	1,446,316,000	1,416,732,000	−105,941,000	604
10986	Defense	34,147,850,000	33,635,066,000	33,635,066,000	34,147,850,000	34,983,734,000	34,783,734,000	34,656,727,000	+508,877,000	
10003	District of Columbia	(182,899,500)	(179,797,800)	(179,797,800)	(182,899,500)	(181,682,050)	(181,687,490)	(181,612,490)	(−1,287,010)	
	Federal payment	22,358,650	22,358,650	22,358,650	22,358,650	22,708,650	22,708,650	22,558,650	+200,000	
9536	General Government	15,014,475	14,849,275	14,849,275	15,014,475	14,969,975	14,969,975	14,969,975	−44,500	578
9739	Independent Offices	5,783,704,000	6,005,157,260	6,010,543,290	5,783,704,000	5,916,997,258	5,925,187,646	5,966,517,826	+182,813,826	623
9390	Interior	426,748,200	415,963,200	415,963,200	435,142,300	433,851,400	433,876,400	423,934,100	−11,208,200	573
9720	Labor-HEW	2,363,648,400	2,296,810,781	2,296,981,781	2,363,885,400	2,372,023,281	2,372,523,281	2,366,380,781	+2,495,381	
11473	Legislative	93,664,903	89,376,450	89,376,450	122,496,933	117,804,058	117,804,058	117,804,058	−4,692,875	624
11319	Public Works	818,501,000	787,453,000	790,758,000	818,501,000	871,886,000	872,186,000	856,727,000	+38,226,000	
10721	State-Justice-Judiciary	598,169,820	541,367,372	541,367,372	599,104,820	556,271,517	556,271,517	548,930,957	−50,173,863	603
9064	Treasury, Post Office	3,649,872,000	3,618,699,000	3,618,699,000	3,649,872,000	3,639,579,000	3,639,579,000	3,629,139,000	−20,733,000	467
	Total	51,429,506,716	50,792,616,556	50,801,478,586	51,470,444,246	52,392,162,207	52,203,487,595	52,014,166,315	+543,722,069	

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to further amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I call up my amendments designated as "6-27-56-E" and "6-27-56-F," which, because they deal with the same subject, I intend to offer consecutively.

First I shall address myself to amendment E——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment should first be stated by the clerk.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, beginning with line 10, on page 25, it is proposed to strike out down to, and including, line 3 on page 26, and in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 2. Statement of policy: (a) The Congress of the United States recognizes that the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered as long as international communism and the nations it controls continue by threat of military action, by the continuous development of airpower and the construction of nuclear weapons, and by the use of economic pressure, internal subversion, or other means, to attempt to bring under their domination peoples now free and independent, and continue to deny the rights of freedom and self-government to peoples and nations once free but now subject to such domination. The Congress therefore declares it to be the policy of the United States to continue, as long as such danger persists, (1) to expand its own airpower through the construction, in accordance with appropriations heretofore or hereafter made by the Congress, of planes, guided missiles, and other advanced weapons, so as to be prepared at all times to resist any attack by Communist power, and (2) to make available to free nations and peoples upon request assistance of such nature and in such amounts as the United States deems advisable and compatible with its own stability, strength, and other obligations, and as may be needed and effectively used by such free nations and peoples to help them maintain their freedom.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the two amendments en bloc?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I did not make that request. I said I would offer them consecutively. Therefore, I am offering first the amendment identified as "E." I want the full time, if it should be necessary.

Now, in order to explain this amendment—and I allow myself 10 minutes for that purpose—I must refer to the statement of policy which the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has adopted as an amendment to the House bill. I congratulate the committee and its chairman, whose record and character have never been exceeded upon the floor of the Senate in all its history. The statement of policy as reported by the committee was directed to making it clear to the world why the United States is authorizing these appropriations for mutual security—appropriations for defense and appropriations for economic aid. I read section 2:

The Congress of the United States recognizes that the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered as long as international communism and the nations it controls continue by threat of military action, use of economic pressure, internal subversion, or other means, to attempt to bring under their domination peoples now free and independent, and continue to deny the rights of freedom and self-government to peoples and nations once free but now subject to such domination. The Congress therefore declares it to be the policy of the United States to continue, as long as such danger persists, to make available to free nations and peoples upon request assistance of such nature and in such amounts as the United States deems advisable compatible with its own stability, strength, and other obligations, and as may be needed and effectively used by such free nations and peoples to help them maintain their freedom.

This is an excellent statement of policy, but it does not go quite far enough, in my judgment. It is fortunate that I have the opportunity of offering my amendment to this section immediately after the Senate has adopted the conference report on the defense appropriation bill of 1957. That bill, by vote now of the whole Congress, has increased the appropriations available for the construction of aircraft and for aircraft pro-

curement and for research, in order that the United States may continue to have a dominant control of the air—not for the purposes of aggression, not to wage war, but to make it clear to all nations that we do have the airpower, which alone can prevent aggression and a third world war.

And so my amendment is a simple one. On page 25 of the bill, after line 14, following the statement of the committee amendment that:

The peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered as long as international communism and the nations it controls continue by threat of military action—

At that point my amendment would add the words—

by the continuous development of airpower and the construction of nuclear weapons.

That is a known fact. No one can deny that Russia, under the Soviet leadership, has been endeavoring to outproduce all the other nations of the world in nuclear weapons, and the Russians so boast.

The amendment reported by the committee recites, on page 25:

The Congress therefore declares it to be the policy of the United States to continue, as long as such danger persists—

Which means as long as danger from communism persists—

to make available to free nations and peoples upon request assistance of such nature and in such amounts as the United States deems advisable and compatible with its own stability—

And so forth. My amendment inserts in the committee amendment, after the words "as such danger persists," the following statement of policy:

(1) to expand its own airpower through the construction, in accordance with appropriations heretofore or hereafter made by the Congress, of planes, guided missiles, and other advanced weapons, so as to be prepared at all times to resist any attack by Communist power.

These are the only changes my amendment makes in the statement of policy. The purpose of those changes is to announce to all concerned—to all the nations of the world, and particularly to Soviet Russia—that it is our purpose, in pursuit of peace, to construct an Air Force which will be so great that it can protect the world from subversion by military force by the Communist power. We dare not risk the danger that the Soviet power may undertake an unnoticed attack upon the United States, such as was undertaken by the Japanese on December 7, 1941.

Mr. President, it seems to me that there can be no doubt on the part of any Member of the Senate, particularly on the part of any member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, whose members have so clearly announced the danger, that today we should by means of adopting this amendment to the committee amendment, make it clear that we intend to keep in effect the appropriations which have been voted this year by the Senate.

We are operating now under limited time, and I wonder whether we can shorten the debate by having the Senator from Georgia state now whether he will accept this amendment. It seems to me there is no controversy regarding it. The peace of the world was preserved when the British Government had control of the seas, but seapower is not now the great and decisive military factor. Today the dominant military power lies with the nation which has the facilities to deliver nuclear weapons at strategic points. There is no doubt that at this moment Russia could send its bombers over the North Pole area to the industrial centers of America, and that could be done without notice. A totalitarian power does not waste time declaring war, Mr. President. As was indicated in World War II, a totalitarian power strikes without notice; and we cannot hope to believe that the time has come when the totalitarian power has changed its spots. If we are to protect the free world against Communist aggression, we must make certain that the United States is not going to abandon the building up of her airpower.

Mr. President, let me ask the Chair how much time I have used.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The Chair is advised that the Senator from Wyoming has used 11 minutes, and has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the former Secretary of the Air Force, and a very distinguished Member of this body, who knows this problem. I yield to him such time as he may wish to use.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, who always has been an ardent advocate of airpower.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming to state briefly exactly the purpose of his amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There are two amendments. The first amendment declares it to be the policy of the United States to continue to expand its airpower as long as Soviet Russia continues to do so. In other words, I want disarmament, but I want disarmament by agreement, and I do not want the United States of America to be in such a position that it may be subject to another sneak attack.

Mr. SYMINGTON. What will the second amendment do?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The second amendment, which I submitted the other day, would provide a new section, section 13, as follows:

SEC. 13. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, in the event any portion of the funds appropriated by the Congress in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1957, for aircraft and related procurement is impounded by Executive order or otherwise and not expended, there shall be withheld from expenditure a corresponding percentage of the unexpended balances of funds appropriated pursuant to authorizations contained in this act.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is the Senator from Wyoming acquainted with the statement made by General Eisenhower on September 25, 1952, in which by implication he criticized the impounding of funds by the previous administration?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am aware that such criticism was voiced.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Nevertheless last year the funds which the Senate appropriated to maintain the Marine Corps at its current strength at that time were impounded by this administration. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. The opinion of the Congress was that the Marines should be kept in a position of greater strength than that which they occupied at the time when the Congress appropriated the funds. But the administration, notwithstanding the Presidential signature to the appropriation bill making the appropriation for the strengthening of the Marines, gave orders that the money should not be expended.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The purpose of the Senator's second amendment is, in effect, to say that improving the air forces, naval forces, and armies of other countries should not be done at the expense of the United States Air Force. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does not the Senator know that in the case of some countries to which military aid is going, we have shipped the planes, but they have not yet trained the pilots; so the planes, in quantities, are lying around idle?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is in a much better position than I am to state the facts. I shall be glad to have him answer his own question in that respect.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think I presented those facts yesterday to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, with respect to one particular case.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is the Senator referring to the situation in Belgium?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am. It is a matter of published record.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Although Belgium has the planes, it does not have the personnel.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Has not trained the personnel.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Let me say to the Senator at this point that a young gentleman from my State, Mr. Larry Johnson, of Casper, Wyo., who was an all-American high-school football player on the Casper, Wyo., high-school team, on which he played center, and who was one of my two appointees to the Air Force Academy, was sitting in the gallery a few minutes ago. He is going to the Air Force Academy. I want to be sure that when he and all the other students at the Air Force Academy are graduated, they will have the material with which to defend themselves and their country.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As the Senator well knows, commanders of all the major commands of the Air Force have stated in testimony released by the Department of Defense, that they are short of planes, that they are short of personnel, and that they are short of bases. That situation has now been recognized by the Congress, which, under the Constitution, has the responsibility to raise and maintain our military establishment.

As I understand it, what the Senator has in mind is that, inasmuch as the Congress has decided on more money for the Air Force, he does not want to see more money given to foreign military establishments if it is to be denied to the United States Air Force through the impounding of funds.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My conviction is that if the United States does not have adequate airpower, the whole world lacks airpower, and a sneak attack on the United States would mean the destruction of freedom. Therefore, I believe it is important that both of these amendments should be added to the bill.

Inquiry at the desk indicates that I have only 13 minutes remaining of the time allotted to me under the unanimous-consent agreement. After I answer the Senator's next question, or after he makes his next observation, I shall ask the opposition to express itself, if there is any opposition.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is an able constitutional lawyer with long experience in this field. What we are really getting into is the question of the right of the President and his aides to thwart the will of the Congress with respect to the size of the Military Establishment.

Is not that true?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Constitution of the United States gives to the Congress the right to make the appropriations. Congress passes the bills. The bills are sent to the President, and when they are signed by the President they become the law of the land. The President then, under his oath of office to execute the laws which are passed by the Congress, with his approval, has no right to impound funds thus appropriated.

Efforts have been made in the past to give the President the power to veto sections or items in appropriation bills. I would be glad to support such an amendment. But when there is no such power in the President, I want to make it explicitly clear that he cannot act in that way. That is totalitarianism. That is executive government.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Last night several Senators stated they were voting only with great reservations for military assistance to Yugoslavia, and they were doing so on the basis of trust in the President. Certainly if the Senate is willing to trust the President in connection with foreign aid, especially foreign military aid, the President should respect the opinion of the Congress as expressed only today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time will be charged to the remaining time of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Chair advise me how much time I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I want the Senators to know what is being offered. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3½ minutes. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am told by Senators who are walking around the Chamber that it may be possible to work out an agreement on the amendment. I therefore ask unanimous consent that my time may be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is trying to state it. Is there objection to the request that the time of the Senator from Wyoming be suspended?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am asking that the time which is now being occupied by Members of the Senate in seeking to come to a compromise upon the amendment may not be taken out of my time. I have only 3 minutes remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Georgia as much time as he may desire to use in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the statement of policy in the bill contains everything that is contained in the proposed amendment, except that the Senator from Wyoming desires to add, as an additional policy statement, that, so long as the threat of communism continues, the United States will build up its airpower and nuclear power, and so forth, for its own security.

As a matter of fact, it would present to the world, on the one hand, an assurance of help, and, with the other hand, carry the deadly threat of nuclear weapons. It has no place in the bill. It ought not to be added to the bill. What our policy is, is a matter for the determination of other committees which have jurisdiction over matters of that kind. If the Senator wishes to press his amendment, I suggest, rather than to continue to debate it on the floor, that we have a yea-and-nay vote on it. I would agree merely to take it to conference, but I would not agree to insist on it in conference, because it is so decidedly inharmonious with the whole purpose of the Mutual Security Act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I now read from page 25 of the bill, beginning at line 10:

> SEC. 2. Statement of policy: (a) The Congress of the United States recognizes that the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered as long as international communism and the nations it controls continue by threat of military action.

I ask the Senator if that language in the bill does not recognize the fact that there is a Communist threat of military action.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from Georgia deny that the Communist threat of military action includes the threat of the use of nuclear weapons?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know about that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Has not the Senator heard reports to that effect?

Mr. GEORGE. The declaration of policy which appears in the pending bill has been contained in all mutual-security bills practically in this form since the beginning. Sometimes it has been rewritten, but all mutual-security acts have carried practically this same declaration.

What I am pointing out is that it does not make very much progress toward the peace of the world to be threatening the world with nuclear weapons. It is not a matter of public policy which the Committee on Foreign Relations should be inserting in the bill. It is a matter for the Committee on Armed Services and for other committees of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that Congress continues to appropriate the money to build the atom bomb?

Mr. GEORGE. I presume so. That comes within the jurisdiction of other committees.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We are talking now about the jurisdiction of the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is the Senate which passes the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course the Senator understands it. Why, then, should not the Senate, after having just agreed to the conference report on the Defense Department appropriation bill, containing the funds, declare now that we intend to continue to build up our own airpower.

Mr. GEORGE. I would get nowhere arguing with the Senator. I merely say that it is wholly inconsistent with the mutual-aid program, a program which we instituted for the purpose of restoring a war-devastated world, to write this sort of threat in the very body of the preamble, so to speak, as a statement of policy. The Senator has other amend-

ments which undertake to force the President to use certain money for the Air Force or to suffer the withdrawal of an equal amount of money provided by the bill to carry out this purpose. The Foreign Relations Committee has nothing to do with atomic energy, and has nothing to do with building nuclear weapons, and has nothing to do with airplanes as such, or with navies, as such. I hope the Senator will not insist on the amendment.

I could not agree to take the amendment to conference unless it were understood that the other amendments he has submitted are to be withdrawn. If that is to be understood, I will agree to take this amendment to conference, but I will very frankly say that I do not think it has any place in the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do I understand the Senator now to say that he will accept the amendment to the declaration of policy and take it to conference?

Mr. GEORGE. I will, provided the other amendments of the Senator are withdrawn.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is only one other amendment which is related to this subject, although I have two other amendments.

Mr. GEORGE. I mean the one that is related to this subject.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am a realist. I see what the situation is. It is 20 minutes to 2 o'clock. Many Members of the Senate are at luncheon and many are attending committee meetings. I know there are several committee meetings in progress from which it is not possible to draw Members at this time. I shall, therefore, in order to get this declaration of policy before the conferees, agree, reluctantly and against my better judgment, not to offer the new section 13 which I had intended to propose, to erect a legal bar against the impounding of funds appropriated by Congress only today for the defense of the United States.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am willing to take the amendment to conference, with the statement I made for the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the time on the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which is at the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 38, between lines 18 and 19, it is proposed to insert the following:

(e) Add the following new section:

"SEC. 515. Provisions of this act authorizing the appropriation of funds shall be construed to authorize the granting in any appropriation act of authority to enter into contracts, within the amounts so authorized to be appropriated, creating obligations in advance of appropriations."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, and subject, of course, to further advice by the department heads who have to deal with this problem, I shall be willing to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does it provide for money not appropriated for contracts?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It merely gives to the Appropriations Committee the authority to use the contract authority within the limits of this bill, if it sees fit to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back our time on the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back our time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have one more amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, in section 8 (a) which amends section 401, to add the following new paragraph:

(4) In the next to the last sentence of section 401 (a), which imposes a cumulative ceiling on the use of funds without voucher, strike out "$50 million" and insert "$55 million."

(5) Add to section 401 the following new subsection:

"'(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $5 million, to remain available until expended, to enable the President in his discretion, through programs of information, relief, exchange of persons, education, resettlement, to make grants to private nonprofit organizations engaged in keeping alive the will for freedom, and by other material means to encourage the hopes and aspirations of peoples who have been enslaved by communism.'"

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the committee, so far as I am able to speak for it, is willing to accept this amendment and take it to conference. I think it is a meritorious amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does it increase the appropriation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would increase the authorization of the unvouchered funds.

Mr. President, the amendment has the support of the Secretary of State expressed in a letter addressed to me.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back our time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. I call up my amendment identified as "6–28–56—C."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 14. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this act, such provisions shall not be construed to authorize the appropriation for the fiscal year 1957 of amounts aggregating in excess of $3,270,075,000.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last evening 27 Senators voted for the Long amendment which provided for a reduction of approximately $2 billion. I now offer my amendment reducing the amount by $1 billion.

Because of my temporary disability, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read a statement which I have prepared in connection with the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection to the reading by the clerk, because of the condition of the Senator's eyes, if it may be understood that it will be within the time limitation.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I understand, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has 30 minutes. If the clerk uses the 30 minutes and has not concluded within that time he will discontinue reading, or there will be extra time yielded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Is there objection to the unanimous consent request? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read the statement of the Senator from North Dakota.

There being no objection, the legislative clerk read as follows:

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, once more, almost as inexorably as death and taxes, the mutual security bill is with us this year for Senate action. Once again, as it has been asked every year since 1948, this body is asked to approve enormous expenditures of the people's money for a program which—I do not care how many times it may be denied—has lost the confidence of the American people. The point has been reached, Mr. President, when even its most fanatical supporters can no longer suppress their misgivings as to the soundness and effectiveness of a foreign policy which is predicated upon a profligacy of the public funds, and little else. I think it is about time we appreciated that this is the people's money we are throwing away—I say "throwing away" advisedly—and that the people are getting fed up with the entire business. As I shall attempt to demonstrate somewhat later in this statement, the people have good reason to be fed up.

I have repeatedly voted against the mutual security bills, and I intend to do so again this time. When the basic legislation, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, came before us, I voted against it in the Foreign Relations Committee, and I filed

a report setting forth the reasons for my dissent. It is not my purpose here to review all the considerations which I detailed in support of my dissenting views. Suffice it to observe that, among other things, I protested against furnishing new M–47 tanks to Yugoslavia's Tito; to a nation which is not particularly devoted to the cause of democracy; to a nation which was—and still is—unreliable and which might someday even direct against us the power we furnished it.

Oh, I know, this was said to be a calculated risk. It is now beginning to be clear that this was a miscalculated risk; and many a people has wound up in chains for errors of this kind. Mr. President, it is about time we stopped conducting foreign relations on the basis of a haphazard arithmetic which hardly passes for statesmanship.

I protested, too, against the pouring out of billions for military equipment for people overseas; and against the tremendous sums spent to maintain American troops and bases abroad, while neglecting our own military bastions in the United States. I protested against the dissipation of our national resources—resources which were once thought inexhaustible, but which, alas, we realize now are by no means unlimited. Like a great many other people who were concerned lest we spend our way into the economic collapse which the Soviet Marxists confidently predict, I worried over the grevious debt load of the United States. I protested against this load which should have been substantially reduced by this time, during the 10 years of postwar prosperity we are now supposed to be enjoying at inflated prices. If that debt load could not be whittled down during these years of high-level income, what shall we anticipate in lean years? Repudiation?

I pointed out in my report 2 years ago that we must no longer be deceived about NATO; that it was time we recognized it was a flat failure, and that, despite a thousand assurances to the contrary from our military leaders, the forces at the disposal of that organization could never offer any real obstacle to a determined push by 175 divisions of Soviet troops backed, as they are today, with atomic weapons. No, Mr. President, there is only one real deterrent to Soviet aggression, and that is the armed might and the economic solvency of the United States; and the fear of Russian leaders that though they might bomb the cities of Europe or of this country into radioactive dust, they would in turn be reduced to rubble by our own airpower. Today, NATO's disintegration has become self-evident even to our Secretary of State, who has been proposing methods for reinvigorating it along other than military lines.

Against all this scattergun squandering of tax money, I protested; but above all, I protested against the fundamental principles on which the so-called mutual-security bill is founded. The entire program is based upon a misconception as to how we should proceed in order to safeguard the security of our Nation. Somehow, the policymakers of our country for the past 8 years have managed to persuade the American people and their Representatives in Congress that the only way to insure the security of the United States is by putting vast sums of money and arms at the disposal of foreign governments, many of whom, when the chips are down, are found in our adversaries' camp on important international issues. It is a curious conception—this notion that our security can be increased directly in proportion to the amount of money we spend abroad. It seems to involve two primary assumptions, both fallacious: First, that by giving away large amounts of money we would make friends of countries in those areas which are in dire need. We are coming to appreciate, to our sorrow, the fallacy of this assumption; high authority recently admitted that we should not expect any more than that these countries remain neutral. We found we could not buy their friendship; now we hope our aid program will at least preserve their neutrality in the latest phase of this coexistence battle of which we have heard so much from Khrushchev and his cohorts.

We should not be surprised at these developments. As it usually happens, generosity to friends results in loss of both money and friends.

The second erroneous assumption in this approach to security is that by furnishing military aid to friendly countries we may thereby build a strong military bulwark of freedom, against overt and subversive aggression. This assumption is still reflected in the current mutual security bill, which provides more than 3 times as much military as economic aid, as though nothing had been learned at all in the past 5 years about the nature of the enemy we face, and how that threat should be met. The policy planners are drifting blithely along, ignoring that all the trends in Europe are away from, not toward, increased military security; ignoring that the German people are most reluctant to conscript the divisions we thought we would have for NATO; ignoring that the French have moved all their infantry to North Africa in a "first things first" reaction to national interest; ignoring that even the British are seriously thinking of abolishing conscription; yes, ignoring almost everything of any relevance to the problem before us except the same blind course of spending more and more money on military aid.

Mr. President, in the past 2 years I have seen nothing to make me believe I was wrong in opposing the Mutual Security Act of 1954, or to feel that I should now change my position. No effort whatsoever has been made by the executive branch to reexamine the sterile policy it is following, or to challenge the assumptions we have been asked to swallow. On the contrary, the administration this year has asked for a bigger authorization, for more extended control, with nothing to justify it except the same worn-out slogans that have been tossed at us year after year.

And the program has become almost a disease of the National Government. It has become a habit, from which no relief is promised. If there was the slightest basis for hoping that the pending request would mark the end of this drain on American wealth, then, even though the program itself be badly planned, there might be some excuse for accepting it. But there is no such hope. I know what will happen and what has happened on this floor. One of my colleagues after another will rise to declaim that this is the last time he will vote for the program—at least, until the subject has been thoroughly reexamined. He will protest against the bill as bad legislation. But he will vote for it. And why? Because we have been sold a bill of goods, an excuse for a policy where there is no real policy. We have been given no choice, except a wrong one.

If ever, Mr. President, there was a program that called for an "agonizing reappraisal," it is the euphemistic monstrosity called the Mutual Security Act. Yet only now, after 8 years of a cavalier largesse with the people's hard-earned money, are we beginning to perceive that there must be something very wrong with what we have suffered to continue away beyond reason. Only now are we convinced that a complete examination must be made of the program.

Last Monday the Senate Foreign Relations Committee approved a resolution which would provide for an objective and impartial investigation of the entire aid program. It is a pity such a resolution was not adopted by the Senate at least 5 years ago. Both our prestige and our people would have been the richer. The worst of it is that there is no proof, other than unverified assertion, that our security would not have been equally as advanced, or retarded, as it is today. In fact, there is disturbing evidence that we are in a weaker position internationally than we were 2 years ago.

I know that the people of my own State have long since had enough of this mutual aid—or, as it is more accurately called, "foreign aid." They have been unconvinced by the battery of arguments thrown at them that there is anything mutual about it. They know it is a one-way street. They know it for what it really is, aid to foreign people, to foreign governments, which is taken out of their pockets. This draining of their resources hits them in two ways, first by depriving them directly of things they could buy for themselves, and second, by contributing to the inflationary process which operates every time vast sums are expended in nonproductive goods. Yet, at the very time when farmers are being driven to the wall, when small-business men are going broke, when a rebellion is brewing throughout the country against the weight of a murderous taxload, the administration has the temerity to ask for more billions. Stupidity in foreign relations is compounded by callous indifference to the welfare of our own people.

Mr. President, I have always believed it to be right for Americans to give assistance to people abroad whenever they are struck by a catastrophe or are in grave distress. The world knows, or should know, how generous Americans are by nature. But the first obligation of the American Government is to its

own citizens. The first duty of the American family is to itself. We are not here to remake the lives or the society of other peoples. In our effort to do so we have alienated friends, kindled resentment, and aroused jealousy of our material possessions. Just what this has cost us in cold cash, just what it has cost each individual American, we shall see in a moment, when we consider the staggering sums that have been spent striving for a supposed worldwide security, a venture which has produced considerable suspicion as to our motives. We should have remembered that extravagance often breeds contempt, among nations as well as individuals. Altruism without ulterior motives is something that most backward areas of the world, with their colonial history, simply do not understand.

On June 16, Mr. President, the Secretary of State delivered an address at Iowa State College, in which he denied that the taxpayers' money has been spent on so foolish an effort as to seek either gratitude or subservience.

After blandly asserting that the foreign-aid program was successful, he said:

> Our policies command wide respect abroad, because of their intrinsic merit. But the success of our foreign-aid program is to be tested, not by gratitude, not by subservience, but by whether it makes more vigorous the freedoms elsewhere that buttress the freedom of ourselves. By that test, our program works.

Mr. President, this is a most astonishing statement. Neither by Mr. Dulles' test, nor by any other objective standard, can the foreign-aid program be characterized as a success. In fact, by almost any measuring rod it is an abysmal failure, and at an appalling cost. To say that our policies—any of our policies—have been a howling successs in the face of the new Soviet dynamics, is to float in a pharisaical dream world.

Far from capturing any initiative in the cold war—or in its new seductive model of competitive existence—we have been captured by a snare of our own making, victims of a delusion that this thing called foreign aid can be a universal substitute for sound diplomacy and realistic thinking.

I submit, Mr. President, that one of the cardinal objectives of a foreign policy should be to keep old friends, win over new ones, and impress upon other nations—whether they be neutral or allied governments—the conviction that it is to their greatest advantage to conform their own policies to the great objectives of world peace and the independence of all nations, which we pursue. It might be worth while to cast a quick glance at some of the critical areas of the world, just to see how successful American foreign-aid policy has been.

The Middle East is one area that permits of no complacency by anybody. We have all been deeply concerned over the path which Egypt's leaders have been following in the past months. Economic aid programed for Egypt during fiscal 1955 and 1956 was fixed at approximately 100 million dollars. Presumably, one of the prime goals of our policy should have been to prevent Egypt from being drawn into the Soviet orbit. Has our policy been successful? Just read the daily newspapers. In one of the most strategically vital areas of the globe, where the fate of civilization has repeatedly been determined throughout history, our policy—or lack of policy—has been a rank, dismal and tragic failure. We have lost Nasser, despite the foreign aid program; and we lost him because our diplomacy in the Middle East during the past few years is a bewildering illustration of a floundering policy in Washington that has brought us into disrepute all over the world. Diplomacy—not dollar aid—would have salvaged that situation in Egypt, and the records of the Department of State will prove it. We lost Nasser because we refused to sell him arms he could pay for in pounds, and at a time when we knew the alternative before him was to purchase munitions from the Iron Curtain. The path to peace in the Middle East is not through foreign aid; but through a hard diplomacy that knocks recalcitrant heads together in a definitive arbitral settlement of the Arab-Israeli crisis; a diplomacy that sternly warns these lilliputian nations that we simply will not tolerate any more of their sabre-rattling, much less full-scale warfare. But let us keep on drifting, and we are apt to find ourselves confronted with another Mussolini in North Africa.

The crowning irony of this whole wretched episode is that it had to be left to the Soviet Union to arrest the drift toward war in the Middle East, not for any "peace-loving" considerations, but for reasons of its own national and international aspirations. Our government sat on its hands, apparently fearful to move in any direction, fearful to show positive determination, lest it offend either party, hoping that someone else would resolve the crisis, or that it would go away like a bad dream.

We really showed a "recaptured initiative" on that one, did we not? Soviet action alone permitted the limited, temporary success attained by the Hammerskjold mission. And here we are, still sitting on our hands, though the crisis remains with us; though the Arab-Israeli sore is festering; though the plight of Palestine refugees worsens; and though the Nasser regime has made it clear it will, when ready, smash at Israel with all the Soviet equipment it commands. Does anyone think that because we refrained from "offending" Nasser, his glandular reactions toward us will be more sugary and affectionate? Greece offers additional proof that our foreign aid program is a poor substitute for an intelligent, forthright diplomacy. Despite the millions upon millions we have poured into that country, Greek-American relations have been steadily deteriorating. But the Russians come along when a segment of Greek agriculture is threatened; all they do is buy up a few orange and lemon crops, and immediately grateful praise is tendered to them as the saviours of the Greek farmer. The same nauseating picture is repeatedly encountered elsewhere.

About the best that can be said of our foreign-aid accomplishments in the Far East is that, although we are still bumbling along, we have not yet been thrown out of that area. But can it honestly be said that our aid policy has promoted brotherly understanding and strengthened the cause of peace? On the contrary, our predominantly military programing, designed to support an unrealistic association of infirm nations, has fanned old irritations and provoked suspicions as to the intentions of the SEATO powers. SEATO is a formula, not a structure; it is mere verbiage, devoid of any substantial vitality apart from the armed power of the United States.

Military aid to Pakistan enrages its Indian neighbor, and vice versa. Economic assistance freely given without strings, and even when on a nonreimbursable basis, is taken for granted with little or no credit acknowledged to the United States; whereas the hard business propositions extended with a wave and a flourish by the Soviet Union are acclaimed by the people as an unselfish contribution, from a nation whose motives are always ulterior.

If there is one nation on the face of the earth that at least should not show consistent hostility to the United States, that nation is India. It was our powerful support that pressured the British into granting India complete political liberty. We have felt a certain responsibility for the continued independence of that country. We have given India almost half a billion dollars in aid. Surely, one would think, this should have been sufficient to deter anti-Americanism among the Indian people. Alas, nowhere else on earth are America's motives more suspect; nowhere else are we more disliked—except in the Soviet Union itself—than in India. Yet, I do not say that nations—particularly those struggling to find their way—should be pressured into joining us as allies. Such tactics would only alienate our friends. What I do say is that these nations, while professing neutrality, should not be openly hostile in word or deed while supping at our table. When has Nehru ever indicated his support for our position, as opposed to the Soviets, on vital international issues? No propaganda against us is too extreme for Indian acceptance, whether it be bacteriological warfare, or racial hatred. Oh, I know, we are told we must not expect the Indians to take our side; our objective must be only to maintain India's independence. This, it is asserted, will be a victory for the free world. I can agree with that proposition, Mr. President; but I submit that there is not a scintilla of evidence to demonstrate that we are unable to achieve the very same result, perhaps even more effectively, by means other than this incredible squandering of public money. If that be our objective, we are not only pursuing wrong methods, but we are paying a fantastic price.

Much the same can be said for our policy in Indonesia. In our supreme altruism, we literally tore that archipelago from the Netherlands, before the native population was ready for the responsibilities of nationhood. Yet there,

too, we not only will not win any popularity contest, but the coloration of Indonesia's political future is altogether obscure.

Mr. President, when I reflect upon the myopic course of our policies in the Far East, I am depressed. We started making mistakes with respect to China and Japan back in 1931, and apparently we have not learned anything from the errors of the past 25 years. Those mistakes embroiled us in a war with Japan. They involved us in a terrible war with Communist China which, as I see it, could have been avoided by a sound policy toward the Chinese Communist government at the beginning, no matter how much we detested it.

Why has not someone had the courage to get up on this floor and admit that we made a ghastly blunder in our China policy after the Communists gained control of the mainland? With 96 Senators in this Chamber, why have not any of us attempted to challenge the course which both Democratic and Republican administrations have clung to as gospel since 1950, so that the barest suggestion that there might have been an alternative is treated as heresy? Why did we not perceive, once China had fallen to the Communists, that we had an opportunity to help shape the future course of that country—even though it be Communist—in ways less detrimental to our security than the course we have pursued?

Why could not we realize, Mr. President, that it was to our national interest to drive a wedge between Stalin and Mao Tze-tung, to win the Chinese leader over to our side, or at least to a neutral position, instead of driving him closer and closer to the Soviet Union by a blind-alley concept of foreign relations? Why could not we have sought to make China less instead of more dependent upon the Soviet Union? When the Communist regime took over, they were starting almost from scratch, industrially. It might have been American equipment, American technicians, American replacement parts on which the government of Mao has to rely. Now it is probably too late to salvage anything from this self-defeating policy. We are stuck with it.

Oh, I know, we do not like Red China. We do not like murderous revolutionaries, gangsters, and criminals. But it was not so long ago, Mr. President, that we felt the same way about the Japanese people, and about the German people. They, too, were barbarians. They conducted a Bataan death march, remember? They raped our nurses; they burned people in gas chambers. Yet today we have clasped them to our bosom as defenders of the free way of life.

It is no tribute to statesmanship to make enemies, or to keep them when it is no longer in the national interest. And it is stupidity to retain a policy when events make clear that the policy injures the national interest. That point, I submit, has been reached with respect to our foreign aid program, as it has been operated in the Far East and in Europe.

It is anything but reassuring to survey the results of that program in Europe. I have already referred to Yugoslavia. Perhaps the recent realinement of Tito with the Soviet Union—and make no mistake about it, it is a realinement—could have been anticipated in view of Yugoslavia's evolving trade pattern. Last year, the U. S. S. R. was fifth in importance among all Yugoslav markets. A considerable increase in that trade is inevitable as a result of its latest, extensive credit agreements with the Soviet bloc. Foreign aid put Yugoslavia back on its feet—so that it could march side by side with the U. S. S. R. in a more proliferating pan-Russian commonwealth.

One of the principal beneficiaries of the aid program in Europe has been France. Since 1949, the French have received from us over $3 billion in military assistance and approximately $3.2 billion in straight economic aid. About $500 million in military aid from 1950–56 funds is still to be delivered. In addition to all this, Mr. President, we gave them during fiscal 1955 and fiscal 1956 something over $800 million in military supplies specifically for the conduct of their war in Indochina. This comes to a grand total of over $7.5 billion for France alone, since 1949. All of this, of course, came out of the pocket of the American taxpayer.

Now, just what did all that financial and military support accomplish? Is the French internal political and economic situation more favorable than it was when the program was started? Has the French economy been placed upon a sounder footing? Or would it not be in a healthier position today if the French people had been forced by circumstances to put their own house in order, as did the Belgians and Dutch, who suffered great devastation?

Mr. President, I was always under the impression that the purpose of granting military aid to France, at least initially, was to strengthen that country as a force for NATO and the defense of Europe. How has France used this strength? It has been spewed out on the battlefields of a colonial war in Indochina which became transmuted into another war with the Chinese Communists. Hundreds of millions of dollars in equipment were abandoned in Vietnam, and are still in the process of being recovered by our military teams.

At the present time, France is using our military aid to retain control over her colonial empire in Algeria—or to suppress an insurrection—depending upon the way one looks at it. And today, France is a weak link in NATO. My personal conviction is that so far as another war in Europe is concerned, we have no business counting on the French military power for any purpose. This is a simple sociological deduction, drawn, among other things, from the awesome bloodletting France sustained in the First World War, and the history of the Second World War.

Mr. President, I have no desire to extend this review of the reasons why I am voting against the foreign-aid program. But there are some hard facts upon which we must reflect before deciding to continue a policy as demonstrably ineffectual as this one. The facts are these:

From 1940 to 1955, we furnished a net total of over $94 billion in aid to other governments. If we include the amounts expended during the current fiscal year, that total becomes more than $101 billion. Do all of us fully realize what this means to the people of the United States? Taking an average population base of 140 million people during that 15-year period, every man, woman, and child in our country contributed over $720 to foreign aid. In somewhat different terms, from the pockets of every family of four persons, the Government seized over $2,880 to provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare of nations all over the globe. Think of it, Mr. President: almost $3,000 per family. And this was saddled on the American taxpayer in addition to $12 billion in grants and credits which we furnished to Europe after World War I, when the dollar had far more value.

We who are the elected agents of the people in Congress are the custodians of their wealth. This wealth is a sacred public trust. I dispute bitterly that we are discharging our trust when we invite every nation on earth to drain the people's birthright for this foreign-aid program.

There is so much that needs to be done inside our own country for the welfare of our people—apart from building American military might—which only a small portion of this money could accomplish. One-tenth of the sum thus far expended would have paid enormous dividends in medical research, and directly contributed to the strength of America. Mr. President, there are over 9 million of our people who are receiving treatment for arthritis. Five million of these individuals require financial assistance, if they are to be treated. The incidence of heart disease and cancer is too familiar to require comment here. Does anyone doubt that a fraction of the sum spent on foreign aid would have permitted great strides to be made in conquering these ailments, as we are now eradicating polio?

It was not long ago that we were very complacent about our technological advancement. Suddenly we find that Soviet output of highly skilled engineers far exceeds our own. We are in short supply, while the Soviets have an exportable surplus. We should be investing money in projects designed to overcome our deficiencies in the training of engineers and technical personnel, if we are to meet this Soviet challenge. And we should be spending it on crash programs in aircraft and missiles, as well as atomic development, before the Soviets have achieved a decisive advantage, if they have not already done so.

I see very little in the record to induce me to accept blindly assertions from any quarter, whether it be military or political, about our alleged superiority in atomic or other weapons over the Soviet Union. Last year—according to information given us when the foreign-aid bill was being considered—we were supposed to posses a vast margin of superiority over the Soviet Union in long-range bombers, and an almost unchallengeable position with respect to medium bombers. Yet where are we, in fact, today?

According to the most reliable figures available, the United States has 1 wing of B–52's—between 35 to 45 planes—that are combat ready, in comparison with some 90 to 100 Soviet bombers in the same class. In the medium bomber category, the Russians are rapidly overhauling us, with 2,000 planes to our 3,000. Our vaunted primacy of B–47's has dwindled to 1,000 airplanes. In the remaining two important categories, we are an also-ran. The Soviet light jet bombers outnumber ours by a margin of 5 to 1; and in the vital combat category of jet fighters, the Soviet planes outnumber ours by a margin of at least 7 to 1, for in this category the Soviets possess from 12,000 to 15,000 planes. On Tuesday, it was reported from the Moscow air show that the Soviets had unveiled a supersonic twin-engine bomber, something we do not yet have.

All of us are aware of these facts. I think we can also assume that the regime which turned out the MIG–15, can also make first-rate bombers. The truth of the matter is that the Soviets have been quietly pushing a crash program in air power, in atomic power, and in naval power, ever since the end of the World War II.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). The time yielded to the Senator from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 1 more minute on the bill to the Senator from North Dakota, so that his speech may be completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for an additional minute on the bill.

The legislative clerk read the remainder of Mr. LANGER'S speech, as follows:

Mr. LANGER. To what have we been devoting the maximum of our effort? To foreign aid. This foreign aid will, indeed, be great protection for our surface vessels against Russian submarines.

Mr. President, the battle with Soviet communism is being lost in the schools of this Nation; it is being lost in our laboratories; and it is being lost in our aircraft factories. But what is much worse, that battle is being lost on the floor of the Senate. If the foreign-aid program could be said to have created even a small portion of the security it was supposed to provide, I might feel differently about the cost to our people. What is so serious is that we could have developed a much more impregnable position in force—which the Russian leaders understand—with far less drain on our people.

I have no illusions, Mr. President, that anything I may say here will prevent the passage of this bill. Yet my convictions compel me to vote against it. I must vote against it because only if we deprive our policy planners of the means to perpetuate the foreign-aid program will they perhaps be driven to develop a foreign policy which will be truly in the national interest, a foreign policy which will take the place of the miserable excuse for sound and diplomatic action embodied in the foreign-aid program.

Following the reading of Mr. LANGER'S speech,

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to my amendment to the committee amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the request for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The Senator from Alabama will state it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. From whose time would the time required for a quorum call be taken?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the Senator from North Dakota has no time which can be used for a quorum call.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall take only a little time to discuss the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota to the committee amendment, because I think all the pertinent facts were well presented to the Senate during the debate on yesterday by the very able chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the other members of the Foreign Relations Committee and other Members of the Senate.

The net effect of the amendment submitted by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota would be to cut the amount requested by the administration by $1,400,000,000. The amendment would cut it $1 billion below the amount reported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and would cut it $400 million below the amount voted by the House of Representatives.

I certainly believe that a majority of the Senate would feel that such a cut as that would be entirely too drastic.

Furthermore, it would be a blanket cut, and I wish to point out that there is no way of knowing where it would apply; although by the very nature of the bill itself, the principal cut would come in the military aid item, because 80 or 85 percent of the program consists of military aid. A great part of that military aid—much greater than has been the case in past acts providing mutual-security funds—goes to Asia, and particularly to Formosa and some of the other countries in that area, which I believe the great majority of the Senate would like to see strengthened. The same thing is true with reference to Korea.

Only a little more than a year ago the Senate virtually handed to the President of the United States the right to use American forces in Korea if necessary to defend that country. The purpose of the heavy aid which we offer to Formosa in the pending bill is to provide for the building up of the strength of that country. I think it is certainly not stretching the imagination to say that it might mean the difference between the ability of Formosa to defend itself, and our having to use American boys to defend Formosa, which the Senate indicated its willingness to do a little more than a year ago.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that only a few days ago the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, said that this appropriation could easily stand a $1 billion cut?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not talk with the Senator from Georgia myself, but I saw him quoted in the press. I take it for granted that that is his personal view. The distinguished Senator from Georgia, whom we all admire and respect, was expressing his own personal opinion. He did not sit through the hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee during the weeks we sat there.

Furthermore, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota knows that we invited the Senator from Georgia to appear before the Foreign Relations Committee and state his views. I do not know why he did not appear. Be that as it may, I was pointing out the fact that a great part of this money does go to such places as Formosa and Korea. We are called upon to support those countries. They are maintaining their own defense, but a burden is imposed on their economies which they are unable to carry without the funds provided in this bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that yesterday the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, voted for a cut of nearly $2 billion proposed by the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. LONG]?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct; but I am not certain he would have done so had he attended the hearings of the Committee on Foreign Relations and studied the problem at first hand, as our committee did. The majority of the committee decided on the action which should be taken on this bill.

Mr. President, I merely wished to point out those few facts. I am not adding anything to what has been said before. We are confronted with a problem. No one wishes to see the continuation of this program beyond the time when it is absolutely necessary. Every one of us would like to see the appropriation reduced as much as it can be reduced. After hearing the testimony, and after discussing it among ourselves, the decision which the Committee on Foreign Relations reached was that in these perilous times the program could not stand any such cut as has been proposed.

Mr. President, it is not my desire to take any further time of the Senate. Unless some other Senator wishes to speak against the amendment, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been exhausted or yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 11 (c), on page 52, line 19, in the committee amendment before the word "substitute", it is proposed to insert the following: "strike out 'section 110 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law 778, 83d Cong.)' and insert 'section 108 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1956 (Public Law 208, 84th Cong.).'"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This is purely a techical amendment to the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to know the date and designation of this amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will hear me through, I will explain it.

Mr. FLANDERS. I merely wish to know what we are talking about.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The amendment has not been printed.

This amendment would correct an error in the bill. Section 11 (c) of the bill contains an amendment to section 548 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 extending for another year the limitation of section 548 on the amount of unobligated and unreserved funds which may be carried forward to the fiscal year 1957. Section 548 now refers to section 110 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1955—Public Law 778, 83d Congress. This reference is now out of date because section 110 was repealed by and is now superseded by section 108 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1956—Public Law 208, 84th Congress. Section 548 should therefore be corrected to refer to section 108 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1956. This amendment will make that correction.

I repeat that this amendment is of a purely technical, perfecting character.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is time desired on the other side?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, under the circumstances, after listening to the description of the amendment by the distinguished Senator from Montana, I see no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana desire further time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield back the remaining time on this side.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield back all time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been exhausted or yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 9 (b) on page 38, line 4, in the committee amendment it is proposed to strike out the remainder of the sentence after the word "Congress," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "strike out 'Joint Committee on the Economic Report' and insert 'Joint Economic Committee and the Senate Select Committee on Small Business.'"

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this is a technical amendment. Only a few days ago the President signed an act changing the name of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to the Joint Economic Committee. This amendment would merely correct the name of the committee in the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I can see no possible objection to the amendment. If the Senator from Alabama will yield back his time, I will yield back all my time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield back all my time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield back all time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been exhausted or yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] on the bill.

SENATOR GEORGE SOUNDS TRUMPET CALL TO FREE WORLD

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, no one could have heard the eloquent address by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] on June 27 without being impressed. I am convinced that this great patriot voiced the best interests of our country and of the free world when he urged that we continue the programs which have been so successful in recent years toward helping other nations in their efforts to build a stronger economic future for their peoples, and toward joining many of them in building defenses against the military threats of Soviet and Chinese expansionism. The Nation is, indeed, fortunate that the eminent chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has undertaken an important new role in the essential task of the further development of the Atlantic Community, which is the core of these defensive arrangements and of the whole free and democratic world.

For the reasons advanced so ably by Senator GEORGE, I intend, without partisanship, to support the Eisenhower administration in its requests for the continued operation of the mutual security system. Costly as this system is, Mr. President, it is 100 times preferable—nay, 1,000 times preferable—to an armed garrison state or to an ultimate withering, castastrophic war.

However, Mr. President, many residents of my region are disturbed over one inconsistency between the administration's domestic policies and its mutual security program. They do not understand why that program encourages and supports with United States funds the construction of multipurpose hydroelectric power and irrigation projects in foreign lands, while the Eisenhower administration regards the investment of the United States funds in such projects under the same circumstances as inimical to the welfare of our own Nation.

WHY HIGH DAMS FOR FORMOSA, BUT NOT FOR NORTHWEST?

Because of the beneficence of the Almighty, the American Northwest is blessed by the presence of the mightiest source of waterpower on our continent. More than 40 percent of the potential hydroelectricity of the United States lurks within the watershed of the Columbia River. This vast stream carries down to the sea 180,000,000 acre-feet of water. It is as much as the key to the economic future of our as yet undeveloped region as any similar river system abroad.

But, Mr. President, this administration has decided that public investment in dams to tap the water resources of the Columbia Basin for power, navigation, and flood control is adverse to our country's best interests, being even so-called creeping socialism.

I do not understand, Mr. President, how this same administration can promote in Egypt, in Formosa, in Afghanistan, in Rhodesia, a policy which the administration considers unfit and unsound in the United States of America.

Therefore, Mr. President, I intend to put to the administration—and to its supporters and spokesmen in this Chamber—a series of questions concerning its promotion of multipurpose power projects under the mutual security system, elsewhere in the world. I want to offer the spokesmen for the administration's policies this opportunity to explain this evident inconsistency. The replies should prove of immense interest to the residents of my State, who have been denied Federal development of the resources of the Columbia Basin by the policies of the Eisenhower administration.

These are some of the questions which I am voicing with respect to the curious contradiction of an administration which thinks United States investment in high dams for power and irrigation is fine for overseas but bad for the United States.

GOVERNMENT POWER ABROAD BUT NO FEDERAL PROJECTS AT HOME

First. From time to time, tables have been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing the extent to which United States foreign-aid funds have, over the past 7 or 8 years, gone into the development of water resources abroad for reclamation, irrigation, and hydroelectric power; and I suppose it is fair to say that such projects are not only consistent with, but are actually among the best examples of our policy to aid the basic, long-term development of under-

developed regions. Is it not the case that this policy will be continued, and that substantial sums under the authorization bill before us may be spent on such water-resources projects?

Second. Does the United States Government impose any conditions whatever on the ownership and control of these projects overseas which are financed by American aid funds, or, for example, of the power generated at them? Is it not a fact that in almost every instance major power dams and reclamation projects abroad are built and controlled by the recipient government? Who will receive the power revenues from these projects?

Third. Much overseas investment of United States assistance funds is channeled through the World Bank—an independent organization financed primarily by the United States. A few days ago, the World Bank signed a loan of $80,000,000 with the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland to build the 500,000-kilowatt Kariba project on the Zambesi River, which will finally cost about $225,000,000. Similarly, both the United States and World Bank assistance has been offered to Egypt for the Aswan project—the high dam on the Nile River. We have also recently undertaken to aid new water-resource developments on Formosa and, I believe, in Afghanistan. Are we insisting that there be participation by private electric utility companies in these projects, built with United States funds, in Egypt? In Formosa? In Afghanistan? In Rhodesia-Nyasaland?

MUTUAL SECURITY SHOULD NOT RULE OUT SAME POLICY HERE

Fourth. Before Federal investment is undertaken in a proposed project inside of this country, the appropriate Federal agencies make exhaustive studies to establish the benefit-cost ratios and the economic feasibility and desirability of such projects. In the case of United States assistance to similar projects abroad, what United States agency assumes responsibility for determining these data before the investment of United States aid funds?

The Department of State no doubt lacks its own experts in these fields. Is it not the case, then, that in underwriting hydroelectric and similar water development projects abroad, we rely on the recipient government to decide where it thinks government funds need to be invested for the best development of its country's resources?

Fifth. In other words, both in our own foreign assistance policies, as in the present bill, and through the World Bank, we encourage governmental projects abroad, without any protests against socialism, or that the government concerned should really let private companies do the job better. How does this square with the administration's attitude toward development of our own American water resources?

Sixth. The Senate is aware that power facilities in most Federal river projects in the United States fully repay the Federal taxpayers' investment, with interest. How do the administration and its spokesmen explain and justify a policy which refuses necessary Federal investment in resource development in our own country, where it would be fully repaid with interest—while making such investments of United States funds in similar projects abroad, which are not to be repaid to the United States? Why this Jekyll and Hyde procedure?

Seventh. I repeat, I support our policy of assisting underdevelopment nations to build the foundations of a modern economy through development of their own natural resources. But in the light of this policy, can the administration, in all fairness, offer any defense to its criticism, as being socialistic and inconsistent with Americanism, of the investment of Federal funds in underdeveloped regions of our own country? Are high dams for export only?

In conclusion, Mr. President, I would like to express my hope and my concern that the economic assistance we give under this bill will actually benefit the average people of the nations to whom the aid goes—for it is these average people, not their rulers, on whom we must rely for future friends and allies in the world, and on whose future depends the fate of mankind, of which they are the largest part. Some of the recent reports of the actual effects of our aid programs have stressed the difficulties and the problems created in the process of applying large-scale American aid in underdeveloped countries in Asia.

For example, in a recent book entitled "Hunza: Lost Kingdom of the Himalayas," Dr. John Clark, a geologist, calls attention to the fact that much of our economic aid fails to make an impression on local communities—at the level of the village and other small units of population, the support of which is probably essential to the ultimate success of our whole foreign assistance program. An example of the problems thus created is also set forth in an illuminating article entitled "Lesson in Foreign Aid Policy," by Peggy and Pierre Streit, in the New York Times Sunday magazine for March 18, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that this article, slightly abridged, be printed in the RECORD at this point, followed by a book review of Dr. Clark's book by Mr. Orville Prescott from the New York Times of June 11, 1956.

There being no objection, the article and book review were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 18, 1956]

LESSON IN FOREIGN AID POLICY: THE LARGEST AMERICAN-SPONSORED DEVELOPMENT IN ASIA PROMISED MUCH TO AFGHANISTAN, INSTEAD IT HAS BECOME A BURDEN AND A WARNING NOT TO TRY TOO MUCH TOO SOON

(By Peggy and Pierre Streit)

KABUL, AFGHANISTAN.—The Helmand Valley irrigation project, the largest American-financed and constructed development in Asia, was conceived in 1950 as a boon to the people of Afghanistan. Since then, this boon has become a bitter burden that seriously threatens the Afghan economy and presents the United States with a critical problem in a politically strategic area.

The history of the Helmand Valley project is timely and valuable for two reasons. First, most of its problems are encountered again and again in underdeveloped countries. And, second, the American techniques of foreign aid, employed with dubious success in Afghanistan, are being used elsewhere in the Middle East and Asia.

American foreign aid policies are now undergoing critical reappraisal in Washington. To a large extent the story of this important but little known project can help make future aid programs more effective.

Afghanistan is a landlocked country, bordered on the north by Russia, on the west by Iran and on the east and south by Pakistan. Her geographical position has long isolated her people, both physically and culturally, from the social and technological developments of both East and West.

Recently, however, with the awakening of the Middle East and Asian countries, Afghanistan has begun to seek economic development of her potentially rich land, primarily by harnessing the waters of her turbulent Helmand River. This river has its source in the Hindu Kush Mountains and then winds for 800 miles through southern Afghanistan into Iran.

Before World War II, the Afghan Government hired Japanese technicians to begin work on a large canal designed to tap waters of the Helmand for cultivation. Work, interrupted by the war, was resumed shortly thereafter, this time with the help of the Morrison-Knudson Co., an American construction firm hired by the Afghan Government. By 1949, however, the Afghans had vastly increased the scope of their plans. They now envisioned the Helmand River project as providing a firm water supply, hydroelectric power, flood control, improvement of old river land and development of approximately 500,000 acres of new land. Here the Afghans hoped to settle a large percentage of their two million nomads, whose perennial wanderings represent a severe drain on the Afghan economy, if not a complete loss.

The Government of Afghanistan turned to the United States Export-Import Bank for assistance in this vast undertaking. In requesting a loan, it sought aid only for the construction of major works—the dams and principal canals. The Afghans undertook to do the rest—to bring the water from the main canals to the land, to prepare the new lands for cultivation, and to settle the nomads. In 1950, on the basis of these assurances and the fact that Afghanistan had a tidy dollar reserve accumulated during the war years, the bank granted a loan of $21.5 million for the development of the Helmand Basin. The loan stipulated that an American constructing company should do the work, and Morrison-Knudson, already on the scene, was hired.

M-K brought to Afghanistan the efficiency of American private enterprise. It acquired its equipment, from nails to 25-ton trucks, from the United States in record time and was able to work steadily without the onerous handicap of having to apply to Congress each year for funds. It utilized the full talents and capabilities of local Afghan labor by establishing a training program, thus substantially reducing costs. Construction costs were held to American standards despite the fact that all equipment had to be shipped 8,000 miles. Two large dams and the irrigation network were completed months ahead of schedule.

Where once there was parched, brown Afghan earth there are now two fresh, blue lakes, and cranes and ducks are nesting where only the desert fox could live. For the first time farmers can rely on a steady supply of water from the Helmand. Last year a drought year, these waters saved a large part of Afghanistan's fruit crop. And whereas in the past farmers have barely been able to reap one crop, they now almost doubled their produce with two yearly plantings. But as Morrison-Knudson's work progressed, the portent of a major economic and political crisis began to appear. It became sharply and tragically apparent that the persons who granted the loan, like the Afghans who accepted it, had failed to evaluate the country's ability, economically and socially, to

handle the problems created by such an extensive undertaking.

It became apparent that the Helmand Valley Authority, the Afghan organization created to take over the operation and maintenance of the irrigation network, to prepare the new lands for cultivation and to settle them, had no trained men to assume these responsibilities. Furthermore, the inadequate Afghan educational system offered little hope of obtaining these men. At the time HVA was to assume operation, it had one trained engineer and one trained agriculturalist, both fresh from foreign schools and with no practical experience. The Afghan Government gradually realized that the operation of hydraulic valves, the determination of proper water distribution, and the maintenance of a tremendous network of canals was a highly complex job and that misuse of equipment and canals could seriously damage or destroy both.

Furthermore, it also became clear that the newly settled nomad farmers had no conception of the proper use of either land or water. Men who for centuries had used the most primitive agricultural methods and had thirsted for water did not understand the importance either of leveling the land or of leaching it of its salt content. Suddenly endowed with an abundance of water, they drowned their land, raising its salt content to the point of ruination. This land can be reclaimed, but the process is expensive and until the Afghan farmer learns how to use his newly acquired treasures, reclamation will be useless.

Some of the newly developed desert lands have also proved of inferior quality and unsuited for cultivation unless very expertly handled. By ill fortune, the very first tracts to be settled and cultivated have been particularly difficult. Though extensive soil surveys ordinarily precede an irrigation project, these surveys had not been considered feasible in the case of the Helmand because of their complicated and time-consuming nature. Thus, nomads, lured from their old life by promises of a new one of ease and plenty, have been settled on lands that offer a hard and meager existence. Some of them have already abandoned the valley to return to their ancient nomadic wanderings.

Despite these ominous developments, the Afghan Government, having used up its first loan, turned to the Export-Import Bank for another to push the project through. In 1954, the bank, primarily to safeguard its initial investment, granted the country a second loan of $18.5 million. To date, however, there has been no decisive improvement in the Helmand Valley project, and the very magnitude of the unforeseen difficulties has created a major political crisis in Afghanistan.

Under the terms of the loan, Afghanistan has paid all local construction and operation costs as her share of the project expenses. These have amounted to about one-third of the Afghan yearly budget of approximately $24 million—or what to Afghanistan is the staggering sum of $8 million a year. Thus, an overwhelming sum has been and is likely to continue to be spent on an undertaking which so far has yielded no revenue and which is not likely to yield any soon.

In consequence, the Helmand Valley project, which was to have been a boon to Afghanistan, has today placed a dangerous strain both on the Afghan economy and on the nation's morale. Some Western observers in Kabul reason that recent Afghan-Russian trade agreements and the Afghan acceptance of a $100 million Soviet credit represent a partial attempt to mitigate this plight. If this is so, the United States may have unwittingly and indirectly contributed to driving Afghanistan into Russian arms.

The current state of Afghan fears and disillusionment over the outcome of the Helmand Valley project is indicated by the fact that no word of it is being published in the local newspapers and by the further fact that no key figure in the present Afghan Cabinet has journeyed the 400 miles from the capital to see the project. American observers guess that top Afghan officials are afraid to associate themselves too closely with such a precarious enterprise.

There are persistent rumors that the Cabinet is considering dropping the development as too big to handle. But strong pressures so far have prevented this. The Afghans have invested too much money to permit their withdrawal. And to abandon the settlement project is to lose face with and control of the nomads, an eventuality Kabul dares not risk.

In their distress over the failures of the project, the Afghans, not unnaturally, have laid much of the blame on those most closely associated with it. These are the Export-Import Bank, which the Afghans somehow feel made an injudicious loan, and the Morrison-Knudson Co., which the Afghans rightly or wrongly hold responsible for the development of some of the inferior lands. But to Afghan eyes these two organizations are synonymous with the American Government. This conviction was further strengthened when the International Cooperation Administration, the foreign-aid arm of the United States Government, began work in Afghanistan in 1952.

Hence, whether Afghan logic is valid or not, in the eyes of Afghanistan, as well as the Middle East and Asia, the good name of the United States is now vitally at stake in the Helmand Valley—and at a time when the Soviet Union is entering the foreign-aid field, not only in Afghanistan but throughout Asia.

ICA faces overwhelming problems in Afghanistan, and particularly in the Helmand Valley. It must work with an almost illiterate people, overcome the language barrier, cope with Washington bureaucracy, and meet many bitter and accumulated problems inherited from a project it had no part in creating. Where responsibility rests for the existing confusion and inefficiency is open to question. But the fact clearly remains that the help Afghanistan needs she is not getting, and the Helmand Valley has profited relatively little from ICA's presence there.

Could the United States have been spared the crisis it now faces in Afghanistan? Four agencies have been involved in the Helmand Valley project, yet it does not seem that full responsibility can be attributed to any one of them.

Undoubtedly the Afghan Government overestimated its ability to cope with such a massive project. But having been long isolated from the rest of the world and having no previous experience with large-scale developments, Afghanistan can hardly be blamed for her lack of knowledge.

The Morrison-Knudson Co. did recognize some of the inherent hazards of the undertaking. But M. K., as a private organization, had responsibility only for a construction job and not for its economic and political consequences.

The United States Export-Import Bank, in granting the first loan, dealt with the project primarily as a banking venture. It could not fully examine the consequences of the loan, nor did it feel called upon to assume responsibility for them.

The American Embassy in Afghanistan was extremely small when the initial loan was made. It had no staff to make extensive appraisals of the project. Furthermore, Afghanistan was then far outside the pale of the primary preoccupations of American foreign policy. At the time of the second loan, the die had been cast—American interests appeared so deeply involved in Afghanistan that there was little choice but to continue with the project.

In short, there was no single agency charged with the responsibility for investigating the long-range consequences of this giant American-financed venture.

What has been learned by 5 years of bitter experience in Afghanistan?

One lesson seems clear: A prerequisite of future extensive economic development projects in Asia and the Middle East is a thorough evaluation of the economic and social tolerance of a given country for a given project. One thing that must be guarded against is doing too much too soon. Furthermore, it seems apparent that overall authority and responsibility for this work and supervising the projects as they progress must be vested in a suitable agency.

It should also be recognized that the techniques of American foreign aid which were effective in Europe, where the foreign-aid program was born, do not necessarily apply in Asia. In Europe trained technicians existed; all they needed was up-to-date technical advice. In Asia these trained technicians seldom exist, and American technical advisers find themselves with no one to advise. Thus, American foreign-aid policies must be revised to permit American technicians to operate projects until the nationals of the assisted country have had sufficient time and training to utilize American advice. This indicates that an economic development project has little practical use in Asia unless it is supplemented with a training program geared to produce the personnel needed to operate it.

The United States must also accept the fact that its prestige will inevitably be at stake wherever any American organization, public or private, engages in development projects in this part of the world.

And, finally, the United States Government and the American people must reconcile themselves to the fact that the much-needed foreign-aid program in underdeveloped countries of Asia and the Middle East is a herculean task, long range in nature, fraught with frustration and criticism, with results that, by American standards, are bound to be agonizingly slow.

Perhaps the most important lesson the Helmand Valley project can teach is that the United States still has much to learn about helping others to help themselves.

[From the New York Times of June 11, 1956]

BOOKS OF THE TIMES

(By Orville Prescott)

Dr. John Clark, "a middle-aged geologist, a specialist on deserts and fossil bones, a bachelor, is a man with the courage of his convictions and an exceptional determination to practice what he preaches. Convinced of the need for the United States to make friends among undeveloped countries of Asia and of the need to help them to improve their shaky economies, Dr. Clark is also convinced that the point 4 program is not the best way to do it.

Six years ago, when no department of the Government would back his offer to demonstrate a better way in the remote Kingdom of Hunza, Dr. Clark formed a small foundation of his own that raised enough money for him to devote 20 months to a 1-man mission helping the Hunza people to help themselves. In Hunza: Lost Kingdom of the Himalayas, Dr. Clark has written an interesting account of his experience. It is also a challenging argument for a new approach to the United States system of foreign aid.

PIONEERING IN A PRIMITIVE LAND

The Kingdom of Hunza lies in the shadow of the Karakorum Mountains in Pakistan-held Northern Kashmir. A little larger than New Jersey, it is so barren that the population of 25,000 dwells in a series of oases surrounded by desolate mountains. Foreign affairs and defense are controlled by Pakistan, but the King, or Mir, is an absolute monarch. The Hunzas are a pre-Bronze Age people, who

have never learned to fashion metals or pottery. They speak 11 languages, belong to the Ismailian Moslem sect, and earn an average annual income of $20 a family. Their scanty pasture land is deteriorating, their water supply is decreasing, and the population is growing rapidly. There is little wood in Hunza and no other source of heat. Unable to raise enough food, the Hunzas endure a period of semistarvation every spring.

When Dr. Clark settled down in the capital city of Baltit the Mir allowed him to live in a 600-year-old castle. There Dr. Clark ran a medical dispensary and treated from 25 to 60 persons a day. He established a craft school in woodworking. He distributed vegetable seeds and he made a geological survey of Hunza. An expert on first aid and a student of anatomy, Dr. Clark treated a variety of diseases and suffered from many himself—malaria, beri-beri, mild heart attacks, and dysentery.

Many of the Hunzas are intelligent and anxious to learn. But all of them are steeped in Asiatic fatalism, in a passive and submissive attitude toward life. They were so accustomed to being cold all winter that they didn't try to keep themselves warm.

"Sahib," a peasant said, "the river is cutting away my field, and I wish you'd come and look at it."

"Look," I told him, "you see that gravel bar across the river? You and your neighbors start on the downstream side and carry away boulders until you've cut a channel right across the bar. Then the water will flow in the channel and will stop cutting here.'

"That's fine!" he said happily. "Please ask the Mir Sahib to order us to do it and we will."

"Would the Mir be angry if you did this on your own initiative?"

"Oh, not at all. It is merely our custom never to do anything unless the Mir orders us."

Dr. Clark considers his influence on the nine boys who lived with him and studied carpentry the most important result he accomplished in Hunza. A trade was useful. Far more important was learning to think for themselves, acquiring self-confidence and self-respect, becoming dissatisfied with their immemorial misery and anxious to take positive steps to improve matters.

BASIS FOR BETTERMENT SET FORTH

These new attitudes could come, Dr. Clark says, only after the boys had absorbed five others that are the basis of Western progress and are alien to traditional Asiatic ways—objectivity, dissatisfaction, creative confidence, individuality, and responsibility.

Although Dr. Clark was the object of suspicion, malicious rumors, and official obstruction, he is positive that his approach was the right one.

"If you want to make friends with any people, you cannot do it by working through their government or their political parties," he insists. He adds:

"Let us stop at once the ruinous system of large, direct gifts from the American Government to Asian governments. Such gifts are expensive to us and always breed avarice and resentment on the part of the recipients. * * * All projects should be on a scale the local community can absorb, but conducted on a wide geographic basis. No $20 million steel mills, but rather $20,000 projects in a thousand villages. * * * Any major industrial project which is economically unsound should receive no capital, because United States financing of noble but unsound projects leads to Asian inefficiency and bankruptcy, and to mutual ill-will. We cannot buy friends, and we should not stoop to attempt it."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a quorum call may be had without the time being charged on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is designated "6-27-56-I."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to have the amendment read, or to have it printed in the RECORD without being read?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment offered by Mr. KNOWLAND is as follows:

On page 55, after line 16, insert the following new section:

"COMMISSION ON FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

"SEC. 14. (a) It is the purpose of this section to insure the soundness and maximum effectiveness of any foreign-aid program in which the United States may hereafter be engaged by providing, on the basis of a detailed study and evaluation of the policies and operations of our present and past foreign-aid programs, a means for—

"(1) clarifying the objectives of any foreign-aid program of the United States, and the considerations which should govern the selection of methods and policies to attain those objectives;

"(2) determining specific organizational standards, procedures, and practices to promote improved administration of any such program at the operational level; and

"(3) developing a policy on foreign aid which will most effectively secure the implementation of such objectives while maintaining maximum economy and efficiency in all parts of the program at all levels of operation.

"(b) To carry out the purpose set forth in subsection (a), there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Foreign Aid Programs (referred to hereinafter as the "Commission"). Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99), or section 512 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1764); nor shall such service be considered as employment or holding of office or position bringing such individual within the provisions of section 6 of the act of May 22, 1920, as amended (5 U. S. C. 715), section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended (5 U. S. C. 59a), or any other Federal law limiting the reemployment of retired officers or employees or governing the simultaneous receipt of compensation and retired pay or annuities.

"(c) The Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

"(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, 2 from the executive branch of the Government and 2 from private life;

"(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, 2 from the Senate and 2 from private life; and

"(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 from the House of Representatives and 2 from private life.

Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made. The Chairman of the Commission shall be designated by the President. The Commission shall elect a Vice Chairman from among its members. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

"(d) Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. Members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. Members of the Commission appointed from private life shall each receive $75 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

"(e) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals.

"(f) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"(g) The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the operation of the present and past foreign-aid programs of the United States, in order to provide complete information concerning—

"(1) The proper objectives of foreign-aid programs and the criteria which can be used to measure accomplishment.

"(2) The capability of the United States to extend aid, in terms of the Nation's economic technical, personnel, and other resources.

"(3) The need and willingness of foreign countries to receive aid, and their capacity to make effective use thereof.

"(4) The various kinds of foreign aid and alternatives thereto as well as the methods by which the conditions on which aid might be furnished.

"(5) The related actions which should be taken to make foreign aid effective in achieving national objectives.

The Commission shall transmit to the President and to the Congress not later than February 15, 1957, the results of the study herein authorized together with such recommendations as it may consider to be desirable.

"(h) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times

and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (2 U. S. C. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

"(i) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, with respect to the question of a study of the mutual-aid program, I believe there has been general unanimity of opinion that a study should be made. There is an honest difference of opinion as to how the study may best be conducted.

The executive branch of the Government, in a measure introduced in the other House, had proposed that congressional authorization be provided for a study to be made by an executive commission. This was not agreed to by either the House or the Senate. The reasons, I think, were several. One was the belief that the executive branch of the Government could set up a purely executive commission without the necessity of congressional authorization for it. Secondly, there was the feeling that Congress itself had a responsibility in this regard.

So far as a congressional survey is concerned, there are, of course, several steps or alternative procedures which might be taken, and there have been suggestions in both the Senate and the House as to how it might best be accomplished.

One approach is a study by the Foreign Relations Committee, or under its direction. This is the approach contained in the resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] which has been reported to the Senate by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Another approach has been the suggestion that there be created a joint committee consisting of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. I believe that a resolution providing for such a joint committee has been introduced by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

There have been other suggestions in the House. Of course, we have no jurisdiction over action by the House.

In my opinion, there is merit in all these approaches, and there are also disadvantages in all of them. Certainly the mutual-aid program is a matter which concerns the Congress of the United States as well as the Executive. For that reason, I did not believe the problem would be properly solved by merely having an executive agency conduct such a survey and such an investigation.

It seems to me that having the survey made only by members of the Foreign Relations Committee, as provided in the Mansfield resolution, does not meet the situation, because the problem is broader, it seems to me, than the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee alone, though I serve as a member of that committee. The Armed Services Committee has an interest. The Appropriations Committee, of course, has a vital interest. And over and above that, the entire Senate of the United States has a vital interest in this program. Of course, under our system, the House of Representatives, being co-equal with the Senate in the legislative arm of Government, has an equal interest in the matter.

That presents this question: Are we to have widespread duplication of effort? Will we have a House committee, a Senate committee, and maybe a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, one from the Appropriations Committee, and possibly a third one from the Armed Services Committee, all conducting surveys, all calling Government witnesses, all having to visit some of the areas where the mutual aid program is being carried on? Perhaps they could not cover all the bases, each would be looking at a little different set of facts; and finally, we would have 3 or 4 different reports from the representatives of the Senate, or the congressional committees, and a different set of facts presented by the executive branch of the Government.

Congress cannot write the ticket alone, because, as we know and as has been reiterated during the course of the debate, it is fundamental that under the Constitution the President, through his authorized representatives, conducts the Nation's foreign policy. But, obviously, likewise Congress is not prepared to surrender its prerogatives and responsibilities in this field, because, under the Constitution, Congress is a coequal branch of the Government and not a subordinate branch, and it has a vital responsibility in the control of the public pursestrings and the support of our armed services, all of which fit into this situation.

The Senate has a particular and peculiar responsibility in advising and consenting in connection with treaties and foreign policy generally.

The administration did not originally support the concept which I have presented in my amendment, which is really the concept of the Hoover Commission, if we may so term it. I should like to read the amendment. It is, in part, as follows:

SEC. 14. (a) It is the purpose of this section to insure the soundness and maximum effectiveness of any foreign-aid program in which the United States may hereafter be engaged by providing, on the basis of a detailed study and evaluation of the policies and operations of our present and past foreign-aid programs, a means for—

(1) clarifying the objectives of any foreign-aid program of the United States, and the considerations which should govern the selection of methods and policies to attain those objectives;

(2) determining specific organizational standards, procedures, and practices to promote improved administration of any such program at the operational level; and

(3) developing a policy on foreign aid which will most effectively secure the implementation of such objectives while maintaining maximum economy and efficiency in all parts of the program at all levels of operation.

(b) To carry out the purpose set forth in subsection (a), there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Foreign Aid Programs (referred to hereinafter as the "Commission"). Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99), or section 512 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1764); nor shall such service be considered as employment or holding of office or position bringing such individual within the provisions of section 6 of the act of May 22, 1920, as amended (5 U. S. C. 715), section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended (5 U. S. C. 59a), or any other Federal law limiting the reemployment of retired officers or employees or governing the simultaneous receipt of compensation and retired pay or annuities.

(c) The Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, 2 from the executive branch of the Government and 2 from private life;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, 2 from the Senate and 2 from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 from the House of Representatives, and 2 from private life.

It provides that any vacancy which may occur shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

Mr. President, under date of June 27, 1956, the Secretary of State addressed the following letter to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. GEORGE]:

This is in reply to your letter of June 14, 1956, in which you requested the views of the Department of State on S. 4035, introduced by Senator KNOWLAND, and your letters of June 15, in which you requested our views on Senate Concurrent Resolution 82, introduced by Senator MARTIN, and Senate Resolution 285 introduced by Senator MANSFIELD.

Senator KNOWLAND's bill would authorize the establishment by the President and the Congress of a Commission on Foreign Aid Programs. Senator MARTIN's proposed concurrent resolution would establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Foreign Aid. Senator MANSFIELD's proposed Senate resolution directs the Foreign Relations Committee to arrange for studies of foreign aid.

You have addressed similar requests for comment to the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the International Cooperation Administration. They have asked me to express their views with mine in this single reply.

As you know, the executive branch is thoroughly in accord with the general objectives of each of the proposals. For some time we have advocated that a careful study be made of the mutual security program and of the best means of carrying it forward in the future. We have recommended the establishment of a nonpartisan committee of distinguished private citizens to make such a study and to report to the President and the Congress.

It is our view that of the various resolutions on which you have asked our comment, the proposal made by Senator KNOWLAND would most effectively, efficiently and economically serve the public interest.

This proposal would provide for the establishment of a 12-member commission. Four members would be appointed by the President, four by the President of the Senate, and four by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Of each group of four, two would be Members of the body involved, and two would be distinguished citizens in private life. This proposal would, therefore, seem to combine the essential features of the suggestions by Senator MARTIN in Senate Concurrent Resolution 82, and by Senator MANSFIELD, in Senate Resolution 285, that the study be carried out by Members of the Congress and the proposal of the President that a public commission be appointed from private life.

A Commission composed of persons chosen in this way would provide the broadest possible base for studying these important programs and the means by which they may be made most effective. Such a single group would, we believe, be inherently better able to carry out a coordinated study than would separate groups, designated by one or both Houses of the Congress and by the executive branch.

I am authorized by the President to say that he is in accord with the proposal for a Commission of this character and that if it is authorized the executive branch will participate in it actively.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I commend the distinguished minority leader for having offered his amendment. I wish to associate myself as being in strong support or as being a cosponsor of it. I think the Senator is approaching the question in a most realistic manner. This approach will insure a nonpartisan attitude. Furthermore, it will assure not only legislative but also administrative and outside interests taking part in the study.

The report of such a Commission would certainly allay any fear on the part of the general public that foreign aid was a waste of the taxpayers' dollars, as is so often feared at present.

After such a Commission as is proposed by the amendment had a study and submitted its report, I believe it would secure for Congress in the next session not only strong support from the general public but an excellent understanding of what we were confronted with.

Again, I commend the Senator for offering the amendment. I think it is a wise course to pursue.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, it is most encouraging to note that my distinguished colleague, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], has proposed an amendment to H. R. 11356 which would create a top-level bipartisan Commission to reexamine and reevaluate our policies with respect to continued military and economic assistance, for it had been my intention to offer a similar amendment calling for the establishment of a Commission on Foreign Aid Programs.

I shall most certainly support the Senator's amendment, for I feel very strongly that an independent Commission, wholly free of all insinuation and suggestion of political bias, would be an eminently effective and forceful instrument to study and recommend our future course in the foreign-aid field.

A reappraisal of our current policies so that we may proceed intelligently is urgently needed. It is long overdue. Rapidly changing world conditions certainly warrant a comprehensive review. Even at this moment, some of our friends abroad are beguiled by sweet nothings from Moscow, and the tendency in Europe is to relax in the dream world of peaceful coexistence. These are but fleeting delusions.

In the Middle East, for example, saber rattling continues. Egyptian Premier Nasser and others act and talk aggressively. Munitions and implements of war from Iron Curtain countries contribute to the jingoism of the Arab States. We may find it necessary and quite compatible with our efforts for peaceful solution of Middle East tensions to counterbalance the shipment of arms to Egypt by supplying Israel with the weapons this nation has requested from our arsenal. Certainly no country, especially a friendly one, can be left to the mercy of Communist aggressive intentions. In addition, the recent realinement of relations between Soviet Russia and Yugoslavia has raised many questions which must be answered and created many doubts which must be resolved.

Until we determine our future policies on foreign military and economic assistance, I sincerely believe that in the light of possible consequences we should support the President. Those consequences encompass the probability of a reduction of military forces of our allies stationed in West Germany and other strategic spots. Even in the atomic age, the bastions of freedom require manpower. A drastic curtailment in foreign military assistance would provide an excuse for a reduction. This means that a much greater burden for defending these strategic positions would fall upon the United States. It would involve an expansion of our own military forces requiring the drafting and induction into the service of more of our own boys.

I, for one, would rather vote money sufficient for our allies to maintain their share of defending the free world against possible Communist attack than to pass that burden to our own soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen. Let us not give our allies an excuse to pull back in these dangerous times.

These remarks, though brief, summarize my thinking on this very important matter—a matter which strikes at the essence of freedom for peace-loving men and women everywhere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, three of my newsletters of recent date which deal with this matter.

There being no objection, the newsletters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE HORNS OF A DILEMMA

(A weekly newsletter by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

WASHINGTON, April 2, 1956.—Soon the Congress will again consider the matter of foreign aid. As now presented, the program involves requests for appropriations totalling about $4.7 billion and authority to engage in long-term commitments estimated at $100 million. The scope and size of this new proposal has many in a quandry, and approval is uncertain.

This dilemma stems from several factors. First, $4.7 billion would exceed last year's appropriations by some $2 billion. Second, unexpended foreign aid funds from previous appropriations total nearly $4.5 billion. Third, although the original mutual aid program—the Marshall plan—was intended to last 4 years, various dangers are ascribed to any long-term policy.

In the past 15 years, the United States has assisted other countries, through grants and loans, to the sum of $92 billion. Slightly more than half of this amount has been made available since World War II. Military assistance, technical cooperation, offshore procurement, development assistance, defense support, counterpart funds, direct forces support—these are the channels through which foreign aid is dispensed. Also, American dollars are provided through the international agencies—the International Monetary Fund; the International Labor Organization; the Organization of American States; various divisions of the United Nations; the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, to mention a few.

That these programs have been helpful, in varying degree, there can be little doubt. There is much agreement on this point. However, this same spirit of agreement does not exist on the idea of long-term commitments. Conceivably, in connection with vast projects such as the Aswan Dam in Egypt and development of the Mekong River in the Far East, obligations of an extended nature must be undertaken. But to eliminate the annual Congressional audit, and thus the traditional control of any part of mutual assistance funds would, it is generally believed, give a permanent set to our bountiful habits.

As a solution to this dilemma, it seems to me that an independent, bipartisan commission should be established, on a continuing basis, for the purpose of studying and evaluating the need, character, and extent of foreign aid in the light of changing domestic and world conditions. Inevitably, there must come a time when our offerings to other nations must be drastically reduced.

A PROPER COURSE OF ACTION

(A weekly newsletter by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

WASHINGTON, May 7, 1956.—In my newsletter of April 2, 1956, I suggested that "an independent bipartisan commission should be established on a continuing basis to evaluate the need, character and extent of foreign aid in the light of changing domestic and world conditions." The idea is by no means new, and in recent weeks, others, including Senator George, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Secretary of State Dulles, and President Eisenhower

have voiced the need for a reappraisal of our aid programs.

When the Marshall plan was first conceived in 1947, Senator Arthur Vandenburg of Michigan proposed that a bipartisan advisory council of our ablest and most experienced citizenship be appointed to determine the extent to which the United States could safely and wisely engage in aid to foreign nations. He said further, " * * * I recognize that intelligent American self-interest immediately requires a second, overall inventory of our own resources to determine the latitudes within which we may consider these foreign needs. This comes first because if America ever sags, the world's hopes sag with her."

Accordingly, President Truman, in June of 1947, appointed not 1, but 3 committees, including a nonpartisan Advisory Council, to undertake this critical assignment of domestic and global impact. Out of these considerations came the framework of the Marshall plan (ECA) which was later approved by Congress.

With the approach of the expiration of ECA in 1952, Senator Vandenberg made a similar recommendation in these words, "* * * I think it would be well for another such commission, equally unpartisan and equally impeccable in character, to resume independent, advisory studies of our new responsibilities as the world's largest creditor nation and the world's spearhead in the quest of dependable peace. * * *"

That suggestion, in all of its wisdom and import is, in my judgment, as pertinent today as it was in 1952—especially in the light of ever-changing world conditions. Past successes and failures in the apportionment and disbursement of foreign aid must be evaluated in terms of changing Soviet tactics and the shifting world situation. Certainly, there is much historical evidence to demonstrate that independent commissions have very usefully served as a crucible for the blending, in proper measure, of reason, soundness and judgment with emotion, responsibility and objectivity while vaporizing the unreasonable, the unsound and the impractical.

THE HOUNDS AND THE HARE

(A weekly newsletter by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

WASHINGTON, June 18, 1956.—Ancient history records the tale of Mithridates IV, King of Pontus and Bithynia (about 63 B. C.), who concocted a confection, composed of 72 ingredients, which he claimed gave him special immunity. Now, it would seem that Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia, has hit upon a similar formula though the ingredients are considerably different and more in numbers. The principal ingredient would seem to be a curious blending of American dollars with the Communist teachings of Karl Marx.

Just 1 year ago, the minstrels of the Kremlin, who wander with a purpose, journeyed to Yugoslavia. By way of a return engagement, only recently, Marshal Tito, with much pomp and ceremony, made a pilgrimage to Moscow. Simultaneously, on both occasions, this Government was being importuned to send more economic and more foreign assistance to Yugoslavia.

It is interesting to note that, since the end of World War II, the community of free nations has furnished Yugoslavia nearly $2.5 billion in aid. Of this amount, the United States supplied an estimated $2 billion. In the sense that Tito has added more ingredients to his Mithridates, he has also obtained financial help from Communist bloc nations totaling about $464 million equivalent.

Singly, and together, these events are fully consistent with the duplicity which has sparked the spread of world communism. The plan of operation never changes. Such a double and deceitful game was once described as "to hold with the hare and run with the hounds"—or to run with the hounds as if to catch the hare, all the while being the secret friend of the hare. Those among us who have any doubts as to Marshal Tito's real motives might ponder the meaning of this old adage.

These two meetings have served to strengthened the Belgrade-Moscow axis—there can be little mistake about this. These two partners have again demonstrated a solidness of mutual interests—interests which fit the pattern of the international Communist conspiracy—interests which are contrary to those of the free world. Support of this point of view can certainly be found in the coming gathering of Tito of Yugoslavia, Nehru of India, and Nasser of Egypt, all of which has been carefully cultivated in advance by the foreign minister of Soviet Russia.

The need for a reappraisal of our policy with all of these countries is now more pressing than ever.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. How much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. First, I may say to the Senator from California, the minority leader, that I am heartily in favor of his amendment and expect to vote for it.

I call the attention of the Senator to page 5, line 13, of the amendment. I refer to the third subject which the Commission is asked to study. I read as follows:

(g) The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the operation of the present and past foreign aid programs of the United States, in order to provide complete information concerning—

(3) The need and willingness of foreign countries to receive aid, and their capacity to make effective use thereof.

My suggestion is that the word "need" be stricken out, so that the paragraph would read:

The willingness of foreign countries to receive aid, and their capacity to make effective use therof.

If a commission is to be asked, in a period of 4 or 5 months, to study the need of foreign countries to receive aid, it seems to me we shall be running into two problems. First, some countries may say they need a lot of military assistance; others may say they need a lot of economic assistance. The Commission would not have the opportunity or the ability to study and consider all those needs.

Second, it seems to me we might run into the question of, I will not say insulting a foreign country on what their needs were, if the Commission intended to be very frank, but it might be disquieting or undiplomatic, with all the embarrassment that goes with such action.

It seems to me the objective could be accomplished by ascertaining, first, what countries were willing to receive aid, and then to have the Commission determine the capacity of those countries to use the aid.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Frankly, the word "need" was included in the amendment for a purpose. I have sat on the Committee on Appropriations with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, [Mr. ELLENDER] and have discussed with him, both privately and publicly, certain aspects of the mutual-aid program. He has had—and I thought with some justification—objections to certain phases of the program on the ground that many countries have rehabilitated themselves economically and no longer need aid, although they might be willing to accept it.

Under the circumstances, it seems to me that we almost are obliged to include the question of need, because I think it is pertinent for us to know if a foreign country is economically rehabilitated, if it can take care of its own problems, whether it be in the collective security system or elsewhere. If it is able to take care of itself, I do not think the United States should assume all the burden, for instance, of that country's defense efforts. I feel certain the Senator from Massachusetts likewise, does not believe we should.

So while I understand the Senator's point, I should be somewhat reluctant to remove the word "need," because to do so would seem to establish a legislative history that the aid to be given would be based on the willingness to receive it; and my observation is that most foreign countries are willing to receive aid.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand the Senator's point. I think there should be some qualifying phrase, possibly as to the extent to which the Commission should go into the details, or the thoroughness with which they should consider the matter.

I should think the words "overall need" might be used. That would make it a general conclusion, without the commission's having to determine whether a country needed a steel plant, or without having to determine the feasibility of building a dam, or without having to determine any questions of that nature which might arise.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It seems to me that the overall authority of the Commission would be sufficient to meet that problem. Obviously, the Commission could not make the physical examination; but they would have facts and figures presented to them, and could take judicial notice, so to speak, of certain requirements. They could then determine whether a country was on its feet and was able to carry its own burden. For instanee, I should think the question of a country's national debt as compared with our own should be considered, and also whether the country was collecting taxes from its people in the way in which the United States collects taxes from its citizens.

There are many factors the Commission could consider without going into the last detail, which obviously no commission could do in the limited time provided, because if any commission is to be of value, it should report in time for the next Congress to take some action. The amendment provides that the report

shall be made early in the next session—by February 15 of next year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would the Senator be willing to add, after the word "need", language which might read "the need, in the time available to the Commission," or something of that character?

Possibly this discussion will help, but what I had in mind was language which would enable a commission to satisfy itself that it could make a report by February 15. I agree with the Senator that a report would be of no value unless it were made soon; but, at the same time, I had in mind that the members of the Commission should not be under the impression that they could not determine the question because they did not have time. I am merely suggesting language such as, "the need so far as the Commission can determine in the time available."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to consider the suggestion, if the Senator will work out an amendment. I do not know that they would precisely do it. I see what the point of the Senator is. I am willing to hold a further discussion with him.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. Who is in control of the time on the other side?

Mr. KNOWLAND. If I may answer the inquiry, the Senator in control of time on the other side is the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am unalterably opposed to the amendment——

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from North Dakota will have time to speak in opposition. I ask the Senator not to speak on my time. The opposition, I am sure, will give him time to speak.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it implicit in the language of the amendment, on page 5, line 22, that the Commission will cease to exist after it makes its report on or before February 15, 1957?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I think the Commission would cease, unless Congress itself took action to continue it.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator consider that to be desirable? Would it not be better to have the Commission remain in existence for some further time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would not want to see a permanent commission established. I believe it will work, but if Congress should find it does not work suitably, the Congress would have a chance to continue or enlarge the Commission or change the formula. I think what we want to do is get the basic information which we need before any other proposed legislation is presented to the Congress.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I shall support the amendment of the Senator from California. I think it is a most practical approach to the problem, and that it will provide answers to the questions of many Senators who want to be helpful and do everything possible for the defense of the country, but who have misgivings as to the way in which aid should be continued. I think this is a step in the right direction. I certainly hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a year ago tomorrow a very fateful event occurred. On that day, in the last 5 hours of the last day of the last fiscal year, the Defense Establishment reserved $674 million. In the period from June 28 to June 30, it reserved over $1 billion.

In the Kingdom of Laos at the present time, under this aid program, our Government is paying up to $800 a year in family allowances to the families of the soldiers of the Laotian Army.

I think it is about time that the Senate undertook the assumption of its responsibility, without regard to the executive department, and looked into this program to find out just where the waste and mismanagement are.

After all, we are being asked for a huge sum of money once again. Are we going to shirk our responsibility and vote for a Hoover-type commission which will give the executive the opportunity to do with it what it sees fit? Does the Senate want a whitewash of the investigation of the foreign-aid administration, or does the Senate want to get up on its hind legs and take unto itself the responsibility which is ours under the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. President, the amendment proposed by the Senator from California would set up a Hoover-type commission to study the foreign-aid program—and, believe me, the foreign-aid program needs a thorough-going study.

The Commission proposed would include 4 Presidential nominees, 4 Senate nominees and 4 House nominees. Put in another way, of the total membership of 12, 8 would be appointed by the President and the Vice President, and 4 would be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The President would name the chairman.

I must oppose this amendment, Mr. President, because it flies in the face of action by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and by the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, both of which considered similar proposals and rejected them. But more important, this amendment if adopted would constitute a fundamental surrender of the congressional investigative power to the executive.

I am unalterably opposed to turning a study of the foreign-aid program to the executive, to any executive-dominated group, or to any joint executive-public-congressional group. I have no confidence that recommendations from such groups would be objective or effective. We have had experience in the past. In those instances in which Hoover-type commissions have made recommendations with which the executive has agreed, the executive acts. In those cases in which the executive has not agreed with recommendations, it has done nothing.

I recall a few years ago when Mr. Stassen took over the FOA. With great fanfare he appointed a commission of objective businessmen—the Francis Committee, I believe it was called. That group went over the FOA from top to bottom. It submitted recommendations that the FOA should be in the Department of State, that aid should be in the form of loans, and numerous other recommendations. But was anything done? No, not a single thing was done to carry out the recommendations of this group of objective businessmen, who were, by and large, Republican, so far as their politics were concerned.

This year the House Foreign Affairs Committee rejected an executive branch proposal that it investigate itself. The Committee on Foreign Relations likewise rejected that proposal for self-analysis.

The Executive has pulled all the stops in support of a great study of foreign aid. Just now we have had read to us, by the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], a letter from the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, saying he would approve of a combined executive-congressional type of investigation.

But what kind of study is wanted?

First, the executive wanted a study of the executive, by the executive and for the executive. But now that the bureaucracy has found that Congress will not give the President authority to do what he already can do—that is, inspect his own administrators—we are presented with a proposal for a Hoover-type commission, with two-thirds of the membership to be selected by the President and the Vice President.

What kind of an arrangement is this? I will have no part of it, and I do not think this Congress will have any part of it.

We have had experience in the past, and have seen recommendations of dependent groups conformed to the desires of the bureaucracy. We have seen past recommendations of independent groups ignored. We have seen our own proposals embodied in legislation shuttled off to the side and ignored.

Any proposal for a study that would be guided by the tender hands of the people who have been engaged for years in the foreign-aid program would only result in a beautiful whitewash.

We have no alternative, Mr. President. There is now pending before the Committee on Rules and Administration a resolution which embodies the original proposal of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. GEORGE]. That resolution, Senate Resolution 285, calls upon the Committee on Foreign Relations to undertake exhaustive studies of the extent to which "foreign assistance by the United States Government serves, can be made to serve, or does not serve the national interest, to the end that such studies and recommendations based thereon may be available to

the Senate in considering foreign-aid policies for the future."

That resolution is based upon a proposal which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations first put forth in early April, and which he made available to the press on April 18, 1956.

By way of brief background, the record should show that shortly after the senior Senator from Georgia first offered his suggestion, the Secretary of State and the President endorsed the idea in general terms. In specific terms, however, the executive branch began talking of a Presidential commission, instead of a Senate committee, to undertake the broad review suggested.

The original proposal embodied in Senate Resolution 285 made it clear that the Committee on Foreign Relations, acting for the Senate, was to undertake the study, making use of such independent, outside sources of information as it might find necessary. That proposal is clear on the fundamental point that the results of the study and the recommendations to be submitted to the Senate must be those of the Committee on Foreign Relations. It cannot delegate its responsibility to the Senate to anyone—any more than the Senate can delegate its responsibility for the examination of this program to the President or to a Hoover-type commission.

On the same day that the committee favorably reported the Mutual Security Act to the Senate, it favorably reported Senate Resolution 285, authorizing the George study. The committee took that action with only one dissenting vote, because it deeply felt the need for a careful, objective, nonpartisan examination of the program.

Despite that action of the Committee on Foreign Relations—followed some 2 days later by the action of the House committee in undertaking a similar, but independent, study—it now appears that there is afoot a coordinated move on the part of the bureaucracy to prevent the adoption of this resolution, and to substitute therefor a study which will be under executive branch control. As a matter of fact, all we need to do is adopt the Knowland amendment; and if it turns out that the House does not like this approach, the whole idea of an independent examination of foreign aid can be scuttled in conference.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, the last statement the Senator from Montana has made simply is, I submit respectfully to the Senator from Montana, not in keeping with the facts, because there is ample power, under the rules of the Senate, under the La Follette-Monroney Act, for the Appropriations Committee, with its investigative powers, or for the Committee on Foreign Relations, or for the Committee on Armed Services; and certainly there could be no scuttling of any investigation which the Congress might order, regardless of whether this amendment should be accepted or rejected or whether the resolution referred to by the Senator from Montana should be adopted or rejected.

But even though I serve as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I submit in connection with this matter, which is of concern to other Senators besides the 13 members of the Foreign Relations Committee, that the Appropriations Committee has as vital an interest, and I think perhaps the Armed Services Committee has as vital an interest, as does the Foreign Relations Committee. We could have 3 or 4 or 5 examinations going at the same time, plus an examination by the House of Representatives, plus an examination by the executive branch, and thus could obtain entirely different sets of facts, because each group would be looking at different segments of the picture, whereas in this case we shall get a coordinated picture.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What the Senator from California has said is true with respect to the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee. However, I certainly hope that the distinguished Senator from California, for whom I have the greatest respect and admiration, will not turn his back on the committee of which he is a distinguished member, and on which he has rendered outstanding service. I would expect him to be fighting in behalf of the resolution reported by that committee with only one dissenting vote, instead of pointing out the obvious fact that the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, and perhaps other committees, can undertake investigations of their own.

I am requesting something that is fundamental, not only so far as a particular committee is concerned, but insofar as the Senate of the United States is concerned; and I, for one, do not intend to abdicate the responsibility I have as a Member of this body.

Mr. President, when the Committee on Rules and Administration met yesterday to consider Senate Resolution 285, it was impossible to obtain a quorum, because Members from across the aisle were absent. Incidentally, Mr. President, in the committee there were sufficient votes in favor of reporting favorably Senate Resolution 285; but in the interest of bipartisanship and senatorial responsibility, the committee took no action at that time.

If the administration had shown as much initiative in responding to the new Soviet strategy as it has shown in reacting to the proposed independent study of the foreign aid, there would be no need for the Senate to take on this job.

In view of the early friendly reaction of the administration to the George proposal, I have been surprised by the recent activities of the bureaucracy. I have been reminded of the restaurant with the sign in the window stating that the kitchen is open for inspection. But when someone tries to inspect the kitchen, he finds all the doors locked. That always makes me suspicious.

When the committee reported Senate Resolution 285, it considered various alternatives.

It rejected the idea of a joint Senate-House committee, because this fall Members of the House will be occupied with the elections, and because of the problems in getting such a committee under way in an expeditious manner. Furthermore, the other House is free to conduct its own study, as it did in the case of the Herter committee, prior to the Marshall plan, and as it is doing now, on the basis of its own initiative, vis-a-vis the foreign-aid program.

The Committee on Foreign Relations also rejected the idea of a Hoover-type commission because that would involve a big staff and would take a long time in organization. It is doubtful if such a study could be under way, much less completed, by next February. I may add that it is my personal view that the reports of the last Hoover Commission did not elicit widespread support simply because the Commission was packed by too many men whose personal predilections got in the way of the objectivity needed if such a group is to be of influence. If there is anything the foreign-aid program needs it is an objective analysis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield 5 additional minutes to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Although serious consideration was given to expanding the proposed committee to include members from other Senate committees, as has been done in some past instances, it was felt that this particular job was primarily one for the Committee on Foreign Relations. Furthermore it was the clear intent of the Legislative Reorganization Act to limit the number of special committees that might be created and to give the standing committees authority broad enough to enable them to carry on studies of this kind.

Finally, Mr. President, underlying the decision of the committee was full awareness that it is a constitutional function of the Congress to exercise a constant control over the executive. Unless we discharge that responsibility efficiently and fully, we are not doing our job.

The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations remarked yesterday that "the questions of our citizens about the foreign-aid program must be well and fully answered before this body is again asked to authorize the appropriation of funds for mutual security." It is the purpose of Senate Resolution 285 to help our citizens answer their many questions about foreign aid. I do not think the American people will accept answers from the very bureaucracy which has administered foreign aid, or from appointees of that bureaucracy.

Mr. President, while I have indicated my concern at the backstage maneuvers that have been going on in connection with the proposed study, I want to state emphatically that I think it would be a most serious mistake if this study were launched in a partisan atmosphere.

If the amendment now before us is defeated and the resolution reported favorably by the Committee on Foreign Relations is adopted after Rules Committee action, I know that the study will be conducted in a nonpartisan manner. I would for my part, for example, urge that the committee take no decisions without broad bipartisan support. I would urge it not to make public the results of any studies until after the election. The subject matter of this amendment and of the proposed resolution is too important for the security of this Nation to be viewed in a partisan light.

Although the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations will not be with us when the final recommendations are submitted, I know that for the next critical 6 months he will be in full and active charge of the study proposed by Senate Resolution 285. There is no finer leadership under which to start this long-needed evaluation of the mutual-security programs. No one need fear that the senior Senator from Georgia would lend himself to a partisan approach to the problem or that he would be other than scrupulously fair in getting this much needed job under way. As chairman of this committee the great Senator from Georgia will add to the many brilliant accomplishments which have already marked his outstanding senatorial career.

I hope we will not shirk our constitutional responsibilities to the American people and that this amendment will be rejected so that we can in due course undertake a proper Senate investigation of foreign aid, and thereby assume our full and complete responsibility.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With regard to the point which the able minority leader made, that there is a broad interest in this bill, does the Senator think that there is any broader interest in this bill than there is in the defense appropriation bill, or in the development of our natural resources?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not at all. The Senator from Arkansas is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is always that broad interest. However, the traditions of the Senate call for the delegation of specific inquiries to specific committees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct; and in this instance the specific committee which has legislative authority is the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If something is to be done about the problem next year, that is the committee to do it. It would not be a special committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is stating the fact.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If a special Hoover-type commission were created, it could not actually put anything into effect. It could only recommend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield another minute to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is again correct. I believe that any investigation committee which involved outside members would be more or less directed by the Executive, and that very likely in the end the result would be a whitewash. Mr. President, the American people will not be satisfied with a whitewash investigation of the foreign-aid program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will not be, either. I should like to associate myself with the Senator's remarks.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to my colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I completely endorse the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Senate has no higher duty, under our legislative system, than to deal with the policies and subjects with which a standing committee of that jurisdiction is properly charged.

The Senate also has the highest possible duty to the Nation, as the prime mover, the prime originator of investigations of the conduct of our foreign policy. To turn that duty over to an executive department which has shown little interest in learning how the program is being administered, how much waste is occurring in the program, or what completely opposite directions our foreign-aid program is taking, when we are faced with a new type of cold war, is not sufficient.

I believe that the situation indicates the wisdom of the plea of the distinguished Senator from Montana for legislative surveillance in this field. To do less would be to abdicate the duty of the Foreign Relations Committee. As one who has consistently supported foreign aid, from the time I was a member of the Herter committee, I am disappointed to find the foreign-aid program so musclebound, and so encumbered with retreaded ideas that it cannot possibly meet the new cold war problem which now is facing us.

The only alternative to misdirection of aid or overemphasis on military aid is to vote for deep and heavy cuts to try to bring about in some way an agonizing reappraisal of the policies which, to those of us who have followed the foreign-aid program, appear to be obsolete and useless. Many of the strongest supporters of foreign aid in the past feel this same way.

Uncle Sam is acting like a man who does not count his change. We act like a football team, coached to defend against a ground attack, for which we might have been prepared during the days of the mailed-fist policy of the Communists. But now the Communists have resorted to a change in tactics in their desire for world domination. They are now using a forward passing and an aerial attack but the coach does not change the defense of the football team to meet this new threat.

It seems to me that to try to offer munitions around the world, to the tune of $3,400,000,000 as proposed in this bill, or $4 billion, as recommended by the State Department, is as obsolete and old-fashioned in today's cold war as trying to sell buggy whips in Detroit.

People are interested in ideas and ideals. All the State Department offers, under its present policy, is dollars and more dollars. It seems to me that a study by the Foreign Relations Committee, which has a firm understanding of the background, and is desirous of giving us a modern, aggressive, effective foreign-aid policy and foreign-aid program, would be far better than an investigation by a few executives from big business, who would be brought here to take the advice of the foreign-aid administrators and conclude that everything is fine and dandy, and that, although we are losing the cold war on every front, we should do more and more of what has been done during past years.

Mr. President, I intend to support, to the limit of my ability, the reappraisal contemplated by the resolution to which reference has been made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. I certainly agree with him, a coauthor of the Monroney-La Follette Reorganization Act, in putting his finger on the fact that the responsibility lies with the Committee on Foreign Relations, acting as the agent of the Senate as a whole.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Montana. Is it not true that the minds of the Executive and his assistants are already made up? In fact, they came before the Committee on Foreign Relations and asked for a 10-year extension on some features of foreign aid. If it had not been for the stamina and statesmanship of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] they might have succeeded in that respect. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. I may say to my good friend from North Dakota the question is why all of a sudden there should be this intense interest in looking into the foreign-aid program, which is being developed by the executive department at this late date. Why is it only after the idea was originally advanced by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations? The big question is, Why?

Mr. LANGER. Did not the executive want a 10-year extension, only a short time ago?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; indeed.

Mr. LANGER. And if it had not been for the Senator from Georgia, they would have succeeded in getting it. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I know of some individuals who have suggested a program as long as 75 years. I will give the Senator the names, if he wishes me to do so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the views expressed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I do not wish to obstruct any other agency in making its own investigation. However, I do not believe that such an investigation should be in substitution for an investigation to be made by the Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee should make its own study. Personally I would not be satisfied with the recommendations of an outside committee on a matter of this kind.

The Foreign Relations Committee has the special responsibility in this field. Granted that every Member of the Senate has an interest in it, just as he does in all major legislation; but under our traditions and under our rules, the primary responsibility is in the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is up to the committee to make an intelligent judgment of the need and it is that committee's responsibility to make the study.

Personally I have been very doubtful, and I am still very critical, of some of the purposes to which this money will be devoted. One of the things which has reconciled me in voting to report the bill and in my intention to vote for it on the floor of the Senate is the resolution of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I have said to myself, "I can go along for one more year if we are sure to have an investigation and a careful study and a full reevaluation of the purposes." If, after that study is made, the same purposes are apparent in the bill which comes before the Senate next year, I will conclude that I was wrong in my criticism of the bill.

I still believe that the bill is too heavily weighted for the military and too little devoted, relatively, to the economic development of underdeveloped countries. I believe in that sense it will be a waste of money. I believe we are paying too much attention to the military aspect in countries like Turkey, for example. Some very restrictive and regressive and reactionary developments have taken place in Turkey. Yesterday Turkey took a further step toward muzzling freedom of speech and muzzling the opposition in its young democratic parliament. I consider that a very backward step. That is an example, in my view, of an unbalanced policy in that field. I very strongly hope that the Senate will not sidetrack the resolution supported by the committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am greatly disturbed by the turn that this discussion has taken this afternoon. I was present in committee when the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, made the original suggestion that a thorough study be made of this whole subject. We all agreed that there was need for such a study. I did not then know that there would be an issue created as to how the study was to be organized or who should conduct it.

I had the privilege to attend a conference in the White House, which was also attended by the Senator from Georgia, and other Senators. At that time I understood there was no difference between the executive branch of the Government and the legislative branch in connection with the effort which was to be made to study our aid program.

Mr. President, it is most unfortunate that we should have reached this turn in the matter, and that the implication should be raised that the Executive would not make an honest study or investigation of the subject. I must protest any such insinuation.

Mr. President, I believe the Foreign Relations Committee has a perfect right to set up its own investigation. I also believe that the executive department has a perfect right to set up its own investigation. I had hoped that we could have some kind of arrangement which would provide for cooperation between them.

The whole idea was that we should try to get together and determine who could best make the investigation, whether it be the Brookings Institution, or some other outstanding group interested in foreign affairs. That is the spirit in which I understood the investigation would be made. I regret exceedingly that we have reached the point where a vote on the question will look like a political difference of opinion. I cannot very well vote against my party. However, I thought we had arranged the matter in the committee in such form as would recognize both the executive and the legislative branch of the Government.

To say that the Senate cannot trust the President of the United States to have a part in the investigation is certainly obectionable, and I cannot go along with any such suggestion. Therefore I shall be compelled to vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I shall do so because I must protest the suggestion that the President should be bypassed, or that we cannot trust his participation in such a study, and that therefore we should make an investigation independent of the Executive.

I believe the legislative and executive branches should be working together. We should not be getting into a row, so to speak, as to whether we will appoint a commission in which the Executive will participate, or whether an independent investigation should be made, where we would ignore the executive branch and, in effect, imply that the President would not make an honest investigation, or that anything done by the executive branch would be a whitewash. I am distressed by the whole thing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not correct to say that the idea behind the resolution adopted by the Committee on Foreign Relations was that the committee would conduct this study, and that we fully expected the executive to conduct a separate but parallel study, as was done when the Marshall plan, for instance, was put into effect? There we had a congressional study made by the Herter Committee of the House of Representatives, and the executive had its own, separate study made. The two were made to mesh, one with the other. It seemed to me that was done very well. I thought that was the reasoning behind the adoption of our resolution. I am sure the Senator from New Jersey will agree with me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I believe that is true, but it appears to me the implications are now that we are adopting the resolution in order to keep the Executive out of the picture entirely. That is something I cannot go along with. Therefore I am compelled to vote for the Knowland amendment, because that issue has been forced on us in the presentation of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Will the Senator from California yield me 1 minute?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am unable to do so. I have only 2 minutes remaining. Mr. President, I started my remarks by pointing out that there was certainly room for an honest difference of opinion as to how we should proceed to make a proper investigation. I have the highest confidence in the Senate. When I have found it necessary to be critical of the Executive, whether a Democrat or a Republican, I have never hesitated to discharge my responsibility as a Senator.

I have been shocked and surprised at the assertion that the Executive could not be depended upon to make a proper investigation, but I do not think the Executive should make the investigation alone. I believe that Congress has a coequal responsibility in that regard. It could happen that there would be 5 or 6 or 7 congressional reports, followed by a report from the Executive, and thus we would wind up without any constructive accomplishment in the long run.

We should all be interested in this matter. No man knows whether the next administration will be a Republican administration, which I hope it will be, or an administration dominated by the other party, which Members on the other side of the aisle hope it will be. We have a common responsibility as Americans, and I think the approach should be to have the Congress and the executive working together. There will be a bipartisan control. The procedure as to appointments to committees which has been followed heretofore I am sure would be followed in this instance, on recommendation of the majority leader and the minority leader, and I think the House would follow the same general procedure.

I would hope that under those circumstances the Commission could make a report which would be impressive both to the executive and to the legislative arm of the Government. For that reason, Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield 1 minute on the bill, so that I may add a few words?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to add, at the end of subsection (g) (3), in line 15 on page 5 of the amendment, the following: "by such inquiries and reports as it can obtain in the time permitted before its report is to be submitted."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I accept that amendment and I modify my amendment accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from California is so modified.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California as modified.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "nay" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay" and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State convention.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

I wish to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—41

Aiken	Dirksen	Mundt
Allott	Duff	Payne
Barrett	Dworshak	Potter
Beall	Flanders	Purtell
Bender	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Bricker	Hruska	Smith, Maine
Bridges	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Bush	Knowland	Thye
Butler	Kuchel	Watkins
Case, N. J.	Malone	Welker
Case, S. Dak.	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Cotton	McCarthy	Young
Curtis	Millikin	

NAYS—45

Anderson	Hill	McClellan
Bible	Holland	McNamara
Byrd	Humphrey, Minn.	Monroney
Chavez	Humphreys, Ky.	Morse
Clements	Jackson	Murray
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Neuberger
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Kefauver	Pastore
Ervin	Kennedy	Robertson
Frear	Kerr	Scott
Fulbright	Langer	Smathers
George	Lehman	Sparkman
Gore	Long	Stennis
Green	Mansfield	Symington
Hayden		Wofford
Hennings		

NOT VOTING—10

Capehart	Laird	Russell
Carlson	Magnuson	Wiley
Daniel	Martin, Iowa	
Jenner	Neely	

So Mr. KNOWLAND's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I submit an amendment which I ask to have lie on the table. I shall call it up later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and will lie on the table.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "6-27-56—C."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois desire that his amendment be read in full, or that it be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment proposed by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. DUFF, and Mr. LEHMAN) to the committee amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. —. (a) It is the declared policy of the Congress to resist the spread of communism. The issue between the free and the slave world is essentially whether freedom shall survive. The struggle to preserve freedom, however, is not to be won solely by further resistance to enslavement, but also by keeping alive in the hearts of enslaved people the spirit and hope of freedom. It is the purpose of this section to advance the cause of freedom by providing aid and support to those groups which are actively engaged in maintaining, inspiring, and instilling that spirit and hope.

"(b) (1) There is hereby created an agency under the name 'Freedom Administration' (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administration'), which shall be under the general direction and supervision of the President and shall not be affiliated with or be a part of any other agency or department of the Federal Government. The principal office of the Administration shall be located in the District of Columbia, but the Administration may establish offices in such other places as may be determined by the Administrator of the Administration.

"(2) The management of the Administration shall be vested in an Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator') who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Administrator shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum. There shall also be appointed to the Administration, by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, 8 Deputy Administrators who shall each be paid at the rate of $15,000 per annum. The deputy administrators shall be outstanding citizens of the United States, 1 of whom shall be of German descent, 1 of Polish descent, 1 of Lithuanian descent, 1 of Latvian descent, 1 of Estonian descent, 1 of Czech descent, 1 of Ukrainian descent, and 1 of such descent as to represent the remaining Slavic peoples in the Communist world.

"(c) The Administration shall have power to adopt, alter, and use a seal which shall be judicially noticed. The Administrator is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, to select, employ, appoint, and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. The Administration, with the consent of any department or agency of the Government, may avail itself on a reimbursable basis of the services, facilities, and personnel of any such department or agency.

"(d) For the purpose of carrying out its functions under this section, the Administration—

"(1) may sue and be sued;

"(2) may adopt, amend, and repeal rules and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and its powers exercised;

"(3) may make and carry out such contracts and other arrangements as are necessary or advisable in carrying out its functions;

"(4) may determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures, and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid subject to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended; and

"(5) take such other action as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(e) (1) The Administrator is authorized to make grants to any private or semiprivate nonprofit organization, committee, or group which is actively engaged in broadcasting, publishing, correspondence, or other activities designed to keep alive the spirit and hope of freedom, and the will to resist enslavement, in persons residing in Communist or Communist-dominated countries.

"(2) In making any grant under this section the Administrator shall advise and consult with the Director of Central Intelligence, and no such grant shall be made except with the concurrence of a majority of the deputy administrators of the Administration.

"(f) (1) There shall be established in the Treasury Department a special fund which shall be available without fiscal-year limitation for financing the operation and expenses of the Administration. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to such fund for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1957, the sum of $20 million.

"(2) Notwithstanding section 1415 of the supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, or any other provision of law, foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the United States shall, with the approval of the President, be made available to the Administration for the purpose of making any grant authorized by this section.

"(g) The Administrator shall submit to the President for transmission to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session an annual report of its operations under this section.

"(h) Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U. S. C. 846), is amended by inserting after 'St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation;' the words 'Freedom Administration.'"

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and myself, I offer this amendment establishing a Freedom Administration.

We propose that $20 million, an amount equal to about one-half of 1 percent of the foreign aid funds, be added to this appropriation authorization for the purpose of keeping freedom alive in the now-subjugated countries and peoples behind the Iron Curtain. In particular, I refer to countries held captive by Russia; namely, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania. In addition, Mr. President, I am proposing that the Congress recommend—and authorize where necessary—the use of certain counterpart funds, and also funds credited to the United States by foreign countries under section 550 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 and section 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, for the same purpose.

These funds, Mr. President, would be used to create and establish an independent agency of the Government, directly under the President, to be called a Freedom Administration. This Freedom Administration would allocate the funds provided to approved national freedom committees for the following purposes, among others:

First. To maintain and expand broadcasting activities to the enslaved peoples of Iron Curtain countries.

Second. To expand existing programs of correspondence to subjugated peoples for the purpose of keeping alive the spirit of freedom and resistance.

Third. To aid other programs by national groups, such as the printing and distribution of pamphlets and information, to keep freedom and hope alive in the enslaved nations.

Fourth. To finance programs to encourage and aid those who, at the risk of life itself, flee or have fled to the free world from the Communist world, and to offset the Communist drive to get these refugees to return to their original countries.

Fifth. To give monetary support to resistance groups which aim at eventual independence of now-satellite nations.

I think I should make it clear that it is not the intention of the amendment to incite armed revolt at an inopportune time behind the Iron Curtain, but to keep alive the spirit of resistance and stimulate effective slow-downs, which would have the effect of weakening the economic control of those countries. Of course, if we can help armed uprisings, we should not shrink from it.

Sixth. To publicize the names of those former democratic leaders of the Iron Curtain countries who still remain in jail or work camps, so that the world may know their fate and their struggle.

Seventh. To assist in promoting and maintaining other programs which aim at the eventual freedom of enslaved peoples. And I may say in this respect, that by providing adequate assistance to an agency and a staff of competent people, many other effective methods and ways may be found to further this cause.

Now, Mr. President, let me be more specific; first, about the Freedom Administration which I am proposing, and, second, about how it can be financed.

My amendment would create a Freedom Administration, an independent agency with an administrator who is an American citizen and directly responsible to the President of the United States.

In addition, my amendment provides for 8 assistant administrators, 1 of whom would be an outstanding German-American, 1 a Polish-American, 1 a Lithuanian-American, 1 a Latvian-American, 1 an Estonian-American, 1 a Czech-American, 1 of Ukrainian descent, and 1 American chosen to represent the Slavic peoples and other enslaved ethnic groups now behind the Iron Curtain.

The Administrator would be paid $17,500 per year and each Assistant Administrator, $15,000, or a total of $137,500.

The Administration, with the approval of any four of the Assistant Administrators, could use the funds appropriated for various purposes and specific projects among which are those which I have already mentioned and outlined.

Obviously, the President of the United States would have the final say-so on how and where the funds were to be used. My amendment would allow the Administrator to coordinate his programs with the Central Intelligence Agency. My amendment does not put the agency under the State Department for a number of valid reasons which I shall discuss later, but there is no reason why the President who, after all, is responsible for our foreign policy, could not consult with his Secretary of State on policy questions.

In addition to $20 million of the foreign-aid appropriation, the Freedom Administration could draw upon counterpart funds now on deposit in Europe to the credit of the United States, with the approval of the President, for allocation to approved national freedom committees now or hereafter functioning in the free world, to enable these committees to maintain and to step up their broadcasting, publishing, correspondence, and other campaigns to keep alive freedom and resistance behind the Iron Curtain. Committees to which counterpart funds are allocated shall have the approval of a majority of the Assistant Administrators.

As the Senate knows, in Europe and in Greece and Turkey at this time, 10 percent of the counterpart funds deposited to match dollar funds obligated in the country are reserved for United States use. This has been true since June 20, 1952, and before that time there was a 5-percent requirement. In the fiscal year 1955, the amount of funds of European countries transferred to United States use amounted to $31.9 million, and from April 3, 1948, to June 30, 1955, the cumulative amounts so deposited amounted to $610.6 million. Here, Mr. President, is a source of funds available for United States use which has already been appropriated by the Congress and which certainly can be and ought to be used in part for the purposes I have outlined here.

In addition, funds are made available for United States use under sections 550 of the act of 1951 and 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954. These are funds made available to the United States in the currency of the local country from the sale of United States surplus agricultural commodities. On June 30, 1955, the amount of the balance on deposit for Europe alone was $80,882,000. These funds, of course, are used for a variety of purposes, including direct forces support, defense support, and development assistance programs. Yet, there is no reason why a fair share of these funds could not be used for the purposes of establishing a Freedom Administration Agency.

Thus, Mr. President, it is possible to establish and carry out a Freedom Administration program to keep alive the spirit of freedom of the now subjugated peoples behind the Iron Curtain. The program can be carried out largely with funds which the Congress has already appropriated or which Congress will appropriate in the future for our mutual-security needs.

The program is bady needed. Too many people are being lulled into a sense of well-being and forgetfulness because of what I believe is only an apparent shift in Soviet policy. There is increasing talk in high circles in this country about coexistence and this can lead to dangerous concessions which will be in fact, although not in name, acts of appeasement. We must not forget those of our fellow men who still struggle against the chains of Communist slavery. We have pledged

ourselves as a matter of national policy to do all we can to keep their hope and spirit alive and to help them achieve their freedom and dignity as free men which all men everywhere deserve as a right. I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will approve of my proposal.

My amendment, Mr. President, is in no way designed to do away with certain functions which are already authorized by the Congress. I refer specifically to the program of the United States Information Agency and the United States escapee program and other programs designed to keep the spirit of freedom alive in the conquered countries.

But, Mr. President, the program I propose would extend that program and would use the talents and abilities of groups which are active in the fight for freedom but whose services are not now being used to any great extent.

There are numerous nationality groups—in the United States as well as in Europe—who are working day and night to aid their countrymen who are now in chains. For the most part, these groups have little money and their activities are limited by the small amount of private funds which are available to them. It is true that we are providing $7 million in the present appropriation for the escapee program, which my amendment would aid and abet. It is also true that, under section 401 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, the President has a special fund which he may use for certain specific programs; $100 million may be used for any selected persons who are residing in, or are escapees from, the Soviet Union and the conquered satellites. I wish to stress those words, "selected persons," for the amendment I propose would go beyond selected persons to nationality groups who are already organized and who are fighting by peaceful means to gain freedom for their countrymen. Further, the purposes for which the funds under section 401 can be used by the President have been limited. He can use them—and I quote from the language of Public Law 665 "either to form such persons into elements of the military forces supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or for other purposes when the President determines that such assistance will contribute to the defense of the North Atlantic area or to the security of the United States."

Mr. President, those are worthy purposes. I agree with them. But, Mr. President, the money has not been spent—to my knowledge—in any great amount to use the services of the many nationality groups who are fighting the Communists. The President's fund is a program aimed at persons and it is a program aimed primarily at bringing these persons into the North Atlantic Treaty military organization. Therefore, the amendment I offer in no way conflicts with section 401, the President's special fund, and, in fact, would harness the abilities and knowledge of groups of free men on this side of the Iron Curtain to help speed the day when their own former countries would be free and independent. My amendment would establish a program which is not now in effect and would tap the abilities and resources of peoples and groups whose abilities are not now being used on anything like the scale they should be used. That, Mr. President, is the purpose of my amendment and it is a purpose which is both a worthy one and one which is not now being put into effect.

A word or two of history about this amendment and about an alternative amendment which was offered and adopted earlier this afternoon may be in order. The amendment which is now being offered was first offered by me to the Foreign Relations Committee during its deliberations, in substantially the same form in which it is now offered. At the same time. my colleague, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], proposed an alternative amendment, having some, though not all, of the same aims, but differing from our amendment in at least two major respects:

First, instead of some $20 million provided under my amendment, plus the use of counterpart and other funds available to the United States in foreign countries, his amendment provided $5 million, and that to be spent at the discretion of the President.

Second, whereas I proposed a separate administration based on nationality groups in this country, he proposed that it be administered under the direction of the President.

Both of those proposals were considered by the Foreign Relations Committee, and both were rejected. The State Department sent to the committee a letter, which I shall discuss later in my speech, describing its reasons for opposing my amendment.

I determined to bring this matter up on the floor, and therefore had my amendment printed and presented to a number of Members of the Senate. I gave notice to the leadership that I intended to raise the question, as a matter of public record, and that I was going to bring up the issue. I talked it over at a luncheon for a number of Senators including the minority leader. I held nothing back and was frank about what I intended to do. My colleague did not have his amendment printed. There was no record of which I was aware that it was going to be offered, and I assumed, perhaps unwarily, that it would not be offered.

This afternoon, a little more than 2 hours ago, when very few Senators were on the floor, my colleague presented his amendment in typewritteen form, with some penciled additions to it, and it was accepted and is now a part of the bill.

I regret that I was not notified by him that this alternative proposal to ours was to be submitted. My office was not notified, and I am told that the amendment went through when there were very few Senators present on the floor.

I hasten to say that I have notified my colleague that I intended to speak on this subject. His office was notified; and, just a few minutes ago, I notified him in person. So I feel I at least have observed the amenities of the Senate in giving full notice to my colleague of what I intended to do.

Incidentally, I think it may be worthy of notice that, whereas my amendment was brushed off with a letter from an Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Hill, the Secretary of State himself addressed a letter to my colleague approving his proposal. I am not an expert on protocol, but I sometimes wonder if under this administration they have established two classes of Senators here, first-class Senators and second-class Senators, second-class Senators being Democratic Senators whose proposals receive notice only from an Assistant Secretary of State, whereas Republican Senators get the red-carpet treatment and receive letters from the Secretary of State.

I rather think I am correct on such matters of gentlemanly etiquette, if not State Department protocol, and I respectfully call this fact to the attention of the cutaway-coat and striped-pants boys down in Foggy Bottom who are experts, so they think, in all matters of gentlemanly decorum.

Let me proceed to discuss the substantive merits of our proposal, and to contrast it with the proposal made by my colleague. In the first place, our amendment would give more money; specifically, it would set aside $20 million, as contrasted to the $5 million authorized under the amendment of my colleague. In addition, our amendment would permit counterpart funds and funds built up by the sale of agricultural commodities abroad among others, to be drawn on for the purposes of my amendment. So that our proposal calls for a much more adequately financed program than does that of my colleague.

Secondly, it should be noticed that the proposal of my colleague merely states that the money is to be spent at the discretion of the President. I have discussed the fact that Congress, on a previous occasion, by the adoption of the so-called Kersten amendment some time back, provided funds of $100 million, to be spent at the discretion of the President, for some of these purposes, although they might be regarded as being limited merely to integrating refugees from behind the Iron Curtain countries into the Armed Forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I have been trying to get the facts on how much has been spent under the Kersten program. The committee report seems to indicate, on page 50, that not more than $12 million of the $100 million appropriated last year has been spent; and I have heard reports that appreciably less than that has been spent. So I think it can be said that the administration has not taken advantage of the funds which already have been provided to it, and that if we can judge the future by the past—which is substantially the only way one can judge the future—the prospects do not look very good for much action under the amendment which was adopted when only a few Members were on the floor, and when not many Members knew what was going on.

A third difference is that my colleague's proposal would, of necessity, mean that the work would be carried on

under the direction of the State Department. We had certain very definite reasons for setting up a separate administration from the State Department to handle this matter. I shall try to discuss those reasons very frankly and in all charity. The members of the State Department have frequently been unjustly criticized and when this has been done, I have defended them. But a frank statement of their disqualifications is in order.

In the first place, it is very hard to get the State Department to try to sow discontent within any country with which it has diplomatic relationships. The members of the State Department are trained in the code of diplomacy—at least toward foreign countries, if not toward members of the opposition party within their own country; and they observe a proud punctillio in such matters, by saying that they should not sow discontent with one hand while they balance a teacup or a cocktail glass with the other. They are the teacup boys and the cocktail boys and the diplomatic note-writing boys; and do not like to have their attention diverted in other directions. They sometimes find it beneath their dignity to stir up discontent among the peoples of the governments with which they are dealing. This is not an indictment by me of the State Department; it is merely an indication that those in the State Department have certain occupational characteristics which they cannot overcome. Barbers are said to be loquacious; shoemakers' children are supposed to be ill shod; and members of the State Department do not like to engage in stirring up discontent in the countries to which they are assigned. In fact, members of the State Department feel that they are representatives to governments, not representatives to peoples; and I wish to say that they tend to regard their duties as being discharged when they present diplomatic notes and when they go through the formalities of communication. As a result, when someone like Mrs. Anderson or Mr. Bowles comes along—someone who wishes to be friendly with the people and to establish bonds of amity with them—the members of the State Department shake their collective heads, and their collars wilt, and their faces become longer and longer, and their temperature diminishes to such a point that fruit could be preserved for a long time in the low temperature which exudes from them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator from Illinois be willing to strike out the word "collective" from his phrase "collective heads"?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Perhaps I should strike out the word "heads" and substitute "that organ of the body which gives to them tropismatic responses." [Laughter.] That is one point. We felt that there should be more vigorous administration than that, and that the administration should be handled by a new group.

Furthermore, with the passage of time, any governmental agency tends to become somewhat waterlogged and unenthusiastic about new projects; and if we are to obtain results, it is frequently necessary to start a new administration. We found that to be true when we began the Marshall plan. The State Department wanted to administer it; but it is well known that if that had happened, the Marshall plan would not have been very effective. So a separate administration was established to handle the Marshall plan; that administration was under Mr. Paul Hoffman. Regardless of whether one approves of the principles of the Marshall plan—I think nearly everyone does now, although perhaps some may quarrel about the amounts spent—I think everyone will agree that under Mr. Hoffman, the Marshall plan was handled much more efficiently than it would have been if it had been handled by State Department personnel.

There is another point, and I shall be frank about it, namely, that while the Republican candidate for the presidency and his prospective Secretary of State campaigned vigorously on the program of liberation, in practice that program was not carried out, once the administration took office; and, instead, there has been substituted a program of coexistence and of getting along with the Russians, which tends to make the administration reluctant to embark upon a vigorous program of this type.

Mr. President, I wish to cite, if I may, the pledges which Mr. Dulles and General Eisenhower made in the campaign of 1952. I do this, not in a partisan sense, but in order that Members of the Senate may be apprised of the commitments the administration made when it sought the favor of the American people; and I do so in the hope that the President and the Secretary of State and the State Department may have second thoughts about the matter, and may return to their earlier position.

In an article in Life Magazine on May 19, 1952, Mr. John Foster Dulles wrote:

> Consider the situation of the twenty-odd non-Western nations which are next door to the Soviet world. * * * Today they live close to despair because the United States, the historic leader of the forces of freedom seems dedicated to the negative policy of containment and stalemate.
>
> But liberation from the yoke of Moscow will not occur for a very long time, and courage in neighboring lands will not be sustained, unless the United States makes it publicly known that it wants and expects liberation to occur.

Mr. President, if any Member doubts the accuracy of that quotation, I have before me a photostatic copy of the article which was published in Life magazine.

Mr. Dulles continued, as follows:

> The mere statement of that wish and expectation would change, in an electrifying way, the mood of the captive peoples. It would put heavy new burdens on the jailers and create new opportunities for liberation. (Life, May 19, 1952, p. 154.)

In the Republican Party platform of 1952, there was this statement:

> The policies we espouse will revive the contagious, liberating influences which are inherent in freedom. They will inevitably set up strains and stresses within the captive world which will make the rulers impotent to continue in their monstrous ways and mark the beginning of their end.

Mr. President, Members of the Senate will recall that the chairman of the committee who wrote this section of the Republican Party platform in 1952 was the present Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles.

Then we come to August 1952; and when speaking before the American Legion Convention, on August 25, 1952, Candidate Eisenhower had this to say:

> We must tell the Kremlin that never shall we desist in our aid to every man and woman of those shackled lands who seek refuge with us, any man who keeps burning among his own people the flame of freedom or who is dedicated to the liberation of his fellows.

Mr. President, that quotation will be found in the New York Times for August 26, 1952, on page 12; and if any Member doubts the accuracy of that quotation, I have before me a photostatic copy of the article in the New York Times.

Our proposal would help to make it clear, in the words of General Eisenhower, that the United States "never shall desist in our aid to every man and woman of those shackled lands who seeks refuge with us."

Following this speech of General Eisenhower on August 25, he and Mr. Dulles conferred, and the results of the conference were made public in a news conference by Mr. Dulles on August 26, 1952. Mr. Dulles made the following statement, as quoted in the New York Times of August 27, 1952, pages 1 and 15:

> General Eisenhower agreed with me again that the most important single issue before the American people is the issue of foreign policy.
>
> What we should do is try to split the satellite states away from the control of a few men in Moscow, he urged. The only way to stop a head-on collision with the Soviet Union is to break it up from within.
>
> Mr. Dulles said the United States should never accept a dvided Korea, a divided Germany, or a divided Austria as a finality. Truce negotiations should be continued to end the fighting in Korea, he said, but they should not be used as an arrangement which divide Korea permanently.

And on August 27, 1952, in a speech before the American Political Science Association at Buffalo, N. Y., Mr. Dulles had this to say—and I quote from the New York Times of August 28, 1952, page 12:

> Next, he said, resistance movements would spring up among patriots, who could be supplied and integrated via air drops and other communications from private organizations like the Committee for a free Europe.

Although there were many other specific pledges in the 1952 campaign, I wish to quote only two more by General Eisenhower. Speaking in Cincinnati on September 22, 1952, he made the following statement:

> These principles demand that we use every political, every economic, every psychological tactic to see that the liberating spirit, in the nations conquered by communism, shall never perish. Thus, we shall help each captive nation to maintain an outward strain against its Moscow bond. The lands closed in behind the Iron Curtain will seethe with discontent; their people, not servants docile under a Soviet master, but ardent patriots yearning to be free again. Nothing is so

damaging to a tyrant's war machine as the steadfast spirit of an unhappy people.

And on September 27, 1952, Mr. Eisenhower made this pledge in a letter to the town meeting, Old Sturbridge, Mass., and I quote:

> In the struggle against expanding communism, we must miss no opportunity to rally men and women everywhere to the cause of freedom and progress, as opposed to the reaction of totalitarian policies and methods. We must fully develop under efficient, able direction every psychological weapon that is available to us.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Am I correct in believing that all the statements which the distinguished Senator from Illinois has quoted were made during the Presidential campaign of 1952?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

I believe those pledges were straightforward and clear. I believe that there were no "ifs" or "buts" about them.

I welcomed those statements. I thought that General Eisenhower, Mr. Dulles, and other speakers for the Republican Party were very unjust in the charges they made about the Truman administration and Mr. Acheson. They attacked the Truman policy of containment. They said they had another policy, namely, liberation. It never seemed to me that those were antithetical or opposed policies. We must contain a force before we can roll it back. Therefore it seemed to me that the criticism of the policy of containment was wrong. But I recognized the fact that we were in a stage in which, after communism had been contained by the wise policies of Truman, it was quite proper that we should attempt to roll it back and to liberate the subject peoples.

I believe, therefore, that what I am proposing is clearly in line with the campaign pledges made to the American people in 1952, by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles, and that there is no basic principle by which the administration can, in good conscience, object to the plan I am putting forward.

But, Mr. President, I wish to be fair and I wish to stay away from a partisan position on this subject which is so important to the free world, to the American people, and to the subjugated peoples behind the Iron Curtain. For that reason, let me argue in detail the objective which the State Department raised to my amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that, at this point in my remarks, there be printed a copy of the letter which the State Department sent to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in which they object to my amendment.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1956.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: In accordance with a request by your staff, we have reviewed an amendment to H. R. 10082 intended to be proposed by Senator DOUGLAS which would create a new Freedom Administration, as an independent agency of the United States Government.

The executive branch is in full accord with the policy stated in this proposal, that is, to keep alive in the hearts of enslaved people the spirit and hope of freedom. As you know, many of our programs are pointed exactly toward this objective. The mutual security program, including the United States escapee program, and the activities of the United States Information Agency are examples of this effort now being carried on by the Government.

The Department of State does not, however, feel it can endorse the passage of this amendment for a number of reasons:

1. The Freedom Administration would operate in an area directly impinging on the foreign relations and policies of the United States, but would, although subject to presidential supervision, be independent of the President's principal adviser on foreign policy, the Secretary of State. At the same time, one of the chief functions of the Freedom Administration—the making of monetary grants to certain anti-Communist organizations—would by law be subject to consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence. This provision, especially when linked with the mutual security program, would in itself bring the motives of the administration into question and offer a prime target for Soviet-inspired attacks.

2. The executive branch does, of course, share Senator DOUGLAS' desire to see free institutions restored to the countries and peoples of Eastern Europe now incorporated against their will either within the U. S. S. R. or subjected to its domination. However, once we agree that war is excluded as a means to attain this objective and that other means are required, the most careful attention must be given to the means actually chosen. Certain activities can best be undertaken by agencies of the United States Government, while other steps can be most properly carried out through private, nongovernmental groups.

3. If by grants of public funds the Freedom Administration publicly recorded direct Government interest in certain anti-Communist organizations, there would be the danger that such organizations would immediately take on the character and limitations of official operations, thereby impinging upon similar activities currently being carried out by governmental agencies. Moreover, the appeal which such activities offer as representative national and private groups to the people of the captive nations would thereby be sacrificed.

In addition to the above policy objections there are serious administrative difficulties which would make the proposed amendment unworkable.

Should there be other aspects of this matter which you or Senator DOUGLAS believe should be privately discussed, we should be happy to review them with you and him at any time.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the transmittal to your committee of the report contained in this letter.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HILL,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First of all, Mr. President, they say that they are in "full accord" with the policy stated in my proposal. Then, however, they object to my amendment. I believe that their objections will not stand analysis and I propose to analyze them now.

They say that the making of monetary grants to certain "anti-Communist" organizations when linked with the mutual security program would "in itself bring the motives of the administration into question and offer a prime target for Soviet-inspired attacks."

Mr. President, that objection is one that is hard to take seriously. Our country is committed to an anti-Communist policy. Everyone knows that. We voted an extra $1.1 billion for the Air Force to protect our country and we made no bones about whom it was we feared. The USIA is certainly designed—as a governmental program—to be an "anti-Communist" policy. Do we care that the Russians claim that the USIA is anti-Communist in purpose? Certainly, I do not. So, Mr. President, if our Government, in many different ways is sponsoring and advocating anti-Communist programs, how, in heaven's name, can a program which I am offering and advocating bring the motives of the administration into question and offer a prime target for Soviet-inspired attacks?

I may say in this connection that this objection which the State Department advanced to my amendment would apply equally to the amendment of my colleague, which Mr. Dulles approved, because the amendment of my colleague would permit grants to private organizations engaged in keeping alive the will for freedom behind the Iron Curtain. So apparently if a proposal is advanced by the Democratic Senator from Illinois, it is an improper proposal, but if a similar proposal is advanced by my junior colleague, the Republican Senator from Illinois, it is perfectly proper and praiseworthy. This confirms my long held belief that Mr. Dulles is a Republican before he is anything else and that he is always seeking to put the Democrats, upon whom he depends for support, in a hole. This is apparently his version of bipartisan cooperation. Thank God there are some of us who have higher standards than that.

What motives would be under attack? Are we not proud that our motives are to give hope and freedom to those who are now in chains behind the Iron Curtain? Perhaps the State Department is afraid that that motive might be attacked, but I say that is a decent motive. I say that is a motive which is our national policy. I say that is a motive which the Congress has passed on time and time again, and one for which we have appropriated billions and billions of dollars. And why should we be concerned that the Soviet would inspire attacks on such a Freedom Administration? Of course, they would inspire attacks on it. Are we to sit back and fold our hands because through a Freedom Administration, through a large Air Force, through a huge defense budget, and through our mutual security program, we offer the Soviet Union prime targets for attack? I believe that this argument of the State Department is one which cannot stand the test of analysis and, if we accepted it, we would now cut our defenses, stop our mutual security program, junk the USIA, do away with the CIA, and give up the refugee escapee program. The Communists have aimed their attacks at these acts and organizations. That

merely proves how effective they are. And the Communists would aim their attacks at the Freedom Administration which, so far as I am concerned, is a very valid reason for adopting it.

The second objection which the State Department makes is that "certain activities can best be undertaken by agencies of the United States Government, while other steps can be most properly carried out through private nongovernmental organizations."

I gather that their objection is that my amendment would give the weight and backing of the United States Government to the Freedom Administration program to keep the spirit of freedom alive behind the Iron Curtain. I gather that the State Department believes that this should be done by private groups. I think there are a number of valid answers to that objection.

First, I believe that it should be the policy of the United States Government to keep freedom alive behind the Iron Curtain. Further, I believe that the administration is committed to that—not just that it is to be carried out by private agencies—but is committed to use the agencies for Government to obtain that. That certainly is what our diplomacy should be aimed at. That certainly is what the CIA, the USIA, the President's special fund, and the mutual security program is aimed at. There can be no objection that this program should not be carried out by the United States Government. That is a foolish objection, for the object and the means I propose are already ones which, in part, at least, the United States Government is committed to.

I found it a bit difficult to understand the confusion on this point. On the one hand, it has been argued that my amendment is not needed because we already do some of these things. Of course, as Members know, we do not do all of the things I am proposing and we have failed to tap all of the resources—like the nationality groups with their special knowledge—to carry out the purpose of my amendment. Nonetheless, my amendment has been objected to on grounds that it is already being done.

But, on the other hand, we find the State Department arguing that the Freedom Administration which I am proposing, and the means by which it should be carried out, should be handled by private nongovernmental groups.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on page 55 I move to strike out section 13, beginning in line 1 and ending in line 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is not in order at this time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for a half hour on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would have to object to that, because it would vitiate the whole unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I understand that when the unanimous-consent agreement was discussed, it was pointed out that if a Senator needed more time, he could always offer another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may offer an amendment at the appropriate time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am sure the Senator from California, for whom I have the highest respect, would wish to have this subject discussed fully, irrespective of how Senators vote on the amendment. I hope he will not object to the request of the Senator from Illinois. It is a fair request.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield time to the Senator from Minesota?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I wish to address the Chair. I wish to call up an amendment. On page 4 of the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I seek to strike out——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such an amendment is not in order at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Are we being foreclosed from offering amendments to the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. There is no attempt at foreclosure. However, under the unanimous-consent agreement a half hour is allotted to each side on the amendment. When the opposition has had an opportunity to reply to the Senator from Illinois, and when all time on the amendment has expired, it will be in order for a Senator to offer an amendment, at which time the Senator from Illinois or any other Senator will have an additional half hour of time to speak on another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Does the opposition to the amendment intend to use its time on the amendment, or does it intend to forfeit its time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. We will use some of the time. We may not use all of it. If not, I shall be glad to give some of my time to the Senator from Illinois. However, we do have a number of speakers on the amendment, and I believe the orderly procedure to follow would be to permit the opposition to be heard.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the distinguished majority leader if he would be willing to yield me not to exceed 8 minutes on the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like to cut that request down a little bit. I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Illinois. While he is speaking on the additional time, Senators may be able to get together and decide whether they will offer another amendment. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Yesterday an amendment was offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. Subsequently an amendment was substituted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. At that time I posed the question as to whether we were adopting a system of extending time under the unanimous-consent agreement. I said if we were, I wanted to be notified of that fact, so that the arrangement would apply equally to everyone. I now find that the Senator from Illinois is not privileged to permit another Senator to offer an amendment. I should like to point out that yesterday no one spoke after the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] had spoken, so far as his amendment was concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yesterday the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] withdrew his amendment, and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] offered another amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I shall resume the discussion after we have had an opportunity to consult with one another and to consider the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes on the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, those who oppose the amendment cannot have it both ways. They cannot argue on the one hand that what I propose is not needed—for it is already being done—and on the other hand that it should not be done by the United States Government but should be carried out by private groups. There is a clear inconsistency in this argument. The facts are that what I am proposing is not being carried out by the American Government; it should be carried out by the American Government, and my amendment provides the means for doing it.

The third objection of the State Department is that if funds were granted to these nationality groups, after approval by the President and by the CIA, and by a majority of the administrators of the program—

> There would be the danger that such organizations would immediately take on the character and limitations of official operations, thereby impinging upon similar activities currently being carried out by governmental agencies. Moreover, the appeal which such activities offer as representative national and private groups to the people of the captive nations would thereby be sacrificed.

Now, Mr. President, that is an objection which has already been raised in the first two objections of the State Department. I believe, again, that the State Department cannot have it both ways. They claim that my program would impinge on activities currently being carried out by governmental agencies—which activities apparently do not embarrass the United States—but that if the national and private groups were

given support by the United States Government their special appeal would be sacrificed.

That is an amazing argument. Why is it, then, that the nationality groups support my amendment? Surely, if they thought they would lose their special appeal in gaining freedom for their countrymen, they would oppose my amendment. But, they support it and have urged it, because they know it is yet another method by which their ends—which are the eventual freedom of their countrymen, can be brought about.

And, again, we have conflicting argument that it is already being carried out, and, on the other hand, it should not be carried out. Again, the State Department is trying to argue both ways.

Mr. President, I may say that this is a very serious matter. There has been little or no attempt by the administration to effect liberation. The promises of the administration in the campaign of 1952—that is, the promises of General Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles—probably did help to inspire the abortive armed revolts behind the Iron Curtain in the spring of 1953. However, it was soon found that we had no positive program to support those people. As a result, the leaders were killed or thrown into prison, and it was a net blow to the resistance movement.

We are not proposing an armed revolt at an inopportune time. We are proposing that the spirit of revolt be kept alive, and that a collective slowdown be encouraged, which would be almost impossible to detect and which would be extremely effective in its operation.

Unless we do something to help sustain the spirit of resistance behind the Iron Curtain, we will likely lose out.

A few weeks ago one of the leading members of the Polish Government in exile in London, a man whose previous record had been that of a devoted anti-Communist, announced he was returning to Poland. He said he was returning to Poland because of his disgust with the policies of the American and British Governments.

He had concluded that neither the United States nor Great Britain meant business, and that the only thing to do was for him to make terms with the Communist Government of Poland.

Mr. President, in the riots which started yesterday and which may be going on now in Poland the heroic people of that nation, with their bare hands, have risen against their masters, and, according to the Warsaw-controlled radio, 38 have been killed and 270 wounded. I think we should send a message of hope to them, and I submit that my amendment would do that.

Mr. President, I do not believe the State Department has a single valid argument against my proposal. They say they are in full accord with the policy of my amendment and then turn around and put forward a number of obviously inconsistent arguments.

We are not to do this, according to them, because the Communists might attack our motives. But we all know the Communists attack our motives at every step. When we help colonial peoples to freedom we are accused of being anticolonial. When we arm to keep ourselves strong against the huge Russian military machine, we are accused of being militaristic. When we wish to share our atom knowledge, under proper safeguards, with the rest of the world and to have adequate inspection of atomic facilities throughout the world, we are accused of wanting to foment an atom war. Mr. President, let us not be dissuaded because the Communists might attack our motives.

In summary, Mr. President, I believe that this amendment should be adopted.

It is needed.

Its purposes are unobjected to.

The arguments against it are inconsistent.

The policies it would carry out have been proclaimed by the President and his Secretary of State.

The Congress of the United States has supported its aims by dozens of its actions.

Therefore, I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment and that we can give this further encouragement to the peoples of the Iron Curtain.

Mr. President, I have been glad to send to Chicago to the great meeting honoring the memory of Ignace Jan Paderewski, the first Premier of Poland, on the 15th anniversary of his death, today, the following message:

I not only join with you in honoring the memory of a great world citizen, Ignace Jan Paderewski, but I share with you the deep feelings of encouragement at the dramatic new evidence of the undying determination of the Polish people to struggle for their freedom despite the most brutal and oppressive tyranny. I hope the Congress will answer the courgeous resistance of the people of Poznan by taking affirmative action to establish a Freedom Administration to encourage and assist all proper efforts to liberate the people of Poland and other Iron Curtain countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I have 1 more minute?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hope I can further tell this great Chicago meeting of Polish Americans honoring the memory of Ignace Jan Paderewski that the Senate of the United States has taken action today to encourage the liberation of those under Communist subjugation by approving this amendment, and that we can send a message of hope not only to the victims of tyranny in Poland itself but to all others who suffer under Communist rule. This would be the most fitting tribute of all—positive action for liberation—to the memory of that great statesman and fighter for freedom, Ignace Jan Paderewski.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I join with the distinguished Senator from Illinois in my interest in foreign populations and the people behind the Iron Curtain. I believe my record will show that I have been rather active in that field ever since I have been a Member of the Senate. But I think the approach of the Senator from Illinois to this question is the wrong approach.

I understand the Senate has already adopted an amendment, offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], which covers the same field in a less elaborate way.

The argument which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has made does not strike me as being valid. Certainly, we must do all we can. We have built a foundation, and now we are asked to erect a new edifice—to establish a new executive branch agency. This would interfere with the State Department's functions in the foreign-policy field, would cause confusion about United States policies, and would necessitate coordination with existing agencies. It would raise false hopes, in my judgment, in the minds of the people behind the Iron Curtain.

The amendment calls for eight deputy administrators appointed on a basis of national origins. This idea is contrary to United States traditions of proper qualifications for public office. Frankly, I think it is questionable whether we should use national origins as a basis for such appointments.

The Freedom Administration would be a Government corporation. This form of organization is inconsistent with the tasks which the agency would be called upon to perform.

The amendment would authorize the appropriation of $20 million in each fiscal year for use by the Freedom Administration. This would be in addition to the amounts in the bill recommended by the committee. There is no program for using this new amount, so that the Senate has no idea whether such an appropriation makes sense or not.

Forthermore, it seems to me the Commission would be rather fancy in its general setup. The amendment calls for a Commissioner at a salary of $17,500 a year, and for 8 deputies at $15,000 apiece, and the deputies are to be chosen from certain nationalities in this country.

I cannot imagine how such a Commission would operate or that it could operate in the manner contemplated. The amendment would make available to the Freedom Administration any foreign currencies owned by the United States. This authority would be without control by Congress, since it would be exempt from controls established by section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953.

I am familiar with the general program of student exchange and with how that program is financed. I am wondering whether it is intended to take the use of foreign currencies used for that important program to finance this Freedom Administration.

The amendment would duplicate the authority already existing in the Mutual Security Act of 1954, in sections 401, 403, and 405, to carry out programs consistent with the purpose of the amendment. The amendment would also duplicate authority granted to the State Department and the USIA.

Section 401 of the act provides:

Not to exceed $100,000,000 of the funds available under this section may be expended for any selected persons who are residing in or escapees from the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia or the Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied areas of Germany, or any Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied areas of Asia and any other countries absorbed by the Soviet Union, either to form such persons into elements of the military forces supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or for other purposes, when the President determines that such assistance will contribute to the defense of the North Atlantic area or to the security of the United States.

It seems to me that this section is more comprehensive and more in line with our present setup than this new proposal would be.

Of course, there is always a danger that establishing an organization of this kind would give rise to Soviet propaganda against the United States to the effect that this agency is the only United States agency interested in freedom. It does not seem to me to be the appropriate way to handle the matter.

So, Mr. President, I express my opposition to the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Illinois, at the same time assuring him that I am deeply concerned with the whole problem of the people behind the Iron Curtain and sympathize with their desire for freedom. It should continue to be our purpose to give them every hope of freedom from Communist oppression.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am responsible only for my own conduct, and I trust that whatever I may do here will be supported by the Senate.

There is nothing so irresistible as attack. On the 12th day of February I was in Chicago addressing a meeting, and at that time the question of whether something more should be done to aid the nationality groups in this country to keep alive the spirit of freedom and hope was very widely discussed. I came back to the Nation's Capital a few days later, and, shortly thereafter, I addressed a letter to the very distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. That letter was responded to by the very distinguished clerk of that committee, Dr. Marcy. And may I say that the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate is certainly honored by having as committee clerk one of the very finest gentlemen I ever knew. He is not only a scholar, but, in every sense, he is a gentleman. So, Mr. President, when I want to know anything I go to the very indispensable group of clerks of committees who know the score.

I presented the matter to Dr. Marcy, and he said that in due course it would come before the committee. I submitted certain language at that time, and when the hearings on the foreign aid bill began, that language was considered, but it was laid on the table. It was mentioned to me at the time that my distinguished colleague had also submitted an amendment, and that his amendment was also laid on the table.

I then said to Dr. Marcy, "I wonder if we cannot revise the language so as to make it acceptable to the committee."

A few days later the language was revised and was submitted to me. I made a few modifications in the revised form, and I have carried the amendment very religiously with me since the debate began.

I have been very attentive to this matter, because I have been interested in it, as have other Senators. When the session began at noon today, I found myself beset with two committee sessions, and I came to the Senate Chamber at 12:30.

But I remind my colleague that on yesterday I talked with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], when he was presiding over this body, and suggested two amendments which I desired to offer. I came into the Chamber today and, at his suggestion, deferred offering the amendments on the ground that it was perhaps too early for the committee to accept any amendments to be taken to conference.

The result was that I went to lunch. While I was at lunch, word came to me to return to the Chamber; that there was an opportunity to present the amendments. I presented them. There was no objection. Both of them were agreed to.

I cannot be responsible whether other Senators are in their places. I give an accounting only of my own stewardship. In so doing, I never reflect upon any other Member of this body.

The Senator from Georgia very graciously accepted both amendments. Then I went about my business, first to a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary dealing with judges, and then to hear testimony upstairs, where there is a room full of witnesses.

It was not until I came into the Chamber to respond to a quorum call that I got a message from my office stating that my distinguished senior colleague was going to refer to the fact that my amendments had been offered.

I simply submit that there are a number of persons in the world and quite a number of persons in this body who have had a continuing interest in the question of liberation. I have declaimed it from the housetops and from platforms in probably two-thirds of the States of the Union. So I make no apologies for my action, because I feel as deeply on this subject, and I am just as close to those groups, as is any other Member of the Senate.

Therefore, my conduct was entirely circumspect. If there is any quarrel about the language in which my amendment is couched, I can only say that I enlisted the aid of the very distinguished clerk of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that I proposed this matter almost 6 months ago, when the foreign-aid bill was scarcely in the incubation stage.

I know also of the difficulty of selling an amendment on the floor of the Senate. So it was, some days ago, that I importuned the Department of State concerning the necessity for doing something on this subject. It took me quite some time to get all the answers I wanted. At long last, I contacted one of the officials of the Department and said, "Now I want some kind of answer." That answer came to me yesterday afternoon in the form of a letter signed by the Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles. He said the Department supported the proposal in the form in which it was submitted today.

I do not know what the Department did about the proposal of my colleague, but I know that the State Department has indicated its support of my amendment over the signature of the Secretary of State.

I understand that some reference was made to class A and class B Senators. Selfishly, I hope I shall always be in class A. I do not know what the distinction is between the two, but I do know that any Member of the Senate, regardless of his political persuasion and his partisan affiliation, can always get an answer from the State Department, and can always get polite, courteous treatment.

But I did not wait when I was notified that the Committee on Foreign Relations had laid my amendment on the table along with the amendment of my distinguished colleague. I then went to work to prepare my amendment in a form which would be acceptable, and I labored further to get the approval of the State Department.

So I am grateful, indeed, that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations should have said today, in the very brief discussion we had, that he thought the amendment had merit.

I add only one other thing, namely, that the amendment is amendatory of a section which is already in the bill.

Everyone knows of the Kersten Act, which deals with this matter. One hundred and fifty million dollars was made available, of which $100 million was designed to create smaller components of escapees, in the interest of the support of the United States, the amount to be spent under the direction of the President of the United States.

My amendment is a complete departure from the proposal which is presently pending. It merely authorizes an increase of $5 million for this purpose, expands the purposes somewhat, and eases the administration of the provision by the State Department, because it is quite in line with the basic effort in section 401 of the act.

One other point, and then I shall have finished. I listened to and followed with great interest the speech by the President in August 1954 to the American Legion Convention. I have carried that speech with me. In that speech the President said we must assist the liberation cause by administration. Then he used this language: "By other material means."

So it will be discovered that what I was trying to do was to articulate the program of the President, and the phrase, "by material means," appears in the amendment today. It is a fortuity, of course, that it should come almost on the day when there was a revolt, a protest, and almost a rebellion in Poland

because the people are without bread, and are discovering now what the heavy hand of tyranny and despotism means to them.

I think the amendment comes as a beacon and as a shining light of hope. I trust the amendment will become embedded in the language of the bill, that it will be retained in conference, and that it will be translated into action in the interest of the liberation of peoples for whom the lamps of freedom have long ago been extinguished.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield an additional minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The distinguished Senator from Illinois has correctly pointed out that the Kersten amendment made available $150 million.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My understanding is that only a relatively small amount of the funds provided in the Kersten amendment have been expended. What I have not been able to understand is why the proposed $5 million is needed. As a matter of fact, I feel certain the Senator from Illinois knows that that is really the reason why the Committee on Foreign Relations decided not to add such an amendment to the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I say to my friend from Alabama, first, that I was not advised, and I am not advised, as to how much of the $150 million under the Kersten amendment has been expended. They are unvouchered funds, and the President does not give an account of them. I did not feel free to ask, in the state of the law, for an accounting to ascertain how much money was available. I wanted to be sure, therefore, that funds were available. Whether it is $1 million, $5 million, or $10 million is not nearly so important as that the language of the provision in the existing law be broadened so that this program can go forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Has all time been used on this particular amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that whatever time remains is under the control of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, would the Senator from Minnesota like to have me yield him some time? I have some remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I say most respectfully to the Senator from California that it is my intention to offer an amendment to strike certain sections of this particular amendment, which I think might be somewhat helpful.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In order to facilitate the situation, I am prepared to yield back all my remaining time so that the Senator from Minnesota can offer his amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I say most kindly to the minority leader that if he needs some time on the basis of the amendment I am about to offer, I shall be happy to yield time to him from my side.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Minnesota is generous. I am certain we shall get along all right.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back or has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the Douglas amendment on page 3 to strike out beginning with line 4 through line 4 on page 4.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator restate his amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. On page 3, starting with line 4, strike out all the language on that page through line 25; and on page 4, beginning on line 1, strike out the language through line 4. The amendment would be concluded with subsection (e) (1), on page 4, and the language thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the Chair). The Chair inquires of the Senator from Minnesota how much time he allocates to himself.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I allocate 10 minutes to myself at this time.

Mr. President, the news in the morning radio broadcasts and in the morning press concerning the revolt, or at least the uprising, as Poznan, in Poland, indicates to us, I think, the importance of this particular amendment, as modified by the amendment the junior Senator from Minnesota has just offered.

The purpose of the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Illinois for himself and other Senators is to make it crystal clear once again that an important part of the foreign policy of the United States is to do everything within our powers—the peaceful and legitimate powers of this Government—to offer hope to persons behind the Iron Curtain, particularly those in the enslaved countries which were taken over by the Soviet Union following World War II, and the Baltic States, which were taken over by the Soviet Union in earlier years, around 1940.

Mr. President, in conferences some of us have had with the free leaders of the enslaved countries, such as representatives from Poland, Lithuania, Romania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and other countries behind the Iron Curtain, we have been informed that there is a growing sense of despair and hoplelessness among the people behind the Iron Curtain.

I was happy to see this morning, however, that in Poland the passion for independence and the dedication to freedom still live. I should like to suggest, Mr. President, at this time, that if for no other reason, the amendment ought to be adopted to indicate to the patriots of Poland that the Government of the United States, the greatest free government on the face of the earth, and the people of the United States, who love freedom dearly, have not forgotten their friends and their neighbors in other areas of the world who aspire to national independence and national freedom, and who are willing literally to lay down their lives to throw off the yoke of Communist imperialism and communism.

If there ever was a time, I may say to my friend from Illinois, when the amendment he has offered was appropriate, it is this hour, because, even as we speak in this Chamber today, thousands of men and women, workers in factories, shopkeepers, students, and farmers in Poland are protesting openly, at the risk of their lives—as students did only recently in Czechoslovakia; as 2 years ago German workers did in many of the cities of Germany behind the Iron Curtain. At that time apparently we had, despite all the pronouncements made, no policy whatsoever.

PADEREWSKI

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota subsequently said: Mr. President, at the point in my remarks where I was referring to the uprising in Poland, I should like to note that today marks the 15th anniversary of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski, the world renowned artist and Polish patriot. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared in that connection.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today when the news from Poznan gives us new evidence that the fire of human liberty still burns brightly in Polish hearts, it is fitting that we should pause to commemorate the 15th anniversary of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski, the world-renowned composer and pianist, and great Polish patriot.

Paderewski was a close friend of Woodrow Wilson, and it was this friendship that lent strength to Wilson's insistence on the self-determination of all nations, including Poland. Paderewski was the first Premier of the newly-freed Polish Republic in 1919. During the turbulent years between the two world wars, he played a major role in the difficult adjustment of his nation to the independence the Poles had acquired after generations of subjugation under the Russians and Germans.

Always dedicated to his country's freedom, Paderewski refused to perform public concerts after the fall of Poland at the beginning of World War II. He died in New York City on June 30, 1941, still President of the exiled Parliament.

The dedication of Paderewski to Polish independence inspires the Poles today. While the Wilsonian doctrine of the self-determination of nations remains a strong force in the motivation of American foreign policy, the United States must pay heed to these Polish aspirations. The United States Senate should look upon this commemoration of the death of Paderewski as a reminder of our international responsibilities as a continuing supporter of the cause of oppressed and captive nations everywhere.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, have we here in the Senate forgotten those fateful and eventful hours in Germany 2 years ago, when workers walked out of the factories; when we saw, as demonstrated from photographs obtained, German workers beating on tanks with bare fists, German

workers standing up against machine-guns with sticks and stones, Germans who wanted to be free, who wanted no further nazism, and wanted nothing more of communism?

We were without a policy, I submit. We knew not what to do, except, apparently, to send emergency food to people who could cross the line, the so-called Iron Curtain, and go into West Germany or the free sections of Berlin.

The amendment of the Senator from Illinois, in its preamble, really gives a ringing declaration of independence and freedom. It states:

> It is the declared policy of the Congress to resist the spread of communism. The issue between the free and the slave world is essentially whether freedom shall survive. The struggle to preserve freedom, however, is not to be worn solely by further resistance to enslavement, but also by keeping alive in the hearts of enslaved people the spirit and hope of freedom. It is the purpose of this section to advance the cause of freedom by providing aid and support to those groups which are actively engaged in maintaining, inspiring, and instilling that spirit and hope.

I have read the language of the first section of the amendment. This is its purpose and objective, and it is an objective to which every freedom-loving person in the United States of America subscribes.

The language following, in subsection (b), wherein there is created an agency under the name of "Freedom Administration," is but an outline of the administrative procedure or administrative program for carrying out the previously announced objectives.

There may be those who say we do not need a separate administrator in this area. There may be those who say we surely do not need deputy administrators. Mr. President, if there is one place where we need concentration of effort, it is in this field to which we are addressing ourselves, so as to coordinate and centralize the policies of this Government as they relate to keeping alive the hopes and the aspirations of people behind the Iron Curtain for their ultimate liberation and freedom.

I regret to say that, because of the wide diffusion in the respective agencies of our Government of the responsibility for programs for emancipation and liberation, far too little is being done, or, if it is being done, Mr. President, its effectiveness is lost because of confusion and diffusion—confusion of purpose and diffusion of responsibility.

I feel this amendment, if adopted, will at least indicate to the administration and to nations throughout the world that there is a growing and ever-deepening concern over the fate of peoples who are enslaved. This is the right time for the declaration. If we can believe only a part of what we read, if we can believe only a little bit as to the troubles in the Communist parties in some countries, if we can believe that there is some difficulty in the Kremlin—and may I say that our State Department indicates again and again that there are grave difficulties and problems amongst the leadership of the Kremlin—if we can believe, for example, that the flame of liberty and freedom still burns in the hearts and minds of people behind the Iron Curtain, particularly in those countries which were grabbed up and enslaved after World War II—if we can believe this, and I think we have a right to, in the light of the moving and inspiring news we received this morning, then it is time for the Congress of the United States to do something specifically to help those people.

Mr. President, there are now in America free leaders from Rumania, from Hungary, from Czechoslovakia, from Poland, from Lithuania, from Estonia, from Latvia, from Albania, and from other countries which are behind the Iron Curtain. Many of them are here under the good offices of our Government. Many of them are here because they seek to live in a land of freedom, not only momentarily, but for the rest of their lives. But these persons, these wonderful men and women, who have demonstrated bravery and courage in resisting any form of totalitarianism, have come to Members of the Senate and have asked us why we do not do something just a little more concrete than we have been doing. That is what the amendment proposes to do.

If the amendment were to be taken to conference, it would do two things. First. It would indicate the overall concensus of the Senate of the United States on this issue.

Second. Let me say that if the amendment involves some difficulties in administration, with the result that the amendment requires more refining, I suggest that such matters could be worked out by the conferees.

Frankly, Mr. President, I happen to be one who believes that we are not using all the talent that is available in our country.

Therefore, this particular amendment provides for Deputy Administrators, one of whom shall be of German descent, one of whom shall be of Polish descent, one of whom shall be of Lithuanian descent, one of whom shall be of Latvian descent, one of whom shall be of Esthonian descent, one of whom shall be of Czech descent, one of whom shall be of Ukranian descent, and one of whom shall be of such descent as to represent the remaining Slovak peoples in the Communist world.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to say that I have been impressed by the words of the Senator from Minnesota, but of course actions speak louder than words. I wonder how the Senator from Minnesota voted yesterday on the Bridges amendment, which would cut off American aid to a Communist country which is dedicated to Leninism, which is dedicated to the destruction of our country.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin does not need to ask me, for I know he reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He knows that I voted to support the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, who pleaded with us to do exactly what the junior Senator from Minnesota voted to have the United States do.

In view of some of the votes which were cast on yesterday, I am beginning to wonder whether the Secretary of State had one speech for the Republican caucus and another speech for the Foreign Relations Committee. However, I wish to reconcile that doubt by saying that I imagine what the Secretary of State told those of us who serve on the Foreign Relations Committee was exactly what he told the Republican caucus.

Mr. President, I have no apologies to make for my vote on yesterday; and I say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I have nothing to apologize for in my long fight against totalitarianism. Let me say that I was fighting against totalitarianism long before some other Members took up that fight. Therefore, I think I know whereof I speak.

In this case I am addressing myself to an attempt to crystalize the hope of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain; and I believe that my amendment to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], on behalf of himself and certain other Senators, will do just that.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Now I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, although I have gotten along very well with the able junior Senator from Minnesota, when he says he has no apologies to make for his vote in favor of having the United States give approximately $95 million to a Communist country——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, is the Senator from Wisconsin asking me a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, I am going to ask a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will proceed to ask his question, then.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Minnesota does not mind receiving a compliment first, does he?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. No; but I should like to have the Senator from Wisconsin ask the question he has in mind.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does not the junior Senator from Minnesota honestly feel that every Senator who voted in favor of giving $95 million of aid to a Communist country, to strengthen the Communist economy and to build its armament, even though that country has devoted itself to Leninism—and let me say that I assume that the Senator from Minnesota was completely sincere and honest in so voting, as were the other Senators who voted for that proposal—think the time will come when all Senators who voted for the giving of aid

by us to Communist countries will wish to apologize for voting in that way? I emphasize that I am not accusing those Senators of being insincere; I assume that they had some reasons for voting as they did. What the reasons were, I do not know.

But does not the junior Senator from Minnesota think that all Senators who voted in favor of that proposal will at some time in the future, if and when the war machine they are helping to build up in Yugoslavia is used against American young men, really have an apology to make?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, let me say to my friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, that what the junior Senator from Minnesota did was to vote for the amendment reading as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no assistance under this title or any other title of this act, or under any provision of law repealed by section 542 (a) of this act, shall be furnished to Yugoslavia after the expiration of 90 days following the date of the enactment of this section, unless the President finds—

And then we added the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming, namely—

and so reports to the Congress, with his reasons therefor—

And then the committee amendment continued as follows:

(1) that there has been no change in the Yugoslavian policies on the basis of which assistance under this act has been furnished to Yugoslavia in the past, and that Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union,

And then the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming added these words:

(2) that Yugoslavia does not adhere to any policy for the Communist conquest of the world and (3)—

And then the committee amendment provides—

that it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue the furnishing of assistance to Yugoslavia under this act.

Mr. President, what the junior Senator from Minnesota did—and let me say that I shall not take much more time on this matter—was to vote in favor of the giving of assistance to Yugoslavia if the President of the United States—who is the President of everyone in the United States, and who is vested by the Constitution with the responsibilities of Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces and the responsibilities of being our chief spokesman in foreign affairs—feels that it is in the interest of national security that such assistance be granted.

Let me say to my colleague, the Senator from Wisconsin, that he has voted, as have other Senators, for aid to Yugoslavia; he did so last year, and he did so the year before, and he did so the year before that. And let me point out that Tito was just as Red then as he is now, and let me also point out that he was then just as much of a Communist as he is today. The only difference is that now—at least, according to some persons—Tito, of Yugoslavia, has been able to get the Soviet Union to recognize his independence from the Comintern.

Mr. President, I shall conclude by saying that if there are any apologies to be made, they are to be made by those who are responsible for the foreign policy of this country, those who only a few weeks ago requested the Senate and the House of Representatives not to tie the President's hands.

I am rather surprised to find that the main trouble the President has, again and again, in connection with his foreign policy is with his own party. Let me say that it was not easy for me to rise in the Senate and say—knowing that it is an unpopular matter, knowing that politics can be played with it, knowing that demogogery can be played with it—that I am willing to trust the President and the Secretary of State, despite the extent to which I have disagreed with both of them; and, Mr. President, believe me, my record of disagreement is replete and clear. Despite the extent to which I have disagreed with them, I was not willing to substitute my opinion regarding what should be done in this instance for the opinion of the President of the United States and the opinion of the Secretary of State.

Therefore, I have no apologies to make. If apologies are to be made, they will have to be made by those who requested faith in them. I thought that, at least, inasmuch as the President was as sick as he was, it might be good to give him a little expression of faith. I am sorry that many others did not share that feeling with me.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a correction?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Of course, Mr. President; I am always willing to yield for a correction.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Minnesota said that I voted for aid to Yugoslavia, last year. He is mistaken; I opposed aid to Yugoslavia, last year. I voted for the overall mutual aid bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. That is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did that despite the fact that I thought it was unwise for us to give aid to Yugoslavia. I voted for the bill because of the aid we were giving to some of our real allies.

Let me say that this year I will vote against the entire mutual aid bill, so long as it contains provision for aid to a Communist country, even though I very strongly feel that we should give aid to our allies in the East—such as Formosa, South Vietnam, South Korea, Pakistan, and other countries.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I appreciate the point of view of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I feel very badly that I have to vote against such aid; but I cannot vote for a bill which will give $95 million of aid to a Communist country.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I am not happy about voting for it, either; and I am not happy about having aid go to some other countries which, although they may not be Communist, have in themselves every bit as much iniquity and evil as can be found in Yugoslavia.

However, even though there are partisan differences, yet there are times when we reconcile our doubts—as I did in the case of the treaty with Formosa, and as I did in the case of our bases in north Africa, Spain, and elsewhere. After all, we have to have faith in someone.

We must have some faith, and I suggest that it is running a little thin in some parts of the political spectrum in this country.

I now yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Illinois, as proposed to be amended by the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois would be willing to accept the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I accept the amendment, and ask that my amendment be modified accordingly.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Before the Senator accepts it finally, I should like to ascertain from the Chair if that would result in cutting off the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Then I shall postpone the request.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I withhold my acceptance, with the understanding that at the appropriate time I will accept the amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the people whom we hope to help and encourage through the enactment of this provision of the mutual security bill have received many promises in the past. But the implementation of those promises has been so sterile that they are becoming increasingly discouraged and almost hopeless. They feel that we have been making a great many promises, but have been falling down in the performance of such promises.

During the 1952 campaign a glowing prospect for liberation was held out to the people of the enslaved countries by the Republican Party. After the election, those promises were completely forgotten and discarded by the candidates who had been elected to highest office. It is not surprising that they were abandoned. Obviously, they were merely insincere campaign pledges. Certainly no steps whatsoever have been taken to carry them out.

Since that time—1952—in an ever-growing degree, the feeling of disillusionment in the countries which are captive behind the Iron Curtain has grown to such an extent that today the people living in those enslaved countries are virtually hopeless.

The amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Illinois makes

no promises which are unattainable. It holds out no prospects of achievement that cannot be realized. It does not urge revolt at this time. It does strongly hold out hope. It does give assurance to the enslaved people of the continued interest and sympathy of the American people, and of their intention to do everything possible to maintain and foster the spirit of liberty which we have ever held to be the dearest possession of any democratic nation. We pray with all our hearts that the enjoyment of liberty will soon again become an achieved fact in the countries behind the Iron Curtain and we intend to do what we can to bring that happy day about.

The enslaved countries who will be affected by this amendment have large populations. They have been freedom-loving peoples for generations—in some for centuries—although in many cases they were unhappily deprived of their liberties at different times. However, the torch of liberty, the hope of freedom, and the determination to attain freedom and liberty again, even at the risk of death, have never been extinguished. They have always remained bright in the face of the greatest and most tragic discouragement. Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Albania, and others were all countries which have fought and made indescribable sacrifices for the preservation of their liberty over generations, yet today they are enslaved people, without any real hope of early liberation. Their slender hope will ever grow weaker unless it is encouraged by their friends in the West and it must be encouraged not merely with words, but with deeds.

I have known many of the leaders of the captive countries. I worked closely with many of them during the war years from 1939 to 1945. I have since talked with many of them who are today in exile in this country, or abroad—with some of them I have spoken only a few days ago. Those with whom I have spoken all agree that the inclusion of this amendment in the mutual security bill would provide a great source of encouragement to their people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I have 3 minutes more?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time is left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I believe we would be losing a great opportunity if we did not include this amendment in the bill. Something has happened recently which has not received the attention and consideration of the American people to the extent that I believe it should have. Years ago, in the early years after the war, Tito declared his independence of Soviet domination. I do not know why he did it. I do not know what was in his mind, but he did it, and he won his point. He remained independent of complete Soviet domination.

In recent weeks Tito has again visited Russia. He has been hailed anew as a prodigal son, and given notable welcome and honors. He has been received back into the arms of the Soviet Union, which apparently has been willing to recognize his right to declare his personal independence and the independence of his government and of his people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has again expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield me 1 more minute?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am convinced that what has happened in Russia in recent weeks may be of the greatest encouragement to the captive countries and to the entire free world. I do not believe that from this time on Russia will be able to control the destinies and the actions and policies of such countries in the manner in which she has controlled them in past years. I believe considerable encouragement has already been given to the spirit of independence and liberty in those countries, which will make them far less amenable to the will of the Soviet tyrant. I believe we would be losing a great opportunity in our efforts to bring freedom to the enslaved peoples if we did not approve this amendment.

I pray that we will not reject that opportunity.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back all time on this side, and vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield back his time?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Let me say to the minority leader that we are hoping to be able to agree upon a draft which will be acceptable. While the negotiations are in progress, I wonder if the Senator from California would yield me 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has 2 minutes remaining. The Senator from California has 30 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota, in order that the negotiations to which he referred may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I thank the Senator from California.

The Senator from Illinois is the main author of the amendment, and it is my understanding that some of the difficuty involved in connection with the amendment, as it relates to some of our colleagues, concerns the rather detailed arrangement of the administration. I understand the Senator from Illinois may have a further modification to suggest. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. Because of the parliamentary situation I am forced to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to strike the language from line 3 on page 3 to line 5 on page 4. I am ready to accept that amendment. In view of the determined opposition from the other side of the aisle and from the administration, I would be ready to accept, in default of getting nothing, a proper concession by the minority leader and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois accept the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I accep the amendment, provided it does not exhaust my time, so that another motion can be made by the leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore I have not yet accepted the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Illinois, if he needs some additional time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the time will be utilized by the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished chairman of the committee in an effort to determine if they will accept as much of the proposal as possible.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished majority whip for that purpose.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I would suggest that Senators consult a copy of the amendment, and I should like particularly to have the attention of the Senator from California and the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I would propose that on page 1, line 8, a period be inserted after the word "freedom"; that the remainder of that line be stricken; that all of pages 2 and 3 be stricken; that the first 16 lines on page 4 be stricken; that on page 4, line 17, subsection (f), lines 17 to 22, be stricken, and there be inserted in lieu thereof the following:

(b) (1) There shall be established in the Treasury Department a special fund which shall be available without fiscal-year limitation for financing the activities authorized by paragraph (a). There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to such fund out of the funds heretofore authorized not to exceed the sum of $20 million.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am deeply disappointed that the opposition of the State Department and of the administration is so strong that apparently it is impossible to have the Senate adopt the original proposal. I believe that is a great mistake. I am not blaming any of my colleagues. In my informal contacts on the floor, I find it is impossible, in view of the opposition from the other side of the aisle and from the administration, to have the original proposal adopted. Reluctantly, therefore, I will accept the amendment, with the understanding that at a later date we will renew the struggle.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the distinguished acting majority leader will look at page

5, I believe, in keeping with the action which has already been taken, paragraphs (g) and (h), which refer to the matter which it is proposed to strike out should also be stricken.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no authority to speak for the Committee on Foreign Relations. The distinguished chairman of the committee is on the floor, and he is the one who has authority to speak for that committee. I will say that the language suggested could be taken to conference, and perhaps in conference there might be a further modification made. Certainly the language would remove the major objection, that the amendment would create a separate board which would conflict with the responsible heads of the State Department.

I am highly sympathetic with the objective of the proposal. I believe the Senator from Illinois will agree that there have been a number of us on both sides of the aisle who, like himself, have been vitally interested in the people who find themselves enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

I certainly believe it is important that we hold out to them the hope of freedom, and I am convinced that ultimately they will again be free.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It was only in the hope that something might be done in this field and that something might be accomplished along this line that I offered the suggestion. I did not know whether it would be acceptable to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It appeared to me that it offered more hope than anything else which has been suggested in the past.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In view of the opposition of the State Department and of the administration and the opposition of those under the influence of the State Department, I am reluctantly compelled to accept the proposal which has been transmitted by our friend, the majority whip. I will say that frequently the term "take it to conference" means that a proposal is taken to conference and that it ends there. It is similar to the way Richard III took the two young princes into the Tower of London and then strangled them with his own hands. I commend this child to the conferees, in the hope that it may be treated better than were the two young princes in the Tower of London. Let not the State Department or the administration strangle this child in the dark inner recesses of the conference room.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Do I understand correctly that the Senator from Illinois is willing to modify his amendment accordingly?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will accept it. I will not modify it with my own lips. I will accept the modification reluctantly.

My own lips will not pronounce that modification.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah will state it.

Mr. BENNETT. May an amendment be modified by anyone but the Senator who offers the amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will accept the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair states that the amendment may be amended, but not modified by another Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I accept the amendment.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator from Illinois accepts it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, as modified.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from California for his splendid cooperation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of our time.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield back the remainder of our time, also, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], as modified, to the committee amendment.

The amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 38, between lines 18 and 19, it is proposed to insert the following:

(e) Add the following new section:

"SEC. 515. Suspension of aid to countries shipping strategic materials to the Soviet bloc: Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in any case in which any foreign country exports or knowingly permits the exportation, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China, Communist North Korea and Communist North Indochina), of articles or commodities, shipment of which to the Soviet bloc is embargoed, or would be refused export licenses, by the United States in the interest of national security, no assistance under this act or under any other act providing financial assistance to foreign countries shall be furnished to such country during the 12-month period following the date of such exportation, or the date on which knowledge thereof is received by the officer or agency administering such assistance, whichever date is later."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] to the committee amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I take it that the Senator's amendment is different from his amendment identified as "6-28-56—B."

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on my amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, we have not yet had an explanation of the Senator's amendment. After we have had an opportunity to hear his explanation of the amendment, the Senator can then ask for the yeas and nays. Otherwise, if he wanted to modify his own amendment, he might find himself foreclosed from doing so.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the distinguished minority leader that I do not have an extra copy of my amendment here, but I shall send to my office immediately and get some.

Mr. President, before commencing a discussion of the amendment which was just read by the clerk, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement concerning the amendment which I submitted the other day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARTHY

We are all, of course, extremely happy about the release of the 15 American airmen who were held prisoner by the Chinese Communists. Unfortunately, however, the impression has grown that the prisoner of war situation in China is a closed account. The public has been led to believe that, while there may be some American civilians in China, all of our Korean prisoners of war have been released. This is entirely untrue.

Last spring the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations reported that there were 481 servicemen who are known to have been alive and in Chinese prison camps and still unaccounted for. Last month Defense and State Department officials set the current figure at 450.

As we all know, the Chinese Communists were obliged, under the Korean armistice agreement, to release all prisoners of war as of September 1953. Nearly 3 years have now elapsed and the Communists have still failed to keep their word with respect to 450 American men.

During last year's hearings, the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations learned from top State and Defense Department officials that our Government had done nothing toward obtaining the release of the prisoners beyond requesting the United Nations, through its Secretary General, to make representations to Peiping. Since that time, we know that our Ambassador to Czechoslovakia, Mr. Alexis Johnson, has been conducting negotiations with the Chinese in Geneva, and that as a result, 15 uniformed men have been freed. Beyond this, however, we know only that the balance are being held in Communist prisons or are dead.

Perhaps our Government is making efforts to release the remaining 450 prisoners. Perhaps our Government is still doing nothing. But if efforts are being made, they have produced no results. There are still 450 American men in Communist prison camps. How much brainwashing and brutality they are subjected to, we, of course, do not know. I believe that, under the circumstances, Congress has no alternative but to take the matter into its own hands.

I believe Congress must now do what I have urged it to do for the past 2 years—namely, cut off aid to any foreign country that trades with Communist China while Americans are being held prisoner in China. The Chinese need Western trade and they are getting plenty of it now, especially with the British. If this trade should be halted, I think there is a good chance that the

Communists will release the prisoners. If they fail to do so, we will then have to take sterner measures.

I do not believe that any Member of the Congress or of the executive branch feels easy with himself knowing that our Government has abandoned its fighting men. How can we justify ourselves in appropriating for foreign countries a billion dollars here and a billion there, supposedly for the purpose of fighting world communism, when we neglect to lift a finger to protect our fighting men—when we make no attempt to free those American men who have undergone a loss of personal liberty, all in the service of their country.

Moral cowardice is one of the explanations of the sad state of world affairs. It is one of the reasons other nations do not keep their agreements with us. They don't have to. They can get away with deceit, treachery, and broken promises. They can insult us and then thumb their noses. What respect can you have, after all, for a nation that abandons its fighting men after a war is over? The world must know that when an American soldier goes overseas, he is backed by the entire strength and power of the United States of America.

Those 450 servicemen now languishing in Communist prisons have served their country well. They have done their duty as patriotic Americans. I am a believer in the perhaps antiquated notion that the Nation owes the same duty to the soldier that the soldier owes to the Nation.

For that reason, I have offered an amendment which provides that we cut off all aid to any nation which is shipping goods to Communist China while it holds American prisoners.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I believe that the amendment that I am introducing this afternoon is an absolute must for this year's foreign aid bill in the light of the recent investigation of East-West trade by the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations. My amendment provides that no foreign aid funds be made available to any nation that ships strategic war materials to the Soviet bloc.

The East-West trade investigation, which began 3 years ago under my chairmanship and has been continued under the chairmanship of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] revealed that one of the reasons the Communists are moving ahead of us in the arms race is that the free world is lending a helping hand. Our investigation showed, to be perfectly blunt about it, that American taxpayers are subsidizing the construction of the Communist war machine.

The proof for this charge is very easy to state: countries, such as Great Britain, which have been helped by billions of dollars of American aid, have been selling highly strategic war materials to the Soviet Union—materials that are indispensable for the production of the modern weapons of war.

Moreover, our allies are engaging in this strategic war trade with the express permission of the Government of the United States.

Our committee has discovered that in the summer of 1954, our Government made a secret trade agreement with our allies. This secret agreement—which was made at the behest of the British—permitted our allies to ship to the Soviet Union approximately 200 highly strategic items that had previously been under strict embargo.

Here are some of the items—machine tools and metals—that were taken off the embargo in 1954:

Horizontal boring machines: These machines, which cost up to half a million dollars apiece, are used to make tanks, aircraft and atomic reactors for *Nautilus*-class submarines.

Precision boring mills, which are used in making radar control mechanisms, engines for jet airplanes, and guided missile components.

Vertical boring mills: These machines are used for making jet engines, guided missiles, turbines, and aircraft armament.

Mr. President, I may say that this is all a matter of sworn testimony.

Hydraulic and mechanical presses, which are used for making aircraft parts and ammunition shell casings.

Dynamic balancing machines: These machines are used for guided missile engines, gyros and radar control mechanisms.

Surface grinding machines, which are used in making jet engines, guided missiles and radar.

Copper wire, which is indispensable in making engines for jet bombers.

While we are on the subject of copper, let me illustrate how American tax dollars end up paying for weapons that are designed to destroy us. The committee learned that the American Government is financing British copper mining operations in Rhodesia. Thus, with the benefit of direct American aid, the British take the copper out of the ground in Rhodesia, send it to Britain where it is processed into highly strategic copper wire, and then sell it at a British profit to the Communists. Over the past 2 years, Great Britain, along with other countries receiving American aid, shipped over 250 million pounds of copper wire to the Soviet Union. Is it any wonder that the Russians are turning out vast numbers of jet bombers when our allies give them the materials that are indispensable for building those bombers?

But this is not all. Our allies are also sending the Communists aluminum, magnesium, and nickel alloys. These are some of the most strategic materials imaginable. And the list goes on and on. There are, as I said before, approximately 200 strategic items that have been decontrolled. Let me give just one more example, perhaps the most shocking of all. Our so-called allies—countries that live off the American taxpayer—are shipping to the Communists power generators up to 60,000 kilowatts. These generators make fissionable material for atom and hydrogen bombs.

When we permit our allies to ship strategic materials to the Soviet Union, we give far greater benefits to the Communists than if we sold them actual weapons of war. If we sent them ammunition, the ammunition could be shot back at us only once. But when we send them machine tools and strategic metals we give the Communists the means to make destructive weapons over and over again.

It was brought out at our hearings that the Communists need only to buy one of these machine tools—say, the half a million dollar horizontal boring mill—and, by imitating that model, can make dozens more for factories all over the Soviet Union. If the free world possesses one decisively superior weapon, it is our peerless industrial know-how. That weapon we are now handing to the Communists on a silver platter.

I contend that it is hopeless idiocy for the United States, on the one hand, to subsidize a foreign-aid program designed to fight world communism, and on the other, to permit countries receiving that aid to help build the Communist war machine.

How did this incredible situation come about?

The Battle Act of 1951 provided that no nation that shipped strategic materials to the Soviet bloc should receive American aid. However, the Battle Act was circumvented in 1954 by the then Battle Act Administrator, Mr. Harold E. Stassen. Mr. Stassen bypassed the provisions of the act by deciding arbitrarily that certain highly strategic materials, such as those I have mentioned, were not in fact "strategic" for the purposes of allied trade with the Communists.

There is, however, a curious aspect of the 1954 decontrol decision: it applied only to allied exporters. American exporters were denied the opportunity to share in the handsome profits from the Communist trade. The materials I have mentioned are still embargoed as regards American trade with the Soviet bloc. Such materials are considered "nonstrategic" for purposes of allied trade. But for purposes of American export, they are considered highly strategic.

My amendment seeks to eliminate this senseless distinction. It aims to prevent our so-called allies from shipping to the Soviet bloc materials that we consider so strategic as to make American shipment of them to the Communists a threat to our national security. The amendment provides that no nation that ships strategic materials to the Communists shall receive any of the funds authorized by this act for a period of 12 months following the date that American officials responsible for administering our aid program receive knowledge of such a shipment.

This is surely a place where Congress must step in and correct the unwise policies of the executive branch. The loophole in the Battle Act, which has been so cynically exploited by certain appeasement-minded officials in the bureaucracy, must be closed by Congress.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time taken by the quorum call will be charged to the time of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I am asking for the yeas and nays on my amendment, I ask unanimous consent that the time

for the quorum call not be charged to my time on the amendment.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin request the yeas and nays again?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be ordered on his amendment?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be ordered on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the yeas and nays are ordered on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Does the opposition desire to use any time?

Mr. McCARTHY. If the opposition does not desire to use time, I will yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is there not some Senator on the side of the aisle where the Senator from California sits, who would like to use some time at present?

Mr. KNOWLAND. There may be when we have secured a larger attendance of Senators.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the time taken by quorum call being charged to neither side? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the amendment which is now before the Senate is the one offered today by the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. He had previously offered an amendment, which was printed. This amendment, however, slightly changes the concept, though materially it covers the same subject.

For the benefit of Senators who were not present when the amendment was read, I think it should be read at this time. The amendment is as follows:

On page 38, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

"(e) Add the following new section:

"'SEC. 515. Suspension of aid to countries shipping strategic materials to the Soviet bloc: Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in any case in which any foreign country exports or knowingly permits the exportation, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China, Communist North Korea and Communist North Indochina), of articles or commodities, shipment of which to the Soviet bloc is embargoed, or would be refused export licenses, by the United States in the interest of national security, no assistance under this act or under any other act providing financial assistance to foreign countries shall be furnished to such country during the 12-month period following the date of such exportation, or the date on which knowledge thereof is received by the officer or agency administering such assistance, whichever date is later.'"

Mr. President, I fully recognize that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has long been concerned with the menace of international communism, and is seeking to meet a problem which does exist in the world today. I would be less than frank if I did not say to the Senate that I have not been satisfied with the attitude of some of our allies and associates who have joined with us in the collective-security system for the preservation of a free world of freemen, and some of those with whom we have dealt with and helped abundantly to rehabilitate themselves from war damage, insofar as they have permitted shipment of materials to the Soviet bloc and the satellite states associated with the Soviet Union.

But, Mr. President, I question very much, as a matter of good legislation, whether the amendment, with all its complexities, and without an adequate chance to have it examined by the proper committee of the Senate, is the way of meeting the problem. I frankly do not know what all the ultimate repercussions of the amendment might be. I recognize that the Battle Act has some loopholes in it. I think it is entirely possible that the Congress, in its judgment, may want to strengthen the provisions of the Battle Act.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the very able Senator from California—and that term is not used lightly when I use it in reference to the Senator from California—that my amendment is very simple. It merely provides that if the United States embargoes certain materials and refuses export licenses for materials which it considers to be of a strategic character, the same rule shall be applied to our allies whom we are subsidizing. In other words, if an American merchant cannot ship machine tools to Russia, my amendment provides that a British merchant cannot ship machine tools to Russia while Britain is getting our aid. If they are not receiving our aid, they can do it. They can choose between the two. They can say, "We will ship war materials to Russia, without receiving American aid," or they can say, "We will not ship strategic war materials, and get American aid."

All I say is that we should apply the same rule to our allies as we apply to the United States. I think that is reasonable. It is pretty hard to get around the reasonableness of it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think I understand the purpose of the distinguished Senator, but I believe we face a problem when it comes to dealing with sovereign nations with which we are associated. We have laid down certain criteria in the Battle Act. Personally, I think perhaps we have been too lenient in some cases, under some of the provisions of the act, with respect to what might be shipped to certain countries. At any rate, it is done under a statute which was enacted by the Congress. Perhaps we may have given too much discretion to the President. That is entirely possible.

Perhaps we might be justified, as a matter of policy, in narrowing that field of discretion. But I submit we are beginning to trespass on what is dangerous ground when we say somewhat arbitrarily, perhaps, to a sovereign nation with whom we are affiliated in the free world that she must follow exactly the same list, not as arrived at by negotiation, but as adopted by the American Congress, regardless of whether it was in accord with the legislative intent of the British Parliament or French Parliament or of other nations associated with us—we would tell them that with regard to this question they would have to take our "ticket."

As I said at the beginning, I would be less than frank if I did not say that in times past, under the last administration, and under this administration, we perhaps have not bargained hard enough with our allies to get them to tighten up their lists. Perhaps we should get them to do that. I hope the present administration, indeed any administration, will follow through to see that strategic materials of the type the Senator has mentioned do not go to the Soviet bloc. At the same time, I believe there has been a case made that articles which may appear on the Battle Act list may not be considered by other countries to be strategic, or at least for them they received in return materials which were equally as strategic or more strategic. In that event there may be room for President Eisenhower or any other President of the United States to have discretion in the matter. That is the only point I make to the Senator today.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me say that I have not been blaming the President in this matter. For example, when Mr. Stassen—who had the power to do so—revised the Battle Act list, he submitted a report to the Congress, and I assume he submitted the same report to the President. The McClellan committee, which I think has been doing an outstanding job on this matter, developed the fact that the report was completely false. That being true, the President could not be held responsible for it.

For example, the report—and all this is a matter of record—stated, first, that we were still maintaining an embargo on the shipment of copper. However, we found that 250 million pounds of copper wire used largely for the production of jet planes, were shipped from American mines to Communist Russia, and the transaction was financed by American money. The same is true in the case of railroad tracks, trucks, and other equipment. The committee developed those facts. Many other materials were shipped to Communist Russia; and those materials included aluminum and machine tools—including horizontal and vertical presses—which are used to produce such things as airplane wings.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say that, of course, the Senator from Wisconsin sat in on some of the hearings. All I know is that if a member of my staff gave me a false official report, he would not be a member of my staff 10 minutes thereafter. If an administration official gave me a false report, if I had my way he would no longer retain his job in conducting the affairs of the Government.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes of the time available to me to the Senator from California so that I may ask him another question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Very well.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to point out to the able Senator from California that before the Appropriations Committee we were talking to the man who administers our foreign aid. He is the successor to Harold Stassen. He seems to be a very nice fellow; and he makes the decisions, in large part. I asked him about the shipment to Communist countries of horizontal and vertical drill presses, which perhaps weigh up to 100 tons, and cost up to half a million dollars. I asked him whether he thought it was a great mistake to send those presses to countries which are Communist. Does the Senator from California know what the witness answered? He held his hands about 12 inches apart, and then asked, "What can little presses like that do to help any Communist country?"

The reports which have been submitted are completely inadequate. I should like to ask whether the Senator from California agrees with me that it is a serious mistake for us, who control the pursestrings, indirectly to build up the Communist machine—which is what we do when we appropriate funds to be given to countries which are sending to Communist Russia all the machine tools and other equipment that is necessary for the building up of a war machine. I wish the Senator from California would give some thought to that point.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have given the matter a considerable amount of thought.

Mr. McCARTHY. Of course I realize that; I meant to say that I wish the Senator from California would give additional thought to it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I can say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I am not in favor of building up by one iota the war potential of the Communist world. I do not have confidence that the smiles of Khrushchev and Bulganin indicate any long-term change in their strategy. I think their strategy for the destruction of human freedom is the same as was the Communist strategy under Stalin and Lenin. I think Khrushchev and Bulganin are temporarily zigging, instead of zagging; I think a game of musical chairs for power may be going on in the Kremlin. But, inasmuch as Beria dropped out, after someone pulled the chair from under him, it may likewise be that someone will pull the chair from under Khrushchev and then he will find that he has no place to put himself. Nevertheless, in Communist Russia the dictatorship continues and the policy continues; and I see no indication—regardless of the beliefs which may be held elsewhere—that the Communist tiger has now become a milkfed pussy cat.

THE WHERRY-MALONE JOINT RESOLUTION—PREVENT FINANCING EUROPE'S TRADE WITH COMMUNIST COUNTRIES VERSUS THE BATTLE ACT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Let me say to the distinguished senior Senator from California that around 1949 or 1950 or 1951, when the Senate was debating billions of dollars of foreign aid for European and other countries, the Wherry-Malone joint resolution was passed prohibiting such aid to any country trading with Communist countries. Does the Senator from California remember that resolution?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do.

Mr. MALONE. Immediately after that measure—the Wherry-Malone joint resolution—was passed, the administration rushed in with the so-called Battle Act which the State Department maintained, through a flood of propaganda, was designed to stop aid to such nations trading with foreign countries.

Mr. President, what the Battle Act actually did was to repeal the Wherry-Malone joint resolution to again permit our own taxpayers' money to be paid to foreign countries that were trading and aiding Communist countries.

Whereas the Wherry-Malone joint resolution prohibited such payments giving such countries a choice between receiving aid from us and trading with Communist nations, the Battle Act encouraged foreign aid payments to countries trading with Communist nations purporting to leave the decision to the President. The American people were told through a great flood of propaganda that the Battle Act would stop such payments to countries trading with Communist nations—whereas, as a matter of fact, the Battle Act immediately repealed the Wherry-Malone resolution and encouraged such payments and trade.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That was under the Truman administration.

Mr. MALONE. Yes; but I am discussing the matter now, because it is still the principle that counts and it is worse for us to allow payments of taxpayers' money to countries trading with the Communists because we should know better.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wished to establish the sequence of events.

Mr. MALONE. I realize that.

NATION HAD TO CHOOSE

Inasmuch as the Senator from California remembers the incident, let me point out that under the Wherry-Malone resolution, a nation had to choose between receiving aid from the United States and trading with Communist nations. But immediately the Wherry-Malone joint resolution passed, the Battle Act—which was publicized as one which would stop trading with Communist nations without mentioning that it was already stopped—and actually encouraged such trading to continue; and, as everyone knows, it has continued from that date to the present time—and is now on the increase.

Last year, I spent 2½ months behind the Iron Curtain; and there it was possible to see the American-made machinery, including lathes, drill presses, machine tools and industrial equipment. Therefore, we see that the Battle Act, as it has been administered, does not prevent our taxpayers' money from going to countries trading with Communist nations.

Mr. President, let me say that I shall vote for the pending amendment because it will again retard the payment of money of the taxpayers of the United States to European or Asiatic nations which engage in trade with Communist nations.

WORLDWIDE SOCIALIST SCHEME

I want to remind the senior Senator from California that I have always opposed the division of the American taxpayers cash and markets with the nations of the world—both constitute a grandiose world Socialist scheme of division of our wealth with the foreign countries of the world.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act was the beginning of a scheme to substitute foreign cheap labor goods for American-made products thus depriving American investors and workingmen of the American market.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, let me say that certainly the Senator from Nevada has been consistent in his position regarding that matter; and I respect him for his position and his opinions, which he has held for some time.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I appreciate that statement by the senior Senator from California.

Let me say that in my opinion it is utterly idiotic to use the American taxpayers' money to build up competition by foreign-produced goods with goods being produced in the United States—which, of course, is what was done under the first Marshall plan in 1948. Under such a procedure, our American markets are dominated by foreign cheap-labor goods—and our wealth is divided through cash outlays.

I shall not go into detail regarding that matter at this time. But I arose to remind this body that through the Wherry-Malone amendment we did make it impossible for American financial aid to be paid to countries which were engaging in trade with Communist countries; and as a result of the Wherry-Malone resolution, foreign countries had to choose between receiving aid from the United States or trading with such areas.

But then the Battle Act was proposed and passed as already described, on the basis of the misrepresentation to the American people that it would prevent such trade.

However, instead of preventing such trade it is now amply demonstrated what we knew would happen, that such trade has been continually on the increase.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Nevada for his remarks.

At any rate, Mr. President, I think the amendment will have more farreaching consequences than any Member of the Senate can predict at the present time.

I think it may interrupt a good deal of trade which it would be wise to interrupt, although I fully agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that shipments of vertical and horizontal drill presses and boring machines and copper wire were inexcusable; and if the executive branch of the Government has not made protests against shipments of that sort, I think it obvious that the strongest possible protests regarding such shipments of strategic materials should have been made, and should have been followed up, by the executive branch of the Government of the United States. Despite that fact, I think the Senator's amendment is too far-reaching, and for that reason, at least, I cannot support it.

Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am troubled by certain features of the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, although I find myself in sympathy with what he is driving at. We would all be most reluctant to do anything to aid Red China. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin provides that in any case in which any foreign country exports to the Soviet Union or any of its satellites, including Communist China, North Korea, and Communist North Indochina, articles the shipment of which to the Soviet Union is embargoed by the United States, no assistance may be furnished to such country under this act. My feelings toward Communist China are well known. Our regulations definitely embargo anything going to Communist China. We forbid the shipment of any item to Communist China.

The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin would have the effect of forbidding any country from receiving our aid if it shipped anything—even baby powder—to Communist China. That means that we might as well give up our entire aid program.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator has misread the amendment. It provides for discontinuance of aid if a country ships any material which is embargoed by the United States. In other words, I would apply the same rule to our allies that we apply to our own merchants.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We embargo everything to Communist China. We do not ship anything to Communist China.

Mr. McCARTHY. We do not ship to Communist China. However, we do ship some materials to the satellite nations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is true. Anything that is shipped to Communist China by any of the countries receiving our assistance would be covered. They could not ship anything to Communist China.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have an amendment in regard to Communist China, which provides that so long as they hold American prisoners——

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is a different subject.

Mr. McCARTHY. No aid can be given by us to anyone who ships anything to Communist China. According to the testimony before the investigating committee, the Chinese Reds still have 450 of our uniformed men as prisoners.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am aware of that, and we are terribly troubled by that situation. But we are discussing the particular amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, which provides that if any country ships anything to Communist China, aid will be cut off.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I took some of the time of the Senator from New Jersey. I shall be glad to yield him time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Let me say a word about the Battle Act to try to clarify our thinking.

The Battle Act is designed to allow trade with the Soviet Union in those cases where trade helps our allies more than it helps the Soviet Union. If one of our allies ships a small amount of goods to the Soviet Union—not a shipment of arms but a shipment of something which is regarded as strategic under the Battle Act—and if that country gets back something from the Soviet bloc of higher strategic value such as manganese or other valuable minerals it is the policy of the Battle Act that the President should be permitted to weigh the relative advantages to the free world of such trade and to cut off aid if the net advantage is to the Soviet bloc.

East-West trade controls depend on cooperation of our allies. Without such cooperation there can be no effective controls. If the President has no discretion to negotiate with our allies on such controls there will be no controls. This amendment would undoubtedly result in a great deal less effective East-West trade control than we have under the present Battle Act.

This amendment would result in less effective East-West trade control than we have under the present Battle Act. As I said before, if we forbid anything going to Communist China, it means that under the Senator's amendment every one of our allies with which we are now dealing will be cut off, and we might as well not have any Mutual Security Act at all. So I feel that I must oppose the amendment, although I am entirely in sympathy with what the Senator from Wisconsin is driving at. We must protect ourselves from the building up of Communist China while she is in her present frame of mind, and we must prevent strategic war materials from getting into certain areas.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I should like to say one thing in connection with the statement by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. The last time he and I differed on the floor of the Senate I read in the newspapers the next day that he and I had a fight. I wish to make it clear that there is no Senator whom I admire more than I do the Senator from California. While I differ with him vigorously, I think he is one of our most outstanding Senators, and I hope no one will refer to this difference as a fight.

Let me say to the able Senator from New Jersey that my amendment would prevent any of our allies from shipping to Communist China any material which we think our merchants are not entitled to ship to China. It would merely lay down the same rule for the people who are subsidized and supported by us as we lay down for our merchants in the United States. If it is sound for us to follow that rule, I maintain that it is sound for us not to support a nation which ships what we call strategic materials to Communist countries.

While the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] was conducting an investigation into the shipment of materials to China, the Secretary of Defense wrote a letter stating that any material shipped to Communist China, regardless of what it was, increased her war potential. I do not think we should be indirectly helping Red China, while she is holding 450 of our uniformed men. That is a subject on which I feel very strongly.

There was a time when every uniformed man who was sent overseas from the United States carried all the prestige and power of this country on his shoulders. Now we not only abandon them, but we indirectly support the economy and the military might of the country which is holding them prisoner.

When the Senator from New Jersey says that this amendment would prevent the shipment of anything to Red China, he is correct. As to the other satellite countries, I would apply only the rules which apply to ourselves. For example, we are shipping a great amount of goods to Yugoslavia. I would not prevent our allies from shipping the same type of material there; but when we say that something is a strategic war material, we should not indirectly furnish it to our potential enemies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will yield 1 more minute to myself. I am completely in sympathy with, and wholeheartedly approve some of the things which would be accomplished by the mutual aid bill—for example, military aid to Formosa.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That might be cut off, under the Senator's amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. I favor aid to Pakistan and South Vietnam. If we continue to give aid to Yugoslavia, when Yugoslavia says it favors Leninism—which, as the Senator knows, would mean the destruction of the United States and Great Britain by violent revolution—and if we continue to give aid to allies who are shipping war materials to the Communist bloc, I cannot conceivably, in good conscience, vote for the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I took some of the Senator's time. If he would like additional time, I will yield to him.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the Senator yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator spoke of strategic materials. The United States embargoes the shipment of everything to Red China. The Senator's amendment provides that if any other country sends anything in there which we have embargoed, there will be no aid. That means that we might be forced to cut off aid to Korea, Formosa, and Vietnam. We would have to cut off aid all over the world.

Mr. McCARTHY. Oh, no.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Has the Senator examined the situation?

Mr. McCARTHY. We are talking about aid to Communist countries, not aid to South Korea, Vietnam, and Formosa. The amendment provides that when subsidized countries ship to Communist countries goods which we have embargoed, so far as America is concerned, they will not receive American dollars. The amendment has nothing to do with shipments to South Korea, Vietnam, Pakistan, or Formosa.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It would affect any country where anything may be getting through to Communist China, as I understand.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me a few minutes?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly. How much time does the Senator wish? How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will need only a few minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall probably not need all of it. While I have not had an opportunity to study thoroughly the amendment, but only to glance at it, from a technical aspect, and therefore I am not quite sure just what the amendment would do, I know that the adoption of the amendment would clearly indicate the sentiment of the Senate, that we are opposed to the inconsistent position we are in today of providing troops and military aid to countries which are our allies, but who in turn are aiding the enemy by selling and shipping to the enemy strategic materials which are essential to the enemy's war effort and the enemy's objective of world conquest. It is an inconsistent position in which we find ourselves. If the amendment is adopted, the conferees can do the technical work which may be necessary to be done. However, a vote for it now and the adoption of the amendment will serve notice that the elected representatives of the people of this country are tired of this duplicity, and want to put an end to it.

I cannot conceive that we owe any obligation of aid, either economic or military, to any country which engages in the sale of war material or the essentials which are required in the building of a war machine against the very nations we are endeavoring to fortify to resist the enemy. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, may I ask some questions for information about this proposal?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Perhaps early in the debate the question I am about to ask was answered. If so, I still hope the Senator will enlighten me. Is there a list in existence or any record or information as to the countries which are receiving aid under the mutual security program from the United States that are shipping to Communist China materials which are classified as strategic materials?

Mr. McCARTHY. I would not say that there is in existence any detailed list, except that the Commerce Department and the State Department apparently have information which we have difficulty getting from them. The McClellan subcommittee has had difficulty in trying to get that information. However, it was freely admitted that they knew what was being shipped.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is certainly a movement underway and pressure is being applied to relax controls on Red China, so that Red China may receive from our allies the same strategic materials which are now being sold to the Communist bloc countries of Europe.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is certainly correct about that.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is there any place where there has been made available reliable information as to which countries are engaging in the trade of strategic materials with Red China?

Mr. McCARTHY. Oh, yes; our committee developed that rather thoroughly. It is all in the evidence. I cannot call on my memory for a particular list. Great Britain has been shipping such material. France has been shipping such material. I believe the United Kingdom is the greatest offender in that regard. Many other NATO countries have done so. I would not wish to rely on my memory for that information.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin if the evidence of technical experts before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations did not disclose that a number of nations to which we are furnishing aid, so as to make them militarily strong for the purpose of offering a common defense with us against the Soviet bloc, are sending to the Soviet bloc machine tools which are used for the manufacture of munitions and airplanes and all kinds of weapons? Furthermore, did not those witnesses in some instances testify that it would be better, perhaps, for us to ship the munitions to the Soviet bloc countries, instead of sending them the tools with which they can multiply beyond measure their munitions.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct. One of the witnesses from the Pentagon, I believe, testified that—and I can quote his testimony almost verbatim—if we sent ammunition, the ammunition could be used only once; but, if we shipped them machine tools, they could manufacture munitions ad infinitum.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have checked with the staff of the committee, and the latest information we have regarding that trade with Red China from the western countries is one million tons a month. That tonnage goes into Red China's ports. More than 500,000 tons of that material comes from Great Britain. About 75 percent of the vessels going into Red China ports fly western flags, so to speak.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall yield in a moment. Before I yield I should like to say that I believe the Senate owes an enormous debt of gratitude to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and to the staff of the subcommittee, particularly Mr. Kennedy, for the extremely efficient and detailed work the staff has done in digging out this information.

I now yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. I will ask the Senator if our officials of Government, notably those from the Commerce Department, did not testify before the subcommittee that our allies who are getting aid from us are sending to the Soviet bloc countries materials and machine tools which our own Commerce Department embargoes and forbids American manufacturers to ship to Red China, on the ground that it is necessary to restrict such shipments in the interests of national security?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is absolutely correct. We have embargoed such shipments because it would endanger our national security if those materials were shipped to Red China. On the other hand those materials may be shipped to Communist bloc countries by our allies. I believe it was in August 1954, when Mr. Stassen went to the COCOM meeting and there agreed that these strategic materials could be shipped to all countries receiving our aid.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am trying to recall an item which appeared in the press, to the effect that Under Secretary of State Herbert Hoover made the statement that there was a certain amount of trade going on between Formosa and Communist China. Can the Senator give us information on that point? I do not recall the details.

Mr. McCARTHY. As I recall—and this is a matter of record, although I do not remember it was said in executive session or in an open hearing—Mr. Hoover made such a statement one day, but he returned the next day, and when he was questioned about it, he retracted the statement. He retracted it. He said he had been mistaken. He was very frank about it.

Mr. PASTORE. Will a Senator yield some time to me so that I may ask a question of the distinguished minority leader on this point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield such time to the Senator as he may require for that purpose.

Mr. PASTORE. What is bothering me at this point is the very serious implications with which we are confronted. I should like to address a question to the minority leader, because he is the representative of the administration in the Senate. In view of these implications, can the minority leader tell us—and I am not trying to be facetious or impertinent—whether the President of the United States is for or against this amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I can say to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that the administration is opposed to the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not hear the Senator's reply.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I said the administration is opposed to the amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the Senator from California that the administration unfortunately has completely ignored the disturbing information brought out by the McClellan Committee and has paid no attention to it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that I do not believe that statement is entirely accurate. I am not a member of the McClellan committee, but I have followed its proceedings very carefully in the newspapers and I have the highest regard for the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and for the other members of the committee. I was greatly disturbed by some of the information brought to my attention relative to the shipment of copper and machine tools. I called on the highest levels of the Government, and it is still a matter which is having my personal attention. I am entirely dissatisfied with the things that some of our allies did, and I shall urge to the utmost of my ability, at least, that the strongest representations be made to prevent a repetition.

Mr. McCARTHY. I know the Senator from California is concerned about this problem, and I know he has been following it, but unfortunately nothing has ever been done about it. We have talked to officials of the executive department and have found that they know nothing about the testimony before the committee. The shipment of a horizontal drill press seems not to be important, but someone has to decide whether these things are strategic materials. They simply have not been following the testimony. They have been doing nothing. We talk to them, and they say, "We are concerned about it."

But here is an opportunity for the Congress to say that it shall end, that we will not finance the Communist war machine. There is no way on God's earth we can prove anything other than that we are building the Communist war machine. I think we should step in and call a halt, once and for all.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator's amendment will not solve the problem. The Senator himself has pointed out—and I have to take his word for it, and I do—that apparently one of the chief offenders has been Great Britain.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There have been times when the United States has made very considerable advances to Great Britain, for instance, the British-American loan. I remember when I first came to the Senate, in 1945 or 1946, that was an issue. But at the present time Great Britain is not receiving economic aid or military aid. It is true that we have certain bases in Great Britain, but they do not constitute a part of our mutual defense program which is contained in this bill. We cannot solve the problem, so far as Great Britain is concerned, with this amendment. Perhaps if this step had been taken in 1945 the situation would be different. The statement was made on the floor by either the distinguished Senator from Arkansas or the distinguished Senator from North Carolina that about 40 percent of the tonnage to Communist China was shipped in British bottoms. The problem will not be solved by this amendment.

I do not know whether the facts show what, if anything, Canada is shipping to Communist countries. Canada is not receiving aid from us. We have close relations with Canada and we have some bases in Canada. The adoption of this amendment would cut off all discretion on the part of the President of the United States. If the decision were mine, there would be no doubt in my mind about it, but the decision is not mine to make. There may be shipments of certain things which might be termed strategic materials in return for which the President, in his discretion, might feel we were getting back strategic materials of greater importance to the free world.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am relying on memory, now, but I am positive it is correct that we have received no evidence of any strategic materials flowing the other way.

I wonder if the Senator from California will not agree with the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] that this amendment should go to conference. If it is not technically adequate, and it needs to be modified, that can be done in conference. I assume the able Senator from Georgia and the able minority leader will be among the conferees on the part of the Senate and they will have all the power they need to modify the amendment and change it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 6 minutes remaining. The Senator from Wisconsin has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Why would it not be possible and advisable for the United States to ship behind the Iron Curtain the same things we approve our allies shipping behind said curtain? Evidence before the Government Operations Committee was conclusive that modern machine tools were being shipped from European countries to the Communists, and that the Russians were paying for them in such commodities as butter and wheat.

If we allow our allies to ship these goods, and at the same time we prohibit our own manufacturers from shipping to the countries in question, what we are really doing is providing foreign aid in blanket fashion, without the matter ever coming to the Congress.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator has raised a very interesting point, a legal point and an economic point. I do not know that two wrongs can make a right, and that if our allies are getting away with it we can be getting away with it too. If our allies are being strengthened, we are doubly strengthening them.

In 1941 I was a newspaperman on the west coast, and I remember writing several editorials protesting shipments of scrap iron and oil to Japan practically up to the eve of Pearl Harbor. I thought that was a bad thing. I do not know whether we should compound the situation, so to speak, open our doors and send to Communist countries machine tools, vertical boring machines, and so forth. I admit that from an economic point of view, it does not make very much sense to foreclose the United States from that market while other nations are taking full advantage of the situation. It seems to me that is something which should be decided in the highest levels of the Government. In some very hard bargaining with out allies we should say, "Look. Either we are faced with a situation of danger to the free world, or there is no danger to the free world. If there is danger, we are prepared to continue certain obligations under our mutual defense system and our collective security system. If there is real danger to the free world you should cease this trade. We expect you to cease it, and we expect you to do so now."

If the distinguished Senator from Missouri ever has the responsibilities of a high office I hope he will make that perfectly clear. I hope that our administration will make it perfectly clear. Whether there is a Republican or a Democrat in the White House, I hope he will make it clear. But regardless of whether the President in the White House is a Democrat or a Republican, we have to have some confidence in the man who occupies that position. I think he must have some discretion. World conditions change almost from day to day. I am concerned that the amendment which the Senator from Wisconsin has offered would tie the hands of the President completely in a situation which I think might be very detrimental, and it might not solve the problem with which we are all concerned.

Mr. SYMINGTON. My difference with the learned and excellent presentation the distinguished minority leader has just made is that the facts as developed by the Government Operations Committee, under the chairmanship of the able senior Senator from Arkansas, prove that, over a period of years, all this administration has done, and by careful planning on their part, has been to make it easier instead of harder for our allies to

ship more and more strategic materials behind the Iron Curtain.

The more I listen to this foreign aid bill, the more I am convinced that what we are doing is giving a blank check to this administration. It would appear that under no circumstances do we want to criticize the activities of this administration in the field of foreign aid. The worst justification, or rather the worst effort toward any justification of a program that I have seen, is the effort, on the part of those in this administration who are handling this money, to justify agreements made with our allies in Paris and in this country to the effect that it is right for other countries in the free world to ship hundreds of millions of dollars of material behind the Iron Curtain, but at the same time saying it was and is improper for American companies to follow the same policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thought he had consumed his time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wanted to ask the minority leader, upon looking over the amendment, if it is true that the Japanese are carrying on commercial intercourse with Communist China today, and have carried it on during the Korean war, and that, therefore, the amendment would affect trade which, I understand, has been in progress since General MacArthur's time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not have any firsthand information on that point. That may or may not be an accurate statement. I think some trade has been going on.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In nonstrategic goods.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In nonstrategic goods. I doubt very much whether that trade has included any strategic materials, though persons may differ as to what items belong in a list of strategic materials.

During the Korean war, when the question of British trade came up, I suggested to the administration, and to the previous administration as well, that what we should do, when the British asked what should comprise a strategic list, was to say, "Let us take the British orders in council against imperial Germany in 1914. We will be satisfied with that."

Everything down to a stick of chewing gum was on that list, because it was felt that anything which built up the morale of imperial Germany helped the German war effort.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to call to the attention of the Senator from California what I think was a slight mistake in his statement that Great Britain was getting no aid from us. It is true that the bill does not provide any new aid; but it is also true that there is a very sizable amount of money which has been carried over from previous years, much of it unobligated, which is available to Great Britain. I simply wanted to correct the Senator's statement to that extent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

All time on the amendment having expired, the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. HUMPHREYS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. HUMPHREYS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. HUMPHREYS] would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State convention.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

I wish to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 60, as follows:

YEAS—23

Barrett	Bridges	Curtis
Bible	Butler	Dworshak
Bricker	Chavez	Ellender
Ervin	Langer	Welker
Frear	Malone	Williams
Goldwater	McCarthy	Wofford
Hruska	McClellan	Young
Johnston, S. C.	Symington	

NAYS—60

Aiken	Hayden	Monroney
Allott	Hennings	Morse
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Beall	Hill	Murray
Bender	Holland	Neuberger
Bennett	Humphrey, Minn.	Pastore
Bush	Ives	Payne
Byrd	Jackson	Potter
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Robertson
Clements	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Cotton	Kerr	Scott
Dirksen	Knowland	Smathers
Douglas	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Duff	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Long	Sparkman
Flanders	Mansfield	Stennis
Fulbright	Martin, Pa.	Thye
George	McNamara	Watkins
Gore	Millikin	
Green		

NOT VOTING—13

Capehart	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Laird	Russell
Daniel	Magnuson	Schoeppel
Humphreys, Ky.	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
	Neely	

So Mr. McCARTHY's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEMORIAL TRIBUTES TO THE LATE SENATOR BARKLEY AND THE LATE SENATOR KILGORE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield myself half a minute on the bill.

For the information of the Senate and of all other interested persons, I wish to announce that on Monday, July 9, 1956, the Senate will hold memorial services at which tributes will be paid to the late Senator Alben W. Barkley and the late Senator Harley M. Kilgore.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9952) to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9593) to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Dawson of Illinois, Mr. Jones of Alabama, Mr. Kilgore, Mr. Brown of Ohio, and Mr. Jonas of North Carolina were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 9952. An act to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the

Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty; and

H. R. 10986. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to further amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief announcement. I understand that there are still several amendments at the desk. Some of them will be consolidated, and some of them are duplicates. In the event we are able to restrict our discussion of the amendments, and not use all the available time, we may be able to complete action on the bill this evening.

A number of Senators are very anxious to have that done. Many Senators have speaking engagements which will require that they be out of town over the weekend.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that Senators who are to speak on the remaining amendments will make their remarks as brief as possible; and that Senators who have amendments which have been printed, but which they do not wish to call up, will so advise me, in order that we can make our plans accordingly.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "6–28–56—H," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 55, after line 16, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 14. It is the sense of Congress that in the preparation of the fiscal year 1958 mutual-security program, the President should take more fully into account the desirability of affirmatively promoting the economic development of underdeveloped countries, both as a means of effectively counteracting the increased political and economic emphasis of Soviet foreign policy and as a means of promoting fundamental American foreign policy objectives of political and economic self-determination and independence.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, I should like to address the Senate on the highly important subject of our national security in the perspective of our pending business, the mutual-security program.

The heavy emphasis and primary importance that we place on the defense and security of our Nation will never be subject to serious debate. But the specific policies and methods which we use to pursue these goals are open to serious question. I am convinced that it is entirely in the best interests of our Nation that those methods should be continually reexamined with a view to their improvement. Undoubtedly one of the major questions in planning an effective foreign-aid program concerns the amount of funds which we should allocate to the economic phase of our total mutual-security effort, especially in view of the current changes in Soviet policy.

Mr. President, it has seemed painfully obvious to many of us for some time that a reexamination was in order of the military versus economic aspects of our foreign-aid program. Russia's recent shift in tactics in adopting an extensive program of economic and technical assistance has accelerated my concern that we here in the United States can no longer afford to continue complacently with our previous foreign-aid program as a model for our present requirements. As the Senate knows, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held exhaustive hearings investigating all facets of this program with testimony from scores of administration witnesses. Yet, Mr. President, time after time when Senators have queried the officials in charge of formulating and implementing our foreign-aid policy as to the administration's plans for counteracting this new Soviet challenge, these officials have not been able to delineate any positive, new steps undertaken or even contemplated in the requests for fiscal 1957.

A couple of examples will suffice. On May 14, 1956, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford testified before our committee. The question of areas of relative deficiency in our foreign policy became a subject of discussion. In answer to a question from me, the admiral responded:

I notice that in the NATO meetings of military men there is no disagreement as to the problems that the military face. It is at the political level that there are some difficulties.

I then asked:

And it is therefore at that level that great attention needs to be concentrated?

The admiral answered, "Yes."

Following an exchange of opinion on the entire world situation, I rephrased my question to the admiral.

In other words, we are at a better stage militarily than we are politically; is that what you would say?

The admiral responded:

I would say that our problems in the other fields are greater and more difficult than they are in the military field.

When we consider the "other fields," Mr. President, the whole economic and technical assistance area is obviously of considerable importance. Yet when the ICA Administrator, Mr. Hollister, appeared before the Subcommittee on Technical Assistance Programs on January 23, 1956, he indicated quite frankly that many "attractive" requests for assistance presented to the ICA had been rejected by him largely for budgetary reasons. An effort was made by the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee to discover the essential facts about Mr. Hollister's rejected programs and projects. I myself felt that these rejected proposals should have been carefully considered as a part of an overall study of the future of our economic assistance to underdeveloped countries. I regret to say that the information made available by Mr. Hollister on his rejected requests, including information covering the whole field of guidelines or technical assistance program recommendations, was most discouraging.

Mr. President, it seems to me on the basis of the material made available to us from the ICA that there are three significant conclusions to be drawn:

First, contrary to the practice in previous years, the fiscal year 1957 nonmilitary aid program started with a fiscal target set by the Bureau of the Budget and worked backward to formulate an aid program. My impression is that in other years the assistance requirements were worked out first and then adjusted in accordance with fiscal considerations.

Second, due to the restrictive guidelines and instructions sent to the field, the field felt constrained to stick closely to the planning figures supplied from Washington.

Third, the documents made available to us by the administration indicate that the responsible administration officials, regardless of what they occasionally say, actually do not appear to recognize that a very significant change in Soviet tactics has taken place. Such an awareness has definitely not been reflected in the guidelines sent out by the ICA Administrator to the field. There is no sense of urgency on the part of the administration in the economic and technical assistance aspects of the foreign aid bill. I have found little appreciation or even discussion of the significance of the new Soviet challenge in this area. My impression is that men like Mr. Hollister are drifting along inwardly hoping that the need for the foreign aid program will wither away. This is the only conclusion that can be reached from an intensive examination of administration requests. The same conclusion is obvious from a mere superficial examination of these requests, since they seem in most respects to be a warmed-over hash of previous programs.

We worked long and hard over this complex, and often confused, bill in our Foreign Relations Committee sessions, and I think that after weighing all the various pros and cons, the committee took the action which we believed to be in the best interests of the Nation, even though there were many parts of the measure to which some of us could not give wholehearted support.

Yet, Mr. President, I submit that it is not very comforting to spend $4.5 billion a year for a policy which shows no more imaginativeness, resiliency, or adaptability than the requests presented to us by the administration. We are voting partly on faith. Let no one mistake my words here: I am most certainly not opposed to the necessary expenditures for an adequate foreign policy, but I can see no reason for being satisfied with a program which does nothing to meet the obviously new and different threat of Soviet economic penetration.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that for the security and long-run well-being of our Nation, the Russian approach to foreign aid will at long last wake up those in the administration responsible for formulating our own policy. It is about time that the administration was prodded into doing some reevaluating of our foreign-aid program, not merely paying lip

service to such an idea. The world does not always behave the way the words behave, even the words of high administration spokesmen.

Mr. President, on this issue as on others, the press of the country is away ahead of the administration. Typical of many intelligent criticisms of the relatively obsolete mutual-security program presented to us this year is an editorial in the June 21 issue of the Minneapolis Star. Entitled "Emphasis in Aid," the editorial states that "a good many Americans are worried about the apparent impact of Russia's relatively new foreign-aid program in comparison with that of the United States." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent summary of our present foreign-aid predicament be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPHASIS IN AID

A good many Americans are worried about the apparent impact of Russia's relatively new foreign-aid program in comparison with that of the United States. And rightly so.

It does little good to complain that with comparatively small grants the Russians get more publicity and apparent goodwill than this country reaps with a much larger aid program. For there are other reasons for this disparity of impact than the Soviets' shrewd choice of showcase aid projects.

One reason can be discovered by examining the overall United States foreign-aid program. Although its emphasis ought to have been made plain by the current congressional debate on the program, few Americans realize that at least 89 percent of United States foreign-aid spending is for military or military-support projects.

Russia's foreign-aid venture, on the other hand, however small it may be in comparison with the overall (military included) United States program, is tilted in exactly the opposite direction. Its emphasis is almost all on economic aid.

Keeping these facts in mind might help us appreciate how it is that some young nations overseas, comparing the Russian and American programs in what they consider an objective light, can arrive at judgments which are not favorable to us.

Hardly even the most all-out partisan of greatly expanded United States economic aid, however, would have us drop our military guard. The Communist bloc's past deeds and its still great military potential would make such action foolhardy.

But all things considered, an increasing number of people are beginning to think that if we maintain our own military strength, perhaps even if necessary stepping up slightly our own defense spending, we should be able to work a major shift in emphasis in our foreign aid, from the military to the economic.

Except in a surprisingly few isolated spots in the world, today's militarily oriented program is not producing the dividends (in terms of United States national security) it ought to produce. A major change in emphasis might work for our big program even better than it has for Russia's comparatively smaller effort.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, this editorial suggests that it is high time that a major shift in emphasis from military to economic aid should be seriously considered. This is a view which is not held alone by the Minneapolis Star and Tribune. Verbally it is a view espoused by President Eisenhower not long ago when he said that every dollar spent on economic aid was in his opinion worth five dollars spent on the military aspects of defense. I do not quarrel with the military appropriations, Mr. President, but I look in vain for anything like President Eisenhower's ratio of economic versus military importance in the foreign-aid requests.

Mr. President, instead the administration sent us a program which calls for a $2.1 billion increase in military assistance while the amounts requested for economic aid remained for all practical purposes at last year's levels. According to the Secretary of State, the requests consist of 83 percent for military assistance and only 17 percent for economic aid.

At the same time, Mr. President, the indecision and the confusion within the Administration on our technical assistance program and on use of United Nation's agencies has been demonstrated by the open split between President Eisenhower and Ambassador Lodge over funneling more technical assistance through the U. N. Ambassador Lodge favors increased use of the U. N. agencies. The President does not feel this is practical.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a press release issued by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States representative to the United Nations, in which Mr. Lodge emphasizes that multilateral aid offers a way to prevent so-called auction which some are trying to promote between the United States and the U. S. S. R. to see which will spend the most in underdeveloped countries.

He also points out that we need bilateral and multilateral programs, but that the present world situation is one which requires our giving new emphasis to multilateral programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire press release be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with an article entitled "President Is Cool To Funneling Aid Through the U. N.," written by Elie Abel, and published in the New York Times of May 4, 1956. The article indicates the President's reaction to the multilateral approach to economic aid.

There being no objection, the press release and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS,
New York, N. Y., April 30, 1956.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, ON MULTILATERAL ASSISTANCE

The seeds of international communism fall on fertile ground when impoverished peoples see no hope. A hungry man, therefore, is more interested in four sandwiches than he is in four freedoms. But people who are healthy and have enough to eat will be strong enough to fight for themselves against aggression from without or within. This is one important reason why the United States supports programs for economic aid abroad.

A program to which many nations contribute under the auspices of the United Nations has some real advantages over a program sponsored by the United States alone. That is the difference between so-called multilateral aid and bilateral aid.

Multilateral aid offers a way to prevent the so-called auction which some are trying to promote between the United States and the U. S. S. R. as to which will spend the most in an underdeveloped country.

A multilateral program supplies no cover for engaging in political penetration, which is what the Communists do and which we are unjustly suspected of wanting to do. We thus get credit for unselfish motives in contributing to such a fund; yet we can influence it constructively.

The percentage which a country like ours contributes to a multilateral program is less than it would be under a bilateral program because more countries are sharing the expenses.

A multilateral program conducted in full public view by representatives of the United Nations will not be misunderstood by those who benefit from it. United Nations technicians in special uniforms, for example, would find it difficult to engage in surreptitious political activity.

We need both bilateral and multilateral programs. But the present world situation is one which requires our giving new emphasis to multilateral programs. We can do this without any additional expense by diverting a percentage of our foreign-aid funds to multilateral channels.

NOTE.—This statement was made in response to a correspondent's request for Mr. Lodge's views on the value of multilateral assistance in comparison with bilateral.

PRESIDENT IS COOL TO FUNNELING AID THROUGH THE U. N.—SEES THEORETICAL ADVANTAGE, BUT OPPOSES CHANGE NOW ON GROUNDS OF REALITY—CITES WORLD POLITICS—BACKS BILATERAL PROCEDURES—ASKS CONGRESS APPROVE HIS 4.9 BILLION REQUEST

(By Elie Abel)

WASHINGTON, May 4.—President Eisenhower made plain today his misgivings about transferring any substantial part of the United States foreign-aid program to the United Nations.

Such a shift has been advocated, with varying degrees of enthusiasm, by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States Ambassador to the United Nations; by Adlai E. Stevenson, Democratic presidential aspirant, and by other prominent Americans.

Ambassador Lodge proposed last week that the United States should channel a large part of its foreign aid through the United Nations. Such an arrangement, he declared, would offer "real advantage over a program sponsored by the United States alone."

The Lodge statement, regarded as a bid for the Soviet Union also to use the United Nations as an aid-distribution agency, contended that in this way it might be possible to prevent an East-West contest "as to which will spend the most in an underdeveloped country."

ACTUALITIES ARE NOTED

Mr. Lodge contended that such an approach would minimize the danger of undercover political penetration. Others have taken the view that aid dispensed by the United States would be more acceptable to uncommitted countries because it would not put them on one side or the other.

The President said at his news conference this morning that there might be a theoretical advantage in using the United Nations to distribute economic assistance as a means of removing the whole question from the arena of East-West competition.

"But in practice," he added, "we are quite certain that as of today—and you know the character and difficulties of the United Nations as well as I do—you couldn't keep out politics."

For the present, foreign aid must continue to be carried out through bilateral arrange-

ments with other countries or with groups of countries, the President declared.

He noted, however, that the United States had not been deficient in contributing funds for various forms of relief and technical assistance through the United Nations. In the present fiscal year ending June 30, he said, the United States voluntary contributions would amount to $71 million, far in excess of what anyone else puts in.

The President made a strong plea for congressional approval of his $4,900,000,000 foreign-aid request, which is now before the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

"The program as it is now outlined represents to us a minimum that is necessary for the welfare of the United States in the years to come," he declared.

Asked about his meeting on the foreign-aid issue last Monday with congressional leaders of both major parties, the President said they had studied ways and means of setting up a Commission to reexamine the program and to see how it could be improved.

PROGRAMS CALLED MINIMUM

The Commission will report to the White House and Congress before the Presidential inaugural next January 20, General Eisenhower said. He emphasized, however, that the present program represented a minimum and should not be reduced in anticipation of new proposals next year.

President Eisenhower said it was not entirely true that this year's program could be regarded as a stopgap until better methods of meeting the Soviet Union's economic offensive were devised.

He said the administration was constantly trying to improve the foreign-aid program. To this end, the Council on Foreign Economic Policy, headed by Joseph M. Dodge, former Director of the Budget Bureau, has been at work for many months with every kind of expert advice and counsel that we can get together on this thing, the President said.

"We are certain that in this world of today you cannot walk off and abandon your friends * * * and not have something bad happen," he declared.

CRITICS AT HOUSE HEARING

He acknowledged that the current program was not much different than it had been in recent years, except that the administration had now called on Congress to correct certain past weaknesses. The President was alluding to his request for wider Executive discretion in allocating funds.

Meanwhile, critics of the foreign-aid program were appearing before the Foreign Affairs Committee for the first time in the current session of Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I was hopeful that during these deliberations we might have been able to consider as a part of the foreign aid program a wider use of international agencies. What I refer to in particular is America's possible contribution to international economic development under the auspices of the United Nations. Many of us are familiar with the proposal known as SUNFED—the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development. It is still in the planning stage. It needs the United States, to give it impetus, to give it meaning.

The purpose of the United Nations Special Economic Development Fund would be to improve the economic aid program by promoting the construction of such necessities as roads, hospitals, power stations, and other capital projects essential for industrial development.

The program known as SUNFED would be open to any nation or special agency. The nation or agency would have to be willing to subscribe to the principles and policies of the SUNFED organization.

SUNFED would be directly related to the United Nations technical assistance program and would be in coordination with UNESCO and the United Nations Economic and Social Council.

I have developed a memorandum relative to the background of SUNFED, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM RE SPECIAL UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (SUNFED)

I. EXPLANATION OF SUNFED

A. Purpose: To improve the economic aid program by establishing an international fund to develop the "infrastructure" sectors of the economies of underdeveloped countries. "Infrastructure" includes basic necessities like roads, hospitals, and power stations, all of which are essential for the further development of industrial potential.

B. Membership: Open to any nation or special agency, not necessarily a member of the United Nations, provided that the nation or agency would be willing to subscribe to the principles and policies of SUNFED, to pledge its contribution to the operational budget of SUNFED, and to pay its share of the administrative budget.

C. Costs: SUNFED advocates anticipate an initial contribution of $250 million by at least 30 nations or agencies to get SUNFED going. Actually eventual running costs have been estimated as high as $3 to $10 billion.

D. Relation to other U. N. agencies: The auguration of this fund would also necessitate an extension of the U. N. technical-aid program, and coordination with UNESCO and the Economic and Social Council.

II. HISTORY OF SUNFED

In 1953, a committee of nine submitted a report ordered by the Secretary General of the United Nations, bearing on the organization of a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED).

In 1954 and 1955, Belgian banker Raymond Scheyven, former president of the United Nations Economic and Social Council (1953) reported to the 9th and 10th sessions on the continued studies of SUNFED. The report maintained that "any program of economic development, of necessity, contains a proportion of low-yielding and slow-yielding projects which yet are essential preconditions for the high-yielding and rapid-yielding projects."

During 1954 and 1955 the United Nations General Assembly debated the possibility of implementing the suggestions of the committee of nine. Thirty-two nations, mostly have-not nations, have supported the resolution to implement the report, but in 1954 the United States and other have nations vetoed this resolution.

In 1956 the pressures outside the United States of America for going ahead with SUNFED have increased. The administration has remained opposed. (See IV, infra.)

III. THE VALUE OF SUNFED TODAY

A. Cooperation of the United States in connection with SUNFED would reaffirm in the eyes of the world the good faith of the United States in working with the United Nations.

B. Affiliation with an international organization with the purpose of spreading economic aid to the underdeveloped countries would unburden the United States from some of the onerous consequences of bilateral agreements which have often aroused considered distrust and envy.

C. The United States could thereby call the bluff of the Soviet Union which professes to regard the United Nations as a suitable medium for peaceful activities, untainted by political motives.

D. On the international scale it would fill a gap in the present economic and technical aid plans. This desire to develop the "infrastructure" is a new idea politically but a very widely recognized idea among economists. Former plans have been geared to economies already possessing a strong infrastructure.

E. Our reticence to SUNFED permits the Soviet Union to take the initiative and once more outstrip the United States in winning the approval of the neutral and underdeveloped nations.

F. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States Ambassador to the United Nations, has said (statement made on April 30, 1956):

"Multilateral aid offers a way to prevent the so-called auction which some are trying to promote between the United States and the U. S. S. R. as to which will spend the most in an underdeveloped country.

"A multilateral program supplies no cover for engaging in political penetration, which is what the Communists do and which we are unjustly suspected of wanting to do. We thus get credit for unselfish motives in contributing to such a fund; yet we can influence it constructively."

G. SUNFED might assist in improving domestic political conditions in the recipient assisted countries without the customary adverse reaction to bilateral political "strings". As the Scheyven report stated in 1954:

"It might be easier to carry out such structural reforms through an international organization, which is in a better position to spare national susceptibilities. The intervention of any one country in reforms of this nature would be a very difficult matter, as is illustrated by the reactions which have been aroused whenever lending countries have sought to make their investments conditional upon stipulations which the borrowing countries regarded as infringements of their sovereignty."

IV. UNITED STATES POSITION ON SUNFED

A. The administration believes primarily that SUNFED should not be initiated until disarmament has been well advanced and the funds thereby saved could be profitably reinvested in such economic aid.

B. The administration also contends that other countries involved in large military expenditures would be unable to contribute substantially. If the United States were to bear the brunt of the burden, it would be very costly. Moreover, the argument runs, SUNFED would lose its basic and necessary international characteristics.

C. The administration also claims to feel that a disproportionate part of the original investment would be "wasted" in the organization of the administration of the fund, operational costs, overhead, and plant expenditures.

D. The small initial amounts contributed would have to be followed by spiralling amounts later.

E. In reply to Ambassador Lodge's statement urging the extension of United States support and activities within the United Nations, the President said that the expansion of the United Nations technical- and economic-aid program might alleviate the tension of East-West competition over economic aid, in theory. In practice, though, he said, "We are quite certain that as of today—and you know the character and difficulties of the United Nations as well as I do—you couldn't keep out politics." The President implied that the present American contribution of $71 million to the United Nations was adequate.

F. There is a present schism in the administration position, evidenced in the Lodge-Eisenhower difference of opinion. Also, Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary

of State, stated on April 10 that there was a need for encouragement for projects like SUNFED. Wilcox suggested the use of the United Nations in such a project, but tempered his statement with an appeal to the go-slow philosophy.

G. One other fear is that the economic policies of the United States in regard to economic aid will be governed by an international bureaucracy.

V. REBUTTAL TO THE ADMINISTRATION POSITION

A. We should not postpone action until achieving disarmament. Under the present state of tensions, it would be far more advisable to work on the evils of poverty and hunger which are as much ammunition of the Communists as our military policies. It might also be possible that improvement of economic conditions in the underdeveloped countries might improve the chances for disarmament.

B. One of the basic, unexpressed motives behind the administration position is efficiency. As Walter Reuther said, however:

"We can afford to contribute our share of SUNFED's $250 million—and much more. We have proved we can afford defense expenditures of $1 billion a week ($52 billion a year), and at the same time, contribute to SUNFED and invest in other phases of a rounded development program to the extent of billions a year." (Testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.)

C. There are four safeguards protecting the fund from being "raided" by have-not nations who have not contributed an appropriate amount. The SUNFED proposal would provide that:

(1) Membership is on a year-to-year basis, annually renewable or revocable;

(2) The main contributors to the fund would have half the 8 or 12 members of the governing board;

(3) A board member from a country applying for aid would not participate in action on that application;

(4) The Director would cast the deciding vote in the event of a tie (and the United States as the heaviest contributor, in all probability would name the Director).

VI. SUPPORT FOR SUNFED

A. AFL-CIO, UAW: Walter Reuther said in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

"It is foolish to the point of suicide to put off such economic cooperation until after worldwide disarmament is achieved or even until another study is completed * * *. It is precisely during the period of tension when disarmament is blocked that such positive offensives against poverty and hunger are most needed, most valuable, most powerfully effective in working out of the swamps and jungles of fear and war into the light and confidence needed for peace and disarmament * * *.

"SUNFED is part of a positive peace offensive, a way to get off the dime of military defense and make real for mankind the four freedoms for which World War II was fought and won."

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation.—E. Raymond Wilson before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, May 11, 1956:

"While it is important and imperative to work for universal disarmament under enforceable law, we can't wait for disarmament to undertake a much more adequate economic development program. Technical cooperation programs and economic development must be expanded rapidly, even if there is no political progress toward disarmament. Indeed, the improvement of economic standards may help to decrease tensions, and in turn improve the chances for achieving disarmament."

C. National Farmers Union.—James G. Patton, president, before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Senate Resolutions 85 and 86, May 29, 1956:

"To move in the direction of peace and abundance, we need to open the door to the negotiation and establishment of * * * an International Development Agency such as SUNFED."

D. UAW international relations resolution adopted April 1, 1955, Cleveland, Ohio:

"We strongly urge Congress to approve and provide the $80 million for the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED) in order to further demonstrate the deep concern of the people of America to take immediate and practical steps toward world peace."

SPECIAL UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

(Report prepared in pursuance of General Assembly Resolution 822 (IX); General Assembly; Official Records, 10th sess.; supplement No. 17 (A/2906), New York, 1955)

CHAPTER II. ROLE OF A SPECIAL FUND IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

11. The function of a special fund cannot be that of a vast international charitable organization similar to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration after the Second World War. There is no question of the free distribution of consumer goods and the underdeveloped countries are not asking for charity. This would not be a lasting and reliable solution of their problems. The only real solution consists in raising their national income, or in other words, in increasing their production. Such an increase in output can be attained only by the improvement of methods of production, requiring both the training of people—to obtain higher technological skill, managerial ability and administrative competence—and the introduction of modern equipment.

Large amounts of capital are needed both for the training of people and for the provision of modern equipment. This capital should, in principle, be derived from savings, if these were not so low in the underdeveloped countries. The economic advancement of any country left to itself depends, in effect, essentially on its domestic resources and on their full and effective utilization. The economically underdeveloped countries, however, are in a difficult position not only because their domestic resources of capital and technological skill have not been fully mobilized, but primarily because these resources are inadequate. The vicious circle for underdeveloped countries is that their savings are low because their incomes are low and their incomes will remain low if more savings are not made available for investment in equipment. Hence, in the absence of a sufficient flow of foreign capital, the underdeveloped countries themselves are not able appreciably to raise their incomes and the disparity in standards of living which now exists between wealthy and poor countries will continue to widen. As we have indicated in the introduction to this report, we must, in order to reduce tension, achieve a certain balance between the standards of living of the various peoples. Wide differences of income between members of the same community contribute to political instability; for that reason, one of the fundamental aims of a policy of international peace, of which the Special Fund will be one of the instruments, should be to reduce the widening gap between standards of living in the various countries.

12. This disparity can be corrected only if the process of development is seen as an international problem requiring a common effort, which implies that the resources of wealthy countries will be used to supplement the savings of underdeveloped areas. Such assistance to the latter would enable them to step up their investment programs, and the extent to which they will be able to do so is closely related to the form and the amount of foreign assistance which will become available. In this sphere there is a real need for additional financing along lines different from that provided either by private investors or by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. This additional financing should be directed toward providing the underdeveloped countries with what is called the economic-social "infrastructure," on which the apparatus of production proper is based. The "infrastructure" may be defined as the set of basic facilities needed for effective production, such as a minimum of roads, power stations, schools, hospitals, housing, and Government buildings. Experience has shown that it is only when this basis has been established that production can be developed smoothly and that private initiative can play its full part.

This additional financing can be undertaken only by public capital, largely on a grant basis. This is in conformity with national finance policy in almost all countries. Large sums are continually being spent on this type of investment and it frequently happens that one region of a country finances the development of another region, when this is in the common interest. From the international point of view, there is no reason why this transfer should stop at political frontiers. It is here that the special fund would make an indispensable contribution, supplementing that already made by the other institutions working in the international field.[1]

13. Distinctions, which are theoretical rather than practical, are normally made between the various types of infrastructure investments; some are social because they provide for the education, health, and welfare of the population; [2] others are economic because they tend more directly to promote the economic development of a region. Some investment projects are self-liquidating in the sense that they yield a profit to the investor of sufficient size and over a sufficiently short period to be financed by commercial loans or by private capital; others relate to projects which, although non-self-liquidating, nevertheless constitute an indispensable part of the infrastructure. This category includes roads, schools, hospitals, and other facilities which add to the nation's productive potential, but which are not usually operated in such a way as to yield a profit within a reasonably short period.

It would, in our view, be wrong to consider that the essential purpose of the special fund would be to finance social and not economic "infrastructure" investments. In order to promote the development of a country, it may be more immediately necessary to build power stations and railways than schools and hospitals.

It would be equally wrong to consider that the fund's essential mission would be to finance non-self-liquidating investments and not potentially self-liquidating investments. From the general economic point of view, all "infrastructure" investments, whether social or economic, provided that they are not unnecessarily large and that they are integrated in a coherent development program, are directly or indirectly self-liquidating, since they all contribute to the

---

[1] These transfers should not be confined to relations between industrialized and underdeveloped countries; they are also possible in relations between industrialized countries or between underdeveloped countries themselves.

[2] In some cases, the most desirable form of development may be dependent on migration. One of the aims of the special fund might therefore be to establish conditions favorable to the transfer and resettlement of surplus population.

short-term or long-term development of the economy. Thus the construction of hospitals and schools will provide a country with a healthier and more highly skilled labor force, which cannot fail to have favorable effects on productivity.

In the financial sense of the term, only self-liquidating investments, i. e., investments which yield a financial return on the capital invested within a reasonable period, can attract private capital or be financed by commercial loans. However, the infrastructure may include normally self-liquidating projects, such as power stations, which cannot be financed either by private capital or commercial loans, owing to the subsequent transfer difficulties which such methods of financing may entail. In this case, one of the functions of the special fund would be to solve these difficulties, either by a grant, or by a loan repayable in local currency, as will be explained in chapter IV of this report.[3]

To sum up, it would be the function of the special fund to finance any investment whether economic or social, in underdeveloped countries, which was part of a coherent program designed to attain the maximum rise in national income and which could not be fully financed by private capital, the International Bank, or any other loan-making institution.

14. In performing this function, the special fund would be able to initiate or to stimulate development processes that would not otherwise take place. Its action would be comparable to that of the Marshall plan for the rehabilitation of the war-devasted countries of Europe. The success of the European recovery program was complete. It had all the features of the operations outlined above and broke the vicious circle of low production and low investment which threatened Europe as the result of war damage. It consisted mainly of grants, since it was understood that the balance of payments position would not permit the repayment of loans for some years. It enabled the European countries to restore the most essential parts of their production equipment, including roads, electricity plants, and certain buildings. However, so far as the necessary investments were concerned, United States assistance only supplemented the countries' own contributions. The recovery in production and income in the Western European countries has made it clear that these investments were economically sound and that they helped to restore political stability in the countries concerned.

It is true that in the case of Europe, it was a process of reconstruction rather than of development that was envisaged. It is also true that the assistance was limited in time, whereas the development of underdeveloped countries is a long-term undertaking. However, if even in this case it was considered necessary to assist the recovery of production in Europe by external aid, such assistance would be all the more necessary for underdeveloped countries. The experience of the Marshall plan has shown the path to follow. In view of the dangers to international political stability involved in the alternative of inaction, it would be most unfortunate not to make use of that experience.

[3] A typical case has been brought to our knowledge. We were informed that a financial institution particularly concerned with assistance to underdeveloped countries had made loans to an Asian country to finance four projects, but had refused to finance a fifth. It was not that the fifth project was less important than the first four or that it was not financially self-liquidating. In both respects it was on the same footing as the other four projects. The institution considered, however, that it could not make the fifth loan because of the economic situation and balance of payments position of the applicant country which would have prevented it from repaying the fifth loan within a reasonable period. The fifth project, although self-liquidating, would be within the province of the special fund, which would finance it either by a grant or, more probably, by a loan repayable in local currency.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Moreover, Mr. President, other major areas of confusion remain unresolved. Thus, instead of attempting to formulate an approach to the tremendous economic needs of Asia, estimated by such foreign-aid experts as Professors Millikan and Rostow to be as high as $1.6 billion per year of realistic absorptive capacity, we continue to think largely in terms of planes and tanks which are not necessarily relevant to the Asian situation. In the Indian-Pakistan-Afghanistan area, we are actually upsetting local balances of power.

Another aspect of administration confusion lies in the field of farm surpluses. While many people in the world subsist on starvation diets, the United States has ample supplies of foodstuffs which can be most effectively used in a humanitarian gesture, and in a manner highly valuable to the prestige and respect of the United States abroad. So what does the administration do? It cut back by $50 million the amount of American agricultural products planned for shipment overseas.

Mr. President, when is the administration going to wake up to see what is going on in the world outside? The administration's complacent point of view has created a program which does not begin to meet some of the most pressing needs of the world and our Nation today. Our leaders have talked about the advantages of economic aid, and yet they have done nothing about it. They have talked about the value of more dramatic contributions to the United Nations, and yet they have done nothing about it. They have talked about the urgency of the economic thirst of Asia, and yet they have done relatively nothing about it. Now, more than ever before, we need bold, thoughtful, and imaginative planning of the money we spend on foreign aid, and the administration plays for us the same old record labeled "we must help our allies," and shows no foresight or even common horsesense in the arrangement of the music. Mr. President, I am impatient with an administration that indulges in such constant window dressing and yet when it comes down to actually doing something concrete with their verbiage, they back down.

Mr. President, this confused administration program has been presented to us even in the face of testimony like that of Walter Reuther, who has just returned from an extensive trip to India and who estimates that an overall economic-aid program of $8 billion per year would not be exorbitant. Mr. John Cowles, the distinguished president of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, made a penetrating analysis which was inserted in the RECORD several days ago. He emphasized the urgency of allocating greatly expanded portions of our existing mutual-security funds to economic aid.

Even a casual observer of newspaper headlines would have seen the countless reports and articles which underline the strategic value and need of economic aid. Two articles from the New York Times in relation to the crucially important Asian sector of the globe, for instance, quickly show the shortcomings and failures of our present policy. In the May 26 article entitled "Asian Neutrals Pose Economic-Aid Problem," Mr. Thomas J. Hamilton repeates a common complaint: That no clear indication of our policy has yet come from President Eisenhower or Secretary Dulles toward new developments in Asia. The disturbing cancellation of Prime Minister Nehru's scheduled visit will further postpone such policy considerations.

In an article of April 10, 1956, numerous New York Times foreign correspondents reported a summary of their interviews and observations in many nations. They agreed that good will toward the United States in many strategic Asian nations has been seriously ebbing, and they continue to point out how again and again the problem of economic development is foremost in the minds of our non-Communist friends abroad.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles just described be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 26, 1956]

ASIAN NEUTRALS POSE ECONOMIC-AID PROBLEM—THEY WOULD LIKE TO GET ASSISTANCE THROUGH THE U. N. BUT CONGRESS PREFERS BILATERAL APPROACH—SOVIETS ALSO APPEAR COOL

(By Thomas J. Hamilton)

During his state visit, President Sukarno has given the American people a clear exposition of the policy that Indonesia and indeed all the new countries of Asia and Africa are demanding from the West.

For one thing, they expect the United States to back them all the way in their drive to eliminate the remaining vestiges of colonialism from the earth. Although they are neutralists, or, as they prefer to call themselves, "uncommitted," they insist that the descendants of Thomas Jefferson and Patrick Henry must automatically support Indonesia's claim to West New Guinea and India's to Goa.

This argument obviously presents a problem for the United States. The economic phase is equally difficult. Dr. Sukarno has emphasized that the new nations want economic assistance not guns. He did not discuss methods, but Prime Minister Nehru of India, who will be the next Asian leader to visit Washington, has already proclaimed that this help should be provided through the United Nations, not bilaterally.

Dr. Sukarno's visit has developed the point that the new countries are now just as insistent upon American help in developing their economies as they are upon support in their anticolonial offensive. Walter P. Reuther, who has studied the situation in India and other southeast Asian countries, expressed it in his letter to Secretary of State Dulles last March.

FRIENDSHIP'S GAIN

"The hungry, the naked and dispossessed masses are on the march, and they are determined to free themselves from economic bondage, as many have already freed themselves of colonialism and political bondage," Mr. Reuther wrote. "In the long run, we will

gain by making grateful friends, not jealous enemies."

Gifts and loans by Western governments, in particular by the United States, appear to be the only solution that the new countries will accept; in particular, all of them are allergic to allowing private capital to finance them.

Since the Soviet Union has already started to provide limited but spectacular economic help for the new countries—Moscow might do more after it reduces its armed forces—they now seem to have an alternative if the United States does not respond to their appeals.

But there are no signs that Congress, which in an election year is particularly aware of the tax burden, will either increase the foreign-aid appropriation for economic assistance or permit the United Nations to administer it.

President Eisenhower has asked for a foreign-aid appropriation of $4,900,000,000, of which three-fifths is for military assistance. Another fifth is for economic assistance to countries with which the United States has defense agreements.

This leaves considerably less than $1 billion for economic assistance to the neutral countries and for contributions to the United Nations and related agencies, including the technical-assistance program. The United Nations program is spending $28 million this year, of which half was supplied by the United States.

ISSUE OF COMMITMENTS

During the appropriation bill's passage through the House of Representatives in Washington thus far the military program has been cut more heavily than the economic program. But the administration's request for authority to give more than a year's commitment on projects requiring years to complete seems to have been eliminated for good.

Apart from demonstrating the determination of Congress to retain control of the purse strings, the treatment of the bill reflects the strain on the American taxpayer. He has provided billions of dollars in foreign aid since 1947.

Furthermore, since Mr. Dulles has boasted that the revised Soviet tactics resulted from the defeat of Russia's former policy, the sense of urgency about even the military program is diminished. It is even more weakened in the case of economic assistance.

RUSSIA INCLUDED

As far as the United Nations is concerned, a serious drawback is the fact that the Soviet Union is now participating in the U. N. technical-assistance program to the extent of $1 million worth of nonconvertible rubles a year. While some countries have demurred at admitting Soviet technicians under the U. N. program, Burma has accepted 2 experts on coal-shale mining and India 2 statisticians and a woman physician.

It was, of course, the fear in Washington that the Soviet Union would sabotage the Marshal plan that resulted in the decision to administer it outside the United Nations. Although United Nations authorities say that a $50-million technical assistance program for next year is the minimum that would take care of meritorious applications, it would be idle to disregard the conviction of many Americans that, if the United States is going to spend the money, it ought to get the credit.

In accordance with this feeling, the United States, in fact, has for years blocked the establishment of SUNFED—the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development—although it calls for an annual expenditure of only $250 million a year. The United Nations Atoms for Peace Agency is to be established next year on the initiative of the United States. But if the new countries and the Soviet Union insist upon taking over control, the United States may fall back on its existing bilateral program.

FRENCH PROPOSAL

On the other hand, there is a growing movement, led by France's Foreign Minister Pineau, for the increased use of the United Nations in providing economic assistance. One reason is the technical consideration that experts from less industrialized countries may be more useful—and work for lower cost—than Americans in helping backward countries.

But the basic consideration is the justified belief that the neutralist governments find it easier to accept help from the United Nations than directly from the United States.

The same considerations have applied to bilateral help from the Soviet Union. Judging from the equivocal reaction of the Soviet Union to M. Pineau's proposal, the Presidium apparently is no more enthusiastic about a United Nations program than is Congress.

No clear indication of policy has come from President Eisenhower or Mr. Dulles. However, their representative in the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., is insisting that "we need both bilateral and multilateral programs" and that a larger part of the foreign-aid program should be channeled through the United Nations.

[From the New York Times of April 10, 1956]

ASIA SURVEY FINDS NEED OF MORE AID—SOME SEE CUT IN UNITED STATES LIVING STANDARD TO PROVIDE HELP

(By A. M. Rosenthal)

COLOMBO, CEYLON, April 9.—The great challenge—and the great opportunity—facing United States foreign policy is communism's eager pursuit of nationalist movements all over the world.

The challenge springs from the fact that the Russians have grasped the enormous emotional and political drive behind what Asians like to call the age of nationalism.

Not long ago, at one of those earnest diplomatic garden parties that make up a good deal of New Delhi's official social life, an Indian Foreign Office man was talking about a favorite topic—where the United States goes wrong.

"You don't seem to be able to realize that countries see the world in different ways, that problems unimportant to you are primary to us," he said.

"That's why you are finding yourself losing out to the Russians on this colonialism business," he continued. "They have the wit to see that nationalism is the force of this decade. Intellectually you see it, too, certainly. But you expect the impossible. You expect Algerians, for instance, to take a world view, not the Algerian view."

The United States is no longer counted a sure friend of nationalist movements.

This is a bitter thought for the United States, remembering that freedom was given to the Philippines, and help to India and Indonesia. It is made more bitter by the fear that the western age of colonialism is being replaced by Soviet political and military conquests.

But there is no point in giving argument for argument. It is enough that Asians have lost trust.

The national elections in Ceylon, which resulted in a crushing defeat of the openly prowestern government, were fought on domestic rather than international issues. But certainly they showed that being identified with the West has no great political asset to an Asian politician. And they showed, too, that the West's policies had not struck a real spark in the minds of the Ceylonese.

This is a problem made infinitely more acute by the fact that the Russians, with no political commitments to the "colonial" powers, can and do eagerly push themselves forward as friends of nationalism everywhere.

The opportunity springs from the challenge. It is the opinion of many Asians and some important United States officials in this area that the United States, in its concern for physical and military security, is letting the political battle go by default. They believe too that Americans do not realize that good will toward the United States is ebbing. But they believe that the plain threat that the Communists will be able to identify themselves with nationalism may prod the United States into restating its own traditional friendship for independence movements.

Among some Americans here there is a belief that the best step the United States could take now would be a straight and unequivocal statement of its intention to see that every land capable of self-government attains it.

For the sake of political effect, it might help the United States to bring up the issue itself at the United Nations. It certainly would help if a declaration were made formally by the President of the United States.

This reporter has not heard that last suggestion put in as many words by Indian or United States officials. But there have been many comments that the time has come for clarification of United States policy. Putting that hope together with the fact that President Eisenhower's personal prestige is high here, it is obvious that a Presidential declaration would have more force than any other kind.

ALL CANNOT BE PLEASED

It is the opinion of most westerners in India that for the time being at least the United States cannot evolve a foreign policy that will make New Delhi or all other Asian capitals entirely happy. The reason is in the basic difference in attitude toward the Communist philosophy and toward the danger of that philosophy.

India and other Asian countries are ready to believe the danger of military aggression has passed. As far as the United States is concerned, military containment and preparedness will have to remain the skeletal structure of United States foreign policy. That means something the Indians will never like—military pacts in which their neighbors are armed.

It has to be recognized—and this comes from a number of Asians—that the United States cannot satisfy all Asians' wishes.

But, especially in connection with nationalism, Asians say that Americans must also recognize that they need not keep all their allies happy all the time.

The United States would have to pay a price for meeting the Soviet challenge on nationalism head on—the anger of some United States allies.

But the history of the last 10 years has proved that sooner or later the United States has had to take public stands that its Western allies did not like, and that too often—Cyprus, for instance—those stands were taken too late for maximum political effect. Put another way, opinion in this part of the world is that the time has come for the United States to lead the parade instead of running after the Soviet Union.

The nationalist question cannot, of course, be considered without taking the free world's military security into account. But if the last decade has shown anything—consider Suez, Cyprus, Indochina, and North Africa—it is that military security depends on political security and that democratic countries cannot hold down military bases surrounded by hostile populations.

This is not a suggestion for abandoning military security but for reconsidering the essentials for military security. To give just one example, there are United States military men in Saigon who believed that the pres-

ence of the French Expeditionary Corps in South Vietnam was such a political liability that it amounted to a threat to military security.

And it is being asked whether the British naval base on Cyprus is more secure now than it would have been if the British had given up sovereignty and signed a long-term lease treaty with the willing Greeks.

ECONOMICS AN ESSENTIAL

Some American officials in Asia might disagree with the emphasis on pushing to the front on the colonialism issue. But few would disagree that economics becomes every day a more essential part of our foreign policy. One obvious reason, of course, is that the Russians have entered the picture—in Egypt, India, Syria, Indonesia, Afghanistan, Burma, the Sudan, and Yemen.

But just as important is the fact that the newly independent countries are aware more sharply than ever before of the gap between them and the developed countries. That gap is growing because Western industrialization is outpacing the painful development efforts of Asia and the Middle East.

Sooner or later in a discussion of foreign policy the talk boils down to this: The United States will have to spend still more money and share still more of its wealth with Asia.

What is more, there is a belief among Americans in Asia that the time may be coming when the United States will have to cut down its continually rising standard of living to meet Soviet competition and to help underdeveloped countries get ahead. Indian businessmen say the United States is pricing itself out of the market.

An example among many: The Tata Iron & Steel Co., part of the biggest industrial-commercial enterprise in India, was negotiating with the United States Export-Import Bank for a loan to double its steel producing plant. The negotiations fell through because under a loan, say the Tata spokesmen, the concern would have been obliged to buy all its equipment in the United States and prices were too high, when measured against the high interest rate demanded by the bank.

One of the problems the United States must face in Asia is a drift toward nationalization of economies. Nearly everyone believes it would be unwise and impossible to try to pressure India, for instance, away from socialism.

But among Americans there is the opinion that, without interfering with Asian lands bent on some form of socialism, there is a great deal Washington can do to promote the spirit and philosophy of enlightened private enterprise.

AID TO PRIVATE INDUSTRY

One American businessman said in New Delhi recently that since the United States was willing to give hundreds of millions of dollars to governments, it should be willing to give private Asian industry a hand by making low-interest rate loans. He mentioned the Tata episode as a case in point.

The Tata organization is now negotiating with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a loan. That means the Indian Government would have to stand behind the loan and would have a stronger voice in Tata affairs.

The point this businessman and others made was that where opportunities presented themselves to help reliable private enterprise in Asia, the United States should take them.

High United States prices and interest rates take on political importance because the Soviet Union will make sacrifices to supply goods at prices underdeveloped countries can afford.

There is a feeling among Westerners that sometime soon the people of the United States may have to learn the painful lesson that continuously rising wages and profits may wreck their country's ability to compete with the Soviet Union in the economic struggle for Asia. Already India is buying most of her cement from Communist countries. Multiply this by a hundred products and the political consequences need no underlining.

The job of strengthening the economic foundations of underdeveloped countries was started by the United States a decade ago. Still the insistence of Western and Asian officials is that more and more money must be appropriated because on this now hangs the future of Asia. Not only more money is needed but more imagination and more planning.

CONFERENCE SUGGESTED

So far, planning and spending have been on a national basis and sometimes without clear goals in mind. There are United States officials here who believe that one of the things the United States could do would be to call a technical level conference to work intensively to map out Asia's needs, resources, foreign aid requirements and attainable objectives. There is a good chance the United States would find itself ahead of the Asian countries in the desire for regional planning, but there is nothing wrong with leading the field.

India needs more money, large quantities of it. If the United States was willing to lend India the money—a billion dollars at least—it could assure that India's own democratic way to a mixture of socialism plus private enterprise had stood the test when compared with Communist China's totalitarian economy.

It is in the interest of the United States to help noncommitted countries, but there is no reason why it should be ashamed of making a special economic effort for its allies—Pakistan, for instance. The recent meeting of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization at Karachi expressed some fond hopes about emphasizing the economic aspects of the alliance. But beyond appointing one economist the conference did nothing about it. Here, too, is a field for United States imaginativeness.

The problem of Afghanistan is one of the most difficult the United States faces. For one thing, the Soviet loan of $100 million faces Washington with a decision as to whether to be drawn into the endless, sapping process of trying to outbid the Soviet on loans. That is just what leaders of this area think Washington did in the case of the Aswan High Dam in Egypt, and the action did not enhance the reputation of the United States.

But the bigger problem the United States faces in Afghanistan is the same one it must deal with in many countries in Latin America, the Middle East, and Asia. That is whether United States funds are to be used to bolster dictatorial governments just because they happen to be in power.

There is no easy answer to this. The Russians certainly have no compunctions about supporting any government in power so long as it suits their purpose. But whether that approach and that philosophy in the long run suit the objectives of freedom is questioned by many Asian friends of the United States.

Assuredly the United States cannot change the governments of the world to suit itself. But it would be in keeping with United States traditions to make it clear through Presidential statements that Washington is not ready to build up dictatorships of the right in its fight against dictatorships of the left.

The world struggle is as much as anything a struggle for minds and attitudes. And there is something the United States could do that would not cost astronomical sums, would pay off handsomely and would be welcomed by most Americans who have spent any time in the area. That would be to step up scholarships for foreign students to study and live in the United States and for Americans to study abroad. This correspondent has met many Asians who have lived in the United States and virtually every one has returned with more understanding and sympathy toward United States goals.

Many Asians feel that knowledge of their lands is almost nonexistent in the United States. An increasing number of Americans living in Asia could do much to remedy that.

It might help prevent incidents like the one involving the Member of the United States Congress interviewed at the Karachi Airport, who was asked what Americans thought about Pakistan.

"Think about it?" he asked. "My boy, they never even heard of it."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, the administration has now tacitly admitted its confusion, its lack of direction and foresight, by agreeing that a study of our whole program of foreign aid is called for. The Foreign Relations Committee has likewise now endorsed an appropriate resolution to establish a comprehensive, exhaustive study of the entire, complex foreign aid problem.

Of course, studies themselves will not be self-executing. Depending on who conducts them, these studies may not even be new or path-breaking. It is extremely important that we obtain meaningful, useful results without impairing the flexibility or breadth of analysis which the committee wishes to undertake. We should consider carefully what methods of approach should be utilized to make this study most profitable. Already pertinent questions have been included in Senate Resolution 285 introduced by Senator MANSFIELD. Other proposals that might supplement or implement those already suggested could include the following:

First. The National Planning Association might be requested to bring up to date the Paley Commission Report, 1952, to give us a current estimate of projected industrial raw material shortages which will occur in the United States during the next 20 years. We need to consider what kind of foreign economic policy will be necessary if we are to have continued safe access to these indispensable materials from abroad.

Second. I should like to see special economic reports from the Joint Committee on the Economic Report assessing in detail our own national economic interest in a large-scale, long-term aid program. I would like to have similar reports from the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and I would frankly be interested in comparing the recommendations from the Joint Committee and the Council.

Third. I should like to see the Center for International Studies at MIT be charged with the preparation of a new report on the extent and meaning of the Soviet foreign economic drive.

Fourth. I should like to have a special report from the Institute of International Education regarding its own best informed judgment on the kind of people-to-people exchange projects which should accompany an enlarged economic aid program.

Fifth. Finally, I think we need to examine new methods of bridging the gap between official policy and public opinion as a deliberate device for filling in the gap caused by this administration's chronic lack of Presidential and Cabinet level leadership in explaining our foreign aid objectives to the people. Perhaps a commission of prominent citizens, representing leading national organizations of businessmen, labor, farmers, women, veterans, and religious bodies, might serve as a vehicle for a two-way exchange of views between Washington and the country. I would hope that Government observers or participants could play some role in this commission, but they should not direct it. Indeed, I would like to see some of the participants in the recent 1-year foreign aid study conducted by the Committee for Economic Development play a major role in such a commission.

Mr. President, regardless of what elements make up the comprehensive study now proposed by the Foreign Relations Committee, it is equally important that we must pay attention to the results of the study. I have already referred several times in the Senate to the excellent and incisive study by Professors Millikan and Rostow, of MIT, recently made available to the members of the Foreign Relations Committee. We now know that this report is an up-to-date version of one originally sent to the ICA, then FOA, in the fall of 1954, where it has been gathering dust ever since. We must do better than this in the future, or no amount of "studying" will be productive of practical results.

I think, Mr. President, that we will find that the results of any dispassionate study will invite us to expand our economic aid abroad as indispensable to our international policy. In the face of the new economic conflict with communism I, for one, feel that it is time to ditch some of the past phraseology and overtones of foreign aid in favor of a bold new concept geared to greater overall economic integration of the free world.

The moment when Russians are turning toward economic expansionism is hardly the time for our foreign economic policies to contract. With half of the world's industrial production, we alone are in a position to render really substantial assistance to underdeveloped parts of the free world—in our own long-term interest. Existence of our so-called food surplus suggests, of course, that our assistance need not be in dollars alone. But against Soviet competition which looks a generation or more ahead, it is simply inadequate for us to rely merely on year-by-year congressional appropriations for foreign aid without some long-term sense of direction and continuity. Reasonable assurances of continued aid are essential if some nations are to mobilize their own funds, enlist public and private investment, and plan ahead intelligently. It is the best way to reassert our world leadership. The administration is underestimating, not overestimating, the challenge. On the economic front, it is asking too little, not too much.

Mr. President, time is not necessarily on our side, and I believe we shall come to regret the lack of planning and foresight which the administration has exhibited in the foreign-aid requests this year. I hope that we can still recapture the initiative and, after this interim of relative paralysis, can strike out in a major new economic effort. We should go into such a program with our eyes open, not expecting to purchase either gratitude or allies. Today every underdeveloped nation is struggling to find the investment needed if its industrial growth is to keep pace with the demands of its impatient people. In Asia probably the greatest economic race of the century is now going on between democratic India and totalitarian China, to see which will accomplish the most in the shortest time.

Into this psychological situation come the smiling Russian rulers, brandishing offers of trade and aid, pointing to the significant Soviet economic advances since 1918, and stating the moral: "Where we were then, you are today; where we are today, you will be tomorrow." The underdeveloped world is increasingly impressed.

It is also increasingly comparing Moscow and Washington. For every American politician or administration personality who complains about neutralism saying "Whoever is not with us is against us," some Politburo member is touring non-Communist Asia saying "Whoever is not against us is with us."

Mr. President, what we must seek is the success and stability of these underdeveloped nations themselves, to give them a vested interest in their own and the free world's defense. The alternative is clear. If the underdeveloped nations of Asia, Africa, and even South America, are not able to work out a close economic relationship with us, they will move sooner or later into a close economic relationship with the Soviet Union. That result would be catastrophic—for them, for us, and for the world.

Mr. President, I conclude my remarks on this subject by saying that I hope next year we shall have before us a program which is a little more realistic than the bill we now have. That is the purpose of the amendment I now propose.

With the Soviet Union challenging us on the economic front throughout the world, it appears to me that it is all to our advantage to call the bluff of the Soviet Union in the United Nations, in the international agencies, and everywhere else.

I should like to see the United States Government take the leadership in a program such as SUNFED. I should like to see our Government stake out guidelines and actually call upon the other nations of the world to match the percentage rate of contributions which we make. I think the sooner we do this, the better the program will be.

I am disappointed in the lack of emphasis in the present foreign-aid bill in its economic assistance aspects. The economic aid provided this year is not proportionately more than it was last year. The increase is primarily in military assistance, and military assistance may very well be frittered away.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator from Minnesota will simply delete the date 1958 from his amendment—inasmuch as 1958 would be beyond my present term—and if he will insert the words "in the future" or "for the future," and so forth, then insofar as I am concerned, I shall be willing to accept his amendment, because it relates to the question of the policy.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I so modify my amendment, by striking out, in line 2, the words "fiscal year 1958." As thus modified, the first two lines of my amendment will read:

It is the sense of Congress that in the preparation of the mutual security program—

And so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has a right to modify his amendment, and it will be modified accordingly.

Does the Senator from Minnesota yield back the remainder of his time on his amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I am happy to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to our side on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota to the committee amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to the committee amendment.

The amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment, was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, to the committee amendment, I offer, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 40, in line 25, it is proposed to strike out "section" and insert "sections."

On page 46, between lines 5 and 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 538. Furnishing of information to congressional committees: Upon the request of any appropriate committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, any joint committee of the two Houses, or any subcommittee of any such committee, any officer or employee of the Government having information, or having custody of documents or other data, relating to the programs being administered under this act, shall promptly furnish any such information, documents, or other data to such committee or subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Wyoming yield himself on his amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, first let me state that I submit this amendment to the committee amendment on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and myself. He was kind enough to suggest to me that he would allow me to make a choice between his amendment and mine. It is very difficult to make a choice; the only difference is one of language. However, inasmuch as I am more familiar with the language of my amendment than I am with the language of the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, I have offered the amendment which I had presented the day before.

Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment to the committee amendment is to meet the very important question of whether the Congress of the United States is entitled to receive from the officers and employees of the Government information with respect to the duties which the Congress by law imposes upon the executive branch of the Government. There has been a growing practice on the part of executive agencies to hide behind the policy—which was inaugurated early in the Government, by President George Washington—of not disclosing matters which are clearly within the initiative of the President, if he feels that the public interest would thus be jeopardized.

Congress has never undertaken by law to interpret the power of the Executive to withhold information, because in the early days of our Government it was not the practice of the departments to refuse to the Congress of the United States information concerning the general laws which were enacted.

However, as I have stated, in recent years there has been a tendency, as the executive branch of the Government has increased in size, for even subordinate officials to withhold from Congress evidence as to what they were doing with the funds appropriated to their agencies by the Congress.

In an opinion submitted to the House Committee on Government Operations, the Attorney General cited some of the old cases in which the Supreme Court upheld the right of an individual, under the Bill of Rights, to refuse to answer questions irrelevant to investigations which Congress was making. None of those decisions has any application whatsoever to an investigation by Congress of the activities of the executive departments with respect to the duties imposed upon them by law. There is a difference between the right of an individual citizen not to be interrogated by Congress in matters which are protected by the Bill of Rights, and the refusal of an officer of the Government to give the Congress of the United States answers, information, data, and papers which bear upon the execution of the very power provided by the law.

In the opinion by the Attorney General, the case against Mr. Daugherty, a brother of the Attorney General during the administration of Mr. Harding, was cited, but that case clearly held, when it was finally adjudicated by the Supreme Court, that Congress undoubtedly had the right to obtain information bearing upon legislation and bearing upon the interests of the United States.

The constitutional power of the Congress to appropriate money to the executive department is very clearly stated in the Constitution:

> No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

Words could not be clearer. The amendment which we offer tonight is clearly within that constitutional power of Congress, clearly within the constitutional provision which was designed to protect the public funds raised by taxation from the people of the United States.

We have before us a bill which authorizes the appropriation to the President of billions of dollars. These funds are so great that it is utterly impossible for the President himself to expend them, so he must recruit a large office force of individuals whose appointments are never confirmed by the Senate or by the Congress, and who are never known by the Congress. So we propose to insert in the bill a new section, on page 46, between lines 5 and 6. Let me read it again:

> SEC. 538. Furnishing of information to congressional committees: Upon the request of any appropriate committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, any joint committee of the two Houses, or any subcommittee of any such committee, any officer or employee of the Government having information, or having custody of documents or other data, relating to the programs being administered under this act, shall promptly furnish any such information, documents, or other data to such committee or subcommittee.

The Foreign Relations Committee, through its chairman, has announced upon this floor its purpose to examine into the methods and the manner in which these funds are expended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield myself 2 more minutes.

If we do not have this section in the bill, which makes it the duty of the officers and officials who are to administer this huge appropriation to furnish information, we are surrendering the power of Congress to make appropriations.

I shall never forget one day when I was walking from the Capitol to the Senate Office Building with former Vice President Jack Garner. He had been Speaker of the House of Representatives. There had been a considerable debate—upon which subject I have forgotten at the moment, but it affected the delegation of congressional power to the Executive. Jack Garner said to me, "Young man"—I was a young man in those days—"when the dome of that Capitol breaks down, the Republic is lost."

What he meant was that when Congress loses its power to supervise the expenditure of the people's money, the democratic government bequeathed to us by the Founding Fathers is gone.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] such time as he may desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am very happy to be associated with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming in sponsoring this amendment. Without knowing that he had filed his amendment, I had prepared a similar amendment and had it printed, with the intention of offering it. After learning that he had an amendment with the same objective, which I am confident is adequate in its provisions to achieve the results I desire, I was glad to withhold the amendment I had intended to offer, and I am happy to support his amendment.

As chairman of the Government Operations Committee, and particularly as chairman of the Permanent Investigating Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, I have had some unhappy experiences in trying to get from the executive branch of the Government information which was considered pertinent and vital, and which would have provided information for the Congress which it should have had in the performance of its legislative function. Some of the documents which have been withheld and denied to the committee have been withheld on the pretext that they were interoffice memoranda, that they were working papers in the executive branch of the Government, and that therefore they were not final in the sense that they represented a final decision, and therefore Congress was not entitled to have such information.

I should like to give a concrete illustration. We are all familiar with the Battle Act, and what it was intended to do. During the course of the discussion of the pending bill, we have heard about the problem of our allies selling strategic materials to our potential enemy, while at the same time they have been receiving benefits from the foreign aid legislation.

After negotiations with our allies as to what materials and goods should be embargoed, and as to which were strategic from a war sense and should not be shipped, in order to prevent the potential enemy from getting what he needs to build up his war machine, 16 countries in all, principally the NATO countries, entered into an international agreement and understanding that certain items, consisting of more than 450 in number and description, were not to be sold by our allies. Such an agreement continued until July 1954, at which time what is known as the COCOM conference convened in Paris, for the purpose of downgrading and decontrolling a number of items which had been on the strategic list and under control and embargo by our own country and by our allies. It is to provide military aid and economic aid to those countries that the pending measure is designed.

Before the COCOM conference met, there was organized within the executive branch of the Government a committee composed of representatives from the different agencies and departments involved. This committee was called the Joint Operating Committee, or JOC. Representatives of the Defense Department and other agencies of the Government came before that committee and made their representations with respect to the strategic value and importance of various of the 450 items which were on the list of materials under control and embargo.

Mr. President, I can say, without any fear whatever that my statement can be successfully contradicted or challenged, that in every instance where strategic items were later decontrolled, they were decontrolled over the protests of experts and technicians and those most highly qualified in our own Department of Defense.

Mr. President, I am about to say that they were not agreed upon to be decontrolled at the COCOM conference; in the final analysis one man on the Joint Operating Committee made the decision, and his decision was made over the recommendations of the military branch of the Government.

We asked for those papers. We thought we had a right to learn upon what basis a nonmilitary, civil service employee sat at the head of a committee of that kind, and, over the highest and best military advice available to the Government, took that action. Not only that, but the very best advice of experts who were called in from the outside, who were familiar with the use of the tools and the instrumentalities which were under consideration for decontrol, was rejected.

Yet information as to how the processes of the executive branch of the Government work in the expenditure of billions of dollars of American money is denied to Congress on the ground that it is confidential and inside office memoranda and working material of the executive branch, and that therefore Congress has no business looking at it.

What did we find a few days ago? We read an announcement of the publication of a book containing the inside story of this administration. Of what was that book made up? It was made up, at least in part, by the same character of material and documents, except on a higher level—that of the Cabinet itself—being made available to a private, preferred citizen, a preferred reporter of the press, who was permitted to examine and review the most secret of documents in that area of the executive branch of the Government. He was permitted to use those documents as a basis for the writing of a book for publication for private profit.

That is the issue with which we are confronted. I am not opposed to the book being written. I am not angry or offended that such a book is to be published. Congress can sit silent and quiescent in the face of such treatment if it likes, but I do not propose to be silent about it; I shall register my protest by undertaking by my vote to write into a law, which proposes to spend billions of dollars abroad, a provision which will let Congress have the information on how the inside of the Government works in the expenditure of those billions of dollars.

If the executive branch of the Government is free to make available secret documents to free enterprise and for profit, and for the benefit of a reporter, then Congress certainly should have the right to know what goes on in connection with the expenditure of billions of dollars of mutual-security funds.

I agree with what the able and distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] said about the responsibility of Congress with regard to the purse strings of the Government. The Government cannot spend $1 unless Congress appropriates it. The money for foreign aid will not be appropriated unless the pending bill is passed. If we pass the bill to authorize the appropriations, let us say at the same time that Congress expects to look at how the money is expended, that it expects to get the records pertaining to the expenditure, and that we wish to know what is taking place.

Mr. President, this is a serious, a vital matter. The executive branch of the Government, on the flimsiest pretense, denies Congress the records of its stewardship with respect to the money Congress appropriates.

I believe it is time to make it a matter of law that when we provide for the expenditure of billions of dollars to aid our allies, as we do by this measure, we have a right to look at how the processes work in connection with such expenditure. I am happy to support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Arkansas is chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. In connection with the work of that committee, he has received a great deal of information about the activities of the Government under the laws passed by Congress, and he has also been denied, over and over again, information by representatives of the executive department. Is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I can say that is true. Not only has information been withheld, but employees and officers of the Government in the executive department have been instructed not to testify before the committee with respect to matters within their knowledge.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do we not know as individual Senators that throughout the world, where this money is going and where contracts for its expenditure are being made, that there are persons and there are governments which are not above corruption?

Mr. McCLELLAN. We certainly know that to be so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is there any basis in logic or patriotism on which any person can say that Congress should not have the power to get information on these subjects?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will not say that to the constituents I represent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am appalled that on the floor of the Senate tonight there are so few Members listening to the discussion of this amendment. They know the huge amount of money which is authorized to be appropriated and to be expended the Lord knows where by persons whom we do not know under methods of which we have no information and can get none.

Is it not true that we have heard some say that this is an unconstitutional amendment? Is there anything unconstitutional about it?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not see anything unconstitutional about it.

Mr. President, I may say, in answer to the Senator from Wyoming, that the Congress, under the Constitution, has the power even to impeach the President of the United States for malfeasance in office. If Congress has the power to impeach the President of the United States for malfeasance in office, certainly it has the power to inquire into the actions and the official conduct of the executive branch of the Government. To say we do not have the power to follow through on appropriations we make is saying that Congress under the Constitution is impotent and powerless.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, how much time do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, we hope there will be some voice raised in opposition, if there be any opposition to the amendment.

Mr. President, it is 20 minutes to 8. I ask unanimous consent that a quorum call may be had without taking any of the 4 minutes remaining on the part of the supporters of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes remain under the control of the Senator from Wyoming, and there are 30 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes or so much thereof as I may need.

Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming. I subscribe to the point of view that the Congress of the United States has a right to get the information which it needs in the performance of its legislative duties.

In the Foreign Relations Committee on which I am privileged to serve, and in the Committee on Appropriations on which I serve with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, we have time and time again made requests for information—even information of the highest classification the Government of the United States possesses—and it has been forthcoming. There has not, to my knowledge, at least, been a single bit of information withheld in relation to our mutual-aid program. The State Department, the Department of Defense, the International Cooperation Administration, have brought up and laid before the committee all the details. We have had the testimony of the highest officials of the Government. Members of the committee who were not satisfied that certain pieces of information had been developed in the official presentation requested additional information, and such information was furnished to the committee.

I do not believe a single member of the Committee on Foreign Relations will say that there has been one iota of information withheld by the State Department, the Defense Department, or the International Cooperation Administration in regard to the important measure which is now before the Senate.

I do not know of a single instance of information having been withheld from the Committee on Appropriations when that committee desired it.

I have had some contacts with some of the members of the Committee on Government Operations and learned that certain information to which they felt they were entitled had not been given to them. I personally discussed the matter at the highest levels of the Government and pointed out that, in my judgment, at least, the committee was entitled to have that information in the performance of its legislative duty. I was informed that representatives of the executive branch did go before the committee and present the Battle Act list and certain other information under a security classification. I am not in a position to know whether the classification put on that information was justified or not. I believe it was done, however, in the discretion of the official. But I was told that the information had been presented to the committee.

I recognize that under the Constitution, if Congress has a deep and a vital interest in getting a particular piece of information, and if Congress wants to fulfill its constitutional responsibilities, there is a way Congress can get the information, and that is by saying to any administration, whether it be a Republican or Democratic—and I hope this will not happen if the matter is not of the gravest concern to Congress—"Under the Constitution Congress has control of the purse strings. If we do not get the information, you will not get the money to operate the department."

There is no doubt that Congress has the power to say to any administration, "If Congress does not get the information, you will not get the money with which to operate the department or the agency or the policy."

But that is an entirely different sort of situation from making public every interagency memorandum and personal conversation. From George Washington's time, the Executive has challenged—and I think has properly challenged—every attempt to invade the right of the President of the United States to consult with his advisers in preliminary discussions leading up to the final determination of a policy.

We know that the committees of Congress are always busy. The responsibilities of all of us are spread very thin in order to carry on our work so the burdens are sometimes passed on to subcommittees. Then, in conducting our burdensome duties in Congress, sometimes the subcommittees become subcommittees of one. Then, sometimes a subcommittee of one becomes so busy that the work is passed on to the staff.

If the information desired by a committee is to be obtained according to the intent of the amendment, pretty soon we shall have staff members demanding of the executive branch of the Government certain information, much of which is entitled to be confidential in nature.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from California not acknowledge that there is nothing in the amendment which would enable any staff member to demand anything of any department? The amendment is carefully drawn so as to provide that the authorized committees shall have the right to obtain the information.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is the point of view of the Senator from Wyoming on the situation. But I say that in past administrations there has been a general searching out of information generally.

I think it is clear that from the first administration in our country's history there has been on this question a difference of opinion between the executive branch and the legislative arm of the Government.

All I point out is that if the subject is important enough, Congress has the power to get the information. But it will require the power of the Senate or the House of Representatives as a body to get it by saying to the executive branch, "If you do not give us the information, we will not give you the funds." On that basis, I think we are standing on sound constitutional ground.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I myself am in favor of the purpose of the amendment, but I shall vote against it. My reason for doing so is that I think a question of this magnitude should be considered on its own feet and be voted up or down accordingly. I do not think this is the time to offer such a proposal, because I do not believe it will have any force so far as the President is concerned.

If a bill were reported by the Committee on Government Operations, which I believe has had some trouble along this line, as have other committees, then I think the matter would be given more consideration, and I would be willing to vote for such a bill. If a measure of that kind could be passed, and then there was any difficulty, the question could be taken to the Supreme Court for final adjudication.

I have been somewhat disturbed by the information contained in the book published by Mr. Robert Donovan, of the New York Herald Tribune, because evidently this man, who has no official connection with the Government, but is an excellent reporter, has written an exceedingly good book, and has had access to information which the senatorial committee, duly authorized, has not been able to acquire.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not wish to engage in a detailed discussion, but books have been written in past administrations, including recent administrations, the material for which undoubtedly was withheld from Congress, or at least was not made available to Congress, but was published as memoirs, or otherwise, for profit.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But none of them was written so well as this one, or so interestingly.

Mr. JACKSON. And the timing was perfect.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For whom?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I suppose all of us are in accord with some of the points which have been advanced as to the desirability of Congress being given the information it needs. I share very much the feeling of the Senator from Montana, provided a proposal such as the one contained in the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming has been worked over by a committee and reported to the Senate in a form which is believed to be constitutional. The amendment as offered relates only to programs carried on under the Mutual Security Act.

In dealing with the mutual security program—in fact, in dealing with all the programs with which the Committee on Foreign Relations deals—is the Senator from California aware of any time or any occasion when the committee has been denied any information which it requested from any department of the Government relating to the program under consideration?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say categorically that I do not know of a single instance, in the period of time I have served on the Committee on Foreign Relations, and during the entire consideration of the bill, when there was a single item of information which was denied the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder if we might consider one example which arose in the course of the hearings. The Senator from California will remember that in discussing problems relating to Turkey, for instance, mention was made of

the Randall Commission report, which was a highly classified document at the time. I said I thought it would be helpful to the committee if the report were made available to us. Promptly, the Randall Commission report was made available to the committee. The same thing has been true of many other documents and pieces of information which the committee has required. Is that not true?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct; and some of them have been of the highest type of classification.

I happen to serve also on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is the chairman. The topmost secrets of the Government are made available daily to that committee. The committee is in constant contact with the Atomic Energy Commission, and the fullest of information is supplied. There is no information in that field which is denied to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly so far as the operations under the mutual security program are concerned, the Committee on Foreign Relations has never had cause to complain, has it?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I believe that is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This is a subject which has interested me during all the years I have been in the Senate. It involves a fundamental question. If such a procedure is to be adopted, it should be adopted on its own merits, and should not be tied in to the mutual security bill.

Furthermore, the language of the amendment is so broad that, as I interpret it, under the phrase "any such information, documents, or other data," Congress could ask for a man's personal opinions or for his personal papers, and the committee would be entitled to get them.

I heartily agree with what the Senator from California has said. I hope that if the question comes before the Senate for consideration, it will come in the way the Senator from Montana has suggested—namely, on its own feet—and that there can be a good, clear debate on a very important question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am very sympathetic to the objective of the amendment. With reference to the administration, I may remind the Senator from California that the day before yesterday, in a subcommittee meeting, the Administrator of the USIA refused to furnish information which I requested. I do not know whether the refusal is final or not. It was as of that time. I think the Administrator will refuse to give it. But I hope the administration will keep its record as unblemished in that instance as the minority leader thinks it is generally. However, I think that was an arbitrary attitude on the part of the Administrator.

I believe the matter should be handled on its own merits in a separate bill, because this poor bill dealing with foreign mutual aid has so many obstacles to overcome to get enacted that I would hate to include in it a provision wholly controversial in its nature and involving a constitutional question. I would vote for a bill which would accomplish what the amendment seeks to accomplish, because I think certain agents have been arbitrary. I think Mr. Streibert was arbitrary the day before yesterday. The Senator from California was there. He knows what Mr. Streibert refused to furnish to the subcommittee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In fairness, I will say this to the Senator. I sat in that hearing. I had to leave before it was finally concluded. I did not interpret the statement of Mr. Streibert, in response to the inquiry, as being a refusal to furnish the information requested. I think he pointed out reasons why he felt the information should not be furnished. I do not think the distinguished chairman of the committee, who is also chairman of the subcommittee, pressed him or asked the committee to vote to get that information. If the Senator feels it is essential that he have that information, I shall certainly be prepared, as a member of the committee, to support him in efforts to get it, and I am confident he will get it. I am sure the Senator knows some of the background with regard to that information, and why Mr. Streibert felt he should not release it at that time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I say, I hope he does keep the record clear. It was a tentative refusal. He said he did not wish to give the information; he was not ready to give it; he had reasons why he did not want to give it.

The Senator from California is correct when he states the witness was not pressed at that time. It was the first hearing on that subject. I was not sufficiently sure in my own mind whether the committee should have the information.

I have come to the conclusion that to clutter the bill with a very controversial matter is not very good procedure. We shall have enough difficulty enacting the pending legislation, without including in it a major problem which affects many other activities of the Government, and using this bill as a guinea pig. That is my only objection to the proposal. I think it has great merit as a separate proposal, and that something should be done about the matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to thank the Senator from Arkansas for his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely wish to say——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has 4 minutes on his own time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall not use the whole time remaining to me. I wish to point to an instance in which former Governor Stassen issued a statement at Denver, Colo., saying that, under a Presidential directive, he was going to expend some $10 million, just before the last election, for the purchase of coal. There never was a Presidential directive to that effect, but millions were spent for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator recall how much Mr. Stassen spent to send some friends abroad to play Santa Claus?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If the Senator will examine the record, I think he will find out how much Mr. Stassen spent.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. In connection with the statement made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] with respect to information being denied, I want to ask the Senator if he knows that Mr. Stassen appeared before the Appropriations Committee and admitted that, in addition to a classification for security reasons, he had a new classification in the mutual-aid program, whereby he stamped documents "for official use only," and practically any aid administering the mutual-aid program could so stamp documents and they would not be available to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, do I have any time remaining to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has 2 minutes remaining to him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say a word in conclusion. Every Senator who votes against this amendment, even though it is applied only to the pending bill, is by his vote saying to all the hundreds and thousands of employees of subordinate grade in the executive departments expending these billions of dollars that they need not make an account thereof to the Congress of the United States. All they have to do is refuse, under the umbrella of the Executive stamp of secrecy.

Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have only 1 minute remaining.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I for one plan to vote against the amendment. I certainly do not subscribe to the idea which has just been stated by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and I am not willing to have those words put in my mouth, because I am making no such statement. I believe information required by committees in order to do their work ought to be supplied. I have said that, so far as the Foreign Relations Committee is concerned, and I limit it to that, we have been amply supplied with the information we have requested.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I propose to vote against the amendment. I do not think the Senator from Wyoming, by the statement he made, had any intention to convey the idea to those of us who are present in this Chamber, or to those who may read the RECORD that the executive agencies which administer this fund would deny to the Congress the right to any information concerning the funds which had been expended.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I fully concur in the statement made by the Senator from Minnesota. If anyone in any executive agency capriciously seeks to keep information from the Congress, he had better read the Constitution with reference to the congressional control of the purse-strings. There is no question in my mind that if Congress want information badly enough, it can either get it or cut off funds for the agency refusing to give the information requested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the time remaining to him?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield back the time remaining to me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield back the time remaining to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming has been yielded back. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. HUMPHREYS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. HUMPHREYS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], if present and voting, would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State Convention.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—23

Bible	Humphrey, Minn.	McClellan
Bricker	Jackson	Murray
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kennedy	Stennis
Eastland	Langer	Symington
Ellender	Long	Williams
Ervin	McCarthy	Wofford
Frear		Young

NAYS—58

Aiken	George	Millikin
Allott	Goldwater	Monroney
Anderson	Gore	Morse
Barrett	Hayden	Mundt
Beall	Hennings	Neuberger
Bender	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bennett	Hill	Payne
Bridges	Holland	Potter
Bush	Hruska	Purtell
Butler	Ives	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Smathers
Clements	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Kuchel	Sparkman
Dirksen	Lehman	Thye
Duff	Malone	Watkins
Dworshak	Mansfield	Welker
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	
Fulbright	McNamara	

NOT VOTING—15

Byrd	Jenner	Scott
Capehart	Laird	Wiley
Carlson	Magnuson	
Daniel	Martin, Iowa	
Green	Neely	
Humphreys, Ky.	Russell	
	Schoeppel	

So the amendment offered by Mr. O'MAHONEY, for himself and Mr. MCCLELLAN, to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

That after the expiration of 90 days following the effective date of this act none of the funds appropriated for furnishing economic assistance to foreign countries shall be obligated for expenditure until the exemptions for taxpayers and their spouses and dependents have been increased to $700.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the reason I am offering the amendment is to call attention to the situation which exists in the United States today: That we cannot afford to increase the exemptions for dependents from $600 to $700, but we can give away billions of dollars to foreign countries.

I have always been against giving away our money to foreign countries. This foreign-aid bill which is now before the United States Senate contains provisions for the giving away of billions of dollars of American income to foreign governments.

The money in this bill will be collected in the years to come from the taxpayers of the United States. It represents hard-earned dollars of American workers and American industry. It is a pity that no provision is contained in the Constitution of the United States to require Congress, when money is given away like this, to notify the taxpayers with little pink slips, as faithfully as they receive their income-tax notices, and to tell them, "We in the Senate today gave away billions of dollars to foreign governments for which you will be billed next April 15." Then, if we changed general election day from November to April 15, I believe there would be some changes made in the way we give away the taxpayers' money abroad.

I do not oppose foreign giveaway programs for reasons of political expediency. I oppose them from a practical, logical standpoint in the interest of the American taxpayer and the welfare of this country. Certainly, if I had politics in mind regarding foreign-aid programs, I would have been supporting them years ago when they were popular. I remember well that in 1950 when I was seeking reelection, my opposition to foreign aid was thrown at me from every stump in South Carolina. But with consistency and with the welfare of my people at heart, I have stuck with my position throughout the years.

My opposition to foreign giveaway programs has always been based upon logical reasoning considering what would happen as a result of these programs. I warned, on many occasions, that our program to develop the so-called undeveloped and underprivileged areas of the world would backfire.

I warned that if we helped to industrialize new or degenerated industrial areas, low world raw material prices and cheap labor would cause us to lose our world markets. Never did I dream that this administration would lower import quotas to this country so that we would even lose our domestic markets. But this is what they did at Geneva when the State Department signed the GATT treaty.

I warned that if we built dams and furnished equipment and money for irrigation and other assistance to develop agriculture abroad we would live to see our farmers suffer from foreign competition.

These two warnings went unheeded; and today the farmers of America and the textile industry and workers of America are suffering more than at any time since the great depression resulting from the last Republican administration.

I made a third, and yet unheeded warning, that eventually we would be expected annually to support our foreign beneficiaries as regularly and as firmly as we do ourselves. I also predicted that the cost of this program would prevent us from ever paying off the national debt and from ever bringing substantial tax relief to our people.

My colleagues, such is the case today. Were it not for foreign aid today we would be balancing our budget, retiring our debts, and cutting taxes. Foreign governments still owe us more than $17 billion from World War I. I ask, what good did all this aid from World War I accomplish? Italy received over $2 billion from us but it did us no good in 1939 or 1941. At the outset of World War II, France owed us over $5 billion, and England over $7 billion from World War I, but we had to start all over in 1939 with lend-lease and again with

more aid after World War II, until the present day.

During World War II we loaned more than $42 billion to foreign governments, including over $10 billion to Russia, nearly $30 billion to China, and $18 million to Yugoslavia. I need not ask what this money, material, or whatever it was, accomplished at this time. Certainly it had its effect in winning World War II, but it made no friends for us. There is no gratitude for the mutual aid rendered at that time.

I think it necessary to point out here that only recently it was disclosed that cotton raised in Egypt was being traded off to Red Czechoslovakia for arms which were being used by Egypt to create a crisis in the Near East. This is the same Egypt the State Department wants to send money and technical aid to assist in the construction of dams and irrigation projects to help Egypt develop its arid lands. She will, of course, grow more cotton which will further glut the world market and hurt our cotton farmers. Only 2 weeks ago Egypt flaunted its Communist-supplied military might before the free world in a display of Middle East strength. Obviously, our previous aid of more than $26 million to that country did little good in our behalf.

But the principal figure of note is the post World War II grants we have given foreign countries. This figure is well over $51 billion, all of it going for agricultural, industrial, and other so-called "recovery" programs for so-called "war weary" and "war torn" countries of the world.

In addition to these programs, we have donated nearly $3 billion to the International Monetary Fund and about one-half billion dollars to the International Bank.

The grand total of these figures is $117,042,902,280.07. Yes, that means we have loaned and given away more than 117 billion dollars to foreign countries with no expectation of ever getting it back.

Mr. President, the picture is very black as I see it. The leadership has failed us. We have daily distortions from the White House and executive offices that are devised to fool and divide us.

The one-world theorists are firmly entrenched and our only weapon to curtail their subtle program of amalgamating America with the rest of the world is to cut off their money. These people I speak of in the State Department and elsewhere want to do away with every conceivable difference between us and the rest of the world. For years they have been working like beavers tearing down trade protection barriers, immigration walls, money exchanges and the like until it is now easier for a foreign government to contact and get assistance from Washington than it is for an American citizen.

Frankly, I am fed up with it all and I think it is time Congress woke up to what is going on.

I want to use the American textile industry as an example of what can and will happen to every taxpayer, worker, business and industry in America if we fail to alter our course. It all takes a pattern, and I believe the pattern in the textile industry fits the situation precisely. When I refer to the textile industry, I mean every textile employee and the small main street businessmen who depend upon the textile economy.

After World War II, we undertook a program to rehabilitate poor war-torn, war-weary Japan. Nobody then worried about the war-weary, tax-burdened, ration-ridden American public.

Out went the dollars to Japan. We gave $3 billion in aid to Japan. As late as last year, we gave over $30 million to Japan. In addition, we have authorized credit and loans up to $620 million to that country. This was coupled with technical aid, patent rights, machinery, and other guidance—all of it going to build up the Japanese textile industry. It was a plaything at first. Then, as we relaxed our grip and settled back in our easy chair feeling like sanctified philanthropists, the Japanese textile industry began growing like a fire out of control. In a short time the Japanese industry had surpassed its home consumption and began reaching out for foreign markets. First a little here, a little there, and then came GATT.

The same silk-gloved hands of the one-world theorists that had dipped into our Treasury and industry to put the Japanese on their feet—these same top-hatters who have asked us once again to dip into the Treasury to help other countries—these same State Department officials—delivered the death blow to our textile industry at GATT and thereby took one more step in their program to internationalize America. They gave the Japanese tremendous concessions on trade agreements, allowing the Japanese to strike at our domestic markets in full force with their cheap textile products made with 15 cents an hour labor, and 25 cents a pound world cotton.

When the GATT agreement was announced, I denounced it and warned that the American textile industry was operating on a thin profit margin of less than half of what other industries were operating under.

I stated last year on June 15 that the textile workers of America would remember Geneva June 7 as infamously as we all remember Pearl Harbor December 7.

On June 23, 1955, I announced I would support an import quota program to halt Japanese goods from coming into America and destroying the industry. I was met with implications from the administration that I was shooting at bugaboos and no threat to the textile industry existed.

On July 2, last year, I wired the President of the United States urging him to intervene and correct the damage done at GATT before it seriously affected our domestic textile industry and caused a depression.

I was advised that no serious threat to the industry existed, and that if the industry was suffering that it should either seek relief through the Tariff Commission or through the Secretary of Agriculture.

I would like to state here that little relief for the textile employees and industrialists of America can be expected from the Tariff Commission.

In the first place, the workings of the Commission are so slow and cumbersome that by the time it gets around to acknowledging trouble and the need for help, the industry concerned is usually already gone on the rocks.

The velveteen industry is a good example of the situation. One of three mills in this industry producing velveteen has already gone out of business, and the Commission is just now completing the holding of hearings on the velveteen industry's plea for help which was filed over 6 months ago.

In 6 months a depression can swoop down and close the entire textile industry while the Commission deliberates such problems. Furthermore, at these belated hearings last week, one of the most terrible examples of misuse of authority I have ever heard of took place. I have it on unimpeachable authority that representatives of the American textile industry appearing before this American Commission for relief to save jobs of American workers and American industry, were subjected to cross-examination by representatives of foreign governments, namely, Japanese industrialists who are so opposed to textile quotas.

I am reliably informed, however, that when these foreign representatives got into questions regarding manufacturing techniques of the American industry, the Commission very graciously advised the American representatives they did not have to answer such questions.

To me, the fact that foreign government representatives were even allowed to cross-examine Americans before an American Commission is revolting and represents the degeneration that has taken place in bureaucratic government. It points up the need for Congress to personally take up this matter and to obstruct any such future situations by halting all this foreign aid.

On July 22 an army general in Japan stated that "hardly more than passing concern" should be shown by Americans toward the increasing flow of Japanese textiles to this country. I immediately denounced this general's statement and declared the textile industry of America was at the breaking point.

At intermittent times until January of this year I protested the administration's callous attitude toward the textile industry's plight and in January of this year I pleaded with Secretary of Agriculture Benson to recommend to President Eisenhower to apply textile import quotas against Japanese goods and save the industry from further ruin and depression. By this time there was already a rumble or two within and without the textile industry of impending disaster. Already some mills had slackened their production.

On February 13 Secretary of Agriculture Benson announced he would not recommend that the President do anything to relieve the American textile industry through the use of section 22 of the Agricultural Act and application of textile import quotas.

I immediately informed Mr. Benson on February 23rd that his Department's study and recommendations that no action be taken was a complete white-

wash inasmuch as the figures used by the Department for this study were inaccurate and incomplete. At that time I furnished Mr. Benson with further figures which, of course, received no favorable reply.

Later this year, I wrote Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks regarding a statement of his which appeared in the leading press publications quoting him as stating the textile industries face "serious problems." Among other things Mr. Weeks said that textile imports from foreign countries to the United States "have seriously affected some segments of the domestic textile industry, particularly the producers of velveteens, ginghams, garments, and some other cotton manufactured goods."

I pointed out to Mr. Weeks in my letter that the Bates Manufacturing Co. in Maine had cut production 20 percent at two of its major divisions, and advised him of the curtailment of production at a dozen other mills involving the incomes and job security of nearly 12,000 textile workers. At that time among the mills affected were Berkshire-Hathaway, which cut production 20 percent at three Fall River, Mass., plants, and one at North Adams, Mass. At the same time I advised him that Ervin Mills in North Carolina had cut down to a 4-day workweek as had Aragon Mills in Georgia. Brookside Mills, in Tennessee, has halted production of 1,000 looms and was considering closing down completely. Since that time another mill in New England has closed.

In my own State just 2 weeks ago screaming headlines in the local press announced the complete and unconditional closing down of the Camperdown Mill in Greenville. This mill has been in operation for 84 years and only once before during the dark depression had it ceased to operate. It was at this mill many years ago that my own mother as a young girl had worked.

This latest development has thrown more than 250 people out of work. In announcing the closing of the mill, Sydney Bruce, president of the company, stated flatly that Japanese gingham imports into this country were directly and unquestionably responsible for the closing of his mill. I wish to quote here the exact words of the president of this mill:

With the ever-increasing volume of imports of Japanese ginghams into this country, the market for carded ginghams, which we produce, has substantially disappeared.

We have been operating at a loss for the past 2 years, and our inventories of finished goods have been growing until they have reached alarming proportions.

We have made every possible move to attempt to find purchasers for our goods, but in the face of Japanese competition we have been forced to the conclusion that it is impossible for Camperdown Co. to continue in operation.

No business can continue to operate if it cannot sell its product.

Mr. President, I might add here, no American business can continue to operate when faced with unfair competition from a foreign industry which is not only subsidized by the American Government but is given special privileges on the American market.

On June 6 one of the Nation's best known and largest mills announced it was curtailing production and postponing indefinitely a $10 million expansion program in South Carolina "because of Japanese throatcutting" in the industry. Col. Eliott White Springs, president of Springs Mills, advised the Chester (S. C.) Chamber of Commerce in his announcement:

I wrote you on February 24 that, due to Japanese competition, we had to change our balance and this gave us a surplus of yarn. Therefore, we either had to curtail our production or install additional looms. We don't like to curtail.

After your chamber offered us every cooperation to put the looms in Chester, I wrote you that I would consider enlarging the Eureka plant if I could get permission from the Seaboard to encroach on their property, that I would consider enlarging Springsteen if something could be done about city taxes, and if something were done about Japanese throatcutting.

Since that time the Japanese situation, instead of improving, has deteriorated considerably. They are gaining on us every day. We gave them new machinery as reparations for Pearl Harbor, and the CCC (Commodity Credit Corporation) sells them the same cotton I buy at 10 cents a pound less. We have always been able to meet competition without tears, but we can't lick the State Department, the Secretary of Agriculture, GATT, OTC, and the $64 billion giveaway program while Congress twists our arm.

Therefore, we have been forced to revise our plans and, instead of expanding, we are going to have to curtail. It is with regret that I tell you reluctantly the Springs cotton mills operations will be reduced indefinitely, and that we will have to postpone our plans for installing additional looms.

By "indefinitely," I mean until my customers find out that all that is yellow is not gold, or the public decides our textile industry is not part of foreign aid. If this meets with the approval of the people of Chester, I suggest they write President Eisenhower and tell him how much they love Secretary Dulles.

Prior to Mr. Springs' announcement the South Carolina textile manufacturers, meeting at Sea Island, Ga., issued a new plea for the administration to render assistance to the industry. Meanwhile, more reports from other States indicate further cuts can be expected in the industry. The reports are almost daily, following the same pattern of curtailed production, short workweeks and closing mills.

Another recent development has been the placement of the Kendall Mills in South Carolina on a 4-day workweek, which is seriously affecting the incomes and business stability in the Pelzer area of my State.

The American textile industry last year made an average profit of only 2.4 percent of its total sales. All other industries in the Nation made an average net profit of 5.3 percent which is nearer a normal profit margin. The Japanese industry, to the contrary, by its own admission, currently is making an average profit of more than 12 percent, or nearly 6 times that which the American industries are making. Let me read a Tokyo dispatch appearing in the Cotton Trade Journal, which is the international weekly newspaper of the cotton industry:

TOKYO, June 9.—Japan's "big ten" cotton spinners, who claimed to be in bad financial shape in October 1955, ended the next 6-month period in April 1956, with profits that averaged about 12 percent. A "big ten" spokesman claimed that in April 1956, spinners were making a little over $50 a bale when made up into cotton piece goods.

The "big ten" also manufacture rayon and wool fabrics, and reports indicate that profits on these have been good. But cotton had the best record, doubling the 1955 May–October period profits during the November 1955–April 1956 period.

As a result all 10 companies have decided to increase capital and have predicted that the business term ending in October 1956, would see even greater profits.

In every case of retrenchment by the American textile industry—in every case of a closing mill—in every case of announced layoffs or curtailed production—the officials and the workers involved have blamed without reservation the influx of cheap Japanese goods to this country.

Mr. President, how can anyone meet that kind of competition? It is a question of 15 or 16 cents an hour labor competing with $1 and $1.60 an hour. American workers are paid 10 times as much as the Japanese workers are paid. I do not say that that is too much to pay our workers. I believe that they ought to be paid even more. However, that is the kind of competition we must meet.

Despite the charges of the industry and responsible officials in the textile world that the Japanese imports are to blame for their difficulties, the administration, through its international-minded diplomats, has callously ignored the situation and has, instead, insisted that the Japanese imports are not affecting the industry.

It is not only a question of the amount of the material that comes back to the United States. The Japanese are forcing the market down. For example, in the field of cloth, the Japanese producers will make a raid on velveteen. They make their sales in that field. The market goes down. Then they pick out towels, and the price of towels goes down. The American producers cannot meet that kind of competition. Then they will turn their attention to sheets and pillow cases. They take the articles one at a time, until they force the market down and until the American mills cannot meet the competition and cannot keep the wheels rolling and cannot keep our workers employed because of the unfair competition. Foreign aid has done that.

Two weeks ago Monday a delegation of citizens from Chester, S. C., met at the State Department to urge some relief be given to the American textile industry and brought with them a petition bearing the names of 5,000 citizens of that county who are suffering economically as result of the depression now sweeping the textile industry.

I advised the Senate of this meeting at that time, but what I did not know was what the administration would say at the meeting. The Assistant Secretary of State in charge of far eastern affairs, backed up by a battery of 14 officials from the State Department, the Agriculture Department, and the Commerce Department, flatly stated that the textile

industry of America was not being affected by Japanese imports to this country.

This high official declared that the American textile industry was using the Japanese imports to this country as a convenient scapegoat. This official said, "If we did not have any Japanese textile industry, the American textile industry would still have the problem now confronting it." He even went so far as to say that if the Japanese Islands were to sink in the Pacific Ocean, the American textile industry would still be closing its mills and idling its employees. He said the people had been completely misinformed and that the Japanese textile industry was being used as a whipping boy.

Those who attended the meeting were astonished at the stubborn position held by this official. One would think we were discussing an American problem with an official of the Japanese Government and not a representative of the United States. They claim to hold sympathy for the industry, but they callously ignore the situation and continue on their road of appeasing the foreign industrialists at the sacrifice of the American industry.

I wish to remind the Senate of the now famous "Dear Joe" letter that Ike sent minority leader of the House of Representatives, JOE MARTIN, last February 17. President Eisenhower, in that letter, among many other generalities, told Mr. MARTIN, and I now quote from his letter:

> I wish also to comment on the administration of this legislation if it is enacted into law. Obviously, it would ill serve our Nation's interest to undermine American industry or to take steps which would lower the high wages received by our working men and women. Repeatedly I have emphasized that our country's economic strength is a pillar of freedom everywhere in the world. This program, therefore, must be, and will be, administered to the benefit of the Nation's economic strength, and not to its detriment. No American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure. Were we to do so, we would undermine the ideal for which we have made so many sacrifices and are doing so much throughout the world to preserve.

Mr. President, we have Mr. Eisenhower's promise. I ask now where is the fulfillment from him or the executive department at his command?

To complete the picture of what is happening, I believe you should certainly be advised of a comment or confidence given to the Japanese by Secretary of State Dulles recently. The Japanese reported out of Tokyo that Mr. Dulles had told them: "We confirm"—"we" being the United States—"that no import restrictions will be put into practice." This statement came on June 17 on the heels of Secretary Benson's confused announcement which he backed out of the next day to the effect that the administration was considering the imposition of textile import quotas.

Now, I ask the United States Senate this question, who is keeping their promise and who is not telling the truth?

The President has promised that he would not let this program hurt any American industry.

The Secretary of Commerce has stated that the American industry is being hurt and has admitted such publicly.

Every official of the cotton industry has stated flatly that the textile industry of America is in a curtailed condition and faces serious depression unless something is done.

Presidents of companies, heads of unions, workers, and others in the textile industry have blamed the Japanese imports to this country for the closing of every mill and the general curtailment within the industry.

The State Department, however, brands as a fraud this allegation of the textile industry and claims the Japanese industry is being used as a "whipping boy." In my way of thinking, the State Department, which is very apparently running the whole show, has practically accused the American workers and the American industry of lying to the people of this country.

I see the chairman of the Agricultural Committee is present on the floor. I think he knows that when bills are introduced which would help the farmers the inquiry is always made as to whether they would benefit foreign interests, thus throwing a block in the way of anything which would help our own people.

The State Department has taken the position of defending the Japanese industrialists against the American people.

It is high time that the United States Senate take action to see to it that the American textile industry is protected and that no such dilemma ever again recurs in any other field of American business, labor, or industry. I shall certainly take the word of my people, of the leaders of the textile industry, of the workers in those mills, and of the people in the street who are suffering because of this depression in the textile industry before I will take the word of a State Department official—and I hope this United States Senate will do likewise.

The United States is the only country which helped the Japanese get on their feet and is now allowing Japanese textile goods to come into its borders on a wholesale basis. Thirteen countries who participated in the GATT treaty have refused to allow Japanese textile goods to come into their borders. These countries include Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Cuba, Luxembourg, Haiti, Great Britain, South Africa, New Zealand, the Netherlands, France, and Rhodesian-Nyasaland. If Great Britain and those other countries will not allow any Japanese textile imports within their borders, why should we continue to allow them to come in on a wholesale basis and idly sit by and watch our textile industry go broke and our textile workers walk the streets without jobs?

The State Department and other Government agencies responsible for this problem cite as their principal reason for not imposing textile quotas on Japanese goods the fact that the Japanese have announced they will place self-imposed restrictions on their imports to the United States. This is a ridiculous situation in which we are placing the welfare of our industry and people at the mercy and whims of the Japanese industrialists.

Shortly after the Japanese announced their voluntary quotas, a little-publicized news release from Tokyo announced that the Japanese Government's insistence on quota limitations on imports to the United States are, "Designed to forestall a move in the United States Congress to enact import quotas when it reconvenes in January." In other words, there is no good faith in this voluntary program but simply a device to fool and divide us.

There are many more facts and figures and comments and information regarding the situation in the textile industry which I could have brought with me today, but I do not believe it is necessary. The picture is quite clear as to what has resulted to the economy of the textile industry and the entire Nation because of our giving away money and information to foreign countries to help develop their industrial and agricultural potentialities. What has happened in the case of the textile industry is bound to happen in other industries. It may be my State and the textile industry today—but, Mr. President, it will be your State and your industry tomorrow, unless we immediately halt this giveaway program.

Mr. President, the reason why I have offered this amendment is to call to the attention of the people of the United States the fact that we cannot afford to give a little, meager exemption to dependents, or to increase the exemptions of American taxpayers from $600 to $700, but we can give away billions of dollars with one stroke of a pen. I, for one, do not agree to such expenditures, and I shall vote against the bill when it comes to a vote tonight.

I am glad to see that Members of the United States Senate are beginning to shy off a little bit from foreign aid, and I hope that in the near future they will see fit to cut it off entirely.

Remember this, Mr. President, if we will check the matter we will find that more than half of our national debt has been caused by our foreign giveaway programs. We do not have the money; we are always getting in debt. Every time we give away money to other nations, we go further and further into debt.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time if the Senator from South Carolina will yield back the remainder of his time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on both sides having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "6–26–56–B."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida ask that his amendment be read, or does he ask that it be printed without reading?

Mr. SMATHERS. I ask that the amendment be printed in the RECORD without being read and in the course of my remarks I will explain what it proposes to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment proposed by Mr. SMATHERS to the committee amendment is as follows:

On page 37, line 11, strike out "section" and insert in lieu thereof "sections."

On page 37, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

"SEC. 422. Economic Development Fund for Latin American Countries: (a) The Congress of the United States reaffirms the policy of the United States to further promote friendly relations and Western Hemispheric economic development through assisting the peoples of Latin America in their efforts to obtain economic and social well-being, to safeguard basic rights and liberties, and to protect their security and independence. The Congress hereby recognizes that fundamental to these goals is an expanding economic growth of the Latin American area based upon self-help and mutual cooperation and full utilization of already existing resources and knowledge. The Congress expresses the willingness of the people of the United States to support the foregoing objectives to the extent to which the countries in the area continue to make effective use of their own resources and external resources otherwise available to them.

"(b) In order to carry out the purposes of this section, there is hereby authorized to be established a fund, to be known as the 'Economic Development Fund for Latin American Countries' (hereinafter referred to as the 'fund') and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1957 an amount of $35,000,000, such amount to remain available until expended.

"(c) The President is authorized to utilize the appropriations made available for the fund to accomplish in the Latin American area the policies and purposes declared in this act and to disburse on such terms and conditions, including transfer of funds, as he may specify to any person, corporation, or body of persons however designated, or to any Latin American government, agency, or organization or group of governments or agencies as may be appropriate: *Provided*, That such assistance shall emphasize loans rather than grants wherever possible, and not less than 75 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be available only for furnishing assistance on terms of repayment in accordance with the provisions of section 505, and not more than 25 per centum of said funds may be allocated for assistance to any one country.

"(d) In utilizing the fund, the President shall give preference to: (1) projects or programs that will clearly contribute to promoting health, education, and sanitation in the area as a whole or among a group or groups of countries of the area, and (2) such joint health, education, and sanitation assistance programs undertaken by members of the Organization of American States."

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, first I want to congratulate the Committee on Foreign Relations upon what, obviously, is a very conscientious and, I think, thorough piece of work on the bill.

The amendment which I now propose has to do with Latin America. In this particular respect, I also want to congratulate the committee because it has recognized some of the problems of the Central and South American countries, even though what has been provided is not as much as I think those countries deserve, nor as much as should be done for them.

I point out that the total amount which is provided in the bill for Central and South America is still less than 3 percent of the total amount which is authorized by the bill.

If we go back to 1946, when the foreign-aid program first got underway, we will discover that the amount of help which has been given to the Central and South American countries has actually been less than 2 percent of the tremendous sum of money which has been authorized for our foreign-aid program.

Simply stated, the proposed amendment would create a special economic development fund for Latin America with an authorized appropriation to the President of $35 million to remain available until expended. The amendment in emphasizing loans rather than grants provides that not less than 75 percent of the funds shall be available only for furnishing assistance on a loan basis. Since health, education and sanitation are primary factors in preventing the economic development of Latin America, the amendment contains a proviso that the President in utilizing the fund shall give preference to projects or programs that will clearly contribute to promoting health, education, and sanitation in this region, and such joint programs undertaken by the members of the Organization of American States. The authorized appropriation under the amendment would be in addition to the recommended authorization under the bill, as reported out by the Foreign Relations Committee.

There is nothing novel about the creation of this fund. We have in the past set up a similar fund for Asia in the amount of $200 million, $100 million of which was appropriated last year, and it is my understanding that the administration has requested that the balance be appropriated this year. Under the provisions of the bill as reported out by the Foreign Relations Committee, a special fund providing for an authorization of $100 million is set up for the Middle East. It is high time that we arouse ourselves from the slumber of the past and give to Latin America a little special treatment, too. In setting up this regional economic development fund for Latin America as proposed by the amendment it will give to this area the special treatment which it has so long deserved in our foreign-aid program, and at the same time it demonstrates by deed that our good neighbor policy is more than just a play on words.

The special economic development fund in the amount of $35 million proposed by the amendment will go a long way in further promoting and strengthening our good neighbor relations with this region, which is so important to us from the standpoint of trade, strategy, and raw materials. To assist Latin America in the solution of the economic difficulties which beset the area is in our own enlightened self-interest.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say that this matter was given very careful and sympathetic consideration by the committee. Of course, the Senator will recall that originally the amendment called for $100 million, and then $50 million. There was a very close vote on the amendment. Everybody recognized its merit.

One thing that should be called to the attention of the Senate with reference to the amendment is that 75 percent of the funds will be in loans, and not more than 25 percent in grants, and they relate to health, sanitation, and education. I think the committee as a whole was quite sympathetic to the proposal.

I am authorized by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and my understanding is that the minority leader agrees, to say that we are willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I certainly want to join with my colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] in advocacy of the amendment. While on vacation in Latin America, I saw the needs of the people of that hemisphere. It is the opinion of the junior Senator from Idaho that they are deserving people. They need inspiration and aid. They are not like Tito, whom we bailed out yesterday. They love freedom, and they are seeking to make themselves stronger.

I commend the Senator from Florida, and shall support his amendment.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two articles which point up the fact that the Communists are making great attempts to get control of Latin America at this particular time.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Daily Times of June 26, 1956]

GUATEMALAN PRESIDENT DECLARES SIEGE STATE—ARMY TAKES CONTROL AFTER RIOT—4 KILLED, 17 HURT AS POLICE FIRE UPON STUDENT DEMONSTRATORS

GUATEMALA, June 26.—President Carlos Castillo Armas put the army in control of Guatemala today after demonstrations in which four students were killed.

The President declared a state of siege—modified form of martial law. The army, assuming control, asked the cooperation of the people to avoid further clashes.

AFTER CRACKDOWN

The deaths came last night during student demonstrations on the capital's main street against a Government crackdown on Communist agitation. In addition there were 17 wounded.

The victims were in a parade of several hundred students marching toward the Government Palace to protest curtailment of civil liberties under the state of alarm imposed Sunday by President Carlos Castillo Armas' regime.

ONE GIRL WOUNDED

About half the marchers were girls.

One girl was wounded. So was a policeman.

The state of alarm put Guatemala under a form of martial law. The government said it was necessary to prevent "seditious disorders" plotted by Communists.

Soon after last night's shooting, the government ordered censorship of news dispatches sent abroad.

The students marched defiantly from a meeting at the university. Officials had sent them a warning message that they would be "swept from the streets" if they attempted to stage a protest.

The procession turned into Sixth Avenue, the principal business street of the capital, and headed to the President's offices at the end of the thoroughfare.

FIRED INTO AIR

A witness said a detachment of about 20 policemen, drawn up across the avenue outside a movie theater, ordered the marchers to halt.

"The police fired into the air," the witness reported. "The students kept coming, singing the national anthem.

"Police then started firing into the marchers, while police reinforcements rushed up. Some police were firing pistols, others submachineguns."

GUATEMALA CLAIMS RED PLOT, GETS TOUGH

GUATEMALA.—The Guatemalan Government, announcing discovery of a Communist plot, has imposed a form of martial law on the country to "prevent seditious disorders."

President Carlos Castillo Armas' regime decreed a "state of alarm" after police broke up a mass meeting yesterday sponsored by the newly formed national civic committee.

Demonstrators at the gathering of about 400 persons outside the capital's railway station had distributed leaflets demanding cancellation of Guatemala's mutual-aid pact with the United States and a lifting of the ban on Communist activities.

A Government statement charged the meeting was part of "a subversive plot by Communists hiding within the territory of the republic to disturb the peace."

Six persons were arrested and telephone service was interrupted for 4 hours. The state of alarm decree suspends a dozen or so constitutional rights and allows the Government to prohibit public meetings, make arrests without warrants and impose censorship.

There was no interference with news dispatches sent abroad, however.

Police cordoned off the downtown area after dispersing the demonstrators and no further incidents were reported.

The meeting was called as a celebration of the 12th anniversary of the downfall of Dictator Jorge Ubico who was driven from the country and died later in New Orleans.

Another anniversary meeting scheduled for today was ordered cancelled although its sponsors are considered friendly to Castillo Armas.

The Government claimed Communist plotters planned to spread panic and had instructed yesterday's demontrators "to use their arms in order to blame the Government for the serious consequences of disorders."

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I assumed other amendments would be offered.

I send to the desk my amendments, and ask to have them stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the action of the Senate in agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended, is rescinded, and the amendments offered by the Senator from New Hampshire will be received, and they will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 30, line 2, to strike out "$243,000,000" and insert "$208,000,000."

On page 30, line 10, to strike out "$80,000,000" and insert "$45,000,000."

On page 30, before the period at the end of line 11, to insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That not more than $35,000,000 of such funds shall be used for assistance to India.

On page 31, line 19, to strike out "$140,500,000" and insert "$135,500,000, of which not more than $5,000,000 shall be used for assistance to India."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair should like to inquire whether the Senator from New Hampshire desires the amendments to be considered en bloc.

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask unanimous consent to have the amendments considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, we have heard a good deal about the foreign-aid program. As I have said to the Senate on various occasions, and I repeat it now, I am perfectly willing to help nations which are our friends and allies and are willing to help themselves; but this pouring out of money to nations that are not true allies, and are not even really neutral nations is another thing. One of these nations is India.

I know a great hue and cry will be made by the do-gooders of this country about India. India poses as a neutral nations, but at least 90 percent of the actions of India have by calculated design been contrary to the best interests of the United States.

The Mutual Security Act for fiscal year 1957 would authorize an expenditure of $80 million in aid to India. That is $70 million for development assistance and $10 million for technical cooperation.

What I probably should offer is an amendment to cut out aid to India altogether, but in view of the fact that such an amendment probably would not be adopted in view of the action on Yugoslavia, and since there may be some good in assisting India, I am willing to take a calculated gamble on part of the money that has been proposed. For that reason, my amendment would cut in two the amount of aid to India.

A few days ago I sat and listened to the American Ambassador to India, for whom I have warm affection and high personal esteem both as our Ambassador and a former member of this body; but I just could not swallow the argument he was making for aid to India. For that reason my amendment proposes a 50 percent cut in the amount requested.

The United States is now engaged in a bitter struggle to prevent Soviet Russia from conquering more territory and enslaving more peoples in Asia. In this struggle, the United States has allies, the NATO and SEATO countries. India prefers not to be one of those allies. Nehru has said, and these are his words:

"The only camp we should like to be in is the camp of peace and good will, which should include as many countries as possible and be opposed to none." In the face of current political realities, it is impossible to have your cake and eat it too—as Nehru would like to do.

Nehru would like to have us believe that India is strictly neutral. However, in the United Nations, India has consistently sided with the Communist bloc and against the United States.

This is no bona fide neutrality.

At the Bandung Conference, India was the leader of the pro-Soviet and pro-Communist China faction.

That was not strict neutrality.

And, let us not forget that when "neutral" Nerhu visited Mao Tze-tung—the Chinese Communist dictator who was responsible for the slaughter of over 50,000 American boys in Korea—he drew up a formula of five points for peaceful coexistence which was exactly what the Soviets were saying to all the world. He became a willing mouthpiece for Russian and Chinese Communist propaganda.

That was not strict neutrality.

It is my considered opinion that now is the time—now when this foreign-aid measure is under discussion—for this body to ponder the question asked by our distinguished colleague, Minority Leader KNOWLAND, on January 17—and I quote his words:

> Can our economic system survive prolonged burdens of building a system of collective security and a system of neutralism at one and the same time? If the neutralists are to receive the benefits and have none of the responsibilities of those in the collective defense system, will not this act as an incentive plan to build up the fence sitters?

I say it will.

And Nehru's India is the prime example of our futile and dangerous policy of being equally, or even more generous to so-called neutrals than to proven allies.

Mr. President, I am disturbed that I as a United States Senator have to stand up on the floor of the Senate and argue the folly of our aid policy as it concerns India, but folly it is in my opinion.

No one will deny that in these dangerous times, there is need for us not to stint in the use of funds for our national security. But it should not be necessary to have to plead with this body to decide, intelligently, to offer our aid and

support only to those proven allies who are willing to share with us the calculated risks involved in the worldwide struggle against the deadly Communist menace. Who, in view of the facts, can—in good conscience—argue that we continue unconditionally to aid Nehru when he has definitely set himself up as an active "neutral" against the best interests of the United States?

The facts are clear, Mr. President, we gambled on Yugoslavia and lost. We are gambling on NATO and SEATO and most of it appears to be a pretty good gamble but we would be less than honest with ourselves if we did not admit there were some weak spots. We are gambling on India and frankly it is a gamble that I do not feel like backing with too many American taxpayer dollars. The wisdom of a certain biblical axion keeps asserting itself to me. It is in effect—that those who are not for us are against us. Certainly the so-called neutralism of Nehru is a one-way street and it does not run in our direction.

I want to emphasize the fact that I am not writing off India as I have written off Yugoslavia, even though I think she is a dubious gamble. That is why my amendment calls for a cut in aid—not complete elimination of aid to India.

I might add that not all of my reluctance to go along with the full program is due entirely to the position Nehru takes, although let us not forget that when the neutral Nehru visited the Communist Chinese dictator, who was responsible for the slaughter of tens of thousands of American boys in Korea, he drew up a formula of five points for peaceful coexistence, which was exactly what the Soviet Union was saying to all the world. And by doing this he became a willing mouthpiece for the Communist and Chinese propaganda.

My reluctance to go along with the full program is also due to what I consider the lack of an imaginative program designed specifically to meet the Indian situation. The fact that we do not have a better oriented program is a matter of some amazement to me in view of the fact that Nehru and other Indian leaders have long since pointed out the sources of friction. We must remember that India has but recently emerged from what has been called a colonialism. Her national pride is intense and she resents being considered a weak sister or a poor relation in the company of nations. Nehru likes to pretend that India can accomplish her goals within her own resources and that is why he belittles our aid in speeches while he holds out his palm for as much as we will drop in it. The concept of our program if it is to be successful as far as India is concerned should be in such form as treats India as an adult in the family of nations if we are to have any success whatsoever. Economic aid should be in the form of loans and there should be only such technical assistance as can be assimilated and integrated into the Indian economy in her own struggles to help herself.

Our present giveaway program should be tapered off to the vanishing point because we never could give the vast subcontinent of India enough giveaway for her economic salvation without her making a mighty effort of her own and indeed our efforts to do so would not only impoverish us but create poor relations in the bargain. In tapering off giveaway to the vanishing point there is no better time to begin than the present. Let us do so by adopting my amendment which cuts it by 50 percent. And then let us proceed from there cautiously and hardheadedly in the development of a new program better tailored to the factual situation which we all know exists.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I call for order in the Chamber.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to have order in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to my amendment to the committee amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, again let me pay my respects to the distinguished statesman from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who has the courage to state his convictions when seemingly 90 percent of the Members of the Senate do not see the light.

This afternoon before the Internal Security Subcommitttee there appeared a man who has opposed the Polish Communist conspiracy. He told our subcommittee, and, through our subcommittee, the world, what the Polish people have done and are doing to obtain their freedom. They have even attacked tanks, operated by their oppressors, with their bare hands as they raised aloft bloody flags.

Mr. President, how did you feel, and how did the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire feel, and how did I feel, last night, when a majority of the Senate voted to give aid to Yugoslavia and Tito, whom every Member of the Senate knows is a Communist. In heaven's name, what would be the position of the Senators who voted in favor of giving aid to Yugoslavia, if in the future, the freedom-loving people of Yugoslavia—about whom we heard so many words spoken during the debate in the Senate, last evening—should rise up and say, "We want freedom." In that event, we would know that, as a result of the vote cast last night in the Senate, those people would be shot down with munitions of war obtained by means of the money the Senate voted to give to Tito, to be used, at least in part, for the purchase of shells by Tito. It was said that the United States had previously given guns to Tito, and therefore the United States now must make it possible for Tito to purchase shells—using our money for that purpose—to be fired by the guns with which we already have provided him.

I predict that if the people of Yugoslavia should decide they want freedom, and should revolt—as the people of Poland have done—Senators who voted in favor of United States aid to Tito may find blood dripping from their hands.

Mr. President, I have the most profound respect and admiration for the great statesman who has just spoken—the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is the senior Republican Member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. In fact, Mr. President, I believe that many of the people of the United States are crying for us to follow the advice of the great senior Senator from New Hampshire. I plead with the Senate to pay heed to his words of advice. I commend to every person in the United States what he has said, and I hope that his counsel, as it will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will be read very widely throughout the country.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. President, at present the United States is going through a period similar to the one through which it went in the 1930's, when Mr. Chamberlain's umbrella and the slogan "peace in our time" were the symbols of the day.

Not many of the present Members of the Senate were Members of the Senate at that time. Too many of those Members of Congress hopefully crawled under the umbrella. Many of those Members found that umbrella little protection from the deluge of votes against them which followed and the freedom-loving people of the world found that same umbrella little protection when the shots of battle began to fly.

I feel that I stand at the same crossroads of decision as I did when some of us in this body took a very strong stand in favor of a two-ocean Navy and a large Air Force. We opposed the sale of aviation gasoline and scrap iron to Japan. We were defeated on those issues and although history is said to repeat itself, I hope it does not do so today.

Mr. President, I do not ask for a complete end to foreign aid. I shall support any reasonable foreign-aid program. But I ask that we be selective in the foreign aid we give, and that we help only the countries who will help themselves and who will be true allies of the United States. Let us not throw American money and substance to the wolves of international intrigue.

Mr. President, if there are no questions to be asked of me regarding my amendment to the committee amendment, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Georgia such time as he may desire, of the time under my control.

Mr. GEORGE. I shall use only 2 minutes at most.

Mr. President, the India program includes $30 million in surplus agricultural commodities. They will be furnished from our own surplus now on hand. Of the remainder or the balance, 75 percent will be in loahs. In other words, $30 million will be used to pay for certain agricultural commodities which we now have in long supply; and of the balance of the aid which India will receive under this program, 75 percent will be in loans.

On the basis of philosophy, on the basis of metaphysical convictions, and on the basis of religion, India is probably actually neutral. She does not want to join in an alliance. I myself do not care, and I do not believe we should be greatly concerned when a country is really neutral and intends to remain neutral and to protect her own neutrality. I do not think we should be very greatly concerned about that country.

I hope very much that this amendment will not be agreed to, because when it is analyzed, it will be seen that we would be hurting ourselves, largely, because we ought to get rid of the surplus. The surplus agricultural commodities are needed in India. As for the entire balance, 75 percent of it is in actual loans. I do not think that program will hurt this country. I believe it would be very much better for us frankly to say, "If you are a bona fide neutral country, and propose to protect your neutrality, we will not say that all aid will be withdrawn."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I feel that I must speak on this subject. I have spent some time at the United Nations, where I knew the Indian representatives. Especially I knew Madam Pandit, who was India's Ambassador to the United States for several years, as we all know.

I have been troubled by the subject of neutralism, to which the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire refers, but I have tried to understand the neutralism of India.

In going through some of the records of the country I find that over a period of hundreds of years—perhaps thousands of years—the Indians have been a nonwarring country. So far as I know, until India got into the recent trouble with Pakistan, it had never become involved in military actions. The tradition and religion of India are against warfare. Mahatma Gandhi laid down the tradition of nonresistance, and he urged neutrality for India, insofar as other countries of the world are concerned.

I am not defending Mr. Nehru, especially, because I think he has made a great many mistakes. He has been very much misunderstood. Perhaps some of the prejudice against him is justified. From many talks with Mr. Nehru I became convinced that he was trying to be neutral. He had the Chinese Communists on one border and the Russians on the other border, and he was in a very difficult position. One thing that was very clear to me was that he was anti-Communist within India. The inconsistency of his position with regard to Kashmir and Pakistan is partially true.

I recall the time, a few years ago, when we tried to give grain to India. I introduced the legislation. I was requested by the Indian Embassy not to make it a grant, but to make it a loan. We made it a loan, and the Indians still are paying on that loan. The other agricultural products sent to India have been primarily on a loan basis. There may have been some grants, but the transactions were primarily loans.

I have difficulty in seeing why we should be prejudiced against India at this time because of the question of neutrality. I feel that a nation which wants to be neutral, in the sense that it does not want to join any military alliance with other countries, should be entitled to take that position. We have such a relationship with Burma and with Indonesia today. I think we would be making a mistake if we were to say, "Unless you join our military alliance we cannot give you any further aid."

The 380 million people in India are trying to find a better way of life. God knows, they are starving most of the time. In my opinion, it would be very shortsighted and wrong in principle not to let those people feel that we have a human interest in them and are interested in trying to help them to be self-sustaining. They have been under the Government of Great Britain for many years. Imperialism was the condition under which they lived. Finally they obtained their freedom. India is a new, free country. She is groping her way.

With a thorough understanding of the feelings of my friend from New Hampshire, I hope he will not press this amendment, because I feel that we would be making a mistake at this time if we were to deny or cut aid for the reason given, namely, that India will not take sides with us in the cold war.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to myself.

I point out the fact that I am not advocating the denial of aid to India. I am merely raising a cautionary flag, and proposing to cut the appropriation for India in half. She would still be allowed $40 million. Forty million dollars is a great deal of money to give to a country which is nominally neutral, but which is on the other side of the fence better than 90 percent of the time.

I have heard the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. GEORGE] say that India is truly neutral. There is some argument to be made in favor of a country which is truly neutral, as the Senator has said. I could continue for hours, pointing out one position after another which India has taken, contrary to the best interests and the leadership of the United States and contrary to any recognized concept of neutrality.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am prepared to do so if the other side will do likewise.

Mr JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to support the position of the chairman of our committee. I think it would be a great mistake if this amendment were adopted.

India represents the largest group of free citizens in the world, the largest free nation on earth. If we were to adopt this amendment, I think we would be creating a condition which would justify a loss of confidence on the part of India in our cooperation in the future.

In my opinion, India is neutral in the true sense of the word. I believe she intends to remain neutral. I think that is a relationship which has been beneficial to this country.

It seems to me that what was said in the debate with respect to Yugoslavia would apply to India—not that India is the same kind of country as Yugoslavia from the standpoint of democratic government, but I think the most we can hope for in the future will be that India will remain neutral, and free from domination by Russia or any other Communist country. If she makes a success of her effort to create a strong democratic society, it will be the greatest achievement she could contribute to the defense of the West.

Everyone knows that there is competition between China and India to see which one will be able to create the best life for its citizens, one following the totalitarian system and the other following the democratic system. If India can succeed, without sacrificing the liberty of the individual, in creating a reasonable standard of life under a democratic system, it will be one of the greatest contributions to the stability and security of the West. It will be one of the greatest proofs of the basic validity of the democratic process that could be furnished.

I hope the pending amendment will not be agreed to. Although it involves money in addition, it is, in a sense, a criticism, and a further evidence of our lack of respect or regard for that country.

I deeply regret the necessity for canceling the visit of Mr. Nehru. On top of that, to agree to this amendment would be very unwise strategy, in my judgment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time on our side, with the understanding that the Senator from New Hampshire will yield back his time.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire is exhausted or yielded back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. BENDER (after having voted in the negative). I have voted "nay." On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. HUMPHREYS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. HUMPHREYS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. If present and voting the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting the Senator from Washington would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

I further announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD] if present and voting would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State convention.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent, and his pair with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has been announced previously.

The Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

I wish to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay" and the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

I also announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—23

Barrett	Eastland	McCarthy
Bible	Ervin	McClellan
Bricker	Frear	Mundt
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Welker
Case, S. Dak.	Hruska	Williams
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Wofford
Cotton	Langer	Young
Curtis	Malone	

NAYS—56

Aiken	Hennings	Monroney
Allott	Hill	Murray
Anderson	Holland	Neuberger
Beall	Humphrey, Minn.	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Ives	Pastore
Bush	Jackson	Payne
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Purtell
Clements	Kennedy	Robertson
Dirksen	Kerr	Saltonstall
Douglas	Knowland	Scott
Duff	Kuchel	Smathers
Dworshak	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Long	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	Mansfield	Sparkman
Fulbright	Martin, Pa.	Stennis
George	McNamara	Symington
Gore	Millikin	Thye
Hayden		Watkins

NOT VOTING—17

Bender	Green	Martin, Iowa
Byrd	Humphreys, Ky.	Morse
Capehart	Jenner	Neely
Carlson	Laird	Russell
Daniel	Magnuson	Schoeppel
Goldwater		Wiley

So Mr. BRIDGES' amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, there have been some very spectacular votes on the amendments involving the questions whether we wish to give aid to nations which are on the verge of the Russian orbit or to nations which are neutral 90 percent of the time and favorable to the Russians. The Senate by an overwhelming vote has gone on record for the last, and by a small vote for the first. I think our action will come back to haunt us.

A very mysterious report has come in that there is nothing listed under military assistance—for which there is some excuse—to any nation, but there are some nations which have stood by us. Some nations, when we were fighting in Korea, sent troops. Other nations in whose territory we are building bases are cooperating, and I am confident they will stand by us.

I should like to ask some questions of the responsible Senators in charge of this authorization bill. The House of Representatives adopted an amendment allowing $48 million for military assistance to Spain. I should like to know whether Spain is being scuttled in this bill or whether Spain will receive a reasonable amount. I do not want the exact figure, if it is a secret, but I should like to get an approximate figure which will show whether or not we mean what we say.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that Spain received very sympathetic consideration in the discussions held in the committee. Relative to that particular country, there certainly was no sign of animosity. There was a question, however, as to whether one particular country should be picked out and the possibility raised that other countries would have to be considered in like fashion. I can assure the Senator from New Hampshire that as to the figure agreed to by the administration and incorporated in the bill, on the one hand, and the figure of $48 million in the House bill, there is very little difference between the two. It is understood, on the basis of the recommendations made by the administration and on the basis of discussions in the committee, that a certain sum, a very little bit smaller than the sum provided by the House, will be allocated to Spain, and that sum will be on the "not-less-than" basis.

I wish to assure the Senator that there was complete sympathy for the situation of Spain, and especially so in view of the fact that there may be some difficulties with the bases in Morocco because of the changed situation in that country in connection with the new Sultanate of Morocco.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Montana.

I think the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] wishes to ask a question, and I wish to ask concerning 2 or 3 other nations, if I may.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am sympathetic to the suggestion made by the Senator from Montana, but I know that having sympathy for Spain does not answer the question. I should prefer to have assurance, at least, without naming the amount, if that can be done at this moment, that Spain will be taken care of. We sermonize to the world about how we are against the Communists. The only nation that ever chased Communists out of its territory was Spain.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will take my word for it—and I think I can speak for the committee—I give him every assurance that Spain is taken care of, and that the Senator's suspicions, if any, are not founded on fact.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will take the word of the Senator, of course.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to address a question with reference to Turkey, which has been a great ally of ours. How is Turkey to be treated in this bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. In reply to the Senator from New Hampshire, I will give the same answer. The figure was not publicized because of the possibility that if that were done other countries

might be publicized as well. The administration has taken good care of Turkey, and I can assure the Senator that the Turks will receive special consideration in the discussions held in the committee on this particular measure.

Mr. BRIDGES. Now, with reference to Formosa?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The same answer would apply.

Mr. BRIDGES. South Korea?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The same answer would apply.

Mr. BRIDGES. Guatemala?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There I think the answer is that we did not go as far as did the House. The House allowed $10 million above the administration's estimate. The Senate allowed $5 million for Guatemala and an additional $5 million for all of Latin America, a part of which could be allocated to Guatemala.

I point out that the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] had an amendment accepted providing $35 million for use in all the countries of Latin-America. So I would say that, in general, Guatemala will come out, as the result of this bill, with about the same as was provided by in the House.

Mr. BRIDGES. What about Greece?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Greece, the same as Turkey, Formosa, South Korea, and Spain.

Mr. BRIDGES. What the distinguished Senator from Montana has stated in answer to my questions about some of the countries which have been our true allies gives me encouragement and some satisfaction. I know he speaks with sincerity. I hope he speaks the minds of the rest of the committee, or a majority of the committee, as he must, because of the figures agreed to here. That gives us some satisfaction, when we have been wandering around in the dark on some of the other situations on which we voted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I assure the Senator from New Hampshire that I speak for the committee in my answers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, at the close of this debate, I cannot remain mute and not say the words which come from my heart.

I, in part, represent the sovereign State of Idaho in the United States Senate. I want to be able to go home, look my constituents in the eye, and say that I have done my best to represent them properly in connection with the debate which has taken place and the votes which have been recorded during the past 2 days.

I should like to ask how we can say that the United States Senate has been fair to the American people. I know about the high level of secrecy in the Committee on Foreign Relations. Perhaps I shall never know about it more intimately. I happen, however, to occupy a very strategic position on the Committee on Armed Services, which does not have quite so much secrecy, but is a committee whose members receive abuse and ridicule when they seek to give to the Air Force of the United States approximately $900 million more than was recommended, so as to make the Air Force strong.

Regardless of my political future, I shall not sit here silent when I see my colleagues deliberately vote to give the taxpayers' money to Tito the Communist, who a blind man and a fool would know has quit us.

Nor shall I sit here and remain mute while my colleagues vote to give aid to Mr. Nehru, whose record is painted as lily white, though every person who can read knows where he stands.

Why has not something been said about Mr. Nasser and about the disaster plan of foreign aid, which has been in existence for longer than the junior Senator from Idaho has been in the Senate?

I have seen the smirking and smiling when some of the votes have been taken. With my own eyes I have seen the dedicated internationalists vote to give away in foreign aid the money of the taxpayers of the United States which is so urgently needed at home. I have seen them smile when by their votes they defeated the amendment of the great Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who asked that aid to Nehru be reduced.

I do not like what has happened. If any of my colleagues want to speak on the subject in Idaho, I shall be glad to discuss it with them. But how, when I go home, am I to meet and answer my own constituents, including the small-business men? There is not a Senator in the Chamber who is not in the same situation. How am I going to answer the small-business man who must fill out an application for a loan, so that he can continue in his small business, so that he can exist and can support his family and educate his children?

Where is the small business loan application bill today? It is pigeonholed and forgotten.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues are right; I hope I am wrong. They have not hesitated to give aid to Tito and Nehru, when people in Idaho and Oklahoma and other States are begging for a little financial aid.

There is a little agency called the Farmers' Home Administration, which represents the farming community. Every Senator has had the same problem as has been presented to the junior Senator from Idaho. The veterans of the Korean war, who gave their best in the fight for freedom, came home and finally received land from the Farmers' Home Administration, but a little later they were faced with foreclosure by the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, I wonder when all this will end.

We are said to be brilliant by reason of the secrecy which prevails in this body. Perhaps we are. Perhaps I am ignorant. But I am going to let the chips fall where they may. I am going to let fortune turn the wheel. Then we shall see who is right and who is wrong.

I wonder why it is that I have listened in the past 5 years to great statesmen, some on the Committee on Foreign Relations, who as recently as 1953 said that that year would be the end of mutual security and foreign aid. After 7 years, if the foreign countries have not become strong, they will never become strong. I say it is about time for Congress to do a little thinking for America.

Like the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], I will vote for anyone who is our ally, but I will not vote for a Communist who is out to cut our throats and destroy our liberty.

Nor will I vote aid for Mr. Nehru, who is a neutral sitting it out, when he ought to take a stand one way or the other.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. WELKER. May I have 2 minutes more?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I was in the Senate in the days of the great Ken Wherry, when he was the minority leader, and when the Senate considered and debated the question of furnishing of wheat to India. I was here at the time when we were begging for monosite sand. India at that time had the largest known deposits of monosite sand in the world. Did any Senator ever see any monosite sand from India in repayment for the wheat which the American taxpayers, those whom we represent, gave to India? Oh, no, they did not. We have no time, I guess, to think of America. We have no time to think of the Farm Home Administration.

What has happened to the Aiken-Welker bill and other bills to liberalize the Farmers' Home Administration?

When the farmers of the United States read the mutual security bill, they are going to wonder what kind of representation they have in Congress.

Senators can smirk and smile all they wish, but so long as I represent, in part, the sovereign State of Idaho I will never be hoodwinked about anything so potentially dangerous as the action we are soon to take.

When, O when, are we going to realize that we are a bankrupt nation; that we have spent ourselves into bankruptcy? We are paying more than $8 billion a year in interest alone for this drunken spending spree, the end of which I do not think I will ever see. But so long as I am here and so long as the American people are forgotten, count me as voting "nay" on bills of this character.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have only a brief comment to make on the bill before final action is taken. All of us have given serious and deep thought to how we should vote on this all-important measure. Today, yesterday, and the day before I have heard on the floor as penetrating and careful debate on foreign aid as I have ever heard in this body. This holds true both of those supporting the bill as reported

by the committee, and those offering amendments to the bill.

I believe it is fair to characterize the discussion as having been one of great worry on both sides. There have been expressions of doubt, of hesitation, and of misgiving by almost every speaker.

In these doubts and in these misgivings I share.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. GEORGE], that world statesman who has an unerring instinct for the jugular, stated our problem and summed up the entire discussion yesterday when he said:

> In the past few years there has been a breakdown in the understanding of the so-called foreign-aid program. Since those days when the American people willingly gave of their goods and services, to help Europe rebuild after the war, through the Marshall plan, the Turkish-aid program, and the Greece-aid program, there has been a deterioration of their understanding of the need for continuation of the mutual-assistance program. There is a deep skepticism among many of our people.

I frankly share that skepticism, Mr. President. From the very beginning when the President, in the spring of this year, asked for a new authorization of nearly $5 billion, I have felt that the administration was not taking into account how much public opinion, not only here at home but also abroad, was being affected by the changing situation in the world.

I believe that the administration has paid little attention to the obvious fact that foreign aid was in fact being reappraised throughout the entire world.

The Congress is aware that the whole subject of foreign aid must be reconsidered. We know that in fact the administration has talked for some time about reconsidering it. We are aware that in the light of the new world situation, becoming more obvious every day, there must be a new foreign-aid policy.

There would have been a far happier tone to our debate this week if the administration had some months ago come to the Congress in frankness and in candor and had told us that foreign aid is going to be revised and that in truth such revision was already underway. If it had told us that, and had also stated that existing programs should not be disturbed, since it is impossible to withdraw abruptly from our worldwide commitments, I believe there would have been more trust and more confidence expressed in this body this week.

Mr. President, I am strongly convinced that as responsible men we should not and we must not strip the gears or wreck the machinery of existing foreign-aid programs because we have little faith that serious thought is being given to the future of this program.

Our skepticism, as it has been expressed here in the past 2 days, is in accord with opinion here at home and opinion throughout the world. I think our attitude can be fairly described as caused by a failure in administration leadership, a failure, as columnist Walter Lippmann has phrased it, "to argue the case for foreign aid in terms which are relevant and convincing."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mr. Lippmann's column from the Washington Post of May 31, 1956, be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yet we are faced now with the necessity of acting. We have no intentions of reducing the military security of the United States and of our allies. Then what should we do?

In view of our dissatisfaction, it appears to me, Mr. President, that we should do two things:

First, we should support the proposal of the Foreign Relations Committee, so ably led by that distinguished and wise statesman, the senior Senator from Georgia.

Second, we should approve a critical reexamination of foreign aid and foreign policy by the Foreign Relations Committee—which we, in effect, have done today by rejection of a counter proposal.

There is no blinking the fact, Mr. President, that the American people are not convinced that today's program serves America's national interest. The American people are doubtful that that interest is any longer served by continued economic assistance to many nations and peoples far from our shores. The administration has done little to allay these genuine doubts. Therefore, it is imperative that we seek to do so.

It would be my hope that a comprehensive, careful, and thorough reappraisal of our entire foreign-aid program will be made during the next year by the Foreign Relations Committee, aided and abetted by distinguished experts in the field of foreign policy, and called in as consultants to the committee. This appraisal would be in our hands, so that next year we may take intelligent action for the long term down the long road.

But it is vitally important, Mr. President, that we not destroy faith in the foreign-aid program in the intervening months. So I shall cast my vote in support of the committee. I shall do so reluctantly, but I shall do so in the knowledge that this is no moment in history to destroy the faith of the world in our leadership.

Therefore, I personally prefer to regard the present bill as in the nature of an interim authorization. I shall regard the appropriation bill to support this authorization as an interim appropriation.

Our national interest will not at this time best be served by completely ignoring the recommendations of our President, of the Joint Chiefs, and the other officials of the executive branch concerned with our foreign policy. I do not think that we can also afford to ignore the considered, mature, and the expert judgment of the majority in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

And we cannot afford to ignore, Mr. President, the cry that would go up throughout the world that once again the United States has furled its flag of world leadership, and unfurled once more that tattered and bedraggled banner of isolationism which has served us and the peoples of this earth so badly in the past. We canot indulge ourselves in the luxury of this danger, as once we could have with impunity. Our action today, if it is unfavorable to foreign aid, will be cleverly twisted and turned by our enemies in every world capital.

Just today the Senate adopted a conference report and insisted on increasing the strength of our Air Force.

In my judgment, this was a wise and statesmanlike precaution. I suggest that we cannot afford the contrast between that action and in the same week contribute to the destruction of our foreign aid program, however much we may have misgivings and doubts about that program.

Already the cry is echoing around the earth that once again America is "going it alone". This, we all know, is untrue, but it is not enough that we happen to know it is untrue. It is imperative, I think, that we reassure our allies and the neutral nations that once and forever this Nation has accepted its role of world leadership.

I shall, therefore, cast my vote in favor for the bill as reported by the committee.

EXHIBIT 1

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

WOODEN LEADERSHIP

It is not in the least surprising that Congress is showing so much opposition to this year's request for foreign aid. Ever since the middle of March, when the President asked for a new authorization of nearly five billions, it has been plain enough that he and his advisers were not taking into account how much world public opinion, including American, was being affected by the changing world situation.

The administration has put forward its request for another and a bigger authorization, using the same old slogans that have been doing duty year after year. It has taken no serious notice of the fact that foreign aid, both military and civilian, is undergoing a revolutionary reappraisal throughout the world. It has treated this great development as not strictly relevant to the business before Congress.

* * * * *

Congress has reacted to this lack of plainness and candor. It knows that the whole subject of foreign aid has to be reconsidered. It knows that the administration is in fact beginning to reconsider it. It knows that the administration has not yet reached many definite conclusions as to how, in the light of the new world situation, to form a sound foreign aid policy.

Then Congress finds that the new money it is being asked to vote is to be used to finance the flow of military assistance, not this year and not next year, but in 1958 and in 1959. Knowing that the strategical planning of NATO and of our other alliances may be seriously revised in the next 2 years, Congress is in no mood to authorize large funds to be used 2 or 3 years hence. "The Congress," said the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. RICHARDS, "may well regard the pending mutual security bill as only an interim measure." As there are nearly 2 years' funds already in the pipeline, the committee felt that after cutting the authorization by over a billion dollars, "the sums recommended in this bill are ample until we know more about the direction in which the program will move."

The administration would have done well to listen to those who advised it to go to Congress saying that foreign aid was going to be revised, that while the revision was going on the existing programs should not be disturbed, and that as and when new programs were worked out, Congress would be told all about them. On that kind of submission, the President would in fact have been asking Congress not to approve a program that is out of date, but to trust him while a new program is being worked out. He might well have gotten such a vote of confidence.

In reacting as it has reacted the House Foreign Affairs Committee is moving with, not counter to, the tides of opinion in Western Europe. When it voted to reduce military aid by a billion dollars it did not in the least believe that it was voting to reduce the military security of the United States and of its allies. It was in the same mood as are the Germans, who do not want to conscript the promised German divisions, as the French who have now moved virtually all their infantry to north Africa, as the British, who are beginning to think about abolishing conscription.

It is the mood of people who do not want to waste their time and their money preparing not for the next war but for the last war.

The attitude of Congress is the American expression of the same mood which we are thinking about abroad when we talk of the decline of interest in NATO. I do not believe that the deep cause of this loss of interest is due to the new look of Soviet policy. The deep cause is that the higher leadership of NATO, as it reflects itself in the requests to the governments, has not kept abreast of the revolution in the military art. The loss of interest is due to a loss of belief in the realism of NATO's strategical conceptions.

If we are wise, we shall not regard the action of the committee as merely a relapse into isolationism and know-nothingism. Insofar as there has been such a relapse, it is due to a failure in leadership—a failure to argue the case for foreign aid in terms which are relevant and convincing.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to associate myself with the views expressed by the majority leader. Like him, I shall vote for the bill with reluctance. I am going to go one step further than the majority leader did. I am glad I shall be a member of the committee where the next action will be taken. As a member of that committee, I intend to vote for lesser amounts.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. We have come to the end of the road with a very important piece of legislation. On it there have, of course, been differences of opinion on both sides of the aisle. The administration, of course, has not abdicated, nor does it intend to abdicate, the world leadership responsibilities which this Nation has. Had we cast aside at any time the responsibilities of leadership in the world, there is but one power that could have picked up the torch; and it would have engulfed the world. I refer, of course, to the Soviet Union and the international system of communism it represents.

Mr. President, the present administration came into power only 3 years ago. It found the world in a state of war. After winning World War II, in 1945, when we were associated with our allies, and when men of good will everywhere had hoped that we and our allies might live in peace with honor in a free world of free men, there rose in the world a power—the Soviet Union—which was determined to destroy human freedom.

As a result of wartime agreements at Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam, 500 million people who once had been free passed behind the Communist Iron Curtain. When President Eisenhower's administration came into power, we found ourselves involved in a stalemated war in Korea, which had been going on for a period of time. The United States alone carried a heavy share of the burden of that war. Approximately 90 percent of the manpower supplied by the United Nations in that was was supplied by the United States. More than 90 percent of the resources supplied by the United Nations in that war was provided by the United States. The little Republic of Korea had contributed approximately 600,000 men; the United States had contributed at a single time more than 500,000 men, and we had rotated more than a million men through Korea. All the powers associated with us in the United Nations had contributed only 45,000 men. Because of certain restrictions placed upon us, the war had become a stalemate. The present administration brought peace with honor in that area. However, in the final analysis there is not a peace in the full sense of the word, because we still have only an armistice. The Chinese Communists have not consented to the unification of Korea.

In the period of time since this administration has come into power, only approximately 20 million people in North Vietnam have passed beyond the Iron Curtain, as compared with the more than 500 million people who passed behind the Iron Curtain in the 5 years prior to that time. The Indochina war was raging when this administration came into power.

Mr. President, these problems are not partisan ones. When the war broke out in Korea, Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle supported the then President of the United States. There are also in the Senate at this time Members who supported the Greek-Turkish aid program under the prior administration, and Members who supported the Marshall plan, doing so because they believed it was important to rehabilitate the war-torn world.

Mr. President, I think the American people can be highly pleased and gratified that at the helm of this country today there sits a great American, Dwight Eisenhower, who is devoted to the cause of peace with honor, who is interested in preserving peace for this generation and for future generations of Americans, and who has given leadership to the world in this troubled period. I hope we shall never let narrow partisanship mar our foreign policy in the future.

Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute, tonight—I would not want this opportunity to pass without doing so—to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who has devoted many years of his life to service in the Senate of the United States and who, as the respected and distinguished leader of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has led the fight on the floor of the Senate for the mutual-security bill sponsored by the administration. Some of the rest of us have been pleased to join with him in trying to bring through this legislative battle a piece of proposed legislation which I believe to be important for the future of our country and the preservation of a free world of free men.

Mr. President, we owe our thanks to Senators on both sides of the aisle who have been prepared to join together, and who have joined together, not as partisans, not seeking any political advantage, but as Americans determined that we will maintain this free Republic and carry on our part in present-day civilization.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on the question of final passage of the bill, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep appreciation of the remarks which have been made by the majority leader and the minority leader, and I also wish to express my personal appreciation of the way they have helped in this work. In addition, I wish to give full credit to the Foreign Relations Committee, and to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], its chairman.

Mr. President, I now seek to obtain unanimous consent to have a memorandum printed in the RECORD before the debate on this bill is closed. One of the big problems which has faced us during this debate and during the study our committee has been the problem of unexpended balances under the mutual security program. It is a very complicated subject, and I admit that for a long time I was completely baffled by it. The chairman of the committee asked me to make a study of it, for the benefit of the Senate, in connection with this debate.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a memorandum, based on a study I have had made by the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee, and also by my own staff, covering the unexpended balances—a subject which has disturbed us very much. The memorandum covers the military and the nonmilitary phases of the unexpended-balances issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I do not intend to object—let me say that I think the matter to which the Senator from New Jersey has just referred is the crux of the question before us, insofar as I am concerned.

Under my reservation of the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Jersey what the figures show regarding the total unexpended balances.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be glad to answer, if I have time in which to do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the memorandum shows that as of June 30, 1956, the military unexpended balances under the Department of Defense amount to $5,109.4 million, or slightly in excess of $5 billion; and also that there are unexpended balances in the International Cooperation Administration for military assistance and direct forces support. The total of military unexpended balances amounts to $5,059.1 million.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is in excess of $5 billion?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes, it is slightly in excess of $5 billion. But the obligated or reserved funds in the military assistance program are estimated at $4,863.6 million, and that includes $39.7 million of obligated funds under the International Cooperation Administration.

Therefore, Mr. President, this means that the total of unexpended unobligated funds in the military assistance program is estimated at $195.5 million as of June 30, 1956.

The memorandum shows how these obligated balances are assigned, and how the unobligated balances are arrived at. The memorandum also deals with the nonmilitary unexpended balances, which constitute a very much smaller amount, all told; in that category there are $1,818.6 million unexpended balances but only $146.9 million of that is unobligated.

The memorandum also states what we mean by lead time. I have tried to list these figures in such a way as to explain this very complicated problem, which to me was inexplicable for a long time, but which we have worked out.

I feel it important that this information be placed in the RECORD, for the benefit of the entire Senate. I hope it will be extremely helpful next fall or later next year, when we study the entire problem. I hope this information will help improve the system of accounting. I admit that all of us were at first baffled by this issue. I hope the material I am now submitting for the RECORD will help improve the system of accounting.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, certainly I have no objection to having the figures printed in the RECORD. I had hoped they would be available earlier in the debate. Of course, I am very glad that the figures have been prepared by that time at least. My own feeling is——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has reserved the right to object, and is making a speech, for which time will have to be yielded to him by the majority leader or the minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, whenever we have had this annual discussion of the subject, ever since the Marshall plan was first inaugurated, I have listened. We have heard something of the same story as to the purpose to be served, how it would be accomplished, and why it was necessary that a certain figure had to be authorized.

I do not question the purposes of the program, but I do question the amounts. I feel that the unobligated balances are so large that, coupled with the proposed appropriation, they represent a larger amount than should be made available for this purpose. Therefore I shall vote against the bill, not because I am opposed to its purposes, but because I believe it would be better administered if there were not so much funds made available that it is practically impossible for even a distinguished Senator like the Senator from New Jersey to present the figures without saying he is confused. We would have better administration and a better program if the figures were more sharply defined, and if the amount were not so large.

I withdraw the objection to the printing in the RECORD of the memorandum submitted by the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey?

There being no objection, the memorandum submitted by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESTIMATED UNEXPENDED BALANCES IN THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM AS OF JUNE 30, 1956

I. CONTENTIONS TO BE MET

1. There has been opposition to appropriation or authorization of further sizable funds for the military-assistance program due to the existence of large so-called unexpended balances in the program.

2. It has been suggested that these unexpended balances are sufficient to run the program for 2 years at the current annual rate of expenditure. (Approximately 2.5 billion per annum.)

II. DEFINITION OF TERMS

In order to clarify any discussion of the unexpended balance situation, it is necessary initially to define a few of the terms involved with some precision.

A. Unexpended balances: Includes all funds previously authorized and appropriated which have not been expended, i. e., payment has not been made for goods delivered. This total at any time will include three different classes of funds.

1. Obligated funds: Funds which have been utilized for the negotiation of contracts with suppliers and manufacturers for end items or services which have not as yet been delivered. Represents commitment of funds in strict technical compliance with section 1311 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1955. The technical obligation of the funds occurs when the military-assistance funds are cited in a contract.

2. Reserved funds: Funds which have been allocated to pay for equipment ordered from our own military services. The services utilize their own funds in contracting for such items, or for the purchase of replacement items for their own use—replacing items in stock which will be made available to the military-assistance programs upon the receipt of appropriate replacement items. Such contracts placed by the military services are made on the basis of reserved funds in the military-assistance program. Although such reservations are not technically obligations, a reservation has substantially the same effect as an obligation since, pursuant to statutory direction, funds held in reservation cease to be available for other purposes. (Sec. 108, Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1956.)

3. Unobligated funds: Funds for which obligations or reservations have not been made.

III. MILITARY UNEXPENDED BALANCES, JUNE 30, 1956

1. Amount unexpended: Mr. President, the Defense Department estimates that the total of unexpended balances of military funds under the Defense Department on June 30, 1956, would be $5,019.4 million or slightly over $5 billion.

There also will be $31.2 million of unexpended balances for military assistance under the International Cooperation Administration, $6.1 million under ICA in military assistance for common-use items, and $2.4 million under ICA for Direct Forces Support.

Therefore, including these military funds under ICA, the unexpended balances on June 30, 1956, for the total military assistance program comes to $5,059.1 million.

2. Amount of unexpended balances obligated or reserved: Mr. President, the total of obligated or reserved funds in the military assistance program is estimated to be $4,863.6 million as of June 30, 1956. This includes $39.7 million obligated funds under the International Cooperation Administration.

Therefore, Mr. President, the total of unobligated funds in the military-assistance program is estimated at $195.5 million as of June 30, 1956. All of this figure comes under the Department of Defense. ICA will have no unobligated funds for military assistance as of that date.

3. Mr. President, these unexpended balances can be broken down as follows:

(a) German program plus multilateral commitments for infrastructure, military headquarters, etc., $1.2 billion.

(b) All other programs, $3.8 billion.

(1) Air Force equipment orders (approximate), $2 billion.

(2) Army equipment orders (approximate) $1 billion.

(3) Navy equipment orders (approximate) $0.5 billion.

(4) Miscellaneous (nonregional, special, etc.) $0.3 billion.

4. Thus, the total of unexpended balances anticipated for the military assistance program for June 30, 1956, is almost completely obligated or reserved towards the payment, upon delivery, for specific quantities of specific types of equipment for specific countries.

IV. NONMILITARY UNEXPENDED BALANCES, JUNE 30, 1956

1. Amount unexpended: It is estimated in the committee report, page 51, that the total of unexpended balances of nonmilitary funds on June 30, 1956 will be $1,818.6 million. This figure can be found under "Other mutual security programs."

2. Amount obligated: Of these nonmilitary unexpended balances, the total of obligated funds is estimated to be $1,671.7 million as of June 30, 1956.

3. Amount unobligated: Therefore, Mr. President, the total amount of unobligated nonmilitary funds as of June 30, 1956 will be $146.9 million.

In the case of nonmilitary assistance, the unobligated balance is largely accounted for by $90 million in the President's Asian Development Fund (which was originally intended for a 3-year period) and by $45.3 million for Palestine refugees. It has not

been possible to obligate this money because of the political situation in this area.

V. LEAD TIME

A crucial consideration in the question of unexpended balances is that of lead time in the delivery of equipment, i. e. the amount of time that it takes to obtain delivery of specific equipment to specific countries after authorization and appropriation have been made.

Here again, there are various elements involved. In addition to the production lead times for the assembling of equipment, there is a necessary administrative lead time to insure the orderly pursuit of the objectives of the military assistance program.

1. Administrative lead time: Once the Congress has passed the authorization and appropriation bills for the mutual security program, the military assistance program must be reprogramed, i. e., the sums actually authorized and appropriated to the program must be reconciled with the amounts requested, and the programs reevaluated to whatever changed conditions may have developed between the preparation of the program and the final action by Congress. (It should be obvious that there is necessarily considerable time between the initial preparation of authorization requests and the final appropriation of the money—as in all budget preparations—for instance, the preparation for fiscal year 1958 is already being initiated with the military assistance advisory groups in the field.)

Various persons dealing with the administration of this program have testified before the Senate and House committees that the "reprograming" phase consumes at least 6 months. That the necessary consultations with the personnel in the various countries, the area field commanders, the State Department, the ICA, the Joint Chiefs, and the like preclude the availability of the funds appropriated for any fiscal year before January 1.

Thus there is about a 6-month administrative lead time in the obligation and expenditure of appropriated funds in any fiscal year. In addition, once the reprograming has been completed, and the needs for military equipment have been finally determined within the funds available, then there is substantial production lead time prior to the delivery of any equipment.

2. Production lead time: It is almost impossible for funds appropriated in a fiscal year to result in the delivery and receipt of equipment during that same fiscal year. Even the shortest production lead time items cannot be delivered prior to the expiration of the fiscal year after the reprograming stage has been completed. With longer production lead-time items such as aircraft and naval ships, production lead time plus administrative lead time consumes up to 2 and 3 years.

3. Delivery lead time: Furthermore, in most instances there is encountered a delivery lead time. Since the funds do not become expended until actual delivery to the docks for overseas shipment there is additional time consumed before the actual expenditure of funds. Shipment to appropriate ports plus time consumed in processing paper work for payment may add several weeks to total lead time.

4. Lead time and fiscal year 1957 appropriations: With all these considerations of lead time, an illustration of the nature of the unexpended balances can be made with the fiscal year 1957 appropriations. Of the total of approximately $3 billion appropriation which the administration requested for the military assistance program, only $0.4 billion was estimated for expenditure during the fiscal year 1957. Practically all of that total would be consumed in fixed charges, direct forces support, training, administration, and packing, crating, handling, and transportation of end-items delivered under prior year appropriations.

Of the remainder of the requested fiscal year 1957 appropriation, $1.1 billion would be expended in fiscal year 1958, and $1.5 billion, half of the total requested, would remain unexpended until equipment deliveries and payment in fiscal year 1959.

VI. UNEXPENDED BALANCES AND MILITARY PLANNING

The great bulk of the unexpended balances actually represents equipment ordered, in the process of production and release, committed to specific countries, but not yet delivered and paid for.

These funds are definitely committed to particular programs. As Deputy Asssitant Secretary of Defense E. Perkins McGuire testified, "In most cases our allies have based their own defense and budgetary plans on the assumption that the material and services in these programs would be received from the United States. Thus these items are not available to any substantial degree for redistribution as a consequence of failure to reappropriate needed unobligated balances or failure to appropriate required amounts of new funds."

Furthermore, the equipment represented by the unexpended balances is not necessarily transferable from one country to another because of the special character of that equipment. That is, equipment which is under contract for production and delivery to NATO would probably have little use in meeting the military needs in Indochina, and likewise vice versa.

Reliance upon unexpended balances to carry the program forward, without sufficient additional authorization for fiscal year 1957, can only result in a definite lag during fiscal year 1958 and fiscal year 1959. The military-assistance program needs new obligational authority now in order to insure that appropriate levels of delivery and assistance will be flowing to our allies during those fiscal years. We cannot repair this situation with increased authorization during future years. Contracts must be placed during fiscal year 1957 in order to anticipate inevitable lead time in deliveries for fiscal years 1958 and 1959.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am sorry I cannot vote for the bill. I would like to have voted for what appeared to be a reasonable foreign-aid bill. It has always been my feeling that since the Korean war, during which time we were appropriating as much as $7 million a year for foreign-aid purposes, we should have been reducing the amounts appropriated for that purpose.

Nothing that has happened during the past year would, in my judgment, justify the Congress in appropriating more money this year than was appropriated last year or the year before. This year we are appropriating $1,500,000,000 more, by action of the Senate, than was appropriated the previous year. That is an increase of almost 60 percent, which is a reversal of the trend. It is a move in the direction of disposing of much more of the resources of our people in the foreign-aid program. It seems to me that we should reduce the program, rather than increase it by 60 percent.

Senators know that since 1953 we have been steadily reducing appropriations, and steadily reducing carried-over balances. Now we are reversing the trend.

I hope that some day within the next 10 years we may get this program down to a figure which the American people will not resent. The American people feel that we are spending far too much on this program, and I think they are right in that feeling. So long as additional funds are to be appropriated, and so much money is to be carried forward, I feel that I must vote against the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, as one who would not vote a thin dime for donation programs unless he felt that they were in the interest of the security of the United States, I wish to say that I am very much disturbed by the political undertones of certain statements made here tonight with regard to what I approach as a completely nonpartisan and unpartisan action in the interest of the security of the country.

I have had the honor and the privilege, and sometimes the burden, of serving on the Foreign Relations Committee for the past 10 years. I was a member of the committee in the 80th Congress, when the so-called Marshall Plan was inaugurated. That was a Republican Congress, which authorized the requests of a Democratic administration to spend vast sums of money in an attempt to help in the reconstruction of a war-torn Europe.

I had been in many countries of Europe at that time, and I visited many others later. I saw what I thought was the need for a humane, humanitarian approach to the reconstruction of the economy of those countries, not as a donation program, but in the self-interest of America and a free society.

It was not the Republican Party or the Republicans who gave China to the Russians. It was not the Republican Party or the Republican leadership which put the Kremlin in possession of world dominion, a position in which today it controls more than a third of the population of the world. But today, in this administration, it is the responsibility of the Republican Party to pick up the pieces of the debris which were left as a result of those ill-advised settlements near the close and at the close of World War II.

We are not dodging or shirking that responsibility, at least so far as the leadership is concerned. I am willing to assume it, unpopular as it may be, and unpopular as may be the taxes which are necessary as a result of those past mistakes.

So tonight I dislike to hear the connotation and the insinuation that this is a Republican mistake that we are trying to support. I think it is the responsibility of the American people to act in the best interests of America and of future generations. The only excuse I have for voting for great expenditures of money abroad is that it is in the interest of the security of the United States and tomorrow's generation.

I am sad tonight that political undertones have crept into the excuses for

voting for the bill. We are all concerned about our country, its future, and its security.

I have voted in various ways. I have voted in times past to eliminate the giveaway programs. Today I suggest that in this bill 75 percent of the advances which we make in the so-called giveaway programs are on the basis of repayment. That is a victory for those of us who do not believe in giving away money in a charitable gesture, but rather putting it on the basis that those who receive it will repay it at some future date.

This is not a giveaway program. It is in contrast with the original programs, which gave away vast sums of money without any responsibility on the recipients to pay it back.

This evening I earnestly hope that the Senate will not undertake to assert that this is a political manipulation on the part of those of us who vote for the bill, in spite of the mistakes of the present administration. The Senators who vote for it should vote for it because it is the continuance of a program which was started by a combination of Democratic executive leadership and Republican legislative authority. It started in the 80th Congress. I hope that we shall not adopt an attitude either for or against the bill for reasons of political advantage. I hope we shall be big enough, as a country and as a legislative body, to see that, whichever way we vote—and many Senators will vote against this bill, and many will vote for it—we shall be voting for what we believe to be the long-range security and the best interests of our country, and of tomorrow's generation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I fear that the country will be shocked at the charges we have heard, to the effect that this administration is a failure. I certainly was shocked to hear that our domestic policies have been failures, and that our foreign policy has also failed.

Mr. President, what is failure? Does the fact that our present foreign trade is the greatest in peacetime history and is steadily increasing indicate failure?

Is the fact that we have not been engaged in war and that there has been no major war anywhere in the world for 3 years evidence of failure?

Does the fact that we are enjoying the greatest prosperity we have ever known, either in wartime or in peacetime, warrant the charge of failure?

Does the fact that during the past 3 years we have made great cuts in our taxes and have balanced our budget and put our fiscal system in a sound condition constitute a failure?

Mr. President, if this be failure, may this kind of failure last forever.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I should like to vote for an aid bill which gives reasonable technical assistance to underdeveloped countries to help them to help themselves. I should like to vote for an aid bill which gives military assistance to those nations which have manifested a willingness to stand by the free world in any possible conflict with the Soviet bloc. I should like to vote for an aid bill which gives economic assistance to countries like South Korea and Formosa, which are incapable of self-support.

However, I must confess that the concoction of international slumgullion embodied in the pending bill is more than I can support.

In order to vote for technical assistance and economic aid to those countries which are in need of those things and which are friends of America, I must, under the pending bill, vote for economic aid for countries which have constantly manifested their hostility to this country.

In order to vote for military aid to those nations which have shown their willingness to stand by the free world in any possible conflict with the Soviet bloc, I must vote for military aid for one nation whose leader stated a short time ago that he would never again be separated from Russia, and I must vote for military aid to other nations which, according to the sworn testimony which has been adduced before a committee of which I am a member, are selling strategic materials to Russia and to the other countries of the Soviet bloc—materials which can be used to destroy the lives of American boys in the event of hostilities between America and the Soviet bloc.

That is just too much for my conscience to stand. I shall not vote for the bill for those reasons.

The bill, as the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, increases the appropriation for foreign aid in the 12th year after the end of the Second World War over the appropriation for the 11th year by $1½ billion. It does this at a time when those in charge of the administration of the foreign-aid program already have unexpended funds totaling $6,800 million at their disposal.

The appropriation authorized by this bill would take at least $55 million out of the pockets of the taxpayers of my State of North Carolina at a time when my State has great difficulty in finding enough money with which to educate its children and defray its other necessary expenses. A part of that money would be given to Tito and to countries which are selling strategic materials to Russia. That is too much for me.

Although I have the greatest respect for the judgment of the very genial and able majority leader, I cannot share his feeling that the defeat of this bill would cause any injury to us or the free world. I believe if we did the intelligent thing tonight by voting down this bill, the administration would forthwith come in with an intelligent bill that we could conscientiously support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it seems to me that during a good deal of the debate of the last hour or two we have lost sight of one very important factor which should be high in our minds as we come to cast our decisive vote on this important bill.

I think the important fact is that we are debating this bill at a time when we are nearing the half-year mark in the fourth successive year of peace in the world, certainly a peace so far as all our American soldiers are concerned.

I do not know, and I am sure no other human being knows for sure, the precise formula by which peace is made and by which peace is preserved. Undoubtedly, preserving world peace results from a combination of contributing factors.

At least peace must have some association with the things which we are doing concurrently at the time when we have peace. There must be some relationship between peace and the political and military leadership supplied by the United States as the recognized leader of the free world. Presumably there is a relationship between peace and NATO, which has tended to bind together and to keep going in a common direction a great many of our associates in Western Europe, and the united strength of their armed forces and fabricating plants.

Presumably there is also a relationship between peace and the mutual security program, which provides for countries all over the world some kind of connection, some kind of relationship with the United States and with the other free countries of the world, so we continue moving together, in an economic sense and in a military sense, as a common phalanx of freedom against aggressive world communism.

As for me, I am thinking tonight of what a noncontroversial Republican said a long time ago. He was a Republican by the name of Abraham Lincoln. He said he could never determine which leg of a three-legged stool was most important, because if you knock off any leg the stool falls to the ground.

Perhaps we ought to think a little bit about that tonight. We all want peace. We want it preserved. The three factors I have mentioned have been operating concurrently with our peace. Before we run the risk of kicking a leg off the stool and supplying nothing in its place, perhaps we had better run the risk of being a little bit unpopular at home by assuming our full responsibility as Senators by supporting the Secretary of State, by supporting President Eisenhower, and by supporting those in the world who are trying to march together and work together against this tremendous force of militaristic, aggressive, godless communism.

Mr. President, of course the easy vote is "no"; perhaps the popular vote is also "no." There is always much appeal in the persuasive suggestion that we spend this money on ourselves rather than in this global effort to help strengthen others to work with us and to stand with us against aggressive communism. But, sir, peace is a going concern in the world today and our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, who did so much to make and keep it a going concern, tells us he needs this authorization bill to hold the line for peace. Who among us

who might vote "no" can better promote a program for peace than our President who solemnly assures us he needs this tool to continue and complete the task? Who among us who might vote "no" would assume the blame for war if defeat of this measure signals the world that collective security as a concept for the free world has thus been killed? Mr. President, by my vote tonight I refuse to expand the risk of war or to decrease the hope for peace, reluctant though I am to vote for the full figure of this bill. If I err tonight, as all humans must and do, I want my error to be on the side of voting too much rather than too little for a program which has helped preserve the peace.

I think the money item in this bill is too big. I say to you now, as a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, that I expect to vote for substantial reductions in this bill when it comes to the appropriations. But tonight we now face the choice that we either vote for all of it or none of it. We vote, in my opinion, for too little or too much. We now must vote for all of it or none of it. We now must vote to stay in or get out. I would rather vote to authorize spending a little too much tonight for peace, than run the risk of voting a great deal too little for peace. I prefer an economical peace but I prefer an expensive peace, even, as against risking the world fall-apart that would kick off another war.

Since we now have no alternative, we will do well to pass this authorization bill; we will do well to present it to the Appropriations Committee, and there make the careful, scrutinizing reductions which I am sure are possible and which I believe will have the votes to effectuate.

The difficulty is, Mr. President, if we vote "no" tonight, where do we go? We cannot just walk out of the world and slam the door and look up into space. We are still in the world. There is no other able and proper world leader to take our place. Unless we can provide some other device, some other peace-preserving program, some other tactic, another leg to take the place of the one on the footstool of peace that we would kick out, and thus destroy the only peace program which we have, it seems to me, Mr. President, we are forced tonight perhaps to vote for a little too much money in authorizations, so that we can vote the right amount when appropriation time comes along. It is hard to estimate the proper dollar sign for peace or the full cost of war, Mr. President. But to vote "no" now is to scrap a program associated with our peace without supplying anything in the awful vacuum which we would create.

I was in hopes, Mr. President, that Congress would appropriate some money and authorize a Hoover type commission of some kind as recommended by Senator KNOWLAND, to bring into the next session of Congress a substitute for foreign aid, a substitute for the present program. Perhaps we will get that in any event, if we adopt the resolution for the Senate to set up a study commission of its own and if the President carries out his indication that he will appoint his own executive study committee. In that event, we should come up next year with another kind of program for world cooperation, some other program for holding together the forces of peace.

But in the meantime, Mr. President, I do not want my vote to be responsible in part for running the risk of jeopardizing the peace that we have won at such great cost.

Finally, Mr. President, let me reiterate the hope that by next year we shall have developed or evolved a better, less expensive program to preserve the peace. I hope loans may supplant grants and that better, closer cooperations may be developed among the non-Communist nations of the world. I hope more can then be done by others to help themselves and to make contributions to our common cause of peace and freedom. But above all, Mr. President, I hope and pray that a year from now we shall still have our precious peace so we can argue and debate the best means of sustaining it rather than once again being compelled to spend the billions of dollars and the millions of lives which another cruel war would cost us.

Our working formula for peace, Mr. President, is far from perfect. But, sir, it is working. And we do have peace in the world. This may not be the best plan for preserving peace but it is the only plan and program for which we can vote tonight. It gives great promise of helping to sustain the peace another year. It should give us time to test and evolve other methods and new approaches. Let us not destroy what we have and what is working until we discover a new formula and provide something more than unsupported hope as the substance of our crusade for peace. If we appropriate or authorize too much, Mr. President, we can rescind or reduce our expenditures but if we authorize too little and war eventuates we cannot revive a single lost life or reduce the dimensions of the calamity of an atomic war by any act of Congress or by any proclamation by the President.

So, Mr. President, I shall vote "yes" despite the temptation to take the easy route of voting "no." I shall not vote to pull apart the peace which we have already spent so much to put together. I shall hope and work for a better program to preserve the peace but until we can develop it I shall not vote to kick a support out from under the stool President Eisenhower tells us he requires to meet the war threats and the Communist challenges of today.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time on the bill, provided the minority leader will yield back the time remaining to him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENDER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], who is necessarily absent. If he were present, he would vote "nay"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MORSE (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If he were present, he would vote "nay"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. HUMPHREYS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay" and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. HUMPHREYS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

I further announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], if present and voting, would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State convention.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent, and his pair with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has been announced previously.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—54

Aiken	Hennings	Mundt
Allott	Hickenlooper	Murray
Anderson	Hill	Neuberger
Beall	Holland	Pastore
Bennett	Humphrey, Minn.	Payne
Bridges	Ives	Potter
Bush	Jackson	Purtell
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Clements	Kennedy	Scott
Cotton	Knowland	Smathers
Dirksen	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Mansfield	Sparkman
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Symington
Fulbright	McNamara	Thye
George	Millikin	Watkins
Gore	Monroney	
Hayden		

NAYS—25

Barrett	Ervin	McClellan
Bible	Frear	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hruska	Stennis
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Welker
Chavez	Kerr	Williams
Curtis	Langer	Wofford
Dworshak	Long	Young
Eastland	Malone	
Ellender	McCarthy	

NOT VOTING—17

Bender	Green	Martin, Iowa
Byrd	Humphreys, Ky.	Morse
Capehart	Jenner	Neely
Carlson	Laird	Russell
Daniel	Magnuson	Schoeppel
Goldwater		Wiley

So the bill (H. R. 11356) was passed.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed with the Senate amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. KNOWLAND conferees on the part of the Senate.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit an order and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That notwithstanding the adjournment following today's session, the President pro tempore be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the order be agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

BENEFITS FOR SURVIVORS OF SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 2401, H. R. 7089, to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7089) to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF PURE FOOD AND MEAT INSPECTION ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, tomorrow, June 30, 1956, marks the historic 50th anniversary of two of the most forward-looking, liberal pieces of legislation ever designed to protect the health and welfare of the American people. I refer to the first Pure Food and Drugs Act—Public Law 384, 59th Congress, 1st session, Thirty-fourth United States Statutes at Large, page 768—and the first Meat Inspection Act—Public Law 382, Thirty-fourth United States Statutes at Large, page 674, 59th Congress, 1st session—both signed into law on June 30, 1906, by the great conservationist and humanitarian, Theodore Roosevelt.

Mr. President, we can never reiterate too much the necessity of this type of legislation, nor can we ever relax our surveillance with respect to the protection and improvement of the human resources of this Nation. The problems of health are like the duties of the housewife: they are never finished. Thus, the celebration of the 50th anniversary of this historic legislation should remind us of our continuing responsibility to review the need for improved legislation and improved enforcement procedures of our pure food and meat inspection laws.

It is fitting on this occasion, Mr. President, to recall the conditions that preceded pure food and meat inspection legislation. This type of legislation became imperative because of the willingness of producers of food, drink, and drugs to inundate the markets of the country with adulterated merchandise. Here was a shameful blight on our national conscience because immoral manufacturers put profit ahead of the welfare of the consuming public. Heinous frauds were perpetrated on the unwitting consumer who bought inferior articles labeled as goods of standard quality. Moreover, we must recall the serious menace to public health that these practices engendered; food products, particularly meat, were commonly sold which were impure, diseased, or otherwise completely unfit for human consumption. The grossness of these abuses culminated in the enactment of the first pure food and drug and meat inspection laws.

The Congress led the way and its example provided the States with the incentive to make improvements on the Federal law within their own jurisdictions. Originally, the Congress was faced by constitutional obstacles, because no authority was given by that instrument to legislate on food and drugs or the regulation of the processes of manufacturing. Finally, the interstate commerce clause was used as the basis of this legislation. But the original laws were weak.

It was in 1938, under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, that a Food and Drug Administration was set up under authority of Public Law 717—Fifty-second United States Statutes at Large, page 1040, 75th Congress, 3d session—which put teeth in the earlier law. Senator Copeland, of New York, a great scientist and physician in his own right, is worthy of tribute as the man who successfully sponsored and brought to fruition his dream that governmental authority might more efficaciously lead the way in the protection of the consuming public from the virus of adulterated food products.

Originally under the Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration was transferred to the Federal Security Agency in 1940. It is now part of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department which was created from the Federal Security Agency in 1953.

Thus today we find our Government with machinery to cover the Nation with chemists and inspectors, fully equipped with testing laboratories. The scope of operation under these laws includes enforcement operations, scientific investigations, control of new drugs, food standards, pesticide tolerances, and certification services.

Mr. President, in the July issue of Consumer Reports there is an excellent review of the past 50 years of the Pure Food and Drugs Act. The analysis is made by both medical and economic consultants. I ask unanimous consent that this article appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTY YEARS OF THE FOOD AND DRUG ACT

A REVIEW BY CU'S MEDICAL CONSULTANTS

On the average, consumers spend a quarter of their incomes, a total of about $65 billion a year, for products—foods, drugs, medical devices, and cosmetics—covered by Federal and State food and drug legislation. Basically, these laws are intended to insure that such products are clean, wholesome, and what they are claimed to be. That is, food for sale must not be filthy, decomposed, poisonous, or otherwise unfit for human consumption; drugs must not be dangerous to health and life when used as prescribed, must be up to given standards of potency and reasonably effective for the conditions they are purported to alleviate; dangerous drugs must be kept unavailable to consumers except through prescription; cosmetics and therapeutic devices must be safe to use, and

so on. In short, the food and drug laws—of which the 1906 act was the foundation—are the most important consumer-protection laws of the Nation.

The hero of this year's celebration is Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, physician, and chief chemist of the Department of Agriculture from 1883 to 1912. After leading the drive to arouse the public and Congress to the dangers of impure drugs, patent-medicine quackery, and filthy and poisoned foods, he finally saw his efforts rewarded in the passage on June 30, 1906, of the Federal Food and Drugs Act.

The food and drug law and its companion meat-inspection act, which established the inspection and grading of meats by the United States Department of Agriculture, were enacted during a period of unrestrained competitive abuses, increasing concentration of people in cities, rapid growth of food-processing industries, and rapid progress in the science of medicine. The consumer could no longer even attempt to determine for himself the purity, safety, or nutritional value of foods, for these were often grown on large farms hundreds or thousands of miles away, then processed and packaged in large food factories. Nor could he judge the safety or effectiveness of drugs and patent medicines, which were only too often marketed without proper standards of quality and purity, or concern for safety and effectiveness.

When the medicine man held sway

Uncontrolled to any significant extent by a sense of community responsibility, many food processors and drug makers made little effort to insure the safety or cleanliness of their products. Dr. Wiley and others showed that harmful amounts of boric acid, borax, salicylic acid, and formaldehyde were being used as preservatives in foods; that there was sometimes no chicken or turkey in products sold as potted chicken or potted turkey; that sales of Vermont maple sirup exceeded the production capacity of that State by about 10 times; that doctors were prescribing drugs of uncertain purity and quality; and that scores of patent medicines containing harmful amounts of alcohol, opium, and cocaine were being freely marketed as pain killers, female-trouble remedies, tonics, headache powders, and cancer cures—with claims that would make some contemporary advertisers green with envy.

Cruder abuses curbed

The 1906 law, passed over the bitter opposition of influential sections of the food and drug industries, helped to curb some of the cruder of these abuses. As the population increased, as the food industry continued to grow in size and complexity, and as the pharmaceutical and cosmetic industries began to expand in the wake of advances in medical science and chemistry, new problems in food and drug regulation arose, and serious weaknesses in the law became apparent. Especially conspicuous was the law's failure to give the enforcing agency, the Department of Agriculture, authority to set up legal standards for foods, to inspect food-processing and handling establishments, to require prior proof of the safety of new drugs before they were put on the market, or to exercise any control over cosmetics. Dangerous amounts of harmful chemicals continued to be used in preserving, processing, dyeing, and flavoring foods. Harmful amounts of arsenic and lead residues from insecticide sprays were often present on apples and other fruits when they reached the consumer. Misrepresentation of the weight, composition, and nutritional value of foods still occurred. Imitation foods were widely sold without being labeled as imitations. There was no control whatsoever over therapeutic devices, and such absurdities as whistles for developing weak lungs, nose straighteners, fake sunlamps, bust developers, eye exercisers, and "radioactive" and magnetic devices for the cure of serious ailments were freely sold.

Horror and tragedy

Although the act forbade false claims on labels of remedies for cancer, coughs, colds, tuberculosis, epilepsy, and the like, the 1912 Sherley amendment required the Government to prove that such claims were not only false but fraudulent. The practical problem of providing evidence that would convince a court that a drug manufacturer knew his claims were false was a great handicap to the Government in its efforts to protect the consumer. And even if the Government won its case, the manufacturer could simply transfer his fraudulent claims from the package to his newspaper and magazine advertisements, over which the law had no jurisdiction.

In 1912, Dr. Wiley, "having been convinced that it was useless for me to remain any longer as a Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry which had been deprived of practically all its authority under the law," resigned. In his letter of resignation he said among other things, "I saw the fundamental principles of the 1906 Food and Drugs Act * * * one by one paralyzed or discredited."

The dedication of the Food and Drug Administration officials (now transferred from the Bureau of Chemistry and established as a separate unit of the Department of Agriculture) could not make up for the serious gaps in the law, but with its 1933 "Chamber of Horrors" exhibit, the FDA did succeed in arousing people to the law's deficiencies and the advantage taken of them by food and drug manufacturers. Such books as "100,000,000 Guinea Pigs," published in the thirties, helped to increase public awareness of the need for drastic revision of the law.

In 1937, an event occurred that had a deep effect on public opinion: 105 persons died from poisoning by an "Elixir of Sulfanilamide." After adding diethylene glycol, an antifreeze agent, to the elixir as a solvent, the manufacturer had marketed the product without testing its toxicity. This event helped to end 5 years of debate, characterized by bitter opposition to any change in the law from many drug manufacturers and food processors and by indifference or even hostility to the idea on the part of many newspapers. On June 25, 1938, a new food and drug law came into being—the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act.

The new law

The new law covered cosmetics and therapeutic devices as well as foods and drugs and, in general, was intended to strengthen the Government's hand in its efforts to insure for the American people wholesome, healthful, clean, and truthfully labeled food, and safe and effective drugs, cosmetics, and therapeutic devices. It was designed also to protect legitimate producers from unfair competition by the unscrupulous. Despite some serious weaknesses, it was a definite advance over the 1906 law. The task of enforcing it and four related acts was given to the FDA, now removed from the Agriculture Department and under the aegis of the Federal Security Administration.

Under the seizure provisions of the new law, any food, drug, therapeutic device, or cosmetic that was impure, dangerous, or misbranded could be seized and condemned. Furthermore, the law gave the FDA authority to establish reasonable definitions and standards of identity for foods, to make factory inspections, and to prohibit the marketing of foods produced under insanitary conditions. Containers which might make foods injurious to health, and the use in foods of coal-tar colors, unless officially certified to be harmless, were banned. However, the law does not require manufacturers or processors to supply prior proof of the safety of a chemical before using it in foods.

A food product is deemed misbranded if offered for sale under the name of another food unless it is plainly marked as an imitation of that food. The label of a product sold as a food for which no definition and standard of identity have been established must state the common names of all the ingredients in it in order of their prevalence. Neither the amount nor the proportions of the ingredients are required to be listed, but artificial flavorings and, for dietary aids, information on vitamin and mineral content must be noted. The label must also disclose the use of artificial coloring, except for that in butter, cheese, and ice cream. The Miller amendment, passed in 1954, authorized FDA to establish safe tolerances in the final product for poisonous materials (pesticides, for example) used in the growing of fruit and vegetable crops.

To prevent another tragedy of the elixir of sulfanilamide type, the law requires a company marketing a new drug to file an application giving full reports of investigations showing that the drug was safe for use; a full statement of the composition of the drug; a full description of methods used to make, process, and pack the drug and specimens of proposed labeling of the drug. The FDA studies the data, and, if convinced that the new preparation is safe it makes effective the application.

Loopholes to be plugged

One cannot overlook the fact, however, that the new drug provision has several major weaknesses. The provision as to the safety of a new drug is based largely or entirely on the drug company's experimental and clinical data filed with the application. Consciously or unconsciously, experimental research and clinical tests undertaken by a pharmaceutical company would tend to show the most favorable aspects of the drug's effects and tend to hide serious toxic or other side effects.

A drug or cosmetic is deemed adulterated if it was produced under insanitary conditions, contains insanitary ingredients, is packed in a poisonous container, or is colored with an uncertified coal-tar coloring. Established drugs are required to conform to the standards of purity and quality set forth in the United States Pharmacopoeia and the National Formulary.

If its labeling is "false or misleading in any particular," a cosmetic is considered misbranded. Hair dyes may contain uncertified coal-tar colors only if the label or instructions give adequate directions for preliminary testing and a warning against use on eyelashes or eyebrows, since such use "may cause blindness."

Congress also gave the FDA the task of regulating all intrastate sale of food and drugs shipped across State lines; the sale of colored oleomargarine in hotels and restaurants; drug-store sales of prescription drugs; domestic production of insulin, coal-tar colors, and five antibiotic drugs; and inspecting seafood establishments.

Under the Wheeler-Lea amendment, control over the advertising of foods, drugs, cosmetics, and treatment devices was turned over to the Federal Trade Commission.

To give consumers adequate protection against the many serious hazards which now exist, not only is a much larger appropriation needed for the enforcement of the present food, drug, and cosmetic law, but there is also need for changes in the law and for greater protection of consumers in areas now covered by other agencies and other laws. False, misleading, and exaggerated advertising claims, for example, are outside the scope of FDA's control and are inadequately curbed. Controls on the use of chemicals of unknown hazard in cosmetics and in many foods are grossly inadequate. There is a serious hazard in the lack of compulsory sanitary inspection of poultry processing plants of a kind now required in meat pack-

ing plants. Foods and drugs produced and sold within a State come under often inadequate State laws, not the Federal act. Labels of such commonly used poisonous products as dry cleaning fluids, paint, paint remover, shoe polish, and metal polish must carry neither a warning nor a listing of ingredients.

From this brief survey of the provisions of the 1938 law, related acts, and subsequent amendments and regulations, it might appear that the consumer at last is adequately protected on the food and drug front, but unfortunately this is far from true. While these measures were an important advance in consumer protection, they are marred by serious flaws—and the health and welfare of the American people have suffered as a result. To aggravate the evil, Congress has never provided the FDA with enough money to enforce the laws. Appropriations of $4–$5 million a year for an agency that required $20 million a year to do its job resulted in serious gaps in the protection of consumers (see p. 363). A citizens committee appointed last year to study the FDA confirmed that there were serious deficiencies in the agency's activities and recommended a 3- to 4-fold increase in funds over a 5- to 10-year period.

We do not hear today of elixir of sulfanilamide tragedies. The laws' weaknesses and failures in enforcement are reflected in more subtle impairment of health and danger to life. The cumulative and chronic effects of life-long consumption of foods processed with chemicals of unknown or potential toxic or carcinogenic properties may be difficult to spot but that they constitute a public health problem is affirmed by responsible health organizations such as the American Public Health Association and the American Medical Association.

Consumers beware

A short survey of highlights in the most recent annual report of the FDA (now a part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), for the fiscal year ended June 1955, will give some indication of the Administration's varied activities, the magnitude and complexity of the problems confronting it, and the pressing need for more effective enforcement of our food and drug legislation, and for remedying some of its weaknesses.

"Gross adulteration [of food], such as visible filth or decay, has been left largely for detection by the consumer," says the report, though in the year ending June 30, 1955, the FDA seized 2,544 tons of filthy or decomposed food. Some 300,000 pounds of food tainted with poisonous or harmful materials were also seized. Among these were coffee beans contaminated with lead ore during shipment; soft drinks containing a harmful chemical as a preservative; canned black-eyed peas containing glass; oats that had been treated with a mercury compound for seed use and later entered food channels.

Large and well-known companies as well as small, little-known ones were among the offenders. "One of the oldest and largest manufacturers of chocolate products and candy * * * was found to be operating a seriously infested factory, with resultant contamination of raw materials, equipment, scrap for candy reuse, and finished products awaiting packing," says the report. "Seizures were made of finished chocolate and confectionery products heavily contaminated with rodent and insect filth. Prosecution action is under consideration."

Needed: Money and men

The FDA did not have either the staff or the resources to investigate many suspected swindles, but it uncovered some while looking into sanitary and health violations. "Among the deliberate cheats were coffee adulterated with spent grounds, chaff, and chickpeas; * * * turkeys, oysters, and clams [whose weight had been increased by injection of water]; sorghum with added glucose; egg yolk stretched with nonfat dry milk solids; and fish misbranded with names of more expensive varieties."

Of 32 drugs recalled from distribution during the year, 15 were voluntarily called back by the manufacturers at the FDA's request. Twelve recalled drugs were antibiotics which had not been certified by the FDA or were substandard or mislabeled. Four were new drugs marketed before their safety had been established. Other cases involved nonsterile injection drugs, low potency, decomposition, failure of tablets to disintegrate, a labeling mixup, and contamination with glass particles.

Another FDA activity was tracking down and stopping illegal sales of such drugs as the barbiturates and amphetamines. Amphetamine (benzedrine and dexedrine) pep pills are often used by criminals to bolster their nerve, and they have contributed to highway accidents by stimulating drivers to keep going despite fatigue.

Many drugs were seized for failure to conform to the label statement of composition, for contamination, or for extravagant label claims. In one group of actions, a firm was fined $2,000 for claiming that its ultraviolet ray device would relieve all pain and congestion, stimulate the circulation, restore vigor and youth, insure a clear complexion, prevent baldness, and cure numerous other disorders. There were seizures of alfalfa-seed mixures recommended by the manufacturers for treatment of arthritis, rheumatism, and related troubles. The year also saw the beginning of effective action against Harry M. Hoxsey and the Hoxsey Clinic treatment for cancer. This case reached its climax last April when the FDA issued a public warning that the Hoxsey method not only was worthless as a treatment for cancer, but could sometimes aggravate the condition.

These are some of the accomplishments of the FDA in the face of serious weaknesses of the law and inadequate funds for enforcing the law. How many violations go undetected (particularly in pesticide residues on fruits and vegetables) and how much sickness is the consequence of gaps in protection can only be conjectured.

Balance sheet

Although the FDA has done a good job, within its limitations, it has become more and more apparent in recent years that even the best efforts of a group of dedicated public servants cannot properly protect the public when our food and drug laws are so full of loopholes and when resources for enforcement, education, and research are so inadequate. The consumer has tremendous stakes in adequate food and drug legislation and its effective enforcement. But control will not be adequate so long as consumers remain ignorant of the provisions and shortcomings of the laws, and so long as they assume that an enlightened Government and enlightened industries automatically guarantee them safe and effective foods, drugs, cosmetics, and therapeutic devices.

A REVIEW BY CU'S ECONOMICS CONSULTANTS

Although the products under the control of the Federal Food and Drug Administration are used every day in every home, and their purity and safety are of vital concern to everyone, the general public does not realize that in many areas, food and drug controls have become progressively less effective. Among experts in these areas, however, uneasiness about the deterioration of control has grown over the years into a sense of impending danger. Yet, without public awareness of the seriousness of the situation, there has not been enough pressure on Congress to appropriate the funds required to protect our national health and safety.

That the lack of funds is the key factor in the present hazardous situation is not disputed anywhere. Compare the $5,500,000 FDA 1955 appropriation with the one of $14 million-plus voted to administer the Federal Meat Inspection Act or the one of $18 million to eradicate farm pests and plant and animal diseases. Canada, with a population of only a little over 15 million, today spends almost $1,500,000 to administer its food and drug acts—nearly 10 cents per person for this purpose, as compared with our 3⅓ cents.

As a result of the cripplingly inadequate financial support given the FDA, the agency has had to reduce its personnel by 15 percent since 1951. Laboratory and other equipment has not been kept abreast of modern technological development. Field travel by FDA inspectors and other personnel has been curtailed. A planned program of educational cooperation with industry has not been developed. Consumers have not been informed of violations. While violations of the law continue, a backlog of legal actions has accumulated.

The citizens committee report

In January 1955 the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, of which the FDA is a subsidiary agency, appointed a Citizens Advisory Committee to investigate, report, and make recommendations about the amount and kind of enforcement of food and drug laws needed to serve the best interest of the country.

The report, which came out just a year ago, stated flatly that "the scope and complexity of the present enforcement and regulatory problems, if dealt with inadequately, constitute a threat to the health and welfare of our citizens." Then it went on to make the blunt statement that "the resources of the FDA are woefully inadequate to discharge its present responsibilities."

Those were strong words for such a committee, 14 persons prominent in business, science, education, and such organizations as trade unions and women's clubs—people as unlikely as any you could find to exaggerate or want to alarm the public unduly. Although its statement that the health and safety of every family in the Nation were threatened could hardly be considered less than dramatic news, this did not receive anything like the press coverage it merited.

Modest advances

Still, the report has borne some fruit. This year, Congress was asked to raise FDA's enforcement appropriation by a little over a million dollars, an increase of approximately 17 percent, bringing the total appropriation for the 1956–57 fiscal year to $6,779,000. The House of Representatives already has voted the increase, and, at this writing, all indications are that the Senate will too.

The increase is modest enough. Even with it, the appropriation will amount to less than a tiny fraction of 1 percent of the total retail cost of the goods to be controlled. The Citizens Advisory Committee recommended an annual increase during the next 5 to 10 years that finally would give the FDA an operating budget 3 to 4 times the size of its present one.

There are many reasons why an increase in funds for the FDA has become so necessary and why an eventual appropriation less than that advised by the Citizens Committee will fall far short of the job. The world has been changing, and these changes have compounded the difficulties of the FDA's job. In the first place, as everybody knows, the population has grown. But that is less than half the story. More important is the fact that the urban population has made up a far larger part of the total than it used to. People have been moving off the farms and out of small towns into cities. That means that more and more families have become dependent on what our grandmothers called

store-bought foods—manufactured and processed foods that are hauled long distances before being put on sale to consumers. Manufacturing and processing, hauling and warehousing, loading and unloading—all mean handling. And increased handling always means increased opportunities for spoilage, infestation, decomposition, and contamination.

Deteriorating standards

With a greater quantity of food to handle and longer distances to haul it, food processors have, of course, been eager for ways to protect products from spoilage and infestation. Out of this desire has arisen another serious hazard. Since World War II, the American chemical industry has grown into an industrial giant, with all manner of products to sell to food processors to ease the problems that changing technology and rapid urbanization have created for them. Thus, there are on the market chemicals to color, stabilize, preserve, and flavor foods. There are other chemicals to kill such pests as the rats and flies that plague warehouses and packing plants, and to reduce the insect and fungus infestation of grains, fruits, and vegetables on the farm. In this bonanza of chemical products there are many whose safety for human ingestion in the amounts presently used is highly questionable.

Like most other American industries during these boom years, the chemical industry has quickened its pace and gone in for the "hard sell," constantly putting new products on the market and promoting them with all the pressure possible. Moreover, this fevered drive comes after years at war—first World War II, then Korea. Nearly all commercial standards tend to decline under wartime conditions—standards of quality, sanitation, safety, and ethics. Hence, one of the legacies of any extended wartime period is a deterioration in the commercial world's capacity for self-discipline.

The processor who attempts to keep or raise his standards has a hard time of it under such circumstances. An indication of how difficult it is to keep a food product fit for human consumption was given recently in a trade magazine, Dairy Food Review. The magazine published a speech by Mr. H. F. DePew, an executive of the National Dairy Co., on the subject Quality of Non-Dairy Ingredients in Ice Cream. Mr. DePew recounted some recent experiences of his company in buying materials to be used in its ice cream. Of liquid sugar he said, "Only 4 out of 27 samples were given an unqualified O. K." Of fruit: "I saw a report recently from a plant complaining that shipments of strawberries from one packer contained rope fragments, nails, insect parts, chewing gum, wire, leaves, and stems." Nuts: "Shells found in nut ice creams * * * rancidity * * * a fairly large shipment of walnuts which became webby during storage." Chocolate: "Sanitation in some of the chocolate supply houses is still in a rather primitive state." Dry milk powder: "Infested with insects." Cones and cookies: "I could tell you instances of beetles found in them." Candy for use as an ice cream ingredient: "I am sure you have all encountered candy which has turned slightly rancid." Cartons: "I could also tell you of instances where insects were found in a shipment of containers." Chemicals: "I could tell you about stabilizers and emulsifiers masking flavor or producing off-flavors in ice cream."

Keep in mind that the foregoing is not from a report of an FDA seizure; it is from a speech by one ice-cream maker to other ice-cream makers. Remember, too, that dairy food are subject to more control than any other kind of food. State, county, and city public-health officials, as well as State agricultural departments, join the FDA in attempting to keep dairy products pure and healthful.

What Mr. DePew recommended that ice-cream manufacturers do to correct the unpleasant and dangerous situation he had found was precisely the kind of thing the FDA is empowered to do for foods and drugs in general, but has been unable to do properly because it hasn't had the money. He wound up his talk this way:

"What can we do? * * * We can visit the plants supplying our nondairy ingredients. * * * We can set up specific raw-material standards for liquid sugar, corn syrup, strawberries, and other such materials. We can institute inspection reports. * * * We can require bacteria, yeast, and mold counts on all raw materials received. * * * I believe it is desirable from an industry standpoint that a concerted and united effort be made by the ice-cream manufacturers in this direction."

Herculean task

The visiting of plants recommended by Mr. DePew is similar to the FDA's inspection program. The need for far greater inspection service was repeatedly stressed in the citizens-committee report. Anyone familiar with the problems of the kind of control that FDA is supposed to exercise will tell you that there is no escaping the need for regular and repeated plant inspections. Yet today, the FDA can afford no more than 250 inspectors—and the agency is responsible for checking on every plant, distributor, and retailer making or handling foods, drugs, or cosmetics involved in interstate commerce. The citizens committee estimated that almost 100,000 establishments were under FDA control. In the year ending June 1955, FDA inspectors visited about 11,000 establishments, and at that rate, assuming the 100,000 estimate is accurate, it would take them about 9 years to complete their inspection rounds.

The number of plants under the FDA's supervision changes from day to day. Daily, small firms start, buy products processed in larger plants, package and label them under different brand names, and send them out to market. In the drug field, especially, these small branders can be a serious hazard unless subject to control, because a drug label, containing directions for use and warnings of danger, is so important. In the case of foods, this type of branding operation adds to handling and storage, hence increases the opportunities for spoilage or contamination.

Now that dietetic foods have become important mass-produced products, misbranding of food can sometimes be as much of a health hazard as misbranding of drugs. Take canned food which is sold for certain heart and kidney conditions as sodium-free. Food-and-drug inspectors have found such products that contained sizable amounts of sodium. Obviously, the health of the patient depending on one of these would be endangered.

Doctors, drugs, and detail men

Perhaps the biggest changes, and also the biggest problems for FDA, have occurred in the area of marketing practices and as a result of the volume and rapidity of introduction of new products. An additional legacy of a period of wartime seems to be a speeded-up technology. Hence, the years right after a war find industry after industry experiencing rapid change. Nearly every industry can claim a revolution of sorts since World War II. One of the most dramatic of these has been that in the so-called ethical-drugs (drugs available to consumers only by prescription) industry. During the past 15 years, this industry has undergone one of the profoundest shifts in trade practices in its history. A very large percentage of the drugs now used in filling prescriptions were unknown before World War II. In marketing this spate of new drugs, the industry has turned to tactics which were all but unknown to it before the war—practices which have contributed enormously to the difficulty of controlling the distribution of dangerous drugs.

Manufacturers of what were called "ethical" drugs to distinguish them from patent medicines have adopted the tactics of the oldtime patent medicine seller—but with this difference: their heavy sales pressure, exaggerated claims, and gigantic advertising outlays are aimed at doctors, not consumers. Thus, the medical profession now appears to be viewed as a kind of sales transmission belt for drug manufacturers. Through their prescriptions and recommendations to patients, doctors are looked to to create a market for the rapidly increasing output of drugs advertised and branded by ethical drug manufacturers. The pressure to turn doctors into peddlers of branded drugs has swelled to an avalanche since World War II.

According to industry spokesmen, there are more than 15,000 drug salesmen now calling on doctors, leaving samples, urging that new drugs be tried out on patients or that an old drug not be forgotten. There is no way to check on what claims are made for what drugs by these "detail" men.

Sick chickens

On the food side, one of the most pressing problems at present is the poultry industry. This problem, too, has been compounded by marketing changes. Years ago, poultry raising was hardly an industry at all. Flocks were small. Generally a by-product of grain farming, they were often the sole responsibility of the farmer's wife. Hence, consumers for the most part obtained their poultry from farms near at hand. Today, however, more than half the poultry sold is produced in what the industry calls commercial flocks. The birds are slaughtered and dressed in large plants using semi-automatic machinery and continuous-flow production patterns. The combination of large flocks and modern processing methods has greatly increased the hazard to public health from the sale of diseased poultry.

A good many students of the subject believe that poultry is subject to more diseases that can be transmitted to man than any of the mammals we eat. Some of these diseases—paratyphoid and psittacosis, for example—can be fatal to humans. When poultry was grown in small numbers on widely scattered farms, diseased flocks tended to die out quickly, and the farmer's wife simply started over again with a new set of hatching eggs. However, now that flocks are large, and the sole crop of their grower, and are frequently financed by feed dealers or others, sick or dead birds mean something more serious than putting off the buying of a new bonnet. They mean the loss of a sizable investment. Hence, pressure to salvage at least some of the crop is hard to resist. Furthermore, poultry herded into huge flocks, often running up into the thousands and tens of thousands, obviously is more in danger of infection than the small farm flocks were. As a matter of fact, some agricultural specialists say that our poultry flocks today are so seriously infected that a national program for poultry—somewhat like that undertaken years ago to handle the tuberculosis infection of our cattle herds—is needed.

With modern poultry-processing methods, any infection becomes a multiplied threat, because a single diseased bird can infect a whole day's plant run, even more if the plant's sanitation methods are lax. The only reliable protection is continuous inspection of birds before they hit the processing line, where they can spread infection. Less than 20 percent of the poultry on sale today, however, is inspected, and even that 20 percent is not subject to adequate inspection.

Details of what now goes on in the poultry business—the dosing with new medicines and medicated feeds, the trade stories about the use of chemicals and processing methods to mask evidence of infection, the marketing

of sick and disease-killed birds, and the record of humans infected by diseased poultry—make a tale to rival the lurid accounts of meatpacking plants in Upton Sinclair's The Jungle, a book which has been credited with arousing the Nation to the passage of the Meat Inspection Act back in 1907. At the moment there are several bills in Congress that would require stricter regulation of poultry, but no action on them is expected at this session.

The job ahead

There are many other 1956 FDA problems that are in some respects more explosive than those of a half-century ago and that will require more and more care and caution on the part of both industry and Government. For example, the frozen-food industry, with an excellent record to date, has launched a rapidly expanding program of production of precooked frozen foods (dinners, meat and chicken pies, etc.) that poses potential new dangers. Also, we import far greater quantities of both food and drugs than we used to, and the FDA, even if its new appropriation is approved, will not have enough manpower to inspect these adequately. Medical quackery appears to be growing, and the use of both stimulating drugs to pep us up, tranquilizers to soothe us, and hypnotics to make us sleep is rising at an alarming rate in spite of FDA's efforts to control their sale. And so on and on—until the list includes almost as many new problems as there are kinds of products sold to consumers.

The citizens committee apparently has succeeded in needling Congress into giving the FDA the means to start an attack on the great backlog of undone tasks piled up during the war and postwar years. But it will be up to the consumers of the Nation to see to it that this start is the beginning of a full-scale, long-range program, not just a flash in the pan.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. In conclusion, Mr. President, may I say that the 50th anniversary of this protective, humanitarian legislation should recall to us the pioneers in the Congress and the Nation who made it all possible. It should recall, also, the advantages that have accrued to those manufacturers and producers who have come to realize the commercial advantages of purity and cleanliness and have in numerous cases been happy to advertise the fact that they have gone far beyond the requirements of the minimum requirements of the law.

ECHOES OF THE LADEJINSKY CASE

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, many Senators will have seen the article which appeared in the New York Times on June 17, 1956, concerning the new furor over J. Glen Cassity, the Department of Agriculture official who previously achieved some notoriety in the famous Ladejinsky case. Mr. Cassity has sent out questionnaires bearing on employee loyalty and he received a rather pointed reply from Mr. John C. Baker, chief of the Midwest Information Service of the Department's Agricultural and Marketing Service.

In discussing his possible guilt by association, Mr. Baker reported to Mr. Cassity that—

Then there was another guy who sometimes invited his brother to ride in our car pool during the early months of the war; it crowded us, but we didn't object because he was an Army man and knew so many tricks of espionage. The one guy left Washington and now is connected with some college in Pennsylvania. I wonder what ever became of Milton's brother Ike.

Mr. President, it has also come to my attention that this same John Baker has recently been congratulated by Secretary Benson for his good public-relations work. Among the items for which he has been sent special commendation are his suggestion that President Eisenhower cut the cake celebrating the anniversary of the school-lunch program and for his special public-relations suggestions that were used in connection with one of Secretary Benson's recent appearances in Milwaukee.

It is no wonder, then, that Secretary Benson is reported in yesterday morning's—June 28, 1956—Washington Post and Times Herald to have told his news conference yesterday that his Security Chief, Mr. Cassity, is only "good, generally speaking." But the Secretary's press conference again displayed the lack of coordination within the Department to which we now have become accustomed. Under Secretary of Agriculture True D. Morse had previously announced that Mr. Baker's answers to Mr. Cassity's questionnaire were "satisfactory" and that the case "has been closed." But Secretary Benson told the newsmen yesterday that he did not know who "closed the case" and that it had never been presented to him.

I have expressed the hope on prior occasions, Mr. President, that the responsible officials and the Secretary of Agriculture study their own operations carefully enough so that the left hand knows what the right hand is doing. I express this hope again today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the New York Times and also one from the Washington Post and Times Herald be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 17, 1956]

LADEJINSKY ACCUSER LAUNCHES NEW CASE

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, June 16.—The Department of Agriculture security officer who precipitated the dismissal of Wolf Ladejinsky in 1954 has opened a new case that, officials fear, may cause further commotion within the administration.

The officer, J. Glen Cassity, has drawn the fire of a Department employee to whom he sent questionnaires bearing on the employee's loyalty. The employee, a friend of many past and present high officials of the Department, has denounced Mr. Cassity's methods in a satirical letter that has been circulating privately among a large audience in Washington.

The employee is John C. Baker, Chief of the Midwest Information Service of the Department's Agricultural and Marketing Service. Mr. Baker, a 47-year-old World War II veteran, joined the Department in 1938. He once shared in a Washington car pool with Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, president of Pennsylvania State University and brother of President Eisenhower, a fact which is brought into the letter. Dr. Eisenhower then was with the Department.

It was understood that Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, who backed the security officer in the Ladejinsky case, was unaware of the matter. But the new case has come to the attention of the Department's Loyalty Review Committee that was set up to resolve conflicts in security cases after the Ladejinsky affair caused President Eisenhower to direct an overhaul of the administration's security review procedure.

LADEJINSKY ACCUSED

Mr. Ladejinsky, an expert on land reform, was the American agricultural attaché in Tokyo in 1954 when Mr. Cassity brought security charges against him. Secretary Benson dismissed Mr. Ladejinsky, but later apologized and expunged the security risk charge from Mr. Ladejinsky's record.

In his 2½ page "Dear Glen" letter to Mr. Cassity, whom he has never met, Mr. Baker said in part:

"You're a regular ol' hound dog when you hit the trail of an enemy of democracy, aren't you? And here I've been thinking all along that I was fooling everybody. But not Cassity. Nosirreee. Well, since I've been found out, I might as well tell all.

"When I lived in Washington I did most of my traveling in a car pool. You simply have no idea how the national security is plotted against in a car pool. One of the fellows I used to conspire with is still continuing the good work in Agriculture: Director of Information. Another moved from the USDA underground into the open; he's information director for the Atomic Energy Commission, in charge of leaking secrets to the enemy.

"Then there was another guy who sometimes invited his brother to ride in our car pool during the early months of the war; it crowded us, but we didn't object because he was an Army man and knew so many tricks of espionage. The one guy left Washington and now is connected with some college in Pennsylvania. I wonder whatever became of Milton's brother, Ike.

"Civilian life is all right for an agent provocateur, but the real place to ply your trade is in the military during a war. You see, I was getting toward the upper age limit, had a couple of kids and a draft-exempt job in a war agency; but I found my enemy contacts weren't as close as they might be. So wormed my way into the Marine Corps. That was livin'. And did I fool those generals. They made me custodian of operations plans and other top-secret documents at a Marine headquarters in the Pacific. What a spot for a skilled operator."

QUESTION DEALT WITH

Mr. Baker's letter then dealt with the first question in an interrogatory Mr. Cassity sent him. The question concerned a report that Mr. Baker, in connection with clearance for a sensitive Government position in 1948, had deplored the fact that the Government was conducting a "witch hunt."

Mr. Baker's sworn answer of May 26 stated that he was employed outside the Federal Government from July 1946 to January 1950; therefore I have no recollection of having made such a statement in connection with any investigation.

Mr. Baker's letter said:

"Seems strange I don't remember two words 'witch hunt' that I'm supposed to have used in 1948. But you don't give me any hint as to where, when, to whom, or about what. Gotta sharpen up, boy. National security, you know.

"Honestly, Glen, don't you feel kinda foolish standing there in broad daylight, holding two little words? Trying to fashion them into a noose?"

In his letter, Mr. Baker said that if some parts of his letter "seem frivolous, let me explain it's a device—a device I'm using to try to keep from getting awfully mad.

"But has anybody questioned your loyalty?" He went on, "Ever asked you to tell what you meant by something you may or may not have said 8 years earlier—as a means of determining whether or not your employment is clearly consistent with the interests of national security? It's an experience that

you, more than anybody I know of, really ought to go through."

In answering the "interrogatory," Mr. Baker gave a "no" to 10 questions regarding membership in subversive organizations.

In a letter accompanying the "interrogatory," Mr. Cassity wrote Mr. Baker that "your answer to the questions in the interrogatory will be considered and a determination made in your case under the Government employment security program."

Since the first "interrogatory" Mr. Baker has received another questionnaire about a speech he made in 1942 or 1943.

In Chicago, Mr. Baker said he had "no comment" on his communications with Mr. Cassity.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 28, 1956]

BENSON DENIES OUSTING AIDE

Agriculture Secretary Ezra T. Benson said yesterday he merely suggested to R. B. McLeaish that he consider resigning as head of the Farmers' Home Administration after congressional testimony that he drank on the job.

But Benson said he did not force McLeaish out. He told a news conference McLeaish made the decision.

McLeaish, who resigned last week, said he got the idea from Benson.

Benson also defended the actions of his security chief, J. Glen Cassity, as good, generally speaking. He added, "I have given no thought to replacing him."

Benson referred specifically to Cassity's handling of the security questioning of John C. Baker, information chief of the Department's marketing service in Chicago.

Baker's case came up when he wrote a sharp letter to Cassity indicated that the security chief had questioned Baker's loyalty. Baker is a longtime Government employee and a Marine Corps veteran of World War II.

Under Secretary of Agriculture True D. Morse, said later that Baker's answers to Cassity's questions were satisfactory and that the case has been closed.

Benson said he did not know who closed the case and that it had never been presented to him.

Benson also discussed these subjects:

Soil bank—it is making very good progress. About 12,000 to 15,000 farmers in Iowa alone had signed up by Monday. Reports show many also were signing up in Kansas, Texas, and Illinois.

Agricultural Advisory Commission.—He said the Commission reported crops are looking reasonably good; that farmers liked the veto of the first farm bill calling for a return to high price supports; and approved the relaxed soil-bank restrictions on grazing.

GEN. LAURIS NORSTAD

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, when General Gruenther's resignation as NATO's Supreme Commander was announced last April Minnesotans had a particular interest in his successor. Gen. Lauris Norstad is a native Minnesotan who has been variously described by his associates as "the boy wonder of the military services," "a precision instrument," and "a philosopher in uniform." General Gruenther himself has said of General Norstad that he "has one of the keenest strategic minds in the world today." Those of us who are concerned about the future of NATO are particularly reassured to have General Norstad in command.

Mr. President, in the New York Times for June 27, 1956, Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, writing from France, devoted a full-length column to General Norstad. It is an excellent description of the man and his outlook on his new responsibility. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Sulzberger's column be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—THE GENERALS: V—WEAPONS AND WILL POWER

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

ROCQUENCOURT, FRANCE, June 26.—The next commander of NATO's armed forces, General Norstad, never planned a military career. Like his predecessor, Gruenther, he thought seriously of civilian life. Gruenther almost resigned his commission to enter Harvard Business School. Norstad wanted to be a lawyer.

His father, a clergyman in the town of Red Wing, Minn., made a hobby of the law, taking correspondence courses. The General grew up in a legal atmosphere and spent his spare time around the county court. Even after entering West Point he planned to study for the bar following minimum Army service. However, after preparing for the cavalry, he was persuaded by his roommates to take flight training and became a pilot.

NORSTAD AT LEISURE

Out of SHAPE headquarters and in mufti Norstad looks and behaves like a cultivated middle western attorney. Among books he has recently read are Carl Sandburg's biography of Lincoln and Dean Acheson's A Democrat Looks at His Party. When he is not tinkering with the high-fidelity player which he wired himself, or oiling fishing rods and sorting out flies, his favored way of spending an evening is to put up his feet and read or listen to records—Beethoven, Tchaikovsky, or early New Orleans and Chicago jazz. Unlike Gruenther he doesn't play bridge and considers cards a waste of time.

This is the quiet background of innumerable American civilians. Norstad regards the purpose of NATO as the defense of such a quiet life for the peoples of the Western World. And, both in conception and organization, he considers the alliance a novel organization.

THE GUIDING PRINCIPLE

"There is," he says, "no precedent for a coalition of this size and scope. It has one unique characteristic: it is based upon the principle of moral equality among all members. According to this principle the smallest ally has as much voice as the biggest. It is a great tribute to the United States that this is true. As long as we can maintain moral equality among all members we have a real future."

Norstad recognizes that the durability of any democratic alliance depends upon the desires of civilian populations as expressed through their governments. NATO's strength derives only from this, he says. "The members of the coalition must have a firm political policy from which to derive military policy. Any alert or protective action must be based on this. The Allied Governments must decide what is to be the lowest common denominator for determining military reactions. For example, if there is a hostile maneuver on the frontier of one of our members, like Turkey, what would the NATO Council's reaction be?"

COMMUNALITY OF EFFORT

Norstad is acutely aware that NATO's efficacy rests ultimately upon the willingness of western populations to pay for their police force. The sum total of protection is based upon a communality of effort. Therefore, the general warns: "Any action by one country toward cutting down or eliminating anything from its defensive contribution has an immediate reaction on other alliance members. This is directly proportional to the size of the ally taking such action. Thus, if the United States reduces its effort or ceases to provide defenses at the same level, there would be a bad effect everywhere."

Obviously the degree of resolution tends to vary among nations. Europe is no longer so frightened about imminent possibility of war as it was 5 years ago. The political background from which allied military planning derives is anything but static. Thus, as Norstad prepares to take over NATO's command, he is faced with a shifting situation. It is no longer certain he can rely for long upon bases in Iceland or Morocco. France has denuded its NATO divisions of infantry in order to fight in Algeria. Promised West German divisions have yet to materialize.

THE DANGER POINT

These factors, Norstad admits, are directly reflected in strategy. He adds: "As policies change, the military concept changes. That in turn means the type of forces alters. Nevertheless, as technical developments come about and new improvements are invented, the alliance is permitted to accomplish planning aims with fewer forces. Of course this affects what you do and how you do it. But it does not shift your purpose—the protection of all the territory and peoples in the Western alliance."

Obviously, however, a point could be reached when the military protection afforded by NATO would lose its real meaning. This would arrive if and when the democratic populations lost interest in their own defense. No material weapon can be imagined that can preserve a way of life unwilling to preserve itself. This truism is likely to present Norstad with his greatest single problem as Supreme Allied Commander. He is the first to recognize that military barriers, above all in democracies, depend upon civilian resolve. No armament can substitute for willpower.

RETIREMENT OF MAJ. GEN. CLAUDE H. CHORPENING, CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, today marks the retirement from the Army of a great South Dakotan. I refer to Maj. Gen. Claude H. Chorpening, of Trent, S. Dak., who retired today after 40 years of service in the Army engineers. A 13-gun salute was fired for General Chorpening at Fort Belvoir, Va.

The Daily Argus, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., carries an interesting résumé of General Chorpening's military service and military record. I am particularly impressed by one statement he made at the time of his retirement. He had gone to West Point as an appointee from a small town in South Dakota and worked his way up to the point where he has retired as one of the highest ranking generals South Dakota has ever provided for the military service.

General Chorpening said:

I think my own case is positive proof that the Army is completely democratic and that if a man works hard he can advance to high rank.

Mr. President, I believe that should provide encouragement to hundreds of thousands of young men in the service who may be looking forward to a military career.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRENT MAN TO END LONG ARMY SERVICE

WASHINGTON, June 26.—A 13-gun salute will be fired at Fort Belvoir, Va., Friday, in honor of Maj. Gen. Claude H. Chorpening, of Trent, S. Dak., retiring after 40 years in the Army engineers. He is 58.

One of the highest ranking officers ever to come out of South Dakota, Chorpening has served throughout the world, in war and in peace. He held high command posts in World War II in the European theater and later in the Pacific. And in 1951–54 he was the second ranking officer in the corps, in charge of the engineers' civil works projects, including the building of the big Missouri River dams.

"At retirement time," he said in an interview, "one is both glad and sad. After spending 40 years in service, one can't leave without a little tearing of the heartstrings. However, the prospect of a new career, a civilian career, is interesting, too."

Chorpening, with his wife and 7-year-old daughter, Mary Ann, plans to visit his sister, Mrs. J. C. Sorenson, at Trent, in mid-July. They will go on to Mrs. Chorpening's home at Choteau, Mont.

"I want a good rest, an opportunity to get my batteries recharged," he said. "Then we'll probably return to the Washington area."

His plans are not definite yet but he expects to enter civilian work in the engineering field.

Chorpening says he believes he was "the greenest boy" ever to enter the United States Military Academy at West Point. He had never seen a regular Army soldier and had had only 10½ years of schooling. He was graduated from West Point in 1918.

"I think my own case is positive proof that the Army is completely democratic and that if a man works hard he can advance to high rank," he commented.

In the middle 1930's, Chorpening was assistant to the district engineer constructing Fort Peck Dam in Montana. Early in World War II he was assigned to the Office of the Chief of Engineers here. In 1943, he went to the European theater where he filled numerous posts before being transferred 2 years later to the Pacific He was assistant chief of staff for operations at Camp Zama, Japan.

In 1949 he became Assistant Chief of Engineers for Personnel and Administration here and in 1951 was selected to head the civil-works program.

This brought him in close relationship with Congress as he testified before committees on projects planned or being built by the engineers.

"I enjoyed my dealings with Members of Congress and made many good friends," he said. "Basically, Congressmen want the facts. Just tell them the whole truth and if you're in left field tell them so and you'll get along fine."

Chorpening was born in Waterloo, Iowa, but when he was 3 years old, his parents were among a group which rode a special train into South Dakota in 1900. The family settled on a farm near Trent. This farm has remained in the family. That is where Mrs. Sorenson lives now.

The general has maintained a legal residence in South Dakota and voted there.

The general holds the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal, the Order of the British Empire, and the Order of Taeguk, and the Ulchi Medal of the Republic of Korea.

His last assignment, since 1954, was with the Korean Army.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I feel that a few words are in order on the history and purpose of the eight brief speeches on foreign policy which I have been delivering on the Senate floor.

For many years past it has seemed clear to me that all relations between men are governed by the moral law. If that law is obeyed, successful and constructive cooperation results. If the law is disobeyed, the result is conflict and confusion.

It is furthermore my conviction that the law is effective between groups and associations of people as well as between individuals. It controls the results of social, business, and political relations. It is the determining factor in the relations of nations with each other.

This conviction was examined and set forth in my recently published book, Letter to a Generation. Since it is my belief that the moral law governs much of our legislative responsibility, it was incumbent upon me to bring the subject to the attention of my fellow Senators. The distribution of the book was made in the hope of setting forth, even through a glass darkly, the eternal principles which underlie our work.

These eight brief talks go a step further. They are intended to illustrate the application of the moral law to the pertinent items in a series of problems in the field of international relations. Until and unless further light comes to me these conclusions must govern my voice and vote in the next Congress, no matter how high the administrative authority may be which seeks to persuade us to other conclusions.

Such a statement of purpose has the appearance of self-righteousness. This is in appearance only, if the moral law is rightly interpreted, for all—angels, principalities and powers—are subject to it. The statement then loses its self-righteous aspect and becomes a very practical matter, for the law tells us what will work and what will fail.

This subject must be approached by us in humility rather than in self-righteousness. Our God-given intelligence will be taxed. Some of our undertakings have little moral content. They are purely mechanical or organizational. Other pieces of legislation have a smaller or larger moral content which we are bound to take into account. The great policies have almost completely a moral content. They can work successfully only if grounded in the moral law.

If these principles can be brought clearly into the focus of our legislative vision, the purposes of the book and of these brief talks will have been accomplished.

VI. THE ENSLAVED NATIONS

There are behind the Iron Curtain 14 millions of square miles of territory and 90 millions of people who a generation ago lived in freedom. Now they are enslaved. They can express and act upon no will of their own, except as that will may chance to coincide with that of their masters, the Soviet rulers. As individuals they have been subjected to arbitrary arrest in the middle of the night, without trial or explanation. As people they have been subject to mass deportation, to serve the economic plans of their masters. That this condition should exist so flagrantly and on so large a scale is against the national self-interest of the United States.

Let me again define that self-interest. It lies in so directing our words and our acts that we may assist in organizing a world in which freedom, justice, and peace prevail. This is the kind of a world we would bequeath to our children and grandchildren. This is the basic statement of our national interest and everything else is subsidiary.

Such a purpose as this is contravened by the continued existence of the nations enslaved behind the curtain.

This curtain is a most significant thing. It is important in two ways. It gives evidence that there is something to conceal, within or without. What is within? It can be used to conceal military preparations which are not in accordance with protestations and possible agreements relating to disarmament. This would be an untenable use of the curtain for a government seeking disarmament.

More likely, also, free communication would both reveal social and economic weakness within, and likewise reveal to those within the better life that is lived without. In any case the curtain is a sign and a symbol of an inner weakness in the Soviet empire. No modern government resting on firm foundations would find it necessary to guard its people from knowledge of and contacts with the outside world.

These considerations give the clue to our best service to the enslaved people. By every means of communication we must continually assure them of our concern for them. Without inciting them to a hopeless uprising, we should maintain their hope and courage.

Such passive resistance as may recommend itself to their own judgment is very much in order. The Soviet Government must never be allowed to feel at ease with regard to its unwilling satellites and we must play our part in sustaining uneasiness.

Above all, we must never be persuaded to abandon the means of communication, whether by radio, balloons, or what have you. We must not agree to disarm ourselves psychologically and spiritually. Specious arguments for thus disarming ourselves have been made and will be made ever more strongly. Let us not listen to them. We are engaged in a psychological and spiritual war for the benefit of all people, within or without the curtain. It would be folly to disarm ourselves of these weapons.

Lincoln told us that our Nation could not exist half slave and half free. Can we expect the world to exist as a fit place for our children if it is half slave and half free?

Our next step is to consider all the means of psychological and spiritual offensive against this new colonialism, this new slavery. The possibilities of such an offensive will be the subject of the next talk in this series.

VII. ENCIRCLEMENT AND PENETRATION

Mr. President, in the preceding talks of this series, there have been discussed most of the elements of our opposition to the conquest of the world by the evil forces of Soviet communism. It is now in order to combine those elements into considered and enduring policy.

One of the elements of that policy is military strength. This must be more than a background strength. It must be a force in being, particularly in the air arm, for any major attack must be expected from the air. We must strengthen our defenses and likewise our power of retaliatory offense. In view of all the past history of the aggressive force with which we are faced, in view of the representations made in Asia by the Soviet leaders at the very moment of the much advertised New Look, we can place no trust in the moral effect on them of exemplary disarmament, or any relaxation in vigilance on our part. We are in this thing in deadly earnest.

Along with this determination must go a willingness and deep desire to achieve a peaceful world of disarmed nations. This objective will be discussed in the last talk of this series. Let it here be said that this will not be reached by weakness. Only through armament lies the road to disarmament.

However necessary powerful armament may be, its uses are limited to defense, and particularly to the gaining of time in which more constructive policies may be applied. Again we return to the wise dictum of our great strategist, Admiral Mahan, repeated from the first of these talks, "The purpose of military power is to provide time for moral ideas to take root." What are the moral ideas?

There is a moral law in the universe which governs all the relations of men with men, whether as individuals, or as groups organized in societies, business, governments, or nations. The moral law has existed since men were men. It has set forth from the beginning of human history the terms on which men may work together constructively in any human effort. It is as valid in human relations as are the physical laws in the realm of matter and energy.

We may learn the strength of the moral law by the bumbling process of trial and error, or by the more effective method of applying intelligent analysis to experience. But there is a third and more direct way. Its terms have been directly apprehended by prophets and seers since the beginning of history. We do well to sit at their feet. For Christians the revelation comes from the Divine Source itself, and is most clearly stated in the Golden Rule from the Sermon on the Mount and in the answer to the young lawyer in the 23d chapter of Matthew.

These are not counsels of perfection; they are not moral ideals. They are the facts of life. Let us put them to the test.

The aspect of the Soviet system as seen from without is that of well-nigh irresistible power. That power is illusory, for the impressive facade is based upon and conceals moral weakness. There is no place in the Soviet system for the recognition of men as brothers. There is no recognition of the worth, or even the existence, of the human soul. In broad terms the government does not exist for its citizens. Men exist for the benefit of the state and its current rulers, whoever they may chance to be. Thus men are depressed to the level of materials to be processed or, at best, of tools to be used. The net result is a new and more vicious colonialism. It is the institution of a more radical slavery, which denies the soul, enchains the mind, and directs all human effort toward the achievement of a global empire.

Yet this vast enterprise, based as it is on a denial of the moral law, is therefore weak in its foundations and rotten at the heart. If we understand this, we possess the key to its arrest and eventual reconstruction. The means available to us are moral encirclement and moral penetration.

Military encirclement has little value against a central power which, on short lines, can threaten spots on a vast circumference, where for us distances are great and transportation difficult. Furthermore, around this vast periphery, the present Soviet advances are not now being made by any immediate use of military power. Their weapons are the more subtle ones of economic and psychological penetration. Against these we can prevail through a wise and discriminating use of economic strength, as already suggested, and through a wise moral encirclement, as distinguished from a difficult military one.

By moral encirclement we mean a worldwide, geographically continuous group of nations devoted to the wellbeing of people, considerate of the worth and dignity of the human soul, and joined in the common endeavor to achieve justice, peace and freedom.

While moral encirclement is a major move in the strategy of waging peace, it is by definition not a harmful or hostile move. While it exerts pressure, the pressure is not physical but spiritual. Finally the applying of moral pressure is not a moral drain on the nation that applies it. It builds up; it does not weaken or destroy.

If the encircling ring is to hold, its component nations must seek peace in terms of freedom and justice. Their governments ultimately must be devoted to the wellbeing of peoples rather than to the accumulation of power. Finally, these nations must respect one another and learn to work together.

It is the part of the United States to refine its relationships with cooperating nations. We must be miserly with words of propaganda. Within our means we must be generous with helpful action. Our assistance is not to be given as a bribe for agreement with our plans or withheld as a punishment for noncompliance. We wish all peoples to rise to better living conditions. We will work with them to this end—without domination, without compulsion, without self-righteousness.

The first requirement of such a program is that we ourselves shall obey the moral law in all our relations with other nations, and particularly with those engaged with us in the moral encirclement. This is a determining responsibility laid upon the Congress and the administration of this country. It rests particularly upon the Senate of the United States, in all of its deliberations relating to foreign policy. There is a particular importance in making our services of information more effective.

An excellent example of an unsuccessful attack on moral encirclement is offered by the recent visit of Bulganin and Khrushchev to England. Here the moral defenses are strong. The invaders made no breach in them, even at the point which had seemed weakest—the organization of the Labor Party. When the attack was made, the defenses were found impregnable. The experiences of the Soviet leaders in England and India present an instructive contrast and a hopeful lesson. It shows the difference between strong and weak or absent moral bulwarks. Burma, as we have seen, presents another example. Being without moral defenses, that country has yielded to invasion. But now, we hope not too late, Premeur U Nu has recognized the danger and seeks to construct the needed defense.

Moral encirclement is defensive. It opposes a moral wall against the inherently weak forces of Soviet propaganda. We need also an offensive force. This we have in moral penetration.

It is a commonplace concept in the minds of American youth that our country has no designs on the territory and resources of the Russian people. We raise no questions as to this. We have no reservations whatsoever. It would be unutterably silly for us to look with covetousness at that remote, enormous stretch of the earth's territory, so unnecessary to our physical well-being. We can have for the people of Russia nothing but good will, however we may be opposed to the purposes of their Government.

That the people of Russia do not believe this is the tragedy of our times. Day and night, year in and year out, these people are told that we are their enemies, that we are planning to invade them, that they must arm themselves against us.

The Soviet rulers have sought to assure the reign of falsehood in their empire by erecting the Iron Curtain to keep out truth. Communist China has followed suit with its Bamboo Curtain. These curtains are necessary if communism is to survive in Russia or China. Piercing them with the truth is a major means of waging peace.

This necessary undertaking is not simple. It can be accomplished for the present only fragmentarily and as occasion arises. But we must never falter in this purpose.

The need for such communications is great. I have already dwelt on their application to the enslaved peoples of the satellites. They must be directed to the Russian people as well. These communications must be friendly and per- the satellites. They must be directed to persuasively to the Soviet rulers themselves, for a radical change in their policy which redirects their efforts toward advancing the well-being of their own people might well be in their own long-range self-interest.

It has been my high privilege from time to time to address the people—and rulers—of Russia along these lines. A talk on Thanksgiving Day 1954, is to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 12, page 16184. Again at the Interparliamentary Union Conference in Helsinki in August of last year, I addressed the Soviet delegation. This is to be found on page A2162 of this year's daily RECORD. My most recent broadcast was on the occasion of the Russian Easter which occurred on May 5 of this year. I have the script of this talk with me and ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

Such a program as this, vigorously pursued, will have good results. We do know that radio messages get through. The secret evidence of this cannot be denied. Jamming of the radio frequencies goes on hour after hour, but frequent changes of our wavelength, the freakish behavior of the ionic overcast, and other incidents and accidents give entrance to the Voice of America. We know that it is eagerly listened to.

There is no intent in this to stir up revolution in Russia. That would be fatal. The men of Moscow know how to handle armed resistance. But the gradual growth among their subjects of the suspicion that they are being deceived will be difficult for the leaders to control.

Various friends have objected to a vigorous moral campaign. Some call it a "holy war" and therefore mad policy. Of course it is in a sense a "holy war" but it is of a new kind. It harms no one and it is waged in support of human well-being on both sides of the battle line. In such a "holy war" we may be proud to engage.

Another objection is that this puts us in the objectionable role of the self-righteous. This would be true if our morality were a robe to be put on and taken off. The morality of which we are talking is a recognition of the facts of life. We are no more pharisaical than the engineer is intellectually snobbish, when he follows physical law in devising mechanisms for meeting the needs of mankind.

I believe that all Senators have received copies of my recent book, Letter To a Generation. Those who have had the time and inclination to read into it have found that the basic ideas of these talks have there been more fully discussed.

The last talk of this series will be entitled "The Necessity and Practicability of Disarmament."

VIII. THE NECESSITY AND PRACTICABILITY OF DISARMAMENT

Disarmament has been a dream of the idealist for many years. That men should kill each other by governmental authority and command has seemed outrageous—as it is. Yet when the opposed purposes of sovereign nations find no solution in diplomacy, then the resort to arms is the final arbiter if there is a national determination to bring matters to a conclusion.

Two generations ago a World Court was devised as a substitute for the field of battle. This has proved useful in minor matters, but the major disputes are not referred to it and it has no means of enforcing its decisions.

The First World War raised the curtain on the horrors of modern conflict. It introduced the airplane and the tank and made large use of poison gas. This disturbing view of the future led to valueless treaties for outlawing war and to the first practical attempt to limit armaments. The Naval Treaty of 1922 between England, Japan, France, Italy, and the United States resulted in our sinking of a substantial part of our Navy, the arrest of further shipbuilding abroad, but in the ultimate circumvention of the treaty terms, particularly by Japan.

The multiplied atrocities of World War II, and particularly our unveiling of the atom bomb, made more clearly evident the necessity for the control of warfare. Collective security in the United Nations seemed to be the best solution.

Then we devised the hydrogen bomb; the Soviet Government followed suit, and it became evident that there is no collective security in the face of nations or individual rulers reckless enough to set fire to a fuse which sparks the destruction of our civilization. That destruction has become a practical possibility. Disarmament becomes a necessity. But is it a hopeless necessity?

The answer is "No."

Let it first be recognized that disarmament as the specific goal is not enough. There could conceivably be a disarmed world (disarmed as measured by modern standards) in which freedom, justice, and peace do not prevail. There are then needed additional terms for a really effective disarmament.

One requirement is the opening of the boundaries of the nations, including our own, to effective inspection of progress in carrying out the terms of any disarmament agreement.

There is likewise required the establishment of that minimum of supranational government which will adjudicate international disputes and police its decisions. It will have no authority to go into domestic questions such as tariffs and immigration. Those are matters for the people of each nation to decide.

This is not the time or place to go into the other terms of an effective disarmament agreement, except to say that it must be universal, complete, and controlled. This is the time and place to consider how such an agreement can be arrived at. The two great obstacles to such an agreement are the people of the United States and the rulers of the Soviet Government. With willingness and determination evident in these two quarters, the world will follow gladly. Let us first consider our own problem.

Two means of persuading ourselves are obvious. They are terror and taxes.

It is well that our people should be terrified at the prospect of destruction by the hydrogen bomb in irresponsible hands. The destruction of our civilization is more than a possibility. It is perilously near to a probability if the present trend of history runs its course.

Terror is as yet not really effective. If it were, we would be more in earnest about the diffusion of people and industries, even though only a portion can be safeguarded by this policy. If it were, we would all engage with determination in the exercise of civil defense, even though great masses of the population could not be saved. Terror is a realistic factor, but the human mind is so constructed that terror cannot be maintained, nor perhaps should it be. Yet it must be preserved in the back of the mind as an effective determinant of policy when policy comes up for consideration.

Taxes are another matter. If we give clear consideration to our condition, we will neither reduce taxes nor the national debt so long as the present emergency continues. We will strengthen our defenses of early warning, intercepting planes and ground-to-air missiles. We will improve and multiply our offensive of atomic-driven bombers, atomic submarine launching platforms, long-range ballistic missiles with atomic warheads and all the other means of offensive terror, military and political. This will mean taxes on taxes. We must take it and like it, for it serves to solve the next problem, that of convincing the Soviet leadership.

If we are to arrive with them at a durable, organized peace in the world there must be no letdown on our part, whatever smiles and friendly gestures they may display. Our military defenses must be as nearly impassable as it is possible to make them. We must let them know that we are prepared to use tactical atomic weapons against aggression. Our offensive measures must give them the gravest concern. The road to disarmament of necessity passes through armament.

We likewise must build and strengthen the moral encirclement. Our efforts at moral penetration must be intense and unremitting. It will be folly to give up radio broadcasts, balloons, or any other effective means of reaching the peoples behind the curtain. To give up here is to give up the search for a world in which freedom, justice, and peace prevail.

There will be subsidiary questions to be decided as we go along. For instance, can an effective agreement to cease the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile be arrived at and would such an agreement help or hinder reaching the ultimate objective? Would the settlement of the German dilemma by voluntary disarmament help or hinder? These and other questions must be solved in the light of our ultimate purposes.

That purpose is to save our civilization from impending destruction. This is not a hopeless undertaking, for a very good reason indeed. If the rulers of the Soviet once get a clear picture of their own long-range self-interest, that interest will be found identical with ours. On that basis we can work together. To the establishment of that basis we must bend our every effort.

Disarmament and the replacement of war by viable judicial and administrative processes constitute the prime ingredient in our national interest as it has been defined in these brief speeches. In the judgment of your speaker disarmament can only be reached by effort on the broad front which has been described. Here we have something which

rises above the technical discussions recently held in London.

The whole strategy is that of identifying ourselves with the world's people, military strength in being, moral encirclement, encouragement to the enslaved nations, and penetrating the curtain with messages of cooperation with the Russian people for their and our good. No one of those procedures must be sidestepped or neglected. If we pursue them with diligence, it then becomes possible and important to measure our progress on this broad front from time to time. The best means for doing this would seem to be the holding of recurrent "meetings at the summit." They should be held at least once a year to test the effect of our offense and defense.

It would seem wise to add to the governments who are represented there by their heads of state. Would not clearer understandings and better cooperation be reached if Germany, India, Canada, and Australia were invited to join the panel?

If we keep up the moral pressure and remain true to the moral law, it may well be that future conferences would reveal progress beyond anything that we now deem possible. For this we need a more powerful stimulus than terror and taxes, useful though they may be. The great stimulus will be our earnest concern with the world into which our children and grandchildren are entering. For them we will daily pray that we may attain a world in which freedom, justice, and peace prevail.

Having so prayed, we will rise to our feet and seek by all means to bring our prayer to its fulfillment.

EASTER MESSAGE BY SENATOR FLANDERS TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an Easter message which I delivered last Easter to the Russian people.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Because of the differences in our church calendars, we in America held our Easter on April 1 this year. You are holding yours now. For you and for us this celebration of the resurrection of Christ is a period of thanksgiving, of hope, and of joy. The dark winter is over. The trees put out their leaves. Plants spring anew from both the earth of Russia and America with their promise of future flower and fruit.

This is the time for us to talk together as brothers in the endeavor to end the long winter of suspicion, of hostility, which has resulted in crushing burdens on all peoples in their support of preparations for war.

First, let us explain in a few words our reasons for arming. Following World War II, which we all fought against Hitler, 10 million American soldiers returned to their families and freely engaged in gainful work on their farms and in factories and stores. In recent years also free nations turned their colonial lands over to the 500 million human beings who live in those areas. On the other hand, following World War II, your Government conquered and absorbed the Baltic States, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, East Germany, Bulgaria, and Rumania. Nearly 100 million persons who had once been free to choose their own governments became subject to your rulers.

It was necessary for us to build up a counterforce against further aggression. This we have done and this is why we are now armed. The military bases established by us in cooperation with other countries do not threaten you but protect us against a similar fate which befell the hundred million people I have just mentioned. This is why you and we devote such immense treasure in our natural resources and the work of our people to the wasteful support of armed strength. We and you want to change this foolish policy and devote our resources and work to the happiness of our people. How can we do it?

The first thing we need to do is to remove fear. You need have no fear of us. Our people have no interests which conflict with those of the people of Russia. We do not need more land. What land we have raises an abundance of grain and fiber, and of the flesh of beasts. We have great forests and rich deposits of ore. Our seas teem with fish. Everything we need we have, or can obtain by freely trading for it from our own abundance. What we do want is peace and freedom.

That we want peace with friendly people must have been apparent to your delegation of farming experts, as well as other groups, who visited the United States last year to see how our people till their soil and breed their livestock.

In short, self-interest forbids that we should seek conquests, whether political or economic. I am talking with you today, hoping for your understanding that the same self-interest of your government leaders will dissolve tensions and lead to the abandonment of armies and armament as the main support of the foreign policy of your nation.

I am speaking to the rulers of Russia as well as to you, the people. Is it not reasonable to believe that the leaders of the Soviet Government who will most strongly establish themselves in the future will be the men who make the greatest contribution to the personal well-being of the Russian people? Can there be a more stable basis for government than a successful program for providing more and better food, better clothing and housing, and better educational opportunities for the people?

Dependence on military force works against this well-being. The enormous military programs result in less and poorer food and clothing, inadequate housing, and lowered opportunities. Armies, supported in readiness for attack from without, are in the meantime opposing the happiness of the people within. Disarmament should be the great objective of the people everywhere.

It may be argued that for the Soviet Government armed forces are essential to hold in subjection the satellites I have mentioned. But if there is to be no attack from without, the ring of satellites is unnecessary. Nor are those satellites economically profitable to Russia as virtual colonies. No people, formerly free, will be productive in subjection. Slave labor is uneconomical. A free people, benefiting from their own enterprise, is infinitely more profitable as a neighbor than is the most cowed and subjugated horde of conscripts. In the theory and practice of our system of personal freedom and individual self-reliance, a continuously expanding commerce leads to growing benefits to those who buy and to those who sell. Again, in a word—the same word—your self-interest decrees the freeing of the people of the satellites of the Soviet Union.

Bountiful blessings for the peoples of the earth and for their rulers depend on the establishment of disarmament—complete, universal, and controlled—and on the acceptance of the kind and degree of governmental cooperation required to administer it. The negotiations to this end now underway will be long and difficult. They must be pursued with faith and diligence. Above all, as a practical matter, these negotiations must be continued on the basis of long-range self-interest. Otherwise they will fail.

Therefore, let this Easter of the year 1956 be the day on which the Russian and American people and the Russian and American Governments determine that they will join together to contribute to the well-being of the peoples of our two lands. Nothing must stand in the way of this. It requires mutual discussions in a new spirit. If it requires, as it will, a greater openness of communication, of travel, of mutual personal contacts, let us move towards this also.

Not merely for Russia and for America but for the world, the hope and the joy of Easter must be made manifest and effective through these ways to peace.

ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

By unanimous consent, the following additional reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

H. R. 7732. An act to amend section 402 (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with respect to the coloring of oranges (Rept. No. 2391).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. 3875. A bill to amend section 4 (a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (Rept. No. 2392); and

H. R. 11802. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, as amended, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits until July 1, 1957 (Rept. No. 2393).

By Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. 3956. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (Rept. No. 2394).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, without amendment:

S. 4146. A bill providing for a Civilian Atomic Power Acceleration Program (Rept. No. 2390).

Mr. ANDERSON subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], for himself, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and myself, introduced the bill (S. 4146) to provide for a civilian atomic power acceleration program.

I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the RECORD at this point, together with a copy of a press release issued today by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

There being no objection, the bill and press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 4146

Be it enacted, etc., That this Act may be cited as the Atomic Power Acceleration Amendment of 1956.

SEC. 2. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by redesignating chap-

ter 19 as chapter 20, and inserting a new chapter 19 reading as follows:

"CHAPTER 19. ACCELERATED ATOMIC POWER PROGRAM

"SEC. 241. Purpose and policy:

"(a) It is the purpose of the United States and of this chapter:

"(1) To encourage the continued development of atomic power technology and the advancement of the art through practical experience in the development and operation of prototype atomic powerplants;

"(2) To achieve economic atomic power as rapidly as practicable;

"(3) To advance the spirit of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and the Atoms for Peace plan.

"(b) (1) In order to carry out the purposes of this chapter, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to accelerate the civilian atomic power program and maintain leadership in atomic power technology by the construction of additional demonstration prototype reactors for domestic use and foreign applications at the maximum possible rate consistent with the status of the development of the art.

"(2) The accelerated program authorized by this chapter shall be carried out under the provisions of section 31, and shall be supplementary to other reactor development programs and projects authorized under this act, including sections 31 and 104.

"SEC. 242. In order to implement the policy established in section 241, the Commission is authorized and directed as follows:

"(a) Accelerated power reactor program:

"(1) The Commission is hereby authorized and directed to proceed with the construction under contract, as soon as practicable, of large-scale prototype power reactor demonstration facilities designed to demonstrate the practical value of utilization facilities for the generation of electric energy in industrial or commercial quantities.

"(2) The selection of design for such reactor facilities shall be made on the basis of a determination that development, construction, and operation of a facility so designed offers promise of making a contribution to the advance of the art and technology of the large-scale production of atomic power in the form of electricity in commercial or industrial quantities.

"(3) The power reactor demonstration facilities authorized by this subsection shall be constructed at sites of major production facilities operated by or on behalf of the Commission, and the electric energy generated shall be used by the Commission in connection with the operation of such production facility.

"(b) Advanced design and development program:

"(1) The Commission shall proceed with the development of reactor designs which involve, in concept and approach, significant and promising advances in reactor technology.

"(2) As soon as practicable, consistent with the development of appropriate designs, the Commission is authorized and directed to proceed with the construction under contract of prototype power reactors utilizing such advanced concepts, such reactors to be capable of producing not to exceed 50,000 kilowatts of electricity.

"(c) Foreign atomic power assistance: In order effectively to carry out the atoms for peace plan of the United States, the Commission shall have responsibility for the conduct of a vigorous program of international cooperation and assistance in the design, construction, and operation of power reactors and related matters. The planning and execution of such a program shall be undertaken as rapidly as practicable.

"(d) Supporting facilities: The Commission is authorized to construct, own, and operate supporting facilities necessary in connection with projects initiated under subsections a, b, and c of this section.

"(e) Quarterly report: The Commission shall report to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy quarterly beginning January 1, 1957, on the progress under the acceleration program."

SEC. 3. Chapter 19 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is redesignated as chapter 20 and sections 241 and 251 of this act are redesignated respectively as sections 251 and 252, making appropriate amendment to the table of contents.

SEC. 4. Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) By striking the figure "$319,595,000" in section 101 thereof and inserting the figure "$719,595,000."

(b) By adding at the end of section 101 (c) thereof a new subsection reading:

"11. Project 57–c–11, Civilian atomic power acceleration program, $400,000,000."

[From offices of Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, No. 61, June 29, 1956]

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has favorably reported out a bill designed to accelerate the civilian reactor program in this country and to encourage a vigorous program of international cooperation and assistance in the field of atomic power, it was announced today by Committee Chairman CLINTON P. ANDERSON. The motion to report out the bill was made by Senator PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, and was seconded by Representative CARL HINSHAW, Republican, of California, and was approved by a substantial majority of the Committee.

The bill calls for the construction of additional large scale demonstration prototype reactors "at the maximum possible rate consistent with the status of the development of the art." The accelerated program would be conducted under the research and development provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and would be supplementary to other reactor development programs and projects authorized under the act. The prototype reactors would be constructed at AEC production sites and the electric energy generated is to be used by the Atomic Energy Commission in connection with the operation of its production facilities.

In addition to the accelerated power reactor program, the AEC is directed to "proceed with the development of reactor designs which involve, in concept and approach, significant and promising advances in reactor technology," and "as soon as practicable" to construct small prototype power reactors utilizing such advanced concepts. Reactors constructed under both the demonstration and development program would be carried out under contract with private concerns.

In commenting on this latter provision Senator ANDERSON stated:

"This bill will broaden the base of private industrial participation in the atomic power program and will offer a great opportunity to those firms not presently participating in the program to contribute their efforts and talents."

Total funds authorized for the proposed program would be $400 million.

AGREEMENTS ENTERED INTO BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, from time to time I have reported to the Senate on the receipt of various agreements of cooperation by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which have been entered into by the United States and foreign governments for the development of atomic energy. In accordance with the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, these agreements are required to lie before the joint committee for 30 days before they can become effective.

During the last session of Congress, on behalf of the joint committee, I introduced into the record a large number of agreements for cooperation for research purposes. Today I would like to introduce into the record the research agreements which have most recently come before the joint committee. These agreements are with the Republic of Cuba, which arrived June 22; with France, which arrived June 14; with the Dominican Republic, which arrived June 15; with New Zealand, which arrived June 15; with Austria, which arrived June 12; with Costa Rica, which arrived May 22. These agreements are basically identical with the research agreements last year, except that they provide for a small additional amount of special nuclear material for research purposes, and they provide for a clause holding the United States harmless in the construction and operation of the research reactors abroad. I should also point out that the French agreement contemplates the transfer of more special nuclear material under the research agreement than was the case with respect to the agreements last year. Where those agreements contemplated the transfer of 6 kilograms, the French transfer contemplates 40 kilograms of Uranium-235, enriched to 20 percent. It also permits there to be 6 kilograms of Uranium-235 having a 90-percent enrichment.

Last year the Commission entered into the agreements with Great Britain, Canada, and Belgium. These were the first major agreements for cooperation and were signed with our wartime partners. On June 15 an amendment to the British agreement arrived before the joint committee. This amendment would increase the amounts of special nuclear material transferable under the agreement for industrial purposes; would permit the disclosure of restricted data relating to the propulsion of submarines, ships, and aircraft, and also adds a hold harmless clause. On June 26, a similar amendment to the Canadian agreement arrived before the joint committee.

On June 18 the first of a series of power bilaterals arrived before the joint committee. This agreement is with Australia. It provides for the transfer of restricted data dealing with power bilaterals for the transfer of up to 500 kilograms of U–235, with a small portion of that available as U–235, enriched up to 90 percent, for a test reactor, and for the cooperation in the production of uranium ores and concentrates. Similar power agreements with Switzerland and the Netherlands arrived on June 20.

I request unanimous consent to have copies of all of these agreements printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the agreements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 22, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. An executed agreement for cooperation with the Government of the Republic of Cuba;

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the agreement;

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approving the agreement authorizing its execution and containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

This agreement, as executed, makes cooperation possible between the United States and the Republic of Cuba on the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of the radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. The Republic of Cuba, if it desired to do so, would be able to engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industries in the United States will be permitted, within the limits of the agreement, to render other assistance to the Republic of Cuba. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement. The Atomic Energy Commission, however, would lease to Cuba up to 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Cuba or while fuel elements are in transit. This expressed limitation will restrict the Republic of Cuba in determining the choice of reactor to be constructed to a research reactor.

You will also note that the agreement includes in article V provisions for the sale or transfer of research quantities of materials of interest in connection with defined research projects, which I described to you in my letter of March 30, 1956. The amount of special nuclear material which would be made available to the Republic of Cuba under this agreement would not be important from the military point of view.

Article VIII of the proposed agreement records the obligations undertaken by the Republic of Cuba to safeguard the special nuclear material to be leased by the Commission and article IX contains the guaranties prescribed by section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act.

This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two Governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Cuba.

Sincerely yours,

W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 22, 1956.

Dr. W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. LIBBY: Under date of June 21, you informed me that the Atomic Energy Commission had recommended that I approve a proposed agreement between the Government of the Republic of Cuba and the Government of the United States for cooperation concerning the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The agreement recites that the Government of the Republic of Cuba desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States and United States industry with respect to this program.

I have examined the recommended agreement. It calls for cooperation between the two Governments with respect to the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors as research, development and engineering tools and in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. The agreement contains all of the guaranties prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act. No restricted data would be communicated under the agreement, but the Commission would lease to the Government of the Republic of Cuba special nuclear material for use as reactor fuel. In addition, the Commission would be permitted to sell or otherwise transfer limited quantities of such material, including U–235, U–233 and plutonium, for use in defined research projects related to the peaceful application of atomic energy.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby—

1. Approve the proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of Cuba enclosed with your letter of June 21.

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

It is my hope that this agreement represents but the first stage of cooperation in the field of atomic energy between the United States and Cuba, and that it will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to other peaceful uses of atomic energy in Cuba.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the Republic of Cuba and the Government of the United States of American," and authorize its execution.

This agreement has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and is, in the opinion of the Commission, an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Cuba in accordance with the policy which you have established. The agreement would permit cooperation between the two countries with respect to the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. Cuba, if it desires to do so, may engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industry in the United States will be able, under the agreement, to render other assistance to Cuba. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement, and the Government of the Republic of Cuba has signified its agreement to the guaranties prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 which are a part of this agreement.

Further provisions permit the Atomic Energy Commission to lease to Cuba up to 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235. You will note that article V of this agreement would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials, including U–235, U–233, and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Cuba.

Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the agreement will be formally executed by the appropriate authorities of Cuba and the United States and then placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Respectfully,

W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CUBA CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Whereas the peaceful uses of atomic energy hold great promise for all mankind; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Cuba desire to cooperate with each other in the development of such peaceful uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas the design and development of several types of research reactors are well advanced; and

Whereas research reactors are useful in the production of research quantities of radioisotopes, in medical therapy and in numerous other research activities and at the same time are a means of affording valuable training and experience in nuclear science and engineering useful in the development of other peaceful uses of atomic energy including civilian nuclear power; and

Whereas the Government of the Republic of Cuba desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy, for which purpose, by decree No. 177 of June 22, 1955, it has created the Nuclear Energy Commission of Cuba, and further desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States of America and United States industry in connection with this program; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America, acting through the United States Atomic Energy Commission, desires to assist the Government of the Republic of Cuba in such a program;

The parties agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

For the purposes of this agreement:

(a) "Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission or its duly authorized representatives.

(b) "Equipment and devices" means any instrument or apparatus and includes research reactors, as defined herein, and their component parts.

(c) "Research reactor" means a reactor which is designed for the production of neutrons and other radiations for general research and development purposes, medical therapy, or training in nuclear science and engineering. The term does not cover power reactors, power demonstration reactors, or

reactors designed primarily for the production of special nuclear materials.

(d) The term "restricted data," "atomic weapon," and "special nuclear material" are used in this agreement as defined in the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

ARTICLE II

Restricted data shall not be communicated under this agreement, and no materials or equipment and devices shall be transferred and no services shall be furnished under this agreement to the Government of the Republic of Cuba or authorized persons under its jurisdiction if the transfer of any such materials or equipment and devices or the furnishing of any such services involves the communication of Restricted Data.

ARTICLE III

1. Subject to the provisions of article II, the parties hereto will exchange information in the following fields:

(a) Design, construction, and operation of research reactors and their use as research, development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy.

(b) Health and safety problems related to the operation and use of research reactors.

(c) The use of radioactive isotopes in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry.

2. The application or use of any information or data of any kind whatsoever, including design drawings and specifications, exchanged under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party which receives and uses such information or data, and it is understood that the other cooperating party does not warrant the accuracy, completeness, or suitability of such information or data for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE IV

1. The Commission will lease to the Government of the Republic of Cuba uranium enriched in the isotope U–235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of research reactors which the Government of the Republic of Cuba, in consultation with the Commission, decides to construct and as required in agreed experiments related thereto. Also, the Commission will lease to the Government of the Republic of Cuba uranium enriched in the isotope U–235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of such research reactors as the Government of the Republic of Cuba may, in consultation with the Commission, decide to authorize private individuals or private organizations under its jurisdiction to construct and operate, provided the Government of the Republic of Cuba shall at all times maintain sufficient control of the material and the operation of the reactor to enable the Government of the Republic of Cuba to comply with the provisions of this agreement and the applicable provisions of the lease arrangement.

2. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 transferred by the Commission under this article and in the custody of the Government of the Republic of Cuba shall not at any time be in excess of 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in the Republic of Cuba or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the 6 kilograms of said material.

3. When any fuel elements containing U–235 leased by the Commission require replacement they shall be returned to the Commission, and, except as may be agreed, the form and content of the irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission.

4. The lease of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 under this article shall be at such charges and on such terms and conditions with respect to shipment and delivery as may be mutually agreed and under the conditions stated in articles VIII and IX.

ARTICLE V

Materials in connection with defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy undertaken by the Republic of Cuba, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct materials, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes, will be sold or otherwise transferred to the Republic of Cuba by the Commission for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no case, however, shall the quantity of special nuclear materials under the jurisdiction of the Republic of Cuba, by reason of transfer under this article, be at any one time in excess of 100 grams of contained U–235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U–235.

ARTICLE VI

Subject to the availability of supply and as may be mutually agreed, the Commission will sell or lease, through such means as it deems appropriate, to the Government of the Republic of Cuba or authorized persons under its jurisdiction such reactor materials, other than special nuclear materials, as are not obtainable on the commercial market and which are required in the construction and operation of research reactors in the Republic of Cuba. The sale or lease of these materials shall be on such terms as may be agreed.

ARTICLE VII

It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or the Republic of Cuba may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, with respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III, the Government of the United States will permit persons under its jurisdiction to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for the Government of the Republic of Cuba and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the Government of the Republic of Cuba to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, subject to:

(a) The provisions of article II.

(b) Applicable laws, regulations, and license requirements of the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of Cuba.

ARTICLE VIII

1. The Government of the Republic of Cuba agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that the special nuclear materials received from the Commission shall be used solely for the purposes agreed in accordance with this agreement and to assure the safekeeping of this material.

2. The government of the Republic of Cuba agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that all other reactor materials, including equipment and devices, purchased in the United States under this agreement by the Government of the Republic of Cuba or authorized persons under its jurisdiction shall be used solely for the design, construction, and operation of research reactors which the Government of the Republic of Cuba decides to construct and operate and for research in connection therewith, except as may otherwise be agreed.

3. In regard to research reactors constructed pursuant to this agreement, the Government of the Republic of Cuba agrees to maintain records relating to power levels of operation and burn-up of reactor fuels and to make annual reports to the Commission on these subjects. If the Commission requests, the Government of the Republic of Cuba will permit Commission representatives to observe from time to time the condition and use of any leased material and to observe the performance of the reactor in which the material is used.

4. Some atomic energy materials which the Government of the Republic of Cuba may request the Commission to provide in accordance with this arrangement are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials to the Government of the Republic of Cuba, the Government of the Republic of Cuba shall bear all responsibility, insofar as the Government of the United States is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any special nuclear materials or fuel elements which the Commission may, pursuant to this agreement, lease to the Government of the Republic of Cuba or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction, the Government of the Republic of Cuba shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States against any and all liability (including third party liability) from any cause whatsoever arising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and the possession and use of such special nuclear materials or fuel elements after delivery by the Commission to the Government of the Republic of Cuba or to any authorized private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction.

ARTICLE IX

The Government of the Republic of Cuba guarantees that:

(a) Safeguards provided in article VIII shall be maintained.

(b) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of the Republic of Cuba or authorized persons under its jurisdiction, pursuant to this agreement, by lease, sale, or otherwise will be used for atomic weapons or for research on or development of atomic weapons or for any other military purposes, and that no such material, including equipment and devices, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the Republic of Cuba except as the Commission may agree to such transfer to another nation and then only if the opinion of the Commission such transfer falls within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the United States and the other nation.

ARTICLE X

It is the hope and expectation of the parties that this initial agreement for cooperation will lead to consideration of further cooperation extending to the design, construction, and operation of power producing reactors. Accordingly, the parties will consult with each other from time to time concerning the feasibility of an additional agreement for cooperation with respect to the production of power from atomic energy in the Republic of Cuba.

ARTICLE XI

1. This agreement shall enter into force on the day on which each government shall receive from the other government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 5 years.

2. At the expiration of this agreement or of any extension thereof the Government of the Republic of Cuba shall deliver to the United States all fuel elements containing

reactor fuels leased by the Commission and any other fuel materials leased by the Commission. Such fuel elements and such fuel materials shall be delivered to the Commission at a site in the United States designated by the Commission at the expense of the Government of the Republic of Cuba and such delivery shall be made under appropriate safeguards against radiation hazards while in transit.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and Spanish languages, this ———.

En testimonio de lo cual, las Partes contratantes han convenido la conclusion de este convenio, debidamente autorizados a tal efecto.

Hecho en Washington, en duplicado, en los idiomas ingles y español,

For the Government of the United States of America:

Por el Gobierno de los Estados Unidos de America:

AEC—WLA—June 21, 1956.

SD—TM—June 21, 1956.

For the Government of the Republic of Cuba:

Por el Gobierno de la Republica de Cuba:

OA—June 21, 1956.

JUNE 18, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy,
Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. A proposed Agreement for Cooperation with the Government of the Republic of France;

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the proposed agreement;

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approved the agreement, containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security; and his authorization to execute the proposed agreement.

The proposed agreement will permit cooperation between France and the United States in matters relating to the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy with particular emphasis on the development of nuclear power. No restricted data will be exchanged under this agreement. Under the proposed agreement the Commission would, however, sell to the Government of the Republic of France uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 for use as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of defined research, experimental power, and power reactor projects in France. The quantity of such material which will be transferred and in the custody of the Government of France shall not at any time be in excess of 40 kilograms of contained U–235 enriched, except as noted below, up to a maximum of 20 percent, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous use of the reactors involved. The Commission may, in its discretion, make a portion of the 40 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor, capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms. You will note that article X of the agreement incorporates provisions designed to minimize the possibility that material or equipment transferred under the agreement would be diverted to nonpeaceful purposes. Source or special nuclear material received from the United States under the agreement would be reprocessed in the United States in Commission facilities or in facilities acceptable to the Commission.

Article V of the agreement would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials, including U–235, U–233 and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In article XII the parties affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy and express their intention to reappraise the agreement in the event such an agency is established. Article XII also recognizes the efforts that are now being made in western Europe to integrate the atomic energy programs of a group of nations and accordingly, provides that such an integrated group may assume the rights and obligations of the Government of the Republic of France under the agreement, provided the integrated group can, in the judgment of the United States, effectively and securely carry out the undertakings of this agreement.

Sincerely yours,

W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 19, 1956.

The Honorable LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of June 18, 1956, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve a proposed agreement for cooperation concerning the civil uses of atomic energy between the Government of the Republic of France and the Government of the United States of America.

I have examined the recommended agreement. It calls for cooperation between the two Governments with respect to the development, design, construction and operation of research, experimental power, and power reactors, including related health and safety problems; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. It is provided that no restricted data will be exchanged under this agreement.

I have noted that the agreement would permit the Commission to sell U–235 to France for use as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of defined research, experimental power, and power reactors constructed in France. The quantity of such material which will be transferred and in the custody of the Government of France shall not at any time be in excess of 40 kilograms of contained U–235 enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent, except that the Commission may in its discretion make a portion of the foregoing 40 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor, capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms. I note that the agreement provides for appropriate safeguards against the diversion of materials and equipment for unauthorized uses and in addition, article VIII provides that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States requires reprocessing, such reprocessing will be performed by the Atomic Energy Commission in Commission facilities, or in facilities acceptable to the Commission.

Article VI of the agreement would permit the transfer of special nuclear materials, including U–235, U–233, and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In article XII the parties affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic-energy agency which would foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy and express their intention to reappraise the agreement in the event such an agency is established. Article XII also recognizes the efforts that are now being made in Western Europe to integrate the atomic-energy programs of a group of nations and accordingly, provides that such an integrated group may assume the rights and obligations of the Government of the Republic of France under the agreement, provided the integrated group can, in the judgment of the United States, effectively and securely carry out the undertakings of this agreement.

Accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby—

1. Approve the within proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of France concerning the civil uses of atomic energy.

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JUNE 18, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Governments of the Republic of France and the United States of America, and authorize its execution by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

This agreement has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and is in the opinion of the Commission, an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in France in accordance with the policy which you have established. As you will note, the agreement is designed to facilitate cooperation between the two countries with respect to the development, design, construction, operation, and use of research, experimental power, and power reactors, health and safety problems related to the operation and use of such reactors, and the use of radioactive isotopes and radiation in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry.

France, if it desires to do so, may engage United States companies to construct research, experimental power and power reactors, and private industry in the United States will be able, under the agreement, to render other assistance to France. No restricted data would be communicated under the agreement, and the Government of France has signified its agreement to the guaranties prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 which are a part of this agreement.

The proposed agreement would permit the United States to sell the Government of France contained U–235 in uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 for use as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of defined research, experimental power, and power reactor projects in France. The quantity of such material which will be transferred and in the custody of the Government of France shall not at any time be in excess of 40 kilograms of contained U–235 enriched, except as noted below, up to a maximum of 20 percent, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient, continuous use of the reactors involved. The Commission also may, at its discretion, make a portion of the foregoing 40 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a

materials testing reactor capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms.

The quantity of the U–235 that will be transferred under this agreement will be made available pursuant to your recent announcement that the United States is prepared to make up to 20,000 kilograms of U–235 available to friendly foreign countries to facilitate the development of nuclear power for peaceful purposes, and you will note that article X of the agreement incorporates provisions which are designed to minimize the possibility that material or equipment transferred under the agreement will be diverted to nonpeaceful purposes. In addition, article VIII of the agreement provides that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States requires reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed by the Commission facilities, or in facilities acceptable to the Commission.

Article V of the agreement would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials, including U–235, U–233, and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In article XII the parties affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy and express their intention to reappraise the agreement in the event such an agency is established. Article XII also recognizes the efforts that are now being made in Western Europe to integrate the atomic-energy programs of a group of nations and accordingly, provides that such an integrated group may assume the rights and obligations of the Government of the Republic of France under the agreement, provided the integrated group can, in the judgment of the United States, effectively and securely carry out the undertakings of this agreement.

Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the agreement will be formally executed by the appropriate authorities of France and the United States and placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Respectfully,

W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF FRANCE CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

PREAMBLE

Whereas the peaceful uses of atomic energy hold great promise for all mankind; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of France desire to cooperate with each other in the development of such peaceful uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas reactors are useful in the production of research quantities of radioisotopes, in medical therapy and in numerous other research and experimental activities and at the same time are a means of affording valuable training and experience in nuclear science and engineering useful in the development of other peaceful uses of atomic energy including civilian nuclear power; and

Whereas the Government of the Republic of France desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States of America and the United States industry with respect to this program; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America, represented by the United States Atomic Energy Commission, desires to assist the Government of the Republic of France in such a program;

The parties therefore agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

For purposes of this agreement:

A. "Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

B. "Commissariat" means the French Commissariat a l'Energie Atomique.

C. "Equipment and devices" and "equipment or device" means any instrument, apparatus, or facility and includes any facility, except an atomic weapon, capable of making use of or producing special nuclear material, and component parts thereof.

D. "Person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, group, government agency or government corporation but does not include the parties to this agreement.

E. "Reactor" means an apparatus, other than an atomic weapon in which a self-supporting fission chain reaction is maintained by utilizing uranium, plutonium, or thorium, or any combination of uranium, plutonium, or thorium.

F. "Restricted data" means all data concerning (1) design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapons; (2) the production of special nuclear materials; or (3) the use of special nuclear material in the production of energy, but shall not include data declassified or removed from the category of restricted data by the appropriate authority.

G. "Atomic weapon" means any device utilizing atomic energy, exclusive of the means for transporting or propelling the device (where such means is a separable and divisible part of the device), the principal purpose of which is for use as, or for development of, a weapon, a weapon prototype, or a weapon test device.

H. "Special nuclear material" means (1) plutonium, uranium enriched in the isotope 233 or in the isotope 235, and any other material which the Commission determines to be special nuclear material; or (2) any material artificially enriched by any of the foregoing.

I. "Source material" means (1) uranium, thorium, or any other material which is determined by the Government of the Republic of France or the Commission to be source material; or (2) ores containing one or more of the foregoing materials, in such concentration as the Government of the Republic of France or the Commission may determine from time to time.

J. "Parties" means the Government of the Republic of France and the Government of the United States of America, including the Commissariat on behalf of the Government of the Republic of France and the Commission on behalf of the Government of the United States of America. "Party" means one of the above "parties."

ARTICLE II

This agreement shall enter into force on the day on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 10 years.

ARTICLE III

A. Restricted data shall not be communicated under this agreement, and no materials or equipment and devices shall be transferred and no services shall be furnished under this agreement if the transfer of any such materials or equipment and devices or the furnishing of any such service involves the communication of restricted data.

B. Subject to the provisions of this agreement, the availability of personnel and material, and the applicable laws, regulations and license requirements in force in their respective countries, the parties shall assist each other in the achievement of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

C. This agreement shall not require the exchange of any information which the parties are not permitted to communicate because the information is privately owned or has been received from another government.

ARTICLE IV

Subject to the provisions of article III, information in the specific fields set out below shall be exchanged between the Commission and the Commissariat with respect to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses, including research and development relating to usch uses, and problems of health and safety connected therewith:

A. The development, design, construction, operation and use of research, experimental power, and power reactors;

B. Health and safety problems related to the operation and use of research, experimental power, and power reactors;

C. The use of radioactive isotopes and radiation in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture and industry.

ARTICLE V

The application or use of any information (including design drawings and specifications) and any material, equipment, and devices, exchanged or transferred between the parties under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party receiving it, and the other party does not warrant the accuracy or completeness of such information and does not warrant the suitability of such information, materials, equipment, and devices for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE VI

A. Research materials: Materials of interest in connection with defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy as provided by article IV and under the limitations set forth in article III, including source materials, special nuclear materials, by-product material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes will be exchanged for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no case, however, shall the quantity of special nuclear materials under the jurisdiction of either party, by reason of transfer under this article, be, at any one time, in excess of 100 grams of contained U–235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U–233.

B. Research facilities: Subject to the provisions of article III, and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, and to the extent as may be agreed, specialized research facilities and reactor materials testing facilities of the parties shall be made available for mutual use consistent with the limits of space, facilities, and personnel conveniently available, when such facilities are not commercially available.

ARTICLE VII

It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or France may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, with respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article IV, persons under the jurisdiction of either the Government of the United States or the Government of the Republic of France will be permitted to make arrangements to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for the other Government and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the other Government to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, subject to:

(a) The limitations in article III;

(b) Applicable laws, regulations and license requirements of the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of France.

ARTICLE VIII

A. The Commission will sell to the Government of the Republic of France uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as and when required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of defined research, experimental power, and power reactor projects which the Government of the Republic of France, in consultation with the Commission, decides to construct or authorize private organizations to construct in France, and as required in experiments related thereto.

B. The sale of the uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 under this Article shall be in such form as may be mutually agreed, and at such charges and on such terms and conditions with respect to shipment and delivery as may be mutually agreed, and subject to the other terms and conditions of this agreement.

C. 1. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 transferred by the Commission under this article and in the custody of the Government of the Republic of France shall not at any time be in excess of 40 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235 plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in France or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the 40 kilograms of said material.

2. The Commission may, upon request and at its discretion, make a portion of the foregoing material available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor, capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms.

3. It is understood and agreed that although the Government of the Republic of France will distribute uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 to authorized users in France, the Government of the Republic of France will retain title to any uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 which is purchased from the Commission until such time as private users in the United States are permitted to acquire title in the United States to uranium enriched in the isotope U–235.

D. It is agreed that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States requires reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the Commission in either Commission facilities, or in facilities acceptable to the Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may be otherwise agreed, that the form and content of the irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission or the facilities acceptable to the Commission for reprocessing.

E. With respect to any special nuclear material produced in reactors fueled with materials obtained from the United States which are in excess of France's need for such material in its program for the peacetime uses of atomic energy, the Government of the United States shall have and is hereby granted (a) a first option to purchase such material at prices then prevailing in the United States for special nuclear material produced in reactors which are fueled pursuant to the terms of an agreement for cooperation with the United States, and (b) the right to approve the transfer of such material to any other nation in the event the option to purchase is not exercised.

ARTICLE IX

As may be necessary and as may be mutually agreed in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article IV, and under the limitations set forth in article III, and under such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed, specific arrangements may be made from time to time between the parties for lease, or sale and purchase, of quantities of materials, other than special nuclear material, greater than those required for research, when such materials are not available commercially.

ARTICLE X

The Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of France emphasize their common interest in assuring that any material, equipment, or device made available to the Government of the Republic of France pursuant to this agreement shall be used solely for civil purposes.

A. Except to the extent that the safeguards provided for in this agreement are supplanted, by agreement of the parties as provided in article XII, by safeguards of the proposed international atomic-energy agency, the Government of the United States of America, notwithstanding any other provisions of this agreement, shall have the following rights:

1. With the objective of assuring design and operation for civil purposes and permitting effective application of safeguards, to review the design of any (i) reactor and (ii) other equipment and devices the design of which the Commission determines to be relevant to the effective application of safeguards, which are to be made available to the Government of the Republic of France or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction, or which are to use, fabricate, or process any of the following materials so made available: source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the Commission;

2. With respect to any source or special nuclear material made available to the Government of the Republic of France or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction and any source or special nuclear material utilized in, recovered from, or produced as a result of the use of any of the following materials, equipment, or devices so made available:

(i) Source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the Commission.

(ii) Reactors.

(iii) Any other equipment or device designated by the Commission as an item to be made available on the condition that the provisions of this subparagraph A2 will apply, (a) to require the maintenance and production of operating records and to request and receive reports for the purpose of assisting in insuring accountability for such materials; and (b) to require that any such material in the custody of the Government of the Republic of France or any person under its jurisdiction be subject to all of the safeguards provided for in this article and the guaranties set forth in article XI.

3. To require the deposit in storage facilities designated by the Commission of any of the special nuclear material referred to in subparagraph A2 of this article which is not currently utilized for civil purposes in France and which is not purchased pursuant to article VIII, paragraph E (a) of this agreement, transferred pursuant to article VIII, paragraph E (b) of this agreement, or otherwise disposed of pursuant to an arrangement mutually acceptable to the Parties.

4. To designate, after consultation with the Government of the Republic of France, personnel who, accompanied if either party so requests, by personnel designated by the Government of the Republic of France, shall have access in France to all places and data necessary to account for the source and special nuclear materials which are subject to subparagraph A2 of this article to determine whether there is compliance with this agreement and to make such independent measurements as may be deemed necessary.

5. In the event of noncompliance with the provisions of this article, or the guaranties set forth in article XI, and the failure of the Government of the Republic of France to carry out the provisions of this article within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate this agreement and require the return of any materials, equipment, and devices referred to in subparagraph A2 of this article.

6. To consult with the Government of the Republic of France in the matter of health and safety.

B. The Government of the Republic of France undertakes to facilitate the application of the safeguards provided for in this article.

ARTICLE XI

The Government of the Republic of France guarantees that:

A. Safeguards provided in article X shall be maintained:

B. No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of the Republic of France or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this agreement, by lease, sale or otherwise, and no special nuclear material produced as a result of such transfer will be used for atomic weapons or for research on or development of atomic weapons or for any other military purposes, and that no such material, including equipment and devices, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the Republic of France except as the Commission may agree to such transfer to another nation and then only if in the opinion of the Commission such transfer falls within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the United States and the other nation.

ARTICLE XII

A. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of France affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In the event such an international agency is created:

1. The Parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects, if any, they desire to modify the provisions of this Agreement for Cooperation. In particular, the Parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects and to what extent they desire to arrange for the administration by the international agency of those conditions, controls, and safeguards including those relating to health and safety standards required by the international agency in connection with similar assistance rendered to a cooperating nation under the aegis of the international agency.

2. In the event the Parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement following the consultation provided in paragraph A of this Article, either Party may by notification terminate this Agreement. In the event this Agreement is so terminated, the Government of the Republic of France shall return to the Commission all source and special nuclear materials received pursuant to this Agreement and in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction.

B. It is recognized that efforts are being made in Western Europe to integrate the atomic energy programs of a group of nations. If the Government of the Republic of France becomes a member of such an integrated group and if an agreement for

cooperation on atomic energy is made between the group of nations and the Government of the United States of America, the latter would be prepared if so requested by the Government of the Republic of France to arrange for the integrated group to assume the rights and obligations of the Government of the Republic of France under this agreement, provided the integrated group can, in the judgment of the Government of the United States of America, effectively and securely carry out the undertakings of this Agreement.

In witness whereof the Parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and French languages, this ———.

En foi de quoi les Parties ont fait établir le présent accord en bonne et due forme en vertu des pouvoirs dûment conférés à cet effet.

Fait à Washington, en double exemplaire, en Anglais et en Français le ———.

For the Government of the United States of America.

Pour le Gouvernement des etats-unis D'Amerique.

For the Government of the Republic of France.

Pour le Gouvernement de la Republique Française.

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. An executed agreement for cooperation with the Government of the Dominican Republic;

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the agreement;

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approving the agreement authorizing its execution and containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

This agreement, as executed, makes cooperation possible between the United States and the Dominican Republic on the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. The Dominican Republic, if it desired to do so, would be able to engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industries in the United States will be permitted, within the limits of the agreement, to render other assistance to the Dominican Republic. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement. The Atomic Energy Commission, however, would lease to the Dominican Republic up to 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in the Dominican Republic or while fuel elements are in transit. This expressed limitation will restrict the Dominican Republic in determining the choice of reactor to be constructed to a research reactor.

You will also note that the agreement includes in article V provisions for the sale or transfer of research quantities of materials of interest in connection with defined research projects, which I described to you in my letter of March 30, 1956. The amount of special nuclear material which would be made available to the Dominican Republic under this agreement would not be important from the military point of view.

Article VIII of the proposed agreement records the obligations undertaken by the Dominican Republic to safeguard the special nuclear material to be leased by the Commission, and article IX contains the guaranties prescribed by section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act.

This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two Governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in the Dominican Republic.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS D. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 13, 1956.

The Honorable L. L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of June 7, 1956, you informed me that the Atomic Energy Commission had recommended that I approve a proposed agreement between the Government of the Dominican Republic and the Government of the United States for cooperation concerning the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The agreement recites that the Government of the Dominican Republic desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States and United States industry with respect to this program.

I have examined the recommended agreement. It calls for cooperation between the two Governments with respect to the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors as research, development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. The agreement contains all the guaranties prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act. No restricted data would be communicated under the agreement, but the Commission would lease to the Government of the Dominican Republic special nuclear material for use as reactor fuel. In addition, the Commission would be permitted to sell or otherwise transfer limited quantities of such material, including U–235, U–233, and plutonium, for use in defined research projects related to the peaceful application of atomic energy.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby—

1. Approve the proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Dominican Republic enclosed with your letter of June 7, 1956.

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

It is my hope that this agreement represents but the first stage of cooperation in the field of atomic energy between the United States and the Dominican Republic, and that it will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to other peaceful uses of atomic energy in the Dominican Republic.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 7, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the Dominican Republic and the Government of the United States of America," and authorize its execution.

This agreement has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and is, in the opinion of the Commission, an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in the Dominican Republic in accordance with the policy which you have established. The agreement would permit cooperation between the two countries with respect to the design, construction and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors, in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture and industry. The Dominican Republic, if it desires to do so, may engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industry in the United States will be able, under the agreement, to render other assistance to the Dominican Republic. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement, and the Government of the Dominican Republic has signified its agreement to the guarantees prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 which are a part of this agreement.

Further provisions permit the Atomic Energy Commission to lease to the Dominican Republic up to 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235. You will note that article V of this agreement would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials, including U–235, U–233 and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two Governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to the peaceful uses of atomic energy in the Dominican Republic.

Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the agreement will be formally executed by the appropriate authorities of the Dominican Republic and the United States and then placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Respectfully,

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Whereas the peaceful uses of atomic energy hold great promise for all mankind; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Dominican Republic desire to cooperate with each other in the development of such peaceful uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas the design and development of several types of research reactors are well advanced; and

Whereas research reactors are useful in the production of research quantities of radioisotopes, in medical therapy and in numerous other research activities and at the same time are a means of affording valuable training and experience in nuclear

science and engineering useful in the development of other peaceful uses of atomic energy including civilian nuclear power; and

Whereas the Government of the Dominican Republic desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States of America and United States industry with respect to this program; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America, acting through the United States Atomic Energy Commission, desires to assist the Government of the Dominican Republic in such a program;

The parties agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

For the purposes of this agreement:

(a) "Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission or its duly authorized representatives.

(b) "Equipment and devices" means any instrument or apparatus and includes research reactors, as defined herein, and their component parts.

(c) "Research reactor" means a reactor which is designed for the production of neutrons and other radiations for general research and development purposes, medical therapy, or training in nuclear science and engineering. The term does not cover power reactors, power demonstration reactors, or reactors designed primarily for the production of special nuclear materials.

(d) The terms "restricted data," "atomic weapon," and "special nuclear material" are used in this agreement as defined in the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

ARTICLE II

Restricted data shall not be communicated under this agreement, and no materials or equipment and devices shall be transferred and no services shall be furnished under this agreement to the Government of the Dominican Republic or authorized persons under its jurisdiction if the transfer of any such materials or equipment and devices or the furnishing of any such services involves the communication of restricted data.

ARTICLE III

1. Subject to the provisions of article II, the parties hereto will exchange information in the following fields:

(a) Design, construction, and operation of research reactors and their use as research, development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy.

(b) Health and safety problems related to the operation and use of research reactors.

(c) The use of radioactive isotopes in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry.

2. The application or use of any information or data of any kind whatsover, including design drawings and specifications, exchanged under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party which receives and uses such information or data, and it is understood that the other cooperating party does not warrant the accuracy, completeness, or suitability of such information or data for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE IV

1. The Commission will lease to the Government of the Dominican Republic uranium enriched in the isotope U–235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of research reactors which the Government of the Dominican Republic, in consultation with the Commission, decides to construct and as required in the agreed experiments related thereto. Also, the Commission will lease to the Government of the Dominican Republic uranium enriched in the isotope U–235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of such research reactors as the Government of the Dominican Republic may, in consultation with the Commission, decide to authorize private individuals or private organizations under its jurisdiction to construct and operate, provided the Government of the Dominican Republic shall at all times maintain sufficient control of the material and the operation of the reactor to enable the Government of the Dominican Republic to comply with the provisions of this agreement and the applicable provisions of the lease arrangement.

2. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 transferred by the Commission under this article and in the custody of the Government of the Dominican Republic shall not at any time be in excess of 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in the Dominican Republic or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the 6 kilograms of said material.

3. When any fuel elements containing U–235 leased by the Commission require replacement, they shall be returned to the Commission and, except as may be agreed, the form and content of the irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission.

4. The lease of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 under this article shall be at such charges and on such terms and conditions with respect to shipment and delivery as may be mutually agreed and under the conditions stated in articles VIII and IX.

ARTICLE V

Materials of interest in connection with defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy undertaken by the Government of the Dominican Republic, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes, will be sold or otherwise transferred to the Government of the Dominican Republic by the Commission for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no cases, however, shall the quantity of special nuclear materials under the jurisdiction of the Government of the Dominican Republic, by reason of transfer under this article, be, at any one time, in excess of 100 grams of contained U–235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U–233.

ARTICLE VI

Subject to the availability of supply and as may be mutually agreed, the Commission will sell or lease, through such means as it deems appropriate, to the Government of the Dominican Republic or authorized persons under its jurisdiction such reactor materials, other than special nuclear materials, as are not obtainable on the commercial market and which are required in the construction and operation of research reactors in the Dominican Republic. The sale or lease of these materials shall be on such terms as may be agreed.

ARTICLE VII

It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or the Dominican Republic may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, with respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III, the Government of the United States will permit persons under its jurisdiction to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for, the Government of the Dominican Republic and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the Government of the Dominican Republic to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, subject to:

(a) The provisions of article II.

(b) Applicable laws, regulations, and license requirements of the Government of the United States and the Government of the Dominican Republic.

ARTICLE VIII

1. The Government of the Dominican Republic agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that the special nuclear materials received from the Commission shall be used solely for the purposes agreed in accordance with this agreement and to assure the safekeeping of this material.

2. The Government of the Dominican Republic agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that all other reactor materials, including equipment and devices, purchased in the United States under this agreement by the Government of the Dominican Republic or authorized persons under its jurisdiction shall be used solely for the design, construction, and operation of research reactors which the Government of the Dominican Republic decides to construct and operate and for research in connection therewith, except as may otherwise be agreed.

3. In regard to research reactors constructed pursuant to this agreement, the Government of the Dominican Republic agrees to maintain records relating to power levels of operation and burn up of reactor fuels and to make annual reports to the Commission on these subjects. If the Commission requests, the Government of the Dominican Republic will permit Commission representatives to observe from time to time the condition and use of any leased material and to observe the performance of the reactor in which the material is used.

4. Some atomic energy materials which the Government of the Dominican Republic may request the Commission to provide in accordance wtih this arrangement are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials to the Government of the Dominican Republic, the Government of the Dominican Republic shall bear all responsibility, insofar as the Government of the United States is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any special nuclear materials or fuel elements which the Commission may, pursuant to this agreement, lease to the Government of the Dominican Republic or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction, the Government of the Dominican Republic shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States against any and all liability (including third-party liability) from any cause whatsoever arising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and the possession and use of such special nuclear materials or fuel elements after delivery by the Commission to the Government of the Dominican Republic or to any authorized private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction.

ARTICLE IX

The Government of the Dominican Republic guarantees that:

(a) Safeguards provided in article VIII shall be maintained.

(b) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of the Dominican Republic or authorized persons under its jurisdiction, pursuant to this

agreement, by lease, sale, or otherwise will be used for atomic weapons or for research on or development of atomic weapons or for any other military purposes, and that no such material, including equipment and devices, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the Dominican Republic except as the Commission may agree to such transfer to another nation and then only if in the opinion of the Commission such transfer falls within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the United States and the other nation.

ARTICLE X

It is the hope and expectation of the parties that this initial agreement for cooperation will lead to consideration of further cooperation extending to the design, construction, and operation of power producing reactors. Accordingly, the parties will consult with each other from time to time concerning the feasibility of an additional agreement for cooperation with respect to the production of power from atomic energy in the Dominican Republic.

ARTICLE XI

1. This agreement shall enter into force on the day on which each government shall receive from the other government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 5 years.

2. At the expiration of this agreement or of any extension thereof the government of the Dominican Republic shall deliver to the United States all fuel elements containing reactor fuels leased by the Commission and any other fuel materials leased by the Commission. Such fuel elements and such fuel materials shall be delivered to the Commission at a site in the United States designated by the Commission at the expense of the Government of the Dominican Republic and such delivery shall be made under appropriate safeguards against radiation hazards while in transit.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this 15th day of June 1956.

For the Government of the United States of America:

HENRY F. HOLLAND,
Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs.
LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of the Dominican Republic:

JOAQUÍN E. SALAZAR,
Ambassador of the Dominican Republic.

JUNE 14, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. An executed agreement for cooperation with the Government of New Zealand;

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the agreement;

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approving the agreement, authorizing its execution, and containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

This agreement, as executed, makes cooperation possible between the United States and New Zealand on the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. New Zealand, if it is desired to do so, would be able to engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industries in the United States will be permitted, within the limits of this agreement, to render other assistance to New Zealand. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement. The Atomic Energy Commission, however, would lease to New Zealand up to 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in New Zealand or while fuel elements are in transit. This expressed limitation will restrict New Zealand in determining the choice of reactor to be constructed to a research reactor.

You also will note that the agreement includes in article V provisions for the sale or transfer of research quantities of materials of interest in connection with defined research projects, which I described to you in my letter of March 30, 1956. The amount of special nuclear material which would be made available to New Zealand under this agreement would not be important from the military point of view.

Article VIII of the proposed agreement records the obligations undertaken by New Zealand to safeguard the special nuclear material to be leased by the Commission and article II contains the guaranty prescribed by section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act.

This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in New Zealand.

Sincerely yours,

———,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 13, 1956.

The Honorable L. L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of June 7, 1956, you informed me that the Atomic Energy Commission had recommended that I approve a proposed agreement between the Government of New Zealand and the Government of the United States for cooperation concerning the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The agreement recites that the Government of New Zealand desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States and United States industry with respect to this program.

I have examined the recommended agreement. It calls for cooperation between the two Governments with respect to the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors as research, development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. The agreement contains all of the guaranties prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act. No restricted data would be communicated under the agreement, but the Commission would lease to the Government of New Zealand special nuclear material for use as reactor fuel. In addition, the Commission would be permitted to sell or otherwise transfer limited quantities of such material, including U–235, U–233, and plutonium for use in defined research projects related to the peaceful application of atomic energy.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby:

1. Approve the proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of New Zealand enclosed with your letter of June 7, 1956,

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

It is my hope that this agreement represents but the first stage of cooperation in the field of atomic energy between the United States and New Zealand, and that it will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to other peaceful uses of atomic energy in New Zealand.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT EISENHOWER.

JUNE 7, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of New Zealand and the Government of the United States of America" and authorize its execution.

This agreement has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and is, in the opinion of the Commission, an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in New Zealand in accordance with the policy which you have established. The agreement would permit cooperation between the two countries with respect to the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. New Zealand, if it desires to do so, may engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industry in the United States will be able under the agreement to render other assistance to New Zealand. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement, and the Government of New Zealand has signified its agreement to the guaranties prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 which are a part of this agreement.

Further provisions permit the Atomic Energy Commission to lease to New Zealand up to 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235. You will note that article V of this agreement would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials, including U–235, U–233, and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two Governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to the peaceful uses of atomic energy in New Zealand.

Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the agreement will be formally executed by the appropriate authorities of New Zealand and the United States and then placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Respectfully,

———,
Chairman.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF NEW ZEALAND CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Whereas the peaceful uses of atomic energy hold great promise for all mankind; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of New Zealand desire to cooperate with each other in the development of such peaceful uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas the design and development of several types of research reactors are well advanced; and

Whereas research reactors are useful in the production of research quantities of radioisotopes, in medical therapy and in numerous other research activities and at the same time are a means of affording valuable training and experience in nuclear science and engineering useful in the development of other peaceful uses of atomic energy including civilian nuclear power; and

Whereas the Government of New Zealand desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States of America and United States industry with respect to this program; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America, acting through the United States Atomic Energy Commission, desires to assist the Government of New Zealand in such a program;

The parties agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

For the purposes of this agreement:

(a) "Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission or its duly authorized representatives.

(b) "Equipment and devices" means any instrument or apparatus and includes research reactors, as defined herein, and their component parts.

(c) "Research reactor" means a reactor which is designed for the production of neutrons and other radiations for general research and development purposes, medical therapy, or training in nuclear science and engineering. The term does not cover power reactors, power demonstration reactors, or reactors designed primarily for the production of special nuclear materials.

(d) The terms "restricted data," "atomic weapon," and "special nuclear material" are used in this agreement as defined in the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

ARTICLE II

Restricted data shall not be communicated under this agreement, and no materials or equipment and devices shall be transferred and no services shall be furnished under this agreement to the Government of New Zealand or authorized persons under its jurisdiction if the transfer of any such materials or equipment and devices or the furnishing of any such services involves the communication of restricted data.

ARTICLE III

1. Subject to the provisions of article II, the parties hereto will exchange information in the following fields:

(a) Design, construction, and operation of research reactors and their use as research, development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy.

(b) Health and safety problems related to the operation and use of research reactors.

(c) The use of radioactive isotopes in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry.

2. The application or use of any information or data of any kind whatsoever, including design drawings and specifications, exchanged under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party which receives and uses such information or data, and it is understood that the other cooperating party does not warrant the accuracy, completeness, or suitability of such information or data for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE IV

1. The Commission will lease to the Government of New Zealand uranium enriched in the isotope U–235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of research reactors which the Government of New Zealand, in consultation with the Commission, decides to construct and as required in the agreed experiments related thereto. Also, the Commission will lease to the Government of New Zealand uranium enriched in the isotope U–235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of such research reactors as the Government of New Zealand may, in consultation with the Commission, decide to authorize private individuals or private organizations under its jurisdiction to construct and operate, provided the Government of New Zealand shall at all times maintain sufficient control of the material and the operation of the reactor to enable the Government of New Zealand to comply with the provisions of this agreement and the applicable provisions of the lease arrangement.

2. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 transferred by the Commission under this article and in the custody of the Government of New Zealand shall not at any time be in excess of 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in New Zealand or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the 6 kilograms of said material.

3. When any fuel elements containing U–235 leased by the Commission require replacement, they shall be returned to the Commission and, except as may be agreed, the form and content of the irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission.

4. The lease of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 under this article shall be at such charges and on such terms and conditions with respect to shipment and delivery as may be mutually agreed and under the conditions stated in article VIII and IX.

ARTICLE V

Materials of interest in connection with defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy undertaken by the Government of New Zealand, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes will be sold or otherwise transferred to the Government of New Zealand by the Commission for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no case, however, shall the quantity of special nuclear materials under the jurisdiction of the Government of New Zealand, by reason of transfer under this article, be, at any one time, in excess of 100 grams of contained U–235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U–233.

ARTICLE VI

Subject to the availability of supply and as may be mutually agreed, the Commission will sell or lease, through such means as it deems appropriate, to the Government of New Zealand, or authorized persons under its jurisdiction such reactor materials, other than special nuclear materials, as are not obtainable on the commercial market and which are required in the construction and operation of research reactors in New Zealand. The sale or lease of these materials shall be on such terms as may be agreed.

ARTICLE VII

It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or New Zealand may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, with respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III, the Government of the United States will permit persons under its jurisdiction to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for the Government of New Zealand and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the Government of New Zealand to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, subject to:

(a) The provisions of article II.

(b) Applicable laws, regulations, and license requirements of the Government of the United States and the Government of New Zealand.

ARTICLE VIII

1. The Government of New Zealand agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that the special nuclear materials received from the Commission shall be used solely for the purposes agreed in accordance with this agreement and to assure the safekeeping of this material.

2. The Government of New Zealand agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that all other reactor materials, including equipment and devices, purchased in the United States under this agreement by the Government of New Zealand or authorized persons under its jurisdiction shall be used solely for the design, construction, and operation of research reactors which the Government of New Zealand decides to construct and operate and for research in connection therewith, except as may otherwise be agreed.

3. In regard to research reactors constructed pursuant to this agreement, the Government of New Zealand agrees to maintain records relating to power levels of operation and burn-up of reactor fuels and to make annual reports to the Commission on these subjects. If the Commission requests, the Government of New Zealand will permit Commission representatives to observe from time to time the condition and use of any leased material and to observe the performance of the reactor in which the material is used.

4. Some atomic-energy materials which the Government of New Zealand may request the Commission to provide in accordance with this arrangement are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials to the Government of New Zealand, the Government of New Zealand shall bear all responsibility, insofar as the Government of the United States is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any special nuclear materials or fuel elements which the Commission may, pursuant to this agreement, lease to the Government of New Zealand or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction, the Government of New Zealand shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States against any and all liability (including third-party liability) for any cause whatsoever arising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and the possession and use of such special nuclear materials or fuel elements after delivery by the Commission to

the Government of New Zealand or to any authorized private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction.

ARTICLE IX

The Government of New Zealand guarantees that:

(a) Safeguards provided in article VIII shall be maintained.

(b) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of New Zealand or authorized persons under its jurisdiction, pursuant to this agreement, by lease, sale, or otherwise will be used for atomic weapons or for research on or development of atomic weapons or for any other military purposes, and that no such material, including equipment and devices, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of New Zealand except as the Commission may agree to such transfer to another nation and then only if in the opinion of the Commission such transfer falls within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the United States and the other nation.

ARTICLE X

It is the hope and expectation of the parties that this initial agreement for cooperation will lead to consideration of further cooperation extending to the design, construction, and operation of power producing reactors. Accordingly, the parties will consult with each other from time to time concerning the feasibility of an additional agreement for cooperation with respect to the production of power from atomic energy in New Zealand.

ARTICLE XI

1. This agreement shall enter into force on the day on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 5 years.

2. At the expiration of this agreement or of any extension thereof the Government of New Zealand shall deliver to the United States all fuel elements containing reactor fuels leased by the Commission and any other fuel materials leased by the Commission. Such fuel elements and such fuel materials shall be delivered to the Commission at a site in the United States designated by the Commission at the expense of the Government of New Zealand and such delivery shall be made under appropriate safeguards against radiation hazards while in transit.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this 13th day of June 1956.

For the Government of the United States of America:

WALTER S. ROBERTSON,
LEWIS L. STRAUSS.

For the Government of New Zealand:

L. K. MUNRO.

Certified to be a true copy.

JOHN P. TREVITHICK,
Chief, Agreements Branch,
Division of International Affairs.

JUNE 8,1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. An executed agreement for cooperation with the Government of Austria;

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the agreement;

3. A letter from the President to the Comsion approving the agreement authorizing its execution and containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

This agreement, as executed, makes cooperation possible between the United States and Austria on the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. Austria, if it desired to do so, would be able to engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industries in the United States will be permitted, within the limits of the agreement, to render other assistance to Austria. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement. The Atomic Energy Commission, however, would lease to Austria up to 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uraninum enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Austria or while fuel elements are in transit.

This expressed limitation will restrict Austria in determining the choice of reactor to be constructed to a research reactor.

You also will note that the agreement includes article V provisions for the sale or transfer of research quantities of materials of interest in connection with defined research projects, which I described to you in my letter of March 30, 1956. The amount of special nuclear material which would be made available to Austria under this agreement would not be important from the military point of view.

Article VIII of the proposed agreement records the obligations undertaken by Austria to safeguard the special nuclear material to be leased by the Commission and article IX contains the guaranties prescribed by section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act.

This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two Governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Austria.

Sincerely yours,

———,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 7, 1956.

The Honorable L. L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of June 4, 1956, you informed me that the Atomic Energy Commission had recommended that I approve a proposed agreement between the Government of the Federal Republic of Austria and the Government of the United States for cooperation concerning the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The agreement recites that the Government of the Federal Republic of Austria desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States and United States industry with respect to this program.

I have examined the recommended agreement. It calls for cooperation between the two governments with respect to the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors as research, development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. The agreement contains all of the guaranties prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act. No restricted data would be communicated under the agreement, but the Commission would lease to the Government of the Federal Republic of Austria special nuclear material for use as reactor fuel. In addition, the Commission would be permitted to sell or otherwise transfer limited quantities of such material, including U–235, U–233, and plutonium, for use in defined research projects related to the peaceful application of atomic energy.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby—

1. Approve the proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Federal Republic of Austria enclosed with your letter of June 4, 1956,

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

It is my hope that this agreement represents but the first stage of cooperation in the field of atomic energy between the United States and the Federal Republic of Austria, and that it will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to other peaceful uses of atomic energy in the Federal Republic of Austria.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JUNE 4, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of Austria and the Government of the United States of America," and authorize its execution.

This agreement has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and is, in the opinion of the Commission, an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Austria in accordance with the policy which you have established. The agreement would permit cooperation between the two countries with respect to the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. Austria, if it desires to do so, may engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industry in the United States will be able, under the agreement, to render other assistance to Austria. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement, and the Government of Austria has signified its agreement to the guaranties prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 which are a part of this agreement.

Further provisions permit the Atomic Energy Commission to lease to Austria up to 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235. You will note that article V of this agreement would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials, including U–235, U–233 and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two Governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Austria.

Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the agreement will be formally executed by the appropriate authorities of Austria and the United States and then placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Respectfully,

———————,
Chairman.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF AUSTRIA CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Whereas the peaceful uses of atomic energy hold great promise for all mankind; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Austria desire to cooperate with each other in the development of such peaceful uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas the design and development of several types of research reactors are well advanced; and

Whereas research reactors are useful in the production of research quantities of radioisotopes, in medical therapy, and in numerous other research activities and at the same time are a means of affording valuable training and experience in nuclear science and engineering useful in the development of other peaceful uses of atomic energy including civilian nuclear power; and

Whereas the Government of Austria desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States of America and United States industry with respect to this program; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America, acting through the United States Atomic Energy Commission, desires to assist the Government of Austria in such a program;

The parties agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

For the purposes of this agreement:

(a) "Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission or its duly authorized representatives.

(b) "Equipment and devices" means any instrument or apparatus and includes research reactors, as defined herein, and their component parts.

(c) "Research reactor" means a reactor which is designed for the production of neutrons and other radiations for general research and development purposes, medical therapy, or training in nuclear science and engineering. The term does not cover power reactors, power demonstration reactors, or reactors designed primarily for the production of special nuclear materials.

(d) The terms "restricted data," "atomic weapon," and "special nuclear material" are used in this agreement as defined in the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

ARTICLE II

Restricted data shall not be communicated under this agreement, and no materials or equipment and devices shall be transferred and no services shall be furnished under this agreement to the Government of Austria or authorized persons under its jurisdiction if the transfer of any such materials or equipment and devices or the furnishing of any such services involves the communication of restricted data.

ARTICLE III

1. Subject to the provisions of article II, the parties hereto will exchange information in the following fields:

(a) Design, construction, and operation of research reactors and their use as research development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy.

(b) Health and safety problems related to the operation and use of research reactors.

(c) The use of radio active isotopes in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry.

2. The application or use of any information or data of any kind whatsoever, including design drawings and specifications, exchanged under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party which receives and uses such information or data, and it is understood that the other cooperating party does not warrant the accuracy, completeness, or suitability of such information or data for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE IV

1. The Commission will lease to the Government of Austria uranium enriched in the isotope U–235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of research reactors which the Government of Austria, in consultation with the Commission, decides to construct and as required in the agreed experiments related thereto. Also, the Commission will lease to the Government of Austria uranium enriched in the isotope U–235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of such research reactors as the Government of Austria may, in consultation with the Commission, decide to authorize private individuals or private organizations under its jurisdiction to construct and operate, provided the Government of Austria shall at all times maintain sufficient control of the material and the operation of the reactor to enable the Government of Austria to comply with the provisions of this agreement and the applicable provisions of the lease arrangement.

2. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 transferred by the Commission under this article and in the custody of the Government of Austria shall not at any time be in excess of 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Austria or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the 6 kilograms of said material.

3. When any fuel elements containing U–235 leased by the Commission require replacement, they shall be returned to the Commission and, except as may be agreed, the form and content of the irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission.

4. The lease of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 under this article shall be at such charges and on such terms and conditions with respect to shipment and delivery as may be mutually agreed and under the conditions stated in articles VIII and IX.

ARTICLE V

Materials of interest in connection with defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy undertaken by the Government of Austria, including source materials, special nuclear materials, by-product material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes will be sold or otherwise transferred to the Government of Austria by the Commission for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no case, however, shall the quantity of special nuclear materials under the jurisdiction of the Government of Austria, by reason of transfer under this article, be, at any time, in excess of 100 grams of contained U–235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U–233.

ARTICLE VI

Subject to the availability of supply and as may be mutually agreed, the Commission will sell or lease, through such means as it deems appropriate, to the Government of Austria or authorized persons under its jurisdiction such reactor materials, other than special nuclear materials, as are not obtainable on the commercial market and which are required in the construction and operation of research reactors in Austria. The sale or lease of these materials shall be on such terms as may be agreed.

ARTICLE VII

It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or Austria may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, with respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III, the Government of the United States will permit persons under its jurisdiction to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for the Government of Austria and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the Government of Austria to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, subject to:

(a) The provisions of article II.

(b) Applicable laws, regulations and license requirements of the Government of the United States and the Government of Austria.

ARTICLE VIII

1. The Government of Austria agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that the special nuclear materials received from the Commission shall be used solely for the purposes agreed in accordance with this agreement and to assure the safekeeping of this material.

2. The Government of Austria agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that all other reactor materials, including equipment and devices, purchased in the United States under this agreement by the Government of Austria or authorized persons under its jurisdiction shall be used solely for the design, construction, and operation of research reactors which the Government of Austria decides to construct and operate and for research in connection therewith, except as may otherwise be agreed.

3. In regard to research reactors constructed pursuant to this agreement, the Government of Austria agrees to maintain records relating to power levels of operation and burn-up of reactor fuels and to make annual reports to the Commission on these subjects. If the Commission requests, the Government of Austria will permit Commission representatives to observe from time to time the condition and use of any leased material and to observe the performance of the reactor in which the material is used.

4. Some atomic energy materials which the Government of Austria may request the Commission to provide in accordance with this arrangement are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials to the Government of Austria, the Government of Austria shall bear all responsibility, insofar as the Government of the United States is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any special nuclear materials or fuel elements which the Commission may, pursuant to this agreement, lease to the Government of Austria or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction, the Government of Austria shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States against any and all liability (including third-party liability) from any cause

whatsoever arising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and the possession and use of such special nuclear materials or fuel elements after delivery by the Commission to the Government of Austria or to any authorized private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction.

ARTICLE IX

The Government of Austria guarantees that:

(a) Safeguards provided in article VIII shall be maintained.

(b) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of Austria or authorized persons under its jurisdiction, pursuant to this agreement, by lease, sale, or otherwise will be used for atomic weapons or for research on or development of atomic weapons or for any other military purposes, and that no such material, including equipment and devices, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of Austria except as the Commission may agree to such transfer to another nation and then only if in the opinion of the Commission such transfer falls within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the United States and the other nation.

ARTICLE X

It is the hope and expectation of the parties that this initial agreement for cooperation will lead to consideration of further cooperation extending to the design, construction, and operation of power-producing reactors. Accordingly, the parties will consult with each other from time to time concerning the feasibility of an additional agreement for cooperation with respect to the production of power from atomic energy in Austria.

ARTICLE XI

1. This agreement shall enter into force on the day on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 5 years.

2. At the expiration of this agreement or of any extension thereof the Government of Austria shall deliver to the United States all fuel elements containing reactor fuels leased by the Commission and any other fuel materials leased by the Commission. Such fuel elements and such fuel materials shall be delivered to the Commission at a site in the United States designated by the Commission at the expense of the Government of Austria and such delivery shall be made under appropriate safeguards against radiation hazards while in transit.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this —— day of ———, 1956.

For the Government of the United States of America:

——— ———.

For the Government of Austria:

——— ———.

———

JUNE 18, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. An executed agreement for cooperation with the Government of Costa Rica;

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the agreement;

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approving the agreement authorizing its execution and containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

This agreement, as executed, makes cooperation possible between the United States and Costa Rica on the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. Costa Rica, if it desired to do so, would be able to engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industries in the United States will be permitted, within the limits of the agreement, to render other assistance to Costa Rica. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement. The Atomic Energy Commission, however, would lease to Costa Rica up to six (6) kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Costa Rica or while fuel elements are in transit. This expressed limitation will restrict Costa Rica in determining the choice of reactor to be constructed to a research reactor.

You also will note that the agreement includes in article V provisions for the sale or transfer of research quantities of materials of interest in connection with defined research projects, which I described to you in my letter of March 30, 1956. The amount of special nuclear material which would be made available to Costa Rica under this agreement would not be important from the military point of view.

Article VIII of the proposed agreement records the obligations undertaken by Costa Rica to safeguard the special nuclear material to be leased by the Commission and article IX contains the guaranties prescribed by section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act.

This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two Governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Costa Rica.

Sincerely,

———, ———,
Chairman.

———

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 9, 1956.

The Honorable L. L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of May 4, 1956, you informed me that the Atomic Energy Commission had recommended that I approve a proposed agreement between the Government of Costa Rica and the Government of the United States for cooperation concerning the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The agreement recites that the Government of Costa Rica desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States and United States industry with respect to this program.

I have examined the recommended agreement. It calls for cooperation between the two Governments with respect to the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors as research, development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. The agreement contains all of the guaranties prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act. No restricted data would be communicated under the agreement, but the Commission would lease to the Government of Costa Rica special nuclear material for use as reactor fuel. In addition, the Commission would be permitted to sell or otherwise transfer limited quantities of such material, including U–233, U–235, and plutonium, for use in defined research projects related to the peaceful application of atomic energy.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby—

1. Approve the proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of Costa Rica enclosed with your letter of May 4, 1956.

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States.

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

It is my hope that this agreement represents but the first stage of cooperation in the field of atomic energy between the United States and Costa Rica, and that it will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to other peaceful uses of atomic energy in Costa Rica.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

———

MAY 4, 1956.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of Costa Rica and the Government of the United States of America", and authorize its execution.

This agreement has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and is, in the opinion of the Commission, an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Costa Rica in accordance with the policy which you have established. The agreement would permit cooperation between the two countries with respect to the design, construction and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture and industry. Costa Rica, if it desires to do so, may engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industry in the United States will be able, under the agreement, to render other assistance to Costa Rica. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement, and the Government of Costa Rica has signified its agreement to the guaranties prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 which are a part of this agreement.

Further provisions permit the Atomic Energy Commission to lease to Costa Rica up to 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235. You will note that article V of this agreement would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials, including U–235, U–233, and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two Governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Costa Rica.

Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the agreement will be formally executed by the appropriate

authorities of Costa Rica and the United States and then placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Respectfully,

——— ———, *Chairman.*

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF COSTA RICA CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Whereas the peaceful uses of atomic energy hold great promise for all mankind; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Costa Rica desire to cooperate with each other in the development of such peaceful uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas the design and development of several types of research reactors are well advanced; and

Whereas research reactors are useful in the production of research quantities of radioisotopes, in medical therapy and in numerous other research activities and at the same time are a means of affording valuable training and experience in nuclear science and engineering useful in the development of other peaceful uses of atomic energy including civilian nuclear power; and

Whereas the Government of Costa Rica desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States of America and United States industry with respect to this program; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America, acting through the United States Atomic Energy Commission, desires to assist the Government of Costa Rica in such a program;

The parties agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

For the purposes of this agreement:

(a) "Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission or its duly authorized representatives.

(b) "Equipment and devices" means any instrument or apparatus and includes research reactors, as defined herein, and their component parts.

(c) "Research reactor" means a reactor which is designed for the production of neutrons and other radiations for general research and development purposes, medical therapy, or training in nuclear science and engineering. The term does not cover power reactors, power demonstration reactors, or reactors designed primarily for the production of special nuclear materials.

(d) The terms "Restricted Data," "atomic weapon," and "special nuclear material" are used in this agreement as defined in the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

ARTICLE II

Restricted data shall not be communicated under this agreement, and no materials or equipment and devices shall be transferred and no services shall be furnished under this agreement to the Government of Costa Rica or authorized persons under its jurisdiction if the transfer of any such materials or equipment and devices or the furnishing of any such services involves the communication of restricted data.

ARTICLE III

1. Subject to the provisions of article II, the parties hereto will exchange information in the following fields:

(a) Design, construction, and operation of research reactors and their use as research, development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy.

(b) Health and safety problems related to the operation and use of research reactors.

(c) The use of radioactive isotopes in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry.

2. The application or use of any information or data of any kind whatsoever, including design drawings and specifications, exchanged under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party which receives and uses such information or data, and it is understood that the other cooperating party does not warrant the accuracy, completeness, or suitability of such information or data for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE IV

1. The Commission will lease to the Government of Costa Rica uranium enriched in the isotope U–235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of research reactors which the Government of Costa Rica, in consultation with the Commission, decides to construct and as required in the agreed experiments related thereto. Also, the Commission will lease to the Government of Costa Rica uranium enriched in the isotope U–235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of such research reactors as the Government of Costa Rica may, in consultation with the Commission, decide to authorize private individuals or private organizations under its jurisdiction to construct and operate, provided the Government of Costa Rica shall at all times maintain sufficient control of the material and the operation of the reactor to enable the Government of Costa Rica to comply with the provisions of this Agreement and the applicable provisions of the lease arrangement.

2. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 transferred by the Commission under this article and in the custody of the Government of Costa Rica shall not at any time be in excess of 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Costa Rica or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the 6 kilograms of said material.

3. When any fuel elements containing U–235 leased by the Commission require replacement, they shall be returned to the Commission and, except as may be agreed, the form and content of the irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission.

4. The lease of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 under this article shall be at such charges and on such terms and conditions with respect to shipment and delivery as may be mutually agreed and under the conditions stated in articles VIII and IX.

ARTICLE V

Materials of interest in connection with defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy undertaken by the Government of Costa Rica, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes, will be sold or otherwise transferred to the Government of Costa Rica by the Commission for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no case, however, shall the quantity of special nuclear materials under the jurisdiction of the Government of Costa Rica, by reason of transfer under this article, be, at any one time, in excess of 100 grams of contained U–235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U–233.

ARTICLE VI

Subject to the availability of supply and as may be mutually agreed, the Commission will sell or lease, through such means as it deems appropriate, to the Government of Costa Rica or authorized persons under its jurisdiction, such reactor materials, other than special nuclear materials, as are not obtainable on the commercial market and which are required in the construction and operation of research reactors in Costa Rica. The sale or lease of these materials shall be on such terms as may be agreed.

ARTICLE VII

It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or Costa Rica may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, with respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III, the Government of the United States will permit persons under its jurisdiction to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for the Government of Costa Rica and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the Government of Costa Rica to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, subject to:

(a) The provisions of article II.

(b) Applicable laws, regulations, and license requirements of the Government of the United States and the Government of Costa Rica.

ARTICLE VIII

1. The Government of Costa Rica agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that the special nuclear materials received from the Commission shall be used solely for the purposes agreed in accordance with this agreement and to assure the safekeeping of this material.

2. The Government of Costa Rica agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that all other reactor materials, including equipment and devices, purchased in the United States under this agreement by the Government of Costa Rica or authorized persons under its jurisdiction shall be used solely for the design, construction, and operation of research reactors which the Government of Costa Rica decides to construct and operate and for research in connection therewith, except as may otherwise be agreed.

3. In regard to research reactors constructed pursuant to this agreement, the Government of Costa Rica agrees to maintain records relating to power levels of operation and burn-up of reactor fuels and to make annual reports to the Commission on these subjects. If the Commission requests, the Government of Costa Rica will permit Commission representatives to observe from time to time the condition and use of any leased material and to observe the performance of the reactor in which the material is used.

4. Some atomic energy materials which the Government of Costa Rica may request the Commission to provide in accordance with this arrangement are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials to the Government of Costa Rica, the Government of Costa Rica shall bear all responsibility, insofar as the Government of the United States is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any special nuclear materials or fuel elements which the Commission may, pursuant to this agreement lease to the Government of Costa Rica or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction, the Government of Costa Rica shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States against any and all liability (including third-party liability) from any cause whatsoever arising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and

the possession and use of such special nuclear materials or fuel elements after delivery by the Commission to the Government of Costa Rica or to any authorized private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction.

ARTICLE IX

The Government of Costa Rica guarantees that:

(a) Safeguards provided in article VIII shall be maintained.

(b) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of Costa Rica or authorized persons under its jurisdiction, pursuant to this agreement, by lease, sale, or otherwise will be used for atomic weapons or for research on or development of atomic weapons or for any other military purposes, and that no such material, including equipment and devices, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of Costa Rica except as the Commission may agree to such transfer to another nation and then only if in the opinion of the Commission such transfer falls within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the United States and the other nation.

ARTICLE X

It is the hope and expectation of the parties that this initial agreement for cooperation will lead to consideration of further cooperation extending to the design, construction, and operation of power-producing reactors. Accordingly, the parties will consult with each other from time to time concerning the feasibility of an additional agreement for cooperation with respect to the production of power from atomic energy in Costa Rica.

ARTICLE XI

1. This agreement shall enter into force on the day on which each government shall receive from the other government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 5 years.

2. At the expiration of this agreement or of any extension thereof the Government of Costa Rica shall deliver to the United States all fuel elements containing reactor fuels leased by the Commission and any other fuel materials leased by the Commission. Such fuel elements and such fuel materials shall be delivered to the Commission at a site in the United States designated by the Commission at the expense of the Government of Costa Rica, and such delivery shall be made under appropriate safeguards against radiation hazards while in transit.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this 18th day of May 1956.

For the Government of the United States of America:

HENRY F. HOLLAND,
Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs.

LOUIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of Costa Rica:

FERNANDO FOURNIER,
Ambassador of Costa Rica.

JUNE 14, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy,
Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. An executed amendment to the agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the United States of America," signed on June 15, 1955;

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment;

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approving the amendment, authorizing its execution and containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

Article 1 of this amendment, will permit the exchange of information between the United States and the United Kingdom on reactors which are primarily of military significance. The Amendment provides that the parties shall use their best efforts to insure that classified information exchanged on reactors of primarily military significance will be used only in connection with reactors intended for military use until such time as the parties agree that the information may be exchanged for civilian purposes.

Article 2 of the amendment will permit the parties to make specific arrangements under which special nuclear material required for developmental purposes may be exchanged for other materials. The amendment is required specifically at this time to permit an exchange of uranium from the United Kingdom for uranium from the United States which will be highly enriched in the isotope U–235.

Article 3 of the amendment records the responsibilities of the parties with reference to the application or use of information and material exchanged pursuant to the agreement.

The guaranties undertaken by the parties in the agreement for cooperation, signed on June 15, 1955, will continue and will be applicable to the transactions contemplated by the enclosed amendment.

Sincerely yours,

———, ———,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C. June 13, 1956.

The Honorable L. L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of June 7, 1956, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve a proposed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland an the Government of the United States of America, which was signed on June 15, 1955.

The Commission's letter states that article 1 of the amendment is required at this time to permit the exchange of information, including restricted data, between the United States and the United Kingdom on reactors which are primarily of military significance, and that the Department of Defense has urged the negotiation of this amendment because of its importance to defense planning. Upon analysis of pertinent facts the Commission has found that naval, aircraft, land vehicle, and package power reactors exclusively employed for military use are not atomic weapons as defined by the Atomic Energy Act, and that the vessels, aircraft, and land vehicles which may utilize such reactors are not atomic weapons by virtue of such utilization; that the restricted data proposed to be communicated under the amendment does not involve information relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons. Also, the Commission has concluded, from advice received from the Attorney General, that in light of the foregoing facts the exchange of restricted data such as that provided in this amendment is in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

The letter also mentions that article 2 of the amendment will permit the parties to make specific arrangements under which special nuclear materials required for developmental purposes may be exchanged for other materials. The permissible exchange under this article would be mutually beneficial to the atomic energy programs of both countries.

I have also noted that article 3 of the amendment records the responsibilities of the parties with reference to information and material exchanged under the terms of the agreement.

I have examined the proposed amendment to the agreement and I share in the belief of the Commission that the performance of the agreement will result in mutual benefit to both Governments.

Accordingly, pursuant to provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby

1. Approve the proposed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy;

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed amendment to the agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed amendment to the agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission an the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JUNE 7, 1956.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the attached Amendment to the Agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the United States of America," which was signed on June 15, 1955. It is also recommended that you authorize the execution of this proposed amendment by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Article 1 of the amendment will permit the exchange of information between the United States and the United Kingdom on reactors which are primarily of military significance. The amendment provides that the parties shall use their best efforts to insure that classified information exchanged on reactors of primarily military significance will be used only in connection with reactors intended for military use until such time as the parties agree that the information may be exchanged for civilian purposes. This amendment has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State and is consistent with your expressed interest in the contemplated exchange of information. The Department of Defense has urged the negotiation of this amendment because of its importance to defense planning. Upon analysis of pertinent facts the Commission has found that naval, aircraft, land vehicle, and package power reactors exclusively employed for military use are not atomic weapons as defined by the Atomic Energy Act, and that the vessels, aircraft, and land vehicles which may utilize such reactors are not atomic weapons by virtue of such utilization; that the Restricted Data proposed to be communicated under the amendment does not involve information relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons. Also, the Commission has concluded, from advice received from the Attorney General, that in light

of the foregoing facts the exchange of Restricted Data such as that provided in this Amendment is in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Article 2 of the amendment will permit the parties to make specific arrangements under which special nuclear material required for developmental purposes may be exchanged for other materials. The amendment is required specifically at this time to permit an exchange of uranium from the United Kingdom for uranium from the United States which will be highly enriched in the isotope U-235. The Commission is of the opinion that both countries will obtain considerable benefit from this additional area of cooperation.

Article 3 of the amendment records the responsibilities of the parties with reference to the application or use of information and material exchanged pursuant to the agreement.

The Atomic Energy Commission believes that the execution of the enclosed amendment will be mutually advantageous to the United States and the United Kingdom and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States. The guaranties undertaken by the parties in the existing agreement for cooperation will continue and will be applicable to the transactions contemplated by the enclosed amendment.

In view of the foregoing considerations, it is the opinion of the Commission that the amendment recommended conforms with your policy concerning the development of atomic energy in cooperation with friendly foreign countries.

Respectfully,

———— ————,
Chairman.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION ON THE CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

The Government of the United States of America (including the United States Atomic Energy Commission) and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, on its own behalf and on behalf of the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority, desiring to amend in certain respects the agreement for cooperation on the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (hereinafter referred to as the "agreement for cooperation") signed between them in Washington on the 15th day of June 1955, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

The following amendments shall be made to the agreement for cooperation concerning the exchange of information on reactors of primarily military significance:

(1) Paragraph C (ii) of article I shall be amended to read as follows:

"(ii) Restricted data which is primarily of military significance shall not be exchanged, except as provided in article I bis."

(2) Paragrraph C (iii) of article shall be amended to read as follows:

"(iii) The development of submarine, ship, aircraft, and certain package-power reactors is presently concerned primarily with their military use, and there may be future types of reactors the development of which is concerned primarily with their military use. Accordingly, restricted data pertaining primarily to any of these types of reactors will not be exchanged, except as provided in article I bis."

(3) The following new article shall be inserted after article I:

"ARTICLE I BIS

"Exchange of Information of Reactors of Primary Significance:

"A. At such time as any of the types of reactor referred to in article I–C (iii) warrants application to civil uses, restricted data on that type shall be exchanged as may be agreed, subject to the provisions of article I.

"B. In the meantime, and subject to the provision of article I, classified and unclassified information on the development, design, construction, operation, and use of military package-power reactors and reactors for the propulsion of naval vessels, aircraft, or land vehicles, for military purposes, shall be exchanged to the extent and by such means as may be agreed. Each party will use its best efforts to ensure that any classified information received from the other party pursuant to this paragraph will be used only in connection with reactors intended for military use, until such time as it has been agreed under paragraph A of this article to exchange restricted data on the type of reactor to which such classified information pertains or such information has been removed from the category of classified information by the party from which it has been received."

(4) In paragraph A of article VII the words "in accordance with article II" shall be amended to read "in accordance with article I bis or article II".

ARTICLE 2

Article IV of the agreement for cooperation shall be amended by (1) adding the letter "A" before the present paragraph of that article and (2) adding the following new paragraph:

"B. In connection with any subject of agreed exchange of information as provided in article II subject to the provisions of article I, specific arrangements may be agreed between the parties from time to time under which special nuclear material required for developmental purposes, including use in research and experimental reactors, may be exchanged for other materials under such terms and conditions as may be agreed."

ARTICLE 3

The following new article shall be inserted after article IX of the agreement for cooperation:

"ARTICLE IX BIS

"Responsibility for use of information, materials, equipment, and devices:

"The application or use of any information including design, drawings, and specifications, materials, equipment, or device, exchanged or transferred between the parties under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party receiving it, and the other party does not warrant the accuracy or completeness of such information and does not warrant the suitability of such information, material, equipment, or device for any particular use or application."

ARTICLE 4

This amendment, which shall be regarded as an integral part of the agreement for cooperation, shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such amendment.

In witness whereof the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this amendment.

Done at Washington this 13th day of June 1956 in two original texts.

For the Government of the United States of America:

C. BURKE ELBRICK,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs.
LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Island:

ROGER MAKINS,
Ambassador of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

JUNE 26, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. An executed amendment to the agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States of America," signed on June 15, 1955;

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment;

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approving the amendment, authorizing its execution and containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

Article 1 of this amendment will permit the exchange of information between the United States and Canada on reactors which are primarily of military significance. The amendment provides that the parties shall use their best efforts to insure that classified information exchanged on reactors of primarily military significance will be used only in connection with reactors intended for military use until such time as the parties agree that the information may be exchanged for civilian purposes.

Article 3 of the amendment records the responsibilities of the parties with reference to the application or use of information and material exchanged pursuant to the agreement.

The guaranties undertaken by the parties in the agreement for cooperation, signed on June 15, 1955, will continue and will be applicable to the transactions contemplated by the enclosed amendment.

Sincerely yours,

———— ————,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 26, 1956.

The Honorable LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of June 15, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve a proposed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of Canada and the Goverment of the United States of America, which was signed on June 15, 1955.

The Commission's letter states that article 1 of the amendment is required at this time to permit the exchange of information, including restricted data, between the United States and Canada on reactors which are primarily of military significance, and that the Department of Defense has urged the negotiation of this amendment because of its importance to defense planning. Upon analysis of pertinent facts the Commission has found that naval, aircraft, land vehicle, and package power reactors exclusively employed for military use are not atomic weapons as defined by the Atomic Energy Act, and that the vessels, aircraft, and land vehicles which may utilize such reactors are not atomic weapons by virtue of such utilization; that the restricted data proposed to be communicated under the amendment does not involve information relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons. Also, the Commission has concluded, from advice received from the Attorney General, that in light of the foregoing facts the exchange of restricted data such as that provided in this amendment is in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

I have also noted that article 3 of the amendment records the responsibilities of the parties with reference to information and

material exchanged under the terms of the agreement.

I have examined the proposed amendment to the agreement and I share in the belief of the Commission that the performance of the agreement will result in mutual benefit to both governments.

Accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby

(1) Approve the proposed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy;

(2) Determine that the performance of the proposed amendment to the agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

(3) Authorize the execution of the proposed amendment to the agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JUNE 15, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the attached amendment to the agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada," which was signed on June 15, 1955. It is also recommended that you authorize the execution of this proposed amendment by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Article 1 of the amendment will permit the exchange of information between the United States and Canada on reactors which are primarily of military significance. The amendment provides that the parties shall use their best efforts to insure that classified information exchanged on reactors of primarily military significance will be used only in connection with reactors intended for military use until such time as the parties agree that the information may be exchanged for civilian purposes. This amendment has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State and is consistent with your expressed interest in the contemplated exchange of information. The Department of Defense has urged the negotiation of this amendment because of its importance to defense planning. Upon analysis of pertinent facts the Commission has found that naval, aircraft, land vehicle, and package power reactors exclusively employed for military use are not atomic weapons as defined by the Atomic Energy Act, and that the vessels, aircraft, and land vehicles which may utilize such reactors are not atomic weapons by virtue of such utilization; that the restricted data proposed to be communicated under the Amendment does not involve information relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons. Also, the Commission has concluded, from advice received from the Attorney General, that in light of the foregoing facts the exchange of restricted data such as that provided in this amendment is in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Article 3 of the amendment records the responsibilities of the parties with reference to the application or use of information and material exchanged pursuant to the agreement.

The Atomic Energy Commission believes that the execution of the enclosed amendment will be mutually advantageous to the United States and Canada and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States. The guaranties undertaken by the parties in the existing agreement for cooperation will continue and will be applicable to the transactions contemplated by the enclosed amendment.

In view of the foregoing considerations, it is the opinion of the Commission that the amendment recommended conforms with your policy concerning the development of atomic energy in cooperation with friendly foreign countries.

Respectfully,

———— ————,
Chairman.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION ON THE CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA

The Government of the United States of America (including the United States Atomic Energy Commission) and the Government of Canada, desiring to amend in certain respects the agreement for cooperation on the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation") signed between them in Washington on the 15th day of June, 1955, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

The following amendments shall be made to the agreement for cooperation concerning the exchange of information on reactors of primarily military significance:

(1) In lieu of article II–A of the Agreement for Cooperation substitute the following:

"A. Limitations:

"(1) Of information which is classified, only that relevant to current or projected programs will be exchanged.

"2 The parties to this agreement will not exchange restricted data relating to design or fabrication of atomic weapons or exchange restricted data which, in the opinion of either party, is primarily of military significance under this article II.

"(3) The development of submarine, ship, aircraft, and certain package power reactors is presently concerned primarily with their military use, and there may be future types of reactors the development of which is concerned primarily with their military use. Accordingly, restricted data pertaining primarily to any of these types of reactors will not be exchanged under this article II.

"(4) Within the subject matter of this agreement, the parties may come into possession of privately developed and privately owned information and information received from other Governments which the parties are not permitted to exchange.

"(5) It is mutually understood and agreed that except as limitations are stated to apply specifically to one party or the other, any limitations to cooperation imposed pursuant to this agreement shall be reciprocal."

(2) Article II–B is amended as follows:

1. In lieu of subparagraph (1), substitute the following:

"(1) Information on the development, design, construction, operation and use of research, production, experimental power, demonstration power, and power reactors, except as provided in paragrah A and subparagraph (2) of this paragrah."

(3) Subparagraph (2) of article II–B is hereby deleted.

(4) Amend subparagraph (3) of article II–B by deleting the number (3) and substituting therefor the number (2).

(5) The following new article shall be inserted after article II:

"ARTICLE II BIS

"Exchange of information on reactors of primarily military significance:

"A. At such time as any one of the types of reactors referred to in article II–A (3) warrants application to civil uses, restricted data on that type shall be exchanged as may be agreed, subject to the other provisions of article II–A.

"B. In the meantime, and subject to the provisions of article II–A, classified and unclassified information on the development, design, construction, operation and use of military package power reactors and reactors for the propulsion of naval vessels, aircraft, or land vehicles, for military purposes, shall be exchanged to the extent and by such means as may be agreed. Each party will use its best efforts to insure that any classified information received from the other party pursuant to this paragraph will be used only in connection with reactors intended for military use, until such time as it has been agreed under article II bis A to exchange restricted data on the type of reactor to which such classified information pertains or such information has been removed from the category of classified information by the party from which it has been received."

ARTICLE 2

Article XIII is amended by deleting therefrom all references to article II–B (2).

ARTICLE 3

The following new article shall be inserted after article XIII of the agreement for cooperation:

"ARTICLE XIII BIS

"Responsibility for use of information, material, equipment, and devices:

"The application or use of any information (including design drawings and specifications), material, equipment or device, exchanged or transferred between the parties under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party receiving it, and the other party does not warrant the accuracy or completeness of such information and does not warrant the suitability of such information, material, equipment, or device for any particular use or application."

ARTICLE 4

This amendment, which shall be regarded as an integral part of the agreement for cooperation, shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement.

In witness whereof the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this amendment.

Done at Washington this ————.

For the Government of the United States of America:

———— ————.

For the Government of Canada:

———— ————.

JUNE 18, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy,
Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. A proposed agreement for cooperation with the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia.

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the proposed agreement.

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approving the agreement, containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and his authorization to execute the proposed agreement.

As you know, the Governments of the United States and the Commonwealth of Australia have since 1952 been cooperating in the production of uranium ores and concentrates, and this agreement, therefore, will represent an extension of the cooperation in atomic energy between the two countries.

The proposed agreement, when executed, will permit cooperation between Australia and the United States in matters relating to the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy, with particular emphasis on the development of nuclear power. The agreement will permit the exchange of classified and unclassified information, under appropriate security arrangements. Under the proposed agreement, the Commission would sell to the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U–235 enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent for use as fuel in the operation of defined reactors constructed in Australia. The Commission may, in its discretion, make a portion of the 500 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms. You will note that article X of the agreement incorporates provisions designed to minimize the possibility that material or equipment transferred under the agreement would be diverted to nonpeaceful purposes. Source of special nuclear material received from the United States under the agreement would be reprocessed in the United States in Commission facilities or in facilities acceptable to the Commission.

In article IX of the agreement the parties agree that existing arrangements and contracts between the Combined Development Agency and the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia for the sale of uranium ores and concentrates will continue in effect until their expiration as provided in these arrangements or contracts.

Sincerely yours,

———— ————,
Chairman.

———

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 18, 1956.

Adm. LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of June 16, 1956, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve a proposed agreement for cooperation concerning the civil uses of atomic energy between the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia and the Government of the United States of America.

I have examined the agreement recommended. It calls for an exchange of classified and unclassified information relating to the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy and particularly to the development of atomic power; for the exchange of reactor materials not available commercially; for the transfer of equipment and devices; and for the continuation of the existing raw materials arrangements between the two countries. The agreement also provides for the exchange of information on the exploration for and treatment and production of source materials. It is provided, however, that the exchange of restricted data under the agreement will extend only to that which is relevant to current or projected programs; will not include any information which is primarily of military significance; and will not include information concerning the production of special nuclear materials except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials is a power reactor. Further, no material, equipment, or device which is primarily of military significance will be exchanged under the agreement.

It is provided in the proposed agreement that the Commission will sell to the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia for use as fuel in defined reactors uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent, except that a quantity of the uranium, enriched up to 90 percent, may be made available for use in a materials testing reactor. The agreement provides for appropriate safeguards against the diversion of materials and equipment for unauthorized uses.

The agreement also affirms the interest of the United States and Australia in the establishment of an international atomic-energy agency which would foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of Section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby—

1. Approve the within proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia concerning the civil uses of atomic energy.

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

———

JUNE 16, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia and the Government of the United States of America Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy and authorize its execution by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

The proposed agreement has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and is, in the opinion of the Commission, an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Australia in accordance with the policy which you have established. The Government of the United States and the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia, since 1952, have been cooperating in the production of uranium ores and concentrates, and this agreement, therefore, represents an extension of cooperation in the atomic energy field between the United States and Australia.

The proposed agreement calls for an exchange of classified and unclassified information relating to the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy with particular emphasis on the development of nuclear power. In particular, article III provides for an exchange of general information on the design and characteristics of research reactors, and of experimental, demonstration power, and power reactors as is required to permit an evaluation and comparison of their potential use in a power production program, and technological information, as may be agreed, on specific research, experimental, demonstration power or power reactors as is required for the design, construction and operation of such reactors. In addition, classified information on the exploration for and treatment and production of source materials will be exchanged.

The exchange of restricted data under the agreement will extend to that which is relevant to current or projected programs, will not include any information which is primarily of military significance, and will not include information concerning the production of special nuclear materials except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor. The proposed agreement also provides for an exchange of reactor materials not available commercially. The parties agree, however, that no material, equipment or devices which are primarily of military significance will be transferred or exported under the agreement.

The proposed agreement would permit the United States to sell to the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U–235 enriched, except as noted below, up to a maximum of 20 percent during the period of the agreement for use as fuel in the operation of defined research experimental, demonstration power, and power reactor projects in Australia. The Commission may make a portion of the foregoing 500 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor, capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 transferred to the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia for use as fuel in reactors constructed pursuant to the agreement will not at any time be in excess of the amount of material necessary for the full loading of each defined reactor project plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Australia or while fuel elements are in transit. The U–235 to be transferred under this agreement is being made available in accordance with your recent announcement that the United States is prepared to make up to 20,000 kilograms of U–235 available to friendly countries to facilitate the development of nuclear power for peaceful purposes, and you will note that article X of the agreement incorporates provisions which are designed to minimize the possibility that material or equipment transferred under the agreement will be diverted to nonpeaceful purposes. In addition, article VIII of the agreement provides that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States requires reprocessing such reprocessing will be performed by the Atomic Energy Commission in Commission facilities, or in facilities acceptable to the Commission.

Article IV of the agreement would permit the transfer of special nuclear materials, including U–235, U–233, and plutonium, for defined research projects, related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In article XII the parties affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency which would foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy and express their intention to reappraise the agreement in the event such an agency is established.

In article IX the parties agree that existing arrangements and contracts between the Combined Development Agency and the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia for sale of uranium ores and concentrates to the agency will continue in effect until their expiration as provided in these arrangements or contracts.

Respectfully,

———— ————,
Chairman.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA CONCERNING THE CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

PREAMBLE

Whereas the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia, through the Australian Atomic Energy Commission, and the Government of the United States of America, through the United States Atomic Energy Commission, are cooperating in the production of uranium ores; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia, mindful of

the fact that atomic energy is capable of application for peaceful purposes which hold great promise for all mankind, desire to cooperate with each other in developing and furthering the beneficial uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia is now engaged in the development of facilities for the application of atomic energy for civil purposes: the parties therefore agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

This agreement shall enter into force on the day on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 10 years.

ARTICLE II

A. Subject to the provisions of this agreement, the availability of personnel and material, and the applicable laws, regulations, and license requirements in force from time to time in their respective countries, the parties shall cooperate with each other in the achievement of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

B. The disposition and utilization of atomic weapons and the exchange of restricted data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons shall be outside the scope of this agreement.

C. The exchange of restricted data under this agreement shall be subject to the following limitations:

1. Restricted data which are primarily of military significance shall not be exchanged.

2. Restricted data concerning the production of special nuclear materials except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor shall not be exchanged.

3. The exchange of restricted data shall extend only to that which is relevant to current or projected programs.

4. The development of submarine, ship, aircraft, and certain package-power reactors is presently concerned primarily with their military uses. Accordingly, restricted data pertaining primarily to such reactors will not be exchanged until such time as these types of reactors warrant peacetime application and the exchange of information on these types of reactors may be agreed. Information on the adaptation of these types of reactors to military use will not be exchanged. Likewise, restricted data pertaining primarily to any future reactor types the development of which is concerned primarily with their military use will not be exchanged until such time as these types of reactors warrant civil application and exchange of information on these types of reactors may be agreed; and restricted data on the adaptation of these types of reactors to military use will not be exchanged.

D. This agreement shall not require the exchange of any information which the parties are not permitted to communicate because the information is privately developed and privately owned or has been received from another government.

E. It is agreed that the parties will not transfer or export, or permit the transfer or export, under this agreement, of any material, equipment, or device which is primarily of military significance.

ARTICLE III

A. Subject to the provisions of article II, classified information in the specific fields set out below and unclassified information shall be exchanged between the United States Commission and the Australian Commission with respect to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses, including research and development relating to such uses and problems of health and safety connected therewith. The exchange of information provided for in this article shall be accomplished through the various means available, including reports, conferences, and visits to facilities.

B. The parties agree to exchange the following classified information including restricted data:

1. Reactors:

(a) General information on design and characteristics of research reactors, and of experimental, demonstration power or power reactors as is required to permit evaluation and comparison of their potential use in a power production program.

(b) Technological information as may be agreed, on specific research reactors, and on experimental, demonstration power or power reactors as is required for the design, development, construction and operation of such reactors, and when in the case of the Commonwealth of Australia such information is required in connection with reactors currently in operation in the Commonwealth of Australia or when such reactors are being seriously considered for construction by the Commonwealth of Australia as a source of power or as an intermediate step in a power production program.

(c) Classified information within subparagraphs (a) and (b) hereof shall be exchanged within the following fields:

(1) Specifications for reactor materials: Final form specifications including composition, shape, size and special handling techniques of reactor materials including uranium, heavy water, reactor grade graphite, and zirconium.

(2) Properties of reactor materials: Physical, chemical, metallurgical, nuclear and mechanical properties of reactor materials including fuel, moderator and coolant and the effects of the reactor's operating conditions on the properties of these materials.

(3) Reactor components: The design and performance specifications of reactor components, but not including the methods of production and fabrication.

(4) Reactor physics technology: This area includes theory of and pertinent data relating to neutron bombardment reactions, neutron cross sections, criticality calculations, reactor kinetics and shielding.

(5) Reactor engineering technology: This area includes considerations pertinent to the overall design and optimization of the reactor and theory of and data relating to such problems as reactor stress and heat transfer analysis.

(6) Environmental safety considerations: This area includes considerations relating to normal reactor radiations and possible accidental hazards and the effect of these on equipment and personnel and appropriate methods of waste disposal and decontamination.

2. Source materials:

Geology, exploration techniques, chemistry, and technology of extracting uranium and thorium from their ores and concentrates, the chemistry, production technology, and techniques of purification and fabrication of uranium and thorium compounds and metals, including design, construction, and operation of plants.

ARTICLE IV

A. Research materials: In connection with any subject of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III and subject to the provisions of article II, materials of interest, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes will, under this article, be exchanged in research quantities for research purposes and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially.

B. Research facilities: Subject to the provisions of article II, and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, and to the extent as may be agreed, specialized research facilities and reactor materials testing facilities of the parties shall be made available for mutual use consistent with the limits of space, facilities, and personnel conveniently available, when such facilities are not commercially available. It is understood that neither party will be able to permit access by personnel of the other party to facilities which are primarily of military significance.

ARTICLE V

With respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III and subject to the provisions of article II, equipment and devices may be transferred from one party to the other under such terms and conditions as may be agreed. It is recognized that such transfer will be subject to limitations which may arise from shortages of supplies or other circumstances existing at the time.

ARTICLE VI

A. It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or Australia may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, in the fields referred to in paragraph B of this article, persons under the jurisdiction of either the Government of the United States or the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia will be permitted to make arrangements to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for the other Government and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the other Government to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, provided that any classified information shall fall within the fields specified in paragraph B and subject to (1) the provisions of paragraph E of article II; (2) applicable laws, regulations and license requirements; (3) approval of the party to the jurisdiction of which the person making the arrangement is subject if the materials or services are classified or if the furnishing of such materials or services required the communication of classified information.

B. To the extent necessary in carrying out the arrangements made under paragraph A of this article, classified information in the following fields, subject in each case to the provisions of article II, may be communicated by the person furnishing the material or service to the party or person for whom such material or service is furnished:

1. The subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III.

2. Technological information within the categories set forth in article III. B. 1. c. as is required for the design, construction, and operation of specific research reactors, and of experimental, power demonstration, or power reactors, and when in the case of the Commonwealth of Australia such information is required in connection with reactors currently in operation in the Commonwealth of Australia or when such reactors are being seriously considered for construction by the Commonwealth of Australia or authorized persons under its jurisdiction as a source of power or as an intermediate step in a power-production program.

ARTICLE VII

A. During the period of this agreement, the United States Commission will sell to the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium. This net amount shall be the quantity of contained U–235 in uranium sold to the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia less the quantity of contained U–235 in recoverable uranium resold to the United States or transferred to any other nation or international organization with the approval of the United States in accordance with this agreement. This material may not

be enriched above 20 percent U–235 except as hereinafter provided. Such material will be sold subject to the terms and conditions of this article and the other provisions of this agreement as and when required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of defined research, experimental, demonstration power, and power reactors (1) which the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia, after consultation with the United States Commission, decides to construct or (2) which are constructed by a person in Australia with the concurrence of the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia after consultation with the United States Commission; and as required in experiments related thereto. The United States Commission may, upon request and in its discretion, make a portion of the foregoing 500 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials-testing reactor, capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms.

B. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 transferred by the United States Commission under this article and in the custody of the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia shall not at any time be in excess of the amount of material necessary for the full loading of each defined reactor project which the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia or persons under its jurisdiction decide to construct as provided herein, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the United States Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Australia or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the United States Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the material so transferred.

C. Each sale of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 shall be subject to the agreement of the parties as to the schedule of deliveries, the form of material to be delivered, charges therefor and the amount of material to be delivered consistent with the quantity limitations established in paragraph B. It is understood and agreed that although the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia will distribute uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 to authorized users in Australia, the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia will retain title to any uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 which is purchased from the United States Commission at least until such time as private users in the United States are permitted to acquire title in the United States to uranium enriched in the isotope U–235.

D. It is agreed that when any source or special nuclear materials received from the United States require reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the United States Commission in either United States Commission facilities or facilities acceptable to the United States Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may otherwise be agreed, that the form and content of the irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the United States Commission or the facilities acceptable to the United States Commission for reprocessing.

E. With respect to any special nuclear material produced in reactors fueled with material obtained from the United States which is in excess of Australia's need for such material in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the United States shall have and is hereby granted (a) a first option to purchase such material at prices then prevailing in the United States for special nuclear material produced in reactors which are fueled pursuant to the terms of an agreement for cooperation with the United States, and (b) the right to approve the transfer of such material to any other nation or international organization in the event the option to purchase is not exercised.

ARTICLE VIII

As may be necessary and as may be mutually agreed in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III and under the limitations set forth in Article II and under such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed, specific arrangements may be made from time to time between the parties for lease, or sale and purchase, of quantities of materials including heavy water and natural uranium but not including special nuclear materials, greater than those required for research, when such materials are not available commercially.

ARTICLE IX

It is agreed that existing arrangements and contracts between the Combined Development Agency and the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia for the sale of uranium ores and concentrates to said Agency shall continue in effect until their expiration as provided in these arrangements or contracts.

ARTICLE X

A. With respect to any invention or discovery employing information classified when communicated in accordance with article III and made or conceived as a result of such communication during the period of this agreement, the Government of the United States of America with respect to invention or discovery rights owned by it, and the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia with respect to any invention or discovery owned by it or made or conceived by persons under its jurisdiction:

(1) Agree to transfer and assign or cause to be transferred or assigned to the other all right, title, and interest in and to any such invention, discovery, patent application, or patent in the country of that other, subject to a royalty-free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license for the governmental purposes of the transferring party and for purposes of mutual defense;

(2) Shall, upon request of the other, grant or cause to be granted to the other a royalty-free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license for its governmental purposes in the country of the transferring party or third countries, including use in the production of materials in such countries for sale to the requesting party by a contractor of such party;

(3) Agree that each party may otherwise deal with any invention, discovery, patent application or patent in its own country or third countries as it may desire, but in no event shall either party discriminate against citizens of the country of the other in respect of granting any license under the patents owned by it in its own or third countries;

(4) Waive any and all claims against the other for compensation, royalty or award as respects any such invention or discovery, patent application or patent and releases the other with respect to any such claim.

B. (1) No patent application with respect to any classified invention or discovery employing information which has been communicated under this agreement may be filed by either party or any person in the country of the other party except in accordance with agreed conditions and procedures.

(2) No patent application with respect to any such classified invention or discovery may be filed in any country not a party to this agreement except as may be agreed and subject to article XIV.

(3) Appropriate secrecy or prohibition orders shall be issued for the purpose of giving effect to this paragraph.

ARTICLE XI

A. It is agreed that all information and material, including equipment and devices, which warrant a classification in accordance with the classification criteria referred to in the applicable security arrangements between the United States Commission and the Australian Commission shall be safeguarded in accordance with the security safeguards and standards prescribed in such security arrangements.

B. It is agreed that the recipient party of any material, including equipment and devices, and of any classified information under this agreement shall not further disseminate such information or transfer such material, including equipment and devices, to any other country without the written consent of the originating country. It is further agreed that neither party to this agreement will transfer to any other country equipment or device, the transfer of which would involve the disclosure of any classified information received from the other party, without the written consent of such other party.

ARTICLE XII

The Government of the Commonwealth of Australia and the Government of the United States of America affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In the event such an international agency is created:

1. The parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects, if any, they desire to modify the provisions of this agreement for cooperation. In particular, the parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects and to what extent they desire to arrange for the administration by the international agency of those conditions, controls, and safeguards, including those relating to health and safety standards, required by the international agency in connection with similar assistance rendered to a cooperating nation under the aegis of the international agency.

2. In the event the parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement following the consultation provided in paragraph A of this article, either party may by notification terminate this agreement. In the event this agreement is so terminated, the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia shall return to the United States Commission all source and special nuclear materials received pursuant to this agreement and in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction.

ARTICLE XIII

The Government of the Commonwealth of Australia and the Government of the United States emphasize their common interest in assuring that any material, equipment, or device made available to the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia pursuant to this agreement shall be used solely for civil purposes.

A. Except to the extent that the safeguards provided for in this agreement are supplanted, by agreement of the parties as provided in article XII, by safeguards of the proposed international atomic energy agency, the Government of the United States of America, notwithstanding any other provisions of this agreement, shall have the following rights:

1. With the objective of assuring design and operation for civil purposes and permitting effective application of safeguards, to review the design of any (i) reactor and (ii) other equipment and devices the design of which the United States Commission determines to be relevant to the effective application of safeguards, which are to be made available to the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States or any person under its jurisdiction, or which are to use, fabricate or process any of the following materials so made available: source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or any

other material designated by the United States Commission;

2. With respect to any source or special nuclear material made available to the Government of the Comonwealth of Australia or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States or any person under its jurisdiction and any source or special nuclear material utilized in, recovered from, or produced as a result of the use of any of the following materials, equipment, or devices so made available: (i) source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the United States Commission, (ii) reactors, (iii) any other equipment or device designated by the United States Commission as an item to be made available on the condition that the provision of this subparagraph A2 will apply, (a) to require the maintenance and production of operating records and to request and receive reports for the purpose of assisting in insuring accountability for such materials; and (b) to require that any such material in the custody of the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia or any person under its jurisdiction be subject to all of the safeguards provided for in this article and the guaranties set forth in article XIV;

3. To require the deposit in storage facilities designated by the United States Commission of any of the special nuclear material referred to in subparagraph A2 of this article which is not currently utilized for civil purposes in Australia and which is not purchased pursuant to article VII, paragraph E (a) of this agreement, transferred pursuant to article VII, paragraph E (b) of this agreement, or otherwise disposed of pursuant to an arrangement mutually acceptable to the parties;

4. To designate, after consultation with the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia, personnel who, accompanied, if either party so requests, by personnel designated by the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia, shall have access in Australia to all places and data necessary to account for the source and special nuclear materials which are subject to subparagraph A2 of this article to determine whether there is compliance with this agreement and to make such independent measurements as may be deemed necessary;

5. In the event of noncompliance with the provisions of this article or the guaranties set forth in article XIV and the failure of the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia to carry out the provisions of this article within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate this agreement and require the return of any materials, equipment, and devices referred to in subparagraph A2 of this article;

6. To consult with the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia in the matter of health and safety.

B. The Government of the Commonwealth of Australia undertakes to facilitate the application of the safeguards provided for in this article.

ARTICLE XIV

A. The Government of the Commonwealth of Australia guarantees that:

1. The security safeguards and standards prescribed by the applicable security arrangements between the United States Commission and the Australian Commission will be maintained with respect to all classified information and materials, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this agreement.

2. No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia or authorized persons under its jurisdiction by purchase or otherwise pursuant to this agreement will be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purpose.

3. No material, including equipment and devices, or any restricted data transferred to the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this agreement will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia, except as the United States Commission may agree to such a transfer to another nation, and then only if the transfer of the material or restricted data is within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the United States and the other nation.

B. The Government of the United States of America guarantees that:

1. The security safeguards and standards prescribed by the applicable security arrangements between the United States Commission and the Australian Commission will be maintained with respect to all classified information and materials, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this agreement.

2. No material, including equipment and devices, or any restricted data transferred to the Government of the United States or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this agreement, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States of America, except as the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia may agree to such a transfer to another nation.

ARTICLE XV

The application or use of any information (including design, drawings, and specifications), material, equipment or device, exchanged or transferred between the parties under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party receiving it, and the other party does not warrant the accuracy and completeness of such information and does not warrant the suitability of such information, material, equipment, or device for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE XVI

For purposes of this agreement:

A. "United States Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

B. "Australian Commission" means the Atomic Energy Commission of the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia.

C. "Parties" means the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia and the Government of the United States of America, including the Australian Commission on behalf of the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia and the United States Commission on behalf of the Government of the United States of America. "Party" means one of the above "parties."

D. "Atomic weapon" means any device utilizing atomic energy, exclusive of the means for transporting or propelling the device (where such means is a separable and divisible part of the device), the principal purpose of which is for use as, or for development of, a weapon, a weapon prototype, or a weapon test device.

E. "Byproduct material" means any radioactive material (except special nuclear material) yielded in or made radioactive by exposure to the radiation incident to the process of producing or utilizing special nuclear material.

F. "Classified" means a security designation of "Confidential" or higher applied, under the laws and regulations of either the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia or the Government of the United States, to any data, information, materials, services, or any other matter, and includes "restricted data."

G. "Equipment and devices" and "equipment or device" means any instrument, apparatus, or facility and includes any facility, except an atomic weapon, capable of making use of or producing special nuclear material, and component parts thereof.

H. "Person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, group, Government agency or Government corporation but does not include the parties to this agreement.

I. "Reactor" means an apparatus, other than an atomic weapon in which a self-supporting fission chain reaction is maintained by utilizing uranium, plutonium, or thorium, or any combination of uranium, plutonium, or thorium.

J. "Restricted data" means all data concerning (1) design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapons; (2) the production of special nuclear material; or (3) the use of special nuclear material in the production of energy, but shall not include data declassified or removed from the category of restricted data by the appropriate authority.

K. "Source material" means (1) uranium, thorium, or any other material which is determined by the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia or the United States Commission to be source material or (2) ores containing one or more of the foregoing materials, in such concentration as the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia or the United States Commission may determine from time to time.

L. "Special nuclear material" means (1) plutonium, uranium enriched in the isotope 233 or in the isotope 235, and any other material which the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia or the United States Commission determines to be special nuclear material; or (2) any material artificially enriched by any of the foregoing.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington in duplicate this — day of ———, 1956.

For the Government of the United States of America:

P. J. F. (June 16, 1956).
CLARK C. VOGEL (June 16, 1956).
USAEG.

For the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia:

PERCY SPENDER,
Ambassador for Australia to United States of America.

Certified true copy of proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia and the Government of the United States of America concerning the civil uses of atomic energy identified, as shown, by representatives of the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia and representatives of the Government of the United States of America.

——— ———.

———

JUNE 20, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy,
Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. A proposed agreement for cooperation with the Government of Switzerland;

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the proposed agreement;

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approving the agreement, containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security; and his authorization to execute the proposed agreement.

The proposed agreement, when executed, will permit cooperation between Switzerland and the United States in matters relating to the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy with particular emphasis on the development of nuclear power. The agreement will permit the exchange of classified and unclassified information, under

appropriate security arrangements. Under the proposed agreement the Commission would sell to the Government of Switzerland uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U–235 enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent for use as fuel in the operation of defined reactors constructed in Switzerland. The Commission may, in its discretion, make a portion of the 500 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor, capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium. You will note that article XII of the agreement incorporates provisions designed to minimize the possibility that material or equipment transferred under the agreement would be diverted to nonpeaceful purposes. Source or special nuclear material received from the United States under the agreement would be reprocessed in the United States in Commission facilities or in facilities acceptable to the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

———— ————,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 20, 1956.

Dr. W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman,
Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. LIBBY: Under date of June 19, 1956, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve a proposed agreement for cooperation concerning the civil uses of atomic energy between the Government of Switzerland and the Government of the United States of America.

I have examined the agreement recommended. It calls for an exchange of classified and unclassified information relating to the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy with particular emphasis on the development of nuclear power. It is provided, however, that the exchange of restricted data under the agreement will extend only to that which is relevant to current or projected programs; will not include any information which is primarily of military significance; and will not include information concerning the production of special nuclear materials except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor. Further, no material, equipment, or device which is primarily of military significance will be exchanged under the agreement.

The proposed agreement provides that the Commission will sell to the Government of Switzerland for use as fuel in defined reactors uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent except that a quantity of the uranium, enriched up to 90 percent, may be made available for use in a materials testing reactor. The agreement provides for appropriate safeguards against the diversion of materials and equipment for unauthorized uses.

The agreement also affirms the interest of the United States and Switzerland in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency which would foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby—

1. Approve the within proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of Switzerland concerning the civil uses of atomic energy.

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JUNE 20, 1956.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland," and authorize its execution by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

This agreement, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, will broaden the scope of cooperation between Switzerland and the United States in fields related to the peaceful utilization of atomic energy by providing for cooperation between the two countries on matters relating to the design, development, construction, and operation of experimental, demonstration power, and power reactors. In the opinion of the Commission, the agreement is an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Switzerland in accordance with the policy which you have established.

The proposed agreement calls for an exchange, under appropriate security arrangements, of unclassified and classified information relating to the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In particular, article III provides for an exchange of general information on the design and characteristics of experimental, demonstration power, and power reactors as is required to permit an evaluation and comparison of their potential use in a power production program and for an exchange of technological information, as may be agreed, on specific experimental, demonstration power or power reactors as is required for the development, construction, and operation of such reactors.

The exchange of restricted data under the agreement will extend to that which is relevant to current or projected programs, will not include any information which is primarily of military significance, and will not include information concerning the production of special nuclear materials except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor. The proposed agreement also provides for an exchange of reactor materials not available commercially. The parties agree, however, that no material, equipment, or devices which are primarily of military significance will be transferred or exported under the agreement.

The agreement will permit the Commission to sell to the Government of Switzerland uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U–235 enriched, except as noted below, up to a maximum of 20 percent during the period of the agreement for use as fuel in the operation of defined research, experimental, demonstration power, and power reactor projects in Switzerland. The Commission at its discretion may make a portion of the foregoing 500 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 transferred to the Government of Switzerland for use as fuel in reactors will not at any time be in excess of the amount of material necessary for the full loading of each defined reactor project plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Switzerland or while fuel elements are in transit.

The U–235 to be transferred under this agreement is being made available in accordance with your recent announcement that the United States is prepared to make up to 20,000 kilograms of U–235 available to friendly countries to facilitate the development of nuclear power for peaceful purposes, and you will note that article XII of the agreement incorporates provisions which are designed to minimize the possibility that material or equipment transferred under the agreement will be diverted to nonpeaceful purposes. In addition, article VII of the agreement provides that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States requires reprocessing, such reprocessing will be performed by the Atomic Energy Commisison in Commission facilities, or in facilities acceptable to the Commission.

Article IV of the agreement would permit the transfer of special nuclear materials, including U–235, U–233, and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In article XI the parties affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy and express their intention to reappraise the agreement in the event such an agency is established.

Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the agreement will be executed by the appropriate authorities of Switzerland and the United States. In compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the agreement will be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. This agreement with Switzerland, when executed, will supplement the cooperation undertaken by the two Governments in the agreement signed on July 18, 1955, which provided for cooperation in the field of research reactors and their use.

Respectfully,

W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NETHERLANDS

Whereas the Government of the Netherlands and the Government of the United States have, on July 18, 1955, signed into an agreement for cooperation concerning civil uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas such agreement provides that it is the hope and expectation of the parties that the initial agreement for cooperation will extend to consideration of further cooperation extending to the design, construction and operation of power-producing reactors; and

Whereas the Government of the Netherlands has advised the Government of the United States of America of its desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy including the design, construction, and operation of power-producing reactors; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America desires to cooperate with the Government of the Netherlands in such a program as hereinafter provided; and

Whereas the parties desire to supersede the agreement for cooperation signed on

July 18, 1955, for this agreement which includes the new areas of cooperation;

The parties therefore agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

A. The agreement for cooperation signed on July 18, 1955, is superseded in its entirety on the day this agreement enters into force.

B. This agreement shall enter into force on the day on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 10 years.

ARTICLE II

A. Subject to the provisions of this agreement, the availability of personnel and material, and the applicable laws, regulations, and license requirements in force in their respective countries, the parties shall cooperate with each other in the achievement of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

B. The disposition and utilization of atomic weapons and the exchange of restricted data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons shall be outside the scope of this agreement.

C. The exchange of restricted data under this agreement shall be subject to the following limitations:

(1) Restricted data which in the opinion of the United States Commission is primarily of military significance shall not be exchanged.

(2) Restricted data concerning the production of special nuclear materials except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor shall not be exchanged.

(3) It shall extend only to that which is relevant to current or projected programs.

(4) The development of submarine, ship, aircraft, and certain package power reactors is presently concerned primarily with their military uses. Accordingly, restricted data pertaining primarily to such reactors will not be exchanged until such time as these types of reactors in the opinion of both parties warrant civil application and the exchange of information on these types of reactors may be agreed. Information on the adaptation of these types of reactors to military use will not be exchanged. Likewise, restricted data pertaining primarily to any future reactor types the development of which is concerned primarily with their military use will not be exchanged until such time as these types of reactors warrant civil application and the exchange of information on these types of reactors may be agreed; and restricted data on the adaptation of these types of reactors to military use will not be exchanged.

D. This agreement shall not require the exchange of any information which the parties are not permitted to communicate because the information is privately developed and privately owned or has been received from another government.

E. It is agreed that the United States Commission will not transfer or permit the export, under this agreement, of any materials or equipment and devices if such materials or equipment and devices are, in the opinion of the United States Commission, primarily of military significance.

ARTICLE III

A. Subject to the provisions of article II, classified information in the specific fields set out below and unclassified information shall be exchanged between the United States Commission and the Government of the Netherlands with respect to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses, including research and development relating to such uses and problems of health and safety connected therewith. The exchange of information provided for in this article shall be accomplished through the various means available, including reports, conferences, and visits to facilities.

B. The parties agree to exchange the following classified information, including restricted data:

(1) General information on the design and characteristics of research, experimental, demonstration power or power reactors as is required to permit an evaluation and comparison of their potential use in a research or power production program.

(2) Technological information, as may be agreed, on specific research, experimental, demonstration power or power reactors, and, when in the case of the Netherlands, such information is required in connection with reactors currently in operation in the Netherlands or when such information is required in the development, construction, and operation of specific reactors which the Netherlands intends to construct as part of a current research, experimental, demonstration power or power program in the Netherlands.

(3) Classified information within subparagraphs (1) and (2) hereof shall be exchanged within the following fields:

(a) Specifications for reactor materials: Final form specifications including the composition, shape, size and special handling techniques of reactor materials including uranium, heavy water, reactor grade graphite, and zirconium.

(b) Properties of reactor materials: Physical, chemical, metallurgical, nuclear, and mechanical properties of reactor materials including fuel, moderator and coolant and the effects of the reactor's operating conditions on the properties of these materials.

(c) Reactor components: The design and performance specifications of reactor components, but not including the methods of production and fabrication.

(d) Reactor physics technology: This area includes theory of and pertinent data relating to neutron bombardment reactions, neutron cross sections, criticality calculations, reactor kinetics and shielding.

(e) Reactor engineering technology: This area includes considerations pertinent to the overall design and optimization of the reactor and theory of and data relating to such problems as reactor stress and heat transfer analysis.

(f) Environmental safety considerations: This area includes considerations relating to normal reactor radiations and possible accidental hazards and the effect of such on equipment and personnel and appropriate methods of waste disposal and decontamination.

ARTICLE IV

A. Research materials: Materials of interest in connection with the subject of agreed exchanges of information as provided in article III and under the provisions set forth in article II, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes will be exchanged for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no case, however, shall quantities of special nuclear materials transferred under this article and within the jurisdiction of the Government of the Netherlands be, at any one time, in excess of 100 grams of contained U–235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U–233.

B. Research facilities: Subject to the provisions of article II and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, and to the extent as may be agreed, specialized research facilities and reactor material testing facilities of the parties shall be made available for mutual use consistent with the limits of space, facilities, and personnel conveniently available, when such facilities are not commercially available. It is understood that the United States Commission will not be able to permit access to facilities which are primarily of military significance.

ARTICLE V

With respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III and subject to the provisions of article II, equipment and devices may be transferred from one party to the other under such terms and conditions as may be agreed. It is recognized that such transfer will be subject to limitations which may arise from shortages of supplies or other circumstances existing at the time.

ARTICLE VI

A. It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or the Netherlands may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, in the fields referred to in paragraph B of this article, persons under the jurisdiction of either the Government of the United States or the Government of the Netherlands will be permitted to make arrangements to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for the other government and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the other government to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, provided that any classified information shall fall within the fields specified in paragraph B and subject to:

(1) The provisions of paragraph E of article II;

(2) Applicable laws, regulations and license requirements;

(3) Approval of the party to the jurisdiction of which the person making the arrangement is subject if the materials or services are classified or if the furnishing of such materials or services requires the communications of classified information.

B. To the extent necessary in carrying out the arrangements made under paragraph A of this article, classified information in the following fields, subject in each case to the provisions of article II may be communicated by the person furnishing the material or services to the party or person to whom such material or service is furnished:

(1) The subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III;

(2) Technological information within the categories of information set forth in article III B 3 on specific research, experimental, demonstration power or power reactors and, when in the case of the Netherlands, such information is required in connection with reactors currently in operation in the Netherlands or when such information is required in the construction and operation of specific reactors which the Government of the Netherlands or authorized persons under its jurisdiction intend to construct as part of a current research, experimental, demonstration power or power program in the Netherlands.

ARTICLE VII

A. During the period of this agreement, the United States Commission will sell to the Government of the Netherlands uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium. This net amount shall be the quantity of contained U–235 in uranium sold to the Government of the Netherlands less the quantity of contained U–235 in recoverable uranium resold to the United States or transferred to any other nation or international organization with the approval of the United States in accordance with this agreement. This material may not be enriched above 20 percent U–235 except as hereinafter provided. Such material will be sold subject to the terms and conditions of this article and the other provisions of this agreement as and when required as initial and replacement fuel in the

operation of defined research, and experimental, demonstration power and power reactors which the Government of the Netherlands in consultation with the United States Commission decides to construct or authorize private organizations to construct in the Netherlands and as required in experiments related thereto. The United States Commission may, upon request and in its discretion, make a portion of the foregoing 500 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor, capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium.

B. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 transferred by the United States Commission under this article and in the custody of the Government of the Netherlands shall not at any time be in excess of the amount of material necessary for the full loading of each defined reactor project which the Government of the Netherlands or persons under its jurisdiction decides to construct as provided herein, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the United States Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in the Netherlands or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the United States Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the material so transferred.

C. Each sale of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 shall be subject to the agreement of the parties as to the schedule of deliveries, the form of material to be delivered, charges therefor and the amount of material to be delivered consistent with the quantity limitations established in paragraph B. It is understood and agreed that although the Government of the Netherlands will distribute uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 to authorized users in the Netherlands, the Government of the Netherlands will retain title to any uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 which is purchased from the United States Commission at least until such time as private users in the United States are permitted to acquire title in the United States to uranium enriched in the isotope U–235.

D. It is agreed that when any source or special nuclear materials received from the United States of America require reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the United States Commission in either United States Commission facilities or facilities acceptable to the United States Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may be otherwise agreed, that the form and content of any irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the United States Commission or the facilties acceptable to the United States Commission for reprocessing.

E. With respect to any special nuclear material produced in reactors fueled with materials obtained from the United States which are in excess of the Netherlands' need for such materials in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the Government of the United States of America shall have and is hereby granted (a) a first option to purchase of such material at prices then prevailing in the United States of America for special nuclear material produced in reactors which are fueled pursuant to the terms of an agreement for cooperation with the Government of the United States of America, and (b) the right to approve the transfer of such material to any other nation or international organizations in the event the option to purchase is not exercised.

ARTICLE VIII

As may be necessary and as may be mutually agreed in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III, and under the limitations set forth in article II, and under such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed, specific arrangements may be made from time to time between the parties for lease, or sale and purchase, of quantities of materials, including heavy water and natural uranium, but not including special nuclear materials, greater than those required for research, when such materials are not available commercially.

ARTICLE IX

A. With respect to any invention or discovery employing information classified when communicated in accordance with article III and made or conceived as a result of such communication during the period of this agreement, the Government of the United States of America with respect to invention or discovery rights owned by it, and the Government of the Netherlands with respect to any invention or discovery owned by it or made or conceived by persons under its jurisdiction:

(1) Agree to transfer and assign or cause to be transferred or assigned to the other all right, title, and interest in and to any such invention, discovery, patent application, or patent in the country of that other, subject to a royalty-free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license for the governmental purposes of the transferring party and for purposes of mutual defense;

(2) Shall, upon request of the other, grant or cause to be granted to the other a royalty-free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license for its governmental purposes in the country of the transferring party or third countries, including use in the production of materials in such countries for sale to the requesting party by a contractor of such party;

(3) Agree that each party may otherwise deal with any invention, discovery, patent application or patent in its own country or third countries as it may desire, but in no event shall either party discriminate against citizens of the country of the other in respect of granting any license under the patents owned by it in its own or third countries.

(4) Waive any and all claims against the other for compensation, royalty, or award as respects any such invention or discovery, patent application or patent and release the other with respect to any such claim.

B. (1) No patent application with respect to any classified invention or discovery employing information which has been communicated under this agreement may be filed by either party or any person in the country of the other party except in accordance with agreed conditions and procedures.

(2) No patent application with respect to any such classified invention or discovery may be filed in any country not a party to this agreement except as may be agreed and subject to article XIII.

(3) Appropriate secrecy or prohibition orders shall be issued for the purpose of giving effect to this paragraph.

ARTICLE X

A. The criteria of security classification established by the United States Commission shall be applicable to all information and material, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this agreement. The United States Commission will keep the Government of the Netherlands informed concerning these criteria and any modifications thereof, and the parties will consult with each other from time to time concerning the practical application of these criteria.

B. It is agreed that all information and material, including equipment and devices, which warrant a classification in accordance with paragraph A of this article, shall be safeguarded in accordance with applicable security arrangements between the Government of the United States of America, represented by the United States Commission, and the Government of the Netherlands.

C. It is agreed that the recipient party of any material, including equipment and devices, and of any classified information under this agreement, shall not further disseminate such information or transfer such material, including equipment and devices, to any other country without the written consent of the originating country. It is further agreed that neither party to this agreement will transfer to any other country equipment or device, the transfer of which would involve the disclosure of any classified information received from the other party, without the written consent of such other party.

ARTICLE XI

A. The Government of the Netherlands and the Government of the United States of America affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In the event such an international agency is created:

(1) The parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects, if any, they desire to modify the provisions of this agreement for cooperation. In particular, the parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects and to what extent they desire to arrange for the administration by the international agency of those conditions, controls, and safeguards, including those relating to health and safety standards, required by the international agency in connection with similar assistance rendered to a cooperating nation under the aegis of the international agency.

(2) In the event the parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement following the consultation provided in paragraph A of this article, either party may by notification terminate this agreement. In the event this agreement is so terminated, the Government of the Netherlands shall return to the Commission all source and special nuclear materials received pursuant to this agreement and in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction.

B. It is recognized that efforts are being made in Western Europe to integrate the atomic energy programs of a group of nations. If the Government of the Netherlands becomes a member of such an integrated group, and if an agreement for cooperation on atomic energy is made between the group of nations and the Government of the United States of America, the latter would be prepared if so requested by the Government of the Netherlands to arrange for the integrated group to assume the rights and obligations of the Government of the Netherlands under this agreement, provided the integrated group can, in the judgment of the Government of the United States of America, effectively and securely carry out the undertakings of this agreement.

ARTICLE XII

The Government of the Netherlands and the Government of the United States emphasize their common interest in assuring that any material, equipment, or device made available to the Government of the Netherlands pursuant to this agreement shall be used solely for civil purposes.

A. Except to the extent that the safeguards provided for in this agreement are supplanted, by agreement of the parties as provided in article XI, by safeguards of the proposed international atomic energy agency, the Government of the United States of America, notwithstanding any other provisions of this agreement, shall have the following rights:

(1) With the objective of assuring design and operation for civil purposes and permitting effective application of safeguards, to review the design of any (i) reactor and (ii) other equipment and devices the design of which the Commission determines to be relevant to the effective application of safe-

guards, which are to be made available to the Government of the Netherlands or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction, or which are to use, fabricate, or process any of the following materials so made available: Source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the United States Commission.

(2) With respect to any source or special nuclear material made available to the Government of the Netherlands or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction and any source or special nuclear material utilized in, recovered from, or produced as a result of the use of any of the following materials, equipment, or devices so made available: (i) source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the United States Commission, (ii) reactors, (iii) any other equipment or device designated by the United States Commission as an item to be made available on the condition that the provisions of this subparagraph A2 will apply, (a) to require the maintenance and production of operating records and to request and receive reports for the purpose of assisting in ensuring accountability for such materials; and (b) to require that any such material in the custody of the Government of the Netherlands or any person under its jurisdiction be subject to all of the safeguards provided for in this article and the guaranties set forth in article XIII;

(3) To require the deposit in storage facilities designated by the United States Commission of any of the special nuclear material referred to in subparagraph A2 of this article which is not currently utilized for civil purposes in the Netherlands and which is not purchased pursuant to article VII, paragraph E (a) of this agreement, transferred pursuant to article VII, paragraph E (b) of this agreement, or otherwise disposed of pursuant to an arrangement mutually acceptable to the parties;

(4) To designate, after consultation with the Government of the Netherlands, personnel who, accompanied, if either party so requests, by personnel designated by the Government of the Netherlands, shall have access in the Netherlands to all places and data necessary to account for the source and special nuclear materials which are subject to subparagraph A2 of this article to determine whether there is compliance with this agreement and to make such independent measurements as may be deemed necessary;

(5) In the event of noncompliance with the provisions of this article or the guaranties set forth in article XIII and the failure of the Government of the Netherlands to carry out the provisions of this article within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate this agreement and require the return of any materials, equipment, and devices referred to in subparagraph A2 of this article;

(6) To consult with the Government of the Netherlands in the matter of health and safety.

B. The Government of the Netherlands undertakes to facilitate the application of the safeguards provided for in this article.

ARTICLE XIII

A. The Government of the Netherlands guarantees that:

(1) The security safeguards and standards prescribed by applicable security arrangements between the Government of the United States of America by the United States Commission and the Government of the Netherlands will be maintained with respect to all classified information and materials, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this agreement.

(2) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of the Netherlands or authorized persons under its jurisdiction by purchase or otherwise pursuant to this agreement will be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purpose.

(3) No material, including equipment and devices, or any restricted data transferred to the Government of the Netherlands or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this agreement will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the Netherlands, except as the United States Commission may agree to such a transfer to another nation, and then only if the transfer of the material or restricted data is within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the other nation.

B. The Government of the United States of America guarantees that:

(1) The security safeguards and standards prescribed by applicable security arrangements between the Government of the United States of America by the United States Commission and the Government of the Netherlands will be maintained with respect to all classified information and materials, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this agreement.

(2) No material, including equipment and devices, or any restricted data transferred to the Government of the United States of America or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this agreement, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States of America, except as the Government of the Netherlands may agree to such a transfer to another nation.

ARTICLE XIV

The application or use of any information (including design drawings and specifications), material, equipment, or devices, exchanged or transferred between the parties under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party receiving it, and the other party does not warrant the accuracy and completeness of such information and does not warrant the suitability of such information, material, equipment, or device for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE XV

For the purposes of this agreement:

A. "The Netherlands" means the European part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

B. "Commission" or "United States Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

C. "Parties" means the Government of the Netherlands and the Government of the United States of America, including the United States Commission on behalf of the Government of the United States of America. "Party" means one of the above parties.

D. "Atomic weapon" means any device utilizing atomic energy, exclusive of the means for transporting or propelling the device (where such means is a separable and divisible part of the device), the principal purpose of which is for use as, or for development of, a weapon, a weapon prototype, or a weapon test device.

E. "Byproducts material" means any radioactive material (except special nuclear material) yielded in or made radioactive by exposure to the radiation incident to the process of producing or utilizing special nuclear material.

F. "Classified" means a security designation of "confidential" or higher applied, under the laws and regulations of either the Government of the Netherlands or the Government of the United States of America, to any data, information, materials, services or any other matter, and includes "restricted data."

G. "Equipment and devices" and "Equipment or device" means any instrument, apparatus, or facility and includes any facility, except an atomic weapon, capable of making use of or producing special nuclear material, and component parts thereof.

H. "Person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, group, government agency or government corporation, but does not include the parties to this agreement.

I. "Reactor" means an apparatus, other than atomic weapon, in which a self-supporting fission chain reaction is maintained by utilizing uranium, plutonium, or thorium, or any combination of uranium, plutonium, or thorium.

J. "Restricted data" means all data concerning (1) design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapons; (2) the production of special nuclear material; or (3) the use of special nuclear material in the production of energy, but shall not include data declassified or removed from the category of restricted data by the appropriate authority.

K. "Special nuclear material" means (1) plutonium, uranium, enriched in the isotope 233 or in the isotope 235, and any other materials which the Government of the Netherlands or the United States Commission determines to be special nuclear material; or (2) any material artificially enriched by any of the foregoing.

L. "Source material" means (1) uranium, thorium, or any other material which is determined by the Government of the Netherlands or the United States Commission to be source material; or (2) ores containing one or more of the foregoing materials, in such concentration as the Government of the Netherlands or the United States Commission may determine from time to time.

M. "Atomic energy" means all forms of energy released in the course of nuclear fission or nuclear transformation.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington in duplicate this — day of ———, 1956.

For the Government of the United States of America:

——— ———.

For the Government of the Netherlands:

——— ———.

———

JUNE 20, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,

The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Netherlands", and authorize its execution by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

This agreement, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, will incorporate and supersede the agreement for cooperation concerning civil uses of atomic energy which was entered into on July 18, 1955, between the two Governments. In particular, the proposed agreement will broaden the scope of cooperation between the Netherland and the United States in fields related to the peaceful utilization of atomic energy by providing for cooperation between the two countries on matters relating to the development, construction and operation of experimental, demonstration power, and power reactors, as well as research reactors. In the opinion of the Commission, the agreement is an important and desirable step in advancing the development of thhe peaceful uses of atomic energy in the Netherlands in accordance with the policy which you have established.

The proposed agreement calls for an exchange, under appropriate security arrangements, of unclassified and classified information relating to the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In particular, article III provides for an exchange of general information on the design and characteristics of research, experimental, demonstration power, and power reactors as is required to permit an evaluation and comparison of their potential use in a research and power production program and for an exchange of technological information, as may be agreed, on specific research, experimental, demonstration power or power reactors.

The exchange of restricted data under the agreement will extend to that which is relevant to current or projected programs, will not include any information which is primarily of military significance, and will not include information concerning the production of special nuclear materials except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor. The proposed agreement also provides for an exchange of reactor materials not available commercially. The parties agree, however, that no material, equipment, or devices which are primarily of military significance will be transferred or exported under the agreement.

The agreement will permit the Commission to sell to the Government of the Netherlands uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U–235 enriched, except as noted below, up to a maximum of 20 percent during the period of the agreement for use as fuel in the operation of defined research, experimental, demonstration power, and power reactor projects in the Netherlands. The Commission at its discretion may make a portion of the foregoing 500 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 transferred to the Government of the Netherlands for use as fuel in reactors will not at any time be in excess of the amount of material necessary for the full loading of each defined reactor project plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in the Netherlands or while fuel elements are in transit.

The U–235 to be transferred under this agreement is being made available in accordance with your recent announcement that the United States is prepared to make up to 20,000 kilograms of U–235 available to friendly countries to facilitate the development of nuclear power for peaceful purposes, and you will note that article XII of the agreement incorporates provisions which are designed to minimize the possibility that material or equipment transferred under the agreement will be diverted to nonpeaceful purposes. In addition, article VII of the agreement provides that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States requires reprocessing, such reprocessing will be performed by the Atomic Energy Commission in Commission facilities, or in facilities acceptable to the Commission.

Article IV of the agreement would permit the transfer of special nuclear materials, including U–235, U–233, and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In article XI the parties affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy and express their intention to reappraise the agreement in the event such an agency is established. Article XI also recognizes the efforts that are now being made in Western Europe to integrate the atomic energy programs of a group of nations and accordingly, provides that such an integrated group may assume the rights and obligations of the Government of the Netherlands under the agreement, provided the integrated group can, in the judgment of the United States, effectively and securely carry out the undertakings of this agreement.

Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the agreement will be executed by the appropriate authorities of the Netherlands and the United States. In accordance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the agreement will be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully,

W. F. LIBBY, *Acting Chairman.*

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 21, 1956.

Dr. W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. LIBBY: Under date of June 20, 1956, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve a proposed agreement for cooperation concerning the civil uses of atomic energy between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Netherlands.

I have examined the agreement recommended. It calls for an exchange of classified and unclassified information relating to the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy with particular emphasis on the development of nuclear power. It is provided, however, that the exchange of restricted data under the agreement will extend only to that which is relevant to current or projected programs; will not include any information which is primarily of military significance; and will not include information concerning the production of special nuclear materials except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor. Further, no material, equipment, or device which is primarily of military significance will be exchanged under the agreement.

The proposed agreement provides that the Commission will sell to the Government of the Netherlands for use as fuel in defined reactors uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent, except that a quantity of the uranium, enriched up to 90 percent, may be made available for use in a materials testing reactor. The agreement provides for appropriate safeguards against the diversion of materials and equipment for unauthorized uses.

The agreement also affirms the interest of the United States and the Netherlands in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency which would foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and I note that it takes into account the efforts that are now being made in Western Europe to integrate the atomic-energy programs of a group of nations.

Accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby—

1. Approve the within proposed agreement for cooperation concerning the civil uses of atomic energy between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Netherlands.

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JUNE 21, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: In connection with the proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the Netherlands and the Government of the United States which the Atomic Energy Commission transmitted to you today pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is attached to this letter two copies of an agreement between the Commission and the Government of the Netherlands regarding the agreed security arrangements concerning information and materials, including equipment and devices, relating to civil uses of atomic energy to be exchanged under the agreement for cooperation. There is also attached a copy of the Commission's letter to the President forwarding the security arrangement.

These security arrangements are referred to in articles X and XIII of the proposed agreement for cooperation and establish the security principles and criteria which will apply in the implementation of that agreement.

Your attention is directed to the fact that the Government of the Netherlands has agreed to maintain a security program similar to that maintained by the United States Atomic Energy Commission for the protection of classified information and materials exchanged under the agreement for cooperation and that both Governments guarantee that all classified information and material exchanged under the agreement for cooperation will be safeguarded in accordance with the safeguards and standards established by the security arrangements. An examination of the Netherland's security practices by the Commission's Division of Security has indicated that the security requirements of the agreement for cooperation can be adequately implemented.

Sincerely yours,

W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NETHERLANDS

Whereas the Government of the Netherlands and the Government of the United States have on July 18, 1955, signed an agreements for cooperation concerning civil uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas such agreement provides that it is the hope and expectation of the parties that the initial agreement for cooperation will extend to consideration of further cooperation extending to the design, construction and operation of power-producing reactors; and

Whereas the Government of the Netherlands has advised the Government of the United States of America of its desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy including the design, construction and operation of power-producing reactors; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America desires to cooperate with the Government of the Netherlands in such a program as hereinafter provided; and

Whereas the parties desire to supersede the agreement for cooperation signed on

July 18, 1955, for this agreement which includes the new areas of cooperation;

The parties therefore agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

A. The agreement for cooperation signed on July 18, 1955, is superseded in its entirety on the day this agreement enters into force.

B. This agreement shall enter into force on the day on which each government shall receive from the other government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 10 years.

ARTICLE II

A. Subject to the provisions of this agreement, the availability of personnel and material, and the applicable laws, regulations and license requirements in force in their respective countries, the parties shall cooperate with each other in the achievement of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

B. The disposition and utilization of atomic weapons and the exchange of restricted data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons shall be outside the scope of this agreement.

C. The exchange of restricted data under this agreement shall be subject to the following limitations:

(1) Restricted data which in the opinion of the United States Commission is primarily of military significance shall not be exchanged.

(2) Restricted data concerning the production of special nuclear materials except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor shall not be exchanged.

(3) It shall extend only to that which is relevant to current or projected programs.

(4) The development of submarine, ship, aircraft, and certain package power reactors is presently concerned primarily with their military uses. Accordingly, restricted data pertaining primarily to such reactors will not be exchanged until such time as these types of reactors in the opinion of both parties warrant civil application and the exchange of information on these types of reactors may be agreed. Information on the adaption of these types of reactors to military use will not be exchanged. Likewise, restricted data pertaining primarily to any future reactor-types the development of which is concerned primarily with their military use will not be exchanged until such time as these types of reactors warrant civil application and the exchange of information on these types of reactors may be agreed; and restricted data on the adaptation of these types of reactors to military use will not be exchanged.

D. This agreement shall not require the exchange of any information which the parties are not permitted to communicate because the information is privately developed and privately owned or has been received from another government.

E. It is agreed that the United States Commission will not transfer or permit the export, under this agreement, of any materials or equipment and devices if such materials or equipment and devices are, in the opinion of the United States Commission, primarily of military significanace.

ARTICLE III

A. Subject to the provisions of article II, classified information in the specific fields set out below and unclassified information shall be exchanged between the United States Commission and the Government of the Netherlands with respect to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses, including research and development relating to such uses and problems of health and safety connected therewith. The exchange of information provided for in this article shall be accomplished through the various means available, including reports, conferences and visits to facilities.

B. The parties agree to exchange the following classified information, including restricted data:

(1) General information on the design and characteristics of research, experimental, demonstration power or power reactors as is required to permit an evaluation and comparison of their potential use in a research or power production program.

(2) Technological information, as may be agreed, on specific research, experimental, demonstration power, or power reactors and, when in the case of the Netherlands, such information is required in connection with reactors currently in operation in the Netherlands or when such information is required in the development, construction, and operation of specific reactors which the Netherlands intends to construct as part of a current research, experimental, demonstration power, or power program in the Netherlands.

(3) Classified information within subparagraphs (1) and (2) hereof shall be exchanged within the following fields:

(a) Specifications for reactor materials: Final form specifications including the composition, shape, size, and special handling techniques of reactor materials including uranium, heavy water, reactor grade graphite, and zirconium.

(b) Properties of reactor materials: Physical, chemical, metallurgical, nuclear, and mechanical properties of reactor materials including fuel, moderator, and coolant, and the effects of the reactor's operating conditions on the properties of these materials.

(c) Reactor components: The design and performance specifications of reactor components, but not including the methods of production and fabrication.

(d) Reactor physics technology: This area includes theory of and pertinent data relating to neutron bombardment reactions, neutron cross sections, criticality calculations, reactor kinetics, and shielding.

(e) Reactor engineering technology: This area includes considerations pertinent to the overall design and optimization of the reactor and theory of and data relating to such problems as reactor stress and heat transfer analysis.

(f) Environmental safety considerations: This area includes considerations relating to normal reactor radiations and possible accidental hazards and the effect of such on equipment and personnel and appropriate methods of waste disposal and decontamination.

ARTICLE IV

A. Research materials: Materials of interest in connection with the subject of agreed exchanges of information as provided in article III and under the provision set forth in article II, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes will be exchanged for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no case, however, shall quantities of special nuclear materials transferred under this article and within the jurisdiction of the Government of the Netherlands be, at any one time, in excess of 100 grams of contained U–235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U–233.

B. Research facilities: Subject to the provisions of article II and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, and to the extent as may be agreed, specialized research facilities and reactor material testing facilities of the parties shall be made available for mutual use consistent with the limits of space, facilities, and personnel conveniently available, when such facilities are not commercially available. It is understood that the United States Commission will not be able to permit access to facilities which are primarily of military significance.

ARTICLE V

With respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III and subject to the provisions of article II, equipment and devices may be transferred from one party to the other under such terms and conditions as may be agreed. It is recognized that such transfer will be subject to limitations which may arise from shortages of supplies or other circumstances existing at the time.

ARTICLE VI

A. It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or the Netherlands may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other couuntry. Accordingly, in the fields referred to in paragraph B of this article, persons under the jurisdiction of either the Government of the United States or the Government of the Netherlands will be permitted to make arrangements to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, and to perform services for the other government and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the other government to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, provided that any classified information shall fall within the fields specified in paragraph B and subject to:

(1) The provisions of paragraph E of article II;

(2) Applicable laws, regulations and license requirements;

(3) Approval of the party to the jurisdiction of which the person making the arrangement is subject if the materials or services are classified or if the furnishing of such materials or services requires the communications of classified information.

B. To the extent necessary in carrying out the arrangements made under paragraph A of this article, classified information in the following fields, subject in each case to the provisions of article II may be communicated by the person furnishing the material or services to the party or person to whom such material or service is furnished:

(1) The subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III;

(2) Technological information within the categories of information set forth in article III B. 3 on specific research, experimental, demonstration power or power reactors and when in the case of the Netherlands, such information is required in connection with reactors currently in operation in the Netherlands or when such information is required in the construction and operation of specific reactors which the Government of the Netherlands or authorized persons under its jurisdiction intend to construct as part of a current research, experimental, demonstration power or power program in the Netherlands.

ARTICLE VII

A. During the period of this agreement, the United States Commission will sell to the Government of the Netherlands uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium. This net amount shall be the quantity of contained U–235 in uranium sold to the Government of the Netherlands less the quantity of contained U–235 in recoverable uranium resold to the United States or transferred to any other nation or international organization with the approval of the United States in accordance with this agreement. This material may not be enriched above 20 percent U–235 except as hereinafter provided. Such material will be sold

subject to the terms and conditions of this article and the other provisions of this agreement as and when required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of defined research, and experimental, demonstration power, and power reactors which the Government of the Netherlands in consultation with the United States Commission decides to construct or authorize private organizations to construct in the Netherlands and as required in experiments related thereto. The United States Commission may, upon request and in its discretion, make a portion of the foregoing 500 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor, capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms contained in U–235 in uranium.

B. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 transferred by the United States Commission under this article and in custody of the Government of the Netherlands shall not at any time be in excess of the amount of material necessary for the full loading of each defined reactor project which the Government of the Netherlands or persons under its jurisdiction decides to construct as provided herein, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the United States Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in the Netherlands or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the United States Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the material so transferred.

C. Each sale of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 shall be subject to the agreement of the parties as to the schedule of deliveries, the form of material to be delivered, charges therefor and the amount of material to be delivered consistent with the quantity limitations established in paragraph B. It is understood and agreed that although the Government of the Netherlands will distribute uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 to authorized users in the Netherlands, the Government of the Netherlands will retain title to any uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 which is purchased from the United States Commission at least until such time as private users in the United States are permitted to acquire title in the United States to uranium enriched in the isotope U–235.

D. It is agreed that when any source or special nuclear materials received from the United States of America require reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the United States Commission in either United States Commission facilities or facilities acceptable to the United States Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may be otherwise agreed, that the form and content of any irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the United States Commission or the facilities acceptable to the United States Commission for reprocessing.

E. With respect to any special nuclear material produced in reactors fueled with materials obtained from the United States which are in excess of the Netherlands' need for such materials in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the Government of the United States of America shall have and is hereby granted (a) a first option to purchase of such material at prices then prevailing in the United States of America for special nuclear material produced in reactors which are fueled pursuant to the terms of an agreement for cooperation with the Government of the United States of America, and (b) the right to approve the transfer of such material to any other nation or international organizations in the event the option to purchase is not exercised.

ARTICLE VIII

As may be necessary and as may be mutually agreed in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III, and under the limitations set forth in article II, and under such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed, specific arrangements may be made from time to time between the parties for lease, or sale and purchase, of quantities of materials, including heavy water and natural uranium, but not including special nuclear materials, greater than those required for research, when such materials are not available commercially.

ARTICLE IX

A. With respect to any invention or discovery employing information classified when communicated in accordance with article III and made or conceived as a result of such communication during the period of this agreement, the Government of the United States of America with respect to invention or discovery rights owned by it, and the Government of the Netherlands with respect to any invention or discovery owned by it or made or conceived by persons under its jurisdiction:

(1) Agree to transfer and assign or cause to be transferred or assigned to the other all right, title, and interest in and to any such invention, discovery, patent application or patent in the country of that other, subject to a royalty-free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license for the governmental purposes of the transferring party and for purposes of mutual defense;

(2) Shall, upon request of the other, grant or cause to be granted to the other a royalty-free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license for its governmental purposes in the country of the transferring party or third countries, including use in the production of materials in such countries for sale to the requesting party by a contractor of such party;

(3) Agree that each party may otherwise deal with any invention, discovery, patent application or patent in its own country or third countries as it may desire, but in no event shall either party discriminate against citizens of the country of the other in respect of granting any license under the patents owned by it in its own or third countries.

(4) Waive any and all claims against the other for compensation, royalty or award as respects any such invention or discovery, patent application or patent and release the other with respect to any such claim.

B. (1) No patent application with respect to any classified invention or discovery employing information which has been communicated under this agreement may be filed by either party or any person in the country of the other party except in accordance with agreed conditions and procedures.

(2) No patent application with respect to any such classified invention or discovery may be filed in any country not a party to this agreement except as may be agreed and subject to article XIII.

(3) Appropriate secrecy or prohibition orders shall be issued for the purpose of giving effect to this paragraph.

ARTICLE X

A. The criteria of security classification established by the United States Commission shall be applicable to all information and material, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this agreement. The United States Commission will keep the Government of the Netherlands informed concerning these criteria and any modifications thereof, and the parties will consult with each other from time to time concerning the practical application of these criteria.

B. It is agreed that all information and material, including equipment and devices, which warrant a classification in accordance with paragraph A of this article shall be safeguarded in accordance with applicable security arrangements between the Government of the United States of America, by the United States Commission, and the Government of the Netherlands.

C. It is agreed that the recipient party of any material, including equipment and devices, and of any classified information under this agreement shall not further disseminate such information or transfer such material, including equipment and devices, to any other country without the written consent of the originating country. It is further agreed that neither party to this agreement will transfer to any other country equipment or device, the transfer of which would involve the disclosure of any classified information received from the other party, without the written consent of such other party.

ARTICLE XI

A. The Government of the Netherlands and the Government of the United States of America affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic-energy agency to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In the event such an international agency is created:

(1) The parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects, if any, they desire to modify the provisions of this agreement for cooperation. In particular, the parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects and to what extent they desire to arrange for the administration by the international agency of those conditions, controls, and safeguards including those relating to health and safety standards, required by the international agency in connection with similar assistance rendered to a cooperating nation under the aegis of the international agency.

(2) In the event the parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement following the consultation provided in paragraph A of this article, either party may by notification terminate this agreement. In the event this agreement is so terminated, the Government of the Netherlands shall return to the Commission all source and special nuclear materials received pursuant to this agreement and in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction.

B. It is recognized that efforts are being made in Western Europe to integrate the atomic-energy programs of a group of nations. If the Government of the Netherlands becomes a member of such an integrated group and if an agreement for cooperation on atomic energy is made between the group of nations and the Government of the United States of America, the latter would be prepared if so requested by the Government of the Netherlands to arrange for the integrated group to assume the rights and obligations of the Government of the Netherlands under this agreement, provided the integrated group can, in the judgment of the Government of the United States of America, effectively and securely carry out the undertakings of this agreement.

ARTICLE XII

The Government of the Netherlands and the Government of the United States emphasize their common interest in assuring that any material, equipment, or device made available to the Government of the Netherlands pursuant to this agreement shall be used solely for civil purposes.

A. Except to the extent that the safeguards provided for in this agreement are supplanted, by agreement of the parties as provided in article XI, by safeguards of the proposed International Atomic Energy Agency, the Government of the United States of America, notwithstanding any other provisions of this agreement, shall have the following rights:

(1) With the objective of assuring design and operation for civil purposes and permitting effective application of safeguards,

to review the design of any (i) reactor and (ii) other equipment and devices the design of which the Commission determines to be relevant to the effective application of safeguards, which are to be made available to the Government of the Netherlands or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction, or which are to use, fabricate, or process any of the following materials so made available: source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the United States Commission.

(2) With respect to any source or special nuclear material made available to the Government of the Netherlands or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction and any source or special nuclear material utilized in, recovered from, or produced as a result of the use of any of the following materials, equipment, or devices so made available: (i) source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the United States Commission; (ii) reactors; (iii) any other equipment or device designated by the United States Commission as an item to be made available on the condition that the provisions of this subparagraph A2 will apply: (a) to require the maintenance and production of operating records and to request and receive reports for the purpose of assisting in ensuring accountability for such materials; and (b) to require that any such material in the custody of the Government of the Netherlands or any person under its jurisdiction be subject to all of the safeguards provided for in this article and the guaranties set forth in article XIII.

(3) To require the deposit in storage facilities designated by the United States Commission of any of the special nuclear material referred to in subparagraph A2 of this article which is not currently utilized for civil purposes in the Netherlands and which is not purchased pursuant to article VII, paragraph E (a) of this agreement, transferred pursuant to article VII, paragraph E (b) of this agreement, or otherwise disposed of pursuant to an arrangement mutually acceptable to the parties.

(4) To designate, after consultation with the Government of the Netherlands, personnel who, accompanied, if either party so requests, by personnel designated by the Government of the Netherlands, shall have access in the Netherlands to all places and data necessary to account for the source and special nuclear materials which are subject to subparagraph A2 of this article to determine whether there is compliance with this agreement and to make such independent measurements as may be deemed necessary.

(5) In the event of noncompliance with the provisions of this article or the guaranties set forth in article XIII and the failure of the Government of the Netherlands to carry out the provisions of this article within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate this agreement and require the return of any materials, equipment, and devices referred to in subparagraph A2 of this article.

(6) To consult with the Government of the Netherlands in the matter of health and safety.

B. The Government of the Netherlands undertakes to facilitate the application of the safeguards provided for in this article.

ARTICLE XIII

A. The Government of the Netherlands guarantees that:

(1) The security safeguards and standards prescribed by applicable security arrangements between the Government of the United States of America by the United States Commission and the Government of the Netherlands will be maintained with respect to all classified information and materials, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this agreement.

(2) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of the Netherlands or authorized persons under its jurisdiction by purchase or otherwise pursuant to this agreement will be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purpose.

(3) No material, including equipment and devices, or any restricted data transferred to the Government of the Netherlands or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this agreement will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the Netherlands, except as the United States Commission may agree to such a transfer to another nation, and then only if the transfer of the material or restricted data is within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the other nation.

B. The Government of the United States of America guarantees that:

(1) The security safeguards and standards prescribed by applicable security arrangements between the Government of the United States of America by the United States Commission and the Government of the Netherlands will be maintained with respect to all classified information and materials, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this agreement.

(2) No material, including equipment and devices, or any restricted data transferred to the Government of the United States of America or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this agreement, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States of America, except as the Government of the Netherlands may agree to such a transfer to another nation.

ARTICLE XIV

The application or use of any information (including design drawings and specifications), material, equipment, or devices, exchanged or transferred between the parties under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party receiving it, and the other party does not warrant the accuracy and completeness of such information and does not warrant the suitability of such information, material, equipment, or device for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE XV

For the purposes of this agreement:

A. "The Netherlands" means the European part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

B. "Commission" or "United States Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

C. "Parties" means the Government of the Netherlands and the Government of the United States of America, including the United States Commission on behalf of the Government of the United States of America. "Party" means one of the above parties.

D. "Atomic weapon" means any device utilizing atomic energy, exclusive of the means for transporting or propelling the device (where such means is a separable and divisible part of the device), the principal purpose of which is for use as, or for development of, a weapon, a weapon prototype, or a weapon test device.

E. "By-product material" means any radioactive material (except special nuclear material) yielded in or made radioactive by exposure to the radiation incident to the process of producing or utilizing special nuclear material.

F. "Classified" means a security designation of "confidential" or higher applied, under the laws and regulations of either the Government of the Netherlands or the Government of the United States of America, to any data, information, materials, services or any other matter, and includes "Restricted Data."

G. "Equipment and devices" and "Equipment or device" means any instrument, apparatus, or facility and includes any facility, except an atomic weapon, capable of making use of or producing special nuclear material, and component parts thereof.

H. "Person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, group, government agency or government corporation, but does not include the parties to this agreement.

I. "Reactor" means an apparatus, other than atomic weapons, in which a self-supporting fission chain reaction is maintained by utilizing uranium, plutonium, or thorium, or any combination of uranium, plutonium, or thorium

J. "Restricted data" means all data concerning (1) design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapons; (2) the production of special nuclear material; or (3) the use of special nuclear material in the production of energy, but shall not include data declassified or removed from the category of restricted data by the appropriate authority.

K. "Special nuclear material" means (1) plutonium, uranium, enriched in the isotope 233 or in the isotope 235, and any other material which the Government of the Netherlands or the United States Commission determines to be special nuclear material; or (2) any material artificially enriched by any of the foregoing.

L. "Source material" means (1) uranium, thorium, or any other material which is determined by the Government of the Netherlands or the United States Commission to be source material; or (2) ores containing one or more of the foregoing materials, in such concentration as the Government of the Netherlands or the United States Commission may determine from time to time.

M. "Atomic energy" means all forms of energy released in the course of nuclear fission or nuclear transformation.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington in duplicate this — day of ———, 1956.

For the Government of the United States of America:

——— ———.

For the Government of the Netherlands:

——— ———.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 2, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 29, 1956:

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Masaji Marumoto of Hawaii to be associate justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii, for a term of 4 years vice Philip L. Rice, elevated.

MUNICIPAL COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The following-named persons to be associate judges of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, Domestic Relations Branch, for terms of 10 years to fill new positions:

John H. Burnett, of the District of Columbia.

Godfrey L. Munter, of the District of Columbia.

Frank Hammett Myers, of the District of Columbia.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 29, 1956:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Frederick G. Hamley, of Washington, to be United States circuit judge for the ninth circuit.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

Edwin R. Price, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, term expiring July 15, 1959.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Howard H. Shannon, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Director of Locomotive Inspection.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for appointment in the regular corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law and regulation, in the grade indicated:

To be senior surgeons

Herbert A. Hudgins
Stanley J. Sarnoff

To be senior dental surgeon

Seymour J. Kreshover

To be senior sanitarian

Robert Johnston

To be senior assistant nurse officers

Dorothy L. Connors
Margaret M. Sweeney

The following candidates for permanent promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, in the grade indicated:

To be medical directors

Russell O. Settle
Waldron M. Sennott
Curtis G. Southard
Hugh B. Cottrell
Dorland J. Davis
Albert L. Chapman
James K. Shafer
Louis Jacobs
Carl L. Larson
Max M. Van Sandt

To be senior surgeon

Eli M. Lippman

To be surgeons

William J. Zukel
Carl F. Essig, Jr.
Simon P. Abrahams
Virgil B. Polley
Jarvis E. Seegmiller
John S. Shuttleworth
DeArmond Moore
Richmond T. Prehn
Harry S. Wise
Paul M. Duffy
John V. Osborne
John H. Waite
Thomas J. Kennedy, Jr.
Victor E. Archer
Charles J. Buhrow
Ernest G. Hanowell
William H. Sage III
Charles A. Jarvis
Charles H. Lithgow
John M. Bishop, Jr.
Robert H. Aronstam
James W. Osberg, Jr.
Robert L. Brutsche
James R. Lewis
Carl F. Mattern
Clifford H. Cole
Harvey A. Itano
Daniel J. Tenenberg
C. F. Sparger
Ernest Cotlove
Douglas H. Crockett

To be senior assistant surgeons

Allen C. Pirkle
John F. Lee, Jr.
Jack Durell
Don E. Leuzinger
John R. Moran
James D. Tovey
John W. Glotfelty
William K. Carlile

To be dental director

Herbert A. Spencer

To be dental surgeons

Alfred Popper
John W. Heck
Quentin M. Smith
Reuben L. Turner

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

L. Charles Larsen
Charles H. Davis
George E. Garrington
George J. Yocum
Leonard R. Iverson

To be sanitary engineer director

Glen J. Hopkins

To be senior sanitary engineers

Frederick K. Erickson
Paul C. Henderson
Ernest P. Dubuque
Harry Stierli
John R. Thoman
Frank A. Butrico
Bernard B. Berger
Louis F. Warrick
Ray Raneri
O. John Schmidt
Kenneth C. Lauster
Joseph A. Boyer
Ross W. Buck
Joseph H. Coffey
Frederick Aldridge
E. Carl Warkentin
John H. Ludwig
Harvey F. Ludwig
Harry W. Poston
Donald J. Schliessmann
James H. Crawford
Samuel R. Weibel
Curtis E. Richey
Gerald Dyksterhouse

To be sanitary engineers

William B. Page
Ernest C. Tsivoglou

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

Jerrold M. Michael

To be senior pharmacists

Ernest J. Simnacher
Carmen A. Carrato
Boyd W. Stephenson

To be pharmacists

Milton W. Skolaut
Frank E. Dondero
Allen J. Brands

To be senior assistant pharmacists

Albert B. Ripley
Mario C. Baratta
Joseph N. Salvino
Bertram J. Baughman

To be scientist director

John T. Tripp

To be senior scientists

Francis M. Middleton
Richard P. Dow
Simon Kinsman

To be senior assistant scientist

Virgil R. Carlson

To be senior sanitarian

Daniel E. O'Keefe

To be sanitarians

Charles E. Gerhardt
Samuel M. Rogers

To be senior veterinarian

Robert D. Courter

To be nurse director

Florence H. Callahan

To be senior nurse officers

Elizabeth H. Boeker
Marjorie W. Spaulding
Catherine M. Sullivan
Margaret E. Willhoit
Gladys C. Guydes
M. Lois Power
M. Dolores Jones
Anne H. MacNeill

To be nurse officers

Genevieve T. Piette
Florence J. Ullman
Elizabeth Kuhlman
Faye G. Abdellah
Elizabeth J. Haglund

To be senior dietitian

Engla J. Anderson

To be dietitian

Susanne C. Van Leuzen

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 29, 1956

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal spirit, unto whom all hearts are open and all desires known, may we now be numbered among the seekers and finders of God.

We pray that we may daily assemble here, not primarily to argue and maneuver for the victory of our personal opinions but to yield ourselves to Thy divine guidance and to seek to know the mind of God.

Grant that, before we legislate and make any decision during these dark and troublous days, this Chamber may be for each of us a listening place where we shall catch the inspiration of Thy spirit.

Make us more eager to hear and heed Thy voice revealing Thy will and showing us how best we may discharge all our tasks and responsibilities.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9952. An act to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active service.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9893. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program today and what he has outlined.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very happy to advise the gentleman and I am glad my friend asked this question.

The first order of business today is the conference report on the Defense Department appropriation bill. Thereafter there will be a continuation of general debate on the school construction bill. We hope general debate will be completed this afternoon and the first section read. Beyond that we will not go today.

I will announce the program for next week later. There will be a continuation of this bill, and it is very important that all Members be here Monday—at least

I make that statement as an expression of my own opinion.

The school construction bill will come up, of course, after the other business is disposed of and it will be read under the 5-minute rule.

There may be other matters of import also.

Mr. MARTIN. There is no likelihood of the present bill being considered beyond reading of the first section today?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. The gentleman probably is going to ask me about tomorrow. I may say we are not going to meet tomorrow. That is understood by all the parties interested in the bill. I have taken the matter up with everyone interested.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 83]

Adair	Fino	Rees, Kans.
Anfuso	Fulton	Richards
Ayres	Gamble	Roosevelt
Barrett	Garmatz	Rutherford
Bass, Tenn.	Green, Pa.	Sadlak
Baumhart	Halleck	Saylor
Beamer	Harden	Scott
Belcher, Okla.	Harvey	Scudder
Bell	Hull	Sheehan
Bray	James	Shelley
Brooks, Tex.	Kilburn	Sieminski
Brownson	King, Pa.	Springer
Canfield	Kirwan	Staggers
Celler	Lane	Thompson, La.
Chase	Lesinski	Thompson, Tex.
Chatham	McCulloch	Thornberry
Christopher	McDowell	Tumulty
Coudert	Meader	Van Pelt
Crumpacker	Miller, Md.	Velde
Cunningham	Minshall	Vursell
Curtis, Mo.	Morano	Wainwright
Davidson	Morrison	Wickersham
Davis, Tenn.	O'Hara, Minn.	Wigglesworth
Davis, Wis.	Patman	Wilson, Ind.
Donovan	Powell	Zelenko
Dorn, S. C.	Prouty	
Eberharter	Reece, Tenn.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 343 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. VINSON, Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. ARENDS.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight Saturday to file certain reports on certain bills, together with any minority views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON H. R. 11811

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight Saturday to file a report on the bill H. R. 11811.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MINORITY REPORT ON H. R. 8902

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed until midnight tonight to file a minority report on the bill H. R. 8902.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON H. R. 11861

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight to file committee reports on the bill H. R. 11861, the soil erosion bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

IGNACE JAN PADEREWSKI

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, this day marks the 15th anniversary of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski, world renowned statesman, composer, and pianist. As most of us know, he died in New York City on June 29, 1941, at the age of 80.

Poland, America, the free world followed his body to its temporary resting place in Arlington Cemetery with the grief suitable to our mourning for one whose spirit had come to symbolize all that we hold dear. Poland, then, as now, was the symbol of the unconquerable soul of a nation, suffering under foreign rule and conquest, victim for years and centuries of political and religious oppression; and Paderewski, musician of fire and fervor, famous at once for technical mastery and for emotional appeal, stood before the world as the symbol of Poland.

He became the first Premier of the Polish Republic in 1919, after the people of Poland asserted their independence according to the principle of national self-determination embodied in the famous 14 points of President Woodrow Wilson. In his brief political career of a few years, after the close of World War I, he earned the undying love of his native land and the admiration of the world by his magnificent performance in bringing together warring factions in Poland, and speaking for Poland in the conferences to establish postwar boundaries with a persuasiveness and fairness that brought the world as far on the road toward peace as one man's voice and force could bring it. It has been said that, had his counsels been fully accepted, World War II might have been prevented.

When Poland lost her independence again, at the start of the Second World War, he refused to play concerts in public.

Paderewski's body lies in Arlington, in the custody of our Nation. His heart is preserved in a crypt in Cypress Hills Abbey, in Brooklyn, N. Y., in the custody of the heirs of Paderewski's friend, my good and long-time friend, the late member of the Assembly of the State of New York, John Smolenski.

May God speed the day when this body, that worked for the glory of Poland, and this heart, that beat with a fierce passion for freedom, may be reunited in that free Poland for which we Americans hold them as a sacred trust. I pray that yesterday's uprising against Communist oppression in Poznan may be the beginning of that day.

POLES STRIKE FOR LIBERTY

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the news of yesterday's rioting in Poznan against the Communist oppressors of the Polish Nation electrified the entire free world, and demonstrated once again that the Polish people will continue to resist the Communist rule with every ounce of their strength.

According to news dispatches, thousands of Polish workers clashed yesterday with tanks and troops, shouting for bread and demanding that the Russians leave Poland.

This was the biggest anti-Communist demonstration in the Communist-dominated part of the world since the June 17, 1953, uprising in East Germany, when some 200,000 workers revolted against the Red rule.

The uprising in Poznan shows that the spirit of people who prize liberty and independence cannot be suppressed or killed. Without arms—with bare hands

and stones—the people will rise and resist the oppressor. They have done it before, and they will do it again until they are free.

This most recent momentous event in Poznan should make us pause and think—think hard—about what is happening in the captive nations, and within the entire sphere of Communist domination.

There is trouble behind the Iron Curtain—serious trouble. The Soviet military program has apparently taxed the resources of captive nations, and of the Soviet Union itself, to the utmost. It has forced the Communists to plan a reduction of their armies, and a transfer of this manpower to industrial undertakings, intended to improve the standard of living of the peoples that they dominate. It has forced the ruling clique to change their tactics.

It is very apparent that the present leaders of the Soviet Union find it increasingly difficult to maintain their oppressive rule. The events of the past 2 years show that they are searching for new methods of keeping the satellite and captive nations in line, and of simultaneously advancing their long-range plans for the extension of their rule over other nations.

I do not believe that the long-range objectives of the Communists have changed. The fact remains, however, that the difficulties which they are presently encountering are—in a sense—forcing them into a corner. They can try to get out of it by relaxing their rule, and by trying to improve the living conditions behind the Iron Curtain. Or—and this is a possibility we must not ignore—they can try to do something drastic.

For this reason, the free world must remain alert, and we must be prepared to meet any eventuality.

Together with other Members of this House, and with free men all over the world, I want to pay tribute today to the brave people of Poznan, whose courage and determination serve as an inspiration to all of us.

The struggle for liberty continues, and it will not stop until Poland—and the other captive peoples—are once again free. The people of Poznan and of other areas of Poland have shown that they are determined to win that struggle. It is our task to spare no effort in the endeavors to bring about the victory of liberty, and the establishment of lasting and just peace in the world.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2529)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10986) "making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 7, 8, 13, 16, 17, and 18.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 6, 9, and 11, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$55,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$320,162,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$357,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,140,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,724,185,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$41,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 14.

GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
W. F. NORRELL,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
JOHN J. RILEY,
CHARLES B. DEANE,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
CLARENCE CANNON,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
EDWARD T. MILLER,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
LISTER HILL,
HARRY F. BYRD,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Title III

Department of the Army

Amendment No. 1—Maintenance and operations: Appropriates $2,967,057,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,954,581,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2—Military Construction, Army Reserve Forces: Appropriates $55,000,000 instead of $40,000,000 as proposed by the House and $60,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the $15,000,000 increase over the House bill, $12,000,000 is for National Guard armory and $3,000,000 for National Guard non-armory construction. The managers are agreed that construction of duplicate reserve facilities must be avoided, except in areas where absolutely required as determined by the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Amendment No. 3—Army National Guard: Appropriates $320,162,000 instead of $306,000,000 as proposed by the House and $321,492,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers are agreed that of the increase of $14,162,000 over the amount contained in the bill as passed the House, $11,162,000 is to cover costs resulting from the anticipated increase in the strength of the Guard, and $3,000,000 for salaries of additional technicians and equalization of technicians pay grade structure. The managers are further agreed that this appropriation, in an amount not exceeding $330,000, may be used for the travel of National Guard teams to national rifle matches, provided that no regular activity is in any way reduced.

Amendment No. 4—National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice: Appropriates $357,000 instead of $297,000 as proposed by the House and $534,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of $60,000 over the amount provided by the House is for the purchase of .22-caliber ammunition.

Amendment No. 5—Reduction in Appropriation, Army Industrial Fund: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate reducing the amount available in the Army industrial fund by $110,000,000.

Title IV

Department of the Navy

Amendment No. 6—Service-wide operations: Appropriates $102,435,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $102,472,000 as proposed by the House. The managers are agreed that if the three sets of flag officers quarters are authorized by the Congress and constructed at the Naval Observatory they shall be furnished and maintained with funds available under this appropriation item at a cost of not to exceed $37,000.

Amendment No. 7—Naval Petroleum Reserves: Appropriates $683,000 as proposed by the House instead of $1,183,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers are agreed that this appropriation shall be available for the costs of maintenance and protective guard services of the Government's oil-shale plant at Rifle, Colo., pending disposition of this facility by the responsible Federal agencies.

Amendment No. 8—Reductions in Appropriations: Reduces the Navy Industrial Fund by $52,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $12,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Title V

Department of the Air Force

Amendment No. 9—Aircraft and related procurement: Appropriates $6,848,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,048,500,000 as proposed by the House. The committee of conference is agreed that the added funds should be utilized to expedite production of heavy bombers, tankers, and other essential Air Force weapons to the optimum limit of existing facilities. The Managers on the part of the House place the Department on notice that the action taken in approving the additional funds above the Budget for Aircraft and Related Procurement should not be interpreted as an invitation toward waste and loose fiscal procedures and calls attention to a report on procurement policies released by the House Committee on Appropriations earlier this year.

Amendment No. 10—Procurement other than aircraft: Appropriates $1,140,000,000 instead of $1,100,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,177,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11—Research and development: Appropriates $710,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $610,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12—Operation and maintenance: Appropriates $3,724,185,000 instead of $3,684,185,000 as proposed by the House and $3,780,185,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13—Military personnel: Appropriates $3,718,440,000 as proposed by the House instead of $3,745,440,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14—Military personnel: Reported in disagreement.

Title VI

General Provisions

Amendment No. 15: Limits the availability of funds for preparation for sale or salvage of military materiel to $41,000,000, instead of $31,000,000 as proposed by the House and $53,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Deletes provision of the Senate for the transfer of $40,000,000 from the Navy industrial fund and $110,000,000 from the Army industrial fund to the Air Force industrial fund.

Amendment No. 17: Deletes provision of the Senate making appropriations for procurement of aircraft and missiles available for expenses of development. The committee of conference does not intend that the deletion of this provision alter the existing procedures in the application of these funds.

Amendment No. 18: Changes section number.

GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
W. F. NORRELL,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
JOHN J. RILEY,
CHARLES B. DEANE,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
CLARENCE CANNON,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
EDWARD T. MILLER,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 25 minutes. In a word, the conference report provides for an appropriation for the Department of Defense for the coming fiscal year the sum of $34,656,727,000. This sum is approximately $1 billion more than the bill carried when it passed the House on May 10. It is $127 million less than the sum included in the bill as it passed the Senate. The details of the measure have been outlined in the statement which was read to the House a few moments ago, and I would like to discuss the situation from an overall policy standpoint.

Mr. Speaker, the House, the Senate, and the executive branch of the Government have been wrestling all year with the question: Is the present defense budget adequate?

There is room for differences of opinion, honest differences of opinion on this subject. After World War I we quickly demobilized and had only a token military force. After World War II we rapidly demobilized and we soon had an inadequate military force. At the end of the Korean hostilities our Nation recognized the menacing threat of Soviet Russia and did not make the mistake we made after World War I and World War II.

We have been proceeding on a spending basis for the Army, Navy, and Air Force of around $35 billion per year, which is no small sum to be raised from the taxpayers of our country. I think every American would like to have a stronger national defense than we have.

The civilian leaders and the top military people in the Department of Defense have repeatedly told Congress this: We would like to have more in some fields, but we think, generally speaking, the funds requested by the President are fairly and reasonably adequate for this year. But the people in the Pentagon pointed out earlier in the year, and they pointed out more recently, that next year the level of spending will have to be considerably above the level for this year and the level of appropriations for next year will have to be a few billions above the appropriations for this year.

When the bill was under consideration in the House earlier in the year, in the debate on that bill I made the following statement:

> Our position of military supremacy is in jeopardy, and what we do within the next 2 to 5 years will determine whether or not we are to be definitely surpassed in overall military striking power by the U. S. S. R.

It is perfectly evident that that decision has to be made; it cannot be postponed beyond next year. Members in the other body wanted to make part of that decision this year and they have made it.

Admiral Radford, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, agrees, I think, that it may be that eventualities will arise which will require additional funds during the fiscal year about to begin.

Secretary Quarles has told both branches of Congress, I believe, that in the program for intercontinental ballistic missiles he can foresee the possible requirement for additional funds in the coming fiscal year, funds above the current budget.

He said, Mr. Speaker:

> I do not feel like asking for the money until we can pinpoint the reasons and purposes for which the money will be spent.

It has been evident to me that there is a very strong probability that during the coming fiscal year a supplemental request, in addition to the current presidental budget, will be sent to Congress.

There have been hearings on both sides of the Capitol at which military people have been asked, without taking into account fiscal considerations, "How much money would you like to have?" There seems to be an assumption that when you think about national defense you should not consider economic, fiscal or budgetary matters. I violently disagree with that opinion. National defense, to be effective, must take into consideration the economic structure, the taxpayer and the survival of our way of life while we seek to maintain peace.

Mr. Speaker, asking a military man how much defense he would like to have is like asking how deep is the ocean, how high is the sky? Asking a military man how much money he would like to have is like asking a farmer or a rancher how much land he would like to have. He will say, "Oh, not much; just all the land that adjoins me." Asking a photographer if he wants another picture will always bring the reply, "Just one more." With the Department of Defense it is just one more billion dollars.

I am not speaking critically. We should ask our military men to brush aside budgetary considerations and to tell us what they would like to have. I go along with that because their opinion is most important. But if you ask each service how much money it would like to have, budgetary considerations omitted, you can run up an annual budget for defense of 50 or 75 billion dollars a year. If defense could be achieved without sacrifice and without price we would be moving ahead with a much more expanded program than we now have.

To ask General LeMay how many long-range B–52 heavy bombers he would like to have is important. He has indicated perhaps 2,000. Up to now we have only provided something over 500. Up to date with the funds provided in the pending bill that runs to about $6 billion. You can take $16 billion and get the 2,000 bombers eventually, but if we had 2,000 of the B–52 bombers I am confident that there would be talk about the bomber being obsolescent and the need for hundreds of more modern bombers for the Air Force. We are already making plans of the successor to the B–52. It is not possible, in view of the financial requirements, the heavy cost of manpower, to have everything we would like to have in defense and still survive economically. The people want adequate defense and they want it desperately. They feel there are limits beyond which it should not be necessary for them to go. I do not think they want to work all around the clock every day of the year for defense. They feel that their leadership in the White House and in the Congress ought to be wiser than that, and I agree with them.

The other body asked the Air Force what it would do with an additional billion dollars above the President's budget. That was a good question. A representative of General Twining came to see me yesterday and gave me information as to what the Air Force would like to do

with an additional billion dollars, in the event such sum should be provided.

Well, in that request the Air Force said—and the Air Force is not the only judge, but perhaps the best judge as to its requirements—that for aircraft and related procurement, if it has $1 billion more, it would like to have $200 million for aircraft. The other body gave the Air Force $800 million for B–52's and other aircraft and stood pat on that figure. So, we are giving the Air Force $600 million more than the official advocate within the Air Force has asked for aircraft procurement.

Now, in the field of military construction, the Air Force said that with $1 billion it would like to have $400 million, in additional funds for construction of bases. If you could snap your fingers and get 2,000 B–52's, unless you had the bases, and trained men, unless you were ready for them, they would not do you much good for a long time. We have to have an integrated program. So, the military department said it would like to have $400 million additional for construction of bases, but there is not a dime in the figures of the other body which are carried in this conference report for additional construction above the President's budget.

Now, when asked what they wanted for research and development, if they were to have $1 billion handed to them above the President's budget, Air Force officials said they would like to have $200 million. The bill before you gives them $100 million.

That is the situation with which we are confronted. I would like to talk a little more about the B–52 program. The program is lagging. The House and the Senate and the American people, in my opinion, would like to see the program expedited. Within a certain number of months we are supposed to be producing 20 per month. We are not getting as many B–52's as we would like to have. But, in the regular budget we have provided vast sums of money in order to get these planes. Now, to launch a crash program and try to build additional plants for production of these planes—we have two plants producing them—would take a long time. The Department of Defense does not want to build additional plants, and I doubt that the Congress wants to do it. By increasing production to 100 a month you would have 2,400 in 2 years. Now these planes are expensive; as you know the B–52's cost about $8 million each. We are not in the defense business for this year or next year only; we are in it for probably from now on out, and what the Department of Defense wants to do—and there is logic in it—is to proceed on a graduated basis, phasing in the new things and phasing out the old without too much cost to the taxpayers. Of course, we must all agree that the process must not be too slow.

Legislation is a matter of compromise. I doubt that the additional funds in the bill will cost the taxpayers any additional money in the long run. It will provide additional funds if there is any breakthrough in the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Program, because this is where the money will come from. It does provide that if a more rapid program of production of the B–52 can be worked out on a reasonable basis, the funds will be available. Funds will also be available for tanker aircraft, for fighter planes and related procurement.

This is an election year. There are political overtones in many of the things we do in election year. This is not unwholesome. The defense issue has been made and it is not an improper issue, I felt this way, that we should not appropriate any of the additional funds or we should appropriate substantially all the additional funds and make the issue clear-cut before the Congress and the country.

Had I written the bill myself, I would not have written it as it was written by the other body. But the other body, having agreed on the additional $800 million for the aircraft procurement program and members of the other body having taken an unyielding position on the issue, I did not desire to take the responsibility of seeking, perhaps over long days of controversy, to eliminate that figure, particularly since I think some of it is necessary. If it is not used, since it is a no-year appropriation, it will be there to be used next year, because we are going to have to have the funds next year if we do not provide them this year. So there are two sides to this issue and I do not minimize the position of those who feel that we should have the sum or those who feel that the additional appropriation could be deferred until next year.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might call attention to the fact that since the bill passed the House, there has been a great deal more information developed; and that in the other body, even the administration members were advocating a $500 million increase above the amount carried in the bill as it passed the House. So that in the House and the Senate there has been a change and the position of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is absolutely consistent, is not inconsistent with the speech he made when the bill was in the House before.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for his helpful statement.

To place this whole matter more nearly in proper focus, I should like to make this observation. If we approve this bill in the Congress today the Air Force will have, for procurement of aircraft next week $18 billion—$18.8 billion. That is not a small or niggardly sum. All of those funds but about $10 billion or $11 billion will have already been committed on orders previously entered into. But there will be $10 billion or $11 billion of uncommitted funds available next week to the Air Force to enter into new contracts for planes, and related items of equipment.

What the other body really did was to increase the overall fund for aircraft procurement in the Air Force by less than 5 percent. It was not a gigantic increase percentagewise. That is the difference between the two bodies and between the two bills basically.

Production of the B–52 can be increased to about 45 a month if we spend money tooling up plants which Boeing of Seattle and Wichita now have, and expanding those plants. The plants have the space, but they do not have the tools. Under this program we give the Administration the option of spending an estimated $90 million for these additional tools and stepping up the production of the B–52 to 45 a month, which could be a matter of great urgency before the Congress reconvenes next year.

Mr. Speaker, I see the able gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] on the floor, and I think that he will agree, as I believe he was the one who developed the testimony in his subcommittee, that Boeing by additional tooling and putting the plants on three full shifts can achieve greater production. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Texas that he is correct in the statement that he has just made, that production can be stepped up by putting a complete third shift on. However, I want to say to the gentleman and to the House that as of last Friday the committee which I have the privilege to head which has investigated the aircraft industry was in the Boeing plant at Wichita, Kans., and we inspected the plant.

The Boeing officials told us they did not need additional money at this time to the extent of a billion dollars because they could not produce an additional aircraft. They could use the sum of $100 or $150 million in order to tool up to the projected future, which the gentleman developed a while ago, but as to the complete amount of money, this high figure, the Boeing people themselves say they do not need it because they cannot use it at this time.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman is correct. Boeing already has contracts totaling more than $2 billion for undelivered aircraft. The B–52 may be the finest plane we have ever produced, but it has a lot of imperfections, as all planes do at an early stage. Far more of these planes are being produced per month than are actually being delivered. Some months the company produces 5 or 6 and they have not delivered 1, because they have not been able to sufficiently correct defects for us to accept them.

We have been talking about better procurement proceedings. We have been talking about and urging the Department to get the plane developed to a fairly workable degree before contracting to buy it in quantity. It is sensible, if we can afford the time, to buy these planes more slowly in the beginning and phase up to higher production later on in order that we get more for our money.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to say to my very good and able friend from Texas that I accompanied the gentleman from Louisiana, Chairman HÉBERT, last Thursday and we went through the Boeing plant and discussed these matters with the

executive of that corporation. The facts are that we have got the cart before the horse until such time in the aviation industry as the plants are expanded, the machine tools and equipment are obtained, and the engineering and technical skills are recruited. If you gave them $5 billion they could not produce any more planes. That is the conclusion I reached. So I cannot see where the conferees would agree to this additional billion dollars when it will not, at least in my thinking, produce any more planes because we do not have the manpower, the equipment, and the plants to build the planes. Until such time as the aviation business and industry is expanded to meet the increased demands, no matter how much you appropriate you will not get any more production.

Mr. MAHON. There is some merit, of course, in what the gentleman says, but if we are going to have sharply increased production 1 year or 2 years from now it is necessary to make the start considerably in advance.

I should like to some extent to deemphasize the B–52 aspect of this controversy. While the other body provided these funds mainly for the B–52, these funds are available for the ICBM, the intercontinental ballistic missile, as I said, and they are available for jet tankers, and there is no doubt but that additional funds are needed for the tanker program. They are also available for fighter planes. The figure as approved by the House was, I feel, a rather close figure. The Air Force was canceling out a number of contracts, recouping certain funds, and it recovered a lot of money that way last year. But the experience during the fiscal year 1956 thus far has shown that it is not doing as well in recouping funds as had been expected. So some of these funds may be required for the regular budgeted items. Those who trust the Defense Department, and I think all of us have some faith in the Defense Department, have a right to feel that these funds will be judiciously used and will not be wasted in extravagant procurement procedures.

That is just about the story as I see it. It was a question of whether to give the Department of Defense a greater degree of discretion in the use of funds by making available what was considered a more abundant amount. Within the next 2 to 5 years, if we do not speed up our production, and if we do not increase our defenses, we are going to be second best to the U. S. S. R. in several vital defense fields. I said earlier this year that this question can be postponed until next January. I say it again. But even though that philosophy has not prevailed I do not think we can quarrel too much with the action we are taking today. I admit there is some degree of doubt, but as I previously pointed out, that portion of funds which cannot be advantageously used this year will be carried into the succeeding fiscal year at which time, as is generally agreed, substantial additional funds will be required.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that when the amendment was offered here in the House to add $1 billion to the appropriation, the House evidenced its position and thinking on the matter. There was a standing vote on the amendment and there were less than 10 who stood in favor of the amendment. If I am correct, I think there were exactly four—is that right, may I ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER]? That evidences the thinking of the House and why the conferees would immediately accept the $1 billion after the House had expressed its will on the matter, I cannot understand.

Mr. MAHON. I think we have to agree there is some compromise in legislation. I think the gentleman should understand that what the House voted on is not the issue that was before the conferees. The House voted on a billion dollars additional for the B–52's. In this bill, we have $800 million, and that is not tied to the B–52's only. Priority would be given to the B–52's, but it is easily possible, and it is my personal belief that a larger portion of the added sum will be spent for other defense weapons and for urgent requirements that may very well develop during the fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas is his usual genial and frank self this morning. In a lighter vein he put his finger on the primary situation here, namely, politics. There is an old Chinese proverb that might be translated to fit into the present position as far as the Republican conferees were concerned which would be translated presently this way: "Realism calls for recognition of defeat when defeat is inevitable." Quite frankly, the Republican House conferees were outnumbered 10 to 7 and it is just that simple. We were and we are now outnumbered. Yet, in view of the House action on the original bill, as presented to you so ably by the gentleman from Texas just a few short days ago, when the House, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, overwhelmingly defeated an amendment to add $1 billion, and especially in view of some of the remarks the gentleman from Texas has made today about what the Air Force would do with $1 billion, and especially in view of what the gentleman from Texas said on the floor of the House during debate, it was really a little difficult to understand why the gentleman from Texas and his Democrat conferees did not take a different attitude and adamantly oppose the position taken by the Senate and hold out indefinitely until—well, at least until the 4th of July—against the proposed Senate action of adding $800 million. But, before recalling some of the words he spoke here on the floor, and they were good words, they were convincing words, they were convincing to the House and they were convincing to me—I was in total agreement with them—let me point out that Secretary Quarles whom the gentleman from Texas and others have described as an outstanding Secretary of the Air Force and a most capable man and public servant, stated less than 3 days ago that the 1957 Air Force budget, as provided by the House of Representatives, was adequate and ample. Secretary Quarles said we were solidly sufficient to prevent war by discouraging potential aggressors, and our 1957 program was designed to keep it that way.

Secretary Quarles further stated that strategic capabilities of the United States will still be superior to any other country, according to the best informations of the intentions of other countries. In that statement he was referring to the 1957 budget without the additional $800 million.

It should be pointed out and stressed a little more strongly than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] stressed it, that this additional $800 million is not earmarked for B–52's. The news stories after the action by the other body have indicated that this additional sum was to be all for B–52's. It is not. If you read the conference report, you will see where the conferees say that these added funds shall be used to expedite production of heavy bombers, fighters, tankers, and other air weapons. That includes missiles and a multitude of things necessary for our defense. The conferees, in their report, say that the Air Force shall do that with the existing facilities. General Twining told us quite frankly that the rate of production of the B–52, starting out is low, but the Wichita Boeing plant has now produced its first one. Therefore, there will now be two sources of production, and the number produced will go up and up and up. General Twining told us the proposed production schedule would give us the number of B–52's which we could assimilate into the Air Force in an orderly manner. You have to have bases, trained ground crews, ground-handling equipment, trained crews, training devices, and everything else that goes along with it with a new program. You cannot just put these bombers out there and leave them on the runways. That would do no good. As General Twining pointed out again, this is not a game of numbers. It is not the number of heavy bombers that we have as opposed to the Russians. That should not enter necessarily into it, because you do not fight bombers with bombers. When you realize that one bomber today can carry more death and destruction than was carried in all the raids by all the bombers in all of World War II, sometimes you may well wonder whether we need as many bombers as some folks claim we do.

We have air supremacy, retaliatory supremacy right now. We will continue to have it. Do not make any mistake about it. Either that, or General LeMay has made some false statements and we have wasted billions and billions of dollars.

The conference report speaks for itself. I told you I wanted to mention some of the things the gentleman from Texas said, but I agree with him that if you look at this in the light of reason and without getting too much upset—we may not agree with what was done, but we need not be upset about it—what Congress is doing is prefinancing some program that will be undertaken

a year from now. However, the other body chose to give additional funds to the Air Force now. Probably a billion dollars less will be required next year. So that even though the added money is not wanted by the Department of Defense and has not been asked for by the Air Force, it will not be wasted. We feel sure that if it is not needed for B–52's or fighters or tankers or missiles, it will not be unwisely spent. To unwisely spend it would be going in the face of the admonition of the conferees, because this money is not given to them to spend willy-nilly. They have to spend it wisely. If they cannot, they are not to spend it.

But let us review a little history, going back to May 10, 1956, turning to page 7964 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

We were then discussing a proposed amendment for a billion dollars; and the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], was talking. He said:

> You will not at this time improve the defense posture of the United States in my judgment by appropriating an additional $1 billion for B–52's.

He was just exactly right; it would not, and this $800 million will not now. If you are going to talk about B–52's, it will not give you a single B–52 any sooner unless, contrary to the conferees' report, we do open a further source.

Then Mr. MAHON told you, and it is still true, that as of July 1, the Department of Defense will have $69 billion unexpended. Then he asks you this question and you heeded it:

> Why make this gesture of fiscal irresponsibility and provide an additional $1 billion when the funds could not be properly used at this time?

I agreed with him then, and I agree with him in that query now, for that reason I could not quite understand the attitude he took in conference.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am quite interested in the gentleman's comments, as usual, because he usually speaks to the point so far as his opinion pertains to the point, but I do not think the gentleman is fully justified in leaving the impression with the membership that this is a particular move on the Democratic side. As I recall it, the gentleman himself offered a compromise figure of $500 million.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes, but it was not adopted; and I am realistic about these things.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If it was right in one instance it must have been right in the other, because a compromise is a compromise.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I could make a remark there which I ought not to make, and will not.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I might further call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the 83d Congress the gentleman was not at all reluctant to cast his own votes with his party which was then in the majority.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I did not hear the gentleman's reference to something I had done in the 83d Congress.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would be very happy to have the Clerk read it back.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I have always voted for adequate defense—and as I recall it, that is what I voted for in the 83d Congress. Once again, I have been in this game a long time, although not as long as the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Massachusetts who referred to the $500 million. When you cannot get a whole load of coal, sometimes you are glad to take just half a load; when you cannot get a whole loaf of bread you try to get half a loaf. We tried to be realistic both as to facts, figures, and the existing conditions on the $800 million, and, as I say, the compromise proposal to cut the increase from $800 million down to $500 million was voted down 10 to 7, and that was the end of the conference, period.

Now, as the gentleman from Texas pointed out that without this $800 million, the Air Force would have $10,500,000,000 available to spend for aircraft and related items this coming year. And then he went on further and pointed out what I mentioned a moment ago, that it was not just a matter of the number of planes we had, B–52's or any others; he said we would not have the men to man them, the mechanics and technicians to maintain them, and that more is involved than just planes. I agreed with him then, and I agree with that observation now. He said:

> What we need is more technicians, more trained personnel, and more experience.

This additional money will not provide the very things that the gentleman from Texas said would be necessary. That is, the trained personnel.

Then Mr. MAHON went on to say that we have provided $5¾ billion for B–52's. He said, and this apparently he still believes:

> So it seems to me that the increase in funds is unwise.

I agreed with that then, I agree with that now, that the increase is not needed at this time.

So I could go on commenting on his remarks. Then he made this final plea which the House heeded so overwhelmingly that fewer than 10 voted for the $1 billion amendment, and with which I agreed then, and agree now:

> So, let us go along in an orderly way and next year let us decide whether or not we need additional billions for B-52's.

The amendment was defeated overwhelmingly and the bill passed 377 to 0.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I think we have known all along that next year more B–52's will be required.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Not only B–52's, but we told the House here during the debate that Secretary Quarles and General Twining along with others had said there would be more money needed next year than this year, but they said that this is adequate for 1957.

Mr. MAHON. And when the time comes along there will be more funds needed for other planes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is correct, missiles, too. The minute we bring a new plane off the drawing board, it is already on its way to be succeeded by a still faster, a still better, a longer range plane and, of course, a still more costly plane. There are always more coming along. If any emergency arises we want to have our Air Force equipped with not a lot of old, obsolete planes, but with as many of the latest and best planes as we can reasonably provide. That is the program that has been followed in the last 3 years. It has been carried out in a very fine way under President Eisenhower as Commander in Chief. That is the reason the Nation has been secure and at peace during the last 3 years even though it has been at a terrific price in taxpayers' dollars. The cost of that defense program is the premium that we are paying for our security, but, I believe, as heavy as the tax burden is for defense it is worth what we are paying at the present time. We are, and for the last 3 years have been, at peace—thanks to a good strong national defense.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

In connection with consideration of the appropriation bill for the Defense Department, and for our defense, one of the most important that we have, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that today is the 20th anniversary of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago today, after a long and sometimes bitter battle, the magna carta of American water transportation—the Merchant Marine Act of 1936—was enacted into law.

When the small but dark cloud of Hitler's rise to power in Europe was recognized by only a few, President Roosevelt directed the Congress to spare no reasonable effort in the restoration of the American merchant marine to a level commensurate with our international responsibilities, and adequate to transport our domestic waterborne commerce and a substantial portion of our waterborne foreign commerce.

It is inspirational to me to look back over the past two dynamic decades of growth and power of our great country in a violently changing world. In 1935, after over 15 years of effort to establish a privately owned merchant marine—with almost every conceivable form of aid—but the Federal Government was by far the largest operator of ships in the American merchant marine. American ships were carrying less than 35 percent of our overseas commerce. Many of them were obsolete, and most of them had an economic life of 5 years or less to go. Only two seagoing vessels—small by today's standards—were under construction in the shipyards of the Nation. The ship-repair segment of the industry was comparably impoverished.

Twenty years ago there were those who remembered the lesson of World War I, when most of our Nation denied the possibility of a World War II. The committees of the House and Senate worked arduously and continuously for over 18 months to find a formula for an adequate merchant marine. Seven or eight legislative proposals were introduced and exhaustively examined before the final resulting compromise became the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. In committee, and in floor debate, the battle was between the forces who favored Government ownership and operation and those who—while recognizing the necessity for Government aid because of the higher standards of American living—fought for the maximum degree of private ownership and operation. Above all, the sense of both Houses and both sides of the controversy was for the absolute need for a strong merchant marine.

It is now history that the enactment of the 1936 act produced the nucleus of ships in being and shipbuilding capacity that made possible the transportation miracle of World War II. Our shipbuilding effort, which produced over 5,000 merchant ships in the 4 war years, has never been equaled in the history of the world.

But, Mr. Speaker, without the farsighted executive and congressional impetus which produced the 1936 act, the margin of victory might not have been ours. It will be remembered that the late Otis S. Bland, of Virginia, was the father of this act.

Some have said that the 1936 act has not proved effective—that the modernization and increased stability in our merchant marine has been due solely to the abnormal conditions prevailing througout the world in September 1939—the outbreak of war in Europe—until the end of the Korean war. I cannot agree.

Today we are realizing the fruits of the program called for in the 1936 act. In this program was the development of the excellent, high-speed, modern and safe sea-type cargo and combination vessel designed to serve the dual purpose of commerce and defense. Many of these fine ships were actually in being long before we got into World War II. Their construction effected the revitalization of our shipbuilding capacity. The operators who acquired them under the carefully developed requirements of the 1936 act set about the improvement of their services on the previously determined essential trade routes. The fast, regular, and frequent services required under the law are now paying dividends to American exporters and importers, and to the areas which they serve.

Within the past 2 years the lines which entered into contracts under the 1936 act are embarking upon a replacement of more than 180 new ships, to be built between 1955 and 1970, at an estimated total cost in excess of $1,500,000,000.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another side to this picture which is perhaps even more urgent now than it was 20 years ago.

Today our international trade is expanding and our world obligations are increasing, but I regret to say that our participation in the foreign commerce of the United States is less than 25 percent—lower than it was before the birth of the 1936 act.

There are many reasons for this which I will not attempt to discuss now. One thing, however, is clear, and that is that the principle is the same—the need is as great or greater—and it is our obligation to meet the challenge to keep our merchant marine on an even keel with the ever expanding growth of our foreign commerce and the growing needs of our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House that Schuyler Otis Bland, of Virginia, a most distinguished Member of the House and chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee for 16 years, was the father of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which has proven so essential to the development and expansion of our waterborne commerce and our national defense.

I would like to insert at this point an editorial from today's New York Journal of Commerce:

MERCHANT MARINE ACT ANNIVERSARY

(By Edward P. Tastrom)

Today marks the 20th anniversary of the enactment by Congress of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, a piece of legislation that has come to be regarded as the Magna Carta of the shipping industry.

This law is particularly noteworthy for having set for the first time a long-range formula for the development of our overseas commercial shipping. It did this by establishing the parity formula for both construction and operation, required the lines which proposed to benefit by this arrangement to build up and earmark for new construction certain reserves, and to confine their operating activities to certain specific trade routes which were designed to promote the commerce of the United States.

It recognized the need of an adequate merchant fleet, but it also made certain that its development would be along the lines which would most adequately serve the common good both in time of crisis and in development of trade.

How has the act worked? A look at some statistics shows that the lines holding subsidy contracts have virtually doubled the size of their fleets. Today this fleet consists of 294 vessels of 3.2 million tons deadweight, compared with the prewar fleet of 171 ships aggregating 1.7 million tons.

More striking is the three-fold increase in yearly carrying capacity of this fleet due to the creation of larger and faster ships. Today, estimated cargo capacity lift is placed at more than 14 million tons deadweight, compared with 4.6 million 20 years earlier.

Capital reserves of these lines also have been built up to high levels and are estimated to aggregate about $500 million. This has permitted several of the contract lines to announce new long-range construction plans recently ranging from $175 million to over $300 million.

Thus, this legislation can be said to have achieved its purpose and, according to the Committee of American Steamship Lines which represents the subsidized group, at a modest cost to the taxpayer. The committee estimates that the net operating subsidy cost from 1947 through 1954 (payments were discontinued during the war period) totaled $68.3 million, or an average of $8.5 million a year. This is after Federal income taxes and repayments under subsidy contracts as called for by law.

The 1936 act has been amended several times to meet changing economic and political conditions so that it continues today as the living instrument of our national maritime policy.

Looking into the future it is evident that still further changes will be in order over the years ahead if this law is to continue as a dynamic force.

New problems are constantly arising and new trends having a vital influence on business continue to come to light. Shipping, with its heavy capital investment, is a long-range planning proposition so that, while the securing of cargo is always an immediate concern, the steamship executive, like the master on the bridge of one of his ships, must always look to the horizon.

If one were to peer into the crystal ball today and try to divine what might be in store for us during the next 20 years it is possible to engage in some intriguing speculation, assuming of course, that we are spared th third world war.

Some interesting trends are developing and they all will affect shipping and our maritime policy.

There is, for example, the utilization of atomic power by the merchant marine. This is coming without question, and on a commerically practical scale. The submarine *Nautilus* can be likened to the *Clermont* which first successfully and profitably utilized steam propulsion. During the decade following that initial 1807 trip to Albany, tremendous strides were made and we have never stopped expanding in this direction as the performance of the superliner United States, demonstrates. Look for the same thing to happen with atomic power.

With this will come new problems in ship design, cost, and handling; the need for new types of safeguards afloat and in port; revisions in cost and capital accounting, to mention a few possibilities.

We shall continue to import more and more of our raw materials to feed the giant industrial machine that we call these United States. It may be necessary to insure this flow of products by extending the benefits of our maritime laws to specific types of bulk carriers.

We are engaged in what promises to be a great struggle with the Communist bloc for adoption by the backward countries of Africa, the Middle East, and the Orient of our basic philosophy as opposed to that of the Reds. Its origins must be in economic aid to lift living standards and prove visually that our way of emerging from the dark ages is the more preferable.

This struggle is just beginning, if we read correctly the new change in Russian attitude to one of apparent friendliness.

Actually, the new Moscow attitude is more dangerous than the old truculence because it is more insidious and may lull us into a false sense of security.

Again the steamship industry is in the position of playing a major role. Our flag penetrates every major port of the world and with it brings a segment of our national attitude and way of life. It can be utilized forcefully and effectively in this great struggle which is shaping up for the loyalty of key areas of the world.

We are fortunate in having a strong merchant fleet today. We must be ever alert to keep it strong and to expand it with the needs of our economy and our position as the world's leading trading nation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

AN ACT TO SIMPLIFY ACCOUNTING, FACILITATE THE PAYMENT OF OBLIGATIONS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9593) to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and

agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DAWSON of Illinois, JONES of Alabama, KILGORE, BROWN of Ohio, and JONAS.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, only a very short time ago we did pass through the Congress an appropriation bill for the Department of National Defense which did not include this extra $900 million. At that time and prior to that time I made a special effort to not air my differences during the hearings with other members of the committee, realizing that this is only the second year I have been back on the subcommittee. I have the highest regard for all of the members, and all of them work very hard. If you were on that committee, you know they have to. But, I think there is only one justification at all for this increase which we have gone along with with the Senate in this conference report. I expressed myself very strongly that I personally could not vote for the increase unless it was adequately covered in the report. The report was prepared. I was not given a chance to go over it. It in no way reflects what I thought was agreed on at the time I agreed to vote for this increase, and I want to point out why I felt that way and do now.

Last year, after proving numerous instances of faulty policy, we got an investigation of the National Defense Department's procurement policies and practices, and it is an eye opener. I am sure most of you have not had time to read it, but I wish you would get a copy from the Appropriations Committee. The investigation had to do with the overall procurement policies and practices. It shows that one parachute company was awarded a contract based on political pressure. Another example was excluding royalties and license fees giving extra profits totaling $5 million to North American alone. The Ford Motor Co. made a profit of 29.6 percent before it made voluntary returns to the Government. Contracts have been permitted to run for as long as 5 years without definitive specifications. Six thousand dollars more per engine paid to Buick than was necessary to others.

The things go on and on, and I point out some examples appearing on pages 162–163 of our committee hearings on defense appropriations released this spring:

DEFICIENCIES IN PROCUREMENT PRACTICES

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to go further and what I am trying to get into is whether the Department of Defense is not a directive-issuing addition to or an appendage to the military services.

Based on these documents which I have listed and others, I would like to point out some things which happened in this record. I am not going into too much detail, Mr. Chairman, but on page 99 the statement (p. 57 of this hearing) is made:

"The failure of the procurement status report to contain timely entries of shipment from the manufacturer results in AMA's submitting ASI's and expedites on material that has already been shipped by the manufacturer."

Then, we turn to page 101 (p. 58 of this hearing), and find the following:

"For example, in the Army too frequently, invitations for bids are issued containing items described by manufacturers' part number only. In other bids the part being procured is specified as a part manufactured by X company, or equal.

"The invitation for bid under such circumstances is often silent with respect to the existence or availability of drawings."

That could only lead to higher price bids and would tend to leave the business to one particular company.

I would like to list a number of these because I am of the opinion that it will save a little time if I do it this way.

We turn to page 103 (p. 59 of this hearing), and find the following:

"For example, one Army technical service justified an expenditure of $130,000 in excess of the low bid on an end item on the basis that the cost involved in establishing a parts inventory of the low bidder's parts, together with the cost of preparing spare parts and operational manuals for the same, would exceed the apparent saving of $130,000. Obviously, this thinking, if carried to an ultimate conclusion, would make it impracticable for the Government to acept a low bid if the parts and manuals of a higher bidder are already in the repair parts supply system."

In other words, if a fellow gets this business and supplies a manual, apparently, he stays in the business, even though his bids continued to be high.

Then, turning to page 104 of the report (p. 59–60 of this hearing), there is the following:

"Unwarranted obligations of funds. The initial amount of the contract was $80,835,000, but by September 7, 1955, the amount was increased to $353,822,495. The staff ascertained that as of September 23, 1955, orders placed against the contract amounted to $242,960,217, with estimated requisitions on hand of about $3.2 million. When it was pointed out to an official of ASO that the contract had been increased to over $100 million more than orders and requisitions on hand, he said steps were being taken to modify the contract."

That is a case of ordering $100 million worth more than was needed, apparently.

Now, on page 105 (p. 60 of this hearing) is the following statement:

"One contractor found that it took 98 weeks, on the average, to get a modification kit required as a result of an engineering change proposal, shipped to the planes requiring the change."

It took 98 weeks to get it to the planes requiring change.

Turning to page 106 (p. 61 of this hearing):

"One contractor reported the Air Force procedure of double identification of parts"—double identification—"is unwieldy and costly."

Turning to page 109 (p. 62 of this hearing):

"Another contractor reported that he ordered, at Air Force request, a carload of steer hides as part of the bulk items list for concurrent spares on an aircraft."

And they demanded that he attach a drawing. He measured the steer hides and could not find any two alike.

"The contractor tried to write a pattern description but could find no two of the steer hides of the same dimensions. Consequently it was impossible for him to submit a drawing."

And under those conditions the matter was delayed at considerable expense.

We turn then to page 111 (p. 63 of this hearing), where it is charged that:

"At one Air Force facility (it was) disclosed that the Government representatives were exercising little control over the price the contractor was charging for spare parts."

For example, in less than a 3-year period one item increased from $8.53 each to $15.74.

There are other specific charges. One is with regard to the radio transmitter, where about $11 million worth of them got lost. We still have not found them, and they are procuring still others.

Secretary WILSON. Where is that?

Mr. WHITTEN. That was page 115 (p. 65 of this hearing).

One page 116 (p. 65 of this hearing) it is indicated, with regard to aircraft propellers, 157 were procured at a cost of $1,413,000. In the supply report 62 propellers were accounted for, leaving 95 unaccounted for.

"A special inventory was taken in March 1955 at which time 115 propellers were located. However, 42 propellers worth $378,000 were still unaccounted for."

The story which appears on pages 116 and 117 (pp. 65 and 66 of this hearing) on the Chateauroux Depot shows that the records were in a terrible state and the supplies on hand did not tally at all with the reported inventory.

Then on page 117 (p. 66 of this hearing) it is reported:

"CAMA submitted a listing of excess property to the Sacramento, Calif., Air Materiel area wherein 99 line items valued at $632,540.38 were declared excess to CAMA requirements and disposition instructions were requested to alleviate storage problems. * * * It was stated that 45 of the 99 line items declared excess were subjects of current procurement actions."

In other words, 99 of the items were declared surplus and were set up for sale, at the same time that you were buying 45 of the 99 through other people.

Turning to page 120 (p. 67 of this hearing), the same types of inventory errors are pointed out. I would point out pages 127, 128, 129 (pp. 71 and 72 of this hearing), the relationship with Western Electric (p. 73 of this hearing), page 141 (pp. 77 and 78 of this hearing) on deficient record. Page 144 (p. 79 of this hearing) where $70,000 payment for expedition was jumped to $1,341,103.98. I would point out Convair, General Motors, and page 158 (p. 87 of this hearing), where additional costs to the Government piled up for 2 years while the failure of the contractor was being considered.

If these are typical—and there is every reason to believe they are—the Government is spending billions needlessly to someone's profit.

There are illustrations in this investigation where mistakenly we were supposed to pay $2,100 per unit and the company inadvertently submitted a bill at the rate of $2,700 per unit and the Government paid the $2,700, and then everybody was embarrassed to find out they had paid all that extra money.

I had extreme difficulty in getting this investigators' report printed in the hearings of this committee. I finally managed to get it done. Not only that, but I had another problem in getting Secretary Wilson to come before the committee so that we could question him in regard to it. And we did. He came before us, and he made this significant statement.

He said:

I read this record—

Referring to the investigation of the military department, and I refer to Secretary Wilson after we managed to get him before the committee. He said:

I assure you that this looks like a very bad record. I read the record over all last Sunday and spent all day reading the material. I came into my office Monday morning and I said "Well, I am mad, and sad." I did not like that kind of a record. I was

sad to have such a poor relative performance with your good committee, and that is about all I can say about it.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I was not cognizant of any reluctance on the part of Mr. Wilson to come before the committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I agree with the gentleman, that I saw no reluctance on his part.

Under our procedure in the Congress, concerning which I differ with many of my fine colleagues, who incidentally have served on this subcommittee much longer on this particular subcommittee longer than I, though I served on this committee during the war. Erroneously in my opinion, under existing policy when we provide for a contract, the Congress appropriates the full amount of money for the contract in advance, although it may have 4 or 5 years to run or for the money to become due. As a result, we have to give the Department of Defense the right to use funds for a different purpose from that which they justified before the committee and from that for which we thought they were going to spend it. Later we have the job of trying to keep up with how they actually spent the funds.

As a result of giving them all this money in advance—and I think this statement will be uncontradicted—the Department of Defense as of today will have—that is, on the 1st of July this year—more money on hand than it will expend next year. And yet we are giving them thirty-billion-odd dollars in addition under the policy I describe. This is under what I think is an erroneous policy of Congress, appropriating billions years in advance of its actually having to be expended.

I think if this waste as shown by the investigation were cut out, which Mr. Wilson himself said made him mad and sad and he hated to know his Department had such as record as that, and if this money that they have a right to deobligate and use for other purposes were properly used, then I think the Congress was right and the House in the original bill was right in saying that they did not need another $1 billion or approximately $1 billion, which is included in this conference report.

The only basis for approving tthe Senate increase, with which we have gone along, in my judgment is this. Evidently they feel that is the only way to get the emphasis on these particular programs, the increase in production of the B–52 and these other procurement programs, to give them additional money in a package for that purpose, as we have done. And if that is essential to meet the need for additional emphasis, I subscribe to it. I had hoped that our report would so express it. I thought, when I voted in the conference for the increase that it would. Unfortunately, they gave me no chance to go over the language of the report. The only basis for the conference report, in my opinion, is that you have to give them this extra money in order to get them to do this particular job, and I do not think we should have to do it. I regret that the report does not so express our action as I was led to believe it would.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] knows, we discussed his point of view yesterday in the conference. For a time some of us in the conference felt yesterday that his position was that if the Air Force had better procurement methods we would not have to give the Air Force $800 million for aircraft procurement. We all want better procurement, and I am sure improvements can be made. And I believe he would be the first to admit that certain improvements have been made. But, again, I am sure he did not mean to leave the impression that we can improve our procurement to the extent of $800 million so that then we would not have to appropriate the money to procure these aircraft, guided missiles, and other items.

If I might turn to the Army part of this program for just a minute. The only significant changes from the House version in the conference report, as far as the Army is concerned, are these. We gave additional money for the National Guard Armory construction program, in the amount of $15 million overall. They did make a fairly good case before our panel on the House side for that amount. However, we stayed with the budget figure. Subsequent to the presentations to the House, the Department of Defense and the Army got together and broke some construction roadblocks, so that it permitted them to obligate the funds that had previously been held up. With those roadblocks opened up, there was a need for additional funds for this purpose.

In addition, we gave additional funds for the Army National Guard to permit their personnel strength to go up to 425,000. All indications would lead one to believe that their strength can easily go to 425,000 rather than the Budget figure of 407,000. If the strength does not go up—we all want it to go up—the money will not be spent. If it does go to where they hope, then the money will be available.

I should like to add just 1 or 2 words about this $800 million item. As the gentleman from Kansas indicated, some of us made an effort to reach a lower compromise figure, but we realized the facts of life, when the votes were counted. All of us understand the political implications involved in this specific issue.

As a practical matter, I think this is where we find ourselves. We are making available $800 million in the aircraft procurement account now which will have the net effect of reducing the fiscal 1958 budget by an equal amount. Secretary Quarles said the other day that the Air Force budget for fiscal 1958 will approximate $23 billion rather than about $16 billion for fiscal 1957. It is my feeling from hearing all the experts testify that we have just added $800 million to fiscal 1957 and in turn we are going to subtract $800 million from fiscal 1958. In other words, all you are doing is prefunding, prefinancing.

The gentleman from Texas made a remark or two about asking certain military leaders whether they want more money or more planes. He used the analogy of the farmer who would like more land or who would like better crops. Of course the farmers' answer would be "Yes." But maybe this is a little better analogy from our point of view. I do not use the term with the wrong connotation, but we can rightfully call ourselves politicians. If you ask a politician whether he wants more votes he always says, "Yes."

I think the Air Force has an insatiable appetite. If you ask them if they want more money their inevitable answer is "Yes," just as we would say we would like more votes on election day. Their response and ours are in good faith although neither may be right. I signed the conference report and will vote for its adoption although the House version of this bill was preferable.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, having controlled time on many pieces of legislation over a long period of years, I know how difficult it is to satisfy Members who wish to talk. For that reason I am deeply grateful to my friend from Texas for being so generous as to grant me 1 minute. I had hoped, having served for more than a score of years on the Armed Services Committee, charged with the responsibility for the defense of this Nation, that I might have a little longer time to express my views on this particular conference report.

We are in a most peculiar position at this moment. Usually the Executive demands more money than the Congress is willing to grant. Now the Congress is trying to cram down the throat of the Executive department a billion dollars which the President, the National Security Council, the Director of the Budget, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force have never requested and could not wisely spend.

If we vote for this conference report it will lead only to an unbalanced budget and to unwise and extravagant spending and a waste of public funds. If we stand by our guns, as the bill originally passed the House, we will have at the end of the next fiscal year $13 billion for the Air Force more than they possibly can use.

Mr. Speaker, any wise man will never underestimate the strength of his adversary in war, politics, or love. As the old Confederate general, Nathan B. Forrest, once said—the man who wins in battle is "the one who gets there fustest with the mostest." We all realize that it is better to have too much, too soon—than to have too little, too late. Certainly we do not want to take any chances for the defense and security of our Nation. At the same time we should not commit

the other great error of overestimating our enemy's strength or underestimating our own. We must not become paralyzed with fear of an exaggerated opinion of the strength of our potential enemy where that strength does not exist.

Mr. Speaker, when we speak of national defense we must think not only of planes, tanks, guns, and ships, but must consider the farms, factories, forests, and morale of our own people.

No nation can build up and maintain military might without preserving its economic strength. America was the arsenal of democracy that supplied the food and fiber, munitions and sinews of war—not only to feed, clothe, and supply our own Armed Forces of 12 million men and women in World War II but that took care of our allies as well.

Every great military leader, in all branches of our services, has more than once admitted to me that the one thing that brought victory to the Allied Powers over the Axis forces in World War II was America's industrial might and productive capacity. The battlefront can never be stronger than the home front and in modern mechanized warfare, it requires from 18 to 20 workers back home to supply and support each man on the battlefront. You simply cannot have military might without economic strength. And this, sir, more than the atomic or hydrogen bomb, has deterred further Russian aggression—and no one realizes it more than the Russians themselves.

No loyal, red-blooded American is going to gamble with our Nation's security in these trying and troublesome times, which our President has so well described "an age of peril." World events have taken a long time to get us in our present predicament and it will be a long time before we get out of it.

Many foolish charges have been made that Russia is now or soon will be stronger than we are in a military sense. I just do not believe it, nor do any of the best informed and highly trained experts in all branches of our services believe it. I want to make it clear that the retired general and former Chief of Staff of the Army, Matthew Ridgway, and that the commander of our Strategic Air Command in the Air Force, General Curtis LeMay, are two of our best soldiers who have my great admiration and high confidence. In fact, I have a sort of fond personal affection for each of these warriors who have done battle and rendered incalculable service to their country.

Mr. Speaker, I would lose all of my respect for each of these distinguished, outstanding military leaders if he did not fight hard for his own branch of our services. They would not be worth their salt if they did not.

Let me remind Members that our Defense Department is a terribly big organization, spending more money each year than the 16 largest corporations in our country—60 percent of all the taxpayers' money. But, sir, we have only one pie to cut, and we must distribute the cutting of the pie in such fashion as our military establishment requires and our domestic economy can stand. No general ever had an army big enough to command just as no preacher ever had a congregation large enough to lecture. The different branches of our services, Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and the Air Force make their budgets to meet what they feel to be their minimum requirements in order to carry out their particular missions and to meet our international obligations.

When the Department of Defense receives these requests, they are sent to the Bureau of the Budget where they are carefully screened and then sent down to Capitol Hill for the Committees on Armed Services in the House and Senate to consider.

Our Committee on Armed Services in the House of Representatives is composed of 37 members at the present time—the largest legislative committee in either House of Congress, composed of 20 Democrats and 17 Republicans. There is less partisanship in our Committee on Armed Services, in the House at least, than you will find in any committee in Congress because we realize that we all are in the same boat and will sink or swim together.

After long, careful, and exhaustive hearings, we report a bill to the House just as the Senate does. And after the passage in both House and Senate the bill goes to conference where we try to iron out the differences and send to the White House a bill the President can sign that will redound to the benefit of all our people. It should not be otherwise.

Now, before the bill becomes a law, it is usually reviewed again by the Secretary of Defense who is charged primarily with the security of our Nation, and then sent to the White House. No doubt the President consults with the National Security Council composed of the President, the Vice President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, with a Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

Let no one think that getting any bill through Congress is a simple or easy task. It goes through a long, arduous and tortuous road that is checked and double checked by our high Government officials before it is signed by the President.

Mr. Speaker, I have, I repeat, high admiration and great respect for both General Ridgway and General LeMay, but their testimony could be very dangerous to the American people. I am not willing to put the judgment of either or both of these men above that of the peoples' elected representatives on our committee and the Secretary of Defense, who must consider economic, as well as military factors—and certainly not above the National Security Council or—the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, Dwight D. Eisenhower, who is no altogether without a little military experience. The President must consider the recommendations of his Secretary of Defense who bases his judgment upon—not one Chief of Staff but all three Chiefs of Staff under the chairmanship of Admiral Radford at the present time, and upon the National Security Council. After all the final responsibility is upon the President.

What we are trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is to keep our Armed Forces on an even keel and in balance.

Because of the rapid change in the methods and techniques of modern, mechanized warfare we must have a new look and a reappraisal as to where we can spend our money to do the most good.

After reading some of the testimony given in recent weeks and many newspaper articles by the arm-chair strategists one would get a wholly distorted picture of our Defense Estabment—thrown wholly out of focus. We will always need an Army, Navy, and Air Force, and I trust none of us will be so puerile and immature as to put all our eggs in one basket. We must remain strong on land, sea, and in the air—but I hope that no one will get the impression that we can place all of our faith in the Strategic Air Command or in guided missiles. This is a lopsided view. It is unrealistic and most dangerous. When we talk of national defense we must consider not only planes, tanks, guns, ships and munitions, but we must think of overall strength of America—her farms, factories, forests, and a strong, healthy domestic economy plus the intellectual, moral, and patriotic devotism of all our people to make this country strong and invincible to attack from enemies both from without and within.

The Soviets are hoping that we will spend ourselves into bankruptcy and a bankrupt country never licked anybody—and it never will. The Communists are praying that we will knock ourselves out by our own profligacy. I plead with each and every one of you, for America's sake, let us not be swept off our feet by dangerous propaganda. Let us follow men who look at the picture not from a single aspect but who consider it in its totality. We must see the problem and see it whole.

Only yesterday the senior Senator from Florida pointed out that the billion of dollars, added by the Senate, would produce two results: First, a tendency to bring the budget out of balance; and, second, encourage wasteful spending practices. Those of us who have studied this problem long and hard know that we do not have the existing plant facilities, nor the trained mechanics to spend this money wisely and well. And if we could get the planes—we do not have sufficient bases or trained pilots to man them.

It was also pointed out by the senior Senator from Virginia that we will have $19.4 billion available for aircraft procurement on this July 1. The Air Force cannot economically and efficiently spend for this purpose more than 6.4 billion by June 1957—so that a year from now we will have an unexpended balance of some $13 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what motives are behind the action taken by the other body, except to remind the American people that this is an election year, and perhaps some people who are hungry for a political issue are scraping the bottom of the barrel. A new Congress will meet next January and will still have billions of dollars to spend for the building up of our Armed

Services, but why should we now—with our staggering debt of $278 billion and with the backbreaking burden of taxation upon us vote an additional billion dollars which the President, a great military leader, the National Security Council, the Budget Bureau, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Air Force Chief of Staff, have not wanted and did not request? I do not like, sir, this being rammed down their throats and our throats. Even if the judgment of other men is honest, I think it is mistaken and that this House today should not place an additional, onerous burden upon the backs of our overburdened taxpayers. In my humble but honest opinion that would weaken rather than strengthen our defense.

What I have said has not been easy or pleasant to say, but I say it from the depths of my heart and conviction of my soul.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I include the following editorial from last night's Washington Evening Star:

THE UNWANTED BILLION

The country has just been treated to a rare spectacle on Capitol Hill—the spectacle of the Senate insisting that the Air Force accept an extra billion dollars which the latter says it does not need and cannot spend efficiently.

Ordinarily it is the other way, with the executive agencies asking for more money than Congress is willing to give. In this same session, for instance, the House chopped a billion dollars out of the administration's foreign-aid requests, and remained deaf to all pleas that the full amount was urgently needed to maintain the security of the West.

The vote on the Air Force billion is being pictured as a sharp setback for the administration, and perhaps it is. The President, the National Security Council, the Budget Bureau, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Air Force Chief of Staff had not wanted this additional billion. In effect, it is being rammed down their throats. But if it is a setback, in this sense, for the administration, it is hard to see how the Democrats can thereby derive any political advantage. The vote, 48 to 40, was largely on partisan lines, with only 5 Republicans supporting the increase and only 3 Democrats opposing it. But it is going to be difficult, and perhaps dangerous, for the Democrats to try to make political capital out of their feat. For the average voter, assuming there is no war, is apt to take a dim view of having to fork over a billion dollars in added taxes to cover an appropriation which the administration did not want and which the Air Force certainly cannot spend this year or next year. If the issue comes down this summer to a matter of politicking, it seems to us that the Republicans will be pretty well armed for the battle.

So perhaps the fair assumption is that this was not a partisan vote, that the action reflects an honest difference of opinion as to what will best serve the national security. If this is the case, the question is what effect will the added billion have on the production of aircraft, primarily B–52's.

Senators BYRD and HOLLAND, 2 of the 3 Democrats voting against the increase, thought it would do more harm than good. According to Senator BYRD's figures, the Air Force on this July 1, without the added billion, will have $19.4 billion available for aircraft procurement. He estimated that the Air Force will spend for this purpose $6.4 billion by June 30, 1957, thus winding up a year from now with an unexpended balance of some $13 billion. Senator HOLLAND cited similar figures and ventured the opinion that the added billion would produce two principal results: (1) A tendency to bring the budget out of balance, and (2) encourage wasteful spending practices.

Chairman RUSSELL, of the Armed Services Committee carried the burden of the argument for the Democrats. He cut Defense Secretary Wilson into small pieces, but he offered nothing tangible to show that the production of B–52's would be speeded up. Senator SYMINGTON said that better programing would result from the added billion, and he pointed out that the Air Force budget as submitted to Congress was some $3 billion under the amount originally requested by the Air Force Chief of Staff, General Twining. It is also worth noting that General LeMay, head of the Strategic Air Force, has advocated more money, and that Air Force Secretary Quarles, while opposing any increase now, has said that more money would be needed in 1958 to meet the goals set for 1959 and 1960.

What all of this will shake down to is anyone's guess. A billion dollars will buy something more than 100 B–52's. But we doubt whether the Senators who supported the increase really know whether we will get more of the big bombers sooner as a result of the vote.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, my attitude is exactly like my colleague who preceded me and who is the ranking minority member on the Armed Services Committee and eminently qualified to discuss with the Members this important matter provided he had the time to do so. We are considering today the question of a billion-dollar appropriation and it is to be ended with 1 hour of debate. We who spent weeks and months holding hearings on the aircraft industry are granted 1 minute to present our thinking on this billion dollar increased appropriation.

When the amendment was presented in the House several weeks ago for the billion-dollar increase for the Air Force, it was turned down. And on a standing vote less than 10 Members voted for it. I think, if I recall correctly, 4 Members out of 435 voted for the amendment to grant the increase.

However, the House conferees have readily accepted the action taken in the other body. The fact is regardless of how much we appropriate, even if we appropriated $5 billion, it would not produce more planes. The argument for the billion-dollar increase is that it would increase the production of planes. In my opinion it will be necessary to have plant expansion, increased machine tools and equipment, and recruitment of manpower, which would take considerable time, before many more planes could be produced. After this has been accomplished, then it would be in order to appropriate money for increased production and certainly the Members of the House would readily appropriate the money if more planes could be produced.

The plants now manufacturing planes, regardless of the type of plane being produced, are taxed to capacity. It is not a matter of money but a matter of plants, equipment, and manpower to produce the planes. Certainly granting an increase of a billion dollars is not going to solve the problem.

The entire military appropriation was $33,635,000,000, not including construction. Of this the Air Force was authorized $15,479,125,000, $739,361,000 more than fiscal year 1956. As of July 1, 1956, the Air Force will have unobligated $3,334,000,000. Authorized and partly obligated, but unexpended, $17,510,597,000.

Therefore it does not make sense to me to increase the appropriation at this time.

I reiterate the Congress is ready to appropriate any money necessary, providing we can get the planes. But to get more planes, we must have increased facilities, equipment, and technical and skilled manpower. To just appropriate more money is putting the cart before the horse. Some of these plants now, I presume, from what I have observed, are working around the clock to turn out the production already scheduled on their books.

The President and his administration, in my opinion, have greater and better knowledge of what is required to meet our defense needs and if in his estimation it was needed, I firmly believe he would request it and it would be readily granted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear enough that for the moment we will get no additional planes for the additional money provided in this report. There will be no additional planes built during the current fiscal year, as a result of voting these $800 million. But we will have the assurance of many more planes at an earlier date by going ahead with this program now. That is the important thing to consider. Of course, the services have more money already earmarked for planes than they can spend for the next fiscal year. That is not the question. That has nothing to do with this. We seek to insure the delivery of additional planes that are vital for the defense of this country at an earlier date. That is exactly what these funds will do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SIKES. May I proceed just a little bit further, please?

Mr. Speaker, since we debated this matter in the House, General Twining has gone to Russia.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan for a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not have any question now.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I will yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan if he desires it.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan withdraw his point of order?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; temporarily, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws his point of order.

Mr. SIKES. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire me to yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have noticed that when we have appropriated money, especially for the construction of planes, that immediately thereafter was a demand for an increase in wages in the plant which was awarded a contract. Can the gentleman tell me if we appropriate this money, will there be an increase in wages which will absorb all of the increase or will we get more planes?

Mr. SIKES. I do not have a crystal ball to look into the future. I can only say that this is intended to provide more planes and it will do that. I cannot guarantee what the cost of production is going to be.

Mr. Speaker, since we debated this matter in the House, General Twining has gone to Russia for a look at the Soviet air picture. Already information is coming back to us regarding the remarkable progress made by the Russian aircraft industry, both in advanced design and in numbers. There is evidence that the Soviets are ahead of us in airplant production, and if they are ahead of us, we cannot take chances on such an important matter. It is not only in the production of modern B–52's that we are behind. We are behind in the production of badly needed jet tankers. We are seriously deficient in numbers of transport craft needed to insure rapid movement of military forces. It will be within the discretion of the Secretary of Defense to correct any of these deficiencies if additional funds are voted. Mr. Speaker, I believe planes are cheaper than wars. Defense is America's only real security today. This will help us to have an adequate defense.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my word to that of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], who just preceded me. You know what the issue is. I am not concerned at this point with ramming down anybody's throat these funds. There are Members in the other body who are willing to ram down the throat of the President, who are willing to ram down the throat of the Secretary of Defense, who are willing to ram down the throat of the National Security Council $500 million. My friends on the other side of the aisle in this committee of conference were willing to ram down the same identical and collective throats $500 million. It depends on how big, in the case of national security, you think the respective throats are. It just depends who is doing the ramming.

I say that the other body is sound in its judgment in presenting to this House this conference report. Your conferees went there. The other body had the benefit of information that this House did not have. Had this House had the benefit of the information and testimony which the other body had, then I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this House would have acted in the first instance as did the other body. There was only one dissent—only one vote against this—in the other body. There are five Members of the other body who indicated that they would have voted "aye" if they had been present. They did that with the same feeling of caution, the same feeling of understanding that do we. The decision of the conference was not just an idle gesture. This was not something done off the cuff. This was done based upon testimony and evidence of the greatest generals and leaders of the Air Force—not civilians, but the men who fight the wars and the men who plan the attacks; the men who plan the planes.

I submit this conference committee should be complimented by the people of this Nation for bringing back to this body, with courage and intelligence and sound judgment, this report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has expired.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Defense Department Appropriations Subcommittee, I am convinced that the billion dollar increase in our defense appropriation bill, particularly the funds which are allocated to the Air Force cannot be spent in the next fiscal year. Moreover, the Air Force has indicated that it does not need this money and does not want it. It simply means that the Air Force will wind up next year with an unexpended ballance of about $13 billion instead of $12 billion. Somewhere in the neighborhood of nineteen to twenty billion dollars are now available for aircraft procurement. This additional money will not produce a single bomber a day earlier. If the advocates of this increase want to produce more bombers at a faster rate, it would seem that funds and efforts should be directed toward additional tooling for such production. B–52 bombers will require other considerations and in no way are these factors being given consideration by the advocates of more funds. Military personnel and facilities, as well as bases and other factors are essential to their use and operation. Training is also a factor. All of these matters must be coordinated and developed together if we are to achieve our purposes.

I concur with our chairman in his expressed view that our Defense Establishment will require more money in the next few years than that appropriated this year. This can be understood when thought is given to the prospects of accelerated production of heavy bombers, guided and ballistic missiles, and other important aircraft such as tankers. All of these developments will require increased appropriations; but to appropriate money now in the certain knowledge that it cannot be used during this next year, invites the suspicion and the charge of politicking. Actually, no real harm will come from giving them more than they need. I assume it will not be spent and will remain available for use in subsequent years. Actually we are appropriating, in my judgment, a billion dollars or at least $800 million this year which will automatically reduce the budget requirements for next year.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHORT) there were—ayes 79, noes 57.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I understood there would be no roll call votes today.

Mr. MAHON. If a rollcall is ordered, we will have to pass it over.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The minority leader instructs me not to. So I will withdraw it.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 14, page 27, line 19, insert "of which not to exceed $57,853,000 may be transferred to the appropriation, 'Military personnel, 1956'."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and concur therein.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the conference report may have permission to revise and extend their remarks, and that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] may extend his remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] is recognized.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7535) to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the con-

sideration of H. R. 7535, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] had 2 hours and 13 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL] had 2 hours and 15 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, to start with, we must look for the purpose as stated by the President and by the Department of Education, the United States Commissioner of Education, as to what they propose to do in the administration of this fund or of these three funds, under title I, title II, and title III.

When Mrs. Hobby appeared before our committee she stated what the President himself has stated many times, that there are and were firm conditions that must be carried out in the Federal aid program. First there must be a proved need of the school district that is to participate in these funds; second, there must be a proved lack of local income. Now, who is going to prove the need and the lack of income? Why, the Commissioner of Education and his augmented staff of personnel that will be scattered all over this country trying to pick out from the 57,000 separate school districts in this country the ones that satisfy the czarlike powers of the Commissioner of Education to determine what the need is and what the income is of a particular district.. Just think what that means in the building up and in the strengthening of the personnel of a bureaucracy? And think what it means in political largess in the particularly close election States or congressional districts where he is going to take the money from some and redistribute it to others according to his notion of what the need is.

There is no formula set out in this bill, there is no control of this House over those who shall receive the proceeds of these appropriations which will amount to approximately $8 billion.

Let us see if there is a need by the Department's own statement. On page 751 of the hearings before the committee, this question was asked of the Assistant Secretary of the Department, Mr. Perkins:

> Mr. GWINN. Now, will you give me and this committee examples of school districts in any State that cannot finance themselves if they remove their own limitations or if they are unable themselves to finance themselves where they cannot call on their own State for such aid?

Here is the answer:

> Well, if we are going to take State aid into the picture, I would be inclined personally from what little I have available as personal information to the view that every school district could finance itself. That is, if we are going to take State aid into account. In other words, as I indicated yesterday, the credit of the States themselves is good and the States could issue bonds of their own if they wanted to, which would help out the needy school districts. Thereby they could make all districts able to obtain schools without Federal aid.

We all know that is true. It has been stated over and over again that there is not a State in this Union that is not more capable, better off financially and more able to take care of their own school needs than the Federal Government is.

There must be some other motive back of this perfectly astonishing, feeble, little door-opening process by which the Federal Government is coming into this picture of building schools. We have probably 1,500,000 schoolrooms in this country. The States have been able to take care of them up to now. When did they grow so feeble as to require this gimmick?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present. This is a magnificent, factual speech that is being made and we ought to have more here to listen to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. GWINN. Where did we get the facts about this need that the Government claims exists in the States? Not from the States. There has not been a single legislator or a single political body representative of a single State that has petitioned the Congress to give them Federal aid lest their children go without schoolrooms or school chairs or textbooks or otherwise suffer for lack of education, not one. And we Members know of our own knowledge that the States do not neglect their own children and that the Federal Government has no higher concept of the duty of parents and citizens to their children than the States and the parents themselves.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], the author of the bill.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Is the gentleman satisfied that in the great city of New York the schools are adequate? I think there was testimony before the committee to show that even in the city of New York there were many schools that were old, even up to 75 years of age; that they were firetraps, and that many children were going to school part days because there were not sufficient facilities for them.

Mr. GWINN. We had no exact testimony on the point before our committee.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I would like to answer the question of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania first.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The point of order is that a Member who seeks recognition must first address the Chair rather than inquire of the Member whether he will yield or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The practice which has grown up here is not a good one. When a request is made for a Member to yield, the request should be made to the Chair, and the Chair in turn submits the request to the speaker having the floor.

Mr. GWINN. New York City has not petitioned this body for help. Why should this body seek to impose its will of Federal aid on the city of New York? Why should we think, as regards the funds from West Virginia and Pennsylvania, we can manage their charity to New York City better than they do themselves? Why should we bring the State's money down here, mush it around an incredible period of time, and send it back where it came from in the first place? This is pure compulsory State aid to Uncle Sam to enable him to manage our classrooms and our children on the rankest pretext that he can do it better than the people can themselves.

Now, what about New York and New York City? Under title I of this bill, the Kelley bill, New York State will be required to pay $74 million per year—under title I, I am talking about now—and receive back $32,794,000. So, in effect, for New York City to get 1 schoolroom it would have to pay the Federal Government for 2 schoolrooms. That is necessary in order to get money to hand around to other places. So, when the Members say that the situation in Chicago and in New York and in Hammond, Ind., and other places is perfectly terrible, we have got to look to the Federal Government, you are simply closing your eyes to the language of the bill. They will not get a net dime from those funds. They are on the paying end permanently, not on the receiving end.

You must close your ears. You must knock yourselves on the head to entertain the idea that most of your areas will get a net dime out of this bill.

For the majority to say that they are getting Federal aid for their constituents would be a rank deception. They will not do that. And if we should go home and say, "We will get Federal aid to you, we are going to put every little tot in a new seat, and so on, and so forth," what utter hypocrisy that would be. Before this debate is over it will amount to knowing deception. The truth must be told them that in a majority of the States they will be forced without their consent to pay taxes to build schoolrooms in other States, but not their own.

Here is a record put out by the Department of Education itself showing what each State pays in taxes and what each State will get back in largess under the Kelley bill. These States get back less than they pay out. I will name them to you.

A record of this is on the page's table or out in the hall so that Members can get a picture of their own State, if they want to.

THE "PUT-AND-TAKE" FIGURES

Column 1 of the following table shows the percentage that each State pays of all taxes collected, for whatever purpose; column 2 shows on that basis how much each will contribute annually to the $400 million annual fund; column 3 shows

how much each State will get back, according to the United States Office of Education:

State	Percent pay in	Dollars they will pay in	Dollars they will get back
Alabama	0.542	$2,172,000	$8,968,658
Arizona	.232	928,000	2,537,686
Arkansas	.226	904,000	5,313,957
California	7.620	30,480,000	26,545,819
Colorado	.897	3,588,000	3,611,322
Connecticut	1.841	7,364,000	4,782,562
Delaware	1.288	5,152,000	835,050
Florida	.967	3,868,000	7,623,902
Georgia	1.002	4,008,000	10,237,501
Idaho	.153	612,000	1,691,790
Illinois	8.228	32,912,000	20,247,262
Indiana	2.287	9,148,000	10,226,657
Iowa	.755	3,020,000	6,420,128
Kansas	.719	2,876,000	4,750,027
Kentucky	1.900	7,600,000	8,317,970
Louisiana	.744	3,096,000	8,090,229
Maine	.244	976,000	2,244,876
Maryland [1]	2.726	10,904,000	16,202,148
Massachusetts	2.719	10,876,000	10,573,691
Michigan	8.711	34,844,000	17,058,887
Minnesota	1.516	6,064,000	7,699,816
Mississippi	.200	800,000	6,506,886
Missouri	2.532	10,128,000	9,174,710
Montana	.167	668,000	1,594,187
Nebraska	.585	2,340,000	3,220,909
Nevada	.121	484,000	466,327
New Hampshire	.178	712,000	1,279,688
New Jersey	2.944	11,776,000	11,343,672
New Mexico	.152	608,000	2,320,790
New York	18.794	74,996,000	32,794,708
North Carolina	2.206	8,824,000	12,178,549
North Dakota	.091	364,000	1,724,325
Ohio	6.734	26,936,000	20,236,416
Oklahoma	.894	3,576,000	5,715,215
Oregon	.611	2,444,000	3,893,287
Pennsylvania	7.612	30,448,000	25,105,737
Rhode Island	.424	1,696,000	1,778,549
South Carolina	.361	1,444,000	7,005,748
South Dakota	.102	408,000	1,724,325
Tennessee	.729	2,916,000	9,174,710
Texas	3.120	12,480,000	21,982,431
Utah	.424	1,696,000	2,168,962
Vermont	.198	432,000	965,188
Virginia	1.539	6,156,000	9,207,244
Washington [1]	1.184	4,736,000	6,355,059
West Virginia	.419	1,676,000	5,747,750
Wisconsin	1.857	7,428,000	8,740,918
Wyoming	.081	324,000	780,826
Hawaii	.194	776,000	1,409,825
Possessions			422,000
Total	99.656	398,664,000	400,000,000

[1] Maryland includes District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. Washington State includes Alaska.

See the States that will get less than they pay out. Especially is this so if you add to the cost under this bill the cost of administration and handling. We know that the cost of the Government managing our affairs is at least 30 to 35 percent. They cost us $12 billion to $15 billion of extra money before we start getting any relief or aid money back. So if you add 30 percent, or if that is high, 15 percent, to what we pay out directly in taxes under this bill, many borderline States will get back much less than they pay out.

California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York—New York pays 18.75 percent of all the taxes that are paid and it gets back and has been getting back for over 25 years now a liquidation of itself in the Federal aid process. And of course that is true of many other States, particularly Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois and California. But to go on with the list: Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin.

There are many others that are just over the line. That is the story of those that are clearly on the paying end and not on the receiving end. If you add the overhead cost the list of States increases.

I am going to offer an amendment to this bill substituting therefor the Scrivner bill, which simply says that after the Federal Government collects taxes it shall send a check back to each State for 1 percent of the total taxes collected from that State, to be kept by it for educational purposes. That will do perfect magic. The Southern States will be able to keep their own money at home and be better off than they will under this complicated, utterly fantastic, costly, even corrupt scheme to buy votes with the tax money taken from some of the States for the special benefit of others.

Let me give you an example. Take the State of Arizona, which we do not regard as a poor State or one really needing aid, but it somehow or other under the Government scheme of figuring gets back more than it pays in. If it kept 1 percent of its own taxes back home to manage itself and to control its own schools, keeping the Federal Government out of the State entirely, the picture would be this: Under the Kelley bill Arizona pays $929,000 into this Federal-aid fund. It gets back $2,537,000, or roughly $1,600,000 more than it pays out. But if it kept 1 percent, with no bookkeeping, no control, it would keep of its own money $1,531,000 and be substantially as well off. If you add the 30 percent for management by the Federal Government it would be much better off.

Now take Florida. Florida under the Kelley bill pays $3,868,000 and gets back $7,623,000 or a gain of $3,756,000. If it kept 1 percent of its own income payments it would get back $5,900,000 and be much better off.

Georgia under the Kelley bill will pay $4 million and get back $10 million, or a straight gift of $6 million. If it kept 1 percent of its own income under the proposed amendment it would keep for its own management $5,800,000.

In the case of Louisiana it works out not quite so well but substantially the same. Attached is the complete list of States:

TABLE I

	Income tax collections, fiscal year 1954 (including tax for old-age insurance)	1 percent of tax collected
Alabama	$355,904,000	$3,559,040
Arizona	153,119,000	1,531,190
Arkansas	148,110,000	1,481,100
California	4,671,633,000	46,716,330
Colorado	553,265,000	5,532,650
Connecticut	1,163,589,000	11,635,890
Delaware	869,525,000	8,695,250
Florida	599,990,000	5,999,900
Georgia	581,573,000	5,815,730
Hawaii	126,170,000	1,261,700
Idaho	100,902,000	1,009,020
Illinois	4,926,633,000	49,266,330
Indiana	1,205,079,000	12,050,790
Iowa	494,575,000	4,945,750
Kansas	437,870,000	4,378,700
Kentucky	441,333,000	4,413,330
Louisiana	459,357,000	4,593,570
Maine	159,030,000	1,590,300
Maryland	851,777,000	8,517,770
Massachusetts	1,708,884,000	17,088,840
Michigan	4,857,146,000	48,571,460
Minnesota	917,256,000	9,172,560
Mississippi	129,336,000	1,293,360
Missouri	1,472,722,000	14,727,220
Montana	109,285,000	1,092,850
Nebraska	320,620,000	3,206,200
Nevada	70,308,000	703,080
New Hampshire	118,150,000	1,181,500
New Jersey	1,745,232,000	17,452,320
New Mexico	99,351,000	993,510
New York	11,626,091,000	116,260,910
North Carolina	673,436,000	6,734,360
North Dakota	$60,929,000	$609,290
Ohio	4,147,301,000	41,473,010
Oklahoma	504,416,000	5,044,160
Oregon	403,821,000	4,038,210
Pennsylvania	4,531,795,000	45,317,950
Rhode Island	271,663,000	2,716,630
South Carolina	239,806,000	2,398,060
South Dakota	67,056,000	670,560
Tennessee	463,856,000	4,638,560
Texas	1,969,318,000	19,693,180
Utah	135,924,000	1,359,240
Vermont	70,790,000	707,900
Virginia	641,430,000	6,414,300
Washington	711,456,000	7,114,560
West Virginia	270,198,000	2,701,980
Wisconsin	1,121,973,000	11,219,730
Wyoming	51,764,000	517,640
Alaska	45,843,000	458,430
District of Columbia	707,455,000	7,074,550
Puerto Rico	(9,571,000)	(95,710)
Total	58,578,533,000	585,785,330

NOTE.—Because collections for old-age insurance are not shown separately in internal revenue reports, actual benefits would be somewhat less than shown here when adjustment made for that factor—an average of about 7.2 percent.

The Department of Education, which is the source of most of the information we have, is an unreliable source. When we stand up here and say we have a terrible shortage of schoolteachers and a terrible shortage of classrooms, we are simply parroting what we have been told by the Department that already controls our thoughts, even the thoughts of this House; they are often not true.

The President's own Committee on Intergovernmental Activity made a report showing that over the last 50 years and for longer than that our schoolteaching force has kept almost exactly in the same relation to pupils all the way through, and that there is no sudden increase or decrease in need for teachers. That is true of the school classrooms. It is false to talk about there being a sudden need for classrooms and that the poor States are so miserable that the Federal Government must come forward with help it is incapable of giving. The classrooms have retained the same relation to pupils for the last 50 or more years according to the President's own committee report. We do not hear about that. It has no emphasis on it by the same Department that puts out its own propaganda of shortages.

To show you how utterly unreliable and even ridiculous and, therefore, highly deceptive the Federal Government Education Department can be, let me show you this survey of school facilities made by it in 1952. It has been put out and circulated widely and financed by Congress. According to it, not a single State is able to take care of itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, much of my life has been devoted to the promotion of the cause of education. It is a cliche and probably trite for me to say that a democracy cannot function with complete success unless it has an educated electorate. Ignorance and illit-

eracy make fertile ground for the demagog.

At one time I was chairman of the board of education of my home city of Rome, a town of approximately 40,000 people situated in the beautiful foothills of northwest Georgia. While I served upon the board of education, it was my privilege to sponsor the necessary bond issues to construct schools to try to meet the growing demand for classrooms. When I was a member of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, I served on one of the two house committees on education and did everything I could to advance the cause of education in my State.

When I was elected to Congress, one of the things I promised the people of my State was that I would do my best to secure Federal aid for our schools. I am convinced that it is one of the obligations of the Federal Government to help those States which are unable because of the limitation of their resources to furnish school buildings and educational facilities for their children. It has always seemed to me that the money should be taken where it can be found and spent where it is needed in the field of education.

Since I have been a Member of this House, it has been my privilege to support and vote for legislation giving aid to defense-impacted areas, and this legislation has been of vast help to many counties of my State. Even though the State of Georgia has just about completed a huge school-building program through the device of a school-building authority, nevertheless, these federally impacted areas could not have supplied the necessary school buildings and equipment to care for the great influx of children into their schools without Federal aid. Moreover, I have tried to promote the cause of vocational education, and as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, which provides the money for vocational education, it has been my pleasure to help secure the maximum amount of money authorized by the George-Barden Act.

It has been the experience of the boards of education and the superintendents of the schools receiving funds for vocational education and help under Public Laws 815 and 874 that the Federal Government has not attempted to exercise any unreasonable supervision of the aid thus given to my State. The Commissioner of Education and his office have been most cooperative and have, I think, done a remarkable job promoting the building of schools and the operation of the schools in federally impacted areas.

In no wise has our Government in the past sought to invade the field of social legislation or to use the funds provided under those school laws to interfere with the social pattern and the educational heritage and customs of my State.

Nor do I find objectionable the provision in the bill now under consideration for fixing the wage scales under the Bacon-Davis Act. I have always insisted that wage scales in the South in all fields of labor should be just as high as they are in the North because the workers of the South are the most efficient and loyal to be found anywhere. They learn easily, they give a day's work for a day's pay and they are entitled to be paid just as much as or more than laborers are paid in other sections of our country.

But when an effort is made to bribe my State and the South with school construction money to accept the mixing of the races in our schools, I cannot vote for a bill so designed. It is reported that an amendment will be offered to this bill to deny funds to those States which have not submitted to the invalid invasion by the Supreme Court of the legislative power of the Congress in the infamous integration decision. The Court has its decision. Let it enforce it. The Congress should not be called upon to come to the rescue of the Court which has exceeded its powers and sought to amend the Constitution and to declare the law not what prior decisions have said it is but to be what they think it ought to be. The South does not intend to mix the races in the schools because it believes that to do so would be to break down the social barriers which at present prevent the temptation to intermarriage of the two races. This fear of intermarriage which would destroy both races and result in a race of halfbreeds and mongrels is the basic reason for the South's fight against integration in the schools. If integration in the schools is brought about and the social barriers between the two races are lowered, the next step will be to break down our laws against intermarriage between the races. Neither race should desire this but should seek to develop and preserve the good qualities which each can claim.

It is not a question of mixing an inferior and a superior race. It is the question of mixing two races each of which has many fine qualities which would probably be lost in a mongrelization of the races. The race which desires intermarriage with the other, by this very process, shows its feeling of inferiority.

Neither is it a question of denying to the Negro his civil rights such as the right to vote, the right to security of his person and property and the right to equal pay for the same type and kind of work. It is not a matter of race prejudice or bias. Certainly as far as I am concerned, I am sure I have no prejudice or bias against the Negro race. As a member of the Georgia General Assembly, I voted for the constitutional amendment which eliminated the poll tax as a requisite for voting and throughout my life have done everything I could, both as a member of the general assembly and with the school board of my home city, to advance the education of the Negro race. It is purely and simply a question of the mixing of the races in our schools and other forced social contacts to which we in the South object.

Consequently, we will not be bribed by any such legislation as is proposed to be adopted as an amendment to this bill.

The South will certainly use every legal means at its command to resist either the use of the carrot technique or that of the stick. We will not be driven, cajoled, or bought.

But whether or not the proposed amendment, denying funds to those States which have not integrated the races in the schools, is adopted makes little difference. As a matter of fact, I think the amendment will be defeated; for if I read the news reports correctly, assurances have been given to those favoring such an amendment that it is not necessary but that the desired result will be obtained either by administrative action or through the courts by means of an injunction forbidding the payment of funds to those States which have not integrated.

Consequently, I am unalterably opposed to this legislation. There is certainly an overwhelming need for it but so long as some seek to use the bill to accomplish unwise social and political ends and for political reasons, I cannot support or vote for it.

If the proposed amendment is submitted, I will certainly vote against it and whether or not it is adopted, my vote must be "nay" on H. R. 7535.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to say I favor this bill. I believe the classroom shortage is the great domestic crisis and that we should pass Federal aid to give construction help to alleviate that shortage this year. The various real problems involved with this bill are going to be discussed and have been discussed by other members of the committee. I want to direct my remarks to the brief time that I am permitted to address the Committee to the amendment which the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] says he will offer. That amendment which will provide that none of the money will go to any States maintaining segregated schools or any districts maintaining segregated schools was voted upon and considered in committee. It is an unfortunate coincidence that the consideration of this legislation, this very vital and important legislation, has come into conflict with the recent decision of the Supreme Court relating to segregation in the schools. It is ironic that in this area in the field of education where the proponents of desegregation and integrated schools have won their greatest victory, they are trying to push that victory further and further with such amendments as the gentleman from New York is going to offer when there are no such amendments offered in other fields such as FHA or hospitals where Hill-Burton money is expended. Even the other day, when we passed the conference report on the road bill, there was no provision that the roads would only be permitted to be used for nonsegregated buses.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. METCALF. I yield for a question.

Mr. YOUNGER. Does the gentleman know of any public road in the United States that practices segregation?

Mr. METCALF. I know of buses in the United States that travel over public roads that are segregated in violation of the Supreme Court decision.

Now let us get in proper perspective the timing of this decision. The first decision of the Supreme Court came down on May 17, 1954, holding that the 14th amendment prohibited the discrimination in education between the races because the maintenance of separate but equal schools was a denial of equal protection of the laws as guaranteed by the 14th amendment; and that the due process clause of the 5th amendment prevents such discrimination. The Court by that decision outlawed segregation, but the Court retained jurisdiction of the cases. The attorneys for the plaintiffs, and the NAACP, came back into that Court and said that segregation should be permitted immediately, and argued to the Court to that effect.

In the hearings, at page 1054, you can read what Mr. Shad Polier of the American Jewish Congress, and Mr. Clarence Mitchell, of the NAACP, said a few days before the second Supreme Court decision came down. They argued that it would be a repudiation of the first Supreme Court decision if the Congress did not pass implementing legislation, pointing out that section 5 of the 14th amendment provided that Congress had the power to enact such legislation. They guessed wrong. The Court could have left it to Congress to enact implementing legislation. That course would have been the easiest for the Court to take, but it would not have been the most straightforward.

The advances already made in applying the principle of equality have been achieved through resort to the Court, not to Congress: zoning, primaries, university education. Congress was not in the habit of taking responsibility in this field, or indeed in any of the other ramifications of the 14th amendment. That course would have resulted in impotence. We all recognize that in certain areas of this country no laws would be passed by State legislatures and in this Congress opponents of integration could effectively prevent implementing legislation and render the Court's decision impotent. But the Court refused to agree that implementing legislation was needed and affirmatively ordered desegregation.

In a recent article in the American Bar Association Journal the Attorney General of Georgia has made the same argument. He says that—

> The Supreme Court usurped the prerogatives of the United States Congress. It handed down an implementation decision on May 31, 1955, in spite of the fact that the 14th amendment itself vests in Congress the power of implementation.

He was referring to section 5 of the 14th amendment:

> Congress shall have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this article.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. The Court, in fact, did legislate in that decision.

Mr. METCALF. I hoped not to get into a controversy about the merits of the decision. In fact, that is an implementing decision and has the force and effect, as I see it, of legislation.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. LANDRUM. The distinguished gentleman from Montana is also a former distinguished member of the Montana Supreme Court, is he not?

Mr. METCALF. I served for 6 years on that court.

Mr. LANDRUM. I assume the gentleman has approached his study of this question from the standpoint of a jurist, trying to analyze it in the light of what this legislation can do in regard to authorizing an appropriation and making it available to all States.

Mr. METCALF. That is right.

Mr. LANDRUM. Is it the gentleman's opinion, in the light of that study, that whether or not the so-called Powell amendment should be adopted, the school not following the decision of the Supreme Court of May 17, 1954, will be denied funds?

Mr. METCALF. I think they can be, and they may be denied funds. I will elaborate on that in just a moment.

Mr. LANDRUM. Without any additions or amendments to the present legislation?

Mr. METCALF. The Powell amendment is not needed. Even if this bill does not pass, I believe that under the implementation decision of the Supreme Court, the Attorney General of the United States or the Commissioner of Education has the power to deny funds to the schools, for construction or for any other purpose.

Mr. LANDRUM. But if the bill should pass, the money authorized under its terms certainly could be withheld without the Powell amendment.

Mr. METCALF. Yes. They can withhold for a short time. I wish to elaborate on that.

I feel that the NAACP and the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] when he says, "Let us not repudiate the Supreme Court decision," is repudiating it himself in coming into this body and asking for implementing legislation, because the Supreme Court decision said, "Let us have a moderate approach."

Now Mr. POWELL comes along and says that the two decisions of the Supreme Court are not enough to prevent discrimination of minorities in violation of the 5th and 14th amendments, that it is necessary to have special legislation to carry out the decision of the Court. We have the anomalous situation of Attorney General Cook of Georgia on the one hand, and the gentleman from New York and the NAACP on the other, each trying to discredit and belittle the Supreme Court decision; each insisting that Congress has to pass legislation to put the decision into effect. But the Court retained jurisdiction of the cases before it and ordered the district courts to carry out the principles of the Constitution without congressional action.

If the decision of the Supreme Court that segregation in the schools is a deprivation of equal rights under the law, and a denial of the equal protection of the laws; if that decision needs further implementing legislation, such as the Powell amendment, to make it effective, then decisions of the Supreme Court and provisions of the Constitution can be nullified if implementing legislation does not follow. If that is true, Congress can deny to the citizens of the United States the benefits of the Bill of Rights or the 14th amendment by failure to act or refusal to act.

I shall never agree to the proposition advanced that these provisions of the Constitution require legislation before they can be enforced.

I shall never concede that basic constitutional rights of American citizens can be withheld because of the failure or refusal of Congress to act.

I do not believe that to be the law and I will not vote for any proposition that concedes that the failure or refusal of Congress to act can nullify the Constitution.

But suppose the Powell amendment were adopted, would it contribute to an orderly solution of the problem? In the argument before the Supreme Court, attorneys for the NAACP urged prompt and immediate desegregation. The Supreme Court refused to make such an order, and refused to enter a direct decree which would have required immediate and indiscriminate admission of Negro students to schools hitherto reserved for white children. Now, by legislative act the Powell amendment would attempt to accelerate the process of integration of schools faster than the Supreme Court thought it should go.

Adlai Stevenson said in a speech in Portland, Oreg.:

> And as a practical matter we must recognize that punitive action by the Federal Government may actually delay the process of integration in education.
>
> We will not, for example, reduce race prejudice by denying to areas afflicted with it the means of improving the educational standards of all their people.
>
> Certainly we will not improve the present condition or future prospects of any Negro citizen by coercive Federal action that will arm the extremists and disarm the men of good will in the South who, with courage and patience, have already accomplished so much.

Since the Supreme Court's decision there has been definite progress in many States toward integration in the schools. Except for an unsuccessful citizen's suit attempting to delay integration in the District of Columbia until the Supreme Court had rendered final judgment, integration has gone forward in the District, in Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, Oklahoma, West Virginia, and in parts of Maryland. If the States which maintained segregated schools be regarded as a region, rather than taken separately State by State, amazingly swift progress has been made, and the Supreme Court's directive that integration proceed with "deliberate speed" has been obeyed.

At this point I call attention to the following articles on the progress of compliance with the Supreme Court decision:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

TWO YEARS OF ACHIEVEMENT

The Nation has been looking too long and too hard at the desegregation issue in the Deep South. It is time to look elsewhere.

If the extremism in five States of the Deep South were the only criterion of the results of the United States Supreme Court de-

cision against racial segregation in public schools, which came 2 years ago this week, then the American people would be justified in thinking there has been little progress. But is that true?

Let us inspect the picture in Missouri and surrounding States which also have had to meet the issue of school integration:

Missouri: Here is a State which was born with slavery and steeped in southern tradition in many areas. Though there had been much progress toward equality for all citizens, still few Missourians could have guessed prior to the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, what has happened since.

What has happened, of course, is nearly complete integration of the public schools, plus advances in other fields. Even at the start of this school year, nearly 85 percent of the State's 65,000 Negro schoolchildren were attending integrated classes. Missouri's record is remarkable and has won nationwide study.

Kansas: Unlike Missouri, the Sunflower State was born of a battle to free the slaves, and its constitution specifically prohibited segregation except in a few big-city primary schools and Kansas City high schools. Yet Kansas in 1954 was a party with Southern States in the "States' rights" defense of school segregation before the Supreme Court.

Since the Court decision, however, five Kansas cities report complete integration of their schools and eight others have begun it. Hence Kansas shows that the Court's ruling has had an effect well outside the South, even on a State with Northern attitudes.

Oklahoma: Just a few years ago integration would have seemed unlikely in this State with a southern back door and a Western front door. But 273 of its schools began this term open to children of all races and many more districts have joined the integration movement, as have the State colleges.

The Sooner State's attitude was summed up by Attorney General Mac Q. Williamson who said: "Our (State) constitution begins with a clause saying that the laws shall not be in conflict with the supreme law of the land. We're still in the Union, so that is that."

Arkansas: Both attitudes and geography split Arkansas between Deep South and border State. The University of Arkansas was a southern pioneer in opening its doors to the minority race. Following the Supreme Court decision, Fayetteville, Charleston, and Hoxie decided to desegregate their schools, while the State colleges were opened to Negroes. Even the capital of Little Rock offered a desegregation proposal, though it was vague.

But a furor over the Hoxie case helped to mobilize the white supremacy advocates, and Gov. Orval Faubus, who had stood aloof from them, now favors the mystical doctrine of interposition. The land of opportunity is still debating whether to offer more opportunity to all its citizens.

Tennessee: Here, too, on the Deep South's border, a State is poised in hesitant balance over desegregation. The Supreme Court ruling brought tentative decisions from Knoxville, Chattanooga, and Nashville, to comply, while the Oak Ridge school district became the first in Tennessee to adopt full integration.

Now a political campaign year has revived the forces of prejudice against the moderate leadership of Gov. Frank Clement and Senators Kefauver and Gore. Under pressure, the Chattanooga school board says there will be no desegregation for probably 5 years, while a Federal court is prodding Nashville to adopt some plan within 7 months. The University of Tennessee's trustees are reconsidering a 4-year plan to desegregate their undergraduate schools. But Tennessee stays on middle ground.

Kentucky: At last report several score school districts had desegregated or decided to do so in the land of the mint julep—including the capital of Frankfort. Louisville plans desegregation next fall on a flexible transfer basis. Public colleges and several private colleges are open without regard to race. And the legislature let an interposition resolution die quietly.

State Superintendent of Public Instruction Robert Martin said: "Integration has progressed without incident in Kentucky and without the mouthings of demagogs."

This record of six States shows varying degrees of progress and hesitancy toward public school integration, but it shows much more progress than hesitation.

Most important, Missouri and these five States touching upon it have one quality in common which is notably lacking in the Deep South. All of them have at least considered the possibility of integrating public schools and most have done so. None of them has attempted to say "No" to the law of the land. None has tried to bar the door against the requirements of democracy.

Five recalcitrant States of the Deep South cannot write the record on the Supreme Court's unanimous decision of 2 years ago. When the results of that decision are put in proper national perspective, the other 43 States may see that they are good.

[From the New York Times]

BRIEF SUMMARY OF SURVEY

INTRODUCTION

A social revolution confronts the South. Dramatic adjustments are demanded by the Supreme Court order to end racial segregation in the schools. The problems present a challenge to the Nation as a whole.

I. States integrating

District of Columbia: The South watches Washington. There schools have been totally desegregated. But, while solving one problem, racial intregration has created others—including a lowering of educational levels.

Kentucky: Without quibbling, Kentucky agreed to comply with the Supreme Court's desegregation order. Integration started last September in some districts. By next September it will be under way in all.

Maryland: Marylanders respect the law of the land and the Supreme Court's interpretation of that law. Despite some opposition, the State is moving faster toward integration than even its leaders claim.

Missouri: In every corner of Missouri, Negro pupils are now sitting at desks once reserved for whites only. Some form of integration has taken place in counties where 85 percent of the pupils live.

Oklahoma: Under the leadership of its Governor, Oklahoma has calmly taken the first steps toward integration. School districts in more than half the counties have desegregated to some degree.

West Virginia: School integration in parts of West Virginia began with anger and tears. But a happy ending is foreseen. Every county with Negro residents is making a start toward integration.

II. States divided or delaying

Arkansas: At the university level Arkansas was a pioneer in integration. But school desegregation lags. Only three districts have begun to integrate. Some say total integration is a distant prospect.

Delaware: Integration has cut a chasm across Delaware. The northern industrial one-third is moving gradually toward desegregation. The southern agricultural two-thirds is fighting back.

Florida: Segregation still reigns in Florida. But the racial temperature, like the State's weather, remains mild. Officials are calmly and carefully appraising the problems of desegregating the schools.

Louisiana: Nominally Deep South in its attitudes, Louisiana has nevertheless taken significant steps toward desegregation. Led partly by the Catholic Church, the State has passed the "point of no return."

North Carolina: No integration has taken place in North Carolina, but there are signs of a willingness to start. Four cities have indicated they will comply with the Supreme Court's desegregation ruling.

Tennessee: Although divided against itself, Tennessee is headed hesitantly toward desegregation. Schools in some localities have complied or say they will comply with the Supreme Court's ruling.

Texas: Compared to Mississippi, "Texas is a kind of heaven" for Negro rights, says one Negro leader. West and south Texas are gradually integrating schools; east Texas will resist.

III. States resisting

Alabama: This State stands as a symbol of southern resistance to desegregation. Racial barriers seem to be rising. There is no race-mixing except in one Roman Catholic and one Negro institution.

Georgia: The State flatly refuses to integrate its schools, and is using every device to circumvent the Supreme Court's decision. Even here, however, legal segregation seems eventually doomed.

Mississippi: Among Southern States, Mississippi is probably furthest from integration. Yet, racial barriers are being buffeted. There are intimations that segregation may one day end.

South Carolina: Not a single Negro has been admitted to a white public school in South Carolina. Serious trouble might result from an immediate attempt to enforce desegregation. Yet, integration seems inevitable.

Virginia: In gentlemanly but determined fashion, the State is fighting integration, armed with the weapon of interposition. There has been no desegregation, and there are no immediate plans for any.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of June 23, 1956]

DESEGREGATION: THE SECOND YEAR

As time passes the shape of the American race problem conforms ever more closely to the dimensions foreseen by informed observers when the Supreme Court first ruled against law-required segregation in the public schools.

The Southern School News since shortly after the decision has been performing an invaluable service by reporting factually its impact on the States affected. The SSN has just published a summary of developments, State by State, during the second year following the ruling.

How do these summaries add up? Gradual desegregation, varying in speed and extent, by the border States: Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, Oklahoma (and the District of Columbia). A somewhat mixed and moderate response in States such as North Carolina and Tennessee, in which mountain tradition has persisted (this was what might be called nonslavery before the Civil War), and in States such as Texas and Florida, whose populations contain a large infusion of northern and western elements.

As for the Deep South (Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana), opposition continues complete and resistance active. Virginia and Arkansas need special comment. For from a policy of limited compliance sentiment has shifted to resistance.

It should be noted, however, that steps are under way even in some resisting States to adapt to the decision by measures which, in theory at least, would give State support to voluntarily segregated as well as desegregated schooling.

The composite of social attitudes and actions this picture presents should not surprise anyone who understands the complexity and depth of the problem. It is keenly disappointing, of course, to those who have suffered most from the injustices which stem from the time when northern shipowners began transporting Negro slaves from Africa to work for southern planters. One reader of this newspaper (presumably a Negro) writes us:

"I do not understand your plea for time. * * * The Constitution dates from 1787. The Civil War closed around 1865. This prolonged disregard for individual human dignity should * * * cease * * * immediately if not sooner."

Freedom from slavery, of course. And it has. The right to vote, the right to equal protection of the law and equal justice before the courts, certainly. And this newspaper has and will continue to urge the speediest fulfillment of these rights.

But desegregation—in the schools, in other public places—involves not occasional contacts but association. And a pattern of association long hardened into custom and heavily overlaid with feelings of propriety and racial consciousness is not changed overnight. It cannot be remade by fiat or even by force.

The change will come gradually, first where the problems are least, until a moderating climate of opinion pervading the Nation fosters solutions everywhere by mutual accommodations through mutual consent.

In some States these changes are not going to come overnight, or even in a few years. All of us will grant the truth of the statement in the southern manifesto that the separate but equal doctrine "became a part of the life of the people of many of the States and confirmed their habits, customs, traditions, and way of life." William Graham Sumner's statement that "stateways cannot change folkways" is pertinent here.

In two of the cases that were before the Supreme Court, Briggs against Elliott from South Carolina, and Davis against Prince Edward County from Virginia, the district courts have held that the school boards were not in compliance. These cases are on their way back to the Supreme Court for further action. The Court's decision in those cases will give us further guides to carry out the constitutional principles.

A procedure of gradualism and moderation should be followed for school construction and President Eisenhower's statement at one of his press conferences affirms this. President Eisenhower said:

The Supreme Court * * * specifically provided that there be a gradual implementation and referred it back to the district courts so that it should be gradual.

He added that the Justices "recognize the deep ruts of prejudice and attitudes that have been built up over the years in this problem." He then referred to the quote interim close quote policy decisions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the General Accounting Office pending quote final judicial determination close quote of the cases. Such final judicial determination will not be had until the Supreme Court has again passed on the Virginia and South Carolina cases referred to. An act of Congress disrupting this orderly and gradual process will destroy the firm moderation that was implicit in the Supreme Court's decision.

But what happens if you put in the Powell amendment? It is a punitive amendment; it makes immediately effective what the Supreme Court said we should do gradually. It says to the South: "You must desegregate promptly"; whereas the Supreme Court said it should be done gradually.

What does the South get when you leave the Powell amendment out? The South buys some time.

What does the North and the people who are in favor of integration get? They get encouragement and a following of the Supreme Court decision, the North gets moderation.

The Powell amendment is not needed; it should not be put in this legislation. It is a repudiation of the Supreme Court decision if it is put in.

Yesterday my chairman mentioned the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. I am going to ask that it be included in full in my remarks, but the purpose and intent of the policy is to prevent the use of Federal funds to further or to influence racial segregation in airport buildings.

The gentleman who wrote it testified in recent hearings that in announcing that policy the Department of Commerce was implementing the general executive policy not to use Federal funds in any way which might result in furthering the principle of segregation.

We asked him if that went further than the Supreme Court decision, and he said:

No, sir; the letter does not in my judgment go further than the Supreme Court decision went.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 6, 1956.

Airports Policy and Procedure, Memorandum No. 41.

To: All Holders of the Office of Airports Field Operations Manual.

From: Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

Subject: Airport building policy—segregation.

Programing standard G (3), as stated in the "Policies and Procedures" booklet, dated October 1, 1955, reads as follows:

"(3) No Federal-aid Airport Program funds will be made available for the development of separate facilities or space in an airport building when such facilities or space are designed for use now or in the future for separate racial groups."

The purpose and intent of the policy expressed in this programing standard is to prevent the use of Federal funds to further or to increase racial segregation in airport buildings. Under this policy, Federal-aid Airport Program funds will not be used in the construction or reconstruction of any areas of a building which are intended for use by separate racial groups.

It will, therefore, be required, prior to the issuance of a grant offer for any project involving a building, that the chief executive officer of the sponsor of each building project clearly state, in writing, whether or not it is the intent of the sponsor that all of the areas and facilities in the building will be available without regard to race, creed or color, and are intended to be operated on a nonsegregated basis.

If not, it will be necessary that the written statement describe those areas and facilities within the building which are intended for segregated use.

If so, a simple written statement to this effect will suffice, unless the building will, upon completion, contain separate facilities, such as two or more waiting rooms, two or more dining areas, or two or more sets of sanitary facilities (a set consisting of one restroom for men and one restroom for women), etc. In this event, the sponsor's written statement shall, in addition, specifically point out the reason for providing such duplicate facilities and the intent of the sponsor in providing them.

If the written statement of the sponsor describes areas within the building that are intended for segregated use, such areas will not be eligible for, and will be excluded from, Federal-aid airport program participation. This will be accomplished by a special provision in the grant offer clearly specifying the ineligible space.

Where single facilities (one waiting room, one dining area or one set of sanitary facilities) are provided, from which it is intended that any person will be excluded on the basis of race, creed or color, such segregated areas will be excluded from the project.

Where duplicate facilities are provided, intended for segregated use, the areas involved in such duplicate facilities will be excluded from the project. For example:

(a) If separate waiting rooms for segregated use are provided, all waiting room areas will be excluded.

(b) If separate dining areas are provided for segregated use, all dining, kitchen, and related areas will be excluded.

(c) If separate sanitary facilities are provided for segregated use, all areas involving sanitary facilities will be excluded.

This policy will apply to all types of building construction work, including the construction of new buildings, the construction of additions to existing buildings, and the remodeling, alteration or repair of existing buildings, and will apply whether the work consists of the completion of a facility or its partial completion, such as the roughing-in of utilities.

The allowable costs of a building project, which include space and/or facilities excluded from Federal participation in the grant agreement, will be determined on the basis of an equitable distribution of the costs of the eligible and ineligible space and/or facilities. This, of course, should be taken into consideration in computing the maximum obligation of the Government as stated in the grant offer.

Any unusual cases which are not clearly covered by this policy will be presented to the Administrator for final determination.

C. J. LOWEN.

The issue in the Kelley bill is not a civil-rights issue, it is whether we are going to help build schools. If the school-aid bill is defeated in this Congress, the losers will be the boys and girls all over America. This classroom shortage has been with us too long already, and we have already sent some of our boys and girls out into life inadequately prepared for citizenship in a 20th-century world. Thomas Jefferson once said, "Young people come this way but once." Even if the Federal-aid bill is passed this year, it is going to take 2 to 3 years to get the classrooms built. To fail to pass a bill for Federal aid before adjournment of this Congress will be a grim gamble with the destiny of our most precious national resource, our boys and girls, white or red or black, in the South and East and West and North.

President Eisenhower has said, "The need of the American children for schools is right now, immediately, today." Let us fix our attention on the main objective, remove the roadblock of civil-

rights legislation from the educational bills, and enact legislation for Federal aid to schools this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. METCALF. I am sorry I did not get to answer the questions propounded to me by the gentleman from Alabama yesterday.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this time to express what I believe to be the views of the people of Dallas County, Tex., the district which I have the honor to represent. Regardless of political party, the majority of these people feel that Federal aid to education is entirely unnecessary and, as a matter of fact, is entirely contrary to the American system of education and government.

In order to state these views, I would like to analyze just the first two pages of H. R. 7535, the so-called Kelley bill cited as the School Construction Assistance Act of 1955. Let us just study these two pages and see what the bill says. Page 1, line 7, section 2, under findings and purpose of act:

> The Congress finds that despite sustained and vigorous efforts by the States and local communities, which have increased current school construction to an unprecedented level, there is still a serious national shortage of classrooms requiring emergency action on the part of the Federal Government.

Perhaps we have answered the problem, without going further in the bill, in this sentence which says, "which have increased current school construction to an unprecedented level"; 60,000 classrooms at a cost of over $2 billion is the production for 1955 and the program is accelerating without Federal aid. Since 50,000 rooms are needed yearly for replacement purposes and growth of school-age population, we are already more than meeting requirements. Therefore, Federal aid is not necessary since the local communities within the States are doing the job already.

Further, is this a situation requiring "emergency action"? No, it is not. True, more classrooms are needed and the situation, even if critical, can be solved, as it is being solved, at the local level. This bill, on the contrary, will impede school construction. When Federal funds are in the offing, State and local efforts are bound to slow down or halt, awaiting help from the Federal grab bag.

Now, to continue, page 2, line 3:

> The limited financial resources available to a number of communities are not adequate to support construction programs of sufficient size to eliminate their classroom shortages.

Now, just what are the financial resources? They are the aggregate tax moneys available from the pocketbooks in any given area. True, these resources are limited, but they certainly are not increased by Federal handout, which, of course, comes from these same pocketbooks. As a matter of fact, the available money is decreased as Government deducts a sizable chunk in the round trip from pocketbook to Washington and return to the community level. For this reason, again, schools should be financed at the local level. Perhaps we should dwell on the word "limited" in this sentence and realize there is a limit to what we can tax our people; that there is a limit to Federal debt. For that matter, it is well to remember that the Federal debt is now greater than the combined debts of localities, cities, States, and the rest of the world. Is this reason to presume financial help is more sensible from the Federal Government than from local sources?

Now, to continue, line 6:

> Other communities, in their efforts to apply their potential resources to their needs, are confronted with restrictive debt and tax limits, an inability to borrow the necessary funds at reasonable rates, and other obstacles.

It might be well for us to examine these restrictive debt and tax limitations because we might find they were imposed by the people for sound reasons, the same fiscal reasons which should prompt the Federal Government from extending its debt, but whatever the restrictive local debt and tax limitation, these problems should be solved by these communities who know their situation and financial needs without the stimulus of a heavily indebted Federal Government prompting them to exceed existing limitation.

It seems only commonsense that the communities know best about solving their financial problems along with school construction. In fact, this bill might even penalize those communities that have indebted themselves more heavily in the positive effort of solving the educational problem as they saw fit. Here is another instance of where the Federal law may well subsidize a lack of effort rather than encourage it.

> While the Congress recognizes that responsibility for providing adequate school facilities lies primarily with the States and local communities, the national interest requires that the Federal Government join with State and local governments in solving these pressing problems.

Now, just what does this mean—that up is down and black is white, that we teach a child to save while giving him money? That local effort is aided by Federal control? How is it possible that we in Congress can believe, based on experience, other than Federal money means Federal control? This bill itself proves it, for hereafter follows 29 pages of detailed instructions controlling the Federal help that is to be extended. In fact, the Federal Government must control its expenditures or the Federal Government's obligation to protect the taxpayers' money is violated. How, then, realizing this fact, can we justify this sentence? Now, as to the national interest, as herein mentioned, what is this national interest? Is there some national interest in our children greater and supersedent to the interest of parents and local communities in their young people? Of course not. Big Federal Government is entirely impersonal. There is no national interest, as such, but only the composite of the local communities. Only in the school district can there be immediate and specific interest in educational problems. This argument, like all others affecting big centralized Government, is in direct conflict with the 10th amendment of the Constitution and States rights. Where are the Congressmen who really believe in States rights now?

As to the alternative programs mentioned, beginning in line 16, number (1), permitting grants to communities is simply the modern equivalent of "Rob Peter to pay Paul." Federal grants, if not unconstitutional, are inherently wrong when superimposed on a society where the people, the communities, the States can look after themselves—at least under our traditional system of Government checks and balances wherein sovereign States are recognized. The grant-in-aid will simply cause our States to compete with each other to secure as large a share of the Federal handout as possible in self-protection, remembering their large Federal tax contributions.

Line 19 to the end of the page suggests two proposals: one, the purchase of bonds, and the other, credit assistance to States, wherein the Federal Government becomes liable for all obligations to be incurred by the communities. If we reflect that in addition to the $278 billion of national debt there is an additional $240-odd billion of contingent Federal liabilities, we might realize that the Federal Government is not itself such a good credit risk, and we might not be so quick to add the contingent liability of $6 billion of credit assistance in this bill.

These remarks are directed just at the first 2 pages of the 29-page Kelley bill. Time does not permit a further study of the many and varied types of Federal control herein laid down to be imposed on our States and communities. There is some question whether it is possible to even understand the language of the bill. Perhaps we are not supposed to understand but accept once again blindly a huge Federal program at the expense of traditional States rights.

Is this just a temporary program to last until 1960, as we are told, to alleviate the temporary critical classroom shortage? Of course not. Whoever heard of the Federal Government backing off a program once it has started? Rather, it mushrooms in growth, so let us not delude ourselves.

Our decision in this aid-to-education bill is simply a matter of whether we want political domination of our schools in the future or not. With the passage of this bill, education will enter full-fledged into the arena of politics, where decisions are made by political expediency and not on principle. Is this the heritage of our children? I pray that it is not.

Federal aid means Federal control. It cannot be otherwise. Yet the advocates of the bill blandly assure us that such is not the case when even they must know that Federal control inevitably follows the expenditure of Federal money. Then, why are the proponents of this bill deluding themselves? I do not know. I only suspect that we Americans are now no longer fighting but are embracing the principles of socialism. For our well-educated, intelligent Members of Congress to fail to see the dangers inherent

in this course of action is regrettable indeed.

At this point, I would like to close with a letter which I directed to our beloved President which quotes him and through using his own logic and outlook defeats, at least to my satisfaction, the principle of Federal aid to education:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 6, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is my belief that the educational conference just concluded is not indicative of the grassroots opinion of the citizens of our country. There were too many delegates connected with education professionally—and a system employed wherein no votes were taken to get the majority view.

Whatever the reason, I am certain that Federal aid to education is not desired by the majority of Dallas County citizens for the same reasons you outlined so clearly in your congressional message last year.

"For unless education continues to be free—free in its response to local community needs, free from any suggestion of political domination, and free from impediments to the pursuit of knowledge by teachers and students—it will cease to serve the purpose of free men."

Education would not be free from political domination, or Government control in some form, once Federal funds are used. Citizens expect a fiscally responsible Government to oversee expenditures, so controls would be mandatory. Experience in other Government programs has shown that Government control follows financial aid. No one, to my knowledge, contradicts this time-tested fact. Those who promise that no Federal control will accompany Federal funds, it seems to me, are indulging in wishful thinking.

It is my hope that you will not hastily adopt the conference findings as a basis for requested legislation, but in view of the criticisms recognize that we still need a truly grassroots digest of opinion. As one suggestion, would it not be sensible to secure the views of the delegates in writing, together with their relationship with education?

If the principle is wrong, then any amount of Federal aid is wrong; even a small amount would be "a foot in the door" and would be followed by more. To quote you once again:

"Federal aid in a form that tends to lead to Federal control of our schools could cripple education for freedom. In no form can it ever approach the mighty effectiveness of an aroused people."

As aroused people, we can do this job at the local and State level; otherwise, we will lose freedom of education, jeopardizing our children's and the Nation's future, a result certainly not sought by a majority of grassroot Americans.

With warm personal regards.

Respectfully,

BRUCE ALGER.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks immediately following those of the gentleman from Arizona.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, this bill we have before us for consideration has been widely discussed and I do not see that I can add anything very important to what has been said, but I would like to address myself for a moment to the question which the gentleman from Georgia asked of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] concerning the effect of this bill insofar as the States which practice segregation in the schools are concerned.

The question, as I recall, was to the point that no matter what happens as to the Powell amendment, that very likely the States that practice segregation would not receive funds under this bill. I merely would like to point out to the House that that may well be the situation, but it does not necessarily have to be the situation. I take the analogy of the federally impacted school districts and the aid to those districts which was given under Public Laws 815 and 874. There has been no attempt, as far as I know, on the part of the administration or anybody else since the famous Supreme Court decision in Brown against Board of Education to cut off any of the money which was appropriated under the authorization of those public laws to schools because such schools practiced segregation. I cannot say that such a movement may not be made in the future, but I can say that I do not believe the possibility that that might occur is any good reason to oppose this legislation.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman. I feel that whether or not the Powell amendment, which requires prompt and immediate desegregation, is put in this legislation, the administration and the courts in following out the implementing decision of the Supreme Court for gradual and moderate desegregation will not bring about any change in our present system during the life of this bill.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman will also agree with me, as he mentioned, if this bill passes without the Powell amendment, in those States which have not been able to desegregate, very likely before there is any attempt to cut them out from participation in this bill there may be other developments or there may be integration in some of the States which now practice desegregation. Then this particular bug-a-boo should be laid at rest and anybody who opposes this bill on the basis that his State or her State will definitely not receive money will realize, that such is not necessarily the situation.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday there was a very fine presentation made by the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, a man for whom I have the greatest respect and greatest amount of affection. However, the presentation was aimed largely at the so-called Federal control which might come from the enactment of a bill such as this. Federal control, if it will exist, must exist as the result of the State planning provisions found in section 103, pages 3 to 6, inclusive.

I would like to go through the provisions of that particular section very briefly with the Members, to see what we require from the States in the way of a State plan before the States are eligible to receive money under this bill.

Subsection 1 provides that the State educational agency shall be the sole agency for administering the plan. Of course, an educational agency is required as a go-between between the Office of Education and the school district itself. We do not want this law to be passed in such a way that the Federal Government or the Office of Education will find it necessary to deal directly with school districts. We want the States to be in this picture; we want the States to have the authority to say how this plan will be administered in the States in which it might operate. So we have set up as a go-between the State educational agency.

In subsection 2 it is stated that the money which goes to the States under this bill will go for the further construction of schools. Of course, it will go for the construction of schools. This bill is for school construction. I cannot see anything very wrong with that.

Subsection 3, which is a long subsection, sets forth the principles on which the States will determine the priorities for distribution of this money when it is received by the States. It provides that the States will first favor those school districts which have made efforts commensurate with their economic resources and which are unable solely because of lack of such resources to finance available school facilities.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. But who determines that?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The State determines that. The only thing that the State has to do is to set up a plan which sets forth the criteria under which it will make the determination. Then the State agency itself determines which school district gets the money and which does not.

Now then, as to subsection 4, it merely provides for such fiscal-control and fund-accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under this title. In other words, the State plan will set forth the procedures which will be used. It does not say the Office of Education will set forth procedures. It says that the State plan will set forth the procedures.

Subsection 5 provides that a hearing may be had by any school district that feels that it is aggrieved by the allotments made under this act by the State. I do not think anybody would quarrel with the right of any school district to have such a hearing if it feels it has been unfairly treated.

Subsection 6 has to do with building standards. We are not going to tell anybody how to build schools, but we do want the school plan to include the criteria under which schools shall be constructed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understood you to say you are not telling the States how to build schools, but you are telling the States what wages to pay if you leave it to the Secretary of Labor to fix the prevailing wage.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I agree with the gentleman. That is what the Davis-Bacon Act provides. If the gentleman wants to talk about it now, I will be happy to. Does the gentleman have any further questions?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No. But I cannot see the justice of letting the Secretary of Labor here in Washington fix the prevailing wage and requiring the people of that community to pay that wage and forcing people to belong to the union, even though they pay part of the bill. I cannot see the justice of that.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The Davis-Bacon Act says that builders shall pay the prevailing wage in the community and that those wages shall be paid on any construction job. It does not require union membership.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not understand that to be the situation. The Davis-Bacon Act provides for the fixing of the prevailing wage by the Secretary of Labor here, does it not?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right. But when you get down into the district and you want to construct a school, then the agency has nothing more to say about wages, and under the present situation you cannot get work on that job until you get the consent of the union and pay dues. Now, that is a practical situation. There is nothing in the law about it, but that is what exists. So the fellow that pays the bill cannot get the job.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I know that is not the situation in my particular State. If it is in the gentleman's State, then I would certainly be down at the Department of Labor and doing what I could about it as a Member of the Congress, because the law is not being enforced as it was written.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You say it does not prevail in your district. Do you mean by that that anybody can work on these projects without belonging to the union?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I certainly do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Thank God you live in a good community where you can, but up in our particular territory, where Walter Reuther and Jimmy Hoffa are in control, you have to join the union and pay dues. That is a supertax now. Maybe you ought to come up and learn about it, because it is vicious and wicked.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. From what the gentleman says, I am very happy to live in Arizona.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They will come out there, too. Do not worry. They will move in as soon as they make up their minds to move out. They are up in Cincinnati now, trying to take over.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. They are still a long way off.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But with the modern methods of transportation, they will get there overnight.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The seventh subsection provides for reports. In other words, it becomes rather important for the Commissioner of Education, as the coordinator of the whole plan, to have some idea as to the problems which are being met in the various States in the operation of this plan.

I would like to point out, on line 13, page 5, that these reports will be such as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this title.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have just been advised by the distinguished gentleman from the West and by the ranking minority Member that in your State you have a right-to-work law, and I understand it is enforced. Is that true?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, do you charge anything for establishing residence out there?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. No, sir. We take all immigrants. We would be glad to have even Members of the Congress if they wish to come; that is, if they give up their seats and do not have any further political aspirations.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What about giving up any rights to a pension which we so generously voted for ourselves?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. We do not seek indigent immigrants to our State, so we would like to have the gentleman keep his pension.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, just this further observation, if the gentleman will permit. While the gentleman feels good over this situation now, the Supreme Court has not passed on that particular statute yet, has it?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Yes; the Supreme Court has upheld our right-to-work law.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They upheld the one in Virginia, but you never can tell when they are going to change their minds.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I have no quarrel with the last statement of the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to thank the gentleman if I have found someone to agree with me on one thing.

In the end the gentleman will find that he is right, if he agrees.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Subparagraph 7 merely calls for reports. I was very much interested in the wording of this, because those of you who were here when we debated the library extension bill will recall that this bill called for reports and the reports had no qualifying language. In other words, almost any kind of report could have been called for and if the report was not submitted as the Commissioner thought it should be submitted, then funds could have been cut off. We corrected this by amendment. We did not want this to happen in this bill, and therefore we have this wording in here "as is reasonably necessary." We also have, further on, a provision for judicial review. In other words, if any State feels that the Commissioner has not treated it right, then it may go into the courts and present its grievance in the Federal Court of the United States.

It is also true, that if the Commissioner asked for any unreasonable reports and the State refused to give the reports and for that reason the Commissioner cut off funds, the State could certainly take that particular matter to the courts and have the Federal courts in the district in which the capital of the State is located adjudicate that particular point.

This is all that was required of the State as far as a plan is concerned. Bear in mind it is a plan. On line 16, page 5, it is stated that the Commissioner shall approve—not may approve but shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a). I have read the provisions of subsection (a). I do not think there is anything in this State plan which is dangerous. I do not think there is anything here which would require any State—your State or my State—to give up any sovereignty over its people or its school system. I do not think there is anything in here which would require any local educational agency to sell its soul for a mess of pottage in order to build schools.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SELDEN. May I assume from the gentleman's remarks that he feels that the passage of H. R. 7535 will not ultimately result in Federal control of our school system?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I will say to the gentleman from Alabama, if I felt that there was the slightest danger that the passage of this bill would result in any control whatsoever by the Federal Government over our school systems, I would be against it and I would have voted against it in committee and would have done my very best to keep it from coming to this floor.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield further.

Mr. SELDEN. In the event this measure is enacted into law, and in the gentleman's opinion, would it be possible for an organization or a group opposed to segregation to obtain an injunction that would prevent these funds from being spent in any State which now practices segregation in its public-school system?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. There is nothing in the bill which provides that that can be done; but I would say in all candor to the gentleman that although I know of no precedent for such an injunction, I could not state positively that such an action might not be brought.

Mr. SELDEN. Then, can I gather from the gentleman's statement that, in his opinion, there is a possibility that funds authorized under this bill will be denied States which practice segregation in their public-school system even if the Powell amendment is defeated?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman knows full well that the wheels of justice grind slowly, and I would say

that even if such an action can be brought, before such a case could progress from the Federal district court to the Supreme Court, many months and possibly years could be consumed. Whereas, if the Powell amendment is passed, immediately after the passage of the bill with the Powell amendment in it, the States which practice segregation would not be eligible for funds.

Mr. SELDEN. The gentleman feels, though, that the ultimate results would be the same?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am not going to try to guess what the Supreme Court decision would be. I have said to the gentleman, that an action possibly would lie under this bill to enjoin payment to States which have segregated schools. As to the results, I would not hazard a guess.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the gentleman for yielding, because I promised to answer this series of questions yesterday when they were propounded by the gentleman from Alabama.

I agree that there is a posibility of an injunction by any group or any individual. In addition to that, of course, there is a provision of statute, title 42, section 1983, that authorizes a civil action on deprivation of any rights, privileges, and immunities secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States. However, it would be a matter of the burden of proof, it seems to me, to show that the State has not complied with the various provisions that are laid down in implementing the decision of the Court, and had not made a start with deliberate speed so far as the physical condition of the plant, school transportation, personnel, and all the things enumerated are concerned. As the gentleman says, in some of the areas where segregation has been a way of life for many years, it would take longer than it would in some of the border States.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Would the gentleman agree with me that you might have certain very hard cases under this? You might have a case brought concerning payment to a State in which there was partial integration and partial segregation. In such a situation under this bill I would think the Supreme Court might have a great deal of difficulty in coming to a decision.

Mr. METCALF. I would say that under the implementing decision that would be enough to carry out the burden of proof of moderation, a gradual start with deliberate speed.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. In other words, if the same philosophy that was set forth in Brown against Board of Education is followed through, in such event you might have all sorts of cases going over all four points of the compass.

Mr. METCALF. Some of the border States that have started to segregate would certainly be entitled to get money under this bill and would have a defense in the case of an injunction such as the gentleman mentions.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Does the gentleman know of any statute presently existing or any authority which would permit a suit against a Federal official to enjoin that Federal official from paying out Federal funds without any reason?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I know of no such statute. I do not know it cannot be done now. The law has changed much in the last few years.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. May I suggest to the gentleman that I do not know of any statute which permits a citizen to enjoin a Federal official from the disbursement of Federal funds. I call to his attention that the statute to which the gentleman referred on civil rights is a statute directed against State officials and has absolutely no application to Federal officials.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman from Montana alluded to the statute.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I am interested in the matter of the time element, as has been suggested in the various speeches of the last few minutes. Do I correctly understand that there would be any longer period before payment could be withheld under the bill without the Powell amendment? Would not injunction proceedings immediateley start the withholding of the money?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I may say to the gentlewoman from Illinois that she has been listening to lawyers' talk. We are merely conjecturing as to how long it would take to get a case through the courts.

Mrs. CHURCH. I generally understand when lawyers talk. But, I am wondering about the difference in timing, and I am sincere about it. I had inferred from the gentleman's remarks, and they have been excellent, sir, and from the remarks by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], that there would be more delay in possible withholding of funds, without the Powell amendment. I cannot see how that would be the case. It would be my untutored opinion that once a suit were started, payment of money would automatically cease; is that or is that not so?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If a suit could be brought for injunctive relief and a temporary injunction was granted, the gentlewoman is correct. It depends entirely upon how the suit is begun and how it is prosecuted.

Mrs. CHURCH. So it would be a mere faint hope that is being held out here to those who do not want to integrate and who feel it would be easier to continue segregation without the Powell amendment. Is that not so?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I understand the gentlewoman's point. But, the point that the gentleman from Montana and I are trying to make is that there is a chance if this bill is passed without the Powell amendment that funds will be paid to the States to build schools which are so much required. If the bill is passed with the Powell amendment, then certain States almost certainly will not get money under the bill.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. VELDE. I compliment the gentleman for his very fine statement. I believe the gentleman heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] read a list of those States where the State would pay in more money in taxes than it would be receiving in school-construction funds. I noticed that the State of Arizona was among them. I just would like to ask the gentleman how he explains to his taxpayers why he is favorable to that type of bill. I have a similar situation in Illinois.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I dislike to correct my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, but the State of Arizona is on the other side of the ledger, which makes it, perhaps, easier for me to do what I am doing today, but I must also inform him that I would still be doing what I am doing even if it were the other way around.

Mr. VELDE. I am sorry I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mrs. BLITCH. Would the gentleman permit the gentlewoman from Georgia to take all of the legal language and lawyer's talk that the gentleman is using and just put it in a few simple words that all of us can understand and say that it is the difference between killing us quickly and killing us slowly?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I assure the gentlewoman that the gentleman from Arizona has no desire to kill anyone. All I want to do is to build schools for children of all races and creeds, and to build them as rapidly as possible, and I want to build them in all the 48 States.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, findings from surveys by reputable authorities show clearly that only by an investment of substantial proportions in education can our States in this Nation hope to have the trained personnel necessary to operate successfully in our age. Obviously, the money must come from some tax source, and I know that the people back home in Wisconsin are looking for some relief from the direct property tax for financing schools which has become almost unbearable in some of our less favored communities.

The finance section of the Wisconsin White House Conference report shows that we are about an average State—putting into the pot through Federal withholding and other taxes about what would be returned to our State. But I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that this bill does two very significant things for education in Wisconsin:

First. It returns at least a small portion of Federal taxes for use of a very important State function, and in a truer sense, a local school district function—the building of sorely needed school buildings; and

Second. It makes this money available under a plan promulgated by our State Department of Public Instruction and approved by the United States Commissioner of Education.

With regard to its distribution within my State, I am satisfied that our State Department of Public Instruction will actually use the rather meager amount which would be alloted to Wisconsin—meager in relation to the total cost of education in the State—to very good advantage. Ours is one of the States that provides no State support whatsoever for school building construction.

This federally collected money could therefore be available to assist needy districts to provide new buildings and do remodeling of obsolescent buildings so that it would definitely benefit the health and welfare of children in underprivileged areas of our own State.

Whereas Wisconsin laws now provide equalization aid to level out severe tax overloads for operating costs only, this money from Federal sources could, and I am sure would, be used to equalize opportunity for proper school housing within our State. And it is one of the strong points of this measure that permits every State to develop its own plan to use this Federal assistance to the best advantage for school housing.

Wisconsin is in the forefront of States in that it has, by recent constitutional amendment, removed artificial borrowing limitations on its school districts. Each district may now bond itself for 5 percent of its State equalized valuation. But the State superintendent of schools informs me that, in the spite of this high ceiling on borrowing for school construction, a recent survey reveals that there are still 9 cities in our State that cannot finance the school buildings they need. And I am certain there must be dozens of such school districts centering in villages and rural hamlets, because the Wisconsin White House conference report—pages 7 and 8, on finance—shows that the State equalized valuation back of each pupil varies from $6,700 in Forest County to $39,700 in Ozaukee County. But the school district is the unit that bears the load for buildings—and here the variation in ability ranges from less than $4,000 per pupil in property valuation to over $80,000—1 to 20.

This bill then would provide a vehicle to do two things for our State:

First, show that Congress is interested in some of the severe problems that face our local school districts in providing proper school housing for this avalanche of children; and, second, provide some tangible means to more nearly equal school housing facilities where most needed, and therefore, because it provides this means of equalizing opportunity for children and relieving excessive property tax burdens in the poorer areas of my own State. I am happy to support this bill and urge my associates to do likewise.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], that he may insert his remarks on this legislation immediately following my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST].

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, this is a significant day in House history. We have before us the first school construction bill to be cleared by a committee of the Congress. If ever a committee should be complimented on a fine job—a job well done—this is the day to do it.

I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that the vast majority of the American people want a school construction bill passed—and they want it passed immediately. It is up to us to get through a measure that is acceptable to as many of them as possible. The Nation cannot wait any longer for additional schools.

Our present school enrollment is about 29 million. There are no regular classrooms for thousands of schoolchildren. Thousands of others study in facilities that are substandard and even dangerous to life and health.

This fall another million 6-year-olds will set out on their big adventure. When the babies born in the past 5 record-breaking years are ready for school, enrollment will be close to 35 millions. By 1960 there will be 170 children for every 100 we now have.

Faced with such galloping gains, school officials all over the country have stated frankly that the only way they can catch up on school construction is for the Federal Government to help the States. Local district after local district has bonded itself to statutory and constitutional debt limits and still found itself unable to meet the increased needs for school buildings.

We, in Idaho, have been making a greater than average effort to keep a roof over the heads of our schoolchildren. We spend a larger percent of our individual incomes than most States on schools. We also pay our teachers somewhat more than the national average, and still their salaries are vastly inadequate.

Idaho will need about $60 million for school buildings between now and 1960—and that is a big sum in a small State. The bill before us would give Idaho about $7 million. Add to this the provisions for bonding and loans provided in titles II and III of this bill, and the outlook brightens considerably.

Idahoans are overwhelmingly in favor of this bill. The propriety of Federal aid for school construction is not a compelling issue there. I believe most people in Idaho support local control of schools, just as do most people elsewhere. But very few of them feel that Federal aid for school construction will in any way violate that long-standing principle.

Mr. Chairman, the eyes of the mothers and fathers of America are on the House of Representatives today. What happens here is also being watched with crisp attention by school board members, school superintendents, supervisors, principals, teachers, and many, many other Americans in all walks of life and of all ages.

We must find a satisfactory solution to the problems of integration and segregation that have so long held up consideration of this legislation. We must pass a school construction bill without further delay.

I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for yielding this time to me.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN], who addressed the House earlier, has left the floor. I do feel I would be remiss in my duty if I failed to correct in the RECORD some misstatements that the gentleman made to the House.

The gentleman said that New York does not need this Federal aid. He also said that nobody from the State of New York appeared before the committee at the hearings to lay the situation in the State of New York before the committee.

I call attention to page 823 of the hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor on this legislation, that a member of the committee from New York, Mr. ZELENKO, inquired of the Governor of the State of New York his position on this legislation.

I want to read a telegram from Governor Harriman, addressed to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO], a member of the committee. It is in the hearings at page 823:

Hon. HERBERT ZELENKO,
House of Representatives:

I am happy to respond to your request for a statement of New York State's interest in Federal aid for school construction to be submitted to the Committee on Education and Labor. We do not have in New York State adequate classroom space for our present school population and the situation is going to become more rather than less acute in the next few years.

In addition, we in New York State believe that we stand to gain by improvements in the educational standards of the entire country's school system. Accordingly, I will be obliged if you would advise the committee that I am strongly in favor of Federal aid for school construction to be equitably distributed. I am not in favor of the administration's proposed program in this field because it will not be of assistance to New York State, nor will it substantially contribute to a national solution.

AVERELL HARRIMAN.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman advised me he could not yield. I cannot yield to him. I believe in reciprocity of courtesy. I did not get it and I am not going to yield.

The United Parents Association of New York submitted testimony in the hearings to this effect, and I am going to read briefly:

This year the school budget reached $100 million. Despite these huge outlays we cannot meet our needs. Estimates for the next 5 years indicate that if we are to meet the emergency in time for children now in school, and about to enter school, there must be help from other echelons of government.

That is from the city of New York.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in urging favorable action on H. R. 7535—the pending bill—I shall preface my remarks with a quotation from the Bible. I call my colleague's attention to the 40th verse of

the 25th chapter from the Scripture as recorded by St. Matthew, and I quote:

And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.

The Holy Scriptures are replete with exhortations that we care for and properly train our children.

We, Members of Congress, have for the past several weeks and even months been devoting time, energy, and the taxpayers' money to material things. Back of this effort has been the profit angle and the desire to boost business and to stabilize our own and international economy.

Today we are faced with a more basic problem, and I refer to our youth who will be the citizens of tomorrow.

Our America, if it is to survive in this troubled world, must get back to the fundamentals on which the Republic stands. No nation is greater than the people who compose it. Democracy cannot thrive on ignorance. Its citizenry must be an educated citizenry.

Good schools are good business—as an investment, there is no better than our young people. A good education is the best heritage we can leave them.

The issue we face today is quite controversial. There are some who say the Federal Government should stay out of the field of local education.

Chief among the opponents is the United States Chamber of Commerce. They have a pocketbook approach. Primarily, they are interested in putting a dollar sign on this proposal of Federal grants-in-aid to help State and local school boards catch up on the shortage of school classrooms. They lose sight of the program's broader and humanitarian aspects. They can see no immediate profits; their attitude reflects the materialistic viewpoint.

Only a few days ago the Congress approved and sent to the President what we boastfully called the greatest construction program in the history of the world. We are going to spend some $33 billion on our Nation's highways. Why? Because it is good business. The Farm Bureau, the American Legion, and other satellites of the chamber of commerce approve. They, too, can see the profit angle in better transportation. When we want to do something for our Nation's greatest asset, our boys and girls, they put on their dark glasses and conjure out of thin air such worn-out slogans as "creeping socialism" and "encroachment on States' rights."

We think nothing of appropriating millions of dollars of American taxpayers' money to build school facilities in foreign countries, from Ethiopia to Pakistan, and from Patagonia to Iceland. It occurs to me that we could best serve America by making our future as a nation more secure by acting now to meet a situation that is rapidly developing into a national disgrace.

Let me briefly sketch for you the situation we propose to eliminate by the passage of H. R. 7535:

As the author of Public Law 815 in 1950, I conducted hearings throughout the country. I was amazed and appalled by the situation that those hearings brought forth, and reports and legislation were prepared by my subcommittee for aid to the impacted school districts.

The national school facilities survey was authorized in 1950 by title I of Public Law 815, 81st Congress. Progress reports of the survey were published in 1952–53. Most of the data for the final long-range planning report were gathered by the States in 1954 and the final report, signed by Samuel M. Brownell, United States Commissioner of Education, was released in March 1956.

The report known as the Long Range Planning Phase of the School Facilities Survey concludes that 476,000 classrooms should be built during the 5-year period 1954 to 1959. To build 476,000 classrooms in 5 years will require building at a rate of 95,000 per year. In 1953–54 we built 55,000 classrooms; in 1954–55 we built 60,000 classrooms; the Health, Education, and Welfare Department has reports from the States indicating that 67,000 classrooms would be completed for use in 1955–56.

But what about the 95,000 that must be constructed if we are to meet the increasing enrollment and take care of the obsolescent classrooms? In 1952 there were 995,000 school classrooms in the entire United States. One hundred and ninety-one thousand of those classrooms were over 30 years old and they will need to be abandoned; they are evidently obsolescent.

We should build 476,000 classrooms in the 5-year period 1954–59 instead of the 300,000 which would be built if construction continues at the present rate. This means that an average of 35,000 classrooms each year for 5 years should be built in addition to what is already being constructed; and that is the object of this program, this legislation.

The total cost of meeting our school building needs by 1959 will be $16 billion. This averages to $3.2 billion a year. Present construction amounts to $2.5 billion a year. The problem is to close the gap between a required expenditure of $3.2 billion and actual expenditures of $2.5 billion.

And if we clear this legislation and provide $400 million to be matched by an equal amount of $400 million from States and local school districts we will have practically reached that goal of spending $3.2 billion which will permit us to build 95,000 classrooms.

The problem is complicated by the fact that 1 out of every 6 school districts—I would like for my colleagues to get this significant statement—the problem is complicated by the fact that 1 out of every 6 school districts covered by the survey will not be able to construct the schools it needs unless it finds new sources of money or increased help from outside the district. These districts need to build $11 billion worth of schools by 1959.

In connection with those same districts, out of a total of forty-some thousand districts in the Nation, something like 7,000 cannot meet their construction needs. They have $4 billion of resources available and they need $11 billion. The $7 billion shortage in those 7,000 school districts would account for 212,000 of the 475,000 classrooms. So you see, despite what the gentleman from New York said, we do have a serious national situation affecting our schools and some of it is right in his own State of New York.

BIRTH RATES IN RECENT YEARS

The great increase in birth rate is obviously the greatest single factor producing our classroom shortage. Almost 50 percent more children were born in 1954 than in 1944, 10 years earlier, as indicated by the following portion of table B on page 6 of the School Facilities Survey:

Year:	*Number of live births*
1944	2,939,000
1945	2,858,000
1946	3,411,000
1947	3,817,000
1948	3,637,000
1949	3,649,000
1950	3,632,000
1951	3,823,000
1952	3,913,000
1953	3,971,000
1954	4,100,000

Are you aware that means that approximately 1,400,000 schoolchildren will enter school in September for the first time? Are you aware of the fact that it will take 50,000 classrooms to meet that increased enrollment, to say nothing about the shortage we have been talking about and worrying about? Yet they tell you there is no problem in the Nation. The gentleman from New York is a mouthpiece for the United States Chamber of Commerce, an organization that is against everything that does not have a dollar interest attached to it. We have got to get away from this materialistic viewpoint and get back to the humanitarian angle in this piece of legislation if nowhere else.

Now, let us talk about the school enrollment.

ENROLLMENTS

Increased birth rates mean enlarged enrollments all along the line through 12 years of schooling.

During the school year just ended (1955–56) 32 million pupils were enrolled in our elementary and secondary schools. This was approximately 1.4 million more children than were enrolled in the previous year. The children who will enter school in September 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 have already been born. Enrollments for these years can, therefore, be predicted with great accuracy. United States Office of Education enrollment estimates are as follows:

1955–56	32,026,000
1956–57	33,350,000
1957–58	34,679,000
1958–59	36,054,000
1959–60	37,300,000

The 37.3 million figure for 1960 represents a 50 percent increase over the enrollments of 1949–50.

THE SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION BACKLOG

The status phase report of the school facilities survey published in 1953 indicated the existence of a backlog of 312,000 classrooms needed in September 1952. More than half of this backlog consisted of classrooms needed to replace obsolete or unsafe buildings. The other half represented classrooms needed to relieve overcrowding and to accommodate the enrollment increase from the previous year.

Overcrowding: In January 1956 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reported that 2,250,000 pupils were enrolled in excess of the normal capacity of public school buildings. These children were being accommodated by increasing class sizes, by use of double sessions, or by placing them in buildings not intended for school use. Churches, lodge halls, garages, and warehouses were being pressed into service. The reports from the States estimated that 80,000 classrooms should be built to take care of pupils enrolled in excess of normal capacity.

Obsolescence: The 1952 status phase survey showed that 47 percent of the school buildings in use at that time were over 30 years old. The judgment that a building is obsolete or unfitted for school purposes is one that varies from State to State and from district to district. Generally speaking, a building more than 30 years old requires more to be spent on it for maintenance and repair or necessary remodeling than a newer building.

Because standards of building fitness vary so widely, the Office of Education has suggested a conservative figure for classroom replacement over the 5 years ending in September 1959. The rate is 36,000 classrooms a year, a total of 180,000 classrooms. On this basis the life of a classroom is 28 years at the end of which it is ready for replacement or extensive—and expensive—remodeling. The rate of obsolescence will vary from State to State depending on climatic and other local conditions.

TABLE J.—*Estimated capital outlay of projected plans for meeting school plant needs by 1959–60: Totals for States, and for administrative units with inadequate applicable capital outlay resources, within the law and customary practice in the respective States at the time of the survey*

[Financial data in thousands]

State	For entire State		For administrative units with inadequate applicable capital outlay resources (within the limitations of law and customary practice)				State	For entire State		For administrative units with inadequate applicable capital outlay resources (within the limitations of law and customary practice)			
	Number of administrative units	Costs	Number of such units	Costs	Applicable capital outlay resources	Computed deficits		Number of administrative units	Costs	Number of such units	Costs	Applicable capital outlay resources	Computed deficits
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Alabama	108	$350,411	108	$350,411	$16,337	$334,074	New Hampshire [1]	234	$45,326	26	$31,946	$19,623	$12,323
Arizona	158	117,004	62	63,651	39,222	24,429	New Jersey	546	506,659	395	440,120	[2] 0	440,120
Arkansas	423	198,391	375	185,233	56,319	128,914	New Mexico [1]	104	123,073	73	115,721	1,442	114,279
California	2,018	2,116,924	146	1,264,665	645,717	618,948	North Carolina	174	303,693	155	259,119	100,002	159,117
Colorado	1,151	171,618	51	44,636	30,972	13,664	Oklahoma	1,845	211,142	1,014	205,137	60,752	144,385
Connecticut	174	261,449	83	170,484	77,581	92,903	Oregon	766	104,233	71	23,930	12,881	11,049
Florida	67	326,937	38	131,422	71,310	60,112	Pennsylvania	2,505	871,125	1,989	798,963	165,338	633,625
Georgia	200	492,550	187	426,338	244,796	181,542	Rhode Island	39	64,334	31	63,114	6,920	56,194
Indiana	1,104	439,150	424	318,100	127,000	191,100	Tennessee	150	337,476	139	310,916	104,380	206,536
Iowa	4,558	113,980	198	82,665	42,154	40,511	Texas	2,030	862,059	126	543,158	88,671	454,487
Kansas	3,420	292,460	195	292,460	180,455	112,005	Vermont	263	36,568	70	21,551	14,987	6,564
Kentucky	228	359,091	127	305,565	108,514	197,051	Washington	524	242,240	104	184,502	48,948	135,554
Louisiana	67	235,591	19	49,974	35,234	14,740	West Virginia	55	106,608	42	90,299	32,161	58,138
Maine	497	84,803	343	77,176	19,690	57,486	Wisconsin	5,778	189,074	289	70,095	33,215	36,880
Maryland	24	280,130	24	280,130	67,138	212,992	Alaska	31	20,876	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	351	558,708	146	213,748	131,368	82,380	Hawaii	5	42,548	5	42,548	15,929	26,619
Michigan	4,532	526,287	180	239,038	162,476	76,562	Puerto Rico	77	46,348	[3]	[3]	[3]	[4]
Minnesota [1]	5,441	419,453	158	172,589	108,354	64,235	38 States	42,509	11,630,883	7,513	7,941,267	2,918,061	5,023,206
Mississippi [1]	1,417	117,608	63	61,832	41,689	20,143							
Montana	1,274	33,610	35	7,000	4,500	2,500	United States [4]		16,013,882		10,933,866	4,017,708	6,916,158
Nevada	171	21,346	22	3,031	1,986	1,045							

[1] Data based on local planning areas instead of local school administrative units.
[2] All of the 395 deficit units have exhausted their statutory bonding capacity.
[3] The territory is a single fiscal unit for school construction, with applicable resources of $21,953,000 and a deficit of $24,415,000.
[4] Projected on the basis of enrollments in all States and territories, rounded to thousands, from data reported from 38 States enrolling 72.62965 percent of the pupils in the fall of 1954.

It is my considered opinion that the passage of the Kelley bill in its present form, except for some essential committee amendments, will clear this legislation for Senate action.

As a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor that drafted this bill I agreed with my colleagues that this would be offered on a nonpartisan basis. Title I is a grant-in-aid plan drafted by the committee itself. Titles II and III were taken from President Eisenhower's proposal and were prepared by the Health, Education, and Welfare Department.

It is my plan to offer amendments to both titles II and III to remove certain objections raised in the Rules Committee. These will be authorized committee amendments. One will restore the authority of the Comptroller General to audit and control all expenditures under the act and would apply to both title II and title III.

The other committee amendment will show the exact amount of Government obligation under title III.

I shall oppose any and all crippling amendments in order that we can send to the other body a bill that has an excellent chance of final approval.

In conclusion let me once more plead with you, my colleagues, that we keep uppermost in our minds the humanitarian angle. America needs now, a strong, well educated, and virile citizenry. We must disregard the plea of those who for selfish or political reasons are opposed to approving this effort in the interest of national security, the preservation of our Republic and our American way of life.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, last year I introduced a bill (H. R. 2857) to provide a program of Federal loans to those school districts which are unable to finance school construction due to the lack of an adequate tax base. I am happy to see that the administration and the committee have adopted my thinking along these lines and have included the provision contained in title II of the bill presently under consideration to provide Federal funds for the purchase of bonds of those districts which cannot otherwise finance their school construction. This is, I believe, a very necessary addition to the program for Federal aid to education.

It is imperative that this legislation under consideration be enacted. Let me give you an example of how it is needed by one school district in my area, a district that typifies the suburban "bedroom" areas of Wayne County. The district comprises an area of 2½ square miles just west of Dearborn. Prior to 1950, it was farmland with one 6-room school serving the entire area. However, about that time, small home developments began with the result that the school membership has been increasing at about 30 percent each year over the previous year. Here are the figures on it:

School year:	*Elementary membership*
1951–52	575
1952–53	723
1953–54	975
1954–55	1,222
1955–56	1,485
1956–57 (estimated)	2,000

Of course, the tax base has also been increasing. Assessed valuation is almost entirely composed of residential property—with an average home being assessed in the range of $4,000 to $4,500. The school district has no industrial tax

base and only limited commercial property. The total assessed valuations during the years from 1951 to 1957 are as follows:

	Assessed valuation
1951–52	$2,100,000
1952–53	3,600,000
1953–54	5,400,000
1954–55	7,600,000
1955–56	9,500,000
1956–57	11,600,000

During that period the school-facilities investments have totaled about $1½ million and just recently the community voted an additional $2-million bond issue for further work.

The community is making every attempt to work out its school-construction problems; however, assistance will be needed in the future.

School census statistics show that this district will have a 4,000-pupil membership by 1961. To house the children will take approximately $4 million over and above the expenditures now authorized. Maximum forecast tax base will be about $18 million assessed valuation, not sufficient to support the bond-retirement requirements for such a program. The new bond issue will put the outstanding debt at about $3.1 million—about 30 percent of assessed valuation, and principal retirements can average only about $80,000 annually. A locally sponsored program would necessitate a debt ratio in 1959–60 of over 40 percent for school purposes only.

I believe this one example shows clearly the urgent need for the legislation under consideration. This is not an isolated case; other school districts face the same problems. I therefore strongly urge that favorable action be taken to provide the greatly needed Federal aid.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

(Mr. HENDERSON and Mr. BYRD asked and were given permission to extend their remarks following those of Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the bill which we are presently considering is the most important piece of legislation which the present session of the Congress has had before it. I think all of us are thoroughly agreed that our children are our greatest national asset. The issue revolves around the question of the way in which the Federal Government should assist in the construction of classrooms. There are those who feel it is not advisable to lend any assistance, but it is my hope that a majority of the Members of the House and of the other body will feel that we should do something now to assist in a serious shortage of classrooms throughout the Nation.

I believe this legislation is realistic, sound in principle, and that it will be effective in action. It will provide prompt and effective relief for a serious problem. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I am naturally interested in the bill. I have served in both the 83d and 84th Congresses on special subcommittees on school construction.

At this time I would like to congratulate the fine leadership of the respective chairmen of the subcommittees, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY]. In both committees and in the full committee this problem was discussed thoroughly, objectively, and with little or no partisanship. I trust that that will be true also during the present discussion of this bill.

I would like to comment very briefly on some references which others have made about this bill. It was asserted yesterday, for instance, that we were departing from a basic principle if we should adopt legislation of this kind and that the result would be that we would take education out of the hands of the local people. In my opinion, that is a total misunderstanding of what is being suggested. Everybody feels very strongly that control of the educational system of this country should remain at the local level. That feeling is no argument against financial assistance under certain terms by the Federal Government. I likewise think it is pure distortion to charge that this is a corrupt scheme to buy votes or for any other reason. It is not easy to come up with any kind of specific legislation of this kind without running into certain problems, but our intentions are honorable and the objective is desirable.

Coming from one of the so-called wealthy States, I would like to discuss the problem of why we should pay out more from our States in order to support a program of this kind. The simple fact is that it is unquestionably in the national interest to relieve a nationwide shortage of classrooms. We should always seek to legislate in the national interest. If we should operate on an essentially selfish basis, putting the dollar sign first, and say we will consider no Federal-aid program unless our State receives more than it must pay in taxes, we would cripple many good programs that have proved their worth to the Nation. In my own hometown, for example, we have a hospital built in part with Federal money under the Hill-Burton program. We have just passed a rural library assistance bill. We have passed a tremendous highway construction program. We have had flood control and emergency relief and have provided money for soil conservation and timberland, and for parks, rivers and harbors. All these uses of Federal funds are for good purposes. This program is also for a good purpose.

Mention was made yesterday, before the rule was adopted, about the length of time which had elapsed before this bill could be brought to the floor. I think members of the Committee on Education and Labor should certainly not be blamed for the 11-month delay since the bill was reported out by the committee.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] pointed out yesterday that hearings on school-construction bills began in March 1955. I should like to say again that the subject was discussed in the 83d Congress. At that time, you will recall, President Eisenhower had made no specific recommendations. It was not until receipt of his special message on education in February 1955, that consideration could be given to the proposals now incorporated in this bill. A bill providing a 2-year program of emergency construction assistance was, however, approved by the Kearns subcommittee on August 1954. And in December 1954, a unanimous report by the nine-man subcommittee was submitted to the Committee on Education and Labor. I shall read just a few paragraphs from that:

> The hearings held by the subcommittee have demonstrated that the national interest requires that the Federal Government join with State and local governments in solving this pressing problem. Adequate education for our children is essential to the preservation of a free and strong Nation. Their education must not be impaired by the serious classroom shortages which exist in every State.
>
> While the subcommittee has not yet reached agreement on any one particular bill, it is clear that Federal legislation is needed, and that this legislation must be designed to encourage State and local efforts to meet the problem. Care must be taken to avoid any possibility of Federal control over local school systems, or any tendency for Federal action to supplant State and local efforts. The subcommittee is confident that early in the coming session agreement can be reached on legislation to accomplish these objectives.

That, I repeat, was back in December 1954. In 1955, the Kelley subcommittee held hearings over a 3-month period, from March to May. After intensive consideration during June of the features of various bills, a compromise bill was adopted on July 1. After making certain changes, the full committee adopted what is now before us as H. R. 7535.

We have had already some discussion of the basic objective of the legislation and the reasons for it. I should like to reiterate certain points. In the first place, the basic purpose of this bill must be emphasized. We are anxious to help in the building of more classrooms promptly. No one questions that the Nation needs more classrooms. We feel very strongly that the Nation needs them now. We feel also that these classrooms can be provided essentially by lending help of various kinds to States and local communities so that they can help themselves.

The Federal grants provided in this bill should not be overemphasized as a solution, or the only solution to the problem. The grant program will be helpful, but admittedly it will provide comparatively few of the total classrooms which are needed. By requiring matching funds, however, the purpose of this title is to make available more money to build schools in the areas of greatest need and where there is the least capacity to meet that need. These grants are only one of a variety of weapons which the Federal Government is making available. In my own opinion, the provisions for credit assistance and the purchase of bonds may have even greater significance as the program develops.

From the discussion thus far, it is plain to see that the bill is controversial. Mention was made yesterday about the lack of enthusiasm for a bill of this kind.

In my opinion, public opinion throughout the Nation definitely supports assistance such as we are suggesting. In January 1956 the Gallup Poll indicates that 67 percent of those polled would be in favor of construction assistance. All parts of the country, and members of both political parties were reported solidly sympathetic to such aid. In two successive years the constituents in my district, in answer to questionnaires, have supported Federal aid construction assistance by percentages of about 70 percent. For various reasons, I hope we are going to approve this legislation. If enacted, there will surely result an accelerated program of school construction. Passage of the bill will mark a milestone in legislative history by making the Federal Government a partner over a 4, or perhaps 5-year, period with States and local communities in the construction of hundreds of thousands of public schools throughout this country.

There have been, of course, many problems which we have considered in committee, some of which we are discussing now in connection with this particular bill.

There has been, for example, much testimony regarding the extent of the need which exists. The gentleman from West Virginia has pointed out that the birth rate in this country has gone up from an average of about 2,500,000 a year to approximately 4 million in 1955. As of now, there are approximately 2,200,000 children who are being taught in double sessions or in inadequate quarters. Roughly 80,000 rooms are needed to eliminate that overcrowding.

In addition, during the next 4 years it is estimated that 180,000 classrooms will be obsolete. We will need an estimated 210,000 for the new growth in our school-age population. The population of the country has gone up 14.5 percent in the 10-year period 1940 to 1950. The classroom shortage, of course, is aggravated by the fact that the growth of some areas has been much more rapid than others. The three Pacific States grew 48.8 percent in this 10-year period. It is because the impact varies in different areas that the question of distribution of funds is a difficult one to solve.

Before going into the question of the philosophy behind the bill I should like to make a very brief quotation from the farewell address of George Washington, which indicates again that the Federal Government has long had an interest in education:

> It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who, that is a sincere friend to it, can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?
>
> Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened.

There were many early indications of interest in education, going back to the period before the Constitution was adopted, with land grants made in 1785. In 1861, almost 100 years ago, Abraham Lincoln signed the Morrill Act, giving funds to land-grant colleges. Federal grants thus authorized, as my colleagues from the West will testify, made possible the fine educational system of our Western States.

Interestingly enough, President Buchanan 2 years previous to the action by President Lincoln had vetoed a similar bill. The justification for his action was interesting and may not sound unfamiliar to us today. He said the bill would encourage States to rely on Federal aid instead of expending their own resources for education.

Having spoken of these events of a hundred years ago, I should like now to mention some of the current attitudes toward this legislation. I have been somewhat disturbed by some of the current criticisms of this particular bill, and of any other legislation of this kind. There are those who feel that Federal aid to education is something that is easy to criticize. They are skeptical of any program in this field. The critics often make no distinction about the kind of Federal aid, the reasons for the assistance, or the importance of the problem which it is hoped to solve by participation of the Government. They even question the reality of the need for the classrooms. They say, "Prove it," but they then do not wait for an answer. They feel that if Washington helps it will set up a bad precedent and perhaps we might even end up with "socialized education." Such fears are unfounded if we examine this bill now before us.

Even those not openly hostile will often be extremely cautious. They are chary of authorizing Federal assistance lest this aid be the foot in the door which disrupts the traditional, generally approved ways of dealing with educational problems. There exists also, I think, a genuine apprehension on the part of some individuals about the proposed assistance. The fact that the apprehension is based largely upon misapprehensions about what is proposed makes it nonetheless real.

Will Federal assistance result in Federal control of our schools? There are those who honestly believe that will be the result. There are those who will capitalize on those fears that this will happen, even though they know such a result is highly unlikely. I am convinced that under the bill we are considering there is no honest basis for such a conclusion. Underlying the skepticism and the misapprehension, and of far greater significance, is a real awareness of the importance of providing our children with adequate education. If we can only set up the right kind of program, and accelerate the building of classrooms, and if we do it so as to preserve traditional concepts, I think we shall find wide support for this bill.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I wonder if the gentleman would agree with me that proper education for our children does not necessarily come out of bricks and mortar. We are getting a great many really serious criticisms of the education our children are not getting in the schools—that they can neither read nor multiply nor divide or write or spell.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That I do not think would be a proper subject for Federal intervention.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think that is an entirely local problem.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Yes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. It was felt that the field of construction, providing assistance to house these children, would be a proper and responsible role for the Federal Government. In this bill there is no possibility of controlling the curriculum, improving the quality of teaching, or providing funds for the operation of schools or teachers' salaries or any such thing. I doubt if there would be any strong support for such ideas if they were brought up in separate legislation.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I am happy to have the gentleman say so.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let me state that I feel that H. R. 7535, which incorporates many of the important recommendations of President Eisenhower, preserves local initiative and control. It is an emergency program of cooperation between all levels of Government and not a taking over by the Federal Government of the financing of our schools.

The grant-in-aid provisions of this bill will provide about $1,250,000,000 which must be matched by State or local funds. Since the needed construction is estimated at about $15 billion, these Federal grants in themselves will hardly put a dent in the total needs. The grants are to be provided on the basis of plans approved by the States. The States will decide the need, and inability of certain school districts to meet that need. I feel the State plans will insure there will not be Federal control. I consider them an essential part of a program of this kind.

Perhaps the best way to emphasize the philosophy behind the program is to read briefly some quotations from various public statements of President Eisenhower. As far back as his state of the Union message on February 2, 1953, the President referred to the school situation in these words, and I quote:

> This administration is profoundly aware of two great needs born of our living in a complex industrial economy. First, the individual citizen must have safeguards against personal disaster inflicted by forces beyond his control; second, the welfare of the people demands effective and economical performance by the Government of certain indispensable social services.

Then the President continues:

> Our school system demands some prompt, effective help. During each of the last 2 years, more than 1½ million children have swelled the elementary and secondary school population of the country. Generally, the school population is proportionately higher in States with low per capita income. This whole situation calls for careful congressional study and action. I am sure you share my conviction that the firm conditions of Federal aid must be proved need and proved lack of local income.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. I just wanted to make it clear that so far as I know the President has never recommended the Kelley bill about which the gentleman is speaking.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the gentleman will bear with me, he will see there are many features of the Kelley bill incorporated directly from the specific recommendations to the Congress by the President of the United States. This bill is not 100 percent perfect. It is a compromise measure. I feel some amendments should be made in the Kelley bill, but many essential provisions of the Eisenhower approach are incorporated in H. R. 7535.

Mr. YOUNGER. The essential features of all aid bills has been the formula by which the money is distributed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I agree that the formula should be changed if we are going to adopt the philosophy of President Eisenhower. I shall support such action.

Mr. YOUNGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In the State of the Union message of January 7, 1954, the President said:

> Youth—our greatest resource—is being seriously neglected in a vital respect. The Nation as a whole is not preparing teachers or building schools fast enough to keep up with the increase in our population.
>
> The preparation of teachers as, indeed, the control and direction of public education policy, is a State and local responsibility. However, the Federal Government should stand ready to assist States which demonstrably cannot provide sufficient school buildings. In order to appraise the needs, I hope that this year a conference on education will be held in each State, culminating in a national conference. From these conferences on education, every level of government—from the Federal Government to each local school board—should gain the information with which to attack this serious problem.

On February 8, 1955, President Eisenhower submitted his first special message on education, proposing what he described "a plan of Federal cooperation with the States, designed to give our schoolchildren as quickly as possible the classrooms they must have." In his opinion "the present shortage requires immediate effective action that will produce more rapid results." His four-point program to meet this emergency he then described as "a broad effort to widen the accepted channels of financing school construction and to increase materially the flow of private lending through them, without interference with the responsibility of State and local school systems. Over the next 3 years, this proposed effort envisages a total of $7 billion put to work building badly needed new schools, in addition to construction expenditures outside these proposals."

Again this year, on January 12, the President sent another message to Congress regarding education. Key sections of this message are well worth quoting:

THE NEED FOR FEDERAL AID IN MEETING THE CLASSROOM SHORTAGE

> The responsibility for public education rests with the States and the local communities. Federal action which infringes upon this principle is alien to our system. But our history has demonstrated that the Federal Government, in the interest of the whole people, can and should help with certain problems of nationwide scope and concern when States and communities—acting independently—cannot solve the full problem or solve it rapidly enough.
>
> Clearly this is the kind of situation we face today in considering the school-classroom shortage. In the war and postwar periods school construction was drastically curtailed by shortages of materials. And then schools were filled to overflowing by the largest, most rapid enrollment increase in history. Today hundreds of thousands of children study under overcrowded conditions, in half-day or doubled-up school sessions, or in makeshift buildings not designed as schools. Further, many classrooms in use today are obsolete, inadequate—and each year more rooms become so. School enrollments will continue to increase rapidly over the years ahead—and this will require still more classrooms.
>
> Against this backdrop of needs, States and communities are substantially increasing their classroom construction. But many communities simply do not have available locally the resources needed to cope both with the legacy of shortages from past years and with future needs. Unless these communities get help, they simply cannot provide enough good schools. The best estimates indicate that, on a nationwide basis, the current rate of construction only a little more than meets each year's new enrollment and replacement needs. This rate barely dents the large accumulation of needs from past years.
>
> The rate of classroom construction must be further increased, as the White House Conference on Education asked, by a greater combined effort of local and State governments. And the Conference concluded that Federal assistance also is necessary. The facts support this conclusion.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSALS

> A year ago I proposed a Federal program designed to aid the States and communities in overcoming the classroom shortage. The Congress has not yet enacted legislation. In the light of a full year of further experience and study, in the light of congressional hearings and the White House Conference on Education, I now submit a revised and broadened program to meet our pressing classroom needs. I propose—
>
> A program of Federal grants amounting to $1,250 million, at a rate of $250 million annually for 5 years, matched with State funds, to supplement local construction efforts in the neediest school districts.
>
> A program to authorize $750 million over 5 years for Federal purchase of local school construction bonds when school districts cannot sell them in private markets at reasonable interest rates.
>
> A 5-year program of advances to help provide reserves for bonds issued by State school-financing agencies. These bonds would finance local construction of schools to be rented and eventually owned by the local school systems.
>
> A 5-year, $20 million program of matching grants to States for planning to help communities and States overcome obstacles to their financing of school construction.
>
> If speedily and fully utilized, this Federal program, added to the increased basic efforts of States and communities, should overcome the Nation's critical classroom shortage within 5 years. Once this shortage is overcome, the Federal-grant program can and must terminate. The States and localities should then go forward, without Federal funds, to meet their current and future needs. Present construction levels indicate their ability to do this.
>
> I am confident the Federal Government with this program can help construct schools without in any way weakening the American tradition that control of education must be kept close to the local communities. Any legislation enacted should embody this principle.

ESSENTIAL PRINCIPLES IN FEDERAL GRANTS

> I strongly urge the Congress, in providing grants for school construction, to follow certain principles, which are indispensable if Federal aid is to serve the cause of American education most effectively.
>
> The first broad principle is that Federal grants must not reduce the incentive for State and local efforts—but rather should stimulate an increase in such efforts. If Federal funds are used merely to replace funds which otherwise would or could be provided at State and local levels, there is no net gain of schools for our children. I propose, therefore, that Federal grants be matched by State appropriations. Because many of the State legislatures will not have a session this year, I recommend, in order to speed the program at the outset, that during the first year of the 5-year period the matching of Federal funds may be by either the States or by local school districts. The requirement for State matching will result in a larger total program of school construction, and will assure active participation of the States in improving laws relating to financing of school construction, as well as sound administration of the program.
>
> Furthermore, I propose a formula to reduce the proportion of Federal funds for those few States which are noticeably lagging, behind their ability, to support their public schools. This feature should act as an incentive for the lagging States to increase their effort.
>
> Another fundamental principle is that Federal funds, under this type of program, should be distributed according to relative need. We must recognize that some States have more financial resources than others. We must recognize that a weakness in education anywhere is a weakness in the Nation as a whole. Federal appropriations will most quickly accomplish the most good if a relatively larger share of Federal funds is distributed where local and State resources are least adequate to meet classroom needs.
>
> I propose that this principle be fulfilled in three ways: First, in distributing Federal funds, larger amounts per school-age child should be allotted to States with lower income per child. Second, in fixing matching requirements, States with lower income should not be required to put up as large a proportion of funds as higher income States. For the Nation as a whole, the total of State matching funds would approximately equal the total of Federal funds. Third, as the States distribute these funds, the highest priority should be given to school districts with the least economic ability to meet their needs.

The President has many times expressed the conviction that the ultimate solution to our educational problems lies in public understanding and in the determination of citizens to take effective action in their own communities and States. The educational policies and proposals of this administration are consistent with this basic philosophy. They represent a grassroots approach to ending the crisis in our schools—an approach aimed at encouraging the kind of local responsibility and individual initiative which has made our educational system great.

The State and White House conferences on education recently concluded are outstanding examples of the vitality and worth of this grassroots approach to

the solution of the problems confronting our schools.

In the course of this program every State in the Union, four Territories, and the District of Columbia held a conference at which citizens critically reviewed their educational policies and needs. In all of the States the Governor appointed committees of laymen and educators to organize the conference and to help gather the facts and information needed. Most States held more than one statewide meeting. Many held district and community conferences. All told, there were over 3,600 such citizen conferences, involving over half a million persons, held prior to the White House conference last December.

These conferences, including the White House conference, were for the most part devoted to a consideration of ways and means of improving educational opportunities—of overcoming critical shortages of good teachers and adequate school facilities—by community and State action. The results—solid, encouraging results—are already apparent in many States and communities, and more are yet to come. As the President summed them up:

> The conferences helped to erase the corroding notion that schools were the other person's responsibility.

Out of these citizen conferences there came a clear request for Federal financial assistance in meeting the nationwide shortage of classrooms. These are the words of the Committee for the White House Conference on Education:

> This committee believes that Federal aid for school construction should be made available on a limited basis to all States and Territories and the District of Columbia to help overcome the present school building emergency. It believes, also, that Federal funds should be provided under the philosophy of encouraging greater use of State and local funds for school purposes. We believe that the best schools can be produced by continuing to assign to the States and local districts primary responsibility for financing, organizing, administering, and controlling the public schools. The committee believes that Federal aid to all the States can be justified, however, only on a temporary basis to meet an emergency situation such as the present school building emergency.

The White House conference and a majority of the State conferences which considered Federal aid, urged that Federal funds be made available to help the States and local school districts overcome the huge backlog shortage of classrooms which has developed in the aftermath of depression and war. These citizens recognized that, while the rate of school construction is meeting present requirements and is slowly reducing the enormous deficit in school facilities, Federal assistance is needed if this critical deficit is to be eliminated in the foreseeable future.

The President, as I have just indicated, has sent to Congress specific proposals for a temporary program of Federal assistance which would accomplish that end. These proposals, many of which are embodied in the bill now before us, are soundly based upon the philosophy of this administration as stated by the President. They constitute an emergency program to solve a problem which the States and communities—acting independently—cannot solve quickly enough. It is a problem of nationwide scope and concern—one which in a very real sense involves our national security and well-being.

The President's school construction aid program would assist every State; but assistance would recognize relative financial need among the States and would require the States to match the Federal funds according to their ability to do so. It would penalize States notably lagging in effort to finance their educational needs. It would stimulate further State efforts and would encourage States and localities to overcome obstacles to providing adequate financial support for school construction.

This program closely follows the recommendations of the White House Conference and those made at a number of State conferences. It is in line with the thoughtful recommendations of the President's Committee for the White House Conference. This Committee, composed of 33 outstanding citizens representing both educators and laymen as well as every section of the Nation and nearly every walk of life, made a carefull, independent study of America's school needs for more than a year.

The President's school construction program is true to the basic education policy of the Administration, indeed, to that of the Nation. It encourages local responsibility for good schools. It does not infringe in any manner upon local control of our system of free public education. At the same time, it will help solve a major problem of grave national concern.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I expect to oppose this legislation and vote against it. This proposed legislation that is now before the House for consideration is very important in many ways. It involves new principles of government, the like of which have never been exercised before in our great country that I know of. Heretofore we have been proud of our public schools and were glad to think that they are typical of America. Our schools truly come from the people, and they have truly been by the people, and there is no question but that they have always been for the people.

We are now finding ourselves being requested to change our system of education and make it a part of the Government and under the direct control of the Federal Government. I read over the bill that is before us for consideration and there is nothing like it anywhere in our lawbooks. In the first few lines of this proposed legislation, I find this language:

> SEC. 101. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1956, and the three succeeding fiscal years, such amounts, not to exceed $400 million in any fiscal year, as may be necessary for making payments to State educational agencies under this title.

Boldly we set out with a program that is going to cost us $400 million before we do anything else.

Another startling feature of this proposed legislation is that in the second section of this bill, immediately following the provision providing for this colossal appropriation, is language as follows:

> SEC. 102. From the total funds appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 101, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the total funds so appropriated as the school-age population of the State bears to the total of the school-age populations of all the States.

In this language you will see that this proposed legislation provides for the appointment of a Commissioner who will have more power to spend more money than any man, anywhere, in any branch of the Government.

In other words, this Congress, by this legislation, is asked to appropriate this tremendous amount of money every year, if necessary, to be administered by a Commissioner, about whom we do not know anything, and who is not elected by the people, and over whom the people have little or no control.

Those who favor this proposed legislation most ardently, I presume, feel that the Government should take charge of the public schools in the country and administer them from Washington. I take a directly opposite view of the origin and function of our public schools. I maintain that the public schools owe their origin absolutely to local people and have come up in strength, and in power, and in usefulness through the townships, through the counties, and up to the State. In other words the little red schoolhouse was not located somewhere waiting for the pioneers to come and use it. On the contrary—the little red schoolhouse was built by the pioneers as soon as they could afford to build it, and proudly they used it for the benefit of their children and for the benefit of the community, and for the benefit of the Nation. Abraham Lincoln and most of our great men are a product of the county and State schools, and not the product of a school established and managed out of Washington.

I feel very strongly about this proposed legislation because it is directly contrary to all of my experiences—and I think would be opposed by most of our people in my section of the country. No doubt some of our people will be carried away by the propaganda that the Federal Government is going to give us a lot of money for construction of schoolhouses and the maintenance of our schools. These people must not forget, however, that we will be called upon to pay our part, and under this proposed legislation, our part will be much more in proportion than it is now. Ohio has every reason to be proud of its school system and to be proud of the products of its schools and colleges. I know that our people in Ohio are willing to do for others as much as we can, but from our pioneer days up to now we have built our schools in such a way that we are proud of them and proud of their products. I may appear to be

somewhat enthusiastic about the public schools of Ohio, but I have been closely identified with them for many years, and I am, of course, proud of what they have done and what they are doing.

The district that I have the honor to represent is comprised of eight counties. It runs along the Ohio River about 150 miles, then runs back to the north about 125 miles. In that territory, and 2 other adjoining counties, are located the 3 oldest settlements in the Northwest Territory. Also in my district is located the oldest university west of the Allegheny Mountains. I refer to Ohio University, at Athens, Ohio. From this university and the schools in this section of Ohio have gone forth thousands of educated men and women who have met and helped conquer the most difficult problems that have confronted our great Nation from its earliest days up to now, when it ranks, beyond any question, as the greatest nation in the world.

My colleagues, I hesitate to encroach upon a system that is so distinctively of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Mr. Chairman, I am personally interested in school legislation because I have most of my life been closely connected with the schools. Like most of the children in my section of southern Ohio, I walked over the hill and up the railroad about 2 miles every day, and at 17 years of age, I was teaching school in a little schoolhouse that had few facilities—and where they paid me the fabulous sum of $25 a month. After teaching school in a rural section and as a high school principal, I worked my way through Providence University and also through Ohio State University, which was then and is now one of the greatest universities in the world. This experience convinced me that something should be done to give those smart children of that hilly country a better chance. The deep snows, the high fences, and the swollen streams kept these children at home a good portion of the time. My chance to do something for them came when I was elected to the State Senate of Ohio in 1922. I had become quite voluble over this problem of education, and I coined a sentence that found its way around the country, in school journals, and so forth. This is what it was, "We must educate the children where we find them, and we must tax wealth where it is to be found."

In my district, in those days there were many coal mines—and many of the children of these coal miners were denied the opportunity to attend school with any kind of regularity. The men and the companies who owned these mines shipped much of the coal to the north and northwestern sections of the country, but, of course, they gave little heed to the welfare of the children from the standpoint of education. One day I talked with one of these mine owners, who proved to be, in my estimation, a very fine gentleman. I knew that he had built a big hotel in one of the northern cities from the money he made in the coal business and also he had become the head of a large bank—as the result of his fortune made by reason of the manual labor by the parents of these children who were being denied an education. This man proved his manliness by immediately espousing my motto, and admitted that he had made his wealth from the sweat of the brow of these workers—and he would be willing to do his part in educating the children. I consulted with teachers, businessmen, and statisticians, until we worked out what we thought would be a formula that would solve our problem. Here is what it was. We agreed that the schools should be maintained from a public source—that is, from taxes. We also agreed that education was a State problem and that the great State of Ohio should adequately maintain the schools of the State. We decided that what we called the poor school districts should be assisted by the metropolitan areas. We estimated that it would require the taxes from $6,000 worth of taxable property to maintain one pupil.

I introduced a bill in the State senate which was described and spoken of "as a bill to establish an equalization fund." It provided that any section in which the property was not of such value as to be worth as many $6,000 as there were schoolchildren should be assisted. In other words my bill established a State equalization fund taken from public taxes of the State and from that fund the weak school districts should be provided with sufficient funds to maintain them as they should be maintained. In other words all the poor school districts were taken care of.

As soon as I introduced this bill, the news went over the State very rapidly, and the teachers, school organizations, and many public authorities immediately indicated their aproval, and encouraged me in my efforts.

To the everlasting credit and honor of the State senators from the rich districts, when the vote came on my proposal, every senator in the State voted his approval. The same was true as to the house of representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I maintain that "we must educate the children where we find them, and that we must tax wealth where it is located." I maintain that up to now we have taken care of the schools and schoolchildren on a home basis. On a State basis. And that we will make a mistake to bring our public schools under the direct control of the Government in Washington.

And, Mr. Chairman, I forgot to say that while we were working our way in the school-maintenance program we encountered the fact that many of the teachers in those so-called poor districts had not been paid for many months. They had a total of more than a million dollars coming to them and we took care of them in my bill. My bill brought to those sections, a number of fine centralized schoolbuildings and my bill brought many schoolbuses which haul the children. I think we are well satisfied and do not want Washington to take us over.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, we are approaching through the course of this debate, that momentous decision which will indicate to the United States of America and the world whether this Congress respects law and order, or whether this Congress shall be an accomplice to the violations of the decisions of the Supreme Court. The issues before us are legal, but more than that, moral and ethical. On one hand we find a group of people believing in the relative values of the material, and on the other hand, a group that believes in the absolute values of the spirit. America surged to greatness because it was founded by men who placed the spiritual above the material. By the rude bridge that arched the flood the embattled farmers stood because they believed in things spiritual.

Now certain things are self-evident; you cannot teach respect for law and order in schools built in defiance of law and order. You cannot teach loyalty to "one nation indivisible" in schools that Jim Crow its students in absolute defiance of the Supreme Court of the United States. You cannot bring about integration through segregated schools.

During the past year and a half, I have exhausted every possible avenue trying to find someone, someone in authority, who would speak the word so that I would be sure that my amendments were not vitally necessary. I have asked this question of everyone: "Is it not illegal and immoral to appropriate Federal funds to any State which, not by public opinion, but by legislative action, has voted to defy the law of the land?" Not a single person nor organization has been able to factually indicate that I am wrong.

I will cite seven different attitudes toward this amendment:

First. Our President has consistently said that my amendments are extraneous and unnecessary. Yet repeated correspondence with him has failed to bring forth one statement from him or his assistants that he would use the executive power of his office to keep Federal funds from going to those States that are in defiance of the law of the land. It is possible that he might do so after this bill becomes law, but I do not want to posit the moral future of our country, the respect for the Supreme Court, and Federal law and order upon mere speculation.

Second. The Comptroller General of the United States has told me and I quote from his letter:

> On the fundamental basis that it is for the Congress to say how and on what conditions public moneys shall be spent, the position of the General Accounting Office as the agent of the Congress is to give full effect to enactments of the Congress.

Third, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which will administer this act, both Mrs. Hobby and her successor, Mr. Folsom, have indicated that they would do nothing to withhold the money.

Fourth, Mr. Walter Lippmann, the New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, have said that a taxpayer's suit could obtain an injunction against the use of such funds. This is absolutely untrue. In the case of Massachusetts versus Mellon in 1923, the Supreme Court ruled out any taxpayer's suit for any such purpose.

Fifth, the reactionary, anticivil rights wing of the new united labor movement has done and is doing all it can to lobby

against my amendment. One of its paid hired hands, Arthur J. Goldberg wrote:

> All public schools in the States must be operated on a nonsegregated basis, it necessarily follows that public schools built with Federal aid constitutionally can only be operated on a nonsegregated basis.

Mr. Goldberg is a self-appointed tenth member of the Supreme Court, one of the nonvoting members. His legal opinion is ridiculous.

First, during the past 2 years since the Supreme Court decision, public schools have been built with Federal funds in the impacted areas and they have been and are being built on a Jim Crow, segregated basis. Why didn't the Supreme Court stop this? Anybody who advances the facetious argument that the Supreme Court decision is sufficient need only realize that right now in this House we appropriated since the Supreme Court decision for Jim Crow, segregated educational purposes in 6 defiant States—Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, South Carolina, Virginia—$75 million per year of Federal funds. If the Supreme Court decision is adequate then why is it that this Federal money is being spent now for segregated education? I have asked this question of the President, the Comptroller General, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and have met always the same answer—the Supreme Court will take care of it. Is has not and it cannot.

There are those who say the Supreme Court has the power to compel compliance with its decisions. How? They are not dealing now with individuals or organizations or groups. They are dealing with entire States which by legislative action have voted. How are you going to force an entire sovereign State to comply with a Supreme Court decision? No one dares suggest the use of Federal troops. This would be a confession of the moral decadence of our country. There are not enough Federal marshals to force compliance. So, that is an utterly ridiculous statement. The truth is that during all of the years when the Supreme Court doctrine was "separate but equal" it was never obeyed except, and only except, when the President, through executive order, or this Body, through legislative action, implemented the Supreme Court decision.

After 56 years of the doctrine of "separate but equal"—

Current expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance, 1952

State	White	Negro
Georgia	$190.15	$115.39
Alabama	172.48	107.84
Mississippi	147.49	39.93
South Carolina	195.50	98.14
Florida	221.20	159.77
North Carolina	186.30	149.60

Overall expenditures for school construction and maintenance, 1953–54

State	Construction		Maintenance	
	Negro	White	Negro	White
Alabama	$2,194,000	$7,771,000		
Florida	9,114,000	29,280,000	$516,000	$4,092,000
Mississippi	1,757,000	3,802,000	357,000	1,437,000

You cannot escape this stark fact: The Supreme Court has never had the power to compel any State to obey any of its decisions. It does not have that power now. We have a very rich legislative history here in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress on implementing the Supreme Court decision. We did it with the Draft Act when Representative Hamilton Fish in this House and Senator Robert Wagner in the other House introduced a nondiscriminatory amendment which was passed by record vote. We did it again in the Hill-Burton Act when the committee itself brought forth a nondiscriminatory provision. We did it again in the Federal school lunch program when you adopted my amendment. Now, the doctrine of separate but equal has changed to the doctrine of integration. This is the first opportunity we have had to implement the Supreme Court decision which is our legislative duty and history. What the executive branch of Government does or does not do is not germane to the duty that we, the legislative branch of the Government, have clearly defined. When any branch of government—executive, judicial, or legislative—hands down an order, decision, or a law, it is then incumbent upon all of the other branches of government to yield to whatever those decisions, orders, or laws may be.

From where do we get this new concept that the protection of basic liberties should be left solely to the courts? In reality, are not the courts the last and not the first resort for the protection of basic rights?

Sixth, then there are those who say—we believe that the Powell amendment is right in principle but the issue should be taken up separately. May I point out that for 9 years my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. DOLLINGER] has introduced a bill "to withhold Federal Aid from schools which discriminate between students by reason of their race, color, religion, ancestry, and national origin." That bill is before the Committee on Education and Labor right now, H. R. 3305, and yet not a single thing has been done for 9 years to bring this bill before the House.

Seventh, then again, there is another group that says—look, 300,000 children have been integrated already. It is to aid those very same consecrated, dedicated, white southerners who have dared to build expanding islands of democracy in the morass of defiance that I offer these amendments. But the fact that 300,000 have been integrated in the past 2 years is not sufficient to excuse those States who by legislative action are totally in defiance of the Supreme Court and have not integrated a single school district in eight States.

The Board of Education of the State of Georgia has voted to revoke for life the teaching certificates of any teachers who give instruction to colored and white pupils in the same public school classrooms. Also State aid will be cut off from those school districts that vote to integrate classes.

In his inaugural address on January 11, 1955, Gov. Marvin Griffin, of Georgia, said:

> The Supreme Court of the United States issued an unthinkable decision, outlawing school segregation. * * * We Georgia people are firm in our conviction that this tyranny must be resisted with every resource at our command.

Officials in Prince Edward County, Va., have voted not to appropriate funds for public schools during the coming year for the purpose of resisting the Court's decision.

In a radio broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System on June 4, 1955, a Member of the other body said:

> Regardless of whatever decree the United States Supreme Court might issue in the foreseeable future, it will be a nullity in every school district in the State of Mississippi.

The Alabama Legislature has passed a bill which has as its purpose the evasion of the United States Supreme Court's decision.

South Carolina has taken steps to use its power to abolish its public schools as a means of defying the highest court of the land. The Congress cannot ignore these obvious attacks upon the authority of the Federal Government.

We are face to face today with four reactions to the Supreme Court decision by school districts in hitherto segregated parts of the United States: school districts that have integrated, school districts that are integrating, school districts that have said that they will integrate, and school districts which by punitive and prohibitive laws will not integrate and are in absolute defiance of the Supreme Court.

My amendment will help all those school districts that have integrated, are integrating, or have stated that they will integrate, by granting Federal funds to any school district that is obeying the law of the land. Do we or do we not bear responsibility for the manner in which Federal money is spent? My amendment does not punish anyone or penalize anyone. It only restrains the Federal Government from being a partner to the crime of defiance of law and order. It will help those school districts within States that are integrating even though the majority of the districts of the State have not yet integrated. Furthermore, to show the absolute fairness of my approach, I have another amendment which will hold in escrow the funds that would have been allocated to school districts that have not integrated, and will hold those funds in escrow until the last year of the bill. If by then they decide to integrate, then they will receive the accumulated funds. This cannot be called extremism. By the time the Kelley bill comes to an end, 7 years will have passed since the first Supreme Court decision. Is not 7 years long enough for anyone to make up his mind whether or not to obey the law of the land?

Let us stop strangling America by semantics. The Supreme Court said to move "with all deliberate speed." You may say go slow, but at least that means go. It does not mean that because you integrate in Muscogee, Okla., that that is

an excuse for not integrating in Jackson, Miss. The law of the land must be obeyed everywhere at the same time, not in any particular area.

Without my amendment what would happen?

First. It would mean nullification by Congress of the integration decision of the Supreme Court.

Second. It would mean a gain for the Soviet amongst the nations of Asia and Africa.

Third. It might well thrust the Negro people of America into a massive, passive resistance program such as is succeeding so successfully in Montgomery, Ala., and Tallahassee, Fla.

Fourth. It would hold the United States and democracy up to ridicule before the whole world as a nation of pretense and preachments but not practices.

The majority of the Members of the Republican side of this House have agreed to vote in favor of the Powell amendment. In other words, if the Powell amendment is defeated, it will mean that it has been defeated by my own fellow-Democrats. What a tragedy it would be if the party of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman became in 1956 the anti-Civil Rights Party of reaction in the field of civil liberties.

Some people say this is an unholy alliance between people who want to kill the bill and people who want civil rights. This I do not believe. The Rules Committee itself produced an unholy alliance during the past week and brought forth two bills that never would have been brought out otherwise. If the northern Democrats will stand up and vote in the great tradition of Roosevelt and Truman, then the Powell amendment will be part of this bill, and more than that, this bill will be passed by the House of Representatives.

But then comes the great cry: If we do have the Powell amendment, then the bill will be killed in the Senate. This is sheer and utter stupidity. If the Powell amendment is attached to this bill, it will not come before the Senate. What will happen is that in the other House, the bill that is already before them does not contain the Powell amendment, it will be substituted after the enacting clause of this bill. In other words, all the talk in newspapers and in the Halls of Congress about a certain filibuster in the Senate is absolutely ridiculous, sheer nonsense, propaganda, and in some instances, downright lies. The bill that the Senate will consider will be the bill of Senator LISTER HILL not the bill of Congressman AUGUSTINE KELLEY.

There are those who say that maybe an amendment on the style of mine will be introduced in the Senate. If so, that has nothing to do with what we do here, for with or without the Powell amendment in the House, such an amendment is possible in the Senate. Finally, if the Senate does pass the Federal aid to education bill without the Powell amendment, the bills will then go to conference. So let us for once and for all stop these lies about my amendment will kill the bill.

May I emphasize that the Powell amendment is distinctly not racial. Above all, it is not political. It is an amendment aimed at upholding the moral grandeur of the law of our land at a time in history when our Nation needs every single son and daughter to stand in a solid phalanx and give a burnished witness that this is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

What about our little children?

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I shall gladly support the Kelley bill (H. R. 7535) as reported by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, there is probably little disagreement on the basic need for Federal aid to education, which H. R. 7535 would provide. Simply stated, we are confronted with the question of whether or not we are going to provide our young people with an adequate public-school system. There may be other side issues, but that remains the basic problem.

We are agreed as to the necessity of a free public-school system. That principle was long ago accepted as being the foundation on which our Republic rests.

We all accept as one of our responsibilities as citizens the fact that we must provide adequate educational facilities for our young people. The question then becomes: Are we doing an adequate job in this respect? Almost any educator, almost any parent who has children of school age would be able to give you the answer.

The sad fact is that we are failing to provide classrooms to take care of our ever-increasing school-age population. At the present rate of construction, it is estimated that we will be short 176,000 classrooms by 1959. This would mean inadequate facilities for approximately 4½ million children.

School districts across the Nation have been staging an uphill battle to build the classrooms they need. They have managed, in most cases without aid from the Federal Government, to keep pace with the growing numbers of children reaching school age. But it has been impossible to reduce the backlog, resulting from depression and war, of desperately needed new school buildings.

Federal aid to the States now should help them get over the hump in catching up with essential school construction. That is what H. R. 7535 is designed to accomplish. It is a vital shot in the arm which will enable hard-pressed school districts to catch up. Once the backlog of needed classroom space is overcome, then local school districts can continue from there in keeping pace with the year-to-year increase in enrollment. And Federal aid to education is not a brandnew principle being trotted out by the "socializers." Federal aid to education has been approved in various forms since 1785.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to Federal control of education. If I believed that H. R. 7535 would result in Federal control of education I would oppose it. But I do not believe that Federal control of schools would follow Federal aid for construction of the classrooms which are needed now by school districts all across the Nation.

H. R. 7535 is in the national interest. This bill will not be of great help in my particular district, but I believe the people I represent are ready to assume their share of responsibility in bringing our schools up to the highest possible standards.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the worthy objectives of the Kelley bill as it was reported unanimously by the committee, subject to the approval of the amendments, as stated by the gentleman from West Virginia, [Mr. BAILEY], and any other which may be found essential.

Some of the reasons why I shall support this bill are as follows:

First. While I was a member for some time of the California State Board of Education, before I first came to Congress about 10 years ago, I obtained a statewide knowledge of some of the school needs in my native State of California. And, even then, there was rapidly increasing need of substantially more schoolroom construction in parts of the State; especially in metropolitan areas.

Second. In the great 23d Congressional District which I have the honor and responsibility of representing in this my fifth term in this legislative body, I have received many communications from groups of citizens; school officials and individual citizens stating it was their opinion, that the Kelley bill, which is now before us, should be enacted into law. Comparably, I have received but very, very few communications opposed to the enactment of the Kelley bill.

Furthermore, when I was recently home in connection with the June 5 primary vote, I asked the opinion of a goodly number of representative citizens about the need for Federal aid for schoolroom construction and their reply was almost unanimous in the affirmative. Furthermore, I know that several of the school districts in the great 23d Congressional District have communicated to me directly, that they need Federal aid for schoolroom construction as promptly as possible, on account of the present existing lack of schoolroom capacity, together with the sharp increase in school population from school term to school term. Therefore, my belief is that the benefits of this bill will definitely and materially be a benefit to the existing and increasing schoolroom need in the great 23d District which I represent. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I well remember that when I was on the State board of education in California and the question of Federal aid to schools was before us, at that time Dr. Dexter, who was then the superintendent of public instruction in California, communicated to me that California favored Federal aid at that time even though California itself might not receive a single cent of Federal money. This position, he explained to me, was taken by California school authorities because so many thousands of children were annually coming to California with their parents from other States, where the school programs and facilities were so comparatively less than those in California, that it was found necessary when these thousands

of children came from such States to virtually reeducate and retrain them in California schools. This, he explained, not only took much time but cost large sums of California tax money.

Third. The report of our House Committee on Education, from which this Kelley bill emanated, was unanimous after extended and thorough hearings, which demonstrated by factual information and evidence that there is a nationwide need for thousands of additional classrooms to be added to our nationwide school facilities at the earliest possible date; lest we wish to further be responsible for a school generation partially illiterate and unschooled on account of less than full-day sessions and on account of continuing lack of schoolroom facilities. I do not choose to be a party to having any American child, regardless of place of birth, or color, or economic status, having less than a fair chance for schooling. I want every child to have fair schooling when he should.

Fourth. Granting that some of the States are presently doing a fair job in this connection, it appears fairly clear to me that Federal aid, as a temporary measure only, for the 4-year term of the Kelley bill, is the only prompt, effective solution. Granting also that it would be a good judgment and a sound expenditure of tax money for the States to themselves assume their primary responsibility, many of the States have not done so; many of them apparently will not promptly do so. Therefore, Federal aid for this 4-year term of the Kelley bill is both necessary and the only sensible, effective present solution to an immediate problem. I know, for instance, that some of the allegedly poorer States are expending more for their schools than is the average in the United States, which is 2.7 percent. For instance, Alabama spends 2.85 percent, Arkansas 3.02 percent, and Mississippi 3.16 percent. And, of course, the ability of States varies.

Fifth. This bill should act as a norman welcome stimulant to the States which need the use of it. And, of course, under section 103 on page 3 of the bill, only those States which desire to accept the benefits of the bill and apply through their own State educational agencies can benefit under the bill. As I read all of section 103, it appears crystal clear to me, that the respective State educational agencies in the States applying, shall be the sole agencies for administering this beneficent plan within their respective States. The States provide for establishment of standards on their own State level; they provide opportunities for hearing before the State educational agencies for the respective school district desiring to obtain Federal aid for their respective school districts; and funds paid to the State under this bill will be expended solely for school facilities and classroom construction projects, which must be first approved by their respective school educational agencies; the fiscal control and fund accounting procedures will also expressly be under the control of State educational agencies. It appears to me that the committee has deliberately endeavored to make it technically true, as well as a practical fact that there shall be no Federal control of local educational policies. This is as it should be. I could not favor the bill if it was otherwise.

Sixth. Also, by the raising of Federal funds for this worthy proposal in the various States, the Federal Government taxing ability and authority, which does not depend primarily on the real estate tax, as do most of the State tax systems, for their school funds, will be logically tapping sources of income other than the comparatively meager assets of low income brackets. This should not be objectionable to any taxpayer who wishes that all American children shall have a fair opportunity for adequate schooling. A child grown into adulthood as an illiterate in any substantial manner is an economic liability and not an asset. Every American child, each day, is becoming either an asset or a liability to our American way of life.

Seventh. With the application of this Federal aid to those States which apply for it on the basis of their respective needs for it, some goodly percentage of school funds from the various local school districts will thereby be released from the needs of local schoolroom construction, to the existing local school needs of increased teachers salaries; maintenance of school property; transportation needs, and other worthy local school needs which cannot now be met and for which there is no local sources of obtaining the funds.

Eighth. And on this last point, which I here mention, the time limit of this debate will only permit me to urge to your attention the fact that our beloved Nation is now engaged in a war with Soviet communism which has been described as the war of the classroom; the war of ideas. Knowing that you agree with me, it resolves itself into a contest between the nations of the world in the field of education; in the training of the mind and the spirit, it is primarily a civilian task rather than preparation for war. This is essentially true because the chief nations of the world already have, or will have, available hydrogen bombs and atomic power and energy. Thus the Soviet Union has recently changed its course of conduct and changed its method of attack against our Nation as a capitalistic nation. It is far outdistancing us in the field of engineers, scientists, chemists, and so forth. And, school children are attending Soviet schools longer hours each day and more days a week than do ours in the United States. They offer substantial inducements and bonuses for especially talented youths to proceed further with their education. We must not let any nation pass us in this regard lest we pay an assured penalty of falling behind as a Nation which is not only founded upon spiritual values, but which preaches that our Nation is a Government of the people, by the people,, and for the people, as Abraham Lincoln, our citizen of the world, stated in his lifetime.

May I again urge that time is the essence of this need. There is no time to delay. The problem is before us and this present bill is the best solution, with its proposed amendments, which we will apparently have opportunity to enact this session. Let us do the thing that is necessary and just and right and sound in behalf of our children and the United States. We must do this because as the children of our Nation are today, so will our Nation be tomorrow.

Another thing, our national defense is involved. Too much so in fact because thousands of lads who would otherwise be qualified to respond to the call of duty from the military, fail to qualify on account of their illiteracy. This means lack of schooling in the fields of simple spelling, language, and even simple arithmetic. I urge enactment.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 7535. To my way of thinking, I feel that this pending legislation is the most important that has been before us this year. By enacting this legislation, we would not be setting any precedents—we would only be fulfilling our obligation to the schoolchildren in this country.

Federal aid to education antedates the Constitution. There is no longer a question whether Federal aid for school construction is necessary. We must accept the fact that America's school systems are in serious trouble throughout the country. The Nation's need for more classrooms cannot be doubted. This has been proven by nationwide surveys and long congressional hearings.

Ever since I came to Congress, bills have been introduced providing Federal aid for school construction. A subcommittee in the 82d Congress conducted extended hearings on various bills that were pending before the committee at that time and reported a bill to the full committee in 1952.

While these studies have been taking place, and the problem getting a little bigger all the time, we have been confronted with groups that have undertaken to minimize the needs of the schools for classrooms. The crisis has been on us a long time. We have seen it mount each year. We know that there are not enough schools being built each year. We know each year more and more youngsters are ready for school. Facing a situation of this kind, we must recognize that the school classroom shortage has become so great that it is now a Federal responsibility to aid the States and localities.

All studies made by interested school groups and by the Government point up the serious shortage of adequate school buildings in which to house our schoolchildren. All of this exists in the most modernized up-to-date country in the world. Here we spend billions for defense and practically nothing for our children. There could come a day when guided missiles, superbombers, and atomic-powered submarines will all be useless if we do not see fit to help the States provide adequate classrooms for the Nation's children. Money spent on defense weapons could be wasted taxpayers' money if we do not give our children the chance for education in safe, adequate surroundings. Much of our defense is replaced and replenished every few years, but in many cases, our youngsters are forced to attend schools

in buildings which if they were military equipment would have been abandoned after World War I. We cannot afford to spend what we do for defense and not do more than we have for our schoolchildren.

We must not forget the fact that our children are the Nation's most important investment. I am hoping that this Congress will assume its responsibility to the children of this Nation and no longer listen to these arguments attempting to minimize the needs and delay action any further. This is emergency legislation and it should be treated as such. We all know that there are enough glaring examples of inadequate schools throughout the length and breadth of this land to destroy the need for more adequate financing.

Before our Constitution, the Congress of the Confederation set aside public lands in the Northwest Territory for the endowment of the common schools. Later, the Congress of the United States continued to appropriate public lands for this purpose as new States were admitted. In more recent years, the Congress has enacted various other provisions for Federal aid to education in the States, including, since 1917, direct support of vocational education in the schools. The Supreme Court has already ruled on legislation of this type and there is no question about its legality.

I want to tell you something about Kentucky's classroom needs, which are critical. Dr. Robert Martin, superintendent of public instruction of Kentucky, described our dilemma to me in a recent letter. He writes that—

> Many boards of education are looking forward with hopeful anticipation to the enactment of this bill into law as an aid in the solution of their problems in school housing.

Superintendent Martin emphasizes that—

> These problems in Kentucky are gradually increasing annually. A number of districts which have voted special taxes find that they have obligated all the income from the taxes and are still much in need of school buildings and equipment.

According to Dr. Martin, a comprehensive study of Kentucky's need for school facilities has been completed recently. He reports that—

> This study shows that by 1960 we will have an estimated need of 10,600 new instruction rooms as additions to present buildings or as a part of more than 400 new school centers. In addition to these instructional spaces, the new buildings in each center will need central heat, indoor toilets, sewage disposal, lunchrooms and fixed handwashing facilities. The survey shows that in the old buildings of the State, more than 200,000 children now attend school in buildings with no central heat and with no inside toilets. More than 175,000 children attend school in buildings with no handwashing facilities available.

Superintendent Martin points out further that—

> The cost of needed school building facilities by 1960 will be approximately $350 million. The total amount that could be raised in this State for this purpose from local districts' funds, under the laws in force at the time the study was completed, was approximately $162 million. This left a deficit of approximately $188 million to be supplied from some other source. The last session of the Legislature provided for capital outlay purposes approximately $5 million annually from State sources as a part of its appropriation to support the Foundation Program of the State. It would take some 40 years for this sum to provide facilities so badly needed today.

This, I submit, is only the picture of classroom needs for Kentucky, but when you multiply the facts, they add up to one solution—there must be Federal aid for school construction. We must provide enough schools to supply the demands of an expanding Nation.

Since the 81st Congress, and especially in the 82d Congress, when I was a member of the subcommittee studying school classroom shortages, I have favored and supported a formula for aid which was based on giving aid where there was the greatest need. No one can object to a distribution formula which rightly takes into consideration the income of the people of the State, the number of children to be educated, and the effort the people are making to finance education from their own resources. This formula was developed in the general Federal aid bills which passed the Senate by an overwhelming vote in both the 79th and 80th Congresses.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] and myself sponsored a similar formula in school construction bills pending in the 84th Congress but our suggestions were turned down by the committee in favor of the flat grant formula. It was not until after the President came out for the Hill formula, which is now termed the Eisenhower formula, that additional support was obtained. I have always thought that this principle was most equitable because it is simply a distribution based on need. We all know that it often happens that a very considerable part of the wealth taxed in one State under our Federal system may actually be created by people working in another State. Personally, I feel that the Hill formula will emerge from the Senate, but I am willing to go along with the committee and support the flat grant formula of the Kelley bill.

There is another issue which is obstructing the path and has no place in this legislation. I see no reason for an amendment guaranteeing that no Federal money would go to States with segregated schools. It is not needed because the Supreme Court's decision has said what the law of the land is on this subject. The Court also recognized the complications surrounding integration when it provided in the decision that the Federal court system would oversee the integration process. The decision announced that integration should take place with deliberate speed. This language does not mean integration overnight. It could easily mean over a period of years depending upon the facts in different sections of the country. We do not need to have other Federal legislation concerning integration. We certainly do not need any other legislation in this bill. I for one have confidence in the Supreme Court decisions. These decisions guarantee to every individual affected equal protection of the laws. The adoption of the Powell amendment would have but one purpose and that would be to kill this legislation for the remainder of this session of Congress. This would be a terrific blow to all the schoolchildren in this country after the committee has worked for more than 4 years in bringing this legislation to the floor.

Federal aid for school construction now is of very great importance if we are to give children an equal chance in the years ahead. As the old saying goes, "You don't help a fellow understand you by hitting him with a big stick just to prove you have the power." We should not further complicate this emergency legislation and hurt the future of our children. This school year there were over 2 million schoolchildren in excess of the normal capacity of the school buildings. Approximately 32 million pupils were enrolled in public, elementary, and secondary schools this year. We did not have enough classrooms in which to house them. How can we sit idly by and say in the face of the facts that this is not a national problem? I for one remain hopeful that we will defeat the Powell amendment and pass this legislation next week, and when we do that, we will let the people in this country know we are fulfilling our obligation to these unhoused schoolchildren.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON].

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly in favor of Federal aid for the construction of schools. I know of no more important problem confronting the country today.

For years, the construction of schools has not kept pace with the increase in population—probably from the fact that during the depression, World War II, the reconstruction period following World War II, and the Korean hostilities, school construction was at a standstill.

The birth rate of this country increased tremendously at the close of World War II. These children are now entering, in many cases, obsolete and overcrowded schools.

I have thought for some time that Federal assistance in financing the building of schools is a necessity. Certainly, it is becoming painfully evident that something must be done substantially beyond the present effort to house the rapidly rising population of our schools, particularly when present efforts—insufficient as they are—are putting a severe strain on the resources of many school communities.

My awareness of this situation has been sharpened from my years as a practicing lawyer, in which calling one is of necessity closely concerned with the affairs and problems of local communities. From that experience, I can see clearly the very real difficulty that local taxing units have in raising funds to build schools.

School housing conditions are distressing now, and, without some substantial remedy, they can only become worse. There is a continuing vigorous growth in our national population, but our school population is increasing more

than twice as fast as that of the Nation. At the same time, the cost of constructing school facilities has mounted even more sharply than the population figures.

The combination of those factors can have dire consequences to the well-being of the Nation for generations to come, unless positive steps are taken now. We must face up to this problem before educational deterioration sets in and brings social, political, and economic stagnation, before such regression destroys our traditional ideal of progress. To maintain the one tradition requires, I believe, that we forsake what may appear to have become another tradition: That school building costs be borne only by purely local revenues.

Up to now, most schools have had to be built with the proceeds of bond issues secured upon tax levies on the respective school communities. But, in Indiana, as elsewhere, the restriction imposed by the State constitution upon local bond indebtedness has set an inescapable limit on the construction of schools.

This was brought very vividly to my attention not long ago when a school building was destroyed by fire in one of the most wealthy communities in my district. Fire insurance was carried on this building and the proceeds of this insurance were realized after the fire. But building costs had so greatly increased that the insurance proceeds would not nearly cover the expense of replacing the building. Issuance of bonds to produce additional capital was necessary, but there the school authorities were balked by the constitutional restriction. There was simply no way in which this community could build its own school. Finally, a building was rented under the holding corporation act, which I will mention in a moment.

That situation arose, as I say in one of the wealthier communities of my district, where, except for the constitutional restriction, financial resources were available to support the building program. Unfortunately, many other communities in the State are troubled not merely by the legal difficulty, but also by the more basic handicap of inadequate resources.

For one or the other of these reasons, 46 percent of the schoolchildren of Indiana are housed in obsolete buildings. Forty-seven percent attend classes in fire-hazard buildings, and 62 percent of their classrooms are overcrowded. Some of the deficiences could be met by rehabilitating existing buildings, but 28 percent of the pupils need new buildings.

The needed construction and renovation in Indiana would cost an estimated $257 million of which $183 million is unavailable from local resources. A 6-year Federal program of $500 million in annual grants apportioned on a ratio of pupils per State would give Indiana about $75 million. That figure being less than half of the State's deficiency in available resources, I think such a grant could hardly be called unreasonable.

I have outlined the situation in Indiana, where I think there is ample evidence of need for a Federal-assistance program, even in a State where the per capita income is higher than the national average, and where per capita expenditures for school purposes likewise exceed the national average. I do not doubt that an even more desperate need can be demonstrated in the case of some others of the 48 States.

There has been no lack of efforts on the State level in Indiana to meet the problem of financing school construction. Perhaps the most extreme step was taken in legislation to establish a State school building authority—in effect a holding corporation. This authority was given power to issue bonds for the raising of capital to construct schoolhouses to be rented to local school communities.

A constitutional issue was promptly raised as to whether this was not a mere subterfuge to permit the local communities to get around the constitutional debt limitation. The holding corporation was finally held constitutional by the Indiana supreme court, although misgivings were expressed from the bench that the sole purpose of the legislation was to evade the State constitution. Even if such holding corporations were upheld in all the States—and they have been struck down in at least two States—they still suffer a failing in that many local communities could not afford even to rent school buildings once they were constructed.

The device of tax accumulation in capital funds has also been inaugurated in Indiana. But the defect in such a plan is that, while an appreciable amount of capital might eventually be created for building purposes, such funds cannot be drawn upon for current construction needs.

I do not think anyone concerned with the future of our country can seriously dispute the need for prompt and effective steps to meet the real national crisis in school housing. The only question is: How shall these scools be financed? It is clear that they cannot be paid for from current tax revenues. So, the money for them must be borrowed. True, if the Federal Government provides direct grants, the public debt might be increased. But the indebtedness of people throughout the Nation would be increased just as surely if funds were borrowed by State or local governments for these purposes. Hence, I think the debt question is no argument against a Federal program.

If these expenditures for schools were to be supported by taxes levied by local governments, the burden would fall on real estate, on which, I believe, taxes are already too high. Under modern conditions, much of our wealth is held in forms other than real property, which was not the case in earlier times when taxes were first levied for the support of schools. The Federal Government, with its power to tax income and various other revenue sources, can bear the school building burden better and distribute it much more equitably than can the local governments which must look primarily to real estate for their revenues.

I believe that, regardless of where a child is born in this country, he is entitled to a good education. I believe that he is entitled to go to school in a building that would not be condemned as a slum if used as a residence, or abated as a nuisance if used as a factory.

I believe that any nation which can spend $40 billion a year for defense and $4 billion a year for foreign aid can afford to provide a half-million dollars per year for schoolhouses. I believe that a nation which spent billions to crack the atom and unleash a potential for destroying civilization can spend a sizable fraction of that sum to promote civilization.

Federal help for schools is by no means a new concept. Portions of the public domain were set aside as "school lands" nearly a century ago. Schools were built by the WPA during the 1930's and the Federal Government made grants to schools during World War II and, in the postwar years, to "Federal-impact" areas having school problems.

In none of these cases has the Federal Government interfered with the affairs of the local school communities, and I see no likelihood of such interference under H. R. 7535.

When I first entered the House in the 81st Congress, I proposed school construction legislation and Chairman BARDEN, of the Education and Labor Committee, joined me in requesting the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare a report on the needs and possibilities for the financing of school construction. This report was submitted to the Education and Labor Committee in 1950. Its contents, as revised up to date from time to time, furnished a basis for dealing with this problem.

In every session of Congress, of which I have been a Member, I have introduced legislation providing for Federal aid for school construction. I am certainly in favor of the Kelley bill, and I hope that this legislation will be enacted, whereby the Government can assist in the construction of schools.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, for 9 years of my life I was a schoolteacher. For 6 of those years I was superintendent of a public school system. I loved it. I received many rich rewards from my experiences and associations in the teaching profession. Today I enjoy the friendships that came to me while I was a schoolteacher, and I enjoy also the things I understand and know better now because I was a schoolteacher. Also, as are most of you in this body, I am a father of school-age children. I love them. I am concerned about their future. So I am not going to be even slightly modest in extolling my own enthusiastic interest and concern about public school education.

A critical shortage of adequate classrooms does exist. There is also a grave deficiency, more critical, in my opinion, than the classroom inconveniences, in qualified teachers. But this bill we have today, this composition, a legalistic monstrosity, is too heavily endowed with misleading statements and political promises to hope for any relief from crowded schoolrooms, and it certainly ignores the more tragic of our shortages,

a sufficient number of qualified schoolteachers dedicated to teaching the fundamentals of formal education.

Why is this bill misleading? Page 1, line 6, in the very beginning, states that the Congress finds that after sustained and vigorous efforts on the part of the State and local subdivisions of government they still cannot meet the demands for classrooms.

The hearings which were recorded and which were held before this committee certainly do not justify this Congress finding any such thing. The hearings of the committee justify the finding of the shortage of classrooms, but in no instance—not a State of the 48 States nor a Territory showed any evidence or brought in any facts to sustain the charge that they cannot do the job that needs to be done at home. I will say more about that later.

Now where are the political promises? Title I authorizes $400 million a year for school construction. That is only a drop in the bucket to what is needed. If the classrooms that we say are needed must be built, $400 million a year for 4 years is simply a drop in the bucket, but it is enough and just enough to get the camel's nose under the tent. Look—Alabama gets a measly $9 million, Arkansas gets $5 million, Kentucky $8 million, and West Virginia only $5 million, and Oklahoma $6 million and so on down the line with paltry sums to each State. What do we do to get this amount of money? We just simply abdicate our responsibility as States and surrender to the United States Commissioner of Education the complete power, if he desires to exercise the authority given in this bill, over our public schools. Moreover, we must raise an equal amount at home to match him while he is doing the dictating. No Federal officer short of the President of these United States has ever sought or been offered more direct, more discretionary or more implied powers than those now proposed for a United States Commissioner of Education. He says, "Just let me get my fingers in your business—that is all I want." It is true that an amendment will be proposed to correct some of this by the distinguished chairman of the committee. I think the amendment would help. I still think he would have too much power even with that amendment. So much for title I and the broadest power ever offered to any Federal officer.

Title II and title III are a continuation of political promises. In those titles, there is absolutely nothing but pure political hokum. There is no other way to understand it. Again he says in this title, "Just let me get my fingers on your public schools." Can we no longer take at face value the commitment of the citizens of the local school districts to levy taxes and pay off the school bonds that they have voted? Can we no more accept at face value the pledge of a State legislative body to appropriate the money to pay off debentures issued under authority flowing from the vote of its members? This bill says, "No"—that we cannot depend on those things. This bill says, "Just let me, the Commissioner of Education of the United States endorse your note and fix your interest rate and tell you when to pay." But to "give you the service I shall have a voice in the operation of your schools." That is all that title I, title II, and title III amount to—pure political hokum. Why? Do we not all know that the bonds of a school district once voted, or that the revenue certificates of a State financing authority with legislative approval of its State legislature can be and are today sold at higher premiums and lower interest rates usually than is our own Federal Government paper?

Now about the States that have moved against this problem. There are five—Indiana, Maine, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, and my own State of Georgia. About the first four named, I know none of the details as to the method or progress. But, when the progress in Georgia is recited, I believe with all modesty, that the argument about these poor little old States not being able to solve these problems will be shot to shreds. What have we done in Georgia? We, first, are paying more than 53 percent of our entire State revenue to our educational program. That is the first thing. We have a minimum foundation program which provides $200 per teacher for capital outlay. We have set up $14,500,000 annually for construction.

Since 1951, the year of the creation of the Georgia State School Building Authority, the State of Georgia alone, exclusive of local districts and counties, has spent $91,218,059.68 on school construction; classrooms. Altogether, local and State, and other, we have spent $274 million, and we built 6,401 new classrooms as of January 31, this year.

Presently we are spending $3 million per month, and the 1956 estimate for spending is $35,865,518. That, my friends, from a State classified by some as a poor State, but not by me, and with a per capita income of $600 less than the national average. That, from a State that many would call a poor State, spending that kind of money on public school education; and then come here and tell me that many States in this Union, with a per capita income above the average, cannot spend it; some States spend as little as 12.5 percent of their income on public education.

One thing further. So many are giving lip service to the matter of local control of public schools. So many believe that in order for a public school program to function properly control must be kept as close to home as possible. I not only believe that. I subscribe to it, and I am going to fight for it. But so many are just giving lip service.

Let us see what the White House Conference found. Among other things, it said, "We want maintenance and operation funds as soon as we can get it."

This bill means the beginning of the end of local controls for public schools, the Powell amendment notwithstanding. It is not necessary. You have heard distinguished lawyers and eminent former jurists stand here and tell you that it means nothing; that they can withhold funds even without the so-called Powell amendment.

One final thing: I believe that this National Government, great and strong as it is, derives its strength and grew from one thing only. That is the strength of the 48 States making the Nation. I can think of a great giant oak with the roots spread out all around, bringing up strength from the soil from all around it, growing into a magnificent tree. I can think of this Federal Government in the same way. It derives its strength from the States only. When we commence to get into the nerve center of those States, the public school system, we are beginning to destroy that. They will atrophy. No longer will we have anything approaching the public school programs we have today because all our responsibilities and authority have shifted to Washington and a United States Commission of Education.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield.

Mr. McCONNELL. Each of the States having the ability to take care of their school program, do they not also have the ability to take care of their library services?

Mr. LANDRUM. Well now, the gentleman well knows that the Library Services bill is in no way analogous to this. The gentleman knows that the public library program is not founded upon the same principles as the public school program. I believe the gentleman also knows that we are dealing with an entirely different field, and if my friend from Pennsylvania will permit me a bit of levity, can he not also, as a Member of Congress, permit one slight inconsistency along the line we travel?

Mr. McCONNELL. I would certainly permit the gentleman that inconsistency. I was wondering about this thought, that some who are advocating the Library Services legislation might be doing wrong because the States do have the power to take care of their own needs.

Mr. LANDRUM. In reply to the gentleman's inquiry I will say this: The gentleman from Georgia is not concerned about the money; the gentleman from Georgia does not complain that the amount of money is too much to be spent on public education; the gentleman from Georgia is concerned only with how that money is spent, by whom it is spent, and who develops the program for which it is spent.

Mr. McCONNELL. Of course I have some feeling regarding the Library Services legislation. I do not know of any State that could not raise money for libraries and books within its own borders. I do not see why the Government should have to furnish that service, although I know there are many who disagree with me. But I cannot see where this school construction problem is not also a companion one with the Library Services inasmuch as both require State plans be submitted to the Commissioner of Education before grants can be made.

Mr. LANDRUM. I could not agree with my dear friend on that. I say to him again that the State Library Services bill is something in another field. I believe it has no relationship to this bill at all and absolutely all control is left to the State.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I wish to express my appreciation to the gentleman for the fine statement he has made and hate to interrupt him, but one thing that concerns me about the Federal approach to this problem is the matter of the Government purchase of bonds. We have some very poor counties in the State of Mississippi, yet even during the depression I do not know of any district in that State that ever voted a bond issue that could not sell its bonds at some reasonable figure; and it seems to me there is less justification for this feature which permits the Federal Government to walk in and set the interest rates and purchase the bonds.

Mr. LANDRUM. One further point, and I think this is important to the people who continue to think and talk only about this business of segregation: We are rich in tradition in Georgia and the Southland. We are going to stick to those traditions. We are going to keep respect among the races, but we are also going to continue to keep our segregated schools, and I want the Members to know this, that in this great building program in Georgia more than 50 percent, more than 50 percent of the amount that has been spent for schools has been spent for Negro schools; and in two systems, Lee County, Ga., the whole amount, 100 percent, has been spent for colored schools, and in Quitman City schools the whole amount of money allotted was spent on Negro schools, and in not one instance were the schools built for the colored children of any lower standard than those built for the whites.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the question of the gentleman from Mississippi regarding the purchase of bonds, he mentions that various school districts can sell their bonds successfully. I say where that is true I see no reason for the Federal Government to purchase those bonds. This is merely an effort to support the incentive idea of this program; in other words, if the district has no general financial background and is without established credit standing because it has not been in the bond market before, it will have its chance to sell its bonds to the Federal Government at a more reasonable figure than it could sell them on the market. That is the only reason for it, and there is no reason why an educational group would sell the bonds to the Federal Government if they could float them in the open market at a figure of 2 or 3 percent.

Mr. WINSTEAD. The point I am making is that I have known of school districts in my section, even poor districts and in depression times which if they voted a bond issue for the construction of school buildings could sell them on the market at a reasonable rate. Certainly I see no reason for the Federal Government to get into the bond buying end of this thing. I think there is far greater merit to the grant section of the bill than there is to the lending section, because I believe the school districts will have no difficulty selling their bonds on the market. As I say, I represent one of the poorest counties in the State of Mississippi, yet I have never seen the occasion when they could not find a sale for their bonds for school construction.

It is hard for me to believe that there is not a district in the whole United States but what can float its bonds and get a buyer at a reasonable rate of interest without the Federal Government launching out into this phase of it.

Mr. McCONNELL. If the gentleman will go over the bond market and the sales prices and yields of some of these bonds of school districts throughout the country, he will discover many of them have to borrow money for school purposes at a higher rate than under the bond purchase plan proposal of the bill under consideration.

The gentleman says he prefers grants. What we are trying to do is avoid too much of the grant idea. We are trying to encourage the local districts and the States to do the job themselves. That is the central purpose of this bill. Most remarks have been addressed to the grant section of it, which is not the main part of the bill.

Mr. WINSTEAD. What rate of interest? Do you have a minimum and maximum rate of interest?

Mr. McCONNELL. How the rate of interest is determined is mentioned in the bill. It is determined by the Secretary of the Treasury who specifies the rate of interest applicable to the calendar quarter during which obligations are purchased plus three-eighths of 1 percent.

The applicable rate shall be determined by the Secretary by estimating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations of prices during the month preceding such calendar quarter, on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 or more years. I would say that at the present time the rate of interest for bond purchases would be about 3¼ percent.

Mr. WINSTEAD. That would result in every district in the United States selling its bonds to the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I am intensely interested in this bill but not being a member of the Committee on Education and Labor I feel I should not take up too much time in expressing my views. However, I want to point out the situation in California which has made this bill a very important one to our people.

We have had an unprecedented influx of people into California since the days of the Dust Bowl, when the distressed farmers in Arkansas and Oklahoma, in particular, started to move into California.

Soon thereafter we had persons from the Middle West and the Southwest move into California to work in the aircraft and shipbuilding plants during the middle and late thirties when we were building up our military potential as the menace of a war by Germany faced us.

The net result of all this has been that for about 30 years there has been an influx of people into California which has averaged about 1,000 a day and the migration has continued down to this very moment.

We need help now because many of the school districts, while they have a great many people, including children, living in them, do not have enough tax capacity to raise the money needed to provide proper classrooms for the pupils.

Our need was recognized by the committee because 3 years ago one of our school districts was given $145,000 to use in completing a large elementary school in the north end of Stockton, Calif.

To show you how this continual influx of migrants has been going I need but remind you that following the 1950 census California was given 7 additional Congressmen. We went from 23 to 30 and it now looks as though we will have a similar increase following reapportionment after the 1960 census.

Our State is liberal in its spending for school purposes. We have a sales tax of 3½ percent that goes for education. Despite all this many children are in crowded rooms, which are unsatisfactory for the proper training of our pupils.

Our children are our greatest future asset. We need well trained students if they as adults are to cope with the complex situations in the world today. California requires high standards for its teachers. My personal contact with many teachers has convinced me of their devotion and their competence in teaching our pupils.

We hope the plan that finally emerges for Federal assistance in providing more classrooms will be completely free from any Federal control. That seems to be the aim of all the members of the Education and Labor Committee.

California will pay every dollar required of it under the law that will emerge.

In addition, our cities and counties contribute liberally toward the proper type schooling and appropriate teaching for our children.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON].

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I have listened to several months of testimony on this bill to provide Federal aid for school construction. After giving the matter a great deal of thought and study, I feel that the proponents of this legislation did not justify the need for it.

School construction certainly is necessary and is a worthy project. I want to do all that we can for the good of our schoolchildren. However, this fact does not prove to me that the Federal Government should embark on a huge new program of Federal aid. Education and school construction are primary responsibilities of our States and our local communities. In cases where local school districts cannot undertake necessary construction, it seems to me that

the problem should and can be solved through State action. Present State equalization programs can be extended and perfected. Additional taxes can be levied where necessary.

People speak of rich States and poor States. In these present good times, I do not think that any State is so poor that it cannot afford to build adequate schools and provide its children with excellent school facilities.

Now a Federal-aid program is not a gift program insofar as the taxpayers are concerned. All of us pay for these programs through the present high burden of Federal taxes and we should remember that. The Federal Government cannot give you anything until it first takes it from you.

In addition to the matter of cost, we are faced with a situation where more and more power is being centralized in Washington, and at the same time, the rights and responsibilities of the States and communities are shrinking. In the matter of school legislation, I think this is a field where we should make a special effort to resist this trend.

Several thousand of my constituents answered a public opinion poll which I mailed to them this year. In reading their answers, I discovered an overwhelming sentiment against any Federal program of aid to the States for building schools that would mean any Federal controls.

In this bill, as in others of the same type, this will be a foot in the door to start actual Federal control. It seems to me that the history of Federal programs of grants in aid shows that they keep expanding and becoming more expensive. As they expand, more and more conditions become attached to the grants. These conditions lead to stronger and stronger Federal control.

I think that we should continue to determine our educational programs and policies at State and local levels. I do not ever want to see the time come when bureaucrats in Washington will dictate to us how we should run our schools.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, we are confronting today a major problem. The facts and statistics have been stated and restated. The arguments for and against Federal aid for school construction have been argued and reargued. It is in many ways a complex and perplexing problem. Yet, in the last analysis, the problem before us is a very simple one and the challenge we must meet is a very clear one.

We must build schools or condemn millions of children to second-rate education in crowded and often dangerous buildings. And only help to the local communities by the Federal Government can do the job that must be done, in time to meet the need.

These are the facts, in their simplest terms. If there are those who still dispute them, then let them answer the rollcall of parents, teachers, businessmen, labor spokesmen, civic groups, government officials—the rollcall of responsible people from the towns and the countryside, all over America, who know these facts at first hand, and who have presented them, over and over, till only those can deny them who are determined not to face them. Support for this bill spans every community and every walk of life in America. Let me remind you of the groups and organizations through which the American people, in overwhelming numbers, are urging this action to save our schools. Here are just a few of those who have supported the principle of this legislation in committee hearings last year, or in public statements:

American Jewish Congress.
American Association of University Women.
American Federation of Labor.
National Education Association.
Georgia School Boards Association.
Council of Chief State School Officers.
California Teachers Association.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
Spokesmen for Children.
North Carolina State Superintendent of Public Instruction.
National Parent-Teachers' Association.
American Association of School Administrators.
The Governor of New York.
New Jersey Education Association.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Superintendent of Schools, Lewis County, W. Va.
Oregon Education Association.
National Farmers' Union.
Los Angeles City Superintendent of Schools.
Minnesota State Commissioner of Education.
Jewish War Veterans.
Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction.
American Federation of Teachers.
Georgia State Superintendent of Schools.
American Vocational Association.
United Mine Workers.
American Institute of Architects.
United Auto Workers-CIO.
American Home Economics Association.
American Library Association.
American Parents Committee.
AMVETS.
Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.
Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen.
Friends Committee on National Legislation.
International Association of Machinists.
National Association of Secretaries of State Teachers Associations.
National Congress of Colored Parents and Teachers.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Council on Schoolhouse Construction.
Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen.
Textile Workers' Union of America.

This is, of course, only part of those who are on record in support of the objectives of this legislation. There are many others—school officials, civic groups, private citizens—that I cannot take the time to list. In the past year, as this issue has been debated, the list of newspapers, civic groups, and others endorsing this objective has become almost endless.

I do not list these many names simply for the record. They have made their own record, more eloquently than I could state it. But I mention them now to raise the essential question, Why is this great cross section of Americans so concerned with the need for Federal aid for schools? The answer, I think, is clear. They know the facts. They have seen overcrowded schools, old and dilapidated schools, children jammed in basements, children on half sessions. They have faced the problems of trying to finance desperately needed new schools out of limited and already overtaxed local resources. And having strained local resources to build new schools, they have seen them filled up, overflowing, almost before they were completed, so that the job must start all over again.

Let me briefly describe the situation in just one school district, in my own county, right now. This is the Lynch school district, in Multnomah County, Oreg. In just 4 years their enrollment has doubled. This fall they will have nearly 200 more students than they have space for. Now they are building seven new classrooms. But by a year from now, even with these new classrooms, their increase in enrollment will again give them more than 200 students for whom they will not have the classrooms. Their resources have been exhausted by current construction. They have completely used up their legal bonding capacity. In the past year and a half alone they have floated two bond issues. They have absolutely no other resources under the law on which they can draw. They are using storerooms for libraries, basements for music rooms, storerooms for offices, a boiler room for a teachers' workroom.

Where are these people to turn for help? Will "theories" about what the States ought to be able to do help them? Will those theories build schools? Are these people likely to be frightened by these cries of Federal domination, because they provide money for bricks and mortar—when without Federal aid, they won't even have classrooms to worry about?

The case I have stated is just one case and it is from a State, I am proud to say, that has done an outstanding job and made an outstanding effort for its schools. Yet we, in Oregon, have this problem and I know that, in other States, it is far worse. Every member here has similar cases in his own State. That is why these representatives of millions of Americans who live with these facts, have come before us favoring Federal aid for school construction. That is why they are not frightened away by theoretical objections. Theories will not build schools, will not solve our problems. If we withhold this help now, because in "theory" the States should be able to do the job, or because of "theories" about Federal domination, we will end up with theoretical classes in theoretical buildings but the neglected and poorly educated children will be very real indeed.

We hear a lot of fine generalities from those who oppose this legislation. They talk about the horrors of Federal domination—they see camels' noses under every tent and they are absolutely certain that one thing leads to another. I sometimes wonder if these men, in 1790, would not have opposed a Federal Post Office on the argument it would lead to Federal control of letter writing.

Some of these people came in before the Education and Labor Committee and opposed Federal aid because, they said, they were handling the problem at the local level. A spokesman for a State "taxpayers' association" came in and told us his State "is paying its own way and is solving its school-construction problems" and assured us that they would "use the taxing power of the whole State" to meet their school needs. But a little later, a representative of the State Teachers Association from the same State testified before us and told us they did need help. Furthermore, he said the earlier witness, who wanted this problem left to the State has not helped us a bit at the State level. Some people who oppose Federal aid for schools say let the States do it. Then they go home and do everything they can to prevent State help—because of fear of State control or because the local district ought to do it or some other reason. So little gets done and we find ourselves in the situation we are in today.

They tell us that Federal funds will lead to Federal domination of the schools. But we have been spending Federal funds to help the States with their schools for many years, and we do not have Federal domination. Do we have Federal control of schools through the school lunch program, the school milk program, the vocational education program for which we just this week approved $29 million? Do we have it through the impacted areas program? I was in the education field for many years. I never once saw any indication of Federal control. We will not have Federal control of schools as long as we have responsible, alert citizens who care about their schools and who are prepared to protect them against Federal, State, or any other domination.

Can anyone seriously go through the long list of organizations I have cited, all of whom support this bill, and say these people are supporting Federal domination, or that, caring as they do about education, they and millions of other Americans like them would support the bill that would in any way allow Federal control.

I appeal today to those who deal in rigid generalities and theoretical dogmas to lay aside these prejudgments and these generalities, and judge this issue in light of the facts. We need schools. Our children desperately need them if we are not to have a generation of half-educated young people whose first lesson in school was how to sit two to a seat and in some cases how to duck the crumbling masonry. To build the schools we need when we need them, and that means now, the Federal Government will have to help. These are the facts. They have been recorded, beyond argument, by the long list of Americans I have cited, who know and care about this problem. Can we not consider this problem in a practical, calm, and factual way, leaving aside for the moment these fine, theoretical arguments? Can we not go ahead to build these schools? Our children 10 years from now will never know whether the schoolroom they sat in was built with Federal or State money. They will be educated as well in one room as another. They will not be tainted by the money that built the room. But if they have decent schoolrooms and the chance for a decent education, wherever the money came from, I believe they will be grateful. I hope we can give them that chance.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to express my very strong and enthusiastic support for the bill which we are considering today, H. R. 7535, the Kelley school construction bill. And particularly, Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment my able colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, whose name the bill bears. His able leadership has been largely responsible for the excellent measure which now lies before you for action. I wish to express my keen pleasure in working together with him in committee on this bill. The opportunity to associate with the gentlemen in this constructive way for the welfare of our Nation and our Nation's children is one of the rewarding experiences of public life as the representative of the good citizens of the Fourth New Jersey Congressional District.

Now, my purpose in rising, Mr. Chairman, is to focus our minds' eyes upon one particular provision of the bill—upon section 107 of the bill.

This section makes sure that wages prevailing in the locality are paid to laborers and mechanics who build the schools which our children will occupy. I am 100 percent in favor of this proposition.

This prevailing wage principle is nothing new in our Government—either State or Federal. Just the other day I had some research done on State prevailing wage laws covering public construction. I found that 31 States, Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia all have these laws similar to the Federal Davis-Bacon Act. My own State of New Jersey has an excellent law. But our law does not apply to federally assisted projects for the reason that these projects should be subject to an overall Federal prevailing wage law. So we in New Jersey are counting on the Congress to fill up the gap by enacting section 107 as it now stands in the bill.

I have also found, Mr. Chairman, that adoption of a prevailing wage principle has not been a partisan issue over the years. As a matter of fact, the original Davis-Bacon Act was first introduced in this House in 1926 by the late Congressman Robert Low Bacon, a distinguished Republican Representative from the State of New York. In the Senate the bill was first introduced by the late Senator James Davis, former Secretary of Labor under three Republican Presidents. It was first passed in 1931 under a Republican administration and by a Republican Congress.

Later on, in 1935, the Davis-Bacon Act was considerably strengthened and improved under a Democratic administration and by a Democratic Congress. Today, both Democrats and Republicans are supporting the extension of the Davis-Bacon Act to apply to federally assisted school construction under this bill. Section 107 of the bill, the section which applies the Davis-Bacon Act is absolutely identical to the section in the education bill endorsed by President Eisenhower and sponsored in the Senate by Senator SMITH of my own State. We received strong bipartisan support for this section in committee and I am confident that the section now receives the strong bipartisan support and approval of a very large majority of this House today.

A very sound principle underlies the prevailing wage requirements affirmed by this bill. It is simply this: The very great purchasing power of the Federal Government—the vast expenditure of public moneys shall not be used in a manner to depress the wage structure of the community. A striking example of the opposite of this principle was given by Congressman Bacon when, many years ago, he explained on the floor of this House what prompted him to introduce the original bill.

He told a true story occurring in his own community where the United States Government asked for bids on a new hospital. Out-of-State contractors underbid all New York State contractors on this job because the out-of-State men could ignore the comparatively high labor standards then prevailing in the New York area but the local contractors could not.

What was the result?

The successful bidder brought in some thousand laborers at low wages, crowding out the local labor supply. Local conditions were entirely disrupted. I am told that these out-of-State laborers were later cast off by the contractor at the end of the job. They became a relief burden to the people of New York—and a continuing threat to the jobs of craftsmen in that locality.

Now this is a condition which we cannot afford to have repeated where the massive expenditure of Federal funds is involved. Today the volume of new construction put in place runs somewhere over 40 billions of dollars year after year. The amount of federally supported construction runs about 14 billions each year—or more than a third of our total annual dollar volume. Let's just stop and think for a minute about the meaning of these figures, in terms of production, of employment, of payrolls, in the mines and mills, the shops and factories of America.

No really accurate figures are available to demonstrate the immense impact of the construction industry on the Nation's welfare. It is enough to say that prosperity or depression in the construction industry can make the difference between prosperity and depression for our national economy as a whole, and the great and increasing role

of the Federal Government in the construction industry carries with it a very heavy burden of responsibility. Any person or agency promoting or assisting at least a third of all new construction put in place in a single year, year after year, has what amounts to a public duty to use this enormous economic power in the best interests of all segments of our economy.

A false or a misguided step here or there can help to undermine the very standards which have been an important part of our prosperity and of our growth.

Here is where the matter of prevailing wages comes in. In 1954, there were around 900,000 craftsmen employed on work assisted by the Federal Government.

About the same number were employed last year. The payrolls on this work run annually into the billions of dollars. Now, these dollars are not only put to work to provide the journeymen and his family with the necessities and a few of the modest luxuries of life.

They do much more than that; they help us buy the products of the farmer, the merchant, and the manufacturer.

They help these businessmen support their families and meet their payrolls, and thus in turn support even more workers in other lines of endeavor and to meet their own modest demands. We can easily see the serious hidden effects which can follow any serious cuts in wages on construction assisted by the Federal Government. Unless the Government makes sure that wages on this construction are in line with going rates and practices, the contracts for construction can easily go to the firm whose labor costs are below the standards set for that particular area.

These cut rates present ruthless competition for contractors who pay the going or prevailing rate. Inevitably they serve to undermine the going rate. They bring about the gradual collapse of the entire wage structure, not only on Government work, but on all construction in any community where this kind of unfair competition is allowed to exist. Then, there can follow a kind of chain reaction, a broad downward movement of wages and prices in the community, a slowing down in the business of all who depend upon the construction work for making a living.

The exact effects are hard to measure; but they are easy to describe. I think I have said enough to give you the idea that wage practices on Government construction can, in my judgment, provide the opening wedge for a full-blown depression in this land of ours.

In one area after another the Federal Government has faced up to this challenging responsibility. We passed the Davis-Bacon Act 25 years ago to apply to public works. In those days the great bulk of Federal construction expenditures was for public works of the United States. Gradually over the years, however, the character of Federal construction outlays has changed. More and more, we have been tending to aid and support construction by local public and private agencies. Today almost $10 billion of the $14 billion total involves federally assisted construction rather than direct construction on Federal public works.

As each new authorizing statute has been passed, the Congress has frequently taken action to make sure that construction undertaken with Federal money is carried out in accordance with the prevailing-wage principle of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Since the middle thirties, for example, housing has been a fundamental concern of the Federal Government—slum clearance, urban renewal, low-rent public housing, defense housing, multitype dwellings for rental purposes, and so on.

The Federal Government has not undertaken this housing itself. Instead it has assisted construction through loans, grants, or mortgage insurance.

Nevertheless, to each one of these programs the Congress has extended the prevailing wage principle. I refer to the United States Housing Act of 1937; the Housing Act of 1949; the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Service Act of 1951; the National Housing Act, as amended.

Building airports, planning and building hospitals, even planning and building schools—building done through State funds matching Federal grants—the very subject of the Kelley bill—all these have been very properly subjected to the prevailing wage principle by applying the Davis-Bacon Act to State and local construction aided by Federal financing. I refer to the Federal Airport Act; the Hospital Survey and Construction Act; and the School Survey and Construction Act.

Just recently we passed a multibillion-dollar public highway bill which places the finances of the Federal Government behind a vast network of new nationwide superhighways. These will be State-built roads but the Davis-Bacon Act will apply to them whenever the moneys are mingled for construction of interstate highways.

We can readily see, Mr. Chairman, that there is broad basis—ample precedent for applying the Davis-Bacon Act to State and local construction financed in part by local funds. The fact that Federal financing is also involved presents long recognized and very valid grounds for seeing that Federal funds are not improperly used to destroy existing labor standards.

Now, let us turn to the particular program presented to us by the Kelley bill. We have here a 4-year, multibillion-dollar school construction proposal.

With the State and Federal authorities cooperating on a 50–50 basis, over $3 million will be spent at a rate of $800 million a year. This will mean about 57,000 more jobs each year for building and construction tradesmen. At this rate it is clear, Mr. Chairman, that this program will have a very substantial impact upon the economy of the whole country. If we do not make sure that these schools are built in line with the standards prevailing in the community, we may very likely see a repetition in one instance after another of the very evils that Congressman Bacon found in his hometown. We may see the wage structures in our communities completely disrupted by cheap outside labor. We may see Federal funds used on one contract after another where the lowest bidder gets the job solely because he is able to undercut the labor costs of the hometown contractors.

This will mean one city after another in which the wages and purchasing power can be seriously undermined with surprisingly disastrous results to local business and industry. It certainly can help to start the very kind of downward spiral that results in depressions on a national basis.

These are very real possibilities which the committee considered carefully when it decided to apply the Davis-Bacon Act to school construction under this bill. But they were not the only considerations. One other very important factor served to persuade us that this provision is an indispensable item in the bill.

It is this.

The wage-cutting contractor—the out-of-State contractor who chisels on his labor costs—not only gets poor workmen and poor workmanship but he is apt to use defective or poorly made equipment and materials wherever he can.

In particular, I have in mind an investigation made some years ago at a time when the housing agencies did not take any direct action to secure compliance with prevailing wage requirements. In 11 States alone workers were deprived of more than $600,000 worth of unpaid wages due to violations of the act.

This will give a rough idea of what can happen when there are no prevailing wage standards at all to curb the chiseler.

But the investigation showed much more than that. It also showed that faulty building goes hand in hand with chiseling on wages. In case after case, where workers were underpaid the building structure itself was inferior.

Mr. Chairman, we are embarking on a nationwide program under which more than $1,500,000,000 of taxpayers' money in the Federal Treasury can be converted into much needed schools for our children. I am sure we all want to get our money's worth in sound and lasting structures. I am sure we all want to see safe and sanitary school buildings of lasting quality.

The prevailing wage provisions of section 107 are a guarantee to the Federal Government that we will obtain the qualified craftsmen in every community to build our schools because these provisions guarantee the going rate paid to these craftsmen in each and every community. Poor workmanship due to poorly paid and inferior workers can be avoided by the fair and effective use of this provision. The quality of the work will meet requirements. The rate of construction will be in time with the best standards. The taxpayer and his children will receive the best product which his money can buy.

I think it is rather obvious, Mr. Chairman, that the local school construction with Federal funds under this bill is as much a national problem of concern to the Federal Government as the building of a local hospital with Federal funds in Congressman Bacon's district 30 years ago. Both impose a clear responsibility—a duty to act. The Congress first

took the required action back in 1931. We took the same type of action when we of the committee voted to recommend section 107 to the House for passage. As I have stated before, I am sure that a very large majority of this body will see the wisdom of our action and give overwhelming approval to this aspect of the school construction bill.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, may I say at the outset I would like to commend and congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] for his calm and logical analysis of the amendment which he proposes to place before this body at the proper time. I believe that those who will reread it and study it will find that it is almost unanswerable. Certainly in the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky when he said he was opposed to the Powell amendment because of the fact that the Supreme Court had not set or given any time limitation to the implementation of the recent Supreme Court decision and that, therefore, the 4-year life of the Kelley bill would mean that it was not applicable, logic has disappeared. We must remember the fact that not only on this floor, but also in legislative action in some States it has been made very clear that it is not a question of time but a frank statement that never will an effort be made to live up to the Supreme Court decision. It is that, I believe, which we must face as responsible Members of this House. Therefore, as we reread the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], I think that they will remain as completely unanswerable, except for the understandable position taken by those who are determined that this Supreme Court decision shall not remain the law of the land. It is because of this unyielding stand that we urge the adoption of the Powell amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hear a great deal about the fact that States like my own State of California and the State of New York ought not to support Federal aid for schools because we are so well able to take care of our own needs. These people seem to believe, and many of them have said so, that education has no interstate character—that each State needs to be concerned with its own residents alone and with the children of no other State.

I am sorry to say that with the single exception of one outstanding member, Mrs. Georgiana Hardy, the school board of my home city of Los Angeles has resolved on such a point of view. But I must remind these Californians of something that they, as residents of this progressive and growing State, know better than probably any other people in America. That fact is—the people who live in any one State of the Union today may have been born and educated in nearly any and every other State in the Union. America is on the move today, and great numbers have moved into California and other States. They make their homes and their livings in California, and they cast their votes in California. We never ask our neighbors where they came from or how adequate their educations were before they move into our State. But it would be most shortsighted to believe that we have no stake in the educations that these people and their children may receive before coming to California. I think it is quite clear that we have an interest in the education being given today to the children of every State in the Nation.

As a Representative from California, which has grown faster than perhaps any other State in the country in the last few years, I could emphasize and document this point at great length. However, I would prefer to spend the time allotted to me in dealing with another point of interest to the people of my district and all districts which has, I am afraid, so far received far too little attention, and which will help to explain my deep interest in this Federal-aid measure.

The argument is often made by those who oppose Federal assistance for education to the States that both the Federal taxes and the State taxes must be paid by the same people, and that there is, therefore, no reason for letting the Federal Government use its tax powers to raise money for schools.

The most important answer to this argument, an answer that is all too often overlooked, is that the Federal tax system does not tax the same people in the same way as do the systems under which the States raise their tax revenue. Studies submitted to the Joint Economic Committee have shown in detail what we all know in general, that the Federal system places far less burden on the lower-income families of our Nation than do the various State tax systems.

For example, in 1954, those families whose incomes were below $5,000 per year paid 26½ percent of the Federal taxes; however, they paid 42 percent of the State and local taxes collected that year.

For those families whose incomes were below $3,000 per year, the difference is even more marked. These families paid 8 percent of the Federal taxes; they paid almost twice that share—15.5 percent—of the State and local taxes on which our schools now depend.

I submit for the RECORD one table taken from such a study, to show how the effect of the Federal taxes compares with effect of these State and local taxes, by income group:

Estimated distribution of tax payments for 1954

[Percent of total yield contributed by income brackets]

	Spending unit income brackets (thousands of dollars)							
	0 to $2,000	$2,000 to $3,000	$3,000 to $4,000	$4,000 to $5,000	$5,000 to $7,500	$7,500 to $10,000	Over $10,000	Total
FEDERAL TAXES								
(1) Personal income tax	1.6	3.7	8.0	10.2	28.3	13.9	34.3	100
(2) Estate and gift taxes							100.0	100
(3) Corporate profits tax	3.3	4.5	6.3	6.8	15.0	6.9	57.1	100
(4) Excises	8.2	9.8	14.4	14.8	28.2	10.3	14.3	100
(5) Customs	8.2	9.8	14.4	14.8	28.2	10.3	14.3	100
(6) Social-insurance contribution	6.8	10.3	17.9	18.5	28.6	8.6	9.1	100
(7) Total	3.7	5.6	9.7	10.9	24.4	10.7	35.0	100
(8) Without social-insurance contribution	3.2	4.9	8.5	9.8	23.9	11.0	38.7	100
STATE AND LOCAL TAXES								
(9) Personal income tax	.2	2.3	6.0	7.2	22.0	12.7	49.5	100
(10) Inheritance and gift taxes							100.0	100
(11) Corporate profits tax	3.3	4.6	6.4	6.8	15.0	6.9	56.9	100
(12) Excise and sales taxes	8.2	9.8	14.4	14.8	28.2	10.3	14.3	100
(13) Property	7.0	8.4	13.0	13.9	25.7	10.0	22.1	100
(14) Social-insurance contribution	4.7	8.8	13.2	18.8	30.8	11.5	12.1	100
(15) Total	6.9	8.5	13.0	13.9	26.3	10.1	21.3	100
(16) Without social-insurance contribution	7.0	8.5	12.9	13.6	26.0	10.0	21.9	100
ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT								
(17) Total	4.6	6.4	10.6	11.8	25.0	10.5	31.2	100
(18) Without social-insurance contribution	4.3	6.0	9.8	10.9	24.5	10.7	33.8	100

Source: The Incidence of the Tax Structure and Its Effects on Consumption, Richard A. Musgrave, University of Michigan; Federal Tax Policy for Economic Growth and Stability, papers submitted by panelists appearing before the Subcommittee on Tax Policy, Joint Committee on the Economic Report, Nov. 9, 1955.

The reason for this difference lies mainly in the fact that no State can make the same use of the personal income tax and the tax on corporate profits that the Federal Government has made of these taxes. It is the Federal Government, far more than even the most favored States, that can reach the most fortunate and wealthiest people in our country, and ask them to assume their share of the cost of educating our children. In 1955, 15 States had no corporation profits tax at all, and 17 States had no personal income tax. Thirteen of the States had neither a tax on personal nor on corporate incomes, and many of the others got only a very small part of their revenue from these taxes.

Up until the time of the depression, the major source of money for schools was the local property tax. The local property owner carried nearly all the cost of providing the basic education for our children.

In 1929, the local school districts provided 83 percent of the money for schools, while the States paid only 17 percent of the cost of public education.

In the 1930 depression, the States had to relieve the property owner of some

part of this burden. The States did assume a larger share of the cost of paying for schools; they adopted sales taxes to provide the revenue.

In the 1953–54 school year, the States put up more than 37 percent of the money spent for schools, more than twice their predepression share, and by this time, the States were getting almost 60 percent of their tax revenue out of sales and similar taxes, instead of the very small, nominal use they had made of these taxes before the depression.

The result is that the States and the local school districts are forced to raise the money—not just for schools but for all State services—in great measure through property taxes and through sales taxes which bear unduly on those families which have the lowest incomes to begin with. By permitting the Federal tax system to raise even the small amount of the money here being proposed, we would be giving those families at least this small protection against further erosion of their buying power through these particular taxes.

The situation that I am describing is not unique to a few of our States; there is not one State in this Nation which can do as well as Congress can in placing the tax burden for the schools that are immediately needed on those best able to bear it.

In supporting this Federal aid measure, I am, in addition to other fundamental reasons, seeking to protect the buying power and the living standards of the lowest income families of my State of California. But the same program will protect the same group of families in the other 47 States as well.

These are the people who most need and deserve our help; helping them, we are protecting the market which they provide and on which American prosperity depends.

Let me talk for just a few minutes about the families whose incomes are below $6,000 per year. They make up more than two-thirds of our families.

The State and local tax systems, as they were constituted in 1954, would tax these families $1.60 when the Federal system would tax them a dollar. It is that additional 60 cents of burdensome taxation that I am trying to avoid. Federal aid for schools would save the under-$3,000 families in my State of California between $2 and $2.5 million for each billion dollars in our Federal-aid program. Under the Kelley bill, which would provide $1.6 billion in 4 years, the saving could run as high as $3 to $4 million for these families, which need the buying power so much.

Certainly, I understand that the total amount of Federal tax raised in California would be greater than the amount of Federal aid we would receive. But California is a wealthy State. I say this not in pride, but in thankfulness for the blessings we have received. In 1953, when the national per capita income was $1,707, the per capita income in California was $2,039. I am not surprised, nor am I shocked, that Federal taxes would take a small part of the income of our wealthiest people and our corporations to provide for the children of the lowest income families—our neighbors and fellow Americans—in other parts of the country.

I am glad to support a bill that will help provide schools for American children. I am particularly glad to support it, knowing that I am at the same time helping the lowest income families in California, as well as in every other State of the Union by doing so.

I want to emphasize that the lowest income groups in practically every State will save millions of dollars if the Kelley bill is passed. This will be true, not alone in the States where the average income is low; it will be true, too, in my State and in the big industrial States like Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan.

I have studied the figures. I have compared the amount of money that will be paid by the people in the various income brackets in each State under these different conditions:

First. The burden on these people if the tax revenues of the Federal Government are used to provide a billion dollars of Federal aid for schools; and

Second. The burden on these same people if each of the States were to provide, out of its own revenues, the same amount of money that would otherwise come from the Federal-aid program.

Let me give you a few examples of the benefits that will come to the lowest income families from a Federal-aid program, like this one we are discussing:

In the State of Georgia, the average per capita income is unfortunately below the national average. This bill would help the people of Georgia, even those in the middle-income brackets. But the people who need help the most, those whose incomes are below $5,000 per year, would save about $8 million in taxes for each billion dollars of aid that we might provide for the schoolchildren of America. The Kelley bill would save these people nearly $13 million. This is purchasing power that these people can use for the necessities of life. We will be helping not only these families, but those whose business depends on their purchases.

Illinois is a wealthy State, but it too has low-income families. Our proposal to aid Illinois schools, along with the rest of the country, will save approximately $4 million for the families in Illinois whose incomes are below $5,000 per year for each billion dollars of Federal aid. The savings under the Kelley bill should run as high as $6 million for these families.

Mississippi has a very low per capita income, less than half the national average in 1953. If Mississippi were to raise, through its own tax system, the money to which it would be entitled under a Federal-aid program of a billion dollars, the under $5,000 group of families would pay $6,500,000 more in State taxes than they would pay if the Federal Government financed the program.

But, so would this same group of families in Michigan pay $6,500,000 more in State taxes to raise the amount of money which Michigan would get in Federal aid from such a program. Again, under the Kelley bill, the savings would be greater—approximately $10 million for this group in each of the States. Here are some of these facts in table form:

Michigan

[In millions]

Federal tax, per billion dollars of tax collections.... $48.2
Share of a billion dollars of school aid (flat amount per child)..... 43.2

Income group	How Federal tax of $48.2 million would be distributed in Michigan	How Michigan tax of $43.2 million would be distributed	Difference
Under $3,000	$4.0	$7.5	+$3.5
$3,000 to $5,000	9.0	12.3	+3.0
$5,000 to $7,500	11.5	12.0	+.5
$7,500 to $10,000	5.0	4.5	−.5
Over $10,000	18.5	7.0	−11.5
Total	48.2	43.2	−5.0

Ohio

[In millions]

Federal tax, per billion dollars of tax collections.... $58.0
Share of a billion dollars of school aid (flat amount per child)..... 50.5

Income group	How Federal tax of $58 million would be distributed in Ohio	How Ohio tax of $50.5 million would be distributed	Difference
Under $3,000	$4.5	$8.5	+$4.0
$3,000 to $5,000	10.5	14.5	+4.0
$5,000 to $7,500	13.5	14.0	+.5
$7,500 to $10,000	6.5	5.5	−1.0
Over $10,000	23.0	8.0	−15.0
Total	58.0	50.5	−7.5

NOTE.—Per capita income in Ohio, $2,012; national average, $1,707.

Georgia

[In millions]

Federal tax, per billion dollars of tax collections.... $13.5
Share of a billion dollars of school aid (flat amount per child)..... 27.0

Income group	How Federal tax of $13.5 million would be distributed in Georgia	How Georgia tax of $27 million would be distributed	Difference
Under $3,000	$1.1	$4.4	+$3.3
$3,000 to $5,000	2.7	7.5	+4.8
$5,000 to $7,500	3.2	7.2	+4.0
$7,500 to $10,000	1.5	2.9	+1.4
Over $10,000	5.0	5.0	
Total	13.5	27.0	+13.5

NOTE.—Per capita income in Georgia $1,184; national average, $1,707.

California

[In millions]

Federal tax, per billion dollars of tax collections.... $94.5
Share of a billion dollars of school aid (flat amount per child)..... 66.0

Income group	How Federal tax of $94.5 million would be distributed in California	How California tax of $66 million would be distributed	Difference
Under $3,000	$7.5	$10.0	+$2.5
$3,000 to $5,000	16.7	16.7	
$5,000 to $7,500	22.0	17.0	−5.0
$7,500 to $10,000	10.0	6.5	−3.5
Over $10,000	38.3	15.8	−22.5
Total	94.5	66.0	−28.5

NOTE.—Per capita income in California $2,039 (ranks 7), national average $1,707.

Mississippi

[In millions]

Federal tax, per billion dollars of tax collections.... $4.20
Share of a billion dollars of school aid (flat amount per child)..... 17.65

Income group	How Federal tax of $4.20 million would be distributed in Mississippi	How Mississippi tax of $17.65 million would be distributed	Difference
Under $3,000	$0.40	$2.85	+$2.5
$3,000 to $5,000	.80	4.80	+4.0
$5,000 to $7,500	1.00	4.50	+3.5
$7,500 to $10,000	.50	2.00	+1.5
Over $10,000	1.50	3.50	+2.0
Total	4.20	17.65	+13.50

NOTE.—Per capita income in Mississippi $834, national average $1,707.

I will not burden this body with additional figures. I will, however, ask the important question to which these figures lead. That question is: What defensible reason can there be for not passing this bill; how can we justify refusing to give the people whose incomes are low, and whose purchasing power is crucial, this protection? Are we turning down this proposal because of unfounded fears about States' rights—fears that in this case will mean that the wealthiest families in each State will escape paying their rightful share of the cost of the schools our children need?

No one is suggesting that the Federal Government build all the schools that are needed, or that we raise all the money through Federal taxes. It is this slight measure of relief, important to the lower income families out of proportion to its total significance in the economy, that we are being asked to provide. I hope we can take advantage of the opportunity that is ours. By the passage of this bill we take a vital step of insuring that all American children, no matter where the accident of their birth, shall have reasonably adequate school facilities.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Are there any taxes that residents of the State of California do not pay whether it be corporate, income, sales, or any kind of tax?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will be glad to put in the RECORD the exact figures to show why they have not, in California, the same kind of income-tax law the Federal Government has. However, if you will examine the two laws you will see that even in California the State income-tax law bears more heavily on those in the lower income brackets.

Mr. YOUNGER. The gentleman is going to put those facts in the RECORD?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes; I am.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I want to state my position on Federal aid to schools as follows.

I am opposed to Federal aid for the maintenance and operation of our schools largely on account of the danger of Federal control. On the other hand I favor Federal aid for school construction only but as a last resort because the danger from any Federal control is slight and that danger exists only during the planning and construction period. When the building is turned over to the local authorities there can be no more Federal control.

I favor helping only those States which need help and only in proportion to their need. That is why I favor S. 2905, the Senate bill. It has a strong equalization factor. For example with an allotment of $250 million under the provisions of S. 2905, the two poorest States would receive $11,393,000 and $11,317,000 respectively, whereas by an allotment of $400 million under the Kelley bill these same States would receive only $5,731,000 and $5,266,000. In other words, the Senate version would give these two States nearly double the money with 38 percent less burden on the taxpayers.

Then again, I am in favor of the incentive factor found in S. 2905 and not found in the Kelley bill. By this method, needy States are helped in proportion to their effort to help themselves.

I favor Federal aid for school construction only as a temporary expedient to tide us over the present crisis. We faced a similar building crisis on the college level after World War II. The President's Commission on Higher Education, of which I was a member, was faced with the problem of finding room for 1½ million student stations. Federal aid was the answer. This aid was withdrawn as soon as the emergency was met. Likewise we had Federal aid under the GI bill of rights. This bill did not fasten itself upon us as a permanent policy. It was terminated a year ago last January 30.

My first choice then is S. 2905 and I shall support any amendments to the Kelley bill which incorporate the principles of the Senate version. My second choice is the Kelley bill. If both bills become so bogged down with extraneous social legislation that they cannot pass, then the third best thing would be to grant a flat sum of $400 million to the States to match their funds for building purposes or better still to reduce the Federal income tax 1 percent to States that would add to their State income tax for school construction a like amount.

My reasons for supporting Federal aid are as follows:

First, there is a demonstrated need for more and better public school buildings.

This need has been so clearly brought out in the White House Conference Report and on the floor of the House today that I shall not take the time to dwell upon it further. I do ask, however, consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following this speech to include a statement of need in my own State.

The White House Conference Report says:

> It appears that under present plans, only 2 or 3 States have been quoted as stating that they can meet their building needs for the next 5 years * * * Under present plans and time limitation stipulations, it seems to be virtually impossible for most of the States to meet building needs.

The New York Times, under date of January 13, reports:

> Fifty thousand new classrooms a year are needed just to keep up with the new faces that appear at the doors, and we have a deficit of some 300,000 classrooms. Nearly a million American children are being deprived of full educational opportunities.

Second, the need can be met more successfully through Federal aid.

While I favor Federal aid only as a last resort, and not at all for operating expenses, I am now convinced that the need for school buildings is so acute that we have reached this last resort.

Committee 5 of the White House Conference reporting on "How can we finance our schools, build and operate them?" states:

> A substantial majority felt that some States do not have sufficient financial resources to take care of the essential needs of the schools. * * * The participants approved by a ratio of more than 2 to 1 the proposition that the Federal Government should increase its financial participation in public education. Of those favoring such an increase, the overwhelming majority favored an increase in Federal funds for school building construction.

Third, Federal aid is the only effective solution. Opponents of Federal aid say:

> The Federal Government is in debt nearly $300 billion, while many of the States are out of debt. The States themselves are better prepared than the Federal Government to build their own school buildings.

I have the conviction that the wealth of the Nation, wherever it is, should be taxed to support the children of the Nation, wherever they are, and that our Government should go as far as it can to equalize educational opportunity for the children of all of the States. In this respect, the Senate bill is superior to the Kelley bill. Now the wealth per school child ranges greatly from State to State. The average State income per child in 1953 varies from $3,537 in Arkansas, $3,904 in Alabama to $11,517 in New York, $11,301 in Delaware, and $11,110 in Connecticut. In other words, some States are almost four times as able to finance their schools as other States—White House Conference Report, table 6, page 67.

The average State spends 2.72 percent of the income of its citizens for education. Our poorest States, Alabama, Arkansas, and Georgia, already spend more than that; namely, 2.85 percent, 3.02 percent and 3.16 percent respectively, while Connecticut spends 1.9 percent. Apparently, Utah, a State with less than average wealth per school child, makes the greatest sacrifice for education in proportion to her wealth; namely, an expenditure of 4.2 percent—White House Conference Report, page 71, chart 5. New Mexico spends 4 percent and Oregon 4 percent.

Federal aid in situations of this sort is defensible for three reasons; namely, first, it is the only likely source of building funds; second, it relieves the householders from an increased tax on property for buildings at a time when almost

the entire burden of education in my State and other States has been saddled upon the property tax almost to the point of ruin—Federal funds, on the other hand, come mostly from income taxes and other less destructive sources of revenue; and third, in addition to the cost of new classroom facilities there will be an increase in operational costs of $3 to $5 million per year in the State which again must fall largely upon the local property tax. Furthermore, long before the building needs of the elementary and high schools are satisfactorily met, the rising tide of students will be reaching college and our problems will be fully as acute there as in the lower reaches of the school system.

Third, Federal aid to school construction is necessary for the protection of freedom. The cold war has developed into a war of the classrooms.

For a number of years, we have been hearing and reading about the cold war between the Communist East and the democratic West. Recently the nature of this war has greatly changed.

The all-important weapon is no longer the atomic nor the hydrogen bomb. The Soviets, as well as we, know that initiating full-scale nuclear warfare would bring upon themselves quick and sudden destruction. So the Soviet leaders have undertaken to beat us at our own game.

They have openly challenged us to a duel with a weapon which has been basically all-important through the centuries. This instrument, in different forms, has been often used by dictators to establish and extend their power. In other forms it has been used by republics to maintain their freedom from tyranny. This instrument is education.

In the words of former United States Senator and diplomat William Benton, the cold war has become the "war of the classrooms"—New York Times magazine, April 1, 1956, page 15. It has developed into an open competition for technological and scientific supremacy. The maintenance of our supremacy in science, technology, and other fields of knowledge essential to our national survival depends, of course, upon the improvement of our provisions for education.

Let us not be lulled into complacency by the delusion that maintenance of the superiority of our educational system is assured. Our newspapers and other sources of information are bringing us startling news of educational accomplishment behind the Iron Curtain.

For example, a recent article in Life magazine—Life, March 5, 1956, pages 31–36—pointed out that the Soviets are producing an elite generation of specialists "enormously dangerous to the West but so far little noticed by it." This and other sources have revealed that the Russians are showering unprecedented educational opportunities upon their youth in whom they have placed their hope for triumph over the West. Over half a million Soviet youth are already receiving college and university training in science and engineering; and the number of lower school pupils being prepared for higher education in these fields is steadily growing.

According to reliable estimates, at the present rate, by 1960 Soviet specialists will far outnumber those of the United States—in the work cited. President Eisenhower recently drew attention to our national shortage of persons trained in medicine, teaching, nursing, science, engineering, and other fields—message to Congress on January 12, 1956.

A recent study financed by our National Academy of Sciences brought forth significant figures—Nicholas Dewitt, Soviet Professional Manpower, December 1955. It pointed out, for example, that in 1953 there were more than 5½ million persons with higher education in the United States as against only 2 million in the Soviet Union. However, the number of Soviet professionals who had completed higher education was somewhat greater than the number with similar training in the United States. The study revealed that the Soviets are strenuously exerting themselves to improve their whole educational system. In order to prepare such a large number of their youth for professional higher education they are building up their lower schools.

Russia today is going all out for the education of her youth. She is preparing two engineers to our one. She is winning over her youth by providing for them the finest hotels, the finest recreational centers and the finest schools. I am told that gifted youths meeting the requirements of the Communist Party are given free schooling on through the doctor's degree. Russia is cutting her military budget to build her education budget and reducing expenditures for adult activities in order to lavish money on youth. Can the United States afford to sit complacently by and watch such progress of the enemy?

Forty years ago, at least half the Soviet population was classed as illiterate. Today Russia has a 7-year primary school system rivaling our own, with nearly 100 percent enrollment. The secondary schools have developed accordingly, and in spite of labor shortages, practically all children from 7 to 17 are kept in school. Right now, authoritative sources indicate that the U. S. S. R. has already surpassed us in both number and percentage of students enrolled above the secondary level.

Russian students go to school 6 days a week, 10 months a year; discipline, study hours and curriculum follow a strict and rigid pattern. There is a strong concentration on basic subjects, and as the students advance, close to half their work is in science and mathematics, with little or no choice of electives.

There has been a great increase in what the Russians call the "thkhnikums," a type of vocational college which gives a 2½- or 4-year nonprofessional education to technicians, and one estimate places the number of these schools near 2,000.

Money has been no object in the great expansion of Russia's educational system. The new University of Moscow science building, for example, cost about $150 million, which is more than what the complete physical plants costs for many American universities.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy reports:

> In 1954 we graduated only half as many college-trained specialists in engineering and science as we did in 1950. In the same year the Soviets turned out more than twice as many as we.

Allan Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, recently warned that in this present decade the Soviet Union will graduate 1,200,000 university students in the basic physical sciences while we will graduate only 900,000.

Herbert Hoover said 4 years ago:

> The United States with one-sixth the populaion of the world has 40 percent of the world's college graduates. Therein lies America's might and let no one shear us Delilah-like of this strength.

How long will the United States retain this supremecy? Not very long unless there is an awakening here.

I heard Senator Thomas, the sponsor of the GI education bill, testify before the Senate Committee on Education during World War II that the States with 18-year-old compulsory school attendance laws qualified seven out of every 10 draftees while the States with the 14-year to 16-year-old compulsory school attendance laws had almost the reverse situation; namely, they had nearly 7 out of 10 draftees disqualified.

The Selective Service rejection rate of the States is to a great extent almost inversely in proportion to the amount of money spent on education. The poorest States average rejection rate was 48 percent, for educational deficiencies, in 1953, with an average rejection rate among all the States of 16.6 percent. The lowest rejection rate was Minnesota with 2.2 percent and Utah with 2.6 percent. These statistics show rather convincingly the close correlation between national safety and education.

Some opponents of the school bill coming from the more wealthy States ask, "Why should my State pay in so much more than we get out?" One good answer is because when we are at war every State should be able to provide its just quota of men which is impossible when some States have as high as 48 percent rejection for educational deficiencies and other States only 2.2 percent. Furthermore, the best investment the United States can make is to qualify every person possible not only for military service but for scientific, social, and economic and moral progress.

I recall the old fable of the fox and the wild boar, where the fox came upon the wild boar sharpening his teeth on a rock. "What are you doing that for?" asked the fox. "Because when the hounds are after me it's too late."

Fourth, the people have spoken out in favor of Federal aid for school construction.

The people of the United States spoke out in no uncertain terms for Federal aid for school buildings through the White House Conference at Washington, D. C., November 28–December 1, 1955. This conference was the culmi-

nation of more than 4,000 local and State conferences. From the thousands of participants in the State conferences, the State governor appointed 1,800 to attend the White House Conference. Official tabulation of occupations and professions of the 1,800 participants showed that for every educator—that is, teacher, administrator, or school board member—there were two noneducators present. Surely Congress cannot refuse to hear the voice of the people.

The White House Conference in its final report says: "This committee believes that Federal aid for school construction should be made available on a limited basis for all States and Territories and the District of Columbia to help overcome the present school building emergency."

As previously stated, the participants approved such aid by a vote of more than 2 to 1.

Let me summarize as follows: First, there is a need for Federal aid for school buildings to tide us over the present emergency. This need is impressive and has been demonstrated. Second, the need cannot be met successfully by local or State effort alone. Third, Federal aid is necessary for national safety and the protection of freedom. Fourth, the people have spoken.

This is a time for action in the interest of our national survival and the welfare of our Nation's children. Now is the time for us to amend and enact the Kelley bill providing Federal aid for school construction, or if it is not amended we should, in conference committee, substitute the Senate bill for the Kelley bill.

I am the child—all the world awaits my coming.
What I am today the world of tomorrow will be.
Give me, I pray you, those things
Which will make me a blessing to humanity.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Utah yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I congratulate the gentleman from Utah upon his splendid statement. Coming from a former college president and a member of the President's Commission on Higher Education, it is especially significant.

Mr. DIXON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Do you not realize that if Federal grants-in-aid are made to the States and local districts and remove at least 50 percent of the burden of building additional classrooms, they will have a greater amount of local funds left, for instance, to pay for transportation costs, than if they have to assume all of that construction?

Mr. DIXON. Exactly, and that is the only source they can get it from.

Mr. BAILEY. So indirectly we are helping out another situation rather than the building situation without any Federal control.

Mr. DIXON. Without any control over the teachers or the textbooks or the course of study.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Is it not true also that one of the reasons we have this problem is the centralization of the taxing power and the taxing fields in the Federal Government? If it were possible for us to go into a very definite tax study and yield up some of the fields of taxation which we have now entered to these States and local communities, would not the problem solve itself? But since we have not been able to do that, is not this just about the only thing we can do to make sure that the children get an education?

Mr. DIXON. Yes; that is why I am in favor, if we cannot pass one of these bills, of yielding 1 percent of Federal income tax to the States for the support of their schools.

THE UTAH SURVEY REPORT

Mr. Chairman, the research division of the Utah State Department of Education has recently completed a preliminary report of school finance problems in Utah for the next few years.

This study shows, rather dramatically, the magnitude of the problems which we must face in Utah in the next 5 years. After that, we can expect an even greater financial pinch, as our postwar baby crop reaches our colleges and universities.

The first significant increase in children came in 1942. These children are now in our junior high schools. They will be ready for college in about 1960. Because of the urgency of the elementary and secondary problem, I will mention only the school building problem in these grade levels.

The report shows that we can expect to spend between $9 and $12 million per year just to provide new classrooms for the increased numbers of children entering the Utah schools; in addition, we will need between $64 and $85 million to replace those buildings classified as poor and unsatisfactory by the recent State school building survey commission. Poor: If the score is below 500, the building is so inadequate that its continued use is hardly debatable. A building scoring 500 or above in this range may be used as a temporary expedient for a few years, but plans for its abandonment in the near future unquestionably should be made. Unsatisfactory: The building should be abandoned at the earliest possible time. This commission actually visited and scored the school buildings individually. These figures do not include any funds to renovate or remodel substandard buildings. To replace those classified by the commission as poor and unsatisfactory over a 5-year period, it would be necessary to spend between $13 and $17 million each year. If the replacement period is extended to 10 years, the annual expenditure would be between $6.4 and $8.5 million.

The following data will give you a summary picture of the magnitude of our problem in Utah to provide needed classrooms:

	Minimum annual need	More realistic estimates
Annual cost to house increased enrollments	$9,208,200	$12,071,000
Annual cost to replace obsolete buildings in 10 years	6,434,400	8,586,000
Total annual cost of needed classrooms	15,642,600	20,657,000

We are now spending approximately $13 to $14 million annually for physical school facilities in Utah. To raise this money, many of the districts in Utah have bonded to their legal limit. For those districts that have no further bonding power, there is little hope of meeting their needs from present resources.

Assuming a figure half-way between the minimum annual need and a more realistic estimate figure—$18,149,800—for the next several years, we will be required to increase our annual school building expenditures by about $4 million.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-six Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 84]

Adair	Fulton	O'Hara, Minn.
Anfuso	Gordon	Patman
Baker	Gray	Philbin
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Pillion
Bass, N. H.	Halleck	Powell
Bass, Tenn.	Harden	Preston
Bates	Harrison, Va.	Reece, Tenn.
Beamer	Harvey	Reed, N. Y.
Belcher	Hays, Ohio	Rees, Kans.
Bell	Healey	Rutherford
Blatnik	Hillings	Sadlak
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hoffman, Ill.	St. George
	Holtzman	Saylor
Bray	Hull	Scott
Brooks, Tex.	James	Scrivner
Brownson	Jones, Mo.	Scudder
Burdick	Kee	Seely-Brown
Canfield	Kelly, N. Y.	Sheehan
Celler	Kilburn	Shelley
Chase	King, Calif.	Springer
Chatham	Kirwan	Staggers
Coudert	Lane	Taylor
Crumpacker	Lesinski	Thompson, La.
Cunningham	McCulloch	Thompson, Tex.
Curtis, Mo.	McDowell	Thornberry
Davidson	Mack, Wash.	Van Pelt
Davis, Ga.	Martin	Whitten
Davis, Tenn.	Mason	Wickersham
Davis, Wis.	Meader	Wigglesworth
Dempsey	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Calif.
Dorn, N. Y.	Miller, N. Y.	Wilson, Ind.
Dorn, S. C.	Minshall	Withrow
Eberharter	Morano	Yates
Fallon	Morrison	Zelenko
Fino	Mumma	
Fogarty	O'Brien, N. Y.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. McCORMACK] having assumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7535, to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms, and

finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 316 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF JULY 2, 1956

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to inquire of the majority leader concerning the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. The program for next week is as follows:

On Monday, we shall take up the Consent Calendar.

Then there are 12 suspensions. They are as follows:

H. R. 11683, to authorize increased officer strength of the Armed Forces.

H. R. 11575, authorizing the appointment of 3 Assistant Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, for research and development.

H. R. 9555, to amend section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948.

H. R. 10624, a bill relating to General Public Utilities Commission.

S. 3163, the Civil Aeronautics Act, for air carriers, Hawaii and Alaska.

H. R. 9801, to authorize a bridge, Panama Canal Zone.

H. R. 10433, relating to the training of personnel in the fishing industry.

H. R. 11554, relating to the private financing of passenger vessels.

H. R. 11122, relating to the charter of tankers.

H. R. 11570, relating to the Fisheries and Wildlife Act of 1956.

H. R. 10432, relating to travel expenses for students, Federal civil defense.

Then we shall have House Resolution 527, which is the rule on H. R. 11380, the bill relating to readjustment of postal rates. That is on the rule only.

We shall then continue with the bill now under consideration. If this bill is not disposed of on Monday, it will continue until disposed of.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called.

After the disposition of the pending bill—if not on Monday, then on Tuesday—we take up the postal rate increase bill itself.

On Wednesday, July 4, there will be no session.

If there are any rollcalls asked for on Tuesday, they will be put over until Thursday, because there is an Oklahoma primary.

Thereafter, for the remainder of the week, after the disposition of the postal rate increase bill, we shall take up H. R. 10765, relating to the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

House Resolution 541, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2, relating to loan agencies.

H. R. 11695, to extend the school construction program in impacted areas.

H. R. 11132, to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

There are the usual reservations. Conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. May I ask the majority leader: We expect on Thursday, following the recess over the 4th of July, to go on with the regular work at 12 o'clock; is that correct?

Mr. McCORMACK. We shall go on with the regular work, but please do not confine me to the hour of meeting. The hour of meeting on Thursday will be at 12 o'clock. I do not know yet what the hour for meeting will be on Friday.

I hope I have given this program so that it is clearly understood. The important thing is that, with the exception of the suspensions—and I think these are more or less noncontroversial—after the disposition of the bill presently under consideration the next order of business will be the postal increase bill. As to the other bills I have mentioned, we will bring up as many of them as we can.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the hour of meeting on Monday be 12 o'clock?

Mr. McCORMACK. 12 o'clock, yes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to indicate there might be a Saturday session?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, next week. Of course, I always keep a certain amount of flexibility on the program, but I strongly indicate that there may be a Saturday session next week, although I would not want to be bound by that statement.

Mr. LECOMPTE. No, of course not.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are some resolutions out of the Committee on House Administration which have a preferential status. They may be brought up Monday or Tuesday. There are several of them, but I have not put them on the program.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I understood from the Committee on Armed Services that the bill H. R. 5731, relating to substandard military housing, was also going to be brought up under suspension. It has already been granted a rule. I was told it was to be brought up under suspension on Monday, but I did not hear it read in the list of suspensions.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The Committee on Rules just granted that rule today.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I was told by the committee the rule had been granted and it was going to be brought up under suspension, so as to avoid having full debate on it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very sorry to state to my friend from Florida that, although some Member may have spoken to me about it, my memory now is completely vacant as to anyone talking to me about it. Was the bill unanimously reported out of committee?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Yes; it was.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I do not believe there is any objection to the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the Speaker and my friend from Illinois has no objection, suppose I also put that bill down for suspension. The more of these bills we can get rid of by suspension the better it is for all of us, where they are bills that have no strong opposition. If anything should arise concerning this bill between now and Monday, it is with the understanding that the bill will not be called up then.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. May I inquire of the majority leader if he can give us some indication how long these 11 or 12 suspensions will take on Monday? I have been asked probably a hundred times this afternoon if I thought we would get into the consideration of the school construction bill on Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. The answer to that, I think, is yes. I do not think the suspensions will take long. As far as I know, after looking into them and examining them, I think they have all been reported out of committee unanimously. Some of them may be passed by unanimous consent. In the case of bills which involve over a million dollars, the objectors' committee feels such bills should come up under suspension or under the regular rules of the House. I think they are right as a general rule. While this is a long list of suspensions, I do not think their consideration will take long.

Mr. BARDEN. I wonder if the gentleman will go along with me in the statement that if we do not complete the school construction bill on Monday, then, there being no rollcall votes on Tuesday, and the Fourth of July coming on Wednesday, the first rollcall vote possible after Monday would be on Thursday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, during the debate on the armed services bill today, I got up and asked some of the Members why it was that Russia was able to produce more planes and probably better planes than we were. Well, the thing is, they did not want to answer that question and they were quite worried about it. One of the answers, I think, is that they are turning out 2½ times as many engineers as we are. I went to the National Science Foundation, to the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to the NEA, and to the gentleman who spent 1 year in Russia, making a special study on scientific development in Russia. They tell me that one of the major reasons is that the Russians are worshiping science and not God, and that they are making a terrific expansion in nuclear science.

Mr. Chairman, we are now considering H. R. 7535 to provide Federal aid to the States for construction of critically needed school facilities. Earlier this

year I polled educational leaders in my district to get their views on this question.

I mailed questionnaires to teachers, P. T. A. leaders, members of boards of education, and others directly connected with the field of education. I received 392 responses. Of these, 345 unqualifiedly endorsed Federal aid; 17 favored Federal aid with restrictions, and only 30 opposed Federal aid in toto. In view of the overwhelming approval of Federal aid in my district revealed by this questionnaire, I feel that I must, in good conscience, as a representative of the residents of my congressional district, go on record as an endorser of the Kelley bill. Beyond my obligation to the majority of my constituents however, I could not oppose the Kelley bill without ignoring my own convictions which have been strengthened and affirmed by research I have undertaken recently into this very urgent problem.

It is customary to preface all discussions of Federal aid to education with a reaffirmation of the principle that education is primarily a local responsibility. Proponents of Federal aid then normally point out their own determination not to avoid this tradition. Opponents are likely to argue that despite the honorable intentions of those who advocate Federal participation, there can be none without a measure of Federal control, which, however insignificent ab initio, must inevitably burgeon into total occupation of the educational system by the Federal Government, accompanied by the consequent elimination of the primary and preferred responsibility of the localities.

Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that while the debate on this basic question has certainly not been in vain, it has most definitely been overemphasized. That the education of our youth can most conveniently be supervised on the local level, is certainly not subject to debate. That local supervision results in a healthy interest in the school system benefiting both the community and the child is likewise axiomatic. But what is equally true in my estimation is that there is a clear national interest in education which, although it has existed since the founding of our Nation, has become increasingly critical only in recent years.

First of all, education is at the basis of our form of government, for democracy is prefaced upon the right of the individual to intelligently choose how he shall be governed. This choice, in turn, can only be made if the people are sufficiently educated so as to equip themselves with the knowledge and facts necessary to make it. Quite beyond this basic interest, however, the existence of an adequate school system is directly related to innumerable functions delegated by the Constitution to the Federal Government.

One of the most vital of these is the obligation imposed upon the Congress by the Constitution of protecting the United States against foreign enemies. To that end, we are empowered to maintain an Army and a Navy and to promote sufficient military strength to oppose the subjugation of this Nation by an alien power. Since the drafting of the Constitution in Philadelphia over a century and a half ago, the measures called for by this requirement have radically changed. It was for a time sufficient to rely upon a minute defense establishment, far greater reliance for our safety being placed in our natural barriers, the seas, which surround us. Now those obstacles are, in effect, avenues of approach over and through which an aggressor could with ease bring his forces to our shores. It was sufficient for a time to rely for our safety upon the natural pacifism of our fellow nations and their peoples. Even when powerful and aggressive tyrants threatened us, we could rely upon our quick ability to spring to the defense, and meet, with equal military weapons, the challenge to our freedom. Today, however, we are engaged in a new and frightening kind of struggle. It is not war, nor is it peace in the traditional sense—it is not a simple arms race, though, of course, that is a part of the conflict. This unceasing duel, to which we are a party, is developing around the invention and improvement of technological methods. The most essential element of this contest is the production of scientists, engineers, and skilled technicians. Herein lies one of our greatest weapons in this unusual conflict. Our school system, of course, is basic in our efforts to recruit people in technical fields, and that is why, Mr. Chairman, education has become so urgent to the Nation in the last few years. Our modern defense system cannot exist unless our school system is adequate. It is obvious then that we, as a nation, must be concerned with the education of our children, even though it be equally obvious that the respective States of which we, as a nation, are composed, are themselves responsible in the first instance for the maintenance of a system for the instruction of their own citizens.

Throughout our history, the Federal Government has made contributions to the progress of education. Land grants, vocational education legislation, and, of course, veterans' benefits in that field, have been of tremendous assistance to the States; but none of these projects has effected a change in the principle of primary local responsibility. Likewise, I see nothing in the bill now before us exceeding the Federal interest or threatening local control of our educational system. In view of the peril which we face, and the importance of education in our efforts to meet the danger, we must, I firmly believe, take immediate action to help our States keep their schools up to date.

Mr. Chairman, the urgency for action is graphically revealed by a brief look at progress within the Soviet Union. We have only recently been awakened to the growth of the Soviet military effort—a development so dramatic and so far-reaching as to challenge, equal, or, as some have said, to surpass our own defensive strength. A prominent part of her accomplishments can undoubtedly be traced to the development within the U. S. S. R. of a vast educational system. Less than half a century ago, probably more than one-half of the Russian population was illiterate. Today, we find the Communist totalitarian government embarked upon a school program which will shortly approach an enrollment of 100 percent. Under the Russian 10-year school program, each child from 7 to 17 will ultimately be required to attend classes held 6 days a week, 10 months a year. Even today, these children are encouraged, cajoled, and forced into absorbing as much knowledge as their abilities will permit. There are vast numbers of 10-year schools in Russia now. Many more are being constructed.

In addition, there are more than 2,000 vocational colleges which give technical training to 2½ million students who take over key jobs in the Russian industrial effort. Some 800 colleges and universities in Russia have an estimated student population of nearly 2 million. One of these institutions, the University of Moscow, recently completed a 33-story science building containing 1,900 laboratory rooms. This one building cost the equivalent of $150 million. This is more than has been spent on the entire plant of most American universities.

In addition, the Russian Government offers every conceivable incentive to education. According to former Senator William Benton, who visited Soviet Russia and who is an expert in this field, Soviet professors earn the equivalent of the annual salary of an American corporation president. They are granted great prestige and freedom. It is only natural, therefore, that Russia has increased the number of trained engineers from 41,000 in 1920 to 541,000 in 1954, or 1,300 percent.

In the same period, engineers in the United States increased only about 43 percent. Russia last year graduated some 63,000 engineers, 40,000 more than the United States. This same picture is true of scientists and other professions in the technological field. One of our greatest weaknesses is in inducing a sufficient number of high-school graduates to enroll in higher education and particularly in scientific fields.

Of all high-school graduates whose qualifications are such as to warrant their striving to become engineers and scientists, about one-half cease further schooling to go into the business of earning a living. Of the half who go on to college, only 40 percent graduate. Thus, of every 10 high-school graduates with capacities for careers in engineering and science, only 2 graduate from college. From that point on, the attrition is even greater, for of all college graduates less than 3 percent go on with their studies to earn a doctor of philosophy degree.

Secretary Folsom, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, states the same facts in another way. He says that—

> Each year about 60,000 students of high ability drop out of high school before graduation * * * and half of the students in the upper one-fourth of their high-school classes do not go on to college.

Dr. Dael Wolfe, administration secretary, American Association for the Advancement of Science, estimates that 150,000 high-school graduates who have the potential capacities to enter such important specialties as engineering and

science, fail each year to go on to college. This is a loss equal to one-fifth of all the freshmen who enrolled in America's colleges and universities last fall. Had they enrolled, the entering class would have been about 840,000, instead of the presently reported 690,000.

During the current college year, about 10.5 percent of the entire freshman enrollment in colleges and universities chose to specialize in engineering. They totaled 72,800 students. Had all the capable high-school graduates gone to college, and had they followed the present pattern of electing their courses, nearly 84,000 students would have been in engineering courses. And had they carried on to complete their courses, the graduating class in 1960 would be increased by about 20 percent, or some 8,000 more than the 41,000 now estimated for that year.

About half of the students who do not attend college might pursue further education with proper incentive. The lack of incentive is in large part due to the inadequate training in sciences in our high schools. Mr. Speaker, we know that many of our schools lack proper facilities for good science instruction. I shall not dwell upon the need for such facilities because I think it is obvious to anyone who has visited many American schools. This shortage, however, not only deprives the student of training in a field vital to the Nation; but it discourages education in every way. It handicaps teachers and places a burden upon school and college administrations. It is, however, a deficiency which we can correct or at least make progress toward correcting by enactment of the legislation before us today.

Turning again to Russia, let us look at the steps which are being taken there. In 1953, the last year for which statistics are available, the Russian budget included 62,089,527,000 rubles for education and culture. This was approximately 12 percent of the entire Russian budget. In the 1957 budget, we propose to spend for educational purposes a total of $393,705,351, or one-half of 1 percent of our total budget. Using approximate dollar values, this means that the Soviet is spending at least some 20 times as much for education as we are spending. Such a contrast cannot long be continued if we are to continue to exist as a nation. Already, the Russian advances have revealed themselves in the production of planes, nuclear energy, and many other military resources. They will increase to a point far in excess of that which we can hope to attain in the future unless we begin to keep pace. One of the best ways to start is to enact into law H. R. 7535 which will give a much needed boost to our public schools and which will improve the chances of our children to equip themselves to exist in times which will call for the fullest utilization of the abilities of every American citizen.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, America has many domestic problems today. We are trying to solve some of them. This Congress is trying to solve some of them. We just completed the passage of the largest highway construction bill in the history of the earth. The Congress is now in the midst of expanding and broadening the coverage of the Social Security Act. Effective on March 1 of this year, by law we raised the minimum wage. Shortly, we will receive a rivers and harbors bill and a flood-control authorization bill. There are many others. Mr. Chairman, having said this as a background, I want to say, in my humble judgment, there is no piece of legislation now before the Congress, or that has been before the Congress this year, that is of greater importance to the welfare and the well-being of America than is this bill providing Federal aid for school construction.

Mr. Chairman, I have had the privilege of serving on the various subcommittees that have worked on this matter since 1953. I served with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] and his subcommittee that made its final report on December 2, 1954. At that time we said to the country that—

> There is no question that more classrooms are urgently needed. This need has been repeatedly demonstrated by school surveys, by reports from State governors and by testimony during extensive * * * hearings.

I would like to say to the Members of the House that I believe we have had just about every school officer in every State in America before one or the other of our subcommittees since 1953. After hearing all of this testimony, which now comprises many hundred printed pages, we went a bit further and made this statement on December 2, 1954, to which I wholeheartedly subscribe:

> Adequate education for our children is essential to the preservation of a free and strong Nation. Their education must not be impaired by serious classroom shortages which exist in every State in this Union.

My friends, I do not know from first-hand information, of course, what may be the case in any other State in America, but last year in the month of February, I called on the school superintendent of the county of Fayette, Ala., and a member, I believe the chairman of the county board of education. I said to those gentlemen, let us take the next 2 or 3 days and look at every single schoolhouse in this county. We did just that. Then I followed that up last fall by visiting an additional 60 schools in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama. I know not except from what I have heard the witnesses testify what the situation may be in any other State in America, but insofar as what I found to exist in my own congressional district, what I have seen with my own eyes, there is a great and immediate, and I might say, a critical need for school construction and for the legislation which we have before this House this afternoon.

I would like to say at this point, and I want to say it because I believe it very sincerely, that I think we tried in this bill more than any other committee in Congress has ever done in any other bill to eliminate those elements of Federal control that we all fear and that we do not want in this bill. My friend and colleague from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], dealt at great length with that subject this afternoon. I will not repeat what he said, except to say this, that this bill contains less Federal control, if indeed there is any in it, it contains less Federal control than any education bill we have ever passed in the United States Congress, and that includes Public Law 815 and Public Law 874. It includes the original law that we passed in 1917 on vocational education, and it includes the most recent amendments of that act, Public Law 565 of the 83d Congress, which became the law on August 3, 1954.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am glad the gentleman made that point. Is it not true that practically every law that we passed dealing with education has contained State plans? In other words, the State had to decide how the money would be administered and how it would be operated. There is nothing new about a State plan?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The State plan is at least 39 years of age. The State plan is something that this Congress is familiar with. This bill has less State plan about it than does any of the others, insofar as I have been able to ascertain.

Now, this ought to be said: When we had about finished this bill I offered what is commonly known in our committee as the Elliott amendment. It is the last section of this bill, section 405. I want to read it, because I think it is important. I think it cures any other defect in this field of Federal control that you might find in this bill.

Section 405 reads as follows:

> In the administration of this act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curriculum, or program of instruction of any school or school system.

Now, I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that in my humble judgment this bill does not have in it the Federal control that some people who have spoken on it this afternoon appear to find; of course, I accord to them the right to view the matter in any manner they may see fit.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. In relation to section 409 of the bill which the gentleman has just read, I wonder if he would favor an amendment to that section making it read something like this:

> That in the administration of this act no Federal officer, employee, or agency shall have any supervision, direction, or control over: (1) the personnel, curriculum, or program of the institution; (2) the establishment of standards for admission to public schools for any district; or (3) the defining of the area to be served by the school.

Would the gentleman object to the amendment spelling out exactly what is meant by control?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I may say to the gentleman that I think that section 405, as I have just read it, does everything the gentleman wishes except that it does not

go into the detail that he has spelled out. I say further to the gentleman, that if he offers his amendment it will be my intention to vote for it.

Mr. LANDRUM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the membership of this House that I think it would be particularly ill-timed and ill-advised for us to pass the so-called Powell amendment.

We have an unusual problem in the Southland with which many of the Members of this House are familiar; and I say to the membership of this House: Please do not push too far in this direction. All sections of the Deep South have complete school segregation at the present time, and if you pass this so-called Powell amendment, I say to you, Mr. Chairman, the result is going to be that the school children of America, white school children and colored school children in every section are going to suffer. The Powell amendment which seeks to prevent the expenditure of Federal school construction funds in segregated areas, can do no good. It will do great harm.

Let us go forward, Mr. Chairman, to pass this bill and get this school construction program under way and in the next 3 or 4 years get sufficient classrooms that all of our children of whatever race or color will have adequate schools to attend. I sincerely hope that the Members of this House will defeat the Powell amendment and pass this bill.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Does the gentleman believe it will make any great difference whether the Powell amendment were adopted or not insofar as the public schools in his State receiving funds authorized here?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I certainly do, I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi. I have done some research in this field. I may be wrong, no one can be positive about this, but I do not believe it is the intention of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to withhold these funds from any State unless the Department is forced to do so by the Powell amendment. or unless it is directed to do so by court order. As I read the decision of the Supreme Court I do not believe it is the spirit of the decision to press this matter at this time with the speed the gentleman thinks it will be pressed. As I say, maybe the gentleman is right and maybe I am wrong; I do not know, but the gentleman asked me for my opinion.

Mr. COLMER. I did, and I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me and I appreciate his frank statement, but I think the gentleman is doing a little hopeful thinking.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. COLMER. I think the gentleman is doing a little wishful thinking. I call his attention to the fact that I pointed out here yesterday on the floor and put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of the AFL–CIO executive committee, whatever that is, that they are going to watch the administration of this act and that they are going to see there are no funds going to the segregated schools.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I may say to the gentleman that I have not had a chance to read his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and have not seen the statement he refers to, but I do not know that the people to whom he refers will have a great deal to do with the distribution of the funds any more than the gentleman from Mississippi will have or that the gentleman now speaking will have.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman recognizes they have funds and plenty of lawyers, just as the NAACP. I think the gentleman is doing a little wishful thinking.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will say to the gentleman that I hope no group agitates the very delicate situation under which we are operating in the South at the present time. If suits are brought I trust that the courts will handle them with due consideration, and will rule justly and with equity. Our defeat of the Powell amendment here will be a warning to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that it is not the intention of the Congress of the United States that the Department withholds funds from our schools, either under this bill, or under Public Laws 815 and 874, or under the laws pertaining to rehabilitation, or under the laws pertaining to vocational education. I regret with the gentleman that the Supreme Court has ruled segregation in the public schools to be illegal. I regret that there are those who continue to agitate the matter. The gentleman knows, and I know that the South will exhaust every legal means to preserve segregation. I believe there will be segregation in the schools of the South for a long, long time.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE].

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in these few moments in opposition to this legislation. I would not be misunderstood and have you believe that I am of the opinion, however, that we do not need additional school buildings in this country or additional facilities or better facilities. I admit that. I do not think that is the issue here today and it has not been the issue since the beginning of the study on this all-important problem.

We all recognize the fact that in many areas of this land there are not sufficient buildings, there are not sufficient schools, and in many cases facilities and teachers. In some cases the teachers are underpaid. But, whose duty is it to supply these things? That is the issue. That is the fact that is facing us.

Are we going to set aside the orderly processes of carrying on our educational program in this country since the beginning of the country? Are we going to take that duty and that responsibility out of the hands of the local authorities, out of the hands of the people back in the States? I could talk for a long time on States rights. All of us know that much has been said on that question. Much has been said to the effect that some of our States rights have been taken from us, that many steps have been taken in the direction of placing a little more control in the hands of the Federal Government. That is true. Some gentleman yesterday held up a volume that looked almost like a Sears, Roebuck catalog and said:

> These many laws, these many statutes have already been enacted in this country depriving States and the local authorities of certain rights, privileges or powers in connection with the operation of their schools.

They use that as an argument to show it is not dangerous to take a few more rights, privileges, authority and responsibilities from the people.

But I say, look at it on the other hand. The very fact that many statutes, that many regulations, that many steps have been taken that would deprive the States and the local authorities of these rights is evidence we are going to the ultimate end that I tell you we are headed for. You do not do these things, Mr. Chairman, all in one step. You do it by a bite at a time, step by step, one act after another. This one that we are going to take now if we pass this legislation is the biggest, the longest step of all of them and it is the one that will lead to the ultimate end, which means that the control of your schools will before many years go into the hands of Federal authorities. There is no doubt in my mind about that. Of course, that is an opinion, just like those on the other side who have an opposite opinion. But, my friends, you can look at history and you will see that Federal authority follows Federal money, and you give it time enough and it will get there in this case. Federal control follows Federal cold cash dollars. So you do not have to write it into this legislation in order for that to be true. You do not have to have the Powell amendment, as several have already argued here. No. The President of the United States, as a reasonable inference under the decisions of the United States Supreme Court within the last 2 years, or the Commissioner of Federal Education, in my opinion, could issue a Federal order that would say not 1 dollar of this money shall be spent in any school unless that school goes down the line for integration. I do not think there is any question about that, and many good lawyers here have told you that, one a former judge of the supreme court of the State of Montana. I am willing to stand on that gentleman's opinion on that matter.

So let us keep these things that are closest to our people, these things that are dearest, our own schools, in the hands of the people, and let us not, by giving this Federal money, invite Washington and a strong Central Government to come in and take over. Now, I am not the only one of that opinion. There are other Members of the House who have spoken here today who are of that opinion. But also, there are many others who think likewise. Just recently I am sure some of you read an editorial in the Saturday Evening Post. That editorial showed a great deal of background and analysis and thought and study, and it

pointed out, among other things, that the shortage of school buildings in this country today, the shortage of facilities or lack of facilities, was not in the ghost towns or in the depressed areas of this country. It is not there, but on the contrary, the shortage is in the big, wealthy areas where they have people with money and property that they can levy taxes on to remedy their own situation.

Gentlemen, I happen to be from South Carolina, and I would like to tell you what we have done there in the short time I have remaining. When Jim Byrnes was elected governor in 1950 and took office in 1951, South Carolina, the smallest of the Southern States, one of the poorest in the Nation, immediately enacted under this leadership a 3 percent sales tax. That money was earmarked to be used for school buildings and for school purposes and for no other. Now, no one can tell me that every State in this Union cannot take care of its own needs and facilities so far as schools go. I am citing what we did in my little, poor State of South Carolina. In those 4 years while he was governor, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, the State of South Carolina spent $100 million for school buildings and many more millions for facilities and to increase the pay of teachers. So, if we can do it, you can do it. All that you and your people, your governors, and your State legislators have to do is have the courage, enthusiasm, and love to go forth and do what they ought to do, and not call on the Federal Government to hand out more Federal funds.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly happy to follow the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE] because I think the point that I shall attempt to make complements and supplements precisely the point the gentleman has made.

Mr. Chairman, we in the Congress are on clear notice, from certain determined and powerful organizations and leadership in this country, as to their long-term purpose and intent in supporting the legislation before this committee.

For me that purpose and intent is the most compelling reason, among many reasons, for my opposition to this or any similar legislation.

Because I believe we are all entitled to a knowledge and understanding of this purpose and intent, I propose to document a few of the representative declarations on this score.

And because I wish to present these facts as an uninterrupted narrative, I hope I will not be asked to yield during my presentation.

On July 6 of last year the Honorable Adlai Stevenson addressed the annual convention of the National Education Association on the subject of America's No. 1 Must. In this address he said:

> To meet this appalling situation (of schoolroom shortage) we must start—

And I stress the word "start"—

> We must start with passage of the proposals now before Congress for $400 million of Federal funds each year for the next 4 years for school construction to be matched by State funds.

And, Mr. Stevenson went on to say:

> Careful calculations indicate that a Federal grant to the States of approximately $50 million a year for teacher education, if matched by an equal amount of new State funds, will at least break the back of this problem.

That is not all. Mr. Stevenson goes on to say further:

> So much for the present. Over the longer run—

Mr. Stevenson does not say how much longer—

> Over the longer run it may be best, it seems to me, not to tie Federal assistance to specific purposes, such as school contruction, but rather to make unrestricted cash grants to the States on a per pupil basis. State governments would then have much greater flexibility to distribute these funds among local school districts for whatever purpose would most effectively advance education.

There is still another proposal in Mr. Stevenson's program:

> Finally, I would suggest a modest program of national scholarships to promising candidates who upon graduation would undertake to give some years to teaching.

Then comes the payoff sentence in Mr. Stevenson's address to the NEA—and I respect his candor and hope it will be matched on this floor during this debate:

> Yet there should be no evading the fact that the composite program I am suggesting here will be expensive, and it is just a beginning.

There you have it—"just a beginning."

That is what I am talking about today. There is the clear warning signal from one who knows whereof he speaks, and has no hesitancy in proclaiming the goal he has in view.

Unfortunately, the candor of Mr. Stevenson's statement is not always matched by the National Education Association, whose convention he was addressing. Presumably other Members of this House have received in recent months the NEA brochure entitled "Now Is the Time—Act Today To Build Tomorrow's Schools."

This brochure prominently quotes the statement of a witness before a committee of the other body who purported to speak for the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. This witness said:

> This has become a national emergency, and emergencies need special consideration. We believe that such legislation to aid this situation should be on a terminal emergency basis.

The witness, of course, was speaking of the classroom shortage. By quoting this statement, the NEA brochure clearly gives the impression that it favors Federal assistance only on "a terminal emergency basis." Such an impression is totally false. The NEA is officially on record in its 1955 platform as advocating—without any reference to a terminal emergency basis—"financial assistance from the Federal Government to the States for the support of public education."

If there is any remaining question as to the goal of the National Education Association—the goal of permanent, all-out, all-type Federal aid to education—the doubts must be completely dispelled by the testimony before a committee of the other body last year by Dr. William G. Carr, executive secretary of the National Education Association:

> As long as our schools are cut off from the most powerful and efficient and productive form of taxation that we have (Federal taxation, of course), so long will they fail to receive a reasonable share of the great wealth and income of our country.

Can you, my colleagues, by the most generous interpretation of this statement, by the remotest stretch of the imagination, read into this statement of Dr. Carr, an intention to seek and secure Federal assistance to the States for school construction on merely a terminal emergency basis?

Can you interpret this as conforming, in the slightest degree, to the declared intention of President Eisenhower that "once"—the classroom—"shortage is overcome, the Federal-grant program can and must terminate"?

You know the answer.

You know that Adlai Stevenson spoke the truth—"it is just the beginning."

I am not, for a moment, questioning the honesty or the sincerity of those—including many of my colleagues—who earnestly protest that Federal assistance to the States for school construction is a one-time, emergency, terminal program.

But I do question their realism. I question their understanding of the resolute and unyielding purpose of many who welcome—and have long sought—this measure as an opening wedge, as a camel's nose in the tent. I question their awareness of the pressures built up behind the floodgates they propose to open only temporarily.

Bear with me as I cite further testimony as to what these relentless and ruthless pressure groups admittedly have in mind.

I invite you to note this statement, in the February 1956 NEA Journal, by Dr. John K. Norton, head of the department of educational administration at Teachers College, Columbia University:

> Even if $500 million (a year) were voted for school-building aid, it would represent only a first step toward adequate Federal participation in the financial support of education in the United States.

Note also this testimony before a congressional committee last year by Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers:

> We recommend * * * that Federal assistance for school facilities be at least one-third the amount of Federal assistance for highways during the next decade, in order that competition for State (matching) funds may be equitable.

These statements are moderate indeed compared with the next one I shall offer. Listen to this, written in the October 1955 NEA Journal by Finis E. Engleman, State commissioner of education of Connecticut:

> Since for many years funds (that is, from Federal sources) will only be sufficient to supplement the State and local efforts, some safeguards must be erected to insure the continuance of local and State effort to finance their schools.

Can anyone deny that the import of these words is that some day funds from Federal sources will do all—or at least the bulk—of the job? Perhaps Mr. Stevenson spoke even more truly than he knew when he said, "It is just a beginning." I want no part of such a beginning.

In my own State of Michigan, as both you and Mr. Stevenson have reason to know, we have a governor who openly avows his opposition to moderation. That applies to this matter of Federal aid to education as well. He has no patience with a program of $400 million a year for 4 years—a paltry total of $1,600,000,000. He is on record as advocating a 5-year program of $16 billion plus—including $3½ billion for college and university construction and adult education, fertile fields for still further ventures in Federal aid.

Let us make no mistake about it. This small string of "terminal emergency assistance" we hold in our hand, if we elect here to pull it, will release upon us and upon succeeding Congresses, an avalanche of demands which will surely smother all capacity for resistance—and with it all that we have heretofore known as the American principle of State and local responsibility for education, the very foundation of freedom and Federal Government of limited powers.

Permit me to bring it home to you in even more specific terms as to what we are beginning—in political terms if you please.

The NEA brochure I mentioned earlier, issued to the teachers of the Nation, carries this instruction:

> In addition to personal visits and communications with your Congressman, seek the support of political party leaders, including precinct, county, congressional district, and State chairmen. Remember that 1956 is an election year in which each member of the House of Representatives runs for office.

How could coming events cast a clearer shadow before?

And some of us thought we had a difficult problem these past few days in dealing with the subject of veterans' pensions!

This proposed legislation is "just a beginning" not alone in terms of financial demands or perpetual lobbying pressures.

It is also "just a beginning" for the insidious and fatal doctrine that there is really nothing to fear in terms of Federal power and control in the field of education.

Already we are hearing the siren words of reassurance—words that ought to ring like an alarm bell in our conscience and consciousness. Governor Averell Harriman, speaking to his State's White House Conference on Education in support of Federal assistance for school construction said:

> For members of the Administration to oppose Federal aid because of the supposed danger of Federal control, as some have done, is to assert in effect, that they do not have the ability to write the simplest of statutory paragraphs. It is to assert, further, that they do not have the capacity to restrain themselves when they administer the law. I refuse to believe such confessions of ineptitude—even from Republicans.

I prefer to accept the far more realistic warnings of another Democrat, Thomas Jefferson, who spoke so eloquently of the dangers of "confidence in men," and who insisted that they ought to be "bound by the chains of the Constitution."

I recall the statement of another individual, Dr. Benjamin Fine, education editor of the New York Times, who also apparently does not share the concern voiced by Jefferson. Some years ago Dr. Fine told a congressional committee, with what seems to me an excess of flattery:

> I don't know why so many of us are afraid of our Government when all of the people back home are the ones that send you here, and if they continue to send such intelligent representatives in the future as they have in the past, I don't think we need to be concerned that you or the Government will take over the prerogatives of our own citizens.

I am not sure Thomas Jefferson would share that confidence in the Government. I know I do not.

There is written into this bill, H. R. 7535, a purported guarantee against the encroachment of Federal control over education. Section 450 provides that—

> In the administration of this act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curriculum, or program of instruction of any school or school system.

I think the most appropriate comment to be made on that provision was made by the President of Columbia University in 1949 when he spoke of "fancied safeguards" proposed by those "who urge greater and greater centralization of authority and greater and greater dependence upon the Federal Treasury." That Columbia University president, Dwight D. Eisenhower, said:

> My own conviction is that the very fact that they feel the need to surround their proposal with legal safeguards is in itself a cogent argument for the defeat of the proposal.

No statutory provision in the world can provide adequate safeguard against Federal control of education once Federal financing support of education is an accepted principle.

The then United States Commissioner of Education, Samuel M. Brownell, in a minority report of the Education Study Committee of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, said that Federal "grants should be given in such a way as to encourage effective organization and administration of schools; they should not tend to perpetuate inefficient structural school organization within the States." Is not that Federal control of education?

Or listen to this statement in an article in the NEA Journal of December 1955 by Roy E. Larsen and Henry Toy, Jr., chairman and director, respectively, of the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools. This article, incidentally, was not written on the subject of Federal assistance to the States for school construction—it was written on Forces Affecting the Curriculum, for consumption within the professional educational circles—hence its extreme frankness:

> Over the years * * * a number of administrative and leadership functions have devolved upon the (U. S.) Office (of Education) which have made it a vital force in the area of curriculum. The Smith-Hughes and later vocational education acts give the Office of Education considerable administrative authority over vocational programs at both the State and community level.
>
> The publications of the Office of Education have exercised a potent influence over the thinking and action in our classrooms. And the agency's leadership in sponsoring curriculum research and experimentation (as in the case of life-adjustment education) is widely known.

Is not that Federal control of education?

What conceivable statutory safeguard can assure that this terminal emergency program of assistance to the States for school construction will not be just a beginning of more and more Federal influence and control in education?

To ask the question, it seems to me, is to answer it.

In one final respect—to me the most serious of all—this is literally "just a beginning."

I refer to the shameful practice of advocates of all-out permanent Federal aid deprecating and minimizing the accomplishments of States and local units in meeting their own educational problems.

Dr. Carr, of the NEA, whose compelling urge to gain access to the most powerful and efficient and productive form of taxation I have already cited, exemplifies this attitude. In his testimony before the same congressional committee, Dr. Carr asserted that failure to recognize the economic necessity of access to Federal tax support is "the real obstacle beside which all the petty details of tinkering with some local tax rate or some State statute about debt limitations are as molehills to mountains."

Never have I seen concentrated in a single sentence such an ungracious, ungrateful, unwarranted, and brutal expression of contempt for State and local support which over the years has made the American public-school system the greatest and the freest in the world.

It is a wanton and unpardonable slap in the face for a host of public officials and private citizens at State and local levels who have worked, and are working today, unremittingly and with growing success, to cope with the problem of adequate financial support for the schools.

Compare this statement with the fact that in 1955 aggregate State and local support of the schools totaled $10.9 billion—an increase of $1½ billion over the previous year. Incidentally this $1½ billion increase is nearly 4 times the amount of annual Federal aid for school construction proposed in the Kelley bill.

Compare this statement of Dr. Carr with the comment of Governor Stratton, of Illinois:

> We don't need Federal aid for schools (in Illinois). * * * Whatever Federal aid we could get would be only a drop in the bucket compared to what we are doing ourselves.

Compare this slurring comment of Dr. Carr with the fact that in my own congressional district, in the city of Kalamazoo, Mich., the voters of the school district within the past month approved financing of a $14-million school-building program. This is only $3 million less than the Kelley bill would provide for distribution in the entire State of Michigan for an entire year. Incidentally, Michigan will pay $2 for every $1 it will receive under this program. Also, incidentally, this statute will vest in one official of the State of Michigan authority to determine the criteria, the priorities, and the allocations on which these funds will be distributed within the State. And, furthermore, Kalamazoo, I am sure, will not be eligible for any aid—the penalty of having met its own problems; the penalty, in Dr. Carr's words, of "tinkering with some local tax rate."

I want you to know, my colleagues, of some of the thinking, of some of the purposes, of some of the declarations of intent emanating from powerful sources in this Nation. I want you to know of the firm and ruthless determination that this will in truth be "just a beginning."

And what will the end be, if we set our foot upon this path?

I offer only the prophecy of one expert in the field of Federal-State relations, Leonard D. White of the University of Chicago. And it is a dire and tragic warning, particularly with respect to its implications for free public education in these United States. Says Dr. White:

> If present trends continue for another quarter century, the States may be left hollow shells, operating primarily as the field districts of Federal departments and dependent upon the Federal treasury for their support.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The Chairman. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, regardless of the effect on our individual State allotments, we all should support an amendment to this legislation in order that, first, Federal funds will be allocated for school construction on the basis of need; and, second, that those States which are taxing themselves to the hilt to meet their own school-building crisis be given special encouragement.

The bill as reported from committee fails in these particulars.

We all recognize that there is a serious schoolbuilding shortage in the Nation today. This legislation will not solve that shortage. An annual grant of $400 million is a lot of money, but it is only a drop in the bucket as far as the amount of money States and local school districts are now spending for new schools.

Unless we want to go further in debt—or increase Federal taxes—this Federal school-construction aid can never, except in a very small way, solve our schoolbuilding shortage. We must continue to depend upon the resources of our States and local school districts to meet their own building needs.

What then is the excuse for any Federal aid at all? To my mind, the best argument for this legislation is that it is designed to stimulate and encourage our States and local government subdivisions to meet their own problems. By offering to return some of the Federal taxes levied from local residents, this measure hopes to spur State and local governmental units to make even greater efforts locally to finance and build new school structures.

The so-called Kelley bill is inferior to the measure supported by President Eisenhower in this regard. By distributing Federal funds on a straight per-capita basis—to rich and poor districts alike—the Kelley bill will promote even greater inequities in school facilities than now exst. A rich State, which can meet its own building needs, will use this extra money either to put icing on their school building cakes or to reduce an already moderate school-tax levy.

A poor State or district, however, already bonded to the hilt, paying heavy levies for school debt service, taxing to the limit to meet operating expenses, may be hard-pressed meeting the matching requirements of the Kelley bill.

For that reason, I support the President's program. Federal aid for school construction should be more than just another program of returning to the taxpayers dollars the Federal Government takes from them and brings to Washington. The program should be so designed to lead the States and localities toward a solution of their own problem. I hope the House will support the amendment to use the President's formula for distributing Federal-aid funds.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I regard this as an historic debate, and I have listened with great interest to the comments that have come from men who have a dedicated concern about this problem. I speak to you, myself, out of a wealth of educational experience. I was the 1916 summer session teacher at Sunny Point Schoolhouse, District No. 7, Illinois township, Pope County, Ark. I had reached the mature age of 17. I had only 81 pupils enrolled so you know that I imparted a lot of information that summer and acquired a lot myself. It was a little one-room schoolhouse, and I could not find room to seat them all. But, I can say to you today, on the basis of that experience, and contemplating the conditions that have been presented to us today, that this Nation cannot long endure half-seated and half-sheltered.

I must confess that I am a bit envious of the members of the House Committee on Education and Labor. Its members have produced a great piece of legislation and have participated in a dramatic forward step in rounding out a Federal policy on education. I am glad to give this measure my enthusiastic support. While I have reservations as to some of its provisions, particularly those which appear to bypass the States in the extension of credit to districts, I am convinced that its formula for a grant-in-aid is basically correct and that it meets our responsibilities in the present emergency.

We cannot be sure, of course, how the bill will look when amendments have been acted upon, and naturally I will reserve judgment on some of these very difficult questions that have been presented. But, I fear that in a discussion of some of the technical points, we may lose sight of the crucial policy decision being made, and might fail to do a constructive job in what is, perhaps, the No. 1 problem in the United States. Some of my colleagues have spoken as if we were entering a new field. I do not agree that this is the case. As early as 1787, the first year in which we operated under a Federal Constitution, there were Federal grants to education. So, it is not a new program.

This is not the first study that has been made of Federal and State functions in public education. Recently, for example, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, the Kestnbaum Commission, of which I had the privilege of serving along with my friends, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], attempted to approach this problem with an objective attitude. There was little emotion in the discussion we gave to the problem over a period of months. I would like the RECORD to show that the Kestnbaum Commission recommended that where there is a proven need for school building construction, Federal assistance be extended to the States. I am not prepared to say today on the basis of personal knowledge that the need exists in every State. I know it exists in the State of Arkansas. But, the committee finds it exists everywhere. To me, one of the most interesting phases of this debate is that two of the leading proponents from opposite sides of the aisle, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL] come from a State which would contribute more to this program than they would receive from it. Obviously, we will not do a good job from the national standpoint if we base our decisions solely on the effect on our individual States.

This bill meets established standards for grants-in-aid. It is a States rights bill, it provides for a specialized program only, and it is definitely limited as to time and the amount that may be expended. There is a wholesome interest throughout the country in redefining more precisely the functions of government. The Kestnbaum report contains interesting historical data on Federal assistance for education. The Commission pointed out that the concept of primary responsibility by the States and localities for elementary education is basic in our Government. That principle is unimpaired by this bill. The Commission found, however, that the Federal Government has long been interested in public education. The Land Grant Program of 1862, advanced by Mr. Lincoln, projected a Federal interest into school problems. In succeeding legislation, notably the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, the vocational education programs in which the distinguished chairman of

the House Committee, Mr. BARDEN, has been so influential, and more recently Public Laws 815 and 874, all evidence a deep concern on the part of the Federal Government for the effectiveness of our school system.

Those who designed the patterns of our Government recognized the relationship of education to free institutions. James Madison put it like this: "A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy, or perhaps both," and as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] reminded us, George Washington in his Farewell Message asked the citizens of the young Republic to "promote those institutions that make for diffusion of knowledge."

If in the simple society of the nineteenth century leaders in the Federal Government recognized a relationship to the problems of education, certainly we of the twentieth century, constantly made conscious of the interdependence of communities and States, should be equally responsive to it.

Some of my friends from the same area I am honored to represent say that the States are able to meet this problem. Assuming that they could, this policy would impose great hardship upon many States and would disregard the principle of equalizing tax burdens.

Consider the contrast between the poorest area and the wealthiest area within the Nation. In 1950 areas of the 9 most favored States had 22 percent of the Nation's children and 30 percent of the Nation's income. The less favored area had 8.6 of the children and 1.6 of the income. In other words, in that favored area there was 19 times the income, and 2½ times the children. So the favored area gets an advantage of 7½ times per child over the least favored region.

The language read to you by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] was as clear as it could be on the question of limiting Federal authority over the schools. As I tried to indicate, it is a specialized program. It does not deal with general aid. It does not even touch the problem of curriculum and personnel. It does not deal with ideological questions. When you provide brick and mortar to build schoolhouses for children, you escape many of the problems that defy solution.

The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], put his hand on one important phase of the legislation yesterday, and again today. I refer to the mobility of people. California has a severe problem, but the States which supplied her new population were left with problems too. Mobility of wealth is another element to consider not only in the Nation as a whole but within each of the States. There are islands of distress in the wealthiest State. Moreover the favored States will benefit from the building up of schools in the less economically favorder States.

One of the best speeches I ever heard in support of Federal legislation in this field was at a Kiwanis meeting in Pennsylvania. The speaker said:

> Pennsylvania will contribute more than it will receive, but people who come from the less economically favored States to live and work among us will as a result be better prepared for our industrial life and will be greater assets to us. It would be money well spent for us Pennsylvanians.

At one stage of the discussions pertaining to aid for schools, Mr. Chairman, the theory was advanced that only the extremely low-income States should be the recipients of Federal aid. If the equalization principle could be applied with perfect precision that might be true, but I am glad that in this building program it was found advisable to include every State, for the emergency is nationwide.

According to the United States Office of Education figures, in 1952 we had 1 million classrooms, needing 312,000 additional classrooms to house our 8,881,000 children. Nearly one-third of the children enrolled in 1952–53 were affected by the classroom deficit. At the beginning of 1954 there was still a classroom deficit of more than 300,000. Increased enrollments require 50,000 new classrooms annually, with obsolescence requiring 8,000 additional classrooms. We are building 50,000 to 60,000 classrooms annually, meeting growth needs but not reducing the deficit. The cost of 300,000 classrooms is $10 to $12 billion, so we can see the importance of Federal assistance to eliminate the shortage. This bill would provide Arkansas with $22,907,488 over a 4-year period, a significant contribution to overcoming the classroom shortage in my State, but obviously leaving the major responsibility to the State and local government educational agencies. Thus the theory on which this legislation rests is unassailable.

The Kestnbaum Commission classified the historic grants-in-aid programs as those, first to support State-administered activities that carry a primary Federal obligation; second, to stimulate activities that should remain State functions but carry certain national aspects; and third, to equalize throughout the Nation the opportunities and advantages that should be governmentally sustained. It is fair to say, I believe, that this legislation is impressed to some degree with all three of these motivations.

The declaration of the Kestnbaum Commission to which I alluded in support of school-building construction rested upon a compromise. It reads as follows:

> The Commission recommends that responsibility for providing general public education continue to rest squarely upon the States and their political subdivisions. The Commission further recommends that the States act vigorously and promptly to discharge this responsibility. The Commission does not recommend a general program of Federal financial assistance to elementary and secondary education, believing that the States have the capacity to meet their educational requirements. However, where, upon a clear factual finding of need and lack of resources, it is demonstrated that one or more States do not have sufficient tax resources to support an adequate school system, the National Government, through some appropriate means, would be justified in assisting such States temporarily in financing the construction of school facilities—exercising particular caution to avoid interference by the National Government in educational processes or programs.

Mr. Chairman, the need is great and the proposed remedy will go far toward meeting it. For that reason I favor this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I have greatly enjoyed this debate, pro and con. It has been highly worth the time that anyone would want to invest in it.

Then, too, I want to praise the ranking minority member of our committee, [Mr. McCONNELL], for having the foresight when he was chairman of the full committee in the 83d Congress to appoint a subcommittee, which I had the pleasure of heading, to hold hearings in order to try to cope with the problem of classroom shortages. It was a problem then; it is a problem now.

We sent telegrams to all the Governors, asking them to state their needs either personally or through their chief school officers. I could not help but think when the gentleman from South Carolina was speaking that of all the messages we sent out the only refusal we had was a telegram from then Governor Byrnes. He said they did not need any Federal money, that they could take care of their own school system. So when the gentleman was speaking to you just now, he was telling you the truth.

I would share those opinions with him and Governor Byrnes. If it were possible for us to keep the tax dollars at home because then we would not be in the dilemma we are down here trying to find enough depleted dollars to go around. But notwithstanding this fact, we do bring the tax dollars to Washington, and we have money for everything else—highways, airports, and so forth—but when it comes to helping the schoolchild then we are immediately accused of being on the threshold of Federal control of education.

I am 100 percent opposed to Federal control of education; I want no part of it and believe in no phase of it, and when the day ever comes that this Federal Government gets into the practice of buying textbooks and paying teachers' salaries, then we will be on dangerous ground.

But in this Kelley bill, particularly Title I in which I am interested and claim some pride of authorship, we have a straight grant-in-aid program; it is a brick-and-mortar approach, as has been said here, to try to put classrooms in all the States where they are needed so that the boys and girls of America will have a suitable place to attend school.

Now let us look at one phase. I think in Pennsylvania, using the Keystone State again, we had for a number of years, some 27 years at least, one superintendent of public instruction, Dr. Haas, one of the grand men of education. He has retired now, but many of

your States have men heading your educational systems who are on a par with him.

The money that a State will receive under title I of the Kelley bill will be in the hands of such individuals for distribution in their States, not in the hands of any Member of this Congress, not in the hands of the legislatures of the States, but in the hands of the chief school officers, whether they have been appointed or elected. They are the ones who will have to point out the needy districts in their States, and that is where these classrooms will be placed. I do not know that I can recall any place in my district that would qualify for any of these classrooms; I think in my particular district we can take care of ourselves very well, but there are a lot of districts in Pennsylvania, as well as other States, that can well use the money to build much-needed classrooms. That, I think, is most excellent Federal assistance.

Title II and title III of the bill provide that if a school district does not qualify under the definition of needy, and is already bonded to its limit, yet additional classrooms are required, that district can still be taken care of.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Getting back to title I concerning plans, as I understand, under title I it will be those needy areas in Pennsylvania, as the plan provides, that will get those classrooms. Is that correct?

Mr. KEARNS. That is correct, and the same will be true of Kentucky. But the person who would determine that would be your own State educational officer and he would have the entire use of the money with which to do that very thing.

Getting back to Titles II and III, they have very fine possibilities. I know of a school that was just completed two months ago up in my area. They built it and they occupy it, yet they are now 18 classrooms short. Just think, 10 years ago we had less than 2 million babies being born in this country a year. In 1956 we will have had 4 million babies born. Then every six months, from the time that a child becomes of school age, he goes up and knocks on the door and wants to be admitted into a classroom, but possibly there is no classroom available for him to attend.

So when we begin reading this bill for amendment next week, I sincerely hope that we will stay with the Kelley bill and titles I, II, and III. However, I want to say that if we cannot be successful in the structure of the bill as it is now before us, the issue is vital enough that the amendments to be introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] would be highly acceptable.

As we have the weekend to think this over, all of us should be very, very cognizant of the fact that in considering this legislation we are considering the boys and girls of America, we are considering the greatest collateral we have in this country, the adult statesmen, lawyers, and physicians of tomorrow. I hope each and every one of us will take time out to sit down in meditation over the weekend and decide to pass, for the first time, a bill to do something farsighted for the boys and girls of this country.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, the anchor man on the committee and the junior member comes on the scene when all the good arguments have been made. There is very little left to say except perhaps to indulge in a few generalizations. This to me has been a very educational day listening to Members of the House discuss this very vital national problem. I think we can draw some conclusions, too.

A year and a half ago when I first came to the Congress, there was in our committee a rather lively dispute at that time whether there really was a classroom shortage in the country. Apparently we have settled that question once and for all and that no longer is really the basic issue. Practically all of us are agreed that there is a very serious shortage. The only really serious argument that I heard made today in opposition to this legislation was the argument made very effectively, and I respect it, made by the gentleman from South Carolina when he said the States can handle this matter, leave them alone and let them handle it. He stated, and perhaps it is true, that in his own State, and there are a few others in a similar situation, they have done a remarkable job in recent years in building classrooms. But we are here in the National Legislature and we must consider the needs of the Nation as a whole. I think the one fact that governed our thinking in the committee was the national picture. That picture is one of a classroom shortage of 250,000 units or 300,000, something in that neighborhood.

What is the picture as far as eliminating that backlog and that shortage is concerned?

I think the latest statistics that I have seen show that we need annually, to take care of the increased enrollment, about 50,000 classrooms; due to obsolescence and replacement, another additional need of 8,000 to 10,000 classrooms; that the annual rate of construction today is somewhere in the neighborhood of 60,000 or perhaps a little over. In other words, we are not eliminating that great classroom shortage that we have carried as a legacy of the depression and of the war years. Therefore, that is the reason that we cannot accept that argument on a national basis. Perhaps we do not have the right leadership in the States at the State level, but in any event, we are not eating into that backlog and we are not getting our children properly housed.

There is another argument that has occurred from time to time in our discussion here, and to me it is not an argument that I think any of us should take seriously. It is the argument of Federal control. I think it has been pretty well demolished already, and I had hoped with one little push perhaps I could put it in its grave and we could give it a decent burial at this time. I happened to have served, shortly before I came here to Congress, on a school board, and I think I know a little bit about the functions and the control of a school board, because it is the school board and the people who elect the people on the school board who exercise control over school matters. Therefore, this business of Federal control is not something hanging up in the air. When you are talking about Federal control, you are talking about control of a school board that makes the decisions; that board that hires and fires the teachers and administrators and makes policy, that handles the textbooks, and provides the curriculum and all those things. And, unless you have legislation which is designed and which in its normal functions will give someone the right to discharge those functions, you do not have Federal control. It has been my experience that at the school board level in our country we have democratic self-government at its best. I know of no area of public life where there is a greater interest by parent-teacher groups and by all our citizens in what goes on than at the school level in our government. I know of no area in our government or international life where outside intrusion is so instantly repelled by those who are charged with conducting these programs. I know of no area where those who are in charge of these programs are quicker to resent intrusions on their responsibilities and their prerogatives. So, I have no fear, as one who has served rather recently on a school board, of any Federal control or Federal interference out of this legislation. I have experienced contact with the Federal Government under programs such as Public Law 815, which is perhaps one of the most popular pieces of legislation that this Congress has ever enacted—and we had a great deal more Federal control in that program than you find in this—and I can say to you there was no Federal control on anybody in this very important area of responsibility. So, let us once and for all bury that myth of Federal control and let us confine ourselves to the real basic issues here, namely, whether there is a need, and if there is such a need, how we are to provide Federal help and guidance that is needed to stimulate our States and our local communities to tackle and solve this problem. That is what this bill would do, and I intend to support this legislation all the way.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, no piece of legislation in the short time that I have had the honor to be a Member of this body has caused me as much struggle with my conscience as this one. I think there is no doubt that there is a need. I think also there is no doubt that there is a danger. Out of all the maze of argument that to which we have listened in the days this bill has been before us there are a few facts which seem to be self-evident.

One, that there is a need in many areas of this country for additional classrooms.

Two, that there is not a State in this Union which cannot afford to take care of that need.

I give that second reason as a fact because I have asked the United States Commissioner of Education, the officials in the National Education Association, and many other people in the field of education in a sincere effort to find out the facts and they have yet to name one State that cannot afford to pay for the schools that are needed.

Those two facts seem to make self-evident a third fact, and that is that the States simply are not doing the job they can and should do. And that, it seems to me, is the one and only justification for a vote in favor of this bill.

Now, why are the States not doing the job that they can and should do? They are not doing that job because the politicians in our State legislatures are not providing the taxes. And why are those men in the State legislatures not providing the taxes? Because at the ballot box the voters tell them that they do not want them to increase local taxes. When the State legislature raises the taxes or when the county commissioners raise the taxes, the taxes are an issue at the next election and the local politician can be and often is defeated on that issue, regardless of the fact that the taxes were raised for schools.

I can cite two examples in my own State, one involving a Democratic governor who passed new taxes to take care of the schools. At the next election that was the issue and he was defeated. Then a Republican government in my own county raised the taxes on the county level, providing more schools in 8 years than had been built in the entire history of that county for some 100-odd years and yet, in the 1954 election, the issue was taxes and that administration was defeated on that issue.

So the problem, like so many other problems—and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that I think this needs to be said in this House—goes back to the people at home. For some reason or other the unfortunate fact seems to be that they feel that if they can get the money from the Federal level it will not cost them anything, but if they have to provide the money on the State or county level, it is going to come out of their own pocket and they cannot afford it. That, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, is the simple truth of this whole problem. If this legislation is just a temporary matter to attempt to get us over a hump, it seems to me that our duty as leaders in our community would be to go to the people and attempt to have them do the job they should do on the county and the State levels.

The people can pass resolutions in citizens' committees and PTA's and all those other places, but you and I know that there is one voice the legislator, whether he be on the county, State or national level, will listen to, and that is the voice of the ballot box. And when the people in their local elections, tell the legislators at the ballot box that they are more interested in keeping their taxes down than they are in providing more schools, then the results are going to be those with which we are faced today.

So, Mr. Chairman, recognizing what I submit are some of the simple facts of life with which we are faced, it may be that if certain amendments to this proposed legislation are adopted I might go along with it on the theory, as has been said from this well a number of times, that it may be a stimulation to local action, because certainly some stimulation is needed for proper action on the county and State levels.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR RELIEF TO THE SPANISH ALL-HAVANA CIGAR INDUSTRY OF TAMPA, FLA., FROM TARIFF REDUCTIONS GRANTED UNDER RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—PART I

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I have today addressed a request to the President of the United States asking that certain actions hereinafter described be taken to afford relief to the Spanish All-Havana Cigar Industry of Tampa, Fla., which manufactures 95 percent of the hand-made, class G, finest quality cigars in America.

This action was taken after a meeting and conference in my office this week with representatives of the Cigar Manufacturers Association of Tampa, Fla.; the International Cigar Makers Union; and all Government agencies concerned with the original negotiations and procedures under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of June 25, 1956.

A very critical situation will develop in the near future in this industry due to competition from the imported Havana manufactured cigars from Cuba which are given an advantage in profits through the reduction of tariffs effective July 1, 1956, which will inure in benefits not to the public at large by reduction of retail prices but to the distributor and for purposes of advertising which will lend to far greater promotion and competition of the imported product over the domestic and higher quality domestic cigar.

The recent Presidential proclamation making effective on July 1, 1956, the tariff reductions negotiated in Geneva reduced duties on Cuban cigars 15 percent over a 3-year period. I have heretofore filed a protest to this action.

The tremendous hardships imposed on this industry by the reduction of tariff duties on Cuban cigars was fully pointed out by representatives of the Tampa industry and representatives of the Cigar Makers International Union. It is clearly established that without some relief this could eventually mean the destruction of the All-Havana Cigar Industry in Tampa.

I believe the presentation made by the industry unquestionably justifies approval of the request.

This reduction negotiated at Geneva is the first time in over 50 years that duties have been reduced on Cuban cigars adversely affecting this particular industry without a correlative reduction in Havana leaf imports to offset this competitive advantage. Since 1900, duties on Cuban cigars have had an established differential in relation to Cuban leaf tobacco, and a reduction in the duties of one has always been accompanied by a correlative reduction in the duties of the other. The Geneva negotiations reverse this established and long-justified relation which has been reflected in the various tariff acts and under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, time and time again.

The Tampa cigar industry advises me that at this time the only relief which may be obtained with any reasonable expediency is a reduction in the duties on imported Cuban tobacco, the maximum of which, under the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, can be 10 percent over the next 2 years. I wish to emphasize that, while the reduction in duties negotiated at Geneva grants to Cuban manufacturers a reduction of $7 per thousand cigars, a 10-percent reduction in duties on imported tobacco leaf as a correlative concession to the domestic industry would mean to Tampa manufacturers a reduction of approximately 50 cents per thousand in cost of tobacco leaf for cigars. Although this provides hardly what could be termed reciprocal relief, it would be of some assistance and is strongly urged.

I feel that immediate action is necessary to grant maximum relief available under existing law to Tampa manufacturers. I feel confident that in the near future, in exploring this problem further and attempting to arrive at a more equitable solution through this and other means, the Tampa all-Havana cigar industry can be assisted.

Under figures available from the manufacturers of Tampa, the effective return to the industry of 10 percent reduction in tariffs would approximate $169,289. As already has been pointed out, this amount would not equal the $7 per thousand cigars benefit gained by the Cuban manufacturer but would place the Tampa industry in a better position to meet the competitive advantage which now seems imminent.

It is my earnest hope that the Members of this House and the executive agencies of the Government will realize and confirm the urgency of this situation and concur in my plea to the President and to those who at his direction may be requested to negotiate for this tariff reduction.

PART II

Mr. Chairman, I further request the following letter addressed to me be included as a part of the RECORD:

JUNE 18, 1956.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Member of Congress,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRAMER: The Cigar Manufacturers Association of Tampa is writing you this letter asking that you take all proper steps to save from economic extinction the Spanish all-Havana cigar industry of Tampa and of Florida.

Under the terms of GATT, the United States State Department has without any

warning or notice to our industry, negotiated a 15-percent reduction in tariff rates on Cuban cigars imported into the United States. If not stopped this will most probably cause the destruction of the world renowned Tampa cigar industry manufacture of high quality "all-Havana" cigars. These new lower tariff rates do not become effective until a presidential proclamation is issued. It is understood that this may be done before June 30, 1956 when the new rates would become effective. Immediate action is necessary.

The seriousness of the situation cannot be understand. The jobs and livelihood of several thousand persons in Tampa are directly involved. The investments and labor of this Tampa industry for over one-half a century are at stake.

The facts involved are these:

I. GATT WOULD REDUCE TARIFFS ON CUBAN CIGARS 15 PERCENT OVER A 3 YEAR PERIOD—WITH NO CONCESSIONS TO THE UNITED STATES ON OUR EXPORTS OF CIGARS TO OTHER COUNTRIES OR ON AMERICAN IMPORTS OF CIGAR LEAF TOBACCOS

The State Department, under the terms of GATT, negotiated an agreement granting other GATT nations a tariff reduction of 5 percent for each of 3 years on cigars imported into the United States. Present duty on Cuban cigars is $1.50 pound plus 10 percent ad valorem. Under the full 15-percent reduction in tariff the duty will decrease to $1.27 per pound plus 8½ ad valorem.

The following table shows the present and prospective duties upon imported cigars:

Product of Cuba

Present rate	Geneva 1956 agreement		
	1st stage	2d stage	3d stage
$1.50 per pound plus 10 percent ad valorem.	$1.42 per pound plus 9½ percent ad valorem.	$1.35 per pound plus 9 percent ad valorem.	$1.27 per pound plus 8½ percent ad valorem.

There is no rational basis for this purely administrative action. Apparently it is now a national policy to succor foreign industry by the economic destruction of a long-established American industry. We invite your considerate thought of the following matters in determining the course of action to be taken which will save our industry.

II. THE TAMPA ALL-HAVANA SPANISH METHOD CIGAR INDUSTRY IS THE OLDEST SEGMENT OF THE CIGAR INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES—IT WAS FOUNDED AND FOSTERED ON THE PREMISE THAT IT CAN EXIST ONLY WITH A PROTECTIVE TARIFF

When we speak of the all-Havana Spanish method of cigar manufacture, we speak of two things. First, cigars composed entirely of Cuban tobacco (i. e., the wrapper, the binder, and filler are all Cuban tobaccos), and secondly, cigars manufactured by the Spanish method—the slowest, most meticulous, and most expensive method of manufacture. This system originated in Cuba centuries ago.

Over 75 years ago the manufacture of all-Havana cigars commenced in Florida. This was done with the encouragement of the United States Government by its then existing protective tariff rates which were $3 per pound plus 50 percent ad valorem. The cities of Tampa and Key West received their initial industrial impetus from this new cigar industry. The Federal Government over this entire period of time—and until recent date—has recognized that the Florida all-Havana industry can exist only with a protective tariff.

We wish to emphasize one thing—an all-Havana cigar, whether made in Tampa or Havana is identical. The types of tobacco are the same; the quality of the tobacco is the same, and the method of manufacture is the same. Most importantly, the workmanship is the same.

However, and we stress this point, the American consumer does not know this and 75 years of advertising has not been able to overcome this obstacle.

The American consumer considers all-Havana cigars no differently than many other commodities—when he sees the word "imported" and "made in Havana" he believes that cigar is superior to the Tampa-made cigar. This has been true for years. In 1913 the Tariff Act was amended to help overcome this—the cigar industry was given a special "bonded manufacturing warehouse" provision applicable only to factories making only cigars composed entirely of Cuban tobacco. This was done under United States Government supervision and such manufacturer put a bonded stamp on each box which guaranteed that cigars were made entirely of Cuban tobaccos.

This competitive advantage of cigars made in Havana results in one basis consumer fact. If Tampa- and Havana-made cigars are offered to dealers and the consumer at the same price—there is a far greater acceptance of Havana-made cigars. The Tampa manufacturers have sought to overcome this by the best known method—offering more for the money. That is, not only are prices lower, but also the cigars are larger; that is, the cigars weigh more per thousand.

Actually, the workmanship of Tampa-made cigars is better than that of Havana—due to the fact that the Cuban Government in recent years enacted laws providing that Cuban cigars made for export could be manufactured by machine. The only cigars which may be manufactured by machine in Cuba are the cigars which are to be exported. This has resulted in over 80 percent of the all-Havana cigars made in Cuba and exported to the United States to be machine-made cigars. This was done by the Government of Cuba for the purpose of giving the Cuban manufacturers a competitive advantage over the all-Havana cigars made by the Tampa manufacturers. In turn, this has been one of the primary reasons compelling the Tampa manufacturers to go to the manufacture of all-Havana cigars by machine. This has resulted in unemployment of American workers—particularly in Tampa.

III. THE 1956 GENEVA CONFERENCE TARIFF REDUCTION ON CUBAN CIGARS THREATENS THE TAMPA ALL-HAVANA CIGAR INDUSTRY WITH DESTRUCTION

At the outset two things should be made clear. The all-Havana cigar is now and always has been the expensive, high-quality cigar. The all-Havana cigar, because of its high price, is competitive for practical purposes only with the all-Havana cigar of American manufacture. Moreover, in the United States there is a distinct market for the all-Havana cigars—a demand solely for the aroma and flavor of Havana tobaccos.

The all-Havana cigars made in Cuba and imported into the United States are practically all in the class G, excise tax bracket—i. e., the highest class—cigars retailing over 20 cents each. In 1955 approximately 99 percent of the Cuban cigars imported were in this class G.

Most of the all-Havana cigars made in the United States are manufactured in Tampa or in Florida. For example, in 1955 over 50 percent of all class G cigars sold in the United States were made in Tampa.

It has been recognized for many years—and reflected throughout various tariff acts—that a differential of at least 5 cents a cigar is necessary to maintain the competitive position of American-made cigars against Cuban cigars of the same quality. The studies of the Tariff Commission are replete with this information. The 1956 Geneva Conference, without any reason, has destroyed this long-recognized and existing differential. This convention has completely reversed the long-existent national tariff policy of the United States upon which the Tampa all-Havana cigar industry has been built and that this has been done without any warning or notice.

IV. UNDER PRESENT TARIFF RATES AMERICAN MADE CLASS G ALL-HAVANA CIGARS ARE LOSING A STEADILY INCREASED SHARE OF THE "CLASS G" AMERICAN MARKET TO CUBAN MADE CIGARS

Since 1903 Cuban made cigars have enjoyed preferential treatment by United States tariffs over the cigars of any other nation. Up until 1945 this is generally a 20 percent lower tariff than that of the cigars of other nations.

Since World War II the tariff on Cuban made cigars has twice been lowered correlative with a reduction on tariffs on Cuban leaf tobaccos. These two reductions of tariffs on Cuban cigars amount to a total reduction of $2.10 per pound plus 10 percent ad valorem—a reduction in tariff of over 57 percent. (For example—present rates established in 1948 are $1.50 per pound plus 10 percent ad valorem; prior to the 1945 reduction tariffs were $3.60 per pound plus 20 percent ad valorem). Applied to 1955 average value and weights of imported Cuban cigars the present rates produce $43.82 per thousand cigars—the pre-1945 rates would produce $102.26 per thousand cigars).

Most importantly, under the existing tariff rates (i. e., the 1948 rates) cigars made in Cuba are capturing an increasingly greater share of the class G American cigar market. It is highly significant that this increase has been a steady one since the last reduction of tariff on Cugan cigars in 1948. Under the existing tariff rate the imported Cuban cigar, as a result of the tariff reductions since World War II is more than holding its own and proportionately, is capturing a great share of the class G all-Havana market than are the Tampa manufacturers of all-Havana class G cigars. Exhibit 1 attached to this letter shows the sale of class G cigars in 1948 and in 1955. This table shows that in this period of time the number of class G cuban cigars sold has increased 44.5 percent. In the same period of time, the all-Havana class G cigars made by Tampa manufacturers has increased 36 percent. Expressed differently, proportionately speaking the imported Cuban cigar has increased its rate of sales nearly 23 percent more than have the Tampa manufacturers of all-Havana cigars. Certainly, the basis of experience shows that the existing tariff rates is providing a fair opportunity to the Cuban made cigar.

It is also important to note that during the year 1956 the importation of Cuban cigars has increased 12.5 percent in the last 12 months (i e., 12 months ending March 31, 1956). This is greater than the rate of increase of class G all-Havana cigars made. Certainly, if tariff considerations and competition within the all-Havana cigar field are alone to be used as a criteria for the determination of the amount of tariffs to be applied, this would strongly indicate that the tariff on Cuban cigars should be increased rather than decreased.

The proposed 15 percent reduction amounting to $7 per thousand on class G

cigars all-Havana Cuban-made cigars gives Cuban cigars an unfair advantage at the expense of the highest paid cigar workers in the United States. We do not know exactly how much lower rates are in Havana than they are in the Spanish system cigar factories of Tampa. We do know that the wage rates of the Tampa factories established under its contractual relations for many years with the Cigar Makers International Union are the highest wages in the cigar industry in the United States. This, despite the fact that the Tampa factories have long been in a disadvantageous financial position. Exhibit 2 attached hereto shows findings of independent wage arbitrators who have made findings with reference to the level of cigar wages in the Tampa Spanish factories, showing that they are the highest in the United States.

We estimate that the hourly wage rates and piece rates paid in Havana factories are in excess of 30 percent less than the corresponding rates in the Tampa Spanish factories. The labor costs of the Tampa Spanish factories are approximately 32 percent of gross sales (based upon an audit of a certified public accountant).

This means that the wage rates of these Havana Cuba factories are approximately 9.5 percent (of net sales) lower than the wage rates of factories in Tampa. Using for the net sales price of Havana cigars imported into the United States in 1955, their average value per thousand cigars ($192.70) plus the tariff duties thereon ($43.82) a "net selling price of $236.52 is determined for all-Havana class G cigars imported from Cuba. Upon this basis Cuban factories enjoy a wage cost of $22.47 per thousand cigars lower than the corresponding wage costs of Tampa manufacturers (i. e., 9.5 percent of $236.52).

We will furnish you with more accurate Cuban labor costs within a few days.

The Cuban manufacturer of cigars has other competitive advantages over the Tampa manufacturer. As heretofore mentioned the all-Havana cigars manufactured in Tampa weigh more per thousand cigars than competitive Cuban cigars. Using the 1948 Treasury Department Customs bonded warehouse figures, there is approximately 21½ pounds of tobacco in a Tampa made all-Havana cigar per thousand. In 1955 the Cuban cigars imported into the United States had an average weight of 17.70 pounds per thousand, a difference of 3.80 pounds of tobacco more per thousand cigars in the Tampa made cigars. Using the price of Havana stemmed filler tobacco as a basis of computation with at least $1.75 per pound results in an additional competitive cost to Tampa manufacturers of $6.65 per thousand cigars. There are many other additional cost factors involved such as higher city and county ad valorem taxes on buildings, equipment and inventory.

Apparently none of these factors are to be considered.

The proposed additional competitive favoritism to Cuban cigars of an additional $7 per thousand cigars is more than the Tampa all-Havana manufacturers can stand and still survive.

V. THE $7.50 PER THOUSAND TARIFF REDUCTION ON IMPORTED CUBAN CIGARS WILL IMMEDIATELY DESTROY WHAT REMAINS OF THE TAMPA HAND CIGAR INDUSTRY

We have heretofore pointed out that practically all of the Cuban cigars imported into the United States are made by machine in Cuba. Based upon a certified public accountant's audit of the 5 most popular class G all-Havana cigars made by 2 large Tampa manufacturers the net profit on these cigars before income taxes was 1.59 percent of net selling price, or $2.86 per thousand. Obviously this $7 per thousand reduction in tariff on Cuban cigars will destroy most of what remains of the hand cigar industry in the all-Havana factories. It will be interesting to note what provision is going to be made for these workers displaced and the manufacturers destroyed by this governmental action and to what extent it will benefit the cigarworkers of Cuba.

The tariff reduction on Cuban cigars of $7 per thousand will impose a competitive burden of $650,000 per year on the Tampa all-Havana industry—which is a declining industry. Tampa manufacturers to maintain their competitive position will have to take competitive steps which will equal it in cost to the amount of the tariff reduction granted. This will amount to approximately $650,000 per year. It is well known that the Tampa cigar industry is a declining industry—that is, the per capita consumption of cigars is declining annually. Less cigars are consumed now than were consumed in 1920. The records are replete with this information. It is obvious that the financial wherewithal does not exist to meet this additional favoritism granted to the Cuban manufacturers of cigars.

We think it worthy of your consideration that this administrative action of the executive department of the Government has been taken without a full study of the situation and has been taken by guess and by hearsay to destroy an old established industry of this city.

We also think it worthy of consideration that these Tampa manufacturers and their employees have paid and are paying taxes to support the foreign-aid program of this Nation which includes substantial grants of economic aid to foreign industries. We cannot conceive of a situation where we are on the one hand compelled to pay taxes in support of economic aid to foreign industries and at the same time be destroyed by the administrative fiat of our own Federal Government in its unilateral reduction of tariff duties of Cuban cigars.

This is a matter which affects thousands of people in this city and we think that if this action cannot be stopped that it should be announced what aid will be given to the displaced workers and to the destroyed industry of this city.

We will come to Washington to meet with you and any other departments of the Government at any time upon a few hours' notice. We solicit your counsel and support. We hope that you will use your good efforts with the executive department to prevent this action. Your cooperation will be very greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

CIGAR MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF TAMPA,
By LOUIS LOPEZ, *President*.

EXHIBIT A

American-made all-Havana cigars under present tariff rates are losing a steadily increasing share of the class G market to Cuban-made cigars

[In thousands]

Year	Class	Price	Total manufactured, including imports	Cuban importation	Tampa manufacture
A	B	C	D	E	F
1955	All classes	Not over 2½ cents, over 20 cents	[1] 6,127,588	[2] 14,708	[3] 698,746
	G	Over 20 cents	[1] 186,520	[4] 14,536	[3] 107,241
1948	All classes	Not over 2½ cents, over 20 cents	[5] 5,688,089	[5] 10,220	[3] 524,399
	G	Over 20 cents	[5] 138,963	[5] 10,054	[3] 78,785

[1] Source: CMA of America letter report of Feb. 28, 1956.
[2] Source: CMA of America Bulletin No. 773 of June 13, 1956.
[3] Source: Internal Revenue returns, Florida district.
[4] Source: Estimated, based on 1954 percent of classes (exhibit 4, p. 13, CMA of America Statistical Record).
[5] Source: exhibit 4, 1954–55 CMA of America Statistical Record based on Annual Report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, U. S. Treasury Department, Bureau of Internal Revenue.

EXHIBIT B

Wage arbitration 1950–56 has conclusively shown:

1. Serious economic decline of members of CMA of Tampa, primary manufacturers of all-Havana cigars in the United States.
2. That members of CMA of Tampa pay highest labor rates in the United States.
3. That cigar workers are not suited for other type of work.

The following are pertinent conclusions of wage arbitrations from the opinions of: (1) Alfred A. Colby, arbitrator, appointed by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, opinion on January 23, 1950; (2) Paul H. Sanders, arbitrator, appointed by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, opinion on January 27, 1954; and (3) Robert T. Amis, arbitrator, appointed by Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, opinion on January 23, 1956.

I. SERIOUS ECONOMIC DECLINE OF MEMBERS OF CMA OF TAMPA, PRIMARY MANUFACTURERS OF ALL-HAVANA CIGARS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Colby on January 23, 1950, after considering the excessive unreasonableness of union demands, said "I doubt if it was aware, before the calculable costs were analyzed, that almost $1,500,000 would be added to labor costs of the manufacturers and that in a very short time the industry's entire capital would be wiped out and that the workers would be left without means of livelihood, particularly since practically all of them are unfitted for any other occupation, and this for so many reasons unnecessary to relate"; and further stated: "It is undisputed that a surplusage of labor exists in the Tampa cigar-manufacturing industry and that the industry is at the same time hard pressed with a steadily declining market for its products and with formidable competition of machine-made production at appreciable lower manufacturing costs. This is wholly aside from the inroads constantly made by changes in smoking habits and customers diversion to lower-priced competition and to other tobacco products."

Mr. Sanders on January 27, 1954, reiterated Mr. Colby's opinion in these words: "The association (CMA. of Tampa) in this case has presented considerable evidence to indicate that its economic position is not one to justify further increases. * * * There was testimony by the manufacturers and exhibits M, R, and T, indicating the not-too-favorable position of the industry and of these manufacturers particularly."

And further said in considering the union demands "the arbitrator is of the opinion that the factors relating to the economic conditions of the industry are of particular importance in considering whether this expense should be added at this particular time."

And Mr. Amis on January 23, 1956, noted the same serious economic condition saying "According to manufacturers' testimony association factories are not in a position to increase wholesale prices of cigars due to

competitive conditions. Accepting this statement."

II. THAT MEMBERS OF CMA OF TAMPA PAY HIGHEST LABOR RATES IN UNITED STATES

Mr. Sanders on January 27, 1954, found that the members of the CMA of Tampa pay the highest labor rates in the United States, saying "when it is borne in mind that their rates are accepted as being the best in the industry."

And Mr. Amis on January 23, 1956, with great particularity noted the highest labor rates, saying "when compared to the national trend, association hand cigarmakers have for the past 2 years increased their weekly earnings 17 percent more than have all United States cigar workers and approximately 4.9 percent over other cigar workers in Hillsborough County, Fla." And further noted "Average hourly earnings in the Tampa area for pickers and packers (men) is $1.43 as compared to national figures of $1.39 or 4 cents and .029 percent higher. Average hourly earnings in the Tampa area for pickers and packers (women) is $1.67 as compared to the national figure of $1.21 or 46 cents and 38 percent higher."

III. THAT CIGAR WORKERS ARE NOT SUITED FOR OTHER TYPE WORK

Quoting again from Mr. Colby's opinion on January 23, 1950: "I doubt if it was aware, before the calculable costs were analyzed, that almost $1,500,000 would be added to labor costs of the manufacturers and that in a very short time the industry's entire capital would be wiped out and that the workers would be left without means of livelihood, particularly since practically all of them are unfitted for any other occupation and this for so many reasons unnecessary to relate."

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill H. R. 7535, the short title of which describes it as the "School Construction Assistance Act of 1955."

I am opposed to it for many reasons. I am opposed to it primarily because I believe this question of Federal control of education is more than a myth. I think that danger is real. I think that it is both vicious and treacherous.

In this connection I think that no one here can deny or will seek to deny that under the long-established concept of control of public education on the State and local level we have brought about and it has caused us to have the finest and best system of public education ever devised by the brain and purpose of man.

I do not think that any other nation in any part of the world or in any phase of world history has ever brought about or devised a system of public education which comes anywhere near to equaling that which we have in this country. I think it is largely because we have carefully controlled the education of our boys and girls on as near a local level as possible that we have been able to bring about in this Nation a greater way of life than has ever been known by any other people in the entire history of civilized man.

I believe this control which we fear and which we deprecate is real. I think it is a menace. As stated by many of my colleagues here today, I believe this bill in its present form is simply getting the nose of the camel under the tent. Once Federal aid is proposed for the construction of classrooms and public schools in this country it will not be long before the same people who sponsor this particular legislation, those who operate down in the Office of the Commissioner of Education, will be coming before this Congress asking for funds to supplement teachers' salaries, and to have the Federal Government pay and bear a portion and perhaps eventually all of the cost of the operation and maintenance of every public school in this country. Then control of our schools will be lodged down there on Independence Avenue instead of in the byways and highways of America, which have made this Nation great.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. May I ask the gentleman, if a legislative act by the Congress was the correct and proper one in 1836, is it wrong in 1956? In explanation of the question, let me say that during the administration of Andrew Jackson in 1836 the Congress found itself with $40 million of surplus money. A law was passed distributing that money on a population basis to the several States, and the gentleman's State of Georgia got $1 million and spent it for school construction. If it was right in 1836, how can it be wrong in 1956?

Mr. FLYNT. I think that the gentleman from West Virginia has already answered his own question when he referred to the surplus of $40 million at that time whereas now there is a debt of $281 billion and it will probably be greater in the future. Bear in mind that the national debt is greater than the combined debts of all of the States and subdivisions of government.

Mr. BAILEY. They tell us that we are going to have a surplus of $2 billion this year.

Mr. FLYNT. I think that is wishful thinking on the part of a lot of people and I do not think the gentleman from West Virginia goes along with that line of thinking at this time or any other time.

But, in connection with this question of Federal control which I feel about very deeply and which I deprecate, I believe most strongly that once the Federal Government gets into the business of providing funds for any phase of education, it wil gradually preempt the field of public education as it has preempted every field in which the Federal Government has entered during your lifetime and mine. I can think of nothing worse than having the curricula in the public-school systems in each of the 48 States supervised directly by remote control from a little ivory tower—the Office of the Commissioner of Education—in Washington. I think it would be one of the things that would most effectively destroy the basic principle of the separation of powers between the States and the Federal Government. Bear this in mind. Once these powers are yielded by the States and the local instrumentalities and subdivisions of government to the Federal Government, or usurped by the Federal Government, there never will be any recalling them back because once they are gone, they are gone forever.

I think the time has come for us to seriously and carefully reappraise this system of taking away from the States one by one each and everyone of the reserve powers of the States. We have now reached the point where just about the only authority that the States have left lies in the field of public education. If, and when, this is gone, along with it may go the last of the sacred, reserved powers and rights of the several sovereign States. If, and when, this time comes and if, and when, the right to run our own schools is preempted by the Federal Government, we might as well realize that the next thing will be the partial, if not complete, destruction of the right of the State legislatures to legislate, and the right of the State courts to judicially pass upon those things which have historically been reserved to the several States. It has been said, and I think it well to repeat here: "Leave to the control of the States those things which the States can best do for themselves." If this bill passes, we shall completely and directly reverse a traditional and historic concept of control of public education by the States on a local level. If, and when, this is done, we will be going one step further toward the accomplishment of the goal of those, whoever they may be, and in whatever positions of power they find themselves, who seek by one more method and by one more movement to destroy the States and reduce them to mere administrative agencies of an all-powerful central Federal Government. I hope that time never comes because, Mr. Chairman, if, and when, that happens and the States are reduced to mere administrative agencies of an all-powerful Federal Government, you will see the rights and liberties and personal freedom of all our citizens wherever they may live destroyed along with those rights of the several States. I expect to oppose this bill in the form in which it now is. I can think of very few, if any, amendments which could cause me to cast my vote in favor of it, with the possible exception of the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. I have been very interested in the gentleman's statement. Since the Federal Government has had a direct responsibility in the funds provided for the education of the American Indians, does the gentleman think the Federal Government has done an outstanding job?

Mr. FLYNT. I certainly do not think the Federal Government has done a good job in that field or in any other field of public education in which it is now engaged up until this time. The complete failure of the Federal Governmnet to provide a decent educational system for the American Indians is the best warning we can ever have concerning the effect of Federal intervention in and control of public education.

I hope that this measure will not be enacted into law.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have never more earnestly wished for the eloquence of a Churchill, a Jefferson or a Lincoln than at this moment of addressing the House on the measure now before us.

The legislation we are considering—to provide much needed Federal assistance to the States for school construction—in spirit, goes far beyond the material good it would accomplish.

Here is an opportunity for the Congress to fulfill its moral obligation to give leadership, direction and purpose to the thinking of our people in a moment of national need.

I most prayerfully hope that in our deliberations we shall put aside political and sectional differences and preconceived ideas, in order that we may serve the youth of this Nation as wisely, as well and as faithfully as we would serve the Nation itself.

Every one of the 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico—everything we know and think of as the United States of America—is today encountering overwhelming difficulties in adjusting its educational programs and systems to the demands of this modern age.

A major problem is created by the fact that this Nation is blessed with more children of school-age than the States presently have schoolrooms—or can immediately afford to build schoolrooms—to accommodate them.

A problem of equal concern springs from their inability to engage adequate teaching staffs at the low salaries they are able to pay.

Here are some of the pertinent facts which have swelled the educational problems of our States and local communities to crisis proportions:

These facts have been verified by the Committees on Education and Labor of the 81st, the 82d, the 83d, and now, the 84th Congresses—they have been substantiated by the White House, the governors of the 48 States and the United States Office of Education—accepted by the people—and publicized by the press.

In my own State, whose problems I, of course, know best, the Honorable W. W. Trent, State superintendent of schools, testified in 1954 before the Special Subcommittee on Federal Aid for School Construction, as follows:

> School construction in West Virginia, curtailed by the depression, almost stood still from 1933 to 1949. Two factors contributed to this lag, the depression itself (followed by the war and material shortages), and the constitutional limitation of taxes that resulted in the transfer from local districts to the State the financing of the major part of the public schools.
>
> In 1950 a constitutional amendment permitted bonding up to 3 percent of valuation, and the State appropriated $10 million for school building aid. However, this amount did not catch up with the wornout buildings, nor did it enable the State to build enough schools to meet new enrollments. Small counties have for the most part been unable to construct buildings, and still do not have sufficient bonding capacities to catch up.
>
> In the State, as a whole, there is a total current need for 2,823 classrooms, and by 1960, the need will have mounted to over 3,700. The estimated total cost, figuring $31,800 per room, including furniture and fixtures, is $119,727,000.
>
> Subtracting the total possible bonding capacity of all the counties from this need, a deficit of about $60 million faces West Virginia. Added to this must be the money needed for purchasing and improving sites, about $3 million more, making the total need over $63 million.
>
> In conclusion, West Virginia feels that the counties and the State cannot, within reasonable measures or possible resources, maintain adequate school terms with prepared teachers and, at the same time, finance the construction of sufficient buildings to house the pupils of the State.

Nationwide, the situation is even graver, as shown by the 1953 United States Office of Education report on conditions of school housing and the need for additional facilities in 43 States, followed, in 1954, by the National Education Association's report of its findings.

Since the 81st Congress appropriated $3 million to aid the States in carrying out a nationwide inventory of existing school facilities, surveys, statewide studies, regional conferences and national conferences have kept the problems alive but have failed to remedy the condition.

The facts remain unchanged. While the critical shortage of classrooms continues, and teaching staffs diminish, our blessings continue to multiply.

This past fall—1955—enrollment in the elementary schools increased 24.1 percent over 1950. In the high schools the increase in 1955 over 1950 was 18.9 percent. However, according to the Office of Education estimate, at the beginning of 1954 there was already a deficit of more than 300,000 classrooms.

Meanwhile, as the report accompanying H. R. 7535, from the Committee on Education and Labor of the House, so succinctly states:

> The rate of construction has more than kept pace with mounting enrollment, but it has only slightly reduced the total classroom deficit. As a consequence, millions of children still attend schools which are unsafe, or which permit learning only part-time, or under serious conditions of overcrowding.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, run as fast as we can—at our present pace—we are only standing still.

What disturbs me even more than our lack of schoolrooms and our continued dependence upon obsolete buildings and firetraps, are the limitations placed upon the educational opportunities the schools can offer our children under these present circumstances.

The future of this Nation, Mr. Chairman, does not depend upon the amounts Congress can appropriate for fighter planes, guided missiles, foreign aid, research and development programs and even health and other public services—as important as these are.

For the plane to fly, there still has to be a skilled human hand; and leaning over the test tube and the drawing board, there must be a trained, scientific mind.

Already we are suffering from a dearth of both skilled and trained men and women. So that, quite literally, within the next 2 decades, the fate of this Nation and its destiny will be in the hands of the 5-year old who enrolled in kindergarten this past fall.

In a speech before the District of Columbia Chapter of the West Virginia University Alumni Association on May 17, 1956, here is what Dr. C. B. Joliffe, vice president and technical director of the Radio Corporation of America, had to say on this subject:

> The increasing complexity of our machines, systems, and techniques has created an ever greater demand for skilled people to produce, install, and maintain them. The broader knowledge that has come from research has created a growing demand for more research workers with more specialized training. In an economy dedicated to growth through innovation, we must equip a constantly greater number of our young people with these skills or suffer a serious—if not a fatal—reverse.
>
> I feel strongly that this is the great problem of our time. * * * Even if there were no threat whatever from abroad, we should still be deeply concerned by the fact that while 30,000 engineering graduates were turned out by our universities in 1952, the total in 1955, after 3 more years of rapid technological growth, was only 23,000.

Industry, science, and the professions are most concerned that our schools are not turning out sufficient numbers of engineers, technologists, researchers, chemists, and physicists.

There is no longer any great demand for unskilled labor, and the untrained worker is finding it more and more difficult to earn his livelihood. Unless we make a more vigorous effort to expand the educational opportunities of all our people, the need to support the ignorant, the illiterate, and the untrained could eventually place an intolerable burden upon our entire society.

On the other hand, I am equally concerned that the education we now provide for our children will not produce the well-rounded and informed citizens whose intellectual curiosity, skills, and training will be required to keep the ideals of our democracy and the spirit of our freedom alive tomorrow.

In passing H. R. 7535, Mr. Chairman, we shall be neither violating a tradition nor establishing a precedent. During the economic depression of the 1930's, the Federal Government provided large-scale financial assistance to communities throughout the Nation for the construction of public schools. The Public Works Administration made allotments from July 1933, through June 1942, for 6,687 elementary and secondary school-building projects costing nearly $1 billion.

Antedating the Constitution, Federal aid to school construction actually began with the early land and monetary grants made by the Congress of the Confederation—1785—for the support of education in States formed from the public domain. And later, by act of the Congress of the United States, education in each new State admitted to the Union received an endowment of public lands and—in some cases—monetary grants derived from the sales of public lands.

So let us lay once and for all, Mr. Chairman, the ancient bogey that "Federal aid leads to Federal control." It has not happened in 200 years and it is even less likely to happen now. On so flimsy a pretext, let us not deny to our children the equal and enriched educational opportunities that are the birthright of every American child.

A vast audience is sitting in silent judgment upon the 84th Congress as it debates this first vital step toward remedying our sorry educational problems. The really interested parties to this legislation, however—the children of America—are not present, nor do they have a voice in these proceedings. Yet it is their future—their lives—we are deciding here.

When they are grown to man's estate, when they have reached maturity, when they must take our places here, how shall they judge us? Will these future generations of America's citizens condemn us for our blindness and indifference? Or will they honor the record of the 84th Congress of the United States for its progressiveness, its wisdom, and its vision?

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. My sincere thanks to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

This week a several-page letter from the American Legion was placed on my desk, and I understand each Member received a copy of the same letter. Therefore, it seems desirable to read the following telegrams which I received this afternoon from three veterans organizations.

From Kenneth M. Birkhead, executive director, American Veterans Committee, comes this telegram:

The American Veterans Committee denies implication made by American Legion that veterans oppose aid to school construction. We doubt that Legion members themselves are opposed to this Federal program. President Eisenhower is one Legion member favoring aid to schools. With one-half Nation's schoolchildren, sons and daughters of veterans, we do not believe that veterans want their children to receive their education in crowded unsanitary and unsafe classrooms. AVC urges full support of Federal aid to school construction bill.

From Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, director, Veterans of Foreign Wars national legislative service, comes this telegram:

On behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I reiterate the statement in my letter of February 21, 1955, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with respect to the school construction program to the effect that our organization approves direct Federal participation in the school construction program and believe the Congress is in best position to determine extent of the need.

From John R. Holden, national legislative director of the AMVETS, comes the following telegram:

The American Veterans of World War II and Korean AMVETS urge your active support of legislation to provide Federal aid for school construction. In view of indications that schools in the United States have fallen far behind both the aspirations of the American people and their capabilities, it is essential that legislation of this nature be enacted. Your continued effort on its behalf is sincerely appreciated.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that these three fine organizations, joining many, many other national groups who are urging Federal aid in school construction, should be commended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

In conclusion, I would like to make 1 or 2 comments. I have noticed all through the debate that the general discussion has been toward the title that deals with grants-in-aid. I cannot emphasize strongly enough that the big hope of this entire legislative proposal resides in sections other than those dealing with grants.

The main purpose and the ultimate goal is to stimulate State and local action. If this legislation will not do that, then I feel we have failed in the major part of our endeavor. Control of our schools by the Federal Government is undesirable and unthinkable and not in the tradition of America. We all strongly feel that way. In this present program, which we admit is a limited one, every safeguard that we can think of has been placed in the legislation to insure that the Federal Government will not be controlling the running of the school systems of America. If it can be brought out clearly that there are certain parts that may cause such a situation, I will be one only too glad to consider changes in those sections. Our main objective is to eliminate classroom deficiencies that have accumulated in America, not only because of some State and local inaction, but also because of national and international situations.

We have never been able in the normal way to catch up with the classroom shortages, and this is a measure designedly of a temporary nature in order to make up for those deficiencies and to put our school system, as far as the facilities are concerned, on a normal operating basis so that the States and local communities can carry on.

Let me close with this one thought: Our whole aim is to not only preserve the welfare of our children but also the intrinsic worth of our American Republic.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the right to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that my congressional district will be hard hit by inadequate school facilities in the near future. The people from my State are proud and have not waited for the Government to pass a Federal aid to school construction bill—they have built new schools in the areas where there was a need for them. Even with this community pride and zeal to provide proper education for their children, the school system is not adequate, and in 5 more years, with the rate of development in the middle and northwest going at the pace at which it is now traveling, our schools will not begin to fill the needs of our children.

I would like to go on record in support of H. R. 7535, the school construction bill.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss for a moment the subject of my remarks in the opening of this debate, pertaining to the amendment which I propose to offer. The amendment I think has been read and everyone is familiar with it. It rewrites section 103 in such a way as to very briefly set out just exactly what the six pages it proposes to strike out will do without the objectionable features that have been complained about all during this debate.

For your information I include it in full at this point in my remarks:

Page 3, strike out line 21 and all that follows through line 10 on page 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"PAYMENTS OF STATE ALLOTMENTS

"SEC. 103. The Commissioner shall pay the State allotment for any fiscal year, or so much thereof as the State educational agency requests, to the State educational agency upon certification by it that the amount to be paid does not exceed one-half of the cost of constructing the school facilities for which such funds are to be expended. Funds paid to a State educational agency under this section shall be expended solely for construction of school facilities in the State, and shall be used to pay not more than one-half of the total cost of constructing all school facilities in the State which are assisted under this title.

"JUDICIAL REMEDY

"SEC. 104. (a) The district court of the United States for any district in which the capital of a State is located shall have jurisdiction, as provided in this section, to grant appropriate relief in any case where any funds paid to the State under this title have been or are about to be expended in violation of this act.

"(b) An action under this section shall be brought in the name of the United States by the United States attorney for the district involved, and shall be brought against the State. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure shall apply.

"(c) The court may grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems appropriate pending final disposition of any action under this section. If in any such action it is determined that any funds paid to the State under this title have been or are about to be expended in violation of section 103, the court shall grant a permanent injunction or other appropriate relief, including restitution of any funds so expended, or such part thereof as may be just and equitable under the circumstances of the case."

I might say that this has been a rather unusual experience for me. I have had much comment upon the amendment. I think I have never sponsored any piece of legislation or an amendment that seemed to be so acceptable to so many; but the strange thing about it is that so many have said to me: "I am a little skeptical about voting for the amendment, because if that is adopted the bill would be so good I will probably have to vote for it."

I do hope that idea will not gain headway, for I think I said at the outset that my very purpose and the very thing that prompted me to introduce this amendment was that if the bill becomes law it should be in the best possible form.

Members would say: "Why did you have this idea? Why did you prepare this amendment?" There is not a single member of this committee but what recalls exactly what prompted me. In the instigation of the school impact law we incorporated language intended to take care of the situation where the military had abandoned a base or post and there were not enough children left to operate an on-base school. So we extended to the United States Commissioner of Education some discretionary power under which he could arrange for those children to be accepted in adjacent State schools. What did he do?

He came out with an order that closed the Quantico High School where there was the best housing and one of the finest schools we know anything about and ordered those children to be scattered around over the State of Virginia. Some of them had to be hauled 20 miles. I called upon him, I begged him, I reasoned with him, and pointed out that they had a fine school, a fine teaching staff, well organized and with plenty of building space. It was an economical operation and a practical operation. Then I sought him out again for a conference between us. The ranking minority member of the committee, Mr. McCONNELL, did the same thing. No, he was going to close it. I said, "Dr. Brownell, there can be but one result. It will be embarrassing to you and inconvenient to the committee."

We had to bring them before the committee. We introduced a bill. A hearing was held before the committee. There was not a member of that committee who thought it was even good sense to close that school. But we had to bring a bill last year to the floor of this House. The House passed it, the Senate passed it and the President signed it. To do what? To force this same United States Commissioner of Education to do the will of Congress.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor if he does not recall that Dr. Brownell testified, and so did counsel for the Department, that Dr. Brownell had made that ruling under advice of the counsel? I am not saying that the counsel was right, but at the same time there seemed to be involved some misinterpretation of the law. Perhaps we should get new lawyers, but let us let up on the Commissioner.

Mr. BARDEN. In this case the Commissioner's interpretation substituted the word "available" for the word "suitable." No other lawyer had ever interpreted it that way, no other Commissioner of Education had ever put that interpretation on it. There are some pretty good lawyers on my committee and not one of them put that interpretation on it.

I desire at this time to read a part of the Senate report which accompanied H. R. 3253, a bill which was passed solely to prevent the Commissioner's order from going into effect:

His interpretation has the effect of substituting the word "available" for the word "suitable" in the law as it exists now. The committee does not believe that Congress intended such a narrow construction of this section. Since the Commissioner of Education has insisted on such a narrow interpretation of the present law, the committee is of the opinion that remedial legislation must be enacted.

In addition I wish to quote from House Report No. 736, 84th Congress, which was filed in connection with the same bill, H. R. 3253, as follows:

After full consideration of all the circumstances in this case, your committee does not believe that the Commissioner's action in this matter conforms with the intent of Congress as expressed in Public Law 874 and subsequent amendments. The committee believes that under the full circumstances of this case, local educational facilities are not now "suitable" for the free public education of students residing on the Quantico Marine Corps base. The committee does not agree that under the law the Commissioner is forbidden to look prospectively at such a situation. Members of the committee, as these excerpts from the hearing record show, literally pleaded with the Commissioner and his aides to take a broader and more reasonable view of the matter, so that legislative action would not be required.

If we have this much trouble over one school, what may we expect from the powers granted the same administrator, the United States Commissioner of Education. If we grant him the power contained in H. R. 7535, beginning with section 103 on page 3 and including sections 104, 105, and 106 which involves all 48 States of this Union. The basic law creating the Office of United States Commissioner of Education never intended that he should be either a powerful administrator or have any such powers over the school facilities, construction, or administration.

So in the name of safety and wise legislation I offer this amendment, and I hope it will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the first section of the bill.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7535) to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 245. An act for the relief of Ahmet Haldun Koca Taskin;

S. 1375. An act for the relief of Pingfong Ngo Chung and Pearl Wah Chung;

S. 1814. An act for the relief of Teresa Lucia Cilli and Guiseppe Corrado Cilli; and

S. 2842. An act for the relief of Toini Margareta Heino.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10986) entitled "an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to amendments Nos. 1, 3, and 4 of the House to the bill (S. 1622) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, S. Dak., of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes," disagrees to amendment No. 2, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MURRAY, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. WATKINS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

REPORT ON H. R. 10269

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Saturday, June 30, 1956, to file a report on the bill H. R. 10269.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

LUMP-SUM READJUSTMENT PAYMENT FOR MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 9952) to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, after "duty," insert "after the enactment of this section and."

Page 2, line 5, strike out all after "year." down to and including "disregarded." in line 8 and insert: "For the purposes of computing the amount of readjustment payment (1) a part of a year that is six months or more is counted as a whole year, and a part of a year that is less than six months is disregarded, and (2) any prior period for which severance pay has been received under any other provision of law shall be excluded. There shall be deducted from any lump-sum readjustment payment any mustering-out pay received under the provisions of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 or the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952."

Page 2, line 16, after "Defense," insert "or by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to members of the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy."

Page 2, lines 18 and 19, strike out "would be" and insert "is."

Page 2, line 23, strike out "would be" and insert "is."

Page 3, lines 3 and 4, strike out "would be" and insert "is."

Page 3, lines 10, 11, and 12, strike out "subsequently become entitled under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration" and insert "become entitled, on the basis of subsequent service, under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IGNACE JAN PADEREWSKI

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today is a day which will live long in the minds and memories of free men. It is the anniversary of the birth of Ignace Jan Paderewski, Polish musician, statesman and patriot.

It is in like manner a day on which the indomitable will of the Polish people to be free has made itself felt again after years of oppression and slavery at the hands of godless nazism and atheistic Russian communism.

Untold hundreds of thousands of Poles have been imprisoned, exiled, tortured, and killed during these long years, and yet today we read how the Polish people have risen in the industrial city of Poznan and other places in Poland in expression of this spirit of freedom.

Newspaper accounts are necessarily brief, and do not give the full details because of the Communist censorship. The situation is such that Radio Warsaw has called this a "well-organized revolt," but has said also that the "rebellion has been overcome and the guilty will be punished severely." Perhaps the revolt has failed and no doubt ruthless reprisals are forthcoming, but they will not kill this enduring spirit. It is clear from reports that it was a general strike, and that Communist headquarters and government buildings were attacked. Communist flags have been torn down and a jail burned and prisoners freed.

The citizens of Poznan made their protest at a time when foreign visitors were present for a trade fair. The Poles cried to foreign visitors to "tell the outside world what you have seen. We want things to become better, and we want the Soviets to disappear."

Other reports indicate that revolt is continuing and spreading, and that these unarmed heroes are seizing Army tanks. No doubt reports of unrest elsewhere are and have been stifled.

I join them in their wish for freedom, and I pray that their revolt will result in liberation for themselves and their brothers imprisoned by the Communists in other so-called "people's republics" behind the Iron Curtain.

Now is the time for America to make a strong statement reiterating the fact that we stand squarely behind the principle of self-determination for Poland and other captive nations. We must cease compromise with the Soviets over the slavery of these peoples and must so announce to the world. I hope that our President and Secretary of State will not only proclaim that it is the policy of the United States to push with all available means to secure self-determination and with it freedom and liberty for all those held behind the Iron Curtain, but will also actively pursue such a course by all means short of war.

Such a policy would be a real tribute to the late distinguished Paderewski and to the thousands of other Poles who are desperately struggling to achieve that freedom with their blood and lives.

THE LATE FLEET ADMIRAL ERNEST J. KING, UNITED STATES NAVY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, as I watched the extremely impressive funeral procession for Fleet Admiral King as it passed in front of the United States Capitol, the thought occurred to me that this very great sailor and this distinguished admiral of our Navy was making his last voyage to the Capitol prior to leaving for Annapolis where he will rest and receive the admiration and respect of thousands upon thousands for the rest of time. Many of us remember his official calls at the Capitol during the war.

Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King was, without question, one of the great naval commanders and leaders in all history. He was our great Chief of Naval Operations during World War II and also our great Commander in Chief of the entire United States Fleet during this gigantic struggle. Taking over these two great responsibilities after Pearl Harbor when our Navy and our country suffered from one of the most devastating blows in our history, Admiral King brought a clear mind, steel courage, unshakable determination, and firm decision, not only to the United States Navy but to the Nation as a whole. His force, tremendous ability, and power of decision soon marshalled our Navy into a fighting unit that struck blow after blow after blow for victory. During his leadership he built the United States Navy into the greatest naval fighting force in the world. Throughout his long career of 59 years as a sailor and a leader of men, Admiral King distinguished himself in serving his country as the kind of a commanding officer who rises to the leadership of mankind only once in generations. Fortunate, indeed, was the United States Navy and the United States of America that when the time required a great leader he was there and in position to take command.

As I watched the impressive march of the sailors in white, the precision of the company of marines, and the performance of the great Navy and Marine bands, I was deeply impressed with the solemn respect that was being shown to this wartime leader of the Navy. It seemed as if the Navy were saying, "Admiral King, you have led us through many rough and dangerous seas and it is now our great privilege and honor to lead you on your last voyage." The respect rendered by the military services was inspiring and this inspiration was almost as deep as the inspiration Adm. Ernest King gave to America in the dark days of 1941 and 1942. This inspiration will never die, for it will be always a part of young men who follow in his footsteps as officers of our Navy.

Impressive, too, was the presence there of some of those great officers of the Navy, some of those great fighting leaders in those historic sea struggles of World War II, to pay their respects and to lead their old chief on his last voyage. There was Fleet Admiral Nimitz, Fleet Admiral Halsey, Fleet Admiral Leahy, and many, many other distinguished flag officers. They were all on deck Friday afternoon, for in their hearts they knew one of the greatest of America's fighting men and one of the greatest of our country's leaders was stepping down for all time. Admiral King would be one of the first to say that no leader can accomplish gigantic deeds without great men at his side. These men and many others have earned their place in history and were at the admiral's side to the very end.

With his place in history secure, the deeds and accomplishments of Admiral King will never cease to be important. Always he will be an inspiration to American fighting men. If the time should ever come again when our great Navy must sail into action against an enemy, somewhere ahead of the ships in the sea mist will be the image of Admiral King still leading, still commanding.

To have led the United States Navy in the greatest of human conflicts not only was a tremendous task but it was also a great privilege and a great honor. Admiral King was always proud he was an American and America will be grateful forever as a country and as a people that Admiral King commanded the United States Navy. He steered the course to victory at sea.

America is proud of its great leaders. In the days to come may America never forget the tremendous inspiration of the leadership of Admiral King. Let it be preserved through the ages for all America in the form of a fitting monument in the Nation's Capital. Already enshrined in the hearts of his countrymen, this great monument will stand as a lasting and inspiring tribute to the glory and magnificence of the Nation's wartime naval leader, Fleet Adm. Ernest J. King.

PADEREWSKI DAY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on this 29th day of June, which has been designated "Paderewski Day," I wish to join with my colleagues in tribute to Poland's great musician, patriot, and statesman.

Ignace Paderewski will perhaps be best remembered as a great concert pianist. His debut was in Vienna in 1887 and this was followed by brilliant performances in Paris, London, and Berlin. Having captured the hearts of Europeans, he traveled to America in 1891 and proceeded to do the same here. In concert after concert he played to capacity houses. He became the musician of the many as he traveled through the country. This instrumental artist even thrilled the unmusical, and it has been said that the test of a musician's genius is his power over the unmusical. American critics compared him with Liszt and Rubinstein. As he traveled through our country, he also came to love it, for her people were allowed to live freely and to enjoy liberty. Such was not the case in his native Poland.

Paderewski's talents were not confined to music; he was also a patriot. Through his music he was able to advance Poland's cause for independence. For over a hundred years, Poland had been partitioned amongst Prussia, Russia, and Austria, but Paderewski never gave up hope of seeing his native land unified. This dream was to be realized soon after the end of the First World War.

It was during the war that Paderewski saw Poland's opportunity to break the shackles that bound her. He came to America to arouse American interest in Polish freedom. He had triumphed over American musical critics but now he faced the more difficult task of convincing politicians and statesmen on a different subject—that Poland should be free and independent. He traveled across the continent and in speeches in universities, concert halls, and theaters—usually combined with Chopin's music—he advanced the Polish dream for independence. Chiefly through his efforts large sums of money were collected to aid his devastated homeland, and the American people opened their hearts for the Polish cause. In recognition of his patriotic devotion to this country, the American Poles chose him as their plenipotentiary to act for them and decide all political matters in their names.

Although Paderewski had convinced many Americans that Poland should be free, he also saw the necessity of getting President Wilson interested in his pleas for the Polish people. In the summer of 1916, he was invited to the White House. By playing Chopin's music—which revealed the true Polish spirit—he opened the subject of Poland's freedom and in a conversation that followed, he succeeded in gaining Wilson's sympathy. President Wilson was impressed with Paderewski's devotion and generosity for his country. In subsequent meetings Wilson assured the Polish patriot that he was confident that Poland would be resurrected and would be free again.

Time proved that Paderewski's conversations with Wilson would be fruitful. On January 22, 1917, in an address before the Senate, President Wilson said:

> Statesmen everywhere are agreed that there should be a united, independent, and autonomous Poland.

And a year later when his 14 points were announced his 13th stated:

> An independent Polish state should be erected * * * which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea.

Paderewski had secured America's support. As soon as the war was over, Paderewski left the United States and returned to Poland to press Poland's claim for independence. It was largely through his efforts that the various factions in Poland were unified and a coalition government was established to represent Poland at the Paris Peace Conference. He became Premier and Foreign Minister of this coalition government. He was, also, the chief Polish delegate at the peace conference.

At Paris, Paderewski the musician and patriot proved that he was also a statesman. Secretary of State Lansing said that he had the innate genius for political leadership. He succeeded in outlining the boundaries of Poland along much the same lines as discussed with Wilson during the war. He urged the conference to establish the Polish Corridor giving Poland access to the sea. When Paderewski signed the Versailles Treaty, his dream of an independent Poland was finally realized. Poland once more was in the family of nations.

Having accomplished his purpose of establishing a unified and independent Poland and worn from his patriotic struggle, Paderewski retired from public life. He returned to the music he loved so well, and once more thrilled the world. In 1939, he made his last tour to America—his 20th. During this tour he suffered a heart attack which forced him to retire from music.

It was while he was in retirement in Switzerland that Germany and Russia dismembered Poland again. Once more Paderewski answered the call of his country in distress and accepted, on January 11, 1940, the Presidency of the exiled Polish National Council in France. In September of that same year, against the advice of his physician he returned to America to carry on his fight for his beloved country. He died on June 29, 1941, at the age of 80, still fighting to alleviate the sufferings of the Polish people.

Paderewski's body has temporarily been buried in the National Cemetery at Arlington. It is an honor indeed for Americans to guard the grave of this Polish musician, patriot, and statesman who won the admiration of not only his countrymen but also the lovers of freedom the world over. I pray, along with all Poles, that the day will not be too distant when Poland will be free again and Paderewski's body will be returned to his native soil which he loved and served so devotedly.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] for today be transferred to Thursday, July 5.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SIGN BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS DURING RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk may be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PEACETIME APPLICATION OF THE ATOM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill which was favorably reported today by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. As is our custom, a member of the joint committee from each body of the Congress is introducing simultaneously the same bill. This bill will provide for the acceleration of our civilian atomic power reactor program.

In 1954 the Congress passed a basic revision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. The objective, as stated at that time, by the proponents of the bill was to increase the peacetime application of the atom, and as part of that peacetime application it was hoped that private enterprize would initiate a vigorous program in the field of construction of atomic reactors for the purpose of producing electrical energy.

At that time I expressed my doubts that the technology of the industry had advanced to the point where private industry could or would accept the financial responsibility of developing successful economic power reactors. I stated, at that time, that the reactor technology was in its infancy; that a great deal of money would have to be expended before electrical energy could be produced by fission on an economical basis. I also stated that if we were to progress in

the art it would be necessary for the Government to expend public funds for some time to come. The evidence of the intervening years has proven my statements to be correct. Private industry has not been able to finance the investment which has been needed to do the experimental work necessary to attain the objective of economic kilowatts.

Our progress has been slow and faltering. I do not blame private industry altogether for this situation. Some blame could be attached to either their gullibility or their overenthusiasm, as expressed by various witnesses during our hearings on the 1954 act.

The fact remains that privately financed efforts have been completely inadequate and 2 years have been lost in the international race to produce economic electrical energy by fission.

Excuses which may be offered for past performances, or glittering promises of future action cannot, at this time, be seriously considered. Our main objective, at this time, is to promote a rapid development of atomic power reactors. It is my opinion today, as it was in 1954, that the Government must accept this responsibility or fall behind the Soviet Union and England in the race.

For these reasons and many others which I have not the time today to express, I have introduced a bill which authorizes and directs the Atomic Energy Commission to accelerate the atomic-power program by building large scale prototype power reactor demonstration facilities which are to be designed to demonstrate the practical value of the production of electric energy in industrial or commercial quantities.

These reactors are to be built at existing atomic-energy sites and the power used in Government atomic-energy facilities. This power will undoubtedly be intermittent in its delivery and will also undoubtedly still be above the present cost of conventional electrical energy now being used in these facilities. The public versus private power controversy will not be involved as power will not be offered for sale to nongovernmental distributing groups. The reactors will be built for the purpose of taking a necessary step toward our goal of producing economic power so as to hasten the day when electrical energy can be produced by the fission of the atom at a price which we hope will be as cheap or cheaper than the cost of conventional power today.

Mr. Speaker, I realize it is late in the second session of the 84th Congress, but I hope that this bill may be considered before the present Congress adjourns so that we may not be left behind in the race to achieve leadership in this very important field.

Economic power will, in my opinion, someday be produced. The question facing us today is will the United States, who first developed atomic energy, preserve its leadership in the peacetime application of atomic energy in the power field or shall we take second or third place to England or the Soviet Union.

H. R. 12061

A bill providing for a civilian atomic power acceleration program

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the Atomic Power Acceleration Amendment of 1956.

SEC. 2. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by redesignating chapter 19 as chapter 20, and inserting a new chapter 19 reading as follows:

"CHAPTER 19. Accelerated atomic power program

"SEC. 241. Purpose and policy:

a. It is the purpose of the United States and of this chapter:

(1) To encourage the continued development of atomic power technology and the advancement of the art through practical experience in the development and operation of prototype atomic powerplants;

(2) To achieve economic atomic power as rapidly as practicable;

(3) To advance the spirit of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and the atoms-for-peace plan.

b. (1) In order to carry out the purposes of this chapter, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to accelerate the civilian atomic power program and maintain leadership in atomic power technology by the construction of additional demonstration prototype reactors for domestic use and foreign applications at the maximum possible rate consistent with the status of the development of the art;

(2) The accelerated program authorized by this chapter shall be carried out under the provisions of section 31, and shall be supplementary to other reactor development programs and projects authorized under this act, including sections 31 and 104.

SEC. 242. In order to implement the policy established in section 241, the Commission is authorized and directed as follows:

a. Accelerated power reactor program:

(1) the Commission is hereby authorized and directed to proceed with the construction under contract, as soon as practicable, of large-scale prototype power reactor demonstration facilities designed to demonstrate the practical value of utilization facilities for the generation of electric energy in industrial or commercial quantities.

(2) The selection of design for such reactor facilities shall be made on the basis of a determination that development, construction, and operation of a facility so designed offers promise of making a contribution to the advance of the art and technology of the large-scale production of atomic power in the form of electricity in commercial or industrial quantities.

(3) The power reactor demonstration facilities authorized by this subsection shall be constructed at sites of major production facilities operated by or on behalf of the Commission, and the electric energy generated shall be used by the Commission in connection with the operation of such production facility.

b. Advanced design and development program:

(1) The Commission shall proceed with the development of reactor designs which involve, in concept and approach, significant and promising advances in reactor technology.

(2) As soon as practicable, consistent with the development of appropriate designs, the Commission is authorized and directed to proceed with the construction under contract of prototype power reactors utilizing such advanced concepts, such reactors to be capable of producing not to exceed 50,000 kilowatts of electricity.

c. Foreign atomic power assistance:

In order effectively to carry out the atoms-for-peace plan of the United States, the Commission shall have responsibility for the conduct of a vigorous program of international cooperation and assistance in the design, construction, and operation of power reactors and related matters. The planning and execution of such a program shall be undertaken as rapidly as practicable.

d. Supporting facilities:

The Commission is authorized to construct, own, and operate supporting facilities necessary in connection with projects initiated under subsections a, b, and c of this section.

e. Quarterly report:

The Commission shall report to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy quarterly beginning January 1, 1957, on the program under the acceleration program.

SEC. 3. Chapter 19 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is redesignated as chapter 20 and sections 241 and 251 of this act are redesignated respectively as sections 251 and 252, making appropriate amendment to the table of contents.

SEC. 4. Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) By striking the figure "$319,595,000" in section 101 thereof and inserting the figure "$719,595,000."

(b) By adding at the end of section 101 (c) thereof a new subsection reading:

"11. Project 57–c–11, civilian atomic power acceleration program, $400,000,000."

IS THE AMERICAN TEXTILE INDUSTRY EXPENDABLE?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ALEXANDER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Since 1945, we have spent nearly $55 billion in foreign aid.

Whether this vast outpouring of our resources has accomplished its intended result is debatable. Some say that, without these expenditures, communism would have taken over in France, Italy, and much of the rest of Europe and the world.

Others—and I am proud to include myself among them—believe that it is impossible to buy reliable friends and allies and keep them bought.

We do not believe that our Government should further dissipate the Nation's resources in impractical and impossible efforts to raise the living standards of vast segments of the world's ever-increasing population. We believe such ill-considered efforts are foredoomed to failure and will actually make more enemies than friends by raising false hopes.

However, the wisdom or unwisdom of foreign aid is not the issue here involved.

The issue—and I suggest that it is already of acute urgency—is whether, if we are to have a foreign aid program, it should be paid by all the taxpayers or whether certain industries are to be called upon to bear an extra and disproportionate share of the burden.

Up to now, we have never deliberately destroyed any important American industry in pursuit of our foreign aid policy. We have hurt some. We have put them deeply in debt and have taxed them at astronomically high levels.

But up to now, we have stopped short of throwing the American market wide open to the sort of foreign competition which now threatens a long list of our most vital industries.

The textile industry is a case in point.

In 1951, Japanese textile imports into this country aggregated only 744,000 yards.

By 1953, these imports had risen to 29,760,000 yards.

The 1954 figure was 47 million yards and 1955 imports more than doubled the imports of 1954, reaching a high last year of nearly 100 million yards.

And if we add to this the yardage brought into this country in the form of finished apparel, the total for 1955 was equivalent to more than 250 million yards.

Coming on to the current year, importations for January 1956 were more than 400 percent greater than for January 1955, while, on the basis of imports for January, February, and March, the first quarter, total imports for the year will run to roughly half a billion yards.

Nor is this all. The Japanese imports are not distributed evenly over the whole United States market. Instead, they are picking off certain segments or products of the industry and destroying them.

Thus the Japanese have already captured 70 percent of our velveteen market. In 1955 they shipped us 5,754,000 square yards. At that time the total production of velveteen was 7,308,000. This unexpected influx resulted in the closing of practically all the velveteen mills in the United States.

In the case of ginghams and blouses, the Japs have already taken over 30 percent of our market.

Thus the sinister pattern emerges: Pick off one segment or product at a time until they have the entire United States market, and the United States industry is destroyed.

How do they do this? Why cannot the American mills meet this competition?

The answer is simple.

Labor costs and raw-cotton costs account for 80 percent of the total cost of production.

The Japanese pay their textile mill labor 13 cents an hour as compared with an average of $1.35 in this country.

They buy their cotton—under our two-price system—at from 8 to 10 cents less per pound than our mills have to pay for it.

And as if this were not enough, they have a brand new, highly modern plant and equipment which we gave them. In other words, we handed them the knife with which to cut our throat.

The result?

United States mills have been forced to curtail production, shorten the workweek, and discharge temporarily or permanently 260,000 employees.

As one mill operator in South Carolina recently put it, "We have always been able to meet competition without tears. But we can't lick the State Department, the Secretary of Agriculture, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the Organization for Trade Cooperation, and the $64 billion give-away program while Congress twists our arm."

I repeat:

For the first time, key industries—industries vital to the national defense—are regarded by this administration as expendable—at least in substantial part.

For the first time, we have a policy which places the burden of foreign aid, not on the taxpayers generally, but on a selected group of industries which have been marked for the sacrifice.

And for the first time, we are deliberately and with full knowledge of the consequences importing unemployment and reducing the American standard of living.

What is being done to remedy the textile import problem?

Along with congressional leaders and others, I have personally appealed to the President and sought the assistance of the Secretary of State and Secretary of Agriculture to negotiate trade limitation agreements with Japan in an effort to establish import controls of textiles as authorized under the present law.

All of these efforts have been in vain.

An effort is being made in the Congress requiring the use of the emergency authority of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 to establish limitations on the imports of cotton textiles to a level not to exceed the past 5 years' average. This proposed legislation makes no fundamental changes in the prescribed procedure for the determination of the facts by the Tariff Commission. Neither does it limit the authority of the President to decide ultimately whether quantitative limitations should be imposed. It merely temporarily controls imports to keep an already serious situation from getting further out of hand and provides time to find a solution for this problem. I shall vigorously support this proposed legislation.

POLICY ON GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS TO INDUSTRIES IN TARGET AREAS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress from the city of Detroit and the State of Michigan, I was appalled to read in today's newspaper a statement by Mr. Victor Roterus, Director of the Office of Area Development, that no Government contracts would be given to new industries locating within some 50 cities which are prime atom and hydrogen bomb targets. According to him, defense contracts would be withheld from new industries establishing themselves as far as 25 or 30 miles from such areas.

According to reporters present, Mr. Roterus extended the policy to include withholding of fast tax writeoffs, and Government financing, of such new facilities, as well as other Government stimuli to new industry.

Now let us analyze this situation. Each of the fifty-odd cities affected is told that no new defense industry can move into their area, because if it be so foolish as to build there, no Government defense work will be given.

And, I repeat this, new business cannot come into areas where it knows that Government contracts will not be given.

In effect, these areas are absolutely precluded from participation in new business with the largest single customer in the world.

Now who is affected? Mr. Roterus mentions Washington, D. C., and Baltimore. Certainly included are New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and my own city of Detroit. Each of the Members of this House can determine whether the fifty-odd cities alluded to by the Director of Area Development is or is not included in such a blanket withholding of new business and new contracts.

Now, let us look at the effect on my own area of Detroit. Michigan has now 220,000 unemployed, of whom 138,000 reside in the Detroit area. Percentage-wise 7.8 percent of the work force in the Michigan area are out of work, and 9.1 percent are unemployed in Detroit.

These figures which I have cited do not mention the great number of people who are working 1 or 2 days a week, or less, who are not technically unemployed, but have almost the same hardship. Further, they are based upon those drawing unemployment compensation, and do not make allowance for those who are not covered by unemployment compensation, and for whom no statistics are readily available. These people are coldly told no possibility of new defense work is open to them.

The Government has gone so far as to declare that the Detroit area is one of substantial labor surplus, and is channeling certain extra defense contracts into the area, and offering certain other helps to our economy. And now this blow to our people.

I have taken the matter up with the Secretary of Commerce, asking for an explanation and for revocation of the statement.

If we have all the peace and prosperity which the administration would have us believe in their blatant campaign announcements such a policy is not necessary. If we are so close to war as to justify such a proposal, the people must be informed of it.

I hope my colleagues will join me in attempting to put a stop to such a ruthless policy of discrimination against our large cities, unless the need be desperate.

While I have no quarrel with dispersal of industry, it must not where necessary to defense be done in so sudden a way as this unless danger of war is imminent, particularly in view of the hardship to millions which will certainly follow.

To summarize my position, Mr. Speaker, I demand that the administration revoke the statement, and that the policy to which it alludes be revoked so as not to cause further hardship in areas like Detroit and other large cities.

NARCOTIC CONTROL ACT OF 1956

Mr. BOGGS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 11619) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Narcotics Drugs Import and Export Act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs and marihuana and for other purposes.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DINGELL, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. MASON (at the request of Mr. McCONNELL), for 5 minutes, on Monday, July 2.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole, and to include certain quotations and extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE.

Mr. METCALF, the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole, and to include three newspaper articles, and a memorandum of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska (at the request of Mr. McCONNELL).

Mr. CRAMER (at the request of Mr. McCONNELL).

Mr. KRUEGER (at the request of Mr. McCONNELL) and to include an article.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), his remarks today in Committee of the Whole and to include certain tables and extraneous matter.

Mr. DODD.

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. EBERHARTER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MOSS.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7763. An act to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determination of the claims, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9852. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9952. An act to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty; and

H. R. 10986. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7763. An act to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determination of the claims, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9852. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10872. An act to provide for extension of the time during which annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims validated under section 2 of the Act of August 11, 1955 may be made, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 2, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2019. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill relating to the retirement of members of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2020. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with Edgar G. Wellman, doing business as Wellman Enterprises, which, when executed by the Superintendent, Glacier National Park, Mont., will authorize him to operate a saddle and pack horse transportation service in Glacier National Park for a period of 5 years from January 1, 1956, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2021. A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

2022. A letter from the Presidential Adviser on Personnel Management, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to consolidate and revise certain provisions of law relating to additional compensation of civilian employees of the Federal Government stationed in foreign areas and to facilitate recruitment, reduce turnover, and compensate for extra costs and hardships due to overseas assignments"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2023. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to encourage the extension and improvement of voluntary health prepayment plans or policies"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2024. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes,' approved April 29, 1942"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2025. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MACK of Illinois: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8902. A bill to amend subsection 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2530). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRICE: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H. R. 12050. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2531). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 9904. A bill to provide vocational training for adult Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 2532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 11449. A bill to amend section 69 of the Hawaiian Organic Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 11696. A bill to authorize the conveyance of homestead allotments to Indians, Aleuts, or Eskimos in Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 2534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 11787. A bill to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2535). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 609. A bill to amend the Federal Import Milk Act, approved February 15, 1927 (44 Stat. 1101, 21 U. S. C. Annotated, 141–149); with amendment (Rept. No. 2536). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. S. 2092. An act transferring to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army the bridge across the Missouri River between the Fort Leavenworth military reservation in Kansas and Platte County, Mo., and authorizing its removal; without amendment Rept. No. 2538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1135. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes"; with amendment (Rept. No. 2539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1456. An act to amend sections 212, 219 (a), 221 (a), and 410 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2540). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9419. A bill to authorize the disposal of the U. S. S. *Hartford*, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2541). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4719. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 11811. A bill to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment and underemployment in depressed industrial and rural areas; with amendment (Rept. No. 2543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 11861. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; without amendment (Rept. No. 2544). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant, Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 613. Joint resolution to authorize the vessel operations revolving fund of the Department of Commerce to be used for expenses in connection with the chartering of merchant ships under jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 2545). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOGGS: Committee of conference. H. R. 11619. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2546). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. KING of California: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 10269. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place metallurgical grade alumina on the free list; with amendment (Rept. No. 2547). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 449. An act for the relief of George Pantelas; without amendment (Rept. No. 2537). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 12050. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 12051. A bill to authorize the erection of a memorial in the Badlands National Monument in honor of Peter Norbeck, Paul E. Bellamy, Sr., and Ben Millard; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 12052. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to allow credit for certain service rendered States or instrumentalities thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 12053. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 12054. A bill to establish a system for the classification and compensation of scientific and professional positions in the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 12055. A bill to establish a system for the classification and compensation of scientific and professional positions in the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 12056. A bill relating to the amount deductible for income-tax purposes in the case of losses of commercial fruit and nut trees in a major disaster; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 12057. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands in Shiloh National Military Park to the State of Tennessee for the relocation of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 12058. A bill to amend section 403 of title IV of the National Housing Act affecting insurance of savings and loan accounts and to amend section 5 (i) of Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, affecting Federal savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 12059. A bill to determine the rights and interests of the Navaho Tribe, Hopi Tribe, and individual Indians to the area set aside by the Executive order of December 6, 1882, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 12060. A bill to provide for decorative art in Federal buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 12061. A bill providing for a civilian atomic power acceleration program; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 12062. A bill to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 12063. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the misuse by collecting agencies of names, emblems, and insignia to indicate Federal agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 12064. A bill to increase the rates of disability and death compensation and additional allowances for dependents payable to veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 12065. A bill to amend the law in force with respect to the display and use of the flag of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

H. J. Res. 668. Joint resolution to urge the creation of an International Juridical Commission within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in order to document the crimes against humanity committed by the international Communist conspiracy and to reduce the dangers of world war III; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. J. Res. 669. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the further protection of certain basic rights of citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. J. Res. 670. Joint resolution to authorize participation by the United States in the 1959 Pan-American games to be held in Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 259. Concurrent resolution providing for the drafting of legislation for combat pay and recognizing the importance of the frontline fighting forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. Con. Res. 260. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 232, 84th Congress, entitled "The Capitol in Story and Pictures"; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 12066. A bill for the relief of John M. Dean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 12067. A bill for the relief of Chong Gee Yueng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 12068. A bill for the relief of Irmgard Glancy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 12069. A bill for the relief of Peter Nyktas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 12070. A bill for the relief of Hideo Ono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 12071. A bill for the relief of Elise Delree; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 12072. A bill for the relief of Raffaele D'Auria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 12073. A bill for the relief of William C. Brady and Joyce Brady; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1172. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of Mary M. Eldridge, legislative director of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rhode Island, Inc., and 69 others from Rhode Island, urging enactment of legislation to remove alcoholic-beverage advertising from the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1173. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. Christian Arnesen and 15 other citizens of Clackamas County, Oreg., urging the passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1174. Also, petition of Mrs. Ralph Nordlund and 56 other citizens of Washington County, Oreg., urging the passage of legisla-

tion to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1175. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of Mrs. Cecile Kennedy, president of Evergreen WCTU, Sanilac County, Mich., residing in Cass City, Mich., and 32 others, of Cass City and Decker, Mich., in favor of S. 923 and H. R. 4627, bills to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1176. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman, Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, New York, N. Y., requesting that Dr. Clark Foreman, director of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, not be cited for contempt by the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Capt. Chester McPherson Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege, as a result of my affiliation with the United States Coast Guard, to have become acquainted with one of its unsung heroes.

Capt. Chester M. Anderson retires from the United States Coast Guard service tomorrow, June 30, 1956, after 32 years of loyal, efficient, and distinguished service.

Captain Anderson was born in Seattle, Wash., in 1894. He received his primary education in that city's schools and later attended the DeKoven Military School and the Navigation School of the University of Washington.

During World War I he served on active duty as a lieutenant, junior grade, with the United States Naval Reserve. He entered that service in October 1918 and was honorably discharged therefrom in September 1921. He continued to follow the sea until 1924 when he was commissioned as an ensign in the United States Coast Guard.

During World War II he was the commanding officer of the cutter *Algonquin*, assigned to the North Atlantic. His fine service is only partly recognized by the awards from our Government to him which consist of, among others, the Navy Commendation Ribbon for convoy escort operations in the North Atlantic during World War II, the American Defense Service Ribbon with Sea Clasp, the American Area Ribbon, the European-African-Middle Eastern Area Ribbon, the Asiastic-Pacific Ribbon, and the World War I and World War II Victory Medals.

During the last 4 years he has served as Director of the United States Coast Guard Auxiliary where he has done an exceptionally outstanding job. He systematized their procedures, he minimized and standardized the forms they use, he assisted with their new manuals, encouraged the enrollment of new men, and aided considerably in increasing the present roster of the northern area to well over 2,000 men and women.

He is loved and respected by all, particularly because of the way he extended himself beyond the call of regular duty.

I know that every Auxiliarist joins me in saluting him and wishing him well in all that he undertakes in the years ahead.

The 15th Anniversary of the Death of Ignace Jan Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, June 30, will mark the 15th anniversary of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski, Polish composer and pianist, statesman and a foremost champion of freedom and democratic ideals. This is a most appropriate occasion to remember not only the profound works of the immortal Paderewski, but also to extend our sympathy to the millions of Polish-Americans in the United States and the Poles throughout the world who have been persecuted for their belief in the same ideals for which Paderewski fought so hard.

Paderewski was born in Poland in the year 1860, and at a very early age made manifest his great talents in music. As he continued his career as an artist and composer, he received increasing acclaim throughout the world, and in 1891 made his first American appearance at a recital in New York City. This, of course, was only the beginning of a career in this country that was to bring him closer to the heart of every American.

But Paderewski's contributions in the field of music were not his only ones—not by any means. He received innumerable honors for his statesmanship and to thousands of people he is still a symbol of liberty. It is significant to note in this centennial year of the birth of Woodrow Wilson that it was largely due to Paderewski that the 13th of Wilson's Fourteen Points was devoted to the restoration of a free and independent Poland. After the people of Poland asserted their independence according to the principle of national self-determination, Paderewski was the first Premier of the Polish Republic in 1919.

We all remember with sadness that the freedom gained by Poland after the First World War was short lived and the land of Poland was again taken over by a totalitarian aggressor. But the independent spirit of the Poles still prevails today and I am sure that none of the Polish people will ever forget the last words of Paderewski, which were "Poland will rise again."

This could not be manifest more clearly than by the protest of the Polish workers yesterday against the dominating rule of the Communists when thousands of Polish workers revolted against their undemocratic rulers.

Amend Section 165 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend section 165 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the amount deductible for income tax purposes in the case of losses of commercial fruit and nut trees in a major disaster.

As a direct result of widespread floods in December 1955 and January 1956 in northern California and elsewhere in the Nation, hundreds of commercial fruit and nut growers were virtually rendered destitute by the destruction of their fruit and nut trees.

The problem of the orchardist who suffers a loss to his trees is more serious than that of the farmer losing a crop as a result of flood. The orchardist who loses his trees must wait a minimum of 4 or 5 years in order to grow new ones during which time his source of income is destroyed; the farmer may produce a bumper crop in the next growing season.

The method of planting orchards, and growing and cultivating the trees does not lend itself to a practical solution of capitalizing costs, as the Bureau of Internal Revenue terms it. Most nut or fruit growers are single operators. Orchards are planted periodically in small blocks, with the grower doing his own work, and naturally there are very few costs to capitalize even if it were practical to do so. For this simple but cogent reason, it is far more equitable and sound to measure the grower's loss by fair market values, rather than by the Bureau of Internal Revenue's "cost approach" method.

In other words, the fair market approach measures the real loss suffered. Current provisions of the Revenue Code are such that with this real loss provided, the grower could get some relief of his taxes when it is most sorely needed.

As things are today, we have the paradoxical situation of growers being completely wiped out of homes, and livelihoods, although still faced with a staggering tax burden. This situation cries out for remedy in major flood disaster areas of the Nation.

Foreign Aid Does Not Pay Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO KRUEGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, while the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee proceeds to restore the foreign aid funds cut by the House, there is a growing feeling over the Nation that we should tighten up on this aid to the whole world. If this sentiment thrives there may be trouble when the appropriation bill for this so-called mutual security comes up.

It is likely that the Senate will follow the recommendation of the committee and restore $715 million of the $1.1 billion cut that the House made when that body considered the mutual security authorization. The Senate has always been rather generous where the State Department was concerned.

There has been no change in the foreign aid situation. It looks like the same silly business that we have indulged in for years, this attempt to buy friends. We look ridiculous when we have to be so careful how we beg some of these nations to accept our cash. They will take our money and then tell us that we should drop all barriers against Red China and recognize the international outlaws that still hold our citizens as prisoners.

This is the type of cooperation that our billions have bought. The American taxpayer is asked to dig up more billions to continue the deal. In the House last week, before passing it, we debated and argued on a pension bill for our veterans. The costs of the measure were brought up time and again, and there were some touching words about the expense that the country would have to face.

We should spend what is proper to care for those veterans who suffer from service-connected disability, or those veterans who are past their productive years. If we have so much money that we can spend it overseas, I would like to cut that out and put some of it into circulation here at home. Certainly our veterans should merit as much consideration as Tito or Nehru.

These spending plans, once they are started, never seem to end. Back in 1945 we were to have the Marshall plan in operation for 4½ years and it was to cost only $11 billion. We still have the foreign aid going in 1956, and the authorizations from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1957, if the Senate committee figures are retained, will amount to $72,154,816,750.

We are told that this is smart spending; that it has halted the spread of communism. From 1945, when this program began, Soviet Russia has brought 5 million square miles of territory under its control, and more than 700 million free people suffer oppression and slavery that come with the Red flag. I would say that such a program has failed dismally. The idea sounded good, but it did not make friends. You have to earn their respect and cooperation.

We know that these billions have not checked communism. Congress cannot find out how the money is being spent. We are told much of it goes for military purposes and that is a secret. The General Accounting Office is supposed to be the watchdog, but it makes little progress in running down the way the money goes. GAO says that the foreign-aid program suffers from "poor planning, lack of accountability, poor coordination, overestimating the capabilities of recipient countries, and overambitious programing."

If it should come to pass that Congress would refuse to appropriate the money which has been authorized for this year, the foreign aid could go rolling right along for quite a while with the money still on hand. The request was for $4.9 billion for this year. During the recent debate on the bill, Congress did find out that there was $6.8 billion still on hand. This was money that had been appropriated and was not spent. The spenders got the money faster than the countries could spend it.

Many people seem concerned about the growing idea that our Government can provide money for all of us in any circumstance or any condition; that all we have to do is ask for it. When we review the billions that have been spent abroad on these questionable programs, then I cannot see how anyone can take issue with Government spending here at home.

Spirit of Independence Inspired by Paderewski Burns Anew in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the 15th anniversary of the death of the great Polish patriot, Ignace Jan Paderewski—so well known in America that we considered him one of us—it is encouraging and gratitfying to witness the rekindling of the fire of liberty and freedom so well fed by him through his lifetime.

The inspiration Paderewski gave the Polish people is still nurtured in their hearts and the smoldering embers of their national patriotism today are bursting into full flame—threatening to engulf the Communist tyrants who have enslaved their Christian land for the past decade. In these efforts the Polish people have the sincere support of the entire free world. Here in the United States the prayers of millions are with them in their struggle.

Paderewski, world-renowned composer and pianist, became the first Premier of the Polish Republic in 1919 after the people of Poland asserted their independence according to the principle of national self-determination embodied in the famous Fourteen Points promulgated by President Woodrow Wilson. It was most fitting that this new blow for liberty being struck by Polish patriots should come on the 15th anniversary of Paderewski's death.

Jan Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, today, June 29, is the 15th anniversary of the death of one of the world's truly great figures—Jan Paderewski, statesman, musician, and patriot. It is also the centennial year of the birth of Woodrow Wilson, who did so much to further the cause of a free Poland. The lives of these two leaders touched at many points; both were passionate advocates of the principle of national self-determination, and both dedicated their lives to their respective countries.

It is ironic to read in today's headlines of the revolt against Red troops in the Polish city of Poznan. For it was in this historic city that Jan Paderewski dedicated a statue to Woodrow Wilson after the end of World War I. Paderewski wished to commemorate America's friendship to the new Polish Republic by honoring our wartime President. Perhaps this one incident illustrates the difference between the United States and the Soviet Union. The Poles honor a statue of one of American's greatest leaders in Poznan, while for Communist Russia they have nothing but hatred and armed resistance to her troops.

It has been said that all humanity pays tribute to genius, and the genius of Jan Paderewski brought esthetic pleasure to millions. But his career has an even greater significance. He was an outstanding leader in world affairs, and an articulate spokesman for his homeland.

Paderewski was born in the Province of Podolia, then a part of Czarist Russia, in 1860. From relatively obscure origin, he rose to become the Premier of Poland and an almost legendary figure in the world of music. Paderewski's father played an important role in the uprising against Russia in 1863. For his struggle against Russian tyranny the elder Paderewski was banished to Siberia when his son was less than 3 years old. The great musician probably inherited his lifelong hatred of oppression from his father, who was an active leader in the cause of liberty.

Jan Paderewski was a man of deep and sincere humility. On his 75th birthday, in 1935, he asked the people of Poland not to be "bothered" to commemorate the occasion, but nevertheless hundreds of thousands of people throughout the world sent their grateful thoughts to him, even if they were not always recorded. For this man had contributed not only his talent, but his fortune, to the cause of freedom. It was his lifelong wish to see a free and happy Poland before he died.

The signing of the armistice after the First World War gave Paderewski the

opportunity to return to his homeland. Czarist Russia had fallen, Germany defeated, and all Europe was in a state of chaos. The time had come to press Poland's claim to freedom from foreign domination. On June 26, 1919, Paderewski accepted the task of forming a coalition government, in which he held the dual posts of Premier and Foreign Minister. His genius as a statesman became apparent when, with freedom in sight, Poland was torn with internal strife. There were numerous factions, each fighting for political control of Poland, and it was his duty to bring a measure of peace to his homeland.

Paderewski became a world figure at the Versailles Peace Conference, where he ably represented his country. He argued for Polish territorial claims on the basis of the principles set forth in President Wilson's Fourteen Points. The result of his negotiations was the establishment of the Polish Corridor, with Danzig as a free city of Europe. Paderewski obtained German and Austrian recognition of the new Poland and achieved a friendly relationship with Czechoslovakia, Latvia, and other European nations born of the war. Paderewski eventually resigned as Premier of Poland and came to the United States, where he began a series of concerts that added to his world fame.

Paderewski's generosity, almost to the point of folly, has become well known throughout the world. He gave vast sums of money to help relieve the suffering of the people of Europe during World War I, and turned over his great estate on Lake Geneva, in Switzerland, to victims of the war. It has been said that before leaving Europe for the United States in 1930, he had given away most of his fortune. The true extent of his generosity, both in spirit and money, will never be known.

Americans, and indeed all the people of the free world, will never forget the contribution to the cause of freedom made by this musician, patriot and statesman. The prayers of millions for world peace will someday be realized, largely because of the groundwork laid by such giants as Jan Paderewski.

A Tribute to Ignace Jan Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, 15 years have passed since the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski and nearly 100 since his birth. Each year his contribution to mankind's welfare shines more brilliantly in the pages of history.

It is appropriate to recall that this year also is the centennial of the birth of another great champion of human liberty, Woodrow Wilson. Wilson and Paderewski worked together in the common effort for the self-determination and independence of Poland which was achieved after the First World War.

The 20 years of Polish freedom—from 1919 to 1939—were glorious ones. Paderewski was the first Premier of the Polish Republic and his name is inextricably tied to the cause of Polish liberty.

Providence is rarely as generous in her endowments as with Ignace Jan Paderewski. He would have won immortal fame as a composer and artist alone. But linked with his brilliant musical achievements was his dedication to a free Poland. When he died on June 29, 1941, he left a record from which all Poles and all Americans of whatever national origin will find inspiration for generations to come.

Fifteenth Anniversary of Death of Ignace Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, June 29, 1956, is the 15th anniversary of the death of Ignace Paderewski, the internationally renowned Polish composer, pianist, and patriot who in 1919 became the first Premier of the Polish Republic.

A great portion of the credit for the formation of that Republic has to be attributed to the efforts of Paderewski. Although he had already won world fame with his incomparable piano concerts, this Polish patriot considered the freedom and independence of Poland more important than his musical career. Early in life he said, "The vision of a strong and independent Poland has always been the lodestar of my existence. Its realization is still the great aim of my life."

No one was more aware than Paderewski that the establishment of an independent Poland would be a difficult task. Poland had been partitioned for nearly 150 years by her aggressive neighbors Austria, Prussia, and Russia. There seemed to be little chance that the Polish people could ever be united. However, the outbreak of World War I was to give them that chance.

Paderewski quickly took advantage of this opportunity that arose during the war. He came to the United States to arouse the sympathy of the American people for Polish freedom. He had previously in concert tours in this country won their hearts with his peerless music; he now came to open their hearts for the Polish people in their struggle for independence. In a short period of time he accomplished much. He was successful, through a series of lecture and concert tours, in raising funds for his war-ravaged homeland; he was instrumental in the recruitment of Polish-American volunteers to serve in the Polish Army already fighting with the Allies in Europe—and perhaps his greatest achievement—he obtained the sympathy of President Wilson for the Polish cause.

President Wilson was always a stanch supporter of the rights of small nations. Through Colonel House, a close friend of Paderewski, consultations were arranged in which this champion of Polish freedom expressed to the President his pleas for his beloved homeland. These meetings formed the foundation upon which the Polish Republic was to be constructed at the Paris Peace Conference. President Wilson was impressed with the devotion of Paderewski to this cause, and assured him that he was confident that one day Poland would be free and united. The famous Fourteen Points that were published soon after these conversations and in which the Chief Executive stated that an independent Poland should be erected, was tangible evidence that Paderewski had succeeded in gaining the support of President Wilson. Paderewski's vision of an independent Poland was almost realized.

This dream became a reality at the Paris Peace Conference. After the war Paderewski returned to Poland and succeeded in uniting the various political factions and in forming a coalition government so that a unified country could formulate plans for the legalization of Polish freedom at Paris. He became premier of the new government and was chosen as chief delegate to the Conference. At Paris he took an active part in the delimitation of Poland's frontiers along much the same borders as discussed with President Wilson during the war. Finally, Paderewski's supreme confidence in a resurrected Poland became an established fact when he signed the Versailles Treaty.

Paderewski had contributed his time, energy, talents, and resources to aid in the establishment of the Polish Republic. Having accomplished the chief aim of his life, in 1921 he retired from public life and returned to his music. In 1939 ill health forced him to abandon his piano concerts.

It was while he was in retirement in Switzerland that his beloved country was once more invaded by Russia and Germany. Quickly, this heroic Polish patriot emerged from his retirement and although aged and fatigued he returned to America to solicit aid for his subjugated country. On January 11, 1940, he accepted the presidency of the exiled Polish Parliament in France.

He died on June 29, 1941, fighting to his last breath for the freedom of his native land.

I would like to take this opportunity on the anniversary of Paderewski's death to again express my concern for Poland and all other enslaved nations which are suffering under Communist tyranny. I am confident that the Polish desire for freedom expressed so nobly by her patriot Paderewski will never be extinguished despite the brutality of the Soviets. May the memory of Paderewski serve to encourage the Poles who are today oppressed by the ruthless Kremlin.

Record of Hon. A. L. Miller on Public Power and Reclamation: The Truth of the Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a misstatement, if repeated often enough and by persons in authoritative positions, can inevitably acquire the appearance of fact. How many times have we heard the remark "It must be true, so and so said it and he ought to know"; "it must be true, I read it in the paper."

Misappropriations of the truth can come about quite innocently, or false impressions can be created deliberately. In either case, it becomes necessary to set the record straight, and I feel this compulsion now with respect to my record in Congress as it applies to Federal power projects.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], Chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, by his May 22, 1956, attack upon my voting record and my motives, precipitated a campaign that has been taken up by segments of the New Deal press and Federal power zealots throughout the country. The fact that his intemperate remarks had no foundation in truth does not lessen the vigor of battle, and I suspect that his remark that "Doc MILLER would not vote for the second coming of Christ" may have brought smiles to the faces of the few who follow his line.

There is truth in his statement that I am interested in power and reclamation development for Nebraska. I want my State to progress. I have authored legislation that created the Ainsworth project, the Sargent project, the Farwell project, the Mirage Flats project, the Lavaca Flats, O'Neill and Mirage Flats extension units; I have actively supported the Salt-Wahoo, the Frenchman-Cambridge, the Bostwick, and other irrigation and flood control developments in our State. I have also supported projects adjacent to Nebraska that have enhanced the growth of irrigation and electrical power for the people of these neighboring States as well as my own, such as Kendrick, Alcova and Glendo in Wyoming, and all of the outstanding projects in the seven-State Missouri River Basin.

During the 14 years I have been a Member of Congress I have supported at least 371 reclamation, hydroelectric, and flood-control projects that have passed the House. These acts authorized construction of works throughout the United States; the Chief Joseph project in Washington, Trinity, Ventura, and the Central Valley in California, the Washita in Oklahoma, Weber Basin in Utah, and the upper Colorado. I have voted for steam plants in the Tennessee Valley Authority, irrigation and power in Bonneville, dams and transmission facilities in the Southwestern Power Authority, and many others. My interest is not confined to Nebraska alone. Quite obviously, it is nationwide.

In 1952, President Truman declared a moratorium on new reclamation and power projects starts and when this order went into effect, I addressed the House as follows:

> It comes to my attention that no new starts have been before the Congress and the administration for some time; and if this program continues, the present irrigation projects will have been finished and we will be without a new start for irrigation. I earnestly hope that the policy of the Government and the Committee on Appropriations will be changed so that we can proceed with the orderly development of feasible irrigation and electric-power projects.

This, you will recall, was a Democratic administration and a Democratic Congress.

In 1955, it was my amendment, offered on the floor of the House, that increased the appropriations bill $32 million so there would be money for 8 new irrigation and power projects that had been deleted by the Democrat-controlled House Appropriations Committee.

Now, if my critics who have branded me as being anti-public-power had examined the record I am sure they honestly could not have issued these statements. I have supported the REA's and the rural telephone in Nebraska, and in the Nation at large.

At the same time, I have been concerned about economy in Government, and it was for this reason that I voted, with the majority of the Democratic 82d Congress, to trim the appropriations for power and reclamation projects for 1 year when we were experiencing adverse fortunes in the Korean war. The Government's current operating budget at that time was in the red by $14 billion, and the 5-percent cut I supported was certainly in order. The Democratic Party, described by some as the patron saint of public power, must not have felt that this action was intended to destroy public power because the majority vote was with the Nebraska delegation.

In recent days I have been told that I cannot qualify as a public-power supporter because I did not vote to build a high Federal dam in Hells Canyon when this bill was before the House Interior Committee. However, the issue is not that simple. It can be understood by a sketch of the factual background of this legislation. The Hells Canyon bill has been introduced in at least four different Congresses—the Democratic 81st, the Democratic 82d, the Republican 83d, and the Democratic 84th. In 1950 it died silently in the Senate. On June 18, 1952, it was killed by unanimous vote in the House Interior Committee, when the Democratic members controlled the committee by a 15-to-13 majority. It was again introduced and referred to the committee of which I was chairman in the 83d Congress, but the sponsor of the bill did not request a hearing, and no attempt was made to press the bill forward. When Hells Canyon legislation was before the subcommittee of the House Interior Committee last year the Democrats walked out of the committee room to defeat a quorum call on a motion to indefinitely postpone action on the bill; but they did not again bring up the bill until Paul Butler, chairman of their national committee, ordered that it be done because of its importance to the reelection of the senior Member of the other body from Oregon, and Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, from the same State.

This, considered together with the fact that Idaho Power Co.'s three-dam proposal will cost less than half and produce 98 percent as much power as the Federal high dam, makes it obvious that the Hells Canyon issue is intensely political and nothing more.

I am sure that you, in fair-mindedness, will understand that there are two sides to this looking-glass. I could easily accuse Mr. KIRWAN of being against public power, because he admittedly killed the Fort Randall-Grand Island 230-kilovolt line. No better opportunity to prove his advocacy of public power could be presented to him, and the excuse he made to explain his opposition was indeed flimsy.

It is my hope that these decisions will be considered in the light of the welfare of our country, with intellectual honesty, and in the spirit of fairness toward the people upon whom these responsibilities rest.

Ignace Jan Paderewski—The 15th Anniversary of the Death of Ignace Jan Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the 15th anniversary of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski, famed Polish musician, humanitarian, and statesman. Paderewski certainly deserves the laudation being accorded him for his untiring efforts and devotion to duty in helping restore the integrity and liberty of the great nation of Poland. Poland, long torn apart by internal insurrections and by external aggression of powerful neighbors, was given a new chance for national survival largely by the courage and energy of this one man, Ignace Jan Paderewski. He felt that an independent Poland, which had once played a major role in central Europe, was still needed there. Paderewski himself said:

> The need of Poland is an integral part of the need of the world. Totalitarianism must be defeated and liberty and self-government restored. Until that is accomplished the rest is idle talk.

The history of Poland is familiar to us all. This history, often one of national frustration, defeat, and international strife, also has had many glorious chapters. The greatest opportunity, however, for Polish patriots to realize the restoration of Poland as an independent country came with World War I.

Many Poles carried their dream for national revival to various parts of the world. Ignace Paderewski was chosen to go to America for this purpose. The reason for choosing him doubtless was that he was better known in the United States—through his musical career—than any other Pole, and he could speak and write English. The selection was a good one, too, for he not only won the sympathy of the American people but also that of President Woodrow Wilson. When Woodrow Wilson went before Congress to deliver his annual message, he mentioned Poland and stressed it should be independent, united, and autonomous. Twelve months later he listed an independent Poland as the thirteenth point of his famous Fourteen Points. The creation of a free and united Poland by the World War I statesmen at Paris was largely due to the great prophet for the movement of Polish freedom, Ignace Paderewski.

The commemoration of the death of Paderewski this year coincidentally comes during the centenary celebration of the birth of Woodrow Wilson. These two men, more than many others of the past generation, held fast to a vision of the kind of healthy international atmosphere, based on faith in justice, righteousness, belief in the common cause of liberty and democracy, that would make the world a better place in which to live. We of this generation could do no better than to follow in the course they laid out.

Remarks on H. R. 12022, A Bill To Provide Relief for the Sponge-Fishing Industry by Making Special Nonquota Immigrant Visas Available to Certain Skilled Alien Spongedivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. I yesterday introduced H. R. 12022, being a bill for providing relief for the sponge-fishing industry by making special nonquota immigrant visas available to certain skilled alien spongedivers.

At Tarpon Springs on the west coast of Florida is located the only sponge-fishing community and industry in the United States. This community was established in 1905 when the Greeks brought to Tarpon Springs the first sponge boat equipped for sponge diving with a completely Greek crew. Prior to that date sponge fishing was entirely dependent upon "sponge hooking" or fishing from the surface with various size poles to bring the sponges from the bottom. Currently, sponge fishing is conducted in the beds off the Florida coast in maximum depths up to 26 and 27 fathoms. The industry continued to prosper until during the Second World War. Tarpon Springs provided 65 percent of the sponges, valued in millions of dollars used by our military forces and allies. The sponge-fishing community near the end of the war numbered hundreds of active Greek-American sponge fishermen, and at least 200 vessels were manned and active. For one-half century the sponge industry constituted and kept open the economic life of the large Greek-American community of Tarpon Springs, Fla. As a community it is one of the outstanding Greek centers of the United States with a record of self-sustenance and great pride in all civic matters.

Approximately 8 years ago a mysterious disease struck at and ruined the entire sponge-fishing grounds on the gulf coast, limiting the source of supply of what was generally stated to be the world's finest sponges. Many of the young descendants of those Greek fishing founders and those capable of working in the industry left for opportunities in the north. Frankly, there was much suffering in the community because of the loss of its one great source of income. I am proud to point out, however, that this Greek community has taken care of its own, and has fought through the years to provide a living for its people.

The sponge fields today have been by nature ridded of the blight and restored to their full productive ability. During the past year we have been successful in efforts with the Department of Interior, Bureau of Wildlife and Fisheries, Florida State University, University of Miami, Small Business Administration, Department of Commerce, and other Government agencies in organizing through the Sponge Industrial Committee of Tarpon Springs, Florida, a research of the potential of the industry and its rightful participation in the commercial market of the country. This has been a point of great effort on the part of the many individuals, organizations, and agencies.

In the further redevelopment of the industry an impasse has been reached through lack of experienced and capable spongedivers, skilled in the art of gathering this most useful and vital product of the sea. In Tarpon Springs there are ready and outfitted sponge-fishing boats only awaiting skilled divers to put out for the sponge beds. Through the Florida State Employment Service determination has been made that nowhere in the United States are these skilled craftsmen available. Sponge diving is an extremely skilled industry, one in which the Greeks have excelled for generations.

I have just introduced a bill, H. R. 12022, which would permit the entry into the United States of 50 skilled spongedivers for the relief of this industry, and to be employed therein; the same to be granted entrance to this country under this special bill not to be charged against the quota of the country from which they will come. It is anticipated these divers will come as Greek nationals for it is well known that the best sponge fishermen in the world are from the Dodecanese Islands of Greece, and particularly from the islands of Kalymnos, Halki, and Symi, where, from ancient times, sponge fishing has been the principal means of livelihood of these people. It is appropriate that such immigration should be permitted from these particular areas, because 90 percent of the original Greek population of Tarpon Springs originated from these same islands and these emigrees would find themselves among their friends and relatives. I would quote from a letter addressed to me by Archbishop Michael of the Greek Orthodox Church in North and South America in which he urged such action in the economic relief of Tarpon Springs, saying:

> Granting permission to this type of highly specialized labor will certainly be a credit to the industry and will not be a burden to the community, but rather will safeguard an industry that has contributed much economically to Tarpon Springs, to the State, and to our country as a whole.

Under the present immigration quotas and preferences established, this favorable action upon my bill is the only means available to save the economic life of one of America's most unique and proud communities.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives it is my intent to vigorously bring this matter to the attention of the committee seeking favorable report to the House of Represenatives during this session of Congress, or otherwise to seek passage of this needed legislation.

Ignace Jan Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, June 29, 1956, marks the 15th anniversary of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski.

The world of culture knows him as a renowned composer and pianist. Freedom-loving people everywhere remember him as the first Premier of the Polish Republic. It was in 1919 that he was elevated to that post by the people of Poland, after they asserted their independence in accordance with the principles of national self-determination as contained in the famous Fourteen Points of President Woodrow Wilson.

Paderewski was born in 1860 in a Polish province which was then under the domination of Russia. Much of his love of freedom was instilled in him by his father, who was imprisoned in Siberia.

Having attained world success in terms of both fame and money, he could easily have turned to an easy way of life. Instead, he returned to his homeland and his people where he devoted himself to furthering the true concepts of democratic freedom.

We hope some day to see the spirit of Paderewski revived not only in enslaved Poland but in every part of the world where liberty is presently suppressed.